

Abstraction, Up-To Techniques and Games for Systems of Fixpoint Equations

Paolo Baldan 

Università Padova, Italy
baldan@math.unipd.it

Barbara König 

Universität Duisburg-Essen, Germany
barbara_koenig@uni-due.de

Tommaso Padoan

Università di Padova, Italy
padoan@math.unipd.it

Abstract

Systems of fixpoint equations over complete lattices, consisting of (mixed) least and greatest fixpoint equations, allow one to express many verification tasks such as model-checking of various kinds of specification logics or the check of coinductive behavioural equivalences. In this paper we develop a theory of approximation for systems of fixpoint equations in the style of abstract interpretation: a system over some concrete domain is abstracted to a system in a suitable abstract domain, with conditions ensuring that the abstract solution represents a sound/complete overapproximation of the concrete solution. Interestingly, up-to techniques, a classical approach used in coinductive settings to obtain easier or feasible proofs, can be interpreted as abstractions in a way that they naturally fit into our framework and extend to systems of equations. Additionally, relying on the approximation theory, we can characterise the solution of systems of fixpoint equations over complete lattices in terms of a suitable parity game, generalising some recent work that was restricted to continuous lattices. The game view opens the way for the development of local algorithms for characterising the solution of such equation systems. We describe a local algorithm for checking the winner on specific game positions. This corresponds to answering the associated verification question (i.e., for model checking, whether a state satisfies a formula or, for equivalence checking, whether two states are behaviourally equivalent). The algorithm can be combined with abstraction and up-to techniques, thus providing ways of speeding up the computation.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Verification by model checking; Software and its engineering → Model checking

Keywords and phrases fixpoint equation systems, complete lattices, parity games, abstract interpretation, up-to techniques, local algorithms, μ -calculus, bisimilarity

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2020.33

Funding Supported by the PRIN Project Analysis of Program Analyses (ASPRA), the University of Padova project ASTA and the DFG projects BEMEGA and SpeQt.

1 Introduction

Systems of fixpoint equations over complete lattices, consisting of (mixed) least and greatest fixpoint equations, allow one to uniformly express many verification tasks. Notable examples come from the area of model-checking. In fact, in order to express properties of infinite computations, specification logics almost invariably rely on some notion of recursion which leads to the use of fixpoints as key mathematical tool.

Invariant/safety properties can be characterised as greatest fixpoints, while liveness/reachability properties as least fixpoints. Using both least and greatest fixpoints leads to expressive



© Paolo Baldan, Barbara König, and Tommaso Padoan;
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY

31st International Conference on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 2020).

Editors: Igor Konnov and Laura Kovács; Article No. 33; pp. 33:1–33:28



Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

specification logics. The μ -calculus [28] is a prototypical example, encompassing various other logics such as LTL and CTL. Another area of special interest for the present paper is that of behavioural equivalences, which typically arise as solutions of greatest fixpoint equations. The most famous example is bisimilarity that can be seen as the greatest fixpoint of a suitable operator over the lattice of binary relations on states (see, e.g., [39]).

In the first part of the paper we develop a theory of approximation for systems of equations in the style of abstract interpretation. The general idea of abstract interpretation [13, 14] consists of extracting properties of programs by defining an approximated program semantics over a so-called abstract domain, usually a complete lattice. Concrete and abstract semantics are typically expressed in terms of (systems of) least fixpoint equations, with conditions ensuring that the approximation obtained is sound, i.e., that properties derived from the abstract semantics are also valid at the concrete level. In an ideal situation also the converse holds and the abstract interpretation is called complete (see e.g. [19]). Abstract interpretation has been applied also for the model checking of various kinds of mu-calculi and temporal logics (see, e.g., [20, 31, 15, 41, 18, 29]).

We generalise this idea to systems of fixpoint equations, where least and greatest fixpoints can coexist (§4). A system over some concrete domain C is abstracted by a system over some abstract domain A . Suitable conditions are identified that ensure the soundness and completeness of the approximation. This enables the use of the approximation theory on a number of verification tasks. We show how to recover some results on property preserving abstractions for the μ -calculus [31]. We also discuss a fixpoint extension of Łukasiewicz logic, considered in [35] as a precursor to model-checking PCTL or probabilistic μ -calculi.

When dealing with greatest fixpoints, a key proof technique relies on the coinduction principle, which uses the fact that a monotone function f over a complete lattice has a greatest fixpoint νf , which is the join of all post-fixpoints, i.e., the elements l such that $l \sqsubseteq f(l)$. As a consequence proving $l \sqsubseteq f(l)$ suffices to conclude that $l \sqsubseteq \nu f$.

Up-to techniques have been proposed for “simplifying” proofs [33, 40, 38, 36] and for reducing the search space in verification (e.g., in [8], up-to techniques applied to language equivalence of NFAs are shown to provide in many cases an exponential speed-up). A sound up-to function is a function u on the lattice such that $\nu(f \circ u) \sqsubseteq \nu f$ and hence $l \sqsubseteq f(u(l))$ implies $l \sqsubseteq \nu(f \circ u) \sqsubseteq \nu f$. The characteristics of u (typically, extensiveness) make it easier to show that an element is a post-fixpoint of $f \circ u$ rather than a post-fixpoint of f .

We show that up-to techniques admit a natural interpretation as abstractions in our framework (§5). This allows us to generalise the theory of up-to techniques to systems of fixpoint equations and contributes to the understanding of the relation between abstract interpretation and up-to techniques, a theme that received some recent attention [6].

We have recently shown in [2] that the solution of systems of fixpoint equations can be characterised in terms of a parity game when working in a suitable subclass of complete lattices, the so-called continuous lattices [42]. Here, relying on our approximation theory, we get rid of continuity and design a game that works for general complete lattices (§6.1).

The above results open the way to the development of game-theoretical algorithms, possibly integrating abstraction and up-to techniques, for solving systems of equations over complete lattices. While global algorithms deciding the game at all positions, based on progress measures [26], have already been studied in [21, 2], here we focus on local algorithms, confining the attention to specific positions. For instance, in the case of the μ -calculus, rather than computing the set of states satisfying some formula φ , one could be interested in checking whether a specific state satisfies or does not satisfy φ . For probabilistic logics, rather than determining the full evaluation of φ , we could be interested in determining the

value for a specific state or only in establishing a bound for such a value. Similarly, in the case of behavioural equivalences, rather than computing the full behavioural relation, one could be interested in determining whether two specific states are equivalent. Taking inspiration from backtracking methods for bisimilarity [22] and for the μ -calculus [46, 45], we first design a local (also called on-the-fly) algorithm for the case of a single equation (§6.2). The algorithm is then extended to general systems §6.3. We also show how these algorithms can be enhanced with up-to techniques.

This also establishes a link with some recent work relating abstract interpretation and up-to techniques [6] and exploiting up-to techniques for language equivalence on NFAs [8].

This paper is the full version of [3], extended with additional examples, containing all proofs and a description of the local algorithm for general systems.

2 Preliminaries and Notation

A preordered or partially ordered set $\langle P, \sqsubseteq \rangle$ is often denoted simply as P , omitting the (pre)order relation. Given $X \subseteq P$, we denote by $\downarrow X = \{p \in P \mid \exists x \in X. p \sqsubseteq x\}$ the *downward-closure* and by $\uparrow X = \{p \in P \mid \exists x \in X. x \sqsubseteq p\}$ the *upward-closure* of X . The *join* and the *meet* of a subset $X \subseteq P$ (if they exist) are denoted $\bigsqcup X$ and $\bigsqcap X$, respectively.

► **Definition 2.1** (complete lattice, basis). *A complete lattice is a partially ordered set (L, \sqsubseteq) such that each subset $X \subseteq L$ admits a join $\bigsqcup X$ and a meet $\bigsqcap X$. A complete lattice (L, \sqsubseteq) always has a least element $\perp = \bigsqcup \emptyset$ and a greatest element $\top = \bigsqcap \emptyset$. A basis for a complete lattice is a subset $B_L \subseteq L$ such that for each $l \in L$ it holds that $l = \bigsqcup(\downarrow l \cap B_L)$.*

For instance, the powerset of any set X , ordered by subset inclusion $(2^X, \subseteq)$ is a complete lattice. Join is union, meet is intersection, top (\top) is X and bottom (\perp) is \emptyset . A basis is the set of singletons $B_{2^X} = \{\{x\} \mid x \in X\}$. Another complete lattice used in the paper is the real interval $[0, 1]$ with the usual order \leq . Join and meet are the sup and inf over the reals, 0 is bottom and 1 is top. Any dense subset, e.g., the set of rationals $\mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1]$, is a basis.

A function $f: L \rightarrow L$ is *monotone* if for all $l, l' \in L$, if $l \sqsubseteq l'$ then $f(l) \sqsubseteq f(l')$. By Knaster-Tarski's theorem [47, Theorem 1], any monotone function f on a complete lattice has a least fixpoint arising as the meet of all pre-fixpoints $\mu f = \bigsqcap \{l \mid f(l) \sqsubseteq l\}$ and a greatest fixpoint arising as the join of all post-fixpoints $\nu f = \bigsqcup \{l \mid l \sqsubseteq f(l)\}$.

The least and greatest fixpoint can also be obtained by iterating the function on the bottom and top elements of the lattice. This is often referred to as Kleene's theorem (at least for continuous functions) and it is one of the pillars of abstract interpretation [17]. Given a complete lattice L , define its *height* λ_L as the supremum of the length of any strictly ascending, possibly transfinite, chain. Then we have the following result.

► **Theorem 2.2** (Kleene's iteration [17]). *Let L be a complete lattice and let $f: L \rightarrow L$ be a monotone function. Consider the (transfinite) ascending chain $(f^\beta(\perp))_\beta$ where β ranges over the ordinals, defined by $f^0(\perp) = \perp$, $f^{\alpha+1}(\perp) = f(f^\alpha(\perp))$ for any ordinal α and $f^\alpha(\perp) = \bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} f^\beta(\perp)$ for any limit ordinal α . Then $\mu f = f^\gamma(\perp)$ for some ordinal $\gamma \leq \lambda_L$. The greatest fixpoint νf can be characterised dually, via the (transfinite) descending chain $(f^\alpha(\top))_\alpha$.*

Given a complete lattice L , a subset $X \subseteq L$ is *directed* if $X \neq \emptyset$ and every pair of elements in X has an upper bound in X . If L, L' are complete lattices, a function $f: L \rightarrow L'$ is (*directed-*)*continuous* if for any directed set $X \subseteq L$ it holds that $f(\bigsqcup X) = \bigsqcup f(X)$. The function f is called *strict* if $f(\perp) = \perp$. *Co-continuity* and *co-strictness* are defined dually.

► **Definition 2.3** (Galois connection). *Let (C, \sqsubseteq) , (A, \leq) be complete lattices. A Galois connection (or adjunction) is a pair of monotone functions $\langle \alpha, \gamma \rangle$ such that $\alpha : C \rightarrow A$, $\gamma : A \rightarrow C$ and for all $a \in A$ and $c \in C$ it holds that $\alpha(c) \leq a$ iff $c \sqsubseteq \gamma(a)$.*

Equivalently, for all $a \in A$ and $c \in C$, (i) $c \sqsubseteq \gamma(\alpha(c))$ and (ii) $\alpha(\gamma(a)) \leq a$. In this case we will write $\langle \alpha, \gamma \rangle : C \rightarrow A$. The Galois connection is called an insertion when $\alpha \circ \gamma = id_A$.

For a Galois connection $\langle \alpha, \gamma \rangle : C \rightarrow A$, the function α is called the left (or lower) adjoint and γ the right (or upper) adjoint. The left adjoint α preserves all joins and the right adjoint γ preserves all meets. Hence, in particular, the left adjoint is strict and continuous, while the right adjoint is co-strict and co-continuous.

A function $f : L \rightarrow L$ is *idempotent* if $f \circ f = f$ and *extensive* if $l \sqsubseteq f(l)$ for all $l \in L$. When f is monotone, extensive and idempotent it is called an (*upper*) *closure*. In this case, $\langle f, i \rangle : L \rightarrow f(L)$, where i is the inclusion, is an insertion and $f(L) = \{f(l) \mid l \in L\}$ is a complete lattice.

We will often consider tuples of elements. Given a set A , an n -tuple in A^n is denoted by a boldface letter \mathbf{a} and its components are denoted as $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$. For an index $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we write \underline{n} for the integer interval $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Given $\mathbf{a} \in A^n$ and $i, j \in \underline{n}$ we write $\mathbf{a}_{i,j}$ for the subtuple $(a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_j)$. The empty tuple is denoted by $()$. Given two tuples $\mathbf{a} \in A^m$ and $\mathbf{a}' \in A^n$ we denote by $\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}' \rangle$ or simply by $\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}'$ their concatenation in A^{m+n} .

Given a complete lattice (L, \sqsubseteq) we will denote by (L^n, \sqsubseteq) the set of n -tuples endowed with the *pointwise order* defined, for $\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}' \in L^n$, by $\mathbf{l} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{l}'$ if $l_i \sqsubseteq l'_i$ for all $i \in \underline{n}$. The structure (L^n, \sqsubseteq) is a complete lattice. More generally, for any set X , the set of functions $L^X = \{f \mid f : X \rightarrow L\}$, endowed with pointwise order, is a complete lattice.

A tuple of functions $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_m)$ with $f_i : X \rightarrow Y$, will be seen itself as a function $\mathbf{f} : X \rightarrow Y^m$, defined by $\mathbf{f}(x) = (f_1(x), \dots, f_m(x))$. We will also need to consider the *product function* $\mathbf{f}^\times : X^m \rightarrow Y^m$, defined by $\mathbf{f}^\times(x_1, \dots, x_m) = (f_1(x_1), \dots, f_m(x_m))$.

3 Systems of Fixpoint Equations over Complete Lattices

We deal with systems of (fixpoint) equations over some complete lattice, where, for each equation one can be interested either in the least or in the greatest solution. We define systems, their solutions and we provide some examples that will be used as running examples.

► **Definition 3.1** (system of equations). *Let L be a complete lattice. A system of equations E over L is an ordered list of m equations of the form $x_i =_{\eta_i} f_i(x_1, \dots, x_m)$, where $f_i : L^m \rightarrow L$ are monotone functions (with respect to the pointwise order on L^m) and $\eta_i \in \{\mu, \nu\}$. The system will often be denoted as $\mathbf{x} =_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$, where \mathbf{x} , $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ and \mathbf{f} are the obvious tuples. We denote by \emptyset the system with no equations.*

Systems of this kind have been often considered in connection to verification problems (see e.g., [11, 43, 21, 2]). In particular, [21, 2] work on general classes of complete lattices.

Note that \mathbf{f} can be seen as a function $\mathbf{f} : L^m \rightarrow L^m$. The solution of the system is a selected fixpoint of such function. We first need some auxiliary notation.

► **Definition 3.2** (substitution). *Given a system E of m equations over a complete lattice L of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$, an index $i \in \underline{m}$ and $l \in L$ we write $E[x_i := l]$ for the system of $m - 1$ equations obtained from E by removing the i -th equation and replacing x_i by l in the other equations, i.e., if $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}'x_i\mathbf{x}''$, $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \boldsymbol{\eta}'\eta_i\boldsymbol{\eta}''$ and $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{f}'f_i\mathbf{f}''$ then $E[x_i := l]$ is $\mathbf{x}'x'' =_{\boldsymbol{\eta}'\boldsymbol{\eta}''} \mathbf{f}'\mathbf{f}''(\mathbf{x}', l, \mathbf{x}'')$.*

For solving a system of m equations $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$, the last variable x_m is considered as a fixed parameter x and the system of $m - 1$ equations $E[x_m := x]$ that arises from dropping the last equation is recursively solved. This produces an $(m - 1)$ -tuple parametric on x , i.e., we get $\mathbf{s}_{1,m-1}(x) = \text{sol}(E[x_m := x])$. Inserting this parametric solution into the last equation, we get an equation in a single variable $x =_{\eta_m} f_m(\mathbf{s}_{1,m-1}(x), x)$ that can be solved by taking for the function $\lambda x. f_m(\mathbf{s}_{1,m-1}(x), x)$, the least or greatest fixpoint, depending on whether the last equation is a μ - or ν -equation. This provides the m -th component of the solution $s_m = \eta_m(\lambda x. f_m(\mathbf{s}_{1,m-1}(x), x))$. The remaining components are obtained inserting s_m in the parametric solution $\mathbf{s}_{1,m-1}(x)$ previously computed, i.e., $\mathbf{s}_{1,m-1} = \mathbf{s}_{1,m-1}(s_m)$.

► **Definition 3.3** (solution). *Let L be a complete lattice and let E be a system of m equations over L of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$. The solution of E , denoted $\text{sol}(E) \in L^m$, is defined inductively:*

$$\text{sol}(\emptyset) = () \quad \text{sol}(E) = (\text{sol}(E[x_m := s_m]), s_m)$$

where $s_m = \eta_m(\lambda x. f_m(\text{sol}(E[x_m := x]), x))$.

In words, for solving a system of m equations, the last variable is considered as a fixed parameter x and the system of $m - 1$ equations that arises from dropping the last equation is recursively solved. This produces an $(m - 1)$ -tuple parametric on x , i.e., we get $\mathbf{s}_{1,m-1}(x) = \text{sol}(E[x_m := x])$. Inserting this parametric solution into the last equation, we get an equation in a single variable

$$x =_{\eta_m} f_m(\mathbf{s}_{1,m-1}(x), x)$$

that can be solved by taking for the function $\lambda x. f_m(\mathbf{s}_{1,m-1}(x), x)$, the least or greatest fixpoint, depending on whether the last equation is a μ - or ν -equation. This provides the m -th component of the solution $s_m = \eta_m(\lambda x. f_m(\mathbf{s}_{1,m-1}(x), x))$. The remaining components of the solution are obtained inserting s_m in the parametric solution $\mathbf{s}_{1,m-1}(x)$ previously computed, i.e., $\mathbf{s}_{1,m-1} = \mathbf{s}_{1,m-1}(s_m)$.

The order of equations matters: changing the order typically leads to a different solution.

► **Example 3.4** (solving a simple system of equations). Consider the powerset lattice $\mathbf{2}^S$ of any non-empty set S and the system of equations E consisting of the following two equations


$$\begin{aligned} x &=_{\mu} x \cup y \\ y &=_{\nu} x \cap y \end{aligned}$$

In order to solve the system E , initially we need to compute the solution of the first equation $x =_{\mu} x \cup y$ parametric in y , that is, $s_x(y) = \mu(\lambda x. (x \cup y)) = y$. Now we can solve the second equation $y =_{\nu} x \cap y$ replacing x with the parametric solution, obtaining an equation in a single variable whose solution is $\nu(\lambda y. (s_x(y) \cap y)) = \nu(\lambda y. y) = S$. Finally, the solution of the first equation is obtained by inserting $y = S$ in the parametric solution $x = s_x(S) = S$.

Observe that even in this simple example the order of the equations matters. Indeed, if we consider the system where the two equations above are swapped the solution is $x = y = \emptyset$.

► **Example 3.5** (μ -calculus formulae as fixpoint equations). We adopt a standard μ -calculus syntax. For fixed disjoint sets $PVar$ of propositional variables, ranged over by x, y, z, \dots and $Prop$ of propositional symbols, ranged over by p, q, r, \dots , formulae are defined by

$$\varphi ::= \mathbf{t} \mid \mathbf{f} \mid p \mid x \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \Box \varphi \mid \Diamond \varphi \mid \eta x. \varphi$$



■ Figure 1

where $p \in Prop$, $x \in PVar$ and $\eta \in \{\mu, \nu\}$.

The semantics of a formula is given with respect to an unlabelled transition system (or Kripke structure) $T = (\mathbb{S}_T, \rightarrow_T)$ where \mathbb{S}_T is the set of states and $\rightarrow_T \subseteq \mathbb{S}_T \times \mathbb{S}_T$ is the transition relation. Given a formula φ and an environment $\rho: Prop \cup PVar \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{S}_T}$ mapping each proposition or propositional variable to the set of states where it holds, we denote by $\|\varphi\|_\rho^T$ the semantics of φ defined as usual (see, e.g., [9]).

As observed by several authors (see, e.g., [11, 43]), a μ -calculus formula can be seen as a system of equations, with an equation for each fixpoint subformula. For instance, consider $\varphi = \mu x_2.((\nu x_1.(p \wedge \Box x_1)) \vee \Diamond x_2)$ that requires that a state is eventually reached from which p always holds. The equational form is reported in Fig. 1c. Consider a transition system $T = (\mathbb{S}_T, \rightarrow_T)$ where $\mathbb{S}_T = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and \rightarrow_T is as depicted in Fig. 1a, with p that holds in the grey states b, d and e . Define the semantic counterpart of the modal operators as follows: given a relation $R \subseteq X \times X$ let $\blacklozenge_R, \blacksquare_R: 2^X \rightarrow 2^X$ be the functions defined, for $Y \subseteq X$, by $\blacklozenge_R(Y) = \{x \in X \mid \exists y \in Y. (x, y) \in R\}$, $\blacksquare_R(Y) = \{x \in X \mid \forall y \in X. (x, y) \in R \Rightarrow y \in Y\}$. Then the formula φ interpreted over the transition system T leads to the system of equations over the lattice $2^{\mathbb{S}_T}$ in Fig. 1d, where we write \blacklozenge_T and \blacksquare_T for $\blacklozenge_{\rightarrow_T}$ and $\blacksquare_{\rightarrow_T}$.

The solution is $x_1 = \{b, d, e\}$ (states where p always holds) and $x_2 = \{a, b, d, e\}$ (states where the formula φ holds).

► **Example 3.6** (Łukasiewicz μ -terms). Systems of equations over the real interval $[0, 1]$ have been considered in [35] as a precursor to model-checking PCTL or probabilistic μ -calculi. More precisely, the authors study a fixpoint extension of Łukasiewicz logic, referred to as Łukasiewicz μ -terms, whose syntax is as follows:

$$t ::= \mathbf{1} \mid \mathbf{0} \mid x \mid r \cdot t \mid t \sqcup t \mid t \sqcap t \mid t \oplus t \mid t \odot t \mid \eta x.t$$


where $x \in PVar$ is a variable (ranging over $[0, 1]$), $r \in [0, 1]$ and $\eta \in \{\mu, \nu\}$. The various syntactic operators have a semantic counterpart, given in Fig. 2a.

Then, each Łukasiewicz μ -term, in an environment $\rho: PVar \rightarrow [0, 1]$, can be assigned a semantics which is a real number in $[0, 1]$, denoted as $\|t\|_\rho$. Exactly as for the μ -calculus, a Łukasiewicz μ -term can be naturally seen as a system of fixpoint equations over the lattice $[0, 1]$. For instance, the term $\nu x_2. (\mu x_1. (\frac{5}{8} \oplus \frac{3}{8} x_2) \odot (\frac{1}{2} \sqcup (\frac{3}{8} \oplus \frac{1}{2} x_1)))$ from an example in [35], can be written as the system:

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= \mu \left(\frac{5}{8} \oplus \frac{3}{8} x_2 \right) \odot \left(\frac{1}{2} \sqcup \left(\frac{3}{8} \oplus \frac{1}{2} x_1 \right) \right) \\ x_2 &= \nu x_1 \end{aligned}$$

► **Example 3.7** (Łukasiewicz μ -calculus). The Łukasiewicz μ -calculus, as defined in [35], extends the Łukasiewicz μ -terms with propositions and modal operators. The syntax is as follows:

$$\varphi ::= p \mid \bar{p} \mid r \cdot \varphi \mid \varphi \sqcup \varphi \mid \varphi \sqcap \varphi \mid \varphi \oplus \varphi \mid \varphi \odot \varphi \mid \blacklozenge \varphi \mid \blacksquare \varphi \mid \eta x.t$$



■ **Figure 2**

where x ranges in a set $PVar$ of propositional variables, p ranges in a set $Prop$ of propositional symbols, each paired with an associated complement \bar{p} , and $\eta \in \{\mu, \nu\}$.

