

A unified method to decentralized state inference and fault diagnosis/prediction of discrete-event systems

Kuize Zhang

the date of receipt and acceptance should be inserted later

Abstract The state inference problem and fault diagnosis/prediction problem are fundamental topics in many areas. In this paper, we consider discrete-event systems (DESs) modeled by finite-state automata (FSAs). There exist plenty of results on decentralized versions of the latter problem but there is almost no result for a decentralized version of the former problem. In this paper, we propose a decentralized version of strong detectability called *co-detectability* which implies that once a system satisfies this property, for each generated infinite-length event sequence, at least one local observer can determine the current and subsequent states after a common observation time delay. We prove that the problem of verifying co-detectability of FSAs is coNP-hard. Moreover, we use a unified *concurrent-composition* method to give PSPACE verification algorithms for co-detectability, co-diagnosability, and co-predictability of FSAs, without any assumption or modifying the FSAs under consideration, where co-diagnosability is firstly studied by [Debouk & Lafortune & Teneketzis 2000], while co-predictability is firstly studied by [Kumar & Takai 2010]. By our proposed unified method, one can see that in order to verify co-detectability, more technical difficulties will be met compared to verifying the other two properties, because in co-detectability, generated outputs are counted, but in the latter two properties, only occurrences of events are counted. For example, when one output was generated, any number of unobservable events could have occurred. The PSPACE-hardness of verifying co-diagnosability is already known in the literature. In this paper, we prove the PSPACE-hardness of verifying co-predictability.

Keywords Discrete-event system · Finite-state automaton · Co-detectability · Co-diagnosability · Co-predictability · Concurrent composition · Complexity

K. Zhang
School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 10044 Stockholm, Sweden
E-mail: kuzhan@kth.se

1 Background

1.1 State inference

The state inference problem of dynamical systems has been a central problem in computer science [32,4]. This problem has been a central problem also in control theory, arranging from linear systems [20,51], to nonlinear systems [44,9,18], to switched systems [47], and also to networked systems [24,1]. In two seminal papers [32,20], a property (with its variants) of whether one can use an input sequence and the corresponding output sequence to determine the initial state is investigated. In the former, the property is called *Gedanken-experiment* and Moore machines (deterministic finite-state machines, not necessarily linear) are considered; while in the latter, it is called *observability* and linear differential equations are considered. Theoretically, such a property is of its intrinsic interest. When internal states are only partially observed, it is interesting to develop different techniques according to features of different models to infer internal states by using partial observations. From a practical point of view, such a property has extensive applications in different areas, e.g., in traffic networks, it is meaningful to locate a crucial car by using traceable interaction information with the car when the car itself is not directly traceable; in genetic regulatory networks, it is important to use the states of a subset of directly measurable nodes to estimate or determine the whole network state because usually not all nodes could be directly measured [29]. When the initial or past state information is not crucial but only the current and subsequent state information is needed, the property could be reformulated as a weaker notion of *detectability* [43,12,63,38,21,11], which means that whether one could determine the current and subsequent states by using observed information.

Discrete-event systems (DESs) consists of discrete states and transitions between states caused by spontaneous occurrences of events [6,52], where states and events are partially observed. DESs could also be regarded as a suitable model for the cyber-layer of *cyber-physical systems* (CPSs) that are ubiquitous in control engineering, computer technology, communication engineering, etc. Usually, a CPS consists of a cyber layer and a physical layer, where the former is a decision process that is usually a discrete system, and the latter usually comprises several physical processes modeled by differential equations. The two layers are connected by networks, where the cyber layer should be able to monitor the working status of the physical layer in real time, and also allocate commands to the physical layer, both through networks. In such a way, DESs play a central role in governing global behavior of CPSs, and the detectability property of DESs is of particular importance in governing the global behavior.

1.2 Fault diagnosis/prediction

As mentioned before, DESs have two partially observed components, states and events. Hence one may be interested in inference problems of either states or events by using observed information. The inference problem to the former is formulated

as detectability as mentioned before. While the inference of occurrences of several events could be formulated as *diagnosability* [27,37], where if the property holds then once a special event (usually regarded to be faulty) occurred, after sufficiently many new events occurred, one could make sure that a faulty event (although may not be the previous one) had occurred. This property means inference of occurrences of faulty events. However, from a dual point of view, sometimes the occurrence of a faulty event will lead to great economic loss, which also motivates the study of a dual notion of *predictability* [13], where if this notion holds then before a particular faulty event occurs, one could make sure that some faulty event will definitely occur. The same as detectability, diagnosability also has extensive applications, e.g., in railway traffic systems [3].

1.3 Literature review and an idea of unifying detectability and diagnosability/predictability

In the literature, these properties are treated by using different methods, and most of the corresponding methods rely on (at least one of) TWO FUNDAMENTAL ASSUMPTIONS that a system is deadlock-free (which means that it can always run), and has no unobservable reachable cycle (which means its running can always be observed). The two assumptions for FSAs are formulated in Assumption 1. The notions of *strong detectability* and *weak detectability* are two fundamental notions of detectability of DESs. The former implies that there is delay n , for each infinite-length output sequence generated by a DES, each prefix of the output sequence of length greater than n allows reconstructing the current state. While the latter implies that there is delay n , for some infinite-length output sequence generated by a DES, each prefix of the output sequence of length greater than n allows doing that. These two notions are first studied in the seminal paper [43]. Under Assumption 1, a polynomial-time verification algorithm based on a *detector* method for strong detectability and an exponential-time verification algorithm based on an *observer* method for weak detectability are given in [41] and [43], respectively. Later, verifying weak detectability is proved to be PSPACE-hard, even for deterministic fully-observed FSAs [59, 30]. Initial results on detectability of labeled Petri nets could be found in [60, 31, 61], where in [60], weak detectability is proved to be undecidable for labeled Petri nets with inhibitor arcs, and later this undecidable result is strengthened to hold for labeled Petri nets in [31]; strong detectability is proved to be decidable in [31] for labeled Petri nets under the two fundamental assumptions for labeled Petri nets, and later the decidable result is strengthened to hold only based on the second of the two assumptions in [64]. Results on essentially different variants of detectability notions could be found in [61]. In [62], a *concurrent-composition* method is found to verify strong detectability of FSAs in polynomial time without any assumption, where the concurrent-composition structure exactly comes from characterizing *negation* of strong detectability. Note that the terminology “concurrent composition” is not a new one, but already exists in the literature, representing similar operations to automata or transition systems compared to those in the current paper.

For diagnosability of FSAs, in the seminal paper [37], the notion is first formulated, and an exponential-time verification algorithm based on a *diagnoser* method is given also under Assumption 1. Later on, a *twin-plant* method is developed respectively in [19, 46] so that polynomial-time verification algorithms are designed, but still under Assumption 1. After comparing the twin-plant structure with the concurrent-composition structure, one can see that the former is actually a simplified version of the latter. In more details, in the former, unobservable transitions are not synchronized but only common observable transitions are synchronized; while in the latter, observable transitions are synchronized as pairs, and unobservable transitions are also synchronized, so more information is contained. Later on, the twin-plant method has been extended so that it does not rely on Assumption 1 any more, e.g., in [33]. On the other hand, there is an alternative verification algorithm for diagnosability given in [49] without any assumption, but the algorithm runs in exponential time, because it is based on the observer proposed in [43] that is of exponential complexity. Further related works could be found in [53, 45, 56, 54, 17, 8], etc. The notion of predictability is first proposed in [13], in which a polynomial-time verification algorithm is designed, under ii) of Assumption 1. Differently from detectability, there exist a large number of publications on diagnosability and predictability with their variants, it is partially because in the seminal paper [37], it is not defined what diagnosability is for a terminating transition sequence. We can introduce only a few of them. We refer the reader to [16] for more related references. For results on diagnosability of labeled Petri nets, we refer the reader to [5, 2, 57, 15], etc. In [5], a new technique is developed to verify diagnosability; in [57], diagnosability is proved to be decidable with EXPSPACE lower bound under the first of the two fundamental assumptions; in [2], a weaker notion of diagnosability called trace diagnosability is proved to have EXPSPACE upper bound and lower bound without any assumption.

Sometimes, limited by the ability of external observers, not all observable events could be observed, which weakens the possibility of determining states or occurrences of events. In order to deal with such a setting, a *decentralized version* of the above properties is investigated. In a decentralized version, one chooses several observers and put them into different places, and takes into accounts the results returned by all local observers and makes a final verification whether the system satisfies a property. In such a way, the original version of a property could be call the *centralized version*. A *decentralized version of diagnosability* called *co-diagnosability* of FSAs is firstly studied in [10] and later revisited in [34, 50], etc., by extending the original twin-plant structure. The results in [34, 50] hardly rely on Assumption 1, while it is clearly shown in [33] that a simplified version of the extended twin-plant structures used in [34, 50] does not rely on any assumption. Actually, the verification algorithm shown in [33] runs in exponential time, but not in polynomial time as is claimed. The problems of verifying decentralized versions of diagnosability for deterministic FSAs are proved to be PSPACE-hard [7], and a PSPACE upper bound is also given based on item i) of Assumption 1 for *timed automata* that are substantially more general than FSAs.

The results on decentralized versions of predictability of FSAs could be found in [28, 26], where the notion of co-predictability studied in [28] is exactly the decentralized version of the predictability proposed in [13], and is equivalent to the

notion of uniform bounded prognosability studied in [26]. The results in [28] are based on Assumption 1; but in [26], the results work after adding at each deadlock state an unobservable self-loop. We will point out that such a modification does not always preserve (co)-diagnosability or (co)-predictability, as will shown in Remarks 2 and 3. Further results can be found in [58,55], etc. Unlike diagnosability or predictability, there exists almost no result on a decentralized version of detectability. The only results on decentralized versions of detectability could be found in [40], but the notions are not very reasonable, because they require some local observer to observe all observable events, so they are actually equivalent to centralized versions of detectability. In addition, language-based decentralized observability results (called joint observability) could be found in [48,14], where generally the verification problem is undecidable. In this paper, we will reformulate a notion of co-detectability that matches a decentralized setting, and characterize its complexity.

To sum up, there have been plenty of results on decentralized versions of diagnosability and predictability of FSAs, while there has been almost no result on a decentralized version of detectability. We will formulate a notion of co-detectability, and extend the concurrent-composition method developed in [62,61] to give a method for verifying co-detectability of FSAs, without any assumption or modifying the FSAs. We will also show that the method also works for co-diagnosability and co-predictability after being simplified. Moreover, we will characterize complexity of the notions of co-detectability, co-diagnosability, and co-predictability. As potential extensions, these results could be used to study more general distributed versions of these notions under weaker assumptions compared to existing results in the literature (e.g., in [55,23]).

1.4 Contributions

The contributions of the paper are listed as follows (briefly illustrated in Tabs. 1 and 2 together with related results in the literature).

1. We formulate a notion of co-detectability, use the concurrent-composition method to give a PSPACE verification algorithm for the property. We also prove that it is coNP-hard to verify the notion by reducing the known NP-complete *acyclic deterministic finite automata (DFAs) intersection problem* [36] to negation of co-detectability.
2. For co-diagnosability and co-predictability in the literature, we use the concurrent-composition method to give a PSPACE verification algorithm for both properties. We also prove that it is PSPACE-hard to verify co-predictability by reducing the known PSPACE-complete *DFAs intersection problem* [25] to negation of co-predictability (a PSPACE lower bound for co-diagnosability is already given in [7]).

