

# Reachability and Related Problems in Vector Addition Systems with Nested Zero Tests

Roland Guttenberg  
Department of Computer Science  
Technical University of Munich  
Munich, Germany  
guttenbe@in.tum.de

Wojciech Czerwiński  
Department of Computer Science  
University of Warsaw  
Warsaw, Poland  
wczcrwin@mimuw.edu.pl

Sławomir Lasota  
Department of Computer Science  
University of Warsaw  
Warsaw, Poland  
sl@mimuw.edu.pl

**Abstract**—Vector addition systems with states (VASS), also known as Petri nets, are a popular model of concurrent systems. Many problems from many areas reduce to the reachability problem for VASS, which consists of deciding whether a target configuration of a VASS is reachable from a given initial configuration. In this paper, we obtain an Ackermannian (primitive-recursive in fixed dimension) upper bound for the reachability problem in VASS with nested zero tests. Furthermore, we provide a uniform approach which also allows to decide most related problems, for example semilinearity and separability, in the same complexity. For some of these problems like semilinearity the complexity was unknown even for plain VASS.

**Index Terms**—Vector Addition Systems, Extended Vector Addition Systems, Reachability, Separability, Semilinearity

## I. INTRODUCTION

Vector addition systems (VAS), also known as Petri nets, are a popular model of concurrent systems. VAS have a very rich theory and have been intensely studied. In particular, the *reachability problem* for VAS, which consists of deciding whether a target configuration of a VAS is reachable from a given initial configuration, has been studied for over 50 years. It was proved decidable in the 1980s [14, 15, 26], but its complexity (Ackermann-complete) could only be determined recently [5, 6, 21, 23].

In [17] and [20], Leroux proved two fundamental results about the reachability sets of VAS. In [17], he showed that every configuration outside the reachability set  $\mathbf{R}$  of a VAS is separated from  $\mathbf{R}$  by a semilinear inductive invariant (for basic facts on semilinear sets see e.g. [11]). This immediately led to a very simple algorithm for the reachability problem consisting of two semi-algorithms, one enumerating all possible paths to certify reachability, and one enumerating all semilinear sets and checking if they are separating inductive invariants. In [20], he showed that semilinear relations contained in the reachability relation are flatable, which immediately led to an algorithm for checking whether a semilinear relation is included in or equal to the reachability relation. Both of these results were obtained using abstract *geometric properties* of reachability relations. This strand of research was later continued in [10], where some additional geometric axioms were used to reprove that the semilinearity problem, i.e. deciding whether the reachability relation of a given VAS is

semilinear, is decidable. The semilinearity problem was first shown to be decidable in [12].

**Related Work.** One major branch of ongoing research in the theory of VAS studies whether results like the above extend to more general systems [1]–[4, 8, 13, 16, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28]. In particular, in a famous but very technical paper, Reinhardt proved that the reachability problem is decidable for VASS with nested zero tests (VASSnz) [27], in which counters can be tested for zero in a restricted manner: There is an order on the counters such that whenever counter  $i$  is tested for 0, also all counters  $j \leq i$  are tested for 0. Later [1] proved that reachability in VASS controlled by finite-index grammars is decidable by reducing to VASSnz. In [3, 4], Bonnet presented a more accessible proof of VASSnz reachability by extending the result of [17], separability by inductive semilinear sets. Recently, in [9], also the result of [20] was extended to VASSnz.

**Our contribution.** The following questions remain for VASSnz: The complexity of the reachability and related problems as well as the decidability status of the semilinearity problem, which we both resolve in this paper. We establish the complexity of reachability, semilinearity and related problems as being Ackermann-complete. The complexity of semilinearity was unknown even for plain VAS.

To this end, we proceed as follows: In step 1/Lemma VI.2 we convert the input VASSnz into what we call monotone  $\mathcal{C}$ -extended VASS. This is an extension of VASS allowing more general counter operations than only addition. As the framework is quite general, we expect that there might be other applications for  $\mathcal{C}$ -extended VASS.

In step 2/Theorem VI.3 we then provide an algorithm which approximates the reachability relation of a given input  $\mathcal{C}$ -extended VASS, assuming its operations can be approximated accordingly. In particular the approximation allows to decide reachability in  $\mathcal{C}$ -extended VASS. Our algorithm to perform the approximation is an adaptation of the classic algorithm KLM solving reachability in VASS, however we managed to remove some elements to simplify the presentation of the algorithm.

Finally we solve also problems related to reachability by observing that our approximation can be viewed as an improvement upon a framework of [10], providing axioms such that for any class  $\mathcal{C}$  of systems fulfilling the axioms,

the reachability, semilinearity, separability, etc. problems are decidable in Ackermann time. We consider finalizing this framework started in [10] a main contribution of this paper, since it unifies the ideas behind the algorithms solving the reachability, semilinearity, etc. problems in an elegant fashion.

Above we only stated Ackermann-completeness, but in fact we provide more fine-grained complexity. The usual parameters of VASSnz are the dimension  $d$  and the number of priorities  $k$ , i.e. the number of different  $i$  such that the VASSnz uses a zero test on all  $j \leq i$ . Often  $k$  is just 1 or 2, because only one or two types of zero tests are used. Our algorithm approximating the reachability relation has a time bound of  $\mathfrak{F}_{2kd+2k+2d+5}$  in the fast-growing function hierarchy. The complexity is the result of a sequence of  $2k + 2$  Turing reductions, each of which will add  $d + 1$  to the subscript of the fast-growing complexity class, ending at  $\mathfrak{F}_3$  for dealing with semilinear sets. These reductions form a chain as follows, where  $Reach_k$  stands for reachability in VASSnz with  $k$  priorities, and  $Cover_k$  for coverability, that is, deciding whether it is possible to reach a configuration at least as large as the given target from the given initial configuration:

$$Reach_k \xrightarrow{+d+1} Cover_k \xrightarrow{+d+1} Reach_{k-1} \xrightarrow{+d+1} \dots$$

**Outline/Structure of the paper.** Section II provides a few preliminaries. Section III introduces the fast-growing functions we use for complexity analysis. Section IV introduces VASS and VASSnz. Section V introduces the most important tools we utilize in our algorithm, and in particular the definition of the approximation we compute. Section VI introduces monotone  $\mathcal{C}$ -extended VASS and proves that VASSnz can be converted into extended VASS. Section VII provides an algorithm approximating the reachability relation of  $\mathcal{C}$ -extended VASS. Finally, Section VIII introduces the geometric axioms and shows how to solve most relevant problems of VASSnz using only the axioms, before we conclude in Section IX.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

We let  $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$  denote the sets of natural numbers containing 0, the integers, and the (non-negative) rational numbers respectively. We use uppercase letters for sets/relations and boldface for vectors and sets/relations of vectors.

Given a vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}^d$ , we use an array like notation  $\mathbf{x}[i]$  to refer to the  $i$ -th coordinate.

Given sets  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^d, Z \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ , we write  $\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{Y} := \{\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Y}\}$  for the Minkowski sum and  $Z \cdot \mathbf{X} := \{\lambda \cdot \mathbf{x} \mid \lambda \in Z, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}\}$ . By identifying elements  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}^d$  with  $\{\mathbf{x}\}$ , we define  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{X} := \{\mathbf{x}\} + \mathbf{X}$ , and similarly  $\lambda \cdot \mathbf{X} := \{\lambda\} \cdot \mathbf{X}$ .

Given  $\mathbf{b} = (\mathbf{b}_s, \mathbf{b}_t) \in \mathbb{N}^d \times \mathbb{N}^d$  we let  $\Delta(\mathbf{b}) := \mathbf{b}_t - \mathbf{b}_s \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  be the effect of  $\mathbf{b}$  and extend it to  $\mathbf{F} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d \times \mathbb{N}^d$  via  $\Delta(\mathbf{F}) := \{\Delta(\mathbf{b}) \mid \mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{F}\}$ .

Given relations  $\mathbf{R}_1 \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_2}$  and  $\mathbf{R}_2 \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{d_2} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_3}$ , we write  $\mathbf{R}_1 \circ \mathbf{R}_2 := \{(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{N}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_3} \mid \exists \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^{d_2} : (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbf{R}_1, (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbf{R}_2\}$  for composition. Given  $\mathbf{R} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d \times \mathbb{N}^d$ , we write  $\mathbf{R}^*$  for the reflexive and transitive closure (w.r.t.  $\circ$ ).

A relation  $\mathbf{R} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_2}$  is *monotone* if  $d_1 = d_2$  and for all  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}^d$  we have  $(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{m}) \in \mathbf{R}$ .

Let  $\mathbb{S} \in \{\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}\}$  and let  $\mathbf{F} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ . The set of  $\mathbb{S}$ -linear combinations of  $\mathbf{F}$  is

$$\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{F}) := \{\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \mathbf{f}_i \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbf{f}_i \in \mathbf{F}, \lambda_i \in \mathbb{S}\}.$$

By convention for  $\mathbf{F} = \emptyset$  we have  $\sum_{x \in \emptyset} x := \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{S}(\mathbf{F})$ .

A set  $\mathbf{X}$  is  $\mathbb{S}$ -(finitely) generated if there exists a (finite) set  $\mathbf{F}$  with  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbb{S}(\mathbf{F})$ . The properties  $\mathbb{S}$ -generated and  $\mathbb{S}$ -finitely generated are respectively abbreviated  $\mathbb{S}$ -g. and  $\mathbb{S}$ -f.g..

There are different names for  $\mathbb{S}$ -g. sets depending on  $\mathbb{S}$ , for example  $\mathbb{Q}$ -g. sets are usually called vector spaces,  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$  are cones, etc. but we will avoid this in favor of the general terminology of being  $\mathbb{S}$ -generated.

A set  $\mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$  is *linear* if  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{b} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  for some  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^d$  and finite  $\mathbf{F} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ . A set  $\mathbf{S}$  is *semilinear* if it is a finite union of linear sets. The semilinear sets are equivalently definable via formulas  $\varphi \in \text{FO}(\mathbb{N}, +)$ , called Presburger Arithmetic.

The *dimension* of a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -generated set defined as its minimal number of generators is a well-known concept. It can be extended to arbitrary subsets of  $\mathbb{Q}^d$  as follows.

**Definition II.1.** [18] Let  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^d$ . The *dimension* of  $\mathbf{X}$ , denoted  $\dim(\mathbf{X})$ , is the smallest natural number  $k$  such that there exist finitely many  $\mathbb{Q}$ -g. sets  $\mathbf{V}_i \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^d$  with  $\dim(\mathbf{V}_i) \leq k$  and  $\mathbf{b}_i \in \mathbb{Q}^d$  such that  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^r \mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{V}_i$ . [ $\dim(\emptyset) := -\infty$ ]

This dimension function has the following properties.

**Lemma II.2.** Let  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}' \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^d, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Q}^d$ . Then  $\dim(\mathbf{X}) = \dim(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{X})$  and  $\dim(\mathbf{X} \cup \mathbf{X}') = \max\{\dim(\mathbf{X}), \dim(\mathbf{X}')\}$ .

Further, if  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{X}'$ , then  $\dim(\mathbf{X}) \leq \dim(\mathbf{X}')$ .

For  $\mathbb{Q}$ -generated sets  $\mathbf{V}$  it is known that  $\mathbf{V} \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^r \mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{V}_i$  implies  $\mathbf{V} \subseteq \mathbf{V}_i$  for some  $i$ , similar results hold for any  $\mathbb{N}$ -g. set  $\mathbf{P} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$  and lead to the following lemma.

**Lemma II.3.** [18, Lemma 5.3] Let  $\mathbf{P} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$  be  $\mathbb{N}$ -generated. Then  $\dim(\mathbf{P}) = \dim(\mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{P}))$ .

Let  $\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2 \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$  be sets. Then  $\mathbf{X}_1$  and  $\mathbf{X}_2$  have a *non-degenerate intersection* if  $\dim(\mathbf{X}_1 \cap \mathbf{X}_2) = \dim(\mathbf{X}_1) = \dim(\mathbf{X}_2)$ . In the sequel many of our lemmas only work under the assumption that two sets have a non-degenerate intersection, i.e. this is a very central notion.

Let us provide some examples of (non-)degenerate intersections. Intersecting  $\mathbb{N}^2 \cap \mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}$  is degenerate because we did not intersect same dimension objects. Also

$\{(x, y) \mid y \geq x\} \cap \{(x, y) \mid y \leq x\} = \{(x, y) \mid y = x\}$  is degenerate because their intersection is lower dimensional. On the other hand  $\{(x, y) \mid y \geq x\} \cap \{(x, y) \mid y \leq 2x\}$  is a typical non-degenerate intersection.

Because “ $\mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{L}'$  have a non-degenerate intersection” is rather long, we will often just write “ $\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}'$  is non-degenerate”.

All the definitions above defined for sets apply to relations  $\mathbf{R} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_2}$  by viewing them as sets  $\mathbf{R} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{d_1+d_2}$ .

## III. HIERARCHY OF FAST-GROWING FUNCTIONS

We let  $F_1 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}, n \mapsto 2n$ , and define  $F_d : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}, n \mapsto F_{d-1}^{n-1}(2)$ , where  $F_{d-1}^{n-1}$  is  $(n-1)$ -fold application of the function  $F_{d-1}$ . For example  $F_2(n) = 2^n, F_3 = \text{Tower}$  and so on. The functions  $F_d$  are called the fast-growing functions.

(One possible) Ackermann-function  $F_\omega$  is obtained from these via  $F_\omega : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}, n \mapsto F_n(n)$  via diagonalization. The  $d$ -th level of the Grzegorzcyk hierarchy [29] is the set of functions  $\mathfrak{F}_d := \{F_d \circ r_1 \circ \dots \circ r_k \mid r_1, \dots, r_k \in \mathfrak{F}_{d-1}\}$ . I.e. we close  $F_d$  under applying reductions of the lower level  $\mathfrak{F}_{d-1}$ . For example  $\mathfrak{F}_3$  is the set of functions obtained by inputting an elementary function into the tower function.

One main way to prove that a function falls into some level of this hierarchy is a theorem of [7]. It considers sequences over  $\mathbb{N}^d$ . Given  $a \in \mathbb{N}$ , write  $\mathbf{a}$  for the constant vector  $\mathbf{a} = (a, \dots, a) \in \mathbb{N}^d$ . Given a sequence  $(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  we call the sequence  $(g, n)$ -controlled if  $\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_\infty \leq g^i(n)$  for all  $i$ , i.e. the sequence starts below  $n$ , and in every step entries grow at most by an application of the function  $g$ . The sequence *contains an increasing pair* if  $\mathbf{x}_i \leq \mathbf{x}_j$  for some  $i < j$ .

**Proposition III.1.** *Let  $k, r, \gamma \geq 1$  be natural numbers. Let  $f$  be a monotone function in  $\mathfrak{F}_\gamma$  with  $f(x) \geq \max(1, x)$  for all  $x$ . Then the function mapping a given  $n$  to the length of the longest  $(f, n)$ -controlled sequence in  $\mathbb{N}^d$  without an increasing pair is in  $\mathfrak{F}_{\gamma+d-1}$ .*

For example if a rank in  $\mathbb{N}^d$  decreases lexicographically in an algorithm, then the sequence of ranks has no increasing pair. We therefore obtain a complexity bound for the algorithm.

#### IV. EXTENDED VECTOR ADDITION SYSTEMS

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of relations on  $\mathbb{N}^d$ . A  $\mathcal{C}$ -extended VASS ( $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS) of dimension  $d$  is a finite directed multigraph  $(Q, E)$  which is labelled as follows:

- 1) Every SCC  $S \subseteq Q$  has a subset  $I(S)$  of active counters.
- 2) Every edge  $e$  inside an SCC is labelled with  $\mathbf{R}(e) \in \mathcal{C}$ .
- 3) Every edge  $e$  leaving an SCC is labelled with *either* a relation  $\mathbf{R}(e) \in \mathcal{C}$  or with two subsets  $I_+(e), I_-(e) \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$  of counters to add and delete respectively.

The set of configurations is  $\bigcup_{SCC} Q, Q' \times \mathbb{N}^{I(Q')}$ , and an edge  $e$  has semantics  $\rightarrow_e$  defined by  $(q, \mathbf{x}) \rightarrow_e (p, \mathbf{y})$  if  $e = (q, p)$  and either  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbf{R}(e)$  if  $e$  is labelled by  $\mathbf{R}(e)$ , or  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}_{I_+(e), I_-(e)}$  is equal to  $\mathbf{x}$  with coordinates from  $I_-(e)$  deleted and coordinates in  $I_+(e)$  readded with value 0 otherwise.

Intuitively,  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS model finite automata operating on counters with values in  $\mathbb{N}$ . An operation consists of a state change of the automaton and updating the counters according to the relation  $\mathbf{R}(e)$  written on the edge. Sometimes it is convenient to change the dimension of the system when leaving an SCC, hence the automaton is allowed to add/delete counters when leaving an SCC.

There are multiple classes of systems which fall into this definition. For example consider the class *Add* of relations of the form  $\rightarrow_{\mathbf{a}}$  for  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  defined as  $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow_{\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{y} \iff \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{a}$ . Then *Add*-eVASS without counter deletions form the class of *vector addition system with states* (VASS).

Furthermore, counter machines are *Semil*-eVASS, where *Semil* is the class of semilinear relations. To see this, observe that zero tests  $ZT(I, d) := \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{N}^d \times \mathbb{N}^d \mid \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} \text{ and } \mathbf{x}[i] = 0 \forall i \in I\}$  are a special case of linear relations.

Another subclass we will consider are VASSnz. Let *NZT* be the class of *nested zero tests*, defined as relations of the form  $NZT(j, d) := ZT(\{1, \dots, j\}, d)$  for some  $j \leq d \in \mathbb{N}$ . Intuitively, the vector  $\mathbf{x}$  stays the same and the first  $j$  coordinates are “tested for 0”. In particular if counter  $j$  is tested also all lower index counters are tested.

The class  $(Add \cup NZT)$ -eVASS is called VASSnz.

Observe that we do not disallow class  $\mathcal{C}$  from containing non-deterministic relations  $\mathbf{R} \in \mathcal{C}$ , in this way  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS can naturally model both determinism and non-determinism.

We continue with a few more semantic definitions. Let  $q_{\text{in}} \in Q$  and  $q_{\text{fin}} \in Q$  be states called the initial and final state respectively. A run  $\rho$  is a sequence  $(p_0(\mathbf{x}_0), \dots, p_r(\mathbf{x}_r))$  of configurations s.t.  $\mathbf{x}_i \rightarrow_{e_i} \mathbf{x}_{i+1}$  for some edges  $e_i \in E$ ,  $p_0 = q_{\text{in}}$  and  $p_r = q_{\text{fin}}$ . The source of  $\rho$  is  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , the target is  $\mathbf{x}_r$ , and the source/target pair is  $\text{ends}(\rho) := (\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_r)$ . We write  $\Omega$  for the set of all runs (from  $q_{\text{in}}$  to  $q_{\text{fin}}$ ). The reachability relation is  $\text{Rel}(\mathcal{V}, q_{\text{in}}, q_{\text{fin}}) := \text{ends}(\Omega) \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d \times \mathbb{N}^d$ .

Since the class of reachability relations is lacking some important closure properties, we usually consider a slightly larger class of relations which we call sections.

**Definition IV.1.** *A relation  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{d'} \times \mathbb{N}^{d''}$  is a  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS section if  $\mathbf{X} = \pi(\mathbf{R} \cap \mathbf{L})$ , where  $\mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d \times \mathbb{N}^d$  for some  $d \geq d', d''$  is linear,  $\mathbf{R}$  is the reachability relation of a  $d$ -dimensional  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS, and  $\pi : \mathbb{N}^d \times \mathbb{N}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{d'} \times \mathbb{N}^{d''}$  is a projection, i.e. a function deleting some coordinates.*

#### V. ALGORITHM TOOLBOX

In this section we introduce important lemmas, definitions and tricks we will use throughout. This is intended as a quick lookup location containing most relevant lemmas/definitions.

We start with one of the most important definitions to remember, as this will be the basis of our reachability algorithm.

**Definition V.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$  be sets with  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{b} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  being linear. Then  $\mathbf{L}$  is a nice overapproximation of  $\mathbf{X}$  (written  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$ ) if for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L}$  and every  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$ , there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}_{\geq N} \mathbf{w} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ .*

*Observe the  $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$  instead of  $\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ , which is crucial.*

*This definition applies to relations  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_2}$  by viewing them as sets  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{d_1+d_2}$ .*

I.e. a linear overapproximation  $\mathbf{L}$  of a relation  $\mathbf{X}$  is nice if starting at any point  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L}$  and “walking in an interior direction”  $\mathbf{w}$  of  $\mathbf{L}$ , eventually all the visited points are in  $\mathbf{X}$ . Since this is a very central notion, let us carefully introduce an example and some properties.

Observe first of all that clearly every linear set  $\mathbf{L}$  is nicely overapproximated by itself. But a more interesting example is on the right of Figure 1: While  $\mathbf{X}$  is non-semilinear, as long as  $\mathbf{w}$  is not “vertical”, i.e.  $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$  is indeed crucial, one can find an  $N$  as in Definition V.1. Observe also that there is no uniform  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  which works for every  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}$ : Different  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^2$  can have a different “distance” from  $\mathbf{X}$ .

Some more in-depth understanding of nice overapproximations can be gained by considering closure properties:




Fig. 1. *Left*: Illustration of  $\dim(\mathbf{L} \setminus (\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{L})) < \dim(\mathbf{L})$  with  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbb{N}^2$  and  $\mathbf{x} = (3, 4)$ . The dimension drops from 2 to 1, since the set is now coverable by finitely many lines.

*Right*:  $\mathbf{X} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \mid y \leq x^2\}$  has the nice overapproximation  $\mathbb{N}^2$ .

**Lemma V.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$  and let  $\mathbf{L}'$  a linear set s.t.  $\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}'$  is non-degenerate and remains linear. Then  $\mathbf{X} \cap \mathbf{L}' \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}'$ .*

*Let  $\mathbf{X}_{12} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}_{12} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_2}$  and  $\mathbf{X}_{23} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}_{23} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{d_2} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_3}$ . Assume that  $\pi_{in}(\mathbf{L}_{23}) \cap \pi_{out}(\mathbf{L}_{12})$  is non-degenerate, where  $\pi_{in}: \mathbb{N}^{d_2} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_3} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{d_2}$  and  $\pi_{out}: \mathbb{N}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{d_2}$  are the projections to in- and output. Then  $\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23}$ .*

*Proof sketch.* Observe that the definition of nice overapproximation makes a claim about every point  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L}$  and every  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$ , hence decreasing  $\mathbf{L}$  and decreasing the set  $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$  of possible  $\mathbf{w}$ 's preserves the property. Hence the main part of the proof is to check that  $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$  decreases through the intersection/composition. The formal proof is in the appendix, but let us observe here that if we for example intersect  $\mathbb{N}^2 \cap \{0\} \times \mathbb{N}$ , then  $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}) \not\subseteq \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\{(0, 1)\})$ : We would exactly get the vertical direction  $\mathbf{w}$  as before. Therefore the non-degenerate intersection is crucial.  $\square$

In order for nice overapproximations to be useful, we need an algorithm which given  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}$ , splits it into finitely many parts with a nice overapproximation each.

**Definition V.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of relations. Then  $\mathcal{C}$  is approximable in  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$  if there is an algorithm with running time in  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$  which given  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}$ , outputs finitely many  $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_k \in \mathcal{C}$ , linear relations  $\mathbf{L}_1, \dots, \mathbf{L}_k$  and a function  $g \in \mathfrak{F}_\alpha$  s.t.*

- 1)  $\mathbf{X} = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathbf{X}_j$ ,
- 2) If  $\mathbf{X}$  is monotone, then also the  $\mathbf{X}_j$ .
- 3)  $\forall 1 \leq i \leq k$  we have  $\mathbf{X}_j \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}_j$  and
- 4)  $N$  in Definition V.1 fulfills  $\text{size}(N) \leq g(\text{size}(\mathbf{X}_j) + \text{size}(\mathbf{x}) + \text{size}(\mathbf{w}))$ .

We will later give such an algorithm for a large class of eVASS, in particular VASS, VASSnz, etc.

