

Complexity Results on Branching-Time Pushdown Model Checking

Laura Bozzelli

Università di Napoli Federico II, Via Cintia, 80126 - Napoli, Italy

Abstract. The model checking problem of pushdown systems (PMC problem, for short) against standard branching temporal logics has been intensively studied in the literature. In particular, for the modal μ -calculus, the most powerful branching temporal logic used for verification, the problem is known to be EXPTIME-complete (even for a fixed formula). The problem remains EXPTIME-complete also for the logic *CTL*, which corresponds to a fragment of the alternation-free modal μ -calculus. However, the exact complexity in the size of the pushdown system (for a fixed *CTL* formula) is an open question: it lies somewhere between PSPACE and EXPTIME. To the best of our knowledge, the PMC problem for *CTL** has not been investigated so far. In this paper, we show that this problem is 2EXPTIME-complete. Moreover, we prove that the program complexity of the PMC problem against *CTL* (i.e., the complexity of the problem in terms of the size of the system) is EXPTIME-complete.

1 Introduction

Model checking is a useful method to verify automatically the correctness of a system with respect to a desired behavior, by checking whether a mathematical model of the system satisfies a formal specification of this behavior given by a formula in a suitable propositional temporal logic. There are two types of temporal logics: linear and branching. In linear temporal logics, each moment in time has a unique possible future (formulas are interpreted over linear sequences corresponding to single computations of the system), while in branching temporal logics, each moment in time may split into several possible futures (formulas are interpreted over infinite trees, which describe all the possible computations of the system). The size of an instance of a model checking problem depends on two parameters: the size of the finite formal description of the given system and the size of the formula. In practice, the formula is normally very small, while the description of the system is often very large. Therefore, the complexity of the problem in terms of the size of the system (called *program complexity*) is very important in practice. Traditionally, model checking is applied to finite-state systems, typically modelled by labelled state-transition graphs.

Recently, the investigation of model-checking techniques has been extended to infinite-state systems. An active field of research is model-checking of infinite-state sequential systems. These are systems in which each state carries a finite, but unbounded, amount of information e.g. a pushdown store. The origin of this

research is the result of Muller and Schupp concerning the decidability of the monadic second-order theory of *context-free systems* [MS85]. This result can be extended to *pushdown systems* [Cau96], and it implies decidability of the model checking problem for all those logics (modal μ -calculus, CTL^* , CTL , etc.) which have effective translations to the monadic second-order logic. As this general decidability result gives a non-elementary upper bound for the complexity of model checking, researchers sought decidability results of elementary complexity. Concerning pushdown systems, model checking with branching-time logics is quite hard. In particular, Walukiewicz [Wal96] has shown that model checking these systems with respect to modal μ -calculus, the most powerful branching temporal logic used for verification, is EXPTIME-complete. Even for a fixed formula in the *alternation-free* modal μ -calculus, the problem is EXPTIME-hard in the size of the pushdown system. The problem remains EXPTIME-complete also for the logic CTL [Wal00], which corresponds to a fragment of the alternation-free modal μ -calculus. However, the exact complexity in the size of the system (for a fixed CTL formula) is an open problem: it lies somewhere between PSPACE and EXPTIME [BEM97]. In [Wal00], Walukiewicz has shown that even for the simple branching-time logic EF (a fragment of CTL) the problem is quite hard since it is PSPACE-complete (even for a fixed formula). For other branching-time temporal logics such as EG, UB (which are fragments of CTL) and CTL^* (which subsumes both CTL and LTL) the problem is still open. To the best of our knowledge, the pushdown model checking problem for CTL^* has not been investigated so far.

For standard linear temporal logics, model-checking pushdown systems with LTL and the *linear-time μ -calculus* is EXPTIME-complete [BEM97]. However, the problem is polynomial in the size of the pushdown system. It follows that the problem is only slightly harder than for finite-state systems, where it is PSPACE-complete but polynomial for any fixed formula [SC85, Var88]. For optimal pushdown model-checking algorithms, see also [EHR00, EKS03, PV04, AEM04].

In this paper we study the pushdown model checking problem (PMC problem, for short) against CTL^* and the program complexity of the PMC problem against CTL . In particular, we state the following two results:

- The PMC problem against CTL^* is 2EXPTIME-complete (and EXPTIME-complete in the size of the system).
- The program complexity of the PMC problem w.r.t. CTL is EXPTIME-complete.

In order to solve the PMC problem for CTL^* we exploit an automata-theoretic approach. In particular, we propose an exponential time reduction (in the size of the formula) to the emptiness problem of *alphabet-free alternating parity pushdown automata*. The emptiness problem for this class of automata can be solved by a construction similar to that given in [KPV02] to solve the emptiness problem for nondeterministic parity pushdown tree automata (the algorithm in [KPV02] is based on a polynomial reduction to the emptiness of two-way alternating parity finite-state tree automata, which is known to be decidable in exponential time [Var98]). 2EXPTIME-hardness is shown by a technically non-trivial reduction from the word problem for EXPSPACE-bounded alternating Turing Machines.

EXPTIME-hardness of the pushdown model checking problem against *CTL* was shown by Walukiewicz [Wal00] using a reduction from the word problem for PSPACE-bounded alternating Turing Machines. We use the basic ideas of the construction in [Wal00] in order to prove that the program complexity of the problem (i.e., assuming the *CTL* formula is fixed) is still EXPTIME-hard.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we recall syntax and semantics of *CTL** and *CTL* [EH86, CE81]. Also, we define pushdown systems and the model checking problem.

CTL* and **CTL logics.** The logic *CTL** is a branching-time temporal logic [EH86], where a path quantifier, E (“for some path”) or A (“for all paths”), can be followed by an arbitrary linear-time formula, allowing boolean combinations and nesting, over the usual linear temporal operators X (“next”), \mathcal{U} (“until”), F (“eventually”), and G (“always”). There are two types of formulas in *CTL**: *state formulas*, whose satisfaction is related to a specific state, and *path formulas*, whose satisfaction is related to a specific path. Formally, for a finite set AP of proposition names, the class of state formulas φ and the class of path formulas θ are defined by the following syntax:

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi &:= prop \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid A \theta \mid E \theta \\ \theta &:= \varphi \mid \neg\theta \mid \theta \wedge \theta \mid X\theta \mid \theta \mathcal{U} \theta\end{aligned}$$

where $prop \in AP$. The set of state formulas φ forms the language *CTL**. The other operators can be introduced as abbreviations in the usual way: for instance, $F\theta$ abbreviates *true* $\mathcal{U} \theta$ and $G\theta$ abbreviates $\neg F \neg \theta$.

The *Computation Tree Logic CTL* [CE81] is a restricted subset of *CTL**, obtained restricting the syntax of path formulas θ as follows: $\theta := X\varphi \mid \varphi \mathcal{U} \varphi$. This means that X and \mathcal{U} must be immediately preceded by a path quantifier.

The models for the logic *CTL** are labelled graphs $\langle W, R, \mu \rangle$ where W is a countable set of vertices, $R \subseteq W \times W$ is the edge relation, and $\mu : W \rightarrow 2^{AP}$ maps each vertex $w \in W$ to the set of atomic propositions that hold in w . Such labelled graphs are called transition systems (TS, for short) here. In this context vertices are also called (global) states. For $(w, w') \in R$, we say that w' is a successor of w . A path is a (finite or infinite) sequence of vertices $\pi = w_0, w_1, \dots$ such that $(w_i, w_{i+1}) \in R$ for any $i \geq 0$. We denote the suffix w_i, w_{i+1}, \dots of π by π^i , and the i -th vertex of π by $\pi(i)$. A *maximal* path is either an infinite path or a finite path leading to a vertex without successors.

