

# Concavely-Priced Probabilistic Timed Automata

Marcin Jurdziński<sup>1</sup>, Marta Kwiatkowska<sup>2</sup>, Gethin Norman<sup>2</sup> and Ashutosh Trivedi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Computer Science, University of Warwick, UK

<sup>2</sup> Computing Laboratory, University of Oxford, UK.

**Abstract.** Concavely-priced probabilistic timed automata, an extension of probabilistic timed automata, are introduced. In this paper we consider expected reachability, discounted, and average price problems for concavely-priced probabilistic timed automata for arbitrary initial states. We prove that these problems are EXPTIME-complete for probabilistic timed automata with two or more clocks and PTIME-complete for automata with one clock. Previous work on expected price problems for probabilistic timed automata was restricted to expected reachability for linearly-priced automata and integer valued initial states. This work uses the boundary region graph introduced by Jurdziński and Trivedi to analyse properties of concavely-priced (non-probabilistic) timed automata.

## 1 Introduction

*Markov decision processes* [27] (MDPs) extend finite automata by providing a probability distribution over successor states for each transition. Timed automata [1] extend finite automata by providing a mechanism to constrain the transitions with real-time. Probabilistic timed automata (PTAs) [20,15,3] generalise both timed automata and MDPs by allowing both probabilistic and real-time behaviour.

Priced timed automata are timed automata with (time-dependent) prices attached to locations. Optimisation problems on priced timed automata are fundamental to the *verification* of (quantitative timing) properties of systems modelled as timed automata. In linearly-priced timed automata [2,24] the price information is given by a real-valued function over locations which returns the price to be paid for each time-unit spent in the location. Jurdziński and Trivedi [18] have recently proposed a generalisation to *concave prices*, where the price of remaining in a location is a concave function over time, and demonstrated that, for such prices, a number of optimisation problems including reachability-price, discounted-price, and average-price are PSPACE-complete.

In this paper we present *concavely-priced probabilistic timed automata*, that is, probabilistic timed automata with concave prices. Concave functions appear frequently in many modelling scenarios such as in economics when representing resource utilization, sales or productivity. Examples include:

1. when renting equipment the rental rate decreases as the rental duration increases [11];
2. the expenditure by *vacation travellers* in an airport is typically a concave function of the waiting time [28];
3. the price of perishable products with fixed stock over a finite time period is usually a concave function of time [12], e.g., the price of a low-fare air-ticket as a function of the time remaining before the departure date.

*Contribution.* We show that finite-horizon expected total price, and infinite-horizon expected reachability, discounted price and average price objectives on concavely-priced PTAs are decidable. We also show that the complexity of solving expected reachability price, expected discounted price and expected average price problems are EXPTIME-complete for concavely-priced PTAs with two or more clocks and PTIME-complete for concavely-priced PTAs with one clock. An important contribution of this paper is the proof techniques which complement the techniques of [18]. We extend the boundary region graph construction for timed automata [18] to PTAs and demonstrate that all the optimisation problems considered can be reduced to similar problems on the boundary region graph. We characterise the values of the optimisation problems by *optimality equations* and prove the correctness of the reduction by analysing the solutions of the optimality equations on the boundary region graph. This allows us to obtain an efficient algorithm matching the EXPTIME lower bound for the problems. Complete proofs can be found in the technical report version of this paper [16].

*Related Work.* For a review of work on optimisation problems for (non-probabilistic) timed automata we refer the reader to [18]. For priced probabilistic timed automata work has been limited to considering linearly-priced PTAs. Based on the digital clocks approach [13], Kwiatkowska et. al. [19] present a method for solving infinite-horizon expected reachability problems for a subclass of probabilistic timed automata. In [6] an algorithm for calculating the maximal probability of reaching some goal location within a given cost (and time) bound is presented. The algorithm is shown to be partially correct in that if it terminates it terminates with the correct value. Following this, [5] demonstrates the undecidability of this problem. We also mention the approaches for analysing unpriced probabilistic timed automata against temporal logic specifications based on the region graph [20,15] and either forwards [20] or backwards [21] reachability. The complexity of performing such verification is studied in [23,17].

## 2 Preliminaries

We assume, wherever appropriate, sets  $\mathbb{N}$  of non-negative integers,  $\mathbb{R}$  of reals and  $\mathbb{R}_{\oplus}$  of non-negative reals. For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\llbracket n \rrbracket_{\mathbb{N}}$  and  $\llbracket n \rrbracket_{\mathbb{R}}$  denote the sets  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ , and  $\{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid 0 \leq r \leq n\}$  respectively. A *discrete probability distribution* over a countable set  $Q$  is a function  $\mu : Q \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $\sum_{q \in Q} \mu(q) = 1$ . For a possible uncountable set  $Q'$ , we define  $\mathcal{D}(Q')$  to be the set of functions  $\mu : Q' \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that the set  $\text{supp}(\mu) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{q \in Q' \mid \mu(q) > 0\}$  is countable and, over the domain  $\text{supp}(\mu)$ ,  $\mu$  is a distribution. We say that  $\mu \in \mathcal{D}(Q)$  is a *point distribution* if  $\mu(q) = 1$  for some  $q \in Q$ .

A set  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is *convex* if  $\theta x + (1-\theta)y \in \mathcal{D}$  for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ . A function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is *concave* (on its domain  $\text{dom}(f) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ ), if  $\text{dom}(f) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is a convex set and  $f(\theta \cdot x + (1-\theta) \cdot y) \geq \theta \cdot f(x) + (1-\theta) \cdot f(y)$  for all  $x, y \in \text{dom}(f)$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ . We require the following well known [8] properties of concave functions.

