

Data Structures for Finite Downsets of Natural Vectors: Theory and Practice

Michaël Cadilhac¹, Vanessa Flügel², Guillermo A. Pérez², and Shrisha Rao²

¹ DePaul University, Chicago, USA

michael@cadilhac.name

² University of Antwerp – Flanders Make, Antwerp, Belgium

{guillermo.perez,shrisha.rao}@uantwerpen.be

Abstract. Manipulating downward-closed sets of vectors forms the basis of so-called antichain-based algorithms in verification. In that context, the dimension of the vectors is intimately tied to the size of the input structure to be verified. In this work, we formally analyze the complexity of classical list-based algorithms to manipulate antichains as well as that of Zampuniéris’s sharing trees and traditional and novel k -d-tree-based antichain algorithms. In contrast to the existing literature, and to better address the needs of formal verification, our analysis of k -d tree algorithms does not assume that the dimension of the vectors is fixed. Our theoretical results show that k -d trees are asymptotically better than both list- and sharing-tree-based algorithms, as an antichain data structure, when the antichains become exponentially larger than the dimension of the vectors. We evaluate this on applications in the synthesis of reactive systems from linear-temporal logic and parity-objective specifications, and establish empirically that current benchmarks for these computational tasks do not lead to a favorable situation for current implementations of k -d trees.

Keywords: Antichain algorithms · Data structures

1 Introduction

The efficiency and scalability of verification techniques such as model checking and temporal synthesis largely depend on the size and complexity of the input. One way to mitigate this consists in making use of (symbolic) data structures to represent the model implicitly [9]. For instance, when the states of a model admit some partial order and sets of states satisfying properties of interest are downward-closed with respect to the partial order, verification algorithms can manipulate sets of states by storing their (antichain of) maximal states only.

Antichain-based algorithms exist for various verification problems. There are antichain-based algorithms for stable failures refinement checking, for failures-divergence refinement checking, and for probabilistic refinement checking [30,28]. Antichains have also been used in algorithms to check the inclusion between the sets of traces (i.e. data languages) recognized by generic register automata—this

is undecidable, but there is a semi-algorithm based on abstraction refinement and antichains that is known to be sound and complete [22]. There are also antichain algorithms to solve universality and language inclusion problems for nondeterministic Büchi automata, and the emptiness problem for alternating Büchi automata [16]. As a final example, there are antichains algorithms for the inclusion problem between infinite-word visibly pushdown languages [15].

It is important to note that there is no easy template for antichain-based algorithms. Each algorithm mentioned above exploits a slightly different partial order and must argue that different operations preserve closure of the sets to be able to manipulate antichains only. In this work, we are primarily interested in state spaces that can be encoded as vectors of natural numbers in \mathbb{N}^k . The partial order we consider is the product order, that is, the component-wise order. There are a number of antichain-based algorithms where such an encoding into natural vectors arises naturally. They appear, for example, in checking safety properties for Petri net markings, such as mutual exclusion and coverability [12] and in antichain algorithms to solve parity and mean-payoff games with imperfect information [17,4,24], where the vectors keep track of visits to vertices with “bad priorities” and running sums of weights, respectively. Finally, in antichain algorithms for the synthesis of reactive systems [19,7], the vectors keep track of visits to rejecting states (in universal co-Büchi automata).

Despite the abundance of antichain-based algorithms, there seems to be no systematic study of the complexity of antichain-manipulating operations. There are two notable exceptions: First, there are algorithms and upper bounds for the computation of the antichain of maximal elements given a downward-closed set [11, Sec. 4]. Second, a result from [19] implies that computing the intersection of a given set of antichains cannot be done in polynomial time unless $\mathbf{NP} = \mathbf{P}$.

Similarly, the body of work focusing on data structures to support the manipulation of antichains is surprisingly slim. Delzanno et al. [12,21] propose a representation of downward-closed sets based on sharing trees, an extension of binary decision diagrams (BDDs) for natural vectors proposed by Zampuniéris [31]. However, the work of Zampuniéris focuses on general sets of vectors instead of downward-closed sets and the works by Delzanno et al. do not reduce downward-closed sets to antichains of maximal elements but instead use approximate reductions. In [7], it is suggested that some version of k -d trees may work well for closed sets of natural vectors. These are classic data structures used in computational geometry to implement efficient range-search algorithms [2]. In particular, they support fast dominance queries, which can be used to implement membership of a vector in a downward-closed set. Unfortunately, in [7] it is also reported that a simple textbook implementation of k -d trees does not outperform list-based versions of antichain operations. We postulate that this is due to the fact that the algorithm analyses and optimizations for k -d trees described in the computational geometry literature make the assumption that the dimension k of the vectors is fixed or at least logarithmically small with respect to the rest of the input [8]. In contrast, for antichain-based algorithms, the dimension is a crucial part of the input. For instance, in the reactive-system synthesis application, k

corresponds to the number of states of a (co-)Büchi automaton, which is typically large, while small sets of vectors with small entries are not uncommon.

Our contributions. In this work, we formally compare the worst-case running times of classic list-based, novel (antichain-ensuring) sharing-tree-based, and novel k -d-tree-based antichain algorithms. On the way, we re-examine classic tree-building and searching algorithms for k -d trees. These lead to a more efficient implementation of k -d trees than the simple textbook one used in [7]. We have implemented optimized versions of list-, sharing-tree-, and k -d-tree-based algorithms in a library written in C++20, enabling an empirical evaluation of the algorithms. This evaluation is carried out on applications to synthesis of reactive systems inside Acacia-Bonsai [7] and Oink [13,14].

2 Preliminaries

We write \mathbb{N} for the set of all nonnegative integers, including 0. When we need to exclude 0, we instead write $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and consider vectors $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^k$. Then, \mathbf{u} is *smaller* than \mathbf{v} (equivalently, \mathbf{v} is *larger* than \mathbf{u}), denoted by $\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{v}$, if each component of \mathbf{v} is greater than or equal to that component of \mathbf{u} and the inequality is strict if the relation is strict for at least one component. If \mathbf{u} is neither larger, nor smaller than \mathbf{v} , then they are said to be *incomparable*.

Definition 1 (Downset). Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. A set $V \subset \mathbb{N}^k$ is a *downset* if all vectors smaller than any vector in the set are also in the set, i.e. if for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^k$ and $\mathbf{v} \in V$ we have that $\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{v}$ implies $\mathbf{u} \in V$.

For any $V \subset \mathbb{N}^k$, we use $V\downarrow$ to denote the *downward closure* of V , i.e. the set obtained by adding to V all the vectors smaller than the vectors in V . In symbols, $V\downarrow = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^k \mid \exists \mathbf{v} \in V, \mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{v}\}$. Note that the downward closure of any set of vectors is a downset.

Next, we define *antichains* of natural vectors. These arise, for instance, when considering the maximal elements of a downset.

Definition 2 (Antichain). Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. A set $V \subset \mathbb{N}^k$ is an *antichain* if it consists only of pairwise incomparable vectors, i.e. for all $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in V$ we have neither $\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{v}$ nor $\mathbf{v} \leq \mathbf{u}$ (i.e. they are incomparable).

It follows from Dickson's lemma that any antichain (of natural vectors) is finite.

For a finite set $V \subset \mathbb{N}^k$, we write $\lceil V \rceil$ to denote the *antichain of maximal elements* from V . In symbols, $\lceil V \rceil = \{\mathbf{v} \in V \mid \forall \mathbf{u} \in V, \mathbf{v} \not\leq \mathbf{u}\}$.

Antichain algorithms. We are interested in efficient algorithms to manipulate k -dimensional downsets, for $k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Note that for any finite downset $V \subset \mathbb{N}^k$, we have that $V = \lceil V \rceil\downarrow$. This follows from the result below, which is itself a simple consequence of the transitivity of the partial order on vectors.

Proposition 1. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^k$, and a finite set $V \subset \mathbb{N}^k$. Then, $\mathbf{u} \in V\downarrow$ if and only if $\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{v}$ for some $\mathbf{v} \in \lceil V \rceil$.

Hence, one can store the antichain $A = \lceil V \rceil$ as a representation of $V = A\downarrow$.

To realize (binary) operations on downsets represented by the antichains A and B , an algorithm can avoid (as much as possible) to explicitly compute the downward closures of the antichains. Further, the result of the operation should also be output by the algorithm represented as antichains. Since, we focus on union and intersection, the following result implies that a single antichain suffices as output of such an algorithm.

Proposition 2. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and $U, V \subset \mathbb{N}^k$. If U and V are both downsets, then $U \cup V$ and $U \cap V$ are also downsets.*

Concretely then, given $A = \lceil U \rceil$ and $B = \lceil V \rceil$, we are looking for efficient algorithms to compute $\lceil A\downarrow \cup B\downarrow \rceil$ and $\lceil A\downarrow \cap B\downarrow \rceil$. In the rest of this paper we consider data structures to encode A , B , and their union or intersection.

