Expressive power of Cost Logics over Infinite Words (and Trees)

Denis Kuperberg, joint work with Michael Vanden Boom

FREC Days
05-06-2012

Introduction

- Regular cost functions: counting extension of regular languages.

Introduction

- Regular cost functions: counting extension of regular languages.
- Motivation: solving bound-related problems on regular languages (e.g. star-height).

Introduction

- Regular cost functions: counting extension of regular languages.
- Motivation: solving bound-related problems on regular languages (e.g. star-height).
- Definable over finite or infinite structures, like words or trees.

Introduction

- Regular cost functions: counting extension of regular languages.
- Motivation: solving bound-related problems on regular languages (e.g. star-height).
- Definable over finite or infinite structures, like words or trees.
- Definable via automata, logics, algebraic structures,...

Cost automata over infinite words

Nondeterministic finite-state automaton $\mathcal{A}$

+ finite set of counters
  (initialized to 0, values range over $\mathbb{N}$)
+ counter operations on transitions
  (increment $\mathtt{I}$, reset $\mathtt{R}$, check $\mathtt{C}$, no change ε)

Semantics

$$[\![\mathcal{A}]\!] : \mathbb{A}^\omega \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$$

Cost automata over infinite words

Nondeterministic finite-state automaton $\mathcal{A}$

+ finite set of counters
  (initialized to 0, values range over $\mathbb{N}$)
+ counter operations on transitions
  (increment $\mathtt{I}$, reset $\mathtt{R}$, check $\mathtt{C}$, no change ε)

Semantics

$$val_B(\rho) := \text{max checked counter value during run } \rho$$

$$[\![\mathcal{A}]\!]_B(u) := \min\{val_B(\rho) : \rho \text{ is an accepting run of } \mathcal{A} \text{ on } u\}$$

Example

$[\![\mathcal{A}]\!]_B(u) =$ min length of block of a's surrounded by b's in u



Cost automata over infinite words

Nondeterministic finite-state automaton $\mathcal{A}$

+ finite set of counters
  (initialized to 0, values range over $\mathbb{N}$)
+ counter operations on transitions
  (increment $\mathtt{I}$, reset $\mathtt{R}$, check $\mathtt{C}$, no change ε)

Semantics

$$val_S(\rho) := \text{min checked counter value during run } \rho$$

$$[\![\mathcal{A}]\!]_S(u) := \max\{val_S(\rho) : \rho \text{ is an accepting run of } \mathcal{A} \text{ on } u\}$$

Example

$[\![\mathcal{A}]\!]_S(u) =$ min length of block of a's surrounded by b's in u



Boundedness relation

"$[\![\mathcal{A}]\!] = [\![\mathcal{B}]\!]$": undecidable [Krob '94]

Boundedness relation

"$[\![\mathcal{A}]\!] = [\![\mathcal{B}]\!]$": undecidable [Krob '94]

"$[\![\mathcal{A}]\!] \approx [\![\mathcal{B}]\!]$": decidable on words
[Colcombet '09, following Bojánczyk+Colcombet '06]
for all subsets U, $[\![\mathcal{A}]\!](U)$ bounded iff $[\![\mathcal{B}]\!](U)$ bounded



$$[\![\mathcal{A}]\!] \approx [\![\mathcal{B}]\!]$$

Boundedness relation

"$[\![\mathcal{A}]\!] = [\![\mathcal{B}]\!]$": undecidable [Krob '94]

"$[\![\mathcal{A}]\!] \approx [\![\mathcal{B}]\!]$": decidable on words
[Colcombet '09, following Bojánczyk+Colcombet '06]
for all subsets U, $[\![\mathcal{A}]\!](U)$ bounded iff $[\![\mathcal{B}]\!](U)$ bounded



$[\![\mathcal{A}]\!] \not\approx [\![\mathcal{B}]\!]$

Applications

Many problems for a regular language L can be reduced to deciding $\approx$ for some class of automata with counting features:

- **Finite power property** (finite words)
  [Simon '78, Hashiguchi '79]

  is there some n such that $(L + \epsilon)^n = L^*$?

- **Star-height problem** (finite words/trees)
  [Hashiguchi '88, Kirsten '05, Colcombet+Löding '08]

  given n, is there a regular expression for L
  with at most n nestings of Kleene star?

- **Parity-index problem** (infinite trees)
  [reduction in Colcombet+Löding '08, decidability open]

  given $i < j$, is there a parity automaton for L
  which uses only priorities $\{i, i+1, \ldots, j\}$?