Let us illustrate one *main* trick in our toolbox: On the left of Figure 1, we illustrate an important lemma we use often:

**Lemma V.4** ([20], Corollary D.2). *Let  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{b} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  be linear, and  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ . Then  $\dim(\mathbf{L} \setminus \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{L}) < \dim(\mathbf{L})$ .*

Both Lemma V.2 and Lemma V.4 can be used for recursion in algorithms: By Lemma V.2, problems only occur if the intersection has lower dimension, and by Lemma V.4, it is sufficient to understand a set *asymptotically*, as we can deal with the rest via an appropriate recursion.

Finally, since we will often have to deal with projections, which can be slightly annoying, we use the following:

**Lemma V.5.** *Let  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$ , and  $\pi$  a proj.. Then  $\pi(\mathbf{X}) \trianglelefteq \pi(\mathbf{L})$ .*

*Proof.* Immediate from the definition.  $\square$

## VI. VASSNZ AND MONOTONE eVASS

In this section we introduce a restriction of  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS we call *monotone  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS* and prove that VASSnz can be converted into monotone  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS. This will be the first step for our reachability algorithm.

The main observation is the following: Similar to how *Semil-eVASS* can simulate counter machines, if transitions inside an SCC are allowed to be non-monotone, then  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS will likely be undecidable. Hence we define:

**Definition VI.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of relations. A monotone  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS is a  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS where transition labels  $\mathbf{R}(e)$  for edges  $e$  inside an SCC are monotone relations  $\mathbf{R}(e) \in \mathcal{C}$ .*

For example for  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Add}$  all  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS are monotone, because this class  $\mathcal{C}$  contains only monotone relations. On the other hand, *monotone Semil-eVASS* can no longer simulate counter machines, in fact they are closer to VASS: Using what is called the *controlling counter technique*, VASS can in fact simulate zero tests on the exits of SCCs. However, monotone *Semil-eVASS* are nevertheless slightly more general, as for example *weak doubling*, the monotone linear relation defined by the periods  $(1, 1), (1, 2)$ , is now allowed on edges. The more intuitive way to write weak doubling is  $\{(x, x') \in \mathbb{N}^2 \mid x \leq x' \leq 2x\}$ , i.e.  $x$  gets at most doubled, but maybe less.

Given a VASSnz  $\mathcal{V}$ , the number of priorities  $k$  is the number of different  $j$  s.t. some transition has the label  $NZT(j, d)$ , i.e. the number of different types of zero tests. We prove that VASSnz with  $k$  priorities can be converted into monotone eVASS, whose labels are VASSnz sections with  $k-1$  priorities.

**Lemma VI.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{C} := (k-1)\text{-VASSnzSec}$  be the class of sections of VASSnz with  $k-1$  priorities. There is a polytime algorithm converting a  $k\text{-VASSnz}$   $\mathcal{V}_k$  into a monotone  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS  $\mathcal{V}'$  with the same reachability relation.*

*Proof.* First let us explain the crucial observation this construction is based on: What is a zero test? It is a linear relation, which is monotone on some counters and *leaves the others* 0. If the fixed counters are considered as *non-existent* in the current SCC  $S$  (remember eVASS have this capability), then a zero test is monotone and may be used as transition label.

Let  $m$  be the index of the highest counter which is zero tested in  $\mathcal{V}_k$ , and write  $\mathcal{V}_k = (Q, E)$  with initial/final states  $q_{in}, q_{fin}$ . Let  $\mathcal{V}_{k-1}$  be the VASSnz obtained from  $\mathcal{V}_k$  by deleting all edges zero testing counter  $m$ .

The target  $\mathcal{C}'$ -eVASS  $\mathcal{V}' = (Q', E')$  has 5 types of states  $Q' := \{src, del, main, add, tgt\} \times Q$  and 7 types of edges  $E_1, \dots, E_7$  with  $E' := \bigcup_{i=1}^7 E_i$ . The new initial/final states are  $q'_{in} := (src, q_{in})$  and  $q'_{fin} := (tgt, q_{fin})$ . Let us start with the simplest type of edge:  $E_1 = \{e_1\}$ , where  $e_1: (src, q_{in}) \rightarrow$

$(tgt, q_{fin})$  is labelled with  $\text{Rel}(\mathcal{V}_{k-1}, q_{in}, q_{fin})$ . This allows  $\mathcal{V}'$  to simulate runs of  $\mathcal{V}_k$  not using zero tests on  $m$ .

Next let us explain the states  $\{main\} \times Q$ , where the interesting computation happens: The set of active counters for these states is  $I(\{main\} \times Q) = \{m+1, \dots, d\}$ , i.e. in these states we assume that the first  $m$  counters have been deleted. We have two types of edges on  $main$  called  $E_2$  and  $E_3$ , where  $E_2$  simulates zero tests on  $m$ . Formally, we define  $E_2 := \{((main, q), (main, p)) \mid (q, p) \in E, \text{ and has the label } \mathbf{R}(q, p) = NZT(m, d)\}$ . We give every  $e_2 \in E_2$  the label  $\mathbf{R}(e_2) := \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^{d-m}\}$ . Observe that this label faithfully applies the zero test: The first  $m$  counters do not exist in this SCC, and on the rest of the counters the “zero test” is the identity.

Next we consider  $E_3$ . The idea is that in state  $main$  we want to still be able to apply transitions of  $\mathcal{V}_{k-1}$ . Set  $E_3 := (\{main\} \times Q) \times (\{main\} \times Q)$ , i.e. for all  $(p, q) \in Q^2$  we have an edge. For every  $e_3 = (main, p) \rightarrow (main, q) \in E_3$  we set the label  $\mathbf{R}(e_3)$  of  $e_3$  to

$$\pi_m(\text{Rel}(\mathcal{V}_{k-1}, p, q) \cap \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mid \mathbf{x}[i] = \mathbf{y}[i] = 0 \forall 1 \leq i \leq m\}),$$

where  $\pi_m$  projects the first  $m$  coordinates away. Hence edges  $e_3$  apply arbitrary runs of  $\mathcal{V}_{k-1}$  between the corresponding states which *preserve value* 0 on the first  $m$  counters.

Next we explain the states  $del$  and  $add$ : They ensure that when entering and leaving the  $main$  component we have only the counters  $m+1, \dots, d$ . We set  $E_4 := \{((del, p), (main, p)) \mid p \in Q\}$ , and add the labels  $I_+(e_4) := \emptyset$  and  $I_-(e_4) := \{1, \dots, m\}$ , i.e. we delete the first  $m$  many counters and do not change the state of  $\mathcal{V}_k$ .

Similarly, we set  $E_5 := \{((main, p), (add, p)) \mid p \in Q\}$  with labels  $I_+(e_5) := \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $I_-(e_5) := \emptyset$ , which reread the first  $m$  counters.

We set  $E_6 = \{((src, q_{in}), (del, p)) \mid p \in Q\}$ , and for every  $e_6 \in E_6$  the label  $\mathbf{R}(e_6) := \text{Rel}(\mathcal{V}_{k-1}, q_{in}, p) \cap \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mid \mathbf{y}[i] = 0 \forall 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ , i.e. we perform any run of  $\mathcal{V}_{k-1}$  which starts in  $q_{in}$  and sets the first  $m$  counters to 0.

Similarly, we set  $E_7 := \{((add, p), (tgt, q_{fin})) \mid p \in Q\}$  and the label  $\mathbf{R}(e_7) := \text{Rel}(\mathcal{V}_{k-1}, p, q_{fin})$ , i.e. we end again with any run of  $\mathcal{V}_{k-1}$ . This finishes the construction of  $\mathcal{V}'$ .

To see that  $\mathcal{V}'$  is equivalent to  $\mathcal{V}_k$ , let  $\rho$  be any run of  $\mathcal{V}_k$ . If  $\rho$  does not use a zero-test on  $m$  then we simulate  $\rho$  using  $E_1$ . Otherwise  $\rho$  eventually visits a configuration  $\mathbf{x}$  with  $\mathbf{x}[i] = 0 \forall 1 \leq i \leq m$  to enable the zero test. Write  $\rho = \rho_{pre}\rho_{mid}\rho_{suf}$  where  $\rho_{pre}$  is the prefix until the first time  $\mathbf{x}[i] = 0 \forall 1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $\rho_{suf}$  is the suffix starting from the last time we have  $\mathbf{x}[i] = 0 \forall 1 \leq i \leq m$ . Then  $\rho_{pre}$  and  $\rho_{suf}$  do not use zero tests on  $m$ , hence we can simulate them using edges of type  $E_6$  and  $E_7$  respectively. To simulate  $\rho_{mid}$ , we use edge types  $E_2$  and  $E_3$  repeatedly.  $\square$

Lemma VI.2 shows that even if  $\mathcal{C}$  contains non-monotone relations, one can recover some monotonicity at the cost of complicated edge labels. This might seem like a difficulty, but they will turn out to be surprisingly easy to deal with:

Remember Definition V.3 of approximability. We will now approximate monotone  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS and therefore VASSnz:

**Theorem VI.3.** *Let  $\alpha \geq 3$  and let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of relations approximable in  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$ , containing  $Add$  and closed under intersection with semilinear relations. Then sections of monotone  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS are approximable in  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+2d+2}$ .*

We move the proof of Theorem VI.3 to Section VII, and first show Theorem VI.4, our first main theorem.

**Theorem VI.4.** *The class of sections of VASSnz of dimension  $d$  and with  $k$  priorities is approximable in  $\mathfrak{F}_{2kd+2k+2d+5}$ .*

*The class of all VASSnz sections is approximable in  $\mathfrak{F}_\omega$  time.*

*Proof.* Proof by induction on  $k$ .

$k = 0$ : VASS are a special case of monotone Semil-eVASS, and since the class of semilinear sets is approximable in  $\mathfrak{F}_3$  (namely we have  $\mathbf{L} \leq \mathbf{L} \vee \mathbf{L}$ ), we hence obtain  $\mathfrak{F}_{3+2d+2} = \mathfrak{F}_{2d+5}$  time for VASS by Theorem VI.3.

$k - 1 \rightarrow k$ : By Lemma VI.2 we can convert VASSnz with  $k$  priorities into  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS for  $\mathcal{C} := (k-1)$ -priority VASSnz sections. By induction together with Theorem VI.3 approximating  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS takes time  $\mathfrak{F}_{2kd+2k+2d+5}$ .

For the class of all VASSnz we immediately obtain  $\mathfrak{F}_\omega$ .  $\square$

Theorem VI.4 trivially implies the following:

**Corollary VI.5.** *Reachability for VASSnz is in  $\mathfrak{F}_\omega$ .*

Hence we can now focus solely on proving Theorem VI.3.

## VII. APPROXIMATING MONOTONE EVASS

In this section we prove Theorem VI.3, i.e. we prove that the class of sections of monotone  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS is approximable.

In order to decompose a section  $\pi(\mathbf{R} \cap \mathbf{L})$ , by Lemma V.5 we simply decompose  $\mathbf{R} \cap \mathbf{L}$  instead. Hence in the following we will only deal with such sections.

First we introduce the main data structure of our algorithm:

**Definition VII.1.** *A  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequence is a relation  $\mathbf{X}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{X}_r$ , where  $\mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{R}_i \cap \mathbf{L}_i$  are monotone  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS sections.*

*It is represented as a list of  $(\mathcal{V}_i, q_{in,i}, q_{fin,i})$  and  $(\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{F}_i)$ .*

I.e. a  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequence is a composition of monotone  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS sections. In more intuitive terms, when a monotone  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS leaves an SCC, it is now allowed to test whether the *total behaviour* it performed inside this SCC is in some linear relation. Observe that this is stronger than just zero testing at exits: For example the  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS can now check that inside an SCC it exactly doubled.

The main idea of the algorithm is the following, see Algorithm 1: Maintain a workset of current  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequences. While one of them does not fulfill a condition we call “perfectness”, decompose such a  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequence  $\mathbf{X}$  into “smaller”  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequences. Here “smaller” is w.r.t. some well-founded ordering. Finally, if a  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequence  $\mathbf{X}$  is perfect, then output  $\mathbf{X}$  together with the projection of the solution set of an integer linear program (ILP) called the characteristic system  $\text{CharSys}(\mathbf{X})$  to the variables  $src$  and  $tgt$ .

**Algorithm 1** Approximation(Reach.Rel.  $\mathbf{R}$ , linear relation  $\mathbf{L}$ )

---

**Output:** Set of Pairs  $(\mathbf{X}_j, \mathbf{L}_j)$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequences  $\mathbf{X}_j$  and their nice approximations  $\mathbf{L}_1, \dots, \mathbf{L}_k$  each such that  $\mathbf{R} \cap \mathbf{L} = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathbf{X}_j$ .  
 Workset  $\leftarrow \{\mathbf{R} \cap \mathbf{L}\}$ .  
**while** exists  $\mathbf{X} \in \text{Workset}$ :  $\mathbf{X}$  is not perfect **do**  
   Workset  $\leftarrow (\text{Workset} \setminus \{\mathbf{X}\}) \cup \text{Decompose}(\mathbf{X})$ .  
**end while**  
 Output  $\leftarrow \emptyset$   
**for all**  $\mathbf{X} \in \text{Workset}$  **do**  
   Output  $\leftarrow \text{Output} \cup \{(\mathbf{X}, \pi_{\text{src,tgt}}(\text{sol}(\text{CharSys}(\mathbf{X}))))\}$   
**end for**  
**Return** Output.

---

The rest of this section is structured as follows: First we define perfectness. Secondly, we define the integer linear program (ILP) called the characteristic system (CharSys) which overapproximates the KLM sequence, and is used to define perfect. Thirdly, we define the rank of  $\mathbf{X}$ . Fourthly, we describe how to decide perfectness and decompose. We end with a correctness proof and complexity analysis.

For the rest of this section fix a  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequence  $\mathbf{X} := \mathbf{X}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{X}_r$ , where  $(\mathcal{V}_i, q_{\text{in},i}, q_{\text{fin},i}), \mathbf{L}_i$  define  $\mathbf{X}_i$ . Let  $d_i$  be the dimension of  $i$ -th  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS  $\mathcal{V}_i$ . The index  $i$  is reserved for the  $i$ -th relation in  $\mathbf{X}$ , and  $r$  is the length of the composition. These letters are not used for anything else.

**Definition VII.2. Perfectness:** A  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM seq.  $\mathbf{X}$  is perfect if:

- P1 Every  $\mathbf{R}(e) \in \mathcal{C}$  occurring on an edge  $e$  of some  $\mathcal{V}_i$  has a nice overapproximation  $\mathbf{L}(e) = \mathbf{b}(e) + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}(e))$  fulfilling  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{R}(e)$ , and we add  $\mathbf{L}(e)$  as an edge label.
- P2 For every  $i$ ,  $\mathcal{V}_i$  is either strongly-connected, or  $\mathcal{V}_i$  fulfills  $q_{\text{in},i} \neq q_{\text{fin},i}$  and has only one edge  $e_i = (q_{\text{in},i}, q_{\text{fin},i})$ .
- P3 For all  $i$  the relation  $\mathbf{L}_i$  is the projection of the solutions of CharSys to the source/target variables for  $\mathcal{V}_i$ .
- P4 If  $\mathcal{V}_i$  has only a single edge  $e_i$ , then  $\mathbf{L}(e_i) \cap \mathbf{L}_i$  is a non-degenerate intersection.
- P5 If  $\mathcal{V}_i$  is strongly-connected, then for every counter  $j$ , there is a cycle with non-zero effect on  $j$ .
- P6 In CharSys every auxiliary variable is unbounded.
- P7 Every configuration of every strongly-connected  $\mathcal{V}_i$  can be forwards- and backwards-covered, i.e. for every such  $i$  and every configuration  $p(\mathbf{x}_t)$  of  $\mathcal{V}_i$ , we have

$$\text{Rel}(\mathcal{V}_i, q_{\text{in},i}, p) \cap (\pi_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{L}_i) \times (\mathbf{x}_t + \mathbb{N}^{d_i})) \neq \emptyset \text{ and}$$

$$\text{Rel}(\mathcal{V}_i, p, q_{\text{fin},i}) \cap ((\mathbf{x}_t + \mathbb{N}^{d_i}) \times \pi_{\text{out}}(\mathbf{L}_i)) \neq \emptyset.$$

**Characteristic System:** The characteristic system is an ILP whose goal is to overapproximate reachability in a  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequence  $\mathbf{X}$ . This ILP can only be defined in case the  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequence  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{X}_r$  fulfills P1-P2 of perfectness. Its variables are vectors  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_r$  and  $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_r$  of appropriate dimension, which stand for the source/target configurations of  $\mathcal{V}_i$ , and auxiliary variables  $\text{Aux}_1, \dots, \text{Aux}_r$  for every  $\mathcal{V}_i$ . The  $\pi_{\text{src,tgt}}$  in Algorithm 1 corresponds to the projection to  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_r$ .

For every  $i$  we will in a moment define an ILP  $\text{LocCharSys}_i$  which overapproximates reachability in  $\mathbf{X}_i$ . The full ILP is then defined in terms of these local ILP as follows:

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^r \text{LocCharSys}_i(\mathbf{x}_i, \text{Aux}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^{r-1} \mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{x}_{i+1}.$$

Hence it only remains to define the local ILPs  $\text{LocCharSys}_i$ .

**Remark VII.3.** We will define some equations of  $\text{LocCharSys}_i$  by writing “ $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L}$ ”, where  $\mathbf{x}$  is some vector of variables and  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{b} + \mathbb{N}(\{\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_r\})$  is a linear set/relation. The expanded technical meaning is that we create variables  $\#(\mathbf{p}_i)$  for how often the periods are taken, and add the equations  $\mathbf{x} - \sum_{i=1}^r \#(\mathbf{p}_i) \cdot \mathbf{p}_i = \mathbf{b}$ .

**Definition of LocCharSys:** Remember that by P1 we have access to a nice overapproximation  $\mathbf{L}(e)$  for every edge  $e$ , and that by P2 we only have three cases to distinguish:

Case 1:  $\mathcal{V}_i$  has a single edge labelled with  $\mathbf{R}(e) \in \mathcal{C}$ : Then  $\text{LocCharSys}_i(\mathbf{x}_i, \text{Aux}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)$  is defined by  $(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \mathbf{L}(e) \wedge (\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \mathbf{L}_i$ . In particular the only auxiliary variables count how often each period of these linear relations is used.

Case 2:  $\mathcal{V}_i$  has a single edge labelled with  $I_+(e), I_-(e)$ : Then the reachability relation of  $\mathcal{V}_i$  is linear (the semantics of the edge), and we can hence define  $\text{LocCharSys}(\mathbf{x}_i, \text{Aux}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)$  by the equations  $(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \mathbf{R}_i \wedge (\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \mathbf{L}_i$ .

Case 3:  $\mathcal{V}_i = (Q_i, E_i)$  is strongly connected: This is the interesting case. The first step to defining  $\text{LocCharSys}$  is to overapproximate the set of paths in the control graph via the so-called *Euler-Kirchhoff-equations*, defined as follows:

**Definition VII.4.** Let  $\mathcal{V} = (Q, E)$  be a graph with initial/final states  $q_{\text{in}}, q_{\text{fin}}$ . Then  $\text{EK}(\mathcal{V})$  is the following ILP with variables  $\#(e) \in \mathbb{N}$  for every  $e \in E$ :

$$\bigwedge_{q \in Q} \sum_{e \in \text{in}(q)} \#(e) - \sum_{e \in \text{out}(q)} \#(e) = 1_{q=q_{\text{in}}}(q) - 1_{q=q_{\text{fin}}}(q),$$

where  $\text{in}(q)$  and  $\text{out}(q)$  are the in- and outgoing neighbourhoods of state  $q$  respectively and  $1_S: Q \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  for a condition  $S$  is the indicator function, i.e.  $1_S(q) = 1$  if  $q \in Q$  fulfills  $S$ , and  $1_S(q) = 0$  otherwise.

We write the corresponding homogeneous ILP, where we replace  $1_{q=q_{\text{fin}}}(q) - 1_{q=q_{\text{in}}}(q)$  by 0, as  $\text{HEK}(\mathcal{V})$ .

Intuitively,  $\#(e)$  is the number of times an edge  $e$  is used, and for every state which is not initial or final, we require it to be entered as often as left, the final state has to be entered one more time than left etc. This leads to Euler’s lemma:

**Lemma VII.5.** Let  $\mathcal{V} = (Q, E)$  be a graph with initial/final states  $q_{\text{in}}, q_{\text{fin}}$ . Let  $\pi$  be a path from  $q_{\text{in}}$  to  $q_{\text{fin}}$ . Then  $\text{pk}(\pi)$ , the parikh image of  $\pi$ , fulfills  $\text{EK}(\mathcal{V})$ . Conversely, if  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}^E$  fulfills  $\text{EK}(\mathcal{V})$ , then there is a path  $\pi$  with  $\text{pk}(\pi) = \mathbf{w}$ . Observe that the converse requires  $\mathbf{w}[e] \geq 1$  for every  $e$ .

Now we can continue defining LocCharSys for an SCC  $\mathcal{V}_i$ . Let  $d_i$  be the dimension of  $\mathcal{V}_i$ . Remember that for  $\mathbf{b} = (\mathbf{b}_s, \mathbf{b}_t) \in \mathbb{N}^{d_i} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_i}$  we write  $\Delta(\mathbf{b}) := \mathbf{b}_t - \mathbf{b}_s$  for the effect.

For every edge  $e \in E_i$  we write  $\mathbf{L}(e) = \mathbf{b}(e) + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}(e)) \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{d_i} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_i}$  for the nice overapproximation of the edge. We define its  $\mathbb{Z}$ -semantics:

$$\mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{L}(e)) := \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_i} \times \mathbb{Z}^{d_i} \mid \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} - \Delta(\mathbf{b}(e)) \in \Delta(\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}(e)))\}$$

Observe that this overapproximation is not as small as one might imagine: For example if  $\mathbf{L} = \{(x, x') \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \mid 0.5x \leq x' \leq 2x\}$  combines “weak-doubling” and “weak-halving”, then  $\mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{L}) = \mathbb{Z}^2$ : Indeed, the condition “ $\in \Delta(\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}))$ ” is vacuous here, since every  $\Delta \in \mathbb{Z}$  is a possible effect  $x' - x$  for large enough  $x \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Now let  $\mathbf{F}_i := \bigcup_{e \in E_i} \Delta(\mathbf{F}(e)) \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{d_i}$ . For every  $\mathbf{w}_i \in \mathbb{N}^{E_i}$  define  $\Delta(\mathbf{w}) := \sum_{e \in E_i} \mathbf{w}(e) \cdot \Delta(\mathbf{b}(e))$ , i.e. the effect of an edge sequence only takes the base  $\mathbf{b}(e)$  into account. Finally we define LocCharSys $_i(\mathbf{x}_i, \text{Aux}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)$  as

$$\text{EK}(\mathcal{V}_i)(\mathbf{w}_i) \wedge \mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{x}_i - \Delta(\mathbf{w}_i) \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_i) \wedge (\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \mathbf{L}_i.$$

Let us give intuition on this overapproximation: Assume first that the overapproximation  $\mathbf{L}(e)$  of the edges have no periods. Then the overapproximation says the following: The effect  $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}$  of the pair  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  has to be the effect of a parikh vector  $\mathbf{w}$  fulfilling  $\text{EK}(\mathcal{V}_i)$ . Usually this is called  $\mathbb{Z}$ -VASS-reachability. With periods, we require that  $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} - \Delta(\mathbf{w})$  is the effect of some periods. I.e. the effect which we did not manage to produce using normal  $\mathbb{Z}$ -reachability may be compensated by using periods arbitrarily often. The system does not distinguish between which linear relation the necessary periods would be coming from.

Similar to normal VASS, there is a related notion of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -run: A  $\mathbb{Z}$ -run is a sequence of pairs  $q_j(\mathbf{x}_j)$  with  $q_j \in Q_j, \mathbf{x}_j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  s.t.  $q_j \rightarrow_{e_j} q_{j+1}$  for some edge  $e_j$ , and  $(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_{j+1}) \in \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{L}(e_j))$ , and from Lemma VII.5 it is easy to see that any full support solution of the characteristic system gives rise to a corresponding  $\mathbb{Z}$ -run.

**Recap:** We explained the algorithm structure, defined perfectness and the characteristic system. Next we define the rank, followed by deciding perfectness and the decomposition.

