






Weakly acyclic diagrams: A data structure for infinite-state symbolic verification^{*}

Michael Blondin¹ , Michaël Cadilhac² , Xin-Yi Cui³, Philipp Czerner³ ,
Javier Esparza³ , and Jakob Schulz³ 

¹ Université de Sherbrooke, Canada

² DePaul University, Chicago, USA

³ Technical University of Munich, Germany

Abstract. Ordered binary decision diagrams (OBDDs) are a fundamental data structure for the manipulation of Boolean functions, with strong applications to finite-state symbolic model checking. OBDDs allow for efficient algorithms using top-down dynamic programming. From an automata-theoretic perspective, OBDDs essentially are minimal deterministic finite automata recognizing languages whose words have a fixed length (the arity of the Boolean function). We introduce weakly acyclic diagrams (WADs), a generalization of OBDDs that maintains their algorithmic advantages, but can also represent infinite languages. We develop the theory of WADs and show that they can be used for symbolic model checking of various models of infinite-state systems.

Keywords: binary decision diagrams · weakly acyclic languages · partially ordered automata · well-structured transition systems.

1 Introduction

Ordered binary decision diagrams (OBDDs) are a fundamental data structure for the manipulation of Boolean functions [8,13], widely used to support symbolic model checking of finite-state systems [14,16]. In this approach to model checking, sets of configurations of a system are encoded as Boolean functions of fixed arity, say n , and the transition relation is encoded as a Boolean function of arity $2n$. After fixing a total order on the Boolean variables, the OBDD representation of a Boolean function is unique up to isomorphism, and one can implement different model checking algorithms on top of an OBDD library.

The fundamental operations on sets and relations used by symbolic model-checking algorithms are—besides union, intersection, and complement of sets and relations—the *pre* and *post* operations that return the immediate predecessors or successors of a given set of configurations with respect to the transition relation. All of them are efficiently implemented on OBDDs using top-down dynamic programming: a call to an operation for functions of arity n invokes one or more

^{*} M. Blondin was supported by a Discovery Grant from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).

calls to the same or other operations for functions of arity $n - 1$; intermediate results are stored using memoization [9,14,16].

OBDDs can be presented in automata-theoretic terms. A Boolean function $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ with order $x_1 < \dots < x_n$ is representable by the language $L_f := \{b_1 \dots b_n \in \{0, 1\}^n : f(b_1, \dots, b_n) = \text{true}\}$. The OBDD for f with this variable order is very close to the minimal DFA (MDFA) for L_f .⁴ From this point of view, OBDDs are just MDFA recognizing *fixed-length languages*—languages whose words have all the same length—and operations on OBDDs are just operations on fixed-length languages canonically represented by their unique MDFA.

The automata-theoretic view of OBDDs immediately suggests a generalization from fixed-length languages to arbitrary regular languages: canonically represent a regular language by its unique MDFA, and manipulate MDFA using automata-theoretic operations. (This is for example the approach of the tool MONA [28].) However, in this generalization crucial advantages of OBDD algorithms get lost. Consider the implementation of the *post* operation that, given a MDFA \mathcal{A} recognizing a set of configurations and the MDFA \mathcal{T} recognizing the transition relation, computes the MDFA for the set of immediate successors of $L(\mathcal{A})$ with respect to $L(\mathcal{T})$ (see *e.g.* [20, Chap. 5]). The algorithm proceeds in three steps. First, it constructs an NFA \mathcal{A}' recognizing the set of immediate successors; then, it applies the powerset construction to determinize \mathcal{A}' into a DFA \mathcal{A}'' ; finally, it minimizes \mathcal{A}'' to yield the final MDFA \mathcal{A}''' . The crucial point is that the intermediate DFA \mathcal{A}'' can be *exponentially larger* than \mathcal{A}''' , and so, in the worst case, *post* uses exponential space in the size of \mathcal{A}''' , the final output. This is not the case for the OBDD implementation for fixed-length languages, which constructs \mathcal{A}''' *directly* from \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{T} , using only space $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{A}'''|)$.

This observation raises the question of whether OBDDs can be generalized beyond fixed-length languages *while maintaining the advantages of OBDD algorithms*. We answer it in the affirmative. We introduce *weakly acyclic diagrams (WADs)*, a generalization of OBDDs for the representation of *weakly acyclic languages*. A language is weakly acyclic if it is recognized by a weakly acyclic DFA, and a DFA is weakly acyclic if every simple cycle of its state-transition diagram is a self-loop. So, for example, the language a^*ba^* is weakly acyclic. Note that, contrary to fixed-length languages, weakly acyclic languages can be infinite.

We develop the theory of WADs and in particular show that small modifications to the top-down dynamic programming algorithms for OBDDs generalize them to WADs. We also present a first application of WADs to symbolic infinite-state model checking. A fundamental technique in this area is the backwards reachability algorithm for well-structured transition systems [23,3]. The algorithm computes the set of all predecessors of a given upward-closed set of configurations (with respect to the partial order making the system well-structured). For that, it iteratively computes the immediate predecessors of the current set of configurations, until a fixpoint is reached. Well-structuredness ensures that all intermediate sets remain upward-closed, and termination. We show that for

⁴ See *e.g.* [20, Chap. 6], which even introduces a slight generalization of DFA such that the OBDD is the unique minimal deterministic generalized automaton for L_f .

many well-structured transition systems, including lossy channel systems [4,6], Petri nets [31], and broadcast protocols [21], upward-closed sets of configurations can be easily encoded as weakly acyclic languages, and so the backwards reachability algorithm can be implemented with WADs as data structure.

We implemented our algorithms in WADL, a prototype library for weakly acyclic diagrams. We conduct experiments on over 200 inputs for the backwards reachability algorithm, including instances of lossy channel systems, Petri nets, and broadcast protocols. We compare with some established tools using dedicated data structures and show that our generic approach is competitive.

Related work. Weakly acyclic automata have been studied extensively. However, past work has focused on algebraic, logical, and computational complexity questions, not on their algorithmics as a data structure.

In [15], Brzozowski and Fich showed that weakly acyclic automata, called *partially ordered automata* there, capture the so-called \mathcal{R} -trivial languages. They credit Eilenberg for earlier work on \mathcal{R} -trivial monoids [19]. Weakly acyclic automata have also been called *extensive automata*, *e.g.* in [32].

Weak acyclicity has also been defined in terms of *nondeterministic* automata. As we shall see, one such definition yields a model as expressive as the deterministic one, while another one is more expressive. These models have sometimes been called *restricted partially ordered NFAs (rpoNFAs)* and *partially ordered NFAs (poNFAs)*. Schwentick, Thérien and Vollmer have shown that poNFAs characterize level 3/2 of the Straubing-Thérien hierarchy [34]. Bouajjani *et al.* characterized the class of languages accepted by poNFAs as languages closed under permutation rewriting, *i.e.*, languages described by so-called *alphabetic pattern constraints* [12]. As mentioned, *e.g.*, in the introduction of [30], further equivalences are known in first-order logic.

More recently, Krötzsch, Masopust and Thomazo have studied the computational complexity of basic questions for several types of partially ordered automata [29,30], and Ryzhikov and Wolf have studied the complexity of problems for upper triangular Boolean matrices [33]; these matrices arise naturally from the transformation monoid of partially ordered automata.

In the context of symbolic verification, there is work on *dedicated* data structures for the representation of configuration sets for *specific* systems. In particular, Delzanno *et al.* introduced *covering sharing trees* to represent upward-closed sets of Petri net markings [18], which were later extended to *interval sharing trees* by Ganty *et al.* [24]. Boigelot and Godefroid studied *queue-content decision diagrams* to analyze channel systems [11].

Structure of the paper. In Section 2, we introduce and study weakly acyclic languages. In Sections 3 and 4, we introduce weakly acyclic diagrams and explain how to implement many operations. In Section 5, we explain how our framework can be used for infinite-state symbolic verification, and we then report on experimental results in Section 6. We conclude in Section 7. Some proofs and experimental results are deferred to the appendix of the full version [10].

2 Weakly acyclic languages

We assume familiarity with basic automata theory. Let us recall some notions. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ be a deterministic finite automaton (DFA). We write $L(\mathcal{A})$ to denote the language accepted by \mathcal{A} . The language accepted by a state $q \in Q$, denoted $L(q)$, is the language accepted by the DFA $(Q, \Sigma, \delta, q, F)$. We write Σ^+ to denote the set of all nonempty words over alphabet Σ .

For every word $w \in \Sigma^*$, we define $\alpha(w)$ as the set of letters that occur within w , e.g. $\alpha(\text{baacac}) = \{a, b, c\}$. The *residual* of a language $L \in \Sigma^*$ with respect to a word $u \in \Sigma^*$ is $L^u := \{v \in \Sigma^* : uv \in L\}$. Recall that a language is regular iff it has finitely many residuals. Moreover, every regular language has a unique minimal DFA. The states of a minimal DFA \mathcal{A} accept distinct residuals of $L(\mathcal{A})$, and each residual of $L(\mathcal{A})$ is accepted by a state of \mathcal{A} . For example, let $L \subseteq \{a, b\}^*$ be the language described by $(ab^* + b + \varepsilon)ab^*$. The minimal DFA for L is depicted in Figure 1. Its residuals are L^ε , L^a , L^b , L^{aa} and L^{aaa} .




Fig. 1. Example of a minimal DFA (whose language is weakly acyclic).

We say that a DFA $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ is *weakly acyclic* if for every $q \in Q$, $w \in \Sigma^+$ and $a \in \alpha(w)$, it is the case that $\delta(q, w) = q$ implies $\delta(q, a) = q$. For example, Figure 1 depicts a weakly acyclic DFA. Equivalent definitions of weak acyclicity are as follows:

- the binary relation \preceq over Q given by “ $q \preceq q'$ if $\delta(q, w) = q'$ for some word w ” is a partial order;
- each strongly connected component of the underlying directed graph of \mathcal{A} contains a single state; and
- the underlying directed graph of \mathcal{A} does not have any cycle beyond self-loops.

Analogously, a nondeterministic finite automaton (NFA) $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ is *weakly acyclic* if $q \in \delta(q, w)$ implies $\delta(q, a) = \{q\}$ for all $a \in \alpha(w)$. In other words, the underlying directed graph does not contain any simple cycle beyond self-loops, and nondeterminism with a letter a can only occur from states without self-loops labeled by a .

We make some observations whose proofs appear in the appendix of the long version of this work. Let us observe that the powerset construction (determinization), and DFA minimization, both preserve weak acyclicity.

