

Late Weak Bisimilarity for Markov Automata

Christian Eisentraut¹, Jens Chr. Godskesen²,
Holger Hermanns¹, Lei Song^{3,1}, and Lijun Zhang^{4,1}

¹ Saarland University, Germany

² IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark

³ Max-Planck-Institut für Informatik, Germany

⁴ Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

Abstract. Weak bisimilarity is a distribution-based equivalence notion for Markov automata. It has gained some popularity as the coarsest reasonable behavioural equivalence on Markov automata. This paper studies a strictly coarser notion: Late weak bisimilarity enjoys valuable properties if restricting to important subclasses of schedulers: Trace distribution equivalence is implied for partial information schedulers, and compositionality is preserved by distributed schedulers. The intersection of the two scheduler classes thus spans a coarser and still reasonable compositional theory of Markov automata.

1 Introduction

Compositional theories have become a foundation for developing effective techniques for analysing stochastic systems. Their potential ranges from compositional minimization [3,1,2] approaches to component based verification [14,10].

Markov Automata (MAs) are a compositional behavioural model for continuous time stochastic and nondeterministic systems [8,9] subsuming Interactive Markov Chains (IMCs) [12] and Probabilistic Automata (PAs) [19]. Markov automata weak probabilistic bisimilarity has been introduced as an elegant and powerful way of abstracting from internal computation cascades. It is a conservative extension of IMCs weak bisimilarity, and also extends weak probabilistic bisimilarity on PAs. But different from standard bisimulation notions, Markov automata weak bisimulations are defined as relations on subprobability distributions instead of states. This enables us to equate automata such as the ones on the left in Fig. 1, but not the ones on the right, where \approx denotes the weak bisimilarity defined in [9].

An alternative formulation of MA weak probabilistic bisimilarity has later been coined [5] that, despite slight differences in the setup, coincides with the original. As




Fig. 1. Examples of Markov automata.

| Tossing 1 | Tossing 2 |
|--|---|
| <pre> print("I am going to toss"); r = rand(); if r ≥ ½ then print("head"); else print("tail"); end </pre> | <pre> r = rand(); if r ≥ ½ then print("I am going to toss"); print("head"); else print("I am going to toss"); print("tail"); end </pre> |

Fig. 2. Two pieces of program used to simulate coin tossing.

shown there, weak probabilistic bisimilarity on MAs can be considered as the *coarsest* equivalence relation preserving observable behaviour and enjoying a congruence property with respect to parallel composition. More precisely, it is shown to be the coarsest reduction-closed barbed congruence [13].

However, the relation discriminates automata, which one might intuitively expect to behave equivalent for every reasonable observer, for instance the states s_0 and s_2 on the right of Fig. 1. We illustrate this with the following example, inspired by [19,11].

Example 1. Refer to Fig 2 for two pieces of program used to simulate coin tossing. We assume only “print” is observable while others are non-observable. In “Tossing 1”, a sentence “I am going to toss” is first printed to inform others who want to guess the tossing result. Then r is assigned with a random number in $(0,1)$. If r is $\geq \frac{1}{2}$, “head” is printed meaning that the coin tossing result is head, otherwise “tail” is printed. Program “Tossing 2” is slightly different. It first assigns r with a random number in $(0,1)$ as in “Tossing 1”. In case $r \geq \frac{1}{2}$, “I am going to toss” is printed followed by the tossing result. Otherwise we obtain the tail of the coin. Intuitively, these two programs have no essential difference. However, when modelling them, we will obtain two different models, which are shown in Fig. 3 (a) and (b) respectively. Non-observable action is modelled by the internal action τ as in Fig. 3 (b). In Fig. 3 (c) the guesser is modelled. While the tossing takes place (action i), he non-deterministically guesses the outcome, which he announces with the action h or t , which stands for head or tail, respectively.

The complete system is obtained by a parallel composition of the coin tosser automaton and the guesser automaton. We use a CSP-style parallel composition. Throughout our example, synchronization is enforced for actions in the set $A = \{i, h, t\}$. These actions synchronize with corresponding actions of the coin tosser. Thus, if the guess was right, the guesser finally performs the action Suc to announce that he successfully guessed the outcome. \square

In the example, the probability to see head or tail after a (fake) coin toss is one half each, both for tosser (a) and (b). One would expect that hence the chance to guess correct is one half for both tossers. However, $s_0 \parallel_A r_0$ and $s'_0 \parallel_A r_0$ are not weakly bisimilar, refer to Fig. 4. We will now show that the executions that distinguish the two systems are actually caused by unrealistic schedulers, which cannot appear in real world applications. In Fig. 4, we color the execution of $s'_0 \parallel_A r_0$ which is generated by a scheduler that chooses transitions in a way such that \xrightarrow{Suc} will be executed with

probability 1. It is easy to see that in contrast the probability that \xrightarrow{Suc} is executed in $s_0 \parallel_A r_0$ is at most 0.5, for every scheduler.

The intuitive reason why the scheduler for $s'_0 \parallel_A r_0$ is too powerful to be realistic is that it can base its decision which transition to choose in state r_0 on the state the tosser has reached by performing his internal probabilistic decision, namely either state s_5 or s_6 . If we consider the tosser and the guesser to be independently running processes, this is not a realistic scheduler, as then the guesser would need to see the internal state of the tosser. However, no communication between guesser and tosser




Fig. 3. s_0 and s'_0 represent two different ways of tossing a coin and r_0 denotes the guesser.

has happened at this point in time, by which this information could have been conveyed. Thus, in distributed systems, where components only share the information they gain through explicit communication via observable actions, this behaviour is unrealistic. Thus, for practically relevant models, weak bisimilarity for MAs is still too coarse.

In this paper, we present a novel notion of weak bisimilarity on MAs, called *late weak bisimilarity*, that is coarser than the existing notions of weak bisimilarity. It equates, for instance, the two automata of Example 1, and all the ones in Fig.1. As weak bisimilarity is the coarsest notion of equivalence that preserves observable behaviour and is closed under parallel composition, late weak bisimilarity cannot satisfy these properties in their entirety. However, as we will show, for a restricted class of schedulers, late weak bisimilarity preserves observable behaviour, in the sense that trace distribution equivalence (*i*) is implied by late weak bisimilarity, and (*ii*) is preserved in the context of parallel composition. This also means that time-bounded reachability properties are preserved with respect to parallel composition. The class of schedulers under which these properties are satisfied is the intersection of two well-known scheduler classes, namely partial information schedulers [4] and distributed schedulers [11]. Both these classes have been coined as principal means to exclude undesired or unrealistically powerful schedulers. The co-inductive definition of late weak bisimilarity we provide echoes these considerations on the automaton level, thereby resulting in a very coarse, yet reasonable, notion of equality.

2 Preliminaries

Let S be a finite set of states ranged over by r, s, t, \dots . A *distribution* is a function $\mu : S \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfying $\mu(S) = \sum_{s \in S} \mu(s) \leq 1$. If $\mu(S) = 1$, it is called a *full distribution*, otherwise it is a *sub-distribution*. Let $ADist(S)$ denote the set of all (sub or full) distributions over S , ranged over by μ, ν, γ, \dots . Moreover, we use $Dist(S)$ to

denote the set of all full distributions. Define $Supp(\mu) = \{s \mid \mu(s) > 0\}$ as the support set of μ . If $\mu(s) = 1$, then μ is called a *Dirac* distribution, written as δ_s . Let $|\mu| = \mu(S)$ denote the size of the distribution μ . Given a real number x , $x \cdot \mu$ is the distribution such that $(x \cdot \mu)(s) = x \cdot \mu(s)$ for each $s \in Supp(\mu)$ if $x \cdot |\mu| \leq 1$, while $\mu - s$ is the distribution such that $(\mu - s)(s) = 0$ and $(\mu - s)(t) = \mu(t)$ with $s \neq t$. Moreover, $\mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2$ whenever $\mu(s) = \mu_1(s) + \mu_2(s)$ for each $s \in S$ and $|\mu| \leq 1$. We often write $\{s : \mu(s) \mid s \in Supp(\mu)\}$ alternatively for a distribution μ . For instance, $\{s_1 : 0.4, s_2 : 0.6\}$ denotes a distribution μ such that $\mu(s_1) = 0.4$ and $\mu(s_2) = 0.6$.

2.1 Markov Automata

Definition 1. An MA M is a tuple $(S, Act_\tau, \xrightarrow{\cdot}, \xrightarrow{\cdot}, \bar{s})$ where \bar{s} is the initial state, S is a finite but non-empty set of states, $Act_\tau = Act \cup \{\tau\}$ is a set of actions including the internal action τ , $\xrightarrow{\cdot} \subset S \times Act_\tau \times Dist(S)$ is a finite set of probabilistic transitions, and $\xrightarrow{\cdot} \subset S \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times S$ is a finite set of Markovian transitions.

Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \dots$ range over the actions in Act_τ and λ over the rates in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Moreover, let θ and θ' range over $Act_{\tau,r} = Act_\tau \cup \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Let $rate(s, s') = \sum \{\lambda \mid (s, \lambda, s') \in \xrightarrow{\cdot}\}$ (with empty sum equal to 0) denote the rate from s to s' . We overload $rate$ to also denote the exit rate of a state s by writing $rate(s) = \sum_{s' \in S} rate(s, s')$. A state $s \in S$ is stable, written as $s \downarrow$, iff there does not exist μ such that $(s, \tau, \mu) \in \xrightarrow{\cdot}$, similarly a distribution μ is stable, written as $\mu \downarrow$, iff $s \downarrow$ for each $s \in Supp(\mu)$. For a stable state s , the sojourn time at s is exponentially distributed with rate equal to $rate(s)$, thus the probability of leaving state s within time interval $[a, b]$ is equal to $e^{-rate(s)a} - e^{-rate(s)b}$. If more than one Markovian transition is enabled from s , there is a race between them, and the probability that the transition to state s' is taken within $[a, b]$ is given by $(e^{-rate(s)a} - e^{-rate(s)b}) \cdot \frac{rate(s, s')}{rate(s)}$. We write $s \xrightarrow{\theta} \mu$

if either (i) $\theta \in Act_\tau$ and $s \xrightarrow{\theta} \mu$ or (ii) $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $s \downarrow$, $rate(s) = \theta$, and for every




Fig. 4. Executions of $s_0 \parallel_A r_0$ and $s'_0 \parallel_A r_0$ where A is omitted.

state s' , $\mu(s') = \frac{rate(s,s')}{rate(s)}$, or (iii) $\theta = 0$, $\mu = \delta_s$, $rate(s) = 0$ and $s \downarrow$. This notation unifies immediate transitions (i) and timed transitions (ii). As in [12,9], we make the *maximal progress assumption* and encoded it with this notation. It says that if state s is not stable, no Markovian transitions can be executed. Clause (iii) generalizes the implicit tangibility check of Clause (ii) to states without outgoing timed transitions. This generalization is needed to encode a stability check in weak bisimilarity, which is inherited from IMCs, and necessary to achieve compositionality.

We remark that MAs extend the well-known probabilistic automata (PAs) [19] and interactive Markov chains (IMCs) [12]. Precisely, if $\longrightarrow = \emptyset$, we obtain PAs. On the other side, if distributions are all Dirac, i.e., $\longrightarrow \subset S \times Act_\tau \times \delta_S$ with $\delta_S = \{\delta_s \mid s \in S\}$, we obtain IMCs.

