
NONINTERFERENCE ANALYSIS OF IRREVERSIBLE OR REVERSIBLE SYSTEMS WITH NONDETERMINISM AND PROBABILITIES

ANDREA ESPOSITO , ALESSANDRO ALDINI , AND MARCO BERNARDO 

Dipartimento di Scienze Pure e Applicate, Università di Urbino, Italy

e-mail address: andrea.esposito@uniurb.it, alessandro.aldini@uniurb.it, marco.bernardo@uniurb.it

ABSTRACT. Noninterference theory supports the analysis of secure computations in multi-level security systems. Classical equivalence-based approaches to noninterference mainly rely on bisimilarity. In a nondeterministic setting, assessing noninterference through weak bisimilarity is adequate for irreversible systems, whereas for reversible ones branching bisimilarity has been recently proven to be more appropriate. In this paper we address the same two families of systems, with the difference that probabilities come into play in addition to nondeterminism. For irreversible systems we extend the results of Aldini, Bravetti, and Gorrieri developed in a generative-reactive probabilistic setting, while for reversible systems we extend the results of Esposito, Aldini, Bernardo, and Rossi developed in a purely nondeterministic setting. We recast noninterference properties by adopting probabilistic variants of weak and branching bisimilarities for irreversible and reversible systems respectively. Then we investigate a taxonomy of those properties as well as their preservation and compositionality aspects, along with a comparison with the nondeterministic taxonomy. The adequacy of the extended noninterference theory is illustrated via a probabilistic smart contract example.

1. INTRODUCTION

The notion of noninterference was introduced in [GM82] to reason about the way in which illegitimate information flows can occur in multi-level security systems due to covert channels from high-level agents to low-level ones. Since the first definition, conceived for deterministic systems, in the last four decades a lot of work has been done to extend the approach to a variety of more expressive domains, such as nondeterministic systems, systems in which quantitative aspects like time and probability play a central role, and reversible systems; see, e.g., [FG01, Ald06, Man11, HS12, VS98, SS00, BT03, ABG04, HMPR21, EABR25] and the references therein. Likewise, to verify information-flow security properties based on noninterference, several different approaches have been proposed ranging from the application of type theory [ZM04] and abstract interpretation [GM18] to control flow and equivalence or model checking [FPR02, Mar03, AB11].

Noninterference guarantees that low-level agents cannot infer from their observations what high-level ones are doing. Regardless of its specific definition, noninterference is closely

Key words and phrases: Security, Noninterference, Reversibility, Process Calculi, Probability.

tied to the notion of behavioral equivalence [Gla01] because, given a multi-level security system, the idea is to compare the system behavior with high-level actions being prevented and the system behavior with the same actions being hidden. A natural framework in which to study system behavior is given by process algebra [Mil89]. In this setting, weak bisimilarity has been employed in [FG01] both to reason formally about covert channels and illegitimate information flows and to study a classification of noninterference properties for irreversible nondeterministic systems.

In [EABR25] noninterference analysis has been extended to reversible systems, which feature both forward and backward computations. Reversibility has started to gain attention in computing since it has been shown that it may achieve lower levels of energy consumption [Lan61, Ben73]. Its applications range from biochemical reaction modeling [PUY12, Pin17] and parallel discrete-event simulation [PP14, SOJB18] to robotics [LES18], wireless communications [SPP19], fault-tolerant systems [DK05, VKH10, LLM⁺13, VS18], program debugging [GLM14, LNPV18], and distributed algorithms [Yca93, BLM⁺23].

As shown in [EABR25], noninterference properties based on weak bisimilarity are not adequate in a reversible context because they fail to detect information flows emerging when backward computations are triggered. A more appropriate semantics turns out to be branching bisimilarity [GW96] because it coincides with weak back-and-forth bisimilarity [DMV90]. The latter behavioral equivalence requires systems to be able to mimic each other’s behavior stepwise not only when performing actions in the standard forward direction, but also when undoing those actions in the backward direction. Formally, weak back-and-forth bisimilarity is defined on computation paths instead of states thus preserving not only causality but also history, as backward moves are constrained to take place along the same path followed in the forward direction even in the presence of concurrency.

In this paper we extend the approach of [EABR25] to a probabilistic setting, so as to address noninterference properties in a framework featuring nondeterministic, probabilistic, and reversible behaviors. The starting point for our study is given by the probabilistic noninterference properties developed in [ABG04] over a probabilistic process calculus based on the generative and reactive process models of [GSS95]. In addition to probabilistic choice, in [ABG04] other operators such as parallel composition and hiding are decorated with a probabilistic parameter, so that the selection among all the actions executable by a process is fully probabilistic. Moreover, the behavioral equivalence considered in [ABG04] is akin to the weak probabilistic bisimilarity of [BH97], which is known to coincide with probabilistic branching bisimilarity over fully probabilistic processes.

Here we move to a more expressive model combining nondeterminism and probabilities, called the strictly alternating model [HJ90]. In this model, states are divided into nondeterministic and probabilistic, while transitions are divided into action transitions – each labeled with an action and going from a nondeterministic state to a probabilistic one – and probabilistic transitions – each labeled with a probability and going from a probabilistic state to a nondeterministic one. A more flexible variant, called the non-strictly alternating model [PLS00], allows for action transitions also between two nondeterministic states.

Following [HJ90] we build a process calculus that, unlike the one in [ABG04], supports nondeterminism and decorates with probabilistic parameters only probabilistic choices. As for behavioral equivalences, we introduce a weak probabilistic bisimilarity inspired by the one in [PLS00] and adapt the probabilistic branching bisimilarity of the non-strictly alternating model in [AGT12]. By using these two equivalences, we recast the noninterference properties of [FG01, FR06] for irreversible systems and the noninterference properties of [EABR25]

for reversible systems, respectively, to study their preservation and compositionality aspects as well as to provide a taxonomy similar to those in [FG01, EABR25].

Unlike [ABG04], the resulting noninterference properties are lighter as they do not need additional universal quantifications over probabilistic parameters. Furthermore, reversibility comes into play by extending a result of [DMV90] to the strictly alternating model; we show that a probabilistic variant of weak back-and-forth bisimilarity coincides with the probabilistic branching bisimilarity of [AGT12]. Finally, we point out that for proving some results we have to resort to the bisimulation-up-to technique [SM92] and therefore introduce probabilistic variants of up-to weak [Mil89] and branching [Gla93] bisimulations.

This paper, which is a revised and extended version of [EAB24], is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall the strictly alternating model of [HJ90] along with various definitions of strong and weak bisimilarities for it – with the latter inspired by [PLS00, AGT12] – and a process calculus interpreted on it. In Section 3 we recast in our probabilistic framework a selection of noninterference properties taken from [FG01, FR06, EABR25]. In Section 4 we study their preservation and compositionality characteristics as well as their taxonomy and relate it to the nondeterministic taxonomy of [EABR25]. In Section 5 we establish a connection with reversibility by introducing a weak probabilistic back-and-forth bisimilarity and proving that it coincides with probabilistic branching bisimilarity. In Section 6 we present an example of a lottery implemented through a probabilistic smart contract to show the adequacy of our approach when dealing with information flows in systems featuring nondeterminism and probabilities, both in the irreversible case and in the reversible one. Finally, in Section 7 we provide some concluding remarks and directions for future work.

2. BACKGROUND DEFINITIONS AND RESULTS

In this section, we recall the strict alternating model of [HJ90] (Section 2.1) along with weak probabilistic bisimilarity [PLS00] and probabilistic branching bisimilarity [AGT12] (Section 2.2). Then we introduce a probabilistic process language inspired by [HJ90] through which we will express bisimulation-based information-flow security properties accounting for nondeterminism and probabilities (Section 2.3).

2.1. Probabilistic Labeled Transition Systems. To represent the behavior of a process featuring nondeterminism and probabilities, we use a probabilistic labeled transition system. This is a variant of a labeled transition system [Kel76] whose transitions are labeled with actions or probabilities. Since we adopt the strictly alternating model of [HJ90], we distinguish between nondeterministic and probabilistic states. The transitions of the former are labeled only with actions, while the transitions of the latter are labeled only with probabilities. Every action transition leads from a nondeterministic state to a probabilistic one, while every probabilistic transition leads from a probabilistic state to a nondeterministic one. In the following, we denote by \mathcal{S}_n (resp. \mathcal{S}_p) the set of nondeterministic (resp. probabilistic) states. The action set \mathcal{A}_τ contains a set \mathcal{A} of visible actions and a single action $\tau \notin \mathcal{A}$ representing unobservable actions.

Definition 2.1. A *probabilistic labeled transition system (PLTS)* is a triple $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}_\tau, \longrightarrow)$ where $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_n \cup \mathcal{S}_p$ with $\mathcal{S}_n \cap \mathcal{S}_p = \emptyset$ is an at most countable set of states, $\mathcal{A}_\tau = \mathcal{A} \cup \{\tau\}$ is a countable set of actions, and $\longrightarrow = \longrightarrow_a \cup \longrightarrow_p$ is the transition relation, where

$\longrightarrow_a \subseteq \mathcal{S}_n \times \mathcal{A}_\tau \times \mathcal{S}_p$ is the action transition relation whilst $\longrightarrow_p \subseteq \mathcal{S}_p \times \mathbb{R}_{]0,1]} \times \mathcal{S}_n$ is the probabilistic transition relation satisfying $\sum_{(s,p,s') \in \longrightarrow_p} p \in \{0,1\}$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}_p$. ■

An action transition (s, a, s') is written $s \xrightarrow{a}_a s'$ while a probabilistic transition (s, p, s') is written $s \xrightarrow{p}_p s'$, where s is the source state and s' is the target state. We say that s' is reachable from s , written $s' \in \text{reach}(s)$, iff $s' = s$ or there exists a sequence of finitely many transitions such that the target state of each of them coincides with the source state of the subsequent one, with the source of the first one being s and the target of the last being s' .

2.2. Bisimulation Equivalences. Bisimilarity [Par81, Mil89] identifies processes that are able to mimic each other's behavior stepwise. In the strictly alternating model, this extends to probabilistic behavior [HJ90]. Let $\mu(s, C) = \sum_{s \xrightarrow{p}_p s', s' \in C} p$ be the cumulative probability with which state s reaches a state in C ; note that $\mu(s, C) = 0$ when s is not a probabilistic state or C is not a set of nondeterministic states.

Definition 2.2. Let $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}_\tau, \longrightarrow)$ be a PLTS. We say that $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ are *strongly probabilistic bisimilar*, written $s_1 \sim_p s_2$, iff $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ for some strong probabilistic bisimulation \mathcal{B} . An equivalence relation $\mathcal{B} \subseteq (\mathcal{S}_n \times \mathcal{S}_n) \cup (\mathcal{S}_p \times \mathcal{S}_p)$ is a *strong probabilistic bisimulation* iff, whenever $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, then:

- For each $s_1 \xrightarrow{a}_a s'_1$ there exists $s_2 \xrightarrow{a}_a s'_2$ such that $(s'_1, s'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- $\mu(s_1, C) = \mu(s_2, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathcal{S}_n/\mathcal{B}$. ■

In [PLS00] a strong probabilistic bisimilarity more liberal than the one in [HJ90] allows a nondeterministic state and a probabilistic state to be identified when the latter concentrates all of its probabilistic mass in reaching the former. Think, e.g., of a probabilistic state whose outgoing transitions all reach the same nondeterministic state. To this purpose the following function is introduced in [PLS00]:

$$\text{prob}(s, s') = \begin{cases} p & \text{if } s \in \mathcal{S}_p \wedge \sum_{s \xrightarrow{p'}_p s'} p' = p > 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } s \in \mathcal{S}_n \wedge s' = s \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and is then lifted to a set C of states by letting $\text{prob}(s, C) = \sum_{s' \in C} \text{prob}(s, s')$.

Definition 2.3. Let $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}_\tau, \longrightarrow)$ be a PLTS. We say that $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ are *strongly mix-probabilistic bisimilar*, written $s_1 \sim_{\text{mp}} s_2$, iff $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ for some strong mix-probabilistic bisimulation \mathcal{B} . An equivalence relation \mathcal{B} over \mathcal{S} is a *strong mix-probabilistic bisimulation* iff, whenever $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, then:

- If $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}_n$, for each $s_1 \xrightarrow{a}_a s'_1$ there exists $s_2 \xrightarrow{a}_a s'_2$ such that $(s'_1, s'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- $\text{prob}(s_1, C) = \text{prob}(s_2, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathcal{S}/\mathcal{B}$. ■

Weak bisimilarity [Mil89] is additionally capable of abstracting from unobservable actions. In a probabilistic setting, it is also desirable to be able to abstract from probabilistic transitions in certain circumstances. Let $s \Longrightarrow s'$ mean that $s' \in \text{reach}(s)$ and, when $s' \neq s$, there exists a finite sequence of transitions from s to s' in which τ -transitions and probabilistic transitions alternate. Moreover let $\xrightarrow{a} \Longrightarrow$ stand for $\Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{a}_a \Longrightarrow$ and $\xrightarrow{\hat{a}} \Longrightarrow$ stand for \Longrightarrow if $a = \tau$ or $\xrightarrow{a} \Longrightarrow$ if $a \neq \tau$. The weak probabilistic bisimilarity below is inspired by the one in [PLS00]. The constraint $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}_n$ occurring in the first clause of Definition 2.3 is no longer necessary due to the use of \Longrightarrow .




Figure 1: States s_1 and s_2 are related by \approx_p but distinguished by \approx_{pb}

Definition 2.4. Let $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}_\tau, \longrightarrow)$ be a PLTS. We say that $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ are *weakly probabilistic bisimilar*, written $s_1 \approx_p s_2$, iff $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ for some weak probabilistic bisimulation \mathcal{B} . An equivalence relation \mathcal{B} over \mathcal{S} is a *weak probabilistic bisimulation* iff, whenever $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, then:

- For each $s_1 \xrightarrow{a} s'_1$ there exists $s_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} s'_2$ such that $(s'_1, s'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- $\text{prob}(s_1, C) = \text{prob}(s_2, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathcal{S}/\mathcal{B}$. ■

Branching bisimilarity [GW96] is finer than weak bisimilarity as it preserves the branching structure of processes even when abstracting from τ -actions – see the condition $(s_1, \bar{s}_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ in the definition below. We adapt the probabilistic branching bisimilarity developed in [AGT12] for the non-strictly alternating model.

Definition 2.5. Let $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}_\tau, \longrightarrow)$ be a PLTS. We say that $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ are *probabilistic branching bisimilar*, written $s_1 \approx_{pb} s_2$, iff $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ for some probabilistic branching bisimulation \mathcal{B} . An equivalence relation \mathcal{B} over \mathcal{S} is a *probabilistic branching bisimulation* iff, whenever $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, then:

- For each $s_1 \xrightarrow{a} s'_1$:
 - either $a = \tau$ and $(s'_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{B}$;
 - or there exists $s_2 \xrightarrow{\bar{a}} \bar{s}_2$ such that $(s_1, \bar{s}_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(s'_1, s'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- $\text{prob}(s_1, C) = \text{prob}(s_2, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathcal{S}/\mathcal{B}$. ■

An example that highlights the higher distinguishing power of probabilistic branching bisimilarity is given in Figure 1, where every PLTS is depicted as a directed graph in which vertices represent states and action- or probability-labeled edges represent transitions. The initial states s_1 and s_2 of the two PLTSs are weakly probabilistic bisimilar but not probabilistic branching bisimilar. The only transition that distinguishes s_1 and s_2 is the a -transition of s_1 , which can be mimicked by s_2 according to weak probabilistic bisimilarity by performing the τ -transition, the 1-transition, and lastly the a -transition. However, s_2 cannot respond in the same way according to probabilistic branching bisimilarity. The reason is that the state reached after the τ -transition and the 1-transition should be probabilistic branching bisimilar to s_1 , which is not the case because of the b -transition departing from s_1 .

2.3. A Probabilistic Process Calculus with High and Low Actions. We now introduce a probabilistic process calculus to formalize the security properties of interest. To address two security levels, actions are divided into high and low. We partition the set \mathcal{A} of observable actions into $\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{L}$, with $\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{L} = \emptyset$, where $\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{H}$ is the set of high-level actions, ranged over by h , and $\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{L}$ is the set of low-level actions, ranged over by l . Note that $\tau \notin \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{L}$.

<i>Prefix</i>	$a . P \xrightarrow{a} P$
<i>Choice</i>	$\frac{N_1 \xrightarrow{a} P_1}{N_1 + N_2 \xrightarrow{a} P_1} \qquad \frac{N_2 \xrightarrow{a} P_2}{N_1 + N_2 \xrightarrow{a} P_2}$
<i>Parallel</i>	$\frac{N_1 \xrightarrow{a} P_1 \quad a \notin L}{N_1 \parallel_L N_2 \xrightarrow{a} P_1 \parallel_L [1]N_2} \qquad \frac{N_2 \xrightarrow{a} P_2 \quad a \notin L}{N_1 \parallel_L N_2 \xrightarrow{a} [1]N_1 \parallel_L P_2}$
<i>Synch</i>	$\frac{N_1 \xrightarrow{a} P_1 \quad N_2 \xrightarrow{a} P_2 \quad a \in L}{N_1 \parallel_L N_2 \xrightarrow{a} P_1 \parallel_L P_2}$
<i>Restriction</i>	$\frac{N \xrightarrow{a} P \quad a \notin L}{N \setminus L \xrightarrow{a} P \setminus L}$
<i>Hiding</i>	$\frac{N \xrightarrow{a} P \quad a \in L}{N / L \xrightarrow{\tau} P / L} \qquad \frac{N \xrightarrow{a} P \quad a \notin L}{N / L \xrightarrow{a} P / L}$
<i>Constant</i>	$\frac{NC \triangleq N \quad N \xrightarrow{a} P}{NC \xrightarrow{a} P}$

Table 1: Operational semantic rules for nondeterministic processes

The overall set of process terms is given by $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_n \cup \mathbb{P}_p$, ranged over by E . The set \mathbb{P}_n of nondeterministic process terms, ranged over by N , is obtained by considering typical operators from CCS [Mil89] and CSP [BHR84]. The set \mathbb{P}_p of probabilistic process terms, ranged over by P , is obtained by taking a probabilistic choice operator similar to the one in [HJ90]. In addition to prefix and choice, we have restriction and hiding as they are necessary to formalize noninterference properties, the CSP parallel composition so as not to turn into τ the synchronization between high-level actions as would happen with the CCS parallel composition, and recursion (which was not considered in [EAB24]).

The syntax for \mathbb{P} is:

$$\begin{aligned} N & ::= \underline{0} \mid a . P \mid N + N \mid N \parallel_L N \mid N \setminus L \mid N / L \mid NC \\ P & ::= \bigoplus_{i \in I} [p_i] N_i \mid P \parallel_L P \mid P \setminus L \mid P / L \mid PC \end{aligned}$$

where:

- $\underline{0}$ is the terminated process.
- $a . -$, for $a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau$, is the action prefix operator describing a process that initially performs action a .
- $- + -$ is the alternative composition operator expressing a nondeterministic choice between two processes based on their initially executable actions.
- $\bigoplus_{i \in I} [p_i] -$, for I finite and not empty, is the generalized probabilistic composition operator expressing a probabilistic choice among finitely many processes each with probability $p_i \in \mathbb{R}_{]0,1]}$ and such that $\sum_{i \in I} p_i = 1$. We will use $[p_1]N_1 \oplus [p_2]N_2$ as a shorthand for $\bigoplus_{i \in \{1,2\}} [p_i]N_i$ and we will often omit the probability prefix when it is equal to 1.
- $- \parallel_L -$, for $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, is the parallel composition operator allowing two processes to proceed independently on any action not in L and forcing them to synchronize on every action in L as well as on probabilistic transitions [HJ90].
- $- \setminus L$, for $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, is the restriction operator, which prevents the execution of actions belonging to L .

<i>ProbChoice</i>	$\frac{j \in I}{\bigoplus_{i \in I} [p_i] N_i \xrightarrow{p_j} N_j}$
<i>ProbSync</i>	$\frac{P_1 \xrightarrow{p_1} N_1 \quad P_2 \xrightarrow{p_2} N_2}{P_1 \parallel_L P_2 \xrightarrow{p_1 \cdot p_2} N_1 \parallel_L N_2}$
<i>ProbRestriction</i>	$\frac{P \xrightarrow{p} N}{P \setminus L \xrightarrow{p} N \setminus L}$
<i>ProbHiding</i>	$\frac{P \xrightarrow{p} N}{P / L \xrightarrow{p} N / L}$
<i>Constant</i>	$\frac{PC \triangleq P \quad P \xrightarrow{p} N}{PC \xrightarrow{p} N}$

Table 2: Operational semantic rules for probabilistic processes

- $_ / L$, for $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, is the hiding operator, which turns all the executed actions belonging to L into the unobservable action τ .
- NC (resp. PC) is a process constant equipped with a defining equation of the form $NC \triangleq N$ (resp. $PC \triangleq P$), where every constant possibly occurring in N (resp. P) – including NC (resp. PC) itself thus allowing for recursion – must be in the scope of an action prefix operator.

The operational semantic rules for the process language are shown in Tables 1 and 2 for nondeterministic and probabilistic processes respectively. Together they produce the PLTS $(\mathbb{P}, \mathcal{A}_\tau, \longrightarrow)$ where $\longrightarrow = \longrightarrow_a \cup \longrightarrow_p$, $\longrightarrow_a \subseteq \mathbb{P}_n \times \mathcal{A}_\tau \times \mathbb{P}_p$, and $\longrightarrow_p \subseteq \mathbb{P}_p \times \mathbb{R}_{[0,1]} \times \mathbb{P}_n$, to which the bisimulation equivalences defined in Section 2.2 are applicable. Note that in the rules *Parallel* the nondeterministic subprocess that does not move has to be prefixed by $[1]$ to make it probabilistic within the overall target process [HJ90].