In the subsequent main results, one will see that in order to characterize co-detectability, more technical difficulties will be met than to deal with co-diagnosability and co-predictability, because in co-detectability, generated outputs are counted, but in co-diagnosability and co-predictability, only generated events are counted. When one output was counted, any number of unobservable events could have occurred.

co-detectability	co-diagnosability	co-predictability
PSPACE (Thm. 2)	PSPACE (Thm. 6)	PSPACE (Thm. 8)
coNP-hard (Thm. 4)	PSPACE-hard ([7])	PSPACE-hard (Thm. 10)

Table 1 Complexity results for decentralized versions of detectability, diagnosability, and predictability of finite-state automata.

strong detectability	diagnosability	predictability
NL (Thm. 3)	NL-complete ([2])	NL-complete (Thm. 9)
NL-hard ([30])		

Table 2 Complexity results for strong detectability, diagnosability, and predictability of finite-state automata.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we introduce preliminaries on FSAs and languages, and the notion of concurrent composition of FSAs. In Section 3, we show main results. Finally in Section 4, we show a short conclusion.

2 Preliminaries

Next we introduce necessary notions that will be used throughout this paper. Symbols \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{Z}_+ denote the sets of natural numbers and positive integers, respectively. For a set Σ , Σ^* and Σ^ω are used to denote the sets of finite sequences (called *words*) of elements of Σ including the empty word ϵ and infinite sequences (called *configurations*) of elements of Σ , respectively. As usual, we denote $\Sigma^+ = \Sigma^* \setminus \{\epsilon\}$. For a word $s \in \Sigma^*$, $|s|$ stands for its length, and we set $|s'| = +\infty$ for all $s' \in \Sigma^\omega$. For $s \in \Sigma$ and natural number k , s^k and s^ω denote the k -length word and configuration consisting of copies of s 's, respectively. For a word (configuration) $s \in \Sigma^*$ (Σ^ω), a word $s' \in \Sigma^*$ is called a *prefix* of s , denoted as $s' \sqsubset s$, if there exists another word (configuration) $s'' \in \Sigma^*$ (Σ^ω) such that $s = s's''$. For two natural numbers $i \leq j$, $[i, j]$ denotes the set of all integers between i and j including i and j ; and for a set S , $|S|$ its cardinality and 2^S its power set.

2.1 Finite automata

A *nondeterministic finite automaton* (NFA) is a 5-tuple

$$\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F), \quad (1)$$

where Q is a finite set of *states*, Σ is a finite *alphabet*, elements of Σ are called *letters* [22] (also called *events* (cf. [35, 43], etc.)), $q_0 \in Q$ is the *initial state*, $F \subset Q$ is the set of *accepting states* (also called *final states* [22] or *marker states* [35]), $\delta \subset Q \times \Sigma \times Q$ is a *transition relation*. A word $\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_n \in \Sigma^* \setminus \{\epsilon\}$ is called *accepted by* \mathcal{A} if there exist states $q_1, \dots, q_n \in Q$ such that $q_n \in F$ and $(q_i, \sigma_{i+1}, q_{i+1}) \in \delta$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$. Particularly ϵ is *accepted by* \mathcal{A} if and only if $q_0 \in F$. The set of words accepted by \mathcal{A} is called the *language recognized by* \mathcal{A} . Automaton \mathcal{A} is called *acyclic* if there is no cycle in \mathcal{A} ; called *complete* if for each state $q \in Q$ and each letter

$\sigma \in \Sigma$, there is a transition $(q, \sigma, q') \in \delta$ for some $q' \in Q$; and called a *deterministic finite automaton* (DFA) if for all $q_1, q'_2, q''_2 \in Q$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$, $(q_1, \sigma, q'_2) \in \delta$ and $(q_1, \sigma, q''_2) \in \delta$ imply $q'_2 = q''_2$.

2.2 Finite-state automata

A DES can be modeled by an FSA, which can be obtained from an NFA (1) by removing all accepting states, replacing a unique initial state by a set X_0 of initial states, and adding a labeling function ℓ .

Formally, an FSA is a sextuple

$$\mathcal{S} = (X, T, X_0, \delta, \Sigma, \ell), \quad (2)$$

where X is a finite set of *states*, T a finite set of *events*, $X_0 \subset X$ a set of *initial states*, $\delta \subset X \times T \times X$ a *transition relation*, Σ a finite set of *outputs (labels)*, and $\ell : T \rightarrow \Sigma \cup \{\epsilon\}$ a *labeling function*, where ϵ denotes the empty word. The event set T can be rewritten as disjoint union of *observable* event set T_o and *unobservable* event set T_ϵ , where events of T_o are with label in Σ , but events of T_ϵ are labeled by ϵ . When an observable event occurs, its label can be observed, but when an unobservable event occurs, nothing can be observed. For an observable event $t \in T$, we say t can be directly observed if $\ell(t)$ differs from $\ell(t')$ for any other $t' \in T$. Transition relation $\delta \subset X \times T \times X$ can be recursively extended to $\delta \subset X \times T^* \times X$ as follows: (1) for all $x, x' \in X$, $(x, \epsilon, x') \in \delta$ if and only if $x = x'$; (2) for all $x, x' \in X$, $s \in T^*$, and $t \in T$, one has $(x, st, x') \in \delta$, also denoted by $x \xrightarrow{st} x'$, called a *transition sequence*, if and only if (x, s, x'') , $(x'', t, x') \in \delta$ for some $x'' \in X$. Labeling function $\ell : T \rightarrow \Sigma \cup \{\epsilon\}$ can be recursively extended to $\ell : T^* \cup T^\omega \rightarrow \Sigma^* \cup \Sigma^\omega$ as $\ell(t_1 t_2 \dots) = \ell(t_1)\ell(t_2)\dots$ and $\ell(\epsilon) = \epsilon$. Transitions $x \xrightarrow{t} x'$ with $\ell(t) = \epsilon$ are called *unobservable transitions*, and other transitions are called *observable transitions*. The event set T can also be rewritten as disjoint union of *controllable* event set T_c and *uncontrollable* event set T_{uc} , where controllable events are such that one can disable their occurrences, and uncontrollable events are such that one cannot do that. Analogously, transitions $x \xrightarrow{t} x'$ with t being controllable are called *controllable*, and other transitions are called *uncontrollable*. For $x \in X$ and $s \in T^+$, (x, s, x) is called a *transition cycle* if $(x, s, x) \in \delta$. An *observable transition cycle* is defined by a transition cycle with at least one observable transition. Analogously an *unobservable transition cycle* is defined by a transition cycle with no observable transition. Automaton \mathcal{S} is called *deterministic* if for all $x, x', x'' \in X$ and $t \in T$, $(x, t, x'), (x, t, x'') \in \delta$ imply $x' = x''$.

A state $x \in X$ is called *deadlock* if $(x, t, x') \notin \delta$ for any $t \in T$ and $x' \in X$. \mathcal{S} is called *deadlock-free* if it has no deadlock state. We say a state $x' \in X$ is *reachable* from a state $x \in X$ if there exists $s \in T^+$ such that $x \xrightarrow{s} x'$. We say a subset X' of X is *reachable* from a state $x \in X$ if some state of X' is reachable from x . Similarly a state $x \in X$ is *reachable* from a subset X' of X if x is reachable from some state of X' . We call a state $x \in X$ *reachable* if either $x \in X_0$ or it is reachable from some initial state. We denote by $\text{Acc}(\mathcal{S})$ the *accessible part* of \mathcal{S} that is obtained by removing all unreachable states of \mathcal{S} .

We use $L(\mathcal{S}) = \{s \in T^* | (\exists x_0 \in X_0)(\exists x \in X)[x_0 \xrightarrow{s} x]\}$ to denote the set of finite-length event sequences generated by \mathcal{S} , we also use $L^\omega(\mathcal{S}) = \{t_1 t_2 \dots \in T^\omega | (\exists x_0 \in X_0)(\exists x_1, x_2, \dots \in X)[x_0 \xrightarrow{t_1} x_1 \xrightarrow{t_2} \dots]\}$ to denote the set of infinite-length event sequences generated by \mathcal{S} . For each $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$, we denote by $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{S}, \sigma)$ the *current state estimate*, i.e., set of states that the system can be in after σ has been observed, i.e., $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{S}, \sigma) := \{x \in X | (\exists x_0 \in X_0)(\exists s \in T^*)[(\ell(s) = \sigma) \wedge (x_0 \xrightarrow{s} x)]\}$. $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S})$ denotes the *language generated* by system \mathcal{S} , i.e., $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}) := \{\sigma \in \Sigma^* | \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{S}, \sigma) \neq \emptyset\}$. We use $\mathcal{L}^\omega(\mathcal{S})$ to denote the ω -*language generated* by \mathcal{S} , i.e., $\mathcal{L}^\omega(\mathcal{S}) := \{\sigma \in \Sigma^\omega | (\exists s \in L^\omega(\mathcal{S}))[\ell(s) = \sigma]\}$.

The following two assumptions are commonly used in detectability studies (cf. [43, 41, 42]) and diagnosability studies [37, 19, 46], but are not needed in the current paper.

Assumption 1 An FSA $\mathcal{S} = (X, T, X_0, \delta, \Sigma, \ell)$ satisfies

- (i) \mathcal{S} is deadlock-free,
- (ii) \mathcal{S} is prompt (or divergence-free), i.e., for every reachable state $x \in X$ and every nonempty unobservable event sequence $s \in (T_\epsilon)^+$, $(x, s, x) \notin \delta$.

2.3 Concurrent composition

The concurrent-composition structure was found in [61] when *negation* of stronger versions of detectability was characterized. It provides a polynomial-time verification method to strong detectability [62, 64] without any assumption, which strengthens the detector method for verifying strong detectability proposed in [41] under Assumption 1. In this paper, we extend the concurrent composition structure from two automata to a finite number of automata, and show that it could provide a unified approach to verifying decentralized versions of strong detectability, diagnosability, and predictability, without any assumption or changing the automata under consideration.

Given $L \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and a number $L + 1$ of FSAs $\mathcal{S}_i = (X^i, T^i, X_0^i, \delta^i, \Sigma^i, \ell^i)$, $i \in [0, L]$, we construct the *concurrent composition*

$$\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}_0; \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L) := (X', T', X_0', \delta') \quad (3)$$

of $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L$ with respect to \mathcal{S}_0 as follows:

1. $X' = X^0 \times X^1 \times \dots \times X^L$;
2. $T' \subset (T^0 \cup \{\epsilon\}) \times (T^1 \cup \{\epsilon\}) \times \dots \times (T^L \cup \{\epsilon\})$, where for all $(\check{t}^0, \check{t}^1, \dots, \check{t}^L) \in (T^0 \cup \{\epsilon\}) \times (T^1 \cup \{\epsilon\}) \times \dots \times (T^L \cup \{\epsilon\})$, $(\check{t}^0, \check{t}^1, \dots, \check{t}^L) \in T'$ if and only if one of the followings holds:
 - (a) $\ell^j(\check{t}^0) = \epsilon$ for all $j \in [1, L]$ such that $\check{t}^0 \in T^j \cup \{\epsilon\}$ (which includes the case $\check{t}^0 \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^L T^i$):
 $\ell^k(\check{t}^k) = \epsilon$ for all $k \in [1, L]$, and $\check{t}^l \neq \epsilon$ for only one $l \in [0, L]$,
 - (b) $\ell^j(\check{t}^0) \neq \epsilon$ for some $j \in [1, L]$ such that $\check{t}^0 \in T^j$:
for all $l \in [1, L]$, $\check{t}^l = \epsilon$ if $\ell^l(\check{t}^0) = \epsilon$ or $\check{t}^0 \notin T^l$, $\ell^l(\check{t}^l) = \ell^l(\check{t}^0)$ otherwise;
3. $X_0' = X_0^0 \times X_0^1 \times \dots \times X_0^L$;

4. for all $(\check{x}^0, \check{x}^1, \dots, \check{x}^L), (\check{y}^0, \check{y}^1, \dots, \check{y}^L) \in X'$, and $(\check{t}^0, \check{t}^1, \dots, \check{t}^L) \in T'$, one has $((\check{x}^0, \check{x}^1, \dots, \check{x}^L), (\check{t}^0, \check{t}^1, \dots, \check{t}^L), (\check{y}^0, \check{y}^1, \dots, \check{y}^L)) \in \delta'$ if and only if
- for all $i \in [0, L]$, $\check{x}^i = \check{y}^i$ if $\check{t}^i = \epsilon$, $(\check{x}^i, \check{t}^i, \check{y}^i) \in \delta^i$ otherwise.

