Real Equation Systems with Alternating Fixed-points

(full version with proofs)

Jan Friso Groote and Tim A.C. Willemse

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands {J.F.Groote,T.A.C.Willemse}@tue.nl

Abstract

We introduce the notion of a Real Equation System (RES), which lifts Boolean Equation Systems (BESs) to the domain of extended real numbers. Our RESs allow arbitrary nesting of least and greatest fixed-point operators. We show that each RES can be rewritten into an equivalent RES in normal form. These normal forms provide the basis for a complete procedure to solve RESs. This employs the elimination of the fixed-point variable at the left side of an equation from its right-hand side, combined with a technique often referred to as Gauß-elimination. We illustrate how this framework can be used to verify quantitative modal formulas with alternating fixed-point operators interpreted over probabilistic labelled transition systems.

1 Introduction

The modal mu-calculus is a logic that allows to formulate and verify a very wide range of properties on behaviour, far more expressive than virtually any other behavioural logic around [3, 2]. For instance, CTL and LTL can be mapped to it, but the reverse is not possible. By allowing data parameters in the fixed point variables in modal formulas, this can even be done linearly, without loss of computational effectiveness [5]. Using alternating fixed-points, the modal mu-calculus can intrinsically express various forms of fairness, which in other logics can often only be achieved by adding special fairness operators.

An effective way to evaluate a modal property on a labelled transition system is by translating both to a single Boolean Equation System (BES) with alternating fixed-points [20, 22]. Exactly if the initial boolean variable of the obtained BES has the solution true, the property is valid for the labelled transition system. A BES with alternating fixed-points is equivalent to a parity game [21, 2]. There are many algorithms to solve BESs and parity games [26, 4, 17, 25]. Although, it is a long standing open problem whether a polynomial algorithm exists to solve BESs [4, 17], the existing algorithms work remarkably well in practical contexts.

For a while now, it has been argued that modal logics can become even more effective if they provide quantitative answers [15, 16], such as durations, probabilities and expected values. In this paper we lift boolean equation systems to real numbers to form a framework for the evaluation of quantitative modal formulas, and call the result *Real Equation Systems (RESs)*, i.e., fixed-point equation systems over the domain of the extended reals, $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$. Conjunction and disjunction are interpreted as minimum and maximum, and new operators such as addition and multiplication with positive constants are added. A typical example of a real equation system is the following

$$\mu X = (\frac{1}{2}X + 1) \lor (\frac{1}{5}Y + 3),$$

$$\nu Y = ((\frac{1}{10}Y - 10) \lor (2X + 5)) \land 17.$$

Based on Tarski's fixed-point theorem, this real equation system has a unique solution. Using the method provided in this paper we can determine this solution using algebraic manipulation. In the case above, see Section 4, the second fixed-point equation can be simplified to $\nu Y = -\frac{100}{9} \lor ((2X+5) \land 17)$. It is sound to substitute this in the first equation, which becomes $\mu X = (\frac{1}{2}X+1) \lor \frac{7}{9} \lor ((\frac{2}{5}X+4) \land \frac{32}{5})$. This equation can be solved for X yielding $X = \frac{32}{5}$, from which it directly follows that Y = 17.

Concretely, this paper has the following results. We define real equation systems with alternating fixed-points. The base syntax for expressions is equal to that of [7] with constants, minimum, maximum, addition and multiplication with positive real constants. We add four additional operators, namely two conditional operators, and two tests for infinity, which turn out to be required to algebraically solve arbitrary real equation systems.

We provide algebraic laws that allow to transform any expression to *conjunctive/disjunctive normal* form. Based on this normal form we provide rules that allow to eliminate each variable bound in the left-hand side of an equation from the right-hand side of that equation. This enables 'Gauß-elimination', developed for BESs, using which any real equation system can be solved.

We provide a quantitative modal logic, and define how a quantitative formula and a (probabilistic) labelled transition system ((p)LTS) can be transformed into a RES. The solution of the initial variable of this equation system is equal to the evaluation of the quantitative formula on the labelled transition system. We also briefly touch upon the embedding of BESs into RESs.

The approach in this paper follows the tradition of boolean equation systems [19, 20, 21]. By allowing data parameters in the fixed-point variables we obtain Parameterised Boolean Equation Systems (PBESs) which is a very expressive framework that forms the workhorse for model checking [22, 13, 11]. In this paper we do not address such parametric extensions, as they are pretty straightforward, but in combination with parameterised quantitative modal logic, it will certainly provide a very versatile framework for quantitative model checking.

There are a number of extensions of the boolean equation framework to the setting of reals but these typically limit themselves to only single fixed-points. In [7] the minimal integer solutions for a set of equations with only minimal fixed-points is determined. In [8] a polynomial algorithm is provided to find the minimal solution for a set of real equation systems. In [1] convex lattice equation systems are introduced, also restricted to a single fixed-point. In that paper a proof system is given to show that all models of the equations are consistent, meaning that the evaluation of a quantitative modal formula is limited by some upper-bound.

In [24], the Łukasiewicz μ -calculus is studied, which resembles RESs restricted to the interval [0,1]. This logic does allow minimal and maximal fixed-points. They provide two algorithmic ways of computing the solutions for formulas in their logic, viz. an indirect method that builds formulas in the first-order theory of linear arithmetic and exploits quantifier elimination, and a method that uses iteration to refine successive approximations of conditioned linear expressions. Embedding our logic in the Łukasiewicz μ -calculus can be done by mapping the extended reals onto the interval [0,1] using an appropriate sigmoid function. But such a mapping does not map our addition and constant multiplication to available counterparts in the Łukasiewicz μ -calculus, which prevents using algorithms for Łukasiewicz μ -terms [18, 24] to our setting. However, as the Łukasiewicz μ -calculus is directly encodable into the RES framework, all our results are directly applicable to the Łukasiewicz μ -calculus. The proofs of all lemmas and theorems are given in Appendix A.

2 Expressions and normal forms

We work in the setting of extended real numbers, i.e., $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty, -\infty\}$, denoted by $\hat{\mathbb{R}}$. We assume the normal total ordering \leq on $\hat{\mathbb{R}}$ where $-\infty \leq x$ and $x \leq \infty$ for all $x \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$. Throughout this text we employ a set \mathcal{X} of variables and valuations $\eta: \mathcal{X} \to \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ that map variables to extended reals. We write $\eta(X)$ to apply η to X, and $\eta[X:=r]$ to adapt valuations by:

$$\eta[X:=r](Y) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} r & \text{if } X=Y, \\ \eta(Y) & \text{otherwise.} \end{array} \right.$$

We consider expressions over the set \mathcal{X} of variables with the following syntax.

$$e ::= X \mid d \mid c \cdot e \mid e + e \mid e \land e \mid e \lor e \mid e \Rightarrow e \diamond e \mid e \rightarrow e \diamond e \mid eq_{\infty}(e) \mid eq_{-\infty}(e)$$

where $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $d \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ is a constant, $c \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ a positive constant, + represents addition, \wedge stands for minimum, \vee for maximum, $_{-} \Rightarrow _{-} \diamond _{-}$ and $_{-} \rightarrow _{-} \diamond _{-}$ are conditional operators, and eq_{∞} and $eq_{-\infty}$ are

auxiliary functions to check for $\pm \infty$. The conditional operators and the checks for infinity occur naturally while solving fixed-point equations and therefore, we made them part of the syntax. We apply valuations to expressions, as in $\eta(e)$, where η distributes over all operators in the expression.

The interpretation of these operators on the domain $\hat{\mathbb{R}}$ is largely obvious. A variable X gets a value by a valuation. Multiplying expressions with a constant c is standard, and yields $\pm \infty$ if applied on $\pm \infty$. The conditional operators, addition and infinity operators are defined below where $e, e_1, e_2, e_3 \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$.

$$\begin{split} e_1 + e_2 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 + e_2 & \text{if } e_1, e_2 \in \mathbb{R} \text{, i.e., apply normal addition,} \\ \infty & \text{if } e_1 = \infty \text{ or } e_2 = \infty, \\ -\infty & \text{if } e_i = -\infty \text{ and } e_{3-i} \neq \infty \text{ for } i = 1, 2. \end{array} \right. \\ e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_2 \wedge e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \leq 0, \\ e_3 & \text{if } e_1 > 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_2 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_2 & \text{if } e_1 < 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_2 & \text{if } e_1 < 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_2 & \text{if } e_1 < 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_2 & \text{if } e_1 < 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_2 & \text{if } e_1 < 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_2 & \text{if } e_1 < 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_2 & \text{if } e_1 < 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 & \text{if } e_1 \geq 0. \end{array} \right. \\ e_4 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\ e_2 \vee e_3 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} e_1 &= 0, \\$$

Note that all defined operators are monotonic on $\hat{\mathbb{R}}$. We have the identity $eq_{\infty}(e)=e+-\infty$, and so, we do not treat eq_{∞} as a primary operator. We write e[X:=e'] for the expression representing the syntactic substitution of e' for X in e. We write $\operatorname{OCC}(e)$ for the set of variables from \mathcal{X} occurring in e. Table 1 contains many useful algebraic laws for our operators.

The addition operator + has as property that $-\infty + \infty = \infty + -\infty = \infty$. One may require the other natural addition operator $\hat{+}$, as used in [8], satisfying that $-\infty \hat{+} \infty = \infty \hat{+} - \infty = -\infty$. It can be defined as follows:

$$e_1 + e_2 = eq_{-\infty}(e_1) \Rightarrow -\infty \diamond (eq_{-\infty}(e_2) \Rightarrow -\infty \diamond (e_1 + e_2)).$$

We can extend the syntax with unary negation -e with its standard meaning, and, provided no variable occurs in the scope of its definition within an odd number of negations, negation can be eliminated using standard simplification rules. Therefore, we do not consider it as a primary part of our syntax. At the end of Table 1 we list several identities involving negation. Note that operators + and $\hat{+}$ are each other's dual with regard to negation.

We introduce normal forms, crucial to solve real equation systems, where the sum, conjunction and disjunction over empty domains of variables equal $0, \infty$ and $-\infty$, respectively.

Definition 2.1. Let \mathcal{X} be a set of variables. An expression e is in *simple conjunctive normal form* iff it has the shape

$$\bigwedge_{i \in I} \bigvee_{j \in J_i} ((\sum_{X \in \mathcal{X}_{ij}} c^X_{ij} \cdot X) + (\sum_{X \in \mathcal{X}'_{ij}} eq_{-\infty}(X)) + d_{ij})$$

and it is in simple disjunctive normal form iff it has the shape

$$\bigvee_{i \in I} \bigwedge_{j \in J_i} ((\sum_{X \in \mathcal{X}_{ij}} c^X_{ij} \cdot X) + (\sum_{X \in \mathcal{X}'_{ij}} eq_{-\infty}(X)) + d_{ij})$$

where $\mathcal{X}_{ij} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X}'_{ij} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ are finite sets of variables, $c^X_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and $d_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$. An expression e is in *conjunctive*, resp. disjunctive normal form iff

- 1. e is in simple conjunctive, resp. disjunctive normal form, or
- 2. e has the shape $e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3$ or $e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3$ where e_1 is in simple conjunctive, resp. disjunctive normal form and e_2 and e_3 are conjunctive resp. disjunctive normal forms.

Lemma 2.2. Each expression e not containing the conditional operators $e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3$ or $e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3$ can be rewritten to a simple conjunctive or disjunctive normal form using the equations in Table 1.

