

Lexicographic Ranking Supermartingales: An Efficient Approach to Termination of Probabilistic Programs

SHESHANSH AGRAWAL, IIT Bombay

KRISHNENDU CHATTERJEE, IST Austria

PETR NOVOTNÝ, IST Austria

Probabilistic programs extend classical imperative programs with real-valued random variables and random branching. The most basic liveness property for such programs is the termination property. The qualitative (aka almost-sure) termination problem given a probabilistic program asks whether the program terminates with probability 1. While ranking functions provide a sound and complete method for non-probabilistic programs, the extension of them to probabilistic programs is achieved via ranking supermartingales (RSMs). While deep theoretical results have been established about RSMs, their application to probabilistic programs with nondeterminism has been limited only to academic examples. For non-probabilistic programs, lexicographic ranking functions provide a compositional and practical approach for termination analysis of real-world programs. In this work we introduce lexicographic RSMs and show that they present a sound method for almost-sure termination of probabilistic programs with nondeterminism. We show that lexicographic RSMs provide a tool for compositional reasoning about almost sure termination, and for probabilistic programs with linear arithmetic they can be synthesized efficiently (in polynomial time). We also show that with additional restrictions even asymptotic bounds on expected termination time can be obtained through lexicographic RSMs. Finally, we present experimental results on abstractions of real-world programs to demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach.

ACM Reference format:

Sheshansh Agrawal, Krishnendu Chatterjee, and Petr Novotný. 2021. Lexicographic Ranking Supermartingales: An Efficient Approach to Termination of Probabilistic Programs. 1, 1, Article 1 (November 2021), 36 pages.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Probabilistic programs with nondeterminism. Randomness plays a fundamental role in many areas across science, and in computer science in particular. In applications such as stochastic network protocols [4, 44], randomized algorithms [26, 50], security [6, 7] machine learning [34, 38], the probabilistic behavior must be considered to faithfully model the underlying dynamic system. The

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2021 Association for Computing Machinery.

XXXX-XXXX/2021/11-ART1 \$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

extension of classical imperative programs with *random value generators*, that produce random values according to some desired probability distribution, naturally gives rise to probabilistic programs. Along with probability, nondeterminism also plays a crucial role. In particular in program analysis, for effective analysis of large programs, all variables cannot be considered, and abstraction ignores some variables, and the worst-case analysis is represented by adversarial nondeterminism. Hence, probabilistic programs with nondeterminism have become an active and important research focus in program analysis.

Termination problem. In static analysis of programs the most basic, as well most important, liveness property is the *termination* problem. While for non-probabilistic programs the termination question asks whether an input program *always* terminates, for probabilistic programs the termination questions must account for the probabilistic behaviors. The most basic and fundamental extensions of the termination problem for probabilistic programs are:

- (1) *Almost-sure termination.* The *almost-sure termination* problem asks whether the program terminates with probability 1.
- (2) *Positive termination.* The *positive termination* problem asks whether the expected termination time is finite. A related quantitative generalization of the positive termination question is to obtain asymptotic bounds on the expected termination time.

While the positive termination implies almost-sure termination, the converse is not true (e.g., see Example 4.8).

Ranking functions and ranking supermartingales (RSMs). The key technique that applies for liveness analysis of non-probabilistic programs is the notion of *ranking functions*, which provides a sound and complete method for termination of non-probabilistic programs [32]. There exist a wide variety of approaches for construction of ranking functions for non-probabilistic programs [12, 21, 54, 58]. The generalization of ranking functions to probabilistic programs is achieved through the *ranking supermartingales (RSMs)* [15, 17, 31]. The ranking supermartingales provide a powerful and automated approach for termination analysis of probabilistic programs, and algorithmic approaches for special cases such as linear and polynomial RSMs have also been considered [15, 18–20].

Practical limitations of existing approaches. While an impressive set of theoretical results related to RSMs has been established [15, 17–20, 31], for probabilistic programs with nondeterminism the current approaches are only applicable to academic examples of variants of random walks. The key reason can be understood as follows: even for non-probabilistic programs while ranking functions are sound and complete, they do not necessarily provide a practical approach. This is because to prove termination, a witness in the form of a ranking function has to be computed: to this automatically, ranking functions of a restricted shape (such as linear ranking functions) have to be considered, and 1-dimensional ranking functions of a restricted type can only prove termination of a limited class of programs. In contrast, as a practical and scalable approach for non-probabilistic programs the notion of lexicographic ranking functions has been widely studied [2, 14, 24, 35]. Algorithmic approaches for linear lexicographic ranking functions allow the termination analysis to be applicable to real-world non-probabilistic programs (after abstraction). However both the theoretical foundations as well as practical approaches related to such lexicographic ranking functions are completely missing for probabilistic programs, which we address in this work.

Our contributions. In this work our main contributions range from theoretical foundations of lexicographic RSMs, to algorithmic approaches for them, to experimental results showing their applicability to programs. We describe our main contributions below:

- (1) *Theoretical foundations.* First, we introduce the notion of lexicographic RSMs, and show that such supermartingales ensure almost-sure termination (Theorem 3.3 in Section 3). Our first result is a purely mathematical result that introduces a new concept, and proves almost-sure termination, that is independent of any probabilistic program. Based on the mathematical result we show that for probabilistic programs with nondeterminism the existence of a lexicographic RSM with respect to an invariant ensures almost-sure termination (Theorem 4.7 in Section 4).
- (2) *Compositionality.* Second we study the compositional properties of lexicographic RSMs. A key limitation of the previous approaches related to compositional RSMs [31] is that it imposes a technical *uniform integrability* conditions, which is hard to reason about automatically. We show (in Section 6) how lexicographic RSMs present an easy-to-automatize compositional approach for almost-sure termination of probabilistic programs.
- (3) *Algorithm.* We then consider algorithms for synthesis of lexicographic RSMs, and for efficient algorithms we consider nondeterministic probabilistic programs that are *affine* (i.e., the arithmetic operations are linear). We present a polynomial-time algorithm for synthesis of lexicographic RSMs for affine programs (Theorem 5.1).
- (4) *Asymptotic bounds.* In general, the existence of lexicographic RSMs does not imply positive termination. In other words, we present an example (Example 4.8) where a lexicographic RSM exists ensuring almost-sure termination, yet the expected termination time is infinite. We then present a natural restriction under which the lexicographic RSMs not only imply positive termination, but even asymptotic bounds on the expected termination time can be derived from them (Theorem 7.2 and Corollary 7.3).
- (5) *Experimental results.* We present experimental results of our approach on realistic programs to show the applicability of our approach. To demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach we consider the benchmarks of non-probabilistic programs from [2] which are obtained as abstraction of real-world programs, where lexicographic ranking functions were applied for termination analysis. We extend these benchmarks with probabilistic statements and apply lexicographic RSMs to these programs. Our experimental results show that our approach can handle these programs very efficiently.

2 PRELIMINARIES

We use a standard notation in the field of probabilistic program analysis [20].

2.1 Basic Notions

For a set A we denote by $|A|$ the cardinality of A . We denote by $\mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{N}_0$, $\mathbb{Z}$, and $\mathbb{R}$ the sets of all positive integers, non-negative integers, integers, and real numbers, respectively. We assume basic knowledge of matrix calculus. We use boldface notation for vectors, e.g. $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{y}$, etc., and we denote an i -th component of a vector $\mathbf{x}$ by $\mathbf{x}[i]$. We identify 1-dimensional vectors with numbers. For an n -dimensional vector $\mathbf{x}$, index $1 \leq i \leq n$, and number a we denote by $\mathbf{x}(i \leftarrow a)$ a vector $\mathbf{y}$ such that $\mathbf{y}[i] = a$ and $\mathbf{y}[j] = \mathbf{x}[j]$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n, j \neq i$. For comparison of vectors (e.g. as in $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y}$), we consider componentwise comparison. For comparing functions f, g with the same domains, we write $f \leq g$ if $f(x) \leq g(x)$ for all x in the domain.

Variables. Throughout the paper we fix a countable set of variables $\mathcal{V}$. We consider some arbitrary but fixed linear order on the set of all variables, hence we write $\mathcal{V} = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots\}$.

2.2 Syntax of Probabilistic Programs

In this subsection we define the form of probabilistic programs that we consider in our analysis. We consider two classes of probabilistic programs: general probabilistic programs (PPs) with arbitrary (measurable) expressions and their subclass, affine probabilistic programs (APPs) where all expressions are restricted to be affine (see below for a precise definition). The reason for this dual view is that our work also has two main points of focus: a theoretical one, where we introduce new proof rules that can be used to prove properties of general probabilistic programs; and an algorithmic one, where we aim to prove properties of probabilistic programs automatically, using the aforementioned proof rules. As already testified in the non-probabilistic world, programs that contain only affine expressions allow for more efficient automation of the analysis and at the same time, due to the presence of non-determinism they can be used to form sound abstractions of programs with non-linear arithmetic. Hence, we consider general programs when providing our theoretical results and APPs when presenting the automation of our techniques.

Expressions. An *expression* over the set of variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is an expression in the standard programming-language sense, i.e. a formula built in finite number of steps from constants, variables $x_1, \dots, x_n$, and numerical operators from some fixed finite set. Each expression E over $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ determines a function which for each m -dimensional vector $\mathbf{x}$, where $m \geq n$, returns a number resulting from substituting each x_i in E by $\mathbf{x}[i]$. Slightly abusing our notation, we denote this function also by E and the value of this function on argument $\mathbf{x}$ by $E(\mathbf{x})$. We do not a priori fix a concrete set of operators that can be used to form expressions. However, in order to ensure that semantics of probabilistic programs with real-valued variables is defined correctly, we impose the following two conditions on the set of expressions used in each program: (1) For each expression E over variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and each n -dimensional vector $\mathbf{x}$ the value $E(\mathbf{x})$ is well defined.¹ (2) The function defined by each expression E is Borel-measurable (for definition of Borel-measurability, see, e.g. [10]).

From measure theory it is known that these conditions hold in particular for programs where expressions are build using the standard arithmetic operators of addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division (provided that expressions evaluating to zero are not allowed as divisors).

Affine Expressions. An *affine expression* over the set of variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is an expression of the form $d + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i$, where $d, a_1, \dots, a_n$ are real-valued constants. A function of the form $E(\mathbf{x})$ for some affine expression E is called affine. As noted above, each affine function is Borel-measurable.

Predicates. A *predicate* is a logical formula obtained by a finite number of applications of conjunction, disjunction and negation operations on *atomic predicates* of the form $E \leq E'$, where E, E' are expressions. We denote by $\mathbf{x} \models E$ the fact that E is satisfied by substituting values from of $\mathbf{x}$ for the corresponding variables in E .

Linear constraints, assertions, predicates. In the case of predicates involving only linear expression we use the following standard nomenclature:

¹Our results can be easily extended to programs where encountering an expression of undefined value, such as division by zero, triggers an exception which terminates the program, but we abstract away from such details for the sake of clarity.

- *Linear Constraint.* A *linear constraint* is a formula of the form ψ or $\neg\psi$, where ψ is a non-strict inequality between affine expressions.
- *Linear Assertion.* A *linear assertion* is a finite conjunction of linear constraints.
- *Propositionally Linear Predicate.* A *propositionally linear predicate* (PLP) is a finite disjunction of linear assertions.

The Syntax of Probabilistic Programs (PPs). We consider the standard syntax for probabilistic programs, which encompasses basic programming mechanisms such as assignment statement (indicated by ‘:=’), while-loop, if-branch. Expressions appear on right-hand sides of assignments, and predicates act as loop guards and conditions in if-then-else statements. We also consider basic probabilistic mechanisms such as probabilistic branch (indicated by ‘prob’) and random sampling (e.g. $x := \text{sample}(\text{Uniform}[-2, 1])$ assigns to x a random number uniformly sampled from interval $[-2, 1]$). We also allow constructs for (demonic) non-determinism, in particular non-deterministic branching indicated by ‘if $\star$ then...’ construct and non-deterministic assignment. Variables (or identifiers) of a probabilistic program are of *real* type, i.e., values of the variables are real numbers. We also assume that each PP $\mathcal{P}$ is preceded by a preamble specifying possible initial values of program variables: the preamble consists of a single predicate characterizing possible initial valuations.

Affine Probabilistic Programs (APPs). A probabilistic program is *affine* if all the expressions that occur in the program (i.e. in loop guards, conditionals, right-hand sides of assignments) are affine and if the set of possible initial valuations is a polyhedron. We refer to the class of affine probabilistic programs as APPs.

Due to space restrictions, details of syntax (such as grammar) are relegated to the supplementary material. For an example see Figure 1.

2.3 Semantics of Probabilistic Programs

We now formally define the semantics of PP’s. In order to do this, we first recall some fundamental concepts from probability theory.

Basics of Probability Theory. A probability space is a triple $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, where Ω is a non-empty set (so called *sample space*), $\mathcal{F}$ is a *sigma-algebra* of measurable sets over Ω , i.e. a collection of subsets of Ω that contains the empty set $\emptyset$, and that is closed under complementation and countable unions, and $\mathbb{P}$ is a *probability measure* on $\mathcal{F}$, i.e., a function $\mathbb{P}: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

- $\mathbb{P}(\emptyset) = 0$,
- for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$ it holds $\mathbb{P}(\Omega \setminus A) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(A)$, and
- for all pairwise disjoint countable set sequences $A_1, A_2, \dots \in \mathcal{F}$ (i.e., $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$) we have $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(A_i) = \mathbb{P}(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i)$.

Following the usual probabilistic terminology, we say that *almost all* ω belonging to some set $O \subseteq \Omega$ satisfy some property Ψ if it holds that $\mathbb{P}(\{\omega \in O \mid \omega \text{ does not satisfy } \Psi\}) = 0$.

Random variables and filtrations. A *random variable* in a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is an $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable function $R: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, i.e., a function such that for every $a \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ the set $\{\omega \in \Omega \mid R(\omega) \leq a\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}$. If $R(\omega) \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$, we say that R is *real-valued*. We denote by $\mathbb{E}[R]$ the *expected value* of a random variable X (see [10, Chapter 5] for a formal definition). A *random vector* in $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is a vector whose every component is a random variable in this probability space. A *stochastic process* in a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is an infinite sequence of random vectors in this space. We will also use random variables of the form $R: \Omega \rightarrow S$ for some finite set S , which is

easily translated to the variables above. A *filtration* of a sigma-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ is a sequence $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ of σ -algebras such that $\mathcal{F}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{F}_n \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{F}$.

Distributions. We assume the standard definition of a probability distribution specified by a cumulative distribution function [10]. We denote by $\mathcal{D}$ be a set of probability distributions on real numbers, both discrete and continuous.

Probabilistic Control Flow Graphs. We consider standard operational semantics of PPs defined via an uncountable state-space Markov decision process (MDP) (uncountable due to real-valued variables). That is, we associate to each program a certain stochastic process. To define this process, we first define so called *probabilistic control flow graphs* [18].

Definition 2.1. A *probabilistic control flow graph* (pCFG) is a tuple $C = (L, V, \ell_{init}, \Xi_{init}, \mapsto, Up, Pr, G)$, where

- L is a finite set of *locations* partitioned into four pairwise disjoint subsets L_{NB} , L_{PB} , L_D , and L_A of non-deterministic branching, probabilistic branching, deterministic, and assignment locations;
- $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_{|V|}\}$ is a finite set of *program variables* (note that $V \subseteq \mathcal{V}$);
- ℓ_{init} is an initial location and Ξ_{init} is a set of initial *assignment vectors*;
- $\mapsto \subseteq L \times L$ is a transition relation;
- Up is a function assigning to each transition outgoing from an assignment location a tuple (i, u) , where $1 \leq i \leq |V|$ is a *target variable index* and u is an *update element*, which can be one of the following mathematical objects: (a) a Borel-measurable function $u: \mathbb{R}^{|V|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$; (b) a distribution $d \in \mathcal{D}$; or (c) a set $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ (representing a non-deterministic update).
- $Pr = \{Pr_\ell\}_{\ell \in L_{PB}}$ is a collection of probability distributions, where each Pr_ℓ is a discrete probability distribution on the set of all transitions outgoing from ℓ ;
- G is a function assigning a propositionally linear predicate (a *guard*) over V to each transition outgoing from a deterministic location.

