

Exploiting Adjoints in Property Directed Reachability Analysis ^{*}

Mayuko Kori^{1,2} , Flavio Ascari³ , Filippo Bonchi³ , Roberto Bruni³ ,
Roberta Gori³ , and Ichiro Hasuo^{1,2} 

¹ National Institute of Informatics, Tokyo, Japan

² The Graduate University for Advanced Studies
(SOKENDAI), Hayama, Japan
{mkori,hasuo}@nii.ac.jp

³ Dipartimento di Informatica, Università di Pisa, Pisa, Italy
flavio.ascari@phd.unipi.it
{filippo.bonchi,roberto.bruni,roberta.gori}@unipi.it

Abstract. We formulate, in lattice-theoretic terms, two novel algorithms inspired by Bradley’s property directed reachability algorithm. For finding safe invariants or counterexamples, the first algorithm exploits over-approximations of both forward and backward transition relations, expressed abstractly by the notion of adjoints. In the absence of adjoints, one can use the second algorithm, which exploits lower sets and their principals. As a notable example of application, we consider quantitative reachability problems for Markov Decision Processes.

Keywords: PDR · Lattice theory · Adjoints · MDPs · Over-approximation.

1 Introduction

Property directed reachability analysis (PDR) refers to a class of verification algorithms for solving safety problems of transition systems [5, 12]. Its essence consists of 1) interleaving the construction of an *inductive invariant* (a *positive chain*) with that of a *counterexample* (a *negative sequence*), and 2) making the two sequences *interact*, with one narrowing down the search space for the other.

PDR algorithms have shown impressive performance both in hardware and software verification, leading to active research [15, 18, 28, 29] going far beyond its original scope. For instance, an abstract domain [8] capturing the over-approximation exploited by PDR has been recently introduced in [13], while PrIC3 [3] extended PDR for quantitative verification of probabilistic systems.


To uncover the abstract principles behind PDR and its extensions, Kori et al. proposed LT-PDR [19], a generalisation of PDR in terms of lattice/category

^{*} Research supported by MIUR PRIN Project 201784YSZ5 *ASPRA*, by JST ER-ATO HASUO Metamathematics for Systems Design Project JPMJER1603, by JST CREST Grant JPMJCR2012, by JSPS DC KAKENHI Grant 22J21742 and by EU Next-GenerationEU (NRRP) SPOKE 10, Mission 4, Component 2, Investment N. 1.4, CUP N. I53C22000690001.

theory. LT-PDR can be instantiated using domain-specific *heuristics* to create effective algorithms for different kinds of systems such as Kripke structures, Markov Decision Processes (MDPs), and Markov reward models. However, the theory in [19] does not offer guidance on devising concrete heuristics.

Adjoints in PDR. Our approach shares the same vision of LT-PDR, but we identify different principles: *adjunctions* are the core of our toolset.


An adjunction $f \dashv g$ is one of the central concepts in category theory [23]. It is prevalent in various fields of computer science, too, such as abstract interpretation [8] and functional programming [22]. Our use of adjoints in this work comes in the following two flavours.



- (forward-backward adjoint) f describes the *forward semantics* of a transition system, while g is the *backward* one, where we typically have $A = C$.
- (abstraction-concretization adjoint) C is a concrete semantic domain, and A is an abstract one, much like in abstract interpretation. An adjoint enables us to convert a fixed-point problem in C to that in A .

Our Algorithms. The problem we address is the standard lattice theoretical formulation of safety problems, namely whether the least fixed point of a continuous map b over a complete lattice (L, \sqsubseteq) is below a given element $p \in L$. In symbols $\mu b \sqsubseteq_{\text{?}} p$. We present two algorithms.

The first one, named **AdjointPDR**, assumes to have an element $i \in L$ and two adjoints $f \dashv g: L \rightarrow L$, representing respectively initial states, forward semantics and backward semantics (see right) such that $b(x) = f(x) \sqcup i$ for all $x \in L$. Under this assumption, we have the following equivalences (they follow from the Knaster-Tarski theorem, see §2):



$$\mu b \sqsubseteq p \Leftrightarrow \mu(f \sqcup i) \sqsubseteq p \Leftrightarrow i \sqsubseteq \nu(g \sqcap p),$$

where $\mu(f \sqcup i)$ and $\nu(g \sqcap p)$ are, by the Kleene theorem, the limits of the *initial* and *final* chains illustrated below.

$$\perp \sqsubseteq i \sqsubseteq f(i) \sqcup i \sqsubseteq \dots \qquad \dots \sqsubseteq g(p) \sqcap p \sqsubseteq p \sqsubseteq \top$$

As positive chain, PDR exploits an over-approximation of the initial chain: it is made greater to accelerate convergence; still it has to be below p .


The distinguishing feature of **AdjointPDR** is to take as a negative sequence (that is a sequential construction of potential counterexamples) an over-approximation of the final chain. This crucially differs from the negative sequence of LT-PDR, namely an under-approximation of the computed positive chain.

We prove that **AdjointPDR** is sound (Theorem 5) and does not loop (Proposition 7) but since, the problem $\mu b \sqsubseteq_{\text{?}} p$ is not always decidable, we cannot prove termination. Nevertheless, **AdjointPDR** allows for a formal theory of heuristics that are essential when instantiating the algorithm to concrete problems. The theory prescribes the choices to obtain the boundary executions, using initial and final chains (Proposition 10); it thus identifies a class of heuristics guaranteeing termination when answers are negative (Theorem 12).

`AdjointPDR`'s assumption of a forward-backward adjoint $f \dashv g$, however, does not hold very often, especially in probabilistic settings. Our second algorithm `AdjointPDR↓` circumvents this problem by extending the lattice for the negative sequence, from L to the lattice L^\downarrow of *lower sets* in L .

Specifically, by using the second form of adjoints, namely an abstraction-concretization pair, the problem $\mu b \sqsubseteq_? p$ in L can be translated to an equivalent problem on b^\downarrow in L^\downarrow , for which an adjoint $b^\downarrow \dashv b_r^\downarrow$ is guaranteed. This allows one to run `AdjointPDR` in the lattice L^\downarrow .

We then notice that the search for a positive chain can be conveniently restricted to principals in L^\downarrow , which have representatives in L . The resulting algorithm, using L for positive chains and L^\downarrow for negative sequences, is `AdjointPDR↓`.



The use of lower sets for the negative sequence is a key advantage. It not only avoids the restrictive assumption on forward-backward adjoints $f \dashv g$, but also enables a more thorough search for counterexamples. `AdjointPDR↓` can simulate step-by-step LT-PDR (Theorem 17), while the reverse is not possible due to a single negative sequence in `AdjointPDR↓` potentially representing multiple (Proposition 18) or even all (Proposition 19) negative sequences in LT-PDR.

Concrete Instances. Our lattice-theoretic algorithms yield many concrete instances: the original IC3/PDR [5, 12] as well as Reverse PDR [27] are instances of `AdjointPDR` with L being the powerset of the state space; since LT-PDR can be simulated by `AdjointPDR↓`, the latter generalizes all instances in [19].

As a notable instance, we apply `AdjointPDR↓` to MDPs, specifically to decide if the maximum reachability probability [1] is below a given threshold. Here the lattice $L = [0, 1]^S$ is that of fuzzy predicates over the state space S . Our theory provides guidance to devise two heuristics, for which we prove negative termination (Corollary 20). We present its implementation in Haskell, and its experimental evaluation, where comparison is made against existing probabilistic PDR algorithms (PrIC3 [3], LT-PDR [19]) and a non-PDR one (Storm [11]). The performance of `AdjointPDR↓` is encouraging—it supports the potential of PDR algorithms in probabilistic model checking. The experiments also indicate the importance of having a variety of heuristics, and thus the value of our adjoint framework that helps coming up with those.

Additionally, we found that abstraction features of Haskell allows us to code lattice-theoretic algorithms almost literally (~ 100 lines). Implementing a few heuristics takes another ~ 240 lines. This way, we found that mathematical abstraction can directly help easing implementation effort.

Related Work. Reverse PDR [27] applies PDR from unsafe states using a backward transition relation \mathbf{T} and tries to prove that initial states are unreachable. Our right adjoint g is also backward, but it differs from \mathbf{T} in the presence of nondeterminism: roughly, $\mathbf{T}(X)$ is the set of states which *can* reach X in one step, while $g(X)$ are states which *only* reach X in one step. `fbPDR` [28, 29] runs PDR and Reverse PDR in parallel with shared information. Our work uses both forward and backward directions (the pair $f \dashv g$), too, but approximate differ-

ently: Reverse PDR over-approximates the set of states that can reach an unsafe state, while we over-approximate the set of states that only reach safe states.

The comparison with LT-PDR [19] is extensively discussed in Section 4.2. PrIC3 [3] extended PDR to MDPs, which are our main experimental ground: Section 6 compares the performances of PrIC3, LT-PDR and $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$.

We remark that PDR has been applied to other settings, such as software model checking using theories and SMT-solvers [6,21] or automated planning [30]. Most of them (e.g., software model checking) fall already in the generality of LT-PDR and thus they can be embedded in our framework.

It is also worth to mention that, in the context of abstract interpretation, the use of adjoints to construct initial and final chains and exploit the interaction between their approximations has been investigated in several works, e.g., [7].

Structure of the paper. After recalling some preliminaries in Section 2, we present AdjointPDR in Section 3 and $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ in Section 4. In Section 5 we introduce the heuristics for the max reachability problems of MDPs, that are experimentally tested in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries and Notation

We assume that the reader is familiar with lattice theory, see, e.g., [10]. We use (L, \sqsubseteq) , (L_1, \sqsubseteq_1) , (L_2, \sqsubseteq_2) to range over complete lattices and x, y, z to range over their elements. We omit subscripts and order relations whenever clear from the context. As usual, \sqcup and \sqcap denote least upper bound and greatest lower bound, \sqcup and \sqcap denote join and meet, \top and \perp top and bottom. Hereafter we will tacitly assume that all maps are monotone. Obviously, the identity map $id: L \rightarrow L$ and the composition $f \circ g: L_1 \rightarrow L_3$ of two monotone maps $g: L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ and $f: L_2 \rightarrow L_3$ are monotone. For a map $f: L \rightarrow L$, we inductively define $f^0 = id$ and $f^{n+1} = f \circ f^n$. Given $l: L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ and $r: L_2 \rightarrow L_1$, we say that l is the *left adjoint* of r , or equivalently that r is the *right adjoint* of l , written $l \dashv r$, when it holds that $l(x) \sqsubseteq_2 y$ iff $x \sqsubseteq_1 r(y)$ for all $x \in L_1$ and $y \in L_2$. Given a map $f: L \rightarrow L$, the element $x \in L$ is a *post-fixed point* iff $x \sqsubseteq f(x)$, a *pre-fixed point* iff $f(x) \sqsubseteq x$ and a *fixed point* iff $x = f(x)$. Pre, post and fixed points form complete lattices: we write μf and νf for the least and greatest fixed point.

Several problems relevant to computer science can be reduced to check if $\mu b \sqsubseteq p$ for a monotone map $b: L \rightarrow L$ on a complete lattice L . The Knaster-Tarski fixed-point theorem characterises μb as the least upper bound of all pre-fixed points of b and νb as the greatest lower bound of all its post-fixed points:

$$\mu b = \bigsqcup \{x \mid b(x) \sqsubseteq x\} \quad \nu b = \bigsqcap \{x \mid x \sqsubseteq b(x)\} .$$

This immediately leads to two proof principles, illustrated below:

$$\frac{\exists x, b(x) \sqsubseteq x \sqsubseteq p}{\mu b \sqsubseteq p} \quad \frac{\exists x, i \sqsubseteq x \sqsubseteq b(x)}{i \sqsubseteq \nu b} \quad (\text{KT})$$

By means of (KT), one can prove $\mu b \sqsubseteq p$ by finding some pre-fixed point x , often called *invariant*, such that $x \sqsubseteq p$. However, automatically finding invariants




Fig. 1. The transition system of Example 1, with $S = \{s_0, \dots, s_6\}$ and $I = \{s_0\}$.

might be rather complicated, so most of the algorithms rely on another fixed-point theorem, usually attributed to Kleene. It characterises μb and νb as the least upper bound and the greatest lower bound, of the *initial* and *final chains*:

$$\perp \sqsubseteq b(\perp) \sqsubseteq b^2(\perp) \sqsubseteq \dots \quad \text{and} \quad \dots \sqsubseteq b^2(\top) \sqsubseteq b(\top) \sqsubseteq \top. \quad \text{That is,}$$

$$\mu b = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} b^n(\perp), \quad \nu b = \bigsqcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} b^n(\top). \quad (\text{K1})$$

The assumptions are stronger than for Knaster-Tarski: for the leftmost statement, it requires the map b to be ω -continuous (i.e., it preserves \bigsqcup of ω -chains) and, for the rightmost ω -co-continuous (similar but for \bigsqcap). Observe that every left adjoint is continuous and every right adjoint is co-continuous (see e.g. [23]).

As explained in [19], property directed reachability (PDR) algorithms [5] exploits (KT) to try to prove the inequation and (K1) to refute it. In the algorithm we introduce in the next section, we further assume that b is of the form $f \sqcup i$ for some element $i \in L$ and map $f: L \rightarrow L$, namely $b(x) = f(x) \sqcup i$ for all $x \in L$. Moreover we require f to have a right adjoint $g: L \rightarrow L$. In this case

$$\mu(f \sqcup i) \sqsubseteq p \quad \text{iff} \quad i \sqsubseteq \nu(g \sqcap p) \quad (1)$$

(which is easily shown using the Knaster-Tarski theorem) and $(f \sqcup i)$ and $(g \sqcap p)$ are guaranteed to be (co)continuous. Since $f \dashv g$ and left and right adjoints preserve, resp., arbitrary joins and meets, then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(f \sqcup i)^n(\perp) = \bigsqcup_{j < n} f^j(i) \quad (g \sqcap p)^n(\top) = \bigsqcap_{j < n} g^j(p) \quad (2)$$

which by (K1) provide useful characterisations of least and greatest fixed points.

$$\mu(f \sqcup i) = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} f^n(i) \quad \nu(g \sqcap p) = \bigsqcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} g^n(p) \quad (\text{K1}\dashv)$$

We conclude this section with an example that we will often revisit. It also provides a justification for the intuitive terminology that we sporadically use.

Example 1 (Safety problem for transition systems). A transition system consists of a triple (S, I, δ) where S is a set of states, $I \subseteq S$ is a set of initial states, and $\delta: S \rightarrow \mathcal{P}S$ is a transition relation. Here $\mathcal{P}S$ denotes the powerset of S , which forms a complete lattice ordered by inclusion \sqsubseteq . By defining $F: \mathcal{P}S \rightarrow \mathcal{P}S$ as $F(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{s \in X} \delta(s)$ for all $X \in \mathcal{P}S$, one has that $\mu(F \cup I)$ is the set of all states reachable from I . Therefore, for any $P \in \mathcal{P}S$, representing some safety

$$\begin{array}{ll}
x_0 = \perp & \text{(I0)} \\
1 \leq k \leq n & \text{(I1)} \\
\forall j \in [0, n-2], x_j \sqsubseteq x_{j+1} & \text{(I2)} \\
i \sqsubseteq x_1 & \text{(P1)} \\
x_{n-2} \sqsubseteq p & \text{(P2)} \\
\forall j \in [0, n-2], f(x_j) \sqsubseteq x_{j+1} & \text{(P3)} \\
\forall j \in [0, n-2], x_j \sqsubseteq g(x_{j+1}) & \text{(P3a)} \\
\text{If } \mathbf{y} \neq \varepsilon \text{ then } p \sqsubseteq y_{n-1} & \text{(N1)} \\
\forall j \in [k, n-2], g(y_{j+1}) \sqsubseteq y_j & \text{(N2)} \\
\forall j \in [k, n-1], x_j \not\sqsubseteq y_j & \text{(PN)} \\
\forall j \in [0, n-1], (f \sqcup i)^j(\perp) \sqsubseteq x_j \sqsubseteq (g \sqcap p)^{n-1-j}(\top) & \text{(A1)} \\
\forall j \in [1, n-1], x_{j-1} \sqsubseteq g^{n-1-j}(p) & \text{(A2)} \\
\forall j \in [k, n-1], g^{n-1-j}(p) \sqsubseteq y_j & \text{(A3)}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 2. Invariants of AdjointPDR.

property, $\mu(F \cup I) \sqsubseteq P$ holds iff all reachable states are safe. It is worth to remark that F has a right adjoint $G: \mathcal{P}S \rightarrow \mathcal{P}S$ defined for all $X \in \mathcal{P}S$ as $G(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{s \mid \delta(s) \sqsubseteq X\}$. Thus by (1), $\mu(F \cup I) \sqsubseteq P$ iff $I \sqsubseteq \nu(G \cap P)$.

Consider the transition system in Fig. 1. Hereafter we write S_j for the set of states $\{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_j\}$ and we fix the set of safe states to be $P = S_5$. It is immediate to see that $\mu(F \cup I) = S_4 \sqsubseteq P$. Automatically, this can be checked with the initial chains of $(F \cup I)$ or with the final chain of $(G \cap P)$ displayed below on the left and on the right, respectively.

$$\emptyset \sqsubseteq I \sqsubseteq S_2 \sqsubseteq S_3 \sqsubseteq S_4 \sqsubseteq S_4 \sqsubseteq \dots \qquad \dots \sqsubseteq S_4 \sqsubseteq S_4 \sqsubseteq P \sqsubseteq S$$

The $(j+1)$ -th element of the initial chain contains all the states that can be reached by I in at most j transitions, while $(j+1)$ -th element of the final chain contains all the states that in at most j transitions reach safe states only.

3 Adjoint PDR

In this section we present AdjointPDR, an algorithm that takes in input a tuple (i, f, g, p) with $i, p \in L$ and $f \dashv g: L \rightarrow L$ and, if it terminates, it returns true whenever $\mu(f \sqcup i) \sqsubseteq p$ and false otherwise.

The algorithm manipulates two sequences of elements of L : $\mathbf{x} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}$ of length n and $\mathbf{y} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} y_0, \dots, y_{n-1}$ of length $n-1$. These satisfy, through the executions of AdjointPDR, the invariants in Fig. 2. Observe that, by (A1), x_j over-approximates the j -th element of the initial chain, namely $(f \sqcup i)^j(\perp) \sqsubseteq x_j$, while, by (A3), the j -indexed element y_j of \mathbf{y} over-approximates $g^{n-j-1}(p)$ that, borrowing the terminology of Example 1, is the set of states which are safe in $n-j-1$ transitions. Moreover, by (PN), the element y_j witnesses that x_j is unsafe, i.e., that $x_j \not\sqsubseteq g^{n-1-j}(p)$ or equivalently $f^{n-j-1}(x_j) \not\sqsubseteq p$. Notably, \mathbf{x} is a positive chain and \mathbf{y} a negative sequence, according to the definitions below.

Definition 2 (positive chain). A positive chain for $\mu(f \sqcup i) \sqsubseteq p$ is a finite chain $x_0 \sqsubseteq \dots \sqsubseteq x_{n-1}$ in L of length $n \geq 2$ which satisfies (P1), (P2), (P3) in Fig. 2. It is conclusive if $x_{j+1} \sqsubseteq x_j$ for some $j \leq n-2$.

