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Abstract

Coalgebraic partition refinement generalizes classical transition system minimization to general system types equipped with a coalgebraic equivalence notion, subsuming strong, weighted, and probabilistic bisimilarity. The asymptotically fastest algorithm requires an ad-hoc condition on the system type and uses large amounts of memory, limiting the size of the transition system that can be handled. A subsequent distributed algorithm is able to handle larger systems by distributing the memory requirement over several compute nodes, but this algorithm is asymptotically slower.

We present an algorithm that is applicable to all computable set functors, and runs in time $O(k^2 n \log n)$, where $n$ is the number of states and $k$ is the number of transitions per state. This algorithm is asymptotically slower than the fastest algorithm by a factor of $k$, but asymptotically faster than the distributed algorithm by a factor of $n$. In practice, our algorithm uses much less time and memory on existing benchmarks. Transition systems that previously required half an hour on HPC clusters can be minimized in seconds on a single core of a laptop by our algorithm.
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1 Introduction

The task of determining states exhibiting the same behaviour is present throughout computer science, and a variety of algorithms solving this task have been developed in the past decades. Early examples are Hopcroft’s automata minimization algorithm [19] and the algorithm for bisimilarity minimization by Kanellakis and Smolka [20, 21]. Both are so-called partition refinement algorithms, since they tentatively consider all states equivalent and then successively distinguish states that turn out to have different behaviour.

Given a transition system with $n$ states and $m$ transitions, the algorithm by Kanellakis and Smolka [20, 21] computes the largest bisimulation in time $O(m \cdot n)$ and for systems with an outdegree bounded by $k$, they present an optimized algorithm running in $O(k^2 \cdot \log n)$. As an improvement, Paige and Tarjan [28] designed a partition refinement algorithm for bisimilarity with run-time in $O(m \cdot \log n)$. Their algorithm inspired subsequent algorithms with similar running times for other system equalities, such as strong bisimilarity for labelled transition systems [34], weighted bisimilarity [35], bisimilarity for weighted tree automata [17, 16], and Markov decision processes [3, 11].

Recently, those algorithms and system equivalences were subsumed by a coalgebraic generalization [10, 39, 8, 38]. The algorithm is parametrized by a functor that describes the
concrete system type of interest, allowing to freely combine deterministic, non-deterministic, and probabilistic behaviour. Despite its genericity, the algorithm makes certain assumptions about the types of systems that can be minimized; for instance it is not capable of minimizing frames for the monotone neighbourhood logic [13, 14].

Another drawback is that the data structures used for efficient partition refinement come at the cost of hungry memory usage. This has already been observed for the instance of labelled transition systems [34] and was corroborated by the coalgebraic case studies [8, 38], where a machine with 16GB of RAM was only able to minimize weighted-tree automata up to a size of 223MB. In order to increase the total memory available, distributed partition refinement algorithms have been developed, for labelled transition systems [6] and for the generic coalgebraic algorithm [5]. The time complexity of these algorithms scales with $n^2$ instead of $n \log n$, and expensive hardware is required.

We present a new algorithm that works for all system types given by computable Set-functors, and has time complexity $O(k^2 n \log n)$. Empirical evaluation of our implementation shows that the memory usage is much reduced, such that the benchmarks that were used to illustrate the scalability of the distributed algorithm [5] can now be solved on a laptop, faster than the distributed algorithm can solve them on a HPC cluster.

Contributions
- An algorithm for coalgebraic partitioning for any computable set functor (Section 3).
- Time complexity analysis showing that the algorithm runs in time $O(k^2 n \log n)$, where $n$ is the number of states, and $k$ is the size of a state (Subsection 3.4).
- Instantiations of the algorithm showing its increased genericity (Section 4).
- A time and space efficient implementation of the algorithm in Rust, with benchmark results showing that our algorithm outperforms earlier work (Section 5).

2 Preliminaries on Coalgebra

Before defining the algorithm, we recall the notation and coalgebraic background required.

► Notation 2.1. We write $+$ for the disjoint union of sets. We use natural numbers $n \in \mathbb{N}$ as finite cardinal $n = \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$, in particular the sets $0 = \emptyset$, $1 = \{0\}$, $2 = \{0, 1\}$, and $2^*$ are bit vectors. We write $\rightarrow$ for surjective maps and $\hookrightarrow$ for injective maps. A range $i..j$ with two dots indicates the numbers $i, i+1, i+2, \cdots, j-1$, excluding $j$.

We model state-based systems as coalgebras for set functors:

► Definition 2.2. A (set-)functor $F$ (written $F : \text{Set} \rightarrow \text{Set}$) consists of two assignments:

1. Every set $X$ is sent to a set $FX$.
2. Every map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is sent to a map $Ff : FX \rightarrow FY$ such that identity maps and composition of maps is preserved.

For example, the finite powerset functor $P_f : \text{Set} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ sends each set $X$ to the set of finite subsets $P_f X := \{S \subseteq X \mid S \text{ finite}\}$ and a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ to the map taking direct images:

$$P_f f : P_f X \rightarrow P_f Y \quad P_f f(S) = f[S]$$

Further examples are given in Example 2.5. We use coalgebras to model state-based systems:
Definition 2.3. An \( F \)-coalgebra for a functor \( F \) consists of a set \( C \) (the carrier) and a map \( f: C \to FC \) (the structure).

Intuitively, the carrier \( C \) of a coalgebra \( (C, c) \) is the set of states of the system, and for each state \( x \in C \), the map provides \( c(x) \in FC \) that is the structured collection of successor states of \( x \). If \( F = P_f \), then \( c(x) \) is simply a finite set of successor states. The functor determines a canonical notion of behavioural equivalence.

Definition 2.4. A homomorphism between coalgebras \( h: (C, c) \to (D, d) \) is a map \( h: C \to D \) with \( Fh(c(x)) = dh(x) \) for all \( x \in C \). States \( x, y \) in a coalgebra \( (C, c) \) are behaviourally equivalent if there is some other coalgebra \( (D, d) \) and a homomorphism \( h: (C, c) \to (D, d) \) such that \( h(x) = h(y) \).

