

Expressiveness and Decidability of Temporal Logics for Asynchronous Hyperproperties

Laura Bozzelli

University of Napoli “Federico II”, Napoli, Italy

Adriano Peron

University of Napoli “Federico II”, Napoli, Italy

César Sánchez

IMDEA Software Institute, Madrid, Spain

Abstract

Hyperproperties are properties of systems that relate different execution traces, with many applications from security to symmetry, consistency models of concurrency, etc. In recent years, different linear-time logics for specifying *asynchronous* hyperproperties have been investigated. Though model checking of these logics is undecidable, useful decidable fragments have been identified with applications e.g. for asynchronous security analysis. In this paper, we address expressiveness and decidability issues of temporal logics for asynchronous hyperproperties. We compare the expressiveness of these logics together with the extension $S1S[E]$ of $S1S$ with the equal-level predicate by obtaining an almost complete expressiveness picture. We also study the expressive power of these logics when interpreted on singleton sets of traces. We show that for two asynchronous extensions of HyperLTL, checking the existence of a singleton model is already undecidable, and for one of them, namely Context HyperLTL (HyperLTL_C), we establish a characterization of the singleton models in terms of the extension of standard FO[<] over traces with addition. This last result generalizes the well-known equivalence between FO[<] and LTL. Finally, we identify new boundaries on the decidability of model checking HyperLTL_C.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Logic and verification


Keywords and phrases Asynchronous hyperproperties, Temporal logics for hyperproperties, Expressiveness, Decidability, Model checking

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs...

1 Introduction

Hyperproperties. In the last decade, a novel specification paradigm has been introduced that generalizes traditional trace properties by properties of sets of traces, the so called *hyperproperties* [6]. Hyperproperties relate execution traces of a reactive system and are useful in many settings. In the area of information flow control, hyperproperties can formalize security policies (like noninterference [16, 22] and observational determinism [28]) which compare observations made by an external low-security agent along traces resulting from different values of not directly observable inputs. These security requirements go, in general, beyond regular properties and cannot be expressed in classical regular temporal logics such as LTL [23], CTL, and CTL* [10]. Hyperproperties also have applications in other settings, such as the symmetric access to critical resources in distributed protocols [13], consistency models in concurrent computing [2], and distributed synthesis [12].

In the context of model checking of finite-state reactive systems, many temporal logics for hyperproperties have been proposed [9, 5, 3, 24, 11, 7, 17] for which model checking is decidable, including HyperLTL [5], HyperCTL* [5], HyperQPTL [24, 7], and HyperPDL- Δ [17] which extend LTL, CTL*, QPTL [25], and PDL [15], respectively, by explicit first-order quantification over traces and trace variables to refer to multiple traces at the same time.



© Author: Please provide a copyright holder;

licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0

Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics


Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

The semantics of all these logics is *synchronous* and the temporal modalities are evaluated by a lockstepwise traversal of all the traces assigned to the quantified trace variables.

A different approach for the formalization of synchronous hyper logics is based on hyper variants of monadic second-order logic over traces or trees [7]. For the linear-time setting, we recall the logic S1S[E] [7] (and its first-order fragment FO[<,E] [14]) which syntactically extends monadic second-order logic of one successor S1S with the *equal-level predicate* E , which relate the same time points on different traces. Another class of hyperlogics is obtained by adopting a *team semantics* for standard temporal logics, in particular, LTL [20, 21, 27].

Asynchronous extensions of Hyper logics. Many application domains require asynchronous properties that relate traces at distinct time points which can be arbitrarily far from each other. For example, asynchronous specifications are needed to reason about a multithreaded environment in which threads are not scheduled in lockstep, and traces associated with distinct threads progress at different speed. Asynchronous hyperproperties are also useful in information-flow security where an observer is not time-sensitive, so the observer cannot distinguish consecutive time points along an execution having the same observation. This again requires asynchronously matching sequences of observations along distinct execution traces. A first systematic study of asynchronous hyperproperties is done in [18], where two powerful and expressively equivalent linear-time asynchronous formalisms are introduced: the temporal fixpoint calculus H_μ and an automata-theoretic formalism where the quantifier-free part of a specification is expressed by the class of parity multi-tape Alternating Asynchronous Word Automata (AAWA) [18]. While the expressive power of the quantifier-part of HyperLTL is just that of LTL over tuples of traces of fixed arity (*multi-traces*), AAWA allow to specify very expressive non-regular multi-trace properties. As a matter of fact, model checking against H_μ or its AAWA-based counterpart is undecidable even for the quantifier alternation-free fragment. In [18], two decidable subclasses of parity AAWA are identified which express only multi-trace ω -regular properties and lead to two H_μ fragments with decidable model checking. More recently, other temporal logics [1, 4] which syntactically extend HyperLTL have been introduced for expressing asynchronous hyperproperties. *Asynchronous HyperLTL* (A-HyperLTL) [1], useful for asynchronous security analysis, models asynchronicity by means of an additional quantification layer over the so called *trajectories*. Intuitively, a trajectory controls the relative speed at which traces progress by choosing at each instant which traces move and which traces stutter. The general logic also has an undecidable model-checking problem, but [1] identifies practical decidable fragments, and reports an empirical evaluation. *Stuttering HyperLTL* (HyperLTL_S) and *Context HyperLTL* (HyperLTL_C) are introduced in [4] as more expressive asynchronous extensions of HyperLTL. HyperLTL_S uses relativized versions of the temporal modalities with respect to finite sets Γ of LTL formulas. Intuitively, these modalities are evaluated by a lockstepwise traversal of the sub-traces of the given traces which are obtained by removing “redundant” positions with respect to the pointwise evaluation of the LTL formulas in Γ . HyperLTL_C extends HyperLTL by unary modalities $\langle C \rangle$ parameterized by a non-empty subset C of trace variables—called the *context*—which restrict the evaluation of the temporal modalities to the traces associated with the variables in C . Both HyperLTL_S and HyperLTL_C are subsumed by H_μ and still have an undecidable model-checking problem, and fragments of the two logics with a decidable model-checking have been investigated [4].

Our contribution. In this paper, we study expressiveness and decidability of asynchronous extensions of HyperLTL [18, 1, 4]. Our main goal is to compare the expressive power of these logics together with the known logics for linear-time hyperproperties based on the equal-level predicate whose most powerful representative is S1S[E]. The first-order



■ **Figure 1** Expressiveness comparisons between linear-time hyper logics

fragment $\text{FO}[\langle, E]$ of $\text{S1S}[E]$ is already strictly more expressive than HyperLTL [14] and, unlike $\text{S1S}[E]$, its model-checking problem is decidable [7]. We obtain an almost complete expressiveness picture, summarized in Figure 1, where novel results are annotated in red. In particular, for A-HyperLTL , we show that although HyperLTL and A-HyperLTL are expressively incomparable, HyperLTL can be embedded into A-HyperLTL using a natural encoding. We also establish that A-HyperLTL is strictly less expressive than H_μ and its AAWA counterpart. For the relative expressiveness of A-HyperLTL , HyperLTL_S , and HyperLTL_C , we prove that A-HyperLTL and HyperLTL_S are expressively incomparable, and that HyperLTL_C is not subsumed by A-HyperLTL or by HyperLTL_S . The question of whether A-HyperLTL and HyperLTL_S are subsumed or not by HyperLTL_C remains open. Additionally, we show that each of these logics is not subsumed by $\text{S1S}[E]$. This last result solves a recent open question [18, 1].

Since hyperproperties are a generalization of trace properties, we also investigate the expressive power of the considered asynchronous extensions of HyperLTL when interpreted on singleton sets of traces. For HyperLTL and its more expressive extension HyperLTL_S , singleton models are just the ones whose traces are LTL-definable and checking the existence of such a model (*single-trace satisfiability*) is decidable and PSPACE-complete. On the other hand, we show that for both A-HyperLTL and HyperLTL_C , single-trace satisfiability is highly undecidable being Σ_1^1 -hard. Moreover, for HyperLTL_C extended with past temporal modalities, we provide a nice characterization of the singleton models which generalizes the well-known equivalence of LTL and first-order logic $\text{FO}[\langle]$ over traces established by Kamp's theorem. We show that over singleton models, HyperLTL_C with past corresponds to the extension $\text{FO}[\langle, +]$ of $\text{FO}[\langle]$ with addition over variables.

Finally, we investigate the decidability frontier for model-checking HyperLTL_C by enforcing the undecidability result of [4] and by identifying a maximal fragment of HyperLTL_C for which model checking is decidable. This fragment subsumes HyperLTL and can be translated into $\text{FO}[\langle, E]$. Due to lack of space, many proofs are omitted and included in the Appendix.

2 Preliminaries

Let \mathbb{N} be the set of natural numbers. For all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $[i, j]$ denotes the set of natural numbers h such that $i \leq h \leq j$. Given a word w over some alphabet Σ , $|w|$ is the length of w ($|w| = \infty$ if w is infinite). For each $0 \leq i < |w|$, $w(i)$ is the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ symbol of w , and w^i is the suffix of w from position i , i.e., the word $w(i)w(i+1) \dots$.

We fix a finite set AP of atomic propositions. A *trace* is an infinite word over 2^{AP} . A *pointed trace* is a pair (π, i) consisting of a trace π and a position $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Two traces π and π' are *stuttering equivalent* if there are two infinite sequences of positions $0 = i_0 < i_1 \dots$ and $0 = i'_0 < i'_1 \dots$ s.t. for all $k \geq 0$ and for all $\ell \in [i_k, i_{k+1} - 1]$ and $\ell' \in [i'_k, i'_{k+1} - 1]$, $\pi(\ell) = \pi'(\ell')$.

The trace π' is a *stuttering expansion* of the trace π if there is an infinite sequence of positions $0 = i_0 < i_1 \dots$ such that for all $k \geq 0$ and for all $\ell \in [i_k, i_{k+1} - 1]$, $\pi'(\ell) = \pi(k)$.

Kripke structures. A *Kripke structure* (over AP) is a tuple $\mathcal{K} = \langle S, S_0, E, V \rangle$, where S is a finite set of states, $S_0 \subseteq S$ is the set of initial states, $E \subseteq S \times S$ is a transition relation and $V : S \rightarrow 2^{\text{AP}}$ is an AP-valuation of the set of states. A *path* of \mathcal{K} is an infinite sequence of states t_0, t_1, \dots such that $t_0 \in S_0$ and $(t_i, t_{i+1}) \in E$ for all $i \geq 0$. The Kripke structure \mathcal{K} induces the set $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K})$ of traces of the form $V(t_0), V(t_1), \dots$ such that t_0, t_1, \dots is a path of \mathcal{K} .

Relative Expressiveness. In Sections 3-4, we compare the expressiveness of various logics for linear-time hyperproperties. Let \mathcal{M} be a set of models (in our case, a model is a set of traces), and L and L' be two logical languages interpreted over models in \mathcal{M} . Given two formulas $\varphi \in L$ and $\varphi' \in L'$, we say that φ and φ' are *equivalent* if for each model $M \in \mathcal{M}$, M satisfies φ iff M satisfies φ' . The language L is *subsumed by* L' , denoted $L \leq L'$, if each formula in L has an equivalent formula in L' . The language L is *strictly less expressive than* L' (written $L < L'$) if $L \leq L'$ and there is a L' -formula which has no equivalent in L . Finally, two logics L and L' are *expressively incomparable* if both $L \not\leq L'$ and $L' \not\leq L$.

Linear-time hyper specifications. We consider an abstract notion of linear-time hyper specifications which are interpreted over sets of traces. We fix a finite set VAR of trace variables. A *pointed-trace assignment* Π is a partial mapping over VAR assigning to each trace variable x in its domain $\text{Dom}(\Pi)$ a pointed trace. The assignment Π is *initial* if for each $x \in \text{Dom}(\Pi)$, $\Pi(x)$ is of the form $(\pi, 0)$ for some trace π . For a variable $x \in \text{VAR}$ and a pointed trace (π, i) , we denote by $\Pi[x \mapsto (\pi, i)]$ the pointed-trace assignment having domain $\text{Dom}(\Pi) \cup \{x\}$ defined as: $\Pi[x \mapsto (\pi, i)](x) = (\pi, i)$ and $\Pi[x \mapsto (\pi, i)](y) = \Pi(y)$ if $y \neq x$.

A *multi-trace specification* $S(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a specification (in some formalism) parameterized by a subset $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ of VAR whose semantics is given by a set Υ of *initial* pointed-trace assignments with domain $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$: we write $\Pi \models S(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for the trace assignments Π in Υ . Given a class \mathcal{C} of multi-trace specifications, *linear-time hyper expressions* ξ over \mathcal{C} are defined as: $\xi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists x.\xi \mid \forall x.\xi \mid S(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, where $x, x_1, \dots, x_n \in \text{VAR}$, $S(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{C}$, and $\exists x$ (resp., $\forall x$) is the *hyper* existential (resp., universal) trace quantifier for variable x . An expression ξ is a *sentence* if every variable x_i in the multi-trace specification $S(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of ξ is *not free* (i.e., x_i is in the scope of a quantifier for variable x_i). The *quantifier alternation depth* of ξ is the number of switches between \exists and \forall quantifiers in the quantifier prefix of ξ . For a set \mathcal{L} of traces and an initial pointed-trace assignment Π such that $\text{Dom}(\Pi)$ contains the free variables of ξ and the traces referenced by Π are in \mathcal{L} , the satisfaction relation $(\mathcal{L}, \Pi) \models \xi$ is inductively defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}, \Pi) \models \exists x.\xi & \quad \Leftrightarrow \text{for some trace } \pi \in \mathcal{L} : (\mathcal{L}, \Pi[x \mapsto (\pi, 0)]) \models \xi \\ (\mathcal{L}, \Pi) \models \forall x.\xi & \quad \Leftrightarrow \text{for each trace } \pi \in \mathcal{L} : (\mathcal{L}, \Pi[x \mapsto (\pi, 0)]) \models \xi \\ (\mathcal{L}, \Pi) \models S(x_1, \dots, x_n) & \quad \Leftrightarrow \Pi \models S(x_1, \dots, x_n) \end{aligned}$$

For a sentence ξ , we write $\mathcal{L} \models \xi$ to mean that $(\mathcal{L}, \Pi_\emptyset) \models \xi$, where Π_\emptyset is the empty assignment. If $\mathcal{L} \models \xi$ we say that \mathcal{L} is a *model* of ξ . If, additionally, \mathcal{L} is a singleton we call it a *single-trace model*. By restricting our attention to the single-trace models, a linear-time hyper sentence ξ denotes a trace property consisting of the traces π such that $\{\pi\} \models \xi$. For a class \mathcal{C} of multi-trace specifications, we consider the following decision problems:

- the *satisfiability* (resp., *single-trace satisfiability*) problem is checking for a linear-time hyper sentence ξ over \mathcal{C} , whether ξ has a model (resp., a single-trace model), and
- the model checking problem is checking for a Kripke structure \mathcal{K} and a linear-time hyper sentence ξ over \mathcal{C} , whether $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}) \models \xi$.

For instance, HyperLTL formulas are linear-time hyper sentences over the class of multi-trace specifications, called *HyperLTL quantifier-free formulas*, obtained by standard LTL formulas [23] by replacing atomic propositions p with relativized versions $p[x]$, where $x \in \text{VAR}$. Intuitively, $p[x]$ asserts that p holds at the current position of the trace assigned to x . Given an HyperLTL quantifier-free formula $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, an initial pointed trace assignment Π such that $\text{Dom}(\Pi) \supseteq \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, and a position $i \geq 0$, the satisfaction relation $(\Pi, i) \models \psi$ is defined as a natural extension of the satisfaction relation $(\pi, i) \models \theta$ for LTL formulas θ and traces π . In particular,

- $(\Pi, i) \models p[x_k]$ if $p \in \Pi(x_k)(i)$,
- $(\Pi, i) \models X\psi$ if $(\Pi, i+1) \models \psi$, and
- $(\Pi, i) \models \psi_1 \cup \psi_2$ if there is $j \geq i$ such that $(\Pi, j) \models \psi_2$ and $(\Pi, k) \models \psi_1$ for all $k \in [i, j-1]$.

Asynchronous Word Automata and the Fixpoint Calculus H_μ . We shortly recall the framework of parity alternating asynchronous word automata (parity AAWA) [18], a class of finite-state automata for the asynchronous traversal of multiple infinite words. Intuitively, given $n \geq 1$, an AAWA with n tapes (n AAWA) has access to n infinite words over the input alphabet Σ and at each step, activates multiple copies where for each of them, there is exactly one input word whose current input symbol is consumed (i.e., the reading head of such word moves one position to the right). In particular, the target of a move of \mathcal{A} is encoded by a pair (q, i) , where q indicates the target state while the direction $i \in [1, n]$ indicates on which input word to progress. Details on the syntax and semantics of AAWA are given in Appendix 6. We denote by *Hyper AAWA* the class of linear-time hyper sentences over the multi-trace specifications given by parity AAWA. We also consider the fixpoint calculus H_μ introduced in [18] that provides a logical characterization of Hyper AAWA.

3 Advances in Asynchronous Extensions of HyperLTL

In this section, we investigate expressiveness and decidability issues on known asynchronous extensions of HyperLTL, namely, *Asynchronous HyperLTL* [1], *Stuttering HyperLTL* [4], and *Context HyperLTL* [4].

3.1 Results for Asynchronous HyperLTL (A-HyperLTL)

We first recall A-HyperLTL [1], a syntactical extension of HyperLTL which allows to express pure asynchronous hyperproperties. Then, we show that although A-HyperLTL does not subsume HyperLTL, HyperLTL can be embedded into A-HyperLTL by means of an additional proposition. Second, we establish that A-HyperLTL is subsumed by Hyper AAWA and the fixpoint calculus H_μ . Finally, we show that unlike HyperLTL, single-trace satisfiability of A-HyperLTL is undecidable.

The logic A-HyperLTL models the asynchronous passage of time between computation traces using the notion of a trajectory. Given a non-empty subset $V \subseteq \text{VAR}$, a *trajectory over V* is an infinite sequence t of non-empty subsets of V . Intuitively, the positions $i \geq 0$ along t model the global time flow and for each position $i \geq 0$, $t(i)$ determines the trace variables in V whose associated traces make progress at time i . The trajectory t is *fair* if for each $x \in V$, there are infinitely many positions i such that $x \in t(i)$.

A-HyperLTL formulas are linear-time hyper sentences over multi-trace specifications ψ , called *A-HyperLTL quantifier-free formulas*, where ψ is of the form $E\theta$ or $A\theta$ and θ is a HyperLTL quantifier-free formula: E is the existential trajectory modality and A is the universal trajectory modality. Given a pointed trace assignment Π and a trajectory t over

$Dom(\Pi)$, the *successor* of (Π, t) , denoted by $(\Pi, t) + 1$, is defined as (Π', t') , where: (1) t' is the trajectory t^1 (the suffix of t from position 1), and (2) $Dom(\Pi') = Dom(\Pi)$ and for each $x \in Dom(\Pi)$ with $\Pi(x) = (\pi, i)$, $\Pi'(x) = (\pi, i + 1)$ if $x \in t(0)$, and $\Pi'(x) = \Pi(x)$ otherwise.

For each $k \geq 1$, we write $(\Pi, t) + k$ for denoting the pair (Π'', t'') obtained by k -applications of the successor function starting from (Π, t) . Given a HyperLTL quantifier-free formula θ such that $Dom(\Pi)$ contains the variables occurring in θ , the satisfaction relations $\Pi \models E\theta$, $\Pi \models A\theta$, and $(\Pi, t) \models \theta$ are defined as follows (we omit the semantics of the Boolean connectives):

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi \models E\theta &\Leftrightarrow \text{for some fair trajectory } t \text{ over } Dom(\Pi), (\Pi, t) \models \theta \\ \Pi \models A\theta &\Leftrightarrow \text{for all fair trajectories } t \text{ over } Dom(\Pi), (\Pi, t) \models \theta \\ (\Pi, t) \models p[x] &\Leftrightarrow \Pi(x) = (\pi, i) \text{ and } p \in \pi(i) \\ (\Pi, t) \models X\theta &\Leftrightarrow (\Pi, t) + 1 \models \theta \\ (\Pi, t) \models \theta_1 \cup \theta_2 &\Leftrightarrow \text{for some } i \geq 0 : (\Pi, t) + i \models \theta_2 \text{ and } (\Pi, t) + k \models \theta_1 \text{ for all } 0 \leq k < i \end{aligned}$$

We also exploit an alternative characterization of the semantics of quantifier-free A-HyperLTL formulas which easily follows from the definition of trajectories.