Finally, there is a decision problem whose complexity is related to that of (all variations) of the union and intersection algorithms present in this paper. Namely, given a k -dimensional vector \mathbf{v} and an antichain $A \subset \mathbb{N}^k$ representing a downset, determine whether $\mathbf{v} \in A\downarrow$. We call this the *membership problem*.

Algorithm analysis. For all our analyses, our working computational model is that of a random-access machine instead of a Turing machine. In particular, this means we assume indirect addressing takes constant time. Furthermore, we assume comparing two natural numbers $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ takes constant time. That is, all of the following constitute atomic operations: $a \leq b$, $a < b$, and $a = b$.

3 List-based antichain algorithms

Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and a finite k -dimensional downset represented by the antichain $A \subset \mathbb{N}^k$ of its maximal elements. Write m for the cardinality of A , i.e. $|A| = m$.

3.1 The membership problem

The naïve approach to check whether a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^k$ is in the downset $A\downarrow$ consists in comparing it, component by component, with each vector in A . Correctness of this approach follows from Proposition 1. This requires km time in the worst case since checking whether a vector is smaller than another vector can be done in k comparisons of numbers.

Proposition 3. *List-based algorithms solve membership in time $O(km)$.*

3.2 The union operation

Henceforth, let us fix a second antichain $B \subset \mathbb{N}^k$ representing a k -dimensional downset. Further, write $|B| = n$ for the cardinality of B .

To compute the antichain corresponding to $\lceil A\downarrow \cup B\downarrow \rceil$, we first note that this antichain will be a subset of vectors in A and B .

Lemma 1 ([19, Prop. 2, (i)]). *Let $C = \lceil A \downarrow \cup B \downarrow \rceil$. Then, $C \subseteq A \cup B$. Moreover, for all $\mathbf{u} \in A$, we have $\mathbf{u} \notin C$ if and only if $\mathbf{u} < \mathbf{v}$ for some $\mathbf{v} \in B$.*

Based on this, we can check, for each vector in A , whether it is in the downward closure of B using the membership algorithm described earlier. If the answer is yes, the vector from A is discarded, if not, it is kept for the resulting antichain. We repeat the process once again but now checking, for each vector in B , whether some vector in the downward closure of A is strictly larger than it. (This can be done with a minimally modified membership algorithm.) Both of these checks take kmn time in the worst case: when the new antichain is $A \cup B$.

Proposition 4. *List-based algorithms for union run in time $O(kmn)$.*

We describe a small optimization for the union algorithm that halves the number of comparisons required. Instead of comparing each element of A with each element of B twice, when comparing the components of a vector $\mathbf{u} \in A$ with those of $\mathbf{v} \in B$, we check for equality until we find a dimension $1 \leq i \leq k$ such that $u_i \neq v_i$. Let us assume, without loss of generality, $u_i > v_i$. We can now conclude that $\mathbf{u} \not< \mathbf{v}$. Thus, for the remaining components $i < p \leq k$, we only need to check whether $u_p > v_p$, to determine whether $\mathbf{u} > \mathbf{v}$. In total, these are $k + 1$ comparisons for each pair of vectors instead of $2k$.

3.3 The intersection operation

For the intersection, we note that $\lceil A \downarrow \cap B \downarrow \rceil$ will be a subset of the *meets* of vectors in A and B , i.e. their component-wise minimum. Formally, the meet of two vectors $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^k$ is defined as $\mathbf{u} \sqcap \mathbf{v} = (\min(u_1, v_1), \dots, \min(u_k, v_k))$. The notion is extended to sets: $U \sqcap V$ of $U, V \subset \mathbb{N}^k$ is the set $\{\mathbf{u} \sqcap \mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{u} \in U, \mathbf{v} \in V\}$.

Lemma 2 ([19, Prop. 2, (ii)]). *Let $C = \lceil A \downarrow \cap B \downarrow \rceil$. Then, $C = \lceil A \sqcap B \rceil$.*

The cardinality of $A \sqcap B$ is at most mn . Now, to compute its antichain of maximal elements, we check the membership of each vector in $A \sqcap B$ within the downward closure of the other vectors using the membership algorithm introduced earlier. This results in a quadratic worst-case running time.

Proposition 5. *List-based algorithms for intersection run in time $O(km^2n^2)$.*

Observe that intersection is much more costly than union even when working with antichains as a representation of downsets. There is no known approach to computing intersection which avoids the explicit computation of the set of meets of both antichains. We do know that the intersection of a given set of antichains cannot be done in polynomial time unless $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{NP}$ [19, Proposition 5].

As a small optimization, we observe that a vector $\mathbf{v} \in A$ can be excluded from the computation of all meets if the membership check $\mathbf{v} \in B \downarrow$ is positive, i.e. there is some $\mathbf{w} \in B$ such that $\mathbf{v} \leq \mathbf{w}$. This is because all elements in $\{\mathbf{u} \sqcap \mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{u} \in B\}$ will be smaller than $\mathbf{v} \sqcap \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{v}$. This can be used to reduce the number of meets that must be considered. To conclude, one could also follow the analysis from [11, Theorem 11] to establish a bound which replaces one of the mn factors in Proposition 5 by the *width*, i.e. the largest antichain over $A \sqcap B$.

4 Sharing-tree-based antichain algorithms

As before, let us fix $k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and a finite k -dimensional downset represented by the antichain $A \subset \mathbb{N}^k$ of its m maximal elements. An additional parameter of interest is $W = \max_{\mathbf{v} \in A} \|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty$, the maximal norm over elements in A .

In this section, instead of encoding A as a plain list, we construct a *sharing tree* [31] for it. One can look at each vector $v \in V$ as a word over \mathbb{N} of length k . Hence, A is a (finite) regular language. The sharing tree of A is nothing more than its minimal deterministic *acyclic* finite-state automaton (DFA) [10,5].

Definition 3 (Sharing tree). *A sharing tree³ $(N, r, \text{val}, \text{succ})$ is a rooted acyclic graph where $N = N_0 \uplus \dots \uplus N_k$ is a set of nodes, partitioned into $k + 1$ layers, $N_0 = \{r\}$ is the root, $\text{val}: N \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\top\}$ is a value-labeling function that satisfies $\text{val}(r) = \top$, and $\text{succ}: N \rightarrow 2^N$ is the successor function. Additionally:*

1. For all $0 \leq i < k$ and $n \in N_i$, $\text{succ}(n) \subseteq N_{i+1}$, i.e., nodes can only have edges to the next layer;
2. For all $n \in N$ and $s_1 \neq s_2 \in \text{succ}(n)$, it holds that $\text{val}(s_1) \neq \text{val}(s_2)$, i.e., two successors cannot have the same value;
3. For all $0 \leq i < k$ and $n_1 \neq n_2 \in N_i$, $\text{val}(n_1) = \text{val}(n_2) \implies \text{succ}(n_1) \neq \text{succ}(n_2)$, i.e., same-layer nodes cannot have the same label and successors;
4. For all $n \in N_k$, $\text{succ}(n) = \emptyset$, i.e., nodes on the last layer have no successors;
5. If $n \in N_1 \cup \dots \cup N_{k-1}$, then $\text{succ}(n) \neq \emptyset$, that is, each node which is not r or in N_k must have at least one successor.

Note that we label nodes of the graph and not the edges for ease of notation. Equivalently, one can label all the incoming edges of a node by the value of that node to obtain a DFA in the usual sense.

4.1 Growing sharing trees

Our algorithm for building a sharing tree is given in Algorithm 1, where $j = 0$ initially and (for technical convenience) $v_0 = \top$ for all $\mathbf{v} \in A$. Intuitively, one builds an (implicit) trie for A and then minimizes the resulting DFA in a bottom-up fashion. Minimization, i.e. merging of the (language-)equivalent nodes, is then handled à la Revuz [29] by giving unique identifiers to the nodes based on their label and the indices of their successors in their layer.⁴

Note that every layer of the trie will have at most m nodes. Then, since we have k layers, and every recursive call of the algorithm runs in $O(W)$ time (initializing the buckets to empty already costs that much), we get that the tree can be computed in time $O(kmW)$. Observe that if $W > m$ one can “compress” the vectors by sorting them per dimension (in time $O(km \log m)$) and keeping only their position in the corresponding sorted list. This ensures $W \leq m$ and one can store the sorted lists as an $m \times k$ matrix to keep the original values (the components of which can be accessed in constant time via the stored indices).

³ It is a directed acyclic graph, not a tree, but it was thus named in earlier literature.

⁴ By Item 4 this combination is indeed unique per layer.

