

Quantitative Graded Semantics and Spectra of Behavioural Metrics

Jonas Forster¹, Lutz Schröder¹, Paul Wild¹, Harsh Beohar², Sebastian Gurke³,
Barbara König³, Karla Messing³

¹ Friedrich-Alexander Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg
² University of Sheffield ³ Universität Duisburg-Essen

Abstract. Behavioural metrics provide a quantitative refinement of classical two-valued behavioural equivalences on systems with quantitative data, such as metric or probabilistic transition systems. In analogy to the linear-time/branching-time spectrum of two-valued behavioural equivalences on transition systems, behavioural metrics vary in granularity. We provide a unifying treatment of spectra of behavioural metrics in the emerging framework of graded monads, working in coalgebraic generality, that is, parametrically in the system type. In the ensuing development of *quantitative graded semantics*, we introduce algebraic presentations of graded monads on the category of metric spaces. Moreover, we obtain a canonical generic notion of invariant real-valued modal logic, and provide criteria for such logics to be expressive in the sense that logical distance coincides with behavioural distance. We present positive examples based on this criterion, covering both known and new expressiveness results; in particular, we show that expressiveness holds essentially always for Eilenberg-Moore type trace semantics, and we obtain a new expressiveness result for trace semantics of fuzzy transition systems. As a negative result, we show that trace distance on probabilistic metric transition systems does not admit any characteristic real-valued modal logic, even in a more broadly understood sense.

1 Introduction

While qualitative models of concurrent systems are traditionally analysed using various notions of two-valued process equivalence, it has long been recognized that for systems involving quantitative data, notions of behavioural *distance* play a useful role as a more fine-grained measure of process similarity. Well-known examples include behavioural distances on probabilistic transition systems [23,12,7], on systems combining nondeterminism and probability [9], and on metric transition systems [2,15]. Like in the two-valued case, where process equivalences of varying granularity are arranged on the *linear-time/branching-time spectrum* [24], one has a spectrum of behavioural metrics on a given system that vary in granularity (with greater distances thought of as having finer granularity) [14]. In the present work, we provide a framework for behavioural metrics on quantitative systems that is parametric both in the *type* of systems (e.g.

probabilistic, metric, fuzzy) and in the quantitative *semantics* of systems, i.e. the choice of behavioural distance. For parametricity in the system type, we rely on *universal coalgebra* [38], in which the transition type of systems is abstracted as an endofunctor on a suitable base category. Parametricity in the system semantics, on the other hand, is based on the framework of *graded monads* [34,13], which handles additional semantic identifications (beyond branching-time equivalence) by algebraic means, using grades to control the depth of look-ahead. For the syntactic treatment of spectra of behavioural distances, we introduce a graded extension of *quantitative algebra* [33] that allows describing graded monads on the category of metric spaces by operations and approximate equations.

We then focus on providing *characteristic real-valued modal logics* for behavioural distances, in the sense that logical distance should coincide with the respective behavioural distance; this amounts to a quantitative form of the Hennessy-Milner property, which we briefly refer to as *expressiveness*. A prototypical example is quantitative probabilistic modal logic, which is characteristic for branching-time behavioural distance on probabilistic transition systems [7], so that high behavioural distance may be *certified* by means of distinguishing modal formulae [36]. We consider a notion of logical distance induced by a general form of *quantitative graded logic*, building on previous work in the two-valued setting [13,17]. Quantitative graded logics are always *invariant* under the underlying behavioural distance in the sense that formula evaluation is nonexpansive, so that logical distance is below behavioural distance. We provide a general criterion for the reverse inequality, i.e. for *expressiveness* of quantitative graded logics; building on similar criteria for the two-valued case [13,17] but needs to deal with issues that are quite specific to the metric setting. In particular, it needs to be parametric in a strengthening of the inductive hypothesis in the induction on depth of look-ahead that it encapsulates; indeed, this happens already in strikingly simple cases. We develop a number of example applications: We partially recover results on expressiveness of quantitative modal logics for (finite-depth) branching-time distances [30,41,17,29], as well as a recent result on expressiveness of a quantitative modal logic for trace distance in metric transition systems [5]; we show that Eilenberg-Moore style trace semantics [26] essentially always admits an expressive quantitative modal logic; and we establish a new expressiveness result for a modal logic for fuzzy trace distance. Beyond these positive results, we establish a maybe surprising negative result: For probabilistic metric trace distance (on generative probabilistic transition systems in which the set of labels is equipped with a metric, i.e. on the probabilistic variant of metric transition systems), there does not exist any characteristic quantitative modal logic, in a fairly broadly defined sense that includes having a compositional semantics defined directly on the transition system. Probabilistic metric trace distance may be cast as an instance of Kleisli-style coalgebraic trace semantics [25], so this result contrasts sharply with the above-mentioned positive result on Eilenberg-Moore style trace semantics [26].

Proofs are generally given in the appendix.

Related Work We have mentioned previous work on coalgebraic branching-time behavioural distances [3,30,20,42,43,5,29] and on graded semantics for two-valued behavioural equivalences and preorders [34,13,17]. Kupke and Rot [31] study logics for *coinductive predicates*, which generalize branching-time behavioural distances. Recent work on Galois connections for logical distances [5,6] is highly general but leaves more work to the instance logics than the framework of graded monads; see Remark 33 for more concrete comments. Alternative coalgebraic approaches to process equivalences coarser than branching time include coalgebraic trace semantics in Kleisli [25] and Eilenberg-Moore categories [26], which are both subsumed by the paradigm of graded monads [34], as well as an approach in which behavioural equivalences are *defined* via characteristic logics [28]. The Eilenberg-Moore and Kleisli setups can be unified using corecursive algebras, which also support, under certain assumptions, a logical characterization for these cases [37]. The Eilenberg-Moore approach has been applied to linear-time behavioural distances [3]. De Alfaro et al. [2] introduce a linear-time logic for (state-labelled) metric transition systems. The semantics of this logic is defined by first computing the set of paths of a system, so that propositional operators and modalities have a different meaning than in corresponding branching-time logics, while our graded logics are fragments of branching-time logics. Fahrenberg et al. [15] present a game-based approach to a spectrum of behavioural distances on metric transition systems. A two-valued logic for probabilistic trace semantics (for a discrete set of labels) has been considered in the context of differential privacy [8]. A notion of logical distance is then obtained via a real-valued semantics defined using a syntactic distance on formulae; this semantics is not compositional (truth values are defined by taking infima over the whole logical syntax), so subsequent results relating this logical distance to notions of weak anonymity do not contradict our negative result on (compositional) characteristic logics for probabilistic trace semantics.

2 Preliminaries

We assume basic familiarity with category theory (e.g. [1]). We briefly recall some background on metric spaces and on graded monads.

Metric spaces The real unit interval $[0, 1]$ will serve as the domain of distances and truth values. Under the usual ordering \leq , $[0, 1]$ forms a complete lattice; we write \bigvee, \bigwedge for joins and meets in $[0, 1]$ (e.g. $\bigvee_i x_i = \sup_i x_i$), and \vee, \wedge for binary join and meet, respectively. Moreover, we write \oplus and \ominus for truncated addition and subtraction, respectively; that is, $x \oplus y = \min(x + y, 1)$ and $x \ominus y = \max(x - y, 0)$. These operations form part of a structure of $[0, 1]$ as a (co-)quantale; for readability, we refrain from working with more general quantales [42,20].

Definition 1. A *pseudometric space* is a pair (X, d) consisting of a set X and a function $d: X \times X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfying the standard conditions of *reflexivity* ($d(x, x) = 0$ for all $x \in X$), *symmetry* ($d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ for all $x, y \in X$), and the

triangle inequality ($d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$ for all $x, y, z \in X$); if additionally *separation* holds (for $x, y \in X$, if $d(x, y) = 0$ then $x = y$), then (X, d) is a *metric space*. A function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between pseudometric spaces (X, d_X) and (Y, d_Y) is *nonexpansive* if $d_Y(f(x), f(y)) \leq d_X(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$. Metric spaces and nonexpansive maps form a category **Met**. A set $X_0 \subseteq X$ is *dense* in (X, d_X) if for every $\epsilon > 0$ and every $x \in X$, there exists $x' \in X_0$ such that $d_X(x, x') \leq \epsilon$.

We often do not distinguish notationally between a (pseudo-)metric space (X, d) and its underlying set X . If multiple (pseudo-)metric spaces are involved, we sometimes denote the respective (pseudo-)metric with subscripts, so d_X is the (pseudo-)metric of the space with carrier X . The categorical product $(X, d_X) \times (Y, d_Y)$ of (pseudo-)metric spaces equips the Cartesian product $X \times Y$ with the supremum (pseudo-)metric $d_{X \times Y}((a, b), (a', b')) = d_X(a, a') \vee d_Y(b, b')$. Similarly, the *Manhattan tensor* \boxplus equips $X \times Y$ with the *Manhattan (pseudo-)metric* $d_{X \boxplus Y}((a, b), (a', b')) = d_X(a, a') \oplus d_Y(b, b')$. We may occasionally write elements of the product X^{n+m} as vw if $v \in X^n$ and $w \in X^m$. Given (pseudo-)metric spaces X, Y , the set of nonexpansive functions $X \rightarrow Y$ forms a (pseudo-)metric space under the standard supremum distance.

Example 2. We recall some key examples of functors on the category **Set** of sets and maps, and associated functors on **Met**.

1. We write \mathcal{P}_ω for the finite powerset functor on **Set**, and $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega$ for the lifting of \mathcal{P}_ω to **Met** given by the Hausdorff metric. Explicitly,

$$d_{\overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega X}(A, B) = (\bigvee_{a \in A} \bigwedge_{b \in B} d_X(a, b)) \vee (\bigvee_{b \in B} \bigwedge_{a \in A} d_X(a, b))$$

for a metric space (X, d_X) and $A, B \in \mathcal{P}_\omega X$.

2. Similarly, \mathcal{D}_ω denotes the functor on **Set** that maps a set X to the set of finitely supported probability distributions on X , and $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega$ denotes the lifting of \mathcal{D}_ω to **Met** that equips $\mathcal{D}_\omega X$ with the Kantorovich metric. Explicitly,

$$d_{\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega X}(\mu, \nu) = \bigvee_f \sum_{x \in X} f(x)(\mu(x) \ominus \nu(x))$$

for a metric space (X, d) and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{D}_\omega X$, where f ranges over all nonexpansive functions $X \rightarrow [0, 1]$. We often write elements of $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega X$ as finite formal sums $\sum p_i \cdot x_i$, with $x_i \in X$ and $\sum p_i = 1$.

3. The *finite fuzzy powerset* functor \mathcal{F}_ω is given on sets X by $\mathcal{F}_\omega X = \{A: X \rightarrow [0, 1] \mid A(x) = 0 \text{ for almost all } x \in X\}$, and on maps $f: X \rightarrow Y$ by $\mathcal{F}_\omega f(A)(y) = \bigvee \{A(x) \mid f(x) = y\}$ for $A \in \mathcal{F}_\omega X$. We lift \mathcal{F}_ω to a functor $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega$ on metric spaces that equips $\mathcal{F}_\omega X$ with the fuzzy Hausdorff distance [42, Example 5.3.1]. Explicitly, $d_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega X}(A, B) = d_0(A, B) \vee d_0(B, A)$ for a metric space (X, d) and $A, B \in \mathcal{F}_\omega X$, where

$$d_0(A, B) = \bigvee_x \bigwedge_y (A(x) \ominus B(y)) \vee (A(x) \wedge d(x, y)).$$

Coalgebra *Universal coalgebra* [38] has established itself as a way to reason about state-based systems at an appropriate level of abstraction. It is based on encapsulating the transition type of systems as an endofunctor $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ on a base category \mathcal{C} . Then, a G -coalgebra (X, γ) consists of a \mathcal{C} -object X , thought of as an object of *states*, and a morphism $\gamma: X \rightarrow GX$, thought of as assigning to each state a collection of successors, structured according to G . A \mathcal{C} -morphism $h: X \rightarrow Y$ is a morphism $(X, \gamma) \rightarrow (Y, \delta)$ of G -coalgebras if $Gh \cdot \gamma = \delta \cdot h$.

Example 3. Throughout the paper, we fix a metric space \mathcal{A} of *labels*. In some examples, \mathcal{A} will be required to be discrete. Finitely branching metric transition systems with transition labels in \mathcal{A} are coalgebras for the functor $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \times (-))$. (More precisely, a metric transition system is usually assumed to have a set as its state space, while $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \times (-))$ -coalgebras more generally have a metric space of states, subsuming mere sets of states as discrete metric spaces).

We will use trace semantics on metric labelled transition systems as a running example of concepts as they appear through the text, and give a variety of further examples in a consolidated fashion towards the end, in particular in Section 7.

Graded monads and graded algebras The framework of *graded semantics* [13,34] is based on the central notion of *graded monads*, which algebraically describe the structure of observable behaviours at each finite depth, with *depth* understood as look-ahead, measured in terms of numbers of transition steps.

Definition 4. A *graded monad* \mathbb{M} on a category \mathcal{C} consists of a family of functors $M_n: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and natural transformations $\eta: Id \rightarrow M_0$ (the *unit*) and $\mu^{n,k}: M_n M_k \rightarrow M_{n+k}$ for all $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ (the *multiplications*), subject to essentially the same laws as ordinary monads up to the insertion of grades (specifically, one has unit laws $\mu^{0,n} \cdot \eta M_n = id_{M_n} = \mu^{n,0} \cdot M_n \eta$ and an associative law $\mu^{n+k,m} \cdot \mu^{n,k} M_m = \mu^{n,k+m} \cdot M_n \mu^{k,m}$).

In particular, (M_0, η, μ^{00}) is an ordinary (non-graded) monad.

Example 5. We give examples of graded monads for later use in graded semantics. We concentrate on the linear-time end of the spectrum but note that graded monads cover also branching-time and intermediate semantics, involving readiness, failures etc. [13].

1. A *Kleisli distributive law* is a natural transformation $\lambda: FT \rightarrow TF$ where F is a functor and T a monad, subject to coherence with the monad structure [25]. This yields a graded monad with $M_n = TF^n$ [34]. We will use the following instance of this construction for our running example:
2. Put $F = \mathcal{A} \times -$ and $T = \overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega$. Then $\lambda(a, U) = \{(a, x) \mid x \in U\}$ defines a distributive law $\lambda: \mathcal{A} \times \overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(-) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \times -)$. We obtain the *graded metric trace monad* $M_n = \overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(\mathcal{A}^n \times (-))$.

Graded monads come with a graded analogue of Eilenberg-Moore algebras, which play a central role in the semantics of graded logics [34,13].

Definition 6 (Graded Algebra). Let \mathbb{M} be a graded monad in \mathcal{C} . A graded M_n -Algebra $((A_k)_{k \leq n}, (a^{mk})_{m+k \leq n})$ consists of a family of \mathcal{C} -objects A_i and morphisms $a^{mk}: M_m A_k \rightarrow A_{m+k}$ satisfying essentially the same laws as a monad algebra, up to insertion of the grades. Specifically, we have $a^{0m} \cdot \eta_{A_m} = id_{A_m}$ for $m \leq n$, and whenever $m+r+k \leq n$, then $a^{m+r,k} \cdot \mu_{A_k}^{m,r} = a^{m,r+k} \cdot M_m a^{r,k}$. An M_n -homomorphism of M_n -algebras A and B is a family of maps $(f_k: A_k \rightarrow B_k)_{k \leq n}$ such that whenever $m+k \leq n$, then $f_{m+k} \cdot a^{m,k} = b^{m,k} \cdot M_m f_k$. Graded M_n -Algebras and their homomorphisms form a category $\text{Alg}_n(\mathbb{M})$.

(In fact, the canonical choice of Eilenberg-Moore algebra of a graded monad are M_ω -algebras, which have carriers A_k for all $k < \omega$ [34,22]; however, for our present purposes we mainly just need M_1 -algebras.) It is easy to see that $((M_k X)_{k \leq n}, (\mu^{m,k})_{m+k \leq n})$ is an M_n -algebra for every \mathcal{C} -object X . Again, M_0 -algebras are just (non-graded) algebras for the monad (M_0, η, μ^{00}) .

For $n = 1$, this definition instantiates as follows: An M_1 -algebra is a tuple $(A_0, A_1, a^{00}, a^{01}, a^{10})$, with a^{10} termed the *main structure map*, such that

1. (A_0, a^{00}) and (A_1, a^{01}) are M_0 -algebras.
2. (Homomorphy) $a^{10}: M_1 A_0 \rightarrow A_1$ is an M_0 -homomorphism $(M_1 A_0, \mu^{01}) \rightarrow (A_1, a^{01})$.
3. (Coequalization) $a^{10} \cdot M_1 a^{00} = a^{10} \cdot \mu^{10}$, i.e. the following diagram commutes (without necessarily being a coequalizer):

$$M_1 M_0 A_0 \xrightarrow[\mu^{10}]{M_1 a^{00}} M_1 A_0 \xrightarrow{a^{10}} A_1 \quad (2.1)$$

The semantics of modalities will later need the following property:

Definition 7 (Canonical algebras). Let $(-)_i: \text{Alg}_1(\mathbb{M}) \rightarrow \text{Alg}_0(\mathbb{M})$ be the functor taking an M_1 -algebra $A = ((A_k)_{k \leq 1}, (a^{mk})_{m+k \leq 1})$ to the M_0 -algebra (A_i, a^{0i}) , the *i-part* of A . An M_1 -algebra A is *canonical* if it is free over $(A)_0$, i.e. if for every M_1 -algebra B and M_0 -homomorphism $f: (A)_0 \rightarrow (B)_0$, there is a unique M_1 -homomorphism $g: A \rightarrow B$ such that $(g)_0 = f$.

