

Semilinear Home-space is Decidable for Petri Nets

Petr Jančar¹ and Jérôme Leroux²

¹*Dept of Comp. Sci., Faculty of Science, Palacký Univ. Olomouc, Czechia*

petr.jancar@upol.cz

²*LaBRI, CNRS, Univ. Bordeaux, France*

jerome.leroux@labri.fr

July 7, 2022

Abstract

A set of configurations \mathbf{H} is an home-space for a set of configurations \mathbf{X} of a Petri net if every configuration reachable from \mathbf{X} can reach \mathbf{H} . The semilinear home-space problem for Petri nets asks, given a Petri net A , and semilinear sets of configurations \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{H} if \mathbf{H} is an home-space for \mathbf{X} . In 1989, Davide de Frutos Escrig and Colette Johnen proved that the problem is decidable when \mathbf{X} is a singleton and \mathbf{H} is a finite union of linear sets using the same periods. In this paper, we show that the general problem is decidable. This result is obtained by proving a duality between the reachability problem and the non-home-space problem. More formally, we prove that for any Petri net A and for any linear set of configurations \mathbf{L} , we can effectively compute a semilinear set \mathbf{W} of configurations such that for every set \mathbf{X} , the set \mathbf{L} is not an home-space for \mathbf{X} if, and only if \mathbf{W} is reachable from \mathbf{X} .

1 Introduction

Petri nets are one of the most popular formal methods for the representation and the analysis of parallel processes [4].

The central algorithmic problem for Petri net is reachability: given a Petri net A and two configurations \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} , decide whether there exists an execution of A from \mathbf{x} to \mathbf{y} . In fact many important computational problems in logic and complexity reduce or are even equivalent to this problem [11, 6]. Recently, the complexity of the Petri net reachability problem was proved to be “Ackermannian-complete” (see [8] for the upper-bound and [9, 2] for the lower-bound),

The reachability problem for Petri nets can be easily generalized to semilinear sets, a class of geometrical sets that coincides with the sets definable in the Presburger arithmetic [5]. The semilinear reachability problem for Petri nets asks, given a Petri net A , and (presentations of) semilinear sets of configurations \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} if there exists an execution from a configuration in \mathbf{X} to a configuration in \mathbf{Y} . Denoting by $\text{POST}_A^*(\mathbf{X})$ the configurations reachable from \mathbf{X} and by $\text{PRE}_A^*(\mathbf{Y})$ the configurations that can reach a configuration in \mathbf{Y} , the semilinear reachability problem is equivalent to decide if the intersection $\text{POST}_A^*(\mathbf{X}) \cap \text{PRE}_A^*(\mathbf{Y})$ is empty.

This problem can be easily reduced to classical (instances when \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} are singleton) reachability problems for Petri nets.

The semilinear home-space problem is a problem that seems to be similar to the semilinear reachability problem at a first sight. This problem asks, given a Petri net A , and two semilinear sets \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{H} , if every configuration reachable from \mathbf{X} can reach \mathbf{H} . This problem is equivalent to prove the inclusion $\text{POST}_A^*(\mathbf{X}) \subseteq \text{PRE}_A^*(\mathbf{H})$. In 1989, Davide de Frutos Escrig and Colette Johnen proved that the semilinear home-space problem is decidable for instances where \mathbf{X} is a singleton set and \mathbf{H} is a finite union of linear sets using the same periods and let open the general case. The decidability status of the home-space problem stays open for several years. In fact, it was unclear if the general problem should be decidable since the inclusion (in fact also the equality) problem $\text{POST}_A^*(\mathbf{X}) \subseteq \text{PRE}_B^*(\mathbf{H})$ is undecidable even when \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{H} are singleton sets and the dimensions of the Petri nets A, B are fixed to some small values [7].

Our contribution. In this paper, we show that the general semilinear home-space problem is decidable. This result is obtained by proving a duality between the reachability problem and the non-home-space problem. More formally, we prove that for any Petri net A and for any linear set of configurations \mathbf{L} , we can effectively compute a semilinear set \mathbf{W} of configurations such that for every set \mathbf{X} , the set \mathbf{L} is not an home-space for \mathbf{X} if, and only if \mathbf{W} is reachable from \mathbf{X} .