3. PROBABILISTIC INFORMATION-FLOW SECURITY PROPERTIES

In this section we recast the definitions of noninterference properties of [FG01, FR06, EABR25] – *Nondeterministic Non-Interference* (NNI) and *Non-Deducibility on Composition* (NDC) – by taking as behavioral equivalence the weak probabilistic bisimilarity and the branching probabilistic bisimilarity of Section 2.2. The intuition behind noninterference in a two-level security system is that, if a group of agents at the high security level performs some actions, the effect of those actions should not be seen by any agent at the low security level. To formalize this, the restriction and hiding operators play a central role.

Definition 3.1. Let $E \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\approx \in \{\approx_p, \approx_{pb}\}$:

- $E \in \text{BSNNI}_\approx \iff E \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx E / \mathcal{A}_H$.
- $E \in \text{BNDC}_\approx \iff$ for all $F \in \mathbb{P}$ such that every $F' \in \text{reach}(F)$ has only actions in \mathcal{A}_H and for all $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_H$, $E \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx ((E \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$.
- $E \in \text{SBSNNI}_\approx \iff$ for all $E' \in \text{reach}(E)$, $E' \in \text{BSNNI}_\approx$.
- $E \in \text{P.BNDC}_\approx \iff$ for all $E' \in \text{reach}(E)$, $E' \in \text{BNDC}_\approx$.

- $E \in \text{SBNDC}_{\approx} \iff$ for all $E' \in \text{reach}(E)$ and for all E'' for which there exists $h \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ such that $E' \xrightarrow{h}_a E''$, $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. \blacksquare

Historically, one of the first and most intuitive proposals has been *Bisimulation-based Strong Nondeterministic Non-Interference* (BSNNI). Basically, it is satisfied by any process E that behaves the same when its high-level actions are prevented (as modeled by $E \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$) or when they are considered as hidden, unobservable actions (as modeled by $E / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$). The equivalence between these two low-level views of E states that a low-level agent cannot observe the high-level behavior of the system. For instance, in our probabilistic setting, a low-level agent that observes the execution of l in $E = l.\underline{0} + l.([0.5]h.l_1.\underline{0} \oplus [0.5]h.l_2.\underline{0}) + l.([0.5]l_1.\underline{0} \oplus [0.5]l_2.\underline{0})$ cannot infer anything about the execution of h . Indeed, after the execution of l , what the low-level agent observes is either a deadlocked state or the execution of either l_1 or l_2 , both with probability 0.5. Formally, $E \setminus \{h\} \approx E / \{h\}$ because $l.\underline{0} + l.\underline{0} + l.([0.5]l_1.\underline{0} \oplus [0.5]l_2.\underline{0}) \approx l.\underline{0} + l.([0.5]\tau.l_1.\underline{0} \oplus [0.5]\tau.l_2.\underline{0}) + l.([0.5]l_1.\underline{0} \oplus [0.5]l_2.\underline{0})$.

BSNNI_{\approx} is not powerful enough to capture covert channels that derive from the behavior of the high-level agent interacting with the system. For instance, $l.\underline{0} + l.([0.5]h_1.l_1.\underline{0} \oplus [0.5]h_2.l_2.\underline{0}) + l.([0.5]l_1.\underline{0} \oplus [0.5]l_2.\underline{0})$ is BSNNI_{\approx} for the same reason discussed above. However, a high-level agent could decide to enable only h_1 , thus turning the low-level view of the system into $l.\underline{0} + l.([0.5]\tau.l_1.\underline{0} \oplus [0.5]\underline{0}) + l.([0.5]l_1.\underline{0} \oplus [0.5]l_2.\underline{0})$, which is clearly distinguishable from $l.\underline{0} + l.\underline{0} + l.([0.5]l_1.\underline{0} \oplus [0.5]l_2.\underline{0})$, as in the former the low-level agent can never observe l_2 after the execution of l . To overcome such a limitation, the most obvious solution consists of checking explicitly the interaction on any action set $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ between the system and every possible high-level agent. The resulting property is *Bisimulation-based Non-Deducibility on Composition* (BNDC), which features a universal quantification over F containing only high-level actions.

To circumvent the verification problems related to such a quantifier, several properties have been proposed that are stronger than BNDC. They all express some persistency conditions, stating that the security checks have to be extended to all the processes reachable from a secure one. Three of the most representative among such properties are: the variant of BSNNI that requires every reachable process to satisfy BSNNI itself, called *Strong BSNNI* (SBSNNI); the variant of BNDC that requires every reachable process to satisfy BNDC itself, called *Persistent BNDC* (P_BNDC); and *Strong BNDC* (SBNDC), which requires the low-level view of every reachable process to be the same before and after the execution of any high-level action, meaning that the execution of high-level actions must be completely transparent to low-level agents. In the nondeterministic case, P_BNDC and SBSNNI have been proven to be equivalent in [FR06] for their weak bisimilarity variants and in [EABR25] for their branching bisimilarity variants. In the next section we will see that this is the case in our probabilistic setting too.

4. CHARACTERISTICS OF PROBABILISTIC SECURITY PROPERTIES

In this section we investigate preservation and compositionality characteristics of the noninterference properties introduced in the previous section (Section 4.1) as well as the inclusion relationships between the ones based on \approx_p and the ones based on \approx_{pb} (Section 4.2). Then we relate the resulting probabilistic taxonomy with the nondeterministic one of [EABR25] (Section 4.3).

4.1. Preservation and Compositionality. All the probabilistic noninterference properties turn out to be preserved by the bisimilarity employed in their definition. This means that, whenever a process E_1 is secure under any of such properties, then every other equivalent process E_2 is secure too, provided that the considered equivalence is the one in the definition of the property. This is very useful for automated property verification, as it allows one to work with the process with the smallest state space among the equivalent ones. These results immediately follow from the next lemma, which states that \approx_p and \approx_{pb} are congruences with respect to action prefix, parallel composition, restriction, and hiding (similar results are present in [PLS00, AGT12] for the non-strictly alternating model).

Lemma 4.1. *Let $E_1, E_2 \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\approx \in \{\approx_p, \approx_{pb}\}$. If $E_1 \approx E_2$ then:*

- $a . E_1 \approx a . E_2$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau$, when $E_1, E_2 \in \mathbb{P}_p$.
- $E_1 \parallel_L E \approx E_2 \parallel_L E$ and $E \parallel_L E_1 \approx E \parallel_L E_2$ for all $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ and $E \in \mathbb{P}$, when $E_1, E_2, E \in \mathbb{P}_n$ or $E_1, E_2, E \in \mathbb{P}_p$.
- $E_1 \setminus L \approx E_2 \setminus L$ for all $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}$.
- $E_1 / L \approx E_2 / L$ for all $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}$.

Proof. We first prove the result for the \approx_p -based properties. Let \mathcal{B} be a probabilistic weak bisimulation witnessing $E_1 \approx_p E_2$:

- The symmetric relation $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \cup \{(a . F_1, a . F_2) \mid (F_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is a weak probabilistic bisimulation too. The result immediately follow from the fact that if $a . F_1 \xrightarrow{a} F_1$ then $a . F_2 \xrightarrow{a} F_2$ and $(F_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}$. Since $a . F_1$ and $a . F_2$ are nondeterministic processes and $(F_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, it follows that for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}'$, $\text{prob}(a . F_1, C) = \text{prob}(a . F_2, C)$.
- The symmetric relation $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \cup \{(F_1 \parallel_L F, F_2 \parallel_L F) \mid (F_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B} \wedge F \in \mathbb{P}\}$ is a weak probabilistic bisimulation too. There are three cases:
 - If $F_1 \parallel_L F \xrightarrow{a} F_1' \parallel_L F'$ with $a \in L$, then $F_1 \xrightarrow{a} F_1'$ (and $F \xrightarrow{a} F'$) and hence there exists a process F_2' such that $F_2 \xrightarrow{a} F_2'$ with $(F_1', F_2') \in \mathcal{B}$. Therefore $F_2 \parallel_L F \xrightarrow{a} F_2' \parallel_L F'$ with $(F_1' \parallel_L F', F_2' \parallel_L F') \in \mathcal{B}'$.
 - If $F_1 \parallel_L F \xrightarrow{a} F_1' \parallel_L [1]F$ with $a \notin L$, then $F_1 \xrightarrow{a} F_1'$ and hence there exists a process F_2' such that $F_2 \xrightarrow{a} F_2'$ (or $F_2 \xrightarrow{a} F_2'$ when $a = \tau$) with $(F_1', F_2') \in \mathcal{B}$. Therefore $F_2 \parallel_L F \xrightarrow{a} F_2' \parallel_L [1]F$ with $(F_1' \parallel_L [1]F, F_2' \parallel_L [1]F) \in \mathcal{B}'$.
 - The case $F_1 \parallel_L F \xrightarrow{a} [1]F_1 \parallel_L F'$ with $a \notin L$ is trivial.

As for probabilities, we start by observing that for all $G_1, G_2, G'_1, G'_2 \in \mathbb{P}$ and for all $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, $\text{prob}(G_1 \parallel_L G_2, G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2) = \text{prob}(G_1, G'_1) \cdot \text{prob}(G_2, G'_2)$. If G_1 and G_2 are nondeterministic processes, then $\text{prob}(G_1, G'_1) \cdot \text{prob}(G_2, G'_2) = 1$ if $G_1 = G'_1$ and $G_2 = G'_2$ and $\text{prob}(G_1, G'_1) \cdot \text{prob}(G_2, G'_2) = 0$ otherwise. From this fact it follows that $\text{prob}(G_1 \parallel_L G_2, G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2) = 1$ if $G_1 \parallel_L G_2 = G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2$, i.e., $G_1 = G'_1$ and $G_2 = G'_2$, and $\text{prob}(G_1 \parallel_L G_2, G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2) = 0$ otherwise. If G_1 and G_2 are both probabilistic processes, we have that $\text{prob}(G_1, G'_1) = \sum_{G_1 \xrightarrow{p} G'_1} p$ and $\text{prob}(G_2, G'_2) = \sum_{G_2 \xrightarrow{q} G'_2} q$ and hence $\text{prob}(G_1, G'_1) \cdot \text{prob}(G_2, G'_2) = \sum_{G_1 \xrightarrow{p} G'_1} p \cdot \sum_{G_2 \xrightarrow{q} G'_2} q = \sum_{G_1 \xrightarrow{p} G'_1} \sum_{G_2 \xrightarrow{q} G'_2} p \cdot q$, which, according to the rules in Table 2, is equal to $\text{prob}(G_1 \parallel_L G_2, G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2)$. With this result we observe that given an arbitrary equivalence class $D = [H \parallel_L F']_{\mathcal{B}}$, for $H \in \mathbb{P}_n$, (note that in this case F_1, F_2 and F are probabilistic processes, we consider only this as the case in which they are nondeterministic is straightforward), $\text{prob}(F_1 \parallel_L F, D) =$

$\sum_{\bar{H} \parallel_L \bar{F}' \in D} \text{prob}(F_1 \parallel_L F, \bar{H} \parallel_L \bar{F}') = \sum_{\bar{H} \parallel_L \bar{F}' \in D} \text{prob}(F_1, \bar{H}) \cdot \text{prob}(\bar{F}, \bar{F}')$. This in turn implies that $\sum_{\bar{H} \parallel_L \bar{F}' \in D} \text{prob}(F_1, \bar{H}) \cdot \text{prob}(\bar{F}, \bar{F}') = \sum_{\bar{H} \approx_p H, \bar{F}' \approx_p F'} \text{prob}(F_1, \bar{H}) \cdot \text{prob}(F, \bar{F}') = (\sum_{\bar{H} \approx_p H} \text{prob}(F_1, \bar{H})) \cdot (\sum_{\bar{F}' \approx_p F'} \text{prob}(F, \bar{F}'))$. By the same reasoning $\text{prob}(F_2 \parallel_L F, D) = (\sum_{\bar{H} \approx_p H} \text{prob}(F_2, \bar{H})) \cdot (\sum_{\bar{F}' \approx_p F'} \text{prob}(F, \bar{F}'))$. Lastly, from $F_1 \approx_p F_2$ and $F \approx_p F'$ we obtain that $(\sum_{\bar{H} \approx_p H} \text{prob}(F_1, \bar{H})) \cdot (\sum_{\bar{F}' \approx_p F'} \text{prob}(F, \bar{F}')) = (\sum_{\bar{H} \approx_p H} \text{prob}(F_2, \bar{H})) \cdot (\sum_{\bar{F}' \approx_p F'} \text{prob}(F, \bar{F}'))$, hence $\text{prob}(F_1 \parallel_L F, D) = \text{prob}(F_2 \parallel_L F, D)$.

- The symmetric relation $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \cup \{(F_1 \setminus L, F_2 \setminus L) \mid (F_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is a probabilistic weak bisimulation too. There are two cases:
 - If $F_1 \setminus L \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F_1' \setminus L$, then $F_1 \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F_1'$ and hence there exists a process F_2' such that $F_2 \Longrightarrow F_2'$ with $(F_1', F_2') \in \mathcal{B}$. Since the restriction operator does not apply to τ and to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $F_2 \setminus L \Longrightarrow F_2' \setminus L$, with $(F_1' \setminus L, F_2' \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}'$.
 - If $F_1 \setminus L \xrightarrow{a}_a F_1' \setminus L$ with $a \notin L \cup \{\tau\}$, then $F_1 \xrightarrow{a}_a F_1'$ and hence there exists a process F_2' such that $F_2 \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{a}_a \Longrightarrow F_2'$ with $(F_1', F_2') \in \mathcal{B}$. Since the restriction operator does not apply to τ and to probabilistic transitions and $a \notin L$, it follows that $F_2 \setminus L \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{a}_a \Longrightarrow F_2' \setminus L$ with $(F_1' \setminus L, F_2' \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}'$.

As for probabilities, from the fact that $(F_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ it follows that $\text{prob}(F_1, C) = \text{prob}(F_2, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}$ and from the fact that the restriction operator does not apply to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $\text{prob}(F_1 \setminus L, C) = \text{prob}(F_2 \setminus L, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}'$.

- The symmetric relation $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \cup \{(F_1 / L, F_2 / L) \mid (F_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is a probabilistic weak bisimulation too. There are two cases:
 - If $F_1 / L \xrightarrow{a}_a F_1' / L$ with $F_1 \xrightarrow{b}_a F_1'$ and $b \in L \wedge a = \tau$ or $b \notin L \cup \{\tau\} \wedge a = b$, then there exists a process F_2' such that $F_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{b}} F_2'$ with $(F_1', F_2') \in \mathcal{B}$. Since the hiding operator does not apply to τ , it follows that $F_2 / L \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} F_2' / L$, $(F_1' / L, F_2' / L) \in \mathcal{B}'$.
 - If $F_1 / L \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F_1' / L$ with $F_1 \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F_1'$, then there exists a process F_2' such that $F_2 \Longrightarrow F_2'$ with $(F_1', F_2') \in \mathcal{B}$. Since the hiding operator does not apply neither to τ nor to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $F_2 / L \Longrightarrow F_2' / L$ with $(F_1' / L, F_2' / L) \in \mathcal{B}'$.

As for probabilities, from the fact that $(F_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ it follows $\text{prob}(F_1, C) = \text{prob}(F_2, C)$ that for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}$ and from the fact that the hiding operator does not apply to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $\text{prob}(F_1 / L, C) = \text{prob}(F_2 / L, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}'$.

We now prove the same result for \approx_{pb} . Let \mathcal{B} be a probabilistic branching bisimulation witnessing $E_1 \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2$:

- The symmetric relation $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \cup \{(a.F_1, a.F_2) \mid (F_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is a probabilistic branching bisimulation too. The result immediately follow from the fact that if $a.F_1 \xrightarrow{a}_a F_1'$ then $a.F_2 \Longrightarrow a.F_2' \xrightarrow{a}_a F_2'$, $(a.F_1, a.F_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$ and $(F_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}$. Since $a.F_1$ and $a.F_2$ are nondeterministic processes and $(F_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, it follows that for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}'$, $\text{prob}(a.F_1, C) = \text{prob}(a.F_2, C)$.
- The symmetric relation $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \cup \{(F_1 \parallel_L F, F_2 \parallel_L F) \mid (F_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B} \wedge F \in \mathbb{P}\}$ is a probabilistic branching bisimulation too. There are three cases:
 - If $F_1 \parallel_L F \xrightarrow{a}_a F_1' \parallel_L F'$ with $a \in L$, then $F_1 \xrightarrow{a}_a F_1'$ (and $F \xrightarrow{a}_a F'$) and hence there exist \bar{F}_2 and F_2' such that $F_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{F}_2 \xrightarrow{a}_a F_2'$ with $(F_1, \bar{F}_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(F_1', F_2') \in \mathcal{B}$. Therefore $F_2 \parallel_L F \Longrightarrow \bar{F}_2 \parallel_L F \xrightarrow{a}_a F_2' \parallel_L F'$ with $(F_1 \parallel_L F, \bar{F}_2 \parallel_L F) \in \mathcal{B}'$ and $(F_1' \parallel_L F', F_2' \parallel_L F') \in \mathcal{B}'$.

- If $F_1 \parallel_L F \xrightarrow{a} F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F$ with $a \notin L$, then $F_1 \xrightarrow{a} F'_1$ and hence either $(F'_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ when $a = \tau$, or there exist \bar{F}_2 and F'_2 such that $F_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{F}_2 \xrightarrow{a} F'_2$ with $(F_1, \bar{F}_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(F'_1, F'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$. In the former subcase $F_2 \parallel_L F$ is allowed to stay idle with $(F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F, F_2 \parallel_L F) \in \mathcal{B}'$, while in the latter subcase $F_2 \parallel_L F \Longrightarrow \bar{F}_2 \parallel_L F \xrightarrow{a} F'_2 \parallel_L [1]F$ with $(F_1 \parallel_L F, \bar{F}_2 \parallel_L F) \in \mathcal{B}'$ and $(F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F, F'_2 \parallel_L [1]F) \in \mathcal{B}'$.
- The case $F_1 \parallel_L F \xrightarrow{a} F_1 \parallel_L F'$ with $a \notin L$ is trivial.

As for probabilities, the reasoning is the same as in the case of the compositionality of \approx_p with respect to the parallel operator (see the third case in the first part of the proof).

- The symmetric relation $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \cup \{(F_1 \setminus L, F_2 \setminus L) \mid (F_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is a probabilistic branching bisimulation too. There are two cases:

- If $F_1 \setminus L \xrightarrow{\tau} F'_1 \setminus L$, then $F_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} F'_1$ and hence either $(F'_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, or there exist \bar{F}_2 and F'_2 such that $F_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{F}_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} F'_2$ with $(F_1, \bar{F}_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(F'_1, F'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$. Since the restriction operator does not apply neither to τ nor to probabilistic transitions, in the former subcase $F_2 \setminus L$ is allowed to stay idle with $(F'_1 \setminus L, F_2 \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}'$, while in the latter subcase $F_2 \setminus L \Longrightarrow \bar{F}_2 \setminus L \xrightarrow{\tau} F'_2 \setminus L$, with $(F_1 \setminus L, \bar{F}_2 \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}'$ and $(F'_1 \setminus L, F'_2 \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}'$.
- If $F_1 \setminus L \xrightarrow{a} F'_1 \setminus L$ with $a \notin L \cup \{\tau\}$, then $F_1 \xrightarrow{a} F'_1$ and hence there exist \bar{F}_2 and F'_2 such that $F_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{F}_2 \xrightarrow{a} F'_2$ with $(F_1, \bar{F}_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(F'_1, F'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$. Since the restriction operator does not apply neither to τ nor to probabilistic transitions and $a \notin L$, it follows that $F_2 \setminus L \Longrightarrow \bar{F}_2 \setminus L \xrightarrow{a} F'_2 \setminus L$ with $(F_1 \setminus L, \bar{F}_2 \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}'$ and $(F'_1 \setminus L, F'_2 \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}'$.

As for probabilities, from the fact that $(F_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ it follows that $\text{prob}(F_1, C) = \text{prob}(F_2, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}$ and from the fact that the restriction operator does not apply to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $\text{prob}(F_1 \setminus L, C) = \text{prob}(F_2 \setminus L, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}'$.

- The symmetric relation $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \cup \{(F_1 / L, F_2 / L) \mid (F_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is a probabilistic branching bisimulation too. There are two cases:

- If $F_1 / L \xrightarrow{a} F'_1 / L$ with $F_1 \xrightarrow{b} F'_1$ and $b \in L \wedge a = \tau$ or $b \notin L \cup \{\tau\} \wedge a = b$, then there exist \bar{F}_2 and F'_2 such that $F_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{F}_2 \xrightarrow{b} F'_2$ with $(F_1, \bar{F}_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(F'_1, F'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$. Since the hiding operator does not apply neither to τ nor to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $F_2 / L \Longrightarrow \bar{F}_2 / L \xrightarrow{a} F'_2 / L$, with $(F_1 / L, \bar{F}_2 / L) \in \mathcal{B}'$ and $(F'_1 / L, F'_2 / L) \in \mathcal{B}'$.
- If $F_1 / L \xrightarrow{\tau} F'_1 / L$ with $F_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} F'_1$, then either $(F'_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, or there exist \bar{F}_2 and F'_2 such that $F_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{F}_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} F'_2$ with $(F_1, \bar{F}_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(F'_1, F'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$. Since the hiding operator does not apply neither to τ nor to probabilistic transitions, in the former subcase F_2 / L is allowed to stay idle with $(F'_1 / L, F_2 / L) \in \mathcal{B}'$, while in the latter subcase $F_2 / L \Longrightarrow \bar{F}_2 / L \xrightarrow{\tau} F'_2 / L$ with $(F_1 / L, \bar{F}_2 / L) \in \mathcal{B}'$ and $(F'_1 / L, F'_2 / L) \in \mathcal{B}'$.