The Łukasiewicz μ -calculus can be seen as a logic for probabilistic transition systems. It extends the quantitative modal μ -calculus of [32, 25] and it allows to encode PCTL [5]. For a finite set \mathbb{S} , the set of (discrete) probability distributions over \mathbb{S} is defined as $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{S}) = \{d : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow [0, 1] \mid \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} d(s) = 1\}$. A formula is interpreted over a *probabilistic non-deterministic transition system (PNDT)* $N = (\mathbb{S}, \rightarrow)$ where $\rightarrow \subseteq \mathbb{S} \times \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{S})$ is the transition relation. An example of PNDT can be found in Fig. 2b. Imagine that the aim is to reach state b . State a has two transitions. A “lucky” one where the probability to get to b is $\frac{1}{3}$ and an “unlucky” one where b is reached with probability $\frac{1}{6}$. For both transitions, with probability $\frac{1}{3}$ one gets back to a and then, with the residual probability, one moves to c . Once in states b or c , the system remains in the same state with probability 1.

Given a formula φ and an environment $\rho : Prop \cup PVar \rightarrow (\mathbb{S} \rightarrow [0, 1])$ mapping each proposition or propositional variable to a real-valued function over the states, the semantics of φ is a function $\|\varphi\|_\rho^N : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ defined as expected using the semantic operators. In addition to those already discussed, we have the semantic operators for the complement and the modalities: for $v : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$

$$\bar{v}(x) = 1 - v(x) \quad \blacklozenge_N(v)(x) = \max_{x \rightarrow d} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{S}} d(y) \cdot v(y) \quad \blacksquare_N(v)(x) = \min_{x \rightarrow d} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{S}} d(y) \cdot v(y)$$

As it happens for the propositional μ -calculus, also formulas of the Łukasiewicz μ -calculus can be seen as systems of equations, but on a different complete lattice, i.e., $[0, 1]^{\mathbb{S}}$. For instance, consider the formulas $\varphi = \mu x_2.(\nu x_1.(p \odot \Box x_1) \oplus \Diamond x_2)$ and $\varphi' = \mu x_2.(\nu x_1.(p \odot \Box x_1) \oplus \Box x_2)$, rendered as (syntactic) equations in Fig. 2c. Roughly speaking, they capture the probability of eventually satisfying forever p , with an angelic scheduler and a daemon one, choosing at each step the best or worst transition, respectively. Assuming that p holds with probability 1 on b and 0 on a and c , we have $\|\varphi\|_\rho(a) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\|\varphi'\|_\rho(a) = \frac{1}{4}$.

► **Example 3.8** ((bi)similarity over transition systems). For defining (bi)similarity uniformly with the example on μ -calculus, we work on unlabelled transition systems with atoms $T = (\mathbb{S}, \rightarrow, A)$ where $A \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{S}}$ is a fixed set of atomic properties over the states. Everything can be easily adapted to labelled transition systems.

Given $T = (\mathbb{S}, \rightarrow, A)$, consider the lattice of relations on \mathbb{S} , namely $\text{Rel}(\mathbb{S}) = (2^{\mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S}}, \subseteq)$. We take as basis the set of singletons $B_{\text{Rel}(\mathbb{S})} = \{\{(x, y)\} \mid x, y \in \mathbb{S}\}$. The *similarity relation* on T , denoted \preceq_T , is the greatest fixpoint of the function $\text{sim}_T : \text{Rel}(\mathbb{S}) \rightarrow \text{Rel}(\mathbb{S})$, defined by

$$\text{sim}_T(R) = \{ (x, y) \in R \mid \forall a \in A. (x \in a \Rightarrow y \in a) \wedge \forall x \rightarrow x'. \exists y \rightarrow y'. (x', y') \in R \}$$

In other words it can be seen as the solution of a system consisting of a single greatest fixpoint equation $x =_\nu \text{sim}_T(x)$.

For instance, consider the transition system T in Fig. 1a and take $p = \{b, d, e\}$ as the only atom. Then similarity \lesssim_T is the transitive reflexive closure of $\{(c, a), (a, b), (b, d), (d, e), (e, b)\}$.

Bisimilarity \sim_T can be obtained analogously as the greatest fixpoint of $bis_T(R) = sim_T(R) \cap sim_T(R^{-1})$. In the transition system T above, bisimilarity \sim_T is the least equivalence such that $b \sim_T d \sim_T e$.

4 Approximation for Systems of Fixpoint Equations

In this section we design a theory of approximation for systems of fixpoint equations over complete lattices. The general setup is borrowed from abstract interpretation [13, 14], where a concrete domain C and an abstract domain A are fixed. Semantic operators on the concrete domain C have a counterpart in the abstract domain A , and suitable conditions can be imposed on such operators to ensure that the least fixpoints of the abstract operators are sound and/or complete approximations of the fixpoints of their concrete counterparts.

Similarly, here we will have a system of equations $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}^C(\mathbf{x})$ over a concrete domain C and its abstract counterpart $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}^A(\mathbf{x})$ over an abstract domain A , and we want that the solution of the latter provides an approximation of the solution of the former.

Let us first focus on the case of a single equation. Let (C, \sqsubseteq) and (A, \leq) be complete lattices and let $f^C : C \rightarrow C$ and $f^A : A \rightarrow A$ be monotone functions. The fact that f^A is a sound (over)approximation of f^C can be formulated in terms of a concretisation function $\gamma : A \rightarrow C$, that maps each abstract element $a \in A$ to a concrete element $\gamma(a) \in C$, for which, intuitively, a is an overapproximation. In the setting of abstract interpretation, where the interest is for program semantics, typically expressed in terms of least fixpoints, the desired *soundness* property is $\mu f^C \sqsubseteq \gamma(\mu f^A)$. A standard sufficient condition for soundness (see [13, 14, 34]) is $f^C \circ \gamma \sqsubseteq \gamma \circ f^A$. The same condition ensures soundness also for greatest fixpoints, i.e., $\nu f^C \sqsubseteq \gamma(\nu f^A)$, provided that γ is co-continuous and co-strict (see, e.g., [15, Proposition 15], which states the dual result). For clarity we state this result explicitly in the appendix (see Lemma A.1(1)).

Then we can suitably combine the conditions for least and greatest fixpoints. We will allow a different concretisation function for each equation.

► **Theorem 4.1** (sound concretisation for systems). *Let (C, \sqsubseteq) and (A, \leq) be complete lattices, let E_C of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}^C(\mathbf{x})$ and E_A of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}^A(\mathbf{x})$ be systems of m equations over C and A , with solutions $\mathbf{s}^C \in C^m$ and $\mathbf{s}^A \in A^m$, respectively. Let γ be an m -tuple of monotone functions, with $\gamma_i : A \rightarrow C$ for $i \in \underline{m}$. If γ satisfies $\mathbf{f}^C \circ \gamma^{\times} \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\times} \circ \mathbf{f}^A$ with γ_i co-continuous and co-strict for each $i \in \underline{m}$ such that $\eta_i = \nu$, then $\mathbf{s}^C \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\times}(\mathbf{s}^A)$.*

The standard abstract interpretation framework of [17] relies on Galois connections: concretisation functions γ are right adjoints, whose left adjoint, the abstraction function α , intuitively maps each concrete element in C to its “best” overapproximation in A . When $\langle \alpha, \gamma \rangle$ is a Galois connection, α is automatically continuous and strict, while γ is co-continuous and co-strict. This leads to the following result, where, besides the soundness conditions, we also make explicit the completeness conditions.

► **Theorem 4.2** (abstraction via Galois connections). *Let (C, \sqsubseteq) and (A, \leq) be complete lattices, let E_C of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}^C(\mathbf{x})$ and E_A of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}^A(\mathbf{x})$ be systems of m equations over C and A , with solutions $\mathbf{s}^C \in C^m$ and $\mathbf{s}^A \in A^m$, respectively. Let α and γ be m -tuples of monotone functions, with $\langle \alpha_i, \gamma_i \rangle : C \rightarrow A$ a Galois connection for each $i \in \underline{m}$.*

1. Soundness: *If γ satisfies $\mathbf{f}^C \circ \gamma^{\times} \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\times} \circ \mathbf{f}^A$ or equivalently α satisfies $\alpha^{\times} \circ \mathbf{f}^C \leq \mathbf{f}^A \circ \alpha^{\times}$, then $\alpha^{\times}(\mathbf{s}^C) \leq \mathbf{s}^A$ (equivalent to $\mathbf{s}^C \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\times}(\mathbf{s}^A)$).*

2. Completeness (for abstraction): If α satisfies $\mathbf{f}^A \circ \alpha^\times \leq \alpha^\times \circ \mathbf{f}^C$ with α_i co-continuous and co-strict for each $i \in \underline{m}$ such that $\eta_i = \nu$, then $\mathbf{s}^A \leq \alpha^\times(\mathbf{s}^C)$.
3. Completeness (for concretisation): If γ satisfies $\gamma^\times \circ \mathbf{f}^A \sqsubseteq \mathbf{f}^C \circ \gamma^\times$ with γ_i continuous and strict for each $i \in \underline{m}$ such that $\eta_i = \mu$, then $\gamma^\times(\mathbf{s}^A) \sqsubseteq \mathbf{s}^C$.

Completeness for the abstraction, i.e., $\mathbf{s}^A \leq \alpha^\times(\mathbf{s}^C)$, together with soundness, leads to $\alpha^\times(\mathbf{s}^C) = \mathbf{s}^A$. This is a rare but very pleasant situation in which the abstraction does not lose any information as far as the abstract properties are concerned. We remark that here the notion of “completeness” slightly deviates from the standard abstract interpretation terminology where soundness is normally indispensable, and thus complete abstractions (see, e.g., [19]) are, by default, also sound.

Moreover, completeness for the concretisation is normally of limited interest in abstract interpretation. Alone, it states that the abstract solution is an underapproximation of the concrete one, while typically the interest is for overapproximations. Together with soundness, it leads to $\mathbf{s}^C = \gamma^\times(\mathbf{s}^A)$, a very strong property which is not meaningful in program analysis. In our case, keeping the concepts of soundness and completeness separated and considering also completeness for the concretisation is helpful in some cases, especially when dealing with up-to functions, which are designed to provide underapproximations of fixpoints.

As in the standard abstract interpretation framework, dealing with Galois connections, we can consider the best (smallest) sound abstraction of the concrete system in the abstract domain.

► **Definition 4.3** (best abstraction). *Let (C, \sqsubseteq) and (A, \leq) be complete lattices, let E_C be a system of m equations over C of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_\eta \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$. Let α and γ be m -tuples of monotone functions, with $\langle \alpha_i, \gamma_i \rangle : C \rightarrow A$ a Galois connection for each $i \in \underline{m}$. The best abstraction of E_C is the system over A defined by $\mathbf{x} =_\eta \mathbf{f}^\#(\mathbf{x})$, where $\mathbf{f}^\# = \alpha^\times \circ \mathbf{f} \circ \gamma^\times$.*

Standard arguments shows that $\mathbf{f}^\#$ is a sound abstraction of \mathbf{f} over A , and it is the smallest one.

Moreover, sound abstract operators can be obtained compositionally out of basic ones, preserving soundness.

► **Example 4.4** (abstraction for the μ -calculus). The paper [31] observes that (bi)simulations over transition systems can be seen as Galois connections and interpreted as abstractions. Then it characterises fragments of the μ -calculus which are preserved and strongly preserved by the abstraction. We next discuss how this can be derived as an instance of our framework.

Let $T_C = (\mathbb{S}_C, \rightarrow_C)$ and $T_A = (\mathbb{S}_A, \rightarrow_A)$ be transition systems and let $\langle \alpha, \gamma \rangle : \mathbf{2}^{\mathbb{S}_C} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^{\mathbb{S}_A}$ be a Galois connection. It is a *simulation*, according to [31], if it satisfies the following condition: $\alpha \circ \blacklozenge_{T_C} \circ \gamma \subseteq \blacklozenge_{T_A}$. In this case T_A is called a $\langle \alpha, \gamma \rangle$ -*abstraction* of T_C , written $T_C \sqsubseteq_{\langle \alpha, \gamma \rangle} T_A$. This can be shown to be equivalent to the ordinary notion of simulation between transition systems [31, Propositions 9 and 10]. In particular, if $R \subseteq \mathbb{S}_C \times \mathbb{S}_A$ is a simulation in the ordinary sense then one can consider $\langle \blacklozenge_{R^{-1}}, \blacksquare_R \rangle : \mathbf{2}^{\mathbb{S}_C} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^{\mathbb{S}_A}$, where $\blacklozenge_{R^{-1}}$ is the function $\blacklozenge_{R^{-1}}(X) = \{y \in \mathbb{S}_A \mid \exists x \in X. (x, y) \in R\}$. This is a Galois connection (in the abstract interpretation setting $\blacklozenge_{R^{-1}}$ and \blacksquare_R are often denoted \widetilde{pre}_R and $post_R$, respectively [12]) inducing a simulation in the above sense, i.e., $\blacklozenge_{R^{-1}} \circ \blacklozenge_{T_C} \circ \blacksquare_R \subseteq \blacklozenge_{T_A}$.

When $T_C \sqsubseteq_{\langle \alpha, \gamma \rangle} T_A$, by [31, Theorem 2], one has that α “preserves” the $\mu\blacklozenge$ -calculus, i.e., the fragment of the μ -calculus without \square operators. More precisely, for any formula φ of the $\mu\blacklozenge$ -calculus, we have $\alpha(\|\varphi\|_\rho^{T_C}) \subseteq \|\varphi\|_{\alpha \circ \rho}^{T_A}$. This means that for each $s_C \in \mathbb{S}_C$, if s_C satisfies φ in the concrete system, then all the states in $\alpha(\{s_C\})$ satisfy φ in the abstract system, provided that each proposition p is interpreted in A with $\alpha(\rho(p))$, the abstraction of its interpretation in C .

This can be obtained as an easy consequence of Theorem 4.2, where we use the same function α as an abstraction for all equations. The condition $\alpha \circ \blacklozenge_{T_C} \circ \gamma \subseteq \blacklozenge_{T_A}$ above can be rewritten as $\alpha \circ \blacklozenge_{T_C} \subseteq \blacklozenge_{T_A} \circ \alpha$ which is the soundness condition $(\alpha^\times \circ \mathbf{f}^C \leq \mathbf{f}^A \circ \alpha^\times)$ in Theorem 4.2 for the semantics of the diamond operator. For the other operators the soundness condition is trivially shown to hold. In fact,

- for \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{f} we have $\alpha(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ and $\alpha(\mathbb{S}_C) \subseteq \mathbb{S}_A$;
- for \wedge and \vee we have $\alpha(X \cup Y) = \alpha(X) \cup \alpha(Y)$ and $\alpha(X \cap Y) \subseteq \alpha(X) \cap \alpha(Y)$;
- a proposition p represents the constant function $\rho(p)$ in T_C and $\alpha(\rho(p))$ in T_A .

In order to extend the logic by including negation on propositions, in [31], an additional condition is required, called *consistency* of the abstraction with respect to the interpretation: $\alpha(\rho(p)) \cap \alpha(\overline{\rho(p)}) = \emptyset$, for all p . This is easily seen to be equivalent to $\alpha(\overline{\rho(p)}) \subseteq \overline{\alpha(\rho(p))}$ which is the soundness condition $(\alpha^\times \circ \mathbf{f}^C \leq \mathbf{f}^A \circ \alpha^\times)$ in Theorem 4.2 for negated propositions.

Our theory naturally suggests generalisations of [31]. E.g., by (the dual of) Theorem 4.1, continuity and strictness of the abstraction α are sufficient to retain the results, hence one could deal with an abstraction not being an adjoint, thus going beyond ordinary simulations.

► **Example 4.5** (abstraction for Łukasiewicz μ -terms). For Łukasiewicz μ -terms, as introduced in Example 3.6, leading to systems of fixpoint equations over the reals, we can consider as an abstraction a form of discretisation: for some fixed n define the abstract domain $[0, 1]_{/n} = \{0\} \cup \{k/n \mid k \in \underline{n}\}$ and the insertion $\langle \alpha_n, \gamma_n \rangle : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]_{/n}$ with α_n defined by $\alpha_n(x) = \lceil n \cdot x \rceil / n$ and γ_n the inclusion. We can consider for all operators op , their best abstraction $op^\# = \alpha_n \circ op \circ \gamma_n^\times$, thus getting a sound abstraction.

Note that for all semantic operators, $op^\#$ is the restriction of op to the abstract domain, with the exception of $r \cdot^\# x = \alpha_n(r \cdot x)$ for $x \in [0, 1]_{/n}$. Moreover, for $x, y \in [0, 1]$ we have

- $\alpha_n(\mathbf{0}(x)) = \mathbf{0}^\#(\alpha_n(x))$, $\alpha_n(\mathbf{1}(x)) = \mathbf{1}^\#(\alpha_n(x))$;
- $\alpha_n(r \cdot x) \leq r \cdot^\# \alpha_n(x)$;
- $\alpha_n(x \sqcup y) = \alpha_n(x) \sqcup^\# \alpha_n(y)$, $\alpha_n(x \sqcap y) = \alpha_n(x) \sqcap^\# \alpha_n(y)$;
- $\alpha_n(x \oplus y) \leq \alpha_n(x) \oplus^\# \alpha_n(y)$, $\alpha_n(x \odot y) \leq \alpha_n(x) \odot^\# \alpha_n(y)$ since $\alpha_n(x+y) \leq \alpha_n(x) + \alpha_n(y)$ i.e., the abstraction is complete for $\mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{1}$, \sqcup , \sqcap , while it is just sound for the remaining operators.

For instance, the system in Example 3.6 can be shown to have solution $x_1 = x_2 = 0.2$. With abstraction α_{10} we get $x_1 = x_2 = 0.8$, with a more precise abstraction α_{100} we get $x_1 = x_2 = 0.22$ and with α_{1000} we get $x_1 = x_2 = 0.201$.

► **Example 4.6** (abstraction for Łukasiewicz μ -calculus). Although space limitations prevent a detailed discussion, observe that when dealing with Łukasiewicz μ -calculus over some probabilistic transition system $N = (\mathbb{S}, \rightarrow)$, we can lift the Galois insertion above to $[0, 1]^\mathbb{S}$. Define $\alpha_n^\rightarrow : [0, 1]^\mathbb{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]_{/n}^\mathbb{S}$ by letting, $\alpha_n^\rightarrow(v) = \alpha_n \circ v$ for $v \in [0, 1]^\mathbb{S}$. Then $\langle \alpha_n^\rightarrow, \gamma_n^\rightarrow \rangle : [0, 1]^\mathbb{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]_{/n}^\mathbb{S}$, where γ_n^\rightarrow is the inclusion, is a Galois insertion and, as in the previous case, we can consider the best abstraction for the operators of the Łukasiewicz μ -calculus.

For instance, consider the system for φ' in Example 3.7. Recall that the exact solution is $x_2(a) = 0.25$. With abstraction α_{10} we get $x_2(a) = 0.3$, with α_{15} we get $x_2(a) = 0.2\bar{6}$.

5 Up-To Techniques

Up-to techniques have been shown effective in easing the proof of properties of greatest fixpoints. Originally proposed for coinductive behavioural equivalences [33, 40], they have been later studied in the setting of complete lattices [36, 37]. Some recent work [6] started the exploration of the relation between up-to techniques and abstract interpretation. Roughly,

they work in a setting where the semantic function of interest $f^* : L \rightarrow L$ admits a left adjoint $f_* : L \rightarrow L$, the intuition being that f^* and f_* are predicate transformers mapping a condition into, respectively, its strongest postcondition and weakest precondition. Then complete abstractions for f^* and sound up-to functions for f_* are shown to coincide. This has a natural interpretation in our game theoretic framework, as discussed in §6.2.

Here we take another view. We work with general semantic functions and, in §5.1, we first argue that up-to techniques can be naturally interpreted as abstractions where the concretisation is complete (and sound, if the up-to function is a closure). Then, in §5.2 we can smoothly extend up-to techniques from a single fixpoint to systems of fixpoint equations.

5.1 Up-To Techniques as Abstractions

The general idea of up-to techniques is as follows. Given a monotone function $f : L \rightarrow L$ one is interested in the greatest fixpoint νf . In general, the aim is to establish whether some given element of the lattice $l \in L$ is under the fixpoint, i.e., if $l \sqsubseteq \nu f$. In turn, since by Tarski's Theorem, $\nu f = \bigsqcup \{x \mid x \sqsubseteq f(x)\}$, this amounts to proving that l is under some post-fixpoint l' , i.e., $l \sqsubseteq l' \sqsubseteq f(l')$. For instance, consider the function $bis_T : \text{Rel}(\mathbb{S}) \rightarrow \text{Rel}(\mathbb{S})$ for bisimilarity on a transition system T in Example 3.8. Given two states $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{S}$, proving $\{(s_1, s_2)\} \subseteq \nu bis_T$, i.e., showing the two states bisimilar, amounts to finding a post-fixpoint, i.e., a relation R such that $R \subseteq bis_T(R)$ (namely, a bisimulation) such that $\{(s_1, s_2)\} \subseteq R$.

► **Definition 5.1** (up-to function). *Let L be a complete lattice and let $f : L \rightarrow L$ be a monotone function. A sound up-to function for f is any monotone function $u : L \rightarrow L$ such that $\nu(f \circ u) \sqsubseteq \nu f$. It is called complete if also the converse inequality $\nu f \sqsubseteq \nu(f \circ u)$ holds.*

When u is sound, if l is a post-fixpoint of $f \circ u$, i.e., $l \sqsubseteq f(u(l))$ we have $l \sqsubseteq \nu(f \circ u) \sqsubseteq \nu f$. The idea is that the characteristics of u should make it easier to prove that l is a postfix-point of $f \circ u$ than proving that it is for f . This is clearly the case when u is extensive. In fact by extensiveness of u and monotonicity of f we get $f(l) \sqsubseteq f(u(l))$ and thus obtaining $l \sqsubseteq f(u(l))$ is “easier” than obtaining $l \sqsubseteq f(l)$. Note that extensiveness also implies “completeness” of the up-to function: since $f \sqsubseteq f \circ u$ clearly $\nu f \sqsubseteq \nu(f \circ u)$. We remark that for up-to functions, since the interest is for underapproximating fixpoints, the terms soundness and completeness are somehow reversed with respect to their meaning in abstract interpretation.

A common sufficient condition ensuring soundness of up-to functions is compatibility [36].

► **Definition 5.2** (compatibility). *Let L be a complete lattice and let $f : L \rightarrow L$ be a monotone function. A monotone function $u : L \rightarrow L$ is f -compatible if $u \circ f \sqsubseteq f \circ u$.*

The soundness of an f -compatible up-to function u can be proved by viewing it as an abstraction. When u is a closure (i.e., extensive and idempotent), $u(L)$ is a complete lattice that can be seen as an abstract domain in a way that $\langle u, i \rangle : L \rightarrow u(L)$, with i being the inclusion, is a Galois insertion. Moreover $f|_{u(L)}$ can be shown to provide an abstraction of both f and $f \circ u$ over L , sound and complete with respect to the inclusion i , seen as the concretisation. The formal details are given below. Since we later aim to apply up-to techniques to systems of equations, we deal with not only greatest but also least fixpoints.

► **Lemma 5.3** (compatible up-to functions as sound and complete abstractions). *Let $f : L \rightarrow L$ be a monotone function and let $u : L \rightarrow L$ be an f -compatible closure. Consider the Galois insertion $\langle u, i \rangle : L \rightarrow u(L)$ where $i : u(L) \rightarrow L$ is the inclusion. Then*

1. f restricts to $u(L)$, i.e., $f|_{u(L)} : u(L) \rightarrow u(L)$;
2. $\nu f = i(\nu f|_{u(L)}) = \nu(f \circ u)$. If u is continuous and strict then $\mu f = i(\mu f|_{u(L)}) = \mu(f \circ u)$.

$$f \circ u \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ \hookrightarrow \end{array} L \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{i} \\ \xrightarrow{u} \end{array} u(L) \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowleft \\ \hookleftarrow \end{array} f_{|u(L)}$$

When the up-to function is just f -compatible (hence sound), but possibly not a closure, we canonically turn u into an f -compatible closure (hence sound and complete) by taking the least closure \bar{u} above u .