► **Proposition 3.1.** *Let θ be a quantifier-free HyperLTL formula over trace variables x_1, \dots, x_k , and let π_1, \dots, π_k be k traces. Then:*

- $\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_1, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\pi_k, 0)\} \models E\theta$ iff for all $i \in [1, k]$, there is a stuttering expansion π'_i of π_i such that $\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi'_1, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\pi'_k, 0)\} \models \theta$.
- $\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_1, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\pi_k, 0)\} \models A\theta$ iff for all $i \in [1, k]$ and for all stuttering expansions π'_i of π_i , it holds that $\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi'_1, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\pi'_k, 0)\} \models \theta$.

A-HyperLTL versus HyperLTL. We now show that, unlike other temporal logics for asynchronous hyperproperties (see Sections 3.2 and 3.3), A-HyperLTL does not subsume HyperLTL. Given an atomic proposition p , we consider the following linear-time hyperproperty.

p -synchronicity: a set \mathcal{L} of traces satisfies the p -synchronicity hyperproperty if for all traces $\pi, \pi' \in \mathcal{L}$ and positions $i \geq 0$, $p \in \pi(i)$ iff $p \in \pi'(i)$.

This hyperproperty can be expressed in HyperLTL as follows: $\forall x_1. \forall x_2. G(p[x_1] \leftrightarrow p[x_2])$. However, it cannot be expressed in A-HyperLTL (for details, see Appendix 7.1).

► **Theorem 3.2.** *A-HyperLTL cannot express p -synchronicity. Hence, A-HyperLTL does not subsume HyperLTL.*

Though A-HyperLTL does not subsume HyperLTL, we can embed HyperLTL into A-HyperLTL by using an additional proposition $\# \notin AP$ as follows. We can ensure that along a trajectory, traces progress at each global instant by requiring that proposition $\#$ holds exactly at the even positions. Formally, given a trace π over AP, we denote by $enc_{\#}(\pi)$ the trace over $AP \cup \{\#\}$ defined as: $enc_{\#}(\pi)(2i) = \pi(2i) \cup \{\#\}$ and $enc_{\#}(\pi)(2i + 1) = \pi(2i + 1)$ for all $i \geq 0$. We extend the encoding $enc_{\#}$ to sets of traces \mathcal{L} and assignments Π over AP in the obvious way. For each $x \in VAR$, let $\theta_{\#}(x)$ be the following one-variable quantifier-free HyperLTL formula: $\#[x] \wedge G(\#[x] \leftrightarrow \neg X\#[x])$. It is easy to see that for a trace ρ over $AP \cup \{\#\}$, a stuttering expansion ρ' of ρ satisfies $\theta_{\#}(x)$ with x bound to ρ' iff $\rho' = \rho$ and ρ is the $\#$ -encoding of some trace over AP. It follows that satisfiability of an HyperLTL formula φ can be reduced in linear-time to the satisfiability of the A-HyperLTL formula $\varphi_{\#}$ obtained from φ by replacing the quantifier-free part $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ of φ with the quantifier-free A-HyperLTL formula $E.(\psi(x_1, \dots, x_k) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [1, k]} \theta_{\#}(x_i))$. For model checking, given a Kripke structure $\mathcal{K} = \langle S, S_0, E, V \rangle$, we construct in linear-time a Kripke structure $\mathcal{K}_{\#}$ over $AP \cup \{\#\}$ such that $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}_{\#}) = enc_{\#}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}))$. Formally, $\mathcal{K}_{\#} = \langle S \times \{0, 1\}, S_0 \times \{1\}, E', V' \rangle$ where $E' = \{((s, b), (s', 1 - b)) \mid (s, s') \in E \text{ and } b = 0, 1\}$, $V'((s, 1)) = V(s) \cup \{\#\}$ and $V'((s, 0)) = V(s)$ for all $s \in S$. Thus, we obtain the following result.

► **Theorem 3.3.** *Satisfiability (resp., model checking) of HyperLTL can be reduced in linear-time to satisfiability (resp., model checking) of A-HyperLTL.*

A-HyperLTL versus Hyper AAWA and H_μ . We show that A-HyperLTL is subsumed by Hyper AAWA and H_μ . To this purpose, we exhibit an exponential-time translation of quantifier-free A-HyperLTL formulas into equivalent parity AAWA.

► **Theorem 3.4.** *Given an A-HyperLTL quantifier-free formula ψ with trace variables x_1, \dots, x_n , one can build in singly exponential time a parity nAAWA \mathcal{A}_ψ over 2^{AP} accepting the set of n -tuples (π_1, \dots, π_n) of traces such that $(\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_1, 0), \dots, x_n \leftarrow (\pi_n, 0)\}) \models \psi$.*

Proof sketch. We first assume that ψ is of the form $E\theta$ for some HyperLTL quantifier-free formula θ . By an adaptation of the standard automata theoretic approach for LTL [26], we construct a *nondeterministic nAAWA* (*nNAWA*) $\mathcal{A}_{E\theta}$ equipped with standard generalized Büchi acceptance conditions which accepts a n -tuple (π_1, \dots, π_n) of traces iff there is a fair trajectory t such that $(\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_1, 0), \dots, x_n \leftarrow (\pi_n, 0)\}), t \models \theta$. By standard arguments, a generalized Büchi nNAWA can be converted in quadratic time into an equivalent parity nNAWA. The behaviour of the automaton is subdivided into phases where each phase intuitively corresponds to a global timestamp. During a phase, $\mathcal{A}_{E\theta}$ keeps tracks in its state of the guessed set of subformulas of θ that hold at the current global instant and guesses which traces progress at the next global instant by moving along a non-empty guessed set of directions in $\{1, \dots, n\}$ in turns. In particular, after a movement along direction i , the automaton keeps track in its state of the previous chosen direction i and *either* moves to the next phase, *or* remains in the current phase by choosing a direction $j > i$. The transition function in moving from the end of a phase to the beginning of the next phase captures the semantics of the next modalities and the ‘local’ fixpoint characterization of the until modalities. Moreover, the generalized Büchi acceptance condition is used for ensuring the fulfillment of the liveness requirements θ_2 in the until sub-formulas $\theta_1 U \theta_2$, and for guaranteeing that the guessed trajectory is fair (i.e., for each direction $i \in [1, n]$, the automaton moves along i infinitely often). Details of the construction are given in Appendix 7.2.

Now, let us consider a quantifier-free A-HyperLTL formula of the form $A\theta$ with trace variables x_1, \dots, x_n , and let $\mathcal{A}_{E-\theta}$ be the parity nAAWA associated with the formula $E-\theta$. By [18], one can construct in linear-time (in the size of $\mathcal{A}_{E-\theta}$), a parity nAAWA $\mathcal{A}_{A\theta}$ accepting the complement of the language of n -tuples of traces accepted by $\mathcal{A}_{E-\theta}$. ◀

Thus, being H_μ and Hyper AAWA expressively equivalent, we obtain the following result.

► **Corollary 3.5.** *Hyper AAWA subsumes A-HyperLTL. H_μ also subsumes A-HyperLTL.*

Undecidability of single-trace satisfiability for A-HyperLTL. It is easy to see that for HyperLTL, single-trace satisfiability corresponds to LTL satisfiability (hence, it is PSPACE-complete). We show now that for A-HyperLTL, the problem is highly undecidable being at least Σ_1^1 -hard. The crucial observation is that we can enforce alignment requirements on distinct stuttering expansions of the same trace which allow to encode recurrent computations of *non-deterministic 2-counter machines* [19]. Recall that such a machine is a tuple $M = \langle Q, \Delta, \delta_{init}, \delta_{rec} \rangle$, where Q is a finite set of (control) locations, $\Delta \subseteq Q \times L \times Q$ is a transition relation over the instruction set $L = \{\text{inc}, \text{dec}, \text{if_zero}\} \times \{1, 2\}$, and $\delta_{init} \in \Delta$ and $\delta_{rec} \in \Delta$ are two designated transitions, the initial and the recurrent one.

An M -configuration is a pair (δ, ν) consisting of a transition $\delta \in \Delta$ and a counter valuation $\nu : \{1, 2\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. A computation of M is an *infinite* sequence of configurations of the form $((q_0, (op_0, c_0), q_1), \nu_0), ((q_1, (op_1, c_1), q_2), \nu_1), \dots$ such that for each $i \geq 0$:

- $\nu_{i+1}(3 - c_i) = \nu_i(3 - c_i)$;
- $\nu_{i+1}(c_i) = \nu_i(c_i) + 1$ if $op_i = \text{inc}$, and $\nu_{i+1}(c_i) = \nu_i(c_i) - 1$ if $op_i = \text{dec}$;
- $\nu_{i+1}(c_i) = \nu_i(c_i) = 0$ if $op_i = \text{if_zero}$.

The recurrence problem is to decide whether for a given machine M , there is a computation starting at the initial configuration (δ_{init}, ν_0) , where $\nu_0(c) = 0$ for each $c \in \{1, 2\}$, which visits δ_{rec} infinitely often. This problem is known to be Σ_1^1 -complete [19].

► **Theorem 3.6.** *The single-trace satisfiability problem of A-HyperLTL is at least Σ_1^1 -hard.*

Proof sketch. Let $M = \langle Q, \Delta, \delta_{init}, \delta_{rec} \rangle$ be a counter machine. We construct a two-variable A-HyperLTL formula φ_M such that M is a positive instance of the recurrence problem if and only if φ_M has a single-trace model. The set of atomic propositions is $\text{AP} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Delta \cup \{c_1, c_2, \#, beg, pad\}$. Intuitively, propositions c_1 and c_2 are used to encode the values of the two counters in M and $\#$ is used to ensure that the values of the counters are not modified in the stuttering expansions of a trace encoding a computation of M . Proposition beg marks the beginning of a configuration code, and proposition pad is exploited for encoding a padding word at the end of a configuration code: formula φ_M will ensure that only these words can be “expanded” in the stuttering expansions of a trace. Formally, an M -configuration (δ, ν) is encoded by the finite words over 2^{AP} (called *segments*) of the form $\{beg, \delta\}P_1 \dots P_m\{pad\}^k$, where $k \geq 1$, $m = \max(\nu(1), \nu(2))$, and for all $i \in [1, m]$,

- $\emptyset \neq P_i \subseteq \{\#, c_1, c_2\}$,
- $\# \in P_i$ iff i is odd, and
- for all $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$, $c_\ell \in P_i$ iff $i \leq \nu(\ell)$.

A computation ρ of M is then encoded by the traces obtained by concatenating the codes of the configurations along ρ starting from the first one. The A-HyperLTL formula φ_M is given by $\exists x_1 \exists x_2. \text{E} \psi$, where the quantifier-free HyperLTL formula ψ guarantees that for the two stuttering expansions π_1 and π_2 of the given trace π , the following holds:

- both π_1 and π_2 are infinite concatenations of segments;
- the first segment of π_1 encodes the initial configuration (δ_{init}, ν_0) of M and the second segment of π_1 encodes a configuration which is a successor of (δ_{init}, ν_0) in M ;
- δ_{rec} occurs infinitely often along π_1 ;
- for each $i \geq 2$, the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ segment s_2 of π_2 starts at the same position as the i^{th} segment s_1 of π_1 . Moreover, s_1 and s_2 have the same length and the configuration encoded by s_2 is a successor in M of the configuration encoded by s_1 .

Now, since π_1 and π_2 are stuttering expansions of the same trace π , the alternation requirement for proposition $\#$ in the encoding of an M -configurations ensures that π_1 and π_2 encode the same infinite sequence of M -configurations. Hence, φ_M has a single-trace model if and only if M is a positive instance of the recurrence problem. Details appear in Appendix 7.3. ◀

3.2 Results for Stuttering HyperLTL (HyperLTL_S)

Stuttering HyperLTL (HyperLTL_S) [4] is an asynchronous extension of HyperLTL obtained by using *stutter-relativized* versions of the temporal modalities w.r.t. finite sets Γ of LTL formulas. In this section, we show that A-HyperLTL and HyperLTL_S are expressively incomparable.

In HyperLTL_S, the notion of successor of a position i along a trace π is relativized using a finite set Γ of LTL formulas. If in the interval $[i, \infty[$, the truth value of each formula in Γ does not change along π (i.e., for each $j \geq i$ and for each $\theta \in \Gamma$, $(\pi, i) \models \theta$ iff $(\pi, j) \models \theta$), then the Γ -successor of i in π coincides with the local successor $i + 1$. Otherwise, the Γ -successor of i in π is the smallest position $j > i$ such that the truth value of some formula θ in Γ changes in moving from i to j (i.e., for some $\theta \in \Gamma$, $(\pi, i) \models \theta$ iff $(\pi, j) \not\models \theta$). The Γ -successor induces

a trace, called Γ -stutter trace of π and denoted by $stfr_{\Gamma}(\pi)$, obtained from π by repeatedly applying the Γ -successor starting from position 0, i.e. $stfr_{\Gamma}(\pi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \pi(i_0)\pi(i_1)\dots$, where $i_0 = 0$ and i_{k+1} is the Γ -successor of i_k in π for all $k \geq 0$. Note that $stfr_{\Gamma}(\pi) = \pi$ if $\Gamma = \emptyset$. Given a pointed-trace assignment Π , the Γ -successor $succ_{\Gamma}(\Pi)$ of Π is the pointed trace-assignment with domain $Dom(\Pi)$ defined as follows for each $x \in Dom(\Pi)$: if $\Pi(x) = (\pi, i)$, then $succ_{\Gamma}(\Pi) = (\pi, \ell)$ where ℓ is the Γ -successor of i in π . For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we use $succ_{\Gamma}^j$ for the function obtained by j applications of the function $succ_{\Gamma}$.

HyperLTL_S formulas are linear-time hyper sentences over multi-trace specifications ψ , called *HyperLTL_S quantifier-free formulas*, where the syntax of ψ is as follows:

$$\psi ::= \top \mid p[x] \mid \neg\psi \mid \psi \wedge \psi \mid X_{\Gamma}\psi \mid \psi U_{\Gamma}\psi$$

where $p \in \text{AP}$, $x \in \text{VAR}$, Γ is a finite set of LTL formulas over AP , and X_{Γ} and U_{Γ} are the stutter-relativized versions of the LTL temporal modalities. Informally, the relativized temporal modalities X_{Γ} and U_{Γ} are evaluated by a lockstepwise traversal of the Γ -stutter traces associated with the currently quantified traces. Standard HyperLTL corresponds to the fragment of HyperLTL_S where the subscript of each temporal modality is the empty set \emptyset .

Given a HyperLTL_S quantifier-free formula ψ and a pointed trace assignment Π such that $Dom(\Pi)$ contains the trace variables occurring in ψ , the satisfaction relation $\Pi \models \psi$ is inductively defined as follows (we omit the semantics of the Boolean connectives):

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi \models p[x] &\Leftrightarrow \Pi(x) = (\pi, i) \text{ and } p \in \pi(i) \\ \Pi \models X_{\Gamma}\psi &\Leftrightarrow succ_{\Gamma}(\Pi) \models \psi \\ \Pi \models \psi_1 U_{\Gamma}\psi_2 &\Leftrightarrow \text{for some } i \geq 0 : succ_{\Gamma}^i(\Pi) \models \psi_2 \text{ and } succ_{\Gamma}^k(\Pi) \models \psi_1 \text{ for all } 0 \leq k < i \end{aligned}$$

Stuttering LTL formulas, corresponding to one-variable HyperLTL_S quantifier-free formulas, can be translated in polynomial time into equivalent LTL formulas (see [4]). Thus, since LTL satisfiability is PSPACE-complete, the following result holds.

► **Proposition 3.7.** *The trace properties definable by HyperLTL_S formulas are LTL definable, and single-trace satisfiability of HyperLTL_S is PSPACE-complete.*

HyperLTL_S versus A-HyperLTL. We show that HyperLTL_S and A-HyperLTL are expressively incomparable even over singleton sets of atomic propositions. By Theorem 3.2, unlike HyperLTL_S , A-HyperLTL does not subsume HyperLTL even when $|\text{AP}| = 1$. Hence, HyperLTL_S is not subsumed by A-HyperLTL even when $|\text{AP}| = 1$. We show now that the converse holds as well. Intuitively, A-HyperLTL can encode counting mechanisms which cannot be expressed in HyperLTL_S . Let $\text{AP} = \{p\}$. We exhibit two families $\{\mathcal{L}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ and $\{\mathcal{L}'_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ of trace sets and an A-HyperLTL formula φ_A such that

- φ_A can distinguish the traces set \mathcal{L}_n and \mathcal{L}'_n for each $n \geq 1$, but
- for each HyperLTL_S formula ψ , there is n such that ψ does not distinguish \mathcal{L}_n and \mathcal{L}'_n .

For each $n \geq 1$, let π_n , ρ_n , and ρ'_n be the traces defined as:

$$\pi_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\emptyset \cdot p)^n \cdot \emptyset^{\omega} \quad \rho_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\emptyset \cdot p)^{2n} \cdot \emptyset^{\omega} \quad \rho'_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\emptyset \cdot p)^{2n+1} \cdot \emptyset^{\omega}$$

For each $n \geq 1$, define $\mathcal{L}_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\pi_n, \rho_n\}$ and $\mathcal{L}'_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\pi_n, \rho'_n\}$. Let $\psi_1(x)$ and $\psi_2(x)$ be two one-variable quantifier-free HyperLTL formulas capturing the following requirements:

- $\psi_1(x)$ captures traces of the form $(\emptyset \cdot p)^k \cdot \emptyset^{\omega}$ for some $k \geq 1$,
- $\psi_2(x)$ captures traces of the form $(\emptyset^2 \cdot p^2)^k \cdot \emptyset^{\omega}$ for some $k \geq 1$.

Let $\psi(x, y)$ be the two-variable quantifier-free HyperLTL formula defined as follows:

$$\psi(x, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(p[x] \wedge p[y] \wedge XG(\neg p[x] \wedge \neg p[y]))$$

Intuitively, if x is bound to a trace ν_1 satisfying ψ_1 and y is bound to a trace ν_2 satisfying ψ_2 , then $\psi(x, y)$ holds iff ν_1 is of the form $(\emptyset \cdot p)^{2k}$ and ν_2 is of the form $(\emptyset^2 \cdot p^2)^k$ for some $k \geq 1$. The A-HyperLTL formula φ_A is then defined as follows:

$$\varphi_A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall x_1. \forall x_2. \text{E} \left([\psi(x_1, x_2) \wedge \psi_1(x_1) \wedge \psi_1(x_2)] \vee [\psi(x_1, x_2) \wedge \bigvee_{i \in \{1, 2\}} (\psi_1(x_i) \wedge \psi_2(x_{3-i}))] \right)$$

Let π a trace of the form $\pi = (\emptyset \cdot p)^k \cdot \emptyset^\omega$ for some $k \geq 1$. We observe that the unique stuttering expansion ν_1 of π such that ν_1 satisfies $\psi_1(x)$ is π itself. Similarly, there is a unique stuttering expansion ν_2 of π such that ν_2 satisfies $\psi_2(x)$, and such a trace ν_2 is given by $(\emptyset^2 \cdot p^2)^k \cdot \emptyset^\omega$. Fix $n \geq 1$. Let us consider the trace set $\mathcal{L}_n = \{\pi_n, \rho_n\}$. By construction, if both variables x_1 and x_2 in the definition of φ_A are bound to the same trace π in \mathcal{L}_n , then the first disjunct in the definition of φ_A is fulfilled by taking π itself as an expansion of π . On the other hand, assume that variable x_1 (resp., x_2) is bound to trace π_n and variable x_2 (resp., x_1) is bound to trace ρ_n . In this case, by taking as stuttering expansion of π_n the trace $(\emptyset^2 \cdot p^2)^n \cdot \emptyset^\omega$ and as stuttering expansion of $\rho_n = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{2n} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$ the trace ρ_n itself, the second disjunct in the definition of φ_A is fulfilled. Hence, \mathcal{L}_n is a model of φ_A .