As for probabilities, from the fact that $(F_1, F_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ it follows that $\text{prob}(F_1, C) = \text{prob}(F_2, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}$ and from the fact that the hiding operator does not apply to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $\text{prob}(F_1 / L, C) = \text{prob}(F_2 / L, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}'$. \square

Theorem 4.2. *Let $E_1, E_2 \in \mathbb{P}$, $\approx \in \{\approx_p, \approx_{pb}\}$, and $\mathcal{P} \in \{\text{BSNNI}_{\approx}, \text{BNDC}_{\approx}, \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx}, \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx}, \text{SBNDC}_{\approx}\}$. If $E_1 \approx E_2$ then $E_1 \in \mathcal{P} \iff E_2 \in \mathcal{P}$.*

Proof. A straightforward consequence of the definition of the various properties, i.e., Definition 3.1, and Lemma 4.1. \square

As far as modular verification is concerned, like in the nondeterministic case [FG01, EABR25] only the local properties SBSNNI_{\approx} , P_BNDC_{\approx} , and SBNDC_{\approx} are compositional,

i.e., are preserved by some operators of the calculus in certain circumstances. Moreover, similar to [EABR25] compositionality with respect to parallel composition is limited, for $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ and $\text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$, to the case in which no synchronization can take place among high-level actions, i.e., $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}$. To establish compositionality, we first prove some ancillary results about parallel composition, restriction, and hiding under SBSNNI and SBNDC.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $E_1, E_2 \in \mathbb{P}_n$ or $E_1, E_2 \in \mathbb{P}_p$, $E \in \mathbb{P}$, and $\approx \in \{\approx_p, \approx_{\text{pb}}\}$. Then:*

- (1) *If $E_1, E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx}$ and $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}$, then $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx (G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ for all $F_1, G_1 \in \text{reach}(E_1)$ and $F_2, G_2 \in \text{reach}(E_2)$ such that $F_1 \parallel_L F_2, G_1 \parallel_L G_2 \in \text{reach}(E_1 \parallel_L E_2)$, $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx G_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, and $F_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx G_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.*
- (2) *If $E \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx}$ and $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, then $(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \approx (G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ for all $F, G \in \text{reach}(E)$ such that $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.*
- (3) *If $E_1, E_2 \in \text{SBNDC}_{\approx}$ and $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, then $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx (G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ for all $F_1, G_1 \in \text{reach}(E_1)$ and $F_2, G_2 \in \text{reach}(E_2)$ such that $F_1 \parallel_L F_2, G_1 \parallel_L G_2 \in \text{reach}(E_1 \parallel_L E_2)$, $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $F_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx G_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.*

Proof. We start by proving the results for the \approx_p -based properties. Let \mathcal{B} be a symmetric relation containing all the pairs of processes that have to be shown to be weak probabilistically bisimilar according to the property considered among the three stated above:

- (1) Starting from $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ related by \mathcal{B} , so that $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $F_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p G_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ there are thirteen cases. In the first five cases it is $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ to move first:
 - If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F_1 \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_1$ and $l \notin L$, then $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p G_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that there exists a process G'_1 such that $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{l}_a \Longrightarrow G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ and l , it follows that $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{l}_a \Longrightarrow (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $((F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a ([1]F_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F_2 \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_2$ and $l \notin L$, then the proof is similar to the one of the previous case.
 - If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a (F'_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F_i \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $l \in L$, then $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p G_i / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that there exists a process G'_i such that $G_i / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{l}_a \Longrightarrow G'_i / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p G'_i / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{l}_a \Longrightarrow (G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $((F'_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F_1 \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F'_1$, then $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $\tau \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p G_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that there exists a process G'_1 such that $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $((F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a ([1]F_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F_2 \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F'_2$, then the proof is similar to the one of the previous case.
 - If $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $G_1 \xrightarrow{l}_a G'_1$ and $l \notin L$, then $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that there exists a process F'_1 such that $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{l}_a \Longrightarrow F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and

- $G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ and l , it follows that $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{l}_a \Longrightarrow (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $((G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H, (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- If $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a ([1]G_1 \parallel_L G'_2) / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_2 \xrightarrow{l}_a G'_2$ and $l \notin L$, then the proof is similar to the one of the previous case.
 - If $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a (G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2) / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_i \xrightarrow{l}_a G'_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $l \in L$, then $G_i / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a G'_i / \mathcal{A}_H$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_H$. From $G_i / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that there exists a process F'_i such that $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{l}_a \Longrightarrow F'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G'_i / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p F'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{l}_a \Longrightarrow (F'_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $((G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2) / \mathcal{A}_H, (F'_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_1 \xrightarrow{\tau}_a G'_1$, then $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H$ as $\tau \notin \mathcal{A}_H$. From $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that there exists a process F'_1 such that $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $((G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H, (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (G_1 \parallel_L G'_2) / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_2 \xrightarrow{\tau}_a G'_2$, then the proof is similar to the one of the previous case.
 - If $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_1 \xrightarrow{h}_a G'_1$ and $h \notin L$, then $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H$ as $h \in \mathcal{A}_H$. From $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that there exists a process F'_1 such that $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $((G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H, (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a ([1]G_1 \parallel_L G'_2) / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_2 \xrightarrow{h}_a G'_2$ and $h \notin L$, then the proof is similar to the one of the previous case.
 - If $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (G_1 \parallel_L G'_2) / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_i \xrightarrow{h}_a G'_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $h \in L$, then $G_i / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a G'_i / \mathcal{A}_H$. From $G_i / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that there exist F'_i such that $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow F'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G'_i / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p F'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow (F'_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $((G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2) / \mathcal{A}_H, (F'_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.

As for probabilities, given two arbitrary processes $H_1, H_2 \in \mathbb{P}_p$ we observe that $\text{prob}((F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \parallel_L (F_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H), [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}}) = \text{prob}(F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, [H_1]_{\mathcal{B}}) \cdot \text{prob}(F_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, [H_2]_{\mathcal{B}})$ and $\text{prob}((G_1 / \mathcal{A}_H) \parallel_L (G_2 / \mathcal{A}_H), [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}}) = \text{prob}(G_1 / \mathcal{A}_H, [H_1]_{\mathcal{B}}) \cdot \text{prob}(G_2 / \mathcal{A}_H, [H_2]_{\mathcal{B}})$ (see the proof of Lemma 4.1). From $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p G_i / \mathcal{A}_H$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, it follows that $\text{prob}(F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, C) = \text{prob}(G_i / \mathcal{A}_H, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}$, which in turn implies that $\text{prob}((F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \parallel_L (F_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H), [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}}) = \text{prob}((G_1 / \mathcal{A}_H) \parallel_L (G_2 / \mathcal{A}_H), [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}})$. Finally from the fact that the hiding and restriction operators do not apply to probabilistic transitions we conclude that $\text{prob}((F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}}) = \text{prob}((G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H, [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}})$.

- (2) Starting from $(F / \mathcal{A}_H) \setminus L$ and $(G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_H$ related by \mathcal{B} , so that $F / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p G \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ in the weak probabilistic bisimulation game there are six cases based on the operation semantic rules in Table 1:

- If $(F / \mathcal{A}_H) \setminus L \xrightarrow{l}_a (F' / \mathcal{A}_H) \setminus L$ with $F \xrightarrow{l}_a F'$ and $l \notin L$, then $F / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a F' / \mathcal{A}_H$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_H$. From $F / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p G \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that there exists a process G' such that

- $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{l}_a \Longrightarrow G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since neither the restriction operator nor the hiding operator applies to τ , l , and probabilistic transitions, it follows that $(G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{l}_a \Longrightarrow (G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $((F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L, (G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- If $(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ with $F \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F'$, then $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $\tau \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that there exists a process G' such that $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since neither the restriction operator nor the hiding operator applies to τ and probabilistic transitions, it follows that $(G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow (G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with and $((F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L, (G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ with $F \xrightarrow{h}_a F'$, then $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $h \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and the rest of the proof is similar to the one of the previous case.
 - If $(G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a (G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $G \xrightarrow{l}_a G'$ and $l \notin L$, then $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that there exists a process F' such that $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{l}_a \Longrightarrow F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since the restriction operator does not apply to τ , l , and probabilistic transitions it follows that $(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{l}_a \Longrightarrow (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ with $((G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $G \xrightarrow{\tau}_a G'$, then $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $\tau \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that there exists a process F' such that $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since the restriction operator does not apply to τ and probabilistic transitions, it follows that $(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \Longrightarrow (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ with and $((G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $G \xrightarrow{h}_a G'$ and $h \notin L$, then $G / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a G' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $h \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ (note that $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ cannot perform h). From $G / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ – as $E \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ and $G \in \text{reach}(E)$ – and $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that there exists a process F' such that $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $G' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and hence $G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since the restriction operator does not apply to τ , it follows that $(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \Longrightarrow (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ with $((G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}$.

As for probabilities, from the fact that $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that $\text{prob}(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C) = \text{prob}(G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}$ and from the fact that the hiding operator and the restriction do not apply to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $\text{prob}((F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L, C) = \text{prob}((G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C)$.

- (3) Starting from $((F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ so that in the weak probabilistic bisimulation game there are five cases based on the operational semantic rules in Table 1:
- If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F_1 \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_1$ and $l \notin L$, then $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that there exists a process G'_1 such that $G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{l}_a \Longrightarrow G'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p G'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{l}_a \Longrightarrow (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with and $((F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a ([1]F_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F_2 \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_2$ and $l \notin L$, then the proof is similar to the one of the previous case.
 - If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a (F'_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F_i \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $l \in L$, then $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $l \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p G_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that there exists a process G'_i such that $G_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{l}_a \Longrightarrow G'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p$

- $G'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{l}_a \Longrightarrow (G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $((F'_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, (G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $F_1 \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F'_1$, then $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. From $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that there exists a process G'_1 such that $G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow G'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p G'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow (G'_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $((F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a ([1]F_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $F_2 \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F'_2$, then the proof is similar to the one of the previous case.

As for probabilities, given two arbitrary probabilistic processes $H_1, H_2 \in \mathbb{P}$, we observe that $\text{prob}((F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \parallel_L (F_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H), [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}}) = \text{prob}(F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, [H_1]_{\mathcal{B}}) \cdot \text{prob}(F_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, [H_2]_{\mathcal{B}})$ and $\text{prob}((G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \parallel_L G_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}}) = \text{prob}(G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, [H_1]_{\mathcal{B}}) \cdot \text{prob}(G_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, [H_2]_{\mathcal{B}})$ (see the proof of Lemma 4.1). From $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p G_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, it follows that for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}$, $\text{prob}(F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, C) = \text{prob}(G_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, C)$, which in turn implies that $\text{prob}((F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \parallel_L (F_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H), [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}}) = \text{prob}((G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \parallel_L (G_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H), [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}})$. Lastly, from the fact that the restriction operators does not apply to probabilistic transitions we conclude that $\text{prob}((F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}}) = \text{prob}((G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}})$.

We now prove the results for the \approx_{pb} -based properties. Let \mathcal{B} be a symmetric relation containing all the pairs of processes that have to be shown to be probabilistically branching bisimilar according to the property considered among the three stated above:

- (1) Starting from $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ related by \mathcal{B} , so that $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $F_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p G_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ there are thirteen cases. In the first five cases it is $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ to move first:
 - If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $F_1 \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_1$ and $l \notin L$, then $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_H$. From $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that there exist \bar{G}_1 and G'_1 such that $G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow \bar{G}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a G'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{G}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} G'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ and l , it follows that $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow (\bar{G}_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $((F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, (\bar{G}_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $((F'_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, (G'_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a ([1]F_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $F_2 \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_2$ and $l \notin L$, then the proof is similar to the one of the previous case.
 - If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a (F'_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $F_i \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $l \in L$, then $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_H$. From $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} G_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that there exist \bar{G}_i and G'_i such that $G_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow \bar{G}_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a G'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{G}_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $F'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} G'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow (\bar{G}_1 \parallel_L \bar{G}_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a (G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $((F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, (\bar{G}_1 \parallel_L \bar{G}_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $((F'_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, (G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $F_1 \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F'_1$, then $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as $\tau \notin \mathcal{A}_H$. From $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that either $F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, or there exist \bar{G}_1 and G'_1 such that $G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow \bar{G}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a G'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{G}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} G'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. In the former subcase

- $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H$ is allowed to stay idle with $((F'_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, (G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$, while in the latter subcase, since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow (\bar{G}_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (G'_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $((F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, (\bar{G}_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $((F'_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, (G'_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a ([1]F_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $F_2 \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F'_2$, then the proof is similar to the one of the previous case.
 - If $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_1 \xrightarrow{l}_a G'_1$ and $l \notin L$, then $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_H$. From $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that there exist \bar{F}_1 and F'_1 such that $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow \bar{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ and l , it follows that $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow (\bar{F}_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $((G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H, (\bar{F}_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $((G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H, (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a ([1]G_1 \parallel_L G'_2) / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_2 \xrightarrow{l}_a G'_2$ and $l \notin L$, then the proof is similar to the one of the previous case.
 - If $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a (G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2) / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_i \xrightarrow{l}_a G'_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $l \in L$, then $G_i / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a G'_i / \mathcal{A}_H$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_H$. From $G_i / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that there exist \bar{F}_i and F'_i such that $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow \bar{F}_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_i / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{F}_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $G'_i / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} F'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow (\bar{F}_1 \parallel_L \bar{F}_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a (F'_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $((G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H, (\bar{F}_1 \parallel_L \bar{F}_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $((G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2) / \mathcal{A}_H, (F'_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_1 \xrightarrow{\tau}_a G'_1$, then $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H$ as $\tau \notin \mathcal{A}_H$. From $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that either $G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, or there exist \bar{F}_1 and F'_1 such that $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow \bar{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. In the former subcase $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ is allowed to stay idle with $((G'_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H, (F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$, while in the latter subcase, since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow (\bar{F}_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $((G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H, (\bar{F}_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $((G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H, (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a ([1]G_1 \parallel_L G'_2) / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_2 \xrightarrow{\tau}_a G'_2$, then the proof is similar to the one of the previous case.
 - If $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (G'_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_1 \xrightarrow{h}_a G'_1$ and $h \notin L$, then $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H$ as $h \in \mathcal{A}_H$. From $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that either $G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, or there exist \bar{F}_1 and F'_1 such that $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow \bar{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $G'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. In the former subcase $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ is allowed to stay idle with $((G'_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H, (F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$, while in the latter subcase, since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow (\bar{F}_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (F'_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $((G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H, (\bar{F}_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $((G'_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H, (F'_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a ([1]G_1 \parallel_L G'_2) / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $G_2 \xrightarrow{h}_a G'_2$ and $h \notin L$, then the proof is similar to the one of the previous case.

As for probabilities, given two arbitrary processes $H_1, H_2 \in \mathbb{P}$, we observe that $\text{prob}((F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \parallel_L (F_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H), [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}}) = \text{prob}(F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, [H_1]_{\mathcal{B}}) \cdot \text{prob}(F_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, [H_2]_{\mathcal{B}})$ and

$prob((G_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \parallel_L (G_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}), [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}}) = prob(G_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, [H_1]_{\mathcal{B}}) \cdot prob(G_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, [H_2]_{\mathcal{B}})$ (see the proof of Lemma 4.1). From $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} G_i / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, it follows that $prob(F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C) = prob(G_i / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}$, which in turn implies that $prob((F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \parallel_L (F_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}), [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}}) = prob((G_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \parallel_L (G_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}), [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}})$. Finally from the fact that the hiding and restriction operators do not apply to probabilistic transitions we conclude that $prob((F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}}) = prob((G_1 \parallel_L G_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}})$.

- (2) Starting from $(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ and $(G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ related by \mathcal{B} , so that $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{p}} G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ in the probabilistic branching bisimulation game there are six cases based on the operation semantic rules in Table 1:

Assuming that $(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ and $(G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ are related by \mathcal{B} , there are six cases:

- If $(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \xrightarrow{l}_{\text{a}} (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ with $F \xrightarrow{l}_{\text{a}} F'$ and $l \notin L$, then $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_{\text{a}} F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that there exist \bar{G} and G' such that $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{G} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_{\text{a}} G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{G} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since neither the restriction operator nor the hiding operator applies to τ , l , and to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $(G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow (\bar{G} \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_{\text{a}} (G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $((F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L, (\bar{G} \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $((F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L, (G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- If $(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ with $F \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} F'$, then $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $\tau \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that either $F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, or there exist \bar{G} and G' such that $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{G} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{G} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. In the former subcase $(G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is allowed to stay idle with $((F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L, (G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$, while in the latter subcase, since neither the restriction operator nor the hiding operator applies to τ and to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $(G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow (\bar{G} \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} (G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $((F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L, (\bar{G} \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $((F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L, (G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- If $(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ with $F \xrightarrow{h}_{\text{a}} F'$, then $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $h \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and the rest of the proof is similar to the one of the previous case.
- If $(G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_{\text{a}} (G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $G \xrightarrow{l}_{\text{a}} G'$ and $l \notin L$, then $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_{\text{a}} G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that there exist \bar{F} and F' such that $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{F} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_{\text{a}} F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{F} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since the restriction operator does not apply to τ , l , and probabilistic transitions, it follows that $(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \Longrightarrow (\bar{F} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \xrightarrow{l}_{\text{a}} (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ with $((G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (\bar{F} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $((G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- If $(G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} (G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $G \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} G'$, then $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $\tau \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that either $G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, or there exist \bar{F} and F' such that $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{F} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{F} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. In the former subcase $(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ is allowed to stay idle with $((G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}$, while in the latter subcase, since the restriction operator does not apply to τ and to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \Longrightarrow (\bar{F} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ with $((G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (\bar{F} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $((G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- If $(G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} (G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $G \xrightarrow{h}_{\text{a}} G'$ and $h \notin L$, then $G / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} G' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $h \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ (note that $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ cannot perform h). From $G / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ – as $E \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ and $G \in \text{reach}(E)$ – and $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows

that either $G' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and hence $G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} F \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, or there exist \bar{F} and F' such that $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{F} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $G / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{F} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $G' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and hence $G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{F} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $G' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} F' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. In the former subcase $(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ is allowed to stay idle with $((G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}$, while in the latter subcase, since the restriction operator does not apply to τ and to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \Longrightarrow (\bar{F} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ with $((G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (\bar{F} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $((G' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (F' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L) \in \mathcal{B}$.

As for probabilities, from the fact that $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that $\text{prob}(F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C) = \text{prob}(G \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}$ and from the fact that the hiding operator and the restriction do not apply to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $\text{prob}((F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L, C) = \text{prob}((G \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C)$.

- (3) Starting from $((F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ so that, in the probabilistic branching bisimulation game there are five cases based on the operational semantic rules in Table 1:

Assuming that $((F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$, there are five cases:

- If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F_1 \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_1$ and $l \notin L$, then $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that there exist \bar{G}_1 and G'_1 such that $G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{G}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a G'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{G}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} G'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow (\bar{G}_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $((F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (\bar{G}_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $((F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a ([1]F_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F_2 \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_2$ and $l \notin L$, then the proof is similar to the one of the previous case.
- If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a (F'_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F_i \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $l \in L$, then $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a F'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} G_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that there exist \bar{G}_i and G'_i such that $G_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{G}_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a G'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{G}_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $F'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} G'_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow (\bar{G}_1 \parallel_L \bar{G}_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a (G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $((F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (\bar{G}_1 \parallel_L \bar{G}_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $((F'_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (G'_1 \parallel_L G'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F_1 \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F'_1$, then $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that either $F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, or there exist \bar{G}_1 and G'_1 such that $G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{G}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a G'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{G}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $F'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} G'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. In the former subcase $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is allowed to stay idle with $((F'_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$, while in the latter subcase, since synchronization does not apply to τ , it follows that $(G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow (\bar{G}_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $((F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (\bar{G}_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $((F'_1 \parallel_L [1]F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, (G'_1 \parallel_L [1]G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- If $(F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a ([1]F_1 \parallel_L F'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $F_2 \xrightarrow{\tau}_a F'_2$, then the proof is similar to the one of the previous case.

As for probabilities, given two arbitrary probabilistic processes $H_1, H_2 \in \mathbb{P}$, we observe that $\text{prob}((F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \parallel_L (F_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}), [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}}) = \text{prob}(F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, [H_1]_{\mathcal{B}}) \cdot \text{prob}(F_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, [H_2]_{\mathcal{B}})$ and $\text{prob}((G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \parallel_L G_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}), [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}}) = \text{prob}(G_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, [H_1]_{\mathcal{B}}) \cdot$

$prob(G_2 / \mathcal{A}_H, [H_2]_{\mathcal{B}})$ (see the proof of Lemma 4.1). From $F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{pb} G_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, it follows that for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}$, $prob(F_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, C) = prob(G_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, C)$, which in turn implies that $prob((F_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \parallel_L (F_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H), [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}}) = prob((G_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \parallel_L (G_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H), [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}})$. Lastly, from the fact that the restriction operators does not apply to probabilistic transitions we conclude that $prob((F_1 \parallel_L F_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}}) = prob((G_1 \parallel_L G_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, [H_1 \parallel_L H_2]_{\mathcal{B}})$. \square

Theorem 4.4. *Let $E_1, E_2 \in \mathbb{P}_n$ or $E_1, E_2 \in \mathbb{P}_p$, $E \in \mathbb{P}$, $\approx \in \{\approx_p, \approx_{pb}\}$, and $\mathcal{P} \in \{\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx}, \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx}, \text{SBND}_{\approx}\}$. Then:*

- (1) $E \in \mathcal{P} \implies a.E \in \mathcal{P}$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}} \cup \{\tau\}$, when $E \in \mathbb{P}_p$.
- (2) $E_1, E_2 \in \mathcal{P} \implies E_1 \parallel_L E_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ for all $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}$ if $\mathcal{P} \in \{\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}, \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_{pb}}\}$ or for all $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ if $\mathcal{P} \in \{\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}, \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_p}, \text{SBND}_{\approx_p}, \text{SBND}_{\approx_{pb}}\}$.
- (3) $E \in \mathcal{P} \implies E \setminus L \in \mathcal{P}$ for all $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}$.
- (4) $E \in \mathcal{P} \implies E / L \in \mathcal{P}$ for all $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}$.

