

J-P: MDP. FP. PP.*

**Characterizing Total Expected Rewards in Markov
Decision Processes as Least Fixed Points
with an Application to
Operational Semantics of Probabilistic Programs
(Technical Report)**

Kevin Batz¹[0000-0001-8705-2564], Benjamin Lucien
Kaminski^{2,3}[0000-0001-8705-2564], Christoph Matheja⁴[0000-0001-9151-0441], and
Tobias Winkler¹[0000-0003-1084-6408]

¹ RWTH Aachen University, Germany

`{kevin.batz,tobias.winkler}@cs.rwth-aachen.de`

² Saarland University, Saarland Informatics Campus, Germany

`kaminski@cs.uni-saarland.de`

³ University College London, United Kingdom

⁴ Technical University of Denmark, Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark

`chmat@dtu.dk`

Abstract. Markov decision processes (MDPs) with rewards are a widespread and well-studied model for systems that make both probabilistic and nondeterministic choices. A fundamental result about MDPs is that their minimal and maximal expected rewards satisfy Bellmann’s optimality equations. For various classes of MDPs – notably finite-state MDPs, positive bounded models, and negative models – expected rewards are known to be the least solution of those equations. However, these classes of MDPs are too restrictive for probabilistic program verification. In particular, they assume that all rewards are finite. This is already not the case for the expected runtime of a simple probabilistic program modeling a 1-dimensional random walk.

In this paper, we develop a generalized least fixed point characterization of expected rewards in MDPs without those restrictions. Furthermore, we demonstrate how said characterization can be leveraged to prove weakest-preexpectation-style calculi sound with respect to an operational MDP model.

1 Introduction

(Discrete) probabilistic programs are ordinary programs which can base control flow on the outcome of coin flips. They are ubiquitous in computer science. They

* This research was partially supported by the ERC AdG project 787914 FRAPPANT, the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 101008233 (MISSION), the DFG Research Training Group 2236 UnRAVeL, and the DFF project AuRoRa.

appear, e.g., as implementations of randomized algorithms and communication protocols, as models of physical or biological processes, and as descriptions of statistical models used in artificial intelligence; see [3] for an overview.

Typical questions in the design and verification of probabilistic programs are concerned with quantifying their expected – or average – behavior. Examples include the expected number of retransmissions of a protocol, the probability that a particle reaches its destination, and the expected resource consumption of an algorithm. In the presence of truly *nondeterministic* choices that the program does *not* resolve by flipping coins, a typical goal is to *maximize* the expected reward earned by a system, or to *minimize* its expected cost over all possible ways to resolve those nondeterministic choices.

J-P. At least over the past decade, Joost-Pieter has pushed the boundaries of probabilistic program verification by studying (1) the semantics of probabilistic programs with intricate features, (2) rules for reasoning about them, and (3) algorithms for automating their verification. A reoccurring question – indeed, almost a leitmotif – in Joost-Pieter’s probabilistic program research is:

“What about loops?”

While quickly stated, it is a profound question that quickly unravels into concrete research questions which continue to drive Joost-Pieter, such as:

- *How to verify probabilistic programs with unbounded loops or recursion?*
- *How can model checking benefit from deductive verification and vice versa?*
- *How to make probabilistic program verification a “push-button” technology?*

To address these questions, Joost-Pieter (J.-P.) worked extensively on connecting probabilistic programs (PPs) and Markov decision processes (MDPs) via fixed point (FP) theory.

MDP. Markov decision processes [1,41] with rewards (or costs) are a standard mathematical model for systems that can make both discrete probabilistic and truly nondeterministic choices. They are for probabilistic systems what labelled transition systems are for ordinary ones. From a probability theory perspective, MDPs are well-understood, although the standard treatment involves – perhaps surprisingly – advanced machinery like cylinder sets. Nevertheless, MDPs allow for an intuitive understanding of expected rewards in terms possible execution paths through an MDP. For finite MDPs, probabilistic model checkers, such as STORM [15], can compute minimal and maximal rewards fully automatically.

MDPs are a natural model for assigning *operational semantics* to probabilistic programs, just like transition systems are a natural model for assigning operational semantics to ordinary programs. For example, the PRISM language [36] – a standard format for probabilistic model checking problems – can be viewed as a probabilistic programming language similar to Dijkstra’s guarded commands [16]. Since it requires that all variables have bounded domains, every PRISM program corresponds to a finite-state MDP.

PP. Verifying programs written in more general probabilistic programming languages than PRISM – think: with unbounded variable domains – is arguably harder than ordinary program verification [27,29]. In particular, those programs correspond to infinite-state MDPs [20], just like arbitrary programs correspond to infinite transition systems. Hence, model checking by explicit state space exploration becomes infeasible.

To reason about non-probabilistic programs, one may use *deductive verification* approaches, such as Hoare logic or weakest preconditions. For probabilistic programs, Kozen was the first to propose a dynamic logic [34,35] for reasoning about expected values of probabilistic programs with unbounded loops. McIver and Morgan [37] extended Kozen’s approach by incorporating nondeterministic choices. They also coined the term *weakest preexpectation* calculus in reminiscence of Dijkstra’s weakest preconditions. Intuitively, the weakest preexpectation $\text{wp}[[C]](X)$ of a program C and a random variable X maps every initial program state σ to the (minimal or maximal) expected value of X after termination of C on σ . The main advantage of such *wp-style* calculi is that they can be defined as *symbolic* – and even entirely *syntactic* [10] – expressions *by induction on the program structure*. They are in that sense *compositional*. For example, the weakest preexpectation of the program $\{C_1\} [p] \{C_2\}$, which executes C_1 with probability p and C_2 with probability $(1 - p)$, is given by

$$\text{wp}[[\{C_1\} [p] \{C_2\}]](X) = p \cdot \text{wp}[[C_1]](X) + (1 - p) \cdot \text{wp}[[C_2]](X) .$$

That is, if we already know the expected value of random variable X after termination of the subprograms C_1 and C_2 , respectively, then the expected value of X after termination of $\{C_1\} [p] \{C_2\}$ is a weighted sum of those expected values. Hence, *wp-style* calculi enable formal reasoning about probabilistic programs.

Joost-Pieter’s works on PP verification feature advanced *wp-style* calculi for reasoning about, amongst others, conditioning [25], expected runtimes [31,30], probabilistic pointer programs [11], and amortized expected runtimes [12]. Joost-Pieter also pushed for automating verification, e.g. through techniques for learning loop invariants [19,6], specialized proof rules [9,38,22], novel verification algorithms [7,8], and by developing an automated verification infrastructure [46].

Throughout those works, probabilistic programs turned out to be full of subtleties. For example, the semantics of allowing observations inside of loops is non-trivial [25]. The same holds for allowing variables with mixed-sign data domains [28]. Joost-Pieter thus always strongly advised that the developed

calculi must be proven sound with respect to an intuitive operational model.

More technically put, a *wp-style* calculus should be accompanied by a soundness theorem stating that, for every initial program state, the value obtained from the calculus corresponds to the (minimal or maximal) expected reward of an MDP representing the program’s operational semantics.⁵

⁵ There are of course other reasonable semantical models of probabilistic programs that one could consider as a “ground truth”, such as *probabilistic Turing ma-*

When attempting to connect wp-style calculi to expected rewards of suitable MDPs, one encounters the following (solved) issue: An operational semantics models how a program is executed, i.e. it moves forward through a program, whereas wp-style calculi push suitable objects (usually random variables) *backward* through a program. In particular, for nondeterministic choices, a semantics based on MDPs resolves all nondeterminism upfront (through a scheduler), whereas wp-style calculi resolve nondeterminism on demand.

A similar issue arises when reasoning about unbounded loops. Both approaches deal with loops by *unfolding* them, i.e. they treat the following two programs as equivalent:

$$\text{while}(\textit{guard})\{C\} \equiv \text{if}(\textit{guard})\{C; \text{while}(\textit{guard})\{C\}\} \text{else}\{\text{skip}\}$$

As is standard for operational semantics [50], the MDP semantics unfolds loops on demand. By contrast, wp calculi capture all unfoldings at once through taking the least *fixed point* of the above equivalence, as is standard for denotational semantics [50].

FP. To deal with the above issues, soundness proofs rely on the fact that expected rewards are the least solution of Bellman’s optimality equations [13]. In other words, both the minimal and the maximal expected reward of an MDPs can be characterized as the least fixed point of a Bellmann operator – a recursive definition of expected rewards that is closer to wp-style calculi than the more intuitive path-based definition.

Least fixed point characterizations of expected rewards have been extensively studied. For example, they are considered in [1] for finite-state MDPs. Puterman gives least fixed point characterizations of (undiscounted) expected rewards for infinite-state MDPs with non-negative rewards (cf. [41, Theorems 7.2.3a and 7.3.3a]). However, there are slight mismatches between his characterizations and the precise theorems required for proving wp-style calculi sound:

The fixed point characterization of *maximal* expected rewards is close to Puterman’s *positive bounded models* [41, Section 7.2]. But, those models assume that all rewards are finite, see [41, Assumption 7.2.1]. This assumption is unrealistic when using wp-style calculi, where ∞ appears naturally in the value domain of certain random variables of interest. Puterman also requires that *expected values* are finite, which is problematic in two ways: First, discharging this assumption requires a technique for analyzing the expected value of a probabilistic program

chines [45], *stochastic Petri nets* [48], *measure transformers* [33], *probabilistic control flow graphs* [18], *stochastic lambda calculi* [43], or even formal approaches where one assumes that *the de facto semantics is the sampler* [14], to name only a few. But – borrowing from the Rifleman’s Creed [44]:

*MDPs are Joost-Pieter’s operational model.
There are many like it, but this one is Joost-Pieter’s.*

– exactly what we want to use weakest preexpectations for. To prove a verification technique sound, we would thus first need another sound verification technique for probabilistic programs to discharge all assumptions. Second, infinite expected values occur naturally when considering probabilistic programs. For example, a probabilistic program may terminate with probability one but still have an infinite expected runtime [30].

For *minimal* expected rewards, the fixed point characterization is close to the one given by Puterman for *negative models* [41, Section 7.3]. However, Puterman again rules out infinite (expected) rewards.

Goal of this Paper. To avoid ad-hoc arguments in future soundness proofs, we give least fixed point characterizations of expected rewards of MDPs with assumptions suitable for probabilistic program verification, in particular allowing for infinite rewards.

Contributions and Outline. Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- After briefly recapitulating MDPs with assumptions suitable for probabilistic program verification in Section 2, we formalize minimal and maximal total expected rewards as sums-over-all-paths in Section 3. Section 4 shows how those expected rewards relate to reachability probabilities for MDPs.
- Our main results are the least fixed point characterizations of minimal and maximal rewards (Theorem 3) in Section 6; the necessary background on fixed point theory is presented in Section 5.
- We show that optimal schedulers for minimal expected rewards always exists in Section 7. For maximal expected rewards, this is not the case.
- We demonstrate the usefulness of our least fixed point characterizations by proving the soundness of two weakest preexpectation calculi for probabilistic programs with user-defined reward structures in Section 8.

Origins of this Paper. Parts of this article are an extension of [4, Chapter 2.2]. More specifically, Lemma 2 is a generalization of [4, Lemma 2.8] and Theorem 3 is a generalization of [4, Theorem 2.9] from expected reachability-rewards to total expected rewards.

2 Markov Decision Processes

An MDP can be thought of as a probabilistic extension of a labelled transition system. We consider here *finitely branching* processes with *countable* state spaces. It goes without saying that we follow the presentation of [1, Chapter 10]. If the reader is familiar with [1], almost everything in this section should be completely standard, except that we do not designate an initial state. The latter is motivated by the fact that the probabilistic programs we consider later in Section 8 do not have a fixed initial state either.




Fig. 1: Example MDP with infinite state space. Omitted probabilities are 1. Numbers in boxes next to states – like \boxed{r} or $\boxed{2}$ – are rewards (see Section 3).

Definition 1 (MDPs). A Markov decision process (MDP)

$$\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \text{Act}, P),$$

is a structure where:

1. \mathcal{S} is a countable set of states. If \mathcal{S} is finite, then we say that \mathcal{M} is finite-state. Otherwise, we say that \mathcal{M} is infinite-state.
2. Act is a finite set of actions.
3. $P: \mathcal{S} \times \text{Act} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a transition probability function such that:
 - (a) For all states $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and actions $\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}$, the function $P(s, \mathbf{a}, -)$ is either a (full) probability distribution over finitely many successor states, or a null distribution. Formally:

$$\underbrace{\{s' \in \mathcal{S} \mid P(s, \mathbf{a}, s') > 0\}}_{\text{probability distribution has finite support}} \text{ is finite} \quad \text{and} \quad \overbrace{\sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s, \mathbf{a}, s')}^{\text{a maps to full probability distribution or null distribution}} \in \{0, 1\}$$

We say that action \mathbf{a} is enabled in state s if $\sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s, \mathbf{a}, s') = 1$ and denote the set of actions enabled in s by $\text{Act}(s)$.

- (b) Every state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ has at least one enabled action, i.e. $|\text{Act}(s)| \geq 1$.

If $P(s, \mathbf{a}, s') > 0$, then s' is called an \mathbf{a} -successor of s and we denote the finite set of \mathbf{a} -successors of s by $\text{Succs}_{\mathbf{a}}(s)$.

Example 1 (Markov Decision Processes). Figure 1 depicts an infinite-state MDP with states $\mathcal{S} = \{s_i, s_i^L, s_i^R \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{\perp\}$ and actions $\text{Act} = \{N, L, R\}$. The transition probability function P takes, e.g., values $P(s_0, L, s_0^L) = 1$ and $P(s_0, R, s_0^R) = 1/2$, etc. \triangleleft

An MDP moves between states by nondeterministically selecting an action that is enabled in the current state. The next state is then chosen probabilistically according to the transition probability function for that action. To “execute” an MDP, we move from state to state, thus creating *paths* of visited states. Towards a formal definition, we denote by \mathcal{S}^+ the set of *non-empty* sequences over \mathcal{S} .

Definition 2 (Paths). Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathbf{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ be an MDP.

1. A path in \mathcal{M} is a finite, non-empty sequence of states

$$\pi = s_0 \dots s_n \in \mathbf{S}^+$$

such that there is for each state s_i , with $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, an enabled action $\alpha \in \text{Act}(s_i)$ such that s_{i+1} is an α -successor of s_i , i.e., $s_{i+1} \in \text{Succs}_\alpha(s_i)$.

2. We define the set of all paths of length exactly $n \in \mathbb{N}$ starting in $s \in \mathbf{S}$ as

$$\text{Paths}^{\overline{n}}(s) = \{ \pi \mid \pi = s_0 \dots s_n \text{ is a path in } \mathcal{M} \text{ and } s_0 = s \} .$$

3. We define the set of paths of length at most $n \in \mathbb{N}$ starting in $s \in \mathbf{S}$ as

$$\text{Paths}^{\leq n}(s) = \{ \pi \mid \pi = s_0 \dots s_m \text{ is a path in } \mathcal{M} \text{ and } s_0 = s \text{ and } m \leq n \} .$$

4. We define the set of all (finite) paths starting in state $s \in \mathbf{S}$ as

$$\text{Paths}(s) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Paths}^{\leq n}(s) .$$

Note that all of the above sets of paths are countable.

Our goal is to formalize expected rewards in terms of probabilities and rewards of paths. However, if multiple actions are enabled for some state s , the probability of moving from s to some other state s' – and the probability of paths including ss' – depends on the nondeterministically chosen action. To assign *unique* probability measures to paths, we must first resolve all nondeterminism. To perform this resolution, we employ *schedulers*, which determine the next action based on the previously visited states.

Definition 3 (Schedulers). A scheduler for an MDP $\mathcal{M} = (\mathbf{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ is a function⁶

$$\mathfrak{S}: \mathbf{S}^+ \rightarrow \text{Act}$$

which for each history of previously visited states $s_0 \dots s_n \in \mathbf{S}^+$ always chooses an action enabled in s_n , i.e. for all $s_0 \dots s_n \in \mathbf{S}^+$, we have $\mathfrak{S}(s_0 \dots s_n) \in \text{Act}(s_n)$.

