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\textbf{Abstract.} Timed pattern matching has strong connections with \textit{monitoring} real-time systems. Given a log and a specification containing timing parameters (that can capture uncertain or unknown constants), \textit{parametric} timed pattern matching aims at exhibiting for which start and end dates, as well as which parameter valuations, a specification holds on that log. This problem is notably close to robustness. We propose here a new framework for parametric timed pattern matching. Not only we dramatically improve the efficiency when compared to a previous method based on parametric timed model checking, but we further propose optimizations based on skipping. Our algorithm is suitable for online monitoring, and experiments show that it is fast enough to be applied at runtime.
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\section{Introduction}

Monitoring real-time systems consists in deciding whether a log satisfies a specification. A problem of interest is to determine for which segment of the log the specification is satisfied or violated. This problem can be related to string matching and pattern matching. The \textit{timed pattern matching problem} was formulated in [UFAM14], with subsequent works varying the setting and improving the technique (e.g., [UFAM16, WAH16, AMNU17, WHS17]). The problem takes as input a log and a specification, and decides where in the log the specification is
satisfied or violated. In [WAH16, WHS17], we introduced a solution to the timed pattern matching problem where the log is given in the form of a timed word (a sequence of events with their associated timestamps), and the specification in the form of a timed automaton (TA), an extension of finite-state automata with clocks [AD94].

**Example 1.** As a motivating example, consider the example in Fig. 1. Consider the automaton in Fig. 1a, and fix $p_1 = 1$ and $p_2 = 1$—which gives a timed automaton [AD94]. Here $\$ is a special terminal character. For this timed automaton (say $A$) and the target timed word $w$ in Fig. 1b, the output of the timed pattern matching problem is the set of matching intervals $\{(t, t') \mid w|_{(t,t')} \in L(A)\} = \{(t, t') \mid t \in [3.7, 3.9], t' \in (6.0, \infty)\}$.

While the log is by definition concrete, it may happen that the specification is subject to uncertainty. For example, we may want to detect *cyclic patterns* with a period $d$, without knowing the value of $d$ with full uncertainty. Therefore, the more abstract problem of *parametric timed pattern matching* becomes of interest: given a (concrete) timed log and an incomplete specification where some of the timing constants may be known with limited precision or completely unknown, what are the intervals and the valuations of the parameters for which the specification holds?

Coming back to Fig. 1, the question becomes to exhibit values for $t, t', p_1, p_2$ for which the specification holds on the log, i.e., $\{(t, t', v) \mid w|_{(t,t')} \in L(v(A))\}$, where $v$ denotes a valuation of $p_1, p_2$ and $v(A)$ denotes the replacement of $p_1, p_2$ in $A$ with their respective valuation in $v$. In [AHW18], we showed that this problem is decidable (mainly due to the finiteness of the logs), and we proposed an approach based on parametric timed model checking using timed words and parametric timed automata [AHV93], implemented in the IMITATOR model checker.

**Contribution** Our contribution is threefold. First, we propose a new *ad-hoc* technique for performing efficient parametric timed pattern matching. Second, we propose optimizations based on *skipping*, in the line of [WHS17]. Third, we implement our framework, we perform a set of experiments on a set of automotive benchmarks, and show that we increase the efficiency compared to the state-of-the-art [AHW18] by an order of magnitude. Our algorithm is suitable for online monitoring, as it does not need the whole run to be executed, and experiments show that it is fast enough to be applied at runtime.
Related work Several algorithms have been proposed for online monitoring of real-time temporal logic specifications. Online monitoring consists in monitoring on-the-fly at runtime, while offline monitoring is performed after the execution is completed, with less hard constraints on the monitoring algorithm performance. An online monitoring algorithm for ptMTL (a past time fragment of MTL [Koy90]) was proposed in [RFB14] and an algorithm for MTL[U,S] (a variant of MTL with both forward and backward temporal modalities) was proposed in [HOW14]. In addition, a case study on an autonomous research vehicle monitoring [KCDK15] shows such procedures can be performed in an actual vehicle.

The approaches most related to ours are [UFAM14,UFAM16,Ulu17]. In that series of works, logs are encoded by signals, i.e., values that vary over time. This can be seen as a state-based view, while our timed words are event-based. The formalism used for specification in [UFAM14,UFAM16] is timed regular expressions (TREs). An offline monitoring algorithm is presented in [UFAM14] and an online one is in [UFAM16]. These algorithms are implemented in the tool Montre [Ulu17]. In [BFN+18], the setting is signals matched against a temporal pattern; the construction is automata-based as in [WAH16,WH17].

We described our previous work [AHW18] as an offline algorithm. In fact, it is essentially online in the sense that it can potentially run with only a portion of the log: it relies on parallel composition of a specification automaton and a log automaton, and this parallel composition can be achieved on-the-fly. However, as mentioned in [BDD+18], “a good online monitoring algorithm must: (1) be able to generate intermediate estimates of property satisfaction based on partial signals, (2) use minimal amount of data storage, and (3) be able to run fast enough in a real-time setting.” So, at least for point (3), the algorithm in [AHW18] cannot really run in a real-time setting. In contrast, we claim our contribution here to be fast enough to run in a real-time setting, with runs of dozens of thousands of events being analyzable in less than a second.

Some algorithms have also been proposed for parameter identification of a temporal logic specification with uncertainty over a log. For discrete time setting, an algorithm for an extension of LTL is proposed in [FR08] and for real-time setting, algorithms for parametric signal temporal logic (PSTL) are proposed in [ADMN11,BFM18]. Although these works are related to our approach, previous approaches do not focus on segments of a log but on a whole log. In contrast, we exhibit intervals together with their associated parameter valuations, in a fully symbolic fashion. We believe our matching-based setting is advantageous in many usage scenarios e.g., from hours of a log of a car, extracting timing constraints of a certain actions to cause slipping. Also, our setting allows the patterns with complex timing constraints (see the pattern in Fig. 3c for example).

In [BFMU17], the robust pattern matching problem is considered over signal regular expressions, consisting in computing the quantitative (robust) semantics of a signal relative to an expression. For piecewise-constant and piecewise-linear signals, the problem can be effectively solved using a finite union of zones.
Further works attempted to quantify the distance between a specification and a signal temporal logic (STL) specification (e.g., [DFM13,DMP17,JBG+18]). The main difference with our work is that these works compute a distance w.r.t. to a whole log, while we aim at exhibiting where in the log is the property satisfied; our notion of parameters can also be seen as a relative time distance. However, our work is closer to the robust satisfaction of guards rather than signal values; in that sense, our contribution is more related to the time robustness in [DM10] or the distance in [ABD18].

Finally, while our work is related to parameter synthesis, in the sense that we identify parameter valuations in the property such that it holds (or not), the term “parameter synthesis” is also used in monitoring with a slightly different meaning: given a model with parameters, the goal is to find parameters that maximize the robustness of the specification, i.e., satisfying behaviors for a range of parameters for which the model robustly satisfies the property. A notable tool achieving this is BREACH [Don10].

A summary of various matching problems is recalled in Table 1.

Outline We introduce the necessary definitions and state our main objective in Section 2. We introduce an online algorithm for parametric timed pattern matching in Section 3, and enhance it with skipping in Section 4. We evaluate our algorithms in Section 5 and conclude in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries and objective

Our target strings are timed words [AD94], that are time-stamped words over an alphabet \( \Sigma \). Our patterns are given by parametric timed automata [AHV93].

