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A Production System

Two products can be combined to form a third one: $P_1 + 2P_2 \rightarrow P_3$

A possible Petri net modelling with 17000 $P_1$ and 1200 $P_2$ is:

$17000p_1 + 1200p_2 \xrightarrow{t_1} 16999p_1 + 1198p_2 + p_3$

Allowing fractional firings (here 0.01) another possible modelling is:

$170p_1 + 12p_2 \xrightarrow{0.01t_1} 169.99p_1 + 11.98p_2 + 0.01p_3$

The state space is no more discrete.
Fluidification

Fluidification “approximates” a discrete space system by a continuous one.

- **Optimisation.**
  - when the constraints and utility are linear;
  - one considers the integer variables (NP-complete problem) as real ones;
  - and one computes in polynomial time a bound of the optimal value.

- **Mean Field Analysis.**
  - when populations of species randomly evolve;
  - one substitutes their number by their proportion and introduces appropriate differential or recurrence equations;
  - whose behaviour is the asymptotic behaviour of the discrete system.
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A continuous Petri net is a Petri net $\mathcal{N} = \langle P, T, \text{Pre}, \text{Post} \rangle$ whose markings are real vectors over places.

The firing rule allows a fractional firing of transitions $m \xrightarrow{\alpha t} m'$.

- The enabling degree of $t$ w.r.t. $m$, $\text{enab}(t, m) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \infty$, is defined by:
  $$\text{enab}(t, m) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \min\{ \frac{m[p]}{\text{Pre}[p, t]} \mid \text{Pre}[p, t] > 0 \}$$

- $t$ is enabled in $m$ if $\text{enab}(t, m) > 0$.

![Diagram of a Petri net with markings and enabling degrees](image-url)
Transition $t$ can be fired by any amount $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $0 \leq \alpha \leq \text{enab}(t, m)$ and its firing leads to marking $m'$ defined by:

$$\text{for all } p \in P \quad m'[p] \overset{\text{def}}{=} m[p] + \alpha C[p, t]$$

where $C \overset{\text{def}}{=} \text{Post} - \text{Pre}$
A Finite Firing Sequence

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{p}_1 & \xrightarrow{t_1} \text{p}_2 \\
\text{p}_2 & \xrightarrow{t_2} \text{p}_3 \\
\text{p}_3 & \xrightarrow{t_1} \text{p}_1 \\
\text{p}_3 & \xrightarrow{0.5t_2} \text{p}_4 \\
\text{p}_3 & \xrightarrow{0.5t_3} \text{p}_2 \\
\text{p}_3 & \xrightarrow{0.25t_2} \text{p}_1 \\
\text{p}_3 & \xrightarrow{0.25t_3} \text{p}_4 \\
\end{align*}
\]
Infinite Firing Sequences

With Parikh image \( \bar{\sigma} = t_1 + t_2 + t_3 \)

\[ \sigma = (1t_1)(1/2t_2)(1/3t_1) \ldots \]

With Parikh image \( \bar{\sigma} = \infty t_1 + \infty t_2 \)
Reachability Set

The reachability set $\text{RS}(\mathcal{N}, m_0)$ is defined by:

$$\text{RS}(\mathcal{N}, m_0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ m | \text{there exists a finite sequence } m_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma} m \}.$$
**Lim-Reachability Set**

The lim-reachability set, \( \text{lim-} \text{RS}(N, m_0) \), is defined by:

\[
\text{lim-} \text{RS}(N, m_0) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{ m \mid \text{there exists an infinite sequence } m_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma} \infty m \}.
\]

The lim-reachability set is not necessarily closed.

\[
p_1 + p_3 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon t_1} (1 - \varepsilon)p_1 + \varepsilon p_2 + p_3 \to \infty (1 - \varepsilon)p_1 + \varepsilon p_2 \ldots \text{ but } p_1 \notin \text{lim-} \text{RS}(N, m_0)
\]
State Problems for Petri Nets

Reachability and coverability. Given a system $\langle N, m_0 \rangle$ and a marking $m$, $m$ is reachable (resp. coverable) in $\langle N, m_0 \rangle$ if $m \in \text{RS}(N, m_0)$ (resp. $\exists m' \geq m \ m' \in \text{RS}(N, m_0)$).

Boundedness. A system $\langle N, m_0 \rangle$ is bounded if there exists $b \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that for all $m \in \text{RS}(N, m_0)$ and all $p \in P$, $m[p] \leq b$.