Proposition 1. *Applying the powerset construction to a weakly acyclic NFA yields a weakly acyclic DFA.*

Proposition 2. *Let \mathcal{A} be a weakly acyclic DFA. The minimal DFA that accepts $L(\mathcal{A})$ is also weakly acyclic.*

We say that a language is *weakly acyclic* if it is accepted by a weakly acyclic automaton \mathcal{A} . By the above propositions, this means that \mathcal{A} can interchangeably be an NFA, a DFA, or a minimal DFA. The lemma below yields a characterization of weakly acyclic languages in terms of residuals rather than automata.

Lemma 1. *A regular language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is weakly acyclic iff for all $u \in \Sigma^*$ and $v \in \Sigma^+$ it is the case that $L^u = L^{uv}$ implies $L^u = L^{uw}$ for every $w \in \alpha(v)^*$.*

It can also be shown that weakly acyclic languages are precisely the languages described by such *weakly acyclic expressions*: $r ::= \emptyset \mid \Gamma^* \mid \Lambda^*ar \mid r + r$ where $\Gamma, \Lambda \subseteq \Sigma$ and $a \in \Sigma \setminus \Lambda$ (see the appendix of the full version). Note that these expressions are essentially “ \mathcal{R} -expressions”, which are known to be equivalent to weakly acyclic languages via algebraic automata theory. Moreover, [29, Thm. 7], shows that weakly acyclic DFAs and NFAs are equivalent, and the proof is very similar our conversion from weakly acyclic NFAs to expressions given in the appendix of the full version.

Complementing a weakly acyclic DFA preserves weak acyclicity since no cycle is created. Moreover, weakly acyclic regular expressions allow for union. Thus:

Proposition 3. *Weakly acyclic languages are closed under complementation, union and intersection.*

3 A data structure for weakly acyclic languages

Note that if a language L is weakly acyclic, then so is L^a for all $a \in \Sigma$. From this simple observation, one can imagine an infinite deterministic automaton where each state is a weakly acyclic language L , and each a -transition leads to L^a . Let us define this “master automaton” formally.

Definition 1. *The master automaton over alphabet Σ is the tuple $\mathcal{M} = (Q_{\mathcal{M}}, \Sigma, \delta_{\mathcal{M}}, F_{\mathcal{M}})$, where*

- $Q_{\mathcal{M}}$ is the set of all weakly acyclic languages over Σ ;
- $\delta_{\mathcal{M}}: Q_{\mathcal{M}} \times \Sigma \rightarrow Q_{\mathcal{M}}$ is given by $\delta_{\mathcal{M}}(L, a) := L^a$ for all $L \in Q_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $a \in \Sigma$;
- $L \in F_{\mathcal{M}}$ iff $\varepsilon \in L$.

Given weakly acyclic languages K and L , let $K \preceq L$ denote that $K = L^w$ for some word w . An immediate consequence of the definition of weakly acyclic DFAs is that \preceq is a partial order. The minimal elements of \preceq satisfy the equation $L = L^a$ for every letter a . The equation has exactly two solutions: $L = \emptyset$ and $L = \Sigma^*$. Moreover, we can easily show by structural induction that \preceq has no infinite descending chains. This allows to reason about a weakly acyclic language recursively through its residuals until reaching \emptyset or Σ^* .

Proposition 4. *Let L be a weakly acyclic language. The language accepted from the state L of the master automaton is L .*

By Proposition 4, we can look at the master automaton as a structure containing DFAs recognizing all the weakly acyclic languages. To make this precise, each weakly acyclic language L determines a DFA $\mathcal{A}_L = (Q_L, \Sigma, \delta_L, q_{0L}, F_L)$ as follows: Q_L is the set of states of the master automaton reachable from the state L , q_{0L} is the state L , δ_L is the projection of $\delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ onto Q_L , and $F_L := F_{\mathcal{M}} \cap Q_L$. It is easy to show that \mathcal{A}_L is the *minimal* DFA recognizing L .

Proposition 5. *For every weakly acyclic language L , automaton \mathcal{A}_L is the minimal DFA recognizing L .*

Proposition 5 allows us to define a data structure for representing finite sets of weakly acyclic languages. Loosely speaking, the structure representing the languages $\mathcal{L} = \{L_1, \dots, L_n\}$ is the fragment of the master automaton containing the states recognizing L_1, \dots, L_n and their descendants. It is a DFA with multiple initial states which we call the *weakly acyclic diagram* for \mathcal{L} . Formally:

Definition 2. *Let $\mathcal{L} = \{L_1, \dots, L_n\}$ be weakly acyclic languages over Σ . The weakly acyclic diagram $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the tuple $(Q_{\mathcal{L}}, \Sigma, \delta_{\mathcal{L}}, Q_{0\mathcal{L}}, F_{\mathcal{L}})$ where $Q_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the subset of states of the master automaton reachable from at least one of L_1, \dots, L_n ; $Q_{0\mathcal{L}} := \{L_1, \dots, L_n\}$; $\delta_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the projection of $\delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ onto $Q_{\mathcal{L}}$; and $F_{\mathcal{L}} = F_{\mathcal{M}} \cap Q_{\mathcal{L}}$.*

In order to manipulate weakly acyclic diagrams, we represent them as tables of nodes. Let us fix $\Sigma = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m\}$. A *node* is a triple $q: (s, b)$ where

- q is the node *identifier*;
- $s = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m)$ is the *successor tuple* of the node, where each q_i is either a node identifier or the special symbol SELF; and
- $b \in \{0, 1\}$ is the *acceptance flag* that indicates whether q is accepting or not.

We write q^{a_i} to denote q_i . We write $L(s, b)$ for the language defined recursively as follows, where $i \in [1..m]$ and $w \in \Sigma^*$:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \in L(q) &\iff b = 1, \\ a_i w \in L(q) &\iff ((q^{a_i} = \text{SELF} \wedge w \in L(q)) \vee (q^{a_i} \neq \text{SELF} \wedge w \in L(q^{a_i}))). \end{aligned}$$

For every node $q: (s, b)$, we write $L(q)$ to denote $L(s, b)$.

We denote the identifiers of the nodes for languages \emptyset and Σ^* by q_{\emptyset} and q_{Σ^*} , respectively, *i.e.*, $q_{\emptyset}: ((\text{SELF}, \dots, \text{SELF}), 0)$ and $q_{\Sigma^*}: ((\text{SELF}, \dots, \text{SELF}), 1)$.

Example 1. Let K and L be the languages over $\Sigma = \{a, b, c\}$ described by the regular expressions $a^*(\varepsilon + b^+ a \Sigma^*)$ and $ab^* a \Sigma^* + (b + c) \Sigma^*$. These languages are represented by the table depicted on the left of Figure 2, which corresponds to the diagram on the right. It is readily seen that $L(q_3) = K$ and $L(q_4) = L$. \square

Note that there is a risk that two distinct nodes represent the same language. For example, suppose $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$ and that we create a node $p: ((\text{SELF}, q_{\Sigma^*}), 1)$. We obtain the following table, where $L(p) = L(q_{\Sigma^*}) = \{a, b\}^*$:

identifier	succ. tuple			flag
	a	b	c	
q_4	q_2	q_{Σ^*}	q_{Σ^*}	0
q_3	SELF	q_2	q_\emptyset	1
q_2	q_{Σ^*}	SELF	q_\emptyset	0
q_{Σ^*}	SELF	SELF	SELF	1
q_\emptyset	SELF	SELF	SELF	0




Fig. 2. Example of the representation of weakly acyclic languages.

identifier	succ. tuple		flag
	a	b	
p	SELF	q_{Σ^*}	1
q_{Σ^*}	SELF	SELF	1

We will avoid this: we will maintain a table of nodes such that the language of distinct nodes is distinct. The procedure `make` of Algorithm 1 serves this purpose. Given a successor tuple s and an acceptance flag b , it first checks whether there is already an entry for language $L(s, b)$, and if not it creates one with a new identifier. The identifiers created by `make` are generated in increasing order. We assume that the table initially contains q_\emptyset and q_{Σ^*} as the first two identifiers.

Algorithm 1: Algorithm to maintain nodes.

Input: $s = (q_1, \dots, q_m)$ and $b \in \{0, 1\}$ where $q_i = \text{SELF}$ or an existing identifier
Result: unique identifier q with language $L(s, b)$ and $q \notin s$

```

1 make( $s, b$ ):
2   if the table contains  $q: (s, b)$  then return  $q$ 
3   else
4      $q' \leftarrow \max\{r \in s : r \neq \text{SELF}\}$ 
5      $s' \leftarrow s[q'/\text{SELF}]$ 
6     if the table contains  $q: (s', b)$  then return  $q$ 
7     else
8        $q \leftarrow$  next fresh identifier
9       add  $q: (s, b)$  to the table
10    return  $q$ 

```

Let us explain how `make` checks whether a node must be created. Given a tuple $s = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m)$, we write $s[r/r']$ to denote the tuple obtained from s by replacing each occurrence $q_i = r$ by r' . As already explained, when trying to add (s, b) to the table, there might already be an entry $q: (s', b')$ with $L(s', b') = L(s, b)$. It can be shown that this happens iff $b' = b$ and there exists $q' \in s$ such that $s' = s[q'/\text{SELF}]$ (see the proof of Proposition 6 below in the full version [10]). In fact, it can be shown that such a q' must be the maximal identifier of s ; hence,

there is no need to check all elements of s . For example, in the aforementioned problematic case, we have $s = (\text{SELF}, q_{\Sigma^*})$ and $s[q_{\Sigma^*}/\text{SELF}] = (\text{SELF}, \text{SELF})$ which is already in the table, so no node is created.

The amortized time of **make** belongs to $\mathcal{O}(|\Sigma|)$. Further, it works as intended:

Proposition 6. *A table obtained from successive calls to Algorithm 1 does not contain nodes $q \neq q'$ such that $L(q) = L(q')$.*

4 Operations on weakly acyclic languages

4.1 Unary and binary operations

Algorithms 2 and 3 describe recursive procedures that respectively complement a weakly acyclic language, and intersect two weakly acyclic languages. They are *very similar* to the classical algorithms for negation and conjunction in OBDDs (see [20, Chap. 6, Algorithms 27 and 26]); they essentially only differ in the usage of **SELF**. For this reason, their correctness and time complexity are established with the same arguments. Let us expand for readers less familiar with OBDDs.

Procedure **comp** terminates because on each recursive call, q^a is a smaller identifier than q . Procedure **inter** terminates because on each recursive call, either $p^a \neq \text{SELF}$ and p^a is a smaller identifier than p , or likewise for q^a and q .