Proof. We divide the proof into two parts. In the first part we prove the theorem for the \approx_p -based properties, and in the second part we do the same for the \approx_{pb} -based properties. We first prove the results for $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$, and hence for $\text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_p}$ too by virtue of the forthcoming Theorem 4.10:

- (1) Given an arbitrary $E \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ and an arbitrary $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}} \cup \{\tau\}$, from $E \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E / \mathcal{A}_H$ we derive that $a.(E \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \approx_p a.(E / \mathcal{A}_H)$ because \approx_p is a congruence with respect to action prefix (see proof of Lemma 4.1), from which it follows that $(a.E) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p (a.E) / \mathcal{A}_H$, i.e., $a.E \in \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_p}$, because $a \notin \mathcal{A}_H$. To conclude the proof, it suffices to observe that all the processes reachable from $a.E$ after performing a are processes reachable from E , which are known to be BSNNI_{\approx_p} .
- (2) Given two arbitrary $E_1, E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ and an arbitrary $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}$, the result follows from Lemma 4.3(1) by taking Q_1 identical to G_1 and Q_2 identical to G_2 .
- (3) Given an arbitrary $E \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ and an arbitrary $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, the result follows from Lemma 4.3(2) by taking F identical to G – which will be denoted by E' – because:
 - $(E' \setminus L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p (E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \setminus L$ as the order in which restriction sets are considered is unimportant.
 - $(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \setminus L \approx_p (E' / \mathcal{A}_H) \setminus L$ due to $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E' / \mathcal{A}_H$ – as $E \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ and $E' \in \text{reach}(E)$ – and \approx_p being a congruence with respect to the restriction operator due to Lemma 4.1.
 - $(E' / \mathcal{A}_H) \setminus L \approx_p (E' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_H$ as shown in Lemma 4.3(2).
 - From the transitivity of \approx_p we obtain that $(E' \setminus L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p (E' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_H$.
- (4) Given an arbitrary $E \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ and an arbitrary $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}$, for every $E' \in \text{reach}(E)$ it holds that $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E' / \mathcal{A}_H$, from which we derive that $(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) / L \approx_p (E' / \mathcal{A}_H) / L$ because \approx_p is a congruence with respect to the hiding operator (see the proof of Lemma 4.1). Since $L \cap \mathcal{A}_H = \emptyset$, we have that $(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) / L$ is isomorphic to $(E' / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $(E' / \mathcal{A}_H) / L$ is isomorphic to $(E' / L) / \mathcal{A}_H$, hence $(E' / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p (E' / L) / \mathcal{A}_H$, i.e., E' / L is BSNNI_{\approx_p} .

We now prove the results for SBND_{\approx_p} :

- (1) Given an arbitrary $E \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_p}$ and an arbitrary $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\tau} \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, it trivially holds that $a.E \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_p}$.

- (2) Given two arbitrary $E_1, E_2 \in \text{SBNDC}_{\approx_p}$ and an arbitrary $L \subseteq A$, the result follows from Lemma 4.3(3) as can be seen by observing that whenever $E'_1 \parallel_l E'_2 \xrightarrow{h}_a E''_1 \parallel_l E''_2$ for $E'_1 \parallel_l E'_2 \in \text{reach}(E_1 \parallel_l E_2)$:
- If $E'_1 \xrightarrow{h}_a E''_1$, $E'_2 = E''_2$, and $h \notin L$, then from $E_1 \in \text{SBNDC}_{\approx_p}$ it follows that $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and hence $((E'_1 \parallel_l E'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, ((E''_1 \parallel_l E''_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}})) \in \mathcal{B}$ as $E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.
 - If $E'_2 \xrightarrow{h}_a E''_2$, $E'_1 = E''_1$, and $h \notin L$, then from $E_2 \in \text{SBNDC}_{\approx_p}$ it follows that $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and hence $((E'_1 \parallel_l E'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, ((E''_1 \parallel_l E''_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}})) \in \mathcal{B}$ as $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.
 - If $E'_1 \xrightarrow{h}_a E''_1$, $E'_2 \xrightarrow{h}_a E''_2$, and $h \in L$, then from $E_1, E_2 \in \text{SBNDC}_{\approx_p}$ it follows that $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, which in turn entail that $((E'_1 \parallel_l E'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, ((E''_1 \parallel_l E''_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}})) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- (3) Given an arbitrary $E \in \text{SBNDC}_{\approx_p}$ and an arbitrary $L \subseteq A$, for every $E' \in \text{reach}(E)$ and for every E'' such that $E' \xrightarrow{h}_a E''$ it holds that $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, from which we derive that $(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \approx_p (E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ because \approx_p is a congruence with respect to the restriction operator (see the proof of Lemma 4.1). Since $(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ is isomorphic to $(E' \setminus L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $(E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ is isomorphic to $(E'' \setminus L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, we have that $(E' \setminus L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p (E'' \setminus L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.
- (4) Given an arbitrary $E \in \text{SBNDC}_{\approx_p}$ and an arbitrary $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}$, for every $E' \in \text{reach}(E)$ and for every E'' such that $E' \xrightarrow{h}_a E''$ it holds that $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, from which we derive that $(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) / L \approx_p (E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) / L$ because \approx_p is a congruence with respect to the hiding operator (see the proof of Lemma 4.1). Since $L \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} = \emptyset$, we have that $(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) / L$ is isomorphic to $(E' / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $(E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) / L$ is isomorphic to $(E'' / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, hence $(E' / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p (E'' / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.

We now prove the same result for the \approx_{pb} -based properties. As for the first part of the proof, we first prove the results for $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$, and hence for $\text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ too by virtue of the forthcoming Theorem 4.10:

- (1) Given an arbitrary $E \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ and an arbitrary $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}} \cup \{\tau\}$, from $E \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ we derive that $a.(E \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \approx_{\text{pb}} a.(E / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}})$ because \approx_{pb} is a congruence with respect to action prefix (see Lemma 4.1), from which it follows that $(a.E) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} (a.E) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, i.e., $a.E \in \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$, because $a \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. To conclude the proof, it suffices to observe that all the processes reachable from $a.E$ after performing a are processes reachable from E , which are known to be $\text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$.
- (2) Given two arbitrary $E_1, E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ and an arbitrary $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}$, the result follows from Lemma 4.3(1) by taking Q_1 identical to G_1 and Q_2 identical to G_2 .
- (3) Given an arbitrary $E \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ and an arbitrary $L \subseteq A$, the result follows from Lemma 4.3(2) by taking F identical to G – which will be denoted by E' – because:
- $(E' \setminus L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} (E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ as the order in which restriction sets are considered is unimportant.
 - $(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \approx_{\text{pb}} (E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ due to $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ – as $E \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ and $E' \in \text{reach}(E)$ – and \approx_{pb} being a congruence with respect to the restriction operator due to Lemma 4.1.
 - $(E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \approx_{\text{pb}} (E' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as shown in Lemma 4.3(2).
 - From the transitivity of \approx_{pb} we obtain that $(E' \setminus L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p (E' \setminus L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.

- (4) Given an arbitrary $E \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ and an arbitrary $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}$, for every $E' \in \text{reach}(E)$ it holds that $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, from which we derive that $(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) / L \approx_{\text{pb}} (E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) / L$ because \approx_{pb} is a congruence with respect to the hiding operator (see the proof of Lemma 4.1). Since $L \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} = \emptyset$, we have that $(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) / L$ is isomorphic to $(E' / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $(E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) / L$ is isomorphic to $(E' / L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, hence $(E' / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} (E' / L) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, i.e., E' / L is $\text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$.

We now prove the results for $\text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$:

- (1) Given an arbitrary $E \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ and an arbitrary $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\tau} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, it trivially holds that $a.E \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$.
- (2) Given two arbitrary $E_1, E_2 \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ and an arbitrary $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, the result follows from Lemma 4.3(3) as can be seen by observing that whenever $E'_1 \parallel_l E'_2 \xrightarrow{h}_a E''_1 \parallel_l E''_2$ for $E'_1 \parallel_l E'_2 \in \text{reach}(E_1 \parallel_l E_2)$:
- If $E'_1 \xrightarrow{h}_a E''_1$, $E'_2 = E''_2$, and $h \notin L$, then from $E_1 \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ it follows that $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and hence $((E'_1 \parallel_l E'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \approx_{\text{pb}} ((E''_1 \parallel_l E'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ as $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.
 - If $E'_2 \xrightarrow{h}_a E''_2$, $E'_1 = E''_1$, and $h \notin L$, then from $E_2 \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ it follows that $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and hence $((E'_1 \parallel_l E'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \approx_{\text{pb}} ((E'_1 \parallel_l E''_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ as $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.
 - If $E'_1 \xrightarrow{h}_a E''_1$, $E'_2 \xrightarrow{h}_a E''_2$, and $h \in L$, then from $E_1, E_2 \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ it follows that $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, which in turn entail that $((E'_1 \parallel_l E'_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \approx_{\text{pb}} ((E''_1 \parallel_l E''_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- (3) Given an arbitrary $E \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ and an arbitrary $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, for every $E' \in \text{reach}(E)$ and for every E'' such that $E' \xrightarrow{h}_a E''$ it holds that $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, from which we derive that $(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L \approx_{\text{pb}} (E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ because \approx_{pb} is a congruence with respect to the restriction operator (see the proof of Lemma 4.1). Since $(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ is isomorphic to $(E' \setminus L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $(E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \setminus L$ is isomorphic to $(E'' \setminus L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, we have that $(E' \setminus L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} (E'' \setminus L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.
- (4) Given an arbitrary $E \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ and an arbitrary $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}$, for every $E' \in \text{reach}(E)$ and for every E'' such that $E' \xrightarrow{h}_a E''$ it holds that $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, from which we derive that $(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) / L \approx_{\text{pb}} (E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) / L$ because \approx_{pb} is a congruence with respect to the hiding operator (see the proof of Lemma 4.1). Since $L \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} = \emptyset$, we have that $(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) / L$ is isomorphic to $(E' / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $(E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) / L$ is isomorphic to $(E'' / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, hence $(E' / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} (E'' / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. \square

As far as parallel composition is concerned, the compositionality of $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ holds only for all $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}$. For example, both $E_1 = h.[1]\underline{0} + l_1.[1]\underline{0} + \tau.[1]\underline{0}$ and $E_2 = h.[1]\underline{0} + l_2.[1]\underline{0} + \tau.[1]\underline{0}$ are $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$, but $E_1 \parallel_{\{h\}} E_2$ is not because the transition $(E_1 \parallel_{\{h\}} E_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a ([1]\underline{0} \parallel_{\{h\}} [1]\underline{0}) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ arising from the synchronization between the two h -actions cannot be matched by $(E_1 \parallel_{\{h\}} E_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ in the probabilistic branching bisimulation game. As a matter of fact, the only two possibilities are $(E_1 \parallel_{\{h\}} E_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow (E_1 \parallel_{\{h\}} E_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a ([1]\underline{0} \parallel_{\{h\}} [1]E_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{1}_p (\underline{0} \parallel_{\{h\}} E_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a ([1]\underline{0} \parallel_{\{h\}} [1]\underline{0}) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as well as $(E_1 \parallel_{\{h\}} E_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow (E_1 \parallel_{\{h\}} E_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a ([1]E_1 \parallel_{\{h\}} [1]\underline{0}) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{1}_p (E_1 \parallel_{\{h\}} \underline{0}) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a ([1]\underline{0} \parallel_{\{h\}} [1]\underline{0}) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ but neither $([1]\underline{0} \parallel_{\{h\}} [1]E_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ nor $([1]E_1 \parallel_{\{h\}} [1]\underline{0}) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is probabilistic branching bisimilar to $(E_1 \parallel_{\{h\}} E_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ when $l_1 \neq l_2$. Note that $(E_1 \parallel_{\{h\}} E_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$

$\approx (E_1 \parallel_{\{h\}} E_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ because $(E_1 \parallel_{\{h\}} E_2) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a ([1]\underline{0} \parallel_{\{h\}} [1]\underline{0}) / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is matched by $(E_1 \parallel_{\{h\}} E_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow ([1]\underline{0} \parallel_{\{h\}} [1]\underline{0}) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. As observed in [EABR25], it is not only a matter of the higher discriminating power of \approx_{pb} with respect to \approx_{p} . If we used the CCS parallel composition operator [Mil89], which turns into τ the synchronization of two actions thus combining communication with hiding, then the parallel composition of E_1 and E_2 with restriction on $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ would be able to respond with a single τ -transition reaching the parallel composition of $\underline{0}$ and $\underline{0}$ with restriction on $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.

Like for the nondeterministic case [FG01, EABR25], none of the considered noninterference properties is compositional with respect to alternative composition. As an example, let us consider the processes $E_1 = l.\underline{0}$ and $E_2 = h.\underline{0}$, where we omit $[1]$ before $\underline{0}$. Assuming $\approx \in \{\approx_{\text{p}}, \approx_{\text{pb}}\}$, both are BSNNI_{\approx} , as $l.\underline{0} \setminus \{h\} \approx l.\underline{0} / \{h\}$ and $h.\underline{0} \setminus \{h\} \approx h.\underline{0} / \{h\}$, but $E_1 + E_2 \notin \text{BSNNI}_{\approx}$ because $(l.\underline{0} + h.\underline{0}) \setminus \{h\} \approx l.\underline{0} \not\approx l.\underline{0} + \tau.\underline{0} \approx (l.\underline{0} + h.\underline{0}) / \{h\}$. It can be easily checked that $E_1 + E_2 \notin \mathcal{P}$ for $\mathcal{P} \in \{\text{BNDC}_{\approx}, \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx}, \text{SBND}_{\approx}\}$.

4.2. Taxonomy of Security Properties. First of all, like in the nondeterministic case, the noninterference properties listed in Section 3 turn out to be increasingly finer, with the result holding for both those based on \approx_{p} and those based on \approx_{pb} .

In [EAB24] some parts of the proof of the forthcoming Theorem 4.11 proceeded by induction on the depth of the probabilistic labeled transition system underlying the process under examination. Now that the language includes recursion, which may introduce cycles, we have to follow a different proof strategy. This relies on the bisimulation-up-to technique [SM92] and requires introducing probabilistic variants of up-to weak [Mil89] and branching [Gla93] bisimulations. In doing so in our quantitative setting, we have to take into account some technicalities mentioned in [BBG98, HL97, GSS95]. In particular, given $\approx \in \{\approx_{\text{p}}, \approx_{\text{pb}}\}$ and a related bisimulation \mathcal{B} , we cannot consider the relation composition $\approx \mathcal{B} \approx$ like in the fully nondeterministic case as it may not be transitive and this would not make it possible to work with equivalence classes for the probabilistic part. Rather we have to consider $(\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx)^+ = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx)^n$ to ensure transitivity in addition to reflexivity and symmetry, where \mathcal{B}^{-1} is the inverse of \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{B} is no longer required to be an equivalence relation thus avoiding redundant information in it.

Definition 4.5. A relation \mathcal{B} over \mathbb{P} is a *weak probabilistic bisimulation up to \approx_{p}* iff, whenever $(E_1, E_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, then:

- For each $E_1 \xrightarrow{a} E'_1$ there exists $E_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} E'_2$ such that $(E'_1, E'_2) \in (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx_{\text{p}})^+$, and vice versa.
- $\text{prob}(E_1, C) = \text{prob}(E_2, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P} / (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx_{\text{p}})^+$. ■

Definition 4.6. A relation \mathcal{B} over \mathbb{P} is a *probabilistic branching bisimulation up to \approx_{pb}* iff, whenever $(E_1, E_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, then:

- for each $E_1 \xrightarrow{a} \bar{E}_1 \xrightarrow{a}_a E'_1$ with $E_1 \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{E}_1$:
 - either $a = \tau$ and $\bar{E}_1 \approx_{\text{pb}} E'_1$;
 - or there exists $E_2 \xrightarrow{a} \bar{E}_2 \xrightarrow{a}_a E'_2$ such that $(\bar{E}_1, \bar{E}_2) \in (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and $(E'_1, E'_2) \in (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$;
 and vice versa.
- $\text{prob}(E_1, C) = \text{prob}(E_2, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P} / (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$. ■

In the definition above, in the case that $a = \tau$ and $\bar{E}_1 \approx_b E'_1$, since \approx_{pb} is symmetric it holds that $E'_1 \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{E}_1 \approx_{\text{pb}} E_1 \mathcal{B} E_2$ and hence $(E'_1, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$. We now prove that the two previous notions are correct, i.e., they imply the respective bisimilarity.

Proposition 4.7. *Let $E_1, E_2 \in \mathbb{P}$ and \mathcal{B} be a weak probabilistic bisimulation up to \approx_p . If $(E_1, E_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ then $E_1 \approx_p E_2$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that $(\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx_p)^+$ is weak probabilistic bisimulation. Let $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1}$. We need to show that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ if $(E_1, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^n$ then:

- For each $E_1 \xrightarrow{a} E'_1$ then exists $E_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} E'_2$ such that $(E'_1, E'_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$.
- $\text{prob}(E_1, C) = \text{prob}(E_2, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in H/(\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$.

We treat the action clause and the probability clause separately, starting with the former. Assuming $(E_1, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^n$, we proceed by induction on n :

- If $n = 1$, then assuming $(E_1, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)$ and $E_1 \xrightarrow{a} E'_1$ we consider two cases:
 - If $(E_1, E_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$ then from $E_1 \xrightarrow{a} E'_1$ it follows that $E_1 \xrightarrow{a} E'_1$ and from the fact that \mathcal{B}' is a weak bisimulation up to \approx_p it follows that there exist $E_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} E'_2$ with $(E'_1, E'_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$.
 - $E_1 \approx_p E_2$ then from $E_1 \xrightarrow{a} E'_1$ it follows that there exist $E_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} E'_2$ with $E'_1 \approx_p E'_2$. Since $\approx_p \subseteq (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$ we then obtain $(E'_1, E'_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$.
- If $n > 1$, then assuming $(E_1, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^n$ it follows that there exist $E_3 \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $(E_1, E_3) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^{n-1}$ and $(E_3, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)$. Suppose that $E_1 \xrightarrow{a} E'_1$, by applying the induction hypothesis we obtain that there exist $E_3 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} E'_3$ with $(E'_1, E'_3) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$. From $(E_3, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)$ there are two cases:
 - If $(E_3, E_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$ then from $E_3 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} E'_3$ and from the fact that \mathcal{B}' is a weak probabilistic bisimulation up to \approx_p it follows that there exist $E_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} E'_2$ with $(E'_3, E'_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$. From $(E'_1, E'_3) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$ and $(E'_3, E'_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$ it follows that $(E'_1, E'_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$.
 - If $E_3 \approx_p E_2$ then from $E_3 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} E'_3$ it follows that there exist $E_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} E'_2$ with $E'_3 \approx_p E'_2$. Since $\approx_p \subseteq (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$ we then obtain $(E'_3, E'_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$. From $(E'_1, E'_3) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$ and $(E'_3, E'_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$ it follows that $(E'_1, E'_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$.

We now treat the probabilistic clause. Assuming $(E_1, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^n$, we proceed by induction on n :

- If $n = 1$, then assuming $(E_1, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)$ we consider two cases:
 - If $(E_1, E_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$ then from the fact that \mathcal{B}' is a weak probabilistic bisimulation up to \approx_p it follows that $\text{prob}(E_1, C) = \text{prob}(E_2, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/(\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$.
 - If $E_1 \approx_p E_2$ then observing that $\approx_p \subseteq (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$ every equivalence class of $(\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$ can be written as an union of equivalence classes of \approx_p . Then $\text{prob}(E_1, C) = \text{prob}(E_2, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/(\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$.
- If $n > 1$, then from $(E_1, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^n$ it follows that there exists E_3 such that $(E_1, E_3) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^{n-1}$ and $(E_3, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)$. By the induction hypothesis we obtain $\text{prob}(E_1, C) = \text{prob}(E_3, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/(\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$. As for $(E_3, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)$ we can apply the same reasoning done for the base case and obtain $\text{prob}(E_1, C) = \text{prob}(E_2, C) = \text{prob}(E_3, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/(\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_p)^+$. \square

Proposition 4.8. *Let $E_1, E_2 \in \mathbb{P}$ and \mathcal{B} be a probabilistic branching bisimulation up to \approx_{pb} . If $(E_1, E_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ then $E_1 \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that $(\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+ = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^n$ is a probabilistic branching bisimulation. Let $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1}$. We need to show that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ if $(E_1, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^n$ then:

- for each $E_1 \xrightarrow{a} E_1'$:
 - either $a = \tau$ and $(E_1', E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$
 - or there exists $E_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{E}_2 \xrightarrow{a} E_2'$ with $(E_1, \bar{E}_2) \in (\mathcal{B} \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and $(E_1', E_2') \in (\mathcal{B} \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$.
- $\text{prob}(E_1, C) = \text{prob}(E_2, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in H/(\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$.