Lemma 8. ([13, Lemma 5.3]) *An M_1 -algebra A is canonical iff (2.1) is a coequalizer diagram in the category of M_0 -algebras.*

3 Graded Quantitative Semantics

We proceed to introduce the framework of *graded quantitative semantics*. Generally, a *graded semantics* [34] of a functor $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is given by a graded monad \mathbb{M} and a natural transformation $\alpha: G \rightarrow M_1$. Intuitively, $M_n 1$ (where 1 is a terminal object of \mathcal{C}) is a domain of observable behaviours after n transitions, with α determining behaviours after one step. For a G -coalgebra (X, γ) , we inductively define maps $\gamma^{(n)}: X \rightarrow M_n 1$ assigning to a state in X its behaviour after n steps:

$$\gamma^{(0)}: X \xrightarrow{M_0! \cdot \eta} M_0 1 \quad \gamma^{(n+1)}: X \xrightarrow{\alpha \cdot \gamma} M_1 X \xrightarrow{M_1 \gamma^{(n)}} M_1 M_n 1 \xrightarrow{\mu^{1n}} M_{n+1} 1$$

From these maps, we induce a notion of *behavioural distance*:

Definition 9 (Graded behavioural distance). Given a graded semantics $\alpha: G \rightarrow M_1$ of a functor G on **Met**, *(graded) behavioural distance* is the pseudometric on states in G -coalgebras (X, γ) given by $d^\alpha(x, y) = \bigvee_{n \in \mathbb{N}} d_{M_n 1}(\gamma^{(n)}(x), \gamma^{(n)}(y))$ for $x, y \in X$.

Example 10. The metric trace semantics of metric transition systems [2, 14] is captured by the graded metric trace monad $M_n = \overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(\mathcal{A}^n \times -)$ (Example 5.2); the semantics calculates, at each depth n , sets of length- n traces, equipped with the Hausdorff distance induced by the supremum metric on traces.

4 Graded Quantitative Theories

Monads on **Set** are induced by equational theories [32]. By equipping each operation with an assigned depth and requiring each axiom to be of uniform depth, one obtains a notion of *graded equational theory* which, with some care applied to size issues, can be brought into bijective correspondence with graded monads [34]. On the other hand, Mardare et al. [33] introduce a system of quantitative equational reasoning, with formulae of the form $s =_\epsilon t$ understood intuitively as “ s differs from t by at most ϵ ”. These quantitative equational theories induce monads on the category of metric spaces. We use a graded version of this system of quantitative equational reasoning to present graded monads in **Met**.

Definition 11 (Graded similarity types, uniform terms). A *graded similarity type* consists of an algebraic similarity type Σ and a function $\delta: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ assigning a *depth* to each algebraic operation $\sigma \in \Sigma$. The concept of *uniform depth* is then defined inductively: variables have uniform depth 0, and a term of the form $\sigma(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ has uniform depth $n + k$ if $\delta(\sigma) = n$ and all t_i have uniform depth k . Thus, constants $c \in \Sigma$ have uniform depth n for all $n \geq \delta(c)$. We write $\mathbb{T}_n^\Sigma X$ for the set of terms of uniform depth n over X , or $\mathbb{T}_n X$ if Σ is clear from the context. A *substitution of uniform depth n* is a function $\sigma: X \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_n Y$. Such a substitution extends to a map $\sigma: \mathbb{T}_k X \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{k+n} Y$ on terms for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where as usual one defines $\sigma(f(t_1, \dots, t_m)) = f(\sigma(t_1), \dots, \sigma(t_m))$. We will usually write application of substitutions in postfix notation, i.e. $t\sigma$ applies σ to a term t . A substitution is *uniform-depth* if it is of uniform depth n for some n .

Definition 12 (Graded quantitative theory). Let X be a set of variables. By $\mathcal{E}(X)$ we denote the set of quantitative equalities $x =_\epsilon y$ where $x, y \in X$ and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$. We write $\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{T}(X)) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{T}_n(X))$; that is, $\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{T}(X))$ is the set of uniform-depth quantitative equalities among Σ -terms over X . A *quantitative theory* $\mathcal{T} = (\Sigma, \delta, E)$ consists of a graded similarity type (Σ, δ) and a set $E \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}(X)) \times \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{T}(X))$. Elements of E are termed *basic quantitative inferences*, and written in the form $\Gamma \vdash s =_\epsilon t$; the *depth* of $\Gamma \vdash s =_\epsilon t$ is that of $s =_\epsilon t$. We say that \mathcal{T} is *depth-1* if all its operations and basic quantitative inferences have depth at most 1.

Derivability of quantitative equalities in $\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{T}(X))$ over a graded quantitative theory \mathcal{T} and a *context* $\Gamma_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}(X))$ is defined inductively by the following

rules:

$$\begin{array}{lll}
(\mathbf{triang}) \frac{t =_{\epsilon} s \quad s =_{\epsilon'} u}{t =_{\epsilon+\epsilon'} u} & (\mathbf{refl}) \frac{}{s =_0 s} & (\mathbf{sym}) \frac{t =_{\epsilon} s}{s =_{\epsilon} t} \\
(\mathbf{wk}) \frac{t =_{\epsilon} s}{t =_{\epsilon'} s} (\epsilon' \geq \epsilon) & (\mathbf{arch}) \frac{\{t =_{\epsilon'} s \mid \epsilon' > \epsilon\}}{t =_{\epsilon} s} & (\mathbf{assn}) \frac{}{\phi} (\phi \in \Gamma_0) \\
(\mathbf{ax}) \frac{\Gamma \sigma}{t \sigma =_{\epsilon} s \sigma} ((\Gamma, t =_{\epsilon} s) \in E) & (\mathbf{nexp}) \frac{t_1 =_{\epsilon} s_1 \quad \dots \quad t_n =_{\epsilon} s_n}{f(t_1, \dots, t_n) =_{\epsilon} f(s_1, \dots, s_n)}
\end{array}$$

where σ is a uniform-depth substitution. (Note the difference between rules **(ax)** and **(assn)**: Quantitative equalities from the theory can be substituted into, while this is not sound for quantitative equalities from the context.) A graded quantitative equational theory *induces* a graded monad \mathbb{M} on **Met** where $M_n X$ is the set of terms of uniform depth n over variables in X , quotiented by the equivalence relation that identifies terms s, t if $s =_0 t$ is derivable in context X , with the distance $d_{M_n}([s], [t]) = \epsilon$ of equivalence classes $[s], [t] \in M_n X$ being least ϵ such that $s =_{\epsilon} t$ is derivable (which exists by **(arch)**). Multiplication collapses terms-over-terms, and the unit maps an element of $x \in X$ to $[x] \in M_0 X$.

Remark 13. The above system for quantitative reasoning follows Ford et al. [18] in slight modifications to the original (ungraded) system [33]. In particular, we make do without a cut rule, and allow substitution only into axioms (substitution into derived equalities is then admissible [18]). We include the rule **(nexp)** ensuring that all operations are non-expansive, i.e. the induced graded monad is *enriched* (acts non-expansively on functions).

We recall that a graded monad is *depth-1* [34, 13] if μ^{nk} and $M_0 \mu^{1k}$ are epi-transformations and the diagram below is a coequalizer of M_0 -algebras for all X and $n < \omega$:

$$M_1 M_0 M_n X \xrightarrow[\mu^{10} M_n]{M_1 \mu^{0n}} M_1 M_n X \xrightarrow{\mu^{1n}} M_{1+n} X. \quad (4.1)$$

Proposition 14. *Graded monads in **Met** induced by depth-1 graded quantitative theories are depth-1.*

The following is then immediate [13]:

Proposition 15. *If \mathbb{M} is a depth-1 graded monad, then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every object X , the M_1 -algebra with carriers $M_n X$, $M_{n+1} X$ and multiplications as algebra structure is canonical.*

We briefly refer to canonical algebras as per the above proposition as being *of the form $M_n X$* .

Presentations of graded trace monads We proceed to investigate the quantitative-algebraic presentation of graded trace monads, given by a Kleisli distributive law of a metric space of action labels over some monad.

Let $\sigma = (a_1, \dots, a_n) = (a_1, \sigma')$ and $\rho = (b_1, \dots, b_n) = (b_1, \rho')$ be traces of labels in a metric space $(\mathcal{A}, d_{\mathcal{A}})$. There are several ways to define the distance $d(\sigma, \rho)$, depending on the application. Some obvious choices are the p -norms, recursively defined by $d(\sigma, \rho) = \sqrt[p]{d(a_1, b_1)^p + d(\sigma', \rho')^p}$. All of these metrics are similar, in the sense that there is a (not necessarily nonexpansive) function $k: [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $d(\sigma, \rho) = k(d(a, b), d(\sigma', \rho'))$.

We will write \otimes for the tensor that equips the Cartesian product of two sets with the metric generated by k . So $d_{A \otimes B}((a, b), (a', b')) = k(d(a, a'), d(b, b'))$. The fact that k computes distances of traces recursively “one symbol at a time” translates into uniform depth-1 equations, guaranteeing that the resulting theory as a whole is depth-1:

Definition 16. Let $\mathcal{T} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantitative algebraic presentation of a (plain) monad T on **Met**, and \mathcal{A} a metric space. We define a graded quantitative theory $\mathcal{T}[\mathcal{A}]$ by including the operations and equations of \mathcal{T} at depth 0, along with unary depth-1 operations a for all labels $a \in \mathcal{A}$, and as depth-1 axioms the distributive laws $\vdash a(f(x_1, \dots, x_n)) =_0 f(a(x_1), \dots, a(x_n))$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $f \in \Sigma$, as well as the distance axioms $x =_{\epsilon} y \vdash a(x) =_{k(d(a, b), \epsilon)} b(y)$.

One would ideally define a Kleisli distributive law $\lambda: \mathcal{A} \otimes T- \rightarrow T(\mathcal{A} \otimes -)$ by $\lambda_X(a, t) = T\langle a, id_X \rangle_{\otimes}(t)$, where $\langle a, id_X \rangle_{\otimes}$ takes $x \in X$ to $(a, x) \in \mathcal{A} \otimes X$, and then obtain that the graded monads induced by the theory $\mathcal{T}[\mathcal{A}]$ and the Kleisli law are isomorphic. However, non-expansiveness of λ is not guaranteed in general:

Example 17. Take the monad $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_{\omega}$ and construct λ as above, using supremum distance. Put $s = 0.5 \cdot x + 0.5 \cdot y$ and $t = 1 \cdot x \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_{\omega}\{x, y\}$ where $d(x, y) = 1$. Clearly $d(s, t) = 0.5$. Given $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ with $d(a, b) = 0.5$, we have $d((a, s), (b, t)) = 0.5$ while $d(\lambda(a, s), \lambda(b, t)) = d(0.5 \cdot (a, x) + 0.5 \cdot (a, y), 1 \cdot (b, x)) = 0.75$

In the special case of Manhattan distance, on the other hand, nonexpansivity always works out in a nice way:

Lemma 18. *The maps $\lambda_X: \mathcal{A} \boxplus TX \rightarrow T(\mathcal{A} \boxplus X)$ as above are nonexpansive.*

In case λ as above is nonexpansive, we do in fact have that the distributive law λ and the algebraic theory defined above induce the same graded monad:

Lemma 19. *Let $\lambda: \mathcal{A} \otimes T- \rightarrow T(\mathcal{A} \otimes -)$ be defined as above. If all components λ_X are nonexpansive, then the quantitative equational theory $\mathcal{T}[\mathcal{A}]$ is a presentation of the graded monad defined by the distributive law λ .*

Example 20. We give explicit descriptions for our running example of metric trace semantics: It is easy to check that the distributive law claimed in Example 5.2 is indeed non-expansive, so the respective graded monad is, by Lemma 19,

presented by the corresponding theory as per Definition 16, and in particular is depth-1. Recall [33, Corollary 9.4] that $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega$ is a monad, presented in quantitative algebra by the usual axioms of join semilattices, i.e. by a binary operation $+$ and a constant 0 , with basic ‘quantitative’ inferences $\vdash x + 0 =_0 x$, $\vdash x + x =_0 x$, $x + y =_0 y + x$, $\vdash (x + y) + z =_0 x + (y + z)$ (non-expansiveness of $+$ is enforced by the deduction rules). The quantitative graded theory presenting the graded metric trace monad $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(\mathcal{A}^n \times (-))$ according to Lemma 19 has depth-0 operators $+$ and 0 and adds unary depth-1 operations a for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, subject to additional axioms

$$\vdash a(0) =_0 0 \quad \vdash a(x + y) =_0 a(x) + a(y) \quad x =_\epsilon y \vdash a(x) =_{\epsilon \vee d_{\mathcal{A}}(a,b)} b(y)$$

for $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$.

5 Quantitative Graded Logics

We proceed to introduce our notion of quantitative graded logic. While previous presentations of graded logics [34, 13, 18] worked with a semantics defined on the codomains $M_n 1$ of the graded semantics, guaranteeing invariance under the graded semantics by construction, we instead opt for a semantics defined directly on the original coalgebra. We show that this semantics agrees with the original one. Our new approach identifies (quantitative) graded logics as fragments of the corresponding branching-time logics, whose definition [40, 30, 43] we recall first.

Syntactically, a *modal logic* is a triple $\mathcal{L} = (\Theta, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$ where Θ is a set of truth constants, \mathcal{O} is a set of propositional operators, each with associated finite arity, and Λ is a set of modal operators, also each with an associated finite arity. For readability, we restrict to unary modalities; extending our (positive) results to modalities of higher arity is simply a matter of adding indices. The set of *formulae* of \mathcal{L} is then given by the grammar

$$\phi ::= c \mid p(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n) \mid L\phi$$

where $p \in \mathcal{O}$ is n -ary, $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $c \in \Theta$

In the semantic framework of (quantitative) coalgebraic modal logic [40, 30, 43], formulae are interpreted in G -coalgebras for a given functor $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ (we will be interested in $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Met}$), taking values in a truth value object Ω of \mathcal{C} . We assume that \mathcal{C} has finite products and a terminal object. The evaluation of a formula ϕ on a G -coalgebra (X, γ) is a morphism $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma: X \rightarrow \Omega$. The semantics is parametric in the following components:

- For every $c \in \Theta$, a \mathcal{C} -morphism $\hat{c}: 1 \rightarrow \Omega$.
- For $p \in \mathcal{O}$ with arity n , a \mathcal{C} -morphism $\llbracket p \rrbracket: \Omega^n \rightarrow \Omega$
- For $L \in \Lambda$, a \mathcal{C} -morphism $\llbracket L \rrbracket: G\Omega \rightarrow \Omega$

Formula evaluation is then defined inductively by

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket c \rrbracket_\gamma &= X \xrightarrow{!} 1 \xrightarrow{\hat{c}} \Omega \\ \llbracket p(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n) \rrbracket_\gamma &= \llbracket p \rrbracket \cdot \langle \llbracket \phi_1 \rrbracket_\gamma, \dots, \llbracket \phi_n \rrbracket_\gamma \rangle \\ \llbracket L\phi \rrbracket_\gamma &= \llbracket L \rrbracket \cdot G\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma \cdot \gamma \end{aligned}$$

Formula evaluation is always invariant under branching-time semantics, e.g. non-expansive under branching-time behavioural distance [30,43,20] (Section 7). We next identify criteria for invariance under a graded semantics (α, \mathbb{M}) for a functor $G: \mathbf{Met} \rightarrow \mathbf{Met}$ that we fix from now on; also, we fix $[0, 1]$ as the underlying metric space of Ω , and occasionally write Ω for $[0, 1]$.

Definition 21 (Graded logic). Let $o: M_0\Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ be an M_0 -algebra structure on Ω . A logic \mathcal{L} is a *graded logic* (for (α, \mathbb{M})) if the following hold:

1. For every n -ary $p \in \mathcal{O}$, the semantics $\llbracket p \rrbracket$ is an M_0 -algebra homomorphism $(\Omega, o)^n \rightarrow (\Omega, o)$.
2. For every $L \in \Lambda$, the semantics $\llbracket L \rrbracket$ factors as $\llbracket L \rrbracket = f \cdot \alpha_\Omega$ such that the tuple $(\Omega, \Omega, o, o, f)$ constitutes an M_1 -algebra (that is, f satisfies homomorphy and coequalization, cf. Section 2).