► **Definition 5.4** (least upper closure). *Let L be a complete lattice and let $u : L \rightarrow L$ be a monotone function. We let $\bar{u} : L \rightarrow L$ be the function defined by $\bar{u}(x) = \mu(\hat{u}_x)$ where $\hat{u}_x(y) = u(y) \sqcup x$.*

► **Lemma 5.5** (properties of \bar{u}). *Let $u : L \rightarrow L$ be a monotone function. Then*

1. \bar{u} is the least closure larger than u ;
2. if u is f -compatible then \bar{u} is;
3. if u is continuous and strict then \bar{u} is.

The least upper closure above a given function has been considered already in [16], with a slightly different construction.

Using Lemmas 5.3 and 5.5, whenever u is a compatible up-to function for f , we have that \bar{u} is a sound and complete up-to function for f . The soundness of u then immediately follows.

► **Corollary 5.6** (soundness of compatible up-to functions). *Let $f : L \rightarrow L$ be a monotone function, let $u : L \rightarrow L$ be an f -compatible up-to function and let \bar{u} be the least closure above u . Then $\nu(f \circ u) \sqsubseteq \nu(f \circ \bar{u}) = \nu f$. If u is continuous and strict, then $\mu(f \circ u) \sqsubseteq \mu(f \circ \bar{u}) = \mu f$.*

In [36] the proof of soundness of a compatible up-to technique u relies on the definition of a function u^ω defined as $u^\omega(x) = \bigsqcup \{u^n(x) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $u^n(x)$ is defined inductively as $u^0(x) = x$ and $u^{n+1}(x) = u(u^n(x))$. The function u^ω is extensive but not idempotent in general, and it can be easily seen that $u^\omega \sqsubseteq \bar{u}$. The paper [37] shows that for any monotone function one can consider the largest compatible up-to function, the so-called companion, which is extensive and idempotent. The companion could be used in place of \bar{u} for part of the theory. However, we find it convenient to work with \bar{u} since, despite not discussed in the present paper, it plays a key role for the integration of up-to techniques into the verification algorithms. Furthermore the companion is usually hard to determine.

5.2 Up-To Techniques for Systems of Equations

Exploiting the view of up-to functions as abstractions, moving to systems of equations is easy. As in the case of abstractions, a different up-to function is allowed for each equation.

► **Definition 5.7** (compatible up-to for systems of equations). *Let (L, \sqsubseteq) be a complete lattice and let E be $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$, a system of m equations over L . A compatible tuple of up-to functions for E is an m -tuple of monotone functions \mathbf{u} , with $u_i : L \rightarrow L$, satisfying compatibility ($\mathbf{u}^\times \circ \mathbf{f} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{f} \circ \mathbf{u}^\times$) with u_i continuous and strict for each $i \in \underline{m}$ such that $\eta_i = \mu$.*

We can then generalise Corollary 5.6 to systems of equations.

► **Theorem 5.8** (up-to for systems). *Let (L, \sqsubseteq) be a complete lattice and let E be $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$, a system of m equations over L , with solution $\mathbf{s} \in L^m$. Let \mathbf{u} be a compatible tuple of up-to functions for E and let $\bar{\mathbf{u}} = (\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_m)$ be the corresponding tuple of least closures. Let \mathbf{s}' and $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ be the solutions of the systems $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}^\times(\mathbf{x}))$ and $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{u}}^\times(\mathbf{x}))$, respectively. Then $\mathbf{s}' \sqsubseteq \bar{\mathbf{s}} = \mathbf{s}$. Moreover, if \mathbf{u} is extensive then $\mathbf{s}' = \mathbf{s}$.*

► **Example 5.9** (μ -calculus up-to (bi)similarity). Consider the problem of model-checking the μ -calculus over some transition system with atoms $T = (\mathbb{S}, \rightarrow, A)$.

Assuming that we have an a priori knowledge about the similarity relation \lesssim over some of the states in T , then, restricting to a suitable fragment of the μ -calculus we can avoid checking the same formula on similar states. This intuition can be captured in the form of an up-to technique, that we refer to as up-to similarity. It is based on an up-to function $u_{\lesssim} : \mathbf{2}^{\mathbb{S}} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^{\mathbb{S}}$ defined, for $X \in \mathbf{2}^{\mathbb{S}}$, by $u_{\lesssim}(X) = \{s \in \mathbb{S} \mid \exists s' \in X. s' \lesssim s\}$.

Function u_{\lesssim} is monotone, extensive, and idempotent. It is also continuous and strict.

Moreover, u_{\lesssim} is a compatible (and thus sound) up-to function for the $\mu\Diamond$ -calculus where propositional variables are interpreted as atoms. In fact, \lesssim is a simulation (the largest one) and the function u_{\lesssim} is the associated abstraction as defined in Example 4.4, namely $u_{\lesssim} = \Diamond_{\lesssim}$. Therefore, compatibility $u_{\lesssim} \circ f \sqsubseteq f \circ u_{\lesssim}$ corresponds to condition $\alpha \circ \Diamond_{TC} \circ \gamma \subseteq \Diamond_{TA}$ in Example 4.4 which has been already observed to coincide with soundness in the sense of Theorem 4.2 for the operators of the $\mu\Diamond$ -calculus. Concerning propositional variables, in Example 4.4, they were interpreted, in the target transition system, by the abstraction of their interpretation in the source transition system. Since here we have a single transition system and a single interpretation $\rho : Prop \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^{\mathbb{S}}$, we must have $\rho(p) = u_{\lesssim}(\rho(p))$, i.e., $\rho(p)$ upward-closed with respect to \lesssim . This automatically holds by the fact that \lesssim is a simulation.

Similarly, we can define up-to bisimilarity via the up-to function $u_{\sim}(X) = \{s \in \mathbb{S} \mid \exists s' \in X. s \sim s'\}$. As above, one can see that compatibility $u_{\sim} \circ f \sqsubseteq f \circ u_{\sim}$ holds for the full μ -calculus with propositional variables interpreted as atoms. For instance, consider the formula φ in Example 3.5 and the transition system in Fig. 1a. Using the up-to function u_{\sim} corresponds to working in the bisimilarity quotient in Fig. 1b. Note, however, that when using a local algorithm (see §6.2) the quotient does not need to be actually computed. Rather, only the bisimilarity over the states explored by the searching procedure is possibly exploited.

► **Example 5.10** (bisimilarity up-to transitivity). Consider the problem of checking bisimilarity on a transition system $T = (\mathbb{S}, \rightarrow)$. A number of well-known sound up-to techniques have been introduced in the literature [38]. As an example, we consider the up-to function $u_{tr} : Rel(\mathbb{S}) \rightarrow Rel(\mathbb{S})$ performing a single step of transitive closure. It is defined as:

$$u_{tr}(R) = R \circ R = \{(x, y) \mid \exists z \in \mathbb{S}. (x, z) \in R \wedge (z, y) \in R\}.$$

It is easy to see that u_{tr} is monotone and compatible with respect to the function $bis_T : Rel(\mathbb{S}) \rightarrow Rel(\mathbb{S})$ of which bisimilarity is the greatest fixpoint (see Example 3.8). Since A is deterministic, bisimilarity coincides with language equivalence.

Note that u_{tr} is neither idempotent nor extensive. The corresponding closure \bar{u}_{tr} maps a relation to its (full) transitive closure (this is known to be itself a sound up-to technique, a fact that we can also derive from the compatibility of u_{tr} and Corollary 5.6).

6 Solving Systems of Equations via Games

In this section, we first provide a characterisation of the solution of a system of fixpoint equations over a complete lattice in terms of a parity game. This generalises a result in [2]. While the original result was limited to continuous lattices, here, exploiting the results on abstraction in §4, we devise a game working for any complete lattice.

The game characterisation opens the way to the development of algorithms for solving the game and thus the associated verification problem.

Position	Player	Moves
(b, i)	\exists	\mathbf{X} s.t. $b \sqsubseteq f_i(\bigsqcup \mathbf{X})$
\mathbf{X}	\forall	(b', j) s.t. $b' \in X_j$

■ **Table 1** The game on the powerset of the basis

6.1 Game Characterization

We show that the solution of a system of equations over a complete lattice can be characterised using a parity game.

► **Definition 6.1** (powerset game). *Let L be a complete lattice with a basis B_L . Given a system E of m equations over L of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$, the corresponding powerset game is a parity game, with an existential player \exists and a universal player \forall , defined as follows:*

- *The positions of \exists are pairs (b, i) where $b \in B_L$, $i \in \underline{m}$. Those of \forall are tuples of subsets of the basis $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_m) \in (\mathbf{2}^{B_L})^m$.*
- *From position (b, i) the moves of \exists are $\mathbf{E}(b, i) = \{\mathbf{X} \mid \mathbf{X} \in (\mathbf{2}^{B_L})^m \wedge b \sqsubseteq f_i(\bigsqcup \mathbf{X})\}$.*
- *From position $\mathbf{X} \in (\mathbf{2}^{B_L})^m$ the moves of \forall are $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \{(b, i) \mid i \in \underline{m} \wedge b \in X_i\}$.*

The game is schematised in Table 1. For a finite play, the winner is the player who moved last. For an infinite play, let h be the highest index that occurs infinitely often in a pair (b, i) . If $\eta_h = \nu$ then \exists wins, else \forall wins.

If we instantiate the game to the setting of standard μ -calculus model-checking, we obtain an alternative encoding of μ -calculus into parity games, typically resulting in more compact games.

► **Example 6.2.** We provide a simple example illustrating the game. Consider the infinite lattice $L = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\omega, \omega + 1\}$ (where $n \leq \omega \leq \omega + 1$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$) with basis $B_L = L$. Furthermore let $f: L \rightarrow L$ be a monotone function with $f(n) = n + 1$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f(\omega) = \omega$, $f(\omega + 1) = \omega + 1$. Hence $\mu f = \omega$.

We set $b = \omega$ and attempt to show via the game that $b \leq \mu f$, by exhibiting a winning strategy for \exists . Note that since we are dealing with a μ -equation, in order to win \exists must ensure that \forall eventually has no moves left. Since there is only one fixpoint equation, we omit the indices. Starting with $b = \omega$, \exists plays $X = \mathbb{N}$, which is a valid move since $\omega \leq f(\bigsqcup X) = f(\omega)$. Now \forall has to pick some $n \in X$. In the next move, \exists can play $X = \{n - 1\}$, which means that \forall picks $n - 1$. Hence we obtain a descending chain, leading to 1, which can be covered by \exists by choosing $X = \emptyset$, since $1 \leq f(\bigsqcup \emptyset) = f(0)$. Now \forall has no moves left and \exists wins.

Instead for $b = \omega + 1 \not\leq \mu f$, \exists has no winning strategy since she has to play a set X that contains $\omega + 1$. Then player \forall can reply by choosing $\omega + 1$ and the game will continue forever. This is won by \forall since we are dealing with a μ -equation.

Interestingly, the correctness and completeness of the game can be proved by exploiting the results in §4. The crucial observation is that there is a Galois insertion between L and the powerset lattice of its basis (which is algebraic hence continuous) $\langle \alpha, \gamma \rangle : \mathbf{2}^{B_L} \rightarrow L$ where abstraction α is the join $\alpha(X) = \bigsqcup X$ and concretisation γ takes the lower cone $\gamma(l) = \downarrow l \cap B_L$. Then a system of equations over a complete lattice L can be “transferred” to a system of equations over the powerset of the basis $\mathbf{2}^{B_L}$ along such insertion, in a way that the system in L can be seen as a sound and complete abstraction of the one in $\mathbf{2}^{B_L}$.

► **Theorem 6.3** (correctness and completeness). *Let E be a system of m equations over a complete lattice L of the kind $x =_{\eta} f(x)$ with solution s . For all $b \in B_L$ and $i \in \underline{m}$, $b \sqsubseteq s_i$ iff \exists has a winning strategy from position (b, i) .*

6.2 An Algorithmic View

The game theoretical characterisation can be the basis for the development of algorithms, possibly integrating abstraction and up-to techniques, for solving systems of equations. Here we consider local algorithms for the case of a single equation. Our main focus is to provide a general procedure which transcends the verification problem at hand, and also takes advantage of heuristics based on abstractions and up-to techniques. This allows us also to establish a link with some recent work relating abstract interpretation and up-to techniques [6] and exploiting up-to techniques for computing language equivalence on NFAs [8]. While not improving the complexity bounds, our algorithm is still in line with other local algorithms designed for specific settings, such as [8, 22, 23], as they arise as proper instantiations.

An algorithm for general systems is considerably more difficult and the description of such an algorithm will be postponed to §6.3. We first focus on the special case of a single (greatest) fixpoint equation $x =_{\nu} f(x)$.

6.2.1 Selections

For a practical use of the game it can be useful to observe that the set of moves of the existential player can be suitably restricted without affecting the completeness of the game, by introducing a notion of selection, similarly to what is done in [2].

Given a lattice L , define a preorder \sqsubseteq_H on $\mathbf{2}^{B_L}$ by letting, for $X, Y \in \mathbf{2}^{B_L}$, $X \sqsubseteq_H Y$ if $\bigsqcup X \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup Y$. (The subscript H comes from the fact that for completely distributive lattices, if B_L is the set of irreducible elements, then \sqsubseteq_H is the “Hoare preorder” [1], requiring that $\forall x \in X. \exists y \in Y. x \sqsubseteq y$.) Observe that \sqsubseteq_H is not antisymmetric. We write \equiv_H for the corresponding equivalence, i.e., $X \equiv_H Y$ when $X \sqsubseteq_H Y \sqsubseteq_H X$.

The moves of player \exists can be ordered by the pointwise extension of \sqsubseteq_H , thus leading to the following definition. Since we deal with a single equation, we will omit the indices from the positions of player \exists and write b instead of $(b, 1)$.

► **Definition 6.4** (selection). *Let $x =_{\nu} f(x)$ be an equation over a complete lattice L , with basis B_L . A selection is a function $\sigma : B_L \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^{B_L}$ such that for all $b \in B_L$ it holds $\uparrow_H \sigma(b) = \mathbf{E}(b)$, i.e. the set of moves of \exists from position b , where \uparrow_H is the upward-closure with respect to \sqsubseteq_H .*

This is equivalent to requiring that $\sigma(b) \subseteq \mathbf{E}(b)$ and for each $X \in \mathbf{E}(b)$ there exists $Y \in \sigma(b)$ such that $\bigsqcup Y \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup X$.

For the case of a single fixpoint equation it is easy to see that Theorem 6.3 continues to hold if we restrict the moves of player \exists to those prescribed by a selection.

► **Theorem 6.5** (game with selections). *Let $x =_{\nu} f(x)$ be an equation over a complete lattice L with solution s . For all $b \in B_L$, it holds that $b \sqsubseteq s$ iff \exists has a winning strategy from position b in the game restricted to selections.*

6.2.2 Local Algorithm for a Special Case

In this section we assume that $f : L \rightarrow L$ is some fixed function that preserves non-empty meets, i.e., for $X \neq \emptyset$, $f(\bigsqcap X) = \bigsqcap f(X)$. This is equivalent to asking $f(x) = f^*(x) \sqcap c$ for

some $c \in L$ (just take $c = f(\top)$), with f^* being a right adjoint of a map f_* , a setting that has been studied also in [6]. We will call a function satisfying this assumption a *deterministic function*. Note that the adjunction $\langle f_*, f^* \rangle$ is completely orthogonal to the adjunctions (Galois connections) studied so far.

► **Example 6.6.** For a simple example adopted from [8], consider a deterministic finite automaton $A = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, F)$, where Q is a finite set of states, Σ is a finite alphabet, $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow Q$ is the transition function and $F \subseteq Q$ is the set of final states. Since A is deterministic, language equivalence coincides with bisimilarity. Consider the lattice of relations $L = (\mathbf{2}^{Q \times Q}, \sqsubseteq)$ with basis $B_L = \{\{(q_1, q_2)\} \mid q_1, q_2 \in Q\}$. The behaviour map, having bisimilarity as largest fixpoint, is $f : \mathbf{2}^{Q \times Q} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^{Q \times Q}$ defined as $f(R) = f^*(R) \cap C$ where $f^*(R) = \{(q_1, q_2) \mid \forall a \in \Sigma. (\delta(q_1, a), \delta(q_2, a)) \in R\}$ with $C = \{(q_1, q_2) \mid q_1 \in F \iff q_2 \in F\}$. The left adjoint is $f_*(R) = \{(\delta(q_1, a), \delta(q_2, a)) \mid (q_1, q_2) \in R, a \in \Sigma\}$.

Given two states $q_1, q_2 \in R$, we want to decide whether $(q_1, q_2) \in S$, where S is bisimilarity, the solution of the greatest fixpoint equation $R =_\nu f(R)$.

We first observe that for deterministic functions we can take a very simple selection.

► **Lemma 6.7 (selection).** *Let L be a complete lattice with basis B_L , and let $f : L \rightarrow L$ be a deterministic function, i.e., $f(x) = f^*(x) \sqcap c$ for some $c \in L$ and $\langle f_*, f^* \rangle : L \rightarrow L$ a Galois connection. A selection $\sigma : B_L \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^{B_L}$ for $x =_\nu f(x)$ can be defined, for $b \in B_L$, as:*

$$\sigma(b) = \begin{cases} \{X\} & \text{with } X \subseteq B_L \text{ s.t. } X \equiv_H \downarrow f_*(b) \cap B_L & \text{when } b \sqsubseteq c \\ \emptyset & & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Observe that there might be several choices for $X \subseteq B_L$: one that always works is $X = \downarrow f_*(b) \cap B_L$, but subsets $X \subseteq \downarrow f_*(b) \cap B_L$ are also feasible, as long as $\bigsqcup X = f_*(b)$. In Example 6.6, given $\{(q_1, q_2)\} \in B_L$, we can define $\sigma(\{(q_1, q_2)\}) = \{\{\{(q'_1, q'_2)\} \mid (q'_1, q'_2) \in f_*(\{(q_1, q_2)\})\}\}$.

By Lemma 6.7, in the game for $x =_\nu f(x)$, either the existential player is stuck or she has a best move. As a consequence, the game in §6.1 can be simplified. Let B_L be any basis for L such that $\perp \notin B_L$. The moves of player \exists are deterministic, governed by σ , and only player \forall has choices when exploring the elements included in such moves.

For checking whether $b \sqsubseteq_\nu f$, for some $b \in B_L$, the game starts from position b . Then, at a generic position b' , we do the following:

1. if $b' \not\sqsubseteq c$ then $\sigma(b') = \emptyset$ and \exists loses;
2. otherwise, \exists has to play the only element in $\sigma(b') = \{X\}$
 - a. if $f_*(b') = \perp$ then take $X = \emptyset$; hence \exists wins since \forall has no moves;
 - b. if instead $f_*(b') \neq \perp$, we can take $X \equiv_H \downarrow f_*(b') \cap B_L$ and thus player \forall can play any $b'' \in X$ and the game continues.

Player \exists wins the game iff no losing position for her ($b' \not\sqsubseteq c$) is encountered in the exploration. When a losing position for \exists is encountered we immediately know that \forall wins.

The game can be further simplified by observing that, if W denotes the set of positions already visited during the exploration, whenever, at a position b' , we have $b' \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup W$ then \exists wins from b' as long as she wins from all the positions in W . This leads to the local algorithm outlined in List. 1, whose proof of correctness formalises the arguments above. The procedure `Explore` allows to check if $b \sqsubseteq_\nu f = \nu(f^* \sqcap c)$ by invoking `Explore(b, \emptyset)`, which returns `true` if and only if player \exists wins in the simplified game.

■ **Listing 1** Local algorithm for the simplified game.

```
Explore( $b', W$ ):
```



```

if  $b' \not\sqsubseteq c$  then return false;
else if  $b' \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup W$  then return true;
else take  $X \subseteq B_L$  s.t.  $X \equiv_H \downarrow f_*(b') \cap B_L$ ;
return  $\bigwedge_{b'' \in X} \text{Explore}(b'', W \cup \{b'\})$ ;

```

► **Theorem 6.8** (correctness and completeness of the simplified game). *Let L be a complete lattice with basis $B_L \subseteq L \setminus \{\perp\}$, and let $f : L \rightarrow L$ be a deterministic function, i.e., $f(x) = f^*(x) \sqcap c$ for some $c \in L$ and $\langle f_*, f^* \rangle : L \rightarrow L$ a Galois connection. Then, for all $b \in B_L$, $b \sqsubseteq \nu f$ iff the invocation $\text{Explore}(b, \emptyset)$ returns true.*

For instance, for Example 6.6, the local algorithm of List. 1 works as follows: for checking whether $\{(q_1, q_2)\}$ is dominated by the solution, i.e., states q_1 and q_2 are bisimilar, one starts from $\{(q_1, q_2)\}$. At position $\{(q'_1, q'_2)\}$, if one state is final and the other is not, \exists loses. If the pair has been already explored, the branch is not considered. Otherwise, the pairs arising as a -successors $\{(q'_1, q'_2)\}$ are explored. If no losing position is found, the exploration finishes (recall that there are finitely many states) and $\bigcup W$ is a bisimulation including (q_1, q_2) .

Observe that when the basis is $B_L = L \setminus \{\perp\}$, the game becomes deterministic also for player \forall : in List. 1, when $f_*(b') \neq \perp$ one can take $X = \{f_*(b')\}$, otherwise $X = \emptyset$. Therefore, since f_* is a left adjoint and thus continuous, if we take the set S of all the positions generated during the exploration (i.e., W with the addition of the last position, for finite games) then $\bigsqcup S = \bigsqcup_i f_*^i(b)$ is the least fixpoint of f_* above b , which in turn coincides with the least fixpoint of $f^* \sqcup b$. This establishes a direct link with [6] which shows that for $b \in L$ it holds that $\mu(f^* \sqcup b) \sqsubseteq c$ iff $b \sqsubseteq \nu(f^* \sqcap c) = \nu f$.

Furthermore, we can bring up-to techniques into the picture: given an up-to function u we can modify the procedure in List. 1 by replacing the winning condition for \exists , that is, $b' \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup W$, by $b' \sqsubseteq u(\bigsqcup W)$. The procedure remains clearly complete and it is also correct due to Theorem 5.8. This allows us to cover the algorithm in [8] which checks language equivalence for non-deterministic automata. It performs on-the-fly determinization and constructs a bisimulation up-to congruence on the determinized automaton. More concretely, it tries to construct a bisimulation relation for the determinized automaton (along the lines of Example 6.6) and remembers pairs (X_1, X_2) of sets of states seen so far in a relation W (as explained in the algorithm in List. 1). Once a pair (Y_1, Y_2) is encountered that is contained in the congruence closure of W (the least equivalence, closed under union, that contains W), one can stop exploring this branch. A more detailed comparison can be found in Appendix D.

6.3 Local Algorithm for Solving the Game in the General Case

We now extend the local algorithm to the general case of a system of equations. This gives us a technique for determining whether a lattice element is below a component of the solution. As in the simpler case, the idea consists in computing only the information needed for the local problem of interest, in the line of other local algorithms developed for bisimilarity [23] and for μ -calculus model checking [45]. In particular, our algorithm arises as a natural generalisation of the one in [45] to the setting of fixpoint games (see Definition 6.1).

We fix some notation and conventions which will be useful for describing the algorithm.

Notation

For the rest of the section, L denotes a complete lattice, with a basis B_L , and E is a system of m fixpoint equations over L of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$, with solution $\mathbf{s} \in L^m$.

A generic *player*, that can be either \exists or \forall , is usually represented by the upper case letter P . The opponent of player P is denoted by \bar{P} . The set of all *positions* of the game is denoted by $Pos = Pos_{\exists} \cup Pos_{\forall}$, where $Pos_{\exists} = B_L \times \underline{m}$, ranged over by (b, i) is the set of positions controlled by \exists , and $Pos_{\forall} = (\mathbf{2}^{B_L})^m$, ranged over by \mathbf{X} is the set of positions controlled by \forall . A generic position is usually denoted by the upper case letter C and we write $P(C)$ for the player controlling the position C .