In a conclusive positive chain, x_{j+1} provides an invariant for $f \sqcup i$ and thus, by (KT), $\mu(f \sqcup i) \sqsubseteq p$ holds. So, when \mathbf{x} is conclusive, AdjointPDR returns true.

```

AdjointPDR ( $i, f, g, p$ )

<INITIALISATION>
( $\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y}$ ) $_{n,k} := (\perp, \top \parallel \varepsilon)_{2,2}$ 
<ITERATION>                                     %  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$  not conclusive
  case ( $\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y}$ ) $_{n,k}$  of
     $\mathbf{y} = \varepsilon$  and  $x_{n-1} \sqsubseteq p$  :                %(Unfold)
      ( $\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y}$ ) $_{n,k} := (\mathbf{x}, \top \parallel \varepsilon)_{n+1, n+1}$ 
     $\mathbf{y} = \varepsilon$  and  $x_{n-1} \not\sqsubseteq p$  :                %(Candidate)
      choose  $z \in L$  such that  $x_{n-1} \not\sqsubseteq z$  and  $p \sqsubseteq z$ ;
      ( $\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y}$ ) $_{n,k} := (\mathbf{x} \parallel z)_{n, n-1}$ 
     $\mathbf{y} \neq \varepsilon$  and  $f(x_{k-1}) \not\sqsubseteq y_k$  :          %(Decide)
      choose  $z \in L$  such that  $x_{k-1} \not\sqsubseteq z$  and  $g(y_k) \sqsubseteq z$ ;
      ( $\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y}$ ) $_{n,k} := (\mathbf{x} \parallel z, \mathbf{y})_{n, k-1}$ 
     $\mathbf{y} \neq \varepsilon$  and  $f(x_{k-1}) \sqsubseteq y_k$  :          %(Conflict)
      choose  $z \in L$  such that  $z \sqsubseteq y_k$  and  $(f \sqcup i)(x_{k-1} \sqcap z) \sqsubseteq z$ ;
      ( $\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y}$ ) $_{n,k} := (\mathbf{x} \sqcap z \parallel \text{tail}(\mathbf{y}))_{n, k+1}$ 
  endcase
<TERMINATION>
  if  $\exists j \in [0, n-2]. x_{j+1} \sqsubseteq x_j$  then return true %  $\mathbf{x}$  conclusive
  if  $i \not\sqsubseteq y_1$  then return false %  $\mathbf{y}$  conclusive

```

Fig. 3. AdjointPDR algorithm checking $\mu(f \sqcup i) \sqsubseteq p$.

Definition 3 (negative sequence). A negative sequence for $\mu(f \sqcup i) \sqsubseteq p$ is a finite sequence y_k, \dots, y_{n-1} in L with $1 \leq k \leq n$ which satisfies (N1) and (N2) in Fig. 2. It is conclusive if $k = 1$ and $i \not\sqsubseteq y_1$.

When \mathbf{y} is conclusive, AdjointPDR returns false as y_1 provides a counterexample: (N1) and (N2) entail (A3) and thus $i \not\sqsubseteq y_1 \supseteq g^{n-2}(p)$. By (K1-), $g^{n-2}(p) \supseteq \nu(g \sqcap p)$ and thus $i \not\sqsubseteq \nu(g \sqcap p)$. By (1), $\mu(f \sqcup i) \not\sqsubseteq p$.

The pseudocode of the algorithm is displayed in Fig. 3, where we write $(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k}$ to compactly represent the state of the algorithm: the pair (n, k) is called the *index* of the state, with \mathbf{x} of length n and \mathbf{y} of length $n - k$. When $k = n$, \mathbf{y} is the empty sequence ε . For any $z \in L$, we write \mathbf{x}, z for the chain x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}, z of length $n + 1$ and z, \mathbf{y} for the sequence z, y_k, \dots, y_{n-1} of length $n - (k - 1)$. Moreover, we write $\mathbf{x} \sqcap z$ for the chain $x_0 \sqcap z, \dots, x_j \sqcap z, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{n-1}$. Finally, $\text{tail}(\mathbf{y})$ stands for the tail of \mathbf{y} , namely y_{k+1}, \dots, y_{n-1} of length $n - (k + 1)$.

The algorithm starts in the initial state $s_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\perp, \top \parallel \varepsilon)_{2,2}$ and, unless one of \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} is conclusive, iteratively applies one of the four mutually exclusive rules: (Unfold), (Candidate), (Decide) and (Conflict). The rule (Unfold) extends the positive chain by one element when the negative sequence is empty and the positive chain is under p ; since the element introduced by (Unfold) is \top , its application typically triggers rule (Candidate) that starts the negative sequence with an over-approximation of p . Recall that the role of y_j is to witness that x_j is unsafe. After (Candidate) either (Decide) or (Conflict) are possible: if y_k witnesses that, besides x_k , also $f(x_{k-1})$ is unsafe, then (Decide) is used to further extend the negative sequence to witness that x_{k-1} is unsafe; otherwise, the rule (Conflict) improves the precision of the positive chain in such a way that y_k no longer witnesses $x_k \sqcap z$ unsafe and, thus, the negative sequence is shortened.

Note that, in (Candidate), (Decide) and (Conflict), the element $z \in L$ is chosen among a set of possibilities, thus **AdjointPDR** is nondeterministic.

To illustrate the executions of the algorithm, we adopt a labeled transition system notation. Let $\mathcal{S} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k} \mid n \geq 2, k \leq n, \mathbf{x} \in L^n \text{ and } \mathbf{y} \in L^{n-k}\}$ be the set of all possible states of **AdjointPDR**. We call $(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k} \in \mathcal{S}$ *conclusive* if \mathbf{x} or \mathbf{y} are such. When $s \in \mathcal{S}$ is not conclusive, we write $s \xrightarrow{D}$ to mean that s satisfies the guards in the rule (Decide), and $s \xrightarrow{D}_z s'$ to mean that, being (Decide) applicable, **AdjointPDR** moves from state s to s' by choosing z . Similarly for the other rules: the labels Ca , Co and U stands for (Candidate), (Conflict) and (Unfold), respectively. When irrelevant we omit to specify labels and choices and we just write $s \rightarrow s'$. As usual \rightarrow^+ stands for the transitive closure of \rightarrow while \rightarrow^* stands for the reflexive and transitive closure of \rightarrow .

Example 4. Consider the safety problem in Example 1. Below we illustrate two possible computations of **AdjointPDR** that differ for the choice of z in (Conflict). The first run is conveniently represented as the following series of transitions.

$$\begin{aligned} & (\emptyset, S \parallel \varepsilon)_{2,2} \xrightarrow{Ca_P} (\emptyset, S \parallel P)_{2,1} \xrightarrow{Co_I} (\emptyset, I \parallel \varepsilon)_{2,2} \xrightarrow{U} (\emptyset, I, S \parallel \varepsilon)_{3,3} \xrightarrow{Ca_P} (\emptyset, I, S \parallel P)_{3,2} \\ & \xrightarrow{Co_{S_2}} (\emptyset, I, S_2 \parallel \varepsilon)_{3,3} \xrightarrow{U} \xrightarrow{Ca_P} (\emptyset, I, S_2, S \parallel P)_{4,3} \xrightarrow{Co_{S_3}} (\emptyset, I, S_2, S_3 \parallel \varepsilon)_{4,4} \xrightarrow{U} \xrightarrow{Ca_P} (\emptyset, I, S_2, S_3, S \parallel P)_{5,4} \\ & \xrightarrow{Co_{S_4}} (\emptyset, I, S_2, S_3, S_4 \parallel \varepsilon)_{5,5} \xrightarrow{U} \xrightarrow{Ca_P} (\emptyset, I, S_2, S_3, S_4, S \parallel P)_{6,5} \xrightarrow{Co_{S_4}} (\emptyset, I, S_2, S_3, S_4, S_4 \parallel \varepsilon)_{6,6} \end{aligned}$$

The last state returns true since $x_4 = x_5 = S_4$. Observe that the elements of \mathbf{x} , with the exception of the last element x_{n-1} , are those of the initial chain of $(F \cup I)$, namely, x_j is the set of states reachable in at most $j - 1$ steps. In the second computation, the elements of \mathbf{x} are roughly those of the final chain of $(G \cap P)$. More precisely, after (Unfold) or (Candidate), x_{n-j} for $j < n - 1$ is the set of states which only reach safe states within j steps.

$$\begin{aligned} & (\emptyset, S \parallel \varepsilon)_{2,2} \xrightarrow{Ca_P} (\emptyset, S \parallel P)_{2,1} \xrightarrow{Co_P} (\emptyset, P \parallel \varepsilon)_{2,2} \\ & \xrightarrow{U} \xrightarrow{Ca_P} (\emptyset, P, S \parallel P)_{3,2} \xrightarrow{D}_{S_4} (\emptyset, P, S \parallel S_4, P)_{3,1} \xrightarrow{Co_{S_4}} (\emptyset, S_4, S \parallel P)_{3,2} \xrightarrow{Co_P} (\emptyset, S_4, P \parallel \varepsilon)_{3,3} \\ & \xrightarrow{U} \xrightarrow{Ca_P} (\emptyset, S_4, P, S \parallel P)_{4,3} \xrightarrow{D}_{S_4} (\emptyset, S_4, P, S \parallel S_4, P)_{4,2} \xrightarrow{Co_{S_4}} (\emptyset, S_4, S_4, S \parallel P)_{4,3} \end{aligned}$$

Observe that, by invariant (A1), the values of \mathbf{x} in the two runs are, respectively, the least and the greatest values for all possible computations of **AdjointPDR**.

Theorem 5.1 follows by invariants (I2), (P1), (P3) and (KT); Theorem 5.2 by (N1), (N2) and (K1-). Note that both results hold for any choice of z .

Theorem 5 (Soundness). *AdjointPDR is sound. Namely,*

1. If **AdjointPDR** returns true then $\mu(f \sqcup i) \sqsubseteq p$.
2. If **AdjointPDR** returns false then $\mu(f \sqcup i) \not\sqsubseteq p$.

3.1 Progression

It is necessary to prove that in any step of the execution, if the algorithm does not return true or false, then it can progress to a new state, not yet visited. To this aim we must deal with the subtleties of the non-deterministic choice of the element z in (Candidate), (Decide) and (Conflict). The following proposition ensures that, for any of these three rules, there is always a possible choice.

Proposition 6 (Canonical choices). *The following are always possible:*

1. in (Candidate) $z = p$;
2. in (Decide) $z = g(y_k)$;
3. in (Conflict) $z = y_k$;
4. in (Conflict) $z = (f \sqcup i)(x_{k-1})$.

Thus, for all non-conclusive $s \in \mathcal{S}$, if $s_0 \rightarrow^* s$ then $s \rightarrow$.

Then, Proposition 7 ensures that `AdjointPDR` always traverses new states.

Proposition 7 (Impossibility of loops). *If $s_0 \rightarrow^* s \rightarrow^+ s'$, then $s \neq s'$.*

Observe that the above propositions entail that `AdjointPDR` terminates whenever the lattice L is finite, since the set of reachable states is finite in this case.

Example 8. For (I, F, G, P) as in Example 1, `AdjointPDR` behaves essentially as IC3/PDR [5], solving reachability problems for transition systems with finite state space S . Since the lattice \mathcal{PS} is also finite, `AdjointPDR` always terminates.

3.2 Heuristics

The nondeterministic choices of the algorithm can be resolved by using heuristics. Intuitively, a heuristic chooses for any states $s \in \mathcal{S}$ an element $z \in L$ to be possibly used in (Candidate), (Decide) or (Conflict), so it is just a function $h: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow L$. When defining a heuristic, we will avoid to specify its values on conclusive states or in those performing (Unfold), as they are clearly irrelevant.

With a heuristic, one can instantiate `AdjointPDR` by making the choice of z as prescribed by h . Syntactically, this means to erase from the code of Fig. 3 the three lines of `choose` and replace them by $z := h((\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{c})_{n,k})$. We call `AdjointPDRh` the resulting deterministic algorithm and write $s \rightarrow_h s'$ to mean that `AdjointPDRh` moves from state s to s' . We let $\mathcal{S}^h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{s \in \mathcal{S} \mid s_0 \rightarrow_h^* s\}$ be the sets of all states reachable by `AdjointPDRh`.

Definition 9 (legit heuristic). *A heuristic $h: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow L$ is called legit whenever for all $s, s' \in \mathcal{S}^h$, if $s \rightarrow_h s'$ then $s \rightarrow s'$.*

When h is legit, the only execution of the deterministic algorithm `AdjointPDRh` is one of the possible executions of the non-deterministic algorithm `AdjointPDR`.

The canonical choices provide two legit heuristics: first, we call *simple* any legit heuristic h that chooses z in (Candidate) and (Decide) as in Proposition 6:

$$(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k} \mapsto \begin{cases} p & \text{if } (\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k} \xrightarrow{C^a} \\ g(y_k) & \text{if } (\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k} \xrightarrow{D} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Then, if the choice in (Conflict) is like in Proposition 6.4, we call h *initial*; if it is like in Proposition 6.3, we call h *final*. Shortly, the two legit heuristics are:

<i>simple initial</i>	(3) and $(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k} \mapsto (f \sqcup i)(x_{k-1})$ if $(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k} \in Co$
<i>simple final</i>	(3) and $(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k} \mapsto y_k$ if $(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k} \in Co$

Interestingly, with any simple heuristic, the sequence \mathbf{y} takes a familiar shape:

Proposition 10. *Let $h: S \rightarrow L$ be any simple heuristic. For all $(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k} \in \mathcal{S}^h$, invariant (A3) holds as an equality, namely for all $j \in [k, n-1]$, $y_j = g^{n-1-j}(p)$.*

By the above proposition and (A3), the negative sequence \mathbf{y} occurring in the execution of AdjointPDR_h , for a simple heuristic h , is the least amongst all the negative sequences occurring in any execution of AdjointPDR .

Instead, invariant (A1) informs us that the positive chain \mathbf{x} is always in between the initial chain of $f \sqcup i$ and the final chain of $g \sqcap p$. Such values of \mathbf{x} are obtained by, respectively, simple initial and simple final heuristic.

Example 11. Consider the two runs of AdjointPDR in Example 4. The first one exploits the simple initial heuristic and indeed, the positive chain \mathbf{x} coincides with the initial chain. Analogously, the second run uses the simple final heuristic.

3.3 Negative Termination

When the lattice L is not finite, AdjointPDR may not terminate, since checking $\mu(f \sqcup i) \sqsubseteq p$ is not always decidable. In this section, we show that the use of certain heuristics can guarantee termination whenever $\mu(f \sqcup i) \not\sqsubseteq p$.

The key insight is the following: if $\mu(f \sqcup i) \not\sqsubseteq p$ then by (K1), there should exist some $\tilde{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(f \sqcup i)^{\tilde{n}}(\perp) \not\sqsubseteq p$. By (A1), the rule (Unfold) can be applied only when $(f \sqcup i)^{n-1}(\perp) \sqsubseteq x_{n-1} \sqsubseteq p$. Since (Unfold) increases n and n is never decreased by other rules, then (Unfold) can be applied at most \tilde{n} times.

The elements of negative sequences are introduced by rules (Candidate) and (Decide). If we guarantee that for any index (n, k) the heuristic in such cases returns a finite number of values for z , then one can prove termination. To make this formal, we fix $\text{CaD}_{n,k}^h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k} \in \mathcal{S}^h \mid (\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k} \xrightarrow{Ca} \text{ or } (\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k} \xrightarrow{D}\}$, i.e., the set of all (n, k) -indexed states reachable by AdjointPDR_h that trigger (Candidate) or (Decide), and $h(\text{CaD}_{n,k}^h) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{h(s) \mid s \in \text{CaD}_{n,k}^h\}$, i.e., the set of all possible values returned by h in such states.

Theorem 12 (Negative termination). *Let h be a legit heuristic. If $h(\text{CaD}_{n,k}^h)$ is finite for all n, k and $\mu(f \sqcup i) \not\sqsubseteq p$, then AdjointPDR_h terminates.*

Corollary 13. *Let h be a simple heuristic. If $\mu(f \sqcup i) \not\sqsubseteq p$, then AdjointPDR_h terminates.*

Note that this corollary ensures negative termination whenever we use the canonical choices in (Candidate) and (Decide) *irrespective of the choice for (Conflict)*, therefore it holds for both simple initial and simple final heuristics.

4 Recovering Adjoints with Lower Sets

In the previous section, we have introduced an algorithm for checking $\mu b \sqsubseteq p$ whenever b is of the form $f \sqcup i$ for an element $i \in L$ and a left-adjoint $f: L \rightarrow L$. This, unfortunately, is not the case for several interesting problems, like the max reachability problem [1] that we will illustrate in Section 5.

The next result informs us that, under standard assumptions, one can transfer the problem of checking $\mu b \sqsubseteq p$ to lower sets, where adjoints can always be defined. Recall that, for a lattice (L, \sqsubseteq) , a *lower set* is a subset $X \subseteq L$ such that if $x \in X$ and $x' \sqsubseteq x$ then $x' \in X$; the set of lower sets of L forms a complete lattice $(L^\downarrow, \sqsubseteq)$ with joins and meets given by union and intersection; as expected \perp is \emptyset and \top is L . Given $b: L \rightarrow L$, one can define two functions $b^\downarrow, b_r^\downarrow: L^\downarrow \rightarrow L^\downarrow$ as $b^\downarrow(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} b(X)^\downarrow$ and $b_r^\downarrow(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \mid b(x) \in X\}$. It holds that $b^\downarrow \dashv b_r^\downarrow$.

$$b \circlearrowleft (L, \sqsubseteq) \xleftarrow[\begin{smallmatrix} \sqcup \\ \perp \\ (-)^\downarrow \end{smallmatrix}]{\sqcup} (L^\downarrow, \sqsubseteq) \circlearrowright b^\downarrow \dashv b_r^\downarrow \quad (4)$$

In the diagram above, $(-)^{\downarrow}: x \mapsto \{x' \mid x' \sqsubseteq x\}$ and $\sqcup: L^\downarrow \rightarrow L$ maps a lower set X into $\sqcup\{x \mid x \in X\}$. The maps \sqcup and $(-)^{\downarrow}$ form a *Galois insertion*, namely $\sqcup \dashv (-)^{\downarrow}$ and $\sqcup(-)^{\downarrow} = \text{id}$, and thus one can think of (4) in terms of *abstract interpretation* [8, 9]: L^\downarrow represents the concrete domain, L the abstract domain and b is a sound abstraction of b^\downarrow . Most importantly, it turns out that b is *forward-complete* [4, 14] w.r.t. b^\downarrow , namely the following equation holds.

$$(-)^{\downarrow} \circ b = b^\downarrow \circ (-)^{\downarrow} \quad (5)$$

Proposition 14. *Let (L, \sqsubseteq) be a complete lattice, $p \in L$ and $b: L \rightarrow L$ be a ω -continuous map. Then $\mu b \sqsubseteq p$ iff $\mu(b^\downarrow \cup \perp^\downarrow) \sqsubseteq p^\downarrow$.*

By means of Proposition 14, we can thus solve $\mu b \sqsubseteq p$ in L by running **AdjointPDR** on $(\perp^\downarrow, b^\downarrow, b_r^\downarrow, p^\downarrow)$. Hereafter, we tacitly assume that b is ω -continuous.

4.1 AdjointPDR $^\downarrow$: Positive Chain in L , Negative Sequence in L^\downarrow

While **AdjointPDR** on $(\perp^\downarrow, b^\downarrow, b_r^\downarrow, p^\downarrow)$ might be computationally expensive, it is the first step toward the definition of an efficient algorithm that exploits a convenient form of the positive chain.

A lower set $X \in L^\downarrow$ is said to be a *principal* if $X = x^\downarrow$ for some $x \in L$. Observe that the top of the lattice $(L^\downarrow, \sqsubseteq)$ is a principal, namely \top^\downarrow , and that the meet (intersection) of two principals x^\downarrow and y^\downarrow is the principal $(x \sqcap y)^\downarrow$.

Suppose now that, in (Conflict), **AdjointPDR** $(\perp^\downarrow, b^\downarrow, b_r^\downarrow, p^\downarrow)$ always chooses principals rather than arbitrary lower sets. This suffices to guarantee that all the elements of \mathbf{x} are principals (with the only exception of x_0 which is constantly the bottom element of L^\downarrow that, note, is \emptyset and not \perp^\downarrow). In fact, the elements of \mathbf{x} are all obtained by (Unfold), that adds the principal \top^\downarrow , and by (Conflict), that takes their meets with the chosen principal.