Now, we show that $\mathcal{L}'_n = \{\pi_n, \rho'_n\}$ does not satisfy φ_A . Let us consider the mapping assigning to variable x_1 the trace π_n and to variable x_2 the trace ρ'_n . With this mapping, the quantifier-free part of φ_A cannot be fulfilled. This because the unique stuttering expansion of $\pi_n = (\emptyset \cdot p)^n \cdot \emptyset^\omega$ (resp., $\rho'_n = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{2n+1} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$) satisfying ψ_1 is π_n (resp., ρ'_n) itself. Moreover, the unique stuttering expansion of π_n (resp., ρ'_n) satisfying ψ_2 is $(\emptyset^2 \cdot p^2)^n \cdot \emptyset^\omega$ (resp., $(\emptyset^2 \cdot p^2)^{2n+1} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$). Hence, for all $n \geq 1$, $\mathcal{L}_n \models \varphi_A$ and $\mathcal{L}'_n \not\models \varphi_A$. On the other hand, one can show that the following holds (for details, see Appendix 8.1).

► **Proposition 3.8.** *For each HyperLTL_S formula ψ , there is $n \geq 1$ s.t. $\mathcal{L}_n \models \psi$ iff $\mathcal{L}'_n \models \psi$.*

Thus, since A-HyperLTL does not subsume HyperLTL_S, we obtain the following result.

► **Corollary 3.9.** *A-HyperLTL and HyperLTL_S are expressively incomparable.*

3.3 Results for Context HyperLTL (HyperLTL_C)

Context HyperLTL (HyperLTL_C) [4] extends HyperLTL by unary modalities $\langle C \rangle$ parameterized by a non-empty subset C of trace variables—called the *context*—which restrict the evaluation of the temporal modalities to the traces associated with the variables in C . We show that HyperLTL_C is not subsumed by A-HyperLTL or HyperLTL_S, and single-trace satisfiability of HyperLTL_C is undecidable. Moreover, we provide a characterization of the *finite trace properties* denoted by HyperLTL_C formulas in terms of the extension FO_f[<, +] of standard first-order logic FO_f[<] over finite words with *addition*. We also establish that the variant of FO_f[<, +] over infinite words characterizes the trace properties expressible in the extension of HyperLTL_C with past temporal modalities. Finally, we identify a fragment of HyperLTL_C which subsumes HyperLTL and for which model checking is decidable.

HyperLTL_C formulas are linear-time hyper sentences over multi-trace specifications ψ , called *HyperLTL_C quantifier-free formulas*, where the syntax of ψ is as follows:

$$\psi ::= \top \mid p[x] \mid \neg\psi \mid \psi \wedge \psi \mid \text{X}\psi \mid \psi \text{U}\psi \mid \langle C \rangle \psi$$

where $p \in \text{AP}$, $x \in \text{VAR}$, and $\langle C \rangle$ is the context modality with $\emptyset \neq C \subseteq \text{VAR}$. A context C is *global for a formula φ* if C contains all the trace variables occurring in φ . Let Π be a pointed-trace assignment. Given a context C and an offset $i \geq 0$, we denote by $\Pi +_C i$ the

pointed-trace assignment with domain $Dom(\Pi)$ defined as follows. For each $x \in Dom(\Pi)$, where $\Pi(x) = (\pi, h)$: $[\Pi +_C i](x) = (\pi, h + i)$ if $x \in C$, and $[\Pi +_C i](x) = \Pi(x)$ otherwise. Intuitively, the positions of the pointed traces associated with the variables in C advance of the offset i , while the positions of the other pointed traces remain unchanged. Let ψ be a HyperLTL_C quantifier-free formula such that $Dom(\Pi)$ contains the variables occurring in ψ . The satisfaction relation $(\Pi, C) \models \psi$ is defined as follows (we omit the semantics of the Boolean connectives):

$$\begin{aligned} (\Pi, C) \models p[x] &\Leftrightarrow \Pi(x) = (\pi, i) \text{ and } p \in \pi(i) \\ (\Pi, C) \models \mathbf{X}\psi &\Leftrightarrow (\Pi +_C 1, C) \models \psi \\ (\Pi, C) \models \psi_1 \mathbf{U} \psi_2 &\Leftrightarrow \text{for some } i \geq 0 : (\Pi +_C i, C) \models \psi_2 \text{ and } (\Pi +_C k, C) \models \psi_1 \text{ for all } k < i \\ (\Pi, C) \models \langle C' \rangle \psi &\Leftrightarrow (\Pi, C') \models \psi \end{aligned}$$

We write $\Pi \models \psi$ to mean that $(\Pi, \text{VAR}) \models \psi$.

HyperLTL_C versus A-HyperLTL and HyperLTL_S. We show that HyperLTL_C is able to capture powerful non-regular trace properties which cannot be expressed in A-HyperLTL or in HyperLTL_S . In particular, we consider the following trace property over $\text{AP} = \{p\}$:

Suffix Property: a trace π satisfies the suffix property if π has a proper suffix π^i for some $i > 0$ such that $\pi^i = \pi$.

This property can be expressed in HyperLTL_C by the following formula

$$\varphi_{\text{suffix}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall x_1. \forall x_2. \bigwedge_{p \in \text{AP}} \mathbf{G}(p[x_1] \leftrightarrow p[x_2]) \wedge \{x_2\} \mathbf{FX}\{x_1, x_2\} \bigwedge_{p \in \text{AP}} \mathbf{G}(p[x_1] \leftrightarrow p[x_2])$$

We show that no A-HyperLTL and no HyperLTL_S formula is equivalent to φ_{suffix} .

► **Theorem 3.10.** *A-HyperLTL and HyperLTL_S cannot express the suffix property. Hence, HyperLTL_C is not subsumed by A-HyperLTL or by HyperLTL_S.*

Proof sketch. By Proposition 3.7, the set of single-trace models of a HyperLTL_S formula is regular. Thus, since the suffix trace property is not regular, the result for HyperLTL_S follows.

Consider now A-HyperLTL . For each $n \geq 1$, let $\pi_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (p^n \cdot \emptyset)^\omega$ and $\pi'_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} p^{n+1} \cdot \emptyset \cdot (p^n \cdot \emptyset)^\omega$. By construction π_n satisfies the suffix property but π'_n not. Hence, for each $n \geq 1$, the HyperLTL_C formula φ_{suffix} distinguishes the singleton sets $\{\pi_n\}$ and $\{\pi'_n\}$. On the other hand, we can show the following result, hence, Theorem 3.10 directly follows (a proof of the following claim is given in Appendix 9.1).

Claim. For each A-HyperLTL formula ψ , there is $n \geq 1$ such that $\{\pi_n\} \models \psi$ iff $\{\pi'_n\} \models \psi$. ◀

Single-trace satisfiability and characterization of HyperLTL_C finite-trace properties. Like A-HyperLTL , and unlike HyperLTL and HyperLTL_S , single-trace satisfiability of HyperLTL_C turns out to be undecidable. In particular, by a straightforward adaptation of the undecidability proof in [4] for model checking HyperLTL_C , one can reduce the recurrence problem in Minsky counter machines [19] to single-trace satisfiability of HyperLTL_C .

► **Theorem 3.11.** *The single-trace satisfiability problem for A-HyperLTL is Σ_1^1 -hard.*

A finite trace (over AP) is a finite non-empty word over 2^{AP} . By adding a fresh proposition $\# \notin \text{AP}$, a finite trace can be encoded by the trace $\text{enc}(w)$ over $\text{AP} \cup \{\#\}$ given by $w \cdot \{\#\}^\omega$. Given a HyperLTL_C formula φ over $\text{AP} \cup \{\#\}$, the *finite-trace property denoted by φ* is the language $\mathcal{L}_f(\varphi)$ of finite traces w over AP such that the single-trace model $\{\text{enc}(w)\}$ satisfies φ . We provide now a characterization of the finite-trace properties denoted by HyperLTL_C formulas over $\text{AP} \cup \{\#\}$ in terms of the extension $\text{FO}_f[\langle, + \rangle]$ of standard

first-order logic $\text{FO}_f[<]$ over finite words on 2^{AP} with addition. Formally, $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$ is a first-order logic with equality over the signature $\{<, +\} \cup \{P_a \mid a \in \text{AP}\}$, where the atomic formulas ψ have the following syntax with x, y and z being first-order variables: $\psi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x = y \mid x < y \mid z = y + x \mid P_a(x)$. A $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$ sentence (i.e., a $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$ formula with no free variables) is interpreted over finite traces w , where: (i) variables ranges over the set $\{0, \dots, |w| - 1\}$ of positions of w , (ii) the binary predicate $<$ is the natural ordering on $\{0, \dots, |w| - 1\}$, and (iii) the predicates $z = y + x$ and $P_a(x)$ are interpreted in the obvious way. We establish the following result.

► **Theorem 3.12.** *Given a $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$ sentence φ over AP , one can construct in polynomial time a HyperLTL_C formula ψ over $\text{AP} \cup \{\#\}$ such that $\mathcal{L}_f(\psi)$ is the set of models of φ . Vice versa, given a HyperLTL_C formula ψ over $\text{AP} \cup \{\#\}$, one can construct in single exponential time a $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$ sentence φ whose set of models is $\mathcal{L}_f(\psi)$.*

Intuitively, when a HyperLTL_C formula ψ over $\text{AP} \cup \{\#\}$ is interpreted over singleton models $\{\text{enc}(w)\}$ for a given finite trace w , the trace variables in the quantifier-free part of ψ and the temporal modalities evaluated in different contexts can simulate quantification over positions in w and the atomic formulas of $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$. In particular, the addition predicate $z = x + y$ can be simulated by requiring that two segments of w whose endpoints are referenced by trace variables have the same length: this is done by shifting with the eventually modality in a suitable context the left segment of a non-negative offset, and by checking that the endpoints of the resulting segments coincide. Note that for trace variables x and y which refer to positions i and j of w , one can require that i and j coincide by the HyperLTL_C formula $\{x, y\}F(\neg\#[x] \wedge \neg\#[y] \wedge X(\#[x] \wedge \#[y]))$. A detailed proof of Theorem 3.12 is given in Appendix 9.2. Similarly, if we consider the extension of HyperLTL_C with the past counterparts of the temporal modalities, then the trace properties denoted by past HyperLTL_C formulas correspond to the ones denoted by sentences in the variant $\text{FO}[<, +]$ of $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$ over infinite words on 2^{AP} (traces). For arbitrary traces, past temporal modalities are crucial for enforcing that two variables refer to the same position (for details see Appendix 9.3).

► **Theorem 3.13.** *Past HyperLTL_C and $\text{FO}[<, +]$ capture the same class of trace properties.*

Results about model checking HyperLTL_C . Model checking HyperLTL_C is known to be undecidable even for formulas where the unique temporal modality occurring in the scope of a non-global context is F . For the fragment where the unique temporal modality occurring in a non-global context is X , then the problem is decidable. This fragment has the same expressiveness as HyperLTL but it is exponentially more succinct than HyperLTL [4]. We provide now new insights on model checking HyperLTL_C . On the negative side, we show that model checking is undecidable even for the fragment \mathcal{U} consisting of two-variable quantifier alternation-free formulas of the form $\exists x_1. \exists x_2. \psi_0 \wedge \{x_2\}F\{x_1, x_2\}\psi$, where ψ_0 and ψ are quantifier-free HyperLTL formulas. A proof of Theorem 3.14 is in Appendix 9.4.

► **Theorem 3.14.** *Model-checking against the fragment \mathcal{U} of HyperLTL_C is Σ_0^1 -hard.*

By Theorem 3.14, HyperLTL_C model checking becomes undecidable whenever in a formula a non-singleton context C occurs within a distinct context $C' \neq C$. Thus, we consider the fragment of HyperLTL_C , called *simple HyperLTL_C* , where each context C which occurs in a distinct context $C' \neq C$ is a singleton. Note that simple HyperLTL_C subsumes HyperLTL .

► **Theorem 3.15.** *The model checking problem of simple HyperLTL_C is decidable.*

Theorem 3.15 is proved by a polynomial time translation of simple HyperLTL_C formulas into equivalent sentences of *first-order logic $\text{FO}[<, E]$ with the equal-level predicate E* [14]

whose model checking problem is known to be decidable [7]. This logic is interpreted over sets \mathcal{L} of traces, and first-order variables refer to pointed traces over \mathcal{L} . In simple HyperLTL_C , the evaluation of temporal modalities is subdivided in two phases. In the first phase, modalities are evaluated by a synchronous traversal of the traces bound to the variables in a non-singleton context. In the second phase, the temporal modalities are evaluated along a single trace and singleton contexts allows to switch from a trace to another one by enforcing a weak form of mutual temporal relation. This behaviour can be encoded in $\text{FO}[\langle, E]$ (for details, see Appendix 9.5).

3.4 H_μ versus A-HyperLTL, HyperLTL_S , and HyperLTL_C

Both HyperLTL_S and HyperLTL_C are subsumed by H_μ and Hyper AAWA [4]. In particular, quantifier-free formulas of HyperLTL_S and HyperLTL_C can be translated in polynomial time into equivalent Büchi AAWA. Corollary 3.5 shows that A-HyperLTL is subsumed by H_μ as well. Thus, since A-HyperLTL and HyperLTL_S are expressively incomparable (by Corollary 3.9), there is an H_μ formula which cannot be expressed in A-HyperLTL (resp., HyperLTL_S). Therefore, we obtain the following corollary.

► **Corollary 3.16.** *H_μ is strictly more expressive than A-HyperLTL and HyperLTL_S , and subsumes HyperLTL_C .*

4 Asynchronous vs Synchronous Extensions of HyperLTL

We compare now the expressiveness of the asynchronous extensions of HyperLTL against $\text{S1S}[E]$ [7]. $\text{S1S}[E]$ is a monadic second-order logic with equality over the signature $\{\langle, E\} \cup \{P_a \mid a \in \text{AP}\}$ which syntactically extends the monadic second-order logic of one successor S1S with the equal-level binary predicate E . While S1S is interpreted over traces, $\text{S1S}[E]$ is interpreted over sets of traces. A set \mathcal{L} of traces induces the relational structure with domain $\mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{N}$ (i.e., the set of pointed traces associated with \mathcal{L}), where

- the binary predicate \langle is interpreted as the set of pairs of pointed traces in $\mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{N}$ of the form $((\pi, i_1), (\pi, i_2))$ such that $i_1 < i_2$, and
- the equal-level predicate E is interpreted as the set of pairs of pointed traces in $\mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{N}$ of the form $((\pi_1, i), (\pi_2, i))$.

Hence, \langle allows to compare distinct timestamps along the same trace, while the equal-level predicate allows to compare distinct traces at the same timestamp. For a formal definition of the syntax and semantics of $\text{S1S}[E]$, see Appendix 10.1.

We show that the considered asynchronous extensions of HyperLTL are not subsumed by $\text{S1S}[E]$. Intuitively, for some $k \geq 1$, the logic A-HyperLTL (resp., HyperLTL_S , resp., HyperLTL_C) can express hyperproperties whose set of models having cardinality k (k -models) can be encoded by a non-regular set of traces. On the other hand, we show that the encoding of the k -models of a $\text{S1S}[E]$ formula always leads to a regular language.

Let $k \geq 1$. We consider the set of atomic propositions given by $\text{AP} \times [1, k]$ for encoding sets \mathcal{L} of traces (over AP) having cardinality k by traces over $\text{AP} \times [1, k]$.

A trace ν over $\text{AP} \times [1, k]$ is *well-formed* if for all $\ell, \ell' \in [1, k]$ with $\ell \neq \ell'$, there is $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \in \text{AP}$ so that $(p, \ell) \in \nu(i)$ iff $(p, \ell') \notin \nu(i)$. A well-formed trace ν over $\text{AP} \times [1, k]$ encodes the set $\mathcal{L}(\nu)$ of the traces π (over AP) such that there is $\ell \in [1, k]$ where π corresponds to the projection of ν over $\text{AP} \times \{\ell\}$, i.e. for each $i \geq 0$, $\pi(i) = \{p \in \text{AP} \mid (p, \ell) \in \nu(i)\}$. Since ν is well-formed, $|\mathcal{L}(\nu)| = k$ and we say that ν is a k -code of $\mathcal{L}(\nu)$. Note that for a set \mathcal{L} of traces (over AP) of cardinality k , each ordering of the traces in \mathcal{L} induces a distinct k -code.

Given an hyperproperty specification ξ over AP, a k -model of ξ is a set of traces satisfying ξ having cardinality k . The k -language of ξ is the set of k -codes associated with the k -models of ξ . The specification ξ is k -regular if its k -language is a regular language over $\text{AP} \times [1, k]$.

We first show that for each $k \geq 1$, S1S[E] sentences are k -regular.

► **Lemma 4.1.** *Let $k \geq 1$ and φ be a S1S[E] sentence over AP. Then, one can construct a S1S sentence φ' over $\text{AP} \times [1, k]$ whose set of models is the k -language of φ .*

A proof of Lemma 4.1 is in Appendix 10.2. Since S1S sentences capture only regular languages of traces, by Lemma 4.1, we obtain the following result.

► **Proposition 4.2.** *Let $k \geq 1$ and φ be a S1S[E] sentence over AP. Then, φ is k -regular.*

We now show that given one of the considered asynchronous extensions L of HyperLTL, there is $k \geq 1$ and a L formula φ such that φ is not k -regular.

► **Proposition 4.3.** *There is a HyperLTL_C formula over $\{p\}$ which is not 1-regular, and there are A-HyperLTL and HyperLTL_S formulas over $\{p\}$ which are not 2-regular.*

Proof. Let $\text{AP} = \{p\}$. The HyperLTL_C formula φ_{suff} defined in Section 3.3 whose models consist of the singletons $\{\pi\}$ such that π satisfies the suffix property is not 1-regular.

Consider now A-HyperLTL and HyperLTL_S. For all $k, n \geq 1$, let $\pi_{k,n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \emptyset^k \cdot (\{p\} \cdot \emptyset)^n \cdot \emptyset^\omega$ and $\mathcal{L}_{k,n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\pi_{1,n}, \pi_{k,n}\}$. We denote by \mathcal{L}_2 the set of traces over $\text{AP} \times [1, 2]$ which are 2-codes of the sets $\mathcal{L}_{k,n}$ for $k > 1$ and $n \geq 1$. Clearly, \mathcal{L}_2 is not regular. Let $\theta(x)$ be a one-variable quantifier-free HyperLTL formula capturing the traces $\pi_{k,n}$ for $k, n \geq 1$. We define a HyperLTL_S formula ψ_S and an A-HyperLTL formula ψ_A whose 2-language is \mathcal{L}_2 :

$$\psi_S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists x_1. \forall x_2. \mathbf{X}p[x_1] \wedge \theta(x_1) \wedge \theta(x_2) \wedge \mathbf{G}_{\{p\}}(p[x_1] \leftrightarrow p[x_2]);$$

$$\psi_A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists x_1. \forall x_2. \forall x_3. \mathbf{E}. \mathbf{X}p[x_1] \wedge \theta(x_2) \wedge \theta(x_3) \wedge \mathbf{G}(p[x_2] \leftrightarrow p[x_3]). \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

By Propositions 4.2 and 4.3, and since A-HyperLTL, HyperLTL_S, and HyperLTL_C are subsumed by H_μ (Corollary 3.16), we obtain the following result.

► **Corollary 4.4.** *A-HyperLTL, HyperLTL_S, HyperLTL_C, and H_μ are not subsumed by S1S[E].*

5 Conclusions

Two interesting questions are left open. The first concerns the expressiveness of HyperLTL_C versus A-HyperLTL and HyperLTL_S. We have shown that HyperLTL_C is not subsumed by A-HyperLTL or HyperLTL_S. We conjecture that the converse holds too. The motivation is that (unlike HyperLTL_C) A-HyperLTL and HyperLTL_S implicitly allow a restricted form of monadic second-order quantification. In particular, we conjecture that the hyperproperty characterizing the sets consisting of stuttering-equivalent traces, which can be easily expressed both in A-HyperLTL and HyperLTL_S, cannot be captured by HyperLTL_C.