We treat the action clauses and the probability clause separately. Starting with the former. Assuming $(E_1, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^n$, we proceed by induction on n :

- If $n = 1$, then assuming $(E_1, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})$ and $E_1 \xrightarrow{a} E_1'$ we consider two cases:
 - If $(E_1, E_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$ then from $E_1 \xrightarrow{a} E_1'$ it follows that $E_1 \Longrightarrow E_1 \xrightarrow{a} E_1'$ and from the fact that \mathcal{B}' is a probabilistic branching bisimulation up to \approx_{pb} there are two subcases:
 - * if $a = \tau$ then $E_1 \approx_{\text{pb}} E_1'$ and hence $(E_1, E_1') \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and by noting that $(E_1, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and by applying the transitivity and reflexivity of $(\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ we obtain $(E_1', E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$.
 - * otherwise there exist $E_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{E}_2 \xrightarrow{a} E_2'$ such that $(E_1, \bar{E}_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and $(E_1', E_2') \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and we are done.
 - If $E_1 \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2$ then:
 - * If $a = \tau$ then $E_1' \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2$ and hence $(E_1', E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$.
 - * Otherwise, there exist $E_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{E}_2 \xrightarrow{a} E_2'$ such that $E_1 \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{E}_2$ and $E_1' \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2'$. From $\approx_{\text{pb}} \subseteq (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ it follows that $(E_1, \bar{E}_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and $(E_1', E_2') \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$.
- If $n > 1$, then assuming $(E_1, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^n$ it follows that there exist $E_3 \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $(E_1, E_3) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^{n-1}$ and $(E_3, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})$. Suppose that $E_1 \xrightarrow{a} E_1'$, by applying the induction hypothesis we obtain that:
 - either $a = \tau$ and $(E_1', E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$.
 - or $E_3 \Longrightarrow \bar{E}_3 \xrightarrow{a} E_3'$ with $(E_1, \bar{E}_3) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and $(E_1', E_3') \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$.
From $(E_3, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})$ we then consider two cases:
 - If $(E_3, E_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$ then there are two further subcases:
 - * If $a = \tau$ then E_3 can stay idle and we are done because $(E_1', E_3) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and $(E_3, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})$ imply $(E_1', E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ by transitivity.
 - * otherwise, from the fact that there exist $E_3 \Longrightarrow \bar{E}_3 \xrightarrow{a} E_3'$ and that \mathcal{B} is a probabilistic branching bisimulation up to \approx_{pb} it follows that there exist $E_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{E}_2 \xrightarrow{a} E_2'$ with $(\bar{E}_3, \bar{E}_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and $(E_3', E_2') \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$. By transitivity, from $(E_1, \bar{E}_3) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and $(\bar{E}_3, \bar{E}_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ it follows that $(E_1, \bar{E}_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and from $(E_1', E_3') \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and $(E_3', E_2') \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ it follows that $(E_1', E_2') \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$.
 - If $E_3 \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2$ then there are two further subcases:
 - * If $a = \tau$ then E_3 can stay idle and we are done because $(E_1', E_3) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and $(E_3, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})$ imply $(E_1', E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$.
 - * otherwise, if $E_3 \Longrightarrow \bar{E}_3 \xrightarrow{a} E_3'$ then from $E_3 \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2$ and $E_3 \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{E}_3$ it follows by transitivity that $\bar{E}_3 \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2$. From $\bar{E}_3 \xrightarrow{a} E_3'$ it follows that there exist $E_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{E}_2 \xrightarrow{a} E_2'$ with $(\bar{E}_3, \bar{E}_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and $(E_3', E_2') \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$. By transitivity we obtain $(E_1, \bar{E}_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and $(E_1', E_2') \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$.

We now treat the probability clauses. Assuming $(E_1, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})$, we proceed by induction on n :

- If $n = 1$, then assuming $(E_1, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})$ we consider two cases:
 - If $(E_1, E_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$ then from the fact that \mathcal{B}' is a weak probabilistic bisimulation up to \approx_{p} it follows that $\text{prob}(E_1, C) = \text{prob}(E_2, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/(\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$.
 - If $E_1 \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2$ then observing that $\approx_{\text{pb}} \subseteq (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ every equivalence class of $(\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ can be written as an union of equivalence classes of \approx_{pb} . Then $\text{prob}(E_1, C) = \text{prob}(E_2, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/(\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$.
- If $n > 1$, then from $(E_1, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^n$ it follows that there exists E_3 such that $(E_1, E_3) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^{n-1}$ and $(E_1, E_3) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})$. By the induction hypothesis we obtain $\text{prob}(E_1, C) = \text{prob}(E_3, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/(\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$. As for $(E_3, E_2) \in (\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})$ we can apply the same reasoning done for the base case and obtain $\text{prob}(E_1, C) = \text{prob}(E_2, C) = \text{prob}(E_3, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/(\mathcal{B}' \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$. \square

Before presenting the taxonomy, we prove some further ancillary results about parallel composition, restriction, and hiding under SBSNNI and SBNDP.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $E, E_1, E_2 \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\approx \in \{\approx_{\text{p}}, \approx_{\text{pb}}\}$. Then:*

- (1) *If $E \in \text{SBNDP}_{\approx}$ and $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ for $E' \in \text{reach}(E)$, then $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \hat{E}'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx \hat{E}'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.*
- (2) *If $E_1, E_2 \in \text{SBNDP}_{\approx}$ and $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, then $E_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx E_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.*
- (3) *If $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx}$ and $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, then $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx ((E'_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ for all $F \in \mathbb{P}$ having only actions in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and for all $E'_1 \in \text{reach}(E_1)$ and $E'_2 \in \text{reach}(E_2)$ such that $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.*

Proof. We first prove the result for the \approx_{p} -based properties.

Let \mathcal{B} be a symmetric relation containing all the pairs of processes that have to be shown to be weak probabilistic bisimilar according to the property considered between the last two stated above:

- (1) We proceed by induction on the number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ of τ /probabilistic transitions in $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$:
 - If $n = 0$, then $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ stays idle and $E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Likewise, $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ can stay idle, i.e., $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, with $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{p}} E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as \approx_{p} is reflexive.
 - Let $n > 0$ and $E'_0 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow E'_{n-1} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} E'_n / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ or $E'_0 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow E'_{n-1} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\text{p}} E'_n / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ where $E'_0 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $E'_n / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is $E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From the induction hypothesis it follows that $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $E'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{p}} \hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. We now focus on the last performed transition, i.e., $E'_{n-1} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} E'_n / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ or $E'_{n-1} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\text{p}} E'_n / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. There are three cases, depending on whether $E'_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} E'_n$, $E'_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\text{h}}_{\text{a}} E'_n$ or $E'_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\text{p}} E'_n$:
 - If $E'_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} E'_n$, then $E'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{a}} E'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since $E'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{p}} \hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, it follows that there exists $\hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \hat{E}'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $E'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{p}} \hat{E}'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Thus we are done because $E \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \hat{E}'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.
 - If $E'_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\text{h}}_{\text{a}} E'_n$, then from $E \in \text{SBNDP}_{\approx_{\text{p}}}$ it follows that $E'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{p}} E'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since $E'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{p}} \hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and \approx_{p} is symmetric and transitive, we obtain $E'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{p}} \hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Thus we are done because $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.

- If $E'_{n-1} \xrightarrow{p}_p E'_n$ then from the fact that $E'_{n-1} / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p \hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that $\text{prob}(E'_{n-1} / \mathcal{A}_H, C) = \text{prob}(\hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, C)$ and hence there exists $\hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{q}_p \hat{E}'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ such that $\hat{E}'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \in [E'_n / \mathcal{A}_H]_{\approx_p}$.
- (2) Starting from $(E_1 / \mathcal{A}_H, E_2 / \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$, so that $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, in the weak probabilistic bisimulation game there are three cases based on the operational semantic rules in Table 1:

- If $E_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E_1 \xrightarrow{h}_a E'_1$, then $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as $h \in \mathcal{A}_H$ and $E_1 \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_p}$. Since $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, so that $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as \approx_p is symmetric and transitive, and $E'_1, E_2 \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_p}$, it follows that E_2 / \mathcal{A}_H is allowed to stay idle with $(E'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H, E_2 / \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- If $E_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a E'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E_1 \xrightarrow{l}_a E'_1$, then $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_H$. From $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that there exists E'_2 such that $E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\hat{l}} E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Thus $E_2 / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\hat{l}} E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H$. Since $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E'_1, E'_2 \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_p}$, we have $(E'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H, E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- If $E_1 / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E_1 \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E'_1$, then the proof is similar to the previous one, with the additional possibility that, in response to $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, $E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ stays idle with $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, so that E_2 / \mathcal{A}_H stays idle too with $(E'_1 / \mathcal{A}_H, E_2 / \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ because $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $E'_1, E_2 \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_p}$.

As for probabilities, it is sufficient to notice that from $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that $\text{prob}(E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, C) = \text{prob}(E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P} / \approx_p$, and since the hiding and restriction operators do not apply to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $\text{prob}(E_1 / \mathcal{A}_H, C) = \text{prob}(E_2 / \mathcal{A}_H, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P} / \mathcal{B}$.

- (3) Starting from $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $((E'_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ related by \mathcal{B} , so that $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H$, in the weak probabilistic bisimulation game there are six cases based on the operational semantic rules in Table 1. In the first two cases, it is $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ to move first:

- If $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ we observe that from $E'_2 \in \text{reach}(E_2)$ and $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ it follows that $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H$, so that $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, i.e., $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, as \approx_p is symmetric and transitive. As a consequence, since $l \neq \tau$ there exists E''_2 such that $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l} E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Thus, $((E'_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l} ((E''_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $(E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, ((E''_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ – because $E''_1 \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $E''_2 \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$.
- If $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ then we observe that from $E'_2 \in \text{reach}(E_2)$ and $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ it follows that $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H$, so that on the one hand $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, i.e., $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, while on the other hand $E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \not\approx_p E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, i.e., $E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \not\approx_p E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. As a consequence, there exists E''_2 such that $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau} E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Therefore, $(E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, ((E''_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ – because $E''_1 \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $E''_2 \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$.

In the other four cases, instead, it is $((E'_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ to move first:

- If $((E'_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a ((E''_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E'_2 \xrightarrow{l}_a E''_2$ so that $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l}_a E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_H$, we observe that from $E'_2 \in \text{reach}(E_2)$ and $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ it follows that $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H$, so that $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$,

- i.e., $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Consequently, since $l \neq \tau$ there exists E''_1 such that $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l} E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Therefore, $((E'_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \in \mathcal{B}$ – because $E''_1 \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $E''_2 \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$.
- If $((E'_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow ((E''_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E'_2 \Longrightarrow E''_2$ so that $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as $\tau \notin \mathcal{A}_H$, we observe that from $E'_2 \in \text{reach}(E_2)$ and $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ it follows that $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H$, so that $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, i.e., $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Hence, there exists E''_1 such that $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Therefore, $((E'_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \in \mathcal{B}$ – because $E''_1 \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $E''_2 \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$.
 - If $((E'_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow ((E'_2 \parallel_L F') / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $F \Longrightarrow F'$, then trivially $((E'_2 \parallel_L F') / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $((E'_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a ((E''_2 \parallel_L F') / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E'_2 \xrightarrow{h}_a E''_2$ – so that $E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E''_2 / \mathcal{A}_H$ as $h \in \mathcal{A}_H$ – and $F \xrightarrow{h}_a F'$ for $h \in L$, we observe that from $E'_2, E''_2 \in \text{reach}(E_2)$ and $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ it follows that $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H$ and $E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E''_2 / \mathcal{A}_H$, so that $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, i.e., $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Hence, there exists E''_1 such that $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Therefore, $((E'_2 \parallel_L F') / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \in \mathcal{B}$ – because $E''_1 \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $E''_2 \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$.

As for probabilities, we observe that from the fact that $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_p E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H$ it follows that for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}$, $\text{prob}(E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, C) = \text{prob}(E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H, C)$. If we consider $((E'_2 \parallel_L F') / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ we observe that since F' can only perform high level actions, which are later hidden or restricted, the processes that F' reaches by performing a probabilistic transition do not change the equivalence class reached by $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_H (see the first part of this case). This implies that $\text{prob}(E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, C) = \text{prob}(((E'_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}$.

We now prove the results for the \approx_{pb} -based properties. Let \mathcal{B} be a symmetric relation containing all the pairs of processes that have to be shown to be probabilistic branching bisimilar according to the property considered between the last two stated above:

- (1) We proceed by induction on the number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ of τ /probabilistic transitions in $E' / \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow E'' / \mathcal{A}_H$:
 - If $n = 0$, then E' / \mathcal{A}_H stays idle and E'' / \mathcal{A}_H is E' / \mathcal{A}_H . Likewise, $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ can stay idle, i.e., $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, with $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as \approx_{pb} is reflexive.
 - Let $n > 0$ and $E'_0 / \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow E'_{n-1} / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E'_n / \mathcal{A}_H$ or $E'_0 / \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow E'_{n-1} / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{p}_p E'_n / \mathcal{A}_H$ where E'_0 / \mathcal{A}_H is E' / \mathcal{A}_H and E'_n / \mathcal{A}_H is E'' / \mathcal{A}_H . From the induction hypothesis it follows that $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow \hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} \hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. We now focus on the last performed transition, i.e., $E'_{n-1} / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E'_n / \mathcal{A}_H$ or $E'_{n-1} / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{p}_p E'_n / \mathcal{A}_H$. There are three cases, depending on whether $E'_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E'_n$, $E'_{n-1} \xrightarrow{h}_a E'_n$ or $E'_{n-1} \xrightarrow{p}_p E'_n$:
 - If $E'_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E'_n$, then $E'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Since $E'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} \hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, it follows that:
 - * Either $E'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} \hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, in which case $\hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ stays idle and we are done because $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \Longrightarrow \hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$.

- * Or $\hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \hat{E}''_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a \hat{E}'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $E'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \hat{E}''_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $E'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \hat{E}'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, in which case we are done because $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \hat{E}'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.
 - If $E'_{n-1} \xrightarrow{h}_a E'_n$, then from $E \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ it follows that $E'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since $E'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and \approx_{pb} is symmetric and transitive, we obtain $E'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Thus we are done because $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.
 - If $E'_{n-1} \xrightarrow{p}_p E'_n$ then from the fact that $E'_{n-1} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that $\text{prob}(E'_{n-1} / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C) = \text{prob}(\hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C)$ and hence there exists $\hat{E}'_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{q}_p \hat{E}'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ such that $\hat{E}'_n \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \in [E'_n / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}]_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$.
- (2) Starting from $(E_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, E_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$, so that $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, in the probabilistic branching bisimulation game there are three cases based on the operational semantic rules in Table 1:
- If $E_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E'_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $E_1 \xrightarrow{h}_a E'_1$, then $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $h \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $E_1 \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$. Since $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, so that $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as \approx_{pb} is symmetric and transitive, and $E'_1, E_2 \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$, it follows that $E_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is allowed to stay idle with $(E'_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, E_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $E_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a E'_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $E_1 \xrightarrow{l}_a E'_1$, then $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that there exist \bar{E}_2 and E'_2 such that $E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{E}_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{E}_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $P'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} P'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Thus $E_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{E}_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{E}_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $E_1, \bar{E}_2 \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ and $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $E'_1, E'_2 \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$, we have $(E_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, \bar{E}_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(E'_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $E_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E'_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $E_1 \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E'_1$, then the proof is similar to the previous one, with the additional possibility that, in response to $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, $E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ stays idle with $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, so that $E_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ stays idle too with $(E'_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, E_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ because $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $E'_1, E_2 \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$.
- As for probabilities, it is sufficient to notice that from $E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that $\text{prob}(E_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C) = \text{prob}(E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P} / \approx_{\text{pb}}$, and since the hiding and restriction operators do not apply to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $\text{prob}(E_1 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C) = \text{prob}(E_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P} / \mathcal{B}$.
- (3) Starting from $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $((E'_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ related by \mathcal{B} , so that $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, in the probabilistic branching bisimulation game there are six cases based on the operational semantic rules in Table 1. In the first two cases, it is $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ to move first:
- If $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ we observe that from $E'_2 \in \text{reach}(E_2)$ and $E_2 \in \text{SBSN}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ it follows that $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, so that $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E'_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, i.e., $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, as \approx_{pb} is symmetric and transitive. As a consequence, since $l \neq \tau$ there exist \bar{E}_2 and E''_2 such that $E'_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{E}_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{E}_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E''_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Thus, $((E'_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow ((\bar{E}_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{l}_a ((E''_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $(E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, ((\bar{E}_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ – because $E'_1 \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $\bar{E}_2 \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{E}_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSN}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ – and $(E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, ((E''_2 \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ – because $E''_1 \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $E''_2 \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E''_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSN}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$.
 - If $E'_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E''_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ there are two subcases:

- If $E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' / \mathcal{A}_H$ then $(E_2' \parallel_L F) / L \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ is allowed to stay idle with $(E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, ((E_2' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ because $E_1'' \in \text{reach}(E_1)$ and $E_2' \in \text{reach}(E_2)$.
- If $E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \not\approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' / \mathcal{A}_H$ we observe that from $E_2' \in \text{reach}(E_2)$ and $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ it follows that $E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' / \mathcal{A}_H$, so that on the one hand $E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, i.e., $E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, while on the other hand $E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \not\approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, i.e., $E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \not\approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. As a consequence, there exist \bar{E}_2' and E_2'' such that $E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \implies \bar{E}_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau} E_2'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{E}_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Therefore, $((E_2' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \implies ((\bar{E}_2' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau} ((E_2'' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $(E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, ((\bar{E}_2' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ – because $E_1'' \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $\bar{E}_2' \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{E}_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ – and $(E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, ((E_2'' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ – because $E_1'' \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $E_2'' \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$.

In the other four cases, instead, it is $((E_2' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ to move first:

- If $((E_2' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l} ((E_2'' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E_2' \xrightarrow{l} E_2''$ so that $E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l} E_2'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as $l \notin \mathcal{A}_H$, we observe that from $E_2' \in \text{reach}(E_2)$ and $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ it follows that $E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' / \mathcal{A}_H$, so that $E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, i.e., $E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Consequently, since $l \neq \tau$ there exist \bar{E}_1' and E_1'' such that $E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \implies \bar{E}_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{l} E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{E}_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $E_2'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Therefore, $((E_2' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, \bar{E}_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ – because $\bar{E}_1' \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $E_2' \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $\bar{E}_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' / \mathcal{A}_H$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ – and $((E_2'' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ – because $E_1'' \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $E_2'' \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2'' / \mathcal{A}_H$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$.
- If $((E_2' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau} ((E_2'' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E_2' \xrightarrow{\tau} E_2''$ so that $E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau} E_2'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ as $\tau \notin \mathcal{A}_H$, we observe that from $E_2' \in \text{reach}(E_2)$ and $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ it follows that $E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' / \mathcal{A}_H$, so that $E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, i.e., $E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. There are two subcases:
 - If $E_2'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ then $E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ is allowed to stay idle with $((E_2'' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ because $E_1' \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $E_2'' \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2'' / \mathcal{A}_H$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$.
 - If $E_2'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \not\approx_{\text{pb}} E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ then there exist \bar{E}_1' and E_1'' such that $E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \implies \bar{E}_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau} E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{E}_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $E_2'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. Therefore, $((E_2' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, \bar{E}_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ – because $\bar{E}_1' \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $E_2' \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $\bar{E}_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' / \mathcal{A}_H$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ – and $((E_2'' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$ – because $E_1'' \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $E_2'' \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2'' / \mathcal{A}_H$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$.
- If $((E_2' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau} ((E_2' \parallel_L F') / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $F \xrightarrow{\tau} F'$, then trivially $((E_2' \parallel_L F') / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H, E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- If $((E_2' \parallel_L F) / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau} ((E_2'' \parallel_L F') / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ with $E_2' \xrightarrow{h} E_2''$ – so that $E_2' / \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau} E_2'' / \mathcal{A}_H$ as $h \in \mathcal{A}_H$ – and $F \xrightarrow{h} F'$ for $h \in L$, we observe that from $E_2', E_2'' \in \text{reach}(E_2)$ and $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ it follows that $E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' / \mathcal{A}_H$ and $E_2'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2'' / \mathcal{A}_H$, so that $E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \xrightarrow{\tau} E_2'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$ and $E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2' / \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$, i.e., $E_2' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H \approx_{\text{pb}} E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_H$. There are two subcases:

- If $E_2'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ then $E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is allowed to stay idle with $((E_2'' \parallel_L F') / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathcal{B}$ because $E_1' \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $E_2'' \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$.
- If $E_2'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \not\approx_{\text{pb}} E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ then there exist \bar{E}_1' and E_1'' such that $E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{E}_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_a E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $E_2'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{E}_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $E_2'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Therefore, $((E_2'' \parallel_L F') / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, \bar{E}_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathcal{B}$ – because $\bar{E}_1' \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $E_2'' \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $\bar{E}_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ – and $((E_2'' \parallel_L F') / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathcal{B}$ – because $E_1'' \in \text{reach}(E_1)$, $E_2'' \in \text{reach}(E_2)$, and $E_1'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E_2'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $E_2 \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$.

As for probabilities, we observe that from the fact that $E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p E_2'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that $\text{prob}(E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C) = \text{prob}(E_2'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P} / \approx_{\text{pb}}$. If we consider $((E_2'' \parallel_L F') / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ we observe that since F' can only perform high level actions, which are later hidden or restricted, the processes that F' reaches by performing a probabilistic transition do not change the equivalence class reached by $E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $E_2'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ (see the first part of this case). This implies that $\text{prob}(E_1' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C) = \text{prob}(((E_2'' \parallel_L F') / L) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathbb{P} / \mathcal{B}$. \square

Theorem 4.10. *Let $\approx \in \{\approx_p, \approx_{\text{pb}}\}$. Then:*

$$\text{SBND}_{\approx} \subset \text{SBSN}_{\approx} = \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx} \subset \text{BNDC}_{\approx} \subset \text{BSN}_{\approx}$$

Proof. We first prove the results for the \approx_p -based properties. Let us examine each relationship separately:

- $\text{SBND}_{\approx_p} \subset \text{SBSN}_{\approx_p}$. Given $E \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_p}$, the result follows by proving that the binary relation $\mathcal{B} = \{(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \mid E' \in \text{reach}(E)\}$ is a weak probabilistic bisimulation up to \approx_p . Starting from $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ related by \mathcal{B} , in the up-to weak probabilistic bisimulation game there are three cases based on the operational semantic rules in Table 1. In the first case, it is $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ to move first:
 - If $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{a} E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}} \cup \{\tau\}$, then $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $\tau, a \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, with $(E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and hence $(E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx_p)^+$.
 In the other two cases, instead, it is $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ to move first (note that possible τ -transitions arising from high actions in $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ can no longer be executed when starting from $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$):
 - If $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{a} E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}} \cup \{\tau\}$, then there exist $\bar{E}', \bar{E}'' \in \text{reach}(E')$ such that $\bar{E}' \xrightarrow{a}_{\tau} \bar{E}''$ and hence $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{E}' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{a}_{\tau} \bar{E}'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{E}' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and by Lemma 1 (2) it follows that there exists $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \hat{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $\bar{E}' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p \hat{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $\bar{E}' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{a}_{\tau} \bar{E}'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that there exist $\hat{E}'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} \hat{E}'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $\bar{E}'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p \hat{E}'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $\bar{E}'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ by Lemma 1 (2) it then follows that there exist $\hat{E}''' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \hat{E}''' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p \hat{E}''' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Summing up, we have that $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} \hat{E}''' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p \hat{E}''' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and hence $(E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, \hat{E}''' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx_p)^+$.
 - If $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau} E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $\bar{E}' \xrightarrow{h}_{\tau} \bar{E}''$, for some $\bar{E}', \bar{E}'' \in \text{reach}(E')$, then the result directly follows from Lemma 4.9, because there exist $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \hat{E}'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ such that $E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p \hat{E}'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and hence $(E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, \hat{E}'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx_p)^+$.