We assume that each location has at least one outgoing transition. Also, for every deterministic location ℓ we assume the following: if $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k$ are all transitions outgoing from ℓ , then $G(\tau_1) \vee \dots \vee G(\tau_k) \equiv \text{true}$ and $G(\tau_i) \wedge G(\tau_j) \equiv \text{false}$ for each $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. For each distribution d appearing in the pCFG we assume the following features are known: expected value $\mathbb{E}[d]$ of d and a set SP_d containing the *support* of d . The support is the smallest closed set of real numbers whose complement has probability zero under d ². Finally, we assume that each assignment location has at most (and thus exactly) one outgoing transition. The translation from probabilistic programs to the corresponding pCFG is standard [19], and the details are presented in the supplementary material.

Configurations. A *configuration* of a pCFG C is a tuple $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$, where ℓ is a location of C and $\mathbf{x}$ is an $|V|$ -dimensional vector. We say that a transition τ is *enabled* in a configuration $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ if ℓ is the source location of τ and in addition, $\mathbf{x} \models G(\tau)$ provided that ℓ is deterministic.

Executions and reachable configurations. We say that a configuration $(\ell', \mathbf{x}')$ is a *successor* of a configuration $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ if there is a transition $\tau = (\ell, \ell')$ enabled in $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{x}'$ satisfies the following:

- if ℓ is not an assignment location, then $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x}$;

²In particular, a support of a *discrete* probability distribution d is simply the at most countable set of all points on a real line that have positive probability under d .

- if ℓ is an assignment location with $Up(\tau) = (j, u)$, then $\mathbf{x}_{i+1} = \mathbf{x}_i(j \leftarrow a)$ where a satisfies one of the following depending on the type of u :
 - if u is a Borel-measurable function, then $a = u(\mathbf{x})$;
 - if u is an integrable³ distribution d , then $a \in \text{supp}(d)$;
 - if u is a set, then a is some element of u .

A *finite path* (or *execution fragment*) of length k in C is a finite sequence of configurations $(\ell_0, \mathbf{x}_0) \cdots (\ell_k, \mathbf{x}_k)$ such that $\ell_0 = \ell_{\text{init}}$, $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \Xi_{\text{init}}$, and for each $0 \leq i < k$ the configuration $(\ell_{i+1}, \mathbf{x}_{i+1})$ is a successor of $(\ell_i, \mathbf{x}_i)$. A *run* (or *execution*) in C is an infinite sequence of configurations whose every finite prefix is a finite path. A configuration $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ is *reachable* from the initial configuration $(\ell_{\text{init}}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{init}})$ (where, $\mathbf{x}_{\text{init}} \in \Xi_{\text{init}}$) if there is a finite path starting in $(\ell_{\text{init}}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{init}})$ that ends in $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$. We denote by Conf_C , Fpath_C and Run_C the sets of all configurations, finite paths and runs in C , respectively, dropping the index C when known from the context.

Non-determinism and Schedulers. The probabilistic behaviour of C can be captured by constructing a suitable probability measure over the set of all its runs. Before this can be done, non-determinism in C needs to be resolved. This is achieved using the standard notion of a *scheduler*. Note that there are two sources of non-determinism in our programs: one in branching and one in assignments. We call a location ℓ non-deterministic if ℓ is a non-deterministic branching location or if ℓ is an assignment location with the only transition τ outgoing from ℓ having a non-deterministic assignment. A configuration $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ is non-deterministic if ℓ is non-deterministic.

Definition 2.2 (Schedulers). A scheduler in a pCFG C is a function σ assigning to every finite path that ends in a non-deterministic configuration $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ a probability distribution on successor configurations of $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$.

Measurable schedulers. Note that schedulers can be viewed as partial functions from the set Fpath to the set of probability distributions over the set Conf . Since we deal with programs operating over real-valued variables, both Fpath and Conf can be uncountable sets. Hence, we impose an additional *measurability* condition on schedulers, so as to ensure that the semantics of probabilistic non-deterministic programs is defined in a mathematically sound way. First we need to clarify what are measurable sets of configurations and histories. We define a sigma-algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Conf}}$ of measurable sets of configurations to be the sigma-algebra over Conf generated⁴ by all sets of the form $\{\ell\} \times B$, where ℓ is a location of C and B is a Borel-measurable subset of $\mathbb{R}^{|V|}$. Next, the set of finite paths Fpath can be viewed as a subset of $\text{Conf} \cup \text{Conf} \times \text{Conf} \cup \text{Conf} \times \text{Conf} \times \text{Conf} \cup \dots$. Hence, we define the sigma-algebra $\mathcal{H}$ of measurable sets of finite paths to be the sigma algebra generated by all sets of the form $Z_1 \times Z_2 \times \dots \times Z_k \subseteq \text{Fpath}$ such that $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $Z_i \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{Conf}}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Now we can define the measurability of schedulers. Recall that for each finite path π ending in a non-deterministic configuration we have that $\sigma(\pi)$ is a probability distribution on Conf . For each measurable set of configurations Z we denote by $\sigma(\pi)(Z)$ the probability that the random draw from distribution $\sigma(\pi)$ selects an element of Z . We say that a scheduler σ is measurable if for each $Z \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{Conf}}$ and each $p \in [0, 1]$ the set $\{\pi \in \text{Fpath} \mid \sigma(\pi)(Z) \leq p\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}$, i.e., it is a measurable set of paths.

³A distribution on some numerical domain is integrable if its expected value exists and is finite. In particular, each Dirac distribution is integrable.

⁴In general, it is known that for each set Ω and each collection of its subsets $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^\Omega$ there exists at least one sigma-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ s.t. $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ and the intersection of all such sigma-algebras is again a sigma algebra – so called sigma-algebra generated by $\mathcal{F}$ [10].

While the definition of a measurable scheduler might seem somewhat technical, it is natural from measure-theoretic point of view and analogous definitions inevitably emerge in works dealing with systems that exhibit both probabilistic and non-deterministic behaviour over a continuous state space [51, 52]. In particular, if all the variables in a program range over a discrete set (such as the integers), then each scheduler in the associated pCFG is measurable.

Stochastic process. A pCFG C together with a scheduler σ and initial valuation $\mathbf{x}_{init} \in \Xi_{init}$ define a stochastic process which produces a random run $(\ell_0, \mathbf{x}_0)(\ell_1, \mathbf{x}_1)(\ell_2, \mathbf{x}_2) \cdots$. The evolution of this process can be informally described as follows: we start in the initial configuration, i.e. $(\ell_0, \mathbf{x}_0) = (\ell_{init}, \mathbf{x}_{init})$. Now assume that i steps have elapsed, i.e. a finite path $\pi_i = (\ell_0, \mathbf{x}_0)(\ell_1, \mathbf{x}_1) \cdots (\ell_i, \mathbf{x}_i)$ has already been produced. Then a successor configuration $(\ell_{i+1}, \mathbf{x}_{i+1})$ is chosen as follows:

- If ℓ_i is a non-deterministic location, then $(\ell_{i+1}, \mathbf{x}_{i+1})$ is sampled according to scheduler σ , i.e. from the distribution $\sigma(\pi_i)$.
- If ℓ_i is an assignment location (but not a non-deterministic one) with, there is exactly one transition $\tau = (\ell_i, \ell')$ outgoing from it and we put $\ell_{i+1} = \ell'$. Denoting $Up(\tau) = (j, u)$, the vector $\mathbf{x}_{i+1}$ is then defined as $\mathbf{x}_{i+1} = \mathbf{x}_i(j \leftarrow a)$ where a is chosen depending on u :
 - If u is a function $u: \mathbb{R}^{|V|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then $a = f(\mathbf{x}_i)$.
 - If u is a distribution d , then a is sampled from d .
- In all other cases we have $\mathbf{x}_{i+1} = \mathbf{x}_i$, and ℓ_{i+1} is determined as follows:
 - If ℓ_i is a probabilistic branching location, then a transition (ℓ_i, ℓ') is sampled from Pr_{ℓ_i} and we put $\ell_{i+1} = \ell'$;
 - If ℓ_i is deterministic, then there is exactly one transition (ℓ_i, ℓ') enabled in $(\ell_i, \mathbf{x}_i)$, in which case we put $\ell_{i+1} = \ell'$.

The above intuitive explanation can be formalized by showing that each pCFG C together with a scheduler σ and initial valuation $\mathbf{x}_{init} \in \Xi_{init}$ uniquely determine a certain probabilistic space $(\Omega_{Run}, \mathcal{R}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}_{init}}^\sigma)$ in which Ω_{Run} is a set of all runs in C , and a stochastic process $C^\sigma = \{C_i^\sigma\}_{i=0}^\infty$ in this space such that for each run $\varrho \in \Omega_{Run}$ we have that $C_i^\sigma(\varrho)$ is the i -th configuration on ϱ (i.e., C_i^σ is a random vector $(\ell_i^\sigma, \mathbf{x}_i^\sigma)$ with ℓ_i^σ taking values in L and $\mathbf{x}_i^\sigma$ being a random vector of dimension $|V|$ consisting of real-valued random variables). The sigma-algebra $\mathcal{R}$ is the smallest (w.r.t. inclusion) sigma-algebra under which all the functions C_i^σ , for all $i \geq 0$, are $\mathcal{R}$ -measurable (i.e., for each C_i^σ and each measurable set of configurations $Z \in \mathcal{F}_{Conf}$ it holds $\{\varrho \mid C_i^\sigma(\varrho) \in Z\} \in \mathcal{R}$). Equivalently, $\mathcal{R}$ can be defined as a sigma algebra generated by all set of runs of the form $F \times Conf^\infty$, where $F \in \mathcal{H}$ is a measurable set of finite paths. The probability measure $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}_{init}}^\sigma$ is such that for each i , the distribution of C_i^σ reflects the aforementioned way in which runs are randomly generated. The formal construction of $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}_{init}}^\sigma$ proceeds via the standard *cylinder construction* [3, Theorem 2.7.2] and is somewhat technical, hence we omit it. We denote by $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_{init}}^\sigma$ the expectation operator in probability space $(\Omega_{Run}, \mathcal{R}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}_{init}}^\sigma)$.

2.4 Almost-Sure and Positive Termination

Termination is the basic liveness property of PPs.

Termination and termination time. In the following, consider a PP P and its associated pCFG C_P . This pCFG has a special location ℓ_{term} corresponding to the value of the program counter after executing P . We say that a run *terminates* if it reaches a configuration whose first component is ℓ_p^{out} . We define a random variable $Term$ such that for each run ϱ the value $Term(\varrho)$ represents the first point in time when the current location is ℓ_p^{out} . If a run ϱ does *not* terminate, then $Term(\varrho) = \infty$. We call $Term$ the *termination time* of $\mathcal{P}$. Since a probabilistic program may exhibit more than one

```

x := 10
while x ≥ 1 do
  if prob (0.75) then x := x - 1 else x := x + 1
fi
od

```




Fig. 1. An APP modelling an asymmetric 1-D random walk and the associated pCFG. Probabilistic locations are depicted by circles, with probabilities given on outgoing transitions. Transitions are labelled by their effects. Location ℓ_0 is initial and ℓ_2 is terminal.

run, we are interested in probabilities of runs that terminate or reach some set of configurations. This gives rise to the following fundamental computational problems regarding termination:

- (1) *Almost-sure termination*: A probabilistic program P is almost-surely (a.s.) terminating if under each scheduler σ and for each initial valuation $\mathbf{x}_{init} \in \Xi_{init}$ it holds that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}_{init}}^{\sigma}(\{\varrho \mid \varrho \text{ terminates}\}) = 1$, or equivalently, if for each σ it holds $\mathbb{P}^{\sigma}(\text{Term} < \infty) = 1$. In almost-sure termination question for P we aim to prove that P is almost-surely terminating.
- (2) *Positive termination*: A probabilistic program P is positively terminating if under each scheduler σ and for each initial valuation $\mathbf{x}_{init} \in \Xi_{init}$ it holds that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_{init}}^{\sigma}(\{\text{Term}\}) < \infty$. In positive termination question for P we aim to prove that P is positively terminating. Note that each positively terminating program is also a.s. terminating, but the converse does not hold.

3 LEXICOGRAPHIC SUPERMARTINGALES

In this section we introduce the notion of a *lexicographic ranking supermartingale*, which generalizes the standard notion of ranking supermartingales. However, to define any form of a supermartingale, we need the crucial notion of conditional expectation.

Conditional Expectation. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, $X: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ an $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable function, and $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ sub-sigma-algebra of $\mathcal{F}$. A *conditional expectation* of X given $\mathcal{F}'$ is an $\mathcal{F}'$ -measurable random variable denoted by $\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{F}']$ which satisfies, for each set $A \in \mathcal{F}'$, the following:

$$\mathbb{E}[X \cdot 1_A] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{F}'] \cdot 1_A], \quad (1)$$

where $1_A: \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is an *indicator function* of A , i.e. function returning 1 for each $\omega \in A$ and 0 for each $\omega \in \Omega \setminus A$. Note that the left hand-side of (1) intuitively represents the expected value of $X(\omega)$ with domain restricted to A .

Note that any $\mathcal{F}'$ -measurable random variable satisfying (1) can be called a conditional expectation. The definition does not guarantee that the conditional expectation is uniquely defined or that it exists at all. However, from probability theory we have the following:

PROPOSITION 3.1. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, $X: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ an $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable function, and $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ sub-sigma-algebra of $\mathcal{F}$. Assume that one of the following conditions hold:*

- $\mathbb{E}[|X|] < \infty$; or
- X is real-valued and non-negative.

Then there exists a conditional expectation of X given $\mathcal{F}'$ and it is almost-surely unique, i.e. for each two $\mathcal{F}'$ -measurable functions f, g that satisfy (1) it holds $\mathbb{P}(\{\omega \mid f(\omega) \neq g(\omega)\}) = 0$.

PROOF (KEY IDEAS). The proof for the case when $\mathbb{E}[|X|]$ is standard and appears in many textbooks on probability theory (e.g. [3, 10, 56]). The proof for the second case is essentially the same: the condition that X is non-negative and not admitting infinite value suffices for satisfying the assumptions of Radon-Nikodym Theorem, the main theoretical tool used in the proof. For the sake of completeness we present the proof in the supplementary material. $\square$

Since the constraint (1) defining conditional expectation is phrased in terms of expected values, the almost-sure uniqueness cannot be strengthened to uniqueness, as re-defining a random variable on a set of probability zero does not change its expectation. In the following, when we say that a conditional expectation of a random variable X satisfies some inequality (e.g. $\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{F}] \geq 0$) on set $L \subseteq \Omega$, we mean that for each $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable function $\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{F}]$ satisfying (1) the inequality holds on some subset $L' \subseteq L$ such that $\mathbb{P}(L') = \mathbb{P}(L)$.

In context of probabilistic programs we work with probability spaces of the form $(\Omega, \mathcal{R}, \mathbb{P}^\sigma)$, where Ω is a set of runs in some C and $\mathcal{R}$ is (the smallest) sigma-algebra such that all the functions C_i^σ , where $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and σ is a scheduler, are $\mathcal{R}$ -measurable. In such a setting we can also consider sub-sigma-algebras $\mathcal{R}_i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, of $\mathcal{R}$, where $\mathcal{R}_i$ is the smallest sub-sigma-algebra of $\mathcal{R}$ such that all the functions C_j^σ , $0 \leq j \leq i$, are $\mathcal{R}_i$ -measurable. Intuitively, each set A belonging to such an $\mathcal{R}_i$ consists of runs whose first i steps satisfy some property, and the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{R}_i, \mathbb{P}^\sigma)$ allows us to reason about probabilities of certain events happening in the first i steps of program execution. Then, for each $A \in \mathcal{R}_i$, the value $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{R}_i] \cdot 1_A]$ represents the expected value of $X(\varrho)$ for the randomly generated run ϱ provided that we restrict to runs whose prefix of length i satisfies the property given by A . The sequence $\mathcal{R}_0, \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \dots$ forms a filtration of $\mathcal{R}$, which we call a *canonical filtration*.