By \mathbb{N} we denote the set $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ of nonnegative integers. For (a dimension) $d \in \mathbb{N}$, the elements of \mathbb{N}^d are called (d -dimensional) vectors; they are denoted in bold face, and for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ we put $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}(1), \mathbf{x}(2), \dots, \mathbf{x}(d))$ so that we can refer to the vector components. We use the component-wise sum $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}$ of vectors, and their component-wise order $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y}$. For $c \in \mathbb{N}$, we put $c \cdot \mathbf{x} = (c \cdot \mathbf{x}(1), c \cdot \mathbf{x}(2), \dots, c \cdot \mathbf{x}(d))$. By $\|\mathbf{x}\|$ we denote the sum of components, i.e., $\|\mathbf{x}\| = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{x}(i)$.

2 Semilinear Petri Net Reachability Problem

In this section, we briefly recall related notions about semilinear sets and Petri nets.

A set $\mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ is *linear*, if there are d -dimensional vectors \mathbf{b} (the *basis*) and $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_k$ (the *periods*, $k \in \mathbb{N}$) such that

$$\mathbf{L} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^d \mid \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{u}(1) \cdot \mathbf{p}_1 \cdots + \mathbf{u}(k) \cdot \mathbf{p}_k \text{ for some } \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^k\}.$$

In this case \mathbf{L} is said to be *presented* by the tuple $(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_k)$. A set $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ is *semilinear* if it is a finite union of linear sets, i.e. $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{L}_1 \cdots \cup \mathbf{L}_m$ where all \mathbf{L}_i are linear. In that case, we present \mathbf{S} as a sequence of presentations of $\mathbf{L}_1, \dots, \mathbf{L}_m$. When such a presentation is effectively computable, the semilinear set \mathbf{S} is said to be *effectively constructible*.

Given a set $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$, by $\overline{\mathbf{S}}$ we denote its complement, i.e., $\overline{\mathbf{S}} = \mathbb{N}^d \setminus \mathbf{S}$. If \mathbf{S} is semilinear, then also $\overline{\mathbf{S}}$ is semilinear. Moreover, $\overline{\mathbf{S}}$ is effectively constructible from a presentation of \mathbf{S} ; this follows from the well-known fact that a set is semilinear iff it is expressible in Presburger arithmetic [5].

We use a concise definition of (unmarked place/transition) Petri nets. By a *d -dimensional Petri-net action* we mean a pair $a = (\mathbf{a}_-, \mathbf{a}_+) \in \mathbb{N}^d \times \mathbb{N}^d$. With $a = (\mathbf{a}_-, \mathbf{a}_+)$ we associate the

binary relation \xrightarrow{a} on the set \mathbb{N}^d by putting $(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{a}_-) \xrightarrow{a} (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{a}_+)$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^d$. The relations \xrightarrow{a} are naturally extended to the relations $\xrightarrow{\sigma}$ for finite sequences σ of (d -dimensional Petri net) actions.

A Petri net A of dimension d (with d places in more traditional definitions) is a finite set of d -dimensional Petri-net actions (transitions). Here the vectors $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ are also called *configurations* (markings). On the set \mathbb{N}^d of configurations we define the *reachability relation* $\xrightarrow{A^*}$: we put $\mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{y}$ if there is $\sigma \in A^*$ such that $\mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mathbf{y}$. Given two sets $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$, we write $\mathbf{X} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{Y}$ if there exist $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Y}$ such that $\mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{y}$.

We recall that the *reachability problem* (given $A, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$, is $\mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{y}$?) is decidable [10]; it has been recently shown to be ‘‘Ackermannian-complete’’ [9, 2]. Moreover, if two sets $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ are linear, the problem $\mathbf{X} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{Y}$ is decidable since it is logspace reducible to the reachability problem (by adding to A one Petri net action for each period of \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y}). Furthermore, by decomposing semilinear sets into finite union of linear sets, it follows that the problem $\mathbf{X} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{Y}$ is also decidable when \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} are (effectively) semilinear.

3 Home Space Problem

We first define a few useful notions and then specify some variants of the home-space problem that we consider. We implicitly assume a fixed Petri net A of dimension d if not said otherwise.