Algorithm 2: Complement.	Algorithm 3: Intersection.
Input: identifier q	Input: identifiers p and q
Result: id. $r : L(r) = \overline{L(q)}$	Result: id. $r : L(r) = L(p) \cap L(q)$
1 comp (q) :	1 inter (p, q) :
2 if $q = q_\emptyset$ then	2 if $p = q_\emptyset$ or $q = q_\emptyset$ then
3 return q_{Σ^*}	3 return q_\emptyset
4 else if $q = q_{\Sigma^*}$ then	4 else if $p = q_{\Sigma^*}$ then
5 return q_\emptyset	5 return q
6 else	6 else if $q = q_{\Sigma^*}$ then
7 for $a \in \Sigma$ do	7 return p
8 if $q^a = \text{SELF}$ then	8 else
9 $s_a \leftarrow \text{SELF}$	9 for $a \in \Sigma$ do
10 else	10 $p' \leftarrow p^a$ if $p^a \neq \text{SELF}$ else p
11 $s_a \leftarrow \text{comp}(q^a)$	11 $q' \leftarrow q^a$ if $q^a \neq \text{SELF}$ else q
12 return make ($s, \neg \text{flag}(q)$)	12 if $p' = p$ and $q' = q$ then
	13 $s_a \leftarrow \text{SELF}$
	14 else
	15 $s_a \leftarrow \text{inter}(p', q')$
	16 return make ($s, \text{flag}(p) \wedge \text{flag}(q)$)

The two procedures may have an exponential complexity since the recursion may recompute the same values repeatedly. However, this is easily avoided with memoization. This will apply to all our algorithms, *i.e.*, each recursive procedure

$\tau(x)$ can first check in a dictionary whether the output value for x has already been computed, and only proceed to compute it if not. To avoid cluttering the presentation, we will not explicitly describe such memoization in our pseudocode.

The following proposition is established with standard arguments (see the appendix of the full version).

Proposition 7. *Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 are correct. Moreover, with memoization, they respectively work in time $\mathcal{O}(|\Sigma|n_q)$ and $\mathcal{O}(|\Sigma|n_p n_q)$, where n_x is the number of nodes reachable from node x .*

It is easy to adapt Algorithm 3 to other binary operations such as union: It suffices to change the base cases and the way the acceptance flag is set.

Note that testing emptiness, universality and language equality can be done in *constant time*. Indeed, as the table keeps a unique identifier for each language, we have $L(q) = \emptyset$ iff $q = q_\emptyset$, $L(q) = \Sigma^*$ iff $q = q_{\Sigma^*}$, and $L(p) = L(q)$ iff $p = q$.

4.2 Fixed-length relations: a general approach

For a relation $R \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*$ and a language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$, we define $\text{Post}_R(L) := \{v \in \Sigma^* : u \in L, (u, v) \in R\}$ and $\text{Pre}_R(L) := \{u \in \Sigma^* : (u, v) \in R, v \in L\}$. A relation is said to be *fixed-length* if $(u, v) \in R$ implies $|u| = |v|$.

We consider fixed-length regular relations, *i.e.*, those that can be represented by automata over alphabet $\Sigma \times \Sigma$, which we call transducers. Given a fixed-length regular relation R and a weakly acyclic language L , $\text{Post}_R(L)$ and $\text{Pre}_R(L)$ may not be weakly acyclic. For example, consider the relation R and the language L depicted by the transducer and automata of Figure 3. We have $\text{Post}_R(L) = (a+b)^*b$ which is not weakly acyclic (as its minimal DFA has a nontrivial cycle).



Fig. 3. *Left:* A transducer \mathcal{T} that converts each occurrence of letter c into letter b . *Right:* A weakly acyclic DFA \mathcal{A} accepting language $(a + b)^*c$.

Yet, under the guarantee that the resulting language is weakly acyclic, we can compute $\text{Post}_R(L)$ and $\text{Pre}_R(L)$. The key observation is that if a DFA accepting a weakly acyclic language has a cycle, then this cycle can be “contracted”. Thus, given a transducer \mathcal{T} and a node q , we apply the powerset construction on the pairing of \mathcal{T} and q , and we contract cycles on the fly. Informally, cycle detection is achieved by testing whether a successor is already on the call stack. Algorithm 4 implements this idea for $\text{Pre}_R(L)$. In the pseudocode, symbols S and S' denote sets of pairs of states.

Algorithm 4: General algorithm for the Pre operation

Input: transducer $\mathcal{T} = (P, \Sigma \times \Sigma, \delta, p_0, F)$, and identifier q such that $\text{Pre}_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})}(\mathcal{L}(q))$ is weakly acyclic
Result: identifier r such that $\mathcal{L}(r) = \text{Pre}_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})}(\mathcal{L}(q))$

```

1 pre( $\mathcal{T}, q$ ) :
2   succ( $q, b$ ) :
3     if  $q^b \neq \text{SELF}$  then return  $q^b$ 
4     else return  $q$ 
5   pre-aux( $S$ ) :
6     mark  $S$ 
7     for  $a \in \Sigma$  do
8        $S' \leftarrow \bigcup_{b \in \Sigma} \{(p', q') : (p, q) \in S, p' \in \delta(p, (a, b)), q' = \text{succ}(q, b)\}$ 
9       if  $S'$  is marked then  $s_a \leftarrow \text{SELF}$  // Contract detected cycle
10      else  $s_a \leftarrow \text{pre-aux}(S')$ 
11     unmark  $S$ 
12     return make( $s, \exists(p, q) \in S : p \in F \wedge \text{flag}(q)$ )
13   return pre-aux( $\{(p_0, q)\}$ )

```

Let us analyze Algorithm 4. We write $\text{Pre}_p(q)$ to denote $\text{Pre}_{\mathcal{L}(p)}(\mathcal{L}(q))$. Let $\mathcal{L}(S) := \bigcup_{(p,q) \in S} \text{Pre}_p(q)$. Given S and $a \in \Sigma$, we write $S \rightarrow^a S'$ where

$$S' := \bigcup_{b \in \Sigma} \{(p', q') : (p, q) \in S, p' \in \delta(p, (a, b)), q' = \text{succ}(q, b)\}.$$

In words, “ $S \rightarrow^a S'$ ” denotes that **pre-aux**(S) constructs the set S' on Line 8. By extension, we write $S \rightarrow^\varepsilon S'$ if $S = S'$, and we write $S \rightarrow^{a_1 a_2 \dots a_n} S'$ if $S = S_0 \rightarrow^{a_1} S_1 \rightarrow^{a_2} S_2 \dots \rightarrow^{a_n} S_n = S'$ for some S_0, S_1, \dots, S_n .

Proposition 8. *Let $w \in \Sigma^*$. If $S \rightarrow^w S'$, then $\mathcal{L}(S)^w = \mathcal{L}(S')$.*

Proposition 9. *If $S_0 \rightarrow^* S' \rightarrow^* S \rightarrow^a S'$ for some $a \in \Sigma$, and $\mathcal{L}(S_0)$ is weakly acyclic, then $\mathcal{L}(S) = \mathcal{L}(S')$.*

Proposition 10. *Algorithm 4 is correct and terminates.*

Proof. Termination follows easily by the fact that only finitely many subsets can be generated (see the appendix of the full version). Let us prove correctness.

Let $S_0 := \{(p_0, q)\}$ be the input and let **pre-aux**(S) be a recursive call made by **pre**(S_0). Recall that $\mathcal{L}(S) = \bigcup_{(p,q) \in S} \text{Pre}_p(q)$. So, we must show that $\mathcal{L}(\text{pre-aux}(S)) = \mathcal{L}(S)$. To do so, we must prove that, for each $a \in \Sigma$, Algorithm 4 assigns to s_a the state accepting $\mathcal{L}(S)^a$. Moreover, we must show that the acceptance flag is set correctly. We show the latter first, and then the former.

We have $\varepsilon \in \bigcup_{(p,q) \in S} \text{Pre}_p(q)$ iff there exists $(p, q) \in S$ such that $(\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \in \mathcal{L}(p)$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}(q)$ iff there exists $(p, q) \in S$ such that $p \in F$ and $\text{flag}(q) = \text{true}$. Thus, the flag is set correctly on Line 12.

Let $a \in \Sigma$. Let S' be the set computed on Line 8 for letter a . By definition, we have $S \rightarrow^a S'$. We make a case distinction on whether S' is marked or not.

Case 1: S' is marked. Since S' is marked, we have $S_0 \rightarrow^* S' \rightarrow^* S$. Therefore, $S_0 \rightarrow^* S' \rightarrow^* S \rightarrow^a S'$. By Proposition 9, we have $L(S) = L(S')$. Moreover, by Proposition 8, we have $L(S)^a = L(S')$. Thus, $L(S)^a = L(S') = L(S)$. As S' is marked, Algorithm 4 executes Line 9, which correctly assigns “ $s_a \leftarrow \text{SELF}$ ”.

Case 2: S' is unmarked. By Proposition 8, $L(S)^a = L(S')$. As S' is unmarked, Algorithm 4 executes Line 10, which correctly assigns “ $s_a \leftarrow \text{pre-aux}(S')$ ”. \square

Note that Algorithm 4 has exponential worst-case time complexity since this is already the case for the particular case of OBDDs (see [20, Chap. 6.5, pp. 148–149]). Indeed, given an arbitrary NFA A , one can find a (deterministic) transducer and a DFA whose composition yields A , and it is well known that determinizing an NFA blows up its size exponentially in the worst case.

4.3 Fixed-length relations: a more efficient approach

As just mentioned, pairing a transducer and an automaton can result in a non-deterministic automaton. For this reason, Algorithm 4 determinizes on the fly by constructing subsets of states, and minimizes on the fly by contracting cycles.

We describe a setting in which determinism is guaranteed, and hence where cycle contraction is avoided. This allows for a polynomial-time procedure.

Observe that a weakly acyclic language K over $\Sigma \times \Sigma$ can be represented with our data structure. As shown in Figure 3, even if K and L are weakly acyclic, it is not necessarily the case that $\text{Post}_K(L)$ and $\text{Pre}_K(L)$ are weakly acyclic. Yet, we provide a sufficient condition under which weak acyclicity is guaranteed.

Let K and L be weakly acyclic languages respectively over $\Sigma \times \Sigma$ and Σ . We say that K and L are *pre-compatible* if for every $a \in \Sigma$ the following holds:

- there exists at most one $b \in \Sigma$ such that $K^{(a,b)} \neq \emptyset$ and $L^b \neq \emptyset$; and
- if $K^{(a,b)} \neq \emptyset$ and $L^b \neq \emptyset$, then $K^{(a,b)}$ and L^b are pre-compatible.

Algorithm 5 describes a procedure that computes a node accepting $\text{Pre}_K(L)$. Similarly to Algorithms 2 and 3, a simple analysis yields the following proposition (see the appendix of the full version).