Example 2.5. We consider coalgebras for the following functors (see also Table 1):

1. Coalgebras for \( P_f \) are finitely-branching transition systems and states \( x, y \) are behaviourally equivalent iff they are bisimilar.
2. A signature is a set \( \Sigma \) together with a map \( \ar: \Sigma \to \mathbb{N} \). The elements of \( \sigma \in \Sigma \) are called operation symbols and \( \ar(\sigma) \) is the arity. Every signature induces a functor defined by
   \[
   \Sigma X = \{ (\sigma, x_1, \ldots, x_{\ar(\sigma)}) \mid \sigma \in \Sigma, x_1, \ldots, x_{\ar(\sigma)} \in X \}
   \]
on sets and for maps \( f: X \to Y \) defined by
   \[
   \Sigma f(\sigma, x_1, \ldots, x_{\ar(\sigma)}) = (\sigma, f(x_1), \ldots, f(x_{\ar(\sigma)})).
   \]
   Every state in a \( \Sigma \)-coalgebra describes a possibly infinite \( \Sigma \)-tree, with nodes labelled by \( \sigma \in \Sigma \) with \( \ar(\sigma) \) many children. Two states are behaviourally equivalent iff they describe the same \( \Sigma \)-tree.
3. Deterministic finite automata with input alphabet \( A \) are coalgebras for the signature \( \Sigma \) containing two operation symbols of arity \( |A| \). Two states are behaviourally equivalent iff they accept the same language.
4. For a commutative monoid \( (M, +, 0) \), the monoid-valued functor \( M^X \) [12, Def. 5.1] can be thought of as \( M \)-valued distributions over \( X \):
   \[
   M^X := \{ \mu: X \to M \mid \mu(x) \neq 0 \text{ for only finitely many } x \in X \}
   \]
The map \( f: X \to Y \) is sent by \( M^{(-)} \) to
   \[
   M(f): M^X \to M^Y \quad M(f)(\mu) = \left( y \mapsto \sum_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} \mu(x) \right)
   \]
   Coalgebras for \( M^{(-)} \) are weighted systems whose weights come from \( M \).
A coalgebra \( c: C \to M^C \), sends a state \( x \in C \) and another state \( y \in C \) to a weight \( m := c(x)(y) \in M \) which is understood as the weight of the transition \( x \xrightarrow{m} y \), where \( c(x)(y) \neq 0 \) is understood as no transition. The coalgebraic behavioural equivalence captures weighted bisimilarity [22]. Concretely, a weighted bisimulation is an equivalence relation \( R \subseteq C \times C \) such that for all \( x R y \) and \( z \in C \):
   \[
   \sum_{z R z'} c(x)(z') = \sum_{z R z'} c(x)(z')
   \]
5. Taking \( M = (\mathbb{R}, +, 0) \), we get that \( M^X \) are \( \mathbb{R} \)-linear combinations over \( X \). If we restrict to the subfunctor \( D(X) = \{ f \in \mathbb{R}^X \mid \sum_{x \in X} f(x) = 1 \} \) where the weights are nonnegative and sum to 1, we get (finite support) probability distributions over \( X \).
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Table 1 List of functors, their coalgebras, and the accompanying notion of behavioural equivalence. The first five is given in Example 2.5, the last introduced later in Section 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functor $F$</th>
<th>Coalgebras $c: C \to FC$</th>
<th>Coalgebraic behavioural equivalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{P}_f$</td>
<td>Transition Systems</td>
<td>(Strong) Bisimilarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{P}_f(A \times {-})$</td>
<td>Labelled Transition Systems</td>
<td>(Strong) Bisimilarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M'$</td>
<td>Weighted Systems (for a monoid $M$)</td>
<td>Weighted Bisimilarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{P}_f \mathcal{D}$</td>
<td>Markov Decision Processes</td>
<td>Probabilistic Bisimilarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M(\Sigma(-))$</td>
<td>Weighted Tree Automata</td>
<td>Backwards Bisimilarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{N}$</td>
<td>Monotone Neighbourhood Frames</td>
<td>Monotone Bisimilarity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. For two functors $F$ and $G$, we can consider the coalgebra over their composition $F \circ G$. Taking $F = \mathcal{P}_f$ and $G = A \times (-)$, coalgebras over $F \circ G$ are labeled transition systems with strong bisimilarity. Taking $F = \mathcal{P}_f$ and $G = \mathcal{D}$, coalgebras over $F \circ G$ are Markov decision processes with probabilistic bisimilarity [25, Def. 6.3], [4, Thm. 4.2]. For $F = M(-)$ and $G = \Sigma$ for some signature functor, $FG$-coalgebras are weighted tree automata and coalgebraic behavioural equivalence is backward bisimilarity [8, 17].

Sometimes, we need to reason about successors and predecessors of a general $F$-coalgebra:

Definition 2.6. Given a coalgebra $c: C \to FC$ and a state $x \in C$, we say that $y \in C$ is a successor of $x$ if $c(t)$ is not in the image of the inclusion $F(C \setminus \{y\}) \hookrightarrow FC$. Likewise, $x$ is a predecessor of $y$, and the outdegree of $x$ is the number of successors of $x$.

3 Coalgebraic Partition Refinement

Many minimization algorithms for various kinds of state-based systems follow a similar scheme. Given the set of states $C$, a partition on the state set is maintained that identifies those states that have not (yet) been found to be of different behaviour. Mathematically speaking, a partition is quotient, i.e. a surjective map $p: C \to P$. The quotient map $p$ sends $x, y \in C$ to the same $p(x) = p(y)$ as long as the algorithm did not find any difference in the behaviour of $x$ and $y$. The basic idea of König and Küpper’s final chain algorithm [23] is that it computes a sequence of partitions $p_i: C \to P_i$ for a given input coalgebra $c: C \to FC$. Initially this partition identifies all states $p_0: C \to 1$, and then this partition is refined successively under consideration of the transition structure: $x, y$ are identified by $p_{i+1}: C \to P_{i+1}$ if they are identified by the composed map

$$C \xrightarrow{c} FC \xrightarrow{FP_i} FP_i.$$

The algorithm terminates as soon as $p_i = p_{i+1}$, which then identifies precisely the behaviourally equivalent states in the input coalgebra $(C, c)$. In the case of labelled transition systems $FX = \mathcal{P}_f(A \times X)$, the sequence of partitions $p_i$ corresponds to the partitions computed by the algorithm by Kanellakis and Smolka [20], which runs in $O(m \cdot n)$, where $n = |C|$ is the number of states and $m$ is the number of transitions in the labelled transition system.

