

Symbolic ω -Automata with Obligations

Luca Di Stefano^[0000-0003-1922-3151]

TU Wien, Institute of Computer Engineering, Treitlstraße 3, 1040 Vienna, Austria
`luca.di.stefano@tuwien.ac.at`

Abstract. Extensions of ω -automata to infinite alphabets typically rely on symbolic guards to keep the transition relation finite, and on registers or memory cells to preserve information from past symbols. Symbolic transitions alone are ill-suited to act on this information, and register automata have intricate formal semantics and issues with tractability. We propose a slightly different approach based on *obligations*, i.e., assignment-like constructs attached to transitions. Whenever a transition with an obligation is taken, the obligation is evaluated on the *current* symbol and yields a constraint on the *next* symbol that the automaton will read. We formalize obligation automata with existential and universal branching and Emerson-Lei acceptance conditions, which subsume classic families such as Büchi, Rabin, Strett, and parity automata. We show that these automata recognise a strict superset of ω -regular languages. To illustrate the practicality of our proposal, we also introduce a machine-readable format to express obligation automata and describe a tool implementing several operations over them, including automata product and emptiness checking.

1 Introduction

Automata over infinite words (or ω -automata) are a cornerstone of theoretical computer science, as they enable representing and reasoning about computing systems, protocols, linear temporal properties, and game structures; thus, they are widely applied in domains ranging from formal verification, to logical satisfiability checking, to reactive synthesis. However, these automata only operate on finite alphabets and thus are ill-suited to contexts that involve infinite-state domains, which are becoming extremely relevant to the research community of today [1,15,19]. *Symbolic automata* represent a first step towards handling infinite alphabets. Transitions in a symbolic automaton are not guarded by mere symbols, but rather by predicates from an alphabet theory. This allows each single symbolic transition to handle a possibly infinite set of symbols. However, the automaton's finite state space leads to an inevitable limitation: after reading one of infinitely many symbols, the automaton must pick a successor state from a finite set of choices. By the pigeonhole principle, there will be infinitely many symbols for which the automaton chooses the same successor state, losing some information in the process. Fully symbolic models, such as those expressible in nuXmv [7] or MoXi [17], overcome this limitation by also treating the (now

infinite) state space symbolically. This begs the question: can we seize at least some of the expressive power of these symbolic models while retaining a finite state space, and thus the rich analytical toolbox of ω -automata theory? Previous work, discussed below, answered through *register automata* [18] that are able to store and recall data from memory cells. This framework yields complicated semantics and highly complex decision problems on infinite words.

In this work, we suggest an alternative approach by introducing *obligation automata*. An obligation automaton is a symbolic automaton: it reads valuations of variables from a (finite) set V , and its transitions are guarded by predicates over said set. In addition, a transition may be labelled by an *obligation*. If such a transition is taken, the obligation constrains the *next* valuations that the automaton can read, based on the *current* valuation. This construct is reminiscent of how languages such as SMV [10] and BTOR [20] use `next(\cdot)` to declare symbolic transition relations; its simplicity lets us easily define formal semantics for Emerson-Lei acceptance conditions with existential and universal branching. As we will see, obligations are a direct generalisation of ω -automata (Theorem 2) and recognise a superset of ω -regular languages (Theorem 3).

On the practical side, we also contribute a dialect of the popular Hanoi Omega-Automata format (HOA) [2] to express obligation automata over integer and real variables. We call this format “HOA plus plus” (HOAPP). Lastly, we introduce a prototype tool that can validate and perform several useful operations on HOAPP automata. These include computing the product of two automata, translating an LTL formula with predicates into an automaton, and checking the emptiness of an automaton via a reduction to model checking.

This work is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces obligation automata and their semantics. In Section 3 we describe our proposed dialect of HOA for obligation automata, while Section 4 describes the capabilities of our prototype tool to handle this format. Lastly, Section 5 contains our concluding remarks.

Related work. The common approach to model memory in automata or temporal logics is to introduce the concept of a *register* or *memory cell*. This approach is seen, for instance, in register automata (RA), also known as finite-memory automata [18], and Temporal Stream Logic (TSL) [14]. In the finite-state setting, AIGER [4] also supports registers (latches). While arguably intuitive, this approach introduces a conceptual divide between the automaton’s (or the formula’s) alphabet and its memory, resulting in intricate formal semantics. For instance, register reset logic needs to be specified explicitly (e.g., [5]). RA can be constructed from Freeze LTL [11], which extends LTL [21] with quantifiers to store and recall values in registers: this implies that several decision problems for RA over infinite words are either extremely complex or undecidable. Similarly, satisfiability of TSL modulo theories is based on *Büchi stream automata*, similar to RA but with support for rich expressions in updates, and is also proven undecidable [13]. The language for the Issy synthesis tool [16] supports game structures with next-state constraints that resemble obligations, but it does not feature semantics for alternation.

2 Obligation automata

Preliminary definitions. A *theory* T_V is a fixed interpretation of *terms* and *predicates*, constructed from *variables* (taken from a set V) and *constants*. Let $\mathcal{T}(V)$ be the set of terms of a theory, with free variables in V , and let $\mathcal{Pr}(V)$ the set of predicates over $\mathcal{T}(V)$. A partial (r. total) *valuation* is a partial (r. total) mapping from variables to constant terms. We denote by $\llbracket z \rrbracket v$ the evaluation within T_V of a term or predicate z against a total valuation v , and by \mathcal{V} the set of all total valuations. When p is a predicate, $v \models p$ is shorthand for $\llbracket p \rrbracket v = \text{true}$.

An *obligation* is a partial, possibly empty mapping from V to terms in $\mathcal{T}(V)$. For an obligation $o = \{x_1 \mapsto t_1, \dots, x_n \mapsto t_n\}$, with a slight abuse of notation we will use $\llbracket o \rrbracket v$ to denote the predicate $\bigwedge_i (x_i = \llbracket t_i \rrbracket v)$. For the empty obligation ε we define $\llbracket \varepsilon \rrbracket v = \text{true}$, for every v .

Obligation automata with existential branching. An obligation automaton (modulo T_V) is a tuple $\mathcal{A} = \langle V, Q, R, I, F, \text{Acc} \rangle$, with V the set of variables, Q a finite set of *states*, R an edge relation, $I \subseteq Q$ a set of *initial states*, $F \subseteq 2^R$ a set of (transition-based) *acceptance sets*, and Acc an *acceptance condition*. We assume that sets in F are non-empty and and numbered F_1, \dots, F_n .

R is a set of tuples (q, γ, o, q') where $q, q' \in Q$ are respectively the edge's *source* and *target*, $\gamma \in \mathcal{Pr}(V)$ is its *guard*, and $o \in (V \hookrightarrow \mathcal{T}(V))$ its *obligation*. Intuitively, such an edge indicates that, when the automaton is in state q , it can read a valuation v such that $v \models \gamma$ and then transition to state q' . In this state, the additional constraint $\llbracket o \rrbracket v$ will have to hold against the *next* valuation read by \mathcal{A} . We may also denote an edge by $q \xrightarrow{\gamma, o} q'$, and use R_q to denote the set of edges leaving q .

