

Robust Probabilistic Temporal Logics

Martin Zimmermann

Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark.

Abstract

We robustify PCTL and PCTL*, the most important specification languages for probabilistic systems, and show that robustness does not increase the complexity of the model-checking problems.

1 Introduction

Specifications of reactive systems are typically implications $\varphi_a \rightarrow \varphi_g$ where φ_a is an environment assumption and φ_g is a system guarantee. Such a specification is satisfied whenever the assumption is violated, independently of the system’s behaviour. Assume, for example, that both the assumption and the guarantee are invariants $\varphi_a = \Box\psi_a$ and $\varphi_g = \Box\psi_g$ for propositional formulas ψ_g and ψ_a . Then, the specification $\Box\psi_a \rightarrow \Box\psi_g$ is satisfied if the formula ψ_a is violated just once, even if the formula ψ_g never holds. Such a behaviour is clearly undesirable: the classical semantics of temporal logics are not sufficiently robust to deal with violations of the environment assumption.

Considerable effort has been put into overcoming this “defect” to provide robust semantics for temporal logics. However, the notion of robustness is hard to formalize, which is witnessed by the plethora of incomparable notions of robustness in the literature on verification (see, e.g., the introduction of [1] for a recent overview). Here, we further develop the approach of Tabuada and Neider based on a novel, robust semantics for temporal logics, originally introduced for Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) [21]. They argue that there are four canonical degrees a formula of the form $\Box\psi$ can be violated:

1. ψ is violated only finitely often.
2. ψ is violated infinitely often, but also holds infinitely often.
3. ψ is satisfied only finitely often.
4. ψ is never satisfied.

Note that there is a natural order between these cases. Consequently, their robust semantics uses five truth values, one for satisfaction and four more to capture the four degrees of violation. Furthermore, Tabuada and Neider defined the semantics of implication such that $\Box\psi_a \rightarrow \Box\psi_g$ is satisfied whenever the degree of violation of the guarantee $\Box\psi_g$ is not more severe than the violation of the assumption $\Box\psi_a$. Thus, the semantics indeed robustly handles violations of environment assumptions.

The resulting logic, called robust LTL (rLTL), has been extensively studied with very encouraging results: robustness can be added without increasing the complexity of model-checking and synthesis [1, 21, 16], robust semantics increases the usefulness of runtime monitoring [13], and rLTL can even be extended with increased expressiveness or timing constraints, again without an increase in complexity [17]. This approach towards robustness even extends to other temporal logics, e.g., branching-time logics like CTL and CTL* [15] and alternating-time logics like ATL and ATL* [14], where robustness can again be added without increasing the complexity of the most important verification problems.

Beyond the fact that this form of robustness comes for free (in terms of computational complexity), it only changes the semantics of the logics, but not the syntax. Furthermore, these logics are also evaluated over classical transition systems with the classical binary satisfaction relation for atomic propositions, i.e., robustness does not emerge from multi-valued semantics of the models (which might be hard to determine), but purely from the semantics. These aspects allow for a smooth transition from classical semantics to robust semantics for temporal logics. In conclusion, Tabuada and Neider introduced a natural and lightweight approach to add robustness that is applicable to a wide range of logics.

However, these logics capture only robustness in the temporal dimension, i.e., they are concerned with a single execution. Statements like “99% of the executions answer each request eventually” require robustness in terms of the whole set of executions, which is orthogonal to the capabilities of the robust logics studied thus far. To express such specifications, Hansson and Jonsson introduced probabilistic CTL (PCTL) [9], while Aziz, Singhal, and Balarin introduced probabilistic CTL* (PCTL*) [3]. PCTL and PCTL* replace the existential and universal quantification over paths in CTL and CTL* by the probabilistic operator $\mathcal{P}_I(\Phi)$, where $I \subseteq [0, 1]$ is an interval with rational endpoints and Φ is a property of paths. Intuitively, $\mathcal{P}_I(\Phi)$ is satisfied in a state s if the probability that a path starting in s satisfies Φ is in the interval I . As CTL, PCTL requires each temporal operator to be preceded by a \mathcal{P} while PCTL* (as CTL*) allows arbitrary nesting of Boolean connectives, temporal operators, and \mathcal{P} . For example, the property “99% of the executions answer each request eventually” is expressed by the PCTL* formula $\mathcal{P}_{\geq .99}(\Box(q \rightarrow \Diamond p))$, where q represents a request and p a response.

In this work, we further the study of robust semantics for temporal logics a la Tabuada and Neider by robustifying PCTL and PCTL*, obtaining the logics rPCTL and rPCTL*. In line with the design goals of the approach, the robust variants have (essentially) the same syntax as the non-robust variants and are evaluated over the same structures, simplifying the transition from the non-robust to the robust setting. The semantics of rPCTL and rPCTL* also follow the blueprint, i.e., they are five-valued employing the four degrees of violation described above. This simplifies the transition from robust semantics for linear, branching, and alternating time to the robust probabilistic setting.

As our main contribution, we show that this robustification comes again for free: the automata-based model-checking algorithms for rPCTL and rPCTL* can be generalized to the robust semantics. This result is in line with those on the robust temporal logics studied thus far, once more showing the versatility of robustness a la Tabuada and Neider.