Lemma 2.3. Expression of the forms $e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3$ and $e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3$ can be rewritten to equivalent expressions where the first argument of such a conditional operator is a simple conjunctive or disjunctive normal form using the equations in Table 1.

```
I_{\vee}
\mathrm{D}_{\perp}^{+}
               (e_1 + e_2) + e_3 = e_1 + (e_2 + e_3)
                                                                                                               C+
                                                                                                                              e_1 + e_2 = e_2 + e_1
D_{\vee}^{\vee}
               (e_1 \vee_2) \vee e_3 = e_1 \vee (e_2 \vee e_3)
                                                                                                               C \lor
                                                                                                                              e_1 \lor e_2 = e_2 \lor e_1
               (e_1 \wedge e_2) \wedge e_3 = e_1 \wedge (e_2 \wedge e_3)
                                                                                                                              e_1 \wedge e_2 = e_2 \wedge e_1
D_{\Rightarrow}
             (e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) \Rightarrow f_1 \diamond f_2 = ((e_1 \lor e_2) \land e_3) \Rightarrow f_1 \diamond f_2
               (e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) \rightarrow f_1 \diamond f_2 = e_1 \rightarrow (e_2 \Rightarrow f_1 \diamond f_2) \diamond (e_2 \lor e_3 \Rightarrow f_1 \diamond f_2)
D^c_{\rightarrow}
               c \cdot (e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) = e_1 \Rightarrow c \cdot e_2 \diamond c \cdot e_3
               (e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) + f = e_1 \Rightarrow (e_2 + f) \diamond (e_3 + f)
D^{\wedge}
               (e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) \land f = e_1 \Rightarrow (e_2 \land f) \diamond (e_3 \land f)
               (e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) \lor f = e_1 \Rightarrow (e_2 \lor f) \diamond (e_3 \lor f)
D^{-}
               (e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) \rightarrow f_1 \diamond f_2 = (e_2 \lor (e_1 \land e_3)) \rightarrow f_1 \diamond f_2
               (e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) \Rightarrow f_1 \diamond f_2 = e_1 \Rightarrow (e_2 \land e_3 \rightarrow f_1 \diamond f_2) \diamond (e_3 \rightarrow f_1 \diamond f_2)
\mathrm{D}_{\sim}^c
               c \cdot (e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) = e_1 \rightarrow c \cdot e_2 \diamond c \cdot e_3
D+
               (e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) + f = e_1 \rightarrow (e_2 + f) \diamond (e_3 + f)
D^{\wedge}
              (e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) \land f = e_1 \rightarrow (e_2 \land f) \diamond (e_3 \land f)
\mathrm{D}^{\scriptscriptstyle\vee}_{\scriptscriptstyle\vee}
              (e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) \vee f = e_1 \rightarrow (e_2 \vee f) \diamond (e_3 \vee f)
\mathsf{D}^{\wedge}_{+}
               e_1 + (e_2 \wedge e_3) = (e_1 + e_2) \wedge (e_1 + e_3) \mathsf{D}^{\downarrow}_{\vee} e_1 + (e_2 \vee e_3) = (e_1 + e_2) \vee (e_1 + e_3)
\mathrm{D}^c_{\perp}
               c \cdot (e_1 + e_2) = c \cdot e_1 + c \cdot e_2
               c \cdot (e_1 \wedge e_2) = c \cdot e_1 \wedge c \cdot e_2
\mathsf{D}^c_\wedge
                                                                                                               \mathsf{D}^c_\vee
                                                                                                                        c \cdot (e_1 \vee e_2) = c \cdot e_1 \vee c \cdot e_2
\mathbf{D}_{\vee}^{\vee}
               e_1 \wedge (e_2 \vee e_3) = (e_1 \wedge e_2) \vee (e_1 \wedge e_3)
                                                                                                              \mathbf{D}_{\wedge}^{\vee} \quad e_1 \vee (e_2 \wedge e_3) = (e_1 \vee e_2) \wedge (e_1 \vee e_3)
                                                                                                              \begin{array}{ll} \mathbf{D}_{\infty}^{-\infty} & eq_{-\infty}(eq_{\infty}(e)) = eq_{\infty}(e) \\ \mathbf{D}_{-\infty}^{-\infty} & eq_{-\infty}(eq_{-\infty}(e)) = eq_{-\infty}(e) \end{array}
             eq_{\infty}(eq_{\infty}(e)) = eq_{\infty}(e)
\mathbf{D}_{-\infty}^{\infty} \ eq_{\infty}(eq_{-\infty}(e)) = eq_{-\infty}(e)
                                                                                                              D_c^{-\infty} \quad eq_{-\infty}(c \cdot x) = eq_{-\infty}(x)
D_c^{\infty}
               eq_{\infty}(c \cdot e) = eq_{\infty}(e)
\begin{array}{ll} \mathbb{D}_{+}^{\infty} & eq_{\infty}(e_{1}+e_{2}) = eq_{\infty}(e_{1}) + eq_{\infty}(e_{2}) = eq_{\infty}(e_{1}) \vee eq_{\infty}(e_{2}) \\ \mathbb{D}_{+}^{\infty} & eq_{-\infty}(e_{1}+e_{2}) = (eq_{-\infty}(e_{1}) \vee eq_{\infty}(e_{2})) \wedge (eq_{\infty}(e_{1}) \vee eq_{-\infty}(e_{2})) \end{array}
                                                                                                       \mathbf{D}_{\vee}^{-\infty} \ eq_{-\infty}(e_1 \vee e_2) = eq_{-\infty}(e_1) \vee eq_{-\infty}(e_2)
               eq_{\infty}(e_1 \vee e_2) = eq_{\infty}(e_1) \vee eq_{\infty}(e_2)
                                                                                                          \begin{array}{ll} \mathbf{D}_{\wedge}^{-\infty} & eq_{-\infty}(e_1 \wedge e_2) = eq_{-\infty}(e_1) \wedge eq_{-\infty}(e_2) \\ \mathbf{E}_{-\infty}^{\vee} & eq_{\infty}(e) \vee eq_{-\infty}(e) = eq_{-\infty}(e) \end{array}
\begin{array}{c} D_{\wedge}^{\infty} \\ E_{\infty}^{\wedge} \end{array}
               eq_{\infty}(e_1 \wedge e_2) = eq_{\infty}(e_1) \wedge eq_{\infty}(e_2)
               eq_{\infty}(e) \wedge eq_{-\infty}(e) = eq_{\infty}(e)
               eq_{\infty}(e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) = e_1 \Rightarrow eq_{\infty}(e_2) \diamond eq_{\infty}(e_3)
\mathbf{D}_{\Rightarrow}^{-\infty} \ eq_{-\infty}(e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) = e_1 \Rightarrow eq_{-\infty}(e_2) \diamond eq_{-\infty}(e_3)
\overrightarrow{D_{\infty}}
            eq_{\infty}(e_1 \to e_2 \diamond e_3) = e_1 \to eq_{\infty}(e_2) \diamond eq_{\infty}(e_3)
\mathbf{D}_{\rightarrow}^{-\infty} \ eq_{-\infty}(e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) = e_1 \rightarrow eq_{-\infty}(e_2) \diamond eq_{-\infty}(e_3)
D_c^-
              -c \cdot e = c \cdot -e
\mathrm{D}_{-}^{+}
              -(e_1 + e_2) = -e_1 + -e_2
                                                                                                             D_{\hat{1}}^- - (e_1 + e_2) = -e_1 + -e_2
                                                                                                              D_{\vee}
               -(e_1 \vee e_2) = -e_1 \wedge -e_2
                                                                                                                          -(e_1 \wedge e_2) = -e_1 \vee -e_2
             -(e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) = -e_1 \rightarrow -e_3 \diamond -e_2 \qquad \mathbf{D}_{\rightarrow}^- \qquad -(e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3) = -e_1 \Rightarrow -e_3 \diamond -e_2
            -eq_{\infty}(e) = eq_{-\infty}(-e)
                                                                                                              D_{-\infty}^- - eq_{-\infty}(e) = eq_{\infty}(-e)
```

Table 1: Algebraic laws

Theorem 2.4. Each expression e can be rewritten to both a conjunctive and a disjunctive normal form using the equations in Table 1.

3 Real equation systems and Gauß-elimination

In this section we introduce Real Equation Systems (RESs) as sequences of fixed-point equations, introduce a natural equivalence between RESs, and provide a generic solution method, known as Gauß-elimination [20].

Definition 3.1. Let \mathcal{X} be a set of variables. A *Real Equation System (RES)* \mathcal{E} is a finite sequence of (fixed-point) equations

$$\sigma_1 X_1 = e_1, \ldots, \sigma_n X_n = e_n$$

where σ_i is either the minimal fixed-point operator μ or the maximal fixed-point operator ν , $X_i \in \mathcal{X}$ are variables and e_i are expressions. We write $\mathsf{bnd}(\mathcal{E})$ for the set of variables occurring in the left-hand side, i.e., $\mathsf{bnd}(\mathcal{E}) = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$.

The empty sequence of equations is denoted by ε .

The semantics of a real equation system is a valuation giving the solutions of all variables, based on an initial valuation η giving the solution for all variables not bound in \mathcal{E} .

Definition 3.2. Let \mathcal{X} be a set of variables and \mathcal{E} be a real equation system over \mathcal{X} . The solution $[\![\mathcal{E}]\!]\eta: \mathcal{X} \to \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ yields an extended real number for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$, given a valuation $\eta: \mathcal{X} \to \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ of \mathcal{E} . It is inductively defined as follows:

$$\label{eq:definition} \begin{split} [\![\varepsilon]\!] \eta &= \eta, \\ [\![\sigma X \! = \! e, \mathcal{E}]\!] \eta &= [\![\mathcal{E}]\!] (\eta[X := \sigma(X, \mathcal{E}, \eta, e)]) \end{split}$$

where $\sigma(X, \mathcal{E}, \eta, e)$ is defined as

$$\begin{array}{l} \mu(X,\mathcal{E},\eta,e) = \bigwedge \{r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}} \mid r \geq [\![\mathcal{E}]\!] (\eta[X:=r])(e)\} \text{ and } \\ \nu(X,\mathcal{E},\eta,e) = \bigvee \{r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}} \mid [\![\mathcal{E}]\!] (\eta[X:=r])(e) \geq r\}. \end{array}$$

It is equivalent to write = instead of \geq in the above sets. This makes the fixed-points easier to understand. Note that if the real equation system is closed, i.e., all variables in the right-hand sides occur in $\mathsf{bnd}(\mathcal{E})$, the value $[\![\mathcal{E}]\!]\eta(X)$ is independent of η for all $X \in \mathsf{bnd}(\mathcal{E})$.

Following [14], we introduce the notion of equivalency between equation systems. We use the symbol \equiv to distinguish this equivalence from '=' used in equation systems.

Definition 3.3. Let $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}'$ be real equation systems. We say that $\mathcal{E} \equiv \mathcal{E}'$ iff $[\![\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}]\!] \eta = [\![\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F}]\!] \eta$ for all valuations η and real equation systems \mathcal{F} with $\mathsf{bnd}(\mathcal{F}) \cap (\mathsf{bnd}(\mathcal{E}) \cup \mathsf{bnd}(\mathcal{E}')) = \emptyset$.

In [14] it was observed that defining $\mathcal{E} \equiv \mathcal{E}'$ as $[\![\mathcal{E}]\!]\eta = [\![\mathcal{E}']\!]\eta$ for all η is not desirable, as the resulting equivalence is not a congruence. With this alternative notion, we find that $\mu X = Y$ and $\nu X = Y$ are equivalent. But $\mu X = Y$, $\nu Y = X$ and $\nu X = Y$, $\nu Y = X$ are not as the first one has solution $X = Y = -\infty$ and the second one has $X = Y = \infty$.

However, if the fixed-point symbol is the same, it is not necessary to take surrounding equations into account. This is a pretty useful lemma which makes the proofs in this paper much easier, and of which we are not aware that it occurs elsewhere in the literature.

Lemma 3.4. Let X be a variable, e and f be expressions and σ either the minimal or the maximal fixed-point symbol. If for any valuation η it holds that $[\![\sigma X = e]\!] \eta = [\![\sigma X = f]\!] \eta$ then $\sigma X = e \equiv \sigma X = f$.

The proof of the main Theorem 4.1 is quite involved and heavily uses the following two lemmas, which we only give for the minimal fixed-point. The formulations for the maximal fixed-point are dual.

Lemma 3.5. Let $X \in \mathcal{X}$ be a variable and e, f be expressions. It holds that $\mu X = e \equiv \mu X = f$ if for every valuation η :

E1
$$\frac{\mathcal{E} \equiv \mathcal{E}'}{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E} \equiv \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E}'}$$
. E2 $\frac{\mathcal{E} \equiv \mathcal{E}'}{\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F} \equiv \mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F}}$.

E3
$$\sigma X = e, \mathcal{E}, \sigma' Y = e' \equiv \sigma X = e[Y := e'], \mathcal{E}, \sigma' Y = e' \text{ if } X, Y \notin bnd(\mathcal{E}).$$

E4
$$\sigma X = e, \mathcal{E} \equiv \mathcal{E}, \sigma X = e$$
 if $occ(e) = \emptyset$ and $X \notin bnd(\mathcal{E})$.

E5
$$\sigma X = e, \sigma Y = e' \equiv \sigma Y = e', \sigma X = e.$$

E6
$$\frac{\mu X = e_1 \equiv \mu X = f_1 \text{ and } \mu X = e_2 \equiv \mu X = f_2}{\mu X = e_1 \wedge e_2 \equiv \mu X = f_1 \wedge f_2}.$$

E7
$$\frac{\nu X = e_1 \equiv \nu X = f_1 \text{ and } \nu X = e_2 \equiv \nu X = f_2}{\nu X = e_1 \lor e_2 \equiv \nu X = f_1 \lor f_2}$$
.

Table 2: Properties of the equivalence ≡ on RESs

- 1. for the smallest $r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r = \eta[X := r](e)$ it holds that there is an $r' \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfying that $r' \leq r$ and $r' \geq \eta[X := r'](f)$, and, vice versa,
- 2. for the smallest $r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r = \eta[X := r](f)$ it holds that there is an $r' \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfying that $r' \leq r$ and $r' \geq \eta[X := r'](e)$.

Lemma 3.6. If $\mu X = e \equiv \mu X = f$, then for any valuation η it holds that

- 1. for any $r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r \geq \eta[X := r](e)$, there is an $r' \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r' \leq r$ and $r' = \eta[X := r'](f)$, and, vice versa,
- 2. for any $r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r \geq \eta[X := r](f)$, there is an $r' \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r' \leq r$ and $r' = \eta[X := r'](e)$.

The notion of equivalence of Definition 3.3 is an equivalence relation on RESs and it satisfies the properties E1-E7 in Table 2. E1-E5 are proven for boolean equation systems in [14] and the proofs carry over to our setting. The proofs of E6 and E7 are given in Appendix B. In the table, σ and σ' stand for the fixed-point symbols μ and ν . The equivalences E3 and E4 above give a method to solve arbitrary equation systems, provided a single equation can be solved. Here, solving a single equation $\sigma X = e$ means replacing it by an equivalent equation $\sigma X = e'$ where X does not occur in e', which is the topic of the next section. This method is known as Gauß-elimination as it resembles the well-known Gauß-elimination procedure for sets of linear equations [20].

