

Stack-Aware Hyperproperties^{*}

Ali Bajwa², Minjian Zhang¹, Rohit Chadha², and Mahesh Viswanathan¹

¹ University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, USA

² University of Missouri in Columbia, USA

Abstract. A hyperproperty relates executions of a program and is used to formalize security objectives such as confidentiality, non-interference, privacy, and anonymity. Formally, a hyperproperty is a collection of allowable sets of executions. A program violates a hyperproperty if the set of its executions is not in the collection specified by the hyperproperty. The logic HYPERCTL^{*} has been proposed in the literature to formally specify and verify hyperproperties. The problem of checking whether a finite-state program satisfies a HYPERCTL^{*} formula is known to be decidable. However, the problem turns out to be undecidable for procedural (recursive) programs. Surprisingly, we show that decidability can be restored if we consider restricted classes of hyperproperties, namely those that relate only those executions of a program which have the same call-stack access pattern. We call such hyperproperties, *stack-aware hyperproperties*. Our decision procedure can be used as a proof method for establishing security objectives such as noninterference for recursive programs, and also for refuting security objectives such as observational determinism. Further, if the call stack size is observable to the attacker, the decision procedure provides exact verification.

Keywords: Hyperproperties · Temporal Logic · Recursive Programs · Model Checking · Pushdown Systems · Visibly Pushdown Automata.

1 Introduction

Temporal logics HYPERLTL and HYPERCTL^{*} [5] were designed to express and reason about security guarantees that are *hyperproperties* [6]. A hyperproperty [6] is a security guarantee that does not depend solely on individual executions. Instead, a hyperproperty relates multiple executions. For example, non-interference, a confidentiality property, states that any *two* executions of a program that differ only in high-level security inputs must have the same *low*-security observations. As pointed out in [6], several security guarantees are hyperproperties. The logic HYPERCTL^{*} subsumes HYPERLTL, and the problem of checking a finite-state system against a HYPERCTL^{*} formula is decidable [5].

^{*} Ali Bajwa was partially supported by NSF CNS 1553548. Rohit Chadha was partially supported by NSF CNS 1553548 and NSF SHF 1900924. Mahesh Viswanathan and Minjian Zhang were partially supported by NSF SHF 1901069 and NSF SHF 2007428.

In this paper, we consider the problem of model checking procedural (recursive) programs against security hyperproperties. Recall recursive programs are naturally modeled as a pushdown system. Unlike the case of finite-state transition systems, the problem of checking whether a pushdown system satisfies a HYPERCTL* formula is undecidable [16]. In contrast, CTL* model checking is decidable for pushdown systems [3,18].

Our contributions. We consider restricted classes of hyperproperties for recursive programs, namely those that relate only those executions that have the same *call-stack access pattern*. Intuitively, two executions have the same stack access pattern if they access the call stack in the same manner at each step, i.e., if in one execution there is a push (pop) at a point, then there is a push (pop) at the same point in the other execution. Observe that if two executions have the same stack access pattern, then their stack sizes are the same at all times. We call such hyperproperties, *stack-aware hyperproperties*.

In order to specify stack-aware hyperproperties, we extend HYPERCTL* to SHCTL*. The logic SHCTL* has a two level syntax. At the first level, the syntax is identical to HYPERCTL* formulas, and is interpreted over executions of the pushdown system with the same stack access pattern. At the top-level, we quantify over different stack access patterns. The formula $E\psi$ is true if for some stack access pattern ρ of the system, the pushdown system restricted to executions with stack access pattern ρ satisfies the HYPERCTL* formula ψ . The formula $A\psi$ is true if for each stack access pattern ρ of the system, the pushdown system restricted to executions with stack access pattern ρ satisfies the HYPERCTL* formula ψ . See Figure 1 on Page 8 for a side-by-side comparison of the syntax for HYPERCTL* and SHCTL*. HYPERLTL is extended to SHLTL similarly. Please note that SHCTL* subsumes SHLTL, and that SHCTL* (SHLTL) coincides with HYPERCTL* (HYPERLTL) for finite state systems as all executions of finite state systems have the same stack access pattern.

We show that the model checking problem for SHCTL* is decidable. We demonstrate three different ways this result can aid in verifying recursive programs. First, for security guarantees such as noninference [14], which are expressible in the $\forall\exists^*$ fragment of HYPERLTL, we can use the model checking algorithm to establish that a recursive program satisfies the HYPERLTL property. Secondly, for the \forall^* fragment of HYPERLTL, the model checking algorithm can be used to detect security flaws by establishing that a recursive program does not satisfy security guarantees. Observational determinism [13,19] is an example of such a property. Finally, when the attacker can observe stack access patterns (or, equivalently, stack sizes), we can get exact verification for several properties. The assumption of the attacker observing stack access patterns holds, for example, in the program counter security model [15] in which the attacker has access to program counters at each step. As argued in [15], the program security model is appropriate to capture control-flow side channels such as those arising from timing behavior and/or disclosure of errors.

The decision procedure uses an automata-theoretic approach inspired by the model checking algorithm for finite state systems and HYPERCTL* given

in [10]. Since stack-aware hyperproperties relate only executions with the same stack access-pattern, a set of executions with the same stack access pattern can be encoded as a word over a *pushdown* alphabet,³ and the problem of model checking a SHCTL* formula can be reduced to the problem of checking emptiness of a *non-deterministic visibly pushdown automaton (NVPA)* over infinite words [1]. The reduction of the model checking problem to the emptiness problem is based on a compositional construction of an automaton for each sub-formula which accepts exactly the set of assignments to path variables that satisfy the sub-formula. For this construction to be optimal, we carefully leverage two equi-expressive classes of automata on infinite words, namely NVPAs and *1-way alternating jump automata (1-AJA)* [4]. The model checking algorithm for SHCTL* against procedural programs has a complexity that is very close to the complexity of model checking finite state systems against HYPERCTL*. If $g(k, n)$ denotes a tower of exponentials of height k , where the top most exponent is $\text{poly}(n)$, then for a formula with formula complexity r ,⁴ and a system and formula whose size is bounded by n , our algorithm is in $\text{DTIME}(g(\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil, n))$. In comparison, model checking finite state systems against HYPERCTL* is in $\text{NSPACE}(g(\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil - 1, n))$. This slight difference in complexity is consistent with checking other properties like invariants for finite state systems (NL) versus procedural programs (P).

We also prove that our model checking algorithm is optimal by proving a matching lower bound. Our proof showing $\text{DTIME}(g(\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil, n)$ -hardness of the model checking problem for formulas with (formula) complexity r , relies on reducing the membership problem for $g(\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil - 1, n)$ space bounded *alternating Turing machines (ATM)* to the model checking problem. The reduction requires identifying an encoding of computations of ATMs, which are trees, as strings that can be guessed and generated by pushdown systems. The pushdown system we construct for the model checking problem guesses potential computations of the ATM, while the SHCTL* formula we construct checks if the guessed computation is a valid accepting computation.

Related work. Clarkson and Schneider introduced *hyperproperties* [6] and demonstrated their need to capture complex security properties. Temporal logics HYPERLTL and HYPERCTL*, that describe hyperproperties, were introduced by Clarkson et al. [5]. They also characterized the complexity of model checking finite state transition systems against HYPERCTL* specifications by a reduction to the satisfiability problem of QPTL [17]. Subsequently, other model checking algorithms for verifying finite state systems against HYPERCTL* properties have been proposed [10,7]. Tools that check satisfiability [8] and runtime verification [9] for HYPERLTL formulas have also been developed. Finkbeiner et al. introduced the automata-theoretic approach to model checking HYPERCTL* for finite-state systems [10].

³ A pushdown alphabet is an alphabet that is partitioned into three sets: a set of call symbols, a set of internal symbols, and a set of return symbols. See Section 4.1.

⁴ Our definition of formula complexity is roughly double the usual notion of quantifier alternation. For a precise definition, see Definition 4.

The model checking problem for HYPERLTL, and consequently HYPERCTL*, was shown to be undecidable for pushdown systems in [16]. For restricted fragments of HYPERLTL, Pommellet and Tayssir [16] introduced over-approximations and under-approximations to establish/refute that a pushdown system satisfies a HYPERLTL formula in those fragments. Gutsfeld et al. introduced stuttering H_μ , a *linear* time logic for checking asynchronous hyperproperties for recursive programs in [12]. The authors present complexity results for the model checking problem under an assumption of *fairness*, and a restriction of *well-alignment*. While the restriction to paths with the same *stack access pattern* is similar to the well-alignment restriction, we do not assume any fairness condition to establish decidability. However, as SHCTL* is a branching time logic and only considers synchronous hyperproperties, the two logics are not directly comparable. It is also worth mentioning that the branching nature of SHCTL* requires us to “copy” a potentially unbounded stack, from the most recently quantified path variable, when assigning a path to the “current” quantified path variable. In contrast, all path assignments in [12] start with an empty stack.

An extended abstract of this paper appears in the 29th International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems (TACAS) [2].

2 Motivation

Clarkson and Schneider [6] argue that many important *security* guarantees are expressible only as *hyperproperties*. We discuss two examples of security hyperproperties, and the logics HYPERLTL and HYPERCTL* used to specify them.

Hyperproperties and temporal logics. We discuss two variants of non-interference [11] that model confidentiality requirements. In non-interference, the inputs of a system are partitioned into *low*-level input security variables and *high*-level input security variables. The attacker is assumed to know the values of low-level security inputs. During an execution, the attacker can observe parts of the system configuration such as system outputs, or the memory usage. A system satisfies *non-interference* if the attacker cannot deduce the values of high-level inputs from the low-level observations. To formally specify the variants, we use the logic HYPERLTL [5], a fragment of the logic HYPERCTL* [5]. The precise syntax of HYPERLTL and HYPERCTL* is shown in Fig. 1. In the syntax, π is a path variable and the formula a_π is true if the proposition a is true along the path “ π ”. Intuitively, the formula $\exists\pi. \psi$ is existential quantification over paths, and is true if there is a path that can be assigned to π such that ψ is true. Universal quantification ($\forall\pi. \psi$), and other logical connectives such as conjunction (\wedge), implication (\rightarrow), equivalence (\leftrightarrow) and the temporal operators G and F can be defined in the standard way. By having explicit path variables, HYPERLTL and HYPERCTL* allow quantification over multiple paths simultaneously.

Example 1. The first variant, noninterference [14], states that for each execution σ of a program, there is another execution σ' such that (a) σ' is obtained from σ by

replacing the high-level security inputs by a dummy input, and (b) σ and σ' have the same low-level observations. Noninference is a hyperliveness property [5,6].

Let us assume that the low-level observations of a configuration are determined by the values of the propositions in $L = \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m\}$. As shown in [5], noninference is expressible by the HYPERLTL formula: $\text{NI} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall \pi. \exists \pi'. (\text{G } \lambda_{\pi'}) \wedge \pi \equiv_L \pi'$. Here $\text{G } \lambda_{\pi'}$ expresses that *Globally* (or in each configuration of the execution) the high input of π' is the dummy input λ , and $\pi \equiv_L \pi' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{G}(\wedge_{\ell \in L} (\ell_\pi \leftrightarrow \ell_{\pi'}))$ expresses that π and π' have the same low-level observations.

Example 2. The second variant, observational determinism [13,19], states that any two executions that have the same low-level initial inputs, must have the same low-level output observations. Observational determinism is a hypersafety property [5,6], and is also expressible in HYPERLTL using the formula [5]: $\text{OD} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall \pi. \forall \pi'. (\pi[0] \equiv_{L,in} \pi'[0]) \rightarrow \pi \equiv_{L,out} \pi'$. Here $\equiv_{L,in}$ and $\equiv_{L,out}$ express the fact that π and π' have the same low-security inputs and outputs respectively.

Procedural (recursive) programs and Stack-aware hyperproperties.

Pushdown systems model procedural programs that do not dynamically allocate memory, and whose program variables take values in finite domains. Unlike finite-state transition systems, the problem of checking whether a pushdown system satisfies a HYPERCTL* formula is undecidable [16]. However, we identify a natural class of hyperproperties for which the model checking problem becomes decidable. As we shall shortly see, this class of hyperproperties not only enjoys decidability, but is also useful in reasoning about security hyperproperties such as noninference and observational determinism.

We consider a restricted class of hyperproperties for recursive programs, which relate only executions that access the call stack in the same manner, i.e., push or pop at the same time. An execution of a pushdown system \mathcal{P} is a sequence of configurations (control state + stack) $\sigma = c_1 c_2 \dots$, such that the stacks of consecutive configurations c_i and c_{i+1} differ only due to the possible presence of an additional element at the top of the stack of either c_i or c_{i+1} . For such a sequence, we can associate a sequence $\text{pr}(\sigma) = o_1 o_2 \dots$ such that $o_i \in \{\text{call}, \text{int}, \text{ret}\}$ such that $o_i = \text{call}$ (ret respectively) if and only if the stack in c_{i+1} has one more (less respectively) element than c_i . The sequence $\text{pr}(\sigma)$ is said to be the *stack access pattern* of σ . Observe that the stack sizes of two executions with the same stack access pattern evolve in a similar fashion. Thus, equivalently, we can consider this class of hyperproperties to be the hyperproperties that relate executions with identical memory usage.