Recently, Birkmann et al. [5] have adapted this algorithm to a distributed setting, with a run time of roughly $O(m \cdot n)$, supporting the functors listed above (Example 2.5). In both these coalgebraic algorithms the sets $FP_i$ for partition $P_i$ play a crucial role to determine
the next partition. Before presenting our improved algorithm, we first specify what it means that we use sets like \( FP_i \) or maps like the above \( Fp_i \cdot c : C \to FP_i \) in an algorithm.

### 3.1 Representing Abstract Data

When writing an abstract algorithm, how the abstract data is actually represented in memory is crucial for the complexity analysis. We understand finite sets like the carrier of the input coalgebra as finite cardinals \( C \simeq \{0, \ldots, |C| - 1\} \), and a map \( f : C \to D \) for finite \( C \) is represented by an array of length \(|C|\).

- **Assumption 3.1.** We assume that for the functor \( F : \text{Set} \to \text{Set} \) of interest, we have an injective map \( \text{enc}_F : F(2^*) \to 2^* \). That is, whenever we have some \( t \in FC \) and an encoding of elements of \( C \) as binary data via some \( \text{enc}_C : C \to 2^* \), we assume that \( t \) is represented as the binary data blob \( \text{enc}_F(F\text{enc}_C(t)) \in 2^* \).

The injectivity of these encodings guarantees that different \( s, t \in FC \), \( s \neq t \) have different encodings. Conversely, since \( \text{enc}_F \) is a map, if \( s, t \in FC \) have different binary encodings, then they are indeed different \( s \neq t \). This assumption requires that all elements \( t \in FC \) need to be represented in memory in a normalized form, and it allows us to check elements \( s, t \in FC \) for equality simply by comparing their binary representation.

- **Example 3.2.** For \( F = P_i \), the encoding \( \text{enc}_{P_i} : P_i(2^*) \to 2^* \) sorts the elements and removes duplicates. E.g. for \( s, t \in 2^* \), the identical sets \( \{t, s\} = \{s, t\} = \{s, t, t\} \) must all have the same binary representation. Hence, we define \( \text{enc}_{P_i}(S) \) as a binary encoding of the array obtained by sorting the elements of \( S \) in ascending order and removing duplicates.

- **Notation 3.3.** We use \( \sharp(t) \) for the number of bits required to represent \( t \).

For plain bit vectors \( t \in 2^* \), the number of bits \( \sharp(t) \) is simply the length of \( t \). For maps \( t : B \to 2^* \), which are encoded as arrays, the required memory size is essentially the length of \( B \) plus the size of each array entry.

**Input encoding and functor interface.** The coalgebra \( c : C \to FC \) that we wish to minimize is given to the algorithm as \( \text{enc}_F \cdot F\ell \cdot c : C \to 2^* \) where \( \ell : C \to N \) assigns a unique ID to each of the states. Given a coarser partition \( p : C \to N \), we must be able to compute \( \text{enc}(Fp(c(s))) \) for each \( s \in C \) from \( \text{enc}(F\ell(c(s))) \) in linear time \( O(\sharp(\text{enc}(F\ell(s)))) \).

- **Example 3.4.** We can implement \( P_i \) in linear time: Take a map \( p : C \to N \) (encoded as an array) and a set \( t \in P_iC \) in encoded form:

1. Create a new array \( t' \) of integers, and for each \( C \)-element \( a \in t \), add \( p(a) \) to \( t' \); this runs linear in the length of \( t \) because we assume that the map \( p \) is represented as an array with \( O(1) \) access.
2. Sort \( t' \) via radix sort and then remove all duplicates, with both steps taking linear time. Thus, \( t' = Fp(t) \) can be computed in the desired time bound.

Subsequently, we will often omit \( \text{enc} \) and specify algorithms directly in terms of the mathematical data. The actual algorithm would operate on the data encoded as specified by \( \text{enc} \).

---

1 We assume the standard \( N \simeq 2^* \).
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Algorithm 1: Renumbering an array using radix sort

procedure Renumber$\langle p \colon B \to 2^* \rangle$  \> Or $p \colon B \to D$ where $D$ is encoded as $2^*$
\begin{algorithmic}
\State Create a new array $r$ of size $|B|$ containing numbers $0..|B|$
\State Sort $r$ by the key $p \colon B \to 2^*$ using radix-sort
\State Create a new array $p' \colon B \to \mathbb{N}$
\State $j := 0$
\For{$i \in 0..|B|$} \Do
\If{$i > 0$ and $p[r[i-1]] \neq p[r[i]]$} then $j := j + 1$
\EndIf
\EndFor
\State $p'[r[i]] := j$
\State return $p'$
\end{algorithmic}

Renumber. By encoding everything as binary data in a normalized way, we are able to make heavy use of radix sort, and thus achieve linear bounds on sorting tasks. This trick is also used in the complexity analysis of Kanellakis and Smolka, who refer to it as lexicographic sorting method by Aho, Hopcroft, and Ullman [2]. We use this trick in order to turn arrays $p$ into their corresponding partitions $p' : B \to \{0, \ldots, |\text{Im}(p)| - 1\}$ satisfying $p(x) = p(y) \iff p'(x) = p'(y)$ for all $x, y \in B$. The pseudocode is listed in Algorithm 1: first, a permutation $r : B \to B$ is computed such that $p \cdot r : B \to 2^*$ is sorted. This radix sort runs in $O(\#(p))$. Since identical entries in $p$ are now adjacent, a simple for-loop iterates over $r$ and readily assigns block numbers.

- Lemma 3.5. Algorithm 1 runs in time $O(\#(p))$ for the parameter $p : B \to 2^*$ and returns a map $p' : B \to b$ for some $b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $x, y \in B$ we have $p(x) = p(y) \iff p'(x) = p'(y)$.

- Remark 3.6. In the actual implementation, we use hash maps to implement Renumber. This is faster in practice but due to the resolving of hash-collisions, the theoretical worst-case complexity of the implementation has an additional log factor.

The renumbering can be understood as the compression of a map $p : B \to 2^*$ possibly taking much space to an integer array $p' : B \to \mathbb{N}$. In the algorithm, the data $2^*$ for instance is returned by functor-specific operations.