Given a position $C \in Pos$, the possible moves for player $P(C)$ are indicated by $M(C) \subseteq Pos$. In particular, if $C \in Pos_{\exists}$ then $M(C) \subseteq Pos_{\forall}$, otherwise $M(C) \subseteq Pos_{\exists}$. A function $i : Pos \rightarrow (\underline{m} \cup \{0\})$ maps every position to a *priority*, which, for positions (b, i) of player \exists is the index i , while it is 0 for positions of \forall . With this notation, the winning condition can be expressed as follows:

- Every finite play is won by the player who moved last.
- Every infinite play, seen as a sequence of positions (C_1, C_2, \dots) , is won by player \exists (resp. \forall) if there exists a priority $h \in \underline{m}$ s.t. $\eta_h = \nu$ (resp. μ), the set $\{j \mid i(C_j) = h\}$ is infinite and the set $\{j \mid i(C_j) > h\}$ is finite.

Note that there cannot be an infinite sequence of positions with priority 0 since only positions of player \forall have priority 0 and players alternate during the game.

6.3.1 The Algorithm

Given an element of the basis $b \in B_L$ and some index $i \in \underline{m}$, the algorithm checks whether b is below the solution of the i -th fixpoint equation of the system, i.e., $b \sqsubseteq s_i$. According to Theorem 6.3, this corresponds to establish which of the players has a winning strategy in the fixpoint game starting from the position (b, i) . The procedure roughly consists in a depth-first exploration of the tree of plays arising as unfolding of the game graph starting from the initial position (b, i) . The algorithm optimises the search by making assumptions on particular subtrees, which are thus pruned. Assumptions can be later confirmed or invalidated, and thus withdrawn. The algorithm is split into three different functions (see Fig. 3).

- Function EXPLORE explores the tree of plays of the game, trying different moves from each node in order to determine the player who has a winning strategy from such node.
- Function BACKTRACK allows to backtrack from a node after the algorithm has established who was the winner from it, transmitting the information backwards.
- Sometimes the algorithm makes erroneous assumptions when pruning the search in some position, this leads it to incorrectly designate a player as the winner from that position. However, the algorithm is able to detect this fact and correct its decisions. The correction is performed by the function FORGET.

The algorithm uses the following data structures:

- The *counter* \mathbf{k} , i.e., an m -tuple of natural numbers, which associates each non-zero priority with the number of times the priority has been encountered in the play since an higher priority was last encountered (the current position is not included). After any move, the counter is updated taking into account the priority of the current position. More precisely, the update of a counter \mathbf{k} when moving from a position with priority i , denoted $next(\mathbf{k}, i)$, is defined as follows: $next(\mathbf{k}, i)_j = 0$ for all $j < i$, $next(\mathbf{k}, i)_i = k_i + 1$, and $next(\mathbf{k}, i)_j = k_j$ for all $j > i$. Note that, in particular, $next(\mathbf{k}, 0) = \mathbf{k}$, i.e., moves from a position with priority 0, which are the moves of \forall , do not change \mathbf{k} . We also define two total orders $<_{\exists}$ and $<_{\forall}$ on counters, that intuitively measure how good the

current advancement of the game is for the two players. We let $\mathbf{k} <_{\exists} \mathbf{k}'$ when the largest i s.t. $k_i \neq k'_i$ is the index of a greatest fixpoint equation and $k_i < k'_i$, or it is the index of a least fixpoint and $k_i > k'_i$. The other order $<_{\forall}$ is the reverse of $<_{\exists}$, that is $\mathbf{k} <_{\forall} \mathbf{k}'$ iff $\mathbf{k}' <_{\exists} \mathbf{k}$. For each player P , we write $\mathbf{k} \leq_P \mathbf{k}'$ for $\mathbf{k} <_P \mathbf{k}'$ or $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k}'$. Notice that the update function $next$ is monotone on the counter, that is, given a priority i , for every player P , if $\mathbf{k} \leq_P \mathbf{k}'$, then $next(\mathbf{k}, i) \leq_P next(\mathbf{k}', i)$.

- The *playlist* ρ , i.e., a list of the positions encountered from the root to the current node (empty if the current node is the root), each with the corresponding counter \mathbf{k} and the indication of the alternative moves which have not been explored (exploration is performed depth-first). Thus, ρ is a list of triples (C, \mathbf{k}, π) , where C is a position, \mathbf{k} is a counter and $\pi \subseteq Pos$ is the set of the unexplored moves from that position.
- The *assumptions* for players \exists and \forall , i.e., a pair of sets $\Gamma = (\Gamma_{\exists}, \Gamma_{\forall})$. A position C is assumed to be winning for some player when it is encountered for the second time in the current playlist ρ . This reveals the presence of a loop in the game graph which can be unfolded into an infinite play. Position C is assumed to be winning for the player who would win such an infinite play. In detail, if \mathbf{k} is the current counter and \mathbf{k}' is the counter of the previous occurrence of C , then the winner P is the player such that $\mathbf{k}' <_P \mathbf{k}$. In fact, this ensures that the highest priority in the loop is the index of a least fixpoint if $P = \forall$ and of a greatest fixpoint if $P = \exists$. The assumption is stored with the corresponding counter, i.e., Γ_P contains pairs of the kind (C, \mathbf{k}) . Since other possible paths branching from the loop are possibly unexplored, assumptions can still be falsified afterwards.
- The *decisions* for player \exists and \forall , i.e., a pair of sets $\Delta = (\Delta_{\exists}, \Delta_{\forall})$. Intuitively, a decision for a player P is a position C of the game such that we established that P has a winning strategy from C . The decision is stored with the corresponding counter, i.e., Δ_P contains pairs of the kind (C, \mathbf{k}) . When a new decision is added, we also record its *justification*, i.e., the assumptions and decisions we relied on for deriving the new decision, if any.

For checking whether $b \sqsubseteq s_i$ for $b \in B_L$ and $i \in \underline{m}$, we call the function $EXPLORE((b, i), \mathbf{0}, [], (\emptyset, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \emptyset))$, where $\mathbf{0}$ is the everywhere-zero counter. This returns the (only) player P having a winning strategy from position (b, i) , and, by Theorem 6.3, $P = \exists$ if and only if $b \sqsubseteq s_i$.

Given the current position C , the corresponding counter \mathbf{k} , the playlist ρ describing the path that led to C , and the sets of assumptions Γ and decisions Δ , function $EXPLORE(C, \mathbf{k}, \rho, \Gamma, \Delta)$ checks if one of the following three conditions holds, each one corresponding to a different **if** branch.

- If $M(C) = \emptyset$, then the controller $P(C)$ of position C cannot move and its opponent $\overline{P(C)}$ wins. Therefore, a new decision for the current position is added for the opponent, and we backtrack. A decision of this kind, with empty justification is called a *truth*.
- If there is already a decision for a player P for the current position C , that is, $(C, \mathbf{k}') \in \Delta_P$ and $\mathbf{k}' \leq_P \mathbf{k}$, then we can reuse that information to assert that P would win from the current position as well. The requirement $\mathbf{k}' \leq_P \mathbf{k}$ intuitively ensures that we arrived to the current position C with a play that is at least as good for P as the play which led to the previous decision (C, \mathbf{k}') .
- If the current position C was already encountered in the play, i.e., $(C, \mathbf{k}', \pi) \in \rho$ for some \mathbf{k}' and π , then C becomes an assumption for the player P for which the counter got strictly better, that is, $\mathbf{k}' <_P \mathbf{k}$. Then we backtrack.
- If none of the conditions above holds, the exploration continues from C . A move $C' \in M(C)$ is chosen to be explored. The playlist is thus extended by adding (C, \mathbf{k}, π) where π records

```

function EXPLORE( $C, \mathbf{k}, \rho, \Gamma, \Delta$ )
  if  $M(C) = \emptyset$  then
     $\Delta_{\overline{P(C)}} := \Delta_{\overline{P(C)}} \cup \{(C, \mathbf{k})\}$ ;
    BACKTRACK( $\overline{P(C)}, C, \rho, \Gamma, \Delta$ );
  else if there is  $(C, \mathbf{k}') \in \Delta_P$  s.t.  $\mathbf{k}' \leq_P \mathbf{k}$ 
  then
    BACKTRACK( $P, C, \rho, \Gamma, \Delta$ );
  else if there is  $(C, \mathbf{k}', \pi) \in \rho$  then
    let  $P$  s.t.  $\mathbf{k}' <_P \mathbf{k}$ ;
     $\Gamma_P := \Gamma_P \cup \{(C, \mathbf{k}')\}$ ;
    BACKTRACK( $P, C, \rho, \Gamma, \Delta$ );
  else
    pick  $C' \in M(C)$ ;
     $\mathbf{k}' := \text{next}(\mathbf{k}, i(C))$ ;
     $\pi := (M(C) \setminus \{C'\}) \times \{\mathbf{k}'\}$ ;
    EXPLORE( $C', \mathbf{k}', ((C, \mathbf{k}, \pi) :: \rho), \Gamma, \Delta$ );
  end if
end function

function BACKTRACK( $P, C, \rho, \Gamma, \Delta$ )
  if  $\rho = []$  then
     $P$ ;
  else if  $\rho = ((C', \mathbf{k}', \pi) :: t)$  then
    if  $P(C') \neq P$  and  $\pi \neq \emptyset$  then
      pick  $(C'', \mathbf{k}'') \in \pi$ ;
       $\pi' := \pi \setminus \{(C'', \mathbf{k}'')\}$ ;
      EXPLORE( $C'', \mathbf{k}'', ((C', \mathbf{k}', \pi') :: t), \Gamma, \Delta$ );
    else
      if  $P(C') = P$  then
         $\Delta_P := \Delta_P \cup \{(C', \mathbf{k}')\}$  justified by  $C$ ;
      else
         $\Delta_P := \Delta_P \cup \{(C', \mathbf{k}')\}$  justified by  $M(C')$ ;
      end if
       $\Gamma_P := \Gamma_P \setminus \{(C', \mathbf{k}')\}$ ;
      if there is  $(C', \mathbf{k}') \in \Gamma_{\overline{P}}$  then
         $\Delta_{\overline{P}} := \text{FORGET}(\Delta_{\overline{P}}, \Gamma_{\overline{P}}, (C', \mathbf{k}'))$ ;
         $\Gamma_{\overline{P}} := \Gamma_{\overline{P}} \setminus \{(C', \mathbf{k}')\}$ ;
      end if
      BACKTRACK( $P, C', t, \Gamma, \Delta$ );
    end if
  end if
end function

```

■ **Figure 3** The general local algorithm.

the remaining moves to be explored. The counter \mathbf{k} is updated according to the priority of the now past position C .

Function $\text{BACKTRACK}(P, C, \rho, \Gamma, \Delta)$ is used to backtrack from a position C , reached via the playlist ρ , after assuming or deciding that player P would win from such position.

- If $\rho = []$ we are back at the root, the position from where the computation started, and the exploration is concluded. The algorithm decides that player P is the winner from such a position.
- Otherwise, the head (C', \mathbf{k}, π) of the playlist ρ is popped and the status of position C' is investigated.
 - If C' is controlled by the opponent of P ($P(C') \neq P$) and there are still unexplored moves ($\pi \neq \emptyset$), we must explore such moves before deciding the winner from C' . Then, a new move is extracted from π and explored.
 - If instead the controller of C' is P ($P(C') = P$) then P wins also from C' . Hence C' is inserted in Δ_P , justified by the move C from where we backtracked. Similarly, if the controller of C' is the opponent of P ($P(C') \neq P$), we already explored all possible moves from C' ($\pi = \emptyset$) and all turn out to be winning for P , again we decide that P wins from C' , which is inserted in Δ_P , justified by all possible moves from C' . Since we decided that P would win from C' we can now continue to backtrack. However, before backtracking we must discard all assumptions for the opponent of P in conflict with the newly taken decision, and this must be propagated to the decisions depending on such assumptions. This is done by the invocation $\text{FORGET}(\Delta_{\overline{P}}, \Gamma_{\overline{P}}, (C', \mathbf{k}'))$.

In general the choice of moves to explore, performed by the action “pick” in the pseudocode, is random. However, we observed in §6.1, that for player \exists it can be shown that it is sufficient to explore the minimal moves. Furthermore, it is usually convenient to give priority to

moves which are immediately reducible to valid decisions or assumptions for the player who is moving. A practical way to do this is to check if there is a decision for a position C' , with a valid counter wrt. the current one, such that either the current position $C = (b, i)$, $C' = (b', i)$ and $b \sqsubseteq b'$, or $C = \mathbf{X}$, $C' = \mathbf{X}'$ and $\mathbf{X}' \subseteq \mathbf{X}$. Then, the move to pick is the one justifying such decision, which by those features is guaranteed to be a move also from the current position C .

The function FORGET is not given explicitly. The precise definition of the property that function FORGET must satisfy in order to ensure the correctness of the algorithm is quite technical (it can be found in the appendix provided as extra material). Intuitively, when an assumption in Γ_P fails and is withdrawn, then it must remove from Δ_P at least all the decisions depending on such assumption. It is possible that decisions taken on the base of the deleted assumption remain valid because they can be justified by other decisions or assumptions, possibly introduced later. Different sound realisations of FORGET are then possible (see [45]) and, experimentally, it can be seen that those removing only the least possible set of decisions can be practically inefficient. A simple sound implementation, which, at least in the setting of the μ -calculus, resulted to be the most efficient is based on a temporal criterion: when an assumption fails, all decisions which have been taken after that assumption are deleted. This can be implemented by associating timestamps with decisions and assumptions, and avoiding the complex management of justifications.


► **Example 6.9** (model-checking μ -calculus). Consider the transition system $T = (\mathbb{S}, \rightarrow)$ in Fig. 1a and the μ -calculus formula $\varphi = \mu x_2.((\nu x_1.(p \wedge \Box x_1)) \vee \Diamond x_2)$ discussed in Example 3.5. As already discussed, the formula φ interpreted over T leads to the system E in Fig. 1d over the lattice $\mathbf{2}^{\mathbb{S}}$.

Suppose that we want to verify whether the state $a \in \mathbb{S}$ satisfies the formula φ . This requires to determine the winner of the fixpoint game from position $(a, 2)$, which can be done by invoking $\text{EXPLORE}((a, 2), \mathbf{0}, [], (\emptyset, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \emptyset))$. A computation performed by the algorithm is schematised in Fig. 4, where we only consider minimal moves. Since the choice of moves is non-deterministic, other search sequences are possible. In the diagram, positions of player \exists are represented as diamonds, while those of \forall are represented as boxes, the counters associated with the positions is on their lefthand side

Recall that the second equation is $x_2 =_{\mu} x_1 \cup \Diamond_T x_2$. Then, from the initial position $(a, 2)$, with counter $(0, 0)$, there are four available minimal moves, i.e., $(\{a\}, \emptyset)$, $(\emptyset, \{a\})$, $(\emptyset, \{b\})$ and $(\emptyset, \{c\})$, represented by the four outgoing edges from position $(a, 2)$ in the diagram, all four will have counter $(0, 1) = \text{next}((0, 0), 2)$. Indeed, it is easy to see that $a \in \{a\} \cup \Diamond_T \emptyset = \emptyset \cup \Diamond_T \{a\} = \emptyset \cup \Diamond_T \{b\} = \{a\} \subseteq \emptyset \cup \Diamond_T \{c\} = \{a, c\}$. Suppose that the algorithm chooses to explore the move $(\emptyset, \{b\})$, as highlighted by the bold arrow. Even though not shown in the diagram, the other moves are stored in the set of unexplored moves π associated with the position $(a, 2)$ in the playlist ρ . The search proceeds in this way along the moves

$$(a, 2) \overset{\exists}{\rightsquigarrow} (\emptyset, \{b\}) \overset{\forall}{\rightsquigarrow} (b, 2) \overset{\exists}{\rightsquigarrow} (\{b\}, \emptyset) \overset{\forall}{\rightsquigarrow} (b, 1) \overset{\exists}{\rightsquigarrow} (\{d, e\}, \emptyset) \overset{\forall}{\rightsquigarrow} (d, 1) \overset{\exists}{\rightsquigarrow} (\{d\}, \emptyset) \overset{\forall}{\rightsquigarrow}$$

until position $(d, 1)$ occurs again, with counter $(2, 2)$. Since the counter associated with the first occurrence of $(d, 1)$ was $(1, 2)$ and $(1, 2) <_{\exists} (2, 2)$, then the pair position and counter $((d, 1), (1, 2))$ is added as an assumption for player \exists and the algorithm starts backtracking. While backtracking it generates a decision for \exists , which is $((\{d\}, \emptyset), (2, 2))$ justified by the only possible move $(d, 1)$ of player \forall . When it comes back to the first occurrence of $(d, 1)$, since it is a position controlled by \exists , the procedure transforms the assumption $((d, 1), (1, 2))$ into a decision for \exists justified by the move $(\{d\}, \emptyset)$. Then, it backtracks to position $(\{d, e\}, \emptyset)$,



■ **Figure 4** An execution of the local algorithm.

which is controlled by player \forall and there is still an unexplored move $(e, 1)$. Therefore, the algorithm starts exploring again from $(e, 1)$, and does so similarly to the previous branch of $(d, 1)$. After making decisions for those positions as well, the algorithm resumes backtracking from $(\{d, e\}, \emptyset)$, since all possible moves have been explored, making decisions for player \exists along the way back. This goes on up until the root is reached again. The last invocation $\text{BACKTRACK}(\exists, (a, 2), [], \Gamma, \Delta)$ terminates since $\rho = []$, and returns player \exists . Indeed, \exists wins starting from position $(a, 2)$ since the state a satisfies the formula φ .

6.3.2 Correctness

We show that, when the lattice is finite, the algorithm terminates. Moreover, when it terminates (which could happen also on infinite lattices), it provides a correct answer.

Termination on finite lattices can be proved by observing that the set of positions (which are either elements of the basis or tuples of sets of elements of the basis) is finite. The length of playlists is bounded by the number of positions, since, whenever a position repeats in a playlist, it necessarily becomes an assumption and backtracking starts. Finally, one can observe that it is not possible to cycle indefinitely between two positions, so that termination immediately follows.

► **Lemma 6.10** (termination). *Given a fixpoint game on a finite lattice, any call $\text{EXPLORE}(C_0, \mathbf{0}, [], (\emptyset, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \emptyset))$ terminates, hence at some point $\text{BACKTRACK}(P, C_0, [], (\emptyset, \emptyset), \Delta)$ is invoked, for some player P and pairs of sets Γ and Δ .*

The proof of correctness is long and technical. The underlying idea is to prove that, at any invocation of $\text{EXPLORE}(\cdot, \cdot, \rho, \Gamma, \Delta)$ and $\text{BACKTRACK}(\cdot, \cdot, \rho, \Gamma, \Delta)$, the justifications for the decisions Δ_P , can be interpreted as a winning strategy for player P from the positions $C \in \Delta_P$, in a modified game where P immediately wins on the assumptions Γ_P . Since at termination, the set of assumptions is empty, the modified game coincides with the original one and thus we conclude.

► **Theorem 6.11** (correctness). *Given a fixpoint game, if a call $\text{EXPLORE}(C, \mathbf{0}, [], (\emptyset, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \emptyset))$ returns a player P , then P wins the game from C .*

Notice that it is unnecessary to prove the converse implication, that is, if P wins the game from C , then the call $\text{EXPLORE}(C, \mathbf{0}, [], (\emptyset, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \emptyset))$ returns P . Indeed, since the game can never result in a draw, this is equivalent to show that if the call $\text{EXPLORE}(C, \mathbf{0}, [], (\emptyset, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \emptyset))$ returns \bar{P} , then \bar{P} wins the game from C . And this already holds by Theorem 6.11.

6.3.3 Using Up-To Techniques in the Algorithm

In the literature about bisimilarity checking, up-to techniques have been fruitfully integrated with local checking algorithm for speeding up the computation (see, e.g., [23]). Here we show that a similar idea can be developed for our local algorithm for general systems of fixpoint equations.

Let E be a system of m equations of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ over a complete lattice L and let \mathbf{u} be a compatible tuple of up-to functions for E . By Theorem 5.8 we have that the system $E\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ with equations $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \mathbf{x})$ has the same solution as E . Now, since $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ is a tuple of functions obtained as least fixpoints (see Definition 5.4), the system $E\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ can be “equivalently” written as the system of $2m$ equations that we denote by $d(E, \mathbf{u})$, defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y} &=_{\mu} (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{y}) \sqcup \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{x} &=_{\eta} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y}) \end{aligned}$$

More precisely, we can show the following result.

► **Theorem 6.12** (preserving solutions with up-to). *Let E be a system of m equations of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ over a complete lattice L . Let \mathbf{u} be a m -tuple of up-to functions compatible for E (Definition 5.7). The solution of the system $d(E, \mathbf{u})$ is $\text{sol}(d(E, \mathbf{u})) = (\text{sol}(E), \text{sol}(E))$.*

By relying on Theorem 6.12 we can derive an algorithm that exploits the up-to function \mathbf{u} . It is obtained by instantiating the general algorithm discussed before to the system $d(E, \mathbf{u})$ and suitably restricting the moves considered in the exploration. Roughly, the idea is to allow the use of the up-to function only when it leads immediately to an assumption or a decision. This is in some sense similar to what is done for bisimilarity checking in [23], where the up-to function is used only to enlarge the set of states which are considered bisimilar. More precisely, when the exploration is in a position (b, i) corresponding to one of the added equations $y_i =_{\mu} u_i(y_i) \sqcup x_i$, according to the definition of the game, a possible move would be any $2m$ -tuple of sets (\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X}) such that $b \sqsubseteq u_i(\sqcup Y_i) \sqcup \sqcup X_i$. First of all, since only the i -th and $(m+i)$ -th components Y_i and X_i play a role and we can restrict to minimal moves (see §6.1), we can assume $X_j = Y_j = \emptyset$ for $j \neq i$. Moreover, for X_i and Y_i , we only allow two types of moves:

1. $X_i = \{b\}$ and $Y_i = \emptyset$, which means that we keep the focus on element b and just jump to the “original” equation $x_i =_{\eta_i} f(y_i)$, or

2. $X_i = \emptyset$ and all positions in Y_i will immediately become assumptions or decisions when explored.

At the level of the pseudocode, this only means that the action “pick” needs to be refined. Instead of simply choosing randomly a move in $M(C)$, in some cases it has to perform a constrained choice. This is made precise below.

► **Definition 6.13** (up-to algorithm). *Let E be a system of m fixpoint equations over the complete lattice L and let \mathbf{u} be a compatible tuple of up-to function for E . The up-to algorithm for E based on \mathbf{u} is just the algorithm in Fig. 3 applied to the system $d(E, \mathbf{u})$, where, in function $\text{EXPLORE}(C, \mathbf{k}, \rho, \Gamma, \Delta)$, when $C = (b, i)$ with $i \in \underline{m}$, the action “pick” can select only moves $C' = (\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$ such that $Y_j = X_j = \emptyset$ for $j \neq i$ and X_i, Y_i complying with either of the following conditions*

1. $Y_i = \emptyset$ and $X_i = \{b\}$ or
2. $X_i = \emptyset$ and for all $b' \in Y_i$ it holds
 - a. $((b', i), \mathbf{k}') \in \Delta_{\exists}$ with $\mathbf{k}' \leq_{\exists} \text{next}(\mathbf{k}, i)$ or
 - b. $((b', i), \mathbf{k}', \pi) \in \rho$ with $\mathbf{k}' <_{\exists} \text{next}(\mathbf{k}, i)$.

Condition (1) has been already clarified above. Condition (2) is a formal translation of the fact that Y_i can contain only positions for which there are usable decisions (case (2a)) or that will immediately become assumptions (case 2b)).

Clearly the modification does not affect termination on finite lattices (in fact, we just restrict the possible moves of a procedure which is known to be terminating). We next show that the up-to algorithm is also correct.

► **Theorem 6.14** (correctness with up-to). *Let E be a system of m equations of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ over a complete lattice L . Let \mathbf{u} a compatible m -tuple of up-to functions for E . Then the up-to algorithm associated with the system $d(E, \mathbf{u})$ as given in Definition 6.13 is correct, i.e., if a call $\text{EXPLORE}(C, \mathbf{0}, [], (\emptyset, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \emptyset))$ returns a player P , then P wins the game from C .*

The proof is based on the observation that any winning strategy for player \exists in the game associated with the original system E can be replicated in the game associated with the modified system $d(E, \mathbf{u})$, even when the moves are restricted as in Definition 6.13. This is done by choosing always moves corresponding to case (1) in Definition 6.13. Then strategies in the constrained game for $d(E, \mathbf{u})$ are also valid in the unconstrained game. We conclude since, by Theorem 6.12, we know that winning positions for player \exists are the same in the game for E and in the game for $d(E, \mathbf{u})$.