2.2 Schedulers

We now recall some notations from [16] defined originally for CTMDPs. Let throughout the paper \mathcal{M} denote the MA $(S, Act_\tau, \longrightarrow, \longrightarrow, \bar{s})$. Finite paths of \mathcal{M} are sequences like $\pi = s_0, \theta_0, t_0, \dots, s_n$, where $s_0 = \bar{s}$ and $s_i \in S$ are states on the path and $t_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is the sojourn time in state s_i . Recall that θ_i is either an action in Act_τ or a Markovian action in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Moreover $\theta_i \in Act_\tau$ implies $t_i = 0$. The length of π , denoted as $|\pi|$, is equal to the number of states on π , and $last(\pi) = s_n$ is the last state on π . Let $\mathcal{T}(\pi) = \sum_{0 \leq i < n} t_i$ be the total time spent on π , $\pi[n]$ denote the n -th state in π , and $\pi[0..n]$ denote the prefix of π with length n . Let $\pi \circ (\theta, t, s)$ denote a path obtained by extending π with (θ, t, s) . Let $\Omega = Act_{\tau,r} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times S$, then $Paths^n(\mathcal{M}) = S \times \Omega^n$ is the set of paths of \mathcal{M} with length n . Accordingly, let $Paths^*(\mathcal{M})$, $Paths^\omega(\mathcal{M})$, and $Paths(\mathcal{M})$ denote the set of finite, infinite, and all paths of \mathcal{M} , respectively. In case \mathcal{M} is replaced by a state s , they are constrained to paths starting from s . For simplicity we shall omit the script \mathcal{M} in the following if it is clear from the context. Define $\mathfrak{F} = \sigma(2^{Act_{\tau,r}} \times \mathfrak{B} \times 2^S)$ as the σ -field over subsets of Ω , where \mathfrak{B} is the Borel σ -field over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. According to standard measure theory, $\mathfrak{F}_{Paths^n} = \sigma(\{S_0 \times tr_0 \times \dots \times tr_n \mid S_0 \in 2^S \wedge tr_i \in \mathfrak{F}\})$ are measurable subsets of $Paths^n$. Given $\Pi \in \mathfrak{F}_{Paths^n}$, a *cylinder* C based on Π can be defined as follows: $C = Cyl(\Pi) = \{\pi \in Paths^\omega \mid \pi[0..n] \in \Pi\}$. The σ -field $\mathfrak{F}_{Paths^\omega} = \sigma(\cup_{n=0}^\infty \{Cyl(\Pi) \mid \Pi \in \mathfrak{F}_{Paths^n}\})$ contains all the cylinders.

As usual, we need to resolve non-determinism before we can define a probability measure for paths of a given MA. This is done by introducing schedulers. Intuitively, a scheduler will decide how to resolve non-deterministic choices probabilistically based on some prior information like the states visited, the elapsed time and so on. Let $Steps(s) = \{(\theta, \mu) \mid s \xrightarrow{\theta} \mu\}$ denote the set of transitions enabled at s . Below follows the formal definition of schedulers.

Definition 2. A scheduler ξ of \mathcal{M} is a function $Paths^* \times Act_{\tau,r} \times Dist(S) \mapsto [0, 1]$ with $\xi(\pi, \cdot, \cdot) \in Dist(Steps(last(\pi)))$ for all $\pi \in Paths^*$ and where $\xi(\cdot, \theta, \mu) : Paths^* \mapsto [0, 1]$ are measurable for all $(\theta, \mu) \in 2^{Act_{\tau,r} \times Dist(S)}$.

Given a scheduler ξ of \mathcal{M} , we can now define a unique probability measure $Pr_{\bar{s}}^\xi : \mathfrak{F}_{Paths^\omega} \mapsto [0, 1]$ on $(Paths^\omega, \mathfrak{F}_{Paths^\omega})$. The measure $Pr_{\bar{s}}^\xi$ is defined inductively as

follows: if $\Pi \in \mathfrak{F}_{Paths^0}$, then $Pr_{\bar{s}}^{\xi} = I_{\Pi}(\bar{s})$, where I is the characteristic function of set Π . If $\Pi \in \mathfrak{F}_{Paths^{n+1}}$, then $Pr_{\bar{s}}^{\xi}(\Pi) =$

$$\int_{\pi \in Paths^n} Pr_{\bar{s}}^{\xi}(\pi) \left(\sum_{(\theta, \mu) \in Steps(last(\pi))} \xi(\pi, \theta, \mu) \eta(\theta, t) \sum_{s' \in S} I_{\Pi}(\pi \circ (\theta, t, s')) \mu(s') \right) d\pi$$

where $\eta(\theta, t) = 1$ if $\theta \in Act_{\tau} \wedge t = 0$, $\eta(\theta, t) = 0$ if $\theta \in Act_{\tau} \wedge t \neq 0$, and $\eta(\theta, t) = \lambda e^{-\lambda t}$ if $\theta = \lambda$. Intuitively, the value of $Pr_{\bar{s}}^{\xi}(\Pi)$ is equal to the sum of $Pr_{\bar{s}}^{\xi}(\pi \circ (\theta, t, s'))$ for each $\pi \circ (\theta, t, s') \in \Pi$, where the value of $Pr_{\bar{s}}^{\xi}(\pi \circ (\theta, t, s'))$ is inductively determined by the product of four probabilities: (i) the probability of the prefix of π with length n , given ξ : $Pr_{\bar{s}}^{\xi}(\pi)$; (ii) the probability of $(\theta, \mu) \in Steps(last(\pi))$ being chosen by ξ , given π : $\xi(\pi, \theta, \mu)$; (iii) the probability of staying at state $last(\pi)$ for t time units: $\eta(\theta, t)$; (iv) the probability of s' in μ : $\mu(s')$. The characteristic function $I_{\Pi}(\pi \circ (\theta, t, s'))$ guarantees that we only count paths in Π . Function $\eta(\theta, t)$ is the probability of staying at state $last(\pi)$ for t time units before performing the transition labelled with θ . Therefore if $\theta = \lambda$, it is equal to $\lambda e^{-\lambda t}$. If $\theta \in Act_{\tau}$, it must be case that $t = 0$, otherwise we let $\eta(\theta, t) = 0$ to ignore impossible paths.

3 Weak Bisimilarities for Markov Automata

In this section, we first introduce early weak bisimulation, which is a variant of weak bisimulation defined in [5], and then define late weak bisimulation, which is strictly coarser than early weak bisimulation.

We first introduce a standard weak transition relation needed in the definitions of bisimulation that allows to abstract from internal actions. Intuitively, $s \xrightarrow{\theta} \mu$ denotes that a distribution μ is reached from s by a θ -transition, which may be preceded and followed by an arbitrary sequence of internal transitions. Formally, we define them as derivations [6,5] for MAs. In the following, let $\mu \xrightarrow{\theta} \mu'$ iff there exists a transition $s \xrightarrow{\theta} \mu_s$ for each $s \in Supp(\mu)$ such that $\mu' = \sum_{s \in Supp(\mu)} \mu(s) \cdot \mu_s$. Then, $s \xrightarrow{\tau} \mu$ iff there exists $\delta_s = \mu_0^{\rightarrow} + \mu_0^{\times}$, $\mu_0^{\rightarrow} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mu_1^{\rightarrow} + \mu_1^{\times}$, $\mu_1^{\rightarrow} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mu_2^{\rightarrow} + \mu_2^{\times}$, \dots , where $\mu = \sum_{i \geq 0} \mu_i^{\times}$. We write $s \xrightarrow{\theta} \mu$ iff there exists $s \xrightarrow{\tau} \xrightarrow{\theta} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mu$.

Given a transition relation $\rightsquigarrow \subseteq S \times Act_{\tau} \times Dist(S)$, we let $s \rightsquigarrow_c \mu$ iff there exists a finite number of real numbers $w_i > 0$, and transitions $s \rightsquigarrow \mu_i$ such that $\sum_i w_i = 1$, and $\sum_i w_i \cdot \mu_i = \mu$. We call \rightsquigarrow_c *combined transitions* (of \rightsquigarrow). In general, we lift a transition relation $\rightsquigarrow \subseteq S \times Act_{\tau} \times Dist(S)$ over states to a transition relation $Dist(S) \times Act_{\tau} \times Dist(S)$ over distributions by letting $\mu \rightsquigarrow \mu'$ iff there exists a transition $s \rightsquigarrow \mu_s$ for each $s \in Supp(\mu)$ such that $\mu' = \sum_{s \in Supp(\mu)} \mu(s) \cdot \mu_s$.

Definition 3. A relation $\mathcal{R} \subseteq Dist(S) \times Dist(S)$ is an *early weak bisimulation* over \mathcal{M} iff $\mu \mathcal{R} \nu$ implies: (i) whenever $\mu \xrightarrow{\theta}_c \mu'$, there exists a $\nu \xrightarrow{\theta}_c \nu'$ such that $\mu' \mathcal{R} \nu'$; (ii) whenever $\mu = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i \cdot \mu_i$, there exists $\nu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i \cdot \nu_i$ such that $\mu_i \mathcal{R} \nu_i$ for each $0 \leq i \leq n$ where $\sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i = 1$; (iii) symmetrically for ν . We say that μ and

ν are early weak bisimilar, written as $\mu \stackrel{\bullet}{\approx} \nu$, iff there exists an early weak bisimulation \mathcal{R} such that $\mu \mathcal{R} \nu$. Moreover $s \stackrel{\bullet}{\approx} r$ iff $\delta_s \stackrel{\bullet}{\approx} \delta_r$.

Clause (i) is standard. Clause (ii) says that no matter how we split μ , there always exists a splitting of ν probably after internal transitions to simulate the splitting of μ . Definition 3 is slightly different from Definition 5 in [5], where Clause (ii) is missing and Clause (i) is replaced by: whenever $\mu \xrightarrow{\theta}_c \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i \cdot \mu_i$, there exists $\nu \xrightarrow{\theta}_c \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i \cdot \nu_i$ such that $\mu_i \mathcal{R} \nu_i$ for each $0 \leq i \leq n$. Essentially, this condition subsumes Clause (ii), since $\mu = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i \cdot \mu_i$ implies $\mu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i \cdot \mu_i$. As we shall prove later, both definitions induce the same equivalence relation on Markov automata. Clause (ii) in Definition 3 is, in fact, the cause why this relation is unrealistically strong for scenarios as those discussed in Example 1. The reason is that in order to establish a bisimulation, every splitting of μ into subdistributions must be matched by ν (possibly after some internal transitions). This also includes splittings into Dirac distributions. Intuitively, this means that still the individual behaviour of each single state in $Supp(\mu)$ must be matched. In our scenarios, however, we want to focus on the behaviour of distributions over states and not their individual supporting states. We will correct this in our definition of late weak bisimulation later. We still need to introduce a few notions beforehand.

Definition 4. A distribution μ is transition consistent, written as $\overline{\mu}$, if for any $s \in Supp(\mu)$ and $\theta \notin \{\tau, 0\}$, $s \xrightarrow{\theta} \gamma$ for some γ implies $\mu \xrightarrow{\theta} \gamma'$ for some γ' .