Let $G = \langle W, R, \mu \rangle$ be an TS, $w \in W$, and π be a maximal path of G . For a state (resp., path) formula φ (resp. θ), the satisfaction relation $(G, w) \models \varphi$ (resp., $(G, \pi) \models \theta$), meaning that φ (resp., θ) holds at state w (resp., holds along π) in G , is defined by induction. The clauses for proposition letters, negation, and conjunction are standard. For the other constructs we have:

- $(G, w) \models A \theta$ iff for each maximal path π in G from w , $(G, \pi) \models \theta$;
- $(G, w) \models E \theta$ iff there exists a maximal path π from w such that $(G, \pi) \models \theta$;

- $(G, \pi) \models \varphi$ iff $(G, \pi(0)) \models \varphi$;
- $(G, \pi) \models X\theta$ iff $\pi(1)$ is defined and $(G, \pi^1) \models \theta$;
- $(G, \pi) \models \theta_1 \cup \theta_2$ iff there exists $i \geq 0$ such that $(G, \pi^i) \models \theta_2$ and for all $0 \leq j < i$, we have $(G, \pi^j) \models \theta_1$.

Pushdown systems. A pushdown system (*PDS*, for short) is a tuple $\mathcal{S} = \langle AP, \Gamma, P, \Delta, L \rangle$, where AP is a finite set of proposition names, Γ is a finite stack alphabet, P is a finite set of (control) states, $\Delta \subseteq (P \times (\Gamma \cup \{\gamma_0\})) \times (P \times \Gamma^*)$ is a *finite* set of transition rules (where $\gamma_0 \notin \Gamma$ is the *stack bottom symbol*), and $L : P \times (\Gamma \cup \{\gamma_0\}) \rightarrow 2^{AP}$ is a labelling function. A *configuration* is a pair (p, α) where $p \in P$ is a control state and $\alpha \in \Gamma^* \cdot \gamma_0$ is a stack content. For each $(p, B) \in P \times (\Gamma \cup \{\gamma_0\})$, we denote by $\text{next}_{\mathcal{S}}(p, B)$ the finite set (possibly empty) of the pairs (p', β) such that $((p, B), (p', \beta)) \in \Delta$. The size $|\mathcal{S}|$ of \mathcal{S} is $|P| + |\Delta|$, with $|\Delta| = \sum_{((p, B), (p', \beta)) \in \Delta} |\beta|$.

The semantics of an *PDS* $\mathcal{S} = \langle AP, \Gamma, P, \Delta, L \rangle$ is described by an *TS* $G_{\mathcal{S}} = \langle W, R, \mu \rangle$, where W is the set of pushdown configurations, for all $(p, B \cdot \alpha) \in W$ with $B \in \Gamma \cup \{\gamma_0\}$, $\mu(p, B \cdot \alpha) = L(p, B)$, and R is defined as follows:

- $((p, B \cdot \alpha), (p', \beta)) \in R$ iff there is $((p, B), (p', \beta')) \in \Delta$ such that either $B \in \Gamma$ and $\beta = \beta' \cdot \alpha$, or $B = \gamma_0$ (note that $\alpha = \varepsilon$) and $\beta = \beta' \cdot \gamma_0$ (note that every transition that removes the bottom symbol γ_0 also pushes it back).

For each configuration $w \in W$, we denote by $bd_{\mathcal{S}}(w)$ the number of successors of w (note that $bd_{\mathcal{S}}(w)$ is finite).

The *pushdown model checking* problem (PMC problem, for short) against *CTL* (resp., *CTL*^{*}) is to decide, for a given *PDS* \mathcal{S} , an initial configuration w_0 of \mathcal{S} , and a *CTL* (resp., *CTL*^{*}) formula φ , whether $(G_{\mathcal{S}}, w_0) \models \varphi$.

3 Tree Automata

In order to solve the PMC problem for *CTL*^{*}, we use an automata theoretic approach; in particular, we exploit the formalisms of *Alternating Parity (finite-state) Tree automata* (*APT*, for short) [MS87, EJ91] and *Alphabet-free alternating parity pushdown automata* (*PD-APA*, for short).

Let \mathbb{N} be the set of positive integers. A *tree* T is a subset of \mathbb{N}^* such that if $i \cdot x \in T$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathbb{N}^*$, then also $x \in T$ and for all $1 \leq j < i$, $j \cdot x \in T$. The elements of T are called *nodes* and the empty word ε is the *root* of T . For $x \in T$, the set of *children* (or *successors*) of x (in T) is $\text{children}(T, x) = \{i \cdot x \in T \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$. For $x \in T$, a (full) path π of T from x is a *minimal* set $\pi \subseteq T$ such that $x \in \pi$ and for each $y \in \pi$ such that $\text{children}(T, y) \neq \emptyset$, there is exactly one node in $\text{children}(T, y)$ belonging to π . For $k \geq 1$, the (complete) k -ary tree is the tree $\{1, \dots, k\}^*$. For an alphabet Σ , a Σ -labelled tree is a pair $\langle T, V \rangle$ where T is a tree and $V : T \rightarrow \Sigma$ maps each node of T to a symbol in Σ . Note that $\langle T, V \rangle$ corresponds to the labelled graph $G_T = \langle T, R, V \rangle$ where $(x, y) \in R$ iff $y \in \text{children}(T, x)$. If $\Sigma = 2^{AP}$, then for a given *CTL*^{*} formula φ over AP , we say that $\langle T, V \rangle$ satisfies φ if $(G_T, \varepsilon) \models \varphi$.

For a set X , let $\mathcal{B}^+(X)$ be the set of positive boolean formulas over X . Elements of X are called *atoms*. For $Y \subseteq X$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{B}^+(X)$, we say that Y satisfies ψ iff assigning **true** to all elements of Y and assigning **false** to all elements of $X \setminus Y$, makes ψ true. For $k \geq 1$, we denote by $[k]$ the set $\{1, \dots, k\}$.

Alternating Parity (finite-state) Tree automata (APT). We describe APT over (complete) k -ary trees for a given $k \geq 1$. Formally, an APT is a tuple $\mathcal{A} = \langle \Sigma, Q, q_0, \delta, F \rangle$, where Σ is a finite input alphabet, Q is a finite set of states, $q_0 \in Q$ is an initial state, $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^+([k] \times Q)$ is a transition function, and F is a parity acceptance condition [EJ91], i.e., $F = \{F_1, \dots, F_m\}$ is a sequence of subsets of Q , where $F_1 \subseteq F_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq F_m = Q$ (m is called the index of \mathcal{A}).

A run of \mathcal{A} on a Σ -labelled k -ary tree $\langle T, V \rangle$ (where $T = [k]^*$) is a labelled tree $\langle T_r, r \rangle$ in which each node is labelled by an element of $T \times Q$. A node in T_r labelled by (x, q) describes a copy of the automaton that is in the state q and reads the node x of T . Note that many nodes of T_r can correspond to the same node of T . The labels of a node and its children (successors) have to satisfy the transition function. Formally, a run over $\langle T, V \rangle$ is a $T \times Q$ -labelled tree $\langle T_r, r \rangle$ such that $r(\varepsilon) = (\varepsilon, q_0)$ and for all $y \in T_r$ with $r(y) = (x, q)$, the following holds:

- there is a (possibly empty) set $\{(h_1, q_1), \dots, (h_n, q_n)\} \subseteq [k] \times Q$ satisfying $\delta(q, V(x))$ such that for each $1 \leq j \leq n$, $j \cdot y \in T_r$ and $r(j \cdot y) = (h_j \cdot x, q_j)$.