An Emerson-Lei *acceptance condition* over acceptance sets F is a term from the following grammar [12]:

$$\zeta ::= \text{true} \mid \text{false} \mid \text{Fin}(k) \mid \text{Inf}(k) \mid \zeta \wedge \zeta \mid \zeta \vee \zeta, \quad 1 \leq k \leq |F|$$

Intuitively, $\text{Fin}(k)$ is only satisfied if the automaton takes every transition from F_k at most a finite number of times; otherwise, $\text{Inf}(k)$ is satisfied. (As is commonplace for ω -automata, whenever we mention that a state q is “accepting”, we merely mean that all edges in R_q belong to some accepting set.)

Words, runs, acceptance, languages. A *word* is a sequence of valuations $\mathbf{v} = v_1 v_2 \dots \in \mathcal{V}^\omega$. A *run* over a word in an automaton \mathcal{A} , if it exists, is a sequence of edges $e_i = (q_i, \gamma_i, o_i, q'_i)$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $q_1 \in I$, and for every i : 1. $q'_i = q_{i+1}$; 2. $v_i \models \gamma_i$; and 3. $v_{i+1} \models \llbracket o_i \rrbracket v_i$. Given an acceptance set F_k , a run $e_1 e_2 \dots$ is *accepting* for $\text{Fin}(k)$ iff the set $\{i \mid e_i \in F_k\}$ is finite; otherwise, it is accepting for $\text{Inf}(k)$. A run is accepting for a conjunction (r. disjunction) of conditions iff it is accepting for all (r. at least one) of them. Every run is accepting for *true*, and no run is accepting for *false*. The *language* of \mathcal{A} , $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$, is the set of words over which there exists an accepting run for Acc . \mathcal{A} is *empty* iff $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ is the empty set. *Product of obligations.* Given two obligations o_1, o_2 , we now want to introduce a product operator $o_1 \times o_2$ to formalise the meaning of a transition that “combines” both obligations. We will need this to formalise other concepts, including the product of two automata and the semantics of universal branching.

When the domains of o_1 and o_2 are disjoint, we can simply take the union of the two mappings; however, in general the domains overlap. In the simplest case, we have an edge $(q, \gamma, o_1 \times o_2, q')$ where o_1, o_2 map a single variable x to two terms t_1, t_2 . We choose to treat an edge like this as equivalent to the edge $(q, \gamma \wedge t_1 = t_2, \{x \mapsto t_1\}, q')$. That is, we reduce the obligation to $x \mapsto t_1$, but also force the *current* valuation to satisfy $t_1 = t_2$, since this is the only way to enforce that the *next* symbol will also obey $x \mapsto t_2$. To generalise, every edge $(q, \gamma, o_1 \times o_2, q')$ is treated as the edge $(q, \gamma \wedge \gamma', o', q')$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma' &= \bigwedge \{t_{1j} = t_{2j} \mid x_{ij} \in \text{dom}(o_1) \cap \text{dom}(o_2)\}, & \text{with } i = 1, 2, \text{ and} \\ o' &= \{x_{ij} \mapsto t_{ij} \mid x_{ij} \in \text{dom}(o_1) \cup (\text{dom}(o_2) \setminus \text{dom}(o_1))\}, & \text{with } i = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

This definition of product is not commutative: $o_1 \times o_2$ will preserve terms from o_1 in the obligation and relegate terms from o_2 to γ' , and vice versa for $o_2 \times o_1$. However, by symmetry and transitivity of $=$, an edge with obligation $o_1 \times o_2$ is semantically equivalent to one with $o_2 \times o_1$; thus, this definition may be readily generalised to any number of obligations.

Product and sum of automata. Let us consider two automata $\mathcal{A}_{1,2}$ modulo the same theory. Then, their product $\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2$ is an automaton with states in $Q_1 \times Q_2$ and initial states $I_1 \times I_2$. Whenever each automaton \mathcal{A}_i has an edge e_i from q_i to q'_i with guard γ_i and obligation o_i , then the product automaton has an edge $e_1 \times e_2 = (q_1, q_2) \xrightarrow{\gamma_1 \wedge \gamma_2, o_1 \times o_2} (q'_1, q'_2)$.

To obtain the acceptance condition, let $F_1^1, \dots, F_n^1, F_1^2, \dots, F_m^2$ be the accepting sets of $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$. Define new sets F_1, \dots, F_{n+m} , and let $e_1 \times e_2 \in F_i$ iff either $e_1 \in F_i^1$ for $i \leq n$, or $e_2 \in F_{i-n}^2$ for $n < i \leq n+m$. Lastly, lift $\text{Acc}_1, \text{Acc}_2$ to F by substituting references to sets in F^1, F^2 with references to the corresponding sets in F . Then, the acceptance condition of the product is the conjunction of the (lifted) conditions.

The sum of two automata $\mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$ has states $Q_1 \cup Q_2$, initial states $I_1 \cup I_2$, edges $R_1 \cup R_2$, and acceptance condition $\text{Acc}_1 \vee \text{Acc}_2$.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ be two Büchi obligation automata (BOA) with languages \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 . Then $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2) = \mathcal{L}_1 \cap \mathcal{L}_2$.*

Proof. Given in the appendix; simple extension of the proof for Büchi ω -automata.

Semantics of universal branching. We now outline the (transition-based) semantics of automata with universal branching. This is important as it allows one to define alternating automata, which are exponentially more succinct than equivalent nondeterministic automata [6]. At any time, an automaton with universal branching may be in a non-empty conjunction of states (or *and-state*, for short); the initial state may be an and-state as well. Therefore, we amend the previous definition of an automaton \mathcal{A} as follows: the set I is now a non-empty set of and-states, and edges have the form (q, γ, o, Z) , where Z is an and-state.

A run over a word $\mathbf{v} = v_1 v_2 \dots \in \mathcal{V}^\omega$, if it exists, is an infinite directed acyclic graph (DAG) whose nodes are labelled by and-states, and whose (unique) root

is labelled by an element of I . Note that multiple nodes may have the same and-state as their label. Each arc in the tree has a label (γ, o, \mathbf{f}) , where γ is a predicate, o an obligation, and \mathbf{f} a set of indices referring to accepting sets: we call these the *accepting indices* of the arc.

The arcs in a run must satisfy additional constraints. For a node labelled by $Z = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$, an arc labelled (γ, o, \mathbf{f}) from this node to one labelled by Z' exists if and only if: 1. There exist n edges $e_j = (q_j, \gamma_j, o_j, Z'_j)$ such that $e_j \in R_{q_j}$ for every j ; 2. $\gamma = \bigwedge_j \gamma_j$; 3. $o = o_1 \times \dots \times o_n$; 4. $Z' = \bigcup_j Z'_j$; 5. $\mathbf{f} = \{k \mid \exists j. e_j \in F_k\}$, where F_k is the k -th accepting set of the automaton; 6. $v_i \models \gamma_i$, for every i ; 7. $v_{i+1} \models \llbracket o_i \rrbracket v_i$, for every i .


