

# Realizability Problem for Constraint LTL

**Ashwin Bhaskar**

Chennai Mathematical Institute, India

**M. Praveen**

Chennai Mathematical Institute, India

CNRS IRL ReLaX, India

---

## Abstract

Constraint linear-time temporal logic (CLTL) is an extension of LTL that is interpreted on sequences of valuations of variables over an infinite domain. The atomic formulas are interpreted as constraints on the valuations. The atomic formulas can constrain valuations over a range of positions along a sequence, with the range being bounded by a parameter depending on the formula. The satisfiability and model checking problems for CLTL have been studied by Demri and D’Souza. We consider the realizability problem for CLTL. The set of variables is partitioned into two parts, with each part controlled by a player. Players take turns to choose valuations for their variables, generating a sequence of valuations. The winning condition is specified by a CLTL formula—the first player wins if the sequence of valuations satisfies the specified formula. We study the decidability of checking whether the first player has a winning strategy in the realizability game for a given CLTL formula. We prove that it is decidable in the case where the domain satisfies the completion property, a property introduced by Balbiani and Condotta in the context of satisfiability. We prove that it is undecidable over  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$ , the domain of integers with order and equality. We prove that over  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$ , it is decidable if the atomic constraints in the formula can only constrain the current valuations of variables belonging to the second player, but there are no such restrictions for the variables belonging to the first player. We call this single-sided games.

Prompt-LTL is an extension of LTL with the prompt-eventually operator, which imposes a bound on the wait time for all prompt-eventually sub-formulas. CLTL can be similarly extended to prompt-CLTL. We prove that decidability is maintained for single-sided games, even if we allow prompt-CLTL formulas.

**2012 ACM Subject Classification** Theory of computation  $\rightarrow$  Logic and verification; Theory of computation  $\rightarrow$  Modal and temporal logics; Theory of computation  $\rightarrow$  Verification by model checking; Theory of computation  $\rightarrow$  Automata over infinite objects; Theory of computation  $\rightarrow$  Tree languages

**Keywords and phrases** Realizability, constraint LTL, Strategy trees, Tree automata

**Funding** *M. Praveen*: This author is partially supported by the Infosys foundation

## 1 Introduction

Propositional linear temporal logic (LTL) and related automata theoretic models have been extended in various ways to make it more expressive. Prompt-LTL [17], Constraint LTL [11], LTL with freeze operators [10], temporal logic of repeating values [9, 23], finite memory automata [15], data automata [6] are all examples of this. Prompt-LTL is concerned with bounding wait times for formulas that are intended to become true eventually, while other extensions are concerned with using variables that range over infinite domains in place of Boolean propositions used in propositional LTL. Variables ranging over infinite domains are a natural choice for writing specifications for systems that deal with infinite domains. For example, constraint LTL has been used for specifications of cloud based elastic systems [5], where the domain of natural numbers are used to reason about the number of resources that are being used by cloud based systems.

An orthogonal development in formal verification is synthesis, that is concerned with

automatically synthesizing programs from logical specifications. The problem was identified by Church [8] and one way to solve it is by viewing it as the solution of a two person game. For specifications written in propositional LTL, the worst case complexity of the realizability problem is doubly exponential [22]. However, efficient algorithms exist for fragments of LTL. The algorithms are efficient enough and the fragments are expressive enough to be used in practice, for example to synthesize robot controllers [16], data buffers and data buses [21].

This paper is in an area that combines both developments mentioned in the above paragraphs. We consider constraint LTL (CLTL) and partition the set of variables into two parts, each being owned by a player in a two player game. The players take turns to choose a valuation for their variables over an infinite domain. The game is played forever and results in a sequence of valuations. The first player tries to ensure that the resulting sequence satisfies a specified CLTL formula (which is the winning condition) and the second player tries to foil this. We study the decidability of checking whether the first player has a winning strategy, called the realizability problem in the sequel. CLTL is parameterized by a constraint system, that can have various relations over the infinite domain. The atomic formulas of CLTL can compare values of variables in different positions along a range of positions, using the relations present in the constraint system. The range of positions is bounded and depends on the formula. E.g., an atomic formula can say that the value of  $x$  at a position is less than the value of  $y$  in the next position, in the domain of integers or real numbers with linear order. Decidability of the CLTL realizability problem depends on the constraint system. It also depends on whether the atomic formulas can compare values at different positions of the input, as opposed to comparing values of different variables at the same position of the input. If the former is allowed only for variables belonging to one of the players, they are called single-sided games. This is illustrated next.

For instance in cloud based elastic systems [5], the number of resources in use is tracked with respect to the number of virtual machines running. One desirable property is that if the number of virtual machines increases, the number of resources allocated must also increase. Typically the number of resources allocated is under the system's control and the number of virtual machines is under the environment's control. Specifying this property will require comparing the number of currently allocated resources with the same number in the next position. We may also compare the current number of virtual machines with the same number at the next position, but this will need the both the system and the environment to compare numbers at different positions. Instead, if we only allow the environment to decide whether a new virtual machine request is raised at the current position, the game will be single-sided.

**Contributions** We prove that the realizability problem is

1. 2EXPTIME-complete for CLTL over constraint systems that satisfy a so-called completion property,
2. undecidable for CLTL over integers with linear order and equality and
3. 2EXPTIME-complete for CLTL single-sided games on integers with linear order and equality.
4. 2EXPTIME-complete for prompt-CLTL single-sided games on integers with linear order and equality.

The third result above is the main one and is inspired by concepts used in satisfiability [11]. In satisfiability, this technique is based on patterns that repeat in ultimately periodic words. It requires new insights to make it work in trees that we use to represent strategies here.

**Related works** Two player games on automata models and logics dealing with infinite domains have been studied before [25, 12]. The techniques involved are similar to those

used here in the sense that instead of reasoning about sequences of values from an infinite domain, sequences of elements from a finite abstraction are considered. Single-sided games are considered in [12], like we do here, but for register automata specifications. Their result subsumes ours, since register automata are more expressive than CLTL. In register automata, values can be compared even if they occur far apart in the input sequence, but in CLTL, values can only be compared if they occur within a bounded distance. For this reason, CLTL can be handled with simpler arguments, resulting in some differences in technical details, which we will highlight later in this paper. This can potentially speed up procedures in case the specifications only need CLTL and not the full power of register automata<sup>1</sup>. Similar single-sided games are also considered in [24], for an extension of LTL incomparable with CLTL. There, single-sided games are reduced to energy games [2] to get decidability.

Even apart from infinite alphabets, the synthesis problem continues to be actively under research. In [13], environment is assumed to satisfy some properties, and the system is expected to guarantee that it satisfies some properties. Both the assumptions and guarantees can be written in prompt-LTL and it is shown that theoretically, the complexity does not increase from the case of plain prompt-LTL synthesis (i.e. without assumptions and guarantees). We consider prompt-LTL without assumptions and guarantees, but we consider infinite domains.

## 2 Preliminaries

Let  $\mathbb{Z}$  be the set of integers and  $\mathbb{N}$  be the set of non-negative integers. We denote by  $\lceil i \rceil_k$  the number  $i$  ceiled at  $k$ :  $\lceil i \rceil_k = i$  if  $i \leq k$  and  $\lceil i \rceil_k = k$  otherwise. If  $m$  is any mapping and  $S$  is a subset of the domain of  $m$ , we denote by  $m \upharpoonright S$  the mapping  $m$  restricted to the domain  $S$ . For a sequence of mappings  $m_1 \cdot m_2 \cdots$ , we write  $m_1 \cdot m_2 \cdots \upharpoonright S$  for  $m_1 \upharpoonright S \cdot m_2 \upharpoonright S \cdots$ . For integers  $n_1, n_2$ , we denote by  $[n_1, n_2]$  the set  $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} \mid n_1 \leq n \leq n_2\}$ .

We recall the definitions of constraint systems and constraint LTL (CLTL) from [11]. A constraint system  $\mathcal{D}$  is of the form  $(D, R_1, \dots, R_n, \mathcal{I})$ , where  $D$  is a non-empty set called the domain. Each  $R_i$  is a predicate symbol of arity  $a_i$ , with  $\mathcal{I}(R_i) \subseteq D^{a_i}$  being its interpretation.

Let  $V$  be a set of variables, partitioned into the sets  $V^a, V^b$  of look-ahead and future-blind variables. A look-ahead term is of the form  $X^i y$ , where  $y$  is a look-ahead variable,  $i \geq 0$  and  $X$  is a symbol intended to denote “next”. For  $k \geq 0$ , we denote by  $T^a[k]$  the set of all look-ahead terms of the form  $X^i y$ , where  $i \in [0, k]$  and  $y$  is a look-ahead variable. A constraint  $c$  is of the form  $R(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ , where  $R$  is a predicate symbol of arity  $n$  and  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  are all future-blind variables or they are all look-ahead terms. The syntax of CLTL is given by the following grammar, where  $c$  is a constraint as defined above.

$$\phi ::= c \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi \vee \psi \mid X\phi \mid \phi U \psi$$

The semantics of CLTL are defined over sequences  $\sigma$  (also called concrete models in the following); for every  $i \geq 0$ ,  $\sigma(i): V \rightarrow D$  is a mapping of the variables. Given,  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in V^a$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the  $i^{\text{th}}$  position of a concrete model  $\sigma$  satisfies the constraint  $R(X^{i_1} x_1, \dots, X^{i_n} x_n)$  (written as  $\sigma, i \models R(X^{i_1} x_1, \dots, X^{i_n} x_n)$ ) if  $(\sigma(i + i_1)(x_1), \dots, \sigma(i + i_n)(x_n)) \in \mathcal{I}(R)$ . If the constraint is of the form  $R(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  where  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in V^b$ , then  $\sigma, i \models R(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  if  $(\sigma(i)(x_1), \dots, \sigma(i)(x_n)) \in \mathcal{I}(R)$ . The semantics is extended to the rest of the syntax similar to the usual propositional LTL. We use the standard abbreviations

<sup>1</sup> This does need a detailed study, which we defer to future work.

$F\phi$  (resp.  $G\phi$ ) to mean that  $\phi$  is true at some position (resp. all positions) in the future. The  $X$ -length of a look-ahead term  $X^i y$  is  $i$ . We say that a formula is of  $X$ -length  $k$  if it uses look-ahead terms of  $X$ -length at most  $k$ . The constraint system  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$  (resp.  $(\mathbb{N}, <, =)$ ) has the domain  $\mathbb{Z}$  (resp.  $\mathbb{N}$ ) and  $<, =$  are interpreted as the usual linear order and equality relations. The formula  $G(x < Xy)$  will be true in the first position of a concrete model if in all positions, the value of  $x$  is less than the value of  $y$  in the next position.

We adapt the concept of realizability games [22] to CLTL. There are two players **system** and **environment**. The set of variables  $V$  is partitioned into two parts  $SV, EV$  owned by **system**, **environment** respectively. The **environment** begins by choosing a mapping  $em_0: EV \rightarrow D$ , to which **system** responds by choosing a mapping  $sm_0: SV \rightarrow D$ . This first round results in the mapping  $em_0 \oplus sm_0$ . This notation is used to define the function such that  $em_0 \oplus sm_0(x) = em_0(x)$  if  $x \in EV$  and  $em_0 \oplus sm_0(x) = sm_0(x)$  if  $x \in SV$ . In the next round, the two players chose mappings  $em_1, sm_1$ . Both the players continue to play forever and the play results in a concrete model  $\sigma = (em_0 \oplus sm_0)(em_1 \oplus sm_1) \cdots$ . The winning condition is specified by a CLTL formula  $\phi$ . **System** wins this play of the game if  $\sigma, 0 \models \phi$ .

Let  $M$  (resp.  $EM, SM$ ) be the set of all mappings of the form  $V \rightarrow D$  (resp.  $EV \rightarrow D, SV \rightarrow D$ ). For a concrete model  $\sigma$  and  $i \geq 0$ , let  $\sigma \upharpoonright i$  denote the prefix of  $\sigma$  of length  $i$  (for  $i = 0$ ,  $\sigma \upharpoonright i$  is the empty sequence  $\epsilon$ ). An **environment** strategy is a function  $et: M^* \rightarrow EM$  and a **system** strategy is a function  $st: M^* \cdot EM \rightarrow SM$ . We say that the **environment** plays according to the strategy  $et$  if the resulting model  $\sigma = (em_0 \oplus sm_0)(em_1 \oplus sm_1) \cdots$  is such that  $em_i = et(\sigma \upharpoonright i)$  for all  $i \geq 0$ . **System** plays according to the strategy  $st$  if the resulting model  $\sigma = (em_0 \oplus sm_0)(em_1 \oplus sm_1) \cdots$  is such that  $sm_i = st(\sigma \upharpoonright i \cdot em_i)$  for all  $i \geq 0$ . We say that  $st$  is a winning strategy for **system** if she wins all plays of the game played according to  $st$ , irrespective of the strategy used by **environment**. For example, let us consider a CLTL game with  $V = V^a = \{x, y\}, EV = \{x\}, SV = \{y\}$ , over the constraint system  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$  with winning condition  $G((y > Xy) \wedge \neg((X^2x > y) \wedge (X^2x < Xy)))$ . For **system** to win, the sequence of valuations for  $y$  should form a descending chain, and at any position, the value of  $x$  should be outside the interval defined by the previous two values of  $y$ . **System** has a winning strategy in this game: it can choose  $y$  to be  $-i$  in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  round and the **environment** cannot choose its  $x$  to be strictly between the previous two values of  $y$  in any round. **System** does not have a winning strategy in the same game when it is considered over  $(\mathbb{N}, <, =)$ , as there is no infinite descending sequence of natural numbers. **System** does not have a winning strategy over dense domains, since **environment** can choose the third value of  $x$  to be strictly between the first two values of  $y$ , violating the winning condition. Given a CLTL formula  $\phi$ , the **realizability problem** is to check whether **system** has a winning strategy in the CLTL game whose winning condition is  $\phi$ .