Note that several copies of the automaton may go to the same direction and that the automaton is not required to send copies to all the directions. The automaton \mathcal{A} is *symmetric* if for each $(q, \sigma) \in Q \times \Sigma$, $\delta(q, \sigma)$ is a positive boolean combination of sub-formulas (called *generators*) either of the form $\bigvee_{i=1}^{i=k}(i, q')$ or of the form $\bigwedge_{i=1}^{i=k}(i, q')$ (note that q' is independent from the specific direction i). The *size* $|\mathcal{A}|$ of a symmetric APT \mathcal{A} is $|Q| + |\delta| + |F|$ where $|\delta| = \sum_{(q, \sigma) \in Q \times \Sigma} |\delta(q, \sigma)|$ and $|\delta(q, \sigma)|$ is the length of the formula obtained from $\delta(q, \sigma)$ considering each generator occurring in $\delta(q, \sigma)$ as an atomic proposition.

For a run $\langle T_r, r \rangle$ over $\langle T, V \rangle$ and an infinite path $\pi \subseteq T_r$, let $inf_r(\pi) \subseteq Q$ be the set such that $q \in inf_r(\pi)$ iff there are infinitely many $y \in \pi$ such that $r(y) \in T \times \{q\}$. For the parity acceptance condition $F = \{F_1, \dots, F_m\}$, π is *accepting* if there is an even $1 \leq i \leq m$ such that $inf_r(\pi) \cap F_i \neq \emptyset$ and for all $j < i$, $inf_r(\pi) \cap F_j = \emptyset$. A run $\langle T_r, r \rangle$ is *accepting* if all its infinite paths are accepting. The automaton \mathcal{A} accepts an input tree $\langle T, V \rangle$ iff there is an accepting run of \mathcal{A} over $\langle T, V \rangle$. The language of \mathcal{A} , denoted $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$, is the set of Σ -labelled (complete) k -ary trees accepted by \mathcal{A} .

It is well-known that formulas of CTL^* can be translated to tree automata. In particular, we are interested in optimal translations to symmetric APT.

Lemma 1 ([Kvw00]). *Given a CTL^* formula φ over AP and $k \geq 1$, we can construct a symmetric APT of size $O(2^{|\varphi|})$ and index $O(|\varphi|)$ that accepts exactly the set of 2^{AP} -labelled complete k -ary trees satisfying φ .¹*

¹ [Kvw00] gives a translation from CTL^* to *Hesitant alternating tree automata* which are a special case of parity alternating tree automata.

Alphabet-free alternating parity pushdown automata (*PD-APA*). An *PD-APA* is a tuple $\mathcal{P} = \langle \Gamma, P, p_0, \alpha_0, \rho, F \rangle$, where Γ is a finite stack alphabet, P is a finite set of (control) states, $p_0 \in P$ is an initial state, $\alpha_0 \in \Gamma^* \cdot \gamma_0$ is an initial stack content, $\rho : P \times (\Gamma \cup \{\gamma_0\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^+(P \times \Gamma^*)$ is a transition function, and $F = \{F_1, \dots, F_m\}$ is a *parity* acceptance condition over P . Intuitively, when the automaton \mathcal{P} is in state p and the stack contains a word $B \cdot \alpha \in \Gamma^* \cdot \gamma_0$, then \mathcal{P} chooses a (possibly empty) finite set $\{(p_1, \beta_1), \dots, (p_n, \beta_n)\} \subseteq P \times \Gamma^*$ satisfying $\rho(p, B)$ and splits in n copies such that for each $1 \leq j \leq n$, the j -th copy moves to state p_j and updates the stack content by removing B and pushing β_j .

Formally, a run of \mathcal{P} is a $P \times \Gamma^*. \gamma_0$ -labelled tree $\langle T_r, r \rangle$ such that $r(\varepsilon) = (p_0, \alpha_0)$ and for all $y \in T_r$ with $r(y) = (p, B \cdot \alpha)$ and $B \in \Gamma \cup \{\gamma_0\}$, the following holds:

- there is a (possibly empty) finite set $\{(p_1, \beta_1), \dots, (p_n, \beta_n)\} \subseteq P \times \Gamma^*$ satisfying $\rho(p, B)$ such that for each $1 \leq j \leq n$, $j \cdot y \in T_r$ and $r(j \cdot y) = (p_j, \beta_j \cdot \alpha)$ if $B \neq \gamma_0$, and $r(j \cdot y) = (p_j, \beta_j \cdot \gamma_0)$ otherwise (note that in this case $\alpha = \varepsilon$).

The notion of *accepting* path $\pi \subseteq T_r$ is defined as for *APT* with $\text{inf}_r(\pi)$ defined as follows: $\text{inf}_r(\pi) \subseteq P$ is the set such that $p \in \text{inf}_r(\pi)$ iff there are infinitely many $y \in \pi$ for which $r(y) \in \{p\} \times \Gamma^* \cdot \gamma_0$. A run $\langle T_r, r \rangle$ is *accepting* if every infinite path $\pi \subseteq T_r$ is accepting. The *emptiness* problem for *PD-APA* is to decide, for a given *PD-APA*, the existence of an accepting run.

For $(p, \alpha) \in P \times \Gamma^*$, the size of (p, α) is $|\alpha|$. The size $|\rho|$ of the transition function is given by $\sum_{(p, B) \in P \times (\Gamma \cup \{\gamma_0\})} |\rho(p, B)|$ where $|\rho(p, B)|$ is the sum of the sizes of the occurrences of atoms in $\rho(p, B)$.

In the following we are interested in the emptiness problem for *PD-APA*. In [KPV02], an optimal algorithm is given to solve the emptiness problem for nondeterministic parity pushdown tree automata. This algorithm is based on a polynomial reduction to the emptiness of two-way alternating parity tree automata, which is known to be decidable in exponential time [Var98]. By a similar reduction we obtain the following.

Proposition 1. *The emptiness problem for PD-APA with index m and transition function ρ is solvable in time exponential in $m \cdot |\rho|$.*

4 Upper Bound for CTL^*

We solve the PMC problem for CTL^* using an automata theoretic approach. We fix an *PDS* $\mathcal{S} = \langle AP, \Gamma, P, \Delta, L \rangle$, an initial configuration $w_0 = (p_0, \alpha_0)$ of \mathcal{S} , and a CTL^* formula φ . The unwinding of the TS $G_{\mathcal{S}} = \langle W, R, \mu \rangle$ from w_0 induces a W -labelled tree $\langle T_{\mathcal{S}}, V_{\mathcal{S}} \rangle$: the root of $T_{\mathcal{S}}$ is associated with the initial configuration w_0 , and each node $x \in T_{\mathcal{S}}$ labelled by $w \in W$ has $bds(w)$ successors, each associated with a successor w' of w .² In the following, we sometime view $\langle T_{\mathcal{S}}, V_{\mathcal{S}} \rangle$

² Assuming that W is ordered, there is indeed only a single such tree. Since CTL^* formulas cannot distinguish between trees obtained by different orders, we do not lose generality by considering a particular order.

as a 2^{AP} -labelled tree, taking the label of a node x to be $\mu(V_S(x))$ instead of $V_S(x)$. Which interpretation is intended will be clear from the context.