Reachability set inclusion. Given systems $\langle N, m_0 \rangle$ and $\langle N', m'_0 \rangle$ with $P = P'$, $\langle N, m_0 \rangle$ is included in $\langle N', m'_0 \rangle$ if $\text{RS}(N, m_0) \subseteq \text{RS}(N', m'_0)$.

A marking $m$ is a home state if $\text{RS}(N, m_0) \subseteq \text{RS}(N^{-1}, m)$.

Marking $p_2$ is not reachable.
This system is bounded and does not admit a home state.
Transition Problems for Petri Nets

Deadlock-freeness. A system \( \langle \mathcal{N}, m_0 \rangle \) is deadlock-free if for all \( m \in \text{RS}(\mathcal{N}, m_0) \), there exists \( t \in T \) such that \( t \) is enabled at \( m \).

Liveness. A system \( \langle \mathcal{N}, m_0 \rangle \) is live if for all transition \( t \) and for all marking \( m \in \text{RS}(\mathcal{N}, m_0) \) there exists \( m' \in \text{RS}(\mathcal{N}, m) \) such that \( t \) is enabled at \( m' \).

This net is deadlock-free but not live.

All properties can be considered at the limit with \( \lim - \text{RS} \) instead of \( \text{RS} \).

This net is not lim-deadlock-free and the dead marking \( p_2 \) is a lim-home state.
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Necessary Conditions for Reachability

Let $m_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma} m$ with $\sigma = \alpha_1 t_1 \ldots \alpha_k t_k$

1. State equation

$$m - m_0 = C\vec{\sigma}$$

2. Firing set

- $[\vec{\sigma}] \in FS(\mathcal{N}, m_0)$
- $[\vec{\sigma}] \in FS(\mathcal{N}^{-1}, m)$

where the firing set $FS(\mathcal{N}, m_0) \subseteq 2^T$ is defined by:

$$FS(\mathcal{N}, m_0) = \{[\vec{\sigma}] \mid m_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma} \}$$
Siphons and Firing Set

Some definitions
Let $X$ a subset of transitions or places,
- $\bullet X$ (resp. $X^\bullet$, $\bullet X^\bullet$) is the set of predecessors (resp. successors, neighbours) of $X$.

$\mathcal{N}_U$ is the net restricted to set of transitions $U$ and set of places $\bullet U^\bullet$.

A non empty subset of places $Q$ is a siphon if $\bullet Q \subseteq Q^\bullet$

A siphon is empty in a marking if the marking of all its places is null.

Observation
By construction, if $\mathcal{N}_U$ has an empty siphon in $m_0$ then $U \notin FS(\mathcal{N}, m_0)$.

$p_2$ is an empty siphon of $\mathcal{N}\{t_2,t_3\}$
Characterisation of the Firing Set

Let $\langle \mathcal{N}, m_0 \rangle$ be a CPN system and $U$ be a subset of transitions. Then:

$U \in FS(\mathcal{N}, m_0)$ iff $\mathcal{N}_U$ has no empty siphon in $m_0$.

Furthermore if $U \in FS(\mathcal{N}, m_0)$ then there exists $\sigma = \alpha_1 t_1 \ldots \alpha_k t_k$ with $U = \{t_1, \ldots, t_k\}$, $\alpha_i > 0$ for all $i$ and a marking $m$ such that:

- $m_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma} m$;
- for all place $p$, $m(p) > 0$ iff $m_0(p) > 0$ or $p \in \mathcal{U}^\bullet$.

$$p_1 + p_3 \xrightarrow{0.5t_1 0.4t_2 0.2t_3} 0.5p_1 + 0.5p_2 + 0.4p_3 + 0.2p_2$$
Proof of the Characterisation (1)

Suppose that $\mathcal{N}_U$ has no empty siphon in $m_0$.
We inductively prove for increasing values of $i$ that there exists a partition of $U$ (with $T''$ possibly empty):

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
U & T_0 & T_1 & \ldots & T_{i-1} & T'' \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
m_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma_0} m_1 \ldots m_{i-1} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{i-1}} m_i \text{ with } [\overline{\sigma_j}] = T_j
\]

\[
m_i[p] > 0 \text{ iff } m_0[p] > 0 \text{ or } p \in \bullet(\bigcup_{j<i} T_j)\bullet
\]

There is nothing to prove for the basis case $i = 0$.
Suppose that the assertion holds until $i$. If $T'' = \emptyset$ then we are done.
Proof of the Characterisation (2)

- Let $T_i = \{ t \text{ enabled in } m_i \mid t \in T'' \}$.