2.1 Timed words and timed segments

For an alphabet \( \Sigma \), a timed word is a sequence \( w \) of pairs \((a_i, \tau_i)\) in \((\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}_{>0})\) satisfying \( \tau_i < \tau_{i+1} \) for any \( i \in [1, |w| - 1] \). We require \( \tau_0 = 0 \). For an alphabet \( \Sigma \), we denote the set of the timed words on \( \Sigma \) by \( \mathcal{T}(\Sigma) \). For an alphabet \( \Sigma \) and \( n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \), we denote the set of the timed words of length \( n \) on \( \Sigma \) by \( \mathcal{T}^n(\Sigma) \).

Table 1: Matching problems

| string matching | a word \( w \in \Sigma^* \) | a word \( pat \in \Sigma^* \) | \( \{(i, j) \in (\mathbb{N}_{>0})^2 \mid w(i, j) = pat\} \)
| pattern matching (PM) | a word \( w \in \Sigma^* \) | an NFA \( \mathcal{A} \) | \( \{(i, j) \in (\mathbb{N}_{>0})^2 \mid w(i, j) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})\} \)
| timed PM | a timed word \( w \in (\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}_{>0})^* \) | a TA \( \mathcal{A} \) | \( \{(t, t') \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^2 \mid w(t, t') \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})\} \)
| parametric timed PM | a timed word \( w \in (\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}_{>0})^* \) | a PTA \( \mathcal{A} \) | \( \{(t, t', v) \mid w(t, t', v) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}(v))\} \)

Given a timed word \( w \), we often denote it by \( \langle \pi, \tau \rangle \), where \( \pi \) is the sequence \((a_1, a_2, \cdots)\) and \( \tau \) is the sequence \((\tau_1, \tau_2, \cdots)\). Let \( w = \langle \pi, \tau \rangle \) be a timed word. We denote the subsequence \((a_i, \tau_i), (a_{i+1}, \tau_{i+1}), \cdots, (a_j, \tau_j)\) by \( w(i, j) \). For \( t \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \(-\tau_1 < t\), the \( t \)-shift of \( w \) is \( \langle \pi, \tau \rangle + t = \langle \pi + t, \tau \rangle \) where \( \pi + t = \tau_1 + \tau_2 + t, \cdots, \tau_{|\tau|} + t \). For timed words \( w = \langle \pi, \tau \rangle \) and \( w' = \langle \pi', \tau' \rangle \), their
absorbing concatenation is \( w \cdot w' = (\pi \cdot \eta, \tau \cdot \eta) \) where \( \pi_\eta \) and \( \tau_\eta \) are usual concatenations, and their non-absorbing concatenation is \( w \cdot w' = w \cdot (w' + \tau_{\eta}) \).

The concatenations on \( T(\Sigma) \) are also defined similarly. For a set \( W \in T(\Sigma) \) of timed words, its untimed projection \( \text{Untimed}(W) \in \Sigma^* \) is \( \{ \pi \mid (\pi, \eta) \in W \} \).

For a timed word \( w = (\pi, \eta) \) on \( \Sigma \) and \( t, t' \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) satisfying \( t < t' \), a timed word segment \( w_{i\to j}(t, t') \) is defined by the timed word \( (w(i, j) - t) \circ (\$; t' - t) \) on the augmented alphabet \( \Sigma \cup \{ \$ \} \), where \( i, j \) are chosen so that \( \tau_{i-1} \leq t < \tau_i \) and \( \tau_j < t' \leq \tau_{j+1} \). Here the fresh symbol \$ is called the terminal character.

### 2.2 Clocks, parameters and guards

We assume a set \( X = \{ x_1, \ldots, x_H \} \) of clocks, i.e., real-valued variables that evolve at the same rate. A clock valuation is a function \( \nu : X \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \). We write \( 0 \) for the clock valuation assigning \( 0 \) to all clocks. Given \( d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \), \( \nu + d \) denotes the valuation s.t. \( (\nu + d)(x) = \nu(x) + d \), for all \( x \in X \). Given \( R \subseteq X \), we define the reset of a valuation \( \nu \), denoted by \( [\nu]_R \), as follows: \( [\nu]_R(x) = 0 \) if \( x \in R \), and \( [\nu]_R(x) = \nu(x) \) otherwise.

We assume a set \( P = \{ p_1, \ldots, p_M \} \) of parameters, i.e., unknown constants. A parameter valuation \( v \) is a function \( v : \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{Q}_+ \). We assume \( \preceq \in \{ <, \leq, =, \geq, > \} \). A guard \( g \) is a constraint over \( X \cup P \) defined by a conjunction of inequalities of the form \( x \preceq d \), or \( x \succeq p \) with \( d \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( p \in P \). Given \( g \), we write \( \nu \models v(g) \) if the expression obtained by replacing each \( x \) with \( \nu(x) \) and each \( p \) with \( v(p) \) in \( g \) evaluates to true.

A linear term over \( X \cup P \) is of the form \( \sum_{1 \leq i \leq H} \alpha_i x_i + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq M} \beta_j p_j + d \), with \( x_i \in X \), \( p_j \in P \), and \( \alpha_i, \beta_j, d \in \mathbb{Z} \). A constraint \( C \) (i.e., a convex polyhedron) over \( X \cup P \) is a conjunction of inequalities of the form \( l t \preceq 0 \), where \( l t \) is a linear term. Given a set \( P \) of parameters, we denote by \( C|_P \) the projection of \( C \) onto \( P \), i.e., obtained by eliminating the variables not in \( P \) (e.g., using Fourier-Motzkin [Sch86]). \( \perp \) denotes the constraint over \( P \) representing the empty set of parameter valuations.

### 2.3 Parametric timed automata

Parametric timed automata (PTA) extend timed automata with parameters within guards in place of integer constants [AHV93].

**Definition 1 (PTA).** A PTA \( A \) is a tuple \( A = (\Sigma, L, l_0, F, X, P, E) \), where:

1. \( \Sigma \) is a finite set of actions,
2. \( L \) is a finite set of locations,
3. \( l_0 \in L \) is the initial location,
4. \( F \subseteq L \) is the set of accepting locations,
5. \( X \) is a finite set of clocks,
6. \( P \) is a finite set of parameters,

\(^1\) We choose \( \mathbb{Q}_+ \) by consistency with most of the PTA literature, but also because, for classical PTAs, choosing \( \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) leads to undecidability [Mil00].
7. $E$ is a finite set of edges $e = (l, g, a, R, l')$ where $l, l' \in L$ are the source and target locations, $a \in \Sigma$, $R \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ is a set of clocks to be reset, and $g$ is a guard.

Given a parameter valuation $v$, we denote by $v(A)$ the non-parametric structure where all occurrences of a parameter $p_i$ have been replaced by $v(p_i)$. We denote as a timed automaton any structure $v(A)$, by assuming a rescaling of the constants: by multiplying all constants in $v(A)$ by their least common denominator, we obtain an equivalent (integer-valued) TA, as defined in [AD94].

Let us now recall the concrete semantics of TA.