For $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ we put $\text{POST}_A^*(\mathbf{X}) = \bigcup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}} \text{POST}_A^*(\mathbf{x})$ where $\text{POST}_A^*(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{N}^d \mid \mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{y}\}$. Symmetrically, for $\mathbf{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ we put $\text{PRE}_A^*(\mathbf{Y}) = \bigcup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Y}} \text{PRE}_A^*(\mathbf{y})$ where $\text{PRE}_A^*(\mathbf{y}) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^d \mid \mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{y}\}$. A set $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ is an *inductive invariant* if $\text{POST}_A^*(\mathbf{X}) \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ (hence $\overline{\text{POST}_A^*(\mathbf{X})} = \mathbf{X}$). We note that $\text{POST}_A^*(\mathbf{X})$ is an inductive invariant for each $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$. Also $\text{PRE}_A^*(\mathbf{Y})$ is an inductive invariant for any $\mathbf{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$.

Given two sets $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{H} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$, we say that \mathbf{H} is a *home-space for \mathbf{X}* , if $\text{POST}_A^*(\mathbf{X}) \subseteq \text{PRE}_A^*(\mathbf{H})$. We are interested in the decidability of the *home-space problem* asking, given a Petri net A of dimension d and two effective semilinear sets $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{H} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$, if \mathbf{H} is a home-space for \mathbf{X} .

Remark 1. *One might also consider ‘‘existential’’ problems that asks given a petri net A of dimension d and (a finite presentation of) a semilinear set $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$, if there exists a home space \mathbf{H} for \mathbf{X} such that \mathbf{H} is a singleton, or such that \mathbf{H} is a semilinear set included in $\text{POST}_A^*(\mathbf{X})$. The former case was proved to be decidable in [1], and the last one is still open.*

By [3] we know that the home-space problem is decidable for the instances $A, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{H}$ where \mathbf{X} is a singleton set, and \mathbf{H} is a finite union of linear sets with the same period-sets. The decidability is established by a Turing reduction to the reachability problem.

In [3] it was left open if the problem is decidable also for the instances $A, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{H}$ where \mathbf{X} is a singleton, and \mathbf{H} is a general effective semilinear set (a finite union of linear sets with possibly different period-sets). Here we give the positive answer by proving the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *There is an algorithm that, given a Petri net A of dimension d , and two presentations of semilinear sets \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{H} decides if \mathbf{H} is a home-space for \mathbf{X} .*

4 Non-Home-Space Witnesses

Now we start to think about a proof of Theorem 1. Given a Petri net A of dimension d , two semilinear sets $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{H} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$, it is clear that we have:

$$\mathbf{H} \text{ is not a home-space for } \mathbf{X} \text{ iff there exists } \mathbf{c} \text{ such that } \mathbf{X} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{c} \not\xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{H}$$

If we have no means to directly verify this property, we can look for a suitable (e.g. semilinear) set \mathbf{W} which has the property for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^d$, we have $\mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{W}$ iff there exists $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ such that $\mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{c} \not\xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{H}$. In that case, we say that $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ is a *non-home-space witness*, or just a *witness*, for $\mathbf{H} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$.

So we would be done (with a proof of Theorem 1) if we could construct a semilinear witness of \mathbf{H} . This does not seem straightforward, so we will use still other general observations to simplify the problem (so that it will suffice when a semilinear witness is effectively constructible for a linear set).

Proposition 2. *If $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}_1 \cup \mathbf{H}_2 \cdots \cup \mathbf{H}_m$, and if $\mathbf{W}_1, \dots, \mathbf{W}_k$ are such that \mathbf{W}_i is a witness for \mathbf{H}_i for each i , then \mathbf{H} is not an home-space for a set $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ if, and only if, there is an execution*

$$\mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{x}_1 \cdots \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{x}_m \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}$, and $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbf{W}_i$ for each i . (In fact, the order of \mathbf{W}_i is irrelevant.)