Evidently, $(G_S, w_0) \models \varphi$ iff $\langle T_S, V_S \rangle$ satisfies φ . Therefore, the model checking problem of S against φ can be reduced to check whether $\langle T_S, V_S \rangle$ belongs to the language of the *APT* (whose existence is guaranteed by Lemma 1) accepting the tree-models of φ . However, note that the branching degree of T_S is not uniform and, in particular, some nodes of T_S may not have successors. We solve this problem as follows. Let $k = \max\{bd_S(w) \mid w \in W\}$ (note that k is finite and can be trivially computed from the transition relation Δ of S). We can encode the computation tree $\langle T_S, V_S \rangle$ as a $2^{AP \cup \{t\}} \cup \{\perp\}$ -labelled complete k -ary tree (where \perp and t are fresh proposition names not belonging to AP) in the following way: first, we add the proposition t to the label of all leaf nodes (corresponding to configurations without successors) of the tree T_S ; second, for each node $x \in T_S$ with d children $1 \cdot x, \dots, d \cdot x$ (note that $0 \leq d \leq k$), we add the children $(d+1) \cdot x, \dots, k \cdot x$ and label these new nodes with \perp ; finally, for each node x labelled by \perp we add recursively k children labelled by \perp . Let $\langle [k]^*, \tilde{V}_S \rangle$ be the tree thus obtained. Since a node labelled by \perp stands for a node that actually does not exist, we have to take this into account when we interpret CTL^* formulas over the tree $\langle [k]^*, \tilde{V}_S \rangle$. This means that we have to consider only the paths in this tree (called “legal” paths) that either never visit a node labelled by \perp or contain a *terminal* node (i.e. a node labelled by t). Note that a path is *not* “legal” iff it satisfies the formula $\neg t \mathcal{U} \perp$. In order to achieve this, we define inductively a function $f : CTL^* \text{ formulas} \rightarrow CTL^* \text{ formulas}$ such that $f(\varphi)$ restricts path quantification to only “legal” paths:

- $f(prop) = prop$ for any proposition $prop \in AP$;
- $f(\neg\varphi) = \neg f(\varphi);$
- $f(E\varphi) = E((G\neg\perp) \wedge f(\varphi)) \vee E((F t) \wedge f(\varphi));$
- $f(A\varphi) = A((\neg t \mathcal{U} \perp) \vee f(\varphi));$
- $f(X\varphi) = X(f(\varphi) \wedge \neg\perp);$
- $f(\varphi_1 \mathcal{U} \varphi_2) = (f(\varphi_1) \wedge \neg\perp) \mathcal{U} (f(\varphi_2) \wedge \neg\perp).$

Note that $|f(\varphi)| = O(|\varphi|)$. By definition of f , it follows that $\langle T_S, V_S \rangle$ satisfies φ (i.e., $(G_S, w_0) \models \varphi$) iff $\langle [k]^*, \tilde{V}_S \rangle$ satisfies $f(\varphi)$.

Let $\mathcal{A}_{f(\varphi)} = \langle 2^{AP \cup \{t\}} \cup \{\perp\}, Q, q_0, \delta, F \rangle$, with $F = \{F_1, \dots, F_m\}$, be the symmetric *APT* (whose existence is guaranteed by Lemma 1) accepting exactly the $2^{AP \cup \{t\}} \cup \{\perp\}$ -labelled complete k -ary trees that satisfy $f(\varphi)$. We have to check whether $\langle [k]^*, \tilde{V}_S \rangle$ belongs to the language $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_{f(\varphi)})$. We reduce this problem to the emptiness of an *PD-APA* $\mathcal{P} = \langle \Gamma, (P \cup \{\perp\}) \times Q, (p_0, q_0), \alpha_0, \rho, F' \rangle$, which is defined as follows. The states of \mathcal{P} consist either of pairs of states of S and states of $\mathcal{A}_{f(\varphi)}$, or pairs of the form (\perp, q) where q is a state of $\mathcal{A}_{f(\varphi)}$. Intuitively, when the automaton \mathcal{P} is in state $(p, q) \in P \times Q$ with stack content α , and (p, α) is a configuration associated with some node x of $\langle T_S, V_S \rangle$, then \mathcal{P} simulates the behaviour of \mathcal{A} starting from state q on the input tree given by the subtree of $\langle [k]^*, \tilde{V}_S \rangle$ rooted at node x . Moreover, in state (\perp, q) , \mathcal{P} simulates the behaviour of \mathcal{A} from state q on the input tree in which all nodes are labelled by \perp .

The parity acceptance condition F' is given by $\{(P \cup \{\perp\}) \times F_1, \dots, (P \cup \{\perp\}) \times F_m\}$. Finally, the transition function ρ is defined as follows:

- for each $(p, q) \in P \times Q$ and $B \in \Gamma \cup \{\gamma_0\}$, $\rho((p, q), B)$ is defined as follows. Let $\text{next}_S(p, B) = \{(p_1, \alpha_1), \dots, (p_d, \alpha_d)\}$ (note that $0 \leq d \leq k$). If $d > 0$ (resp., $d = 0$), then $\rho((p, q), B)$ is obtained from formula $\delta(q, L(p, B))$ (resp., $\delta(q, L(p, B) \cup \{t\})$) by replacing each generator occurring in it of the form $\bigvee_{i=1}^{i=k} (i, q')$ with $\bigvee_{i=1}^{i=d} ((p_i, q'), \alpha_i) \vee \bigvee_{i=d+1}^{i=k} ((\perp, q'), \varepsilon)$, and each generator of the form $\bigwedge_{i=1}^{i=k} (i, q')$ with $\bigwedge_{i=1}^{i=d} ((p_i, q'), \alpha_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=d+1}^{i=k} ((\perp, q'), \varepsilon)$;
- for each $q \in Q$ and $B \in \Gamma \cup \{\gamma_0\}$, $\rho((\perp, q), B)$ is obtained from formula $\delta(q, \perp)$ by replacing each generator occurring in it of the form $\mathcal{C}_{i=1}^{i=k} (i, q')$, where $\mathcal{C} \in \{\vee, \wedge\}$, with $\mathcal{C}_{i=1}^{i=k} ((\perp, q'), \varepsilon)$.

It is not hard to see that \mathcal{P} has an accepting run iff $\langle [k]^*, \tilde{V}_S \rangle \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_{f(\varphi)})$.

Note that the size $|\rho|$ of the transition function of \mathcal{P} is bounded by $k \cdot |\delta| \cdot |\Delta|$. By Lemma 1, it follows that \mathcal{P} has index $O(|\varphi|)$ and $|\rho|$ is bounded by $O(k \cdot 2^{|\varphi|} \cdot |\Delta|)$. Then, by Proposition 1 we obtain the main result of this section.

Theorem 1. *Given an PDS $\mathcal{S} = \langle AP, \Gamma, P, \Delta, L \rangle$, a configuration w_0 of \mathcal{S} , and a CTL* formula φ , the model checking problem of \mathcal{S} with respect to φ is solvable in time exponential in $k \cdot |\Delta| \cdot 2^{|\varphi|}$ with $k = \max\{bd_{\mathcal{S}}(w) \mid w \in P \times \Gamma^* \cdot \gamma_0\}$.*

5 Lower Bounds

In this section we give lower bounds for the PMC problem against *CTL** and for the program complexity of the PMC problem against *CTL*. The lower bound for *CTL* (resp., *CTL**) is shown by a reduction from the word problem for PSPACE–bounded (resp., EXPSPACE–bounded) alternating Turing Machines. Without loss of generality, we consider a model of alternation with a binary branching degree. Formally, an alternating Turing Machine (TM, for short) is a tuple $\mathcal{M} = \langle \Sigma, Q, Q_{\forall}, Q_{\exists}, q_0, \delta, F \rangle$, where Σ is the input alphabet, which contains the blank symbol $\#$, Q is the finite set of states, which is partitioned into $Q = Q_{\forall} \cup Q_{\exists}$, Q_{\exists} (resp., Q_{\forall}) is the set of existential (resp., universal) states, q_0 is the initial state, $F \subseteq Q$ is the set of accepting states, and the transition function δ is a mapping $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow (Q \times \Sigma \times \{L, R\})^2$.