To specify these hyperproperties, we propose the logic sHCTL* which extends HYPERCTL*. sHCTL* has a two level syntax. At the innermost level, the syntax is identical to that of HYPERCTL* formulas, but is interpreted over executions of the pushdown system with the same stack access pattern. At the outer level, we quantify over different stack access patterns. Intuitively, the formula $E\psi$ is true if there is a stack access pattern ρ exhibited by the system such that the set of executions with access pattern ρ satisfy the hyperproperty ψ . The dual formula $A\psi$, defined as $\neg E\neg\psi$, is true if for each stack access pattern

ρ exhibited by the system, the set of all executions with stack access pattern ρ satisfy ψ . The syntax of SHLTL is obtained from HYPERLTL in a similar fashion. Please see Fig. 1 on Page 8 for a side-by-side comparison of the syntax of HYPERCTL* (HYPERLTL) and SHCTL* (SHLTL). Unlike HYPERCTL*, we show that the problem of checking SHCTL* is decidable for pushdown systems (Theorem 3). Formal definitions of stack access patterns, syntax and semantics of SHCTL* are in Section 3.

For the rest of the paper, hyperproperties expressible in SHCTL* will be called *stack-aware hyperproperties*. Restricting to stack-aware hyperproperties is useful in verifying security guarantees of recursive programs as discussed below.

Proving $\forall\exists^*$ hyperproperties. The *noninference* property (Example 1) can be expressed in HYPERLTL as $\text{NI} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall\pi. \exists\pi'. (\text{G } \lambda_{\pi'}) \wedge \pi \equiv_L \pi'$. Consider the SHLTL formula $A(\text{NI})$ obtained by putting an A in front NI. A pushdown system satisfies $A(\text{NI})$ only if for each execution σ of the system, there is another execution σ' with *the same stack access pattern as σ* such that σ, σ' together satisfy $(\text{G } \lambda_{\sigma'}) \wedge \sigma \equiv_L \sigma'$. Thus, if the pushdown system satisfies the SHLTL formula $A(\text{NI})$, then it also satisfies noninference. Thus, a decision procedure for SHLTL can be used to prove that a recursive program satisfies noninference.

The above observation generalizes to HYPERLTL formulas of the form $\psi = \forall\pi. \exists\pi_1. \dots \exists\pi_k. \psi'$ — if a system satisfies the SHLTL formula $A\psi$ then it must also satisfy the HYPERLTL formula ψ . Though the model checking problem is undecidable for pushdown systems even when restricted to such HYPERLTL formulas, we gain decidability by restricting the search space for π, π_1, \dots, π_k .

Refuting \forall^* hyperproperties. *Observational determinism* (Example 2) can be written in HYPERLTL as $\text{OD} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall\pi. \forall\pi'. (\pi[0] \equiv_{L,in} \pi'[0]) \rightarrow \pi \equiv_{L,out} \pi'$. Consider the SHLTL formula $A(\text{OD})$. A pushdown system *fails* to satisfy the SHLTL formula $A(\text{OD})$ only if there is a stack access pattern ρ and executions σ_1 and σ_2 with stack access pattern ρ such that the pushdown system does not satisfy $(\sigma[0] \equiv_{L,in} \sigma'[0]) \rightarrow \sigma \equiv_{L,out} \sigma'$.

This observation generalizes to HYPERLTL formulas of the form $\psi = \forall\pi_1. \dots \forall\pi_k. \psi'$ — if a pushdown system fails to satisfy the SHLTL formula $A\psi$ then it does not satisfy ψ . Even though model checking pushdown systems against such restricted specifications is undecidable, our decision procedure can be used to show that a recursive program does not meet such properties.

Exact verification when stack access pattern is observable. Often, it is reasonable to assume that the attacker can observe the stack access pattern. For example, in the program counter security model [15], the attacker has access to the program counter transcript, i.e., the sequence of program counters during an execution. Access to the program counter transcript implies that the attacker can observe stack access pattern. The assumption that the program counter transcript is observable helps model control flow side channel attacks which include timing attacks and error disclosure attacks [15]. SHCTL* can be used to verify security guarantees in this security model. For example, the SHCTL* formula $A(\text{NI})$ models noninference faithfully by introducing a unique proposition for

each control state. Observational determinism can also be verified in this model by suitably transforming the pushdown automaton.

Another scenario in which stack access patterns are observable is when the attacker can observe the memory usage of a program in terms of stack size. As observing stack size may lead to information leakage, stack size should be considered a low-level observation. Since the stack size can be unbounded, it cannot be modeled as a proposition. sHCTL*, however, can still be used to verify security guarantees in this case. For example, $A(\text{NI}) = A(\forall\pi. \exists\pi'. (G \lambda_{\pi'}) \wedge \pi \equiv_L \pi')$ faithfully models non-inference as semantics of sHCTL* forces π and π' to have the same call-stack size in addition to other low-level observations. Once again, observational determinism can also be verified in this model by suitably transforming the pushdown automaton.

3 Stack-aware Hyper Computation Tree Logic (sHCTL*)

Stack-aware Hyper Computation Tree Logic (sHCTL*), and its sub-logic Stack-aware Hyper Linear Temporal Logic (sHLTL) are formally presented. We begin by establishing some conventions over strings.

Strings. A *string/word* w over a finite alphabet Σ is a sequence $w = a_0a_1 \dots$ of finite or infinitely many symbols from Σ , i.e., $a_i \in \Sigma$ for all i . The *length* of a string w , denoted $|w|$, is the number of symbols appearing in it — if $w = a_0a_1 \dots a_{n-1}$ is finite then $|w| = n$, and if $w = a_0a_1 \dots$ is infinite then $|w| = \omega$. The *unique* string of length 0, the *empty string*, is denoted ε . For a string $w = a_0a_1 \dots a_i \dots$, $w(i) = a_i$ denotes the i th symbol, $w[:i] = a_0a_1 \dots a_{i-1}$ denotes the prefix of length i , $w[i:] = a_i a_{i+1} \dots$ denotes the suffix of w starting at position i , and $w[i:j] = a_i a_{i+1} \dots a_{j-1}$ denotes the substring from position i (included) to position j (not included). Thus $w[0:] = w$. By convention, when $i \leq 0$, we take $w[:i] = \varepsilon$. Over Σ , the set of all finite strings is denoted Σ^* , and the set of all infinite strings is denoted Σ^ω . For a finite string u and a (finite or infinite) string v , uv denotes the *concatenation* of u and v .

3.1 Pushdown Systems

Pushdown systems naturally model for sequential recursive programs. Formally, an AP-labeled *pushdown system* is a tuple $\mathcal{P} = (S, \Gamma, s_{\text{in}}, \Delta, L)$, where S is a finite set of *control states*, Γ is a finite set of *stack symbols*, $s_{\text{in}} \in S$ is the *initial control state*, $L : S \rightarrow 2^{\text{AP}}$ is the *labeling function*, and Δ is the transition relation. The transition relation $\Delta = \Delta_{\text{int}} \cup \Delta_{\text{call}} \cup \Delta_{\text{ret}}$ is the disjoint union of *internal transitions* $\Delta_{\text{int}} \subseteq S \times S$ where the stack is unchanged, *call transitions* $\Delta_{\text{call}} \subseteq S \times (S \times \Gamma)$ where a single symbol is *pushed* onto the stack, and *return transitions* $\Delta_{\text{ret}} \subseteq (S \times \Gamma) \times S$ where a single symbol is *popped* from the stack. When AP is clear from the context, we simply refer to them as pushdown systems. **Transition System Semantics.** We recall the standard semantics of a pushdown system as a transition system. Let us fix a pushdown system $\mathcal{P} = (S, \Gamma, s_{\text{in}}, \Delta, L)$. A *configuration* c of \mathcal{P} is a pair (s, α) where $s \in S$ and $\alpha \in \Gamma^*$.

$a \in \text{AP}, \pi \in \mathcal{V}$	
$\psi ::= a_\pi \mid \neg\psi \mid \psi \vee \psi \mid \mathbf{X}\psi$ $\mid \psi \mathbf{U} \psi \mid \exists\pi. \psi$	$\theta ::= E\psi \mid \neg\theta \mid \theta \vee \theta$ $\psi ::= a_\pi \mid \neg\psi \mid \psi \vee \psi \mid \mathbf{X}\psi \mid \psi \mathbf{U} \psi \mid \exists\pi. \psi$
(a) HYPERCTL*	(b) SHCTL*

Fig. 1: BNF for HYPERCTL* and SHCTL*. Let \forall denote $\neg\exists\neg$ and A denote $\neg E\neg\psi$. HYPERLTL is the set of HYPERCTL* formulas $Q_1\pi_1 \dots Q_r\pi_r.\psi$ where $Q_i \in \{\exists, \forall\}$ and ψ is quantifier-free. SHLTL is the set of SHCTL* formulas $\mathbb{E}\varphi$, where $\mathbb{E} \in \{A, E\}$ and φ is in HYPERLTL.

The set of all configurations of \mathcal{P} will be denoted $\text{Conf}_{\mathcal{P}} = S \times \Gamma^*$. The *labeled transition system* associated with \mathcal{P} is $\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket := (\text{Conf}_{\mathcal{P}}, c_{\text{in}}, \longrightarrow, \text{AP}, L)$ where $c_{\text{in}} = (s_{\text{in}}, \varepsilon)$ is the *initial configuration*, $\longrightarrow \subseteq \text{Conf}_{\mathcal{P}} \times (\{\text{call}, \text{ret}, \text{int}\} \times S \times (\Gamma \cup \{\varepsilon\}) \times S) \times \text{Conf}_{\mathcal{P}}$ is the *transition relation*, and L is the *labeling function* that extends the labeling function of \mathcal{P} to configurations as follows: $L(s, \alpha) = L(s)$. The transition relation \longrightarrow is defined to capture the informal semantics of internal, call, and return transitions — for any $\alpha \in \Gamma^*$, $(\text{int}) (s, \alpha) \xrightarrow{(\text{int}, s, \varepsilon, s')} (s', \alpha)$ iff $(s, s') \in \Delta_{\text{int}}$; $(\text{call}) (s, \alpha) \xrightarrow{(\text{call}, s, a, s')} (s', a\alpha)$ iff $(s, (s', a)) \in \Delta_{\text{call}}$; and $(\text{ret}) (s, a\alpha) \xrightarrow{(\text{ret}, s, a, s')} (s', \alpha)$ iff $((s, a), s') \in \Delta_{\text{ret}}$.

A *path* of $\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket$ is an infinite sequence of configurations $\sigma = c_0, c_1, \dots$ such that for each i , $c_i \xrightarrow{(\text{o}, s, a, s')} c_{i+1}$ for some $\text{o} \in \{\text{int}, \text{call}, \text{ret}\}$, $s, s' \in S$ and $a \in \Gamma \cup \{\varepsilon\}$. The path σ is said to *start* in configuration c_0 (the first configuration in the sequence). We will use $\text{Paths}(\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket, c)$ to denote the set of paths of $\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket$ starting in the configuration c and $\text{Paths}(\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket)$ to denote all paths of $\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket$.

We conclude this section by introducing some notation on configurations. For $c = (s, \alpha)$, its *stack height* is $|\alpha|$, its *control state* is $\text{state}(c) = s$, and its *top of stack symbol* is $\text{top}(c) = a \in \Gamma$ if $\alpha = a\alpha'$ and is undefined if $\alpha = \varepsilon$.

3.2 Syntax of SHCTL*

Let us fix a set of atomic propositions AP , and a set of path variables, \mathcal{V} . The BNF grammar for SHCTL* formulas is given in Figure 1(b). In the BNF grammar, $a \in \text{AP}$ is an *atomic proposition*, π is a *path variable*, ψ is a *cognate formula*, and θ is a SHCTL* formula. The syntax has two levels, with the inner level identical to HYPERCTL* formulas, while the outer level allows quantification over different stack access patterns (see Section 3.3). Also, following [5,10], we assume that the until operator \mathbf{U} only occurs within the scope of a path quantifier.

Remark 1. We have chosen to not have A , the dual of E , and conjunction as explicit logical operators to keep our exposition simple. This choice does makes the automata constructions presented here less efficient for formulas involving

conjunction. Adding them explicitly does not pose a technical challenge to our setup and our automata constructions can be extended to handle them explicitly. In addition, we will sometimes use other quantifiers and logical operators to write formulas. Some standard examples include: $\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2 = \neg(\neg\theta_1 \vee \neg\theta_2)$, where θ_i ($i \in \{1, 2\}$) is either a SHCTL* or cognate formula; $\forall\pi.\psi = \neg\exists\pi.\neg\psi$; $F\psi = \text{true} \mathbf{U} \psi$, where $\text{true} = a_\pi \vee \neg a_\pi$; $G\psi = \neg F\neg\psi$.

We call formulas of the form $\mathbb{E}\psi$ (where $\mathbb{E} \in \{A, E\}$ and ψ is a cognate formula) *basic formulas*. Observe that any SHCTL* formula is a Boolean combination of basic formulas. A SHCTL* formula θ is a *sentence* if in each basic sub-formula $\mathbb{E}\psi$, ψ is a sentence, i.e., every path variable appearing in ψ is quantified. Without loss of generality, we assume that in any cognate formula ψ , all bound variables in ψ are renamed to ensure that any path variable is quantified at most once. We will only consider SHCTL* sentences in this paper. The logic sHLTL is the sub-logic of SHCTL* consisting of all formulas of the form $\mathbb{E}Q_1\pi_1.\dots Q_r\pi_r.\psi$ where $\mathbb{E} \in \{A, E\}$, $Q_i \in \{\exists, \forall\}$ and ψ is quantifier free.