The second question is whether S1S[E] is subsumed or not by H_μ . It is known that contrary to S1S[E] and FO[<,E], HyperLTL cannot express requirements which relate at some point an unbounded number of traces [3]. The main reason is that—differently from S1S[E] and FO[<,E]—quantifiers in HyperLTL only refer to the initial positions of the traces. Since in H_μ the semantics of quantifiers is the same as HyperLTL, we conjecture that the inexpressiveness result for HyperLTL in [3] can be extended to H_μ as well. This would imply together with the results of Corollary 4.4 that S1S[E] and H_μ are expressively incomparable and that so are FO[<,E] and H_μ .

References

- 1 J. Baumeister, N. Coenen, B. Bonakdarpour, B. Finkbeiner, and C. Sánchez. A Temporal Logic for Asynchronous Hyperproperties. In *Proc. 33rd CAV*, LNCS 12759, pages 694–717. Springer, 2021. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-81685-8_33.
- 2 B. Bonakdarpour, C. Sánchez, and G. Schneider. Monitoring Hyperproperties by Combining Static Analysis and Runtime Verification. In *Proc. 8th IsoLA*, LNCS 11245, pages 8–27. Springer, 2018. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-03421-4_2.
- 3 L. Bozzelli, B. Maubert, and S. Pinchinat. Unifying Hyper and Epistemic Temporal Logics. In *Proc. 18th FoSSaCS*, LNCS 9034, pages 167–182. Springer, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-46678-0_11.
- 4 L. Bozzelli, A. Peron, and C. Sánchez. Asynchronous Extensions of HyperLTL. In *Proc. 36th LICS*, pages 1–13. IEEE, 2021. doi:10.1109/LICS52264.2021.9470583.
- 5 M.R. Clarkson, B. Finkbeiner, M. Koleini, K.K. Micinski, M.N. Rabe, and C. Sánchez. Temporal Logics for Hyperproperties. In *Proc. 3rd POST*, LNCS 8414, pages 265–284. Springer, 2014. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-54792-8_15.
- 6 M.R. Clarkson and F.B. Schneider. Hyperproperties. *Journal of Computer Security*, 18(6):1157–1210, 2010. doi:10.3233/JCS-2009-0393.
- 7 N. Coenen, B. Finkbeiner, C. Hahn, and J. Hofmann. The hierarchy of hyperlogics. In *Proc. 34th LICS*, pages 1–13. IEEE, 2019. doi:10.1109/LICS.2019.8785713.
- 8 S. Demri, V. Goranko, and M. Lange. *Temporal Logics in Computer Science: Finite-State Systems*. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science. Cambridge University Press, 2016. doi:10.1017/CB09781139236119.
- 9 R. Dimitrova, B. Finkbeiner, M. Kovács, M.N. Rabe, and H. Seidl. Model Checking Information Flow in Reactive Systems. In *Proc. 13th VMCAI*, LNCS 7148, pages 169–185. Springer, 2012. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-27940-9_12.
- 10 E.A. Emerson and J.Y. Halpern. "Sometimes" and "Not Never" revisited: on branching versus linear time temporal logic. *J. ACM*, 33(1):151–178, 1986. doi:10.1145/4904.4999.
- 11 B. Finkbeiner and C. Hahn. Deciding Hyperproperties. In *Proc. 27th CONCUR*, LIPIcs 59, pages 13:1–13:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2016. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2016.13.
- 12 B. Finkbeiner, C. Hahn, P. Lukert, M. Stenger, and L. Tentrup. Synthesis from hyperproperties. *Acta Informatica*, 57(1-2):137–163, 2020. doi:10.1007/s00236-019-00358-2.
- 13 B. Finkbeiner, M.N. Rabe, and C. Sánchez. Algorithms for Model Checking HyperLTL and HyperCTL*. In *Proc. 27th CAV Part I*, LNCS 9206, pages 30–48. Springer, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-21690-4_3.
- 14 B. Finkbeiner and M. Zimmermann. The first-order logic of hyperproperties. In *Proc. 34th STACS*, LIPIcs 66, pages 30:1–30:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2017.30.
- 15 M.J. Fischer and R.E. Ladner. Propositional Dynamic Logic of Regular Programs. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 18(2):194–211, 1979. doi:10.1016/0022-0000(79)90046-1.
- 16 J.A. Goguen and J. Meseguer. Security Policies and Security Models. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 11–20. IEEE Computer Society, 1982. doi:10.1109/SP.1982.10014.
- 17 J. Oliver. Gutsfeld, M. Müller-Olm, and C. Ohrem. Propositional dynamic logic for hyperproperties. In *Proc. 31st CONCUR*, LIPIcs 171, pages 50:1–50:22. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2020.50.
- 18 J. Oliver. Gutsfeld, M. Müller-Olm, and C. Ohrem. Automata and fixpoints for asynchronous hyperproperties. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 4(POPL), 2021. doi:10.1145/3434319.
- 19 D. Harel. Effective transformations on infinite trees, with applications to high undecidability, dominoes, and fairness. *J. ACM*, 33(1):224–248, 1986. doi:10.1145/4904.4993.

- 20 A. Krebs, A. Meier, J. Virtema, and M. Zimmermann. Team Semantics for the Specification and Verification of Hyperproperties. In *Proc. 43rd MFCS*, LIPIcs 117, pages 10:1–10:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.MFCS.2018.10.
- 21 M. Lück. On the complexity of linear temporal logic with team semantics. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 837:1–25, 2020. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2020.04.019.
- 22 J. McLean. A General Theory of Composition for a Class of "Possibilistic" Properties. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, 22(1):53–67, 1996. doi:10.1109/32.481534.
- 23 A. Pnueli. The Temporal Logic of Programs. In *Proc. 18th FOCS*, pages 46–57. IEEE Computer Society, 1977. doi:10.1109/SFCS.1977.32.
- 24 M.N. Rabe. *A temporal logic approach to information-flow control*. PhD thesis, Saarland University, 2016.
- 25 A.P. Sistla, M.Y. Vardi, and P. Wolper. The Complementation Problem for Büchi Automata with Applications to Temporal Logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 49:217–237, 1987. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(87)90008-9.
- 26 M. Y. Vardi and P. Wolper. Reasoning about infinite computations. *Inf. Comput.*, 115(1):1–37, 1994. doi:10.1006/inco.1994.1092.
- 27 J. Virtema, J. Hofmann, B. Finkbeiner, J. Kontinen, and F. Yang. Linear-Time Temporal Logic with Team Semantics: Expressivity and Complexity. In *Proc. 41st IARCS FSTTCS*, LIPIcs 213, pages 52:1–52:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.FSTTCS.2021.52.
- 28 S. Zdancewic and A.C. Myers. Observational Determinism for Concurrent Program Security. In *Proc. 16th IEEE CSFW-16*, pages 29–43. IEEE Computer Society, 2003. doi:10.1109/CSFW.2003.1212703.

Appendix

6 Syntax and semantics of AAWA

We recall the syntax and semantics of parity AAWA [18]. We need additional definitions.

For a set X , $\mathbb{B}^+(X)$ denotes the set of *positive* Boolean formulas over X , i.e. Boolean formulas built from elements in X using \vee and \wedge (we also allow the formulas **true** and **false**). A subset Y of X *satisfies* $\theta \in \mathbb{B}^+(X)$ iff the truth assignment that assigns **true** to the elements in Y and **false** to the elements of $X \setminus Y$ satisfies θ .

Labeled trees. A tree T is a prefix closed subset of \mathbb{N}^* . Elements of T are called nodes and ε (the empty word) is the root of T . For $x \in T$, the set of children of x in T is the set of nodes of the form $x \cdot n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A path of T is a maximal sequence π of nodes such that $\pi(0) = \varepsilon$ and $\pi(i)$ is a child in T of $\pi(i-1)$ for all $0 < i < |\pi|$. For an alphabet Σ , a Σ -labeled tree is a pair $\langle T, Lab \rangle$ consisting of a tree and a labelling $Lab : T \mapsto \Sigma$ assigning to each node in T a symbol in Σ .

Syntax and Semantics of parity AAWA. Here, we consider a equivalent and slight variant of the automata in [18]. Let $n \geq 1$. A parity AAWA with n tapes (parity n AAWA for short) over a finite alphabet Σ is a tuple $\mathcal{A} = \langle \Sigma, Q, Q_0, \rho, \Omega \rangle$, where Q is a finite set of (control) states, $Q_0 \subseteq Q$ is a set of initial states, $\rho : Q \times \Sigma^n \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^+(Q \times [1, n])$ is the transition function, and $\Omega : Q \mapsto \mathbb{N}$ is a parity acceptance condition assigning to each state a natural number (*color*). If $\rho(q, \sigma)$ only consists of disjunctions for all $q \in Q$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma^n$, we call an AAWA a Nondeterministic Asynchronous Word Automaton (NAWA for short).

Let $n \geq 1$ and $\mathcal{A} = \langle \Sigma, Q, Q_0, \rho, \Omega \rangle$ be a parity AAWA with n tapes (parity n AAWA). A run of \mathcal{A} over an n -tuple $\vec{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$ of infinite words over Σ is a $(Q \times \mathbb{N}^n)$ -labeled tree $r = \langle T_r, Lab_r \rangle$, where each node of T_r labelled by (q, \wp) with $\wp = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$ describes a copy of the automaton that is in state q and reads the $(i_h + 1)^{th}$ symbol of the input word w_h for each $h \in [1, n]$. Moreover, we require that $r(\varepsilon) = (q_0, (0, \dots, 0))$ (initially, the automaton is in state q_0 reading the first position of each input word), and for each $\tau \in T_r$ with $Lab_r(\tau) = (q, \wp)$ and $\wp = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$, there is a (possibly empty) set $\{(q_1, d_1), \dots, (q_k, d_k)\} \subseteq Q \times [1, n]$ for some $k \geq 0$ satisfying $\delta(q, (w_1(i_1), \dots, w_n(i_n)))$ such that τ has k children τ_1, \dots, τ_k and $Lab_r(\tau_j) = (q_j, (i_1, \dots, i_{d_j} + 1, \dots, i_n))$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k$. The run r is accepting if for each infinite path ν of r , the smallest color of the states in Q that occur infinitely often along ν is even. An n -tuple \vec{w} of infinite words over Σ is accepted by \mathcal{A} if there exists an accepting run of \mathcal{A} over \vec{w} .

We also consider Büchi n AAWA and generalized Büchi n AAWA. In a Büchi n AAWA, the acceptance condition is given by a set F of accepting states (encodable as a parity condition with two colors): in this case, a run is accepting if each infinite path visits infinitely often some accepting state in F . In a generalized Büchi n AAWA, the acceptance condition is given by a family \mathcal{F} of sets of accepting states (Büchi components): a run is accepting if every infinite path visits a state in every set $F \in \mathcal{F}$ infinitely often. By standard arguments (see e.g. [8]), a generalized Büchi n AAWA can be translated into an equivalent Büchi n AAWA with quadratic blowup by exploiting a counter modulo the number of Büchi components.

7 Proofs from Section 3.1

7.1 Proof of Theorem 3.2

In this section, we provide a proof of Theorem 3.2 by showing that A-HyperLTL cannot express the p -synchronicity requirement. At this purpose, we need additional definitions.

Let $\text{AP} = \{p\}$ and for each $n \geq 1$, let π_n and π'_n be the traces defined as:

$$\pi_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} p^n \cdot \emptyset^\omega \text{ and } \pi'_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} p^{n+1} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$$

Moreover, let $\mathcal{L}_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\pi_n\}$ and $\mathcal{L}'_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\pi_n, \pi'_n\}$. By construction \mathcal{L}_n satisfies the p -synchronicity requirement while \mathcal{L}'_n not. Thus, in order to show that A-HyperLTL cannot express p -synchronicity, it suffices to prove the following result.

► **Proposition 7.1.** *For each A-HyperLTL formula ψ , there is $n \geq 1$ such that $\mathcal{L}_n \models \psi$ if and only if $\mathcal{L}'_n \models \psi$.*

In order to prove Proposition 7.1, we first establish the following preliminary result.

► **Lemma 7.2.** *Let $n \geq 1$ and ψ be an HyperLTL quantifier-free formula over $\{p\}$ with trace variables x_1, \dots, x_k , and whose nesting depth of next modality is at most $n - 1$. Then, for all initial pointed-trace assignments Π over \mathcal{L}_n and Π' over \mathcal{L}'_n such that $\text{Dom}(\Pi) = \text{Dom}(\Pi') = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$, it holds that $\Pi \models E\psi$ iff $\Pi' \models E\psi$.*

Proof. By the definition of the traces π_n and π'_n , each stuttering expansion of π'_n is also a stuttering expansion of π_n . Recall that $\mathcal{L}_n = \{\pi_n\}$ and $\mathcal{L}'_n = \{\pi_n, \pi'_n\}$. Hence, by Proposition 3.1, we have that $\Pi' \models E\psi$ entails that $\Pi \models E\psi$.

Now assume that $\Pi \models E\psi$. By Proposition 3.1, for all $i \in [1, k]$, there is a stuttering expansion ρ_i of $\pi_n = p^n \cdot \emptyset^\omega$ such that

$$\{x_1 \leftarrow (\rho_1, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\rho_k, 0)\} \models \psi$$

For all $i \in [1, k]$, let ρ'_i be the trace given by $p \cdot \rho_i$. By definition of π_n and π'_n , it holds that ρ'_i is a stuttering expansion of π'_n for all $i \in [1, k]$. We prove that

$$\{x_1 \leftarrow (\rho'_1, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\rho'_k, 0)\} \models \psi$$

Hence, by Proposition 3.1, we obtain that $\Pi' \models E\psi$ and the result follows. We first deduce the following preliminary result which can be proved by a straightforward induction on $n - i - 1$.

Claim. Let $i \in [0, n - 1]$ and ψ' be an HyperLTL quantifier-free formula over $\{p\}$ with variables in $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and whose nesting depth of next modality is at most $n - i - 1$. Then:

$$(\{x_1 \leftarrow (\rho'_1, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\rho'_k, 0)\}, i) \models \psi' \text{ iff } (\{x_1 \leftarrow (\rho'_1, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\rho'_k, 0)\}, i + 1) \models \psi'$$

By construction, we have that for each $i \in [1, k]$, $(\rho'_i)^1 = \rho_i$. Thus, by the previous claim, we obtain that for each HyperLTL quantifier-free formula over $\{p\}$ with trace variables x_1, \dots, x_k , and whose nesting depth of next modality is at most $n - 1$,

$$\{x_1 \leftarrow (\rho_1, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\rho_k, 0)\} \models \psi \text{ iff } \{x_1 \leftarrow (\rho'_1, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\rho'_k, 0)\} \models \psi$$

and we are done. ◀

Proof of Proposition 7.1. Let $\psi = Q_1x_1 \dots Q_kx_k.\psi'$ be a A-HyperLTL formula where ψ' is quantifier free and $Q_i \in \{\exists, \forall\}$ for all $i \in [1, k]$. If ψ' is of the form $E\psi''$ for some HyperLTL quantifier-free formula ψ'' , then the result directly follows from Lemma 7.2 by taking $n > |\psi''|$.

Now, assume that ψ' is of the form $A\psi''$ for some HyperLTL quantifier-free formula ψ'' . We observe that by the semantics of A-HyperLTL, for each trace set \mathcal{L} , $\mathcal{L} \models Q_1x_1 \dots Q_kx_k.A\psi''$ if and only if $\mathcal{L} \models \overline{Q}_1x_1 \dots \overline{Q}_kx_k.E\neg\psi''$, where for each $i \in [1, k]$, $\overline{Q}_i = \exists$ if $Q_i = \forall$, and $\overline{Q}_i = \forall$ otherwise. Hence, by Lemma 7.2, by taking $n > |\psi''|$, the result holds in this case as well. \blacktriangleleft

7.2 Construction of the generalized Büchi n AWA in the proof of Theorem 3.4

In this section, we provide a detailed proof of the following result.

Proposition 7.3. *Given an existential A-HyperLTL quantifier-free formula $E\psi$ with trace variables x_1, \dots, x_n , one can build in singly exponential time a generalized Büchi n AWA $\mathcal{A}_{E\psi}$ over 2^{AP} accepting the set of n -tuples (π_1, \dots, π_n) of traces such that $(\{x_1 \mapsto (\pi_1, 0), \dots, x_1 \mapsto (\pi_n, 0)\}) \models E\psi$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that AP is the set of atomic propositions occurring in the HyperLTL quantifier-free formula ψ . The *closure* $cl(\psi)$ of ψ is the set consisting (i) of the relativized propositions $p[x_i]$ for each $p \in AP$ and $i \in [1, n]$ and of their negations, and (2) of the subformulas θ of ψ and of their negations $\neg\theta$ (we identify $\neg\neg\theta$ with θ). An *atom* A of ψ is a maximal propositionally consistent subset of $cl(\psi)$, i.e. such that the following holds:

- for each $\theta \in cl(\psi)$, $\theta \in A$ iff $\neg\theta \notin A$,
- for each $\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2 \in cl(\psi)$, $\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2 \in A$ iff $\{\theta_1, \theta_2\} \subseteq A$.

We denote by $Atoms(\psi)$ the set of atoms of ψ . Note that $|Atoms(\psi)| = 2^{O(n \cdot |\psi|)}$. For two ψ -atoms A and A' , we say that A' is a successor of A if:

- for each $X\theta \in cl(\psi)$, $X\theta \in A$ iff $\theta \in A'$,
- for each $\theta_1 \cup \theta_2 \in cl(\psi)$, $\theta_1 \cup \theta_2 \in A$ iff either $\theta_2 \in A$ or $\theta_1 \in A$ and $\theta_1 \cup \theta_2 \in A'$.

Intuitively, if an atom A describes the set of subformulas of ψ that hold at the current phase, then the set of subformulas associated to the next phase must be a successor of A .

An atom A is consistent with an n -tuple $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \in (2^{AP})^n$ of input symbols if for each $p \in AP$ and $i \in [1, n]$, $p[x_i] \in A$ iff $p \in \sigma_i$.

The generalized Büchi n AWA $\mathcal{A}_{E\psi} = \langle 2^{AP}, Q, Q_0, \rho, \mathcal{F} \rangle$ is defined as follows. The set Q of states is given by $(Atoms(\psi) \times [1, n]) \cup (Atoms(\psi) \times [1, n] \times \{beg\})$. States in $Atoms(\psi) \times [1, n] \times \{beg\}$ are associated with the beginning of a phase, and the second component $d \in [1, n]$ in a state represents the previous chosen direction. The set Q_0 of initial states consists of the states of the form $(A, 1, beg)$ such that $\psi \in A$, and the transition function $\rho : Q \times (2^{AP})^n \rightarrow 2^{Q \times [1, n]}$ is defined as follows for each $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \in (2^{AP})^n$:

- for each $(A, i, beg) \in Atoms(\psi) \times [1, n] \times \{beg\}$, $\rho((A, i, beg), (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n))$ is empty if A is not consistent with $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$. Otherwise, $\rho((A, i, beg), (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n))$ consists (i) of the target moves of the form $((A, d), d)$ for $d \in [1, n]$, and (ii) of the target moves $((A', d, beg), d)$ such that A' is a successor of A and $d \in [1, n]$.
- for each $(A, i) \in Atoms(\psi) \times [1, n]$, $\rho((A, i), (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n))$ consists (i) of the target moves of the form $((A, d), d)$ such that $d > i$, and (ii) of the target moves $((A', d, beg), d)$ such that $d > i$ and A' is a successor of A .

Finally, the family \mathcal{F} of acceptance components is defined as follows:

- for each until formula $\theta_1 \mathbf{U} \theta_2$, \mathcal{F} has a component consisting of the states (A, d) and (A, d, beg) such that either $\theta_2 \in A$ or $\theta_1 \mathbf{U} \theta_2 \notin A$ (*fulfillment of the eventuality modalities*),
- for each direction $d \in [1, n]$, \mathcal{F} has a component consisting of states of the form (A, d) or (A, d, beg) (*fulfillment of the fairness condition for trajectories*).

Correctness of the construction directly follows from the following claim.

Claim. Let (π_1, \dots, π_n) be an n -tuple of traces. Then there is an accepting run of $\mathcal{A}_{E\psi}$ over (π_1, \dots, π_n) if and only if $(\{x_1 \mapsto (\pi_1, 0), \dots, x_n \mapsto (\pi_n, 0)\}) \models E\psi$.