**Lemma 1.** *1. If  $f_1, \dots, f_k : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are concave and  $w_1, \dots, w_k \in \mathbb{R}_{\oplus}$ , then  $\sum_{i=1}^k w_i \cdot f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is concave on the domain  $\bigcap_{i=1}^k \text{dom}(f_i)$ .*  
*2. If  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is concave and  $g : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  linear, then  $x \mapsto f(g(x))$  is concave.*

3. If  $f_1, \dots, f_k : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are concave, then  $x \mapsto \min_{i=1}^k f_i(x)$  is concave on the domain  $\bigcap_{i=1}^k \text{dom}(f_i)$ .
4. If  $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is concave for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $x \mapsto \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} f_i(x)$  is concave.

**Lemma 2.** If  $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a concave function and  $\bar{f}$  is the (unique) continuous extension of  $f$  to the closure of the interval  $(a, b)$ , then  $\inf_{x \in (a, b)} f(x) = \min\{\bar{f}(a), \bar{f}(b)\}$ .

A function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is *Lipschitz-continuous* on its domain, if there exists a constant  $K \geq 0$ , called a Lipschitz constant of  $f$ , such that  $\|f(x) - f(y)\|_\infty \leq K\|x - y\|_\infty$  for all  $x, y \in \text{dom}(f)$ ; we then also say that  $f$  is  $K$ -continuous.

### 3 Markov Decision Processes

In this section we introduce Markov decision processes (MDPs), a form of transition systems which exhibit both probabilistic and nondeterministic behaviour.

**Definition 3.** A priced Markov decision process is a tuple  $\mathcal{M} = (S, A, p, \pi)$  where:

- $S$  is the set of states;
- $A$  is the set of actions;
- $p : S \times A \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(S)$  is a partial function called the probabilistic transition function;
- $\pi : S \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a bounded and measurable price function assigning real-values to state-action pairs.

We write  $A(s)$  for the set of actions available at  $s$ , i.e., the set of actions  $a$  for which  $p(s, a)$  is defined. For technical convenience we assume that  $A(s)$  is nonempty for all  $s \in S$ . We say  $\mathcal{M}$  is finite, if the sets  $S$  and  $A$  are finite.

In the priced MDP  $\mathcal{M}$ , if the current state is  $s$ , then a strategy chooses an action  $a \in A(s)$  after which a probabilistic transition is made according to the distribution  $p(s, a)$ , i.e., state  $s' \in S$  is reached with probability  $p(s'|s, a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} p(s, a)(s')$ . We say that  $(s, a, s')$  is a transition of  $\mathcal{M}$  if  $p(s'|s, a) > 0$  and a *run* of  $\mathcal{M}$  is a sequence  $\langle s_0, a_1, s_1, \dots \rangle \in S \times (A \times S)^*$  such that  $(s_i, a_{i+1}, s_{i+1})$  is a transition for all  $i \geq 0$ . We write  $\text{Runs}^{\mathcal{M}}$  ( $\text{Runs}_{\text{fin}}^{\mathcal{M}}$ ) for the sets of infinite (finite) runs and  $\text{Runs}^{\mathcal{M}}(s)$  ( $\text{Runs}_{\text{fin}}^{\mathcal{M}}(s)$ ) for the sets of infinite (finite) runs starting from state  $s$ . For a finite run  $r = \langle s_0, a_1, \dots, s_n \rangle$  we write  $\text{last}(r) = s_n$  for the last state of the run. Furthermore, let  $X_i$  and  $Y_i$  denote the random variables corresponding to  $i^{\text{th}}$  state and action of a run.

A *strategy* in  $\mathcal{M}$  is a function  $\sigma : \text{Runs}_{\text{fin}}^{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(A)$  such that  $\text{supp}(\sigma(r)) \subseteq A(\text{last}(r))$  for all  $r \in \text{Runs}_{\text{fin}}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . Let  $\text{Runs}_{\sigma}^{\mathcal{M}}(s)$  denote the subset of  $\text{Runs}^{\mathcal{M}}(s)$  which correspond to the strategy  $\sigma$  when starting in state  $s$ . Let  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}$  be the set of all strategies in  $\mathcal{M}$ . We say that a strategy  $\sigma$  is *pure* if  $\sigma(r)$  is a point distribution for all  $r \in \text{Runs}_{\text{fin}}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . We say that a strategy  $\sigma$  is *stationary* if  $\text{last}(r) = \text{last}(r')$  implies  $\sigma(r) = \sigma(r')$  for all  $r, r' \in \text{Runs}_{\text{fin}}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . A strategy  $\sigma$  is *positional* if it is both pure and stationary. To analyse the behaviour of an MDP  $\mathcal{M}$  under a strategy  $\sigma$ , for each state  $s$  of  $\mathcal{M}$ , we define a probability space  $(\text{Runs}_{\sigma}^{\mathcal{M}}(s), \mathcal{F}_{\text{Runs}_{\sigma}^{\mathcal{M}}(s)}, \text{Prob}_s^{\sigma})$  over the set of infinite runs of  $\sigma$  with  $s$  as the initial state. For details on this construction see, for example, [27]. Given a *real-valued random variable* over the set of infinite runs  $f : \text{Runs}^{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , using standard techniques from probability theory, we can define the expectation of this variable  $\mathbb{E}_s^{\sigma}\{f\}$  with respect to  $\sigma$  when starting in  $s$ .

**Performance objectives.** For a priced MDP  $\mathcal{M} = (S, A, p, \pi)$ , under any strategy  $\sigma$  and starting from any state  $s$ , there is a sequence of random prices  $\{\pi(X_{i-1}, Y_i)\}_{i \geq 1}$ . Depending on the problem under study there are a number of different performance objectives that can be studied. Below are the objectives most often used.