In many examples, $\alpha = id$, in which case condition 2 just states that $(\Omega, \Omega, o, o, \llbracket L \rrbracket)$ is an M_1 -algebra (non-identity α are associated, for instance, with readiness and failure semantics [13]). Invariance additionally relies on the requirement that formulae have *uniform depth* [13] in essentially the same sense as for terms (Definition 11), with propositional operators having depth 0 and modal operators depth 1 (and hence every depth ≥ 0 or ≥ 1 , respectively, for nullary operators), and truth constants having only depth 0. If there are no truth constants (which happens in examples where $M_01 = 1$), then all formulae are uniform. We write $\mathcal{L}_{\text{unif}}$ for the set of uniform-depth \mathcal{L} -formulae, and restrict to uniform-depth formulae in the definition of logical distance:

Definition 22. *Logical distance* under the logic \mathcal{L} on a G -coalgebra (X, γ) is the pseudometric $d^{\mathcal{L}}$ given by

$$d^{\mathcal{L}}(x, y) = \bigvee \{d_\Omega(\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma(x), \llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma(y)) \mid \phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{unif}}\}.$$

We say that \mathcal{L} is *invariant* with respect to a graded semantics (α, \mathbb{M}) , if for all G -coalgebras we have that $d^{\mathcal{L}} \leq d^\alpha$, and *expressive* if $d^{\mathcal{L}} \geq d^\alpha$.

Theorem 23 (Invariance). *Let \mathcal{L} be a graded logic for (α, \mathbb{M}) . Then the evaluation maps $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma$ of uniform-depth \mathcal{L} -formulae ϕ on G -coalgebras (X, γ) are non-expansive w.r.t. behavioural distance d^α , and hence \mathcal{L} is invariant.*

The proof is based on showing, by induction on ϕ , the stronger property that the evaluation functions $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma$ of depth- n formulae ϕ factor through M_0 -homomorphisms $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}}: M_n1 \rightarrow \Omega$, as used in earlier formulations of the semantics [13,17], with canonicity of M_n1 (Lemma 8) being the key property in the step for modalities.

Example 24. We have a graded logic $\mathcal{L}^{\text{mtrace}}$ for metric trace semantics (Example 10) featuring modalities \Diamond_a for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, a single truth constant 1, and no propositional operators. For the semantics, we take the truth object Ω to be the $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega$ -algebra $([0, 1], \vee)$, with $\hat{1}: 1 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ being constantly 1 and $\llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket: \overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \times \Omega) \rightarrow \Omega$ given by $\llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket(U) = \bigvee_{(b,v) \in U} (1 - d(a, b)) \wedge v$. $\mathcal{L}^{\text{mtrace}}$ remains invariant under metric trace semantics when extended with propositional operators that are non-expansive join-semilattice morphisms, such as \vee .

Remark 25. In previous work [34,13,18], uniform depth was a technical necessity to define the semantics of formulae. Defining graded logic as a fragment of coalgebraic modal logic, as we do here, gives a well-defined semantics even to non-uniform depth formulae, for which, however, invariance fails in general: As a counterexample, instantiate Example 5.1 with the monad $T = \mathcal{P}$, the functor $FX = X \times X$, and the Kleisli distributive law $\lambda: FT \rightarrow TF$ given by $\lambda_X(A, B) = X \times Y$ for $A, B \subseteq X$. These data induce a minimal form of *tree-shaped-trace* semantics: For a state x in a TF -coalgebra (X, γ) , $\gamma^{(n)}(x) \in TF^n 1 = \mathcal{P}(1)$ records whether the complete binary tree of depth n can be executed at x ; we view $\mathcal{P}(1)$ as a discrete metric space, corresponding to the Hausdorff metric (indeed the counterexample works also in the two-valued setting). We define a graded logic \mathcal{L} over (Ω, o) , where $\Omega = [0, 1]$ and $o: \mathcal{P}\Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ takes suprema. The logic contains a truth constant \top , where $\hat{\top}: 1 \rightarrow \Omega$ is the constant map to 1. We also have a binary modal operator \Diamond , with $\llbracket \Diamond \rrbracket: \mathcal{P}(\Omega^2 \times \Omega^2) \rightarrow \Omega$ defined as $\llbracket \Diamond \rrbracket(S) = o(\mathcal{P}\pi_1(S)) \wedge o(\mathcal{P}\pi_4(S))$ where π_i is the i -th projection of $\Omega^2 \times \Omega^2 \cong \Omega^4$; that is, $\Diamond(\phi_1, \phi_2)$ is the degree to which there is a successor pair whose first component satisfies ϕ_1 and whose second component satisfies ϕ_2 . We define a TF -coalgebra $(\{x, y, z\}, \gamma)$ where $\gamma(x) = \{(z, z)\}$, $\gamma(y) = \{(x, z)\}$, and $\gamma(z) = \emptyset$. Then x and y disagree by 1 on the non-uniform formula $\Diamond(\Diamond(\top, \top), \top)$, even though $d^\alpha(x, y) = 0$.

6 Expressivity Criteria

We proceed to adapt expressivity criteria appearing in previous work on two-valued behavioural equivalences [13,17] to the quantitative setting, which poses quite specific challenges. A key role in the treatment of expressiveness of logics will be played by the notion of initiality.

Definition 26. A *cone* in a category is a family of morphisms $f_i: A \rightarrow B_i$ with joint domain A . A cone of nonexpansive maps is *initial* if A carries the (pseudo-)metric induced from the (pseudo-)metrics d_i on B_i via f_i , explicitly: $d(x, y) = \bigvee_i d_i(f_i(x), f_i(y))$.

Using this notion, the definition of expressivity can be rephrased as follows: \mathcal{L} is expressive if for every G -coalgebra (X, γ) , the cone of all evaluation maps $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma$ of uniform-depth formulae ϕ is initial on (X, d^α) .

Remark 27. In the branching-time case, a stronger notion of expressiveness, roughly phrased as *density* of the set of depth- n formulae in the set of non-expansive properties at depth n , follows from expressiveness under certain additional conditions [20,41,42,44,30], using lattice-theoretic variants of the Stone-Weierstraß theorem. We show in the appendix that the analogue of the Stone-Weierstraß theorem in general fails for coarser semantics. Also, for semantics coarser than branching time, expressiveness in the sense of Definition 22 can often be established using more economic sets of propositional operators (e.g. no propositional operators at all), for which density will clearly fail.

Definition 28. An *initiality invariant* is a property Φ of sets $A \subseteq \mathbf{Met}(X, \Omega)$ of nonexpansive functions (such sets are a special form of cones) such that (i) every cone satisfying Φ is initial, and (ii) Φ is upwards closed w.r.t. subset inclusion. A graded logic \mathcal{L} consisting of $\Theta, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda$ is *Φ -type depth-0 separating* if the family of maps $\{o \cdot M_0 c : 1 \rightarrow \Omega \mid c \in \Theta\}$ has property Φ . Moreover, \mathcal{L} is *Φ -type depth-1 separating* if whenever A is a canonical M_1 -algebra of the form $M_n 1$ (Proposition 15) and \mathfrak{A} is a set of M_0 -homomorphisms $A_0 \rightarrow \Omega$ that has property Φ and is closed under the propositional operators in \mathcal{O} , then the set

$$\Lambda(\mathfrak{A}) := \{\llbracket L \rrbracket^\#(g) : A_1 \rightarrow \Omega \mid L \in \Lambda, g \in \mathfrak{A},\}$$

has property Φ , where $\llbracket L \rrbracket^\#(g)$ is the (by canonicity, unique) morphism making the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M_1 A_0 & \xrightarrow{M_1 g} & M_1 \Omega \\ \downarrow a^{10} & & \downarrow f \\ A_1 & \xrightarrow{\llbracket L \rrbracket^\#(g)} & \Omega \end{array}$$

- Example 29.** 1. Initiality itself is an initiality invariant. If Φ is initiality, then we say ‘initial-type’ for ‘ Φ -type’.
2. We say that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathbf{Met}(X, \Omega)$ is *normed isometric* if whenever $d(x, y) > \epsilon$ for $x, y \in X$ and $\epsilon > 0$, then there is some $f \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $|f(x) - f(y)| > \epsilon$ and $f(x) \vee f(y) = 1$. Normed isometry is an initiality invariant.

Theorem 30 (Expressiveness). *Let Φ be an initiality invariant, and suppose that a graded logic \mathcal{L} is both Φ -type depth-0 separating and Φ -type depth-1 separating. Then \mathcal{L} is expressive.*

Remark 31. Our definition of separation differs from that of previous instantiations of the framework of graded semantics in several ways. Most obvious is the parametrization by a property Φ . Choosing a Φ other than initiality amounts to strengthening the induction hypothesis in the inductive proof of Theorem 30. We will see that this is needed even in very simple examples in the quantitative setting (nothing comparable being needed in the two-valued case [13, 17])

Moreover, we have phrased separation in terms of the specific canonical algebras $M_n 1$ on which it is needed, rather than on unrestricted canonical algebras like in previous work [13, 17]. This occasionally allows exploiting additional properties of $M_n 1$. In particular, we use that for graded monads $M_n = TF^n X$ arising from Kleisli distributive laws (Example 5.1), $M_n 1$ is free as an M_0 -algebra.

Example 32. 1. *Metric Streams:* A simple example for failure of initial-type separation is the following: Metric streams, i.e. streams over a metric space of labels $(\mathcal{A}, d_{\mathcal{A}})$, are coalgebras for the functor $G = \mathcal{A} \times -$. The behavioural distance on streams is captured by the ‘branching’-time graded semantics that uses the graded monad $G^n = \mathcal{A}^n \times \{-\}$ (cf. Example 7). Expressivity of a logic \mathcal{L} that has modalities \Diamond_a for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, with interpretation $\llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket : \mathcal{A} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$

given by $(b, v) \mapsto (1 - d_A(a, b)) \wedge v$, no propositional operators, and the truth constant 1 can be shown using Theorem 30: \mathcal{L} is Φ -type depth-0 separating and Φ -type depth-1 separating for Φ being normed isometry. On the other hand, \mathcal{L} fails to be initial-type depth-1 separating, illustrating the necessity of the general form of Theorem 30.

2. *Metric transition systems*: The graded logic $\mathcal{L}^{\text{mtrace}}$ for metric trace semantics (Example 24), in the version with no propositional operators, is Φ -type depth-0 separating and Φ -type depth-1 separating for Φ being normed isometry, and hence is expressive by Theorem 30. We thus improve on an example from recent work based on Galois connections [5], where application of the general framework required the inclusion of propositional shift operators (which were subsequently eliminated in an ad-hoc manner).

Remark 33. In a recent approach based on Galois connections [5,6], logics are related to fixpoints of behaviour functions induced by the logic itself (similar to approaches that define trace semantics via intended characteristic logics [28]), while our present interest is in providing logical characterizations of *given* behavioural distances. In the Galois setting, one considers complete lattices \mathbb{L} (‘logics’) and \mathbb{B} (‘behaviours’) where in typical instances, \mathbb{L} consists of sets of (quantitative) predicates on a set X , and \mathbb{B} of pseudometrics on X (or indeed on a different set, such as $\mathcal{P}(X)$). The Galois connection then consists of a map $\alpha: \mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ that assigns to a set of predicates the least pseudometric making all predicates non-expansive, and a map $\gamma: \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}$ that assigns to each pseudometric its set of non-expansive predicates. One then designs a logic function $\log: \mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}$ on the basis of a given coalgebra, whose least fixpoint represents the semantics of the logic, and which induces a behaviour map $\text{beh} = \alpha \cdot \log \cdot \gamma: \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ whose least fixpoint yields a notion of behavioural distance. Under suitable conditions, one obtains that logical and behavioural distance coincide; notably, these include *compatibility* of \log with the *closure* $\gamma \cdot \alpha$ of the Galois connection, which roughly speaking amounts to depth-1 separation of the logic w.r.t. its own Kantorovich lifting [3,6]. The Galois framework is highly general but on the other hand offers little guidance on how to set up the logic function. By comparison, the framework of graded logic comes with more definite recipes in the shape of the conditions in Definition 21, and then yields invariance entirely for free.

7 Examples

The recipe outlined above and applied in the following examples can be summarized as follows: One first casts the desired behavioural metric as a graded semantics, that is, a depth-1 graded monad \mathbb{M} and the appropriate α . If \mathbb{M} has the form of a trace semantics, in many cases the check that \mathbb{M} is depth-1 follows from application of the techniques outlined in Section 4. Then one identifies a candidate for a characteristic logic \mathcal{L} , checking that all operators satisfy the axioms of graded logics. Invariance of \mathcal{L} under the graded semantics then follows automatically. Expressivity can then be shown by providing an appropriate initiality invariant Φ and showing Φ -type depth-0 and Φ -type depth-1 separation.

Branching-Time semantics Any functor G yields a graded monad given by iterated application of G , that is $M_n = G^n$, and by unit and multiplication being identity [34]. In general, the finite-depth branching-time semantics of a G -coalgebra (X, γ) is defined via its *canonical cone* $(p_i: X \rightarrow G^i 1)_{i < \omega}$ into the *final sequence* $1 \xleftarrow{!} G1 \xleftarrow{G!} G^2 1 \leftarrow \dots$ of G . The p_i are defined inductively by $p_0 = !: X \rightarrow 1$ and $p_{i+1} = Gp_i \cdot \gamma$. This semantics is captured by the graded monad $M_n = G^n$ and $\alpha = id$ [34]. More specifically, the *finite-depth branching-time behavioural distance* of states $x, y \in X$ is $\bigvee_{i < \omega} d(p_i(x), p_i(y))$, and thus agrees with the graded behavioural distance obtained via the graded semantics in the graded monad $M_n = G^n$. This monad has $M_0 = id$, so that the corresponding graded logics are just branching-time logics without further restriction [34, 13]. Coalgebraic quantitative logics of this kind have received some recent attention [20, 41, 42, 44, 2, 27, 30]. Suppose Λ is a finite *separating* set of modalities, i.e. the maps $\llbracket L \rrbracket \cdot Gf: GX \rightarrow \Omega$, with L ranging over modalities and f over non-expansive maps $X \rightarrow \Omega$, form an initial cone. Moreover, let \mathcal{O} contain truth 1, meet \wedge , fuzzy negation \neg (i.e. $\neg x = 1 - x$), and truncated addition of constants $(-) \oplus c$. Then one shows using a variant of the Stone-Weierstraß theorem [44] that the graded logic \mathcal{L} given by Λ , \mathcal{O} , and $\Theta = \emptyset$ is initial-type depth-0 separating and initial-type depth-1 separating. By Theorem 30, we obtain that \mathcal{L} is expressive. Previous work on quantitative branching-time logics [44, 30, 41, 42, 20] discusses, amongst other things, conditions on G that allow concluding expressiveness even for infinite-depth behavioural distance.

Eilenberg-Moore Semantics We have seen examples of graded monads TF^n arising from Kleisli distributive laws $FT \rightarrow TF$ (Example 5.1). An *Eilenberg-Moore (EM) distributive law* is a natural transformation $\lambda: TF \rightarrow FT$ for a functor F and a monad T , subject to coherence with the monad structure [26]. We then have a graded semantics (id, \mathbb{M}^λ) , where $M_n^\lambda = F^n T$ [34]. Eilenberg-Moore laws correspond to liftings $\tilde{F}: \mathbf{EM}(T) \rightarrow \mathbf{EM}(T)$ of F to the Eilenberg-Moore category $\mathbf{EM}(T)$ of T [26]. Coalgebras $\gamma: X \rightarrow FTX$ admit a generalized powerset construction, $\gamma^\#: TX \rightarrow FTX$ [26]. Eilenberg-Moore semantics typically applies to variants of word automata; e.g., reactive probabilistic automata are FT -coalgebras for $F = 2 \times (-)^A$ and $T = \mathcal{D}_\omega$. The usual notion of (finite-depth) behavioural equivalence on the determinization is language equivalence. It is obtained as a natural quotient of the arising graded semantics (which in general also includes information about traces) [34], with which it agrees if $T1 \cong 1$ [19], e.g. on probabilistic automata.

Logics for EM-Semantics: The graded monad \mathbb{M}^λ admits a complete characterization of operators admissible in graded logics. Propositional operators are precisely T -algebra homomorphisms $(\Omega, o)^n \rightarrow (\Omega, o)$ (e.g. affine maps in case $T = \mathcal{D}_\omega$), and one can show that the admissible n -ary modal operators are precisely the maps of the form $g \cdot Fo^{(n)}$ where g is a homomorphism $\tilde{F}(\Omega, o)^n \rightarrow (\Omega, o)$ and $o^{(n)}: T(\Omega^n) \rightarrow \Omega^n$ is the algebra structure of the n -fold product $(\Omega, o)^n$ in $\mathbf{EM}(T)$. Moreover, let Φ be an initiality invariant and

$\mathcal{L} = (\Theta, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$ a graded logic for (id, \mathbb{M}^λ) . Then Φ -type depth-1 separation holds for \mathcal{L} iff Φ -type depth-1 separation holds for $\mathcal{L}' = (\Theta, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda')$ w.r.t. the semantics (id, \mathbb{M}_F) of F -coalgebras, where $\Lambda' = \{g: F\Omega^n \rightarrow \Omega \mid g \cdot Fo^{(n)} \in \Lambda\}$. If F is the machine functor $F = \Omega \times -^{\mathcal{A}}$ on **Met**, consider the set of modalities $\Lambda' = \{f\} \cup \{\diamond_a \mid a \in A\}$, where f has arity 0, while the \diamond_a have arity 1. The semantics is defined by $\llbracket f \rrbracket(v, \delta) = v$ and $\llbracket \diamond_a \rrbracket(v, \delta) = \delta(a)$, that is, the modalities are the projections of the infinite product constructed by F . Then Λ' forms a separating set of modalities for (id, \mathbb{M}_F) , and by abstract reasoning the corresponding set Λ contains only valid graded modalities for (id, \mathbb{M}^λ) . Therefore we always have an expressive logic for cases where the $F = \Omega \times -^{\mathcal{A}}$. We spell this out in greater detail in the appendix.