We denote the set of all schedulers for \mathcal{M} by Scheds because \mathcal{M} will always be clear from context.

A scheduler \mathfrak{S} is called *memoryless*, if its choices depend solely on the last state of the history, i.e. for all $s_0 \dots s_n \in \mathbf{S}^+$ and $t_0 \dots t_m \in \mathbf{S}^+$, we have

$$s_n = t_m \text{ implies } \mathfrak{S}(s_0 \dots s_n) = \mathfrak{S}(t_0 \dots t_m) .$$

Otherwise, \mathfrak{S} is called *history-dependent*. A memoryless scheduler can be identified with a function of type $\mathbf{S} \rightarrow \text{Act}$. We denote the set of all memoryless schedulers for \mathcal{M} by MLScheds (again \mathcal{M} will be clear from context).

⁶ We consider only *deterministic* schedulers. Some applications also consider *randomized* schedulers.

A scheduler \mathfrak{S} resolves the nondeterminism in an MDP \mathcal{M} as follows: Starting in some initial state s_0 , \mathfrak{S} first chooses *deterministically* the action $\mathfrak{S}(s_0)$. If thereafter *probabilistically* drawn $\mathfrak{S}(s_0)$ -successor of s_0 is s_1 , then \mathfrak{S} next chooses action $\mathfrak{S}(s_0s_1)$, and so on. If \mathfrak{S} is memoryless, the chosen action only depends on the current state s_1 .

Since a scheduler \mathfrak{S} resolves the nondeterminism in \mathcal{M} , it makes now sense to speak about *the probability of a path in \mathcal{M} under \mathfrak{S}* .

Definition 4 (Path Probabilities). *Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathbb{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ be an MDP, let $\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}$ be a scheduler, and let $s_0 \dots s_n \in \mathbb{S}^+$. The probability of $s_0 \dots s_n$ in \mathcal{M} under \mathfrak{S} is*

$$\text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_0 \dots s_n) = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} P(s_i, \mathfrak{S}(s_0 \dots s_i), s_{i+1}) ,$$

where the empty product (i.e., in case $n = 0$) equals 1.

Remark 1. Somewhat contrary to what the notation suggests, $\text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}$ as defined above is *not* actually a probability distribution over the (countable) set of all finite paths. This is for two reasons: First, as our MDPs have no initial state, we have $\text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s) = 1$ for *every* $s \in \mathbb{S}$. It is thus clear that $\text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}$ cannot be a sensible distribution if $|\mathbb{S}| > 1$. But even for a fixed initial state $s_0 \in \mathbb{S}$, $\text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}$ is not a distribution over $\text{Paths}(s_0)$. In fact, we have $\sum_{\pi \in \text{Paths}(s_0)} \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(\pi) = \infty$. However, $\text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}$ *is* a meaningful distribution over $\text{Paths}^{\leq n}(s_0)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The path probability $\text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_0 \dots s_n)$ can then be understood as the probability that the path $s_0 \dots s_n$ occurs assuming that

- \mathfrak{S} is used to resolve all nondeterminism,
- the MDP is started in s_0 , and
- the MDP is executed for exactly n steps.

Finally, we remark that constructing a probability measure over (measurable) sets of infinite paths in line with our path probabilities is standard, see [1, Chaper 10]. We omit such constructions to keep the presentation more elementary. \triangleleft

3 Expected Rewards

We now equip MDPs with a reward structure and formalize *expected rewards* based on the probability of and the reward collected along paths. In contrast to definitions found in the literature, e.g. [1,41], our rewards can be any extended real in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$. Apart from that, our definition of expected (total) rewards is standard (cf. [41, p. 77 - 79]).

We first formalize summation over countable index sets. Throughout this paper, we let $\alpha + \infty = \infty + \alpha = \infty$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$, and moreover $0 \cdot \infty = \infty \cdot 0 = 0$. Following [49, Section 6.2], given a countable set A and $g: A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$, we define

$$\sum_{\alpha \in A} g(\alpha) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in F} g(\alpha) \mid F \text{ finite and } F \subseteq A \right\} ,$$

which is a well-defined number in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$. An important feature of the above sum is that even for countably *infinite* A , the order of summation is irrelevant: For every bijective function $\text{enum}: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$ (i.e. every permutation of A), we have (by [49, Proposition 6.1])

$$\sum_{\alpha \in A} g(\alpha) = \sum_{i=0}^{\omega} g(\text{enum}(i)) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{i=0}^n g(\text{enum}(i)) ,$$

where ω is the first infinite ordinal number. With this notion of countable summation at hand, we now define reward functions and expected rewards of MDPs.

Definition 5 (Reward Functions). *A function*

$$\text{rew}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$$

for an MDP $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ mapping MDP states to non-negative extended reals is called a reward function (for \mathcal{M}). We call $\text{rew}(s)$ the reward of state s .

Intuitively, we think of $\text{rew}(s)$ as a reward that is collected upon *entering* state s as one progresses along a path through the MDP. We thus extend the definition of rew from states to paths of \mathcal{M} : For $s_0 \dots s_n \in \mathcal{S}^+$, we define

$$\text{rew}(s_0 \dots s_n) = \sum_{i=0}^n \text{rew}(s_i) .$$

The above sum is never empty as every path contains at least one state.

Now that we have assigned a reward to each path and we have earlier assigned a probability to each path (under a given scheduler), we associate each state of an MDP with a minimal and a maximal *expected reward*.⁷

Definition 6 (Expected Rewards). *Let $\text{rew}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$ be a reward function for an MDP $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ and $\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}$. We define the following:*

1. *The expected reward from $s \in \mathcal{S}$ after $n \in \mathbb{N}$ steps under \mathfrak{S} is defined as*

$$\text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^n(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) = \sum_{s_0 \dots s_n \in \text{Paths}^n(s)} \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_0 \dots s_n) \cdot \text{rew}(s_0 \dots s_n) .$$

Notice that the number of summands is finite.

2. *The expected reward from $s \in \mathcal{S}$ under \mathfrak{S} is defined as*

$$\text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^n(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) .$$

3. *The minimal expected reward from $s \in \mathcal{S}$ after $n \in \mathbb{N}$ steps is defined as*

$$\text{MinER}^n(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) = \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^n(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) .$$

⁷ Similarly to our definition of path probabilities, we consider it more intuitive to give direct path-based definitions of expected values instead of defining them in the framework of probability theory, i.e. via measurable functions and Lebesgue integrals.

4. The minimal expected reward from $s \in \mathbf{S}$ is defined as

$$\text{MinER}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) = \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) .$$

5. The maximal expected reward from $s \in \mathbf{S}$ after $n \in \mathbb{N}$ steps is defined as

$$\text{MaxER}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) = \sup_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) .$$

6. The maximal expected reward from $s \in \mathbf{S}$ is defined as

$$\text{MaxER}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) = \sup_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) .$$

If clear from context, we omit \mathcal{M} from the notation above.

We briefly go over the above notions of expected rewards: Upon reaching a state $s' \in \mathbf{S}$, the MDP collects reward $\text{rew}(s')$. Then $\text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\text{=n}}(s, \text{rew})$ is the expected reward collected after exactly n steps if we start the MDP in state s and resolve all nondeterminism according to \mathfrak{S} . As the number of steps the process progresses tends to ω , i.e. “in the limit”, we obtain the (total) expected reward $\text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s, \text{rew})$. $\text{MinER}(s, \text{rew})$ is the minimal – under all possible choices of nondeterminism-resolving schedulers – expected reward when starting in state s . Analogously, $\text{MaxER}(s, \text{rew})$ is the maximal⁸ expected reward. $\text{MinER}^{\text{=n}}(s, \text{rew})$ and $\text{MaxER}^{\text{=n}}(s, \text{rew})$ are the corresponding step-bounded variants. Finally, we call a scheduler *min-optimal* (resp. *max-optimal*) if the infimum in $\text{MinER}(s, \text{rew})$ (resp. the supremum in $\text{MaxER}(s, \text{rew})$) is attained for that scheduler.

Example 2 (Expected Rewards). Consider the MDP in Figure 1 together with the reward function $\text{rew}(s_i^L) = r$, for some constant $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$, $\text{rew}(s_i^R) = i + 1$, and $\text{rew}(s_i) = 0$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ (see numbers in boxes next to states in Figure 1). We have the following:

- If $r > 0$ then $\text{MaxER}(s_0, \text{rew}) = \infty$ as witnessed by the strategy that always stays in the topmost row (cf. Example 11). On the other hand, to *minimize* the expected reward, it is best to reach the sink state \perp as early as possible, i.e. to follow the scheduler \mathfrak{S} with $\mathfrak{S}(s_i) = R$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence,

$$\text{MinER}(s_0, \text{rew}) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot 1 + \frac{1}{4} \cdot 2 + \frac{1}{8} \cdot 3 + \dots = 2 .$$

- Now, let $r = 0$. Then the minimal expected reward is $\text{MinER}(s_0, \text{rew}) = 0$. For the maximal expected reward, we claim that still $\text{MaxER}(s_0, \text{rew}) = \infty$. To see this, consider for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the unique scheduler \mathfrak{S}_k with $\mathfrak{S}_k(s_i) = L$ for all $i < k$ and $\mathfrak{S}_k(s_j) = R$ for all $j \geq k$. Note that $\text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}_k}^{\text{=2}(k+1)}(s_0, \text{rew}) =$

⁸ For historical reasons, we will speak of maximal expected rewards, even though the supremum in Definition 6.6 is not necessarily a maximum (cf. Section 7).

$\frac{1}{2}(k+1)$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{MaxER}(s_0, \text{rew}) &= \sup_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_0, \text{rew}) \\
&\geq \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}_k}(s_0, \text{rew}) \\
&= \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}_k}^{\leq n}(s_0, \text{rew}) \\
&= \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}_k}^{\leq 2(n+1)}(s_0, \text{rew}) \\
&\geq \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}_k}^{\leq 2(k+1)}(s_0, \text{rew}) = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2}(k+1) = \infty .
\end{aligned}$$

However, it can be shown that $\text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}_k}(s_0, \text{rew}) < \infty$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e. none of the schedulers \mathfrak{S}_k attains the maximal expected reward. In general, max-optimal schedulers are not guaranteed to exist in infinite-state MDPs. In *this* example, however, there does exist a max-optimal scheduler, see Example 6. \triangleleft

4 Reachability Probabilities

Readers with a probabilistic model checking background may perhaps be more familiar with *reachability probabilities* or *expected rewards upon reaching a set of target states* than with the (total) expected rewards we formalized in the previous section. Those notions can be recovered from expected rewards. For example, reachability probabilities can be defined in terms of expected rewards as follows (cf. [1, Chapter 10]):

Definition 7 (Reachability Probabilities). *Let $\mathcal{M} = (S, \text{Act}, P)$ be an MDP and let $T \subseteq S$ be a set of target states. Consider the MDP $\mathcal{M}_T = (S \cup \{\perp\}, \text{Act}, P')$, where*

$$P'(s, a, t) = \begin{cases} P(s, a, t), & \text{if } s \in S \setminus T \text{ and } t \neq \perp \\ 0, & \text{if } s \in S \setminus T \text{ and } t = \perp \\ 0, & \text{if } s \in T \cup \{\perp\} \text{ and } t \neq \perp \\ 1, & \text{if } s \in T \cup \{\perp\} \text{ and } t = \perp . \end{cases}$$

Intuitively, \mathcal{M}_T is obtained from \mathcal{M} by adding a fresh sink state \perp and redirecting all outgoing transitions from target states in T to the sink \perp .

Consider furthermore the reward function rew_T for \mathcal{M}_T given by

$$\text{rew}_T(s) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } s \in T \\ 0, & \text{if } s \notin T . \end{cases}$$

Then we define the probability to reach T from a state s under a scheduler \mathfrak{S} as

$$\Pr_{\mathfrak{S}}(\mathcal{M}, s \models \diamond T) = \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}(\mathcal{M}_T, s, \text{rew}_T) .$$

The minimal probability to reach \top from a state s is defined as

$$\text{MinPr}(\mathcal{M}, s \models \diamond\top) = \text{MinER}(\mathcal{M}_\top, s, \text{rew}_\top) .$$

Analogously, the maximal probability to reach \top from a state s is defined as

$$\text{MaxPr}(\mathcal{M}, s \models \diamond\top) = \text{MaxER}(\mathcal{M}_\top, s, \text{rew}_\top) .$$

Example 3 (Reachability Probabilities). Reconsider the MDP \mathcal{M} from Figure 1 on page 6. Let $\top = \{s_i^R \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Note that \mathcal{M} is already identical to \mathcal{M}_\top .⁹ For the (memoryless) scheduler \mathfrak{S} that always stays in the topmost row (cf. Example 11), we have $\text{Pr}_{\mathfrak{S}}(\mathcal{M}, s_0 \models \diamond\top) = 0$ and thus $\text{MinPr}(\mathcal{M}, s_0 \models \diamond\top) = 0$. On the other hand, we have $\text{MaxPr}(\mathcal{M}, s_0 \models \diamond\top) = 1$ because some state from \top can be eventually reached with probability 1 by, for example, always choosing action R in the s_i states. \triangleleft

5 Basic Fixed Point Theory

The things we are interested in – expected rewards – live in a world of probability measures and expected values over paths through an MDP (under a scheduler). This world is not very compatible with the way one gives denotational semantics to programming languages, which is usually in the language of ordered spaces and fixed points. In that world, finite approximations of a process progression are captured as a finite amount of iterations of some appropriate function Φ . One application of Φ will correspond to one progression step. The limiting behavior of the process is then captured as iterating Φ ad infinitum. Our goal is to connect these two views.¹⁰ In some sense, we will later describe how to obtain $\text{MinER}^{-n+1}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew})$ from $\text{MinER}^{-n}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew})$ by applying a suitable function Φ to $\text{MinER}^{-n}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew})$, and how $\text{MinER}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew})$ emerges from iterating Φ ad infinitum to a suitable initial value. This fixed point iteration will moreover happen to correspond to the *least* fixed point of the ambient ordered space that we are working in.

Let us recap some basics of these ordered spaces. Imagine that we want to assign an expected reward to each (of possibly infinitely many) MDP states. Let us gather such an assignment in a reward vector. Consider now an MDP with two states and the reward vectors $u = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, $v = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4})$, and $w = (\frac{1}{3}, 1)$. Clearly, v is “larger” than u , in that all entries of u are component-wise larger than v . On the other hand, w is not comparable to u nor v : while the second component of w is indeed larger, the first component is not. In that sense, reward vectors do *not* form a *total* order but only a *partial* order.

⁹ Very pedantically speaking, we would have to add to \mathcal{M} a *fresh* sink state, say \perp_\perp , have all the s_i^R 's redirect to \perp_\perp , and have \perp also redirect to \perp_\perp , but have \perp itself be unreachable. We do not do this for clarity of exposition.

¹⁰ Yet another time – this has been done often before, but always with restrictions that are not really suitable for an application to probabilistic program semantics.

Definition 8 (Partial Orders). Let D be a set and $\sqsubseteq \subseteq D \times D$. The structure

$$(D, \sqsubseteq)$$

is called a partial order, if the following conditions hold:

1. \sqsubseteq is reflexive, i.e. for all $d \in D$,

$$d \sqsubseteq d .$$

2. \sqsubseteq is transitive, i.e. for all $d, e, c \in D$,

$$d \sqsubseteq e \quad \text{and} \quad e \sqsubseteq c \quad \text{implies} \quad d \sqsubseteq c .$$

3. \sqsubseteq is antisymmetric, i.e. for all $d, e \in D$,

$$d \sqsubseteq e \quad \text{and} \quad e \sqsubseteq d \quad \text{implies} \quad d = e .$$

We will usually say “ d is smaller than e ” for $d \sqsubseteq e$ instead of the more precise formulation “ d is smaller than or equal to e ”; and similarly for “larger than”.