Intuitively, an alternating automaton runs multiple “instances” of the same automaton at once, and the conditions above ensure that the run only captures executions where all instances can read a given word. In detail, condition 1 states that every instance must take a suitable edge to read the symbol. Conditions 2–4 state that the arc composes edge guards by conjunction and obligations by product (assuming that overlapping obligation domains are handled by extending the guard, as seen above), and that the target’s label is the union of all end-states in the edges. Condition 5 ensures that arcs hold the necessary information to determine acceptance. Conditions 6 and 7 implement the semantics of guards and obligations.

A *branch* of a run is a maximal path starting from its root. For any branch, let $\mathbf{f}_1 \mathbf{f}_2 \dots$ be the sequence of accepting indices on its arcs. Then, the branch is *accepting* for $\text{Fin}(k)$ iff the set $\{i \mid k \in \mathbf{f}_i\}$ is finite; otherwise, the branch is accepting for $\text{Inf}(k)$. Conjunctions and disjunctions work as in the existential-branching case. A run is accepting for an acceptance condition iff all its branches are accepting.

Notes on expressiveness. We now state a few claims about the expressiveness of obligation automata. We will first formalise that every obligation automaton accepts a fragment of the language of a corresponding ω -automaton. Then, we show that finite obligation automata go beyond ω -regular languages. These claims may appear contradictory, but intuitively the additional expressive power of obligation automata comes from obligations within cycles, which effectively turn some variables into a sort of memory cell.

Theorem 2. *Let \mathcal{A} be an obligation automaton, and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ the automaton we obtain from \mathcal{A} by replacing every obligation with ε . Then: 1. $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is a symbolic ω -automaton over the same theory of \mathcal{A} ; 2. $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\hat{\mathcal{A}})$.*

Proof. The first part of the theorem states that obligations are the *only* element that differentiates obligation automata from ordinary symbolic automata: in fact, if we replace every obligation by the empty one, the definitions of accepting run under existential/universal branching from above collapse into the traditional definitions for symbolic ω -automata. The second part of the theorem is justified by observing that obligations may only ever *restrict* the language of an automaton. In fact, by adding an obligation to any edge of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ we can only ever *reject* some valuations that would have been *read* by $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$, but not vice versa. \square

Fig. 1: Recognising the language \mathcal{L} of a repeatedly-incrementing counter.

Theorem 3. *There exists at least one finite obligation automaton \mathcal{A} that recognises a language for which no finite symbolic ω -automaton exists.*

Proof. Consider the theory of linear integer arithmetic (LIA) over a single integer variable x . We may think of the language \mathcal{L} of valuation sequences where x repeatedly increments by one unit; i.e., \mathcal{L} is made of sequences $v_0 v_1 \dots$ such that $v_i(x) = v_0(x) + i$ for every i . This language cannot be captured by any *finite* symbolic automaton. In fact, handling the first valuation already requires an infinite set of transitions. Symbolic predicates will not help us here: if an initial transition can be triggered by multiple values of x , then in the target state we inevitably lose information on the actual valuation that had just been read, which makes it impossible to recognise \mathcal{L} . At the same time, the automaton must also have infinitely many states. If that is not the case, by the pigeonhole principle the automaton must send the prefixes of two different words into the same state. This would make it impossible for the automaton to recognise the suffixes of both words. The best that we can do is an automaton with infinitely many states and transitions, with the (co-Büchi) condition that no state is visited infinitely often (Fig. 1a). This also means that \mathcal{L} is not ω -regular.

By contrast, the Büchi obligation automaton (BOA) of Fig. 1b is able to recognise \mathcal{L} . We can prove this inductively. In the initial state, the automaton may read any valuation v_0 . Every such valuation is the beginning of a word in \mathcal{L} , therefore we recognise \mathcal{L} at least up to the first symbol. Now, assume we recognise every word up to the first k symbols $v_0 \dots v_{k-1}$. After v_{k-1} is read and the automaton's only transition is taken, the obligation yields the constraint $v_k \models \llbracket x \mapsto x + 1 \rrbracket v_{k-1}$, that is, $v_k \models (x = v_{k-1}(x) + 1)$. But this means that we also read the $k + 1$ -th symbol, and since we reject everything except that symbol, we recognise \mathcal{L} up to $k + 1$ symbols. Therefore, since the automaton recognises all of \mathcal{L} and rejects every word not in \mathcal{L} , its language is \mathcal{L} . \square

Notes on complementation. Figure 1c recognises the complement of language \mathcal{L} from Theorem 3 by introducing a fresh variable y . This variable is continually constrained to “store” $x + 1$, so that a successful test $x \neq y$ is enough to recognise

that the word belongs to \mathcal{L}^c . Words in \mathcal{L} are instead rejected, as they make the automaton continuously loops in the non-accepting state in the middle. We should stress that, although the role of y is reminiscent of that of a register, formally there is no difference between x and y in terms of semantics.


We suspect that complementation without either recurring to alternation or changing the theory domain V is impossible even for simple automata such as this one. Obligations may only introduce *equality* constraints, and for complementation we would likely need a dedicated construct to add *inequality* constraints. We sketch such a construct in Appendix A and will investigate it in future work.

For other automata, complementation appears to be significantly harder, and it is unclear whether any such extension would help. For instance, consider a more complex example from the literature [11]: the language Nonce_x of words such that x never takes the same value more than once. Interestingly, while this language is relatively easy to capture with register automata, it requires a rather complex obligation automaton. In turn, its complement Nonce_x^c can be recognised by a simple nondeterministic BOA, but not by a simple RA. Let us start by discussing this automaton (Fig. 2a). In the initial state, we admit every valuation, but constrain y in the next valuation to assume the current value of x . Then, as long as we read symbols with $x \neq y$, we may nondeterministically decide to hold the current value of y , or replace it by the value of x . As soon as the test $x = y$ holds, we transition into the accepting state. Thus, words that belong to Nonce_x^c always have an accepting run associated to them, unlike words from Nonce_x which force the automaton to remain in the middle state forever.

Recognising Nonce_x is rather more difficult. Here we need the intuition that, in order to reject a word from Nonce_x^c , we need to “store” in y the first occurrence of the duplicated value, and then hold that value until the second occurrence appears. To capture this behaviour, we need to consider *every* possible sequence of the two obligations $y \mapsto x$, $y \mapsto y$, by means of universal branching (Fig. 2b). We start, again, by setting obligation $y \mapsto x$ after reading any initial valuation. Then, we enter a gadget composed of two accepting states, each connected to each other and itself by edges that are guarded by $x \neq y$, and that set either $y \mapsto x$ (for edges labelled by λ_x) or $y \mapsto y$ (for λ_y). As soon as $x = y$ holds, we leave the gadget and reach a non-accepting sink.