2 Preliminaries

We denote the set of non-negative integers by \mathbb{N} . Throughout the paper, we fix a finite set AP of atomic propositions we use to label our models and to build our formulas. For algorithmic purposes, we assume that all probabilities used in the following are rational.

A discrete-time Markov chain (DTMC) $\mathcal{M} = (S, s_I, \delta, \ell)$ consists of a finite set S of states containing the initial state s_I , a (stochastic) transition function $\delta: S \times S \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfying $\sum_{s' \in S} \delta(s, s') = 1$ for all $s \in S$, and a labeling function $\ell: S \rightarrow 2^{AP}$. The size $|\mathcal{M}|$ of \mathcal{M} is defined as $\sum_{s, s' \in S} |\delta(s, s')|$, where $|p|$ denotes the length of the binary encoding of $p \in \mathbb{Q}$.

A path of \mathcal{M} is an infinite sequence $\pi = s_0 s_1 s_2 \dots \in S^\omega$ such that $\delta(s_n, s_{n+1}) > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that π starts in s_0 . For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $\pi(n) = s_n$ for the n -th state of π and $\pi[n, \infty) = s_n s_{n+1} s_{n+2} \dots$ for the suffix of π starting at position n . We write $\Pi(\mathcal{M}, s)$ for the set of all paths of \mathcal{M} starting in $s \in S$ and define $\Pi(\mathcal{M}) = \bigcup_{s \in S} \Pi(\mathcal{M}, s)$.

The probability measure μ_s on sets of paths starting in some state $s \in S$ is defined as usual: Fix some non-empty path prefix $\rho = s_0 \dots s_n$. The probability of the cylinder set $C_\rho = \{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}, s) \mid \rho \text{ is a prefix of } \pi\}$ is

$$\mu_s(C_\rho) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s_0 \neq s, \\ \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \delta(\rho(j), \rho(j+1)) & \text{if } s_0 = s. \end{cases}$$

Using Carathéodory’s extension theorem, we lift μ_s to a measure on the σ -algebra induced by the cylinder sets of path prefixes starting in s (see, e.g., [12, Theorem 1.41] for details). All sets of paths used in the following are ω -regular (see, e.g., [8, Chapter 1] for background on ω -regular languages) and therefore measurable.

3 Robust PCTL

In this section, we robustify PCTL [9]. Robust PCTL (rPCTL) and PCTL share the same syntax (but for the dots to distinguish them), i.e., the formulas of rPCTL are given by the grammar

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi ::= & p \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \varphi \rightarrow \varphi \mid \\ & \mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\odot\varphi) \mid \mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\diamond\varphi) \mid \mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\square\varphi) \mid \mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\varphi \mathbf{U} \psi) \mid \mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\varphi \mathbf{R} \psi) \end{aligned}$$

where p ranges over AP , $\sim \in \{<, \leq, =, \geq, >\}$, and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ is a rational probability threshold. The size $|\varphi|$ of a formula φ is defined as the number of subformulas of φ plus the maximal length $|\lambda|$ of the binary encodings of the thresholds $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$ appearing in φ . Note that we have all Boolean operators in the grammar, as the semantics of negation is non-classical and implication cannot be derived from negation and disjunction. This is due to the five-valued robust semantics (see [21, Section 3.3] for a detailed discussion). For didactic reasons, we also prefer to explicitly have the operators eventually (\diamond) and always (\square) as they already capture the essence of the robust semantics. The robust semantics of until (\mathbf{U}) and release (\mathbf{R}) then generalize these.

Let DTMC $\mathcal{M} = (S, s_I, \delta, \ell)$ be a DTMC. The semantics of rPCTL is defined via an evaluation function $V_{\mathcal{M}}$ mapping a vertex s of \mathcal{M} and a formula φ to a truth value in the (ordered) set $\mathbb{B}_4 = \{1111 \succ 0111 \succ 0011 \succ 0001 \succ 0000\}$. Given a truth value $t = b_1b_2b_3b_4 \in \mathbb{B}_4$, we write $t[k]$ for b_k .

