

# Linear-Time–Branching-Time Spectroscopy Accounting for Silent Steps\*

Benjamin Bisping 

Technische Universität Berlin, Germany  
<https://bbisping.de>  
[benjamin.bisping@tu-berlin.de](mailto:benjamin.bisping@tu-berlin.de)

David N. Jansen 

Key Laboratory of System Software and  
State Key Laboratory of Computer Science, Institute of Software,  
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China  
[dnjansen@ios.ac.cn](mailto:dnjansen@ios.ac.cn)

We provide the first generalized game characterization of van Glabbeek’s linear-time–branching-time spectrum with silent steps. Thereby, *one* multi-dimensional energy game can be used to characterize and decide a wide array of weak behavioral equivalences between stability-respecting branching bisimilarity and weak trace equivalence in one go. To establish correctness, we relate attacker-winning energy budgets and distinguishing sublanguages of Hennessy–Milner logic that we characterize by eight dimensions of formula expressiveness.

## 1 Introduction: Mechanizing the Spectrum

Picking the right notion of behavioral equivalence for a particular use case can be hard.<sup>1</sup> Theoretically, van Glabbeek’s “linear-time–branching-time spectrum” [21, 22, 23] brings order to the zoo of equivalences by casting them as a hierarchy of modal logics. But practically, it is difficult to navigate in particular the second part [22], which considers so-called *weak equivalences* that abstract from “internal” behavior, expressed by “silent”  $\tau$ -steps. Abstracting internal behavior is crucial to model communication happening without participation of the observer and refinements, that is, for virtually every application.

In this paper, we show how to *operationalize the silent-step linear-time–branching-time spectrum* of [22]. We enable researchers to provide a set of processes that ought to be equated (or distinguished) for their scenario and to learn “where” in the spectrum this set of (in-)equivalences holds. In prior work on the strong spectrum [21] (without silent steps), we dubbed this process *linear-time–branching-time spectroscopy* [6]. Implicitly, we obtain decision procedures (and games) for each individual notion of equivalence as a by-product.

As outlined in Figure 1, we apply our recent approach [6, 5] to use a *generalized bisimulation game* with moves corresponding to sets of conceivable distinguishing formulas. The background is that *formulas can be partially ordered by the amount of Hennessy–Milner logic expressiveness* they use in a way that aligns with the spectrum. The game can then be understood as a *multi-weighted energy game* [5, 12, 25] where moves use up attacker’s resources to distinguish processes. So, defender-won energy levels reveal non-distinguishing subsets of Hennessy–Milner logic (HML) and thus sets of maintained equivalences.

Applying the above approach to the weak spectrum faces many obstacles: The modal logics of the weak spectrum in [22] are quite intricate and are not closed under HML-subterms. Also, van Glabbeek [22] does not account for unstable linear-time equivalences, but other publications like Gazda et al. [18] use these. On the game side, existing weak bisimulation games by De Frutos Escrig et al. [17]

---

\*This report provides the proofs for the paper “One Energy Game for the Spectrum between Branching Bisimilarity and Weak Trace Semantics”, to appear in the proceeding of EXPRESS/SOS 2024.

<sup>1</sup>Some accounts of researchers who struggled to pick fitting equivalence for verification and encoding challenges: [2, 3, 24].




Figure 1: How the paper combines the weak spectrum [22] and the spectroscopy approach [5].

and Bisping et al. [8] lack moves for many observations that are relevant for weaker notions in the spectrum. This paper shows how all this can still be brought together.

**Contributions.** At its core, this paper extends the spectroscopy energy game of [5] by modalities needed to cover the weak equivalence spectrum of [22], namely, delayed observations, stable conjunctions, and branching conjunctions. More precisely:

- In Section 2, we capture a big chunk of the *linear-time–branching-time spectrum with silent steps by measuring expressive powers* used in an HML-subset, which we prove to correspond to stability-respecting branching bisimilarity.
- In Section 3, we introduce the first generalized game characterization of the silent-step equivalence spectrum. For this, we adapt the *spectroscopy energy game* of [5] to account for distinctions in terms of delayed observations ( $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle a \rangle \dots$ ), stable conjunctions ( $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \wedge \{ \neg \langle \tau \rangle \top, \dots \}$ ), and branching conjunctions ( $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \wedge \{ \langle a \rangle \dots, \langle \varepsilon \rangle \dots \}$ ).
- Section 4 proves that *winning energy levels and equivalences coincide* by closely relating distinguishing formulas and ways the attacker may win the energy game. The proofs have been Isabelle/HOL-formalized.
- Section 5 lays out how to use the game to *decide all equivalences at once* in exponential time using our prototype tool for everyday research.

## 2 Distinctions and Equivalences in Systems with Silent Steps

This paper follows the paradigm that *equivalence is the absence of possibilities to distinguish*. Equivalently, one could speak about apartness, i.e. the view that non-equivalence is based on evidence of difference [19]. We begin by introducing distinguishing Hennessy–Milner logic formulas (Subsection 2.1), and a quantitative characterization of weak equivalences in terms of distinctive capabilities (Subsection 2.2).

### 2.1 Transition Systems and Hennessy–Milner Logic

**Definition 2.1** (Labeled transition system with silent steps). *A labeled transition system is a tuple  $\mathcal{S} = (\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, \rightarrow)$  where  $\mathcal{P}$  is the set of processes,  $\Sigma$  is the set of actions, and  $\rightarrow \subseteq \mathcal{P} \times \Sigma \times \mathcal{P}$  is the transition relation.*

$\tau \in \Sigma$  labels *silent steps* and  $\rightarrow$  is notation for the reflexive transitive closure of *internal activity*  $\xrightarrow{\tau}^*$ . The name  $\varepsilon \notin \Sigma$  is reserved and indicates no (visible) action. A process  $p$  is called *stable* if  $p \not\xrightarrow{\tau}$ . We write  $p \xrightarrow{(\alpha)} p'$  if  $p \xrightarrow{\alpha} p'$ , or if  $\alpha = \tau$  and  $p = p'$ .




Figure 2: A pair of processes  $P_e$  and  $P_l$  together with versions  $P_e^\tau$  and  $P_l^\tau$  of the two where *idle* has been abstracted into internal  $\tau$ -behavior.

We implicitly lift the relations to sets of processes  $P \xrightarrow{\alpha} P'$  (with  $P, P' \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ ,  $\alpha \in \Sigma$ ), which is defined to be true if  $P' = \{p' \in \mathcal{P} \mid \exists p \in P. p \xrightarrow{\alpha} p'\}$ .

**Example 2.1.** Figure 2 presents transition systems of four processes:  $P_e$  makes a nondeterministic choice *op* between *a* and *b*, performing arbitrarily many *idle*-actions in between.  $P_l$  does the same but can change the choice while idling.  $P_e^\tau$  and  $P_l^\tau$  are variants of the two obtained by abstracting *idle* into  $\tau$ -actions.

The example is helpful to test whether a process equivalence can be a congruence for abstraction. Any congruence for abstraction  $\sim$  would need to have the property that  $P_e \sim P_l$  implies  $P_e^\tau \sim P_l^\tau$ . So, if we just had a quick way of testing for all weak behavioral equivalences at once, we could quickly narrow down which equivalences work for this example. Using this paper’s spectroscopy algorithm, we can achieve this.

Bisimilarity and other notions of equivalence can conveniently be defined in terms of Hennessy–Milner logic. We direct our attention to variants that allow for silent behavior to happen before visible actions are observed. We thus focus on the following variant, where the **brick-red** part represents *stable conjunctions* and the **steel-blue** part *branching conjunctions*:

**Definition 2.2** (Branching Hennessy–Milner logic). We define *stability-respecting branching* Hennessy–Milner modal logic,  $HML_{\text{srb}}^b$ , over an alphabet of actions  $\Sigma$  by the following context-free grammar starting with  $\varphi$ :

$\varphi ::= \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$		“delayed observation”
$\bigwedge \{ \psi, \psi, \dots \}$		“immediate conjunction”
$\chi ::= \langle a \rangle \varphi$	with $a \in \Sigma \setminus \{ \tau \}$	“observation”
$\bigwedge \{ \psi, \psi, \dots \}$		“standard conjunction”
$\bigwedge \{ \neg \langle \tau \rangle \top, \psi, \psi, \dots \}$		“stable conjunction”
$\bigwedge \{ \langle \alpha \rangle \varphi, \psi, \psi, \dots \}$	with $\alpha \in \Sigma$	“branching conjunction”
$\psi ::= \neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi \mid \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$		“negative / positive conjuncts”

Its semantics  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^{\mathcal{S}} : HML_{\text{srb}}^b \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , where a formula “is true,” over a transition system  $\mathcal{S} = (\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, \rightarrow)$

is defined in mutual recursion with helper functions  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_\varepsilon$  for subformulas in the “delayed” context ( $\chi$ -productions) and  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_\wedge$  for conjuncts ( $\psi$ -productions):

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi \rrbracket^\mathcal{S} &:= \{p \in \mathcal{P} \mid \exists p' \in \llbracket \chi \rrbracket_\varepsilon^\mathcal{S} . p \rightarrow p'\} \\ \llbracket \bigwedge \Psi \rrbracket^\mathcal{S} &:= \llbracket \bigwedge \Psi \rrbracket_\varepsilon^\mathcal{S} := \bigcap \{ \llbracket \psi \rrbracket_\wedge^\mathcal{S} \mid \psi \in \Psi \} \\ \llbracket \langle a \rangle \varphi \rrbracket_\varepsilon^\mathcal{S} &:= \{p \in \mathcal{P} \mid \exists p' \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^\mathcal{S} . p \xrightarrow{a} p'\} \\ \llbracket \neg \langle \tau \rangle \top \rrbracket_\wedge^\mathcal{S} &:= \{p \in \mathcal{P} \mid p \not\xrightarrow{\tau}\} \\ \llbracket \langle \alpha \rangle \varphi \rrbracket_\wedge^\mathcal{S} &:= \{p \in \mathcal{P} \mid \exists p' \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^\mathcal{S} . p \xrightarrow{(\alpha)} p'\} \\ \llbracket \neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi \rrbracket_\wedge^\mathcal{S} &:= \mathcal{P} \setminus \llbracket \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi \rrbracket^\mathcal{S} \\ \llbracket \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi \rrbracket_\wedge^\mathcal{S} &:= \llbracket \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi \rrbracket^\mathcal{S} \end{aligned}$$

$\bigwedge \{ \psi, \psi, \dots \}$  in the grammar stands for conjunction with arbitrary branching. We write  $\top$  for the empty conjunction  $\bigwedge \emptyset$ .

**Definition 2.3** (Distinguishing formulas and preordering languages). A formula  $\varphi \in \text{HML}_{\text{srb}}^{\text{bb}}$  is said to *distinguish* a process  $p$  from  $q$  iff  $p \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^\mathcal{S}$  and  $q \notin \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^\mathcal{S}$ . The formula is said to *distinguish* a process  $p$  from a set of processes  $Q$  iff it is true for  $p$  and false for every  $q \in Q$ .

A sublogic,  $\mathcal{O}_N \subseteq \text{HML}_{\text{srb}}^{\text{bb}}$ , corresponding to a notion of observability  $N$ , *distinguishes* two processes,  $p \not\preceq_N q$ , if there is  $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}_N$  with  $p \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^\mathcal{S}$  and  $q \notin \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^\mathcal{S}$ . Otherwise  $N$  *preorders* them,  $p \preceq_N q$ . If processes are mutually  $N$ -preordered,  $p \preceq_N q$  and  $q \preceq_N p$ , then they are considered  *$N$ -equivalent*,  $p \sim_N q$ .

**Example 2.2.** In Example 2.1,  $\varphi_\tau := \langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle op \rangle \langle \varepsilon \rangle \bigwedge \{ \neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle b \rangle \top \}$  distinguishes  $P_\varepsilon^\tau$  from  $P_\ell^\tau$ .  $\varphi_\tau$  states that a weak  $op$ -step may happen such that, afterwards,  $b$  is not  $\tau$ -reachable. This is true of  $P_\varepsilon^\tau$  because of the  $A_\varepsilon^\tau$ -state, but not of  $P_\ell^\tau$ .

*Remark 2.1.* Definition 2.2 is constructed to fit the distinctive powers we need from HML to characterize varying notions of the weak spectrum by controlling which productions are used. Subformulas in the grammar usually start with  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \dots$ , effectively hiding silent steps. Formulas with fewer  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle$ -positions bring in additional distinctive power. We will use immediate conjunctions to distinguish non-delay-bisimilar processes, and branching conjunctions (that contain one positive conjunct without leading  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle$ ) to distinguish non- $\eta$ -(bi)similar processes. Allowing the observation of stabilization,  $\neg \langle \tau \rangle \top$ , increases distinctive power; requiring stabilization for conjunct observations decreases it.