Since principals are in bijective correspondence with the elements of L , by imposing to **AdjointPDR** $(\perp^\downarrow, b^\downarrow, b_r^\downarrow, p^\downarrow)$ to choose a principal in (Conflict), we obtain an algorithm, named **AdjointPDR** $^\downarrow$, where the elements of the positive chain are drawn from L , while the negative sequence is taken in L^\downarrow . The algorithm is reported in Fig. 4 where we use the notation $(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{Y})_{n,k}$ to emphasize that the elements of the negative sequence are lower sets of elements in L .

```

AdjointPDR↓(b,p)
<INITIALISATION>
(x||Y)n,k := (∅, ⊥, T||ε)3,3
<ITERATION>
case (x||Y)n,k of
  Y = ε and xn-1 ⊆ p : % x, Y not conclusive
                        % (Unfold)
                        (x||Y)n,k := (x, T||ε)n+1,n+1
  Y = ε and xn-1 ⊈ p : % (Candidate)
                        choose Z ∈ L↓ such that xn-1 ∉ Z and p ∈ Z;
                        (x||Y)n,k := (x||Z)n,n-1
  Y ≠ ε and b(xk-1) ∉ Yk : % (Decide)
                        choose Z ∈ L↓ such that xk-1 ∉ Z and b↓k(Yk) ⊆ Z;
                        (x||Y)n,k := (x||Z, Y)n,k-1
  Y ≠ ε and b(xk-1) ∈ Yk : % (Conflict)
                        choose z ∈ L such that z ∈ Yk and b(xk-1 ⊓ z) ⊆ z;
                        (x||Y)n,k := (x ⊓k z || tail(Y))n,k+1
endcase
<TERMINATION>
if ∃j ∈ [0, n-2]. xj+1 ⊆ xj then return true % x conclusive
if Y1 = ∅ then return false % Y conclusive

```

Fig. 4. The algorithm $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ for checking $\mu b \sqsubseteq p$: the elements of negative sequence are in L^\downarrow , while those of the positive chain are in L , with the only exception of x_0 which is constantly the bottom lower set \emptyset . For x_0 , we fix $b(x_0) = \perp$.

All definitions and results illustrated in Section 3 for AdjointPDR are inherited⁴ by $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$, with the only exception of Proposition 6.3. The latter does not hold, as it prescribes a choice for (Conflict) that may not be a principal. In contrast, the choice in Proposition 6.4 is, thanks to (5), a principal. This means in particular that the simple initial heuristic is always applicable.

Theorem 15. *All results in Section 3, but Prop. 6.3, hold for $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$.*

4.2 $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ simulates LT-PDR

The closest approach to AdjointPDR and $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ is the lattice-theoretic extension of the original PDR, called LT-PDR [19]. While these algorithms exploit essentially the same positive chain to find an invariant, the main difference lies in the sequence used to witness the existence of some counterexamples.

Definition 16 (Kleene sequence, from [19]). *A sequence $\mathbf{c} = c_k, \dots, c_{n-1}$ of elements of L is a Kleene sequence if the conditions (C1) and (C2) below hold. It is conclusive if also condition (C0) holds.*

$$(C0) \ c_1 \sqsubseteq b(\perp), \quad (C1) \ c_{n-1} \not\sqsubseteq p, \quad (C2) \ \forall j \in [k, n-2]. \ c_{j+1} \sqsubseteq b(c_j).$$

LT-PDR tries to construct an under-approximation c_{n-1} of $b^{n-2}(\perp)$ that violates the property p . The Kleene sequence is constructed by trial and error, starting by some arbitrary choice of c_{n-1} .

⁴ Up to a suitable renaming: the domain is $(L^\downarrow, \sqsubseteq)$ instead of (L, \sqsubseteq) , the parameters are $\perp^\downarrow, b^\downarrow, b_r^\downarrow, p^\downarrow$ instead of i, f, g, p and the negative sequence is \mathbf{Y} instead of \mathbf{y} .

AdjointPDR crucially differs from **LT-PDR** in the search for counterexamples: **LT-PDR** under-approximates the final chain while **AdjointPDR** over-approximates it. The algorithms are thus incomparable. However, we can draw a formal correspondence between **AdjointPDR**[↓] and **LT-PDR** by showing that **AdjointPDR**[↓] simulates **LT-PDR**, but cannot be simulated by **LT-PDR**. In fact, **AdjointPDR**[↓] exploits the existence of the adjoint to start from an over-approximation Y_{n-1} of p^\downarrow and computes backward an over-approximation of the set of safe states. Thus, the key difference comes from the strategy to look for a counterexample: to prove $\mu b \not\sqsubseteq p$, **AdjointPDR**[↓] tries to find Y_{n-1} satisfying $p \in Y_{n-1}$ and $\mu b \notin Y_{n-1}$ while **LT-PDR** tries to find c_{n-1} s.t. $c_{n-1} \not\sqsubseteq p$ and $c_{n-1} \sqsubseteq \mu b$.

Theorem 17 below states that any execution of **LT-PDR** can be mimicked by **AdjointPDR**[↓]. The proof exploits a map from **LT-PDR**'s Kleene sequences \mathbf{c} to **AdjointPDR**[↓]'s negative sequences $\mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c})$ of a particular form. Let (L^\uparrow, \supseteq) be the complete lattice of upper sets, namely subsets $X \subseteq L$ such that $X = X^\uparrow \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x' \in L \mid \exists x \in X. x \sqsubseteq x'\}$. There is an isomorphism $\neg: (L^\uparrow, \supseteq) \xrightarrow{\cong} (L^\downarrow, \subseteq)$ mapping each $X \subseteq S$ into its complement. For a Kleene sequence $\mathbf{c} = c_k, \dots, c_{n-1}$ of **LT-PDR**, the sequence $\mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \neg(\{c_k\}^\uparrow), \dots, \neg(\{c_{n-1}\}^\uparrow)$ is a negative sequence, in the sense of Definition 3, for **AdjointPDR**[↓]. Most importantly, the assignment $\mathbf{c} \mapsto \mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c})$ extends to a function, from the states of **LT-PDR** to those of **AdjointPDR**[↓], that is proved to be a *strong simulation* [24].

Theorem 17. *AdjointPDR*[↓] *simulates LT-PDR.*

Remarkably, **AdjointPDR**[↓]'s negative sequences are not limited to the images of **LT-PDR**'s Kleene sequences: they are more general than the complement of the upper closure of a singleton. In fact, a single negative sequence of **AdjointPDR**[↓] can represent *multiple* Kleene sequences of **LT-PDR** at once. Intuitively, this means that a single execution of **AdjointPDR**[↓] can correspond to multiple runs of **LT-PDR**. We can make this formal by means of the following result.

Proposition 18. *Let $\{\mathbf{c}^m\}_{m \in M}$ be a family of Kleene sequences. Then its pointwise intersection $\bigcap_{m \in M} \mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c}^m)$ is a negative sequence.*

The above intersection is pointwise in the sense that, for all $j \in [k, n-1]$, it holds $(\bigcap_{m \in M} \mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c}^m))_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcap_{m \in M} (\mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c}^m))_j = \neg(\{c_j^m \mid m \in M\}^\uparrow)$: intuitively, this is (up to $\mathbf{neg}(\cdot)$) a set containing all the M counterexamples. Note that, if the negative sequence of **AdjointPDR**[↓] makes (A3) hold as an equality, as it is possible with any simple heuristic (see Proposition 10), then its complement contains *all* Kleene sequences possibly computed by **LT-PDR**.

Proposition 19. *Let \mathbf{c} be a Kleene sequence and \mathbf{Y} be the negative sequence s.t. $Y_j = (b_r^\downarrow)^{n-1-j}(p^\downarrow)$ for all $j \in [k, n-1]$. Then $c_j \in \neg(Y_j)$ for all $j \in [k, n-1]$.*

While the previous result suggests that simple heuristics are always the best in theory, as they can carry all counterexamples, this is often not the case in practice, since they might be computationally hard and outperformed by some smart over-approximations. An example is given by (6) in the next section.

5 Instantiating AdjointPDR[↓] for MDPs

In this section we illustrate how to use AdjointPDR[↓] to address the max reachability problem [1] for Markov Decision Processes.

A *Markov Decision Process* (MDP) is a tuple (A, S, s_i, δ) where A is a set of labels, S is a set of states, $s_i \in S$ is an initial state, and $\delta: S \times A \rightarrow \mathcal{DS} + 1$ is a transition function. Here \mathcal{DS} is the set of probability distributions over S , namely functions $d: S \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\sum_{s \in S} d(s) = 1$, and $\mathcal{DS} + 1$ is the disjoint union of \mathcal{DS} and $1 = \{*\}$. The transition function δ assigns to every label $a \in A$ and to every state $s \in S$ either a distribution of states or $*$ $\in 1$. We assume that both S and A are finite sets and that the set $Act(s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a \in A \mid \delta(s, a) \neq *\}$ of actions enabled at s is non-empty for all states.

Intuitively, the *max reachability problem* requires to check whether the probability of reaching some bad states $\beta \subseteq S$ is less than or equal to a given threshold $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Formally, it can be expressed in lattice theoretic terms, by considering the lattice $([0, 1]^S, \leq)$ of all functions $d: S \rightarrow [0, 1]$, often called frames, ordered pointwise. The max reachability problem consists in checking $\mu b \leq p$ for $p \in [0, 1]^S$ and $b: [0, 1]^S \rightarrow [0, 1]^S$, defined for all $d \in [0, 1]^S$ and $s \in S$, as

$$p(s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \lambda & \text{if } s = s_i, \\ 1 & \text{if } s \neq s_i, \end{cases} \quad b(d)(s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s \in \beta, \\ \max_{a \in Act(s)} \sum_{s' \in S} d(s') \cdot \delta(s, a)(s') & \text{if } s \notin \beta. \end{cases}$$

The reader is referred to [1] for all details.

Since b is not of the form $f \sqcup i$ for a left adjoint f (see e.g. [19]), rather than using AdjointPDR, one can exploit AdjointPDR[↓]. Beyond the simple initial heuristic, which is always applicable and enjoys negative termination, we illustrate now two additional heuristics that are experimentally tested in Section 6.

The two novel heuristics make the same choices in (Candidate) and (Decide). They exploit functions $\alpha: S \rightarrow A$, also known as memoryless schedulers, and the function $b_\alpha: [0, 1]^S \rightarrow [0, 1]^S$ defined for all $d \in [0, 1]^S$ and $s \in S$ as follows:

$$b_\alpha(d)(s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s \in \beta, \\ \sum_{s' \in S} d(s') \cdot \delta(s, \alpha(s))(s') & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since for all $D \in ([0, 1]^S)^\downarrow$, $b_r^\downarrow(D) = \{d \mid b(d) \in D\} = \bigcap_\alpha \{d \mid b_\alpha(d) \in D\}$ and since AdjointPDR[↓] executes (Decide) only when $b(x_{k-1}) \notin Y_k$, there should exist some α such that $b_\alpha(x_{k-1}) \notin Y_k$. One can thus fix


$$(x \parallel \mathbf{Y})_{n,k} \mapsto \begin{cases} p^\downarrow & \text{if } (x \parallel \mathbf{Y})_{n,k} \xrightarrow{C_\alpha} \\ \{d \mid b_\alpha(d) \in Y_k\} & \text{if } (x \parallel \mathbf{Y})_{n,k} \xrightarrow{D} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Intuitively, such choices are smart refinements of those in (3): for (Candidate) they are exactly the same; for (Decide) rather than taking $b_r^\downarrow(Y_k)$, we consider a larger lower-set determined by the labels chosen by α . This allows to represent

each Y_j as a set of $d \in [0, 1]^S$ satisfying a *single* linear inequality, while using $b_r^\downarrow(Y_k)$ would yield a systems of possibly exponentially many inequalities (see Example 21 below). Moreover, from Theorem 12, it follows that such choices ensures negative termination.

Corollary 20. *Let h be a legit heuristic defined for (Candidate) and (Decide) as in (6). If $\mu b \not\leq p$, then $\text{AdjointPDR}_h^\downarrow$ terminates.*

Example 21. Consider the maximum reachability problem with threshold $\lambda = \frac{1}{4}$ and $\beta = \{s_3\}$ for the following MDP on alphabet $A = \{a, b\}$ and $s_i = s_0$.



Hereafter we write $d \in [0, 1]^S$ as column vectors with four entries $v_0 \dots v_3$ and we will use \cdot for the usual matrix multiplication. With this notation, the lower set $p^\downarrow \in ([0, 1]^S)^\downarrow$ and $b: [0, 1]^S \rightarrow [0, 1]^S$ can be written as

$$p^\downarrow = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \mid [1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \leq [\frac{1}{4}] \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad b\left(\begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix}\right) = \begin{bmatrix} \max(\frac{v_1+v_2}{2}, \frac{v_0+2v_2}{3}) \\ \frac{v_0+v_3}{2} \\ v_0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Amongst the several memoryless schedulers, only two are relevant for us: $\zeta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (s_0 \mapsto a, s_1 \mapsto a, s_2 \mapsto b, s_3 \mapsto a)$ and $\xi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (s_0 \mapsto b, s_1 \mapsto a, s_2 \mapsto b, s_3 \mapsto a)$. By using the definition of $b_\alpha: [0, 1]^S \rightarrow [0, 1]^S$, we have that

$$b_\zeta\left(\begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix}\right) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{v_1+v_2}{2} \\ \frac{v_0+v_3}{2} \\ v_0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad b_\xi\left(\begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix}\right) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{v_0+2v_2}{3} \\ \frac{v_0+v_3}{2} \\ v_0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is immediate to see that the problem has negative answer, since using ζ in 4 steps or less, s_0 can reach s_3 already with probability $\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8}$.

To illustrate the advantages of (6), we run $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ with the simple initial heuristic and with the heuristic that only differs for the choice in (Decide), taken as in (6). For both heuristics, the first iterations are the same: several repetitions of (Candidate), (Conflict) and (Unfold) exploiting elements of the positive chain that form the initial chain (except for the last element x_{n-1}).

$$\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon\right)_{3,3} \xrightarrow{C_a C_o} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon\right)_{3,3} \xrightarrow{U C_a C_o U C_a C_o U C_a C_o U C_a} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{4} \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow\right)_{7,6}.$$

In the latter state the algorithm has to perform (Decide), since $b(x_5) \notin p^\downarrow$. Now the choice of z in (Decide) is different for the two heuristics: the former uses $b_r^\downarrow(p^\downarrow) = \{d \mid b(d) \in p^\downarrow\}$, the latter uses $\{d \mid b_\zeta(d) \in p^\downarrow\}$. Despite the different choices, both the heuristics proceed with 6 steps of (Decide):

$$\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{4} \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \mathcal{F}^0\right)_{7,6} \xrightarrow{D D D D} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{4} \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \mathcal{F}^5, \mathcal{F}^4, \mathcal{F}^3, \mathcal{F}^2, \mathcal{F}^1, \mathcal{F}^0\right)_{7,1}$$

$$\begin{array}{l}
\mathcal{F}^0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \mid [1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{4} \rfloor \end{array} \right\} \\
\mathcal{F}^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \mid \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{4} \rfloor \end{array} \right\} \\
\mathcal{F}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \mid \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 4 & 0 & 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{4} \rfloor \end{array} \right\} \\
\mathcal{F}^3 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \mid \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\ 3 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 13 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 2 & 2 & 0 \\ 10 & 3 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{4} \rfloor \end{array} \right\} \\
\mathcal{F}^4 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \mid \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{array} \right\} \\
\mathcal{F}^5 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \emptyset
\end{array} \quad \left| \quad \begin{array}{l}
\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \mid [1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{4} \rfloor \end{array} \right\} \\
\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \mid [0 \ \frac{1}{2} \ \frac{1}{2} \ 0] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{4} \rfloor \end{array} \right\} \\
\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \mid [\frac{3}{4} \ 0 \ 0 \ \frac{1}{4}] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{4} \rfloor \end{array} \right\} \\
\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \mid [0 \ \frac{3}{4} \ \frac{3}{4} \ 0] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \leq \lfloor 0 \rfloor \end{array} \right\} \\
\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \mid [\frac{9}{16} \ 0 \ 0 \ \frac{3}{16}] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \leq \lfloor 0 \rfloor \end{array} \right\} \\
\emptyset
\end{array}
\right.
\end{array}$$

Fig. 5. The elements of the negative sequences computed by $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ for the MDP in Example 21. In the central column, these elements are computed by means of the simple initial heuristics, that is $\mathcal{F}^i = (b_r^\downarrow)^i(p^\downarrow)$. In the rightmost column, these elements are computed using the heuristic in (6). In particular $\mathcal{F}^i = \{d \mid b_\zeta(d) \in \mathcal{F}^{i-1}\}$ for $i \leq 3$, while for $i \geq 4$ these are computed as $\mathcal{F}^i = \{d \mid b_\xi(d) \in \mathcal{F}^{i-1}\}$.

The element of the negative sequence \mathcal{F}^i are illustrated in Fig. 5 for both the heuristics. In both cases, $\mathcal{F}^5 = \emptyset$ and thus $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ returns false.

To appreciate the advantages provided by (6), it is enough to compare the two columns for the \mathcal{F}^i in Fig. 5: in the central column, the number of inequalities defining \mathcal{F}^i significantly grows, while in the rightmost column is always 1.

Whenever Y_k is generated by a single linear inequality, we observe that $Y_k = \{d \in [0, 1]^S \mid \sum_{s \in S} (r_s \cdot d(s)) \leq r\}$ for suitable non-negative real numbers r and r_s for all $s \in S$. The convex set Y_k is generated by finitely many $d \in [0, 1]^S$ enjoying a convenient property: $d(s)$ is different from 0 and 1 only for at most one $s \in S$. The set of its generators, denoted by \mathcal{G}_k , can thus be easily computed. We exploit this property to resolve the choice for (Conflict). We consider its subset $\mathcal{Z}_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{d \in \mathcal{G}_k \mid b(x_{k-1}) \leq d\}$ and define $z_B, z_{01} \in [0, 1]^S$ for all $s \in S$ as


$$z_B(s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} (\bigwedge \mathcal{Z}_k)(s) & \text{if } r_s \neq 0, \mathcal{Z}_k \neq \emptyset \\ b(x_{k-1})(s) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad z_{01}(s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \lceil z_B(s) \rceil & \text{if } r_s = 0, \mathcal{Z}_k \neq \emptyset \\ z_B(s) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where, for $u \in [0, 1]$, $\lceil u \rceil$ denotes 0 if $u = 0$ and 1 otherwise. We call **hCoB** and **hCo01** the heuristics defined as in (6) for (Candidate) and (Decide) and as z_B , respectively z_{01} , for (Conflict). The heuristics **hCo01** can be seen as a Boolean modification of **hCoB**, rounding up positive values to 1 to accelerate convergence.

Proposition 22. *The heuristics **hCoB** and **hCo01** are legit.*

By Corollary 20, $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ terminates for negative answers with both **hCoB** and **hCo01**. We conclude this section with a last example.

Example 23. Consider the following MDP with alphabet $A = \{a, b\}$ and $s_i = s_0$



and the max reachability problem with threshold $\lambda = \frac{2}{5}$ and $\beta = \{s_3\}$. The lower set $p^\downarrow \in ([0, 1]^S)^\downarrow$ and $b: [0, 1]^S \rightarrow [0, 1]^S$ can be written as

$$p^\downarrow = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \mid [1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \leq \left[\frac{2}{5} \right] \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad b\left(\begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} \max(v_0, \frac{v_1+v_2}{2}) \\ \frac{v_0+2 \cdot v_3}{3} \\ \frac{v_2}{1} \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

With the simple initial heuristic, $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ does not terminate. With the heuristic hCo01 , it returns true in 14 steps, while with hCoB in 8. The first 4 steps, common to both hCoB and hCo01 , are illustrated below.

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon \right)_{3,3} \xrightarrow{C_a} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow \right)_{3,2} \xrightarrow{C_b} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{2}{5} \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon \right)_{3,3} & b\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathcal{Z}_2 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2}{5} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2}{5} \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2}{5} \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2}{5} \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\} \\ \xrightarrow{U} \xrightarrow{C_a} & \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{2}{5} \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow \right)_{4,3} \xrightarrow{C_b} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{2}{5} & \frac{2}{5} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon \right)_{4,4} & \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{2}{5} \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon \right)_{4,4} & b\left(\begin{bmatrix} \frac{2}{5} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2}{5} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathcal{Z}_3 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2}{5} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2}{5} \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Observe that in the first (Conflict) $z_B = z_{01}$, while in the second $z_{01}(s_1) = 1$ and $z_B(s_1) = \frac{4}{5}$, leading to the two different states prefixed by vertical lines.

6 Implementation and Experiments

We first developed, using Haskell and exploiting its abstraction features, a common template that accommodates both AdjointPDR and $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$. It is a program parametrized by two lattices—used for positive chains and negative sequences, respectively—and by a heuristic.

