

Coefficient Synthesis for Threshold Automata

A. R. Balasubramanian *

Max Planck Institute for Software Systems

Kaiserslautern, Germany

bayikudi@mpi-sws.org

Abstract. Threshold automata are a formalism for modeling fault-tolerant distributed algorithms. The main feature of threshold automata is the notion of a threshold guard, which allows us to compare the number of received messages with the total number of different types of processes. In this paper, we consider the coefficient synthesis problem for threshold automata, in which we are given a sketch of a threshold automaton (with some of the constants in the threshold guards left unspecified) and a violation describing a collection of undesirable behaviors. We then want to synthesize a set of constants which when plugged into the sketch, gives a threshold automaton that does not have the undesirable behaviors. Our main result is that this problem is undecidable, even when the violation is given by a coverability property and the underlying sketch is acyclic.

We then consider the bounded coefficient synthesis problem, in which a bound on the constants to be synthesized is also provided. Though this problem is known to be in the second level of the polynomial hierarchy for coverability properties, the algorithm for this problem involves an exponential-sized encoding of the reachability relation into existential Presburger arithmetic. In this paper, we give a polynomial-sized encoding for this relation. We also provide a tight complexity lower bound for this problem against coverability properties. Finally, motivated by benchmarks appearing from the literature, we also consider a special class of threshold automata and prove that the complexity decreases in this case.

Keywords: Threshold automata, Coefficient synthesis, Presburger arithmetic with divisibility

Address for correspondence: Max Planck Institute for Software Systems, Kaiserslautern, Germany.

*A part of the work was done when the author was at Technische Universität München, Munich, Germany

1. Introduction

Threshold automata [9] are a formalism for modeling and analyzing parameterized fault-tolerant distributed algorithms. In this setup, an arbitrary but finite number of processes execute a given distributed protocol modeled as a threshold automaton. Verifying these systems amounts to proving that the given protocol is correct with respect to a given specification, irrespective of the number of agents executing the protocol. Many algorithms have been developed for verifying properties of threshold automata [10, 4, 8, 7, 9, 2] and it is known that the reachability problem for threshold automata is NP-complete [3, Theorem 1 and Corollary 1].

In many formalisms for modeling distributed systems (like rendez-vous protocols [6] and reconfigurable broadcast networks [5]), the status of a transition being enabled or not depends only on a fixed number of processes, independent of the total number of participating processes. One of the central features that distinguishes threshold automata from such formalisms is the notion of a *threshold guard*. A threshold guard can be used to specify relationships between the number of messages received and the total number of participating processes, in order for a transition to be enabled. For example, if we let x be a variable counting the number of messages of a specified type, n be the number of participating processes and t be the maximum number of processes which can fail, then the guard $x \geq n/3 + t$ on a transition specifies that the number of messages received should be at least $n/3 + t$, in order for a process to execute this transition.

While the role of these guards is significant for the correctness of these protocols, they can also be unstable as small changes (and hence small calculation errors) in the coefficients of these guards can make a correct protocol faulty. (A concrete example of this phenomenon will be illustrated in the next section). For this reason, it would be desirable to automate the search for coefficients so that once the user gives a “sketch” of a threshold automaton (which only specifies the control flow but leaves out some of the arithmetic details) and a violation property (such as the property of being able to put a process in some error state), we can compute a set of coefficient values, which when “plugged into” the sketch does not have any of the behaviors given by the violation property. With this motivation, the authors of [11] tackle this *coefficient synthesis problem* and provide theoretical and experimental results. They show that for a class of “sane” threshold automata, this problem is decidable against a particular class of properties and provide a CEGIS approach for synthesizing these coefficients. However, the decidability status of the coefficient synthesis problem for the general case has remained open so far.

In this paper, we prove that this problem is actually undecidable, hence settling the decidability status of this problem. We do this by giving a reduction from a fragment of *Presburger arithmetic with divisibility*, for which the validity problem is known to be undecidable. Further, our result already shows that the coefficient synthesis problem is undecidable, even when the violation property simply specifies that a given state can be populated by some process (a so-called coverability property) and the underlying control-flow structure of the sketch automaton is acyclic.

We then consider the *bounded coefficient synthesis* problem [3], where in addition to the sketch and the property, the user also gives a bound (in the form of an interval) on the coefficients. For violations specified by coverability properties, this problem was already known to be in Σ_2^P [3, Theorem 7]. The main ingredient that was used to prove this upper bound was that the reachability relation of a

threshold automaton can be defined using an existential Presburger formula. However, the size of the formula given in [3] can be exponential in the size of the input. Our second main result is that we can efficiently construct a formula in existential Presburger arithmetic of polynomial size for the same task. Furthermore, we also provide a matching lower bound for bounded coefficient synthesis against coverability properties. Finally, motivated by benchmarks appearing in the literature, we consider a special class of threshold automata and prove that bounded coefficient synthesis for this class against coverability properties is **coNP**-complete.

Related work.

As mentioned before, the coefficient synthesis problem has already been studied in [11]. However, the decidability status of the general case was left open in that paper and here we show it is undecidable. A similar problem has also been studied for *parametric timed automata* [1], where the control flow of a timed automaton is given as input and we have to synthesize coefficients for the guards in order to satisfy a given reachability specification. The authors show that the problem is undecidable, already for timed automata with three clocks. They also show that it is decidable when the automaton has only one clock. Unlike clocks, the shared variables in our setting cannot be reset. Further, in our setting, variables can be compared with both the coefficients and other environment variables, which is not the case with parametric timed automata.

Organization of the paper.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the necessary definitions needed to state the coefficient synthesis problem. In Section 3, we define the fragment of Presburger arithmetic with divisibility that we will be working with and we prove our main undecidability result by giving a reduction from this fragment. Then, in Section 4, we present all our results regarding the bounded coefficient synthesis problem and the reachability relation of a threshold automaton. We conclude in Section 5.

2. Preliminaries

Let $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$ be the set of positive integers and \mathbb{N} be the set of non-negative integers.

2.1. Threshold Automata

We introduce threshold automata, mostly following the definitions and notations used in [3, 2]. Along the way, we also illustrate the definitions on the example of Figure 2 from [8], which is a model of the Byzantine agreement protocol of Figure 1.

Environment.

An *environment* is a tuple $\text{Env} = (\Pi, RC, N)$, where Π is a finite set of *environment variables* ranging over \mathbb{N} , $RC \subseteq \mathbb{N}^\Pi$ is a *resilience condition* over the environment variables, given as a linear formula,

```

1 var  $myval_i \in \{0, 1\}$ 
2 var  $accept_i \in \{false, true\} \leftarrow false$ 
3
4 while true do (in one atomic step)
5   if  $myval_i = 1$ 
6     and not sent ECHO before
7     then send ECHO to all
8
9   if received ECHO from at least
10     $t + 1$  distinct processes
11    and not sent ECHO before
12    then send ECHO to all
13
14   if received ECHO from at least
15     $n - t$  distinct processes
16   then  $accept_i \leftarrow true$ 
17 od

```

Figure 1. Pseudocode of a reliable broadcast protocol from [13] for a correct process i , where n and t denote the number of processes, and an upper bound on the number of faulty processes. The protocol satisfies its specification (if $myval_i = 0$ for every correct process i , then no correct process sets its $accept$ variable to $true$) if $t < n/3$.




Figure 2. Threshold automaton from [8] modeling the body of the loop in the protocol from Fig. 1. Symbols γ_1, γ_2 stand for the threshold guards $x \geq (t + 1) - f$ and $x \geq (n - t) - f$, where n and t are as in Fig. 1, and f is the actual number of faulty processes. The shared variable x models the number of ECHO messages sent by correct processes. Processes with $myval_i = b$ (line 1) start in location l_b (in green). Rules r_1 and r_2 model sending ECHO at lines 7 and 12.

and $N: RC \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a linear function called the *number function*. Intuitively, an assignment of Π determines the number of processes of different kinds (e.g. faulty) executing the protocol, and RC describes the admissible combinations of values of environment variables. Finally, N associates to a each admissible combination, the number of processes explicitly modeled. In a Byzantine setting, faulty processes behave arbitrarily, and so we do not model them explicitly; In the crash fault model, processes behave correctly until they crash and they must be modeled explicitly.

Example 2.1. In the threshold automaton of Figure 2, the environment variables are n , f , and t , describing the number of processes, the number of (Byzantine) faulty processes, and the maximum possible number of faulty processes, respectively. The resilience condition is the constraint $n/3 > t \geq f$. The function N is given by $N(n, t, f) = n - f$, which is the number of correct processes.

Threshold automata.

A *threshold automaton* over an environment Env is a tuple $\text{TA} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{I}, \Gamma, \mathcal{R})$, where \mathcal{L} is a finite set of *local states* (or *locations*), $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ is a nonempty subset of *initial locations*, Γ is a finite set of *shared variables* ranging over \mathbb{N} , and \mathcal{R} is a finite set of *transition rules* (or just *rules*), formally described below.