Proof. Given an execution (1), we have for each i that $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbf{W}_i$, and thus $\mathbf{x}_i \not\xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{H}_i$. It follows that $\mathbf{x}_j \not\xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{H}_i$ for all $j \in \{i, \dots, m\}$. Hence $\mathbf{x}_m \not\xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{H}$. Thus \mathbf{H} is not an home-space for \mathbf{X} . Conversely, assume that \mathbf{H} is not an home-space for a set $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$. Then, there exist configurations \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_0 such that $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}$, and $\mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{x}_0 \not\xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{H}$. Since $\mathbf{x}_0 \not\xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{H}$ then $\mathbf{x}_0 \not\xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{H}_1$. It follows that $\mathbf{x}_0 \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{x}_1$ for some configuration $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathbf{W}_1$. Now, observe that $\mathbf{x}_1 \not\xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{H}$ and now we deduce that $\mathbf{x}_1 \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathbf{W}_2$; etc. \square

Proposition 3. *If \mathbf{X} and the witnesses $\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \dots, \mathbf{W}_m$ in Proposition 2 are effectively constructible semilinear sets, then the existence of an execution (1) is decidable (by a reduction to reachability).*

Proof. We can construct a bigger Petri net that stepwise freezes m configurations of an original execution from $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}$ and checks (by the correspondingly defined gadgets and the end-configuration) that these configurations belong to $\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \dots, \mathbf{W}_m$, respectively. \square

Hence a proof of Theorem 1 will be finished once we show:

Lemma 4. *Given a Petri net A of dimension d , and a linear set $\mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$, we can effectively construct a semilinear witness for \mathbf{L} .*

Before proving the lemma, we verify that it indeed entails Theorem 1: We have $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}_1 \cup \mathbf{H}_2 \dots \cup \mathbf{H}_m$ where \mathbf{H}_i are linear sets, and by the lemma we can construct a semilinear witness \mathbf{W}_i for \mathbf{H}_i , for each i . Then we ask if there is an execution (1). Proposition 3 thus finishes a proof of the decidability claimed in Theorem 1.

5 Witness of Non-Home-Space For Linear Sets

It thus remains to prove Lemma 4.

As a gentle introduction, we first prove the lemma for the case when \mathbf{L} is a singleton, hence $\mathbf{L} = \{\mathbf{b}\}$ (there is a basis \mathbf{b} but no periods).

Referring to the assumed Petri net A of dimension d , we say that $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ *can decrease the token-count* if $\|\mathbf{x}'\| < \|\mathbf{x}\|$ for some $\mathbf{x}' \in \text{POST}_A^*(\mathbf{x})$. We note that the set

$$\text{DC} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^d \mid \mathbf{x} \text{ can decrease the token-count}\}$$

is upward closed and the set $\text{MIN}(\text{DC})$ of its minimal elements (w.r.t. the component-wise partial order) is effectively constructible. (We can use a general framework by Valk-Jantzen [12]. A crucial fact is that if we are given a “partial configuration” $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$, in which some components are unspecified, then the question if there is a configuration $\mathbf{x} \in \text{DC}$ that is an instance of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ can be easily reduced to the reachability problem.)

We observe that $\mathbf{x} \in \text{DC}$ entails that $\mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{x}'$ for some $\mathbf{x}' \in \text{NDC}$ where we put $\text{NDC} = \overline{\text{DC}}$. In other words, NDC is a home-space for any $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$.

Recalling that $\mathbf{L} = \{\mathbf{b}\}$, we now verify that

$$\mathbf{W} = \text{NDC} \cap (\{\mathbf{x}; \|\mathbf{x}\| > \|\mathbf{b}\|\} \cup \{\mathbf{x}; \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq \|\mathbf{b}\| \text{ and } \mathbf{x} \not\xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{b}\})$$

is a witness for \mathbf{L} ;

- $\mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{W}$ clearly entails $\mathbf{c} \not\xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{b}$;
- $\mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{c} \not\xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{L}$, entails that $\mathbf{c} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{c}'$ where $\mathbf{c}' \not\xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{c}' \in \text{NDC}$; hence $\mathbf{c}' \in \mathbf{W}$ (and thus $\mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathbf{W}$).

We easily note that \mathbf{W} is an effectively constructible semilinear set.

Now we prove Lemma 4 in general. We have a Petri net A of dimension d , and a linear set \mathbf{L} presented with a basis $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ and periods $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_k \in \mathbb{N}^d$. For $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^k$ we put

$$\text{CONF}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{u}(1) \cdot \mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{u}(2) \cdot \mathbf{p}_2 \cdots + \mathbf{u}(k) \cdot \mathbf{p}_k.$$

Hence

$$\mathbf{L} = \{\text{CONF}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^k\}.$$

Remark 2. We note that each configuration $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ is equal to $\text{CONF}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u})$ for one or more presentation pairs $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{N}^d \times \mathbb{N}^k$.