**Definition 2 (Semantics of a TA).** Given a PTA $A = (\Sigma, L, l_0, F, X, \mathcal{P}, E)$, and a parameter valuation $v$, the semantics of $v(A)$ is given by the timed transition system (TTS) $(S, s_0, \rightarrow)$, with

- $S = L \times \mathbb{R}^H_{\geq 0}$
- $s_0 = (l_0, 0)$,
- $\rightarrow$ consists of the discrete and (continuous) delay transition relations:
  1. discrete transitions: $(l, v) \xrightarrow{e, d} (l', v')$, if there exists $e = (l, g, a, R, l') \in E$, such that $v' = [v]_R$, and $v = v(g)$.
  2. delay transitions: $(l, v) \xrightarrow{d} (l, v + d)$, with $d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

Moreover we write $(l, v) \xrightarrow{(e, d)} (l', v')$ for a combination of a delay and discrete transition if $\exists v' : (l, v) \xrightarrow{d} (l, v') \xrightarrow{e} (l', v')$.

Given a TA $v(A)$ with concrete semantics $(S, s_0, \rightarrow)$, we refer to the states of $S$ as the concrete states of $v(A)$. A run of $v(A)$ is an alternating sequence of concrete states of $v(A)$ and pairs of edges and delays starting from the initial state $s_0$ of the form $s_0, (e_0, d_0), s_1, \cdots$ with $i = 0, 1, \ldots$, $e_i \in E$, $d_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $(s_i, e_i, s_{i+1}) \in \rightarrow$. Given such a run, the associated timed word is $(a_1, \tau_1), (a_2, \tau_2), \cdots$, where $a_i$ is the action of edge $e_{i-1}$, and $\tau_i = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq i-1} d_j$, for $i = 1, 2, \cdots$. Given a state $s = (l, v)$, we say that $s$ is reachable in $v(A)$ if $s$ appears in a run of $v(A)$. By extension, we say that $l$ is reachable; and by extension again, given a set $T$ of locations, we say that $T$ is reachable if there exists $l \in T$ such that $l$ is reachable in $v(A)$.

A finite run is accepting if its last state $(l, v)$ is such that $l \in F$. The (timed) language $L(v(A))$ is defined to be the set of timed words associated with all accepting runs of $v(A)$.

### 2.4 Reachability synthesis

We use here reachability synthesis to improve our new parametric timed pattern matching algorithm with a skipping optimization. This procedure, called EFsynth, takes as input a PTA $A$ and a set of target locations $T$, and attempts to synthesize all parameter valuations $v$ for which $T$ is reachable in $v(A)$. EFsynth

\(^2\) The “-1” in indices comes from the fact that, following usual conventions in the literature, states are numbered starting from 0 while words are numbered from 1.
was formalized in e.g., [JLR15] and is a procedure that may not terminate, but that computes an exact result (sound and complete) if it terminates. EFsynth traverses the parametric zone graph of A, which is a potentially infinite extension of the well-known zone graph of TAs (see, e.g., [ACEF09,JLR15] for a formal definition).

2.5 Parametric timed pattern matching

Let us recall parametric timed pattern matching [AHW18].

**Parametric timed pattern matching problem:**

**Input:** A PTA A, a timed word w over a common alphabet Σ

**Problem:** Compute all the triples (t, t', v) for which the segment w|[t,t'] is accepted by v(A). That is, it requires the match set \( M(w, A) = \{ (t, t', v) \mid w|[t,t'] \in L(v(A)) \} \).

The match set \( M(w, A) \) is in general uncountable; however it allows finite representation, as a finite union of special polyhedra in |P| + 2 dimensions, i.e., the number of parameters + 2 further dimensions for t and t' [AHW18].

3 An online algorithm for parametric timed pattern matching

In this section, we present an online algorithm for parametric timed pattern matching, which is our first contribution. Similarly to the online algorithm for timed pattern matching in [WAH16], our algorithm finds all the matching triples (t, t', v) ∈ \( M(w, A) \) by a breadth-first search. Our algorithm is online in the following sense: after reading the i-th element \((a_i, \tau_i)\) of the timed word \( w = (a, \tau) \), it immediately outputs all the matching triples \((t, t', v)\) over the available prefix \((a_1, \tau_1), (a_2, \tau_2), \ldots, (a_i, \tau_i)\) of \( w \).

Firstly, we define the auxiliary for our online algorithm for parametric timed pattern matching. We introduce an additional variable \( t \) representing the absolute time of the beginning of the matching. We use a function \( \rho: X \to (\mathbb{R}_>0 \cup \{ t \}) \) to represent the latest reset time of each clock variable \( x \in X \). Intuitively, \( \rho(x) = \tau \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \) means the latest reset of \( x \) is at \( \tau \), and \( \rho(x) = t \) means \( x \) is not reset after the beginning of the matching.

**Definition 3** \( \text{eval}(\rho, \tau), \text{reset}(\rho, R, \tau), \rho_0 \). Let \( X \) be the set of clock variables and \( t \) the variable for the beginning of a matching. For a function \( \rho: X \to (\mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{ t \}) \) and the current time \( \tau \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \), \( \text{eval}(\rho, \tau) \) is the following constraint on \( X \cup \{ t \} \):

\[
\text{eval}(\rho, \tau) = \bigwedge_{x \in X} (x = \tau - \rho(x))
\]
Fig. 2: Example of parametric timed pattern matching: input PTA and timed word (left); and output polyhedron (right).

For a function $\rho \colon X \to (\mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{\{\}\})$, the set $R \subseteq X$ of clocks to be reset, and the current time $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $\text{reset}(\rho, R, \tau) : X \to (\mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{\{\}\})$ is the following function.

\[
\text{reset}(\rho, R, \tau)(x) = \begin{cases} 
\tau & \text{if } x \in R \\
\rho(x) & \text{if } x \notin R 
\end{cases}
\]

By $\rho_0 : X \to (\mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{\{\}\})$, we denote the function mapping each $x \in X$ to $t$.

Intuitively, $\text{eval}(\rho, \tau)$ is the constraint corresponding to the clock valuation, and $\text{reset}(\rho, R, \tau)$ is the operation to reset the clock variables $x \in R$ at $\tau$.

**Algorithm 1** Online parametric timed pattern matching without skipping

Require: A timed word $w = ([\tau, \tau])$, and a PTA $A = (\Sigma, L, l_0, F, X, p, E)$.

Ensure: $\forall Z$ is the match set $\mathcal{M}(w, A)$

1: $\text{CurrConf} \leftarrow \emptyset$, $Z \leftarrow \emptyset$
2: for $i \leftarrow 1$ to $|w|$ do
3: \hspace{1em} push $(l_0, \rho_0, (\tau_{i-1} \leq t < \tau_i))$ to $\text{CurrConf}$
4: \hspace{1em} for $(l, p, C) \in \text{CurrConf}$ do \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} Lines 4 to 7 try to insert $\$ \text{in} (\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i]$.
5: \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} for $l_i \in F$ do
6: \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} push $(l, g, s, R, l_i) \in E$ do
7: \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} push $([C \land (\tau_{i-1} < t \leq \tau_i)] \land g \land \text{eval}(\rho, t)) \mid_{\mathbb{R}_{<0}(l_i)}$ to $Z$
8: \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} $(\text{PrevConf}, \text{CurrConf}) \leftarrow (\text{CurrConf}, \emptyset)$
9: \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} for $(l, p, C) \in \text{PrevConf}$ do \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} Lines 9 to 13 try to go forward using $(a_i, \tau_i)$.
10: \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} for $(l, g, a_i, R, l') \in E$ do
11: \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} $C' \leftarrow [C \land g \land \text{eval}(\rho, \tau_i)] \mid_{\mathbb{R}_{<0}(l_i)}$
12: \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} if $C' \neq \perp$ then
13: \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} push $(l', \text{reset}(\rho, R, \tau), C')$ to $\text{CurrConf}$
14: \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} push $(l_0, \rho_0, (\tau_{|w|} \leq t < \infty))$ to $\text{CurrConf}$
15: \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} for $(l, p, C) \in \text{CurrConf}$ do \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} Lines 15 to 18 try to insert $\$ \text{in} (\tau_{|w|}, \infty]$.
16: \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} for $l_i \in F$ do
17: \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} \hspace{1em} push $(C \land (\tau_{|w|} < t < \infty)) \land g \land \text{eval}(\rho, t') \mid_{\mathbb{R}_{<0}(l_i)}$ to $Z$

