

A Quadratic Lower Bound for Simulation

Jan Friso Groote

Eindhoven University of Technology
Eindhoven, The Netherlands
j.f.groote@tue.nl

Jan Martens

Leiden University
Leiden, The Netherlands
j.j.m.martens@liacs.leidenuniv.nl

November 22, 2024

Abstract

We show that deciding simulation equivalence and simulation preorder have quadratic lower bounds assuming that the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis holds. This is in line with the best known quadratic upper bounds of simulation equivalence. This means that deciding simulation is inherently quadratic. A typical consequence of this result is that computing simulation equivalence is fundamentally harder than bisimilarity.

1 Introduction

Commonly, processes are abstractly represented as directed graphs with states and transitions where states or transitions are labelled. One process is simulated by another if each step of the first process can be simulated by the second. Two processes are simulation equivalent if they can both simulate each other. Simulation preorders for the comparison of the behaviour of programs have been defined in [13]. Algorithms for deciding simulation and simulation preorders were only defined decades later [1, 8, 2] and they all have a complexity in terms of the number of states times the number of transitions. In [15, 17, 3, 14] these algorithms are improved by reducing both the required memory footprint and the time complexity to the number of simulation equivalence classes times the number of transitions, but as the number of equivalence classes can be the number of states this essentially means that all algorithms have quadratic time complexity in terms of the input.

This raises the question whether calculating simulation preorder and simulation equivalence is essentially quadratic. Hitherto, there is no real answer to this question. The only analysis is that determining simulation is at least as hard as bisimilarity [12]. This follows from the observation that via a polynomial translation of the process graph bisimulation equivalence reduces to simulation equivalence, showing that modulo this transformation simulation can be used

to calculate bisimilarity. For bisimilarity there is a quasi-linear lower bound assuming partition refinement is used [7].

In this paper we provide an answer by showing that if the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH) holds, then determining simulation preorder on deterministic transition systems and simulation equivalence on non-deterministic transition systems must be quadratic in complexity.

The Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH) states that satisfiability of a propositional formula with n propositional variables cannot be solved in time $O(2^{\delta n})$ for any $\delta < 1$ [10]. There is also the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH), also occurring in [10], which says that determining satisfiability of propositional formulas in conjunctive normal form where each clause has length 3 needs at least time $O(2^{\epsilon n})$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. The strong exponential time hypothesis implies the exponential time hypothesis, which in turn implies $P \neq NP$. Both hypotheses ETH and SETH state that in essence no algorithm for satisfiability significantly outperforms brute-force methods. They are especially useful to prove lower bounds for problems within P [4, 18].

For us the results in [4] are particularly interesting. They deal with the problem of determining the non-emptiness of the intersection for k deterministic finite state machines (k -DFA-NEI). This problem is defined as follows. Given k deterministic finite state machines A_1, \dots, A_k , each over an alphabet Σ and having n states, determine whether

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{L}(A_i) \stackrel{?}{=} \emptyset$$

where $\mathcal{L}(A_i)$ is the set of accepted strings by state machine A_i . For unbounded k this problem is PSPACE-complete [11]. If the number of input DFAs k is fixed, this problem can be solved naively in $O(n^k)$ time by constructing the product automaton of the input. Under the assumption ETH, it cannot be solved in $O(n^{o(k)})$ [5, Prop. 3]. Furthermore, under the stronger assumption SETH, an algorithm running in $O(n^{k-\epsilon})$ is impossible for any constant $\epsilon > 0$, which is more interesting to us.

We show in a quite straightforward way that if simulation preorder on the initial states of two DFAs, all with n states, can be determined in time $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$, then 2-DFA-NEI can be solved in time $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$, which would imply that the assumption SETH does not hold. As a corollary it follows that computing simulation equivalence for the initial states of two nondeterministic automata is also inherently quadratic.

2 SETH implies that DFA-NEI has quadratic complexity

In this section we rephrase in more detail that the strong exponential time hypothesis (SETH) implies that calculating the non-emptiness of the intersection

of two deterministic finite state machines requires quadratic time. In particular, we illustrate by example how a slightly improved algorithm for the non-emptiness of language intersection would mean an exponential improvement for CNF-SAT. More detailed proofs of this construction can be found in [19, Theorem 7.21].