The idea behind Gauß-elimination for a real equation system $\mathcal E$ is as follows. First, the last equation $\sigma_n X_n = e_n$ of $\mathcal E$ is solved for X_n . Assume the solution is $\sigma_n X_n = e_n'$, where X_n does not occur in e_n' . Using E3 the expression e_n' is substituted for all occurrences X_n in right-hand sides of $\mathcal E$ removing all occurrences of X_n except in the left hand side of the last equation. Subsequently, this process is repeated for the one but last equation of $\mathcal E$ up to the first equation. Now the first equation has the shape $X_1 = e_1$ where no variable X_1 up till X_n occurs in e_1 . Using E4 this equation can be moved to the end of $\mathcal E$, and by applying E3 all occurrences of X_1 are removed from the right-hand sides of $\mathcal E$. This is then repeated for X_2 , which now also does not contain X_1, \ldots, X_n , until all variables X_1, \ldots, X_n have been removed from all right-hand sides of $\mathcal E$.

A concrete, but simple example is the following. Consider the real equation system

$$\mu X = Y$$
, $\nu Y = (X + 1) \wedge Y$.

We can derive:

$$\mu X = Y, \ \nu Y = (X+1) \land Y \stackrel{(\dagger)}{\equiv} \mu X = Y, \ \nu Y = X+1 \stackrel{E3}{\equiv} \mu X = X+1, \ \nu Y = X+1 \stackrel{(\dagger)}{\equiv} \mu X = -\infty, \ \nu Y = X+1 \stackrel{E4}{\equiv} \nu Y = X+1, \ \mu X = -\infty, \stackrel{E3}{\equiv} \nu Y = -\infty, \ \mu X = -\infty.$$

Solving the equation $\nu Y = (X+1) \wedge Y$ at (†) above, and $\mu X = X+1$ at (‡) can be done with simple fixed-point iteration. In $\nu Y = (X+1) \wedge Y$ fixed-pointed iteration starts with $Y = \infty$. This yields in the first iteration Y = X + 1, and this iteration is stable, and hence it is the maximal fixed-point solution. For $\mu X = X + 1$, the initial approximation $X = -\infty$ is also a solution, and hence the minimal solution. Unfortunately, fixed-point iteration does not terminate always. For instance, $\mu X = (X+1) \vee 0$ has minimal solution $X = \infty$, which can only be obtained via an infinite number of iteration steps.

Solving single equations

In this section we show that it is possible to solve each fixed-point equation $\sigma X = e$ in a finite number of steps. First assume that e does not contain conditional operators. If we have a minimal fixed-point equation $\mu X = e$, we know via Theorem 2.4 that we can rewrite e to simple conjunctive normal form. We want to explicitly expose occurrences of the variable X in the normal form of e and do this by denoting the normal form of e as shown in (1). Here, all expressions containing variables different from X are moved to f_{ij} or m_i .

$$\bigwedge_{i \in I} (\bigvee_{j \in J_i} (c_{ij} \cdot X + c'_{ij} \cdot eq_{-\infty}(X) + f_{ij}) \vee m_i). \tag{1}$$

The expressions f_{ij} and m_i do not contain X. Subexpressions $c_{ij} \cdot X$ are optional, i.e., abusing notation, we allow c_{ij} to be 0 if this sub-term is not present. Likewise, $eq_{-\infty}(X)$ is optional and therefore, c'_{ij} is either 0 or 1, where 0 means that the expression is not present. Constants c_{ij} and c'_{ij} cannot both be 0, as in that case the conjunct does not contain X and is hence part of m_i .

We define the solution of $\mu X = e$, in which e is assumed to be of shape (1), as $\mu X = Sol_{X=e}^{\mu}$ where:

$$Sol_{X=e}^{\mu} = \bigwedge_{i \in I} ((eq_{\infty}(\bigvee_{j \in J_{i}} f_{ij}))$$

$$\Rightarrow (eq_{-\infty}(m_{i}) \Rightarrow -\infty \diamond ((\bigvee_{j \in J_{i}} f_{ij} + (c_{ij} - 1) \cdot U_{i}) \lor \bigvee_{j \in J_{i} \mid c_{ij} = 1} \otimes \infty)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \infty)$$

$$(2)$$


where
$$U_i = m_i \lor \bigvee_{j \in J_i \mid c_{ij} < 1} \frac{1}{1 - c_{ij}} \cdot f_{ij}$$

where $U_i = m_i \vee \bigvee_{j \in J_i \mid c_{ij} < 1} \frac{1}{1 - c_{ij}} \cdot f_{ij}$. Note that we use the notation $\bigvee_{j \in J_i \mid cond}$ where cond is a condition. This means that the disjunction also observe that we use expressions such as is only taken over elements j that satisfy the condition. Also observe that we use expressions such as $\frac{1}{1-c_{ij}} \cdot f_{ij}$. This is an ordinary multiplication with $\frac{1}{1-c_{ij}}$ as positive constant. It is worth noting that if only rational numbers are used in the equations, the solutions to the variables are restricted to $-\infty$, ∞ and rationals.

It can be understood that (2) is a solution of (1) as follows. First observe that due to property E6 the solution of a minimal fixed-point distributes over the initial conjunction $\bigwedge_{i \in I}$ of clauses. This means that we can fix some $i \in I$ and only concentrate on understanding how one single clause $\bigvee_{i \in J_i} (c_{ij} \cdot X + i)$ $c'_{ij} \cdot eq_{-\infty}(X) + f_{ij}) \vee m_i$ must be solved. If f_{ij} is equal to ∞ for some $j \in J_i$, the solution must be infinite. This is ensured by the outermost conditional operator in (2). Now, assuming that no f_{ij} is equal to ∞ , we inspect m_i . If m_i equals $-\infty$, then the minimal solution for the given $i \in I$ is also $-\infty$. This explains the nested conditional operator in (2).

Next consider the innermost conditional operator of (2) and additionally assume $m_i > -\infty$. If there is some c'_{ij} that is equal to 1, then the minimal solution is at least m_i due to the disjunct m_i that appears in the clause. But then it must also be at least $1 \cdot eq_{-\infty}(m_i) = \infty$. Hence, in this case the solution is ∞ , which is ensured by the expression in the condition of the innermost conditional $\bigvee_{j \in J_i \mid c'_{ii} = 1} \infty$. Otherwise, all c'_{ij} equal 0, and both the right-hand side of (1) and the solution (2) can be simplified to

$$\bigvee_{j \in J_i} (c_{ij} \cdot X + f_{ij}) \vee m_i \quad \text{and} \quad (\bigvee_{j \in J_i \mid c_{ij} \ge 1} f_{ij} + (c_{ij} - 1) \cdot U_i) \Rightarrow U_i \diamond \infty.$$






Figure 1: Solving a simple minimal fixed-point equation/An LTS with an infinite sequence of b's

This resulting situation is best explained using Figure 1 (left). The simple conjunctive normal form consists of a number of disjunctions of the shape $c_{ij} \cdot X + f_{ij}$. These characterise lines of which we are interested in their intersection with the line x=y. In Figure 1 such lines are drawn as l_1,\ldots,l_4 , and h_1 and h_2 . Due to the disjunction, we are interested in the maximal intersection point. If we first concentrate on those lines with $c_{ij} < 1$, then we see that (U_i,U_i) is the maximal intersection point of these lines above m_i . This intersection point is the solution for the equation unless there is a steep line, with $c_{ij} \ge 1$ which at $x = U_i$ lies above (U_i,U_i) . In the figure there is such a line, viz. h_2 . In such a case the fixed-point lies at the intersection of h_2 with the line x=y for $x>U_i$. As this point does not exist in \mathbb{R} , the solution is ∞ . The expression $\bigvee_{j\in J_i|c_{ij}\ge 1} f_{ij} + (c_{ij}-1)\cdot U_i$ in (2) takes care of this situation. Steep lines, like h_1 which lie below (U_i,U_i) at $x=U_i$ can be ignored, as they do not force the minimal fixed-point U_i to become larger.

In case of a maximal fixed-point equation, $\nu X = e$ where e is a simple disjunctive normal form, it is useful to again expose the occurrences of X. We can denote the normal form of e in the following way:

$$\bigvee_{i \in I} \left(\bigwedge_{j \in J_i} (c_{ij} \cdot X + c'_{ij} \cdot eq_{-\infty}(X) + f_{ij}) \wedge m_i \right)$$
(3)

where $c_{ij} \cdot X$ and $eq_{-\infty}(X)$ are optional, i.e., c_{ij} can be 0, and c'_{ij} is either 0 or 1, where 0 means that the expression is not present. One of c_{ij} and c'_{ij} is not equal to 0. Again, the expressions f_{ij} and m_i do not contain X.

The solution of $\nu X = e$, where e is of the shape (3), is $\nu X = Sol_{X=e}^{\nu}$ with

$$Sol_{X=e}^{\nu} = \bigvee_{i \in I} (eq_{\infty}(m_i))$$

$$\Rightarrow (\bigwedge_{j \in J_i \mid c_{ij} \ge 1 \land c'_{ij} = 0} (f_{ij} + (c_{ij} - 1)) \cdot U_i) \to -\infty \diamond U_i$$

$$\diamond \infty)$$

$$(4)$$

where
$$U_i = m_i \wedge \bigwedge_{j \in J_i \mid c_{i,j} < 1 \wedge c'_{i,j} = 0} \frac{1}{1 - c_{ij}} \cdot f_{ij}$$

The two fixed-point solutions are not syntactically dual which is due to the fact that simple conjunctive and disjunctive normal forms are not each other's dual, because of the presence of + and $eq_{-\infty}$. We refrain from sketching the intuition underlying the solution to the maximal fixed-point as it is similar to that of the minimal fixed-point.

A full normal form can contain the conditional operators $e_1\Rightarrow e_2\diamond e_3$ and $e_1\to e_2\diamond e_3$. Suppose we have an equation $\sigma X=e_1\Rightarrow e_2\diamond e_3$ with σ either μ or ν . For the minimal fixed-point the right-hand side of the solution is $Sol^{\mu}_{X=e_1\Rightarrow e_2\diamond e_3}=(e_1[X:=Sol^{\mu}_{X=e_2}\wedge Sol^{\mu}_{X=e_3}])\Rightarrow Sol^{\mu}_{X=e_2}\diamond Sol^{\mu}_{X=e_3}$. For the maximal fixed-point we find the right-hand side $Sol^{\nu}_{X=e_1\Rightarrow e_2\diamond e_3}=(e_1[X:=Sol^{\nu}_{X=e_3}])\Rightarrow Sol^{\nu}_{X=e_2\wedge e_3}\diamond Sol^{\nu}_{X=e_3}$.

In case of the other conditional operator $\sigma X = e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3$ we obtain for the right side of the minimal fixed-point $Sol_{X=e_1 \to e_2 \diamond e_3}^{\mu} = (e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu}]) \to Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu} \diamond Sol_{X=e_2 \lor e_3}^{\mu}$, and for the right side of the maximal fixed-point $Sol_{X=e_1 \to e_2 \diamond e_3}^{\nu} = (e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu} \lor Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}]) \to Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu} \diamond Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu} \diamond Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}$. The following theorem summarises that these solutions solve fixed-point equations.

Theorem 4.1. For any fixed-point symbol σ , variable $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and expression e, it holds that

$$\sigma X = e \equiv \sigma X = Sol_{X=e}^{\sigma}$$

and $X \notin \mathsf{OCC}(Sol_{X=e}^{\sigma})$, where $Sol_{X=e}^{\sigma}$ is defined above.

Relation to boolean equation systems 5

A boolean equation system (BES) is a restricted form of a real equation system where solutions can only be true or false [20]. Concretely, the syntax for expressions is

$$e ::= X \mid true \mid false \mid e \lor e \mid e \land e$$

where X is taken from some set \mathcal{X} of variables [20]. A boolean equation system is a sequence of fixedpoint equations $\sigma_1 X_1 = e_1, \dots, \sigma_n X_n = e_n$ where σ_i are fixed-point operators, X_i are variables from \mathcal{X} ranging over true and false, and e_i are boolean expressions.

We do not spell out the semantics of boolean equation systems, as it is similar to that of RESs. However, we believe that it is useful to indicate the relation with real equation systems.

The simplest embedding is where a given BES is literally transformed to a RES and true and false are interpreted as ∞ and $-\infty$. We consider a minimal fixed-point equation. The right-hand side can be rewritten to a simple conjunctive normal form. We write this in the shape of equation (1). So, $c_{ij} = 1$, $c'_{ij}=0,\,f_{ij}$ is absent and m_i does not contain X and can only be interpreted as $\pm\infty$. Exactly if J_i is not empty, X is present in conjunct i.

$$\mu X = \bigwedge_{i \in I} ((\bigvee_{j \in J_i} X) \vee m_i).$$

The solution is given by equation (2), which can be simplified to:

$$\bigwedge_{i \in I} (eq_{-\infty}(m_i) \Rightarrow -\infty \diamond ((\bigvee_{j \in J_i} 0) \Rightarrow m_i \diamond \infty)) = \bigwedge_{i \in I} m_i = \bigwedge_{i \in I} ((\bigvee_{j \in J_i} -\infty) \vee m_i).$$

The latter exactly coincides with the Gauß-elimination rule for BESs that says that in an equation $\mu X = e$, any occurrence of X in e can safely be replaced by false. For the maximal fixed-point operator, dual reasoning applies. As Gauß-elimination is a complete way to solve a BES with true and false, and exactly the same reduction works with the corresponding RES with ∞ and $-\infty$, this confirms that this interpretation works.

An alternative interpretation is given by taking two arbitrary constants c_{true} and c_{false} with as only constraint that $c_{true} > c_{false}$. A boolean equation system $\sigma_1 X_1 = e_1, \dots, \sigma_n X_n = e_n$ is translated into $\sigma_1 X_1 = c_{false} \lor (c_{true} \land e_1), \ldots, \sigma_n X_n = c_{false} \lor (c_{true} \land e_n)$ of which the validity can be established in the same way as above.