### 3 Undecidability over Integers with Order and Equality

The realizability problem is undecidable for CLTL over  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$  and  $(\mathbb{N}, <, =)$ . We prove this by a reduction from the repeated control state reachability problem for 2-counter machines, which is known to be undecidable [3]. The undecidability result holds even in the case where only the **environment** can own future-blind variables (unboundedly many) and both **system** and **environment** are restricted to own only a single look-ahead variable each. The main idea of the reduction is that one of the players simulates the counter machine and the other player catches mistakes, like other similar reductions for games [1]. To make this work when each player owns a single look-ahead variable, we use the following idea. Let  $x$  be the look-ahead variable owned by the **environment** player, and  $y$  be the look-ahead variable owned by the

**system** player. The first counter is updated only at odd rounds of a play of the game, and it is set to be the difference between  $x$  and  $y$  in that round. Similarly, the second counter is updated only at even rounds of a play of the game and is set to be the difference between  $x$  and  $y$  in the that round. So both players participate in the simulation. The **environment** additionally chooses the next counter machine transition to be executed at every odd round using its future-blind variables. **System** has the additional responsibility of catching mistakes. The CLTL formulas specifying the winning condition ensure that any player who doesn't fulfill their responsibility loses.

We now state and prove the result formally.

► **Theorem 1.** *Checking whether **system** has a winning strategy in CLTL games over  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$  or  $(\mathbb{N}, <, =)$  where both players have only one look-ahead variable each and **environment** additionally has unboundedly many future-blind variables is undecidable.*

**Proof.** Given a 2-counter machine, we design an instance of the CLTL realizability problem. Let  $x$  be the look-ahead variable owned by the **environment** player, and  $y$  be the look-ahead variable owned by the **system** player. Corresponding to every transition  $t$  of the counter machine, let  $u_t$  and  $v_t$  be two future-blind variables owned by the **environment** such that at every position of the concrete model built during the game,  $u_t = v_t$  would indicate that the transition  $t$  is taken at that position and  $\neg(u_t = v_t)$  indicates that transition  $t$  is not taken at that position. For the sake of notational convenience, we shall assume that corresponding to each such  $t$ , the **environment** player has a Boolean variable  $p_t$  and we enforce that at each position  $p_t$  holds iff  $(u_t = v_t)$  holds.

Now, using the variables  $x$  and  $y$ , we shall encode the counter  $c_1$  at the even positions and the counter  $c_2$  at the odd positions. The role of the **environment** is to choose a transition of the counter machine and then, both players together participate in ensuring that the counters are updated according to the transition chosen. In addition, the **system** player (using the variable  $y$ ) also ensures that the **environment** player neither makes an illegal transition nor updates the counters incorrectly.

Suppose  $\sigma$  is the concrete model built during a game. We denote by  $x_i$  the value of  $x$  at position  $i$ . Similarly for  $y_i$ . The initial value of the counter  $c_1$  is given by  $x_0 - y_0$  and the initial value of  $c_2$  is given by  $x_1 - y_1$ . The  $i^{\text{th}}$  transition chosen by the **environment** is in the  $2i^{\text{th}}$  position of the valuation sequence of the concrete model. The value of the counter  $c_1$  just after taking the  $i^{\text{th}}$  transition is updated at the  $2i^{\text{th}}$  position and is given by  $(x_{2i} - y_{2i})$  and the value of the counter  $c_2$  just after taking the  $i^{\text{th}}$  transition is updated at the  $(2i + 1)^{\text{st}}$  position and is given by  $(x_{2i+1} - y_{2i+1})$ . Let the set  $\Phi_e$  consist of the following formulas, each of which denotes a 'mistake' made by the **environment** player.

- The **environment** chooses some transition in either the  $0^{\text{th}}$  or the  $1^{\text{st}}$  position.

$$\left( \bigvee_{t \text{ is a any transition}} p_t \right) \vee X \left( \bigvee_{t \text{ is a any transition}} p_t \right)$$

- First transition chosen, is not an initial transition

$$X^2 \left( \bigvee_{t \text{ is not an initial transition}} p_t \right)$$

- **environment** chooses more than one transition at some position

$$X^2 F \left( \bigvee_{t \neq t'} (p_t \wedge p_{t'}) \right)$$

## 6 Realizability Problem for Constraint LTL

- environment chooses a transition at two consecutive positions

$$X^2F(\bigvee_{t,t'}(p_t \wedge Xp_{t'}))$$

- environment does not choose any transition at two consecutive positions (other than the 0<sup>th</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> positions)

$$XF(\bigwedge_t(\neg p_t) \wedge \bigwedge_t X(\neg p_t))$$

- Consecutive transitions are not compatible

$$X^2F(\bigvee_{t' \text{ cannot come after } t}(p_t \wedge X^2p_{t'}))$$

- A transition increments  $c_1$  but the value of  $x$  does not increase.

$$F(\bigvee_{t \text{ increments } c_1} X^2p_t \wedge \neg(x < X^2x))$$

- A transition increments  $c_2$  but the value of  $x$  in the position just after the transition does not increase.

$$F(\bigvee_{t \text{ increments } c_2} Xp_t \wedge \neg(x < X^2x))$$

- A transition decrements  $c_1$  but the value of  $x$  does not decrease.

$$F(\bigvee_{t \text{ decrements } c_1} X^2p_t \wedge \neg(x > X^2x))$$

- A transition decrements  $c_2$  but the value of  $x$  in the position just after the transition does not decrease.

$$F(\bigvee_{t \text{ decrements } c_2} Xp_t \wedge \neg(x > X^2x))$$

- A transition demands that the counter  $c_1$  remain same, but the value of  $x$  changes at that position.

$$F(\bigvee_{t \text{ does not change } c_1} X^2p_t \wedge \neg(x = X^2x))$$

- A transition demands that the counter  $c_2$  remain same, but the value of  $x$  changes at that position.

$$F(\bigvee_{t \text{ does not change } c_2} Xp_t \wedge \neg(x = X^2x))$$

- A transition tests that the value of  $c_1$  is zero but the value of  $x$  at that position does not equal the value of  $y$

$$F\left(\bigvee_{t \text{ tests } c_1=0} p_t \wedge \neg(x = y)\right)$$

- A transition tests that the value of  $c_2$  is zero but in the next position, the value of  $x$  does not equal the value of  $y$

$$F\left(\bigvee_{t \text{ tests } c_2=0} p_t \wedge \neg X(x = y)\right)$$

- The value of a counter is negative at some position.

$$F(x < y)$$

- Either  $c_1$  or  $c_2$  at some position, is incremented or decremented by more than 1.

$$F(((x < X^2y) \wedge (X^2y < X^2x)) \vee ((X^2x < X^2y) \wedge (X^2y < x)))$$

- For some transition  $t$ , at some position,  $p_t$  is true but  $u_t \neq v_t$  or vice versa.

$$F\left(\bigvee_t \neg((u_t = v_t) \iff p_t)\right)$$

The set  $\Phi_s$  consists of the following formulas, each of which denotes constraints that the **system** has to satisfy.

- The value of  $y$  is same in the first three positions.

$$(y = Xy) \wedge X(y = Xy)$$

- The initial value of the counter  $c_1$  is positive. (This combined with the previous constraint automatically ensures that the initial value of counter  $c_2$  is also positive)

$$y \geq x$$

- The **system** ensures that either the value of  $y$  remains constant throughout or it is used at some position to catch a mistake (of incrementing or decrementing a counter value) made by the **environment**

$$G(y = Xy) \vee F(((x < X^2y) \wedge (X^2y < X^2x)) \vee ((X^2x < X^2y) \wedge (X^2y < x)))$$

- If the **environment** has not made a mistake at any point, then, the halting state is reached infinitely often.

$$G(y = Xy) \implies GF\left(\bigvee_{t \text{ is halting}} p_t\right)$$

The winning condition of the CLTL game is given by:

$$\bigvee \Phi_e \vee \bigwedge \Phi_s$$

For the **system** player to win, either one of the formulas in  $\Phi_e$  must hold or all the formulas in  $\Phi_s$  must be true. Hence, for the **system** to win, the **environment** should make a mistake during the simulation or both players together simulate the 2-counter machine correctly and the halting state is reached infinitely often. Thus, the **system** has a winning strategy if and only if the 2-counter machine reaches the halting state. ◀

## 4 Symbolic Models

The models of CLTL are infinite sequences over infinite alphabets. Frames, introduced in [11], abstract them to finite alphabets. We adapt frames to constraint systems of the form  $(D, <, =)$ . Conceptually, frames and symbolic models as we will define here are almost the same as introduced in [11], where the authors used these notions to solve the satisfiability problem for CLTL. For the purpose of CLTL games, we use slightly different definitions and notations, as this makes it easier to present game-theoretic arguments. For the rest of the paper, we shall assume that the set of variables  $V$  is finite. And unless mentioned otherwise, we shall assume that  $D$  is  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\mathbb{N}$  or a domain that satisfies a so-called completion property.

Suppose that the first player owns the variables  $x, z$ . The second player owns  $y$  and wants to ensure that  $x < y \wedge y < z$  over the domain of integers. It depends on whether the gap between the values assigned by the first player to  $x$  and to  $z$ , is large enough for the second player to push  $y$  in between.

► **Definition 2** (gap functions). *Given a mapping  $m: V^b \rightarrow D$ , we associate with it a gap function  $gp: V^b \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  as follows. Arrange  $V^b$  as  $x_0, x_1, \dots$  such that  $m(x_0) \leq m(x_1) \leq \dots$ . Define the function  $gp$  such that  $gp(x_0) = 0$  and  $gp(x_{l+1}) = gp(x_l) + \lceil m(x_{l+1}) - m(x_l) \rceil_{|V^b|-1}$  for all  $l < |V^b| - 1$ .*

The left hand side of the above equation denotes the gap between  $x_l$  and  $x_{l+1}$  according to the  $gp$  function. The right hand side denotes the gap between the same variables according to the mapping  $m$ , ceiled at  $|V^b| - 1$ . Since,  $V^b$  is finite, the set of gap functions is also finite. We use gap functions only for future-blind variables  $V^b$ , only for the domains  $\mathbb{Z}$  or  $\mathbb{N}$ . Hence, the minus sign ‘-’ in the definition of gap functions is interpreted as the usual subtraction over  $\mathbb{Z}$  or  $\mathbb{N}$ .

The following definition formalizes how a frame captures information about orders and gaps for  $s$  successive positions.

► **Definition 3** (Frames). *Given a number  $s \geq 1$ , an  $s$ -frame  $f$  is a pair  $(\leq_f, gp_f)$ , where  $\leq_f$  is a total pre-order<sup>2</sup> on the set of look-ahead terms  $T^a[s-1]$  and  $gp_f: V^b \times [0, s-1] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is a function such that for all  $i \in [0, s-1]$ ,  $\lambda x. gp_f(x, i)$ <sup>3</sup> is a gap function.*

In the notation  $s$ -frame,  $s$  is intended to denote the size of the frame—the number of successive positions about which information is captured. The current position and the

<sup>2</sup> a reflexive and transitive relation such that for all  $x, y$ , either  $x \leq_f y$  or  $y \leq_f x$

<sup>3</sup> Note that we could have used a function  $h_i(x) = gp_f(x, i)$  instead of using the lambda notation. But this introduces a new notation—the function  $h_i$ , which will not be used anywhere else.



following  $(s - 1)$  positions are considered, for which the look-ahead terms in  $T^a[s - 1]$  are needed. We denote by  $<_f$  and  $\equiv_f$  the strict order and equivalence relation induced by  $\leq_f: x <_f y$  iff  $x \leq_f y$  and  $y \not\leq_f x$  and  $x \equiv_f y$  iff  $x \leq_f y$  and  $y \leq_f x$ .

We will deal with symbolic models that constitute sequences of frames. An  $s$ -frame will capture information about the first  $s$  positions of a model. If this is followed by a  $(s + 1)$ -frame, it will capture information about the first  $(s + 1)$  positions of the model. Both frames capture information about the first  $s$  positions, so they must be consistent about the information they have about the shared positions. Similarly, an  $s$ -frame meant for positions  $i$  to  $i + s - 1$  may be followed by another  $s$ -frame meant for positions  $i + 1$  to  $i + s$ . The two frames must be consistent about the positions  $i + 1$  to  $i + s - 1$  that they share. The following definition formalizes these requirements.

► **Definition 4 (One-step compatibility).** For  $s \geq 1$ , an  $s$ -frame  $f$  and an  $(s + 1)$ -frame  $g$ , the pair  $(f, g)$  is one-step compatible if the following conditions are true.

- For all terms  $t_1, t_2 \in T^a[s - 1]$ ,  $t_1 \leq_f t_2$  iff  $t_1 \leq_g t_2$ .
  - For all  $j \in [0, s - 1]$  and all variables  $x \in V^b$ ,  $gp_f(x, j) = gp_g(x, j)$ .
- For  $s \geq 2$  and  $s$ -frames  $f, g$ , the pair  $(f, g)$  is one-step compatible if:
- For all terms  $t_1, t_2 \in T^a[s - 2]$ ,  $Xt_1 \leq_f Xt_2$  iff  $t_1 \leq_g t_2$  and
  - for all  $j \in [0, s - 2]$  and all variables  $x \in V^b$ ,  $gp_f(x, j + 1) = gp_g(x, j)$ .

Fix a number  $k \geq 0$  and consider formulas of  $X$ -length  $k$ . A symbolic model is a sequence  $\rho$  of frames such that for all  $i \geq 0$ ,  $\rho(i)$  is an  $[i + 1]_{k+1}$ -frame and  $(\rho(i), \rho(i + 1))$  is one-step compatible. CLTL formulas can be interpreted on symbolic models, using symbolic semantics  $\models_s$  as explained next. To check if the  $i^{\text{th}}$  position of  $\rho$  symbolically satisfies the atomic constraint  $t_1 < t_2$  (where  $t_1, t_2$  are look-ahead terms), we check whether  $t_1 < t_2$  according to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  frame  $\rho(i)$ . In formal notation, this is written as  $\rho, i \models_s t_1 < t_2$  if  $t_1 <_{\rho(i)} t_2$ . For future-blind variables  $x, y$ ,  $\rho, i \models_s x < y$  if  $gp_{\rho(i)}(x, 0) < gp_{\rho(i)}(y, 0)$ . The symbolic satisfaction relation  $\models_s$  is extended to all CLTL formulas of  $X$ -length  $k$  by induction on structure of the formula, as done for propositional LTL. To check whether  $\rho, i \models_s t_1 < t_2$  in this symbolic semantics, we only need to check  $\rho(i)$ , the  $i^{\text{th}}$  frame in  $\rho$ , unlike the CLTL semantics, where we may need to check other positions also. In this sense, the symbolic semantics lets us treat CLTL formulas as if they were formulas in propositional LTL and employ techniques that have been developed for propositional LTL. But to complete that task, we need a way to go back and forth between symbolic and concrete models.