**Definition VII.6. Ranking function.** The  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1}$  is similar to [23], and only takes SCCs  $(S, E_S)$  of the  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS into account. We first assume that P1 holds. Similar to the characteristic system, let  $\Delta := \{\mathbf{x} \mid \exists \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}^{E_S} : \mathbf{w} \in \text{HEK}(S, E_S) \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{x}\}$  be the set of effects of cycles. Let  $\mathbf{F}_S := \bigcup_{e \in E_S} \Delta(\mathbf{F}_e)$ , where  $\mathbf{F}_e$  are the periods of  $\mathbf{L}(e)$ . We let  $d_{\text{geom}} := \dim(\mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{F}_S) + \mathbb{Q}(\Delta))$  be the dimension of the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -generated set of the cycle effects (including periods), and define  $\text{rank}(S, E_S) := \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1}$ , where  $\mathbf{r}[d+1-d_{\text{geom}}] := |E_S|$  is the number of edges, and  $\mathbf{r}[j] = 0$  otherwise. Finally,  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{\text{SCC}(S, E_S)} \text{rank}(S, E_S)$  is the sum of the ranks of all SCCs occurring in any  $\mathcal{V}_i$ .

We use the lexicographic ordering on  $\mathbb{N}^{d+1}$ .

If P1 does not hold, then the rank is assigned as if the decomposition restoring property P1 had already been

applied: In particular if an edge  $e$  would split into 5 edges, then it is counted 5 times for determining  $|E_S|$ .

The intuition on the rank is as follows: It defines a notion of “dimension” for SCCs, and if we replace a “high-dimensional” SCC by an arbitrary number of “lower-dimensional” SCCs, then the rank decreases. However, SCCs have to be weighted correctly, namely with the number of edges. In case P1 does not hold, we calculate this in a strange way.

**Deciding Perfectness and Decomposition:** We explain how to decide perfectness (Def. VII.2) and decompose otherwise.

Leroux [23] first observed for normal VASS that the properties of perfectness fall into two categories: *Cleaning properties* and *actual properties*. The difference is that the decomposition for a cleaning property *does not decrease the rank*. In exchange these properties *do not harm each other* in the following sense: In our case P1-P5 are cleaning properties, and if we do the corresponding decomposition steps in sequence, we arrive at a  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequence fulfilling *all of* P1-P5. In particular, when we decompose for P2, we do not lose P1, when we decompose for P3 we do not lose P1-P2, etc.

This is in contrast to P6 and P7: When a transition is bounded (may only be used finitely often) and hence P6 does not hold, we will remove this transition from SCCs. Removing transitions might cause certain configurations to no longer be coverable in the SCC, and property P7 is lost. Conversely if a counter is bounded in P7 and we store it in the control state, then the characteristic system now has new variables for the new edges, etc. and some of these might be bounded.

With this new knowledge, consider again Algorithm 1. We can now describe what Decompose( $\mathbf{X}$ ) does: It first guarantees properties P1-P5 simultaneously, since they are cleaning properties, and afterwards applies one actual decomposition for property P6 or P7. This way, even though P1-P5 did not decrease the rank, the whole procedure Decompose did.

This leads to the following two lemmata:

**Lemma VII.7 (Cleaning).** Let  $\mathbf{X}$  be a  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequence. Then one can in time  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+2}(\text{size}(\mathbf{X}))$  compute a finite set of  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequences  $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_k$  such that  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{X}_j) \leq \text{rank}(\mathbf{X})$ ,  $\mathbf{X} = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathbf{X}_j$ , and every  $\mathbf{X}_j$  fulfills properties P1-P5.

**Lemma VII.8 (Decomposition).** Let  $\mathbf{X}$  be a  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequence fulfilling P1-P5, which is not perfect. Then one can in time  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+d+1}(\text{size}(\mathbf{X}))$  compute a finite set of  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequences  $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_k$  s.t.  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{X}_j) < \text{rank}(\mathbf{X})$  and  $\mathbf{X} = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathbf{X}_j$ .

In the following we prove Lemma VII.7 and Lemma VII.8.

**Proof of Lemma VII.7.** The proof proceeds by doing decompositions for P1-P5 respectively in sequence.

First remember the assumptions on class  $\mathcal{C}$ :

- $\mathcal{C}$  is closed under intersection with semilinear sets.
- There is an algorithm  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}$  which given  $\mathbf{R} \in \mathcal{C}$ , in time  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha}$  outputs finitely many  $\mathbf{R}_j, \mathbf{L}_j$  and a function  $g \in \mathfrak{F}_{\alpha}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{R} = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathbf{R}_j$  with  $\mathbf{R}_j \preceq \mathbf{L}_j$ . The  $N$  in nice overapproxim. is bounded by  $g(\text{size}(\mathbf{x}) + \text{size}(\mathbf{w}) + \text{size}(\mathbf{R}_j))$ .

**P1:** We decide P1 as follows: We check for every edge  $e$  of every  $\mathcal{V}_i$  whether we have already written a label  $\mathbf{L}(e)$  on

the edge. If not, then we decompose all such edges separately, but *do not change the structure of any*  $\mathcal{V}_i$ . So let  $e$  be an edge not currently labelled with a nice overapproximation  $\mathbf{L}(e)$ . We apply  $\mathcal{A}_C$  on  $\mathbf{R}(e)$ , replacing  $e$  by edges  $e_1, \dots, e_k$  with (same source/target and)  $\mathbf{R}(e_j) := \mathbf{R}_j$  and  $\mathbf{L}(e_j) := \mathbf{L}_j$ . These are not the final output however: We still have to guarantee that  $\mathbf{L}(e_j) = \mathbf{b}_j + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_j)$  for  $\mathbf{b}_j \in \mathbf{R}(e_j)$ , i.e. that the basis of the linear relation is an element of  $\mathbf{R}(e_j)$ . If we had some handle on the class  $\mathcal{C}$ , there would be more efficient ways, but in general we can apply the main trick in the toolbox/Lemma V.4: If we understand the asymptotics, we understand  $\mathbf{R}_j$ :

Choose  $\mathbf{w}_j := \sum_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{F}_j} \mathbf{f}$  and  $\mathbf{p}_j := g(\text{size}(\mathbf{X}_j) + \text{size}(\mathbf{b}_j) + \text{size}(\mathbf{w}_j)) \cdot \mathbf{w}_j$  and set  $\mathbf{b}'_j := \mathbf{b}_j + \mathbf{p}_j$ . By Lemma V.2,  $\mathbf{L}'_j := \mathbf{b}'_j + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  is a nice overapproximation of  $\mathbf{R}_j \cap \mathbf{L}'_j$ , and by definition of the function  $g$  we have  $\mathbf{b}'_j \in \mathbf{R}_j = \mathbf{R}(e_j)$ . It remains to approximate also  $\mathbf{R}_j \cap (\mathbf{L}_j \setminus \mathbf{p}_j + \mathbf{L}_j)$ : By Lemma V.4  $\dim(\mathbf{L}_j \setminus (\mathbf{p}_j + \mathbf{L}_j)) < \dim(\mathbf{L}_j)$ . Hence we can deal with  $\mathbf{R}_j \cap (\mathbf{L}_j \setminus \mathbf{p}_j + \mathbf{L}_j)$  by again applying algorithm  $\mathcal{A}_C$  recursively, continuing until we are done.

Observe that this recursion in particular computed the minimal elements of  $\mathbf{R}(e)$ , a trick we will use again later.

Running time  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+1}$ : We have  $g \in \mathfrak{F}_\alpha$ , and use a bounded depth recursion (at most  $\dim(\mathbf{L}(e))$ ), giving  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+1}$ .

**Example VII.9.** If similar to Figure 1 we have  $\mathbf{R}(e) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \mid x \geq 1, y \leq x^2\}$ , algorithm  $\mathcal{A}_C$  might at first output  $\mathbf{L}_1(e) = \mathbb{N}^2$ . However,  $(0, 0) \notin \mathbf{R}(e)$ . Instead the algorithm computes  $g(\dots)$  (say 1), adds  $\mathbf{L}'_1(e) := (1, 1) + \mathbb{N}^2$  as an overapproximation and recursively approximates  $\mathbf{R}(e) \cap \{0\} \times \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbf{R}(e) \cap \mathbb{N} \times \{0\}$  to further add  $\mathbf{L}'_2(e) = (\mathbb{N} + 1) \times \{0\}$ .

**P2:** Simply decompose every graph into sequences of strongly-connected components and edges. This can clearly be done in exponential time. Since this does not change any edge labels, we preserve property P1.

**P3:** To check P3, we only have to compute with semilinear sets, which is in EXPTIME. If P3 does not hold, do the following: Determine the set  $\{\text{sol}_1, \dots, \text{sol}_k\}$  of minimal solutions to CharSys. Create  $k$  copies of  $\mathbf{X}$ , but  $\forall 1 \leq j \leq k$  and  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , in the  $j$ -th copy replace the  $i$ -th linear relation  $\mathbf{L}_i$  by  $\mathbf{L}'_i := \pi_i(\text{sol}_j + \text{HomCharSys})$ , where  $\pi_i$  projects CharSys to the variables for  $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i$ . Again this can be done in exponential time, and the property now holds by definition.

The intuition for this decomposition for P3 is the following: Imagine there are five “components”, and the third “component” determined that some counter  $j$  is bounded. Now the other four components have to learn this information somehow, and update their local overapproximations. The most effective way to do this is to consider the “global reachability” described by the characteristic system, and simply project its solutions. Projection of ILP solutions is computationally and mathematically simple, but unifies multiple properties like *saturatedness*, etc. of prior versions of reachability in VASS. It is one of the milestones of our version, simplifying the presentation, and removing the need for multiple  $\omega$ -configurations everywhere.

**P4:** To check condition P4, observe that by Lemma II.2 and Lemma II.3, the dimension of a linear set is simply the

rank of the matrix of periods. Hence to check P4, we compute the intersection of two linear relations, and the ranks of the matrices of periods. This is possible in exponential time.

Let  $i$  be an index where P4 does not hold, let  $e_i$  be the unique edge. Remember the approximation algorithm  $\mathcal{A}_C$ . We apply  $\mathcal{A}_C$  to  $\mathbf{R}(e_i) \cap \mathbf{L}_i$ , obtaining  $\mathbf{R}(e_i) \cap \mathbf{L}_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathbf{X}_j$  with nice overapproximations  $\mathbf{L}_1, \dots, \mathbf{L}_k$ . Similar to P1, we have to recursively refine this to reobtain  $\mathbf{b}(e) \in \mathbf{R}(e)$ , in the following let  $(\mathbf{X}'_1, \mathbf{L}'_1), \dots, (\mathbf{X}'_s, \mathbf{L}'_s)$  be the results of this recursion. We create  $s$  many  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequences from  $\mathbf{X}$  by creating  $s$  copies, in the  $j$ -th copy we change *only the labels of*  $e_i$  by  $\mathbf{R}(e_i) := \mathbf{X}'_j$  and  $\mathbf{L}(e_i) := \mathbf{L}'_j$ . Since  $\dim(\mathbf{L}(e_i) \cap \mathbf{L}_i) < \max\{\dim(\mathbf{L}(e_i)), \dim(\mathbf{L}_i)\}$  (property P4 did not hold), we have  $\dim(\mathbf{L}'_j) < \max\{\dim(\mathbf{L}(e_i)), \dim(\mathbf{L}_i)\}$ .

The dimension decrease is crucial because this only preserves properties P1 and P2, but P3 might no longer hold. Hence we now have to apply the decomposition for P3 again, which again damages property P4 and so on. However, again Toolbox trick number 1: After at most  $2 \dim(\mathbf{L}(e_i))$  many alternations between guaranteeing P3 and P4, the dimension decrease guarantees we achieved both properties P3 and P4. This decomposition takes time  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+2}$ , since we have bounded depth recursion with time  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+1}$  each step.

**P5:** To check whether there is a cycle with non-zero effect on counter  $j$ , first we check whether some period of an edge  $e$  changes  $j$ . If yes, then clearly such a cycle exists. Else for the exponentially many possible supports  $S \subseteq E_i$  the cycle could have and  $\sim \in \{>, <\}$  we write down an ILP as follows:

$$\{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}^S \mid \bigwedge_{e \in S} \mathbf{w}(e) \geq 1 \wedge \text{HEK}(\mathcal{V})(\mathbf{w}) \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{w})(j) \sim 0\}$$

If one of these ILP has a solution, then there exists such a cycle, otherwise not. If a counter does not have a loop changing it, then its value can be uniquely determined from the state of the automaton. In particular there is a unique exit value *out* at  $q_{\text{fin}, i}$ . We decompose  $\mathbf{X}_i$  into  $\text{Del} \circ \pi_{-j}(\mathbf{X}_i) \circ \text{RevDel} \circ \text{Add}$ , where Del deletes counter  $j$ , RevDel readds counter  $j$  and Add sets counter  $j$  from its current value 0 to *out*.

**Proof of Lemma VII.8:** We have to explain how to decide properties P6 and P7 of Definition VII.2, and how to decompose if they do not hold. We may assume P1-P5 hold.

**P6:** We can in exponential time decide whether a variable of an ILP is bounded. It remains to decompose. The decomposition depends on which variable is bounded: We know by P3 that  $\mathbf{L}_i$  has only homogeneous solutions as periods, hence the hidden auxiliaries for periods of  $\mathbf{L}_i$  are already unbounded. Similarly, since by P4, in case  $\mathcal{V}_i$  uses a single edge, the intersection  $\mathbf{L}(e_i) \cap \mathbf{L}_i$  is non-degenerate, the periods of  $\mathbf{L}(e_i)$  are also unbounded. The variables  $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i$  for source/target are not auxiliaries, and do not have to be unbounded. Hence the only variables for which we decompose here are  $\text{Aux}_i$  for strongly-connected  $\mathcal{V}_i$ . These are either counts of periods of  $\mathbf{L}(e)$  for edges  $e \in E_i$ , or  $\#(e)$ , the number of edge uses.

Sketch of Construction: If  $\#(e)$  is bounded by some  $n$ , then we create  $n+1$  copies of the SCC, and redirect  $e$  to point to the next copy (in particular it is no longer in an SCC, vanishing



from the rank). If a period  $\mathbf{p}$  of some linear relation  $\mathbf{L}(e)$  is bounded, then we store in the control state how often we used this period already, up to the bound. For all  $i \leq j \leq B$  where  $B$  is the bound, we have an edge from the  $i$ -th copy to the  $j$ -th which uses the period  $j - i$  many times.

What makes this decomposition step tricky is that *every* bounded variable of an SCC has to be removed *at once*, otherwise the rank does not decrease, see the appendix.

**P7:** Let  $d_i$  be the dimension of  $\mathcal{V}_i$ . Let us rephrase the two parts of property P7: Since the second half corresponds to the first if we turn around all edges as well as the relation  $\mathbf{L}_i$ , we w.l.o.g. only consider the first part here. Write  $\pi_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{L}_i) = \mathbf{b} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ . The first part can be reformulated as follows:

**Lemma VII.10.** *Let  $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, d_i\}$  be the set of counters which cannot be increased using a period of  $\pi_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{L}_i)$ . Let  $\pi: \mathbb{N}^{d_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^I$  be the projection removing counters outside  $I$ . Consider the monotone  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS  $\pi(\mathcal{V}_i)$  obtained from  $\mathcal{V}_i$  by deleting counters outside  $I$ .*

*The first part of P7 holds  $\iff (\pi(\mathbf{b}), \pi(\mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{up}) \in \text{Rel}(\pi(\mathcal{V}_i), q_{\text{in},i}, q_{\text{in},i})$  for some vector  $\mathbf{up} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}^I$ .*

*Proof.* “ $\implies$ ”: Choose configuration  $q_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{b} + 1^{d_i})$ , and apply property P6: We obtain vectors  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$  s.t.  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \text{Rel}(\mathcal{V}_i, q_{\text{in},i}, q_{\text{in},i})$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{b} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  and  $\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{b} + 1^{d_i} > \mathbf{b}$ . Defining  $\mathbf{up} := \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{b}$  and observing that deleting counters makes existence of runs easier, we obtain  $(\pi(\mathbf{b}), \pi(\mathbf{b}) + \pi(\mathbf{up})) = (\pi(\mathbf{x}), \pi(\mathbf{y})) \in \mathbf{R}(\pi(\mathcal{V}_i))$  as required.

“ $\impliedby$ ”: By definition of monotone  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS, all edges inside an SCC have monotone semantics  $\mathbf{R}(e)$ . Since  $\mathcal{V}_i$  and hence  $\pi(\mathcal{V}_i)$  is strongly-connected, *every* edge has monotone semantics. This implies that we also have  $(\pi(\mathbf{b}) + n\mathbf{up}, \pi(\mathbf{b}) + (n+1)\mathbf{up}) \in \text{Rel}(\pi(\mathcal{V}_i), q_{\text{in},i}, q_{\text{in},i})$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . By transitivity of  $\text{Rel}(\pi(\mathcal{V}_i), q_{\text{in},i}, q_{\text{in},i})$  we therefore obtain  $(\pi(\mathbf{b}), \pi(\mathbf{b}) + n\mathbf{up}) \in \text{Rel}(\pi(\mathcal{V}_i), q_{\text{in},i}, q_{\text{in},i})$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , reaching arbitrarily large configurations.

To see that this transfers back to  $\mathcal{V}_i$ , again use monotonicity: Let  $p(\mathbf{x}_t)$  be any configuration of  $\mathcal{V}_i$ . We have to show that we can cover it. Let  $n := \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_\infty$ , and let  $\rho$  be a run in  $\pi(\mathcal{V}_i)$  reaching  $\geq n$  on every counter. Write  $\rho = p_0(\mathbf{x}'_0), \dots, p_k(\mathbf{x}'_k)$  with  $\mathbf{x}'_0 = \pi(\mathbf{b}), p_0 = q_{\text{in},i}$  and  $p_k = p$ . Since the steps  $(\mathbf{x}'_m, \mathbf{x}'_{m+1}) \in \pi(\mathbf{R}(e_m))$  exist in the projection, there exist vectors  $\mathbf{x}_m, \mathbf{y}_m \in \mathbb{N}^{d_i}$  s.t.  $\pi(\mathbf{x}_m) = \mathbf{x}'_m, \pi(\mathbf{y}_m) = \mathbf{x}'_{m+1}$  and  $(\mathbf{x}_m, \mathbf{y}_m) \in \mathbf{R}(e_m)$ . Define  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^{d_i}$  by  $\mathbf{x}[j] = \mathbf{x}'_0[j]$  if  $j \in I$ , and  $\mathbf{x}[j] = \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \mathbf{x}_m[j]$  otherwise. Similarly define  $\mathbf{y}$  by  $\mathbf{y}[j] = \mathbf{x}'_k[j]$  if  $j \in I$  and  $\mathbf{y}[j] = \sum_{m=1}^k \mathbf{y}_m[j]$  otherwise. In particular  $\pi(\mathbf{x}) = \pi(\mathbf{b})$  and  $\pi(\mathbf{y})[j] \geq n$  for every  $j \in I$ . By monotonicity and transitivity we have  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \text{Rel}(\mathcal{V}_i, q_{\text{in},i}, p)$ . Since  $\pi$  only projects away coordinates which can be increased by periods of  $\pi_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{L}_i)$ , by taking every period of  $\pi_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{L}_i)$  a total of  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty$  many times, we have  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{new}} := \mathbf{b} + \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \sum_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{F}} \mathbf{f} \geq \mathbf{x}$ . By monotonicity we obtain  $(\mathbf{x}_{\text{new}}, \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{x}_{\text{new}} - \mathbf{x}) \in \text{Rel}(\mathcal{V}_i, q_{\text{in},i}, p)$ , obtaining a run in  $\mathcal{V}_i$  starting in  $\pi_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{L}_i)$  and reaching large values as claimed.  $\square$

To decide the property in Lemma VII.10 we use the well-known *backwards coverability algorithm*. It works as

follows: We maintain a finite  $\mathbf{B} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^I$  s.t. we know for all configurations  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{B} + \mathbb{N}^I$ , there exists  $\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{b} + 1^I$  with  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \text{Rel}(\pi(\mathcal{V}_i), q_{\text{in},i}, q_{\text{in},i})$ . Initially we can choose  $\mathbf{B}_0 := \{\mathbf{b} + 1^I\}$ , since we can choose  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{b} + 1^I$ , and trivially  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \in \text{Rel}(\pi(\mathcal{V}_i), q_{\text{in},i}, q_{\text{in},i})$ .

Then in a loop we enlarge the set  $\mathbf{B}_i$  by “applying transitions backwards”: If we find  $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathbf{B}_i + \mathbb{N}^I$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow_e \mathbf{B}_i$ , then we can set  $\mathbf{B}_{i+1} = \mathbf{B}_i \cup \{\mathbf{x}\}$ .

In order to apply a transition  $e$  backwards at some vector  $\mathbf{y}$ , similar to the decomposition for property P1, compute nice overapproximations  $\mathbf{L}_1, \dots, \mathbf{L}_k$  of  $\mathbb{N}^I \times \{\mathbf{y}\} \cap \mathbf{R}(e)$  using algorithm  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}$ , and improve them recursively to compute the minimal elements of  $\mathbb{N}^I \times (\mathbf{y} + \mathbb{N}^I) \cap \mathbf{R}(e)$ .

Thankfully, the backwards coverability algorithm has an easy termination guarantee by Proposition III.1: Since we only add vectors which are not larger than a vector we already had, we produce a sequence without an increasing pair. Applying a transition backwards takes  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+1}$  time similar to the decomposition for P1, and the vectors are at most in  $\mathbb{N}^d$ , hence by Proposition III.1 the complexity is at most  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+d+1}$ .

This procedure has the additional advantage that if P6 does not hold, then we obtain a bound  $B \in \mathbb{N}$  on some counter  $j \in I$  in  $\pi(\mathcal{V}_i)$ . The bound  $B$  continues to hold if we readd the projected counters, i.e. also in  $\mathcal{V}_i$  counter  $j$  is bounded by  $B$ , and we decompose by deleting counter  $j$  and instead storing it in the control state.

**Recap:** We finished the proof of Lemma VII.8, which is the last decomposition step. Hence perfectness is now decidable, and Algorithm 1 can be implemented. It remains to give a bound on the running time and explain correctness.

**Complexity:** By Lemma VII.7 and Lemma VII.8, a single loop iteration takes time  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+d+1}$ . Furthermore, the rank  $\in \mathbb{N}^{d+1}$  decreases lexicographically. Hence we are in the setting of Proposition III.1: The sequence of ranks is a  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+d+1}$ -controlled sequence in  $\mathbb{N}^{d+1}$  without an increasing pair, hence it has length at most  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+2d+2}$ .

**Correctness:** This is where the pieces of our theory fall into place. In prior versions of reachability in VASS one has to perform a complicated global argument here, but instead we only have to show the following *local* property:

**Lemma VII.11.** *For all  $1 \leq i \leq r$  the relation  $\mathbf{X}_i$  has  $\mathbf{L}'_i :=$  the projection of  $\text{LocCharSys}_i$  to the variables  $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i$  as nice overapproximation.*

Let us first explain why Lemma VII.11 is enough. Algorithm 1 outputs the projection of  $\text{CharSys}$  to  $\mathbf{x}_1$  and  $\mathbf{y}_r$  by definition, which is equal to  $\mathbf{L}'_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{L}'_r$ . Furthermore, we have  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{X}_r$ . We hence want to apply Lemma V.2, and consider the intersection  $\pi_{\text{out}}(\mathbf{L}'_{i-1}) \cap \pi_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{L}'_i)$ . By P3, these sets are equal to the projection of the solutions of  $\text{CharSys}$  to  $\mathbf{y}_{i-1}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_i$  respectively. Since  $\text{CharSys}$  contains the equations  $\mathbf{y}_{i-1} = \mathbf{x}_i$ , these sets are hence equal, in particular their intersection is non-degenerate. Hence applying Lemma V.2  $r - 1$  times, we get that  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{X}_r$  has the nice overapproximation  $\mathbf{L}'_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{L}'_r$  as claimed.

Hence it suffices to prove Lemma VII.11. We first need a standard lemma for VASS: An  $n$ -fold repetition of a cycle is enabled iff the first and last repetition of the cycle are.