1. *Expected Reachability Price* (with target set  $F$ ):

$$\text{EReach}_{\mathcal{M}}(F)(s, \sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_s^\sigma \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\min\{i \mid X_i \in F\}} \pi(X_{i-1}, Y_i) \right\}.$$

2. *Expected Total Price* (with horizon  $N$ ):

$$\text{ETotal}_{\mathcal{M}}(N)(s, \sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_s^\sigma \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \pi(X_{i-1}, Y_i) \right\}.$$

3. *Expected Discounted Price* (with discount factor  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ ):

$$\text{EDisct}_{\mathcal{M}}(\lambda)(s, \sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_s^\sigma \left\{ (1-\lambda) \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda^{i-1} \pi(X_{i-1}, Y_i) \right\}.$$

4. *Expected Average Price*:

$$\text{EAvg}_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_s^\sigma \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \pi(X_{i-1}, Y_i) \right\}.$$

For an objective  $\text{ECost}_{\mathcal{M}}$  and state  $s$  we let  $\text{ECost}_{\mathcal{M}}^*(s) = \inf_{\sigma \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}} \text{ECost}_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \sigma)$ . A strategy  $\sigma$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  is *optimal* for  $\text{ECost}_{\mathcal{M}}$  if  $\text{ECost}_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \sigma) = \text{ECost}_{\mathcal{M}}^*(s)$  for all  $s \in S$ . Note that an optimal strategy need not exist, and in such cases one can consider, for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , a  $\varepsilon$ -optimal strategy, that is, a strategy  $\sigma$  such that  $\text{ECost}_{\mathcal{M}}^*(s) \geq \text{ECost}_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \sigma) - \varepsilon$  for all  $s \in S$ . For technical convenience we make the follows assumptions for reachability objectives [9].

**Assumption 1.** If  $s \in F$ , then  $s$  is *absorbing* and *price free*, i.e.  $p(s|s, a) = 1$  and  $\pi(s, a) = 0$  for all  $a \in A(s)$ .

**Assumption 2.** For all  $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $s \in S$  we have  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{Prob}_s^\sigma(X_i \in F) = 1$ .

*Optimality Equations.* We now review optimality equations for determining the objectives given above.

1. Let  $P : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $F \subseteq S$ ; we write  $P \models \text{Opt}_R^F(\mathcal{M})$ , and we say that  $P$  is a solution of optimality equations  $\text{Opt}_R^F(\mathcal{M})$  if, for all  $s \in S$ , we have:

$$P(s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s \in F \\ \inf_{a \in A(s)} \left\{ \pi(s, a) + \sum_{s' \in S} p(s'|s, a) \cdot P(s') \right\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

2. Let  $T_0, \dots, T_N : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ; we say that  $\langle T_i \rangle_{i=0}^N$  is a solution of optimality equations  $\text{Opt}_T^N(\mathcal{M})$  if, for all  $s \in S$ , we have:

$$T_i(s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = 0 \\ \inf_{a \in A(s)} \left\{ \pi(s, a) + \sum_{s' \in S} p(s'|s, a) \cdot T_{i-1}(s') \right\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

3. Let  $D : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ; we write  $D \models \text{Opt}_D^\lambda(\mathcal{M})$ , and we say that  $D$  is a solution of optimality equations  $\text{Opt}_D^\lambda(\mathcal{M})$  if, for all  $s \in S$ , we have:

$$D(s) = \inf_{a \in A(s)} \left\{ (1-\lambda) \cdot \pi(s, a) + \lambda \cdot \sum_{s' \in S} p(s'|s, a) \cdot D(s') \right\}.$$

4. Let  $G : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $B : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ; we write  $(G, B) \models \text{Opt}_A(\mathcal{M})$ , and we say that  $(G, B)$  is a solution of optimality equations<sup>3</sup>  $\text{Opt}_A(\mathcal{M})$ , if for all  $s \in S$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} G(s) &= \inf_{a \in A(s)} \left\{ \sum_{s' \in S} p(s'|s, a) \cdot G(s') \right\} \\ B(s) &= \inf_{a \in A(s)} \left\{ \pi(s, a) - G(s) + \sum_{s' \in S} p(s'|s, a) \cdot B(s') \right\} \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the following proposition is routine and for details see, for example, [10].

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a priced MDP.*

1. *If  $P \models \text{Opt}_R^F(\mathcal{M})$ , then  $P(s) = \text{EReach}_{\mathcal{M}}^*(F)(s)$  for all  $s \in S$ .*
2. *If  $\langle T_i \rangle_{i=0}^N \models \text{Opt}_R^N(\mathcal{M})$ , then  $T_i(s) = \text{ETotal}_{\mathcal{M}}^*(i)(s)$  for all  $i \leq N$  and  $s \in S$ .*
3. *If  $D \models \text{Opt}_D^\lambda(\mathcal{M})$  and  $D$  is bounded, then  $D(s) = \text{EDisct}_{\mathcal{M}}^*(\lambda)(s)$  for all  $s \in S$ .*
4. *If  $(G, B) \models \text{Opt}_A(\mathcal{M})$  and  $G, B$  are bounded, then  $G(s) = \text{EAvg}_{\mathcal{M}}^*(s)$  for all  $s \in S$ .*

Notice that, for each objective, if, for every state  $s \in S$ , the infimum is attained in the optimality equations, then there exists an optimal positional strategy. An important class of MDPs with this property are finite MDPs, which gives us the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.** *For every finite MDP, the existence of a solution of the optimality equations for the expected reachability, discounted and average price implies the existence of a positional optimal strategy for the corresponding objective.*

For a finite MDP  $\mathcal{M}$  a solution of optimality equations for expected reachability, total, discounted, and average price objectives can be obtained by value iteration or strategy improvement algorithms [27].

**Proposition 6.** *For every finite MDP, there exist solutions of the optimality equations for expected reachability, total, discounted, and average price objectives.*

Proposition 5 together with Proposition 6 provide a proof of the following well-known result for priced MDPs [27].

**Theorem 7.** *For a finite priced MDP the reachability, discounted, and average price objectives each have an optimal positional strategy.*

Notice that the total price objective need not have an optimal positional strategy since, unlike the other objectives, it is a finite horizon problem. However, for this reason, its analysis concerns only finitely many strategies.