Kleisli Semantics In contrast to Eilenberg-Moore semantics, where expressivity follows automatically from general results for a large class of important examples, semantics that arise via Kleisli-laws, treated in the following, tend to require a more individual approach. Many examples involve strengthening of the initiality invariant Φ to prove depth-1 separation, and as we will see, in some cases an expressive and invariant logic in fact fails to exist.

Fuzzy Trace semantics A *fuzzy \mathcal{A} -labelled transition system (fuzzy LTS)* (e.g. [11,45,46,27]) consists of a set (or metric space) X of states and a fuzzy transition relation $R: X \times \mathcal{A} \times X \rightarrow [0, 1]$, with \mathcal{A} discrete. A fuzzy LTS (X, R) is *finitely branching* if $\{(a, y) \mid R(x, a, y) > 0\}$ is finite for every $x \in X$. Equivalently, a finitely branching fuzzy LTS is a coalgebra for the functor $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \times (-))$.

The fuzzy trace monad: A natural notion of *fuzzy trace semantics* of fuzzy transition systems is given by assigning to each state x of a fuzzy LTS (X, R) a fuzzy trace set $Tr(x) \in \mathcal{F}_\omega(\mathcal{A}^*)$ where

$$Tr(x)(a_1 \dots a_n) = \bigvee \{ \bigwedge_{i=1}^n R(x_{i-1}, a_i, x_i) \mid x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n \in X \}.$$

This notion of trace relates, for instance, to a notion of fuzzy path that is implicit in the semantics of fuzzy computation tree logic [35] and to notions of fuzzy language accepted by fuzzy automata (e.g. [4]). We equip the set \mathcal{A}^* of traces with the discrete metric, and then obtain a notion of *fuzzy trace distance* d^T of states x, y , given by the distance of $Tr(x), Tr(y)$ in $\mathcal{F}_\omega(\mathcal{A}^*)$, which simplifies to $d^T(x, y) = \bigvee_{w \in \mathcal{A}^*} |Tr(x)(w) - Tr(y)(w)|$. To define the graded semantics, consider the distributive law $\lambda: \mathcal{A} \times \overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega(-) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \times -)$ given by $\lambda(a, U)(a, x) = U(x)$ and $\lambda(a, U)(b, x) = 0$ for $b \neq a$. By instantiating Example 5.1 we thus obtain the *graded fuzzy trace monad* $M_n = \overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega(\mathcal{A}^n \times (-))$. We show in the appendix (Section A.5) that $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega$ is a monad presented by the following quantitative equational theory: Take a binary operation $+$, a constant 0 , and unary operations r for every $r \in [0, 1]$. Impose strict equations ($=_0$) saying that $+$, 0 form a join semilattice structure and that the operations r define an action of the monoid $([0, 1], \wedge)$ (e.g. $r(s(x)) =_0 (r \wedge s)(x)$). Finally, impose basic

quantitative inferences $x =_\epsilon y \vdash r(x) =_\epsilon s(y)$ for $r, s \in [0, 1]$ such that $|r - s| \leq \epsilon$. By Lemma 19, the graded fuzzy trace monad $M_n = \overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega(\mathcal{A}^n \times X)$ (with \mathcal{A} discrete) is presented by the above algebraic description of $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega$ at depth 0, with additional depth-1 unary operations a for $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and strict depth-1 equations $a(x + y) =_0 a(x) + a(y)$, $a(0) =_0 0$, and $a(r(x)) =_0 r(a(x))$.

Fuzzy trace logic: Again, we use $[0, 1]$ as the truth value object, interpreting the additional algebraic structure by meets in $[0, 1]$. We define modal operators \Diamond_a for $a \in \mathcal{A}$, with interpretation $\llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket: M_1[0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by $\llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket(A) = \bigvee_{v \in [0, 1]} A(a, v) \wedge v$, thus capturing the usual fuzzy diamond modality (e.g. [16]). Additionally we have a truth constant \top , with $\hat{\top}$ being the constant map 1. Again, the logic remains invariant when extended with additional non-expansive propositional operators that are homomorphic w.r.t. the operations in the presentation of $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega$. This logic is initial-type depth-0 separating and initial-type depth-1 separating, and hence expressive for fuzzy trace distance by Theorem 30, a result that appears to be new.

Probabilistic Trace Semantics Similarly, finitely branching probabilistic *metric* transition systems with transition labels in \mathcal{A} are coalgebras for the functor $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \boxplus (-))$. When \mathcal{A} is discrete (in which case $\mathcal{A} \boxplus (-) = \mathcal{A} \times (-)$), then we speak of *probabilistic labelled transition systems*.

Probabilistic (metric) trace semantics: The *probabilistic (metric) trace semantics* [10] of a probabilistic transition system calculates, at each depth n , a distribution over length- n traces. This semantics is captured as the graded semantics induced by the graded probabilistic (metric) trace monad $\mathbb{M}^{\text{ptrace}}$, with $M_n^{\text{ptrace}} = \overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A}^{\boxplus n} \boxplus (-))$. Setting $\alpha = id$, one obtains a notion of *depth- n probabilistic trace distance* d_n^{ptrace} , which takes Kantorovich distances of depth- n trace distributions under the Manhattan distance on traces. The arising notion of behavioural distance is then *probabilistic trace distance* $d^{\text{ptrace}} = \bigvee_{n < \omega} d_n^{\text{ptrace}}$. The monad $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega$ on **Met** may be presented by the quantitative theory of *interpolative barycentric algebras* [33], a quantitative version of the theory of convex algebras that has binary operations $+_p$ for all $p \in [0, 1]$ (and axioms that we do not repeat here). By Lemma 19, the graded monad $\mathbb{M}^{\text{ptrace}}$ is presented by this theory at depth 0 and additional depth-1 operations a for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, subject to the axioms

$$\vdash a(x +_p y) =_0 a(x) +_p a(y) \quad x =_\epsilon y \vdash a(x) =_{\epsilon \oplus d(a, b)} b(y)$$

for $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. (Replacing the second axiom with $x =_\epsilon y \vdash a(x) =_{\epsilon \vee d(a, b)} b(y)$ will induce a graded monad \mathbb{M} such that $M_n X$ is carried by $\mathcal{D}_\omega(\mathcal{A}^n \times X)$ but carries, by Example 17, a metric strictly smaller than that of the space $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A}^n \times X)$.)

Probabilistic trace logic: As we have shown expressivity of logics with diamond-type modalities for trace semantics in both metric and fuzzy transition systems,

as well as for most instance of Eilenberg-Moore-type trace semantics, one might expect this pattern to continue for the distribution monad, or even generalize to arbitrary monads. However, instead we have the following negative result:

Theorem 34. *Let $\mathcal{L} = (\Theta, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$ be a coalgebraic modal logic with unary modalities for the functor $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \boxplus -)$, over a non-discrete metric space \mathcal{A} of labels. Then $d^\mathcal{L} \neq d^\alpha$.*

In other words, no branching-time quantitative modal logic for probabilistic metric transition systems has a compositionally defined fragment that characterizes probabilistic metric trace distance, as long as modalities are restricted to be unary. In particular, the logic featuring modalities \Diamond_a for $a \in \mathcal{A}$, with $\Diamond_a\phi$ being the expected truth value of ϕ restricted to a -successors, fails to characterize probabilistic trace distance (even though it characterizes probabilistic trace equivalence [13]). We emphasize that this result does not assume that \mathcal{L} is a graded logic in the sense of Definition 21. We leave the question of whether a characteristic logic with higher-arity modalities exists as an open problem.

8 Conclusions

We have developed a generic framework for linear-time/branching-time spectra of behavioural distances on state-based systems in coalgebraic generality, covering, for instance, metric, probabilistic, and fuzzy transition systems. The key abstraction in the framework is the notion of a graded monad on the category of metric spaces, and an arising notion of quantitative graded semantics. We have provided a graded quantitative algebraic system for the description of such graded monads (extending the existing non-graded system [33]), as well as a notion of graded logic that is invariant under the given graded semantics, in the sense of being nonexpansive w.r.t. behavioural distance. We have shown that such graded logics are *expressive* under natural conditions, a criterion that we have exploited to show expressiveness of, e.g., logics for metric traces and fuzzy traces, respectively, as well as generic logics for Eilenberg-Moore-type trace semantics [26]. Contrasting with these positive results, in particular with the last, we have shown that there does not exist any expressive logic for probabilistic metric trace distance, an instance of Kleisli-type trace semantics [25].

One important next step in the development will be to identify a generic game-based characterization of behavioural distances in the framework of graded semantics, generalizing work specific to metric transition systems [14] and building on game-based concepts for two-valued graded semantics [19].

References

1. Adámek, J., Herrlich, H., Strecker, G.E.: Abstract and Concrete Categories. John Wiley and Sons (1990), reprint: <http://www.tac.mta.ca/tac/reprints/articles/17/tr17abs.html>

2. de Alfaro, L., Faella, M., Stoelinga, M.: Linear and branching system metrics. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* **35**(2), 258–273 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2008.106>, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2008.106>
3. Baldan, P., Bonchi, F., Kerstan, H., König, B.: Coalgebraic behavioral metrics. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* **14**(3) (2018). [https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-14\(3:20\)2018](https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-14(3:20)2018), [https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-14\(3:20\)2018](https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-14(3:20)2018)
4. Belohlávek, R.: Determinism and fuzzy automata. *Inf. Sci.* **143**(1–4), 205–209 (2002). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-0255\(02\)00192-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-0255(02)00192-5), [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-0255\(02\)00192-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-0255(02)00192-5)
5. Beohar, H., Gurke, S., König, B., Messing, K.: Hennessy-Milner theorems via Galois connections. In: Klin, B., Pimentel, E. (eds.) *Computer Science Logic, CSL 2023. LIPIcs*, vol. 252, pp. 12:1–12:18. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2023). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2023.12>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2023.12>
6. Beohar, H., Gurke, S., König, B., Messing, K., Forster, J., Schröder, L., Wild, P.: Expressive quantale-valued logics for coalgebras: an adjunction-based approach (2023), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.05711>, arXiv:2310.05711
7. van Breugel, F., Worrell, J.: A behavioural pseudometric for probabilistic transition systems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **331**(1), 115–142 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2004.09.035>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2004.09.035>
8. Castiglioni, V., Chatzikokolakis, K., Palamidessi, C.: A logical characterization of differential privacy via behavioral metrics. In: Bae, K., Ölveczky, P. (eds.) *Formal Aspects of Component Software, FACS 2018. LNCS*, vol. 11222, pp. 75–96. Springer (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02146-7>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02146-7>
9. Castiglioni, V., Gebler, D., Tini, S.: Logical characterization of bisimulation metrics. In: Tribastone, M., Wiklicky, H. (eds.) *Quantitative Aspects of Programming Languages and Systems, QAPL 2016. EPTCS*, vol. 227, pp. 44–62 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.227>, <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.227>
10. Christoff, I.: Testing equivalences and fully abstract models for probabilistic processes. In: Baeten, J.C.M., Klop, J.W. (eds.) *Theories of Concurrency: Unification and Extension, CONCUR 1990. LNCS*, vol. 458, pp. 126–140. Springer (1990). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0039056>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0039056>
11. D’Errico, L., Loreti, M.: Modeling fuzzy behaviours in concurrent systems. In: Italiano, G.F., Moggi, E., Laura, L. (eds.) *Theoretical Computer Science, 10th Italian Conference, ICTCS 2007*. pp. 94–105. World Scientific (2007). https://doi.org/10.1142/9789812770998_0012
12. Desharnais, J., Gupta, V., Jagadeesan, R., Panangaden, P.: Metrics for labelled markov processes. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **318**(3), 323–354 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2003.09.013>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2003.09.013>
13. Dorsch, U., Milius, S., Schröder, L.: Graded monads and graded logics for the linear time - branching time spectrum. In: Fokkink, W.J., van Glabbeek, R. (eds.) *Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2019. LIPIcs*, vol. 140, pp. 36:1–36:16. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2019). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2019.36>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2019.36>

14. Fahrenberg, U., Legay, A.: The quantitative linear-time-branching-time spectrum. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **538**, 54–69 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2013.07.030>
15. Fahrenberg, U., Legay, A., Thrane, C.: The quantitative linear-time-branching-time spectrum. In: Chakraborty, S., Kumar, A. (eds.) *Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2011*. LIPIcs, vol. 13, pp. 103–114. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2011). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.FSTTCS.2011.103>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.FSTTCS.2011.103>
16. Fitting, M.: Many-valued modal logics. *Fund. Inform.* **15**, 235–254 (1991). <https://doi.org/10.3233/FI-1991-153-404>, <https://doi.org/10.3233/FI-1991-153-404>
17. Ford, C., Milius, S., Schröder, L.: Behavioural preorders via graded monads. In: *Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2021*. pp. 1–13. IEEE (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS52264.2021.9470517>, <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS52264.2021.9470517>
18. Ford, C., Milius, S., Schröder, L.: Monads on categories of relational structures. In: Gadducci, F., Silva, A. (eds.) *Algebra and Coalgebra in Computer Science, CALCO 2021*. LIPIcs, vol. 211, pp. 14:1–14:17. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2021). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CALCO.2021.14>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CALCO.2021.14>
19. Ford, C., Milius, S., Schröder, L., Beohar, H., König, B.: Graded monads and behavioural equivalence games. In: Baier, C., Fisman, D. (eds.) *Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2022*. pp. 61:1–61:13. ACM (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531130.3533374>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531130.3533374>
20. Forster, J., Goncharov, S., Hofmann, D., Nora, P., Schröder, L., Wild, P.: Quantitative hennessy-milner theorems via notions of density. In: Klin, B., Pimentel, E. (eds.) *Computer Science Logic, CSL 2023*. LIPIcs, vol. 252, pp. 22:1–22:20. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2023). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2023.22>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2023.22>
21. Forster, J., Schröder, L., Wild, P., Beohar, H., Gurke, S., König, B., Messing, K.: Graded semantics and graded logics for eilenberg-moore coalgebras. *CoRR abs/2307.14826* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.14826>, <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.14826>
22. Fujii, S., Katsumata, S., Melliès, P.: Towards a formal theory of graded monads. In: Jacobs, B., Löding, C. (eds.) *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures, FOSSACS 2016*. LNCS, vol. 9634, pp. 513–530. Springer (2016). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-49630-5_30, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-49630-5_30
23. Giacalone, A., Jou, C., Smolka, S.: Algebraic reasoning for probabilistic concurrent systems. In: Broy, M. (ed.) *Programming concepts and methods, PCM 1990*. pp. 443–458. North-Holland (1990)
24. van Glabbeek, R.J.: The linear time - branching time spectrum I. In: Bergstra, J.A., Ponse, A., Smolka, S.A. (eds.) *Handbook of Process Algebra*, pp. 3–99. North-Holland/Elsevier (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-044482830-9/50019-9>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-044482830-9/50019-9>

25. Hasuo, I., Jacobs, B., Sokolova, A.: Generic trace semantics via coinduction. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* **3**(4) (2007). [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-3\(4:11\)2007](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-3(4:11)2007), [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-3\(4:11\)2007](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-3(4:11)2007)
26. Jacobs, B., Silva, A., Sokolova, A.: Trace semantics via determinization. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* **81**(5), 859–879 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2014.12.005>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2014.12.005>
27. Jain, M., Madeira, A., Martins, M.A.: A fuzzy modal logic for fuzzy transition systems. In: Felty, A.P., Marcos, J. (eds.) *Logical and Semantic Frameworks with Applications, LSFA 2019. ENTCS*, vol. 348, pp. 85–103. Elsevier (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2020.02.006>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2020.02.006>
28. Klin, B., Rot, J.: Coalgebraic trace semantics via forgetful logics. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* **12**(4) (2016). [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-12\(4:10\)2016](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-12(4:10)2016), [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-12\(4:10\)2016](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-12(4:10)2016)
29. Komorida, Y., Katsumata, S., Kupke, C., Rot, J., Hasuo, I.: Expressivity of quantitative modal logics : Categorical foundations via codensity and approximation. In: *Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2021*. pp. 1–14. IEEE (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS52264.2021.9470656>, <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS52264.2021.9470656>
30. König, B., Mika-Michalski, C.: (metric) bisimulation games and real-valued modal logics for coalgebras. In: Schewe, S., Zhang, L. (eds.) *Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2018. LIPIcs*, vol. 118, pp. 37:1–37:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2018). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2018.37>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2018.37>
31. Kupke, C., Rot, J.: Expressive logics for coinductive predicates. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* **17**(4) (2021). [https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-17\(4:19\)2021](https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-17(4:19)2021), [https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-17\(4:19\)2021](https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-17(4:19)2021)
32. Linton, F.E.J.: Some aspects of equational categories. In: Eilenberg, S., Harrison, D.K., MacLane, S., Röhrl, H. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Conference on Categorical Algebra*. pp. 84–94. Springer (1966). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-99902-4_3, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-99902-4_3
33. Mardare, R., Panangaden, P., Plotkin, G.D.: Quantitative algebraic reasoning. In: Grohe, M., Koskinen, E., Shankar, N. (eds.) *Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2016*. pp. 700–709. ACM (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2933575.2934518>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/2933575.2934518>
34. Milius, S., Pattinson, D., Schröder, L.: Generic trace semantics and graded monads. In: Moss, L.S., Sobocinski, P. (eds.) *Algebra and Coalgebra in Computer Science, CALCO 2015. LIPIcs*, vol. 35, pp. 253–269. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2015). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CALCO.2015.253>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CALCO.2015.253>
35. Pan, H., Li, Y., Cao, Y., Ma, Z.: Model checking computation tree logic over finite lattices. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **612**, 45–62 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2015.10.014>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2015.10.014>
36. Rady, A., van Breugel, F.: Explainability of probabilistic bisimilarity distances for labelled Markov chains. In: Kupferman, O., Sobocinski, P. (eds.) *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures, FoSSaCS 2023. LNCS*, vol. 13992, pp. 285–307.