Given a concrete model  $\sigma$ , we associate with it a symbolic model  $\mu(\sigma)$  as follows. Imagine we are looking at the concrete model through a narrow aperture that only allows to view  $k + 1$  positions of the concrete model, and we can slide the aperture to view different portions. The  $i^{\text{th}}$  frame of  $\mu(\sigma)$  will capture information about the portion of the concrete model visible when the right tip of the aperture is at position  $i$  of the concrete model (so the left tip will be at  $i - [i]_k$ ). Formally, the total pre-order of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  frame is the one induced by the valuations along the positions  $i - [i]_k$  to  $i$  of the concrete model. For every  $j \in [0, [i]_k]$ , the function  $\lambda x. gp_f(x, j)$  of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  frame is the gap function associated with the mapping  $\sigma(i - [i]_k + j) \upharpoonright V^b$ .

For every concrete model, there is an associated symbolic model, but the converse is not true. E.g., if every frame in a symbolic model requires  $Xx < x$ , the corresponding concrete model needs to have an infinite descending chain, which is not possible in the constraint system  $(\mathbb{N}, <, =)$ . We say that a symbolic model  $\rho$  admits a concrete model if there exists a concrete model  $\sigma$  such that  $\rho = \mu(\sigma)$ .

► **Lemma 5** ([11, Lemma 3.1]). *Let  $\phi$  be a CLTL formula of  $X$ -length  $k$ . Let  $\sigma$  be a concrete model and  $\rho = \mu(\sigma)$ . Then  $\sigma, 0 \models \phi$  iff  $\rho, k \models_s \phi$ .*

## 5 Decidability Over Domains Satisfying the Completion Property

In this section, we prove that the CLTL realizability problem is decidable if the domain satisfies a so called completion property. Let  $C$  be a set of constraints over a constraint system  $\mathcal{D}$ . We call  $C$  satisfiable if there is a valuation satisfying all the constraints in  $C$ . For a subset  $U \subseteq V$  of variables,  $C \upharpoonright U$  is the subset of  $C$  consisting of those constraints that only use terms built with variables in  $U$ . A partial valuation  $v'$  is a valuation for the terms occurring in  $C \upharpoonright U$ . We say  $\mathcal{D}$  has the completion property if for every satisfiable set of constraints  $C$  and every subset  $U \subseteq V$ , every partial valuation  $v'$  satisfying  $C \upharpoonright U$  can be extended to a valuation  $v$  satisfying  $C$ . An example of a constraint system which does not satisfy the completion property is  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$ , since for the set of constraints  $C = \{x < y, x < z, z < y\}$  over the set of variables  $V = \{x, y, z\}$ , the partial valuation  $v: x \mapsto 0, y \mapsto 1$  satisfies the constraints in  $C$  involving  $x$  and  $y$ , but cannot be extended to a valuation which satisfies the constraints  $x < z$  and  $z < y$  in  $C$ . The constraint systems  $(\mathbb{Q}, <, =)$  and  $(\mathbb{R}, <, =)$  satisfy the completion property. Also, one can easily see that for every infinite domain  $D$ , the constraint system  $(D, =)$  always satisfies the completion property.

It is known that CLTL satisfiability is decidable for constraint systems that satisfy the completion property [11, 4]. The completion property of a constraint system is closely related to the denseness of the underlying domain. A constraint system satisfies the completion property if and only if the underlying domain is dense and open [11, Lemma 5.3]. Now we prove that for constraint systems of the form  $(D, <, =)$  that satisfy the completion property, the CLTL realizability problem is decidable. This holds even when both players have look-ahead variables, so we don't need to treat future-blind variables separately. Hence, we set  $V^b$  to be empty and ignore gap functions in frames.

We reduce CLTL games to parity games on finite graphs, which are known to be decidable (see, e.g., [18]). In a CLTL game, **environment** chooses a valuation for  $EV$ , which we track in our finite graph by storing the positions of the new values relative to the values chosen in the previous rounds. We do this with partial frames, which we define next.

► **Definition 6** (Partial frames and compatibility). *For  $s \geq 1$ , a partial  $s$ -frame  $pf$  is a total pre-order  $\leq_{pf}$  on the set of terms  $T^a[s-2] \cup \{X^{s-1}y \mid y \in EV\}$ . For  $s \geq 0$ , an  $s$ -frame  $f$  and an  $(s+1)$ -partial frame  $pf$ , the pair  $(f, pf)$  is one step compatible if for all  $t_1, t_2 \in T^a[s-1]$ ,  $t_1 \leq_f t_2$  iff  $t_1 \leq_{pf} t_2$ . For  $s \geq 2$ , an  $s$ -frame  $f$  and an  $s$ -partial frame  $pf$ , the pair  $(f, pf)$  is one-step compatible if for all  $t_1, t_2 \in T^a[s-2]$ ,  $Xt_1 \leq_f Xt_2$  iff  $t_1 \leq_{pf} t_2$ . For  $s \geq 2$ , an  $s$ -partial frame  $pf$  and an  $s$ -frame  $f$ ,  $(pf, f)$  is one step compatible if for all  $t_1, t_2 \in T^a[s-2] \cup \{X^{s-1}y \mid y \in EV\}$ ,  $t_1 \leq_{pf} t_2$  iff  $t_1 \leq_f t_2$ .*

In the set of terms  $T^a[s-2] \cup \{X^{s-1}y \mid y \in EV\}$  used in partial frames, the terms in the first set represent values chosen in the previous rounds and the terms in the second set represent values chosen by **environment** for  $EV$  in the current round.

Note that a partial  $s$ -frame is a total pre-order on the set of terms  $T^a[s-2] \cup \{X^{s-1}y \mid y \in EV\}$  and an  $s$ -frame is a total pre-order on the set of terms  $T^a[s-1]$ . Let  $pf$  be an  $s$ -partial frame and let  $f$  be an  $s$ -frame such that  $(pf, f)$  is one-step compatible. Suppose  $C_1 = \{t_1 = t_2 \mid t_1 \equiv_f t_2\} \cup \{t_1 < t_2 \mid t_1 <_f t_2\}$  and  $C_2 = \{t_1 = t_2 \mid t_1 \equiv_{pf} t_2\} \cup \{t_1 < t_2 \mid t_1 <_{pf} t_2\}$ . Clearly,  $C_2$  is a subset of  $C_1$  skipping all those constraints that contain **system** variables corresponding to the  $s^{\text{th}}$  position. If a finite sequence of

mappings  $(em_1 \oplus sm_1) \dots (em_{s-1} \oplus sm_{s-1})em_s$  satisfies the pre-order  $\leq_{pf}$  then it satisfies the constraints in  $C_2$ . Since the constraint system satisfies the completion property, there must exist a **system** mapping  $sm_s$  for the **system** variables at position  $s$  such that the sequence of mappings  $(em_1 \oplus sm_1) \dots (em_s \oplus sm_s)$  satisfies the constraints in  $C_1$  and hence, also satisfies the pre-order  $\leq_f$ . Thus, we have the following proposition:

► **Proposition 7.** *Given  $s \geq 1$ , suppose  $(em_1 \oplus sm_1) \dots (em_i \oplus sm_i)em$  is a sequence of mappings, where  $em_1, \dots, em_i, em \in EM$ ,  $sm_1, \dots, sm_i \in SM$ ,  $pf$  is the  $s$ -partial frame induced by  $em$  and the previous  $(s - 1)$  mappings in the sequence, and  $f$  is an  $s$ -frame such that  $(pf, f)$  is one-step compatible (where  $i \geq s$ ). If the constraint system satisfies the completion property, then  $em$  can be extended to a mapping  $em \oplus sm$  such that  $f$  is the  $s$ -frame associated with  $em \oplus sm$  and the previous  $(s - 1)$  mappings in the sequence.*

We know that any LTL formula  $\phi$  can be converted to an equivalent non-deterministic Büchi automaton with an exponential number of states in the size of  $\phi$  in EXPTIME [27]. Now, every non-deterministic Büchi automaton  $B$  with  $n$  states can be converted to a deterministic parity automaton [14, Chapter 1] with number of states exponential in  $n$  and number of colours polynomial in  $n$  [20, Theorem 3.10]. Using these results, it is easy to see that given a CLTL formula  $\phi$ , we can construct a deterministic parity automaton  $A_\phi$  with set of states  $Q$  and with number of colours  $d$ , accepting the set of all sequences of frames that symbolically satisfy  $\phi$ , such that  $|Q|$  is double exponential in the size of  $\phi$  and  $d$  is exponential in the size of  $\phi$ . Now we design parity games to simulate CLTL games.

► **Definition 8.** *Let  $\phi$  be the CLTL formula defining the winning condition for a CLTL game and  $k$  be its  $X$ -length. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  denote the set of all  $s$ -frames for  $s \in [0, k]$ . Let  $A_\phi$  be a deterministic parity automaton accepting the set of all sequences of frames that symbolically satisfy  $\phi$ , with  $Q$  being the set of states,  $q_I \in Q$  being the initial state and  $d$  being the number of colours. We define a parity game with **environment** vertices  $V_e = \{(f, q_I) \mid f \text{ is an } s\text{-frame}, 0 \leq s \leq k\} \cup \{(f, q) \mid f \text{ is a } (k+1)\text{-frame}, q \in Q\}$ . The set of **system** vertices is  $V_s = \{(f, q_I, pf) \mid f \text{ is an } s\text{-frame}, 0 \leq s \leq k, pf \text{ is an } (s+1)\text{-partial frame}\} \cup \{(f, q, pf) \mid f \text{ is a } (k+1)\text{-frame}, pf \text{ is a } (k+1)\text{-partial frame}\}$ . There is an edge from  $(f, q)$  to  $(f, q, pf)$  if  $(f, pf)$  is one-step compatible,  $f$  is an  $s$ -frame for some  $s$  and  $pf$  is a partial  $\lceil s+1 \rceil_{(k+1)}$ -frame. There is an edge from  $(f, q_I, pf)$  to  $(g, q_I)$  if  $(pf, g)$  is one step compatible and  $g$  is an  $s$ -frame for  $s \in [1, k]$ . There is an edge from  $(f, q, pf)$  to  $(g, q')$  if  $(pf, g)$  is one-step compatible,  $g$  is a  $(k+1)$ -frame and  $A_\phi$  goes from  $q$  to  $q'$  on reading  $g$ . Vertices  $(f, q)$  and  $(f, q, pf)$  get the same colour as  $q$  in the parity automaton  $A_\phi$ . The initial vertex is  $(\perp, q_I)$ , where  $\perp$  is the trivial 0-frame.*

The edges of the parity game above are from  $V_s$  to  $V_e$  or vice-versa. They are designed such that  $q_I$  is the only state used for the first  $k$  rounds, where the frames will be of size at most  $k$  (this is because for the **system** to win in a play of the parity game generating a frame sequence  $\rho$ , we only require that the sequence  $\rho[k, \infty)$  symbolically satisfy  $\phi$ , according to Lemma 5). For the first  $(k + 1)$  frame, an edge from a **system** vertex of the form  $(f, q_I, pf)$  to an **environment** vertex of the form  $(g, q')$  is taken and from then on, we track the state of the parity automaton as it reads the sequence of frames contained in the sequence of vertices that are chosen by the players in the game.

► **Lemma 9.** *For a CLTL game over a constraint system satisfying the completion property with winning condition given by a formula  $\phi$ , **system** has a winning strategy iff she has a positional winning strategy in the parity game given in Definition 8.*

**Proof idea.** For every play in the CLTL game, there is a corresponding play in the parity game, but the converse is not true in general, since only the order of terms are tracked in the parity game and not the actual values. For constraint systems satisfying the completion property, Proposition 7 implies that there exist valuations corresponding to all possible orderings of terms, so the converse is also true.  $\blacktriangleleft$

**Proof.** ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Suppose **system** has a winning strategy  $st$  in the CLTL game. We show that **system** has a winning strategy in the parity game. Plays in the parity game are of the form  $(\perp, q_I)(\perp, q_I, pf_1)(f_1, q_1)(f_1, q_1, pf_2)(f_2, q_2) \cdots (f_i, q_i, pf_{i+1})(f_{i+1}, q_{i+1}) \cdots$ , where  $(f_i, pf_{i+1})$  and  $(pf_{i+1}, f_{i+1})$  are one-step compatible for all  $i$ . For any such play  $\pi$ , let  $\pi \upharpoonright i$  be  $(\perp, q_I)(\perp, q_I, pf_1)(f_1, q_1)(f_1, q_1, pf_2)(f_2, q_2) \cdots (f_i, q_i, pf_{i+1})$ . Let  $\Pi = \{\pi \upharpoonright i \mid \pi \text{ is a play in the parity game, } i \geq 0\}$ . We will show the existence of a function  $st_p: \Pi \rightarrow V_e \times EM \times SM$  satisfying some properties. Such a function can be used as a strategy by **system** in the parity game: for a play  $\pi \upharpoonright i$ , **system**'s response  $(f_{i+1}, q_{i+1})$  is given by  $st_p$ , i.e.,  $st_p(\pi \upharpoonright i) = ((f_{i+1}, q_{i+1}), em_{i+1}, sm_{i+1})$ . For such plays that **system** plays according to  $st_p$ , let  $\text{frames}(\pi \upharpoonright i)$  be the symbolic model  $f_1 f_2 \cdots f_{i+1}$  and let  $\text{maps}(\pi \upharpoonright i)$  be the concrete model  $(em_1 \oplus sm_1)(em_2 \oplus sm_2) \cdots (em_{i+1} \oplus sm_{i+1})$ .