Algorithm 1 BuildSharingTree(A, j)

```

1: if  $j = k$  then
2:   Return (cached) leaf  $T$  with label  $v_k$ , where  $A = \{\mathbf{v}\}$ 
3: for all  $\mathbf{v} \in A$  do
4:   add  $\mathbf{v}$  to bucket[ $v_{j+1}$ ]
5:  $T \leftarrow$  tree node with label  $v_j$ 
6: for all  $a \in \mathbb{N}$  such that bucket[ $a$ ] is nonempty, in decreasing order do
7:    $T_a, \text{idx}_{j+1}(a) \leftarrow$  BuildSharingTree(bucket[ $a$ ],  $j + 1$ )  $\triangleright$  New node & its index
8:   add  $T_a$  as successor of  $T$ 
9: Set id of  $T$  to  $(j, v_j, \text{idx}_{j+1}(0), \text{idx}_{j+1}(1) \dots)$   $\triangleright$  Uniquely identifies this subtree
10: Return (cached) (sub)tree root  $T$ 

```

Lemma 3. *A sharing tree, with $O(km)$ nodes and edges, for a set of m vectors in dimension k with max norm W can be constructed in time $O(km \min(m, W))$.*

To avoid wasting memory due to sparse successor arrays, the trie can be built by first sorting the vectors based on the relevant component and using a linked list instead of an array with $\{0, 1, \dots, W\}$ as indices. This also means we can conveniently store all successors in decreasing order of their labels. Additionally, instead of an exact cache for nodes, one can use a hash table.

Although building a sharing tree for A is more costly than storing it as a list, it may result in exponential savings in terms of space and subsequent membership queries. Indeed, due to sharing, the constructed sharing tree could be exponentially smaller than the starting set. For example, the antichain represented by the language $\{01 + 10\}^n$ has size exponential in n , but can be represented as a sharing tree of size $O(n)$ (cf. [31, Sec. 1.3.3] and [12, Prop. 2]).

4.2 The membership problem

To determine whether a vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^k$ is part of the downset $A\downarrow$, we can use a depth-first search (DFS). Starting from the root, the values of the successors are compared to the corresponding component of \mathbf{u} at every layer. If the value of the node is greater than or equal to the component, the branch is followed further down the sharing tree or membership is confirmed, in case of being at the last layer, otherwise it is discarded. Based on the linear-time complexity of DFS and Lemma 3, we get the following result.

Proposition 6. *Sharing-tree-based algorithms solve membership in time $O(km)$.*

We again remark that the sharing tree may be of logarithmic size with respect to A . Hence, the DFS may in fact be much more efficient than a search over A , even if the conclusion is that the given vector is not a member of $A\downarrow$.

As a small optimization, we note that having stored the successors of every node in decreasing label order allows for early exits. Indeed, if during the DFS we encounter a node whose first successor has a smaller label than the corresponding

component of \mathbf{u} , there is no need to check the remaining branches following the remaining successors. Similarly, when searching at the second-to-last layer of the sharing tree, a dominating vector is encoded by some branch only if the label of the last successor is larger than the last component of \mathbf{u} .

Covering sharing trees. We are using Zampuni eris’ version of sharing trees [31] while ensuring we encode an antichain. This is in contrast to *covering sharing trees*, as proposed in [12], which do not encode the antichain of maximal elements only. Due to the usage of an *approximate* domination check, covering sharing trees could be much larger than the sharing tree of the antichain of maximal elements. Moreover, the union and intersection algorithms for covering sharing trees are more graph-based and reminiscent of BDD operations than the ones we give below (see following subsection, cf. Appendix B). These facts make complexity comparisons with the other approaches in this work more difficult and less interesting. In Section 6 we do present some empirical evidence showing that ensuring that the encoded set is an antichain results in size and time gains.

4.3 The union and intersection operations

As before, for the binary operations, we shall fix a second antichain $B \subset \mathbb{N}^k$ with n vectors representing a k -dimensional downset. We also extend our bound on the maximal norm so that $W = \max_{\mathbf{v} \in A \cup B} \|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty$. Our sharing-tree-based algorithms for the binary operations are mostly identical to the list-based ones. However, their complexity is higher due to the added cost of building sharing trees compared to just keeping a list of vectors.

Recall that the antichain $C = \lceil A \downarrow \cup B \downarrow \rceil$ is a subset of both A and B , see Lemma 1. Moreover, for both A and B , the vectors are added to C if they are not in the closure of the respective other set, so if there is no strictly larger vector. As shown, these checks can be realized using a DFS in time $O(kmn)$. Finally, constructing the sharing tree for C takes time $O(k(m+n) \min(m+n, W))$.

Theorem 1. *There is a sharing-tree-based algorithm for the union operation that runs in time $O(kn(m + \min(n, W)))$ assuming (w.l.o.g.) that $m \leq n$.*

For intersection, our starting point is the set $A \sqcap B$, as per Lemma 2. To compute the antichain $C = \lceil A \sqcap B \rceil$, we first construct a sharing tree for the set $A \sqcap B$. Then, we use the sharing tree to check, for each vector in the set, whether it is strictly smaller than some other vector. Finally, we construct a second sharing tree for the vectors for which the result of the previous check was negative (i.e. the maximal elements from $A \sqcap B$). The number of possible meets $A \sqcap B$ is at most mn and can be enumerated in time $O(kmn)$. Conveniently, constructing the sharing tree removes duplicates due to the minimization step. So constructing a sharing tree for $A \sqcap B$ is as simple as enumerating all the meets and constructing a sharing tree, the latter in time $O(kmn \min(mn, W))$. Hence, building the first sharing tree can be done in time $O(kmn \min(mn, W))$. Then, for each vector in the set, the strict membership takes time $O(kmn)$,

yielding a total time of $O(k(mn)^2)$. To conclude, we note that, in the worst case, constructing the second tree is just as costly as constructing the first one.

Theorem 2. *There is a sharing-tree-based algorithm for the intersection operation that runs in time $O(km^2n^2)$.*

5 k -d-tree-based antichain algorithms

One final time, let us fix $k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and a finite k -dimensional downset represented by the antichain $A \subset \mathbb{N}^k$ of its m maximal elements. In this section, we encode A using a (real) tree structure that generalizes binary search trees to higher dimensions. In fact, we will make use of k -d trees.

We closely follow the presentation from [2, Ch. 5.2]. To present the theory as close as possible to what we implement for the forthcoming experiments, we introduce some additional notation. Mainly, we need a clear definition of the median of a sorted list with repeated elements and a total strict order on the elements of the list (cf. [2, Ch. 5.5]).

Consider a sequence x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p of natural numbers. Let us write $x_i \prec x_j$ if and only if $x_i < x_j$ or $x_i = x_j$ and $i < j$. That is, \prec is the lexicographic order obtained from the order on the elements in the sequence and their indices. Now, the \prec -median of the sequence is the $\lceil p/2 \rceil$ -th \prec -largest number in the sequence.

5.1 Growing k -d trees

Intuitively, a k -d tree is the natural generalization of a binary search tree from 1 to multiple dimensions. When going down a branch of the tree by j levels, the remaining set of vectors is partitioned based on the $(j + 1)$ -th coordinate. The algorithm to build a k -d tree is given in Algorithm 2, where $j = 0$ initially.

Algorithm 2 BuildKDTree(A, j)

- 1: **if** $A = \{\mathbf{v}\}$ **then**
 - 2: Return leaf storing \mathbf{v}
 - 3: $i \leftarrow (j \bmod k) + 1$ ▷ The current dimension
 - 4: $\mu \leftarrow$ the \prec -median of A with respect to the i -th coordinate
 - 5: $B_{\prec} \leftarrow \{\mathbf{v} \in A \mid v_i \prec \mu_i\}$
 - 6: $B_{\succ} \leftarrow \{\mathbf{v} \in A \mid v_i \succ \mu_i\} \cup \{\mu\}$
 - 7: $T_{\prec} \leftarrow$ BuildKDTree($B_{\prec}, j + 1$)
 - 8: $T_{\succ} \leftarrow$ BuildKDTree($B_{\succ}, j + 1$)
 - 9: Return tree T with children T_{\prec} and T_{\succ} and label μ_i
-

Note that when k is small, e.g. 2, then we need to make sure we are still partitioning the vectors according to valid dimensions even after the second layer of the tree. This is why Algorithm 2 requires a modulo operator.

It is instructive to consider the case where all elements of A are unique with respect to all coordinates. Here, one can think of each step of the algorithm as computing the median of the vectors according to dimension i , splitting the

space \mathbb{N}^k into two on the i -th coordinate: the left subtree encodes the region of space consisting of all the vectors whose i -component is strictly less than that of the median; the right one, all those greater than or equal to it. The use of \prec is really only a technicality useful to ensure the tree is balanced.

Lemma 4 ([2, Lemma 5.3]). *A k -d tree for a set of m vectors in k dimensions can be constructed in time $O(m \log m)$.*

We highlight a discrepancy between k -d trees in fixed dimension and those where k is part of the input. In most presentations of k -d trees (e.g. [2,6]) it is suggested that computing the median on every recursive call of the algorithm to build the tree can be avoided by doing some preprocessing: compute a sorted version of the initial list for each dimension and split these into sorted sublists for the recursive calls. Note that even the presorting introduces a dependency on k as sorting k lists costs us $O(km \log m)$ if the dimension is part of the input. Hence, computing the median in each recursive call does seem better in our case.

