

# Predicate and relation liftings for coalgebras with side effects: an application in coalgebraic modal logic

Harsh Beohar<sup>1</sup>, Barbara König<sup>2</sup>, Sebastian Küpper<sup>3</sup>, and Christina Mika-Michalski<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The University of Sheffield, U.K.

`h.beohar@sheffield.ac.uk`

<sup>2</sup> Universität Duisburg-Essen, Germany

`barbara.koenig@uni-due.de`

<sup>3</sup> FernUniversität Hagen, Germany

`sebastian.kuepper@fernuni-hagen.de`

<sup>4</sup> Hochschule Rhein-Waal, Germany

`christina.mika-michalski@hochschule-rhein-waal.de`

**Abstract.** We study coalgebraic modal logic to characterise behavioural equivalence in the presence of side effects, i.e., when coalgebras live in a (co)Kleisli or an Eilenberg-Moore category. Our aim is to develop a general framework based on indexed categories/fibrations that is common to the aforementioned categories. In particular, we show how the coalgebraic notion of behavioural equivalence arises from a relation lifting (a special kind of indexed morphism) and we give a general recipe to construct such liftings in the above three cases. Lastly, we apply this framework to derive logical characterisations for (weighted) language equivalence and conditional bisimilarity.

**Keywords:** (co)Kleisli categories · Indexed morphisms · Indexed categories/fibrations.

## 1 Introduction

Coalgebra [34] offers a categorical framework for specifying and reasoning about state-based transition systems in a generic way. In particular, new types of transition systems, behavioural equivalences (or distances), modal logics and games can be obtained by suitably instantiating the theory of coalgebras. While many types of transition systems can already be studied in the category **Set**, systems with side effects – leading to a notion of trace equivalence or conditional bisimilarity – usually require to move to a setting beyond **Set**, using Kleisli, coKleisli or Eilenberg-Moore categories, where the (co)monad specifies the side-effects.

Behavioural equivalences for such scenarios have already been studied extensively (see e.g. [1,13,17,20]). Modal logics, on the other hand, have been considered to a lesser extent with side effects [22,24,10]; the emphasis (see the survey [29] and the recent articles [12,22,26,30]) has been on logical characterisation of

various notions of bisimulation relations and metrics. The aim of the present paper is to close this gap by applying the dual adjunction setup for fibrations developed by Kupke and Rot [30] to derive logical characterisations for coalgebras with side effects. Recently, another powerful approach [10] based on graded monads has been developed to handle equivalences from the van Glabbeek spectrum and beyond. There the characterising notion is not coalgebraic behavioural equivalence, but a refinement of it, called finite depth behavioural equivalence. In addition, Kupke and Rot [30] when comparing their work with [10] noted that “trace equivalences of various kinds covered in [10] cannot be captured directly in their setup”. Hence we will show how to capture linear notions such as trace, language, and failure equivalences in their setup.

Here, in order to treat these linear notions of equivalence uniformly, we follow the approach of Hermida and Jacobs [15] to capture bisimulation relations using the language of fibrations [16]; they have increasingly appeared in the coalgebraic literature [7,8,14,18,23,25,30,37]. The general idea is as follows and is illustrated above in (1). First, a system is modelled as a coalgebra  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} FX$  for some endofunctor  $\mathbf{Set} \xrightarrow{F} \mathbf{Set}$ . Second a fibration  $\mathbf{E}$  of binary relations on the working category of sets is realised, whose fibres are all the relations on the underlying state space. Third, a mechanism  $\mathcal{P}(X \times X) \xrightarrow{\lambda} \mathcal{P}(FX \times FX)$  (aka relation lifting) is defined, which amounts to the lifting of  $F$  to an endofunctor  $F_\lambda$  on  $\mathbf{E}$ . Now one can study the coalgebras induced by  $F_\lambda$  and, more importantly, this category  $\mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{E}}(F_\lambda)$  can be again arranged (see (1)) as a fibration on  $\mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{Set}}(F)$ . Lastly, the applicability is shown by characterising bisimulation relations on  $X$  as coalgebras of a certain endofunctor living in the fibre above  $(X, \alpha)$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{E}}(F_\lambda) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{E} \curvearrowright F_\lambda \\
 \downarrow & (1) & \downarrow \\
 \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{Set}}(F) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Set} \curvearrowright F
 \end{array}$$

One of the objectives of this paper is to extend this ‘categorical’ picture (1) w.r.t. coalgebraic notion of behavioural equivalence for dynamical systems having side effects, i.e., those systems that can be modelled as coalgebras living in a (co)Kleisli or Eilenberg-Moore category for some (co)monad on  $\mathbf{Set}$ . Typical examples, in the context of this paper, are the following: nondeterministic (linear weighted) automata modelled as coalgebras in the Kleisli category for the powerset (multiset) monad (see Sections 6 and B); conditional transition systems (which facilitate formal modelling of software product lines) modelled as coalgebras in the coKleisli category for the writer comonad  $\mathbb{K} \times \_$  (see Section 7). We left out case studies in Eilenberg-Moore categories in this paper; however, they are shown to satisfy the assumptions of this paper (Section C).

We explore the general conditions on relation liftings (technically they are called indexed morphisms in the paper like the ones indicated by  $\lambda$  in (1)) to ensure that behavioural equivalences can be viewed as coalgebras living in the fibre above a given coalgebra  $(X, \alpha)$  with side effects. Another contribution is a recipe for obtaining relation and predicate liftings (a special type of indexed morphisms) whose definition and correctness proof are otherwise (at least in the Kleisli case) quite cumbersome to establish. Predicate liftings are instrumental

in providing interpretation to various modalities for coalgebras in (co)Kleisli or Eilenberg-Moore categories, just like in the case of **Set** (cf. [18,32,35]). Technically, our study focuses on lifting an indexed morphism for a given endofunctor  $F$  on **Set** to an indexed morphism for a (co)Kleisli extension/Eilenberg-Moore lifting  $\bar{F}$  of  $F$ . And to the best of our knowledge, this question is open at least for coalgebras with side effects.

Once we have captured behavioural equivalence in a fibration, we can then apply the Kupke-Rot setup [30] based on dual adjunctions (see the survey [29] on coalgebraic modal logic) to establish the logical characterisation of behavioural equivalence. In particular, we first construct the Kupke-Rot setup for behavioural equivalences and show that the sufficient conditions for adequacy (i.e., behavioural equivalence is contained in logical equivalence) and expressivity (i.e., converse of adequacy) given in [30] are satisfied. This setup is later used to derive the logical characterisation for (weighted) language equivalence and conditional bisimilarity; note that these notions were not studied in [30].

While several ingredients (especially encompassing fibrations) used in this paper are already known, our paper contains the following original contributions:

- We capture behavioural equivalences on coalgebras beyond **Set** as a fibred notion by characterising them as special types of coalgebras.
- We give concrete recipes for defining predicate and relation liftings (which is both tedious and error-prone) in (co)Kleisli and Eilenberg-Moore categories.
- We extend the dual adjunction framework for fibrations by Kupke and Rot to side effects, in particular to Kleisli categories. Here we need a mechanism to factor the state space of a coalgebra by behavioural equivalence, which is difficult if the category has no coequalisers. We provide a technique based on reflective subcategories to circumvent this issue.

This paper is organised as follows. Section 2 sets the relevant categorical preliminaries required for this paper. It is assumed that the reader is already familiar with basic category theory, particularly, how a Kleisli or an Eilenberg-Moore category is induced by a monad. Section 3 introduces the assumptions that ensure behavioural equivalence is a fibred notion (in the sense of (1)). Section 4 is devoted to coalgebraic modal logic where general adequacy and expressivity results for behavioural equivalence are derived from [30]. Section 5 gives the recipe to construct relation/predicate liftings for coalgebras with side effects. In the next sections, the results of this paper are applied in the context of non-deterministic automata and conditional transition systems. Section 8 concludes this paper with some discussions on future research. Note that proofs as well as additional material on linear weighted and generalised Moore automata in Kleisli and Eilenberg-Moore categories can be found in the appendix.

## 2 Preliminaries

*Coalgebraic preliminaries [19,34]* Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be a category and let  $\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{F} \mathbf{C}$  be an endofunctor modelling the branching type of the system of interest. Then the

behaviour of a state-based system will be modelled as an  $F$ -coalgebra (or, simply coalgebra), i.e., as a morphism  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} FX$  in the category  $\mathbf{C}$ .

**Definition 1.** A coalgebra homomorphism  $f$  between  $(X, \alpha)$  and  $(Y, \beta)$  is a morphism  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{C}$  satisfying  $Ff \circ \alpha = \beta \circ f$ . The collection of coalgebras and their homomorphisms forms a category denoted  $\mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{C}}(F)$ .

Moreover, one can define behavioural equivalence on the (concrete) states of a coalgebra under the assumption that there is a functor  $\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{|\cdot|} \mathbf{Set}$ . By the concrete state-space of a coalgebra  $(X, \alpha)$ , we mean the set  $|X|$ . Typically, in our case studies, the functor  $|\cdot|$  will be a forgetful functor and will have a left/right adjoint  $\iota$ . For instance,  $\iota$  is left adjoint to  $|\cdot|$  when  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Kl}(T)$  or  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{EM}(T)$  (for some monad  $\mathbf{Set} \xrightarrow{T} \mathbf{Set}$ ), while it is right adjoint when  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{coKl}(G)$  for some comonad  $\mathbf{Set} \xrightarrow{G} \mathbf{Set}$ .

**Definition 2.** Two states  $x, x' \in |X|$  of a coalgebra  $(X, \alpha)$  are behaviourally equivalent iff there is a coalgebra homomorphism  $f$  such that  $|f|x = |f|x'$ .

*Example 3.* An interesting example of coalgebras living in Kleisli categories is nondeterministic automata (NDA). Following [13] an NDA is a coalgebra living in  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Kl}(\mathcal{P})$ , which is isomorphic to the category  $\mathbf{Rel}$  of sets as objects and relations as maps. Recall that a Kleisli extension  $\mathbf{Rel} \xrightarrow{\bar{F}} \mathbf{Rel}$  of  $\mathbf{Set} \xrightarrow{F} \mathbf{Set}$  (i.e.  $\bar{F} \circ \iota = \iota \circ F$ ) is in correspondence [31, Theorem 2.2] with a distributive law  $FT \xrightarrow{\vartheta} TF$  such that the following diagrams commute in  $\mathbf{Set}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 FX \xlongequal{\quad} FX & FTTX \xrightarrow{\vartheta_{TX}} TFTX \xrightarrow{T\vartheta_X} TTFX & \\
 \downarrow F\eta_X & \downarrow F\mu_X & \downarrow \mu_{FX} \\
 FTX \xrightarrow{\vartheta_X} TFX & FTX \xrightarrow{\vartheta_X} TFX & \\
 \end{array} \quad (2)$$

Consider  $F_- = A \times \_ + 1$  (where  $1 = \{\bullet\}$ ) with the following distributive law [17]:

$$Act \times \mathcal{P}X + 1 \xrightarrow{\vartheta_X} \mathcal{P}(Act \times X + 1) \quad (a, U) \mapsto \{a\} \times U, \bullet \mapsto \{\bullet\}. \quad (3)$$

This induces a functor  $\mathbf{Rel} \xrightarrow{\bar{F}} \mathbf{Rel}$  which acts on a relation  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$ , seen as a Kleisli arrow  $X \xrightarrow{f'} \mathcal{P}Y$ , as follows:  $\bar{F}f = \vartheta_Y \circ Ff'$ . Notice that  $\bar{F}$ -coalgebras model implicit nondeterminism (i.e. this side-effect is hidden to an outside observer) [13], thus behavioural equivalence typically coincides with *language equivalence* (instead of bisimilarity) in this case.

*Predicate liftings as indexed morphisms* Predicates and their liftings are quite common within the literature on (coalgebraic) modal logic. In particular, a predicate is used as the semantics of a logical formula [32], or as a relation on the state space of a coalgebra [15]. In the basic setting, when  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Set}$ , the predicates on a set  $X$  are given by the subsets of  $X$ . Now, given a function  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$ , a

predicate  $V$  on  $Y$  (i.e.  $V \subseteq Y$ ) can be transformed into a predicate on  $X$  by the pullback operation  $f^{-1}V \subseteq X$  in **Set**. Note that this operation is functorial in nature; thus this ‘logical’ structure can be organised as a functor  $\mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \mathbf{Cat}$  [18], where  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}X$  is the poset  $(\mathcal{P}X, \subseteq)$  viewed as a category. As noted by Jacobs in [18], *predicate logic on a category is given by an indexed category and predicate liftings are (endo)morphisms of indexed categories*.

**Definition 4.** *An indexed category is a **Cat**-valued presheaf, i.e., a contravariant functor  $\Phi$  from  $\mathbf{C}$  to **Cat**. In addition, a morphism between two indexed categories  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{\Phi} \mathbf{Cat}$  and  $\mathbf{D}^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{\Psi} \mathbf{Cat}$  is a pair of a functor  $\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{G} \mathbf{D}$  and a natural transformation  $\Phi \xrightarrow{\lambda} \Psi \circ G^{\text{op}}$ .*

*Note 5.* Often the application of  $\Phi$  on  $f \in \mathbf{C}$  is denoted as  $f^*$ . We also omit the use of superscript ‘op’ on functors and use the phrases ‘indexed morphism’ and ‘predicate lifting’ interchangeably.

*Remark 6.* Another, equivalent, way to organise logic is by specifying the fibration of predicates over a category [16]. The transformation of a fibration over  $\mathbf{C}$  into a contravariant pseudofunctor  $\mathbf{C} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$  is given by taking the fibres at each object in  $\mathbf{C}$ . Conversely one has to invoke the so-called *Grothendieck construction* to get a fibration, which glues all the fibres  $(\Phi X)_{X \in \mathbf{C}}$  to form a total category of predicates  $\mathbb{E}(\Phi)$  defined as follows.

$$\frac{X \in \mathbf{C} \wedge U \in \Phi X}{(X, U) \in \mathbb{E}(\Phi)} \quad \frac{X \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{C} \wedge U \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} f^*V \in \Phi X}{(X, U) \xrightarrow{f, \bar{f}} (Y, V) \in \mathbb{E}(\Phi)}$$

Moreover, there is an obvious ‘forgetful’ functor  $\mathbb{E}(\Phi) \xrightarrow{p} \mathbf{C}$  given by  $(X, U) \mapsto X$  that induces a (split) fibration on  $\mathbf{C}$  [16,18]. In the parlance of concrete categories, the functor  $p$  is topological [2, Definition 21.1] when  $\Phi$  has fibred limits. Often, in applications, the fibres  $(\Phi X, \preceq)$  (at each  $X \in \mathbf{C}$ ) form a poset (rather than a full-fledged category); we label such an indexed category/fibration as *thin*. We restrict ourselves to thin fibrations in this paper.

*Example 7.* The contravariant powerset functor  $\mathbf{Set} \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \mathbf{Cat}$  is an example of an indexed category such that  $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  is a bifibration [16]. This is because the reindexing functor  $f^{-1}$  (for any function  $f$ ) has a left adjoint given by the direct image functor  $f_!$ . Moreover, as an example of a predicate lifting, consider  $F = \mathcal{P}$  over  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Set}$  (which describes the branching type of unlabelled transition systems) with  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}X \xrightarrow{\lambda_X} \hat{\mathcal{P}}\mathcal{P}X$  given by  $U \mapsto \mathcal{P}U$ . It is well known that the above predicate lifting encodes the box modality  $\Box$  from logic [18].

### 3 Behavioural equivalence through indexed morphisms

Indexed morphisms not only induce modalities of interest in Computer Science; but they can also be used to characterise behavioural equivalence. The original idea [15] is to work with an indexed category  $\mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{\Psi} \mathbf{Cat}$  of binary relations,

i.e.,  $\Psi$  is the composition  $\mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{-\times-} \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{\hat{p}} \mathbf{Cat}$ . In particular,  $\Psi X$  is the set of all relations on  $X$ . Then, for a relation lifting  $\Psi X \xrightarrow{\lambda_X} \Psi FX$  and a coalgebra  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} FX \in \mathbf{Set}$ , bisimilarity is the largest fixpoint of the functional:

$$\Psi X \xrightarrow{\lambda_X} \Psi FX \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \Psi X. \quad (4)$$

Unfortunately, this idea of working with relations on the concrete state space immediately does not generalise to coalgebras with side effects; e.g., in the case of conditional transition systems (CTSs) viewed as coalgebras living in the  $\text{coKleisli}$  category of the writer comonad  $\mathbb{K} \times -$  (see Section 7). The problem essentially lies in associating a fibre to be the set of all binary relations on the state space. There are situations (as in CTSs) where the fibres will only be some subset of all the relations on the state space. As a result, we impose the following restriction:

**A1** our working category  $\mathbf{C}$  has binary products  $\otimes$ .

Thus we can define an indexed category  $\Psi$  of relations as the composition:

$$\mathbf{C}^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{-\otimes-} \mathbf{C}^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{|\cdot|} \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{\hat{p}} \mathbf{Cat}. \quad (5)$$

We view the elements of  $\Psi X$  (for some object  $X \in \mathbf{C}$ ) as ‘abstract’ relations on  $X$ . Furthermore, **A1** also ensures that for any object  $X \in \mathbf{C}$  there is a function

$$|X \otimes X| \xrightarrow{\langle |\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X| \rangle} |X| \times |X|,$$

where  $X \otimes X \xrightarrow{\pi_1^X, \pi_2^X} X$  are the two projection arrows in  $\mathbf{C}$ . And thanks to these functions, we can define abstract equality in the fibre  $\Psi X$ . In particular,

$$\equiv_X = \langle |\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X| \rangle^{-1} =_{|X|}.$$

Notice that in some cases (like when  $\mathbf{C}$  is a Kleisli or Eilenberg-Moore category) the abstract equality  $\equiv_X$  coincides with the equality on the concrete state space  $=_{|X|}$  because the forgetful functor is product preserving. However, in the context of CTSs, we will see that the two notions of equality differ.