We will show that there is a function  $st_p$  such that for all plays  $\pi$  that **system** plays according to  $st_p$  and all  $i \geq 0$ ,  $\text{maps}(\pi \upharpoonright i)$  is a concrete model resulting from **system** playing the CLTL game according to  $st$  and  $\text{frames}(\pi \upharpoonright i) = \mu(\text{maps}(\pi \upharpoonright i))$ . We will define such a function  $st_p$  by induction on  $i$ . We assume this has been done for  $i$  and show how to extend to  $i+1$ . We have  $\pi \upharpoonright (i+1) = (\perp, q_I)(\perp, q_I, pf_1)(f_1, q_1)(f_1, q_1, pf_2)(f_2, q_2) \cdots (f_i, q_i, pf_{i+1})(f_{i+1}, q_{i+1})(f_{i+1}, q_{i+1}, pf_{i+2})$ . By induction hypothesis,  $f_1 f_2 \cdots f_{i+1} = \mu(\text{maps}(\pi \upharpoonright i))$ . Since the constraint system satisfies the completion property and  $(f_{i+1}, pf_{i+2})$  is one-step compatible, by Proposition 7, there is a mapping  $em: EV \rightarrow D$  such that the symbolic model induced by  $\text{maps}(\pi \upharpoonright i) \cdot em$  is  $f_1 f_2 \cdots f_{i+1} \cdot pf_{i+2}$ . Let  $sm: SV \rightarrow D = st(\text{maps}(\pi \upharpoonright i) \cdot em)$  be **system**'s response in the CLTL game according to  $st$ . Let  $f_{i+2}$  be the frame such that  $f_1 f_2 \cdots f_{i+1} f_{i+2} = \mu(\text{maps}(\pi \upharpoonright i) \cdot (em \oplus sm))$ . Set  $st_p(\pi \upharpoonright (i+1))$  to be  $((f_{i+2}, q_{i+2}), em, sm)$ , where  $q_{i+2}$  is the state  $A_\phi$  reaches after reading  $f_{i+2}$  in state  $q_{i+1}$ . Now,  $\text{maps}(\pi \upharpoonright (i+1))$  is a concrete model resulting from **system** playing the CLTL game according to  $st$  and  $\text{frames}(\pi \upharpoonright (i+1)) = \mu(\text{maps}(\pi \upharpoonright (i+1)))$ , as required for the inductive construction.

Let  $\pi$  be any infinite play in the parity game that **system** plays according to  $st_p$ . Then  $\text{maps}(\pi)$  is a concrete model resulting from **system** playing the CLTL game according to  $st$  and  $\text{frames}(\pi) = \mu(\text{maps}(\pi))$ . Since  $st$  is a winning strategy for **system**,  $\text{maps}(\pi), 0 \models \phi$ . We infer from Lemma 5 that  $\text{frames}(\text{maps}(\pi)), k \models_s \phi$ . Hence, the sequence of states  $q_I, q_1, q_2, \dots$  contained in the sequence of vertices that are visited in  $\pi$  satisfy the parity condition of  $A_\phi$ . Hence,  $\pi$  itself satisfies the parity condition and hence **system** wins  $\pi$ . Hence,  $st_p$  is a winning strategy for **system** in the parity game.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Suppose  $st_p$  is a positional strategy for **system** in the parity game. We will show that **system** has a winning strategy  $st$  in the CLTL game. We will define  $st$  by induction on the number of rounds played. For the base case, suppose **environment** starts by choosing a mapping  $em_1: EV \rightarrow D$ . In the parity game, let **environment** go to the vertex  $(\perp, q_I, pf_1)$  in the first round, where  $pf_1$  is the 1-partial frame associated with  $em_1$ . Let  $(f_1, q_1) = st_p((\perp, q_I, pf_1))$  be **system**'s response according to  $st_p$ . Since  $(pf_1, f_1)$  is one-step compatible and the constraint system satisfies the completion property, by Proposition 7,  $em_1$  can be extended to a mapping  $em_1 \oplus sm_1: V \rightarrow D$  such that  $f_1$  is the frame associated with  $em_1 \oplus sm_1$ . Set  $st(em_1)$  to be  $sm_1$ . After  $i$  rounds of the CLTL game, suppose  $(em_1 \oplus sm_1) \cdots (em_i \oplus sm_i)$  is the resulting concrete model and let  $(\perp, q_I)(\perp, q_I, pf_1)(f_1, q_1) \cdots (f_i, q_i)$  be the corresponding play in the parity game. Suppose **environment** chooses  $em_{i+1}$  in the

next round. Let  $pf_{i+1}, f_{i+1}, q_{i+1}, sm_{i+1}$  be obtained similarly as in the base case. Set  $st((em_1 \oplus sm_1) \cdots (em_i \oplus sm_i) \cdot em_{i+1})$  to be  $sm_{i+1}$ .

Suppose  $(em_1 \oplus sm_1)(em_2 \oplus sm_2) \cdots$  is an infinite play in the CLTL game that **system** plays according to  $st$ . There is a play  $(\perp, q_I)(\perp, q_I, pf_1)(f_1, q_1)(f_1, q_1, pf_2)(f_2, q_2) \cdots$  in the parity game that is winning for **system**. This satisfies the parity condition, hence  $A_\phi$  accepts the symbolic model  $f_1 f_2 \cdots$ . The symbolic model  $f_1 f_2 \cdots$  is the one associated with  $(em_1 \oplus sm_1)(em_2 \oplus sm_2) \cdots$  by construction of  $st$ , so Lemma 5 implies that  $(em_1 \oplus sm_1)(em_2 \oplus sm_2) \cdots, 0 \models \phi$ . Hence,  $st$  is a winning strategy for **system** in the CLTL game.  $\blacktriangleleft$

► **Theorem 10.** *The CLTL realizability problem over constraint systems that satisfy the completion property is 2EXPTIME-complete.*

**Proof.** From Lemma 9, this is effectively equivalent to checking the existence of a winning strategy for **system** in a game. Now, checking if **system** has a winning strategy in the parity game (constructed using  $A_\phi$ ) can be achieved in  $O(n^{\log d})$  time where  $n$  is the number of states in the game graph [7]. Now, by our construction,  $n = |Q| \times |\mathcal{F}|$ . We know,  $|\mathcal{F}|$  is the number of total pre-orders on  $V$ , for which  $2^{\binom{k \cdot |V|}{2}}$  is a crude upper bound. This means that  $|\mathcal{F}|$  is exponential in the size of  $\phi$  and hence, overall we get a 2EXPTIME upper bound for our realizability problem. We also know that the realizability problem for LTL is complete for 2EXPTIME [22] and every LTL formula is also a CLTL formula. Thus, the CLTL realizability problem over constraint systems satisfying the completion property is also 2EXPTIME-complete.  $\blacktriangleleft$

We know that a positional winning strategy in the parity game for a player, if it exists, can be implemented by a deterministic finite state transducer. Since  $\mathcal{D}$  satisfies the completion property, consider a resource-bounded Turing machine  $M$ , which can, given an environment mapping  $em$  as described in Proposition 7, extend it to a mapping  $em \oplus sm$  such that the order  $f$  imposed by the  $em \oplus sm$  and the previous  $s - 1$  mappings over the set of all terms extends the order  $pf$  imposed by  $em$  and the previous  $s - 1$  mappings. Now, for implementing the winning strategy for a player in a CLTL game, we use the deterministic finite state transducer corresponding to the parity game given in Definition 8. For every input of a partial frame  $pf$  by **environment** in a round, the transducer returns a frame  $f$  for **system** that extends  $pf$ . The transducer along with the machine  $M$  implements the winning strategy for **system** in a given CLTL game, if it exists.

Note that as we saw above, the constraint systems  $(\mathbb{N}, =)$  and  $(\mathbb{Z}, =)$  (with just equality and no linear order) also satisfy the completion property. So, it follows that the CLTL realizability problem over these constraint systems is also decidable.

## 6 Decidability of single-sided CLTL games over $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$

We consider games where **environment** has only future-blind variables, while the **system** has both future-blind and look-ahead variables. We call this single-sided CLTL games. So, in a single-sided game,  $EV = EV^b$  and  $SV = SV^b \cup SV^a$ . Given a CLTL formula  $\phi$ , the **single-sided realizability problem** is to check whether **system** has a winning strategy in the single-sided CLTL game whose winning condition is  $\phi$ . We only consider the constraint system  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$  and show that the single-sided realizability problem is decidable over  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$ . We do this in two stages. In the first stage, we reduce it to the problem of checking the non-emptiness of a set of trees satisfying certain properties. These trees

represent **system** strategies. In the second stage, we show that non-emptiness can be checked using tree automata techniques.

Let  $G$  be the set of gap functions associated with mappings of the form  $EV^b \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . For  $s \geq 1$ , an  $s$ -frame  $g$  and a function  $gp \in G$ , the pair  $(gp, g)$  is gap compatible if for all  $x, y \in EV^b$ ,  $gp(x) - gp(y) = gp_g(x, s-1) - gp_g(y, s-1)$ . Intuitively, the gaps that frame  $g$  imposes between  $EV^b$  variables in its last position are same as the gaps imposed by  $gp$ .

► **Proposition 11** (gap compatibility). *For  $s \geq 1$ , an  $s$ -frame  $g$  and a function  $gp \in G$ , suppose the pair  $(gp, g)$  is gap compatible. If  $gp$  is the gap function associated with a mapping  $em: EV^b \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ , it can be extended to a mapping  $em \oplus sm: V^b \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $\lambda x. gp_g(x, s-1)$  is the gap function associated with  $em \oplus sm$ .*

**Proof.** Arrange  $EV^b$  as  $x_0, x_1, \dots$  such that  $0 = gp(x_0) < gp(x_1) < \dots$ . For any  $j$ , let  $V_j = \{y \in SV^b \mid gp_g(x_{j-1}, s-1) < gp_g(y, s-1) < gp_g(x_j, s-1)\}$  be the set of variables in  $SV^b$  that occur “in-between”  $x_{j-1}$  and  $x_j$  according to  $gp_g(\cdot, s-1)$ . Since the pair  $(gp, g)$  is gap compatible,  $gp_g(x_j, s-1) - gp_g(x_{j-1}, s-1) = gp(x_j) - gp(x_{j-1}) = \lceil em(x_j) - em(x_{j-1}) \rceil_{|V^b|-1}$ . The second equality follows from the fact that  $gp$  is the gap function associated with  $em$ . Since  $|V_j| < |V^b| - 1$ , the gap  $\lceil em(x_j) - em(x_{j-1}) \rceil_{|V^b|-1}$  is wide enough to accommodate all variables in  $V_j$ . The mapping  $sm$  assigns to each variable in  $V_j$  some value between  $em(x_{j-1})$  and  $em(x_j)$  such that  $\lambda x. gp_g(x, s-1)$  is the gap function associated with  $em \oplus sm$ . ◀

Let  $\phi$  be the CLTL formula defining the winning condition of a single-sided CLTL game and let  $k$  be its  $X$ -length. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the set of all  $s$ -frames for  $s \in [0, k]$ . For technical convenience, we let  $\mathcal{F}$  include the trivial 0-frame  $\perp = (\leq_\perp, gp_\perp)$ , where  $\leq_\perp$  is the trivial total pre-order on the empty set and  $gp_\perp$  is the trivial function on the empty domain.

► **Definition 12** (Winning strategy trees). *A strategy tree is a function  $T: G^* \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  such that for every node  $\eta \in G^*$ ,  $T(\eta)$  is a  $\lceil |\eta| \rceil_{k+1}$ -frame and for every  $gp \in G$ ,  $(T(\eta), T(\eta \cdot gp))$  is one-step compatible and  $(gp, T(\eta \cdot gp))$  is gap compatible. A function  $L$  is said to be a labeling function if for every node  $\eta \in G^*$ ,  $L(\eta): V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  is a mapping of the variables in  $V$ . For an infinite path  $\pi$  in  $T$ , let  $T(\pi)$  (resp.  $L(\pi)$ ) denote the infinite sequence of frames (resp. mappings) labeling the nodes in  $\pi$ , except the root node  $\epsilon$ . A winning strategy tree is a pair  $(T, L)$  such that  $T$  is a strategy tree and  $L$  is a labelling function satisfying the condition that for every infinite path  $\pi$ ,  $T(\pi) = \mu(L(\pi))$  and  $T(\pi), k \models_s \phi$ .*

The last condition above means that  $T(\pi)$  is the symbolic model associated with the concrete model  $L(\pi)$  and that it symbolically satisfies the formula  $\phi$ .

Two concrete models may have the same symbolic model associated with them, if they differ only slightly, as explained next. Two concrete models  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$  are said to coincide on  $V^a$  if  $\sigma_1(i) \upharpoonright V^a = \sigma_2(i) \upharpoonright V^a$  for all  $i \geq 0$ . They are said to coincide on  $V^b$  up to gap functions if for every  $i \geq 0$ , the same gap function is associated with  $\sigma_1(i) \upharpoonright V^b$  and  $\sigma_2(i) \upharpoonright V^b$ . The following result follows directly from definitions.

► **Proposition 13** (similar concrete models have same symbolic model). *If two concrete models coincide on  $V^a$  and they coincide on  $V^b$  up to gap functions, then they have the same symbolic model associated with them.*

The following result accomplishes the first stage of the decidability proof, reducing the existence of winning strategies to non-emptiness of a set of trees.

► **Lemma 14** (strategy to tree). *System has a winning strategy in the single-sided CLTL game with winning condition  $\phi$  iff there exists a winning strategy tree.*



**Proof idea.** If **environment** chooses a mapping  $em: EV^b \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  in the CLTL game, the corresponding choice in the tree  $T$  is to go to the child  $gp$ , the gap function associated with  $em$ . **System** responds with the mapping  $L(gp) \upharpoonright SV^a$  for the look-ahead variables. For the future-blind variables  $SV^b$ , **system** chooses a mapping that ensures compatibility with the frame  $T(gp)$ . This will ensure that **system**'s response and  $L$  coincide on  $V^a$  and coincide on  $V^b$  up to gap functions, so Proposition 13 ensures that both have the same symbolic model. The symbolic model symbolically satisfies  $\phi$  by definition of winning strategy trees and Lemma 5 implies that the concrete model satisfies  $\phi$ . ◀

**Proof.** We introduce a notation to use in this proof. For a labeling function  $L$  and a node  $\eta = gp_1 \cdot gp_2 \cdots gp_n$ , we denote by  $\hat{L}(\eta)$  the sequence of mappings  $L(gp_1) \cdot L(gp_1 \cdot gp_2) \cdots L(\eta)$ . The notation  $\hat{T}$  has similar meaning.