Applications

Many problems for a regular language L can be reduced to deciding $\approx$ for some class of automata with counting features:

- **Finite power property** (finite words)
  [Simon '78, Hashiguchi '79]

  distance

  is there some n such that $(L + \epsilon)^n = L^*$?

- **Star-height problem** (finite words/trees)
  [Hashiguchi '88, Kirsten '05, Colcombet+Löding '08]

  nested distance-desert

  given n, is there a regular expression for L with at most n nestings of Kleene star?

- **Parity-index problem** (infinite trees)
  [reduction in Colcombet+Löding '08, decidability open]

  given $i < j$, is there a parity automaton for L which uses only priorities $\{i, i+1, \ldots, j\}$?

  cost-parity

Languages as cost functions

- A standard automaton $\mathcal{A}$ computing a language L can be viewed as a B- or S-automaton without any counters. Then $[\![\mathcal{A}]\!]_B = \chi_L$ and $[\![\mathcal{A}]\!]_S = \chi_{\overline{L}}$, with

$$\chi_L(u) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u \in L \\ \infty & \text{if } u \notin L \end{cases}$$

Languages as cost functions

- A standard automaton $\mathcal{A}$ computing a language L can be viewed as a B- or S-automaton without any counters. Then $[\![\mathcal{A}]\!]_B = \chi_L$ and $[\![\mathcal{A}]\!]_S = \chi_{\overline{L}}$, with

$$\chi_L(u) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u \in L \\ \infty & \text{if } u \notin L \end{cases}$$

- Switching between B and S semantics corresponds to a complementation.

Languages as cost functions

- A standard automaton $\mathcal{A}$ computing a language L can be viewed as a B- or S-automaton without any counters. Then $[\![\mathcal{A}]\!]_B = \chi_L$ and $[\![\mathcal{A}]\!]_S = \chi_{\overline{L}}$, with

$$\chi_L(u) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u \in L \\ \infty & \text{if } u \notin L \end{cases}$$

- Switching between B and S semantics corresponds to a complementation.
- If L and L' are languages, $\chi_L \approx \chi_{L'}$ iff $L = L'$, so cost function theory, even up to $\approx$, strictly extends language theory.

Languages as cost functions

- A standard automaton $\mathcal{A}$ computing a language L can be viewed as a B- or S-automaton without any counters. Then $[\![\mathcal{A}]\!]_B = \chi_L$ and $[\![\mathcal{A}]\!]_S = \chi_{\overline{L}}$, with

$$\chi_L(u) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u \in L \\ \infty & \text{if } u \notin L \end{cases}$$

- Switching between B and S semantics corresponds to a complementation.
- If L and L' are languages, $\chi_L \approx \chi_{L'}$ iff $L = L'$, so cost function theory, even up to $\approx$, strictly extends language theory.
- **Aim:** Extend classic theorems from languages to cost functions

Cost functions on infinite words

- In the following, input structures $=$ $\mathbb{A}$-labelled infinite words.

Cost functions on infinite words

- In the following, input structures $=$ $\mathbb{A}$-labelled infinite words.
- Dual B- and S- semantics as before, defining functions: $\mathbb{A}^\omega \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$.

Cost functions on infinite words

- In the following, input structures $=$ $\mathbb{A}$-labelled infinite words.
- Dual B- and S- semantics as before, defining functions: $\mathbb{A}^\omega \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$.
- Acceptance condition : Büchi.

Cost functions on infinite words

- In the following, input structures $=$ $\mathbb{A}$-labelled infinite words.
- Dual B- and S- semantics as before, defining functions: $\mathbb{A}^\omega \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$.
- Acceptance condition : Büchi.
- Example :



Cost functions on infinite words

- In the following, input structures $=$ $\mathbb{A}$-labelled infinite words.
- Dual B- and S- semantics as before, defining functions: $\mathbb{A}^\omega \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$.
- Acceptance condition : Büchi.
- Example :



- This automaton computes $\begin{cases} |u|_a \text{ if } |u|_b < \infty \\ \infty \text{ if } |u|_b = \infty \end{cases}$

Logics on infinite words

- LTL on $\mathbb{A}$ describes regular languages:
  $\varphi := a \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{R} \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{U} \varphi$
  where the negations have been pushed to the leaves, and the **U** corresponds to "Next Until".

$$\varphi U \psi: \qquad \begin{array}{cccccccccc} & & & & & & & & \varphi & \psi \\ a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & a_4 & a_5 & a_6 & a_7 & a_8 & a_9 a_{10} \end{array}$$

  We can define **X** (Next), **G** (Always) and **F** (Eventually) in terms of these operators.