<sup>3</sup> These optimality equations are slightly different from Howard's optimality equations for expected average price, and correspond to Puterman's [27] modified optimality equations.

## 4 Concavely-Priced Probabilistic Timed Automata

In this section we introduce concavely-priced probabilistic timed automata and begin by defining clocks, clock valuations, clock regions and zones.

### 4.1 Clocks, clock valuations, regions and zones.

We fix a constant  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and finite set of *clocks*  $\mathcal{C}$ . A ( $k$ -bounded) *clock valuation* is a function  $\nu : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \llbracket k \rrbracket_{\mathbb{R}}$  and we write  $V$  for the set of clock valuations.

**Assumption 3.** Although clocks in (probabilistic) timed automata are usually allowed to take arbitrary non-negative values, we have restricted the values of clocks to be bounded by some constant  $k$ . More precisely, we have assumed the models we consider are *bounded* probabilistic timed automata. This standard restriction [7] is for technical convenience and comes without significant loss of generality.

If  $\nu \in V$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\oplus}$  then we write  $\nu+t$  for the clock valuation defined by  $(\nu+t)(c) = \nu(c)+t$ , for all  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ . For  $C \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  and  $\nu \in V$ , we write  $\nu[C:=0]$  for the clock valuation where  $\nu[C:=0](c) = 0$  if  $c \in C$ , and  $\nu[C:=0](c) = \nu(c)$  otherwise.

The set of *clock constraints* over  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of conjunctions of *simple constraints*, which are constraints of the form  $c \bowtie i$  or  $c-c' \bowtie i$ , where  $c, c' \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $i \in \llbracket k \rrbracket_{\mathbb{N}}$ , and  $\bowtie \in \{<, >, =, \leq, \geq\}$ . For every  $\nu \in V$ , let  $\text{SCC}(\nu)$  be the set of simple constraints which hold in  $\nu$ . A *clock region* is a maximal set  $\zeta \subseteq V$ , such that  $\text{SCC}(\nu) = \text{SCC}(\nu')$  for all  $\nu, \nu' \in \zeta$ . Every clock region is an equivalence class of the indistinguishability-by-clock-constraints relation, and vice versa. Note that  $\nu$  and  $\nu'$  are in the same clock region if and only if the integer parts of the clocks and the partial orders of the clocks, determined by their fractional parts, are the same in  $\nu$  and  $\nu'$ . We write  $[\nu]$  for the clock region of  $\nu$  and, if  $\zeta = [\nu]$ , write  $\zeta[C:=0]$  for the clock region  $[\nu[C:=0]]$ .

A *clock zone* is a convex set of clock valuations, which is a union of a set of clock regions. We write  $\mathcal{Z}$  for the set of clock zones. For any clock zone  $W$  and clock valuation  $\nu$ , we use the notation  $\nu \triangleleft W$  to denote that  $[\nu] \in W$ . A set of clock valuations is a clock zone if and only if it is definable by a clock constraint. For  $W \subseteq V$ , we write  $\overline{W}$  for the smallest closed set in  $V$  containing  $W$ . Observe that, for every clock zone  $W$ , the set  $\overline{W}$  is also a clock zone.

### 4.2 Probabilistic timed automata

We are now in a position to introduce probabilistic timed automata.

**Definition 8.** A probabilistic timed automaton  $\mathbb{T} = (L, \mathcal{C}, \text{inv}, \text{Act}, E, \delta)$  consists of:

- a finite set of locations  $L$ ;
- a finite set of clocks  $\mathcal{C}$ ;
- an invariant condition  $\text{inv} : L \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ ;
- a finite set of actions  $\text{Act}$ ;
- an action enabledness function  $E : L \times \text{Act} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ ;
- a transition probability function  $\delta : (L \times \text{Act}) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(2^{\mathcal{C}} \times L)$ .

When we consider a probabilistic timed automaton as an input of an algorithm, its size should be understood as the sum of the sizes of encodings of  $L, \mathcal{C}, \text{inv}, \text{Act}, E$ , and  $\delta$ . A *configuration* of a probabilistic timed automaton  $\mathbb{T}$  is a pair  $(\ell, \nu)$ , where  $\ell \in L$  is a location and  $\nu \in V$  is a clock valuation over  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $\nu \triangleleft \text{inv}(\ell)$ . For any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , we let  $(\ell, \nu) + t$  equal the configuration  $(\ell, \nu + t)$ . Informally, the behaviour of a probabilistic timed automaton is as follows. In configuration  $(\ell, \nu)$  time passes before an available action is triggered, after which a discrete probabilistic transition occurs. Time passage is available only if the invariant condition  $\text{inv}(\ell)$  is satisfied while time elapses, and the action  $a$  can be chosen after time  $t$  if the action is enabled in the location  $\ell$ , i.e., if  $\nu + t \triangleleft E(\ell, a)$ . Both the amount of time and the action chosen are nondeterministic. If the action  $a$  is chosen, then the probability of moving to the location  $\ell'$  and resetting all of the clocks in  $\mathcal{C}$  to 0 is given by  $\delta[\ell, a](\mathcal{C}, \ell')$ .

Formally, the semantics of a probabilistic timed automaton is given by an MDP which has both an infinite number of states and an infinite number of transitions.

**Definition 9.** Let  $\mathbb{T} = (L, \mathcal{C}, \text{inv}, \text{Act}, E, \delta)$  be a probabilistic timed automaton. The semantics of  $\mathbb{T}$  is the MDP  $\llbracket \mathbb{T} \rrbracket = (S_{\mathbb{T}}, A_{\mathbb{T}}, p_{\mathbb{T}})$  where

- $S_{\mathbb{T}} \subseteq L \times V$  such that  $(\ell, \nu) \in S_{\mathbb{T}}$  if and only if  $\nu \triangleleft \text{inv}(\ell)$ ;
- $A_{\mathbb{T}} = \mathbb{R}_{\oplus} \times \text{Act}$ ;
- for  $(\ell, \nu) \in S_{\mathbb{T}}$  and  $(t, a) \in A_{\mathbb{T}}$ , we have  $p_{\mathbb{T}}((\ell, \nu), (t, a)) = \mu$  if and only if
  - $\nu + t' \triangleleft \text{inv}(\ell)$  for all  $t' \in [0, t]$ ;
  - $\nu + t \triangleleft E(\ell, a)$ ;
  - $\mu(\ell', \nu') = \sum_{C \subseteq \mathcal{C} \wedge (\nu + t)[C := 0] = \nu'} \delta[\ell, a](C, \ell')$  for all  $(\ell', \nu') \in S$ .