( $\Rightarrow$ ) Suppose **system** has a winning strategy  $st$ . We first construct a labeling function  $L$  such that for any node  $\eta$  with  $|\eta| \geq 1$ , if  $\hat{L}(\eta) \upharpoonright EV^b$  is the sequence of **environment** choices, then  $\hat{L}(\eta) \upharpoonright SV$  are the **system** responses according to  $st$ . We proceed by induction on  $|\eta|$ . For the base case  $|\eta| = 0$ ,  $\eta = \epsilon$ . We set  $L(\epsilon)$  to be the constant function that maps everything to 0. This satisfies the specified condition vacuously.

For the induction step, consider a node  $\eta \cdot gp$  for some  $gp \in G$ . Let  $em_{gp}: EV^b \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be a mapping such that the gap function associated with  $em_{gp}$  is  $gp$ . Set  $L(\eta \cdot gp) = em_{gp} \oplus st(\hat{L}(\eta) \cdot em_{gp})$ . By induction hypothesis, for the sequence  $\hat{L}(\eta) \upharpoonright EV^b$  of **environment** choices,  $\hat{L}(\eta) \upharpoonright SV$  are the **system** responses according to  $st$ . Hence, for the sequence  $\hat{L}(\eta) \upharpoonright EV^b \cdot em_{gp}$  of **environment** choices,  $\hat{L}(\eta) \upharpoonright SV \cdot st(\hat{L}(\eta) \cdot em_{gp})$  are the **system** responses. This completes the induction step and the construction of the labeling function  $L$ . Let  $T$  be the tree such that for every infinite path  $\pi$ ,  $T(\pi)$  is  $\mu(L(\pi))$ , the symbolic model associated with the concrete model  $L(\pi)$ . Since  $L(\pi) \upharpoonright SV$  are the **system** responses to **environment** choices  $L(\pi) \upharpoonright EV^b$  according to the winning strategy  $st$ ,  $L(\pi), 0 \models \phi$ . Lemma 5 implies that  $\mu(L(\pi)), k \models_s \phi$ , so  $T(\pi), k \models_s \phi$ .

( $\Leftarrow$ ) For a sequence  $\sigma$  of mappings over  $V$  and  $S \subseteq V$ , let  $\hat{gp}(\sigma \upharpoonright S)$  denote the sequence of gap functions  $gp_1 \cdot gp_2 \cdots$  such that for all  $i$ ,  $gp_i$  is the gap function associated with the mapping  $\sigma(i)$  restricted to the domain  $S$ . Suppose there exists a winning strategy tree  $(T, L)$ . We will construct a strategy  $st$  that is winning for **system** satisfying the following property: suppose  $\sigma \in M^*$  is a sequence of mappings resulting from a play that **system** plays according to  $st$  and  $\eta = \hat{gp}(\sigma \upharpoonright EV^b)$ . Then  $\hat{L}(\eta)$  and  $\sigma$  coincide on  $SV^a$  and they coincide on  $V^b$  up to gap functions. We proceed by induction on  $|\sigma|$ . For the base case  $|\sigma| = 0$ ,  $\sigma = \epsilon$  and there is nothing to prove.

For the induction step, let  $\sigma$  be the sequence of mappings resulting from the rounds played so far and in the next round, suppose **environment** chooses the mapping  $em: EV^b \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $gp_{em}$  be the gap function associated with  $em$ ,  $\eta = \hat{gp}(\sigma \upharpoonright EV^b)$  and  $f = T(\eta \cdot gp_{em})$ . Say  $f$  is an  $s$ -frame for some  $s$ . By definition of winning strategy trees, the pair  $(gp_{em}, f)$  is gap compatible. Proposition 11 implies that  $em$  can be extended to a mapping  $em': V^b \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $\lambda x. gp_f(x, s-1)$  is the gap function associated with  $em'$ . Also  $\lambda x. gp_f(x, s-1)$  is the gap function associated with  $L(\eta \cdot gp_{em}) \upharpoonright V^b$ , by definition of winning strategy trees. So  $em'$  and  $L(\eta \cdot gp_{em}) \upharpoonright V^b$  coincide up to gap functions. Set  $st(\sigma \cdot em)$  to be  $sm = (L(\eta \cdot gp_{em}) \upharpoonright SV^a) \oplus (em' \upharpoonright SV^b)$ . In words, **system**'s response resembles  $L(\eta \cdot gp_{em})$  on  $SV^a$  and resembles  $em'$  on  $SV^b$ . By induction hypothesis,  $\hat{L}(\eta)$  and  $\sigma$  coincide on  $SV^a$  and they coincide on  $V^b$  up to gap functions. Hence,  $\hat{L}(\eta \cdot gp_{em})$  and  $\sigma \cdot sm$  coincide on  $SV^a$  and they coincide on  $V^b$  up to gap functions. This completes the induction step and hence the construction of  $st$ .

It remains to prove that  $st$  is a winning strategy. Let  $\sigma$  be a concrete model resulting from

a play in which **system** follows the strategy  $st$ . The sequence of gap functions  $\hat{g}p(\sigma \upharpoonright EV^b)$  induces an infinite path  $\pi$  in the tree  $(T, L)$ . By construction of  $st$ ,  $\sigma$  and  $L(\pi)$  coincide on  $V^a = SV^a$  and coincide on  $V^b$  up to gap functions. Proposition 13 implies that  $\sigma$  and  $L(\pi)$  have the same symbolic model  $T(\pi)$ . By definition of winning strategy trees,  $T(\pi), k \models_s \phi$ . Lemma 5 implies that  $\sigma, 0 \models \phi$ . Since this holds for any  $\sigma$  resulting from a play in which **system** follows the strategy  $st$ , this shows that  $st$  is winning for **system**.  $\blacktriangleleft$

Given a tree  $G^* \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ , a tree automaton over finite alphabets can check whether it is a strategy tree or not, by allowing transitions only between one-step and gap compatible frames. However, to check whether it is a winning strategy tree, we need to check whether there exists a labeling function  $L$ , which is harder. One way to check the existence of such a labeling function is to start labeling at the root and inductively extend to children. Suppose there are two variables  $x, y$  at some node and we have to label them with integers. There may be many variables in other nodes whose labels should be strictly between those of  $x, y$  in the current node. So our labels for  $x, y$  in the current node should leave gap large enough to accommodate others that are supposed to be in between. Next we introduce some orderings we use to formalize this.

A node variable in a strategy tree  $T$  is a pair  $(\eta, x)$  where  $\eta$  is a node and  $x \in V^a$  is a look-ahead variable. The tree induces an order on node variables as follows. Suppose  $\eta$  is a node,  $T(\eta)$  is an  $s$ -frame for some  $s$  and  $\eta_a$  is an ancestor of  $\eta$  such that the difference in height  $h = |\eta| - |\eta_a|$  between the descendant and ancestor is at most  $s - 1$ . For look-ahead variables  $x, y \in V^a$ , recall that the term  $X^{s-1}x$  represents the variable  $x$  in the last position of the frame  $T(\eta)$ , and  $X^{s-1-h}y$  represents the variable  $y$  at  $h$  positions before the last one. We say  $(\eta, x) \sqsubseteq_T (\eta_a, y)$  (resp.  $(\eta_a, y) \sqsubseteq_T (\eta, x)$ ) if  $X^{s-1}x \leq_{T(\eta)} X^{s-1-h}y$  (resp.  $X^{s-1-h}y \leq_{T(\eta)} X^{s-1}x$ ). In other words, for the variables and positions captured in the frame  $T(\eta)$ ,  $\sqsubseteq_T$  is same as the total pre-order  $\leq_{T(\eta)}$ . We define  $(\eta, x) \sqsubset_T (\eta_a, y)$  (resp.  $(\eta_a, y) \sqsubset_T (\eta, x)$ ) if  $(\eta, x) \sqsubseteq_T (\eta_a, y)$  and  $(\eta_a, y) \not\sqsubseteq_T (\eta, x)$  (resp.  $(\eta_a, y) \sqsubseteq_T (\eta, x)$  and  $(\eta, x) \not\sqsubseteq_T (\eta_a, y)$ ). We define  $\sqsubset_T^*$  to be the reflexive transitive closure of  $\sqsubset_T$  and  $\sqsubset_T^+$  to be the transitive closure of  $\sqsubset_T$ . Note that  $\sqsubset_T^*$  and  $\sqsubset_T^+$  can compare node variables that are in different branches of the tree also, though they are not total orders. We write  $(\eta_1, x) \sqsubset_T^* (\eta_2, y)$  (resp.  $(\eta_1, x) \sqsubset_T^+ (\eta_2, y)$ ) equivalently as  $(\eta_2, y) \supset_T^* (\eta_1, x)$  (resp.  $(\eta_1, x) \supset_T^+ (\eta_2, y)$ ). By definition,  $(\eta_1, x) \sqsubset_T^+ (\eta_2, y)$  (resp.  $(\eta_2, y) \sqsubset_T^+ (\eta_1, x)$ ) if  $(\eta_1, x) \sqsubset_T^* (\eta_2, y)$  and  $(\eta_2, y) \not\sqsubset_T^* (\eta_1, x)$  (resp.  $(\eta_2, y) \sqsubset_T^* (\eta_1, x)$  and  $(\eta_1, x) \not\sqsubset_T^* (\eta_2, y)$ ).  $\sqsubset^+$  is irreflexive and transitive.

► **Definition 15** (Bounded chain strategy trees). *Suppose  $T$  is a strategy tree,  $\eta, \eta'$  are two nodes and  $x, y \in V^a$  are look-ahead variables such that  $(\eta, x) \sqsubset_T^+ (\eta', y)$ . A chain between  $(\eta, x)$  and  $(\eta', y)$  is a sequence  $(\eta_1, x_1)(\eta_2, x_2) \cdots (\eta_r, x_r)$  such that  $(\eta, x) \sqsubset_T^+ (\eta_1, x_1) \sqsubset_T^+ (\eta_2, x_2) \sqsubset_T^+ \cdots \sqsubset_T^+ (\eta_r, x_r) \sqsubset_T^+ (\eta', y)$ . We say  $r$  is the length of the chain. The strategy tree  $T$  is said to have bounded chains if for any two node variables  $(\eta, x)$  and  $(\eta', y)$ , there is a bound  $N$  such that any chain between  $(\eta, x)$  and  $(\eta', y)$  is of length at most  $N$ .*

► **Lemma 16.** *A strategy tree  $T$  has a labeling function  $L$  such that  $(T, L)$  is a winning strategy tree iff  $T$  has bounded chains.*

**Proof.** ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Suppose  $T$  has a labeling function  $L$  such that  $(T, L)$  is a winning strategy tree. Since for every infinite path  $\pi$ ,  $T(\pi) = \mu(L(\pi))$ ,  $L$  should respect the relation  $\sqsubset_T^+$ , i.e., if  $(\eta, x) \sqsubset_T^+ (\eta', y)$ , then  $L(\eta)(x) < L(\eta')(y)$ . Hence, any chain between  $(\eta, x)$  and  $(\eta', y)$  cannot be longer than  $L(\eta')(y) - L(\eta)(x)$ .

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Suppose  $T$  has bounded chains. We construct a labeling function  $L$  such that  $(T, L)$  is a winning strategy tree. At every node  $\eta$ , we choose mappings for future-blind variables



$V^b$  such that the gap function associated with  $L(\eta) \upharpoonright V^b$  is  $gp_{T(\eta)}$ . These choices can be done independently for every node. For look-ahead variables, we construct  $L$  for every node by induction on depth of the node such that for any node variables  $(\eta, x), (\eta', y)$  such that  $(\eta, x) \sqsubset_T^+ (\eta', y)$  and  $L(\eta), L(\eta')$  have been constructed,  $L(\eta')(y) - L(\eta)(x)$  is at least as large as the length of the longest chain between  $(\eta, x)$  and  $(\eta', y)$ . For the base case  $\eta = \epsilon$ , let  $L(\eta)$  be the trivial mapping on the empty domain.

For the induction step, consider a node  $\eta$ . Let  $(\eta, x_0), (\eta, x_1), \dots$  be the node variables from  $\eta$  and let  $(\eta_1, y_1), (\eta_2, y_2), \dots$  be the node variables from all the ancestors of  $\eta$ . Arrange them in ascending order according to  $\sqsubset_T^*$ . In this arrangement, suppose  $(\eta_i, y_i)(\eta, x_j)(\eta, x_{j+1}) \cdots (\eta, x_l)(\eta_{i+1}, y_{i+1})$  is a contiguous sequence of node variables from  $\eta$  surrounded by ancestor node variables  $(\eta_i, y_i)$  and  $(\eta_{i+1}, y_{i+1})$ . Set  $L(\eta)(x_j)$  to be the sum of  $L(\eta_i)(y_i)$  and the length of the longest chain between  $(\eta_i, y_i)$  and  $(\eta, x_j)$ . Set  $L(\eta)(x_{j+1})$  to be the sum of  $L(\eta)(x_j)$  and the length of the longest chain between  $(\eta, x_j)$  and  $(\eta, x_{j+1})$ . Continue this way till  $(\eta, x_l)$ . The value set for  $L(\eta)(x_l)$  will be less than  $L(\eta_{i+1})(y_{i+1})$  minus the length of the longest chain between  $L(\eta)(x_l)$  and  $(\eta_{i+1}, y_{i+1})$ , since by induction hypothesis,  $L(\eta_{i+1})(y_{i+1}) - L(\eta_i)(y_i)$  is large enough to accommodate the longest chain between  $(\eta_i, y_i)$  and  $(\eta_{i+1}, y_{i+1})$  (note that any chain between  $(\eta, x_j)$  and  $(\eta, x_{j+1})$  can be concatenated with any chain between  $(\eta, x_{j+1})$  and  $(\eta, x_{j+2})$  and so on to form a chain between  $(\eta_i, y_i)$  and  $(\eta_{i+1}, y_{i+1})$ ). This way, all contiguous sequence of node variables from  $\eta$  can be mapped satisfactorily. This completes the induction step and hence the proof.  $\blacktriangleleft$

The above lemma characterizes those strategy trees that are winning strategy trees. This is the main technical difference between CLTL games and games with register automata specifications [25, 12]. Since register automata can compare values that are arbitrarily far apart, the corresponding characterization of symbolic structures that have associated concrete structures is more involved compared to Lemma 16 above.