Configurations of \mathcal{M} are words in $\Sigma^* \cdot (Q \times \Sigma) \cdot \Sigma^*$. A configuration $\eta \cdot (q, \sigma) \cdot \eta'$ denotes that the tape content is $\eta\sigma\eta'$, the current state is q , and the reading head is at position $|\eta| + 1$. When \mathcal{M} is in state q and reads an input $\sigma \in \Sigma$ in the current tape cell, then it nondeterministically chooses a triple (q', σ', dir) in $\delta(q, \sigma) = \langle (q_l, \sigma_l, dir_l), (q_r, \sigma_r, dir_r) \rangle$, and then moves to state q' , writes σ' in the current tape cell, and its reading head moves one cell to the left or to the right, according to dir . For a configuration c , we denote by $\text{succ}_l(c)$ and $\text{succ}_r(c)$ the successors of c obtained choosing respectively the left and the right triple in $\langle (q_l, \sigma_l, dir_l), (q_r, \sigma_r, dir_r) \rangle$. The configuration c is *accepting* if the associated state q belongs to F . Given an input $x \in \Sigma^*$, a computation tree of \mathcal{M} on x is a tree in which each node corresponds to a configuration. The root of the tree corresponds to the initial configuration associated with x .³ A node that corresponds to a universal configuration (i.e., the associated state is in Q_{\forall}) has two

³ We assume that initially \mathcal{M} 's reading head is scanning the first cell of the tape.

successors, corresponding to $\text{succ}_l(c)$ and $\text{succ}_r(c)$, while a node that corresponds to an existential configuration (i.e., the associated state is in Q_{\exists}) has a single successor, corresponding to either $\text{succ}_l(c)$ or $\text{succ}_r(c)$. The tree is *accepting* if all its paths (from the root) visit an accepting configuration. An input $x \in \Sigma^*$ is *accepted* by \mathcal{M} if there exists an accepting computation tree of \mathcal{M} on x .

If \mathcal{M} is PSPACE-bounded (resp., EXPSPACE-bounded), then there is a constant $k \geq 1$ such that for each $x \in \Sigma^*$, the space needed by \mathcal{M} on input x is bounded by $k \cdot |x|$ (resp., $2^{k \cdot |x|}$). It is well-known [CKS81] that EXPTIME (resp., 2EXPTIME) coincides with the class of all languages accepted by PSPACE-bounded (resp., EXPSPACE-bounded) alternating Turing Machines.

EXPTIME-hardness of the pushdown model checking problem against *CTL* was shown by Walukiewicz [Wal00] using a reduction from the word problem for PSPACE-bounded alternating Turing Machines. We use the basic ideas of the construction in [Wal00] in order to prove that the program complexity of the problem (i.e., assuming the *CTL* formula is fixed) is still EXPTIME-hard.

Theorem 2. *The program complexity of the PMC problem for CTL is EXPTIME-hard.*

Proof. We show that there is a *CTL* formula φ such that given a PSPACE-bounded alternating Turing Machine $\mathcal{M} = \langle \Sigma, Q, Q_V, Q_{\exists}, q_0, \delta, F \rangle$ and an input x , it is possible to define an *PDS* \mathcal{S} and a configuration w of \mathcal{S} , whose sizes are polynomial in $n = k \cdot |x|$ and in $|\mathcal{M}|$,⁴ such that \mathcal{M} accepts x iff $(G_{\mathcal{S}}, w) \models \varphi$.

Note that any reachable configuration of \mathcal{M} over x can be seen as a word in $\Sigma^* \cdot (Q \times \Sigma) \cdot \Sigma^*$ of length exactly n . If $x = \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_r$ (where $r = |x|$), then the initial configuration is given by $(q_0, \sigma_1)\sigma_2 \dots \sigma_r \underbrace{\#\# \dots \#}_{n-r}$.

\mathcal{S} guesses accepting computation trees of \mathcal{M} starting from TM configurations of length n . The internal nodes of these trees are non-accepting configurations and the leaves are accepting configurations. The trees are traversed as follows. If the current non-accepting configuration c is universal, then \mathcal{S} , first, will examine the subtrees associated with the left successor of c , and successively the subtrees associated with the right successor. If instead c is existential, then \mathcal{S} will guess one of the two successors of c and, consequently, it will examine only the subtrees associated with this successor. In order to guess an accepting tree (if any) from a given configuration, \mathcal{S} keeps track on the stack of the path from the root to the actual TM configuration by pushing the new guessed configurations and popping when backtracking along the accepting subtree guessed so far. Therefore, \mathcal{S} accepts by empty stack. The stack alphabet of \mathcal{S} is given by $\Sigma \cup (Q \times \Sigma) \cup \{\exists_l, \exists_r, \forall_l, \forall_r\}$ where \exists_l and \exists_r (resp., \forall_l and \forall_r) are used to delimitate the left and right successors of an existential (resp., universal) configuration. The behaviour of \mathcal{S} can be subdivided in three steps.

1. *Generation of a TM configuration (operative phase)* - \mathcal{S} generates nondeterministically by push transitions a TM configuration c followed by a symbol

⁴ Where $k \geq 1$ is a constant such that for each input $y \in \Sigma^*$, the space needed by \mathcal{M} on input y is bounded by $k \cdot |y|$.

in $\{\forall_l, \exists_l, \exists_r\}$ on the stack, with the constraint that \forall_l is chosen iff c is a universal configuration (i.e., the TM state q associated with c belongs to Q_{\forall}). In this phase, a (control) state of \mathcal{S} has the form $(gen, q, i, flag)$, where $q \in Q$ keeps track of the TM state associated with c , gen is a label identifying the current operation of \mathcal{S} , $i \in \{0, \dots, n+1\}$ is used to ensure that c has exactly length n , and $flag \in \{0, 1\}$ is used to ensure that $c \in \Sigma^* \cdot (Q \times \Sigma) \cdot \Sigma^*$.

When \mathcal{S} finishes to generate a TM configuration c followed by a symbol $m \in \{\forall_l, \exists_l, \exists_r\}$, i.e. \mathcal{S} is in a state of the form $(gen, q, n+1, 1)$, then it chooses nondeterministically between two possible options. Choosing the first option, \mathcal{S} goes to state *cont*, pops m from the stack, and performs Step 3 (see below). Choosing the second option, the behaviour of \mathcal{S} depends on whether c is accepting. If c is *not* accepting (i.e., $q \notin F$), then \mathcal{S} guesses a successor of c going to a state of the form $(gen, q', 0, 0)$ for some $q' \in Q$ without changing the stack content. Therefore, Step 1 is newly performed. If instead c is accepting (i.e., $q \in F$), then \mathcal{S} goes to state *rem*, pops m from the stack, and performs Step 2 (see below).