Proposition 11. *Algorithm 5 is correct. Moreover, with memoization, it works in time $\mathcal{O}(|\Sigma|^2 n_p n_q)$, where n_x is the number of nodes reachable from node x .*

5 Weakly acyclic (regular) model checking

In this section, we present interesting examples of systems that can be modeled with WADs. In our setting, a system has a set of configurations equipped with a partial order \preceq and a monotone labeled transition relation, *i.e.*, if $C \rightarrow^t D$ and

Algorithm 5: Algorithm for the Pre operation under pre-compatibility

Input: identifier p over $\Sigma \times \Sigma$, identifier q over Σ such that $L(p)$ and $L(q)$ are pre-compatible

Result: identifier r such that $L(r) = \text{Pre}_{L(p)}(L(q))$

```

1  pre( $p, q$ ) :
2  |   for  $a \in \Sigma$  do
3  |   |   if  $\neg(\exists b \in \Sigma : p^{(a,b)} \neq p_\emptyset \wedge q^b \neq q_\emptyset)$  then  $s_a \leftarrow q_\emptyset$ 
4  |   |   else
5  |   |   |   let  $b$  be the unique letter such that  $p^{(a,b)} \neq p_\emptyset$  and  $q^b \neq q_\emptyset$ 
6  |   |   |    $p' \leftarrow p^{(a,b)}$  if  $p^{(a,b)} \neq \text{SELF}$  else  $p$ 
7  |   |   |    $q' \leftarrow q^b$  if  $q^b \neq \text{SELF}$  else  $q$ 
8  |   |   |   if  $p' = p \wedge q' = q$  then  $s_a \leftarrow \text{SELF}$ 
9  |   |   |   else  $s_a \leftarrow \text{pre}(p', q')$ 
10 |   return make( $s, \text{flag}(p) \wedge \text{flag}(q)$ )

```

$C' \succeq C$, then $C' \rightarrow^t D'$ for some $D' \succeq C'$. The *safety verification problem* asks, given configurations C and C' , whether $C \rightarrow^* C''$ for some $C'' \succeq C'$.

For every D , let $\text{Pre}(D) := \{C : C \rightarrow^* D\}$. We extend this notation to sets, *i.e.*, $\text{Pre}(X) := \bigcup_{C \in X} \text{Pre}(C)$. Let $\text{Pre}^*(X) := \bigcup_{i \geq 0} \text{Pre}^i(X)$. A set of configurations X is *upward-closed* if $\uparrow X = X$, where $\uparrow X := \{C' : C' \succeq C \text{ and } C \in X\}$.

Safety verification amounts to testing whether $C \in \text{Pre}^*(\uparrow C')$. If the system is well structured, namely if \preceq is a well-quasi-order, then it is well-known that $\text{Pre}^*(\uparrow C') = \text{Pre}^i(\uparrow C')$ for some $i \geq 0$. Thus, verification can be done by the *backward algorithm*: compute $\text{Pre}^0(\uparrow C') \cup \text{Pre}^1(\uparrow C') \cup \dots$ until reaching a fixed point. So, for well-structured transition systems, the approach is as follows:

- Choose a suitable alphabet Σ ;
- For each configuration D , define an encoding $\text{enc}(\uparrow D) \subseteq \Sigma^*$ of $\uparrow D$ which is a weakly acyclic language;
- For each t , define a transducer \mathcal{T}_t for the language $\{(\text{enc}(D), \text{enc}(D')) : D \rightarrow^t D'\} \subseteq (\Sigma \times \Sigma)^*$;
- Create a weakly acyclic diagram for $L(q_0) = \text{enc}(\uparrow C')$ and compute $L(q_{i+1}) = \text{Pre}_{\mathcal{T}_t}(L(q_i))$ iteratively until $q_{i+1} = q_i$.

Since \preceq is a well-quasi-order, any upward-closed set X of configurations has a finite basis, *i.e.*, there exist configurations C_1, \dots, C_n such that $X = \bigcup_{i \in [1..n]} \uparrow C_i$. Thus, as weakly acyclic languages are closed under union, $\text{enc}(X)$ must be weakly acyclic. Moreover, since $\text{Pre}(X)$ is upward-closed by monotonicity, $\text{Pre}_{\mathcal{T}_t}(\text{enc}(X))$ is necessarily weakly acyclic.

5.1 Lossy channel systems

A *channel system* is a finite directed graph whose nodes P are called *states*, and whose arcs, called *transitions*, are labeled by $\text{read}_i(a)$, $\text{write}_i(a)$ or nop with

$a \in \Gamma$ and $i \in [1..k]$. There are m processes starting in some states, and evolving by reading from the left and writing to the right of channels, and by moving to other states. A *lossy channel system (LCS)* is a channel system where any letter may be lost at any moment from any channel.




Fig. 4. *Left:* Example of a lossy channel system with $\Gamma = \{a, b\}$. *Right:* Transducers encoding respectively the transitions $\text{read}_1(a)$, $\text{write}_2(b)$ and nop (under the semi-lossy semantics), where $s \in \{p, q, r\}$, $\sigma \in \{a, b\}$ and γ stands for any letter.

For example, consider the channel system depicted on the left of Figure 4. Consider its configuration $C := ([p, q], ab, \varepsilon, b)$ with two processes in states p and q , and with three channels currently containing ab , ε and b . We have, *e.g.*,

$$C \xrightarrow{\text{read}_1(a)} ([q, q], b, \varepsilon, b) \xrightarrow{\text{write}_2(b)} ([q, p], b, b, b) \xrightarrow{\text{nop}} ([q, r], b, b, b).$$

We encode configurations as words over $\Sigma := P \cup \Gamma \cup \{\#\}$, *e.g.* the encoding of C is $pq\#ab\#\#\varepsilon\#$. Moreover, we encode operations as transducers with an extra letter X . Let us explain this through an example.

The transducers for the three transitions of our example are depicted on the right of Figure 4. As a preprocessing step for operation $\text{write}_i(\sigma)$, we pad channels of a configuration on the right with X^* . This way, the first occurrence of X can be replaced by the letter to insert. This padding can then be removed in a postprocessing step. Furthermore, we model the “lossiness” of the channels through $\text{read}_i(\sigma)$: when reading an a , all letters in front of the first a may be lost. Transducers for $\text{write}_i(\sigma)$ and nop are nonlossy. For safety verification, the standard “pure lossy” semantics is equivalent to our “semi-lossy” semantics.

Let us formalize it. Given configurations $C = (X, w_1, \dots, w_k)$ and $C' = (X', w'_1, \dots, w'_k)$, we write $C \preceq C'$ if $X = X'$ and $w_i \sqsubseteq w'_i$ for all $i \in [1..k]$, where \sqsubseteq denotes the subword order. For example, $([p, q], ab, \varepsilon, b) \preceq ([p, q], aab, a, baa)$. By Higman’s lemma, the subword order \sqsubseteq is a well-quasi-order. Moreover, equality over a finite set is a well-quasi-order. As the order \preceq over configurations is a product of these orders, it is also a well-quasi-order. Moreover:

Proposition 12. *We have $C \xrightarrow{*}_{\text{pure-lossy}} C''$ for some $C'' \succeq C'$ iff $C \xrightarrow{*}_{\text{semi-lossy}} C''$ for some $C'' \succeq C'$. Furthermore, $\rightarrow_{\text{semi-lossy}}$ is monotone.*

Note that $\text{enc}(\uparrow C)$ is weakly acyclic. Indeed, for $C = ([p_1, \dots, p_m], w_1, \dots, w_k)$, the language $\text{enc}(\uparrow C)$ can be expressed by a weakly acyclic expression:

$$p_1 \cdots p_m \# \prod_{i \in [1..k]} \left(\prod_{a \in w_i} (\Gamma \setminus \{a\})^* a \right) \Gamma^* \#.$$

5.2 Petri nets

A Petri net is a tuple (P, T, F) where P is a finite set of *places*, T is a finite set of *transitions* disjoint from P , and $F: (P \times T) \cup (T \cup P) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. A *marking* is an assignment $\mathbf{m}: P \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ of tokens to places. A transition t is *enabled* in \mathbf{m} if $\mathbf{m}(p) \geq F(p, t)$ for every place p . If t is enabled, then it can be *fired*, which leads to the marking \mathbf{m}' obtained by removing $F(p, t)$ tokens and adding $F(t, p)$ tokens to each place p , *i.e.*, $\mathbf{m}'(p) = \mathbf{m}(p) - F(p, t) + F(t, p)$.

Consider, *e.g.*, the Petri net depicted on the left of Figure 5. From the marking $[p \mapsto 3, q \mapsto 1]$, written as $\mathbf{m} := (3, 1)$, we have, *e.g.*, $\mathbf{m} \xrightarrow{t} (2, 3) \xrightarrow{t} (1, 5)$.

We encode markings over $\Sigma := \{\bullet, \#\}$, *e.g.* the encoding of \mathbf{m} is $\bullet\bullet\bullet\#\bullet$. Moreover, we encode operations as transducers with an extra letter X . Let us explain this through an example. The transducer for the transition of our example is depicted on the right of Figure 5. As a preprocessing step, we pad places of a configuration on the right with X^* . This symbol can be used to remove and add tokens. The padding is then removed in a postprocessing step.

We write $\mathbf{m} \leq \mathbf{m}'$ if $\mathbf{m}(p) \leq \mathbf{m}'(p)$ for all p . By Dickson's lemma, \leq is a well-quasi-order. Note that $\text{enc}(\uparrow \mathbf{m})$ is weakly acyclic. Indeed, for $\mathbf{m} = (n_1, \dots, n_k)$, it is the language of this weakly acyclic expression: $\bullet^{n_1} \bullet^* \# \dots \bullet^{n_k} \bullet^* \#$.

5.3 Broadcast protocols

A *broadcast protocol* is a finite directed graph whose nodes P are called *states*, and where each arc (*transition*) is labeled by a , $b!$, $b?$, $c!!$ or $c??$ where $a \in \Gamma$, $b \in \Gamma'$ and $c \in \Gamma''$ (three disjoint alphabets). There are m processes starting in some states, and evolving by local, rendez-vous or broadcast communication:

- A local update a only changes the state of a single process;
- A rendez-vous occurs when two processes respectively take a $b!$ -transition and a $b?$ -transition;




Fig. 5. *Left:* Example of a Petri net where $P = \{p, q\}$, $T = \{t\}$, $F(p, t) = 2$, $F(t, p) = 1 = F(q, t)$ and $F(t, q) = 3$. *Right:* Transducer encoding transition t .

- A broadcast occurs when a process takes a $c!-$ transition; when this happens, any other process that can take a $c??-$ transition takes it.

For example, consider the broadcast protocol depicted on the left of Figure 6. Let $C := [p, p, p, p]$ be the configuration with four processes in state p . We have, e.g., $C \xrightarrow{b} [q, r, p, p] \xrightarrow{b} [q, r, q, r] \xrightarrow{c} [p, q, p, r] \xrightarrow{c} [p, p, p, q]$. We encode configurations as words over $\Sigma := P$, e.g. $[p, r, p, q]$ becomes $prpq$. The transducers for our example are depicted on the middle and right of Figure 6.