The evaluation function is defined inductively via

- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, p) = \begin{cases} 1111 & \text{if } p \in \ell(s), \\ 0000 & \text{if } p \notin \ell(s), \end{cases}$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \neg\varphi) = \begin{cases} 1111 & \text{if } V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi) \prec 1111, \\ 0000 & \text{if } V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi) = 1111, \end{cases}$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_0 \wedge \varphi_1) = \min(V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_0), V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_1)),$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_0 \vee \varphi_1) = \max(V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_0), V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_1)),$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_0 \rightarrow \varphi_1) = \begin{cases} 1111 & \text{if } V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_0) \preceq V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_1), \\ V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_1) & \text{if } V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_0) \succ V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_1), \end{cases}$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\odot\varphi)) = b_1b_2b_3b_4$ with $b_k = 1$ iff $\mu_s(\{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}, s) \mid V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(1), \varphi)[k] = 1\}) \sim \lambda,$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\diamond\varphi)) = b_1b_2b_3b_4$ with $b_k = 1$ iff $\mu_s(\{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}, s) \mid (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(n), \varphi))[k] = 1 \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}\}) \sim \lambda,$ and
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\square\varphi)) = b_1b_2b_3b_4$ with
 - $b_1 = 1$ iff $\mu_s(\{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}, s) \mid (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(n), \varphi))[1] = 1 \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}\}) \sim \lambda,$
 - $b_2 = 1$ iff $\mu_s(\{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}, s) \mid (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(n), \varphi))[2] = 1 \text{ for all but finitely many } n \in \mathbb{N}\}) \sim \lambda,$
 - $b_3 = 1$ iff $\mu_s(\{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}, s) \mid (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(n), \varphi))[3] = 1 \text{ for infinitely many } n \in \mathbb{N}\}) \sim \lambda,$
 - $b_4 = 1$ iff $\mu_s(\{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}, s) \mid (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(n), \varphi))[4] = 1 \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}\}) \sim \lambda,$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\varphi \mathbf{U} \psi)) = b_1b_2b_3b_4$ with $b_k = 1$ iff $\mu_s(\{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}, s) \mid \text{there exists } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(n), \psi))[k] = 1 \text{ and } (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(n'), \varphi))[k] = 1 \text{ for all } n' < n\}) \sim \lambda,$ and
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\varphi \mathbf{R} \psi)) = b_1b_2b_3b_4$ with
 - $b_1 = 1$ iff $\mu_s(\{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}, s) \mid \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N} (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(n), \psi))[1] = 1 \text{ or } (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(n), \varphi))[1] = 1 \text{ some } n' < n\}) \sim \lambda,$
 - $b_2 = 1$ iff $\mu_s(\{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}, s) \mid (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(n), \psi))[2] = 1 \text{ for all but finitely many } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ or } (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(n), \varphi))[2] = 1 \text{ some } n \in \mathbb{N}\}) \sim \lambda,$
 - $b_3 = 1$ iff $\mu_s(\{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}, s) \mid (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(n), \psi))[3] = 1 \text{ for infinitely many } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ or } (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(n), \varphi))[3] = 1 \text{ some } n' < n\}) \sim \lambda,$ and

- $b_4 = 1$ iff $\mu_s(\{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}, s) \mid (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(n), \psi))[4] = 1 \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ or } (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(n), \varphi))[4] = 1 \text{ some } n' < n\}) \sim \lambda$.

For a detailed motivation and description of the semantics, we refer to [21, Section 3].

Example 1. Consider the formula $\varphi = \mathcal{P}_{\geq .9}(\Box a) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\geq .95}(\Box g)$ expressing a robust assume-guarantee property. Assume φ evaluates to 1111 and consider the following cases:

- Assume $\mathcal{P}_{\geq .9}(\Box a)$ evaluates to 1111, i.e., with probability $\geq .9$, a holds at every position of a path. Then, by the semantics of the implication, with probability $\geq .95$, g holds at every position.
- Assume $\mathcal{P}_{\geq .9}(\Box a)$ evaluates to 0111, i.e., with probability $\geq .9$, a holds at all but finitely many positions of a path (but not at every position of a path with probability $\geq .9$). Then, by the semantics of the implication, with probability $\geq .95$, g holds at least at all but finitely many positions.
- Similar arguments hold for the truth values 0011 and 0001: Assume with probability $\geq .9$, a holds infinitely often (a holds at least once). Then, with probability $\geq .95$, g holds infinitely often (g holds at least once).

Thus, the semantics of φ ensures that a violation of the assumption $\Box a$ is met with (at most) a proportional violation of the guarantee $\Box g$.

But we can even derive useful information if φ does not evaluate to 1111. Assume, φ evaluates to $t < 1111$. This can only be the case if the assumption $\mathcal{P}_{\geq .9}(\Box a)$ evaluates to some truth value strictly smaller than t and the guarantee $\mathcal{P}_{\geq .95}(\Box g)$ evaluates to t . Hence, even if the implication does not hold, it still yields the degree of satisfaction of the guarantee.

The above example show that the robust semantics does indeed capture the intuition described in the introduction.

3.1 Expressiveness

In this section, we discuss the expressiveness of rPCTL; in particular, we compare it to the expressiveness of PCTL.

Our first result shows that rPCTL is at least as expressive as PCTL. Note that the restriction to implication-free formulas is just technical, as implications $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$ in PCTL formulas can always be rewritten as $\neg\varphi \vee \psi$. The need for the implication-removal stems from the fact that robust implication does not generalize classical implication [13, Footnote 3].

Lemma 1. Let φ be a PCTL formula without implications, and let \mathcal{M} be a DTMC with initial state s_I . Then, $\mathcal{M}, s_I \models \varphi$ iff $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s_I, \dot{\varphi}) = 1111$, where $\dot{\varphi}$ is the rPCTL formula obtained from φ by dotting all temporal operators.

Proof. By induction over the construction of φ , formalizing the fact that the first bit of the robust semantics captures the classical semantics of PCTL. This can be seen by a careful inspection of the robust semantics. \square

Corollary 1. rPCTL is at least as expressive as PCTL.