- Springer (2023). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30829-1_14, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30829-1_14
37. Rot, J., Jacobs, B., Levy, P.B.: Steps and traces. *J. Log. Comput.* **31**(6), 1482–1525 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1093/logcom/exab050>, <https://doi.org/10.1093/logcom/exab050>
 38. Rutten, J.J.M.M.: Universal coalgebra: a theory of systems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **249**(1), 3–80 (2000). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(00\)00056-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(00)00056-6), [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(00\)00056-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(00)00056-6)
 39. Schröder, L.: Expressivity of coalgebraic modal logic: The limits and beyond. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **390**(2-3), 230–247 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2007.09.023>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2007.09.023>
 40. Schröder, L., Pattinson, D.: Description logics and fuzzy probability. In: Walsh, T. (ed.) *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2011*. pp. 1075–1081. IJCAI/AAAI (2011). <https://doi.org/10.5591/978-1-57735-516-8/IJCAI11-184>, <https://doi.org/10.5591/978-1-57735-516-8/IJCAI11-184>
 41. Wild, P., Schröder, L.: Characteristic logics for behavioural metrics via fuzzy lax extensions. In: Konnov, I., Kovács, L. (eds.) *Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2020. LIPIcs*, vol. 171, pp. 27:1–27:23. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2020). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2020.27>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2020.27>
 42. Wild, P., Schröder, L.: A quantified coalgebraic van Benthem theorem. In: Kiefer, S., Tasson, C. (eds.) *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures, FOSSACS 2021. LNCS*, vol. 12650, pp. 551–571. Springer (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71995-1_28, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71995-1_28
 43. Wild, P., Schröder, L.: Characteristic logics for behavioural hemimetrics via fuzzy lax extensions. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* **18**(2) (2022). [https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-18\(2:19\)2022](https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-18(2:19)2022), [https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-18\(2:19\)2022](https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-18(2:19)2022)
 44. Wild, P., Schröder, L., Pattinson, D., König, B.: A van Benthem theorem for fuzzy modal logic. In: Dawar, A., Grädel, E. (eds.) *Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2018*. pp. 909–918. ACM (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3209108.3209180>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3209108.3209180>
 45. Wu, H., Chen, T., Han, T., Chen, Y.: Bisimulations for fuzzy transition systems revisited. *Int. J. Approx. Reason.* **99**, 1–11 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2018.04.010>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2018.04.010>
 46. Wu, H., Chen, Y., Bu, T., Deng, Y.: Algorithmic and logical characterizations of bisimulations for non-deterministic fuzzy transition systems. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* **333**, 106–123 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fss.2017.02.008>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fss.2017.02.008>

A Appendix: Additional Details and Omitted Proofs

We give details and proofs omitted in the main body. The example of Eilenberg-Moore semantics in Section 7 is provided with additional details and underscored with further examples in a preprint available on arXiv [21].

A.1 Details for Section 4

Proof of Proposition 14 Let $\mathcal{T} = (\Sigma, \delta, E)$ be a depth-1 graded quantitative equational theory and \mathbb{M} the graded monad it induces.

1. We show that Diagram (4.1) is a coequalizer. Elements of $M_1 M_n X$ are represented as equivalence classes $[s]$ of depth-1-terms over depth- n terms over variables from X ; we briefly refer to such terms s as *layered terms*. More precisely speaking, the element of $[s] \in M_1 M_n X$ represented by s is formed by first taking the equivalence classes of the lower depth- n terms, and then taking the equivalence class of the depth-1 term over $M_n X$ thus obtained. We write \bar{s} for the collapse of s into a depth- $n+1$ term over X , so \bar{s} represents the element $\mu^{10}([s]) \in M_{n+1} X$. Given layered terms s, t , $d(\mu_X^{1n}([s]), \mu_X^{1n}([t])) = \epsilon$ implies that there is a proof for $\bar{s} =_\epsilon \bar{t}$ in the context $\Gamma_X = \{x =_\delta y \mid x, y \in X, d(x, y) = \delta\}$.

Approximate equalities of layered terms in $M_1 M_n X$ are derived by regarding the lower depth- n terms as variables, assembled in a context Γ_0 containing all derivable approximate equalities among them, and then applying the usual derivation system to the upper depth-1 terms. The coequalizer of $M_1 \mu_X^{0n}$ and $\mu^{10} M_n X$ as in (4.1) is formed by additionally allowing derivation steps using strict equalities where depth-0 operations are shifted from the upper depth-1 layer to the lower depth- n layer. Equivalently (by **(nexp)**, which on strict equalities acts like a congruence rule), this amounts to using as assumptions, instead of just Γ_0 , all approximate equalities $u =_\epsilon v$ among depth-0 terms u, v over depth- n terms over X (i.e. representatives of elements of $M_0 M_n X$) that hold in $M_n X$ (i.e. the elements of $M_0 M_n X$ represented by u, v are identified up to ϵ by μ^{0n}); that is, we assume, in the upper-layer depth-1 derivations, not only the metric structure of $M_n X$ but also the structure of $M_n X$ as an M_0 -algebra. We write Δ for the set of these assumptions.

We now claim that whenever $\bar{s} =_\epsilon \bar{t}$ is derivable in context Γ_X for layered terms s, t , then $s =_\epsilon t$ is derivable, as a depth-1 approximate equality, from the assumptions in Δ (of course, like the usual assumptions on variables, the assumptions in Δ cannot be substituted into). By the above discussion, it follows that (4.1) is indeed a coequalizer. We proceed by induction on the derivation of $\bar{s} =_\epsilon \bar{t}$, distinguishing cases on the last step. We note that since \bar{s}, \bar{t} have depth at least 1, the case for **(assn)** does not occur. The remaining cases are as follows.

- **(refl)**: In this case, the layered terms s and t collapse into syntactically identical terms, which implies that they differ only by shifting depth-0 operations between the upper depth-1 layer and the lower depth- n layer, and hence are derivably equal under Δ .

- Steps using **(sym)**, **(triang)**, **(wk)**, and **(arch)** can just be copied. As an example, we treat the case for **(triang)** in detail: Since approximate equalities derivable in context Γ_X are uniform-depth and use only variables from Γ_X , the intermediate term used in the last step is necessarily a depth- $n+1$ term over X , and therefore a collapse \bar{w} of some layered term w . That is, we have concluded $\bar{s} =_\epsilon \bar{t}$ from $\bar{s} =_{\delta_1} \bar{w}$ and $\bar{w} =_{\delta_2} \bar{t}$ where $\epsilon = \delta_1 + \delta_2$. By induction, $s =_{\delta_1} w$ and $w =_{\delta_2} t$ are derivable under Δ , and then the same holds for $s =_\epsilon t$.
- **(nexp)**: Nonexpansiveness of an operation f is equivalently phrased as a basic quantitative inference $x_1 =_\epsilon y_1, \dots, x_n =_\epsilon y_n \vdash f(x_1, \dots, x_n) =_\epsilon f(y_1, \dots, y_n)$, so we omit this case, referring to the case for **(ax)**.
- **(ax)**: In this case, we have applied an axiom $\Gamma \vdash u =_\epsilon v$, and derived $u\sigma =_\epsilon v\sigma$ from $\sigma(x) =_\delta \sigma(y)$ for all $(x =_\delta y) \in \Gamma$. First we consider the case that u, v are depth-0. Then for $(x =_\delta y) \in \Gamma$, $\sigma(x)$ and $\sigma(y)$ have depth $n+1$, and hence arise by collapsing layered terms w_x, w_y ; by induction, $w_x =_\delta w_y$ is derivable under Δ , and again applying $\Gamma \vdash u =_\epsilon v$, we obtain that $u\sigma' = v\sigma'$ is derivable under Δ where σ' is the substitution given by $\sigma'(x) = w_x$. Since the layered terms $u\sigma'$ and $v\sigma'$ collapse to \bar{s} and \bar{t} , respectively, they differ from s and t , respectively, only by shifting depth-0 operations between the layers, and hence $s =_\epsilon t$ is derivable under Δ .
The remaining case is that u, v have depth 1. In this case, for $(x =_\delta y) \in \Gamma$, $\sigma(x)$ and $\sigma(y)$ have depth n , and $\sigma(x) =_\delta \sigma(y)$ is derivable, hence in Δ . We write u_σ and v_σ for the layered terms with depth-1 layer given by u and v , respectively, and depth- n layer given by σ . Then $u_\sigma =_\epsilon v_\sigma$ is derivable under Δ . The layered terms u_σ and v_σ differ from s and t , respectively, at most by shifting depth-0 operations between the depth-1 layer and the depth- n layer, so $s =_\epsilon t$ is also derivable under Δ .

2. Second, we show that the μ^{nk} are epi. The μ^{1k} are (regular) epimorphisms since diagram 4.1 is a coequalizer diagram. This implies that all μ^{nk} are epi. To see this, first note that each μ^{0k} is split epi by the unit law $\mu^{0k}\eta M_k = id_{M_k}$. We show that μ^{nk} is epi by induction on n . The base cases $n \leq 1$ are already discharged. For the step from n to $n+1$, recall the associative law $\mu^{n+1,k}\mu^{1n}M_k = \mu^{1,m+k}M_1\mu^{nk}$. We have that $\mu^{1,m+k}$ is epi, and by induction, so is $M_1\mu^{nk}$. Thus, both sides of the associative law are epi. It follows that $\mu^{(n+1)k}$ is epi as desired. \square

A.2 Details on Section 4

Fix $k: [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

1. $x + y \geq z$ and $x' + y' \geq z'$ implies $k(x, x') + k(y, y') \geq k(z, z')$.
2. $k(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y = 0$

Put $d_{A \otimes B}((a, b), (a', b')) = k(d(a, a'), d(b, b'))$.

Lemma 35. *The function $d_{A \otimes B}$ defined above is a metric on the set $A \times B$.*

Proof. For reflexivity, we have that $d_{A \otimes B}((a, b), (a, b)) = k(d_A(a, a), d_B(b, b)) = k(0, 0) = 0$. For positivity, suppose that $d_{A \otimes B}((a, b), (a', b')) = 0$. Then $k(d(a, a'), d(b, b')) = 0$, implying $d(a, a') = 0$ and thus $a = a'$ and similarly $b = b'$, therefore $(a, a') = (b, b')$. For the triangle inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{A \otimes B}((a, b), (a', b')) + d_{A \otimes B}((a', b'), (a'', b'')) \\ &= k(d(a, a'), d(b, b')) + k(d(a', a''), d(b', b'')) \\ &\geq k(d(a, a''), d(b, b'')) \\ &= d_{A \otimes B}((a, b), (a'', b'')). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 36. *The p -norms for $1 \leq p \in \mathbb{N}$ with discount factor $\delta \in (0, 1]$, i.e. $k(x, y) = \sqrt[p]{x^p + (\delta y)^p}$, satisfy these conditions.*

Proof. For the second condition: It is clear that $k(0, 0) = 0$. So suppose $k(x, y) = 0$. This is the case if and only if $x^p + (\delta y)^p = 0$, which in turn implies $x = y = 0$. For the first condition, suppose that $x + y \geq z$ and $x' + y' \geq z'$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & k(x, x') + k(y, y') \\ &= \sqrt[p]{x^p + (\delta y)^p} + \sqrt[p]{x'^p + (\delta y')^p} \\ &\geq \sqrt[p]{(x + x')^p + ((\delta y) + (\delta y'))^p} \quad (\text{Minkowski inequality}) \\ &\geq \sqrt[p]{z^p + (\delta z')^p} \quad (\text{Monotonicity of } +, \sqrt[p]{\cdot} \text{ and } \delta \cdot) \\ &= k(z, z') \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 37. *The sup norm $k(x, y) = x \vee \delta y$ satisfies these conditions.*

Proof. Satisfaction of the second condition is obvious, we show the first condition. Assume $x + y \geq z$ and $x' + y' \geq z'$. Then $k(x, x') + k(y, y') = (x \vee \delta x') + (y \vee \delta y') \geq (x + y) \vee (\delta x' + \delta y') \geq z \vee \delta z' = k(z, z')$ □

Proof of Lemma 18 Let $(a, s), (b, t) \in \mathcal{A} \boxplus TX$ where $s = g(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $t = h(y_1, \dots, y_m)$ are terms of TX written in form of a algebraic equational theory associated to T . Then we have that $d((a, s), (b, t)) = d(a, b) \oplus d(s, t)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & d(\lambda_X(a, s), \lambda_X(b, t)) \\ &= d(g((a, x_1), \dots, (a, x_n)), h(((b, y_1), \dots, (b, y_m)))) \\ &\leq d(g((a, x_1), \dots, (a, x_n)), g(((b, x_1), \dots, (b, x_n)))) \\ &\oplus d(g((b, x_1), \dots, (b, x_n)), h(((b, y_1), \dots, (b, y_m)))) \\ &\leq d(a, b) \oplus d(g((b, x_1), \dots, (b, x_n)), h(((b, y_1), \dots, (b, y_m)))) \\ &= d(a, b) \oplus d(s, t) = d((a, s), (b, t)) \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 19 We proceed in two parts. First, we show that $(M_n X)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a quantitative graded $\mathcal{T}[\mathcal{A}]$ algebra, i.e. a quantitative algebra [33], extended with grades in the obvious way (generalized from the set-based concept [13]). Second, we show that $(M_n X)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is generated from X via the operations of $\mathcal{T}[\mathcal{A}]$. Lastly, we prove completeness of the axioms with respect to this algebra. We interpret depth-0 operations on $M_n X = T(\mathcal{A}^{\otimes n} \otimes X)$, ensuring satisfaction of \mathcal{T} , using the fact that T is the monad generated by \mathcal{T} , so that every set TY is a free \mathcal{T} -algebra. Depth-1 operations a are given by the functions $a_n: T(\mathcal{A}^{\otimes n} \otimes -) \rightarrow T(\mathcal{A}^{\otimes n+1} \otimes -)$ defined by $a_n(s) = \lambda_{\mathcal{A}^{\otimes n} \otimes X}(a, s)$. For satisfaction of the distributivity axiom, let $v_1, \dots, v_n \in T(\mathcal{A}^{\otimes n} \otimes X)$, represented as \mathcal{T} -terms, and let g be an n -ary operation of \mathcal{T} ; then $a(g(v_1, \dots, v_n)) = \lambda(a, g(v_1, \dots, v_n)) = T(a, id_{\mathcal{A}^{\otimes n} \otimes X})(t) = g((a, v_1), \dots, (a, v_n))$. For the distance axiom $x =_\epsilon y \vdash a(x) =_{k(d(a,b), \epsilon)} b(y)$, let $s, t \in T(\mathcal{A}^{\otimes n} \otimes -)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(a(s), b(t)) &= d(\lambda_X(a, s), \lambda_X(b, t)) \\ &\leq d_{\mathcal{A} \otimes T(\mathcal{A}^{\otimes n} \otimes X)}((a, s), (b, t)) \\ &= k(d(a, b), d(s, t)), \end{aligned}$$

using non-expansiveness of λ in the second step.