For all $\check{t}^0 \in T^0$ and $i \in [1, L]$ such that $\check{t}^0 \notin T^i$, we denote $\ell^i(\check{t}^0) = \epsilon$. For an event sequence $s' \in (T')^*$, we use $s'(i)$ to denote its i -th component, $i \in [0, L]$. This notation is applied to states of X' and transition sequences of (3) as well. Then for all $i \in [1, L]$, one has $\ell^i(s'(0)) = \ell^i(s'(i)) =: \ell^i(s')$. Then one observes $\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}_0; \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L)$ aggregates all transition sequences of $\mathcal{S}_0, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L$ starting from initial states such that the transition sequences in \mathcal{S}_i and \mathcal{S}_0 produce the same label sequence under labeling function ℓ^i , $i \in [1, L]$. Hence we call this notion the concurrent composition of $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L$ with respect to \mathcal{S}_0 . When $L = 1$ and $\mathcal{S}_0 = \mathcal{S}_1$, (3) reduces to the concurrent composition used in [61, 64]. The above observation could be formulated as the following proposition, we omit its straightforward proof.

Proposition 1 Consider FSAs $\mathcal{S}_i = (X^i, T^i, X_0^i, \delta^i, \Sigma^i, \ell^i)$, $i \in [0, L]$, and transition sequences $x_0^i \xrightarrow{s^i} x^i$ of \mathcal{S}_i with x_0^i being initial and $s^i \in (T^i)^*$. If for all $i \in [1, L]$, $\ell^i(s^0) = \ell^i(s^i)$, then in concurrent composition $\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}_0; \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L)$, there is a transition sequence $x_0^j \xrightarrow{s^j} x^j$ the j -th component of which equals the above $x_0^i \xrightarrow{s^i} x^i$ for all $j \in [0, L]$.

Concurrent composition $\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}_0; \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L)$ has at most $|X^0| \times |X^1| \times \dots \times |X^L|$ states, the number of its transitions shown in 2a) is bounded by $\sum_{i=0}^L |T_\epsilon^i|$, where T_ϵ^i is the unobservable event set of automaton \mathcal{S}_i , the number of its transitions shown in 2b) is bounded by $\prod_{i=0}^L |T_o^i|$, where T_o^i is the observable event set of automaton \mathcal{S}_i , $i \in [0, L]$. Hence $\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}_0; \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L)$ has at most $|X^0|^2 \times |X^1|^2 \times \dots \times |X^L|^2 \times (\prod_{i=0}^L |T_o^i| + \sum_{i=0}^L |T_\epsilon^i|)$ transitions.

3 Main results

Consider an FSA \mathcal{S} (2). In order to formulate co-detectability, we first choose a number $L \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ of locations, where in each location there is a *local observer* O_i who can observe a subset $T_i \subset T_o$ of observable events via *local labeling function* $O_i : T_i \rightarrow \Sigma \cup \{\epsilon\}$: if an observable event $t \in T_i$ occurs, then O_i observes $\ell(t)$, which is denoted by $O_i(t) = \ell(t)$; however, if an event $t \in T \setminus T_i$ occurs, then O_i observes nothing, which is denoted by $O_i(t) = \epsilon$. In this sense, we also call labeling function ℓ the *global observer*. O_i is also recursively extended to $O_i : T^* \cup T^\omega \rightarrow \Sigma^* \cup \Sigma^\omega$. Corresponding to observer O_i , we say an event $t \in T_i$ is O_i -*observable*, and $t \in T \setminus T_i$ is O_i -*unobservable*. We write the set of local observers by $O = \{O_i | i \in [1, L]\}$. For each $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$, we denote the *current state estimate via* O_i by $\mathcal{M}_{O_i}(\mathcal{S}, \sigma) := \{x \in X | (\exists x_0 \in X_0)(\exists s \in T^*)[(O_i(s) = \sigma) \wedge ((x_0, s, x) \in \delta)]\}$. Similarly, we denote $\mathcal{M}_{O_i}(X', \sigma) := \{x \in X' | (\exists x_0' \in X_0')(\exists s \in T'^*)[(O_i(s) = \sigma) \wedge ((x_0', s, x) \in \delta')]\}$ for all $X' \subset X$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$. We also call automaton

$$\mathcal{S}_i = (X, T, X_0, \delta, \Sigma, O_i) \quad (4)$$

local automaton in location i of automaton \mathcal{S} , $i \in [1, L]$.

3.1 Co-detectability

3.1.1 Formulation

We extend the notion of strong detectability studied in [43,41] (shown in Definition 1) to a decentralized version (shown in Definition 2). Definition 1 implies that there is a time delay k , for each infinite-length event sequence generated by \mathcal{S} , every prefix of the label sequence generated by the event sequence of length no less than k allows reconstructing the current state. More generally, Definition 2 implies that there is a time delay k , for each infinite-length event sequence generated by \mathcal{S} , in some location i , every prefix of the label sequence generated by the event sequence via O_i of length no less than k allows reconstructing the current state.

Definition 1 (StrDet) An FSA \mathcal{S} (2) is called *strongly detectable* if

$$\begin{aligned} & (\exists k \in \mathbb{N})(\forall s \in L^\omega(\mathcal{S}))(\forall \sigma \sqsubset \ell(s)) \\ & [(|\sigma| \geq k) \implies (|\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{S}, \sigma)| = 1)]. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2 (CoDet) An FSA \mathcal{S} (2) is called *O-co-detectable* if

$$\begin{aligned} & (\exists k \in \mathbb{N})(\forall s \in L^\omega(\mathcal{S}))(\exists i \in [1, L])(\forall \sigma \sqsubset O_i(s)) \\ & [(|\sigma| \geq k) \implies (|\mathcal{M}_{O_i}(\mathcal{S}, \sigma)| = 1)]. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2 means that an FSA \mathcal{S} is O-co-detectable if for each infinite-length event sequence generated by \mathcal{S} , at least one local observer can determine the current and subsequent states after a common observation time delay k that does not depend on infinite-length event sequences. When $L = 1$ and $O_1 = \ell$, Definition 2 reduces to Definition 1. Note that when we consider O-co-detectability of \mathcal{S} , the labeling function ℓ works if and only if $T_o = T_i$ for some $i \in [1, L]$, i.e., one local observer can observe all observable events. In this case, O-co-detectability is equivalent to strong detectability. Otherwise, one has $T_i \subsetneq T_o$ for all $i \in [1, L]$.

The notion of strong detectability studied in [62,64] is strictly weaker than Definition 1. The former is defined as follows: $(\exists k \in \mathbb{N})(\forall s \in L^\omega(\mathcal{S}))(\forall \sigma' \sqsubset \sigma)[(|\sigma'| \geq k) \implies (|\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{S}, \sigma')| = 1)]$. The former can describe more systems than the latter, and they are quite close to each other, so the former works better in a centralized setting. However, since the former directly relies on observation sequences, it is not easy to extend it to a decentralized setting, since in different locations, the local labeling functions may differ.

The notion of strong co-detectability formulated in [40] is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\exists k \in \mathbb{N})(\forall s \in L^\omega(\mathcal{S}))(\forall \sigma \sqsubset \ell(s)) \\ & [(|\sigma| \geq k) \implies ((\exists i \in [1, L])(|\mathcal{M}_{O_i}(\mathcal{S}, O_i(s))| = 1))]. \end{aligned}$$

This notion is actually not well defined, because $\mathcal{M}_{O_i}(\mathcal{S}, O_i(s))$ may not be well defined, as $O_i(s)$ may be of infinite length. Even if after changing $O_i(s)$ to a prefix of itself, which makes this notion well defined, this notion is not very reasonable, because the usage of $\ell(s)$ in this notion requires some local observer to observe all

observable events, otherwise one may have $O_i(s) = \epsilon$. The notion actually implies strong detectability that is in a centralized setting. We are not interested in extending the notion of weak detectability studied in [43,41,62,64] to a decentralized version, since it is too weak so that it is very difficult to use this notion to determine the current and subsequent states.

The problem considered in this subsection is formulated as follows.

Problem 1 (FSA CO-DETECTABILITY)

INSTANCE: An FSA \mathcal{S} (2) and a set $O = \{O_i | i \in [1, L]\}$ of local observers.

QUESTION: Is \mathcal{S} O-co-detectable?

The size of the input of Problem 1 is $|\mathcal{S}| + \sum_{i=1}^L |T_i| \leq |\mathcal{S}| + L|T|$, where $|\mathcal{S}|$ is the size of \mathcal{S} , i.e., the number of states and the number of transitions, plus the labeling function, each T_i is the set of O_i -observable events.

3.1.2 Equivalent condition

In the sequel, in order to develop an equivalent condition for O-co-detectability without any assumption or changing the FSAs, we consider its negation. To implement this idea, we first show negation of O-co-detectability as follows.

Proposition 2 *An FSA \mathcal{S} (2) is not O-co-detectable if and only if*

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N})(\exists s_k \in L^\omega(\mathcal{S}))(\forall i \in [1, L])(\exists \sigma_i \sqsubset O_i(s_k)) \\ [(|\sigma_i| \geq k) \wedge (|\mathcal{M}_{O_i}(\mathcal{S}, \sigma_i)| > 1)].$$

In order to derive an equivalent condition for negation of O-co-detectability, we need an extra structure. Given a concurrent composition $CC_A(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L)$ (3), we compute a variant

$$CC_A^\diamond(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L) \quad (5)$$

from (3) as follows: (i) Add new states to (3) to make its state set become $X \times (X \cup \{\diamond\})^L$, where \diamond is a fresh state not in X . (ii) For each state (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_L) in $X \times (X \cup \{\diamond\})^L$ satisfying $x_0 \neq x_i$ for some $i \in [1, L]$, at x_0 we choose an arbitrary transition $(x_0, t_0, x'_0) \in \delta$ with $t_0 \in T \cup \{\epsilon\}$; at each $x_j, j \in [1, L]$, such that $x_j = x_0$, choose an arbitrary transition $(x_j, t_j, x'_j) \in \delta$ with $t_j \in T \cup \{\epsilon\}$; at each $x_k, k \in [1, L]$, such that $x_k \neq x_0$, we define transition $x_k \xrightarrow{t_k} x'_k$, where $t_k = x'_k = \diamond$; add transition $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_L) \xrightarrow{(t_0, t_1, \dots, t_L)} (x'_0, x'_1, \dots, x'_L)$ to (3) whenever $(x_0, x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_l}) \xrightarrow{(t_0, t_{j_1}, \dots, t_{j_l})} (x'_0, x'_{j_1}, \dots, x'_{j_l})$ is a transition of $CC_A(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_{j_1}, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{j_l})$ or $t_0 = t_{j_1} = \dots = t_{j_l} = \epsilon$, where x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_l} are exactly all states in $\{x_1, \dots, x_L\}$ such that $x_{j_1} = \dots = x_{j_l} = x_0$. See Fig. 1 for a sketch. (iii) We define $\ell(\diamond) = \diamond$. We have obtained (5).

Intuitively, in (5), for every transition from state \bar{x}' to state \hat{x}' , the number of \diamond 's in \hat{x}' is no less than the number of \diamond 's in \bar{x}' , and in addition, once a component in \bar{x}' equals \diamond , then the same component in \hat{x}' must also be \diamond . This observation can be stated as follows.