Definition 3.2 (Lexicographic Ranking Supermartingale). Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ a filtration of $\mathcal{F}$, T a stopping time w.r.t. that filtration, and $\epsilon \geq 0$. An n -dimensional real-valued stochastic process $\{X_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ is a *lexicographic ϵ -ranking supermartingale for T* (ϵ -LexRSM) if the following conditions hold:

- (1) For each $1 \leq j \leq n$ the 1-dimensional stochastic process $\{X_i[j]\}_{i=0}^\infty$ is adapted to $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$.
- (2) For each $\omega \in \Omega$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$ it holds $X_i(\omega)[j] \geq 0$.
- (3) For each $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there exists a partition of the set $\{T > i\}$ into $n+1$ subsets $L_1^i, \dots, L_n^i, L_{n+1}^i$, all of them $\mathcal{F}_i$ -measurable, such that for each $1 \leq j \leq n$:
 - $\mathbb{E}[X_{i+1}[j] \mid \mathcal{F}_i] \leq X_i[j] - \epsilon$ on L_j^i ;
 - for all $1 \leq j' < j$ we have $\mathbb{E}[X_{i+1}[j'] \mid \mathcal{F}_i] = X_i[j']$ on L_j^i ; and
 - $\mathbb{E}[X_{i+1}[j] \mid \mathcal{F}_i] \leq X_i[j]$ on L_{n+1}^i .

The n -dimensional LexRSM is *strict* if $L_{n+1}^i = \emptyset$ for each i .

An *instance* of an n -dimensional LexRSM $\{X_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ is a tuple $(\{X_{i=0}^\infty, \{L_1^i, \dots, L_{n+1}^i\}_{i=0}^\infty)$ where the second component is a sequence of partitions of Ω satisfying the condition in Definition 3.2. Intuitively, the sets L_j^i for $1 \leq j \leq n$ represent the lexicographic ranking condition, i.e. for strict

LexRSMs, we are in each step able to partition Ω into subsets such that on j -th subset the j -th component of $\mathbf{X}$ is expected to decrease while the previous components are not expected to increase. On additional sets L_{n+1}^i , none of the components is expected to increase, but decrease is not required: this will become handy later when we deal with compositional LexRSM-based proofs (Section 6) – we will not require decrease in every step as long as decrease happens at least once on each cycle in the pCFG. We say that $\omega \in \Omega$ has level j in step i of instance $(\{\mathbf{X}_{i=0}^\infty, \{L_1^i, \dots, L_{n+1}^i\}_{i=0}^\infty\})$ if $\omega \in L_j^i$. We also say that ω has level 0 in step i if $T(\omega) \leq i$.

The strict 1-dimensional lexicographic ϵ -ranking supermartingale is, to a large extent, equivalent to the notion of a ranking supermartingale as studied in [19, 31]. There is one significant difference: in these works there is an additional *integrability* condition imposed on the one-dimensional process $\{X_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$, which requires that for each $i \geq 0$ it holds $\mathbb{E}[|X_i|] < \infty$ (or equivalently $\mathbb{E}[X_i] < \infty$, as the process is required to be non-negative). We do not impose this condition, which simplifies possible application of LexRSMs to programs with non-linear arithmetic, where, as already shown in [31], integrability of program variables is not guaranteed. The reason why integrability condition can be dropped is that it is only needed in the previous works to ensure that the conditional expectations exist and are well-defined. However, the existence of conditional expectations is also guaranteed for random variables that are real-valued non-negative, see Proposition 3.1.

The following theorem states our main mathematical result on LexRSMs.

THEOREM 3.3. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ a filtration of $\mathcal{F}$, T a stopping time w.r.t. that filtration, and $\epsilon > 0$. Assume there exists an n -dimensional ϵ -LexRSM for T and its instance $(\{\mathbf{X}_{i=0}^\infty, \{L_1^i, \dots, L_{n+1}^i\}_{i=0}^\infty\})$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\{\omega \in \Omega \mid \text{level of } \omega \text{ is } < n+1 \text{ in infinitely many steps}\}) = 1$. Then $\mathbb{P}(T < \infty) = 1$. In particular, if there exists a strict ϵ -LexRSM for T , then $\mathbb{P}(T < \infty) = 1$.*

PROOF. The proof proceeds by contradiction, i.e. we assume that an ϵ -LexRSM for T satisfying the above conditions exists and $\mathbb{P}(T = \infty) > 0$. For succinctness we denote the set $\{\omega \mid T(\omega) = \infty\}$ by A_∞ .

For $\omega \in \Omega$ we denote the level of ω at step i by $\text{lev}_i(\omega)$. The value $\text{lev}_i(\omega)$ is well-defined for all ω and moreover, the random variable lev_i is $\mathcal{F}_i$ -measurable. We denote by $\text{min-lev}(\omega)$ the smallest $0 \leq j \leq n$ such that j is a level of ω at infinitely many steps. Note that $\omega \in A_\infty$ if and only if $\text{min-lev}(\omega) \neq 0$, so $\mathbb{P}(A_\infty) = \mathbb{P}(\{\text{min-lev} \neq 0\})$. We denote by M_i the set of all ω 's with $\text{min-lev}(\omega) = i$.

Throughout the proof we use several times the following fundamental fact: if $\mathbb{P}(A) > 0$ for some set A and $A = A_1 \cup A_2 \cup A_3 \dots$ for some sequence of sets $A_1, A_2, A_3, \dots$, then there exists i such that $\mathbb{P}(A_i) > 0$.

Now $A_\infty = M_1 \cup \dots \cup M_n \cup M_{n+1}$ and $\mathbb{P}(M_{n+1}) = 0$ (as the measure of ω 's that have level $< n+1$ in only finitely many steps is zero, per Theorem's assumption), there must be $1 \leq j^* \leq n$ s.t. $\mathbb{P}(M_{j^*}) > 0$, i.e. with positive probability the smallest level appearing infinitely often is j^* . For each $\omega \in M_{j^*}$ there is the smallest number $i_{\omega, j^*} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for all $i \geq i_{\omega, j^*}$ it holds $\text{lev}_i(\omega) \geq j^*$, i.e. after step i_{ω, j^*} the level of ω in all steps up to infinity is at least j^* . Denote by $S_{j^*, i}$ the set of all ω 's in M_{j^*} s.t. $i_{\omega, j^*} = i$. Since $M_{j^*} = M_{j^*, 1} \cup M_{j^*, 2} \cup M_{j^*, 3} \cup \dots$, there is $i^* \in \mathbb{N}_0$ s.t. $\mathbb{P}(M_{j^*, i^*}) > 0$. That is, there is a point in time such that with positive probability, after this point the level of ω is at least j^* , and it is equal to j^* infinitely many times. Continuing on the same note, for each $B \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by M_{j^*, i^*}^B the set off all ω 's in M_{j^*, i^*} s.t. $\mathbf{X}_{i^*}[j^*](\omega) \leq B$. Since $M_{j^*, i^*} = M_{j^*, i^*}^1 \cup M_{j^*, i^*}^2 \cup M_{j^*, i^*}^3 \cup \dots$, there is $B^* \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $\mathbb{P}(M_{j^*, i^*}^{B^*}) > 0$.

So there is a set of positive probability $M = M_{j^*, i^*}^{B^*}$ such that for all ω 's in the set: after step i^* the level of ω is at least j^* (which, intuitively, means that $X[j^*]$ does not have a tendency to increase after this time step on ω 's in M), the level of ω is infinitely often equal to j^* (intuitively, $X[j^*]$ has infinitely often the tendency to decrease by $\geq \epsilon$ for ω 's in M), and at time i^* the value of $X[j^*]$ is bounded (by B) on M . This should, again intuitively, lead to a conclusion, that when “restricted to M ”, $X[j^*]$ has tendency to decrease unboundedly over time, a contradiction with non-negativeness of $X[j^*]$. However, proving this intuitive result is much more intricate: most importantly, it is not clear what “restricted to M ” stands for. The stochastic process $\{X\}_{i=0}^\infty$ as well as the LexRSM conditions are tied to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$, but the set M is not necessarily $\mathcal{F}_i$ measurable for any concrete i , since whether ω belongs to M depends on values of $lev_i(\omega)$ for *infinitely many* i . Hence, we use a work-around.

Let D be the set of all $\omega \in \Omega$ such that $X_{i^*}[j^*](\omega) \leq B^*$. Note that $M \subseteq D$ and $D \in \mathcal{F}_{i^*}$ (and thus also $D \in \mathcal{F}_{i'}$ for all $i' \geq i^*$). Define a stopping time F w.r.t. filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ as follows: for all $\omega \in \Omega$ we put $F(\omega) = \inf\{k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid k \geq i^* \text{ and } lev_k(\omega) < j^*\}$.

Define a (one-dimensional) stochastic process $\{Y_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ as follows:

$$Y_k(\omega) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \omega \notin D \\ B^* & \text{if } \omega \in D \text{ and } k < i^* \\ X_k[j^*](\omega) & \text{if } \omega \in D, k \geq i^* \text{ and } F(\omega) > k \\ X_{F(\omega)}[j^*](\omega) & \text{if } \omega \in D, k \geq i^* \text{ and } F(\omega) \leq k. \end{cases}$$

Intuitively, the process $\{Y_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is an over-approximation of what we would like to call “ $X[j^*]$ restricted to M .” We prove several properties of the process. First, clearly for all $k \geq 0$, $Y_k(\omega) \geq 0$. Second, for each $k \geq i^*$, the variable Y_k is $\mathcal{F}_k$ -measurable, as $D \in \mathcal{F}_{i^*}$, $\{X_i[j^*](\omega)\}_{i=0}^\infty$ is adapted to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ and F is a stopping time w.r.t. this filtration. Finally, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ denote by $\sharp_k$ the random variable such that $\sharp_k(\omega) = |\{i' \in \mathbb{N} \mid i^* \leq i' < k \text{ and } lev_{i'}(\omega) = j^*\}|$, i.e. $\sharp_k(\omega)$ counts the number of steps between i^* and k in which level is j^* . We prove that for each $k \geq i^*$ it holds

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_k] \leq B^* \cdot \mathbb{P}(D) - \epsilon \cdot \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-i^*} \ell \cdot \mathbb{P}(D \cap \{F \geq k\} \cap \{\sharp_k = \ell\}). \quad (2)$$

The proof of (2) goes by induction on k . The computations being somewhat technical, we defer them to the supplementary material.

Now according to (2) it holds $\mathbb{E}[Y_k] \leq B^* \cdot \mathbb{P}(D) - \epsilon \cdot \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-i^*} \ell \cdot \mathbb{P}(D \cap \{F \geq k\} \cap \{\sharp_k = \ell\})$ for all $k \geq i^*$. Let $m = 3B^* \cdot \mathbb{P}(D) / (\epsilon \cdot \mathbb{P}(M))$. For each $\omega \in M$ we see level j^* infinitely often, so there exists step $k(\omega) \geq i^*$ such that $\sharp_{k(\omega)} \geq m$, i.e. ω has level j^* at least in m steps between steps i^* and $k(\omega)$. Clearly, $M = \bigcup_{\ell=i^*}^\infty (M \cap \{k(\omega) \leq \ell\})$ and hence $\mathbb{P}(M) = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(M \cap \{k_m \leq \ell\})$. Thus, there exists $\ell_0 \geq m + i^*$ such that $\mathbb{P}(M \cap \{\sharp_{\ell_0} \geq m\}) \geq \mathbb{P}(M)/2$. Clearly $M \cap \{\sharp_{\ell_0} \geq m\} \subseteq D \cap \{F \geq \ell_0\} \cap \{\sharp_{\ell_0} \geq m\}$.

From (2) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[Y_{\ell_0}] &\leq B^* \cdot \mathbb{P}(D) - \epsilon \cdot \sum_{\ell=0}^{\ell_0-i^*} \ell \cdot \mathbb{P}(D \cap \{F \geq \ell_0\} \cap \{\#_{\ell_0} = \ell\}) \\
 &= B^* \cdot \mathbb{P}(D) - \epsilon \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0-i^*} \mathbb{P}(D \cap \{F \geq \ell_0\} \cap \{\#_{\ell_0} \geq \ell\}) \\
 &\leq B^* \cdot \mathbb{P}(D) - \epsilon \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^m \mathbb{P}(D \cap \{F \geq \ell_0\} \cap \{\#_{\ell_0} \geq \ell\}) \\
 &\leq B^* \cdot \mathbb{P}(D) - \epsilon \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^m \mathbb{P}(D \cap \{F \geq \ell_0\} \cap \{\#_{\ell_0} \geq m\}) \\
 &\leq B^* \cdot \mathbb{P}(D) - \epsilon \cdot m \cdot \mathbb{P}(M)/2 < 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows by standard re-arranging of terms, the third line follows from the fact that $m \leq \ell_0 + i^*$, the fourth line follows from $\{\#_{\ell_0} \geq m\} \subseteq \{\#_{\ell_0} \geq \ell\}$ for each $\ell \leq m$, the first inequality on the last line follows by using $\mathbb{P}(M)/2 \leq \mathbb{P}(M \cap \{\#_{\ell_0} \geq m\}) \leq \mathbb{P}(D \cap \{F \geq \ell_0\} \cap \{\#_{\ell_0} \geq m\})$, and the last inequality follows by expanding the definition of m . But for each k the random variable Y_k is non-negative, so it must also have a non-negative expectation, a contradiction. Finally, note that for strict n -dimensional LexRSMs the condition of level $< n + 1$ appearing infinitely many times is trivially satisfied. $\square$

4 APPLYING LEXICOGRAPHIC SUPERMARTINGALES TO PROBABILISTIC PROGRAMS

We now discuss how to leverage the mathematical results of the previous section to provide a sound proof rule for almost-sure termination of probabilistic programs. Hence, for the rest of this section we fix a PP $\mathcal{P}$ and the associated pCFG $C_{\mathcal{P}} = (L, V, \ell_{init}, \Xi_{init}, \mapsto, Up, Pr, G)$.

We aim to define a function assigning a non-negative vector to each configuration (so called measurable map) such that in each point of computation, the expected value of the function after performing one more computational step is smaller (in lexicographic ordering) than the current one. We formalize this property below.

Definition 4.1 (Measurable Maps and Linear Expression Maps). A 1-dimensional *measurable map* for a PP $\mathcal{P}$ is a real-valued function η assigning to each program location ℓ of $C_{\mathcal{P}}$ a Borel-measurable function $\eta(\ell)$ of program variables, i.e. each $\eta(\ell)$ is a function of type $\mathbb{R}^{|V|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. As a special case, if all the functions $\eta(\ell)$ are affine, then we call η a 1-dimensional *linear expression map (LEM)*. An n -dimensional measurable/linear expression map is a vector $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$ of 1-dimensional measurable/linear expression maps.

Each 1-dimensional measurable map η and location ℓ determines a function $\eta(\ell)$ which takes as an argument an $|V|$ -dimensional vector. We use $\eta(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ as a shorthand notation for $\eta(\ell)(\mathbf{x})$.

We now formalize the notion of a transition in a pCFG being ranked by a measurable map. We first define this notion for transitions that do not go out of a probabilistic branching location, as these require a special treatment.

Definition 4.2. Let η be a measurable map, $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ be a configuration such that $\ell \notin L_{PB}$ and let $\tau = (\ell, \ell')$ be a transition outgoing from ℓ . For an $\epsilon \geq 0$ we say that τ is ϵ -ranked by η from $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ if the following conditions are satisfied, depending on the type of ℓ :

- if ℓ is a deterministic or non-deterministic branching location, then

$$\eta(\ell', \mathbf{x}) \leq \eta(\ell, \mathbf{x}) - \epsilon;$$

- If ℓ is an assignment location, then we distinguish three cases, depending on $Up(\tau) = (j, u)$ (recall that u is an update element):
 - If $u: \mathbb{R}^{|V|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Borel-measurable function, then we require

$$\eta(\ell', \mathbf{x}(j \leftarrow u(\mathbf{x}))) \leq \eta(\ell, \mathbf{x}) - \epsilon$$

- If u is a distribution d , then we require

$$\eta(\ell', \mathbf{x}(j \leftarrow \mathbb{E}[d])) \leq \eta(\ell, \mathbf{x}) - \epsilon,$$

where $\mathbb{E}[d]$ is the expected value of the distribution d .

- If u is a set, then we require

$$\sup_{a \in u} \eta(\ell', \mathbf{x}(j \leftarrow a)) \leq \eta(\ell, \mathbf{x}) - \epsilon.$$

Since ranking supermartingales are required to decrease on average, for individual transitions outgoing from L_{PB} it does not make sense to say that they are ranked or not. Instead, for each $\ell \in L_{PB}$ we consider all outgoing transitions together.

Definition 4.3. Let η be a measurable map, and let $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ be a configuration with $\ell \in L_{PB}$. For an $\epsilon \geq 0$ we say that ℓ is ϵ -ranked by η from $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ if

$$\sum_{(\ell, \ell') \in \rightarrow} Pr_{\ell}(\ell, \ell') \cdot \eta(\ell', \mathbf{x}) \leq \eta(\ell, \mathbf{x}) - \epsilon.$$

To capture the specific of L_{PB} , we introduce the notion of *generalized transition*.