Let us briefly discuss the other inclusion, e.g., is rPCTL strictly more expressive than PCTL? This is true for the non-probabilistic setting, where rCTL (robust CTL) is strictly more expressive than CTL, as $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s_I, \forall \Box p) \succeq 0111$ holds iff p holds at all but finitely many positions of every path starting in s . This property cannot be expressed in CTL [5, Theorem 6.21]. However, the analogous property “ p holds at all but finitely many positions often with probability one” can be expressed in PCTL [5, Theorem 10.48] (when considering finite DTMCs), relying on the fact that a path ends up with probability one in a bottom strongly-connected component. We leave open the question whether similar arguments are sufficient to show that rPCTL can be embedded into PCTL (w.r.t. finite DTMCs).

Let us conclude this section with a consequence of the embedding proven in Lemma 1. rPCTL satisfiability asks, given a formula φ and a truth value t^* whether there is a DTMC \mathcal{M} with initial state s_I such that $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s_I, \varphi) \succeq t^*$. Decidability of PCTL satisfiability is an open problem [7]. So, due to Lemma 1, which allows us to embed PCTL in rPCTL, settling the decidability of rPCTL satisfiability problem is most likely challenging.

3.2 Model-checking

In this section, we prove that model-checking rPCTL is not harder than model-checking PCTL, which is in PTIME [9], i.e., robustness can be added for free. Formally, rPCTL model-checking is the following problem: Given a DTMC \mathcal{M} with initial state s_I , an rPCTL formula φ , and a truth value $t^* \in \mathbb{B}_4$, is $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s_I, \varphi) \succeq t^*$?

Theorem 1. *rPCTL model-checking is in PTIME.*

Proof. Fix a DTMC $\mathcal{M} = (S, s_I, \delta, \ell)$ and an rPCTL formula φ , and let $\text{cl}(\varphi)$ denote the set of subformulas of φ (which is defined as expected). We show how to inductively compute the satisfaction sets

$$\text{Sat}(\psi, t) = \{s \in S \mid V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \psi) \succeq t\}$$

for $\psi \in \text{cl}(\varphi)$ and $t \in \mathbb{B}_4$. Note that $\text{Sat}(\psi, 0000) = S$ holds for all subformulas ψ . Hence, in the following, we only consider $t \succ 0000$. Also, the cases for atomic propositions and Boolean connectives are trivial, as they amount to Boolean combinations of already computed sets (see, e.g., [15]). For example, we have $\text{Sat}(\psi' \wedge \psi'', t) = \text{Sat}(\psi', t) \cap \text{Sat}(\psi'', t)$ and $\text{Sat}(\psi' \vee \psi'', t) = \text{Sat}(\psi', t) \cup \text{Sat}(\psi'', t)$. Hence, it only remains to consider subformulas ψ of the form $\mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\odot\psi')$, $\mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\diamond\psi')$, $\mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\square\psi')$, $\mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\psi' \mathbf{U} \psi'')$, or $\mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\psi' \mathbf{R} \psi'')$.

We begin with the next operator. Here, we have $s \in \text{Sat}(\mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\odot\psi'), t)$ iff

$$\mu_s(\{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}, s) \mid \pi(1) \in \text{Sat}(\psi', t)\}) = \left(\sum_{s' \in \text{Sat}(\psi', t)} \delta(s, s') \right) \sim \lambda.$$

The value $\sum_{s'} \delta(s, s')$ can be computed and compared to λ in polynomial time, as $\text{Sat}(\psi', t)$ has already been computed by induction hypothesis.

For the remaining temporal operators, we rely on standard automata-theoretic characterizations of the sets of paths satisfying a temporal formula (see, e.g., [8, Section 1] for an introduction to automata on infinite words). We will then apply the following result due to Baier et al.: Given a DTMC \mathcal{M} , one of its states s , and an unambiguous Büchi automaton¹ with n states accepting a language L , the probability $\mu_s(L)$ can be computed in polynomial time in $|\mathcal{M}|$ and n [6, Theorem 2].

We begin by considering the always operator and then deal with the remaining operators, as we can reuse the machinery developed for the always operator to deal with them. By definition, we have $s \in \text{Sat}(\mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\square\psi'), t)$ iff

- $t = 1111$ and $\mu_s(\text{Safe}(\text{Sat}(\psi', 1111))) \sim \lambda$,
- $t = 0111$ and $\mu_s(\text{CoBüchi}(\text{Sat}(\psi', 0111))) \sim \lambda$,
- $t = 0011$ and $\mu_s(\text{Büchi}(\text{Sat}(\psi', 0011))) \sim \lambda$, and
- $t = 0001$ and $\mu_s(\text{Reach}(\text{Sat}(\psi', 0001))) \sim \lambda$,

where

- $\text{Safe}(S') = \{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}) \mid \pi(n) \in S' \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$,
- $\text{CoBüchi}(S') = \{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}) \mid \pi(n) \in S' \text{ for all but finitely many } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$,
- $\text{Büchi}(S') = \{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}) \mid \pi(n) \in S' \text{ for infinitely many } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$,
- $\text{Reach}(S') = \{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}) \mid \pi(n) \in S' \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

All these sets are accepted by some unambiguous Büchi automaton with at most three states (see Figure 1). As the satisfiability sets $\text{Sat}(\psi', t)$ are already computed by induction assumption, we only need to compute $\mu_s(L)$ for these languages and compare it to the given threshold λ . This can be achieved in polynomial time as argued above.