A *transition rule* (or just a *rule*) is a tuple $r = (\text{from}, \text{to}, \varphi, \vec{u})$, where $\text{from}, \text{to} \in \mathcal{L}$ are the *source*

and *target* locations respectively, $\varphi \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\Pi \cup \Gamma}$ is a conjunction of *threshold guards* (described below), and $\vec{u}: \Gamma \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is an *update*. We often let $r.from, r.to, r.\varphi, r.\vec{u}$ denote the components of r . Intuitively, r states that a process can move from *from* to *to* if the current values of Π and Γ satisfy φ , and when it moves, it updates the current valuation \vec{g} of Γ by performing the update $\vec{g} := \vec{g} + \vec{u}$. Since all components of \vec{u} are nonnegative, the values of shared variables never decrease. A *threshold guard* φ has one of the following forms: $b \cdot x \bowtie a_0 + a_1 \cdot p_1 + \dots + a_{|\Pi|} \cdot p_{|\Pi|}$ where $\bowtie \in \{\geq, >, =, <, \leq\}$, $x \in \Gamma$ is a shared variable, $p_1, \dots, p_{|\Pi|} \in \Pi$ are the environment variables, $b \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{|\Pi|} \in \mathbb{Z}$ are integer coefficients.

The underlying graph of a threshold automaton is the graph obtained by taking the vertices as the locations and connecting any two vertices with an edge as long as there is a rule between them. A threshold automaton is called *acyclic* if its underlying graph is acyclic.

Example 2.2. The threshold automaton from Figure 2 is acyclic. The rule r_3 of this automaton has ℓ_2 and ℓ_3 as its source and target locations, $x \geq (n - t) - f$ as its guard, and does not increment any shared variable. On the other hand, the rule r_1 has ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 as its source and target locations, no guard (denoted by *true*) and increments the variable x .

Configurations and transition relation.

A *configuration* of TA is a triple $\sigma = (\vec{\kappa}, \vec{g}, \mathbf{p})$ where $\vec{\kappa}: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ describes the number of processes at each location, and $\vec{g} \in \mathbb{N}^\Gamma$ and $\mathbf{p} \in RC$ are valuations of the shared variables and the environment variables respectively. In particular, $\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \vec{\kappa}(\ell) = N(\mathbf{p})$ always holds. A configuration is *initial* if $\vec{\kappa}(\ell) = 0$ for every $\ell \notin \mathcal{I}$, and $\vec{g} = \vec{0}$. We often let $\sigma.\vec{\kappa}, \sigma.\vec{g}, \sigma.\mathbf{p}$ denote the components of σ .

A configuration $\sigma = (\vec{\kappa}, \vec{g}, \mathbf{p})$ *enables* a rule $r = (from, to, \varphi, \vec{u})$ if $\vec{\kappa}(from) > 0$, and (\vec{g}, \mathbf{p}) satisfies the guard φ , i.e., substituting $\vec{g}(x)$ for x and $\mathbf{p}(p_i)$ for p_i in φ yields a true expression, denoted by $\sigma \models \varphi$. If σ enables r , then there is a *step* from σ to the configuration $\sigma' = (\vec{\kappa}', \vec{g}', \mathbf{p}')$ given by, (i) $\mathbf{p}' = \mathbf{p}$, (ii) $\vec{g}' = \vec{g} + \vec{u}$, and (iii) $\vec{\kappa}' = \vec{\kappa} + \vec{v}_r$, where $\vec{v}_r = \vec{0}$ if $from = to$ and otherwise, $\vec{v}_r(from) = -1$, $\vec{v}_r(to) = +1$, and $\vec{v}_r(\ell) = 0$ for all other locations ℓ . We let $\sigma \xrightarrow{r} \sigma'$ denote that TA there is a step from σ to σ' using the rule r . We use $\sigma \rightarrow \sigma'$ to denote that $\sigma \xrightarrow{r} \sigma'$ for some rule r .

A *schedule* is a finite sequence of rules. Given a schedule $\tau = r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k$ and two configurations σ, σ' we say that $\sigma \xrightarrow{\tau} \sigma'$ if there exist configurations $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$ such that $\sigma_0 = \sigma$, $\sigma_{i-1} \xrightarrow{r_i} \sigma_i$ for all $0 < i \leq k$ and $\sigma_k = \sigma'$. In this case, we will call the sequence $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$ a *run* or a *path* between σ and σ' .

We let $\sigma \xrightarrow{*} \sigma'$ to mean that $\sigma \xrightarrow{\tau} \sigma'$ for some schedule τ . If $\sigma \xrightarrow{*} \sigma'$, we say that σ' is *reachable* from σ .

Coverability.

Let $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ be a location. We say that a configuration σ *covers* ℓ if $\sigma(\ell) > 0$. We say that σ can cover a location ℓ if σ can reach a configuration σ' such that σ' covers ℓ . Finally, we say that TA can cover ℓ if some initial configuration of TA can cover ℓ . Hence, TA *cannot cover* ℓ if and only if every initial configuration of TA cannot cover ℓ . It is known that deciding whether a given threshold automaton can cover a given location is NP-complete [3, Theorem 1 and Corollary 1].

Coefficient synthesis.

We now come to the definition of the main problem that we will be interested in this paper, namely the coefficient synthesis problem [11]. To introduce this problem, we first have to introduce the notion of *sketch threshold automata*, which we do now.

Sketch threshold automata. In a threshold automaton, a guard is an inequality which can be of the form $b \cdot x \bowtie a_0 + a_1 \cdot p_1 + \dots + a_{|\Pi|} \cdot p_{|\Pi|}$ with $\bowtie \in \{\geq, >, =, <, \leq\}$, $b \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and $a_1, \dots, a_{|\Pi|} \in \mathbb{Z}$. A *sketch threshold automaton* (or simply a *sketch*) is the same as a threshold automaton, except that some of the $b, a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{|\Pi|}$ terms in any guard of the automaton are now allowed to be *indeterminates*, which are variables that can take any integer values. Intuitively, a sketch threshold automaton completely specifies the control flow of the protocol, but leaves out some of the precise arithmetic details of the threshold guards.

Given a sketch TA and an integer assignment μ to the indeterminates, we let $\text{TA}[\mu]$ denote the threshold automaton obtained by replacing the indeterminates with their corresponding values in μ . The *coefficient synthesis problem against coverability properties* for threshold automata is now defined as the following problem:

Given: An environment Env, a sketch TA and a location ℓ

Decide: Whether there is an assignment μ to the indeterminates such that $\text{TA}[\mu]$ *cannot* cover ℓ .

Remark 2.3. The coefficient synthesis problem as defined in [11] is a more general problem than the one that will be defined here. In that paper, along with an environment and a sketch, a violation is also given as input, where a violation is a collection of behaviors specified in a logic called ELTL_{FT} . The question then is to find an assignment to the indeterminates so that plugging in the assignment results in a threshold automaton that avoids the behaviors specified by the violation. Since coverability can be specified in that logic, it follows that our formulation is a special case of that formulation.

In this paper, for the sake of simplicity and presentation, we will only restrict ourselves to coverability violations. Since the main result of this paper is an undecidability result, this will also translate to the general case. In fact, all of our results, except the final one, all translate to the general case as well. A more detailed discussion regarding this point could also be found in the conclusion of this paper.

Example 2.4. We consider the threshold automaton from Figure 2. As mentioned in the text under Figure 1, if no (correct) process initially starts at ℓ_1 , then no process can ever reach ℓ_3 . This implies that if we remove the location ℓ_1 in the threshold automaton of Figure 2, then the modified threshold automaton TA' will never be able to cover ℓ_3 .

We can now convert TA' into a sketch, by replacing the guard γ_1 with $x \geq (t + a) - f$, where a is an indeterminate. When $a = 1$, we get TA' and so no reachable configuration has a process at the location ℓ_3 . However, when $a = 0$, this is not the case. Indeed if we set $n = 6$, $t = f = 1$ and if all the $N(6, 1, 1) = 6 - 1 = 5$ processes start at ℓ_0 initially, then the guard γ_1 will always be true and so all the 5 processes can move to ℓ_2 , thereby setting the value of x to 5. At this point, the guard γ_2

becomes true and so all the processes can move to ℓ_3 . This indicates that very small changes in the coefficients can make a protocol faulty.

Having stated all the necessary definitions, we now move on to the first result of this paper.

3. Undecidability of Coefficient Synthesis

The first main result that we shall prove in this paper is that

Theorem 3.1. The coefficient synthesis problem against coverability properties is undecidable, even for acyclic threshold automata.

Remark 3.2. As mentioned in Remark 2.3, in this paper we will only be concerned with violations specified by coverability properties. For this reason, in the sequel, we will refer to the coefficient synthesis problem against coverability properties as simply the coefficient synthesis problem.

Theorem 3.1 is proved in two steps. First, we consider a restricted version of the coefficient synthesis problem, called the *non-negative coefficient synthesis problem*, in which given a tuple $(\text{Env}, \text{TA}, \ell)$, we want to find a *non-negative assignment* μ to the indeterminates so that the resulting automaton $\text{TA}[\mu]$ does not cover ℓ . We first show that the non-negative coefficient synthesis problem is undecidable. Then, we reduce non-negative coefficient synthesis to coefficient synthesis, thereby achieving the desired result.

To prove that the non-negative coefficient synthesis problem is undecidable, we give a reduction from the validity problem for a restricted fragment of *Presburger arithmetic with divisibility*, which is known to be undecidable. We now proceed to formally define this fragment.

3.1. Presburger Arithmetic with Divisibility

We now recall the necessary definitions for introducing Presburger arithmetic with divisibility. We will mostly follow the notations given in [12].