Fig. 6. *Left:* Example of a broadcast protocol with $P = \{p, q, r\}$, $\Gamma = \emptyset$, $\Gamma' = \{b\}$ and $\Gamma'' = \{c\}$. *Middle and right:* Transducers encoding the transitions, where $s \in \{p, q, r\}$.

6 Experimental results

We developed a prototype C++ library for weakly acyclic diagrams, which we refer to as WADL⁵. It implements all operations described in Section 4, and backwards reachability for lossy channel systems, Petri nets and broadcast protocols, as in Section 5. To benchmark the performance, we use four different sets:

- *Lossy channel systems.* We collected 13 instances used by the tools BML [25] and MCSM [26,27]. They arise from a mutual exclusion algorithm and from protocols (communication, business, etc.) The instance `ring2` comes from a parameterized family. Thus, we generalized it to `ring3`, `ring4`, etc.
- *Petri nets.* We collected 173 instances used in many papers on Petri net safety verification (e.g. see [22]). They model protocols (mutual exclusion, communication, etc.); concurrent C and Erlang programs; provenance analysis of messages of a medical messaging system and a bug-tracking system.
- *Broadcast protocols.* We collected 38 broadcast protocol instances from the benchmark set of DODO, a tool for regular model checking that uses the encoding of Section 5.3 for broadcast protocols [17,35]. The instances correspond to safety properties of several cache-coherence protocols.
- *Regular model checking problems.* Backwards reachability can also be applied to systems which are not well structured, as long as all the intermediate sets of configurations remain weakly acyclic. The algorithm may not terminate, but if it does then it yields the correct answer. We collected 35 further instances from DODO modeling parameterized mutual exclusion algorithms, variants of the dining philosophers, algorithms for termination detection and leader election, and token passing algorithms.

⁵ Our artifact is available at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14624775>.

We carried experiments for the four above categories with the goal of testing the potential and versatility of WADs. We used a machine with an 8-Core 11th Gen Intel® Core™ i7-1165G7 CPU @ 2.80GHz running on Kubuntu 24.04 with 31.1GiB of memory. The time was determined with the sum of the `user` and `sys` times given by Linux tool `time`. We used a timeout of 10 minutes per instance, except for Petri nets where we used a timeout of 20 minutes⁶.

Lossy channel systems. We made a few optimizations compared to Section 5. First, states are represented in binary to avoid using $|P|$ letters. Second, we tweaked the transducers so that they yield the pre-compatibility of Section 4.3. The transducers of Figure 4 do not necessarily satisfy it as the initial states use letters (x, y) and (x', y') with $x = x'$. This can be fixed, *e.g.* make the initial state of the top transducer loop on (q, q) and (r, r) , but not (p, p) . This slightly changes the semantics: only the first process in p can execute. Yet, as processes in a common state are indistinguishable, only the state count matters and so the change does not alter safety verification. Moreover, in our benchmarks, processes evolve in disjoint subgraphs and hence can never even be in a common state.

We compared with BML [25] which runs the backward algorithm with pruning (modes: CSRE, MOF, SI). Pruning can be disabled to yield the basic algorithm. We also compared to McSCM [26,27] which (in its default mode) uses an adaptive extrapolated backwards computation. The results are depicted on the left of Figure 7. WADL solves the most instances and does so generally faster, although the competition is close. We further tested the same tools on `ring3`, `ring4`, etc. Our tool terminates on large n (e.g. `ring99` in 2m38s and `ring187` is the largest solved), but the other tools did not scale, as depicted in Table 1.




Fig. 7. Cumulative number of instances decided over time (semi-log scale) for lossy channel systems excluding $\{\text{ring3}, \text{ring4}, \dots\}$ (left), and Petri nets (right). WADL+MIST refers to the best outcome on instances solved by at least one of the two tools.

⁶ During the reviewing process, a reviewer requested a longer timeout for this case.

	BML	BML-CSRE	BML-MOF	BML-SI	McSCM	WADL
ring2	0.63	1.02	0.89	0.37	TO	0.04
ring3	TO	TO	TO	9.13	416.48	0.10
ring4	TO	TO	TO	307.98	SO	0.19
ring5	TO	TO	TO	TO	TO	0.33

Table 1. Time in seconds to solve `ring n` (TO = timeout, SO = stack overflow).

Petri nets. We compared with MIST [18,24], an established efficient tool that, in particular, offers an implementation of the backward algorithm without pruning, as in our case, but using interval sharing trees as the data structure. The results are depicted on the right of Figure 7. MIST is competitive, but we solved more instances in total. There are 31 instances that we solved that MIST did not; 2 instances for the other way around; and 58 instances solved by both tools.

Broadcast protocols. We solved 32/38 instances, with 25 solved within 100ms. We do not compare with DODO as its goal is not to check the property, but rather to compute small invariants explaining why it holds. So, although we would look good in comparison, it would be meaningless (the runtimes of DODO reported in [35] are at least ten times higher than ours in every instance).

Regular model checking. While there is *a priori* no reason why the instances should be checkable with WADs, we solved 22/35 instances (all within 10ms). We further timed out on 6 instances, and could not verify 7 instances. For the latter, a cycle was contracted in Line 9 of Algorithm 4, and hence we cannot be certain that the result is weakly acyclic.

The fact we solved many instances suggests that weakly acyclic languages may be common in regular model checking. In fact, popular examples used to introduce the technique, like the token-passing protocol, FIFO channel, and stack examples of the surveys [5,1,7,2], or the alternating bit protocol of [4] are modeled with weakly acyclic languages.

7 Conclusion

We introduced weakly acyclic diagrams as a general data structure that extends binary decision diagrams to (possibly) infinite languages, while maintaining their algorithmic advantages. Many instances in regular model checking fall within the class of weakly acyclic languages. Moreover, weakly acyclic diagrams allow for the manipulation and verification of various well-structured transition systems such as lossy channel systems, Petri nets and broadcast protocols.

As future work, it would be interesting to see whether the good algorithmic properties can be retained under a slight extension of nondeterminism, *e.g.* for languages like $(a + b)^*b$ which are simple but not weakly acyclic per se.

References

1. Abdulla, P.A.: Regular model checking. *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer* **14**(2), 109–118 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10009-011-0216-8>
2. Abdulla, P.A.: Regular model checking: Evolution and perspectives. In: *Model Checking, Synthesis, and Learning – Essays Dedicated to Bengt Jonsson on The Occasion of His 60th Birthday*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 13030, pp. 78–96. Springer (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-91384-7_5
3. Abdulla, P.A., Cerans, K., Jonsson, B., Tsay, Y.: General decidability theorems for infinite-state systems. In: *Proc. 11th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*. pp. 313–321. IEEE Computer Society (1996). <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.1996.561359>
4. Abdulla, P.A., Jonsson, B.: Verifying programs with unreliable channels. In: *Proc. 8th Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*. pp. 160–170 (1993). <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.1993.287591>
5. Abdulla, P.A., Jonsson, B., Nilsson, M., Saksena, M.: A survey of regular model checking. In: *Proc. 15th International Conference on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR)*. vol. 3170, pp. 35–48. Springer (2004). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-28644-8_3
6. Abdulla, P.A., Kindahl, M.: Decidability of simulation and bisimulation between lossy channel systems and finite state systems (extended abstract). In: *Proc. 6th International Conference on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR)*. vol. 962, pp. 333–347. Springer (1995). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-60218-6_25
7. Abdulla, P.A., Sistla, A.P., Talupur, M.: Model checking parameterized systems. In: *Handbook of Model Checking*, pp. 685–725. Springer (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10575-8_21
8. Akers, S.: Binary decision diagrams. *IEEE Transactions on Computers* **27**(6), 509–516 (1978), <https://doi.org/10.1109/TC.1978.1675141>
9. Andersen, H.R.: An introduction to binary decision diagrams (1998)
10. Blondin, M., Cadilhac, M., Cui, X., Czerner, P., Esparza, J., Schulz, J.: Weakly acyclic diagrams: A data structure for infinite-state symbolic verification. *CoRR* **abs/2411.17250** (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2411.17250>
11. Boigelot, B., Godefroid, P.: Symbolic verification of communication protocols with infinite state spaces using QDDs. *Formal Methods in System Design (FMSD)* **14**(3), 237–255 (1999). <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008719024240>
12. Bouajjani, A., Muscholl, A., Touili, T.: Permutation rewriting and algorithmic verification. *Information and Computation* **205**(2), 199–224 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IC.2005.11.007>
13. Bryant, R.E.: Graph-based algorithms for boolean function manipulation. *IEEE Transactions on Computers* **35**(8), 677–691 (1986). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TC.1986.1676819>
14. Bryant, R.E.: Binary decision diagrams. In: *Handbook of Model Checking*, pp. 191–217. Springer (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10575-8_7
15. Brzozowski, J.A., Fich, F.E.: Languages of \mathcal{R} -trivial monoids. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* **20**(1), 32–49 (1980), [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000\(80\)90003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000(80)90003-3)
16. Chaki, S., Gurfinkel, A.: BDD-based symbolic model checking. In: *Handbook of Model Checking*, pp. 219–245. Springer (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10575-8_8