We now want to speak about some notion of limits and convergence in these ordered spaces called partial orders. Fix a partial order (D, \sqsubseteq) and take any subset $S \subseteq D$. An element $d \in D$ is called an *upper bound* of S , if d is larger than all elements of S , i.e. if

$$\text{for all } e \in S, \quad e \sqsubseteq d .$$

Moreover, d is called the *least upper bound* or *supremum* of S , if

1. d is an upper bound of S , and
2. every upper bound e of S is larger than d , i.e. $d \sqsubseteq e$.

Antisymmetry of \sqsubseteq implies that if the supremum of S exists, then it is unique and we denote it by $\bigsqcup S$.

Dually to upper bounds, $d \in D$ is called a *lower bound* of S , if d is smaller than all elements of S , i.e. if

$$\text{for all } e \in S, \quad d \sqsubseteq e .$$

Dually to suprema, one can define a (unique) infimum $\bigsqcap S$ of S .

We usually restrict to partially ordered spaces in which all suprema and infima are guaranteed to exist. Such spaces are called *complete lattices*:

Definition 9 (Complete Lattices). A partial order (D, \sqsubseteq) is called a complete lattice, if every $S \subseteq D$ has a supremum $\bigsqcup S \in D$ and an infimum $\bigsqcap S \in D$.

In particular, every complete lattice has a *least element* \perp given by $\perp = \bigsqcup \emptyset$, and a *greatest element* \top given by $\top = \bigsqcap \emptyset$.

So far we have described the ambient spaces in which we would like to operate – complete lattices. We now come to the functions Φ which are supposed to

capture the one-step progression of a process. Fix a complete lattice (D, \sqsubseteq) . We now consider endomaps on (D, \sqsubseteq) , i.e. functions

$$\Phi: D \rightarrow D$$

mapping from the carrier set D into itself. We already hinted above to the fact that we will be interested in least fixed points of these functions; *least* in terms of the ambient partial order \sqsubseteq . Formally, we have:

Definition 10 (Least Fixed Points). *Let (D, \sqsubseteq) be a complete lattice and let $\Phi: D \rightarrow D$ be an endomap on D .*

1. *An element $d \in D$ is called a fixed point of Φ , if*

$$\Phi(d) = d .$$

2. *A fixed point $d \in D$ of Φ is called the least fixed point of Φ , if*

$$\text{for all fixed points } d' \text{ of } \Phi: \quad d \sqsubseteq d' .$$

If it exists, we denote the least fixed point of Φ by $\text{lfp } \Phi$.

Antisymmetry of \sqsubseteq implies that if the least fixed point of Φ exists, then it is unique, which justifies the above notation and to speak of *the* least fixed point.

Next, we impose a very basic property on such endomaps: monotonicity.

Definition 11 (Monotone Functions). *An endomap*

$$\Phi: D \rightarrow D$$

on a complete lattice (D, \sqsubseteq) is called monotone (w.r.t. (D, \sqsubseteq)), if

$$\text{for all } d, e \in D \quad d \sqsubseteq e \quad \text{implies} \quad \Phi(d) \sqsubseteq \Phi(e) .$$

Intuitively, monotonicity of Φ states: The more we pour into Φ , the more we get out of Φ . In our context, it will mean: The more reward we have already collected after n steps, the more reward we will collect after $n+1$ steps. Somewhat astonishingly, monotonicity of an endomap Φ on a complete lattice is already a sufficient criterion for Φ to have a least fixed point – a theorem famously attributed to Knaster [32] and Tarski [47]. However, the Knaster-Tarski theorem is non-constructive and it is not apparent how to arrive at or even approach the least fixed point. A stricter notion than monotonicity – *continuity* – will yield such approachability.

Definition 12 (ω -Continuity [50]). *Let (D, \sqsubseteq) be a complete lattice and let $\Phi: D \rightarrow D$ be an endomap on D . We say that Φ is ω -continuous (or simply continuous), if for all increasing ω -chains¹¹ $S = \{d_0 \sqsubseteq d_1 \sqsubseteq \dots\} \subseteq D$, we have*

$$\Phi\left(\bigsqcup S\right) = \bigsqcup \Phi(S) = \bigsqcup \{\Phi(d) \mid d \in S\} .$$

¹¹ I.e. ordinary infinite sequences of elements which are consecutively ordered by \sqsubseteq .

In other words: Φ is continuous if taking suprema of and applying Φ to an ω -chain S commutes, i.e. it does not matter whether we first determine the supremum of the chain and then apply Φ to it, or whether we first take the image of S under Φ and then determine the supremum of the so-obtained set.

For continuous functions, we will now see an also very well-known fixed point iteration method that approaches the least fixed point in the limit. Given a natural number n , let $\Phi^n(d)$ denote n -fold iteration of Φ to d , e.g. $\Phi^3(d) = \Phi(\Phi(\Phi(d)))$ (we also speak of the n -th iteration of Φ on d). Then we can characterize the least fixed point of a continuous function as follows:

Theorem 1 (Kleene Fixed Point Theorem [50]). *Let (D, \sqsubseteq) be a complete lattice and let $\Phi: D \rightarrow D$ be a continuous endomap on D . Then*

$$\text{lfp } \Phi = \bigsqcup \{ \Phi^n(\perp) \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \} .$$

The Kleene fixed point theorem is a very powerful general principle. For instance, the much more prominent Banach fixed point theorem is a consequence of it [2].

Moreover, because continuity implies monotonicity and hence Φ is monotonic, iterating Φ on \perp actually forms an increasing chain

$$\perp \sqsubseteq \Phi(\perp) \sqsubseteq \Phi^2(\perp) \sqsubseteq \dots \sqsubseteq \text{lfp } \Phi$$

whose supremum is the least fixed point of Φ . This means that not only does the fixed point iteration actually converge to $\text{lfp } \Phi$, but moreover any iterate $\Phi^n(\perp)$ is smaller than (or equal to) $\text{lfp } \Phi$ and hence the fixed point iteration approaches $\text{lfp } \Phi$ faithfully *from below*. Ultimately, this is (one argument) why value iteration in probabilistic model checking gives sound lower bounds.¹²

While the Kleene fixed point theorem gives us a handle at iteratively approaching the sought-after least fixed point, that least fixed point remains in some sense an intrinsically infinitary object, namely in that it is the supremum of an ω -chain that will generally (and even for simple examples) indeed only stabilize at iteration ω and *not* already after some finite number of iterations. Yet, even for non-continuous but monotonic maps, the Knaster-Tarski theorem yields as an immediate consequence a powerful induction principle:

Lemma 1 (Park Induction [39]). *Let (D, \sqsubseteq) be a complete lattice and $\Phi: D \rightarrow D$ be a monotonic endomap on D . Then for all $d \in D$,*

$$\Phi(d) \sqsubseteq d \quad \text{implies} \quad \text{lfp } \Phi \sqsubseteq d .$$

Intuitively, Park induction provides a way to check if some candidate d is an upper bound on the least fixed point of Φ . For that, we push d through Φ just *once* and check whether this will take us *down* in the partial order \sqsubseteq . If yes, then we have immediately verified that d is an upper bound on $\text{lfp } \Phi$ – the supremum of a potentially infinite chain.

¹² Although without additional ado, one has no idea how tight these lower bounds are [21,42,23].

Park induction is yet another powerful principle that is ubiquitous in computer science, but especially in the realm of verification and formal methods. For example, the invariant rule of Hoare logic [24] can be entirely deduced from Park induction. For a detailed explanation, see [26].

6 Expected Rewards via Least Fixed Points

In Section 3, we defined expected rewards in terms of their paths. While we believe this notion is the most intuitive one – it is straightforward to comprehend the expected reward of small (especially acyclic) MDPs by considering their paths – it is also desirable to characterize expected rewards as least fixed points (see Section 5), particularly when reasoning symbolically about infinite-state MDPs (see Section 8).

Least fixed point characterizations of expected rewards are typically derived from *Bellman's optimality equations* [13]. More specifically, for an MDP $\mathcal{M} = (\mathbf{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ and a reward function $\text{rew}: \mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$, the set of Bellmann equations is given by

$$X = \lambda s. \text{rew}(s) + \text{op} \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(s)} \sum_{s' \in \text{Succs}_{\mathbf{a}}(s)} P(s, \mathbf{a}, s') \cdot X(s'), \quad (1)$$

where $X: \mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$ is a reward vector and the choice of $\text{op} \in \{\min, \max\}$ depends on whether we are considering minimal or maximal expected rewards.

For various classes of MDPs with finitely-valued reward functions, i.e. $\text{rew}(s) < \infty$ for all states $s \in \mathbf{S}$, it is well-established, that $\text{MinER}(s, \text{rew})$ is the least solution of Equation (1) for $\text{op} = \min$ (cf. [41, Theorem 7.2.3a]) and $\text{MaxER}(s, \text{rew})$ is the least solution of Equation (1) for $\text{op} = \max$ (cf. [41, Theorem 7.3.3a]).

In this section, we will show that the same result holds for *unbounded* reward functions $\text{rew}: \mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$ and expected rewards of MDPs as introduced in Sections 2 and 3. That is, the least solution of Equation (1) exists (Theorem 2) and is equal to the sought-after expected rewards (Theorem 3). The solution domain of Equation (1), i.e. reward vectors, is the complete lattice of *value functions*.

Definition 13 (Value Functions). *Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathbf{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ be an MDP. The complete lattice of value functions (for \mathcal{M}) is defined as*

$$(\mathbb{V}, \preceq), \quad \text{where:}$$

1. $\mathbb{V} = \mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$ is the set of value functions, and
2. \preceq is the pointwise lifted ordinary order on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$, i.e. for all $v, v' \in \mathbb{V}$,

$$v \preceq v' \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbf{S}: v(s) \leq v'(s) .$$

The least element of (\mathbb{V}, \preceq) is the constant-zero-function $\lambda s. 0$, which we — by slight abuse of notation — denote by 0. Moreover, suprema and infima in (\mathbb{V}, \preceq) are the pointwise liftings of suprema and infima in $(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}, \leq)$, i.e. for all $V \subseteq \mathbb{V}$,

$$\bigsqcup V = \lambda s. \sup \{v(s) \mid v \in V\} \quad \text{and} \quad \bigsqcap V = \lambda s. \inf \{v(s) \mid v \in V\} .$$

Equipped with a complete lattice, we next translate the Bellman equations in Equation (1) into an endomap $\mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$:

Definition 14 (Bellman Operators). Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ be an MDP and $\text{rew}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$ be a reward function for \mathcal{M} .

1. The function $\min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}: \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$, defined as

$$\min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}(v) = \lambda s. \text{rew}(s) + \min_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(s)} \sum_{s' \in \text{Succs}_{\mathbf{a}}(s)} P(s, \mathbf{a}, s') \cdot v(s'),$$

is called the min-Bellman operator of \mathcal{M} with respect to rew .

2. Analogously, the function $\max_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}: \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$, defined as

$$\max_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}(v) = \lambda s. \text{rew}(s) + \max_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(s)} \sum_{s' \in \text{Succs}_{\mathbf{a}}(s)} P(s, \mathbf{a}, s') \cdot v(s'),$$

is called the max-Bellman operator of \mathcal{M} with respect to rew .

Example 4 (Bellman Operators). The min-Bellman operator of the MDP \mathcal{M} from Figure 1 with respect to the reward function indicated by the boxed numbers next to the states is given by

$$\min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}(v) = \lambda s. \begin{cases} \min \{ v(s_i^L), \frac{1}{2}v(s_{i+1}) + \frac{1}{2}v(s_i^R) \} & \text{if } s = s_i, i \in \mathbb{N} \\ r + v(s_{i+1}) & \text{if } s = s_i^L, i \in \mathbb{N} \\ i + 1 + v(\perp) & \text{if } s = s_i^R, i \in \mathbb{N} \\ v(\perp) & \text{if } s = \perp. \end{cases}$$

The max-Bellman operator is identical except that min is replaced by max. \triangleleft

Next, we will show the existence of the least fixed point of the Bellman operators:

Theorem 2 (Continuity of Bellman Operators). Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ be an MDP and let $\text{rew}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$.

1. Both the min-Bellman operator $\min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}$ and the max-Bellman operator $\max_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}$ of \mathcal{M} w.r.t. rew are continuous w.r.t. (\mathbb{V}, \preceq) .
2. Both $\min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}$ and $\max_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}$ have a least fixed point given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}} \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}} &= \bigsqcup \{ \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}^n(0) \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \} \\ \text{and} \quad \text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}} \max_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}} &= \bigsqcup \{ \max_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}^n(0) \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Theorem 2.1 is a consequence of the fact that addition, multiplication, minima, and maxima are continuous w.r.t. $(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}, \leq)$ [17, Chapter 1]. Theorem 2.2 is then an instance of Kleene's fixed point theorem, see Theorem 1. \square

Now that we have established that the least fixed points exist, we will show that they evaluate to the sought-after expected rewards. To this end, we first show that performing $n + 1$ fixed point iterations yields the n -step bound expected reward (see Definition 6).

Lemma 2 (Step-Bounded Exp. Rew. via Fixed Point Iteration). *Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ be an MDP and let $\text{rew}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$. Then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$:*

1. $\min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}^{n+1}(0) = \lambda s. \text{MinER}^n(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew})$
2. $\max_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}^{n+1}(0) = \lambda s. \text{MaxER}^n(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew})$

Proof. By induction on n . See Appendix A.4 for details. \square

Our main result states that, in the limit, the least fixed points of the Bellmann operators is equal to the minimal and maximal expected reward, respectively.

Theorem 3 (Expected Rewards via Least Fixed Points). *Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ be an MDP and $\text{rew}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$. Then:*

1. $\text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}} \min \Phi_{\text{rew}} = \lambda s. \text{MinER}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew})$
2. $\text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}} \max \Phi_{\text{rew}} = \lambda s. \text{MaxER}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew})$

Proof (sketch). For maximal expected rewards, the claim follows from Theorem 1 and Lemma 2.2. The proof for minimal expected rewards is more involved and relies on the fact $\text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}} \min \Phi_{\text{rew}}$ gives rise to an optimal memoryless scheduler (cf. Lemma 7 in the appendix). The full proof is given in Appendix A.5. \square

Example 5 (Expected Rewards as Least Fixed Points in Action). In general, the Bellmann operators of MDPs may have many fixed points. In particular, for every MDP \mathcal{M} with reward function rew , the constant value function $\infty (= \lambda s. \infty)$ is a trivial fixed point of both $\min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}$ and $\max_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}$. For many interesting examples, however, the *least* fixed point is strictly smaller than ∞ . For instance, if \mathcal{M} is the MDP from Figure 1, then the value function v with

$$v(s_i) = \infty, \quad v(s_i^L) = \infty, \quad v(s_i^R) = i + 1, \quad \text{and} \quad v(\perp) = 0,$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, is a non-trivial fixed point of both $\max_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}$ and $\min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}$. This holds for all possible concrete values of the reward r . The value function v is a fixed point of $\max_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}$ because, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we have (cf. Example 4)

$$\begin{aligned} \max \left\{ v(s_i^L), \frac{1}{2}v(s_{i+1}) + \frac{1}{2}v(s_i^R) \right\} &= \max \left\{ \infty, \frac{1}{2} \cdot \infty + \frac{1}{2}(i+1) \right\} = \infty = v(s_i), \\ r + v(s_{i+1}) &= r + \infty = \infty = v(s_i^L), \\ i + 1 + v(\perp) &= i + 1 + 0 = v(s_i^R), \quad \text{and} \\ v(\perp) &= 0 = v(\perp). \end{aligned}$$

The fact that v is also a fixed point of $\min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}$ follows similarly by noticing that

$$\min \left\{ v(s_i^L), \frac{1}{2}v(s_{i+1}) + \frac{1}{2}v(s_i^R) \right\} = \min \left\{ \infty, \frac{1}{2} \cdot \infty + \frac{1}{2}(i+1) \right\} = \infty = v(s_i).$$

We claim that v as defined above is indeed the *least* fixed point of $\max_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}$ (it is, however, *not* the least fixed point of $\min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}$, see below). This already follows with Theorem 3 and Example 2, but it is instructive to give a direct proof:

Towards a contradiction, assume that $v' \preceq v \neq v'$ is another fixed point of $\max_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}$. It is immediate that $v'(s_i^R) = v(s_i^R)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and hence $v'(s_i) < \infty$ or $v'(s_i^L) < \infty$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Since v' is a fixed point, this already implies that $v'(s_i) < \infty$ and $v'(s_i^L) < \infty$ for *all* $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} v'(s_0) &\geq \frac{1}{2}v'(s_0^R) = \frac{1}{2} \\ v'(s_0) &\geq v'(s_0^L) \geq v'(s_1) \geq \frac{1}{2}v'(s_1^R) = 1 \\ v'(s_0) &\geq v'(s_0^L) \geq v'(s_1) \geq v'(s_1^L) \geq v'(s_2) \geq \frac{1}{2}v'(s_2^R) = \frac{3}{2}, \text{ etc.} \end{aligned}$$

The above argument shows that $v'(s_0)$ is greater than *any* real number, and so it must hold that $v'(s_0) = \infty$, contradiction.