### 3.2 The Naive Method Coalgebraically

To illustrate the use of the encoding, let us recap a coalgebraic version of Kanellakis and Smolka’s naive method for transition systems (i.e. $\mathcal{P}\_I$-coalgebras). In the $i$-th iteration corresponds to looking $i$ steps into the transition structure when trying to distinguish states. For a general functor $F$, König and Küpper [23] observed that this corresponds to the $i$-th step of the so-called final chain of $F$. We recall this final chain algorithm in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2: Final chain partitioning, also called the naive method

procedure FinalChainPartition$\langle c : C \to FC \rangle$
\begin{algorithmic}
\State Create a new array $p : C \to \mathbb{N} := (x \mapsto 0)$  \> i.e. $p[x] = 0$ for all $x \in C$
\While{$|\text{Im}(p)|$ changes \Do
\State compute $p' : C \to FN := Fp \cdot c$ \> Via sig of $F$
\State $p : C \to \mathbb{N} := \text{Renumber}(p')$
\EndFor
\end{algorithmic}

Initially, all states are identified in the single block with index $0 \in 1$. In the first iteration,
the map $p': (C \xrightarrow{c} FC \xrightarrow{Fp} FN)$ sends each state to its output behaviour: this distinguishes final from non-final states in DFAs and dead-lock from live states in transition systems.

In the $i$-th iteration of the while loop, the partition $p: C \to N$ distinguishes states up to depth $i$. For the case of labelled transition systems, Blom and Orzan [6] call $Fp(c(x)) \in FN$ the signature of $x \in C$ with respect to $p$. This signature of $x$ describes the transition behaviour from $x \in C$ to the blocks of the partition $p$ of the previous iteration. For example for $FX = \mathcal{P}_l(A \times X)$, the signature of $x$ tells for each block $B$ of $p$ and each label $a \in A$, whether there is an $a$-transition from $x$ to some state of $B$. Thus, states $x, y$ need to be distinguished if they have different signatures w.r.t. the old partition $p$. The RENUMBER subroutine computes the partition corresponding to these signatures in $O(m)$ time, where $m$ is the total size of the coalgebra. One can show that $p'$ is a refinement of $p$, i.e., distinguished states remaining distinguished. Thus, the while loop can have at most $n = |C|$ iterations, and if the functor $F$ can be implemented in linear time, then Algorithm 2 runs in $O(m \cdot n)$.

3.3 The Refinable Partition Data Structure

For the naive method it sufficed to represent the quotient on the state space $p: C \to N$ by a simple array. For more efficient algorithms, it is crucial to quickly perform certain operations on the partition, for which we have built upon a refinable partition data structure [34, 36]. Our version of the data structure keeps track of the partition of the states into blocks, and for each state whether it is clean or dirty. Intuitively, if a state is dirty, then its signature needs to be recomputed, which possibly leads to a refinement. We will use these operations:

- Given a block $B$, return its dirty states $B_{di}$ in $O(|B_{di}|)$.
- Given a block $B$, determine $B_{cl}$, which contains one arbitrary clean state or is empty if all states of $B$ are dirty; in $O(1)$.
- Get a block with a dirty state off the worklist, in $O(1)$.
- MARKDIRTY($s$): mark state $s$ dirty, and put its block on the worklist, in $O(1)$.
- SPLIT($B, A$): split block $B$ into many sub-blocks according to array $A: B_{di} \to N$. The array $A$ indicates that the $i$-th dirty state is placed in the sub-block $A[i]$. The clean states are placed into the 0-th sub-block.

The block $B$ gets re-used for the largest sub-block, and all states of are marked $B$ clean. For the time complexity of our algorithm, it is important that SPLIT($B, A$) runs in time $O(|B_{di}|)$, regardless of the number of clean states.

The pseudocode the MARKDIRTY and new SPLIT operation is given in Algorithm 3.

3.4 Optimized Algorithm

With the refinable partition data structure at hand, we can improve on the naive algorithm without restricting the choice of $F$. Our efficient algorithm is given in Algorithm 4. We start by creating a refinable partition data structure with a single block for all the states. We then iterate while there is still a block with dirty states, i.e. with states whose signatures should be recomputed. We split the block into sub-blocks in a refinement step that is similar to the naive algorithm, and re-use the old block for the largest sub-block.

To achieve our complexity bound, this splitting must happen in time $|B_{di}|$, regardless of the number of clean states. Fortunately, this is possible because the clean states all have
Algorithm 3 Refinable partition data structure with n-way split

- block[s] maps state s to the ID of the block that contains s.
- state[s] contains a permutation of the states.
- loc[s] indicates the location of state s in state.
- blocks[B] gives a tuple (start, mid, end), indicating that state[start..mid] are the clean states of B and state[mid..end] are the dirty states of B.
- worklist keeps track of the blocks with a dirty state.

procedure MarkDirty(s)

\[\begin{align*}
& \triangleright \text{Determine the block data} & B := \text{block}[s] \\
& j := \text{loc}[s] \\
& (\text{start}, \text{mid}, \text{end}) := \text{blocks}[B] \\
& \triangleright \text{Do nothing if already dirty} & \text{if } \text{mid} \leq j \text{ then return} \\
& \triangleright \text{Add to worklist if first dirty state} & \text{if } \text{mid} = \text{end} \text{ then worklist.add}(B) \\
& \triangleright \text{Swap s to be the last clean state} & \text{loc}[s'] := j \\
& s' := \text{state[}\text{mid} - 1\text{]} \\
& \text{loc}[s'] := j \\
& \text{loc}[s] := \text{mid} \\
& \text{state[j]} := s' \\
& \text{state[}\text{mid}\text{]} := s \\
& \triangleright \text{Move marker to make s dirty} & \text{blocks[B].}\text{mid} := 1 \\
\end{align*}\]

procedure Split(B, A : B_{\text{di}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N})