For our experiments, we instantiated the template to $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ for MDPs (letting $L = [0, 1]^S$), with three different heuristics: hCoB and hCo01 from Proposition 22; and hCoS introduced below. Besides the template (~ 100 lines), we needed ~ 140 lines to account for hCoB and hCo01 , and additional ~ 100 lines to further obtain hCoS . All this indicates a clear benefit of our abstract theory: a general template can itself be coded succinctly; instantiation to concrete problems is easy, too, thanks to an explicitly specified interface of heuristics.

Our implementation accepts MDPs expressed in a symbolic format inspired by Prism models [20], in which states are variable valuations and transitions are described by symbolic functions (they can be segmented with symbolic guards $\{\text{guard}_i\}_i$). We use rational arithmetic (Rational in Haskell) for probabilities to limit the impact of rounding errors.

Heuristics. The three heuristics (hCoB , hCo01 , hCoS) use the same choices in (Candidate) and (Decide), as defined in (6), but different ones in (Conflict).

The third heuristic **hCoS** is a *symbolic* variant of **hCoB**; it relies on our symbolic model format. It uses z_S for z in (Conflict), where $z_S(s) = z_B(s)$ if $r_s \neq 0$ or $Z_k = \emptyset$. The definition of $z_S(s)$ otherwise is notable: we use a piecewise affine function $(t_i \cdot s + u_i)_i$ for $z_S(s)$, where the affine functions $(t_i \cdot s + u_i)_i$ are guarded by the same guards $\{\text{guard}_i\}_i$ of the MDP’s transition function. We let the SMT solver Z3 [25] search for the values of the coefficients t_i, u_i , so that z_S satisfies the requirements of (Conflict) (namely $b(x_{k-1})(s) \leq z_S(s) \leq 1$ for each $s \in S$ with $r_s = 0$), together with the condition $b(z_S) \leq z_S$ for faster convergence. If the search is unsuccessful, we give up **hCoS** and fall back on the heuristic **hCoB**.

As a task common to the three heuristics, we need to calculate $Z_k = \{d \in \mathcal{G}_k \mid b(x_{k-1}) \leq d\}$ in (Conflict) (see (7)). Rather than computing the whole set \mathcal{G}_k of generating points of the linear inequality that defines Y_k , we implemented an ad-hoc algorithm that crucially exploits the condition $b(x_{k-1}) \leq d$ for pruning.

Experiment Settings. We conducted the experiments on Ubuntu 18.04 and AWS t2.xlarge (4 CPUs, 16 GB memory, up to 3.0 GHz Intel Scalable Processor). We used several Markov chain (MC) benchmarks and a couple of MDP ones.

Research Questions. We wish to address the following questions.

- RQ1** Does **AdjointPDR**[↓] advance the state-of-the-art performance of *PDR* algorithms for probabilistic model checking?
- RQ2** How does **AdjointPDR**[↓]’s performance compare against *non-PDR* algorithms for probabilistic model checking?
- RQ3** Does the theoretical framework of **AdjointPDR**[↓] successfully guide the discovery of various heuristics with practical performance?
- RQ4** Does **AdjointPDR**[↓] successfully manage nondeterminism in MDPs (that is absent in MCs)?

Experiments on MCs (Table 1). We used six benchmarks: Haddad-Monmege is from [17]; the others are from [3, 19]. We compared **AdjointPDR**[↓] (with three heuristics) against LT-PDR [19], PrIC3 (with four heuristics *none*, *lin.*, *pol.*, *hyb.*, see [3]), and Storm 1.5 [11]. Storm is a recent comprehensive toolsuite that implements different algorithms and solvers. Among them, our comparison is against *sparse-numeric*, *sparse-rational*, and *sparse-sound*. The *sparse* engine uses explicit state space representation by sparse matrices; this is unlike another representative *dd* engine that uses symbolic BDDs. (We did not use *dd* since it often reported errors, and was overall slower than *sparse*.) *Sparse-numeric* is a value-iteration (VI) algorithm; *sparse-rational* solves linear (in)equations using rational arithmetic; *sparse-sound* is a sound VI algorithm [26].⁵

Experiments on MDPs (Table 2). We used two benchmarks from [17]. We compared **AdjointPDR**[↓] only against Storm, since RQ1 is already addressed using MCs (besides, PrIC3 did not run for MDPs).

Discussion. The experimental results suggest the following answers to the RQs.

⁵ There are another two sound algorithms in Storm: one that utilizes interval iteration [2] and the other does optimistic VI [16]. We have excluded them from the results since we observed that they returned incorrect answers.

Table 1. Experimental results on MC benchmarks. $|S|$ is the number of states, P is the reachability probability (calculated by manual inspection), λ is the threshold in the problem $P \leq? \lambda$ (shaded if the answer is no). The other columns show the average execution time in seconds; TO is timeout (900 s); MO is out-of-memory. For **AdjointPDR[↓]** and LT-PDR we used the **tasty-bench** Haskell package and repeated executions until std. dev. is $< 5\%$ (at least three execs). For PrIC3 and Storm, we made five executions. Storm’s execution does not depend on λ : it seems to answer queries of the form $P \leq? \lambda$ by calculating P . We observed a wrong answer for the entry with (†) (Storm, sp.-num., Haddad-Monmege); see the discussion of RQ2.

Benchmark	$ S $	P	λ	AdjointPDR [↓]			LT-PDR	PrIC3				Storm		
				hCoB	hCoO1	hCoS		none	lin.	pol.	hyb.	sp.-num.	sp.-rat.	sp.-sd.
Grid	10^2	0.033	0.3	0.013	0.022	0.659	0.343	1.383	23.301	MO	MO	0.010	0.010	0.010
			0.2	0.013	0.031	0.657	0.519	1.571	26.668	TO	MO			
	10^3	<0.001	0.3	1.156	2.187	5.633	126.441	TO	TO	TO	MO	0.010	0.017	0.011
			0.2	1.146	2.133	5.632	161.667	TO	TO	TO	MO			
BRP	10^3	0.035	0.1	12.909	7.969	55.788	TO	TO	MO	MO	0.012	0.018	0.011	
			0.005	1.977	8.111	5.645	21.078	60.738	626.052	524.373				823.082
	10^2	0.5	0.9	1.217	68.937	0.196	TO	19.765	136.491	0.630	0.468	0.010	0.018	0.011
			0.75	1.223	68.394	0.636	TO	19.782	132.780	0.602	0.467			
Zero-Conf	10^4	0.5	0.52	1.228	60.024	0.739	TO	19.852	136.533	0.608	0.474	0.037	262.193	0.031
			0.45	<0.001	0.001	0.001	<0.001	0.035	0.043	0.043	0.043			
	10^3	0.394	0.9	MO	TO	7.443	TO	TO	0.602	0.465	0.010	0.014	0.011	
			0.75	MO	TO	15.223	TO	TO	TO	0.599				0.470
Chain	10^3	0.394	0.52	MO	TO	TO	TO	TO	0.488	0.475	0.010	0.014	0.011	
			0.45	0.108	0.119	0.169	0.016	0.035	0.040	0.040				0.040
	10^3	0.215	0.9	36.083	TO	0.478	TO	269.801	TO	0.938	0.686	0.010	0.014	0.011
			0.4	35.961	TO	394.955	TO	271.885	TO	0.920	TO			
Double-Chain	10^3	0.215	0.35	101.351	TO	454.892	435.199	238.613	TO	TO	TO	0.011	0.018	0.010
			0.3	62.036	463.981	120.557	209.346	124.829	746.595	TO	TO			
	41	0.7	0.9	0.004	0.009	8.528	TO	1.188	31.915	TO	MO	0.011	0.011	1.560
			0.75	0.004	0.011	2.357	TO	1.209	32.143	TO	712.086			
Haddad-Monmege	10^3	0.7	0.9	59.721	61.777	TO	TO	TO	TO	TO	0.013 (†)	0.043	TO	
			0.75	60.413	63.050	TO	TO	TO	TO	TO				TO

RQ1. The performance advantage of **AdjointPDR[↓]**, over both LT-PDR and PrIC3, was clearly observed throughout the benchmarks. **AdjointPDR[↓]** outperformed LT-PDR, thus confirming empirically the theoretical observation in Section 4.2. The profit is particularly evident in those instances whose answer is positive. **AdjointPDR[↓]** generally outperformed PrIC3, too. Exceptions are in ZeroConf, Chain and DoubleChain, where PrIC3 with polynomial (pol.) and hybrid (hyb.) heuristics performs well. This seems to be thanks to the expressivity of the polynomial template in PrIC3, which is a possible enhancement we are yet to implement (currently our symbolic heuristic hCoS uses only the affine template).

RQ2. The comparison with Storm is interesting. Note first that Storm’s *sparse-numeric* algorithm is a VI algorithm that gives a guaranteed lower bound *without guaranteed convergence*. Therefore its positive answer to $P \leq? \lambda$ may not be correct. Indeed, for Haddad-Monmege with $|S| \sim 10^3$, it answered $P = 0.5$ which is wrong ((†) in Table 1). This is in contrast with PDR algorithms that discovers an explicit witness for $P \leq \lambda$ via their positive chain.

Table 2. Experimental results on MDP benchmarks. The legend is the same as Table 1, except that P is now the maximum reachability probability.

Benchmark	S	P	λ	AdjointPDR \downarrow			Storm		
				hCoB	hCo01	hCoS	sp.-num	sp.-rat.	sp.-sd.
CDrive2	38	0.865	0.9	MO	0.172	TO	0.019	0.019	0.018
			0.75	MO	0.058	TO			
			0.5	0.015	0.029	86.798			
TireWorld	8670	0.233	0.9	MO	3.346	TO	0.070	0.164	0.069
			0.75	MO	3.337	TO			
			0.5	MO	6.928	TO			
			0.2	4.246	24.538	TO			

Storm’s *sparse-rational* algorithm is precise. It was faster than PDR algorithms in many benchmarks, although AdjointPDR \downarrow was better or comparable in ZeroConf (10^4) and Haddad-Monmege (41), for λ such that $P \leq \lambda$ is true. We believe this suggests a general advantage of PDR algorithms, namely to accelerate the search for an invariant-like witness for safety.

Storm’s *sparse-sound* algorithm is a sound VI algorithm that returns correct answers aside numerical errors. Its performance was similar to that of sparse-numeric, except for the two instances of Haddad-Monmege: sparse-sound returned correct answers but was much slower than sparse-numeric. For these two instances, AdjointPDR \downarrow outperformed sparse-sound.

It seems that a big part of Storm’s good performance is attributed to the sparsity of state representation. This is notable in the comparison of the two instances of Haddad-Monmege (41 vs. 10^3): while Storm handles both of them easily, AdjointPDR \downarrow struggles a bit in the bigger instance. Our implementation can be extended to use sparse representation, too; this is future work.

RQ3. We derived the three heuristics (hCoB, hCo01, hCoS) exploiting the theory of AdjointPDR \downarrow . The experiments show that each heuristic has its own strength. For example, hCo01 is slower than hCoB for MCs, but it is much better for MDPs. In general, there is no silver bullet heuristic, so coming up with a variety of them is important. The experiments suggest that our theory of AdjointPDR \downarrow provides great help in doing so.

RQ4. Table 2 shows that AdjointPDR \downarrow can handle nondeterminism well: once a suitable heuristic is chosen, its performances on MDPs and on MCs of similar size are comparable. It is also interesting that better-performing heuristics vary, as we discussed above.

Summary. AdjointPDR \downarrow clearly outperforms existing probabilistic PDR algorithms in many benchmarks. It also compares well with Storm—a highly sophisticated toolsuite—in a couple of benchmarks. These are notable especially given that AdjointPDR \downarrow currently lacks enhancing features such as richer symbolic templates and sparse representation (adding which is future work). Overall, we believe that AdjointPDR \downarrow *confirms the potential of PDR algorithms in probabilistic model checking*. Through the three heuristics, we also observed the value of an abstract general theory in devising heuristics in PDR, which is probably true of verification algorithms in general besides PDR.

References

1. Baier, C., Katoen, J.: Principles of model checking. MIT Press (2008)
2. Baier, C., Klein, J., Leuschner, L., Parker, D., Wunderlich, S.: Ensuring the reliability of your model checker: Interval iteration for Markov Decision Processes. In: Majumdar, R., Kuncak, V. (eds.) Proc. of CAV 2017, Part I. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 10426, pp. 160–180. Springer (2017). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63387-9_8
3. Batz, K., Junges, S., Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J., Matheja, C., Schröder, P.: PrIC3: Property directed reachability for MDPs. In: Lahiri, S.K., Wang, C. (eds.) Proc. of CAV 2020, Part II. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12225, pp. 512–538. Springer (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53291-8_27
4. Bonchi, F., Ganty, P., Giacobazzi, R., Pavlovic, D.: Sound up-to techniques and complete abstract domains. In: Dawar, A., Grädel, E. (eds.) Proc. of LICS 2018. pp. 175–184. ACM (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3209108.3209169>
5. Bradley, A.R.: SAT-based model checking without unrolling. In: Jhala, R., Schmidt, D.A. (eds.) Proc. of VMCAI 2011. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 6538, pp. 70–87. Springer (2011). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-18275-4_7
6. Cimatti, A., Griggio, A.: Software model checking via IC3. In: Madhusudan, P., Seshia, S.A. (eds.) Proc. of CAV 2012. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 7358, pp. 277–293. Springer (2012). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-31424-7_23
7. Cousot, P.: Partial completeness of abstract fixpoint checking. In: Choueiry, B.Y., Walsh, T. (eds.) Proc. of SARA 2000. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 1864, pp. 1–25. Springer (2000). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44914-0_1
8. Cousot, P.: Principles of Abstract Interpretation. MIT Press (2021)
9. Cousot, P., Cousot, R.: Abstract interpretation: A unified lattice model for static analysis of programs by construction or approximation of fixpoints. In: Proc. of POPL 1977. p. 238–252. ACM (1977). <https://doi.org/10.1145/512950.512973>
10. Davey, B.A., Priestley, H.A.: Introduction to Lattices and Order, Second Edition. Cambridge University Press (2002)
11. Dehnert, C., Junges, S., Katoen, J., Volk, M.: A storm is coming: A modern probabilistic model checker. In: Majumdar, R., Kuncak, V. (eds.) Proc. of CAV 2017, Part II. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 10427, pp. 592–600. Springer (2017). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63390-9_31
12. Eén, N., Mishchenko, A., Brayton, R.K.: Efficient implementation of property directed reachability. In: Bjesse, P., Slobodová, A. (eds.) Proc. of FMCAD 2011. pp. 125–134. FMCAD Inc. (2011), <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2157675>
13. Feldman, Y.M.Y., Sagiv, M., Shoham, S., Wilcox, J.R.: Property-directed reachability as abstract interpretation in the monotone theory. Proc. ACM Program. Lang. **6**(POPL), 1–31 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3498676>
14. Giacobazzi, R., Ranzato, F., Scozzari, F.: Making abstract interpretations complete. J. ACM **47**(2), 361–416 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1145/333979.333989>
15. Gurfinkel, A.: IC3, PDR, and friends (2015), https://arieg.bitbucket.io/pdf/gurfinkel_ssft15.pdf
16. Hartmanns, A., Kaminski, B.L.: Optimistic value iteration. In: Lahiri, S.K., Wang, C. (eds.) Proc. of CAV 2020, Part II. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12225, pp. 488–511. Springer (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53291-8_26

17. Hartmanns, A., Klauck, M., Parker, D., Quatmann, T., Ruijters, E.: The quantitative verification benchmark set. In: Vojnar, T., Zhang, L. (eds.) Proc. of TACAS 2019, Part I. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 11427, pp. 344–350. Springer (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-17462-0_20
18. Hoder, K., Bjørner, N.: Generalized property directed reachability. In: Cimatti, A., Sebastiani, R. (eds.) Proc. of SAT 2012. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 7317, pp. 157–171. Springer (2012). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-31612-8_13
19. Kori, M., Urabe, N., Katsumata, S., Suenaga, K., Hasuo, I.: The lattice-theoretic essence of property directed reachability analysis. In: Shoham, S., Vizel, Y. (eds.) Proc. of CAV 2022, Part I. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 13371, pp. 235–256. Springer (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-13185-1_12
20. Kwiatkowska, M.Z., Norman, G., Parker, D.: PRISM 4.0: Verification of probabilistic real-time systems. In: Gopalakrishnan, G., Qadeer, S. (eds.) Proc. of CAV 2011. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 6806, pp. 585–591. Springer (2011). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-22110-1_47
21. Lange, T., Neuhäufser, M.R., Noll, T., Katoen, J.: IC3 software model checking. *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transf.* **22**(2), 135–161 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-019-00547-x>
22. Levy, P.B.: Call-By-Push-Value: A Functional/Imperative Synthesis, Semantics Structures in Computation, vol. 2. Springer (2004)
23. MacLane, S.: Categories for the Working Mathematician. Springer-Verlag, New York (1971), Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 5
24. Milner, R.: Communication and Concurrency. Prentice-Hall, Inc., USA (1989)
25. de Moura, L.M., Bjørner, N.S.: Z3: an efficient SMT solver. In: Ramakrishnan, C.R., Rehof, J. (eds.) Proc. of TACAS 2008. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 4963, pp. 337–340. Springer (2008). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78800-3_24
26. Quatmann, T., Katoen, J.: Sound value iteration. In: Chockler, H., Weissenbacher, G. (eds.) Proc. of CAV 2018, Part I. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 10981, pp. 643–661. Springer (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96145-3_37
27. Seufert, T., Scholl, C.: Sequential verification using reverse PDR. In: Große, D., Drechsler, R. (eds.) Proc. of MBMV 2017. pp. 79–90. Shaker Verlag (2017)
28. Seufert, T., Scholl, C.: Combining PDR and reverse PDR for hardware model checking. In: Madsen, J., Coskun, A.K. (eds.) Proc. of DATE 2018. pp. 49–54. IEEE (2018). <https://doi.org/10.23919/DATE.2018.8341978>
29. Seufert, T., Scholl, C.: fbPDR: In-depth combination of forward and backward analysis in property directed reachability. In: Teich, J., Fummi, F. (eds.) Proc. of DATE 2019. pp. 456–461. IEEE (2019). <https://doi.org/10.23919/DATE.2019.8714819>
30. Suda, M.: Property directed reachability for automated planning. In: Chien, S.A., Do, M.B., Fern, A., Ruml, W. (eds.) Proc. of ICAPS 2014. AAAI (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.4231>

A Additional material

A.1 The Three Executions in Example 23

In this appendix we report in full details the execution of $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ for the max reachability problem in Example 23 with the simple initial heuristic (Fig. 6), with the hCo01 heuristic (Fig. 7) and with the hCoB heuristic (Fig. 8).

In Fig. 7 we exploit the scheduler $\xi: S \rightarrow A$ defined as $\xi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [s_0 \mapsto b, s_1 \mapsto a, s_2 \mapsto a, s_3 \mapsto a]$, for which we illustrate

$$b_\xi \left(\begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{v_1 + v_2}{2} \\ \frac{v_0 + 2 \cdot v_3}{3} \\ v_2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_\xi^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{d \mid b_\xi(d) \in p^\downarrow\} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \mid \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} \leq \left\lfloor \frac{4}{5} \right\rfloor \right\} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon \right)_{2,2} \xrightarrow{C^a} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow \right)_{2,1} \xrightarrow{C^o} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon \right)_{2,2} \\ \xrightarrow{U} & \xrightarrow{C^a} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow \right)_{3,2} \xrightarrow{C^o} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon \right)_{3,3} \\ \xrightarrow{U} & \xrightarrow{C^a} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow \right)_{4,3} \xrightarrow{C^o} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon \right)_{4,4} \\ \xrightarrow{U} & \xrightarrow{C^a} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow \right)_{5,4} \xrightarrow{C^o} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon \right)_{4,4} \\ \xrightarrow{U} & \xrightarrow{C^a} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow \right)_{6,5} \xrightarrow{C^o} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon \right)_{6,6} \\ \xrightarrow{U} & \xrightarrow{C^a} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow \right)_{7,6} \xrightarrow{C^o} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon \right)_{7,7} \dots \end{aligned}$$

Fig. 6. The non-terminating execution of $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ with the simple initial heuristics for the max reachability problem of Example 23. The elements of the positive chain, with the exception of the last one x_{n-1} are those of the initial chain.

A.2 A Summary About the Max Reachability Problem

As a courtesy to the reader, we provide here a short description of the max reachability problems for MDPs. The reader is referred to [1] for further details.