Further optimizations of the up-to algorithm are possible by exploiting the fact that a variable y_i has the same solution of the corresponding x_i in the system $d(E, \mathbf{u})$. Intuitively, decisions and assumptions for positions associated with a variables y_i could be used as decisions and assumptions for the corresponding positions of variable x_i , and the other way around.

► **Example 6.15** (model-checking μ -calculus up-to bisimilarity). In Example 6.9 we showed how the algorithm would solve a model-checking problem by exploring the corresponding fixpoint game. Suppose that this time we also want to use up-to bisimilarity as an up-to technique to answer the same question, that is, whether the state $a \in \mathbb{S}$ satisfies the formula $\varphi = \mu x_2.((\nu x_1.(p \wedge \Box x_1)) \vee \Diamond x_2)$. In Example 5.9 we presented the up-to function $u_{\sim} : \mathbf{2}^{\mathbb{S}} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^{\mathbb{S}}$ corresponding to up-to bisimilarity defined as $u_{\sim}(X) = \{s \in \mathbb{S} \mid s \sim_T s' \wedge s' \in X\}$. In order

to apply the procedure described above, first we need to build the system $d(E, (u_\sim, u_\sim))$, which is

$$\begin{aligned} y_1 &=_{\mu} u_\sim(y_1) \cup x_1 & x_1 &=_{\nu} \{b, d, e\} \cap \blacksquare_T y_1 \\ y_2 &=_{\mu} u_\sim(y_2) \cup x_2 & x_2 &=_{\mu} y_1 \cup \blacklozenge_T y_2 \end{aligned}$$

Then, to check whether the state a satisfies the formula φ we invoke the function `EXPLORE`(($a, 4$), $\mathbf{0}$, \square , (\emptyset, \emptyset) , (\emptyset, \emptyset)), where the index 4 is that of the variable x_2 in the system $d(E, (u_\sim, u_\sim))$. Then, the algorithm behaves in similar fashion to what described in Example 6.9. However, this time the exploration of position $(d, 1)$ with counter $(0, 0, 1, 2)$ is pruned by using the up-to function. Recalling that position $(b, 1)$ occurred in the past, hence it is included in the playlist, with counter $(0, 0, 0, 2)$, we have that condition (2) above holds here for the move $(\{b\}, \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$ since $d \sim b$, hence $d \in u_\sim(\{b\}) \cup \emptyset$, and $(0, 0, 0, 2) <_{\exists} \text{next}((0, 0, 1, 2), 1) = (1, 0, 1, 2)$. This leads to making an assumption for $(b, 1)$ and then backtracking up to the root. The same happens when exploring the other branch, that is position $(e, 1)$, since also $e \sim b$. Similarly to the previous example, the last invocation `BACKTRACK`(\exists , ($a, 4$), \square , Γ , Δ) returns player \exists . Indeed, \exists wins starting from position $(a, 4)$ since the state a satisfies the formula φ .

7 Conclusion

Our contribution is based on the notion of approximation as formalised in abstract interpretation [13, 14]. Due to the intimate connection of Galois connections and closure functions, there is a close correspondence with up-to techniques for enhancing coinduction proofs [36, 38], originally developed for CCS [33]. However, as far as we know, recent research has only started to explore this connection: [6] explains the relation between sound up-to techniques and complete abstract domains in the setting where the semantic function has an adjoint. This adjunction or Galois connection plays a different role than the abstractions: it gives the existential player a unique best move, a concept explored in §6.2.2.

Fixpoint equation systems largely derive their interest from μ -calculus model-checking [9]. Evaluating μ -calculus formulae on a transition system can be reduced to solving a parity game and the exact complexity of this task is still open. Progress measures, introduced in [26], allow one to solve parity games with a complexity which is polynomial in the number of states and exponential in (half of) the alternation depth of the formula. Recently quasi-polynomial algorithms for parity games [10, 27, 30] have been devised. Instead of improving the complexity bounds, our aim here is to introduce heuristics, based on a local algorithm and up-to functions that are known to achieve good efficiency in practice, in particular we explained how to combine the up-to technique with μ -calculus model-checking algorithm.

Many papers deal with abstraction in the setting of μ -calculus model checking. We noted that the results on simulation-based abstraction in [31] can be obtained as an instance of our framework. The abstraction of the μ -calculus along a Galois connection and its soundness is discussed in [4]. A general framework for abstract interpretation of temporal calculi and logics is developed in [15]. In particular, an abstract calculus for expressing nested fixpoint expressions is studied, parametric with respect to the basic operators. The calculus is interpreted over complete boolean lattices and conditions ensuring the soundness and the completeness of the abstraction along a Galois connection are singled out. Such results are closely related to those in Section 4. The main differences reside in the fact that we work with general complete lattices, rather than with boolean lattices. In addition, we treat separately

soundness and completeness, and, in order to establish a connection with up-to techniques, we distinguish two forms of completeness (for the abstraction and for the concretisation).

We showed – for a special case – how local algorithms inspired by [8, 6, 22, 23] for a single (greatest) fixpoint equation can be adapted to the case of general lattices. For the general case of arbitrary fixpoint equation systems a considerably more complex generalisation along the lines of [45] is possible, but omitted due to lack of space.

The use of assumptions as stopping conditions in the algorithm is reminiscent of parameterized coinduction [44, 24], closely related to up-to-techniques, as spelled out in [37].

The notion of progress measures that has been studied in [2] can be adapted to the game for arbitrary complete (rather than just continuous) lattices, introduced in this paper. A natural question is whether the local algorithm arises as an instance of the single equation algorithm instantiated with the progress measure fixpoint equation.

With respect to the applications, we believe that our case study on abstractions respectively simulations for μ -calculus model-checking can also be generalised to modal respectively mixed transition systems [41, 18, 29] or to abstraction for the full μ -calculus as studied in [20] by combining both under- and over-approximations. Furthermore, we plan to further study over-approximations for fixpoint equations over the reals, closely connected to probabilistic logics. In particular, we will investigate under which circumstances one can obtain guarantees to be close to the exact solution or to compute the exact solution directly. Another interesting area is the use of up-to techniques for behavioural metrics [7].

References

- 1 Samson Abramsky and Achim Jung. Domain theory. In Samson Abramsky, Dov Gabbay, and Thomas Stephen Edward Maibaum, editors, *Handbook of Logic in Computer Science*, pages 1–168. Oxford University Press, 1994.
- 2 Paolo Baldan, Barbara König, Christina Mika-Michalski, and Tommaso Padoan. Fixpoint games in continuous lattices. In Stephanie Weirich, editor, *Proc. of POPL'19*, volume 3, pages 26:1–26:29. ACM, 2019.
- 3 Paolo Baldan, Barbara König, and Tommaso Padoan. Abstraction, up-to techniques and games for systems of fixpoint equations. In *Proc. of CONCUR '20*, volume 171 of *LIPICs*, pages 25:1–25:20. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz Center for Informatics, 2020.
- 4 Gourinath Banda and John P. Gallagher. Constraint-based abstract semantics for temporal logic: A direct approach to design and implementation. In Edmund M. Clarke and Andrei Voronkov, editors, *LPAR 2010*, volume 6355 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 27–45. Springer, 2010.
- 5 Andrea Bianco and Luca de Alfaro. Model checking of probabilistic and nondeterministic systems. In *Proc. of FSTTCS '95*, volume 1026 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 499–513. Springer, 1995.
- 6 Filippo Bonchi, Pierre Ganty, Roberto Giacobazzi, and Dusko Pavlovic. Sound up-to techniques and complete abstract domains. In *Proc. of LICS '18*, pages 175–184. ACM, 2018.
- 7 Filippo Bonchi, Barbara König, and Daniela Petrişan. Up-to techniques for behavioural metrics via fibrations. In *Proc. of CONCUR '18*, volume 118 of *LIPICs*, pages 17:1–17:17. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz Center for Informatics, 2018.
- 8 Filippo Bonchi and Damien Pous. Checking NFA equivalence with bisimulations up to congruence. In *Proc. of POPL '13*, pages 457–468. ACM, 2013.
- 9 Julian Bradfield and Igor Walukiewicz. The mu-calculus and model checking. In Edmund M. Clarke, Thomas A. Henzinger, Helmut Veith, and Roderick Bloem, editors, *Handbook of Model Checking*, pages 871–919. Springer, 2018.
- 10 Cristian S. Calude, Sanjay Jain, Bakhadyr Khoussainov, Wei Li, and Frank Stephan. Deciding parity games in quasipolynomial time. In *Proc. of STOC '17*, pages 252–263. ACM, 2017.

- 11 Rance Cleaveland, Marion Klein, and Bernhard Steffen. Faster model checking for the modal μ -calculus. In *Proc. of CAV 1992*, volume 663 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 410–422. Springer, 1992.
- 12 Patrick Cousot. Partial completeness of abstract fixpoint checking. In Berthe Y. Choueiry and Toby Walsh, editors, *Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Abstraction, Reformulations and Approximation, SARA '2000*, volume 1864 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–25. Springer, 26–29 July 2000.
- 13 Patrick Cousot and Radhia Cousot. Abstract interpretation: A unified lattice model for static analysis of programs by construction or approximation of fixpoints. In *Proc. of POPL '77*, pages 238–252. ACM, 1977.
- 14 Patrick Cousot and Radhia Cousot. Systematic design of program analysis frameworks. In *Proc. of POPL '79*, pages 269–282. ACM, 1979.
- 15 Patrick Cousot and Radhia Cousot. Temporal abstract interpretation. In Mark N. Wegman and Thomas W. Reps, editors, *Proc. of POPL '00*, pages 12–25. ACM, 2000.
- 16 Radhia Cousot and Patrick Cousot. A constructive characterization of the lattices of all retractions, preclosure, quasi-closure and closure operators on a complete lattice. *Portugaliae Mathematica*, 38(1-2):185–198, 1979.
- 17 Radhia Cousot and Patrick Cousot. Constructive versions of Tarski’s fixed point theorems. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 82(1):43–57, 1979.
- 18 Dennis Dams, Rob Gerth, and Orna Grumberg. Abstract interpretation of reactive systems. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 19(2):253–291, 1997.
- 19 Roberto Giacobazzi, Francesco Ranzato, and Francesca Scozzari. Making abstract interpretations complete. *Journal of the ACM*, 47(2):361–416, 2000.
- 20 Orna Grumberg, Martin Lange, Martin Leucker, and Sharon Shoham. When not losing is better than winning: Abstraction and refinement for the full μ -calculus. *Information and Computation*, 205(8):1130–1148, 2007.
- 21 Ichiro Hasuo, Shunsuke Shimizu, and Corina Cîrstea. Lattice-theoretic progress measures and coalgebraic model checking. In *Proc. of POPL '16*, pages 718–732. ACM, 2016.
- 22 Daniel Hirschhoff. Automatically proving up to bisimulation. In *Proc. of MFCS '98 Workshop on Concurrency*, number 18 in *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 75–89. Elsevier, 1998.
- 23 Daniel Hirschhoff. *Mise en oeuvre de preuves de bisimulation*. PhD thesis, Ecole Nationale des Ponts et Chaussées, 1999.
- 24 Chung-Kil Hur, Georg Neis, Derek Dreyer, and Viktor Vafeiadis. The power of parameterization in coinductive proof. In *Proc. of POPL '13*, pages 193–206. ACM, 2013.
- 25 Michael Huth and Marta Kwiatkowska. Quantitative analysis and model checking. In *Proc. of LICS '97*, pages 111–122. IEEE, 1997.
- 26 Marcin Jurdziński. Small progress measures for solving parity games. In *Proc. of STACS '00*, volume 1770 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 290–301. Springer, 2000.
- 27 Marcin Jurdzinski and Ranko Lazic. Succinct progress measures for solving parity games. In *Proc. of LICS '17*, pages 1–9. ACM/IEEE, 2017.
- 28 Dexter Kozen. Results on the propositional μ -calculus. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 27(3):333–354, 1983.
- 29 Kim Guldstrand Larsen and Bent Thomsen. A modal process logic. In *Proc. of LICS '88*, pages 203–210. IEEE, 1988.
- 30 Karoliina Lehtinen. A modal μ perspective on solving parity games in quasi-polynomial time. In *Proc. of LICS '18*, pages 639–648. ACM/IEEE, 2018.
- 31 Claire Loiseaux, Susanne Graf, Joseph Sifakis, Ahmed Bouajjani, and Saddek Bensalem. Property preserving abstractions for the verification of concurrent systems. *Formal Methods in System Design*, 6:1–35, 1995.
- 32 Annabelle McIver and Carroll Morgan. Results on the quantitative μ -calculus $qm\mu$. *ACM Trans. Comp. Log.*, 8(1:3), 2007.

- 33 Robin Milner. *Communication and Concurrency*. Prentice Hall, 1989.
- 34 Antoine Miné. Tutorial on static inference of numeric invariants by abstract interpretation. *Foundations and Trends in Programming Languages*, 4(3-4):120–372, 2017.
- 35 Matteo Mio and Alex Simpson. Łukasiewicz μ -calculus. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 150(3-4):317–346, 2017.
- 36 Damien Pous. Complete lattices and up-to techniques. In *Proc. of APLAS '07*, pages 351–366. Springer, 2007. LNCS 4807.
- 37 Damien Pous. Coinduction all the way up. In *Proc. of LICS'16*, pages 307–316. ACM, 2016.
- 38 Damien Pous and Davide Sangiorgi. Enhancements of the bisimulation proof method. In Davide Sangiorgi and Jan Rutten, editors, *Advanced Topics in Bisimulation and Coinduction*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- 39 Davide Sangiorgi. *Introduction to Bisimulation and Coinduction*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- 40 Davide Sangiorgi and Robin Milner. The problem of “weak bisimulation up to”. In W.R. Cleaveland, editor, *Proc. of CONCUR'92*, pages 32–46. Springer, 1992.
- 41 David A. Schmidt. Binary relations for abstraction and refinement. In *Workshop on Refinement and Abstraction*. Elsevier Electronic, 2000.
- 42 Dana Scott. Continuous lattices. In F. W. Lawvere, editor, *Toposes, Algebraic Geometry and Logic*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, pages 97–136. Springer, 1972.
- 43 Helmut Seidl. Fast and simple nested fixpoints. *Information Processing Letters*, 59(6):303–308, 1996.
- 44 David Sprunger and Lawrence S. Moss. Precongruences and parametrized coinduction for logics for behavioral equivalence. In *Proc. of CALCO '17*, volume 72 of *LIPICs*, pages 23:1–23:15. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2017.
- 45 Perdita Stevens and Colin Stirling. Practical model-checking using games. In *Proc. of TACAS '98*, volume 1384 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 85–101. Springer, 1998.
- 46 Colin Stirling. Local model checking games. In *Proc. of CONCUR '95*, volume 962 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–11. Springer, 1995.
- 47 Alfred Tarski. A lattice-theoretical fixpoint theorem and its applications. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 5:285–309, 1955.

A

 Proofs for Section 4 (Approximation for Systems of Fixpoint Equations)

► **Lemma A.1** (concretisation for single fixpoints). *Let $\gamma : A \rightarrow C$ be a monotone function.*

1. *If*

$$f_C \circ \gamma \sqsubseteq \gamma \circ f_A \tag{1}$$

then $\mu f_C \sqsubseteq \gamma(\mu f_A)$; if, in addition, γ is co-continuous and co-strict $\nu f_C \sqsubseteq \gamma(\nu f_A)$.

2. *If*

$$\gamma \circ f_A \sqsubseteq f_C \circ \gamma \tag{2}$$

then $\gamma(\nu f_A) \sqsubseteq \nu f_C$; if, in addition, γ is continuous and strict then $\gamma(\mu f_A) \sqsubseteq \mu f_C$.

Proof. We focus on the soundness results since the completeness results follow by duality.

For least fixpoint, we prove that for all ordinals β we have $f_C^\beta(\perp_C) \leq \gamma(f_A^\beta(\perp_A))$, whence the thesis, since $\mu f_C = f_C^\beta(\perp_C)$ and $\mu f_A = f_A^\beta(\perp_A)$ for some ordinal β (just take the largest of the ordinals needed to reach the two fixpoints).

We proceed by transfinite induction:

- ($\beta = 0$) We have $f_C^0(\perp_C) = \perp_C \sqsubseteq \gamma(f_A^0(\perp_A))$, as desired.
- ($\beta \rightarrow \beta + 1$) Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} f_C^{\beta+1}(\perp_C) &= f_C(f_C^\beta(\perp_C)) \\ &\sqsubseteq f_C(\gamma(f_C^\beta(\perp_C))) && \text{[by ind. hyp. and monotonicity of } f_C\text{]} \\ &\leq \gamma(f_A(f_A^\beta(\perp_A))) && \text{[by (1)]} \\ &= \gamma(f_A^{\beta+1}(\perp_A)) \end{aligned}$$

- (β limit ordinal) In this case

$$\begin{aligned} f_C^\beta(\perp_C) &= \bigsqcup_{\beta' < \beta} f_C^{\beta'}(\perp_C) \\ &\sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{\beta' < \beta} \gamma(f_A^{\beta'}(\perp_A)) && \text{[by ind. hyp.]} \\ &\sqsubseteq \gamma(\bigsqcup_{\beta' < \beta} f_A^{\beta'}(\perp_A)) && \text{[by properties of joins]} \\ &= \gamma(f_A^\beta(\perp_A)) \end{aligned}$$

For greatest fixpoints, we prove that for all ordinals β we have $f_C^\beta(\top_C) \leq \gamma(f_A^\beta(\top_A))$, again by transfinite induction.

- ($\beta = 0$) We have $f_C^0(\top_C) = \top_C = \gamma(\top_A) = \gamma(f_A^0(\top_A))$, since γ is assumed to be co-strict, hence we have the desired inequality.
- ($\beta \rightarrow \beta + 1$) Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} f_C^{\beta+1}(\top_C) &= f_C(f_C^\beta(\top_C)) \\ &\sqsubseteq f_C(\gamma(f_A^\beta(\top_A))) && \text{[by ind. hyp. and monotonicity of } f_C\text{]} \\ &\sqsubseteq \gamma(f_A(f_A^\beta(\top_A))) && \text{[by (1)]} \\ &= \gamma(f_A^{\beta+1}(\top_A)) \end{aligned}$$

- (β limit ordinal) In this case

$$\begin{aligned}
 f_C^\beta(\top_C) &= \prod_{\beta' < \beta} f_C^{\beta'}(\top_C) \\
 &\sqsubseteq \prod_{\beta' < \beta} \gamma(f_A^{\beta'}(\top_A)) && \text{[by ind. hyp.]} \\
 &= \gamma\left(\prod_{\beta' < \beta} f_A^{\beta'}(\top_A)\right) && \text{[since } \gamma \text{ is co-continuous]} \\
 &= \gamma(f_A^\beta(\top_A))
 \end{aligned}$$

◀

We can get analogous results for abstractions, by duality.

► **Lemma A.2** (abstraction for single fixpoints). *Let $\alpha : C \rightarrow A$ be an abstraction function.*

1. If

$$\alpha \circ f_C \leq f_A \circ \alpha \tag{3}$$

then $\alpha(\nu f_C) \leq \nu f_A$; if, in addition, α is continuous and strict $\alpha(\mu f_C) \leq \mu f_A$.

2. If

$$f_A \circ \alpha \leq \alpha \circ f_C \tag{4}$$

then $\mu f_A \leq \alpha(\mu f_C)$; if, in addition, α is co-continuous and co-strict then $\nu f_A \leq \alpha(\nu f_C)$.

► **Lemma A.3** (Galois insertions). *Let $f_C : C \rightarrow C$ and $f_A : A \rightarrow A$ be monotone functions and let $\langle \alpha, \gamma \rangle : C \rightarrow A$ be a Galois insertion.*

1. Assume soundness for α i.e., (3) (equivalent to soundness for γ , i.e., (1)), and completeness for both α and β , i.e., (4), (2). Then

$$\alpha(\eta f_C) = \eta f_A \text{ for } \eta \in \{\mu, \nu\} \quad \nu f_C = \gamma(\nu f_A) \quad \mu f_C \sqsubseteq \gamma(\mu f_A)$$

2. Assume

$$f_C = \gamma \circ f_A \circ \alpha \tag{5}$$

then $\alpha(\eta f_C) = \eta f_A$ and $\eta f_C = \gamma(\eta f_A)$ for $\eta \in \{\mu, \nu\}$.

Proof. 1. Just using Lemma A.1 and Lemma A.2, we obtain

$$(a) \alpha(\mu f_C) = \mu f_A \quad (b) \nu f_C = \gamma(\nu f_A) \quad (c) \alpha(\mu f_C) \leq \mu f_A \quad (d) \mu f_C \sqsubseteq \gamma(\mu f_A)$$

From (b), applying α , we obtain $\alpha(\nu f_C) = \alpha(\gamma(\nu f_A)) = \nu f_A$, and we are done.

2. In this case, from the assumption $f_C = \gamma \circ f_A \circ \alpha$ one can easily deduce the soundness and completeness conditions for α and γ , i.e., (3), (4), (1), (2). Therefore, by the previous point we get all desired inequalities but $\gamma(\mu f_A) \sqsubseteq \mu f_C$. For this observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \gamma(\mu f_A) &= \gamma(\alpha(\mu f_C)) && \text{[since } \mu f_A = \alpha(\mu f_C)\text{]} \\
 &= \gamma(\alpha(f_C(\mu f_C))) && \text{[since } \mu f_C \text{ is a fixpoint of } f_C\text{]} \\
 &= \gamma(\alpha(\gamma(f_A(\alpha(\mu f_C)))))) && \text{[since } f_C = \gamma \circ f_A \circ \alpha\text{]} \\
 &= \gamma(f_A(\alpha(\mu f_C))) && \text{[since } \alpha \circ \gamma = id_A\text{]} \\
 &= f_C(\mu f_C) && \text{[since } f_C = \gamma \circ f_A \circ \alpha\text{]} \\
 &= \mu f_C && \text{[since } \mu f_C \text{ is a fixpoint of } f_C\text{]}
 \end{aligned}$$

◀

► **Theorem 4.1** (sound concretisation for systems). *Let (C, \sqsubseteq) and (A, \leq) be complete lattices, let E_C of the kind $x =_{\eta} f^C(x)$ and E_A of the kind $x =_{\eta} f^A(x)$ be systems of m equations over C and A , with solutions $s^C \in C^m$ and $s^A \in A^m$, respectively. Let γ be an m -tuple of monotone functions, with $\gamma_i : A \rightarrow C$ for $i \in \underline{m}$. If γ satisfies $f^C \circ \gamma^{\times} \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\times} \circ f^A$ with γ_i co-continuous and co-strict for each $i \in \underline{m}$ such that $\eta_i = \nu$, then $s^C \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\times}(s^A)$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on m . The case $m = 0$ is trivial.

For the inductive case, consider systems with $m + 1$ equations. Recall that, in order to solve the system, the last variable x_{m+1} is considered as a fixed parameter x and the system of m equations that arises from dropping the last equation is recursively solved. This produces an m -tuple $t_{1,m}^z(x) = \text{sol}(E_z[x_{m+1} := x])$ parametric on x , for $z \in \{A, C\}$. For all $a \in A$, by inductive hypothesis applied to the systems $E_A[x_{m+1} := a]$ and $E_C[x_{m+1} := \gamma_{m+1}(a)]$ we obtain

$$t_{1,m}^C(\gamma_{m+1}(a)) \sqsubseteq \gamma_{1,m}^{\times}(t_{1,m}^A(a)) \quad (6)$$

Inserting the parametric solution into the last equation, we get an equation in a single variable

$$a =_{\eta_m} f_{m+1}^A(t_{1,m}^A(a), a).$$

This equation can be solved by taking the corresponding fixpoint, i.e., if we define $f_A(a) = f_{m+1}^A(t_{1,m}^A(a), a)$, then $s_{m+1}^A = \eta_{m+1} f_A$. In the same way, $s_{m+1}^C = \eta_{m+1} f_C$ where $f_C(c) = f_{m+1}^C(t_{1,m}^C(c), c)$.