The name already alludes to  $\text{HML}_{\text{srb}}^{\text{bb}}$  as a whole characterizing stability-respecting branching bisimilarity. Let us quickly recall the operational definition for branching bisimilarity (for instance from [14]):

**Definition 2.4** (Branching bisimilarity, operationally). A symmetric relation  $\mathcal{R}$  is a *branching bisimulation* if, for all  $(p, q) \in \mathcal{R}$ , a step  $p \xrightarrow{\alpha} p'$  implies (1)  $\alpha = \tau$  and  $(p', q) \in \mathcal{R}$ , or (2)  $q \rightarrow q' \xrightarrow{\alpha} q''$  for some  $q', q''$  with  $(p, q') \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $(p', q'') \in \mathcal{R}$ .

If moreover every  $(p, q) \in \mathcal{R}$  with  $p \not\xrightarrow{\tau}$  implies that there is some  $q'$  with  $q \rightarrow q' \not\xrightarrow{\tau}$  and  $(p, q') \in \mathcal{R}$ , the relation is *stability-respecting*.

If there is a stability-respecting branching bisimulation  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{BB}^{\text{sr}}}$  with  $(p_0, q_0) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{BB}^{\text{sr}}}$ , then  $p_0$  and  $q_0$  are stability-respecting branching bisimilar.

The power of Definition 2.2 to distinguish matches exactly the power of Definition 2.4 to equate:




Figure 3: Hierarchy of weak behavioral equivalences/preorders, becoming finer towards the top. Each notion  $N$  comes with its expressiveness coordinate  $e_N$ . Lines mean implication of equivalence/preordering from bottom to top.

**Lemma 2.1.**  $\text{HML}_{\text{srb}} b$  characterizes stability-respecting branching bisimilarity. (i.e.  $p$  is not stability-respecting branching bisimilar to  $q$  iff there exists a formula in  $\text{HML}_{\text{srb}}[\Sigma]$  that distinguish  $p$  from  $q$  or  $q$  from  $p$ , respectively.)

*Proof.* We use the standard approach for Hennessy–Milner theorems: We prove that  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{srb}} := \{(p, q) \mid \forall \varphi \in \text{HML}_{\text{srb}}. p \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \longrightarrow q \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket\}$  is a stability-respecting branching bisimulation by definition, and that any formula  $\varphi \in \text{HML}_{\text{srb}}$  is equally true for stability-respecting branching bisimilar states by induction on the structure of  $\varphi$ . See full proof on page 18.  $\square$

## 2.2 Price Spectra of Behavioral Equivalences

Van Glabbeek [22] uses about 20 binary dimensions to characterize 155 “notions of observability” (derived from five dimensions of testing scenarios). These then entail behavioral preorders and equivalences given as modal characterizations. In this subsection, we recast the *notions of observability as coordinates* in a (more quantitative) 8-dimensional space of HML formula expressiveness.

We will “price” formulas of  $\text{HML}_{\text{srbb}}$  by vectors we call *energies*. The pricing allows to conveniently select subsets of  $\text{HML}_{\text{srbb}}$  in terms of coordinates.

**Definition 2.5** (Energies). We denote as *energies*,  $\mathbf{En}_\infty$ , the set  $(\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\})^8$ .

We compare energies component-wise:  $(e_1, \dots, e_8) \leq (f_1, \dots, f_8)$  iff  $e_i \leq f_i$  for each  $i$ . Least upper bounds sup are defined as usual as component-wise supremum.

We write  $\hat{e}_i$  for the standard unit vector where the  $i$ -th component is 1 and every other component equals 0.  $\mathbf{0}$  is defined to be the vector  $(0, 0, \dots, 0)$ . Vector addition and subtraction happen component-wise as usual.

In Figure 3, we order weak equivalences along dimensions of  $\text{HML}_{\text{srbb}}$ -expressiveness in terms of *operator depths* (i.e. maximal occurrences of an operator on a path from root to leaf in the abstract syntax tree). Intuitively, the dimensions are:

1. Modal depth (of observations  $\langle \alpha \rangle, (\alpha)$ ),
2. Depth of **branching conjunctions** (with one observation conjunct not starting with  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle$ ),
3. Depth of unstable conjunctions (that do not enforce stability by a  $\neg \langle \tau \rangle \text{T}$ -conjunct),
4. Depth of **stable conjunctions** (that do enforce stability by a  $\neg \langle \tau \rangle \text{T}$ -conjunct),
5. Depth of immediate conjunctions (that are not preceded by  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle$ ),
6. Maximal modal depth of positive conjuncts in conjunctions,
7. Maximal modal depth of negative conjuncts in conjunctions,
8. Depth of negations.

**Definition 2.6** (Formula prices). The *expressiveness price* of a formula  $\text{expr} : \text{HML}_{\text{srbb}} \rightarrow \mathbf{En}_\infty$  is defined in mutual recursion with helper functions  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon$  and  $\text{expr}^\wedge$ ; if multiple rules apply to a subformula, pick the first one:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{expr}(\text{T}) &:= \text{expr}^\varepsilon(\text{T}) := \mathbf{0} \\
\text{expr}(\langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi) &:= \text{expr}^\varepsilon(\chi) \\
\text{expr}(\wedge \Psi) &:= \hat{e}_5 + \text{expr}^\varepsilon(\wedge \Psi) \\
\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\langle a \rangle \varphi) &:= \hat{e}_1 + \text{expr}(\varphi) \\
\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\wedge \Psi) &:= \sup \{ \text{expr}^\wedge(\psi) \mid \psi \in \Psi \} + \begin{cases} \hat{e}_4 & \text{if } \neg \langle \tau \rangle \text{T} \in \Psi \\ \hat{e}_2 + \hat{e}_3 & \text{if there is } (\alpha)\varphi \in \Psi \\ \hat{e}_3 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\text{expr}^\wedge(\neg \langle \tau \rangle \text{T}) &:= \mathbf{0} \\
\text{expr}^\wedge(\neg \varphi) &:= \sup \{ \hat{e}_8 + \text{expr}(\varphi), (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, (\text{expr}(\varphi))_1, 0) \} \\
\text{expr}^\wedge((\alpha)\varphi) &:= \sup \{ \hat{e}_1 + \text{expr}(\varphi), (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1 + (\text{expr}(\varphi))_1, 0, 0) \} \\
\text{expr}^\wedge(\varphi) &:= \sup \{ \text{expr}(\varphi), (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, (\text{expr}(\varphi))_1, 0, 0) \}
\end{aligned}$$

**Definition 2.7** (Linear-time–branching-time equivalences). Each notion  $N$  named in Figure 3 with coordinate  $e_N$  is defined through the language of formulas with prices below, i.e., through  $\mathcal{O}_N = \{ \varphi \mid \text{expr}(\varphi) \leq e_N \}$ .

Recalling Definition 2.3, that is,  $p \preceq_N q$  with respect to notion  $N$ , iff no  $\varphi$  with  $\text{expr}(\varphi) \leq e_N$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $q$ . So, this paper sees notions of preorder / equivalence to be defined through these coordinates and not through other characterizations.

**Example 2.3.** The formula  $\varphi_\tau = \langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle op \rangle \langle \varepsilon \rangle \wedge \{ \neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle b \rangle \top \}$  in Example 2.2 has expressiveness price  $\text{expr}(\varphi_\tau) = (2, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$ . The coordinate is below the one of failures  $e_F = (\infty, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$  in Figure 3. Accordingly,  $P_e^\tau$  is distinguished from  $P_\ell^\tau$  by failure  $\varphi_\tau \in \mathcal{O}_F$ , that is,  $P_e^\tau \not\preceq_F P_\ell^\tau$ . There neither are strictly-stable nor strictly-positive formulas to distinguish  $P_e^\tau$  from  $P_\ell^\tau$ . Therefore, stable bisimulation preorder,  $P_e^\tau \preceq_{SB} P_\ell^\tau$ , and  $\eta$ -simulation preorder,  $P_e^\tau \preceq_{\eta S} P_\ell^\tau$ , apply. (The latter implies the more well-known weak simulation preorder.)

For stability-respecting branching bisimilarity, where  $\mathcal{O}_{BB^{sr}} = \text{HML}_{\text{srbb}}$ , Lemma 2.1 establishes that our modal characterization corresponds to the common relational definition. For some notions, there are superficial differences to other modal characterizations in the literature, which do not change distinctive power. We give two examples.

**Example 2.4** (Weak trace equivalence and inclusion). The notion of weak trace inclusion (and equivalence) is defined through  $e_T = (\infty, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$  and Definition 2.6 inducing  $\mathcal{O}_T$ , the language given by the grammar:

$$\varphi_T ::= \langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle a \rangle \varphi_T \mid \langle \varepsilon \rangle \top \mid \top.$$

This slightly deviates from languages one would find in other publications. For instance, Gazda et al. [18] do not have the second production. But this production does not increase expressiveness, as  $\llbracket \langle \varepsilon \rangle \top \rrbracket = \llbracket \top \rrbracket = \mathcal{P}$ .

**Example 2.5** (Weak bisimulation equivalence and preorder). The logic of weak bisimulation observations  $\mathcal{O}_B$  defined through  $e_B = (\infty, 0, \infty, 0, 0, \infty, \infty, \infty)$  equals the language defined by the grammar:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_B & ::= \langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle a \rangle \varphi_B \mid \langle \varepsilon \rangle \bigwedge \{ \psi_B, \psi_B, \dots \} \mid \top \\ \psi_B & ::= \neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle a \rangle \varphi_B \mid \neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \bigwedge \{ \psi_B, \psi_B, \dots \} \mid \langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle a \rangle \varphi_B \mid \langle \varepsilon \rangle \bigwedge \{ \psi_B, \psi_B, \dots \}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us contrast this to the definition for weak bisimulation observations  $\mathcal{O}_{B'}$  from Gazda et al. [18]:

$$\varphi_{B'} ::= \langle \varepsilon \rangle \varphi_{B'} \mid \langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle a \rangle \langle \varepsilon \rangle \varphi_{B'} \mid \bigwedge \{ \varphi_{B'}, \varphi_{B'}, \dots \} \mid \neg \varphi_{B'}.$$

Our  $\mathcal{O}_B$  allows a few formulas that  $\mathcal{O}_{B'}$  lacks, e.g.  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle a \rangle \langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle a \rangle \langle \varepsilon \rangle \top$ . This does not add expressiveness as  $\mathcal{O}_{B'}$  has  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle a \rangle \langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle a \rangle \langle \varepsilon \rangle \top$  and  $\llbracket \langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle \varepsilon \rangle \varphi \rrbracket = \llbracket \langle \varepsilon \rangle \varphi \rrbracket$ .

For the other direction, there is a bigger difference due to  $\mathcal{O}_{B'}$  allowing more freedom in the placement of conjunction and negation. In particular, it permits top-level conjunctions and negated conjunctions without  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle$  in between. But these features do not add distinctive power.  $\mathcal{O}_{B'}$  also allows top-level negation, and this adds distinctive power to the preorders, effectively turning them into equivalence relations. We do not enforce this and thus our  $\preceq_B \neq \sim_B$ ; e.g.  $\tau.a \preceq_B \tau + \tau.a$ , but  $\tau + \tau.a \not\preceq_B \tau.a$  due to  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \wedge \{ \neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle a \rangle \top \}$ . However, as a distinction by  $\neg \varphi$  in one direction implies one by  $\varphi$  in the other, we know that this difference is ironed out once we consider the equivalence  $\sim_B$ .

*Remark 2.2.* None of the logics in Figure 3 restrict the first dimension, but the modal depth is kept to simplify the calculation of dimensions 6 and 7. It could also be used to define  $k$ -step bisimilarity and similar notions.

More generally, there is no deeper necessity to use *exactly* the dimensions that this paper employs or the original ones of [22]—in both cases, they are chosen in order to conveniently cover notions of equivalence that stem from varying contexts. To cover even more notions, additional dimensions would be necessary, as we will discuss in Section 5.

### 3 A Game of Distinguishing Capabilities

This section introduces a game to find out how two states can be distinguished in the silent-step spectrum: Attacker tries to implicitly construct a distinguishing formula, defender wants to prove that no such formula exists. The twist is that we use an *energy* game where energies ensure the possible formulas to lie in sublogics along the lines of the previous section.

#### 3.1 Declining Energy Games

Equivalence problems of the strong linear-time–branching-time spectrum can be characterized as multi-dimensional declining energy games with special min-operations between components as outlined in [5]. In this subsection, we revisit the definitions we will need in this paper. For a more detailed presentation—in particular on how to compute attacker and defender winning budgets on this class of games—we refer to [5] and [9].

**Definition 3.1** (Energy updates). The set of *energy updates*,  $\mathbf{Up}$ , contains  $(u_1, \dots, u_8) \in \mathbf{Up}$  where each component  $u_k$  is a symbol of the form

- $u_k \in \{-1, 0\}$  (relative update), or
- $u_k = \min_D$  where  $D \subseteq \{1, \dots, 8\}$  and  $k \in D$  (minimum selection update).

Applying an update to an energy,  $\text{upd}(e, u)$ , where  $e = (e_1, \dots, e_8) \in \mathbf{En}_\infty$  and  $u = (u_1, \dots, u_8) \in \mathbf{Up}$ , yields a new energy vector  $e'$  where  $k$ th components  $e'_k := e_k + u_k$  for  $u_k \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $e'_k := \min_{d \in D} e_d$  for  $u_k = \min_D$ . Updates that would cause any component to become negative are undefined, i.e.,  $\text{upd}$  is a partial function.