6 Quantitative modal formulas and their translation to RESs

We can write quantitative modal formulas that yield a value instead of true and false. In the next section we provide examples of what can be expressed. Our formulas have the syntax

$$\phi ::= X \mid d \mid c \cdot \phi \mid \phi + \phi \mid \phi \vee \phi \mid \phi \wedge \phi \mid \langle a \rangle \phi \mid [a] \phi \mid \mu X. \phi \mid \nu X. \phi.$$

Here $d \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ with c > 0 are constants, $X \in \mathcal{X}$ is a variable, and $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is an action from some set of actions A. Although there are many similar logics around, we have not encountered this exact form before.

We evaluate these modal formulas on probabilistic LTSs. For a finite set of states S, we use distributions $d: S \to [0,1]$ where d(s) is the probability to end up in state s. Distributions satisfy that $\sum_{s \in S} d(s) = 1$. The set of all distributions over S is denoted by $\mathcal{D}(S)$.

Definition 6.1. A probabilistic labelled transition system (pLTS) is a four-tuple $M=(S,\mathcal{A},\to,d_0)$ where S is a finite set of states, \mathcal{A} is a finite set of actions, the relation $\to \subseteq S \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{D}(S)$ represents the transition relation, and $d_0 \in \mathcal{D}(S)$ is the initial distribution.

We leave out the definition of the interpretation of quantitative modal formulas on probabilistic LTSs, as it is standard. Instead, we define the real equation system that is generated given a modal formula ϕ and a probabilistic labelled transition system $M=(S,\mathcal{A},\to,d_0)$, following the translations in [20, 14, 21, 11]. The function $Eq(\phi)$ generates the required sequence of RES equations for ϕ and $rhs(s,\phi)$ yields the expression for the right-hand side of such an equation representing the value of ϕ in state s.

```
Eq(X) = \epsilon,
                                                                                  rhs(s,X)=X_s
Eq(d) = \epsilon,
                                                                                  rhs(s,d) = d,
Eq(c \cdot \phi) = Eq(\phi),
                                                                                  rhs(s, c \cdot \phi) = c \cdot rhs(s, \phi),
Eq(\phi_1 + \phi_2) = Eq(\phi_1), Eq(\phi_2),
                                                                                  rhs(s, \phi_1 + \phi_2) = rhs(s, \phi_1) + rhs(s, \phi_2),
                                                                                  rhs(s, \phi_1 \lor \phi_2) = rhs(s, \phi_1) \lor rhs(s, \phi_2),
Eq(\phi_1 \vee \phi_2) = Eq(\phi_1), Eq(\phi_2),
                                                                                 rhs(s, \phi_1 \land \phi_2) = rhs(s, \phi_1) \land rhs(s, \phi_2),
rhs(s, \langle a \rangle \phi) = \bigvee_{\{d \in \mathcal{D}(S) \mid s \xrightarrow{a} d\}} \sum_{s' \in S} d(s') \cdot rhs(s', \phi),
rhs(s, [a]\phi) = \bigwedge_{\{d \in \mathcal{D}(S) \mid s \xrightarrow{a} d\}} \sum_{s' \in S} d(s') \cdot rhs(s', \phi),
\langle Eq(\phi), \qquad rhs(s, \mu X.\phi) = X_s,
Eq(\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2) = Eq(\phi_1), Eq(\phi_2),
Eq(\langle a \rangle \phi) = Eq(\phi),
Eq([a]\phi) = Eq(\phi),
Eq(\mu X.\phi) = \langle \mu X_s = rhs(s,\phi) \mid s \in S \rangle, Eq(\phi),
Eq(\nu X.\phi) = \langle \nu X_s = rhs(s,\phi) \mid s \in S \rangle, Eq(\phi).
                                                                                                           rhs(s, \nu X.\phi) = X_s.
```

We use the notation $\langle \sigma X_s = e_s \mid s \in S \rangle$ for the sequence of all equations $\sigma X_s = e_s$ for all states $s \in S$.

The evaluation of a modal formula ϕ in M with initial distribution d_0 is the solution in $\hat{\mathbb{R}}$ of variable X_{init} in the RES $\mu X_{init} = (\sum_{s \in S} d_0(s) \cdot rhs(s, \phi))$, $Eq(\phi)$. The use of the minimal fixed-point for the initial variable is of no consequence as X_{init} does not occur elsewhere in the equation system. A maximal fixed-point could also be used.

7 Applications

7.1 The longest a-sequence to a b-loop

We are interested in the longest sequence of actions a to reach a state where an infinite sequence of actions b can be done. The modal formula that expresses this is the following:

$$\mu X.(1 + \langle a \rangle X) \vee (0 \wedge \nu Y.\langle b \rangle Y).$$

The last part with the maximal fixed-point $0 \wedge \nu Y.\langle b \rangle Y$ when evaluated in a state equals $-\infty$ if no infinite sequence of b's is possible. Otherwise, it evaluates to 0. The first part $1+\langle a \rangle X$ yields 1 plus the maximum values of the evaluation of X in all states reachable by an action a. If no infinite b-sequence can be reached from such a state, this value is $-\infty$, and otherwise it represents the maximal number of steps to reach such an infinite b-sequence.

We evaluate this formula in the labelled transition system given at the right in Figure 1. This leads to the following real equation system where X_i and Y_i correspond to the value of X, resp. Y in state s_i . The solution of the equation system is written behind each equation.

$$\begin{array}{lllll} \mu X_1 = (1 + (X_2 \vee X_3 \vee X_4 \vee X_6)) \vee (0 \wedge Y_1) & 2 & \nu Y_1 = -\infty & -\infty \\ \mu X_2 = (1 + X_3) \vee (0 \wedge Y_2) & 1 & \nu Y_2 = -\infty & -\infty \\ \mu X_3 = (1 + -\infty) \vee (0 \wedge Y_3) & 0 & \nu Y_3 = Y_3 & \infty \\ \mu X_4 = (1 + X_5) \vee (0 \wedge Y_4) & -\infty & \nu Y_4 = -\infty & -\infty \\ \mu X_5 = (1 + X_6) \vee (0 \wedge Y_5) & -\infty & \nu Y_5 = -\infty & -\infty \\ \mu X_6 = (1 + -\infty) \vee (0 \wedge Y_6) & -\infty & \nu Y_6 = -\infty & -\infty \end{array}$$

We find that the longest sequence of actions a is 2, which matches our expectation.




Figure 2: A probabilistic LTS with a loop/An LTS with rewards

7.2 The probability to reach a loop

We are interested in the probability to reach a *b*-loop. We apply it to the LTS at the left in Figure 2. Due to the non-determinism there are more paths to such loops, and we are interested in the path with the highest probability. This is expressed by the modal formula

$$\mu X.\langle a \rangle X \vee \langle b \rangle X \vee ((\nu Y.\langle b \rangle Y \vee 0) \wedge 1).$$

The formula $\nu Y.\langle b \rangle Y \vee 0$ yields ∞ if an infinite sequence of actions b is possible and 0 otherwise. As we want a probability, we use $_ \land 1$ and $_ \lor 0$ to enforce that the solution is in [0,1].

The translation of this formula on the labelled transition system in Figure 2 yields the following real equation system.

$$\begin{array}{llll} \mu X_1 = (\frac{1}{3} \cdot X_2 + \frac{2}{3} \cdot X_3) \vee (\frac{1}{2} \cdot X_4 + \frac{1}{2} \cdot X_5) \vee (Y_1 \wedge 1) & \nu Y_1 = -\infty \vee 0 & = & 0, \\ & = & \frac{1}{3} \vee \frac{1}{2} \vee 0 = \frac{1}{2}, & \nu Y_2 = Y_2 & = & \infty, \\ \mu X_2 = X_2 \vee (Y_2 \wedge 1) & = & X_2 \vee 1 = 1, & \nu Y_2 = Y_2 & = & \infty, \\ \mu X_3 = -\infty \vee (Y_3 \wedge 1) & = & -\infty \vee 0 = 0, & \nu Y_3 = -\infty \vee 0 & = & 0, \\ \mu X_4 = X_4 \vee (Y_4 \wedge 1) & = & X_4 \vee 1 = 1, & \nu Y_4 = Y_4 & = & \infty, \\ \mu X_5 = -\infty \vee (Y_5 \wedge 1) & = & -\infty \vee 0 = 0, & \nu Y_5 = -\infty \vee 0 & = & 0. \end{array}$$

This shows that the maximal probability to reach a *b*-loop is $\frac{1}{2}$.

7.3 Determining the reward of process behaviour

In Figure 2 at the right a labelled transition system is drawn, where a reward R is changed when a transition takes place. The transition labelled with action a costs one unit, b yields $\frac{1}{2}R + 5$ units, and the transition c adapts the reward by $\frac{9}{10}R + 2$. We want to know what the maximal stable reward is. This is expressed by the following formula:

$$\mu R.\langle a\rangle(R-1)\vee\langle b\rangle(\frac{1}{2}\cdot R+5)\vee\langle c\rangle(\frac{9}{10}\cdot R+2)\vee 0.$$

Note that we express this as the minimal reward larger than 0, which is the maximum of all individual rewards. Translating this to a real equation system yields

$$\mu R_1 = (R_2 - 1) \vee -\infty \vee -\infty \vee 0, \quad \mu R_2 = -\infty \vee (\frac{1}{2} \cdot R_1 + 5) \vee (\frac{9}{10} R_1 + 2) \vee 0.$$

We solve this using Gauß-elimination. This means that the second equation is substituted in the first, which, after some straightforward simplifications, gives us

$$\mu R_1 = (\frac{1}{2} \cdot R_1 + 4) \vee (\frac{9}{10} \cdot R_1 + 1) \vee 0.$$

We solve this equation using the technique of Section 4, leading to:

$$R_1 = \frac{4}{1 - \frac{1}{2}} \lor \frac{1}{1 - \frac{9}{10}} \lor 0 = 10.$$

8 Conclusions and outlook

We introduce real equation systems (RESs) as the pendant of Boolean Equation Systems with solutions in the domain of the reals extended with $\pm \infty$. By a number of examples we show how this can be used to evaluate a wide range of quantitative properties of process behaviour.

We provide a complete method to solve RESs using an extension of what is called 'Gauß-elimination' [21] to solve boolean equation systems. It shows that any RES can be solved by carrying out a finite number of substitutions. As solving RESs generalises solving BESs, and Gauß-elimination on BESs is exponential, our Gauß-elimination technique can also lead to exponential growth of intermediate terms. A prototype implementation shows that depending on the nature of the system being analysed, this may or may not be an issue. For instance, analysing the Game of the Goose [12] or The Ant on a Grid [6] are practically undoable with the method proposed here, while the Lost Boarding Pass Problem [10] is easily solved, even for planes with 100,000 passengers.

We believe that the next step is to come up with algorithms that are more efficient in practice than Gauß-elimination. This is motivated by the situation with BESs where for instance the recursive algorithm [23, 26] turns out to be practically far more efficient than Gauß-elimination [9].

References

- [1] Giorgio Bacci, Giovanni Bacci, Mathias Claus Jensen, and Kim G. Larsen. Convex lattice equation systems. In Jean-François Raskin, Krishnendu Chatterjee, Laurent Doyen, and Rupak Majumdar, editors, *Principles of Systems Design Essays Dedicated to Thomas A. Henzinger on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, volume 13660 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 438–455. Springer, 2022.
- [2] Julian C. Bradfield and Colin Stirling. Modal mu-calculi. In *Handbook of Modal Logic*, volume 3 of *Studies in logic and practical reasoning*, pages 721–756. North-Holland, 2007.
- [3] Julian C. Bradfield and Igor Walukiewicz. The mu-calculus and model checking. In *Handbook of Model Checking*, pages 871–919. Springer, 2018.
- [4] Cristian S. Calude, Sanjay Jain, Bakhadyr Khoussainov, Wei Li, and Frank Stephan. Deciding parity games in quasipolynomial time. In Hamed Hatami, Pierre McKenzie, and Valerie King, editors, *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2017, Montreal, QC, Canada, June 19-23, 2017*, pages 252–263. ACM, 2017.
- [5] Sjoerd Cranen, Jan Friso Groote, and Michel A. Reniers. A linear translation from CTL* to the first-order modal μ -calculus. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 412(28):3129–3139, 2011.
- [6] Susmoy Das and Arpit Sharma. On the use of model and logical embeddings for model checking of probabilistic systems. In Marieke Huisman and António Ravara, editors, Formal Techniques for Distributed Objects, Components, and Systems 43rd IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference, FORTE 2023, Held as Part of the 18th International Federated Conference on Distributed Computing Techniques, DisCoTec 2023, Lisbon, Portugal, June 19-23, 2023, Proceedings, volume 13910 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 115–131. Springer, 2023.
- [7] Thomas Gawlitza and Helmut Seidl. Precise fixpoint computation through strategy iteration. In Rocco De Nicola, editor, *Programming Languages and Systems, 16th European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2007, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practics of Software, ETAPS 2007, Braga, Portugal, March 24 April 1, 2007, Proceedings, volume 4421 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 300–315. Springer, 2007.
- [8] Thomas Martin Gawlitza and Helmut Seidl. Solving systems of rational equations through strategy iteration. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 33(3):11:1–11:48, 2011.