Words that are in Nonce_x have no way of reaching this sink, and remain in the accepting gadget. The intuition here is that the specific order of obligations over y *does not matter* for these words: if every value of x is different from all others, and y may only store a previous value of x , then the test $x = y$ will fail no matter which concrete value is “held” in y . On the contrary, for words in Nonce_x^c there exists at least one execution (that is, a branch in its run tree) that performs the “correct” sequence of obligations which makes the test $x = y$ hold when a value is seen for the second time. This branch is not accepting because it ends up in the non-accepting sink state, and thus the entire run is not accepting.¹

¹ See Figure 7 in appendix for a graphical representation of an accepting and a non-accepting run for this automaton.

Fig. 2: Automata for a language of non-repeating values of x .

3 The HOAPP format


In this section, we give an overview of our proposed HOA dialect. We first briefly review the original HOA format² (Section 3.1), and then describe our syntactic additions to it (Section 3.2). Notice that these changes are meant to be incremental: any HOA automaton should also be accepted by a HOAPP parser. Then, we introduce a simple type system for the new format (Section 3.3), and discuss its semantics (Section 3.4).

3.1 Overview of HOA

The description of an automaton in HOA is split into two parts: a *header* containing general information, and a *body* describing its states and transitions.

The header always starts with `HOA: v1` and is organised into header items (or simply *items*), which are made of a name, a colon sign, and some data. For instance, the item `States: 10` declares that the automaton has 10 states, while `Start: 0` indicates that the automaton starts from the state with index 0. The `AP` item introduces a number of *atomic propositions* (*AP*). For instance, `AP: 2 "x" "y"` declares that the automaton's edges are labelled by predicates over two propositions x, y . The `Acceptance` item contains the automaton's (Emerson-Lei) acceptance condition, following the same grammar described in Section 2. For instance, a valid acceptance item would be `Acceptance: 2 Fin(0) & Inf(1)`, where the initial 2 indicates the total number of acceptance sets in the automaton. (The actual composition of these sets is defined in the body of the automaton). Lastly, *aliases* are another kind of header item worth mentioning. An alias is an identifier prefixed by `@`, and associated to an expression. When used in an expression, an alias is expanded into its corresponding expression, akin to a syntactic macro. Expansion is recursive, meaning that an alias may refer to other, simpler aliases. Expressions refer to an atomic proposition simply by its (0-based)

² This overview focusses on automata with transition-based acceptance and explicit edge labels, due to space constraints. The format is rather more flexible than this: for more details, we refer the reader to HOA's full documentation (<https://ad1.github.io/hoaf/>).

Fig. 3: HOA description of a Büchi automaton for Gx .

position in the AP header item. For instance, given AP: 2 "x" "y", the item Alias: @x-and-noty 0 & !1 defines an alias for the predicate $x \wedge \neg y$. Users may also attach custom items, as long as they start with a lowercase letter: tools that do not recognise these items are allowed to simply ignore them.

The body is introduced by the keyword `--BODY--` and contains a sequence of state descriptors. Each of these starts with the `State:` keyword, followed by the *index* of the state and zero or more *edges* describing its outgoing transitions. Each edge has a predicate over AP (its *guard*), the index of a *target state*, and an optional acceptance *signature*, i.e., the list of acceptance sets the edge belongs to (if any). The body is terminated by the keyword `--END--`.

To illustrate the format, we provide an example of a simple HOA description of an automaton for the LTL property Gx , along with its graphical representation (Fig. 3). From initial state s_0 , the automaton loops back to s_0 if x holds, or moves to state s_1 otherwise. State s_1 is a sink, as it only allows an always-enabled transition that loops back to s_1 . The edges leaving s_0 belong to acceptance set 0, and the Büchi condition $\text{Inf}(0)$ states that the automaton must take at least one of them infinitely often. This may only happen if $\neg x$ never holds, which indeed matches the semantics of Gx . The example also illustrates the usage of an alias (`@x`) to improve the readability of labels.

3.2 Syntactic extensions to HOA

First, we detail the new syntactic constructs that HOAPP adds to HOA. We use an extended BNF adapted from the latter's documentation: a quoted string `"lit"` is a literal, an unquoted name `rule` refers to a production rule, `(p)?` denotes an optional occurrence of `p`, and `(p)*` denotes zero or more occurrences of `p`. Production rules for non-terminals and terminals are defined with `:=` and `:`, respectively. If we omit a production rule, it is implied that the rule is part of the HOA specification; similarly, when we use ellipsis in a production rule (e.g., `p ::= p1 | ...`), we are extending a HOA rule with the same name.

The HOA item. A HOAPP specification must start with the `HOA: v1pp` item.

The AP and AP-type items. The header item AP has the same syntax as in HOA. However, we now refer to the elements of AP as *variables*, rather than atomic propositions. We introduce an optional header item `AP-type`: if present, it shall be followed by $|AP|$ type names, which are `bool`, `int`, or `real`. The i -th element

Table 1: Extended syntax of HOAPP.

header-item ::= "AP-type:" TYPE* "controllable-AP:" INT INT*	
"assume:" ltl "guarantee:" ltl ...	
ltl ::= label-expr "!" ltl MOD ltl	
ltl "&" ltl ltl " " ltl ltl "U" ltl	
label ::= "[" label-expr (" \$" obl)? "]"	
label-expr ::= INTLIT REALLIT "-" label-expr	
label-expr OP label-expr label-expr CMP label-expr	
label-expr TEST label-expr ...	
obl ::= asgn ("," asgn)*	OP : "+" "-" "*"
asgn ::= lhs ":" label-expr	CMP : "<" "<=" ">" ">="
lhs ::= INT ANAME	TEST : "==" "!="
TYPE : "bool" "int" "real"	INTLIT : i(0 [1-9][0-9]*)
MOD : "F" "G" "X"	REALLIT : r(0 [1-9][0-9]*) . [0-9]*

of this vector gives the type of the i -th variable. If this header is omitted, we shall assume all variables to be Booleans.

Extended expression syntax. We extend the grammar of expressions (**label-expr**) with numeric constants, comparisons, and arithmetic operators. Operators bind in the following, descending order of precedence: ! - (unary); *, + -, < <= > >; == !=; &; |. All binary operators are left-associative; unary ones (- and !) are right-associative.

Like in HOA, plain numeric literals are references to variables; thus, we use prefixes **i** and **r** to denote integer and real constants, respectively.

Extended edge syntax. Edges are labelled by a predicate, which is the edge's *guard*, and zero or more assignments that constitute the edge's *obligation*. The left-hand side of each assignment shall be a reference to a variable: thus, either a plain integer or an alias that resolves to an integer. Examples of (syntactically) valid labels in HOAPP are [t \$ 0 := f] or [1 \$ 2 := 2 + 3, 0 := i1].