Generatedness of $M_n X$ under these operations is then clear. For completeness, we show that low distances in $M_n X$ are derivable using quantitative equational reasoning: Let $s, t \in M_n X = T(\mathcal{A}^{\otimes n} \otimes X)$. By generatedness, we can write s, t as terms $s = g(\sigma_1(x_1), \dots, \sigma_n(x_n))$, $t = h(\rho_1(y_1), \dots, \rho_m(y_m))$ where g, h are \mathcal{T} -terms, $\sigma_i, \rho_i \in \mathcal{A}^{\otimes n}$, and $x_i, y_i \in X$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let Γ contain all distances among $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n$. Assume $d(s, t) \leq \epsilon$, then we need to show that $\Gamma \vdash s =_\epsilon t$. By completeness of the theory \mathcal{T} for T , it is clear that $\Gamma' \vdash s =_\epsilon t$ where Γ' contains all distances among the trace-poststate pairs $\sigma_1(x_1), \dots, \sigma_n(x_n), \rho_1(y_1), \dots, \rho_n(y_n)$. So we reduce to proving that distances of these traces can be derived, i.e. $\Gamma \vdash (a_1, \dots, a_n, x) =_{\epsilon'} (b_1, \dots, b_n, y)$ if $d((a_1, \dots, a_n, x), (b_1, \dots, b_n, y)) \leq \epsilon'$. This is immediate by induction over n , where the inductive step applies the distance axiom. \square

A.3 Details for Section 5

Proof of Theorem 23 We define for each depth- n formula ϕ an M_0 -algebra homomorphism $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}}: M_n 1 \rightarrow \Omega$ and show that on a coalgebra (X, γ) , we have $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_{\gamma} = \llbracket \phi \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}} \cdot \gamma^{(n)}$. The claim then follows from the fact that the $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}}$ are nonexpansive and $d^\alpha(x, y) \leq d_{M_n 1}(\gamma^{(n)}(x), \gamma^{(n)}(y))$ for $x, y \in X$. We define $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}}$ recursively as follows.

- $\llbracket c \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}} = M_0 1 \xrightarrow{M_0 \hat{c}} M_0 \Omega \xrightarrow{o} \Omega$ for $c \in \Theta$;
- $\llbracket p(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k) \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}} = \llbracket p \rrbracket \cdot \langle \llbracket \phi_1 \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}}, \dots, \llbracket \phi_k \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}} \rangle$ for $p \in \mathcal{O}$ k -ary;
- $\llbracket L\phi \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}} = f(\llbracket \phi' \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}})$ for $L \in \Lambda$ and $\llbracket L \rrbracket = f \cdot \alpha_\Omega$ as per Definition 21.

Here, the definition of modal operators is by freeness of the canonical algebra, that is, $f(\llbracket \phi' \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}})$ is the unique morphism that makes the following square com-

mute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 M_1 M_n 1 & \xrightarrow{M_1 \llbracket \phi' \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}}} & M_1 \Omega \\
 \downarrow \mu^{1n} & & \downarrow f \\
 M_{n+1} 1 & \xrightarrow{f^\#(\llbracket \phi' \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}})} & \Omega
 \end{array} \tag{A.1}$$

It is straightforward to show by induction on the depth of ϕ that the morphism $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}}$ defines a homomorphism of M_0 -algebras $(M_n 1, \mu^{0n})$ and (Ω, o) , which is needed for $\llbracket L\phi \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}}$ to be defined.

Given a coalgebra (X, γ) and a depth- n formula ϕ of \mathcal{L} , we now show by induction on ϕ that $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma = \llbracket \phi \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}} \cdot \gamma^{(n)}$.

For the case of $\phi = c \in \Theta$ we have, by unfolding definitions, that $\llbracket c \rrbracket_\gamma = \hat{c} \cdot !_X$ and $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}} \cdot \gamma^{(n)} = o \cdot M_0 \hat{c} \cdot M_0 !_X \cdot \eta_X$, which are the outer paths in the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{!} & 1 & \xrightarrow{\hat{c}} & \Omega \\
 \downarrow \eta_X & & \downarrow \eta_1 & & \downarrow \eta_\Omega \quad \searrow id \\
 M_0 X & \xrightarrow{M_0 !} & M_0 1 & \xrightarrow{M_0 \hat{c}} & M_0 \Omega \xrightarrow{o} \Omega
 \end{array}$$

The squares commute by naturality of η , while commutativity of the triangle is implied by o being an M_0 -algebra.

The step for formulae of the form $\phi = p(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$ is immediate from the definitions. For $\phi = L\phi'$ with ϕ' being of uniform depth n , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma &= \llbracket L \rrbracket \cdot G\llbracket \phi' \rrbracket_\gamma \cdot \gamma \\
 &= f \cdot \alpha_\Omega \cdot G\llbracket \phi' \rrbracket_\gamma \cdot \gamma \\
 &= f \cdot M_1 \llbracket \phi' \rrbracket_\gamma \cdot \alpha_X \cdot \gamma && \text{(naturality of } \alpha) \\
 &= f \cdot M_1 \llbracket \phi' \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}} \cdot M_1 \gamma^{(n)} \cdot \alpha_X \cdot \gamma && \text{(induction)} \\
 &= f^\#(\llbracket \phi' \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}}) \cdot \mu^{1n} \cdot M_1 \gamma^{(n)} \cdot \alpha_X \cdot \gamma && \text{(A.1)} \\
 &= \llbracket \phi \rrbracket_{\mathbb{M}} \cdot \gamma^{(n+1)} && \text{(definitions)}
 \end{aligned}$$

□

A.4 Details for Section 6

Details for Remark 27 We make explicit the fact that given an initial cone \mathfrak{A} of $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega$ -homomorphisms (i.e. quantitative join semilattice homomorphisms) $A \rightarrow [0, 1]$, the closure of \mathfrak{A} under all admissible propositional operators (i.e. $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega$ -homomorphisms $[0, 1]^k \rightarrow [0, 1]$) may not be dense in the space of all $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega$ -homomorphisms $A \rightarrow [0, 1]$, even when A is free. Take for instance the $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega$ -algebra $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(X, d_X)$ where $X = \{a, b, c\}$ with $d(a, b) = d(b, c) = 0.3$ and $d(a, c) = 0.4$. We attempt to recover the $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega$ -homomorphism $f: \overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(X, d_X) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ uniquely defined by $f(\{a\}) = 0.6$, $f(\{b\}) = 0.8$, $f(\{c\}) = 1$ and $f(\{d\}) = 0$. We define a set \mathfrak{A} as above as consisting of all join semilattice homomorphisms g where either a) $g \not\leq f$ or b) $g(\{c\}) < 1$. This set of functions is initial. We show

that \mathfrak{A} is also closed under the propositional operators mentioned above: Let $o: [0, 1]^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a join semilattice homomorphism, and let $g_1, \dots, g_n \in \mathfrak{A}$. We have to show that $o\langle g_i \rangle \in \mathfrak{A}$. It is clear that $o\langle g_i \rangle$ is a join semilattice morphism. For the remaining property, we distinguish cases as follows.

- Suppose that $o(1, \dots, 1) < 1$. Then by monotonicity of join semilattice morphisms, $o(\langle g_i \rangle_{i \leq n}(\{c\})) < 1$, so $o\langle g_i \rangle \in \mathfrak{A}$.
- Otherwise, $o(1^n) = 1$. By join continuity, the set $J = \{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid o(0^{j-1}10^{n-j-1}) = 1\}$ is nonempty. Since o preserves the empty join, i.e. $o(0^n) = 0$, we know by nonexpansiveness that

$$o(0^{j-1}10^{n-j-1}) = v \quad \text{for all } j \in J. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

If $g_j(\{c\}) < 1$ for all $j \in J$, then $o(\langle g_i \rangle_{i \leq n}(\{c\})) < 1$ by join continuity, so $o\langle g_i \rangle \in \mathfrak{A}$ as claimed. Otherwise, we have $j \in J$ such that $g_j(\{c\}) = 1$. Since $g_j \in \mathfrak{A}$, this means that we have $z \in X$ such that $g_j(z) > f(z)$, implying by (A.2) that $o(0^{j-1}g_j(z)0^{n-j-1}) = g_j(z) > f(z)$ and thus $o(\langle g_i \rangle_{i \leq n}(z)) > f(z)$ by monotonicity. Thus, $o\langle g_i \rangle \not\leq f$, so $o\langle g_i \rangle \in \mathfrak{A}$.

On the other hand, it is clear that \mathfrak{A} is not dense in $\text{Alg}_0(M)(\overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(X), [0, 1])$.

Proof of Theorem 30 We have to show that the closure of the family of maps

$$\{\llbracket \phi \rrbracket : M_n 1 \rightarrow [0, 1] \mid \phi \text{ is a depth-}n \text{ formula}\}$$

under the propositional operators in \mathcal{O} has property Φ and is thus initial for each n . We proceed by induction on n . The base case $n = 0$ is immediate by Φ -type depth-0 separation. For the inductive step let \mathfrak{A} denote the set of evaluations $M_n 1 \rightarrow \Omega$ of depth- n formulae. By the induction hypothesis, \mathfrak{A} has property Φ . By definition, \mathfrak{A} is closed under propositional operators in \mathcal{O} . By Φ -type depth-1 separation, it follows that set

$$\{\llbracket L \rrbracket^\#(\llbracket \phi \rrbracket) \mid L \in \Lambda, \phi \text{ a depth-}n \text{ formula}\}$$

has property Φ , proving the claim. \square

Details on Example 32.1 (Metric Streams) In the following, we write $\mathcal{L}^{\text{stream}}$ for the logic of metric streams featuring only the truth constant 1 and modalities \Diamond_a for $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

Lemma 38. $\mathcal{L}^{\text{stream}}$ is normed isometric depth-0 and normed isometric depth-1 separating.

Proof. For normed isometric depth-0 separation, note that $M_0 1 = 1$ and that $\llbracket \top \rrbracket = M_0 \hat{\top}$ is defined by $* \mapsto 1$, so that $\{\llbracket \top \rrbracket\}$ is normed isometric. For normed isometric depth-1 separation, note that since $M_0 = id$ in the present case, canonical M_1 -algebras have the form $id: GA_0 \rightarrow A_1 = GA_0 = \mathcal{A} \times A_0$. Let A be

such a canonical M_1 -algebra, and let \mathfrak{A} be a normed isometric set of morphisms $A_0 \rightarrow \Omega$. Let $(a, v), (b, w) \in M_1 A_0 = \mathcal{A} \times A_0$. Since \mathfrak{A} is normed isometric, there is $f \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $f(v) = 1$ and $f(w) = 1 - d(v, w)$. To show that $\Lambda(\mathfrak{A})$ is normed isometric, we show that $\llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket(f) \in \Lambda(\mathfrak{A})$ exhibits the required properties. On the one hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket^\#(f)((a, v)) \\ &= \llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket((a, f(v))) \\ &= \min\{1 - d(a, a), f(v)\} \\ &= f(v) \\ &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

and on the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket^\#(f)((b, w)) \\ &= \llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket((b, f(w))) \\ &= \min\{1 - d(a, b), f(w)\} \\ &= \min\{1 - d(a, b), 1 - d(v, w)\} \\ &= 1 - \max\{d(a, b), d(v, w)\} \\ &= 1 - d((a, v), (b, w)). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 39. $\mathcal{L}^{\text{stream}}$ is not initial-type depth-1 separating.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{a, b\}$ with $d(a, b) = 0.8$. Let A be a canonical M_1 -algebra (described as in the proof of Lemma 38) with $A_0 = \{v, w\}$ where $d(v, w) = 0.5$. The map $f: A_0 \rightarrow \Omega$ defined by $f(w) = 0.25$ and $f(v) = 0.75$ is thus initial; we show that $\Lambda(\{f\}) = \{\llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket^\#(f), \llbracket \Diamond_b \rrbracket^\#(f)\}$ (a set of maps $A_1 = \mathcal{A} \times A_0 \rightarrow \Omega$) is not, thus proving the claim (recall that there are no propositional operators). For $\llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket^\#(f)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket^\#(f)((a, v)) - \llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket^\#(f)((b, w))| \\ &= |\llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket((a, f(v))) - \llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket((b, f(w)))| \\ &= |\min\{1 - d(a, a), f(v)\} - \min\{1 - d(a, b), f(w)\}| \\ &= |f(v) - \min\{1 - d(a, b), f(w)\}| \\ &= |0.75 - \min\{0.2, 0.25\}| = 0.55 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for $\llbracket \Diamond_b \rrbracket^\#(f)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\llbracket \Diamond_b \rrbracket^\#(f)((a, v)) - \llbracket \Diamond_b \rrbracket^\#(f)((b, w))| \\ &= |\llbracket \Diamond_b \rrbracket((a, f(v))) - \llbracket \Diamond_b \rrbracket((b, f(w)))| \\ &= |\min\{1 - d(b, a), f(v)\} - \min\{1 - d(b, b), f(w)\}| \\ &= |\min\{1 - d(b, a), f(v)\} - f(w)| \\ &= |\min\{0.2, 0.75\} - 0.25| = 0.05. \end{aligned}$$

Since $d((a, v), (b, w)) = 0.8$, this shows that $\Lambda(\mathfrak{A})$ is not initial. □

Details on Example 32.2 (Metric Transition Systems)

Lemma 40. *The graded quantitative theory in Example 20 induces the graded monad $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(L^n \times -)$*

Proof. By Lemma 19, it suffices to show that the natural transformation $\lambda: \mathcal{A} \times \overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega - \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \times -)$ given by $\lambda_X(a, S) = \{(a, s) \mid s \in S\}$ is nonexpansive. Let $(a, S), (b, T) \in \mathcal{A} \times \overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega X$ for a metric space X . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & d(\lambda_X(a, S), \lambda_X(b, T)) \\ &= \left(\bigvee_{s \in S} \bigwedge_{t \in T} d((a, s), (b, t)) \right) \vee \left(\bigvee_{t \in T} \bigwedge_{s \in S} d((a, s), (b, t)) \right) \\ &= \left(\bigvee_{s \in S} \bigwedge_{t \in T} d(a, b) \vee d(s, t) \right) \vee \left(\bigvee_{t \in T} \bigwedge_{s \in S} d(a, b) \vee d(s, t) \right) \\ &= d(a, b) \vee \left(\bigvee_{s \in S} \bigwedge_{t \in T} d(s, t) \right) \vee \left(\bigvee_{t \in T} \bigwedge_{s \in S} d(s, t) \right) \\ &= d((a, S), (b, T)). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 41. *The logic for trace semantics given in Example 24 is expressive.*

Proof. As indicated in Example 32.2, we use Theorem 30, with normed isometry as the initiality invariant. Depth-0 separation is straightforward. For depth-1 separation, we proceed according to Remark 31 and exploit that canonical M_1 -algebras of the form $M_n 1$ are free as M_0 -algebras, which in the case at hand means they are finite-powerset quantitative join semilattices carrying the Hausdorff metric. That is, we are given a canonical M_1 -algebra A such that $A_0 = \overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(X)$ where X is a metric space, and then $A_1 = \overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \times X)$. Let \mathfrak{A} be a normed isometric set of nonexpansive join-semilattice morphisms $A \rightarrow \Omega$. We have to show that $\Lambda(\mathfrak{A})$ is normed isometric. So let $S, T \in \overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \times X)$ such that $d(S, T) > \epsilon$. Without loss of generality this means that we have $(a, x) \in S$ such that $d((a, x), T) > \epsilon$. Put

$$C_{a, \epsilon}(T) = \{y \in X \mid \exists (b, y) \in T. d(a, b) \leq \epsilon\}.$$

Then $d(\{x\}, C_{a, \epsilon}(T)) > \epsilon$ in $A_0 = \overline{\mathcal{P}}_\omega(X)$. To see this, let $y \in C_{a, \epsilon}(T)$, i.e. $(b, y) \in T$ for some b such that $d(a, b) \leq \epsilon$. Then $d((a, x), (b, y)) > \epsilon$ because $d((a, x), T) > \epsilon$, and hence $d(x, y) > \epsilon$, as required.

It follows that $d(\{x\} \cup C_{a, \epsilon}(T), C_{a, \epsilon}(T)) > \epsilon$. Since \mathfrak{A} is normed isometric, we thus have $f \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that

$$|f(\{x\} \cup C_{a, \epsilon}(T)) - f(C_{a, \epsilon}(T))| > \epsilon$$

and moreover $f(\{x\} \cup C_{a, \epsilon}(T)) \vee f(C_{a, \epsilon}(T)) = 1$. Since f , being a join semilattice morphism, is monotone w.r.t. set inclusion, this implies that $f(\{x\} \cup C_{a, \epsilon}(T)) = 1$ and $f(C_{a, \epsilon}(T)) < 1 - \epsilon$, and moreover $f(\{x\} \cup C_{a, \epsilon}(T)) = f(x) \vee f(C_{a, \epsilon}(T))$, so $f(\{x\}) = 1$. It follows that $\diamond_a(f)(S) = 1$; it remains to show that $\diamond_a(f)(T) < 1 - \epsilon$. So let $(b, y) \in T$; we have to show that $f(y) \wedge (1 - d(a, b)) < 1 - \epsilon$. We distinguish cases:

- $d(a, b) \leq \epsilon$: Then $y \in C_{a, \epsilon}(T)$. Since $f(C_{a, \epsilon}(T)) < 1 - \epsilon$ and f preserves joins, we have $f(y) < 1 - \epsilon$, which implies the claim.
- $d(a, b) > \epsilon$: Then $1 - d(a, b) < 1 - \epsilon$, which implies the claim.

□

A.5 Details for Section 7

Details on Eilenberg-Moore Semantics

We need the rather technical definition of \overline{M}_1 , introduced in [19] for our results relating to Eilenberg-Moore semantics.