17. Czermer, P., Esparza, J., Krasotin, V., Welzel-Mohr, C.: Computing inductive invariants of regular abstraction frameworks. In: Proc. 35th International Conference on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR). LIPIcs, vol. 311, pp. 19:1–19:18 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.CONCUR.2024.19>, The tool DODO and the instances are available at <https://zenodo.org/records/8354894>.
18. Delzanno, G., Raskin, J., Begin, L.V.: Covering sharing trees: a compact data structure for parameterized verification. *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer (STTT)* **5**(2-3), 268–297 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10009-003-0110-0>
19. Eilenberg, S.: Automata, Languages, and Machines, vol. B. Academic Press (1976)
20. Esparza, J., Blondin, M.: Automata theory: An algorithmic approach. MIT Press (2023)
21. Esparza, J., Finkel, A., Mayr, R.: On the verification of broadcast protocols. In: Proc. 14th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS). pp. 352–359. IEEE Computer Society (1999). <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.1999.782630>
22. Esparza, J., Ledesma-Garza, R., Majumdar, R., Meyer, P.J., Nisic, F.: An SMT-based approach to coverability analysis. In: Proc. 26th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV). pp. 603–619. Springer (2014). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-08867-9_40
23. Finkel, A., Schnoebelen, Ph.: Well-structured transition systems everywhere! *Theoretical Computer Science* **256**(1-2), 63–92 (2001). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(00\)00102-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(00)00102-X)
24. Ganty, P., Meuter, C., Delzanno, G., Kalyon, G., Raskin, J.F., Van Begin, L.: Symbolic data structure for sets of k -uples. Tech. Rep. 570, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium (2007)
25. Geffroy, T., Leroux, J., Sutre, G.: Backward coverability with pruning for lossy channel systems. In: Proc. 24th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Model Checking of Software (SPIN). pp. 132–141. ACM (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3092282.3092292>, The tool BML and the lossy channel system instances are available at <https://dept-info.labri.fr/~tgeffroy/lcs/>.
26. Heußner, A., Gall, T.L., Sutre, G.: Extrapolation-based path invariants for abstraction refinement of FIFO systems. In: Proc. 16th International on Model Checking Software (SPIN). pp. 107–124. Springer (2009). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-02652-2_11, The tool McScM is available at <https://svn.labri.fr/repos/acs/www/redmine/projects/mcscm/wiki.html>
27. Heußner, A., Gall, T.L., Sutre, G.: McScM: A general framework for the verification of communicating machines. In: Proc. 18th International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems (TACAS). pp. 478–484. Springer (2012). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-28756-5_34
28. Klarlund, N., Møller, A.: MONA Version 1.4 User Manual. BRICS, Department of Computer Science, University of Aarhus (January 2001), notes Series NS-01-1. Available from <http://www.brics.dk/mona/>
29. Krötzsch, M., Masopust, T., Thomazo, M.: Complexity of universality and related problems for partially ordered NFAs. *Information and Computation* **255**, 177–192 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2017.06.004>
30. Masopust, T., Krötzsch, M.: Partially ordered automata and piecewise testability. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* **17**(2) (2021). [https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-17\(2:14\)2021](https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-17(2:14)2021)
31. Murata, T.: Petri nets: Properties, analysis and applications. *Proceedings of the IEEE* **77**(4), 541–580 (1989). <https://doi.org/10.1109/5.24143>

32. Éric Pin, J.: Varieties of formal languages. North Oxford, London and Plenum (1986)
33. Ryzhikov, A., Wolf, P.: Monoids of upper triangular matrices over the Boolean semiring. In: Proc. 49th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS). LIPIcs, vol. 306, pp. 81:1–81:18 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.MFCS.2024.81>
34. Schwentick, T., Thérien, D., Vollmer, H.: Partially-ordered two-way automata: A new characterization of DA. In: Proc. 5th International Conference on Developments in Language Theory (DLT). vol. 2295, pp. 239–250. Springer (2001). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-46011-X_20
35. Welzel-Mohr, C.: Inductive Statements for Regular Transition Systems. Ph.D. thesis, Technical University of Munich, Germany (2024), <https://mediatum.ub.tum.de/1721365>

A Missing proofs of Section 2

Proposition 1. *Applying the powerset construction to a weakly acyclic NFA yields a weakly acyclic DFA.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ be a weakly acyclic NFA. Recall that the states of the DFA obtained by the powerset construction are subsets of states of \mathcal{A} , and we have a transition $Q_1 \xrightarrow{a} Q_2$ in the DFA iff $\delta(Q_1, a) = Q_2$, where $\delta(R, a) := \bigcup_{q \in R} \delta(q, a)$. So, by definition of weakly acyclic DFAs, it suffices to show that the following binary relation \preceq over 2^Q is a partial order:

$$Q_1 \preceq Q_2 \iff \delta(Q_1, w) = Q_2 \text{ for some word } w.$$

The relation is reflexive because $\delta(Q_1, \varepsilon) = Q_1$, and transitive since $\delta(Q_1, w_1) = Q_2$ and $\delta(Q_2, w_2) = Q_3$ implies $\delta(Q_1, w_1 w_2) = Q_3$. It remains to show that \preceq is antisymmetric, *i.e.*, that $\delta(Q_1, w_1) = Q_2$ and $\delta(Q_2, w_2) = Q_1$ implies $Q_1 = Q_2$.

Assume $\delta(Q_1, w_1) = Q_2$ and $\delta(Q_2, w_2) = Q_1$. We say that a state $q \in Q_1$ is *cyclic* if there exists some $n \geq 1$ such that $q \in \delta(q, (w_1 w_2)^n)$. We prove that every state of Q_1 is cyclic, which establishes $Q_1 = Q_2$.

Assume Q_1 has an acyclic state q . We can pick q minimal w.r.t. \preceq . Since $\delta(Q_1, w_1 w_2) = Q_1$ by assumption, there is some $q' \in Q_1$ such that $q \in \delta(q', w_1 w_2)$, and so $q \succeq q'$. As q is acyclic we have $q' \neq q$, and so $q \succ q'$. By minimality of q , the state q' is cyclic. As \mathcal{A} is weakly acyclic, $\delta(q', a) = \{q'\}$ for all $a \in \alpha(w_1 w_2)$, and so, in particular, $\delta(q', w_1 w_2) = \{q'\}$. This contradicts $q \neq q'$. \square

Proposition 2. *Let \mathcal{A} be a weakly acyclic DFA. The minimal DFA that accepts $L(\mathcal{A})$ is also weakly acyclic.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ be a weakly acyclic DFA. Given states $p, q \in Q$, we write $p \preceq q$ if $p \xrightarrow{w} q$ for some word $w \in \Sigma^*$. Note that \preceq is a partial order.

Let \mathcal{A}' be the minimal DFA for $L := L(\mathcal{A})$. Towards a contradiction, suppose that \mathcal{A}' is not weakly acyclic. It contains a simple cycle of length at least two, *i.e.*, there are residuals $L^x \neq L^y$ and $w_1, w_2 \in \Sigma^+$ with $L^{x w_1} = L^y$ and $L^{y w_2} = L^x$.

Let $w := w_1 w_2$ and $p_n := \delta(q_0, x w^n)$. The set $\{p_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is finite, so it has at least one maximal state w.r.t. \preceq . Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that p_n is maximal. As $p_n \xrightarrow{w} p_{n+1}$, we have $p_n \preceq p_{n+1}$, and by maximality, $p_n = p_{n+1}$.

Now, define $q := \delta(p_n, w_1)$. Note that $\delta(q, w_2) = \delta(p_n, w) = p_{n+1} = p_n$, so p_n and q lie on a cycle in \mathcal{A} . Thus, for a contradiction to the weak acyclicity of \mathcal{A} , it remains to show that $p_n \neq q$. We have $L^{x w} = L^x$, so we get inductively $L(p_n) = L^{x w^n} = L^x$. On the other hand, this implies $L(q) = L(p_n)^{w_1} = L^{x w_1} = L^y \neq L^x$. Thus, $L(p_n) \neq L(q)$, which yields the contradiction $p_n \neq q$. \square

Lemma 1. *A regular language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is weakly acyclic iff for all $u \in \Sigma^*$ and $v \in \Sigma^+$ it is the case that $L^u = L^{uv}$ implies $L^u = L^{uv}$ for every $w \in \alpha(v)^*$.*


Proof. \Rightarrow) Let $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ be a weakly acyclic language. Let $u \in \Sigma^*$ and $v \in \Sigma^+$ be such that $L^u = L^{uv}$. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ be the minimal weakly acyclic

DFA that accepts L . Let $q, r \in Q$ be the states such that $q_0 \xrightarrow{u} q \xrightarrow{v} r$. Since $L^u = L^{uv}$, $|v| > 0$, and \mathcal{A} is weakly acyclic, we have $q = r$ and $q \xrightarrow{a} q$ for every $a \in \alpha(v)$. Thus, $L^u = L^{uw}$ for every $w \in \alpha(v)^*$.

\Leftarrow) Let \mathcal{A} be the minimal DFA that accepts L . We must show that \mathcal{A} is weakly acyclic. For the sake of contradiction, suppose that $q_0 \xrightarrow{u} q \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{x} q$ holds for some states $q \neq r$, $u \in \Sigma^*$, $a \in \Sigma$ and $x \in \Sigma^+$. We have $L^u = L^{uv}$ where $v := ax$. By assumption, this implies that $L^u = L^{uw}$ for every $w \in \alpha(v)^*$. In particular, $L^u = L^{ua}$. By minimality of \mathcal{A} , each state accepts a distinct residual. Hence, we must have $q_0 \xrightarrow{u} q \xrightarrow{a} q$, which contradicts $q \neq r$. \square

Proposition 13. *For every weakly acyclic expression r , there is an acyclic DFA that accepts $L(r)$.*

Proof. We proceed by structural induction on expression r . The claim is obvious for $r = \emptyset$ and $r = \Gamma^*$. Assume $r = \Lambda^*ar$ for some $\Lambda \subseteq \Sigma$ and $a \notin \Lambda$. By induction, there exists a weakly acyclic DFA $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ such that $L(\mathcal{A}) = L(r)$. The following weakly acyclic DFA accepts $\Lambda^*aL(r)$:



Assume $r = r_1 + r_2$. By induction, there are weakly acyclic DFAs $\mathcal{A}_1 = (Q_1, \Sigma, \delta_1, q_{01}, F_1)$ and $\mathcal{A}_2 = (Q_2, \Sigma, \delta_2, q_{02}, F_2)$ such that $L(\mathcal{A}_i) = L(r_i)$ for both $i \in \{1, 2\}$. We claim that the usual pairing $\mathcal{A} = [\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2]$ for $L(\mathcal{A}_1) \cup L(\mathcal{A}_2)$ is acyclic. To obtain a contradiction, suppose it is not. There are states $[p_1, p_2] \neq [q_1, q_2]$ and words $u, v \in \Sigma^+$ such that $[p_1, p_2] \xrightarrow{u} [q_1, q_2] \xrightarrow{v} [p_1, p_2]$.

Let $i \in \{1, 2\}$ be such that $p_i \neq q_i$. By definition of pairing, we have $\delta(p_i, u) = q_i$ and $\delta(q_i, v) = p_i$. So, p_i and q_i are distinct states of \mathcal{A}_i that belong to the same strongly connected component. This contradicts the weak acyclicity of \mathcal{A}_i . \square

Proposition 14. *For every weakly acyclic NFA \mathcal{A} , there is a weakly acyclic expression for $L(\mathcal{A})$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$. Without its self-loops, \mathcal{A} is a directed acyclic graph, and hence has finitely many paths. So, $L(\mathcal{A})$ is a finite union of languages of the form $\Lambda_1^*a_1 \cdots \Lambda_n^*a_n\Gamma^*$ where $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n, \Gamma \subseteq \Sigma$ and each $a_i \notin \Lambda_i$. \square

Corollary 1. *A language is weakly acyclic iff it is described by a weakly acyclic expression.*

B Missing proofs of Section 3

Proposition 4. *Let L be a weakly acyclic language. The language accepted from the state L of the master automaton is L .*

Proof. The result clearly holds for \emptyset and Σ^* . Further, assume that for every L^a such that $L^a \neq L$ the language accepted from state L^a is L^a . Since for each such letter a we have $\delta_{\mathcal{M}}(L, a) = L^a$, for each other letter b we have $\delta_{\mathcal{M}}(L, b) = L$, and state L is accepting iff $\varepsilon \in L$, the language recognized from state L is L . \square

Proposition 5. *For every weakly acyclic language L , automaton \mathcal{A}_L is the minimal DFA recognizing L .*

Proof. By definition, states of the master automaton are distinct languages. By Proposition 4, distinct states of \mathcal{A}_L accept distinct languages. Recall that a DFA is minimal iff its states accept different languages. So, \mathcal{A}_L is minimal. \square

Proposition 6. *A table obtained from successive calls to Algorithm 1 does not contain nodes $q \neq q'$ such that $L(q) = L(q')$.*

Proof. For the sake of contradiction, let us consider a table obtained by successive calls to `make`, and let `make`(s, b) be the first call that creates a state q whose language is the same as another existing state $q' \neq q$. Note that q' is unique, as otherwise there would already have been two states with the same language.