3.3 Semantics of SHCTL*

The syntax of cognate formulas is identical to that HYPERCTL* formulas. Their semantics will be described in a similar manner, in a context where free path variables in the formula are interpreted as executions of a system. However, we will require that the interpretations of every path variable share a *common* stack access pattern — hence the term *cognate*. Thus, before defining the semantics, we will define what we mean by the *stack access pattern* of a path and a *path environment* that assigns an interpretation to path variables.

For the rest of this section let us fix a pushdown system $\mathcal{P} = (S, \Gamma, s_{\text{in}}, \Delta, L)$. A string $w \in \{\text{call}, \text{int}, \text{ret}\}^*$ is said to be *well matched* if either $w = \varepsilon$ or $w = \text{int}$ or $w = \text{call } u \text{ ret}$ or $w = uv$, where $u, v \in \{\text{call}, \text{int}, \text{ret}\}^*$ are (recursively) well matched. In a string $\rho \in \{\text{call}, \text{int}, \text{ret}\}^\omega$, $\rho(i)$ is an *unmatched return*, if $\rho[: i + 1] = w \text{ ret}$, where w is well matched. We are now ready to present the definition of a stack access pattern.

Definition 1 (Stack access pattern). A string $\rho \in \{\text{call}, \text{int}, \text{ret}\}^\omega$ is a stack access pattern if the set $\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid \rho(i) \text{ is an unmatched return}\}$ is finite.

A path $\sigma = c_0c_1c_2\dots \in \text{Paths}(\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket)$ is said to have a stack access pattern $\rho = o_0o_1\dots$ (denoted $\text{pr}(\sigma) = \rho$) if for every i : (a) $o_i = \text{call}$ if and only if $\text{stack}(c_{i+1}) = \text{top}(c_{i+1})\text{stack}(c_i)$, (b) $o_i = \text{int}$ if and only if $\text{stack}(c_{i+1}) = \text{stack}(c_i)$, and (c) $o_i = \text{ret}$ if and only if $\text{stack}(c_i) = \text{top}(c_i)\text{stack}(c_{i+1})$.

We now present the definition of *path environment* that interprets the free path variables in a cognate formula as paths of $\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket$ such that they share a common stack access pattern. This plays a key role in defining the semantics of SHCTL*. For a set of path variables \mathcal{V} , let \mathcal{V}^\dagger be defined as the set $\mathcal{V} \cup \{\dagger\}$.

Definition 2 (Path Environment). A path environment for pushdown system \mathcal{P} over variables \mathcal{V} is function $\Pi : \mathcal{V}^\dagger \rightarrow \text{Paths}(\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket) \cup \{\text{call}, \text{int}, \text{ret}\}^\omega$ such

that $\Pi(\dagger)$ is a stack access pattern, and for every $\pi \in \mathcal{V}$, $\Pi(\pi) \in \text{Paths}(\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket)$ with $\text{pr}(\Pi(\pi)) = \Pi(\dagger)$. When the pushdown system is clear from the context, we will simply refer to it as a path environment over \mathcal{V} .

When $\mathcal{V} = \emptyset$, we additionally require that there is a path $\sigma \in \text{Paths}(\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket, c_{\text{in}})$ (where c_{in} is the initial configuration of $\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket$) such that $\text{pr}(\sigma) = \Pi(\dagger)$.

We introduce some notation related to path environments. Let us fix a path environment Π over variables \mathcal{V} . Given a path $\sigma \in \text{Paths}(\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket)$, $\Pi[\pi \mapsto \sigma]$ denotes the path environment over $\mathcal{V} \cup \{\pi\}$ such that $\Pi[\pi \mapsto \sigma](\pi) = \sigma$, and $\Pi[\pi \mapsto \sigma](\pi') = \Pi(\pi')$, for any $\pi' \in \mathcal{V}^\dagger$ with $\pi' \neq \pi$. Finally, for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Pi[i : \cdot]$ denotes the *suffix* path environment, where every variable is mapped to the suffix of the path starting at position i . More formally, for every $\pi' \in \mathcal{V}^\dagger$, $\Pi[i : \cdot](\pi') = \Pi(\pi')[i : \cdot]$.

We now define when a pushdown system \mathcal{P} satisfies a SHCTL* sentence θ , denoted $\mathcal{P} \models \theta$. The definition of satisfaction of θ relies on a definition of satisfaction for cognate formulas. To inductively define the semantics of cognate formulas, we will interpret free path variables using a path environment. Finally, as in HYPERCTL*, it is important to track the most recently quantified path variable because that influences the semantics of $\exists \pi(\cdot)$. Thus satisfaction of cognate formulas takes the form $\mathcal{P}, \Pi, \pi' \models \psi$, where π' is the most recently quantified path variable, and Π is a path environment over the free variables of ψ . Finally, by convention, we will take $\text{Paths}(\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket, \Pi(\dagger)(0))$ to mean $\text{Paths}(\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket, c_{\text{in}})$, where c_{in} is the initial configuration of $\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket$ ⁵. Below, θ, θ_1 , and θ_2 are SHCTL* sentences, while ψ, ψ_1, ψ_2 are cognate formulas.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P} \models \neg \theta &\text{ iff } \mathcal{P} \not\models \theta \\
\mathcal{P} \models \theta_1 \vee \theta_2 &\text{ iff } \mathcal{P} \models \theta_1 \text{ or } \mathcal{P} \models \theta_2 \\
\mathcal{P} \models E\psi &\text{ iff for some path environment } \Pi \text{ over } \emptyset, \mathcal{P}, \Pi, \dagger \models \psi \\
\mathcal{P}, \Pi, \pi' \models a_\pi &\text{ iff } a \in L(\Pi(\pi)(0)) \\
\mathcal{P}, \Pi, \pi' \models \neg \psi &\text{ iff } \mathcal{P}, \Pi, \pi' \not\models \psi \\
\mathcal{P}, \Pi, \pi' \models \psi_1 \vee \psi_2 &\text{ iff } \mathcal{P}, \Pi, \pi' \models \psi_1 \text{ or } \mathcal{P}, \Pi, \pi' \models \psi_2 \\
\mathcal{P}, \Pi, \pi' \models X\psi &\text{ iff } \mathcal{P}, \Pi[1 : \cdot], \pi' \models \psi \\
\mathcal{P}, \Pi, \pi' \models \psi_1 \cup \psi_2 &\text{ iff } \exists i \geq 0 : \mathcal{P}, \Pi[i : \cdot], \pi' \models \psi_2 \text{ and } \forall j, 0 \leq j < i, \\
&\quad \mathcal{P}, \Pi[j : \cdot], \pi' \models \psi_1 \\
\mathcal{P}, \Pi, \pi' \models \exists \pi. \psi &\text{ iff } \exists \sigma \in \text{Paths}(\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket, \Pi(\pi')(0)) \text{ with } \text{pr}(\sigma) = \Pi(\dagger), \\
&\quad \text{such that } \mathcal{P}, \Pi[\pi \mapsto \sigma], \pi \models \psi
\end{aligned}$$

4 A Decision Procedure for SHCTL*

Given a pushdown system \mathcal{P} and a SHCTL* sentence θ , we present an algorithm that determines if $\mathcal{P} \models \theta$. Our approach is similar to the one in [10]. Given a finite state transition system \mathcal{K} and a HYPERCTL* formula φ , Finkbeiner et. al. [10], construct an alternating (finite state) Büchi automaton $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}, \varphi}$, by induction on φ , such that an input word σ is accepted by $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}, \varphi}$ if and only if σ is the encoding

⁵ The convention is needed because $\Pi(\dagger)(0)$ is not a configuration but an element of the set $\{\text{call}, \text{int}, \text{ret}\}$.

of a path environment Π such that $\mathcal{K}, \Pi \models \varphi$. Determining if $\mathcal{K} \models \varphi$ then reduces to checking if $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}, \varphi}$ accepts any string.

Extending these ideas to sHCTL* and pushdown systems, requires one to answer two questions: (a) What is an encoding of path environments for cognate formulas where path variables are mapped to sequences of configurations (control state + stack)?; (b) Which automata models can capture the collection of path environments satisfying a cognate formula with respect to a pushdown system? We encode path environments for cognate formulas using strings over a *pushdown alphabet* — pushdown tags on symbols adds structure that helps encode sequences of configurations. And for automata, we consider automata that process such strings and accept *visibly pushdown languages*. A natural generalization of the approach outlined in [10] would suggest the use of alternating visibly pushdown automata (AVPA) on infinite strings [4]. However, using AVPAs results in an inefficient algorithm. To get a more efficient algorithm, we instead rely on a careful use of *nondeterministic visibly pushdown automata (NVPA)* [1] and *1-way alternating jump automata (1-AJA)* [4]. The advantage of using NVPA and 1-AJA can be seen in the case of existential quantification ($\exists\pi.$) which requires converting an alternating automaton to a nondeterministic one [10]: Converting from 1-AJA to NVPA leads to exponential blowup while converting AVPA to NVPA leads to a doubly exponential blowup [4].

The rest of this section is organized as follows. We begin by introducing the automata models on pushdown alphabets (Section 4.1). Next we present our encoding of path environments, and finally our automata constructions that establish the decidability result (Section 4.2).

4.1 Automata on Pushdown Alphabets

A *pushdown alphabet* is a finite set Σ that is partitioned into three sets $\Sigma_{\text{call}} \cup \Sigma_{\text{int}} \cup \Sigma_{\text{ret}}$, where Σ_{call} is the set of *call symbols*, Σ_{int} is the set of *internal symbols*, and Σ_{ret} is the set of *return symbols*. Automata models processing strings over a pushdown alphabet are restricted to perform certain types of transitions based on whether the read symbol is a call, internal, or return symbol. We introduce, informally, two such automata models next. Precise definition and its semantics can be found in Appendix B and Appendix C.

Nondeterministic Visibly Pushdown Büchi Automata. A *nondeterministic visibly pushdown automaton (NVPA)* [1] is like a pushdown system. It has finitely many control states and uses an unbounded stack for storage. However, unlike a pushdown system, it is an automaton that processes an infinite sequence of input symbols from a pushdown alphabet $\Sigma = \Sigma_{\text{call}} \cup \Sigma_{\text{int}} \cup \Sigma_{\text{ret}}$. Transitions are constrained to conform to pushdown alphabet — whenever a Σ_{call} symbol is read, a symbol onto the stack, whenever a Σ_{ret} symbol is read, the top stack symbol is popped, and whenever Σ_{int} symbol is read, the stack is unchanged.

1-way Alternating Jump Automata. Our second automaton model is *1-way Alternating Parity Jump Automata (1-AJA)* [4]. 1-AJA are computationally equivalent to NVPAs (i.e., accept the same class of languages) but provide

greater flexibility in describing algorithms. 1-AJAs are alternating automata, which means that they can define acceptance based on multiple runs of the machine on an input word. Though they are finite state machines with no auxiliary storage, their ability to spawn a computation thread that jumps to a future portion of the input string on reading a symbol, allows them to have the same computational power as a more conventional machine with storage (like NVPAs).

We present some useful properties of NVA and 1-AJA. The two models are equi-expressive with the size of automata constructed by the translation known.

Theorem 1 ([4]). *For any NVA N of size n , there is a 1-AJA \mathcal{A}_N of size $O(n^2)$, such that $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_N) = \mathcal{L}(N)$. Conversely, for any 1-AJA \mathcal{A} of size n , there is a NVA $N_{\mathcal{A}}$ of size $2^{O(n)}$, such that $\mathcal{L}(N_{\mathcal{A}}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$. Constructions can be carried out in time proportional to the size of the resulting automaton.*

Both 1-AJA and NVPAs are closed for language operations like complementation, union and prefixing. We also recall the following result.

Theorem 2. *([1]) For NVPAs, the emptiness problem is PTIME-complete.*

4.2 Algorithm for sHCTL*

Let us fix a pushdown system $\mathcal{P} = (S, \Gamma, s_{\text{in}}, \Delta, L)$ and a sHCTL* sentence θ . Our goal is to decide if $\mathcal{P} \models \theta$. We will reduce this problem to checking the emptiness of multiple NVPAs (Theorem 2). Our approach is similar to [10] — for each cognate sub-formula ψ (not necessarily sentence) of θ , we will compositionally construct an automaton that accepts the path environments satisfying ψ . Path environments will be encoded by strings over pushdown alphabets as follows.

For a path $\sigma = c_0 c_1 c_2 \dots$ of $\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket$, the *trace* of σ , denoted $\text{tr}(\sigma)$, is the (unique) sequence $(\mathfrak{o}_0, q_0, a_0, q_1)(\mathfrak{o}_1, q_1, a_1, q_2) \dots$ such that for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $c_i \xrightarrow{(\mathfrak{o}_i, q_i, a_i, q_{i+1})} c_{i+1}$ where $\mathfrak{o}_i \in \{\text{call}, \text{int}, \text{ret}\}$, $q_i, q_{i+1} \in Q$, and $a_i \in \Gamma \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ ⁶.