Let DCB-PR (determined by the Petri net A and the sequence of periods) be the set of presentation pairs that present configurations that *can decrease the token-count in the presentation basis*:

$$\text{DCB-PR} = \{(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{N}^d \times \mathbb{N}^k \mid \exists(\mathbf{y}', \mathbf{u}') : \|\mathbf{y}\| > \|\mathbf{y}'\|, \text{CONF}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \xrightarrow{A^*} \text{CONF}(\mathbf{y}', \mathbf{u}')\}.$$

We note that if $\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{p}_i$, for some i , then we trivially have $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \in \text{DCB-PR}$ since $\text{CONF}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) = \text{CONF}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{u}')$ where \mathbf{u}' arises from \mathbf{u} by adding 1 to $\mathbf{u}(i)$.

Claim. DCB-PR is upward closed and the set $\text{MIN}(\text{DCB-PR})$ is effectively constructible.

(We compare (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) and $(\mathbf{y}', \mathbf{u}')$ component-wise. It is easy to verify that DCB-PR is upward-closed. The effective constructibility is again based on the fact that we can decide, by a reduction to reachability, if a partial presentation pair $(\bar{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{\mathbf{u}})$ has an instance in DCB-PR.)

We now define the set of configurations that can be presented so that the presentation basis cannot be decreased:

$$\text{NDCB} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^d \mid \mathbf{x} = \text{CONF}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \text{ for some } (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \notin \text{DCB-PR}\}.$$

Claim. NDCB is an effectively constructible semilinear set.

(We recall that DCB-PR is an effectively constructible semilinear set, and that semilinear sets coincide with the sets definable in Presburger arithmetic. Then the claim is clear.)

Similarly as NDC, the set NDCB can be easily verified to be a home-space for any set $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$.

Now we recall the basis \mathbf{b} of \mathbf{L} , and consider the following subset of NDCB:

$$\mathbf{W} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^d \mid \mathbf{x} = \text{CONF}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \text{ where } (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \notin \text{DCB-PR} \text{ and} \\ \text{either } \|\mathbf{y}\| > \|\mathbf{b}\|, \text{ or } \|\mathbf{y}\| \leq \|\mathbf{b}\| \text{ and } \text{CONF}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \not\stackrel{A^*}{\rightarrow} \mathbf{L}\}.$$

(We do not claim the effective semilinearity of \mathbf{W} at the moment.) We recall that $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L}$ iff $\mathbf{x} = \text{CONF}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{u})$ for some $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^k$, and we verify that \mathbf{W} is a witness for \mathbf{L} :

- $\mathbf{x} \stackrel{A^*}{\rightarrow} \mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{W}$ clearly entails $\mathbf{c} \stackrel{A^*}{\rightarrow} \mathbf{L}$;
- $\mathbf{x} \stackrel{A^*}{\rightarrow} \mathbf{c} \not\stackrel{A^*}{\rightarrow} \mathbf{L}$, entails that $\mathbf{c} \stackrel{A^*}{\rightarrow} \mathbf{c}'$ where $\mathbf{c}' \stackrel{A^*}{\rightarrow} \mathbf{L}$ and $\mathbf{c}' \in \text{NDCB}$; hence there is $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \notin \text{DCB-PR}$ such that $\mathbf{c}' = \text{CONF}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u})$; hence $\mathbf{c}' \in \mathbf{W}$ (and thus $\mathbf{x} \stackrel{A^*}{\rightarrow} \mathbf{W}$).