Definition 4.4. A generalized transition of a pCFG C is either a transition of C outgoing from location not in L_{PB} or a location $\ell \in L_{PB}$.

Intuitively, we represent the set of transitions outgoing from $\ell \in L_{PB}$ by the source location ℓ . For generalized transitions $\tilde{\tau} = \ell \in L_{PB}$ we say that $\tilde{\tau}$ is outgoing from ℓ .

Definitions 4.2 and 4.3 define when is a generalized transition ϵ -ranked by η from configuration $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$. We say that a generalized transition is *unaffected* by η from $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ if it is 0-ranked by η from $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$.

As in termination analysis of non-probabilistic programs, our LexRSMs are typically supported by *invariants*, i.e. overapproximations of the set of reachable configuration.

Definition 4.5 (Invariant Map and Linear Invariant Map). An *invariant map* for a PP $\mathcal{P}$ is a function I assigning to each location of $C_{\mathcal{P}}$ a Borel-measurable set $I(\ell) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{|V|}$ of variable valuations, so called invariant of ℓ , such that for each configuration $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ reachable from the initial configuration it holds $\mathbf{x} \in I(\ell)$. Additionally, if each set $I(\ell)$ is of the form $\{\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \models \Psi^{\ell}\}$ for some propositionally linear predicate Ψ^{ℓ} , then we call I a *linear invariant map* (LIM).

Slightly abusing the notation, we view each LIM equivalently as a function assigning linear predicates (whose satisfaction sets overapproximate the set of reachable valuations) to program locations.

We now have all the ingredients needed to define the notion of LexRSM maps for probabilistic programs. For notational convenience, we extend the function G (which assigns guards to deterministic transitions) to the set of all generalized transition: for a generalized transition τ' which is not a standard transition outgoing from deterministic location, we put $G(\tau') = 0 \leq 0 \equiv \text{true}$.

Definition 4.6 (Lexicographic Ranking Supermartingale Map). Let $\epsilon > 0$. An n -dimensional *lexicographic ϵ -ranking supermartingale map* (ϵ -LexRSM map) for a program $\mathcal{P}$ supported by an invariant map I is an n -dimensional measurable map $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$ for $\mathcal{P}$ such that for each configuration $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ where $\ell \neq \ell_{\text{term}}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in I(\ell)$ the following conditions are satisfied:

- for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, $\eta_j(\ell, \mathbf{x}) \geq 0$; and
- for each generalized transition $\tilde{\tau}$ outgoing from ℓ such that $\mathbf{x} \models G(\tilde{\tau})$ there exists $1 \leq j \leq n$ such that
 - $\tilde{\tau}$ is ϵ -ranked by η_j from $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$
 - for all $1 \leq j' < j$ we have that $\tilde{\tau}$ is unaffected by $\eta_{j'}$ from $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$.

If additionally η is a linear expression map, then we call it a linear ϵ -LexRSM map (ϵ -LinLexRSM).

The main result is the soundness of ϵ -LexRSM maps for proving a.s. termination.

THEOREM 4.7. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a probabilistic program. Assume that there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ and an n -dimensional ϵ -LexRSM map $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$ for $\mathcal{P}$ supported by some invariant map I . Then $\mathcal{P}$ terminates almost surely.*

PROOF. Let σ be any measurable scheduler and $\mathbf{x}_{\text{init}} \in \Xi_{\text{init}}$ any initial variable valuation in $\mathcal{P}$. We define an n -dimensional stochastic process $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ on the probability space $(\Omega_{\text{Run}}, \mathcal{R}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}_{\text{init}}}^\sigma)$ such that for each $i \geq 0$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$ and each run ϱ we put $\mathbf{X}_i[j](\varrho) = \eta_j(C_i^\sigma(\varrho))$. We claim that $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ is a strict n -dimensional ϵ -LexRSM for the termination time Term of $\mathcal{P}$. Clearly the process is real-valued, componentwise non-negative, and adapted to the canonical filtration of $\mathcal{R}$. It remains to prove that condition (3) in Definition 3.2 is satisfied. To this end, for each $i \geq 0$ we define an almost-sure partition of the set $\{\varrho \in \Omega_{\text{Run}} \mid \text{Term}(\varrho) > i\}$ into sets $L_1^i, \dots, L_n^i$ by putting L_j^i to be the set of all runs ϱ such that $\text{Term}(\varrho) > i$ and for ϱ the index j is the smallest one such that the $(i+1)$ -th transition on ϱ is ranked by η_j from $C_i^\sigma(\varrho)$. Due to definition of an ϵ -LexRSM map such a j exists for all $\varrho \in \{\text{Term} > i\}$ and hence we indeed have a partition (so $L_{n+1}^i = \emptyset$ for all i). It remains to prove that irrespective of the initial choice of σ and $\mathbf{x}_{\text{init}}$ it holds, for each $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $j' < j$, that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_{\text{init}}}^\sigma[\mathbf{X}_{i+1}[j] \mid \mathcal{R}_i] \leq \mathbf{X}_i[j] - \epsilon$ on L_j^i and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_{\text{init}}}^\sigma[\mathbf{X}_{i+1}[j] \mid \mathcal{R}_i] \leq \mathbf{X}_i[j]$ on $L_{j'}^i$. This follows easily from the definition of $L_1^i, \dots, L_n^i$ and from the definition of a transition being ϵ -ranked by η_j .

Since $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ is an ϵ -LexRSM for Term , from Theorem 4.7 it follows that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}_{\text{init}}}^\sigma(\text{Term} < \infty) = 1$, irrespective of σ and $\mathbf{x}_{\text{init}}$. $\square$

We conclude this section by showing that (Lin)LexRSMs can, unlike 1-dimensional RSMs, prove a.s. termination of programs whose expected termination time is infinite.

Example 4.8. Consider the program in Figure 2. It is easy to see that it terminates a.s., but the expected termination time is infinite: to see this, note that the expected value of variable x

```

x := 1 ; c := 1
while c ≥ 1 do (6c + 2, x) [c ≥ 0 ∧ x ≥ 1]
  if prob (0.5) then (6c + 1, x) [c ≥ 1 ∧ x ≥ 1]
    x := 2 · x (6c + 3, x) [c ≥ 1 ∧ x ≥ 1]
  else
    c := 0 (3, x) [c ≥ 1 ∧ x ≥ 1]
  fi
od
while x ≥ 0 do x := x - 1 od (0, x) [x ≥ 0]

```

Fig. 2. An a.s. terminating program with infinite expected termination time. A 2-dimensional 1-LinLexRSM map for the program is given on the right, along with the supporting invariants in square brackets. The invariants and a LinLexRSM on each line belong to the program location in which the program is *before* executing the command on that line. The function is indeed a 1-LinLexRSM, since in the probabilistic branching location ℓ we have $\text{pre}_\eta(\ell, (x, c)) = 3c + 3$ and $3c + 3 \leq 6c + 1 - 1$ for all $c \geq 1$.

upon reaching the second loop is $\frac{1}{2} \cdot 1 + \frac{1}{4} \cdot 2 + \frac{1}{8} \cdot 4 + \dots = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \dots = \infty$ and that the time needed to get out of the second loop is equal to the value of x upon entering the loop. However, a.s. termination of the program is proved by a 2-dimensional LinLexRSM η pictured in the figure.

5 ALGORITHMIC ASPECTS

In this section we describe a polynomial-time algorithm for synthesizing linear ϵ -LexRSM maps in affine probabilistic programs supported by a given linear invariant map I . The algorithm, based on iterative solving of linear constraints, is a generalization of an algorithm for finding lexicographic ranking functions in non-probabilistic programs [2]. Hence, we provide only a high-level description, focusing on the new aspects.

The main idea is to iteratively synthesize 1-dimensional linear expression map that 1-rank a subset of generalized transitions. These maps form the individual components of the sought-after 1-LinLexRSM map. In each iteration, we start with a set U of the yet-unranked generalized transitions. We seek a 1-dimensional LEM which ranks the maximal number of elements of U , and is unaffected by the remaining elements of U (here by ranking a generalized transition $\tilde{\tau}$ we mean ranking it from each configuration $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$, where ℓ is the source location of $\tilde{\tau}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in I(\ell)$). If no 1-dimensional LEM that would rank at least one element in U exists, then there is no LinLexRSM map for the program. Otherwise, we remove the newly ranked elements from U and continue into the next iteration, until U becomes empty. The process is summarized in Algorithm 1.

Hence, the main computational task of the algorithm is to check, for a given set of generalized transition U , whether there exists a 1-dimensional LEM η such that:

- (1) for each location $\ell \in L$ and all $\mathbf{x} \in I(\ell)$ it holds $\eta(\ell, \mathbf{x}) \geq 0$;
- (2) for each $\tilde{\tau} \in U$ and each configuration $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ where ℓ is the source of $\tilde{\tau}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in I(\ell) \cap \{\mathbf{x}' \mid \mathbf{x}' \models G(\tilde{\tau})\}$ we have that $\tilde{\tau}$ is unaffected by η from $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$; and
- (3) there is $\tilde{\tau} \in U$ that is 1-ranked by η , from each configuration $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ where ℓ is the source of $\tilde{\tau}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in I(\ell) \cap \{\mathbf{x}' \mid \mathbf{x}' \models G(\tilde{\tau})\}$; we then say that η ranks $\tilde{\tau}$ w.r.t. I .

Moreover, if such an LEM η exists, the algorithm has to find one that maximizes the number of gen. transitions in U ranked by it. Both these tasks can be accomplished by the standard method of linear constraints based on the use of Farkas's lemma, which was widely use for synthesis of termination proofs in both probabilistic and non-probabilistic programs [15, 19, 21, 54]. That is, the algorithm first constructs, for each location ℓ a *template* for η , i.e. an expression of the form $a_1^\ell x_1 + \dots + a_{|V|}^\ell x_{|V|} = b^\ell$, where $x_1, \dots, x_{|V|}$ are program variables and $a_1^\ell, \dots, a_{|V|}^\ell, b^\ell$ are yet unknown coefficients. That is, supplying concrete values for all the unknown coefficients yields an LEM. Now the conditions (1) and (2) above can be expressed using linear constraints on the coefficients. More precisely, using the construction provided e.g. in [15, 19] (which includes a use of the Farkas's lemma) we construct in polynomial time, for each generalized transition $\tilde{\tau}$, a system of linear constraints $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{\tau}}$ over set of variables $\{a_1^\ell, \dots, a_{|V|}^\ell, b^\ell \mid \ell \in L\} \cup \{\epsilon_{\tilde{\tau}}\} \cup F$, where F is the set of fresh variables (not appearing in any template) and $\epsilon_{\tilde{\tau}}$ is constrained to be non-negative. Each solution of the system $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{\tau}}$ yields a LEM which satisfies the constraints (1) and (2) for $\tilde{\tau}$. Moreover, each solution of $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{\tau}}$ yields a LEM which $\epsilon_{\tilde{\tau}}$ -ranks $\tilde{\tau}$. To find a LEM which satisfies all constraints (1)–(3) as well as maximizes the number of 1-ranked elements of U it is sufficient to construct $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{\tau}}$ for each $\tilde{\tau} \in U$ and solve the following linear program $\mathcal{LP}_U$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize } \sum_{\tilde{\tau} \in U} \epsilon_{\tilde{\tau}} \text{ subject to constraints} \\ & \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{\tau}}; \quad \tilde{\tau} \in U \\ & 0 \leq \epsilon_{\tilde{\tau}} \leq 1; \quad \tilde{\tau} \in U \end{aligned}$$

Each system $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{\tau}}$ is constructed in such a way that if it admits a solution with some $\epsilon_{\tilde{\tau}}$ positive, then decreasing the value of $\epsilon_{\tilde{\tau}}$ in that solution to any non-negative value still yield a valid solution (this corresponds to the fact that if some transition is ϵ -ranked by η , then it is ϵ' -ranked by η for each $0 \leq \epsilon' \leq \epsilon$). Moreover, each solution where $\epsilon_{\tilde{\tau}}$ is positive can be rescaled into another solution in which $\epsilon_{\tilde{\tau}}$ is at least 1. It follows that of $\mathcal{LP}_U$ has at least one feasible solution, then it has an optimal solution in which each $\epsilon_{\tilde{\tau}}$ is either 0 or 1. If the system does not have a solution or all the $\epsilon_{\tilde{\tau}}$ are equal to zero then there is no LEM satisfying (1)–(3). Otherwise, the optimal solution of $\mathcal{LP}_U$ yields a LEM η which satisfies (1)–(3) and maximizes the number of 1-ranked elements of U .

This polynomial-time linear-programming step is used as a sub-procedure in Algorithm 1 for LinLexRSM synthesis.

Both soundness and relative completeness of Algorithm 1 follow by arguments identical to those presented in [2].

THEOREM 5.1. *Suppose that Algorithm 1 is run on an APP $\mathcal{P}$ together with linear invariant map I . If the algorithm returns a d -dimensional LEM $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d)$, then η is a 1-LinLexRSM map for $\mathcal{P}$ supported by I . Conversely, if the algorithm returns “No LinLexRSM”, then for any $d' \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ there is no d' -dimensional ϵ -LinLexRSM for $\mathcal{P}$ supported by I . If guards of all conditionals and loops in App are linear assertion, then the algorithm runs in time polynomial in size of $\mathcal{P}$ and I .*

PROOF (KEY IDEAS). For soundness, let U_i and U_i denote the content of U just before the i -th iteration of the while loop. Then each $\tilde{\tau} \in U_i \setminus U_{i+1}$ is 1-ranked by η_i , for each $1 \leq i \leq d$. Since $U_d = \emptyset$, each generalized transition of $C_{\mathcal{P}}$ is 1-ranked by some component of η . Non-negativity of each η_i is ensured directly by $\mathcal{LP}_{U_i}$. Hence, it remains to show that each $\tilde{\tau} \in U_i$ is unaffected by

Algorithm 1: Synthesis of LinLexRSMs for APPs**input** : An APP $\mathcal{P}$ together with an invariant map I .**output** : A multi-dimensional LinLexRSM if it exists, otherwise “No LinLexRSM”

```

1  $U \leftarrow$  all generalized transitions of  $C_{\mathcal{P}}$ 
2  $d \leftarrow 0$ 
3 while  $U$  is non-empty do
4    $d \leftarrow d + 1$ 
5   construct and solve  $\mathcal{LP}_U$ 
6   if  $\mathcal{LP}_U$  does not have feasible solution or optimal value is 0 then
7     return No LinLexRSM
8   else
9      $sol \leftarrow$  optimal solution of  $\mathcal{LP}_U$ 
10     $\eta_d \leftarrow$  the LEM  $\eta$  induced by  $sol$ 
11     $U \leftarrow U \setminus \{\tilde{\tau} \mid \epsilon_{\tilde{\tau}} = 1 \text{ in } sol\}$ 
12 return  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d)$ 

```

$\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{i-1}$. But this follows from $U_i \subseteq U_{i-1} \subseteq \dots \subseteq U_1$ and from the fact that each gen. transition in U_j is unaffected by η_j .

Proving completeness is more intricate; as pointed out in [2], one needs to show that the greedy strategy of selecting LEM that ranks maximal number of remaining transitions does not cut off some possible LinLexRSMs. In [2] the completeness of the greedy strategy is proved by using several geometric arguments that exploit the fact that the underlying programs are affine. The same geometric properties hold for our generalization to APPs (all ranking conditions in Definitions 4.2 and 4.3 are linear in program variables), so the result is easily transferable. The complexity argument is rather standard and we present it in the supplementary material. $\square$

6 COMPOSITIONALITY OF RANKING SUPERMARTINGALES REVISITED

6.1 One-Dimensional Compositional Proofs of Almost-Sure Termination

Compositionality in the context of termination proving means providing the proof of termination step-by-step, handling one loop at a time, rather than attempting to construct the proof (in our case, a LexRSM) at once [43]. In the context of probabilistic programs, the work [31] attempted to provide a compositional notion of almost-sure termination proof based on the *probabilistic variant rule* (V-rule), which we explain in a more detail below. However, for the method to work, [31] imposes a technical *uniform integrability* condition, whose checking is hard to automatize. In this section we show that using our insights into LexRSMs we can obtain a different notion of a probabilistic V-rule which is sound without any additional assumptions, and which can be used to compositionally prove termination of programs that the previous method cannot handle.