**Lemma VII.12.** *Let  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \text{Rel}(\mathcal{V}_i, p, p)$  be some cycle, and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')$  be s.t.  $\mathbf{y}' - \mathbf{x}' = n(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})$  and  $\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}' \geq \mathbf{x}$ . Then  $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}') \in \text{Rel}(\mathcal{V}_i, p, p)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbf{x}' \geq \mathbf{x}$ , by monotonicity we can use the cycle and hence reach  $\mathbf{x}' + (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}' + \frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{y}' - \mathbf{x}') = \frac{n-1}{n}\mathbf{x}' + \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{y}'$ . This is a convex combination of vectors  $\geq \mathbf{x}$ , and hence still  $\geq \mathbf{x}$ . We can therefore repeat the cycle reaching  $\frac{n-2}{n}\mathbf{x}' + \frac{2}{n}\mathbf{y}'$ , another such convex combination. We repeat this  $n$  times.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma VII.11.* By Property P2 we have two cases:

Case 1:  $\mathcal{V}_i$  has only one (non-loop) edge  $e_i$ : Since the label  $\mathbf{L}(e_i)$  of  $e_i$  is a nice overapproximation of  $\mathbf{R}(e_i) = \text{Rel}(\mathcal{V}_i)$ , and we have  $\mathbf{L}'_i = \mathbf{L}_i \cap \mathbf{L}(e_i)$  is non-degenerate by property P4, Lemma V.2 (this time the first part) implies that  $\mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{R}(e_i) \cap \mathbf{L}_i$  has the nice overapproximation  $\mathbf{L}'_i$ .

Case 2:  $\mathcal{V}_i$  is strongly-connected. Let  $d_i$  be the dimension of  $\mathcal{V}_i$ . Write  $\mathbf{L}_i = \mathbf{b}_i + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_i)$  and let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L}_i$  and  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F}_i)$  be arbitrary. We have to show that there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  of size at most  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+2d+2}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}_{\geq N}\mathbf{w} \subseteq \text{Rel}(\mathcal{V}_i, q_{\text{in},i}, q_{\text{fin},i})$ . Write  $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{x}_t)$  and  $\mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{w}_t)$ . Before we can give a further overview of the proof, we need some more setup.

By Lemma VII.10, since P7 holds, we get runs **up** and **dwn** which are enabled at  $\pi_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{L}_i)$  and  $\pi_{\text{out}}(\mathbf{L}_i)$  respectively and increase the counters from  $I_{\text{in}}$  and  $I_{\text{out}}$ , where  $I_{\text{in}}$  is the set of counters which are not increased by some period of  $\pi_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{L}_i)$ , and respectively for  $I_{\text{out}}$  and  $\pi_{\text{out}}(\mathbf{L}_i)$ . We remark that they might however have negative effects on  $\{1, \dots, d_i\} \setminus I_{\text{in}}$  and  $\{1, \dots, d_i\} \setminus I_{\text{out}}$  respectively.

By property P3,  $\mathbf{L}_i$  is the projection of the characteristic system. In particular  $\mathbf{x}$  is the projection of a solution  $\mathbf{s}$  to the characteristic system. Similarly,  $\mathbf{w}$  is the projection of a homogeneous solution  $\mathbf{h}$ , and in fact since  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F}_i)$  uses every period, we see that  $\mathbf{h}$  gives value  $\geq 1$  to every auxiliary variable: Namely by property P6 every such variable is unbounded. By adding  $\mathbf{h}$  once to  $\mathbf{s}$  we w.l.o.g. assume that  $\mathbf{s}$  uses every edge, and therefore gives rise to a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -run  $\rho_{\mathbb{Z}}$ .

Let the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -run corresponding to  $\mathbf{s}$  be  $q_{\text{in},i}(\mathbf{x}_s) = q_{\text{in},i}(\mathbf{c}_0) \rightarrow_{e_1} \dots \rightarrow_{e_k} q_{\text{fin},i}(\mathbf{c}_k) = q_{\text{fin},i}(\mathbf{x}_t)$ . We can now start an overview of the proof, which will be similar to VASS:

**Goal:** We want to create (though it will not quite work out) a run of the form  $\mathbf{up}^n \mathbf{diff}^n \rho_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{dwn}^n$  for large enough  $n$ , where  $\mathbf{diff}^n$  is a run we will design, and  $\rho_{\mathbb{Z}}$  is as above.

**Observations:** We know that **up** is enabled if we add enough periods, and hence make  $\mathbf{x}_s$  large enough on the counters outside  $I_{\text{in}}$ . Similarly for **dwn**, where we need to make  $\mathbf{x}_t$  large enough outside  $I_{\text{out}}$ . Since **up** and respectively **dwn** have only positive (resp. only negative) effects, we can by monotonicity automatically apply them an arbitrary number  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  of times. So  $\mathbf{up}^n$  and  $\mathbf{dwn}^n$  are not an issue. Since both source and target of  $\mathbf{diff}^n$  become arbitrarily large, by Lemma VII.12  $\mathbf{diff}^n$  is enabled for all large enough  $n$ .

Hence the remaining problems are:

- How to choose **diff**.
- The steps of  $\rho_{\mathbb{Z}}$  might be invalid without periods.

The first problem is clear, but what is an invalid step? We know that  $(\mathbf{c}_{i-1}, \mathbf{c}_i) \in \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{L}(e_i))$  by definition of a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -run. But we require  $(\mathbf{c}_{i-1}, \mathbf{c}_i) \in \mathbf{R}(e_i)$  for it to be an actual run. To solve this, by monotonicity, we can w.l.o.g. assume  $(\mathbf{c}_{i-1}, \mathbf{c}_i) \in \mathbf{L}(e_i)$  by increasing every configuration of the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -run by enough. Later we will then invoke  $\mathbf{R}(e_i) \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}(e_i)$  with appropriate  $\mathbf{w}(e_i)$  to obtain  $(\mathbf{c}_{i-1}, \mathbf{c}_i) \in \mathbf{R}(e_i)$  as required. But first we turn to the construction of **diff**.

In the following we have to use the value  $\mathbf{s}$  assigns to the variable  $\#(e)$  for number of edges. We write  $\mathbf{s}[\#(e)]$  in this case, and for accessing how often the periods of edge  $e$  are used we write  $\mathbf{s}[\mathbf{p}(e)] \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbf{F}(e)}$ , i.e. this does not refer to a specific period, but rather all periods of  $\mathbf{L}(e)$  together. We will never need to single out one period.

The idea for defining **diff** is: In order to remain an element of  $\mathbf{L}_i$ , we have to remain a (projection of a) solution to the characteristic system. However, we added runs **up** and **dwn** damaging this fact. Hence we have to compensate them, ensuring that  $\mathbf{up} + \mathbf{diff} + \mathbf{dwn}$  is induced by a homogeneous solution of CharSys. So first we create a homogeneous solution  $k\mathbf{h}$  “ $\geq \mathbf{up} + \mathbf{dwn}$ ” by choosing  $k$  large enough.

Since  $\mathbf{h}[\#(e)] \geq 1$  and  $\mathbf{h}[\mathbf{p}(e)] \geq \mathbf{1}$  for every edge  $e$ , we can scale  $\mathbf{h}$  by an appropriate constant  $k$  to get  $(k\mathbf{h} - \text{pk}(\mathbf{up}) - \text{pk}(\mathbf{dwn}))[\#(e)] \geq 1$  for every  $e$ , where  $\text{pk}(\rho)$  is the parikh image of the run  $\rho$ . Similarly,  $(k\mathbf{h} - \text{pk}(\mathbf{up}) - \text{pk}(\mathbf{dwn}))[\mathbf{p}(e)] \geq \mathbf{0}$  for every period  $\mathbf{p}(e)$ . Hence there is a cycle **cyc** with parikh image  $k\mathbf{h} - \text{pk}(\mathbf{up}) - \text{pk}(\mathbf{dwn})$  using every edge. There is however a new problem: How to insert the periods, i.e. the  $(k\mathbf{h} - \text{pk}(\mathbf{up}) - \text{pk}(\mathbf{dwn}))[\mathbf{p}(e)]$  part?

The answer is we have to invoke  $\mathbf{R}(e) \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}(e)$  correctly. Write  $\mathbf{cyc} = e'_1 e'_2 \dots e'_m$ , and for every edge  $e \in E_i$ , fix a use  $e'_{j(e)}$  of edge  $e$  in **cyc**. For every  $e \in E_i$  use  $\mathbf{R}(e) \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}(e)$  with  $\mathbf{x}(e) := \text{ends}(e'_{j(e)})$  and  $\mathbf{w}(e) := \mathbf{h}[\mathbf{p}(e)]$ , which is possible since  $\mathbf{h}[\mathbf{p}(e)]$  uses every period of  $\mathbf{L}(e)$ . We obtain a number  $N(e)$  s.t. inserting  $n\mathbf{h}[\mathbf{p}(e)]$  periods is possible for any number  $n \geq N(e)$ . We define  $k_{\text{new}} := k + \max_{e \in E} N(e)$ .

We can now build **diff** by adapting **cyc**: We add  $(k_{\text{new}}\mathbf{h} - \text{pk}(\mathbf{up}) - \text{pk}(\mathbf{dwn}))[\mathbf{p}(e)]$  times the periods  $\mathbf{p}(e)$  into the selected edge  $e'_{j(e)}$  of **cyc** to obtain **cyc'**. We hence fixed the periods, but are now missing  $(k_{\text{new}} - k)\mathbf{h}[\#(e)]$  uses of  $e$ . We use the last unused property of perfectness: By P1 the basis  $\mathbf{b}(e) \in \mathbf{R}(e)$  for every  $e \in E_i$ . Hence we just pick any cycle **cyc''** with  $\text{pk}(\mathbf{cyc}'')[e] = (k_{\text{new}} - k)\mathbf{h}[\#(e)]$  for every edge  $e$ . We do not use any periods in **cyc''**. We define **diff** = **cyc'cyc''**, which by construction compensates correctly.

Making the steps of  $\rho_{\mathbb{Z}}$  valid can be solved similarly to **diff**, and we obtain a new  $\mathbb{Z}$ -run  $\rho'_{\mathbb{Z}}$  consisting of valid steps. At this point our goal run is a run for every large enough  $n$ , but we have a problem: We can so far only pump multiples of  $k_{\text{new}}$  of homogeneous solutions, since we have to add full copies of **up**, **diff** and **dwn**, however the Lemma claims a run for every  $m \geq N$ .

The last trick is the following: We repeat the above con-

struction of  $\text{diff}$  with  $k_{\text{new},1} := k_{\text{new}} + 1$  to obtain  $\text{diff}_1$  with

$$\text{pk}(\text{up})[\#(e)] + \text{pk}(\text{diff}_1)[\#(e)] + \text{pk}(\text{dwn})[\#(e)] = k_{\text{new},1} \mathbf{h}[\#(e)]$$

for every edge  $e$  and accordingly for periods, i.e. we add up to  $k_{\text{new},1}$  many homogeneous solutions now. We define  $N := k_{\text{new}}^2$ , and observe that any  $m \geq N = k_{\text{new}}^2$  can be written as  $m = j_1 k_{\text{new}} + j_2 k_{\text{new},1}$ . This allows us to define for every  $m \geq N$  the following final run proving the theorem:

$$\rho_m := \text{up}^{j_1+j_2} \text{diff}^{j_1} \text{diff}_1^{j_2} \rho'_Z \text{dwn}^{j_1+j_2}$$

which by construction fulfills  $\text{ends}(\rho_m) = \mathbf{x} + m\mathbf{w}$  as claimed. The arguments for why the goal run was enabled still apply to  $\rho_m$ . Finally, the size of  $\rho_m$  and  $N = k_{\text{new}}^2$  is proportional to the runs  $\text{up}$  and  $\text{dwn}$ , which have size  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+d+1}$ .  $\square$

### VIII. NICE OVERAPPROXIMATION

In this section we define axioms, and prove that for classes of systems fulfilling them most problems are decidable.

We start with some preliminary definitions.

**Definition VIII.1.** A set  $\mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$  is directed hybridlinear if  $\mathbf{L} = \{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_k\} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  for a finite set  $\mathbf{F}$  and  $(\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})) \cap (\mathbf{b}_j + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})) \neq \emptyset$  for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ .

Intuitively, a directed hybridlinear set is a linear set minus some minor things on the boundary. For example in  $\mathbb{N}^3$  we have  $\mathbf{L} = \{(1, 1, 0), (1, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1)\} + \mathbb{N}^3$  is directed hybridlinear, is obtained from  $\mathbb{N}^3$  by removing three lines. On the other hand, sets of the form  $\{0, 1\} \times \mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^2$  are clearly not directed hybridlinear, the base points can never be chosen to fulfill the extra condition.

Dir.hybridlinear has the following advantage over linear:

**Lemma VIII.2.** Let  $\mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{L}'$  be directed hybridlinear with a non-degenerate intersection. Then  $\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}'$  is dir. hybridlinear.

While linear sets are not closed under intersection at all, dir. hybridlinear sets are closed under non-degenerate intersection.

The following is the basis of our semilinearity algorithm:

**Definition VIII.3.** Let  $\mathbf{L} = \{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_k\} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  be directed hybridlinear and  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{L}$ . If there is  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ , then  $\mathbf{X}$  is called reducible, otherwise irreducible.

Such a vector  $\mathbf{x}$  is called a reduction point.

Intuitively, if  $\mathbf{X}$  is reducible with reduction point  $\mathbf{x}$ , then  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{L}$  coincide for points larger than  $\mathbf{x}$ .

Now we are ready to define the axioms, and afterwards give intuition. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of relations closed under intersecting with semilinear relations, in our case the VASSnz sections. A relation  $\trianglelefteq$  relating objects  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}$  to directed hybridlinear relations  $\mathbf{L}$  is nice (for  $\mathcal{C}$ ) if it fulfills the following axioms.

**Definition VIII.4.** The following are the geometric axioms:

- 1) Let  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ . Then for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L}$  and every  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$ ,  $\exists N \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}_{\geq N}\mathbf{w} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ .
- 2) There is an algorithm which given  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}$  computes a set of dir. hybridlinear  $\{\mathbf{L}_1, \dots, \mathbf{L}_k\}$  s.t. there exist  $\mathbf{X}_j$  with  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathbf{X}_k$  and  $\mathbf{X}_j \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}_j$  for every  $j$ .

- 3) If  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  is directed hybridlinear, then  $\mathbf{L} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$ .
- 4) If  $\mathbf{X}_1 \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}_1$  and  $\mathbf{X}_2 \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}_2$  s.t.  $\mathbf{L}_1 \cap \mathbf{L}_2$  is non-degenerate then  $(\mathbf{X}_1 \cap \mathbf{X}_2) \trianglelefteq (\mathbf{L}_1 \cap \mathbf{L}_2)$ .<sup>1</sup>
- 5) If  $\mathbf{X}_1 \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{X}_2 \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$ , then  $(\mathbf{X}_1 \cup \mathbf{X}_2) \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$ .
- 6) If  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  is irreducible, then  $\mathbf{X}$  is non-semilinear.
- 7) There is an algorithm which given  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{L}$  fulfilling the promise  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$  decides whether  $\mathbf{X}$  is reducible, and if yes computes a reduction point  $\mathbf{x}$ .
- 8) Let  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  and  $\mathbf{S}$  be semilinear s.t.  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{S}$ . Then there exists  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbf{S}$ .

Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ . If class  $\mathcal{C}$  fulfills the Axioms with running time  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$  for Axioms 2 and 7, then  $\mathcal{C}$  is called  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$ -effective.

Using Theorem VI.4 to solve Axiom 2, and an adaptation of Theorem VI.4 to solve Axiom 7, we obtain:

**Theorem VIII.5.** The class  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $(k, d)$ -VASSnz sections is  $\mathfrak{F}_{2kd+2k+2d+5}$ -effective with the model:  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$  iff

$\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  is directed hybridlinear and for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L}$  and all  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$ , there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}_{\geq N}\mathbf{w} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ .

With the framework in place and a first class of systems inside, it remains to exhibit the power of the framework.

**Theorem VIII.6.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$ -effective. Then the following problems are decidable in the time bound stated:

- (1) Reachability, i.e. is  $\mathbf{X}$  non-empty? Time:  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$ .
- (2) Boundedness, i.e. is  $\mathbf{X}$  finite? Time:  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$ .
- (3) Semilinearity, i.e. is  $\mathbf{X}$  semilinear, and if yes, output a semilinear representation. Time:  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+1}$ .
- (4) Given  $\mathbf{X}$  and semilinear  $\mathbf{S}$ , is  $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ ? Time:  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+1}$ .
- (5) Given  $\mathbf{X}$  and semilinear  $\mathbf{S}$ , is  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{X}$ ? Time:  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+1}$ .
- (6)  $\mathcal{F}$ -separability for  $\mathcal{F} = \text{Semil, Mod, Unary}$  in time  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+1}$ .

We now proceed to prove the parts one after the other, while simultaneously introducing intuition for the axioms. Axioms 1 and 2 we have already used in the reachability algorithm.

*Proof of Theorem VIII.6, (1)-(2).* If  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$ , then  $\mathbf{X} \neq \emptyset$  by Axiom 1. Hence for (1) apply Axiom 2) and check for  $k = 0$ .

Regarding (2), if  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$ , then by Axiom 1, if  $\mathbf{L}$  has a period, then  $\mathbf{X}$  is infinite. Hence for (2) we apply Axiom 2) and simply check whether some  $\mathbf{L}_j$  has a period.  $\square$

For solving the semilinearity problem, we have to understand the intuition behind Axioms 6 and 7. Imagine 6) and 7) were both true even under the weaker assumption  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{L}$ , under which we defined reducibility. Then there would be an obvious algorithm for deciding semilinearity of  $\mathbf{X}$ : Apply 7) to check whether there exists a reduction point  $\mathbf{x}$ . If not, then  $\mathbf{X}$  is irreducible and hence we can answer non-semilinear by Axiom 6). If yes, then we can reduce  $\mathbf{X}$ : 7) provides a reduction point  $\mathbf{x}$ , and because of  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ , whether  $\mathbf{X}$  is semilinear or not only depends on  $\mathbf{X} \cap \mathbf{S}$ , where  $\mathbf{S} := \mathbf{L} \setminus (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{L})$ . Since  $\dim(\mathbf{S}) < \dim(\mathbf{L})$  by Lemma V.4, we can simply continue recursively with  $\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}} := \mathbf{X} \cap \mathbf{S}$ .

<sup>1</sup>Linear sets are not closed under non-degenerate intersection, hence we require directed hybridlinear.

There are however two problems with this simpler version. Problem 1 is that Axiom 6 is false with only the assumption  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{L}$ : For example  $\mathbf{X} = \{x - \text{axis}\} \cup \{y - \text{axis}\} \subseteq \mathbf{L} := \mathbb{N}^2$  is irreducible, but semilinear. Problem 2 is that while an algorithm for Axiom 7 exists without the promise, it more or less requires the semilinearity algorithm as a subroutine, leading to circular reasoning.

Problems 1 and 2 are resolved by adding the assumption  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$  in 6) and 7), and using the closure properties in Axioms 3-5) we can complete the algorithm sketch. The argument for this fact is presented in [10], Section 5.

*Proof of Theorem VIII.6, (3)-(5).* (3): We explained the algorithm in the paragraphs above/refer to [10], Section 5. For the time bound observe that Axiom 7 takes time  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$ , and we have recursion depth at most  $d+1$ , hence the time bound is a  $(d+1)$ -fold application of a function in  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$ , leading to  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+1}$ .

(4): Apply the semilinearity algorithm on  $\mathbf{X}_{new} := \mathbf{X} \cap \mathbf{S}$ . If you obtain a semilinear representation equivalent to  $\mathbf{S}$ , return true, otherwise return false. Clearly again  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+1}$ .

(5): Check  $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$  via (4), and check that  $\mathbf{X}_{new} := \mathbf{X} \cap \mathbf{S}^C = \emptyset$  via (1), where  $\mathbf{S}^C$  is the complement of  $\mathbf{S}$ .  $\square$

Also problems of the following type, called *separability problems*, can be answered using  $\trianglelefteq$ . Fix a class  $\mathcal{F}$  of relations.

E.g.  $\mathcal{F} = \text{Semilinear, Recognizable, Modulo, etc.}$

**Definition VIII.7.** *Two sets  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  are  $\mathcal{F}$ -separable if there exists  $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{F}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{S}$  and  $\mathbf{Y} \cap \mathbf{S} = \emptyset$ . The  $\mathcal{F}$ -separability problem asks given  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$ , are they  $\mathcal{F}$ -separable?*

To solve these problems, we use the following definition:

**Definition VIII.8.** *Let  $\mathbf{X}$  be any set. Let  $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{S}$ . Then  $\mathbf{S}$  is called up-to-boundary-optimal (utbo)  $\mathcal{F}$  overapproximation of  $\mathbf{X}$  if any other overapproximation  $\mathbf{S}' \in \mathcal{F}$  fulfills  $\mathbf{S} + \mathbf{x} \subseteq \mathbf{S}'$  for some vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ .*

Intuitively, an  $\mathcal{F}$ -overapproximation  $\mathbf{S}$  would be *optimal* if every other overapproximation  $\mathbf{S}' \in \mathcal{F}$  is larger. We require a weaker property: Utbo, which states that some parts of the boundary of  $\mathbf{S}$  might not be contained in  $\mathbf{S}'$ , instead a shifted version  $\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{S}'$ . As an example of this definition, consider Axiom 8: Axiom 8 states that if  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$ , then  $\mathbf{L}$  is a utbo semilinear overapproximation of  $\mathbf{X}$ : Namely any semilinear overapproximation  $\mathbf{S}$  necessarily contains  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{L}$  for  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ .

Theorem VIII.6(6) will be a consequence of the following:

**Theorem VIII.9.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$ -effective class, and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a class of relations s.t. the following hold:*

- $\mathcal{F}$  is closed under Boolean operations in time  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$ .
- Computing  $\dim(\mathbf{T})$  given  $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{F}$  is in time  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$ .
- There is an algorithm with a time bound of  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$  for:  
*Input: A utbo semilinear overapproximation  $\mathbf{S}$  of  $\mathbf{X}$ .*  
*Output: A utbo  $\mathcal{F}$  overapproximation  $\mathbf{S}'$  of the same  $\mathbf{X}$ .*

*Then  $\mathcal{F}$ -separability is decidable in time  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+1}$ .*

*Proof.* We check  $\mathcal{F}$ -separability for  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  as follows:

Step 1: Apply Axiom 2 to write  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathbf{X}_k$  and  $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{Y}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathbf{Y}_s$  with  $\mathbf{X}_j \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}_j$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_m \trianglelefteq \mathbf{S}_m$  for all  $j, m$ .

Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed under all Boolean operations, it is sufficient and necessary to  $\mathcal{F}$ -separate every  $\mathbf{X}_j$  from every  $\mathbf{Y}_m$ .

Step 2: For all indices  $j, m$  do: By Axiom 8,  $\mathbf{L}_j$  is a utbo semilinear overapproximation of  $\mathbf{X}_j$  and similarly  $\mathbf{S}_m$  is a utbo semilinear overapproximation of  $\mathbf{Y}_m$ . From these compute utbo  $\mathcal{F}$ -overapproximations  $\mathbf{L}'_j$  and  $\mathbf{S}'_m$  of  $\mathbf{X}_j$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_m$  respectively using bullet point 3.

Step 3: Finally we check whether  $\mathbf{L}'_j \cap \mathbf{S}'_m$  is non-degenerate for *some*  $j$  and  $m$ . This can be done by bullet points 1 and 2.

Step 4: If such  $j, m$  exist, then the algorithm rejects. Otherwise the algorithm continues recursively with  $\mathbf{X}_{new} := \mathbf{X} \cap \bigcup_{j,m} (\mathbf{L}'_j \cap \mathbf{S}'_m)$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_{new} := \mathbf{Y} \cap \bigcup_{j,m} (\mathbf{L}'_j \cap \mathbf{S}'_m)$ , which are of lower dimension.

*Correctness:* We prove that the algorithm can safely reject if any  $\mathbf{L}'_j \cap \mathbf{S}'_m$  is non-degenerate. We remove the indices for readability, referring to  $\mathbf{X}_j, \mathbf{L}'_j$  as  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_m, \mathbf{S}'_m$  as  $\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{S}$ .

Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed under complement,  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}$  are  $\mathcal{F}$ -separable if and only if there exist  $\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{F}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \subseteq \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{Y}$  and  $\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{X} \cap \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{Y} = \emptyset$ . We claim that such  $\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{Y}$  do not exist.

Let  $\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y} \subseteq \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{Y}$  be arbitrary candidates for separating. Since  $\mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{S}$  are utbo  $\mathcal{F}$  overapproximations of  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}$  respectively, there exist shifts  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$  such that  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{Y}$ . Since  $\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{S}$  is non-degenerate, also  $(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{L}) \cap (\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{S})$  is non-degenerate, and in particular  $\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{X} \cap \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{Y} \supseteq (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{L}) \cap (\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{S}) \neq \emptyset$  is non-empty as was to prove.

*Time Bound:* The recursion depth of Step 4 is at most  $d+1$ , a constant, and one call takes  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$ , hence we obtain  $\mathfrak{F}_{\alpha+1}$ .  $\square$

We remark that while Theorem VIII.9 may be applied for  $\mathcal{F} \not\subseteq \text{Semilinear}$ , already for  $\mathcal{F} = \text{Semilinear}$  separability is equivalent to disjointness of  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$ . This fact is similar to [10], Cor. 6.5 and is a consequence of this algorithm: For  $\mathcal{F} = \text{Semilinear}$ , if in step 4 of Theorem VIII.9 we find  $\mathbf{L}_i \cap \mathbf{S}_j$  non-degenerate, then by Axiom 4 we have  $\mathbf{X}_i \cap \mathbf{Y}_j \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}_i \cap \mathbf{S}_j$ . In particular  $\mathbf{X}_i \cap \mathbf{Y}_j \neq \emptyset$ . Otherwise the algorithm outputs a semilinear separator, in particular there exists one.

Finally we are ready to finish the proof of Theorem VIII.6.

*Proof of Theorem VIII.6(6).* It is easy to check that the classes mentioned fulfill bullet points 1-3 of Theorem VIII.9. Hence Theorem VIII.6(6) follows from Theorem VIII.9.  $\square$

## IX. CONCLUSION

Theorem VIII.5 and Theorem VIII.6 in particular imply:

**Corollary IX.1.** *The reachability, boundedness, semilinearity and  $\mathcal{F}$ -separability (for  $\mathcal{F} = \text{Semilinear, Modulo, Unary}$ ) problems are decidable in Ackermann time for VASS and VASSnz.*

To achieve this we have introduced monotone  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS, indirectly also answering the question of ‘‘What types of transitions can we allow a VASS to have while remaining decidable?’’ Namely, by Theorem VI.3, under minor assumptions on  $\mathcal{C}$ , monotone  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS sections are approximable if and only if  $\mathcal{C}$  is approximable.

This leaves the following questions: 1) Can the parameterized complexity be improved? On the level of  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS,

can we avoid  $+d$  for coverability? Does the index have to depend on  $k$ ? Do VASSnz have lower complexity than nested  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS? In particular, one can ask about the parameterized complexity for both VASSnz and  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS.

2) Are there other applications of  $\mathcal{C}$ -eVASS, or other classes  $\mathcal{C}$  for which they are interesting to consider?

3) Are there other classes of systems which have a model of “nice”, for example Pushdown VASS?

## REFERENCES

- [1] Mohamed Faouzi Atig and Pierre Ganty. Approximating petri net reachability along context-free traces. In *FSTTCS*, volume 13 of *LIPICs*, pages 152–163. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2011.
- [2] Michael Blondin and François Ladouceur. Population protocols with unordered data. In *ICALP*, volume 261 of *LIPICs*, pages 115:1–115:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
- [3] Rémi Bonnet. The reachability problem for vector addition system with one zero-test. In *MFCS*, volume 6907 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 145–157. Springer, 2011.
- [4] Rémi Bonnet. *Theory of Well-Structured Transition Systems and Extended Vector-Addition Systems*. Thèse de doctorat, Laboratoire Spécification et Vérification, ENS Cachan, France, 2013.
- [5] Wojciech Czerwinski, Slawomir Lasota, Ranko Lazic, Jérôme Leroux, and Filip Mazowiecki. The reachability problem for petri nets is not elementary. In *STOC*, pages 24–33. ACM, 2019.
- [6] Wojciech Czerwinski and Lukasz Orlikowski. Reachability in vector addition systems is ackermann-complete. In *FOCS*, pages 1229–1240. IEEE, 2021.
- [7] Diego Figueira, Santiago Figueira, Sylvain Schmitz, and Philippe Schnoebelen. Ackermannian and primitive-recursive bounds with dickson’s lemma. In *LICS*, pages 269–278. IEEE Computer Society, 2011.
- [8] Alain Finkel, Jérôme Leroux, and Grégoire Sutre. Reachability for two-counter machines with one test and one reset. In *FSTTCS*, volume 122 of *LIPICs*, pages 31:1–31:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018.
- [9] Roland Guttenberg. Flattability of priority vector addition systems. In *ICALP*, volume 297 of *LIPICs*, pages 141:1–141:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2024.
- [10] Roland Guttenberg, Mikhail A. Raskin, and Javier Esparza. Geometry of reachability sets of vector addition systems. In *CONCUR*, volume 279 of *LIPICs*, pages 6:1–6:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
- [11] Christoph Haase. A survival guide to presburger arithmetic. *ACM SIGLOG News*, 5(3):67–82, 2018.
- [12] Dirk Hauschildt. *Semilinearity of the reachability set is decidable for Petri nets*. PhD thesis, University of Hamburg, Germany, 1990.
- [13] Piotr Hofman, Slawomir Lasota, Ranko Lazic, Jérôme Leroux, Sylvain Schmitz, and Patrick Totzke. Coverability trees for petri nets with unordered data. In *FoSSaCS*, volume 9634 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 445–461. Springer, 2016.
- [14] S. Rao Kosaraju. Decidability of reachability in vector addition systems. In *STOC*, pages 267–281. ACM, 1982.
- [15] Jean-Luc Lambert. A structure to decide reachability in petri nets. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 99(1):79–104, 1992.
- [16] Ranko Lazic and Sylvain Schmitz. The complexity of coverability in  $\nu$ -petri nets. In *LICS*, pages 467–476. ACM, 2016.
- [17] Jérôme Leroux. The general vector addition system reachability problem by presburger inductive invariants. In *LICS*, pages 4–13. IEEE Computer Society, 2009.
- [18] Jérôme Leroux. Vector addition system reachability problem: A short self-contained proof. In *LATA*, volume 6638 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 41–64. Springer, 2011.
- [19] Jérôme Leroux. Vector addition systems reachability problem (A simpler solution). In *Turing-100*, volume 10 of *EPiC Series in Computing*, pages 214–228. EasyChair, 2012.
- [20] Jérôme Leroux. Presburger vector addition systems. In *LICS*, pages 23–32. IEEE Computer Society, 2013.
- [21] Jérôme Leroux. The reachability problem for petri nets is not primitive recursive. In *FOCS*, pages 1241–1252. IEEE, 2021.
- [22] Jérôme Leroux, M. Praveen, and Grégoire Sutre. Hyper-ackermannian bounds for pushdown vector addition systems. In *CSL-LICS*, pages 63:1–63:10. ACM, 2014.
- [23] Jérôme Leroux and Sylvain Schmitz. Reachability in vector addition systems is primitive-recursive in fixed dimension. In *LICS*, pages 1–13. IEEE, 2019.
- [24] Jérôme Leroux and Grégoire Sutre. Reachability in two-dimensional vector addition systems with states: One test is for free. In *CONCUR*, volume 171 of *LIPICs*, pages 37:1–37:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [25] Jérôme Leroux, Grégoire Sutre, and Patrick Totzke. On the coverability problem for pushdown vector addition systems in one dimension. In *ICALP (2)*, volume 9135 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 324–336. Springer, 2015.
- [26] Ernst W. Mayr. An algorithm for the general petri net reachability problem. In *STOC*, pages 238–246. ACM, 1981.
- [27] Klaus Reinhardt. Reachability in petri nets with inhibitor arcs. In *RP*, volume 223 of *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 239–264. Elsevier, 2008.
- [28] Fernando Rosa-Velardo and David de Frutos-Escrig. Decidability and complexity of petri nets with unordered data. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 412(34):4439–4451, 2011.
- [29] Sylvain Schmitz. Complexity hierarchies beyond elementary. *ACM Trans. Comput. Theory*, 8(1):3:1–3:36, 2016.
- [30] Alexander Schrijver. *Theory of linear and integer programming*. Wiley-Interscience series in discrete mathematics and optimization. Wiley, 1999.

## APPENDIX

### A. Appendix of Section V

This is the appendix of Section V.

We start with an important statement about Definition V.1 of nice overapproximation, which is not obvious from the definition we gave, since we use  $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$ : Definition V.1 is independent of the representation of  $\mathbf{L}$ . The simplest way to prove this is to consider the following definition only depending on  $\mathbf{L}$ , not some representation of it.

**Definition A.1.** Let  $\mathbf{P}$  be  $\mathbb{N}$ -g., and  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{P}$ .

The vector  $\mathbf{v}$  is in the interior of  $\mathbf{P}$  if for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{P}$ , there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $n\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{P}$ .

The set of all interior vectors is denoted  $\text{int}(\mathbf{P})$ .

Accordingly, we define the interior of a linear set as  $\text{int}(\mathbf{L}) = \mathbf{b} + \text{int}(\mathbf{L} - \mathbf{b})$ , where  $\mathbf{b}$  is the base point of  $\mathbf{L}$ . Observe that since linear sets are  $\subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ , the base point is the unique minimal point in  $\mathbf{L}$ , hence this definition does not depend on the representation.

Now we can prove that nice overapproximation does not depend on the representation, by proving that  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$  can equivalently be replaced by  $\mathbf{w} \in \text{int}(\mathbf{L}) - \mathbf{b}$ :

**Lemma A.2.** Let  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{b} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  be a linear set, and  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{L}$ . Then in Definition V.1 “ $\forall \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$ ” can equivalently be replaced by “ $\forall \mathbf{w} \in \text{int}(\mathbf{L}) - \mathbf{b}$ ”.

In particular, the definition of nice overapproximation is independent of the representation of  $\mathbf{L}$ .

*Proof.* First observe that by definition of  $\text{int}(\mathbf{L})$ , we have  $\text{int}(\mathbf{L}) - \mathbf{b} = (\mathbf{b} + \text{int}(\mathbf{L} - \mathbf{b})) - \mathbf{b} = \text{int}(\mathbf{L} - \mathbf{b}) = \text{int}(\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}))$ .

“ $\Leftarrow$ ”: We assume the line containment property holds for all  $\mathbf{w} \in \text{int}(\mathbf{L}) - \mathbf{b} = \text{int}(\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}))$  and prove it for all  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$ . It suffices to prove  $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F}) \subseteq \text{int}(\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}))$ . Hence let  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$ . To prove  $\mathbf{w} \in \text{int}(\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}))$ , let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  arbitrary.

We have to show that there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $n\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ . Write  $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{F}} \lambda_{\mathbf{f}} \mathbf{f}$ , and simply define  $n := \max_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{F}} \lambda_{\mathbf{f}}$ . Then  $n\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{x}$  uses every  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{F}$  at least  $n - \lambda_{\mathbf{f}} \geq 0$  times, i.e. is in  $\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  as claimed.

“ $\Rightarrow$ ”: We assume the line containment property holds for all  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$  and have to prove it for all  $\mathbf{w} \in \text{int}(\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}))$ . Hence let  $\mathbf{w} \in \text{int}(\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}))$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L}$ . We claim the following: There exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $n\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$ .

Proof of claim: For all  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{F}$ , we do the following: We use that  $\mathbf{w}$  is in the interior to obtain  $n_{\mathbf{f}} \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $n_{\mathbf{f}}\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ . We define  $n := \sum_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{F}} n_{\mathbf{f}}$  and observe that it proves the claim.

Therefore let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be s.t.  $n\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$ . For all  $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$  we define  $\mathbf{x}_j := \mathbf{x} + j\mathbf{w}$ . Observe that

$$\bigcup_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{x}_j + n\mathbb{N}\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{w},$$

since  $\mathbb{N} = \{0, \dots, n-1\} + n\mathbb{N}$ . For all  $0 \leq j \leq n-1$  we use our assumption with  $\mathbf{x}_j \in \mathbf{L}$  and  $n\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$  to obtain  $N_j \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x}_j + \mathbb{N}_{\geq N_j} n\mathbf{w} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ . Defining  $N := n + \max_{0 \leq j \leq n-1} N_j$ , we obtain  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}_{\geq N} n\mathbf{w} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ .  $\square$

In particular we will (indirectly) use Lemma A.2 whenever we want to prove that  $\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{L}$ , since we might not be given the exact representation considered.

Before we can start with the lemmas from the main text, we first need two more observations/lemmas about the interior. The first states that the interior makes up “most of the points” in a linear set, in the sense of dimension.

**Lemma A.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  be  $\mathbb{N}$ -finitely generated.*

*Then  $\dim(\mathbf{P} \setminus \text{int}(\mathbf{P})) < \dim(\mathbf{P})$ .*

*Proof.* First observe that by Lemma II.3 we have  $\dim(\mathbf{P}) = \dim(\mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{P}))$ , hence it suffices to prove  $\dim(\mathbf{P} \setminus \text{int}(\mathbf{P})) < \dim(\mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{P}))$ . I.e. we have to show that  $\mathbf{P} \setminus \text{int}(\mathbf{P})$  is contained in a union of lower dimensional vector spaces/ $\mathbb{Q}$ -generated sets. To this end, consider any vector  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{P} \setminus \text{int}(\mathbf{P})$ .

Write  $\mathbf{v} = \sum_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{F}} \lambda_{\mathbf{f}} \mathbf{f}$ . Since  $\mathbf{v}$  is not interior, there exists a  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{P}$  (in fact  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{F}$ ) s.t. there is no scalar  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n\mathbf{v} \geq \mathbf{x}$ . Let  $\mathbf{F}' := \{\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{F} \mid \lambda_{\mathbf{f}} \geq 1\}$  be the set of coefficients used for  $\mathbf{v}$ . Then  $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{F}')$  by the above: Otherwise such a scalar  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  would exist.

Hence  $\dim(\mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{F}')) < \dim(\mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{F}') + \mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{x})) \leq \dim(\mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{P}))$ .

Since we chose  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{P} \setminus \text{int}(\mathbf{P})$  arbitrary, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P} \setminus \text{int}(\mathbf{P}) \subseteq \bigcup_{\mathbf{F}' \subseteq \mathbf{F}, \dim(\mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{F}')) < \dim(\mathbf{P})} \mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{F}'),$$

which has lower dimension than  $\mathbf{P}$ .  $\square$

The next lemma states a dichotomy: If  $\mathbf{P}' \subseteq \mathbf{P}$ , then either  $\text{int}(\mathbf{P}') \subseteq \text{int}(\mathbf{P})$ , or their intersection is empty. The lemma even states  $\mathbf{P}' \cap \text{int}(\mathbf{P})$  being empty.

**Lemma A.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{P}' \subseteq \mathbf{P}$  be  $\mathbb{N}$ -generated sets. Then either  $\text{int}(\mathbf{P}') \subseteq \text{int}(\mathbf{P})$  or  $\mathbf{P}' \cap \text{int}(\mathbf{P}) = \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\mathbf{P}' \cap \text{int}(\mathbf{P}) \neq \emptyset$ . We have to prove that  $\text{int}(\mathbf{P}') \subseteq \text{int}(\mathbf{P})$ . Let  $\mathbf{w} \in \text{int}(\mathbf{P}')$ . It suffices to prove  $\mathbf{w} \in \text{int}(\mathbf{P})$ . To prove this, we have to take an arbitrary  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{P}$  and prove that there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $n\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{P}$ .

Since  $\mathbf{P}' \cap \text{int}(\mathbf{P}) \neq \emptyset$ , there exists  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{P}' \cap \text{int}(\mathbf{P})$ . By definition of  $\text{int}(\mathbf{P})$  there exists  $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $n_1\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{P}$ . Since  $\mathbf{w} \in \text{int}(\mathbf{P}')$  and  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{P}'$ , there exists  $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $n_2\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{P}'$ . It follows that

$$n_1 n_2 \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{x} = n_1(n_2\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}) + (n_1\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbf{P}' + \mathbf{P} \subseteq \mathbf{P},$$

since  $\mathbf{P}' \subseteq \mathbf{P}$  are  $\mathbb{N}$ -g..  $\square$

After this short discourse, we can start proving lemmas from the main text, starting with the closure properties.

**Lemma V.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{L}$  and let  $\mathbf{L}'$  a linear set s.t.  $\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}'$  is non-degenerate and remains linear. Then  $\mathbf{X} \cap \mathbf{L}' \leq \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}'$ .*

*Let  $\mathbf{X}_{12} \leq \mathbf{L}_{12} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_2}$  and  $\mathbf{X}_{23} \leq \mathbf{L}_{23} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{d_2} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_3}$ . Assume that  $\pi_{in}(\mathbf{L}_{23}) \cap \pi_{out}(\mathbf{L}_{12})$  is non-degenerate, where  $\pi_{in}: \mathbb{N}^{d_2} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_3} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{d_2}$  and  $\pi_{out}: \mathbb{N}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{d_2}$  are the projections to in- and output. Then  $\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23} \leq \mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23}$ .*

*Proof.* Part 1 (Intersection): We stated the important observation in the main text, and said it remains to prove what we can now write as  $\text{int}(\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}') \subseteq \text{int}(\mathbf{L})$ .

Let  $\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}'$  be non-degenerate. We claim that  $\text{int}(\mathbf{L}) \cap \mathbf{L}' \neq \emptyset$ : Assume otherwise. Then  $\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}' \subseteq \mathbf{L} \setminus \text{int}(\mathbf{L})$ . By Lemma II.2 and Lemma A.3, we obtain

$$\dim(\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}') \leq \dim(\mathbf{L} \setminus \text{int}(\mathbf{L})) < \dim(\mathbf{L}) = \dim(\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}'),$$

where the last equality is due to the intersection being non-degenerate. This is a contradiction.

Hence  $\text{int}(\mathbf{L}) \cap \mathbf{L}' \neq \emptyset$ . By the dichotomy in Lemma A.4, we obtain  $\text{int}(\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}') \subseteq \text{int}(\mathbf{L})$  as required.

Part 2 (Composition): Write  $\mathbf{L}_{12} = (\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_{12})$  and  $\mathbf{L}_{23} = (\mathbf{b}'_2, \mathbf{b}_3) + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_{23})$ .

First observe that  $\mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_{12}) \circ \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_{23}) \subseteq \mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23}$ , i.e. composing periods of  $\mathbf{L}_{12}, \mathbf{L}_{23}$  gives periods of  $\mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23}$ . To see this, let  $(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2) \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_{12})$  and  $(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{p}_3) \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_{23})$ . Let  $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_3) \in \mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23}$  arbitrary. Then there exists  $\mathbf{x}_2$  s.t.  $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \in \mathbf{L}_{12}$  and  $(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3) \in \mathbf{L}_{23}$ . Then also  $(\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 + \mathbf{p}_2) \in \mathbf{L}_{12}$  and  $(\mathbf{x}_2 + \mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{x}_3 + \mathbf{p}_3) \in \mathbf{L}_{23}$ , implying  $(\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{x}_3 + \mathbf{p}_3) \in \mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23}$ .

Now we start the actual proof. Let  $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_3) \in \mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23}$  and let  $(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_3) \in \text{int}(\mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23}) - \text{base}$ , where base is the base vector of  $\mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23}$ . Remember that by Lemma A.2, we can use the interior instead of  $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F}')$ . Let  $\mathbf{x}_2$  be s.t.  $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \in \mathbf{L}_{12}$  and  $(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3) \in \mathbf{L}_{23}$ . We have to show that  $\exists N \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.

$$(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_3) + \mathbb{N}_{\geq N}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_3) \subseteq \mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23}.$$

Assume first that  $(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_3) \in \text{int}(\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_{12})) \circ \text{int}(\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_{23}))$ . Then there exists  $\mathbf{w}_2$  such that  $(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) \in \text{int}(\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_{12}))$  and  $(\mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{w}_3) \in \text{int}(\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_{23}))$ . Since  $\mathbf{X}_{12} \leq \mathbf{L}_{12}$ , there exists  $N_{12} \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) + \mathbb{N}_{\geq N_{12}}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) \subseteq \mathbf{X}_{12}$  and similarly  $N_{23} \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3) + \mathbb{N}_{\geq N_{23}}(\mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{w}_3) \subseteq \mathbf{X}_{23}$ . Choosing  $N := \max\{N_{12}, N_{23}\}$  this implies the claim.

However, we made the assumption that  $(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_3) \in \text{int}(\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_{12})) \circ \text{int}(\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_{23}))$ . It remains to argue that the statement also holds for other interior periods  $(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_3) \in \mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23}$ . The corresponding proof is similar to repeating Lemma A.2, Lemma A.3 and Lemma A.4.  $\square$

## B. Appendix of Section VII

There are some minor checks we did not perform in the main text, in particular the following:

- 1) Why are edges inside an SCC always monotone, i.e. why are the new  $\mathcal{V}_i$  still *monotone C-eVASS*?
- 2) Why do cleaning properties not disturb the respective properties restored before?
- 3) Why does the rank decrease/not increase?

Hence we have to revisit every one of the decomposition steps, and ensure these three properties.

**P1:** Monotonicity inside SCCs is preserved as we explicitly required it in Definition V.3, which our  $\mathcal{A}_C$  adheres to. There are no prior cleaning properties, and the rank stays the same by definition of the rank in this case.

**P2:** Monotonicity inside SCCs is preserved as we do not change edge labels, similarly for P1.

The rank depends on cycle spaces, and these do not change by splitting into SCCs. If anything, some SCC might be removed and the rank might decrease.

**P3:** Changing the  $\mathbf{L}_i$  neither changes edge labels nor strongly-connectedness.

The rank does not depend on  $\mathbf{L}_i$ , only on the  $\mathcal{V}_i$ .

**P4:** Monotonicity is not required for edges leaving SCCs. This decomposition explicitly restores P1 and P3, and the decomposed  $\mathcal{V}_i$  with a single edge continues to have a single edge. Hence P2 is also preserved.

Regarding the rank, observe that the rank is defined only considering strongly-connected components, and this edge is not inside an SCC.

**P5:** Deleting a counter which is already stored in the state only performs projections on edge labels, hence we can rely on Lemma V.5 to see that with the new label we still have  $\pi(\mathbf{R}(e)) \leq \pi(\mathbf{L}(e))$ . This projection preserves monotonicity. Strongly-connectedness is clearly preserved, since we do not change any states or redirect edges. The characteristic system does not care either, since all  $\mathbb{Z}$ -runs anyways respected the counter value. Since the characteristic system did not change, (4) was also preserved.

We did not change the cycle space of any SCC or its number of edges, hence the rank is preserved.