Logics on infinite words

- LTL on $\mathbb{A}$ describes regular languages:
  $\varphi := a \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{R} \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{U} \varphi$
  where the negations have been pushed to the leaves, and the **U** corresponds to "Next Until".

$$\varphi U \psi: \qquad \begin{matrix} \varphi & \varphi & \varphi & \varphi & \varphi & \varphi & \varphi & \psi \\ a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & a_4 & a_5 & a_6 & a_7 & a_8 & a_9 a_{10} \end{matrix}$$

  We can define **X** (Next), **G** (Always) and **F** (Eventually) in terms of these operators.

- First-Order Logic (FO):

$$\varphi := a(x) \mid x = y \mid x < y \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \exists x.\varphi \mid \forall x.\varphi$$

Logics on infinite words

- LTL on $\mathbb{A}$ describes regular languages:
  $\varphi := a \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{R} \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{U} \varphi$
  where the negations have been pushed to the leaves, and the **U** corresponds to "Next Until".

$$\varphi U \psi: \quad \begin{array}{cccccccccc} \varphi & \varphi & \varphi & \varphi & \varphi & \varphi & \varphi & \varphi & \psi & \\ a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & a_4 & a_5 & a_6 & a_7 & a_8 & a_9 a_{10} \end{array}$$

  We can define **X** (Next), **G** (Always) and **F** (Eventually) in terms of these operators.

- First-Order Logic (FO):

$$\varphi := a(x) \mid x = y \mid x < y \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \exists x.\varphi \mid \forall x.\varphi$$

- (Weak) MSO: FO with quantification over (finite) sets, set variables noted X, Y.

Cost LTL

- CLTL on $\mathbb{A}$ describes regular cost functions:
  $\varphi := a \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{R} \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{U} \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{U}^{\leq N} \varphi$

Cost LTL

- CLTL on $\mathbb{A}$ describes regular cost functions:
  $\varphi := a \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{R} \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{U} \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{U}^{\leq N} \varphi$
- $\varphi \mathbf{U}^{\leq N} \psi$ means that ψ is true somewhere in the future, and φ is false at most N times until then.

$\varphi \mathbf{U}^{\leq N} \psi$:

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccc} & \varphi & \times & \varphi & \varphi & \times & \varphi & \varphi & \psi & & \\ a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & a_4 & a_5 & a_6 & a_7 & a_8 & a_9 & a_{10} \end{array}$$

Cost LTL

- CLTL on $\mathbb{A}$ describes regular cost functions:
  $\varphi := a \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{R} \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{U} \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{U}^{\leq N} \varphi$
- $\varphi \mathbf{U}^{\leq N} \psi$ means that ψ is true somewhere in the future, and φ is false at most N times until then.

$$\varphi \mathbf{U}^{\leq N} \psi: \qquad \begin{array}{c} \varphi \times \varphi \; \varphi \times \varphi \; \varphi \; \psi \\ a_0 \, a_1 \, a_2 \, a_3 \, a_4 \, a_5 \, a_6 \, a_7 \, a_8 \, a_9 a_{10} \end{array}$$

- The "error value" variable N is unique, and is shared by all occurrences of $\mathbf{U}^{\leq N}$ operator.

Cost LTL

- CLTL on $\mathbb{A}$ describes regular cost functions:
  $\varphi := a \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{R} \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{U} \varphi \mid \varphi \mathbf{U}^{\leq N} \varphi$
- $\varphi \mathbf{U}^{\leq N} \psi$ means that ψ is true somewhere in the future, and φ is false at most N times until then.

$$\varphi \mathbf{U}^{\leq N} \psi: \qquad \begin{array}{c} \varphi \times \varphi \; \varphi \times \varphi \; \varphi \; \psi \\ a_0 \, a_1 \, a_2 \, a_3 \, a_4 \, a_5 \, a_6 \, a_7 \, a_8 \, a_9 a_{10} \end{array}$$

- The "error value" variable N is unique, and is shared by all occurrences of $\mathbf{U}^{\leq N}$ operator.
- $\mathbf{G}^{\leq N}$ and $\mathbf{R}^{\leq N}$ can be defined in terms of the previous operators.

CFO and CMSO

- CFO on $\mathbb{A}$ describes regular cost functions:

  $$\varphi := a(x) \mid x = y \mid x < y \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \exists x.\varphi \mid \forall x.\varphi \mid \forall^{\leq N} x.\varphi$$

- As before, N is a unique free variable and counts the number of mistakes.
- (Weak) CMSO extends CFO with quantification over (finite) sets.