We now consider the least fixed point of $\min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}$. If $r = 0$, then it is easy to see that the least fixed point is given by $v(s_i) = v(s_i^L) = v(\perp) = 0$ and $v(s_i^R) = i + 1$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand, if $r > 0$, then one can verify that the least fixed point is v with $v(s_i) = i + 2$, $v(s_i^L) = r + i + 3$, $v(s_i^R) = i + 1$ and $v(\perp) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. \triangleleft

7 Existence of Optimal Schedulers for Expected Reward

We saw in Section 3 that minimal and maximal expected rewards are defined via the infimum and supremum, respectively, over all schedulers for an MDP. However, even though the maximal expected reward is a well-defined number, that does not necessarily mean that there also *exists* a scheduler that actually attains this supremum. It may well be that there is only a sequence of schedulers that converges to the maximal expected reward. By contrast, for minimal expected rewards, there always exists a single scheduler.

For restricted classes of MDPs, these results are known (cf. [41, Sections 7.23 and 7.32]). In this section, we show that they still hold for our generalized expected rewards.

Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ be an MDP and let $\text{rew}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$ be a reward function. Recall from Section 3 that a scheduler \mathfrak{S} is *min-optimal* for \mathcal{M} with respect to rew at state s , if \mathfrak{S} attains the minimal expected reward, i.e. if

$$\text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) = \text{MinER}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) .$$

We say that \mathfrak{S} is *uniformly min-optimal* for \mathcal{M} w.r.t. rew , if \mathfrak{S} is min-optimal at all states $s \in \mathcal{S}$, i.e. if

$$\text{for all } s \in \mathcal{S}: \quad \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) = \text{MinER}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) .$$

For maximal expected rewards, both notions are defined analogously.

We obtain as a by-catch of Lemma 7 and Theorem 3.1 that there is always a uniformly *min-optimal* scheduler \mathfrak{S} , which is moreover memoryless.




Fig. 2: An MDP where no max-optimal scheduler exist at any state s_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Theorem 4 (Optimal Schedulers for Min. Expected Rewards). *Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ be an MDP and let rew be a reward function for \mathcal{M} . There is a memoryless uniformly min-optimal scheduler $\mathfrak{S} \in \text{MLScheds}$ for \mathcal{M} .*

Since such a memoryless scheduler actually exists, the infimum from Definition 6.4 can be expressed as a *minimum*, namely

$$\text{MinER}(s, \text{rew}) = \min_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{MLScheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s, \text{rew}) . \quad (2)$$

Regarding *maximal* expected rewards, it is known that *neither* uniform *nor* non-uniform max-optimal schedulers necessarily exist, see, e.g. [41, Example 7.2.4]. Indeed, for the MDP depicted in Figure 2, there does not exist a max-optimal scheduler at any state s_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$. This is because for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a scheduler \mathfrak{S}_n achieving reward $\text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(s, \text{rew}) = n + i$ from s_i by playing the L -action $n - 1$ times and then the R -action to collect reward $n + i$. Hence, $\text{MaxER}(s_i, \text{rew}) = \infty$, but there does not exist a scheduler that actually achieves infinite expected reward (note that the scheduler that always chooses L obtains zero reward). In particular, the supremum from Definition 6.6 is *not necessarily attained*. Somewhat analogous to Equation (2), one could, however, ask whether the supremum from Definition 6.6 over *all* schedulers can at least be replaced by a supremum over *memoryless* schedulers, i.e. whether for all states s ,

$$\text{MaxER}(s, \text{rew}) \stackrel{?}{=} \sup_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{MLScheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s, \text{rew}) .$$

This is the case if and only if, for all states s and all $\epsilon > 0$, there is an ϵ -max-optimal memoryless scheduler \mathfrak{S} , i.e. a memoryless scheduler \mathfrak{S} with

$$\text{MaxER}(s, \text{rew}) - \epsilon \leq \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s, \text{rew}) .$$

While the above is known for positive models if the expected reward is strictly less than ∞ for every state [41, Corollary 7.2.8], the answer to this question is, to the best of our knowledge, *open* when admitting infinite (expected) rewards. An in-depth treatment of scheduler existence is outside the scope of this paper.

Example 6 (Optimal Schedulers for MDPs). Reconsider the MDP from Figure 1 on page 6 together with the reward function indicated by the boxed numbers next to the states. Theorem 4 asserts existence of a uniformly min-optimal memoryless scheduler. Indeed, a memoryless scheduler \mathfrak{S} is uniformly min-optimal iff,

- assuming $r = 0$, $\mathfrak{S}(s_i) = L$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$;
- assuming $r > 0$, $\mathfrak{S}(s_i) = R$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

We now consider max-optimal schedulers. First, if $r > 0$, then there exists a uniformly max-optimal memoryless scheduler \mathfrak{S} with $\mathfrak{S}(s_i) = L$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. This scheduler attains the least fixpoint of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{rew}}^{\text{max}}$ described in Example 5. For the case $r = 0$ we claim that the scheduler \mathfrak{S} which is uniquely determined by requiring that $\mathfrak{S}(s_i) = R$ iff $i = 2^k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is uniformly max-optimal. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_i, \text{rew}) &= \frac{1}{2}(i+1) + \frac{1}{4}(i+2) + \frac{1}{8}(i+4) + \dots \\ &= i + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot 2 + \frac{1}{4} \cdot 4 + \frac{1}{8} \cdot 8 + \dots \right) = \infty . \end{aligned}$$

We recall that, in general, max-optimal schedulers are not guaranteed to exist in infinite-state MDPs, see Figure 2. \triangleleft

8 Probabilistic Programs

We will now turn towards “an application to operational semantics of probabilistic semantics”. For that, we will introduce a simple probabilistic programming language à la McIver & Morgan [37]. Besides standard constructs such as assignments, while loops as well as conditional, probabilistic, and nondeterministic branching, our language has a designated statement for modelling the collection of rewards during execution.

In this section, we discuss syntax and operational semantics of our language, i.e. a single infinite-state MDP describing all program executions. In Section 9.2, we will present two weakest preexpectation calculi for the same language and – using Theorem 3 – prove them sound with respect to the operational semantics.

8.1 A Probabilistic Guarded Command Language with Rewards

Let $\text{Vars} = \{x, y, z, \dots\}$ be a countably infinite set of program variables. A (program) state is a function of type $\text{Vars} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$. Program states are denoted by σ, τ , and variations thereof. We restrict to non-negative rationals for the sake of convenience (this is further discussed in Section 9.1). Since program states will be part of the state space of an MDP, which, by Definition 1, must be countable, we must ensure that there are only countably many program states. Hence, we define the set of program states as

$$\text{States} = \{ \sigma : \text{Vars} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \mid \text{the set } \{x \in \text{Vars} \mid \sigma(x) > 0\} \text{ is finite} \} .$$

In other words, we assume that all but finitely many variables evaluate to zero for every program state. This is a fair assumption because only finitely many variables will appear in any given program.

A *predicate (over States)* is a set $P \subseteq \text{States}$ and the *set of predicates* is $\mathcal{P}(\text{States})$. We usually write $\sigma \models P$ instead of $\sigma \in P$ and say that σ *satisfies* P . Moreover, we employ the usual logical connectives between predicates. For instance, we write

$$P \wedge Q \quad \text{instead of} \quad P \cap Q .$$

With these notions at hand, we introduce our probabilistic programming language pGCL.

Definition 15 (The Probabilistic Guarded Command Language). *The set pGCL of programs in the probabilistic guarded command language is given by the grammar*

C	\longrightarrow	skip	(effectless program)
		$x := A$	(assignment)
		reward (r)	(collect reward)
		$C; C$	(sequential composition)
		$\{C\} [p] \{C\}$	(probabilistic choice)
		$\{C\} \square \{C\}$	(nondeterministic choice)
		if (B) $\{C\}$ else $\{C\}$	(conditional choice)
		while (B) $\{C\}$,	(while loop)

where:

1. $A: \text{States} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ is an arithmetic expression,
2. $r \in \mathbb{Q}_{> 0}^{\infty}$ is a rational reward (or ∞),
3. $p \in [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ is a rational probability, and
4. $B \in \mathcal{P}(\text{States})$ is a predicate also referred to as a guard.

The command **reward** (r) collects reward r and then immediately terminates. All other commands are fairly standard: **skip** does nothing, i.e. it behaves like **reward** (0). The assignment $x := A$ assigns the value of expression A (evaluated in the current program state) to variable x . The sequential composition $C_1; C_2$ executes C_1 followed by C_2 . The probabilistic choice $\{C_1\} [p] \{C_2\}$ executes C_1 with probability p and C_2 with probability $(1 - p)$. By contrast, $\{C_1\} \square \{C_2\}$ nondeterministically executes either C_1 or C_2 . **if** (B) $\{C_1\}$ **else** $\{C_2\}$ executes C_1 if the guard B holds in the current program state; otherwise, it executes C_2 . Similarly, the loop **while** (B) $\{C\}$ checks if the guard B holds. If yes, it executes C and repeats. Otherwise, it stops immediately like **skip**.

To simplify the presentation, we abstract from a concrete syntax for arithmetic or Boolean expressions. Instead, we admit any function $\text{States} \rightarrow \text{Vals}$ and any predicate in $\mathcal{P}(\text{States})$ as expressions. However, to ensure that the set pGCL of programs is countable, we assume that (i) both arithmetic and Boolean expressions are taken from some countable universe of expressions and (ii) rewards are taken from the countable set of non-negative rationals or infinity.

```

while (x = 0) {
  { reward (r) }
  □
  { { skip } [1/2] { x := 1 } };
  y := y + 1 }

```

Fig. 3: An example pGCL program. We assume that $r \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$ is a constant.

8.2 Operational MDP Semantics of pGCL

Towards defining the operational MDP semantics of pGCL, we define a small-step execution relation à la Plotkin [40]. We mainly follow the presentation from [11] with adaptations from [5]. We define the (countable) *set of configurations* as

$$\text{Conf} = (\text{pGCL} \cup \{\Downarrow\}) \times \text{States} \cup \{\perp\} .$$

Configurations are denoted by \mathbf{c} and variations thereof. A configuration of the form (C, σ) indicates that program C is to be executed on program state σ . A configuration of the form (\Downarrow, τ) is called *final* and indicates termination in the final state τ . \perp is a special configuration reached from every final configuration and is needed to properly encode the semantics in terms of expected rewards as will be explained in Section 9. We then define the *small-step execution relation*

$$\rightarrow \subseteq \text{Conf} \times \{N, L, R\} \times ([0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}) \times \text{Conf}$$

as the smallest relation satisfying the rules given in Figure 5, where we write $\mathbf{c} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{a}, p} \mathbf{c}'$ instead of $(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{a}, p, \mathbf{c}') \in \rightarrow$. This yields pGCL's *operational MDP*:

Definition 16 (Operational MDP). *The operational MDP of pGCL is*

$$\mathcal{O} = (\text{Conf}, \text{Act}, P) , \quad \text{where:}$$

1. $\text{Act} = \{N, L, R\}$ is the set of actions,
2. $P: \text{Conf} \times \text{Act} \times \text{Conf} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the transition probability function with

$$P(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}') = \begin{cases} p & \text{if } \mathbf{c} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{a}, p} \mathbf{c}' \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} . \end{cases}$$

The transition probability function P of the operational MDP \mathcal{O} formalizes the behavior of pGCL programs informally explained at the end of Section 8.1: If

$$P((C, \sigma), \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}') = p$$

then executing C for *one* step on initial state σ when taking action \mathbf{a} yields the new configuration \mathbf{c}' with probability p . We have $p \in (0, 1)$ only if executing C for one step involves a probabilistic choice. For all other statements, we have $p \in \{0, 1\}$. Moreover, we have $|\text{Act}((C, \sigma))| = \{L, R\}$ iff executing C for one




Fig. 4: A reachable fragment of pGCL’s operational MDP \mathcal{O} for the loop from Figure 3. Program states are denoted by conjunctions of equalities, i.e. $x = n \wedge y = m$ indicates that the current state σ satisfies $\sigma(x) = n$ and $\sigma(y) = m$.

step involves a nondeterministic choice, where L is the action for the left branch and R is the action for the right branch. If executing C for one step involves one of the remaining statements, then $\text{Act}((C, \sigma)) = \{N\}$, indicating that no nondeterministic choice is possible.

In the above discussion, the `reward` (r) statements were treated in exactly the same way as the effectless program `skip`. Indeed, the only influence of `reward` (r) on the operational semantics of pGCL is that they induce the following reward function on \mathcal{O} :

Definition 17 (Reward Function of Operational MDP). *The reward function rew_{pGCL} of the operational MDP $\mathcal{O} = (\text{Conf}, \text{Act}, P)$ for pGCL is the function $\text{rew}_{\text{pGCL}} : \text{Conf} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$ with $\text{rew}_{\text{pGCL}}(\perp) = 0$ and*

$$\text{rew}_{\text{pGCL}}((C, \sigma)) = \begin{cases} r & \text{if } C = \text{reward } (r) \\ & \text{or } C = \text{reward } (r); C' \text{ for some } C' \in \text{pGCL} \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

1. Final configurations:

$$\frac{}{(\Downarrow, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N,1} \perp} \quad \frac{}{\perp \xrightarrow{N,1} \perp}$$
2. Effectless Program:

$$\frac{}{(\text{skip}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N,1} (\Downarrow, \sigma)}$$
3. Assignment:

$$\frac{}{(x := A, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N,1} (\Downarrow, \sigma [x \mapsto A(\sigma)])}$$
4. Reward:

$$\frac{}{(\text{reward } (r), \sigma) \xrightarrow{N,1} (\Downarrow, \sigma)}$$
5. Sequential Composition:

$$\frac{(C_1, \sigma) \xrightarrow{a,p} (\Downarrow, \sigma')}{(C_1 ; C_2, \sigma) \xrightarrow{a,p} (C_2, \sigma')} \quad \frac{(C_1, \sigma) \xrightarrow{a,p} (C'_1, \sigma')}{(C_1 ; C_2, \sigma) \xrightarrow{a,p} (C'_1 ; C_2, \sigma')}$$
6. Probabilistic Choice:

$$\frac{C_1 \neq C_2}{(\{C_1\} [p] \{C_2\}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N,p} (C_1, \sigma)} \quad \frac{C_1 \neq C_2}{(\{C_1\} [p] \{C_2\}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N,1-p} (C_2, \sigma)}$$

$$\frac{}{(\{C\} [p] \{C\}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N,1} (C, \sigma)}$$
7. Nondeterministic Choice:

$$\frac{}{(\{C_1\} \square \{C_2\}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{L,1} (C_1, \sigma)} \quad \frac{}{(\{C_1\} \square \{C_2\}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{R,1} (C_2, \sigma)}$$
8. Conditional Choice:

$$\frac{\sigma \models B}{(\text{if } (B) \{C_1\} \text{ else } \{C_2\}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N,1} (C_1, \sigma)} \quad \frac{\sigma \models \neg B}{(\text{if } (B) \{C_1\} \text{ else } \{C_2\}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N,1} (C_2, \sigma)}$$
9. While Loop:

$$\frac{\sigma \models B}{(\text{while } (B) \{C\}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N,1} (C ; \text{while } (B) \{C\}, \sigma)} \quad \frac{\sigma \models \neg B}{(\text{while } (B) \{C\}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N,1} (\Downarrow, \sigma)}$$

Fig. 5: Rules defining the small-step execution relation \rightarrow .