We start out with some preliminaries and the common notion of a deterministic finite automaton. An alphabet is a finite set of letters Σ . A word is a finite sequence of letters over an alphabet where we write ϵ for the empty sequence. For a number $i \in \mathbb{N}$ the set Σ^i is the set of all sequences of length i . The set $\Sigma^* = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma^i$ is the Kleene closure and contains all finite words over Σ . Given a word $w \in \Sigma^*$ and a position $1 \leq i \leq |w|$, we write $w[i]$ for the i -th symbol in w .

Definition 1. A *Deterministic Finite Automaton (DFA)* $A = (S, \Sigma, \delta, F, q_0)$ is a five-tuple consisting of:

- a finite set of states S ,
- a finite set of labels Σ called the alphabet,
- a deterministic transition function $\delta : S \times \Sigma \mapsto S$,
- a set of final states $F \subseteq S$, and
- an initial state $q_0 \in S$.

The *language* accepted by a DFA $A = (S, \Sigma, \delta, F, q_0)$, denoted as $\mathcal{L}(A)$, is the set of words $w \in \Sigma^*$ such that the path with labels from w starting in q_0 ends up in an accepting state.

$$\mathcal{L}(A) = \{w \mid w \in \Sigma^* \text{ and } \delta(q_0, w) \in F\}$$

where we use the generalised transition function δ by taking $\delta(q, \epsilon) = q$ and $\delta(q, aw) = \delta(\delta(a, q), w)$ for any state q .

Given a finite number k of DFAs the non-empty intersection problem of DFAs asks whether there is a word which is accepted by all DFAs. More concretely, it contains all tuples of DFAs of which the intersection of the accepted languages is not empty.

Definition 2. The *decision problem k -DFA-NEI* is the following set of tuples of DFAs

$$k\text{-DFA-NEI} = \{(A_1, \dots, A_k) \mid \bigcap_{i \in [1, k]} \mathcal{L}(A_i) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

We define DFA-NEI as the union of k -DFA-NEI for all k . This problem is well known to be PSPACE-complete [11]. For a fixed k the problem is naively solvable in $O(n^k)$ by computing the product automata. Surprisingly, it turns out that if this can be computed more efficiently, it also means more efficient algorithms for deciding CNF-SAT [19]. We elaborate on that below.

Given an $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, the decision problem ℓ -CNF-SAT is the variant of the boolean satisfiability problem over formulas in conjunctive normal form with at most ℓ literals per clause. The computational complexity of deciding ℓ -CNF-SAT, for increasing values of ℓ is studied in [10]. Let

$$s_\ell = \inf\{\delta \mid \ell\text{-CNF-SAT is solvable in time } 2^{\delta n}\},$$

for each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, where \inf is the infimum. The exponential time hypothesis (ETH) asserts that $s_3 > 0$, i.e., 3-CNF-SAT cannot be solved in less than exponential time. The strong exponential time hypothesis (SETH) asserts that

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} s_\ell = 1.$$

Equivalently SETH asserts that for any $\delta < 1$ there is no algorithm solving CNF-SAT that has a runtime of $O(2^{\delta n})$.

We consider a CNF-formula Φ with m clauses C_1, \dots, C_m and an even number n of propositional variables x_1, \dots, x_n . We construct the languages $L_1^\Phi, L_2^\Phi \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$ that consist of words $w \in \Sigma^{n+m}$ in which the first n letters comprise a bitstring in which for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ the bit $w[i]$ encodes the truth assignment for x_i . The second part of m letters encode a gadget which assigns each clause to either L_1^Φ or L_2^Φ . We require that $w \in L_1^\Phi$ if and only if $w = w_\rho b_1 \cdots b_m$ for a word $w_\rho \in \Sigma^n$ modelling a truth assignment and $b_1, \dots, b_m \in \{0, 1\}$ such that if $b_i = 0$ then C_i is satisfied by the assignment to some variable $x_1, \dots, x_{\frac{1}{2}n}$. Similarly, $w_\rho b_1 \cdots b_m \in L_2^\Phi$ if and only for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ if $b_i = 1$ then C_i is satisfied by the assignment of some variable $x_{\frac{1}{2}n+1}, \dots, x_n$.

For example, consider $\Psi = (x_1 \vee \overline{x_2}) \wedge (\overline{x_1} \vee x_2)$. In Fig. 1 the minimal automata that accepts the languages L_1^Ψ and L_2^Ψ are given.