Semantics of Cost Logics

From formula to cost function:

$[\![\varphi]\!]$ is the cost function associated to φ, defined by

$$[\![\varphi]\!](u) = \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N}, \varphi \text{ is true on } u \text{ with } n \text{ as error value}\}$$

Example

For all $u \in \{a, b\}^\omega$, we have

- $|u|_a = [\![b\mathbf{U}^{\leq N}(\mathbf{G}b)]\!](u) = [\![\forall^{\leq N} x.b(x)]\!](u)$.
- $$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{maxblock}_a(u) &= [\![\mathbf{G}(\bot \mathbf{U}^{\leq N} b)]\!](u) \\ &= [\![\forall X, \mathrm{block}_a(X) \Rightarrow (\forall^{\leq N} x, x \notin X)]\!](u) \end{aligned}$$.

Alternating B-automata

- **Alternating B-automaton:** Game between Eve and Adam, with counter actions on transitions. Eve must satisfy acceptance condition AND low counter value.

Alternating B-automata

- **Alternating B-automaton:** Game between Eve and Adam, with counter actions on transitions. Eve must satisfy acceptance condition AND low counter value.
- **Weak B-automaton:** Büchi condition, no cycle with both accepting and rejecting states.

Alternating B-automata

- **Alternating B-automaton:** Game between Eve and Adam, with counter actions on transitions. Eve must satisfy acceptance condition AND low counter value.
- **Weak B-automaton:** Büchi condition, no cycle with both accepting and rejecting states.
- **Very-weak B-automaton:** Büchi condition, no non-trivial cycle.

Classical picture



Cost Functions



Proof ideas for WCMSO to CMSO

- By Colcombet, CMSO $\Leftrightarrow$ nondeterministic B/S-Büchi automata.
- By [Vanden Boom 11], WCMSO $\Leftrightarrow$ weak alternating B-automata.

We just need to show a translation from nondeterministic B-Büchi automata to weak alternating B-automata.

Classical Proof from [Kupferman+Vardi '01]



Fix a word u, and analyze the run-DAG of the Büchi-automaton on u (here for $u = baab^{\omega}$):



Ranks : No more Büchi or finite path on the remaining DAG.
Initial node gets a rank $\Rightarrow$ u is rejected.

Classical Proof from [Kupferman+Vardi '01]



Fix a word u, and analyze the run-DAG of the Büchi-automaton on u (here for $u = baab^{\omega}$):



Ranks : No more Büchi or finite path on the remaining DAG.
Initial node gets a rank $\Rightarrow$ u is rejected.

Classical Proof from [Kupferman+Vardi '01]



Fix a word u, and analyze the run-DAG of the Büchi-automaton on u (here for $u = baab^{\omega}$):



Ranks : No more Büchi or finite path on the remaining DAG.
Initial node gets a rank $\Rightarrow$ u is rejected.

Extending to cost functions



Run-DAG for $u = a^\omega$:



Problem to assign ranks : how to prove that this run has value ∞ ?

Solution :

Normal form for nondeterministic B-Büchi automata : must do a reset on every counter after each Büchi state.

The modified automaton guesses whether there is

- a finite number of increments $\Rightarrow$ ignore early Büchi states:



- infinitely many resets $\Rightarrow$ delay Büchi states locally:



On these Büchi automata in normal form, we can define ranks in a sound way, for each value n.

Description of the weak alternating automaton

The weak B-automaton W describes a game between two players:

- Eve wants to prove that $\mathcal{A}$ accepts with low value
- Adam wants to prove that this is not the case

It allows Eve to play a run of $\mathcal{A}$, and Adam to guess ranks. It is designed in such a way that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

- playing a n-run (if exists) is a strategy of value $\leq n$ for Eve.
- playing the n-ranks (if possible) is a strategy of value $> n$ for Adam.

From this we get $[\![W]\!] = [\![\mathcal{A}]\!]$.

Summary



What are the limits of this correspondence ?

On Infinite trees

Theorem (Rabin 1970, Kupferman + Vardi 1999)

A language L of infinite trees is recognizable by an alternating weak automaton iff there are nondeterministic Büchi automata $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{U}'$ such that

$$L = L(\mathcal{U}) = \overline{L(\mathcal{U}')}.$$



Extension to Cost Functions

Complementation becomes switching between B- and S-semantic:



Weak:



Quasi-Weak:



Inclusions are strict, and intersection is effective.

Application

Going back to the initial purpose of cost functions : deciding problems on languages.

Theorem

Boundedness of Quasi-Weak automata is decidable.

Theorem (Colcombet+Löding '08)

Given a regular language L and a parity rank $[i, j]$, we can build a B-$[i, j]$-parity automaton, which computes χ_L iff L is recognizable by a nondeterministic $[i, j]$-parity automaton.