Algorithm 1 shows our online algorithm for parametric timed pattern matching. In the pseudocode, we used $\text{CurrConf}$, $\text{PrevConf}$, and $Z$: $\text{CurrConf}$ and $\text{PrevConf}$ are finite sets of triples $(l, p, C)$ made of a location $l \in L$, a mapping $\rho : X \to (\mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{\{\}\})$ denoting the latest reset of each clock, and a constraint $C$ over $\mathbb{P} \cup \{t\}$; and $Z$ is a finite set of constraints over $\mathbb{P} \cup \{t, t'\}$. As a running example, we use the PTA and the timed word in Fig. 2.
At first, the counter $i$ is 1 (line 2), and we start the matching trial from $t \in [\tau_0, \tau_1)$. At line 3, we add the new configuration $(l_0, \rho_0, (\tau_0 \leq t < \tau_1))$ to $\text{CurrConf}$, which means we are at the initial location $l_0$, we have no reset of the clock variables yet, and we can potentially start the matching from any $t \in [\tau_0, \tau_1)$. In lines 4 to 7, we try to insert $\$ \$ (i.e., the end of the matching) in $(\tau_0, \tau_1]$ but since there is no edges from $l_0$ to the accepting state, we immediately jump to line 8. Then, in lines 9 to 13, we consume $(a_1, \tau_1) = (a, 0.7)$ and try to transit from $l_0$ to $l_1$. The guard $x > 1$ at the edge from $l_0$ to $l_1$ is examined at line 11. We take the conjunction of the current constraint $C$, the guard $g$, and the constraints $\text{eval}(\rho, \tau_1)$ on the clock valuations. We take the projection to $P \cup \{t\}$ because the constraint on the clock variables changes after time passing. Since no clock variable is reset so far, the constraint on the clock valuation is $x = \tau_1 - t$. The constraint $C \land g \land \text{eval}(\rho, \tau_1) = (0 \leq t < 0.7) \land (x > 1) \land (x = 0.7 - t)$ is unsatisfiable and we go back to line 3.

At line 3, we add the new configuration $(l_0, \rho_0, (\tau_1 \leq t < \tau_2))$ to $\text{CurrConf}$. Similarly, we immediately jump to line 8, and we try the edge from $l_0$ to $l_1$ in lines 9 to 13. This time, the constraint $C \land g \land \text{eval}(\rho, \tau_2) = (0.7 \leq t < 2.0) \land (x > 1) \land (x = 2.0 - t)$ is satisfiable at line 12, and we push the next configuration $(l_1, \rho_0, C')$ to $\text{CurrConf}$ at line 13.

Similarly, we keep adding and updating configurations until the end of the input timed word $w$. Finally, in lines 15 to 18, we try to insert $\$ \$ in $(\tau_3, \infty) = (4.1, \infty)$. We can use the edge from $l_2$ to the accepting state, and we add the constraint at the right of Fig. 2 to $Z$.

Algorithm 1 terminates because the size of $\text{CurrConf}$ is always finite. Algorithm 1 is correct because it symbolically keeps track of all the runs of $v(A)$ over $w|_{(t,t')} \$ for any $v \in (Q_+)^P$ and $(t,t') \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

## 4 Skipping enhanced parametric timed pattern matching

In this section, we present automata-based skipping for Algorithm 1, which is our second contribution. In an algorithm with skipping, the counter $i$ in Algorithm 1 is increased at line 2 by the skip value. The skip value can be more than 1 and, as a consequence, some unnecessary matching trials may be prevented. A large part of the skip value computation can be reused and the whole algorithm can be faster. Following [WHS17], we employ $FJS$-style skipping [FJS07]. An FJS-style skipping consists of two skip value functions: the KMP-style skip value function $\Delta_{\text{KMP}}$ [KJP77] and the Quick Search-style skip value function $\Delta_{\text{QS}}$ [Sun90]. See Appendix A for the proof.

The following are auxiliary for the skip values. For a PTA $A$ and a parameter valuation $v$, the language without the last element is denoted by $L_A(v(A)) = \{w|1, |w| - 1) \mid w \in L(v(A))\}$. For a PTA $A = (\Sigma, L, l_0, F, \mathbb{X}, P, E)$ and $l \in L$, $A_l$ denotes the PTA $A_l = (\Sigma, L, l_0, \{l\}, \mathbb{X}, P, E)$.

**KMP-style skip values** Given a location $l \in L$ and a set $V \subseteq (Q_+)^P$ of parameter valuations, the KMP-style skip value function $\Delta_{\text{KMP}}$ returns the skip value
\[ \Delta_{\text{KMP}}(l, V) \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \]. The location \( l \) and the parameter valuations \( V \) present one of the configurations in the previous matching trial. We utilize the pair \((l, V)\) to overapproximate the subsequence \( w(i, j) \) of the timed word \( w \) examined in the latest matching trial.

**Definition 4 (\( \Delta_{\text{KMP}} \)).** Let \( A \) be a PTA \( A = (\Sigma, L, l_0, F, \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{P}, E) \). For a location \( l \in L \) and \( n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \), let \( V_{l,n} \) be the set of parameter valuations \( v \) such that there is a parameter valuation \( v' \in (\mathbb{Q}_+)^\mathbb{P} \) satisfying \( L(v(A_l)) \cdot T(\Sigma) \cap T^n(\Sigma) \cdot \{ w'' + t \mid w'' \in L_{\geq}(v'(A)), t > 0 \} \cdot T(\Sigma) \neq \emptyset \). The KMP-style skip value function \( \Delta_{\text{KMP}} : L \times \mathcal{P}((\mathbb{Q}_+)^\mathbb{P}) \to \mathbb{N}_{>0} \) is \[ \Delta_{\text{KMP}}(l, V) = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \mid V \subseteq V_{l,n} \} \].

Let \( l \) be a location we reached in the end of the matching trial from \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |w|\} \) for the parameter valuation \( v \). Intuitively, the subsequence \( w(i, |w|) \) is overapproximated by the language \( L(v(A_l)) \cdot T(\Sigma) \). For \( n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \), the matching from \( i + n \) is overapproximated by \( \bigcup_{v' \in (\mathbb{Q}_+)^\mathbb{P}} T^n(\Sigma) \cdot \{ w'' + t \mid w'' \in L_{\geq}(v'(A)), t > 0 \} \cdot T(\Sigma) \). Therefore, \( v \notin V_{l,n} \) implies that we have no matching from \( i + n \), and we can skip the matching trials from \( i + 1, i + 2, \ldots, i + \Delta_{\text{KMP}}(l, \{v\}) - 1 \). We note that if we reached both \( l \) and \( l' \), the intersection \( (L(v(A_l)) \cdot T(\Sigma)) \cap (L(v(A_{l'})) \cdot T(\Sigma)) \) is an overapproximation of \( w(i, |w|) \), and therefore, we take the maximum of \( \Delta_{\text{KMP}}(l, V) \) over the reached configurations.