While $\text{tr}(\sigma)$ is uniquely determined by the path σ , the converse is not true — different paths may have the same trace. To see this, consider the following example. For configuration c and $\gamma \in \Gamma^*$, let $\gamma(c)$ denote the configuration $(\text{state}(c), \text{stack}(c)\gamma)$, i.e., the configuration with the same control state, but with stack containing the symbols in γ at the bottom. Observe that, for any $\gamma \in \Gamma^*$, if $\sigma = c_0 c_1 c_2 \dots$ is a path then so is $\gamma(\sigma) = \gamma(c_0)\gamma(c_1)\gamma(c_2) \dots$. Additionally, $\text{tr}(\sigma) = \text{tr}(\gamma(\sigma))$. Two paths σ_1 and σ_2 of $\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket$ will be said to be equivalent if $\text{tr}(\sigma_1) = \text{tr}(\sigma_2)$ and will be denoted as $\sigma_1 \simeq \sigma_2$. Observe that equivalent paths have the same stack access pattern, i.e. if $\sigma_1 \simeq \sigma_2$ then $\text{pr}(\sigma_1) = \text{pr}(\sigma_2)$. The semantics of sHCTL* doesn't distinguish between equivalent paths.

⁶ Observe that even when σ is not a path in $\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket$ (i.e., corresponds to an actual sequence of transitions of \mathcal{P}), the trace of σ is uniquely defined as long as stacks of successive configurations of σ can be obtained by leaving the stack unchanged, or pushing/popping one symbol.

Proposition 1. *Let φ be a cognate formula with \mathcal{V} as the set of free path variables. Let Π_1 and Π_2 be two path environments such that for every $\pi \in \mathcal{V}$, $\Pi_1(\pi) \simeq \Pi_2(\pi)$. Then, $\mathcal{P}, \Pi_1, \pi \models \varphi$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}, \Pi_2, \pi \models \varphi$.*

The proof of Proposition 1 follows by induction on cognate formulas. Proposition 1 establishes that the set of path environments satisfying a cognate formula is a union of equivalence classes with respect to path equivalence. Thus, instead of constructing automata that accept path environments, we will construct automata that accept mappings from path variables to traces of paths. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Sigma[m] = \Sigma[m]_{\text{call}} \cup \Sigma[m]_{\text{int}} \cup \Sigma[m]_{\text{ret}}$ be the pushdown alphabet where $\Sigma[m]_{\text{call}} = \{\text{call}\} \times S^m \times \Gamma^m$, $\Sigma[m]_{\text{int}} = \{\text{int}\} \times S^m \times \{\varepsilon\}^m$, and $\Sigma[m]_{\text{ret}} = \{\text{ret}\} \times S^m \times \Gamma^m$. Observe $\Sigma[0]$ is (essentially) the set $\{\text{int}, \text{call}, \text{ret}\}$.

Definition 3 (Encoding Path Environments). *Consider a set of m path variables $\mathcal{V} = \{\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_m\}$. A string $w \in \Sigma[m]^\omega$ where for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $w(j) = (\circ_j, (s_1^j, s_2^j, \dots, s_m^j), (a_1^j, a_2^j, \dots, a_m^j))$ encodes all path environments Π such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(\dagger) &= \circ_0 \circ_1 \circ_2 \cdots \circ_j \cdots \\ \text{tr}(\Pi(\pi_i)) &= (\circ_0, s_i^0, a_i^0, s_i^1)(\circ_1, s_i^1, a_i^1, s_i^2) \cdots \end{aligned}$$

for any $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. The string encoding a path environment Π is denoted as $\text{enc}(\Pi)$ ($= w$, in this case).

Based on the definitions, the following observation about traces and encodings can be concluded.

Proposition 2. *For any path $\sigma \in \text{Paths}(\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket)$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{tr}(\sigma[i :]) = \text{tr}(\sigma)[i :]$. For any path environment Π and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{enc}(\Pi[i :]) = \text{enc}(\Pi)[i :]$.*

The encoding of path environments as strings over $\Sigma[m]$ (for an appropriate value of m) is used in our decision procedure, which compositionally constructs automata that accept path environments satisfying each cognate formula. The size of our constructed automata, like in [10], will be tower of exponentials that depends on the *formula complexity* of the cognate formula φ .

Definition 4 (Formula Complexity). *The formula complexity of a SHCTL* formula φ , denoted $\text{fc}(\varphi)$, is inductively defined as follows. Let $\text{odd} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be the function that maps a number n to the smallest odd number $\geq n$, i.e., $\text{odd}(n) = n$ if n is odd and $\text{odd}(n) = n + 1$ if n is even. Similarly, $\text{even} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ maps n to the smallest even number $\geq n$, i.e., $\text{even}(n) = \text{odd}(n + 1) - 1$. Below ψ_1, ψ_2 denote cognate formulas, and θ_1, θ_2 denote SHCTL* sentences.*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{fc}(a_\pi) &= 0 & \text{fc}(\neg\psi_1) &= \text{even}(\text{fc}(\psi_1)) & \text{fc}(X\psi_1) &= \text{fc}(\psi_1) \\ \text{fc}(\psi_1 \vee \psi_2) &= \max(\text{fc}(\psi_1), \text{fc}(\psi_2)) & \text{fc}(\psi_1 \cup \psi_2) &= \text{even}(\max(\text{fc}(\psi_1), \text{fc}(\psi_2))) \\ \text{fc}(\exists\pi. \psi_1) &= \text{odd}(\text{fc}(\psi_1)) & \text{fc}(E\psi_1) &= \text{odd}(\text{fc}(\psi_1)) \\ \text{fc}(\neg\theta_1) &= \text{fc}(\theta_1) & \text{fc}(\theta_1 \vee \theta_2) &= \max(\text{fc}(\theta_1), \text{fc}(\theta_2)) \end{aligned}$$

Observe the difference in the definition of $\text{fc}(\neg\theta_1)$ and $\text{fc}(\neg\psi_1)$; for $\neg\theta_1$ there is no change in formula complexity, while for $\neg\psi_1$ we move to the next even level.

Our main technical lemma is a compositional construction of an automaton for cognate formulas ψ . Depending on the parity of $\text{fc}(\psi)$, the automaton we construct will either be a 1-AJA or a NVPA. Before presenting this lemma, we define a function that is a tower of exponentials. For $c, k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, the value $g_c(k, n)$ is defined inductively on k as follows: $g_c(0, n) = cn \log n$, and $g_c(k + 1, n) = 2^{g_c(k, n)}$. We use $g_{O(1)}(k, n)$ to denote the family of functions $\{g_c(k, n) \mid c \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Lemma 1. *Consider pushdown system $\mathcal{P} = (S, \Gamma, s_{\text{in}}, \Delta, L)$ and sHCTL* sentence θ . Let ψ be a cognate subformula of θ with free path variables in the set $\mathcal{V} = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_m\}$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$. We assume, without loss of generality, that the variables π_1, \dots, π_m are in the order in which they are quantified in θ with π_m being the first free variable of ψ that will be quantified in the context θ . In addition, we assume that the size of both ψ and \mathcal{P} is bounded by n . There is an automaton \mathcal{A}_ψ over pushdown alphabet $\Sigma[m]$ such that for any path environment Π over \mathcal{V} ,*

$$\mathcal{P}, \Pi, \pi_m \models \psi \text{ if and only if } \text{enc}(\Pi) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\psi). \quad ^7$$

The automaton \mathcal{A}_ψ is a NVPA if $\text{fc}(\psi)$ is odd, and a 1-AJA if $\text{fc}(\psi)$ is even. The size of \mathcal{A}_ψ is at most $g_{O(1)}(\lceil \frac{\text{fc}(\psi)}{2} \rceil, n)^8$.

Before presenting the proof of Lemma 1, we would like to highlight a subtlety about its statement. The result guarantees that for *valid* path environments Π , encoding $\text{enc}(\Pi)$ is accepted by \mathcal{A}_ψ if and only if Π satisfies ψ . It says nothing about path environments that are not valid. In particular, there may be functions that map path variables to traces that do not correspond to actual paths of $\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket$, but which are nonetheless accepted by \mathcal{A}_ψ . Notice, however, when $\psi = \exists \pi. \psi_1$ is a cognate sentence, a string over $\{\text{call}, \text{int}, \text{ret}\}$ will, by conditions guaranteed in Lemma 1, be accepted if and only if it corresponds to a stack access pattern of a path from the initial state that satisfies $\exists \pi. \psi_1$.

Proof (Sketch of Lemma 1). Our construction of \mathcal{A}_ψ will proceed inductively. The type of automaton constructed will be consistent with the parity of $\text{fc}(\psi)$, i.e., an NVPA if $\text{fc}(\psi)$ is odd and a 1-AJA if $\text{fc}(\psi)$ is even. We sketch the main ideas here, with the full proof available in Appendix D.

For $a_\pi, \neg \psi_1, \psi_1 \vee \psi_2$, and $X\psi_1$, the construction essentially proceeds by converting \mathcal{A}_{ψ_i} ($i \in \{1, 2\}$) if needed, into the type (NVPA or 1-AJA) of the target automaton using Theorem 1, and then using standard closure properties to combine them to get the desired automaton. In case of $\psi = \psi_1 \cup \psi_2$, we first convert (if needed) \mathcal{A}_{ψ_i} ($i \in \{1, 2\}$) into a 1-AJA. At each step, the automaton for ψ will choose to either run \mathcal{A}_{ψ_2} , or run \mathcal{A}_{ψ_1} and restart itself. Correctness relies on the fact that our encoding for path environments satisfies Proposition 2.

The most interesting case is that of $\psi = \exists \pi. \psi_1$. We will first convert (if needed) the automaton for ψ_1 into a NVPA \mathcal{A}_1 . The automaton for ψ will essentially guess the encoding of a path that is consistent with the transitions of

⁷ When $m = 0$, we take π_m to be \dagger .

⁸ When the size of the specification ψ is considered constant, the size of \mathcal{A}_ψ is at most $g_{O(1)}(\lceil \frac{\text{fc}(\psi)}{2} \rceil - 1, n)$

\mathcal{P} , and check if assigning the guessed path to variable π satisfies ψ_1 by running the automaton \mathcal{A}_1 . The additional requirement we have is that the guessed path start at the *same configuration* as the current configuration of the path assigned to variable π_m which introduces some subtle challenges. In order to be able to guess a path, \mathcal{A}_ψ will keep track of \mathcal{P} 's control state in its control state, and use its stack to track \mathcal{P} 's stack operations along the guessed path. Since the stacks of all paths are synchronized, it makes it possible for \mathcal{A}_ψ to use its (single stack) to track the stack of both \mathcal{P} and the stack of \mathcal{A}_1 . \square

Using Lemma 1, we can establish the main result of this section.

Theorem 3. *Given a $\mathcal{P} = (S, \Gamma, s_{\text{in}}, \Delta, L)$ and a sHCTL* sentence θ , the problem of determining if $\mathcal{P} \models \theta$ is in $\cup_c \text{DTIME}(g_c(\lceil \frac{\text{fc}(\theta)}{2} \rceil, n))$, where n is a bound on the size of \mathcal{P} and θ .*

Proof. Recall that a sHCTL* sentence is a Boolean combination of formulas of the form $E\psi$, where ψ is a cognate sentence. Results on whether $\mathcal{P} \models E\psi$ for each such subformula can be combined to determine whether $\mathcal{P} \models \theta$. Given this, the time to determine if $\mathcal{P} \models \theta$ is at most the time to decide if \mathcal{P} satisfies each subformula of the form $E\psi$ plus $O(n)$ (to compute the Boolean combination of these results). Next, recall that the construction in Lemma 1 ensures that for a cognate sentence of the form $\exists\pi. \psi$, $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_{\exists\pi. \psi})$ consists exactly of strings in $\{\text{call}, \text{int}, \text{ret}\}^\omega$ that encode a path environment over \emptyset that satisfy $\exists\pi. \psi$.

Consider a sHCTL* sentence $E\psi$. Let π be a path variable that does not appear in the sentence ψ . Based on the semantics of sHCTL* the following observation holds: $\mathcal{P} \models E\psi$ if and only if for some path environment Π over \emptyset , $\mathcal{P}, \Pi, \dagger \models \exists\pi. \psi$. Which is equivalent to saying that $\mathcal{P} \models E\psi$ if and only if $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_{\exists\pi. \psi}) \neq \emptyset$. Since $\text{fc}(E\psi) = \text{fc}(\exists\pi. \psi)$, and the emptiness problem of NVPA can be decided in polynomial time (Theorem 2), our theorem follows. \square

5 Lower Bound

In this section, we establish a lower bound for the problem of model checking sHCTL* sentences against pushdown systems. Our proof establishes a hardness result for the sHLTL sub-fragment of sHCTL*. Before presenting this lower bound, we introduce the function $h_c(\cdot, \cdot)$, which is another tower of exponentials, inductively defined as follows: $h_c(0, n) = n$, and $h_c(k+1, n) = h_c(k, n) \cdot c^{h_c(k, n)}$.

Theorem 4. *Let \mathcal{P} be a pushdown system and θ be a sHLTL sentence such that the sizes of both \mathcal{P} and θ is bounded by n and $\text{fc}(\theta) = 2k - 1$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The problem of checking if $\mathcal{P} \models \theta$ is $\text{DTIME}(h_c(k, n))$ -hard, for every $c \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof (Sketch). We sketch the main intuitions behind the proof. To highlight the novelties of this proof, it is useful to recall how $\text{NSPACE}(h_c(k-1, n))$ -hardness for HYPERLTL model checking is proved [5]. The idea is to reduce the language of a nondeterministic $h_c(k-1, n)$ space bounded machine M to the model checking

problem by constructing a finite state transition system that guesses a run of M , and a HYPERLTL formula that checks if the path is a valid accepting run.