\[\begin{align*}
& \triangleright \text{Cumulative counts of sub-block sizes} & (\text{start}, \text{mid}, \text{end}) := \text{blocks}[B] \\
& D[0..\text{max}, A[i]] := 0 \\
& D[0] := \text{mid} - \text{start} \\
& \text{for } j \in A \text{ do } D[j] := 1 \\
& i_{\text{max}} = \text{argmax}_i D[i] \\
& \text{for } i \in 1..|D| \text{ do } D[i] := D[i - 1] \\
& \triangleright \text{Re-order the states by A-value} & \text{states'} := \text{copy(state[mid..end])} \\
& \text{for } i \in \text{reverse}(0..|A|) \text{ do} & D[A[i]] := 1 \\
& j := \text{start} + D[A[i]] \\
& \text{state}[j] := \text{states'}[i] \\
& \text{loc}[\text{state}[i]] := j \\
& \triangleright \text{Create blocks and assign IDs} & D[0] := \text{mid} - \text{start} \\
& D.\text{add}(\text{end}) \\
& n := |\text{blocks}| \\
& \text{for } i \in 0..|D| - 1 \text{ do} & \text{blocks.add}(j_0, j_1, j_1) \\
& j_0 := \text{start} + D[i] \\
& j_1 := \text{start} + D[i + 1] \\
& \text{if } i \neq i_{\text{max}} \text{ then} \\
& \text{else} \\
& \triangleright \text{blocks[B] = (j_0, j_1, j_1)} \\
& \text{if } i < i_{\text{max}} \text{ then} & \text{blocks[states[j_0..j_1]] := n + A[i]} \\
& \text{if } i > i_{\text{max}} \text{ then} & \text{blocks[states[j_0..j_1]] := n + A[i] - 1} \\
& \text{if } i_{\text{max}} \neq 0 \text{ then} & \text{return } n..|\text{blocks}| \\
\end{align*}\]
the same signature, because all their successors remained unchanged. Hence it suffices to compute the signature for one arbitrary clean state $B_{cl}^1$.

▶ **Lemma 3.7.** If for a finite input coalgebra $c : C \to FC$ and two partitions $p_1, p_2 : C \to N$, $p_1(y) = p_2(y)$ for all successors $y$ of $x \in C$, then $Fp_1(c(x)) = Fp_2(c(x))$.

After the block $B$ is split, we need to mark all predecessors of those states $x \in B$ as dirty that were moved to a new block, i.e. for which $p[x]$ changed.

**Algorithm 4** Optimized Partition Refinement for all Set functors

```python
procedure PartRefSetFun(c : C -> FC)
Create a new refinable partition structure $p : C \to N$
Init $p$ to have one block of all states, and all states marked dirty.
while there is a block $B$ with a dirty state do
  compute the compositions
  $\text{sig}_{di} := (B_{di} \to C \xrightarrow{Fp} FC \xrightarrow{FN} FN)$
  $\text{sig}_{cl} := (B_{cl}^1 \to C \xrightarrow{Fp} FC \xrightarrow{FN} FN)$
  $A : B_{di} \to N := \text{RENUMBER}'(\text{sig}_{di}, \text{sig}_{cl})$
  $B_{new} := \text{SPLIT}(B, A)$
  for every $B' \in B_{new}$ and $s \in B'$ do
    for every predecessor $s'$ of $s$ do
      MarkDirty($s'$)
  return the partition $p$
procedure Renumber'(p : $B_{di} \to 2^*$, $q : B_{cl}^1 \to 2^*$)
  $p' := \text{RENUMBER}(p)$
  Swap numbers in $p'$ to ensure that $p'(c) = 0$ if $\exists c_1 \in B_{cl}^1$. $p(c) = q(c_1)$.
return $p'$
```

▶ **Theorem 3.8.** If the functor $F$ is implemented in linear time, then Algorithm 4 computes behavioural equivalence on the input coalgebra $c : C \to FC$ in $O(m \cdot \min(k \log n, n))$, where $m$ is the size of the coalgebra ($m = \sharp(c)$), $n = |C|$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is the maximum outdegree.

We structure the complexity analysis in a series of lemmas.

▶ **Lemma 3.9.** A state is moved into a new block at most $O(\log n)$ times, that is, for every $x \in C$, the value of $p(x)$ in Algorithm 4 changes at most $\lceil \log_2 |C| \rceil$ many times.

▶ **Lemma 3.10.** A state goes from clean to dirty at most $O(\min(n, k \log n))$ times.

▶ **Lemma 3.11.** The inner loop runs in $O(k|B_{di}|)$, excluding the dirty marking loop.

For an individual iteration, the dirty marking loop may take longer than $O(k|B_{di}|)$, but when considered over the course of the whole algorithm, the bound is still met:

▶ **Lemma 3.12.** The dirty marking part of the algorithm runs in time $O(kn \log n)$

With the complexity of these steps analysed, one can then show that the main algorithm indeed in time $O(m \cdot \min(k \log n, n))$. 
3.5 Comparison to related work on the algorithmic level

We can classify partition refinement algorithms by their time complexity, and by the classes of functors they are applicable to. For concrete system types, there are more algorithms than we can recall, so instead, we focus on early representatives and on generic algorithms.

The Hopcroft line of work. One line of work originates in Hopcroft’s 1971 work on DFA minimization [19], and continues with Kanellakis and Smolka’s [20, 20] work on partition refinement for transition systems, and was generalized to coalgebras in Deifel, Dorsch, Milius, Schröder and Wißmann’s work on CoPaR, which is applicable to a large class of functors satisfying their zippability condition. These algorithms keep track of a worklist of blocks with respect to which other blocks still have to be split. Our algorithm, by contrast, keeps track of a worklist of blocks that themselves still potentially have to be split. Although similar at first sight, they are fundamentally different: in the former, one is given a block, and must determine how to split all the blocks that contain predecessors of the block, whereas in the latter one is given a block, and one must split that one block based on the successors of the block.

The advantage of the former class of algorithms is that they have optimal time complexity $O(kn \log n)$, provided one can implement the special splitting procedure for the functor in question. Our algorithm, by contrast, has an extra factor of $k$ (the outdegree of a state), but is applicable to all computable (set-)functors, because one only needs to compare the different states of the block given the current partition in order to determine how it splits.

A practical advantage of our algorithm is that one recomputation of a block split can take into account the changes to all the other blocks that happened since the recomputation. The Hopcroft-CoPaR line of work, on the other hand, has to consider each change of the other blocks separately. This advantage is of no help in the asymptotic complexity, because in the worst case only one other split happened each time, and then our algorithm does in $O(k)$ what CoPaR can do in $O(1)$. However, as we shall see in the benchmarks of Section 5, in practice our algorithm outperforms CoPaR, even though our algorithm is applicable to a more general class of functors.