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a PP of the form **while** Ψ **do** $\mathcal{P}_{body}$ **od**, and let $C_{\mathcal{P}}$ be the associated pCFG, whose set of locations we denote by L . We denote by $loops(\mathcal{P})$ the set of all locations of $C_{\mathcal{P}}$ that belong to a sub-pCFG of $C_{\mathcal{P}}$ corresponding to some nested loop of $\mathcal{P}$. We also define $slice(\mathcal{P})$ to be the set $L \setminus loops(\mathcal{P})$ of locations that do not belong to any nested sub-loop. A formal definition of both functions is given in the supplementary material, we illustrate them in the following example.

Example 6.1. Consider the program $\mathcal{P}$ in Figure 4a and its associated pCFG. Then $\text{loops}(\mathcal{P}) = \{\ell_2, \ell_3\}$ and $\text{slice}(\mathcal{P}) = \{\ell_0, \ell_1, \ell_4, \ell^{out}\}$.

Given an invariant map I , we say that a 1-dimensional measurable map η for $\mathcal{C}\mathcal{P}$ is ϵ - I -ranking/unaffected in location ℓ , if for each $\mathbf{x} \in I(\ell)$ each generalized transition $\tilde{\tau}$ outgoing from ℓ is ϵ -ranked/unaffected by η .

We recall the notion of compositional ranking supermartingale as introduced in [31]. We call it a PV supermartingale, as it is based on so called probabilistic variant rule. Due to differences in syntax and semantics, the definition is syntactically slightly different from [31], but the essence is the same. A measurable map η is propositionally linear, if each function $\eta(\ell)$ is of the form $1_{G_1} \cdot E_1 + \dots + 1_{G_k} \cdot E_k$, where each 1_{G_i} is an indicator function of some polyhedron and each E_i is a linear expression.

Definition 6.2 (PV-supermartingale [31, Definition 7.1]). A 1-dimensional propositionally linear map η is a PV supermartingale (PVSM) for a program $\mathcal{P}$ supported by an invariant map I if there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that η is ϵ - I -ranking an I -non-negative in each location $\ell \in \text{slice}(\mathcal{P})$ and I -unaffected in each $\ell \in \text{loops}(\mathcal{P})$.

As a matter of fact, the condition that η should be non-negative in locations of $\text{slice}(\mathcal{P})$ is not explicitly mentioned in [31]. However, it is implicitly used in some of the proofs and one can easily construct an example where, if the non-negativity in $\text{slice}(\mathcal{P})$ is not required, the Theorem 6.3 below, which also comes from [31], does not hold. Hence, we state the condition explicitly.

In [31] they show that even if all nested loops were already proved to terminate a.s. and there is a PVSM for the program, then the program itself might not terminate a.s. Then they impose a *uniform integrability* constraint on the PVSM under which a PVSM together with a proof of a.s. termination of each nested sub-loop of $\mathcal{P}$ entails termination of the whole program $\mathcal{P}$. Uniform integrability is a deep concept from probability and measure theory: a sequence $X_0, X_1, X_2, \dots$ of random variables is uniformly integrable if for each $\delta > 0$ there exists an $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq 0$ it holds $\mathbb{E}[|X_n| \cdot 1_{X_n \geq K}] \leq \delta$. Apart from uniform integrability being somewhat restrictive in itself, in [31] it is argued that proving uniform integrability is beyond the capability of state-of-the-art automated theorem provers. As a substitute for these, [31] introduces a type system that can be used to automatically prove uniform integrability of ranking supermartingales for a restricted class of programs. We do not repeat the precise definition of the typesystem here, we just say that a PVSM satisfying the condition imposed by the type system *typechecks* correctly. In [31] the following was proved:

THEOREM 6.3 ([31]). *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a PP of the form **while** Ψ **do** $\mathcal{P}_{body}$ **od**. Assume that each nested loop of $\mathcal{P}$ terminates almost surely from each reachable configuration, and that there exists a PVSM for $\mathcal{P}$ that typechecks correctly. Then $\mathcal{P}$ terminates almost surely.*

The intricacies of uniform integrability are shown in the following example.

Example 6.4. Consider the two APPs in Figure 3, that differ only in one coefficient in the assignment on line 5. For the inner loop there exists (in both cases) a 1-dimensional linear ranking supermartingale whose value in each location is equal to $c + d_\ell$, where d_ℓ is a location-specific constant. Since the expected change of c in each loop step is -0.5 , this is indeed a LRSM. Also, in both cases, a LEM of the form $x + d'_\ell$, again for some suitable location-specific constants d'_ℓ , is a PVSM for the outer loop, as x decreases and is non-negative within the outer loop and its expected change is

<pre> while $x \geq 0$ do $c := 1$; while $x \geq 1$ and $c \geq 1$ do if $\text{prob}(0.5)$ then $x := 0$ else $x := 2(x-1)$ fi; if $\text{prob}(0.5)$ then $c := 0$ else skip fi od; $x := x - 1$ od </pre>	<pre> while $x \geq 0$ do $c := 1$; while $x \geq 1$ and $c \geq 1$ do if $\text{prob}(0.5)$ then $x := 0$ else $x := \frac{3}{2}(x-1)$ fi; if $\text{prob}(0.5)$ then $c := 0$ else skip fi od; $x := x - 1$ od </pre>
---	---

Fig. 3. Examples of programs with (right) and without (left) uniformly integrable PVSMs.




Fig. 4. Program illustrations.

non-negative within the inner loop (more precisely, the inner-loop expected change of x zero in the left program and $-\frac{x}{4} - \frac{3}{4}$ in the right program). However, the variable x is uniformly integrable within the inner loop of the right program while for the left program this does not hold: we show this in the supplementary material. The example shows that proving uniform integrability requires intricate reasoning about quantitative behaviour of the program. Moreover, as shown below, none of the two programs have a PVSM that typechecks.

Indeed, taking a closer look at typesystem in [31], there are several reasons for typechecking of PVSM to fail. The major ones are:

- (1) A PVSM η for PP $\mathcal{P}$ will not typecheck if $\mathcal{P}$ has a nested loop in which the value of η can change unboundedly in a single step (see Figure 3).

- (2) A PVSM η for PP $\mathcal{P}$ will not typecheck if $\mathcal{P}$ has a nested loop which itself has a nested loop in which some variable appearing in some expression in η is modified, see Figure 4b.⁵

Thus, the typechecking algorithm may rule out programs where the termination-controlling variable represents e.g. a length of an array, which can be doubled/halved in some sub-program do to (de)allocation, merging, or splitting. To overcome the rather strict typechecking, we use the results on LexRSMs to define a new notion of compositional ranking supermartingales, which we call *nob-negative compositional* (NC) supermartingales. For the sake of generality, we allow NC martingales to be general measurable maps, not necessarily propositionally linear.

Definition 6.5. A 1-dimensional measurable map η is an NC supermartingale (NCSM) for a program $\mathcal{P}$ supported by an invariant map I if there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that η is:

- (1) non-negative in each $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ where ℓ is a location of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in I(\ell)$;
- (2) ϵ - I -ranking in each location $\ell \in \text{slice}(\mathcal{P})$; and
- (3) I -unaffecting in each $\ell \in \text{loops}(\mathcal{P})$.

A (propositionally) linear NCSM (LinNCSM) is a NCSM which is also a (propositionally) linear expression map.

We can prove that NCSMs are a sound method for proving a.s. termination in a compositional way, without any additional assumptions.

THEOREM 6.6. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a PP of the form **while** Ψ **do** $\mathcal{P}_{\text{body}}$ **od**. Assume that each nested loop of $\mathcal{P}$ terminates almost surely from each reachable configuration, and that there exists a NCSM for $\mathcal{P}$ supported by some invariant map. Then $\mathcal{P}$ terminates almost surely from each initial configuration.*

PROOF (KEY IDEA). Let $\{X_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ be a stochastic process returning the value of NCSM η in step i . Then $\{X_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ is a (non-strict) 1-dimensional ϵ -LexRSM for the termination time of the program, for some $\epsilon > 0$. Since all sub-loops of $\mathcal{P}$ terminate, with probability one each run has level < 2 in infinitely many steps. From theorem 3.3 it follows that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}_{\text{init}}}^{\sigma}(\text{Term} < \infty) = 1$, for all σ and $\mathbf{x}_{\text{init}}$. $\square$

Hence, NCSMs effectively trade the uniform integrability condition for non-negativity over the whole program. We believe that the latter condition is substantially easier to impose and check automatically, especially in the case of affine probabilistic programs and (propositionally) linear NCSMs: for APPs, synthesizing NCSM entails synthesizing sufficient program invariants (for which there is a good automated tool support [28]) encoding the ranking, unaffecting, and non-negativity conditions into a collection of linear constraints (as for general LinLexRSMs in Section 5). Figures 3 and 4b show instances where attempts to prove of a.s. termination via PVSMs fail while proofs via LinNCSMs work.

Example 6.7. For all programs in Figures 3 and 4b there are LinNCSMs for all the loops in the program, which shows that the programs terminate a.s. In Figure 3, for both programs the inner loops have LinNCSMs of the form $c + d_{\ell}$, for d_{ℓ} a location-specific constant, while the outer loops have LinNCSMs of the form $x + d'_{\ell}$. In Figure 4b the program similarly has LinNCSMs defined, proceeding from the innermost loop and neglecting the location-specific constants, by variables z, y, x .

⁵Both these statements regarding typechecking failure are somewhat simplified, even in these two cases the PVSM might sometimes typecheck correctly, in case where the nested loops are followed by assignments which completely overwrite the effect of these loops, e.g. if the program in Figure 4b contained an assignment $x := 0$. However, the statements intuitively summarize the major reasons for typechecking failure.

Using LinNCSMs we can devise the following simple algorithm for compositional proving of almost-sure termination of APPs:

Algorithm 2: Compositional Termination Proving

input : An APP $\mathcal{P}$ together with an invariant map I .

```

1  $d \leftarrow$  depth of loop nesting in  $\mathcal{P}$ 
2 for  $i \leftarrow d$  to 0 do
3   foreach sub-loop  $\mathcal{P}'$  of  $\mathcal{P}$  nested  $i$  levels below the main loop do
4      $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow$  system of lin. constraints encoding the existence of LinNCSM for  $\mathcal{P}'$  supported by  $I$ 
5     if  $\mathcal{L}$  not solvable then
6       check existence of a PVSM for  $\mathcal{P}'$  [31]
7       if PVSM does not exist then return “cannot prove a.s. termination of  $\mathcal{P}$ ”
8 return “ $\mathcal{P}$  terminates a.s.”
  
```

The soundness of the algorithm follows from Theorems 6.6 and 6.3. Note that we use the PVSM-based algorithm of [31] as a back-up sub-procedure for the case when LinNCSM-based proof fails. Hence, Algorithm 2 can compositionally prove a.s. termination of strictly larger class of programs than the PVSM-based algorithm alone.

To summarize, the novelty of NCSMs is the following:

- (1) NCSMs allow compositional, fully automated proofs of a.s. termination without the need for reasoning about uniform integrability.
- (2) LinNCSMs are capable of proving a.s. termination of programs for which no uniformly integrable PVSMs exist (and hence the method of [31] cannot be used at all on such programs).
- (3) LinNCSMs are capable of proving a.s. termination of programs for which the method of [31] cannot be applied in an automated way, do to failure of the typechecking procedure.

6.2 Multidimensional Compositional Ranking

Above, we defined NCSMs as one-dimensional objects, to make them analogous to PVSMs for better comparison. However, we can also define a multi-dimensional version of NCSMs, to take advantage of the fact that LexRSMs can handle loops for which no 1-dimensional linear RSM exists. We say that, given an invariant map I , an n -dimensional measurable map is ϵ - I -ranking in a location ℓ if for each $\mathbf{x} \in I(\ell)$ and each gen. transition $\tilde{\tau}$ outgoing from ℓ there exists $1 \leq j \leq n$ such that $\tilde{\tau}$ is ϵ -ranked by η_j and for each $j' < j$ we have that $\tilde{\tau}$ is unaffected by $\eta_{j'}$.

Definition 6.8. An n -dimensional measurable map $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$ is an NC supermartingale (NCSM) for a program $\mathcal{P}$ supported by an invariant map I if there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that:

- (1) for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, η_i is non-negative in each location of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}}$;
- (2) η is ϵ - I -ranking in each location $\ell \in \text{slice}(\mathcal{P})$; and
- (3) for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, η_i is unaffected in each $\ell \in \text{loops}(\mathcal{P})$.

An n -dimensional linear NCSM (LinNCSM) is an n -dimensional NCSM which is also a linear expression map.

The following theorem can be proved in essentially the same way as Theorem 6.6.

THEOREM 6.9. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a PP of the form **while** Ψ **do** $\mathcal{P}_{\text{body}}$ **od**. Assume that each nested loop of $\mathcal{P}$ terminates almost surely from each reachable configuration, and that there exists a NCSM for $\mathcal{P}$ supported by some invariant map. Then $\mathcal{P}$ terminates almost surely.*

For APPs, we can generalize Algorithm 2 by changing line 3 to “check existence of a multi-dimensional LinNCSM for $\mathcal{P}'$ ” and line 4 to “if a multi-dimensional LinNCSM does not exist.” The check of existence of a multi-dimensional LinNCSM for $\mathcal{P}'$ can be done by algorithm presented in Section 5, modified so as to only pursue ranking for generalized transitions outgoing from locations belonging to $\text{slice}(\mathcal{P}')$. (I.e., only these gen. transitions have ϵ_τ included in the objective function, and algorithm terminates once all such transitions are ranked.)

7 BOUNDS ON EXPECTED TERMINATION TIME

As shown in Example 4.8, already LinLexRSM maps are capable of proving almost-sure termination of programs whose expected termination time is infinite. However, it is often desirable to obtain bounds on expected runtime of a program. In this section, we present a LexRSM-based proof rule for obtaining bounds on expected runtime, and we show how to automatize the usage of this proof rule to obtain bounds on expected runtime in a subclass of PPs.

As in the case of a.s. termination we start with general mathematical statement about LexRSMs. We define a restricted class of strict LexRSMs with *bounded expected conditional increase* property. Recall from definition 3.2 that strict LexRSM for a stopping time T is characterized by the possibility to a.s. partition, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the set $\{\omega \in \Omega \mid T(\omega) > i\}$ into n sets $L_1^i, \dots, L_d^i$ such that, intuitively, on L_j^i the conditional expectation of $X_{i+1}[j]$ given $\mathcal{F}_i$ is smaller than $X_i[j]$, and for all $j' < j$, on $L_{j'}^i$ the conditional expectation of $X_{i+1}[j]$ given $\mathcal{F}_i$ is no larger than $X_i[j]$. This leaves the opportunity of conditional expectation of $X_{i+1}[j]$ being larger than $X_i[j]$ on $L_{j''}^i$ with $j'' > j$. The conditional expected increase property bounds the possibility of this increase.

Definition 7.1. Let $\{X_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ be an n -dimensional strict LexRSM for some stopping time T , defined w.r.t. some filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$. We say that $\{X_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ has *c-bounded expected conditional increase (ECI)*, for some non-negative vector $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, if there exists an instance $(\{X_{i=0}^\infty, \{L_1^i, \dots, L_{n+1}^i\}_{i=0}^\infty)$ of the strict LexRSM (i.e. $L_{n+1}^i = \emptyset$ for all i) such that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and each $1 \leq j \leq n$ it holds $\mathbb{E}[X_{i+1}[j] \mid \mathcal{F}_i] \leq X_i[j] + \mathbf{c}[j]$ on $L_{j''}^i$, for all $j'' > j$ (here $L_1^i, \dots, L_n^i$ are as in Definition 3.2).

For strict LexRSMs with $\mathbf{c}$ -bounded ECI we have the following result. For simplicity, we formulate the result for 1-LexRSMs, though it is easy to prove analogous result for general ϵ -LexRSMs, $\epsilon > 0$, at the cost of obtaining less readable formula.