Proof of the claim. An n -pointer is an n -tuple (i_1, \dots, i_n) of natural numbers. Given two n -pointers $\wp = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$ and $\wp' = (i'_1, \dots, i'_n)$, we say that \wp' is a successor of \wp , if (i) $i'_d \in \{i_d, i_d + 1\}$ for each $d \in [1, n]$, and (ii) $i'_d = i_d + 1$ for some $d \in [1, n]$. An infinite sequence $\nu = \wp_0, \wp_1, \dots$ of n -pointers is *well-formed* if $\wp_0 = (0, \dots, 0)$ and for each $i \geq 0$, \wp_{i+1} is a successor of \wp_i . Moreover, ν is *fair* if for each $d \in [1, n]$ and $m > 0$, there is $\ell \geq 0$ such that the d^{th} -component of \wp_ℓ is greater than m . Evidently, there is a bijection between (fair) well-formed infinite sequences $\nu = \wp_0, \wp_1, \dots$ of n -pointers and the (fair) trajectories over the set $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ of trace variables. In particular, the trajectory $t(\nu)$ associated with ν has as k^{th} element the non-empty set of trace variables x_d such that the d^{th} -component of \wp_{k+1} is greater than the d^{th} -component of \wp_k .

Let $\text{AP}_{[x_1, \dots, x_n]}$ be the finite set consisting of the relativized propositions $p[x_i]$ for each $p \in \text{AP}$ and $i \in [1, n]$. We interpret $\text{AP}_{[x_1, \dots, x_n]}$ as a set of atomic propositions and ψ as an LTL formula over $\text{AP}_{[x_1, \dots, x_n]}$. Then, given an n -pointer $\wp = (j_1, \dots, j_n)$, we denote by $(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n)[\wp]$ the subset of $\text{AP}_{[x_1, \dots, x_n]}$ given by

$$\bigcup_{i \in [1, n]} \bigcup_{p \in \pi_i(j_i)} \{p[x_i]\}$$

By the semantics of A-HyperLTL, it easily follows that $(\{x_1 \mapsto (\pi_1, 0), \dots, x_n \mapsto (\pi_n, 0)\}) \models E\psi$ if and only if there is a fair well-formed infinite sequence $\nu = \wp_0, \wp_1, \dots$ of n -pointers such that the infinite word ξ over $2^{\text{AP}_{[x_1, \dots, x_n]}}$ given by

$$(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n)[\wp_0], (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n)[\wp_1], \dots$$

is a model of the LTL formula ψ over $\text{AP}_{[x_1, \dots, x_n]}$. By the standard automata-theoretic construction for LTL, it follows that $(\{x_1 \mapsto (\pi_1, 0), \dots, x_n \mapsto (\pi_n, 0)\}) \models E\psi$ if and only if there is a fair well-formed infinite sequence $\nu = \wp_0, \wp_1, \dots$ of n -pointers and an infinite sequence of ψ -atoms A_0, A_1, \dots such that

- $\psi \in A_0$ and A_{i+1} is a successor of A_i for each $i \geq 0$,
- for each $i \geq 0$ with $\wp_i = (j_1, \dots, j_n)$, A_i is consistent with $(\pi_1(j_1), \dots, \pi_n(j_n))$,
- and for each until formula $\theta_1 \mathbf{U} \theta_2$, there are infinitely many i such that either $\theta_2 \in A_i$ or $\theta_1 \mathbf{U} \theta_2 \notin A_i$.

Thus by construction of the automaton $\mathcal{A}_{E\psi}$, the result easily follows. This concludes the proof of the claim and Proposition 7.3 as well. \blacktriangleleft

7.3 Construction of the A-HyperLTL formula φ_M in the proof of Theorem 3.6

In this section, we provide details about the construction of the A-HyperLTL formula φ_M in the proof of Theorem 3.6. Fix a counter machine $M = \langle Q, \Delta, \delta_{init}, \delta_{rec} \rangle$ and let $\text{AP} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Delta \cup \{c_1, c_2, \#, beg, pad\}$. Recall that an M -configuration (δ, ν) is encoded by the finite words

over 2^{AP} (called *segments*) of the form:

$$\{beg, \delta\}P_1 \dots P_m \{pad\}^k$$

where $k \geq 1$, $m = \max(\nu(1), \nu(2))$, and for all $i \in [1, m]$, (i) $\emptyset \neq P_i \subseteq \{\#, c_1, c_2\}$, (ii) $\# \in P_i$ iff i is odd, and (iii) for all $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$, $c_\ell \in P_i$ iff $i \leq \nu(\ell)$. A computation ρ of M is then encoded by the traces obtained by concatenating the codes of the configurations along ρ starting from the first one. In order to define the A-HyperLTL formula φ_M , we exploit the following auxiliary formulas for each trace variable x :

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{beg}(x) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} beg[x] \wedge \bigvee_{\delta \in \Delta} (\delta[x] \wedge \bigwedge_{p \in \text{AP} \setminus \{beg, \delta\}} \neg p[x]) \\ \theta_c(x) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (c_1[x] \vee c_2[x]) \wedge \bigwedge_{p \in \text{AP} \setminus \{c_1, c_2, \#\}} \neg p[x] \\ \theta_{pad}(x) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} pad[x] \wedge \bigwedge_{p \in \text{AP} \setminus \{pad\}} \neg p[x] \end{aligned}$$

Intuitively, $\theta_{beg}(x)$ characterizes the first position of a segment, and $\theta_c(x)$ and $\theta_{pad}(x)$ characterize the counter and the pad positions of a segment, respectively. Then, the A-HyperLTL formula φ_M is given by $\varphi_M \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists x_1 \exists x_2. \mathbf{E} \psi$, where the quantifier-free HyperLTL formula ψ guarantees that for the two stuttering expansions π_1 and π_2 of the given trace π , the following holds:

- both π_1 and π_2 are infinite concatenations of segments. This is ensured by the following conjunct for each $i = 1, 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\theta_{beg}(x_i) \wedge \mathbf{GF} \theta_{beg}(x_i) \wedge \mathbf{G} \left(\theta_{beg}(x_i) \rightarrow \mathbf{X}[(\theta_c(x_i) \wedge \#[x_i]) \vee \theta_{pad}(x_i)] \wedge \right. \\ &\theta_{pad}(x_i) \rightarrow \mathbf{X}[\theta_{pad}(x_i) \vee \theta_{beg}(x_i)] \wedge (\theta_c(x_i) \wedge \#[x_i]) \rightarrow \mathbf{X}[(\theta_c(x_i) \wedge \neg \#[x_i]) \vee \theta_{pad}(x_i)] \wedge \\ &\left. [\theta_c(x_i) \wedge \neg \#[x_i]] \rightarrow \mathbf{X}[(\theta_c(x_i) \wedge \#[x_i]) \vee \theta_{pad}(x_i)] \wedge \bigwedge_{\ell=1,2} [\theta_c(x_i) \wedge \neg c_\ell[x_i]] \rightarrow \neg \mathbf{X} c_\ell \right) \end{aligned}$$

- The first segment of π_1 encodes the initial configuration (δ_{init}, ν_0) of M and the second segment of π_1 encodes a configuration which is a successor of (δ_{init}, ν_0) in M . Without loss of generality we assume that δ_{init} corresponds to an increment instruction for the first counter. Then, the previous requirement can be expressed as follows:

$$\delta_{init}[x_1] \wedge \mathbf{X} \left(pad[x_1] \wedge (\neg \theta_{beg}(x_1) \mathbf{U} [\theta_{beg}(x_1) \wedge \mathbf{X}(c_1[x_1] \wedge \neg c_2[x_1] \wedge \mathbf{X} pad[x_1])]) \right)$$

- δ_{rec} occurs infinitely often along π_1 :

$$\mathbf{GF} \delta_{rec}$$

- For each $i \geq 2$, the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ segment s_2 of π_2 starts at the same position as the i^{th} segment s_1 of π_1 . Moreover, s_1 and s_2 have the same length.

$$\mathbf{X} \left((\neg \theta_{beg}(x_1) \wedge \neg \theta_{beg}(x_2)) \mathbf{U} (\neg \theta_{beg}(x_1) \wedge \theta_{beg}(x_2) \wedge \mathbf{XG}(\theta_{beg}(x_1) \leftrightarrow \theta_{beg}(x_2))) \right)$$

- For each segment s_2 of π_2 distinct from the first one whose start position coincides with the start position of a segment s_1 of π_1 , we have that the configuration encoded by s_2 is a successor in M of the configuration encoded by s_1 .

$$\bigwedge_{\delta=(q,(op,\ell),q') \in \Delta} \mathbf{XG} \left((\theta_{beg}(x_1) \wedge \theta_{beg}(x_2) \wedge \delta[x_1]) \rightarrow \left(\bigvee_{\delta'=(q',(op',\ell'),q') \in \Delta} \delta'[x_2] \wedge \right. \right.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \underbrace{\mathsf{X}((c_{3-\ell}[x_1] \wedge c_{3-\ell}[x_2])\mathsf{U}(\neg c_{3-\ell}[x_1] \wedge \neg c_{3-\ell}[x_2]))}_{\text{the value of counter } 3-\ell \text{ does not change}} \wedge \\
& \underbrace{op = \text{inc} \rightarrow \mathsf{X}((c_\ell[x_1] \wedge c_\ell[x_2])\mathsf{U}(\neg c_\ell[x_1] \wedge c_\ell[x_2] \wedge \neg \mathsf{X}c_\ell[x_2]))}_{\text{increment of counter } \ell} \wedge \\
& \underbrace{op = \text{dec} \rightarrow \mathsf{X}((c_\ell[x_1] \wedge c_\ell[x_2])\mathsf{U}(c_\ell[x_1] \wedge \neg c_\ell[x_2] \wedge \neg \mathsf{X}c_\ell[x_1]))}_{\text{decrement of counter } \ell} \wedge \\
& \underbrace{op = \text{if_zero} \rightarrow \mathsf{X}(\neg c_\ell[x_1] \wedge \neg c_\ell[x_2])}_{\text{zero test of counter } \ell}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we crucially observe that since π_1 and π_2 are stuttering expansions of the same trace π , the alternation requirement for proposition $\#$ in the encoding of an M -configurations ensures that π_1 and π_2 encode the same infinite sequence of M -configurations. Hence, φ_M has a single-trace model *if and only if* M has an infinite computation starting from the initial configuration and visiting the designated transition δ_{rec} infinitely often.

8 Proofs from Section 3.2

8.1 Proof of Proposition 3.8

In this section, we provide a proof of Proposition 3.8.

► **Proposition 3.8.** *For each HyperLTL_S formula ψ , there is $n \geq 1$ s.t. $\mathcal{L}_n \models \psi$ iff $\mathcal{L}'_n \models \psi$.*

Recall that for each $n \geq 1$, $\mathcal{L}_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\pi_n, \rho_n\}$ and $\mathcal{L}'_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\pi_n, \rho'_n\}$, where π_n , ρ_n , and ρ'_n are the traces over $\text{AP} = \{p\}$ defined as follows:

$$\pi_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\emptyset \cdot p)^n \cdot \emptyset^\omega \quad \rho_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\emptyset \cdot p)^{2n} \cdot \emptyset^\omega \quad \rho'_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\emptyset \cdot p)^{2n+1} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$$

For a pointed trace (π, i) and a finite set of LTL formulas Γ , we write $\text{succ}_\Gamma(\pi, i)$ to mean the pointed trace (π, ℓ) where ℓ is the Γ -successor of position i in π . In order to prove Proposition 3.8, we need two preliminary technical results.

► **Lemma 8.1.** *The following holds for all $n \geq 1$ and $k \geq 1$;*

1. *Let us consider the trace $\pi = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{k+n} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$. Then for all LTL formulas θ such that $|\theta| < n$ and $i \in [0, k-1]$, it holds that (i) $(\pi, 2i) \models \theta$ iff $(\pi, 2i+2) \models \theta$, and (ii) $(\pi, 2i+1) \models \theta$ iff $(\pi, 2i+3) \models \theta$.*
2. *Let Γ be a finite set of LTL formulas θ such that $|\theta| < n$. Then, there is a trace ρ coinciding with the Γ -stutter trace of some suffix of $(\emptyset \cdot p)^{n-1} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$ such that*
 - either $\text{stfr}_\Gamma(\rho_n) = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{n+1} \cdot \rho$, $\text{stfr}_\Gamma(\rho'_n) = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{n+2} \cdot \rho$, and $\text{stfr}_\Gamma(\pi_n) = (\emptyset \cdot p) \cdot \rho$,
 - or $\text{stfr}_\Gamma(\rho_n) = \text{stfr}_\Gamma(\rho'_n) = \text{stfr}_\Gamma(\pi_n) = \emptyset \cdot \rho$.
3. *Let us consider the trace $\pi = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{k+n} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$. Then for all stuttering LTL formulas θ_S such that $|\theta_S| < n$ and $i \in [0, k-1]$, it holds that (i) $(\pi, 2i) \models \theta_S$ iff $(\pi, 2i+2) \models \theta_S$, and (2) $(\pi, 2i+1) \models \theta_S$ iff $(\pi, 2i+3) \models \theta_S$.*

Proof. Property (1) of Lemma 8.1 can be proved by a straightforward double induction on k and the structure of the given LTL formula θ . Now, let us consider Property (2). Let Γ be a finite set of LTL formulas θ such that $|\theta| < n$. Recall that $\pi_n = (\emptyset \cdot p)^n \cdot \emptyset^\omega$, $\rho_n = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{2n} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$, and $\rho'_n = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{2n+1} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$. Thus, the result easily follows from Property (1) and the definition of the function stfr_Γ .

Finally, let us consider Property (3). The proof is by a double induction on n and the structure of the given stuttering LTL formula θ_S where $|\theta_S| < n$. We focus on the case where $k = 1$ and consider the positions 1 and 3 of $\pi = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{1+n} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$ (the proof for the other cases being similar). We proceed on the structure of the formula θ_S . The base case (where θ_S is an atomic proposition) and the case of Boolean connectives directly follow from the induction hypothesis. It remains to consider the cases where either $\theta_S = X_\Gamma \theta_1$ or $\theta_S = \theta_1 U_\Gamma \theta_2$ for some formulas θ_1 and θ_2 , and finite set Γ of LTL formulas. Since $|\theta_S| < n$, it holds that $n - 1 \geq 1$, $|\theta_1| < n - 1$, $|\theta_2| < n - 1$, and Γ consists of LTL formulas with size smaller than $n - 1$. Note that π can be written in the form $\pi = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{k+n-1} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$ where $k = 2$. Thus, by the induction hypothesis on the length of the formula, we have that for all formulas $\theta \in \Gamma \cup \{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$, it holds that (i) $(\pi, 1) \models \theta$ iff $(\pi, 3) \models \theta$, and (ii) $(\pi, 0) \models \theta$ iff $(\pi, 2) \models \theta$ iff $(\pi, 4) \models \theta$. Hence, the result easily follows. \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 8.2.** *Let $n \geq 1$ and ψ be a HyperLTL_S quantifier-free formulas over $\{p\}$ with two trace variables x_1 and x_2 such that $|\psi| < n$. Then, for all $i, j \in [0, 2n - 1]$ such that $j \leq i$:*

$$\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_n, i), x_2 \leftarrow (\rho_n, j)\} \models \psi \text{ iff } \{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_n, i), x_2 \leftarrow (\rho'_n, j)\} \models \psi$$

Proof. Recall that $\pi_n = (\emptyset \cdot p)^n \cdot \emptyset^\omega$, $\rho_n = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{2n} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$, and $\rho'_n = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{2n+1} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$.

Fix $i, j \in [0, 2n - 1]$ such that $j \leq i$. The proof is by a double induction on $2n - 1 - i$ and the structure of ψ . The case where $\psi = p[x_i]$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ directly follows from the fact that $\rho_n(j) = \rho'_n(j)$ for all $j \in [0, 2n - 1]$. The cases of Boolean connectives where either $\psi = \neg\psi_1$ or $\psi = \psi_1 \wedge \psi_2$ for some formulas ψ_1 and ψ_2 directly follow from the induction hypothesis. It remains to consider the cases where either $\psi = X_\Gamma \psi_1$ or $\psi = \psi_1 U_\Gamma \psi_2$ for some formulas ψ_1 and ψ_2 , and finite set Γ of LTL formulas. Since $|\psi| < n$, all the LTL formulas θ in Γ satisfy $|\theta| < n$. By Property (2) of Lemma 8.1, there is a suffix ρ_S of $(\emptyset \cdot p)^{n-1} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$ such that one of the following holds:

- either $stfr_\Gamma(\rho_n) = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{n+1} \cdot stfr_\Gamma(\rho_S)$, $stfr_\Gamma(\rho'_n) = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{n+2} \cdot stfr_\Gamma(\rho_S)$, and $stfr_\Gamma(\pi_n) = (\emptyset \cdot p) \cdot stfr_\Gamma(\rho_S)$,
- or $stfr_\Gamma(\rho_n) = stfr_\Gamma(\rho'_n) = stfr_\Gamma(\pi_n) = \emptyset \cdot stfr_\Gamma(\rho_S)$. Note that in this case, being $\rho_n = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{2n} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$ and $\rho'_n = (\emptyset \cdot p) \cdot \rho_n$, it holds that for all $k \geq 1$, $succ_\Gamma^k(\rho'_n, j) = succ_\Gamma^k(\rho_n, j) + 2$.

We first consider the case of next modality where $\psi = X_\Gamma \psi_1$. We distinguish two cases:

- $stfr_\Gamma(\rho_n) = stfr_\Gamma(\rho'_n) = stfr_\Gamma(\pi_n) = \emptyset \cdot stfr_\Gamma(\rho_S)$. Hence, $succ_\Gamma(\rho'_n, j) = succ_\Gamma(\rho_n, j) + 2$, i.e. there is $k > j$ such that $succ_\Gamma(\rho_n, j) = k$ and $succ_\Gamma(\rho'_n, j) = k + 2$. Thus, since $(\rho_n)^k = (\rho'_n)^{k+2}$, the result trivially follows.
- Now assume that $stfr_\Gamma(\rho_n) = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{n+1} \cdot stfr_\Gamma(\rho_S)$, $stfr_\Gamma(\rho'_n) = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{n+2} \cdot stfr_\Gamma(\rho_S)$, and $stfr_\Gamma(\pi_n) = (\emptyset \cdot p) \cdot stfr_\Gamma(\rho_S)$. Hence, $succ_\Gamma(\rho_n, j) = j + 1$ and $succ_\Gamma(\rho'_n, j) = j + 1$. We distinguish two cases:
 - $i = 2n - 1$. Since $\pi_n = (\emptyset \cdot p)^n \cdot \emptyset^\omega$, we have that $succ_\Gamma(\pi_n, 2n - 1) = 2n$ and $\pi_n(k) = \emptyset$ for all $k \geq 2n$. Let θ_S be the stuttering LTL formula obtained from ψ_1 by replacing each occurrence of $p[x_2]$ with p and each occurrence of $p[x_1]$ with $\neg\top$. Evidently, (i) $\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_n, 2n), x_2 \leftarrow (\rho_n, j + 1)\} \models \psi_1$ iff $(\rho_n, j + 1) \models \theta_S$, and (ii) $\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_n, 2n), x_2 \leftarrow (\rho'_n, j + 1)\} \models \psi_1$ iff $(\rho'_n, j + 1) \models \theta_S$. Since ρ'_n can be written in form $\rho'_n = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{(n+1)+n} \cdot \emptyset^\omega$, $|\theta_S| < n$ and $j + 1 \in [0, 2n]$, by applying Property (3) of Lemma 8.1 with $k = n + 1$, it holds that $(\rho'_n, j + 1) \models \theta_S$ iff $(\rho'_n, j + 3) \models \theta_S$. Hence, being $(\rho_n)^{j+1} = (\rho'_n)^{j+3}$, we obtain that $(\rho_n, j + 1) \models \theta_S$ iff $(\rho'_n, j + 1) \models \theta_S$. Thus, since $succ_\Gamma(\rho_n, j) = j + 1$ and $succ_\Gamma(\rho'_n, j) = j + 1$, the result follows.

- $i < 2n - 1$. If $\text{succ}_\Gamma(\pi_n, i) \geq 2n$, we proceed as in the previous case. Otherwise, $\text{succ}_\Gamma(\pi_n, i) \leq 2n - 1$ and $j + 1 \leq \text{succ}_\Gamma(\pi_n, i)$ (recall that $j \leq i$). Thus, since $\text{succ}_\Gamma(\rho_n, j) = j + 1$, $\text{succ}_\Gamma(\rho'_n, j) = j + 1$, and $2n - 1 - \text{succ}_\Gamma(\pi_n, i) < 2n - 1 - i$, the result directly follows from the induction hypothesis.