As for probabilities, from the fact that the hiding and restriction operator do not apply to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $\text{prob}(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C) = \text{prob}(E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C)$ for all $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}$.

- $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p} = \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_p}$. We first prove that $\text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_p} \subseteq \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$. If $E \in \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_p}$, then $E' \in \text{BNDC}_{\approx_p}$ for every $E' \in \text{reach}(E)$. Since $\text{BNDC}_{\approx_p} \subseteq \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ as will be shown in the last case of the proof of this part of the theorem, $E' \in \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ for every $E' \in \text{reach}(E)$, i.e., $E \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$.
The fact that $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p} \subseteq \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_p}$ follows from Lemma 4.9(3) by taking E'_1 identical to E'_2 and both reachable from $P \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$.
- $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p} \subseteq \text{BNDC}_{\approx_p}$. If $E \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p} = \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_p}$, then it immediately follows that $E \in \text{BNDC}_{\approx_p}$.
- $\text{BNDC}_{\approx_p} \subseteq \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_p}$. If $E \in \text{BNDC}_{\approx_p}$, i.e., $E \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p (E \parallel_L F) / L \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ for all $F \in \mathbb{P}$ such that every $F' \in \text{reach}(F)$ executes only actions in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and for all $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, then we can consider in particular \hat{F} capable of stepwise mimicking the high-level behavior of E , in the sense that \hat{F} is able to synchronize with all the high-level actions executed by E and its reachable processes, along with $\hat{L} = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. As a consequence $(E \parallel_{\hat{L}} \hat{F}) / \hat{L} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is isomorphic to $E / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, hence $E \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p E / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, i.e., $E \in \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_p}$.

We now prove the same results for the \approx_{pb} -based properties. Let us examine each relationship separately:

- $\text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}} \subseteq \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$. Given $E \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$, the result follows by proving that the binary relation $\mathcal{B} = \{(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}), (E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \mid E' \in \text{reach}(E)\}$ is a probabilistic branching bisimulation up to \approx_{pb} . Starting from $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ related by \mathcal{B} , in the up-to branching bisimulation game there are three cases based on the operational semantic rules in Table 1. In the first case, it is $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ to move first:
 - If $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{a}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}} E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $\bar{E}' \xrightarrow{a}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}} E''$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}} \cup \{\tau\}$, then $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{E}' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{a}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}} E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $\tau, a \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, with $(\bar{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, \bar{E}' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and hence $(\bar{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, \bar{E}' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and $(E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$.
 In the other two cases, instead, it is $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ to move first (note that possible τ -transitions arising from high actions in $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ can no longer be executed when starting from $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$):
 - If $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{E}' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{a}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}} E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $\bar{E}' \xrightarrow{a}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}} E''$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}} \cup \{\tau\}$, then $\bar{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{a}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}} E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as $a \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{E}' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ implies $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \hat{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $\bar{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \hat{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ by virtue of Lemma 4.9(1), from $\bar{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{a}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}} E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that:
 - * Either $a = \tau$ and $E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \hat{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, hence $\bar{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ as \approx_{pb} is symmetric and transitive. From Lemma 4.9(2) it then follows that $\bar{E}' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ because $\bar{E}', E'' \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$. Therefore $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ can stay idle in the up-to branching bisimulation game.
 - * Or $\hat{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \hat{E}'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{a}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}} \hat{E}''' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $\bar{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \hat{E}'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \hat{E}''' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. From $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \hat{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ it follows that $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \hat{E}'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{a}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}} \hat{E}''' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $\bar{E}' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \bar{E}' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \mathcal{B} \bar{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \hat{E}'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \mathcal{B} E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} \hat{E}''' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and hence $(\bar{E}' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, \hat{E}'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$ and $(E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, \hat{E}''' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \in (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}^{-1} \cup \approx_{\text{pb}})^+$.
 - If $E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \Longrightarrow \bar{E}' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}} E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $\bar{E}' \xrightarrow{h}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}} E''$, we observe that $\bar{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ cannot perform any h -action as $h \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, nor we know whether it can perform a τ -action –

moreover $(E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) \notin \mathcal{B}$ when E'' is different from E' , hence the need of resorting to the up-to technique. However, from $\bar{E}' \in reach(E)$ and $E \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ it follows that $\bar{E}' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E'' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, hence $\bar{E}' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E'' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ by virtue of Lemma 4.9 (2) because $\bar{E}', E'' \in \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$. Therefore $E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ can stay idle in the up-to probabilistic branching bisimulation game.

As for probabilities, from the fact that the hiding and restriction operator do not apply to probabilistic transitions, it follows that $prob(E' \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C) = prob(E' / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, C)$ for all $C \in \mathbb{P}/\mathcal{B}$.

- $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}} = \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$. We first prove that $\text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}} \subseteq \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$. If $E \in \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$, then $E' \in \text{BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ for every $E' \in reach(E)$. Since $\text{BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}} \subseteq \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ as will be shown in the last case of the proof of this theorem, $E' \in \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ for every $E' \in reach(E)$, i.e., $E \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$.

The fact that $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}} \subseteq \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ follows from Lemma 4.9(3) by taking E'_1 identical to E'_2 and both reachable from $P \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$.

- $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}} \subseteq \text{BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$. If $E \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}} = \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$, then it immediately follows that $E \in \text{BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$.
- $\text{BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}} \subseteq \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$. If $E \in \text{BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$, i.e., $E \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} (E \parallel_L F) / L \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ for all $F \in \mathbb{P}$ such that every $F' \in reach(F)$ executes only actions in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and for all $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, then we can consider in particular \hat{F} capable of stepwise mimicking the high-level behavior of E , in the sense that \hat{F} is able to synchronize with all the high-level actions executed by E and its reachable processes, along with $\hat{L} = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. As a consequence $(E \parallel_{\hat{L}} \hat{F}) / \hat{L} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is isomorphic to $E / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, hence $E \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_{\text{pb}} E / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, i.e., $E \in \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$. \square

All the inclusions above are strict as we now show:

- The process $\tau.l.\underline{0} + l.l.\underline{0} + h.l.\underline{0}$ is SBSNNI_{\approx} (resp. P_BDNC_{\approx}) because $(\tau.l.\underline{0} + l.l.\underline{0} + h.l.\underline{0}) \setminus \{h\} \approx (\tau.l.\underline{0} + l.l.\underline{0} + h.l.\underline{0}) / \{h\}$ and action h is enabled only by the initial process so every derivative is BSNNI_{\approx} (resp. BNDC_{\approx}). It is not SBND_{\approx} because the low-level view of the process reached after action h , i.e., $(l.\underline{0}) \setminus \{h\}$, is not \approx -equivalent to $(\tau.l.\underline{0} + l.l.\underline{0} + h.l.\underline{0}) \setminus \{h\}$.
- The process $l.\underline{0} + l.l.\underline{0} + l.h.l.\underline{0}$ is BNDC_{\approx} because, whether there are synchronizations with high-level actions or not, the overall process can always perform either an l -action or a sequence of two l -actions. The process is not SBSNNI_{\approx} (resp. P_BNDC_{\approx}) because the reachable process $h.l.\underline{0}$ is not BSNNI_{\approx} (resp. BNDC_{\approx}).
- The process $l.\underline{0} + h.h.l.\underline{0}$ is BSNNI_{\approx} due to $(l.\underline{0} + h.h.l.\underline{0}) \setminus \{h\} \approx (l.\underline{0} + h.h.l.\underline{0}) / \{h\}$, but is not BNDC_{\approx} due to $((l.\underline{0} + h.h.l.\underline{0}) \parallel_{\{h\}} (h.\underline{0})) / \{h\} \setminus \{h\} \not\approx (l.\underline{0} + h.h.l.\underline{0}) \setminus \{h\}$ as $(l.\underline{0} + h.h.l.\underline{0}) \setminus \{h\}$ behaves as $l.\underline{0}$.

Secondly, we observe that all the \approx_{pb} -based noninterference properties imply the corresponding \approx_{p} -based ones, due to the fact that \approx_{pb} is finer than \approx_{p} .

Theorem 4.11. *The following inclusions hold:*

- (1) $\text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}} \subseteq \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{p}}}$.
- (2) $\text{BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}} \subseteq \text{BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{p}}}$.
- (3) $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}} \subseteq \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{p}}}$.
- (4) $\text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}} \subseteq \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{p}}}$.
- (5) $\text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}} \subseteq \text{SBND}_{\approx_{\text{p}}}$. \blacksquare

All the inclusions above are strict due to the following result; for an example of E_1 and E_2 below, see Figure 1.




Figure 2: Taxonomy of security properties based on probabilistic bisimilarities

Theorem 4.12. *Let $E_1, E_2 \in \mathbb{P}_n$ be such that $E_1 \approx_p E_2$ but $E_1 \not\approx_{pb} E_2$. If no high-level actions occur in E_1 and E_2 , then $F \in \{E_1 + h. [1]E_2, E_2 + h. [1]E_1\}$ is such that:*

- (1) $F \in \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ but $F \notin \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$.
- (2) $F \in \text{BNDC}_{\approx_p}$ but $F \notin \text{BNDC}_{\approx_{pb}}$.
- (3) $F \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ but $F \notin \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$.
- (4) $F \in \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_p}$ but $F \notin \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_{pb}}$.
- (5) $F \in \text{SBNDC}_{\approx_p}$ but $F \notin \text{SBNDC}_{\approx_{pb}}$.

Proof. Let F be $E_1 + h. [1]E_2$:

- (1) Let \mathcal{B} be a weak probabilistic bisimulation witnessing $E_1 \approx_p E_2$. Then $F \in \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ because the symmetric relation $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \cup \{(F \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}), (F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}, F \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}})\}$ turns out to be a weak probabilistic bisimulation too. The only interesting case is the one where $F / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, which is isomorphic to $E_1 + \tau. [1]E_2$, performs a τ -action toward $[1]E_2 / \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, which is isomorphic to $[1]E_2$. In that case $F \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$, which is isomorphic to E_1 , can respond by staying idle, because from $(E_2, E_1) \in \mathcal{B}$ it follows that $([1]E_2, E_1) \in \mathcal{B}$, and hence $([1]E_2, E_1) \in \mathcal{B}'$.
On the other hand, $F \notin \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$ because $E_2 \not\approx_{pb} E_1$ in the same situation as before.
- (2) Since $F \in \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ and no high-level actions occur in every process reachable from F , it holds that $F \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ and hence $F \in \text{BNDC}_{\approx_p}$ by virtue of Theorem 4.10.
On the other hand, from $F \notin \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$ it follows that $F \notin \text{BNDC}_{\approx_{pb}}$ by virtue of Theorem 4.10.
- (3) We already know from the previous case that $F \in \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$.
On the other hand, from $F \notin \text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$ it follows that $F \notin \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$ by virtue of Theorem 4.10.
- (4) A straightforward consequence of $\text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_p} = \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ (Theorem 4.10) and $\text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_{pb}} = \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$ (Theorem 4.10).
- (5) Since the only high-level action occurring in F is h , in the proof of $F \in \text{SBNDC}_{\approx_p}$ the only interesting case is the transition $F \xrightarrow{h}_a [1]E_2$, for which it holds that $F \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \approx_p E_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ because the former is isomorphic to E_1 , the latter is isomorphic to E_2 , and $E_1 \approx_p E_2$.
On the other hand, $F \notin \text{SBNDC}_{\approx_{pb}}$ because $E_1 \not\approx_{pb} E_2$ in the same situation as before. □

Based on the results in Theorems 4.10 and 4.11, the diagram in Figure 2 summarizes the inclusions among the various noninterference properties, where $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ means that \mathcal{P} is strictly included in \mathcal{Q} . These inclusions follow the same pattern as the nondeterministic case [EABR25]. The missing arrows in the diagram, witnessing incomparability, are justified by the following counterexamples:

- SBND_{\approx_p} vs. $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$. The process $\tau.l.\underline{0} + l.l.\underline{0} + h.l.\underline{0}$ is $\text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$ as $\tau.l.\underline{0} + l.l.\underline{0} \approx_{pb} \tau.l.\underline{0} + l.l.\underline{0} + \tau.l.\underline{0}$. It is also $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$ because every reachable process does not enable any more high-level actions. However, it is not SBND_{\approx_p} , because after executing the high-level action h it can perform a single action l , while the original process with the restriction on high-level actions can go along a path where it performs two l -actions. On the other hand, the process F mentioned in Theorem 4.12 is SBND_{\approx_p} but neither $\text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$ nor $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$.
- $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ vs. $\text{BNDC}_{\approx_{pb}}$. The process $l.h.l.\underline{0} + l.\underline{0} + l.l.\underline{0}$ is $\text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$ as $l.\underline{0} + l.\underline{0} + l.l.\underline{0} \approx_{pb} l.\tau.l.\underline{0} + l.\underline{0} + l.l.\underline{0}$. The same process is $\text{BNDC}_{\approx_{pb}}$ too as it includes only one high-level action, hence the only possible high-level strategy coincides with the check conducted by $\text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$. However, the process is not $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ because of the reachable process $h.l.\underline{0}$, which is not BSNNI_{\approx_p} . On the other hand, the process F mentioned in Theorem 4.12 is $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_p}$ but not $\text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$ and, therefore, cannot be $\text{BNDC}_{\approx_{pb}}$.
- BNDC_{\approx_p} vs. $\text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$. The process $l.\underline{0} + l.([0.5]h_1.l_1.\underline{0} \oplus [0.5]h_2.l_2.\underline{0}) + l.([0.5]l_1.\underline{0} \oplus [0.5]l_2.\underline{0})$ is $\text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$ as discussed in Section 3, but it is not BNDC_{\approx_p} . In contrast, the process F mentioned in Theorem 4.12 is both BSNNI_{\approx_p} and BNDC_{\approx_p} , but not $\text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$.

As for the nondeterministic case [EABR25], the strongest property based on weak probabilistic bisimilarity (SBND_{\approx_p}) and the weakest property based on probabilistic branching bisimilarity ($\text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{pb}}$) are incomparable too. The former is a very restrictive property because it requires a local check every time a high-level action is performed, while the latter requires a check only on the initial state. On the other hand, as shown in Theorem 4.12, it is very easy to construct processes that are secure under properties based on \approx_p but not on \approx_{pb} , due to the minimal number of high-level actions in F .

4.3. Relating Nondeterministic and Probabilistic Taxonomies. We now compare our probabilistic taxonomy to the nondeterministic one of [EABR25]. In the following, we assume that \approx denotes the nondeterministic weak bisimilarity of [Mil89] and \approx_b the branching bisimilarity of [GW96]. These can be obtained by restricting the definitions in Section 2.2 to nondeterministic states and by ignoring the clause involving the *prob* function. Since we are considering probabilistic choices as internal, given a process $E \in \mathbb{P}$ we can obtain its nondeterministic variant, denoted by $nd(E)$, by replacing each probability prefix with τ and each probabilistic choice operator with a nondeterministic choice operator. The next proposition states that if two processes are equivalent according to any of the weak bisimilarities in Section 2.2, then their nondeterministic variants are equivalent according to the corresponding nondeterministic bisimilarity.

Proposition 4.13. *Let $E_1, E_2 \in \mathbb{P}$. Then:*

- $E_1 \approx_p E_2 \implies nd(E_1) \approx nd(E_2)$.
- $E_1 \approx_{pb} E_2 \implies nd(E_1) \approx_b nd(E_2)$.

Proof. In the following, we denote by $\xrightarrow{\tau^*}_a$ a possibly empty sequence of τ transitions.

- We need to prove that the symmetric relation $\mathcal{B} = \{nd(E_1), nd(E_2) \mid E_1 \approx_p E_2\}$ is a weak bisimulation. We start by observing that from $E_1 \approx_p E_2$ it follows that for each $E_1 \xrightarrow{a}_a E'_1$ there exists $E_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} E'_2$ with $E'_1 \approx_p E'_2$ and since $nd(E_1)$ and $nd(E_2)$ are obtained by replacing each probabilistic transition with τ transitions it follows that for each $nd(E_1) \xrightarrow{a}_a nd(E'_1)$ there exist $nd(E_2) \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} nd(E'_2)$ with $(nd(E'_1), nd(E'_2)) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- We need to prove that the symmetric relation $\mathcal{B} = \{nd(E_1), nd(E_2) \mid E_1 \approx_{pb} E_2\}$ is a branching bisimulation. We start by observing that from $E_1 \approx_{pb} E_2$ it follows that for each $E_1 \xrightarrow{a}_a E'_1$ then either $a = \tau$ and $E'_1 \approx_{pb} E_2$ or there exists $E_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{E}_2 \xrightarrow{a}_a E'_2$ with $E_1 \approx_{pb} \bar{E}_2$ and $E'_1 \approx_{pb} E'_2$. Since $nd(E_1)$ and $nd(E_2)$ are obtained by replacing each probabilistic transition with τ transitions it follows that for each $nd(E_1) \xrightarrow{a}_a nd(E'_1)$ then either $a = \tau$ and $(nd(E'_1), nd(E_2)) \in \mathcal{B}$ or there exists $nd(E_2) \xrightarrow{\tau^*}_a nd(\bar{E}_2) \xrightarrow{a}_a nd(E'_2)$ with $(nd(E_1), nd(\bar{E}_2)) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(nd(E'_1), nd(E'_2)) \in \mathcal{B}$. \square

The inverse does not hold. Consider, e.g., the processes E_1 and E_2 defined as $[0.5]l_1 . \underline{0} \oplus [0.5]l_2 . \underline{0}$ and $[0.8]l_1 . \underline{0} \oplus [0.2]l_2 . \underline{0}$ respectively. Clearly, $E_1 \not\approx_p E_2$ (resp. $E_1 \not\approx_{pb} E_2$) but their nondeterministic counterparts are identical: $\tau . l_1 . \underline{0} + \tau . l_2 . \underline{0}$. An immediate consequence is that if a process is secure under any of the probabilistic noninterference properties of Section 3, then its nondeterministic variant is secure under the corresponding nondeterministic property. Therefore, the taxonomy of Figure 2 extends to the left the one in [EABR25], as each of the property of Section 3 is finer than its nondeterministic counterpart.

Corollary 4.14. *Let $\mathcal{P}_{pr} \in \{\text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{pr}}, \text{BNDC}_{\approx_{pr}}, \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{pr}}, \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_{pr}}, \text{SBNDC}_{\approx_{pr}}\}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{nd} \in \{\text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{nd}}, \text{BNDC}_{\approx_{nd}}, \text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{nd}}, \text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_{nd}}, \text{SBNDC}_{\approx_{nd}}\}$ for $\approx_{pr} \in \{\approx_p, \approx_{pb}\}$ and $\approx_{nd} \in \{\approx, \approx_b\}$, where \mathcal{P}_{nd} is meant to be the nondeterministic variant of \mathcal{P}_{pr} . Let $E \in \mathbb{P}$. Then $E \in \mathcal{P}_{pr} \implies nd(E) \in \mathcal{P}_{nd}$.*

Proof. The result follows directly from Proposition 4.13. \square

5. REVERSIBILITY VIA WEAK PROBABILISTIC BACK-AND-FORTH BISIMILARITY

In [DMV90] it was shown that, over nondeterministic processes, weak back-and-forth bisimilarity coincides with branching bisimilarity. In this section we extend that result so that probabilistic branching bisimilarity can be employed in the noninterference analysis of reversible processes featuring nondeterminism and probabilities.

A PLTS $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}_\tau, \longrightarrow)$ represents a reversible process if each of its transitions is seen as bidirectional. When going backward, it is of paramount importance to respect causality, i.e., the last performed transition must be the first one to be undone. Following [DMV90] we set up an equivalence that enforces not only causality but also history preservation. This means that, when going backward, a process can only move along the path representing the history that brought the process to the current state even in the presence of concurrency. To accomplish this, the equivalence has to be defined over computations, not over states, and the notion of transition has to be suitably revised. We start by adapting the notation of the nondeterministic setting of [DMV90] to our strictly alternating probabilistic setting. We use ℓ for a label in $\mathcal{A}_\tau \cup \mathbb{R}_{]0,1[}$.