The Moore line of work. Another line of work originates in Moore’s 1956 work on DFA minimization [27], which in retrospect is essentially the naive algorithm specialized to DFAs. In this class, the most relevant for us is the algorithm by König and Küpper [23] for coalgebras, and the distributed algorithm of Birkmann, Deifel, and Milius [5]. Like our algorithm, algorithms in this class split a block based on its successors, and can be applied to general functors. Unlike the Hopcroft-CoPaR line of work and our algorithm, the running time of these algorithms is $O(kn^2)$.

Another relevant algorithm in this class is the algorithm of Blom and Orzan [6] for transition systems. Their main algorithm runs in time $O(kn^2)$, but in a side note they mention a variation of their algorithm that runs in $O(n \log n)$ iterations. They don’t further analyse the time complexity or describe how to implement an iteration, because the main focus of their paper is a distributed implementation of the $O(kn^2)$ algorithm, and the $O(n \log n)$ variation precludes distributed implementation. Out of all algorithms, Blom and Orzan’s $O(n \log n)$ variation is the most similar to our algorithm, in particular because their algorithm is in the Moore line of work, yet also re-uses the old block for the largest sub-block (which is a feature
that usually appears in the Hopcroft-\textit{CoPaR} line of work). However, their block splitting is different from ours and is only correct for labelled transition systems but can not be easily applied to general functors \(F\).

4 Instances

We give a list of examples of instances that can be supported by our algorithm. We start with the instances that were already previously supported by \textit{CoPaR}, and then give examples of instances that were not previously supported by \(n \log n\) algorithms.

4.1 Instances also supported by \textit{CoPaR}

Products and coproducts The simplest instances are those built using the product \(F \times G\) and disjoint union \(F + G\), or in general, signature functors \(\Sigma\). The binary encoding of an element of signature functor \((\sigma, x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in \tilde{\Sigma}X\) starts with a specification of \(\sigma\), followed by the concatenation of encodings of the parameters \(x_1, \ldots, x_k\). The functor implementation can simply replace these elements \(x_1, \ldots\) with their image, without any need for normalization.

Powerset The finite powerset functor \(\mathcal{P}_f\) can be used to model unlabelled transition systems as coalgebras. In conjunction with products and coproducts, we can model nondeterministic (tree) automata and labelled transition systems.

Monoid-valued functors The binary encoding of \(\mu \in M(X)\) is an array of pairs \((x, \mu(x))\), sorted by \(x\). Given some map \(g: X \to \mathbb{N}\), the functor implementation then sums up (adjacent) elements with the same key using the monoid operation.

4.2 Instances not supported by \textit{CoPaR}

Composition of functors without intermediate states The requirement of zippability in the \(m \log n\) algorithm [8] is not closed under the composition of functors \(F \circ G\). As a workaround, one can introduce explicit intermediate states between \(F\)- and \(G\)-transitions. This introduces potentially many more states into the coalgebra, which leads to increased memory usage. Because our algorithm works for any computable functor, it can instead use the composed functor directly.

Monotone Modal Logics and Monotone Bisimulation When reasoning about game-theoretic settings [29, 31, 30], the arising modal logics have modal operators that talk about the ability of agents to enforce properties in the future. This leads to monotone modal logics whose domain of reasoning are monotone neighbourhood frames and the canonical notion of equivalence is monotone bisimulation. It was shown by Hansen and Kupke [13, 14] that these are an instance of coalgebras and coalgebraic behavioural equivalence for the following functor:

\[\mathcal{N}: \text{Set} \to \text{Set}\]

> Definition 4.1. The monotone neighbourhood functor \(\mathcal{N}: \text{Set} \to \text{Set}\) is given by

\[\mathcal{N}X = \{N \in \mathcal{P}P \times | N \text{ upwards closed} \} \text{ and } \mathcal{N}(f: X \to Y)(N) = \uparrow\{f[S] | S \in N\}.\]
where \( \uparrow \) denotes upwards closure \([13, \text{Lem } 3.3]\).

Hence, in a coalgebra \( c: C \to \mathcal{N}C \), the successor structure of a state \( x \in C \) is an upwards closed family of neighbourhoods \( c(x) \). This functor can be implemented, however with an extra factor in time.

**Theorem 4.2.** \( \mathcal{N} \) has a functor implementation and minimization of monotone neighbourhood frames \((C, c)\) by monotone bisimulation runs in \( \mathcal{O}(m^2 \cdot \min(k \log n, n)) \).

## 5 Benchmarks

To evaluate the practical performance and memory usage of our algorithm, we test it on the benchmark suite of Birkmann, Deifel and Milius \([5]\), consisting of real-world benchmarks (fms & wlan), and randomly generated benchmarks (wta).

The fms and wlan benchmarks are models from the benchmark suite of the PRISM model checker \([24]\), and are meant to evaluate how the algorithms perform on inputs that arise in practice.

For the randomly generated wta (weighted tree automata) benchmarks, the size of the first 5 was chosen to be maximal such that CoPaR \([8]\) can still perform them in 16GB (i.e., the benchmarks with a smaller number of states have larger states), and the size of the 6th benchmark was chosen by Birkmann, Deifel and Milius \([5]\) to demonstrate the scalability of their distributed algorithm.

The benchmark results are given in Table 2. The first two columns list the type of benchmark and the number of states. The three subsequent columns list the running time (in seconds) of CoPaR, DCPR, and ours. The last two columns list the memory usage (in megabytes) of DCPR and ours.

The benchmark results for DCPR and CoPaR are those reported by Birkmann, Deifel and Milius \([5]\), and were run on their high performance computing cluster consisting of nodes with two Xeon 2660v2 chips (10 cores per chip + SMT) and 64GB RAM. The nodes are connected by a fat-tree InfiniBand interconnect fabric with 40 GBit/s bandwidth. The runs were performed using 32 workers on 8 nodes, resulting in 4 worker processes per node. The memory usage of DCPR is given per worker, indicated by the \( \times 32 \) in Table 2.

Execution times of CoPaR were taken using one node of the cluster. Some entries for CoPaR are missing, indicating that it ran out of its 16GB of memory.

The benchmark results for our algorithm were obtained by running it on a single core of an 8-core Ryzen 5700g mini-PC with 32GB of memory\(^2\).