Proposition 3 In (5), there is a transition sequence $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_L) \xrightarrow{s'} (x'_0, \diamond, \dots, \diamond)$ with $x_1, \dots, x_L \in X$ if and only if for each $i \in [1, L]$, in $CC_A(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_i)$, there is a transition sequence $(x_0, x_i) \xrightarrow{s} (\bar{x}_0, \bar{x}_i)$ such that $\bar{x}_0 \neq \bar{x}_i$ and the 0-th component of $(x_0, x_i) \xrightarrow{s} (\bar{x}_0, \bar{x}_i)$ is a prefix of the 0-th component of $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_L) \xrightarrow{s'} (x'_0, \diamond, \dots, \diamond)$.




Fig. 1 Sketch for computing transitions of $CC_A^\diamond(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L)$ (5).

Example 1 Consider FSA \mathcal{S} shown in Fig. 2, where the labeling function ℓ is the identity map, i.e., all events a, b, c, d can be directly observed. Consider two local observers O_1 and O_2 , where a, b can be observed by both observers, but c can only be observed by O_1 , d can only be observed by O_2 . That is, for O_1 , one has $O_1(a) = a$, $O_1(b) = b$, $O_1(c) = c$, and $O_1(d) = \epsilon$; for O_2 , one has $O_2(a) = a$, $O_2(b) = b$, $O_2(c) = \epsilon$, and $O_2(d) = d$. The local automaton corresponding to observer O_i is denoted by \mathcal{S}_i , $i = 1, 2$. Part of the concurrent composition $CC_A^\diamond(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ defined by (5) is drawn in Fig. 3.




Fig. 2 FSA \mathcal{S} with two local automata O_1 and O_2 , where a state with an input arrow from nowhere denotes an initial one, e.g., x_0 .

Theorem 1 An FSA \mathcal{S} (2) is not O -co-detectable if and only if in concurrent composition $CC_A^\diamond(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L)$ (5), where each \mathcal{S}_i is the local automaton corresponding to observer O_i defined by (4), $i \in [1, L]$,

there is a transition sequence (6a)

$$x'_0 \xrightarrow{s'_1} x'_1 \xrightarrow{s'_2} x'_1 \xrightarrow{s'_3} x'_2 \xrightarrow{s'_4} x'_2 \xrightarrow{s'_5} \dots \xrightarrow{s'_{2L-1}} x'_L \xrightarrow{s'_{2L}} x'_L \xrightarrow{s'_{2L+1}} x'_{L+1} \quad (6b)$$




Fig. 3 Part of concurrent composition $\text{CC}_A^\diamond(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$, where \mathcal{S} and its two local automata $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2$ are shown in Fig. 2 and in Example 1.

such that x'_0 is initial; (6c)

for each $i \in [1, L]$, there is $k_i \in [1, L]$ such that $x'_i(k_i) \in X$,

$O_{k_i}(s'_{2i}(0)) = O_{k_i}(s'_{2i}(i)) \in \Sigma^+$, and $k_j \neq k_{j'}$ for all different $j, j' \in [1, L]$; (6d)

for all $i \in [1, L]$, $x'_{L+1}(i) = \diamond$; (6e)

and in \mathcal{S} , there is a transition cycle reachable from $x'_{L+1}(0)$. (6f)

Proof “if”: Assume Eqn. (6) holds. According to (6), for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we choose

$$s'_1(0)(s'_2(0))^k s'_3(0)(s'_4(0))^k \dots s'_{2L-1}(0)(s'_{2L}(0))^k s'_{2L+1}(0) =: \hat{s}' \in L(\mathcal{S}),$$

then we have for every $i \in [1, L]$,

$$|O_{k_i}(s'_1(0)(s'_2(0))^k \dots s'_{2i-1}(0)(s'_{2i}(0))^k)| \geq ik,$$

and there is $\sigma_i \sqsubset O_{k_i}(\hat{s}')$ such that

$$|\mathcal{M}_{O_{k_i}}(\mathcal{S}, \sigma_i)| > 1.$$

In addition, the transition cycle reachable from $x'_{2L+1}(0)$ can be extended to an infinite transition sequence, we conclude that \mathcal{S} is not O-co-detectable by Proposition 2.

“only if”: Assume \mathcal{S} is not O-co-detectable. Choose sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then by Propositions 1, 2, and 3, in (5), there is a transition sequence

$$x'_0 \xrightarrow{s'} x'_{L+1} \tag{7}$$

such that

x'_0 is initial; (8a)

$x'_{L+1}(i) = \diamond$ for all $i \in [1, L]$; (8b)

for every $i \in [1, L]$, there is $s'_i \sqsubset s'$ such that $|O_i(s'_i(0))| \geq n$, (8c)

and $x'_i(0) \neq x'_i(i) \in X$, where x'_i is such that $x'_0 \xrightarrow{s'_i} x'_i$ is a prefix of (7); (8d)

and in \mathcal{S} , there is a transition cycle reachable from $x'_{L+1}(0)$. (8e)

Fix $j \in [1, L]$, and consider the above sub-transition sequence

$$x'_0 \xrightarrow{s'_j} x'_j \quad (9)$$

of (7). Since $|O_j(s'_j(0))| \geq n$, and n is sufficiently large, by the Pigeonhole Principle and the structure of (5), in (9) there is a sub-transition cycle

$$\bar{x}'_j \xrightarrow{\bar{s}'_j} \bar{x}'_j \quad (10)$$

such that $\bar{x}'_j(j) \in X$ and $O_j(\bar{s}'_j(0)) \in \Sigma^+$. We can make the following two modifications repetitively to (7) in order to obtain an extension of (7) such that for all different $i, j \in [1, L]$, there exist non-overlap sub-transition cycles shown in (10), and (8) is still satisfied. Thus, (6) holds.

(i) Assume for some different $i, j \in [1, L]$, there is a sub-transition sequence

$$x'_i \xrightarrow{s'_{i_1}} x'_j \xrightarrow{s'_{j_1}} x'_i \xrightarrow{s'_{i_2}} x'_j \quad (11)$$

in (7) such that $O_i(s'_{i_1}(0)s'_{j_1}(0)) \in \Sigma^+$, $O_j(s'_{j_1}(0)s'_{i_2}(0)) \in \Sigma^+$, and $x'_i(i), x'_j(j) \in X$. We replace (11) by

$$x'_i \xrightarrow{s'_{i_1}} x'_j \xrightarrow{s'_{j_1}} x'_i \xrightarrow{s'_{i_2}} x'_j \xrightarrow{s'_{j_1}} x'_i \xrightarrow{s'_{i_2}} x'_j, \quad (12)$$

where (12) contains non-overlap sub-transition cycles $x'_i \xrightarrow{s'_{i_1}} x'_j \xrightarrow{s'_{j_1}} x'_i$ and $x'_j \xrightarrow{s'_{j_1}} x'_i \xrightarrow{s'_{i_2}} x'_j$.

(ii) On the other hand, assume for some different $i, j \in [1, L]$, there is a sub-transition sequence

$$x'_i \xrightarrow{s'_{i_1}} x'_j \xrightarrow{s'_{j_1}} x'_i \xrightarrow{s'_{i_2}} x'_j \quad (13)$$

in (7) such that $O_i(s'_{i_1}(0)s'_{j_1}(0)s'_{i_2}(0)) \in \Sigma^+$, $O_j(s'_{j_1}(0)) \in \Sigma^+$, and $x'_i(i), x'_j(j) \in X$. We replace (13) by

$$x'_i \xrightarrow{s'_{i_1}} x'_j \xrightarrow{s'_{j_1}} x'_i \xrightarrow{s'_{i_2}} x'_j \xrightarrow{s'_{i_1}} x'_j \xrightarrow{s'_{j_1}} x'_i \xrightarrow{s'_{i_2}} x'_j, \quad (14)$$

where (14) contains non-overlap sub-transition cycles $x'_i \xrightarrow{s'_{i_1}} x'_j \xrightarrow{s'_{j_1}} x'_i$ and $x'_j \xrightarrow{s'_{j_1}} x'_i \xrightarrow{s'_{i_2}} x'_j$. \square

Example 2 Reconsider the FSA \mathcal{S} in Example 1 (in Fig. 2) with its two local automata \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 . We verify its $\{O_1, O_2\}$ -co-detectability by Theorem 1. In the concurrent composition $\text{CC}_A^\circ(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$, there is a transition sequence

$$\begin{aligned} (x_0, x_0, x_0) &\xrightarrow{(a,a,a)} (x_1, x_1, x_1) \xrightarrow{(b,b,b)} (x_1, x_1, x_1) \xrightarrow{(c,c,\epsilon)} \\ (x_3, x_4, x_1) &\xrightarrow{(d,\diamond,\diamond)} (x_3, \diamond, \diamond) \end{aligned}$$

shown in Fig. 3 such that (x_0, x_0, x_0) is initial, satisfying (6c); in self-loop $(x_1, x_1, x_1) \xrightarrow{(b,b,b)} (x_1, x_1, x_1)$, all components of (x_1, x_1, x_1) are states of \mathcal{S} , and $O_1(b) = O_2(b) = b$ are of positive length, satisfying (6d); the latter two components of state $(x_3, \diamond, \diamond)$ are both \diamond , satisfying (6d); in \mathcal{S} , there is a transition cycle $x_3 \xrightarrow{d} x_3$ reachable from the 0-th component x_3 of $(x_3, \diamond, \diamond)$, satisfying (6e). Hence \mathcal{S} is not $\{O_1, O_2\}$ -co-detectable.

3.1.3 Complexity analysis

Next we prove that Theorem 1 provides a PSPACE verification algorithm for O-co-detectability.

Theorem 2 *Problem 1 belongs to PSPACE.*

Proof By Theorem 1, checking negation of O-co-detectability is equivalent to checking whether (6) holds.

Consider $CC_A^\diamond(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L)$ (5), but we do not construct it explicitly. Guess integers k_1, \dots, k_L between 1 and L such that they are pairwise different, guess states $x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_{L+1}$ of (5). Check (i) x'_1 is reachable, (ii) for all $i \in [1, L]$, x'_{i+1} equals x'_i or x'_{i+1} is reachable from x'_i , (iii) for all $i \in [1, L]$, $x'_i(k_i) \in X$, (iv) for all $i \in [1, L]$, there is a transition cycle $x'_i \xrightarrow{s'_i} x'_i$ such that $O_{k_i}(s'_i(0)) \in \Sigma^+$, (v) $x'_{L+1}(l) = \diamond$ for all $l \in [1, L]$, and (vi) there is a transition cycle in \mathcal{S} reachable from $x'_{L+1}(0)$. All above checking could be done by nondeterministic search based on the transition relation of $CC_A^\diamond(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L)$. Hence whether (6) holds could be verified in NPSPACE, i.e., in PSPACE by Savitch's theorem [39]. Then by PSPACE = coPSPACE, Problem 1 belongs to PSPACE. \square

Corollary 1 *Strong detectability of FSA (2) can be verified in PTIME.*

Proof The condition in Theorem 1 in case of $L = 1$ and $O_1 = \ell$ can be verified in linear time in the size of $CC_A^\diamond(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S})$ by computing all its strongly connected components, and $CC_A^\diamond(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S})$ can be computed in quadratic polynomial time in the size of \mathcal{S} . \square

In [30], the NL-hardness of verifying strong detectability of deterministic and deadlock-free FSAs with a single initial state and a single (observable) event was proved, an NL upper bound for verifying strong detectability of FSAs was also given under Assumption 1. Next we show an NL upper bound without any assumption.

Theorem 3 *The problem of verifying strong detectability of FSA (2) belongs to NL.*

Proof Guess states x_1, \bar{x}_1, x_2, x_3 of X . Check in $CC_A^\diamond(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S})$: (i) (x_1, \bar{x}_1) is reachable, (ii) (x_1, \bar{x}_1) belongs to an observable transition cycle, (iii) (x_2, \diamond) is reachable from (x_1, \bar{x}_1) ; and in \mathcal{S} : (iv) x_3 is equal to x_2 or x_3 is reachable from x_2 , (v) x_3 belongs to a transition cycle, all by nondeterministic search. \square

In order to give a lower bound for negation of co-detectability, we adopt the NP-complete acyclic DFA INTERSECTION problem shown in [36, Theorem 1].