**Example 3.1.**  $\text{upd}((2, 0, \infty, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1), (\min_{\{1,7\}}, 0, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1))$  equals  $(1, 0, \infty, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$ .

**Definition 3.2** (Games). An 8-dimensional *declining energy game*  $\mathcal{G} = (G, G_d, \succrightarrow, w)$  is played on a directed graph uniquely labeled by energy updates consisting of

- a set of *game positions*  $G$ , partitioned into
  - *defender positions*  $G_d \subseteq G$  and
  - *attacker positions*  $G_a := G \setminus G_d$ ,
- a relation of *game moves*  $\succrightarrow \subseteq G \times G$ , and
- a *weight function* for the moves  $w: (\succrightarrow) \rightarrow \mathbf{Up}$ .

The notation  $g \xrightarrow{u} g'$  stands for  $g \succrightarrow g'$  and  $w(g, g') = u$ .

In the games of [5], the attacker wins precisely if they can get the defender stuck without running out of energy. The energy budgets that suffice for the attacker to win from a game position can be characterized as follows:

**Definition 3.3** (Winning budgets). The attacker winning budgets  $\text{Win}_a^{\mathcal{G}}$  per position of a game  $\mathcal{G}$  are defined inductively by the rules:

$$\frac{g_a \in G_a \quad g_a \xrightarrow{u} g' \quad \text{upd}(e, u) \in \text{Win}_a^{\mathcal{G}}(g')}{e \in \text{Win}_a^{\mathcal{G}}(g_a)}$$

$$\frac{g_d \in G_d \quad \forall u, g'. g_d \xrightarrow{u} g' \longrightarrow \text{upd}(e, u) \in \text{Win}_a^{\mathcal{G}}(g')}{e \in \text{Win}_a^{\mathcal{G}}(g_d)}$$






Figure 4: Schematic spectroscopy game  $\mathcal{G}_\Delta$  of Definitions 3.4 (the black part), 3.5 (with position  $(\dots)_d^s$ ), and 3.6 (with positions  $(\dots)_d^s$ ,  $(\dots)_d^\eta$  and  $[\dots]_a^\eta$ ).

### 3.2 Delaying Observations in the Spectroscopy Energy Game

We begin with the part of the game that adds the concept of “delayed” attack positions to the “strong” spectroscopy game of [5]. It matches the black part of the  $\text{HML}_{\text{srbb}}$ -grammar of Definition 2.2. Figure 4 gives a schematic overview of the game rules, where the game continues from the dashed nodes as from the initial node. The colors differentiate the layers of following definitions and match the scheme of Definition 2.2 and Figure 3.

**Definition 3.4** (Spectroscopy delay game). For a system  $\mathcal{S} = (\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, \rightarrow)$ , the *spectroscopy delay energy game*  $\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon^\mathcal{S} = (G, G_d, \rightsquigarrow, w)$  consists of

- *attacker positions*  $[p, Q]_a \in G_a,$
- *attacker delayed positions*  $[p, Q]_a^\varepsilon \in G_a,$
- *attacker conjunct positions*  $[p, q]_a^\wedge \in G_a,$
- *defender conjunction positions*  $(p, Q)_d \in G_d,$

where  $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $Q \in 2^\mathcal{P}$ , and nine kinds of moves:

- *delay*  $[p, Q]_a \xrightarrow{0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0} [p, Q']_a^\varepsilon$  if  $Q \rightsquigarrow Q'$ ,
- *procrastination*  $[p, Q]_a^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0} [p', Q]_a^\varepsilon$  if  $p \xrightarrow{\tau} p'$ ,  $p \neq p'$ ,
- *observation*  $[p, Q]_a^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{-1,0,0,0,0,0,0,0} [p', Q']_a$  if  $p \xrightarrow{a} p'$ ,  $Q \xrightarrow{a} Q'$ ,  $a \neq \tau$ ,
- *finishing*  $[p, \emptyset]_a \xrightarrow{0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0} (p, \emptyset)_d,$
- *immediate conj.*  $[p, Q]_a \xrightarrow{0,0,0,0,-1,0,0,0} (p, Q)_d$  if  $Q \neq \emptyset$ ,
- *late conj.*  $[p, Q]_a^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0} (p, Q)_d,$
- *conj. answer*  $(p, Q)_d \xrightarrow{0,0,-1,0,0,0,0,0} [p, q]_a^\wedge$  if  $q \in Q$ ,
- *positive conjunct*  $[p, q]_a^\wedge \xrightarrow{\min\{1,6\}, 0,0,0,0,0,0,0} [p, Q]_a^\varepsilon$  if  $\{q\} \rightsquigarrow Q$ ,
- *negative conjunct*  $[p, q]_a^\wedge \xrightarrow{\min\{1,7\}, 0,0,0,0,0,0,-1} [q, Q]_a^\varepsilon$  if  $\{p\} \rightsquigarrow Q$  and  $p \neq q$ .




Figure 5: Spectroscopy delay game  $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon$  from  $[A_e^\tau, \{A_l^\tau, B_l^\tau\}]_a$  for Example 3.2. Each position names minimal attacker-winning budgets (due to the thick arrows) and corresponding distinguishing formulas (pink). Zeros and  $\mathbf{0}$ -updates are omitted for readability. Also, the game graph under defender-won reflexive position  $[0, \{0\}]_a$  (dashed in blue) is omitted.

**Example 3.2.** Starting at  $P_e^\tau$  and  $P_l^\tau$  of Example 2.1 with energy  $(2, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$ , the attacker can move with  $[P_e^\tau, \{P_l^\tau\}]_a \xrightarrow{\text{delay}} \xrightarrow{\text{observation}} [A_e^\tau, \{A_l^\tau, B_l^\tau\}]_a$ . (For readability, we label the moves by the names of their rules.) This uses up  $\hat{e}_1$  energy leading to level  $(1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$ .

Figure 5 shows how the attacker can win from there. The attacker chooses a delay move and yields to the defender  $(A_e^\tau, \{A_l^\tau, B_l^\tau\})_d$ . If the defender selects  $B_l^\tau$ , bringing the energy to  $(1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$ , the attacker wins by  $[A_e^\tau, B_l^\tau]_a \xrightarrow{\text{negative conjunct}} [B_l^\tau, A_e^\tau]_a \xrightarrow{\text{observation}} \xrightarrow{\text{finishing}} (0, \emptyset)_d \not\rightsquigarrow$ . For the defender choosing  $A_l^\tau$ , a similar attack works due to  $[A_l^\tau, A_e^\tau]_a \xrightarrow{\text{procrastination}} [B_l^\tau, A_e^\tau]_a$ . Thus, the attacker wins the game.

The tree of winning moves corresponds to formula  $\varphi_\tau = \langle \epsilon \rangle \langle op \rangle \langle \epsilon \rangle \wedge \{ \neg \langle \epsilon \rangle \langle b \rangle \top$  and budget of Example 2.3. This is no coincidence, but rather our core design principle for game moves. As we will prove in Section 4, attacker's winning moves match distinguishing  $\text{HML}_{\text{srb}}^\tau$ -formulas and their prices.

Note that the attacker would not win if any component of the starting energy vector were lower. For example,  $e_\tau = (\infty, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0) \notin \text{Win}_a([P_e^\tau, \{P_l^\tau\}]_a)$  corresponds to weak trace inclusion,  $P_e^\tau \leq_\tau P_l^\tau$ .

### 3.3 Covering Stable Failures and Conjunctions

In order to cover “stable” and “stability-respecting” equivalences, we must separately count **stable conjunctions**.

**Definition 3.5** (Spectroscopy stability game). The *stability game*  $\mathcal{G}_s^{\mathcal{S}}$  extends the delay game  $\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon^{\mathcal{S}}$  of Definition 3.4 by

- *defender stable conjunction positions*  $(p, Q)_d^s \in G_d$ ,

where  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $Q \in \mathbf{2}^{\mathcal{P}}$ , and three kinds of moves:

- *stable conj.*  $[p, Q]_a^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{0,0,0,0,0,0,0} (p, Q')_d^s$  if  $Q' = \{q \in Q \mid q \not\stackrel{\tau}{\rightarrow}\}, p \not\stackrel{\tau}{\rightarrow}$ ,
- *conj. stable answer*  $(p, Q)_d^s \xrightarrow{0,0,0,-1,0,0,0,0} [p, q]_a^\wedge$  if  $q \in Q$ ,
- *stable finishing*  $(p, \emptyset)_d^s \xrightarrow{0,0,0,-1,0,0,0,0} (p, \emptyset)_d$ .

In principle, we add a move to enter a defender stable conjunction position and a move to leave it, similar to the defender conjunction positions in Definition 3.4.

**Example 3.3.** Note that these new rules allow no new (incomparable) wins for the attacker in Example 3.2. Therefore, *stable bisimulation* is another finest preorder (and equivalence) for the example processes because  $e_{SB} \notin \text{Win}_a([\mathbb{P}_e^\tau, \{\mathbb{P}_\ell^\tau\}]_a)$  for  $\mathcal{G}_s$ .

### 3.4 Extending to Branching Bisimulation

One last kind of distinctions is necessary to characterize *branching bisimilarity*, the strongest common abstraction of bisimilarity for systems with silent steps: its characteristic **branching conjunctions**.

**Definition 3.6** (Weak spectroscopy game). The *weak spectroscopy energy game*  $\mathcal{G}_\Delta^{\mathcal{S}}$  extends Definition 3.5 by

- *defender branching positions*  $(p, \alpha, p', Q, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta \in G_d$ ,
- *attacker branching positions*  $[p, Q]_a^\eta \in G_a$ ,

where  $p, p' \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $Q, Q_\alpha \in \mathbf{2}^{\mathcal{P}}$  as well as  $\alpha \in \Sigma$ , and four kinds of moves:

- *branching conj.*  $[p, Q]_a^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{0,0,0,0,0,0,0} (p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta$  if  $p \xrightarrow{(\alpha)} p', Q_\alpha \subseteq Q$ ,
- *branch. answer*  $(p, \alpha, p', Q, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta \xrightarrow{0,-1,-1,0,0,0,0} [p, q]_a^\wedge$  if  $q \in Q$ ,
- *branch. observation*  $(p, \alpha, p', Q, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta \xrightarrow{\min\{1,6\}, -1, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0} [p', Q']_a^\eta$  with  $Q_\alpha \xrightarrow{(\alpha)} Q'$ ,
- *branch. accounting*  $[p, Q]_a^\eta \xrightarrow{-1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0} [p, Q]_a$ .

Intuitively, the attacker picks a step  $p \xrightarrow{\alpha} p'$  and some  $Q_\alpha \subseteq Q$  that they claim to be unable to immediately simulate this step. For the remaining  $Q \setminus Q_\alpha$ , the attacker claims that these can be dealt with by other (possibly negative) delayed observations. The defender then chooses which claim to counter.

**Example 3.4.** Consider the CCS processes  $a + \tau.b + b$  and  $a + \tau.b$ . The first process explicitly allows a  $b$  to happen before deciding against  $a$ . To weak bisimilarity, for instance, this is transparent. To more branching-aware notions, it constitutes a difference.

The two processes can be distinguished as follows in the weak spectroscopy game with energy budget  $(1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0)$ : First, the attacker enters a defender branching position  $[a + \tau.b + b, \{a + \tau.b\}]_a \xrightarrow{\text{delay}} [a + \tau.b + b, \{a + \tau.b, b\}]_a^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\text{branching conjunction}} (a + \tau.b + b, b, 0, \{b\}, \{a + \tau.b\})_d^\eta$ . The defender can then pick between two losing options:

- $(\dots)_d^{\eta} \xrightarrow{\text{branching answer}} [a + \tau.b + b, b]_a^{\wedge}$ : Attacker responds  $[\dots]_a^{\wedge} \xrightarrow{\text{positive conjunct}} \xrightarrow{\alpha\text{-observation}} \xrightarrow{\text{finishing}} (0, \emptyset)_d$ , which corresponds to formula  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle a \rangle T$ .
- $(\dots)_d^{\eta} \xrightarrow{\text{branching observation}} [0, \{\}]_a^{\eta}$ : Attacker replies  $[\dots]_a^{\eta} \xrightarrow{\text{branching accounting}} \xrightarrow{\text{finishing}} (0, \emptyset)_d$ , which corresponds to the  $(b)T$ -observation in the context of a branching conjunction.

Taken together, the attacker wins this game constellation with a strategy that corresponds to the formula  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \wedge \{(b), \langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle a \rangle\}$ .

The formula disproves  $\eta$ -simulation preorder and thus branching bisimilarity. However, the two processes are (stability-respecting) delay-bisimilar as there are no delay bisimulation formulas to distinguish them.

## 4 Correctness

We now state in what sense winning energy levels and equivalences coincide in the context of a transition system  $\mathcal{S} = (\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, \rightarrow)$ .