To get the stricter bound of $\text{DTIME}(h_c(k, n))$, we use the fact that we are checking pushdown systems. The stack of the pushdown system can be used to guess a *tree*, as opposed to a simple trace. Therefore, we reduce a $h_c(k - 1, n)$ space bounded *alternating* Turing machine, instead of a nondeterministic machine. Since $\text{ASPACE}(f(n)) = \text{DTIME}(2^{O(f(n))})$ for $f(n) \geq \log n$, the theorem will follow if the reduction succeeds.

Recall that a run of an alternating Turing machine M is a rooted, labeled tree, where vertices are labeled by configurations of M in a manner that is consistent with the transition function of M . To faithfully encode a tree as a sequence of symbols, we record the DFS traversal of the tree, making explicit the stack operations performed during such a traversal. Consider a labeled, rooted tree T with root r whose label is $\ell(r)$ with T_1 as the left sub-tree and T_2 as the right sub-tree. The DFS traversal of T will push $\ell(r)$, traverse T_1 recursively, pop $\ell(r)$, push $\ell(r)$, traverse T_2 , and then pop $\ell(r)$. We will use such a DFS traversal to guess and encode runs of M . Popping and pushing $\ell(r)$ between the traversals of T_1 and T_2 may seem redundant. Why not simply do nothing between the traversals of T_1 and T_2 ? For T to be a valid run of M , the configuration labeling of the root of T_2 must be the result of taking one step from $\ell(r)$. Such checks will be encoded in our sHLTL sentence, and for that to be possible, we need successive configurations of M to be consecutive in the string encoding.

To highlight some additional consistency checks, let us continue with our example tree T from the previous paragraph. For a string to be a correct encoding of T , it is necessary that the string pushed before the traversal of T_i ($i \in \{1, 2\}$) be the same as the string popped after the traversal. This can be ensured by the pushdown system by actually pushing and popping those symbols. In addition, the string popped after T_1 's traversal must be the same as the string pushed before T_2 's traversal. Neither the stack nor the finite control of the pushdown system can be used to ensure this. Instead this must be checked by the sHLTL sentence we construct. But the symbols while popping $\ell(r)$ will be in reverse order of the symbols being pushed, and it is challenging to perform this check in the formula. To overcome this, we push/pop the label *and its reverse* at the same time. This ensures that if we want to check if a string pushed is the same as a string that was just popped, then we can check for string *equality*, and this check is easier to do using formulas in sHLTL. Additional checks to ensure that the tree encodes a valid accepting run are performed by the sHLTL sentence using ideas from [17]. Full details can be found in Appendix E. \square

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we introduced a branching time temporal logic SHCTL* that can be used to specify synchronous hyperproperties for recursive programs modeled as pushdown systems. The primary difference from the standard branching time logic HYPERCTL* for synchronous hyperproperties is that SHCTL* considers

a restricted class of hyperproperties, namely, those that relate only executions that the same stack access pattern. We call such hyperproperties stack-aware hyperproperties. We showed that the problem of model checking pushdown systems sHCTL* specifications is decidable, and characterized its complexity. We also showed how this result can potentially be used to aid security verification.

References

1. Alur, R., Madhusudan, P.: Visibly pushdown languages. In: Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. pp. 202–211. ACM (2004)
2. Bajwa, A., Zhang, M., Chadha, R., Viswanathan, M.: Stack-aware hyperproperties. In: 29th International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems (TACAS) (2023), to appear
3. Bouajjani, A., Esparza, J., Maler, O.: Reachability analysis of pushdown automata: Application to model-checking. In: Concurrency Theory, 8th International Conference. pp. 135–150. Springer (1997)
4. Bozzelli, L.: Alternating automata and a temporal fixpoint calculus for visibly pushdown languages. In: Concurrency Theory, 18th International Conference. pp. 476–491. Springer (2007)
5. Clarkson, M.R., Finkbeiner, B., Koleini, M., Micinski, K.K., Rabe, M.N., Sánchez, C.: Temporal logics for hyperproperties. In: Principles of Security and Trust - Third International Conference. pp. 265–284. Springer (2014)
6. Clarkson, M.R., Schneider, F.B.: Hyperproperties. In: Proceedings of the 21st IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium. pp. 51–65. IEEE Computer Society (2008)
7. Coenen, N., Finkbeiner, B., Sánchez, C., Tentrup, L.: Verifying hyperliveness. In: Computer Aided Verification - 31st International Conference. pp. 121–139. Springer (2019)
8. Finkbeiner, B., Hahn, C., Stenger, M.: EAHyper: Satisfiability, implication, and equivalence checking of hyperproperties. In: Computer Aided Verification - 29th International Conference. pp. 564–570. Springer (2017)
9. Finkbeiner, B., Hahn, C., Stenger, M., Tentrup, L.: RVHyper: A runtime verification tool for temporal hyperproperties. In: Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems - 24th International Conference. pp. 194–200. Springer (2018)
10. Finkbeiner, B., Rabe, M.N., Sánchez, C.: Algorithms for model checking HyperLTL and HyperCTL*. In: Computer Aided Verification - 27th International Conference. pp. 30–48. Springer (2015)
11. Goguen, J.A., Meseguer, J.: Security policies and security models. In: IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy. pp. 11–20. IEEE Computer Society (1982)
12. Gutsfeld, J.O., Müller-Olm, M., Ohrem, C.: Deciding asynchronous hyperproperties for recursive programs. CoRR [abs/2201.12859](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.12859) (2022)
13. McLean, J.: Proving noninterference and functional correctness using traces. Journal of Computer Security **1**(1), 37–58 (1992)
14. McLean, J.: A general theory of composition for trace sets closed under selective interleaving functions. In: IEEE Computer Society Symposium on Research in Security and Privacy. pp. 79–93. IEEE Computer Society (1994)

15. Molnar, D., Piotrowski, M., Schultz, D., Wagner, D.: The program counter security model: Automatic detection and removal of control-flow side channel attacks. In: Proceedings of the 8th international conference on Information Security and Cryptology. p. 156–168. Springer-Verlag (2005)
16. Pommellet, A., Touili, T.: Model-checking HyperLTL for pushdown systems. In: Model Checking Software - 25th International Symposium. pp. 133–152. Springer (2018)
17. Sistla, A.P., Vardi, M.Y., Wolper, P.: The complementation problem for büchi automata with applications to temporal logic. Theoretical Computer Science **49**, 217–237 (1987)
18. Walukiewicz, I.: Pushdown processes: Games and model checking. In: Computer Aided Verification, 8th International Conference. pp. 62–74. Springer (1996)
19. Zdancewic, S., Myers, A.C.: Observational determinism for concurrent program security. In: Proceedings of the 16th IEEE Computer Security Foundations Workshop. p. 29. IEEE Computer Society (2003)

A Observational determinism when the call stack size is visible to the attacker

Observational determinism [13,19] states that any two executions that have the same low-level initial inputs must have the same low-level output observations. Observational determinism is a hypersafety property [5,6]. As [5] shows, observational determinism is also expressible in HYPERLTL using the formula: $\text{OD} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall \pi. \forall \pi'. (\pi[0] \equiv_{L,in} \pi'[0]) \rightarrow \pi \equiv_{L,out} \pi'$. Here $\equiv_{L,in}$ and $\equiv_{L,out}$ express the fact that π and π' have the same low-security inputs and outputs respectively.

In order to see how we can verify observational determinism when call stack sizes are observable, let us consider the simple case when the call stack size is the *only* low-security observation. Let \mathcal{P} be the pushdown automaton corresponding to a program. We can assume by loss of generality that the states of \mathcal{P} encode if the stack is empty, and that pop transitions occur only in states where the stack is empty.⁹ Let $\Delta\mathcal{P}$ be the pushdown automaton obtained from \mathcal{P} which behaves like \mathcal{P} , except that it has additional nondeterministic transitions as follows. $\Delta\mathcal{P}$ has three new states q_{call} , q_{int} and q_{ret} . We also assume there are four new propositions: *new*, *call*, *int* and *ret*. The proposition *new* is true in q_{call} , q_{int} and q_{ret} only. The only transitions in the new states are self-loops that do not change the stack size. Whenever \mathcal{P} has a push/internal/pop transition from a state q to q' in \mathcal{P} , we add an internal nondeterministic transition from q to $q_{\text{call}}/q_{\text{int}}/q_{\text{ret}}$ that does not change the stack size. Furthermore, the proposition *call/int/ret* is

⁹ Essentially, initially the stack is taken to be empty. When a symbol is pushed onto an empty stack, it is “annotated” with information that it is the bottom of the stack, and the state remembers that stack is non-empty. When an “annotated” symbol is popped, the stack now remembers that the stack is empty.

true in q in that case. Consider the formula

$$\begin{aligned}
A \forall \pi. \forall \pi'. (\pi[0] \equiv_{L, \text{in}} \pi'[0]) \rightarrow \\
& ((\text{new}_\pi \vee \text{new}_{\pi'}) \text{R} \\
& \quad ((\text{call}_\pi \Rightarrow \text{call}_{\pi'} \wedge \neg \text{int}_{\pi'} \wedge \neg \text{ret}_{\pi'}) \wedge \\
& \quad (\text{int}_\pi \Rightarrow \text{int}_{\pi'} \wedge \neg \text{call}_{\pi'} \wedge \neg \text{ret}_{\pi'}) \wedge \\
& \quad (\text{ret}_\pi \Rightarrow \text{ret}_{\pi'} \wedge \neg \text{call}_{\pi'} \wedge \neg \text{int}_{\pi'})))
\end{aligned}$$

where R is the dual of U . More precisely, $\psi \text{R} \psi'$ is $\neg(\neg\psi') \text{U}(\neg\psi)$.

Observe that the above formula is not satisfied by the pushdown system $\Delta\mathcal{P}$ if and only if there are two *finite* executions σ_1 and σ_2 of \mathcal{P} leading to states q_1 and q_2 such that (a) the low-level inputs in σ_1 and σ_2 are the same, (b) σ_1 and σ_2 have the same stack access pattern, and (c) a push/internal/pop can be executed from only one of the states q_1 and q_2 , but not the other.

B Nondeterministic Visibly Pushdown Automata (NVPA)

A *nondeterministic visibly pushdown automaton (NVPA)* [1] is like a pushdown system in that it has finitely many control states and uses an unbounded stack for storage. However, unlike a pushdown system, it is an automaton that processes an infinite sequence of input symbols from a pushdown alphabet $\Sigma = \Sigma_{\text{call}} \cup \Sigma_{\text{int}} \cup \Sigma_{\text{ret}}$. Furthermore, transitions are constrained to conform to pushdown alphabet — whenever the automaton reads from Σ_{call} , it pushes a symbol onto its stack, whenever it reads from Σ_{ret} , it pops its top stack symbol, and whenever it reads from Σ_{int} , it leaves its stack unchanged.

Definition 5 (NVPA). A nondeterministic visibly pushdown Büchi automaton (NVPA) is a tuple $N = (Q, q_{\text{in}}, \Sigma, \Gamma, \perp, \delta, Q_F)$ where, Q is a finite set of control states, $q_{\text{in}} \in Q$ is the initial control state, $\Sigma = \Sigma_{\text{call}} \cup \Sigma_{\text{int}} \cup \Sigma_{\text{ret}}$ is a pushdown alphabet that is used to encode inputs, Γ is a finite set called the stack alphabet, $\perp \notin \Gamma$ is the bottom of stack symbol, $Q_F \subseteq Q$ is the set of accepting states, and δ is the transition relation. δ will be assumed to be partitioned into three as $\delta_{\text{call}} \cup \delta_{\text{ret}} \cup \delta_{\text{int}}$ where $\delta_{\text{call}} \subseteq (Q \times \Sigma_{\text{call}} \times Q \times \Gamma)$ is the transition on call symbols, $\delta_{\text{int}} \subseteq (Q \times \Sigma_{\text{int}} \times Q)$ is the transition on internal symbols, and $\delta_{\text{ret}} \subseteq (Q \times \Sigma_{\text{ret}} \times (\Gamma \cup \perp) \times Q)$ is the transition on return symbols.

Let us fix an NVPA $N = (Q, q_{\text{in}}, \Sigma, \Gamma, \perp, \delta, Q_F)$. A *configuration* of N , like in the case of a pushdown system, is a pair of the form $(q, \alpha \perp)$ where $q \in Q$ and $\alpha \in \Gamma^*$. The functions $\text{state}(\cdot)$, $\text{stack}(\cdot)$, and $\text{top}(\cdot)$ are defined in the same manner as for pushdown system configurations. A *run* of N on an input string $w \in \Sigma^\omega$ is an infinite sequence of configurations c_0, c_1, \dots such that $c_0 = (q_{\text{in}}, \perp)$ is the *initial configuration* of N , and successive configurations are consistent with the input symbol read and the transition relation of N . More precisely, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, (a) if $w(i) \in \Sigma_{\text{call}}$ then $(\text{state}(c_i), w(i), \text{state}(c_{i+1}), \text{top}(c_{i+1})) \in \delta_{\text{call}}$ and $\text{stack}(c_{i+1}) = \text{top}(c_{i+1})\text{stack}(c_i)$; (b) if $w(i) \in \Sigma_{\text{int}}$ then

$(\text{state}(c_i), w(i), \text{state}(c_{i+1})) \in \delta_{\text{int}}$ and $\text{stack}(c_{i+1}) = \text{stack}(c_i)$; and (c) if $w(i) \in \Sigma_{\text{ret}}$ then $(\text{state}(c_i), w(i), \text{top}(c_i), \text{state}(c_{i+1})) \in \delta_{\text{ret}}$ and additionally, $\text{stack}(c_{i+1}) = \text{stack}(c_i) = \perp$ if $\text{top}(c_i) = \perp$ and $\text{stack}(c_i) = \text{top}(c_i)\text{stack}(c_{i+1})$ if $\text{top}(c_i) \neq \perp$. It is worth observing that transitions on call symbols push a symbol onto the stack, transitions on internal symbols leave the stack unchanged, and transitions on return symbols typically pop the top of the stack unless the stack is empty (i.e. $= \perp$) in which case they leave the stack unchanged.