Example 7. Figure 3 shows a pGCL program C that models our running example, i.e. the infinite-state MDP in Figure 1 on page 6. A fragment of the operational MDP \mathcal{O} reachable from an initial configuration (C, σ) with $\sigma(x) = \sigma(y) = 0$ is sketched in Figure 4. The reward that rew_{pGCL} (Definition 17) assigns to the configuration starting with $\langle \text{reward}(r); \dots \rangle$ is r . All other states are assigned zero reward by rew_{pGCL} .

Note that \mathcal{O} has some additional “intermediate states” not present in the MDP from Figure 1. Moreover, the latter MDP has several additional rewards attached to the states of the form s_i^R for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. These rewards, which are special in the sense that they are collected right before reaching the terminal sink state \perp , are not modeled (yet) by the reward function rew_{pGCL} . In Section 9 we extend rew_{pGCL} to account for those special rewards as well.

9 Weakest Preexpectation Calculi

We now present two weakest preexpectation calculi that extend McIver & Morgan’s [37] weakest preexpectations by support for reasoning about expected rewards of pGCL programs with user-defined reward structures.

Those calculi only differ in their treatment of nondeterministic choice, which may be either demonic (i.e., minimizing) or angelic (i.e. maximizing). The angelic calculus is similar to the expected runtime calculus [30,31] if rewards are interpreted as required execution time. To specify a runtime model, which is fixed a-priori in [30,31], it then suffices to place $\text{reward}(\cdot)$ commands.

In Section 9.1, we define *expectations* – the objects our calculi operate on. We present the calculi in Section 9.2. Finally, in Section 9.3, we leverage Theorem 3 to prove both calculi sound with respect to the MDP semantics from Section 8.1.

9.1 Expectations

Expectations (think: random variables) are for verification of probabilistic programs what predicates are for verification of ordinary programs. Technically, they are similar to the complete lattice of value functions introduced in Definition 13. The main difference is that the domain of expectations consists of *program* states, whereas the domain of value functions consists of *MDP* states. We briefly recall the definition of expectations and some notation for conveniently describing them.

Definition 18 (Expectations). *The complete lattice of expectations is*

$$(\mathbb{E}, \sqsubseteq), \quad \text{where:}$$

1. $\mathbb{E} = \text{States} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$ is the set of expectations,
2. \sqsubseteq is the pointwise lifted order in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$, i.e., for all $X, Y \in \mathbb{E}$

$$X \sqsubseteq Y \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in \text{States}: X(\sigma) \leq Y(\sigma).$$

The least element of $(\mathbb{E}, \sqsubseteq)$ is the constant-zero-expectation $\lambda\sigma. 0$. The greatest element is $\lambda\sigma. \infty$. Moreover, suprema and infima are given as the pointwise liftings of suprema and infima in $(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}, \leq)$, i.e., for $E \subseteq \mathbb{E}$, we have

$$\bigsqcup E = \lambda\sigma. \sup \{X(\sigma) \mid X \in E\} \quad \text{and} \quad \bigsqcap E = \lambda\sigma. \inf \{X(\sigma) \mid X \in E\} .$$

Given two expectations $X, Y \in \mathbb{E}$, we often write

$$X \sqcup Y \text{ instead of } \bigsqcup \{X, Y\} \quad \text{and similarly} \quad X \sqcap Y \text{ instead of } \bigsqcap \{X, Y\} .$$

We define standard arithmetic operations on expectations by pointwise application, e.g.

$$X \cdot Y = \lambda\sigma. X(\sigma) \cdot Y(\sigma) \quad \text{and} \quad X + Y = \lambda\sigma. X(\sigma) + Y(\sigma) ,$$

where we recall that $0 \cdot \infty = \infty \cdot 0 = 0$. The order of precedence is standard, i.e., \cdot binds stronger than $+$, and we use parentheses to resolve ambiguities. Moreover, we often identify constants $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$ and variables $x \in \mathbf{Vars}$ with expectations. That is, we write x for the expectation $\lambda\sigma. \sigma(x)$ and α for the expectation $\lambda\sigma. \alpha$.

We use *Iverson brackets* $[P]$ to turn predicates $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{States})$ into expectations, i.e.

$$[P] = \lambda\sigma. \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sigma \models P \\ 0 & \text{if } \sigma \not\models P . \end{cases}$$

Finally, given $X \in \mathbb{E}$, a variable x , and an arithmetic expression $A: \mathbf{States} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vals}$, the *expectation* $X[x/A]$ obtained from substituting x in X by A is given by

$$X[x/A] = \lambda\sigma. X(\sigma[x \mapsto A(\sigma)]) .$$

9.2 Weakest Preexpectations

We now define two weakest preexpectation calculi by induction on the structure of pGCL programs. Moreover, we discuss some properties of these calculi that are required for justifying that they are well-defined and sound.

Definition 19 (Weakest Preexpectation Transformers). *Let $C \in \text{pGCL}$ and $X \in \mathbb{E}$.*

1. *The demonic weakest preexpectation transformer of C*

$$\text{dwp}[C]: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$$

is defined by induction on C in Table 1. We call $\text{dwp}[C](X)$ the demonic weakest preexpectation of C w.r.t. postexpectation X .

2. *The angelic weakest preexpectation transformer of C*

$$\text{awp}[C]: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$$

is defined by induction on C in Table 1 after replacing every occurrence of dwp by awp and every occurrence of \sqcap by \sqcup . We call $\text{awp}[C](X)$ the angelic weakest preexpectation of C w.r.t. postexpectation X .

C	$\text{dwp}[[C]](X)$
skip	X
$x := A$	$X [x/A]$
reward (r)	$r + X$
$C_1 ; C_2$	$\text{dwp}[[C_1]](\text{dwp}[[C_2]](X))$
$\{C_1\} \sqcap \{C_2\}$	$\text{dwp}[[C_1]](X) \sqcap \text{dwp}[[C_2]](X)$
$\{C_1\} [p] \{C_2\}$	$p \cdot \text{dwp}[[C_1]](X) + (1 - p) \cdot \text{dwp}[[C_2]](X)$
if (B) $\{C_1\}$ else $\{C_2\}$	$[B] \cdot \text{dwp}[[C_1]](X) + [\neg B] \cdot \text{dwp}[[C_2]](X)$
while (B) $\{C'\}$	$\text{lfp } Y. [B] \cdot \text{dwp}[[C']](Y) + [\neg B] \cdot X$

Table 1: Inductive definition of $\text{dwp}[[C]]$.

The transformers $\text{dwp}[[C]]$ and $\text{awp}[[C]]$ only differ in how they resolve nondeterminism: *demonically* (minimizing using \sqcap) versus *angelically* (maximizing using \sqcup). Our main goal for this section is to formalize (and prove in Section 9.3) that

$$\text{dwp/awp}[[C]](X)(\sigma) = \begin{array}{l} \text{minimal/maximal expected reward obtained from} \\ \text{(i) executing } C \text{ on } \textit{initial} \text{ state } \sigma \text{ and} \\ \text{(ii) collecting reward } X(\tau) \text{ upon terminating in some } \tau. \end{array}$$

In particular, the postexpectation X can be thought of as a continuation which models the expected reward obtained *after* executing C . Notice that if C does not contain a **reward** (\cdot) statement, then both calculi coincide with McIver & Morgan’s classical weakest preexpectation calculi [37] for reasoning about expected outcomes. On the other hand, for programs C (possibly) containing **reward** (\cdot) and postexpectation $X = 0$, the two calculi yield the minimal/maximal expected reward obtained from executing C — similarly to Kaminski et al.’s expected runtime calculus [30,31].

Apart from the **reward** (r), which adds the just collected reward r to the given postexpectation X , the weakest preexpectation of each pGCL command is standard (cf. [26]). For assignments, we substitute the assigned variable x by expression A in postexpectation X . The rule for sequential composition $C_1 ; C_2$ demonstrates that weakest preexpectation calculi perform backward reasoning: We first determine the weakest preexpectation of C_2 wrt. postexpectation X and then use this intermediate result as the postexpectation of C_1 . The weakest preexpectation wrt. that intermediate result then yields the weakest preexpectation of $C_1 ; C_2$ wrt. X . For nondeterministic, probabilistic, and conditional choices between C_1 and C_2 , we first determine the weakest preexpectations of the branches C_1 and C_2 wrt. postexpectation X . For the nondeterministic choice $\{C_1\} \sqcap \{C_2\}$, we then take the minimum – for dwp – or the maximum – for awp – of the previously determined expectations. For the probabilistic choice

$\{C_1\} [p] \{C_2\}$, we sum those expectations after weighting each branch with its probability. The conditional choice `if (B) {C1} else {C2}` is similar except that the weights are always zero or one, depending on whether the guard B holds or not.

Finally, the weakest preexpectation of loops is defined using a least fixed point construction. To get an intuition on this construction, we first observe that the weakest preexpectations of the two programs

$$\text{while}(B)\{C'\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{if}(B)\{C'; \text{while}(B)\{C'\}\} \text{ else } \{\text{skip}\}$$

must coincide, since these two programs are semantically equivalent, see also Figure 5 (9). Hence, by the rules for `skip`, sequential composition, and conditional choice from Table 1, $\text{dwp}[\text{while}(B)\{C'\}](X)$ (and analogously awp) must satisfy the equation

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dwp}[\text{while}(B)\{C'\}](X) \\ &= [B] \cdot \text{dwp}[C'](\text{dwp}[\text{while}(B)\{C'\}](X)) + [\neg B] \cdot X, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

and the *least* solution of this equation in the complete lattice $(\mathbb{E}, \sqsubseteq)$ precisely captures (minimal or maximal) expected outcomes of loops. More formally, we associate each loop and each postexpectation with an endomap $\mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ that captures the effect of perform one (more) loop iteration.

Definition 20 (Characteristic Functions). *Let $C = \text{while}(B)\{C'\} \in \text{pGCL}$ and $X \in \mathbb{E}$.*

1. The dwp -characteristic function of C w.r.t. X is defined as

$$\text{dwp}_C \Phi_X : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}, \quad \text{dwp}_C \Phi_X(Y) = [B] \cdot \text{dwp}[C'](Y) + [\neg B] \cdot X.$$

2. The awp -characteristic function of C w.r.t. X is defined as

$$\text{awp}_C \Phi_X : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}, \quad \text{awp}_C \Phi_X(Y) = [B] \cdot \text{awp}[C'](Y) + [\neg B] \cdot X.$$

The least solution of Equation (3) is then given by the least fixed point of the respective characteristic function, i.e.,

$$\text{dwp}[C](X) = \text{lfp } \text{dwp}_C \Phi_X \quad \text{and} \quad \text{awp}[C](X) = \text{lfp } \text{awp}_C \Phi_X.$$

As discussed in Section 5, these least fixed points exist if characteristic functions are monotonic. Moreover, they can be approximated iteratively via fixed point iteration (cf. Theorem 1) if the characteristic function is also continuous.

Theorem 5 (Healthiness Properties [31]). *Let $C \in \text{pGCL}$ and $X \in \mathbb{E}$.*

1. Both $\text{dwp}[C]$ and $\text{awp}[C]$ are monotonic w.r.t. $(\mathbb{E}, \sqsubseteq)$.
2. Both $\text{dwp}[C]$ and $\text{awp}[C]$ are continuous w.r.t. $(\mathbb{E}, \sqsubseteq)$.
3. For loop $C = \text{while}(B)\{C'\}$, both $\text{dwp}_C \Phi_X$ and $\text{awp}_C \Phi_X$ are continuous w.r.t. $(\mathbb{E}, \sqsubseteq)$. Hence, by Kleene's Theorem 1, we have

$$\text{lfp } \text{dwp}_C \Phi_X = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{dwp}_C \Phi_X^n(0) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{lfp } \text{awp}_C \Phi_X = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{awp}_C \Phi_X^n(0).$$

As we will see next, proving **dwp** and **awp** sound with respect to our operational semantics introduced in Section 8.2 involves showing that the above fixed points are equal to the expected rewards obtained from unfolding loops on demand as in Figure 5 (9).

Example 8. Recall our running example **pGCL** program C from Figure 3 on page 23. We fix postexpectation $X = y = \lambda\sigma.\sigma(y)$. Then, for all concrete values of the constant $r \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$ in C , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dwp}\llbracket C \rrbracket(y) &= \text{lfp}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{dwp}} \Phi_y = [x \neq 0] \cdot y + [x = 0] \cdot (y + 2) \quad \text{and} \\ \text{awp}\llbracket C \rrbracket(y) &= \text{lfp}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{awp}} \Phi_y = [x \neq 0] \cdot y + [x = 0] \cdot \infty . \end{aligned}$$

Intuitively, under *demonic* nondeterminism, we try to avoid collecting additional reward as much as possible, i.e. we never execute **reward** (r). Hence, $\text{dwp}\llbracket C \rrbracket(y)$ is equal to the expected value of y after termination of C , which is the original value of y if $x \neq 0$ holds initially as we never enter the loop. Otherwise, i.e. for $x = 0$, the expected value of y is $y + 2$ as the loop body is, on average, executed twice and y is incremented in every execution. Under *angelic* nondeterminism, on the other hand, we try to collect as much reward as possible. If we can enter the loop at all, i.e. if $x \neq 0$ holds initially, we thus collect an infinite amount of reward. Otherwise, i.e. if $x = 0$, we collect no additional reward beyond the already collected y .

To confirm the above intuitive explanations of the two fixed points, we will connect them to expected rewards of operational MDPs in the next section.

9.3 Soundness of the Weakest Preexpectation Calculus

We now leverage our generalized fixed point characterization of expected rewards, i.e. Theorem 3, to prove **dwp** and **awp** are sound with respect to our operational MDP semantics. More precisely, we show that, for all $C \in \text{pGCL}$ and all $X \in \mathbb{E}$, $\text{dwp}\llbracket C \rrbracket(X)$ and $\text{awp}\llbracket C \rrbracket(X)$ evaluate to appropriate minimal and maximal expected rewards in **pGCL**'s operational MDP \mathcal{O} . An analogous result has been proven in [20] for *bounded* expectations¹³ and **pGCL** programs not containing **reward** (\cdot). Our proofs very closely follow the lines of [11, Theorem 4.5] (for **dwp**) and [12, Theorem 4.6] (for **awp**), unifying these results with minor simplifications.

We first associate with each postexpectation a reward function for \mathcal{O} :

Definition 21 (Rew. Function induced by Postexpectation). *Let $X \in \mathbb{E}$. The reward function $\text{rew}_X : \text{Conf} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$ for the operational MDP \mathcal{O} is defined as*

$$\text{rew}_X(\mathfrak{c}) = \begin{cases} X(\tau) & \text{if } \mathfrak{c} = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \text{rew}_{\text{pGCL}}(\mathfrak{c}) & \text{else ,} \end{cases}$$

where rew_{pGCL} is the reward function of Definition 17 (which is independent of X).

¹³ An expectation X is *bounded*, if there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $X(\sigma) \leq \alpha$ for all $\sigma \in \text{States}$.

Example 9. Recall once again the running example pGCL program from Figure 3 on page 23 that models the MDP in Figure 1 on page 6. With postexpectation $X = y$, the reward function rew_y (Definition 21) on the operational MDP \mathcal{O} faithfully models the rewards depicted in boxes in Figure 1. \triangleleft

It is convenient to introduce expectation transformers capturing the expected rewards obtained from executing pGCL programs as modeled by the MDP \mathcal{O} :

Definition 22 (Operational Weakest Preexpectations). *Let $C \in \text{pGCL}$ and $X \in \mathbb{E}$.*

1. We define the demonic operational weakest preexpectation of C w.r.t. X as

$$\text{dop}\llbracket C \rrbracket (X) = \lambda\sigma. \text{MinER}(\mathcal{O}, (C, \sigma), \text{rew}_X) .$$

2. We define the angelic operational weakest preexpectation of C w.r.t. X as

$$\text{aop}\llbracket C \rrbracket (X) = \lambda\sigma. \text{MaxER}(\mathcal{O}, (C, \sigma), \text{rew}_X) .$$

Proving soundness then amounts to showing that, for all $C \in \text{pGCL}$ and $X \in \mathbb{E}$, we have

$$\text{dwp}\llbracket C \rrbracket (X) = \text{dop}\llbracket C \rrbracket (X) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{awp}\llbracket C \rrbracket (X) = \text{aop}\llbracket C \rrbracket (X) .$$

To prove equality, we show the inequalities \sqsubseteq and \sqsupseteq separately.