- [9] Maciej Gazda and Tim A. C. Willemse. Zielonka's recursive algorithm: dull, weak and solitaire games and tighter bounds. In Gabriele Puppis and Tiziano Villa, editors, *Proceedings Fourth International Symposium on Games, Automata, Logics and Formal Verification, GandALF 2013, Borca di Cadore, Dolomites, Italy, 29-31th August 2013*, volume 119 of *EPTCS*, pages 7–20, 2013.
- [10] Jan Friso Groote and Erik P. de Vink. Problem solving using process algebra considered insightful. In Joost-Pieter Katoen, Rom Langerak, and Arend Rensink, editors, *ModelEd, TestEd, TrustEd - Essays* Dedicated to Ed Brinksma on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday, volume 10500 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 48–63. Springer, 2017.
- [11] Jan Friso Groote and Mohammad Reza Mousavi. *Modeling and Analysis of Communicating Systems*. MIT Press, 2014.
- [12] Jan Friso Groote, Freek Wiedijk, and Hans Zantema. A probabilistic analysis of the game of the goose. *SIAM Rev.*, 58(1):143–155, 2016.
- [13] Jan Friso Groote and Tim A. C. Willemse. Model-checking processes with data. *Sci. Comput. Program.*, 56(3):251–273, 2005.
- [14] Jan Friso Groote and Tim A. C. Willemse. Parameterised boolean equation systems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 343(3):332–369, 2005.
- [15] Thomas A. Henzinger. From boolean to quantitative notions of correctness. In Manuel V. Hermenegildo and Jens Palsberg, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2010, Madrid, Spain, January 17-23, 2010*, pages 157–158. ACM, 2010.
- [16] Thomas A. Henzinger and Joseph Sifakis. The embedded systems design challenge. In Jayadev Misra, Tobias Nipkow, and Emil Sekerinski, editors, FM 2006: Formal Methods, 14th International Symposium on Formal Methods, Hamilton, Canada, August 21-27, 2006, Proceedings, volume 4085 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 1–15. Springer, 2006.
- [17] Marcin Jurdzinski and Ranko Lazic. Succinct progress measures for solving parity games. In 32nd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2017, Reykjavik, Iceland, June 20-23, 2017, pages 1–9. IEEE Computer Society, 2017.
- [18] Kyriakos Kalorkoti. Solving Łiukasiewicz µ-terms. Theor. Comput. Sci., 712:38–49, 2018.
- [19] Kim Guldstrand Larsen. Efficient local correctness checking. In Gregor von Bochmann and David K. Probst, editors, *Computer Aided Verification, Fourth International Workshop, CAV '92, Montreal, Canada, June 29 July 1, 1992, Proceedings*, volume 663 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 30–43. Springer, 1992.
- [20] Angelika Mader. Modal μ-calculus, model checking and gauß elimination. In Ed Brinksma, Rance Cleaveland, Kim Guldstrand Larsen, Tiziana Margaria, and Bernhard Steffen, editors, Tools and Algorithms for Construction and Analysis of Systems, First International Workshop, TACAS '95, Aarhus, Denmark, May 19-20, 1995, Proceedings, volume 1019 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 72–88. Springer, 1995.
- [21] Angelika Mader. Verification of Modal Properties Using Boolean Equation Systems. PhD thesis, Technische Universität München, 1997.
- [22] Radu Mateescu. *Vérification des propriétés temporelles des programmes parallèles*. PhD thesis, Institut National Polytechnique de Grenoble, 1998.
- [23] Robert McNaughton. Infinite games played on finite graphs. Ann. Pure Appl. Logic, 65(2):149–184, 1993.

- [24] Matteo Mio and Alex Simpson. Łukasiewicz μ -calculus. *Fundam. Informaticae*, 150(3-4):317–346, 2017.
- [25] Tom van Dijk. Oink: An implementation and evaluation of modern parity game solvers. In Dirk Beyer and Marieke Huisman, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems* 24th International Conference, TACAS 2018, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2018, Thessaloniki, Greece, April 14-20, 2018, Proceedings, Part I, volume 10805 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 291–308. Springer, 2018.
- [26] Wieslaw Zielonka. Infinite games on finitely coloured graphs with applications to automata on infinite trees. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 200(1-2):135–183, 1998.

A Full proofs of the lemmas and theorems in this paper

This appendix repeats all lemmas and theorems in this paper and adds proofs.

Lemma A.1 (Lemma 2.2). Each expression e not containing the conditional operators $e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3$ or $e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3$ can be rewritten to a simple conjunctive or disjunctive normal form using the equations in Table 1.

Proof. The proof uses induction on the structure of terms. The only case that is more involved is if e has the shape $eq_{-\infty}(e')$. For this we use that $eq_{-\infty}(\sum_{i\in I}e_i)=(\bigwedge_{i\in I}eq_{-\infty}(e_i))\vee\bigvee_{i\in I}eq_{\infty}(e_i)$ which is provable with induction on the finite index set I.

Lemma A.2 (Lemma 2.3). Expression of the forms $e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3$ and $e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3$ can be rewritten to equivalent expressions where the first argument of such a conditional operator is a simple conjunctive or disjunctive normal form using the equations in Table 1.

Proof. The proof uses induction on the number of operators $_\Rightarrow _\diamond _/_ \rightarrow _\diamond _$ in e_1 .

The case where e_1 is X or d is trivial. If e_1 does not contain a conditional operator, we are ready using Lemma 2.2. Otherwise, if any of the operators $c \cdot , + , \vee , \wedge$, or $eq_{-\infty}$ occur as outermost symbols of e_1 , they can be pushed inside the conditional operator, transforming e_1 to an expression of the shape $f_1 \Rightarrow f_2 \diamond f_3$ or $f_1 \to f_2 \diamond f_3$. The four cases that ensue are all similar. We only show one case and derive it using equation $D_{\Rightarrow}^{\Rightarrow}$:

$$e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3 = (f_1 \Rightarrow f_2 \diamond f_3) \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3 = ((f_1 \lor f_2) \land f_3) \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3.$$

Now $(f_1 \lor f_2) \land f_3$ is an expression containing one less conditional operator, and hence, using the induction hypothesis, we can transform it to a simple conjunctive/disjunctive normal form. This finishes the proof.

Theorem A.3 (**Theorem 2.4**). Each expression e can be rewritten to both a conjunctive and a disjunctive normal form using the equations in Table 1.

Proof. The proof uses induction on the structure of expressions.

- The expressions d and X are by themselves conjunctive and disjunctive normal forms.
- Consider the expressions $c \cdot e$. Using the induction hypothesis, there is a conjunctive/disjunctive normal form equal to e. The normal form $c \cdot e$ is obtained by pushing c inside the normal form.
- Consider the expressions $e_1 + e_2$, $e_1 \lor e_2$ and $e_1 \land e_2$. If e_1 and e_2 are simple normal forms, the result follows by Lemma 2.2. If one or both of e_1 and e_2 has the shape $f_1 \Rightarrow f_2 \diamond f_3$, then the other term can be pushed inside the second and third argument, and using the induction hypothesis, these terms can be transformed to the required normal forms also.
- For an expression of the form $eq_{-\infty}(e)$, we find with induction a conjunctive/disjunctive normal form for e. Using the equations in Table 1, and using the identity from the proof of Lemma 2.2, the operator $eq_{-\infty}$ can be pushed inside, leading to the required normal form.
- The last cases are $e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3/e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3$. Using the induction hypothesis there are conjunctive/disjunctive normal forms f_1 , f_2 and f_3 equal to e_1 , e_2 and e_3 , respectively. If e_1 has a simple conjunctive/disjunctive normal form, we are ready, as in that case $f_1 \Rightarrow f_2 \diamond f_3$, respectively, $f_1 \rightarrow f_2 \diamond f_3$ is the required normal form.

The only non-trivial case is if f_1 has the shape $f_{11} \Rightarrow f_{12} \diamond f_{13}$ or $f_{11} \to f_{12} \diamond f_{13}$. But in this case Lemma 2.3 applies, also leading to the required normal form.

The following lemma provides a monotonicity property that we require and that does not occur in the main text. We write $\eta \geq \eta'$ for valuations η and η' iff $\eta(X) \geq \eta'(X)$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$.

Lemma A.4. Let \mathcal{E} be real equation system, e an expression, and let η and η' be valuations such that $\eta \geq \eta'$. Then $(\llbracket \mathcal{E} \rrbracket \eta)(e) \geq (\llbracket \mathcal{E} \rrbracket \eta')(e)$.

Proof. We prove this lemma with induction on the size of \mathcal{E} . If \mathcal{E} is empty, then the lemma reduces to $\eta(e) \geq \eta'(e)$ which follows by monotonicity of e.

If \mathcal{E} equals $\sigma X = f$, \mathcal{F} then, by definition, we must show that

$$(\llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket (\eta[X := \sigma(X, \mathcal{F}, \eta, f)]))(e) \geq (\llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket (\eta'[X := \sigma(X, \mathcal{F}, \eta', f)]))(e).$$

We prove this for $\sigma = \mu$. The proof for $\sigma = \nu$ is completely similar.

$$\begin{split} (\llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket (\eta[X := \sigma(X, \mathcal{F}, \eta, f)]))(e) &= \\ (\llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket (\eta[X := \bigwedge \{r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}} \mid r \geq \llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket (\eta[X := r])(f) \}]))(e) &\geq \\ (\llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket (\eta[X := \bigwedge \{r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}} \mid r \geq \llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket (\eta'[X := r])(f) \}]))(e) &\geq \\ (\llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket (\eta'[X := \bigwedge \{r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}} \mid r \geq \llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket (\eta'[X := r])(f) \}]))(e) &= \\ (\llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket (\eta'[X := \sigma(X, \mathcal{F}, \eta', f)]))(e). \end{split}$$

In the first \geq above, we use the induction hypothesis saying that $[\![\mathcal{F}]\!](\eta[X:=r]) \geq [\![\mathcal{F}]\!](\eta'[X:=r])$ and therefore, the minimal fixed-point can only decrease, and hence $[\![\mathcal{F}]\!]\eta[X:=\bigwedge\ldots]$ decreases also using the induction hypothesis. In the second \geq we again use the induction hypothesis.

Lemma A.5 (Lemma 3.4). Let X be a variable, e and f be expressions and σ either the minimal or the maximal fixed-point symbol. If for any valuation η it holds that $\llbracket \sigma X = e \rrbracket \eta = \llbracket \sigma X = f \rrbracket \eta$ then $\sigma X = e \equiv \sigma X = f$.

Proof. We prove this lemma for $\sigma = \mu$. The case where $\sigma = \nu$ is completely dual. First we elaborate a little on the condition of this lemma. It can be rewritten to

$$\eta[X := \bigwedge \{ r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}} \mid r \ge \eta[X := r](e) \}] = \eta[X := \bigwedge \{ r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}} \mid r \ge \eta[X := r](f) \}].$$

Applying both sides to X reduces this further to

$$\bigwedge\{r\in\hat{\mathbb{R}}\mid r\geq\eta[X:=r](e)\}=\bigwedge\{r\in\hat{\mathbb{R}}\mid r\geq\eta[X:=r](f)\}.$$
 (5)

This means that the smallest r satisfying $r \ge \eta[X := r](e)$ is equal to the smallest r' satisfying $r' \ge \eta[X := r'](f)$. We use this property below.

We must prove that for all valuations η and real equation systems \mathcal{F} with $X \notin \mathsf{bnd}(\mathcal{F})$ that

$$\llbracket \mu X = e, \mathcal{F} \rrbracket \eta = \llbracket \mu X = f, \mathcal{F} \rrbracket \eta.$$

Expanding this definition gives us an equivalent statement.

$$\begin{split} & \llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket (\eta[X := \bigwedge \{r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}} \mid r \geq \llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket (\eta[X := r])(e) \}]) = \\ & \llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket (\eta[X := \bigwedge \{r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}} \mid r \geq \llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket (\eta[X := r])(f) \}]). \end{split}$$

Define

$$m_e = \bigwedge \{ r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}} \mid r \ge [\![\mathcal{F}]\!] (\eta[X := r])(e) \} \text{ and } m_f = \bigwedge \{ r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}} \mid r \ge [\![\mathcal{F}]\!] (\eta[X := r])(f) \}.$$

Note that the lemma follows if we have shown $m_e = m_f$, which we do below.

Due to symmetry we assume that $m_f \leq m_e$ without loss of generality. Consider the following expression.

$$m = \bigwedge \{ r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}} \mid r \ge \zeta[X := r](f) \}$$

where $\zeta = [\![\mathcal{F}]\!](\eta[X := m_f])$. Clearly, m_f satisfies

$$m_f \ge \zeta[X := m_f](f)$$

as this is equivalent to

$$m_f \ge ([\![\mathcal{F}]\!](\eta[X := m_f]))[X := m_f](f).$$

So, $m \leq m_f$. Vice versa, m satisfies

$$m \ge \zeta[X := m](f).$$

This implies

$$m \geq ([\![\mathcal{F}]\!](\eta[X:=m]))[X:=m](f) \geq ([\![\mathcal{F}]\!](\eta[X:=m]))[X:=m](f) = ([\![\mathcal{F}]\!]\eta[X:=m])(f)$$

using Lemma A.4 and the fact that $m_f \ge m$. From this we derive that $m_f \le m$, and combined with the already derived $m \le m_f$, that $m = m_f$.

We now turn our attention to m_e and show that m is a solution for r in

$$r \geq [\![\mathcal{F}]\!](\eta[X := r])(e).$$

So, we must show

$$m \ge [\![\mathcal{F}]\!](\eta[X := m])(e).$$

We know that m is the smallest value that satisfies

$$m \ge \zeta[X := m](f).$$

By (5) we also have that

$$m > \zeta[X := m](e)$$
.