**Proposition 8.** *Under Assumption A1 the square drawn in (6) commutes for any arrow  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$  in  $\mathbf{C}$ . As a result, there is a functor  $\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{\text{Eq}} \mathbb{E}(\Psi)$  (henceforth called equality functor) that maps an object  $X$  to the abstract equality  $\equiv_X$ .*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} |X \otimes X| \xrightarrow{\langle |\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X| \rangle} |X| \times |X| & \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbb{E}(\Phi)}(F_\lambda) = \mathbb{E}(\Phi_\lambda^F) \longrightarrow \mathbb{E}(\Phi) & \\ |f \otimes f| \downarrow & (6) \quad \downarrow (|f| \times |f|) & p_\lambda^F \downarrow & (7) \quad \downarrow p \\ |Y \otimes Y| \xrightarrow{\langle |\pi_1^Y|, |\pi_2^Y| \rangle} |Y| \times |Y| & & \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{C}}(F) \longrightarrow \mathbf{C} & \end{array}$$

The next proposition (originally from [18]) is a general result on indexed categories useful in lifting an endofunctor on  $\mathbf{C}$  to an endofunctor on the given

fibration  $\mathbb{E}(\Phi)$ . Moreover the category of coalgebras of the lifted endofunctor can be structured again as a fibration on the given category of coalgebras in which our original system of interest is modelled.

**Proposition 9.** *Consider the diagram in (7), then the following statements hold for a given functor  $\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{F} \mathbf{C}$  and an indexed morphism  $\Phi \xrightarrow{\lambda} \Phi F$ .*

- *The map  $\lambda$  induces a map  $\mathbb{E}(\Phi) \xrightarrow{F_\lambda} \mathbb{E}(\Phi)$  of fibrations given by  $(X, U) \mapsto (FX, \lambda_X U)$ .*
- *The category of coalgebras induced by  $F_\lambda$  forms a fibration on  $\mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{C}}(F)$ , where  $\mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{C}}(F)^{op} \xrightarrow{\Phi_\lambda^F} \mathbf{Cat}$  is the mapping:  $(X, \alpha) \mapsto \mathbf{Coalg}_{\Phi_X}(\alpha^* \circ \lambda_X)$ .*

Now recall (4) and  $\Psi$  as indexed category of relations on  $\mathbf{Set}$  (i.e. substitute  $\otimes$  by  $\times$  and  $|-$  by the identity functor in (5)), an arbitrary bisimulation relation  $R$  on a coalgebra  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} FX \in \mathbf{Set}$  is the relation  $R \in \Psi X$  satisfying  $R \subseteq \alpha^* \lambda_X R$ . In other words, bisimulation relations on the state space  $X$  are again coalgebras of the functor  $\alpha^* \circ \lambda_X$  living in the fibre  $\Psi X$ . Next we show that the same holds for behavioural equivalence in general, however, under the following assumptions:

**A2** the given morphism  $\Psi \xrightarrow{\lambda} \Psi F$  preserves Eq, i.e.,  $F_\lambda \circ \text{Eq} = \text{Eq} \circ F_\lambda$ .

Equivalently, this means that  $\lambda_X(\equiv_X) = \equiv_{FX}$  for every  $X \in \mathbf{C}$ .

**A3** the functor Eq has a left adjoint  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

*Remark 10.* Assumption **A3** already appeared in [15] to model quotient types in the context of type theory. However, our usage is in the unit  $\kappa$  of  $\mathbb{Q} \dashv \text{Eq}$  to construct a witnessing coalgebra homomorphism in Theorem 12. This idea is already known in type theory; for instance, see [11, Theorem 3.7] where a similar result was proven albeit under the stronger assumption that the final coalgebra for  $F$  exists. So when  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Set}$ ,  $\mathbb{Q}$  maps an relation  $R$  on  $X$  to the quotient generated by the smallest equivalence containing  $R$ ; the unit  $\kappa_X$  (for any set  $X$ ) is the usual quotient function mapping an element to its equivalence class.

**Theorem 11.** *Given an indexed morphism  $\Psi \xrightarrow{\lambda} \Psi \circ F$ , then under Assumptions **A1** and **A2**, the behavioural equivalence induced by a coalgebra homomorphism  $f \in \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{C}}(F)$  on a coalgebra  $(X, \alpha) \in \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{C}}(F)$  is a  $\alpha^* \circ \lambda$ -coalgebra living in the fibre  $\Psi X$ , i.e.,  $f^*(\equiv_Y) \subseteq \alpha^* \lambda_X(f^* \equiv_Y)$ .*

**Theorem 12.** *Under Assumptions **A1**, **A2**, and **A3** for every  $\alpha^* \circ \lambda$ -coalgebra  $R$  there is a coalgebra homomorphism  $f \in \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{C}}(F)$  such that  $R \subseteq f^*(\equiv_{\text{cod}(f)})$ , where  $\text{cod}(f)$  denotes the codomain of  $f$ . Moreover,  $R = f^*(\equiv_{\text{cod}(f)})$  when the unit of  $\mathbb{Q} \dashv \text{Eq}$  is Cartesian.*

*Remark 13.* An application of Theorem 12 could be in establishing the completeness of coalgebraic games (as in the spirit of [28]). For instance, if the winning positions of Duplicator viewed as a relation  $R$  is a coalgebra in the fibre of  $\Psi$ , then Theorem 12 can be used to show that winning positions of Duplicator are behaviourally equivalent. In the future, we would like to test this application by working out a notion of 2-player games for coalgebra with side effects.

## 4 Coalgebraic modal logic

The ‘partial’ characterisation of behavioural equivalence as a fibred notion (cf. Theorems 11 and 12) enables us to use the dual adjunction framework of Kupke and Rot [30] in (8) to develop a logical characterisation of behavioural equivalence. It should be noted that, although this framework can handle behavioural preorders and distances, we prove our results only for behavioural equivalence, i.e. in the context of Assumptions **A1** and **A2**. Below we explain the role of various functors drawn in (8) in an incremental manner; subsequently, we will establish our general adequacy and expressivity results (Theorems 18 and 21) for behavioural equivalences.

The fibration  $\mathbb{E}(\Psi) \xrightarrow{p} \mathbf{C}$  will be used to define (internally) a behavioural equivalence of interest. Often it is defined as a colimit of a diagram resembling the final sequence in a fibre (cf. [14]). More abstractly, we assume that the indexed category  $\Psi_\lambda^F$  (recall this notation from Proposition 9) has indexed final objects, for some indexed morphism  $\Psi \xrightarrow{\lambda} \Psi F$ .

The fibration  $\mathbb{E}(\Psi) \xrightarrow{p} \mathbf{C}$  will be used to define (internally) a behavioural equivalence of interest. Often it is defined as a colimit of a diagram resembling the final sequence in a fibre (cf. [14]). More abstractly, we assume that the indexed category  $\Psi_\lambda^F$  (recall this notation from Proposition 9) has indexed final objects, for some indexed morphism  $\Psi \xrightarrow{\lambda} \Psi F$ .

**Lemma 14.** *Suppose  $\mathbf{C}^{op} \xrightarrow{\Phi} \mathbf{Cat}$  has indexed final objects (i.e., the final object exists in each fibre  $\Phi X$ ) and the reindexing functor  $f^*$  preserves these final objects. Then there is a functor  $\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}} \mathbb{E}(\Phi)$  that is right adjoint to  $p$ .*

Usually,  $\mathbb{1}$  is used (called the *truth functor* [16] in the context of logic) when the underlying fibration  $\mathbb{E}(\Phi) \xrightarrow{p} \mathbf{C}$  has indexed final objects. However when  $\Psi_\lambda^F$  satisfies the conditions of the previous lemma, it results in a functor

$\mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{C}}(F) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}^\lambda} \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbb{E}(\Psi)}(F_\lambda)$  (which we call *the behavioural conformance functor*) that maps a coalgebra  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} FX$  to the terminal element in  $\mathbf{Coalg}_{\Psi X}(\alpha^* \circ \lambda_X)$  denoted as  $1_X^\lambda$ . Note that  $1_X^\lambda$  in our applications will correspond to the largest behavioural equivalence on a given system. Moreover, it is not hard to arrive at the adjoint situation as indicated in (9). So, in other words, the behavioural conformance functor is right adjoint to the forgetful functor that witnesses the fibration of behavioural conformance on coalgebras.

*Example 15.* Consider the indexed category  $\Psi$  induced by binary relations on sets and a labelled transition system modelled as a coalgebra  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} (\mathcal{P}X)^{Act}$ , i.e., our  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Set}$ ,  $F = (\mathcal{P}_-)^{Act}$ . Consider the function  $\Psi X \xrightarrow{\lambda_X} \Psi FX$  that maps a relation  $R \in \Psi X$  to a relation  $\lambda_X R \in \Psi FX$  (below  $q, q' \in (\mathcal{P}X)^{Act}$ ):

$q \lambda_X R q' \iff \forall_{a,x} \exists_{x'} (x \in qa \implies x' \in q'a) \wedge \forall_{a,x'} \exists_x (x' \in q'a \implies x \in qa).$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{E}(\Psi) & \xleftarrow{\bar{\mathcal{T}}} & \mathbf{A}^{op} \\
 p \downarrow & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{S}} & \mathbf{A}^{op} \\
 \mathbf{C} & \xleftarrow{\bar{\mathcal{T}}} & \mathbf{A}^{op} \\
 F \downarrow & \Downarrow \delta & \downarrow L \\
 \mathbf{C} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{S}} & \mathbf{A}^{op} \\
 & \xleftarrow{\bar{\mathcal{T}}} & 
 \end{array} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbb{E}(\Psi)}(F_\lambda) = \mathbb{E}(\Psi_\lambda^F) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{E}(\Psi) \\
 p_\lambda^F \downarrow \dashv \uparrow \mathbb{1}^\lambda & & \downarrow p \\
 \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{C}}(F) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{C}
 \end{array} \quad (9)$$



It is well known (as first noted in [15]) that a bisimulation relation is a  $\alpha^* \circ \lambda$ -coalgebra. Moreover, bisimilarity  $\Leftrightarrow_X$  (the largest bisimulation relation on  $X$ ) corresponds to the final object in  $\Psi_\lambda(X, \alpha)$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{1}^\lambda(X, \alpha) = (X, \alpha, \Leftrightarrow_X)$ .

As for the dual adjunction  $\mathcal{S} \dashv \mathcal{T}$  in (8), it provides a connection (cf. [33]) between states and theories (the formulae satisfied by a state). The syntax of the logic is given by a functor  $\mathbf{A} \xrightarrow{L} \mathbf{A}$  and it is assumed that the initial algebra  $L\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{h} \mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{A}$  exists for  $L$ , which models the typical Lindenbaum algebra induced by the term algebra. Lastly, the natural transformation  $\delta$  gives the one-step interpretation to the formulae which can be given its mate  $\theta$  as described below (cf. [21, Proposition 2]).

**Proposition 16.** *Given  $\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{F} \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A} \xrightarrow{L} \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{C} \xrightleftharpoons[\mathcal{T}]{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{A}^{op}$  with  $\mathcal{S} \dashv \mathcal{T}$ , there is a correspondence between  $F\mathcal{T} \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathcal{T}L$  and  $SF \xrightarrow{\theta} LS$ .*

Now given a coalgebra  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} FX \in \mathbf{C}$ , the semantics  $\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{\llbracket - \rrbracket_X} SX$  of the logic  $(L, \delta)$  is given by the universal property of the initial algebra  $L\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{h} \mathcal{A}$ . In particular, it is the unique arrow in  $\mathbf{A}$  that makes the following diagram (drawn on the left) commutative. And the transpose of the semantics map  $\llbracket - \rrbracket_X$  under  $\mathcal{S} \dashv \mathcal{T}$  gives a ‘theory’ map  $X \xrightarrow{(\_)_X} Q\mathcal{A}$ ; it is the unique arrow in  $\mathbf{C}$  that makes the following diagram on the right commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 L\mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{L\llbracket - \rrbracket_X} & LSX & \xrightarrow{\theta_X} & SFX & & X & \xrightarrow{(\_)_X} & \mathcal{T}\mathcal{A} \\
 h \downarrow & & (10) & & \downarrow S\alpha & & \alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{T}h \\
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\llbracket - \rrbracket_X} & SX & & & & FX & \xrightarrow{F(\_)_X} & F\mathcal{T}\mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\delta_{\mathcal{A}}} & \mathcal{T}L\mathcal{A}
 \end{array}$$

Once these niceties are set up, one can argue when a logic  $(L, \delta)$  is adequate and expressive. Intuitively, a logic  $(L, \delta)$  is adequate if behaviourally equivalent states satisfy the same logical formulae; while an adequate logic is expressive if logically equivalent states are also behaviourally equivalent. The formulation below is a straightforward formulation of adequacy and expressivity given in [30] using the language of indexed categories.

**Definition 17.** *Suppose the behavioural conformance functor  $\mathbb{1}^\lambda$  exists (for some  $\lambda$ ) with  $\mathbf{A}^{op} \xrightarrow{\bar{\mathcal{T}}} \mathbb{E}(\Psi)$  such that  $p \circ \bar{\mathcal{T}} = \mathcal{T}$ . Then a logic  $(L, \delta)$  is adequate (resp. expressive) w.r.t.  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$  if  $(X, \mathbb{1}_X^\lambda) \xrightarrow{(\_)_X} \bar{\mathcal{T}}\mathcal{A}$  is a (resp. Cartesian) map in  $\mathbb{E}(\Psi)$ , for every coalgebra  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} FX \in \mathbf{C}$ .*

The role of  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$  is to encode a relationship between the theories of any two states (cf. [30]); so we let  $\bar{\mathcal{T}} = \text{Eq} \circ \mathcal{T}$  in the context of behavioural equivalence. Next we state the main result of this section, which is a refinement of adequacy and expressivity results given in [30].

**Theorem 18.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 11, if  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$  has a left adjoint  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ , the logic  $(L, \delta)$  is adequate. Moreover it is expressive if  $|\delta_{\mathcal{A}}|$  is injective.*

In short, the Kupke-Rot logical setup for behavioural equivalence can be summarised as drawn left on the next page. Now if our indexed category  $\Psi$  satisfies **A3** (like in the case of coKleisli and Eilenberg-Moore categories), then  $\bar{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S} \circ \mathbb{Q}$  as indicated in (11). However, in the case of Kleisli categories we will construct  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$  under some restrictions (cf. Theorem 21).

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{E}(\Psi) & \xrightarrow{\bar{\mathcal{S}}} & \mathbf{A}^{\text{op}} \\
 \uparrow \text{Eq} & \xleftarrow{\perp} & \uparrow \text{Eq} \circ \mathcal{T} \\
 \downarrow p & & \downarrow p \\
 \mathbf{C} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{S}} & \mathbf{A}^{\text{op}} \\
 & \xleftarrow{\perp} & \xleftarrow{\mathcal{T}}
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{E}(\Psi) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{S} \circ \mathbb{Q}} & \mathbf{A}^{\text{op}} \\
 \uparrow \text{Eq} & \xleftarrow{\perp} & \uparrow \text{Eq} \\
 \downarrow p & & \downarrow p \\
 \mathbf{C} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{S}} & \mathbf{A}^{\text{op}} \\
 & \xleftarrow{\perp} & \xleftarrow{\mathcal{T}}
 \end{array}
 \quad (11)$$

### Construction of $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ for Kleisli categories

Unfortunately, arbitrary (co)limits in general do not exist in a Kleisli category. For instance, one of our working categories  $\mathbf{Kl}(\mathcal{P}) \cong \mathbf{Rel}$  (the category of sets and relations) does not have all coequalisers, but  $\mathbf{Rel}$  has a reflective subcategory  $\mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}}$  that does. The presence of these coequalisers in the reflective subcategory will then be used to construct  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ .

**Definition 19.** A subcategory  $\mathbf{B} \xrightarrow{j} \mathbf{C}$  is reflective when the inclusion functor  $j$  has a left adjoint  $\tau$  (often called as reflector).

**Theorem 20** ([1]). If  $\mathbf{B} \xrightarrow{j} \mathbf{C}$  is a reflective subcategory of  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{F} \mathbf{C}$  preserves  $\mathbf{B}$ , i.e.,  $\forall B, f \in \mathbf{B} (FB \in \mathbf{B} \wedge Ff \in \mathbf{B})$  and  $F \circ j = j \circ F$ , then  $\mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{B}}(F) \xleftarrow{\bar{\tau}} \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{C}}(F) \xrightarrow{\bar{j}}$  with  $\bar{\tau} \dashv \bar{j}$ . Here,  $\bar{j}$  is the obvious inclusion.

The reflector  $\bar{\tau}$  typically results in a form of (on-the-fly) determinisation (cf. Example 27). Moreover, in our case studies, these reflective subcategories will also take the place of algebras in (11), and if these reflective subcategories have coequalisers, then we can construct  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$  in general.