2. *Removing a TM configuration (operative phase)* - When \mathcal{S} is in state *rem*, it removes deterministically by pop transitions the TM configuration c on the top of the stack (if any). After having removed c , if the symbol on the top of the stack, say B , belongs to $\{\forall_r, \exists_l, \exists_r\}$ (this means intuitively that \mathcal{S} has already generated a “pseudo” accepting computation tree for the TM configuration currently on the top of the stack), then \mathcal{S} pops B from the stack and goes to state *rem* (i.e., Step 2.2 is newly performed). If instead $B = \forall_l$, then \mathcal{S} goes to a state of the form $(gen, q', 0, 0)$ for some $q' \in Q$ and replaces \forall_l with the symbol \forall_r on the top of the stack. Therefore, Step 1 is newly performed. Finally, if $B = \gamma_0$ (i.e., the stack is empty), then \mathcal{S} goes to state *fin* and terminates its computation.
3. *Checking δ -consistency (control phase)*- When \mathcal{S} is in state *cont*, it checks that one of the following holds:

- the stack contains exactly one TM configuration.
- the stack content has the form $c' \cdot m \cdot c \cdot \alpha$ where c and c' are TM configurations and $m \in \{\exists_l, \exists_r, \forall_l, \forall_r\}$.

In the first case, \mathcal{S} signals success by generating (by its finite control) the symbol *good*. In the second case, \mathcal{S} signals success if and only if c' is a TM successor of c in accordance with m , i.e.: $c' = succ_s(c)$ where $s = l$ iff $m \in \{\exists_l, \forall_l\}$. In order to understand how this can be done by using a number of states polynomial in n and $|\mathcal{M}|$, let $c = a_1 \dots a_n$. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, the value a'_i of the i -th cell of $succ_l(c)$ (resp., $succ_r(c)$) is completely determined by the values a_{i-1} , a_i and a_{i+1} (taking a_{n+1} for $i = n$ and a_0 for $i = 1$ to be some special symbol, say “-”). As in [KTMV00], we denote by $next_l(a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1})$ (resp., $next_r(a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1})$) our expectation for a'_i (these functions can be trivially obtained from the transition function of \mathcal{M}). Then, in state *cont*, \mathcal{S} chooses nondeterministically between n states, $cont_1, \dots, cont_n$ without changing the stack content. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, if \mathcal{S} is in state *cont_i*, then first, it *deterministically* removes $c' \cdot m$ from the stack, keeping track by its finite control of m and the i -th symbol a'_i of

c' . Successively, \mathcal{S} deterministically removes c from the stack, keeping also track of the symbols a_{i-1} , a_i , and a_{i+1} . Finally, \mathcal{S} checks whether $a'_i = \text{next}_s(a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1})$ with $s = l$ iff $m \in \{\exists_l, \forall_l\}$. If this condition is satisfied (and only in this case), then \mathcal{S} generates the symbol *good* and terminates the computation.

Formally, $\mathcal{S} = \langle AP, \Gamma, P, \Delta, L \rangle$ is defined as follows:

- $AP = \{op, cont, good, fin\}$ and $\Gamma = \Sigma \cup (Q \times \Sigma) \cup \{\forall_l, \forall_r, \exists_l, \exists_r\}$;
- $P = \{good, fin, rem\} \cup P_G \cup P_\delta$ where $P_G = \{(gen, q, i, flag) \mid q \in Q, 0 \leq i \leq n+1, flag \in \{0, 1\}, flag = 0 \text{ if } i = 0 \text{ and } flag = 1 \text{ if } i = n, n+1\}$ is the set of (control) states used in Step 1, and P_δ , which is used in Step 3, is given by $\{cont, cont_1, \dots, cont_n\} \cup \{(cont_i, j, a) \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n \text{ and } a \in \Sigma \cup (Q \times \Sigma)\} \cup \{(cont_i, j, a, m, a_1, a_2, a_3) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 0 \leq j \leq n, m \in \{\forall_l, \forall_r, \exists_l, \exists_r\}, a, a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \Sigma \cup (Q \times \Sigma) \cup \{-\}, \text{ and } a \neq -\}$
- $((p, B), (p', \beta)) \in \Delta$ iff one of the following holds:
 - *Step 1 (generation of a TM configuration)* - If $p \in P_G$, then:
 - * if $p = (gen, q, i, flag)$ and $i < n$, then $\beta = B'B$ with $B' \in \Sigma \cup (\{q\} \times \Sigma)$ and $p' = (gen, q, i+1, flag')$. Moreover, if $flag = 1$, then $B' \in \Sigma$ and $flag' = 1$; otherwise, $flag' = 0$ iff $B' \in \Sigma$.
 - * if $p = (gen, q, n, 1)$, then $p' = (gen, q, n+1, 1)$ and $\beta = B'B$ with $B' = \forall_l$ if $q \in Q_\forall$, and $B' \in \{\exists_l, \exists_r\}$ otherwise.
 - * if $p = (gen, q, n+1, 1)$, then or (1) $\beta = \varepsilon$ and $p' = cont$, or (2) $q \notin F$, $\beta = B \in \Gamma$, and $p' = (gen, q', 0, 0)$ for some $q' \in Q$, or (3) $q \in F$, $\beta = \varepsilon$, and $p' = rem$.
 - *Step 2 (Removing a TM configuration)*. If $p = rem$, then:
 - * if $B \in \Sigma \cup (Q \times \Sigma) \cup \{\forall_r, \exists_l, \exists_r\}$, then $\beta = \varepsilon$ and $p' = rem$;
 - * if $B = \forall_l$, then $\beta = \forall_r$ and $p' = (gen, q', 0, 0)$ for some $q' \in Q$;
 - * if $B = \gamma_0$, then $\beta = \varepsilon$, and $p' = fin$.
 - *Step 3 (Checking δ -consistency)*. If $p \in P_\delta$, then:
 - * if $p = cont$, then $\beta = B$ and $p' = cont_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$.
 - * if $p = cont_i$, then $B \in \Sigma \cup (Q \times \Sigma)$, $\beta = \varepsilon$, and $p' = (cont_i, 1, B)$;
 - * if $p = (cont_i, j, a)$ and $j < n$, then $B \in \Sigma \cup (Q \times \Sigma)$, $\beta = \varepsilon$, and $p' = (cont_i, j+1, a')$ where $a' = B$ if $j = i-1$, and $a' = a$ otherwise;
 - * if $p = (cont_i, n, a)$, then either $B = \gamma_0$, $\beta = \varepsilon$, and $p' = good$, or $B \in \{\exists_l, \forall_l, \exists_r, \forall_r\}$, $\beta = \varepsilon$, and $p' = (cont_i, 0, a, B, -, -, -)$;
 - * if $p = (cont_i, j, a, m, a_1, a_2, a_3)$ and $j < n$, then $B \in \Sigma \cup (Q \times \Sigma)$, $\beta = \varepsilon$, and $p' = (cont_i, j+1, a, m, a'_1, a'_2, a'_3)$ where for each $1 \leq h \leq 3$, $a'_h = B$ if $j = i+h-3$, and $a'_h = a_h$ otherwise;
 - * if $p = (cont_i, n, a, m, a_1, a_2, a_3)$, then $a = \text{next}_s(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ where $s = l$ if and only if $m \in \{\exists_l, \forall_l\}$. Moreover, $\beta = \varepsilon$ and $p' = good$.
- For all $B \in \Gamma \cup \{\gamma_0\}$, $L(good, B) = \{good\}$, $L(fin, B) = \{fin\}$, $L(rem, B) = op$, for all $p \in P_G$, $L(p, B) = \{op\}$, and for all $p \in P_\delta$, $L(p, B) = \{cont\}$.

Let $G_S = \langle W, R, \mu \rangle$. The correctness of the construction is stated by the following claim:

Claim. Given a TM configuration c with TM state q , there is an accepting computation tree of \mathcal{M} over c iff there is a path of $G_{\mathcal{S}}$ of the form $\pi = w_0 w_1 \dots w_n$ such that $w_0 = ((gen, q, n, 1), c \cdot \gamma_0)$, $\mu(w_n) = fin$, and for each $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, $\mu(w_i) = op$ and if w_i has a successor w'_i such that $\mu(w'_i) = cont$, then each path from w'_i visits a state of the form $(good, \beta)$.