Observe that $f_C \circ \gamma_{m+1} \sqsubseteq \gamma_{m+1} \circ f_A$. In fact

$$\begin{aligned} f_C(\gamma_{m+1}(a)) &= \\ &= f_{m+1}^C(t_{1,m}^C(\gamma_{m+1}(a)), \gamma_{m+1}(a)) && \text{[definition of } f_C] \\ &\sqsubseteq f_{m+1}^C(\gamma_{1,m}^{\times}(t_{1,m}^A(a)), \gamma_{m+1}(a)) && \text{[by (6)]} \\ &\sqsubseteq f_{m+1}^C(\gamma^{\times}(t_{1,m}^A(a), a)) && \text{[application of } \gamma] \\ &\sqsubseteq \gamma_{m+1}(f_{m+1}^A(t_{1,m}^A(a), a)) && \text{[hypothesis } f^C \circ \gamma^{\times} \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\times} \circ f^A] \\ &= \gamma_{m+1}(f_A(a)) && \text{[definition of } f_A] \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, recalling that when $\eta_{m+1} = \mu$ we are assuming co-continuity and co-strictness for γ_{m+1} , we can apply Lemma A.1(1) and deduce that

$$s_{m+1}^C = \eta_{m+1} f_C \sqsubseteq \gamma_{m+1}(\eta_{m+1} f_A) = \gamma_{m+1}(s_{m+1}^A) \quad (7)$$

Finally, recall that the first m components of the solutions are $s_{1,m}^z = t_{1,m}^z(s_{m+1}^z)$ for $z \in \{C, A\}$. Therefore, exploiting (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_{1,m}^C &= \\ &= t_{1,m}^C(s_{m+1}^C) \\ &\sqsubseteq t_{1,m}^C(\gamma_{m+1}(s_{m+1}^A)) && \text{[by (7)]} \\ &\sqsubseteq \gamma_{1,m}^{\times}(t_{1,m}^A(s_{m+1}^A)) && \text{[by (6)]} \\ &= \gamma_{1,m}^{\times}(s_{1,m}^A) \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the inductive step. ◀

Everything can be dually formulated in terms of abstraction functions.

33:32 Abstraction, Up-To Techniques and Games for Systems of Fixpoint Equations

► **Theorem A.4** (sound abstraction for systems). *Let (C, \sqsubseteq) and (A, \leq) be complete lattices and let E_C of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}^C(\mathbf{x})$ and E_A of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}^A(\mathbf{x})$ be systems of m equations over C and A , with solutions $\mathbf{s}^C \in C^m$ and $\mathbf{s}^A \in A^m$, respectively. Let α be an m -tuple of monotone functions, with $\alpha_i : C \rightarrow A$ for $i \in \underline{m}$. If α satisfies*

$$\alpha^{\times} \circ \mathbf{f}^C \leq \mathbf{f}^A \circ \alpha^{\times}$$

with α_i continuous and strict for each $i \in \underline{m}$ such that $\eta_i = \mu$, then $\alpha^{\times}(\mathbf{s}^C) \leq \mathbf{s}^A$.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 4.1 by duality. ◀

► **Theorem 4.2** (abstraction via Galois connections). *Let (C, \sqsubseteq) and (A, \leq) be complete lattices, let E_C of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}^C(\mathbf{x})$ and E_A of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}^A(\mathbf{x})$ be systems of m equations over C and A , with solutions $\mathbf{s}^C \in C^m$ and $\mathbf{s}^A \in A^m$, respectively. Let α and γ be m -tuples of monotone functions, with $\langle \alpha_i, \gamma_i \rangle : C \rightarrow A$ a Galois connection for each $i \in \underline{m}$.*

1. Soundness: *If γ satisfies $\mathbf{f}^C \circ \gamma^{\times} \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\times} \circ \mathbf{f}^A$ or equivalently α satisfies $\alpha^{\times} \circ \mathbf{f}^C \leq \mathbf{f}^A \circ \alpha^{\times}$, then $\alpha^{\times}(\mathbf{s}^C) \leq \mathbf{s}^A$ (equivalent to $\mathbf{s}^C \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\times}(\mathbf{s}^A)$).*
2. Completeness (for abstraction): *If α satisfies $\mathbf{f}^A \circ \alpha^{\times} \leq \alpha^{\times} \circ \mathbf{f}^C$ with α_i co-continuous and co-strict for each $i \in \underline{m}$ such that $\eta_i = \nu$, then $\mathbf{s}^A \leq \alpha^{\times}(\mathbf{s}^C)$.*
3. Completeness (for concretisation): *If γ satisfies $\gamma^{\times} \circ \mathbf{f}^A \sqsubseteq \mathbf{f}^C \circ \gamma^{\times}$ with γ_i continuous and strict for each $i \in \underline{m}$ such that $\eta_i = \mu$, then $\gamma^{\times}(\mathbf{s}^A) \sqsubseteq \mathbf{s}^C$.*

Proof. Due to Theorems 4.1 and A.4 (and the fact that we can apply the theorems to lattices with reversed order), the only thing to prove is that the conditions $\alpha^{\times} \circ \mathbf{f}^C \leq \mathbf{f}^A \circ \alpha^{\times}$ and $\mathbf{f}^C \circ \gamma^{\times} \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\times} \circ \mathbf{f}^A$ are equivalent. If we assume $\alpha^{\times} \circ \mathbf{f}^C \leq \mathbf{f}^A \circ \alpha^{\times}$, by definition of Galois connection, we get $\mathbf{f}^C \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\times} \circ \mathbf{f}^A \circ \alpha^{\times}$. Now, post-composing with γ^{\times} and exploiting the fact that $\alpha^{\times} \circ \gamma^{\times} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{id}^{\times}$ we obtain

$$\mathbf{f}^C \circ \gamma^{\times} \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\times} \circ \mathbf{f}^A \circ \alpha^{\times} \circ \gamma^{\times} \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\times} \circ \mathbf{f}^A$$

as desired.

The converse implication is analogous. ◀

For Galois insertions, we make explicit a very special case where we get rid of all the (co-)continuity and (co-)strictness requirements, and get soundness and completeness both for the abstraction and the concretisation.

► **Lemma A.5** (Galois insertions for systems). *Let (C, \sqsubseteq) and (A, \leq) be complete lattices, let E_C of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}^C(\mathbf{x})$ and E_A of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}^A(\mathbf{x})$ be systems of m equations over C and A , with solutions $\mathbf{s}^C \in C^m$ and $\mathbf{s}^A \in A^m$, respectively. Let α and γ be m -tuples of abstraction and concretisation functions, with $\langle \alpha_i, \gamma_i \rangle : C \rightarrow A$ a Galois insertion for each $i \in \underline{m}$. If*

$$\mathbf{f}_C = \gamma^{\times} \circ \mathbf{f}^A \circ \alpha \tag{8}$$

then $\alpha^{\times}(\mathbf{s}^C) = \mathbf{s}^A$ and $\mathbf{s}^C = \gamma^{\times}(\mathbf{s}^A)$.

Proof. 1. We first observe that \bar{u} is a closure. For extensiveness, just observe that $\hat{u}_x(y) = u(y) \sqcup x \sqsupseteq x$ for all $y \in L$ and thus obviously $\bar{u}(x) = \mu(\hat{u}_x) \sqsupseteq x$.

In order to show that \bar{u} is idempotent, note that, by extensiveness, $\bar{u} \sqsubseteq \bar{u} \circ \bar{u}$. Hence to conclude, we just need to prove the converse inequality $\bar{u} \circ \bar{u} \sqsubseteq \bar{u}$. For all $x \in L$, we have $\bar{u}(\bar{u}(x)) = \mu(\hat{u}_{\bar{u}(x)}) = \hat{u}_{\bar{u}(x)}^\gamma$ for some ordinal γ . We prove, by transfinite induction that for all α , that $\hat{u}_{\bar{u}(x)}^\alpha \sqsubseteq \bar{u}(x)$.

($\alpha = 0$) We have that $\hat{u}_{\bar{u}(x)}^0 = \perp \sqsubseteq \bar{u}(x)$.

($\alpha \rightarrow \alpha + 1$) We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{u}_{\bar{u}(x)}^{\alpha+1} &= \hat{u}_{\bar{u}(x)}(\hat{u}_{\bar{u}(x)}^\alpha) \\
 &= u(\hat{u}_{\bar{u}(x)}^\alpha) \sqcup \bar{u}(x) && \text{[by def. } \hat{u}_{\bar{u}(x)} \text{]} \\
 &\sqsubseteq u(\bar{u}(x)) \sqcup \bar{u}(x) && \text{[by ind. hyp.]} \\
 &\sqsubseteq \hat{u}_x(\bar{u}(x)) \sqcup \bar{u}(x) && \text{[since } u \sqsubseteq \hat{u}_x \text{]} \\
 &= \bar{u}(x) \sqcup \bar{u}(x) && \text{[since } \hat{u}_x(\bar{u}(x)) = \bar{u}(x) \text{]} \\
 &= \bar{u}(x)
 \end{aligned}$$

(α limit) We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{u}_{\bar{u}(x)}^\alpha &= \bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} \hat{u}_{\bar{u}(x)}^\beta \\
 &\sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} \bar{u}(x) && \text{[by ind. hyp.]} \\
 &= \bar{u}(x)
 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, \bar{u} is larger than u , i.e., $u \sqsubseteq \bar{u}$. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{u}(x) &= \hat{u}_x(\bar{u}(x)) && \text{[since } \bar{u}(x) \text{ is a fixpoint of } \hat{u}_x \text{]} \\
 &= u(\bar{u}(x)) \sqcup x && \text{[by def. of } \hat{u}_x \text{]} \\
 &\sqsupseteq u(x) \sqcup x && \text{[since } \bar{u} \text{ is extensive]} \\
 &\sqsupseteq u(x)
 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, let v any closure such that $u \sqsubseteq v$. We show that for all $x \in L$, $\hat{u}_x^\alpha \sqsubseteq v(x)$, whence $\bar{u}(x) \sqsubseteq v(x)$, as desired.

($\alpha = 0$) We have that $\hat{u}_{\bar{u}(x)}^0 = \perp \sqsubseteq v(x)$.

($\alpha \rightarrow \alpha + 1$) We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{u}_{\bar{u}(x)}^{\alpha+1} &= \hat{u}_x(\hat{u}_x^\alpha) \\
 &= u(\hat{u}_x^\alpha) \sqcup x && \text{[by def. } \hat{u}_x \text{]} \\
 &\sqsubseteq u(v(x)) \sqcup x && \text{[by ind. hyp.]} \\
 &\sqsubseteq v(v(x)) \sqcup x && \text{[since } u \sqsubseteq v \text{]} \\
 &= v(x) \sqcup x && \text{[by idempotency of } v \text{]} \\
 &= v(x) && \text{[by extensiveness of } v \text{]}
 \end{aligned}$$

(α limit) We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{u}_x^\alpha &= \bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} \hat{u}_x^\beta \\ &\sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} v(x) && \text{[by ind. hyp.]} \\ &= v(x)\end{aligned}$$

2. Observe that for all $x \in L$, we have $\bar{u}(f(x)) = \hat{u}_{f(x)}^\gamma$ for some ordinal γ . Hence also here we proceed by transfinite induction, showing that for all α

$$\hat{u}_{f(x)}^\alpha \sqsubseteq f(\bar{u}(x))$$

($\alpha = 0$) We have that $\hat{u}_{f(x)}^0 = \perp \sqsubseteq f(\bar{u}(x))$.

($\alpha \rightarrow \alpha + 1$) We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{u}_{f(x)}^{\alpha+1} &= \hat{u}_{f(x)}(\hat{u}_{f(x)}^\alpha) \\ &\sqsubseteq \hat{u}_{f(x)}(f(\bar{u}(x))) && \text{[by ind. hyp.]} \\ &= u(f(\bar{u}(x))) \sqcup f(x) && \text{[by def. of } \hat{u}_{f(x)}\text{]} \\ &\sqsubseteq f(u(\bar{u}(x))) \sqcup f(x) && \text{[by compatibility of } f\text{]} \\ &\sqsubseteq f(u(\bar{u}(x)) \sqcup x) && \text{[by general properties of } \sqcup\text{]} \\ &= f(\hat{u}_x(\bar{u}(x))) && \text{[by def. of } \hat{u}_x\text{]} \\ &= f(\bar{u}(x)) && \text{[since } \hat{u}_x \text{ is a fixpoint]}\end{aligned}$$

(α limit) We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{u}_{f(x)}^\alpha &= \bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} \hat{u}_{f(x)}^\beta \\ &\sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} f(\bar{u}(x)) && \text{[by ind. hyp.]} \\ &= f(\bar{u}(x))\end{aligned}$$

3. Assume that u is continuous and strict. Then \hat{u}_x is continuous for all $x \in L$. In fact, for each directed set $D \subseteq L$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{u}_x(\bigsqcup D) &= u(\bigsqcup D) \sqcup x \\ &= \bigsqcup \{u(d) \mid d \in D\} \sqcup x \\ &= \bigsqcup \{u(d) \sqcup x \mid d \in D\} \\ &= \bigsqcup \{\hat{u}_x(d) \mid d \in D\}\end{aligned}$$

Now, we can show that \bar{u} is continuous. Let $D \subseteq L$ be a directed set. We have to prove that $\bar{u}(\bigsqcup D) = \bigsqcup_{d \in D} \bar{u}(d)$. It is sufficient to prove that $\bar{u}(\bigsqcup D) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{d \in D} \bar{u}(d)$, as the other inequality follows by monotonicity and general properties of \bigsqcup . As usual, we recall that $\bar{u}(\bigsqcup D) = \hat{u}_{\bigsqcup D}^\gamma$ for some γ and thus show, by transfinite induction on α that

$$\hat{u}_{\bigsqcup D}^\alpha \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{d \in D} \bar{u}(d).$$

($\alpha = 0$) We have that $\hat{u}_{\sqcup D}^0 = \perp \sqsubseteq \sqcup_{d \in D} \bar{u}(d)$.

($\alpha \rightarrow \alpha + 1$) We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{u}_{\sqcup D}^{\alpha+1} &= \hat{u}_{\sqcup D}(\hat{u}_{\sqcup D}^\alpha) \\
 &\sqsubseteq \hat{u}_{\sqcup D}(\sqcup_{d \in D} \bar{u}(d)) && \text{[by ind. hyp.]} \\
 &= \sqcup_{d \in D} \hat{u}_{\sqcup D}(\bar{u}(d)) && \text{[by continuity of } \hat{u}_{\sqcup D}] \\
 &= \sqcup_{d \in D} (u(\bar{u}(d)) \sqcup \sqcup D) && \text{[by def. of } \hat{u}_{\sqcup D}] \\
 &\sqsubseteq \sqcup_{d \in D} (\hat{u}_d(\bar{u}(d)) \sqcup \sqcup D) && \text{[since } u \sqsubseteq \hat{u}_d] \\
 &= \sqcup_{d \in D} (\bar{u}(d) \sqcup \sqcup D) && \text{[since } \hat{u}(d) \text{ is a fixpoint]} \\
 &= \sqcup_{d \in D} (\bar{u}(d) \sqcup d) \\
 &= \sqcup_{d \in D} \bar{u}(d) && \text{[by extensiveness of } \bar{u}]
 \end{aligned}$$

(α limit) We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{u}_{\sqcup D}^\alpha &= \sqcup_{\beta < \alpha} \hat{u}_{\sqcup D}^\beta \\
 &\sqsubseteq \sqcup_{\beta < \alpha} \sqcup_{d \in D} \bar{u}(d) && \text{[by ind. hyp.]} \\
 &= \sqcup_{d \in D} \bar{u}(d)
 \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, \bar{u} is strict since $\hat{u}_\perp(\perp) = u(\perp) \sqcup \perp = \perp \sqcup \perp = \perp$, and thus $\bar{u}(\perp) = \mu(\hat{u}_\perp) = \perp$. ◀

► **Theorem 5.8** (up-to for systems). *Let (L, \sqsubseteq) be a complete lattice and let E be $\mathbf{x} =_\eta \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$, a system of m equations over L , with solution $\mathbf{s} \in L^m$. Let \mathbf{u} be a compatible tuple of up-to functions for E and let $\bar{\mathbf{u}} = (\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_m)$ be the corresponding tuple of least closures. Let \mathbf{s}' and $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ be the solutions of the systems $\mathbf{x} =_\eta \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}^\times(\mathbf{x}))$ and $\mathbf{x} =_\eta \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{u}}^\times(\mathbf{x}))$, respectively. Then $\mathbf{s}' \sqsubseteq \bar{\mathbf{s}} = \mathbf{s}$. Moreover, if \mathbf{u} is extensive then $\mathbf{s}' = \mathbf{s}$.*

Proof. Immediate extension to systems of the proofs of the Lemma 5.3 and Corollary 5.6, exploiting Theorem 4.1. ◀

C Proofs for Section 6 (Solving Systems of Equations via Games)

► **Theorem 6.3** (correctness and completeness). *Let E be a system of m equations over a complete lattice L of the kind $\mathbf{x} =_\eta \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ with solution \mathbf{s} . For all $b \in B_L$ and $i \in \underline{m}$, $b \sqsubseteq s_i$ iff \exists has a winning strategy from position (b, i) .*

Proof. Define $\langle \alpha, \gamma \rangle : \mathbf{2}^{B_L} \rightarrow L$, by letting $\alpha(X) = \bigsqcup X$ for $X \in \mathbf{2}^{B_L}$ and $\gamma(l) = \downarrow l \cap B_L$ for $l \in L$. It is immediate to see that this is a Galois insertion: for all $X \in \mathbf{2}^{B_L}$ we have $X \subseteq \gamma(\alpha(X)) = (\downarrow \bigsqcup X) \cap B_L$ and, for $l \in L$ we have $l = \alpha(\gamma(l)) = \bigsqcup(\downarrow l \cap B_L)$.

Below we abuse the notation and write \downarrow and \bigsqcup for the m -tuples where each function is \downarrow and \bigsqcup applied componentwise, respectively.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} ((\mathbf{2}^{B_L})^m, \subseteq) & \xleftarrow{\gamma = \downarrow - \cap B_L} & L^m \\ \uparrow & \alpha = \bigsqcup - & \uparrow \\ f^C = \downarrow f \bigsqcup & & f \end{array}$$

Define a “concrete” system $x =_{\eta} f^C(x)$ where $f^C = \gamma^{\times} \circ f \circ \alpha^{\times} : (\mathbf{2}^{B_L})^m \rightarrow (\mathbf{2}^{B_L})^m$. Then we can use Lemma A.5 to deduce that, if we denote by S^C the solution of the concrete system and by s the solution of the original system, we have $S^C = \downarrow s \cap B_L^m$.

Now, $(\mathbf{2}^{B_L}, \subseteq)$ is an algebraic, hence continuous lattice. Therefore, by [2, Theorem 4.8], the lattice game for the “concrete” system on $(\mathbf{2}^{B_L})^m$ is sound and complete.

It is immediate to realise that, if we fix as basis for $\mathbf{2}^{B_L}$ the set of singletons, this corresponds exactly to what we called here the powerset game. In fact, the game aims to show that $\{b\} \subseteq S_i^C = \downarrow s_i$, for some $b \in B_L$ and $i \in \underline{m}$, and this amounts to $b \sqsubseteq s_i$. Positions of \exists are pairs $(\{b\}, i)$ where $b \in B_L$ and $i \in \underline{m}$, and she has to play some tuples $\mathbf{X} \in (\mathbf{2}^{B_L})^m$ such that $\{b\} \subseteq f_i^C(\mathbf{X}) = \downarrow f_C(\bigsqcup \mathbf{X})$ which amounts to $b \sqsubseteq f_C(\bigsqcup \mathbf{X})$. Positions of \forall are tuples $\mathbf{X} \in (\mathbf{2}^{B_L})^m$ and he chooses some $j \in \underline{m}$ and $b' \in X_j$. This is exactly the powerset game, hence we conclude. \blacktriangleleft

► **Theorem 6.5** (game with selections). *Let $x =_{\nu} f(x)$ be an equation over a complete lattice L with solution s . For all $b \in B_L$, it holds that $b \sqsubseteq s$ iff \exists has a winning strategy from position b in the game restricted to selections.*

Proof. Assume that \exists has a winning strategy in the original game: given b she would play X , where all $b' \in \mathbf{A}(X)$ are winning positions.

Instead, in the game restricted by selections, she might only be able to play Y where $\bigsqcup Y \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup X$. Now \forall picks $b' \in Y$. By construction $b' \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup X$. Since all elements of X are winning positions in the original game (and hence below the solution), b' is also a winning position and we can continue. Now either \exists wins directly or the game continues forever, giving us a winning strategy in the restricted game. \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 6.7** (selection). *Let L be a complete lattice with basis B_L , and let $f : L \rightarrow L$ be a deterministic function, i.e., $f(x) = f^*(x) \sqcap c$ for some $c \in L$ and $\langle f_*, f^* \rangle : L \rightarrow L$ a Galois connection. A selection $\sigma : B_L \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^{B_L}$ for $x =_{\nu} f(x)$ can be defined, for $b \in B_L$, as:*

$$\sigma(b) = \begin{cases} \{X\} \text{ with } X \subseteq B_L \text{ s.t. } X \equiv_H \downarrow f_*(b) \cap B_L & \text{when } b \sqsubseteq c \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Proof. In order to see that this is a selection, note that if $b \sqsubseteq c$ then given $X \subseteq B_L$ it holds that $X \in \mathbf{E}(b)$ (i.e., $b \sqsubseteq f(\bigsqcup X) = f^*(\bigsqcup X) \sqcap c$) iff $b \sqsubseteq f^*(\bigsqcup X)$ iff $f_*(b) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup X$, where the last step is motivated by adjointness. \blacktriangleleft

► **Theorem 6.8** (correctness and completeness of the simplified game). *Let L be a complete lattice with basis $B_L \subseteq L \setminus \{\perp\}$, and let $f : L \rightarrow L$ be a deterministic function, i.e., $f(x) = f^*(x) \sqcap c$ for some $c \in L$ and $\langle f_*, f^* \rangle : L \rightarrow L$ a Galois connection. Then, for all $b \in B_L$, $b \sqsubseteq \nu f$ iff the invocation $\text{Explore}(b, \emptyset)$ returns **true**.*

Proof. First we prove that if $b \sqsubseteq \nu f$, then the algorithm in Fig. 1 determines that \exists wins the simplified game. Observe that by monotonicity of f , we have that $b \sqsubseteq \nu f = f(\nu f) \sqsubseteq f(\top)$, so \exists does not immediately lose. Moreover, let $X \subseteq B_L$ such that $X \equiv_H \downarrow f_*(b) \cap B_L$, hence $\bigsqcup X = f_*(b)$. Since $b \sqsubseteq \nu f$, by monotonicity of f_* we have $\bigsqcup X = f_*(b) \sqsubseteq f_*(\nu f) = f_*(f(\nu f)) = f_*(f^*(\nu f) \sqcap f(\top)) \sqsubseteq f_*(f^*(\nu f)) \sqsubseteq \nu f$ because of the properties of the Galois connection. Since $\bigsqcup X \sqsubseteq \nu f$ we must have that $b' \sqsubseteq \nu f$ for all $b' \in X$, therefore the same argument as before holds on all $b' \in X$ as well, and so no position losing for \exists can ever be reached, hence \exists wins.