**Theorem 4.1** (Correctness). *For all  $e \in \mathbf{En}_{\infty}$ ,  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $Q \in \mathbf{2}^{\mathcal{P}}$ , the following are equivalent:*

1. *There exists a formula  $\varphi \in \text{HML}_{\text{srb}}^{\text{bb}}$  with price  $\text{expr}(\varphi) \leq e$  that distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ .*
2. *Attacker wins  $\mathcal{G}_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{S}}$  from  $[p, Q]_a$  with  $e$  (that is,  $e \in \text{Win}_a^{\mathcal{G}_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{S}}}([p, Q]_a)$ ).*

With Definition 2.7, this means that, for a notion of equivalence  $N$  with coordinate  $e_N$  in Figure 3,  $p \preceq_N q$  precisely if the defender wins,  $e_N \notin \text{Win}_a([p, \{q\}]_a)$ .

The proof of the theorem is given through the following three lemmas. The direction from (1) to (2) is covered by Lemma 4.1 when combined with the upward-closedness of attacker winning budgets. From (2) to (1), the link is established through *strategy formulas* by Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3. The proofs have also been formalized in an Isabelle/HOL theory.<sup>2</sup>

### 4.1 Distinguishing formulas imply attacker-winning budgets

**Lemma 4.1.** *If  $\varphi \in \text{HML}_{\text{srb}}^{\text{bb}}$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ , then  $\text{expr}(\varphi) \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q]_a)$ .*

*Proof.* By mutual structural induction on  $\varphi$ ,  $\chi$ , and  $\psi$  with respect to the following claims:


1. If  $\varphi \in \text{HML}_{\text{srb}}^{\text{bb}}$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\text{expr}(\varphi) \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q]_a)$ ;
2. If  $\chi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q \neq \emptyset$  and  $Q$  is closed under  $\rightarrow$  (that is  $Q \rightarrow Q$ ), then  $\text{expr}^{\varepsilon}(\chi) \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q]_a^{\varepsilon})$ ;
3. If  $\psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $q$ , then  $\text{expr}^{\wedge}(\psi) \in \text{Win}_a([p, q]_a^{\wedge})$ .
4. If  $\wedge \Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\text{expr}^{\varepsilon}(\wedge \Psi) \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d)$ ;
5. If  $\wedge \{\neg \langle \tau \rangle T\} \cup \Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q \neq \emptyset$  and all the processes in  $Q$  are stable, then  $\text{expr}^{\varepsilon}(\wedge \{\neg \langle \tau \rangle T\} \cup \Psi) \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d^s)$ ;
6. If  $\wedge \{\langle \alpha \rangle \varphi'\} \cup \Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ , then, for any  $p \xrightarrow{\langle \alpha \rangle} p' \in \llbracket \varphi' \rrbracket$  and  $Q_{\alpha} = Q \setminus \llbracket \langle \alpha \rangle \varphi' \rrbracket$ ,  $\text{expr}^{\varepsilon}(\wedge \{\langle \alpha \rangle \varphi'\} \cup \Psi) \in \text{Win}_a((p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_{\alpha}, Q_{\alpha})_d^{\eta})$ .

See full proof on page 20. □

<sup>2</sup>The formalization can be found on <https://github.com/equivio/silent-step-spectroscopy>.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{delay} \frac{[p, Q]_a \xrightarrow{u} [p, Q']_a^e \quad e' = \text{upd}(e, u) \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q']_a^e) \quad \chi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q']_a^e, e')}{\langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a, e)} \\
\text{procr} \frac{[p, Q]_a^e \xrightarrow{u} [p', Q]_a^e \quad e' = \text{upd}(e, u) \in \text{Win}_a([p', Q]_a^e) \quad \chi \in \text{Strat}([p', Q]_a^e, e')}{\chi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a^e, e)} \\
\text{observation} \frac{e' = \text{upd}(e, u) \in \text{Win}_a([p', Q']_a) \quad [p, Q]_a^e \xrightarrow{u} [p', Q']_a \quad p \xrightarrow{a} p' \quad Q \xrightarrow{a} Q' \quad \varphi \in \text{Strat}([p', Q']_a, e')}{\langle a \rangle \varphi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a^e, e)} \\
\text{immediate conj} \frac{[p, Q]_a \xrightarrow{u} (p, Q)_d \quad e' = \text{upd}(e, u) \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d) \quad \varphi \in \text{Strat}((p, Q)_d, e')}{\varphi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a, e)} \\
\text{late conj} \frac{[p, Q]_a^e \xrightarrow{u} (p, Q)_d \quad e' = \text{upd}(e, u) \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d) \quad \chi \in \text{Strat}((p, Q)_d, e')}{\chi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a^e, e)} \\
\text{conj} \frac{(p, Q)_d \xrightarrow{uq} [p, q]_a^\wedge \quad \forall q \in Q. e_q = \text{upd}(e, u_q) \in \text{Win}_a([p, q]_a^\wedge) \wedge \psi_q \in \text{Strat}([p, q]_a^\wedge, e_q)}{\bigwedge \{ \psi_q \mid q \in Q \} \in \text{Strat}((p, Q)_d, e)} \\
\text{pos} \frac{[p, q]_a^\wedge \xrightarrow{u} [p, Q']_a^e \quad e' = \text{upd}(e, u) \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q']_a^e) \quad \chi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q']_a^e, e')}{\langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi \in \text{Strat}([p, q]_a^\wedge, e)} \\
\text{neg} \frac{[p, q]_a^\wedge \xrightarrow{u} [q, P']_a^e \quad e' = \text{upd}(e, u) \in \text{Win}_a([q, P']_a^e) \quad \chi \in \text{Strat}([q, P']_a^e, e')}{\neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi \in \text{Strat}([p, q]_a^\wedge, e)} \\
\text{stable} \frac{[p, Q]_a^e \xrightarrow{u} (p, Q')_d^s \quad e' = \text{upd}(e, u) \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q')_d^s) \quad \chi \in \text{Strat}((p, Q')_d^s, e')}{\chi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a^e, e)} \\
\text{stable conj} \frac{Q \neq \emptyset \quad (p, Q)_d^s \xrightarrow{uq} [p, q]_a^\wedge \quad \forall q \in Q. e_q = \text{upd}(e, u_q) \in \text{Win}_a([p, q]_a^\wedge) \wedge \psi_q \in \text{Strat}([p, q]_a^\wedge, e_q)}{\bigwedge (\{ \neg \langle \tau \rangle T \} \cup \{ \psi_q \mid q \in Q \}) \in \text{Strat}((p, Q)_d^s, e)} \\
\text{stable finish} \frac{(p, \emptyset)_d^s \xrightarrow{u} (p, \emptyset)_d \quad e' = \text{upd}(e, u) \in \text{Win}_a((p, \emptyset)_d)}{\bigwedge \{ \neg \langle \tau \rangle T \} \in \text{Strat}((p, Q)_d^s, e)} \\
\text{branch} \frac{[p, Q]_a^e \xrightarrow{u} (p, \alpha, p', Q', Q_\alpha)_d^\eta \quad e' = \text{upd}(e, u) \in \text{Win}_a((p, \alpha, p', Q', Q_\alpha)_d^\eta) \quad \chi \in \text{Strat}((p, \alpha, p', Q', Q_\alpha)_d^\eta, e')}{\chi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a^e, e)} \\
\text{branch conj} \frac{g_d = (p, \alpha, p', Q, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta \xrightarrow{u\alpha} [p', Q']_a^\eta \xrightarrow{u\alpha} [p', Q']_a \quad e_\alpha = \text{upd}(\text{upd}(e, u_\alpha), u'_\alpha) \in \text{Win}_a([p', Q']_a) \quad \varphi_\alpha \in \text{Strat}([p', Q']_a, e_\alpha) \quad \forall q \in Q. g_d \xrightarrow{uq} [p, q]_a^\wedge \wedge e_q = \text{upd}(e, u_q) \in \text{Win}_a([p, q]_a^\wedge) \wedge \psi_q \in \text{Strat}([p, q]_a^\wedge, e_q)}{\bigwedge (\{ \langle \alpha \rangle \varphi_\alpha \} \cup \{ \psi_q \mid q \in Q \}) \in \text{Strat}((p, \alpha, p', Q, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta, e)}
\end{array}$$

Figure 6: Strategy formula constructions for Definition 4.1.

Figure 7: Screenshot of `equiv.io` solving Example 5.1.

## 4.2 Winning attacks imply cheap distinguishing formulas

**Definition 4.1** (Strategy formulas). The set of *attacker strategy formulas*  $\text{Strat}$  for a  $\mathcal{G}_\Delta$ -position with given energy level  $e$  is derived from the sets of winning budgets,  $\text{Win}_a$ , inductively according to the rules in Figure 6.

As an example how to read the above rules, *procr* states that if there is a move  $[p, Q]_a^e \xrightarrow{u} [p', Q']_a^e$  (based on Definition 3.4, this must be a procrastination move), and the strategy formulas of the latter position contain  $\chi$ , then also the strategy formulas of the former position contain  $\chi$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *If  $e \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q]_a)$ , then there is  $\varphi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a, e)$  with  $\text{expr}(\varphi) \leq e$ .*

*Proof.* By induction over the structure of Definition 3.3. See full proof on page 21.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.3.** *If  $\varphi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a, e)$ , then  $\varphi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ .*

*Proof.* By induction over the derivation of  $\dots \in \text{Strat}(g, e)$  according to Definition 4.1. See full proof on page 23.  $\square$

## 5 Deciding All Weak Equivalences at Once

The weak spectroscopy energy game enables algorithms to decide all considered behavioral equivalences. An open-source prototype implementation can be tried out on <https://equiv.io>. Moreover, there is an extension of CAAL (Concurrency Workbench, Aalborg Edition, [1]) with the entailed algorithm on <https://github.com/equivio/CAAL>. Both yield the expected output on the finitary examples from [22].

The game allows *checking individual equivalences* by instantiating it to start with an energy vector  $e_N$  from Figure 3. The remaining reachability game can be decided with (usually exponential) time and space complexities depending on the selected energy vector.

More generally, one can *decide all equivalences at once* by computing the pareto frontier of attacker budgets  $\text{Win}_a([p, \{q\}]_a)$ . The algorithm of [9] for multi-weighted games, has space complexity  $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$  and time complexity  $\mathcal{O}(|\succrightarrow| \cdot |G| \cdot o)$  for bounded energies (due to a concrete spectrum), where  $o$  is the out-degree of  $\succrightarrow$ . For this paper’s weak spectroscopy game,  $\mathcal{G}_\Delta$ , we have  $|G_\Delta| \in \mathcal{O}(|\rightarrow| \cdot 3^{|\mathcal{P}|})$  and  $|\succrightarrow_\Delta| \in \mathcal{O}(|\rightarrow| \cdot |\mathcal{P}| \cdot 3^{|\mathcal{P}|})$ , and also  $o_\Delta \in \mathcal{O}(|\rightarrow| \cdot 2^{|\mathcal{P}|})$ , because of the defender branching positions and their surroundings. This amounts to exponential time complexity. Clearly, the approach is mostly tailored towards small examples. But often these are all one needs:

**Example 5.1.** Let us try our initial Example 2.1 of abstracted processes (Figure 7 and <https://equiv.io/#stable-unstable-abstraction>). The browser tool takes about 100 ms (considering a game of 112 positions) to report that  $P_e$  and  $P_\ell$  are stable *and* unstable readiness-equivalent.  $P_e^\tau$  and  $P_\ell^\tau$  on the other hand are stable-bisimilar. This output immediately tells us that only notions either strictly finer than readiness or coarser than stable bisimilarity can be congruences for abstraction. In particular, unstable failures, which Gazda et al. [18, Corr. 9] report to be a congruence for abstraction, cannot be one because the unstable failure formula  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle op \rangle \langle \varepsilon \rangle \wedge \{ \neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle a \rangle T \}$  distinguishes  $P_e^\tau$  from  $P_\ell^\tau$ , analogously to  $\varphi_\tau$  of Example 2.2.

## 6 Related Work and Conclusion

This paper provides the first *generalized game characterization* for the spectrum of “weak” behavioral equivalences and preorders. To this end, Section 2 introduced a new *modal characterization of branching bisimilarity* that can be used to capture the *modal logics of the silent-step spectrum*. With this perspective, the set of weak equivalence problems becomes just one *quantitative problem*, expressible as one energy game in Section 3.

Other *generalized game characterizations* by Chen and Deng [10] and by us [6, 5] have only addressed strong equivalences or parts of the spectrum [27, 28]. Fahrenberg et al. [13] treated a quantitative game interpretation for behavioral distances, as well disregarding silent-step notions. Extending this line of work to account for silent steps in full is necessary for virtually every application.

In the silent-step spectrum, many things are more complicated. There are *several abstractions of bisimilarity*: branching,  $\eta$ , delay and weak bisimilarity, as well as contrasimilarity, stable bisimilarity and coupled similarity. We have had to radically depart from their existing games [17, 8, 7] to cover all equivalences. Depending on *whether stabilization is required* for negated and conjunct observations, each equivalence notion has different weak versions. Our game characterization is the first to explicitly consider stability-respecting notions, thereby unifying stable equivalences [22] and unstable ones [18]. This unification enables observations about the applicability of (un)stable equivalences as the one in Example 5.1.