We claim that $T_i$ is not empty.

Otherwise for all $t \in T''$, there exists an empty place $p_t$ in $m_i$.

Due to the inductive hypothesis, $m_0(p_t) = 0$ and $p_t \cap (\bigcup_{j < i} T_j) = \emptyset$.

So the union of places $p_t$ is an empty siphon of $\langle N_{T'}, m_0 \rangle$
which contradicts our hypothesis.

- Let us denote $T_i = \{ t_{i,1}, \ldots, t_{i,k_i} \}$.

Choose $\alpha$ enough small.

The sequence $\sigma_i = \alpha t_{i,1} \ldots \alpha t_{i,k_i}$ is fireable from $m_i$
and leads to a marking $m_{i+1}$ fulfilling the inductive hypothesis.
A Sufficient Condition for Reachability

Let $\langle \mathcal{N}, m_0 \rangle$ be a system, $m$ be a marking and $v \in \mathbb{R}^{T}_{\geq 0}$ that fulfill:

- $m = m_0 + Cv$;
- $\forall p \in \bullet[v] \; m_0[p] > 0$;
- $\forall p \in [v] \; m[p] > 0$.

Then there exists a finite sequence $\sigma$ such that $m_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma} m$ and $\vec{\sigma} = v$.

Sketch of proof.

Let $\sigma$ be an arbitrary sequence such that $\vec{\sigma} = v$.

Let $m_i = \frac{n-i}{n} m_0 + \frac{i}{n} m$.

Then for large $n$, $m_0 \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{n}\sigma} m_1$ and $m_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{n}\sigma} m$.

By convexity, $m_0 \xrightarrow{(\frac{1}{n}\sigma)^n} m$. 
Illustration
Characterisation of Reachability

Let $\langle N, m_0 \rangle$ be a CPN system and $m$ be a marking.

Then $m \in RS(N, m_0)$ iff there exists $v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{|T|}$ such that:

1. $m = m_0 + Cv$
2. $[v] \in FS(N, m_0)$
3. $[v] \in FS(N^{-1}, m)$
Proof

Since $[v] \in FS(N, m_0)$, there exists a sequence $\sigma_1$ such that $[v] = [\sigma_1]$ and for all $0 < \alpha_1 \leq 1$, $m_0 \xrightarrow{\alpha_1 \sigma_1} m_1$ with $m_1(p) > 0$ for $p \in \bullet[v] \bullet$.

Since $[v] \in FS(N^{-1}, m)$, there exists a sequence $\sigma_2$ such that $[v] = [\sigma_2]$ and for all $0 < \alpha_2 \leq 1$, $m \xrightarrow{\alpha_2 \sigma_2} m_2$ in $N^{-1}$ with $m_2(p) > 0$ for $p \in \bullet[v] \bullet$.

Choose $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ enough small such that $v' = v - \alpha_1 \sigma_1 - \alpha_2 \sigma_2$ is non negative and $[v'] = [v]$. This is possible since $[v] = [\sigma_1] = [\sigma_2]$.

Since $m_1$ and $m_2 = m_1 + C v'$ fulfill the sufficient condition for reachability, there exists a sequence $\sigma_3$ such that $v' = \sigma_3$ and $m_1 \xrightarrow{\sigma_3} m_2$.

Let $\sigma \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\alpha_1 \sigma_1) \sigma_3 (\alpha_2 \sigma_2)^{-1}$ then $m_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma} m$. 
Maximal Firing Set

Let $m_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma_1}$ and $m_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma_2}$

Then $0.5m_0 \xrightarrow{0.5\sigma_1}$ and $0.5m_0 \xrightarrow{0.5\sigma_2}$

Entailing $m_0 \xrightarrow{0.5\sigma_1 0.5\sigma_2}$

So $FS(N, m_0)$ is closed by union.

Its maximal item is denoted $\text{maxFS}(N, m_0)$. 
Characterisation of Boundedness

Let \( \langle N, m_0 \rangle \) be a system. Then \( \langle N, m_0 \rangle \) is unbounded iff:

There exists \( v \in \mathbb{R}^T_\geq 0 \) such that \( Cv \geq 0 \) and \( [v] \subseteq \text{maxFS}(N, m_0) \).

Proof of sufficiency.
Assume there exists \( v \in \mathbb{R}^T_\geq 0 \) such that \( Cv \geq 0 \) and \( [v] \subseteq \text{maxFS}(N, m_0) \).