¹An automaton is unambiguous if it has at most one accepting on every input.




Figure 1: The unambiguous Büchi automata for the path properties used in the rPCTL model-checking algorithm. Transitions are labeled by sets of states that represent all states in them (recall that S is the set of all states while S' and S'' are subsets of S). \bar{S}' denotes the complement of S' w.r.t. S .

Now, let us consider the eventually operator. By definition, we have $s \in \text{Sat}(\mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\diamond\psi'), t)$ iff $\mu_s(\text{Reach}(\text{Sat}(\psi', t))) \sim \lambda$, which we have just seen how to check in polynomial time. For the until operator, we have $s \in \text{Sat}(\mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\psi' \mathbf{U} \psi''), t)$ iff $\mu_s(\text{Until}(\text{Sat}(\psi', t), \text{Sat}(\psi'', t))) \sim \lambda$, where

$$\text{Until}(S', S'') = \{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}) \mid \text{there is an } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } \pi(n) \in S'' \text{ and } \pi(n') \in S' \text{ for all } n' < n\}.$$

There is an unambiguous Büchi automaton with two states accepting this language (see Figure 1). Thus, $\mu_s(\text{Until}(\text{Sat}(\psi', t), \text{Sat}(\psi'', t))) \sim \lambda$ can again be checked in polynomial time.

Finally, we consider the release operator. By definition, we have $s \in \text{Sat}(\mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\psi' \mathbf{R} \psi''), t)$ iff

- $t = 1111$ and $\mu_s([\text{Until}(\text{Sat}(\psi'', 1111), \text{Sat}(\psi', 1111)) \cap \text{Sat}(\psi'', 1111)] \cup \text{Safe}(\text{Sat}(\psi'', 1111))) \sim \lambda$,
- $t = 0111$ and $\mu_s(\text{CoBüchi}(\text{Sat}(\psi'', 0111)) \cup \text{Reach}(\text{Sat}(\psi', 0111))) \sim \lambda$,
- $t = 0011$ and $\mu_s(\text{Büchi}(\text{Sat}(\psi'', 0011)) \cup \text{Reach}(\text{Sat}(\psi', 0011))) \sim \lambda$, and
- $t = 0001$ and $\mu_s(\text{Reach}(\text{Sat}(\psi'', 0001)) \cup \text{Reach}(\text{Sat}(\psi', 0001))) \sim \lambda$. Note that $\text{Reach}(S') \cup \text{Reach}(S'') = \text{Reach}(S' \cup S'')$ for all sets S' and S'' , i.e., we can rely on the results for Reach shown above.

Again, all these languages are accepted by unambiguous Büchi automata (see Figure 1) with at most four states, which implies that we can again decide $\mu_s(L) \sim \lambda$ in polynomial time for these languages L .

Altogether, our algorithm inductively computes $5|\text{cl}(\varphi)|$ many satisfaction sets, each one in polynomial time (in $|\mathcal{M}|$), and then checks whether $s_I \in \text{Sat}(\varphi, t^*)$. Thus, the algorithm has polynomial running time. \square

Again, this result is in line with previous work on robustifying temporal logics: The robustification comes for free (here in terms of computational complexity of the model-checking problem) and the algorithms for the classical semantics can be adapted to handle the robust semantics as well.

4 Robust PCTL*

In this section, we robustify PCTL* [3]. In line with the general approach, rPCTL* and PCTL* share the same syntax (but for the dots), i.e., the formulas of rPCTL are either state formulas or path formulas. State formulas are given by the grammar

$$\varphi ::= p \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \varphi \rightarrow \varphi \mid \mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\Phi)$$

where p ranges over AP , $\sim \in \{<, \leq, =, \geq, >\}$, $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ is a rational probability threshold, and Φ ranges over path formulas. Path formulas are given by

$$\Phi ::= \varphi \mid \neg\Phi \mid \Phi \wedge \Phi \mid \Phi \vee \Phi \mid \Phi \rightarrow \Phi \mid \odot\Phi \mid \diamond\Phi \mid \square\Phi \mid \Phi \mathbf{U} \Phi \mid \Phi \mathbf{R} \Phi$$

where φ ranges over state formulas. Formula size is defined as for rPCTL.

Let DTMC $\mathcal{M} = (S, s_I, \delta, \ell)$ be a DTMC. The semantics of rPCTL* is again defined via an evaluation function $V_{\mathcal{M}}$, this time mapping a vertex s of \mathcal{M} and a state formula, or a path of \mathcal{M} and a path formula to a truth value in \mathbb{B}_4 . The evaluation function is defined inductively via

- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, p) = \begin{cases} 1111 & \text{if } p \in \ell(s), \\ 0000 & \text{if } p \notin \ell(s), \end{cases}$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \neg\varphi) = \begin{cases} 1111 & \text{if } V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi) < 1111, \\ 0000 & \text{if } V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi) = 1111, \end{cases}$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_0 \wedge \varphi_1) = \min(V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_0), V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_1)),$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_0 \vee \varphi_1) = \max(V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_0), V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_1)),$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_0 \rightarrow \varphi_1) = \begin{cases} 1111 & \text{if } V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_0) \preceq V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_1), \\ V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_1) & \text{if } V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_0) \succ V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi_1), \end{cases}$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\Phi)) = \max\{t \in \mathbb{B}_4 \mid \mu_s(\{\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{M}, s) \mid V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi) \succeq t\}) \sim \lambda\}$ with the convention $\max \emptyset = 0000$,
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \varphi) = V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi(0), \varphi),$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \neg\Phi) = \begin{cases} 1111 & \text{if } V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi) < 1111, \\ 0000 & \text{if } V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi) = 1111, \end{cases}$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi_0 \wedge \Phi_1) = \min(V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi_0), V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi_1)),$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi_0 \vee \Phi_1) = \max(V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi_0), V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi_1)),$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi_0 \rightarrow \Phi_1) = \begin{cases} 1111 & \text{if } V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi_0) \preceq V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi_1), \\ V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi_1) & \text{if } V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi_0) \succ V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi_1), \end{cases}$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \odot\Phi) = V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi[1, \infty), \Phi),$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \diamond\Phi) = b_1 b_2 b_3 b_4$ with $b_k = \max_{n \geq 0} (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi[n, \infty), \Phi))[k],$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \square\Phi) = b_1 b_2 b_3 b_4$ with
 - $b_1 = \min_{n \geq 0} (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi[n, \infty), \Phi))[1],$
 - $b_2 = \max_{m \geq 0} (\min_{n \geq m} V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi[n, \infty), \Phi))[2],$
 - $b_3 = \min_{m \geq 0} (\max_{n \geq m} V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi[n, \infty), \Phi))[3],$ and
 - $b_4 = \max_{n \geq 0} (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi[n, \infty), \Phi))[4],$
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi \mathbf{U} \Psi) = b_1 b_2 b_3 b_4$ with
 - $b_k = \max_{n \geq 0} \min\{(V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi[n, \infty), \Psi))[k], \min\{(V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi[n', \infty), \Phi])[k] \mid 0 \leq n' < n\}\},$ and
- $V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi, \Phi \mathbf{R} \Psi) = b_1 b_2 b_3 b_4$ with
 - $b_1 = \min_{n' \geq 0} \max\{(V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi[n', \infty), \Psi))[1], \max_{n'' < n'} (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi[n'', \infty), \Phi))[1]\},$
 - $b_2 = \max_{n \geq 0} \min_{n' \geq n} \max\{(V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi[n', \infty), \Psi))[2], \max_{n'' < n'} (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi[n'', \infty), \Phi))[2]\},$
 - $b_3 = \min_{n \geq 0} \max_{n' \geq n} \max\{(V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi[n', \infty), \Psi))[3], \max_{n'' < n'} (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi[n'', \infty), \Phi))[3]\},$ and
 - $b_4 = \max_{n' \geq 0} \max\{(V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi[n', \infty), \Psi))[4], \max_{n'' < n'} (V_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi[n'', \infty), \Phi))[4]\}.$

Note how the semantics of Boolean operators in state and path formulas is similar, and that the semantics generalizes the semantics of rPCTL. Finally, the semantics of path formulas is derived from the (non-probabilistic) semantics of rLTL [21], just as the semantics of the path formulas of CTL* is derived from the semantics of LTL.

Example 2. Consider the formula $\mathcal{P}_{\geq .9}(\Box a \rightarrow \Box g)$, a variant of the assume-guarantee property of Example 1. It evaluates to the largest truth value t such that $\Box a \rightarrow \Box g$ evaluates to t with probability $\geq .9$. Now, on a single path, $\Box a \rightarrow \Box g$ evaluates to

- 1111 if $\Box g$ evaluates to a larger or equal truth value than $\Box a$ and
- to $t < 1111$ if $\Box a$ evaluates to t and $\Box g$ evaluates to a truth value larger than t .

4.1 Expressiveness

As usual for temporal logics that allow arbitrary nesting of temporal operators like LTL, CTL*, and ATL*, rPCTL* has the same expressiveness as its non-robust version.

Theorem 2. *rPCTL* is as expressive as PCTL*. Both translations can be computed in polynomial time.*

Proof. The translation from PCTL* to rPCTL* is a generalization of the analogous result for PCTL and rPCTL (see Lemma 1): Let φ be a PCTL* state formula without implications, and let \mathcal{M} be a DTMC with initial state s_I . Then, $\mathcal{M}, s_I \models \varphi$ iff $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s_I, \dot{\varphi}) = 1111$, where $\dot{\varphi}$ is the rPCTL* state formula obtained from φ by dotting all temporal operators. This is again proven by induction over the construction of φ .

For the other direction, we inductively translate an rPCTL* state formula φ and a truth value $t \in \mathbb{B}_4$ into a PCTL* state formula φ_t such that $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi) \succeq t$ iff $\mathcal{M}, s \models \varphi_t$ for all DTMCs \mathcal{M} and all states s of \mathcal{M} . This is in line with previous work on LTL [21], CTL* [15], and ATL* [14].