THEOREM 7.2. *Let $\{X_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ be an n -dimensional strict LexRSM with $\mathbf{c}$ -bounded ECI for some stopping time T . Then $\mathbb{E}[T] \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_0[j]] \cdot (\mathbf{c}[j] + 1)^{n-j}$.*

PROOF. Fix an instance $(\{X_{i=0}^\infty, \{L_1^i, \dots, L_{n+1}^i\}_{i=0}^\infty)$ satisfying Definition 7.1. Denote $\#lev_j(\omega)$ the number of steps i in which $\omega \in L_j^i$. Since by Theorem 3.3 the existence of strict LexRSM entails $\mathbb{P}(T < \infty) = 1$, the value $\#lev_j(\omega)$ is a.s. finite for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. We prove that for each $1 \leq j \leq n$ it holds $\mathbb{E}[\#lev_j] \leq \mathbf{c}[j] \cdot (\sum_{j' < j} \mathbb{E}[\#lev_{j'}]) + \mathbb{E}[X_0[j]]$. Since $T(\omega) = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} \#lev_j(\omega)$, for each $\omega \in \Omega$ (and hence, due to linearity of expectation $\mathbb{E}[T] = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} \mathbb{E}[\#lev_j]$), the statement of the Theorem follows by an easy induction.

To prove the required inequality, let $\#_k \text{lev}_j(\omega)$ be the number of steps i within the first k steps such that $\omega \in L_j^i$. We prove, by induction on k , that for each k it holds $\mathbb{E}[\#_k \text{lev}_j] \leq \mathbf{c}[j] \cdot (\sum_{j' < j} \mathbb{E}[\#_k \text{lev}_{j'}]) + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_0[j]] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_k[j]]$. Once this is proved, the desired inequality follows by taking k to ∞ , since $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\#_k \text{lev}_j] = \mathbb{E}[\# \text{lev}_j]$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_k[j]] \geq 0$.

The base case $k = 0$ is simple as both sides of the inequality are zero. Assume that the inequality holds for some $k \geq 0$. We have $\mathbb{E}[\#_{k+1} \text{lev}_j] = \mathbb{E}[\#_k \text{lev}_j] + \mathbb{P}(L_j^k)$, so from induction hypothesis we get

$$\mathbb{E}[\#_{k+1} \text{lev}_j] \leq \mathbf{c}[j] \cdot \left(\sum_{j' < j} \mathbb{E}[\#_k \text{lev}_{j'}] \right) + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_0[j]] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_k[j]] + \mathbb{P}(L_j^k). \quad (3)$$

Now denote $L_{<j}^k = L_1^k \cup \dots \cup L_{j-1}^k$ and $L_{>j}^k = L_{j+1}^k \cup \dots \cup L_d^k$. We have $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_k[j]] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_k[j] \cdot 1_{L_{<j}^k}] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_k[j] \cdot 1_{L_j^k}] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_k[j] \cdot 1_{L_{>j}^k}] \geq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_{k+1}[j] \cdot 1_{L_{<j}^k}] - \mathbf{c}[j] \cdot \mathbb{P}(L_{<j}^k) + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_{k+1}[j] \cdot 1_{L_j^k}] + \mathbb{P}(L_j^k) + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_{k+1}[j] \cdot 1_{L_{>j}^k}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_{k+1}[j]] - \mathbf{c}[j] \cdot \mathbb{P}(L_{<j}^k) + \mathbb{P}(L_j^k)$. Plugging this into 3 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\#_{k+1} \text{lev}_j] &\leq \mathbf{c}[j] \cdot \left(\sum_{j' < j} \mathbb{E}[\#_k \text{lev}_{j'}] \right) + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_0[j]] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_{k+1}[j]] + \mathbf{c}[j] \cdot \mathbb{P}(L_{<j}^k) \\ &= \mathbf{c}[j] \cdot \left(\sum_{j' < j} \mathbb{E}[\#_{k+1} \text{lev}_{j'}] \right) + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_0[j]] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_{k+1}[j]]. \end{aligned}$$

□

To transfer this mathematical result to probabilistic programs, we want to impose a restriction on LexRSM maps that ensures that all components of a LexRSM map have, from each reachable configuration, an expected one-step increase of at most c . Here c can be a constant, but it can also be a value that depends on the initial configurations: this is to handle cases where some variables are periodically reset to a value related to the initial variable values, such as variable z in Figure 4b. To this end, let $\mathcal{P}$ be a PP with a pCFG $C_{\mathcal{P}}$ and let $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$ be an n -dimensional 1-LexRSM map for $\mathcal{P}$. Consider an n -dimensional vector $\bar{c} = (\bar{c}_1, \dots, \bar{c}_n)$ whose each component is an expression over variables of $\mathcal{P}$. We say that η has $\bar{c}$ -bounded ECI w.r.t. invariant map I if the following holds for each initial configuration $(\ell_{\text{init}}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{init}})$ with $\mathbf{x}_{\text{init}} \in \Xi_{\text{init}}$: for each configuration $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ with $\mathbf{x} \in I(\ell)$ and generalized transition $\tilde{\tau}$ of $C_{\mathcal{P}}$ outgoing from $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$ it holds that if j is the smallest index such that $\tilde{\tau}$ is 1-ranked by η_j from $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$, then for all $j' > j$ the gen. transition $\tilde{\tau}$ is f -ranked by $\eta_{j'}$ from $(\ell, \mathbf{x})$, where $f = -c_{j'}(\mathbf{x}_{\text{init}})$. From Theorem 7.2 we have the following:

COROLLARY 7.3. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a probabilistic program. Assume that there exists an n -dimensional ϵ -LexRSM map $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d)$ for $\mathcal{P}$ supported by some invariant map I , such that η has $\bar{c}$ -bounded ECI (w.r.t. I) for some vector of expressions $\bar{c} = (\bar{c}_1, \dots, \bar{c}_n)$. Then under each scheduler σ and for each initial valuation of program variables $\mathbf{x}_{\text{init}} \in \Xi_{\text{init}}$ it holds $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_{\text{init}}}^{\sigma}[\text{Term}] \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j(\ell_{\text{init}}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{init}}) \cdot (\bar{c}_j(\mathbf{x}_{\text{init}}))^{n-j}$.*

Now assume that we have synthesized a 1-LexRSM map η and we want to check if there exists $\bar{c}$ such that η has $\bar{c}$ -bounded ECI. In the linear setting (i.e. the program is an APP, masp η and I are linear, and we seek $\bar{c}$ which is a vector of affine expressions) we can encode the existence of $\bar{c}$ into a system of linear inequalities in the similar way as the existence of a linear LexRSM maps was encoded in Section 4. That is, we set up a linear template with unknown coefficients for each component of $\bar{c}$ and using Farkas's lemma we set up a system of linear constraints, which includes

the unknown coefficients as variables, encoding the fact that η has $\bar{c}$ -bounded ECI. Details are provided in the supplementary material. In this way, we can check in polynomial time if Corollary 7.3 can be applied to η , and if yes, we can synthesize the witness vector $\bar{c}$. Since $\bar{c}$ consists of affine expressions, Corollary 7.3 provides a polynomial (in the size of initial variable valuation) upper bound on expected runtime.

8 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We have implemented the algorithm of Section 5 (in C++) and present two sets of experimental results. For all the experimental results we use the tool ASPIC [28] for invariant generation, and our algorithm requires linear-programming solver for which we use CPLEX [1]. All our experimental results were obtained on the following platform: Ubuntu16.04, 7.7GB, Intel-Core i3-4130 CPU 3.40GHz QuadCore 64-bit.

Abstraction of real-world programs. We consider benchmarks from abstraction of real-world non-probabilistic programs in [2]. Note that there are no abstraction tools available for probabilistic programs (to the best of our knowledge). Hence we consider the abstract programs obtained from real-world benchmarks as considered in the benchmark suite of [2]. Given these non-probabilistic programs we obtain probabilistic programs in two ways: (a) *probabilistic loops* where the existing while loops are made probabilistic by executing the existing statements with probability 1/2, and with remaining probability executing skip statements; and (b) *probabilistic assignments* where the existing assignments are perturbed uniformly in range $[-1, 1]$ (i.e., we consider additional variables whose value is, in each loop iteration, generated by probabilistic assignment uniformly in the range $[-1, 1]$, and we add such variable to the RHS of an existing assignment). We report our results on twenty five benchmarks in Table 1 (we consider around fifty benchmark examples and the results on the remaining ones are presented in the supplementary material. The experimental results show that the time taken by our approach is always less than 1/10-th of second. In the table, along with the benchmark name, and time in seconds, we show whether a solution exists or not (i.e., whether linear lexicographic RSMs exist or not), and if the solution exists we present the dimension of the lexicographic RSM we obtain. The final two columns of the table represent whether the non-probabilistic program is extended with probabilistic loops and/or probabilistic assignments.

Synthetic examples of large programs. The programs obtained as abstractions of real-world programs in the benchmarks as mentioned above have between 10-100 lines of code. To test the how does our approach scale with larger codes we consider synthetic examples of large probabilistic programs generated as follows. Given n additional Boolean-like variables, we consider probabilistic while loops, with some nondeterministic conditional branches, and generate all possible 2^n if conditions based on the Boolean variables. Hence given n variables we have probabilistic programs of size $O(2^n)$. For such programs we first run an invariant generation tool, followed by our algorithm. In all these examples lexicographic RSMs exist, and has dimension at most 3. Even for programs with around 12K lines of codes the total time taken is around one hour, where the invariant generation (i.e., running Aspic) takes the maximum time, and our algorithm requires around two minutes. The results are presented in Table 2 where we present the number of variables, then lines of code, followed by the time taken for invariant generation by Aspic, then the time taken by our algorithm, and finally the total time.

Benchmark	Time (s)	Solution	Dimension	Prob. loops	Prob. Assignments
alain	0.11	yes	2	yes	yes
catmouse	0.08	yes	2	yes	yes
counterex1a	0.1	no		no	no
counterex1c	0.11	yes	3	yes	yes
easy1	0.09	yes	1	yes	yes
exmini	0.09	yes	2	yes	yes
insertsort	0.1	yes	3	yes	yes
ndecr	0.09	yes	2	yes	yes
perfect	0.11	yes	3	yes	yes
perfect2	0.1	yes	3	yes	no
	0.11	no		yes	yes
real2	0.09	no		no	no
realbubble	0.22	yes	3	yes	yes
realselect	0.11	yes	3	yes	yes
realshellsort	0.09	no		yes	no
serpent	0.1	yes	1	yes	yes
sipmabubble	0.1	yes	3	yes	yes
speedDis2	0.09	no		no	no
speedNestedMultiple	0.1	yes	3	yes	yes
speedpldi2	0.09	yes	2	yes	yes
speedpldi4	0.09	yes	3	yes	yes
speedSimpleMultipleDep	0.09	no		no	no
speedSingleSingle2	0.12	yes	2	yes	no
	0.1	no		yes	yes
unperfect	0.1	yes	2	yes	no
	0.16	no		yes	yes
wcet1	0.11	yes	2	yes	yes
while2	0.1	yes	3	yes	yes

Table 1. Experimental results for benchmarks from [2] extended with probabilistic loops and/or probabilistic assignments.

9 RELATED WORK

In this section we discuss the related works.

Probabilistic programs and termination. In early works the termination for concurrent probabilistic programs was studied as fairness [57], which ignored precise probabilities. For countable state space a sound and complete characterization of almost-sure termination was presented in [37], but nondeterminism was absent. A sound and complete method for proving termination of finite-state programs was given in [27]. For probabilistic programs with countable state space and without nondeterminism, the *Lyapunov ranking functions* provide a sound and complete method to prove positive termination [11, 33]. For probabilistic programs with nondeterminism, but restricted to discrete probabilistic choices, the termination problem was studied in [46, 47]. The RSM-based (ranking supermartingale-based) approach extending ranking functions was first presented in [15] for probabilistic programs without non-determinism, but with real-valued variables, and its extension

Variables	LOC	Inv Time (s)	Our Time (s)	Total Time (s)
2	20	0.06	0.03	0.08
3	32	0.07	0.03	0.09
4	56	0.08	0.04	0.11
5	104	0.14	0.06	0.19
6	200	0.36	0.1	0.46
7	392	1.31	0.3	1.61
8	776	7.56	0.7	8.25
9	1544	33.07	2.5	35.57
10	3080	164.09	8.77	172.86
11	6152	817.92	35.37	853.29
12	12296	4260.96	145.18	4406.14

Table 2. Experimental results for synthetic examples.

for probabilistic programs with non-determinism has been studied in [17–20, 31, 48]. Supermartingales were also considered for other liveness and safety properties [5, 16]. While all these results deeply clarify the role of RSMs for probabilistic programs, the notion of lexicographic RSMs to obtain a practical approach for termination analysis for probabilistic programs has not been studied before, which we consider in this work.

Compositional a.s. termination proving. A compositional rule for proving almost-sure termination was studied in [31] under the uniform integrability assumption. In [47], a soundness of the probabilistic variant rule is proved for programs with finitely many configurations.

Other approaches. Besides RSMs, other approaches has also been considered for probabilistic programs. Logical calculi for reasoning about properties of probabilistic programs (including termination) were studied in [29, 30, 41, 42] and extended to programs with demonic non-determinism in [36, 39, 40, 46, 47, 53]. However, none of these approaches is readily automatizable. A sound approach [49] for almost-sure termination is to explore the exponential decrease of probabilities upon bounded-termination through abstract interpretation [25]. A method for a.s. termination of weakly finite programs (where number of reachable configurations is finite from each initial configuration) based on *patterns* was presented in [27].

Non-probabilistic programs. Termination analysis of non-probabilistic programs has also been extensively studied [12, 13, 21–23, 43, 45, 54, 55, 58]. Ranking functions are at the heart of the termination analysis, and lexicographic ranking function has emerged as one of the most efficient and practical approaches for termination analysis [2, 24, 35], being used e.g. in the prominent T2 temporal prover [14]. In this work we extend lexicographic ranking functions to probabilistic programs, and present lexicographic RSMs for almost-sure termination analysis of probabilistic programs with non-determinism. Theoretical complexity of synthesizing lexicographic ranking functions in non-probabilistic programs was studied in [8, 9].

10 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this work we considered lexicographic RSMs for termination analysis of probabilistic programs with non-determinism. We showed it presents a sound approach for almost-sure termination, that

is algorithmically efficient, enables compositional reasoning about termination, and leads to approach that can handle realistic programs. There are several interesting directions of future work. Lexicographic ranking functions has been considered in several works to provide different practical methods for analysis of non-probabilistic programs. First, while our work presents the foundations of lexicographic RSMs for probabilistic programs, extending other practical methods based on lexicographic ranking functions to lexicographic RSMs is an interesting direction of future work. Second, while our algorithmic approaches focus on the linear case, it would be interesting to consider other non-linear, and polynomial functions in the future.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2010. IBM ILOG CPLEX Optimizer. <http://www-01.ibm.com/software/integration/optimization/cplex-optimizer/>. (2010).
- [2] Christophe Alias, Alain Darté, Paul Feautrier, and Laure Gonnord. 2010. Multi-dimensional Rankings, Program Termination, and Complexity Bounds of Flowchart Programs. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Static Analysis (SAS'10)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 117–133. <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1882094.1882102>
- [3] R.B. Ash and C. Doléans-Dade. 2000. *Probability and Measure Theory*. Harcourt/Academic Press.
- [4] Christel Baier and Joost-Pieter Katoen. 2008. *Principles of Model Checking*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 984 pages.
- [5] Gilles Barthe, Thomas Espitau, Luis María Ferrer Fioriti, and Justin Hsu. 2016. Synthesizing Probabilistic Invariants via Doob's Decomposition. In *Computer Aided Verification: 28th International Conference, CAV 2016, Toronto, ON, Canada, July 17-23, 2016, Proceedings, Part I*, Swarat Chaudhuri and Azadeh Farzan (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, 43–61. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-41528-4_3
- [6] Gilles Barthe, Marco Gaboardi, Benjamin Grégoire, Justin Hsu, and Pierre-Yves Strub. 2016. Proving Differential Privacy via Probabilistic Couplings. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS '16)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 749–758. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2933575.2934554>
- [7] Gilles Barthe, Marco Gaboardi, Justin Hsu, and Benjamin Pierce. 2016. Programming Language Techniques for Differential Privacy. *ACM SIGLOG News* 3, 1 (Feb. 2016), 34–53. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2893582.2893591>
- [8] Amir M. Ben-Amram and Samir Genaim. 2013. On the Linear Ranking Problem for Integer Linear-constraint Loops. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL '13)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2429069.2429078>
- [9] Amir M. Ben-Amram and Samir Genaim. 2015. Complexity of Bradley-Manna-Sipma Lexicographic Ranking Functions. In *Computer Aided Verification: 27th International Conference, CAV 2015, San Francisco, CA, USA, July 18-24, 2015, Proceedings, Part II*, Daniel Kroening and Corina S. Păsăreanu (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, 304–321. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21668-3_18
- [10] P. Billingsley. 1995. *Probability and Measure* (3rd ed.). Wiley.
- [11] Olivier Bournez and Florent Garnier. 2005. Proving Positive Almost-Sure Termination. In *RTA*. 323–337.
- [12] Aaron R. Bradley, Zohar Manna, and Henny B. Sipma. 2005. Linear Ranking with Reachability. In *Computer Aided Verification, 17th International Conference, CAV 2005, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, July 6-10, 2005, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Kousha Etessami and Sriram K. Rajamani (Eds.), Vol. 3576. Springer, 491–504. https://doi.org/10.1007/11513988_48
- [13] Aaron R. Bradley, Zohar Manna, and Henny B. Sipma. 2005. The Polyranking Principle. In *ICALP*. 1349–1361.
- [14] Marc Brockschmidt, Byron Cook, Samin Ishtiaq, Heidy Khlaaf, and Nir Piterman. 2016. T2: Temporal Property Verification. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems: 22nd International Conference, TACAS 2016, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2016, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, April 2-8, 2016, Proceedings*, Marsha Chechik and Jean-François Raskin (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 387–393. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-49674-9_22
- [15] Aleksandar Chakarov and Sriram Sankaranarayanan. 2013. Probabilistic Program Analysis with Martingales. In *Computer Aided Verification - 25th International Conference, CAV 2013, Saint Petersburg, Russia, July 13-19, 2013. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Natasha Sharygina and Helmut Veith (Eds.), Vol. 8044. Springer, 511–526. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39799-8_34
- [16] Aleksandar Chakarov, Yuen-Lam Voronin, and Sriram Sankaranarayanan. 2016. Deductive Proofs of Almost Sure Persistence and Recurrence Properties. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems: 22nd International Conference, TACAS 2016, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software,*