Denote \( U \overset{\text{def}}{=} \text{maxFS}(N, m_0) \). Using the characterisation of the firing set, there exists \( m_1 \in RS(N, m_0) \) such that for all \( p \in \bullet U \bullet \), \( m_1(p) > 0 \).

Define \( m_2 \overset{\text{def}}{=} m_1 + Cv \), thus \( m_2 \geq m_1 \).
Since \( [v] \subseteq U \), \( m_1 \) and \( m_2 \) fulfill the sufficient condition for reachability.

Applying it, yields a firing sequence \( m_1 \xrightarrow{\sigma} m_2 \).
Iterating this sequence establishes the unboundedness of \( \langle N, m_0 \rangle \).
Proof of Necessity

- Assume there exists $p \in P$ and a family of firing sequences $\{\sigma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $m_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma_n} m_n$ and $m_n[p] > \max(n, m_{n-1}[p])$.

W.l.o.g. we can assume that all these sequences have the same support $U$.

- Let $v_n = C \sigma_n$ and $w_n = \frac{v_n}{\|v_n\|_1}$.

For all $p' \in P$, $w_n[p'] = \frac{m_n[p'] - m_0[p']}{{\|v_n\|_1}} \geq \frac{-m_0[p']}{\|v_n\|_1}$.

$\|v_n\|_1 \geq v_n[p] = m_n(p) - m_0[p] \geq n - m_0[p]$.

So for $n > m_0[p]$, $w_n[p'] \geq \frac{-m_0[p']}{n-m_0[p]}$.

- There exists a subsequence $\{w_{\alpha(n)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging to some $w \neq 0$.

Applying the inequality to $\alpha(n)$ and letting $n$ go to infinity yields $w \geq 0$.

- Due to polyhedra theory, $\{C_{P \times U} u \mid u \in \mathbb{R}_{U \geq 0}^U\}$ is closed.

So there exists $u \in \mathbb{R}_{U \geq 0}^U$ such that $w = C_{P \times U} u$.

Adding null components for $T \setminus U$ yields the required vector.
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Using the Characterisations

**Preliminary observation.** One can compute $\maxFS(N, m_0)$ and decide whether $U \in FS(N, m_0)$ in polynomial time.

**Boundedness in PTIME.** Compute $\maxFS(N, m_0)$ and solve a linear program.

**Reachability in NP.**
- Guessing a support $U$, one looks for $v$ with support $U$
- such that $m = m_0 + Cv$ and $U \in FS(N, m_0) \cap FS(N^{-1}, m)$.

**Coverability in NP.** Just add “loosing” transitions.

**Deadlock freeness in coNP.**
- Guessing a support $U$ and a subset of places $P'$ such that for all $t$, $\bullet t \cap P' \neq \emptyset$
- one looks for $v$ with support $U$ and marking $m$ null over $P'$
- such that $m = m_0 + Cv$ and $U \in FS(N, m_0) \cap FS(N^{-1}, m)$.

**Reachability set inclusion in EXPTIME.** Build (and solve) an exponential number of exponentially sized linear programs representing the difference set.

*Can we do better?*
A PTIME Fixed Point Computation for Reachability

01 If $m = m_0$ then return(true,0)
02 $T' \leftarrow T$ % $T'$ contains the support of all reachability sequences
03 While $T' \neq \emptyset$ do
    % Compute a maximal support solution in $T'$ of the state equation
04    $nbsol \leftarrow 0$; $sol \leftarrow 0$
05    For $t \in T'$ do
06        solve $\exists!v \ v \geq 0 \land v[t] > 0 \land C_{P \times T'} v = m - m_0$
07        If $\exists v$ then $nbsol \leftarrow nbsol + 1$; $sol \leftarrow sol + v$
08        If $nbsol = 0$ then return(false) else $sol \leftarrow \frac{1}{nbsol}sol$; $T' \leftarrow [sol]$
    % Potentially restrict the support solution to fulfill the firing set conditions
10    $T' \leftarrow T' \cap \text{maxFS}(N_{T'}, m_0[\bullet T'\bullet])$
11    $T' \leftarrow T' \cap \text{maxFS}(N_{T'}^{-1}, m[\bullet T'\bullet])$
    % If the support is unchanged return the solution
12    If $T' = [sol]$ then return(true,sol)
    % 0 is not a solution
13 Return(false)
Proof of Correctness

**Soundness.** Assume that the algorithm returns true at line 12.

By construction, sol fulfills the first statement of the characterisation.