Combining these results leads to

$$m \ge \zeta[X := m](e) = (\llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket (\eta[X := m_f]))[X := m](e) = \llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket (\eta[X := m])(e)$$

where $m=m_f$ is used in the last equality. Hence, we know that $m_e \leq m$, and since $m=m_f$, also $m_e \leq m_f$. We conclude $m_e=m_f$, which means we have proven this lemma.

Lemma A.6 (Lemma 3.5). Consider some variable X. We find that $\mu X = e \equiv \mu X = f$ if for every valuation η :

- 1. for the smallest $r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r = \eta[X := r](e)$ it holds that there is an $r' \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfying that $r' \leq r$ and $r' \geq \eta[X := r'](f)$, and vice versa,
- 2. for the smallest $r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r = \eta[X := r](f)$ it holds that there is an $r' \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfying that $r' \leq r$ and $r' \geq \eta[X := r'](e)$.

Dually, it is the case that $\nu X = e \equiv \nu X = f$ if for every valuation η :

- 1. for the largest $r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r = \eta[X := r](e)$ it holds that there is an $r' \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfying that $r' \geq r$ and $r' \leq \eta[X := r'](f)$, and vice versa,
- 2. for the largest $r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r = \eta[X := r](f)$ it holds that there is an $r' \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfying that $r' \geq r$ and $r' \leq \eta[X := r'](e)$.

Proof. Due to duality, we only provide the proof for the minimal fixed-point. Define the following two sets:

$$\begin{split} S_e &= \{r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}} \mid r \geq \eta[X := r](e)\} \\ S_f &= \{r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}} \mid r \geq \eta[X := r](f)\}. \end{split}$$

We first prove that $\bigwedge S_e = \bigwedge S_f$. Consider $r = \bigwedge S_e$. By the first condition, there is an $r' \leq r$ such that $r' \geq \eta[X := r'](f)$. Hence, $\bigwedge S_f \leq r' \leq r = \bigwedge S_e$. Using the second condition we prove similarly that $\bigwedge S_e \leq \bigwedge S_f$. So, we conclude $\bigwedge S_e = \bigwedge S_f$.

The remainder of the proof consists of a straightforward expansion of the definition. In order to prove that $\mu X = e \equiv \mu X = f$, it suffices to prove that

$$\llbracket \mu X = e \rrbracket \eta = \llbracket \mu X = f \rrbracket$$

using Lemma 3.4. Expanding this further, yields the equivalent equality

$$\eta[X := \bigwedge S_e] = \eta[X := \bigwedge S_f]$$

with S_e and S_f as defined above. As we have already derived that $\bigwedge S_e = \bigwedge S_f$, we can conclude that this last equation is derivable, and hence the lemma follows.

Lemma A.7 (Lemma 3.6). If $\mu X = e \equiv \mu X = f$, then for any valuation η it holds that

- 1. for any $r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r \geq \eta[X := r](e)$, there is an $r' \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r' \leq r$ and $r' = \eta[X := r'](f)$, and vice versa,
- 2. for any $r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r \geq \eta[X := r](f)$, there is an $r' \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r' \leq r$ and $r' = \eta[X := r'](e)$.

If $\nu X = e \equiv \nu X = f$, then for any valuation η it holds that

- 1. for any $r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $\eta[X := r](e) \ge r$, there is an $r' \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r' \ge r$ and $r' = \eta[X := r'](f)$, and vice versa,
- 2. for any $r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $\eta[X := r](f) \ge r$, there is an $r' \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r' \ge r$ and $r' = \eta[X := r'](e)$.

Proof. Both statements in this lemma are dual to each other, so, we only provide the proof for the minimal fixed-point. The statement $\mu X = e \equiv \mu X = f$ implies to the following equation by expanding the definitions with an empty real equation system. For any valuation η

$$\eta[X := \bigwedge S_e] = \eta[X := \bigwedge S_f]$$

where $S_e = \{r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}} \mid r \geq \eta[X := r](e)\}$ and $S_f = \{r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}} \mid r \geq \eta[X := r](f)\}$. From this we can conclude $\bigwedge S_e = \bigwedge S_f$.

According to the condition of case 1 of this lemma there is an $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $r \leq \eta[X := r](e)$. Clearly, $\bigwedge S_e \leq r$. Now take $r' = \bigwedge S_f$. Clearly, $r' = \bigwedge S_f = \bigwedge S_e \leq r$ and r' satisfies the equation $r' = \eta[X := r'](f)$ because it is a fixed-point.

The second part is completely symmetric to the first and has the same proof.

Theorem A.8 (Theorem 4.1). For any fixed-point symbol σ , variable $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and expression e, it holds that

$$\sigma X = e \equiv \sigma X = Sol_{X=e}^{\sigma},$$

where $Sol_{X=e}^{\sigma}$ is defined in the main text of this paper. Furthermore, the variable X does not occur in $Sol_{X=e}^{\sigma}$.

Proof. By construction it is straightforward to see that X does not occur in $Sol_{X=e}^{\sigma}$. We concentrate on the first part of this theorem.

Consider an equation of the shape $\sigma X = e$. If $\sigma = \mu$ we can assume that e is a conjunctive normal form, and if $\sigma = \nu$ we can assume e is a disjunctive normal form, by Theorem 2.4.

We show by induction on the number of conditional operators in e that the first part of the theorem holds. By the normal form theorem, e either consists of an application of a conditional operator or it is a simple conjunctive/disjunctive normal form.

• Assume e has the shape $e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3$. We know using the induction hypothesis that the equations $\sigma X = e_2$, $\sigma X = e_2 \wedge e_3$ and $\sigma X = e_3$ have equivalent equations $\sigma X = Sol_{X=e_2}^{\sigma}$, $\sigma X = Sol_{X=e_3}^{\sigma}$ and $\sigma X = Sol_{X=e_3}^{\sigma}$. For these equivalences we know the properties as listed in Lemma 3.6

First we consider the case where $\sigma=\mu$. We use Lemma 3.5. So, we fix some valuation η and we show that both cases 1 and 2 of Lemma 3.5 hold. For case 1 we can assume that there is an $r\in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r=\eta[X:=r](e_1\Rightarrow e_2\diamond e_3)$. It suffices to show that there is an $r'\leq r$ such that $r'\geq \eta[X:=r']((e_1[X:=Sol_{X=e_2}^\mu\wedge Sol_{X=e_3}^\mu])\Rightarrow Sol_{X=e_2}^\mu\diamond Sol_{X=e_3}^\mu)$. We distinguish two cases

- First the situation where $\eta[X:=r](e_1) \leq 0$ is considered. In this case $r=\eta[X:=r](e_2 \wedge e_3)$, and hence $r=\eta[X:=r](e_2)$ or $r=\eta[X:=r](e_3)$. So, using the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.6 there is an $r' \leq r$ such that either $r'=\eta[X:=r'](Sol^\mu_{X=e_2})$ or $r'=\eta[X:=r'](Sol^\mu_{X=e_3})$. In either case, $r' \geq \eta[X:=r'](Sol^\mu_{X=e_2} \wedge Sol^\mu_{X=e_3})$. We find that $\eta(e_1[X:=Sol^\mu_{X=e_2} \wedge Sol^\mu_{X=e_3})) \leq \eta[X:=r'](e_1) \leq \eta[X:=r](e_1) \leq 0$. So, we can derive that

$$\eta[X := r']((e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu} \land Sol_{X=e_3}^{\mu}]) \Rightarrow Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu} \diamond Sol_{X=e_3}^{\mu}) = \eta[X := r'](Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu} \land Sol_{X=e_3}^{\mu}) \leq r'$$

as was to be shown.

- Now we investigate the situation where $\eta[X:=r](e_1)>0$. It follows that $r=\eta[X:=r](e_3)$. Using the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.6 we know that there is some $r'\leq r$ such that $r'=\eta[X:=r'](Sol^\mu_{X=e_3})$. Hence, r' also satisfies $r'\geq\eta[X:=r'](Sol^\mu_{X=e_2}\wedge Sol^\mu_{X=e_3})$. So, we can conclude that $r'\geq\eta[X:=r']((e_1[X:=Sol^\mu_{X=e_2}\wedge Sol^\mu_{X=e_3}])\Rightarrow Sol^\mu_{X=e_2}\diamond Sol^\mu_{X=e_3})$ as we had to show.

For case 2 of Lemma 3.5 and the minimal fixed-point, we consider some valuation η and we assume there is an $r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r = \eta[X := r]((e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu} \wedge Sol_{X=e_3}^{\mu}]) \Rightarrow Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu} \diamond Sol_{X=e_3}^{\mu})$. We must show that there is an $r' \leq r$ such that $r' \geq \eta[X := r'](e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3)$. We distinguish two cases.

- First assume $\eta[X := r](e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu} \wedge Sol_{X=e_3}^{\mu}]) \le 0$. In that case $r = \eta(Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu}) \wedge \eta(Sol_{X=e_3}^{\mu})$. By the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.6 it follows that there is an $r_1 \le r$ such that $r_1 = \eta[X := r_1](e_2)$ and there is an $r_2 \le r$ such that $r_2 = \eta[X := r_2](e_3)$. Define $r' = r_1 \wedge r_2$. Clearly, $r' \le r$. Observe that $\eta[X := r'](e_1) = \eta[X := r_1 \wedge r_2](e_1) \le \eta[X := r](e_1) = \eta(e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu} \wedge Sol_{X=e_3}^{\mu}]) \le 0$. Hence, $\eta[X := r'](e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3)$ is equal to $\eta[X := r'](e_2 \wedge e_3)$. We find $r' = r_1 \wedge r_2 = \eta[X := r_1](e_2) \wedge \eta[X := r_2](e_3) \ge \eta[X := r_1 \wedge r_2](e_2) \wedge \eta[X := r_1 \wedge r_2](e_3) = \eta[X := r'](e_2 \wedge e_3)$. Hence, $r' \ge \eta[X := r'](e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3)$ as had to be shown.
- Now assume $\eta[X:=r](e_1[X:=Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu} \wedge Sol_{X=e_3}^{\mu}])>0$. Hence, $r=\eta(Sol_{X=e_3}^{\mu})$. So, using the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.6 there is an $r'\leq r$ such that $r'=\eta[X:=r'](e_3)$. So, it also follows that $r'\geq \eta[X:=r'](e_2\wedge e_3)$. Hence, $r'\geq \eta[X:=r'](e_1\Rightarrow e_2\diamond e_3)$ as it is larger than both possible outcomes of the conditional expression, which finishes this case.

This means the proof for the minimal fixed-point is finished.

Now we consider the case where $\sigma = \nu$. The proof is very similar to that of the minimal fixed-point, but as reasoning with fixed-points is tedious we give it in full.

We again apply Lemma 3.5. So, fix some valuation η . For case 1 of Lemma 3.5 consider an r such that $r=\eta[X:=r](e_1\Rightarrow e_2\diamond e_3)$. We are ready with this case if we have shown that there is an $r'\geq r$ and $r'\leq \eta[X:=r']((e_1[X:=Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}])\Rightarrow Sol_{X=e_2\wedge e_3}^{\nu}\diamond Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$. We distinguish two cases.

- First we consider the case where $\eta[X:=r](e_1) \leq 0$. Then $r=\eta[X:=r](e_2 \wedge e_3)$. So, $r \leq \eta[X:=r](e_3)$. Using the induction hypothesis and by applying Lemma 3.6, we know

that there are $r_1 \geq r$ such that $r_1 = \eta[X := r_1](Sol_{X=e_2 \wedge e_3}^{\nu})$, and $r_2 \geq r$ such that $r_2 = \eta[X := r_2](Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$. Choose $r' = r_1 \wedge r_2$, i.e., the minimum of the two. Clearly, $r' \geq r$. Furthermore, $\eta[X := r']((e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}]) \Rightarrow Sol_{X=e_2 \wedge e_3}^{\nu} \diamond Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$ is either equal to $\eta(Sol_{X=e_2 \wedge e_3}^{\nu} \wedge Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$ or to $\eta(Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$. In the first case we find that $r' = r_1 \wedge r_2 = \eta(Sol_{X=e_2 \wedge e_3}^{\nu}) \wedge \eta(Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}) = \eta[X := r'](Sol_{X=e_2 \wedge e_3}^{\nu} \wedge Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$, and in the second case $r' = r_1 \wedge r_2 \leq r_2 = \eta(Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}) = \eta[X := r'](Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$. From these two cases it follows that $r' \leq \eta[X := r']((e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}]) \Rightarrow Sol_{X=e_2 \wedge e_3}^{\nu} \diamond Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$ as had to be shown.

- Second, we consider the case $\eta[X:=r](e_1)>0$. Then $r=\eta[X:=r](e_3)$. Using the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.6 there is an $r'\geq r$ such that $r'=\eta[X:=r'](Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$. So, we find that $\eta(e_1[X:=Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}])=\eta[X:=r'](e_1)\geq \eta[X:=r](e_1)>0$. Hence,

$$\eta[X := r']((e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}]) \Rightarrow Sol_{X=e_2 \wedge e_3}^{\nu} \diamond Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}) = \eta[X := r'](Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}) = r'$$

which implies our proof obligation.

Now we concentrate on case 2 of Lemma 3.5 for the maximal fixed-point. So, we consider an $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $r = \eta[X := r]((e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}]) \Rightarrow Sol_{X=e_2 \wedge e_3}^{\nu} \diamond Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$, and we must show that an $r' \geq r$ exists such that $r' \leq \eta[X := r'](e_1 \Rightarrow e_2 \diamond e_3)$. Again, we distinguish two cases.