We assume the following—standard and easy to syntactically verify—restriction on PTAs which ensures *time divergent* behaviour.

**Assumption 4.** We restrict attention to *structurally non-Zeno* probabilistic timed automata [29,17]. A PTA is structurally non-Zeno if, for any run  $\langle s_0, (t_1, a_1), \dots, s_n \rangle$ , such that  $s_0 = (\ell_0, \nu_0)$ ,  $s_n = (\ell_n, \nu_n)$  and  $\ell_0 = \ell_n$  (i.e., the run forms a cycle in the finite graph of the locations and transitions of the automaton) we have  $\sum_{i=1}^n t_i \geq 1$ .

### 4.3 Priced probabilistic timed automata

We now introduce priced probabilistic timed automata which extend probabilistic timed automata with price functions over state and time-action pairs.

**Definition 10.** A priced probabilistic timed automaton  $\mathcal{T} = (\mathbb{T}, \pi)$  consists of a probabilistic timed automaton  $\mathbb{T}$  and a price function  $\pi : (L \times V) \times (\mathbb{R}_{\oplus} \times \text{Act}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

The semantics of a priced PTA  $\mathcal{T}$  is the priced MDP  $\llbracket \mathcal{T} \rrbracket = (\llbracket \mathbb{T} \rrbracket, \pi)$  where  $\pi(s, (t, a))$  is the price of taking the action  $(t, a)$  from state  $s$  in  $\llbracket \mathbb{T} \rrbracket$ . In a *linearly-priced* PTA [19], the price function is represented as a function  $r : L \cup \text{Act} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , which gives a *price rate* to every location  $\ell$ , and a price to every action  $a$ ; the price of taking the timed move  $(a, t)$  from state  $(\ell, \nu)$  is then defined by  $\pi((\ell, \nu), (t, a)) = r(\ell) \cdot t + r(a)$ .

In this paper we restrict attention to *concave* price functions requiring that for any location  $\ell \in L$  and action  $a \in \text{Act}$  the function  $\pi((\ell, \cdot), (\cdot, a)) : V \times \mathbb{R}_{\oplus} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is concave.

However, the results in this paper for PTAs with more than 1 clock, also hold for the more general *region-wise concave* price functions of [18]. Notice that every linearly-priced PTA is also concavely-priced.

Considering the optimisation problems introduced for priced MDPs in Section 3, the following is the main result of the paper.

**Theorem 11.** *The minimisation problems for reachability, total, discounted, and average cost functions for concavely-priced PTAs are decidable.*

In the next section we introduce the boundary region graph, an abstraction whose size is exponential in the size of PTA. In Section 6 we show that to solve the above mentioned optimisation problems on concavely-priced PTAs, it is sufficient to solve them on the corresponding boundary region graph.

## 5 Boundary Region Graph Construction

Before introducing the boundary region graph we review the standard region graph construction for timed automata [1] extended in [20] to probabilistic timed automata.

### 5.1 The region graph

A *region* is a pair  $(\ell, \zeta)$ , where  $\ell$  is a location and  $\zeta$  is a clock region such that  $\zeta \subseteq \text{inv}(\ell)$ . For any  $s=(\ell, \nu)$ , we write  $[s]$  for the region  $(\ell, [\nu])$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  for the set of regions. A set  $Z \subseteq L \times V$  is a *zone* if, for every  $\ell \in L$ , there is a clock zone  $W_\ell$  (possibly empty), such that  $Z = \{(\ell, \nu) \mid \ell \in L \wedge \nu \triangleleft W_\ell\}$ . For a region  $R=(\ell, \zeta) \in \mathcal{R}$ , we write  $\bar{R}$  for the zone  $\{(\ell, \nu) \mid \nu \in \bar{\zeta}\}$ , recall  $\bar{\zeta}$  is the smallest closed set in  $V$  containing  $\zeta$ .

For  $R, R' \in \mathcal{R}$ , we say that  $R'$  is in the future of  $R$ , or that  $R$  is in the past of  $R'$ , if there is  $s \in R$ ,  $s' \in R'$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\oplus}$  such that  $s' = s+t$ ; we then write  $R \rightarrow_* R'$ . We say that  $R'$  is the *time successor* of  $R$  if  $R \rightarrow_* R'$ ,  $R \neq R'$ , and  $R \rightarrow_* R'' \rightarrow_* R'$  implies  $R''=R$  or  $R''=R'$  and write  $R \rightarrow_{+1} R'$  and  $R' \leftarrow_{+1} R$ . Similarly we say that  $R'$  is the  $n^{\text{th}}$  successor of  $R$  and write  $R \rightarrow_{+n} R'$ , if there is a sequence of regions  $\langle R_0, R_1, \dots, R_n \rangle$  such that  $R_0=R$ ,  $R_n=R'$  and  $R_i \rightarrow_{+1} R_{i+1}$  for every  $0 \leq i < n$ .

The region graph is an MDP with both a finite number of states and transitions.