We still need to show that \mathbf{W} is an effectively constructible semilinear set. Though for any concrete \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{u} we can decide if $\text{CONF}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \stackrel{A^*}{\rightarrow} \mathbf{L}$, and there are only finitely many \mathbf{y} to consider (those satisfying $\|\mathbf{y}\| \leq \|\mathbf{b}\|$), we are not done: it is not immediately obvious how to express $\text{CONF}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \not\stackrel{A^*}{\rightarrow} \mathbf{L}$ in Presburger arithmetic, even when \mathbf{y} is fixed. To this aim, for any fixed \mathbf{y} we define the set

$$\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{y}} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^k \mid \text{CONF}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \stackrel{A^*}{\rightarrow} \mathbf{L}\} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^k \mid \exists \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^k : \text{CONF}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \stackrel{A^*}{\rightarrow} \text{CONF}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{v})\}.$$

Claim. For each fixed $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{N}^d$, the set $\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{y}}$ is upward closed and the set $\text{MIN}(\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{y}})$ is effectively constructible. (It is obvious that $\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{y}}$ is upward-closed; the effective constructibility is again based on the fact that we can decide if $\text{CONF}(\mathbf{y}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}) \stackrel{A^*}{\rightarrow} \mathbf{L}$ where some components in $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ might be unspecified; we thus ask if there is an instance $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^k$ of $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ such that $\text{CONF}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \stackrel{A^*}{\rightarrow} \mathbf{L}$.)

Hence now it is clear that we can effectively construct a Presburger formula expressing that $\|\mathbf{y}\| \leq \|\mathbf{b}\|$ and $\text{CONF}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \not\stackrel{A^*}{\rightarrow} \mathbf{L}$. Hence the above \mathbf{W} is an effectively constructible semilinear set. This finishes a proof of Lemma 4, and thus also of Theorem 1.

References

- [1] Eike Best and Javier Esparza. Existence of home states in petri nets is decidable. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 116(6):423–427, 2016. doi:10.1016/j.ip1.2016.01.011.
- [2] Wojciech Czerwinski and Lukasz Orlikowski. Reachability in vector addition systems is ackermann-complete. In *62nd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2021, Denver, CO, USA, February 7-10, 2022*, pages 1229–1240. IEEE, 2021. doi:10.1109/FOCS52979.2021.00120.
- [3] Davide de Frutos Escrig and Colette Johnen. Decidability of home space property. Univ. de Paris-Sud, Centre d’Orsay, Laboratoire de Recherche en Informatique LRI-503, July 1989.
- [4] J. Esparza and M. Nielsen. Decidability issues for petri nets - a survey. *Bulletin of the European Association for Theoretical Computer Science*, 52:245–262, 1994.
- [5] S. Ginsburg and E. H. Spanier. Semigroups, Presburger formulas and languages. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 16(2):285–296, 1966. doi:10.2140/pjm.1966.16.285.
- [6] M. H. T. Hack. *Decidability questions for Petri nets*. PhD thesis, MIT, 1975. URL: <http://publications.csail.mit.edu/lcs/pubs/pdf/MIT-LCS-TR-161.pdf>.
- [7] Petr Jancar. Undecidability of bisimilarity for petri nets and some related problems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 148(2):281–301, 1995. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(95)00037-w.
- [8] J. Leroux and S. Schmitz. Reachability in vector addition systems is primitive-recursive in fixed dimension. In *34th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 24-27, 2019*, pages 1–13. IEEE, 2019. doi:10.1109/LICS.2019.8785796.
- [9] Jérôme Leroux. The reachability problem for petri nets is not primitive recursive. In *62nd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2021, Denver, CO, USA, February 7-10, 2022*, pages 1241–1252. IEEE, 2021. doi:10.1109/FOCS52979.2021.00121.
- [10] E. W. Mayr. An algorithm for the general petri net reachability problem. In *Proceedings of the 13th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 11-13, 1981, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA*, pages 238–246. ACM, 1981. doi:10.1145/800076.802477.
- [11] S. Schmitz. The complexity of reachability in vector addition systems. *SIGLOG News*, 3(1):4–21, 2016. URL: <https://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2893585>.
- [12] Rüdiger Valk and Matthias Jantzen. The residue of vector sets with applications to decidability problems in petri nets. In Grzegorz Rozenberg, Hartmann J. Genrich, and Gérard Roucairol, editors, *Advances in Petri Nets 1984, European Workshop on Applications and Theory in Petri Nets, covers the last two years which include the workshop 1983 in Toulouse and the workshop 1984 in Aarhus, selected papers*, volume 188 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 234–258. Springer, 1984. doi:10.1007/3-540-15204-0_14.