Additional header items. Our format adopts the **controllable-AP** item [22] to specify whether a variable is set adversarially by the environment or may be controlled by the system, allowing HOAPP to represent game structures. We also introduce additional items **assume**, **guarantee** that contain LTL formulas, and may appear zero or more times.

3.3 Typing rules

Our format considers three data types, namely Booleans (**bool**), integers (**int**), and real numbers (**real**), with domains $\text{dom}(\text{bool}) = \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$, $\text{dom}(\text{int}) =$

Table 2: Typing rules. Assume κ an INT term and $r\rho$ a REALLIT term.

$\begin{array}{l} t : \text{bool} \\ f : \text{bool} \\ i\kappa : \text{int} \\ r\rho : \text{real} \end{array}$	$\frac{\text{type}(\kappa) = \tau}{\kappa : \tau}$	$\frac{e : \sigma \quad \sigma \leq \tau}{e : \tau}$	$\frac{e : \tau \quad \tau \leq \text{real}}{-e : \tau}$
$\frac{e_1 : \tau_1 \quad e_2 : \tau_2 \quad \tau_1, \tau_2 \leq \text{real}}{\begin{array}{l} e_1 \text{ CMP } e_2 : \text{bool} \\ e_1 \text{ TEST } e_2 : \text{bool} \\ e_1 \text{ OP } e_2 : \max(\tau_1, \tau_2) \end{array}}$	$\frac{e_1 : \tau_1 \quad e_2 : \tau_2 \quad \tau_1, \tau_2 \leq \text{ltl_t}}{\begin{array}{l} e_1 \text{ TEST } e_2 : \max(\tau_1, \tau_2) \\ e_1 \ \& \ e_2 : \max(\tau_1, \tau_2) \\ e_1 \mid e_2 : \max(\tau_1, \tau_2) \end{array}}$	$\frac{\varphi : \text{ltl_t}}{\begin{array}{l} \text{X } \varphi : \text{ltl_t} \\ \text{F } \varphi : \text{ltl_t} \\ \text{G } \varphi : \text{ltl_t} \end{array}}$	
$\frac{e : \tau \quad \tau \leq \text{ltl_t}}{!e : \tau}$	$\frac{\varphi_1 : \text{ltl_t} \quad \varphi_2 : \text{ltl_t}}{\varphi_1 \text{ U } \varphi_2 : \text{ltl_t}}$	$\frac{\text{lhs} : \tau \quad e : \tau}{\text{lhs} := e : \diamond}$	

\mathbb{Z} , $\text{dom}(\text{real}) = \mathbb{R}$. We also introduce an internal type `ltl_t` of well-typed LTL formulas. We assume `int` to be a subtype of `real` and `bool` to be a subtype of `ltl_t`, denoted by $\text{int} \leq \text{real}$ and $\text{bool} \leq \text{ltl_t}$, respectively. Subtyping is reflexive, transitive, and antisymmetric. Given types τ_1, τ_2 , we define $\max(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ to be τ_1 iff $\tau_2 \leq \tau_1$; τ_2 iff $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2$; and \perp otherwise. We use $\max(\cdot)$ to describe some implicit type conversion rules: for instance, the result of `i1 + r2.5` has type $\max(\text{int}, \text{real})$, which in this case is `real`; `i0 + i2`, in turn, has type `int`. We do not define a separate type for assignments; instead, we use the notation $x := e : \diamond$ to denote that an assignment is *well-typed*.

Given a HOAPP automaton with variables x_1, \dots, x_n and **AP-type**: τ_1, \dots, τ_n , we define $\text{type}(i) = \tau_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Under this definition, we can type-check expressions and obligations according to the rules in Table 2. We say that the automaton is *well-typed* iff all the following requirements hold: (i) all its guards have type `bool`; (ii) all of its obligations are well-typed; and (iii) all formulas under LTL header items (**assume**, **guarantee**) have type `ltl_t`.

3.4 Semantics

A well-typed HOAPP specification describes an obligation automaton $\mathcal{A} = \langle V, Q, R, I, F, \text{Acc} \rangle$. The set of variables V is given by the **AP**: item. Q, R, F are derived by the specification's body: each **State** term defines a state $q \in Q$ and its associated R_q , as well as the acceptance sets F to which the edges belong (if any). I and Acc are given by **Start**: and **Acceptance**: items, respectively.

Notice that **State**: items may contain conjunctions of states; similarly, the target of any edge may be a conjunction of states. A HOAPP automaton features universal branching if and only if any of these features occur.

*Semantics of **guarantee**.* Each **guarantee** header item specifies an additional acceptance condition in the form of an LTL formula. Atoms in the formula may be arbitrary predicates over the automaton's variables. The intended meaning of these items is that the automaton accepts only those words that satisfy its acceptance condition *and* the additional formulas.

Table 3: Denotational semantics of expressions.

$\llbracket \mathbf{t} \rrbracket v = \text{true}$	$\llbracket \mathbf{i}\kappa \rrbracket v = \kappa$	$\llbracket !e \rrbracket v = \neg \llbracket e \rrbracket v$	$\llbracket \mathbf{f} \rrbracket v = \text{false}$	$\llbracket \mathbf{r}\rho \rrbracket v = \rho$	$\llbracket -e \rrbracket v = \neg \llbracket e \rrbracket v$
$\llbracket \kappa \rrbracket v = v(p_\kappa)$	$\llbracket e_1 + e_2 \rrbracket v = \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket v + \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket v$	$\llbracket e_1 \& e_2 \rrbracket v = \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket v \wedge \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket v$			
$\llbracket e_1 * e_2 \rrbracket v = \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket v \cdot \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket v$	$\llbracket e_1 - e_2 \rrbracket v = \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket v - \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket v$	$\llbracket e_1 \mid e_2 \rrbracket v = \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket v \vee \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket v$			
$\llbracket e_1 < e_2 \rrbracket v = \text{true}$ iff $\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket v < \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket v$	$\llbracket e_1 == e_2 \rrbracket v = \text{true}$ iff $\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket v = \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket v$				

Formally, let $\mathcal{B}(\varphi)$ be the Büchi automaton for LTL property φ . Such an automaton may be obtained by treating the atoms of φ as atomic propositions, and then using the usual construction for LTL [23]. An implementation of this procedure is presented in Section 4. Then, a HOAPP specification with one or more **guarantee** formulas $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots$ describes the automaton $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \wedge \dots)$, where \mathcal{A} is the automaton given by the specification ignoring LTL header items. *Semantics of **assume**.* An automaton with an **assume** formula immediately accepts every run where the assumption is *not* satisfied. Thus, a specification with **assume** formulas $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots$ and guarantees $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots$ describes the automaton $\mathcal{B}(\neg(\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2 \wedge \dots)) \oplus (\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \wedge \dots))$, where $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}(\cdot)$ are as defined above.