So let  $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{A}^{\text{op}}$ ,  $\mathcal{S} = \tau$ ,  $\mathcal{T} = j$ , and  $(X, R) \in \mathbb{E}(\Psi)$ . Then the idea is to use the following series of transformations (depicted below on the left) to construct  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$  as the equaliser of the parallel arrows  $\mathcal{S}p'_1, \mathcal{S}p'_2 \in \mathbf{A}$ . Below  $p_i$  (for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ) are the obvious projection functions and each  $p'_i$  is the transpose of  $p_i$  under the free-forgetful adjunction  $\iota \dashv |-$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 R \xrightarrow{p_1} |X| \in \mathbf{Set} & & \bar{\mathcal{S}}(X, R) \xrightarrow{e} SX \xrightarrow{\mathcal{S}p'_1} \mathcal{S}(\iota R) \\
 \downarrow p_2 & & \uparrow \mathcal{S}f \\
 \iota R \xrightarrow{p'_1} X \in \mathbf{Kl}(T) & & \uparrow \mathcal{S}f \\
 \downarrow p'_2 & & \uparrow \mathcal{S}f \\
 \mathcal{S}\iota R \xrightarrow{\mathcal{S}p'_1} \mathcal{S}X \in \mathbf{A}^{\text{op}} & & \bar{\mathcal{S}}(Y, S) \xrightarrow{e'} SY \xrightarrow{\mathcal{S}q'_1} \mathcal{S}(\iota S) \\
 & & \downarrow \mathcal{S}g \\
 & & \mathcal{S}(\iota R) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{S}p'_2} \mathcal{S}(\iota R)
 \end{array}
 \quad (12)$$

Let  $(\bar{\mathcal{S}}(X, R), e)$  be the equaliser of  $\mathcal{S}p'_i$  in  $\mathbf{A}$ . Now  $(X, R) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, S) \in \mathbb{E}(\Psi)$  means that  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{Kl}(T)$  and  $R \subseteq (|f| \times |f|)^{-1}S$ . So there is a function

$R \xrightarrow{g} S$  such that  $|f| \circ p_i = q_i \circ g$  with  $p_i, q_i$  being the obvious projections when the relations  $R, S$  are viewed as spans in **Set**. Moreover  $f \circ p'_i = q'_i \circ \iota g$  due to the naturality of the counit of  $\iota \dashv |-|$ . So the two squares in (12) commute and the universal property of equalisers gives the unique  $\bar{S}f$ .

**Theorem 21.** *Under **A1** and  $\mathbf{A}^{op}$  being a reflective subcategory of  $\mathbf{Kl}(T)$  having coequalisers, the above defined  $\bar{S}$  is a functor and left adjoint to  $\bar{T} = \text{Eq} \circ T$ .*

## 5 Lifting of predicate and relation liftings

In this paper, the indexed categories corresponding to predicates (or relations) on our working category (like (co)Kleisli or Eilenberg-Moore categories) are always induced by lifting an indexed category on the underlying base category **Set** (for instance, recall  $\Psi$  from (5)). In a similar spirit, our aim is to construct indexed morphisms on our working category by lifting an indexed morphism on **Set**. So consider an indexed category  $\Phi$  of predicates given by  $\Phi = \hat{\mathcal{P}} \circ |-|$  and an endofunctor  $\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{\bar{F}} \mathbf{C}$  modelling the branching type of behaviour of interest.

*Lifting of predicate liftings* Next we give a recipe to construct a predicate lifting, i.e., an indexed morphism of type  $\Phi \xrightarrow{\lambda} \Phi\bar{F}$ . In particular, we need an endofunctor  $\mathbf{Set} \xrightarrow{G} \mathbf{Set}$ , a predicate lifting  $\hat{\mathcal{P}} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \hat{\mathcal{P}}G$ , and a natural transformation  $\gamma$  as indicated below on the left.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{C} & \xrightarrow{\quad \bar{F} \quad} & \mathbf{C} \\
 \downarrow |-| & \Downarrow \gamma & \downarrow |-| \\
 \mathbf{Set} & \xrightarrow{\quad G \quad} & \mathbf{Set}
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 TFX & \xrightarrow{\quad \quad} & GTX \\
 T\vartheta_X \downarrow & \gamma_{TX} & \downarrow G\mu_X \\
 TTFX & (13) & \\
 \mu_{FX} \downarrow & \gamma_X & \\
 TFX & \xrightarrow{\quad \quad} & GTX
 \end{array}$$

As a result, we can define  $\lambda$  by the composition:

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}|X| \xrightarrow{\sigma|X|} \hat{\mathcal{P}}G|X| \xrightarrow{\gamma_X^*} \hat{\mathcal{P}}|FX|. \quad (14)$$

**Theorem 22.** *The above mapping  $\lambda$  is an indexed morphism.*

Note that in the case of coKleisli and Eilenberg-Moore categories, we simply let  $G = F$  and  $\bar{F}$  be a coKleisli extension/Eilenberg-Moore lifting of  $F$ , which results in a distributive law of type  $|\bar{F}|-| \xrightarrow{\gamma} G|-|$ ; in the case of Eilenberg-Moore categories, such natural transformations are also known as EM-laws [20].

In the case of Kleisli categories, the situation is slightly complicated. This stems from the fact that the distributive law  $FT \xrightarrow{\vartheta} TF$  (which induces a Kleisli extension  $\bar{F}$  of  $F$ ) results in a natural transformation in the ‘wrong’ direction  $F|-| \xrightarrow{\vartheta} |\bar{F}|-|$ . However, in various applications,  $G$  is typically associated with the branching type of a deterministic version of the corresponding system of interest (such as  $G = \_{}^{Act} \times 2$  in the case of NDA) exists. The next result helps in finding such a distributive law  $\gamma$  for a given  $G$  in a more elementary way.

**Lemma 23.** *Let  $\bar{F}$  be a Kleisli extension of  $F$  induced by a distributive law  $FT \xrightarrow{\vartheta} TF$ . Then a natural transformation  $TF \xrightarrow{\gamma} GT$  compatible with  $\vartheta$  and  $\mu$  (i.e., Square 13 commutes) induces a distributive law  $|- \circ \bar{F} \longrightarrow G \circ |-$ . Moreover, the converse also holds.*

*Remark 24.* Note that the compatibility property in the above lemma appeared in [20] as part of an ‘extension’ natural transformation. In short, the properties of an extension natural transformation are more stringent than of Lemma 23.

*Lifting of relation liftings* The above idea can also be used to construct a relation lifting, i.e., an indexed morphism of type  $\Psi \longrightarrow \Psi\bar{F}$ , where  $\Psi$  is the indexed category of abstract relations given in (5). So now given a relation lifting  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}(X \times X) \xrightarrow{\sigma_X} \hat{\mathcal{P}}(GX \times GX)$  of  $G$ , then we can define  $\Psi \xrightarrow{\bar{\lambda}} \Psi\bar{F}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Psi X \xrightarrow{\langle \pi_1^X, \pi_2^X \rangle!} \hat{\mathcal{P}}(|X| \times |X|) \xrightarrow{\sigma_{|X|}} \hat{\mathcal{P}}(G|X| \times G|X|) & & \\ \downarrow (\gamma_X \times \gamma_X)^{-1} & & (15) \\ \hat{\mathcal{P}}(|\bar{F}X| \times |\bar{F}X|) \xrightarrow{\langle \pi_1^{FX}, \pi_2^{FX} \rangle^{-1}} \Psi\bar{F}X. & & \end{array}$$

Here, we use the fact that  $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mathcal{P}})$  is a bifibration [16], i.e., for any function  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$  the reindexing functor  $f^{-1}$  has the direct image functor  $f_!$  as its left adjoint. Now under the following assumption we can show that the  $\bar{\lambda}$  is indeed an indexed morphism.

**A4** The square drawn in (6) is a weak pullback in **Set** for every  $f \in \mathbf{C}$ .

The above assumption ensures that, in the context of  $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mathcal{P}})$ , the square in (6) satisfies the Beck-Chevalley condition, i.e., the following equation holds

$$\langle |\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X| \rangle! \circ (f \otimes f)^{-1} = (|f| \times |f|)^{-1} \circ \langle |\pi_1^Y|, |\pi_2^Y| \rangle! .$$

In turn this equation is used in diagram chasing to show that  $\bar{\lambda}$  is a natural transformation. Furthermore, **A4** trivially holds when  $\mathbf{C}$  is a Kleisli or Eilenberg-Moore category (cf. Corollary 26) because the canonical function  $\langle |\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X| \rangle!$  is a bijection for each  $X \in \mathbf{C}$ . In other words, when  $\mathbf{C}$  is a Kleisli or Eilenberg-Moore category,  $\Psi$  can be alternatively defined as the composition  $\hat{\mathcal{P}} \circ (|- \times |-)$ .

**Theorem 25.** *Under **A4**  $\bar{\lambda}$  as defined in (15) is an indexed morphism.*

**Corollary 26.** *If the forgetful functor  $\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{|\cdot|} \mathbf{Set}$  is product preserving, then **A4** is always satisfied. As a result,  $\bar{\lambda}$  defined in (15) is an indexed morphism.*


## 6 Nondeterministic automata (NDA)

Recall the necessary parameters from Example 3 for coalgebraic modelling of an NDA, i.e.,  $T = \mathcal{P}$ ,  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Kl}(\mathcal{P}) \cong \mathbf{Rel}$ ,  $F = \text{Act} \times \_ + 1$ , the distributive law  $\vartheta$

given in (3), and the free-forgetful adjunction  $\iota \dashv \lfloor \_ \rfloor$  associated with any Kleisli category. To apply Theorem 21, we also recall the reflective subcategory  $\mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}}$  of  $\mathbf{Rel}$  from [1]. Below  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{Set}$  and  $X \xrightarrow{g} Y \in \mathbf{Rel}$ :

$$\begin{array}{lll} jX = X & Y \xrightarrow{jf} X \in \mathbf{Rel} & y jf x \iff fx = y \\ \tau X = \mathcal{P}X & \tau X \xrightarrow{\tau g} \tau Y \in \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}} & \tau g(V) = \{x \mid \exists y \in V \ x g y\}. \end{array}$$


Next we illustrate the definition of  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$  and how the unit of  $\bar{\mathcal{S}} \dashv \bar{\mathcal{T}}$  maps an NDA to the largest subautomaton (respecting language equivalence) obtained after backward determinisation of the given NDA. It is worthwhile to note that the abstract and concrete state space coincide (up to isomorphism) in the case of NDA because forgetful functor preserves products, i.e.,  $\mathcal{P}(X+X) = |X+X| \cong |X| \times |X| = \mathcal{P}X \times \mathcal{P}X$ . Therefore, as mentioned earlier, we will simplify our presentation by working with the indexed category  $\hat{\mathcal{P}} \circ (\lfloor \_ \rfloor \times \lfloor \_ \rfloor)$ .



*Example 27.* Consider the NDA drawn above on the right with the accepting state  $z$  as a coalgebra  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} \text{Act} \times X + 1 \in \mathbf{Kl}(\mathcal{P})$ . Logical equivalence  $\simeq$  is the least equivalence that equates  $\{x, y\}$  with  $\{y\}$  (both accept the language  $\{a, b\}$ ) and  $\{x, y, z\}$  with  $\{y, z\}$  (both accept the language  $\{a, b, \epsilon\}$ ). Also, for any  $U, U' \subseteq X$  such that  $U R U'$  we have  $(U, U') \ p'_1 x \iff x \in U$  and  $(U, U') \ p'_2 x \iff x \in U'$ . Note that  $p'_i$  are transpose of  $p_i$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  (see (12)). So the equaliser  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}(X, \simeq)$  of  $\tau p'_i$  can be computed as follows:

$$\bar{\mathcal{S}}(X, \simeq) = \{W \in \mathcal{P}X \mid \forall U, V \ (U \cap W \neq \emptyset \wedge U \simeq V) \implies V \cap W \neq \emptyset\}.$$

The arrow  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}(X, \simeq) \xrightarrow{\beta} F\bar{\mathcal{S}}(X, \simeq) \in \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}}$  is defined by the following (depicted on the left) universal property of equaliser in  $\mathbf{Set}$ . Here,  $\bar{\tau}\alpha$  is the backward determinisation of the given coalgebra (as described, e.g. in [1] as a deterministic automaton accepting the reverse language), i.e. it maps  $(a, U) \mapsto \{x \mid \exists x' \in U (a, x') \in \alpha(x)\}$  and  $\bullet \mapsto \{x \mid \bullet \in \alpha(x)\}$ . Thus, in essence,  $\beta$  acts like  $\bar{\tau}\alpha$  on the elements of  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}(X, \simeq)$ .



In this example, we obtain as  $\beta$  the automaton drawn above on the right with six states. The relation  $\kappa_X$  indicated by dotted line is the transpose of  $e_X$  w.r.t.  $\tau \dashv j$ ; concretely,  $x \kappa_X U \iff x \in U$ . Furthermore  $\kappa_X \in \mathbf{Rel}$  is a witnessing

coalgebra homomorphism because  $\bar{F}(\kappa_X) \circ \alpha = \beta \circ \kappa_X$ . Note that  $|\kappa_X|$  maps both  $\{x, y\}, \{y\}$  to  $\{\{x, y\}, \{y\}, \{y, z\}, \{x, y, z\}\}$ , witnessing the fact that they are language equivalent. Hence, the coequaliser gives us the largest sub-automaton of the backwards determinisation that respects logical equivalence (removing  $\emptyset, \{y, z\}$ , and  $\{x, y, z\}$  will result in the smallest such sub-automaton).

*Predicate liftings for NDAs* To apply techniques from Section 5, we set  $G = \_{}^{Act} \times 2$  and define  $\gamma$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}(Act \times X + 1) &\xrightarrow{\gamma_X} (\mathcal{P}X)^{Act} \times 2 & \bar{U} &\mapsto (\gamma_X^{Act} \bar{U}, \gamma_X^2 \bar{U}), \\ \text{where } \gamma_X^{Act} \bar{U}(a) &= \{x \mid (a, x) \in \bar{U}\} & \text{and } \gamma_X^2 \bar{U} = 1 &\iff \bullet \in \bar{U}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, from [20] we know that  $\gamma$  is compatible with  $\theta$  and  $\bigcup$  in the sense of Lemma 23. Next consider the family of liftings  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}X \xrightarrow{\sigma_X^a} \hat{\mathcal{P}}(X^{Act} \times 2)$  (for each  $a \in Act$ ) and  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}X \xrightarrow{\sigma_X^\downarrow} \hat{\mathcal{P}}(X^{Act} \times 2)$ :  $U \mapsto \{(p, b) \in X^{Act} \times 2 \mid p(a) \in U\}$  and  $U \mapsto \{(p, 1) \mid p \in X^{Act}\}$ , respectively.