The condition in the claim above can be encoded by the following *CTL* formula

$$\varphi := E \left([op \wedge AX(cont \rightarrow AF good)] \cup fin \right) \quad (1)$$

Let c_0 be the initial TM configuration (associated with the input x). Then, by Claim 1 it follows that \mathcal{M} accepts x iff $(G_{\mathcal{S}}, w) \models \varphi$ where $w = ((gen, q_0, n, 1), c_0 \cdot \gamma_0)$. Since φ is independent from \mathcal{M} and n , and the sizes of $|\mathcal{S}|$ and w are polynomial in n and $|\mathcal{M}|$, the assertion holds. \square

Theorem 3. *Pushdown model checking against CTL* is 2EXPTIME-hard.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M} = \langle \Sigma, Q, Q_{\forall}, Q_{\exists}, q_0, \delta, F \rangle$ be an EXPSPACE-bounded alternating Turing Machine, and let k be a constant such that for each $x \in \Sigma^*$, the space needed by \mathcal{M} on input x is bounded by $2^{k \cdot |x|}$. Given an input $x \in \Sigma^*$, we define an PDS \mathcal{S} , a configuration $w_0 = (p_0, \gamma_0)$ of \mathcal{S} , and a *CTL** formula φ , whose sizes are *polynomial* in $n = k \cdot |x|$ and in $|\mathcal{M}|$, such that \mathcal{M} accepts x iff $(G_{\mathcal{S}}, w_0) \models \varphi$. Some ideas in the proposed reduction are taken from [KTMV00], where there are given lower bounds for the satisfiability of extensions of *CTL* and *CTL**.

Note that any reachable configuration of \mathcal{M} over x can be seen as a word in $\Sigma^* \cdot (Q \times \Sigma) \cdot \Sigma^*$ of length exactly 2^n . If $x = \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_r$ (where $r = |x|$), then the initial configuration is given by $(q_0, \sigma_1)\sigma_2 \dots \sigma_r \underbrace{\# \dots \#}_{2^n - r}$.

Each cell of a TM configuration is coded using a block of n symbols of the stack alphabet of \mathcal{S} . The whole block is used to encode both the content of the cell and the location (the number of cell) on the TM tape (note that the number of cell is in the range $[0, 2^n - 1]$ and can be encoded using n bits). The stack alphabet is given by $\{\forall_l, \forall_r, \exists_l, \exists_r\} \cup (\Sigma \cup (Q \times \Sigma)) \times 2^{\{b, e, f, cn, l\}}$ where b is used to mark the first element of a TM block, e (resp., f) to mark the first (resp., the last) block of a TM configuration, cn to encode the number of cell, and l to mark a left TM successor.

The behaviour of \mathcal{S} is similar to that of the pushdown system defined in the proof of Theorem 2. The main differences can be summarized as follows:

- *Generation of a TM configuration (Step 1)* When \mathcal{S} generates nondeterministically a TM configuration c on the stack, it ensures that each block of c has length n and the symbols b , f , and e are used properly. Moreover, if c is generated as a successor of an other TM configuration, i.e. the stack content before generating c has the form $m \cdot \alpha$ with $m \in \{\exists_l, \exists_r, \forall_l, \forall_r\}$, then \mathcal{S} ensures that the label l is used properly, i.e. any element of c is marked by l iff $m \in \{\exists_l, \forall_l\}$. However, \mathcal{S} does *not* ensure the the cell numbers of c are encoded properly (indeed, this would require a number of control states exponential in n).

- *Generation of the initial TM configuration* - Starting from the global state $w_0 = (p_0, \gamma_0), \mathcal{S}$, first, generates the encoding of the initial TM configuration c_0 (associated with the input x) on the stack. Note that \mathcal{S} ensures that c_0 has the form $(q_0, \sigma_1)\sigma_2\dots\sigma_r\#\#\dots$. However, \mathcal{S} does not ensure that the number of blanks to the right of σ_r is exactly $2^n - r$.
- *Checking δ -consistency* - As for the pushdown system defined in the proof of Theorem 2, after having generated a TM configuration on the stack, \mathcal{S} can choose nondeterministically to go to the (control) state *cont*. When \mathcal{S} is in state *cont*, it chooses nondeterministically between two options *cont*₁ and *cont*₂ (without changing the stack content). Assume that the stack content has the form $c \cdot \alpha$ where c is a “pseudo” TM configuration generated in Step 1, and either α is empty or it has the form $m \cdot c' \cdot \alpha'$ where $m \in \{\exists_l, \exists_r, \forall_l, \forall_r\}$ and c' is a “pseudo” TM configuration. Then, choosing option *cont*₁, \mathcal{S} removes deterministically (by pop transitions) c from the stack and terminates its computation. The computation tree $\langle T, V \rangle$ of $G_{\mathcal{S}}$ rooted at the global state associated with *cont*₁ reduces to a finite path π (corresponding to the configuration c). We use a *CTL** formula φ_1 on this tree $\langle T, V \rangle$ in order to require that the cell numbers of c are encoded correctly (this also implies that the number of blocks of c is exactly 2^n). For each node $u \in \pi$, let $cn(u)$ be the truth value (1 for *true* and 0 for *false*) of the proposition cn in u . Let us consider two consecutive TM blocks $u_1 \dots u_n u'_1 \dots u'_n$ along π , and let k (resp., k') be the number of cell of the first block (resp., the second block), i.e., the integer whose binary code is given by $cn(u_1) \dots cn(u_n)$ (resp., $cn(u'_1) \dots cn(u'_n)$). We have to require that $k' = (k + 1) \bmod 2^n$, and $k = 0$ (resp., $k' = 2^n - 1$) if $u_1 \dots u_n$ corresponds to the first block of c , i.e. u_1 is labelled by proposition e (resp., $u'_1 \dots u'_n$ corresponds to the last block of c , i.e. u'_1 is labelled by proposition f). Therefore, φ_1 is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} AG \left(\left((b \wedge e) \rightarrow \bigwedge_{j=0}^{n-1} (AX)^j \neg cn \right) \wedge \left((b \wedge f) \rightarrow \bigwedge_{j=0}^{n-1} (AX)^j cn \right) \wedge \right. \\ \left[(b \wedge \neg f) \longrightarrow \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} [(AX)^j (\neg cn \wedge (AX)^n cn) \wedge \right. \\ \left. \left. \bigwedge_{i>j} (AX)^i (cn \wedge (AX)^n \neg cn) \wedge \bigwedge_{i<j} (AX)^i (cn \leftrightarrow (AX)^n cn)] \right] \right) \end{aligned}$$

Choosing the second option *cont*₂, \mathcal{S} , first, removes deterministically c from the stack with the additional ability to generate (by its finite control) the symbol *check*₁. Successively, assuming that α has the form $m \cdot c' \cdot \alpha'$, \mathcal{S} removes $m \cdot c'$ from the stack (by pop transitions) and simultaneously generates (by its finite control) at most at one block of c' the symbol *check*₂. After this operation, \mathcal{S} terminates its computation. Let $\langle T, V \rangle$ be the computation tree of $G_{\mathcal{S}}$ rooted at the global state associated with *cont*₂. If α is empty, then by construction, T reduces to a finite path labelled by proposition *check*₁ and corresponding to configuration c . If instead α has the form $m \cdot c' \cdot \alpha'$, then each path (from the root) of T consists of a sequence of nodes corresponding to c labelled by *check*₁ followed by a sequence of nodes corresponding to c' with at most one block labelled by *check*₂. This allows us to define a *CTL** formula φ_2 , asserted on the tree $\langle T, V \rangle$, (whose size is polynomial in n and $|\mathcal{M}|$) in order to require that in the case α is not empty (i.e., α has the form