- ETAPS 2016, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, April 2-8, 2016, *Proceedings*, Marsha Chechik and Jean-François Raskin (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 260–279. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-49674-9_15
- [17] Krishnendu Chatterjee and Hongfei Fu. 2017. Termination of Nondeterministic Recursive Probabilistic Programs. *CoRR* abs/1701.02944 (2017). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1701.02944>
- [18] Krishnendu Chatterjee, Hongfei Fu, and Amir Kafshdar Goharshady. 2016. Termination Analysis of Probabilistic Programs Through Positivstellensatz's. In *CAV*. 3–22.
- [19] Krishnendu Chatterjee, Hongfei Fu, Petr Novotný, and Rouzbeh Hasheminezhad. 2016. Algorithmic analysis of qualitative and quantitative termination problems for affine probabilistic programs. In *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2016, St. Petersburg, FL, USA, January 20 - 22, 2016*, Rastislav Bodík and Rupak Majumdar (Eds.). ACM, 327–342. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2837614.2837639>
- [20] Krishnendu Chatterjee, Petr Novotný, and Djordje Žikelić. 2017. Stochastic Invariants for Probabilistic Termination. In *Proceedings of the 44th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL 2017)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 145–160. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3009837.3009873>
- [21] Michael Colón and Henny Sipma. 2001. Synthesis of Linear Ranking Functions. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, 7th International Conference, TACAS 2001 Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2001 Genova, Italy, April 2-6, 2001, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Tiziana Margaria and Wang Yi (Eds.), Vol. 2031. Springer, 67–81. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45319-9_6
- [22] Byron Cook, Andreas Podelski, and Andrey Rybalchenko. 2006. Termination Proofs for Systems Code. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI '06)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 415–426. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1133981.1134029>
- [23] Byron Cook, Andreas Podelski, and Andrey Rybalchenko. 2011. Proving program termination. *Commun. ACM* 54, 5 (2011), 88–98. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1941487.1941509>
- [24] Byron Cook, Abigail See, and Florian Zuleger. 2013. Ramsey vs. Lexicographic Termination Proving. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems (TACAS'13)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 47–61. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36742-7_4
- [25] Patrick Cousot and Radhia Cousot. 1977. Abstract Interpretation: A Unified Lattice Model for Static Analysis of Programs by Construction or Approximation of Fixpoints. In *Conference Record of the Fourth ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, Los Angeles, California, USA, January 1977*, Robert M. Graham, Michael A. Harrison, and Ravi Sethi (Eds.). ACM, 238–252. <https://doi.org/10.1145/512950.512973>
- [26] Devdatt Dubhashi and Alessandro Panconesi. 2009. *Concentration of Measure for the Analysis of Randomized Algorithms* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA.
- [27] Javier Esparza, Andreas Gaiser, and Stefan Kiefer. 2012. Proving Termination of Probabilistic Programs Using Patterns. In *CAV*. 123–138.
- [28] Paul Feautrier and Laure Gonnord. 2010. Accelerated Invariant Generation for C Programs with Aspic and C2fsm. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* 267, 2 (2010), 3 – 13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2010.09.014> Proceedings of the Tools for Automatic Program Analysis (TAPAS).
- [29] Yishai A. Feldman. 1984. A decidable propositional dynamic logic with explicit probabilities. *Information and Control* 63, 1 (1984), 11–38. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958\(84\)80039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958(84)80039-X)
- [30] Yishai A Feldman and David Harel. 1982. A probabilistic dynamic logic. In *Proceedings of the fourteenth annual ACM Symposium on Theory of computing*. ACM, 181–195.
- [31] Luis María Ferrer Fioriti and Holger Hermanns. 2015. Probabilistic Termination: Soundness, Completeness, and Compositionality. In *Proceedings of the 42nd Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2015, Mumbai, India, January 15-17, 2015*, Sriram K. Rajamani and David Walker (Eds.). ACM, 489–501. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2676726.2677001>
- [32] Robert W. Floyd. 1967. Assigning meanings to programs. *Mathematical Aspects of Computer Science* 19 (1967), 19–33.
- [33] F. G. Foster. 1953. On the Stochastic Matrices Associated with Certain Queuing Processes. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 24, 3 (1953), pp. 355–360.
- [34] Zoubin Ghahramani. 2015. Probabilistic machine learning and artificial intelligence. *Nature* 521, 7553 (2015), 452–459.
- [35] Laure Gonnord, David Monniaux, and Gabriel Radanne. 2015. Synthesis of Ranking Functions Using Extremal Counterexamples. In *Proceedings of the 36th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI '15)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 608–618. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2737924.2737976>
- [36] Friedrich Gretz, Joost-Pieter Katoen, and Annabelle McIver. 2014. Operational versus weakest pre-expectation semantics for the probabilistic guarded command language. *Performance Evaluation* 73 (2014), 110 – 132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.peva.2013.11.004> Special Issue on the 9th International Conference on Quantitative Evaluation of Systems.

- [37] Sergiu Hart and Micha Sharir. 1985. Concurrent Probabilistic Programs, Or: How to Schedule if You Must. *SIAM J. Comput.* 14, 4 (1985), 991–1012.
- [38] L. P. Kaelbling, M. L. Littman, and A. W. Moore. 1996. Reinforcement learning: A survey. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 4 (1996), 237–285.
- [39] Benjamin Lucien Kaminski, Joost-Pieter Katoen, Christoph Matheja, and Federico Olmedo. 2016. Weakest Precondition Reasoning for Expected Run-Times of Probabilistic Programs. In *Programming Languages and Systems: 25th European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2016, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2016, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, April 2–8, 2016, Proceedings*, Peter Thiemann (Ed.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 364–389. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-49498-1_15
- [40] Joost-Pieter Katoen, Annabelle McIver, Larissa Meinicke, and Carroll C. Morgan. 2010. Linear-Invariant Generation for Probabilistic Programs: - Automated Support for Proof-Based Methods. In *SAS*, Vol. LNCS 6337, Springer, 390–406.
- [41] Dexter Kozen. 1981. Semantics of Probabilistic Programs. *J. Comput. System Sci.* 22, 3 (1981), 328–350. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000\(81\)90036-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000(81)90036-2)
- [42] Dexter Kozen. 1983. A Probabilistic PDL. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC '83)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 291–297. <https://doi.org/10.1145/800061.808758>
- [43] Daniel Kroening, Natasha Sharygina, Aliaksei Tsitovich, and Christoph M. Wintersteiger. 2010. Termination Analysis with Compositional Transition Invariants. In *Computer Aided Verification: 22nd International Conference, CAV 2010, Edinburgh, UK, July 15-19, 2010. Proceedings*, Tayssir Touili, Byron Cook, and Paul Jackson (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 89–103. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14295-6_9
- [44] Marta Z. Kwiatkowska, Gethin Norman, and David Parker. 2011. PRISM 4.0: Verification of Probabilistic Real-Time Systems. In *CAV (LNCS 6806)*. 585–591.
- [45] Chin Soon Lee, Neil D. Jones, and Amir M. Ben-Amram. 2001. The size-change principle for program termination. In *POPL*. 81–92.
- [46] Annabelle McIver and Carroll Morgan. 2004. Developing and Reasoning About Probabilistic Programs in *pGCL*. In *PSSE*. 123–155.
- [47] Annabelle McIver and Carroll Morgan. 2005. *Abstraction, Refinement and Proof for Probabilistic Systems*. Springer.
- [48] Annabelle McIver and Carroll Morgan. 2016. A new rule for almost-certain termination of probabilistic and demonic programs. *CoRR* abs/1612.01091 (2016). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1612.01091>
- [49] David Monniaux. 2001. An Abstract Analysis of the Probabilistic Termination of Programs. In *Static Analysis, 8th International Symposium, SAS 2001, Paris, France, July 16-18, 2001, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Patrick Cousot (Ed.), Vol. 2126. Springer, 111–126. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-47764-0_7
- [50] Rajeev Motwani and Prabhakar Raghavan. 1995. *Randomized Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA.
- [51] M. Neuhäuser, M. Stoelinga, and J.-P. Katoen. 2009. Delayed Nondeterminism in Continuous-Time Markov Decision Processes. In *Proceedings of FoSSaCS 2009*, Vol. 5504. 364–379.
- [52] Martin R Neuhäuser and Joost-Pieter Katoen. 2007. Bisimulation and logical preservation for continuous-time Markov decision processes. In *International Conference on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 2007)*. Springer, 412–427.
- [53] Federico Olmedo, Benjamin Lucien Kaminski, Joost-Pieter Katoen, and Christoph Matheja. 2016. Reasoning About Recursive Probabilistic Programs. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS '16)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 672–681. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2933575.2935317>
- [54] Andreas Podelski and Andrey Rybalchenko. 2004. A Complete Method for the Synthesis of Linear Ranking Functions. In *Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation, 5th International Conference, VMCAI 2004, Venice, January 11-13, 2004, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Bernhard Steffen and Giorgio Levi (Eds.), Vol. 2937. Springer, 239–251. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-24622-0_20
- [55] Andreas Podelski and Andrey Rybalchenko. 2004. Transition Invariants. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS '04)*. IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA, 32–41. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2004.50>
- [56] Jeffrey S Rosenthal. 2006. *A First Look at Rigorous Probability Theory* (2nd ed.). World Scientific Publishing Company.
- [57] Micha Sharir, Amir Pnueli, and Sergiu Hart. 1984. Verification of Probabilistic Programs. *SIAM J. Comput.* 13, 2 (1984), 292–314.
- [58] Kirack Sohn and Allen Van Gelder. 1991. Termination Detection in Logic Programs using Argument Sizes. In *Proceedings of the Tenth ACM SIGACT-SIGMOD-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, May 29-31, 1991, Denver, Colorado, USA*, Daniel J. Rosenkrantz (Ed.). ACM Press, 216–226. <https://doi.org/10.1145/113413.113433>

Supplementary Material

A DETAILS OF PROGRAM SYNTAX

In this subsection we present the details of the syntax of (affine) probabilistic programs.

Recall that $\mathcal{V}$ is a collection of *variables*. Moreover, let $\mathcal{D}$ be a set of *probability distributions* on real numbers. The abstract syntax of affine probabilistic programs (APPs) is given by the grammar in Figure 5, where the expressions $\langle pvar \rangle$ and $\langle dist \rangle$ range over $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, respectively. We allow for non-deterministic assignments, expressed by a statement $x := \mathbf{ndet}(dom)$, where dom is a *domain specifier* determining the set from which the value can be chosen: for general programs it can be any Borel-measurable set, for APPs it has to be an interval (possibly of infinite length). The grammar is such that $\langle expr \rangle$ may evaluate to an arbitrary affine expression over the program variables. Next, $\langle bexpr \rangle$ may evaluate to an arbitrary propositionally linear predicate.

For general (not necessary affine) PPs we set $\langle expr \rangle$ to be the set of all expressions permitted by the set of mathematical operations of the underlying language. Similarly, $\langle bexpr \rangle$ is the set of all predicates, as defined in Section 2.

The guard of each if-then-else statement is either $\star$, representing a (demonic) non-deterministic choice between the branches, a keyword **prob**(p), where $p \in [0, 1]$ is a number given in decimal representation (represents a probabilistic choice, where the if-branch is executed with probability p and the then-branch with probability $1 - p$), or the guard is a propositionally linear predicate, in which case the statement represents a standard deterministic conditional branching.

Regarding distributions, for each $d \in \mathcal{D}$ we assume the existence of a program primitive denoted by '**sample**(d)' implementing sampling from d . In practice, the distributions appearing in a program would be those for which sampling is provided by suitable libraries (such as uniform distribution over some interval, Bernoulli, geometric, etc.), but we abstract away from these implementation details. For the purpose of our analysis, it is sufficient that for each distribution d appearing in the program the following characteristics: expected value $\mathbb{E}[d]$ of d and a set SP_d containing *support* of d (the support of d is the smallest closed set of real numbers whose complement has probability zero under d).⁶ For APPs, SP_d is required to be an interval.

B DETAILS OF PROGRAM SEMANTICS

REMARK 1 (USE OF RANDOM VARIABLES). *In the paper we sometimes work with random variables that are functions of the type $R: \Omega \rightarrow S$ for some finite set S . These can be captured by the definition given in Section 2 by identifying the elements of S with distinct real numbers.⁷ The exact choice of numbers is irrelevant in such a case, as we are not interested in, e.g. computing expected values of such random variables, or similar operations.*

From Programs to pCFGs. To every probabilistic program P we can assign a pCFG C_P whose locations correspond to the values of the program counter of P and whose transition relation captures

⁶In particular, a support of a *discrete* probability distribution d is simply the at most countable set of all points on a real line that have positive probability under d . For continuous distributions, e.g. a normal distribution, uniform, etc., the support is typically either $\mathbb{R}$ or some closed real interval.

⁷This is equivalent to saying that a function $R: \Omega \rightarrow S$, with S finite, is a random variable if for each $s \in S$ the set $\{\omega \in \Omega \mid R(\omega) = s\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \text{stmt} \rangle &::= \langle \text{assgn} \rangle \mid \text{'skip'} \mid \langle \text{stmt} \rangle \text{' ; ' } \langle \text{stmt} \rangle \\
&\mid \text{'if'} \langle \text{ndbexpr} \rangle \text{' then' } \langle \text{stmt} \rangle \text{' else' } \langle \text{stmt} \rangle \text{' fi' } \\
&\mid \text{'while'} \langle \text{bexpr} \rangle \text{' do' } \langle \text{stmt} \rangle \text{' od' } \\
\langle \text{assgn} \rangle &::= \langle \text{pvar} \rangle \text{' := ' } \langle \text{expr} \rangle \mid \langle \text{pvar} \rangle \text{' := ndet(} \langle \text{dom} \rangle \text{')' } \\
&\mid \langle \text{pvar} \rangle \text{' := sample(} \langle \text{dist} \rangle \text{')' } \\
\langle \text{expr} \rangle &::= \langle \text{constant} \rangle \mid \langle \text{pvar} \rangle \mid \langle \text{constant} \rangle \text{' . ' } \langle \text{pvar} \rangle \\
&\mid \langle \text{expr} \rangle \text{' + ' } \langle \text{expr} \rangle \mid \langle \text{expr} \rangle \text{' - ' } \langle \text{expr} \rangle \\
\langle \text{bexpr} \rangle &::= \langle \text{affexpr} \rangle \mid \langle \text{affexpr} \rangle \text{' or' } \langle \text{bexpr} \rangle \\
\langle \text{affexpr} \rangle &::= \langle \text{literal} \rangle \mid \langle \text{literal} \rangle \text{' and' } \langle \text{affexpr} \rangle \\
\langle \text{literal} \rangle &::= \langle \text{expr} \rangle \text{' \leq ' } \langle \text{expr} \rangle \mid \langle \text{expr} \rangle \text{' \geq ' } \langle \text{expr} \rangle \\
&\mid \neg \langle \text{literal} \rangle \\
\langle \text{ndbexpr} \rangle &::= \star \mid \text{'prob(p)'} \mid \langle \text{bexpr} \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 5. Syntax of affine probabilistic programs (APP's).

the behaviour of P . We illustrate the construction for APPs, for general programs it is similar. To obtain C_P , we first rename the variables in P to $x_1, \dots, x_n$, where n is the number of distinct variables in the program. The construction of C_P can be described inductively. For each program P the pCFG C_P contains two distinguished locations, ℓ_P^{in} and ℓ_P^{out} , the latter one being always deterministic, that intuitively represent the state of the program counter before and after executing P , respectively. In the following, we denote by id_1 a function such that for each $\mathbf{x}$ we have $id_1(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}[1]$.