5.2 The membership problem

Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^k$. Now, given a k -d tree T encoding the antichain A , we will appeal to Proposition 1 and use T to determine whether $\mathbf{u} \in A \downarrow$ by searching the tree to find some $\mathbf{v} \in A$ such that $\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{v}$. First, we introduce some additional notation.

To each internal node T we associate a region⁵ $\text{Reg}(T) \subseteq \mathbb{N}^k$ inductively. We start with the entirety of \mathbb{N}^k at the root. Then, for a node T at depth j and with $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ the \prec -median used to build it, to its right child T_{\succ} , we associate $\{\mathbf{v} \in \text{Reg}(T) \mid v_i \geq \mu_i, i = (j \bmod k) + 1\}$; to its left child T_{\prec} , the region $\{\mathbf{v} \in \text{Reg}(T) \mid v_i < \mu_i, i = (j \bmod k) + 1\} \cup M$, where M is the set of all vectors $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Reg}(T)$ with $v_i = \mu_i$ if B_{\prec} (as defined in Algorithm 2) contains any such vector and \emptyset otherwise. We also write $\text{Reg}(\mathbf{u})$ for the region $\{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^k \mid \mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{v}\}$, i.e. the *upward closure* of \mathbf{u} . The following is our search algorithm:

Algorithm 3 SearchKDTree(T, \mathbf{u})

- 1: **if** T is a leaf storing \mathbf{v} **then**
 - 2: Return whether $\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{v}$
 - 3: **if** $\text{Reg}(T_{\succ}) \subseteq \text{Reg}(\mathbf{u})$ **then**
 - 4: Return true
 - 5: $R_{\succ} \leftarrow \text{SearchKDTree}(T_{\succ}, \mathbf{u})$, $R_{\prec} \leftarrow \text{false}$
 - 6: **if** $\text{Reg}(T_{\prec}) \cap \text{Reg}(\mathbf{u}) \neq \emptyset$ **then**
 - 7: $R_{\prec} \leftarrow \text{SearchKDTree}(T_{\prec}, \mathbf{u})$
 - 8: Return $R_{\succ} \vee R_{\prec}$
-

By construction of a k -d tree T , if $\text{Reg}(T) \subseteq \text{Reg}(\mathbf{u})$, all vectors \mathbf{v} stored at the leaves of T are such that $\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{v}$. There are no empty k -d trees, so this instance of the membership problem is positive. Conversely, if $\text{Reg}(T) \cap \text{Reg}(\mathbf{u}) = \emptyset$, for all vectors \mathbf{v} stored at its leaves we have $\mathbf{u} \not\leq \mathbf{v}$. Since $\text{Reg}(\mathbf{u})$ is upward closed:

⁵ Technically, we are dealing with the natural vectors contained in the region. We find that the name region still conveys the right intuition.

- $\text{Reg}(T_{\succ}) \cap \text{Reg}(\mathbf{u}) \neq \emptyset$ if $\text{Reg}(T) \cap \text{Reg}(\mathbf{u}) \neq \emptyset$, and
- $\text{Reg}(T_{\prec}) \subseteq \text{Reg}(\mathbf{u})$ only if $\text{Reg}(T) \subseteq \text{Reg}(\mathbf{u})$.

It follows that Algorithm 3 returns true if and only if the instance is positive. It remains to study its complexity.⁶

Theorem 3. *There is a k -d tree algorithm that solves membership in time $O(\min(km, k^2m^{1-1/k}))$.*

Proof. The first term in the minimum comes from the fact that the tree has at most $2m$ nodes. The second term will follow from bounding the number of nodes the algorithm treats by $O(km^{1-1/k})$. For the remaining k factor in both terms, we observe that, on leaves, one does need to compare k numbers against each other. However, on internal nodes of the tree, a recursive call can be made to do only a constant amount of work. It is easy to see that checking whether the intersection of the regions is empty can be done in constant time: we only need to see how μ_i and u_i compare, where μ is the median used to split at this node of the tree and $i = (j \bmod k) + 1$ with j the depth. Slightly less obvious is the fact that one can determine the region inclusions from line 3 in constant time. This can be done by keeping track of k variables which store the lower bounds of the region of the current node and a counter c initially set to the number of strictly positive components of \mathbf{u} . On each recursive call, only one variable needs to be updated and if it becomes larger than the corresponding component of \mathbf{u} we decrement c , i.e. $c \leftarrow c - 1$. Clearly, the inclusion holds if and only if $c = 0$.

It remains to argue that the number of nodes treated is indeed $O(km^{1-1/k})$. Say a region $\text{Reg}(T)$ is i -interesting, for $1 \leq i \leq k$, if there are $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \text{Reg}(T)$ such that $v_i < u_i \leq w_i$. Essentially, not all vectors stored in T are guaranteed to be larger than \mathbf{u} , with respect to the i -th coordinate, but neither are they all strictly smaller. The algorithm makes a recursive call on T only if $\text{Reg}(T)$ is i -interesting for some i . Hence, if for all i we can bound the number of nodes of the tree with an i -interesting region by $O(m^{1-1/k})$, the bound will follow. From here on, our argument follows [6, Ch. 4.10].

Let $1 \leq i \leq k$ be arbitrary and consider a node T at depth $(i - 1)$ from the root. Since B_{\prec} and B_{\succ} are constructed based on the i -th coordinate, we have that at most one subtree among $\text{Reg}(T_{\prec})$ and $\text{Reg}(T_{\succ})$ is i -interesting. This dichotomy holds again for the subtrees rooted k levels down since, once more, the vectors are split based on the i -th coordinate. Now let a_j be the number of nodes at level $0 \leq j \leq \log m$ from the root with an i -interesting region. From the analysis above we have that $a_j \leq 2^{\lfloor (1-1/k)j \rfloor}$ since we double the number of nodes at every level except when $i = (j \bmod k) + 1$. For the total number of nodes (across all levels) with i -interesting regions we get the following.

$$a_0 + a_1 + \dots + a_{\log m} \leq 2(2^{(1-1/k)(\log m)}) = 2m^{1-1/k}$$

⁶ It is interesting to compare the k^2 factor in the bound with the linear one k informally claimed by Chan in the introduction of [8]. We did not find a reference for the claimed $O(km^{1-1/k})$ bound, nor were we able to re-prove it ourselves.

Intuitively, every k layers, the doubling does not happen, so we lose a factor of $m^{\frac{1}{k}}$ nodes out of the total $2m$ nodes. Since the right-hand side of the equation above is $O(m^{1-1/k})$, as required, this concludes the proof. \square

Note that the bound from Theorem 3 simplifies to $O(k^2 m^{1-1/k})$ if $m \geq 2^{k \log k}$. Henceforth, to simplify our analysis, we will assume this inequality holds. Nevertheless, for the claims, we state the bounds in their full generality.

5.3 The union operation

Let $B \in \mathbb{N}^k$ be a second antichain with n vectors representing a k -dimensional downset. Our k -d-tree-based algorithm for the union operation follows the one proposed in Section 3.2. The main difference is that we leverage the complexity of the k -d-tree-based membership problem to obtain a different complexity bound.

By Lemma 1, to compute $C = \lceil A \downarrow \cup B \downarrow \rceil$ it suffices to remove from A those elements dominated by some element in B and to union them with the elements of B that are not (strictly) dominated by some element in A . The strict domination check can be realized with a modification of our membership algorithm. The checks take time $O(k^2 m n^{1-1/k})$ and $O(k^2 m^{1-1/k} n)$, respectively. Finally, constructing the k -d tree for C takes time $O((m+n) \log(m+n))$.

Theorem 4. *There is a k -d-tree-based algorithm for the union operation that runs in time $O(kn \min(m, km^{1-1/k}) + n \log n)$ assuming (w.l.o.g.) that $m \leq n$.*

Observe that, even if $2^{k \log k} \leq m, n$, this bound is *not always* better than the one we get for our list-based algorithm. Indeed, when $\log(m+n)$ is larger than km or kn , the last summand is already worse than kmn . If $m \leq n$, then this cannot happen when, for instance, $n \leq 2^m$.

5.4 The intersection operation

For intersection, we follow Section 3.3 except that we use our k -d-tree-based membership algorithm. To compute $C = \lceil A \sqcap B \rceil$, we first construct a k -d tree for the collection of meets obtained from A and B . Note that this may not be a set. Nevertheless, the collection has size at most mn . Next, we use the tree to check, for all vectors it encodes, whether they are strictly smaller than some other vector in the tree. If the answer is negative, we add them to a new collection of nondominated meets. Now, to remove duplicates, we sort the collection lexicographically, this can be done in time $O(kmn \log(mn))$, and traverse it in search for consecutive copies of the same vector, this can be done in time $O(kmn)$. Finally, we construct a second k -d tree for the set of vectors.