Problem 2 (DFA INTERSECTION)

INSTANCE: DFAs $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ over the same alphabet Σ .

QUESTION: Does there exist $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ such that σ is accepted by each \mathcal{A}_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$?

Proposition 4 ([36]) *Problem 2 is NP-complete if the input DFAs are all acyclic.*

Note that the original version proved in [36, Theorem 1] is such that Problem 2 is NP-complete if the input DFAs all recognize finite languages. However, in the proof of [36, Theorem 1], the well-known NP-complete 3-SAT problem is reduced in polynomial time to Problem 2 when all input DFAs are acyclic. Acyclic DFAs all recognize finite languages. Hence Proposition 4 slightly strengthens [36, Theorem 1].

In order to analyze the complexity of co-detectability of FSAs, we strengthen Proposition 4 slightly as follows.

Proposition 5 *Problem 2 is NP-complete if the input DFAs $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ are acyclic, \mathcal{A}_1 has exactly one accepting state, and all other \mathcal{A}_i 's have all states accepting.*

Proof We are given acyclic DFAs $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ over the same alphabet Σ . Construct acyclic DFA \mathcal{A}'_1 from \mathcal{A}_1 by adding transitions $q \xrightarrow{\lambda} \diamond_1$ at each accepting state q , changing all accepting states to be non-accepting, and changing \diamond_1 to be accepting. For each $2 \leq i \leq n$, construct acyclic DFA \mathcal{A}'_i from \mathcal{A}_i by adding transitions $q \xrightarrow{\lambda} \diamond_i$ at each accepting state q , changing all non-accepting states, including \diamond_i , to be accepting. Then \mathcal{A}'_1 has exactly one accepting state \diamond_1 , and $\mathcal{A}'_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}'_n$ have all states accepting. One sees that for each word $w \in \Sigma^*$, w is accepted by all \mathcal{A}_i 's if and only if $w\lambda$ is accepted by all $\mathcal{A}'_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}'_n$. By Proposition 4, this proposition holds. \square

Next we give a lower bound for co-detectability, where the reduction is inspired from the PSPACE-hardness proof of verifying co-diagnosability of deterministic FSAs [7], instead, acyclic DFAs (but not general DFAs) are chosen to do the reduction according to features of co-detectability.

Theorem 4 *Problem 1 is coNP-hard for deterministic FSAs.*

Proof We prove this result by Proposition 5.

We are given acyclic DFAs $\mathcal{A}_0, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ over the same alphabet Σ such that \mathcal{A}_0 has exactly one accepting state and all other \mathcal{A}_i 's have all states accepting. Next we construct an FSA \mathcal{S} from $\mathcal{A}_0, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ in polynomial time as shown in Fig. 4. In each \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in [0, L]$, change each letter (i.e., event) $\sigma \in \Sigma$ to σ_i , and set $\Sigma_i = \{\sigma_i \mid \sigma \in \Sigma\}$ and $\ell(\sigma_i) = \sigma$, where ℓ is the labeling function. Add initial state \diamond_0 and transition $\diamond_0 \xrightarrow{a_i} q$ to the initial state q of each \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in [0, L]$, where \diamond_0 differs from any state of any \mathcal{A}_i , $a_i \notin \bigcup_{i \in [0, L]} \Sigma_i$, and set $\ell(a_i) = a$. Change each initial state of each \mathcal{A}_i to be non-initial, $i \in [0, L]$. Add two states \diamond_1 and \diamond_2 that are not any state of any \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in [0, L]$, and self-loops on them labeled by event a , and set $\ell(a) = a$. At the accepting state of \mathcal{A}_0 , add transition to \diamond_1 labeled by event a . At each non-accepting state of \mathcal{A}_0 and each state of each \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in [1, L]$, add transition to \diamond_2 labeled by a . We have obtained the deterministic FSA \mathcal{S} with a unique initial state. The number of states of \mathcal{S} equals the sum of numbers of states of all \mathcal{A}_i ,




Fig. 4 Sketch of the reduction in the proof of Theorem 4.

$i \in [0, L]$, plus 3 (corresponding to newly added states $\diamond_1, \diamond_2, \diamond_3$). The event set of \mathcal{S} is $\bigcup_{i \in [0, L]} \Sigma_i \cup \{a\} \cup \{a_i | i \in [0, L]\}$.

Now we specify local automaton \mathcal{S}_i , $i \in [1, L]$, we only need to specify the labeling function O_i of each \mathcal{S}_i . For each $i \in [1, L]$, the observable event set is $\Sigma_0 \cup \Sigma_i \cup \{a\} \cup \{a_i | i \in [0, L]\}$. That is, at each location $i \in [1, L]$, observer O_i can observe \mathcal{A}_0 , \mathcal{A}_i , and all transitions outside $\bigcup_{j \in [0, L]} \mathcal{A}_j$.

In order to prove this theorem, we only need to prove that there is a word $w \in \Sigma^*$ that is accepted by all \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in [0, L]$, if and only if, \mathcal{S} is not O-co-detectable.

\Rightarrow : Assume $w = w^1 \dots w^n \in \Sigma^*$ that is accepted by all \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in [0, L]$, where $w^1, \dots, w^n \in \Sigma$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $a_i w_i^1 \dots w_i^n a^\omega \in L^\omega(\mathcal{S})$ for all $i \in [0, L]$. For each $i \in [1, L]$, $O_i(a_i w_i^1 \dots w_i^n a^\omega) = a w a^\omega$. At each location $i \in [1, L]$, for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the current state estimate via O_i is $\mathcal{M}_{O_i}(\mathcal{S}, a w a^n) = \{\diamond_1, \diamond_2\}$. That is, \mathcal{S} is not O-co-detectable by Proposition 2.

\Leftarrow : Since each DFA \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in [0, L]$, is acyclic, it can only generate at most finitely many words (i.e., finite event sequences), denote the length of the longest words generated by \mathcal{A}_i by k_i . And by the structure of \mathcal{S} , each possible infinite event sequence generated by \mathcal{S} can only be of the form $a_i w a^\omega$ for some $i \in [0, L]$, where $w \in \Sigma_i^*$, and $|w| \leq k_i$. Assume that \mathcal{S} is not O-co-detectable. Choose $m = 2 + \max\{k_i | i \in [0, L]\}$, one has there is $a_\iota u a^\omega \in L^\omega(\mathcal{S})$ for some $\iota \in [0, L]$ and $u \in \Sigma_\iota^*$ such that $\mathcal{M}_{O_j}(\mathcal{S}, a O_\iota(u) a^n) = \{\diamond_1, \diamond_2\}$ in each location $i \in [1, L]$, where $|a O_\iota(u) a^n| \geq m$. Assume $u = \epsilon$. Then one has ϵ leads \mathcal{A}_0 to an accepting state and further to \diamond_1 , hence \mathcal{A}_0 has only one state, and ϵ is accepted by \mathcal{A}_0 . Note that ϵ is always accepted by all other \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in [1, L]$, since all states of \mathcal{A}_i are accepting. Assume $u \neq \epsilon$. Assume $\iota = 0$. Then for each $i \in [1, L]$, $O_i(a_\iota u a^n) = a \ell(u) a^n$. Since $\ell(u)$ leads \mathcal{A}_0 to an accepting state and further to \diamond_1 , word $\ell(u)$ is accepted by \mathcal{A}_0 . $\ell(u)$ is also accepted by all \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in [1, L]$, by negation of O-co-detectability. Assume $\iota \in [1, L]$. If $L = 1$, then $\ell(u) = O_\iota(u)$ is accepted by \mathcal{A}_0 and \mathcal{A}_i . If $L > 1$, choose $j \in [1, L]$, $j \neq \iota$, local observer O_j observes $a a^n$, then by $\mathcal{M}_{O_j}(\mathcal{S}, a a^n) = \{\diamond_1, \diamond_2\}$, one has ϵ is accepted by \mathcal{A}_0 . ϵ is always accepted by all \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in [1, L]$. Based on the

above discussion, one always has there is a word $u \in \Sigma^*$ that is accepted by all \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in [0, L]$, which completes the proof. \square

3.2 Co-diagnosability

In this subsection, we study co-diagnosability. To characterize do-diagnosability, we need to simplify concurrent composition (3), but not to extend it as in dealing with co-detectability, because in co-diagnosability, we only need to count occurrences of events, but in co-detectability, we need to count generated outputs.

3.2.1 Formulation

We specify a subset $T_f \subset T$ of faulty events. Transitions containing a faulty event are called *faulty transitions*. In the literature, e.g., in [37, 19, 46], it is widely assumed that all faulty events are unobservable without loss of generality, since if they are observable, then their occurrences could be directly observed. However, we consider a more general case such that there may exist different observable events that produce the same label. So, not all occurrences of all observable faulty events can be directly observed here. For $s \in L(\mathcal{S})$, we write $T_f \in s$ if s contains a faulty event, and $T_f \notin s$ otherwise as usual.

Definition 3 (CoDiag) An FSA \mathcal{S} (2) is called (O, T_f) -co-diagnosable if

$$(\exists k \in \mathbb{N})(\forall s \in L(\mathcal{S}) \cap T^*T_f)(\forall s' : ss' \in L(\mathcal{S})) \\ [(|s'| \geq k) \implies \mathbf{D}],$$

where $\mathbf{D} = (\exists i \in [1, L])(\forall s'' \in L(\mathcal{S}))[(O_i(s'') = O_i(ss')) \implies (T_f \in s'')]$.

This notion means that whenever a faulty event occurs, in at least one location $i \in [1, L]$, the observer O_i can make sure that after a common time delay (representing the number of occurrences of events), all generated event sequences with the same observation must contain a faulty event.

When $L = 1$ and $O_1 = \ell$, Definition 3 reduces to the following notion of *diagnosability* [37, 19, 46]:

Definition 4 (Diag) An FSA \mathcal{S} (2) is called T_f -diagnosable if

$$(\exists k \in \mathbb{N})(\forall s \in L(\mathcal{S}) \cap T^*T_f)(\forall s' : ss' \in L(\mathcal{S})) \\ [(|s'| \geq k) \implies \mathbf{D}],$$

where $\mathbf{D} = (\forall s'' \in L(\mathcal{S}))[(\ell(s'') = \ell(ss')) \implies (T_f \in s'')]$.

We consider the following problem.

Problem 3 (FSA CO-DIAGNOSABILITY)

INSTANCE: An FSA \mathcal{S} (2), a faulty event set $T_f \subset T$, and a set $O = \{O_i | i \in [1, L]\}$ of local observers.

QUESTION: Is \mathcal{S} (O, T_f) -co-diagnosable?

The size of the input of Problem 3 is $|\mathcal{S}| + |T_f| + \sum_{i=1}^L |T_i| \leq |\mathcal{S}| + (L+1)|T|$, where \mathcal{S} and T_i 's are the same as those in Problem 1.

3.2.2 Equivalent condition

Similarly to characterizing O-co-detectability, we show an equivalent condition for (O, T_f) -co-diagnosability through characterizing its negation.

Proposition 6 *An FSA \mathcal{S} (2) is not (O, T_f) -co-diagnosable if and only if*

$$\begin{aligned} & (\forall k \in \mathbb{N})(\exists ss' \in L(\mathcal{S}) : s \in T^*T_f) \\ & [(|s'| \geq k) \wedge \neg \mathbf{D}], \end{aligned}$$

where $\neg \mathbf{D} = (\forall i \in [1, L])(\exists s'' \in L(\mathcal{S}))[(O_i(s'') = O_i(ss')) \wedge (T_f \notin s'')]$.