The *framework of codesigning games and grammars* can also easily be extended to cater for more notions, for instance, divergence-aware ones, or even to combine strong and weak ones in one game. The connection to energy games enabled us to boost our approach using Brihaye and Goeminne’s recent polynomial decision procedure for multi-weighted games [9].

We have added to the rich body of work on *modal characterizations of branching bisimilarity* [11, 22, 14, 20, 19]. Continuing [6, 5], our work participates in a recent trend towards a modal focus for equivalences, also found in Ford et al. [15] connecting graded modal logics and monads, and in Wißmann et

al. [29] as well as Beohar et al. [4]. Like Martens and Groote [26], we find minimal-depth distinguishing formulas for branching bisimilarity, but we solve the problem for all weak notions at once.

Our main related work, of course, is van Glabbeek’s *linear-time–branching-time spectrum* [21, 22]. Up to today, part II on silent steps is available only as “extended abstract” (in two versions!), while part I has seen a journal version [23] and refinements by others [16]. We hope the present work makes the wisdom on weak equivalences of part II more accessible to tools and humans alike.

**Acknowledgments.** We would like to thank Rob van Glabbeek and the EXPRESS/SOS’24 audience for discussing the material with us, as well as several anonymous referees for pointing out weaknesses in a previous version of this paper. Special thanks is due to the TU Berlin students Lisa A. Barthel, Leonard M. Hübner, Caroline Lemke, Karl P. P. Mattes, and Lenard Mollenkopf, who validated the present paper in Isabelle/HOL, uncovering and addressing several flaws.

## References

- [1] Jesper R. Andersen, Nicklas Andersen, Søren Enevoldsen, Mathias M. Hansen, Kim G. Larsen, Simon R. Olesen, Jiri Srba & Jacob K. Wortmann (2015): *CAAL: Concurrency Workbench, Aalborg Edition*. In Martin Leucker, Camilo Rueda & Frank D. Valencia, editors: *Theoretical Aspects of Computing – ICTAC 2015*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 573–582, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-25150-9\\_33](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-25150-9_33).
- [2] Adam D. Barwell, Francisco Ferreira & Nobuko Yoshida (2022): *CONCUR test-of-time award for the period 1994–97 interview with Uwe Nestmann and Benjamin C. Pierce*. *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming* 125, p. 100744, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlamp.2021.100744>.
- [3] Christian J. Bell (2013): *Certifiably sound parallelizing transformations*. In Georges Gonthier & Michael Norrish, editors: *Certified Programs and Proofs: CPP, LNCS 8307*, Springer, Cham, pp. 227–242, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-03545-1\\_15](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-03545-1_15).
- [4] Harsh Beohar, Sebastian Gurke, Barbara König & Karla Messing (2023): *Hennessy-Milner Theorems via Galois Connections*. In Bartek Klin & Elaine Pimentel, editors: *31st EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL 2023), Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs) 252*, Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany, pp. 12:1–12:18, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2023.12>.
- [5] Benjamin Bisping (2023): *Process Equivalence Problems as Energy Games*. In Constantin Enea & Akash Lal, editors: *Computer Aided Verification*, Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, pp. 85–106, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-37706-8\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-37706-8_5).
- [6] Benjamin Bisping, David N. Jansen & Uwe Nestmann (2022): *Deciding All Behavioral Equivalences at Once: A Game for Linear-Time–Branching-Time Spectroscopy*. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 18(3), pp. 19:1–19:33, [https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-18\(3:19\)2022](https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-18(3:19)2022).
- [7] Benjamin Bisping & Luisa Montanari (2021): *A Game Characterization for Contrasimilarity*. In Ornela Dardha & Valentina Castiglioni, editors: *Proceedings Combined 28th International Workshop on Expressiveness in Concurrency and 18th Workshop on Structural Operational Semantics, Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* 339, Open Publishing Association, Waterloo, Australia, pp. 27–42, <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.339.5>.
- [8] Benjamin Bisping, Uwe Nestmann & Kirstin Peters (2020): *Coupled similarity: the first 32 years*. *Acta Informatica* 57(3–5), pp. 439–463, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00236-019-00356-4>.
- [9] Thomas Brihaye & Aline Goeminne (2023): *Multi-weighted Reachability Games*. In Olivier Bournez, Enrico Formenti & Igor Potapov, editors: *Reachability Problems, RP 2023*, Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, pp. 85–97, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-45286-4\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-45286-4_7).



- [10] Xin Chen & Yuxin Deng (2008): *Game Characterizations of Process Equivalences*. In G. Ramalingam, editor: *Programming Languages and Systems: APLAS, LNCS 5356*, Springer, Berlin, pp. 107–121, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-89330-1\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-89330-1_8).
- [11] Rocco De Nicola & Frits Vaandrager (1995): *Three logics for branching bisimulation*. *J. ACM* 42(2), p. 458–487, <https://doi.org/10.1145/201019.201032>. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1145/201019.201032>.
- [12] Uli Fahrenberg, Line Juhl, Kim G. Larsen & Jiří Srba (2011): *Energy Games in Multiweighted Automata*. In Antonio Cerone & Pekka Pihlajasaari, editors: *Theoretical Aspects of Computing – ICTAC 2011, LNCS 6916*, Springer, Heidelberg, pp. 95–115, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-23283-1\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-23283-1_9).
- [13] Uli Fahrenberg & Axel Legay (2014): *The quantitative linear-time-branching-time spectrum*. *Theoretical Computer Science* 538, pp. 54–69, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2013.07.030>. Quantitative Aspects of Programming Languages and Systems (2011-12).
- [14] Wan Fokkink, Rob van Glabbeek & Bas Luttik (2019): *Divide and congruence III: From decomposition of modal formulas to preservation of stability and divergence*. *Information and Computation* 268, p. 104435, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2019.104435>.
- [15] Chase Ford, Stefan Milius & Lutz Schröder (2021): *Behavioural Preorders via Graded Monads*. In: *2021 36th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, IEEE, New York, NY, USA, pp. 1–13, <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS52264.2021.9470517>.
- [16] David de Frutos Escrig, Carlos Gregorio Rodríguez, Miguel Palomino & David Romero Hernández (2013): *Unifying the Linear Time-Branching Time Spectrum of Strong Process Semantics*. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 9(2:11), pp. 1–74, [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-9\(2:11\)2013](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-9(2:11)2013).
- [17] David de Frutos Escrig, Jeroen J. A. Keiren & Tim A. C. Willemse (2017): *Games for Bisimulations and Abstraction*. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 13(4:15), pp. 1–40, [https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-13\(4:15\)2017](https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-13(4:15)2017).
- [18] Maciej Gazda, Wan Fokkink & Vittorio Massaro (2020): *Congruence from the operator’s point of view: Syntactic requirements on modal characterizations*. *Acta Informatica* 57(3–5), pp. 329–351, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00236-019-00355-5>.
- [19] Herman Geuvers (2022): *Apartness and distinguishing formulas in Hennessy–Milner Logic*. In Nils Jansen, Mariëlle Stoelinga & Petra van den Bos, editors: *A journey from process algebra via timed automata to model learning: essays dedicated to Frits Vaandrager on the occasion of his 60th birthday, LNCS 13560*, Springer, Cham, pp. 266–282, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15629-8\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15629-8_14).
- [20] Herman Geuvers & Anton Golov (2023): *Positive Hennessy-Milner Logic for Branching Bisimulation*. arXiv:2210.07380.
- [21] Rob van Glabbeek (1990): *The linear time-branching time spectrum: extended abstract*. In J. C. M. Baeten & J. W. Klop, editors: *CONCUR’90, LNCS 458*, Springer, Berlin, pp. 278–297, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0039066>.
- [22] Rob van Glabbeek (1993): *The linear time-branching time spectrum II: The semantics of sequential systems with silent moves; extended abstract*. In Eike Best, editor: *CONCUR’93, LNCS 715*, Springer, Berlin, pp. 66–81, [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-57208-2\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-57208-2_6).
- [23] Rob van Glabbeek (2001): *The Linear Time-Branching Time Spectrum I: The Semantics of Concrete, Sequential Processes*. In J. A. Bergstra, A. Ponse & S. A. Smolka, editors: *Handbook of Process Algebra*, chapter 1, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 3–99, <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-044482830-9/50019-9>.
- [24] Ross Horne & Sjouke Mauw (2021): *Discovering ePassport Vulnerabilities using Bisimilarity*. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 17(2), pp. 24:1–24:52, [https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-17\(2:24\)2021](https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-17(2:24)2021).
- [25] Orna Kupferman & Naama Shamash Halevy (2022): *Energy Games with Resource-Bounded Environments*. In Bartek Klin, Sławomir Lasota & Anca Muscholl, editors: *33rd International Conference on Concurrency Theory: CONCUR, LIPIcs 243*, Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Saarbrücken, pp. 19:1–19:23, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2022.19>.

- [26] Jan Martens & Jan Friso Groote (2024): *Minimal Depth Distinguishing Formulas Without Until for Branching Bisimulation*. In Venanzio Capretta, Robbert Krebbers & Freek Wiedijk, editors: *Logics and Type Systems in Theory and Practice: Essays Dedicated to Herman Geuvers on The Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, Springer Nature, Cham, pp. 188–202, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-61716-4\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-61716-4_12).
- [27] Sandeep K. Shukla, Harry B. Hunt III & Daniel J. Rosenkrantz (1996): *HORNSAT, Model Checking, Verification and Games: extended abstract*. In Rajeev Alur & Thomas A. Henzinger, editors: *Computer Aided Verification: CAV, LNCS 1102*, Springer, Berlin, pp. 99–110, [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-61474-5\\_61](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-61474-5_61).
- [28] Li Tan (2002): *An Abstract Schema for Equivalence-Checking Games*. In Agostino Cortesi, editor: *Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation, Third International Workshop, VMCAI 2002, Venice, Italy, January 21-22, 2002, Revised Papers, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 2294*, Springer, pp. 65–78, [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-47813-2\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-47813-2_5).
- [29] Thorsten Wißmann, Stefan Milius & Lutz Schröder (2021): *Explaining Behavioural Inequivalence Generically in Quasilinear Time*. In Serge Haddad & Daniele Varacca, editors: *32nd International Conference on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 2021), Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs) 203*, Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany, pp. 32:1–32:18, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2021.32>.

## A Proofs

An Isabelle/HOL formalization of game and proofs can be found on <https://github.com/equivio/silent-step-spectroscopy>.

**Lemma 2.1.** *HML<sub>srbb</sub> characterizes stability-respecting branching bisimilarity. (i.e.  $p$  is not stability-respecting branching bisimilar to  $q$  iff there exists a formula in  $\text{HML}_{\text{srbb}}[\Sigma]$  that distinguish  $p$  from  $q$  or  $q$  from  $p$ , respectively.)*

*Proof of Lemma 2.1.* We prove that there is no formula  $\varphi \in \text{HML}_{\text{srbb}}$  distinguishing  $p_0$  from  $q_0$  if and only if there is a stability-respecting branching bisimulation  $\mathcal{R}$  by Definition 2.4 with  $(p_0, q_0) \in \mathcal{R}$ .

Assume no  $\varphi \in \text{HML}_{\text{srbb}}$  distinguishes  $p_0$  from  $q_0$ . Consider  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{srbb}} := \{(p, q) \mid \forall \varphi \in \text{HML}_{\text{srbb}}. p \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \rightarrow q \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket\}$ . Clearly,  $(p_0, q_0) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{srbb}}$ . We will show  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{srbb}}$  to be a stability-respecting branching bisimulation.

- Symmetry of  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{srbb}}$  (by contradiction): Assume  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{srbb}}$  were not symmetric. Then there were  $(p, q) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{srbb}}$  with  $(q, p) \notin \mathcal{R}_{\text{srbb}}$ . The latter means there is  $\varphi \in \text{HML}_{\text{srbb}}$  with  $q \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$  and  $p \notin \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$ . Consider the cases of  $\varphi$ :
  - $\varphi = \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$ . Then  $\bigwedge \{\neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi\} \in \text{HML}_{\text{srbb}}$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $q$ , contradicting  $(p, q) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{srbb}}$ .
  - $\varphi = \bigwedge \Psi$ . That means that there is some  $\psi \in \Psi$  such that  $p \notin \llbracket \psi \rrbracket$ , while  $q \in \llbracket \bigwedge \Psi \rrbracket$  implies  $q \in \llbracket \psi \rrbracket$ . If  $\psi = \neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$ , then  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi \in \text{HML}_{\text{srbb}}$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $q$ . But if  $\psi = \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$ , then  $\bigwedge \{\neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi\} \in \text{HML}_{\text{srbb}}$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $q$ . In both cases we have a contradiction to  $(p, q) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{srbb}}$ .
- Respect of stability (by contradiction): Assume there were  $(p, q) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{srbb}}$  with  $p \xrightarrow{\tau}$  but all  $q'$  with  $q \rightarrow q'$  having  $q' \xrightarrow{\tau} q''$  or  $(p, q') \notin \mathcal{R}_{\text{srbb}}$ . For each  $q' \xrightarrow{\tau}$ , there must be a distinguishing formula  $\varphi_{q'}$ . The others can be distinguished from  $p$  by the fragment  $\neg \langle \tau \rangle \top$ . For all  $\varphi_{q'}$  that are conjunctions, let  $\psi_{q'}$  denote some conjunct that distinguishes  $p$  from  $q'$  (some must exist); and let  $\psi_{q'} := \varphi_{q'}$  for the others. Then,  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \bigwedge \{\neg \langle \tau \rangle \top\} \cup \{\psi_{q'} \mid q \rightarrow q' \xrightarrow{\tau}\} \in \text{HML}_{\text{srbb}}$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $q$ , contradicting  $(p, q) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{srbb}}$ .