Since \( T' = [\text{sol}] \) at line 12,

1. \([\text{sol}] = \text{maxFS}(\mathcal{N}_{T'}, m_0[\bullet T' \bullet]) \in FS(\mathcal{N}, m_0) \) (line 10)

2. \([\text{sol}] = \text{maxFS}(\mathcal{N}_{T'}^{-1}, m[\bullet T' \bullet]) \in FS(\mathcal{N}^{-1}, m) \) (line 11)

Thus \( m \) is reachable in \( \langle \mathcal{N}, m_0 \rangle \).

**Completeness.**

Follows from the following loop invariant: for any \( m_0 \xrightarrow{\sigma} m, [\sigma] \subseteq T' \)
Reachability is PTIME-complete.

Reduction from the boolean circuit value problem.

Two places $p_{\text{true}}$ and $p_{\text{false}}$.

One place per gate and one subnet per gate.

An additional subnet (one transition $\text{clean}_p$ per place $p$).

Is $1p_{\text{out}}$ reachable from $1p_{\text{true}}$?
Deadlock freeness is coNP-complete.

Reduction from 3SAT.

\[ \varphi = (\neg x_1 \lor \neg x_3) \land (x_1 \lor \neg x_2 \lor x_3) \land (x_2 \lor \neg x_3) \]
Proof of Correctness.

\( \varphi \) is satisfiable.

Fire one unit of the choice transitions according to the appropriate interpretation. Then for all clause transition there is an empty place.

So the net is dead.

\( \varphi \) is unsatisfiable.

As long as it remains initial tokens the net is not dead.

Once the there are no more initial tokens, one can define an arbitrary interpretation according to the firing of choice transitions.

Since the interpretation does not satisfy \( \varphi \), one clause transition is fireable.

Once \( suc \) is marked, there can be no more deadlock.
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Backward Algorithm: Ingredients.

Upward closed sets.

A set of markings $M$ is upward closed if $m' \geq m \in M \Rightarrow m' \in M$.

Given $M$ a set of markings, $
\uparrow M = \{m' \mid \exists m \in M \ m' \geq m\}$ is the upward closure of $M$.

Given an upward closed set $M$, $base(M)$ the basis of $M$ is the minimal (finite) subset of $M$ such that $M = \bigcup_{m \in base(M)} \uparrow \{m\}$.

Let $\{M_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a family of upward closed sets such that for all $n$, $M_n \subseteq M_{n+1}$ then there exists $n_0$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$, $M_n = M_{n_0}$.

Petri nets.

Let $pred(M)$ be the set of markings that reach $M$ after a transition firing. If $M$ is upward closed then $pred(M)$ is upward closed.

Let $B$ be the basis of $M$ then one can compute $pb(B)$ the basis of $pred(M)$.

Let $m$ be a marking. Define $M_0 = \uparrow \{m\}$ and $M_{n+1} = M_n \cup pred(M_n)$.

Then $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} M_n$ is the set of markings from which one covers $m$. 
Backward Algorithm

\[ B \leftarrow \{ m \} \]

While \( m_0 \notin \uparrow B \) do

\[ \text{newB} \leftarrow pb(B) \setminus \uparrow B \]

If \( \text{newB} = \emptyset \) then return false

\[ B \leftarrow \text{minbase}(B \cup \text{newB}) \]

return true

Correctness and termination follow from properties of upward closed sets.
Improved Backward Algorithm

If not $\text{ContCover}(m_0, m)$ then return false

$B \leftarrow \{m\}$

While $m_0 \not\in \uparrow B$ do

$\text{newB} \leftarrow \text{pb}(B) \setminus \uparrow B$

$\text{newB} \leftarrow \{m' \in \text{newB} | \text{ContCover}(m_0, m')\}$

If $\text{newB} = \emptyset$ then return false

$B \leftarrow \text{minbase}(B \cup \text{newB})$

return true
Related Work

Another necessary condition for reachability in Petri nets.

A *trap* is a non empty set of places \( Q \) such that \( Q^* \subseteq Q\).

- \( \exists v \ m = m_0 + Cv; \)
- For all trap \( Q \) marked in \( m_0 \), \( Q \) is marked in \( m \).

*(An SMT-Based Approach to Coverability Analysis. Esparza & al. CAV 2014)*

\( Q \)-reachability strictly implies this condition.

Marking \( m = 1_q \) is not reachable in this CPN.

However \( m = m_0 + C1_t \) and the single trap \( q \) is unmarked in \( m_0 \).
Observation

- While reachability is checkable in PTIME in continuous Petri nets,
- an efficient alternative consists to express the characterisation in a logical way
- and provide an *existential* formula to a SMT solver ...
- ... since repeated calls to a solver are optimised.