Presburger arithmetic (PA) is the first-order theory over $\langle \mathbb{N}, 0, 1, +, < \rangle$ where $+$ and $<$ are the standard addition and order operations over the natural numbers \mathbb{N} with constants 0 and 1 interpreted in the usual way. We can, in a straightforward manner, extend our syntax with the following abbreviations: $\leq, =, \geq, >$ and $ax = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq a} x$ where $a \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and x is a variable. A *linear polynomial* is an expression of the form $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} a_i x_i + b$ where each x_i is a variable, each a_i belongs to $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and b belongs to \mathbb{N} . An *atomic formula* is a formula of the form $p(\mathbf{x}) \bowtie q(\mathbf{x})$ where p and q are linear polynomials over the variables \mathbf{x} and $\bowtie \in \{<, \leq, =, >, \geq\}$.

Presburger arithmetic with divisibility (PAD) is the extension of PA obtained by adding a divisibility predicate $|$ which is interpreted as the usual divisibility relation among numbers. For the purposes of this paper, we restrict ourselves to the $\forall \exists_R \text{PAD}^+$ fragment of PAD, i.e., we shall only consider

statements of the form

$$\forall x_1, \dots, x_n \exists y_1, \dots, y_m \bigvee_{i \in I} \left(\bigwedge_{(j,k) \in S_i} (x_j | y_k) \wedge \bigwedge_{l \in B_i} A_l(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m) \right) \quad (1)$$

where I, S_i, B_i are finite sets of indices and each A_l is a quantifier-free atomic PA formula. It is known that checking if such a statement is true is undecidable [12]. We now prove the undecidability of the non-negative coefficient synthesis problem by a reduction from this problem.

Remark 3.3. PAD as defined here allows us to quantify the variables only over the natural numbers, whereas in [12] the undecidability result is stated for the variant where the variables are allowed to take integer values. However, the same proof given in [12] allows us to prove the undecidability result over the natural numbers as well.

Remark 3.4. In our definition of $\forall\exists_R\text{PAD}^+$, we only allow divisibility constraints of the form $x_j | y_k$. In [12], divisibility constraints of the form $f(\mathbf{x}) | g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ were allowed, where f and g are any linear polynomials. This does not pose a problem, because of the fact that $\forall x_1, \dots, x_n \exists y_1, \dots, y_m f(\mathbf{x}) | g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is true if and only if $\forall x_1, \dots, x_n, z \exists y_1, \dots, y_m, z' (z \neq f(\mathbf{x})) \vee (z = f(\mathbf{x}) \wedge z' = g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \wedge z | z')$. Because of this identity, it is then clear that any formula in the $\forall\exists_R\text{PAD}^+$ fragment as defined in [12] can be converted into a formula in our fragment without changing its validity.

3.2. The Reduction

Let $\xi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m)$ be a formula of the form 1 with \mathbf{x} denoting the collection x_1, \dots, x_n and \mathbf{y} denoting the collection y_1, \dots, y_m . The set of atomic formulas of ξ is the set comprising each quantifier-free atomic PA formula in ξ and all the divisibility constraints of the form $x_j | y_k$ that appear in ξ . The desired reduction now proceeds in two stages.

First stage: The environment. We begin by defining the environment $\text{Env} = (\Pi, RC, N)$. We will have m environment variables t_1, \dots, t_m , with each t_i intuitively corresponding to the variable y_i in ξ . Further, for every atomic formula A of ξ which is a divisibility constraint, we will have an environment variable d_A . Finally, we will have an environment variable z , which will intuitively denote the total number of participating processes.

The resilience condition RC will be the trivial condition *true*. The linear function $N : RC \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is taken to be $N(\Pi) = z$. Hence, the total number of processes executing the threshold automaton will be z .

Second stage: The indeterminates and the sketch. For each variable x_i of ξ , we will have an indeterminate s_i . Before we proceed with the description of the sketch, we make a remark.

Remark 3.5. Throughout the reduction, a *simple* configuration of a sketch will mean a configuration C such that 1) there is a **unique location** ℓ with $C(\ell) > 0$ and 2) $C(v) = 0$ for every shared variable v , i.e., all the processes of C are in exactly one location and the value of each shared variable is 0.




Figure 3. Sketch for the first case




Figure 4. Sketch for the second case

We now proceed with the description of the sketch. Throughout the reduction, we let \mathbf{s} denote the set of indeterminates s_1, \dots, s_n and \mathbf{t} denote the set of environment variables t_1, \dots, t_m . The sketch will now be constructed in three phases, which are as follows.

3.2.1. First phase.

For each atomic formula A of ξ , we will construct a sketch TA_A . TA_A will have a single shared variable v_A . We now have two cases:

- Suppose A is of the form $x_j | y_k$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Then, corresponding to A , we construct the sketch in Figure 3.
- Suppose A is of the form $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \bowtie g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ where f and g are linear polynomials and $\bowtie \in \{<, \leq, =, >, \geq\}$. Then, corresponding to A , we construct the sketch in Figure 4.

Remark 3.6. Notice that any assignment to the variables of \mathbf{x} (resp. \mathbf{y}) can be interpreted in a straightforward manner as an assignment to \mathbf{s} (resp. \mathbf{t}) and also vice versa. We will use this convention throughout the reduction.

Now let us give an intuitive idea behind the construction of these gadgets. Intuitively, in both these cases, all the processes initially start at $start_A$. Then each process either takes the top transition and increments v_A or takes the bottom transition and does not increment any variable. Ultimately, this would lead to a point where all the processes are now at l_A . Then, in the first case, the guard from l_A to end_A essentially checks that s_j divides t_k and in the second case, the guard from l_A to end_A essentially checks that $f(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) \bowtie g(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t})$. By the previous remark, the variables \mathbf{s} (resp. \mathbf{t}) can be thought of as corresponding to the variables \mathbf{x} (resp. \mathbf{y}) and so this means that a process can reach end_A if and only if A can be satisfied. We now proceed to formalize this intuition.

Lemma 3.7. Let X and Y be assignments to the variables \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} respectively. Then $A(X, Y)$ is true if and only if there is a simple configuration C of $\text{TA}_A[X]$ with $C(start_A) > 0$ and $C(\mathbf{t}) = Y$ such that it can cover end_A .

Proof:

(\Rightarrow): Assume that $A(X, Y)$ is true.

- Suppose A is a divisibility constraint of the form $x_j | y_k$. Let q be such that $X(x_j) \cdot q = Y(y_k)$ and let C be the (unique) simple configuration given by $C(start_A) = C(z) = Y(y_k) + 1$, $C(t_k) = Y(y_k)$ and $C(d_A) = q$.
- Suppose A is of the form $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \bowtie g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. Let C be the (unique) simple configuration given by $C(start_A) = C(z) = f(X, Y) + 1$ and $C(\mathbf{t}) = Y$.

The reason for having a “+1” in the definition of $C(start_A)$ is so that we are guaranteed to have at least one process to begin with.

From C , we proceed as follows: We move exactly one process from $start_A$ to ℓ_A by using the rule which increments nothing and we move all the other processes, one by one, from $start_A$ to ℓ_A by using the rule which increments v_A . This leads to a configuration C' such that $C'(v_A) = C'(z) - 1 = C(z) - 1$. Because we assumed that $A(X, Y)$ is true, it follows that at C' , the outgoing rule from ℓ_A is enabled. Hence, we can now move a process from ℓ_A into end_A , thereby covering end_A .

(\Leftarrow): Assume that C is a simple configuration of $\mathbf{TA}_A[X]$ with $C(start_A) > 0$ and $C(\mathbf{t}) = Y$ such that from C it is possible to cover end_A . Let ρ be a run from C which covers end_A . By construction of \mathbf{TA}_A , it must mean that the outgoing rule from ℓ_A is fired at some point along the run and so its guard must be enabled at some configuration C' along the run. Note that $C'(\mathbf{t}) = C(\mathbf{t})$, since the environment variables never change their value along a run.

Now, suppose A is of the form $x_j | y_k$. This means that we have $X(s_j) \cdot C'(d_A) = C'(t_k)$. Since $X(s_j) = X(x_j)$, $C'(t_k) = C(t_k) = Y(t_k)$, this implies that $X(x_j)$ divides $Y(t_k)$ and so $A(X, Y)$ is true. On the other hand, suppose A is of the form $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \bowtie g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. Since $C'(\mathbf{t}) = C(\mathbf{t}) = Y$, this implies that $f(X, Y) \bowtie g(X, Y)$ and so $A(X, Y)$ is true. \square

3.2.2. Second phase.

Let $\{\xi_i\}_{i \in I}$ be the set of subformulas of ξ such that $\xi = \forall \mathbf{x} \exists \mathbf{y} \bigvee_{i \in I} \xi_i$, i.e., the subformula ξ_i is the disjunct corresponding to the index i in the formula ξ . Let $A_i^1, \dots, A_i^{l_i}$ be the set of atomic formulas appearing in ξ_i . We construct a sketch threshold automaton \mathbf{TA}_{ξ_i} in the following manner: We take the sketches $\mathbf{TA}_{A_i^1}, \dots, \mathbf{TA}_{A_i^{l_i}}$ from the first phase and then for every $1 \leq j \leq l_i - 1$, we add a rule which connects $end_{A_i^j}$ to $start_{A_i^{j+1}}$, which neither increments any shared variable nor has any threshold guards. This is illustrated in Figure 5 for the case of $l_i = 3$.

To prove a connection between the constructed gadget and the formula ξ_i , we first need to state a property of the gadget. We begin with a definition.

Definition 3.8. Let C, C' be two configurations of $\mathbf{TA}_{\xi_i}[X]$ for some assignment X and let $A \in \{A_i^1, \dots, A_i^{l_i}\}$. We say that $C \preceq_A C'$ if $C(v) = C'(v)$ for $v \in \{v_A, d_A, \mathbf{t}\}$ and $C(v) \leq C'(v)$ for $v \in \{start_A, \ell_A, end_A, z\}$.