**Lemma 28.** *The above mappings  $\sigma_X^a$  and  $\sigma_X^\downarrow$  are indexed morphisms.*

Thanks to Theorem 22,  $\lambda^a = \gamma^{-1} \circ \sigma^a, \lambda^\downarrow = \gamma^{-1} \circ \sigma^\downarrow$  are valid predicate liftings for the functor  $\mathbf{Rel} \xrightarrow{Act \times - + 1} \mathbf{Rel}$ . Moreover, for any  $\mathbb{U} \subseteq \mathcal{P}X$  we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_X^a(\mathbb{U}) &= \gamma_X^{-1} \sigma_{\mathcal{P}X}^a(\mathbb{U}) & \lambda_X^\downarrow(\mathbb{U}) &= \gamma_X^{-1} \sigma_{\mathcal{P}X}^\downarrow(\mathbb{U}) \\ &= \gamma_X^{-1} \{(p, b) \in (\mathcal{P}X)^{Act} \times 2 \mid p(a) \in \mathbb{U}\} & &= \gamma_X^{-1} \{(p, 1) \mid p \in (\mathcal{P}X)^{Act}\} \\ &= \{\bar{U} \in Act \times X + 1 \mid \{x \mid (a, x) \in \bar{U}\} \in \mathbb{U}\} & &= \{\bar{U} \in Act \times X + 1 \mid \bullet \in \bar{U}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The above indexed morphisms  $\lambda^a, \lambda^\downarrow$  induce modalities that can be interpreted on determinised automata. Given an NDA  $(X, Act, \rightarrow, \downarrow)$  with  $\downarrow \subseteq X$  being the termination predicate (or  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{P}(Act \times X + 1) \in \mathbf{Set}$ ), then the determinised automaton has state space  $\mathcal{P}X$  with dynamics given by the SOS rules or abstractly by the composition  $\gamma_X \circ \bigcup \circ \mathcal{P}\alpha$ :

$$\frac{U \subseteq X \quad U_\alpha = \{x' \mid \exists x \in U \ x \xrightarrow{a} x'\}}{U \xrightarrow{a} U_\alpha} \quad \frac{U \subseteq X \quad \exists x \in U \ x \downarrow}{U \downarrow} .$$

In turn, we can now rewrite the two modalities to a simpler form:

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha|^{-1} \lambda_X^a \mathbb{U} &= |\alpha|^{-1} \{\bar{U} \mid \{x \mid (a, x) \in \bar{U}\} \in \mathbb{U}\} & |\alpha|^{-1} \lambda_X^\downarrow \mathbb{U} &= |\alpha|^{-1} \{\bar{U} \mid \bullet \in \bar{U}\} \\ &= \{U \mid U \xrightarrow{a} U_\alpha \implies U_\alpha \in \mathbb{U}\} & &= \{U \mid U \downarrow\}. \end{aligned}$$

*Language equivalence through relation lifting* First note that products exist in  $\mathbf{KI}(\mathcal{P})$  and are given by disjoint union. Moreover, Assumption A4 is trivially satisfied since the forgetful functor preserves all limits (cf. Corollary 26). So we can create a relation lifting of  $\bar{F}$  from the following relation lifting  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}(X \times X) \xrightarrow{\bar{\sigma}_X} \hat{\mathcal{P}}(GX \times GX)$  of  $G$  (below  $R \subseteq X \times X$ ):

$$(p, b) \bar{\sigma}_X R (p', b') \iff b = b' \wedge \forall_{a \in Act} pa R p'a .$$

**Lemma 29.** *The mapping  $\bar{\sigma}$  defined above is an indexed morphism.*

So  $\Psi \xrightarrow{\bar{\lambda}} \Psi\bar{F}$  given in (15) is an indexed morphism. Concretely, it maps a relation  $R \subseteq \mathcal{P}X \times \mathcal{P}X$  to a relation  $\bar{\lambda}_X R \subseteq \mathcal{P}FX \times \mathcal{P}FX: \bar{U} \bar{\lambda}_X R \bar{U}'$  iff

$$(\bullet \in \bar{U} \iff \bullet \in \bar{U}') \wedge (\forall_{a \in \text{Act}} \{x \mid (a, x) \in \bar{U}\} R \{x \mid (a, x) \in \bar{U}'\}) .$$

**Lemma 30.** *The indexed morphism  $\bar{\sigma}$  preserves arbitrary intersections at each component; therefore, so does the predicate lifting  $\bar{\lambda}$ . Moreover,  $\bar{\lambda}$  satisfies **A2**.*

**Theorem 31.** *Let  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} FX \in \mathbf{Rel}$  be an NDA. Then language equivalence  $\simeq_X \subseteq \mathcal{P}X \times \mathcal{P}X$  on the determinised system is a  $\Psi(\alpha) \circ \bar{\lambda}_X$ -coalgebra, i.e.,  $\simeq_X \subseteq (|\alpha| \times |\alpha|)^{-1}(\bar{\lambda}_X \simeq_X)$ . Moreover,  $\simeq_X = (|f| \times |f|)^{-1} \simeq_Y$  for any coalgebra homomorphism  $f$  between  $(X, \alpha)$  and  $(Y, \beta)$ ; thus, there is a behavioural conformance functor  $\mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{Rel}}(\bar{F}) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_{\bar{\lambda}}} \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbb{E}(\Psi)}(\bar{F}\bar{\lambda})$ .*

*Logical characterisation of language equivalence* Recall the adjoint situation  $\mathfrak{r} \dashv j$  that witnesses  $\mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}}$  is a reflective subcategory of  $\mathbf{Rel}$ . We use this dual adjunction to model our logic because (intuitively) conjunction is not needed to characterise language equivalence. Thus we fix  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Set}$ ,  $S = \mathfrak{r}$ , and  $T = j$ . Moreover, a left adjoint  $\bar{S}$  of  $\bar{T}$  exists due to Theorem 21.

Since to establish language equivalence one needs to ascertain whether a word in  $\text{Act}^*$  is accepting or not, so we take our syntax functor  $L = \text{Act} \times \_ + 1$ . Note that the initial algebra of  $L$  exists and is given by  $\mathcal{A} = \text{Act}^*$ . As for the one-step semantics given by a natural transformation  $\delta$ , we are going to define it (indirectly) by defining its mate  $LSX = \text{Act} \times \mathcal{P}X + 1 \xrightarrow{\theta_X} \mathcal{P}(\text{Act} \times X + 1) = S\bar{F}X \in \mathbf{Set}$  that acts on objects like the distributive law  $\vartheta_X$  (see (3)). Note that, however, they differ in their naturality conditions.

**Proposition 32.** *The above defined mapping  $\theta$  is a natural transformation.*

The algebra  $\text{Act} \times \text{Act}^* + 1 \xrightarrow{h} \text{Act}^*$  is given by the unary concatenation of words and the constant  $\varepsilon$  (i.e.,  $h(a, w) = aw$  and  $h\bullet = \varepsilon$ ). Consider the map  $X \xrightarrow{(\_)} \mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{Rel}$  that maps a state to the language accepted by it.

**Corollary 33.** *The above map  $(\_)$  is indeed the theory map for a given NDA. So the logic  $(L, \delta)$  is both adequate and expressive for language equivalence on determinised systems.*

## 7 Conditional transition systems: an application in coKleisli categories

We next consider conditional transition systems (CTSs) [1], strongly related to the featured transition systems used for modelling software product lines [9]. A conditional transition system is a compact representation of several transition systems – one for each condition or product – where transitions are labelled

by products. Here we consider the simpler case of conditional transition systems without upgrades and action labels; their full treatment [3,5] is left for the future. In our earlier work, CTSs were coalgebras living in the Kleisli category induced by the reader monad  $\mathbb{K}$  (for a fixed set of conditions  $\mathbb{K}$ ). It is however more convenient to treat CTSs as coalgebras in coKleisli categories, hence we start with a relevant comonad  $G = \mathbb{K} \times \_$  whose counit is given by the projection of the second component and comultiplication  $\Delta$  is given by the diagonal map. The map  $\mathbb{K} \times X \xrightarrow{\Delta_X} \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K} \times X$  is given by  $(k, x) \mapsto (k, k, x)$  (for  $k \in \mathbb{K}, x \in X$ ).

Consider the coKleisli category  $\mathbf{coKl}(G)$  whose objects, just like in any Kleisli category, are sets; an arrow  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$  corresponds to a function  $GX \xrightarrow{f} Y$ . Now there is a forgetful functor  $\mathbf{coKl}(G) \xrightarrow{|\_|} \mathbf{Set}$ ; however, in contrast to the Kleisli setting, it is now left adjoint to the inclusion  $\mathbf{Set} \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathbf{coKl}(G)$ . Concretely, this forgetful functor maps an object  $X \mapsto GX$  and an arrow  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{coKl}(G)$  to a function  $|f|$  mapping  $(k, x) \mapsto (k, f(k, x))$ .

Next to model the branching type of CTSs, take  $\bar{F}$  to be the coKleisli extension [3] of  $F = \mathcal{P}$  given by the following distributive law  $\mathbb{K} \times \mathcal{P}X \xrightarrow{\gamma_X} \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{K} \times X)$ :  $\gamma_X(k, U) = \{k\} \times U$ ; concretely,  $\bar{F}X = \mathcal{P}X$  and  $\bar{F}f(k, U) = \{f(k, x) \mid x \in U\}$  for  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{coKl}(G)$ . A CTS modelled as a coalgebra  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} \bar{F}X \in \mathbf{coKl}(G)$  is a function  $\mathbb{K} \times X \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{P}X$  that assigns to each state  $x \in X$  and each condition  $k \in \mathbb{K}$ , the successors of  $x$  under condition  $k$ .

As mentioned earlier in Section 5, it is easier (than in the Kleisli case) to lift a predicate lifting  $\hat{\mathcal{P}} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \hat{\mathcal{P}}F$  of  $F$  to define a predicate lifting  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}|\_| \xrightarrow{\lambda} \hat{\mathcal{P}}|\bar{F}\_|$  of  $\bar{F}$ . In particular,  $\lambda$  is given by the composition in (14) and, moreover, Theorem 22 ensures that  $\lambda$  is indeed an indexed morphism once we have fixed the predicate lifting  $\sigma$  of  $F$ . To this end, we simply take  $\sigma$  that corresponds to the box modality (cf. Example 7). To answer whether these definitions give the right kind of ‘box’ modality for CTSs, let us first instantiate  $\lambda_X$  for any  $U \subseteq \mathbb{K} \times X$ :

$$\lambda_X U = \gamma_X^{-1} \sigma_X U = \gamma_X^{-1} \{U' \mid U' \subseteq U\} = \{(k, U') \mid \{k\} \times U' \subseteq U\}. \quad (16)$$

Now given a coalgebra  $\mathbb{K} \times X \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{P}X \in \mathbf{Set}$ , we derive the interpretation of box modality for CTSs in the following way (below  $x \xrightarrow{k} x' \iff x' \in \alpha x k$ ):

$$|\alpha|^{-1} \lambda_X U = \{(k, x) \mid \forall_{x'} x \xrightarrow{k} x' \implies (k, x') \in U\}. \quad (17)$$

#### Conditional bisimilarity through relation lifting

Next we introduce conditional bisimilarity in which two states might be bisimilar for all conditions or only under certain conditions.

**Definition 34.** *Given a CTS  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} \bar{P}X \in \mathbf{coKl}(G)$ , a conditional bisimulation is a relation  $R \subseteq (\mathbb{K} \times X) \times (\mathbb{K} \times X)$  satisfying:*

- 1  $\forall_{k, k' \in \mathbb{K}, x, x' \in X} (k, x) R (k', x') \implies k = k'$ .
- 2  $\forall_{x_1, x_2, x_3, k} (x_1 \xrightarrow{k} x_3 \wedge (k, x_1) R (k, x_2)) \implies \exists_{x_4 \in X} (x_2 \xrightarrow{k} x_4 \wedge (k, x_3) R (k, x_4))$ .



Two states  $x, x' \in X$  are conditional bisimilar under  $k$  iff there is a conditional bisimulation relation  $R$  such that  $(k, x) R (k, x')$ . Moreover, two states  $x, x'$  are conditional bisimilar, denoted  $x \simeq_X x'$ , iff  $x$  and  $x'$  are conditional bisimilar under every condition  $k \in \mathbb{K}$ .

In order to capture conditional bisimilarity, we first need a fibration  $\Psi$  of binary relations on the state space. The first choice for  $\Psi$  is to consider the set of all binary relations on the underlying state space, i.e.,  $\Psi = \hat{\mathcal{P}}(|\cdot| \times |\cdot|)$ . Unfortunately, Assumption **A3** fails to hold which we explain next.

*Remark 35.* We argue that Eq1 cannot have a left adjoint since it does not preserve finite limits (in particular, terminal objects). Clearly,  $\iota 1 = 1 = \{\bullet\}$  is the terminal object in  $\mathbf{coKI}(G)$  because  $\iota$  is the right adjoint of  $|\cdot|$ . Now suppose  $\text{Eq1} = (1, =_{\mathbb{K} \times 1})$  is the terminal object in  $\mathbb{E}(\Psi)$ . Then, for any  $(X, R)$ , there is a unique arrow  $(X, R) \xrightarrow{!_X} \text{Eq1}$ , i.e.,  $X \xrightarrow{!_X} 1 \in \mathbf{coKI}(G)$  and  $R \subseteq (|!_X| \times |!_X|)^{-1} =_{\mathbb{K} \times 1}$ . But we argue that  $!_X$  is *not* a map in  $\mathbb{E}(\Psi)$  for  $|\mathbb{K}| \geq 2$ . To see this, let  $k, k' \in \mathbb{K}$  with  $k \neq k'$  and let  $R \subseteq (\mathbb{K} \times X) \times (\mathbb{K} \times X)$  be an equivalence relation such that  $(k, x) R (k', x)$ . Then we find a contradiction

$$R \subseteq (|!_X| \times |!_X|)^{-1} =_{\mathbb{K} \times 1} \implies (k, !_X(k, x)) = (k', !_X(k', x)) \implies k = k'.$$

So we need to restrict ourselves to relations satisfying the first property of conditional bisimulation (see Definition 34). An elegant way to address this is by working with the indexed category of abstract relations given in (5); thus, enabling the applicability of constructions given in Section 5. Note that binary products  $\otimes$  exist in  $\mathbf{coKI}(G)$  and is given by the Cartesian product of two sets. Thus  $\Psi$  in (5) is well defined.

**Lemma 36.** *Assumptions **A3** and **A4** are valid.*

Now to invoke the definition of  $\bar{\lambda}$  in (15), it suffices to define a relation lifting  $\sigma$  of the set endofunctor  $F = \mathcal{P}$ . We take  $\sigma$  to be the relation lifting associated with bisimulation relations as defined in Example 15.

**Theorem 37.** *Alternatively, the indexed morphism  $\Psi \xrightarrow{\bar{\lambda}} \Psi \bar{\mathcal{P}}$  given in (15) can be defined as follows:  $\bar{\lambda}_X R = \{(k, U, U') \mid \forall x \in U \exists x' \in U' (k, x, x') \in R \wedge \forall x' \in U' \exists x \in U (k, x, x') \in R\}$ . Moreover,  $\bar{\lambda}$  satisfies Assumption **A2**.*

**Corollary 38.** *Let  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{P}X \in \mathbf{coKI}(G)$  be a CTS. A relation  $R$  on  $\mathbb{K} \times X$  is a conditional bisimulation iff  $\langle \pi_1^X, \pi_2^X \rangle^{-1} R$  is an  $\alpha^* \circ \bar{\lambda}$ -coalgebra in  $\Psi X$ . Moreover, for any  $(X, \alpha) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, \beta) \in \mathbf{coKI}(G)$  we have  $\simeq_X = (|f| \times |f|)^{-1} \simeq_Y$ ; thus, there is a functor  $\mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{coKI}(G)}(\bar{\mathcal{P}}) \xrightarrow{\bar{\lambda}} \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbb{E}(\Psi)}(\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\bar{\lambda}})$ .*

*Modal characterisation of conditional bisimilarity*

$$\mathbf{coKI}(\mathbb{K} \times \_) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{|\cdot|} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{\iota} \end{array} \mathbf{Set} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{S}} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{\mathcal{T}} \end{array} \mathbf{BA}^{\text{op}}$$

Consider the above adjoint situations where the adjoint situation on the right is the well known duality (see, for instance [29]) between **Set** and the opposite category of Boolean algebras **BA**;  $\mathcal{S}$  is the contravariant powerset functor  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  maps a Boolean algebra to its set of ultrafilters. We follow [21] and use the proposed syntax functor  $\mathbf{BA} \xrightarrow{L} \mathbf{BA}$  and the interpretation  $\mathcal{PT} \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathcal{TL}$  induced by the box modality on (unlabelled) transition systems. Since  $\bar{\mathcal{P}}$  is a coKleisli extension of  $\mathcal{P}$ , i.e.,  $\bar{\mathcal{P}} \circ \iota = \iota \circ \mathcal{P}$ , we consider the following logical interpretation for CTSs:  $\bar{\mathcal{P}} \circ \iota \circ T = \iota \circ \mathcal{P} \circ T \xrightarrow{\iota\delta} \iota \circ T \circ L$ .

**Corollary 39.** *Since the lifting  $\bar{\lambda}$  preserves equalities, the logic  $(L, \iota\delta)$  defined above is adequate for conditional bisimilarity. Moreover, since  $\delta$  is injective in each component [21], the function  $|\iota\delta_{\mathcal{A}}|$  is injective; thus  $(L, \iota\delta)$  is expressive.*

## 8 Conclusions

To recapitulate, we gave a systematic way to construct both predicate and relation liftings in (co)Kleisli categories and Eilenberg-Moore categories. Relation liftings form the basis to define behavioural equivalence as a coalgebra of certain lifted endofunctor in the fibre of relations, although in some cases (such as CTSs) such fibres can be subtle to define.

Once behavioural equivalence is captured as a fibred notion, the Kupke and Rot setup becomes applicable to obtain its corresponding logical characterisation. In particular, we gave a recipe to find the left adjoint  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$  of  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$  which is a sufficient condition for both adequacy and expressivity. For coKleisli and Eilenberg-Moore categories, the construction (11) of  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$  is based on the existence of coequalisers in the underlying categories, while in the Kleisli case one has to resort to a reflective subcategory having coequalisers (cf. Theorem 21).

In the future, we plan to develop extend the 2-player game [28] to coalgebras with side effects. Lastly, we also plan to investigate whether the given recipe of constructing predicate/relation liftings can be extended to more general monads (like the ones on pseudometric spaces). This should help in developing quantitative modal logics for coalgebras with side effects; thus, providing a pertinent litmus test for the categorical unification of quantitative expressivity as claimed in the recent work [26].