Definition 5.1. A sequence $\xi = (s_0, \ell_1, s_1)(s_1, \ell_2, s_2) \dots (s_{n-1}, \ell_n, s_n) \in \longrightarrow^*$ is a *path* of length n from state s_0 . We let $first(\xi) = s_0$ and $last(\xi) = s_n$; the empty path is indicated with ε . We denote by $path(s)$ the set of paths from s . \blacksquare

Definition 5.2. A pair $\rho = (s, \xi)$ is called a *run* from state s iff $\xi \in \text{path}(s)$, in which case we let $\text{path}(\rho) = \xi$, $\text{first}(\rho) = \text{first}(\xi) = s$, $\text{last}(\rho) = \text{last}(\xi)$, with $\text{first}(\rho) = \text{last}(\rho) = s$ when $\xi = \varepsilon$. We denote by $\text{run}(s)$ the set of runs from state s . Given $\rho = (s, \xi) \in \text{run}(s)$ and $\rho' = (s', \xi') \in \text{run}(s')$, their composition $\rho\rho' = (s, \xi\xi') \in \text{run}(s)$ is defined iff $\text{last}(\rho) = \text{first}(\rho') = s'$. We write $\rho \xrightarrow{\ell} \rho'$ iff there exists $\rho'' = (\bar{s}, (\bar{s}, \ell, s'))$ with $\bar{s} = \text{last}(\rho)$ such that $\rho' = \rho\rho''$; note that $\text{first}(\rho) = \text{first}(\rho')$. Moreover *prob* is lifted in the expected way. \blacksquare

In the considered PLTS we work with the set \mathcal{U} of runs in lieu of \mathcal{S} . Following [DMV90], given a run ρ we distinguish between *outgoing* and *incoming* action transitions of ρ during the weak bisimulation game. Like in [BM23], this does not apply to probabilistic transitions, which are thus considered only in the forward direction. If the labels of incoming probabilistic transitions were taken into account, then the nondeterministic state $a.\underline{0}$ and the probabilistic state $[p]a.\underline{0} \oplus [1-p]a.\underline{0}$ would be told apart because $a.\underline{0}$ in the former state has no incoming probabilistic transitions while $a.\underline{0}$ in the latter state is reached with cumulative probability 1. Even a simpler clause requiring for any two related states that they both have incoming probabilistic transitions, or neither has, would distinguish the two states exemplified before.

Definition 5.3. Let $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}_\tau, \longrightarrow)$ be a PLTS. We say that $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ are *weakly probabilistic back-and-forth bisimilar*, written $s_1 \approx_{\text{pbf}} s_2$, iff $((s_1, \varepsilon), (s_2, \varepsilon)) \in \mathcal{B}$ for some weak probabilistic back-and-forth bisimulation \mathcal{B} . An equivalence relation \mathcal{B} over \mathcal{U} is a *weak probabilistic back-and-forth bisimulation* iff, whenever $(\rho_1, \rho_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, then:

- For each $\rho_1 \xrightarrow{a} \rho'_1$ there exists $\rho_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} \rho'_2$ such that $(\rho'_1, \rho'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- For each $\rho'_1 \xrightarrow{a} \rho_1$ there exists $\rho'_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} \rho_2$ such that $(\rho'_1, \rho'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- $\text{prob}(\rho_1, C) = \text{prob}(\rho_2, C)$ for all equivalence classes $C \in \mathcal{U}/\mathcal{B}$. \blacksquare

We show that weak probabilistic back-and-forth bisimilarity over runs coincides with \approx_{pb} , the forward-only probabilistic branching bisimilarity over states. We proceed by adopting the proof strategy followed in [DMV90] to show that their weak back-and-forth bisimilarity over runs coincides with the forward-only branching bisimilarity over states of [GW96]. Therefore we start by proving that \approx_{pbf} satisfies the *cross property*. This means that, whenever two runs of two \approx_{pbf} -equivalent states can perform a sequence of finitely many τ -transitions alternating with probabilistic transitions, such that each of the two target runs ends in a nondeterministic state and is \approx_{pbf} -equivalent to the source run of the other sequence, then the two target runs are \approx_{pbf} -equivalent to each other as well.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ with $s_1 \approx_{\text{pbf}} s_2$. For all $\rho'_1, \rho''_1 \in \text{run}(s_1)$ such that $\rho'_1 \Longrightarrow \rho''_1$ with $\text{last}(\rho'_1) \in \mathcal{S}_n$ and for all $\rho'_2, \rho''_2 \in \text{run}(s_2)$ such that $\rho'_2 \Longrightarrow \rho''_2$ with $\text{last}(\rho'_2) \in \mathcal{S}_n$, if $\rho'_1 \approx_{\text{pbf}} \rho'_2$ and $\rho''_1 \approx_{\text{pbf}} \rho''_2$ then $\rho'_1 \approx_{\text{pbf}} \rho''_2$.*

Proof. Given $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ with $s_1 \approx_{\text{pbf}} s_2$, consider the reflexive and symmetric relation $\mathcal{B} = \approx_{\text{pbf}} \cup \{(\rho''_1, \rho'_2), (\rho'_1, \rho''_2) \in (\text{run}(s_1) \times \text{run}(s_2)) \cup (\text{run}(s_2) \times \text{run}(s_1)) \mid \text{last}(\rho'_1) \in \mathcal{S}_n \wedge \text{last}(\rho'_2) \in \mathcal{S}_n \wedge \exists \rho'_1 \in \text{run}(s_1), \rho'_2 \in \text{run}(s_2). \rho'_1 \Longrightarrow \rho''_1 \wedge \rho'_2 \Longrightarrow \rho''_2 \wedge \rho'_1 \approx_{\text{pbf}} \rho'_2 \wedge \rho''_1 \approx_{\text{pbf}} \rho''_2\}$. The result will follow by proving that \mathcal{B} is a weak probabilistic back-and-forth bisimulation, because this implies that $\rho'_1 \approx_{\text{pbf}} \rho''_2$ for every additional pair – i.e., \mathcal{B} satisfies the cross property – as well as $\mathcal{B} = \approx_{\text{pbf}}$ – hence \approx_{pbf} satisfies the cross property too.

Let $(\rho''_1, \rho'_2) \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \approx_{\text{pbf}}$ to avoid trivial cases. Then there exist $\rho'_1 \in \text{run}(s_1)$ and $\rho'_2 \in \text{run}(s_2)$ such that $\rho'_1 \Longrightarrow \rho''_1$, $\rho'_2 \Longrightarrow \rho''_2$, $\rho'_1 \approx_{\text{pbf}} \rho'_2$, and $\rho''_1 \approx_{\text{pbf}} \rho''_2$. For action transitions we examine the forward and backward directions separately:

- In the forward case, assume that $\rho_1'' \xrightarrow{a} \rho_1'''$, from which it follows that $\rho_1' \Longrightarrow \rho_1'' \xrightarrow{a} \rho_1'''$. Since $\rho_1' \approx_{\text{pbf}} \rho_2''$, we obtain $\rho_2'' \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{a} \rho_2'''$, or $\rho_2'' \Longrightarrow \rho_2'''$ when $a = \tau$, with $\rho_1''' \approx_{\text{pbf}} \rho_2'''$ and hence $(\rho_1''', \rho_2''') \in \mathcal{B}$. Starting from $\rho_2'' \xrightarrow{a} \rho_2'''$ one exploits $\rho_2' \Longrightarrow \rho_2''$ and $\rho_1' \approx_{\text{pbf}} \rho_2'$ instead.
- In the backward case, assume that $\rho_1''' \xrightarrow{a} \rho_1''$. Since $\rho_1'' \approx_{\text{pbf}} \rho_2'$, we obtain $\rho_2''' \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{a} \rho_2''$ $\Longrightarrow \rho_2'$, so that $\rho_2'' \Longrightarrow \xrightarrow{a} \rho_2'''$, or $\rho_2'' \Longrightarrow \rho_2'''$ when $a = \tau$, so that $\rho_2'' \Longrightarrow \rho_2'''$, with $\rho_1''' \approx_{\text{pbf}} \rho_2'''$ and hence $(\rho_1''', \rho_2''') \in \mathcal{B}$. Starting from $\rho_2'' \xrightarrow{a} \rho_2'''$ one exploits $\rho_1' \approx_{\text{pbf}} \rho_2''$ and $\rho_1' \Longrightarrow \rho_1''$ instead.

As for probabilities, since $\text{last}(\rho_1'') \in \mathcal{S}_n$ and $\text{last}(\rho_2'') \in \mathcal{S}_n$ we have that $\text{prob}(\rho_1'', \bar{C}) = 1 = \text{prob}(\rho_2'', \bar{C})$ if \bar{C} is the equivalence class containing ρ_1'' and ρ_2'' , while $\text{prob}(\rho_1'', C) = 0 = \text{prob}(\rho_2'', C)$ for any other $C \in \mathcal{U}/\mathcal{B}$. \square

Theorem 5.5. *Let $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}$. Then $s_1 \approx_{\text{pbf}} s_2 \iff s_1 \approx_{\text{pb}} s_2$.*

Proof. The proof is divided into two parts:

- Suppose that $s_1 \approx_{\text{pbf}} s_2$ and let \mathcal{B} be a weak probabilistic back-and-forth bisimulation over \mathcal{U} such that $((s_1, \varepsilon), (s_2, \varepsilon)) \in \mathcal{B}$. Assume that \mathcal{B} only contains all the pairs of \approx_{pbf} -equivalent runs in $\text{run}(s_1) \cup \text{run}(s_2)$, so that Lemma 5.4 is applicable to \mathcal{B} . We show that $\mathcal{B}' = \{(\text{last}(\rho_1), \text{last}(\rho_2)) \mid (\rho_1, \rho_2) \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is a probabilistic branching bisimulation over \mathcal{S} , from which $s_1 \approx_{\text{pb}} s_2$ will follow.

Given $(\text{last}(\rho_1), \text{last}(\rho_2)) \in \mathcal{B}'$, by definition of \mathcal{B}' we have that $(\rho_1, \rho_2) \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $r_k = \text{last}(\rho_k)$ for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, so that $(r_1, r_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$. Suppose that $r_1 \xrightarrow{a} r_1'$, i.e., $\rho_1 \xrightarrow{a} \rho_1'$ where $\text{last}(\rho_1') = r_1'$. There are two cases:

- If $a = \tau$, then $\rho_2 \Longrightarrow \rho_2'$ with $(\rho_1', \rho_2') \in \mathcal{B}$. This means that there is a sequence of $n \geq 0$ transitions of the form $\rho_{2,i} \xrightarrow{\tau} \rho_{2,i+1}$ or $\rho_{2,i} \xrightarrow{p_i} \rho_{2,i+1}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ – with τ -transitions and probabilistic transitions alternating – where $\rho_{2,0}$ is ρ_2 while $\rho_{2,n}$ is ρ_2' so that $(\rho_1', \rho_{2,n}) \in \mathcal{B}$.

If $n = 0$ then ρ_2' is ρ_2 and we are done because $(\rho_1', \rho_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ and hence $r_2 \Longrightarrow r_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{\tau}} r_2$ with $(r_1, r_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$ and $(r_1', r_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$, otherwise within $\rho_{2,n}$ we can go back to $\rho_{2,n-1}$ via $\rho_{2,n-1} \xrightarrow{\tau} \rho_{2,n}$ or $\rho_{2,n-1} \xrightarrow{p_{n-1}} \rho_{2,n}$. If it is a τ -transition and ρ_1' can match it by doing nothing, so that $(\rho_1', \rho_{2,n-1}) \in \mathcal{B}$, or it is a probabilistic transition with $(\rho_1', \rho_{2,n-1}) \in \mathcal{B}$, and $n = 1$ then we are done because $(\rho_1', \rho_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ and hence $r_2 \Longrightarrow r_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{\tau}} r_2$ with $(r_1, r_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$ and $(r_1', r_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$, otherwise we can go back to $\rho_{2,n-2}$ via $\rho_{2,n-2} \xrightarrow{\tau} \rho_{2,n-1}$ or $\rho_{2,n-2} \xrightarrow{p_{n-2}} \rho_{2,n-1}$. By repeating this procedure, either we get to $(\rho_1', \rho_{2,0}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and we are done because $(\rho_1', \rho_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ and hence $r_2 \Longrightarrow r_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{\tau}} r_2$ with $(r_1, r_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$ and $(r_1', r_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$, or for some $0 < m \leq n$ such that $(\rho_1', \rho_{2,m}) \in \mathcal{B}$ we have that the incoming transition $\rho_{2,m-1} \xrightarrow{\tau} \rho_{2,m}$ is matched by $\bar{\rho}_1 \Longrightarrow \rho_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} \rho_1'$ with $(\bar{\rho}_1, \rho_{2,m-1}) \in \mathcal{B}$.

In the latter case, since $\text{last}(\rho_1) \in \mathcal{S}_n$, $\text{last}(\rho_{2,m-1}) \in \mathcal{S}_n$, $\bar{\rho}_1 \Longrightarrow \rho_1$, $\rho_2 \Longrightarrow \rho_{2,m-1}$, $(\bar{\rho}_1, \rho_{2,m-1}) \in \mathcal{B}$, and $(\rho_1, \rho_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, from Lemma 5.4 it follows that $(\rho_1, \rho_{2,m-1}) \in \mathcal{B}$.

In conclusion $\rho_2 \Longrightarrow \rho_{2,m-1} \xrightarrow{\tau} \rho_{2,m}$ with $(\rho_1, \rho_{2,m-1}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(\rho_1', \rho_{2,m}) \in \mathcal{B}$, so $r_2 \Longrightarrow \text{last}(\rho_{2,m-1}) \xrightarrow{\tau} \text{last}(\rho_{2,m})$ with $(r_1, \text{last}(\rho_{2,m-1})) \in \mathcal{B}'$ and $(r_1', \text{last}(\rho_{2,m})) \in \mathcal{B}'$.

- If $a \neq \tau$, then $\rho_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{\rho}_2 \xrightarrow{a} \bar{\rho}_2' \Longrightarrow \rho_2'$ with $(\rho_1', \rho_2') \in \mathcal{B}$.

From $\bar{\rho}_2' \Longrightarrow \rho_2'$ and $(\rho_1', \rho_2') \in \mathcal{B}$ it follows that $\bar{\rho}_1' \Longrightarrow \rho_1'$ with $(\bar{\rho}_1', \bar{\rho}_2') \in \mathcal{B}$. Since $\rho_1 \xrightarrow{a} \rho_1'$ and hence the last transition in ρ_1' is labeled with a , we derive that $\bar{\rho}_1'$ is ρ_1' and hence $(\rho_1', \bar{\rho}_2') \in \mathcal{B}$.

From $\bar{\rho}_2 \xrightarrow{a}_a \bar{\rho}'_2$ and $(\rho'_1, \bar{\rho}'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ it follows that $\bar{\rho}_1 \Longrightarrow \rho_1 \xrightarrow{a}_a \rho'_1$ with $(\bar{\rho}_1, \bar{\rho}_2) \in \mathcal{B}$. Since $last(\rho_1) \in \mathcal{S}_n$, $last(\bar{\rho}_2) \in \mathcal{S}_n$, $\bar{\rho}_1 \Longrightarrow \rho_1$, $\rho_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{\rho}_2$, $(\bar{\rho}_1, \bar{\rho}_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, and $(\rho_1, \rho_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, from Lemma 5.4 it follows that $(\rho_1, \bar{\rho}_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.

In conclusion $\rho_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{\rho}_2 \xrightarrow{a}_a \bar{\rho}'_2$ with $(\rho_1, \bar{\rho}_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(\rho'_1, \bar{\rho}'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, hence $r_2 \Longrightarrow last(\bar{\rho}_2) \xrightarrow{a}_a last(\bar{\rho}'_2)$ with $(r_1, last(\bar{\rho}_2)) \in \mathcal{B}'$ and $(r'_1, last(\bar{\rho}'_2)) \in \mathcal{B}'$.

As for probabilities, each equivalence class $C' \in \mathcal{S}/\mathcal{B}'$ is of the form $[last(\rho)]_{\mathcal{B}'} = \{last(\rho') \mid (last(\rho), last(\rho')) \in \mathcal{B}'\} = last(\{\rho' \mid (\rho, \rho') \in \mathcal{B}'\}) = last([\rho]_{\mathcal{B}})$, i.e., $C' = last(C)$ for some equivalence class $C \in \mathcal{U}/\mathcal{B}$, provided that function $last$ is lifted from runs to sets of runs. Therefore, for all $C' \in \mathcal{S}/\mathcal{B}'$ such that $C' = last(C)$ for some $C \in \mathcal{U}/\mathcal{B}$, $prob(r_1, C') = prob(\rho_1, C) = prob(\rho_2, C) = prob(r_2, C')$.

- Suppose that $s_1 \approx_{\text{pb}} s_2$ and let \mathcal{B} be a probabilistic branching bisimulation over \mathcal{S} such that $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{B}$. Assume that \mathcal{B} only contains all the pairs of \approx_{pb} -equivalent states reachable from s_1 and s_2 . We show that $\mathcal{B}' = \{(\rho_1, \rho_2), (\rho_2, \rho_1) \in (run(s_1) \times run(s_2)) \cup (run(s_2) \times run(s_1)) \mid (last(\rho_1), last(\rho_2)) \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is a weak probabilistic back-and-forth bisimulation over \mathcal{U} , from which $(s_1, \varepsilon) \approx_{\text{pbf}} (s_2, \varepsilon)$, i.e., $s_1 \approx_{\text{pbf}} s_2$, will follow.

Given $(\rho_1, \rho_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$, by definition of \mathcal{B}' we have that $(last(\rho_1), last(\rho_2)) \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $r_k = last(\rho_k)$ for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, so that $(r_1, r_2) \in \mathcal{B}$. For action transitions we examine the forward and backward directions separately:

- If $\rho_1 \xrightarrow{a}_a \rho'_1$, i.e., $r_1 \xrightarrow{a}_a r'_1$ where $r'_1 = last(\rho'_1)$, then $r_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{r}_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}}_a r'_2$ with $(r_1, \bar{r}_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(r'_1, r'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, hence $\rho_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}}_a \rho'_2$ where $last(\rho'_2) = r'_2$ so that $(\rho'_1, \rho'_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$.
- If $\rho'_1 \xrightarrow{a}_a \rho_1$, i.e., $r'_1 \xrightarrow{a}_a r_1$ where $r'_1 = last(\rho'_1)$, there are two cases:
 - * If ρ'_1 is (s_1, ε) then $r'_1 \xrightarrow{a}_a r_1$ is $s_1 \xrightarrow{a}_a r_1$ and $last(\rho'_1) = s_1$. Therefore $s_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{r}_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}}_a r_2$ with $(s_1, \bar{r}_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(r_1, r_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, hence $\rho'_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}}_a \rho_2$ where $last(\rho'_2) = s_2$ so that $(\rho'_1, \rho'_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$.
 - * If ρ'_1 is not (s_1, ε) then s_1 reaches $last(\rho'_1)$ with a sequence of moves that are \mathcal{B} -compatible with those with which s_2 reaches some $r'_2 = last(\rho'_2)$ such that $(r'_1, r'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ as \mathcal{B} only contains all the states reachable from s_1 and s_2 . Therefore $r'_2 \Longrightarrow \bar{r}_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}}_a r_2$ with $(r'_1, \bar{r}_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(r_1, r_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, hence $\rho'_2 \xrightarrow{\hat{a}}_a \rho_2$ with $(\rho'_1, \rho'_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$.

As for probabilities, each equivalence class $C' \in \mathcal{U}/\mathcal{B}'$ is of the form $[\rho]_{\mathcal{B}'} = \{\rho' \mid (last(\rho), last(\rho')) \in \mathcal{B}'\} = \{\rho' \mid last(\rho') \in [last(\rho)]_{\mathcal{B}}\}$, i.e., C' corresponds to a precise equivalence class $C_{C'} \in \mathcal{S}/\mathcal{B}$. Therefore, for all $C' \in \mathcal{U}/\mathcal{B}'$, $prob(\rho_1, C') = prob(last(\rho_1), C_{C'}) = prob(last(\rho_2), C_{C'}) = prob(\rho_2, C')$. \square

Therefore the properties $\text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$, $\text{BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$, $\text{SBSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$, $\text{P_BNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$, and $\text{SBNDC}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$ do not change if \approx_{pb} is replaced by \approx_{pbf} . This allows us to study noninterference properties for reversible systems featuring nondeterminism and probabilities by using \approx_{pb} in a probabilistic process calculus like the one of Section 2.3, without having to resort to external memories [DK04] of communication keys [PU07].

6. USE CASE: PROBABILISTIC SMART CONTRACTS

Probabilistic modeling [ARL20] and verification [SLHX24, KV24] of smart contracts for blockchain-based, decentralized systems enable an in-depth analysis of potential vulnerabilities. This is even more important if we consider that probabilistic smart contracts for financial and gaming applications [CGP19, QHL⁺23, PBP⁺21] have recently emerged in

modern systems. In fact, subtle effects may be hidden in the implementation of randomness or in the inherent behavior of the smart contract.

As an example, in this section we employ our noninterference approach to analyze two vulnerabilities of a lottery implemented with a probabilistic smart contract [CGP19] based on a public blockchain like, e.g., Ethereum. The first vulnerability can only be revealed by considering the probabilistic behavior of the smart contract, while the second one is intended to motivate the need to consider the greater expressive power of branching bisimilarity semantics over weak bisimilarity semantics.

In the lottery, initially anyone can buy a ticket by invoking a dedicated smart contract function that allows one to pay a predefined amount for the ticket. When the lottery is closed, anyone can invoke another smart contract function, call it `draw()`, in which a random number x , between 1 and the number of sold tickets, is drawn and the entire money is paid to the owner of ticket x .

The first critical point that we consider is the randomization procedure of function `draw()`, which is not natively available to smart contract programmers. A widely adopted approach consists of using the timestamp of the block including the transaction of the `draw()` invocation as the seed for random number generation. However, this approach is vulnerable in the presence of a malicious miner – who is also a lottery participant and hence buys a ticket – succeeding in mining the aforementioned block by choosing a timestamp that allows the miner to win the lottery.

Since both honest users and the malicious miner employ the same functionalities of the smart contract, we consider the invocations of smart contract functions as publicly observable low-level actions. To distinguish the interactions of the malicious miner from those of honest users, such actions are guarded by a high-level action h whenever they refer to the malicious miner. In this way, by looking at the public behavior of the smart contract, a low-level observer can detect whether or not the functioning of the lottery can be compromised by the malicious miner.

For simplicity, we assume that there are only two users buying one ticket each, where the malicious miner is the user buying ticket 1 whilst the honest user buys ticket 2. This scenario can be modeled in our probabilistic framework as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \tau . draw . ([0.5]address_1 . win_1 . \mathbb{0} \oplus [0.5]address_2 . win_2 . \mathbb{0}) + \\ & h . draw . ([1 - \varepsilon]address_1 . win_1 . \mathbb{0} \oplus [\varepsilon]address_2 . win_2 . \mathbb{0}) \end{aligned}$$

The invocation of function `draw()` (action $draw$) shall lead to the probabilistic extraction of the ticket, the determination of the winner (actions $address_i$), and the notification of the winner (actions win_i). The initial nondeterministic choice between action τ and the only high-level action h models the situation in which this procedure, instead of being fair, might be guided by the malicious miner, who is able to pilot the extraction at will ($\varepsilon > 0$ is considered to be negligible).