**P6:** Let  $\mathbf{X}_i = (\mathcal{V}_i = (Q_i, E_i, q_{\text{in},i}, q_{\text{fin},i}), \mathbf{L}_i)$  be a component in a C-KLM sequence s.t.  $\mathcal{V}_i$  is strongly-connected and some edge or period is bounded. For every edge  $e$  we write  $\mathbf{L}(e) = \mathbf{b}(e) + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}(e))$ . Let  $\mathbf{F}'(e) \subseteq \mathbf{F}(e)$  be the set of periods which are bounded. For all  $\mathbf{p}(e) \in \mathbf{F}'(e)$ , let  $k(\mathbf{p}(e))$  be the maximal number of times this period can be used. Let  $E'_i \subseteq E_i$  be the set of edges which are bounded. For all  $e \in E'_i$ , let  $k(e)$  be the maximal number of times edge  $e$  can be taken. Let  $[k] := \{0, \dots, k\}$  be the index set of  $k$ , beware we start at 0 and end at  $k$ , so we include  $k+1$  values. We use the new set of states

$$Q'_i := Q_i \times \prod_{e \in E'_i} [k(e)] \times \prod_{e \in E_i, \mathbf{p}(e) \in \mathbf{F}'(e)} [k(\mathbf{p}(e))],$$

i.e. we track *every* bounded value simultaneously in the state. The idea for the set of edges  $E'_i$  is as follows: If we take a

bounded edge  $e$ , we increment the corresponding counter in the state by 1, blocking if we are at the maximum already. Similarly, if we use a bounded period  $\mathbf{p}(e)$  some  $j \leq k(\mathbf{p}(e))$  number of times, then we increment the corresponding counter by  $j$ , blocking if we would exceed the maximum. Formally, for every  $e = (p, q) \in E'_i$ , every  $(p, \mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) \in Q'_i$  and every vector  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbf{F}'(e)}$  (counting how often we use this period) s.t.  $\mathbf{w}_1(e) \leq k(e) - 1$  and  $\mathbf{w}_2(\mathbf{p}(e)) + \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{p}(e)) \leq k(\mathbf{p}(e))$  for all  $\mathbf{p}(e) \in \mathbf{F}'(e)$ , we add an edge

$$((p, \mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2), (q, \mathbf{w}_1 + 1_e, \mathbf{w}_2 + \mathbf{w})) \in E'_i,$$

where  $\mathbf{w}_1 + 1_e$  is the same as  $\mathbf{w}_1$ , except  $(\mathbf{w}_1 + 1_e)(e) = \mathbf{w}_1(e) + 1$ . We add similar edges for  $e = (p, q) \in E_i \setminus E'_i$ , the difference is we do not add any  $1_e$  to  $\mathbf{w}_1$ .

For edge labels, there is an important mistake which has to be avoided: After a degenerate intersection, we might lose the fact that  $\mathbf{R}(e) \leq \mathbf{L}(e)$ . Since bounding a period in particular is a degenerate intersection, we are hence *not* allowed to write any labels  $\mathbf{L}(e')$  onto the new edges  $e'$ . Instead let  $e' = ((p, \mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2), (q, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2)) \in E'_i$ . Let  $e = (p, q)$  be the edge  $e'$  originated from. We use the label

$$\mathbf{R}(e') := [[\mathbf{b}(e) + (\mathbf{v}_2 - \mathbf{w}_2) \cdot \mathbf{F}] + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}(e) \setminus \mathbf{F}'(e))] \cap \mathbf{R}(e),$$

where in order to enhance readability we used square brackets  $[]$  instead of normal brackets  $()$  but with the same semantics.

Finally, we set  $q'_{\text{in},i} := (q_{\text{in},i}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$ , and consider the context  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{X}_r$  for the component we decompose. We create for every possible vector  $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \prod_{e \in E'_i} [k(e)]$ ,  $\mathbf{w}_2 \in \prod_{e \in E_i, \mathbf{p}(e) \in \mathbf{F}'(e)} [k(\mathbf{p}(e))]$  a separate C-KLM sequence

$$\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \text{full}} = \mathbf{X}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{X}_{i-1} \circ \mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2} \circ \mathbf{X}_{i+1} \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{X}_r,$$

where  $\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2} = \text{Rel}(Q'_i, E'_i, q'_{\text{in},i}, (q_{\text{fin},i}, \mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)) \cap \mathbf{L}_i$ .

We return  $\{\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \text{full}} \mid \mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2 \text{ as above}\}$ .

Why are edge labels  $\mathbf{R}(e')$  still monotone when contained in an SCC? Answer: Since we have property P5, for every counter  $j$  there exists a cycle which increases  $j$ . Hence the periods corresponding to monotonicity are *not* bounded, i.e. not removed. Then, as intersection of two monotone relations,  $\mathbf{R}'(e)$  is monotone again. Alternatively, we could also manually readd the periods corresponding to monotonicity, since the vector space of possible cycle *effects* would not be influenced by adding monotonicity.

To see that the rank decreases, we first refer to [23]: They observed that when removing all bounded edges at once, the dimension of the vector space decreases. Since the dimension decreases, it does not matter that we count most edges multiple times now (remember edges are counted once for every edge they decompose into after applying P1): Since every single edge is now contained in a lower dimensional vector space, the rank, which is lexicographic, still decreases.

Regarding monotonicity: Since P5 holds, for every counter  $j$  there is a cycle increasing  $j$ . Hence the periods corresponding to monotonicity are not bounded, and copied to the new relations.

**P7:** Deleting a counter again only projects the edge labels using Lemma V.5 to see that with the new label we still have  $\pi(\mathbf{R}(e)) \leq \pi(\mathbf{L}(e))$ . This preserves monotonicity.

To see that the rank decreases, observe first of all that since P5 holds, there is a cycle with non-zero effect on the deleted counter. We can proceed exactly as in [23] to see that the dimension of the vector space of cycle effects decreases: Clearly cycles in the new VASS are cycles in the old VASS with effect 0 on the deleted counter. Hence the vector space of cycle effects could only have decreased. And in fact it did strictly decrease, since the cycle with non-zero effect which existed before does not exist anymore. Since the dimension strictly went down, it again does not matter that we count the number of edges weirdly, we decrease in the lexicographic ordering.

**Example for property P1:** Why we need minimal elements: See Figure 2 and its caption.

$$\mathbf{R}(e_1) = \text{dec}(x) + \mathbb{N}(\{\text{inc}(x, y), \text{dec}(x, y), \text{dec}(x)\}) + \text{Mon}$$




Fig. 2. Example of a 2-dimensional monotone *Semil-eVASS* showing that  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{R}(e)$  in property (1) is necessary for correctness. Edge  $e_1$  is labelled with  $\mathbf{L}(e_1) := \mathbb{N}(\{\text{inc}(x, y), \text{dec}(x, y), \text{dec}(x)\}) + \text{Mon}$  and  $\mathbf{R}(e_1) = \text{dec}(x) + \mathbf{L}(e_1)$ , where  $\text{inc}(x, y) := ((0, 0), (1, 1))$ ,  $\text{dec}(x, y) := ((1, 1), (0, 0))$ ,  $\text{dec}(x) := ((1, 0), (0, 0))$  and  $\text{Mon} := \mathbb{N}(\{(1, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (0, 1)\})$ . Edge  $e_2$  is labelled  $\mathbf{R}(e_2) = \mathbf{L}(e_2) = \mathbb{N}(\text{dec}(y)) + \text{Mon}$ , where  $\text{dec}(y) := ((0, 1), (0, 0))$ . The source configuration is  $q(1, 1)$  and the target is  $q(2, 1)$ . Clearly all properties hold except (1), in particular every configuration is forwards/backwards-coverable.

However, there is a semilinear inductive invariant  $\mathbf{S} = q : \{(x, y) \mid x \leq y\}, p : \{(x, y) \mid x \leq y - 1\}$  which proves non-reachability. The problem is that the homogeneous solution of CharSys for decrementing  $y$  while leaving  $x$  the same by using  $e_1 e_2$  without any periods is infeasible: In the actual relation taking edge  $e_1$  causes an automatic decrement on  $x$ .

### C. Appendix of Section VIII

This section of the appendix is split into three parts. First we have to introduce some theory regarding *directed hybridlinear* sets, in order to show the required closure property (Lemma VIII.2) as well as to prove that the dimension recursion (Lemma V.4) still works for directed hybridlinear, which is necessary for some algorithms. Furthermore, the dependence of the definition of directed hybridlinear on the representation has to be removed. This is done in part 1. In part 2, we can then prove most of the axioms, but Axiom 7 will remain out of reach. Hence why in Part 3 we introduce heavy theory from the VASS community to address Axiom 7.

### D. Appendix of Section VIII, Part 1

In this part we define directed hybridlinear sets and prove basic properties for this class. Towards this end, we recall some lemmas regarding  $\mathbb{S}$ -finitely generated (f.g.) sets for  $\mathbb{S} \in \{\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Q}\}$ . Recall that  $\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{F}) := \{\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \mathbf{f}_i \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbf{f}_i \in$

$\mathbf{F}, \lambda_i \in \mathbb{S}\}$  and for (finite)  $\mathbf{F}$  we say that the set  $\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{F})$  is  $\mathbb{S}$ - (finitely) generated. Also recall that a partial order  $(\mathbf{X}, \leq_{\mathbf{X}})$  is a *well-quasi-order* (wqo) if  $\leq$  is well-founded and every subset  $\mathbf{U} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$  has finitely many minimal elements. The most famous example of a wqo is  $(\mathbb{N}^d, \leq_{\mathbb{N}^d})$ , where  $\leq_{\mathbb{N}^d}$  is the component-wise  $\leq$  ordering.

For  $\mathbb{S} \in \{\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Q}\}$  every  $\mathbb{S}$ -g. set is  $\mathbb{S}$ -f.g., because the whole space  $\mathbb{Q}^d$  or respectively  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  is finitely generated, and moving to a substructure does not increase the number of necessary generators. For  $\mathbb{Q}$ -generated sets, this is well-known linear algebra, for  $\mathbb{Z}$ -generated sets this follows from the existence of the hermite normal form for integer matrices (see [30], Chapter 4). For  $\mathbb{S} \in \{\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}\}$  the picture is different.

For  $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$  we have:

**Lemma A.5** ([30], Cor. 7.1a). *Let  $\mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^d$  be a  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -g. set. Then  $\mathbf{C} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}^d \mid \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}\}$  is the preimage of  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^d$  for some integer matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d' \times d}$  iff  $\mathbf{C}$  is  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -finitely generated.*

The essential idea behind this lemma is the following: A  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -f.g. set (or equivalently the set of points on some ray from the top of a pyramid to the base) can be classified depending on what the base of the pyramid looks like. For an ice cream cone this is a circle, for the pyramids in Egypt a square. The lemma classifies pyramids where the base is a polygon: The base of the pyramid has finitely many vertices (generators of the cone) if and only if the base has finitely many faces/side edges. Every side edge gives rise to an inequality  $\mathbf{a}\mathbf{x} \geq 0$ , which we can rescale to obtain  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ .

For  $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{N}$  in [20] Leroux proved a similar characterization.

**Definition A.6.** *Let  $\mathbf{P}$  be  $\mathbb{N}$ -g.. The canonical partial order on  $\mathbf{P}$  is  $\leq_{\mathbf{P}}$  defined via  $\mathbf{x} \leq_{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{y}$  if  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{p}$  for some  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{P}$ .*

**Lemma A.7** ([20], Lemma V.5). *Let  $\mathbf{P} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$  be  $\mathbb{N}$ -g.. T.F.A.E.:*

- 1)  $\mathbf{P}$  is  $\mathbb{N}$ -finitely generated.
- 2)  $(\mathbf{P}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}})$  is a wqo.
- 3)  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \cdot \mathbf{P}$  is  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -finitely generated.

*Proof sketch.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (3): Obvious (use the same generators).

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2): (Only intuition): We show this by providing an order isomorphism  $(\mathbf{P}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}}) \simeq (\mathbb{N}^{d'}, \leq)$  to the wqo on  $\mathbb{N}^{d'}$ .

The ordering  $\leq_{\mathbf{P}}$  (up to minor details) fulfills  $\mathbf{x} \leq_{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{y}$  iff  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{A}\mathbf{y}$ , where  $\mathbf{A}$  is the matrix of Lemma A.5 for  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \cdot \mathbf{P}$ . We have  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y}$  in  $\mathbb{N}^{d'} = \mathbb{Z}^{d'} \cap \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^d$ . Indeed,  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$  is an integer because we performed multiplication and addition of integers. Additionally  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{P} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \cdot \mathbf{P}$  is in the preimage of  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^d$  by choice of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Hence multiplication by  $\mathbf{A}$  is the required order isomorphism. Intuitively, this isomorphism shows that  $\leq_{\mathbf{P}}$  orders the points with respect to the distance to the borders of the  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -f.g. set  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \cdot \mathbf{P}$ : the bigger the distances to the borders the bigger is the point wrt.  $\leq_{\mathbf{P}}$ .

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1): As  $(\mathbf{P}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}})$  is a wqo,  $\mathbf{P} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  has finitely many minimal elements w.r.t.  $\leq_{\mathbf{P}}$ . These generate  $\mathbf{P}$ .  $\square$

So far these results are known, we now utilize the ordering  $\leq_{\mathbf{P}}$  of Lemma A.7 2) to classify semilinear sets.



**Definition A.8.** Let  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$  be any set. A vector  $\mathbf{p}$  is a preservant of  $\mathbf{X}$  if  $\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{p} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ . The set of all preservants is denoted  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$ .

Clearly  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$  is  $\mathbb{N}$ -generated, i.e. closed under addition, for every set  $\mathbf{X}$ . In many cases however,  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$  is very small compared to  $\mathbf{X}$ , see the left of Figure 3.  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$  being large and finitely generated in fact characterizes linear sets and more generally hybridlinear sets.




Fig. 3. Left: The set  $\mathbf{X} := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \mid x \geq y \geq \log_2(x+1)\}$  (blue region)  $\cup \{x\text{-axis}\}$  (red) fulfills  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}} = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ . Namely vectors  $(x, y)$  with  $y > 0$  are  $\notin \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$  because of the red points, and for  $x > 0, y = 0$  the reason is the blue region.

Right: The blue  $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \mid 0 \leq y \leq 2x\}$  and the red  $1 \leq y \leq 1+x$  regions depict linear sets.  $\mathbf{L}_1 \cap \mathbf{L}_2$  is not linear anymore, as it requires both the black points as base points.

**Definition A.9.** A set  $\mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$  is linear if  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{b} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  for some point  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^d$  and finite set  $\mathbf{F} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ .

$\mathbf{L}$  is hybridlinear if  $\mathbf{L} = \{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r\} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  for finitely many points  $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r \in \mathbb{N}^d$ .

**Proposition A.10.** Let  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$  be any set.

Then  $\mathbf{X}$  is hybridlinear if and only if  $(\mathbf{X}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}})$  is a wqo.

*Proof.* If  $\mathbf{X} = \emptyset$  then both statements trivially hold. In the sequel we hence assume  $\mathbf{X} \neq \emptyset$ .

“ $\Leftarrow$ ”: Let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}$ . Since  $(\mathbf{X}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}})$  is a wqo, also  $(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}})$  is a wqo. This is isomorphic to  $(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}})$ , hence by Lemma A.7  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$  is finitely generated. Let  $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r$  be the minimal elements of  $\mathbf{X}$  w.r.t.  $\leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}}$ , observe that  $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r\} + \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$  and we are done.

“ $\Rightarrow$ ”: Write  $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r\} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ . Write  $\mathbf{P} := \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ . We will first show that  $(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}})$  is a wqo by proving the claim  $\mathbb{Q}_{>0} \cdot \mathbf{P} = \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \cdot \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$  and then using Lemma A.7.

By definition of  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$  we have  $\mathbf{P} \subseteq \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$ . Observe that the other inclusion is not always true, as  $\mathbf{X} = \{0, 1\} + 2\mathbb{N}$  fulfills  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbb{N}$ . On the other hand we claim that  $r! \cdot \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}} \subseteq \mathbf{P}$ , where  $r!$  denotes the factorial of  $r$ , which would finish the proof of  $\mathbb{Q}_{>0} \cdot \mathbf{P} = \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \cdot \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$  be any vector. Consider the map  $f_{\mathbf{p}}: \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{p}$ . We will prove that this map induces a map  $\tau: \{1, \dots, r\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\}$ . The important observation is that if we have  $f_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{b}_i) \in \mathbf{b}_j + \mathbf{P}$ , then in fact also  $f_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{P}) \subseteq \mathbf{b}_j + \mathbf{P}$ , since

$$f_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{P}) = f_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{b}_i) + \mathbf{P} \subseteq (\mathbf{b}_j + \mathbf{P}) + \mathbf{P} \subseteq \mathbf{b}_j + (\mathbf{P} + \mathbf{P}) \subseteq \mathbf{b}_j + \mathbf{P}.$$

For every  $i$ , since  $f_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{b}_i) \in \mathbf{X}$ , there is  $\tau(i) = j$  with  $f_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{b}_i) \in \mathbf{b}_j + \mathbf{P}$ . Make any such choice of  $\tau$ , thereby defining

a map  $\tau: \{1, \dots, r\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\}$ . Since  $\tau$  is a map between finite sets,  $\tau$  has some cycle. Let  $n$  be the length of this cycle, and  $i$  some element of the cycle. Since  $n$ -fold application of  $f_{\mathbf{p}}$  causes  $\mathbf{b}_i$  to move back into  $\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{P}$ , we obtain  $\mathbf{b}_i + n\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{P}$ , which implies  $n\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{P}$  and also  $r! \cdot \mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{P}$ . The claim is therefore proven.

By Lemma A.7 we obtain the following implications:  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  is  $\mathbb{N}$ -f.g. implies  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \cdot \mathbf{P} = \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \cdot \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$  is  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -f.g. implies that  $(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}})$  is a wqo. Observe that  $(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}}) \simeq (\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}})$  for all  $i$ , because adding the vector  $\mathbf{b}_i$  on both sides does not influence the definition  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{p}$ . Since finite unions of wqo's are wqos, we obtain that  $(\mathbf{X}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}})$  is a wqo as claimed.  $\square$

**Corollary A.11.** A set  $\mathbf{X}$  is linear if and only if  $(\mathbf{X}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}})$  is a wqo with a unique minimal element.

However, rather than a unique minimal element, an important condition for a wqo is *directedness*.

**Definition A.12.** Let  $(\mathbf{X}, \leq_{\mathbf{X}})$  be a wqo. We say that  $(\mathbf{X}, \leq_{\mathbf{X}})$  is directed if for all  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{X}$ , there exists  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{X}$  such that  $\mathbf{x} \leq_{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{z}$  and  $\mathbf{y} \leq_{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{z}$ .

$\mathbf{X}$  is directed hybridlinear if  $(\mathbf{X}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}})$  is a directed wqo.

A good intuition is that a set  $\mathbf{L}$  is directed hybridlinear if it is equal to a linear set minus finitely many points. Though as a formal statement this is only true in dimension 2: Starting in dimension 3 for example the set  $\{(1, 1, 0), (1, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1)\} + \mathbb{N}^3$  is directed hybridlinear, but missing three lines compared to the linear set  $\mathbb{N}^3$ . In dimension 4 we can remove planes from  $\mathbb{N}^4$  and so on.

Next we give equivalent definitions of directed hybridlinear, preventing descriptions like  $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1\} + (2\mathbb{N})$  in the sequel.

**Lemma A.13.** Let  $\mathbf{X}$  be a hybridlinear set. T.F.A.E.:

- 1)  $\mathbf{X}$  is directed hybridlinear.
- 2) There exists a representation  $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r\} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  s.t.  $(\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})) \cap (\mathbf{b}_j + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})) \neq \emptyset$  for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq r$ .
- 3) There exists a representation  $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r\} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  s.t.  $\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_j \in \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$  for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq r$ .

*Proof.* For  $\mathbf{X} = \emptyset$  all statements hold.

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2): Since  $(\mathbf{X}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}})$  is a wqo,  $\mathbf{X}$  has finitely many minimal elements  $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r$ . We have  $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r\} + \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$ . We claim that this representation fulfills 2).

*Proof of claim:* Observe first that since  $(\mathbf{X}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}})$  is a wqo, also  $(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}})$  is a wqo, and hence by Lemma A.7  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$  is  $\mathbb{N}$ -f.g.. Using that  $(\mathbf{X}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}})$  is directed for each pair  $(\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_j)$  with  $1 \leq i < j \leq r$ , we obtain elements  $\mathbf{z}_{i,j}$  such that  $\mathbf{b}_i \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}} \mathbf{z}_{i,j}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_j \leq_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}} \mathbf{z}_{i,j}$ , i.e. we have  $\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{z}_{i,j} = \mathbf{b}_j + \mathbf{p}'$  for some  $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}' \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$ . Hence  $\mathbf{z}_{i,j} \in (\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}) \cap (\mathbf{b}_j + \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}})$ , proving non-emptiness.

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3): Let  $\{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r\} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  be such a representation. We claim that the same representation works for 3). Let  $1 \leq i, j \leq r$ . By (2) there exists  $\mathbf{z}_{i,j} \in (\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})) \cap (\mathbf{b}_j + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}))$ . I.e.  $\mathbf{z}_{i,j} - \mathbf{b}_i \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  and  $\mathbf{b}_j - \mathbf{z}_{i,j} \in -\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ . Hence  $\mathbf{b}_j - \mathbf{b}_i = (\mathbf{b}_j - \mathbf{z}_{i,j}) + (\mathbf{z}_{i,j} - \mathbf{b}_i) \in \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$ .

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1): Let  $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r\} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  be such a representation. Let  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{p}_x$  and  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{b}_j + \mathbf{p}_y$  be arbitrary points in  $\mathbf{X}$ . First observe that  $\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}) \subseteq \mathbf{P}_x$ , hence it is enough to show that there exists a point  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{X}$  with  $\mathbf{x} \leq_{\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})} \mathbf{z}$  and  $\mathbf{y} \leq_{\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})} \mathbf{z}$ .

Write  $\mathbf{b}_j - \mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{p}_+ - \mathbf{p}_-$  with  $\mathbf{p}_+, \mathbf{p}_- \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ . Therefore  $\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{p}_+ = \mathbf{b}_j + \mathbf{p}_-$ . Define  $\mathbf{z} := \mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{p}_x + \mathbf{p}_y + \mathbf{p}_+ \in \mathbf{X}$ . We have  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x} + (\mathbf{p}_y + \mathbf{p}_+) \geq_{\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})} \mathbf{x}$ . We also have  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{y} + (\mathbf{p}_x + \mathbf{p}_-) \geq_{\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})} \mathbf{y}$ .  $\square$

For an example of a directed hybridlinear set which is not linear, see  $\mathbf{L}_1 \cap \mathbf{L}_2$  on the right of Figure 3. In fact the figure even shows that a non-degenerate intersection [remember this means that  $\dim(\mathbf{L}_1 \cap \mathbf{L}_2) = \dim(\mathbf{L}_1) = \dim(\mathbf{L}_2)$ ] of linear sets is not necessarily linear anymore. On the other hand, an example of a hybridlinear set which is not directed is the union of two parallel lines, for example  $\{(0, 0), (0, 1)\} + \mathbb{N}(1, 0) \subseteq \mathbb{N}^2$ . In our algorithms, such hybridlinear sets would create problems, since the disjoint components cannot interact, and should be treated differently.

Remember the main goal of this part was to obtain the closure property under non-degenerate intersection. We only need one last lemma from [10].

**Lemma A.14** ([10], Prop. 3.9 (3.)), special case of finitely generated). *Let  $\mathbf{P} := \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  and  $\mathbf{P}' := \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}')$  be  $\mathbb{N}$ -f.g. sets with a non-degenerate intersection. Then  $\mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F}) \cap \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F}') = \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{P} \cap \mathbf{P}')$ .*

Essentially this says that if the sets  $\mathbf{P}$  and  $\mathbf{P}'$  are “similar enough”, in the sense of having a non-degenerate intersection, then the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -generated set of the intersection is the intersection of the original  $\mathbb{Z}$ -generated sets. Clearly this will not be correct otherwise, simply intersect sets  $\mathbf{P} := \mathbb{N}, \mathbf{P}' := -\mathbb{N}$  “in opposite directions”, then  $\mathbf{P} \cap \mathbf{P}' = \{0\}$  and hence  $\mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{P} \cap \mathbf{P}') = \{0\}$ , but on the other hand we have  $\mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{P}) = \mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{P}')$ , and therefore  $\mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{P}) \cap \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{P}') = \mathbb{Z}$  is larger. Next we show the closure property.

**Lemma VIII.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{L}'$  be directed hybridlinear with a non-degenerate intersection. Then  $\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}'$  is dir. hybridlinear.*

*Proof.* Write  $\mathbf{L} = \{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r\} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  and  $\mathbf{L}' = \{\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_s\} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}')$ , where these representations fulfill (3) of Lemma A.13. By Proposition A.10 orders  $(\mathbf{L}, \leq_{\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})})$  and  $(\mathbf{L}', \leq_{\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}')}})$  are wqos. By Dickson’s lemma the intersection  $(\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}', \leq_{\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})} \cap \leq_{\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}')}})$  is again a wqo. Hence there exist finitely many minimal elements  $\{\mathbf{d}_1, \dots, \mathbf{d}_k\}$  of  $\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}'$ . By definition of  $\leq_{\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})} \cap \leq_{\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}')} = \leq_{\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}) \cap \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}')}$  we obtain  $\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}' = \{\mathbf{d}_1, \dots, \mathbf{d}_k\} + (\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}) \cap \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}'))$  is hybridlinear, directedness remains.