Intuitively, if a distribution is transition consistent, all states in its support have the same set of enabled visible actions. When a distribution is transition consistent, then $\mu \xrightarrow{\theta}$ whenever there is a state $s \in Supp(\mu)$ with $s \xrightarrow{\theta}$. This also means that when a distribution is *not* transition consistent, then there may be a weak θ transition that a certain state in the support can perform but the distribution cannot. We then say that this state is *blocked* from taking this transition. When we adopt the notion of blocked states accordingly for non-weak transition relations, also τ transitions can be blocked.

We now introduce \hookrightarrow , an alternative lifting of transitions of states to transitions of distributions that differs from the standard definition used in [9,5]. There, a distribution is able to perform a transition labelled with θ if and only if all the states in its support can perform transitions with the very same label. In contrast, the transition relation \hookrightarrow behaves like a weak transition, where every state in the support of μ may at most perform one transition.

Definition 5. $\mu \hookrightarrow \mu'$ iff either (i) for each $s \in Supp(\mu)$ there exists $s \xrightarrow{\theta} \mu_s$ such that $\mu' = \sum_{s \in Supp(\mu)} \mu(s) \cdot \mu_s$ or; (ii) $\theta = \tau$ and there exists $s \in Supp(\mu)$ and $s \xrightarrow{\theta} \mu_s$ such that $\mu' = (\mu - s) + \mu(s) \cdot \mu_s$.

In the definition of late weak bisimulation, this extension will be used to prevent τ transitions of states from being blocked. Below follows an example:

Example 2. Let $\mu = \{s_1 : 0.4, s_2 : 0.6\}$ such that $s_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} \delta_{s'_1} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mu_1$, $s_1 \xrightarrow{\beta} \mu_2$, $s_2 \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mu_3$, and $s_2 \xrightarrow{\beta} \mu_4$, where $\alpha \neq \beta$ are visible actions. According to Clause (i) of

Definition 5, we will have $\mu \xrightarrow{\beta} (0.4 \cdot \mu_2 + 0.6 \cdot \mu_4)$. Without Clause (ii), this would be the only transition of μ , since the τ transition of s_1 and the α transition of s_2 will be blocked by each other, as s_1 and s_2 cannot perform transitions with labels τ and α at the same time.

Note that the α transition is blocked by the τ transition of s_1 , so according to Clause (ii) of Definition 5, we in addition have $\mu \xrightarrow{\tau} (0.4 \cdot \delta_{s'_1} + 0.6 \cdot \delta_{s_2}) \xrightarrow{\alpha} (0.4 \cdot \mu_1 + 0.6 \cdot \mu_3)$. Note that in Clause (i) of Definition 3, \rightarrow can be replaced by \hookrightarrow without changing the resulting equivalence relation, as the same effect can be obtained by a suitable splitting in Clause (ii). In this example, we could let μ be split into $0.4 \cdot \delta_{s_1} + 0.6 \cdot \delta_{s_2}$, such that no transition is blocked in the resulting distributions.

Definition 6. A relation $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \text{Dist}(S) \times \text{Dist}(S)$ is a late weak bisimulation over \mathcal{M} iff $\mu \mathcal{R} \nu$ implies: (i) whenever $\mu \xrightarrow{\theta}_c \mu'$, there exists a $\nu' \xrightarrow{\theta}_c \nu'$ such that $\mu' \mathcal{R} \nu'$; (ii) if not $\overrightarrow{\mu}$, then there exists $\mu = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i \cdot \mu_i$ and $\nu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i \cdot \nu_i$ such that $\overrightarrow{\mu_i}$ and $\mu_i \mathcal{R} \nu_i$ for each $0 \leq i \leq n$ where $\sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i = 1$; (iii) symmetrically for ν . We say that μ and ν are late weak bisimilar, written as $\mu \approx \nu$, iff there exists a late weak bisimulation \mathcal{R} such that $\mu \mathcal{R} \nu$. Moreover $s \approx r$ iff $\delta_s \approx \delta_r$.

In Clause (i), this definition differs from Definition 3 by the use of \hookrightarrow . It is straightforward to show that \hookrightarrow can also be used in Definition 3 without changing the resulting bisimilarity. However, in Definition 6, using \rightarrow instead of \hookrightarrow will lead to a finer relation. The key difference between Definition 3 and 6, however, is Clause (ii). In Definition 3, we require that for any split of μ such that $\mu = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i \cdot \mu_i$, there exists $\nu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i \cdot \nu_i$ with $\mu_i \mathcal{R} \nu_i$ for each i , while in Definition 6, we require to split μ only if it is not transition consistent. We further require

that the resulting distributions μ_i are transition consistent. We do not require this for the ν_i . It can be shown, however, that $\overrightarrow{\mu_i}$ and $\mu_i \mathcal{R} \nu_i$ implies $\overrightarrow{\nu_i}$. These conditions ensure that no states in the support of μ are blocked from executing certain transitions for ever. Clearly, if μ is already transition consistent, we do not need to split it anymore – but rather match the lifted transitions in Clause (i) suffice to capture every visible behaviour.

Remark 1. Essentially, in Definition 6 we keep all states with the same set of enabled actions together. This is similar to the idea in [4], where all states with the same enabled actions are non-distinguishable from the outside. Once a distribution becomes transition consistent, we will not try to split it anymore – but rather match the lifted transitions according to the first clause.

Example 3. We will show that in Fig. 3, $s_0 \approx^* s'_0$. Let $\mathcal{R} = \{(\delta_{s_0}, \delta_{s'_0}), (\delta_{s_0}, \{s_5 : 0.5, s_6 : 0.5\})\} \cup ID$ where ID is the identity relation. It is easy to show that \mathcal{R} is a




Fig. 5. $s_0 \approx^* r_0$.

late weak bisimulation. The only non-trivial case is when $\delta_{s'_0} \xrightarrow{\tau} \{s_5 : 0.5, s_6 : 0.5\}$. But then δ_{s_0} can simulate it without performing any transition i.e. $\delta_{s_0} \xrightarrow{\tau} \delta_{s_0}$. Since $(\delta_{s_0}, \{s_5 : 0.5, s_6 : 0.5\}) \in \mathcal{R}$, Clause (i) of Definition 6 is satisfied. Moreover both δ_{s_0} and $\{s_5 : 0.5, s_6 : 0.5\}$ are transition consistent, thus we do not need to split them any further. Conversely, we can show that \mathcal{R} is not an early weak bisimulation. According to Clause (i) of Definition 3, we require that for any split of $\{s_5 : 0.5, s_6 : 0.5\}$, there must exist a matching split of δ_{s_0} , which cannot be established. For instance the split $\{s_5 : 0.5, s_6 : 0.5\} = 0.5 \cdot \delta_{s_5} + 0.5 \cdot \delta_{s_6}$ cannot be matched by any split of δ_{s_0} . \square

The following example shows that the transition consistency condition of Definition 6 is necessary to not equate states which should be distinguished.

Example 4. Suppose there are two states s_0 and r_0 such that $s_0 \xrightarrow{\tau} s_1$ and $r_0 \xrightarrow{\tau} \{r_1 : 0.5, r_2 : 0.5\}$ where all of s_1 , r_1 , and r_2 have a transition to themselves with labels τ , in addition, $r_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} r_1$ where $\alpha \neq \tau$. Let $\mathcal{R} = \{(\delta_{s_0}, \delta_{r_0}), (\delta_{s_1}, \{r_1 : 0.5, r_2 : 0.5\})\}$. If we dropped the transition consistency condition from Definition 6, we could show that \mathcal{R} is a late weak bisimulation, and therefore $s_0 \approx^\bullet r_0$, because the distribution $\{r_1 : 0.5, r_2 : 0.5\}$ can only perform a τ transition to itself, while the α transition of r_1 would then be blocked. However, s_0 and r_0 should be distinguished, because r_0 can reach r_1 with positive probability, which is a state able to perform a transition with visible label α . Note that as $\{r_1 : 0.5, r_2 : 0.5\}$ is not transition consistent, we should split it further according to Definition 6. Thus we can prove that \mathcal{R} is not a late weak bisimulation i.e. $s_0 \not\approx^\bullet r_0$.

Since we treat Markovian transitions in the same way as non-Markovian transitions, Definition 6 also applies for PAs, a subset of MAs without Markovian transitions:

Example 5. Let s_0 and s_1 be two states in Fig. 5, where we omit the transitions of r_1 , r_2 , and r_3 . Note that in s_0 the probabilistic transition is after the α transition, while in s_1 the probabilistic transition is before the α transition. It is routine to check that s_0 and s_1 are late weak bisimilar, but not early weak bisimilar. Since ν is transition consistent, and can be simulated by δ_{s_0} according to Definition 6. But for early weak bisimulation, there exists a split $\nu = \frac{1}{3} \cdot \delta_{s_2} + \frac{2}{3} \cdot \delta_{s_3}$, which cannot be simulated by δ_{s_0} . Intuitively, states s_0 , s_1 , s_2 , and s_3 have the same set of enabled actions, and both s_0 and s_1 can perform either an α transition evolving into $\{r_2 : \frac{1}{3}, r_3 : \frac{2}{3}\}$, or perform a β transition leading to δ_{r_1} . For schedulers with limited power like partial information schedulers, s_0 and s_1 cannot be distinguished.

The following theorem shows that \approx^\bullet defined in Definition 3 is an equivalence relation, similarly for \approx° . Moreover \approx° is strictly coarser than \approx^\bullet which is straightforward from Definition 3 and 6.

Theorem 1. (i) \approx^\bullet and \approx° are equivalence relations; (ii) $\approx^\bullet \subset \approx^\circ$.

4 Observable Behaviour and Composition

In this section we consider important properties of late weak bisimulation, namely preservation of trace distributions, and compositionality. While these properties do *not*

hold if considering all schedulers, we establish them for the subclass of partial information distributed schedulers. Partial information schedulers \mathcal{S}_P have been coined by De Alfaro [4], and distributed schedulers \mathcal{S}_D stem from D'Argenio and Giro [11]. Both have been proposed to rule out unrealistic scheduling decisions such as the ones discussed in Fig. 3. We echo these arguments to back our claim that late weak bisimulation is a valuable relation in the context of any realistic scheduling. To get started, we review desirable properties we are going to discuss. For this, we recall the parallel operator introduced in [9]. It is an entirely straightforward adaptation of parallel composition for IMCs and for PAs.

Definition 7. Let $\mathcal{M}_1 = (S_1, Act_\tau, \longrightarrow_1, \twoheadrightarrow_1, \bar{s}_1)$ and $\mathcal{M}_2 = (S_2, Act_\tau, \longrightarrow_2, \twoheadrightarrow_2, \bar{s}_2)$ be two MAs, and $A \subseteq Act$ then $\mathcal{M}_1 \parallel_A \mathcal{M}_2 = (S, Act_\tau, \longrightarrow, \twoheadrightarrow, \bar{s})$ such that $\bar{s} = \bar{s}_1 \parallel_A \bar{s}_2$, (i) $S = \{s_1 \parallel_A s_2 \mid (s_1, s_2) \in S_1 \times S_2\}$, (ii) $(s_1 \parallel_A s_2, \alpha, \mu_1 \parallel_A \mu_2) \in \longrightarrow$ iff either $\alpha \in A$ and $s_i \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mu_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ or $\alpha \notin A$, $s_i \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mu_i$, and $\mu_{3-i} = \delta_{s_{3-i}}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, (iii) $(s_1 \parallel_A s_2, \lambda, s'_1 \parallel_A s'_2) \in \twoheadrightarrow$ iff either $s_i = s'_i$ and $(s_i, \lambda_i, s'_i) \in \twoheadrightarrow_i$ with $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \lambda$, or $(s_i, \lambda, s'_i) \in \twoheadrightarrow_i$ and $s_{3-i} = s'_{3-i}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, where $\mu_1 \parallel_A \mu_2$ is a distribution such that $(\mu_1 \parallel_A \mu_2)(s_1 \parallel_A s_2) = \mu_1(s_1) \cdot \mu_2(s_2)$.