Now we prove that if \exists wins starting from $b_0 = b$, then $b \sqsubseteq \nu f$. Actually, we show that if \exists wins the simplified game according to the local algorithm (Fig. 1) then she wins also the general fixpoint game for the single fixpoint equation $x =_\nu f(x)$, and so by Theorem 6.3 we know that $b \sqsubseteq \nu f$. Since \exists wins, for every path (b_0, b_1, \dots) in the tree of positions explored we have three possible cases:

- the path is infinite, thus for all i , $b_i \sqsubseteq f(\top)$ and $b_{i+1} \in X_i$ for some $X_i \subseteq B_L$ such that $X_i \equiv_H \downarrow f_*(b_i) \cap B_L$, hence $\bigsqcup X_i = f_*(b_i)$. Then, for all i , observe that by the Galois connection we have $b_i = b_i \sqcap f(\top) \sqsubseteq f^*(f_*(b_i)) \sqcap f(\top) = f^*(\bigsqcup X_i) \sqcap f(\top) = f(\bigsqcup X_i)$. This means that, for all i , $X_i \in \mathbf{E}(b_i)$ is a valid move for player \exists from position b_i in the fixpoint game. Furthermore, $b_{i+1} \in \mathbf{A}(X_i)$ is a valid move for player \forall in the fixpoint game. Therefore, the infinite sequence $(b_0, X_0, b_1, X_1, \dots)$ is an infinite play in the fixpoint game, which is won by \exists since there is a single greatest fixpoint equation.
- the path is finite and the exploration has been stopped because at some point $b_i \sqsubseteq f(\top)$ and $f_*(b_i) = \perp$ thus the only possible $X_i \subseteq B_L$ such that $X_i \equiv_H \downarrow \perp \cap B_L$ is $X_i = \emptyset$. Similarly to before, for all $j < i$, we have $b_{j+1} \in X_j$ for some $X_j \subseteq B_L$ such that $X_j \equiv_H \downarrow f_*(b_j) \cap B_L$. Note that since the game reached the position b_i , for all $j < i$ we must have $b_j \sqsubseteq f(\top)$. For the same reasons in the previous case, $b_i \sqsubseteq f(\bigsqcup X_i) = f(\bigsqcup \emptyset)$, thus $\emptyset \in \mathbf{E}(b_i)$, and the sequence $(b_0, X_0, b_1, X_1, \dots, b_i, \emptyset)$ is a finite play in the fixpoint game leading to the position \emptyset where player \forall cannot move, hence \exists wins.
- the path is finite and the exploration has been stopped because at some point it holds $b_i \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup W$ and $b_i \sqsubseteq f(\top)$. Again, for all $j < i$, we have $b_{j+1} \in X_j$ for some $X_j \subseteq B_L$ such that $X_j \equiv_H \downarrow f_*(b_j) \cap B_L$. Observe that since W is the set of positions previously encountered, it contains every position previously explored, thus not losing for \exists , including all b_j for $j < i$. Then, for all $b' \in W$ we must have $b' \sqsubseteq f(\top)$. Furthermore, note that positions are put in W only when all their successors are going to be explored. Therefore, for all $b' \in W$, we have $f_*(b') \sqsubseteq f(\top)$, otherwise there would exist a successor $b'' \in X' \equiv_H \downarrow f_*(b') \cap B_L$ such that $b'' \not\sqsubseteq f(\top)$ contradicting the fact that \exists wins the simplified game. Let $X_i \subseteq B_L$ such that $X_i \equiv_H \downarrow f_*(b_i) \cap B_L$. Then, we have that $\bigsqcup X_i = f_*(b_i) \sqsubseteq f_*(\bigsqcup W) = \bigsqcup_{b' \in W} f_*(b') \sqsubseteq f(\top)$ since $b_i \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup W$, f_* as a left adjoint preserves non-empty joins and $f_*(b') \sqsubseteq f(\top)$ for all $b' \in W$. Then, for all $b' \in X_i$, this implies that $b' \sqsubseteq f(\top)$. Moreover, for the same reasoning used in the first case we have that $b_i \sqsubseteq f(\bigsqcup X_i)$, hence $X_i \in \mathbf{E}(b_i)$. An inductive argument thus proves that every path continuing the exploration from a $b' \in X_i$ we will never go beyond $f(\top)$, and so for each of those paths there exists an infinite sequence $(b_0, X_0, b_1, X_1, \dots)$ such that for all j , $X_j \in \mathbf{E}(b_j)$. Then this is an infinite play of the fixpoint game won by \exists .

Since all the possible moves of player \forall in every set X are explored, and all the paths obtained in this way (divided in the three cases above) correspond to plays in the fixpoint game won by \exists , we can conclude that, indeed, \exists wins the fixpoint game. \blacktriangleleft

► **Definition C.1 (sound forget).** Whenever function $\text{FORGET}(\Delta_P, \Gamma_P, (C, \mathbf{k}))$ is invoked, returning Δ'_P , for every decision $(C', \mathbf{k}') \in \Delta'_P$, for every position C'' justifying that decision,

there exists $(C'', \mathbf{k}'') \in \Delta'_P$ such that $\mathbf{k}'' \leq_P \text{next}(\mathbf{k}', i(C''))$ or there exists $(C'', \mathbf{k}'') \in \Gamma_P \setminus \{(C, \mathbf{k})\}$ such that $\mathbf{k}'' <_P \text{next}(\mathbf{k}', i(C'))$.

► **Lemma C.2** (assumptions and plays). *Given a fixpoint game, whenever functions $\text{EXPLORE}(\cdot, \cdot, \rho, \Gamma, \Delta)$ and $\text{BACKTRACK}(\cdot, \cdot, \rho, \Gamma, \Delta)$ are invoked, for every player P , for all $(C, \mathbf{k}) \in \Gamma_P$ it holds $(C, \mathbf{k}, \pi) \in \rho$ for some π .*

Proof. Easily proved by an inspection of the code. Initially, on the call $\text{EXPLORE}(C_0, \mathbf{0}, [], (\emptyset, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \emptyset))$, the property vacuously holds since both Γ_\exists and Γ_\forall are empty. Now, the only way that could make the property fail are by adding new assumptions or backtracking, hence shortening the playlist ρ . The only position in the code where new assumptions are added is in the function EXPLORE . A new assumption (C, \mathbf{k}') is added only if $(C, \mathbf{k}', \pi) \in \rho$, for some π , thus the property still holds. On the other hand, the only place where the backtracking really happens, that is, ρ is effectively shorten, is at the end of the backtracking function, when $\text{BACKTRACK}(P, C', t, \Gamma, \Delta)$ is invoked. More precisely, the head (C', \mathbf{k}', π) is removed from the playlist ρ . However, before the aforementioned invocation, (C', \mathbf{k}') was already removed from Γ_P and from $\Gamma_{\overline{P}}$, if it were in $\Gamma_{\overline{P}}$. And so again the property still holds. ◀

► **Lemma 6.10** (termination). *Given a fixpoint game on a finite lattice, any call $\text{EXPLORE}(C_0, \mathbf{0}, [], (\emptyset, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \emptyset))$ terminates, hence at some point $\text{BACKTRACK}(P, C_0, [], (\emptyset, \emptyset), \Delta)$ is invoked, for some player P and pairs of sets Γ and Δ .*

Proof. Consider the sequence σ of invocations to functions EXPLORE and BACKTRACK in the order they happen, originating from a call $\text{EXPLORE}(C_0, \mathbf{0}, [], (\emptyset, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \emptyset))$. Let τ be the subsequence of σ obtained removing all calls to BACKTRACK . We show that such sequence is finite. First, since the lattice is finite, hence Pos is finite, the set of playlists ρ in the invocations in τ is also finite. Actually, this is not true in general for any set of playlists, but it holds for the set of lists we obtain during any computation. Indeed, this can be seen inductively, showing that every playlist ρ has length bounded by $|\text{Pos}|$. At the beginning we have the empty list $[]$ which is clearly bounded by $|\text{Pos}|$. Then, by inspecting the code it can be seen that the only function which increases the size of ρ is EXPLORE , and it happens only if the current position C , with counter \mathbf{k} , is not already contained in ρ with a counter \mathbf{k}' s.t. $\mathbf{k}' <_P \mathbf{k}$ for some player P . But whenever a position C already in ρ is encountered again it must be with a counter strictly larger for one of the players. The only case where this could possibly fail is when the subsequence of ρ between the two occurrences of C contains only positions with priority 0. But, as already mentioned, this cannot happen because players alternate during the game and only \forall has positions with priority 0. Thus, every time a position recurs, the playlist is not extended any more. So, the size of the playlist is necessarily bounded by the size of Pos . Furthermore, the set of playlists of length bounded by $|\text{Pos}|$ is finite because every π in them is bounded as well, since $\pi \subseteq \text{Pos}$, and the same happens for the counters \mathbf{k} since they are computed starting from $\mathbf{0}$ and increased at most by 1 in some component only when the list is extended. Therefore, τ must contain only a finite number of different playlists ρ , possibly with repetitions. Now, in order to show that τ is finite, we define a partial order \leq over the playlists in τ as follows, $\forall \rho, \rho', \rho'', C, \mathbf{k}, \pi, \pi'$:

- $\rho' \rho \leq \rho$
- if $\pi \subsetneq \pi'$, then $\rho''((C, \mathbf{k}, \pi) :: \rho) \leq \rho''((C, \mathbf{k}, \pi') :: \rho)$.

It is easy to see that such order is reflexive, antisymmetric, and transitive. Since the set of playlists in τ is finite, so is the corresponding poset with the given partial order. By an inspection of the code it can be seen that for every two playlists ρ, ρ' in consecutive invocations of EXPLORE in τ , we have that $\rho' < \rho$, since:

- function EXPLORE extends the playlist ρ until function BACKTRACK is invoked
- function BACKTRACK shortens the playlist ρ until it is empty or function EXPLORE is invoked, after shortening the set of unexplored moves π in ρ .

So the playlists in τ form a strictly descending chain in a finite poset, thus τ must be finite. And this immediately proves that σ is finite as well, because otherwise from a certain point on we would have infinitely many calls to BACKTRACK only, which would shorten the playlist infinitely many times. And so we can conclude that any computation originating from a call $\text{EXPLORE}(C_0, \mathbf{0}, [], (\emptyset, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \emptyset))$ must terminate. Finally, since the only instruction returning a value (hence terminating the execution) is in the function BACKTRACK and it is reached only when $\rho = []$, then $\text{BACKTRACK}(P, C, [], \Gamma, \Delta)$ must have been invoked on some P, C, Γ, Δ . Furthermore, $C = C_0$ because $\rho = []$ is the list of positions from the root C_0 to the current node C .

We immediately conclude that $\Gamma = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ by exploiting Lemma C.2. ◀

► **Lemma C.3** (backtracking position). *Given a fixpoint game, whenever function $\text{BACKTRACK}(P, C, \rho, \Gamma, \Delta)$ is invoked, it holds $(C, \mathbf{k}) \in \Delta_P \cup \Gamma_P$ for some \mathbf{k} .*

Proof. Immediate by inspecting the invocations of BACKTRACK in the code. ◀

► **Lemma C.4** (uncontrolled decisions). *Given a fixpoint game, whenever functions $\text{EXPLORE}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \Gamma, \Delta)$ and $\text{BACKTRACK}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \Gamma, \Delta)$ are invoked, for every player P , for all $(C, \mathbf{k}) \in \Delta_P$, if $P(C) \neq P$, then for all $C' \in M(C)$ it holds $(C', \mathbf{k}') \in \Delta_P \cup \Gamma_P$ for some \mathbf{k}' .*

Proof. By inspecting the code it is easy to see that every time we add a new decision (C, \mathbf{k}) for a player P that is not the owner of C , either:

- $M(C) = \emptyset$, thus the property vacuously holds, or
- the procedure already explored all possible moves $M(C)$ and they all became decisions or assumptions for P , since we are in the case where $P(C) \neq P$ and $\pi = \emptyset$.

Furthermore, such a decision (C, \mathbf{k}) is justified by $M(C)$. Therefore, if one of those moves were to be deleted from the assumptions or decisions of P at some point, the function FORGET would delete (C, \mathbf{k}) as well. ◀

For the next results we make use of fixpoint games suitably modified for a set of assumptions for a player. For a set S of decisions or assumptions we denote by $C(S)$ its first projection, that is, the set of positions appearing as first component in the elements of S .

► **Definition C.5** (game with assumptions). *Given a fixpoint game G and a player P , the corresponding game with assumptions Γ_P is a parity game $G(\Gamma_P)$ obtained from G where for all $C \in \text{Pos}$, if $C \in C(\Gamma_P)$, then $P(C) = \bar{P}$ and $M(C) = \emptyset$, otherwise they are the same as in G .*

Notice that when the set of assumptions is empty $\Gamma_P = \emptyset$, the modified game is the same of the original one.

Then, we define a kind of strategies based on decisions and assumptions for a player, which fit the modified games above. Such strategies are history-free partial strategies. Indeed they only prescribe moves from decisions.

► **Definition C.6** (strategy with assumptions). *Let G be a fixpoint game. Given a player P , a strategy with assumptions Γ_P from decisions Δ_P for P is a function $s_P : C(\Delta_P \cup \Gamma_P) \rightarrow 2^{C(\Delta_P \cup \Gamma_P)}$ where for all $C \in C(\Gamma_P)$, $s_P(C) = \emptyset$, and for all $C \in C(\Delta_P) \setminus C(\Gamma_P)$, $s_P(C)$ is the set of positions, possibly empty, justifying the decision $(C, \min_{\leq_P} \{\mathbf{k} \mid (C, \mathbf{k}) \in \Delta_P\})$.*

Given a position $C \in \mathcal{C}(\Delta_P)$, we denote by $d_P(C) = \min_{\leq_P} \{\mathbf{k} \mid (C, \mathbf{k}) \in \Delta_P\}$ the counter that was associated with C .

We say that the strategy s_P is winning when it is winning in the modified game $G(\Gamma_P)$, that is, every play in $G(\Gamma_P)$ following s_P starting from a position in $\mathcal{C}(\Delta_P)$ is won by player P .

The definition above is well given since by Lemmata C.3 and C.4 we know that when we add a new decision justified by some other, those are already included in the decisions or assumptions for the same player. Moreover, notice that the minimum of $\{\mathbf{k} \mid (C, \mathbf{k}) \in \Delta_P\}$ is guaranteed to be in the set itself because \leq_P is a total order and the set is never empty since $C \in \mathcal{C}(\Delta_P)$.

In the modified game $G(\Gamma_P)$, given the strategy s_P with assumptions Γ_P from decisions Δ_P , for each position $C \in \mathcal{C}(\Delta_P)$ we can build a tree including all the plays starting from C where player P follows the strategy s_P .

► **Definition C.7** (tree of plays). *Let G be a fixpoint game. Given a player P and the strategy s_P with assumptions Γ_P from decisions Δ_P , for each position $C \in \mathcal{C}(\Delta_P)$, the tree of the plays following s_P starting from C is the tree $\tau_{s_P}^C$ rooted in C , where every node C' in it has successors $s_P(C')$.*

Such trees can contain both finite and infinite paths. Finite complete paths terminate in assumptions or truths, infinite ones contain only decisions. By construction and definition of strategy with assumptions every node is either a decision or an assumption for P . More precisely, every inner node is a position in $\mathcal{C}(\Delta_P)$, and every leaf corresponds to either a truth in Δ_P or an assumption in Γ_P . It is easy to see that a tree $\tau_{s_P}^C$ includes all the possible plays from C following s_P since the successors of inner nodes owned by the opponent are all the possible moves from those positions (decisions controlled by the opponent are justified by all the possible opponent's moves, Lemma C.4).

The trees defined above are all we need to show that a strategy with assumptions is winning. Indeed, it is enough to show that every complete path in each of those trees corresponds to a play won by the player. To this end, first we observe some key properties of the paths in the trees.

► **Lemma C.8** (priorities in strategy paths). *Given a fixpoint game, whenever functions $\text{EXPLORE}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \Gamma, \Delta)$ and $\text{BACKTRACK}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \Gamma, \Delta)$ are invoked, for every player P , given the strategy s_P with assumptions Γ_P from decisions Δ_P , for all $\hat{C} \in \mathcal{C}(\Delta_P)$, the tree of plays $\tau_{s_P}^{\hat{C}}$ satisfies the following properties*

1. for every pair of inner nodes C, C' in $\tau_{s_P}^{\hat{C}}$ s.t. C' is a successor of C , it holds $d_P(C') \leq_P \text{next}(d_P(C), i(C))$
2. for every non-empty inner path C_1, \dots, C_n in $\tau_{s_P}^{\hat{C}}$, if $d_P(C_1) <_P \text{next}(d_P(C_n), i(C_n))$, then $P = \exists$ iff $\eta_h = \nu$, where h is the highest priority occurring along the path.

Proof. We prove the two properties separately.

1. Observe that we must have $C' \in s_P(C)$ by definition of $\tau_{s_P}^{\hat{C}}$. This means that there exists a decision $(C, d_P(C)) \in \Delta_P$ justified by the position C' . Then $(C, d_P(C))$ must have been added by a call to BACKTRACK . By inspecting the code it is easy to see that we were backtracking either after adding a new decision $(C', \text{next}(d_P(C), i(C)))$ or because there was already a decision (C', \mathbf{k}') s.t. $\mathbf{k}' \leq_P \text{next}(d_P(C), i(C))$. Since $d_P(C') = \min_{\leq_P} \{\mathbf{k} \mid (C', \mathbf{k}) \in \Delta_P\}$, in both cases we can immediately conclude that $d_P(C') \leq_P \text{next}(d_P(C), i(C))$.

2. We assume that $d_P(C_1) <_P \text{next}(d_P(C_n), i(C_n))$ and $P = \exists$, and we prove that $\eta_h = \nu$, where h is the highest priority occurring along the path. A dual reasoning holds for $P = \forall$. Let next^j be a function that computes the counter after a subsequence of positions C_1, \dots, C_j in the path C_1, \dots, C_n , for $j \in \underline{n}$. The function is inductively defined by $\text{next}^j(\mathbf{k}) = \text{next}(\text{next}^{j-1}(\mathbf{k}), i(C_j))$ for all $j \in \underline{n}$, and $\text{next}^0(\mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{k}$. The inductive computation just repeatedly applies the function next for each position encountered along the sequence starting from a given counter \mathbf{k} . We observe that the function satisfies the property $d_{\exists}(C_j) \leq_{\exists} \text{next}^{j-1}(d_{\exists}(C_1))$ for all $j \in \underline{n}$. We show this by induction on j . Clearly it holds for $j = 1$, since by definition $\text{next}^0(d_{\exists}(C_1)) = d_{\exists}(C_1)$. Then, assuming it holds for j , we prove it for $j + 1$. Since we know that next is monotone wrt. the input counter, by inductive hypothesis we obtain that $\text{next}(d_{\exists}(C_j), i(C_j)) \leq_P \text{next}(\text{next}^{j-1}(d_{\exists}(C_1)), i(C_j)) = \text{next}^j(d_{\exists}(C_1))$, where the last equality holds by definition of next^j . Furthermore, we know that $d_{\exists}(C_{j+1}) \leq_{\exists} \text{next}(d_{\exists}(C_j), i(C_j))$ by (a) above, since C_{j+1} is a successor of C_j . And so we can immediately deduce that indeed $d_{\exists}(C_{j+1}) \leq_{\exists} \text{next}^j(d_{\exists}(C_1))$. From this and the initial assumptions we have that $d_{\exists}(C_1) <_{\exists} \text{next}(d_{\exists}(C_n), i(C_n)) \leq_{\exists} \text{next}^n(d_{\exists}(C_1))$, where the last inequality holds by definition of next^n and monotonicity of next . Observe that since next^n just recursively applies the function next on the positions C_1, \dots, C_n , the final result and the initial counter $d_{\exists}(C_1)$ can only differ on priorities among those of the positions C_1, \dots, C_n and lower ones (which could have been zeroed). Therefore, the highest priority on which $d_{\exists}(C_1)$ and $\text{next}^n(d_{\exists}(C_1))$ do not coincide must be the highest priority h appearing along the path. Furthermore, we must have $d_{\exists}(C_1)_h < \text{next}^n(d_{\exists}(C_1))_h$, because values can only increase or become zero, when a higher priority is encountered (and its value increased), but this would contradict the fact that h is the highest. Now we can easily conclude since by hypothesis $d_{\exists}(C_1) <_{\exists} \text{next}^n(d_{\exists}(C_1))$, and so by definition of the order $<_{\exists}$ we must have that $\eta_h = \nu$. ◀

We observe that winning strategies with assumptions are preserved by a sound function FORGET after removing an assumption and the related decisions.

► **Lemma C.9** (strategies and forget). *Given a fixpoint game, whenever $\text{FORGET}(\Delta_P, \Gamma_P, (C, \mathbf{k}))$ is invoked, returning Δ'_P , if the strategy with assumptions Γ_P from decisions Δ_P is winning in the modified game with assumptions Γ_P , then the strategy with assumptions $\Gamma_P \setminus \{(C, \mathbf{k})\}$ from decisions Δ'_P is winning in the modified game with assumptions $\Gamma_P \setminus \{(C, \mathbf{k})\}$.*

Proof. It follows immediately from Definitions C.1 and C.6. ◀

► **Lemma C.10** (winning strategy from decisions). *Given a fixpoint game, whenever functions $\text{EXPLORE}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \Gamma, \Delta)$ and $\text{BACKTRACK}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \Gamma, \Delta)$ are invoked, for every player P , the strategy with assumptions Γ_P from decisions Δ_P is winning in the modified game with assumptions Γ_P .*

Proof. We prove this by induction on the sequence of functions calls. Initially, on the first call $\text{EXPLORE}(C, \mathbf{0}, [], (\emptyset, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \emptyset))$, the property vacuously holds since $\Delta_{\exists} = \Delta_{\forall} = \emptyset$. Now, assuming that the property holds when a function is called, we show that it holds also on every invocation performed by such function.

Assume that the property holds when $\text{EXPLORE}(C, \mathbf{k}, \rho, \Gamma, \Delta)$ is called. The only invocation where the property could possibly fail is $\text{BACKTRACK}(\overline{P(C)}, C, \rho, \Gamma, \Delta)$ after (C, \mathbf{k}) has been added to the decisions for $\overline{P(C)}$, when $M(C) = \emptyset$. However we can immediately see that $\overline{P(C)}$ wins from C since the opponent $P(C)$ cannot move (the strategy is always

winning from C). On all the other calls the property is preserved since all decisions are unchanged and no assumption has been removed.