By construction of \mathbf{TA}_{ξ_i} , the following *monotonicity property* is clear.




Figure 5. Example sketch for the second phase

Proposition 3.9. (Monotonicity)

Let X be an assignment to the indeterminates and let $C \xrightarrow{r} C'$ be a step in $\mathbf{TA}_{\xi_i}[X]$ such that the rule r belongs to $\mathbf{TA}_{A_i^j}$ for some j . Then for every D such that $C \preceq_{A_i^j} D$, there exists a D' such that $D \xrightarrow{r} D'$ is a step in $\mathbf{TA}_{\xi_i}[X]$ and $C' \preceq_{A_i^j} D'$.

We now have the following proof which asserts the correctness of our construction.

Lemma 3.10. Let X and Y be assignments to the variables \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} respectively. Then $\xi_i(X, Y)$ is true if and only if there is a simple configuration C of $\mathbf{TA}_{\xi_i}[X]$ with $C(\text{start}_{A_i^1}) > 0$ and $C(\mathbf{t}) = Y$ such that it can cover $\text{end}_{A_i^{l_i}}$

Proof:

(\Rightarrow): Suppose $\xi_i(X, Y)$ is true. Since $\xi_i = \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq l_i} A_i^j$, this means that $A_i^j(X, Y)$ is true for every $1 \leq j \leq l_i$. By Lemma 3.7, for every $1 \leq j \leq l_i$, there exists a simple configuration C_j of $\mathbf{TA}_{A_i^j}[X]$ with $C_j(\text{start}_{A_i^j}) > 0$ and $C_j(\mathbf{t}) = Y$ such that C_j can cover $\text{end}_{A_i^j}$. For each j , let $C_j \xrightarrow{*} C_j'' \xrightarrow{r_j} C_j'$ be a shortest run from C_j which covers $\text{end}_{A_i^j}$. By definition $C_j''(\text{end}_{A_i^j}) = 0$ and $C_j'(\text{end}_{A_i^j}) > 0$. This means that the (unique) outgoing rule from $\ell_{A_i^j}$ is enabled at C_j'' and r_j is in fact, this rule. This also implies that the only difference between C_j'' and C_j' is that a process has moved from $\ell_{A_i^j}$ to $\text{end}_{A_i^j}$. In particular, the shared variables and the environment variables do not change their values during this step and so the guards along the rule r_j are true at C_j' as well.

Let $Z = \max\{C_j(z) : 1 \leq j \leq l_i\}$. Let D_1 be the configuration given by $D_1(\mathbf{t}) = Y$, $D_1(d_{A_i^j}) = C_j(d_{A_i^j})$ for every $A \in \{A_i^1, \dots, A_i^{l_i}\}$ which is a divisibility constraint, $D_1(z) = D_1(\text{start}_{A_i^1}) = Z$ and $D_1(v) = 0$ for every other v . Note that $C_1 \preceq_{A_i^1} D_1$.

We will now show the following by induction: For any $1 \leq j \leq l_i$, there is a configuration D_j which is reachable from D_1 such that $C_j \preceq_{A_i^j} D_j$, $D_j(\text{start}_{A_i^j}) = Z$ and $D_j(v_{A_i^k}) = 0$ for every $k \geq j$. The base case of $j = 1$ is trivial. Assume that we have already shown it for some j and we now want to prove it for $j + 1$. By existence of the run $C_j \xrightarrow{*} C_j'$ and because of the monotonicity property, there is a run $D_j \xrightarrow{*} D_j'$ such that $C_j' \preceq_{A_i^j} D_j'$. Since the guards of the outgoing rule from $\ell_{A_i^j}$ are enabled at C_j' , it follows that they are also enabled at D_j' . We now do the following: From D_j' , we first move all the processes at $\text{start}_{A_i^j}$ to $\ell_{A_i^j}$ by means of the rule which increments nothing. From

there we move all the processes at $\ell_{A_i^j}$ to $end_{A_i^j}$ and then to $start_{A_i^{j+1}}$. This results in a configuration D_{j+1} which satisfies the claim.

By induction, this means that we can reach D_{l_i} from D_1 . By the monotonicity property, we can cover $end_{A_i^{l_i}}$ from D_{l_i} .

(\Leftarrow): Suppose there is a simple configuration C of $\mathbf{TA}_{\xi_i}[X]$ with $C(start_{A_i^1}) > 0$ and $C(\mathbf{t}) = Y$ such that it can cover $end_{A_i^{l_i}}$. Let $C \xrightarrow{*} C'$ be such a run. By construction of \mathbf{TA}_{ξ_i} , this implies that there must be configurations C_1, \dots, C_{l_i} along this run such that at each C_j , the outgoing rule from $\ell_{A_i^j}$ must be enabled. Hence, this means that if A_i^j is a formula of the form $x_k | y_{k'}$, then $X(s_k) \cdot C_j(d_{A_i^j}) = C_j(t_{k'})$ and if A_i^j is a formula of the form $f_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \bowtie g_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, then $f_j(X(\mathbf{s}), C_j(\mathbf{t})) \bowtie g_j(X(\mathbf{s}), C_j(\mathbf{t}))$. Since environment variables do not change their values along a run, this implies that in the former case, $X(x_k) | Y(y_{k'})$ and in the latter case, $f_j(X, Y) \bowtie g_j(X, Y)$. Hence, $A_i^j(X, Y)$ is true for every j and so ξ_i is true. \square

3.2.3. Third phase.

The final sketch threshold automaton \mathbf{TA} is constructed as follows: \mathbf{TA} will have a copy of each of the \mathbf{TA}_{ξ_i} and in addition it will also have two new locations $start$ and end . Then, for each index $i \in I$, \mathbf{TA} will have two rules, one of which goes from $start$ to $start_{A_i^1}$ and the other from $end_{A_i^{l_i}}$ to end . Both of these rules do not increment any variable and do not have any guards. Intuitively, these two rules correspond to choosing the disjunct ξ_i from the formula ξ . This is illustrated in Figure 6 for the case when the index set $I = \{i, j, k\}$.

Setting the initial set of locations of \mathbf{TA} to be $\{start\}$, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.11. Let X and Y be assignments to the variables \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} respectively. Then $\xi(X, Y)$ is true if and only if some initial configuration C with $C(\mathbf{t}) = Y$ can cover the location end in $\mathbf{TA}[X]$.

Proof:

(\Rightarrow): Suppose $\xi(X, Y)$ is true. Then $\xi_i(X, Y)$ is true for some i . By Lemma 3.10, there exists a simple configuration C of $\mathbf{TA}_{\xi_i}[X]$ with $C(start_{A_i^1}) > 0$ and $C(\mathbf{t}) = Y$ which can cover $end_{A_i^{l_i}}$. Consider the initial configuration D in \mathbf{TA} which is the same as C except that $D(start_{A_i^1}) = 0$ and $D(start) = C(start_{A_i^1})$. By construction of $\mathbf{TA}[X]$, we can make D reach C . Since we can cover $end_{A_i^{l_i}}$ from C in $\mathbf{TA}_{\xi_i}[X]$, we can also cover it in $\mathbf{TA}[X]$. Once we can cover $end_{A_i^{l_i}}$, we can also cover end .

(\Leftarrow): Suppose there is some initial configuration C with $C(\mathbf{t}) = Y$ which can cover the location end in $\mathbf{TA}[X]$. Let $C \xrightarrow{*} C'$ be such a run covering end . By construction, there must be an index $i \in I$ and configurations C_1, C_2, \dots, C_{l_i} along this run such that at each C_j , the outgoing rule from $\ell_{A_i^j}$ is enabled. Similar to the argument from Lemma 3.10, we can then show that each $A_i^j(X, Y)$ is true and so $\xi_i(X, Y)$ is true, which implies that $\xi(X, Y)$ is true. \square

It then follows that $\forall \mathbf{x} \exists \mathbf{y} \xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is true if and only if for every assignment X of the indeterminates of \mathbf{TA} , there exists an initial configuration C such that C can cover end in $\mathbf{TA}[X]$. Hence, the




Figure 6. Example sketch for the third phase

formula $\forall x \exists y \xi(x, y)$ is false if and only if there exists an assignment X of the indeterminates of TA such that $\text{TA}[X]$ does not cover end . Since TA is acyclic, we then get the following theorem.

Theorem 3.12. The non-negative coefficient synthesis problem for threshold automata is undecidable, even for acyclic threshold automata.

Example 3.13. We illustrate the above reduction on an example. Suppose we have the formula

$$\forall x_1, x_2 \exists y_1, y_2 (x_1|y_1) \vee (x_2|y_1 \wedge x_1 = 2x_2 + y_2) \quad (2)$$

Let A , B , and C denote the sub-formulas $x_1|y_1$, $x_2|y_1$ and $x_1 = 2x_2 + y_2$ respectively. For the formula 2, our reduction produces the sketch given in Figure 7.

Here s_1, s_2 are indeterminates corresponding to x_1, x_2 and t_1, t_2 are environment variables corresponding to y_1, y_2 . Notice that the formula is true, because if x_1 is assigned the value a and x_2 is assigned the value b , then we can always set y_1 to a and y_2 to b , which will always make the first disjunct true. Similarly, in the sketch threshold automaton, if μ is any assignment to the indeterminates, then by letting C be the (unique) initial configuration such that $C(t_1) = \mu(s_1)$, $C(t_2) = \mu(s_2)$, $C(z) = \mu(s_1) + 1$ and $C(d_A) = C(d_B) = 1$, we can cover end_A from C and so we can also cover end from C .