- (1) *Deterministic Assignments and Skips.* For $P = x_j := E$ where x_j is a program variable and E is an expression, or $P = \text{skip}$, the pCFG C_P consists only of locations ℓ_P^{in} and ℓ_P^{out} (first assignment location, second one deterministic) and a transition $(\ell_P^{\text{in}}, \ell_P^{\text{out}})$. In the first case, $Up(\ell_P^{\text{in}}, \ell_P^{\text{out}}) = (j, E)$.
- (2) *Probabilistic and Non-Deterministic Assignments.* For $P = x_j := \text{sample}(d)$ where x_j is a program variable and d is a distribution, the pCFG C_P consists locations ℓ_P^{in} and ℓ_P^{out} and a transition $\tau = (\ell_P^{\text{in}}, \ell_P^{\text{out}})$ with $Up(\tau) = (j, d)$. For $P = x_j := \text{ndet}(dom)$, the construction is similar, with the only transition being $\tau = (\ell_P^{\text{in}}, \ell_P^{\text{out}})$ and $Up(\tau) = (j, D)$, where D is the set specified by the domain specifier dom .
- (3) *Sequential Statements.* For $P = Q_1; Q_2$ we take the pCFGs C_{Q_1}, C_{Q_2} and join them by identifying the location $\ell_{Q_1}^{\text{out}}$ with $\ell_{Q_2}^{\text{in}}$, putting $\ell_P^{\text{in}} = \ell_{Q_1}^{\text{in}}$ and $\ell_P^{\text{out}} = \ell_{Q_2}^{\text{out}}$.
- (4) *While Statements.* For $P = \text{while } \varphi \text{ do } Q \text{ od}$ we add a new deterministic location ℓ_P^{in} which we identify with ℓ_Q^{out} , a new deterministic location ℓ_P^{out} , and transitions $\tau = (\ell_P^{\text{in}}, \ell_Q^{\text{in}})$, $\tau' = (\ell_P^{\text{in}}, \ell_P^{\text{out}})$ such that $G(\tau) = \varphi$ and $G(\tau') = \neg\varphi$.
- (5) *If Statements.* Finally, for $P = \text{if } ndb \text{ then } Q_1 \text{ else } Q_2 \text{ fi}$ we add a new location ℓ_P^{in} (which is not an assignment location) together with two transitions $\tau_1 = (\ell_P^{\text{in}}, \ell_{Q_1}^{\text{in}})$, $\tau_2 = (\ell_P^{\text{in}}, \ell_{Q_2}^{\text{in}})$, and we identify the locations $\ell_{Q_1}^{\text{out}}$ and $\ell_{Q_2}^{\text{out}}$ with ℓ_P^{out} . (If both Q_j 's consist of a single statement, we also identify ℓ_P^{in} with $\ell_{Q_j}^{\text{in}}$'s.) In this case the newly added location ℓ_P^{in} is non-deterministic branching if and only if ndb is the keyword $\star$. If ndb is of the form $\text{prob}(p)$, the location ℓ_P^{in}

is probabilistic branching with $Pr_{\ell_p^{in}}(\tau_1) = p$ and $Pr_{\ell_p^{in}}(\tau_2) = 1 - p$. Otherwise (i.e. if ndb is a predicate), ℓ_p^{in} is a deterministic location with $G(\tau_1) = ndb$ and $G(\tau_2) = \neg ndb$.

Once the pCFG C_P is constructed using the above rules, we put $G(\tau) = \text{true}$ for all transitions τ outgoing from deterministic locations whose guard was not set in the process, and finally we add a self-loop on the location ℓ_p^{out} . This ensures that the assumptions in Definition 2.1 are satisfied. Furthermore note that for pCFG obtained for a program P , since the only branching is if-then-else branching, every location ℓ has at most two successors ℓ_1, ℓ_2 .

C PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.1

We first recall the general statement of the Radon-Nikodym theorem. Given two measurable spaces⁸ $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \nu)$, we say that ν dominates μ , written $\mu \ll \nu$ if for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$, $\nu(A) = 0$ implies $\mu(A) = 0$. Radon-Nikodym theorem states that if both μ and ν are sigma-finite (that is, Ω is a union of countably many sets of finite measure under ν and μ), then $\mu \ll \nu$ implies that there exists an almost-surely unique $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable function $f: \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that for each $A \in \mathcal{F}$, the Lebesgue integral of the function $f \cdot 1_A$ in measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \nu)$ is equal to $\mu(A)$. The function f is called a Radon-Nikodym derivative of μ w.r.t. ν , and we denote in by $\frac{d\mu}{d\nu}$.

Now assume that X is a non-negative real-valued random variable in some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ is a sub-sigma algebra of $\mathcal{F}$. Note that $\mathbb{P}$ is sigma-finite. Define a measure μ on $\mathcal{F}'$ by putting $\mu(A) = \mathbb{E}[X \cdot 1_A]$, for each $A \in \mathcal{F}'$ (here $\mathbb{E}$ is the expectation operator, i.e. the Lebesgue integral, in probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}')$, where $\mathbb{P}'$ is a restriction of $\mathbb{P}$ to $\mathcal{F}'$). Then μ is sigma-finite: indeed, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $A_n = \{\omega \in \Omega \mid X(\omega) \leq n\}$. Then $\mu(A_n) \in [0, n]$, in particular it is finite, and since X is real-valued, we have $\Omega = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$. Hence, $\frac{d\mu}{d\mathbb{P}'}$ exists and is almost-surely unique. It is now easy to check that $\frac{d\mu}{d\mathbb{P}'}$ satisfies the condition defining the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{F}']$: indeed, the condition is equivalent to $\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{F}']$ being a derivative of μ w.r.t. $\mathbb{P}'$. This concludes the proof.

D COMPUTATIONS FOR THE PROOF OF THEOREM 3.3

Recall that we aim to prove equation (2).

For $k = i^*$ the sum on the right-hand side equals 0, so the inequality immediately follows from the definition of Y_k . Now assume that (2) holds for some $k \geq i^*$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Y_{k+1}] &= \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[Y_{k+1} \cdot 1_{\Omega \setminus D}]}_{=0=\mathbb{E}[Y_k \cdot 1_{\Omega \setminus D}]} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[Y_{k+1} \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F \leq k\}}]}_{=\mathbb{E}[Y_k \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F \leq k\}}]} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[Y_{k+1} \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F > k\}}]}_{=\mathbb{E}[X_{k+1}[j^*] \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F > k\}}]}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where the equality $\mathbb{E}[Y_{k+1} \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F \leq k\}}] = \mathbb{E}[Y_k \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F \leq k\}}]$ follows from the fact that $Y_{k+1}(\omega) = Y_k(\omega) = X_{F(\omega)}[j^*](\omega)$ for $\omega \in \{F \leq k\}$, and similarly for the last term. We prove that

$$\mathbb{E}[X_{k+1}[j^*] \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F > k\}}] \leq \mathbb{E}[Y_k \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F > k\}} - \epsilon \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F > k\} \cap \{lev_k = j^*\}}]. \quad (5)$$

Indeed, it holds

$$\mathbb{E}[X_{k+1}[j^*] \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F > k\}}] = \mathbb{E}[X_{k+1}[j^*] \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F > k\} \cap \{lev_k = j^*\}}] + \mathbb{E}[X_{k+1}[j^*] \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F > k\} \cap \{lev_k > j^*\}}], \quad (6)$$

⁸A generalization of a probability space where the measure of Ω does not have to be 1, but any non-negative number or even infinity.

since $\text{lev}_k(\omega) \geq j^*$ for all $\omega \in \{F > k\}$. Since the set $D \cap \{F > k\} \cap \{\text{lev}_k = j^*\}$ is $\mathcal{F}_k$ -measurable, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_{k+1}[j^*] \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F > k\} \cap \{\text{lev}_k = j^*\}}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_{k+1}[j^*] \mid \mathcal{F}_k] \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F > k\} \cap \{\text{lev}_k = j^*\}}] \quad (7)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{X}_k[j^*] - \epsilon) \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F > k\} \cap \{\text{lev}_k = j^*\}}] \quad (8)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[(Y_k - \epsilon) \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F > k\} \cap \{\text{lev}_k = j^*\}}], \quad (9)$$

where (7) follows from the definition of conditional expectation (1), (8) follows from the definition of $\{\text{lev}_k = j^*\}$, and (9) holds since $Y_k(\omega) = \mathbf{X}_k[j^*](\omega)$ for ω with $F(\omega) > k$. Almost identical argument shows that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_{k+1}[j^*] \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F > k\} \cap \{\text{lev}_k > j^*\}}] \leq \mathbb{E}[Y_k \cdot 1_{D \cap \{F > k\} \cap \{\text{lev}_k > j^*\}}]. \quad (10)$$

Plugging (9) and (10) into (6) yields (5). Now we can plug (5) into (4) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Y_{k+1}] &\leq \mathbb{E}[Y_k] - \epsilon \cdot \mathbb{E}[1_{D \cap \{F > k\} \cap \{\text{lev}_k = j^*\}}] = \mathbb{E}[Y_k] - \epsilon \cdot \mathbb{P}(D \cap \{F > k\} \cap \{\text{lev}_k = j^*\}) \\ &\leq B^* \cdot \mathbb{P}(D) - \epsilon \cdot \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{k-i^*} \ell \cdot \mathbb{P}(D \cap \{F \geq k\} \cap \{\sharp_k = \ell\}) \right) - \epsilon \cdot \mathbb{P}(D \cap \{F > k\} \cap \{\text{lev}_k = j^*\}), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the last inequality follows from induction hypothesis. Hence, using $D_{k,\ell}$ as a shorthand for $D \cap \{F \geq k\} \cap \{\sharp_k = \ell\}$, to prove (2) it remains to show that

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{k-i^*} \ell \cdot \mathbb{P}(D_{k,\ell}) + \mathbb{P}(D \cap \{F > k\} \cap \{\text{lev}_k = j^*\}) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{k+1-i^*} \ell \cdot \mathbb{P}(D_{k+1,\ell}). \quad (12)$$

The left-hand side of (12) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\ell=0}^{k-i^*} \ell \cdot \mathbb{P}(D_{k,\ell} \cap \{\text{lev}_k = j^*\}) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-i^*} \ell \cdot \mathbb{P}(D_{k,\ell} \cap \{\text{lev}_k > j^*\}) \\ &+ \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-i^*} \underbrace{\mathbb{P}(D \cap \{F > k\} \cap \{\text{lev}_k = j^*\} \cap \{\sharp_k = \ell\})}_{= D_{k,\ell} \cap \{\text{lev}_k = j^*\}} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-i^*} (\ell + 1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(D_{k,\ell} \cap \{\text{lev}_k = j^*\}) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-i^*} \ell \cdot \mathbb{P}(D_{k,\ell} \cap \{\text{lev}_k > j^*\}) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-i^*} (\ell + 1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(D_{k+1,\ell+1} \cap \{\text{lev}_k = j^*\}) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-i^*} \ell \cdot \mathbb{P}(D_{k+1,\ell} \cap \{\text{lev}_k > j^*\}) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1-i^*} \ell \cdot \mathbb{P}(D_{k+1,\ell} \cap \{\text{lev}_k = j^*\}) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-i^*} \ell \cdot \mathbb{P}(D_{k+1,\ell} \cap \{\text{lev}_k > j^*\}) \\ &= (k+1-i^*) \cdot \mathbb{P}(D_{k+1,k+1-i^*} \cap \{\text{lev}_k = j^*\}) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-i^*} \ell \cdot \mathbb{P}(D_{k+1,\ell}) \\ &= (k+1-i^*) \cdot \mathbb{P}(D_{k+1,k+1-i^*}) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-i^*} \ell \cdot \mathbb{P}(D_{k+1,\ell}) = \text{right-hand side of (12)}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The individual steps in the above computation are justified as follows: in (13) we use the facts that for all ω 's whose level in step k is j^* it holds that $\sharp_k(\omega) + 1 = \sharp_{k+1}(\omega)$, and similarly, for ω 's

whose level in step k is $> j^*$ it holds $\sharp_k(\omega) = \sharp_{k+1}(\omega)$. Moreover, for all $\omega \in D_{k,\ell}$ it holds that $\text{lev}_\omega(k) \geq j^* \Rightarrow F(\omega) \geq k + 1$. Finally, in (14) we use the fact that all $\omega \in D_{k+1,k+1-i^*}$ need to have level j^* in step k , since otherwise such an ω would need to have level j^* for at least $k + 1 - i^*$ times within steps $\{i^*, i^* + 1, \dots, k - 1\}$, but there are $k - i^*$ such steps, a contradiction. This concludes the proof of (2).

E COMPLEXITY CLARIFICATION FOR THEOREM 5.1

Since instances of linear programming is in PTIME, it remains to show that each system $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{\tau}}$ is constructible in polynomial time. In [19] it is shown that this can be done provided that guard of each transition in pCFG is a propositionally linear predicate. Now all transition guards in $C_{\mathcal{P}}$ are of the form φ or $\neg\varphi$, where φ is a guard of a conditional or of while-loop in $\mathcal{P}$. If φ is a linear assertion, then $\neg\varphi$ can be converted into a propositionally linear predicate in polynomial time, after which the construction of [19] can be used.

F ADDITIONAL COMPUTATION FOR EXAMPLE 6.4

To see that x is uniformly integrable in the left program and not in the right one (within the inner loop), imagine the inner loop as a stand-alone program and let X_n be the value of variable x after n steps of this stand-alone program (i.e., when the loop terminates x no longer changes). Solving a simple linear recurrence shows that in the right program $\mathbb{E}[X_n] \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which in particular shows uniform integrability of $X_0, X_1, X_2, \dots$. On the other hand, in the left program for each $K > 0$ we have $\mathbb{P}(X_K \geq 2^K \cdot x_0) \geq \frac{1}{2^K}$, where x_0 is the value of x upon entering the loop. Hence $\mathbb{E}[|X_K| \cdot 1_{X_K \geq K}] \geq 1$ for each K sufficiently large, which is incompatible with uniform integrability.

G EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In Table 1 in Section 8 we presented results for twenty five benchmarks. We now present additional result for other twenty seven benchmarks in Table 3.

Benchmark	Time (s)	Solution	Dimension	Prob. loops	Prob. Assignments
aaron2	0.09	yes	2	yes	yes
ax	0.11	yes	3	yes	yes
complex	0.1	yes	1	yes	yes
counterex1b	0.1	yes	3	yes	yes
cousot9	0.09	no		yes	no
easy2	0.09	yes	2	yes	yes
loops	0.1	no		no	no
nestedloop	0.16	yes	3	yes	no
	0.23	no		yes	yes
perfect1	0.1	yes	3	yes	yes
random1d	0.1	yes	2	yes	yes
realheapsort	0.22	no		no	no
realheapsort_step1	0.11	no		no	no
realheapsort_step2	0.16	no		yes	no
rsd	0.1	yes	1	yes	yes
sipma91	0.14	yes	2	yes	yes
speedFails1	0.09	yes	2	yes	yes
speedDis1	0.09	no		no	no
speedFails2	0.14	yes	1	yes	no
	0.08	no		yes	yes
speedFails4	0.09	no		no	no
speedNestedMultipleDep	0.1	yes	3	yes	yes
speedpldi3	0.1	yes	3	yes	yes
speedSimpleMultiple	0.1	no		no	no
speedSingleSingle	0.11	yes	2	yes	yes
terminate	0.09	yes	2	yes	yes
wcet0	0.11	yes	2	yes	yes
wcet2	0.09	yes	2	yes	yes
wise	0.09	no		no	no

Table 3. Additional experimental results for benchmarks from [2] extended with probabilistic loops and/or probabilistic assignments.