We now introduce the notion of trace distribution equivalence [18] adapted to our setting. Let $\varsigma \in (Act \cup \mathbb{R}_{>0})^*$ denote a finite trace of an MA \mathcal{M} consisting of an ordered sequence of visible actions. Moreover, the cylinder C_ς induced by ς is defined by: $C_\varsigma = \cup \{Cyl(\Pi) \mid \Pi \in \mathfrak{F}_{Paths^*} \wedge trace(\Pi) = \varsigma\}$ where $trace(\Pi) = \epsilon$ denoting an empty trace if $|\Pi| \leq 1$, and $trace(\Pi) = \begin{cases} trace(\Pi') & \Pi = \Pi' \circ (\theta, t, s') \wedge \theta \in \{\tau, 0\} \\ trace(\Pi')\theta & \Pi = \Pi' \circ (\theta, t, s') \wedge \theta \notin \{\tau, 0\} \end{cases}$. The measurability of C_ς is straightforward from its definition since it is a countable set of cylinders $Cyl(\Pi)$. Below we define a family of equivalences, parametrized by certain classes of schedulers.

Definition 8. Let s_1 and s_2 be two states of an MA, and S a set of schedulers. Then, $s_1 \equiv_S s_2$ iff for each scheduler $\xi_1 \in S$ there exists a scheduler $\xi_2 \in S$, such that $Pr_{s_1}^{\xi_1}(C_\varsigma) = Pr_{s_2}^{\xi_2}(C_\varsigma)$ for each finite trace ς and vice versa. If S is the set of all schedulers, we simply write \equiv .

Below follow examples (and counterexamples) of trace distribution equivalent states:

Example 6. Let s_0 and s'_0 be two states in Fig. 3, then we have $s_0 \equiv s'_0$, since the only trace distribution of s_0 and s'_0 is $\{ih : \frac{1}{2}, it : \frac{1}{2}\}$. In contrast, s_0 and s_1 in Fig. 5 are not trace distribution equivalence. Since there are two possible trace distributions for s_0 : $\{\beta : 1\}$ and $\{\alpha : 1\}$, but for s_1 there are four trace distributions: $\{\alpha : 1\}$, $\{\beta : 1\}$, $\{\alpha : \frac{1}{3}, \beta : \frac{2}{3}\}$, and $\{\beta : \frac{1}{3}, \alpha : \frac{2}{3}\}$.

4.1 Realistic Schedulers

We are now refining the very liberal Definition 2 where the set of all schedulers was introduced. As discussed, this class can be considered too powerful, since it includes

unrealistic schedules such as the one scheduling the coloured execution of $s'_0 \parallel_A r_0$ depicted in Fig. 4.

In the following we define two prominent sub-classes of schedulers, where only limited information is at hand for scheduling. We need to first introduce some notations.

Let $EA : S \mapsto 2^{Act \cup \mathbb{R}_{>0}}$ such that $EA(s) = \{\theta \in (Act \cup \mathbb{R}_{>0}) \mid \exists \mu. s \xrightarrow{\theta} \mu\}$, that is, the function EA returns the set of visible actions that a state is able to perform, possibly after some internal transitions. We generalize this function to paths as follows: $EA(\pi) = EA(s)$ if $\pi = s$, and $EA(\pi) =$

$$\begin{cases} EA(\pi') & \pi = \pi' \circ (\theta, t, s) \wedge \theta \in \{\tau, 0\} \wedge EA(last(\pi')) = EA(s) \quad (1) \\ EA(\pi'), \theta, t, EA(s) & \pi = \pi' \circ (\theta, t, s) \wedge (\theta \notin \{\tau, 0\} \vee EA(last(\pi')) \neq EA(s)) \quad (2) \end{cases}$$

where Case (1) takes care of a special situation such that internal actions do not change enabled actions. In this case EA will not see the difference. Intuitively, $EA(\pi)$ abstracts concrete states on π to their corresponding enabled actions. Whenever an invisible action does not change the enabled actions, this will simply be omitted. In other words, $EA(s)$ can be seen as the interface of s , which is observable by other components. Other components can observe the execution of s , as long as either it performs a visible action ($\theta \notin \{\tau, 0\}$), or its interface has been changed ($EA(last(\pi')) \neq EA(s)$). We are now ready to define the *partial information schedulers* [4] as follows:

Definition 9. A scheduler ξ is a *partial information scheduler* of s if for any $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in Paths^*(s)$, $EA(\pi_1) = EA(\pi_2)$ implies: (i) either $\xi(\pi_1) = (\tau, \mu)$ or $\xi(\pi_2) = (\tau, \mu)$ for some μ , (ii) or $\xi(\pi_1) = (\theta, \mu)$ and $\xi(\pi_2) = (\theta, \nu)$ for some μ, ν such that $\theta \neq \tau$.

We denote the set of all partial information schedulers by S_P . Intuitively a partial information scheduler can only distinguish states via different enabled visible actions. It therefore excludes the possibility to schedule differently only because of different state identities. This fits very well to a behaviour-oriented rather than state-oriented view, as it is typical for process calculi. Consequently, for two different paths π_1 and π_2 with $EA(\pi_1) = EA(\pi_2)$, a partial information scheduler either chooses a transition labelled with τ action for π_i ($i = 1, 2$), or it chooses transitions labelled with the same visible actions for both π_1 and π_2 . Partial information schedulers do not impose any restriction on the execution of τ transitions, instead they can be performed spontaneously.

In order to exclude unrealistic schedulers when composing parallel systems, another important sub-class of schedulers called *distributed schedulers* has been introduced [11]. The idea of distributed schedulers is to assume that a component running in parallel to other components needs to make its local scheduling decisions in isolation, and thus can use only that information about other components that has been communicated to them beforehand. For instance the guesser in Fig. 3 cannot base its local scheduling decision on the tossing outcome at the moment when his guess is to be scheduled.

To formalise this locality idea, we first need to define the projection of a path to the path of its components. Let $s = \parallel_A \{s_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ be a state which is composed by $n > 1$ processes in parallel such that all the processes synchronize on actions in A . Let π be a path starting from s , then the i -projection of π denoted by $[\pi]_i$ is defined as follows: $[\pi]_i = [s]_i$ if $\pi = s$, otherwise

$$[\pi]_i = \begin{cases} [\pi']_i \circ (\theta, t, [s']_i) & \pi = \pi' \circ (\theta, t, s') \wedge (\theta \in A \vee (\theta \notin A \wedge [last(\pi')]_i \xrightarrow{\theta} [s']_i)) \\ [\pi']_i & \pi = \pi' \circ (\theta, t, s') \wedge \theta \notin A \wedge (\exists j \neq i. [last(\pi')]_j \xrightarrow{\theta} [s']_j) \end{cases}$$

where $[s]_i = s_i$ with $1 \leq i \leq n$. Intuitively, given a path π of a state s , the i -projection of π is the path that only keeps track of the execution of the i -th component of s during its execution. Below defines the distributed schedulers in an inductive way.

Definition 10. *A scheduler ξ is a distributed scheduler of $s = \parallel_A \{s_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ iff for any $\pi, \pi' \in Paths^*(s)$, $[\pi]_i = [\pi']_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ implies $\xi(\pi) = \xi(\pi')$.*

We denote the set of all distributed schedulers by \mathcal{S}_D . In case $n = 1$, distributed schedulers degenerate to ordinary schedulers defined in Definition 2. According to Definition 10, a scheduler ξ is distributed, if ξ cannot distinguish different paths starting from s , provided the projections of these paths to each of its parallel component coincide. Note that the scheduler inducing the coloured execution in Fig. 4 is not distributed, since the decision of r_0 depends on the execution history of s'_0 , i.e. at state s_5 , r_0 will choose the left transition, and it will choose the right transition while at state s_6 . By restricting to the set of distributed schedulers, we can avoid the unrealistic execution of $s'_0 \parallel_A r_0$ depicted in Fig. 4.

4.2 Properties of Late Weak Bisimilarity

In this section we show properties of late weak bisimilarity under realistic schedulers. We first introduce some notations: Let \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} denote distributions over set $\{(\pi, s) \mid \pi \in Paths^* \wedge s \in S \wedge last(\pi) = s\}$, moreover $[\mathcal{U}]_2 = \mu$ denotes the projection of \mathcal{U} to its corresponding distribution of states i.e. $\mu(s) = \sum \{\mathcal{U}((\pi, s)) \mid \exists \pi. (\pi, s) \in Supp(\mathcal{U})\}$. Given a scheduler ξ , a transition from \mathcal{U} to \mathcal{V} with label θ is induced by ξ , written as $\mathcal{U} \xrightarrow{\theta}_\xi \mathcal{V}$, iff $\mathcal{V}((\pi \circ (\theta, t, s'), s')) = \mathcal{U}((\pi, s)) \cdot \nu_{(\pi, s)}(s')$ where $\nu_{(\pi, s)} = \sum_{\nu \in Dist(S)} \xi(\pi, \theta, \nu) \cdot \nu$ for each $(\pi, s) \in Supp(\mathcal{U})$. Namely, $\nu_{(\pi, s)}$ is the resulting distribution of s under scheduler ξ given the history information π . For each $s' \in Supp(\nu_{(\pi, s)})$, the probability of s' in \mathcal{V} is weighted by $\mathcal{U}((\pi, s))$, moreover we need to update the history information π to $\pi \circ (\theta, t, s')$. Correspondingly, a transition from μ to ν with label θ is induced by a scheduler ξ , written as $\mu \xrightarrow{\theta}_\xi \nu$, iff $\mathcal{U} \xrightarrow{\theta}_\xi \mathcal{V}$ such that $[\mathcal{V}]_2 = \nu$, where $\mathcal{U}((s, s)) = \mu(s)$ for each $s \in Supp(\mu)$. Intuitively, given a distribution μ , for each $s \in Supp(\mu)$ we use s as the history information for ξ to guide the execution, since it is the only priori information we have known so far. Similarly, we can define weak transitions of μ induced by a given scheduler. Based on the notations introduced above, we can modify Definition 6 with schedulers being considered explicitly.