Observe that, given a formula Φ , for each truth assignment $w_\rho \in \{0, 1\}^n$ there is an extension of $w_C \in \{0, 1\}^m$ such that $w_\rho w_C \in L_1^\Phi \cap L_2^\Phi$ if and only if w_ρ models a satisfying assignment for Φ . This means the intersection $L_1^\Phi \cap L_2^\Phi$ is not empty if and only if there is a satisfying assignment for Φ .

This allows us to prove satisfiability of Φ by constructing L_1^Φ and L_2^Φ and show that their intersection is not empty. Now note that the minimal DFAs that accepts L_1^Φ and L_2^Φ both contain at most $mn2^{\frac{1}{2}n}$ states.

Assume that we can calculate language intersection on two graphs with N states in time $O(N^{2-\epsilon})$, then we can construct L_1^Φ and L_2^Φ , and calculate their intersection in time $O(n^{2-\epsilon}m^{2-\epsilon}2^{n(1-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon)})$ determining CNF-SAT. But this refutes the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis, saying that for CNF-SAT cannot be solved $2^{\delta n}$ for any $\delta < 1$.

Theorem 3. [19, Theorem 7.21] *If 2-DFA-NEI can be solved in $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$ for some constant $\epsilon > 0$, then SETH is false.*




Figure 1: Automata accepting L_1^Ψ (left), and L_2^Ψ (right) for $\Psi = (x_1 \vee \overline{x_2}) \wedge (\overline{x_1} \vee x_2)$.

3 SETH implies simulation has quadratic complexity

In this section we show that determining simulation preorder on deterministic, and simulation equivalence on non-deterministic transition systems is necessarily quadratic, assuming SETH is valid. Simulation is typically defined on labelled transition systems which divert slightly from DFAs.

Definition 4. A *Labelled Transitions System (LTS)* $M = (S, \Sigma, \rightarrow, s_0)$ is a four-tuple consisting of:

- a finite set of states S ,
- a finite set of action labels Σ ,
- a transition relation $\rightarrow \subseteq S \times \Sigma \times S$, and
- the initial state $s_0 \in S$.

Given an LTS $L = (S, Act, \rightarrow)$, we write $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$ when $(s, a, s') \in \rightarrow$. The LTS L is called *deterministic* iff there is at most one outgoing transition for every combination of state $s \in S$ and action label $a \in Act$, i.e. $|\{s' \mid s \xrightarrow{a} s'\}| \leq 1$ for every $(s, a) \in S \times \Sigma$.

Definition 5. Given an LTS $M = (S, \Sigma, \rightarrow, s_0)$, a relation $R \subseteq S \times S$ is called a simulation relation iff for all $(s, t) \in R$ it holds that

- for each $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$ there is a transition $t \xrightarrow{a} t'$ such that $(s', t') \in R$.

The largest simulation relation, written as \sqsubseteq , is called similarity. Given an LTS $M_1 = (S_1, Act_1, \rightarrow_1, s_1)$ and two states $s, t \in S_1$ we say s is simulated by t iff $s \sqsubseteq t$. Given a second LTS $M_2 = (S_2, Act_2, \rightarrow_2, s_2)$, we write $M_1 \sqsubseteq M_2$ iff $s_1 \sqsubseteq s_2$ in the combined LTS $M = (S_1 \cup S_2, Act_1 \cup Act_2, \rightarrow_1 \cup \rightarrow_2, s_1)$, where we assume w.l.o.g. that the states of M_1 and M_2 are disjoint, e.g. $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$.

We say two states s, t are *simulation equivalent*, written $s \simeq t$, iff they simulate each other. A simulation relation which is symmetric is called a bisimulation relation.

We introduce a mapping α from automata to deterministic LTSs such that given two DFAs A_1, A_2 , for the projected deterministic LTSs $M_1 = \alpha(A_1), M_2 = \alpha(A_2)$ it holds that $M_1 \sqsubseteq M_2$ if and only if $\mathcal{L}(A_1) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(A_2)$.