As we have $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi) \succeq 0000$ for all state formulas φ , we define φ_{0000} to be some tautology (say $p \vee \neg p$) and only consider $t \succ 0000$ in the following. We start with atomic propositions and define $p_t = p$. The translation for Boolean connectives is the same for state and path formulas. So, to avoid duplication, χ ranges in the following over state and path formulas.

- $(\neg\chi)_t = \neg\chi_t$,
- $(\chi_1 \vee \chi_2)_t = (\chi_1)_t \vee (\chi_2)_t$ and $(\chi_1 \wedge \chi_2)_t = (\chi_1)_t \wedge (\chi_2)_t$,
- $(\chi_1 \rightarrow \chi_2)_{1111} = \bigwedge_{t \succeq 0000} (\chi_2)_t \vee \neg(\chi_1)_t$, and
- $(\chi_1 \rightarrow \chi_2)_t = (\chi_1 \rightarrow \chi_2)_{1111} \vee (\chi_2)_t$ for $t < 1111$.

Next, we define $(\mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\Phi))_t = \mathcal{P}_{\sim\lambda}(\Phi_t)$ and consider the temporal operators:

- $(\odot\Phi)_t = \odot\Phi_t$ and $(\diamond\Phi)_t = \diamond\Phi_t$,
- $(\Box\Phi)_{1111} = \Box\Phi_{1111}$, $(\Box\Phi)_{0111} = \diamond\Box\Phi_{0111}$, $(\Box\Phi)_{0011} = \Box\diamond\Phi_{0011}$, and $(\Box\Phi)_{0001} = \diamond\Phi_{0001}$,
- $(\Phi \mathbf{U} \Psi)_t = \Phi_t \mathbf{U} \Psi_t$,
- $(\Phi \mathbf{R} \Psi)_{1111} = \Phi_{1111} \mathbf{R} \Psi_{1111}$, $(\Phi \mathbf{R} \Psi)_{0111} = \diamond\Box\Psi_{0111} \vee \diamond\Phi_{1111}$, and $(\Phi \mathbf{R} \Psi)_{0011} = \Box\diamond\Psi_{0011} \vee \diamond\Phi_{1111}$, and $(\Phi \mathbf{R} \Psi)_{0001} = \diamond\Psi_{0001} \vee \diamond\Phi_{1111}$.

An induction over the construction of φ shows that φ_t has the desired properties. □

4.2 Model-checking

The model-checking problem for rPCTL* is defined as for rPCTL: Given a DTMC \mathcal{M} with initial state s_I , an rPCTL* state formula φ , and a truth value $t^* \in \mathbb{B}_4$, is $V_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \varphi) \succeq t^*$? It is PSPACE-complete, as is the PCTL* model-checking problem [3, 22], i.e., robustness comes again for free.

Theorem 3. *rPCTL* model-checking is PSPACE-complete.*

Proof. The result follows immediately from Theorem 2 and the PSPACE-completeness of PCTL* model-checking. □

5 Related Work

There is a plethora of work on the verification of probabilistic systems and on robustifying verification. Due to space restrictions, we focus here on the intersection of these two areas, which is our concern in this work.

A major challenge in the modelling of probabilistic systems is the fact that determining exact transition probabilities is often impossible. Instead one resorts to statistical analyses of the system, which comes with uncertainties.² However, verification results are often highly sensitive to changes in the transition probabilities, i.e., modelling and verification are not robust to those changes. Hence, a large body of work is concerned with capturing uncertainty in probabilistic systems and their subsequent verification.

Various types of uncertain transition functions for Markov chains have been introduced, e.g., interval bounded DTMCs [20] where only upper and lower bounds on the transition probabilities are specified, and convex MDPs, Markov decision processes with convex uncertainties [19], and robust MDPs with rectangular ambiguity sets [10, 18]. However, there are uncertainties beyond the transition probabilities, e.g., in the form of partial observability and adversarial behaviour. A recent position paper by Badings et al. [4] gives a thorough overview of the state-of-the-art in decision making under uncertainty, presenting a survey of uncertainty models that enable more robust modelling and verification. Finally, other approaches to handling uncertainty include simulation [2, 23] and approximation [11].

6 Conclusion

We have shown how to robustify PCTL and PCTL*, obtaining the logics rPCTL and rPCTL*. The model-checking problems for these robust logics are as hard as the model-checking problems for the non-robust variants, i.e., robustness can be added for free. This is in line with previous work on robust variants of LTL [1] and its extensions [17], as well as CTL and CTL* [15], and ATL and ATL* [14]. Probably the most interesting problem left for future work concerns the expressiveness of rPCTL and PCTL. Note that in the non-probabilistic setting, it is known that rCTL is strictly more expressive than CTL [15, Section 3.3]. However, as discussed in Subsection 3.1, it is unclear whether this separation can be lifted to the probabilistic setting.

Acknowledgements We want to thank Marco Muñiz for proposing to study rPCTL and rPCTL* and for many fruitful discussions, as well as the reviewers for their valuable feedback. This work was supported by DIREC – Digital Research Centre Denmark.