Definition 11. *Let $\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi \in \mathcal{S}$ for a given set of schedulers \mathcal{S} . A relation $\mathcal{R} \subseteq Dist(S) \times Dist(S)$ is a late weak bisimulation over \mathcal{M} with respect to \mathcal{S} iff $\mu \mathcal{R} \nu$ implies: (i) whenever $\mu \xrightarrow{\theta}_{\xi_1} \mu'$, there exists $\nu \xrightarrow{\theta}_{\xi_2} \nu'$ such that $\mu' \mathcal{R} \nu'$; (ii) if not $\vec{\mu} \mathcal{R} \vec{\nu}$, then there exists $\mu = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i \cdot \mu_i$ and $\nu \xrightarrow{\tau}_\xi \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i \cdot \nu_i$ such that $\vec{\mu}_i$ and $\mu_i \mathcal{R} \nu_i$ for each $0 \leq i \leq n$ where $\sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i = 1$; (iii) symmetrically for ν . The meanings of $\mu \approx_s^* \nu$ and $s \approx_s^* r$ are the same as in Definition 6.*

Definition 11 is almost the same as Definition 6 except that we require every transition is induced by a scheduler in \mathcal{S} . As we shall prove later, these two definitions are actually equivalent.

As mentioned before, late weak bisimulation has a flavour similar to partial information schedulers in the sense that, due to the transition consistency requirement, there is no difference between states in the support of a distribution if the same set of actions is enabled. Indeed, late weak bisimulation and partial information schedulers are closely related. The following theorem states that partial information schedulers are enough to discriminate late weak bisimilarity with respect to arbitrary schedulers, and that if restricting to partial information schedulers, late weak bisimulation implies trace distribution equivalence.

Theorem 2. *For any states s_1 and s_2 , $s_1 \approx^\bullet s_2 \iff s_1 \approx_{S_P}^\bullet s_2 \implies s_1 \equiv_{S_P} s_2$.*

Theorem 2 does not hold if we consider general schedulers:

Example 7. Let s_0 and s_1 be two states in Fig. 5, and in Example 5 we have shown that $s_0 \approx^\bullet s_1$, while in Example 6 we have shown that $s_0 \not\equiv s_1$. But we also notice that the schedulers giving rise to the trace distributions $\{\alpha : \frac{1}{3}, \beta : \frac{2}{3}\}$ and $\{\beta : \frac{1}{3}, \alpha : \frac{2}{3}\}$ are not partial information schedulers, since at states s_2 and s_3 with the same enabled visible actions, the schedulers can choose transitions with different labels. By restricting to partial information schedulers we exclude these two distributions and can indeed show that $s_0 \equiv_{S_P} s_1$.

It is worthwhile to recall that MA have a continuous time semantics, thus trace distribution equivalence implicitly relates the timed probabilistic behaviour of an MA, basically because traces are composed of external actions as well as rates, hence rates are equated by trace equivalence. This implies that for instance timed reachability probabilities are preserved. So, if we let $Pr_s^\xi(\diamond^{\leq t} G) = Pr_s^\xi(\{\pi \in Paths^\omega \mid \exists n \geq 0. (\pi[n] \in G \wedge \mathcal{T}(\pi[0..n]) \leq t)\})$ denote the probability of reaching states in G from s in no more than t time units, under scheduler ξ , we can establish that $s_1 \approx^\bullet s_2$ implies for arbitrary scheduler $\xi_1 \in S_P$, there exists $\xi_2 \in S_P$ such that $Pr_{s_1}^{\xi_1}(\diamond^{\leq t} G) = Pr_{s_2}^{\xi_2}(\diamond^{\leq t} G)$.

If looking at the effect of parallel composition, we need to restrict to distributed schedulers to establish compositionality, as indicated by the following theorem:

Theorem 3. *For two states s_1 and s_2 of an MA,*

1. $s_1 \approx^\bullet s_2 \iff s_1 \approx_{S_D}^\bullet s_2$, provided s_1 and s_2 are sequential i.e. contain no parallel operators;
2. $s_1 \approx_{S_D}^\bullet s_2 \implies s_1 \parallel_A s_3 \approx_{S_D}^\bullet s_2 \parallel_A s_3$ for any s_3 .

In Clause 1 of Theorem 3, we require that both s_1 and s_2 contain no parallel operators, otherwise the implication does not hold. Moreover when general schedulers are considered, Clause 2 of Theorem 3 will not hold either. This is demonstrated by the following two examples:

Example 8. Let $s'_0 \parallel_A r_0$ be a state as in Example 1, whose execution is depicted in Fig. 4 (b). Additionally, let r be a sequential state whose execution is same as $s'_0 \parallel_A r_0$, such sequential state always exists (simply introducing a state for each node in Fig. 4 (b)). By construction, we have $s'_0 \parallel_A r_0 \approx^\bullet r$. However, if restricted to schedulers in S_D , $s'_0 \parallel_A r_0 \approx_{S_D}^\bullet r$ does not hold. Since the scheduler inducing the coloured execution of $s'_0 \parallel_A r_0$ in Fig. 4 (b) is not distributed, while the scheduler inducing the corresponding execution of r is distributed. Essentially, every possible scheduler of r is distributed because r is sequential.

Example 9. Let s_0 , s'_0 , and r_0 be the states in Fig. 3. We have shown in Example 3 that $s_0 \approx^\bullet s'_0$, but we have $s_0 \parallel_A r_0 \not\approx^\bullet s'_0 \parallel_A r_0$ if general schedulers are considered. Since the coloured execution of $s'_0 \parallel_A r_0$ depicted in Fig. 4 cannot be simulated by $s_0 \parallel_A r_0$ no matter how we schedule the transitions of $s_0 \parallel_A r_0$. For instance the probability for $s'_0 \parallel_A r_0$ reaching states $s_3 \parallel_A r_5$ and $s_4 \parallel_A r_6$ is equal to 1, while the probability for $s_0 \parallel_A r_0$ reaching these two states is at most 0.5.

However, when restricting to distributed schedulers, we can show that both $s_0 \parallel_A r_0$ and $s'_0 \parallel_A r_0$ can reach states $s_3 \parallel_A r_5$ and $s_4 \parallel_A r_6$ with probability 0.5 at most, since the scheduler of $s'_0 \parallel_A r_0$, which induces the coloured execution in Fig. 4 is not distributed. The reason is that at states $s_5 \parallel_A r_0$ and $s_6 \parallel_A r_0$, r_0 makes different decision by looking at the future transitions of s_5 and s_6 , which should not happen in a distributed scheduler.

When restricting to the set of schedulers in $\mathcal{S}_P \cap \mathcal{S}_D$, late weak bisimulation is compositional and implies trace distribution equivalence. Actually, we can show that with respect to schedulers in $\mathcal{S}_P \cap \mathcal{S}_D$, late weak bisimulation is the coarsest congruence preserving trace distribution equivalence, which in turn can be seen as the symmetric version of trace distribution precongruence defined in [15].

Theorem 4. *Let $S = \mathcal{S}_P \cap \mathcal{S}_D$, then $s_1 \approx_S^\bullet s_2$ iff $s_1 \equiv_S^c s_2$ for any s_1 and s_2 , where $s_1 \equiv_S^c s_2$ iff $s_1 \equiv_S s_2$ and $s_1 \parallel_A s_3 \equiv_S s_2 \parallel_A s_3$ for any s_1, s_2, s_3 , and A .*

5 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we have presented a novel and very coarse weak bisimilarity called late weak bisimilarity for MAs. Late weak bisimilarity has interesting properties under two well-known subclasses of schedulers: It implies trace distribution equivalence under partial information schedulers, while it is compositional under distributed schedulers. Working in the intersection of both scheduler classes thus ensures a restricted form of compositionality, where the restriction excludes undesired or unrealistically powerful schedulers. As future work we intend to study reduction barbed congruences [5] under subclasses of schedulers, in order to pinpoint the characteristics of late weak bisimilarity. The logical characterization of \approx^\bullet would be also interesting. Moreover, we are working on an efficient decision algorithm for \approx^\bullet . We expect that the decision algorithm for \approx^\bullet is simpler than the algorithm for $\bullet\approx$, since we do not allow arbitrary splitting, thus it is enough to consider all reachable transition consistent distributions, which are finitely many. However, this is not the case for $\bullet\approx$. To the best of our knowledge, the most efficient algorithm so far to decide $\bullet\approx$ is exponential, see [17,7].

References

1. E. Böde, M. Herbstritt, H. Hermans, S. Johr, T. Peikenkamp, R. Pulungan, J. Rakow, R. Wimmer, and B. Becker. Compositional dependability evaluation for statemate. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, 35(2):274–292, 2009.

2. H. Boudali, P. Crouzen, and M. Stoelinga. A rigorous, compositional, and extensible framework for dynamic fault tree analysis. *IEEE Trans. Dependable Sec. Comput.*, 7(2):128–143, 2010.
3. G. Chehaibar, H. Garavel, L. Mounier, N. Tawbi, and F. Zulian. Specification and verification of the powerscaletm bus arbitration protocol: An industrial experiment with lotos. In *FORTE*, pages 435–450, 1996.
4. L. De Alfaro. The verification of probabilistic systems under memoryless partial-information policies is hard. Technical report, DTIC Document, 1999.
5. Y. Deng and M. Hennessy. On the semantics of markov automata. *Information and Computation*, 222:139–168, 2013.
6. Y. Deng, R. van Glabbeek, M. Hennessy, and C. Morgan. Testing finitary probabilistic processes. In *CONCUR*, pages 274–288, 2009.
7. C. Eisentraut, H. Hermanns, J. Kraemer, A. Turrini, and L. Zhang. Deciding bisimilarities on distributions. In *QEST*, LNCS, Berlin, 2013. Springer.
8. C. Eisentraut, H. Hermanns, and L. Zhang. Concurrency and composition in a stochastic world. In *CONCUR*, pages 21–39, 2010.
9. C. Eisentraut, H. Hermanns, and L. Zhang. On probabilistic automata in continuous time. In *LICS*, pages 342–351, 2010.
10. L. Feng, T. Han, M. Kwiatkowska, and D. Parker. Learning-based compositional verification for synchronous probabilistic systems. In *ATVA*, pages 511–521, 2011.
11. S. Giro and P. R. D’Argenio. Quantitative model checking revisited: neither decidable nor approximable. In *FORMATS*, pages 179–194, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007. Springer-Verlag.
12. H. Hermanns. *Interactive Markov chains: and the quest for quantified quality*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2002.
13. K. Honda and M. Tokoro. On asynchronous communication semantics. In *Object-Based Concurrent Computing*, pages 21–51, 1991.
14. M. Kwiatkowska, G. Norman, D. Parker, and H. Qu. Assume-guarantee verification for probabilistic systems. In *TACAS*, pages 23–37, 2010.
15. N. Lynch, R. Segala, and F. Vaandrager. Observing branching structure through probabilistic contexts. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 37(4):977–1013, Sept. 2007.
16. M. R. Neuhäüßer and L. Zhang. Time-bounded reachability probabilities in continuous-time markov decision processes. In *QEST*, pages 209–218. IEEE Computer Society, 2010.
17. J. Schuster and M. Siegle. Markov automata: Deciding weak bisimulation by means of non-naively vanishing states. *CoRR*, abs/1205.6192, 2012.
18. R. Segala. A compositional trace-based semantics for probabilistic automata. In *CONCUR*, pages 234–248, London, UK, UK, 1995. Springer-Verlag.
19. R. Segala. *Modeling and Verification of Randomized Distributed Realtime Systems*. PhD thesis, MIT, 1995.