We now consider the case where $\psi = \psi_1 \mathbf{U}_\Gamma \psi_2$. We distinguish two cases:

- $\text{stfr}_\Gamma(\rho_n) = \text{stfr}_\Gamma(\rho'_n) = \text{stfr}_\Gamma(\pi_n) = \emptyset \cdot \text{stfr}_\Gamma(\rho_S)$. It follows that for all $k \geq 1$, $\text{succ}_\Gamma^k(\rho'_n, j) = \text{succ}_\Gamma^k(\rho_n, j) + 2$. Moreover, by the induction hypothesis, we can assume that the result holds for the formulas ψ_1 and ψ_2 . Thus, since $(\rho_n)^\ell = (\rho'_n)^{\ell+2}$ for all $\ell \geq 0$, the result trivially follows.
- Now assume that $\text{stfr}_\Gamma(\rho_n) = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{n+1} \cdot \text{stfr}_\Gamma(\rho_S)$, $\text{stfr}_\Gamma(\rho'_n) = (\emptyset \cdot p)^{n+2} \cdot \text{stfr}_\Gamma(\rho_S)$, and $\text{stfr}_\Gamma(\pi_n) = (\emptyset \cdot p) \cdot \text{stfr}_\Gamma(\rho_S)$. Then, since $\pi_n(i') = \emptyset$ for all $i' \geq 2n$, by the induction hypothesis and by reasoning as for case of the next modalities, we deduce that:
 - for all $i', j' \in [0, 2n - 1]$ with $j' \leq i'$ and $h \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_n, i'), x_2 \leftarrow (\rho_n, j')\} \models \psi_h \text{ iff } \{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_n, i'), x_2 \leftarrow (\rho'_n, j')\} \models \psi_h$$

- for all $i' \geq 2n$, $j' \in \{2n, 2n + 2\}$ and $h \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_n, i'), x_2 \leftarrow (\rho_n, 2n)\} \models \psi_h \text{ iff } \{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_n, i'), x_2 \leftarrow (\rho'_n, j')\} \models \psi_h$$

- for all $i' \geq 2n$, $j' \in \{2n + 1, 2n + 3\}$ and $h \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_n, i'), x_2 \leftarrow (\rho_n, 2n + 1)\} \models \psi_h \text{ iff } \{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_n, i'), x_2 \leftarrow (\rho'_n, j')\} \models \psi_h$$

Hence, the result easily follows. This concludes the proof of Lemma 8.2. ◀

Proof of Proposition 3.8. Let $n \geq 1$. Recall that $\mathcal{L}_n = \{\pi_n, \rho_n\}$ and $\mathcal{L}'_n = \{\pi_n, \rho'_n\}$. Given two initial pointed-trace assignments Π over \mathcal{L}_n and Π' over \mathcal{L}'_n , we say that Π and Π' are *similar* if $\text{Dom}(\Pi) = \text{Dom}(\Pi')$ and for all $x \in \text{Dom}(\Pi)$, either (i) $\Pi(x) = \Pi'(x) = (\pi_n, 0)$, or (ii) $\Pi(x) = (\rho_n, 0)$ and $\Pi'(x) = (\rho'_n, 0)$. Thus, if Π and Π' are similar, by Lemma 8.2, for each HyperLTL_S quantifier-free formula ψ such that $|\psi| < n$ it holds that $\Pi \models \psi$ iff $\Pi' \models \psi$. It follows that for each HyperLTL_S formula φ such that $|\varphi| < n$, $\mathcal{L}_n \models \varphi$ iff $\mathcal{L}'_n \models \varphi$. Hence, Proposition 3.8 directly follows.

9 Proofs from Section 3.3

9.1 Proof of the claim in the proof of Theorem 3.10

Let $\text{AP} = \{p\}$ and for each $n \geq 1$, let π_n and π'_n be the traces defined as:

$$\pi_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (p^n \cdot \emptyset)^\omega \text{ and } \pi'_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} p^{n+1} \cdot \emptyset \cdot (p^n \cdot \emptyset)^\omega$$

The claim in the proof of Theorem 3.10 corresponds to the following proposition.

► **Proposition 9.1.** *For each A-HyperLTL formula ψ , there is $n \geq 1$ such that $\{\pi_n\} \models \psi$ if and only if $\{\pi'_n\} \models \psi$.*

In order to prove Proposition 9.1, we need the following preliminary result.

► **Lemma 9.2.** *Let $n \geq 1$ and ψ be an HyperLTL quantifier-free formula over $\{p\}$ with trace variables x_1, \dots, x_k , and whose nesting depth of next modality is at most $n - 1$. Then,*

$$\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_n, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\pi_n, 0)\} \models E\psi \text{ iff } \{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi'_n, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\pi'_n, 0)\} \models E\psi$$

Proof. By the definition of the traces π_n and π'_n , each stuttering expansion of π'_n is also a stuttering expansion of π_n . Hence, by Proposition 3.1, we have that $\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi'_n, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\pi'_n, 0)\} \models E\psi$ entails that $\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_n, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\pi_n, 0)\} \models E\psi$.

Now assume that $\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi_n, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\pi_n, 0)\} \models E\psi$. By Proposition 3.1, for all $i \in [1, k]$, there is a stuttering expansion ρ_i of π_n such that

$$\{x_1 \leftarrow (\rho_1, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\rho_k, 0)\} \models \psi$$

For all $i \in [1, k]$, let ρ'_i be the trace given by $p \cdot \rho_i$. By definition of π_n and π'_n , it holds that ρ'_i is a stuttering expansion of π'_n for all $i \in [1, k]$. We prove that

$$\{x_1 \leftarrow (\rho'_1, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\rho'_k, 0)\} \models \psi$$

Hence, by Proposition 3.1 the result follows. We first deduce the following preliminary result which can be proved by a straightforward induction on $n - i - 1 \in [0, n - 1]$.

Claim. Let $i \in [0, n - 1]$ and ψ' be an HyperLTL quantifier-free formula with variables in $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and whose nesting depth of next modality is at most $n - i - 1$. Then:

$$(\{x_1 \leftarrow (\rho'_1, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\rho'_k, 0)\}, i) \models \psi' \text{ iff } (\{x_1 \leftarrow (\rho'_1, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\rho'_k, 0)\}, i + 1) \models \psi'$$

By construction, we have that for each $i \in [1, k]$, $(\rho'_i)^1 = \rho_i$. Thus, by the previous claim, we obtain that for each HyperLTL quantifier-free formula with trace variables x_1, \dots, x_k , and whose nesting depth of next modality is at most $n - 1$,

$$\{x_1 \leftarrow (\rho_1, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\rho_k, 0)\} \models \psi \text{ iff } \{x_1 \leftarrow (\rho'_1, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\rho'_k, 0)\} \models \psi$$

and we are done. ◀

Proof of Proposition 9.1. Let ψ be an A-HyperLTL formula with trace variables x_1, \dots, x_k and ψ' be the quantifier-free part of ψ . First, assume that ψ' is of the form $E\psi''$ for some HyperLTL quantifier-free formula ψ'' . Note that for each trace variable π , $\{\pi\} \models \psi$ iff $\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\pi, 0)\} \models E\psi''$. Thus, by applying Lemma 9.2, it follows that for each $n > |\psi|$, $\{\pi_n\} \models \psi$ iff $\{\pi'_n\} \models \psi$, and the result holds.

Now, assume that ψ' is of the form $A\psi''$ for some HyperLTL quantifier-free formula ψ'' . Evidently, for each trace variable π , $\{\pi\} \not\models \psi$ iff $\{x_1 \leftarrow (\pi, 0), \dots, x_k \leftarrow (\pi, 0)\} \models E\neg\psi''$. Hence, by Lemma 9.2, for each $n > |\psi|$, $\{\pi_n\} \models \psi$ iff $\{\pi'_n\} \models \psi$, and the result holds in this case as well.

9.2 Proof of Theorem 3.12

In this section, we provide a proof of Theorem 3.12.

► **Theorem 3.12.** *Given a $FO_f[<, +]$ sentence φ over AP , one can construct in polynomial time a HyperLTL_C formula ψ over $AP \cup \{\#\}$ such that $\mathcal{L}_f(\psi)$ is the set of models of φ . Vice versa, given a HyperLTL_C formula ψ over $AP \cup \{\#\}$, one can construct in single exponential time a $FO_f[<, +]$ sentence φ whose set of models is $\mathcal{L}_f(\psi)$.*

In order to prove Theorem 3.12, we first give a formal definition of the syntax and semantics of $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$. Formulas φ of $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$ over AP and VAR are defined by the following syntax:

$$\varphi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \top \mid P_a(x) \mid x = y \mid x < y \mid z = x + y \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \exists x.\varphi$$

where $a \in \text{AP}$ and $x, y, z \in \text{VAR}$. Given a finite trace w , a w -valuation is a partial mapping g over VAR assigning to each variable in its domain $\text{Dom}(g)$ a position $0 \leq i < |w|$. For a $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$ formula φ and a w -valuation g whose domain contains the free variables (i.e. the variables x which do not occur in the scope of a quantifier $\exists x$) of φ , the satisfaction relation $(w, g) \models \varphi$ is defined as follows (we omit the semantics of the Boolean connectives which is standard):

$$\begin{aligned} (w, g) \models P_a(x) &\Leftrightarrow a \in w(g(x)) \\ (w, g) \models x = y &\Leftrightarrow g(x) = g(y) \\ (w, g) \models x < y &\Leftrightarrow g(x) < g(y) \\ (w, g) \models z = x + y &\Leftrightarrow g(z) = g(x) + g(y) \\ (w, g) \models \exists x.\varphi &\Leftrightarrow (w, g[x \mapsto i]) \models \varphi \text{ for some } 0 \leq i < |w| \end{aligned}$$

where $g[x \mapsto i](x) = i$ and $g[x \mapsto i](y) = g(y)$ for each $y \in \text{Dom}(g) \setminus \{x\}$. Note that if φ is a sentence (i.e., φ has no free variables), the satisfaction relation $(w, g) \models \varphi$ is independent of g . We say that w is a model of a sentence φ , denoted $w \models \varphi$, if $(w, g_\emptyset) \models \varphi$, where g_\emptyset is the empty w -valuation.

Recall that for a HyperLTL_C formula ψ over $\text{AP} \cup \{\#\}$, where $\# \notin \text{AP}$, $\mathcal{L}_f(\psi)$ is the set of traces (over $\text{AP} \cup \{\#\}$) of the form $\text{enc}(w) = w \cdot \{\#\}^\omega$ for some finite trace w (over AP) such that $\{\text{enc}(w)\}$ satisfies ψ . For a finite trace w , a w -pointed-trace assignment is a pointed-trace assignment Π associating to each variable $x \in \text{Dom}(\Pi)$, a pointed trace of the form $(\text{enc}(w), i)$. For a quantifier-free HyperLTL_C formula ψ over $\text{AP} \cup \{\#\}$ and a finite trace w , we write $\text{enc}(w) \models \psi$ to mean that the initial w -pointed-trace assignment, having as domain the set of variables occurring in ψ and assigning to each variable the pointed trace $(\text{enc}(w), 0)$, satisfies ψ . Now, we prove Theorem 3.12. The first part of Theorem 3.12 directly follows from the following proposition.

► **Proposition 9.3.** *Let φ be a $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$ sentence over AP . Then, one can construct in polynomial time a HyperLTL_C quantifier-free formula $f(\varphi)$ over $\text{AP} \cup \{\#\}$ such that for each finite trace w , it holds that $w \models \varphi$ if and only if $\text{enc}(w) \models f(\varphi)$.*

Proof. Fix a $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$ sentence φ over AP . Without loss of generality, we assume that each quantifier in φ introduces a different variable. For each atomic subformula θ of φ and for each variable x occurring in θ , we introduce a fresh copy $x_{\theta, S}$ of x we call *synchronization variable*. Moreover, if θ is of the form $z = x + y$, we introduce two fresh copies $x_{\theta, I}$ and $y_{\theta, I}$ of x and y , respectively, we call *initialization variables*. For a variable x occurring in φ , we denote by C_x the set (context) consisting of the variable x plus the synchronization copies of x . Note that C_x does not include the initialization copies of x .

Given two variables x and y , we exploit in the translation a HyperLTL_C quantifier-free formula $\psi_{=}(x, y)$ over $\text{AP} \cup \{\#\}$ and $\{x, y\}$, which intuitively asserts that along the encoding $\text{enc}(w)$ of a finite trace w , x and y refer to the same position of w (recall that $\# \notin \text{AP}$ and $\text{enc}(w) = w \cdot \{\#\}^\omega$):

$$\psi_{=}(x, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x, y\}F(\neg\#[x] \wedge \neg\#[y] \wedge X(\#[x] \wedge \#[y]))$$

Let θ be a subformula of φ . We associate to θ a HyperLTL_C quantifier-free formula $f(\theta)$ over $\text{AP} \cup \{\#\}$. The mapping f is inductively defined as follows:

- $f(P_a(x)) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a[x]$ for each $a \in \text{AP}$.
- θ is of the form $x = y$: $f(\theta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi_{=(x_{\theta,S}, y_{\theta,S})}$.
- θ is of the form $x < y$: $f(\theta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x_{\theta,S}, y_{\theta,S}\}F(\neg\#[x_{\theta,S}] \wedge \#[y_{\theta,S}])$.
- θ is an atomic formula of the form $z = x + y$:

$$f(\theta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x_{\theta,I}, x_{\theta,S}\}F(\psi_{=(x_{\theta,I}, y_{\theta,S})} \wedge \psi_{=(x_{\theta,S}, z_{\theta,S})) \vee \{y_{\theta,I}, y_{\theta,S}\}F(\psi_{=(y_{\theta,I}, x_{\theta,S})} \wedge \psi_{=(y_{\theta,S}, z_{\theta,S}))$$

The first disjunct handles the case where $x \leq y$, while the second disjunct considers the case where $x > y$. For the first case (the second case being similar), we exploit the synchronization variables $x_{\theta,S}$, $y_{\theta,S}$, and $z_{\theta,S}$, and the initialization variable $x_{\theta,I}$. Intuitively, in HyperLTL_C , the variables $x_{\theta,I}$ and $x_{\theta,S}$ are moved forwardly and synchronously of a non-negative offset by the eventually modality. Moreover, assuming that $x_{\theta,I}$ points to the first position of the word, we check (by means of the auxiliary formula $\psi_{=}$) that this offset corresponds to y and at the same time $z = x + y$ by checking that after the shift the variables $x_{\theta,I}$ and $y_{\theta,S}$ (resp., $x_{\theta,S}$ and $z_{\theta,S}$) refer to the same position.

- $f(\neg\theta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \neg f(\theta)$.
- $f(\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(\theta_1) \wedge f(\theta_2)$.
- $f(\exists x.\theta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C_x F(\neg\#[x] \wedge f(\theta))$.

We now prove that the construction is correct. Let VAR be the set of variables occurring in φ and $\widehat{\text{VAR}}$ be the set of variables consisting of the variables in VAR together with their synchronization and initialization copies.

Let w be a finite trace, θ be a subformula of φ , $V \subseteq \text{VAR}$ the set of variables occurring in θ , and g a w -valuation with domain V . We denote by $\Pi_{w,g}$ the w -pointed-trace assignment with domain $\widehat{\text{VAR}}$ defined as follows for all $x \in \text{VAR}$ and for all synchronized copies $x_{\theta,S}$ and initialization copies $x_{\theta,I}$ of x :

- $\Pi_{w,g}(x_{\theta,I}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\text{enc}(w), 0)$,
- if $x \in V$, then $\Pi_{w,g}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\text{enc}(w), g(x))$ and $\Pi_{w,g}(x_{\theta,S}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\text{enc}(w), g(x))$,
- if $x \notin V$, then $\Pi_{w,g}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\text{enc}(w), 0)$ and $\Pi_{w,g}(x_{\theta,S}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\text{enc}(w), 0)$.

By a straightforward induction on the structure of θ , the following holds.

Claim. $(w, g) \models \theta$ if and only if $\Pi_{w,g} \models f(\theta)$.

Since φ is a sentence, by the previous claim, we obtain that $(w, g_\emptyset) \models \theta$ iff $\Pi_{w,g_\emptyset} \models f(\varphi)$, where g_\emptyset is the empty w -valuation. Note that Π_{w,g_\emptyset} associates to each variable in $\widehat{\text{VAR}}$ the pointed-trace $(\text{enc}(w), 0)$. Hence $w \models \varphi$ iff $\text{enc}(w) \models f(\varphi)$, and we are done. ◀

Finally, the second part of Theorem 3.12 directly follows from the following proposition.

► **Proposition 9.4.** *Let φ be a HyperLTL_C quantifier-free formula over $\text{AP} \cup \{\#\}$. Then, one can construct in exponential time a $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$ sentence $f(\varphi)$ over AP such that for each finite trace w , it holds that $w \models f(\varphi)$ if and only if $\text{enc}(w) \models \varphi$.*

Proof. Fix a HyperLTL_C quantifier-free formula φ and let $\text{VAR} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be the set of variables occurring in φ . Given a finite trace w , we define an equivalence relation \sim_w between w -pointed-trace assignments Π_1 and Π_2 having domain $\widehat{\text{VAR}}$: $\Pi_1 \sim_w \Pi_2$ if for each $x_i \in \text{VAR}$ with $\Pi_1(x_i) = (\text{enc}(w), h_1)$ and $\Pi_2(x_i) = (\text{enc}(w), h_2)$, it holds that (i) $h_1 < |w|$ iff $h_2 < |w|$, and (ii) $h_1 = h_2$ iff $h_1 < |w|$. Thus, Π_1 and Π_2 are equivalent if they coincide

on all the variables which refer to positions of the finite trace w . In the translation from HyperLTL_C into $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$, we will exploit the following result which can be proved by a straightforward induction on the structure of φ .

Claim 1. Let w be a finite trace and Π_1 and Π_2 be two w -pointed-trace assignments with domain VAR such that $\Pi_1 \sim_w \Pi_2$. Then, $\Pi_1 \models \varphi$ iff $\Pi_2 \models \varphi$.

For each variable $x_i \in \text{VAR}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, let y_i^ℓ be a fresh copy of x_i . For a subformula θ of φ , a context $\emptyset \neq C \subseteq \text{VAR}$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, and a subset $Ex \subseteq \text{VAR}$, we associate to the tuple (θ, C, ℓ, Ex) a $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$ formula $f(\theta, C, \ell, Ex)$ over AP with free variables $y_1^\ell, \dots, y_n^\ell$. Intuitively, C represents the current context and for the given finite trace w , Ex is the set of variables in VAR whose copies refer to positions in $\text{enc}(w) = w \cdot \{\#\}^\omega$ which go beyond w . The $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$ formula $f(\theta, C, \ell, Ex)$ is inductively defined as follows:

- θ is a relativized atomic proposition $p[x_i]$:

$$f(p[x_i], C, \ell, Ex) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} P_p[y_i^\ell] & \text{if } p \neq \# \text{ and } x_i \notin Ex \\ \top & \text{if } p = \# \text{ and } x_i \in Ex \\ \neg\top & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- $f(\neg\theta, C, \ell, Ex) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \neg f(\theta, C, \ell, Ex)$.
- $f(\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2, C, \ell, Ex) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(\theta_1, C, \ell, Ex) \wedge f(\theta_2, C, \ell, Ex)$.
- $f(C'\theta, C, \ell, Ex) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(\theta, C', \ell, Ex)$.
- θ is of the form $\theta = X\theta_1$.