In order to verify (O, T_f) -co-diagnosability of FSA \mathcal{S} (2), we compute a simplified version

$$\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_1^n, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L^n) \quad (15)$$

of concurrent composition (3), where for each $i \in [1, L]$, automaton \mathcal{S}_i^n is obtained from local automaton \mathcal{S}_i (4) by removing all its faulty transitions, where we call \mathcal{S}_i^n a *normal sub-local automaton in location i* .

Theorem 5 *An FSA \mathcal{S} (2) is not (O, T_f) -co-diagnosable if and only if in concurrent composition $\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_1^n, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L^n) = (X', T', X'_0, \delta')$ (15), where each \mathcal{S}_i^n is the normal sub-local automaton in location i , $i \in [1, L]$,*

there is a transition sequence (16a)

$$x'_0 \xrightarrow{s'_1} x'_1 \xrightarrow{t'} x'_2 \xrightarrow{s'_2} x'_3 \xrightarrow{s'_3} x'_3 \text{ such that} \quad (16b)$$

$$x'_0 \in X'_0, x'_1, x'_2, x'_3 \in X', s'_1, s'_2, s'_3 \in (T')^*, t' \in T'; \quad (16c)$$

$$t'(0) \in T_f; \quad |s'_3(0)| > 0. \quad (16d)$$

Proof “if”: Assume (16) holds. For all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we choose

$$s'_1(0)t'(0)s'_2(0)(s'_3(0))^k \in L(\mathcal{S}),$$

then we have a transition sequence

$$x'_0 \xrightarrow{s'_1} x'_1 \xrightarrow{t'} x'_2 \xrightarrow{s'_2} x'_3 \xrightarrow{s'_3} x'_3 \xrightarrow{s'_3} \dots \xrightarrow{s'_3} x'_3, \quad (17)$$

where $|s'_3(0) \dots s'_3(0)| \geq k$. Since $t'(0)$ is a faulty event, and there exists no faulty event in all components of (17) except for the 0-th component, we have \mathcal{S} is not O-co-diagnosable by Proposition 6.

“only if”: This implication holds by Propositions 1, 6, the finiteness of states of \mathcal{S} , and the Pigeonhole Principle. \square

Remark 1 *Dr. Stéphane Lafortune from University of Michigan also found a so-called verifier-based test for (O, T_f) -co-diagnosability that is equivalent to the result shown in Theorem 5 independently in unpublished course notes provided to the authors. In addition, Theorem 5 is actually equivalent to the result in [33].*

Example 3 Consider the FSA \mathcal{S} shown in Fig. 5, where the labeling function ℓ is defined by $\ell(a) = a$, $\ell(b) = b$, $\ell(f) = \ell(u) = \epsilon$, only f is faulty. Consider two local observers \mathcal{O}_1 and \mathcal{O}_2 , where a can only be observed by \mathcal{O}_1 , b can only be observed by \mathcal{O}_2 . The local automaton corresponding to observer \mathcal{O}_i is denoted by \mathcal{S}_i , $i = 1, 2$, where the corresponding \mathcal{S}_1^n and \mathcal{S}_2^n are shown in Fig. 6. Part of the concurrent composition $\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_1^n, \mathcal{S}_2^n)$ defined by (15) is drawn in Fig. 7.




Fig. 5 FSA \mathcal{S} with two local automata \mathcal{O}_1 and \mathcal{O}_2 .




Fig. 6 Normal sub-local automata \mathcal{S}_1^n (up) and \mathcal{S}_2^n (below) corresponding to \mathcal{S} in Fig. 5.




Fig. 7 Part of concurrent composition $CC_A(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_1^n, \mathcal{S}_2^n)$, where \mathcal{S} is shown in Fig. 5, $\mathcal{S}_1^n, \mathcal{S}_2^n$ are shown in Fig. 6.

We verify its $(\{\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2\}, \{f\})$ -co-diagnosability by Theorem 5. In the concurrent composition $CC_A(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_1^n, \mathcal{S}_2^n)$, there is a transition sequence

$$\begin{aligned} (x_0, x_0, x_0) &\xrightarrow{(a, a, \epsilon)} (x_1, x_2, x_0) \xrightarrow{(\epsilon, \epsilon, a)} (x_1, x_2, x_2) \xrightarrow{(b, \epsilon, b)} (x_3, x_2, x_4) \xrightarrow{(\epsilon, b, \epsilon)} \\ &(x_3, x_4, x_4) \xrightarrow{(f, \epsilon, \epsilon)} (x_5, x_4, x_4) \xrightarrow{(u, \epsilon, \epsilon)} (x_5, x_4, x_4) \end{aligned}$$

shown in Fig. 7 such that (x_0, x_0, x_0) is initial, there is an event (f, ϵ, ϵ) whose 0-th component is f , and after (f, ϵ, ϵ) , there is a transition cycle $(x_5, x_4, x_4) \xrightarrow{(u, \epsilon, \epsilon)} (x_5, x_4, x_4)$ such that the 0-th component of (u, ϵ, ϵ) is of positive length, that is, (16) is satisfied. Hence \mathcal{S} is not $(\{\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2\}, \{f\})$ -co-diagnosable.

Remark 2 We want to point out that the co-diagnosability notion studied in [34] is stronger than Definition 3, here we call the former strong co-diagnosability. Strong co-diagnosability is defined by changing “ $(|s'| \geq k)$ ” in Definition 3 to “ $(|s'| \geq k) \vee (ss' \text{ deadlocks})$ ”. For an FSA (2), the technique of adding at each deadlock state a self-loop containing an unobservable normal event, preserves the strong co-diagnosability, but does not always preserve Definition 3. And for an FSA, after modifying it in this way, the two definitions coincide. Hence the method developed in [34] works after doing this modification to FSAs, it does not apply to general FSAs with deadlock states.

Consider the FSA \mathcal{S}_1 shown in Fig. 8. Choose $k = 1$, then for the unique event sequence f ended by a faulty event generated by \mathcal{S}_1 , there is no continuation of f . Hence \mathcal{S}_1 satisfies Definition 4 vacuously. However, after we add a self-loop on the unique deadlock state x_2 labeled by any non-faulty event of \mathcal{S}_1 or a fresh (also non-faulty) event not in \mathcal{S}_1 , then it does not satisfy Definition 4 any more: For all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, choose event sequence $f \diamond^k$ generated by the modified FSA, where \diamond (non-faulty, could be equal to u) is the event of the newly added self-loop on x_2 , f is faulty, $|\diamond^k| \geq k$, event sequence $u \diamond^k$ generated by the modified FSA does not contain any faulty event but $u \diamond^k$ and $f \diamond^k$ produce the same output sequence ϵ .

Similarly, one can see that there does exist a diagnosable FSA such that after adding at its deadlock state a self-loop labeled by a faulty unobservable event, the modified FSA becomes no longer diagnosable, e.g., the FSA shown in Fig. 9.




Fig. 8 FSA \mathcal{S}_1 , where all events are unobservable, only f is faulty.




Fig. 9 An FSA, where all events are unobservable, only f is faulty.

3.2.3 Complexity analysis

Theorem 6 *Problem 3 belongs to PSPACE.*

Proof We prove this conclusion by Theorem 5. In $CC_A(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_1^n, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L^n)$, guess states x'_1, x'_2, x'_3 . Check (i) x'_1 is reachable, (ii) there is a transition $x'_1 \xrightarrow{t'} x'_2$ such that $t'(0) \in T_f$, (iii) x'_3 equals x'_2 or x'_3 is reachable from x'_2 , and (iv) there is a transition cycle $x'_3 \xrightarrow{s'_3} x'_3$ such that $|s'_3(0)| > 0$, all by nondeterministic search. Then similarly to Theorem 2, we also have (O, T_f) -co-diagnosability of \mathcal{S} can be verified in PSPACE. \square

It was proved in [7] that Problem 3 is PSPACE-hard for deterministic FSAs. It was proved in [2] that the problem of verifying T_f -diagnosability of FSA (2) is NL-complete by using a variant of the twin-plant structure and linear temporal logic and reducing the NL-complete PATH problem to negation of T_f -diagnosability in logarithmic space, where the variant is actually equivalent to $CC_A(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}^n)$.

3.3 Co-predictability

3.3.1 Formulation

Given an FSA (2), a faulty event subset $T_f \subset T$, and a set $O = \{O_i | i \in [1, L]\}$ of local observers, the definition of (O, T_f) -co-predictability is formulated as follows.

Definition 5 (CoPred) An FSA \mathcal{S} (2) is called (O, T_f) -co-predictable if

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (\exists k \in \mathbb{N})(\forall s \in L(\mathcal{S}) \cap T^*T_f)(\exists s' \sqsubset s : T_f \notin s') \\
 & (\exists i \in [1, L])(\forall uv \in L(\mathcal{S})) \\
 & [((O_i(s') = O_i(u)) \wedge (T_f \notin u) \wedge (|v| \geq k)) \implies (T_f \in v)].
 \end{aligned}$$

This notion means that once a faulty event will definitely occur, then before any faulty event occurs, at least one local observer can make sure that after a common time delay (representing the number of occurrences of events), all generated event sequences with the same observation without any faulty event must be continued

by an event sequence containing a faulty event, so as to raise an alarm to definite occurrence of some faulty event.

When $L = 1$ and $O_1 = \ell$, Definition 5 reduces to the following notion of *predictability* [13]:

Definition 6 (Pred) An FSA \mathcal{S} (2) is called *predictable* if

$$(\exists k \in \mathbb{N})(\forall s \in L(\mathcal{S}) \cap T^*T_f)(\exists s' \sqsubset s : T_f \notin s')(\forall uv \in L(\mathcal{S})) \\ [((\ell(s') = \ell(u)) \wedge (T_f \notin u) \wedge (|v| \geq k)) \implies (T_f \in v)].$$

We consider the following problem.

Problem 4 (FSA CO-PREDICTABILITY)

INSTANCE: An FSA \mathcal{S} (2), a faulty event set $T_f \subset T$, and a set $O = \{O_i | i \in [1, L]\}$ of local observers.

QUESTION: Is \mathcal{S} (O, T_f) -co-predictable?

The size of the input of Problem 4 is the same as that of Problem 3.

3.3.2 Equivalent condition

Similarly to characterizing the previous two properties, we still first characterize negation of (O, T_f) -co-predictability in order to obtain its equivalent condition.

Proposition 7 An FSA \mathcal{S} (2) is not (O, T_f) -co-predictable if and only if

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N})(\exists s_k \in L(\mathcal{S}) \cap T^*T_f)(\forall s' \sqsubset s_k : T_f \notin s') \\ (\forall i \in [1, L])(\exists uv \in L(\mathcal{S})) \\ [(O_i(s') = O_i(u)) \wedge (T_f \notin uv) \wedge (|v| \geq k)].$$

In order to verify (O, T_f) -co-predictability of FSA \mathcal{S} (2), we need to compute an even more simplified version

$$\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}^n; \mathcal{S}_1^n, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L^n) \quad (18)$$

of concurrent composition (3), where \mathcal{S}^n is the *normal sub-automaton* obtained from \mathcal{S} by removing all its faulty transitions, for each $i \in [1, L]$, automaton \mathcal{S}_i^n is the previously defined normal sub-local automaton in location i , $i \in [1, L]$. Note that (18) is even simpler than (15) that is used to characterize co-diagnosability.