An MDP (A, S, s_ι, δ) mixes nondeterministic and probabilistic computations. The notion of a *scheduler*, also known as *adversary*, *policy* or *strategy*, is used to resolve nondeterministic choices. Below, we write S^+ for the set of non-empty sequence over S , intuitively representing runs of the MDP. A scheduler is a function $\alpha: S^+ \rightarrow A$ such that $\alpha(s_0 s_1 \dots s_n) \in \text{Act}(s_n)$: given the states visited

$$\begin{array}{l}
(\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon)_{3,3} \xrightarrow{C^a} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow)_{3,2} \xrightarrow{C^o} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon)_{3,3} & b \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathcal{Z}_2 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\} \\
\begin{array}{l} \xrightarrow{U} \\ \xrightarrow{C^a} \end{array} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow)_{4,3} \xrightarrow{C^o} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon)_{4,4} & b \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathcal{Z}_3 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\} \\
\begin{array}{l} \xrightarrow{U} \\ \xrightarrow{C^a} \end{array} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow)_{5,4} \xrightarrow{D} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \mathcal{F}_\xi^1 p^\downarrow)_{5,3} & b \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \max(\frac{2}{5}, \frac{1}{2}) \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \notin p^\downarrow \\
\begin{array}{l} \xrightarrow{C^o} \end{array} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow)_{5,4} & b \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathcal{Z}_3 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 4 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\} \\
\begin{array}{l} \xrightarrow{C^o} \end{array} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon)_{5,5} & b \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathcal{Z}_4 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\} \\
\begin{array}{l} \xrightarrow{U} \\ \xrightarrow{C^a} \end{array} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow)_{6,5} \xrightarrow{D} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \mathcal{F}_\xi^1 p^\downarrow)_{6,4} & b \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \max(\frac{2}{5}, \frac{1}{2}) \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \notin p^\downarrow \\
\begin{array}{l} \xrightarrow{C^o} \end{array} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow)_{6,4} & b \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathcal{Z}_3 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 4 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 7. On the left, the execution of $\text{AdjointPDR}_{\text{hCo01}}^\downarrow$ for the max reachability problem of Example 23: in the last state, it returns true since $x_3 = x_4$. On the right, the data explaining the choices of (Conflict) and (Decide). Note that, in the two (Decide) steps, the guard $b(x_{k-1}) \notin Y_k$ holds because of the possibility of choosing the label b in state s_0 . This explain why Z is taken as $\mathcal{F}_\xi^1(p^\downarrow)$ for the scheduler ξ defined in (8).

$$\begin{array}{l}
(\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon)_{3,3} \xrightarrow{C^a} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow)_{3,2} \xrightarrow{C^o} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon)_{3,3} & b \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathcal{Z}_2 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\} \\
\begin{array}{l} \xrightarrow{U} \\ \xrightarrow{C^a} \end{array} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow)_{4,3} \xrightarrow{C^o} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel \varepsilon)_{4,4} & b \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathcal{Z}_3 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\} \\
\begin{array}{l} \xrightarrow{U} \\ \xrightarrow{C^a} \end{array} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow)_{5,4} \xrightarrow{C^o} (\emptyset \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \parallel p^\downarrow)_{5,4} & b \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathcal{Z}_4 = \mathcal{Z}_3
\end{array}$$

Fig. 8. On the left, the execution of $\text{AdjointPDR}_{\text{hCoB}}^\downarrow$ for the max reachability problem of Example 23: in the last state, it returns true since $x_3 = x_4$. On the right, the data explaining the three choices of (Conflict).

so far, the scheduler decides which action to trigger among the enabled ones so that the MDP behaves as a Markov chain. A scheduler α is called *memoryless* if it always selects the same action in a given state, namely, if $\alpha(s_0s_1 \dots s_n) = \alpha(s_n)$ for any sequence $s_0s_1 \dots s_n \in S^+$. Memoryless schedulers can thus be represented just as functions $\alpha: S \rightarrow A$ such that $\alpha(s) \in Act(s)$ for any $s \in S$.

Given an MDP, the *max reachability problem* requires to check whether the probability of reaching some bad states $\beta \subseteq S$ is less than or equal to a given threshold $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ for all possible schedulers. Thus, to solve this problem, one should compute the supremum over infinitely many schedulers. Notably, it is known that there always exists one memoryless scheduler that maximizes the probabilities to reach β (see e.g. [1]). As the memoryless schedulers are finitely many (although their number can grow exponentially), the supremum can thus be replaced by a maximum.

The fact that the problem stated in this way coincides with the lattice theoretic problem that we illustrated in Section 5, it is well known: see e.g. [1].

B Proofs of Section 3

In this appendix, we illustrate the proofs for the various results in Section 3. After the proofs for the invariants (Appendix B.1), we show soundness (Appendix B.2) and discuss two results about positive and negative sequences (Appendix B.3) that will be used for the proof of Proposition 18. The proofs for the results in Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 are in Appendixes B.4, B.5 and B.6.

B.1 Proofs about invariants

In this appendix we show that the properties in Fig. 2 are invariants of `AdjointPDR`, namely they hold in all reachable states. The proofs are fairly standard and some of them are similar in the spirit to those in [19]. However, we illustrate them in full details as we believe that the reader may find them helpful.

For a state s and a property (Q) , we will write $s \models (Q)$ to mean that (Q) holds in s . In order to show that (Q) is an invariant we will prove

- (a) $s_0 \models (Q)$ and
- (b) if $s \models (Q)$ and $s \rightarrow s'$, then $s' \models (Q)$.

Hereafter, we will fix $s = (\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k}$ and $s' = (\mathbf{x}' \parallel \mathbf{y}')_{n',k'}$. As usual we will write x_j and y_j for the elements of \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} . For the elements of \mathbf{x}' and \mathbf{y}' , we will write x'_j and y'_j . Through the proofs, we will avoid to repeat every time in (b)

that $s \models (Q)$, and we will just write $\stackrel{(Q)}{=}$ or $\stackrel{(Q)}{\sqsubseteq}$ whenever using such hypothesis. Moreover in (b) we will avoid to specify those cases that are trivial: for instance, for the properties that only concerns the positive chain \mathbf{x} , e.g., (I0), (I2), (P1), (P2) and (P3), it is enough to check the property (b) for $s \xrightarrow{U} s'$ and $s \xrightarrow{C_o} s'$, since $s \xrightarrow{D} s'$ and $s \xrightarrow{C_a} s'$ only modify the negative sequence \mathbf{y} .

We begin with proving (I0) and (I2).

Proof of (I0): $x_0 = \perp$

(a) In s_0 , $x_0 = \perp$.

(b) If $s \xrightarrow{U} s'$, then $x'_0 = x_0 \stackrel{(I0)}{=} \perp$.

If $s \xrightarrow{Cz} s'$, then $x'_0 = x_0 \sqcap z \stackrel{(I0)}{=} \perp \sqcap z = \perp$. \square

Proof of (I2): $\forall j \in [0, n-2], x_j \sqsubseteq x_{j+1}$

(a) In s_0 , since $n = 2$ one needs to check only the case $j = 0$: $x_0 = \perp \sqsubseteq \top = x_1$.

(b) If $s \xrightarrow{U} s'$, then $x'_j = x_j \stackrel{(I2)}{\sqsubseteq} x_{j+1} = x'_{j+1}$ for all $j \in [0, n-2]$. For $j = n-1$, $x'_{n-1} = x_{n-1} \sqsubseteq \top = x'_n$. Since $n' = n+1$, then $\forall j \in [0, n'-2], x'_j \sqsubseteq x'_{j+1}$.

If $s \xrightarrow{Cz} s'$, then $x'_j = x_j \sqcap z \stackrel{(I2)}{\sqsubseteq} x_{j+1} \sqcap z \sqsubseteq x'_{j+1}$ for all $j \in [0, k]$. For all $j \in [i+1, n-2], x'_j = x_j \stackrel{(I2)}{\sqsubseteq} x_{j+1} = x'_{j+1}$. Thus, $\forall j \in [0, n'-2], x'_j \sqsubseteq x'_{j+1}$. \square

The proof for the next invariant follows a different pattern and crucially relies on the following observation.

Lemma 24. *When $k = 1$, then the algorithm either returns or does (Conflict).*

Proof. Since $k = 1$ then $\mathbf{y} \neq \varepsilon$. By (I0) $x_0 = \perp$. Since f is a left adjoint, then $f(x_0) = \perp$. Thus $f(x_0) \sqsubseteq y_1$ and if the state is not conclusive then (Conflict) is enabled. \square

Proof of (I1): $1 \leq k \leq n$

- To prove that $1 \leq k$, observe that k is initialised at 2 and that it is only decremented by 1. When $k = 1$, by Lemma 24, we have that the algorithms either returns or does (Conflict) and thus increment k .
- To prove that $k \leq n$, observe that k is incremented only by 1. When $k = n$, the algorithm does either (Unfold) or (Candidate). In the latter case, k is decremented. In the former, both n and k are incremented. \square

It is worth to remark that the proofs of the three invariants (I0), (I1) and (I2) do not rely on the properties of the chosen element $z \in L$. Such properties are instead fundamental for proving the invariants of the positive chain ((P1), (P2), (P3) and (P3a)), and the invariants of the negative sequence ((N1) and (N2)).

Proof of (P1): $i \sqsubseteq x_1$

(a) In s_0 , $x_1 = \top \supseteq i$.

(b) If $s \xrightarrow{U} s'$, then $x'_1 = x_1 \stackrel{(P1)}{\supseteq} i$.

If $s \xrightarrow{Cz} s'$, since $z \supseteq i$, then $x'_1 = x_1 \sqcap z \stackrel{(P1)}{\supseteq} i \sqcap i = i$. \square

Proof of (P2): $x_{n-2} \sqsubseteq p$

- (a) In s_0 , $n = 2$ and $x_0 = \perp \sqsubseteq p$.
- (b) If $s \xrightarrow{U} s'$, since (Unfold) is applied only if $x_{n-1} \sqsubseteq p$ and $n' = n + 1$, then $x'_{n'-2} = x_{n-1} \sqsubseteq p$.
If $s \xrightarrow{C^o} s'$, since $n' = n$, then $x'_{n'-2} = x'_{n-2} \sqsubseteq x_{n-2} \stackrel{(P2)}{\sqsubseteq} p$. \square

Proof of (P3): $\forall j \in [0, n - 2], f(x_j) \sqsubseteq x_{j+1}$

- (a) In s_0 , since $n = 2$ one needs to check only the case $j = 0$: $f(x_0) \sqsubseteq \top = x_1$.
- (b) If $s \xrightarrow{U} s'$, then $f(x'_j) = f(x_j) \stackrel{(I2)}{\sqsubseteq} x_{j+1} = x'_{j+1}$ for all $j \in [0, n - 2]$. For $j = n - 1$, $f(x'_{n-1}) = f(x_{n-1}) \sqsubseteq \top = x'_{j+1}$. Since $n' = n + 1$, then $\forall j \in [0, n' - 2], f(x'_j) \sqsubseteq x'_{j+1}$.
If $s \xrightarrow{C^o} s'$, since $f(x_{k-1} \sqcap z) \sqsubseteq z$, then by (I2) and monotonicity of f it holds that $\forall j \in [0, k - 1], f(x_j \sqcap z) \sqsubseteq z$. Since $f(x_j \sqcap z) \sqsubseteq f(x_j) \stackrel{(P3)}{\sqsubseteq} x_{j+1}$, it holds that $f(x_j \sqcap z) \sqsubseteq x_{j+1} \sqcap z$ for all $j \in [0, k - 1]$. With this observation is immediate to conclude that $\forall j \in [0, n' - 2], f(x'_j) \sqsubseteq x'_{j+1}$. \square

Proof of (P3a): $\forall j \in [0, n - 2], x_j \sqsubseteq g(x_{j+1})$

Follows immediately from (P3) and $f \dashv g$. \square

Next we prove that (N1) and (N2) are invariant. We will omit the cases of (Conflict) and (Unfold) since they are trivial. Indeed, the negative sequence \mathbf{y} is truncated in the rule (Conflict) but if the two invariants holds for \mathbf{y} then they obviously hold also for its tail $\text{tail}(\mathbf{y})$. Moreover the number n is modified by (Unfold) but, the two invariants trivially holds when $\mathbf{y} = \varepsilon$.

Proof of (N1): If $\mathbf{y} \neq \varepsilon$ then $p \sqsubseteq y_{n-1}$

- (a) In s_0 , $\mathbf{y} = \varepsilon$. Thus (N1) trivially holds.
- (b) If $s \xrightarrow{C^a} s'$, since $p \sqsubseteq z$, then $p \sqsubseteq z = y'_{n-1}$.
If $s \xrightarrow{D} s'$, then $p \stackrel{(N1)}{\sqsubseteq} y_{n-1} = y'_{n-1}$. \square

Proof of (N2): $\forall j \in [k, n - 2], g(y_{j+1}) \sqsubseteq y_j$

- (a) In s_0 , $k = 2$ and $n = 2$. Thus (N2) trivially holds.
- (b) If $s \xrightarrow{C^a} s'$, then $k' = n - 1$ and thus (N2) trivially holds.
If $s \xrightarrow{D} s'$, since $z \sqsupseteq g(y_k)$ and $k' = k - 1$, then $y'_{k'} = y'_{k-1} = z \sqsupseteq g(y_k) = g(y'_k) = g(y'_{k'+1})$. For $j \in [k' + 1, n - 2]$, namely for $j \in [k, n - 2]$, it holds that $y'_j = y_j \stackrel{(N2)}{\sqsupseteq} g(y_{j+1}) = g(y'_{j+1})$. Thus, $\forall j \in [k', n - 2], g(y'_{j+1}) \sqsubseteq y'_j$. \square

At this point it is worth to mention that the proofs of the invariants illustrated so far only exploit the second constraints on the chosen element $z \in L$ in the rules (Candidate), (Decide) and (Conflict). The proof of the next invariant, necessary to prove progression, relies on the first constraints on z .

Proof of (PN): $\forall j \in [k, n-1], x_j \not\sqsubseteq y_j$

(a) In s_0 , $k = n$ and thus (PN) trivially holds.

(b) If $s \xrightarrow{U} s'$, then $k' = n'$ and thus (PN) trivially holds.

If $s \xrightarrow{C_a} s'$, since $x_{n-1} \not\sqsubseteq z$, $x'_{n-1} = x_{n-1}$ and $k' = n' - 1 = n - 1$, then $x'_{n'-1} = x_{n-1} \not\sqsubseteq z = y'_{n'-1}$.

If $s \xrightarrow{D} s'$, since $x_{k-1} \not\sqsubseteq z$, then $x'_{k-1} = x_{k-1} \not\sqsubseteq z = y'_{k-1}$. Moreover, $\forall j \in [k, n-1]$, $x'_j = x_j \stackrel{(PN)}{\not\sqsubseteq} y_j = y'_j$. Thus, $\forall j \in [k', n' - 1]$, $x'_j \not\sqsubseteq y'_j$.

If $s \xrightarrow{C_o} s'$, then $k' = k + 1$ and $n' = n$. Observe that for $j \in [k + 1, n - 1]$, $x'_j = x_j \stackrel{(PN)}{\not\sqsubseteq} y_j = y'_j$. Thus $\forall j \in [k', n' - 1]$, $x'_j \not\sqsubseteq y'_j$. \square

We conclude with the proofs of (A1), (A2) and (A3) that are simple arguments based on the invariants proved above.

Proof of (A1): $\forall j \in [0, n-1], (f \sqcup i)^j \perp \sqsubseteq x_j \sqsubseteq (g \sqcap p)^{n-1-j} \top$

– We prove $(f \sqcup i)^j \perp \sqsubseteq x_j$ by induction on $j \in [0, n-1]$. For $j = 0$, $(f \sqcup i)^j \perp = \perp \sqsubseteq x_j$. For $j \in [1, n-1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} (f \sqcup i)^j \perp &= (f \sqcup i)((f \sqcup i)^{j-1} \perp) && \text{(def.)} \\ &= f((f \sqcup i)^{j-1} \perp) \sqcup i && \text{(def.)} \\ &\sqsubseteq f(x_{j-1}) \sqcup i && \text{(Induction hypothesis)} \\ &\sqsubseteq x_j \sqcup i && \text{((P3))} \\ &= x_j && \text{((P1) and (I2))} \end{aligned}$$

– In order to prove $x_j \sqsubseteq (g \sqcap p)^{n-1-j} \top$ for all $j \in [0, n-1]$, it is convenient to prove the equivalent statement $x_{n-1-j} \leq (g \sqcap p)^j \top$ for all $j \in [0, n-1]$. For $j = 0$, $x_{n-1} \sqsubseteq \top = (g \sqcap p)^0 \top$. For $j \in [1, n-1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} (g \sqcap p)^j \top &= (g \sqcap p)((g \sqcap p)^{j-1} \top) && \text{(def.)} \\ &= g((g \sqcap p)^{j-1} \top) \sqcap p && \text{(def.)} \\ &\sqsupseteq g(x_{n-1-j+1}) \sqcap p && \text{(Induction hypothesis)} \\ &\sqsupseteq x_{n-1-j} \sqcap p && \text{((P3a))} \\ &= x_{n-1-j} && \text{((P2) and (I2))} \end{aligned}$$

\square

Proof of (A2): $\forall j \in [1, n-1], x_{j-1} \sqsubseteq g^{n-1-j}(p)$

By (2), for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $(g \sqcap p)^{l+1} \top = \prod_{j \leq l} g^j(p)$. Thus, using (A1), it holds that for all $j \in [1, n-1]$, $x_{j-1} \sqsubseteq (g \sqcap p)^{n-j} \top = \prod_{j \leq n-j-1} g^j(p) \sqsubseteq g^{n-j-1}(p)$. \square

Proof of (A3): $\forall j \in [k, n-1], g^{n-1-j}(p) \sqsubseteq y_j$

In order to prove (A3), we prove the equivalent statement $g^j(p) \sqsubseteq y_{n-1-j}$ for all $j \in [0, n-1-k]$. For $j = 0$, $g^0(p) = p \sqsubseteq y_{n-1}$. The last inequality holds by (N1). For $j \in [1, n-1-k]$,

$$\begin{aligned} g^j(p) &= g(g^{j-1}(p)) && \text{(def.)} \\ &\sqsupseteq g(y_{n-1-(j-1)}) && \text{(Induction hypothesis)} \\ &= g(y_{n-j}) && \text{(def.)} \\ &\sqsupseteq y_{n-1-j} && \text{((N2))} \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proofs of all main invariants of `AdjointPDR`. \square

B.2 Proof of Theorem 5: Soundness for `AdjointPDR`

Proof (Proof of Theorem 5). The first point exploits Knaster-Tarski. The second Kleene.

1. Observe that `AdjointPDR` returns true if $x_{j+1} \sqsubseteq x_j$. By (P3), we thus have $f(x_j) \sqsubseteq x_{j+1} \sqsubseteq x_j$. Moreover, by (P1) and (I2), it holds that $i \sqsubseteq x_j$ and $x_j \sqsubseteq p$. Therefore, it holds that

$$(f \sqcup i)x_j \sqsubseteq x_j \sqsubseteq p.$$

By (KT), we have that $\mu(f \sqcup i) \sqsubseteq p$.

2. Observe that `AdjointPDR` returns false if $i \not\sqsubseteq y_1$. By (A3), $g^{n-2}(p) \sqsubseteq y_1$. Thus $i \not\sqsubseteq g^{n-2}(p)$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} g^{n-2}p &\sqsupseteq \prod_{j \in \omega} g^j(p) && \text{(def.)} \\ &= \nu(g \sqcap p) && \text{((K1-))} \end{aligned}$$

Thus $i \not\sqsubseteq \nu(g \sqcap p)$. By (1), $\mu(f \sqcup i) \not\sqsubseteq p$. \square

B.3 Positive Chains and Negative Sequences Form Semilattices

We show that positive chains form a join-semilattice and negative sequences a meet-semilattices. We recall that joins and meets are defined point-wise, i.e., for all positive chains $\mathbf{x}^1, \mathbf{x}^2$ and negative sequences $\mathbf{y}^1, \mathbf{y}^2$, $(\mathbf{x}^1 \sqcup \mathbf{x}^2)_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x_j^1 \sqcup x_j^2$ and $(\mathbf{y}^1 \sqcap \mathbf{y}^2)_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} y_j^1 \sqcap y_j^2$. The meet semilattice of negative sequences has as bottom element the sequence defined for all $j \in [k, n-1]$ as $g^{n-1-j}(p)$, see (A3) in Fig. 2. The join semilattice of positive chains has as top element the chain defined for all $j \in [0, n-1]$ as $(g \sqcap p)^{n-1-j}(\top)$ and as bottom element the chain $(f \sqcup i)^j(\perp)$, see (A1). Note that, if \mathbf{y}^1 and \mathbf{y}^2 are conclusive, also $\mathbf{y}^1 \sqcap \mathbf{y}^2$ is conclusive, while such property does not necessarily hold for positive chains.