- Assume $\eta(e_1[X:=Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}]) \leq 0$. It follows that $r=\eta(Sol_{X=e_2\wedge e_3}^{\nu})$. Using the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.6 it follows that there is an $r'\geq r$ such that $r'=\eta[X:=r'](e_2\wedge e_3)$. So, it follows that $r'\leq \eta[X:=r'](e_3)$. As $\eta[X:=r'](e_1\Rightarrow e_2\diamond e_3)$ must be equal to one of these, we find that $r'\leq \eta[X:=r'](e_1\Rightarrow e_2\diamond e_3)$ as we had to show.
- Assume $\eta(e_1[X:=Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}])>0$. It follows that $r=\eta(Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$. Using the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.6 there is an $r'\geq r$ such that $r'=\eta[X:=r'](e_3)$. So, $\eta[X:=r'](e_1)\geq \eta[X:=r](e_1)=\eta(e_1[X:=Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}])>0$. Hence, $\eta[X:=r'](e_1\Rightarrow e_2\diamond e_3)=\eta[X:=r'](e_3)=r'$ and this is sufficient to finish the proof for the lemma for this case.
- The proof where e has the shape of the conditional operator e₁ → e₂ ⋄ e₃ is quite similar, but due to
 the intricate nature of fixed-point proofs, we provide it explicitly.

First we consider the case where $\sigma=\mu$. We use Lemma 3.5. So, for some valuation η we show that both cases 1 and 2 of Lemma 3.5 hold. For case 1 we can assume that there is an $r\in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r=\eta[X:=r](e_1\to e_2\diamond e_3)$. It suffices to show that there is an $r'\leq r$ such that $r'\geq \eta[X:=r']((e_1[X:=Sol_{X=e_2}^\mu])\to Sol_{X=e_2}^\mu\diamond Sol_{X=e_2\vee e_3}^\mu)$. We distinguish two cases.

- First the situation where $\eta[X:=r](e_1)<0$ is considered. In this case $r=\eta[X:=r](e_2)$. Using the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.6 there is an $r'\leq r$ such that $r'=\eta[X:=r'](Sol^\mu_{X=e_2})$. From this it follows that $\eta[X:=r'](e_1[X:=Sol^\mu_{X=e_2}])=\eta[X:=r'](e_1)\leq \eta[X:=r](e_1)<0$. This allows us to derive

$$\eta[X := r']((e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu}]) \to Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu} \diamond Sol_{X=e_2 \vee e_3}^{\mu}) = \eta[X := r'](Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu}) = r',$$

which implies our proof obligation.

- Now we investigate the situation where $\eta[X:=r](e_1)\geq 0$. It follows that $r=\eta[X:=r](e_2\vee e_3)$. From this it follows that $r\geq \eta[X:=r](e_2)$. Using the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.6 we know that there are $r_1\leq r$ such that $r_1=\eta[X:=r_1](Sol_{X=e_2}^\mu)$, and $r_2\leq r$ such that $r_2=\eta[X:=r_2](Sol_{X=e_2\vee e_3}^\mu)$. Define $r'=r_1\vee r_2$. Clearly, $r'\leq r$. We find that $r'=r_1\vee r_2\geq r_1=\eta[X:=r_1](Sol_{X=e_2}^\mu)=\eta[X:=r'](Sol_{X=e_2}^\mu)$, using that X does not occur in $Sol_{X=e_2}^\mu$. Moreover, we find that $r'=r_1\vee r_2\geq \eta[X:=r_1](Sol_{X=e_2}^\mu)\vee \eta[X:=r_2](Sol_{X=e_2\vee e_3}^\mu)=\eta[X:=r'](Sol_{X=e_2}^\mu)\vee \eta[X:=r'](Sol_{X=e_2\vee e_3}^\mu)$. So, it follows that both sides of the conditional satisfy the required proof obligation and therefore, we are ready with this case.

For case 2 of Lemma 3.5 and the minimal fixed-point, we consider some valuation η and we assume there is an $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $r = \eta[X := r]((e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu}]) \to Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu} \diamond Sol_{X=e_2 \vee e_3}^{\mu})$. We must show that there is an $r' \leq r$ such that $r' \geq \eta[X := r'](e_1 \to e_2 \diamond e_3)$. We distinguish two cases.

- First assume $\eta[X:=r](e_1[X:=Sol^{\mu}_{X=e_2}])<0$. In that case $r=\eta(Sol^{\mu}_{X=e_2})$. By the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.6 it follows that there is an $r'\leq r$ such that $r'=\eta[X:=r'](e_2)$. So, we derive

$$\eta[X := r'](e_1) \le \eta[X := r](e_1) = \eta[X := \eta(Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu})](e_1) = \eta(e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu}]) = \eta[X := r](e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_2}^{\mu}]) < 0.$$

Hence, $\eta[X:=r'](e_1\to e_2\diamond e_3)$ is equal to $\eta[X:=r'](e_2)$. Hence, $r'=\eta[X:=r'](e_1\to e_2\diamond e_3)$, which implies what had to be shown.

- Now assume $\eta[X:=r](e_1[X:=Sol^{\mu}_{X=e_2}])\geq 0$. Hence, $r=\eta(Sol^{\mu}_{X=e_2}\vee Sol^{\mu}_{X=e_2\vee e_3})$. From this, it follows that $r\geq \eta(Sol^{\mu}_{X=e_2\vee e_3})$. So, using the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.6 there is an $r'\leq r$ such that $r'=\eta[X:=r'](e_2\vee e_3)$. So, we can also derive that $r'=\eta[X:=r'](e_2)\vee\eta[X:=r'](e_3)\geq \eta[X:=r'](e_2)$. Hence, r' is larger than both sides of the conditional operator, and we can conclude $r'\geq \eta[X:=r'](e_1\to e_2\diamond e_3)$, finalising the proof in this case.

This finishes the proof for the minimal fixed-point, and we continue with the maximal fixed-point $\sigma = \nu$

We again apply Lemma 3.5. So, fix some valuation η . For case 1 of Lemma 3.5 consider an r such that $r=\eta[X:=r](e_1\to e_2\diamond e_3)$. We are ready with this case if we have shown that there is an $r'\geq r$ and $r'\leq \eta[X:=r']((e_1[X:=Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu}\vee Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}])\to Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu}\diamond Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$. We distinguish two cases.

- First we consider the case where $\eta[X:=r](e_1)<0$. Then $r=\eta[X:=r](e_2)$. Using the induction hypothesis and by applying Lemma 3.6, we know that there is an $r'\geq r$ such that $r'=\eta[X:=r'](Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu})$. We also see that r' satisfies $r'=\eta[X:=r'](Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu})\leq \eta[X:=r'](Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu}\vee Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$. So, we can conclude that $r'\leq \eta[X:=r']((e_1[X:=Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu}\vee Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}))\to Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu}\otimes Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$ as we had to show.
- Second we consider the case $\eta[X:=r](e_1)\geq 0$. Then $r=\eta[X:=r](e_2\vee e_3)$. So, $r=\eta[X:=r](e_2)$ or $r=\eta[X:=r](e_3)$. We assume that the first case holds, as the proof for the second case is perfectly symmetric. Hence, using the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.6 there is an $r'\geq r$ such that $r'=\eta[X:=r'](Sol^\nu_{X=e_2})$. We derive

$$\begin{array}{ll} \eta[X:=r'](e_1[X:=Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu}\vee Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}])\geq & \eta[X:=r'](e_1[X:=Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu}])=\eta[X:=r'](e_1)\geq \eta[X:=r'](e_1)\geq 0. \end{array}$$

So,

$$\eta[X := r']((e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu} \vee Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}]) \to Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu} \diamond Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}) = \eta[X := r'](Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu} \vee Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}) \ge \eta[X := r'](Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu}) = r'.$$

as we had to prove.

Now we concentrate on case 2 of Lemma 3.5 for the maximal fixed-point. So, we consider an $r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r = \eta[X := r]((e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu} \lor Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}]) \to Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu} \diamond Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$, and we must show that an $r' \geq r$ exists such that $r' \leq \eta[X := r'](e_1 \to e_2 \diamond e_3)$. Again, we distinguish two cases.

- Assume $\eta(e_1[X:=Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu}\vee Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}])<0$. It follows that $r=\eta(Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu})$. Using the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.6 it follows that there is an $r'\geq r$ such that $r'=\eta[X:=r'](e_2)$. So, it follows that $r'\leq \eta[X:=r'](e_2\vee e_3)$. As $\eta[X:=r'](e_1\to e_2\diamond e_3)$ must be equal to one of these, we find that $r'\leq \eta[X:=r'](e_1\to e_2\diamond e_3)$ as we had to show.
- Assume $\eta(e_1[X:=Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu}\vee Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu}])\geq 0$. It follows that $r=\eta(Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu}\vee Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$. Assume $\eta(Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu})\geq \eta(Sol_{X=e_3}^{\nu})$. The reverse assumption follows the same reasoning steps. Hence, $r=\eta(Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu})$. Using the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.6 there is an

 $r' \geq r$ such that $r' = \eta[X := r'](e_2)$. So, $\eta[X := r'](e_1) \geq \eta[X := r](e_1) = \eta(e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu}]) = \eta(e_1[X := Sol_{X=e_2}^{\nu}]) \geq 0$. Hence, $\eta[X := r'](e_1 \to e_2 \diamond e_3) = \eta[X := r'](e_2 \lor e_3) \geq \eta[X := r'](e_2) = r'$ and this is sufficient to finish the proof for the lemma for this case.

With this we have proven that this theorem holds for conditional expressions.

• We now consider the case with a minimal fixed-point where *e* is a conjunctive normal form. Using property E6 it is possible to solve all conjuncts separately. So, without loss of generality, we assume that *e* has the shape

$$e = \bigvee_{j \in J} (c_j \cdot X + c'_j \cdot eq_{-\infty}(X) + f_j) \vee m$$
 (6)

where $c_j \ge 0$ and $c'_j \in \{0,1\}$ are constants such that c_j and c'_j are not both 0, and f_j and m are expressions in which X does not occur. We show that the right-hand side of equation (2) without the initial conjunction provides the required term $Sol^{\mu}_{X=e}$ in this theorem. Concretely,

$$Sol_{X=e}^{\mu} = (eq_{\infty}(\bigvee_{j \in J} f_{j}))$$

$$\Rightarrow (eq_{-\infty}(m) \Rightarrow -\infty \diamond (((\bigvee_{j \in J} f_{j} + (c_{j} - 1) \cdot U) \lor \bigvee_{j \in J \mid c'_{j} = 1} \otimes) \Rightarrow U \diamond \infty))$$

$$(7)$$

where
$$U = m \vee \bigvee_{j \in J \mid c_j < 1} \frac{1}{1 - c_j} \cdot f_j$$
.

Using Lemma 3.5 we must prove case 1 and 2 for a valuation η . We start with case 1. So, consider the smallest $r=\eta[X:=r](e)$. We define $r'=\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\mu})$ automatically satisfying the first proof obligation of Lemma 3.5, where it should be noted that X does not occur in $Sol_{X=e}^{\mu}$. Hence, we only need to show that $r' \leq r$. We distinguish a number of cases.

- Suppose there is some f_j such that $\eta[X:=r](f_j)=\infty$. In that case both $r=\infty$ and $r'=\infty$. So, clearly, $r'\leq r$. Below we can now assume that there is no $j\in J$ such that $\eta[X:=r](f_j)=\infty$.
- Now assume $\eta(m)=-\infty$. By the previous case we know that $f_j\neq\infty$. In that case $r'=\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\mu})=-\infty$, as $\eta(eq_{-\infty}(m))=-\infty\leq 0$, and hence, $r'\leq r$. Below we assume that $\eta(m)\neq -\infty$.
- If there is at least one $j \in J$ such that $c_j' = 1$, then $r = \eta[X := r](e) = \infty$. The reason for this is that $r > -\infty$, as r at least has the value $\eta(m)$. But then $r = \infty$ as $\eta[X := r](c_j' \cdot eq_{-\infty}(X)) = \infty$. Clearly, $r' \leq r$. So, below we can assume that $c_j' = 0$ for all $j \in J$.
- With the assumptions above, we can write e more compactly.

$$e = \bigvee_{j \in J} (c_j \cdot X + f_j) \vee m.$$

We know that r is the smallest value satisfying

$$r = \eta[X := r](e) = \eta[X := r](\bigvee_{j \in J} (c_j \cdot X + f_j) \vee m).$$

Consider $r_1 = \eta(m \vee \bigvee_{j \in J \mid c_i < 1} (\frac{f_j}{1 - c_i}))$.

* First assume that there is no $j \in J$ with $c_j \geq 1$ such that $r_1 < \eta[X := r_1](c_j \cdot X + f_j)$. We show that r_1 is the solution, i.e., $r_1 = r$. Consider the case where that $\eta(m) \geq \frac{\eta(f_j)}{1-c_j}$ for all $j \in J$ such that $c_j < 1$. So, $r_1 = \eta(m)$. In this case $\eta(m)$ is a solution as (i) for those $j \in J$ such that $c_j < 1$ it holds that

 $\eta(m) \ge c_j \cdot \eta(m) + \eta(f_j)$. Moreover, by the assumption of this item for those $j \in J$ such that $c_j \ge 1$, $\eta(m) < c_j \cdot \eta(m) + \eta(f_j)$ (ii). It is obvious that $\eta(m)$ must be the smallest solution.