3.3. Wrapping up

We can now reduce the non-negative coefficient synthesis problem to the coefficient synthesis problem, thereby proving Theorem 3.1.




Figure 7. Sketch for formula 2

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $(\text{Env}, \text{TA}, \text{end})$ be an instance of the non-negative coefficient synthesis problem. Without loss of generality, we can assume that TA is acyclic and has only a single initial location start . This is because we have shown earlier that the non-negative coefficient synthesis problem is already undecidable for inputs satisfying this property.

Let X be the set of indeterminates of TA . We now add a new location begin and a new shared variable check . check will have the invariant that it will never be incremented by any of the rules. Now, from begin we add $|X| + 1$ rules as follows: First, we add a rule from begin to start which neither increments any variable nor has any guards. Then for each indeterminate $x \in X$, we add a rule from begin to end which has the guard $\text{check} > x$. Notice that since check is never incremented, it will always have the value 0 and so the guard $\text{check} > x$ will be true if and only if x takes a negative value. Finally, we set the new initial location to be begin and we let this new sketch threshold automaton be TA' . Notice that TA' is acyclic.

We will now prove that $(\text{Env}, \text{TA}, \text{end})$ is a yes instance of the non-negative coefficient synthesis problem if and only if $(\text{Env}, \text{TA}', \text{end})$ is a yes instance of the coefficient synthesis problem.

Notice that if μ is an assignment to X such that $\mu(x) < 0$ for some $x \in X$, then it is possible to move a process from begin to end . Hence, if μ assigns a negative value to some indeterminate, then there is at least one run from some initial configuration in $\text{TA}'[\mu]$ which covers end . Hence, if no initial configuration of $\text{TA}'[\mu]$ can cover end , then μ has to be a non-negative assignment. But then it is easy to see that no initial configuration of $\text{TA}[\mu]$ can cover end as well.

Similarly, suppose μ is a non-negative assignment such that $\text{TA}[\mu]$ does not cover end . Then, since μ is non-negative, it is clear that the only rule which can be fired from begin is the rule which moves a process from begin to start . Hence, it is then clear that $\text{TA}'[\mu]$ also cannot cover end .

4. Complexity of Bounded Coefficient Synthesis

We have seen that the coefficient synthesis problem for threshold automata is undecidable. Since the reachability relation for threshold automata is decidable [3, Corollary 1], the source of undecidability stems from the unboundedness of the values of the indeterminates needed to satisfy the given specification. Intuitively, this is undesirable, because we would ideally like our indeterminates to not take very big values. This leads to the following *bounded coefficient synthesis* problem, where we are given a tuple $(\text{Env}, \text{TA}, \ell)$ as in the coefficient synthesis problem, and in addition, we are given an interval $[A, B]$ with $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}$. We are then asked to check if there is an integer assignment μ to the indeterminates such that $A \leq \mu(x) \leq B$ for every indeterminate x and $\text{TA}[\mu]$ does not cover ℓ .¹

In this section, we will revisit the known upper and lower bounds for this problem and present different algorithms and constructions for both the upper and the lower bounds. Then, we will consider a special case based on existing benchmarks from the literature and provide better bounds for this case. We begin by concentrating on the upper bound.

4.1. Upper Bound for Bounded Coefficient Synthesis

To start with, the following upper bound is known for the bounded coefficient synthesis problem.

Theorem 4.1. [3, Theorem 7] Bounded coefficient synthesis is in Σ_2^p .²

To explain this result, we need to state a few results regarding threshold automata. It is known that given a threshold automaton TA , we can construct an exponential-sized formula ξ in *existential Presburger arithmetic* which characterizes precisely the reachability relation of TA [3, Theorem 5]. Since the exponential dependence only comes from exponentially many disjuncts, given two configurations σ and σ' of TA , we can decide if $\sigma \xrightarrow{*} \sigma'$ in NP by simply *guessing* and constructing one of the disjuncts of ξ and then using the fact that the existential theory of PA can be decided in NP.

Note that once we have this result, checking whether a given location ℓ cannot be covered is in coNP : we quantify universally over all pairs of configurations σ and σ' and verify that if σ is an initial configuration and $\sigma'(\ell) > 0$, then σ cannot reach σ' . With this observation, bounded synthesis can then be easily seen to be in Σ_2^p : simply guess a value for each indeterminate within the given range, plug-in the guessed values into the sketch and then run the coNP decision procedure.

This argument implies that if we were able to reduce the size of the formula characterizing the reachability relation, then it would automatically lead to shorter formulas for the bounded coefficient synthesis problem as well. Within this context, our main contribution is the following theorem.

Theorem 4.2. Given a pair (Env, TA) , we can construct in polynomial time, a polynomial-sized formula ϕ of existential Presburger arithmetic such that $\sigma \xrightarrow{*} \sigma'$ is true in TA if and only if $\phi(\sigma, \sigma')$ is true.

¹We can also allow a separate interval for each indeterminate. All the results in this section would be applicable to that case as well.

²In [3] this Σ_2^p upper bound was even proven for a broader class of specifications at the cost of restricting the type of automata to those satisfying a property called *multiplicativity*.

Hence, this result improves on the previous upper bound of formulas characterizing the reachability relation. In the rest of this subsection, we will prove Theorem 4.2. The formula that we give is similar to the formula given in [14, Theorem 4] for the Parikh image of a CFG. Further since our formula differs only slightly from the formula given in [3], we will present the formula in a similar manner as the one given in [3].

Existential PA formula for reachability. Fix a threshold automaton $\text{TA} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{I}, \Gamma, \mathcal{R})$ over an environment Env . First, we will construct a polynomial-sized formula for a *restricted form of reachability* between configurations. We now proceed to describe this restricted reachability relation.

Let g be a guard of TA of the form $b \cdot x \bowtie a_0 + a_1 \cdot p_1 + \dots + a_{|\Pi|} \cdot p_{|\Pi|}$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\bowtie \in \{\geq, <\}$, since any other guard could be written as a conjunction of guards of this form. Then, g is called a *rise guard* (resp. *fall guard*) if $\bowtie = \geq$ (resp. $\bowtie = <$).

Given a configuration σ , the *context* of σ , denoted by $\omega(\sigma)$ is the set of all rise guards that evaluate to true and the set of all fall guards that evaluate to false in σ . We say that a run $\sigma \xrightarrow{*} \sigma'$ is *steady* if the set of all configurations visited along this run have the same context. Since shared variables are only incremented and environment variables never change values along a run, it follows that if a rise guard becomes true at some point along a run, then it stays true throughout the run. Similarly, if a fall guard becomes false at some point along a run, then it stays false throughout the run. It then follows that a run is steady if and only if the first and the last configurations of this run have the same context. We will now construct a formula ϕ_{steady} with $(2|\mathcal{L}| + 2|\Gamma| + 2|\Pi|)$ free variables such that $\phi_{\text{steady}}(\sigma, \sigma')$ is true if and only if σ and σ' have the same context and σ can reach σ' .

The formula ϕ_{steady} . For every rule $r \in \mathcal{R}$, we will introduce a variable x_r , which will intuitively denote the number of times the rule r is fired during the (supposed) run from σ to σ' . Let $X = \{x_r\}_{r \in \mathcal{R}}$. The formula ϕ_{steady} is obtained by a conjunction of various subformulas, described as follows.

Subformula 1. σ and σ' must have the same context, the same number of processes and the same values over the environment variables which must also satisfy the resilience condition.

$$\phi_{\text{base}}(\sigma, \sigma') \equiv \sigma \cdot \mathbf{p} = \sigma' \cdot \mathbf{p} \wedge RC(\sigma \cdot \mathbf{p}) \wedge N(\sigma \cdot \mathbf{p}) = N(\sigma' \cdot \mathbf{p}) \wedge \omega(\sigma) = \omega(\sigma')$$

Subformula 2. For a location $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$, let $out_1^\ell, \dots, out_{a_\ell}^\ell$ be all the outgoing rules from ℓ and let $in_1^\ell, \dots, in_{b_\ell}^\ell$ be all the incoming rules to ℓ . The number of processes in ℓ after the run must be the initial number, plus the incoming processes, minus the outgoing processes. Hence, we have

$$\phi_{\mathcal{L}}(\sigma, \sigma', X) \equiv \bigwedge_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{b_\ell} x_{in_i^\ell} - \sum_{j=1}^{a_\ell} x_{out_j^\ell} = \sigma' \cdot \vec{\kappa}(\ell) - \sigma \cdot \vec{\kappa}(\ell) \right)$$

Subformula 3. Similarly, for the shared variables we must have

$$\phi_{\Gamma}(\sigma, \sigma', X) \equiv \bigwedge_{z \in \Gamma} \left(\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} (x_r \cdot r.\vec{u}[z]) = \sigma'.\vec{g}[z] - \sigma.\vec{g}[z] \right)$$

Subformula 4. Since we are searching for a steady run between σ and σ' , for a rule to be fired along this run, it is necessary that its guards are true in σ .

$$\phi_{\mathcal{R}}(\sigma, X) \equiv \bigwedge_{r \in \mathcal{R}} x_r > 0 \Rightarrow (\sigma \models r.\varphi)$$

Subformula 5. Finally, we introduce a collection of variables $Y = \{y_r\}_{r \in \mathcal{R}}$, which intuitively captures the following observation: If a rule r is fired in a run between σ and σ' , then either $\sigma(r.from) > 0$ or there must be a rule r' which is fired before r such that $r'.to = r.from$. The following formula enforces this condition using the variables Y .

$$\phi_{appl}(\sigma, X, Y) \equiv \bigwedge_{r \in \mathcal{R}} x_r > 0 \Rightarrow \phi_{chain}^r(\sigma, X, Y)$$

where

$$\phi_{chain}^r(\sigma, X, Y) \equiv (\sigma(r.from) > 0 \wedge y_r = 1) \vee \left(\bigvee_{r' \in Pre(r)} (x_{r'} > 0 \wedge y_r = y_{r'} + 1) \right)$$

and $Pre(r) = \{r' : r'.to = r.from\}$.