As far as nondeterministic noninterference analysis is concerned, the process above does not leak any information. More precisely, its nondeterministic variant satisfies all the security properties, for both nondeterministic weak bisimilarity and branching bisimilarity. The reason is that if we abstract away from probabilities, the behavior of the malicious miner is indistinguishable from the behavior of the honest user. However, the process is not $BSNNI_{\approx_{pr}}$ for $\approx_{pr} \in \{\approx_p, \approx_{pb}\}$, hence both bisimilarities can be used to capture the aforementioned interference in the probabilistic setting. For instance, consider the case of $BSNNI_{\approx_p}$ and observe that the version of the process with high-level actions hidden – which includes both the branch with fair extraction and the branch with unfair extraction – and the version of

the process with high-level actions restricted – which includes only the fair branch – cannot be weakly probabilistic bisimilar. The reason is that $[0.5]N_1 \oplus [0.5]N_2 \not\approx_p [1 - \varepsilon]N_1 \oplus [\varepsilon]N_2$ for any pair of nondeterministic processes N_1 and N_2 when $\varepsilon \neq 0.5$.

The second critical issue that we consider starts from the assumption that the seed cannot be manipulated by the malicious miner. In spite of this limitation, the malicious miner can exploit another vulnerability that emerges because of the peculiarities of the mining procedure. In fact, if the malicious miner realizes that he is going to lose the lottery and succeeds in mining the block, he can simply ignore the transaction related to the lottery extraction and force its rollback. We model such a behavior through the following process:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{draw} . ([0.5]\text{address}_1 . \text{win}_1 . (\tau . (\tau . \text{failure} . \underline{0} + \text{success} . \underline{0})) \oplus \\ & \quad [0.5]\text{address}_2 . \text{win}_2 . (\tau . (\tau . \text{failure} . \underline{0} + \text{success} . \underline{0})) + \\ & \quad \quad h . (\tau . (\tau . \text{failure} . \underline{0} + \text{success} . \underline{0}) + \tau . \text{failure} . \underline{0})) \end{aligned}$$

With respect to the previous case, the malicious miner cannot affect the probabilistic behavior of the smart contract, i.e., the extraction procedure. However, he can try to interfere if the outcome of the extraction makes him lose, i.e., it is different from ticket 1.

On the one hand, consider the branch after action win_1 , which models the block mining procedure. The first τ -action expresses that the honest user is picked. The subsequent choice is between the successful mining (action success) and an event not depending on the miner (action τ) that causes the failure of the mining (action failure). Notice that there might be several causes for such a failure, e.g., a wrong transaction in the block, a fork in the blockchain, and so on. On the other hand, in the branch after action win_2 , the malicious miner decides to participate actively in the mining procedure, as can be seen from the choice between the action τ , leading to the same behavior surveyed above, and the high-level action h . In this case, the race between the malicious miner and the honest user is solved nondeterministically through a choice between two τ -actions. The former leads to the behavior of the honest user, while the latter enables the behavior of the malicious miner, who decides deterministically to cause the failure as can be seen from the second branch leading immediately to the action failure .

Formally, the process is SBNDC_{\approx_p} . Indeed, observing that we have only one occurrence of the high-level action h , it holds that the subprocess $N_1 = \tau . (\tau . \text{failure} . \underline{0} + \text{success} . \underline{0})$ – denoting the low-level view before executing h – is weakly probabilistic bisimilar to the subprocess $N_2 = \tau . (\tau . \text{failure} . \underline{0} + \text{success} . \underline{0}) + \tau . \text{failure} . \underline{0}$ – denoting the low-level view after executing h .

However, the process is not $\text{BSNNI}_{\approx_{\text{pb}}}$. In fact, the subprocess N_1 is not probabilistic branching bisimilar to the subprocess $N_1 + \tau . N_2$. This is because $N_1 \not\approx_{\text{pb}} N_2$ while they are equated by \approx_p . In essence, N_1 cannot respond whenever N_2 executes the right-hand action τ leading to a state where only the action failure is possible.

Intuitively, by applying the back-and-forth line of reasoning to the subprocess N_2 following action h , undoing the latter action failure reveals that the failure has been forced by the malicious miner, while undoing the former action failure reveals that the failure has been the consequence of a choice involving also the action success . This is sufficient to expose the behavior of the malicious miner, which, however, would not be detected by analyzing only the forward computations.

To conclude, the noninterference analysis based on the strongest \approx_p -based property of Figure 2 fails to reveal the covert channel caused by the malicious miner, while the weakest \approx_{pb} -based property of Figure 2 can detect it.

7. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have investigated a taxonomy of noninterference properties for processes featuring both nondeterminism and probabilities according to the strictly alternating model [HJ90], along with the preservation and compositionality aspects of such properties. The two behavioral equivalences that we have considered for those noninterference properties are a weak probabilistic bisimilarity inspired by the one in [PLS00] and the probabilistic branching bisimilarity of [AGT12].

Since we have shown that the latter coincides with a probabilistic variant of the weak back-and-forth bisimilarity of [DMV90], the noninterference properties based on the latter can be applied to reversible probabilistic systems, thereby extending our previous results in [EABR25] for reversible systems that are fully nondeterministic. Our work also extends the one of [ABG04], where generative-reactive probabilistic systems are considered [GSS95], in a way that avoids additional universal quantifications over probabilistic parameters in the formalization of noninterference properties.

In the strictly alternating model of [HJ90] states are divided into nondeterministic and probabilistic. Each of the former may have action-labeled transitions to probabilistic states, while each of the latter may have probability-labeled transitions to nondeterministic states. In the non-strictly alternating variant of [PLS00] action transitions are admitted also between two nondeterministic states. An alternative model is the non-alternating one given by Segala simple probabilistic automata [Seg95], where every transition is labeled with an action and goes from a state to a probability distribution over states. Regardless of the adopted model, it is worth observing that some characteristics seem to be independent from probabilities, as witnessed by almost all the counterexamples in Section 4.

Both the alternating model and the non-alternating one – whose relationships have been studied in [ST05] – encompass nondeterministic models, generative models, and reactive models as special cases. Since branching bisimulation semantics plays a fundamental role in reversible systems [DMV90, BE23], in this paper we have adopted the alternating model because of the probabilistic branching bisimulation congruence developed for it in [AGT12] along with equational and logical characterizations and a polynomial-time decision procedure. In the non-alternating model, for which branching bisimilarity has been just defined in [SL94], weak variants of bisimulation semantics require – to achieve transitivity – that a single transition be matched by a convex combination of several transitions – corresponding to the use of randomized schedulers – which causes such equivalences to be less manageable although they can be decided in polynomial time [TH15].

With respect to the earlier version of our study [EAB24], the considered process language now supports recursion. Like in [EABR25], this has required us to develop a number of ancillary results and resort to the bisimulation-up-to technique [SM92]. As for the latter, we have introduced the corresponding definitions for \approx_p and \approx_{pb} inspired by [Mil89, Gla93, HL97, BBG98] and proven their correctness.

As for future work, we are planning to further extend the noninterference taxonomy so as to include properties that take into account also stochastic aspects of process behavior like in [HMPR21]. In that work actions are extended with rates expressing exponentially distributed durations, while following the approach of the present paper we should consider action execution separated from stochastic time passing as in [Her02]. The two different views, i.e., integrated time and orthogonal time, can be reconciled as shown in [BCT16]. In any case, it seems necessary to develop a notion of stochastic branching bisimilarity and

– along the lines of [BM23] – prove that it coincides with a stochastic variant of the weak back-and-forth bisimilarity of [DMV90].

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research has been supported by the PRIN 2020 project *NiRvAna – Noninterference and Reversibility Analysis in Private Blockchains*.

REFERENCES

- [AB11] A. Aldini and M. Bernardo. Component-oriented verification of noninterference. *Journal of Systems Architecture*, 57:282–293, 2011.
- [ABG04] A. Aldini, M. Bravetti, and R. Gorrieri. A process-algebraic approach for the analysis of probabilistic noninterference. *Journal of Computer Security*, 12:191–245, 2004.
- [AGT12] S. Andova, S. Georgievska, and N. Trcka. Branching bisimulation congruence for probabilistic systems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 413:58–72, 2012.
- [Ald06] A. Aldini. Classification of security properties in a Linda-like process algebra. *Science of Computer Programming*, 63:16–38, 2006.
- [ARL20] D. Azzolini, F. Riguzzi, and E. Lamma. Modeling smart contracts with probabilistic logic programming. In *Proc. of the 23rd Int. Business Information Systems Workshops (BIS 2020)*, LNBIP, pages 86–98. Springer, 2020.
- [BBG98] M. Bravetti, M. Bernardo, and R. Gorrieri. A note on the congruence proof for recursion in Markovian bisimulation equivalence. In *Proc. of the 6th Int. Workshop on Process Algebra and Performance Modelling (PAPM 1998)*, pages 71–87, 1998.
- [BCT16] M. Bernardo, F. Corradini, and L. Tesei. Timed process calculi with deterministic or stochastic delays: Commuting between durational and durationless actions. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 629:2–39, 2016.
- [BE23] M. Bernardo and A. Esposito. Modal logic characterizations of forward, reverse, and forward-reverse bisimilarities. In *Proc. of the 14th Int. Symp. on Games, Automata, Logics, and Formal Verification (GANDALF 2023)*, volume 390 of *EPTCS*, pages 67–81, 2023.
- [Ben73] C.H. Bennett. Logical reversibility of computation. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 17:525–532, 1973.
- [BH97] C. Baier and H. Hermanns. Weak bisimulation for fully probabilistic processes. In *Proc. of the 9th Int. Conf. on Computer Aided Verification (CAV 1997)*, volume 1254 of *LNCS*, pages 119–130. Springer, 1997.
- [BHR84] S.D. Brookes, C.A.R. Hoare, and A.W. Roscoe. A theory of communicating sequential processes. *Journal of the ACM*, 31:560–599, 1984.
- [BLM⁺23] M. Bernardo, I. Lanese, A. Marin, C.A. Mezzina, S. Rossi, and C. Sacerdoti Coen. Causal reversibility implies time reversibility. In *Proc. of the 20th Int. Conf. on the Quantitative Evaluation of Systems (QEST 2023)*, volume 14287 of *LNCS*, pages 270–287. Springer, 2023.
- [BM23] M. Bernardo and C.A. Mezzina. Bridging causal reversibility and time reversibility: A stochastic process algebraic approach. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 19(2):6:1–6:27, 2023.
- [BT03] R. Barbuti and L. Tesei. A decidable notion of timed non-interference. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 54:137–150, 2003.
- [CGP19] K. Chatterjee, A.K. Goharshady, and A. Pourdamghani. Probabilistic smart contracts: Secure randomness on the blockchain. In *Proc. of the 1st IEEE Int. Conf. on Blockchain and Cryptocurrency (ICBC 2019)*, pages 403–412. IEEE-CS Press, 2019.
- [DK04] V. Danos and J. Krivine. Reversible communicating systems. In *Proc. of the 15th Int. Conf. on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 2004)*, volume 3170 of *LNCS*, pages 292–307. Springer, 2004.
- [DK05] V. Danos and J. Krivine. Transactions in RCCS. In *Proc. of the 16th Int. Conf. on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 2005)*, volume 3653 of *LNCS*, pages 398–412. Springer, 2005.
- [DMV90] R. De Nicola, U. Montanari, and F. Vaandrager. Back and forth bisimulations. In *Proc. of the 1st Int. Conf. on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 1990)*, volume 458 of *LNCS*, pages 152–165. Springer, 1990.

- [EAB24] A. Esposito, A. Aldini, and M. Bernardo. Noninterference analysis of reversible probabilistic systems. In *Proc. of the 44th Int. Conf. on Formal Techniques for Distributed Objects, Components, and Systems (FORTE 2024)*, volume 14678 of *LNCS*, pages 39–59. Springer, 2024.
- [EABR25] A. Esposito, A. Aldini, M. Bernardo, and S. Rossi. Noninterference analysis of reversible systems: An approach based on branching bisimilarity. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 21(1):6:1–6:28, 2025.
- [FG01] R. Focardi and R. Gorrieri. Classification of security properties. In *Proc. of the 1st Int. School on Foundations of Security Analysis and Design (FOSAD 2000)*, volume 2171 of *LNCS*, pages 331–396. Springer, 2001.
- [FPR02] R. Focardi, C. Piazza, and S. Rossi. Proofs methods for bisimulation based information flow security. In *Proc. of the 3rd Int. Workshop on Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation (VMCAI 2002)*, volume 2294 of *LNCS*, pages 16–31. Springer, 2002.
- [FR06] R. Focardi and S. Rossi. Information flow security in dynamic contexts. *Journal of Computer Security*, 14:65–110, 2006.
- [Gla93] R.J. van Glabbeek. A complete axiomatization for branching bisimulation congruence of finite-state behaviours. In *Proc. of the 18th Int. Symp. on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS 1993)*, volume 711 of *LNCS*, pages 473–484. Springer, 1993.
- [Gla01] R.J. van Glabbeek. The linear time – branching time spectrum I. In *Handbook of Process Algebra*, pages 3–99. Elsevier, 2001.
- [GLM14] E. Giachino, I. Lanese, and C.A. Mezzina. Causal-consistent reversible debugging. In *Proc. of the 17th Int. Conf. on Fundamental Approaches to Software Engineering (FASE 2014)*, volume 8411 of *LNCS*, pages 370–384. Springer, 2014.
- [GM82] J.A. Goguen and J. Meseguer. Security policies and security models. In *Proc. of the 2nd IEEE Symp. on Security and Privacy (SSP 1982)*, pages 11–20. IEEE-CS Press, 1982.
- [GM18] R. Giacobazzi and I. Mastroeni. Abstract non-interference: A unifying framework for weakening information-flow. *ACM Trans. on Privacy and Security*, 21(2):9:1–9:31, 2018.
- [GSS95] R.J. van Glabbeek, S.A. Smolka, and B. Steffen. Reactive, generative and stratified models of probabilistic processes. *Information and Computation*, 121:59–80, 1995.
- [GW96] R.J. van Glabbeek and W.P. Weijland. Branching time and abstraction in bisimulation semantics. *Journal of the ACM*, 43:555–600, 1996.
- [Her02] H. Hermanns. *Interactive Markov Chains*. Springer, 2002. Volume 2428 of *LNCS*.
- [HJ90] H. Hansson and B. Jonsson. A calculus for communicating systems with time and probabilities. In *Proc. of the 11th IEEE Real-Time Systems Symp. (RTSS 1990)*, pages 278–287. IEEE-CS Press, 1990.
- [HL97] H. Hermanns and M. Lohrey. Observation congruence in a stochastic timed calculus with maximal progress. University of Erlangen, Technical Report IMMD VII-7/97, 1997.
- [HMPR21] J. Hillston, A. Marin, C. Piazza, and S. Rossi. Persistent stochastic non-interference. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 181:1–35, 2021.
- [HS12] D. Hedin and A. Sabelfeld. A perspective on information-flow control. In *Software Safety and Security – Tools for Analysis and Verification*, pages 319–347. IOS Press, 2012.
- [Kel76] R.M. Keller. Formal verification of parallel programs. *Communications of the ACM*, 19:371–384, 1976.
- [KV24] L.V. Kovalchuk and A.A. Vykhlo. Estimation of the probability of success of a frontrunning attack on smart contracts. *Cybernetics and Systems Analysis*, 60:881–890, 2024.
- [Lan61] R. Landauer. Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 5:183–191, 1961.
- [LES18] J.S. Laursen, L.-P. Ellekilde, and U.P. Schultz. Modelling reversible execution of robotic assembly. *Robotica*, 36:625–654, 2018.
- [LLM⁺13] I. Lanese, M. Lienhardt, C.A. Mezzina, A. Schmitt, and J.-B. Stefani. Concurrent flexible reversibility. In *Proc. of the 22nd European Symp. on Programming (ESOP 2013)*, volume 7792 of *LNCS*, pages 370–390. Springer, 2013.
- [LNPV18] I. Lanese, N. Nishida, A. Palacios, and G. Vidal. CauDER: A causal-consistent reversible debugger for Erlang. In *Proc. of the 14th Int. Symp. on Functional and Logic Programming (FLOPS 2018)*, volume 10818 of *LNCS*, pages 247–263. Springer, 2018.

- [Man11] H. Mantel. Information flow and noninterference. In *Encyclopedia of Cryptography and Security*, pages 605–607. Springer, 2011.
- [Mar03] F. Martinelli. Analysis of security protocols as open systems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 290:1057–1106, 2003.
- [Mil89] R. Milner. *Communication and Concurrency*. Prentice Hall, 1989.
- [Par81] D. Park. Concurrency and automata on infinite sequences. In *Proc. of the 5th GI Conf. on Theoretical Computer Science*, volume 104 of *LNCS*, pages 167–183. Springer, 1981.
- [PBP⁺21] N.S. Patel, P. Bhattacharya, S.B. Patel, S. Tanwar, N. Kumar, and H. Song. Blockchain-envisioned trusted random oracles for IoT-enabled probabilistic smart contracts. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 8:14797–14809, 2021.
- [Pin17] G.M. Pinna. Reversing steps in membrane systems computations. In *Proc. of the 18th Int. Conf. on Membrane Computing (CMC 2017)*, volume 10725 of *LNCS*, pages 245–261. Springer, 2017.
- [PLS00] A. Philippou, I. Lee, and O. Sokolsky. Weak bisimulation for probabilistic systems. In *Proc. of the 11th Int. Conf. on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 2000)*, volume 1877 of *LNCS*, pages 334–349. Springer, 2000.
- [PP14] K.S. Perumalla and A.J. Park. Reverse computation for rollback-based fault tolerance in large parallel systems – Evaluating the potential gains and systems effects. *Cluster Computing*, 17:303–313, 2014.
- [PU07] I. Phillips and I. Ulidowski. Reversing algebraic process calculi. *Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming*, 73:70–96, 2007.
- [PUY12] I. Phillips, I. Ulidowski, and S. Yuen. A reversible process calculus and the modelling of the ERK signalling pathway. In *Proc. of the 4th Int. Workshop on Reversible Computation (RC 2012)*, volume 7581 of *LNCS*, pages 218–232. Springer, 2012.
- [QHL⁺23] P. Qian, J. He, L. Lu, S. Wu, Z. Lu, L. Wu, Y. Zhou, and Q. He. Demystifying random number in Ethereum smart contract: Taxonomy, vulnerability identification, and attack detection. *IEEE Trans. on Software Engineering*, 49:3793–3810, 2023.
- [Seg95] R. Segala. *Modeling and Verification of Randomized Distributed Real-Time Systems*. PhD Thesis, 1995.
- [SL94] R. Segala and N.A. Lynch. Probabilistic simulations for probabilistic processes. In *Proc. of the 5th Int. Conf. on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 1994)*, volume 836 of *LNCS*, pages 481–496. Springer, 1994.
- [SLHX24] S. Semujju, F. Liu, H. Huang, and Y. Xiang. Enhancing fault detection in smart contract loops through adaptive probabilistic sampling. In *Proc. of the 26th Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conf. (GECCO 2024)*, pages 731–734. ACM Press, 2024.
- [SM92] D. Sangiorgi and R. Milner. The problem of “weak bisimulation up to”. In *Proc. of the 3rd Int. Conf. on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 1992)*, volume 630 of *LNCS*, pages 32–46. Springer, 1992.
- [SOJB18] M. Schordan, T. Opielstrup, D.R. Jefferson, and P.D. Barnes Jr. Generation of reversible C++ code for optimistic parallel discrete event simulation. *New Generation Computing*, 36:257–280, 2018.
- [SPP19] H. Siljak, K. Psara, and A. Philippou. Distributed antenna selection for massive MIMO using reversing Petri nets. *IEEE Wireless Communication Letters*, 8:1427–1430, 2019.
- [SS00] A. Sabelfeld and D. Sands. Probabilistic noninterference for multi-threaded programs. In *Proc. of the 13th IEEE Computer Security Foundations Workshop (CSFW 2000)*, pages 200–214. IEEE-CS Press, 2000.
- [ST05] R. Segala and A. Turrini. Comparative analysis of bisimulation relations on alternating and non-alternating probabilistic models. In *Proc. of the 2nd Int. Conf. on the Quantitative Evaluation of Systems (QEST 2005)*, pages 44–53. IEEE-CS Press, 2005.
- [TH15] A. Turrini and H. Hermanns. Polynomial time decision algorithms for probabilistic automata. *Information and Computation*, 244:134–171, 2015.
- [VKH10] E. de Vries, V. Koutavas, and M. Hennessy. Communicating transactions. In *Proc. of the 21st Int. Conf. on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 2010)*, volume 6269 of *LNCS*, pages 569–583. Springer, 2010.

- [VS98] D. Volpano and G. Smith. Probabilistic noninterference in a concurrent language. In *Proc. of the 11th IEEE Computer Security Foundations Workshop (CSFW 1998)*, pages 34–43. IEEE-CS Press, 1998.
- [VS18] M. Vassor and J.-B. Stefani. Checkpoint/rollback vs causally-consistent reversibility. In *Proc. of the 10th Int. Conf. on Reversible Computation (RC 2018)*, volume 11106 of *LNCS*, pages 286–303. Springer, 2018.
- [Yca93] B. Ycart. The philosophers’ process: An ergodic reversible nearest particle system. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 3:356–363, 1993.
- [ZM04] L. Zheng and A. Myers. Dynamic security labels and noninterference. In *Proc. of the 2nd IFIP Workshop on Formal Aspects in Security and Trust (FAST 2004)*, volume 173 of *IFIP AICT*, pages 27–40. Springer, 2004.