A point to note is that compared to CoPaR, the distributed algorithm does best on the randomly generated benchmarks. The distributed algorithm is thus able to beat CoPaR in execution time by taking advantage of the large parallel compute power of the HPC cluster. This comes at the cost of \( \mathcal{O}(n^2) \) worst case complexity, but randomly generated benchmarks are more or less the best case for the distributed algorithm, and require only

\(^2\) We do not have access to the HPC cluster. The Ryzen chip is newer, but significantly cheaper (the total cost of the mini-PC is approximately $700), and difference in performance is sufficiently large that it cannot be explained by difference in hardware.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>benchmark</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>time (s)</th>
<th>memory (MB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CoPaR</td>
<td>DCPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35910</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>152712</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>537768</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1639440</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4459455</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>248503</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>607727</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1632799</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83431</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92615</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94425</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>134082</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>152107</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>944250</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92879</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94451</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100799</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118084</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>156913</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1007990</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86852</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92491</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>134207</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>138000</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154863</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1300000</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Time and memory usage comparison on the benchmarks of Birkmann, Deifel and Milius [5]: CoPaR is the earlier asymptotically efficient sequential algorithm [8], DCPR is the earlier distributed algorithm [5], and ours is Algorithm 4. The results for CoPaR and DCPR are those reported in Birkmann, Deifel and Milius [5]. The memory usage of DCPR is per worker, indicated by ×32 (for the 32 workers on the HPC cluster).

a very small constant number of iterations, so that the effective complexity is \( O(n) \). The real world benchmarks on the other hand, and especially the wlan benchmarks, need more iterations. The second largest wlan benchmark requires 149 iterations of the distributed algorithm, which results in sequential CoPaR outperforming DCPR. Note that 149 is still very far from the worst case of 1408676. In general, benchmarks with transition systems with long shortest path lengths will truly trigger the worst case of the \( O(n^2) \) algorithm, and can make its execution time infeasibly long. In summary, the benchmarks here are not chosen to be favourable to CoPaR and our algorithm, as they do not trigger the time complexity advantage to the full extent.

Nevertheless, our algorithm outperforms both CoPaR and DCPR by a large margin. On
the synthetic benchmarks (wta), roughly speaking, when CoPaR takes 10 minutes, DCPR takes one minute, and our algorithm takes a second. On the real-world wlan benchmark, the difference with DCPR is greatest, with the largest benchmark requiring almost an hour on the HPC cluster for DCPR, whereas our algorithm completes the benchmark in less than a second on a single core.

Sequential CoPaR is unable to run the largest benchmark in each category, because it requires more memory than the 16GB limit. The distributed algorithm is able to spread the required memory usage among 32 workers, thus staying under the 16GB limit per worker. Our algorithm, on the other hand, uses sufficiently less memory to be able to run all benchmarks on a single machine. In fact, it uses significantly less memory than DCPR uses per worker. There are several reasons for this:

- Our algorithm does not require large hash tables.
- Our algorithm operates on an efficient binary representation, with a simple form of in-memory dictionary compression.
- We do not split states into their constituent pieces, as we are able to operate directly on the composed functor.

Even the largest benchmarks stay far away from the 32GB memory limit of our mini-PC. We are thus able to minimize large coalgebraic transition systems on cheap, consumer grade hardware. Our code can be found on GitHub [1].

### 6 Conclusions and Future Work

There is always a trade-off between space and time, and with the newly presented coalgebraic partition refinement algorithm we were able to cut down the memory use to a fraction, at the cost of an extra factor of $k$ in the time-complexity compared to asymptotically optimal algorithms. Thus, we are able to run benchmarks on a consumer laptop, which previously required 32 workers of a high performance cluster. Though our asymptotic complexity is not as good as the $O(m \log n)$-algorithms, the evaluation proves the efficiency of our $O(k^2 n \log n)$ algorithm in practice.

The new algorithm is also able to minimize with respect to more complicated system equivalences. In particular, the algorithm can compute monotone bisimilarity in monotone neighbourhood frames. It remains for future work to turn our model implementation into full tool and to also implement and evaluate more complicated functors such as that for monotone neighbourhood frames.

Along the theoretical axis, the limit of supported system equivalence notions needs to be pushed further. So far, our algorithm is applicable to functors on $\text{Set}$. More advanced bisimilarity notions such as trace semantics [33, 15], branching bisimulations, and others from the linear-time-branching spectrum [37], can be understood coalgebraically using graded monads [9, 26]. Coalgebraically, this corresponds to changing the base category of the functor from $\text{Set}$ to, for example, the Eilenberg-Moore [32] or Kleisli [15] category of a monad.

Up-to techniques provide another successful line of research for deciding bisimilarity. Inspired by Hopcroft and Karp’s algorithm [18] for deciding language equivalence of DFAs, Bonchi and Pous [7] provide a construction for deciding bisimilarity of two particular states of interest, where the transition structure is unfolded lazily while the reasoning evolves. By computing the partitions in a similarly lazy way, performance can hopefully be improved even further.
References

A Omitted Proofs

Proof of Lemma 3.5

Run Time Complexity. Note that the radix sort needs to take care that the bit-strings do not have uniform length. This can be easily achieved in linear time (especially because the sorting is not required to be stable).

Correctness. After the sorting operation, the blocks identical elements are adjacent in the permutation \( r \). Thus, the final for-loop can create a new block whenever it sees an element different from the previous element.

Proof of Lemma 3.7

Let \( S \subseteq C \) be the subset of successors of \( x \). Since \( C \) is finite, we have the finite intersection

\[
S = \bigcap \{C \setminus \{y\} \mid y \text{ not a successor of } x\}.
\]

In general, every set functor preserves finite intersections without loss of generality (for coalgebraic purposes), and every finitary functor preserves even infinite intersections wlog (see [40] for an in-depth discussion). We have that \( c(x) \) is in the image of every \( F(C \setminus \{y\}) \mapsto FC \) for every non-successor \( y \) of \( x \). Since \( F \) preserves the above intersection, we have that \( c(x) \) is also in the image of \( FS \mapsto FC \) (where \( S \mapsto C \) is just the inclusion map). Since \( p_1(z) = p_2(z) \) for all \( z \in S \) by assumption, in other words, \( p_1|_S = p_2|_S \), we have that \( Fp_1(c(x)) = Fp_2(c(x)) \) by the diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & \xrightarrow{c(x)} & FC \\
\exists c' & \mapsto & F\|S \mapsto FC \\
FS & \xrightarrow{Fp_1 = Fp_2} & FN
\end{array}
\]

Proof of Theorem 3.8

Correctness: We show that the property

\[
\text{for all clean states } x, y \in C \text{ we have } p(x) = p(y) \iff Fp(c(x)) = Fp(c(y)).
\]

\( (*) \)
holds throughout the execution of Algorithm 4:

- Initially, all states are marked dirty, so \((\ast)\) holds trivially.
- Whenever a block \(B\) is split, the subblocks are marked clean, and indeed, the subblocks have been arranged such that \((\ast)\) holds. In this splitting operation, it is sufficient to consider only one clean state \(B_{\text{cl}}\), because for two clean states \(x, y\) the invariant \((\ast)\) shows that they have the same signature w.r.t. the partition \(p\) right before the split.