- Branching simulation on  $\xrightarrow{a}$  (by contradiction): Assume  $p \xrightarrow{a} p'$ ,  $(p, q) \in \mathcal{R}_{srbb}$ , but for all  $q'$  and  $q''$  with  $q \rightarrow q' \xrightarrow{a} q''$ ,  $(p, q') \notin \mathcal{R}_{srbb}$  or  $(p', q'') \notin \mathcal{R}_{srbb}$ . Let us refer to the respective distinguishing formulas as  $\varphi_\varepsilon(q')$  (with  $q \rightarrow q'$ ) and define  $Q_a$  as the set of  $q'$  that cannot be distinguished from  $p$ , but where  $\varphi_a(q', q'')$  distinguishes  $p'$  from any  $q''$  with  $q' \xrightarrow{a} q''$ . As in the previous case, let  $\psi_\varepsilon(q')$  and  $\psi_a(q', q'')$  refer to specific distinguishing conjuncts in  $\varphi_\varepsilon(q')$  and  $\varphi_a(q', q'')$ . Consider  $\varphi_\eta = \langle \varepsilon \rangle \wedge \{ \langle a \rangle \wedge \{ \psi_a(q', q'') \mid q' \in Q_a, q' \xrightarrow{a} q'' \} \} \cup \{ \psi_\varepsilon(q') \mid q \rightarrow q', q' \notin Q_a \}$ ,  $\varphi_\eta$  combines all the distinctions for the  $q$ -derivatives in a strengthened formula, which must still be true for  $p$  because we know of the  $p \xrightarrow{a} p'$  transition. For the  $q$ -side, this is sound because whatever distinctions render the follow-up formulas false for  $q' \neq q''$ , must be included in  $\varphi_\eta$ . Thus  $\varphi_\eta$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $q$ , contradicting  $(p, q) \in \mathcal{R}_{srbb}$ .
- Branching simulation on  $\xrightarrow{\tau}$  (by contradiction): Assume  $p \xrightarrow{\tau} p'$  and  $(p, q) \in \mathcal{R}_{srbb}$ . If  $(p', q) \in \mathcal{R}_{srbb}$ , then we are finished. Otherwise, we can derive a contradiction by constructing a similar branching conjunction formula as in the previous case. The difference is that  $\varphi_\tau(q', q'')$  should not only distinguish  $p'$  from  $q''$  but also from  $q'$ ; this is possible because we can use  $(p', q) \notin \mathcal{R}_{srbb}$ .

Assume  $p_0$  and  $q_0$  are stability-respecting branching bisimilar. This means  $(p_0, q_0) \in \mathcal{R}_{BB^{sr}}$ , the greatest stability-respecting branching bisimulation. Assume moreover that  $p_0 \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$ . We will show that this implies  $q_0 \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$  by induction over the structure of  $\varphi$  (and inner  $\psi$ ) with arbitrary  $p_0$  and  $q_0$ .

- Case  $\varphi = \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$ .  $p \in \llbracket \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi \rrbracket$  implies there are  $p \xrightarrow{\tau}^n p'$  such that  $p' \in \llbracket \chi \rrbracket$ . To prove  $q \in \llbracket \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi \rrbracket$ , we will establish that there is  $q' \in \llbracket \chi \rrbracket$  with  $q \rightarrow q'$  by considering the cases for  $\chi$ :

- Case  $\chi = \langle a \rangle \varphi'$ . This implies there is  $p''$  with  $p' \xrightarrow{a} p''$  and  $p'' \in \llbracket \varphi' \rrbracket$ . Due to branching bisimulation, there are  $q', q''$  with  $q \rightarrow q' \xrightarrow{a} q''$ ,  $(p', q') \in \mathcal{R}_{BB^{sr}}$ , and  $(p'', q'') \in \mathcal{R}_{BB^{sr}}$ . With the induction hypothesis, this implies  $q'' \in \llbracket \varphi' \rrbracket$ , and due to the HML semantics,  $q' \in \llbracket \langle a \rangle \varphi' \rrbracket$ .
- Case  $\chi = \bigwedge \Psi$ . We know that each  $\psi \in \Psi$  must be true for  $p'$ . If we choose an appropriate  $q'$  with  $q \rightarrow q'$  and  $(p', q') \in \mathcal{R}_{BB^{sr}}$ , the induction hypothesis implies each  $\psi$  of the form  $\neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi'$  or  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi'$  to be true for  $q'$  as well.

If there is  $\psi = \neg \langle \tau \rangle \top \in \Psi$ , its truth ensures  $p' \not\xrightarrow{\tau}$ , we choose  $q'$  to be one where  $q \rightarrow q' \not\xrightarrow{\tau}$  and  $(p', q') \in \mathcal{R}_{BB^{sr}}$ , thanks to  $\mathcal{R}_{BB^{sr}}$  respecting stability.  $q'$  satisfies  $\neg \langle \tau \rangle \top$ .

If, otherwise, there is  $\psi = \langle \alpha \rangle \varphi' \in \Psi$  (implying  $p'' \in \llbracket \varphi' \rrbracket$  and  $p' \xrightarrow{\alpha} p''$ ), we choose  $q'$  to be one where  $q \rightarrow q' \xrightarrow{\alpha} q''$ ,  $(p', q') \in \mathcal{R}_{BB^{sr}}$ , and  $(p'', q'') \in \mathcal{R}_{BB^{sr}}$ , thanks to  $\mathcal{R}_{BB^{sr}}$  being a branching simulation. By induction hypothesis,  $\varphi'$  must be true for  $q''$  as well and thus  $\langle \alpha \rangle \varphi'$  holds for this  $q'$ .

If neither of the prior two conjuncts are present, we just take a  $q' = q$  if  $p \not\xrightarrow{\tau}$ , or otherwise some  $q'$  with  $q \rightarrow q'$  and  $(p', q') \in \mathcal{R}_{BB^{sr}}$  that is implied by the simulation property of  $\mathcal{R}_{BB^{sr}}$  on  $p \xrightarrow{\tau}^n p'$ .

In every case, we have found a  $q' \in \llbracket \bigwedge \Psi \rrbracket$ .

- Case  $\varphi = \bigwedge \Psi$ . We know that each  $\psi \in \Psi$  must be true for  $p$ . By induction hypothesis,  $(p, q) \in \mathcal{R}_{BB^{sr}}$  implies each  $\psi$  to be true for  $q$  as well. Thus  $q \in \llbracket \bigwedge \Psi \rrbracket$ .
- Case  $\psi = \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$ . The proof of the first case also addresses this case.
- Case  $\psi = \neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$ . Thanks to the proof of the first case and symmetry of  $\mathcal{R}_{BB^{sr}}$ , we know that if  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$  were to be true for  $q$ , it would also need to be true for  $p$ . The case implies that  $p \notin \llbracket \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi \rrbracket$ . By contraposition,  $q \notin \llbracket \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi \rrbracket$ . This proves that  $\neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$ , in the context of a conjunction, does agree with  $q$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.1.** *If  $\varphi \in \text{HML}_{srbb}$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ , then  $\text{expr}(\varphi) \in \text{Win}_a(\llbracket p, Q \rrbracket_a)$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 4.1.* If  $Q = \emptyset$ , the lemma is very easy to prove. So let us assume that  $Q \neq \emptyset$  for the rest. To get an inductive property, we actually prove the following property:

1. If  $\varphi \in \text{HML}_{\text{srbb}}$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\text{expr}(\varphi) \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q]_a)$ ;
2. If  $\chi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q \neq \emptyset$  and  $Q$  is closed under  $\rightarrow$  (that is  $Q \rightarrow Q$ ), then  $\text{expr}^e(\chi) \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q]_a^e)$ ;
3. If  $\psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $q$ , then  $\text{expr}^\wedge(\psi) \in \text{Win}_a([p, q]_a^\wedge)$ .
4. If  $\wedge\Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\text{expr}^e(\wedge\Psi) \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d)$ ;
5. If  $\wedge\{\neg\langle\tau\rangle T\} \cup \Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q \neq \emptyset$  and all the processes in  $Q$  are stable, then  $\text{expr}^e(\wedge\{\neg\langle\tau\rangle T\} \cup \Psi) \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d^s)$ ;
6. If  $\wedge\{(\alpha)\varphi'\} \cup \Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ , then, for any  $p \xrightarrow{(\alpha)} p' \in \llbracket\varphi'\rrbracket$  and  $Q_\alpha = Q \setminus \llbracket\langle\alpha\rangle\varphi'\rrbracket$ ,  $\text{expr}^e(\wedge\{(\alpha)\varphi'\} \cup \Psi) \in \text{Win}_a((p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta)$ .

We prove this by mutual induction over the structure of  $\varphi$ ,  $\chi$ , and  $\psi$ .

1. Assume  $\varphi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q \neq \emptyset$ .

$\varphi = \langle\varepsilon\rangle\chi$ : That means that there exists  $p \rightarrow p' \in \llbracket\chi\rrbracket$  and  $Q' \cap \llbracket\chi\rrbracket = \emptyset$  for  $Q \rightarrow Q'$ . Therefore,  $\chi$  distinguishes  $p'$  from  $Q'$  and  $Q' \rightarrow Q'$ . By induction hypothesis we conclude that  $\text{expr}^e(\chi) \in \text{Win}_a([p', Q']_a^e)$ .

There are moves  $[p, Q]_a \xrightarrow{\text{delay}} [p, Q']_a^e \xrightarrow{\text{procrastination}} \dots \xrightarrow{\text{procrastination}} [p', Q']_a^e$ . Using Definition 3.3 over these moves, we can conclude that  $\text{expr}^e(\chi) \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q]_a)$ . We get the result because  $\text{expr}(\varphi) = \text{expr}^e(\chi)$ .

$\varphi = \wedge\Psi$ : There is the move  $[p, Q]_a \xrightarrow{\text{immediate conj.}} (p, Q)_d$ . By induction hypothesis we conclude that  $\text{expr}^e(\wedge\Psi) \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d)$ . Using Definition 3.3 we immediately get that  $\text{expr}(\varphi) = \text{expr}^e(\varphi) + \hat{\mathbf{e}}_5 \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q]_a)$ .

2. Assume  $\chi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$  (and  $Q \rightarrow Q$ ).

$\chi = \langle a \rangle\varphi'$ : That means that there exists  $p' \in \llbracket\varphi'\rrbracket$  such that  $p \xrightarrow{a} p'$ . On the other hand,  $Q' \cap \llbracket\varphi'\rrbracket = \emptyset$ , where  $Q \xrightarrow{a} Q'$ , and therefore  $\varphi'$  distinguishes  $p'$  from  $Q'$ .

Now there is the move  $[p, Q]_a \xrightarrow{\text{observation}} [p', Q']_a$ . By induction hypothesis we conclude that  $\text{expr}(\varphi') \in \text{Win}_a([p', Q']_a)$ . Because we can calculate  $\text{expr}^e(\langle a \rangle\varphi') := \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1 + \text{expr}(\varphi')$ , we know  $\text{upd}(\text{expr}^e(\chi), -\hat{\mathbf{e}}_1) = \text{expr}(\varphi')$ . With Definition 3.3, we get  $\text{expr}^e(\chi) \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q]_a)$ .

$\chi = \wedge\Psi$ : There is the move  $[p, Q]_a^e \xrightarrow{\text{late conj.}} (p, Q)_d$ ; we use the proof for  $(p, Q)_d$  that follows in (4) and Definition 3.3 to then get  $\text{expr}^e(\chi) \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q]_a)$ .

$\chi = \wedge\{\neg\langle\tau\rangle T\} \cup \Psi$ : There is the move  $[p, Q]_a^e \xrightarrow{\text{late stable conj.}} (p, Q')_d^s$ , where  $Q' = \{q \in Q \mid q \not\stackrel{\tau}{\rightarrow}\}$ . If  $Q'$  is not empty, we argue as in the previous case using (5).

If  $Q'$  is empty, there is the move  $(p, Q')_d^s = (p, \emptyset)_d^s \xrightarrow{\text{stable finishing}} (p, \emptyset)_d$ . The latter position is stuck, so  $\text{Win}_a((p, \emptyset)_d) = \mathbf{En}_\infty$  and by Definition 3.3,  $e \in \text{Win}_a((p, \emptyset)_d^s)$  for all  $e \geq \hat{\mathbf{e}}_4$ . Because  $\text{expr}^e(\chi) \geq \text{expr}^e(\wedge\{\neg\langle\tau\rangle T\}) = \hat{\mathbf{e}}_4$ , we get the result.