We prove that this is a representation fulfilling (3) of Lemma A.13. Hence let  $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ . By Lemma A.14 it is enough to prove that  $\mathbf{d}_j - \mathbf{d}_i \in \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$  and  $\mathbf{d}_j - \mathbf{d}_i \in \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F}')$ . We show the first, the second follows by symmetry. We have  $\mathbf{d}_i, \mathbf{d}_j \in \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}' \subseteq \mathbf{L}$ , hence we can write  $\mathbf{d}_i = \mathbf{b}_m + \mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathbf{d}_j = \mathbf{b}_n + \mathbf{p}'$  for some  $1 \leq m, n \leq r$  and  $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}' \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ . Since we chose  $\mathbf{b}_i$  satisfying point (3) of Lemma A.13, we have  $\mathbf{b}_n - \mathbf{b}_m \in \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$  and therefore:

$$\mathbf{d}_j - \mathbf{d}_i = (\mathbf{b}_n - \mathbf{b}_m) + (\mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F}) + \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F}) = \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F}). \quad \square$$

The other property we wanted to show is in Lemma A.15. Let us start with a useful notation. Let  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  be a directed hybridlinear set, and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L}$  a point. We write  $\mathbf{x} \uparrow_{\mathbf{L}} := \mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  for the “upward-closure” of the point  $\mathbf{x}$ .

**Lemma A.15.** *Let  $\mathbf{L}$  be directed hybridlinear, and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L}$ . Then  $\dim(\mathbf{L} \setminus \mathbf{x} \uparrow_{\mathbf{L}}) < \dim(\mathbf{L})$ .*

*Proof.* For the case of  $\mathbf{L}$  linear see Corollary D.3 of [20]/remember Lemma V.4. We will now prove the lemma by reducing to the linear case.

Write  $\mathbf{L} = \{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r\} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ . Since  $\mathbf{L}$  is directed, there exists a point  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{x} \uparrow_{\mathbf{L}} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^r \mathbf{b}_i \uparrow_{\mathbf{L}}$ . In particular  $\mathbf{y} \uparrow_{\mathbf{L}} \subseteq \mathbf{x} \uparrow_{\mathbf{L}}$ , hence we have

$$\mathbf{L} \setminus (\mathbf{x} \uparrow_{\mathbf{L}}) \subseteq \mathbf{L} \setminus (\mathbf{y} \uparrow_{\mathbf{L}}) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^r [(\mathbf{b}_i \uparrow_{\mathbf{L}}) \setminus (\mathbf{y} \uparrow_{\mathbf{L}})]$$

We obtain  $\dim(\mathbf{b}_i \uparrow_{\mathbf{L}} \setminus \mathbf{y} \uparrow_{\mathbf{L}}) < \dim(\mathbf{b}_i \uparrow_{\mathbf{L}}) \leq \dim(\mathbf{L})$  by the linear case.  $\square$

### E. Appendix of Section VIII, Part 2

In this section of the appendix we prove that Definition V.1 of nice overapproximation (updated to directed hybridlinear) fulfills most of the axioms (namely except Axiom 7). We restate them for convenience.

**Definition VIII.4.** *The following are the geometric axioms:*

- 1) *Let  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ . Then for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L}$  and every  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$ ,  $\exists N \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}_{\geq N} \mathbf{w} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ .*
- 2) *There is an algorithm which given  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}$  computes a set of dir. hybridlinear  $\{\mathbf{L}_1, \dots, \mathbf{L}_k\}$  s.t. there exist  $\mathbf{X}_j$  with  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathbf{X}_k$  and  $\mathbf{X}_j \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}_j$  for every  $j$ .*
- 3) *If  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  is directed hybridlinear, then  $\mathbf{L} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$ .*
- 4) *If  $\mathbf{X}_1 \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}_1$  and  $\mathbf{X}_2 \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}_2$  s.t.  $\mathbf{L}_1 \cap \mathbf{L}_2$  is non-degenerate then  $(\mathbf{X}_1 \cap \mathbf{X}_2) \trianglelefteq (\mathbf{L}_1 \cap \mathbf{L}_2)$ .<sup>2</sup>*
- 5) *If  $\mathbf{X}_1 \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{X}_2 \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$ , then  $(\mathbf{X}_1 \cup \mathbf{X}_2) \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$ .*
- 6) *If  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  is irreducible, then  $\mathbf{X}$  is non-semilinear.*
- 7) *There is an algorithm which given  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{L}$  fulfilling the promise  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$  decides whether  $\mathbf{X}$  is reducible, and if yes computes a reduction point  $\mathbf{x}$ .*
- 8) *Let  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  and  $\mathbf{S}$  be semilinear s.t.  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{S}$ . Then there exists  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbf{S}$ .*

*Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ . If class  $\mathcal{C}$  fulfills the Axioms with running time  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$  for Axioms 2 and 7, then  $\mathcal{C}$  is called  $\mathfrak{F}_\alpha$ -effective.*

**Theorem VIII.5.** *The class  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $(k, d)$ -VASSnz sections is  $\mathfrak{F}_{2kd+2k+2d+5}$ -effective with the model:  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$  iff*

*$\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  is directed hybridlinear and for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L}$  and all  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$ , there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}_{\geq N} \mathbf{w} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ .*

*Proof.* Axiom 1: By definition.

Axiom 2: By Theorem VI.4.

Axiom 3: Let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$ . We choose  $N := 0$  and observe  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N} \mathbf{w} \subseteq \mathbf{L}$  as required.

<sup>2</sup>Linear sets are not closed under non-degenerate intersection, hence we require directed hybridlinear.

Axiom 4: By Lemma VIII.2,  $\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}'$  is again directed hybridlinear. By Lemma V.2 we have  $(\mathbf{X} \cap \mathbf{L}') \triangleleft (\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}')$  and  $(\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{X}) \triangleleft (\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}')$ . Now let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}'$  and  $\mathbf{w}$  as in the definition of  $\triangleleft$ . Since  $(\mathbf{X} \cap \mathbf{L}') \triangleleft (\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}')$ , there exists  $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}_{\geq N_1} \mathbf{w} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ , and since  $(\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{X}) \triangleleft (\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{L}')$ , there exists  $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}_{\geq N_2} \mathbf{w} \subseteq \mathbf{X}'$ . Choosing  $N := \max\{N_1, N_2\}$  we are done.

Axiom 5: Observe that  $\triangleleft$  states that certain lines are in  $\mathbf{X}$ . Clearly increasing  $\mathbf{X}$  preserves this.

Axiom 6: Proof by contraposition. I.e. let  $\mathbf{X} \triangleleft \mathbf{L}$  and assume  $\mathbf{X}$  is semilinear. We have to prove that  $\mathbf{X}$  is reducible. By Axiom 8  $\exists \mathbf{x}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ , i.e.  $\mathbf{X}$  is reducible.

Axiom 8: Define  $\mathbf{S}' := \mathbf{L} \setminus \mathbf{S}$ . Write  $\mathbf{S}' = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathbf{L}_j$  as a union of linear sets. Write  $\mathbf{L}_j = \mathbf{b}_j + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_j)$  for all  $j$ . Let

$$I := \{j \in \{1, \dots, k\} \mid \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_j) \cap \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F}) \neq \emptyset\}$$

be the set of indices such that  $\mathbf{L}_j$  is not parallel to the boundary of  $\mathbf{L}$ . We have to prove that  $I = \emptyset$ .

To this end, let  $j \in I$ . Let  $\mathbf{w}_j \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}_j) \cap \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})$  as per Definition of  $j \in I$ . Since  $\mathbf{X} \triangleleft \mathbf{L}$ , there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{b}_j + N\mathbf{w}_j \in \mathbf{X}$ , in particular  $\mathbf{X} \cap \mathbf{L}_j \neq \emptyset$ .

However,  $\mathbf{X} \cap \mathbf{L}_j \subseteq \mathbf{S} \cap (\mathbf{L} \setminus \mathbf{S}) = \emptyset$ , contradiction.

Therefore all  $\mathbf{L}_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$  are parallel to the boundary of  $\mathbf{L}$  as claimed, and we now simply choose  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  large enough that  $(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{L}) \cap \mathbf{S}' = \emptyset$ .  $\square$

As mentioned Axiom 7 is proven in the next section. We cannot end this section without once again pointing at the proof of Axiom 8, which proves a complicated result using simple algebraic methods without any complicated calculation.

#### F. Appendix of Section VIII, Part 3

In this subsection we introduce some heavy VASS theory in order to deal with Axiom 7. The essence of the proof is the following definition.

**Definition A.16.** Let  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$  be any set. A vector  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^d$  is a pump of  $\mathbf{X}$  if there exists a point  $\mathbf{x}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{v} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ .

The set of all pumps of  $\mathbf{X}$  is denoted  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X})$ .

I.e. a vector  $\mathbf{v}$  is a pump of  $\mathbf{X}$  if some infinite line with step  $\mathbf{v}$  is contained in  $\mathbf{X}$ . For example the pumps of a linear set  $\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  are given as follows:

**Lemma A.17.** [20, Lemma F.1, special case] Let  $\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  be  $\mathbb{N}$ -f.g.. Then  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})) = \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}(\mathbf{F}) \cap \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$ .

Observe in particular that the Pumps are not only  $\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ , but slightly more: Consider the left of Figure 4 for an example for the difference. Intuitively, we fill out the ‘‘cone’’.

**Essence of the proof/algorithm:** The essence of the algorithm for Axiom 7 will be simple: Use Axiom 2, and for every obtained  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequence  $\mathbf{X}$  compute a semilinear representation of  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X})$ , which can then be used to decide Axiom 7. The difficult part of this is visible at first glance: Given an arbitrary VASSnz section  $\mathbf{X}$ , which can be highly non-semilinear, why would  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X})$  even be semilinear in the first place? The proof is extremely complicated, and was




Fig. 4. *Left:* Consider the following example of an  $\mathbb{N}$ -g. set from [10]:  $\mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  for  $\mathbf{F} := \{(1, 0), (1, 2), (1, 3)\}$ . This set fulfills  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}(\mathbf{F}) \cap \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F}) = \{(x, y) \mid 0 \leq y \leq 3x\}$ , and is almost equal to this, except for the points with  $y = 1$ : These are *holes*, as they were called in [10]. *Right:* The blue  $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \mid 0 \leq y \leq x^2\}$  has the set of Pumps  $\{(0, 0)\} \cup \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \mid x > 0\}$ . After the second application we stabilize to  $\mathbb{N}^2$ . This happens with any set which has a partner  $\mathbf{L}$  for  $\mathbf{X} \triangleleft \mathbf{L}$ : The second application of Pumps adds the boundary, stabilizing to  $\mathbf{L}$ .

in case of VASS given by Leroux in [20] and then extended to VASSnz by [9]. We have to trace their ideas here, which requires basic understanding about the Pumps operator.

**Essentials about the Pumps operator:** We start with the observation that Pumps is a monotone operator, and we know a large class of fixed points of Pumps: Both euclidean closed  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -g. sets (by Lemma A.5 in particular all  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -f.g. sets fulfill this) as well as  $\mathbb{Z}$ -g. sets are fixed points of Pumps.

**Lemma A.18.** Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -g. and euclidean closed.

Then  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{C}) = \mathbf{C}$ .

Let  $\mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$  be  $\mathbb{Z}$ -g.. Then  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{L}) = \mathbf{L}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{X}'$ . Then  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}) \subseteq \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}')$ .

*Proof.* ‘‘ $\subseteq$ ’’: Let  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{C}$ . Then  $\mathbb{N}\mathbf{v} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}(\mathbf{v}) \subseteq \mathbf{C}$ , and we obtain  $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{C})$ .

‘‘ $\supseteq$ ’’: Let  $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{C})$ . We have to show  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{C}$ . Since  $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{C})$ , we obtain  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{v} \subseteq \mathbf{C}$  for some  $\mathbf{x}$ . We define  $\mathbf{x}_n := \frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{x} + n\mathbf{v}) \in \mathbf{C}$ . Since  $\mathbf{C}$  is euclidean closed, we obtain that the limit  $\mathbf{v} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathbf{C}$ .

‘‘ $\subseteq$ ’’: Similar to above we have  $\mathbb{N}\mathbf{v} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{v}) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$ .

‘‘ $\supseteq$ ’’: Let  $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Pumps}(\mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F}))$ . Then  $\exists \mathbf{x}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{v} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$ . Hence  $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F}) - \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F}) = \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$ .

Monotonicity of Pumps is obvious.  $\square$

Now we can extend Lemma A.17 to directed hybridlinear sets  $\mathbf{L}$  (while Lemma A.17 does not hold for  $\{0, 1\} + 2\mathbb{N}!$ ):

**Lemma A.19.** Let  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  be directed hybridlinear. Then  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{L}) = \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}(\mathbf{F}) \cap \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$ .

*Proof.* ‘‘ $\supseteq$ ’’ follows from Lemma A.17.

‘‘ $\subseteq$ ’’: Since  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}(\mathbf{F})$  is a closed cone, we obtain  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{L}) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}(\mathbf{F})$  by Lemma A.18. It remains to prove  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{L}) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$ . Let  $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{L})$ . Then there exists  $\mathbf{x}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{v} \subseteq \mathbf{L}$ . Let  $\mathbf{x}_0 := \mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_1 := \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}$ . Write  $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{w}_1$  and  $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{b}_0 + \mathbf{w}_0$  with  $\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$  and  $\mathbf{b}_0, \mathbf{b}_1 \in \mathbf{B}$ . By Lemma A.13(2)/the definition of directed hybridlinear we gave in the paper, we have  $\mathbf{b}_1 - \mathbf{b}_0 \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}) - \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F}) = \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$ . This implies

$$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_0 = (\mathbf{b}_1 - \mathbf{b}_0) + (\mathbf{w}_1 - \mathbf{w}_0) \in \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F}) + \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F}) = \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F}),$$

finishing the proof.  $\square$

The relation of pumps to our problem is that if  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L}$  holds, then we have information not about  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X})$ , but about the *second* application of the Pumps operator. The right of Figure 4 gives an idea about why.

**Lemma A.20.** *Let  $\mathbf{X}$  be  $\mathbb{N}$ -g., and  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{L} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ . Then  $\text{Pumps}(\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X})) = \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}(\mathbf{F}) \cap \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$ .*

*Proof.* Write  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{F})$ . By definition of  $\trianglelefteq$ , we have  $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F}) \subseteq \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X})$ . Since Pumps is monotone, by Lemma A.19 we obtain  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}(\mathbf{F}) \cap \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F}) = \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{L}) = \text{Pumps}(\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}(\mathbf{F})) \subseteq \text{Pumps}(\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}))$ . Furthermore, by Lemma A.18, no matter how often we apply pumps on  $\mathbf{L}$ , we will remain at  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{L}) = \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}(\mathbf{F}) \cap \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$ , since these are a closed  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -g. set and a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -g. set. Since  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{L}$  and pumps is a monotone operator, we obtain that also arbitrarily many applications of pumps on  $\mathbf{X}$  lead to at most  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}(\mathbf{F}) \cap \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$ . In total we obtain  $\text{Pumps}(\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X})) = \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}(\mathbf{F}) \cap \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$ .  $\square$

Applying Lemma A.20 for a KLM sequence  $\mathbf{X}$ , since we have shown  $\mathbf{X} \trianglelefteq \pi_{\text{src,tgt}}(\text{sol}(\text{CharSys}(\mathbf{X})))$ , we know that  $\text{Pumps}(\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X})) = \text{Pumps}(\pi_{\text{src,tgt}}(\text{sol}(\text{CharSys}(\mathbf{X}))))$  is semilinear, in fact of the form  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}(\mathbf{F}) \cap \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{F})$ . But as in the right of Figure 4 one question remains: Which parts of the boundary are in the actual set  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X})$ ?

The answer for a single SCC is a formula first given by Leroux in [20] and then extended to VASSnz in [9].

First we need a definition.

**Definition A.21.** *Let  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ , and  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ . Then  $\mathbf{v}$  is a direction of  $\mathbf{X}$  if  $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $n\mathbf{v} \in \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X})$ .*

*The set of all directions is denoted  $\text{dir}(\mathbf{X})$ .*

I.e. a direction is simply an arbitrarily scaled pump. This has the advantage that for many sets,  $\text{dir}(\mathbf{X})$  is  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -g., a property we will use in the following.

Let  $\mathcal{V}_i$  be an SCC inside a  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequence  $\mathbf{X}$ . Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be the set of pairs  $(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f}) \in \mathbb{N}^{d_i} \times \mathbb{N}^{d_i}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{e}$  is the effect of some cycle in  $\mathcal{V}_i$ . *Beware:* We do *not* require that the cycle uses every edge. Hence this relation *cannot* be captured using a single integer linear program, it requires one per support as in the decomposition for (5). But then we can at the same time also deal with the periods: Namely we only allow periods for the edges  $e$  in the support we picked. Then

$$\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_i) = \text{dir}(\mathbf{C})^* \cap \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{L}_i), \quad (*)$$

where  $*$  is transitive closure w.r.t. composition as always.

This is not hard to explain: Since  $\mathbf{X}_i := \mathbf{R}_i \cap \mathbf{L}_i \subseteq \mathbf{L}_i$ , we must have  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_i) \subseteq \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{L}_i)$ , so the second half is clear. The first half removes disconnected solutions of the characteristic system, but not fully: We are allowed to perform any number  $k$  of *connected* cycles in the SCC in sequence, even if the  $i$ -th cycle is not connected to the  $(i+1)$ -st. The idea is also known under the name *sequentially enabled cycles*: Imagine we have cycles  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k$  with  $\text{ends}(\rho_j) = (\mathbf{v}_{j-1}, \mathbf{v}_j)$ . Then a run  $\rho$  from  $q_{\text{in},i}$  to  $q_{\text{fin},i}$  which enables the cycles  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k$  in this sequence shows

$(\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_k) \in \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_i)$ , even though the cycles  $\rho_j$  were disconnected. To see this, write  $\rho = \rho'_0 \rho'_1 \dots \rho'_k$ , where  $\rho_j$  is enabled after performing  $\rho'_j$ . Then the runs  $\rho'_0 \rho'_1 \dots \rho'_k$  prove  $\text{ends}(\rho) + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_k) \subseteq \text{Rel}(\mathcal{V}_i, q_{\text{in},i}, q_{\text{fin},i})$ .

The one question mark which remains is: Why do we have to take  $\text{dir}(\mathbf{C})$ , and not just  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{C})$ ? The answer is that a transitive closure of semilinear relations can become a counter machine reachability relation, and hence undecidable. Hence we *want* to take  $\text{dir}(\mathbf{C})$  instead, and it happens to still give the correct result. However, now the  $*$  is computable: We have the following, where a  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -g. relation is called *definable* if it is definable in  $\text{FO}(\mathbb{Q}, \leq, +)$ , also called linear arithmetic:

**Theorem A.22** ([20], Theorem VII.1). *Let  $\mathbf{C}_1, \dots, \mathbf{C}_k \subseteq \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^{d_i} \times \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^{d_i}$  be relations which are reflexive, definable and  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -g.. Then  $(\bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathbf{C}_j)^*$  is  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -g. and again definable.*

*A corresponding formula  $\varphi \in \text{FO}(\mathbb{Q}, \leq, +)$  can be computed in polynomial time from formulas  $\varphi_j$  for the  $\mathbf{C}_j$ .*

I.e. for  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -g. relations instead of semilinear relations transitive closure is easy to compute. We remark that we have to perform quantifier elimination afterwards however, which causes a possibly elementary blowup.

**Overview:** From here on the results are new. We explain how to extend this to obtain Axiom 7. We perform a 3-step process: Step 1 is a proof that the formula  $*$  not just gives  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_i)$ , but that  $\mathbf{X}_i$  belongs to a special class of sets we call *uniform*.

Step 2 proves that a non-degenerate composition of uniform sets is again uniform, with *the composition of the pumps of the parts* as new sets of pumps.

Step 3 is to finish implementing Axiom 7 using the semilinear representation for  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X})$ .

### G. Step 1 Towards Axiom 7

The problem with the strategies so far is that they deal with a *single* SCC. It then remains to perform the composition *constructively*. Namely while [20] and [9] respectively show that composition works, the new formula *cannot be computed* just from the old formulas, it simply exists.

To obtain a computational result, the fact that our compositions are non-degenerate will again come to the rescue. But first we need the proper definitions.

**Definition A.23.** *Let  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ . A vector  $\mathbf{v}$  is a preservant of  $\mathbf{X}$  if  $\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{v} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ . The set of all preservants is denoted  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$ .*

**Definition A.24.** *Let  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ . Then  $\mathbf{X}$  is called well-directed if for every infinite sequence  $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots \in \mathbf{X}$  there exists an infinite set  $N \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  of indices (i.e. an infinite subsequence) s.t.  $\mathbf{x}_j + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_j) \subseteq \mathbf{X}$  for all  $k > j$  in  $N$ .*

Let us explain these two definitions. Preservants are best explained using the left of Figure 5. The blue and red sets depicted there are closed under addition and contain  $\mathbf{0}$ , hence they are their own preservants. However, the union has very little preservants, i.e. vectors which can be pumped everywhere: The blue and red sets are simply too different. The operator Pumps however would not see this problem.




Fig. 5. *Left*: The set  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_1 \cup \mathbf{X}_2$  with  $\mathbf{X}_1 := \{(x, y) \mid \log_2(x+1) \leq y \leq x\}$  and  $\mathbf{X}_2 := \{(x, y) \mid y = 0\}$  (the blue and red parts respectively) fulfills  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}} = \{0\}$ . Namely a vector  $(x, y)$  with  $y > 0$  is not a preservant due to the red points, and if  $y = 0$  then the blue points are the problem. However,  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}) = \{(x, y) \mid 0 \leq y \leq x\}$  does not see this problem at all. Intuitively,  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X})$  consider pumps which work *somewhere*, and  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$  contains pumps which *work everywhere*.

*Right*: In case of the depicted blue set, we would find a complete extraction. However, clearly we are not reducible yet: We have to do a recursive call on the red lines.

Well-directed is a completely different property: It says that the set is “well-structured enough” s.t. between some infinitely many points, some pumping will be possible. A set which is not well-directed is for example  $\mathbf{P} := \{(x, n) \mid x \text{ has at most } n \text{ bits set in binary}\}$ . Even though  $\mathbf{P}$  is closed under addition, in this set, it is extremely hard to find any infinite lines at all. We will not go into details, but due to a well-quasi-order on runs, it is guaranteed that all the sets we will consider are automatically well-directed.

Other simple observations to gain understanding about preservants is that  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$  is always closed under addition and contains  $\mathbf{0}$ , i.e. is  $\mathbb{N}$ -generated, or that the function graph of the sin/cos functions has  $(2\pi, 0)$  as preservant, but then automatically also all multiples  $(2\pi n, 0)$ .

We can now define uniform sets, a new notion which captures very well the structure of  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequences  $\mathbf{X}$ .

**Definition A.25.** *Let  $\emptyset \neq \mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ . Then  $\mathbf{X}$  is called uniform if  $\mathbf{X}$  is well-directed and there exists a finite set  $\mathbf{B}$  s.t.:*

- 1)  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}) = \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}})$ ,
- 2)  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{B} + \text{Pumps}(\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}))$ ,
- 3)  $\text{dir}(\mathbf{X})$  is definable in  $\text{FO}(\mathbb{Q}, \leq, +)$ ,
- 4)  $\mathbf{B} + \text{Pumps}(\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}))$  is directed hybridlinear.

There are a lot of parts to this definition, but first understand that the main conditions are 1+3). The others like  $\neq \emptyset$ , well-directed, etc. are secondary but necessary to ensure the closure property we want. So what does 1) say? Again, the left of Figure 5 is a good example:  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_1 \cup \mathbf{X}_2$  is highly non-uniform, in fact  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X})$  has dimension 2 while  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}}) = \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}} = \{0\}$  is small. However, both  $\mathbf{X}_1$  and  $\mathbf{X}_2$  themselves are closed under addition and hence uniform. Uniform is exactly meant to capture that every point can “pump approximately the same”. But uniform is just enough of an extension of “closed under addition”, that  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequences fall into it (as we will now show).

On the other hand, condition 3) is used to guarantee that  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X})$  is semilinear.