Lemma 25. *Let I be a set. For all $m \in I$, let $\mathbf{x}^m = x_0^m, \dots, x_{n-1}^m$ be a positive chain. Then, the chain $\bigsqcup_{m \in I} \mathbf{x}^m$ defined for all $j \in [0, n-1]$ as*

$$\left(\bigsqcup_{m \in I} \mathbf{x}^m \right)_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigsqcup_{m \in I} x_j^m$$

is a positive chain.

Proof. Since $i \sqsubseteq x_1^m$ for all $m \in I$, then $i \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{m \in I} x_1^m$.

Since $x_{n-2}^m \sqsubseteq p$ for all $m \in I$, then $\bigsqcup_{m \in I} x_{n-2}^m \sqsubseteq p$.

To show that $f(\left(\bigsqcup_{m \in I} \mathbf{x}^m\right)_j) \sqsubseteq \left(\bigsqcup_{m \in I} \mathbf{x}^m\right)_{j+1}$ we just observe the following

$$\begin{aligned} f\left(\left(\bigsqcup_{m \in I} \mathbf{x}^m\right)_j\right) &= f\left(\bigsqcup_{m \in I} x_j^m\right) && \text{(def.)} \\ &= \bigsqcup_{m \in I} f(x_j^m) && (f \dashv g) \\ &\sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{m \in I} x_{j+1}^m && \text{((P3))} \\ &= \left(\bigsqcup_{m \in I} \mathbf{x}^m\right)_{j+1} && \text{(def.)} \end{aligned}$$

Thus (P1), (P2) and (P3) hold for $\bigsqcup_{m \in I} \mathbf{x}^m$. \square

Lemma 26. *Let I be a set. For all $m \in I$, let $\mathbf{y}^m = y_0^m, \dots, y_{n-1}^m$ be a negative sequence. Then, the sequence $\prod_{m \in I} \mathbf{y}^m$ defined for all $j = 0, \dots, n-1$ as*

$$\left(\prod_{m \in I} \mathbf{y}^m \right)_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{m \in I} y_j^m$$

is a negative sequence. Moreover, if \mathbf{y}^m is conclusive for all $m \in I$, then also $\prod_{m \in I} \mathbf{y}^m$ is conclusive.

Proof. Since $p \sqsubseteq y_{n-1}^m$ for all $m \in I$, then $p \sqsubseteq \prod_{m \in I} y_{n-1}^m$.

To show that $g\left(\prod_{m \in I} \mathbf{y}^m\right)_{j+1} \sqsubseteq \left(\prod_{m \in I} \mathbf{y}^m\right)_j$ we proceed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} g\left(\prod_{m \in I} \mathbf{y}^m\right)_{j+1} &= g\left(\prod_{m \in I} y_{j+1}^m\right) && \text{(def.)} \\ &= \prod_{m \in I} g(y_{j+1}^m) && (f \dashv g) \\ &\sqsubseteq \prod_{m \in I} y_j^m && \text{((N2))} \\ &= \left(\prod_{m \in I} \mathbf{y}^m\right)_j && \text{(def.)} \end{aligned}$$

For conclusive observe that, since $i \not\sqsubseteq y_1^m$ for all $m \in I$, then $i \not\sqsubseteq \prod_{m \in I} y_1^m = \left(\prod_{m \in I} \mathbf{y}^m\right)_1$. \square

The fact that the bottom element of such meet-semilattice is given by the sequence $g^{n-1-j}(p)$ is exactly the statement of invariant (A3). The top and bottom element for positive chains are defined as in invariant (A1).

B.4 Proof of Section 3.1: Progression

Proof (Proof of Proposition 6). For each rule, we prove that if the guard of the rule is satisfied then the choice of z satisfies the required constraints.

1. The guard of (Candidate) is $x_{n-1} \not\sqsubseteq p$. By choosing $z = p$, one has that $x_{n-1} \not\sqsubseteq z$ and $p \sqsubseteq z$ are trivially satisfied;
2. The guard of (Decide) is $f(x_{k-1}) \not\sqsubseteq y_k$ thus, by $f \dashv g$, $x_{k-1} \not\sqsubseteq g(y_k)$. By choosing $z = g(y_k)$, one has that $x_{k-1} \not\sqsubseteq z$ and $g(y_k) \sqsubseteq z$;

The proofs for the choices in (Conflict) are more subtle. First of all, observe that if $k = 1$, then $i \sqsubseteq y_1$ otherwise the algorithm would have returned false. Moreover, for $k \geq 2$, we have that $i \sqsubseteq x_{k-1} \sqsubseteq y_k$: the first inequality holds by (P1) and the second by (A2) and (A3). In summary,

$$\text{for all } j \geq 1, i \sqsubseteq y_j. \quad (9)$$

We can then proceed as follows.

3. The guard of (Conflict) is $f(x_{k-1}) \sqsubseteq y_k$. By choosing $z = y_k$, one has that $z \sqsubseteq y_k$ trivially holds. For $(f \sqcup i)(x_{k-1} \sqcap z) \sqsubseteq z$ observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (f \sqcup i)(x_{k-1} \sqcap z) &= f(x_{k-1} \sqcap z) \sqcup i && \text{(def.)} \\ &\sqsubseteq f(x_{k-1}) \sqcup i && \text{(monotonicity)} \\ &\sqsubseteq z \sqcup i && \text{(guard)} \\ &= z && \text{((9))} \end{aligned}$$

4. The guard of (Conflict) is $f(x_{k-1}) \sqsubseteq y_k$. By choosing $z = (f \sqcup i)(x_{k-1})$, one has that $(f \sqcup i)(x_{k-1} \sqcap z) \sqsubseteq (f \sqcup i)(x_{k-1}) = z$ holds by monotonicity. For $z \sqsubseteq y_k$, by using the guard and (9), we have that $z = (f \sqcup i)(x_{k-1}) = f(x_{k-1}) \sqcup i \sqsubseteq y_k$. \square

Proof (Proof of Proposition 7). Let us consider the following partial order on positive chains: given two sequences $\mathbf{x} = x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}$ and $\mathbf{x}' = x'_0, \dots, x'_{n'-1}$, we say $\mathbf{x} \preceq \mathbf{x}'$ if

$$n \leq n' \wedge x_j \sqsupseteq x'_j \text{ for each } j \in [0, n-1]$$

We extend the order to states by letting $(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k} \preceq (\mathbf{x}' \parallel \mathbf{y}')_{n',k'}$ with $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{x}'$ or $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}'$ and $k \geq k'$.

We prove the first statement by showing that applying a rule strictly increases the state in that partial order. As before, we use non-primed variables such as \mathbf{x} for values before the application of a rule, and primed variables such as \mathbf{x}' after.

For (Unfold), we have that $n < n' = n + 1$ and $x_j = x'_j$ for each $j \in [0, n-1]$.

For (Candidate), we have $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x}$ and $k' = n - 1 < n = k$.

For (Decide), we have $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x}$ and $k' = k - 1 < k$.

For (Conflict), $n = n'$, and

$$x'_j = \begin{cases} x_j & \text{if } j > k \\ x_j \sqcap z & \text{if } j \leq k \end{cases}$$

So for $j \in [k+1, n-1]$ we have $x_j = x'_j$, and for $j \in [0, k]$ we have $x_j \sqsupseteq x_j \sqcap z = x'_j$. So $\mathbf{x} \preceq \mathbf{x}'$. Assume by contradiction that $x'_k = x_k$. Since $x'_k = x_k \sqcap z$, this is equivalent to $x_k \sqsubseteq z$. The choice of z in (Conflict) satisfies $z \sqsubseteq y_k$, that would imply $x_k \sqsubseteq z \sqsubseteq y_k$. However, this is a contradiction, since by (PN) we know $x_k \not\sqsubseteq y_k$. Hence $x_k \sqsupset x'_k$, meaning $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{x}'$. \square

The following lemma will be useful later on to prove negative termination.

Lemma 27. *If $s_0 \rightarrow^* (\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k} \rightarrow^* (\mathbf{x}' \parallel \mathbf{y}')_{n',k'}$, then $n' \geq n$ and, for all $j \in [0, n-1]$, $x_j \sqsupseteq x'_j$.*

Proof. Follows from proof of Proposition 7. \square

B.5 Proofs of Section 3.2: Heuristics

In this appendix, after illustrating the proof of Proposition 10, we show two results Propositions (28) and (29), about simple initial and final heuristics, briefly mentioned in Section 3.2. These two results will not be used by other proofs.

Proof (Proof of Proposition 10). As for the invariants, we prove this equality by induction showing

- (a) it holds for s_0 and
- (b) if it holds for s and $s \rightarrow s'$, then it holds for s' .

In the initialization and after (Unfold), since $k = n$ there is no $j \in [k, n-1]$.

For (Conflict), since the property holds on \mathbf{y} it also holds on $\mathbf{y}' = \text{tail}(\mathbf{y})$.

For (Candidate), $\mathbf{y}' = p$ and $k' = n-1$, so the thesis holds because $y_{n-1} = p = g^{n-1-(n-1)}p$.

For (Decide), $\mathbf{y}' = g(y_k), \mathbf{y}$ and $k' = k-1$. For all $j \in [k'+1, n-1]$ the thesis holds because $y'_j = y_j$. For $j = k'$, we have $y_{k'} = g(y_k) = g(g^{n-1-k}(p)) = g^{n-1-k'}(p)$. \square

Proposition 28. *Assume $p \neq \top$ and let $h: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow L$ be any simple final heuristic. If $s_0 \rightarrow^* \xrightarrow{U} (\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k}$ then the second inequality in (A1) holds as an equality, namely for all $j \in [1, n-1]$, $x_j = (g \sqcap p)^{n-1-j}(\top)$.*

Proof. To prove this property, first we prove by induction that the following invariants hold:

- (a) either $x_1 = (g \sqcap p)^{n-1}\top$ or $x_1 = (g \sqcap p)^{n-2}\top$,
- (b) if $x_1 = (g \sqcap p)^{n-1}\top$, for all $j \in [1, k-1]$, $x_j = (g \sqcap p)^{n-j}\top$ and for all $j \in [k, n-1]$, $x_j = (g \sqcap p)^{n-1-j}\top$,
- (c) if $x_1 = (g \sqcap p)^{n-2}\top$, for all $j \in [1, n-1]$, $x_j = (g \sqcap p)^{n-1-j}\top$,
- (d) if $k = 1$ then $x_1 = (g \sqcap p)^{n-2}\top$.

Note that by (a) exactly one of the consequences of (b) and (c) hold, and when $k = 1$ (d) prescribes it must be (c). In the rest of the proof, we say that (b) or (c) hold meaning that x_1 is $(g \sqcap p)^{n-1} \top$ or $(g \sqcap p)^{n-2} \top$ respectively, so that the respective consequence holds, too.

At initialization, $\mathbf{x} = \perp, \top$ and $n = 2$, so (a) $x_1 = (g \sqcap p)^{n-2} \top$, and (c) holds.

After (Unfold), $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x}, \top$ and $n' = n + 1$. Since we applied (Unfold), it must be the case that $\mathbf{y} = \varepsilon$, so $k = n$, and $x_{n-1} \sqsubseteq p$. By (a) either $x_{n-1} = (g \sqcap p) \top = p$, or $x_{n-1} = (g \sqcap p)^0 \top = \top$. But since $x_{n-1} \sqsubseteq p$, it can't be the latter. Thus (b) holds before (Unfold). After the rule, (a) holds because $x'_1 = x_1 = (g \sqcap p)^{n-1} \top = (g \sqcap p)^{n'-2} \top$; (c) holds too because for all $j \in [1, n' - 1] = [1, n]$, $x'_j = x_j = (g \sqcap p)^{n-j} \top = (g \sqcap p)^{n'-1-j} \top$ (where we used that (b) holds before the rule) and for $j = n'$, $x'_j = \top = (g \sqcap p)^0 \top$. (d) holds because $k' = n' > 1$.

For (Candidate), since we applied it, it must be the case that $x_{n-1} \not\sqsubseteq p$. If (b) held before the rule, it would mean that $x_{n-1} = (g \sqcap p) \top = p \sqsubseteq p$, so (c) holds. After the rule, (a) and (c) still hold because $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x}$ and $n' = n$. (d) holds because (c) holds.

For (Decide), since we applied it, it must be the case that $f(x_{k-1}) \not\sqsubseteq y_k = g^{n-1-k}(p)$. This, by $f \dashv g$, is equivalent to $x_{k-1} \not\sqsubseteq g^{n-k}(p)$. If (b) held before the rule, it would mean that $x_{k-1} = (g \sqcap p)^{n-k+1} \top \sqsubseteq g^{n-k}(p)$, so (c) holds. After the rule, (a) and (c) still hold because $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x}$ and $n' = n$. (d) holds because (c) holds.

For (Conflict), let us distinguish two cases.

If $k = 1$, (c) holds before the rule because of (d). The choice in the rule is $z = y_1 = g^{n-2}(p)$, so after (Conflict) $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x} \sqcap_1 g^{n-2}(p)$ and $k' = k + 1$. (a) holds because $x'_1 = x_1 \sqcap g^{n-2}(p) = (g \sqcap p)^{n-2} \top \sqcap g^{n-2}(p) = (g \sqcap p)^{n-1} \top$. (b) holds because for $j \in [1, k' - 1] = [1, 1]$, $x'_1 = (g \sqcap p)^{n-1} \top$ and for $j \in [k', n - 1]$, $x'_j = x_j = (g \sqcap p)^{n-1-j} \top$. (d) holds because $k' = 2 > 1$.

If $k > 1$, since we applied (Conflict), it must be the case that $f(x_{k-1}) \sqsubseteq y_k = g^{n-1-k}(p)$. This, by $f \dashv g$, is equivalent to $x_{k-1} \sqsubseteq g^{n-k}(p)$. If (c) held before the rule, it would mean that $x_{k-1} = (g \sqcap p)^{n-k} \top \not\sqsubseteq g^{n-k}(p)$, so (b) holds. The choice in the rule is $z = y_k = g^{n-1-k}(p)$. After (Conflict), (a) holds because $x'_1 = x_1 \sqcap g^{n-1-k}(p) = (g \sqcap p)^{n-1} \top \sqcap g^{n-1-k}(p) = (g \sqcap p)^{n-1} \top$. (b) holds because for $j \in [1, k' - 2] = [1, k - 1]$, $x'_j = x_j \sqcap g^{n-1-k}(p) = (g \sqcap p)^{n-j} \top \sqcap g^{n-1-k}(p) = (g \sqcap p)^{n-j} \top$; for $j = k' - 1 = k$, $x'_j = x_j \sqcap g^{n-1-k}(p) = (g \sqcap p)^{n-1-k} \top \sqcap g^{n-1-k}(p) = (g \sqcap p)^{n-k} \top$; for $j \in [k', n - 1]$, $x'_j = x_j = (g \sqcap p)^{n-1-j} \top$. (d) holds because $k' = k + 1 > 1$.

This concludes the proof of the invariants. To prove the original statement, it is enough to observe that right after (Unfold) (c) holds. \square

In Proposition 29, note that the condition holds for all j but $n - 1$, that is the last element of the sequence can be different. Actually, this is \top when added with (Unfold), and is then lowered to $(f \sqcup i)^{n-1} \perp$ right before the next (Unfold).

Proposition 29. *Assume $p \neq \top$ and let $h : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow L$ be any simple initial heuristic. For all $(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n,k} \in \mathcal{S}^h$, the first inequality in (A1) holds as an equality for all $j \in [0, n - 2]$, namely $x_j = (f \sqcup i)^j(\perp)$.*

Proof. We prove this property by showing the exact sequence of steps the algorithm performs with this heuristics. To do so, assume m is the smallest integer such that $f^m(i) \not\sqsubseteq p$. Note that, if $\mu(f \sqcup i) \sqsubseteq p$, there is no such m ; if that is the case we say $m = +\infty$. Also note that, for all $n < m$ it holds $f^n(i) \sqsubseteq p$, hence also $f(f \sqcup i)^n \perp = f \bigsqcup_{j < n} f^j(i) = \bigsqcup_{j < n} f^{j+1}(i) \sqsubseteq p$, and for $n \sqsubseteq m$ we have $(f \sqcup i)^n \perp = \bigsqcup_{j < n} f^j(i) \sqsubseteq p$.

Intuitively, while $n < m + 2$ the algorithm performs a cycle of (Unfold), then (Candidate), then (Conflict) and then (Unfold) again. When it reaches $n = m + 2$, it enters a sequence of (Decide) that eventually lead to return false. Of course, if $m = +\infty$, this sequence of (Decide) never happens.

To prove this formally, we prove by induction that after initialization and every (Unfold) applied in this sequence, for all $j \in [0, n - 2]$, $x_j = (f \sqcup i)^j \perp$. We do so by showing this holds for initialization, and that if we assume this to be true after initialization or (Unfold), (a) if $n < m + 2$, the algorithm does exactly (Candidate), then (Conflict), then (Unfold) and the invariant holds again, and (b) if $n = m + 2$, the algorithm does (Candidate) then (Decide) until $k = 1$, then returns false. In doing so, we also show that the invariant holds after every rule, that is exactly the thesis.

For initialization, as $k = n = 2$ and $x_0 = \perp$ the property holds.

For (a), suppose the algorithm just did (Unfold) or initialization. Then, by the invariant, for all $j \in [0, n - 2]$, $x_j = (f \sqcup i)^j \perp$, and both after initialization and (Unfold), $x_{n-1} = \top$. Applying the algorithm, the sequence of states is then

$$\begin{aligned} & (\perp, (f \sqcup i) \perp, \dots, (f \sqcup i)^{n-2} \perp, \top \parallel \varepsilon)_{n,n} \\ & \xrightarrow{C_a} (\perp, (f \sqcup i) \perp, \dots, (f \sqcup i)^{n-2} \perp, \top \parallel p)_{n,n-1} \\ & \xrightarrow{C_o} (\perp, (f \sqcup i) \perp, \dots, (f \sqcup i)^{n-2} \perp, (f \sqcup i)^{n-1} \perp \parallel \varepsilon)_{n,n} \\ & \xrightarrow{U} (\perp, (f \sqcup i) \perp, \dots, (f \sqcup i)^{n-2} \perp, (f \sqcup i)^{n-1} \perp, \top \parallel \varepsilon)_{n+1,n+1} \end{aligned}$$

where the choice for (Candidate) is p and the choice for (Conflict) is $(f \sqcup i)x_{n-2} = (f \sqcup i)^{n-1} \perp$. The condition to apply (Candidate) is $x_{n-1} = \top \not\sqsubseteq p$, which follows from $p \neq \top$. The condition to apply (Conflict) is $f(x_{n-2}) = f(f \sqcup i)^{n-2} \perp \sqsubseteq p$, which follows from $n - 2 < m$. The condition to apply (Unfold) is $x_{n-1} = (f \sqcup i)^{n-1} \perp \not\sqsubseteq p$, which follows from $n - 1 \leq m$. The invariant clearly holds for all three states traversed.