A run c_0, c_1, \dots on input w is said to be *accepting* if it satisfies the Büchi acceptance condition, i.e., for some $q \in Q_F$ there are infinitely many i such that $\text{state}(c_i) = q$. Finally, the *language accepted* by NVPA N , denoted $\mathcal{L}(N)$, is

$$\mathcal{L}(N) = \{w \in \Sigma^\omega \mid N \text{ has an accepting run on } w\}.$$

C 1-way Alternating Jump Automata (1-AJA)

Our second model of an automaton with strings over a pushdown alphabet, is *1-way Alternating Parity Jump Automata (1-AJA)* [4]. 1-AJA are computationally equivalent to NVPAs (i.e., accept the same class of languages) but provide greater flexibility in describing algorithms. 1-AJAs are alternating automata, which means that they can define acceptance based on multiple runs of the machine on an input word. Though they are finite state machines with no auxiliary storage, their ability to spawn a computation thread that jumps to a future portion of the input string on reading a symbol, allows them to have the same computational power as a more conventional machine with storage (like NVPAs). We present this model after some necessary definitions.

Transitions of an alternating automata identify subsets of next steps that must all be accepting for the machine to accept an input. We describe these subsets of next steps is using Boolean functions. For a set X , let $\mathcal{B}^+(X)$ denote the set of *positive Boolean expressions* built using elements of X as propositions, i.e., they consist of propositional logic formulas built using `true`, `false`, X , \wedge and \vee . Given $\varphi \in \mathcal{B}^+(X)$ and $A \subseteq X$, we say $A \models \varphi$ if φ evaluates to true under the valuation that assigns true to the elements of A and false to everything else. The *dual* of a formula $\varphi \in \mathcal{B}^+(X)$, denoted $\text{dual}(\varphi)$, is the formula obtained from φ by replacing `true` by `false`, `false` by `true`, \vee by \wedge , and \wedge by \vee . More precisely, $\text{dual}(\cdot)$ can be defined inductively as follows, where $x \in X$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dual}(\text{true}) &= \text{false} & \text{dual}(\text{false}) &= \text{true} & \text{dual}(x) &= x \\ \text{dual}(\varphi \wedge \psi) &= \varphi \vee \psi & \text{dual}(\varphi \vee \psi) &= \varphi \wedge \psi \end{aligned}$$

A 1-AJA is a finite state automaton that reads an input over a pushdown alphabet. In other words, on reading an input symbol, a thread of computation changes its control state based on its current state and symbol read. However, one of the novel features of a 1-AJA is its ability to *jump* when it reads a call symbol. Thus, a transition of a 1-AJA not only specifies what the next state is, but also what the next symbol to be read is. When the symbol read is either an internal symbol or a return symbol, the symbol to be read next is always the one

immediately after; this is denoted as \rightarrow . However, when the symbol read is a call symbol, the automaton can choose to either read the next symbol or to read the *matching return symbol* next; \curvearrowright is used to indicate that the automaton should read the matching return symbol next. We now have all the notation necessary to define a 1-AJA formally.

Definition 6 (1-AJA). A 1-way Alternating Parity Jump Automaton (1-AJA) is a tuple $\mathcal{A} = (Q, q_{\text{in}}, \Sigma, \delta, \text{parity})$ where, Q is a finite set of control states, $q_{\text{in}} \in Q$ is the initial control state, $\Sigma = \Sigma_{\text{call}} \cup \Sigma_{\text{int}} \cup \Sigma_{\text{ret}}$ is a pushdown alphabet that is used to encode inputs, $\delta : (Q \times \Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^+(Q \times \{\rightarrow, \curvearrowright\})$ is the transition relation with the restriction that for any $q \in Q$ and $a \in \Sigma_{\text{int}} \cup \Sigma_{\text{ret}}$, $\delta(q, a) \in \mathcal{B}^+(Q \times \{\rightarrow\})$, and $\text{parity} : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is the parity function.

In order to define a run of 1-AJA on an input string, we need to introduce some notation. Let us fix a pushdown alphabet $\Sigma = \Sigma_{\text{call}} \cup \Sigma_{\text{int}} \cup \Sigma_{\text{ret}}$. We can extend the notion of well matched strings to Σ^* as follows. A string $z \in \Sigma^*$ is said to be *well matched* if either $z = \varepsilon$, or $z \in \Sigma_{\text{int}}$, or $z = cur$, or $z = uv$, where $c \in \Sigma_{\text{call}}$, $r \in \Sigma_{\text{ret}}$, and $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ are (recursively) well matched. Let us fix an input string $w \in \Sigma^\omega$. The *abstract successor* of position i in w , denoted $\curvearrowright(i)$, is given as follows.

$$\curvearrowright(i) = \begin{cases} j & \text{if } w[i : j + 1] = cur \\ & \text{where } u \text{ is well matched,} \\ & c \in \Sigma_{\text{call}}, r \in \Sigma_{\text{ret}} \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Notice that $\curvearrowright(i)$ is defined only if $w(i) \in \Sigma_{\text{call}}$, and if defined, its value is the position of its *matching return symbol*. The abstract successor identifies the position of the next symbol that will be read if the 1-AJA decides to *jump* on a call. Next, the *local successor* of position i in w , denoted $\rightarrow(i)$, is always defined to be $i + 1$.

Let us fix a 1-AJA $\mathcal{A} = (Q, q_{\text{in}}, \Sigma, \delta, \text{parity})$ and input string $w \in \Sigma^\omega$. A *run* of \mathcal{A} on w is a rooted, labeled tree $R = (V, E, r, L)$, where V is the set of vertices, E the set of edges, $r \in V$ is the root, and $L : V \rightarrow (Q \times \mathbb{N})$. The label of vertex indicates the state of \mathcal{A} and the position in w that is being read. We require that $L(r) = (q_{\text{in}}, 0)$, i.e., the automaton is in the initial state and the 0th symbol is being read. Let $v \in V$ be an arbitrary vertex with $L(v) = (q, i)$ and let $C \subseteq V$ be the set vertices that are children of v in R . We require that the labels of v and those of vertices in C are consistent with δ — there is a set $A \subseteq (Q \times \{\rightarrow, \curvearrowright\})$ such that (a) $A \models \delta(q, w(i))$; (b) for every $(q', d) \in A$ such that $d(i)$ is defined, there is a vertex $n \in C$ with $L(n) = (q', d(i))$; and (c) for every vertex $n \in C$, there is $(q', d) \in A$ such that $d(i)$ is defined and $L(n) = (q', d(i))$. A run $R = (V, E, r, L)$ is *accepting* if every infinite path in R satisfies the *parity acceptance* condition as defined by parity . That is, for every infinite path σ in R , $\text{mp}(\sigma)$ is even, where

$$\text{mp}(\sigma) = \min\{\text{parity}(q) \mid \text{for infinitely many } i, L(\sigma(i)) = (q, k) \text{ for some } k\}.$$

Finally, as always, the language recognized by \mathcal{A} is given by

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) = \{w \in \Sigma^\omega \mid \mathcal{A} \text{ has an accepting run on } w\}.$$

D Proof of Lemma 1

Before beginning the proof of Lemma 1, let us recall why NVPAs and 1-AJAs are closed on standard operations on languages. We present these observations with a focus on the size of the resulting automata. For a language $A \subseteq \Sigma^\omega$ and subset $\Gamma \subseteq \Sigma$, we take ΓA to be the language $\{aw \mid a \in \Gamma \text{ and } w \in A\}$.

Proposition 3. *Let \mathcal{A}_i be a 1-AJA (NVPA) recognizing $L_i \subseteq \Sigma^\omega$ of size n_i , for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Let $\Gamma \subseteq \Sigma$. Then the following automata can be constructed in polynomial time.*

1. *There is a 1-AJA (NVPA) recognizing $L_1 \cup L_2$ of size $O(n_1 + n_2)$.*
2. *There is a 1-AJA (NVPA) recognizing ΓL_1 of size $O(n_1)$.*
3. *There is a 1-AJA recognizing $(\Sigma^\omega \setminus L_1)$ of size $O(n_1)$.*

Proof (Sketch). The automaton construction that establishes (1) chooses to either run one of \mathcal{A}_1 or \mathcal{A}_2 nondeterministically to recognize $L_1 \cup L_2$. (2) can be established by checking if the first symbol belongs to Γ (and performing the necessary stack operation demanded by the first symbol in the case of NVPA) and then running the automaton for L_1 . Finally, for (3), the 1-AJA recognizing the complement of L_1 has the same set of states, the parity of each state is increased by 1, and for any state q and symbol a , $\delta(q, a) = \text{dual}(\delta_1(q, a))$, where δ_1 and δ are the transition functions of \mathcal{A}_1 and the automaton recognizing $(\Sigma^\omega \setminus L_1)$, respectively.

Our construction of \mathcal{A}_ψ will proceed inductively based on the structure of ψ . The type of automaton constructed will be consistent with the parity of $\text{fc}(\psi)$, i.e., an NVPA if $\text{fc}(\varphi)$ is odd and a 1-AJA if $\text{fc}(\psi)$ is even.

Case $\psi = a_\pi$: Let $\Gamma \subseteq \Sigma[m]$ be the set of symbols ζ such that a is in the label set of the π th control state in symbol ζ . We will construct a 1-AJA that accepts $\Gamma(\Sigma[m])^\omega$ using Proposition 3 (2).

Case $\psi = \neg\psi_1$: We will convert \mathcal{A}_{ψ_1} into a 1-AJA (if needed) using Theorem 1, and then use Proposition 3 (3) to construct a 1-AJA that accepts the language $\overline{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_{\psi_1})}$.

Case $\psi = \psi_1 \vee \psi_2$: Without loss of generality, assume that $\text{fc}(\psi_1) \geq \text{fc}(\psi_2)$. We convert (if needed) \mathcal{A}_{ψ_2} to an automaton of the same type as \mathcal{A}_{ψ_1} using Theorem 1 and then use Proposition 3 (1), to construct an automaton recognizing $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_{\psi_1}) \cup \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_{\psi_2})$.

Case $\psi = X\psi_1$: We use Proposition 3 (2) to construct an automaton for $\Sigma[m]\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_{\psi_1})$.

Case $\psi = \psi_1 \cup \psi_2$: Using Theorem 1, we will construct (if needed) a 1-AJA equivalent to \mathcal{A}_{ψ_i} and let this be $\mathcal{A}_i = (Q_i, q_{\text{in}_i}, \Sigma[m], \delta_i, \text{parity}_i)$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

The 1-AJA for ψ is given by $\mathcal{A}_\psi = (Q_1 \cup Q_2 \cup \{q_{\text{in}}\}, q_{\text{in}}, \Sigma[m], \delta, \text{parity})$ where $\delta(q_{\text{in}}, \zeta) = \delta_2(q_{\text{in}_2}, \zeta) \vee ((\rightarrow, q_{\text{in}}) \wedge \delta_1(q_{\text{in}_1}, \zeta))$, $\text{parity}(q_{\text{in}}) = 1$, and for $q \in Q_i$ ($i \in \{1, 2\}$), we have $\delta(q, \zeta) = \delta_i(q, \zeta)$ and $\text{parity}(q) = \text{parity}_i(q)$.

Case $\psi = \exists \pi. \psi_1$: Recall that our pushdown system \mathcal{P} has control states S , stack alphabet Γ , and transition relation $\Delta = \Delta_{\text{int}} \cup \Delta_{\text{call}} \cup \Delta_{\text{ret}}$. Using Theorem 1, we will construct (if needed) a NVPA equivalent to \mathcal{A}_{ψ_1} and let this be $\mathcal{A}_1 = (Q_1, q_{\text{in}_1}, \Sigma[m+1], \Gamma_1, \perp, \delta_1, Q_{F_1})$. Notice that the input alphabet of \mathcal{A}_1 is $\Sigma[m+1]$, where the $m+1$ st component is an encoding of the path assigned to variable π . The automaton for ψ will essentially guess the encoding of a path that is consistent with the transitions of \mathcal{P} , and check if assigning the guessed path to variable π satisfies ψ_1 by running the automaton \mathcal{A}_1 . The additional requirement we have is that the guessed path start at the *same configuration* as the current configuration of the path assigned to variable π_m . In order to be able to guess a path, \mathcal{A}_ψ will keep track of \mathcal{P} 's control state in its control state, and use its stack to track \mathcal{P} 's stack operations along the guessed path. Before defining \mathcal{A}_ψ formally we need to introduce some notation that will be convenient. An element $\zeta \in \Sigma[m]$ is of the form $(\mathbf{o}, (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m), (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m))$. We use $\text{op}(\zeta)$ to denote \mathbf{o} , $\text{state}(\zeta)|_i$ to denote s_i , and $\text{stack}(\zeta)|_i$ to denote a_i , for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. By convention we take $\text{state}(\zeta)|_0 = s_{\text{in}}$, and $\text{stack}(\zeta)|_0$ to be *undefined*. Finally, for $s \in S$ and $a \in \Gamma$, $\zeta + (s, a)$ is the symbol in alphabet $\Sigma[m+1]$ given by $(\mathbf{o}, (s_1, \dots, s_m, s), (a_1, \dots, a_m, a))$.