Since \( V_{l,n} \) is independent of the timed word \( w \), we can compute it before the matching trials by reachability synthesis of PTAs. See Appendix B for the construction of the PTAs. During the matching trials, only the inclusion checking \( V \subseteq V_{l,n} \) is necessary. This test can be achieved thanks to convex polyhedra inclusion.

**Theorem 1.** Let \( A \) be a PTA \( A = (\Sigma, L, l_0, F, \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{P}, E) \) and let \( w \in T(\Sigma) \). For any subsequence \( w(i, j) \) of \( w \) and for any \( (l, v) \in L \times (\mathbb{Q}_+)^\mathbb{P} \), if there exists \( t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) satisfying \( w(i, j) - t \in L(v(A_l)) \), for any \( n \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \Delta_{\text{KMP}}(l, \{v\}) - 1\} \), we have \[ ([\tau_{i+n-1}, \tau_{i+n}) \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times (\mathbb{Q}_+)^\mathbb{P}) \cap M(w, A) = \emptyset. \]

Although \( V_{l,n} \) can be computed before the matching trials, the KMP-style skip value function \( \Delta_{\text{KMP}} \) requires checking \( V \subseteq V_{l,n} \) after each matching trial, which means a polyhedral inclusion test in \(|\mathbb{P}| + 2 \) dimensions. To reduce this runtime overhead, we define the non-parametric KMP-style skip value function \( \Delta_{\text{KMP}}^\#(l) = \min_{v \in (\mathbb{Q}_+)^\mathbb{P}} \Delta_{\text{KMP}}(l, \{v\}) \). For comparison, we refer \( \Delta_{\text{KMP}} \) as the parametric KMP-style skip value function.

**Quick Search-style skip values** Given an action \( a \in \Sigma \), the Quick Search-style skip value function \( \Delta_{\text{QS}} \) returns the skip value \( \Delta_{\text{QS}}(a) \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \). Before the matching trial from the \( i \)-th element \( (a_i, \tau_i) \), we look ahead the action \( a_{i+N-1} \), where \( N \) is the length of the shortest matching. If we observe that there is no matching, we also look ahead the action \( a_{i+N} \) and skip by \( \Delta_{\text{QS}}(a_{i+N}) \). The construction of the Quick Search-style skip value function \( \Delta_{\text{QS}} \) is by reachability emptiness of PTAs, i.e., the emptiness of the valuation set reaching a given location.
Algorithm 2 Parametric timed pattern matching with parametric skipping

Require: A timed word \( w \) and a PTA \( A = (\Sigma, L, l_0, F, X, P, E) \)
Ensure: \( Z \) is the match set \( M(w, A) \)
1: \( i \leftarrow 1 \)  \( \triangleright \) \( i \) is the position in \( w \) of the beginning of the current matching trial
2: \( N = \min \{|w| \mid w \in \bigcup_{v \in (Q_+)^2} \mathcal{L}_\delta(v(A))\} \)
3: while \( i \leq |w| - N + 1 \) do
4:   while \( \forall v \in (Q_+)^2, (\overline{a}, \overline{\tau}) \in \mathcal{L}(v(A)) : a_i + N - 1 \neq a_N^v \) do \( \triangleright \) Try matching the tail of \( \mathcal{L}(v(A)) \)
5:     \( i \leftarrow i + \Delta_{QS}(a_i+N) \) \( \triangleright \) Quick Search-style skipping
6:     if \( i > |w| - N + 1 \) then return
7:     \( Z \leftarrow Z \cup \{(t, t', v) \in [|\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i|) \times (\tau_{i-1}, \infty) \times (Q_+)^2 \mid w(t, t') \in \mathcal{L}(v(A))\} \) \( \triangleright \) Try matching
8:     \( j \leftarrow \max\{j \mid i, i + 1, \ldots, |w| \} \mid \exists \ell \in L, v \in (Q_+)^2, t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, w(i, j) - t \in \mathcal{L}(v(A))\} \)
9:     \( C \leftarrow \{(l, V) \in L \times P((Q_+)^2) \mid \forall v \in V, \exists \ell \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, w(i, j) - t \in \mathcal{L}(v(A))\} \)
10: \( i \leftarrow i + \max_{(l, V) \in C} \Delta_{KMP}(l, V) \) \( \triangleright \) Parametric KMP-style skipping
11: \( Z \leftarrow Z \cup \{(t, t', v) \in [|\tau_{i-1}, \infty) \times (\tau_{i-1}, \infty) \times (Q_+)^2 \mid w(t, t') \in \mathcal{L}(v(A))\} \)

Definition 5 (\( \Delta_{QS} \)). For a PTA \( A = (\Sigma, L, l_0, F, X, P, E) \), the Quick-Search-style skip value function \( \Delta_{QS} : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0} \) is as follows, where \( N \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0} \) is \( N = \min \{|w| \mid w \in \bigcup_{v \in (Q_+)^2} \mathcal{L}_\delta(v(A))\} \).

\[ \Delta_{QS}(a) = \min \{n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0} \mid \exists v \in (Q_+)^2, \Sigma^N a \Sigma^* \cap \Sigma^n \text{Untimed}(\mathcal{L}_\delta(v(A))) \neq \emptyset\} \]

For \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |w|\} \), the subsequence \( w(i, |w|) \) is overapproximated by \( \Sigma^N a_i \Sigma^* \). For \( n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0} \), the matching from \( i + n \) is overapproximated by \( \bigcup_{v \in (Q_+)^2} \Sigma^n \text{Untimed}(\mathcal{L}_\delta(v(A))) \). Therefore, for any \( n \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \Delta_{QS}(a_{i+N}) - 1\} \), we have no matching from \( i + n \) and we can skip these matching trials.

Theorem 2. Let \( A \) be a PTA \( A = (\Sigma, L, l_0, F, X, P, E) \), let \( w = (\overline{a}, \overline{\tau}) \in T(\Sigma) \), and let \( N = \min\{|w| \mid w \in \bigcup_{v \in (Q_+)^2} \mathcal{L}_\delta(v(A))\} \). For any index \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |w|\} \) of \( w \) and for any \( m \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \Delta_{QS}(a_{i+N}) - 1\} \), we have \( (|\tau_{i+m-1}, \tau_{i+m}|) \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times (Q_+)^2 \) \( \cap \bigcup_{v \in (Q_+)^2} \mathcal{L}_\delta(v(A)) = \emptyset \).

Algorithm 2 shows an improvement of Algorithm 1 enhanced by skipping. The loop in lines 2 to 13 of Algorithm 1 is used in the matching trial i.e., lines 7 to 9 of Algorithm 2. After reading the \( i \)-th element \( (a_i, \tau_i) \) of the timed word \( w = (\overline{a}, \overline{\tau}) \), Algorithm 2 does not immediately output the matching over the available prefix \( (a_1, \tau_1), (a_2, \tau_2), \ldots, (a_i, \tau_i) \) of \( w \), but it still outputs the matching before obtaining the entire timed word with some delay. At line 10, it skips using the parametric KMP-style skip value \( \Delta_{KMP}(l, V) \). We can employ the non-parametric KMP-style skip value by replacing \( \Delta_{KMP}(l, V) \) with \( \Delta_{KMP}(l) \).