For (b), suppose again the algorithm just did (Unfold) or initialization, so $\mathbf{x} = \langle \perp, (f \sqcup i) \perp, \dots, (f \sqcup i)^{n-2} \perp, \top \rangle$. Recalling that $n = m + 2$, the sequence of

states is

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\perp, (f \sqcup i) \perp, \dots, (f \sqcup i)^m \perp, \top \parallel \varepsilon)_{m+2, m+2} \\
& \xrightarrow{C_a^a}_h (\perp, (f \sqcup i) \perp, \dots, (f \sqcup i)^m \perp, \top \parallel p)_{m+2, m+1} \\
& \xrightarrow{D}_h (\perp, (f \sqcup i) \perp, \dots, (f \sqcup i)^m \perp, \top \parallel g(p), p)_{m+2, m} \\
& \xrightarrow{D}_h \dots \\
& \xrightarrow{D}_h (\perp, (f \sqcup i) \perp, \dots, (f \sqcup i)^m \perp, \top \parallel g^m(p), \dots, g(p), p)_{m+2, 1}
\end{aligned}$$

where the choice for (Candidate) is p and the choice for (Decide) is $g(y_k)$. The condition to apply (Candidate) is again $x_{n-1} = \top \not\sqsubseteq p$. The condition to apply (Decide) for k is $f(x_{k-1}) \not\sqsubseteq y_k$, that is $f(f \sqcup i)^{k-1} \perp \not\sqsubseteq g^{m+1-k}(p)$. This holds because $f(f \sqcup i)^{k-1} \perp \sqsubseteq f^{k-1}(i)$ and, by $f \dashv g$, $f^{k-1}(i) \not\sqsubseteq g^{m+1-k}(p)$ if and only if $f^{m+1-k} f^{k-1}(i) = f^m(i) \not\sqsubseteq p$. Lastly, when $k = 1$, we have $i \not\sqsubseteq g^m(p)$ again by $f \dashv g$, so the algorithm returns false. The invariant clearly holds for all the m states traversed. \square

B.6 Proofs of Section 3.3: Negative Termination

The following lemma is the key to prove termination.

Lemma 30. *If $s_0 \rightarrow^* s \xrightarrow{D}_z \rightarrow^* s' \xrightarrow{D}_{z'}$ and s and s' carry the same index (n, k) , then $z' \neq z$. Similarly, if $s_0 \rightarrow^* s \xrightarrow{C_a^a}_z \rightarrow^* s' \xrightarrow{C_a^a}_{z'}$ and s and s' carry the same index (n, k) , then $z' \neq z$.*

Proof. Since s and s' carry the same index (n, k) and the algorithm only increases n , then n is never increased in the steps between s and s' . Thus (Unfold) is never executed. On the other hand, k will be increased by (Conflict) and decreased in (Candidate) and (Decide).

We prove the proposition for (Decide), the case of (Candidate) is analogous. Let us fix $s = (\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n, k}$. The state immediately after s would be $(\mathbf{x} \parallel z, \mathbf{y})_{n, k-1}$. Observe that before arriving to the state $(\mathbf{x}' \parallel \mathbf{y}')_{n, k}$, the z inserted by the (Decide) right after s should be removed by some (Conflict), as that's the only rule that can remove elements from \mathbf{y} . The state before such (Conflict) will be of the form $(\mathbf{x}'' \parallel z, \mathbf{y})_{n, k+1}$ for some positive chain \mathbf{x}'' . Now let z'' be the element chosen by such (Conflict). It holds that $z'' \sqsubseteq y_{k+1} = z$. The state after the (Conflict) will be $(\mathbf{x}'' \sqcap_k z'' \parallel \mathbf{y})_{n, k}$. In this state and, by Corollary 27 in any of the following states, the $(k-1)$ -th element of the positive chain is below z . In particular, for $s' = (\mathbf{x}' \parallel \mathbf{y}')_{n, k}$, we have that $x'_{k-1} \sqsubseteq z$. Since $(\mathbf{x}' \parallel \mathbf{y}')_{n, k} \xrightarrow{D}_{z'}$, $x'_{k-1} \not\sqsubseteq z'$. Thus $z' \neq z$. \square

Proof (Proof of Theorem 12). Let us fix an n . Since the possible choices of $z \in h(\text{CaD}_{n, k}^h)$ are finitely many, by Lemma 30 we can apply (Candidate) or (Decide) only a finite amount of times for every k . Since by invariant (I1), $1 \leq k \leq n$, we

AdjointPDR ($\perp^\downarrow, b^\downarrow, b_r^\downarrow, p^\downarrow$)

```

<INITIALISATION>
  ( $\mathbf{X} \parallel \mathbf{Y}$ )n,k := ( $\emptyset, L \parallel \varepsilon$ )2,2
<ITERATION>
  case ( $\mathbf{X} \parallel \mathbf{Y}$ )n,k of
     $\mathbf{Y} = \varepsilon$  and  $X_{n-1} \subseteq p^\downarrow$  :                               %(Unfold)
      ( $\mathbf{X} \parallel \mathbf{Y}$ )n,k := ( $\mathbf{X}, L \parallel \varepsilon$ )n+1,n+1
     $\mathbf{Y} = \varepsilon$  and  $X_{n-1} \not\subseteq p^\downarrow$  :                         %(Candidate)
      choose  $Z \in L^\downarrow$  such that  $X_{n-1} \not\subseteq Z$  and  $p^\downarrow \subseteq Z$ ;
      ( $\mathbf{X} \parallel \mathbf{Y}$ )n,k := ( $\mathbf{X} \parallel Z$ )n,n-1
     $\mathbf{Y} \neq \varepsilon$  and  $b^\downarrow(X_{k-1}) \not\subseteq Y_k$  :                   %(Decide)
      choose  $Z \in L^\downarrow$  such that  $X_{k-1} \not\subseteq Z$  and  $b_r^\downarrow(Y_k) \subseteq Z$ ;
      ( $\mathbf{X} \parallel \mathbf{Y}$ )n,k := ( $\mathbf{X} \parallel Z, \mathbf{Y}$ )n,k-1
     $\mathbf{Y} \neq \varepsilon$  and  $b^\downarrow(X_{k-1}) \subseteq Y_k$  :                 %(Conflict)
      choose  $Z \in L^\downarrow$  such that  $Z \subseteq Y_k$  and  $(b^\downarrow \cup \perp^\downarrow)(X_{k-1} \cap Z) \subseteq Z$ ;
      ( $\mathbf{X} \parallel \mathbf{Y}$ )n,k := ( $\mathbf{X} \cap_k Z \parallel \text{tail}(\mathbf{Y})$ )n,k+1
  endcase
<TERMINATION>
  if  $\exists j \in [0, n-2]. X_{j+1} \subseteq X_j$  then return true %  $\mathbf{X}$  conclusive
  if  $\perp^\downarrow \not\subseteq Y_1$  then return false %  $\mathbf{Y}$  conclusive

```

Fig. 9. AdjointPDR algorithm checking $\mu(b^\downarrow \cup \perp^\downarrow) \subseteq p^\downarrow$.

only have a finite amount of different values of k , so (Candidate) and (Decide) occur only finitely many times with the same n .

Since both (Candidate) and (Decide) decrease k , (Conflict) increase k and $1 \leq k \leq n$, then also (Conflict) occurs only finitely many times with the same n . Therefore in any infinite computation of $\mathbf{A}\text{-PDR}_h$ (Unfold), which is the only rule that increase n , should occur infinitely many times.

But when $\mu(f \sqcup i) \not\subseteq p$, by (K1), there is some $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(f \sqcup i)^j \perp \not\subseteq p$. Since (Unfold) can be applied only when $(f \sqcup i)^{n-1} \perp \sqsubseteq x_{n-1} \sqsubseteq p$, then it can be applied only a finite amount of time. \square

Proof (Proof of Corollary 13). By Proposition 10, h maps any reachable state s such that $s \xrightarrow{D}$ into $g^{n-1-k}(p)$ and any reachable state s such that $s \xrightarrow{C_a}$ into p . Thus $h(\text{CaD}_{n,k}^h)$ has cardinality 2. By Theorem 12, if $\mu(f \sqcup i) \not\subseteq p$, then AdjointPDR_h terminates. \square

C Proofs of Section 4

In this appendix, we illustrate the proofs for the various results in Section 4. After illustrating the proofs of Proposition 14 in Appendix C.1, we will show the proofs for the results in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 in Appendixes C.2 and C.3.

AdjointPDR' ($\perp^\downarrow, b^\downarrow, b_r^\downarrow, p^\downarrow$)

```

<INITIALISATION>
  ( $\mathbf{X} \parallel \mathbf{Y}$ )n,k := ( $\emptyset, \top^\downarrow \parallel \varepsilon$ )2,2
<ITERATION>
  case ( $\mathbf{X} \parallel \mathbf{Y}$ )n,k of
     $\mathbf{Y} = \varepsilon$  and  $x_{n-1} \sqsubseteq p$  :                               %  $\mathbf{X}$  has the form  $\emptyset, x_1^\downarrow, \dots, x_{n-1}^\downarrow$ 
                                                                %(Unfold)
      ( $\mathbf{X} \parallel \mathbf{Y}$ )n,k := ( $\mathbf{X}, \top^\downarrow \parallel \varepsilon$ )n+1,n+1
     $\mathbf{Y} = \varepsilon$  and  $x_{n-1} \not\sqsubseteq p$  :                               %(Candidate)
      choose  $Z \in L^\downarrow$  such that  $x_{n-1} \notin Z$  and  $p \in Z$ ;
      ( $\mathbf{X} \parallel \mathbf{Y}$ )n,k := ( $\mathbf{X} \parallel Z$ )n,n-1
     $\mathbf{Y} \neq \varepsilon$  and  $b^\downarrow(x_{k-1}^\downarrow) \not\subseteq Y_k$  :                               %(Decide)
      choose  $Z \in L^\downarrow$  such that  $x_{k-1} \notin Z$  and  $b_r^\downarrow(Y_k) \subseteq Z$ ;
      ( $\mathbf{X} \parallel \mathbf{Y}$ )n,k := ( $\mathbf{X} \parallel Z, \mathbf{Y}$ )n,k-1
     $\mathbf{Y} \neq \varepsilon$  and  $b^\downarrow(x_{k-1}^\downarrow) \subseteq Y_k$  :                               %(Conflict)
      choose  $z \in L$  such that  $z \in Y_k$  and  $(b^\downarrow \cup \perp^\downarrow)(x_{k-1}^\downarrow \cap z^\downarrow) \subseteq z^\downarrow$ ;
      ( $\mathbf{X} \parallel \mathbf{Y}$ )n,k := ( $\mathbf{X} \cap_k z^\downarrow \parallel \text{tail}(\mathbf{Y})$ )n,k+1
  endcase
<TERMINATION>
  if  $\exists j \in [0, n-2]. x_{j+1}^\downarrow \subseteq x_j^\downarrow$  then return true %  $\mathbf{X}$  conclusive
  if  $Y_1 = \emptyset$  then return false %  $\mathbf{Y}$  conclusive

```

Fig. 10. AdjointPDR algorithm checking $\mu(b^\downarrow \cup \perp^\downarrow) \subseteq p^\downarrow$, where we restrict the elements of the positive chain to be principals. Note that: in (Unfold) the condition $x_{n-1} \sqsubseteq p$ is equivalent to $x_{n-1}^\downarrow \subseteq p^\downarrow$; and similarly for their negation in (Candidate), where moreover the condition $x_{n-1}^\downarrow \not\subseteq Z$ is equivalent to $x \notin Z$; same for (Decide); finally in (Conflict) the condition $z \in L$ is equivalent to $z^\downarrow \in L^\downarrow$ and the condition $z \in Y_k$ is equivalent to $z^\downarrow \subseteq Y_k$.

C.1 Proof of Proposition 14

Proof (Proof of Proposition 14). A simple inductive argument using (5) confirms that

$$(b^n x)^\downarrow = (b^\downarrow)^n x^\downarrow \quad (10)$$

for all $x \in L$. The following sequence of logical equivalences

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu b \sqsubseteq p &\Leftrightarrow \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. b^n \perp \sqsubseteq p && \text{(by (K1))} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. (b^n \perp)^\downarrow \subseteq p^\downarrow && \text{(mon. of } (-)^\downarrow, \sqcup \text{ and } \sqcup(-)^\downarrow = id) \\
&\Leftrightarrow \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (b^n \perp)^\downarrow \subseteq p^\downarrow && \text{(def. of } \bigcup) \\
&\Leftrightarrow \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (b^\downarrow)^n \perp^\downarrow \subseteq p^\downarrow && \text{(by (10))} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \mu(b^\downarrow \cup \perp^\downarrow) \subseteq p^\downarrow. && \text{(by (K1-))}
\end{aligned}$$

concludes the proof of the main statement. \square

C.2 Proofs of Section 4.1: From AdjointPDR to AdjointPDR[↓]

Proof (Proof of Theorem 15). The algorithm AdjointPDR[↓] differs from the instance of AdjointPDR on $(\perp^\downarrow, b^\downarrow, b_r^\downarrow, p^\downarrow)$ for two main reasons: first we restrict the elements of the positive chain to be principals, second we optimize the initial state of the algorithm.

To prove that the properties of AdjointPDR can be extended to AdjointPDR[↓], we first show the instance of AdjointPDR on $(\perp^\downarrow, b^\downarrow, b_r^\downarrow, p^\downarrow)$ for the lower set domain $(L^\downarrow, \subseteq)$ in Fig. 9. Clearly, as instance of AdjointPDR, the algorithm in Fig. 9 inherits all its properties about soundness, progression and negative termination. Note that, in (Candidate), the condition $p^\downarrow \subseteq Z$ is equivalent to $p \in Z$, because $Z \in L^\downarrow$. Moreover, we note that the negative termination condition $\perp^\downarrow \not\subseteq Y_1$ amounts to $Y_1 = \emptyset$.

To restrict the elements of the positive chain to be principals we need to add the condition $\exists z \in L. Z = z^\downarrow$ in rule (Conflict), which is thus modified as follows w.r.t. Fig. 9:

```

 $\mathbf{Y} \neq \varepsilon$  and  $b^\downarrow(x_{k-1}^\downarrow) \subseteq Y_k$  :                               % (Conflict)
  choose  $Z \in L^\downarrow$  such that  $Z \subseteq Y_k$  and  $(b^\downarrow \cup \perp^\downarrow)(X_{k-1} \cap Z) \subseteq Z$ 
                                                    and  $\exists z \in L. Z = z^\downarrow$ ;

   $(\mathbf{X} \parallel \mathbf{Y})_{n,k} := (\mathbf{X} \cap_k Z \parallel \text{tail}(\mathbf{Y}))_{n,k+1}$ 

```

Let us call AdjointPDR' such algorithm. All the executions of AdjointPDR' are also possible in AdjointPDR, thus all the invariants of AdjointPDR holds for AdjointPDR'. The invariants suffice to prove Theorem 5, Proposition 7 and Theorem 12.

The elements of the positive chain are introduced by (Unfold) and modified by (Conflict). By choosing $Z = z^\downarrow$ in (Conflict) it follows that all the elements of the positive chain are also principals, with the only exception of $X_0 = \emptyset$. Indeed, every new element of the positive chain has that form (in (Unfold) we take $\top_{L^\downarrow} = \top^\downarrow$) and the meet of two principals x_j^\downarrow and z^\downarrow in (Conflict) is itself the principal $(x_j \sqcap z)^\downarrow$ generated by the meet of x_j and z .

Regarding the canonical choices of Proposition 6,

1. in (Candidate) $Z = p^\downarrow$;
2. in (Decide) $Z = b_r^\downarrow(Y_k)$;
3. in (Conflict) $Z = Y_k$;
4. in (Conflict) $Z = (b^\downarrow \cup \perp^\downarrow)(X_{k-1})$.

we have that choice 3 is not necessarily possible, because we cannot assume that $Y_k = y_k^\downarrow$ for some $y_k \in L$, but 1, 2 and 4 remain valid choices: in fact, 1 and 2 deal with the negative sequence for which we have no restriction; for 4, if $X_{k-1} = x_{k-1}^\downarrow$ for some $x_{k-1} \in L$, then $Z = (b^\downarrow \cup \perp^\downarrow)(X_{k-1}) = (b^\downarrow \cup \perp^\downarrow)(x_{k-1}^\downarrow) = b^\downarrow(x_{k-1}^\downarrow) \cup \perp^\downarrow \stackrel{(5)}{=} b(x_{k-1})^\downarrow \cup \perp^\downarrow = b(x_{k-1})^\downarrow$ is still a principal. Since choices 1, 2 and 4 guarantees the existence of a simple heuristic (i.e., the initial one) we also have that Corollary 13 about negative termination is valid for AdjointPDR'.

We now take advantage of the shape of the positive chain to present the code of AdjointPDR' as reported in Fig. 10: we exploit the fact that $\mathbf{X} = \emptyset, x_1^\downarrow, \dots, x_{n-1}^\downarrow$ to make some simple code transformations described in the caption. Now we note that $b^\downarrow(x_{k-1}^\downarrow) = b(x_{k-1})^\downarrow$, so that the conditions $b^\downarrow(x_{k-1}^\downarrow) \not\subseteq$

LT-PDR (b, p)

```

<INITIALISATION>
  ( $\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{c}$ )n,k := ( $\perp, b(\perp) \parallel \varepsilon$ )2,2
<ITERATION>
  case ( $\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{c}$ )n,k of
     $\mathbf{c} = \varepsilon$  and  $x_{n-1} \sqsubseteq p$  :                               %(Unfold)
      ( $\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{c}$ )n,k := ( $\mathbf{x}, \top \parallel \varepsilon$ )n+1,n+1
     $\mathbf{c} = \varepsilon$  and  $x_{n-1} \not\sqsubseteq p$  :                             %(Candidate)
      choose  $z \in L$  such that  $z \sqsubseteq x_{n-1}$  and  $z \not\sqsubseteq p$ ;
      ( $\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{c}$ )n,k := ( $\mathbf{x} \parallel z$ )n,n-1
     $\mathbf{c} \neq \varepsilon$  and  $c_k \sqsubseteq b(x_{k-1})$  :                       %(Decide)
      choose  $z \in L$  such that  $z \sqsubseteq x_{k-1}$  and  $c_k \sqsubseteq b(z)$ ;
      ( $\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{c}$ )n,k := ( $\mathbf{x} \parallel z, \mathbf{c}$ )n,k-1
     $\mathbf{c} \neq \varepsilon$  and  $c_k \not\sqsubseteq b(x_{k-1})$  :                     %(Conflict)
      choose  $z \in L$  such that  $c_k \not\sqsubseteq z$  and  $b(x_{k-1} \sqcap z) \sqsubseteq z$ ;
      ( $\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{c}$ )n,k := ( $\mathbf{x} \sqcap_k z \parallel \text{tail}(\mathbf{c})$ )n,k+1
  endcase
<TERMINATION>
  if  $\exists j \in [0, n-2]. x_{j+1} \sqsubseteq x_j$  then return true %  $\mathbf{x}$  is conclusive
  if  $k = 1$  then return false %  $\mathbf{c}$  is conclusive

```

Fig. 11. LT-PDR algorithm checking $\mu b \sqsubseteq p$, adapted from [19].

Y_k in (Decide) and $b^\downarrow(x_{k-1}^\downarrow) \sqsubseteq Y_k$ in (Conflict) are equivalent to $b(x_{k-1}) \notin Y_k$ and to $b(x_{k-1}) \in Y_k$, respectively. Moreover, we have $(b^\downarrow \cup \perp^\downarrow)(x_{k-1}^\downarrow \cap z^\downarrow) = (b^\downarrow \cup \perp^\downarrow)((x_{k-1} \sqcap z)^\downarrow) = (b \sqcup \perp)(x_{k-1} \sqcap z)^\downarrow = (b(x_{k-1} \sqcap z) \sqcup \perp)^\downarrow = b(x_{k-1} \sqcap z)^\downarrow$, so that $(b^\downarrow \cup \perp^\downarrow)(x_{k-1}^\downarrow \cap z^\downarrow) \sqsubseteq z^\downarrow$ is equivalent to $b(x_{k-1} \sqcap z)^\downarrow \sqsubseteq z^\downarrow$ and therefore also to $b(x_{k-1} \sqcap z) \sqsubseteq z$.