Theorem 7 An FSA \mathcal{S} (2) is not (O, T_f) -co-predictable if and only if in concurrent composition $\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}^n; \mathcal{S}_1^n, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L^n) = (X', T', X'_0, \delta')$ (18), where \mathcal{S}^n is the normal sub-automaton of \mathcal{S} , and each \mathcal{S}_i^n is the normal sub-local automaton in location i , $i \in [1, L]$,

there is a transition sequence (19a)

$x'_0 \xrightarrow{s'_1} x'_1$ such that (19b)

$x'_0 \in X'_0, x'_1 \in X', s'_1 \in (T')^*$; (19c)

$(x'_1(0), t_f, x) \in \delta$ for some $t_f \in T_f$ and $x \in X$; (19d)

for each $i \in [1, L]$, in \mathcal{S}_i^n , there is a transition cycle reachable from $x'_1(i)$. (19e)

Proof It directly follows from Propositions 1 and 7. \square

Example 4 Reconsider the FSA \mathcal{S} and the two local automata $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2$ shown in Fig. 5, and the corresponding \mathcal{S}_1^n and \mathcal{S}_2^n shown in Fig. 6. Observe that the concurrent composition $\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}^n; \mathcal{S}_1^n, \mathcal{S}_2^n)$ defined by (18) could be obtained from $\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}_1^n, \mathcal{S}_2^n)$ by removing all transitions labeled by events $(f, *, *)$. Then from Fig. 7, one sees a reachable state (x_3, x_4, x_4) of $\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}^n; \mathcal{S}_1^n, \mathcal{S}_2^n)$ such that there is a faulty transition (x_3, f, x_5) in \mathcal{S} , and in \mathcal{S}_i^n , $i = 1, 2$, there is a transition cycle $x_4 \xrightarrow{u} x_4$ reachable from the i -th component x_4 of (x_3, x_4, x_4) . Then by Theorem 7, \mathcal{S} is not $(\{O_1, O_2\}, \{f\})$ -co-predictable.

Remark 3 We want to point out that technique used in [26] of adding at each deadlock state an unbound unobservable trace (e.g., an unobservable self-loop) that is not observed by all local observers does not always preserve co-detectability.

Consider the FSA \mathcal{S}_2 shown in Fig. 10. Choose $k = 2$, then for the unique event sequence f generated by \mathcal{S}_2 ended by a faulty event, for $\epsilon \sqsubset f$, (1) choose ϵu , one has $|\epsilon u| < 2$, (2) choose $u\epsilon$, one also has $|\epsilon| < 2$, hence \mathcal{S}_2 satisfies Definition 6 vacuously. However, if we add self-loops on x_1 and x_2 both labeled by u , then the modified \mathcal{S}_2 becomes no longer predictable: For all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, choose f , choose $\epsilon \sqsubset f$, the existence of event sequence $u\epsilon^k$ generated by the modified \mathcal{S}_2 violates Definition 6.




Fig. 10 FSA \mathcal{S}_2 , where all events are unobservable, only f is faulty.

In the above modification, we add unobservable normal self-loops. It is easy to see if we add a self-loop on x_2 labeled by f , then the predictability of \mathcal{S}_2 will be preserved. Despite of this, we have the following example such that by adding at a deadlock state a self-loop labeled by an unobservable faulty event, predictability is not preserved. Consider \mathcal{S}_3 in Fig. 11. It is predictable vacuously since there is no generated event sequence ended by a faulty event. However, if we add a self-loop on the unique deadlock state x_1 labeled by a faulty event f , then the modified \mathcal{S}_3 becomes no longer predictable.




Fig. 11 FSA \mathcal{S}_3 , where all events are normal and unobservable.

3.3.3 Complexity analysis

Theorem 8 *Problem 4 belongs to PSPACE.*

Proof By Theorem 7, in $\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}^n; \mathcal{S}_1^n, \dots, \mathcal{S}_L^n)$, we guess a state x'_1 . Check (i) $(x'_1(0), t_f, x) \in \delta$ for some $t_f \in T_f$ and $x \in X$, (ii) for each $i \in [1, L]$, in \mathcal{S}_i^n , there is a transition cycle reachable from $x'_1(i)$, all by nondeterministic search. Hence similarly to Theorem 6, we also have (O, T_f) -co-predictability of \mathcal{S} can be verified in PSPACE. \square

Corollary 2 *T_f -predictability of FSA (2) can be verified in PTIME.*

Proof The condition in Theorem 7 in case of $L = 1$ and $O_1 = \ell$ can be verified in linear time in the size of $\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}^n; \mathcal{S}^n)$, and $\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}^n; \mathcal{S}^n)$ can be computed in quadratic polynomial time in the size of \mathcal{S} . \square

Theorem 9 *The problem of verifying T_f -predictability of FSA (2) is NL-complete.*

Proof We first show the NL membership. Guess states x_1, \bar{x}_1, x_2, x_3 of X . Check in $\text{CC}_A(\mathcal{S}^n; \mathcal{S}^n)$: (i) (x_1, \bar{x}_1) is reachable; in \mathcal{S} : (ii) $(x_1, f, x_2) \in \delta$ for some faulty event $t \in T_f$; and in \mathcal{S}^n : (iii) x_3 is equal to \bar{x}_1 or x_3 is reachable from \bar{x}_1 , (iv) x_3 belongs to a transition cycle, all by nondeterministic search.

We can use the logspace reduction from the NL-complete PATH problem to negation of diagnosability constructed in [2] to prove the NL-hardness of verifying (negation of) predictability. Given $G = (V, E)$ and $s, t \in V$, we define the FSA $\mathcal{S}_G = (V \cup \{v_f\}, \{a, f, u\}, \{s\}, \delta_G, \{a\}, \ell)$ as follows: (1) v_f is a fresh state not in V , (2) $\delta_G = \{(v, a, v'), (v, a, v_f) | (v, v') \in E\} \cup \{(t, f, v_f), (t, u, v_f), (v_f, a, v_f)\}$, (3) only f is faulty, $\ell(f) = \ell(u) = \epsilon$, $\ell(a) = a$. We obtain an FSA \mathcal{S}_G that satisfies Assumption 1. Then one sees that \mathcal{S}_G is not predictable if and only if there is a directed path from s to t or $s = t$. \square

In order to give a lower bound to co-predictability, we adopt the PSPACE-complete DFA INTERSECTION problem shown in [25, Lemma 3.2.3].

Proposition 8 ([25]) *Problem 2 is PSPACE-complete if the input DFAs are all complete.*

We need to change Proposition 8 slightly as follows.

Proposition 9 *Problem 2 is PSPACE-hard if the input DFAs $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ satisfy that \mathcal{A}_1 has exactly one accepting state and the accepting state is deadlock, and all other \mathcal{A}_i 's are deadlock-free and have all states accepting.*

Proof We are given complete DFAs $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ over the same alphabet Σ . Construct DFA \mathcal{A}'_1 from \mathcal{A}_1 by adding transitions $q \xrightarrow{\lambda} \diamond_1$ at each accepting state q , changing all accepting states to be non-accepting, and changing \diamond_1 to be accepting. For each $2 \leq i \leq n$, construct deadlock-free DFA \mathcal{A}'_i from \mathcal{A}_i by adding transitions $q \xrightarrow{\lambda} \diamond_i$ at each accepting state q , also adding self-loop on \diamond_i labeled by λ , changing all non-accepting states, including \diamond_i , to be accepting. Then \mathcal{A}'_1 has exactly one

accepting state \diamond_1 , \diamond_1 is the unique deadlock state of \mathcal{A}'_1 , and $\mathcal{A}'_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}'_n$ have all states accepting and deadlock. One sees that for each word $w \in \Sigma^*$, w is accepted by all \mathcal{A}'_i 's if and only if $w\lambda$ is accepted by all $\mathcal{A}'_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}'_n$. By Proposition 8, this proposition holds. \square

Next we give a lower bound for co-predictability, where the reduction is inspired from the PSPACE-hardness proof of verifying co-diagnosability of deterministic FSAs [7].

Theorem 10 *Problem 4 is PSPACE-hard for deterministic deadlock-free FSAs.*

Proof We prove this result by Proposition 9.

We are given DFAs $\mathcal{A}_0, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ over the same alphabet Σ such that \mathcal{A}_0 has exactly one accepting state and the accepting state is deadlock and all other \mathcal{A}_i 's have all states accepting and deadlock-free. Next we construct an FSA \mathcal{S} from $\mathcal{A}_0, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ in polynomial time as shown in Fig. 12. In each $\mathcal{A}_i, i \in [0, L]$, change each letter (i.e., event) $\sigma \in \Sigma$ to σ_i , and set $\Sigma_i = \{\sigma_i | \sigma \in \Sigma\}$ and $\ell(\sigma_i) = \sigma$, where ℓ is the labeling function. Add initial state \diamond_0 and transition $\diamond_0 \xrightarrow{a_i} q$ to the initial state q of each $\mathcal{A}_i, i \in [0, L]$, where \diamond_0 differs from any state of any $\mathcal{A}_i, a_i \notin \bigcup_{i \in [0, L]} \Sigma_i$, and set $\ell(a_i) = a$. Change each initial state of each \mathcal{A}_i to be non-initial, $i \in [0, L]$. Add state \diamond_1 that is not any state of any $\mathcal{A}_i, i \in [0, L]$, and self-loop on it labeled by a fresh event a , and set $\ell(a) = a$. At the accepting state of \mathcal{A}_0 , add transition to \diamond_1 labeled by event F , where F is a new event and set to be faulty. We also set $\ell(F) = \epsilon$, i.e., F is unobservable. We have obtained the deterministic deadlock-free FSA \mathcal{S} with a unique initial state. In \mathcal{S} , all states except for the unique accepting state of \mathcal{A}_0 can be reachable from some state q through only non-faulty transitions such that s belongs to a non-faulty transition cycle. The number of states of \mathcal{S} equals the sum of numbers of states of all $\mathcal{A}_i, i \in [0, L]$, plus 2 (corresponding to newly added states \diamond_1, \diamond_2). The event set of \mathcal{S} is $\bigcup_{i \in [0, L]} \Sigma_i \cup \{a, F\} \cup \{a_i | i \in [0, L]\}$.




Fig. 12 Sketch of the reduction in the proof of Theorem 10.

Now we specify local automaton \mathcal{S}_i , $i \in [1, L]$, we only need to specify the labeling function O_i of each \mathcal{S}_i . For each $i \in [1, L]$, the observable event set is $\Sigma_0 \cup \Sigma_i \cup \{a\} \cup \{a_i | i \in [0, L]\}$. That is, at each location $i \in [1, L]$, observer O_i can observe \mathcal{A}_0 , \mathcal{A}_i , and all transitions outside $\bigcup_{j \in [0, L]} \mathcal{A}_j$ except for the faulty transitions.

In order to prove this theorem, we only need to prove that there is a word $w \in \Sigma^*$ that is accepted by all \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in [0, L]$, if and only if, \mathcal{S} is not (O, T_f) -co-predictable.

\Rightarrow : Assume $w = w^1 \dots w^n \in \Sigma^*$ that is accepted by all \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in [0, L]$, where $w^1, \dots, w^n \in \Sigma$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $a_0 w_0^1 \dots w_0^n F \in L(\mathcal{S})$ and $a_i w_i^1 \dots w_i^n \in L(\mathcal{S})$ for all $i \in [1, L]$. For each $i \in [1, L]$, $O_i(a_i w_i^1 \dots w_i^n) = O_i(a_0 w_0^1 \dots w_0^n F) = aw$. Since \mathcal{S} is deadlock-free and only F is faulty, we have \mathcal{S} is not (O, T_f) -co-predictable by Proposition 7.