5 Experiments

We implemented and evaluated our online algorithms for parametric timed pattern matching. We implemented the following three algorithms: the online algorithm without skipping (Algorithm 1, referred as “no skip”); the online algorithm with skipping (Algorithm 2, referred as “parametric skip”); and the
online algorithm with non-parametric skipping (Algorithm 2 where $\Delta_{KMP}(l, V)$ at line 10 is replaced with $\Delta'_{KMP}(l)$, referred as “non-parametric skip”). In the skip value computation, we use reachability synthesis for PTAs. Since reachability synthesis is intractable in general (the emptiness problem, i.e., the (non-)existence of a valuation reaching a given location, is undecidable [AHV93]), we use the following overapproximation: after investigating 100 configurations, we speculate that all the inconclusive parameter valuations are reachable parameter valuations. We remark that this overapproximation does not affect the correctness of parametric timed pattern matching, as it potentially decreases the skip value. We conducted experiments to answer the following research questions.

**RQ1** Which is the fastest algorithm for parametric timed pattern matching?

**RQ2** Why is parametric timed pattern matching slower than non-parametric timed pattern matching? Namely, is it purely because of the difficulty of the problem itself or is it mainly because of the general implementation and data structure required by the general problem setting?

**RQ3** How large is the overhead of the skip value computation? Namely, is it small and acceptable?

We implemented the online algorithms for parametric timed pattern matching in C++ and we compiled them using GCC 7.3.0. We conducted the experiments on an Amazon EC2 c4.large instance (2.9 GHz Intel Xeon E5-2666 v3, 2 vCPUs, and 3.75 GiB RAM) that runs Ubuntu 18.04 LTS (64 bit). Experiment data can be found on [github.com/MasWag/monaa/blob/PTPM/doc/NFM2019.md](github.com/MasWag/monaa/blob/PTPM/doc/NFM2019.md).

Figure 3 shows the pattern PTAs we used in the experiments. We took the benchmarks GEAR, ACCEL, and BLOWUP from [AHW18] as well as the new original benchmark ONLYTIMING. The timed words for GEAR and ACCEL are generated by the automatic transmission system model in [HAF14]. BLOWUP and ONLYTIMING are toy examples. BLOWUP shows the worst case situation for parametric timed pattern matching. In ONLYTIMING, the parametric skip values are greater than the non-parametric skip values. In Sections 5.2 and 5.3, we also used the non-parametric variants GEAR-np, ACCEL-np, BLOWUP-np, and ONLYTIMING-np where the parameters are substituted to specific concrete values.

### 5.1 RQ1: Overall execution time

To answer RQ1, we compared the total execution time of our online algorithms using GEAR, ACCEL, BLOWUP, and ONLYTIMING. As a baseline, we used our previous implementation of parametric timed pattern matching based on IMITATOR [AHW18] (version 2.10.4). Tables 2 to 5 and Fig. 4 show the execution time of our online algorithms compared with the IMITATOR-based implementation.

In Tables 2 to 5, we observe that our algorithms are faster than the IMITATOR-based implementation by orders of magnitude. Moreover, for BLOWUP, the IMITATOR-based implementation aborted due to out of memory. This is mainly because our implementation is specific to parametric timed pattern matching.
(a) Gear: the parameter $p$ is substituted to 2 in Gear-np.

(b) Accel: the parameter $p$ is substituted to 3 in Accel-np.

(c) Blowup: the parameters $p_1$, $p_2$, and $p_3$ are substituted to 10, 2, and 1, respectively in Blowup-np.

(d) OnlyTiming: the parameter $p$ is substituted to 1 in OnlyTiming-np.

Fig. 3: Pattern PTAs and their non-parametric variants in the experiments while IMITATOR is a general tool for parametric verification. This shows the much better efficiency of our new approach compared to [AHW18].

In Fig. 4, we observe that the curve of “no skip” have the steepest slope and the curve of either “parametric skip” or “non-parametric skip” have the gentlest slope except for Blowup. Blowup is a benchmark designed on purpose to observe exponential blowup of the execution time, and it requires much time for all of the implementations.

For Gear and Accel, the execution time of “non-parametric skip” increase the most gently. This is because the parametric KMP-style skip value $\Delta_{KMP}(l, V)$ and the non-parametric KMP-style skip value $\Delta'_{KMP}(l)$ are equal for these benchmarks, and “parametric skip” is slower due to the inclusion checking $V \subseteq V_{1,n}$.

For OnlyTiming, we observe that the execution time of “parametric skip” increases the most gently because the parametric KMP-style skip value $\Delta_{KMP}(l, V)$ is larger than the non-parametric KMP-style skip value $\Delta'_{KMP}(l)$.

We conclude that skipping usually makes parametric timed pattern matching efficient. The preference between two skipping methods depends on the pattern PTA and it is a future work to investigate the tendency. Since the computation of the skip values does not take much time, the following work flow is reasonable:

1. compute the skip values for both of them; and
Table 2: Execution time for Gear [s]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>w</th>
<th>No Skip</th>
<th>Non-Param. Skip</th>
<th>Param. Skip</th>
<th>IMITATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1467</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2837</td>
<td>0.0725</td>
<td>0.0605</td>
<td>0.0605</td>
<td>3.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4595</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.1005</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>5.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6859</td>
<td>0.1585</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>7.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7301</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.2115</td>
<td>9.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9955</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.2315</td>
<td>0.2505</td>
<td>12.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10315</td>
<td>0.2815</td>
<td>0.2875</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>15.583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Execution time for Accel [s]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>w</th>
<th>No Skip</th>
<th>Non-Param. Skip</th>
<th>Param. Skip</th>
<th>IMITATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2559</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.0515</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>2.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4894</td>
<td>0.0605</td>
<td>0.0605</td>
<td>0.0705</td>
<td>4.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7799</td>
<td>0.1005</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>7.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10045</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.1405</td>
<td>9.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15375</td>
<td>0.1985</td>
<td>0.1935</td>
<td>0.2115</td>
<td>12.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17688</td>
<td>0.2265</td>
<td>0.2255</td>
<td>0.2505</td>
<td>15.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20299</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>18.319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Execution time for Blowup [s]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>w</th>
<th>No Skip</th>
<th>Non-Param. Skip</th>
<th>Param. Skip</th>
<th>IMITATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>66.75</td>
<td>68.0125</td>
<td>67.9735</td>
<td>OutOfMemory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>267.795</td>
<td>271.642</td>
<td>269.084</td>
<td>OutOfMemory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>601.335</td>
<td>611.782</td>
<td>607.58</td>
<td>OutOfMemory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000</td>
<td>1081.42</td>
<td>1081.25</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>OutOfMemory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000</td>
<td>1678.15</td>
<td>1688.22</td>
<td>1694.53</td>
<td>OutOfMemory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Execution time for OnlyTiming [s]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>w</th>
<th>No Skip</th>
<th>Non-Param. Skip</th>
<th>Param. Skip</th>
<th>IMITATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.0995</td>
<td>0.1305</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>4.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>0.2905</td>
<td>0.3265</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>8.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>0.3905</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.3525</td>
<td>12.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.5225</td>
<td>0.4325</td>
<td>16.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>0.6235</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>20.815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4: Execution time for the benchmarks with parameters which MONAA cannot handle: Gear (above left), Accel (above right), Blowup (below left), and OnlyTiming (below right)
2. use “parametric skip” only if its skip values are strictly larger than that of “non-parametric skip”.