Building the first k -d tree can be done in time $O(kmn + mn \log(mn))$. For each vector in the set, the (strict) membership checks can be done in time $O(k^2(mn)^{1-1/k})$, yielding a total of $O(k^2(mn)^{2-1/k})$ checks. After removing duplicates in time $O(kmn \log(mn))$, we construct the second k -d tree in time $O(mn \log(mn))$. The total complexity is summarized in the result below.

Theorem 5. *There is a k -d-tree-based algorithm for the intersection operation that runs in time $O(kmn \min(mn, k(mn)^{1-1/k}))$.*

This is better than our list-based algorithm, assuming $2^{k \log k} \leq m, n$.

A complementary behavior of k -d trees and sharing trees emerges from the fact that k -d trees perform better when a number does not occur in several vectors in the same dimension, whereas in sharing trees, repetition of a number in a dimension enables “sharing”, and hence decreases the size of the tree.

5.5 Discussion: Theory

The following table summarizes the complexity bounds of the list and k -d-tree-based algorithms from the previous sections. To recall, m and n are the sizes of antichains A and B , respectively, of dimension k , and W is the largest integer occurring among all vectors in A and B . To simplify, we assume $m \leq n$.

Operation	Lists	k -d trees	Sharing trees
Membership	$O(km)$	$O(\min(km, k^2 m^{1-1/k}))$	$O(km)$
Union	$O(kmn)$	$O(kn \min(m, km^{1-1/k}) + n \log n)$	$O(kn(m + \min(n, W)))$
Intersection	$O(km^2 n^2)$	$O(kmn \min(mn, k(mn)^{1-1/k}))$	$O(km^2 n^2)$

Our analysis confirms the empirical findings of [7]: k -d trees are not always a better data structure than lists when manipulating antichains. However, based on the remarks at the end of Section 5.3, one could conclude that dynamically switching from lists to k -d trees when $2^{k \log k} \leq m \leq n \leq 2^m$ can result in a good tradeoff. We implemented this, but unfortunately the size-to-dimension ratio of most antichains in our experiments does not trigger a switch to k -d trees.

6 Experiments

We implemented several variations of the list-, k -d-tree-, and sharing-tree-based algorithms using a generic library for partially-ordered sets of vectors.⁷ Tests “in a vacuum,” where the data structure operations are benchmarked on random data, exhibit the expected behavior dictated by their theoretical complexity. We do not report on these unsurprising conclusions (appearing in the appendix). Our main interest lies in tests “in the field,” that is, in applications that rely on antichains; one specific aim is to establish whether the conditions for k -d trees or sharing trees to outperform list-based downsets are met in practice. We focus on two such applications: LTL-realizability and parity game solving, relying on benchmark sets used in authoritative competitions. For both applications, we formally present the computational task at hand, the downset-based algorithm to solve it, and experimental results. We also study the ratio of size vs. dimension within the benchmark sets used in these applications.

All the following experiments were carried on an Intel[®] Core[™] i7-8700 CPU @ 3.20GHz paired with 16GiB of memory.

⁷ Links to our source code and benchmarks will be made available after acceptance.

6.1 LTL-realizability

The task. Let I and O be disjoint and finite sets of *input* and *output propositions*. A *linear-temporal-logic* (LTL) formula over $P = I \cup O$ specifies temporal dependencies between truth values of the propositions. Formulas in LTL are constructed from the propositions, the usual Boolean connectives, and temporal operators “next”, “eventually”, “always”, and “until”, with their intuitive semantics. (We refer the reader to [1] for the formal syntax and semantics of LTL.) It is well known that the set $\text{Words}(\varphi)$ of all words, over valuations 2^P of the propositions, that satisfy a given LTL formula φ can be “compiled” into an infinite-word automaton. In particular, one can construct a non-deterministic automaton \mathcal{N} with a *Büchi acceptance condition* such that its language is exactly $\text{Words}(\varphi)$. The Büchi acceptance condition stipulates that infinite runs of the automaton are accepting if they visit accepting states infinitely often.

LTL realizability can be defined in terms of the aforementioned automaton. Namely, given the nondeterministic Büchi automaton \mathcal{N} constructed from an input LTL formula φ over P , we have an *input player* and an *output player* take turns choosing truth values for I and O . This induces an infinite word over 2^P . The winner of the game depends on whether the word is in the language of \mathcal{N} : the input player wins if it is *not* in the language, otherwise the output player wins. (There are other ways of defining realizability using membership in the language and other acceptance conditions, but this particular one makes it easier to present the algorithm below.) The computational task lies in determining if the input player has a winning strategy for this game.

The algorithm. We succinctly present the downset-based approach of Filiot et al. [19] to solving the task at hand. Fix a *Büchi automaton* $\mathcal{N} = (Q, q_0, \delta, B)$ with Q a set of states, q_0 the initial state, δ the transition relation that uses valuations 2^P as labels, and $B \subseteq Q$ the set of Büchi states. We will be interested in *vectors over Q* , i.e. elements in \mathbb{Z}^Q mapping states to integers, to encode the number of visits to Büchi states—recall the input player wants to avoid there being a run that visits these infinitely often. We will write \mathbf{v} for such vectors, and v_q for its value for state q . In practice, these vectors will range into a finite subset of \mathbb{Z} , with -1 as an implicit minimum value (i.e. $(-1) - 1$ is still -1) and an upper bound k that can be thought of as a hyperparameter of the algorithm.

For a vector \mathbf{v} over Q and a valuation x , we define a function that takes one step back in the automaton, decreasing components that have seen Büchi states. Write $\chi_B(q)$ for the function mapping a state q to 1 if $q \in B$, and 0 otherwise. We then define $\text{bwd}(\mathbf{v}, x)$ as the vector over Q that maps each state $p \in Q$ to:

$$\min_{(p,x,q) \in \delta} (v_q - \chi_B(q)) \ ,$$

and we generalize this to sets: $\text{bwd}(S, x) = \{\text{bwd}(\mathbf{v}, x) \mid \mathbf{v} \in S\}$. For a set S of vectors over Q and a valuation $i \in 2^I$ of the inputs, define:

$$\text{CPre}_i(S) = S \cap \bigcup_{o \in 2^O} \text{bwd}(S, i \cup o) \ .$$

It is proved in [19] that iterating CPre converges to a fixed point that is independent from the order in which the valuation of the inputs is selected. We define $\text{CPre}^*(S)$ to be that set.

All the sets that we manipulate above are *downsets*. Now, for any $k > 0$, if there is a $\mathbf{v} \in \text{CPre}^*(\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid i \leq k\}^Q)$ with $v_{q_0} \geq 0$ then the input player has a winning strategy. Conversely, there is a large enough value of k such that if the condition does not hold then the output player has a winning strategy.

Experimental results. The above algorithm was implemented as the tool Acacia-Bonsai [7], relying on our generic library for partially-ordered sets. We considered the benchmarks used in the yearly competition in LTL-realizability, SYNTCOMP [25]. These consist in 1048 LTL formulas, of which the best LTL tools solve 90% in under a second. We present the experimental results as a survival plot, indicating how many tests are solved (x-axis) within a time limit (y-axis, time per test). In particular, the lower the curve, the better. To reduce clutter, we focus on the benchmarks that took the longest: 500 benchmarks are not shown, with all implementations solving each of them in less than 0.1 seconds. The tests were executed with a 60-second timeout. We observe, crucially, that the dynamic switching between the two data structures follows closely the list-based implementation, witnessing the fact that the threshold provided by the theory at which k -d trees are more advantageous (see Section 5.5) is rarely crossed. To illustrate this, we studied the *ratio* of set size vs. dimension; it is also displayed here as a survival plot, indicating how many sets (x-axis) have a ratio below a certain value (y-axis). The sets we considered are all the different values of CPre, which, over all the benchmarks, amounts to 67,143 sets.




Fig. 1: Survival plots of downset-based LTL-realizability.

The k -d tree implementation solved 779 test cases, while the list implementations solved a strict superset of 787 cases. Sharing tree implementations performed uniformly worse than all the others, solving 717 test cases for covering

sharing trees, and 761 for sharing trees. These are in turn subsets of the ones solved by k -d tree, except for one case.

These results indicate that the size of the antichains and their dimensions are too low to translate into an edge for the k -d tree structure, but that they nonetheless achieve similar performances. This is clearly indicated by Figure 1b: roughly 95% of sets that are created in the algorithm are of size that is bounded by twice the dimension. Larger ratios are only found in 161 of the 787 solved cases. We present, in Appendix D, the same graphics as above but focusing on the instances these 161 instances that *do* induce set sizes that are at least double the dimension. No notable difference in performance is to be reported.

When introduced in 2023, Acacia-Bonsai also included an implementation of k -d trees. We present, in Appendix E, how that implementation fairs against our current implementation: it would be performing slightly worse than sharing trees. Concretely, on the set of benchmarks presented in the next subsection, optimized algorithms based on the theoretical insights presented in this paper have led to half an order of magnitude improvement in the performance of the data structure. We speculate that similar improvements are still possible for our implementation of (covering) sharing trees.