The NVPA $\mathcal{A}_\psi = ((Q_1 \times S) \cup \{q_{\text{in}}\}, q_{\text{in}}, \Sigma[m], (\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma), \perp, \delta, (Q_{F_1} \times S))$; notice that the bottom of stack symbol (\perp) is same as the one in \mathcal{A}_1 . The transition relation $\delta = \delta_{\text{call}} \cup \delta_{\text{ret}} \cup \delta_{\text{int}}$ is defined as follows.

– When $\text{op}(\zeta) = \text{call}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{call}} = \{ & (q_{\text{in}}, \zeta, (q, s), (b, a)) \mid (q_{\text{in}_1}, \zeta + (\text{state}(\zeta)|_m, a), q, b) \in \delta_1 \text{ and} \\ & (\text{state}(\zeta)|_m, (s, a)) \in \Delta_{\text{call}} \} \cup \\ & \{((q, s), \zeta, (q', s'), (b, a)) \mid (q, \zeta + (s, a), q', b) \in \delta_1, (s, (s', a)) \in \Delta_{\text{call}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

– When $\text{op}(\zeta) = \text{int}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{int}} = \{ & (q_{\text{in}}, \zeta, (q, s)) \mid (q_{\text{in}_1}, \zeta + (\text{state}(\zeta)|_m, \varepsilon), q) \in \delta_1, (\text{state}(\zeta)|_m, s) \in \Delta_{\text{int}} \} \\ & \cup \{((q, s), \zeta, (q', s')) \mid (q, \zeta + (s, \varepsilon), q') \in \delta_1, \text{ and } (s, s') \in \Delta_{\text{int}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

– When $\text{op}(\zeta) = \text{ret}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{ret}} = \{ & (q_{\text{in}}, \zeta, \perp, (q, s)) \mid (q_{\text{in}_1}, \zeta + (\text{state}(\zeta)|_m, \text{stack}(\zeta)|_m), \perp, q) \in \delta_1 \text{ and} \\ & ((\text{state}(\zeta)|_m, \text{stack}(\zeta)|_m), s) \in \Delta_{\text{ret}} \} \cup \\ & \{((q, s), \zeta, \perp, (q', s')) \mid (q, \zeta + (s, \text{stack}(\zeta)|_m), \perp, q') \in \delta_1, \text{ and} \\ & ((s, \text{stack}(\zeta)|_m), s') \in \Delta_{\text{ret}} \} \cup \\ & \{((q, s), \zeta, (b, a), (q', s')) \mid (q, \zeta + (s, a), b, q') \in \delta_1, ((s, a), s') \in \Delta_{\text{ret}}\} \end{aligned}$$

The requirement that the guessed path for π start in the same configuration as the current configuration of the path assigned to π_m , introduces a few points in the definition of δ that are worth highlighting. Transitions from q_{in} , whether

they be `call`, `int`, or `ret`, pick a step in \mathcal{P} that starts from the same state as the one in the path assigned to π_m . Stack symbols pushed by \mathcal{P} along the guessed path are pushed by \mathcal{A}_ψ onto its stack (see δ_{call}). If the stack of \mathcal{A}_ψ is \perp at a `ret`-transition, that means on the guessed path the symbol popped must be from what was on the stack at the start of the path. Since that matches with the configuration on the path mapped to π_m , this symbol must be the same as what is popped for π_m . This is reflected in δ_{ret} for the cases with \perp .

An important observation that we will exploit is that if $\psi = \exists\pi.\psi_1$ is a sentence, then the following stronger correctness guarantee holds: for any $\rho \in \{\text{call}, \text{int}, \text{ret}\}^\omega$, $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\psi)$ if and only if ρ is a stack access pattern and $\mathcal{P}, [\dagger \mapsto \rho], \dagger \models \psi$. The language of \mathcal{A}_ψ in this case consists of exactly the set of path environments satisfying ψ . This stronger statement follows from the construction of \mathcal{A}_ψ .

To complete the proof, we will bound the size of \mathcal{A}_ψ by induction on $\text{fc}(\psi)$. Recall that n is a bound on the size of \mathcal{P} and ψ .

Base Case: Consider ψ such that $\text{fc}(\psi) = 0$. Based on the definition of $\text{fc}(\cdot)$ (Definition 4), this means that ψ is built from propositions, \neg , \vee , \mathbf{X} , and \mathbf{U} ; in particular there are no path quantifiers in ψ in this case. Observe that the construction for a_π is a constant sized automaton. Also, the constructions for \neg , \vee , \mathbf{X} , and \mathbf{U} add at most a constant factor to the size of the automaton. Given these observations, size of \mathcal{A}_ψ in this case is bounded by $O(n)$, which is bounded by $g_{O(1)}(0, n)$. Thus the base case holds.

Induction Step: We break the induction step into two cases based on the parity of $\text{fc}(\psi)$. When $\text{fc}(\psi) = 2k$ (for some $k \geq 1$) then ψ is built using subformulas of (formula) complexity at most $2k$ using Boolean operators (\neg , \vee), \mathbf{X} , and \mathbf{U} . Let us assume that we first construct 1-AJAs for each of the subformulas with (formula) complexity $< 2k$. This results in at most a quadratic blowup (Theorem 1), and so the size of the automata for each such subformula is at most $(g_c(k, n))^2$ for some c . The constructions for \neg , \vee , \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{U} produce an automaton that is at most a constant factor of the sum of the sizes of the component automata. Thus, the size of \mathcal{A}_ψ is at most $dn(g_c(k, n))^2 \leq g_{c'}(k, n)$ for some c' , establishing the claim in this case. Now let us consider the case when $\text{fc}(\psi) = 2k + 1$ for some $k \geq 0$. In this case ψ is built using \vee , \mathbf{X} and \exists to combine subformulas of (formula) complexity $\leq 2k + 1$. Again, we can convert automata for each of the sub-formulas of (formula) complexity $< 2k + 1$ into NVPAs for an exponential cost (Theorem 1). Thus, we can assume that the size of all of these automata is bounded by $g_c(k + 1, n)$ for some c . Based on Proposition 3, we can see that disjunction and \mathbf{X} produce automata that grow by at most a constant factor. Existential quantification are the only operators to have a non-trivial blow-up. Based on the construction outlined in this proof, if φ has an NVPA of size ℓ then the automaton of $\exists\pi.\varphi$ has size $O(n\ell)$ as n bounds the size of \mathcal{P} . Since there are at most n quantifiers, we can bound the size of \mathcal{A}_ψ by $dn^n(g_c(k + 1, n)) \leq 2^{d n \log n + g_c(k, n)} \leq g_{c'}(k + 1, n)$; the last step is because $g_c(k, n) \geq cn \log n$. This establishes the induction step.

E Proof of Theorem 4

We will show that every language $L \in \text{ASPACE}(h_c(k-1, n))$ can be reduced to the model checking problem of sHLTL sentence with formula complexity $2k-1$. Since $\text{ASPACE}(f(n)) = \text{DTIME}(2^{O(f(n))})$ for $f(n) \geq \log n$, the theorem will follow.

Consider an arbitrary $h_c(k-1, n)$ -space bounded alternating Turing machine (ATM) M . Since $h_c(k-1, n) \geq n$, we may assume that M is a 1-tape machine. Let $M = (Q_\exists, Q_\forall, \Sigma, \Gamma, \sqcup, q_{\text{in}}, \delta, q_a)$, where Q_\exists is the set of *existential* control states, Q_\forall is the set of *universal* control states, Σ is the *input alphabet*; $\Gamma \supseteq \Sigma$ is the *tape alphabet*, $\sqcup \in \Gamma \setminus \Sigma$ is the *blank symbol*, $q_{\text{in}} \in Q_\exists \cup Q_\forall$ and $q_a \in Q_\exists$ are the *initial* and *accepting* states, respectively, and δ is the transition function of the Turing machine. We use $Q = Q_\exists \cup Q_\forall$ to denote the set of all states of M . We assume that q_a is a halting state (no transitions enabled) and so $\delta : (Q \setminus \{q_a\}) \times \Gamma \rightarrow 2^{(Q \times \Gamma \times \{\rightarrow, \leftarrow\})}$, where given a state and current symbol being read, the transition function identifies choices for the next state, the symbol to be written, and the direction in which to move the tape head (\rightarrow for right, and \leftarrow for left). We assume, without loss of generality, that for each pair $(q, b) \in Q \times \Gamma$ that $|\delta(q, b)| \in \{0, 2\}$, i.e., there are either no or two choices at each step. Also, we assume that these choices are ordered in some fashion so we will often speak of “choice i ” for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

A *configuration* c of M is a string in $\Gamma^*(Q \times \Gamma)\Gamma^*$, where $c = u(q, b)v$ with $u, v \in \Gamma^*$, $b \in \Gamma$ and $q \in Q$, denotes that the tape of M is the string ubv , the control state is q , and the head is reading the cell containing b . Since M is $h_c(k-1, n)$ -space bounded, we can assume any configuration c of M is a string of length *exactly* $h_c(k-1, n)$. The initial configuration of M on input bw of length n is $(q_{\text{in}}, b)w \sqcup^{h_c(k-1, n)-n}$. A configuration $c = u(q, b)v$ is an *existential* configuration if $q \in Q_\exists$, a *universal* configuration if $q \in Q_\forall$, and an *accepting* configuration if $q = q_a$. For a pair of configurations c and c' , we say $c \vdash_i c'$ if M 's configuration is c' if it takes one step according to choice $i \in \{1, 2\}$ from configuration c . A *run* of M on input w is a *finite*, rooted binary tree $T = (V, E, r, \ell)$, where V is the set of vertices, E is the set of edges oriented away from the root, $r \in V$ is the root, and ℓ is a function that maps each vertex to a configuration of M . In addition, ℓ is required to satisfy the following conditions. The root r is labeled by the initial configuration. For any internal vertex $v \in V$, if $\ell(v)$ is an existential configuration then v has one child c such that $\ell(v) \vdash_i \ell(c)$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and if $\ell(v)$ is a universal configuration, then v has two children c_1, c_2 such that $\ell(v) \vdash_i \ell(c_i)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Finally, a run T is *accepting* if every leaf of T is labeled by an accepting configuration. An input w is accepted by M , if M has an accepting run on w .

We will construct a reduction from $\mathcal{L}(M)$ (which by definition is in $\text{ASPACE}(h_c(k-1, n))$) to the model checking problem for sHLTL. That is, given input w , we will construct a pushdown system \mathcal{P}_w and sHLTL sentence θ_w such that $\mathcal{P}_w \models \theta_w$ if and only if $w \in \mathcal{L}(M)$. The idea behind the reduction is to construct a pushdown system \mathcal{P}_w such that labels of paths starting from the initial configuration in $\llbracket \mathcal{P}_w \rrbracket$ encode possible computations of M on w . And θ_w

is constructed to check if a path encodes a valid accepting run of M on w . To formalize this intuition, we need to first identify a way to encode runs of M , which are binary trees, as a string of labels.

Encoding ATM Runs. Recall that a run of M is a binary tree and we need to find a way to encode the tree as string. One way to accomplish this faithfully, is to have the encoding record the stack operations during a depth first search (DFS) traversal of the tree. For example, if we have a tree T with root r , with tree T_1 as the left child and T_2 as the right child, then during DFS, the algorithm will first push r on the stack, perform DFS traversal on T_1 (recursively), pop r from the stack, push r back onto the stack, DFS traverse T_2 (recursively), and finally pop r . When encoding runs, what we need to push/pop is not the node r , but rather its label. Notice that for a sequence of stack operations to conform to the DFS traversal of a tree, it is necessary for the symbols being pushed and popped be the label of the *same* node — for example, in the example tree before, after traversing T_1 , we need the same node r to be popped and pushed. Since the symbols when popping are in reverse order of when they are pushed, for long labels (as in the case of configurations) this check is challenging. To overcome this, we push/pop the label and its reverse at the same time. This ensures that if we want to check if a string pushed is the same as a string that was just popped, then we can check for string *equality* as opposed to one being the reverse of another, and this check is easier to do using formulas in sHLTL.