3.5 Example: A simple arbiter

In this section, we illustrate HOAPP's features by showing how it may be used to describe games over infinite-state arenas, similarly to how [22] uses (an extension of) HOA as a formalism for finite-state reactive synthesis problems.

Namely, we introduce an automaton (Listing 1.1 and Fig. 4) for a game where the environment controls an integer **y** and a Boolean **pause**, while the other variables (**x** of type **int**, **dec** of type **bool**) are left to the controller. Naturally, both players still have to obey the automaton's obligations when giving values to these variables. In the initial state s_0 , the environment picks a value for **y**, which is then assigned to **x** as we move to state s_1 . Here, the controller can manipulate **dec** to choose whether to decrement **x** and remain in s_1 , or do nothing (keeping **x** as-is) and return to s_0 . When the controller chooses the former, the environment can prevent the decrement by setting **pause** to true. However, the assumption $GF \neg \text{pause}$ mandates that the environment must allow **x** to decrement infinitely often. Whenever we are in s_0 and **x** is not equal to 0, the game goes to a sink state s_2 . The goal of the controller is to ensure that the automaton takes infinitely often any of the transitions leaving s_0 . Therefore, every time s_1 is visited, the controller must precisely decrement **x** to 0 (fighting the environment's delays while doing so) before going back to s_0 ; otherwise, the automaton will reach s_2 , where the acceptance condition is impossible to satisfy and the environment wins.

Listing 1.1: Example: Simple arbiter (after auto-aliasing).

```

HOA: v1pp
States: 3
Start: 0
AP: 4 "x" "dec" "y" "pause"
AP-type: int bool int bool
controllable-AP: 0 1
Acceptance: 1 Inf(0)
assume: G F !@pause
Alias: @x 0
Alias: @dec 1
Alias: @y 2
Alias: @pause 3
--BODY--
State: 0 "s0" {0}
[@x = i0 & @y > i0 $ @x := @y] 1
[@x != i0 $ @x := @x] 2
State: 1 "s1"
[@dec & !@pause $ @x := @x - i1] 1
[!@dec & !@pause $ @x := @x] 0
[@pause $ @x := @x] 1
State: 2 "s2"
[t $ @x := @x] 2 "s2"
--END--

```

Listing 1.2: The arbiter from Listing 1.1, lowered into HOA.

```

HOA: v1
States: 3
Start: 0
AP: 11 "@dec" "@pause" "@x" "@x != i0"
      "@x - i1" "@x := @x" "@x := @x - i1"
      "@x := @y" "@x == i0" "@y" "@y > i0"
acc-name: Buchi
Acceptance: 1 Inf(0)
v1pp-AP: 4 x dec y pause
v1pp-AP-type: int bool int bool
v1pp-assume: "GF!@pause"
v1pp-controllable-AP: 0 1
--BODY--
State: 0 "s0" {0}
[7&8&10] 1
[3&5] 2
State: 1 "s1"
[0&1&6] 1
[1] 1
[!0&1&5] 0
State: 2 "s2"
[5] 2
--END--

```





Fig. 4: Graphical representation of the automaton from Listing 1.1.

4 The hoapp tool

We have built a prototype tool **hoapp** that can parse, type-check, and process HOAPP files through a command-line interface. The tool is written in Python and may also be loaded as a package within other programs: then, these can exploit its API to create and manipulate HOAPP automata programmatically. Fig. 5 gives a graphical overview of the tool's capabilities, which we discuss below. Support is currently limited to existential-branching automata.³

Lowering into HOA. The tool implements an invertible procedure to lower a HOAPP automaton \mathcal{A} into a HOA automaton \mathcal{A}^b . To illustrate this procedure, in Listing 1.2 we show the result of lowering Listing 1.1 into HOA. The procedure first performs a helper step called *auto-aliasing*. This step expands all aliases in the automaton, then defines one new alias for each variable, and lastly applies these new aliases to the entire automaton. This ensures consistency for the inverse procedure. Then, we treat every predicate p over non-Boolean variables in \mathcal{A}

³ The tool is open-source: <https://github.com/lou1306/hoapp>.

Fig. 5: Overview of the capabilities of the `hoapp` tool.

as a fresh atomic proposition in \mathcal{A}_b . For instance, in Listing 1.2 predicate $x \neq 0$ becomes a proposition named "`x != 0`". We also replace obligation assignments by fresh APs, and add them as conjuncts to their edge's guard. By the end of this step, every edge contains a single predicate and no obligation, and so it is compatible with HOA. When emitting the HOA file, we remove all aliases generated in the auto-aliasing step. In turn, we attach the names, types, and controllability of \mathcal{A} 's variables under the items `v1pp-AP`, `v1pp-AP-type`, and `v1pp-controllable-AP`, respectively. We also copy `assume` and `guarantee` items, as `v1pp-assume` and `v1pp-guarantee`, but we quote the formulas so that they will be treated as strings by HOA-compliant tools. Note that these tools will ignore these non-standard header items, as they start with a lowercase letter. This additional information makes the transformation invertible. (We cannot recover the original aliases of \mathcal{A} , but these do not affect its semantics.)

The inverse, *lifting* procedure replaces the APs of \mathcal{A}_b by the original predicates; it also separates assignments from guards, and reconstructs obligations. We recover the original variables, their types, and any LTL formulas from the respective `v1pp-` items, and recreate aliases with the same auto-aliasing procedure described earlier. The lowering enables reusing Spot for several operations on automata. Spot also implements translations into a number of output formats, including GraphViz, which makes it easy to visualise HOAPP automata.

Product of automata. The tool implements the product operation by lowering the two automata into HOA, computing their product via Spot, and lifting the result back into HOAPP. The procedure treats variables with the same name as identical, regardless of the order in which they appear, mimicking Spot's behaviour with HOA automata. We report an error if there is a mismatch in the types or controllability of variables between the two automata.

LTL translation. We also provide a proof-of-concept translator from LTL with predicates to Büchi automata, which relies on Spot's `ltl2tgba`. The transla-

tor accepts an LTL formula whose atoms may be HOAPP comparisons over variables, and a mapping describing the type of each variable. The formula must use $@x$ to refer to a variable x , and i/r prefixes for integer and real literals. For instance, the formula $G(x = 0) \rightarrow F(y = 1)$ should be given as $G (@x == i0) \rightarrow F (@y == i1)$ (assuming x, y are declared as integers). The translation workflow type-checks the formula against the mapping given by the user; then, it quotes all sub-expressions not natively understood by Spot and runs the resulting formula through `ltl2tgba`; and finally, it uses the type mapping to lift the resulting HOA automaton into HOAPP.