A Proofs

A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Before proving Theorem 1, we shall introduce two lemmas. In Definition 3 and 6 we have used strong transitions on the left side of Clause (i). As in the standard setting for transition systems, in the lemma below we show that weak bisimulation does not change if we replace the strong transition by weak transition. This simple replacement is useful for proving the transitivity.

Lemma 1. *Let $\mathcal{M} = (S, Act_\tau, \longrightarrow, \Longrightarrow, \bar{s})$ be an MA. A relation $\mathcal{R} \subseteq Dist(S) \times Dist(S)$ is an early weak bisimulation iff $\mu \mathcal{R} \nu$ implies that*

1. whenever $\mu \xRightarrow{\theta}_c \mu'$, there exists a $\nu \xRightarrow{\theta}_c \nu'$ such that $\mu' \mathcal{R} \nu'$,
2. whenever $\mu = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i \cdot \mu_i$, there exists $\nu \xRightarrow{\tau}_c \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i \cdot \nu_i$ such that $\mu_i \mathcal{R} \nu_i$ for each $0 \leq i \leq n$ where $\sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} p_i = 1$,
3. symmetrically for ν .

Similar results hold for late weak bisimulation by adjusting Clause 2 accordingly.

Proof. Note that $\mu \xRightarrow{\theta}_c \mu'$ iff for each $s \in Supp(\mu)$, there exists $s \xRightarrow{\theta}_c \mu_s$ such that $\mu' = \sum_{s \in Supp(\mu)} \mu(s) \cdot \mu_s$. Define $s \xRightarrow{\theta, n} \mu_s$ inductively as follows:

1. $\mu_s = \delta_s$ if $n = 0$ and $\theta = \tau$,
2. If $n > 0$, then either there exists $s \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \nu$ such that $s' \xRightarrow{\theta, (n-1)}_c \mu_{s'}$, or there exists $s \xrightarrow{\theta}_c \nu$ such that $s' \xRightarrow{\tau, (n-1)}_c \mu_{s'}$ for each $s' \in Supp(\nu)$, where $\mu_s = \sum_{s' \in Supp(\nu)} \nu(s') \cdot \mu_{s'}$.

In other words, $s \xRightarrow{\theta, n} \mu_s$ means that μ_s can be reached in n steps from s . Similarly, we can define $\mu \xRightarrow{\theta, n} \mu'$.

We first prove that whenever $\mu \xRightarrow{\theta, n}_c \mu'$, there exists $\mu \xRightarrow{\theta}_c \nu'$ such that $\mu' \mathcal{R} \nu'$ which can be done by induction on n :

1. $n = 0$. Trivial, since it must be the case that $\theta = \tau$ and $\mu' = \mu$.
2. $n > 0$. Then there exists either $\mu \xrightarrow{\theta}_c \mu_1 \xRightarrow{\tau, (n-1)}_c \mu'$, or $\mu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \mu_1 \xRightarrow{\theta, (n-1)}_c \mu'$. We only show the proof of the first case, since the other one is similar. By Definition 3, there exists $\nu \xRightarrow{\theta}_c \nu_1$ such that $\mu_1 \mathcal{R} \nu_1$. The following proof is by induction hypothesis showing that there exists $\nu_1 \xRightarrow{\tau}_c \nu'$ such that $\mu' \mathcal{R} \nu'$. Consequently, there exists $\nu \xRightarrow{\theta}_c \nu'$ such that $\mu' \mathcal{R} \nu'$ as desired.

Next we show that $\mu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \mu'$ iff there exists $\{\mu \xrightarrow{\tau, n}_c \mu'_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ such that $\mu' = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu'_n$. It suffices to show that for any $n \geq 0$ and s , whenever

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_s &= \mu_0^{\rightarrow} + \mu_0^{\times}, \\ \mu_0^{\rightarrow} &\xrightarrow{\tau} \mu_1^{\rightarrow} + \mu_1^{\times}, \\ \mu_1^{\rightarrow} &\xrightarrow{\tau} \mu_2^{\rightarrow} + \mu_2^{\times}, \\ &\vdots \\ \mu_{n-1}^{\rightarrow} &\xrightarrow{\tau} \mu_n^{\times}, \end{aligned}$$

there exists $\delta_s \xrightarrow{\tau, n}_c \mu_s \equiv (\sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} \mu_i)$. This can be proved by induction on n :

1. $n = 0$. Trivial.
2. $n > 0$. By induction hypothesis, $\delta_s \xrightarrow{\tau, n-1}_c \mu'_s$, where $\mu'_s \equiv (\mu_{n-1}^{\rightarrow} + \sum_{0 \leq i < n} \mu_i^{\times})$. Since $\mu_{n-1}^{\rightarrow} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mu_n^{\times}$, there exists $\delta_s \xrightarrow{\tau, n}_c \mu_s \equiv (\sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} \mu_i^{\times})$.

We have proved that $\mu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \mu'$ iff there exists $\{\mu \xrightarrow{\tau, n}_c \mu'_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ such that $\mu' = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu'_n$. Therefore we can conclude that whenever $\mu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \mu'$, there exists $\nu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \nu'$ such that $\mu' \mathcal{R} \nu'$. In case $\mu \xrightarrow{\theta}_c \mu'$ with $\theta \neq \tau$, we have $\mu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \mu'_1 \xrightarrow{\theta}_c \mu'_2 \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \mu'$. As shown above, there exists $\nu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \nu'_1$ such that $\mu'_1 \mathcal{R} \nu'_1$, which indicates that there exists $\nu'_1 \xrightarrow{\theta}_c \nu'_2$ such that $\mu'_2 \mathcal{R} \nu'_2$ by Definition 3, which indicates that there exists $\nu'_2 \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \nu'$ such that $\mu' \mathcal{R} \nu'$. This completes the proof.

In order to prove that \approx^\bullet is an equivalence relation, we shall introduce the following lemma saying that if $\mu \approx^\bullet \nu$, then μ and ν must be transition consistent or not at the same time.

Lemma 2. *For all late weak bisimulation \mathcal{R} , $\mu \mathcal{R} \nu$ implies $\vec{\mu}$ iff $\vec{\nu}$.*

Proof. We prove by contradiction and assume $\mu \mathcal{R} \nu$ and $\vec{\mu}$ for some late weak bisimulation \mathcal{R} , but not $\vec{\nu}$. Since $\mu \mathcal{R} \nu$, then $\mu \xrightarrow{\theta}$ implies $\nu \xrightarrow{\theta}$ and vice versa for any θ , therefore we have $EA(\mu) = EA(\nu)$, where $EA(\mu) = \{\theta \mid \exists \mu' . \mu \xrightarrow{\theta} \mu'\}$, similarly for $EA(\nu)$. Since ν is not transition consistent, there exists $s \in \text{Supp}(\nu)$, such that $s \xrightarrow{\theta}$ where $\theta \notin EA(\nu)$. Therefore there exists $\nu = \sum_{i \in I} p_i \cdot \nu_i$ such that $\nu_i \xrightarrow{\theta}$ for each $i \in I$ and there exists $j \in I$ such that $\nu_j \xrightarrow{\theta}$, where I is a finite set of indexes. Since $\vec{\mu}$ and $\theta \notin EA(\mu)$, there does not exist $\mu \xrightarrow{\tau} \sum_{i \in I} p_i \cdot \mu_i$ such that $\mu_i \xrightarrow{\theta}$, and thus $\mu_i \mathcal{R} \nu_i$, which contradicts the assumption that $\mu \approx^\bullet \nu$.

Below follows the proof of Theorem 1:

Proof. The proofs for early weak bisimulation is straightforward from Lemma 1 and omitted here. We prove that \approx^\bullet is an equivalence relation. The only non-trivial case is transitivity, we need to prove that $\mu \approx^\bullet \nu$ and $\nu \approx^\bullet \gamma$ implies $\mu \approx^\bullet \gamma$ for any μ, ν , and γ . According to Definition 6, there exists late weak bisimulations \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_2 such that

$\mu \mathcal{R}_1 \nu$ and $\nu \mathcal{R}_2 \gamma$. Let $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_1 \circ \mathcal{R}_2 = \{(\mu, \gamma) \mid \exists \nu. (\mu \mathcal{R}_1 \nu \wedge \nu \mathcal{R}_2 \gamma)\}$, it is then enough to prove that \mathcal{R} is also a late weak bisimulation.

Let $\mu \mathcal{R} \gamma$ such that $\mu \mathcal{R}_1 \nu$ and $\nu \mathcal{R}_2 \gamma$ for some ν . First we prove that whenever $\mu \xrightarrow{\theta}_c \mu'$, there exists $\gamma \xrightarrow{\theta}_c \gamma'$ such that $\mu' \mathcal{R} \gamma'$. Due to Lemma 2, the proof is straightforward and omitted here.

Secondly, we need to show that if not $\overline{\mu}$, then there exists $\mu = \sum_{i \in I} p_i \cdot \mu_i$ and $\gamma \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \sum_{i \in I} p_i \cdot \gamma_i$ such that $\mu_i \mathcal{R} \gamma_i$ for each $i \in I$, where $\sum_{i \in I} p_i = 1$. Since $\mu \approx^\bullet \nu$, there exists $\nu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \sum_{i \in I} p_i \cdot \nu_i$ such that $\overline{\mu}_i$ and $\mu_i \mathcal{R}_1 \nu_i$ for each $i \in I$. By Lemma 2, $\overline{\nu}_i$ for each $i \in I$. We distinguish the following two cases:

1. $\nu = \sum_{i \in I} p_i \cdot \nu_i$.

According to Lemma 2, ν is not transition consistent, and moreover we have $\overline{\nu}_i$ for each $i \in I$. Since $\nu \mathcal{R}_2 \gamma$, there exists $\gamma \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \sum_{i \in I} \gamma_i$ such that $\nu_i \mathcal{R}_2 \gamma_i$, thus we have $\mu_i \mathcal{R} \gamma_i$ by the definition of \mathcal{R} for each $i \in I$.

2. $\nu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \nu' = \sum_{i \in I} p_i \cdot \nu_i$.

Since $\nu \mathcal{R}_2 \gamma$, there exists $\gamma \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \gamma'$ such that $\nu' \mathcal{R}_2 \gamma'$ according to the first clause of Definition 6. Since μ is not transition consistent, so there exists $i, j \in I$ such that $i \neq j$ and $EA(\mu_i) \neq EA(\mu_j)$, which indicates that $EA(\nu_i) \neq EA(\nu_j)$, therefore ν' is not transition consistent. As a result there exists $\gamma' \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \sum_{i \in I} p_i \cdot \gamma_i$ i.e. $\gamma' \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \sum_{i \in I} p_i \cdot \gamma_i$ such that $\nu_i \mathcal{R}_2 \gamma_i$, thus $\mu_i \mathcal{R} \gamma_i$ for each $i \in I$.

For Clause 2, it is easy to see that the second condition of Definition 3 implies the second condition of Definition 6, but not vice versa. Example 3 shows that the inclusion is strict.

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. 1. $s_1 \approx^\bullet s_2 \iff s_1 \overset{\bullet}{\sim}_{\mathcal{S}_P} s_2$:

This equivalence is straightforward from Definition 6, since we always group states with the same enable visible actions together and let them either perform transitions with the same visible action at the same time, or an internal transition spontaneously, which never breaks the conditions of partial information schedulers. In other words, all transitions we consider in Definition 6 are induced by some schedulers in \mathcal{S}_P .