Let (s', b') be the entry of q' in the table. As $L(q) = L(q')$, we have $b = b'$. Moreover, we claim that the following properties hold for all $a \in \Sigma$:

- (i) if $q^a \notin \{\text{SELF}, q'\}$, then $(q')^a = q^a$;
- (ii) if $q^a \in \{\text{SELF}, q'\}$, then $(q')^a = \text{SELF}$.

Before proving the claim, let us see why it allows us to prove the proposition. If $q' \notin s$, then, by (i) and (ii), we have $s = s'$, and so Line 2 of `make` is executed, which is a contradiction as q is a new state. Thus, we may assume that $q' \in s$. By (i) and (ii), we have $s[q'/\text{SELF}] = s'$. Let $q'' := \max\{r \in s : r \neq \text{SELF}\}$. If $q' = q''$, then Line 6 of `make` is executed, which yields a contradiction. So, we may assume that $q' < q''$. Let $a \in \Sigma$ be such that $q^a = q''$. We have $L(q')^a = L(q)^a = L(q'')^a = L(q'') = L(q'')$. Thus, by unicity, we have $(q')^a = q''$. This means that q' has a successor q'' such that $q' < q''$, which is impossible. Therefore, we get a contradiction in all cases, which proves the proposition.

It remains to prove (i) and (ii).

Property (i). Let $a \in \Sigma$ be such that $q^a \notin \{\text{SELF}, q'\}$. Since q' is the unique state of the table such that $L(q') = L(q)$, we must have $L(q^a) \neq L(q)$. If $(q')^a = \text{SELF}$, then $L(q^a) = L(q)^a = L(q')^a = L(q') = L(q)$, which is a contradiction. Thus, we may assume that $(q')^a \neq \text{SELF}$.

We have $L(q^a) = L(q)^a = L(q')^a = L((q')^a)$. Note that q^a existed prior to the creation of q . Thus, we must have $q^a = (q')^a$ as otherwise there would be two distinct states accepting the same language.

Property (ii). Let $a \in \Sigma$ be such that $q^a \in \{\text{SELF}, q'\}$. If $q^a = \text{SELF}$, then $L(q')^a = L(q)^a = L(q) = L(q')$. If $q^a = q'$, then $L(q')^a = L(q)^a = L(q^a) = L(q')$. Therefore, in both cases, we have $L(q')^a = L(q')$. This implies $(q')^a = \text{SELF}$, as otherwise $(q')^a$ would be a distinct state accepting the same language as q' . \square

C Missing proofs of Section 4.1

Let us prove the claims of Proposition 7 separately.

Proposition 15. *Algorithm 2 is correct.*

Proof. Let $L := L(q)$. The result r of Algorithm 2 should satisfy $L(r) = \bar{L}$. Let us show that this is the case.

Note that $\varepsilon \in \bar{L}$ iff $\varepsilon \notin L$. Therefore, “ $\neg \text{flag}(q)$ ”, on Line 12, indicates correctly if the empty word belongs to \bar{L} .

Let $a \in \Sigma$. Algorithm 2 must assign to s_a the state accepting $(\bar{L})^a$. For every $u \in \Sigma^*$, we have

$$u \in (\bar{L})^a \iff au \in \bar{L} \iff au \notin L \iff u \notin L^a \iff u \in \bar{L}^a.$$

If $q^a = \text{SELF}$, then $L^a = L$, and so by the above we have $(\bar{L})^a = \bar{L}$. Thus, the algorithm correctly assigns “ $s_a \leftarrow \text{SELF}$ ”.

Otherwise, by the above, assigning “ $s_a \leftarrow \text{comp}(q^a)$ ” is correct. \square

Proposition 16. *Algorithm 2 with memoization works in time $\mathcal{O}(mn)$, where $m := |\Sigma|$ and n is the number of nodes reachable from q .*

Proof. Due to memoization, Line 7 is reached at most once per node q' reachable from q . Moreover, the loop iterates over each letter $a \in \Sigma$. \square

Proposition 17. *Algorithm 3 is correct.*

Proof. Let $K := L(p)$ and $L := L(q)$. The result r of Algorithm 3 should satisfy $L(r) = K \cap L$. Let us show that this is the case.

Note that $\varepsilon \in K \cap L$ iff $\varepsilon \in K \wedge \varepsilon \in L$. Therefore, “ $\text{flag}(p) \wedge \text{flag}(q)$ ”, on Line 16, indicates correctly if the empty word belongs to $K \cap L$.

Let $a \in \Sigma$. Algorithm 3 must assign to s_a the state accepting $(K \cap L)^a$. For every $u \in \Sigma^*$, we have $u \in (K \cap L)^a \iff au \in K \cap L \iff (au \in K) \wedge (au \in L) \iff u \in K^a \wedge u \in L^a$.

If $p^a = q^a = \text{SELF}$, then $L^a = L$ and $K^a = K$, and so by the above we have $(K \cap L)^a = K \cap L$. Thus, the algorithm correctly assigns “ $s_a \leftarrow \text{SELF}$ ”.

Otherwise, by the above, assigning “ $s_a \leftarrow \text{inter}(p', q')$ ” is correct. \square

Proposition 18. *Algorithm 3 with memoization works in time $\mathcal{O}(mn_p n_q)$, where $m := |\Sigma|$ and n_x is the number of nodes reachable from node x .*

Proof. Due to memoization, Line 9 is reached at most once per pair (x, y) where x is a node reachable from p , and y is a node reachable for q . Moreover, the loop iterates over each letter $a \in \Sigma$. \square

D Missing proofs of Section 4.2

Proposition 8. *Let $w \in \Sigma^*$. If $S \rightarrow^w S'$, then $L(S)^w = L(S')$.*

Proof. We consider $w = a \in \Sigma$. The general case follows by induction. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& u \in L(S)^a \\
\iff & au \in L(S) \\
\iff & au \in \bigcup_{(p,q) \in S} \text{Pre}_p(q) \\
\iff & \exists b \in \Sigma, v \in \Sigma^{|u|}, (p,q) \in S : (au, bv) \in L(p) \wedge bv \in L(q) \\
\iff & \exists b \in \Sigma, v \in \Sigma^{|u|}, (p,q) \in S : (u, v) \in L(p)^{(a,b)} \wedge v \in L(q)^b \\
\iff & \exists b \in \Sigma, v \in \Sigma^{|u|}, (p,q) \in S, p' \in \delta(p, (a, b)) : (u, v) \in L(p') \wedge v \in L(\text{succ}(q, b)) \\
\iff & \exists b \in \Sigma, (p, q) \in S, p' \in \delta(p, (a, b)) : u \in \text{Pre}_{p'}(\text{succ}(q, b)) \\
\iff & u \in \bigcup_{(p',q') \in S'} \text{Pre}_{p'}(q') \\
\iff & u \in L(S'). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 9. *If $S_0 \rightarrow^* S' \rightarrow^* S \rightarrow^a S'$ for some $a \in \Sigma$, and $L(S_0)$ is weakly acyclic, then $L(S) = L(S')$.*

Proof. Let $v' \in \Sigma^*$ be such that $S' \rightarrow^{v'} S$. Let $L := L(S_0)$. Let $u \in \Sigma^*$ be such that $S_0 \rightarrow^u S'$. Let $v := v'a$. Since $S_0 \rightarrow^u S' \rightarrow^v S'$, by Proposition 8, we have $L^u = L(S')$ and $L^{uv} = L(S')$. So, $L^u = L^{uv}$. Since L is weakly acyclic, by Lemma 1, we have $L^u = L^{uw}$ for all $w \in \alpha(v)^*$. Thus, $L^u = L^{uv'}$. Since $S_0 \rightarrow^{uv'} S$, by Proposition 8, we have $L^{uv'} = L(S)$. Thus, $L(S) = L^{uv'} = L^u = L(S')$. \square

Proposition 19. *Algorithm 4 terminates.*

Proof. For the sake of contradiction, suppose that the algorithm does not terminate on some input S_0 . There exists an infinite branch $S_0 \rightarrow^{a_0} S_1 \rightarrow^{a_1} S_2 \rightarrow^{a_2} \dots$ generated by successive calls to Line 10. Note that $S_j \neq S_k$ for all $j \neq k$, as otherwise Line 9 would be executed at some point.

For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Q_i := \{q : (p, q) \in S_i\}$. By definition on Line 8, for every $q' \in Q_{i+1}$, there exist $b \in \Sigma$ and $q \in Q_i$ such that $L(q') = L(q)^b$. Thus, for every $q' \in Q_i$, there exists $q \in Q_0$ such that $L(q')$ is a residual of $L(q)$. Since Q_0 is finite and a regular language has finitely many residuals, the set $Q := Q_0 \cup Q_1 \cup \dots$ is finite. Let $P_i := \{p : (p, q) \in S_i\}$. Since the transducer is finite, it must be the case that $P := P_0 \cup P_1 \cup \dots$ is finite.

Since $S_i \subseteq P_i \times Q_i \subseteq P \times Q$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and since $P \times Q$ is finite, there must exist $j \neq k$ such that $S_j = S_k$. This is a contradiction. \square

Let us prove the claims of Proposition 11 separately.

Proposition 20. *Algorithm 5 is correct.*

Proof. Let $K := L(p)$ and $L := L(q)$. The result r of Algorithm 5 should satisfy $L(r) = \text{Pre}_K(L)$. Let us show that this is the case.

Note that $\varepsilon \in \text{Pre}_K(L)$ iff $(\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \in K \wedge \varepsilon \in L$. Therefore, “flag(p) \wedge flag(q)”, on Line 10, indicates correctly if the empty word belongs to $\text{Pre}_K(L)$.