## References

1. Adámek, J., Bonchi, F., Hülsbusch, M., König, B., Milius, S., Silva, A.: A coalgebraic perspective on minimization and determinization. In: Proc. of FOSSACS '12. pp. 58–73. Springer (2012), LNCS/ARCoSS 7213
2. Adámek, J., Herrlich, H., Strecker, G.E.: Abstract and concrete categories: The joy of cats. No. 17, Reprints in Theory and Applications of Categories, online edn. (2006), originally published by: John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1990

3. Beohar, H., König, B., Küpper, S., Silva, A., Wißmann, T.: A coalgebraic treatment of conditional transition systems with upgrades. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* **Volume 14, Issue 1** (Feb 2018). [https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-14\(1:19\)2018](https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-14(1:19)2018), <https://lmcs.episciences.org/4330>
4. Beohar, H., König, B., Küpper, S., Mika-Michalski, C.: Predicate, relation liftings and modal logics for coalgebras with side effects. *CoRR* **abs/2110.09911** (2021), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.09911>
5. Beohar, H., König, B., Küpper, S., Silva, A.: Conditional transition systems with upgrades. *Science of Computer Programming* **186**, 102320 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scico.2019.102320>
6. Bonchi, F., Bonsangue, M., Caltais, G., Rutten, J., Silva, A.: A coalgebraic view on decorated traces. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* **26(7)**, 1234–1268 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129514000449>
7. Bonchi, F., König, B., Petrisan, D.: Up-To Techniques for Behavioural Metrics via Fibrations. In: Schewe, S., Zhang, L. (eds.) 29th International Conference on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 2018). *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, vol. 118, pp. 17:1–17:17. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany (2018). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2018.17>, <http://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2018/9555>
8. Bonchi, F., Petrisan, D., Pous, D., Rot, J.: Coinduction up-to in a fibrational setting. In: Proceedings of the Joint Meeting of the Twenty-Third EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL) and the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS). *CSL-LICS '14*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2603088.2603149>
9. Cordy, M., Classen, A., Perrouin, G., Schobbens, P.Y., Heymans, P., Legay, A.: Simulation-based abstractions for software product-line model checking. In: Proc. of ICSE '12 (International Conference on Software Engineering). pp. 672–682. IEEE (2012)
10. Dorsch, U., Milius, S., Schröder, L.: Graded Monads and Graded Logics for the Linear Time - Branching Time Spectrum. In: Fokkink, W., van Glabbeek, R.J. (eds.) 30th International Conference on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 2019). *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, vol. 140, pp. 36:1–36:16. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany (2019). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2019.36>, <http://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2019/10938>
11. Ghani, N., Johann, P., Fumex, C.: Indexed Induction and Coinduction, Fibrationally. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* **Volume 9, Issue 3** (Aug 2013). [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-9\(3:6\)2013](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-9(3:6)2013), <https://lmcs.episciences.org/738>
12. Gorín, D., Schröder, L.: Simulations and bisimulations for coalgebraic modal logics. In: Heckel, R., Milius, S. (eds.) *Algebra and Coalgebra in Computer Science*. pp. 253–266. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2013)
13. Hasuo, I., Jacobs, B.P.F., Sokolova, A.: Generic Trace Semantics via Coinduction. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* **Volume 3, Issue 4** (Nov 2007). [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-3\(4:11\)2007](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-3(4:11)2007), <https://lmcs.episciences.org/864>
14. Hasuo, I., Kataoka, T., Cho, K.: Coinductive predicates and final sequences in a fibration. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* **28(4)**, 562–611 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129517000056>

15. Hermida, C.A., Jacobs, B.P.F.: Structural induction and coinduction in a fibration setting. *Information and Computation* **145**(2), 107 – 152 (1998)
16. Jacobs, B.P.F.: *Categorical Logic and Type Theory*, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol. 141. Elsevier, 1st edn. (Jan 1999)
17. Jacobs, B.P.F.: Trace semantics for coalgebras. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* **106**, 167 – 184 (2004), proceedings of the Workshop on Coalgebraic Methods in Computer Science (CMCS)
18. Jacobs, B.P.F.: Predicate logic for functors and monads. Available from author’s website (2010), <http://www.cs.ru.nl/~bart/PAPERS/predlift-indcat.pdf>
19. Jacobs, B.P.F.: *Introduction to Coalgebra: Towards Mathematics of States and Observation*. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science, Cambridge University Press (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316823187>
20. Jacobs, B.P.F., Silva, A., Sokolova, A.: Trace semantics via determinization. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* **81**(5), 859 – 879 (2015), 11th International Workshop on Coalgebraic Methods in Computer Science, CMCS 2012 (Selected Papers)
21. Jacobs, B.P.F., Sokolova, A.: Exemplaric expressivity of modal logics. *Journal of Logic and Computation* **20**(5), 1041–1068 (Oct 2010)
22. Kissig, C., Kurz, A.: Generic trace logics (2011), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1103.3239>, arXiv:1103.3239
23. Klin, B.: The least fibred lifting and the expressivity of coalgebraic modal logic. In: Fiadeiro, J.L., Harman, N., Roggenbach, M., Rutten, J.J.J.M. (eds.) *Algebra and Coalgebra in Computer Science*. pp. 247–262. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2005)
24. Klin, B., Rot, J.: Coalgebraic trace semantics via forgetful logics. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* **Volume 12, Issue 4** (Apr 2017). [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-12\(4:10\)2016](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-12(4:10)2016), <https://lmcs.episciences.org/2622>
25. Komorida, Y., Katsumata, S., Hu, N., Klin, B., Hasuo, I.: Codensity games for bisimilarity. In: 2019 34th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS). pp. 1–13 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2019.8785691>
26. Komorida, Y., Katsumata, S.y., Kupke, C., Rot, J., Hasuo, I.: Expressivity of quantitative modal logics: Categorical foundations via codensity and approximation. Accepted for publication in LICS’21 (June 2021)
27. König, B., Küpper, S.: A generalized partition refinement algorithm, instantiated to language equivalence checking for weighted automata. *Soft Computing* **22**(4) (2018)
28. König, B., Mika-Michalski, C.: (Metric) Bisimulation Games and Real-Valued Modal Logics for Coalgebras. In: Proc. of CONCUR ’18. LIPIcs, vol. 118, pp. 37:1–37:17. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz Center for Informatics (2018)
29. Kupke, C., Pattinson, D.: Coalgebraic semantics of modal logics: An overview. *Theoretical Computer Science* **412**(38), 5070 – 5094 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2011.04.023>, CMCS Tenth Anniversary Meeting
30. Kupke, C., Rot, J.: Expressive Logics for Coinductive Predicates. In: Fernández, M., Muscholl, A. (eds.) 28th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL 2020). Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), vol. 152, pp. 26:1–26:18. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany (2020). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2020.26>
31. Mulry, P.S.: Lifting theorems for Kleisli categories. In: Proc. of MFPS (Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics). pp. 304–319. Springer (1993), LNCS 802

32. Pattinson, D.: Coalgebraic modal logic: soundness, completeness and decidability of local consequence. *Theoretical Computer Science* **309**(1), 177 – 193 (2003)
33. Pavlovic, D., Mislove, M.W., Worrell, J.B.: Testing semantics: Connecting processes and process logics. In: Johnson, M., Vene, V. (eds.) *Algebraic Methodology and Software Technology*. pp. 308–322. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2006)
34. Rutten, J.: Universal coalgebra: a theory of systems. *Theoretical Computer Science* **249**(1), 3 – 80 (2000)
35. Schröder, L.: Expressivity of coalgebraic modal logic: The limits and beyond. *Theoretical Computer Science* **390**(2), 230 – 247 (2008)
36. Silva, A., Bonchi, F., Bonsangue, M., Rutten, J.: Generalizing determinization from automata to coalgebras. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* **Volume 9, Issue 1** (Mar 2013). [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-9\(1:9\)2013](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-9(1:9)2013)
37. Sprunger, D., Katsumata, S.y., Dubut, J., Hasuo, I.: Fibrational bisimulations and quantitative reasoning. In: Cirstea, C. (ed.) *Coalgebraic Methods in Computer Science*. pp. 190–213. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2018)

## A Omitted proofs

**Proposition 8.** *Under Assumption A1 the square drawn in (6) commutes for any arrow  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$  in  $\mathbf{C}$ . As a result, there is a functor  $\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{\text{Eq}} \mathbb{E}(\Psi)$  (henceforth called equality functor) that maps an object  $X$  to the abstract equality  $\equiv_X$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{C}$ . We need to show that  $\equiv_X \subseteq f^* \equiv_Y$ . First consider the the following diagram, where  $p_i^\square$  and  $\pi_i^\square$  (for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $\square \in \{X, Y\}$ ) are the obvious projection arrows in  $\mathbf{Set}$  and  $\mathbf{C}$ , respectively.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 |X \otimes X| & \xrightarrow{\langle |\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X| \rangle} & & & |X| \times |X| \\
 \downarrow |f \otimes f| & \searrow |\pi_i^X| & & \swarrow p_i^X & \downarrow (|f| \times |f|) \\
 & & |X| & & \\
 |Y \otimes Y| & \xrightarrow{\langle |\pi_1^Y|, |\pi_2^Y| \rangle} & & & |Y| \times |Y| \\
 \downarrow |f \otimes f| & \searrow |\pi_i^Y| & & \swarrow p_i^Y & \downarrow (|f| \times |f|) \\
 & & |Y| & & 
 \end{array}$$

Note that all the dashed arrows exists due to the universal property of products. Moreover, it is well known that projection functions  $p_i^Y$  are jointly monic. So it suffices to show that the corresponding outermost paths for each  $i$  from  $|X \otimes X|$  to  $|Y|$  commutes, which follows from diagram chasing. Now the result follows from the following implications:

$$\begin{aligned}
 =_{|X|} \subseteq (|f| \times |f|)^{-1} =_{|Y|} &\Rightarrow \langle |\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X| \rangle^{-1} =_{|X|} \subseteq \langle |\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X| \rangle^{-1} (|f| \times |f|)^{-1} =_{|Y|} \\
 &\Rightarrow \langle |\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X| \rangle^{-1} =_{|X|} \subseteq |f \otimes f|^{-1} \langle |\pi_1^Y|, |\pi_2^Y| \rangle^{-1} =_{|Y|}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The second implication holds due to the commutative of rectangle drawn with dashed edges.  $\square$

**Theorem 11.** *Given an indexed morphism  $\Psi \xrightarrow{\lambda} \Psi \circ F$ , then under Assumptions A1 and A2, the behavioural equivalence induced by a coalgebra homomorphism  $f \in \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{C}}(F)$  on a coalgebra  $(X, \alpha) \in \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{C}}(F)$  is a  $\alpha^* \circ \lambda$ -coalgebra living in the fibre  $\Psi X$ , i.e.,  $f^*(\equiv_Y) \subseteq \alpha^* \lambda_X (f^* \equiv_Y)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(X, \alpha) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, \beta) \in \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{C}}(F)$  be a coalgebra homomorphism and consider the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \Phi X & \xrightarrow{\lambda_X} & \Phi F X & \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} & \Phi X \\
 \uparrow f^* & & \uparrow (Ff)^* & & \uparrow f^* \\
 \Phi Y & \xrightarrow{\lambda_Y} & \Phi F Y & \xrightarrow{\beta^*} & \Phi Y
 \end{array}$$

Then using Assumptions **A1**, **A2** and Proposition 8 we find that  $\equiv_Y \subseteq \beta^*(\equiv_{FY}) = \beta^*\lambda_Y(\equiv_Y)$ . Furthermore, we derive

$$f^* \equiv_Y \subseteq f^*\beta^*\lambda_Y \equiv_Y \implies f^* \equiv_Y \subseteq \alpha^*\lambda_X f^* \equiv_Y . \quad \square$$

**Theorem 12.** *Under Assumptions **A1**, **A2**, and **A3** for every  $\alpha^* \circ \lambda$ -coalgebra  $R$  there is a coalgebra homomorphism  $f \in \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{C}}(F)$  such that  $R \subseteq f^*(\equiv_{\text{cod}(f)})$ , where  $\text{cod}(f)$  denotes the codomain of  $f$ . Moreover,  $R = f^*(\equiv_{\text{cod}(f)})$  when the unit of  $\mathbb{Q} \dashv \text{Eq}$  is Cartesian.*

*Proof.* Let  $R \in \Psi X$  such that  $R \preceq \alpha^*\lambda_X R$  and let  $\kappa$  be the unit of adjunction  $\mathbb{Q} \dashv \text{Eq}$ . For a given coalgebra  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} FX$ , we are going to first construct a coalgebra of the form  $\mathbb{Q}(X, R) \xrightarrow{\alpha_R} F\mathbb{Q}(X, R)$  such that  $p\kappa_X$  is the witnessing coalgebra homomorphism. To define  $\alpha_R$ , consider the following diagram in  $\mathbb{E}(\Psi)$  without the dashed arrow.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X, R) & \xrightarrow{\kappa_X} & \text{Eq} \circ \mathbb{Q}(X, R) \\ \alpha \downarrow & & \vdots \text{Eq}(\alpha_R) \\ (FX, \lambda_X R) & \xrightarrow{F\kappa_X} & \text{Eq} \circ F \circ \mathbb{Q}(X, R) \end{array} \quad (18)$$

Note that by the assumption we have  $\lambda_X(\equiv_X) = \equiv_{FX}$  and, since the unit  $\kappa_X \in \mathbb{E}(\Psi)$ , we get that  $R \preceq \kappa_X^* \equiv_{\mathbb{Q}(X, R)}$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_X R \preceq \lambda_X \kappa_X^* \equiv_{\mathbb{Q}(X, R)} &\implies \lambda_X R \preceq (F\kappa_X)^* \lambda_{\mathbb{Q}(X, R)} \equiv_{\mathbb{Q}(X, R)} \\ &\implies \lambda_X R \preceq (F\kappa_X)^* \equiv_{F\mathbb{Q}(X, R)} . \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $F\kappa_X$  drawn in (18) is a valid arrow in  $\mathbb{E}(\Psi)$ . And the universal property of the unit  $\kappa_X$  gives a unique arrow  $\mathbb{Q}(X, R) \xrightarrow{\alpha_R} F\mathbb{Q}(X, R)$ , i.e., a coalgebraic structure on  $\mathbb{Q}(X, R)$ , such that Square (18) commutes. Clearly, applying the forgetful functor  $p$  ensures that  $p\kappa_X$  is a coalgebra homomorphism.  $\square$

**Lemma 14.** *Suppose  $\mathbf{C}^{op} \xrightarrow{\Phi} \mathbf{Cat}$  has indexed final objects (i.e., the final object exists in each fibre  $\Phi X$ ) and the reindexing functor  $f^*$  preserves these final objects. Then there is a functor  $\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{1} \mathbb{E}(\Phi)$  that is right adjoint to  $p$ .*

*Proof.* Define  $\mathbb{1}X = (X, 1_X)$  where  $1_X$  is the final object in  $\Phi X$ . Note for any  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$ , we have  $1_X \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{1_X}} 1_X = f^*1_Y$  since the reindexing functor preserves the indexed final objects. Thus, we let  $\mathbb{1}f = (f, \text{id}_{1_X})$ . Next we show that  $p \dashv \mathbb{1}$ .

$$\begin{array}{c} (X, U) \xrightarrow{(g, \bar{g})} (Y, \text{id}_{1_Y}) \in \mathbb{E}(\Phi) \\ \hline (X, U) \xrightarrow{(g, \bar{g})} \mathbb{1}Y \in \mathbb{E}(\Phi) \\ \hline p(X, U) \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{C} \\ \hline X \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{C} \end{array}$$

$\boxed{\Uparrow}$  Let  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{C}$ . Then take  $g = f$  and let  $\bar{g}$  be the unique arrow  $U \xrightarrow{\bar{g}} 1_X \in \Phi X$  to the final object  $1_X = f^*1_Y$ .

$\boxed{\Downarrow}$  Take  $f = g$  and the implication follows from the construction of  $\mathbb{E}(\Phi)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 18.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 11, if  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$  has a left adjoint  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ , the logic  $(L, \delta)$  is adequate. Moreover it is expressive if  $|\delta_{\mathcal{A}}|$  is injective.*

*Proof.* For adequacy, we show the conditions of [30, Theorem 18] are satisfied. It remains to show that there is a natural transformation  $(F\mathcal{T}\mathcal{A}, \equiv_{F\mathcal{T}\mathcal{A}}) = F_{\lambda}\bar{\mathcal{T}}\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{\delta_{\mathcal{A}}} \bar{\mathcal{T}}L\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{T}L\mathcal{A}, \equiv_{\mathcal{T}L\mathcal{A}})$ . We can simply let  $\bar{\delta} = \delta$  because Eq is a functor. For expressivity, we show that the conditions of [30, Theorem 19] are satisfied, i.e., the arrow  $(F\mathcal{T}\mathcal{A}, =_{|\mathcal{T}\mathcal{A}|}) \xrightarrow{\delta_{\mathcal{A}}} (\mathcal{T}L\mathcal{A}, =_{|\mathcal{T}L\mathcal{A}|}) \in \mathbb{E}(\Psi)$  is Cartesian. But this follows directly from the injectivity of  $|\delta_{\mathcal{A}}|$ . To see this let  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$  be an arrow in  $\mathbf{C}$  such that  $=_{|X|} = (|f| \times |f|)^{-1} =_{|Y|}$ . Then we derive

$$\begin{aligned} |f \otimes f|^{-1}(\equiv_Y) &= |f \otimes f|^{-1}(|\pi_1^Y|, |\pi_2^Y|)^{-1}(\equiv_{|Y|}) \\ &\stackrel{(6)}{=} (|\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X|)^{-1}(|f| \times |f|)^{-1} =_{|Y|} \\ &= (|\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X|)^{-1}(\equiv_{|X|}) \\ &= \equiv_X . \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 21.** *Under **A1** and  $\mathbf{A}^{op}$  being a reflective subcategory of  $\mathbf{Kl}(T)$  having coequalisers, the above defined  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$  is a functor and left adjoint to  $\bar{\mathcal{T}} = \text{Eq} \circ \mathcal{T}$ .*

*Proof.* Due to **A1** product exists in  $\mathbf{Kl}(T)$  and the forgetful functor preserves these products. So we can work with concrete equality  $=_{|X|}$  instead of  $\equiv_X$  (for  $X \in \mathbf{Kl}(T)$ ) by showing that  $\bar{\mathcal{S}} \dashv \bar{\mathcal{T}}$ , i.e., the following correspondence holds

$$\begin{array}{c} X \xrightarrow{f} jY \in \mathbf{Kl}(T) \wedge R \subseteq (|f| \times |f|)^{-1} =_{|jY|} \\ \hline (X, R) \xrightarrow{f} (jY, =_{|jY|}) \in \mathbb{E}(\Psi) \\ \hline \bar{\mathcal{S}}(X, R) \xrightarrow{g} Y \in \mathbf{A}^{op} \\ \hline Y \xrightarrow{g} \bar{\mathcal{S}}(X, R) \in \mathbf{A} \end{array}$$

$\boxed{\Downarrow}$  Let  $X \xrightarrow{f} jY \in \mathbf{Kl}(T)$  such that  $R \subseteq (|f| \times |f|)^{-1} =_{|jY|}$ . Then we find a unique  $Y \xrightarrow{g} \tau X \in \mathbf{A}$  as the transpose of  $f$  under  $\tau \dashv j$ . Moreover, using the counit of  $\iota \dashv |\_|$  one can show that if  $|f| \circ p_1 = |f| \circ p_2 \implies f \circ p'_1 = f \circ p'_2$ . Thus,  $\tau p'_1 \circ g = \tau p'_2 \circ g$ . And by the universal property of equalisers we find a unique  $Y \xrightarrow{u_g} \bar{\mathcal{S}}(X, R)$ .