2. $s_1 \approx^\bullet s_2 \implies s_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{S}_P} s_2$:

Let μ and ν be two distributions such that $Supp(\mu) = \{s_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $Supp(\nu) = \{r_i\}_{i \in J}$ where I and J are two finite sets of indexes. Let $\{\pi_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{\pi'_i\}_{i \in J}$ be two sets of finite paths such that $last(\pi_i) = s_i$ and $last(\pi_j) = r_j$ for each $i \in I$ and $j \in J$. We prove a more general result: $\mu \approx^\bullet \nu$ implies for each partial information scheduler ξ_1 , there exists a partial information scheduler ξ_2 such that

$$Pr_{\xi_1}^\mu(C_\varsigma, \{\pi_i\}_{i \in I}) = Pr_{\xi_2}^\nu(C_\varsigma, \{\pi'_i\}_{i \in J})$$

for each finite trace ς , provided the following conditions hold:

- (a) $EA(s_i) = EA(s_j)$ implies $EA(\pi_i) = EA(\pi_j)$ for each $i, j \in I$,
- (b) $EA(r_i) = EA(r_j)$ implies $EA(\pi'_i) = EA(\pi'_j)$ for each $i, j \in J$,

(c) $EA(s_i) = EA(r_j)$ implies $EA(\pi_i) = EA(\pi'_j)$ for each $i \in I$ and $j \in J$, where $Pr_{\xi_1}^\mu(C_\varsigma, \{\pi_i\}_{i \in I})$ is the probability of C_ς starting from μ given execution history π_i for each $s_i \in Supp(\mu)$ and scheduler ξ_1 . Since $EA(\pi_i) = EA(\pi_j)$ if $EA(s_i) = EA(s_j)$ for any $i, j \in I$, if $\vec{\mu}$ and ξ_1 is a partial information scheduler,

$$Pr_{\xi_1}^\mu(C_\varsigma, \{\pi_i\}_{i \in I}) = Pr_{\xi_1}^\mu(C_\varsigma, EA(\pi_i))$$

for any $i \in I$. We then define $p = Pr_{\xi_1}^\mu(C_\varsigma, EA(\pi_i), n)$ as follows where $n \geq 0$ and $\vec{\mu}$:

- (a) If $|\varsigma| > 0$ and $n = 0, p = 0$,
- (b) else if $|\varsigma| = 0, p = 1$,
- (c) else if $\mu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \sum_{k \in K} p_k \cdot \mu_k$ such that $\vec{\mu}_k$ for each $k \in K$, then

$$p = \sum_{k \in K} p_k \cdot Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu_k}(C_\varsigma, EA(\pi_i \circ (\tau, 0, s_k)), n - 1)$$

for any $s_k \in Supp(\mu_k)$,

- (d) else if $\varsigma = \alpha\varsigma'$ and $\mu \xrightarrow{\alpha}_c \sum_{k \in K} p_k \cdot \mu_k$ such that $\vec{\mu}_k$ for each $k \in K$, then

$$p = \sum_{k \in K} p_k \cdot Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu_k}(C_{\varsigma'}, EA(\pi_i \circ (\alpha, 0, s_k)), n - 1)$$

for any $s_k \in Supp(\mu_k)$,

- (e) else if $\varsigma = \lambda\varsigma'$ and $\mu \xrightarrow{\lambda}_c \sum_{k \in K} p_k \cdot \mu_k$ such that $\vec{\mu}_k$ for each $k \in K$, then

$$p = \sum_{k \in K} p_k \cdot \int_0^\infty \lambda e^{\lambda x} \cdot Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu_k}(C_{\varsigma'}, EA(\pi_i \circ (\lambda, x, s_k)), n - 1) dx$$

for any $s_k \in Supp(\mu_k)$,

- (f) otherwise $p = 0$.
- If $\neg \vec{\mu}$ and $\mu = \sum_{k \in K} \mu_k$ such that $\vec{\mu}_k$ for each $k \in K$, then

$$Pr_{\xi_1}^\mu(C_\varsigma, \{\pi_i\}_{i \in I}, n) = \sum_{k \in K} p_k \cdot Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu_k}(C_\varsigma, EA(\pi_k), n)$$

where $\pi_k = \pi_i$ for any $s_i \in Supp(\mu_k)$.

Now we prove by induction on n that for each partial information scheduler ξ_1 , there exists a partial information scheduler ξ_2 , such that

$$Pr_{\xi_1}^\mu(C_\varsigma, \{\pi_i\}_{i \in I}, n) \leq Pr_{\xi_2}^\nu(C_\varsigma, \{\pi'_i\}_{i \in J})$$

for any $n \geq 0$ and ς .

First we assume that μ is transition consistent, which indicates $\vec{\nu}$ by Lemma 2. This is equivalent to show that

$$Pr_{\xi_1}^\mu(C_\varsigma, EA(\pi_i), n) \leq Pr_{\xi_2}^\nu(C_\varsigma, EA(\pi'_j)).$$

We distinguish the following cases:

- (a) $n = 0$ or $|\varsigma| = 0$. This case is trivial.
 (b) $n > 0$, $|\varsigma| > 0$, and there exists $\mu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \mu' = \sum_{k \in K} p_k \cdot \mu_k$ such that $\vec{\mu}_k$ for each $k \in K$, and

$$Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu}(C_{\varsigma}, EA(\pi_i), n) = \sum_{k \in K} p_k \cdot Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu_k}(C_{\varsigma}, EA(\pi_i \circ (\tau, 0, s_k)), n - 1)$$

for any $i \in I$ and $s_k \in \text{Supp}(\mu_k)$. Suppose $|K| = 1$ i.e. $\vec{\mu}^j$ and $EA(\mu') = EA(\mu)$, then $EA(\pi_i \circ (\tau, 0, s_k)) = EA(\pi_i)$, thus

$$Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu}(C_{\varsigma}, EA(\pi_i), n) = Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu'}(C_{\varsigma}, EA(\pi_i), n - 1).$$

Since $\mu \approx^{\bullet} \nu$, there exists $\nu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \nu'$ such that $\mu' \approx^{\bullet} \nu'$, let ξ_2 be a partial information scheduler mimicking the transition of ν , moreover by induction

$$Pr_{\xi_2}^{\nu'}(C_{\varsigma}, EA(\pi_i)) \geq Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu'}(C_{\varsigma}, EA(\pi_i), n - 1).$$

If $|K| = 1$ and $EA(\mu') \neq EA(\mu)$, or $|K| > 1$, then

$$Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu}(C_{\varsigma}, EA(\pi_i), n) = \sum_{k \in K} p_k \cdot Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu_k}(C_{\varsigma}, EA(\pi_i \circ (\tau, 0, s_k)), n - 1)$$

for any $s_k \in \text{Supp}(\mu_k)$. Since $\mu \approx^{\bullet} \nu$, there exists

$$\nu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \nu' = \sum_{k \in K} p_k \cdot \nu_k$$

such that $\mu_k \approx^{\bullet} \nu_k$, thus $\vec{\nu}_k$ by Lemma 2 for each $k \in K$, moreover $EA(\mu_k) = EA(\nu_k)$. Let ξ_2 be a scheduler mimicking the transition $\nu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \nu'$. According to Definition 9 such partial information scheduler ξ_2 always exists, since only τ transitions are involved. Since $\mu_k \approx^{\bullet} \nu_k$,

$$Pr_{\xi_2}^{\nu_k}(C_{\varsigma}, EA(\pi_i \circ (\tau, 0, r_k))) \geq Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu_k}(C_{\varsigma}, EA(\pi_i \circ (\tau, 0, s_k)), n - 1)$$

by induction, where $r_k \in \text{Supp}(\nu_k)$ for each $k \in K$. Therefore

$$Pr_{\xi_2}^{\nu}(C_{\varsigma}, EA(\pi_i)) \geq Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu}(C_{\varsigma}, EA(\pi_i), n).$$

- (c) $n > 0$, $\varsigma = \alpha\varsigma'$, and there exists $\mu \xrightarrow{\alpha}_c \mu' = \sum_{k \in K} p_k \cdot \mu_k$ such that $\vec{\mu}_k$ for each $k \in K$, and

$$Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu}(C_{\varsigma}, EA(\pi_i), n) = \sum_{k \in K} p_k \cdot Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu_k}(C_{\varsigma'}, EA(\pi_i \circ (\alpha, 0, s_k)), n - 1)$$

for any $i \in I$ and $s_k \in \text{Supp}(\mu_k)$. Since $\mu \approx^{\bullet} \nu$, there exists $\nu \xrightarrow{\alpha}_c \sum_{k \in K} p_k \cdot \nu_k$ such that $\mu_k \approx^{\bullet} \nu_k$ for each $k \in K$. Let ξ_2 be the scheduler which mimic the weak transition of ν . The ξ_2 is guaranteed to be a partial information scheduler, since all states will perform a transition with label α . By induction we have:

$$Pr_{\xi_2}^{\nu_k}(C_{\varsigma'}, EA(\pi_i \circ (\alpha, 0, r_k))) \geq Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu_k}(C_{\varsigma'}, EA(\pi_i \circ (\alpha, 0, s_k)), n - 1)$$

where $r_k \in \text{Supp}(\nu_k)$ for each $k \in K$, therefore

$$Pr_{\xi_2}^\nu(C_\varsigma, EA(\pi_i)) \geq Pr_{\xi_1}^\mu(C_\varsigma, EA(\pi_i), n).$$

The case when $\varsigma = \beta\varsigma'$ such that $\beta \neq \alpha$ is trivial, since $Pr_{\xi_1}^\mu(C_\varsigma, EA(\pi_i), n) = 0$.

(d) $n > 0, n > 0, \varsigma = \lambda\varsigma'$. This case is similar as Case 3, and is omitted here. Secondly, if $\neg \vec{\mu}$ and $\mu = \sum_{k \in K} \mu_k$ such that $\vec{\mu}_k$ for each $k \in K$, then

$$Pr_{\xi_1}^\mu(C_\varsigma, \{\pi_i\}_{i \in I}, n) = \sum_{k \in K} p_k \cdot Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu_k}(C_\varsigma, EA(\pi_k), n)$$

where $\pi_k = \pi_i$ for any $s_i \in \text{Supp}(\mu_k)$. Since $\mu \approx^\bullet \nu$, there exists $\nu \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \sum_{k \in K} p_k \cdot \nu_k$ such that $\mu_k \approx^\bullet \nu_k$ for each $k \in K$. Since $\vec{\mu}_k$ and we have proved that there exists ξ_2 such that

$$Pr_{\xi_2}^{\nu_k}(C_\varsigma, EA(\pi'_k)) \geq Pr_{\xi_1}^{\mu_k}(C_\varsigma, EA(\pi_k), n)$$

for each $k \in K$, again let ξ_2 mimic the transition of ν in a stepwise manner, we get

$$Pr_{\xi_2}^\nu(C_\varsigma, \{\pi'_i\}_{i \in J}) \geq Pr_{\xi_1}^\mu(C_\varsigma, \{\pi_i\}_{i \in I}, n)$$

as desired.

Note that

$$Pr_{\xi_1}^\mu(C_\varsigma, \{\pi_i\}_{i \in I}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Pr_{\xi_1}^\mu(C_\varsigma, \{\pi_i\}_{i \in I}, n),$$

the remaining proof is then straightforward. This completes the proof.