For the variables $x_i \in C \setminus Ex$, we need to distinguish between those whose copies y_i^ℓ refer to the last position of the given finite trace w from those whose copies y_i^ℓ refer to positions along w distinct from the last one. In the first case, when we apply the next modality X in the context C , then the copies y_i^ℓ of the corresponding variables x_i will refer to positions which does not belong to w . This is encoded by adding the set V of these variables x_i to the set Ex . Thus, $f(X\theta_1, C, \ell, Ex)$ is defined as follows, where y_0 is a fresh variable:

$$f(X\theta_1, C, \ell, Ex) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigvee_{V \subseteq C \setminus Ex} \exists y_1^{\ell+1} \dots \exists y_n^{\ell+1} \cdot \left(\bigwedge_{x_i \in C \setminus Ex} (x_i \in V \leftrightarrow \forall y_0. y_0 \leq y_i^\ell) \wedge \bigwedge_{x_i \in (\text{VAR} \setminus C) \cup Ex \cup V} y_i^{\ell+1} = y_i^\ell \wedge \bigwedge_{x_i \in C \setminus (Ex \cup V)} y_i^{\ell+1} = y_i^\ell + 1 \wedge f(\theta_1, C, \ell + 1, Ex \cup V) \right)$$

- θ is of the form $\theta = \theta_1 U \theta_2$.

This is the case more involved. Intuitively, in the evaluation of $\theta_1 U \theta_2$ within the context C , the variables $x_i \in C \setminus Ex$ move forwardly and synchronously of a non-negative offset $z \geq 0$. After this shift, θ_2 must be true and for all intermediate offsets $z' \leq z$, θ_1 must be true. However, during these z' -shifts some variables can move beyond the given finite trace w in $\text{enc}(w) = w \cdot \{\#\}^\omega$. We can handle this situation as follows. For a subset $V \subseteq \text{VAR}$, we denote by $\text{Part}(V)$ the set of tuples (P_1, \dots, P_k) such that P_1, \dots, P_k form a partition of V (i.e., P_1, \dots, P_k are pairwise disjoint and their union is V) and P_1, \dots, P_{k-1} are not empty. Note that $k \leq n$. Then, for the previous offset z , there must be a partition $(P_1, \dots, P_k) \in \text{Part}(C \setminus Ex)$ and intermediate offsets $0 \leq z_1 < \dots < z_k$ such that $z_k = z$ and the following holds:

- for each $i \in [1, k-1]$, P_i is the set of all and only variables in $C \setminus Ex$ that after the z_i -shift move exactly at the last position of w ,

- P_k is the (possibly empty) set of all and only the variables in $C \setminus Ex$ that after the z_k -shift, where $z_k = z$, refer to positions belonging to w .

Then the $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$ formula $f(\theta_1 \cup \theta_2, C, \ell, Ex)$ is defined as follows:

$$f(\theta_1 \cup \theta_2, C, \ell, Ex) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigvee_{(V_1, \dots, V_k) \in \text{Part}(C \setminus Ex)} \exists z_0 \exists z_1 \dots \exists z_k. z_1 < z_2 < \dots < z_k \wedge$$

$$z_0 = 0 \wedge (z_k > 0 \rightarrow f(\theta_1, C, \ell, Ex)) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [1, k-1]} g(z_{i-1}, z_i, V_i, \theta_1, C, \ell, Ex \cup \bigcup_{j \in [1, i-1]} V_j) \wedge$$

$$h(z_{k-1}, z_k, \theta_1, \theta_2, C, \ell, Ex \cup \bigcup_{j \in [1, k-1]} V_j)$$

where for two variables y and z , a subset $V \subseteq C$, two subformulas ψ_1 and ψ_2 of φ , $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, and a subset $Ex \subseteq \text{VAR}$, the $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$ formulas $g(y, z, V, \psi_1, \ell, C, Ex)$ and $h(y, z, \psi_1, \psi_2, C, \ell, Ex)$ are defined as follows:

$$g(y, z, V, \psi_1, C, \ell, Ex) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists y_1^{\ell+1}. \dots \exists y_n^{\ell+1}. \left(\bigwedge_{x_i \in (\text{VAR} \setminus C) \cup Ex} y_i^{\ell+1} = y_i^\ell \wedge \bigwedge_{x_i \in C \setminus Ex} (y_i^{\ell+1} = y_i^\ell + z \wedge (x_i \in V \leftrightarrow \forall z_0. z_0 \leq y_i^{\ell+1})) \wedge \forall z_0 \forall y_1^{\ell+2}. \dots \forall y_n^{\ell+2}. \right.$$

$$\left. [y < z_0 \leq z \wedge \bigwedge_{x_i \in (\text{VAR} \setminus C) \cup Ex} y_i^{\ell+2} = y_i^\ell \wedge \bigwedge_{x_i \in C \setminus Ex} y_i^{\ell+2} = y_i^\ell + z_0] \rightarrow f(\psi_1, C, \ell + 2, Ex) \right)$$

$$h(y, z, \psi_1, \psi_2, C, \ell, Ex) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists y_1^{\ell+1}. \dots \exists y_n^{\ell+1}. \left(\bigwedge_{x_i \in (\text{VAR} \setminus C) \cup Ex} y_i^{\ell+1} = y_i^\ell \wedge \bigwedge_{x_i \in C \setminus Ex} y_i^{\ell+1} = y_i^\ell + z \wedge f(\psi_2, C, \ell + 1, Ex) \wedge \forall z_0 \forall y_1^{\ell+2}. \dots \forall y_n^{\ell+2}. \right.$$

$$\left. [y < z_0 < z \wedge \bigwedge_{x_i \in (\text{VAR} \setminus C) \cup Ex} y_i^{\ell+2} = y_i^\ell \wedge \bigwedge_{x_i \in C \setminus Ex} y_i^{\ell+2} = y_i^\ell + z_0] \rightarrow f(\psi_1, C, \ell + 2, Ex) \right)$$

Now, we prove that the construction is correct. Let w be a finite trace. Given a w -pointed trace assignment Π with domain VAR and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we associate to Π and ℓ a w -valuation $g(\Pi, \ell)$ with domain $\{y_1^\ell, \dots, y_n^\ell\}$ defined as follows for each variable y_i^ℓ , where $\Pi(x_i) = (\text{enc}(w), h)$: $g(\Pi, \ell)(y_i^\ell) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h$ if $h < |w|$, and $g(\Pi, \ell)(y_i^\ell) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |w| - 1$ otherwise.

A w -pointed trace assignment Π is *consistent with a subset* $Ex \subseteq \text{VAR}$ if for each $x_i \in \text{VAR}$ with $\Pi(x_i) = (\text{enc}(w), h)$, it holds that $h < |w|$ iff $x_i \notin Ex$. By construction, Claim 1, and a straightforward induction on the structure of the given subformula θ of φ , we obtain the following result.

Claim 2. Let w be a finite trace, θ a subformula of φ , $\emptyset \neq C \subseteq \text{VAR}$ a context, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, and $Ex \subseteq \text{VAR}$. Then, for each w -pointed-trace assignment Π which is consistent with Ex , it holds that

$$\Pi, C \models \theta \text{ iff } w, g(\Pi, \ell) \models f(\theta, C, \ell, Ex)$$

Let $f(\varphi)$ be the $\text{FO}_f[<, +]$ sentence defined as follows:

$$f(\varphi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists x_1 \dots \exists x_n. (f(\varphi, \text{VAR}, 1, \emptyset) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [1, n]} (y_i^1 = x_i \wedge x_i = 0))$$

By Claim 1, it follows that for each finite trace, $\text{enc}(w) \models \varphi$ if and only if $w \models f(\varphi)$. This concludes the proof of Proposition 9.4. \blacktriangleleft

9.3 Syntax and semantics of past HyperLTL_C and proof of Theorem 3.13

In this section, we first define the syntax and semantics of past HyperLTL_C, the extension of HyperLTL_C with past temporal modalities. Then, we provide a proof of Theorem 3.13.

The syntax of past HyperLTL_C quantifier-free formulas ψ over AP and VAR is as follows:

$$\psi ::= \top \mid p[x] \mid \neg\psi \mid \psi \wedge \psi \mid X\psi \mid Y\psi \mid \psi U\psi \mid \psi S\psi \mid \langle C \rangle \psi$$

where Y (“previous”) and S (“since”) are the standard past counterparts of the temporal modalities X and U, respectively. Let C be a context, Π a pointed-trace assignment, and $i \geq 0$ be an offset. The (C, i) -predecessor of Π , denoted by $\Pi -_C i$, is defined as follows:

- if there is $x \in \text{Dom}(\Pi) \cap C$ such that $\Pi(x) = (\pi, h)$ and $h < i$, then $\Pi -_C i = \text{und}$ (intuitively, **und** denotes the *undefined* value);
- otherwise, $\Pi -_C i$ is the pointed-trace assignment with domain $\text{Dom}(\Pi)$ defined as follows. For each $x \in \text{Dom}(\Pi)$, where $\Pi(x) = (\pi, h)$: $[\Pi -_C i](x) = (\pi, h - i)$ if $x \in C$, and $[\Pi -_C i](x) = \Pi(x)$ otherwise.

Intuitively, if the pointed-trace assignment $\Pi -_C i$ is defined, then the positions of the pointed traces associated with the variables in C move back of i steps, while the positions of the other pointed traces remain unchanged. The semantics of the past temporal modalities is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Pi, C) \models Y\psi &\iff \Pi -_C 1 \neq \text{und} \text{ and } (\Pi -_C 1, C) \models \psi \\ (\Pi, C) \models \psi_1 S\psi_2 &\iff \text{for some } i \geq 0 \text{ such that } \Pi -_C i \neq \text{und} : (\Pi -_C i, C) \models \psi_2 \text{ and} \\ &\quad (\Pi -_C k, C) \models \psi_1 \text{ for all } 0 \leq k < i \end{aligned}$$

We write $\Pi \models \psi$ to mean that $(\Pi, \text{VAR}) \models \psi$. Moreover, for a trace w , we write $w \models \psi$ to mean that $\Pi_w \models \psi$, where Π_w is the initial pointed-trace assignment associating to each trace variable occurring in ψ the pointed trace $(w, 0)$.

Theorem 3.13 directly follows from the following two propositions.

► **Proposition 9.5.** *Let φ be a FO[<, +] sentence over AP. Then, one can construct in polynomial time a HyperLTL_C quantifier-free formula $f(\varphi)$ over AP such that for each trace w , it holds that $w \models \varphi$ if and only if $w \models f(\varphi)$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 9.3 but we use the past temporal modalities for encoding the atomic formulas of the given FO[<, +] sentence φ . In particular, given two variables x and y , we exploit the following past HyperLTL_C quantifier-free formula $\psi_{=}(x, y)$ for expressing that x and y refer to the same position:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{=}(x, y) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\text{init}(x) \wedge \text{init}(y)) \vee \{x, y\}Y(\top S(\text{init}(x) \wedge \text{init}(y))) \\ \text{init}(z) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{z\} \neg Y\left(\bigvee_{p \in \text{AP}} (p[z] \vee \neg p[z])\right) \quad \text{for each } z \in \text{VAR} \end{aligned}$$

◀

The proof of the following proposition is a simplified version of that of Proposition 9.4 and we omit the details here.

► **Proposition 9.6.** *Let φ be a past HyperLTL_C quantifier-free formula over AP. Then, one can construct in polynomial time a FO[<, +] sentence $f(\varphi)$ over AP such that for each trace w , it holds that $w \models f(\varphi)$ if and only if $w \models \varphi$.*

9.4 Proof of Theorem 3.14

In this section, we provide a proof of Theorem 3.14.

► **Theorem 3.14.** *Model-checking against the fragment \mathcal{U} of HyperLTL_C is Σ_0^1 -hard.*

Proof. The result is obtained by a polynomial time reduction from the halting problem of non-deterministic Minsky 2-counter machines [19], a well-known Σ_0^1 -complete problem [19].

Recall that the fragment \mathcal{U} consists of two-variable quantifier alternation-free formulas of the form $\exists x_1. \exists x_2. \psi_0 \wedge \{x_2\}F\{x_1, x_2\}\psi$, where ψ_0 and ψ are quantifier-free HyperLTL formulas. Fix a Minsky 2-counter machine $M = \langle Q, \Delta, \delta_{init}, \delta_{halt} \rangle$. Note that M is defined as at the end of Section 3.1 but the designated transition δ_{rec} is replaced with the halting transition δ_{halt} . An halting computation of M is a finite computation of M starting at the initial configuration and leading to a configuration of the form (δ_{halt}, ν) for some counter valuation $\nu : \{1, 2\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. The halting problem consists in checking the existence of an halting computation for the given machine M . Without loss of generality, we assume that $\delta_{init} \neq \delta_{halt}$. We construct a Kripke structure \mathcal{K}_M and a HyperLTL_C formula φ_M in the fragment \mathcal{U} such that there is an halting computation of M iff $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}_M) \models \varphi_M$ (i.e., \mathcal{K}_M is a model of φ_M).

We first provide a description of the reduction. Codes of M -configurations (*segments*) are similar to the ones described in the proof of Theorem 3.6, where the padding proposition allows to obtain codes of the same M -configuration having arbitrary length. The finite Kripke structure \mathcal{K}_M ensures that its set of traces contains the *well-formed traces* π of the form $s_1 \dots s_n \cdot \{\perp\}^\omega$, where s_1, \dots, s_n are segments, segment s_1 encodes the initial configuration, segment s_n encodes some halting configuration, and the second segment s_2 is marked by a special proposition. Then the \mathcal{U} -formula ensures that both the two variables, say x_1 and x_2 , are bound to a well-formed trace $\pi = s_1 \dots s_n \cdot \{\perp\}^\omega$ and π is faithful to the evolution of M . This last requirement is ensured by moving in the context $\{x_2\}$ the position for the x_2 -trace to the beginning of the second segment s_2 , and by requiring, by means of a lockstepwise traversal of the trace π and the suffix of π starting from the beginning of the second segment s_2 , that all the segments have the same length. In this way, in this traversal, the $(i+1)^{th}$ -segment of π along the x_2 -trace matches the i^{th} -segment along the x_1 -trace, and one can ensure that the configuration encoded by the $(i+1)^{th}$ -segment is a M -successor of the configuration encoded by the i^{th} -segment. Note that the existence of an halting computation in M entails the existence of a uniform upper bound on the values of the counters along the computation. Thus, by exploiting the padding proposition, one can ensure that in the encoding of such a computation all the segments have the same length.

We now proceed with the technical details of the reduction. We exploit the set AP of atomic propositions defined as $\text{AP} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Delta \cup \{c_1, c_2, \#, beg, pad, \perp\}$. An M -configuration (δ, ν) is encoded by the finite words over 2^{AP} (called *segments*) of the form:

$$\{beg, \delta\}P_1 \dots P_m \{pad\}^k$$

where $k \geq 1$, $m = \max(\nu(1), \nu(2))$, and for all $i \in [1, m]$, (i) $\emptyset \neq P_i \subseteq \{c_1, c_2\}$ and (ii) for all $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$, $c_\ell \in P_i$ iff $i \leq \nu(\ell)$. A *marked segment* is defined as a segment but the first position is additionally labeled by the proposition $\#$. A *well-formed trace* of M is a trace of the form $s_1 \dots s_n \cdot \{\perp\}^\omega$ such that (i) $n > 1$ and s_1, \dots, s_n are n segments, (ii) s_1 encodes the initial configuration, (iii) s_n encodes some halting configuration, and (iv) s_2 is a marked segment. Thus, halting computations of M are encoded by well-formed traces which, additionally, are faithful to the evolution of M . The following result is straightforward.

Claim. One can construct in polynomial time a Kripke structure \mathcal{K}_M such that

- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}_M)$ contains all the well-formed traces.
- For each $\pi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}_M)$, π is well-formed iff π visits a position labeled by \perp .

We construct a \mathcal{U} -formula φ_M such that $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}_M) \models \varphi_M$ iff there is a well-formed trace which is faithful to the evolution of M . Hence, the result follows. The \mathcal{U} -formula φ_M is defined as follows:

$$\varphi_M \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists x_1. \exists x_2. \bigwedge_{p \in \text{AP}} \mathbf{G}(p[x_1] \leftrightarrow p[x_2]) \wedge \{x_2\} \mathbf{F}\{x_1, x_2\} (\#[x_2] \wedge \mathbf{F}\perp[x_2] \wedge \psi_f)$$

where ψ_f is a quantifier-free **HyperLTL** formula defined in the following. Note that the first conjunct ensures that variables x_1 and x_2 are bound to the same trace π of \mathcal{K}_M , while by the previous claim, the subformula $\mathbf{F}\perp[x_2]$ in the second conjunct ensures that the trace $\pi = s_1 \dots s_n \cdot \{\perp\}^\omega$ is well-formed. Moreover, the position for the x_2 -trace is moved to the beginning of the second segment of π in the context $\{x_2\}$ and ψ_f ensures by a lockstepwise traversal of the trace π and the suffix of π starting from the beginning of the second segment that π is faithful to the evolution of M . The quantifier-free **HyperLTL** formula ψ_f consists of two conjuncts enforcing the following requirements:

- The segments s_1, \dots, s_n have the same length. This ensures that in the lockstepwise traversal of π (bound to variable x_1) and $s_2 \dots s_n \cdot \{\perp\}^\omega$ (bound to variable x_2), the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ -segment for the x_2 -trace matches in the traversal the i^{th} -segment for the x_1 -trace for all $1 \leq i < n$.

$$\mathbf{G}(\text{beg}[x_2] \leftrightarrow \text{beg}[x_1])$$

- The configuration encoded by the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ -segment for the x_2 -trace is a M -successor of the configuration encoded by the i^{th} -segment for the x_1 -trace for all $1 \leq i < n$.

$$\bigwedge_{\delta=(q,(op,\ell),q') \in \Delta} \mathbf{G} \left(\text{beg}[x_1] \wedge \text{beg}[x_2] \wedge \delta[x_1] \longrightarrow \left(\bigvee_{\delta'=(q',(op',\ell'),q'') \in \Delta} \delta'[x_2] \wedge \right. \right.$$

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{X}((c_{3-\ell}[x_1] \wedge c_{3-\ell}[x_2]) \mathbf{U}(\neg c_{3-\ell}[x_1] \wedge \neg c_{3-\ell}[x_2]))}_{\text{the value of counter } 3-\ell \text{ does not change}} \wedge$$

$$\underbrace{op = \text{inc} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}((c_\ell[x_1] \wedge c_\ell[x_2]) \mathbf{U}(\neg c_\ell[x_1] \wedge c_\ell[x_2] \wedge \neg \mathbf{X}c_\ell[x_2]))}_{\text{increment of counter } \ell} \wedge$$

$$\underbrace{op = \text{dec} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}((c_\ell[x_1] \wedge c_\ell[x_2]) \mathbf{U}(c_\ell[x_1] \wedge \neg c_\ell[x_2] \wedge \neg \mathbf{X}c_\ell[x_1]))}_{\text{decrement of counter } \ell} \wedge$$

$$\left. \left. \underbrace{op = \text{if_zero} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}(\neg c_\ell[x_1] \wedge \neg c_\ell[x_2])}_{\text{zero test of counter } \ell} \right) \right)$$

By construction, if $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}_M) \models \varphi_M$, then there exists a well-formed trace which is faithful to the evolution of M , hence, there is an halting computation of M . Vice versa if there is an halting computation ρ of M , then there is a uniform bound on the counter values along ρ . Hence, by construction, there exists a well-formed trace π whose segments have the same length which satisfies the quantifier-free part of φ_M with x_1 and x_2 bound to π . By the previous claim, it follows that $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}_M) \models \varphi_M$, and we are done. \blacktriangleleft

9.5 Proof of Theorem 3.15

In this section, we provide a proof of Theorem 3.15. We show that a simple HyperLTL_C formula can be translated in polynomial time into an equivalent $\text{FO}[\langle, E]$ formula (see Appendix 10.1 for the definition of the syntax and semantics of $\text{FO}[\langle, E]$). Thus, since model checking of $\text{FO}[\langle, E]$ is decidable [7], Theorem 3.15 directly follows.

► **Proposition 9.7.** *Given a simple HyperLTL_C formula, one can construct in polynomial time an equivalent $\text{FO}[\langle, E]$ formula.*

Proof. Let $\text{VAR} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and \mathcal{F} be the set of quantifier-free HyperLTL_C formulas over VAR of the form $C\psi$ such that C is a context and ψ is a quantifier-free HyperLTL_C formula whose contexts are all singletons, i.e. consisting of a single trace variable. Evidently, each simple HyperLTL_C quantifier-free formula φ can be equivalently rewritten as a Boolean combination of quantifier-free formulas in the fragment \mathcal{F} . Thus, it suffices to show that for each formula $C\psi$ in the fragment \mathcal{F} , there exists a $\text{FO}[\langle, E]$ formula ψ' with free variables x_1, \dots, x_n such that for all sets \mathcal{L} of traces and *initial* pointed-trace assignments Π over VAR and \mathcal{L} , it holds that $\Pi \models C\psi$ iff $\Pi \models_{\mathcal{L}} \psi'$.