Definition 42. Let \mathbb{M} be a graded monad. We have a functor $E: \text{Alg}_0(\mathbb{M}) \rightarrow \text{Alg}_1(\mathbb{M})$ that takes an M_0 -algebra A to the free M_1 -algebra over A (which is then canonical). This gives rise to a functor

$$\overline{M}_1 = (\text{Alg}_0(\mathbb{M}) \xrightarrow{E} \text{Alg}_1(\mathbb{M}) \xrightarrow{(-)_1} \text{Alg}_0(\mathbb{M})),$$

which intuitively takes an M_0 -algebra of behaviours to the M_0 -algebra of behaviours having absorbed one more step.

Since $(M_0X, M_1X, \mu_X^{0,0}, \mu_X^{0,1}, \mu_X^{1,0})$ is canonical (Proposition 15), we have $\overline{M}_1(M_0X, \mu^{0,0}) = (M_1X, \mu^{0,1})$, or stated slightly differently, if we denote the free-forgetful adjunction on $\text{Alg}_0(\mathbb{M})$ by $L \dashv R$, then $M_1 = R\overline{M}_1L$.

Let $\lambda: TF \rightarrow FT$ be an EM-law and \mathbb{M}^λ the graded monad induced by λ . By \tilde{F} we denote the lifting of F to $\mathbf{EM}(T)$ via λ .

Lemma 43. *If $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{M}^\lambda$ then $\overline{M}_1 = \tilde{F}$.*

Proof. Let (A, a) be a T -algebra. Then $\tilde{F}(A, a) = (Fa, Fa \cdot \lambda_A)$. On the other hand, by Lemma 8, the 1-part of the canonical algebra of $\overline{M}_1(A, a)$ is given by the following (split) coequalizer:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} FTTA & \xrightarrow{F\mu_A} & FTA & \xrightarrow{Fa} & FA \\ \curvearrowleft & \text{\scriptsize } F\eta_{TA} & \curvearrowright & \text{\scriptsize } F\eta_A & \\ & & & & \end{array}$$

Commutativity of all relevant paths is obvious from the algebra and monad axioms, implying that the diagram is a coequalizer diagram by virtue of being a split coequalizer. Then $(A, FA, a, Fa \cdot \lambda_A, Fa)$ defines a canonical M_1 -algebra where coequalization, as well as canonicity (due to Lemme 8), are by the above coequalizer, and homomorphy instantiates to the outer paths of the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} TFTA & \xrightarrow{\lambda_{TA}} & FTTA & \xrightarrow{F\mu} & FTA \\ \downarrow TFa & & \downarrow FTa & & \downarrow Fa \\ TFA & \xrightarrow{\lambda_A} & FTA & \xrightarrow{Fa} & FA \end{array}$$

Commutativity of the outer rectangle follows from the fact that the left square commutes by naturality of λ and the right square commutes by virtue of (A, a) being a T -algebra. Taking the 1-part of this canonical algebra then leaves us with $(Fa, Fa \cdot \lambda_A)$. On morphisms $h: (A, a) \rightarrow (B, b)$, the lifting \tilde{F} acts by sending h to Fh . Commutativity of the relevant diagram making Fh a T -algebra morphism between FA and FB is easily checked, as is the fact that (h, Fh) constitutes a morphism between the canonical M_1 -algebras. \square

The following theorem gives a complete characterization of the graded modal operators for a graded semantics of the form (id, \mathbb{M}^λ) .

Theorem 44. *Let $\llbracket L \rrbracket: FT\Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ be a modal operator for a graded logic with truth value object (Ω, o) . Then $\llbracket L \rrbracket = ev_L \cdot Fo$ for some algebra homomorphism $ev_L: \tilde{F}(\Omega, o) \rightarrow (\Omega, o)$. On the other hand, every algebra homomorphism $\tilde{F}(\Omega, o) \rightarrow (\Omega, o)$ yields a modal operator in this way.*

Proof. Since $\llbracket L \rrbracket$ is an M_1 -algebra structure and thus satisfies the coequalization property, it factors through the coequalizer of $\mu_\Omega^{1,0}: M_1 M_0 \Omega \rightarrow M_1 \Omega$ and $M_1 o: M_1 M_0 \Omega \rightarrow M_1 \Omega$, which, by definition, is given by $\overline{M}_1(\Omega, o) = (F\Omega, Fo \cdot \lambda_\Omega)$, as displayed in the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} FTT\Omega & \xrightarrow[FTo]{F\mu_\Omega} & FT\Omega & \xrightarrow{\llbracket L \rrbracket} & \Omega \\ & & \searrow Fo & \nearrow ev_L & \\ & & F\Omega & & \end{array}$$

To show that ev_L is a homomorphism of T -algebras consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} FT\Omega & \xrightarrow{\llbracket L \rrbracket} & \Omega \\ \uparrow F\mu & \searrow Fo & \nearrow ev_L & & \\ & F\Omega & & & \\ \uparrow FTo & \uparrow Fo & & & \\ FTT\Omega & \xrightarrow{FT\Omega} & FT\Omega & & o \\ \uparrow \lambda_{T\Omega} & \uparrow \lambda_\Omega & & & \\ & TF\Omega & & & \\ \uparrow TFo & \nearrow T\llbracket L \rrbracket & \searrow T ev_L & & \\ TFT\Omega & \xrightarrow{TFT\Omega} & T\Omega & & \end{array}$$

The outer square commutes by homomorphism of $\llbracket L \rrbracket$. The top triangle commutes by coequalization, as does the bottom triangle, since it is just T applied to the top triangle. The left top square commutes since o is a T -algebra structure and the left bottom square commutes by naturality of λ . It follows that the right hand square precomposed with TFo commutes. TFo is a split coequalizer,

and therefore an epimorphism. Therefore by canceling TFo we have that the right hand square commutes, which is precisely the condition for ev_L to be a homomorphism of T -algebras.

Conversely, given a morphism $ev_L: \tilde{F}(\Omega, o) \rightarrow (\Omega, o)$ it is straight forward to check that $\llbracket L \rrbracket = ev_L \cdot Fo$ satisfies the laws necessary to make it an M_1 -algebra main structure. \square

As our second result relating to Eilenberg-Moore semantics, we next show that a logic is depth-1 separating for the semantics of \mathbb{M}^λ if the F -algebra part of its modal operators is expressive for F . This criterion is typically very easy to establish and can be shown for general classes of functors, which is what we mean by our slogan that expressive graded logics for EM semantics come essentially for free.

Theorem 45. *Let $\mathcal{L} = (\Theta, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$ be a graded logic for \mathbb{M}^λ and $\mathcal{L}' = (\Theta, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda')$ the (graded) logic for \mathbb{M}_F with $\Lambda' = \{g: F\Omega \rightarrow \Omega \mid g \cdot Fo \in \Lambda\}$. Let Φ be an initiality invariant. Then \mathcal{L} is Φ -type depth-1 separating for \mathbb{M}^λ iff \mathcal{L}' is Φ -type depth-1 separating for \mathbb{M}_F .*

Proof. Let A be a canonical M_1 -algebra. Since $\overline{M}_1 = \tilde{F}$, we know that A has the form $(A_0, FA_0, a^{0,0}, Fa^{0,0} \cdot \lambda, Fa^{0,0})$. For a homomorphism $h: (A_0, a^{0,0}) \rightarrow (\Omega, o)$ of T -algebras and $L \in \Lambda$ where $\llbracket L \rrbracket = g \cdot Fo$, we have that $\llbracket L \rrbracket^\#(h)$ is, by definition, the unique morphism that makes the outer rectangle in the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 FTA_0 & \xrightarrow{FT h} & FT\Omega \\
 \downarrow Fa^{0,0} & & \downarrow Fo \\
 & \nearrow Fh & F\Omega \\
 FA_0 & \dashrightarrow \llbracket L \rrbracket^\#(h) & \downarrow g \\
 & & \Omega
 \end{array}$$

The top square commutes since it is just F applied to the homomorphism square of h . Since $a^{0,0}$ is a split epimorphism (by virtue of being an algebra for a monad), $Fa^{0,0}$ is also a split epimorphism. Therefore, $\llbracket L \rrbracket^\#(h) = g \cdot Fh$. Let $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathbf{EM}(T)((A_0, a^{0,0}), (\Omega, o))$ be a set of algebra homomorphisms satisfying Φ . Since $\llbracket L \rrbracket^\#(h) = g \cdot Fh$ for all $h \in \mathfrak{A}$ and $\llbracket L \rrbracket = g \cdot Fo \in \Lambda$, we have $\Lambda'(\mathfrak{A}) = \{g \cdot Fh \mid g \in \Lambda', h \in \mathfrak{A}\} = \Lambda(\mathfrak{A})$. Therefore $\Lambda(\mathfrak{A})$ satisfies Φ if and only if $\Lambda'(\mathfrak{A})$ satisfies Φ . \square

We conclude our discussion of EM semantics by substantiating the claim that for the machine functor $F = \Omega \times -^A$ we almost always have an expressive logic, independent of the monad: We have the set $\Lambda' = \{ev_a \mid a \in \mathcal{A}\} \cup \{ev_f\}$ of modalities for F , where $ev_\sigma: \Omega \times \Omega^A \rightarrow \Omega$ is a unary operator defined by $(v, \delta) \mapsto \delta(a)$, and $ev_f: \Omega \times 1^A \rightarrow \Omega$ is the 0-ary operator defined by $(v, \delta) \mapsto v$. For a monad T and an algebra structure $o: T\Omega \rightarrow \Omega$, the semantics of each $ev_L \in \Lambda'$ extends to a modal operator $\llbracket L \rrbracket$ for FT , given by $\llbracket \diamond_a \rrbracket = ev_a \cdot Fo$ for

$a \in \mathcal{A}$, and $\llbracket f \rrbracket = ev_f \cdot !_{T1}$. We thus have coalgebraic logics $\mathcal{L}' = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \Lambda')$ for F and $\mathcal{L} = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \Lambda)$ for FT .

Lemma 46. *Let $F = \Omega \times -^{\mathcal{A}}$. Let T be a monad and $\tilde{F}: \mathbf{EM}(T) \rightarrow \mathbf{EM}(T)$ a lifting of F . Moreover, suppose that Ω carries a T -algebra structure $o: T\Omega \rightarrow \Omega$. Then, for every $ev_L \in \Lambda'$, the semantics ev_L is a homomorphism of algebras $\tilde{F}(\Omega, o) \rightarrow (\Omega, o)$*

Proof. Since the ev_L are just product projections, this follows from the fact that the forgetful functor $U: \mathbf{EM}(T) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ creates limits [1, Proposition 20.12]. \square

Corollary 47. *Let $\lambda: TF \rightarrow FT$ be the EM-law associated with \tilde{F} . The logic \mathcal{L} as defined above is a graded logic for the graded semantics (id, \mathbb{M}^λ) .*

Lemma 48. *The logic \mathcal{L}' as defined above is depth-1 separating for the graded semantics (id, \mathbb{M}_F) .*

Proof. By Proposition 15, canonical M_1 -algebras for \mathbb{M}_F have the form $A = (A_0, FA_0, id, id, id)$. Let A be a canonical M_1 -algebra and \mathfrak{A} an initial source $A_0 \rightarrow [0, 1]$; we then need to show that the lower edges in the following diagram collectively form an initial source, where h ranges over \mathfrak{A} :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FA_0 & \xrightarrow{Fh} & F\mathcal{V} \\ id \downarrow & & \downarrow ev_L \\ FA_0 & \xrightarrow{ev_L^\#(h)} & \mathcal{V} \end{array}$$

Since the modal operators ev_L are precisely the projections of the product $F\Omega$, they constitute an initial source; moreover, again since F is a product, it preserves initial sources, so the source of all $Fh: FA_0 \rightarrow F\Omega$ is initial, and also if this source is extended by $F!: FA_0 \rightarrow F1$. Since $\llbracket f \rrbracket: F1 \rightarrow \Omega$ is initial with respect to the first component, and the $\llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket$ are initial with respect to the second components, thus the compositions $\llbracket \Diamond \rrbracket \circ Fh$ and $\llbracket f \rrbracket \circ F!$ together, that is $\Lambda(\mathfrak{A})$, is initial. \square

Details on Fuzzy Trace Semantics

The Fuzzy Finite Powerset Monad The fuzzy finite powerset monad \mathcal{F}_ω on **Set** is given as follows. For a set X , $\mathcal{F}_\omega X$ is the set of maps $X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with finite support. For a map $f: X \rightarrow Y$, $\mathcal{F}_\omega f$ takes fuzzy direct images; explicitly, for $S \in \mathcal{F}_\omega X$ and $y \in Y$, $\mathcal{F}_\omega f(S)(y) = \bigvee_{x \in X | f(x)=y} S(x)$. The unit η takes singletons; explicitly, $\eta_X(x)(x) = 1$, and $\eta_X(x)(y) = 0$ for $y \neq x$. Finally, the multiplication μ takes fuzzy big unions; explicitly, $\mu_X(\mathfrak{S})(x) = \bigvee_{S \in \mathcal{F}_\omega(X)} \mathfrak{S}(S) \wedge S(x)$.

We lift \mathcal{F}_ω to a functor $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega$ on metric spaces by means of the Kantorovich lifting construction [3], applied to the evaluation function $ev_\Diamond: \mathcal{F}_\omega[0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ given by

$$ev_\Diamond S = \bigvee_{v \in [0, 1]} S(v) \wedge v,$$

equivalently presented as the predicate lifting $\diamond: [0, 1]^- \rightarrow [0, 1]^{\mathcal{F}_\omega}$ given by

$$\diamond_X(f)(S) = \bigvee_{x \in X} S(x) \wedge f(x)$$

for $f \in [0, 1]^X$ and $S \in \mathcal{F}_\omega(X)$. Explicitly, for a metric space $X = (X, d)$, the metric on $\overline{\mathcal{F}}X$ is thus given by

$$d(S, T) = \bigvee_{f \in \mathbf{Met}(X, [0, 1])} |\diamond_X(f)(S) - \diamond_X(f)(T)|. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

This metric has an equivalent Hausdorff-style characterization [42, Example 5.3.1] as

$$d(S, T) = \left(\bigvee_x \bigwedge_y (S(x) \ominus T(y)) \vee (S(x) \wedge d(x, y)) \right) \vee \left(\bigvee_y \bigwedge_x (T(y) \ominus S(x)) \vee (T(y) \wedge d(x, y)) \right) \quad (\text{A.4})$$

(in *loc. cit.*, only the asymmetric case is mentioned, but note [43, Lemma 5.10]³).

This metric in fact lifts the monad \mathcal{F}_ω to a monad on **Met**: The unit is clearly nonexpansive. Nonexpansiveness of the multiplication, i.e. of fuzzy big union, is seen by means of the Kantorovich description A.3; in fact, it suffices to show that every map $\diamond_X(f): \mathcal{F}_\omega X \rightarrow [0, 1] \cong \mathcal{F}_\omega 1$ is a morphism of \mathcal{F}_ω -algebras. Indeed, we can then argue as follows: By definition, the cone of all $\diamond_X(f)$ is initial, so it suffices to show that $\diamond_X(f)\mu_X$ is nonexpansive for all f ; but \mathcal{F}_ω -homomorphy of $\diamond_X(f)$ means that these maps equal $\mu_1 \mathcal{F}_\omega \diamond(f)$. The map $\mathcal{F}_\omega \diamond(f)$ is nonexpansive because $\diamond(f)$ is nonexpansive and $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega$ lifts \mathcal{F}_ω ; nonexpansiveness of μ_1 follows from the fact that join and meet are nonexpansive operations on $[0, 1]$.

So we check that $\diamond_X(f)$ is a morphism of \mathcal{F}_ω -algebras. Note that under the isomorphism $\mathcal{F}_\omega(1) \cong [0, 1]$, μ_1 corresponds to ev_\diamond , and under the usual Yoneda correspondence [39] between ev_\diamond and \diamond , $\diamond_X(f) = ev_\diamond \mathcal{F}_\omega f$. But $\mathcal{F}_\omega f$ is a morphism of free \mathcal{F} -algebras, and so is ev_\diamond , since μ_1 is.

We claim that $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega$ is presented by the following quantitative algebraic theory. We have unary operations r for all $r \in [0, 1]$, a constant 0 , and a binary operation $+$. These are subject to strict equations saying that $0, +$ form a join semilattice structure; strict equations stating that the operations r form an action of $([0, 1], \wedge)$, with 0 as zero element:

$$1(x) = x \quad r(s(x)) = (r \wedge s)(x) \quad 0(x) = 0;$$

³ In more detail, one applies [42, Lemma 5.10] to obtain that the Kantorovich lax extension [42] agrees with the Kantorovich lifting [3] on pseudometrics when we additionally consider the dual modality \Box of \diamond ; this Kantorovich lifting, in turn, is easily seen to coincide with (A.3). On the other hand, applying the characterization given in [42, Example 5.3.1] both to \diamond and, dualizing appropriately, to \Box in the Kantorovich lax extension yields (A.4).

and the following basic quantitative inferences governing distance:

$$x =_\epsilon y \vdash r(x) =_\epsilon s(y)$$

under the side condition that $|r - s| \leq \epsilon$. Using nonexpansiveness of joins, one derives

$$x_1 =_\epsilon y_1, \dots, x_n =_\epsilon y_n \vdash \sum_i r_i(x_i) =_\epsilon \sum_i s_i(y_i), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

again under the side condition that $|r_i - s_i| \leq \epsilon$ for all i , where we use big sum notation in the evident sense.