6.2 Parity game solving

The task. A *parity game* \mathcal{G} is a tuple (V_0, V_1, E, p) where V_0 and V_1 are disjoint sets of vertices with $V = V_0 \cup V_1$, $E \subseteq V \times V$ is a set of directed edges, and $p: V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ assigns a *priority* to each vertex.

In such games, we usually assume an *even player* controls V_0 while an *odd player* controls V_1 . The players select outgoing edges from their vertices, and it induces an infinite path from a given starting vertex. The winner of the game depends on the maximal vertex priority appearing infinitely often along the path: the even player wins if it is even, otherwise the odd player wins. The computational task of parity game solving is to determine for each vertex v if the controller of the vertex has a winning strategy in the game starting in v .

The algorithm. We present a new algorithm—to the best of our knowledge—based on a construction of Bernet et al. [3], to determine the winner of a parity game via manipulation of downsets. Our presentation follows the vocabulary of [17, Ch. 6]. Let us fix a parity game (V_0, V_1, E, p) and an initial vertex v_0 . Also, write $d = \lceil \max_{v \in V} p(v)/2 \rceil$ and $p^{-1}: \{0, 1, \dots, 2d\} \rightarrow 2^V$ for the mapping from every priority to the set of all vertices labelled by it. We use vectors $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ to keep track of the number of visits to odd-priority vertices. More precisely, we consider $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $-1 \leq c_i \leq n_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$, where $n_i = \lfloor p^{-1}(2i-1) \rfloor$. We adopt the convention that $c_i - a = -1$ for all $a \geq 1 + c_i$ or if $c_i = -1$, and $c_i + b = n_i$ for all $b \geq n_i - c_i$. The intuition is that c_i keeps track of the number of visits to vertices with odd priority $2i - 1$ and having a value of -1 means that reaching a value of n_i , hence a simple cycle with that odd priority, is unavoidable.

For a vector \mathbf{c} and a vertex $v \in V$, we define an operator to obtain a predecessor vector (recall that we are counting visits to odd-priority vertices). Formally,

$$\text{bwd}(\mathbf{c}, v) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{c} - \mathbf{e}_i & \text{if } p(v) = 2i - 1 \\ \mathbf{c} + \sum_{j=1}^i n_j \mathbf{e}_j & \text{if } p(v) = 2i \end{cases}$$

where \mathbf{e}_i is a vector with 1 as its i -th component and zeros elsewhere. We lift the operator to sets C of vectors as follows.

$$\text{bwd}(C, v) = \{\text{bwd}(\mathbf{c}, v) \mid \mathbf{c} \in C\}$$

Consider a mapping $\mu: V \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{N}^d}$ from vertices to sets of vectors. We introduce an update operation on such mappings to compute over-approximations of the states from which the even player wins. The initial mapping μ_0 is the closure of the vector of n_i , i.e. it assigns the following set to all vertices $v \in V$:

$$\mu_0(v) = \{(n_1, n_3, \dots, n_{2i+1}, \dots)\} \downarrow .$$

Intuitively, this is the worst possible situation for the even player without having reached the maximal number of visits to some odd-priority vertex. The update operation CPre , for a given mapping μ , outputs a new mapping ν such that:

$$\nu(u) = \mu(u) \cap C \text{ , where } C = \begin{cases} \bigcup_{(u,v) \in E} \text{bwd}(\mu(v), u) \downarrow & \text{if } u \in V_0 \\ \bigcap_{(u,v) \in E} \text{bwd}(\mu(v), u) \downarrow & \text{if } u \in V_1. \end{cases}$$

It can be shown that the mappings obtained by iterating CPre starting from μ_0 converge. Write CPre^* for that mapping. We have [17, Lemma 6.4] that for all $v \in V$, there is some $\mathbf{c} \in \text{CPre}^*(v)$ such that $0 \leq c_i \leq n_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$ if and only if even player wins the parity game when starting from v .

Experimental results. We again rely on the SYNTCOMP24 benchmarks, which has a competition track for parity game solvers, and augment these benchmarks with the ones provided by Keiren [27]. We implemented our downset-based algorithm in the tool Oink [13], a tool developed to provide a uniform framework for the comparison of parity game solvers. The implementation is agnostic to the downset implementation, allowing for easy comparison of the underlying data structure. The 779 benchmarks were each executed with a 60-second timeout and 10GB memory limitation. The survival plot appears below.

We studied the ratio of set size vs. dimension, listing the size of the set C (as used in the definition of ν above) every time it is computed; this is a grand total of 1,106,234,004 sets. For 98% of them, the ratio was smaller than 0.03; in fact, out of the billion sets processed by our algorithm, only 746,139 are of size greater or equal to 3. These are concentrated on only 22 out of 1024 benchmarks and we also display the survival plot corresponding to these tests only, since they are more likely to favor implementations that perform well with large-sized sets.




Fig. 2: Survival plots of downset-based parity-game solving.

On these smaller downsets, we see that covering sharing trees does better than sharing trees. It would seem that when the size of the antichain of maximal elements of an antichain is not much smaller than the downset itself, the approximate domination check of covering sharing trees shines through. Nevertheless, it is clear that list-based algorithms are also best for the parity-game use case: over all 779 games, they solve 569 test cases, while k -d trees solve 559, and (covering) sharing trees 544.

In Appendix F, we also plot the memory consumption of the data structures, which clearly indicates (covering) sharing trees are the least space efficient. This supports our earlier claim that (covering) sharing trees have a worse performance due to them storing larger sets than the other data structures.

7 Conclusion

We provided a theoretical analysis of two data structures for downsets of natural vectors: list-, sharing-tree-, and k -d-tree-based. We identified when k -d trees should outperform the others and provided experiments showing that uses “in the field” are not conducive to cases where k -d trees outperform the humble list-based implementation. We posit other antichain-based tools like the Petri-net safety-checking tool MIST [20] may benefit from using list-based antichains.

For future work, it would be interesting to provide average-case complexity bounds for the operations we have studied. Most naive approaches for an average-case analysis of antichain-manipulations seem to require tighter bounds on *Dedekind numbers* (intuitively, the number of different antichains for a given norm bound and dimension) than the ones we found in the literature (see, e.g. [18]). Additionally, our study of antichain size vs. dimension may indicate sharing-tree based antichains benefit from radix-tree like compression [23].

References

1. Baier, C., Katoen, J.: Principles of model checking. MIT Press (2008)
2. de Berg, M., Cheong, O., van Kreveld, M.J., Overmars, M.H.: Computational geometry: algorithms and applications, 3rd Edition. Springer (2008), <https://www.worldcat.org/oclc/227584184>
3. Bernet, J., Janin, D., Walukiewicz, I.: Permissive strategies: from parity games to safety games. *RAIRO Theor. Informatics Appl.* **36**(3), 261–275 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1051/ITA:2002013>, <https://doi.org/10.1051/ita:2002013>
4. Berwanger, D., Chatterjee, K., Wulf, M.D., Doyen, L., Henzinger, T.A.: Strategy construction for parity games with imperfect information. *Inf. Comput.* **208**(10), 1206–1220 (2010)
5. Blumer, A., Blumer, J., Ehrenfeucht, A., Haussler, D., McConnell, R.M.: Linear size finite automata for the set of all subwords of a word - an outline of results. *Bull. EATCS* **21**, 12–20 (1983)
6. Brass, P.: Advanced Data Structures. Cambridge University Press (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511800191>
7. Cadilhac, M., Pérez, G.A.: Acacia-bonsai: A modern implementation of downset-based LTL realizability. In: TACAS (2). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 13994, pp. 192–207. Springer (2023)
8. Chan, T.M.: Orthogonal range searching in moderate dimensions: k-d trees and range trees strike back. *Discret. Comput. Geom.* **61**(4), 899–922 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00454-019-00062-5>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00454-019-00062-5>
9. Clarke, E.M., Henzinger, T.A., Veith, H., Bloem, R. (eds.): Handbook of Model Checking. Springer (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10575-8>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10575-8>
10. Daciuk, J., Mihov, S., Watson, B.W., Watson, R.E.: Incremental construction of minimal acyclic finite state automata. *Comput. Linguistics* **26**(1), 3–16 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1162/089120100561601>, <https://doi.org/10.1162/089120100561601>
11. Daskalakis, C., Karp, R.M., Mossel, E., Riesenfeld, S.J., Verbin, E.: Sorting and selection in posets. *SIAM J. Comput.* **40**(3), 597–622 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1137/070697720>, <https://doi.org/10.1137/070697720>
12. Delzanno, G., Raskin, J., Begin, L.V.: Covering sharing trees: a compact data structure for parameterized verification. *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transf.* **5**(2-3), 268–297 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10009-003-0110-0>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-003-0110-0>
13. van Dijk, T.: Oink: An implementation and evaluation of modern parity game solvers. In: TACAS. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 10805, pp. 291–308. Springer (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-89960-2_16, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-89960-2_16
14. van Dijk, T., van Abbema, F., Tomov, N.: Knor: reactive synthesis using oink. In: Finkbeiner, B., Kovács, L. (eds.) Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems - 30th International Conference, TACAS 2024, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2024, Luxembourg City, Luxembourg, April 6-11, 2024, Proceedings, Part I. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 14570, pp. 103–122. Springer (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57246-3_7, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57246-3_7