Detecting unbounded chains is still difficult for tree automata—to find longer chains, we may have to examine longer paths. This difficulty can be overcome if we can show that longer chains can be obtained by repeatedly joining shorter ones. We now introduce some notation and results to formalize this. For a node  $\eta$  and an ancestor  $\eta_a$ ,  $\hat{T}(\eta_a, \eta)$  is the sequence of frames  $T(\eta_a) \cdots T(\eta)$  labeling the path from  $\eta_a$  to  $\eta$ . A node  $\eta_1$  is said to occur within the influence of  $(\eta_a, \eta)$  if  $\eta_1$  occurs between  $\eta_a$  and  $\eta$  or  $\eta_1$  is an ancestor of  $\eta_a$  and  $|\eta_a| - |\eta_1| \leq s - 1$ , where  $s$  is the size of the frame  $T(\eta_a)$ . The following result follows directly from definitions.

**► Proposition 17** (Identical paths induce identical orders). *Suppose nodes  $\eta, \eta'$  and their ancestors  $\eta_a, \eta'_a$  respectively are such that  $\hat{T}(\eta_a, \eta) = \hat{T}(\eta'_a, \eta')$ . Suppose  $\eta_1, \eta_2$  occur within the influence of  $(\eta_a, \eta)$  and  $\eta'_1, \eta'_2$  occur within the influence of  $(\eta'_a, \eta')$  such that  $|\eta| - |\eta_1| = |\eta'| - |\eta'_1|$  and  $|\eta| - |\eta_2| = |\eta'| - |\eta'_2|$ . For any look-ahead variables  $x, y, (\eta_1, x) \sqsubset_T^* (\eta_2, y)$  (resp.  $(\eta_1, x) \sqsubseteq_T (\eta_2, y)$ ) iff  $(\eta'_1, x) \sqsubset_T^* (\eta'_2, y)$  (resp.  $(\eta'_1, x) \sqsubseteq_T (\eta'_2, y)$ ).*

For a node  $\eta$ , the subtree  $T_\eta$  rooted at  $\eta$  is such that for all  $\eta', T_\eta(\eta') = T(\eta \cdot \eta')$ . A tree  $T$  is called *regular* if the set  $\{T_\eta \mid \eta \in G^*\}$  is finite, i.e., there are only finitely many subtrees up to isomorphism. Two nodes  $\eta, \eta'$  are said to be isomorphic if  $T_\eta = T_{\eta'}$ .

**► Lemma 18** (Pumping chains in regular trees). *Suppose  $T$  is a regular tree. Then  $T$  has unbounded chains iff there exists an infinite path containing two infinite sequences  $(\eta_1, x), (\eta_2, x), (\eta_3, x) \dots$  (resp.  $(\eta'_1, y), (\eta'_2, y), (\eta'_3, y) \dots$ ) such that  $\eta_{i+1}$  (resp.  $\eta'_{i+1}$ ) is a descendant of  $\eta_i$  (resp.  $\eta'_i$ ) for all  $i \geq 1$  and satisfy one of the following conditions.*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
(\eta_1, x) \sqsubseteq_T^+ (\eta_2, x) \sqsubseteq_T^+ (\eta_3, x) \sqsubseteq_T^+ \cdots & & (\eta_1, x) \sqsupseteq_T^+ (\eta_2, x) \sqsupseteq_T^+ (\eta_3, x) \sqsupseteq_T^+ \cdots \\
\begin{array}{c} \sqsupseteq \\ \sqsupseteq \\ \sqsupseteq \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \sqsupseteq \\ \sqsupseteq \\ \sqsupseteq \end{array} & & or & & \begin{array}{c} \sqsubseteq \\ \sqsubseteq \\ \sqsubseteq \end{array} \\
(\eta'_1, y) \sqsupseteq_T^* (\eta'_2, y) \sqsupseteq_T^* (\eta'_3, y) \sqsupseteq_T^* \cdots & & (\eta'_1, y) \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta'_2, y) \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta'_3, y) \sqsubseteq_T^* \cdots
\end{array}$$


**Proof idea.** We can choose a chain that is long enough to contain two isomorphic nodes. The path between them can be repeated infinitely. Proposition 17 will imply that this infinite path contains an infinite chain as required. ◀

**Proof.** ( $\Leftarrow$ ) We consider the first case; the other case is similar. Since  $(\eta_i, x) \sqsubseteq_T (\eta'_i, y) \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta'_{i-1}, y) \sqsubseteq_T^* \cdots \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta'_1, y)$  for all  $i \geq 1$ , we have  $(\eta_i, x) \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta'_1, y)$ . Hence,  $(\eta_1, x) \sqsubseteq_T^+ (\eta_2, x) \sqsubseteq_T^+ \cdots \sqsubseteq_T^+ (\eta_i, x) \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta'_1, y)$  for all  $i \geq 1$ , demonstrating that there are chains of unbounded lengths between  $(\eta_1, x)$  and  $(\eta'_1, y)$ .

( $\Rightarrow$ ) We show the existence of a short segment that can be repeated arbitrarily many times to get the required infinite path. We show that there are node variables along a path satisfying the following conditions:

1. 
$$\begin{array}{ccc}
(\eta_1, x) \sqsubseteq_T^+ (\eta_2, x) & & (\eta_1, x) \sqsupseteq_T^+ (\eta_2, x) \\
\begin{array}{c} \sqsupseteq \\ \sqsupseteq \\ \sqsupseteq \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \sqsupseteq \\ \sqsupseteq \\ \sqsupseteq \end{array} \quad or \quad \begin{array}{c} \sqsubseteq \\ \sqsubseteq \\ \sqsubseteq \end{array} \\
(\eta'_1, y) \sqsupseteq_T^* (\eta'_2, y) & & (\eta'_1, y) \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta'_2, y)
\end{array}$$
2. the nodes are arranged as  $\eta'_1, \eta_1, \eta'_2, \eta_2$  in ascending order of depth,  $|\eta'_1| > k$ ,
3.  $\eta_1, \eta_2$  are isomorphic,  $\eta'_1, \eta'_2$  are isomorphic and  $|\eta_1| - |\eta'_1| = |\eta_2| - |\eta'_2| \leq k$ .

The node variables mentioned above are as shown below.




We first prove that the existence of such nodes is sufficient. Since  $\eta_1, \eta_2$  are isomorphic, for any sequence of frames starting from  $\eta_1$ , the same sequence also starts from  $\eta_2$ . Hence there is a descendant  $\eta_3$  of  $\eta_2$  such that  $\eta_2, \eta_3$  are isomorphic and  $\hat{T}(\eta_1, \eta_2) = \hat{T}(\eta_2, \eta_3)$ . The nodes  $\eta'_1, \eta_1, \eta'_2, \eta_2$  occur within the influence of  $(\eta_1, \eta_2)$  and the nodes  $\eta'_2, \eta_2, \eta_3, \eta_3$  occur within the influence of  $(\eta_2, \eta_3)$ . In the first case in the first condition above,  $(\eta_1, x) \sqsubseteq_T^+ (\eta_2, x) \sqsubseteq_T (\eta'_2, y) \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta'_1, y)$  and Proposition 17 implies that  $(\eta_2, x) \sqsubseteq_T^+ (\eta_3, x) \sqsubseteq_T (\eta'_3, y) \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta'_2, y)$ . This pattern can be repeated arbitrarily many times, proving that there are node variables as stated in the first case of the lemma. The other case is similar.

Now we will show the existence of the short segment as claimed above. Since  $T$  is regular, the number of non-isomorphic subtrees of  $T$  is finite, say  $\kappa$ . Let  $N = \kappa^2 |V^a|^2$ . We will show subsequently that there is a chain of the form  $(\eta, x_1) \sqsubseteq_T^+ (\eta_1, y_1) \sqsubseteq_T^+ (\eta_2, y_2) \sqsubseteq_T^+ \cdots \sqsubseteq_T^+ (\eta_{N+2}, y_{N+2}) \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta', x_2)$  or  $(\eta, x_1) \sqsupseteq_T^+ (\eta_1, y_1) \sqsupseteq_T^+ (\eta_2, y_2) \sqsupseteq_T^+ \cdots \sqsupseteq_T^+ (\eta_{N+2}, y_{N+2}) \sqsupseteq_T^* (\eta', x_2)$ , where  $\eta_1$  is a descendant of both  $\eta$  and  $\eta'$  of depth at least  $(k+1)$  more than both  $\eta$  and  $\eta'$  and  $\eta_{i+1}$  is a descendant of  $\eta_i$  of depth at least  $(k+1)$  more than  $\eta_i$  for all  $i \in [1, N+1]$  (we call such chains straight segments). We will only consider the first case here; the other case is similar. Now  $(\eta_{N+2}, y_{N+2}) \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta', x_2)$  and  $\eta_{N+2}$  is a deep descendant of  $\eta'$  with  $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{N+1}$  (which are themselves at least  $(k+1)$  positions apart from each other) in between. Recall that  $\sqsubseteq_T^*$  is the transitive closure of  $\sqsubseteq_T$  and  $\sqsubseteq_T$  holds only between node variables that are at most  $k$  positions apart. Hence, there must be intermediate node variables between  $(\eta_{N+2}, y_{N+2}), (\eta', x_2)$  so that  $(\eta_{N+2}, y_{N+2}) \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta', x_2)$ . For every  $i \in [1, N+1]$ , there must be some intermediate node variable  $(\eta'_i, y'_i)$  such that  $\eta'_i$  is an ancestor of  $\eta_i$ ,  $|\eta_i| - |\eta'_i| \leq k$  and  $(\eta_{N+2}, y_{N+2}) \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta'_i, y'_i) \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta', x_2)$ . Since  $|\eta_i| - |\eta'_i| \leq k$ , either  $(\eta_i, y_i) \sqsubseteq_T (\eta'_i, y'_i)$  or  $(\eta'_i, y'_i) \sqsubseteq_T (\eta_i, y_i)$  (the frame  $T(\eta_i)$  spans  $\eta'_i$

also; hence the frame imposes an order between the node variables). If  $(\eta'_i, y'_i) \sqsubseteq_T (\eta_i, y_i)$ , then  $(\eta_i, y_i) \sqsubseteq_T^+ (\eta_{N+2}, y_{N+2}) \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta'_i, y'_i) \sqsubseteq_T (\eta_i, y_i)$  implies that  $(\eta_i, y_i) \sqsubseteq_T^+ (\eta_i, y_i)$ , contradicting the fact that  $\sqsubseteq_T^+$  is irreflexive. Hence,  $(\eta_i, y_i) \sqsubseteq_T (\eta'_i, y'_i)$ . Consider the sequence  $(\eta_1, y_1), (\eta'_1, y'_1), (\eta_2, y_2), (\eta'_2, y'_2), \dots, (\eta_{N+1}, y_{N+1}), (\eta'_{N+1}, y'_{N+1})$ . Since  $N = \kappa^2 |V^a|^2$ , there are  $i, j$  such that  $\eta_i$  (resp.  $\eta'_i$ ) is isomorphic to  $\eta_j$  (resp.  $\eta'_j$ ),  $y_i = y_j$  and  $y'_i = y'_j$ . The node variables  $(\eta_i, y_i), (\eta_j, y_j), (\eta'_i, y'_i), (\eta'_j, y'_j)$  satisfy the conditions required for  $(\eta_1, x), (\eta_2, x), (\eta'_1, y), (\eta'_2, y)$  respectively in our claim about the existence of a short segment.

Next we will show that there are chains that go arbitrarily deep in a single branch. Suppose there are chains of unbounded lengths between  $(\eta_1, x_1)$  and  $(\eta_2, x_2)$ . All such chains must pass through the least common ancestor (say  $\eta_a$ ) of  $\eta_1, \eta_2$ . For some variable  $x_a$ , there must be chains of unbounded lengths between either  $(\eta_1, x_1)$  and  $(\eta_a, x_a)$  or between  $(\eta_a, x_a)$  and  $(\eta_2, x_2)$ . Say there are unbounded chains between  $(\eta_1, x_1)$  and  $(\eta_a, x_a)$ ; the other case is similar. There is only one path between  $\eta_1$  and  $\eta_a$ , so there must be chains of unbounded lengths that go beyond this path and come back. There must be node variables  $(\eta_1, y_1), (\eta_1, y_2)$  or  $(\eta_a, y_1), (\eta_a, y_2)$  such that there are chains of unbounded lengths between them. We will consider  $(\eta_1, y_1), (\eta_1, y_2)$ ; the other case is similar. For the chains of unbounded lengths starting from  $(\eta_1, y_1)$  and ending at  $(\eta_2, y_2)$ , let  $\eta$  be the highest node (nearest to the root) visited. There must be  $(\eta, z_1), (\eta, z_2)$  such that there are chains of unbounded lengths between them that only visit descendants of  $\eta$ . If there is a bound (say  $B$ ) on how deep the chains go below  $\eta$  and come back, the number of nodes that can be visited is bounded by the number of node variables that occur in the subtree of height  $B$  rooted at  $\eta$  (a node can occur at most once in a chain; otherwise, it will contradict the fact that  $\sqsubseteq_T^+$  is irreflexive). Hence, for any bound  $B$ , there are chains that go deeper than  $B$  and come back.


Next we prove that there is no bound on the number of node variables in a single path that belong to a chain. For this, first suppose that there is a node  $\eta$  and a chain goes down one child of  $\eta$  starting from  $(\eta, x)$ , comes back to  $\eta$  via  $(\eta, y)$  and goes down another child. Then we have  $(\eta, x) \sqsubseteq_T^+ (\eta, y)$  or  $(\eta, y) \sqsubseteq_T^+ (\eta, x)$  (see the illustration below; if  $(\eta, x) \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta_b, x') \sqsubseteq_T^+ (\eta_b, y') \sqsubseteq_T^* (\eta, y)$  in the branch, we have  $(\eta, x) \sqsubseteq_T^+ (\eta, y)$  in the main path by transitivity). Hence, every such node contributes a node variable in a chain.