We formalize the above discussion to give a precise definition of the encoding of a binary tree as a string. We will abuse notation and overload $\text{enc}(\cdot)$ to refer to multiple functions — the context will disambiguate which $\text{enc}(\cdot)$ we are referring to. Let $\Lambda = \Gamma \cup (Q \times \Gamma)$, the alphabet used to encode configurations of M . For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $[\Lambda]_i = \{[a]_i \mid a \in \Lambda\}$ be a “copy” of the alphabet Λ . For a string $c \in \Lambda^*$ of length m , we define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{enc}(\text{push}, c) &= (\text{call}, [c(0)]_1, [c(m-1)]_2)(\text{call}, [c(1)]_1, [c(m-2)]_2) \cdots \\ &\quad (\text{call}, [c(i)]_1, [c(m-i-1)]_2) \cdots (\text{call}, [c(m-1)]_1, [c(0)]_2) \\ \text{enc}(\text{pop}, c) &= (\text{ret}, [c(m-1)]_1, [c(0)]_2)(\text{ret}, [c(m-2)]_1, [c(1)]_2) \cdots \\ &\quad (\text{ret}, [c(i)]_1, [c(m-i-1)]_2) \cdots (\text{ret}, [c(0)]_1, [c(m-1)]_2) \end{aligned}$$

Essentially, $\text{enc}(\cdot)$ of a string encodes both the string and its reverse, has a tag that indicates whether the string is being pushed or popped, and if it is popped, the order of symbols is reversed. Consider a rooted, labeled binary tree $T = (V, E, r, \ell)$. Its encoding is inductively defined as follows. If $V = \{r\}$ and $E = \emptyset$ (i.e., T is a tree with only one vertex) then $\text{enc}(T) = \text{enc}(\text{push}, \ell(r))\text{enc}(\text{pop}, \ell(r))$. If r has only one child which is the subtree T_1 , then $\text{enc}(T) = \text{enc}(\text{push}, \ell(r))\text{enc}(T_1)\text{enc}(\text{pop}, \ell(r))$, where $\text{enc}(T_1)$ is given recursively. Finally, if r has T_1 and T_2 as left and right subtrees, respectively, then $\text{enc}(T) = \text{enc}(\text{push}, \ell(r))\text{enc}(T_1)\text{enc}(\text{pop}, \ell(r))\text{enc}(\text{push}, \ell(r))\text{enc}(T_2)\text{enc}(\text{pop}, \ell(r))$. Before moving on, let us highlight a subtle aspect of our encoding. In the case of a tree where r has two sub-trees T_1 and T_2 , we “pop” $\ell(r)$ and “push” $\ell(r)$ between the traversals of T_1 and T_2 . This may seem unnecessary on first reading. Notice that for T to be a valid run, the label of the root of T_2 must be the result of

taking one step from $\ell(r)$. Such checks will be encoded in our sentence, and for that to be possible, we need successive ATM configurations to consecutive in the string encoding.

The Pushdown System. Labels of paths of our constructed pushdown system will encode possible runs of M on the input w . At each step the pushdown system guesses the next symbol of the possible run by moving to a control state whose label corresponds to this symbol. The stack is used to ensure that when the “pop” symbols in the encoding are encountered they match the symbols that were “pushed” earlier in the guess. We can define this precisely as follows. Recall that for $A = \Gamma \cup (Q \times \Gamma)$, $[A]_i$ ($i \in \{1, 2\}$) refers to the “ i th copy” of A . Let us fix the set of atomic propositions $\text{AP} = \{\text{call}, \text{ret}, \text{end}\} \cup [A]_1 \cup [A]_2$ and let $S = \{\text{call}, \text{ret}\} \times [A]_1 \times [A]_2$. Let $\mathcal{P} = (S \cup \{s_{\text{in}}, s_e\}, ([A]_1 \times [A]_2) \cup \{\perp\}, s_{\text{in}}, \Delta, L)$, where $L(s_{\text{in}}) = \emptyset$, $L(s_e) = \{\text{end}\}$, and $L((\text{o}, [a]_1, [b]_2)) = \{\text{o}, [a]_1, [b]_2\}$. The transition relation $\Delta = \Delta_{\text{int}} \cup \Delta_{\text{call}} \cup \Delta_{\text{ret}}$ is given as follows: $\Delta_{\text{int}} = \{(s_e, s_e)\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\text{call}} &= \{(s_{\text{in}}, (s, \perp)) \mid s \in S\} \cup \\ &\quad \{((\text{call}, [a]_1, [b]_2), (s, ([a]_1, [b]_2))) \mid s \in S \text{ and } a, b \in A\} \\ \Delta_{\text{ret}} &= \{(((\text{ret}, [a]_1, [b]_2), ([a]_1, [b]_2)), s) \mid s \in S \text{ and } a, b \in A\} \cup \\ &\quad \{((s, \perp), s_e) \mid s \in S\} \end{aligned}$$

Paths of $\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket$ may not correspond to actual computations of M on w since \mathcal{P} doesn’t check for many properties that need to hold for such a string. On the other hand, correct runs of M on w do correspond to paths of \mathcal{P} that end in $(\text{end})^\omega$. Our final pushdown system will be a slight modification of \mathcal{P} , in two ways. First we will add some additional book-keeping to the states and stack symbols to ensure that whenever a universal configuration is guessed, the computation has transitions corresponding to both choices. Second, we will need to modify the system to account for the specification, as we shall see towards the end of this proof.

As mentioned before, for the labels of a path of \mathcal{P} to correspond to the encoding of an accepting computation of M on w , we need to ensure that the labels satisfy a few properties. These will be encoded in our SHLTL sentence. However, instead of encoding these conditions in SHLTL, we will find it convenient to first write them in QPTL, a logic introduced in [17]. We begin by introducing this logic, showing how the properties of accepting runs can be encoded, and then describing a way to translate them back to SHLTL.

QPTL. Quantified propositional temporal logic (QPTL) [17] extends LTL with quantification over propositions. Fixing a set of atomic propositions AP , formulas in the logic are given by the following BNF grammar; in what follows, a is an element of AP .

$$\varphi ::= a \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid X\varphi \mid F\varphi \mid \exists a. \varphi$$

Models of QPTL are the same as those for LTL, namely elements of $(2^{\text{AP}})^\omega$, and the semantics of most of the constructs is similar. For $w \in (2^{\text{AP}})^\omega$, a holds if $a \in w(0)$; $\neg\varphi$ holds if φ does not hold; $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$ holds if either φ_1 or φ_2 hold;

$X\varphi$ holds if φ holds on the suffix $w[1 :]$; and $F\varphi$ holds if φ holds in some suffix $w[i :]$. The only new operator is $\exists a. \varphi$ which holds in w , if φ holds in some word w' which agrees with w in the evaluation of all propositions except possibly a . Recall that $F\varphi$ is equivalent to $\text{true} \cup \varphi$, $G\varphi$ is a short hand for $\neg F(\neg\varphi)$, and $\forall a. \varphi$ is $\neg\exists a. (\neg\varphi)$. We can extend $\text{fc}(\cdot)$ to QPTL formulas, with the same definition; for this definition \neg will behave like negation for cognate formulas, rather than negation for SHCTL*-sentences. Finally, it has been shown that every QPTL formula is equivalent to one in prenex normal form, where all the quantifiers have been pulled to the front of the formula.

Our QPTL formula φ_w that describes when a word encodes an accepting run of M on w , will rely on formulas constructed in [17]. The first is formula $\varphi_{c,k,n}(p_1, p_2)$ (Lemma 4.4. in [17]) of size $O(k + n)$ such that $w \models \varphi_{c,k,n}(p_1, p_2)$ if and only if propositions p_1 and p_2 are true exactly once in w , p_2 is true after p_1 , and they are separated by exactly $h_c(k, n)$ positions. Further more $\text{fc}(\varphi_{c,k,n}) = 2k - 1$, and can be constructed $O(\log n)$ space. We will introduce the other formulas as we describe the conditions needed.

The QPTL formula φ_w . We now describe φ_w with the property that a path of $\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket$ satisfies φ_w if and only if M accepts w ; here a path $c_0 c_1 \dots$ of $\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket$ satisfies φ_w , if $L(c_0)L(c_1)\dots \models \varphi_w$. Observe that the construction of \mathcal{P} ensures that symbols “popped” are the same as the symbols “pushed” and that every universal configuration has two successors correspond to transitions corresponding to each choice.. Therefore, the remaining conditions that need to be checked for a path to be the encoding of an accepting computation of M on w are as follows.

1. Every configuration has length exactly $h_c(k - 1, n)$.
2. All symbols encoding a single configuration have the same tag, i.e., either all call or all ret.
3. The first configuration is the initial configuration of M on w .
4. Successive “pushed” configurations correspond to a single step of M consistent with its transition function.
5. “Leaves” of the run are accepting configurations. In other words, if a push configuration is immediately followed by a pop configuration (they will be identical thanks to \mathcal{P}), then the control state must be q_a .
6. If a pop configuration is immediately followed by a push configuration (i.e., the DFS traversal of the run is exploring the right child) then they must be the same configuration.
7. All the configurations are popped at the end.

If φ denotes the conjunction of all the above conditions written in QPTL, then our desired formula φ_w is $X\varphi$ since the initial state s_{in} of \mathcal{P} is not part of guessing the encoding of the computation.

We describe how to encode each of these conditions in QPTL, often relying on formulas from [17].

1. To state property (1), we will have a proposition \triangleright (which will be existentially quantified) that marks the beginning of each configuration. The fact that \triangleright marks the beginning of each configuration will be ensured by

the other properties we write down. We will require that \triangleright is true exactly $h_c(k-1, n)$ positions apart using the formula $\varphi_{c,k-1,n}(\cdot, \cdot)$ introduced before. This is given by Equation (9) in [17] where r replaced by \triangleright .

2. Since \triangleright marks the beginning of each configuration, saying that all symbols in a configuration have the same tag, is equivalent to saying that if the tag changes then \triangleright must be true when the tag changes. In other words, property (2) can be written as

$$G((\text{call} \wedge X\triangleright) \rightarrow X\triangleright) \wedge G((\text{ret} \wedge X\text{call}) \rightarrow X\triangleright)$$

3. Equation (10) in [17] states the property (3). It needs to be slightly modified to also include the condition that the propositions from $[A]_2$ encode the reverse of the initial configuration of M .
4. Equation (11) in [17] states the property (4). It needs to be slightly to modified to also ensure that the reverse encodings using $[A]_2$ are consistent with the transitions of M , and this requirement is only imposed for successive configurations that have the call tag.
5. Recall that corresponding symbols in successive configurations are $h_c(k-1, n)$ apart. Property (5) can be written to say that if there are two positions p and q that are $h_c(k-1, n)$ apart that have opposite tags, and if in addition p corresponds to a position that is scanned by the tape head, then the control state at p must be the accepting state q_a .

$$\forall p_1 \forall p_2. (\varphi_{c,k-1,n}(p_1, p_2) \wedge F(p_1 \wedge \text{call} \wedge \bigvee_{a \in Q \times \Gamma} [a]_1) \wedge F(p_2 \wedge \text{ret})) \rightarrow F(p_1 \wedge \bigvee_{a \in \{q_a\} \times \Gamma} [a]_1)$$

6. Using the observations in property (5), property (6) can be written as

$$\forall p_1 \forall p_2. ((\varphi_{c,k-1,n}(p_1, p_2) \wedge F(p_1 \wedge \text{ret}) \wedge F(p_2 \wedge \text{call})) \rightarrow \bigvee_{a,b \in \Lambda} (F(p_1 \wedge [a]_1 \wedge [b]_2) \wedge F(p_2 \wedge [b]_1 \wedge [a]_2)))$$

7. This property can be ensured by requiring that the path end in state s_2 . We write this as $F \text{end}$.

Since formulas in QPTL can be written in prenex normal form, we can pull all the universal quantifiers in the various formulas listed above to get a formula φ_w of the form $X \exists \triangleright \forall p_1 \forall p_2. \varphi$ where φ is a Boolean combination of $\neg \varphi_{c,k-1,n}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and simple formulas with temporal operators of (formula) complexity 0. Thus, $\text{fc}(\varphi_w) = 2k - 1$.

Converting to sHLTL. Our QPTL formula φ_w is of the form $X \exists \triangleright \varphi'$. We will describe how to construct an “equivalent” formula in sHLTL; this will require modifying our pushdown system \mathcal{P} as well to obtain our final pushdown system \mathcal{P}_w . Construct a cognate sentence ψ' as follows. Let a be a new proposition *not*

appearing in φ_w . For every *quantified* proposition p in φ_w , replace every bound occurrence of p by a_{π_p} and replace the quantification $\exists p$ with $\exists \pi_p$. Let π_* be a fresh path variable. Replace every free proposition p in φ_w by p_{π_*} . Let ψ be the resulting cognate formula. Finally let $\theta_w = E\exists\pi_*. \psi$.

To finish the reduction, we need to modify \mathcal{P} to account for the new proposition a introduced in θ_w . Our final pushdown system \mathcal{P}_w is constructed as follows. Recall that $S = (\{\text{call}, \text{ret}\} \times [A]_1 \times [A]_2)$ and the states of \mathcal{P} is $S \cup \{s_{\text{in}}, s_e\}$. Let $[S]_1$ and $[S]_2$ be two copies of S . The states of \mathcal{P}_w will be $[S]_1 \cup [S]_2 \cup \{s_{\text{in}}, s_e\}$. The two copies of state $s \in S$ will have the same transitions into and out of it and have the same labels for all the old propositions. The only difference will be that $a \in L([s]_1)$ while $a \notin L([s]_2)$.

It is easy to make the following observations: $\text{fc}(\theta_w) = \text{fc}(\varphi_w)$, and a path of $\llbracket \mathcal{P} \rrbracket$ satisfies φ_w if and only if $\mathcal{P}_w \models \theta_w$. This completes the proof of the hardness result.