Right after the split, we fix \((\ast)\) by marking all the predecessors of the new subblocks as dirty. If a state \(x\) is clean and only has successors outside of \(B\) and the inheriting biggest subblock of \(B\), then for all successors \(x'\), the index \(p[x'] \in \mathbb{N}\) remained unchanged, and thus also the signature \(Fp(c(x))\) of \(x\).

Whenever the algorithm terminates, the invariant \((\ast)\) shows that we have a well-defined map

\[
C/p \longrightarrow F(C/p)
\]

on the \(p\)-equivalence classes of \(C\) turning \(p: C \rightarrow C/p\) into an \(F\)-coalgebra homomorphism.

Thus, all states identified by \(p\) are behaviourally equivalent. For the converse, one can show by induction over loop iterations that whenever two states \(x, y \in C\) are behaviourally equivalent, then they remain identified by \(p\).

In total, upon termination, the returned partition \(p\) precisely identifies the behaviourally equivalent states.

Termination itself is clear because every finite set \(|C|\) has only finitely many quotients. For a tight run-time complexity, we first establish a few lemmas before concluding the proof of Theorem 3.8 on page 19.

Proof of Lemma 3.9

When a block gets split into sub-blocks, the old block is reused for the largest sub-block. Therefore, a newly created block is at most half the size of the old block. Formally, let \(p_{\text{old}}: C \rightarrow \mathbb{N}\) be the partition before an iteration of Algorithm 4 and \(p: C \rightarrow \mathbb{N}\) the partition after the iteration. Then for all \(x \in C\) we have

\[
p_{\text{old}}(x) = p(x) \quad \text{or} \quad |\{x' \in C \mid p_{\text{old}}(x) = p_{\text{old}}(x')\}| \geq 2 \cdot |\{x' \in C \mid p(x) = p(x')\}|
\]

In other words, each time a state is moved to a new block, the size of its containing block gets cut at least in half. Since the initial block has size \(n\), the value of \(p(x)\) can change at most \(\lceil \log_2 n \rceil\) many times.

Proof of Lemma 3.10

We have two bounds on the total number of times that a state is marked dirty:

- **Bounded by block splits** \(O(n)\): In order for a state to go from clean to dirty, some block must have been split. Each splitting of a block may move a state from clean to dirty only once (though it may mark it redundantly dirty more than once). The total number of block splits is less than \(n\), because after \(n - 1\) splits each state is already in its own block. Thus, a state goes from clean to dirty at most \(O(n)\) times.
Bounded by triggering successor states $O(k \log n)$: Every time a new block is created, all predecessors of its states are marked dirty. In other words, each time a successor of a state is moved into a new block, the state may be marked dirty. A state has at most $O(k)$ successors. Combining this with the preceding Lemma 3.9, we conclude that a state is marked dirty at most $O(k \log n)$ times.

The combination of the two items yields the desired bound of $O(\min(n, k \log n))$. ◀

Proof of Lemma 3.11

There are two critical parts of the loop to check:

1. Computing $p'$: by assumption, recomputing the signature of a state takes $O(k)$. Since at most $|B_{di}| + 1$ signatures are recomputed, the bound is met.

2. Moving states into new blocks. There are two cases:
   - The clean states are in the largest sub-block: only dirty states are moved, so the bound is met.
   - The clean states are not in the largest sub-block: now clean states are also moved, but since they are now less numerous that the dirty states, the bound is still met.

The partition refinement structure together with a counting-sort strategy ensures that the work of each move is $O(1)$. ◀

Proof of Lemma 3.12

Each state is marked dirty at most $O(k \log n)$ times. Because each dirty marking runs in $O(1)$ and there are $n$ states, the total contribution is $O(kn \log n)$. ◀

Conclusion of the proof of Theorem 3.8

We have seen that the dirty marking loop only contributes $O(kn \log n)$ which is clearly less than $O(m \cdot \min(k \log n, n))$ since $n \leq m = \sharp(c)$. A state is in the $B_{di}$ part in at most $O(\min(k \log n, n))$ iterations of the main loop, because in order to occur in $B_{di}$ it must have been marked dirty, and the algorithm subsequently marks it clean.

Computing the signature of a state $x$ takes $O(\sharp(c(x)))$ time because we assume $F$ to be implemented in linear time. Thus, computing the signatures for all states $\min(k \log n, n)$-many times takes $O(m \cdot \min(k \log n, n))$ in total. ◀

Proof of Definition 4.1

Usually $\mathbb{N}$ is defined to be a subfunctor of the double contravariant powerset functor, but ◀

Proof of Theorem 4.2

Encoding. Given a family $N \in \mathcal{N}X$ for finite $X$, we define the map

$$\text{atom}: \mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}X \to \mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}X \quad \text{atom}(N) = \{S \in N \mid \not\exists S' \in N : S' \subsetneq S\}$$
which transforms a monotone family into an antichain by taking the minimal elements in the monotone family. When encoding $N \in \mathcal{N}X$, we use the encoding of powerset twice in order to represent the set of sets $\text{atom}(N) \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}X$.

**Functor Implementation.** Given $f : X \to \mathbb{N}$ and an encoded $A = \text{atom}(N)$ for some $N \in \mathcal{N}X$, we encode $\text{sig}$ for $N$ as follows:

1. Compute $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}f(A)$ using the $\text{sig}$ of $\mathcal{P}f$ twice: first on each nested set and then on the outer set. This results in $A' := \mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}f(A)$.
2. For the normalization, iterate over all pairs $S, T \in A'$ and remove $T$ if $S \subseteq T$. This is not linear in the size of $A'$ but bounded by $m \cdot A'$.

This extra work in each refinement step for each state adds an extra factor of $m$ to the overall complexity.