$\chi = \wedge\{(\alpha)\varphi'\} \cup \Psi$ : Note that there must exist  $p \xrightarrow{(\alpha)} p' \in \llbracket\varphi'\rrbracket$  (otherwise  $p \notin \llbracket(\alpha)\varphi'\rrbracket \supseteq \llbracket\chi\rrbracket$ , so  $\chi$  would not distinguish  $p$  from anything). Pick such a  $p'$ , and set  $Q_\alpha = Q \setminus \llbracket\langle\alpha\rangle\varphi'\rrbracket$ . Then there is the move  $[p, Q]_a^e \xrightarrow{\text{branching conj.}} (p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta$ ; so we can use the proof for  $(p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta$  that follows in (6) and Definition 3.3 to get  $\text{expr}^e(\chi) \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q]_a^e)$ .

3. Assume  $\psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $q$ .

$\psi = \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$ : That means that there exists  $p \rightarrow p' \in \llbracket \chi \rrbracket$  and  $Q' \cap \llbracket \chi \rrbracket = \emptyset$  for  $\{q\} \rightarrow Q'$ . Therefore,  $\chi$  distinguishes  $p'$  from  $Q'$  and  $Q' \rightarrow Q'$ . By induction hypothesis we conclude that  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\chi) \in \text{Win}_a([p', Q']_a^\varepsilon)$ .

Now there is a move sequence  $[p, q]_a^\wedge \xrightarrow{\text{positive conjunct}} [p, Q']_a^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\text{procrastination}} \dots \rightarrow [p', Q']_a^\varepsilon$ . Using Definition 3.3 over the procrastination moves, we can conclude that  $\text{expr}(\langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi) = \text{expr}^\varepsilon(\chi) \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q']_a^\varepsilon)$ . Calculation shows  $\text{upd}(\text{expr}^\wedge(\psi), (\min_{\{1,6\}}, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)) \geq \text{expr}^\varepsilon(\chi)$ , and this allows to apply Definition 3.3 and get the result.

$\psi = \neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$ : That means that there exists  $q \rightarrow q' \in \llbracket \chi \rrbracket$  and  $P' \cap \llbracket \chi \rrbracket = \emptyset$  for  $\{p\} \rightarrow P'$ . Therefore,  $\chi$  distinguishes  $q'$  from  $P'$  and  $P' \rightarrow P'$ . By induction hypothesis we conclude that  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\chi) \in \text{Win}_a([q', P']_a^\varepsilon)$ . A similar calculation as in the previous case shows  $\text{upd}(\text{expr}^\wedge(\psi), (\min_{\{1,7\}}, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1)) \geq \text{expr}^\varepsilon(\chi)$ , and this allows to apply Definition 3.3 and get the result.

4. Assume  $\wedge \Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ .

We can find, for every  $q \in Q$ , some  $\psi_q \in \Psi$  such that  $q \notin \llbracket \psi_q \rrbracket$  (so  $\Psi \neq \emptyset$ ). Choose one such covering of  $\psi_q$ s. Let  $\Psi' := \{\psi_q \mid q \in Q\} \subseteq \Psi$ . Each  $\psi_q$  either has the form  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi_q$  or  $\neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi_q$ . It must be the case that  $p \in \llbracket \wedge_{q \in Q} \psi_q \rrbracket$  and  $Q \cap \llbracket \wedge_{q \in Q} \psi_q \rrbracket = \emptyset$ .

Now there are the moves  $(p, Q)_d \xrightarrow{\text{conj. answer}} [p, q]_a^\wedge$  for all  $q \in Q$ . We have to show that  $e_0 := \text{expr}^\varepsilon(\chi) = \hat{e}_3 + \sup\{\text{expr}^\wedge(\psi) \mid \psi \in \Psi\} \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d)$ . As  $\text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d)$  is upwards-closed, we can restrict the supremum to  $\Psi'$  instead of  $\Psi$ , so it suffices to prove that  $\sup\{\text{expr}^\wedge(\psi) + \hat{e}_3 \mid \psi \in \Psi'\} \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d)$ . Now, to show this using Definition 3.3, we have to quantify over all game moves from  $(p, Q)_d$ , i.e. over all conjunction answers, which lead to the positions  $[p, q]_a^\wedge$  for  $q \in Q$ . We have  $\text{upd}(e_0, -\hat{e}_3) \geq \text{expr}^\wedge(\psi_q)$ , and by induction hypothesis know  $\text{expr}^\wedge(\psi_q) \in \text{Win}_a([p, q]_a^\wedge)$ . Applying Definition 3.3 immediately leads to the desired result.

5. Assume  $\wedge \{\neg \langle \tau \rangle T\} \cup \Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q \neq \emptyset$ , where  $p$  and the processes in  $Q$  are stable.

We choose  $\psi_q$  (for every  $q \in Q$ ) and  $\Psi'$  as in the previous case.

Now there are the moves  $(p, Q)_d^s \xrightarrow{\text{conj. s-answer}} [p, q]_a^\wedge$  for all  $q \in Q$ . We have to show that  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\chi) = \hat{e}_4 + \sup\{\text{expr}^\wedge(\psi) \mid \psi \in \Psi'\} \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d^s)$ . This proceeds exactly as in the previous case.

6. Assume  $\wedge \{\langle \alpha \rangle \phi'\} \cup \Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ ,  $p \xrightarrow{(\alpha)} p' \in \llbracket \phi' \rrbracket$  and  $Q_\alpha = Q \setminus \llbracket \langle \alpha \rangle \phi' \rrbracket$ .

There are the moves  $(p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta \xrightarrow{\text{br. answer}} [p, q]_a^\wedge$  for all  $q \in Q \setminus Q_\alpha$ . Additionally, there are the moves  $(p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta \xrightarrow{\text{br. observation}} [p', Q']_a^\eta \xrightarrow{\text{br. accounting}} [p', Q']_a$  for  $Q_\alpha \xrightarrow{(\alpha)} Q'$ , and  $\phi'$  distinguishes  $p'$  from  $Q'$ .

We have to show that  $e_0 := \text{expr}^\varepsilon(\chi) = \hat{e}_2 + \hat{e}_3 + \sup\{\text{expr}^\wedge(\langle \varepsilon \rangle \langle \alpha \rangle \phi')\} \cup \{\text{expr}^\wedge(\psi) \mid \psi \in \Psi\} \in \text{Win}_a((p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta)$ . For the branching answer moves, this proceeds exactly as in the previous cases. For the branching observation move, we have to show that  $e_2 := \text{upd}(\text{upd}(e_0, (\min_{\{1,6\}}, -1, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0)), -\hat{e}_1) \in \text{Win}_a([p', Q']_a)$ . We know  $e_2 \geq \text{expr}(\phi')$ . Moreover, we know  $\text{expr}(\phi') \in \text{Win}_a([p', Q']_a)$  by induction hypothesis (or, trivially, if  $Q' = \emptyset$ ). This suffices to apply Definition 3.3 and get the result.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** *If  $e \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q]_a)$ , then there is  $\varphi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a, e)$  with  $\text{expr}(\varphi) \leq e$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 4.2.* We prove a more detailed result, namely:

1. If  $e \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q]_a)$ , then there is  $\varphi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a, e)$  with price  $\text{expr}(\varphi) \leq e$ ;
2. If  $e \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q]_a^\varepsilon)$ , then there is  $\chi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a^\varepsilon, e)$  with  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\chi) \leq e$ ;
3. If  $e \in \text{Win}_a([p, q]_a^\wedge)$ , then there is  $\psi \in \text{Strat}([p, q]_a^\wedge, e)$  with  $\text{expr}^\wedge(\psi) \leq e$ .

4. If  $e \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d)$ , then there is  $\wedge\Psi \in \text{Strat}((p, Q)_d)$  with  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\wedge\Psi) \leq e$ ;
5. If  $e \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d^s)$ , then there is  $\wedge\{\neg\langle\tau\rangle T\} \cup \Psi \in \text{Strat}((p, Q)_d^s)$  with price  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\wedge\{\neg\langle\tau\rangle T\} \cup \Psi) \leq e$ ;
6. If  $e \in \text{Win}_a((p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta)$ , then there is  $\wedge\{(\alpha)\varphi'\} \cup \Psi \in \text{Strat}((p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta)$  with price  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\wedge\{(\alpha)\varphi'\} \cup \Psi) \leq e$ .

We induct over game positions  $g$  and energies  $e$  according to the inductive Definition 3.3. We distinguish cases depending on the kind of position.

1. Assume  $e \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q]_a)$ . This must be due to one of the following moves:

**Delay move**  $[p, Q]_a \xrightarrow{0} [p, Q_\varepsilon]_a^\varepsilon$ : We know that  $e = \text{upd}(e, \mathbf{0}) \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q_\varepsilon]_a^\varepsilon)$ , so by induction hypothesis we know that there exists  $\chi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q_\varepsilon]_a^\varepsilon, e)$  and  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\chi) \leq e$ . But then  $\langle\varepsilon\rangle\chi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a, e)$  by rule (delay) of Definition 4.1 and  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\langle\varepsilon\rangle\chi) = \text{expr}^\varepsilon(\chi) \leq e$ .

**Immediate conj. move**  $[p, Q]_a \xrightarrow{-\hat{e}_5} (p, Q)_d$ : It must hold that  $e' = \text{upd}(e, -\hat{e}_5) \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d)$ , so by induction hypothesis we know that there exists a conjunction  $\wedge\Psi \in \text{Strat}((p, Q)_d, e')$  and  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\wedge\Psi) \leq e'$ . But then,  $\wedge\Psi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a, e)$  by rule (immediate conj) of Definition 4.1, and  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\wedge\Psi) \leq e$ .

2. Assume  $e \in \text{Win}_a([p, Q]_a^\varepsilon)$ . This must be due to one of the following moves:

**Procrastination move**  $[p, Q]_a^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{0} [p', Q]_a^\varepsilon$ : We know  $\text{upd}(e, \mathbf{0}) = e \in \text{Win}_a([p', Q]_a^\varepsilon)$ . By induction hypothesis, there is  $\chi \in \text{Strat}([p', Q]_a^\varepsilon, e)$  and  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\chi) \leq e$ ; therefore, by rule (procr) of Definition 4.1,  $\chi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a^\varepsilon, e)$ .

**Late (unstable) conjunction move**  $[p, Q]_a^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{0} (p, Q)_d$ : It must be the case that  $e \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d)$ . By induction hypothesis there is  $\wedge\Psi \in \text{Strat}((p, Q)_d, e)$  and  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\wedge\Psi) \leq e$ ; therefore, by rule (late conj) of Definition 4.1,  $\wedge\Psi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a^\varepsilon, e)$ .

**Stable conjunction move**  $[p, Q]_a^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{0} (p, \{q \in Q \mid q \xrightarrow{\tau}\})_d^s$ : It must hold that  $p$  is stable and  $e \in \text{Win}_a((p, \{q \in Q \mid q \xrightarrow{\tau}\})_d^s)$ . By induction hypothesis there is some formula  $\wedge\{\neg\langle\tau\rangle T\} \cup \Psi \in \text{Strat}((p, \{q \in Q \mid q \xrightarrow{\tau}\})_d^s)$  and  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\wedge\{\neg\langle\tau\rangle T\} \cup \Psi) \leq e$ ; thus, by rule (stable) of Definition 4.1,  $\wedge\{\neg\langle\tau\rangle T\} \cup \Psi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a^\varepsilon, e)$ .

**Branch. conjunction move**  $[p, Q]_a^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{0} (p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d$ : It must hold that  $e \in \text{Win}_a((p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d)$ . By induction hypothesis there is a formula  $\wedge\{(\alpha)\varphi'\} \cup \Psi \in \text{Strat}((p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d)$  and  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\wedge\{(\alpha)\varphi'\} \cup \Psi) \leq e$ ; therefore, by rule (branch) of Definition 4.1,  $\wedge\{(\alpha)\varphi'\} \cup \Psi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a^\varepsilon)$ .

3. Assume  $e \in \text{Win}_a([p, q]_a^\wedge)$ . This must be due to one of the following moves:

**Positive conjunct**  $[p, q]_a^\wedge \xrightarrow{\min\{1,6\}, 0,0,0,0,0,0} [p, \{q' \mid q \rightarrow q'\}]_a^\varepsilon$ : It must hold that  $e' := \text{upd}(e, (\min\{1,6\}, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)) \in \text{Win}_a([p, \{q' \mid q \rightarrow q'\}]_a^\varepsilon)$ . By induction hypothesis there is some formula  $\chi \in \text{Strat}([p, \{q' \mid q \rightarrow q'\}]_a^\varepsilon, e')$  and  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\chi) \leq e'$ ; therefore, by rule (pos) of Definition 4.1,  $\langle\varepsilon\rangle\chi \in \text{Strat}([p, q]_a^\wedge, e)$ .