Now consider the case where $\eta(m)<\frac{\eta(f_j)}{1-c_j}$ for some $j\in J$. In this case it holds that $r_1=\bigvee_{j\in J|c_j<1}(\frac{\eta(f_j)}{1-c_j})=\frac{\eta(f_{j'})}{1-c_{j'}}$ for some $j'\in J$, where j' is the index of the largest solution. It is straightforward to check that $\frac{\eta(f_{j'})}{1-c_{j'}}$ is a solution. It is also the smallest solution, which can be seen as follows. Suppose there were a smaller solution $r_2<\frac{\eta(f_{j'})}{1-c_{j'}}$. Hence, $r_2=\eta(m)\wedge\bigwedge_{j\in J}(c_j\cdot r_2+\eta(f_j))\geq c_{j'}\cdot r_2+\eta(f_{j'})$. From this it follows that $r_2\geq\frac{\eta(f_{j'})}{1-c_{j'}}$ contradicting that it is a smaller solution.

It follows that $r_1 = r$ is the smallest solution. Furthermore, $r' = \eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\mu}) = \eta(U) = \eta(m \vee \bigvee_{j \in J \mid c_j < 1} \frac{f_j}{1 - c_j}) = r_1 = r$. Obviously, $r' \leq r$.

* Now assume that there is a $j \in J$ with $c_j \geq 1$ such that $r_1 < \eta[X := r_1](c_j \cdot X + f_j)$. We show that $r = \infty$. Using the argumentation of the previous item, the smallest solution r is at least r_1 . But clearly, r_1 is larger than the non infinite solution of $X = \eta[X := r_1](c_j \cdot X + f_j)$ as by the assumption $r_1 > \frac{\eta(f_j)}{1 - c_j}$. Note that if $c_j > 1$ this solution exists, and if $c_j = 1$ there is only a finite solution if $\eta(f_j) = 0$, but in this latter case the assumption of this item is invalid. Hence, the only remaining minimal solution is $r = \infty$. Clearly, for any choice of r' it holds that r' < r.

Now we concentrate on case 2 for the minimal fixed-point of Lemma 3.5. We know that $r=\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\mu})$ is the minimal solution for $\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\mu})$ and we must show that there is an $r' \leq r$ such that $r' \geq \eta[X:=r'](e)$. We take r'=r leaving us with the obligation to show that $r \geq \eta[X:=r](e)$. We distinguish the following cases.

- Assume that there is some f_j such that $\eta(f_j) = \infty$. In that case $r = \infty$, which satisfies $\infty \ge \eta[X := \infty](e)$. From here we assume that $\eta(f_j) < \infty$ for all $j \in J$.
- Now assume that $\eta(m) = -\infty$. Note that for any $j \in J$ it is the case that $c_j \neq 0$ or $c'_j \neq 0$. In this case, $r = -\infty$ is the solution as $\eta[X := -\infty](e) = -\infty$ and this implies our proof obligation. So, in the steps below we assume that $\eta(m) > -\infty$.
- With the conditions above, if there is at least one $j \in J$ such that $c'_j = 1$, then $r = \infty$ is the fixed-point satisfying our proof obligation. Below we assume that for all $j \in J$ it holds that $c'_j = 0$.
- As all c'_i can be assumed to be 0, we can simplify the equation for X to:

$$\mu X = \bigwedge_{j \in J} (c_j \cdot X + f_j) \vee m.$$

We find $\eta(U)=\eta(m\vee\bigvee_{j\in J|c_j<1}\frac{f_j}{1-c_j})$. If there is no $j\in J$ with $c_j\geq 1$ such that $\eta(f_j)-\eta((1-c_j)\cdot U)>0$ we find that $r=\eta(Sol_{X=e}^\mu)=\eta(U)$. We show that $r\geq \eta[X:=r](e)$. If $\eta(m)\geq\bigvee_{j\in J|c_j<1}\frac{\eta(f_j)}{1-c_j}$ then $r=\eta(m)$. For a $j\in J$ with $c_j<1$ we find that $c_j\cdot \eta(m)+\eta(f_j)\leq \eta(m)$ as $\eta(m)\geq\frac{f_j}{1-c_j}$. For a $j\in J$ with $c_j\geq 1$, we find by the condition above that $\eta(f_j+c_j\cdot U)\leq \eta(U)$, or in other words $\eta(f_j+c_j\cdot m)\leq \eta(m)$. So, $r=\eta(m)=\eta[X:=r](e)$ as we had to show.

Otherwise, there is some $j' \in J$ with $c_{j'} < 1$ such that $\frac{\eta(f_{j'})}{1 - c_{j'}} = \bigvee_{j \in J \mid c_j < 1} \frac{\eta(f_j)}{1 - c_j}$. In this case $r = \frac{\eta(f_{j'})}{1 - c_{j'}}$. From the conditions, we can see that $r = \eta[X := r](e)$ as we had to show.

- Now assume that there is a $j \in J$ with $c_j \ge 1$ such that $\eta(f_j) - \eta((1 - c_j) \cdot U) > 0$. In this case $r = \eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\mu}) = \infty$, clearly satisfying our proof obligation.

This finishes our proof for a minimal fixed-point equation.

• The last case of this proof regards a maximal fixed-point equation. The proof is similar to that of the minimal fixed-point equation. The maximal fixed-point equation that we consider has the shape

$$\nu X = \bigvee_{i \in I} (\bigwedge_{j \in J_i} (c_{ij} \cdot X + c'_{ij} \cdot eq_{-\infty}(X) + f_{ij}) \wedge m_i).$$

Due to property E7 we can solve the disjuncts separately, and take the disjunction of these solutions as the solution of this equation. So, we concentrate on a maximal fixed-point equation of the shape

$$\nu X = \bigwedge_{j \in J} (c_j \cdot X + c'_j \cdot eq_{-\infty}(X) + f_j) \wedge m$$
(8)

and we show that the solution is

$$Sol_{X=e}^{\nu} = eq_{\infty}(m)$$

$$\Rightarrow (\bigwedge_{j \in J \mid c_{j} \geq 1 \land c_{j}' = 0} f_{j} + (c_{j} - 1) \cdot U) \rightarrow -\infty \diamond U$$

$$\diamond \quad \infty$$

where

$$U = m \wedge \bigwedge_{j \in J \mid c_j < 1 \wedge c'_j = 0} \frac{1}{1 - c_j} \cdot f_j.$$

We write e for the right-hand side of Equation (8).

We use Lemma 3.5 for the largest fixed-point. First, we concentrate on case 1. So, for the largest r satisfying $r=\eta[X:=r](e)$ we must show that there is an $r'\geq r$ such that $r'\leq \eta[X:=r'](Sol_{X=e}^{\nu})$. We take $r'=\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\nu})$. As X does not occur in $Sol_{X=e}^{\nu}$ we have that $\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\nu})\leq \eta[X:=\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\nu})](Sol_{X=e}^{\nu})$. So, our only proof obligation is $\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\nu})\geq r$. We split the proof in a number of cases

- In case $\eta(m)=\infty$, we find $r'=\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\nu})=\infty$ and our proof obligation is met. Below, we assume that $\eta(m)<\infty$.
- Now assume that for all $j \in J$ with $c_j \geq 1$ and $c'_j = 0$, it holds that $\eta(f_j + (c_j 1) \cdot U) \geq 0$. We show below that no $r'' > \eta(U)$ can be a solution for (8). In this case $\eta(Sol^{\nu}_{X=e}) = \eta(U)$ from which it follows that $\eta(Sol^{\nu}_{X=e}) \geq r$.

Assume $\eta(m) \leq \frac{\eta(f_j)}{1-c_j}$ for all $j \in J$ such that $c_j < 1$ and $c_j' = 0$. If $r'' > \eta(m)$, then clearly r'' is not a solution, as the solution is at most $\eta(m)$.

If the above does not hold, there is at least one $j \in J$ with $c_j < 1$ and $c_j' = 0$ such that $\eta(m) > \frac{\eta(f_j)}{1-c_j}$. Assume r'' is larger than the smallest conjunct $\frac{\eta(f_j)}{1-c_j}$ for any $j \in J$ with $c_j < 1$ and $c_j' = 0$. If r'' were a solution of (8), then it satisfies $r'' \le c_j \cdot r'' + \eta(f_j)$. This is equivalent to $r'' \le \frac{\eta(f_j)}{1-c_j}$ contradicting the assumption.

- Now assume that there is some $j \in J$ with $c_j \geq 1$ and $c'_j = 0$ for which it holds that $\eta(f_j + (c_j - 1) \cdot U) < 0$. In this case $\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\nu}) = -\infty$. In the previous item it was shown that any solution r'' for (8) it holds that $r'' \leq \eta(U)$. Moreover, r'' has to satisfy that $r'' \leq c_j \cdot r'' + \eta(f_j)$. If $r'' \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c_j \neq 1$, this is the same as saying that $r'' \geq \frac{\eta(f_j)}{1 - c_j}$, and combining it with the assumption of this item, it follows that $r'' > \eta(U)$, leading to a contradiction. If $r'' \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c_j = 1$ we derive that both $\eta(f_j) \geq 0$ and $\eta(f_j) < 0$, also leading to a contradiction. Hence, in both cases $r'' \notin \mathbb{R}$, meaning that $r'' = -\infty$. In this case this is exactly the value of $\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\nu})$, finishing this item of the proof.

In the last part of the proof we focus our attention on case 2 of Lemma 3.5 for maximal fixed-points. So, we consider $r=\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\nu})$ and we have to find an $r'\in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ that satisfies $r'\geq r$ and $r'\leq \eta[X:=r'](e)$. We take r'=r, and this means that we only have to show that $\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\nu})$ satisfies $\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\nu})\leq \eta[X:=\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\nu})](e)$. We again walk through a number of cases.

- First assume that $\eta(m)=\infty$. Then $\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\nu})=\infty$ and it clearly satisfies (8). If $\eta(m)=-\infty$, then the right-hand side of (8) equals $-\infty$. In this case $\eta(U)=-\infty$, and therefore, $\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\nu})=-\infty$, which satisfies our proof obligation. So, below we can safely assume that $\eta(m)\neq\pm\infty$.
- Now assume there is a $j \in J$ with $c'_j = 1$. As $\eta(m) > -\infty$, clearly, $eq_{-\infty}(\eta(m)) = \infty$, and this disjunct equals ∞ , being larger than $\eta(Sol^{\nu}_{X=e})$, satisfying our proof obligation. So, we can safely assume that $c'_j = 0$ for all $j \in J$.
- Assume that for all $j \in J$ such that $c_j \geq 1$ and $c'_j = 0$, it holds that $\eta(f_j + (c_j 1) \cdot U) \geq 0$. We find that $\eta(Sol_{X=e}^{\nu}) = \eta(U)$. Assume that $\eta(U) = \eta(m)$, which means that $\eta(m) \leq \frac{\eta(f_j)}{1-c_j}$ for all $j \in J$ with $c_j < 1$ and $c'_j = 0$. We see that $\eta(m)$ is a solution for (8) by showing that $c_j \cdot \eta(m) + \eta(f_j) \geq \eta(m)$ for all $j \in J$. First consider such a $j \in J$ such that $c_j < 1$. The identity above follows directly from $\eta(m) \leq \frac{\eta(f_j)}{1-c_j}$. Second consider such a $j \in J$ such that $c_j \geq 1$. The required identity follows from the assumption that $\eta(f_j + (c_j 1) \cdot U) \geq 0$. Now assume that $\eta(U) = \frac{\eta(f_j)}{1-c_j}$ for some $j \in J$ with $c_j < 1$ as this is the smallest conjunct of $\eta(U)$. We see that $\eta(U)$ satisfies (8). For those $j' \in J$ with $c_{j'} < 1$ we find that $\eta(c_{j'} \cdot U + f_{j'}) \geq \eta(U)$ as it is equivalent to stating that $\eta(U) \leq \frac{\eta(f_{j'})}{1-c_{j'}}$. For the same reason, we see that $\eta(c_j \cdot U + f_j) = \eta(U) < \eta(m)$. Now consider those $j' \in J$ with $c_{j'} > 1$. By the condition at the beginning of this item it follows that $\eta(f_j + (c_j) \cdot U) \geq \eta(U)$. Hence, the right-hand side of (8) reduces to $\eta(U)$ as we had to show.
- Assume that for some $j \in J$ such that $c_j \ge 1$ and $c'_j = 0$, it holds that $\eta(f_j + (c_j 1) \cdot U) \ge 0$. Hence, $\eta(Sol^{\nu}_{X=e}) = -\infty$, rendering our proof obligation trivial.

This finishes all cases we had to go through in the proof, proving the theorem.

B Validity of E6 and E7

We prove that the implication E6 is valid. The validity of E7 follows by duality.

Proof. We show, given $\mu X = e_1 \equiv \mu X = f_1$ and $\mu X = e_2 \equiv \mu X = f_2$, that

$$\mu X = e_1 \wedge e_2 \equiv \mu X = f_1 \wedge f_2$$

holds using Lemma 3.5. As cases 1. and 2. are symmetric, we only prove case 1. So, we must show that for the smallest $r \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $r = \eta[X := r](e_1 \wedge e_2)$, it holds that there in an r' satisfying that $r' \leq r$ and $r' \geq \eta[X := r'](f_1 \wedge f_2)$.

We know that $r=\eta[X:=r](e_i)$ for i=1 or i=2 as $\hat{\mathbb{R}}$ is totally ordered. As $\mu X=e_i\equiv \mu X=f_i$, we know by Lemma 3.6 that there is an r' such that $r'\leq r$ and $r'=\eta[X:=r'](f_i)$. Clearly, r' also satisfies that $r'=\eta[X:=r'](f_i)\geq \eta[X:=r'](f_1\wedge f_2)$. This finishes the proof.