15. Doveri, K., Ganty, P., Hadzi-Dokic, L.: Antichains algorithms for the inclusion problem between omega-VPL. In: TACAS (1). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 13993, pp. 290–307. Springer (2023)
16. Doyen, L., Raskin, J.: Antichains for the automata-based approach to model-checking. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* **5**(1) (2009)
17. Doyen, L., Raskin, J.: Games with imperfect information: theory and algorithms. In: *Lectures in Game Theory for Computer Scientists*, pp. 185–212. Cambridge University Press (2011)
18. Falgas-Ravry, V., Rätty, E., Tomon, I.: Dedekind’s problem in the hypergrid (2023), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.12946>
19. Filiot, E., Jin, N., Raskin, J.: Antichains and compositional algorithms for LTL synthesis. *Formal Methods Syst. Des.* **39**(3), 261–296 (2011)
20. Ganty, P.: *Algorithmes et Structures de Données Efficaces Pour La Manipulation de Contraintes Sur Les Intervalles* (in French). Master’s thesis, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium (2002)
21. Ganty, P., Meuter, C., Delzanno, G., Kalyon, G., Raskin, J., Van Begin, L.: Symbolic Data Structure for sets of k-uples. Tech. Rep. 570, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium (2007)
22. Holik, L., Iosif, R., Rogalewicz, A., Vojnar, T.: Abstraction refinement and antichains for trace inclusion of infinite state systems. *Formal Methods Syst. Des.* **55**(3), 137–170 (2020)
23. Holub, J., Crochemore, M.: On the implementation of compact dawg’s. In: Champarnaud, J., Maurel, D. (eds.) *Implementation and Application of Automata*, 7th International Conference, CIAA 2002, Tours, France, July 3-5, 2002, Revised Papers. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 2608, pp. 289–294. Springer (2002). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44977-9_31, https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44977-9_31
24. Hunter, P., Pérez, G.A., Raskin, J.: Looking at mean payoff through foggy windows. *Acta Informatica* **55**(8), 627–647 (2018)
25. Jacobs, S., Pérez, G.A., Abraham, R., Bruyère, V., Cadilhac, M., Colange, M., Delfosse, C., van Dijk, T., Duret-Lutz, A., Faymonville, P., Finkbeiner, B., Khalimov, A., Klein, F., Luttenberger, M., Meyer, K.J., Michaud, T., Pommet, A., Renkin, F., Schlehuber-Caissier, P., Sakr, M., Sickert, S., Staquet, G., Tamines, C., Tentrup, L., Walker, A.: The reactive synthesis competition (SYNTCOMP): 2018-2021. *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transf.* **26**(5), 551–567 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-024-00754-1>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-024-00754-1>
26. Jurdzinski, M.: Small progress measures for solving parity games. In: Reichel, H., Tison, S. (eds.) *STACS 2000, 17th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, Lille, France, February 2000, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 1770, pp. 290–301. Springer (2000). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-46541-3_24, https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-46541-3_24
27. Keiren, J.J.A.: Benchmarks for parity games. In: Dastani, M., Sirjani, M. (eds.) *Fundamentals of Software Engineering*. pp. 127–142. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2015)
28. Laveaux, M., Groote, J.F., Willemse, T.A.C.: Correct and efficient antichain algorithms for refinement checking. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* **17**(1) (2021), <https://lmcs.episciences.org/7143>
29. Revuz, D.: Minimisation of acyclic deterministic automata in linear time. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **92**(1), 181–189 (1992). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(92\)90142-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(92)90142-3), [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(92\)90142-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(92)90142-3)

30. Wang, T., Song, S., Sun, J., Liu, Y., Dong, J.S., Wang, X., Li, S.: More anti-chain based refinement checking. In: ICFEM. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 7635, pp. 364–380. Springer (2012)
31. Zampuni eris, D.: The Sharing Tree Data Structure, Theory and Applications in Formal Verification. Ph.D. thesis, PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Namur, Belgium (1997)

A Membership: best and worst-case scenarios

Here we give intuition and examples of antichains showcasing the best- and worst-case scenarios for membership analysis in all three data structures. We have k the dimension of the space, m the number of vectors in the antichain A , also encoded in a k -d tree T and approximated by a sharing tree G , and \mathbf{u} the vector we want to check for membership in $A\downarrow$. We consider two cases: one where the vector being queried is in the downset of the antichain, and one where it is not.

The vector is in the downset. For lists, in the best case, the vector could be smaller than the first vector in the antichain, and the algorithm terminates in k steps, whereas the worst case is when the input vector is only smaller than the last vector in the list, in which case, the algorithm terminates after km steps, i.e. after comparing against all the vectors in the antichain.

For sharing trees, the best case is similar to that of lists: if the vector is dominated by the one encoded by the first branch of G , then the algorithm terminates in k steps. In the worst case, the last branch checked is the one dominating \mathbf{u} . This means the whole sharing tree is traversed and by Lemma 3 this takes $O(km)$.

For k -d trees, the best case is when u is the zero vector. In this case, $\text{Reg}(T_{\succ}) \subseteq \text{Reg}(\mathbf{u})$ and the algorithm terminates in k steps. (The k steps are actually for the initialization of the variable c , a single recursive call of the algorithm suffices afterwards! See the proof of Theorem 3.) In the worst case, consider an antichain such that the last component of each vector is 0 except the one which is the rightmost leaf in the k -d tree representation. The vector for which we ask membership is $(0, 0, \dots, 0, 1)$. On each recursive call, the algorithm will have to explore both branches of the tree, except at the level corresponding to the last dimension. This leads to the worst-case complexity of $O(k^2 m^{1-\frac{1}{k}})$.

The vector is not in the downset. For lists, the best and worst cases are the same: the algorithm takes km steps since the algorithm must compare every vector against \mathbf{u} .

For sharing trees, the best case is when the first component of \mathbf{u} is strictly larger than that of all vectors encoded by G , and since we keep successors ordered by their label, the data structure allows to exit and assert \mathbf{u} is not in $A\downarrow$, which is in $O(1)$. For the worst case, we again use Lemma 3 since we have to traverse the whole sharing tree, and so we get that it takes $O(km)$ time.

For k -d trees, the best case is when $u = (\ell, \ell, \dots, \ell)$ with ℓ strictly greater than the largest number occurring in any vector in the antichain. In this case, $\text{Reg}(T_{\prec}) \cap \text{Reg}(\mathbf{u}) = \emptyset$ will hold on all recursive calls, hence the algorithm will never enter a “left” branch so it will terminate in $O(k + \log m)$ steps.⁸

The worst-case behavior can be obtained with the same example as before: suppose A is such that the last component of all its vectors is 0 and $\mathbf{u} =$

⁸ Here, again, k comes from the initialization of c .

$(0, 0, \dots, 0, 1)$. Now the k -d tree algorithm will have to explore both branches of each subtree except at the level corresponding to the last dimension, which leads to the complexity of $O(k^2 m^{1-\frac{1}{k}})$.

B Covering sharing tree algorithms

We now present the variant of sharing trees proposed in [12] to encode and manipulate antichains. The two main differences between these so-called *covering sharing trees* and the sharing-tree based antichain algorithms we described in this work are the following.

1. Covering sharing trees may encode more than just the antichain of maximal elements. Indeed, due to the *approximate* domination checks proposed in [12], some dominated vectors are not excluded from the encoded set. This makes comparing the complexity of algorithms on covering sharing trees with the others studied in this work rather hard. Indeed, the difference in size between the antichain of maximal elements of a downset and an arbitrary subset of its closure (which includes the maximal elements) is hard to bound in a nontrivial way.
2. Algorithms to operate over two covering sharing trees, as proposed in [12], are much more graph-based. Indeed, these resemble binary decision diagram algorithms. In contrast the algorithms proposed in this work revert to iterating over the encoded vectors for union and intersection and use the sharing tree representation only to speed up membership queries.

Let $A \subset \mathbb{N}^k$ be the antichain of maximal elements for the downward-closed set of interest. We use $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ to denote the *language* recognized by a DFA \mathcal{A} . Ideally, we want a sharing tree encoding $\mathcal{D}_{\lceil V \rceil}$ (i.e., the language accepting the minimal antichain containing V in its downset), but computing this is known to be NP-hard in the size of the sharing tree [12].