Let $a \in \Sigma$. Algorithm 5 must assign to s_a the state accepting $(\text{Pre}_K(L))^a$. For every $u \in \Sigma^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u \in (\text{Pre}_K(L))^a &\iff au \in \text{Pre}_K(L) \\ &\iff \exists b \in \Sigma \text{ and } v \in \Sigma^{|u|} : (au, bv) \in K \wedge bv \in L \\ &\iff \exists b \in \Sigma \text{ and } v \in \Sigma^{|u|} : (u, v) \in K^{(a,b)} \wedge v \in L^b \\ &\iff \exists b \in \Sigma : u \in \text{Pre}_{K^{(a,b)}}(L^b). \end{aligned}$$

So, if there is no $b \in \Sigma$ such that $p^{(a,b)} \neq p_\emptyset$ and $q^{(a,b)} \neq q_\emptyset$, then $(\text{Pre}_K(L))^a = \emptyset$, and hence assigning “ $s_a \leftarrow q_\emptyset$ ” is correct.

Otherwise, let $b \in \Sigma$ be the unique letter given by pre-compatibility for a . By the above equivalences, we have $(\text{Pre}_K(L))^a = \text{Pre}_{K^{(a,b)}}(L^b)$.

Upon reaching Line 8, we have $L(p') = K^{(a,b)}$ and $L(q') = L^b$. Therefore, if $p' = p$ and $q' = q$, then $(\text{Pre}_K(L))^a = \text{Pre}_{K^{(a,b)}}(L^b) = \text{Pre}_K(L)$, and hence assigning “ $s_a \leftarrow \text{SELF}$ ” is correct. Otherwise, since $(\text{Pre}_K(L))^a = \text{Pre}_{K^{(a,b)}}(L^b) = \text{Pre}_{L(p')}(L(q'))$, assigning “ $s_a \leftarrow \text{pre}(p', q')$ ” is correct. \square

Proposition 21. *Algorithm 5 with memoization works in time $\mathcal{O}(m^2 n_p n_q)$, where $m := |\Sigma|$ and n_x is the number of nodes reachable from node x .*

Proof. Due to memoization, Line 2 is reached at most once per pair (x, y) where x is a node reachable from p , and y is a node reachable for q . Moreover, the loop iterates over each letter $a \in \Sigma$. The body of the loop needs to identify the unique letter b or its nonexistence. This can be done naively by checking whether $p^{(a,b)} \neq \emptyset$ and $q^b \neq \emptyset$ for each $b \in \Sigma$. \square

E Missing proofs of Section 5

Proposition 12. *We have $C \xrightarrow{*}_{\text{pure-lossy}} C''$ for some $C'' \succeq C'$ iff $C \xrightarrow{*}_{\text{semi-lossy}} C''$ for some $C'' \succeq C'$. Furthermore, $\rightarrow_{\text{semi-lossy}}$ is monotone.*

Proof. Clearly, pure lossiness allows at least as many behavior as semi-lossiness, so the implication from right to left is obvious. Let us prove the other direction.

Let $C \xrightarrow{\pi}_{\text{pure-lossy}} C'' \succeq C'$. We proceed by induction on the number of $\text{read}(\cdot)$ occurring along π . If there is no occurrence, then we can remove all the losses to obtain a sequence π' . We clearly have

$$C \xrightarrow{\pi'}_{\text{semi-lossy}} D \text{ for some } D \succeq C''.$$

Now, consider the general case. Let $\text{loss}_i(\sigma)$ denote the loss of an occurrence of letter σ on channel i (without changing the state of any process). We have

$$\pi = \pi_0 \text{loss}_{j_1}(a_1) \pi_1 \text{loss}_{j_2}(a_2) \cdots \text{loss}_{j_m}(a_m) \pi_m \text{read}_i(\sigma) \pi',$$

where each π_j is a sequence of `write.(·)` and `nop` operations, and π' is the rest of the sequence. The losses on channel $j_\ell \neq i$ do not impact $\text{read}_i(\sigma)$, and so they can be postponed. Moreover, any $\text{loss}_i(a_\ell)$ that affects a letter appearing *after* the letter first occurrence of σ , can be postponed. Thus, we can reorganize π as

$$w := \overbrace{\pi_0 \pi_1 \cdots \pi_m \prod_{\substack{\ell \in [1..m] \\ j_\ell = i \\ a_j \text{ occurs before } \sigma}}^{\text{u}:=} \text{loss}_i(a_\ell) \text{read}_i(\sigma)} \overbrace{\prod_{\substack{\ell \in [1..m] \\ j_\ell = i \\ a_j \text{ occurs after } \sigma}} \text{loss}_i(a_\ell) \prod_{\substack{\ell \in [1..m] \\ j_\ell \neq i}} \text{loss}_{j_\ell}(a_\ell) \pi'}^{\text{v}:=}.$$

Let D be such that $C \xrightarrow{\text{u}}_{\text{pure-lossy}} D \xrightarrow{\text{v}}_{\text{pure-lossy}} C''$. We have $C \xrightarrow{\text{u}}_{\text{semi-lossy}} D$. We are done by induction on v .

It remains to prove the last part of the proposition, namely that $\rightarrow_{\text{semi-lossy}}$ is monotone. Let C and $C' \succeq C$ be such that $C \xrightarrow{t}_{\text{semi-lossy}} D$.

If t is a `nop` or `write.(·)`, then $C' \xrightarrow{t}_{\text{semi-lossy}} D'$ where $D' \succeq D$. Consider the case where $t = \text{read}_i(a)$. Let $C = ([p_1, \dots, p_m], w_1, \dots, w_k)$ and $C' = ([p_1, \dots, p_m], w'_1, \dots, w'_k)$. Let $w_i = xay$ where x contains no a . Since $w_i \sqsubseteq w'_i$, we have $w'_i = x'ay'$ for some $x' \sqsupseteq x$ and $y' \sqsupseteq y$. If x' contains no a , then we are done since $\text{read}_i(a)$ converts w_i into y ; $\text{read}_i(a)$ converts w'_i into y' ; and $y \sqsubseteq y'$. Otherwise, $x' = uav$ where u contains no a . In this case, $\text{read}_i(a)$ converts w_i into y , and w'_i into avy' . As $y \sqsubseteq y'$, we have $y \sqsubseteq avy'$, and hence we are done. \square

F Extra experimental results for Section 6

	BML	BML-CSRE	BML-MOF	BML-SI	McScM	WADL
tcp_simplest_err	0.04	0.08	0.10	0.22	0.01	0.04
BAwCC	3.28	0.24	0.28	20.79	TO	0.18
BAwCC_enh	4.17	0.25	0.25	23.44	124.72	0.50
tcp_simplest	0.03	0.09	0.11	0.07	0.34	0.06
BAwPC_enh	1.22	0.08	0.08	6.75	0.10	0.19
peterson_3	TO	34.92	36.97	5.21	TO	19.50
BAwPC	0.83	0.11	0.11	7.85	TO	0.11
peterson_4	TO	SO	SO	TO	TO	TO
simple_server-bwerror	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.15	0.01
ring2	0.36	1.02	0.91	0.45	SO	0.04
brp_like_modified	0.39	0.64	0.69	0.28	0.39	0.29
simple_server	0.13	1.44	0.76	2.79	0.25	0.06
pop3	400.20	TO	1.60	0.73	4.73	2.07

Table 2. Time in seconds to solve each lossy channel system instance, where TO = time-out and SO = stack overflow.

Broadcast protocol instance	WADL	Regular model checking instance	WADL
MOESI_exclusivemodified	0.02	icalp-Israeli-Jafon_notoken	0.01
dragon_exclusiveshared	0.12	Dijkstra-ring_deadlock	TO
firefly_deadlock	0.01	token-passing_notoken	0.01
MOESI_sharedexclusive	0.01	icalp-Herman-ring_notoken	0.01
dragon_dirtyshareddirty	0.04	DijkstraMutEx_nomutex	TO
dragon_dirtysharedexclusive	0.16	Burns_nomutex	?
FutureBus_exclusiveexclusive	65.32	Herman_notoken	0.01
Berkeley_exclusiveexclusive	TO	Dijkstra-Scholten_twob	?
MOESI_ownedmodified	0.02	bakery_deadlock	0.01
dragon_exclusivedirty	TO	icalp-bakery_nomutex	0.01
firefly_dirtyexclusive	TO	Burns_deadlock	0.01
MOESI_exclusiveexclusive	0.01	mux-array_deadlock	TO
Berkeley_deadlock	0.01	icalp-Herman-line_notoken	0.01
FutureBus_deadlock	0.01	dining-cryptographers_deadlock	0.01
FutureBus_pendingrightsecond	1.02	token-passing-no-invariant_deadlock	0.01
Berkeley_exclusivenonexclusive	0.01	token-passing-no-invariant_manytoken	?
synapse_dirtydirty	0.01	icalp-Israeli-Jafon_deadlock	0.01
Berkeley_exclusiveunowned	0.01	token-passing_manytoken	0.01
MOESI_deadlock	0.01	Szymanski_nomutex	TO
dragon_deadlock	0.01	res-allocator_deadlock	TO
dragon_exclusiveexclusive	0.05	icalp-bakery_deadlock	0.01
Illinois_dirtyshared	0.06	DijkstraMutEx_deadlock	TO
MOESI_ownedexclusive	0.01	token-passing-no-invariant_nonreach	?
firefly_dirtyshared	0.05	token-passing-no-invariant_notoken	0.01
firefly_dirtydirty	TO	bakery_nomutex	0.01
FutureBus_sharedexclusive	41.12	icalp-Herman-ring_deadlock	0.01
dragon_dirtydirty	TO	icalp-Herman-line_deadlock	0.01
firefly_exclusiveexclusive	TO	token-passing_deadlock	0.01
MESI_sharedmodified	0.01	mux-array_nomutex	?
synapse_deadlock	0.01	Israeli-Jafon_notoken	0.01
MOESI_modifiedmodified	0.01	Dijkstra-Scholten_twod	?
FutureBus_secondpending	0.79	Herman_deadlock	0.01
Illinois_dirtydirty	0.03	Israeli-Jafon_deadlock	0.01
MESI_modifiedmodified	0.01	Dijkstra-ring_nomutex	?
MOESI_sharedmodified	0.01	res-allocator_nomutex	0.01
synapse_dirtyvalid	0.01		
Illinois_deadlock	0.01		
dragon_shareddirty	0.24		

Table 3. Time in seconds to solve each broadcast protocol instance (left) and regular model checking instance (right), where TO = timeout and ? = unknown. The “unknown” instances are those where a cycle was contracted in Line 9 of Algorithm 4, and hence where we cannot be certain that the result is weakly acyclic.




Fig. 8. Cumulative number of instances decided by WADL over time (semi-log scale) for broadcast protocols (left) and for the other regular model checking instances (right).