The state equation can be directly provided as an input to the solver.

How to express the firing set constraints to a solver?
A Logical Formula for a Firing Set

Input variables
- For all \( p \in P \), \( x(p) \) is the initial marking;
- For all \( t \in T \), \( y(t) \) is the \( t \)-component of the Parikh image of the sequence.

Auxiliary variables
- For all \( p \in P \), \( z(p) \), when non null, is the first instant \( p \) is marked;
- For all \( t \in T \), \( z(t) \), when non null, is the firing instant of \( t \).

Auxiliary formulas
- \( \varphi_{N,1} = \bigwedge_{t \in T} \left( y(t) > 0 \Rightarrow \bigwedge_{p \in \cdot t} 0 < z(p) \leq z(t) \right) \)
- \( \varphi_{N,2} = \bigwedge_{p \in P} \left( z(p) > 0 \Rightarrow \left( x(p) > 0 \lor \bigvee_{t \in \cdot p} y(t) > 0 \land 0 < z(t) < z(p) \right) \right) \)

\( \varphi_N = \exists z \varphi_{N,1} \land \varphi_{N,2} \quad \varphi_N, m_0[w, y] = w - m_0 = Cy \land \varphi_N[m_0/x] \land \varphi_{N-1}[w/x] \)

The size of \( \psi_N, m_0[w] = \exists y \varphi_N, m_0 \) is linear w.r.t. the size of \( \langle N, m_0 \rangle \).
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Reachability Set Inclusion belongs to $\Pi_2^P$

Let $\langle \mathcal{N}, m_0 \rangle$ and $\langle \mathcal{N}', m_0' \rangle$ be two continuous Petri nets.

The formula below expresses the reachability set inclusion:

$$\forall w \neg \psi_{\mathcal{N}, m_0} \lor \psi_{\mathcal{N}', m_0'}$$

This formula can be written as $\forall \ldots \exists \ldots \theta$

where $\theta$ is a quantifier-free formula of $\text{FO}(\mathbb{Q}, +, <)$.

So the complexity of the reachability set inclusion belongs to $\Pi_2^P$.

*(Eduardo D. Sontag. Real Addition and the Polynomial Hierarchy. 1985.)*

**Can we do better?**
Reachability Set Inclusion belongs to coNP

Polyhedra theory.

• Let $\varphi(x) = \exists y \theta(x, y)$ where $\theta$ is a quantifier-free formula of FO($\mathbb{Q}, +, <$).

Then there exists a quantifier free-formula $\psi(x)$ whose size is polynomial w.r.t. size of $\varphi$ such that $\forall x \varphi \iff \psi$.

• Assume $\exists x \psi$ is true.

Then there exists a witness $v$ whose size is polynomial w.r.t. size of $\psi$ such that $\psi[v/x]$ is true.

Application to reachability set inclusion.

$\forall w \forall y \exists y' \neg \varphi_{N,m_0} \lor \varphi_{N',m'_0}[y'/y]$ express the reachability set inclusion.

This formula is equivalent to some $\forall w \forall y \theta$ where $\theta$ is quantifier-free, and when false admits a polynomially sized witness.

So one guesses a polynomially sized marking $m$ and checks whether $m$ is reachable in $\langle N, m_0 \rangle$ and unreachable in $\langle N', m'_0 \rangle$. 
Reachability Set Inclusion is coNP-complete

A net is *reversible* if the initial marking is a home state.

**Reduction from 3SAT to reversibility.**

\[ \varphi = (\neg x_1 \lor \neg x_2) \land x_2 \]

![Diagram showing the reduction from 3SAT to reversibility]
Summary of the Results

A full characterisation for problems complexity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(lim-)reachability</td>
<td>PTIME-complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lim-)boundedness</td>
<td>PTIME-complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lim-)deadlock-freeness and (lim-)liveness</td>
<td>coNP-complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lim-)reachability set inclusion</td>
<td>coNP-complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A relevant improvement for Petri nets coverability.
Perspectives

Temporal logic

- In Petri nets, model checking is at the border of decidability/undecidability depending on: branching versus linear, propositional versus evenemential;

- **Goal**: in CPNs, investigation of decidability and complexity issues.

Hybrid Petri nets

- Combination of Petri nets and continuous Petri nets

- **Goal**: establishing the border decidability/undecidability of standard problems for this formalism.