$\boxed{\Uparrow}$  Let  $Y \xrightarrow{g} \bar{\mathcal{S}}(X, R) \in \mathbf{A}$ . Then take  $f$  as the transpose of  $e \circ g$  under  $\tau \dashv j$ . To show that  $f \circ p'_1 = f \circ p'_2$  consider the following commutative diagram



in  $\mathbf{Kl}(T)$ , where  $\eta$  is the unit of  $\tau \dashv j$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 j\iota R & \xrightleftharpoons{j\tau p'_1} & j\tau X & \xrightarrow{j(e \circ g)} & jY \\
 \uparrow \eta_{\iota R} & & \uparrow \eta_X & & \\
 \iota R & \xrightleftharpoons[p'_2]{p'_1} & X & & 
 \end{array}$$

**Lemma 23.** *Let  $\bar{F}$  be a Kleisli extension of  $F$  induced by a distributive law  $FT \xrightarrow{\vartheta} TF$ . Then a natural transformation  $TF \xrightarrow{\gamma} GT$  compatible with  $\vartheta$  and  $\mu$  (i.e., Square 13 commutes) induces a distributive law  $|- \circ \bar{F} \longrightarrow G \circ |-$ . Moreover, the converse also holds.*

*Proof.* Let  $C \xrightarrow{f} D \in \mathbf{Kl}(T)$ . Then we need to show that the following square on the left commutes. But this follows immediately by the commutative diagram drawn on the right, where the top square commutes due to the naturality of  $\gamma$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 |\bar{F}C| \xrightarrow{\gamma_C} G|C| & & TFC \xrightarrow{\gamma_C} GTC \\
 \downarrow |\bar{F}f| & & \downarrow TFf \\
 |\bar{F}D| \xrightarrow{\gamma_D} G|D| & & TFTD \xrightarrow{\gamma_{TD}} GTTD \\
 \downarrow G|f| & & \downarrow T\theta_D \\
 & & TTFD \\
 & & \downarrow \mu_{FD} \\
 & & TFD \xrightarrow{\gamma_D} GTD \\
 & & \downarrow G\mu_D
 \end{array}$$

For the converse, take  $f = \text{id}_{TC}$  and view it as a Kleisli arrow  $TC \longrightarrow C$ .

**Lemma 28.** *The above mappings  $\sigma_X^a$  and  $\sigma_X^\downarrow$  are indexed morphisms.*

*Proof.* Let  $V \subseteq Y$  and  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$  be a function. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (f^{Act} \times 2)^{-1} \sigma_Y^a V &= (f^{Act} \times 2)^{-1} \{(q, b) \in Y^{Act} \times 2 \mid qa \in V\} \\
 &= \{(p, b') \in X^{Act} \times 2 \mid (f^{Act} \times 2)(p, b') \in \{(q, b) \mid qa \in V\}\} \\
 &= \{(p, b') \in X^{Act} \times 2 \mid (f \circ p, b') \in \{(q, b) \mid qa \in V\}\} \\
 &= \{(p, b) \mid f(pa) \in V\} \\
 &= \{(p, b) \mid pa \in f^{-1}V\} \\
 &= \sigma_X^a f^{-1}V.
 \end{aligned}$$

For the mapping associated with termination, we derive

$$(f^{Act} \times 2)^{-1} \sigma_Y^\downarrow V = (f^{Act} \times 2)^{-1} \{(q, 1) \mid q \in Y^{Act}\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \{(p, b) \in X^{Act} \times 2 \mid (f^{Act} \times 2)(p, b) \in \{(q, 1) \mid q \in Y^{Act}\}\} \\
&= \{(p, 1) \in X^{Act} \times 2 \mid f \circ p \in Y^{Act}\} \\
&= \sigma_X^\downarrow f^{-1}V. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 29.** *The mapping  $\bar{\sigma}$  defined above is an indexed morphism.*

*Proof.* Let  $R, R'$  be two binary relations on  $X$  such that  $R \subseteq R'$ . We first show that  $\bar{\sigma}_X R \subseteq \bar{\sigma}_X R'$ . Let  $(p, b) \bar{\sigma}_X R (p', b)$ . Then we find  $\forall_{a \in Act} (pa R p'a \implies pa R' p'a)$ . Thus,  $(p, b) \bar{\sigma}_X R (p', b)$ .

Lastly, we need to show that the equation  $\bar{\sigma}_X \circ (f \times f)^{-1} = (Gf \times Gf)^{-1} \circ \bar{\sigma}_Y$  holds. Below  $S$  is a relation on  $Y$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
(p, b) \bar{\sigma}_X \circ (f \times f)^{-1} S (p', b') &\iff b = b' \wedge \forall_a pa (f \times f)^{-1} p'a \\
&\iff b = b' \wedge \forall_a fpa R fp'a \\
&\iff (f \circ p, b) \bar{\sigma}_Y S (f \circ p', b') \\
&\iff Gf(p, b) \bar{\sigma}_Y S Gf(p', b') \\
&\iff (p, b) (Gf \times Gf)^{-1} \circ \bar{\sigma}_Y S (p', b') . \square
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 30.** *The indexed morphism  $\bar{\sigma}$  preserves arbitrary intersections at each component; therefore, so does the predicate lifting  $\bar{\lambda}$ . Moreover,  $\bar{\lambda}$  satisfies **A2**.*

*Proof.* Let  $R_i$  (for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ) be relations on  $X$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
(p, b) \left( \sigma_X^G \left( \bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} R_i \right) \right) (p', b') &\iff b = b' \wedge \forall_{a \in Act} pa \left( \bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} R_i \right) p'a \\
&\iff b = b' \wedge \forall_{a \in Act, \mathbb{N}} pa R_i p'a \\
&\iff \forall_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (b = b' \wedge \forall_{a \in Act} pa R_i p'a) \\
&\iff \forall_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (p, b) (\sigma_X^G R_i) (p', b') \\
&\iff (p, b) \left( \bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_X^G R_i \right) (p', b') .
\end{aligned}$$

ote that  $\lambda$  is the composition  $(\gamma_X \times \gamma_X)^{-1} \circ \sigma^G$  and since inverse functions preserve arbitrary intersections, we can conclude that  $\lambda$  also preserves intersections at each component.

Lastly, to show that  $\bar{\lambda}$  preserves equalities, let  $R =_{\mathcal{P}X} R'$ . Let  $\bar{U}, \bar{U}' \subseteq Act \times X + 1$  such that  $\bar{U} \lambda_X R \bar{U}'$ . Clearly,  $\bullet \in \bar{U} \iff \bullet \in \bar{U}'$ . So consider  $(a, \bar{x}) \in \bar{U}$ . Then  $\bar{x} \in \{x \mid (a, x) \in \bar{U}\}$  and since the two sets  $\{x \mid (a, x) \in \bar{U}\}, \{x \mid (a, x) \in \bar{U}'\}$  are the same, we find that  $(a, \bar{x}) \in \bar{U}'$ . Likewise, we can show the other direction and we conclude that  $\bar{U} = \bar{U}'$ .

**Theorem 31.** *Let  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} FX \in \mathbf{Rel}$  be an NDA. Then language equivalence  $\simeq_X \subseteq \mathcal{P}X \times \mathcal{P}X$  on the determinised system is a  $\Psi(\alpha) \circ \bar{\lambda}_X$ -coalgebra, i.e.,  $\simeq_X \subseteq (|\alpha| \times |\alpha|)^{-1} (\bar{\lambda}_X \simeq_X)$ . Moreover,  $\simeq_X = (|f| \times |f|)^{-1} \simeq_Y$  for any coalgebra homomorphism  $f$  between  $(X, \alpha)$  and  $(Y, \beta)$ ; thus, there is a behavioural conformance functor  $\mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{Rel}}(\bar{F}) \xrightarrow{1^{\bar{\lambda}}} \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{E}(\Psi)}(\bar{F}_\lambda)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} Act \times X + 1 \in \mathbf{Rel}$  be an NDA. Since the relation lifting  $\bar{\lambda}$  preserves intersections, so from Kleene fixed point theorem, the largest fixpoint  $\sim_X \in \Psi X$  of  $\alpha^* \circ \bar{\lambda}$  exists. That is, the following sequence stabilises (below  $1_X \in \Psi X$  is the total relation on  $\mathcal{P}X$ ):

$$1_X \supseteq (|\alpha| \times |\alpha|)^{-1} \circ \lambda_X(\top_X) \supseteq ((|\alpha| \times |\alpha|)^{-1} \circ \lambda_X)^2(\top_X) \supseteq \dots$$

Let us denote the above projective sequence as a diagram  $\mathbf{N} \xrightarrow{D} \Psi X$ , i.e.  $Di = (|\alpha|^{-1} \circ \lambda_X)^i \top_X$  (note that the zeroth iteration of a function is assumed to return the full relation  $\top_X$  and  $\mathbf{N}$  has the set  $\mathbb{N}$  of natural numbers as objects and arrows induced by the less-than-equal-to relation). So  $\sim_X = \bigcap_i Di$  and note that by definition  $\sim_X$  is  $\alpha^* \circ \bar{\lambda}$ -coalgebra.

Let  $U_w$  is the unique state reached in the determinised system from the state  $U$  after performing the trace  $w$ . Note that for any  $i > 1$  we have:

$$U D(i+1) U' \iff (U \downarrow \iff U' \downarrow) \wedge \forall a \in Act U_a Di U'_a.$$

Moreover, it is not hard to show by induction on  $w$  that we have

$$U \simeq_X U' \iff \forall w \in Act^* U_w \downarrow \iff U'_w \downarrow.$$

Next we show that  $\sim_X = \simeq_X$ . To show that  $\simeq_X \subseteq \sim_X$ , it suffices to show that  $\simeq_X$  is a  $\alpha^* \circ \bar{\lambda}_X$ -coalgebra, i.e., for any  $U, U' \subseteq X$ , if  $U \simeq_X U'$  then  $|\alpha|U \lambda_X \simeq_X |\alpha|U'$ . So let  $U \simeq_X U'$ , clearly,  $U \downarrow \iff U' \downarrow$ . Moreover,  $U_a \simeq_X U'_a$  (for any  $a$ ) because  $U \simeq_X U'$ . So  $\simeq_X \subseteq \sim_X$ .

For the other direction, let  $U \sim_X U'$ . Then for any  $w \in Act^*$  we have  $U D(\#w + 1) U'$ , where  $\#w$  is the length of the word  $w$ . Thus,  $U_w \downarrow \iff U'_w \downarrow$ . Therefore,  $U \simeq_X U'$ .

Lastly, let  $(X, \alpha) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, \beta) \in \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{Rel}}(\bar{F})$ , i.e.,  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$  is a relation satisfying the following two transfer properties:

- $\forall x, y', a (\exists y (x f y \wedge y \xrightarrow{a} y') \iff \exists x' (x' f y' \wedge x \xrightarrow{a} x'))$ .
- $\forall x (x \downarrow \iff \exists y (x f y \wedge y \downarrow))$ .

Note that the second transfer property ensures that  $U_w \downarrow \iff (|f|U)_w \downarrow$ , for any  $U \subseteq X, w \in Act^*$ . This is because

$$U_w \downarrow \iff \exists x \in U_w x \downarrow \iff \exists x \in U_w, y x f y \wedge y \downarrow \iff (|f|U)_w \downarrow.$$

Thus, for any  $w$  we have  $(U_w \downarrow \iff U'_w \downarrow) \iff ((|f|U)_w \downarrow \iff (|f|U')_w \downarrow)$ . Hence  $\simeq_X = (|f| \times |f|)^{-1} \simeq_Y$ .

**Proposition 32.** *The above defined mapping  $\theta$  is a natural transformation.*

*Proof.* We show that the following square commutes for any  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{Rel}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Act \times \mathcal{P}X + 1 & \xrightarrow{\theta_X} & \mathcal{P}(Act \times X + 1) \\ \uparrow L\tau f & & \uparrow \tau \bar{F} f \\ Act \times \mathcal{P}Y + 1 & \xrightarrow{\theta_Y} & \mathcal{P}(Act \times Y + 1) \end{array}$$

Let  $a \in Act, V \subseteq Y$ . Then we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\mathbf{r}}(Ff)\theta_Y(a, V) &= \mathbf{r}(\bar{F}f)(\{a\} \times V) \\
&= \{(a', x) \mid \exists y \in V (a', x) Ff (a, y)\} \\
&= \{(a, x) \mid \exists y \in V x f y\} \\
&= \{a\} \times \{x \mid \exists y \in V x f y\} \\
&= \{a\} \times \mathbf{r}f(V) \\
&= \theta_X(a, \mathbf{r}f(V)) = \theta_X \circ L(\mathbf{r}sf)(a, V).
\end{aligned}$$

Likewise, the case for  $\bullet \in 1$  can be verified; thus,  $LS \xrightarrow{\theta} SF$  is a natural transformation.

**Lemma 36.** *Assumptions A3 and A4 are valid.*

*Proof (A4).* Consider the square drawn in (6) and let  $k, k', y, y', x, x'$  be such that  $\langle |\pi_1^Y|, |\pi_2^Y| \rangle(k, y, y') = |f| \times |f|((k, x), (k', x'))$ . I.e.,  $(k, y) = (k, f(k, x))$  and  $(k, y') = (k', f(k', x'))$ . Thus, we find that  $k = k'$ . Therefore, we can conclude that  $(k, x, x') \in |X \otimes X|$ . Moreover, we also find that  $|f \otimes f|(k, x, x') = (k, f \otimes f(k, x, x')) = (k, f(k, x), f(k, x')) = (k, y, y')$ . Lastly,  $\langle |\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X| \rangle(k, x, x') = ((k, x), (k, x'))$ . I.e., the universal property of weak pullback in **Set** holds.  $\square$

*Proof (A3).* Let  $G = \mathbb{K} \times \_$  and let  $(X, R) \in \mathbb{E}(\Psi)$ , i.e.,  $X \in \mathbf{Set}$  and  $R \in \Psi X$ . This means we have the following diagram in **Set**:

$$R_! \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{p_1} \\ \xrightarrow{p_2} \end{array} GX \xrightarrow{q} GX/R_!,$$

where  $GX/R_!$  is the coequaliser of  $p_1, p_2$  and  $R_! = \langle \pi_1^X, \pi_2^X \rangle_! R = \{((k, x), (k, x')) \mid (k, x, x') \in R\}$ . So we define  $\mathbb{Q}(X, R)$  to be the object  $\iota(GX/R_!)$ . In other words,  $\mathbb{Q}$  can be defined by the composition:

$$\mathbb{E}(\Psi) \xrightarrow{|\_!|} \mathbb{E}(\Psi') \xrightarrow{\mathbb{Q}'} \mathbf{Set} \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathbf{coKl}(G),$$

where  $\Psi'$  is the standard indexed category of relations on sets and  $\mathbb{Q}'$  is the usual quotient functor as described in Remark 10. The functor  $|\_!|$  is defined as:  $(X, R) \mapsto (|X|, R_!)$  and  $f \mapsto |f|$ . This is welldefined due to Beck-Chevalley property on the indexed category  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ , which holds for weak pullback squares. In particular, let  $(X, R) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, S) \in \mathbb{E}(\Psi)$ , i.e.,  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{C}$  and  $R \subseteq (f \otimes f)^{-1}S$ . By applying the direct image functor we get

$$\langle |\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X| \rangle_! R \subseteq \langle |\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X| \rangle_! (f \otimes f)^{-1}S = (|f| \times |f|)^{-1} \langle |\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X| \rangle_! S.$$

Note that the righthmost equality holds due to Beck-Chevalley condition and A4. Therefore  $\mathbb{Q}$  is a functor.