\Leftarrow : Assume that \mathcal{S} is not (O, T_f) -co-predictable. Then by Theorem 7 and the structure of \mathcal{S} (there is a unique faulty transition and the transition starts at the unique accepting state of \mathcal{A}_0), there exist $a_\iota w_\iota F \in L(\mathcal{S})$, $a_{j_i} w_{j_i} \in L(\mathcal{S})$ for each $i \in [1, L]$ such that $O_i(a_\iota w_\iota F) = O_i(a_{j_i} w_{j_i})$, and $a_{j_i} w_{j_i}$ does not lead \mathcal{S} to the unique accepting state of \mathcal{A}_0 . One must have $\iota = 0$ since F can only follow words in Σ_0^* , then $w_\iota \in \Sigma_0^*$. Assume $w_\iota = \epsilon$. Because $\ell(w_\iota) = \epsilon$ leads \mathcal{A}_0 to its accepting state (otherwise w_ι cannot be continued by F), ϵ is accepted by \mathcal{A}_0 . ϵ is always accepted by all other \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in [1, L]$. Next assume $w_\iota \neq \epsilon$. Then one has $\ell(w_\iota)$ is accepted by \mathcal{A}_0 , and then $j_i = i$ for all $i \in [1, L]$, otherwise there exists $k \in [1, L]$ such that $a_{j_k} w_{j_k}$ leads \mathcal{S} to the unique accepting state of \mathcal{A}_0 , reaching a contradiction. Note that $\ell(w_{j_i})$ is accepted by \mathcal{A}_i for each $i \in [1, L]$ since all such \mathcal{A}_i 's have all states accepting, completing the proof. \square

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a decentralized version of strong detectability of FSAs, and gave a PSPACE upper bound and a coNP lower bound for the notion. In addition, we gave a unified concurrent-composition method to verify decentralized versions of strong detectability, diagnosability, and predictability of FSAs without any assumption or changing the FSAs under consideration, which actually reveals essential relationships between these notions.

Moreover, the unified method could provide synthesis algorithms for enforcing the three properties by choosing to disable several controllable transitions. By Theorems 1, 5, and 7, lacks of the three properties are due to existence of special transition sequences in the corresponding concurrent compositions, the synthesis algorithms are to choose to disable several controllable events of FSAs in order to remove all such special transition sequences. These processes can be done in PTIME in the size of the corresponding concurrent compositions.

This unified method could also be applied to characterize other variants of co-diagnosability or co-predictability in the literature, or applied to characterize more general distributed versions of these fundamental properties under weak assumptions on the underlying networks.

References

1. M. T. Angulo, A. Aparicio, and C. H. Moog. Structural accessibility and structural observability of nonlinear networked systems. *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, page online, 2019.
2. B. Bérard, S. Haar, S. Schmitz, and S. Schwon. The complexity of diagnosability and opacity verification for Petri nets. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 161(4):317–349, 2018.
3. A. Boussif and M. Ghazel. Diagnosability analysis of intermittent faults in discrete event systems using a twin-plant structure. *International Journal of Control, Automation and Systems*, 17(X):1–14, Sep 2019.
4. M. Broy, B. Jonsson, J. P. Katoen, L. Martin, and A. Pretschner. *Model-Based Testing of Reactive Systems: Advanced Lectures (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., Secaucus, NJ, USA, 2005.
5. M. P. Cabasino, A. Giua, S. Lafortune, and C. Seatzu. A new approach for diagnosability analysis of Petri nets using verifier nets. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 57(12):3104–3117, Dec 2012.
6. C. G. Cassandras and S. Lafortune. *Introduction to Discrete Event Systems*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2nd edition, 2010.
7. F. Cassez. The complexity of codiagnosability for discrete event and timed systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 57(7):1752–1764, July 2012.
8. F. Cassez and S. Tripakis. Fault diagnosis with static and dynamic observers. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 88(4):497–540, 2008.
9. G. Conte, C.H. Moog, and A.M. Perdon. *Algebraic Methods for Nonlinear Control Systems, 2nd Ed.* Springer-Verlag London, 2007.
10. R. Debouk, S. Lafortune, and D. Teneketzis. Coordinated decentralized protocols for failure diagnosis of discrete event systems. *Discrete Event Dynamic Systems*, 10(1):33–86, 2000.
11. D. Eppstein. Reset sequences for monotonic automata. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 19(3):500–510, 1990.
12. E. Fornasini and M. E. Valcher. Observability, reconstructibility and state observers of Boolean control networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(6):1390–1401, June 2013.
13. S. Genc and S. Lafortune. Predictability of event occurrences in partially-observed discrete-event systems. *Automatica*, 45(2):301–311, 2009.
14. A. Giua, C. Mahulea, and C. Seatzu. Decentralized observability of discrete event systems with synchronizations. *Automatica*, 85:468–476, 2017.
15. S. Haar. What topology tells us about diagnosability in partial order semantics. *Discrete Event Dynamic Systems*, 22(4):383–402, 2012.
16. C. N. Hadjicostis. *Estimation and Inference in Discrete Event Systems*. Communications and Control Engineering. Springer Nature Switzerland AG, 2020.
17. H. Ibrahim, P. Dague, A. Grastien, L. Ye, and L. Simon. Diagnosability planning for controllable discrete event systems. In *Proceedings of the 31st AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1149–1155, San Francisco, California, USA, February 4–9 2017.
18. A. Isidori. *Nonlinear Control Systems*. Communications and Control Engineering. Springer-Verlag London, 1995.
19. S. Jiang, Z. Huang, V. Chandra, and R. Kumar. A polynomial algorithm for testing diagnosability of discrete-event systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 46(8):1318–1321, Aug 2001.
20. R.E. Kalman. Mathematical description of linear dynamical systems. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics Series A Control*, 1(12):152–192, 1963.
21. J. Kari. Synchronizing finite automata on Eulerian digraphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 295(1):223–232, 2003. Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science.
22. J. Kari. *A Lecture Note on Automata and Formal Languages*. <http://users.utu.fi/jkari/automata/>, 2016.
23. C. Keroglou and C. N. Hadjicostis. Distributed fault diagnosis in discrete event systems via set intersection refinements. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 63(10):3601–3607, Oct 2018.
24. A. Y. Kibangou, F. Garin, and S. Gracy. Input and state observability of network systems with a single unknown input. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 49(22):37–42, 2016. 6th IFAC Workshop on Distributed Estimation and Control in Networked Systems NECSYS 2016.
25. D. Kozen. Lower bounds for natural proof systems. In *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, SFCS '77*, pages 254–266, Washington, DC, USA, 1977. IEEE Computer Society.

26. R. Kumar and S. Takai. Decentralized prognosis of failures in discrete event systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 55(1):48–59, Jan 2010.
27. F. Lin. Diagnosability of discrete event systems and its applications. *Discrete Event Dynamic Systems*, 4(2):197–212, May 1994.
28. F. Liu. Predictability of failure event occurrences in decentralized discrete-event systems and polynomial-time verification. *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 16(1):498–504, Jan 2019.
29. Y.-Y. Liu, J.-J. Slotine, and A.-L. Barabási. Observability of complex systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(7):2460–2465, 2013.
30. T. Masopust. Complexity of deciding detectability in discrete event systems. *Automatica*, 93:257–261, 2018.
31. T. Masopust and X. Yin. Deciding detectability for labeled Petri nets. *Automatica*, 104:238–241, 2019.
32. E. F. Moore. Gedanken-experiments on sequential machines. *Automata Studies, Annals of Math. Studies*, 34:129–153, 1956.
33. M. V. Moreira, T. C. Jesus, and J. C. Basilio. Polynomial time verification of decentralized diagnosability of discrete event systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 56(7):1679–1684, July 2011.
34. W. Qiu and R. Kumar. Decentralized failure diagnosis of discrete event systems. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics - Part A: Systems and Humans*, 36:384–395, 2006.
35. P. J. Ramadge and W. M. Wonham. Supervisory control of a class of discrete event processes. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 25(1):206–230, 1987.
36. N. Rampersad and J. Shallit. Detecting patterns in finite regular and context-free languages. *Information Processing Letters*, 110(3):108–112, 2010.
37. M. Sampath, R. Sengupta, S. Lafortune, K. Sinnamohideen, and D. Teneketzis. Diagnosability of discrete-event systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 40(9):1555–1575, Sep 1995.
38. S. Sandberg. *1 Homing and Synchronizing Sequences*, pages 5–33. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005.
39. W. J. Savitch. Relationships between nondeterministic and deterministic tape complexities. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 4(2):177–192, 1970.
40. S. Shu and F. Lin. Co-detectability of multi-agent discrete event systems. In *2011 Chinese Control and Decision Conference (CCDC)*, pages 1708–1713, May 2011.
41. S. Shu and F. Lin. Generalized detectability for discrete event systems. *Systems & Control Letters*, 60(5):310–317, 2011.
42. S. Shu and F. Lin. Delayed detectability of discrete event systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(4):862–875, April 2013.
43. S. Shu, F. Lin, and H. Ying. Detectability of discrete event systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 52(12):2356–2359, Dec 2007.
44. E.D. Sontag. On the observability of polynomial systems, I: Finite-time problems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 17:139–151, 1979.
45. R. Su. *Distributed diagnosis for discrete-event systems*. PhD thesis, University of Toronto, 2004.
46. T.-S. Yoo and S. Lafortune. Polynomial-time verification of diagnosability of partially observed discrete-event systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 47(9):1491–1495, Sep. 2002.
47. A. Tanwani, H. Shim, and D. Liberzon. Observability for switched linear systems: characterization and observer design. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(4):891–904, April 2013.
48. S. Tripakis. Undecidable problems of decentralized observation and control on regular languages. *Information Processing Letters*, 90(1):21–28, 2004.
49. G. S. Viana and J. C. Basilio. Codiagnosability of discrete event systems revisited: A new necessary and sufficient condition and its applications. *Automatica*, 101:354–364, 2019.
50. Y. Wang, T. S. Yoo, and S. Lafortune. Diagnosis of discrete event systems using decentralized architectures. *Discrete Event Dynamic Systems*, 17(2):233–263, 2007.
51. W. M. Wonham. *Linear Multivariable Control: a Geometric Approach, 3rd Ed.* Springer-Verlag New York, 1985.
52. W. M. Wonham and K. Cai. *Supervisory Control of Discrete-Event Systems*. Springer International Publishing, 2019.
53. L. Ye. *Optimized diagnosability of distributed discrete event systems through abstraction*. PhD thesis, Université Paris-Sud, 2011.

54. L. Ye and P. Dague. Undecidable case and decidable case of joint diagnosability in distributed discrete event systems. *International Journal on Advances in Systems and Measurement*, 6(3&4):287–299, 2013.
55. L. Ye, P. Dague, and F. Nouioua. Predictability analysis of distributed discrete event systems. In *52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 5009–5015, Dec 2013.
56. L. Ye, P. Dague, and Y. Yan. An incremental approach for pattern diagnosability in distributed discrete event systems. In *2009 21st IEEE International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence*, pages 123–130, Nov 2009.
57. X. Yin and S. Lafortune. On the decidability and complexity of diagnosability for labeled Petri nets. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(11):5931–5938, Nov 2017.
58. X. Yin and Z. Li. Decentralized fault prognosis of discrete-event systems using state-estimate-based protocols. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 49(4):1302–1313, April 2019.
59. K. Zhang. The problem of determining the weak (periodic) detectability of discrete event systems is PSPACE-complete. *Automatica*, 81:217–220, 2017.
60. K. Zhang and A. Giua. Weak (approximate) detectability of labeled Petri net systems with inhibitor arcs. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 51(7):167–171, 2018. 14th IFAC Workshop on Discrete Event Systems WODES 2018.
61. K. Zhang and A. Giua. On detectability of labeled Petri nets and finite automata. *Discrete Event Dynamic Systems*, 34 pages, accepted, 2019. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.07551>.
62. K. Zhang and A. Giua. K -delayed strong detectability of discrete-event systems. In *Proceedings of the 58th Conference on Decision and Control*, Nice, France, December 2019, accepted.
63. K. Zhang, L. Zhang, and R. Su. A weighted pair graph representation for reconstructibility of Boolean control networks. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 54(6):3040–3060, 2016.
64. K. Zhang, L. Zhang, and L. Xie. *Discrete-Time and Discrete-Space Dynamical Systems*. Communications and Control Engineering. Springer International Publishing, 2020.