References

- [1] Tzanis Anevlavis, Matthew Philippe, Daniel Neider, and Paulo Tabuada. Being correct is not enough: Efficient verification using robust linear temporal logic. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.*, 23(2):8:1–8:39, 2022.
- [2] Pranav Ashok, Jan Kretínský, and Maximilian Weinger. PAC statistical model checking for Markov decision processes and stochastic games. In Isil Dillig and Serdar Tasiran, editors, *CAV 2019, Part I*, volume 11561 of *LNCS*, pages 497–519. Springer, 2019.
- [3] Adnan Aziz, Vigyan Singhal, and Felice Balarin. It usually works: The temporal logic of stochastic systems. In Pierre Wolper, editor, *CAV 1995*, volume 939 of *LNCS*, pages 155–165. Springer, 1995.
- [4] Thom S. Badings, Thiago D. Simão, Marnix Suilen, and Nils Jansen. Decision-making under uncertainty: beyond probabilities. *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transf.*, 25(3):375–391, 2023.
- [5] Christel Baier and Joost-Pieter Katoen. *Principles of model checking*. MIT Press, 2008.
- [6] Christel Baier, Stefan Kiefer, Joachim Klein, David Müller, and James Worrell. Markov chains and unambiguous automata. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 136:113–134, 2023.

²In fact, even the work introducing PCTL* considered models with unknown transition probabilities [3].

- [7] Miroslav Chodil, Antonín Kucera, and Jan Kretínský. Satisfiability of quantitative probabilistic CTL: rise to the challenge. 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 *LNCS*, pages 364–387. Springer, 2022.
- [8] Erich Grädel, Wolfgang Thomas, and Thomas Wilke, editors. *Automata, Logics, and Infinite Games: A Guide to Current Research*, volume 2500 of *LNCS*. Springer, 2002.
- [9] Hans Hansson and Bengt Jonsson. A logic for reasoning about time and reliability. *Formal Aspects Comput.*, 6(5):512–535, 1994.
- [10] Garud N. Iyengar. Robust dynamic programming. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 30(2):257–280, 2005.
- [11] Manfred Jaeger, Giorgio Bacci, Giovanni Bacci, Kim Guldstrand Larsen, and Peter Gjøøl Jensen. Approximating euclidean by imprecise Markov decision processes. In Tiziana Margaria and Bernhard Steffen, editors, *ISO LA 2020, Part I*, volume 12476 of *LNCS*, pages 275–289. Springer, 2020.
- [12] Achim Klenke. *Probability theory - a comprehensive course*. Universitext. Springer, 2008.
- [13] Corto Mascle, Daniel Neider, Maximilian Schwenger, Paulo Tabuada, Alexander Weinert, and Martin Zimmermann. From LTL to rLTL monitoring: improved monitorability through robust semantics. *Formal Methods Syst. Des.*, 59(1):170–204, 2021.
- [14] Aniello Murano, Daniel Neider, and Martin Zimmermann. Robust alternating-time temporal logic. In Sarah Alice Gaggl, Maria Vanina Martinez, and Magdalena Ortiz, editors, *JELIA*, volume 14281 of *LNCS*, pages 796–813. Springer, 2023.
- [15] Satya Prakash Nayak, Daniel Neider, Rajarshi Roy, and Martin Zimmermann. Robust computation tree logic. *Innovations Syst Softw Eng (Article in Press.)*, 2024.
- [16] Satya Prakash Nayak, Daniel Neider, and Martin Zimmermann. Robustness-by-construction synthesis: Adapting to the environment at runtime. In Tiziana Margaria and Bernhard Steffen, editors, *ISO LA 2022, Part I*, volume 13701 of *LNCS*, pages 149–173. Springer, 2022.
- [17] Daniel Neider, Alexander Weinert, and Martin Zimmermann. Robust, expressive, and quantitative linear temporal logics: Pick any two for free. *Inf. Comput.*, 285(Part):104810, 2022.
- [18] Arnab Nilim and Laurent El Ghaoui. Robust control of Markov decision processes with uncertain transition matrices. *Oper. Res.*, 53(5):780–798, 2005.
- [19] Alberto Puggelli, Wenchao Li, Alberto L. Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, and Sanjit A. Seshia. Polynomial-time verification of PCTL properties of MDPs with convex uncertainties. In Natasha Sharygina and Helmut Veith, editors, *CAV 2013*, volume 8044 of *LNCS*, pages 527–542. Springer, 2013.
- [20] Koushik Sen, Mahesh Viswanathan, and Gul Agha. Model-checking Markov chains in the presence of uncertainties. In Holger Hermanns and Jens Palsberg, editors, *TACAS 2006*, volume 3920 of *LNCS*, pages 394–410. Springer, 2006.
- [21] Paulo Tabuada and Daniel Neider. Robust linear temporal logic. In Jean-Marc Talbot and Laurent Regnier, editors, *CSL 2016*, volume 62 of *LIPICs*, pages 10:1–10:21. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2016.
- [22] Moshe Y. Vardi and Pierre Wolper. An automata-theoretic approach to automatic program verification (preliminary report). In *LICS 1986*, pages 332–344. IEEE Computer Society, 1986.
- [23] Wolfram Wiesemann, Daniel Kuhn, and Berç Rustem. Robust Markov decision processes. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 38(1):153–183, 2013.