5.2 RQ2: Parametric vs. non-parametric timed pattern matching

To answer RQ2, we ran our online algorithms for parametric timed pattern matching using the non-parametric benchmarks (ACCEL-np, GEAR-np, BLOWUP-np, and ONLYTIMING-np) and compared the execution time with a tool MONAA [WHS18] for non-parametric timed pattern matching.

In Fig. 5, we observe that our algorithms are slower than MONAA by orders of magnitude even though we solve the same problem (non-parametric timed pattern matching). This is presumably because our implementations rely on Parma Polyhedra Library (PPL) [BHZ08] to compute symbolic states, while MONAA utilizes DBMs (difference bound matrices) [Dil89]. It was shown in [BFMU17] that polyhedra may be dozens of times slower than DBMs; however, for parametric analyses, DBMs are not suitable, and parameterized extensions (e.g., in [HRSV02]) still need polyhedra in their representation.

Moreover, in Figs. 4 and 5, we observe that the execution time of our algorithms are not much different between each parametric benchmark and its non-parametric variant except BLOWUP. This observation shows that at least one additional parameter does not make the problem too difficult.
Table 6: Execution time [s] for the skip value computation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Parametric Skip</th>
<th>Parametric Skip</th>
<th>MONAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEAR</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
<td>0.0175</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEAR-np</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEL</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.0435</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEL-np</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.0305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONLYTIMING</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONLYTIMING-np</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOWUP</td>
<td>0.3665</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOWUP-np</td>
<td>1.268</td>
<td>1.2905</td>
<td>1.5455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, we conclude that the lower efficiency of parametric timed pattern matching is mainly because of its general data structure required by the general problem setting.

5.3 RQ3: Overhead of skip value computation

To answer RQ3, we compared the execution time of our algorithms for an empty timed word using all the benchmarks. As a baseline, we also measured the execution time of MONAA.

In Table 6, we observe that the execution time for the skip values is less than 0.05 seconds except BLOWUP and BLOWUP-np. Even for the slowest pattern PTA BLOWUP-np, the execution time for the skip values is less than 1.5 second and it is faster than that of MONAA. We conclude that the overhead of the skip value computation is small and acceptable in many usage scenario.

6 Conclusion and perspectives

In this work, we proposed a new approach for monitoring logs given in the form of timed words using a specification given in the form of parametric timed automata. Our new approach dramatically outperforms the previous approach of [AHW18]. In addition, we discussed an optimization using skipping.

Natural future works include more expressive specifications than (parametric) timed automata-based specifications, e.g., using more expressive logics such as [BKMZ15].
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A Omitted Proofs

A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

First, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 1. Let \( \mathcal{A} \) be a PTA \( \mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, L, l_0, F, X, P, E) \) and let \( w \in T(\Sigma) \). For a subsequence \( w(i,j) \) of \( w \), let \( C_{i,j} \subseteq L \times (\mathbb{Q}_+)^2 \) be \( C_{i,j} = \{(l, v) \mid \exists t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, w(i,j) - t \in L(v(A_l))\} \). For a subsequence \( w(i,j) \) of \( w \) and \( n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \), if there exists \( (l, v) \in C_{i,j} \) satisfying \( v \notin V_{l,n} \), we have \( ([\tau_{i+1}, \tau_{i+n}) \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times (\mathbb{Q}_+)^2) \cap M(w, \mathcal{A}) = \emptyset \).

Proof. If there exists \( (l, v) \in C_{i,j} \) satisfying \( v \notin V_{l,n} \), by definition of \( C_{i,j} \) and \( V_{l,n} \), there exists \( (l, v) \in L \times (\mathbb{Q}_+)^2 \) satisfying the following.

\[
\exists t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}, w(i,j) - t \in L(v(A_l)) \\
\forall v' \in (\mathbb{Q}_+)^2, \exists t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}, t > 0 \mid (l, v') \in T(\Sigma) \cap T^n(\Sigma) \cap \{w'' + t \mid w'' \in L_{\leq s}(v'(A)), t > 0\} \cdot T(\Sigma) = \emptyset
\]

Therefore, we have the following.

\[
\exists (l, v) \in C_{i,j}, v \notin V_{l,n} \\
\Rightarrow \exists t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}, \forall t \in (\mathbb{Q}_+)^2 \\
\Rightarrow (l, v) \cdot T(\Sigma) \cap T^n(\Sigma) \cap \{w'' + t \mid w'' \in L_{\leq s}(v'(A)), t > 0\} \cdot T(\Sigma) = \emptyset
\]

Then, the proof of Theorem 1 is as follows.

Proof. By definition of \( C_{i,j} \) in Lemma 1, for any subsequence \( w(i,j) \) of \( w \) and \( (l, v) \in L \times (\mathbb{Q}_+)^2 \), \( \exists t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}, w(i,j) - t \in L(v(A_l)) \) implies \( (l, v) \in C_{i,j} \). By definition of \( \Delta_{\mathcal{KMP}} \), for any \( (l, v) \in C_{i,j} \) and \( n \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \Delta_{\mathcal{KMP}}(l, \{v\}) - 1\} \), we have \( v \notin V_{l,n} \). Therefore, Theorem 1 holds because of Lemma 1.

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

First, we prove the following lemma.
Theorem 2. Let $A$ be a PTA $A = (\Sigma, L, l_0, F, X, P, E)$, let $w = (\pi, \tau) \in T(\Sigma)$, and let $N = \min\{w \mid w \in \bigcup_{v \in (Q_+)^P} L_+(v(A))\}$. For any index $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |w|\}$ of $w$ and for any $m \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, if $a_{i+m} \neq a_{N-m+1}'$ holds for any $(\vec{a}, \vec{t}) \in \bigcup_{v \in (Q_+)^P} L(v(A))$, we have $((\tau_{i+m-1}, \tau_{i+m}) \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times (Q_+)^2) \cap M(w, A) = \emptyset$. \hfill $\Box$

Proof. If $a_{i+N} \neq a_{N-m+1}'$ holds for any $(\vec{a}, \vec{t}) \in \bigcup_{v \in (Q_+)^P} L(v(A))$, we have the following.

$$\text{Untimed}(\{w(i + m, |w|)\}) \subseteq \bigcup_{v \in (Q_+)^P} \text{Untimed}(L_+(v(A))) \Sigma^*$$

Lemma 2 is proved by the following.

$$\text{Untimed}(\{w(i + m, |w|)\}) \subseteq \bigcup_{v \in (Q_+)^P} \text{Untimed}(L_-(v(A))) \Sigma^*$$

$$\Rightarrow \forall t \in [\tau_{i+m-1}, \tau_{i+m}), v \in (Q_+)^P, w(i + m, |w|) - t \not\in \bigcup_{v \in (Q_+)^P} L_-(v(A)) \cdot T(\Sigma)$$

$$\Rightarrow \forall t \in [\tau_{i+m-1}, \tau_{i+m}), t' > t, v \in (Q_+)^P, w|_{(t, t')} \not\in \bigcup_{v \in (Q_+)^P} L(v(A))$$

$$\iff ([\tau_{i+m-1}, \tau_{i+m}) \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times (Q_+)^2) \cap M(w, A) = \emptyset$$

Then, the proof of Theorem 2 is as follows.