Informally, the mapping α maintains the same transition structure in the deterministic LTSs but adds one state and action label that encodes the accepting states of the automata. More formally, given a DFA $A = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, F, q_0)$, we define the deterministic LTS $\alpha(A) = (Q \cup \{\top\}, \Sigma \cup \{\checkmark\}, \rightarrow, q_0)$, with a fresh symbols $\top \notin Q, \checkmark \notin \Sigma$, and where the transition relation \rightarrow is defined as:

$$\rightarrow = \{(q, a, \delta(q, a)) \mid \text{for each } q, a \in Q \times \Sigma\} \cup \{(q, \checkmark, \top) \mid \text{for each } q \in F\}.$$

As the construction above is quite straightforward, it is easy to see that we have the following theorem.

Theorem 6. Let A, B be DFAs over the alphabet Σ , then

$$\mathcal{L}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(B) \iff \alpha(A) \sqsubseteq \alpha(B)$$

The construction $\alpha(A)$ is computable in linear time. This allows us to compute 2-DFA-NEI by translating the involved DFAs to deterministic LTSs using α .

Theorem 7. If for some time function f similarity on two deterministic LTSs with n states can be decided in $f(n)$ steps then 2-DFA-NEI for input DFAs of n states is computable in $f(n) + O(n)$ steps.

Proof. Not that deciding $\mathcal{L}(A) \cap \mathcal{L}(B) = \emptyset$ is equivalent to deciding $\mathcal{L}(A) \subseteq \Sigma^* \setminus \mathcal{L}(B)$. The DFA \overline{B} is the complement of B , e.g. with all accepting and non-accepting states swapped, such that $\mathcal{L}(\overline{B}) = \Sigma^* \setminus \mathcal{L}(B)$.

Now by Theorem 6 it holds that $\alpha(A) \sqsubseteq \alpha(\overline{B})$ if and only if $\mathcal{L}(A) \cap \mathcal{L}(B) = \emptyset$. Computing $\alpha(A), \alpha(\overline{B})$ can be done in $O(n)$, and hence any $f(n)$ algorithm for similarity could be translated to 2-DFA-NEI. \square

This immediately translates to the following corollary.

Corollary 8. *SETH* implies that similarity for deterministic LTSs can not be decided in $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$.




Figure 2: The LTS M .

On deterministic structures simulation equivalence coincides with bisimilarity. Meaning that deciding simulation equivalence on deterministic structures can be done in almost linear time [9, 6, 16], where ‘almost’ refers to a multiplicative factor with the inverse Ackermann’s function. However, using one non-deterministic transition a faster than quadratic algorithm for simulation equivalence on LTSs in general violates SETH.

Corollary 9. *SETH implies that simulation equivalence cannot be decided in $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$.*

Proof. In order to see that deciding simulation equivalence is also computationally equivalent to deciding 2-DFA-NEI we reduce from deciding similarity on deterministic LTSs by adding one non-deterministic state. Given LTSs $M_1 = (S_1, \Sigma, \rightarrow_1, s_0)$ and $M_2 = (S_2, \Sigma, \rightarrow_2, t_0)$, we construct the LTS $M = (S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \{s, t\}, \rightarrow_1 \cup \rightarrow_2 \cup \{(s, a, s_0), (s, a, t_0), (t, a, t_0)\})$ with two fresh states $s, t \notin S_1 \cup S_2$ for some $a \in \Sigma$. See Fig. 2. Now in M it holds that $s \simeq t \iff s_0 \sqsubseteq t_0$. If simulation equivalence for LTSs is solvable in $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$, then, using this construction, similarity is solvable in $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$. In that case it follows from Corollary 8 that SETH is false. \square

The proof technique employed in this paper appears to be quite universal. It promises to be useable to show fine-grained, i.e., sub-exponential, lower bounds for a much wider classes of problems in the domain of process theory and model checking. Unfortunately, as yet, we were not able to do so.

References

- [1] Bard Bloom and Robert Paige. Transformational design and implementation of a new efficient solution to the ready simulation problem. *Sci. Comput. Program.*, 24(3):189–220, 1995. doi:10.1016/0167-6423(95)00003-B.