Combining the steps. We then define $\phi_{steady}(\sigma, \sigma')$ as

$$\phi_{steady}(\sigma, \sigma') \equiv \phi_{base}(\sigma, \sigma') \wedge \exists X, Y \phi_{\mathcal{L}}(\sigma, \sigma', X) \wedge \phi_{\Gamma}(\sigma, \sigma', X) \wedge \phi_{\mathcal{R}}(\sigma, X) \wedge \phi_{appl}(\sigma, X, Y)$$

Notice that the size of ϕ_{steady} is polynomial in the size of the given threshold automaton and the environment. We now have the following theorem.

Theorem 4.3. Let TA be a threshold automaton and let σ, σ' be two configurations. Formula $\phi_{steady}(\sigma, \sigma')$ is satisfiable if and only if there is a steady run between σ and σ' .

Before proving this theorem, let us see how it implies Theorem 4.2. If the underlying threshold automaton has K guards, then given *any* formula θ which characterizes the steady reachability relation, the authors of [3] come up with a formula θ' whose size is at most $O(K) \times |\theta|$ such that θ' characterizes the reachability relation, i.e., $\theta'(\sigma, \sigma')$ is true if and only if σ can reach σ' . Using their procedure, Theorem 4.3 then implies that we have a polynomial sized formula for the reachability relation and proves Theorem 4.2.

Hence, all that is left is to prove Theorem 4.3, which we do now.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. In [3], the authors present a formula ξ_{steady} such that $\xi_{steady}(\sigma, \sigma')$ is satisfiable if and only if there is a steady run between σ and σ' . Hence to prove the theorem it suffices to show that $\phi_{steady}(\sigma, \sigma')$ is satisfiable if and only if $\xi_{steady}(\sigma, \sigma')$ is satisfiable.

To do this, we first explain the formula $\xi_{steady}(\sigma, \sigma')$. Similar to ϕ_{steady} , $\xi_{steady}(\sigma, \sigma')$ is of the form

$$\xi_{base}(\sigma, \sigma') \wedge \exists X \xi_{\mathcal{L}}(\sigma, \sigma', X) \wedge \xi_{\Gamma}(\sigma, \sigma', X) \wedge \xi_{\mathcal{R}}(\sigma, X) \wedge \xi_{appl}(\sigma, X)$$

where ξ_q is the same as ϕ_q for every $q \in \{base, \mathcal{L}, \Gamma, \mathcal{R}\}$ and $\xi_{appl}(\sigma, X)$ is defined as follows:

$$\xi_{appl}(\sigma, X) \equiv \bigwedge_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \left(x_r > 0 \Rightarrow \bigvee_{S = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_s\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}} \xi_{chain}^r(S, \sigma, X) \right)$$

where

$$\xi_{chain}^r(S, \sigma, X) \equiv \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq s} x_{r_i} > 0 \wedge \sigma.\vec{\kappa}(r_1.from) > 0 \wedge \bigwedge_{1 < i \leq s} r_{i-1}.to = r_i.from \wedge r_s = r$$

Now, let Z be any non-negative assignment to the variables of X , i.e., we assign to the variable x_r , the natural number z_r . Suppose we show that $\xi_{appl}(\sigma, Z)$ is true if and only if there exists a non-negative assignment Z' to the variables of Y such that $\phi_{appl}(\sigma, Z, Z')$ is true. Then notice that our proof would be complete. This is what we proceed to do now.

(\Rightarrow): Suppose $\xi_{appl}(\sigma, Z)$ is true. Hence, for every rule r such that $z_r > 0$, there is a subset $S_r = \{t_1, \dots, t_{|S_r|}\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ such that for every i , $z_{t_i} > 0$, $\sigma(t_1.from) > 0$, $t_{|S_r|} = r$ and for every $i > 1$, $t_{i-1}.to = t_i.from$. We then construct our assignment Z' to the variables of Y by induction on the size of $|S_r|$.

First, if $z_r = 0$, then we set $z'_r = 0$ as well. Then, if $z_r > 0$ and $|S_r| = 1$, we set $z'_r = 1$. Finally, if $z_r > 0$ and $|S_r| > 1$, then let t be the penultimate rule of S_r . Notice that we can assume that $|S_t| < |S_r|$, because the set $S_r \setminus \{r\}$ satisfies all the conditions needed for S_t . Furthermore $z_t > 0$ and so by the induction hypothesis, we have already defined z'_t . We then set $z'_r = z'_t + 1$.

Now, suppose $z_r > 0$ for some rule r . Then notice that S_r exists and is non-empty. If $|S_r| = 1$, then $\sigma(r.from) > 0$ and we have set $z'_r = 1$. On the other hand if $|S_r| > 1$, then letting t be the penultimate rule of S_r , we have that $t.to = r.from$, $z_t > 0$ and $z'_r = z'_t + 1$. It then follows that $\phi_{chain}^r(\sigma, Z, Z')$ is true for every r with $z_r > 0$. This then implies that $\phi_{appl}(\sigma, Z, Z')$ is also true.

(\Leftarrow): Now, suppose there exists a non-negative assignment Z' to the variables of Y such that $\phi_{appl}(\sigma, Z, Z')$ is true. We need to show that $\xi_{appl}(\sigma, Z)$ is true. To do this, we need to show that if $z_r > 0$ then there is a subset $S_r = \{t_1, \dots, t_{|S_r|}\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ such that for every i , $z_{t_i} > 0$, $\sigma(t_1.from) > 0$, $t_{|S_r|} = r$ and for every $i > 1$, $t_{i-1}.to = t_i.from$. We do this by induction on the value of z'_r .

First, note that z'_r cannot be 0. Indeed if $z'_r = 0$, then since $z_r > 0$, by definition of $\phi_{appl}(\sigma, Z, Z')$ it must be the case that there must be a rule t such that $z'_r = z'_t + 1$. But this would mean that $z'_t = -1$, contradicting the fact that Z' is a non-negative assignment. Hence, $z'_r > 0$.

Suppose $z'_r = 1$. Then by definition of $\phi_{appl}(\sigma, Z, Z')$, it must be the case that $\sigma(r.from) > 0$. Indeed, if $\sigma(r.from) = 0$, then since $z_r > 0$, there must be a rule t such that $z_t > 0$ and $z'_r = z'_t + 1$.

This means that $z'_t = 0$ and $z_t > 0$, which, as we have shown in the previous paragraph, cannot happen. Hence, $\sigma(r.from) > 0$ and so we can simply set S_r to be $\{r\}$.

Suppose $z'_r > 1$. By definition of $\phi_{appl}(\sigma, Z, Z')$, it must be the case that there is a rule t such that $t.to = r.from$, $z_t > 0$ and $z'_r = z'_t + 1$. By induction hypothesis, we have already constructed the set S_t for t . We then set $S_r = S_t \cup \{r\}$. It is then easy to verify that the constructed sets S_r for each rule r satisfy the desired property. This completes the proof of Theorem 4.3.

4.2. Lower Bound for Bounded Coefficient Synthesis

In this subsection, we prove the following lower bound.

Theorem 4.4. Bounded coefficient synthesis is Σ_2^p -hard, even for acyclic threshold automata.

Before, we move on to the proof of this theorem, we make a remark.

Remark 4.5. A Σ_2^p lower bound was also proven in [3, Theorem 8] for bounded coefficient synthesis against arbitrary violations from the ELTL_{FT} logic. In particular, that reduction did not use a coverability violation. By modifying that reduction, it is possible to give a Σ_2^p lower bound for coverability violations as well. However, here we give a self-contained proof of that same result.

We prove this theorem by giving a reduction from the Σ_2 -SAT problem. Here we are given a Boolean formula of the form

$$\exists x_1, \dots, x_n \forall y_1, \dots, y_m \bigvee_{1 \leq j \leq k} D_j \quad (3)$$

where each D_j is a conjunction of literals, i.e., it is a conjunction of entries from $\{x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m\} \cup \{\overline{x_1}, \dots, \overline{x_n}, \overline{y_1}, \dots, \overline{y_m}\}$. Given such a formula, the task is then to decide whether it is valid. This problem is known to be Σ_2^p -hard [15, Corollary 6].

Now, assume that we are given a formula ξ of the form 3. Let \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} denote the sets of variables x_1, \dots, x_n and y_1, \dots, y_m respectively. Our reduction will now proceed in two stages. We describe the first stage now.

First stage: The environment. We begin by defining the environment $\text{Env} = (\Pi, RC, N)$. We will have m environment variables t_1, \dots, t_m , with each t_i intuitively corresponding to the variable y_i in the formula ξ . We will also have another environment variable z , which will intuitively denote the total number of participating processes.