Lemma 3. *We have for all $C \in \text{pGCL}$ and all $X \in \mathbb{E}$:*

1. $\text{dop}\llbracket C \rrbracket (X) \sqsubseteq \text{dwp}\llbracket C \rrbracket (X)$
2. $\text{aop}\llbracket C \rrbracket (X) \sqsubseteq \text{awp}\llbracket C \rrbracket (X)$

Proof. We prove the claim for dwp . The proof for awp is completely analogous. The key idea is to apply Park induction (Lemma 1) to the min-Bellman operator of pGCL's operational MDP \mathcal{O} w.r.t. rew_X (Definition 14.1). For that, we first observe that for all $C \in \text{pGCL}$ and all $X \in \mathbb{E}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dwp}\llbracket C \rrbracket (X) &= \lambda\sigma. \text{rew}_X((C, \sigma)) \\ &+ \min_{\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Act}(C, \sigma)} \sum_{(C, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{a}, p} \mathfrak{c}'} p \cdot \begin{cases} X(\tau) & \text{if } \mathfrak{c}' = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \text{dwp}\llbracket C' \rrbracket (X)(\sigma') & \text{if } \mathfrak{c}' = (C', \sigma') \end{cases} , \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

which follows by induction on the structure of C (cf. Lemma 8). Now define the value function v for pGCL's operational MDP \mathcal{O} as

$$v = \lambda\mathfrak{c}. \begin{cases} \text{dwp}\llbracket C \rrbracket (X)(\sigma) & \text{if } \mathfrak{c} = (C, \sigma) \\ X(\tau) & \text{if } \mathfrak{c} = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathfrak{c} = \perp . \end{cases}$$

It is an immediate consequence of Equation (4) that

$$\min_{\mathcal{O}} \Phi_{\text{rew}_X}(v) = v \preceq v ,$$

which, by Park induction (Lemma 1), yields

$$\text{lfp}_{\mathcal{O}}^{\min} \Phi_{\text{rew}_X} \preceq v .$$

By Theorem 3.1, we thus get

$$\text{lfp}_{\mathcal{O}}^{\min} \Phi_{\text{rew}_X} = \lambda c. \text{MinER}(\mathcal{O}, c, \text{rew}_X) \preceq v$$

so, in particular, we have for every $C \in \text{pGCL}$, $X \in \mathbb{E}$, and $\sigma \in \text{States}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dop}[C](X)(\sigma) &= \text{MinER}(\mathcal{O}, (C, \sigma), \text{rew}_X) \\ &\leq v(C, \sigma) \\ &= \text{dwp}[C](X)(\sigma) , \end{aligned}$$

which is what we had to show.

Next, we prove the converse direction.

Lemma 4. *We have for all $C \in \text{pGCL}$ and all $X \in \mathbb{E}$:*

1. $\text{dwp}[C](X) \sqsubseteq \text{dop}[C](X)$
2. $\text{awp}[C](X) \sqsubseteq \text{aop}[C](X)$.

Proof. We prove the claim for dwp . The proof for awp is completely analogous. The key observation is that dop satisfies the following big-step decomposition w.r.t. sequential composition: For all $C_1, C_2 \in \text{pGCL}$ and all $X \in \mathbb{E}$,

$$\text{dop}[C_1](\text{dop}[C_2](X)) \sqsubseteq \text{dop}[C_1 ; C_2](X) . \quad (\text{see Lemma 9})$$

The claim then follows by induction on C . The most interesting case is $C = \text{while}(B)\{C'\}$: We prove that $\text{dwp}_{\mathcal{O}}^{\text{p}} \Phi_X(\text{dop}[C](X)) \sqsubseteq \text{dop}[C](X)$, which implies $\text{dwp}[C](X) \sqsubseteq \text{dop}[C](X)$ by Lemma 1. For that, consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dwp}_{\mathcal{O}}^{\text{p}} \Phi_X(\text{dop}[C](X)) &= [B] \cdot \text{dwp}[C'](\text{dop}[C](X)) + [\neg B] \cdot X \quad (\text{Definition 20}) \\ &\sqsubseteq [B] \cdot \text{dop}[C'](\text{dop}[C](X)) + [\neg B] \cdot X \quad (\text{I.H.}) \\ &\sqsubseteq [B] \cdot \text{dop}[C' ; C](X) + [\neg B] \cdot X \quad (\text{Lemma 9}) \\ &\sqsubseteq \lambda \sigma. \begin{cases} \text{MinER}(\mathcal{O}, (C' ; C, \sigma), \text{rew}_X) & \text{if } \sigma \models B \\ X(\sigma) & \text{if } \sigma \not\models B \end{cases} \\ &\sqsubseteq \lambda \sigma. \text{MinER}(\mathcal{O}, (C, \sigma), \text{rew}_X) \quad (\text{Definition 6.3 and Figure 5}) \\ &= \text{dop}[C](X) . \quad (\text{Definition 22}) \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Lemmas 3 and 4, and antisymmetry of \sqsubseteq now yield the desired claim.

Theorem 6 (Soundness of Weakest Preexpectations). *For all $C \in \text{pGCL}$ and $X \in \mathbb{E}$:*

1. $\text{dwp}[C](X) = \text{dop}[C](X)$

$$2. \text{awp}[[C]](X) = \text{aop}[[C]](X)$$

Example 10. We consider the running example pGCL program C from Figure 3 on page 23 one last time. From Example 8 we already know that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dwp}[[C]](y) &= [x \neq 0] \cdot y + [x = 0] \cdot (y + 2) \quad \text{and} \\ \text{awp}[[C]](y) &= [x \neq 0] \cdot y + [x = 0] \cdot \infty . \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the link between dwp/awp and expected rewards in the operational MDP (see Theorem 6) shows that, for every initial program state σ with $\sigma(x) \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MinER}(\mathcal{O}, (C, \sigma), \text{rew}_y) &= \sigma(y) + 2 \quad \text{and} \\ \text{MaxER}(\mathcal{O}, (C, \sigma), \text{rew}_y) &= \infty . \end{aligned}$$

Note that this is consistent with our observations from Example 2.

Finally, we remark that we are now in a position to see the relevance of *unbounded* reward functions and *infinite* expected rewards: Establishing the link

$$\text{awp}[[C]](x) = \lambda\sigma. \text{MaxER}(\mathcal{O}, (C, \sigma), \text{rew}_y)$$

from Theorem 6 works only if the right-hand side may evaluate to ∞ .

10 Conclusion

We have generalized well-established least fixed point characterizations of expected rewards of possibly infinite-state MDPs. In particular, our characterizations apply to infinite (expected) rewards, which arise naturally when reasoning about expected outcomes or more general expected values modeled by probabilistic programs. We applied those characterizations to obtain cleaned-up soundness proofs for weakest preexpectation calculi that Joost-Pieter has studied over the past decade.

References

1. Baier, C., Katoen, J.: Principles of model checking. MIT Press (2008)
2. Baranga, A.: The contraction principle as a particular case of Kleene’s fixed point theorem. *Discrete Mathematics* **98**(1), 75–79 (1991)
3. Barthe, G., Katoen, J.P., Silva, A.: Foundations of probabilistic programming. Cambridge University Press (2020)
4. Batz, K.: Automated Deductive Verification of Probabilistic Programs. Ph.D. thesis, RWTH Aachen University, Germany (202?), [submitted; to be defended]
5. Batz, K., Biskup, T.J., Katoen, J.P., Winkler, T.: Programmatic strategy synthesis: Resolving nondeterminism in probabilistic programs. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **8**(POPL), 2792–2820 (2024)
6. Batz, K., Chen, M., Junges, S., Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J., Matheja, C.: Probabilistic program verification via inductive synthesis of inductive invariants. In: TACAS. LNCS, vol. 13994, pp. 410–429. Springer (2023)

7. Batz, K., Chen, M., Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J., Matheja, C., Schröder, P.: Latticed k-induction with an application to probabilistic programs. In: CAV (2). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12760, pp. 524–549. Springer (2021)
8. Batz, K., Junges, S., Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J., Matheja, C., Schröder, P.: PrIC3: Property directed reachability for MDPs. In: CAV (2). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12225, pp. 512–538. Springer (2020)
9. Batz, K., Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J., Matheja, C.: How long, O Bayesian network, will I sample thee? - A program analysis perspective on expected sampling times. In: ESOP. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 10801, pp. 186–213. Springer (2018)
10. Batz, K., Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J., Matheja, C.: Relatively complete verification of probabilistic programs: an expressive language for expectation-based reasoning. Proc. ACM Program. Lang. **5**(POPL), 1–30 (2021)
11. Batz, K., Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J.P., Matheja, C., Noll, T.: Quantitative separation logic: A logic for reasoning about probabilistic pointer programs. Proc. ACM Program. Lang. **3**(POPL), 34:1–34:29 (2019)
12. Batz, K., Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J.P., Matheja, C., Verscht, L.: A calculus for amortized expected runtimes. Proc. ACM Program. Lang. **7**(POPL), 1957–1986 (2023)
13. Bellman, R.: A Markovian decision process. Indiana University Mathematics Journal **6**, 679–684 (1957), <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:123329493>
14. Dahlqvist, F., Silva, A., Smith, W.: Deterministic stream-sampling for probabilistic programming: semantics and verification. In: LICS. pp. 1–13. IEEE (2023)
15. Dehnert, C., Junges, S., Katoen, J., Volk, M.: A Storm is coming: A modern probabilistic model checker. In: CAV (2). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 10427, pp. 592–600. Springer (2017)
16. Dijkstra, E.W.: Guarded commands, nondeterminacy and formal derivation of programs. Commun. ACM **18**(8), 453–457 (1975)
17. Droste, M., Kuich, W., Vogler, H.: Handbook of Weighted Automata. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 1st edn. (2009)
18. Goswami, K.K.: Design for dependability: A simulation-based approach. Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (1993)
19. Gretz, F., Katoen, J., McIver, A.: Prinsys – On a quest for probabilistic loop invariants. In: QEST. LNCS, vol. 8054, pp. 193–208. Springer (2013)
20. Gretz, F., Katoen, J., McIver, A.: Operational versus weakest pre-expectation semantics for the probabilistic guarded command language. Perform. Evaluation **73**, 110–132 (2014)
21. Haddad, S., Monmege, B.: Interval iteration algorithm for MDPs and IMDPs. Theor. Comput. Sci. **735**, 111–131 (2018)
22. Hark, M., Kaminski, B.L., Giesl, J., Katoen, J.: Aiming low is harder: Induction for lower bounds in probabilistic program verification. Proc. ACM Program. Lang. **4**(POPL), 37:1–37:28 (2020)
23. Hartmanns, A., Kaminski, B.L.: Optimistic value iteration. In: CAV (2). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12225, pp. 488–511. Springer (2020)
24. Hoare, C.A.R.: An axiomatic basis for computer programming. Commun. ACM **12**(10), 576–580 (1969)
25. Jansen, N., Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J., Olmedo, F., Gretz, F., McIver, A.: Conditioning in probabilistic programming. In: MFPS. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science, vol. 319, pp. 199–216. Elsevier (2015)
26. Kaminski, B.L.: Advanced Weakest Precondition Calculi for Probabilistic Programs. Ph.D. thesis, RWTH Aachen University, Germany (2019)

27. Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J.P.: On the hardness of almost-sure termination. In: MFCS (1). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 9234, pp. 307–318. Springer (2015)
28. Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J.: A weakest pre-expectation semantics for mixed-sign expectations. In: LICS. pp. 1–12. IEEE Computer Society (2017)
29. Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J.P., Matheja, C.: On the hardness of analyzing probabilistic programs. *Acta Informatica* **56**(3), 255–285 (2019)
30. Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J., Matheja, C., Olmedo, F.: Weakest precondition reasoning for expected run-times of probabilistic programs. In: ESOP. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 9632, pp. 364–389. Springer (2016)
31. Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J., Matheja, C., Olmedo, F.: Weakest precondition reasoning for expected runtimes of randomized algorithms. *J. ACM* **65**(5), 30:1–30:68 (2018)
32. Knaster, B.: Un théorème sur les fonctions d'ensembles. *Annales de la Societe Polonaise de Mathematique* **6**, 133–134 (1928)
33. Kozen, D.: Semantics of probabilistic programs. In: FOCS. pp. 101–114. IEEE Computer Society (1979)
34. Kozen, D.: A probabilistic PDL. In: STOC. pp. 291–297. ACM (1983)
35. Kozen, D.: A probabilistic PDL. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* **30**(2), 162–178 (1985)
36. Kwiatkowska, M.Z., Norman, G., Parker, D.: PRISM: probabilistic symbolic model checker. In: Computer Performance Evaluation / TOOLS. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 2324, pp. 200–204. Springer (2002)
37. McIver, A., Morgan, C.: Abstraction, Refinement and Proof for Probabilistic Systems. Monographs in Computer Science, Springer (2005)
38. McIver, A., Morgan, C., Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J.: A new proof rule for almost-sure termination. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **2**(POPL), 33:1–33:28 (2018)
39. Park, D.: Fixpoint induction and proofs of program properties. *Machine Intelligence* **5** (1969)
40. Plotkin, G.D.: The origins of structural operational semantics. *J. Log. Algebraic Methods Program.* **60–61**, 3–15 (2004)
41. Puterman, M.L.: Markov Decision Processes: Discrete Stochastic Dynamic Programming. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, Wiley (1994)
42. Quatmann, T., Katoen, J.: Sound value iteration. In: CAV (1). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 10981, pp. 643–661. Springer (2018)
43. Ramsey, N., Pfeffer, A.: Stochastic lambda calculus and monads of probability distributions. In: POPL. pp. 154–165. ACM (2002)
44. Rupertus, W.H.: On the supervisory control of distributed high-performance computing systems in engineering. Marine Corps Chevron (1942)
45. Santos, E.S.: Probabilistic turing machines and computability. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **22**(3), 704–710 (1969)
46. Schröer, P., Batz, K., Kaminski, B.L., Katoen, J., Matheja, C.: A deductive verification infrastructure for probabilistic programs. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **7**(OOPSLA2), 2052–2082 (2023)
47. Tarski, A.: A lattice-theoretical fixpoint theorem and its applications. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **5**(2) (1955)
48. Westphal, H., Menge, S.: On the supervisory control of distributed high-performance computing systems in engineering. *WIT Transactions on Information and Communication Technologies* **11** (1970)
49. Wilkins, D.R.: Course 221: Hilary term 2007. Section 6: The extended real number system. Lecture Notes (2007), <https://www.maths.tcd.ie/~dwilkins/Courses/221/Extended.pdf>, accessed online November 20, 2023

50. Winskel, G.: The formal semantics of programming languages – an introduction. Foundation of computing series, MIT Press (1993)

A Omitted Proofs and Results on MDPs (Sections 3, 6 and 7)

A.1 Alternative Characterization of Expected Rewards

We will use the following alternative characterization of the expected reward in some proofs.