A.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. 1. In case that s_1 and s_2 contain no parallel operators, all schedulers of s_1 and s_2 are distributed schedulers according to Definition 10. Therefore $s_1 \approx^\bullet s_2$ implies $s_1 \approx_{S_D}^\bullet s_2$ and vice versa.

2. Let $\mathcal{R} = \{(\mu_1 \parallel_A \mu_3, \mu_2 \parallel_A \mu_3) \mid \mu_1 \approx_{S_D}^\bullet \mu_2\}$, it suffices to prove that \mathcal{R} is a late weak bisimulation with respect to S_D . Let $(\mu_1 \parallel_A \mu_3) \mathcal{R} (\mu_2 \parallel_A \mu_3)$ and $\mu_1 \parallel_A \mu_3 \xrightarrow{\theta}_{\xi_1} \nu$ for some $\xi_1 \in S_D$, we shall show that there exists $\mu_2 \parallel_A \mu_3 \xrightarrow{\theta}_{\xi_2} \nu'$ for some $\xi_2 \in S_D$ such that $\mu \mathcal{R} \nu$. We distinguish several cases:

(a) $\theta \in \text{Act}$ and $\theta \notin A$:

Since ξ_1 is a distributed scheduler, we have either (i) $\mu_1 \xrightarrow{\theta}_{\xi_1} \nu_1$ such that $\nu = \nu_1 \parallel_A \mu_3$, or (ii) $\mu_3 \xrightarrow{\theta}_{\xi_1} \mu'_3$ such that $\nu = \mu_1 \parallel_A \mu'_3$. We first consider Case i). Since $\mu_1 \approx_{S_D}^\bullet \mu_2$, there exists $\mu_2 \xrightarrow{\theta}_{\xi_2} \nu_2$ for some $\xi_2 \in S_D$ such that $\nu_1 \approx_{S_D}^\bullet \nu_2$, therefore there exists $\mu_2 \parallel_A \mu_3 \xrightarrow{\theta}_{\xi_2} \nu_2 \parallel_A \mu_3$. According to the definition of \mathcal{R} , we have $\nu = (\nu_1 \parallel_A \mu_3) \mathcal{R} (\nu_2 \parallel_A \mu_3) = \nu'$ as desired. The proof of Case ii) is similar and omitted here.

(b) $\theta \in A$:

As before ξ_1 is a distributed scheduler, according to the definition of parallel operator, it must be the case that $\mu_1 \xrightarrow{\theta}_{\xi_1} \nu_1$ and $\mu_3 \xrightarrow{\theta}_{\xi_1} \mu'_3$ such that $\nu = \nu_1 \parallel_A \mu'_3$. Since $\mu_1 \approx_{S_D}^{\bullet} \mu_2$, there exists $\mu_2 \xrightarrow{\theta}_{\xi_2} \nu_2$ such that $\nu_1 \approx_{S_D}^{\bullet} \nu_2$, hence there exists $\mu_2 \parallel_A \mu_3 \xrightarrow{\theta}_{\xi_2} \nu_2 \parallel_A \mu'_3$ such that $\nu = (\nu_1 \parallel_A \mu'_3) \mathcal{R} (\nu_2 \parallel_A \mu'_3) = \nu'$.

(c) $\theta = \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$:

By the definition of parallel operator, we have $\mu_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda_1}_{\xi_1} \nu_1$ and $\mu_3 \xrightarrow{\lambda_2}_{\xi_1} \mu'_3$ such that $\lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$ and $\nu = \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda} \cdot (\nu_1 \parallel_A \mu_3) + \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda} \cdot (\mu_1 \parallel_A \mu'_3)$. Since $\mu_1 \approx_{S_D}^{\bullet} \mu_2$, there exists $\mu_2 \xrightarrow{\lambda_1}_{\xi_2} \nu_2$ such that $\nu_1 \approx_{S_D}^{\bullet} \nu_2$, the remaining proof is straightforward based on the above proof.

In order to prove Theorem 4, we shall introduce the following lemma:

Lemma 3. *Let $S = S_P \cap S_D$, then $\mu_1 \approx_S^{\bullet} \mu_2$ implies*

1. $\mu_1 \equiv_S \mu_2$;
2. $\mu_1 \parallel_A \mu_3 \approx_S^{\bullet} \mu_2 \parallel_A \mu_3$ for any μ_3 .

Proof. 1. Refer to the proof of Theorem 2.

2. The proof is similar as the proof of Clause 2 of Theorem 3.

A.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. $-\approx_S^{\bullet} \Rightarrow \equiv_S^c$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1 \approx_S^{\bullet} \mu_2 &\stackrel{\text{Lem. 3}}{\implies} \mu_1 \equiv_S \mu_2 \text{ and } \mu_1 \parallel_A \mu_3 \approx_S^{\bullet} \mu_2 \parallel_A \mu_3 \\ &\stackrel{\text{Def. of } \equiv_S^c}{\implies} \mu_1 \equiv_S^c \mu_2 \end{aligned}$$

$-\equiv_S^c \Rightarrow \approx_S^{\bullet}$:

Let $\mathcal{R} = \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \mid \mu_1 \equiv_S^c \mu_2\}$, we show that \mathcal{R} is a late weak bisimulation with respect to S . Let $\mu_1 \mathcal{R} \mu_2$. We first assume that $\vec{\mu}'_1$ and $\mu_1 \xrightarrow{\theta}_{\xi_1} \mu'_1$ for some θ and $\xi_1 \in S$. We need to prove that there exists $\mu_2 \xrightarrow{\theta}_{\xi_2} \mu'_2$ for some $\xi_2 \in S$ such that $\mu'_1 \mathcal{R} \mu'_2$. We proceed by contradiction and assume that $\mu'_1 \not\mathcal{R} \mu'_2$ i.e. $\mu'_1 \not\equiv_S^c \mu'_2$, we distinguish several cases as follows, where the main idea is to construct a distribution μ_3 with a proper set A such that $\mu_1 \parallel_A \mu_3 \not\equiv_S \mu_2 \parallel_A \mu_3$.

1. $\theta \in Act$ and $\mu'_1 \not\equiv_S \mu'_2$:

Given a set of visible actions A , we let $s' = A.s'$ denote a state which can only perform self loop transitions with labels in A . We can see that for any distribution μ such that $\vec{\mu}, \mu \parallel_A \delta_{s'}$ induces the same trace distribution as μ , where A contains all possible actions which can be performed by states in $Supp(\mu)$ and their successors.

Now let A contains all visible actions which can be performed by states in $Supp(\mu_1)$ and $Supp(\mu_2)$ and their successors. Let $s = \theta.s'$ where s' is

defined as above. Then for each $\xi_2 \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists $\xi_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $Pr_{\mu_1 \parallel_A \delta_s}^{\xi_1}(C_{\theta\varsigma}) = Pr_{\mu'_1 \parallel_A \delta_{s'}}^{\xi_2}(C_\varsigma) = Pr_{\mu'_1}^{\xi_2}(C_\varsigma)$, for each ς , similarly for $\mu_2 \parallel_A \delta_s$. Since $\mu'_1 \not\equiv_S \mu'_2$, we conclude that $\mu_1 \parallel_A \delta_s \equiv_S \mu_2 \parallel_A \delta_s$, which contradicts the assumption that $\mu_1 \equiv_S^c \mu_2$ ($\mu_3 = \delta_s$).

2. $\theta \in Act$ and $\mu'_1 \equiv_S \mu'_2$, but there exists μ'_3 and A' such that $\mu'_1 \parallel_{A'} \mu'_3 \not\equiv_S \mu'_2 \parallel_{A'} \mu'_3$:

If $\theta \in A'$, we can simply let $\mu_3 = \theta.\mu'_3$ and $A = A'$ i.e. the only immediate transition of μ_3 is $\mu_3 \xrightarrow{\theta} \mu'_3$, and the remaining argument is similar as Case 1. Now suppose that $\theta \notin A$. For each $s \in Supp(\mu'_3)$, we let s_θ denote the copy of s but by adding a self loop with label θ to s and all its successors. Let $A = A' \cup \{\theta\}$ and μ_3 be a distribution such that the only immediate transition of μ_3 is $\mu_3 \xrightarrow{\theta} \mu''_3$ where $\mu''_3(s_\theta) = \mu'_3(s)$ for each $s \in Supp(\mu'_3)$, then for each $\xi_1 \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists $\xi_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $Pr_{\mu'_1 \parallel_{A'} \mu'_3}^{\xi_1}(C_\varsigma) = Pr_{\mu'_1 \parallel_{A'} \mu''_3}^{\xi_2}(C_\varsigma)$ for each ς , similarly for $\mu'_2 \parallel_{A'} \mu'_3$ and $\mu'_2 \parallel_{A'} \mu''_3$. Therefore $(\mu'_1 \parallel_{A'} \mu'_3) \not\equiv_S (\mu'_2 \parallel_{A'} \mu''_3)$. Since $\theta \in A$, the remaining proof is similar.

3. $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$:

Since $\mu'_1 \not\mathcal{R} \mu'_2$, we have either i) $\mu'_1 \not\equiv_S \mu'_2$, or ii) there exists μ'_3 and A' such that $\mu'_1 \parallel_{A'} \mu'_3 \not\equiv_S \mu'_2 \parallel_{A'} \mu'_3$. For Case i) let $A = A'$, s' be defined as above, and $\mu_3 = \delta_{\alpha.s'}$ such that α is a fresh action. Then for each $\xi_2 \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists $\xi_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $Pr_{\mu'_1 \parallel_{A'} \mu_3}^{\xi_1}(C_{\alpha\varsigma}) = Pr_{\mu'_1}^{\xi_2}(C_\varsigma)$ for each ς , therefore $\mu'_1 \parallel_A \mu_3 \not\equiv_S \mu'_2 \parallel_A \mu_3$. Since there exists only one transition labelled with $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, hence for each $\xi_2 \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists $\xi_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $Pr_{\mu_1 \parallel_A \mu_3}^{\xi_1}(C_{\theta\varsigma}) = Pr_{\mu'_1 \parallel_{A'} \mu_3}^{\xi_2}(C_\varsigma)$ for each ς , similarly for $\mu_2 \parallel_A \mu_3$. Therefore we conclude that $\mu_1 \parallel_A \mu_3 \not\equiv_S \mu_2 \parallel_A \mu_3$, which contradicts the assumption that $\mu_1 \equiv_S^c \mu_2$.

For Case ii), we can let $A = A'$ and $\mu_3 = \alpha.\mu'_3$ i.e. the only immediate transition of μ_3 is $\mu_3 \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mu'_3$ where α is a fresh action. The remaining argument is similar as Case i).

For now we have only considered case when μ_1 and μ_2 are transition consistent. In case that μ_1 is not transition consistent, we can always find a split $\mu = \sum_{i \in I} p_i \cdot \nu_i$ such that $\sum_{i \in I} p_i = 1$ and $\vec{\nu}_i$ for each $i \in I$, moreover there exists $\mu_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} \xi$ $\sum_{i \in I} p_i \cdot \nu'_i$ such that $\nu_i \equiv_S^c \nu'_i$ for each $i \in I$. Then we can apply the same arguments as when μ_1 is transition consistent.