Emptiness checking. The tool can check an arbitrary HOAPP automaton for emptiness, by translating the automaton into the VMT-LIB format [9]. In this translation, we track visits to an acceptance set F_i by an acceptance bit ACC_i which is set iff a transition belonging to F_i is taken. This lets us turn the acceptance condition Acc into an LTL formula φ_{Acc} . For instance, $Fin(i)$ and $Inf(i)$ are encoded as $FG(\neg ACC_i)$ and $GF(ACC_i)$, respectively. By this translation, we can use the state-of-the-art model checker IC3IA [8] to verify whether the automaton models $\neg\varphi_{Acc}$. If it does, the automaton is empty. Otherwise, the model checker returns an accepting run of the automaton as a counterexample.

5 Conclusion

The growing interest of the research community in infinite-state systems demands effective formalisms for automata over richer-than-Boolean alphabets. Previous approaches have mostly focused on endowing automata with registers or memory cells. In this paper, we suggested obligations as a simpler construct that increases the expressiveness of (finite) symbolic ω -automata while retaining some of their simplicity. This simple mechanism lends itself easily to semantics for nondeterminism, rich acceptance conditions, and universal branching. To demonstrate the practicality of the proposal, we also introduced a dialect of the popular HOA format to define obligation automata over integer and real variables, as well as a prototype tool to manipulate these automata.

Questions about the decidability of emptiness and other problems for obligation automata remain open, and their relation to register automata also requires further inquiry. It is plain to see that we can check emptiness by reduction to model checking, but in the future we might investigate whether any known emptiness algorithm for ω -automata may be adapted to obligation automata: this may provide insights into the complexity of this problem. We also plan to design a temporal logic with obligation-like constructs, akin to TSL [14] but with arguably simpler semantics and a direct correspondence with (a subset of) Büchi obligation automata. On the practical side, the format that we proposed is currently limited to a small selection of operators, which we should expand in the future: as a more general solution, we could extend the syntax to allow arbitrary SMT-LIB terms [3] in the grammar of expressions, and introduce corresponding header items to specify the theories required by the automaton. We also intend to investigate applications of HOAPP to formal verification and synthesis.

References

1. Azzopardi, S., Di Stefano, L., Piterman, N., Schneider, G.: Full LTL Synthesis over Infinite-State Arenas. In: Piskac, R., Rakamaric, Z. (eds.) 37th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV). LNCS, vol. 15934, pp. 274–297. Springer (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-98685-7_13
2. Babiak, T., Blahoudek, F., Duret-Lutz, A., Klein, J., Kretínský, J., Müller, D., Parker, D., Strejcek, J.: The Hanoi Omega-Automata Format. In: Kroening, D., Pasareanu, C.S. (eds.) 27th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV). LNCS, vol. 9206, pp. 479–486. Springer (2015). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21690-4_31
3. Barrett, C.W., Stump, A., Tinelli, C.: The SMT-LIB Standard - Version 2.0 (2010), <http://smtlib.cs.uiowa.edu/papers/smt-lib-reference-v2.0-r10.12.21.pdf>
4. Biere, A.: The AIGER And-Inverter Graph (AIG) Format Version 20071012. Technical Report, Johannes Kepler University (2007). <https://doi.org/10.35011/fmvtr.2007-1>
5. Biere, A., Heljanko, K., Wieringa, S.: AIGER 1.9 and beyond. Technical Report 11/2, Johannes Kepler University, Linz, Austria (2011), <https://doi.org/10.35011/fmvtr.2011-2>
6. Boker, U., Kupferman, O., Rosenberg, A.: Alternation removal in Büchi automata. In: Abramsky, S., Gavaille, C., Kirchner, C., auf der Heide, F.M., Spirakis, P.G. (eds.) 37th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP). LNCS, vol. 6199, pp. 76–87. Springer, Bordeaux, France (2010). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14162-1_7
7. Cavada, R., Cimatti, A., Dorigatti, M., Griggio, A., Mariotti, A., Micheli, A., Mover, S., Roveri, M., Tonetta, S.: The nuXmv Symbolic Model Checker. In: Biere, A., Bloem, R. (eds.) 26th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV). LNCS, vol. 8559, pp. 334–342. Springer (2014). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-08867-9_22
8. Cimatti, A., Griggio, A., Johannsen, C., Rozier, K.Y., Tonetta, S.: Infinite-State Liveness Checking with rlive. In: Piskac, R., Rakamaric, Z. (eds.) 37th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV). LNCS, vol. 15931, pp. 215–236. Springer, Zagreb, Croatia (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-98668-0_11
9. Cimatti, A., Griggio, A., Tonetta, S.: The VMT-LIB Language and Tools. In: Déharbe, D., Hyvärinen, A.E.J. (eds.) 20th Workshop on Satisfiability Modulo Theories (SMT). CEUR Workshop Proceedings, vol. 3185, pp. 80–89. CEUR-WS.org (2022), <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3185/extended9547.pdf>
10. Clarke, E.M., McMillan, K.L., Campos, S.V.A., Hartonas-Garmhausen, V.: Symbolic Model Checking. In: Alur, R., Henzinger, T.A. (eds.) 8th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV). LNCS, vol. 1102, pp. 419–427. Springer (1996). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-61474-5_93
11. Demri, S., Lazic, R.: LTL with the Freeze Quantifier and Register Automata. In: 21th Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS). pp. 17–26. IEEE, Seattle, WA, USA (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2006.31>
12. Emerson, E.A., Lei, C.L.: Modalities for model checking: Branching time logic strikes back. *Science of Computer Programming* **8**(3), 275–306 (1987). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-6423\(87\)90036-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-6423(87)90036-0)

13. Finkbeiner, B., Heim, P., Passing, N.: Temporal stream logic modulo theories. In: Bouyer, P., Schröder, L. (eds.) 25th International Conference on Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures (FOSSACS). LNCS, vol. 13242, pp. 325–346. Springer, Munich, Germany (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-99253-8_17
14. Finkbeiner, B., Klein, F., Piskac, R., Santolucito, M.: Temporal Stream Logic: Synthesis Beyond the Booleans. In: Dillig, I., Tasiran, S. (eds.) 31st International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV). LNCS, vol. 11561, pp. 609–629. Springer (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25540-4_35
15. Heim, P., Dimitrova, R.: Solving Infinite-State Games via Acceleration. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* **8**(POPL), 1696–1726 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3632899>
16. Heim, P., Dimitrova, R.: Issy: A comprehensive tool for specification and synthesis of infinite-state reactive systems. In: Piskac, R., Rakamaric, Z. (eds.) 37th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV). LNCS in Computer Science, vol. 15934, pp. 298–312. Springer (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-98685-7_14
17. Johannsen, C., Nukala, K., Dureja, R., Irfan, A., Shankar, N., Tinelli, C., Vardi, M.Y., Rozier, K.Y.: The MoXI Model Exchange Tool Suite. In: Gurfinkel, A., Ganesh, V. (eds.) 36th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV). LNCS, vol. 14681, pp. 203–218. Springer, Montreal, QC, Canada (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-65627-9_10
18. Kaminski, M., Francez, N.: Finite-memory automata. *Theoretical Computer Science* **134**(2), 329–363 (1994). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(94\)90242-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(94)90242-9)
19. Maderbacher, B., Bloem, R.: Reactive Synthesis Modulo Theories using Abstraction Refinement. In: Griggio, A., Rungta, N. (eds.) 22nd Conference on Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design (FMCAD). pp. 315–324. IEEE (2022). https://doi.org/10.34727/2022/isbn.978-3-85448-053-2_38
20. Niemetz, A., Preiner, M., Wolf, C., Biere, A.: Btor2 , BtorMC and Boolector 3.0. In: Chockler, H., Weissenbacher, G. (eds.) 30th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV). LNCS, vol. 10981, pp. 587–595. Springer (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96145-3_32
21. Pnueli, A.: The Temporal Logic of Programs. In: 18th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS). pp. 46–57. IEEE (1977). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1977.32>
22. Pérez, G.A.: The Extended HOA Format for Synthesis. CoRR **abs/1912.05793** (2019), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1912.05793>
23. Vardi, M.Y., Wolper, P.: An automata-theoretic approach to automatic program verification (preliminary report). In: Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS). pp. 332–344. IEEE, Cambridge, MA, USA (1986)