Next we show that  $\mathbb{Q} \dashv \text{Eq}$ , i.e., we establish the following correspondence:

$$\frac{\frac{\iota(GX/R_!) \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{coKl}(G)}{(X, R) \xrightarrow{g} \text{Eq}Y = (Y, \equiv_Y) \in \mathbb{E}(\Psi)}}{X \xrightarrow{g} Y \in \mathbf{coKl}(G) \wedge R \subseteq (|g \otimes g|)^{-1} \equiv_Y}$$

$\boxed{\Uparrow}$  Let  $X \xrightarrow{g} Y \in \mathbf{coKl}(G)$  (i.e.,  $GX \xrightarrow{g} Y \in \mathbf{Set}$ ) and  $R \subseteq (|g \otimes g|)^{-1} \equiv_Y$ . We claim that  $g \circ p_1 = g \circ p_2$ . So let  $(k, x) R_! (k', x')$ . Then we find  $k = k'$  because of the construction of  $R_!$  and  $g(k, x) = g(k, x')$  because of the inequality  $R \subseteq (|g \otimes g|)^{-1} \equiv_Y$ . This proves the claim. And from the universal property of coequalisers in  $\mathbf{Set}$ , we find a unique function  $GX/R \xrightarrow{g'} Y$  satisfying  $g' \circ q = g$ . So fix  $f = \iota g'$  and clearly  $f$  is uniquely determined by  $g$ .

$\boxed{\Downarrow}$  Let  $\iota(GX/R) \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{coKl}(G)$ . Recall the unit  $X \xrightarrow{\eta_X} \iota|X| \in \mathbf{coKl}(G)$  of the adjunction  $|-| \dashv \iota$ . Then, let  $g$  be the following composition:

$$X \xrightarrow{\eta_X} \iota|X| \xrightarrow{\iota q} \mathbb{Q}(X, R) \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{coKl}(G).$$

Clearly,  $g$  is uniquely determined by  $f$ . Now it remains to show that for  $k, x, x'$ , if  $(k, x, x') \in R$  then  $|g \otimes g|(k, x, x') = (k, g \otimes g(k, x, x')) = (k, g(k, x), g(k, x')) \in \equiv_Y$ . Thus it remains to show that  $g(k, x) = g(k, x')$ .

To this end, we first evaluate  $g$ . Note that  $\eta$  is given by the identity arrow and using the definition of coKleisli composition we find that

$$(k, x) \xrightarrow{\Delta_X} (k, k, x) \xrightarrow{G\eta_X} (k, k, x) \xrightarrow{\iota q} q(k, x).$$

Thus,  $\iota q \circ \eta_X = q$ . So computing the composition  $X \xrightarrow{q} \mathbb{Q}(X, R) \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{coKl}(G)$  results in the evaluation of  $g$ . In particular,

$$g(k, x) = f(Gq(\Delta_X(k, x))) = f(k, q(k, x)).$$

So if  $(k, x, x') \in R$  then  $q(k, x) = q(k, x')$ . Thus,  $g(k, x) = f(k, q(k, x)) = f(k, q(k, x')) = g(k, x')$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 37.** *Alternatively, the indexed morphism  $\Psi \xrightarrow{\bar{\lambda}} \Psi\bar{\mathcal{P}}$  given in (15) can be defined as follows:  $\bar{\lambda}_X R = \{(k, U, U') \mid \forall x \in U \exists x' \in U' (k, x, x') \in R \wedge \forall x' \in U' \exists x \in U (k, x, x') \in R\}$ . Moreover,  $\bar{\lambda}$  satisfies Assumption **A2**.*

*Proof.* Recall from (15), the map  $\bar{\lambda}$  is given by the composition:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi X &\xrightarrow{\langle |\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X| \rangle_!} \hat{\mathcal{P}}(|X| \times |X|) \xrightarrow{\sigma_{|X|}} \hat{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{P}|X| \times \mathcal{P}|X|) \\ &\xrightarrow{\gamma_X \times \gamma_X^{-1}} \hat{\mathcal{P}}(|\mathcal{P}X| \times |\mathcal{P}X|) \xrightarrow{\langle |\pi_1^{\mathcal{P}X}|, |\pi_2^{\mathcal{P}X}| \rangle^{-1}} \Psi\bar{\mathcal{P}}X. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $R \subseteq G(X \times X)$ , where  $G = \mathbb{K} \times \_$ . Then we compute

$$\langle |\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X| \rangle_! R = \{((k, x), (k, x')) \mid (k, x, x') \in R\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{|X|}(|\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X|)R &= \left\{ (S, S') \in \mathcal{P}|X| \times \mathcal{P}|X| \mid \right. \\
&\quad \forall_{k,x} (k S x \implies \exists_{x'} k S' x' \wedge (k, x, x') \in R) \wedge \\
&\quad \left. \forall_{k,x'} (k S' x' \implies \exists_x k S x \wedge (k, x, x') \in R) \right\} \\
(\gamma_X \times \gamma_X)^{-1}(\sigma_{|X|}(|\pi_1^X|, |\pi_2^X|)R) &= \{(k, U), (k, U') \mid U, U' \subseteq X \wedge \\
&\quad \forall_{x \in U} \exists_{x' \in U'} (k, x, x') \in R \wedge \forall_{x' \in U'} \exists_{x \in U} (k, x, x') \in R\} \\
\bar{\lambda}R &= \{(k, U, U') \mid \forall_{x \in U} \exists_{x' \in U'} (k, x, x') \in R \wedge \forall_{x' \in U'} \exists_{x \in U} (k, x, x') \in R\}.
\end{aligned}$$

For **A2** we first find that

$$(k, x, x') \in \equiv_X \iff (k, x, x') \in (\pi_1^X, \pi_2^X)^{-1} =_{|X|} \iff (k, x) = (k, x').$$

Thus,  $\bar{\lambda}_X$  preserve abstract equalities.  $\square$

## B Linear Weighted Automaton (LWA)

We consider (linear) weighted automata (LWA) as coalgebras as studied in [20]. LWA are modelled as coalgebras of the endofunctor  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}(1 + Act \times \_)$ , where  $\mathbb{F}$  is a field and  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}$  is the multiset monad. The set of functions  $\mathbb{F}^X$  having finite support is  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X$  and on arrows it is given by  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}f(\tau)(y) = \sum_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} \tau(x)$  (for  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{Set}$ ). We write  $x \downarrow_s$  and  $x \xrightarrow{a,s'} x'$  whenever  $\alpha(x)(\bullet) = s$  and  $\alpha(x)(a, x') = s'$  for a given LWA  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}(Act \times X + 1)$ .

Recall the language of a given LWA  $\alpha$  starting from a state  $x \in X$  is an inductively defined function  $Act^* \xrightarrow{\mathbf{tr}(x)} \mathbb{F}$  described below, where  $a \in Act$ ,  $w \in Act^*$ , and  $\varepsilon$  is the empty word.

$$\mathbf{tr}(x)(\varepsilon) = \alpha(x)(\bullet), \quad \mathbf{tr}(x)(aw) = \sum \{s \cdot \mathbf{tr}(x')(w) \mid x \xrightarrow{a,s} x'\}.$$

Two states  $x, x' \in X$  are (*weighted*) *language equivalent* iff  $\mathbf{tr}(x) = \mathbf{tr}(x')$ . This coincides with coalgebraic behavioural equivalence in  $\mathbf{KI}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}})$  (see [20,27]). Note that probabilistic automata can be encoded by letting  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$  and restricting the weights to the interval  $[0, 1]$ .

*Predicate lifting for weighted automata* We employ a similar simplification as carried out in NDA, by working with the indexed category  $\hat{\mathcal{P}} \circ (|-| \times |-|)$ . Now to apply techniques of Section 5, we fix  $F = Act \times \_ + 1, G = \_^{Act} \times \mathbb{F}$ , and recall from [20, Section 7.3] the distributive laws  $F\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X \xrightarrow{\vartheta_X} \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}FX$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}FX \xrightarrow{\gamma_X} G\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\vartheta_X(\bullet)(\heartsuit) &= \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \heartsuit = \bullet \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} & \vartheta_X(a, \tau)(\heartsuit) &= \begin{cases} \tau(x), & \text{if } \heartsuit = (a, x), \text{ for some } x \in X \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \\
\gamma_X(\bar{p}) &= (\gamma_X^{Act} \bar{p}, \bar{p}(\bullet)), \text{ where } \gamma_X^{Act} \bar{p}(a)(x) = \bar{p}(a, x) \text{ (for } x \in X, \bar{p} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}FX).
\end{aligned}$$

We know (from [20]) that  $\gamma$  is compatible with  $\theta$  and  $\mu$  (the multiplication of the monad  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}$ ) in the sense of Lemma 23. Similar to NDAs, consider the following predicate liftings  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}X \xrightarrow{\sigma_X^a, \sigma_X^s} \hat{\mathcal{P}}(X^{Act} \times \mathbb{F})$  (for  $a \in Act$  and  $s \in \mathbb{F}$ ):

$$U \mapsto \{(p, s) \in X^{Act} \times \mathbb{F} \mid p(a) \in U\} \quad \text{and} \quad U \mapsto \{(p, s) \mid p \in X^{Act}\}, \text{ respectively.}$$

The proof of the following lemma is similar to the proof of Lemma 28. And thanks to Theorem 22, we know that  $\gamma^{-1} \circ \sigma^a$  and  $\gamma^{-1} \circ \sigma^s$  are valid predicate liftings.

**Lemma 40.** *The above mappings  $\sigma_X^a, \sigma_X^s$  (for  $a \in Act, s \in \mathbb{F}$ ) are indexed morphisms.*

**Lemma 41.** *For any  $\mathbb{U} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X$  we find that  $\lambda_X^a(\mathbb{U}) = \{\bar{p} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}(Act \times X + 1) \mid \gamma_X^{Act} \bar{p}(a) \in \mathbb{U}\}$  and  $\lambda_X^s(\mathbb{U}) = \{\bar{p} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}(Act \times X + 1) \mid \bar{p}(\bullet) = s\}$ .*

*Proof.* For any  $\mathbb{U} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X$  we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_X^a(\mathbb{U}) &= \gamma_X^{-1} \sigma_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X}^a(\mathbb{U}) \\ &= \gamma_X^{-1} \{(p, s) \in (\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X)^{Act} \times \mathbb{F} \mid p(a) \in \mathbb{U}\} \\ &= \{\bar{p} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}(Act \times X + 1) \mid \gamma_X \bar{p} \in \{(p, s) \in (\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X)^{Act} \times \mathbb{F} \mid p(a) \in \mathbb{U}\}\} \\ &= \{\bar{p} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}(Act \times X + 1) \mid \gamma_X^{Act} \bar{p}(a) \in \mathbb{U}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, in the context of termination, we find (for each  $s \in \mathbb{F}$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_X^s(\mathbb{U}) &= \gamma_X^{-1} \sigma_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X}^s(\mathbb{U}) \\ &= \gamma_X^{-1} \{(p, s) \mid p \in (\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X)^{Act}\} \\ &= \{\bar{p} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}(Act \times X + 1) \mid \gamma_X \bar{p} \in \{(p, s) \mid p \in (\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X)^{Act}\}\} \\ &= \{\bar{p} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}(Act \times X + 1) \mid \bar{p}(\bullet) = s\}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof that  $\lambda_X^a, \lambda_X^s$  preserves finite meet is similar to the Boolean case (cf. Lemma 28).

Just like in our running example, the determinisation of an LWA  $\alpha$  is the composition:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X \xrightarrow{\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}\alpha} \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}(Act \times X + 1) \xrightarrow{\mu_{Act \times X + 1}} \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}(Act \times X + 1) \xrightarrow{\gamma_X} (\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X)^{Act} \times \mathbb{F}.$$

More concretely, it maps a  $p \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X$  to a pair  $(\hat{p}, s)$ , where  $\hat{p}(a)(x') = \sum_{x \in X} p(x) \cdot \alpha(x)(a, x')$  and  $s = \sum_{x \in X} p(x) \cdot \alpha(x)(\bullet)$ . In terms of SOS rules, determinisation is given as follows:

$$\frac{p \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X}{p \xrightarrow{\alpha} \hat{p}(a)} \quad \frac{p \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X \quad s = \sum_{x \in X} p(x) \cdot \alpha(x)(\bullet)}{p \downarrow_s}$$

**Lemma 42.** For any  $\mathbb{U} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X$  and  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}(\text{Act} \times X + 1)$ , we have  $|\alpha|^{-1}\lambda_X^a\mathbb{U} = \{p \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X \mid p \xrightarrow{a} \hat{p}(a) \implies \hat{p}(a) \in \mathbb{U}\}$  and  $|\alpha|^{-1}\lambda_X^s\mathbb{U} = \{p \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X \mid s = \sum_{x \in X} p(x) \cdot \alpha(x)(\bullet)\}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbb{U} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X$  and a given LWA  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}(\text{Act} \times X + 1)$ . Then we derive

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha|^{-1}\lambda_X^a\mathbb{U} &= |\alpha|^{-1}\{\bar{p} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}(\text{Act} \times X + 1) \mid \gamma_X^{\text{Act}}\bar{p}(a) \in \mathbb{U}\} \\ &= \{p \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X \mid |\alpha|p \in \{\bar{p} \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Act} \times X + 1) \mid \gamma_X^{\text{Act}}\bar{p}(a) \in \mathbb{U}\}\} \\ &= \{p \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X \mid \gamma_X^{\text{Act}}(\mu_{\text{Act} \times X + 1}\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}\alpha(p))a \in \mathbb{U}\} \\ &= \{p \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X \mid p \xrightarrow{a} \hat{p}(a) \implies \hat{p}(a) \in \mathbb{U}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have a modality to handle termination that can be derived as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha|^{-1}\lambda_X^s\mathbb{U} &= |\alpha|^{-1}\{\bar{p} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}(\text{Act} \times X + 1) \mid \bar{p}(\bullet) = s\} \\ &= \{p \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X \mid |\alpha|p \in \{\bar{p} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}(\text{Act} \times X + 1) \mid \bar{p}(\bullet) = s\}\} \\ &= \{p \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X \mid s = \sum_{x \in X} p(x) \cdot \alpha(x)(\bullet)\}. \end{aligned}$$

*Weighted language equivalence through relation lifting* Consider the relation lifting  $\bar{\sigma}$  of  $G$  that maps a relation  $R$  on  $X$  to  $\bar{\sigma}_X R$  defined as:  $(p, s) \bar{\sigma}_X R (p', s') \iff s = s' \wedge \forall a \in \text{Act} \ p a R p' a$ . So (15) gives a relation lifting  $\bar{\lambda}$  for  $\bar{F}$ . Concretely,  $\bar{\lambda}$  maps a relation  $R$  on  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X$  to a relation  $\bar{\lambda}_X R$  on  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}FX$  given as:  $\bar{p} \bar{\lambda}_X R \bar{p}' \iff \bar{p}(\bullet) = \bar{p}'(\bullet) \wedge \forall a \in \text{Act} \ \gamma_X^{\text{Act}}\bar{p}(a) R \gamma_X^{\text{Act}}\bar{p}'(a)$ .

**Theorem 43.** Let  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} FX \in \mathbf{Kl}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}})$  be an LWA. Then weighted language equivalence  $\equiv_X \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X \times \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X$  on the determinised system is a  $\Psi(\alpha) \circ \bar{\lambda}_X$ -coalgebra. Moreover,  $\equiv_X = (|f| \times |f|)^{-1} \equiv_Y$  for any coalgebra homomorphism  $(X, \alpha) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, \beta)$ ; thus, there is a behavioural conformance functor  $\mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbf{Kl}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}})}(\bar{F}) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{1}_{\bar{\lambda}}} \mathbf{Coalg}_{\mathbb{E}(\Psi)}(\bar{F}_{\lambda})$ .

*Proof.* Let  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} FX \in \mathbf{Kl}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}})$  be an LWA. Just like in the proof of Theorem 31, we will show that weighted language equivalence  $\equiv_X$  coincides with the relation  $\sim$  defined as the limit of the diagram  $\mathbf{N} \xrightarrow{D} \Psi X$  defined in the proof of Theorem 31. Recall the determinisation of an LWA in terms of SOS rules:

$$\frac{p \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X}{p \xrightarrow{a} p_a} \quad \frac{p \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X \quad s = \sum_{x \in X} p(x) \cdot \alpha(x)(\bullet)}{p \downarrow_s},$$

where  $p_a(x') = \sum_{x \in X} p(x) \cdot \alpha(x)(a, x')$ . We can extend this notation to words as follows:  $p_\varepsilon = p$  and  $p_{aw} = (p_a)_w$ . Thus,  $p \equiv_X p' \iff \forall_{w,s} p_w \downarrow_s \iff p'_w \downarrow_s$ .

Note that for any  $i > 1$  and  $p, p' \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X$  we have

$$p D(i+1) p' \iff \forall_{s \in \mathbb{F}} (p \downarrow_s \iff p' \downarrow_s) \wedge p_a D i p'_a.$$



Clearly,  $\equiv_X \subseteq \sim$  because  $\equiv_X \subseteq \alpha^* \lambda_X \equiv_X$ . For the other direction, suppose  $p \sim p'$ . Then for any word  $w \in Act^*$  we have  $p D(\#w + 1) p'$  which results  $p_w \downarrow_s \iff p'_w \downarrow_s$ , for any  $s \in \mathbb{F}$ . Since  $w$  was chosen arbitrarily, we find that  $p \equiv_X p'$ .