Assume that the property holds when $\text{BACKTRACK}(P, C, \rho, \Gamma, \Delta)$ is called. There are only two invocations to check. Clearly the property is preserved on the first one, i.e., $\text{EXPLORE}(C'', \mathbf{k}'', \rho, \Gamma, \Delta)$, since all decisions and assumptions are unchanged. The second case is instead more complex. This is when the function $\text{BACKTRACK}(P, C', t, \Gamma, \Delta)$ is invoked. Let us analyse the strategy for one player at a time. First, consider the opponent \bar{P} . Even though the assumption (C', \mathbf{k}') might have been removed from $\Gamma_{\bar{P}}$, all decisions in $\Delta_{\bar{P}}$ depending on such assumption have been removed as well via the function $\text{FORGET}(\Delta_{\bar{P}}, \Gamma_{\bar{P}}, (C', \mathbf{k}'))$. Let $\Delta'_{\bar{P}}$ be the remaining decisions. By Lemma C.9 we know that the strategy with assumptions $\Gamma_{\bar{P}} \setminus \{(C', \mathbf{k}')\}$ from decisions $\Delta'_{\bar{P}}$ is winning as long as the strategy with assumptions $\Gamma_{\bar{P}}$ from decisions $\Delta_{\bar{P}}$ was winning. Then by inductive hypothesis the property still holds for \bar{P} . Now we need to prove the property for player P as well. That is, the strategy s_P with assumptions $\Gamma_P \setminus \{(C', \mathbf{k}')\}$ from decisions $\Delta_P \cup \{(C', \mathbf{k}')\}$ is winning in the modified game with assumptions $\Gamma_P \setminus \{(C', \mathbf{k}')\}$. To do this we just need to show that for every position $\hat{C} \in \mathcal{C}(\Delta_P \cup \{(C', \mathbf{k}')\})$, every complete path in the tree of plays $\tau_{s_P}^{\hat{C}}$ is a play won by P . First, recall that every finite complete path in $\tau_{s_P}^{\hat{C}}$ terminates in a position of an assumption or a truth. In both cases such a finite play is always won by P since in the modified game assumptions and truths correspond to positions owned by the opponent with no available moves. By inductive hypothesis we know that the strategy s'_P with assumptions Γ_P from decisions Δ_P was winning in the modified game with assumptions Γ_P . Notice that the two strategies can only differ on the position C' of the new decision (C', \mathbf{k}') . It may be that s'_P was not defined on C' , if there was no decision or assumption for such position before now. Anyway, this means that if C' never occurs along the path, then the play must be won by P since s_P and s'_P coincide on all the positions in the path and s'_P was winning by inductive hypothesis. Therefore we just need to check those paths containing C' . If C' appears just finitely many times along the path, consider the subpath starting from the successor C'' of the last occurrence of C' . Such subpath does not contain C' and it is still infinite. Recalling that all positions in infinite paths must come from decisions and $C'' \neq C'$, then the subpath must be one of the complete paths in the tree of plays $\tau_{s'_P}^{C''}$. Thus, by inductive hypothesis the subpath, as well as the initial one, must be a play won by P . Otherwise, C' appears infinitely many times along the path. Consider every subpath between two consecutive occurrences of C' , including only the first one. In such subpath let $C'' \neq C'$ be the last position, which is the predecessor of the second occurrence of C' . Observe that no decision (C', \mathbf{k}) could have been added after exploring (C', \mathbf{k}') and before now, because we would necessarily have either $\mathbf{k} <_P \mathbf{k}'$ or $\mathbf{k} <_{\bar{P}} \mathbf{k}'$, thus satisfying the condition of the third **if** branch of function EXPLORE , in which case the exploration would have stopped and (C', \mathbf{k}) would have never been added as a decision. Furthermore, any decision (C', \mathbf{k}) added before exploring (C', \mathbf{k}') must be such that $\mathbf{k}' < \mathbf{k}$, because otherwise the exploration would have stopped satisfying the second **if** branch of function EXPLORE and (C', \mathbf{k}') would have never been added as a decision. Therefore we must have $d_P(C') = \mathbf{k}'$ and, if $C' \in \mathcal{C}(\Delta_P) \setminus \mathcal{C}(\Gamma_P)$ hence s'_P is defined on C' , $d_P(C') <_P d'_P(C')$ since $d'_P(C')$ is the minimum \mathbf{k} among the decisions for C' added before (C', \mathbf{k}') . Moreover, in the latter case, by Lemma C.8(a) we obtain that $d_P(C') <_P d'_P(C') \leq_P \text{next}(d_P(C''), i(C''))$ since C' succeeds C'' . If instead $C' \notin \mathcal{C}(\Delta_P) \setminus \mathcal{C}(\Gamma_P)$, then we must have that $(C', \mathbf{k}') \in \Gamma_P$, since $C' \in s_P(C'') = s'_P(C'') \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\Delta_P \cup \Gamma_P)$ and $C' \in \mathcal{C}(\Delta_P \cup \{(C', \mathbf{k}')\}) \setminus \mathcal{C}(\Gamma_P \setminus \{(C', \mathbf{k}')\})$ because $s_P(C') \neq \emptyset$. In fact, by inspecting the code it can be seen that C' must have been added as an assumption after exploring C'' , which then became a decision $(C'', d_P(C''))$,

and it must have held $\mathbf{k}' <_P \text{next}(d_P(C''), i(C''))$ as required by the third **if** branch in the function `EXPLORE`. Thus, in both cases we have $\mathbf{k}' = d_P(C') <_P \text{next}(d_P(C''), i(C''))$. And so by Lemma C.8(b) we know that $P = \exists$ iff $\eta_h = \nu$, where h is the highest priority appearing along the subpath. For now assume $P = \exists$. Since this holds for all subpaths between two consecutive occurrences of C' , and there are infinitely many of them, which sequenced form the initial infinite path, then there must exist a priority h s.t. $\eta_h = \nu$ and it is the highest priority appearing infinitely many times along the complete path. A dual reasoning holds for $P = \forall$. Recalling that an infinite play is won by player \exists (resp. \forall) if the highest priority $h \in \underline{m}$ appearing infinitely often is s.t. $\eta_h = \nu$ (resp. μ), we deduce that the path is won by P , whoever P is. And so we conclude that s_P is indeed winning in the modified game with assumptions $\Gamma_P \setminus \{(C', \mathbf{k}')\}$. ◀

Now we can finally present the correctness result.

► **Theorem 6.11** (correctness). *Given a fixpoint game, if a call `EXPLORE`($C, \mathbf{0}, \square, (\emptyset, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \emptyset)$) returns a player P , then P wins the game from C .*

Proof. Assume that the call `EXPLORE`($C, \mathbf{0}, \square, (\emptyset, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \emptyset)$) returns some player P . Since the only instruction returning a value is in the function `BACKTRACK` and it is reached only when $\rho = \square$, then `BACKTRACK`($P, C', \square, \Gamma, \Delta$) must have been invoked for some Γ and Δ . Furthermore, $C' = C$ because $\rho = \square$ is the list of positions from the root C to the current node C' . Also, by Lemma C.2 we have that $\Gamma_P = \emptyset$. Thus, by Lemma C.3 we have that $(C, \mathbf{k}) \in \Delta_P$ for some counter \mathbf{k} . And so by Lemma C.10 we can immediately conclude that P wins the game from C , since the modified game with no assumptions coincides with the original one. ◀

► **Theorem 6.12** (preserving solutions with up-to). *Let E be a system of m equations of the kind $x =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}(x)$ over a complete lattice L . Let \mathbf{u} be a m -tuple of up-to functions compatible for E (Definition 5.7). The solution of the system $d(E, \mathbf{u})$ is $\text{sol}(d(E, \mathbf{u})) = (\text{sol}(E), \text{sol}(E))$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the length m of the original system. The base case is vacuously true since, for $m = 0$, both systems have empty solution. Then, for $m > 0$, assume that the property holds for systems of size $m - 1$. By definition of solution we have that the solution of x_m is

$$\text{sol}_{2m}(d(E, \mathbf{u})) = \eta_m(\lambda x. f_m(\text{sol}_{1,m}(d(E, \mathbf{u})[x_m := x])))$$

and the parametric solution of y_m is the function $s' : L^m \rightarrow L$

$$s'(\mathbf{x}') = \text{sol}_m(d(E, \mathbf{u})[\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{x}']) = \mu(\lambda y. u_m(y) \sqcup \mathbf{x}'_m).$$

Observe that since $s'(\mathbf{x}')$ depends only on \mathbf{x}'_m , we can define the parametric solution of y_m using just a function $s : L \rightarrow L$ instead of s'

$$s(x) = \mu(\lambda y. u_m(y) \sqcup x).$$

Substituting the parametric solution of y_m in the solution of x_m we obtain

$$\text{sol}_{2m}(d(E, \mathbf{u})) = \eta_m(\lambda x. f_m(\text{sol}_{1,m-1}(d(E, \mathbf{u})[x_m := x][y_m := s(x)]), s(x))).$$

Let $h(x) = f_m(\text{sol}_{1,m-1}(d(E, \mathbf{u})[x_m := x][y_m := s(x)]), s(x))$ and $g_x(y) = u_m(y) \sqcup x$, so that $\text{sol}_{2m}(d(E, \mathbf{u})) = \eta_m(h)$ and $s(x) = \mu(g_x)$. Clearly h and g are both monotone (hence s as well). The former because the solutions of a system (see [2]) and \mathbf{f} are monotone, the latter because both u_m and the supremum are. Also notice that s is an extensive function, i.e., $x \sqsubseteq s(x)$ for all x . In fact, since s computes a (least) fixpoint we have that

$s(x) = u_m(s(x)) \sqcup x$, and clearly $x \sqsubseteq u_m(s(x)) \sqcup x$ by definition of supremum. Furthermore, we can prove that s is compatible (wrt. h , i.e., $s(h(x)) \sqsubseteq h(s(x))$ for all x), continuous, and strict, whenever u_m satisfies those conditions, respectively. First, if u_m is continuous, then so is g in both variables, since \sqcup is continuous. Then, since $s(x)$ is the least fixpoint of g_x , it is immediate that s is continuous as well. Recalling that $s(x) = g_x^\alpha(\perp)$ for some ordinal α , both remaining properties can be proved by transfinite induction on $g_x^\alpha(\perp)$ for every α . First we show that for all x , $g_{h(x)}^\alpha(\perp) \sqsubseteq h(s(x))$ for every ordinal α (hence $s(h(x)) \sqsubseteq h(s(x))$). For $\alpha = 0$, we have $g_{h(x)}^0(\perp) = \perp \sqsubseteq h(s(x))$. For a successor ordinal $\alpha = \beta + 1$, we have $g_{h(x)}^{\beta+1}(\perp) = g_{h(x)}(g_{h(x)}^\beta(\perp))$, and by inductive hypothesis we know that $g_{h(x)}^\beta(\perp) \sqsubseteq h(s(x))$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & g_{h(x)}(g_{h(x)}^\beta(\perp)) \\
 \sqsubseteq & \quad [\text{since } g \text{ is monotone}] \\
 & g_{h(x)}(h(s(x))) \\
 = & \quad [\text{by definition of } g] \\
 & u_m(h(s(x))) \sqcup h(x) \\
 = & \quad [\text{by definition of } h] \\
 & u_m(f_m(\text{sol}_{1,m-1}(d(E, \mathbf{u})[x_m := s(x)][y_m := s^2(x)], s^2(x)))) \sqcup h(x) \\
 \sqsubseteq & \quad [\text{by compatibility of } \mathbf{u}] \\
 & f_m(\mathbf{u} \cdot (\text{sol}_{1,m-1}(d(E, \mathbf{u})[x_m := s(x)][y_m := s^2(x)], s^2(x)))) \sqcup h(x)
 \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $u_m(s(z)) \sqsubseteq s(z) = g_z(s(z)) = u_m(s(z)) \sqcup z$ for all z . A similar reasoning applies to the other solutions as well, obtaining that $u_i(\text{sol}_i(d(E, \mathbf{u})[x_m := s(x)][y_m := s^2(x)])) \sqsubseteq \text{sol}_i(d(E, \mathbf{u})[x_m := s(x)][y_m := s^2(x)])$ for all $i \in \underline{m-1}$. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & f_m(\mathbf{u} \cdot (\text{sol}_{1,m-1}(d(E, \mathbf{u})[x_m := s(x)][y_m := s^2(x)], s^2(x)))) \sqcup h(x) \\
 \sqsubseteq & \quad [\text{since } f_m \text{ is monotone}] \\
 & f_m(\text{sol}_{1,m-1}(d(E, \mathbf{u})[x_m := s(x)][y_m := s^2(x)], s^2(x))) \sqcup h(x) \\
 = & \quad [\text{by definition of } h] \\
 & h(s(x)) \sqcup h(x) \\
 \sqsubseteq & \quad [\text{since } h \text{ is monotone}] \\
 & h(s(x) \sqcup x) \\
 = & \quad [\text{since } s \text{ is extensive}] \\
 & h(s(x))
 \end{aligned}$$

And so we established that $g_{h(x)}^{\beta+1}(\perp) \sqsubseteq h(s(x))$. For α limit ordinal, by inductive hypothesis we immediately have that $g_{h(x)}^\alpha(\perp) = \bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} g_{h(x)}^\beta(\perp) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup h(s(x)) = h(s(x))$. Now we show

that $g_\perp^\alpha(\perp) = \perp$ for every ordinal α . For $\alpha = 0$, we have $g_\perp^0(\perp) = \perp$. For $\alpha = \beta + 1$, by inductive hypothesis we have that $g_\perp^{\beta+1}(\perp) = g_\perp(g_\perp^\beta(\perp)) = g_\perp(\perp) = u_m(\perp) \sqcup \perp = \perp$, since u_m is strict. For α limit ordinal, by inductive hypothesis we obtain that $g_\perp^\alpha(\perp) = \bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} g_\perp^\beta(\perp) = \bigsqcup \perp = \perp$. Now we have two different cases depending on η_m .

■ $\eta_m = \nu$

In this case $\text{sol}_{2m}(d(E, \mathbf{u})) = h^\alpha(\top)$ for some ordinal α . Here we show that actually $s(h^\alpha(\top)) = h^\alpha(\top)$ for every ordinal α . Since as we mentioned above s is extensive, we just need to prove that $s(h^\alpha(\top)) \sqsubseteq h^\alpha(\top)$ for every ordinal α . We proceed by

transfinite induction on α . For $\alpha = 0$, we have $s(h^0(\top)) \sqsubseteq \top = h^0(\top)$. If α is a successor ordinal $\beta + 1$, assuming the property holds for β , we show that $s(h^{\beta+1}(\top)) \sqsubseteq h^{\beta+1}(\top)$. Since h is monotone, by inductive hypothesis we have that $h(s(h^\beta(\top))) \sqsubseteq h(h^\beta(\top)) = h^{\beta+1}(\top)$. Recalling that $s(h(x)) \sqsubseteq h(s(x))$ for all x , we also have that $s(h^{\beta+1}(\top)) = s(h(s(h^\beta(\top)))) \sqsubseteq h(s(h^\beta(\top)))$. When α is a limit ordinal we have that $h^\alpha(\top) = \bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} h^\beta(\top)$.

Since s is monotone, we have that $s(h^\alpha(\top)) = s(\bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} h^\beta(\top)) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} s(h^\beta(\top))$. And since by inductive hypothesis $s(h^\beta(\top)) \sqsubseteq h^\beta(\top)$ for all $\beta < \alpha$, we conclude also that $\bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} s(h^\beta(\top)) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} h^\beta(\top)$.

■ $\eta_m = \mu$

In this case $\text{sol}_{2m}(d(E, \mathbf{u})) = h^\alpha(\perp)$ for some ordinal α . Recall also that since $\eta_m = \mu$, by hypothesis we know that u_m is continuous and strict. In such case, as shown above, s is continuous and strict as well. Again, we already know that s is extensive, so we just prove by transfinite induction that $s(h^\alpha(\perp)) \sqsubseteq h^\alpha(\perp)$ for every ordinal α . For $\alpha = 0$, we have $s(h^0(\perp)) = s(\perp) = \perp$, since s is strict. If α is a successor ordinal $\beta + 1$, assuming the property holds for β , we show that $s(h^{\beta+1}(\perp)) \sqsubseteq h^{\beta+1}(\perp)$. Since h is monotone, by inductive hypothesis we have that $h(s(h^\beta(\perp))) \sqsubseteq h(h^\beta(\perp)) = h^{\beta+1}(\perp)$. Recalling that $s(h(x)) \sqsubseteq h(s(x))$ for all x , we also have that $s(h^{\beta+1}(\perp)) = s(h(s(h^\beta(\perp)))) \sqsubseteq h(s(h^\beta(\perp)))$. When α is a limit ordinal we have that $h^\alpha(\perp) = \bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} h^\beta(\perp)$. Since s is continuous, we

have that $s(h^\alpha(\perp)) = s(\bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} h^\beta(\perp)) = \bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} s(h^\beta(\perp))$. And since by inductive hypothesis $s(h^\beta(\perp)) \sqsubseteq h^\beta(\perp)$ for all $\beta < \alpha$, we conclude also that $\bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} s(h^\beta(\perp)) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{\beta < \alpha} h^\beta(\perp)$.

So in both cases we have $s(h^\alpha(\top)) = h^\alpha(\top)$ or $s(h^\alpha(\perp)) = h^\alpha(\perp)$, respectively, for every ordinal α . Consider the function $h'(x) = f_m(\text{sol}_{1,m-1}(d(E, \mathbf{u})[x_m := x][y_m := x]), x)$. The previous fact implies that actually $\eta_m(h') = \eta_m(h) = \text{sol}_{2m}(d(E, \mathbf{u}))$. Furthermore, for the same reason we have that $s(\text{sol}_{2m}(d(E, \mathbf{u}))) = \text{sol}_{2m}(d(E, \mathbf{u}))$. Since $\text{sol}_{2m}(d(E, \mathbf{u}))$ is the solution of x_m and by definition of solution $s(\text{sol}_{2m}(d(E, \mathbf{u}))) = \text{sol}_m(d(E, \mathbf{u}))$ is that of y_m , this means that x_m and y_m have the same solution in $d(E, \mathbf{u})$. So we can rewrite the solutions of x_m and y_m as $\eta_m(h')$, that is

$$\text{sol}_{2m}(d(E, \mathbf{u})) = \text{sol}_m(d(E, \mathbf{u})) = \eta_m(\lambda x. f_m(\text{sol}_{1,m-1}(d(E, \mathbf{u})[x_m := x][y_m := x]), x)).$$

Now, observe that the system $d(E, \mathbf{u})[x_m := x][y_m := x]$ is actually $d(E[x_m := x], \mathbf{u}_{1,m-1})$. Therefore, since $E[x_m := x]$ has size $m - 1$, by inductive hypothesis we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sol}_{1,m-1}(d(E, \mathbf{u})[x_m := x][y_m := x]) &= \text{sol}_{m,2m-2}(d(E, \mathbf{u})[x_m := x][y_m := x]) \\ &= \text{sol}(E[x_m := x]). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, substituting these solutions in those of x_m and y_m above, we obtain

$$\text{sol}_{2m}(d(E, \mathbf{u})) = \text{sol}_m(d(E, \mathbf{u})) = \eta_m(\lambda x. f_m(\text{sol}(E[x_m := x]), x))$$

which is also the definition of the solution of x_m in E . Which means that $\text{sol}_{2m}(d(E, \mathbf{u})) = \text{sol}_m(d(E, \mathbf{u})) = \text{sol}_m(E)$. Then, the remaining solutions are

$$\begin{aligned} &(\text{sol}_{1,m-1}(d(E, \mathbf{u})), \text{sol}_{m+1,2m-1}(d(E, \mathbf{u}))) \\ &= \text{sol}(d(E, \mathbf{u})[x_m := \text{sol}_{2m}(d(E, \mathbf{u}))][y_m := \text{sol}_m(d(E, \mathbf{u}))]) \quad [\text{by definition of solution}] \\ &= \text{sol}(d(E, \mathbf{u})[x_m := \text{sol}_m(E)][y_m := \text{sol}_m(E)]) \\ &= (\text{sol}(E[x_m := \text{sol}_m(E)]), \text{sol}(E[x_m := \text{sol}_m(E)])) \quad [\text{by inductive hypothesis}] \\ &= (\text{sol}_{1,m-1}(E), \text{sol}_{1,m-1}(E)) \quad [\text{by definition of solution}] \end{aligned}$$

This and the previous fact allow us to conclude that

$$\text{sol}(d(E, \mathbf{u})) = (\text{sol}_{1,m-1}(E), \text{sol}_m(E), \text{sol}_{1,m-1}(E), \text{sol}_m(E)),$$

that is indeed $\text{sol}(d(E, \mathbf{u})) = (\text{sol}(E), \text{sol}(E))$. \blacktriangleleft

► **Theorem 6.14** (correctness with up-to). *Let E be a system of m equations of the kind $x =_{\eta} \mathbf{f}(x)$ over a complete lattice L . Let \mathbf{u} a compatible m -tuple of up-to functions for E . Then the up-to algorithm associated with the system $d(E, \mathbf{u})$ as given in Definition 6.13 is correct, i.e., if a call $\text{EXPLORE}(C, \mathbf{0}, [], (\emptyset, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \emptyset))$ returns a player P , then P wins the game from C .*

Proof. Let G be the fixpoint game associated with the initial system E , G_u be the one associated with the modified system $d(E, \mathbf{u})$, and G'_u be the game obtained from G_u by restricting the moves of player \exists from positions associated with variables y_i to only those satisfying either condition (1) or (2). Observe that the moves from every position controlled by player \exists of G are included in the moves from the corresponding position in G'_u since they satisfy condition (1), since in E there are no up-to functions. Therefore, every winning strategy for \exists in G can be easily converted into a winning strategy for the same player in G'_u . So the winning positions of player \exists in G are necessarily included in those of G'_u . Furthermore, the same clearly happens between G'_u and G_u since the moves of \exists in G'_u are defined as a restriction of those in G_u . Then, calling $W_{\exists}(G)$ the set of winning positions of player \exists in the corresponding G , we have that $W_{\exists}(G) \subseteq W_{\exists}(G'_u) \subseteq W_{\exists}(G_u) = W_{\exists}(G)$, where the last equality holds by Theorem 6.12. Since in our case every position not winning for \exists is necessarily winning for \forall , this means that even if we restrict certain moves of player \exists , thus playing in the game G'_u , we still have the same exact winning positions for both players. \blacktriangleleft

D Comparison to the Bonchi/Pous Algorithm

In a seminal paper [8] Bonchi and Pous revisited the question of checking language equivalence for non-deterministic automata and presented an algorithm based on an up-to congruence technique that behaves very well in practice.

We will here give a short description of this algorithm and then explain how it arises as a special case of the algorithm developed in §6.2.2.

We are given a non-deterministic finite automaton (Q, Σ, δ, F) , where Q is the finite set of states, Σ is the finite alphabet, $\delta: Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^Q$ is the transition function and $F \subseteq Q$ is the set of final states. Note that we omit initial states. Given $a \in \Sigma$, $X \subseteq Q$ we define $\delta_a(X) = \bigcup_{q \in X} \delta(q, a)$.

Given $q_1, q_2 \in Q$, the aim is to show whether q_1, q_2 accept the same language (in the standard sense).

In order to do this, the algorithm performs an on-the-fly determinization and constructs a bisimulation relation $R \subseteq \mathbf{2}^Q \times \mathbf{2}^Q$ on the determinized automaton. This relation has to satisfy the following properties:

- $\{q_1\} R \{q_2\}$
- Whenever $X_1 R X_2$, then
 - $\delta_a(X_1) R \delta_a(X_2)$ for all $a \in \Sigma$ (transfer property)
 - and $X_1 \cap F \neq \emptyset \iff X_2 \cap F \neq \emptyset$ (one set is accepting iff the other is accepting)

Due to the up-to technique there is no need to fully enumerate R . Instead in the second item above, it suffices to show that $\delta_a(X_1) c(R) \delta_a(X_2)$ where $c(R)$ is the congruence closure of R , i.e., the least relation R' containing R that is an equivalence and satisfies that $X_1 R X_2$ implies $X_1 \cup X R X_2 \cup X$ (for $X_1, X_2, X \subseteq Q$). A major contribution of [8] is an algorithm for efficiently checking whether two given sets are in the congruence closure of a given relation. Here we will simply assume that this procedure is given and use it as a black box.

We will now translate this into our setting: the lattice is $L = \mathbf{2}^{2^Q \times 2^Q}$ (the lattice of all relations over the powerset of states) with inclusion as partial order. The basis B consists of all singletons $\{(X_1, X_2)\}$ where $X_1, X_2 \subseteq Q$. That is, we consider the setting of §6.2.2.

The behaviour map f is given as follows: $f(R) = f^*(R) \cap C$ where

$$\begin{aligned} f^*(R) &= \{(X_1, X_2) \mid (\delta_a(X_1), \delta_a(X_2)) \in R \text{ for all } a \in \Sigma\} \\ C &= \{(X_1, X_2) \mid X_1 \cap F = \emptyset \iff X_2 \cap F = \emptyset\} \end{aligned}$$

We want to solve a single fixpoint equation $R =_\nu f(R)$ where we are interested in the greatest fixpoint. In particular, we want to check whether $(Q_1, Q_2) \in R$ (where $Q_1 = \{q_1\}$, $Q_2 = \{q_2\}$) or alternatively $I = \{(Q_1, Q_2)\} \subseteq R$.

Since we have determined the automaton, f^* has a left adjoint f_* , given as

$$f_*(R) = \{(\delta_a(X_1), \delta_a(X_2)) \mid (X_1, X_2) \in R, a \in \Sigma\}.$$

Now we can start exploring the game positions. Starting with $I = \{(Q_1, Q_2)\} \subseteq F$, the only move of \exists is to play $\{\{(X_1, X_2)\} \mid (X_1, X_2) \in f_*(I)\}$, then it is the turn of \forall who can choose any singleton set $\{(X_1, X_2)\}$ and one has to explore all those singletons. This continues until one encounters a singleton $\{(X_1, X_2)\} \not\subseteq C$ (which implies that \exists has no move and loses) or one finds a set $\{(X_1, X_2)\}$ where one can cut off a branch due to the up-to technique – more concretely $(X_1, X_2) \in c(W)$ where W is the collection of all pairs visited so far on all paths and $c(W)$ is its congruence closure. One can conclude that \exists wins if all encountered pairs are in C . This is a straightforward instance of the more general algorithm, enriched with an up-to technique, as explained in §6.2.2.