It is clear that the operations and strict equations induce \mathcal{F}_ω . To see that the full theory induces $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega$, it remains to show two things:

Axiom (A.5) is sound over $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega X$: Since we have already shown that $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega$ is a monad, it suffices to show that (A.5) holds in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}\{x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ for $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n \in X$ (with every variable interpreted by itself, and distances inherited from X). But this is immediate from the Hausdorff description of the distance: By symmetry, it suffices to show that the left-hand term in the maximum in (A.4) is at most ϵ . This follows from the fact that by the side conditions of (A.5), $(r_i \ominus s_i) \vee (r_i \wedge d(x_i, y_i)) \leq (r_i \ominus s_i) \vee d(x_i, y_i) \leq \epsilon$ for all i .

Completeness: Low distances in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega X$ are derivable. Let $S, T \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega X$ such that $d(S, T) \leq \epsilon$; read S, T as terms $S = \sum_x S(x)(x)$, $T = \sum_x T(x)(x)$. We have to show that $\Gamma \vdash S =_\epsilon T$ is derivable where Γ records the distances of all elements of the (finite) supports of S and T . Now $d(S, T) \leq \epsilon$ implies that $\bigvee_x \bigwedge_y (S(x) \ominus T(y)) \vee (S(x) \wedge d(x, y)) \leq \epsilon$. That is, for every x there exists y_x such that $(S(x) \ominus T(y_x)) \vee (S(x) \wedge d(x, y_x)) \leq \epsilon$. This means that

1. $S(x) \leq T(y_x) \oplus \epsilon$, and
2. either $d(x, y_x) \leq \epsilon$ or $S(x) \leq \epsilon$. In the latter case, we may take $y_x = x$, ensuring both $S(x) \leq T(y_x) \oplus \epsilon$ and, again, $d(x, y_x) \leq \epsilon$.

By the strict equational laws, it follows that

$$\Gamma \vdash S = \sum_{d(x, y) \leq \epsilon} (S(x) \wedge (T(y) \oplus \epsilon))(x). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Analogously, we obtain

$$\Gamma \vdash T = \sum_{d(x, y) \leq \epsilon} ((S(x) \oplus \epsilon) \wedge T(y))(y). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Using (A.5) and equations (A.6) and (A.7), we obtain that $\Gamma \vdash S =_\epsilon T$ is derivable as desired.

Graded Logic for Fuzzy Trace Semantics To see that the given logic is indeed a graded logic, we have to show that $\llbracket \diamond_a \rrbracket: G[0, 1] = M_1[0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is an M_1 -algebra. In terms of the algebraic description of \mathbb{M} , this means that $\llbracket \diamond_a \rrbracket$ should represent term evaluation w.r.t. the M_0 -algebra structure of $[0, 1]$

(which consists in the usual join semilattice structure of $[0, 1]$ and additionally the interpretation of unary operations r , for $r \in [0, 1]$, as taking meets with r) and suitably chosen nonexpansive interpretations $b^{\diamond_a}: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ of the unary depth-1 operations b for $b \in \mathcal{A}$; we take a^{\diamond_a} to be the identity map on $[0, 1]$ for all a , and b^{\diamond_a} to be constantly 0 for $b \neq a$. For depth-0 operations, the fact that $\llbracket \diamond_a \rrbracket$ agrees with term evaluation then just amounts to the homomorphism condition, which is checked straightforwardly. For the depth-1 operation a , we calculate as follows (exploiting that every depth-0 term over $\Omega = [0, 1]$ can be normalized to have the form $\sum r_i(v_i)$ with $r_i, v_i \in [0, 1]$):

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket \diamond_a \rrbracket(a(\sum r_i(v_i))) \\ &= \llbracket \diamond_a \rrbracket(\sum r_i(a(v_i))) && \text{(equivalence of depth-1 terms)} \\ &= \bigvee_i r_i \wedge v_i && \text{(definition of } \llbracket \diamond_a \rrbracket \text{)} \\ &= a^{\diamond_a}(\bigvee_i r_i \wedge v_i), \end{aligned}$$

and $\bigvee_i r_i \wedge v_i$ is the evaluation of the term $\sum_i r_i \wedge v_i$ in $[0, 1]$. Finally, for $b \neq a$, we similarly have $\llbracket \diamond_a \rrbracket(b(\sum r_i(v_i))) = \llbracket \diamond_a \rrbracket(\sum r_i(b(v_i))) = 0 = b^{\diamond_a}(\bigvee_i r_i \wedge v_i)$.

It is straightforward to check that the logic is initial-type depth-0 separating. To show that it is also initial-type depth-1 separating, let A be a canonical M_1 -algebra with free 0-part $A_0 = \overline{\mathcal{F}}X$ (so $A_1 = \overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{A} \times X)$), and let \mathfrak{A} be an initial cone of maps $A_0 \rightarrow [0, 1]$. We have to show that the cone $\Lambda(\mathfrak{A})$ of maps $A_1 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is again initial. So let $S, T \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \times X)$ such that $d(S, T) \geq \epsilon$. W.l.o.g. this means that there exist a, x such that

$$\bigwedge_{b, y} (S(a, x) \ominus T(b, y)) \vee (S(a, x) \wedge d((a, x), (b, y))) \geq \epsilon.$$

All elements whose meet is taken in the above expression are below $S(a, x)$, and those for $b \neq a$ equal $S(a, x)$ and can hence be omitted. That is, we have

$$\bigwedge_y (S(a, x) \ominus T(a, y)) \vee (S(a, x) \wedge d((a, x), (a, y))) \geq \epsilon. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Now define $T_a \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega X$ by

$$T_a = \sum_y T(a, y)(y).$$

By (A.8),

$$d(S(a, x)(x), T_a) \geq \epsilon. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

By the Hausdorff-style description of the metric on $\overline{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{A} \times X)$, it is immediate that $d(S(a, x)(x) + T_a, T_a) \geq d(S(a, x)(x), T_a)$, so

$$d(S(a, x)(x) + T_a, T_a) \geq \epsilon. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Since \mathfrak{A} is an initial cone and the maps in \mathfrak{A} are M_0 -morphisms, in particular monotone w.r.t. the ordering of $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\omega X$ as a join semilattice, it follows that we have


$f \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $f(T_a) \leq c - \epsilon$ where $c = f(S(a, x)(x) + T_a)$. Since f is an M_0 -morphism, it follows that $f(S(a, x)(x)) = c$, and $f(S(a, x)(x)) = S(a, x) \wedge f(x)$, so

$$\llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket^\#(f)(S) \geq S(a, x) \wedge f(x) = c.$$

We are thus done once we show that $\llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket^\#(f)(T) \leq c - \epsilon$. But $\llbracket \Diamond_a \rrbracket^\#(f)(T) = \bigvee_{y \in X} T(a, y) \wedge f(y)$, and for $y \in X$, we have $T(a, y) \wedge f(y) = f(T(a, y)(y)) \leq f(T_a) \leq c - \epsilon$.

Details on Probabilistic Trace Semantics

Fig. 1. States with probabilistic trace distance v and logical distance $< v^2$.



Proof of Theorem 34 Consider the transition systems pictured in Figure 1. Here, $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ with $a \neq b$ and $d(a, b) = v < 1$. The depth-2 behaviour of x is $0.5(a, a) + 0.5(b, b)$, and that of y is $0.5(a, b) + 0.5(b, a)$. It is easy to see that the behavioural distance of these length-2 trace distributions is v . We show that the deviations of truth values of \mathcal{L} -formulae between x and y stay away from that value, specifically below v^2 .

First, note that x and y are behaviourally equivalent up to depth-1, and hence agree on formulae of depth at most 1; we thus restrict attention to formulae of depth at least 2 (where we do not insist on uniform depth but exclude top-level depth-1 subformulae). Let $L \in \mathcal{A}$ be a modal operator, interpreted as

$\llbracket L \rrbracket : \overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \boxplus [0, 1]) \rightarrow [0, 1]$. For the sake of contradiction we assume that \mathcal{L} is invariant and expressive. Then we have the following:

Claim 49. *The interpretation $\llbracket L \rrbracket$ satisfies the equation*

$$\llbracket L \rrbracket \left(\sum_{i \in I} p_i(a_i, \sum_{j \in J_i} q_{ij} v_{ij}) \right) = \llbracket L \rrbracket \left(\sum_{i \in I, j \in J_i} p_i q_{ij}(a_i, v_{ij}) \right) \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where the outer sum on the left hand side and the sum on the right hand side are formal sums describing probability distributions while the inner sum on the left hand side is an arithmetic one.

Proof (Claim 49). We show the claim first for all values on $v_{ij} \in (0, 1)$. Let x_0 and x_1 be states in coalgebras with probabilistic trace distance 1. By expressiveness, there is a formula ϕ_ϵ for any $\epsilon > 0$ such that $d(\llbracket \phi_\epsilon \rrbracket_\gamma(x_0), \llbracket \phi_\epsilon \rrbracket_\gamma(x_1)) > 1 - \epsilon$ (w.l.o.g. we assume $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket(x_0) < \epsilon$ and $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket(x_1) > 1 - \epsilon$). Now it is possible to create states x_p in a new coalgebra with successor distribution $\gamma(x_p) = \gamma(x_1) +_p \gamma(x_0)$. The probabilistic trace distance of x_0 and x_p is p , while the probabilistic trace distance between x_p and x_1 is $1 - p$. By invariance, $p - \epsilon < \llbracket \phi \rrbracket(x_p) < p + \epsilon$. We construct a coalgebra (X, γ) from the disjoint union of the (X_{ij}, γ_{ij}) and two new states l and r , which receive successor distributions

$$\gamma(l) = \sum_{i \in I} p_i(a_i, \sum_{j \in J_i} q_{ij} x_{v_{ij}}) \quad \gamma(r) = \sum_{i \in I, j \in J_i} p_i q_{ij}(a_i, x_{v_{ij}}).$$

It is clear that l and r are probabilistically trace equivalent. Now $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \boxplus \llbracket \phi_\epsilon \rrbracket)(l)$ has a distance of at most ϵ from the left hand side of (A.11), and symmetrically $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \boxplus \llbracket \phi_\epsilon \rrbracket)(r)$ has distance of at most ϵ from the right hand side. Since $\llbracket L \rrbracket$ is by assumption non-expansive, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket L \rrbracket \left(\sum_{i \in I} p_i(a_i, \sum_{j \in J_i} q_{ij} v_{ij}) \right) &= \\ \llbracket L \rrbracket \left(\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \boxplus \llbracket \phi_\epsilon \rrbracket) \left(\sum_{i \in I} p_i(a_i, \sum_{j \in J_i} q_{ij} x_{v_{ij}}) \right) \right) &= \\ \llbracket L \rrbracket \left(\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \boxplus \llbracket \phi_\epsilon \rrbracket) \left(\sum_{i \in I, j \in J_i} p_i q_{ij}(a_i, x_{v_{ij}}) \right) \right) &= \\ \llbracket L \rrbracket \left(\sum_{i \in I, j \in J_i} p_i q_{ij}(a_i, v_{ij}) \right) & \end{aligned} \tag{A.12}$$

□

Now any distribution $\sum_I p_i(a_i, v_i)$ can be transformed using equation (A.11) to take the form $\sum_I p_i v_i(a_i, 1) + p_i(1 - v_i)(a_i, 0)$. *equivalent* if they are identified under $\llbracket L \rrbracket$. Then any distribution $\sum_I p_i(a_i, v_i)$ is, by equation (A.11), equivalent to one of the form $\sum_I p_i v_i(a_i, 1) + p_i(1 - v_i)(a_i, 0)$. Then we have $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma(x_a) = \llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma(y_a) = v_a$ and $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma(x_b) = \llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma(y_b) = v_b$ with $|v_a - v_b| \leq v$. Then we have

$$\llbracket L \phi \rrbracket_\gamma(x) = \llbracket L \rrbracket \cdot \overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \boxplus \llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma)(0.5(a, x_a) + 0.5(b, x_b)) = L(0.5(a, v_a) + 0.5(b, v_b)).$$

Symmetrically,

$$\llbracket L \phi \rrbracket_\gamma(y) = \llbracket L \rrbracket \cdot \overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \boxplus \llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma)(0.5(a, y_b) + 0.5(b, y_a)) = \llbracket L \rrbracket(0.5(a, v_b) + 0.5(b, v_a))$$

The distribution in the second line x is equivalent to $\mu = 0.5v_a(a, 1) + 0.5(1 - v_a)(a, 0) + 0.5v_b(b, 1) + 0.5(1 - v_b)(b, 0)$, while the second one is equivalent to

$\nu = 0.5v_b(a, 1) + 0.5(1 - v_b)(a, 0) + 0.5v_a(b, 1) + 0.5(1 - v_a)(b, 0)$. We give an upper bound on $d(\mu, \nu)$. Without loss of generality assume $v_a \leq v_b$. Then the following distribution γ is a coupling of μ and ν :

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma = & 0.5v_a((a, 1), (a, 1)) & + 0.5(1 - v_b)((a, 0), (a, 0)) \\ & + 0.5v_a((b, 1), (b, 1)) & + 0.5(1 - v_b)((b, 0), (b, 0)) \\ & + 0.5(v_b - v_a)((b, 1), (a, 1)) & + 0.5(v_b - v_a)((a, 0), (b, 0)) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

By the Kantorovich-Rubinstein duality, $d(\mu, \nu)$ is bounded by $\mathbb{E}_\gamma d$. In the calculation of $\mathbb{E}_\gamma d$, the first two lines in Equation (A.13) contribute 0. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\gamma d &= 0.5(v_b - v_a)d((b, 1), (a, 1)) + 0.5(v_b - v_a)d((a, 0), (b, 0)) \\ &\leq 0.5vd((b, 1), (a, 1)) + 0.5vd((a, 0), (b, 0)) \\ &\leq 0.5v^2 + 0.5v^2 \\ &\leq v^2 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since $d(\mu, \nu) \leq v^2$ and $v < 1$, there is no nonexpansive morphism $h: \overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \times \{0, 1\}) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ (and by extension no modal operator) that separates these distributions in the sense that $|h(\mu) - h(\nu)|$ approximates v . \square

Remark 50. We note that for coalgebraic logics in the sense we employ here, which live natively in the category of metric spaces, interpretations $\llbracket L \rrbracket: \overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \oplus [0, 1]) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ of modalities L are nonexpansive by definition. We can strengthen our above negative result by letting the modal logic live over **Set**, in the sense that interpretations $\llbracket L \rrbracket$ can be unrestricted maps; for purposes of the present discussion, we refer to such modalities as *set-based*. Under a mild additional assumption on the logic, we can show that this relaxation does not actually provide additional room for maneuvering:

Claim. If \mathcal{L} is an adequate and expressive set-based coalgebraic logic for probabilistic metric trace semantics, and there is a formula ϕ and states x_0 and x_1 in a coalgebra (X, ζ) such that $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket(x_0) = 0$ and $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket(x_1) = 1$, then $\llbracket L \rrbracket$ is nonexpansive.

Proof. Assume for the sake of contradiction, there are $s, t \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \boxplus [0, 1])$, such that $d(\llbracket L \rrbracket(s), \llbracket L \rrbracket(t)) > d(s, t)$. Since the logic is assumed to be expressive, x_0 and x_1 must have probabilistic trace distance 1 (and since trace distance is a lower bound of behavioural distance also behavioural distance 1). We define a new coalgebra $(X \cup \{x_p \mid p \in (0, 1)\} \cup \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \zeta')$, where $\zeta'(x) = \zeta(x)$ if $x \in X$. For states x_p we define $\zeta'(x_p) = \zeta(x_1) +_p \zeta(x_0)$. The state x_p is easily seen to have trace distance p (respectively $1 - p$) from x_0 (x_1). Therefore, because of adequacy $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket(x_p) = p$. For the states \bar{x}, \bar{y} we define $\zeta(\bar{x}) = s'$ and $\zeta(\bar{y}) = t'$, where $s', t' \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \boxplus \{x_p \mid p \in [0, 1]\})$ are defined by substituting all values $p \in [0, 1]$ in s, t by x_p . We know that the behavioural distance of x and y is

$d(s, t)$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
& d(\llbracket L\phi \rrbracket_\gamma(\bar{x}), \llbracket L\phi \rrbracket_\gamma(\bar{y})) \\
&= d(\llbracket L \rrbracket(\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \boxplus \llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma)(s')), \llbracket L \rrbracket(\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\omega(\mathcal{A} \boxplus \llbracket \phi \rrbracket_\gamma)t(t'))) \\
&= d(\llbracket L \rrbracket(s), \llbracket L \rrbracket(t)) \\
&> d(s, t),
\end{aligned}$$

so \mathcal{L} is not adequate with respect to behavioural distance. and hence also not adequate with respect to probabilistic trace distance. \square