A Negative obligations

In this appendix, we try and further extend the obligation automata framework with an extra construct that may be useful for complementation. We chose to relegate this extension to an appendix due to space reasons, to make our main treatment of obligation automata easier to follow, and (on a more practical side) because support for this feature has not yet been implemented in HOAPP and its companion tool.

We now assume that every edge may be additionally labelled by a *negative* obligation \bar{o} . This is a set of pairs from $V \times \mathcal{T}(V)$, which places *inequality* constraints on the next input symbol, as opposed to the equality constraints set by obligations. We write a negative obligation as $\bar{o} = \{x_1 \not\mapsto t_1, x_2 \not\mapsto t_2, \dots\}$, where the same variable x may appear any number of times, and define $\llbracket \bar{o} \rrbracket v$ as $\bigwedge_i x_i \neq \llbracket t_i \rrbracket v$, or *true* if \bar{o} is the empty set.

Then, a sequence of edges $e_1 e_2 \dots$ with negative obligations $\bar{o}_1 \bar{o}_2 \dots$ is a run for a word \mathbf{v} iff, in addition to the definition in Section 2, it also satisfies the additional constraint $v_{i+1} \models \llbracket \bar{o}_i \rrbracket v_i$, for every i . When dealing with products, we simply take the union of negative obligations: thus, $(q_1, \gamma_1, o_1, \bar{o}_1, q'_1) \times (q_2, \gamma_2, o_2, \bar{o}_2, q'_2) = (q_1, q_2) \xrightarrow{\gamma_1 \wedge \gamma_2, o_1 \times o_2, \bar{o}_1 \cup \bar{o}_2} (q'_1, q'_2)$. Universal branching is adapted similarly. We conjecture that Theorems 1 and 2 readily extend to negative obligations.

With negative obligations, we can recognise the complement of \mathcal{L} (the language of sequences where x continuously grows by one unit, recognised by the automaton in Fig. 1b) without relying on extra variables, for instance via the Büchi automaton in Fig. 6. When reading words from \mathcal{L} , this automaton simply loops in the initial, non-accepting state. To reach the accepting state, we must at some point read a valuation v_i such that x is *not* equal to $v_{i-1}(x) + 1$; there is a run where reading v_{i-1} takes the edge with the negative obligation, and v_i does satisfy the constrain $v_i(x) \neq v_{i-1}(x) + 1$, so it is successfully read by the automaton. From that point on, the automaton may forever stay in the accepting sink, and thus recognise that the word is in \mathcal{L}^c . Words from \mathcal{L} , instead, keep the automaton in the non-accepting initial state.

B Proofs for Section 2 (Obligation automata)

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ be two Büchi obligation automata (BOA) with languages \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 . Then $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2) = \mathcal{L}_1 \cap \mathcal{L}_2$.*




Fig. 6: Büchi (negative-) obligation automaton for \mathcal{L}^c .




Fig. 7: Sample runs in the automaton from Figure 2b. Values of x in the word corresponding to each run are shown to the right. Although runs are defined as DAGs, in this figure we visualise them as trees by duplicating some nodes. We also omit the guard $y \neq x$ from most edges, to reduce clutter.

Proof. First, we prove that $\mathcal{L}_1 \cap \mathcal{L}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2)$. Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{L}_1 \cap \mathcal{L}_2$. Then there is an accepting run $\rho_j = e_{j1}e_{j2} \dots$ in each \mathcal{A}_j . Let $e_{ji} = (q_{ji}, \gamma_{ji}, o_{ji}, q'_{ji})$. By construction, the product contains edges of the form $e_i = e_{1i} \times e_{2i} = (q_{1i}, q_{2i}) \xrightarrow{\gamma_i, o_i} (q'_{1i}, q'_{2i})$, with $\gamma = \gamma_{1i} \wedge \gamma_{2i} \wedge \gamma'$ and o_i follow the definition of $o_{1i} \times o_{2i}$.

For every i , we have that $v_i \models \gamma_{1i} \wedge \gamma_{2i}$: otherwise, either ρ_1 or ρ_2 would not exist. $v_i \models \gamma'$ because otherwise v_{i+1} would not satisfy $\llbracket o_{2i} \rrbracket v_i$, and ρ_2 would not exist. Finally, o_i only includes constraints from o_{1i} and o_{2i} . Since $v_{i+1} \models \llbracket o_{1i} \rrbracket v_i$ and $v_{i+1} \models \llbracket o_{2i} \rrbracket v_i$, we can conclude that $v_{i+1} \models \llbracket o_i \rrbracket v_i$. Thus, $\rho = e_1 e_2 \dots$ is a run for \mathbf{v} in the product. This run contains infinitely many edges $(e_{1i} \times e_{2i})$ with e_{1i} being a member of some accepting set in \mathcal{A}_1 , and infinitely many edges with e_{2i} belonging to an accepting set in \mathcal{A}_2 , because ρ_1 and ρ_2 are both accepting. But then, by construction of the acceptance condition of the product, ρ is accepting.

The proof for $\mathcal{L}_1 \cap \mathcal{L}_2 \supseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2)$ is quite similar. An accepting run ρ in the product must correspond to two runs ρ_1, ρ_2 in $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$: intuitively, whenever some v_i satisfies a conjunction of guards, or a product of obligations, it must satisfy every individual guard or obligation. Therefore, ρ_1, ρ_2 must exist. Are they accepting? Assume it is not the case: ρ is accepting but some ρ_j is not. This means that, for every accepting set in \mathcal{A}_j , ρ takes every edge in that set only a finite number of times. However, by construction of the product's acceptance

condition, this would also prevent ρ from being an accepting run in the product. Therefore, ρ_1, ρ_2 must be accepting in $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$. \square