Proof. Since $\Sigma^N a\Sigma^* \cap \Sigma^m\text{Untimed}(L_+(v(A))) \neq \emptyset$ holds for any $n \geq N + 1$, we have $\Delta_{QS}(a_{i+n}) - 1 \leq N$. By definition of $\Delta_{QS}$, $m < \Delta_{QS}(a_{i+N})$ implies the following.

$$\forall v \in (Q_+)^P, \Sigma^N a_{i+N}\Sigma^* \cap \Sigma^m\text{Untimed}(L_-(v(A))) = \emptyset$$

Therefore, Lemma 2 implies Theorem 2. \hfill $\Box$

\section*{B Construction of $V_{l,n}$}

We present a construction of $V_{l,n}$ in Definition 4. We fix a PTA $A = (\Sigma, L, l_0, F, X, P, E)$, a location $l \in L$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Since $V_{l,n}$ is the set of parameter valuations $v \in (Q_+)^P$ such that there is a $v' \in (Q_+)^P$ satisfying $L(v(A)) \cdot T(\Sigma) \cap T^n(\Sigma) \cdot \{w'' + t \mid w'' \in L_-(v'(A)), t > 0\} \cdot T(\Sigma) \neq \emptyset$, we construct PTAs $A'_l$ and $A'_{l,n}$ satisfying $L(v(A'_l)) = L(v(A_l)) \cdot T(\Sigma)$ and $L(v(A'_{l,n})) = T^n(\Sigma) \cdot \{w + t \mid w \in L_-(v'(A)), t > 0\} \cdot T(\Sigma)$. We define $A'_l$ as $A'_l = (\Sigma, L \cup \{l_{\text{fin}}\}, l_0, \{l, l_{\text{fin}}\}, X, P, E'_l)$, where $E'_l = E \cup \{(l, T, a, 0, l_{\text{fin}}) \mid a \in \Sigma\} \cup \{(l_{\text{fin}}, T, a, 0, l_{\text{fin}}) \mid a \in \Sigma\}$. For any $v \in (Q_+)^P$,
$w' \in \mathcal{L}(v(A_1))$, and $w'' \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$, we have $l_0 \xrightarrow{w'} l \xrightarrow{w''} l_{\text{fin}}$ in $v(A_1)$ and $w' \cdot w'' \in \mathcal{L}(v(A_1))$. For any $v \in (\mathbb{Q}_+)^2$ and $w \in \mathcal{L}(v(A_1))$, there exist timed words $w', w'' \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$ satisfying $w = w' \cdot w''$ and $l_0 \xrightarrow{w'} l$ in $v(A_1)$, which implies $w' \in \mathcal{L}(v(A_1))$. Therefore, we have $\mathcal{L}(v(A_1')) = \mathcal{L}(v(A_1)) \cdot \mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$.

We define $A'_{+n}$ as $A_{+n} = (\Sigma \sqcup \{\varepsilon\}, L', l_{n+1}, F', X, \mathbb{P}, E')$, where

- $\varepsilon$ is the unobservable character;
- $L' = L \sqcup \{l \mid l \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n + 1\}\}$ \{l_{\text{fin}}\};
- $F' = \{l \mid \exists l' \in F, (l, g, a, R, l') \in E\} \{l_{\text{fin}}\}$; and
- $E' = E \sqcup \{(l_{i+1}, l, a, \emptyset, l_0) \mid a \in \Sigma, i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}\} \cup \{(l_1, \varepsilon, l, l_0)\} \cup \{(l, \top, a, \emptyset, l_{\text{fin}}) \mid a \in \Sigma\}$.

For any parameter valuation $v' \in (\mathbb{Q}_+)^2$, timed words $w' \in \mathcal{T}^n(\Sigma)$, $w'' \in \mathcal{L}(v'(A_1))$, $w''' \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$, and $t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, we have $l_{n+1} \xrightarrow{w'} l_1 \xrightarrow{(\varepsilon, t)} l_0 \xrightarrow{w''} l_f \xrightarrow{w'''} l_{\text{fin}}$ in $v'(A_1)$, where $l_f \in F'$. For any parameter valuation $v' \in (\mathbb{Q}_+)^2$ and for any timed word $w \in \mathcal{L}(v'(A_{+n}'))$, there exist $w' \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$, $w'' \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$, $w''' \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$, and $t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ satisfying $w = w' \cdot (\varepsilon, t) \cdot w'' \cdot w'''$ and $l_0 \xrightarrow{w''} l_f$ in $v(A_{+n})$, where $l_f \in F'$, and therefore, we have $w' \in \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}(v'(A_1))$. Overall, for any $v \in (\mathbb{Q}_+)^2$, we have $\mathcal{L}(v'(A_{+n}')) = \mathcal{T}^n(\Sigma) \{w + t \mid w \in \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}(v'(A_1)), t > 0\} \cdot \mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$.

To take the intersection of $\mathcal{L}(v(A_1'))$ and $\mathcal{L}(v'(A_{+n}'))$, we use the synchronized product. The synchronized product (using strong broadcast, i.e., synchronization on shared actions) of several PTAs gives a PTA.

**Definition 6 (synchronized product of PTAs).** Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Given a set of PTAs $A_i = (\Sigma_i, L_i, (l_i)_0, F_i, X_i, \mathbb{P}_i, E_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq N$, the synchronized product of $A_i$, $1 \leq i \leq N$, denoted by $A_1 \parallel A_2 \parallel \cdots \parallel A_N$, is the tuple $(\Sigma, L, l_0, F, X, \mathbb{P}, E)$, where:

1. $\Sigma = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} \Sigma_i$,
2. $L = \prod_{i=1}^{N} L_i$,
3. $l_0 = ((l_0)_1, \ldots, (l_0)_N)$,
4. $F = \{(l_1, \ldots, l_N) \in L \mid \exists i \in [1, N] \text{ s.t. } l_i \in F_i\}$,
5. $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} X_i$,
6. $\mathbb{P} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{P}_i$,

and $E$ is defined as follows. For all $a \in \Sigma$, let $\zeta_a$ be the subset of indices $i \in 1, \ldots, N$ such that $a \in \Sigma_i$. For all $a \in \Sigma$, for all $(l_1, \ldots, l_N) \in L$, for all $(l'_1, \ldots, l'_N) \in L$, $(l_1, \ldots, l_N, a, l_1', \ldots, l_N') \in E$ if:

- for all $i \in \zeta_a$, there exist $g_i, R_i$ such that $(l_i, g_i, a, R_i, (l'_i, \ldots, l'_N)) \in E_i$, $g = \land_{i \in \zeta_a} g_i$, and
- for all $i \notin \zeta_a$, $l'_i = l_i$.

For any $v, v' \in (\mathbb{Q}_+)^2$, we have $\mathcal{L}(v \sqcup v')(A_1' \parallel A_{+n}') = \mathcal{L}(v(A_1')) \cap \mathcal{L}(v'(A_{+n}'))$. Therefore, we have $V_{N} = \{v \mid \exists v' \in (\mathbb{Q}_+)^2, \mathcal{L}(v \sqcup v')(A_1' \parallel A_{+n}') \neq \emptyset\}$, which can be computed by reachability synthesis of PTAs.