Instead, we use a relaxation of $\mathcal{D}_{\lceil V \rceil}$ called the *simulation minimal* automaton $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{V}}$ with the property that $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_{\lceil V \rceil}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{V}}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_V) = V$. The relaxation is based on a simulation-relation minimization described in [12].

Definition 4. *Let n and m be nodes of the i -th layer of trees S and T , respectively. The node n is (forward) simulated by m , written $n \xrightarrow{F} m$, if $\text{val}(n) \leq \text{val}(m)$ and all successors of n are simulated by some successor of m , that is, for all $s \in \text{succ}(n)$ there exists $t \in \text{succ}(m)$ such that $s \xrightarrow{F} t$.*

We say a sharing tree is *simulation minimal* if no child of a node simulates a sibling. This definition of simulation minimality gives a DFA that is potentially exponentially smaller than the starting set, even if the starting set is an antichain (see [31, Sec. 1.3.3] and [12, Prop. 2]).

B.1 Growing sharing trees

Now, Algorithm 1 can be modified so that every addition of a new node is conditional on it not being (forward) simulated by a sibling that has already been added to the sharing tree. These additional checks mean that building the tree becomes more costly. Even more important is the fact that we no longer require the encoded set to be the antichain of maximal elements whose downward-closure is the original set. We allow vectors that are part of the downward-closure of another encoded vector as long as simulation-minimality holds.

B.2 The membership problem

This can still be realized using a DFS.

B.3 The union operation

Let S be the sharing tree representing a downset $A\downarrow$ and T a sharing tree representing the downset $B\downarrow$ of equal dimension $k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. To compute the union of $S \cup T$, we adapt the union algorithm proposed by Zampuni eris [31]. On a node-level, it is shown that the union of two nodes n and m with the same value, or more precisely the subtrees rooted at those nodes, is a node with that shared value and its successors being the union of a successor of n and one of m if they have the same value and a simple copy of all remaining successors of both nodes. Note that due to definition 3 (2), there is at most one successor of m that has the same value as any of n .

Starting from the roots of S and T , the successors of both nodes are iterated over. Due to the descending ordering, there are three main cases that can occur. In the first case, the value of the current successor in S is larger than that in T , then the whole subtree rooted at this successor-node can be copied as successor of the resulting union-node. In the second case, all successors in one tree were visited, then the subtrees for the remaining successors in the other tree are copied. The last case is that both successors have the same value, then the union is recursively called for the two nodes and the resulting node added as successor of the union node.

To ensure a simulation-minimal tree, all cases include a simulation-check before adding to the union-result. This means, copied nodes as well as the newly constructed union-nodes are only added as successor of a node if it has no other successor that simulates the new addition already.

The algorithm is shown in Algorithm 4. We highlight that here, in contrast to [12], we are trying to get a simulation-minimal result whereas the authors of that work just run simulation minimization afterwards.

B.4 The intersection operation

Let S and T once again be the sharing trees representing downsets. The basic approach to computing the intersection $S \cap T$ directly using the sharing trees is

Algorithm 4 Union($n_S, n_T, layer$)

```

1:  $newNode \leftarrow$  node with value of  $n_s$ 
2: if  $layer < k$  then
3:    $s_s, s_t \leftarrow 0$ 
4:   while  $s_S < |n_S.successors| \vee s_T < |n_T.successors|$  do
5:     if  $s_S = |n_S.successors| \vee n_S.successors[s_S].val < n_T.successors[s_T].val$ 
6:       then
7:          $newNode.addSuccIfNotSimulated(n_T.successors[s_T])$ 
8:          $s_T ++$ 
9:       else if  $s_t = |n_t.successors| \vee n_S.successors[s_S].val > n_T.successors[s_T].val$ 
10:        then
11:           $newNode.addSuccIfNotSimulated(n_S.successors[s_S])$ 
12:           $s_S ++$ 
13:        else
14:           $newSucc \leftarrow Union(n_S.successors[s_S], n_T.successors[s_T], layer + 1)$ 
15:          if  $newSucc \neq null$  then
16:             $newNode.addSucc(newChild)$ 
17:           $s_s ++$ 
18:           $s_t ++$ 
19:  return  $layer.addNodeIfNotSimulated(newNode)$ 

```

similar to that for the union: The result is computed recursively per node-pair of one node from S and one from T by parallely iterating over the successors of both nodes. In contrast to union however, we additionally adapt an idea by Delzanno et al [12]. They describe a way of computing the intersection for upward-closed sets that relies on creating a pre-sharing tree with nodes for all possible combinations of nodes of the two trees in the same layer and subsequent reduction by enforcing the sharing tree conditions.

In our algorithm, see Algorithm 5, we create the new nodes for every pair of one node from S and one from T in the same layer and set its value to the minimum of the two. The successors are then created recursively with every combination of the successors in S and T . Just as for the union, the nodes are only added to the final result if they are not simulated by another node already present.

However, this check has to be implemented differently due to the order in which new successors are added. For the union, the order in which successors are iterated means every successor that is added will have a value smaller than all previously added successors. Consequently, it is only necessary to check simulation in the direction $existingSuccessor \xrightarrow{F} newSuccessor$. In intersection on the other hand, the order in which successors are added is not guaranteed. Therefore, a newly added successor might have an equal or even larger value than the existing ones. The check $existingSuccessor \xrightarrow{F} newSuccessor$ will still be executed in all cases, but if it is determined that the new successor should still be added, additional steps are taken.

We will address the two possible cases separately. If a new successor has to be added that has the same value as an existing one, we follow the approach presented by Zampuni eris [31]: By definition, a node may not have two successors with the same value, therefore we replace the existing successor with the result of the union of the current successor and the new successor to be added. If the new successor has a value larger than the last successor, we add it in the corresponding position in the successor list, following the descending order. Now it is necessary to also check the simulation in the direction $newSuccessor \xrightarrow{F} existingSuccessor$ for all successors after the insertion point, i.e. those with a smaller value. If it is found that the new successor simulates any existing one, it is removed.

Algorithm 5 ST Intersection

```

1:  $n_s, n_t \leftarrow$  ST nodes
2:  $layer \leftarrow$  layer of the two nodes
3:  $father \leftarrow$  ST node
4: function INTERSECT( $n_s, n_t, layer, father$ )
5:    $newNode \leftarrow$  node with value  $\min(n_s.val, n_t.val)$ 
6:   if  $layer < d$  then
7:     for  $s_s = 0; s_s < |n_s.successors|; s_s ++$  do
8:       for  $s_t = 0; s_t < |n_t.successors|; s_t ++$  do
9:          $intersectResult \leftarrow intersect(n_s.successors[s_s], n_t.successors[s_t],$ 
10:           $layer + 1, newNode)$ 
11:         if  $intersectResult \neq null$  then
12:            $newNode.addSucc(intersectResult)$ 
13:       if  $|newNode.successors| = 0$  then
14:         return  $null$ 
15:   if  $father \neq null$  then
16:     return  $layer.addNodeIfNotSimulated(newNode, father)$ 
17:   else
18:     return  $layer.addNode(newNode)$ 

```

C Strategy synthesis for parity games

To obtain a strategy for the even player from $CPre^*$ we follow [26,3] and, from each vertex u controlled by the even player, choose a successor v so as to minimize the minimal element in $\{c \in CPre^*(v) \mid \mathbf{0} \leq c\}$ according to the co-lexicographic order where all dimensions $1 \leq i \leq d$ such that $2i < p(u)$ are ignored.

D LTL-realizability on instances with large sets




Fig. 3: Survival plots of downset-based LTL-realizability focusing on the test cases that have at least one set that is in the top 5% in terms of ratio size vs. dimension.

E Progress in k -d tree performances based on implementations

The following graphic reports on the gains in performance obtained by building the k -d tree as described in Section 5.1 (instead of the classic presorting proposed in computational geometry books) and optimizing the memory management of k -d trees, which are the main difference between the implementation provided in [7], and our implementation. This figure is a survival plot with the same parameters as the ones of Section 6.1.




Fig. 4: Survival plot of k -d-tree-based parity-game solving.

F Memory usage of different data structures in parity-game solving

The following graphic depicts the memory usage of each data structure on all the parity games benchmarked. Each vertical line corresponds to one instance, and these lines are ordered in such a way that the list implementation never decreases in usage.





Fig. 5: Memory usage of data structures on parity games

G Random benchmarks

We evaluate the performances of downset operations on random samples. For membership, we create a random antichain of size t , and query $2t$ elements on the data structures, half of which belong to the downset. For union and intersection, we create a random antichain of size t , another antichain of size t that overlaps the first for *half* the elements, and perform the operation. The dimension is set to 32,000, so that the asymptotic behaviors can be observed.



For this experiment, our goal was to determine when k -d trees start performing better than list-based antichains. Hence, to avoid clutter, we focused on these

two data structures. Nevertheless, we did try both sharing and covering sharing trees on a number of large-dimension examples ($> 8,000$) and remark that it is much slower than the other data structures—presumably because, despite sharing, the resulting automaton is rather “deep and narrow”.