$m \cdot c' \cdot \alpha'$), c is a TM successor of c' in accordance with m , i.e. $c = \text{succ}_s(c')$ where $s = l$ iff $m \in \{\exists_l, \forall_l\}$ (note that by Step 1, $m \in \{\exists_l, \forall_l\}$ iff c is marked by symbol l). Formula φ_2 is defined as follows:

$$\text{AG}(\neg\text{check}_2) \vee \text{AG}((\text{check}_1 \wedge b) \rightarrow E(\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2))$$

where the path formulas θ_1 and θ_2 are defined below. Note that the subformula $\text{AG}(\neg\text{check}_2)$ manages the case in which α is empty. In the other case, we require that for each node $u \in T$ labelled by check_1 and b , i.e. associated with the first element of a block bl of c , there is a path π from u satisfying the following two properties:

1. π visits a node labelled by check_2 and b , i.e. associated with the first element of a block bl' of c' , such that bl and bl' have the same number of cell. This requirement is specified by the path formula θ_1 :

$$\theta_1 := \psi_1 \wedge X(\psi_2 \wedge X(\psi_3 \wedge \dots X(\psi_n) \dots))$$

where for each $1 \leq j \leq n$, ψ_j is defined as follows

$$(cn \rightarrow F(\text{check}_2 \wedge b \wedge X^{j-1} cn)) \wedge (\neg cn \rightarrow F(\text{check}_2 \wedge b \wedge X^{j-1} \neg cn))$$

2. Let $\Sigma' := \Sigma \cup (Q \times \Sigma)$ and let us denote by $\sigma(\hat{bl})$ the Σ' -value of a TM block \hat{bl} . By construction and Property 1 above, there is exactly one node of π that is labelled by check_2 and b . Moreover, by Property 1 this node is associated with a TM block bl' of c' having the same number of cell of bl . Therefore, we have to require that $\sigma(bl) = \text{next}_s(\sigma(bl_{prec}), \sigma(bl'), \sigma(bl_{succ}))$ where bl_{prec} and bl_{succ} represent the blocks soon before and soon after bl' along π , and $s = l$ iff the TM configuration c is a left TM successor (i.e. all nodes of bl are labelled by proposition l). This requirement is expressed by the path formula θ_2 . We distinguish three cases depending on whether bl corresponds to the first block, to the last block or to a non-extremal block of the associated TM configuration c . For simplicity, we consider only the case in which bl is a non-extremal block. The other cases can be handled similarly.

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_2 := & (\neg f \wedge \neg e) \longrightarrow \\ & \bigvee_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3 \in \Sigma'} (F(\sigma_1 \wedge (X)^n (\sigma_2 \wedge b \wedge \text{check}_2 \wedge (X)^n \sigma_3)) \wedge \\ & (l \rightarrow \text{next}_l(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)) \wedge (\neg l \rightarrow \text{next}_r(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3))) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, formula φ is obtained from formula (1) in the proof of Theorem 2 by replacing the subformula $AX(\text{cont} \rightarrow AF\text{good})$ in (1) with the formula $AX[\text{cont} \rightarrow (EX(\text{cont}_1 \wedge \varphi_1) \wedge EX(\text{cont}_2 \wedge \varphi_2))]$. \square

Now, we can prove the main result of this paper.

Theorem 4.

- (1) *The program complexity of the PMC problem for CTL is EXPTIME-complete.*
- (2) *The PMC problem for CTL* is 2EXPTIME-complete. The program complexity of the problem is EXPTIME-complete.*

Proof. Claims 1 follows from Theorem 2 and the fact that model-checking pushdown systems against CTL is known to be EXPTIME-complete [Wal00], while Claim 2 directly follows from Theorems 1 and 3, and Claim 1. \square

References

- [AEM04] R. Alur, K. Etessami, and P. Madhusudan. A temporal Logic of Nested Calls and Returns. In *TACAS'04*, pages 467–481, 2004.
- [BEM97] A. Bouajjani, J. Esparza, and O. Maler. Reachability Analysis of Pushdown Automata: Application to Model-Checking. In *CONCUR'97*, LNCS 1243, pages 135–150. Springer-Verlag, 1997.
- [Cau96] D. Caucal. On infinite transition graphs having a decidable monadic theory. In *Proc. the 23th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP'96)*, LNCS 1099, pages 194–205. Springer-Verlag, 1996.
- [CE81] E.M. Clarke and E.A. Emerson. Design and verification of synchronization skeletons using branching time temporal logic. In *Proceedings of Workshop on Logic of Programs*, LNCS 131, pages 52–71. Springer-Verlag, 1981.
- [CKS81] A.K. Chandra, D.C. Kozen, and L.J. Stockmeyer. Alternation. *Journal of the ACM*, 28(1):114–133, 1981.
- [EH86] E.A. Emerson and J.Y. Halpern. Sometimes and not never revisited: On branching versus linear time. *Journal of the ACM*, 33(1):151–178, 1986.
- [EHR00] J. Esparza, D. Hansel, P. Rossmanith, and S. Schwoon. Efficient algorithms for model checking pushdown systems. In *CAV'00*, LNCS 1855, pages 232–247. Springer-Verlag, 2000.
- [EJ91] E.A. Emerson and C.S. Jutla. Tree automata, μ -calculus and determinacy. In *FOCS'91*, pages 368–377, 1991.
- [EKS03] J. Esparza, A. Kucera, and S. Schwoon. Model checking LTL with regular valuations for pushdown systems. *Inf. Comput.*, 186(2):355–376, 2003.
- [KPV02] O. Kupferman, N. Piterman, and M.Y. Vardi. Pushdown specifications. In *LPAR'02*, LNCS 2514, pages 262–277. Springer-Verlag, 2002.
- [KTMV00] O. Kupferman, P.S. Thiagarajan, P. Madhusudan, and M.Y. Vardi. Open systems in reactive environments: Control and Synthesis. In *CONCUR'00*, LNCS 1877, pages 92–107. Springer-Verlag, 2000.
- [KVV00] O. Kupferman, M.Y. Vardi, and P. Wolper. An Automata-Theoretic Approach to Branching-Time Model Checking. *Journal of the ACM*, 47(2):312–360, 2000.
- [MS85] D.E. Muller and P.E. Shupp. The theory of ends, pushdown automata, and second-order logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 37:51–75, 1985.
- [MS87] D.E. Muller and P.E. Shupp. Alternating automata on infinite trees. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 54:267–276, 1987.
- [PV04] N. Piterman and M.Y. Vardi. Global model-checking of infinite-state systems. In *CAV'04*, LNCS 3114, pages 387–400. Springer-Verlag, 2004.
- [SC85] A.P. Sistla and E.M. Clarke. The complexity of propositional linear temporal logics. *Journal of the ACM*, 32(3):733–749, 1985.
- [Var88] M.Y. Vardi. A temporal fixpoint calculus. In *POPL'88*, pages 250–259. ACM Press, 1988.
- [Var98] M.Y. Vardi. Reasoning about the past with two-way automata. In *ICALP'98*, LNCS 1443, pages 628–641. Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- [Wal96] I. Walukiewicz. Pushdown processes: Games and Model Checking. In *CAV'96*, LNCS 1102, pages 62–74. Springer-Verlag, 1996.
- [Wal00] I. Walukiewicz. Model checking CTL properties of pushdown systems. In *FSTTCS'00*, LNCS 1974, pages 127–138. Springer-Verlag, 2000.