- [2] Doron Bustan and Orna Grumberg. Simulation-based minimization. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.*, 4(2):181–206, 2003. doi:10.1145/635499.635502.
- [3] Silvia Crafa, Francesco Ranzato, and Francesco Tapparo. Saving space in a time efficient simulation algorithm. *Fundam. Informaticae*, 108(1-2):23–42, 2011. doi:10.3233/FI-2011-412.
- [4] Mateus de Oliveira Oliveira and Michael Wehar. On the fine grained complexity of finite automata non-emptiness of intersection. In Natasa Jonoska and Dmytro Savchuk, editors, *Developments in Language Theory - 24th International Conference, DLT 2020, Tampa, FL, USA, May 11-15, 2020, Proceedings*, volume 12086 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 69–82. Springer, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-48516-0_6.
- [5] Henning Fernau and Andreas Krebs. Problems on finite automata and the exponential time hypothesis. *Algorithms*, 10(1):24, 2017.
- [6] Michael J. Fischer. Efficiency of equivalence algorithms. In Raymond E. Miller and James W. Thatcher, editors, *Proceedings of a symposium on the Complexity of Computer Computations, held March 20-22, 1972, at the IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, New York, USA*, The IBM Research Symposia Series, pages 153–167. Plenum Press, New York, 1972. doi:10.1007/978-1-4684-2001-2_14.
- [7] Jan Friso Groote, Jan Martens, and Erik P. de Vink. Lowerbounds for bisimulation by partition refinement. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 19(2), 2023. URL: [https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-19\(2:10\)2023](https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-19(2:10)2023), doi:10.46298/LMCS-19(2:10)2023.
- [8] Monika Rauch Henzinger, Thomas A. Henzinger, and Peter W. Kopke. Computing simulations on finite and infinite graphs. In *36th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA, 23-25 October 1995*, pages 453–462. IEEE Computer Society, 1995. doi:10.1109/SFCS.1995.492576.
- [9] John E. Hopcroft and Richard M. Karp. A linear algorithm for testing equivalence of finite automata. Tr 114, Cornell University, 1971.
- [10] Russell Impagliazzo and Ramamohan Paturi. On the complexity of k-SAT. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 2001. doi:10.1006/jcss.2000.1727.
- [11] Dexter Kozen. Lower bounds for natural proof systems. In *Proceedings of SFCS 1977*, pages 254–266. IEEE, IEEE, 1977. doi:10.1109/SFCS.1977.16.
- [12] Antonín Kucera and Richard Mayr. Why is simulation harder than bisimulation? In Lubos Brim, Petr Jancar, Mojmír Kretínský, and Antonín Kucera, editors, *CONCUR 2002 - Concurrency Theory, 13th International*

- Conference, Brno, Czech Republic, August 20-23, 2002, Proceedings*, volume 2421 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 594–610. Springer, 2002. doi:10.1007/3-540-45694-5_39.
- [13] Robin Milner. An algebraic definition of simulation between programs. In D. C. Cooper, editor, *Proceedings of the 2nd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence. London, UK, September 1-3, 1971*, pages 481–489. William Kaufmann, 1971. URL: <http://ijcai.org/Proceedings/71/Papers/044.pdf>.
- [14] Francesco Ranzato. An efficient simulation algorithm on kripke structures. *Acta Informatica*, 51(2):107–125, 2014. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00236-014-0195-9>, doi:10.1007/S00236-014-0195-9.
- [15] Francesco Ranzato and Francesco Tapparo. A new efficient simulation equivalence algorithm. In *22nd IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2007), 10-12 July 2007, Wroclaw, Poland, Proceedings*, pages 171–180. IEEE Computer Society, 2007. doi:10.1109/LICS.2007.8.
- [16] Robert E. Tarjan. Efficiency of a good but not linear set union algorithm. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 22(2):215–225, 1975. doi:10.1145/321879.321884.
- [17] Rob J. van Glabbeek and Bas Ploeger. Correcting a space-efficient simulation algorithm. In Aarti Gupta and Sharad Malik, editors, *Computer Aided Verification, 20th International Conference, CAV 2008, Princeton, NJ, USA, July 7-14, 2008, Proceedings*, volume 5123 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 517–529. Springer, 2008. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-70545-1_49.
- [18] Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Hardness of Easy Problems: Basing Hardness on Popular Conjectures such as the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis. In Thore Husfeldt and Iyad Kanj, editors, *Proceedings of IPEC 2015*, volume 43 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 17–29. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2015. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.IPEC.2015.17.
- [19] Michael Wehar. *On the complexity of intersection non-emptiness problems*. PhD thesis, University at Buffalo, 2016.