So if there is no bound on the number of such branching nodes along a path, then there is no bound on the number of node variables in a single path that belong to a chain, as required. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that the number of such branching nodes along any path is bounded (by say  $B_1$ ) and the number of node variables in a chain along any one path is also bounded (say by  $B_2$ ). Then any chain is in a subtree with at most  $|G|^{B_1}$  leaves (and hence at most as many paths) and at most  $B_2$  node variables along any path, so the length of such chains is bounded. Hence, either the number of branching nodes along a path is unbounded or the number of node variables in a chain along a path is unbounded. Both of these imply that the number of node variables in a chain along a path is unbounded, as required.

A chain that goes deep down a path may make u-turns (first descend through descendants

and then go to an ascendant or vice-versa) multiple times within the branch. We would like to prove that there is no bound on the length of chain segments that don't have u-turns (these are the straight segments that we need). Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there is a bound on the length of straight segments. Then there is no bound on the number of straight segments in a path, since we have already shown that the number of node variables in a chain along a path is unbounded. There can be only boundedly many distinct straight segments in a path of bounded depth, so the straight segments go deeper without any bound. If there is a straight segment and another one occurs below the first one, the first straight segment can be extended by appending node variables of the second one, as can be seen in the illustration below.



This contradicts the hypothesis that length of straight segments is bounded. This shows that there are unboundedly long straight segments, completing the proof. ◀

Lemma 18 says that if a regular tree has unbounded chains, it will have an infinite path containing an infinite chain. The infinite sequence of the first (resp. second) kind given in Lemma 18 is called an infinite forward (resp. backward) chain. Now we design a tree automaton  $\mathcal{A}_\phi$  whose language  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi)$  is an approximation of the set  $\mathcal{T} = \{T \mid \exists L, (T, L) \text{ is a winning strategy tree}\}$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi)$  is non-empty iff  $\mathcal{T}$  is. Hence, the single-sided CLTL realizability problem is equivalent to checking the non-emptiness of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi)$ . The tree automaton  $\mathcal{A}_\phi$  is defined as the intersection of three automata  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{str}}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{symp}}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{chain}}$ , all of which read  $|G|$ -ary trees labeled with letters from  $\mathcal{F}$ . The automaton  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{str}}$  accepts the set of all strategy trees,  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{symp}}$  accepts the set of all trees each of whose paths symbolically satisfies the formula  $\phi$  and  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{chain}}$  accepts the set of all trees that do not have any infinite forward or backward chains. We now give a detailed construction of these automata.

The automaton  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{str}}$  has set of states  $\mathcal{F}$ . In state  $f$ , it can read the input label  $f$  and go to states  $f_1, \dots, f_{|G|}$  in its children, provided  $(f, f_i)$  is one-step compatible and  $(gp_i, f_i)$  is gap-compatible for all  $i \in [1, |G|]$ . All states are accepting in this Büchi automaton. This automaton just checks that every pair of consecutive frames along every branch of the tree is one-step compatible and gap-compatible and hence verifies that the tree accepted is a strategy tree. Now, the size of the set of states of  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{str}}$  is  $|\mathcal{F}|$ , and the size of the transition set is  $|\mathcal{F}| \times |\Sigma| \times |\mathcal{F}|^{|G|}$  where the input alphabet  $\Sigma = \mathcal{F}$ . Since,  $G$  is the set of all gap functions associated with mappings of the form  $EV^b \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ , by definition of  $G$  its range must be  $\{0, \dots, |EV^b|^2\}$  implying  $|G| \leq |EV^b|^{|EV^b|^2}$ . Also, from the definition of  $\mathcal{F}$ , we get  $|\mathcal{F}| \leq 2^{(k \cdot |V^a|)^2} \times (|V^b| \cdot |V^b|^2)^k$  where  $k$  is the  $X$ -length of  $\phi$ . Thus, the size of  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{str}}$  is double exponential in the size of  $\phi$ .

The automaton  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{symp}}$  checks that every path in the input tree is accepted by a Büchi automaton  $\mathcal{B}_\phi^{\text{symp}}$ , which ensures that the input sequence symbolically satisfies the formula  $\phi$ . Given the Büchi automaton  $\mathcal{B}_\phi^{\text{symp}}$ , we first convert it to some deterministic parity automaton  $\mathcal{C}_\phi^{\text{symp}}$  in exponential time in the size of  $\mathcal{B}_\phi^{\text{symp}}$  and from that, it is easy to construct the parity tree automaton  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{symp}}$  with the same size as  $\mathcal{C}_\phi^{\text{symp}}$ . The Büchi automaton  $\mathcal{B}_\phi^{\text{symp}}$  needs to check symbolic satisfiability—whether an atomic formula is satisfied at a position can be decided by checking just the current frame, just like propositional LTL. Hence the standard

Büchi automaton construction for LTL can be used to construct  $\mathcal{B}_\phi^{\text{symp}}$  in EXPTIME [27]. Thus, the parity tree automaton  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{symp}}$  can be constructed in 2EXPTIME in the size of  $\phi$ .

Next, we describe the construction of the parity tree automaton  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{chain}}$ . It needs to check that there are no infinite forward or backward chains in any of the paths. For this we will first construct a Büchi word automaton that accepts all words not having an infinite forward or backward chain, convert it into a deterministic parity automaton  $\mathcal{C}_\phi^{\text{chain}}$  and then as before, construct  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{chain}}$  with the same size as  $\mathcal{C}_\phi^{\text{chain}}$ . This Büchi word automaton can be constructed by complementing the Büchi automaton  $\mathcal{B}^{\text{chain}}$  which accepts all words that contain an infinite forward chain or an infinite backward chain in EXPTIME in the size of  $\mathcal{B}^{\text{chain}}$  [26]. The construction of such a Büchi automaton  $\mathcal{B}^{\text{chain}}$  is already described in [11], which we reproduce here using our notation. Recall that  $\sqsubset_T^*$  is the transitive closure of  $\sqsubset_T$ . So the part of the infinite chain  $(\eta_1, x) \sqsubset_T^+ (\eta_2, x) \sqsubset_T^+ (\eta_3, x) \sqsubset_T^+ \dots$  may be embedded in a sequence  $(\eta_1, x) \sqsubset_T (\eta_1'', z_1) \sqsubset_T^+ (\eta_2, x) \sqsubset_T (\eta_2'', z_2) \sqsubset_T^+ (\eta_3, x) \sqsubset_T \dots$ . So the Büchi word automaton checks for a sequence of node variables related by  $\sqsubset_T$ , with the order being strict infinitely often.

Define  $\mathcal{B}^{\text{chain}} = (Q, \Sigma, \{q_0\}, \longrightarrow, F)$ , where:

- $Q = \{q_0\} \cup (V^a \times \{0, \dots, (k-1)\} \times V^a \times \{0, \dots, (k-1)\} \times \{d, e\} \times \{0, 1\})$ ; (Here  $d$  and  $e$  denote the forward and backward infinite sequences and 1 or 0 indicate whether or not the order is strict)
- $\Sigma = \mathcal{F}$
- $\longrightarrow$  is given by:
  - $q_0 \xrightarrow{f} q_0$
  - $q_0 \xrightarrow{f} (x, i, y, j, d, 0)$  and  $q_0 \xrightarrow{f} (x, i, y, j, e, 0) \forall x, i, y, j$   
Here  $(x, i)$  and  $(y, j)$  indicate the variables  $x$  and the  $y$  at the  $i^{\text{th}}$  and  $j^{\text{th}}$  positions of the current frame. The automaton guesses  $(x, i)$  as  $(\eta_1, x)$  and  $(y, j)$  as  $(\eta_1', y)$ , as well as which of  $d$  or  $e$  forms a chain.
  - $(x, i, y, j, \delta, b) \xrightarrow{f} (x, i-1, y, j-1, \delta, b)$  for  $\delta \in \{d, e\}$  and  $b \in \{0, 1\}$  provided  $i, j \geq 2$  (Wait till  $x$  or  $y$  is at the edge of the frame).
  - $(x, 1, y, j, \delta, b) \xrightarrow{f} (z, i, y, j-1, \delta, b')$  provided  $j > 1$ ,  
 $x <_f X^i z$  and  $b' = 1$ , or  $x \equiv_f X^i z$  and  $b' = 0$  and  $X^i z <_f X^{j-1} y$ .  
(Guess a continuation of the chain from  $(x, 1)$ ).
  - $(x, i, y, 1, d, b) \xrightarrow{f} (x, i-1, w, j, d, b')$  provided  $i > 1$ ,  
 $X^j w \leq_f y$  and  $b' = b$  and  $X^{i-1} x <_f X^j w$ .  
(Guess a continuation of the chain from  $(y, 1)$ ).
  - similarly for  $(x, 1)$  and  $(y, 1)$  simultaneously.
  - similar transitions for  $e$
- the set of accepting states comprises all states of the form  $(x, i, y, j, \delta, 1)$

The size of  $\mathcal{B}^{\text{chain}}$  is polynomial in the size of the CLTL formula  $\phi$  and hence, the size of  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{chain}}$  is double exponential in the size of  $\phi$ .

Now we have the following result.

► **Lemma 19.** *The system player has a winning strategy in the single-sided CLTL( $\mathbb{Z}, <, =$ ) game with winning condition  $\phi$  iff  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi)$  is non-empty.*

**Proof.** Suppose there is a winning strategy for the **system** player in single-sided CLTL( $\mathbb{Z}, <, =$ ) game with winning condition  $\phi$ . By Lemma 14, there exists a winning strategy tree, say  $(T, L)$ . Since,  $T$  is a strategy tree,  $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{str}})$ . We know that every branch of  $T$  must symbolically satisfy  $\phi$  and hence,  $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{symb}})$ . Further, since  $T$  has the labelling function  $L$ , Lemma 16 implies that  $T$  has bounded chains and thus, it cannot have any infinite forward or backward chains. So  $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{chain}})$ . Thus,  $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi)$ .

Conversely, suppose  $\mathcal{A}_\phi$  accepts a tree  $T$ . Then, using [19, Lemma 8.16, Theorem 8.19, Corollary 8.20] (suitably modifying the proofs to work for tree automata that accept  $|G|$ -ary trees), we can see that  $\mathcal{A}_\phi$  must accept a regular tree  $T'$ . Since,  $T' \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi)$ , every branch of  $T'$  must symbolically satisfy  $\phi$ ,  $T'$  must be a strategy tree and it cannot have any infinite forward or backward chains. Thus, by Lemma 18,  $T'$  must have bounded chains and hence by Lemma 16,  $T'$  must have a labelling function  $L'$  such that  $(T', L')$  is a winning strategy tree. Hence, by Lemma 14 the **system** player has a winning strategy in the single-sided CLTL( $\mathbb{Z}, <, =$ ) game. ◀

► **Theorem 20.** *The single-sided realizability problem for CLTL over  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$  is 2EXPTIME-complete.*

**Proof.** Given a formula  $\phi$ , Lemma 19 implies that it is enough to construct the tree automaton  $\mathcal{A}_\phi$  and check it for non-emptiness. From the description of the construction in Appendix C, we can see that  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{str}}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{symb}}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_\phi^{\text{chain}}$  can be constructed in 2EXPTIME in the size of  $\phi$ . Thus, the automaton  $\mathcal{A}_\phi$  can be constructed in 2EXPTIME. Now, checking non-emptiness of a parity tree automaton is decidable and the upper bound stated in [19, Corollary 8.22 (1)] implies that the single-sided realizability problem for CLTL over  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$  is in 2EXPTIME. Now, the realizability problem for LTL is 2EXPTIME-complete [22] and hence, the single-sided realizability problem for CLTL over  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$  must also be 2EXPTIME-complete. ◀

## 7 Decidability of single-sided prompt-CLTL games over $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$

Prompt-LTL is an extension of LTL with the prompt-eventually operator  $\mathbf{F_P}$ . The realizability problem for prompt-LTL is decidable, as shown in [17] via a reduction to LTL realizability problem. We consider a similar extension of CLTL. We show that the single-sided realizability problem for prompt-CLTL over  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$  is decidable, by giving a reduction to single-sided games on CLTL. We adapt techniques from [17] to show this.

The syntax of prompt-CLTL is given by the grammar  $\phi ::= c \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi \vee \phi \mid X\phi \mid \mathbf{F_P} \phi \mid \phi U \phi$ . The semantics of prompt-CLTL are defined over concrete models  $\sigma$  and a bound  $k \geq 0$ . We say  $(\sigma, i, k) \models \phi$  to indicate that  $\phi$  holds in position  $i$  of  $\sigma$  with bound  $k$ . The relation  $\models$  is defined by induction on the structure of  $\phi$  similar to CLTL, except for  $\mathbf{F_P} \phi$  that is defined as follows:  $(\sigma, i, k) \models \mathbf{F_P} \phi$  iff there exists  $j$  such that  $i \leq j \leq i + k$  and  $(\sigma, j, k) \models \phi$ . We say  $(\sigma, k) \models \phi$  if  $(\sigma, 0, k) \models \phi$ . Single-sided prompt-CLTL games are similar to single-sided CLTL games, except that the winning condition is a prompt-CLTL formula.

A strategy  $st: M^* \cdot EM \rightarrow SM$  is said to be winning for **system** if there is a bound  $k \geq 0$  such that for all models  $\sigma$  generated from plays conforming to  $st$ ,  $(\sigma, k) \models \phi$ . Given, a prompt-CLTL formula  $\phi$ , we define the single-sided realizability problem for prompt-CLTL as the problem of checking whether **system** has a winning strategy in the single-sided prompt-CLTL game with winning condition  $\phi$ .



We now describe the alternating colour technique, as proposed in [17], with minor modifications required to lift it to prompt-CLTL. Let  $x_c^a$  and  $y_c^a$  be new **system** look-ahead variables not in  $V$  and let  $p$  be the constraint  $x_c^a = y_c^a$ . A  $p$ -colouring of a concrete model  $\sigma$  is a concrete model  $\sigma'$  over the set of variables  $V \cup \{x_c^a, y_c^a\}$ , such that  $\sigma'$  agrees with  $\sigma$  on  $V$ . We say that position  $i$  is green (resp. red) if  $p$  is true (resp. false) in  $\sigma'_i$ . A position  $i$  is said to be a  $p$ -change point if either  $i = 0$  or the colours at  $i - 1$  and  $i$  are different. A subword  $\sigma'_i \dots \sigma'_{i'}$  is a  $p$ -block if all positions in the subword have the same colour, and  $i$  and  $i' + 1$  are  $p$ -change points. For  $k \geq 0$ , we say that  $\sigma'$  is  $k$ -spaced/ $k$ -bounded/ $k$ -tight (with respect to the colouring) if  $\sigma'$  has infinitely many blocks, and all the blocks are of length at least  $k$ , at most  $k$  and exactly  $k$ , respectively.