A comment for people familiar with VASS theory: In prior works most abstract statements started with “Let  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{P}$  for  $\mathbf{P}$  smooth”. One reason for the definition of uniform is that *essentially all* these statements still work if we replace this with “Let  $\mathbf{X}$  be uniform”. Hence we are now able to take full advantage of theory by Leroux [18]–[20] and Guttenberg [9, 10], but can do so *computationally*.

**Lemma A.26.** *Let  $\mathbf{X}_i = \text{Rel}(\mathcal{V}_i, q_{in,i}, q_{fin,i}) \cap \mathbf{L}_i$  be a strongly-connected component in a perfect  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequence for  $\mathcal{C} = \text{VASSnzSec}(k-1)$ , the sections of  $k-1$  priority VASSnz. Then  $\mathbf{X}_i$  is uniform with  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_i)$  as in formula (\*).*

*Proof.* Proof by induction on  $k$ .

$k = 0$  (normal VASS) are a subcase of the induction step.

$k \rightarrow k + 1$ : For every edge  $e \in E_i$ , the relation  $\mathbf{R}(e)$  is uniform by induction. Let us consider the formula (\*), and first prove that the pumps are at most the set given in the formula.  $\subseteq \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{L}_i)$  is clear since  $\text{Pumps}$  is monotone,  $\mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{R}_i \cap \mathbf{L}_i \subseteq \mathbf{L}_i$  and  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{L}_i)$  is a fixed point. Arguing containment in the first half would not be easy, but [9] comes to the rescue: Semilinear subreachability relations of VASSnz (in particular the ones of the form  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{v}$  obtained from pumps) are *flattable*, i.e. there exist finitely many runs  $\rho'_0, \dots, \rho'_r$  and cycles  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_r$  s.t. all of  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{v}$  can be reached using runs in  $\rho'_0 \rho_1^* \rho'_1 \dots \rho_r^* \rho'_r$ , exactly what we need.

So the interesting direction is the other containment. Let  $\mathbf{v} \in \text{dir}(\mathcal{C})^*$ . Then there exist vectors  $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k$  s.t.  $(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}) \in \text{dir}(\mathcal{C})$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ . Being  $\in \mathcal{C}$  means there exist  $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$  (we use their common denominator to use a common  $n$ ) s.t.  $n(\mathbf{v}_{i+1} - \mathbf{v}_i)$  is the effect of some cycle  $\rho_i$ . At this point we can explain the main two difficulties of this proof: 1): What does it even mean to prove that  $\mathbf{v}$  is a pump of  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_i}$ , and not of  $\mathbf{X}_i$  itself? 2) How to remove the factor  $n$ ? The reader might think of the  $j_1, j_2$  trick from Lemma VII.11, but it does not work here: That trick requires a full support solution. For a counter example, simply consider a 1-VASS with two states  $q_1, q_2$ . On state  $q_1$  we have a loop with  $+ = 2$ , which is the direction we want to pump. On state  $q_2$  there is a loop with  $x- = 1$ . Clearly, in order to find a cycle with effect  $+ = 1$  it has to be allowed to move to state  $q_2$ , i.e. we need a full support solution to pump  $+ = 1$ , otherwise we can indeed only pump  $+ = 2$ .

Let us explain the solutions to these questions. Regarding 1), in order to prove membership in  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_i}$ , we have fix an amount of homogeneous solutions only depending on  $\mathbf{v}$  s.t. no matter what element of  $\mathbf{X}_i$ , i.e. what *actual* run  $\rho$ , we start from, we can add the fixed amount of homogeneous and ensure that this only slightly enlarged run  $\rho'$  can pump  $\mathbf{v}$ . Regarding 2), there is only one logical solution: We need to write  $\mathbb{N} = \{0, \dots, n-1\} + n\mathbb{N}$  and prove that just  $\rho'$  itself, but also  $n-1$  neighbouring runs  $\rho_j$  with  $\text{ends}(\rho_j) = \text{ends}(\rho') + j\mathbf{v}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq n-1$  can pump  $n\mathbf{v}$ . Then the whole line is reachable, even though we did not find a corresponding single cycle.

We inevitably have to build in the solution to 2) first. Let  $\mathbf{w}_0, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{n-1} \in \text{int}(\mathbf{L}_i) \cap \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_i}$  with  $\mathbf{w}_{j+1} = \mathbf{w}_j + \mathbf{v}$  for all

$0 \leq j \leq n-1$ . These clearly exist since  $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{L}_i)$  and “almost all interior vectors” are in  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_i}$  by Lemma VII.11 and the  $j_1, j_2$  trick.

Now we choose the fixed amount of homogeneous solutions to add: Fix an amount  $k$  s.t.  $k$  homogeneous solutions alone are enough to be able to embed enough up- and down-pumping sequences to perform a cycle  $\rho_{\text{enable}}$  on  $q_{\text{in},i}$  which sequentially enables not only the  $\rho_j$  but also the loops corresponding to  $\mathbf{w}_0, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{n-1}$ .

Now we have to verify our choice. Let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_i$ , i.e. let  $\rho$  be a run with  $\text{ends}(\rho) = \mathbf{x}$  and which we know is executable. We use the run  $\rho' := \mathbf{up}^k \rho_{\text{enable}} \mathbf{diff}^k \rho \mathbf{down}^k$ . We argue that the run is enabled and can pump the required vectors: The run  $\mathbf{up}^k \rho_{\text{enable}} \mathbf{diff}^k$  is enabled by choice of  $k$ . Also by choice of  $k$  and  $\rho_{\text{enable}}$ , this only consumes the extra values we added using the homogeneous solutions. Hence the run  $\rho$  which was originally enabled is still enabled. Finally it is easy to see that also  $\mathbf{down}^k$  is enabled, since it was chosen as a down-pumping sequence, and  $\rho \in \mathbf{L}_i$ , i.e. the target of  $\rho$  is in  $\pi_{\text{out}}(\mathbf{L}_i)$ .

To see that the new run can enable all the  $\rho_j$  in sequence, remember that this was specifically how  $\rho_{\text{enable}}$  was chosen. To argue the factor  $n$  away, remember that  $\rho_{\text{enable}}$  also enables the  $\mathbf{w}_j$ . Hence we have  $(\text{ends}(\rho') + \mathbf{w}_0) + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{v} \subseteq \mathbf{X}_i$ . In particular not  $\rho'$  itself can pump  $\mathbb{N}\mathbf{v}$ , but  $\rho' + \mathbf{w}_0$ . Since  $\rho$  was chosen arbitrarily, we not only found a pump in  $\mathbf{X}_i$ , in fact we have shown that  $k_{\text{hom}} + \mathbf{w}_0 + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{v} \subseteq \mathbf{X}_i$ , where  $k_{\text{hom}}$  stands for the constant number of homogeneous solutions we had to add.  $\square$

#### H. Step 2 Towards Axiom 7

In this section we prove that uniform sets are stable under non-degenerate composition. To this end, we first have to repeat the most important property connected to non-degenerate intersection of  $\mathbb{N}$ -g. sets: Fusing lines. We do this over the course of two lemmas.

**Lemma A.27.** *Let  $\mathbf{P}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{P}_2$  be  $\mathbb{N}$ -g. with  $\dim(\mathbf{P}_1) = \dim(\mathbf{P}_2)$ . Then they generate the same vector space  $\mathbf{V}$ , and for all  $\mathbf{p}_2 \in \mathbf{P}_2$  there exists  $\mathbf{p}'_2 \in \mathbf{P}_2$  with  $\mathbf{p}_2 + \mathbf{p}'_2 \in \mathbf{P}_1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{V}_1$  be the vector space generated by  $\mathbf{P}_1$ , and  $\mathbf{V}_2$  the vector space generated by  $\mathbf{P}_2$ . Since  $\mathbf{P}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{P}_2$  we have  $\mathbf{V}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{V}_2$ . On the other hand remember Lemma II.3: We obtain  $\dim(\mathbf{V}_1) = \dim(\mathbf{P}_1) = \dim(\mathbf{P}_2) = \dim(\mathbf{V}_2)$ . Together we obtain  $\mathbf{V}_1 = \mathbf{V}_2$ .

Now let  $\mathbf{p}_2 \in \mathbf{P}_2$ . Write  $\mathbf{p}_2 \in \mathbf{V}_2 = \mathbf{V}_1$  as linear combination of  $\mathbf{P}_1$ . Simply choose  $\mathbf{p}'_2$  such that all negative components of the linear combination giving  $\mathbf{p}_2$  become positive. Now there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $n(\mathbf{p}_2 + \mathbf{p}'_2) \in \mathbf{P}_1$ . Choose  $\mathbf{p}'_2 := (n-1)\mathbf{p}_2 + n\mathbf{p}'_2 \in \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{P}_2) = \mathbf{P}_2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma A.28.** *Let  $\mathbf{P}_1, \mathbf{P}_2$  be  $\mathbb{N}$ -g. with a non-degenerate intersection. Then for all  $\mathbf{p}_1 \in \mathbf{P}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2 \in \mathbf{P}_2$  there exist  $\mathbf{p}'_1 \in \mathbf{P}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}'_2 \in \mathbf{P}_2$  such that  $\mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{p}'_1 = \mathbf{p}_2 + \mathbf{p}'_2$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbf{P}_1 \cap \mathbf{P}_2$  is non-degenerate, we can apply Lemma A.27 twice, namely with  $\mathbf{P}_1 \cap \mathbf{P}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{P}_i$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . The vector spaces generated by  $\mathbf{P}_1$  and  $\mathbf{P}_2$  are hence equal, and there are  $\mathbf{p}'_1, \mathbf{p}'_2$  with  $\mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{p}'_1, \mathbf{p}_2 + \mathbf{p}'_2 \in \mathbf{P}_1 \cap \mathbf{P}_2$ . Choose

$\mathbf{p}'_1 := \mathbf{p}'_1 + (\mathbf{p}_2 + \mathbf{p}'_2) \in \mathbf{P}_1 + \mathbf{P}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{P}_1$ , and similarly  $\mathbf{p}'_2 := \mathbf{p}'_2 + (\mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{p}'_1) \in \mathbf{P}_2$ . Clearly  $\mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{p}'_1 = \mathbf{p}_2 + \mathbf{p}'_2$ .  $\square$

Lemma A.28 might seem inconspicuous, but is the basis of computing with pumps in case of non-degenerate intersection/composition. Namely Lemma A.28 implies many results like the following, always using exactly the same technique we call *fusing lines*:

**Lemma A.29.** *Let  $\mathbf{P}_1, \mathbf{P}_2$  be  $\mathbb{N}$ -g.,  $\mathbf{P}_1 \cap \mathbf{P}_2$  non-degenerate. Then  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_1) \cap \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_2) = \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_1 \cap \mathbf{P}_2)$ .*

*Proof.* “ $\supseteq$ ” is trivial. Hence let  $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_1) \cap \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_2)$ . We have to prove that  $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_1 \cap \mathbf{P}_2)$ .

By definition of  $\text{Pumps}$ , there exist  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{v} \subseteq \mathbf{P}_1$  and  $\mathbf{x}_2 + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{v} \subseteq \mathbf{P}_2$ . By Lemma A.28, there exist  $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2$  s.t.  $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2 + \mathbf{p}_2 \in \mathbf{P}_1 \cap \mathbf{P}_2$ . We claim  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{v} \subseteq \mathbf{P}_1 \cap \mathbf{P}_2$ . We prove the two containments separately. To see containment in  $\mathbf{P}_1$ , for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$\mathbf{x} + n\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{p}_1 + n\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{x}_1 + n\mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{p}_1 \in \mathbf{P}_1 + \mathbf{P}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{P}_1$$

as claimed.  $\square$

What happened is simple: When “fusing”  $\mathbf{x}_1$  and  $\mathbf{x}_2$  into a common point  $\mathbf{x}$ , also the “lines above them” in direction  $\mathbf{v}$  were fused.

One might wonder how to prove that arbitrary  $\mathbb{N}$ -g. sets have a non-degenerate intersection. Regarding this problem we have the following:

**Proposition A.30** ([10], Prop. 3.9). *Let  $\mathbf{P}_1, \mathbf{P}_2$  be  $\mathbb{N}$ -g. s.t.  $\text{Pumps}(\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_i))$  are semilinear for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $\text{Pumps}(\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_1)) \cap \text{Pumps}(\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_2))$  is non-degenerate. Then  $\mathbf{P} \cap \mathbf{P}'$  is non-degenerate.*

I.e. non-degenerate intersection transfers from the overapproximation to the actual sets. The simplest proof of Proposition A.30 using theory from this paper is to use that  $\mathbf{P} \preceq \text{Pumps}(\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}))$  and use Axiom 8 of utbo overapproximation.

We now start the main proof of this section.

**Lemma A.31.** *Let  $\mathbf{X}_{12} \preceq \mathbf{L}_{12}$  and  $\mathbf{X}_{23} \preceq \mathbf{L}_{23}$  be s.t.  $\mathbf{X}_{12}, \mathbf{X}_{23}$  are uniform and  $\pi_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{L}_{23}) \cap \pi_{\text{out}}(\mathbf{L}_{12})$  is non-degenerate. Then  $\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23} \preceq \mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23}$  is uniform with the set of pumps  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23}) = \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_{12}) \circ \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_{23})$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma V.2  $\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23} \preceq \mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23}$ , in particular  $\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23} \neq \emptyset$ . We use the base points of  $\mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23}$  as  $\mathbf{B}$  and check the properties of Definition A.25. Observe first that by Proposition A.30 not just  $\pi_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{L}_{23}) = \pi_{\text{out}}(\mathbf{L}_{12})$  is non-degenerate, but also  $\pi_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_{23}}) \cap \pi_{\text{out}}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_{12}})$  is non-degenerate, hence we can use line fusion.

1): We will prove that  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23}) \subseteq \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_{12}) \circ \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_{23}) = \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_{12}}) \circ \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_{23}}) \subseteq \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23}}) \subseteq \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23})$ . Observe first that the  $=$  in the middle immediately follows since  $\mathbf{X}_{12}, \mathbf{X}_{23}$  are uniform, and the last  $\subseteq$  is trivial since the preservants always have less pumps. It remains to show the other containments.

$\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_{12}}) \circ \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_{23}}) \subseteq \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23}})$ : Let  $(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2) \in \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_{12}})$  and  $(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_3) \in \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_{23}})$ . Then there exists  $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)$  and  $(\mathbf{x}'_2, \mathbf{x}_3)$  s.t.  $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2) \subseteq \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_{12}}$  and  $(\mathbf{x}'_2 + \mathbf{x}_3) + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_3) \subseteq \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_{23}}$ . Since  $\pi_{\text{out}}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_{12}}) \cap \pi_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_{23}})$  is non-degenerate, we fuse the lines using Lemma A.28 and obtain  $(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_3) \in \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23}})$  as claimed.

$\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23}) \subseteq \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_{12}) \circ \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_{23})$ : Let  $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_3) \in \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23})$ . Then there exists  $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_3)$  s.t.  $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_3) + \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_3) \subseteq \mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23}$ . By definition of  $\circ$ , there exist  $\mathbf{x}_{2,n}$  s.t.  $(\mathbf{x}_1 + n\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{x}_{2,n}) \in \mathbf{X}_{12}$  for all  $n$  and  $(\mathbf{x}_{2,n}, \mathbf{x}_3 + n\mathbf{v}_3) \in \mathbf{X}_{23}$ .

Since  $\mathbf{X}_{12}$  is well-directed, there exists a subset  $N_1 \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  of indices s.t.  $((k-j)\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{x}_{2,k} - \mathbf{x}_{2,j}) \in \text{dir}(\mathbf{X}_{12})$  for all  $k > j$  in  $N_1$ . Since  $\mathbf{X}_{23}$  is well-directed, there exists a subset  $N_2 \subseteq N_1$  of indices s.t. additionally  $(\mathbf{x}_{2,k} - \mathbf{x}_{2,j}, (k-j)\mathbf{v}_3) \in \text{dir}(\mathbf{X}_{23})$  for all  $k > j$  in  $N_2$ . Hence  $(k-j)\mathbf{v} \in \text{dir}(\mathbf{X}_{12}) \circ \text{dir}(\mathbf{X}_{23})$ . We will not describe the way to instead obtain  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_{12}) \circ \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_{23})$  in detail, but the idea is simple: The reason we only obtained directions is due to the same problem we had in the proof of Lemma A.26: Along the boundary, a single run can only pump multiples of the direction. But by cleverly choosing interior directions to add, we generate both in  $\mathbf{X}_{12}$  and  $\mathbf{X}_{23}$  a line without the factor  $(k-j)$ . But now the lines are in completely different locations. Hence we have to use the line fusion idea Lemma A.28 to finish the proof.

2) Since  $\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23} \preceq \mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23}$ , by Lemma A.20 we have  $\text{Pumps}(\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23})) = \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23})$ . Therefore  $\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23} \subseteq \mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23} \subseteq \mathbf{B} + \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{L}) = \mathbf{B} + \text{Pumps}(\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23}))$  as claimed.

3) It suffices to prove that  $\mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23}$  is directed. Let  $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_3), (\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_3) \in \mathbf{L}_{12} \circ \mathbf{L}_{23}$ . Then there exist  $\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}_2$  s.t.  $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2), (\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2) \in \mathbf{L}_{12}$  and  $(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3), (\mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3) \in \mathbf{L}_{23}$ . Since  $\mathbf{L}_{12}$  is directed, there exists  $(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) \in \mathbf{L}_{12}$  above both  $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)$  and  $(\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2)$ . Similarly, since  $\mathbf{L}_{23}$  is directed, there exists  $(\mathbf{z}'_2, \mathbf{z}_3) \in \mathbf{L}_{23}$  above both  $(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3)$  and  $(\mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3)$ . Since  $\pi_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{L}_{23}) \cap \pi_{\text{out}}(\mathbf{L}_{12})$  is non-degenerate, we can combine the points  $\mathbf{z}_2$  and  $\mathbf{z}'_2$  to a common point  $\mathbf{z}_{2,\text{new}}$ , finishing 3).

As a composition of well-directed relations,  $\mathbf{X}_{12} \circ \mathbf{X}_{23}$  is again well-directed. Simply pick  $N_2 \subseteq N_1 \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ , i.e. a subsubsequence.  $\square$

### I. Step 3 Towards Axiom 7

At this point we have shown that for every  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequence  $\mathbf{X}$ , one can in elementary time compute a semilinear formula for  $\text{Pumps}(\mathbf{X})$  by using (\*) for every strongly-connected component  $\mathbf{X}_i$ , and perform composition. It remains to check Axiom 7 using this fact. As already mentioned, our main contribution here was the introduction of the definition of *uniform* and thereby making the theory of [20] and [10] computable. At this point we can simply rely on their semilinearity algorithm, while substituting our procedure at certain locations. We only summarize the idea of the algorithm quickly here.

Since we will now work across  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequences, as opposed to before where  $\mathbf{X}_i$  used to refer to a component

of  $\mathbf{X}$ , we now write  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequences as  $\mathbf{Y}$ , and different indices  $\mathbf{Y}_j$  refer to different  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequences.

The algorithm for Axiom 7 is as follows: Some of the notions we will explain afterwards, but we prefer to give a full description of the algorithm first.

Step 1: Apply Axiom 2 to obtain a finite set  $\{\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_k\}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequences.

Step 2: Compute semilinear sets  $\mathbf{C}_j \cap \mathbf{G}_j = \text{Pumps}(\mathbf{Y}_j)$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , where  $\mathbf{C}_j$  is  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -g. and  $\mathbf{G}_j$  is  $\mathbb{Z}$ -g. (we use the letter  $\mathbf{G}$  because  $\mathbb{Z}$ -g. sets are also called *grids*). Discard all  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequences where  $\dim(\mathbf{S}_j) < \dim(\mathbf{L})$ .

Step 3: Let  $\{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_m\}$  be a representative system for the cosets of  $\mathbf{G} := \bigcap_{j=1}^k \mathbf{G}_j$  inside  $\mathbf{L} - \mathbf{L}$ . For every  $\text{iter} = 1, \dots, m$  do: Define  $I_{\text{iter}} := \{j \in \{1, \dots, k\} \mid \mathbf{Y}_j \cap (\mathbf{b}_j + \mathbf{G}) \neq \emptyset\}$  as the set of  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequences which intersect this coset. Now for the finite set  $\{\mathbf{C}_j \mid j \in I_{\text{iter}}\}$  of  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -g. relations check for existence of a so-called *complete extraction* (described in a moment). If it does not exist, reject. Otherwise we are in the situation in the right of Figure 5: We compute for the corresponding complete extraction  $\{\mathbf{K}_j \mid j \in I_{\text{iter}}\}$  base points  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{iter},j}$  such that  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{iter},j} + (\mathbf{K}_j \cap \mathbf{G}) \subseteq \mathbf{Y}_j$ . We then do a recursive call on  $\mathbf{L} \setminus \bigcup_{j \in I_{\text{iter}}} \mathbf{x}_{\text{iter},j} + (\mathbf{K}_j \cap \mathbf{G})$ , which corresponds to the red lines in the right of Figure 5.

There is a lot to unpack and understand here. First of all, let us start with possible questions regarding the  $\mathbf{G}_j$  and  $\mathbf{G}$ . A  $\mathbb{Z}$ -g. set carries modulo information, i.e. is defined by some formula  $\mathbf{a}\mathbf{x} \equiv \mathbf{b} \pmod{m}$ , where  $\mathbf{b}, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ . When we form the intersection of the  $\mathbf{G}_j$ , we hence deal with the fact that some set might only be able to reach even numbered points, and another set only ones divisible by 3 etc. This also explains the “representative system for the cosets”: Simply use one representative for every possible remainder  $r \pmod{\mathbf{G}}$ . Then the set  $I_{\text{iter}}$  contains the “active” sets in an SCC: If a set is only active on even number, then for the coset of odd numbers this set will not exist.

Finally, we can define complete extraction (see also [20], Appendix E):

**Definition A.32.** Let  $\mathcal{K} = \{\mathbf{C}_1, \dots, \mathbf{C}_k\}$  be a finite set of FO( $\mathbb{Q}, \leq, +$ ) definable  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -g. sets. A complete extraction is a finite set  $\{\mathbf{K}_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}_k\}$  of  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -finitely generated sets s.t.  $\mathbf{K}_j \subseteq \mathbf{C}_j$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq k$  and  $\bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathbf{K}_j = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathbf{C}_j$ .

The idea is best explained using the left of Figure 5: It consists of two uniform sets, whose union of pumps is  $\{(x, y) \mid 0 \leq y \leq x\}$ . So when only consider the union, the algorithm would not detect the “hole” between the two uniform sets. However, complete extraction catches this: The set of cones  $\mathbf{C}_1 := \{(x, y) \mid y = 0\}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_2 := \{(x, y) \mid 0 < y \leq x\}$  does not have a complete extraction, since any finite set of vectors from  $\mathbf{C}_2$  (remember  $\mathbf{K}_2$  has to be finitely generated) would a minimal steepness  $> 0$ , and hence some angle would remain uncovered.

In fact, complete extraction perfectly characterizes whether the union of multiple uniform sets (which agree on the modulus, hence we had to consider the cosets of  $\mathbf{G}$ ) cover “most of the space”: If there is no complete extraction, then a

full dimensional hole will remain, otherwise we will be at least in the situation depicted on the right of Figure 5: The complete extractions give rise to linear sets contained in the respective uniform sets. The starting points might be dislodged, such that some lines remain in the middle, but these can now be taken care of by recursion.

Returning to the actual algorithm, what we just explained is the reason for considering every coset of  $\mathbf{G}$  separately, and checking for complete extractions: From it we will be able to determine linear sets contained in the respective  $\mathcal{C}$ -KLM sequences which together cover most of the space. Finally, in the algorithm we indirectly state what kind of linear set will be contained in the uniform set when finding a complete extraction: Some base point  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{iter},j} + (\mathbf{K}_j \cap \mathbf{G})$ . And by complete extraction, they will cover most of the coset.

Since  $\mathbf{K}_j$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ -finitely generated set,  $\mathbf{K}_j \cap \mathbf{G}$  is  $\mathbb{N}$ -finitely generated, and our algorithm computing  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{iter},j}$  simply applies the argument of Lemma A.26 to find a run pumping the finitely many directions  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k$  which have to be pumped.