*Logical characterisation of weighted language equivalence* Just like language equivalence, its weighted variant is a ‘linear’ notion of behavioural equivalence; thus, we set  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Set}$  and  $L = F$ . As for the dual adjunction, first recall that  $\mathbf{Kl}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}})$  is equivalent to the Eilenberg-Moore category  $\mathbf{EM}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}) = \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{F}}$  [20], which is due to the fact that every vector space has a basis. In particular, the comparison functor  $\mathbf{Kl}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}} \mathbf{EM}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}})$  is fully faithful and essentially surjective. As a result,  $\mathcal{K}$  has an inverse  $\mathcal{K}'$  that maps every vector space to its basis which can be arranged as  $\mathcal{K} \dashv \mathcal{K}'$ . Moreover, the category of vector spaces is related with the category of sets by a dual adjunction [20] as indicated below.

$$\mathbf{Kl}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{\mathcal{K}'} \end{array} \mathbf{EM}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{hom}(\_, \mathbb{F})} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{\mathbb{F}\text{-}} \end{array} \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}}.$$

So  $\mathcal{S} = \text{hom}(\mathcal{K}\_, \mathbb{F})$  and  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{K}'\mathbb{F}\text{-}$ . Note that for any set  $X$  we have  $\mathcal{S}X \cong \mathbb{F}^X$  and  $\mathcal{K}'(\mathbb{F}^X) \cong X$ . The former is true because  $\text{hom}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}}X, \mathbb{F}) \cong \mathbf{Set}(X, \mathbb{F})$ , while the latter is because the basis of a vector space generated by a set is isomorphic to the set itself. So  $\mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}}$  is a subcategory of  $\mathbf{Kl}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}})$  and Theorem 21 ensures that  $\text{Eq} \circ \mathcal{T}$  has a left adjoint  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ . Finally,  $\delta_X$  (for any set  $X$ ) should be a natural transformation of type  $FTX = FX \xrightarrow{\delta_X} FX = TLX$ . Therefore, we simply take  $\delta_X$  to be an identity arrow on  $FX$  in  $\mathbf{Kl}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}})$ . Lastly, the theory map  $X \xrightarrow{(\_)_X} \mathcal{T}Act^* \in \mathbf{Kl}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}})$  is given by the trace function  $\mathbf{tr}$ .

**Theorem 44.** *The above defined map  $(\_)_X$  is a theory map for a given LWA. As a result, the logic  $(L, \delta)$  is both adequate and expressive for weighted language equivalence.*

*Proof.* We show the square associated with theory map is commutative, i.e.,  $\mathcal{T}h \circ (\_)_X = \delta_{Act^*} F(\_)_X \circ \alpha$ ; the uniqueness follows from structural recursion. Since  $\delta_{Act^*}$  is identity arrow, so it suffices to show that  $(\_)_X$  is a coalgebra homomorphism;  $\mathcal{T}h \circ (\_)_X = \bar{F}(\_)_X \circ \alpha$ . Note that we follow [27] by using matrix multiplication to denote the composition of arrows in  $\mathbf{Kl}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}})$ . Also, for a function  $Y \xrightarrow{f} X$ ,  $\mathcal{K}'(\mathbb{F}^f)$  corresponds to unit matrix; namely, the cell  $(\delta_x, \delta_y)$  in  $\mathbb{F}^f$  corresponds to 1 if  $F^f(\delta_x) = \delta_x \circ f = \delta_y$ ; 0 otherwise. So concretely,  $\mathcal{T}f$  is a function defined as follows:  $\mathcal{T}fxy = 1$  if  $fy = x$ ; 0, otherwise.

$$\begin{aligned} F(\_)_X \circ \alpha(x, (a, w)) &= \sum_{(a', x') \in \text{supp}(\alpha x)} \alpha(x, (a', x')) \cdot \bar{F}(\_)_X((a', x'), (a, w)) \\ &= \sum_{(a, x') \in \text{supp}(\alpha x)} \alpha(x, (a, x')) \cdot (\mathcal{K}'(\_)_X)(w) \\ &= (\mathcal{K}(\_)_X)(aw) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{w'=aw} (x)_X w' \cdot \mathcal{T}h(w', (a, w)) \\
&= \mathcal{T}h \circ \alpha(x, (a, w)).
\end{aligned}$$

Adequacy follows from Theorem 18. Furthermore, expressivity follows since  $|\delta_{Act^*}|$  is injective.

## C Eilenberg-Moore categories

Although, in this paper, there are no case studies (see [4] for predicate liftings in generalised Moore automata) worked out in the setting of Eilenberg-Moore categories, it is still worthwhile to report that Eilenberg-Moore categories (at least when  $T$  is finitary) are more well-behaved than Kleisli categories in satisfying the assumptions of this paper. First it is straightforward to show that every predicate lifting  $F$  induces a predicate lifting of  $\bar{F}$ .

**Proposition 45.** *Let  $\bar{F}$  be a lifting of  $F$  to  $\mathbf{EM}(T)$  with  $\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{T} \mathbf{C}$ . Then,*

1. *every indexed category on  $\mathbf{C}$  induces an indexed category  $\mathbf{EM}(T)$  by composing with  $|-|$ .*
2. *every indexed morphism  $\Phi \longrightarrow \Phi F$  induces an indexed morphism of type  $\Phi|-| \longrightarrow \Phi|-|\bar{F}$ .*

Second, the adjunction  $\mathbb{Q} \dashv \text{Eq}$  does exist when  $T$  is finitary and  $\Phi, \Psi$  are instantiated as in the Kleisli case, i.e.,  $\Phi = \hat{\mathcal{P}}(|-|)$  and  $\Psi = \hat{\mathcal{P}}(|-| \times |-|)$ . Intuitively,  $\mathbb{Q}$  creates quotients w.r.t. the smallest congruence relation generated by a relation on the underlying algebra. Formally, for an algebra  $(X, h) \in \mathbf{EM}(T)$ , let  $\text{Cong}(X, h)$  denote the poset of congruences on  $X$  ordered by  $\subseteq$ . Next we claim that arbitrary meets exist in  $\text{Cong}(X, h)$  since  $\mathbf{EM}(T)$  is complete. Therefore, we can construct

$$\mathcal{C}(R) = \bigwedge \{ (R', h') \mid (R', h') \in \text{Cong}(X, h) \wedge R \subseteq R' \} .$$

Now the algebraic structure on  $\mathcal{C}(R)$ , i.e., a function  $T\mathcal{C}(R) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(R)$  exists due to the universal property of limits, which we denote simply  $h_R$ . So we take  $\mathbb{Q}((X, h), R)$  to be the coequaliser of  $(\mathcal{C}(R), h_R) \xrightarrow{p_i} (X, h)$  in  $\mathbf{EM}(T)$ .

**Theorem 46.** *Suppose  $T$  has a finite presentation, then the mapping  $\mathbb{Q}$  is left adjoint to  $\text{Eq}$  functor.*

*Proof.* We need to show that the following correspondence holds.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\mathbb{Q}(X, h, R) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, k) \in \mathbf{EM}(T) \\
\hline\hline
(X, h, R) \xrightarrow{g} \text{Eq}(Y, k) \in \mathbb{E}(\Psi) \\
\hline\hline
(X, h) \xrightarrow{g} (Y, k) \in \mathbf{EM}(T) \wedge R \subseteq (g \times g)^{-1} =_Y
\end{array}$$

The direction from top to bottom is easy. Let  $q_R$  be the coequaliser map of type  $(X, h) \xrightarrow{q_R} \mathbb{Q}(X, h, R)$ . Then, we take  $g$  to be the arrow  $f \circ q_R$ .

For the converse, let  $(X, h) \xrightarrow{g} (Y, k) \in \mathbf{EM}(T)$  be an algebra map such that  $R \subseteq (g \times g)^{-1} =_Y$ . Now it suffices to show that  $g \circ p_1 = g \circ p_2$  because the universal property of coequaliser then gives the unique arrow  $f$ .

To prove this we recall the construction of the congruence  $\mathcal{C}(R)$  generated by  $R$  when  $T$  has a finite presentation  $\mathbb{T} = (\Sigma, E)$ , where  $\Sigma$  is a set of function symbols with finite arity and  $E$  is a set of equations.

- Define  $R_0$  the reflexive and symmetric closure of  $R$ .
- Define  $R_{i+1} = R_i \circ R_i \cup \{(f(x_1, \dots, x_n), f(x'_1, \dots, x'_n)) \mid \forall_j x_j R_i x'_j\}$ , where  $f$  is an  $n$ -ary operator in  $\Sigma$ .
- $\mathcal{C}(R) = \bigcup_i R_i$ .

Now by induction we show that  $\forall_i t R_i t' \implies \mathbb{T} \vdash gt = gt'$ . The base case is trivial. So assume the property is true for some  $i \geq 0$ . Let  $t R_{i+1} t'$ . Then we identify two cases: either  $t R_i \circ R_i t'$  or there is an  $n$ -ary operator and variables  $x_j, x'_j$  (for  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ) such that  $t = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ ,  $t' = f(x'_1, \dots, x'_n)$  and  $x_j R_i x'_j$  (for all  $j$ ). If the former is true then the property holds due to the inductive hypothesis and the transitivity of  $\vdash$ . So suppose the latter is true. Then by the inductive hypothesis we find that  $\mathbb{T} \vdash gx_j = gx'_j$  (for each  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ). Since  $g$  is a homomorphism, so applying the context rule of  $\vdash$  gives us

$$\mathbb{T} \vdash gt = f(gx_1, \dots, gx_n) = f(gx'_1, \dots, gx'_n) = gt'. \quad \square$$

### Predicate liftings for generalised Moore machines

In [6,36], the authors captured failure/ready/trace equivalences as behavioural equivalence for coalgebras living in the Eilenberg-Moore category introduced by a finitary power set monad  $\mathcal{P}_\omega$ . Interestingly, these linear equivalences can be seen as an instance of behavioural equivalence induced by a common ‘generalised Moore’ endofunctor  $F_S = S \times \_{}^{Act}$  [6, Section 3], where  $S \in \mathbf{EM}(\mathcal{P}_\omega)$  is an arbitrary semi-lattice.

Given a map  $X \xrightarrow{o} S \in \mathbf{EM}(\mathcal{P}_\omega)$ , then the generalised determinisation [7] of an LTS  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} (\mathcal{P}_\omega X)^{Act}$  is a coalgebra  $\mathcal{P}_\omega X \xrightarrow{(o', \alpha')} F_S(\mathcal{P}_\omega X) \in \mathbf{EM}(\mathcal{P}_\omega)$ , where the two functions are given as follows (cf. [6]):

$$o'(U) = \bigvee_{x \in U} o(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha'(U)(a) = \bigcup_{x \in U} \alpha(x)(a) \quad (\text{for } U \subseteq X, a \in Act) .$$

In other words, the generalised determinisation induces a transition relation on  $\mathcal{P}_\omega X$  and a predicate on  $\mathcal{P}_\omega X \times S$  defined by the following SOS rules:

$$\frac{U \subseteq X \quad U_\alpha = \{x' \mid \exists_{x \in U} x \xrightarrow{\alpha} x'\}}{U \xrightarrow{\alpha} U_\alpha} \quad \frac{U \subseteq X \quad o'(U) = \bigvee_{x \in U} o(x)}{U \downarrow o'(U)} .$$

The next theorem is recalled from [36] and captures the aforementioned linear equivalences as instances of behavioural equivalence.

**Theorem 47.** *Two states  $U, U' \subseteq X$  in the coalgebra  $\mathcal{P}_\omega X \xrightarrow{(o', \alpha')} F_S(\mathcal{P}_\omega X) \in \mathbf{EM}(\mathcal{P}_\omega)$  are behaviourally equivalent iff they get mapped to a common point in the final coalgebra (which exists for the Moore functor  $F_S$ ). Moreover,*

1. *For  $S = 2$  and  $o$  as constant 1, behavioural equivalence coincides with trace equivalence.*
2. *For  $S = \mathcal{P}_\omega \mathcal{P}_\omega \text{Act}$  and  $o(x)$  (for each  $x \in X$ ) is the set of sets of actions that are refused by the state  $x$ , behavioural coincides with failure equivalence.*
3. *For  $S = \mathcal{P}_\omega \mathcal{P}_\omega \text{Act}$  and  $o(x)$  (for each  $x \in X$ ) is the singleton containing the set of actions enabled at  $x$ , behavioural coincides with ready equivalence.*

Next we define two families of indexed morphisms  $\hat{\mathcal{P}} \xrightarrow{\lambda^a} \hat{\mathcal{P}} \circ F_S$  (for each  $a \in \text{Act}$ ) and  $\hat{\mathcal{P}} \xrightarrow{\lambda^s} \hat{\mathcal{P}} \circ F_S$  (for each  $s \in S$ ).

- $\lambda_X^a U = \{(s', p) \in S \times X^{\text{Act}} \mid p(a) \in U\}$
- $\lambda_X^s U = \{(s, p) \mid p \in X^{\text{Act}}\}$ , for  $U \subseteq X$ .

**Proposition 48.** *The above mappings  $\hat{\mathcal{P}} \xrightarrow{\lambda^a, \lambda^s} \hat{\mathcal{P}} \circ F_S$  are indexed morphisms.*

*Proof.* Let  $V \subseteq Y$  and  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \in \mathbf{Set}$ . Then we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_X^a f^{-1}V &= \{(s, p) \mid p(a) \in f^{-1}V\} \\ &= \{(s, p) \mid f(pa) \in V\} \\ &= \{(s, p) \mid (F_S f)(s, p) \in \{(s, q) \mid qa \in V\}\} \\ &= (F_S f)^{-1} \lambda_Y^a V. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,  $\lambda_X^a$  preserves arbitrary meets since

$$\lambda_X^a \bigcap_{i \in I} U_i = S \times \{p \mid pa \in \bigcap_i U_i\} = \bigcap_i S \times \{p \mid pa \in U_i\} = \bigcap_i \lambda_X^a U_i.$$

Likewise, we derive the related facts for  $\lambda_X^s$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_X^s f^{-1}V &= \{(s, p) \mid p \in X^{\text{Act}}\} \\ &= \{(s, p) \mid (s, f \circ p) \in \{s\} \times Y^{\text{Act}}\} \\ &= \{(s, p) \mid (F_S f)(s, p) \in \{s\} \times Y^{\text{Act}}\} \\ &= (F_S f)^{-1} \lambda_Y^s V. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,  $\lambda_X^s$  preserves arbitrary meets since

$$\lambda_X^s \bigcap_{i \in I} U_i = \{s\} \times X^{\text{Act}} = \bigcap_i (\{s\} \times X^{\text{Act}}) = \bigcap_i \lambda_X^s U_i.$$

As a result, thanks to Proposition 45, the mappings  $\lambda^a, \lambda^s$  are also indexed morphisms of type  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}|\_ \longrightarrow \hat{\mathcal{P}}|\_ \bar{F}_S$ . Recall the determinised systems

$$\mathcal{P}_\omega X \xrightarrow{(o', \alpha')} F_S(\mathcal{P}_\omega X) \in \mathbf{EM}(\mathcal{P}_\omega),$$

which is induced by an LTS  $X \xrightarrow{\alpha} (\mathcal{P}_\omega X)^{\text{Act}}$ . We are now ready to derive the action and observation modalities on the determinised system.

**Theorem 49.** Consider the compositions for  $\heartsuit \in \{a, s\}$ :

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}|\mathcal{P}_\omega X| \xrightarrow{\lambda_{\mathcal{P}_\omega X}^{\heartsuit}} \hat{\mathcal{P}}|\bar{F}_S \mathcal{P}_\omega X| \xrightarrow{|(o', \alpha')|^{-1}} \hat{\mathcal{P}}|\mathcal{P}_\omega X|.$$

Let  $\mathbb{U}$  be a predicate on  $\mathcal{P}_\omega X$ . Then,  $|(o', \alpha')|^{-1} \lambda_{\mathcal{P}_\omega X}^a \mathbb{U} = \{U \subseteq X \mid U \xrightarrow{a} U_\alpha \implies U_\alpha \in \mathbb{U}\}$  and  $|(o', \alpha')|^{-1} \lambda_{\mathcal{P}_\omega X}^s \mathbb{U} = \{U \subseteq X \mid U \downarrow s\}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbb{U} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\omega X$ . Then we derive the modality for action transition:

$$\begin{aligned} |(o', \alpha')|^{-1} \lambda_{\mathcal{P}_\omega X}^a \mathbb{U} &= (o', \alpha')^{-1} \{(s', p) \in S \times (\mathcal{P}_\omega X)^{Act} \mid p(a) \in \mathbb{U}\} \\ &= \{U \subseteq X \mid (o', \alpha')U \in \{(s', p) \in S \times (\mathcal{P}_\omega X)^{Act} \mid p(a) \in \mathbb{U}\}\} \\ &= \{U \subseteq X \mid \alpha'(U) \in \mathbb{U}\} \\ &= \{U \subseteq X \mid U \xrightarrow{a} U_\alpha \implies U_\alpha \in \mathbb{U}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, we derive the modalities for observations living in  $S$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |(o', \alpha')|^{-1} \lambda_{\mathcal{P}_\omega X}^s \mathbb{U} &= (o', \alpha')^{-1} \{(s, p) \mid p \in (\mathcal{P}_\omega X)^{Act}\} \\ &= \{U \subseteq X \mid (o', \alpha')U \in \{(s, p) \mid p \in (\mathcal{P}_\omega X)^{Act}\}\} \\ &= \{U \subseteq X \mid o'(U) = s\} \\ &= \{U \subseteq X \mid U \downarrow s\}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Furthermore, a well-known application of the Linton's theorem when the monad  $T$  is finitary is that the category of Eilenberg-Moore algebras is cocomplete. So, in particular, the finite powerset monad  $\mathcal{P}_\omega$  is finitary, thus,  $\mathbf{EM}(\mathcal{P}_\omega)$  has all coequalisers. Therefore, **A3** is satisfied.