**Negative conjunct**  $[p, q]_a^\wedge \xrightarrow{\min\{1,7\}, 0,0,0,0,0,-1} [q, \{p' \mid p \rightarrow p'\}]_a^\varepsilon$ : It holds that  $e' := \text{upd}(e, (\min\{1,7\}, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1)) \in \text{Win}_a([q, \{p' \mid p \rightarrow p'\}]_a^\varepsilon)$ . By induction hypothesis there is some formula  $\chi \in \text{Strat}([q, \{p' \mid p \rightarrow p'\}]_a^\varepsilon, e')$  and  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\chi) \leq e'$ ; therefore, by rule (neg) of Definition 4.1,  $\neg\langle\varepsilon\rangle\chi \in \text{Strat}([p, q]_a^\wedge, e)$ .

4. Assume  $e \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d)$ . For each move  $(p, Q)_d \xrightarrow{-\hat{e}_3} [p, q]_a^\wedge$ , it must hold that  $e' := \text{upd}(e, -\hat{e}_3) \in \text{Win}_a([p, q]_a^\wedge)$ , so by induction hypothesis there are  $\psi_q \in \text{Strat}([p, q]_a^\wedge)$  with  $\text{expr}^\wedge(\psi_q) \leq e'$ . Therefore, by rule (conj) of Definition 4.1,  $\bigwedge_{q \in Q} \psi_q \in \text{Strat}((p, Q)_d, e)$ , and  $\text{expr}^\varepsilon(\bigwedge_{q \in Q} \psi_q) = \hat{e}_3 + \sup\{\text{expr}^\wedge(\psi_q) \mid q \in Q\} \leq e$ .

5. Assume  $e \in \text{Win}_a((p, Q)_d^s)$ . If  $Q \neq \emptyset$ , we can argue similar to the previous case.  
If  $Q = \emptyset$ , the only move is  $(p, Q)_d^s = (p, \emptyset)_d^s \xrightarrow{-\hat{e}_4} (p, \emptyset)_d$ . It must be the case that  $\text{upd}(e, -\hat{e}_4) \geq \mathbf{0}$ , or equivalently,  $e \geq \hat{e}_4$ . But then we have  $\text{expr}^e(\wedge\{\neg\langle\tau\rangle T\}) = \hat{e}_4 \leq e$  as required.
6. Assume  $e \in \text{Win}_a((p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta)$ . Then there are moves  $(p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta \xrightarrow{-\hat{e}_2 - \hat{e}_3} [p, q]_a^\wedge$  for every  $q \in Q \setminus Q_\alpha$ ; it must be the case that  $e' := \text{upd}(e, -\hat{e}_2 - \hat{e}_3) \in \text{Win}_a([p, q]_a^\wedge)$ , so by induction hypothesis there are formulas  $\psi_q \in \text{Strat}([p, q]_a^\wedge)$  with  $\text{expr}^\wedge(\psi_q) \leq e'$ . Also, for the moves  $(p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta \xrightarrow{\min\{1,6\}, -1, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0} [p', Q']_a^\eta \xrightarrow{-\hat{e}_1} [p', Q']_a$ , it must be the case that  $e'' := \text{upd}(\text{upd}(e, (\min\{1,6\}, -1, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0)), -\hat{e}_1) \in \text{Win}_a([p', Q']_a)$ , so by induction hypothesis there is some  $\varphi' \in \text{Strat}([p', Q']_a, e'')$  with  $\text{expr}(\varphi') \leq e''$ .  
Hence, by rule (branch conj) of Definition 4.1,  $\wedge\{(\alpha)\varphi'\} \cup \{\psi_q \mid q \in Q \setminus Q_\alpha\} \in \text{Strat}((p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta, e)$  and  $\text{expr}^e(\wedge\{(\alpha)\varphi'\} \cup \{\psi_q \mid q \in Q \setminus Q_\alpha\}) \leq e$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.3.** *If  $\varphi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a, e)$ , then  $\varphi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 4.3.* Again, to get an inductive property, we actually prove the following:

1. If  $\varphi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a, e)$ , then  $\varphi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ ;
2. If  $\chi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a^\varepsilon, e)$  and  $Q \twoheadrightarrow Q'$ , then  $\langle\varepsilon\rangle\chi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ ;
3. If  $\psi \in \text{Strat}([p, q]_a^\wedge, e)$ , then  $\psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $\{q\}$ .
4. If  $\wedge\Psi \in \text{Strat}((p, Q)_d, e)$ , then  $\wedge\Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ ;
5. If  $\wedge\{\neg\langle\tau\rangle T\} \cup \Psi \in \text{Strat}((p, Q)_d^s, e)$  and  $p$  is stable, then the stable conjunction  $\wedge\{\neg\langle\tau\rangle T\} \cup \Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ ;
6. If  $\wedge\{(\alpha)\varphi'\} \cup \Psi \in \text{Strat}((p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta, e)$ ,  $p \xrightarrow{(\alpha)} p'$  and  $Q_\alpha \subseteq Q$ , then the branching conjunction  $\wedge\{(\alpha)\varphi'\} \cup \Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ .

We prove the result by induction over the derivation of  $\dots \in \text{Strat}(g, e)$  according to Definition 4.1.

1. Assume  $\varphi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a, e)$ .

**Due to rule (delay) in Definition 4.1:** Then  $\varphi = \langle\varepsilon\rangle\chi$  and for  $Q'$  with  $Q \twoheadrightarrow Q'$  we have  $\chi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q']_a^\varepsilon, e)$ . By induction hypothesis,  $\langle\varepsilon\rangle\chi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q'$ , but then it also distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q \subseteq Q'$ .

**Due to rule (immediate conj) in Definition 4.1:** (immediate conj) has premise  $[p, Q]_a \xrightarrow{u} (p, Q)_d$ , but this move can be a finishing move  $[p, \emptyset]_a \xrightarrow{u} (p, \emptyset)_d$  or an immediate conjunction move  $[p, Q]_a \xrightarrow{-\hat{e}_5} (p, Q)_d$  with  $Q \neq \emptyset$ . In either case, we have that  $\varphi = \wedge\Psi \in \text{Strat}((p, Q)_d, \text{upd}(e, u))$ . By induction hypothesis,  $\wedge\Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ , and this is exactly what we need to prove about  $\varphi = \wedge\Psi$ .

2. Assume  $\chi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a^\varepsilon, e)$  and  $Q \twoheadrightarrow Q'$ .

**Due to rule (procr) in Definition 4.1:** Then there is a step  $p \twoheadrightarrow p'$  such that  $\chi \in \text{Strat}([p', Q]_a^\varepsilon, e)$ . By induction hypothesis, we have that  $\langle\varepsilon\rangle\chi$  distinguishes  $p'$  from  $Q$ , but then it also distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ .

**Due to rule (observation) in Definition 4.1:** Then  $\chi = \langle a \rangle \varphi$  and there are  $p \xrightarrow{a} p'$  and  $Q \xrightarrow{a} Q'$  such that  $\varphi \in \text{Strat}([p', Q']_a, \text{upd}(e, -\hat{e}_1))$ . By induction hypothesis we have that  $\varphi$  distinguishes  $p'$  from  $Q'$ . Therefore,  $p \in \llbracket \chi \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket \langle\varepsilon\rangle\chi \rrbracket$ . If there were some  $q \in Q \cap \llbracket \langle\varepsilon\rangle\chi \rrbracket$ , then we would have a path  $q \twoheadrightarrow q' \xrightarrow{a} q'' \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$ . But  $q' \in Q$  because  $Q \twoheadrightarrow Q$  and therefore  $q'' \in Q' \cap \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket = \emptyset$ . Contradiction! Therefore  $\langle\varepsilon\rangle\chi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ .

- Due to rule (late conj) in Definition 4.1:** Then  $\chi \in \text{Strat}((p, Q)_d, e)$ . By induction hypothesis,  $\chi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ . As in the previous case, we use  $Q \rightarrow Q$  to get that  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ .
- Due to rule (stable) in Definition 4.1:** Then  $\chi = \bigwedge \{ \neg \langle \tau \rangle T \} \cup \Psi \in \text{Strat}((p, \{q \in Q \mid q \not\stackrel{\tau}{\rightarrow}\})_d^s, e)$ . By induction hypothesis,  $\chi$  distinguishes  $p$  from the stable states in  $Q$ . Therefore,  $p \in \llbracket \chi \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi \rrbracket$ . unstable states do not satisfy  $\neg \langle \tau \rangle T$ , so if there were some unstable  $q \in Q \cap \llbracket \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi \rrbracket$ , then we would have a path  $q \rightarrow q' \not\stackrel{\tau}{\rightarrow}$  with  $q' \in \llbracket \chi \rrbracket$ . But  $q' \in Q$  because  $Q \rightarrow Q$ , so  $q'$  cannot satisfy  $\chi$  by induction hypothesis. Contradiction! Therefore  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$  distinguishes  $p$  from all states in  $Q$ .
- Due to rule (branch) in Definition 4.1:** Then  $\chi \in \text{Strat}((p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta)$  (for some  $p \xrightarrow{(\alpha)}$   $p'$  and  $Q_\alpha \subseteq Q$ ). By induction hypothesis,  $\chi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ . As in the previous case, we use  $Q \rightarrow Q$  to get that  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ .
3. Assume  $\psi \in \text{Strat}([p, q]_a^\wedge, e)$ .
- Due to rule (pos) in Definition 4.1:** Then  $\psi$  is of the form  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$  and  $\chi \in \text{Strat}([p, Q']_a^\varepsilon, \text{upd}(e, (\min_{\{1,6\}}, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)))$  for  $\{q\} \rightarrow Q'$ . By induction hypothesis,  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q'$ , and because  $q \in Q'$ , it also distinguishes  $p$  from  $q$ .
- Due to rule (neg) in Definition 4.1:** Then  $\psi$  is of the form  $\neg \langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$  and  $\chi \in \text{Strat}([q, P']_a^\varepsilon, \text{upd}(e, (\min_{\{1,7\}}, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1)))$  for  $\{p\} \rightarrow P'$ . By induction hypothesis,  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle \chi$  distinguishes  $q$  from  $P'$ , and because  $p \in P'$ , its negation  $\psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $q$ .
4. Assume  $\bigwedge \Psi \in \text{Strat}((p, Q)_d, e)$ .
- Due to rule (conj) in Definition 4.1:** Then  $\Psi$  can be written as  $\{\psi_q \mid q \in Q\}$ , where each  $\psi_q \in \text{Strat}([p, q]_a^\wedge, \text{upd}(e, -\hat{e}_3))$ . By induction hypothesis,  $\psi_q$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $q$ , so also  $\bigwedge \Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $q$ . Because this holds for every  $q \in Q$ , we have that  $\bigwedge \Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ .
5. Assume  $\bigwedge \{ \neg \langle \tau \rangle T \} \cup \Psi \in \text{Strat}((p, Q)_d^s, e)$  and  $p$  is stable.
- Due to rule (stable conj) in Definition 4.1:** Then  $\Psi$  can be written  $\{\psi_q \mid q \in Q\}$ , where  $\psi_q \in \text{Strat}([p, q]_a^\wedge, \text{upd}(e, -\hat{e}_4))$ . By induction hypothesis,  $\psi_q$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $q$ . Because this holds for every  $q \in Q$  and  $p$  is stable, we have that  $\bigwedge \{ \neg \langle \tau \rangle T \} \cup \Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ .
- Due to rule (stable fin.) in Definition 4.1:** Then we must have  $Q = \emptyset$  and  $\Psi = \emptyset$ . As  $p$  is stable, it satisfies  $\bigwedge \{ \neg \langle \tau \rangle T \}$ , i.e. the formula in  $\text{Strat}((p, Q)_d^s, e)$ .
6. Assume  $\bigwedge \{ (\alpha) \varphi' \} \cup \Psi \in \text{Strat}((p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta, e)$ ,  $p \xrightarrow{(\alpha)}$   $p'$  and  $Q_\alpha \subseteq Q$ .
- Due to rule (branch conj) in Definition 4.1:** Then  $\Psi$  can be written as  $\{\psi_q \mid q \in Q \setminus Q_\alpha\}$ , where  $\psi_q \in \text{Strat}([p, q]_a^\wedge, \text{upd}(e, -\hat{e}_2 - \hat{e}_3))$ . By induction hypothesis,  $\psi_q$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $q$ . Because this holds for every  $q \in Q \setminus Q_\alpha$ , we have that  $\bigwedge \Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q \setminus Q_\alpha$ . Moreover, there are moves  $(p, \alpha, p', Q \setminus Q_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_d^\eta \rightsquigarrow [p', Q']_a^\eta \rightsquigarrow [p', Q']_a$  where  $p \xrightarrow{(\alpha)}$   $p'$ ,  $Q_\alpha \xrightarrow{(\alpha)}$   $Q'$ , and  $\varphi' \in \text{Strat}([p, Q]_a, \text{upd}(\text{upd}(e, (\min_{\{1,6\}}, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)), -\hat{e}_1))$ . By induction hypothesis,  $\varphi'$  distinguishes  $p'$  from  $Q'$ , so  $(\alpha) \varphi'$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q_\alpha$ . Together we have that  $\bigwedge \{ (\alpha) \varphi' \} \cup \Psi$  distinguishes  $p$  from  $Q$ .  $\square$