For each variable $x_i \in \text{VAR}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, let y_i^ℓ be a fresh copy of x_i . For a quantifier-free HyperLTL_C formula ψ whose contexts are all singletons, a context $\emptyset \neq C \subseteq \text{VAR}$, and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we associate to the tuple (ψ, C, ℓ) , a $\text{FO}[\langle, E]$ formula $f(\psi, C, \ell)$ with free variables $y_1^\ell, \dots, y_n^\ell$. The mapping f is inductively defined as follows (recall that for each $p \in \text{AP}$, $\text{FO}[\langle, E]$ provides the monadic predicate P_p):

- $f(p[x_i], C, \ell) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_p(y_i^\ell).$
- $f(\neg\psi, C, \ell) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \neg f(\psi, C, \ell).$
- $f(\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2, C, \ell) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(\psi_1, C, \ell) \wedge f(\psi_2, C, \ell).$
-

$$f(\mathbf{X}\psi, C, \ell) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists y_1^{\ell+1}. \dots \exists y_n^{\ell+1}. \left(\bigwedge_{x_i \in C} y_i^{\ell+1} = y_i^\ell + 1 \wedge \bigwedge_{x_i \notin C} y_i^{\ell+1} = y_i^\ell \wedge f(\psi, C, \ell + 1) \right)$$

Note that for variables x and y , the predicate $y = x + 1$ can be expressed in $\text{FO}[\langle, E]$ as follows: $x < y \wedge \neg \exists z. x < z \wedge z < y$.

■

$$\begin{aligned} f(\psi_1 \cup \psi_2, C, \ell) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists y_1^{\ell+1}. \dots \exists y_n^{\ell+1}. \left(\bigwedge_{x_i \in C} y_i^\ell \leq y_i^{\ell+1} \wedge \bigwedge_{x_i \notin C} y_i^{\ell+1} = y_i^\ell \wedge \theta_E(C, \ell + 1) \wedge \right. \\ &\quad \left. f(\psi_2, C, \ell + 1) \wedge \forall y_1^{\ell+2}. \dots \forall y_n^{\ell+2}. \left[\bigwedge_{x_i \in C} (y_i^\ell \leq y_i^{\ell+2} \wedge y_i^{\ell+2} < y_i^{\ell+1}) \wedge \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \bigwedge_{x_i \notin C} y_i^{\ell+2} = y_i^\ell \wedge \theta_E(C, \ell + 2) \right] \longrightarrow f(\psi_1, C, \ell + 2) \right) \\ \theta_E(C, \ell) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigwedge_{x_i, x_j \in C \mid x_i \neq x_j} E(y_i^\ell, y_j^\ell) \end{aligned}$$

Note that if C is a singleton, then $\theta_E(C, \ell)$ is \top (the empty conjunction is \top).

- $f(\{x_i\}\psi, C, \ell) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(\psi, \{x_i\}, \ell).$

By construction, we obtain the following result, where a pointed-trace assignment Π with domain VAR is *consistent with a context* C if there is a unique position m such that for all $x_i \in C$, it holds that $\Pi(x_i)$ is of the form (π, m) for some trace π .

Claim. Let ψ be a quantifier-free HyperLTL_C formula over VAR whose contexts are all singletons, $C \subseteq \text{VAR}$ a context, and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for each set \mathcal{L} of traces and each pointed-trace assignment Π over VAR and \mathcal{L} which is consistent with the context C :

$$\Pi \models \psi \text{ if and only if } \Pi_\ell \models_{\mathcal{L}} f(\psi, C, \ell)$$

where Π_ℓ is the pointed-trace assignment over $\{y_1^\ell, \dots, y_n^\ell\}$ defined as: $\Pi_\ell(y_i^\ell) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pi(x_i)$.

Proof of the claim. By a straightforward induction on the structure of the formula ψ , (i) we first prove that the result holds when C is a singleton, and then (ii) we generalize the result to the case where C is not a singleton. \blacktriangleleft

For a formula $C\psi$ in the fragment \mathcal{F} , let ψ' be the FO[<,E] formula with free variables x_1, \dots, x_n given by $\exists y_1^1. \dots \exists y_n^1. (f(\psi, C, 1) \wedge \bigwedge_{x_i \in \text{VAR}} y_i^1 = x_i)$. By the previous claim, we obtain that for all sets \mathcal{L} of traces and *initial* pointed-trace assignments Π over VAR and \mathcal{L} , it holds that $\Pi \models \psi$ iff $\Pi \models_{\mathcal{L}} \psi'$, and we are done. \blacktriangleleft

10 Proofs from Section 4

10.1 Syntax and semantics of FO[<,E] and S1S[E]

We recall syntax and semantics of the logics FO[<,E] [14] and S1S[E] [7]. FO[<,E] [14] extends standard first-order logic FO[<] over infinite words or traces with the equal-level binary predicate E . It is a first-order logic with equality over the signature $\{<, E\} \cup \{P_a \mid a \in \text{AP}\}$ for a given finite set AP of atomic propositions. S1S[E] extends FO[<,E] by second-order quantification over monadic predicates.

Given a finite set AP of atomic propositions, a finite set $V_1 = \{x, y, \dots\}$ of first-order variables, and a finite set $V_2 = \{X, Y, \dots\}$ of second-order variables, the syntax of S1S[E] formulas over AP, V_1 , and V_2 is as follows:

$$\varphi ::= P_a(x) \mid x \in X \mid x < y \mid x = y \mid E(x, y) \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \exists x.\varphi \mid \exists X.\varphi$$

where $a \in \text{AP}$, $x, y \in V_1$, and $X \in V_2$. A S1S[E] sentence is a S1S[E] formula where each (first-order or second-order) variable occurs in the scope of a quantifier. FO[<,E] corresponds to the fragment of S1S[E] where the predicate $x \in X$ and the second-order quantifiers are disallowed. Note that standard first-order logic FO[<] over traces and its monadic second-order extension S1S syntactically correspond to the fragments of FO[<,E] and S1S[E], respectively, where the equal-level predicate E is disallowed.

While S1S is interpreted over traces, S1S[E] is interpreted over sets of traces. A set \mathcal{L} of traces induces the relational structure with domain $\mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{N}$ (i.e., the set of pointed traces associated with \mathcal{L}), where (i) the binary predicate $<$ is interpreted as the set of pairs of pointed traces in $\mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{N}$ of the form $((\pi, i_1), (\pi, i_2))$ such that $i_1 < i_2$, and (ii) the equal-level predicate E is interpreted as the set of pairs of pointed traces in $\mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{N}$ of the form $((\pi_1, i), (\pi_2, i))$. Hence, the predicate $<$ allows to compare distinct timestamps along the same trace, while the equal-level predicate allows to compare distinct traces at the same timestamp. The semantics of S1S[E] is formally defined as follows. A *first-order valuation over \mathcal{L}* is a pointed-trace assignment Π over V_1 and \mathcal{L} , and a *second-order valuation over \mathcal{L}* is a mapping \mathcal{V} assigning to each second-order variable in V_2 a set of pointed traces in $\mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{N}$. Given a S1S[E] formula φ , the satisfaction relation $\Pi, \mathcal{V} \models_{\mathcal{L}} \varphi$ is inductively defined

as follows (we omit the semantics for the Boolean connectives which is standard):

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi, \mathcal{V} \models_{\mathcal{L}} P_a(x) &\Leftrightarrow \Pi(x) = (\pi, i) \text{ and } a \in \pi(i) \\
\Pi, \mathcal{V} \models_{\mathcal{L}} x \in X &\Leftrightarrow \Pi(x) \in \mathcal{V}(X) \\
\Pi, \mathcal{V} \models_{\mathcal{L}} x < y &\Leftrightarrow \Pi(x) = (\pi_1, i_1), \Pi(y) = (\pi_2, i_2), \pi_1 = \pi_2, \text{ and } i_1 < i_2 \\
\Pi, \mathcal{V} \models_{\mathcal{L}} x = y &\Leftrightarrow \Pi(x) = \Pi(y) \\
\Pi, \mathcal{V} \models_{\mathcal{L}} E(x, y) &\Leftrightarrow \Pi(x) = (\pi_1, i_1), \Pi(y) = (\pi_2, i_2), \text{ and } i_1 = i_2 \\
\Pi, \mathcal{V} \models_{\mathcal{L}} \exists x. \varphi &\Leftrightarrow \Pi[x \mapsto (\pi, i)] \models_{\mathcal{L}} \varphi \text{ for some } (\pi, i) \in \mathcal{L} \times N \\
\Pi, \mathcal{V} \models_{\mathcal{L}} \exists X. \varphi &\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{V}[X \mapsto A] \models_{\mathcal{L}} \varphi \text{ for some } A \subseteq \mathcal{L} \times N
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{V}[X \mapsto A](X) = A$ and $\mathcal{V}[X \mapsto A](Y) = \mathcal{V}(Y)$ for $Y \neq X$. Note that if φ is a sentence, then the satisfaction relation $\Pi, \mathcal{V} \models_{\mathcal{L}} \varphi$ is independent of Π and \mathcal{V} . We say that \mathcal{L} is a model of φ , written $\mathcal{L} \models \varphi$ if $\Pi, \mathcal{V} \models_{\mathcal{L}} \varphi$ for some first-order valuation Π and second-order valuation \mathcal{V} over \mathcal{L} .

10.2 Proof of Lemma 4.1

In this section, we provide a proof of Lemma 4.1 (see Appendix 10.1 for the definition of the syntax and semantics of S1S[E] and S1S).

► **Lemma 4.1.** *Let $k \geq 1$ and φ be a S1S[E] sentence over AP. Then, one can construct a S1S sentence φ' over $AP \times [1, k]$ whose set of models is the k -language of φ .*

Proof. Fix $k \geq 1$. Let ψ be a S1S[E] formula over AP with first-order variables $V_1 = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and second-order variables $V_2 = \{X_1, \dots, X_m\}$ for some $n \geq 1$ and $m \geq 0$. For each first-order variable x_i , we introduce k fresh first-order variables $y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,k}$. Moreover, for each second-order variable X_j , we introduce k fresh second-order variables $Y_{j,1}, \dots, Y_{j,k}$. Let $V'_1 = \{y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{1,k}, \dots, y_{n,1}, \dots, y_{n,k}\}$ and $V'_2 = \{Y_{1,1}, \dots, Y_{1,k}, \dots, Y_{m,1}, \dots, Y_{m,k}\}$. Let $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k\}$ be a set of traces (over AP) of cardinality k . Intuitively, for a first-order variable x_i mapped to a pointed trace (π_ℓ, h) , we use the variable $y_{i,\ell}$ in S1S for keeping track of the position h associated to the trace π_ℓ in \mathcal{L} . Moreover, for a set $A \subseteq \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{N}$ mapped to variable X_i , we use the second-order variables $Y_{i,1}, \dots, Y_{i,k}$ for partitioning the set of timestamps in A in accordance to the first component of the pointed traces in A (recall that the second-order variables in S1S are mapped to sets of positions of the given trace).

Let $g : V_1 \mapsto [1, k]$ be a choice function associating to each first-order variable x_i an index $\ell \in [1, k]$. We associate to the S1S[E] formula ψ and the choice function g an S1S formula $f(\psi, g)$ over $AP \times [1, k]$, V'_1 , and V'_2 . The mapping $f(\psi, g)$ is inductively defined as follows:

- f is homomorphic for the Boolean connectives.
- $f(P_a(x_i), g) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_{(a, g(x_i))}(y_{i, g(x_i)})$
- $f(x_i \in X_j, g) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} y_{i, g(x_i)} \in Y_{j, g(x_i)}$
- $f(x_i < x_j, g) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \neg \top & \text{if } g(x_i) \neq g(x_j) \\ y_{i, g(x_i)} < y_{j, g(x_j)} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
- $f(x_i = x_j, g) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \neg \top & \text{if } g(x_i) \neq g(x_j) \\ y_{i, g(x_i)} = y_{j, g(x_j)} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
- $f(E(x_i, x_j), g) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} y_{i, g(x_i)} = y_{j, g(x_j)}$
- $f(\exists x_i. \psi, g) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigvee_{\ell \in [1, k]} \exists y_{i, \ell}. f(\psi, g[x_i \mapsto \ell])$

$$\blacksquare f(\exists X_i. \psi, g) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists Y_{i,1} \dots \exists Y_{i,k}. f(\psi, g)$$

where $g[x_i \mapsto \ell](x_j) = \ell$ if $j = i$, $g[x_i \mapsto \ell](x_j) = g(x_j)$ otherwise. Fix a well-formed trace ν over $\text{AP} \times [1, k]$ and let $\mathcal{L}(\nu)$ be the set of traces over AP having cardinality k associated with ν . Then, $\mathcal{L}(\nu)$ can be written in the form $\mathcal{L}(\nu) = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k\}$ where for each $\ell \in [1, k]$ and $i \geq 0$, $\pi_\ell(i) = \{p \in \text{AP} \mid (p, \ell) \in \nu(i)\}$. Let $g : V_1 \mapsto [1, k]$ be a choice function, \mathcal{V}_1 be a first-order S1S-valuation over V_1' (i.e., a function associating a position $i \geq 0$ to each variable in V_1'), and \mathcal{V}_2 be a second-order S1S-valuation over V_2' for S1S (i.e., a function associating a subset of \mathbb{N} to each variable in V_2'). We denote by $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g)$ and $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}_2)$ the first-order S1S[E]-valuation and the second-order S1S[E]-valuation over V_1 and V_2 , respectively, for the set of traces $\mathcal{L}(\nu)$, defined as follows:

- for each $x_i \in V_1$, let $g(x_i) = \ell$: then $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g)(x_i) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\pi_\ell, \mathcal{V}_1(y_{i,\ell}))$;
- for each $X_i \in V_2$, $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}_2)(X_i) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \{\pi_\ell\} \times \mathcal{V}_2(Y_{i,\ell})$.

We first show the following.

Claim. $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2 \models_\nu f(\psi, g)$ if and only if $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g), \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}_2) \models_{\mathcal{L}(\nu)} \psi$.

Proof of the claim: by induction on the structure of ψ . The case of Boolean connectives directly follows from the induction hypothesis. For the other cases, we proceed as follows:

- $\psi = P_a(x_i)$ for some $a \in \text{AP}$ and $i \in [1, n]$. Let $g(x_i) = \ell$ and $\mathcal{V}_1(y_{i,\ell}) = h$. By construction, $f(\psi, g) = P_{(a,\ell)}(y_{i,\ell})$ and $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g)(x_i) = (\pi_\ell, h)$. Moreover, $a \in \pi_\ell(h)$ iff $(a, \ell) \in \nu(h)$. Hence, the result follows.
- $\psi = x_i \in X_j$ for some $i \in [1, n]$ and $j \in [1, m]$. Let $g(x_i) = \ell$, $\mathcal{V}_1(y_{i,\ell}) = h$, and $\mathcal{V}_2(Y_{j,\ell}) = A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$. By construction, $f(\psi, g) = y_{i,\ell} \in Y_{j,\ell}$, $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g)(x_i) = (\pi_\ell, h)$, and $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}_2)(X_j) \cap (\{\pi_\ell\} \times \mathbb{N}) = \{\pi_\ell\} \times A$. Hence, $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g)(x_i) \in \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}_2)(X_j)$ iff $\mathcal{V}_1(y_{i,\ell}) \in \mathcal{V}_2(Y_{j,\ell})$, and the result holds in this case as well.
- $\psi = x_i < x_j$ for some $i, j \in [1, n]$. Let $g(x_i) = \ell$, $g(x_j) = \ell'$, $\mathcal{V}_1(y_{i,\ell}) = h$, and $\mathcal{V}_1(y_{j,\ell'}) = h'$. By construction, $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g)(x_i) = (\pi_\ell, h)$ and $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g)(x_j) = (\pi_{\ell'}, h')$. Moreover, either $\ell \neq \ell'$ and $f(\psi, g) = \neg \top$, or $\ell = \ell'$ and $f(\psi, g) = y_{i,\ell} < y_{j,\ell}$. Thus, since $\pi_\ell \neq \pi_{\ell'}$ if $\ell \neq \ell'$, the result easily follows.
- $\psi = x_i = x_j$ for some $i, j \in [1, n]$. This case is similar to the previous one.
- $\psi = E(x_i, x_j)$ for some $i, j \in [1, n]$. Let $g(x_i) = \ell$, $g(x_j) = \ell'$, $\mathcal{V}_1(y_{i,\ell}) = h$, and $\mathcal{V}_1(y_{j,\ell'}) = h'$. By construction, $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g)(x_i) = (\pi_\ell, h)$, $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g)(x_j) = (\pi_{\ell'}, h')$, and $f(\psi, g) = y_{i,\ell} = y_{j,\ell'}$. Hence, (i) $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2 \models_\nu f(\psi, g)$ iff $h = h'$ and (ii) $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g), \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}_2) \models_{\mathcal{L}(\nu)} \psi$ iff $h = h'$, and the result follows.
- $\psi = \exists x_i. \theta$ for some $i \in [1, n]$. First, assume that $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2 \models_\nu f(\exists x_i. \theta, g)$. By construction, there exists $\ell \in [1, k]$ such that $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2 \models_\nu \exists y_{i,\ell}. f(\theta, g[x_i \mapsto \ell])$. Hence, for some $h \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{V}_1[y_{i,\ell} \mapsto h], \mathcal{V}_2 \models_\nu f(\theta, g[x_i \mapsto \ell])$. Let $\mathcal{V}_1' = \mathcal{V}_1[y_{i,\ell} \mapsto h]$ and $g' = g[x_i \mapsto \ell]$. By the induction hypothesis, we have that $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1', g'), \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}_2) \models_{\mathcal{L}(\nu)} \theta$. Since $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1', g') = \Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g)[x_i \mapsto (\pi_\ell, h)]$, we obtain that $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g)[x_i \mapsto (\pi_\ell, h)], \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}_2) \models_{\mathcal{L}(\nu)} \theta$. Hence, $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g), \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}_2) \models_{\mathcal{L}(\nu)} \exists x_i. \theta$. The converse implication is similar.
- $\psi = \exists X_i. \theta$ for some $i \in [1, m]$. First, assume that $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2 \models_\nu f(\exists X_i. \theta, g)$. By construction, for each $\ell \in [1, k]$, there exists a set $A_\ell \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2[Y_{i,1} \mapsto A_1, \dots, Y_{i,k} \mapsto A_k] \models_\nu f(\theta, g)$. Let $\mathcal{V}_2' = \mathcal{V}_2[Y_{i,1} \mapsto A_1, \dots, Y_{i,k} \mapsto A_k]$. By the induction hypothesis, we have that $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g), \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}_2') \models_{\mathcal{L}(\nu)} \theta$. Let $A = \bigcup_{\ell \in [1, k]} \{\pi_\ell\} \times A_\ell$. Since $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}_2') = \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}_2)[X_i \mapsto A]$,

we obtain that $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g), \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}_2)[X_i \mapsto A] \models_{\mathcal{L}(\nu)} \theta$. Hence, $\Pi(\mathcal{V}_1, g), \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}_2) \models_{\mathcal{L}(\nu)} \exists X_i. \theta$.
The converse implication is similar.

This concludes the proof of the claim. ◀

Fix an arbitrary choice function $g_0 : V_1 \mapsto [1, k]$. For a S1S[E] sentence φ over AP, V_1 , and V_2 , let φ' be the S1S sentence over $\text{AP} \times [1, k]$ given by

$$\varphi' := f(\varphi, g_0) \wedge \bigwedge_{\ell, \ell' \in [1, k]: \ell \neq \ell'} \exists z_0. \bigvee_{a \in \text{AP}} (P_{(a, \ell)}(z_0) \leftrightarrow \neg P_{(a, \ell')}(z_0))$$

Note that the second conjunct captures the well-formed traces over $\text{AP} \times [1, k]$. By the previous claim, it follows that the k -language of φ is the set of traces (over $\text{AP} \times [1, k]$) satisfying φ' . This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.1. ◀