Corollary

Given a nondeterministic Büchi automaton for a language L, we can decide whether L is weak.

Proof scheme of the corollary

Input : Büchi automaton $\mathcal{A}$ for L

- Build a parity automaton $\mathcal{A}'$ for $\overline{L}$, the complement of L.

Proof scheme of the corollary

Input : Büchi automaton $\mathcal{A}$ for L

- Build a parity automaton $\mathcal{A}'$ for $\overline{L}$, the complement of L.
- Use [CL08] to get a B-Büchi automaton $\mathcal{B}$, which recognizes $\chi_{\overline{L}}$ iff $\overline{L}$ is Büchi-recognizable.

Proof scheme of the corollary

Input : Büchi automaton $\mathcal{A}$ for L

- Build a parity automaton $\mathcal{A}'$ for $\overline{L}$, the complement of L.
- Use [CL08] to get a B-Büchi automaton $\mathcal{B}$, which recognizes $\chi_{\overline{L}}$ iff $\overline{L}$ is Büchi-recognizable.
- Consider $\mathcal{A}$ as an S-Büchi automaton for $\chi_{\overline{L}}$.

Proof scheme of the corollary

Input : Büchi automaton $\mathcal{A}$ for L

- Build a parity automaton $\mathcal{A}'$ for $\overline{L}$, the complement of L.
- Use [CL08] to get a B-Büchi automaton $\mathcal{B}$, which recognizes $\chi_{\overline{L}}$ iff $\overline{L}$ is Büchi-recognizable.
- Consider $\mathcal{A}$ as an S-Büchi automaton for $\chi_{\overline{L}}$.
- Build the Quasi-Weak automaton W from $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$.

Proof scheme of the corollary

Input : Büchi automaton $\mathcal{A}$ for L

- Build a parity automaton $\mathcal{A}'$ for $\overline{L}$, the complement of L.
- Use [CL08] to get a B-Büchi automaton $\mathcal{B}$, which recognizes $\chi_{\overline{L}}$ iff $\overline{L}$ is Büchi-recognizable.
- Consider $\mathcal{A}$ as an S-Büchi automaton for $\chi_{\overline{L}}$.
- Build the Quasi-Weak automaton W from $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$.
- Decide whether $[\![W]\!] \approx \chi_{\overline{L}}$.

Proof scheme of the corollary

Input : Büchi automaton $\mathcal{A}$ for L

- Build a parity automaton $\mathcal{A}'$ for $\overline{L}$, the complement of L.
- Use [CL08] to get a B-Büchi automaton $\mathcal{B}$, which recognizes $\chi_{\overline{L}}$ iff $\overline{L}$ is Büchi-recognizable.
- Consider $\mathcal{A}$ as an S-Büchi automaton for $\chi_{\overline{L}}$.
- Build the Quasi-Weak automaton W from $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$.
- Decide whether $[\![W]\!] \approx \chi_{\overline{L}}$.

Why does it work ?

Proof scheme of the corollary

Input : Büchi automaton $\mathcal{A}$ for L

- Build a parity automaton $\mathcal{A}'$ for $\overline{L}$, the complement of L.
- Use [CL08] to get a B-Büchi automaton $\mathcal{B}$, which recognizes $\chi_{\overline{L}}$ iff $\overline{L}$ is Büchi-recognizable.
- Consider $\mathcal{A}$ as an S-Büchi automaton for $\chi_{\overline{L}}$.
- Build the Quasi-Weak automaton W from $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$.
- Decide whether $[\![W]\!] \approx \chi_{\overline{L}}$.

Why does it work ?

- If L is weak then $[\![W]\!] \approx \chi_{\overline{L}}$ by correctness of the construction.

Proof scheme of the corollary

Input : Büchi automaton $\mathcal{A}$ for L

- Build a parity automaton $\mathcal{A}'$ for $\overline{L}$, the complement of L.
- Use [CL08] to get a B-Büchi automaton $\mathcal{B}$, which recognizes $\chi_{\overline{L}}$ iff $\overline{L}$ is Büchi-recognizable.
- Consider $\mathcal{A}$ as an S-Büchi automaton for $\chi_{\overline{L}}$.
- Build the Quasi-Weak automaton W from $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$.
- Decide whether $[\![W]\!] \approx \chi_{\overline{L}}$.

Why does it work ?

- If L is weak then $[\![W]\!] \approx \chi_{\overline{L}}$ by correctness of the construction.
- If $[\![W]\!] \approx \chi_{\overline{L}}$, then L is weak, because it is recognized by an unfolding of W.

Thank you !