Lemma 5. *Let $\mathcal{M} = (S, \text{Act}, P)$ be an MDP, let $\text{rew}: S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$ be a reward function, and let $\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that*

$$\text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\leq n}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) = \sum_{s_0 \dots s_m \in \text{Paths}^{\leq n}(s)} \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_0 \dots s_m) \cdot \text{rew}(s_m) .$$

As a consequence,

$$\text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) = \sum_{s_0 \dots s_m \in \text{Paths}(s)} \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_0 \dots s_m) \cdot \text{rew}(s_m) .$$

Lemma 5 may strike as rather unintuitive. A good approach is perhaps to draw an analogy to expected values of discrete random variables. There one can characterize the expected value $E(X)$ of a discrete random variable X as

$$E(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{\omega} \Pr(X \geq i) .$$

The (admittedly vague) analogy is that both for paths as for discrete random variables, it suffices to sum over all “initial segments” (the i ’s and $s_0 \dots s_m$ ’s, respectively) and look at what these contribute to the whole expectation mass.

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\leq n}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) \\ = & \sum_{s_0 \dots s_n \in \text{Paths}^{\leq n}(s)} \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_0 \dots s_n) \cdot \text{rew}(s_0 \dots s_n) && \text{(Definition 6.1)} \\ = & \sum_{s_0 \dots s_n \in \text{Paths}^{\leq n}(s)} \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_0 \dots s_n) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^n \text{rew}(s_i) && \text{(Definition of } \text{rew}(s_0 \dots s_n)) \\ = & \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{s_0 \dots s_n \in \text{Paths}^{\leq n}(s)} \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_0 \dots s_n) \cdot \text{rew}(s_i) && \text{(Arithmetic)} \\ = & \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{s_0 \dots s_i \in \text{Paths}^{\leq i}(s)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{s_i \dots s_n \in \text{Paths}^{=n-i}(s_i)} \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_0 \dots s_i) \cdot \text{rew}(s_i) \cdot \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}'}(s_i \dots s_n) \\
 & \quad \text{(Split paths; } \mathfrak{S}' \text{ behaves like } \mathfrak{S} \text{ after seeing } s_0 \dots s_i) \\
 = & \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{s_0 \dots s_i \in \text{Paths}^{=i}(s)} \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_0 \dots s_i) \cdot \text{rew}(s_i) \\
 & \cdot \sum_{s_i \dots s_n \in \text{Paths}^{=n-i}(s_i)} \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}'}(s_i \dots s_n) \quad \text{(Arithmetic)} \\
 = & \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{s_0 \dots s_i \in \text{Paths}^{=i}(s)} \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_0 \dots s_i) \cdot \text{rew}(s_i) \\
 & \quad \text{(Sum of probabilities of paths with fixed length is 1)} \\
 = & \sum_{s_0 \dots s_m \in \text{Paths}^{\leq n}(s)} \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_0 \dots s_m) \cdot \text{rew}(s_m) \\
 & \quad \text{(Paths}^{\leq n}(s) = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^n \text{Paths}^{=i}(s))
 \end{aligned}$$

The second equation follows by taking suprema on both sides.

A.2 Induced Markov Chains

Since memoryless schedulers resolve all nondeterministic choices and their choices depend only on the current state, each memoryless scheduler for an MDP induces a *Markov chain* where all actions are determined.¹⁴

Definition 23 (Induced Markov Chains). *Let $\mathcal{M} = (\text{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ be an MDP and let $\mathfrak{S} \in \text{MLScheds}$ be a memoryless scheduler. The MC of \mathcal{M} induced by \mathfrak{S} is given by*

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}) = (\text{S}, \text{Act}, P_{\mathfrak{S}}),$$

where the transition probability function $P_{\mathfrak{S}}$ is given by

$$P_{\mathfrak{S}}(s, \mathbf{a}, s') = \begin{cases} P(s, \mathbf{a}, s'), & \text{if } \mathbf{a} = \mathfrak{S}(s), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Example 11 (Induced Markov Chains). Reconsider the MDP from Figure 1. Let \mathfrak{S} be a memoryless scheduler satisfying $\mathfrak{S}(s_i) = L$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then in the induced MC, only the topmost row is reachable from s_0 , i.e., the states s_0, s_0^L, s_1, s_1^L , etc. \triangleleft

By construction (cf. [1, p. 845]), the expected reward of \mathcal{M} for scheduler \mathfrak{S} is the same as the (unique) expected reward of $\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S})$:

¹⁴ Restricting to memoryless schedulers suffices for our purposes. One can more generally define Markov chains induced by history-dependent schedulers [1, Definition 10.92].

Lemma 6. *For every MDP \mathcal{M} , scheduler \mathfrak{S} , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, initial state s , and reward function rew , we have*

$$\text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^n(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) = \text{MaxER}^n(\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}), s, \text{rew}) = \text{MinER}^n(\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}), s, \text{rew})$$

The above lemma justifies that we simply write $\text{ER}^n(\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}), s, \text{rew})$ for induced Markov chains $\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S})$ instead of $\text{MaxER}^n(\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}), s, \text{rew})$ or $\text{MinER}^n(\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}), s, \text{rew})$.

A.3 Auxiliary Results on the Existence of Optimal Schedulers

We require the following auxiliary result: The least fixpoint of the *min*-Bellman operator $\min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}$ gives rise to a memoryless scheduler \mathfrak{S} such that the least fixpoint of $\min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}$ and the least fixpoint of the Bellman operator $\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}) \Phi_{\text{rew}}$ w.r.t. the Markov chain $\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S})$ induced by \mathfrak{S} (see Appendix A.2) coincide:

Lemma 7. *Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ be an MDP, let $\text{rew}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$ be a reward function, and let \preceq be some total order on Act . Moreover, define the memoryless scheduler \mathfrak{S} as*

$$\mathfrak{S}(s) = \text{rew}(s) + \underset{\alpha \in \text{Act}(s)}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{s' \in \text{Succs}_{\alpha}(s)} P(s, \alpha, s') \cdot (\text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}} \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}})(s')$$

where in case the above definition does not yield a unique action, we choose the least action w.r.t. \preceq . Then, for the Markov chain $\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S})$ induced by \mathfrak{S} ,

$$\text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}} \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}} = \text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S})} \Phi_{\text{rew}}.$$

Proof. We prove the two inequalities

$$\text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}} \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}} \preceq \text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S})} \Phi_{\text{rew}} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S})} \Phi_{\text{rew}} \preceq \text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}} \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}.$$

The claim then follows from antisymmetry of \preceq . The first inequality is straightforward since

$$\text{for all } v \in \mathbb{V} \quad \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}(v) \preceq \mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}) \Phi_{\text{rew}}(v).$$

For the latter inequality, by Park induction (Lemma 1), it suffices to show

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}) \Phi_{\text{rew}} (\text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}} \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}) \preceq \text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}} \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}.$$

For that, we reason as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}) \Phi_{\text{rew}} (\text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}} \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}) \\ &= \lambda s. \text{rew}(s) + \sum_{s' \in \text{Succs}_{\mathfrak{S}(s)}(s)} P(s, \mathfrak{S}(s), s') \cdot (\text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}} \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}})(s') \\ & \hspace{15em} \text{(Definition 14.1)} \\ &= \lambda s. \text{rew}(s) + \min_{\alpha \in \text{Act}(s)} \sum_{s' \in \text{Succs}_{\alpha}(s)} P(s, \alpha, s') \cdot (\text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}} \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}})(s') \\ & \hspace{15em} \text{(by construction of } \mathfrak{S}) \\ &= \text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}} \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}} \hspace{10em} \text{(Definition 14.1 and fixpoint property)} \\ &\preceq \text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}} \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}} \hspace{10em} \text{(reflexivity of } \preceq) \end{aligned}$$

A.4 Proof of Lemma 2

Lemma 2 (Step-Bounded Exp. Rew. via Fixed Point Iteration). *Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ be an MDP and let $\text{rew}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$. Then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$:*

1. $\min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}^{n+1}(0) = \lambda s. \text{MinER}^n(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew})$
2. $\max_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}^{n+1}(0) = \lambda s. \text{MaxER}^n(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew})$

Proof. We prove the claim for the min-Bellman operator by induction on n . The proof for the max-Bellman operator is completely analogous.

Base case $n = 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}^1(0) \\
&= \lambda s. \text{rew}(s) + \min_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(s)} \sum_{s' \in \text{Succs}_{\mathbf{a}}(s)} P(s, \mathbf{a}, s') \cdot 0 \quad (\text{Definition 14.1}) \\
&= \lambda s. \text{rew}(s) \\
&= \lambda s. \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \sum_{s_0 \in \text{Paths}^0(s)} \underbrace{\text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_0)}_{=1} \cdot \text{rew}(s_0) \\
&= \lambda s. \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^0(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) . \quad (\text{Definition 6.3})
\end{aligned}$$

Induction step. Let $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Given a scheduler \mathfrak{S} and some action $\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(s)$, define the scheduler $(s, \mathbf{a}) \cdot \mathfrak{S}$ as

$$((s, \mathbf{a}) \cdot \mathfrak{S})(s_0 \dots s_m) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{a} & \text{if } s_0 \dots s_m = s \\ \mathfrak{S}(s_0 \dots s_m) & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}^{n+2}(0)(s) \\
&= \text{rew}(s) + \min_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(s)} \sum_{s' \in \text{Succs}_{\mathbf{a}}(s)} P(s, \mathbf{a}, s') \cdot \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}^{n+1}(0)(s') \quad (\text{Definition 14.1}) \\
&= \text{rew}(s) + \min_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(s)} \sum_{s' \in \text{Succs}_{\mathbf{a}}(s)} P(s, \mathbf{a}, s') \cdot \text{MinER}^n(\mathcal{M}, s', \text{rew}) \quad (\text{I.H.}) \\
&= \text{rew}(s) + \min_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(s)} \sum_{s' \in \text{Succs}_{\mathbf{a}}(s)} P(s, \mathbf{a}, s') \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \sum_{s_0 \dots s_m \in \text{Paths}^{\leq n}(s)} \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_0 \dots s_m) \cdot \text{rew}(s_m) \right) \quad (\text{Lemma 5}) \\
&= \text{rew}(s) + \min_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(s)} \sum_{s' \in \text{Succs}_{\mathbf{a}}(s)} \\
&\quad \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \sum_{s_0 \dots s_m \in \text{Paths}^{\leq n}(s)} P(s, \mathbf{a}, s') \cdot \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{S}}(s_0 \dots s_m) \cdot \text{rew}(s_m) \\
&\quad (\cdot \text{ distributes over inf and finite sums})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \text{rew}(s) + \min_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(s)} \inf_{\mathfrak{G} \in \text{Scheds}} \sum_{s' \in \text{Succs}_{\mathbf{a}}(s)} \\
&\quad \sum_{s_0 \dots s_m \in \text{Paths}^{\leq n}(s')} P(s, \mathbf{a}, s') \cdot \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{G}}(s_0 \dots s_m) \cdot \text{rew}(s_m) \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad (\text{the sets } \text{Paths}^{\leq n}(s') \text{ are pairwise disjoint}) \\
&= \min_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(s)} \inf_{\mathfrak{G} \in \text{Scheds}} \sum_{s_0 \dots s_m \in \text{Paths}^{\leq n+1}(s)} \text{Prob}_{(s, \mathbf{a}) \cdot \mathfrak{G}}(s_0 \dots s_m) \cdot \text{rew}(s_m) \\
&\quad (\text{de-factorize } \mathbf{a}\text{-successors; note that this "consumes" the } +\text{rew}(s)) \\
&= \inf_{\mathfrak{G} \in \text{Scheds}} \sum_{s_0 \dots s_m \in \text{Paths}^{\leq n+1}(s)} \text{Prob}_{\mathfrak{G}}(s_0 \dots s_m) \cdot \text{rew}(s_m) \\
&\quad (\text{schedulers cover minimum over } \mathbf{a}\text{-successors}) \\
&= \text{MinER}^{\leq n+1}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) .
\end{aligned}$$

A.5 Proof of Theorem 3

We are now ready to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 3 (Expected Rewards via Least Fixed Points). *Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \text{Act}, P)$ be an MDP and $\text{rew}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$. Then:*

1. $\text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\min} \Phi_{\text{rew}} = \lambda s. \text{MinER}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew})$
2. $\text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\max} \Phi_{\text{rew}} = \lambda s. \text{MaxER}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew})$

Proof. Since the proof of Theorem 3.1 is more involved, we first prove Theorem 3.2. For that, consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\max} \Phi_{\text{rew}} \\
&= \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \max_{\mathcal{M}}^{\Phi_{\text{rew}}^n}(0) && (\text{Theorem 2.2}) \\
&= \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda s. \text{MaxER}^{\leq n}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) && (\text{Lemma 2.2}) \\
&= \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda s. \sup_{\mathfrak{G} \in \text{Scheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{G}}^{\leq n}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) && (\text{Definition 6.5}) \\
&= \lambda s. \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{\mathfrak{G} \in \text{Scheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{G}}^{\leq n}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) && (\text{suprema defined pointwise}) \\
&= \lambda s. \sup_{\mathfrak{G} \in \text{Scheds}} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{G}}^{\leq n}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) && (\text{suprema commute}) \\
&= \lambda s. \sup_{\mathfrak{G} \in \text{Scheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{G}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) && (\text{Definition 6.2}) \\
&= \lambda s. \text{MaxER}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) . && (\text{Definition 6.6})
\end{aligned}$$

In the above reasoning, we have exploited that suprema commute. This step is what yields the proof of Theorem 3.1 to be more involved. In this proof,

we encounter an analogous situation but instead of swapping two suprema we have to swap a supremum with an infimum. Suprema and infima do generally not commute. We will, however, employ Lemma 7 to see that the suprema and infima considered in this proof *do* commute. Now consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}^*} \min_{\text{rew}} \Phi \\
&= \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \min_{\mathcal{M}^*} \Phi_{\text{rew}}^n(0) && \text{(Theorem 2.2)} \\
&= \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda s. \text{MinER}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) && \text{(Lemma 2.1)} \\
&= \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda s. \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) && \text{(Definition 6.3)} \\
&= \lambda s. \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) && \text{(suprema defined pointwise)}
\end{aligned}$$

Assume for the moment that for all $s \in \mathbb{S}$, we have

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) = \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) \quad (5)$$

With this assumption and the above reasoning, we obtain the desired claim:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}^*} \min_{\text{rew}} \Phi \\
&= \lambda s. \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) && \text{(above reasoning and assumption)} \\
&= \lambda s. \text{MinER}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) . && \text{(Definition 6.2 and Definition 6.4)}
\end{aligned}$$

It hence remains to prove Equation (5). For that, we prove that both

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) \leq \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) \quad (6)$$

and

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) \geq \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) . \quad (7)$$

The claim then follows from antisymmetry of \leq . Inequality 6 holds since $\sup \inf \dots \leq \inf \sup \dots$ holds in every complete lattice. For Inequality 7, observe that for every scheduler \mathfrak{S}' ,

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}'}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) \geq \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) .$$

Hence, Inequality 7 follows if there is a scheduler \mathfrak{S}' with

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}'}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) .$$

We claim that \mathfrak{S}' is given by the scheduler constructed in Lemma 7, since

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}'}^{\text{=n}}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ER}^{\leq n}(\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}'), s, \text{rew}) && \text{(Lemma 6)} \\
&= \text{ER}(\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}'), s, \text{rew}) && \text{(Definition 6.2)} \\
&= \text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}')} \Phi_{\text{rew}} && \text{(Theorem 3)} \\
&= \text{lfp}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\min} \Phi_{\text{rew}} && \text{(Lemma 7)} \\
&= \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \min_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi_{\text{rew}}^n(0) && \text{(Theorem 1 (Kleene))} \\
&= \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \inf_{\mathfrak{S} \in \text{Scheds}} \text{ER}_{\mathfrak{S}}^{\leq n}(\mathcal{M}, s, \text{rew}) . && \text{(Lemma 2.1)}
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

B Omitted Results on the Operational MDP Semantics of pGCL

Lemma 8. *Let $C \in \text{pGCL}$ and $X \in \mathbb{E}$. We have:*

1.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{dwp}[C](X) &= \lambda\sigma. \text{rew}_X((C, \sigma)) \\
&+ \min_{a \in \text{Act}(C, \sigma)} \sum_{(C, \sigma) \xrightarrow{a, p} c'} p \cdot \begin{cases} X(\tau) & \text{if } c' = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \text{dwp}[C'](X)(\sigma') & \text{if } c' = (C', \sigma') \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

2.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{awp}[C](X) &= \lambda\sigma. \text{rew}_X((C, \sigma)) \\
&+ \max_{a \in \text{Act}(C, \sigma)} \sum_{(C, \sigma) \xrightarrow{a, p} c'} p \cdot \begin{cases} X(\tau) & \text{if } c' = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \text{awp}[C'](X)(\sigma') & \text{if } c' = (C', \sigma') \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that in the above case distinctions, we do not need to consider the case $c' = \perp$ because \perp is not reachable from a configuration of the form (C, σ) in one step.