For a prompt-CLTL formula  $\phi$  over  $V$ , we define a formula  $c(\phi)$  over  $V \cup \{x_c^a, y_c^a\}$  as  $c(\phi) := (GFp \wedge GF\neg p) \wedge rel_p(\phi)$ , where  $rel_p(\phi)$  denotes the formula obtained from  $\phi$  by recursively, replacing every subformula of the form  $\mathbf{F_P} \psi$  by the CLTL formula  $(p \implies (pU(\neg pU\psi))) \wedge (\neg p \implies (\neg pU(pU\psi)))$ . The formula  $c(\phi)$  forces every concrete model to be partitioned into infinitely many blocks and requires each prompt eventuality to be satisfied in the current or the next block or the position immediately after the next block.

We have the following lemma from [17] (stated in the context of prompt-CLTL). The proof of the lemma is almost the same as that in [17] and hence, we omit the proof over here.

- **Lemma 21.** *Consider a prompt-CLTL formula  $\phi$ , a concrete model  $\sigma$ , and a bound  $k \geq 0$ ,*
1. *If  $(\sigma, k) \models \phi$ , then for every  $k$ -spaced  $p$ -colouring  $\sigma'$  of  $\sigma$ , we have,  $\sigma' \models c(\phi)$ .*
  2. *If  $\sigma'$  is a  $k$ -bounded  $p$ -colouring of  $\sigma$  such that  $\sigma' \models c(\phi)$ , then  $(\sigma, 2k) \models \phi$*

We now have the following theorem.

- **Theorem 22.** *Over the domain  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$ , **system** has a winning strategy in the single-sided prompt-CLTL game with formula  $\phi$  over the set of variables  $V$  iff she has a winning strategy in the single-sided CLTL game with formula  $c(\phi)$  over the set of variables  $V \cup \{x_c^a, y_c^a\}$ .*

**Proof.** ( $\implies$ ) Suppose  $\phi$  is a prompt-CLTL formula which is single-sided realizable. Then there exists a strategy  $st: M^* \cdot EM \rightarrow SM$  for the **system** player in the single-sided prompt-CLTL game with winning condition  $\phi$ , over  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$ , and a bound  $k \geq 0$ , such that for all concrete models resulting from a play conforming to  $st$ ,  $(\sigma, k) \models \phi$ . We shall now extend the strategy  $st$  to a strategy  $st'$  for the **system** player in the single-sided CLTL game with winning condition  $c(\phi)$ .

Let  $M'$  (resp.  $SM'$ ) denote the set of all mappings of the form  $V' \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  (resp.  $SV' \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ ). We define  $st': M^* \cdot EM \rightarrow SM'$  as: for all  $\tau \in M^* \cdot EM$ ,  $st'(\tau) = st(\tau) \cup \{x_c^a \mapsto 0, y_c^a \mapsto 0\}$  if  $|\tau| \bmod 2k$  lies between 0 and  $k - 1$  and  $st'(\tau) = st(\tau) \cup \{x_c^a \mapsto 0, y_c^a \mapsto 1\}$  if  $|\tau| \bmod 2k$  lies between  $k$  and  $2k - 1$ . Now, any concrete model  $\sigma'$  generated by a play in the CLTL game with winning condition  $c(\phi)$  that conforms to  $st'$ , is  $k$ -tight (by construction). Thus, by Lemma 21,  $\sigma' \models c(\phi)$  and hence  $c(\phi)$  is realizable.

( $\impliedby$ ) Suppose the CLTL formula  $c(\phi)$  is realizable by a single-sided CLTL game with winning condition  $c(\phi)$  over  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$ . By Lemma 19, the language of the automaton  $\mathcal{A}^\phi$  (defined in the previous section) is non-empty. Thus,  $\mathcal{A}^\phi$  accepts a tree  $T'$ . Now, as we saw in the proof of Lemma 19,  $\mathcal{A}^\phi$  must also accept a regular strategy tree  $T: G^* \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'$  (with respect to the winning condition formula  $c(\phi)$ ), with a labelling function  $L$  such that  $(T, L)$  is a winning strategy tree. Thus, the infinite sequence  $T(\pi)$  along every infinite path  $\pi$  of the tree  $T$ , satisfies the formula  $c(\phi)$ .

Now, we define a strategy  $st': M^* \cdot EM \rightarrow SM$ , for the **system** player in the single-sided prompt-CLTL game with winning condition  $\phi$ . For all  $\tau = (em_1 \oplus sm_1) \dots (em_{|\tau|-1} \oplus sm_{|\tau|-1})$ .

$em_{|\tau|} \in M^* \cdot EM$ , let  $gp(\tau) = gp(em_1)gp(em_2)\dots gp(em_{|\tau|})$ . Now, define  $st'(\tau) = \hat{L}(gp(\tau)) \upharpoonright SV$ . We shall prove that  $st'$  is a winning strategy for the **system** player.

We know that a regular tree has a finite number of non-isomorphic subtrees. Let us say the number of non-isomorphic subtrees of  $T$  is  $\kappa$ . We will show that every concrete model  $\sigma$  admitted by a symbolic model  $T(\pi)$  along some path  $\pi$  of the strategy tree  $T$  is  $(\kappa + 1)$ -bounded.

Assume for the sake of contradiction that  $\sigma$  has adjacent  $p$ -change points  $i$  and  $j$  such that  $j - i > \kappa + 1$ . Let  $\eta_1\eta_2\eta_3\dots$  be an infinite path along  $T$  such that the infinite sequence of frames along this path admits the concrete model  $\sigma$ . Since, the number of non-isomorphic subtrees is  $\kappa$ , there must exist positions  $i'$  and  $j'$  such that  $i \leq i' < j' \leq j - 1$  and the subtrees rooted at the nodes  $\eta_{i'}$  and  $\eta_{j'}$  are isomorphic. This means that there exists an infinite path in  $T$ , such that the infinite sequence of frames along that path equals  $T(\eta_1)T(\eta_2)\dots T(\eta_{i'-1})(T(\eta_{i'})\dots T(\eta_{j'-1}))^\omega$ . But no concrete model admitted by this sequence of frames can satisfy  $GFP \wedge GF\neg p$ , which contradicts the fact that  $T$  is a winning strategy tree with respect to the winning condition  $c(\phi)$ .

Thus, every concrete model admitted by a symbolic model  $T(\pi)$  along some path  $\pi$  of the strategy tree  $T$  is  $(\kappa + 1)$ -bounded, and satisfies  $c(\phi)$ . Therefore, by Lemma 21, every concrete model  $\sigma'$  generated during a play of the single-sided prompt-CLTL game over  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$ , conforming to strategy  $st'$ , is such that  $(\sigma', 2\kappa + 2) \models \phi$ . This shows that the prompt-CLTL formula  $\phi$  is single-sided realizable.  $\blacktriangleleft$

The above theorem when combined with Theorem 20 gives us the following result.

► **Theorem 23.** *The single-sided realizability problem for prompt-CLTL over  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$  is 2EXPTIME-complete.*

**Proof.** Theorem 22 implies that the single-sided realizability problem for prompt-CLTL over  $(\mathbb{Z}, <, =)$  can be reduced, to the single-sided realizability problem for CLTL. Given a prompt-CLTL formula  $\phi$  over a finite set of variables  $V$ , the CLTL formula  $c(\phi)$  over  $V \cup \{x_c^a, y_c^a\}$  is exponential in the size of  $\phi$  as the definition of  $rel_p(\phi)$  is recursive. However, the number of subformulas of  $rel_p(\phi)$  is linear in the number of subformulas of  $\phi$ . Since the single-sided CLTL realizability game is reduced to checking the non-emptiness of a tree automaton (Lemma 19) whose size depends on the number of subformulas of  $c(\phi)$ , the single-sided realizability problem for prompt-CLTL is also in 2EXPTIME. Now, we know that the realizability problem for LTL is 2EXPTIME-complete [27] and that every LTL formula is also a prompt-CLTL formula. Therefore, the problem of single-sided realizability for prompt-CLTL is 2EXPTIME-complete.  $\blacktriangleleft$

## 8 Discussion and Future Work

We have seen in this paper that the CLTL realizability problem is decidable over domains satisfying completion property and that the single-sided CLTL realizability problem is decidable over integers with linear order and equality. But both these problems have a high complexity (both are 2EXPTIME-complete). It would be interesting to see if there are expressive fragments of CLTL with lower complexity, like the fragments of LTL studied in [21], which work on practical examples.

We believe that single-sided CLTL games over the domain of natural numbers  $(\mathbb{N}, <, =)$  are also decidable. In [11], the authors extend the automata-characterization for the satisfiability problem for CLTL over the integer domain to the domain of natural numbers. A similar extension of the tree-automata characterization for the single-sided games over integers to



one for single-sided games over the naturals seems possible, although the details need to be worked out.

Despite the decidability result that we have for the single-sided CLTL games over integers, the language of the tree automaton that we construct in this paper is an approximation of the set of all winning strategy trees. We do not have a machine-theoretic representation for winning strategies yet, and this is an interesting direction for future exploration.

We have seen that while CLTL games over the integers are undecidable in general, restricting to single-sided games yields decidability. It would be interesting to see if there are other meaningful restrictions on the structure of the game, that yield decidability results.

---

## References

- 1 Parosh Aziz Abdulla, Ahmed Bouajjani, and Julien d’Orso. Deciding monotonic games. In *International Workshop on Computer Science Logic*, pages 1–14. Springer, 2003.
- 2 Parosh Aziz Abdulla, Richard Mayr, Arnaud Sangnier, and Jeremy Sproston. Solving parity games on integer vectors. In *International Conference on Concurrency Theory*, pages 106–120. Springer, 2013.
- 3 Rajeev Alur and Thomas A Henzinger. A really temporal logic. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 41(1):181–203, 1994.
- 4 Philippe Balbiani and Condotta Jean-François. Computational complexity of propositional linear temporal logics based on qualitative spatial or temporal reasoning. In *International Workshop on Frontiers of Combining Systems*, pages 162–176. Springer, 2002.
- 5 Marcello M Bersani, Domenico Bianculli, Schahram Dustdar, Alessio Gambi, Carlo Ghezzi, and Srđan Krstić. Towards the formalization of properties of cloud-based elastic systems. In *proceedings of the 6th international workshop on principles of engineering service-oriented and cloud systems*, pages 38–47, 2014.
- 6 Mikolaj Bojańczyk, Claire David, Anca Muscholl, Thomas Schwentick, and Luc Segoufin. Two-variable logic on data words. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic (TOCL)*, 12(4):1–26, 2011.
- 7 Cristian S Calude, Sanjay Jain, Bakhadyr Khossainov, Wei Li, and Frank Stephan. Deciding parity games in quasi-polynomial time. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 51(2):STOC17–152, 2020.
- 8 Alonzo Church. Logic, arithmetic, and automata. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 29(4), 1964.
- 9 Stéphane Demri, Deepak D’Souza, and Régis Gascon. Temporal logics of repeating values. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 22, 10 2012. doi:10.1093/logcom/exr013.
- 10 Stéphane Demri and Ranko Lazić. Ltl with the freeze quantifier and register automata. *ACM Trans. Comput. Logic*, 10(3), apr 2009. doi:10.1145/1507244.1507246.
- 11 Stéphane Demri and Deepak D’Souza. An automata-theoretic approach to constraint ltl. *Information and Computation*, 205(3):380–415, 2007. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0890540106001076>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2006.09.006>.
- 12 Léo Exibard, Emmanuel Filiot, and Ayrat Khalimov. Church synthesis on register automata over linearly ordered data domains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.12141*, 2020.
- 13 Nathanaël Fijalkow, Bastien Maubert, Aniello Murano, and Moshe Vardi. Assume-guarantee synthesis for prompt linear temporal logic. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Conference on International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 117–123, 2021.
- 14 Erich Gradel and Wolfgang Thomas. *Automata, logics, and infinite games: a guide to current research*, volume 2500. Springer Science & Business Media, 2002.
- 15 Michael Kaminski and Nissim Francez. Finite-memory automata. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 134(2):329–363, 1994.
- 16 Hadas Kress-Gazit, Georgios E Fainekos, and George J Pappas. Temporal-logic-based reactive mission and motion planning. *IEEE transactions on robotics*, 25(6):1370–1381, 2009.

- 17 Orna Kupferman, Nir Piterman, and Moshe Vardi. From liveness to promptness. *Formal Methods in System Design*, 34, 04 2009. doi:10.1007/s10703-009-0067-z.
- 18 René Mazala. *Infinite Games*, pages 23–38. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2002. doi:10.1007/3-540-36387-4\_2.
- 19 Frank Nießner. Nondeterministic tree automata. In *Automata Logics, and Infinite games*, pages 135–152. Springer, 2002.
- 20 Nir Piterman. From nondeterministic büchi and streett automata to deterministic parity automata. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 3, 2007.
- 21 Nir Piterman, Amir Pnueli, and Yaniv Sa’ar. Synthesis of reactive (1) designs. In *International Workshop on Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation*, pages 364–380. Springer, 2006.
- 22 Amir Pnueli and Roni Rosner. On the synthesis of an asynchronous reactive module. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 652–671. Springer, 1989.
- 23 M Praveen, Diego Figueira, and Stephane Demri. Reasoning about data repetitions with counter systems. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 12, 2016.
- 24 M Praveen, Anirban Majumdar, and Diego Figueira. Playing with repetitions in data words using energy games. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 16, 2020.
- 25 Pierre-Alain Reynier, Emmanuel Filiot, and Léo Exibard. Synthesis of data word transducers. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 17, 2021.
- 26 A Prasad Sistla, Moshe Y Vardi, and Pierre Wolper. The complementation problem for büchi automata with applications to temporal logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 49(2-3):217–237, 1987.
- 27 Moshe Y Vardi and Pierre Wolper. An automata-theoretic approach to automatic program verification. In *Proceedings of the First Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 322–331. IEEE Computer Society, 1986.