Then, the only difference between $\text{AdjointPDR}'$ and $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ is the initialization condition: $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ starts from the state reached after the following three steps of $\text{AdjointPDR}'$:

$$(\emptyset, \top^\downarrow \parallel \varepsilon)_{2,2} \xrightarrow{C_a} (\emptyset, \top^\downarrow \parallel p^\downarrow)_{2,1} \xrightarrow{C_o} (\emptyset, \perp^\downarrow \parallel \varepsilon)_{2,2} \xrightarrow{U} (\emptyset, \perp^\downarrow, \top^\downarrow \parallel \varepsilon)_{3,3}.$$

Since the three steps apply the canonical choices for (Candidate) and (Conflict), we conclude that $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ is sound and that it enjoys progression and negative termination. \square

C.3 Proofs of Section 4.2: LT-PDR vs $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$

Proof (Proof of Theorem 17). For the scope of this proof, we call $\mathcal{S} = \{(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{Y})_{n,k}\}$ the set of states of $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$, and $\mathcal{S}' = \{(\mathbf{x}' \parallel \mathbf{c}')_{n',k'}\}$ that of LT-PDR, where we use non-primed variables for the former and primed for the latter. The function $\mathcal{R}: \mathcal{S}' \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is defined for all states $s' = (\mathbf{x}' \parallel \mathbf{c}')_{n',k'} \in \mathcal{S}'$, as

$$\mathcal{R}(s') = (\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{Y})_{n,k} \in \mathcal{S}$$

where

$$n = n' + 1, \quad k = k' + 1, \quad \mathbf{x} = \emptyset, \mathbf{x}' \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{x}').$$

We prove that \mathcal{R} is a simulation [24], that is for all $s', t' \in \mathcal{S}'$, if $s' \rightarrow t'$ then $\mathcal{R}(s') \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(t')$. The pseudo-code of LT-PDR is reported in Fig. 11.

First, we remark that, for any $z, x \in L$, $x \notin \neg(\{z\}^\uparrow)$ if and only if $z \sqsubseteq x$. Moreover, note that indices \mathbf{x}' in s' and \mathbf{x} in $\mathcal{R}(s')$ are off-setted by one: $x_j = x'_{j-1}$. However, as $n = n' + 1$ we have, for instance, $x_{n-1} = x'_{n'-1}$ (and analogously for k').

Consider now a state $s' = (\mathbf{x}' \parallel \mathbf{c}')_{n', k'} \in \mathcal{S}'$ and $\mathcal{R}(s') = (\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{Y})_{n, k} \in \mathcal{S}$. Suppose that LT-PDR can perform a transition from s' . This must be determined by one of the four rules of LT-PDR, possibly performing some choice of $z \in L$. We show that $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ is able to simulate this transition, using the same rule and performing a corresponding choice. We do so by cases on the rule used by LT-PDR.

- If LT-PDR applies rule (Unfold), we have $\mathbf{c}' = \varepsilon$ and $x'_{n'-1} \sqsubseteq p$ so that

$$s' = (\mathbf{x}' \parallel \varepsilon)_{n', n'} \xrightarrow{U} (\mathbf{x}', \top \parallel \varepsilon)_{n'+1, n'+1} = t'.$$

Then, for $(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{Y})_{n, k} = \mathcal{R}(s') = (\emptyset, \mathbf{x}' \parallel \varepsilon)_{n'+1, n'+1}$ it holds $\mathbf{Y} = \varepsilon$ and $x_{n-1} = x'_{n'-1} \sqsubseteq p$, so $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ can apply (Unfold) too and

$$\mathcal{R}(s') = (\emptyset, \mathbf{x}' \parallel \varepsilon)_{n'+1, n'+1} \xrightarrow{U} (\emptyset, \mathbf{x}', \top \parallel \varepsilon)_{n'+2, n'+2} = \mathcal{R}(t').$$

- If LT-PDR applies rule (Candidate), we have $\mathbf{c}' = \varepsilon$ and $x'_{n'-1} \not\sqsubseteq p$, so that $z \in L$ is chosen such that $z \sqsubseteq x'_{n'-1}$ and $z \not\sqsubseteq p$ to derive

$$s' = (\mathbf{x}' \parallel \varepsilon)_{n', n'} \xrightarrow{C_a^z} (\mathbf{x}' \parallel z)_{n', n'-1} = t'.$$

Then, for $(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{Y})_{n, k} = \mathcal{R}(s') = (\emptyset, \mathbf{x}' \parallel \varepsilon)_{n'+1, n'+1}$ it holds $\mathbf{Y} = \varepsilon$ and $x_{n-1} = x'_{n'-1} \not\sqsubseteq p$, so that $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ can apply (Candidate) too. Moreover we can choose $Z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \neg(\{z\}^\uparrow)$, because $z \sqsubseteq x'_{n'-1}$ implies $x_{n-1} = x'_{n'-1} \notin Z$, and $z \not\sqsubseteq p$ implies $p \in Z$. By doing so we derive

$$\mathcal{R}(s') = (\emptyset, \mathbf{x}' \parallel \varepsilon)_{n'+1, n'+1} \xrightarrow{C_a^z} (\emptyset, \mathbf{x}' \parallel Z)_{n'+1, n'} = \mathcal{R}(t').$$

- If LT-PDR applies rule (Decide), we have $\mathbf{c}' \neq \varepsilon$ and $\mathbf{c}'_{k'} \sqsubseteq b(x'_{k'-1})$, so that $z \in L$ is chosen such that $z \sqsubseteq x'_{k'-1}$ and $\mathbf{c}'_{k'} \sqsubseteq b(z)$ to derive

$$s' = (\mathbf{x}' \parallel \mathbf{c}')_{n', k'} \xrightarrow{D_z} (\mathbf{x}' \parallel z, \mathbf{c}')_{n', k'-1} = t'.$$

Then, for $(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{Y})_{n, k} = \mathcal{R}(s') = (\emptyset, \mathbf{x}' \parallel \mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c}'))_{n'+1, k'+1}$ it holds $\mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c}') \neq \varepsilon$ and $b(x_{k-1}) = b(x'_{k'-1}) \notin \mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c}')_k = \neg(\{\mathbf{c}'_{k-1}\}^\uparrow)$, because the latter is implied by $\mathbf{c}'_{k'} \sqsubseteq b(x'_{k'-1})$. Thus $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ can apply (Decide) too.

Moreover we can choose $Z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \neg(\{z\}^\uparrow)$. In fact $z \sqsubseteq x'_{k'-1}$ implies $x_{k-1} = x'_{n'-1} \notin \neg(\{z\}^\uparrow) = Z$. Moreover $b_r^+(Y_k) \subseteq Z$ if and only if $x \notin Z$ implies $b(x) \notin Y_k$. Because $Z = \neg(\{z\}^\uparrow)$ and $\mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c}')_k = \neg(\{c'_{k'}\}^\uparrow)$, this implication is equivalent to requiring that $z \sqsubseteq x$ implies $c'_{k'} \sqsubseteq b(x)$, which is true as $c'_{k'} \sqsubseteq b(z)$ and b is monotone. With this choice of Z we derive

$$\mathcal{R}(s') = (\emptyset, \mathbf{x}' \parallel \mathbf{Y})_{n'+1, k'+1} \xrightarrow{D}_Z (\emptyset, \mathbf{x}' \parallel Z, \mathbf{Y})_{n'+1, k'} = \mathcal{R}(t').$$

- If LT-PDR applies rule (Conflict), we have $\mathbf{c}' \neq \varepsilon$ and $c'_{k'} \not\sqsubseteq b(x'_{k'-1})$, so that $z \in L$ is chosen such that $c'_{k'} \not\sqsubseteq z$ and $b(x'_{k'-1} \sqcap z) \sqsubseteq z$ to derive

$$s' = (\mathbf{x}' \parallel \mathbf{c}')_{n', k'} \xrightarrow{C^o}_z (\mathbf{x}' \sqcap_{k'} z \parallel \mathbf{tail}(\mathbf{c}'))_{n', k'+1} = t'.$$

Then, for $(\mathbf{x} \parallel \mathbf{Y})_{n, k} = \mathcal{R}(s') = (\emptyset, \mathbf{x}' \parallel \mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c}'))_{n'+1, k'+1}$ it holds $\mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c}') \neq \varepsilon$ and $b(x_{k-1}) = b(x'_{k'-1}) \in Y_k = \neg(\{c'_{k-1}\}^\uparrow)$, because the latter is implied by $c'_{k'} \not\sqsubseteq b(x'_{k'-1})$. Thus $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ can apply (Conflict) too. Moreover we can choose the same z as LT-PDR. In fact $c'_{k'} \not\sqsubseteq z$ implies $z \in \neg(\{c'_{k'}\}^\uparrow) = \neg(\{c'_{k-1}\}^\uparrow) = \mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c}')_k$, and $b(x_{k-1} \sqcap z) = b(x'_{k'-1} \sqcap z) \sqsubseteq z$ is also an hypothesis in LT-PDR. With this choice of z we derive

$$\mathcal{R}(s') = (\emptyset, \mathbf{x}' \parallel \mathbf{Y})_{n'+1, k'+1} \xrightarrow{C^o}_z (\emptyset, \mathbf{x}' \sqcap_k z \parallel \mathbf{tail}(\mathbf{Y}))_{n'+1, k'+2} = \mathcal{R}(t').$$

This concludes the proof that \mathcal{R} is a simulation. However, to complete the proof that $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ simulates LT-PDR, we have to take care of initial and final states.

We observe that the initial states $s'_0 = (\perp, b(\perp) \parallel \varepsilon)_{2,2} \in \mathcal{S}'$ of LT-PDR and $s_0 = (\emptyset, \perp, \top \parallel \varepsilon)_{3,3} \in \mathcal{S}$ of $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ are not related: $\mathcal{R}(s'_0) \neq s_0$. To solve this issue, first observe that if $b(\perp) \not\sqsubseteq p$, both algorithms return false in a few steps. If instead $b(\perp) \sqsubseteq p$, $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ can reach the state $\mathcal{R}(s'_0)$ from s_0 in just two steps:

$$s_0 = (\emptyset, \perp, \top \parallel \varepsilon)_{3,3} \xrightarrow{C^a} (\emptyset, \perp, \top \parallel p^\downarrow)_{3,2} \xrightarrow{C^o}_{b(\perp)} (\emptyset, \perp, b(\perp) \parallel \varepsilon)_{3,3} = \mathcal{R}(s'_0)$$

Lastly, we discuss the termination conditions of the two algorithms.

When LT-PDR terminates from a state s' returning true, s' satisfies $x'_{j+1} \sqsubseteq x'_j$ for some j , so also $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ terminates from $\mathcal{R}(s')$ returning true.

Instead, when LT-PDR terminates from s' returning false, the condition $k' = 1$ does not imply that $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ terminates from $s = \mathcal{R}(s')$. However, the latter algorithm can always apply (Decide) from s : as proved in [19], the termination condition $k' = 1$ of LT-PDR implies $c'_1 \sqsubseteq b(\perp)$, which in turn means $b(x_1) = b(x'_0) = b(\perp) \notin Y_2 = \neg(\{c'_1\}^\uparrow)$. Moreover, we can choose $Z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \emptyset$: for all $x \in L$ we have $c'_1 \sqsubseteq b(\perp) \sqsubseteq b(x)$, so $b(x) \notin Y_2$. After this step, we get that $Y_1 = \emptyset$, so $\text{AdjointPDR}^\downarrow$ returns false, too. \square

Proposition 31. *Let \mathbf{c} be a Kleene sequence. Then $\mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c})$ is a negative sequence.*

Proof (Proof of Proposition 31). First, we show that $p \in \mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c})_{n-1}$. Since $c_{n-1} \not\sqsubseteq p$, by (C1), then $p \notin \{c_{n-1}\}^\uparrow$. Thus $p \in \neg(\{c_{n-1}\}^\uparrow)$, that is $p \in \mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c})_{n-1}$.

Then, we show that $b_r^\downarrow(\mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c})_{j+1}) \subseteq \mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c})_j$.

$$\begin{aligned}
b_r^\downarrow(\mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c})_{j+1}) &= b_r^\downarrow(\neg(\{c_{j+1}\}^\uparrow)) && \text{(def.)} \\
&= \{x \mid b(x) \notin (\{c_{j+1}\}^\uparrow)\} && \text{(def.)} \\
&= \{x \mid c_{j+1} \not\sqsubseteq b(x)\} && \text{(def.)} \\
&\subseteq \{x \mid b(c_j) \not\sqsubseteq b(x)\} && \text{((C2))} \\
&\subseteq \{x \mid c_j \not\sqsubseteq x\} && \text{(mon. of } b) \\
&= \neg(\{c_j\}^\uparrow) && \text{(def.)} \\
&= \mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c})_j && \text{(def.)}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof (Proof of Proposition 18). Since each of the \mathbf{c}^m is a Kleene sequence, then for all $m \in M$, then $\mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c}^m)$ is, by Proposition 31, a negative sequence. Thus, by Lemma 26 (in Appendix B.3), their intersection is also a negative sequence. □

Proof (Proof of Proposition 19). Since $\mathbf{c} = c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}$ is a Kleene sequence, then $\mathbf{neg}(\mathbf{c}) = \neg(\{c_k\}^\uparrow), \dots, \neg(\{c_{n-1}\}^\uparrow)$ is, by Proposition 31, a negative sequence. Thus, by (A3), for all $j \in [k, n-1]$, $(b_r^\downarrow)^{n-1-j}(p^\downarrow) \subseteq \neg(\{c_j\}^\uparrow)$. Thus $\neg(b_r^\downarrow)^{n-1-j}(p^\downarrow) \supseteq \{c_j\}^\uparrow$ and thus $c_j \in \neg(b_r^\downarrow)^{n-1-j}(p^\downarrow) = \neg(Y_j)$. □

D Proofs of Section 5

In this appendix we illustrate the proofs about the heuristics introduced in Section 5 to deal with the max reachability problem for MDPs.

Proof (Proof of Corollary 20). Using Theorem 12, it is enough to prove that, for all indexes (n, k) , the set of all possible choices for (Candidate) and (Decide), denoted by $h(\text{Ca}D_{n,k}^h)$, is finite. For simplicity, in this proof let $\text{Ca}D_{n,k}^h = \text{Ca}_{n,k}^h \uplus D_{n,k}^h$, where $\text{Ca}_{n,k}^h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{s \in \text{Ca}D_{n,k}^h \mid s \xrightarrow{C} \}$ is the set of reachable (n, k) -indexed states that trigger (Candidate) and $D_{n,k}^h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{s \in \text{Ca}D_{n,k}^h \mid s \xrightarrow{D} \}$ is the set of reachable (n, k) -indexed states that trigger (Decide). We prove that both images $h(\text{Ca}_{n,k}^h)$ and $h(D_{n,k}^h)$ are finite so that also $h(\text{Ca}D_{n,k}^h)$ is such.

- In (Candidate), any heuristics h defined as in (6) always choose $z = p^\downarrow$. Therefore the image $h(\text{Ca}_{n,k}^h)$ has cardinality 1 for all (n, k) .
- In (Decide), when $k = n - 1$, any heuristic h defined as in (6) may select any lower set $\{d \mid b_\alpha(d) \in p^\downarrow\}$ for some function $\alpha: S \rightarrow A$. Since, there are $|S|^{|A|}$ of such functions α , then there are at most $|S|^{|A|}$ of such lower set. Thus the set $h(D_{n,n-1}^h)$ has at most cardinality $|S|^{|A|}$.

When $k = n - 2$, the heuristic h may select any lower set $\{d \mid b_{\alpha_2}(b_{\alpha_2}(d)) \in p^\downarrow\}$ for any two functions $\alpha_1, \alpha_2: S \rightarrow A$. Thus, the set $h(D_{n,n-2}^h)$ has at most cardinality $(|S|^{|A|})^2$.

One can easily generalise these cases to arbitrary $j \in [1, n]$, and prove with a simple inductive argument that the cardinality of $h(D_{n,n-j}^h)$ is at most $(|S|^{|A|})^j$. Since both S and A are finite, then the set $h(D_{n,k}^h)$ is finite for all indices (n, k) . \square

Proof (Proof of Proposition 22). We need to prove that the choices of **hCoB** and **hCo01** for (Candidate), (Decide) and (Conflict) respect the constraints imposed by **AdjointPDR** $^\downarrow$.

- For (Candidate), both **hCoB** and **hCo01** take $Z = p^\downarrow$. We need to prove that $x_{n-1} \notin Z$ and $p \in Z$.
 - For the former, recall that the guard of (Candidate) is $x_{n-1} \not\sqsubseteq p$. Thus $x_{n-1} \notin p^\downarrow = Z$.
 - The second is trivial: $p \in p^\downarrow = Z$.
- For (Decide), both **hCoB** and **hCo01** take $Z = \{d \mid b_\alpha(d) \in Y_k\}$ for an α such that $b_\alpha(x_{k-1}) \notin Y_k$. We need to prove $x_{k-1} \notin Z$ and $b_r^\downarrow(Y_k) \subseteq Z$.
 - Since $b_\alpha(x_{k-1}) \notin Y_k$, then $x_{k-1} \notin \{d \mid b_\alpha(d) \in Y_k\} = Z$.
 - To see that $b_r^\downarrow(Y_k) \subseteq Z$, it is enough to observe that $b_r^\downarrow(Y_k) = \{d \mid b(d) \in Y_k\} = \bigcap_\alpha \{d \mid b_\alpha(d) \in Y_k\} \subseteq \{d \mid b_\alpha(d) \in Y_k\} = Z$.
- For (Conflict), we start with **hCoB** and show later **hCo01**.

Let us consider first the case $\mathcal{Z}_k = \emptyset$, then **hCoB** chooses $z_B = b(x_{k-1})$. The proof is the same as for Proposition 6.4.

Let us consider now the case $\mathcal{Z}_k \neq \emptyset$, and let $z_k = \bigwedge \mathcal{Z}_k$, so that

$$z_B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} z_k(s) & \text{if } r_s \neq 0 \\ b(x_{k-1})(s) & \text{if } r_s = 0 \end{cases}$$

We first prove $z_k \in Y_k$ and $b(x_{k-1} \wedge z_k) \leq z_k$.

- Since $\mathcal{Z}_k \neq \emptyset$, then there should be at least a $d \in \mathcal{Z}_k$. By definition, d is a (convex) generator of Y_k and thus $d \in Y_k$. Since $z_k = \bigwedge \mathcal{Z}_k \leq d$ and since Y_k is, by definition, a lower set, then $z_k \in Y_k$.
- By definition of \mathcal{Z}_k , $b(x_{k-1}) \leq d$, for all $d \in \mathcal{Z}_k$. Thus $b(x_{k-1}) \leq \bigwedge \mathcal{Z}_k = z_k$. Therefore $b(x_{k-1} \wedge z_k) \leq b(x_{k-1}) \leq z_k$.

Now let us show that $z_B \in Y_k$ and $b(x_{k-1} \wedge z_B) \leq z_B$.

- Since $Y_k = \{d \in [0, 1]^S \mid \sum_{s \in S} (r_s \cdot d(s)) \leq r\}$ and z_B differs from z_k only when $r_s = 0$, we have $\sum_{s \in S} (r_s \cdot z_B(s)) = \sum_{s \in S} (r_s \cdot z_k(s)) \leq r$, because we already proved that $z_k \in Y_k$.
- We know that $b(x_{k-1}) \leq z_k$. Then, for any $s \in S$ it follows that $b(x_{k-1})(s) \leq z_k(s) = z_B(s)$ if $r_s \neq 0$, and $b(x_{k-1})(s) = z_B(s)$ if $r_s = 0$. Therefore $b(x_{k-1}) \leq z_B$, from which we get $b(x_{k-1} \wedge z_B) \leq b(x_{k-1}) \leq z_B$.

Finally, we focus on **hCo01**: we need to prove $z_{01} \in Y_k$ and $b(x_{k-1} \wedge z_{01}) \leq z_{01}$.

- Since $Y_k = \{d \in [0, 1]^S \mid \sum_{s \in S} (r_s \cdot d(s)) \leq r\}$ and z_{01} differs from z_B only when $r_s = 0$, we have $\sum_{s \in S} (r_s \cdot z_{01}(s)) = \sum_{s \in S} (r_s \cdot z_B(s)) \leq r$, because we already proved that $z_B \in Y_k$.

- We know that $b(x_{k-1}) \leq z_B$. Then, for any $s \in S$ it follows that $b(x_{k-1})(s) \leq \lceil z_B(s) \rceil = z_{01}(s)$ if $r_s = 0$ and $\mathcal{Z}_k \neq \emptyset$, and that $b(x_{k-1})(s) \leq z_B(s) = z_{01}(s)$ otherwise. Therefore $b(x_{k-1}) \leq z_{01}$, from which it readily follows $b(x_{k-1} \wedge z_{01}) \leq b(x_{k-1}) \leq z_{01}$. \square