Proof. By induction on C . We prove the claim for dwp . The reasoning for awp is completely analogous. Now let $\sigma \in \text{States}$.

The case $C = \text{skip}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{dwp}[\text{skip}](X)(\sigma) \\
&= X(\sigma) && \text{(Table 1)} \\
&= \min_{a \in \text{Act}(C, \sigma)} \sum_{(C, \sigma) \xrightarrow{a, p} c'} p \cdot \begin{cases} X(\tau) & \text{if } c' = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \text{dwp}[C'](X)(\sigma') & \text{if } c' = (C', \sigma') \end{cases} . \\
&\quad (\text{Act}(\text{skip}, \sigma) = \{N\} \text{ and } (\text{skip}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N, 1} (\Downarrow, \sigma) \text{ by Figure 5})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \text{rew}_X((C, \sigma)) + \min_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(C, \sigma)} \sum_{(C, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{a}, p} \mathbf{c}'} p \cdot \begin{cases} X(\tau) & \text{if } \mathbf{c}' = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \text{dwp}[C'](X)(\sigma') & \text{if } \mathbf{c}' = (C', \sigma') \end{cases} \\
&\quad (\text{Because } \text{rew}_X((\text{skip}, \sigma)) = 0 \text{ by Definitions 17 and 21})
\end{aligned}$$

The case $C = x := A$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{dwp}[x := A](X)(\sigma) \\
&= X(\sigma[x \mapsto A(\sigma)]) \quad (\text{Table 1}) \\
&= \min_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(C, \sigma)} \sum_{(C, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{a}, p} \mathbf{c}'} p \cdot \begin{cases} X(\tau) & \text{if } \mathbf{c}' = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \text{dwp}[C'](X)(\sigma') & \text{if } \mathbf{c}' = (C', \sigma') \end{cases} \\
&\quad (\text{Act}(x := A, \sigma) = \{N\} \text{ and } (x := A, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N, 1} (\Downarrow, \sigma[x \mapsto A(\sigma)]) \text{ by Figure 5}) \\
&= \text{rew}_X((C, \sigma)) + \min_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(C, \sigma)} \sum_{(C, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{a}, p} \mathbf{c}'} p \cdot \begin{cases} X(\tau) & \text{if } \mathbf{c}' = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \text{dwp}[C'](X)(\sigma') & \text{if } \mathbf{c}' = (C', \sigma') \end{cases} \\
&\quad (\text{Because } \text{rew}_X((\text{skip}, \sigma)) = 0 \text{ by Definitions 17 and 21})
\end{aligned}$$

The case $C = \text{reward}(r)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{dwp}[\text{reward}(r)](X)(\sigma) \\
&= r + X(\sigma) \quad (\text{Table 1}) \\
&= r + \min_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(C, \sigma)} \sum_{(C, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{a}, p} \mathbf{c}'} p \cdot \begin{cases} X(\tau) & \text{if } \mathbf{c}' = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \text{dwp}[C'](X)(\sigma') & \text{if } \mathbf{c}' = (C', \sigma') \end{cases} \\
&\quad (\text{Act}(\text{reward}(r), \sigma) = \{N\} \text{ and } (\text{reward}(r), \sigma) \xrightarrow{N, 1} (\Downarrow, \sigma) \text{ by Figure 5}) \\
&= \text{rew}_X((C, \sigma)) + \min_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(C, \sigma)} \sum_{(C, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{a}, p} \mathbf{c}'} p \cdot \begin{cases} X(\tau) & \text{if } \mathbf{c}' = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \text{dwp}[C'](X)(\sigma') & \text{if } \mathbf{c}' = (C', \sigma') \end{cases} \\
&\quad (\text{Because } \text{rew}_X((\text{reward}(r), \sigma)) = r \text{ by Definitions 17 and 21})
\end{aligned}$$

The case $C = C_1; C_2$. First observe that by the rules in Figure 5 we encounter exactly one of the following cases:

1. We have $\text{Act}(C_1, \sigma) = \{N\}$ and $C_1, \sigma \xrightarrow{N, 1} \Downarrow, \tau$. Hence, also $\text{Act}(C_1; C_2, \sigma) = \{N\}$ and $(C_1; C_2, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N, 1} (C_2, \tau)$.
2. For every $\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(C_1, \sigma)$, all configurations in $\text{Succs}_{\mathbf{a}}(C_1, \sigma)$ are of the form (C'_1, σ') . Hence, for every $\mathbf{a} \in \text{Act}(C_1; C_2, \sigma)$, all configurations in $\text{Succs}_{\mathbf{a}}(C_1; C_2, \sigma)$ are of the form $(C'_1; C_2, \sigma')$.

We proceed by distinguishing these two cases. For the first case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{dwp}[C_1; C_2](X)(\sigma) \\
&= \text{dwp}[C_1](\text{dwp}[C_2](X))(\sigma) \quad (\text{Table 1})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \text{rew}_{\text{dwp}[[C_2]](X)}((C_1, \sigma)) \\
&\quad + \min_{\alpha \in \text{Act}(C_1, \sigma)} \sum_{(C_1, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\alpha, p} \mathfrak{c}'} p \cdot \begin{cases} \text{dwp}[[C_2]](X)(\tau) & \text{if } \mathfrak{c}' = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \text{dwp}[[C']](\text{dwp}[[C_2]](X))(\sigma') & \text{if } \mathfrak{c}' = (C', \sigma') . \end{cases} \\
& \hspace{15em} \text{(I.H.)} \\
&= \text{rew}_{\text{dwp}[[C_2]](X)}((C_1, \sigma)) + \text{dwp}[[C_2]](X)(\tau) \\
&\quad \text{(assumption that } \text{Act}(C_1, \sigma) = \{N\} \text{ and } C_1, \sigma \xrightarrow{N, 1} \Downarrow, \tau) \\
&= \text{rew}_X((C_1; C_2, \sigma)) + \text{dwp}[[C_2]](X)(\tau) \hspace{5em} \text{(Definitions 17 and 21)} \\
&= \text{rew}_X((C_1; C_2, \sigma)) \\
&\quad + \min_{\alpha \in \text{Act}(C_1; C_2, \sigma)} \sum_{(C_1; C_2, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\alpha, p} \mathfrak{c}'} p \cdot \begin{cases} X(\tau) & \text{if } \mathfrak{c}' = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \text{dwp}[[C']](X)(\sigma') & \text{if } \mathfrak{c}' = (C', \sigma') . \end{cases} \\
&\quad \text{(assumption that } \text{Act}(C_1; C_2, \sigma) = \{N\} \text{ and } (C_1; C_2, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N, 1} (C_2, \tau))
\end{aligned}$$

For the second case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{dwp}[[C_1; C_2]](X)(\sigma) \\
&= \text{dwp}[[C_1]](\text{dwp}[[C_2]](X))(\sigma) \hspace{10em} \text{(Table 1)} \\
&= \text{rew}_{\text{dwp}[[C_2]](X)}((C_1, \sigma)) \\
&\quad + \min_{\alpha \in \text{Act}(C_1, \sigma)} \sum_{(C_1, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\alpha, p} \mathfrak{c}'} p \cdot \begin{cases} \text{dwp}[[C_2]](X)(\tau) & \text{if } \mathfrak{c}' = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \text{dwp}[[C']](X)(\sigma') & \text{if } \mathfrak{c}' = (C', \sigma') . \end{cases} \hspace{2em} \text{(I.H.)} \\
&= \text{rew}_{\text{dwp}[[C_2]](X)}((C_1, \sigma)) \\
&\quad + \min_{\alpha \in \text{Act}(C_1, \sigma)} \sum_{(C_1, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\alpha, p} (C'_1, \sigma')} p \cdot \text{dwp}[[C'_1]](\text{dwp}[[C_2]](X))(\sigma') \\
& \hspace{15em} \text{(assumption)} \\
&= \text{rew}_X((C_1; C_2, \sigma)) \\
&\quad + \min_{\alpha \in \text{Act}(C_1, \sigma)} \sum_{(C_1, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\alpha, p} (C'_1, \sigma')} p \cdot \text{dwp}[[C'_1; C_2]](X)(\sigma') \\
& \hspace{10em} \text{(Definitions 17 and 21 and Table 1)} \\
&= \text{rew}_X((C_1; C_2, \sigma)) \\
&\quad + \min_{\alpha \in \text{Act}(C_1; C_2, \sigma)} \sum_{(C_1; C_2, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\alpha, p} \mathfrak{c}'} p \cdot \begin{cases} X(\tau) & \text{if } \mathfrak{c}' = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \text{dwp}[[C']](X)(\sigma') & \text{if } \mathfrak{c}' = (C', \sigma') . \end{cases} \\
& \hspace{15em} \text{(assumption)}
\end{aligned}$$

The cases $C = \{C_1\} [p] \{C_2\}$, $C = \{C_1\} \square \{C_2\}$, and $C = \text{if} \dots$ follow immediately from the I.H.

The case $C = \mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}$. Since $\mathbf{dwp}[\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}](X)$ is a fixpoint of $\mathbf{dwp}_C^{\mathbf{dwp}}\Phi_X$, we have

$$\mathbf{dwp}[\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}](X) = [B] \cdot \mathbf{dwp}[C'; \mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}](X) + [\neg B] \cdot X. \quad (8)$$

Now distinguish the cases $\sigma \models B$ and $\sigma \models \neg B$. If $\sigma \models \neg B$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{dwp}[\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}](X)(\sigma) \\ &= X(\sigma) \quad (\text{Equation (8)}) \\ &= \min_{\alpha \in \text{Act}(\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}, \sigma)} \mathbf{rew}_X((C, \sigma)) \\ & \quad + \sum_{(\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\alpha, p} \mathfrak{c}'} p \cdot \begin{cases} X(\tau) & \text{if } \mathfrak{c}' = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \mathbf{dwp}[C''](X)(\sigma') & \text{if } \mathfrak{c}' = (C'', \sigma') \end{cases}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equation holds since $\mathbf{rew}_X((\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}, \sigma)) = 0$ and $\sigma \not\models B$ implies $\text{Act}(\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}, \sigma) = \{N\}$ and $(\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N, 1} (\Downarrow, \sigma)$ by Figure 5.

If $\sigma \models B$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\alpha \in \text{Act}(\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}, \sigma)} \mathbf{rew}_X((C, \sigma)) \\ & \quad + \sum_{(\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\alpha, p} \mathfrak{c}'} p \cdot \begin{cases} X(\tau) & \text{if } \mathfrak{c}' = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \mathbf{dwp}[C''](X)(\sigma') & \text{if } \mathfrak{c}' = (C'', \sigma') \end{cases} \\ &= \mathbf{dwp}[C'; \mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}](X)(\sigma) \quad (\text{see below}) \\ &= \mathbf{dwp}[\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}](X)(\sigma), \quad (\text{Equation (8)}) \end{aligned}$$

where the one but last step holds since $\mathbf{rew}_X((\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}, \sigma)) = 0$ and $\sigma \models B$ implies $\text{Act}(\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}, \sigma) = \{N\}$ $(\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N, 1} (C'; \mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}, \sigma)$ by Figure 5.

Now distinguish the cases $\sigma \models B$ and $\sigma \models \neg B$. If $\sigma \models \neg B$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{dwp}[\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}](X)(\sigma) \\ &= X(\sigma) \quad (\text{Equation (8)}) \\ &= \mathbf{rew}_X(\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}) + X(\sigma) \\ & \quad (\mathbf{rew}_X(\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}) = 0 \text{ by Definitions 17 and 21}) \\ &= \mathbf{rew}_X(\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}) + \min_{\alpha \in \text{Act}(\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}, \sigma)} \\ & \quad \sum_{(\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\alpha, p} \mathfrak{c}'} p \cdot \begin{cases} X(\tau) & \text{if } \mathfrak{c}' = (\Downarrow, \tau) \\ \mathbf{dwp}[C''](X)(\sigma') & \text{if } \mathfrak{c}' = (C'', \sigma') \end{cases}. \\ & (\text{Act}(\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}, \sigma) = \{N\}, (\mathbf{while}(B)\{C'\}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{N, 1} (\Downarrow, \sigma)) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 9. *Let $\mathcal{T} \in \{\text{dop}, \text{aop}\}$. For all $C_1, C_2 \in \text{pGCL}$ and all $X \in \mathbb{E}$, we have*

$$\mathcal{T}[[C_1]](\mathcal{T}[[C_2]](X)) \sqsubseteq \mathcal{T}[[C_1; C_2]](X) .$$

Proof. To enhance readability, we write $\Phi = \min_{\mathcal{O}} \Phi_{\text{rew}_{\text{dop}[[C_2]](X)}}$ and $\text{rew} = \text{rew}_{\text{dop}[[C_2]](X)}$ throughout this proof.

We prove the claim for **dop**. The reasoning for **aop** is completely analogous. First notice that by Definition 22 on page 31 and Theorem 2 on page 17, we have for all $\sigma \in \text{States}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dop}[[C_1]](\text{dop}[[C_2]](X))(\sigma) \\ &= \left(\bigsqcup \{ \Phi^n(0) \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \} \right) ((C_1, \sigma)) . \end{aligned}$$

It hence suffices to prove that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, all $C_1 \in \text{pGCL}$, all $X \in \mathbb{E}$, and all $\sigma \in \text{States}$,

$$\Phi^n(0)((C_1, \sigma)) \leq \text{dop}[[C_1; C_2]](X)(\sigma) .$$

We proceed by induction on n . The base case $n = 0$ is trivial. For the induction step, consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi^{n+1}(0)((C_1, \sigma)) \\ &= \Phi(\Phi^n(0))((C_1, \sigma)) \\ &= \text{rew}((C_1, \sigma)) + \min_{\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Act}(C_1, \sigma)} \left[\right. \\ & \quad \sum_{\substack{(C_1, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{a}, p} (C', \sigma') \\ C' \neq \Downarrow}} p \cdot \Phi^n(0)((C', \sigma')) + \sum_{(C_1, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{a}, p} (\Downarrow, \tau)} p \cdot \Phi^n(0)((\Downarrow, \tau)) \left. \right] \\ & \hspace{15em} \text{(Definition 16 and Definition 14)} \\ &\leq \text{rew}((C_1, \sigma)) + \min_{\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Act}(C_1, \sigma)} \left[\right. \\ & \quad \sum_{\substack{(C_1, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{a}, p} (C', \sigma') \\ C' \neq \Downarrow}} p \cdot \text{dop}[[C'; C_2]](X)(\sigma') \\ & \quad + \sum_{(C_1, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{a}, p} (\Downarrow, \tau)} p \cdot \text{dop}[[C_2]](X)(\tau) \left. \right] \\ & \hspace{15em} \text{(I.H. and using that } \Phi^n(0)((\Downarrow, \tau)) \leq \text{rew}((\Downarrow, \tau)) = \text{dop}[[C_2]](X)(\tau)) \\ &= \text{rew}_X((C_1; C_2, \sigma)) + \min_{\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Act}(C_1; C_2, \sigma)} \left[\right. \\ & \quad \sum_{\substack{(C_1; C_2, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{a}, p} (C', C_2, \sigma') \\ C' \neq \Downarrow}} p \cdot \text{dop}[[C'; C_2]](X)(\sigma') \\ & \quad + \sum_{(C_1; C_2, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{a}, p} (C_2, \tau)} p \cdot \text{dop}[[C_2]](X)(\tau) \left. \right] \hspace{2em} \text{(Definition 16)} \\ &= \text{dop}[[C_1; C_2]](X) . \hspace{10em} \text{(Definition 14)} \end{aligned}$$