The resilience condition RC will be the trivial condition *true*. The linear function $N : RC \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is taken to be $N(\Pi) = z$. Hence, the total number of processes executing the threshold automaton will be z .

Second stage: The indeterminates and the sketch. For each variable x_i in the formula ξ , we will have an indeterminate s_i . Before we proceed with the description of the sketch, we set up some notation.

We let \mathbf{s} denote the set of indeterminates s_1, \dots, s_n and \mathbf{t} denote the set of environment variables t_1, \dots, t_m . For any literal ℓ ,

- If $\ell = x_i$ (resp. y_i) for some i , let $F(\ell)$ be the term $1 - s_i$ (resp. $1 - t_i$).
- If $\ell = \overline{x_i}$ (resp. $\overline{y_i}$) for some i , let $F(\ell)$ be the term s_i (resp. t_i).

Given any valuation X to the Boolean variables x_1, \dots, x_n , let $B(X)$ be the assignment to the indeterminates s_1, \dots, s_n which assigns each s_i the value 1 if $X(x_i)$ is true and the value 0 if $X(x_i)$ is false. Given any valuation Y to y_1, \dots, y_m , let $V(Y)$ be the set of assignments to the environment variables t_1, \dots, t_m which assigns each t_i any strictly positive value if $Y(y_i)$ is true and the value 0 if $Y(y_i)$ is false. Note that $B(X)$ is a single assignment whereas $V(Y)$ is a set of assignments.

Now, let D_j be any conjunct of the formula ξ . Corresponding to D_j , let E_j be the term defined by $E_j = \sum_{\ell \in D_j} F(\ell)$. From the definition of E_j , we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.6. Let X and Y be any assignments to the variables \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} respectively. Then $D_j(X, Y)$ is true if and only if for any assignments S, T with $S = B(X)$ and $T \in V(Y)$, $E_j(S, T) \leq 0$.

Proof:

(\Rightarrow): Suppose $D_j(X, Y)$ is true. This means that any literal ℓ that appears in D_j is set to true by the assignments X and Y . Let $S = B(X)$ and $T \in V(Y)$ be some two assignments. Note that E_j is a sum of terms of the form $F(\ell)$ with $\ell \in D_j$.

Now, pick any $\ell \in D_j$. By assumption, ℓ is set to true by X and Y . By definition of $F(\ell)$, S and T , it follows that $F(\ell)$ evaluates to a value that is at most 0 under S and T . Hence, it follows that $E_j(S, T) \leq 0$.

(\Leftarrow): Suppose for any pair of assignments S, T with $S = B(X)$ and $T \in V(Y)$ we have that $E_j(S, T) \leq 0$. Pick the assignment $T' \in V(Y)$ such that $T'(t_i) = 1$ if $Y(y_i)$ is true and $T'(t_i) = 0$ otherwise. By assumption $E_j(S, T') \leq 0$. Note that E_j is a sum of terms of the form $F(\ell)$ with $\ell \in D_j$.

Now, pick any $\ell \in D_j$. By construction of $F(\ell)$, S and T' it follows that its value cannot go strictly below the value 0 under the assignments S and T' . This combined with the fact that $E_j(S, T') \leq 0$ implies that $F(\ell)$ evaluates to the value 0 under S and T' . By definition of $F(\ell)$, this immediately implies that ℓ is set to true by the assignments X and Y . Since ℓ was any arbitrary literal from D_j , it follows that $D_j(X, Y)$ is true. \square

We will now construct the desired sketch **TA**. Recall that the formula ξ has k disjuncts D_1, D_2, \dots, D_k . For each D_j , the sketch will have one location $start_j$. Furthermore, **TA** has another location $start_0$ and a single shared variable v . The rules of the sketch **TA** are now given as follows: For every $1 \leq j \leq k$, there is a rule between $start_{j-1}$ and $start_j$ with the threshold guard $v < E_j$.

Let the initial set of locations of **TA** be $\{start_0\}$. It is easy to see that the constructed sketch is acyclic. We now show the following lemma which proves the correctness of our construction.

Lemma 4.7. Let X and Y be any assignments to the variables \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} respectively. Then $D_j(X, Y)$ is true for some $1 \leq j \leq k$ if and only if for any assignments S, T with $S = B(X)$ and $T \in V(Y)$, any initial configuration C with $C(\mathbf{t}) = T$ cannot cover $start_k$ in $\mathbf{TA}[S]$.

Proof:

(\Rightarrow): Suppose there exists some $1 \leq j \leq k$ such that $D_j(X, Y)$ is true. Let $S = B(X)$ and $T \in V(Y)$ be two assignments to \mathbf{s} and \mathbf{t} respectively. By Lemma 4.6, it follows that $E_j(S, T) \leq 0$. By construction of $\mathbf{TA}[S]$, the shared variable v is never incremented and so it will always have the value 0 on any run starting from any initial configuration. Since $E_j(S, T) \leq 0$, it then follows that in any run from any initial configuration, the rule between $start_{j-1}$ and $start_j$ is never enabled and hence can never be fired. This then implies that $start_j$ is not coverable from any initial configuration C with $C(\mathbf{t}) = T$. By the structure of \mathbf{TA} , it follows that $start_k$ cannot also be covered.

(\Leftarrow): Suppose for any assignments S, T with $S = B(X)$ and $T \in V(Y)$, any initial configuration C with $C(\mathbf{t}) = T$ cannot cover $start_k$ in $\mathbf{TA}[S]$. Let T' be the assignment in $V(Y)$ such that $T'(t_i) = 1$ if $Y(y_i)$ is true and $T'(t_i) = 0$ if $Y(y_i)$ is false. By assumption, no initial configuration with $C(\mathbf{t}) = T'$ must be able to cover $start_k$ in $\mathbf{TA}[S]$. Let j be the smallest index such that no initial configuration C with $C(\mathbf{t}) = T'$ can cover $start_j$ in $\mathbf{TA}[S]$. Note that $j > 0$, as $start_0$ is an initial location.

Now, consider the rule between $start_{j-1}$ and $start_j$. By assumption on $start_j$, it must be the case that $v < E_j(S, T')$ cannot be true, as otherwise, $start_j$ can be covered from C . Since the shared variable v is never incremented, it follows that $E_j(S, T') \leq 0$. In the second part of the proof of Lemma 4.6, we have already proven that $E_j(S, T') \leq 0$ (for this specific assignment T') already implies that $D_j(X, Y)$ is true. This completes the proof. \square

Notice that any assignment S to the indeterminates \mathbf{s} within the range $[0, 1]$ is of the form $B(X)$ for some assignment X to the variables \mathbf{x} . Similarly, any assignment T to the environment variables \mathbf{t} belongs to $V(Y)$ for some assignment Y to the variables \mathbf{y} . Hence, by Lemma 4.7, we get that there exists an assignment X to \mathbf{x} such that for all assignments Y to \mathbf{y} , at least one $D_j(X, Y)$ is true if and only if there exists an assignment S to the indeterminates \mathbf{s} within the range $[0, 1]$ such that any initial configuration cannot cover $start_k$ in $\mathbf{TA}[S]$. Therefore, Theorem 4.4 now follows.

Example 4.8. We illustrate the above reduction on an example. Suppose we have the formula

$$\exists x_1, x_2 \forall y_1, y_2 (x_1 \wedge y_1 \wedge \neg x_2) \vee (\neg y_1 \wedge y_2 \wedge \neg x_2) \vee (\neg y_2 \wedge x_1) \quad (4)$$

Let D_1, D_2 and D_3 be the sub-formulas $x_1 \wedge y_1 \wedge \neg x_2$, $\neg y_1 \wedge y_2 \wedge \neg x_2$ and $\neg y_2 \wedge x_1$ respectively. Correspondingly, we get the terms $E_1 = (1 - s_1) + (1 - t_1) + s_2$, $E_2 = t_1 + (1 - t_2) + s_2$ and $E_3 = t_2 + (1 - s_1)$. Now, for the formula 4, our reduction produces the sketch given in Figure 8.

Note that the formula is true. Indeed, suppose we set x_1 to true and x_2 to false. Then, D_1 can be made false only by setting y_1 to false, and D_2 can be made false only by setting either y_1 to true or y_2 to false, and D_3 can be made false only by setting y_2 to false. It follows then that for any assignment to y_1 and y_2 , at least one of D_1 or D_2 or D_3 is true.

Correspondingly, in the sketch, if we set s_1 to 1 and s_2 to 0, we cannot cover $start_3$. Indeed, with this assignment to the indeterminates, the first guard becomes $v < 1 - t_1$, the second guard becomes




Figure 8. Sketch for formula 4

$v < t_1 + 1 - t_2$ and the third guard becomes $v < t_2$. Since v is never incremented, in order to cover $start_3$, the inequalities $0 < 1 - t_1$, $0 < t_1 + 1 - t_2$ and $0 < t_2$ must all be simultaneously satisfied. However, if the first inequality is true, then $t_1 = 0$ and so we must have $0 < 1 - t_2$ and $0 < t_2$, which cannot be both true. Hence, $start_3$ cannot be covered if we set s_1 to 1 and s_2 to 0.

4.3. A Special Case of Bounded Coefficient Synthesis

Motivated by the shape of threshold guards appearing in practice, we now consider a special class of sketch threshold automata for which we can obtain better bounds for the bounded coefficient synthesis problem (against coverability properties). We first describe this special class and then state our results.

A sketch is said to have no indeterminate fall guards if for every fall guard $b \cdot x < a_0 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq |\Pi|} a_i \cdot p_i$ of the sketch, all of the entries in $\{b, a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{|\Pi|}\}$ are integers and not indeterminates. As mentioned in [2], shared variables in threshold automata are typically used for two things: To record the number of messages of a specific type that has been broadcasted and to keep track of the number of processes crashed so far. If a shared variable v is used for the first purpose, then all guards containing v are typically rise guards. If v is used for the latter purpose, then we will usually only have a fall guard of the form $v < f$ where f is the maximum number of processes allowed to crash. This means that there is no need to synthesize coefficients for fall guards in these cases. Indeed, for almost all of the benchmarks from [11], fall guards are of this type, and hence the subclass that we consider here is interesting from a practical point of view. We now show that

Theorem 4.9. The bounded coefficient synthesis problem (against coverability properties) for threshold automata with no indeterminate fall guards is **coNP**-complete.

Hardness follows from the fact that checking if a location is coverable in a threshold automaton with no fall guards is **NP**-hard [2]. Hence we concentrate on proving the upper bound.

Let $(\text{Env}, \text{TA}, \ell, I)$ be an input for the bounded coefficient synthesis problem where TA has no indeterminate fall guards and $I = [A, B]$ with $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}$. Given two assignments X and Y to the indeterminates of TA , we say that $X \leq Y$ if $X(s) \leq Y(s)$ for every indeterminate s . Let max be the assignment given by $\text{max}(s) = B$ for every indeterminate s . We have the following proposition whose proof follows from the definition of our subclass.

Proposition 4.10. Suppose X, Y are assignments to the indeterminates of TA such that $X \leq Y$. If a rule r is enabled at a configuration σ in $\text{TA}[Y]$, then r is also enabled at σ in $\text{TA}[X]$.

Proof:

Let r be enabled at a configuration σ in $\text{TA}[Y]$ and let g_1, \dots, g_k be the set of threshold guards appearing in r . For each $1 \leq i \leq k$, consider the guard g_i .

- Suppose g_i is a rise guard. Then, since $X \leq Y$, it follows that every indeterminate in g_i is assigned a lower value in X than in Y . Since, g_i is true in $\text{TA}[Y]$ at the configuration σ , it then follows that g_i is also true in $\text{TA}[X]$ at σ .
- Suppose g_i is a fall guard. Then, since fall guards in TA do not have any indeterminates, it follows that if g_i is true in $\text{TA}[Y]$ at σ , then it is also true in $\text{TA}[X]$ at σ .

This completes the proof. \square

The above proposition gives us the following useful corollary.

Corollary 4.11. Suppose ρ is a run of $\text{TA}[Y]$. Then for every X such that $X \leq Y$, ρ is also a run of $\text{TA}[X]$. Consequently, either ℓ is not coverable in $\text{TA}[max]$ or ℓ is coverable for any assignment to the indeterminates within the range I .

This means that for this class, we can simply reduce bounded coefficient synthesis against coverability properties to checking coverability: Given a sketch TA , compute $\text{TA}[max]$ and check if it covers ℓ or not. Since in NP , we can check if $\text{TA}[max]$ can cover ℓ [3, Corollary 1], this then proves Theorem 4.9.

5. Conclusion

We have shown that the coefficient synthesis problem for threshold automata is undecidable, even when the given sketch threshold automaton is acyclic and the violation is given by a coverability property. This already implies that if we have a class of properties capable of expressing the coverability properties, then the coefficient synthesis problem generalized to that class is also undecidable. For instance, this implies that coefficient synthesis for the class of properties from the ELTL_{FT} logic [8], which has been used to express various properties of threshold automata obtained from distributed algorithms, is also undecidable. By the same discussion, our results also imply that bounded coefficient synthesis against properties from ELTL_{FT} is also Σ_2^p -hard. (However, this result was already known [3, Theorem 8] and our main contribution towards this lower bound in this paper was to prove it for coverability properties). Finally, since our upper bound result pertains to an efficient encoding of the reachability relation into existential Presburger arithmetic, it can be used for bounded coefficient synthesis against other classes of properties as well.

As part of future work, it might be interesting to study the (bounded) coefficient synthesis problem when the assignments to the indeterminates are forced to satisfy a property called *multiplicativity*. The usefulness of this property stems from the fact that it has been utilized to get some efficient model-checking algorithms for threshold automata [8, 3, 2]. It might also be interesting to study these problems for the case when fall guards do not have indeterminates, which as observed in the previous section can be motivated by cases occurring in the benchmarks from literature.

Acknowledgments. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement

No 787367 (PaVeS). This research was sponsored in part by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft project 389792660 TRR 248–CPEC.

References

- [1] Alur, R., Henzinger, T.A., Vardi, M.Y.: Parametric real-time reasoning. In: Kosaraju, S.R., Johnson, D.S., Aggarwal, A. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, May 16-18, 1993, San Diego, CA, USA. pp. 592–601. ACM (1993). <https://doi.org/10.1145/167088.167242>
- [2] Balasubramanian, A.R.: Parameterized complexity of safety of threshold automata. In: Saxena, N., Simon, S. (eds.) *40th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2020*, December 14-18, 2020, BITS Pilani, K K Birla Goa Campus, Goa, India (Virtual Conference). *LIPIcs*, vol. 182, pp. 37:1–37:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2020). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.FSTTCS.2020.37>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.FSTTCS.2020.37>
- [3] Balasubramanian, A.R., Esparza, J., Lazić, M.: Complexity of verification and synthesis of threshold automata. In: Hung, D.V., Sokolsky, O. (eds.) *Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis - 18th International Symposium, ATVA 2020*, Hanoi, Vietnam, October 19-23, 2020, *Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 12302, pp. 144–160. Springer (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-59152-6_8, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-59152-6_8
- [4] Bertrand, N., Konnov, I., Lazić, M., Widder, J.: Verification of randomized consensus algorithms under round-rigid adversaries. *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transf.* **23**(5), 797–821 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10009-020-00603-X>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-020-00603-x>
- [5] Delzanno, G., Sangnier, A., Zavattaro, G.: Parameterized verification of ad hoc networks. In: Gastin, P., Laroussinie, F. (eds.) *CONCUR 2010 - Concurrency Theory, 21th International Conference, CONCUR 2010*, Paris, France, August 31-September 3, 2010. *Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 6269, pp. 313–327. Springer (2010). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15375-4_22, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15375-4_22
- [6] German, S.M., Sistla, A.P.: Reasoning about systems with many processes. *J. ACM* **39**(3), 675–735 (1992). <https://doi.org/10.1145/146637.146681>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/146637.146681>
- [7] Konnov, I., Widder, J.: ByMC: Byzantine Model Checker. In: Margaria, T., Steffen, B. (eds.) *Leveraging Applications of Formal Methods, Verification and Validation. Distributed Systems - 8th International Symposium, ISoLA 2018*, Limassol, Cyprus, November 5-9, 2018, *Proceedings, Part III. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 11246, pp. 327–342. Springer (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03424-5_22, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03424-5_22
- [8] Konnov, I.V., Lazić, M., Veith, H., Widder, J.: A short counterexample property for safety and liveness verification of fault-tolerant distributed algorithms. In: Castagna, G., Gordon, A.D. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 44th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2017*, Paris, France, January 18-20, 2017. pp. 719–734. ACM (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3009837.3009860>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3009837.3009860>
- [9] Konnov, I.V., Veith, H., Widder, J.: On the completeness of bounded model checking for threshold-based distributed algorithms: Reachability. *Inf. Comput.* **252**, 95–109 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IC.2016.03.006>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2016.03.006>

- [10] Kukovec, J., Konnov, I., Widder, J.: Reachability in parameterized systems: All flavors of threshold automata. In: Schewe, S., Zhang, L. (eds.) 29th International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2018, September 4-7, 2018, Beijing, China. LIPIcs, vol. 118, pp. 19:1–19:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2018). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.CONCUR.2018.19>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.CONCUR.2018.19>
- [11] Lazić, M., Konnov, I., Widder, J., Bloem, R.: Synthesis of distributed algorithms with parameterized threshold guards. In: Aspnes, J., Bessani, A., Felber, P., Leitão, J. (eds.) 21st International Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems, OPODIS 2017, Lisbon, Portugal, December 18-20, 2017. LIPIcs, vol. 95, pp. 32:1–32:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2017). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.OPODIS.2017.32>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.OPODIS.2017.32>
- [12] Pérez, G.A., Raha, R.: Revisiting parameter synthesis for one-counter automata. In: Manea, F., Simpson, A. (eds.) 30th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2022, February 14-19, 2022, Göttingen, Germany (Virtual Conference). LIPIcs, vol. 216, pp. 33:1–33:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2022). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.CSL.2022.33>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.CSL.2022.33>
- [13] Srikanth, T.K., Toueg, S.: Simulating authenticated broadcasts to derive simple fault-tolerant algorithms. *Distributed Comput.* **2**(2), 80–94 (1987). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01667080>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01667080>
- [14] Verma, K.N., Seidl, H., Schwentick, T.: On the complexity of equational horn clauses. In: Nieuwenhuis, R. (ed.) Automated Deduction - CADE-20, 20th International Conference on Automated Deduction, Tallinn, Estonia, July 22-27, 2005, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 3632, pp. 337–352. Springer (2005). https://doi.org/10.1007/11532231_25, https://doi.org/10.1007/11532231_25
- [15] Wrathall, C.: Complete sets and the polynomial-time hierarchy. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **3**(1), 23–33 (1976). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(76\)90062-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(76)90062-1), [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(76\)90062-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(76)90062-1)