**Definition 12.** *Let  $\mathsf{T} = (L, \mathcal{C}, \text{inv}, \text{Act}, E, \delta)$  be a probabilistic timed automaton. The region graph of  $\mathsf{T}$  is the MDP  $\mathsf{T}_{\text{RG}} = (S_{\text{RG}}, A_{\text{RG}}, p_{\text{RG}})$  where:*

- $S_{\text{RG}} = \mathcal{R}$ ;
- $A_{\text{RG}} \subseteq \mathbb{N} \times \text{Act}$  such that if  $(n, a) \in A_{\text{RG}}$  then  $n \leq (2 \cdot |\mathcal{C}|)^k$ ;
- for  $(\ell, \zeta) \in S_{\text{RG}}$  and  $(n, a) \in A_{\text{RG}}$  we have  $p_{\text{RG}}((\ell, \zeta), (n, a)) = \mu$  if and only if
  - $(\ell, \zeta) \rightarrow_{+n} (\ell, \zeta_n)$ ;
  - $\zeta_n \triangleleft E(\ell, a)$ ;
  - $\mu(\ell', \zeta') = \sum_{C \subseteq \mathcal{C} \wedge \zeta_n[C:=0]=\zeta'} \delta[\ell, a](C, \ell')$  for all  $(\ell', \zeta') \in S_{\text{RG}}$ .

Since the region graph abstracts away the precise timing information, it can not be used to solve expected reachability, total, discounted, and average price problems for the original probabilistic timed automaton. In the next section, we define a new abstraction of probabilistic timed automata, called the boundary region graph, which retains sufficient timing information to solve these performance objectives.



## 5.2 The boundary region graph

We say that a region  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  is *thin* if  $[s] \neq [s+\varepsilon]$  for every  $s \in R$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ ; other regions are called *thick*. We write  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Thin}}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Thick}}$  for the sets of thin and thick regions, respectively. Note that if  $R \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Thick}}$  then, for every  $s \in R$ , there is an  $\varepsilon > 0$ , such that  $[s] = [s+\varepsilon]$ . Observe that the time successor of a thin region is thick, and vice versa.

We say  $(\ell, \nu) \in L \times V$  is in the *closure of the region*  $(\ell, \zeta)$ , and we write  $(\ell, \nu) \in \overline{(\ell, \zeta)}$ , if  $\nu \in \zeta$ . For any  $\nu \in V$ ,  $b \in \llbracket k \rrbracket_{\mathbb{N}}$  and  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\nu(c) \leq b$ , we let  $\text{time}(\nu, (b, c)) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} b - \nu(c)$ . Intuitively,  $\text{time}(\nu, (b, c))$  returns the amount of time that must elapse in  $\nu$  before the clock  $c$  reaches the integer value  $b$ . Note that, for any  $(\ell, \nu) \in L \times V$  and  $a \in \text{Act}$ , if  $t = \text{time}(\nu, (b, c))$  is defined, then  $(\ell, [\nu+t]) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Thin}}$  and  $\text{supp}(p_{\top}(\cdot | (\ell, \nu), (t, a))) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{Thin}}$ . Observe that, for every  $R' \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Thin}}$ , there is a number  $b \in \llbracket k \rrbracket_{\mathbb{N}}$  and a clock  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ , such that, for every  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  in the past of  $R'$ , we have that  $s \in R$  implies  $(s+(b-\nu(c))) \in R'$ ; and we write  $R \rightarrow_{b,c} R'$ .

The motivation for the boundary region graph is the following. Let  $a \in A$ ,  $s = (\ell, \nu)$  and  $R = (\ell, \zeta) \rightarrow_* R' = (\ell, \zeta')$  such that  $s \in R$  and  $R' \triangleleft E(\ell, a)$ .

- If  $R' \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Thick}}$ , then there are infinitely many  $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\oplus}$  such that  $s+t \in R'$ . One of the main results that we establish is that in the state  $s$ , amongst all such  $t$ 's, for one of the boundaries of  $\zeta'$ , the closer  $\nu+t$  is to this boundary, the ‘better’ the timed action  $(t, a)$  becomes for each performance objective. However, since  $R'$  is a thick region, the set  $\{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\oplus} | s+t \in R'\}$  is an open interval, and hence does not contain its boundary values. Observe that the infimum equals  $b_- - \nu(c_-)$  where  $R \rightarrow_{b_-, c_-} R_- \rightarrow_{+1} R'$  and the supremum equals  $b_+ - \nu(c_+)$  where  $R \rightarrow_{b_+, c_+} R_+ \leftarrow_{+1} R'$ . In the boundary region graph we include these ‘best’ timed action through the actions  $((b_-, c_-, a), R')$  and  $((b_+, c_+, a), R')$ .
- If  $R' \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Thin}}$ , then there exists a unique  $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\oplus}$  such that  $(\ell, \nu+t) \in R'$ . Moreover since  $R'$  is a thin region there exists a clock  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  and a number  $b \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $R \rightarrow_{b,c} R'$  and  $t = b - \nu(c)$ . In the boundary region graph we summarize this ‘best’ timed action from region  $R$  via region  $R'$  through the action  $((b, c, a), R')$ .

With this intuition in mind, let us present the definition of a boundary region graph.

**Definition 13.** Let  $\top = (L, \mathcal{C}, \text{inv}, A, E, \delta)$  be a probabilistic timed automaton. The boundary region graph of  $\top$  is defined as the MDP  $\top_{\text{BRG}} = (S_{\text{BRG}}, A_{\text{BRG}}, p_{\text{BRG}})$  such that:

- $S_{\text{BRG}} = \{((\ell, \nu), (\ell, \zeta)) | (\ell, \zeta) \in \mathcal{R} \wedge \nu \in \overline{\zeta}\}$ ;
- $A_{\text{BRG}} \subseteq (\llbracket k \rrbracket_{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathcal{C} \times \text{Act}) \times \mathcal{R}$ ;
- for any state  $((\ell, \nu), (\ell, \zeta)) \in S_{\text{BRG}}$  and action  $((b, c, a), (\ell, \zeta_a)) \in A_{\text{BRG}}$  we have  $p_{\text{BRG}}((\ell, \nu), (\ell, \zeta), ((b, c, a), (\ell, \zeta_a))) = \mu$  if and only if

$$\mu((\ell', \nu'), (\ell', \zeta')) = \sum_{C \subseteq \mathcal{C} \wedge \nu_a[C:=0] = \nu' \wedge \zeta_a[C:=0] = \zeta'} \delta[\ell, a](C, \ell')$$

for all  $((\ell', \nu'), (\ell', \zeta')) \in S_{\text{BRG}}$  where  $\nu_a = \nu + \text{time}(\nu, (b, c))$  and one of the following conditions holds:

- $(\ell, \zeta) \rightarrow_{b,c} (\ell, \zeta_a)$  and  $\zeta_a \triangleleft E(\ell, a)$
- $(\ell, \zeta) \rightarrow_{b,c} (\ell, \zeta_-) \rightarrow_{+1} (\ell, \zeta_a)$  for some  $(\ell, \zeta_-)$  and  $\zeta_a \triangleleft E(\ell, a)$
- $(\ell, \zeta) \rightarrow_{b,c} (\ell, \zeta_+) \leftarrow_{+1} (\ell, \zeta_a)$  for some  $(\ell, \zeta_+)$  and  $\zeta_a \triangleleft E(\ell, a)$ .

Although the boundary region graph is infinite, for a fixed initial state we can restrict attention to a finite state subgraph, thanks to the following observation [18].

**Proposition 14.** *For every state  $s \in S_{\text{BRG}}$  of a boundary region graph  $\mathbb{T}_{\text{BRG}}$ , the reachable sub-graph  $\mathbb{T}_{\text{BRG}}^s$  is a finite MDP.*

**Proposition 15.** *If  $s = ((\ell, \nu), (\ell, \zeta)) \in S_{\text{BRG}}$  is such that  $\nu$  is an integer valuation, then the MDP  $\mathbb{T}_{\text{BRG}}^s$  is equivalent to the digital clock semantics [19] of  $\mathbb{T}$  and extends the corner point abstraction of [7] to the probabilistic setting.*

**Definition 16.** *Let  $\mathcal{T} = (\mathbb{T}, \pi)$  be a priced probabilistic timed automaton. The priced boundary region graph of  $\mathcal{T}$  equals the priced MDP  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}} = (\mathbb{T}_{\text{BRG}}, \pi_{\text{BRG}})$  where for any state  $((\ell, \nu), (\ell, \zeta)) \in S_{\text{BRG}}$  and action  $((b, c, a), (\ell, \zeta')) \in A_{\text{BRG}}$  available in the state:*

$$\pi_{\text{BRG}}(((\ell, \nu), (\ell, \zeta)), ((b, c, a), (\ell, \zeta'))) = \pi((\ell, \nu), (\text{time}(\nu, (b, c)), a)).$$

## 6 Correctness of the Reduction to Boundary Region Automata

For the remainder of this section we fix a concavely-priced PTA  $\mathcal{T}$ . Proposition 14 together with Proposition 6 yield the following important result.

**Proposition 17.** *For the priced MDP  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}}$  there exist solutions of the optimality equations for expected reachability, total, discounted, and average price objectives.*

We say that a function  $f : S_{\text{BRG}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is *regionally concave* if for all  $(\ell, \zeta) \in \mathcal{R}$  the function  $f(\cdot, (\ell, \zeta)) : \{(\ell, \nu) \mid \nu \in \bar{\zeta}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is concave.

**Lemma 18.** *Assume that  $P \models \text{Opt}_R^F(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}})$ ,  $\langle T_i \rangle_{i=1}^N \models \text{Opt}_T^N(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}})$ , and  $D \models \text{Opt}_D^\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}})$ . We have that  $P$ ,  $T_N$ , and  $D$  are regionally concave.*

*Proof.* (Sketch.) Using an elementary, but notationally involved, inductive proof we can show that  $T_N$  is regionally concave. The proof uses closure properties of concave functions (see Lemma 1), along with the fact that price functions  $\pi$  are concave. The concavity of  $P$  and  $D$  follows from the observation that they can be characterised as the limit (concave due to Lemma 1) of certain optimal expected total price objectives.  $\square$

For any function  $f : S_{\text{BRG}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we define  $\tilde{f} : S_{\mathbb{T}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\tilde{f}(\ell, \nu) = f((\ell, \nu), (\ell, [\nu]))$ .

**Lemma 19.** *If  $P \models \text{Opt}_R^F(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}})$ , then  $\tilde{P} \models \text{Opt}_R^F(\llbracket \mathcal{T} \rrbracket)$ .*

*Proof.* Assuming  $P \models \text{Opt}_R^F(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}})$ , to prove this proposition it is sufficient to show that for any  $s = (\ell, \nu) \in S_{\mathbb{T}}$  we have:

$$\tilde{P}(s) = \inf_{(t, a) \in A(s)} \{ \pi(s, (t, a)) + \sum_{(C, \ell') \in 2^c \times L} \delta[\ell, a](C, \ell') \cdot \tilde{P}(\ell', (\nu + t)[C := 0]) \}. \quad (1)$$

We therefore fix a state  $s = (\ell, \nu) \in S_{\mathbb{T}}$  for the remainder of the proof. For any  $a \in \text{Act}$ , let  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Thin}}^a$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Thick}}^a$  denote the set of thin and thick regions respectively that are successors of  $[\nu]$  and are subsets of  $E(\ell, a)$ . Considering the RHS of (1) we have:

$$\text{RHS of (1)} = \min_{a \in \text{Act}} \{ T_{\text{Thin}}(s, a), T_{\text{Thick}}(s, a) \}, \quad (2)$$

where  $T_{\text{Thin}}(s, a)$  ( $T_{\text{Thick}}(s, a)$ ) is the infimum of the RHS of (1) over all actions  $(t, a)$  such that  $[\nu+t] \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Thin}}^a$  ( $[\nu+t] \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Thick}}^a$ ). For the first term we have:

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\text{Thin}}(s, a) &= \min_{(\ell, \zeta) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Thin}}^a} \inf_{\substack{t \in \mathbb{R}^+ \\ \nu+t \in \zeta}} \left\{ \pi(s, (t, a)) + \sum_{(C, \ell') \in 2^c \times L} \delta[\ell, a](C, \ell') \cdot \tilde{P}(\ell', \nu_C^t) \right\} \\ &= \min_{(\ell, \zeta) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Thin}}^a} \inf_{\substack{t \in \mathbb{R}^+ \\ \nu+t \in \zeta}} \left\{ \pi(s, (t, a)) + \sum_{(C, \ell') \in 2^c \times L} \delta[\ell, a](C, \ell') \cdot P((\ell', \nu_C^t), (\ell', \zeta^C)) \right\} \\ &= \min_{(\ell, \zeta) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Thin}}^a} \left\{ \pi(s, (t^{(\ell, \zeta)}, a)) + \sum_{(C, \ell') \in 2^c \times L} \delta[\ell, a](C, \ell') \cdot P((\ell', \nu_C^{t^{(\ell, \zeta)}}), (\ell', \zeta^C)) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\nu_C^t$  denote the clock valuation  $(\nu+t)[C:=0]$ ,  $t^{(\ell, \zeta)}$  the time to reach the region  $R$  from  $s$  and  $\zeta^C$  the region  $\zeta[C:=0]$ . Considering the second term of (2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\text{Thick}}(s, a) &= \min_{(\ell, \zeta) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Thick}}^a} \inf_{\substack{t \in \mathbb{R}^+ \\ \nu+t \in \zeta}} \left\{ \pi(s, (t, a)) + \sum_{(C, \ell') \in 2^c \times L} \delta[\ell, a](C, \ell') \cdot \tilde{P}(\ell', \nu_C^t) \right\} \\ &= \min_{(\ell, \zeta) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Thick}}^a} \inf_{\substack{t \in \mathbb{R}^+ \\ \nu+t \in \zeta}} \left\{ \pi(s, (t, a)) + \sum_{(C, \ell') \in 2^c \times L} \delta[\ell, a](C, \ell') \cdot P((\ell', \nu_C^t), (\ell', \zeta^C)) \right\} \\ &= \min_{(\ell, \zeta) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Thick}}^a} \inf_{\substack{t_{R_-}^s < t < t_{R_+}^s \\ R \xrightarrow{+1} R_- \\ R \xrightarrow{+1} R_+}} \left\{ \pi(s, (t, a)) + \sum_{(C, \ell') \in 2^c \times L} \delta[\ell, a](C, \ell') \cdot P((\ell', \nu_C^t), (\ell', \zeta^C)) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 18 we have that  $P((\ell', \cdot), (\ell', \zeta^C))$  is concave and, from Lemma 1, since  $\nu_C^t$  is an affine mapping and  $\delta[\ell, a](C, \ell') \geq 0$  for all  $2^c \times L$ , the weighted sum over  $(C, \ell')$  of the functions  $P((\ell', \nu_C^t), (\ell', \zeta^C))$  is concave on the domain  $\{t \mid \nu+t \in \zeta\}$ . From the concavity assumption of price functions,  $\pi(s, (\cdot, a))$  is concave over the domain  $\{t \mid \nu+t \in \zeta\}$ , and therefore, again using Lemma 1, we have that the function:

$$\pi(s, (t, a)) + \sum_{(C, \ell') \in 2^c \times L} \delta[\ell, a](C, \ell') \cdot P((\ell', \nu_C^t), (\ell', \zeta^C))$$

is concave over  $\{t \mid \nu+t \in \zeta\}$ . Therefore using Lemma 2 we have  $T_{\text{Thick}}(s, a)$  equals

$$\min_{(\ell, \zeta) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Thick}}^a} \min_{\substack{t = t_{R_-}^s, t_{R_+}^s \\ (\ell, \zeta) \xrightarrow{+1} R_- \\ (\ell, \zeta) \xrightarrow{+1} R_+}} \left\{ \bar{\pi}(s, (t, a)) + \sum_{(C, \ell') \in 2^c \times L} \delta[\ell, a](C, \ell') \cdot P((\ell', \nu_C^t), (\ell', \zeta^C)) \right\}$$

Substituting the values of  $T_{\text{Thin}}(s, a)$  and  $T_{\text{Thick}}(s, a)$  into (2) and observing that for any thin region  $(\ell, \zeta) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Thin}}^a$  there exist  $b \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $c \in C$  such that  $\nu+(b-\nu(c)) \in \zeta$ , it follows from Definition 13 that RHS of (1) equals:

$$\min_{(\alpha, R) \in A_{\text{BRG}}(s, [s])} \left\{ \pi_{\text{BRG}}((s, [s]), (\alpha, R)) + \sum_{(s', R') \in S_{\text{BRG}}} p_{\text{BRG}}((s', R') \mid (s, [s]), (\alpha, R)) \cdot P(s', R') \right\}$$

which by definition equals  $\tilde{P}(s)$  as required.  $\square$

**Lemma 20.** *If  $\langle T_i \rangle_{i=1}^N \models \text{Opt}_T^N(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}})$ , then  $\langle \tilde{T}_i \rangle_{i=0}^N \models \text{Opt}_T^N(\llbracket \mathcal{T} \rrbracket)$ .*

**Lemma 21.** *If  $D \models \text{Opt}_D^\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}})$ , then  $\tilde{D} \models \text{Opt}_D^\lambda(\llbracket \mathcal{T} \rrbracket)$ .*

Since it is not known to us whether there exists a solution  $(G, B) \models \text{Opt}_A(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}})$  such that both  $G$  and  $B$  are regionally concave, we can not show that  $(G, B) \models \text{Opt}_A(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}})$ , implies  $(G, B) \models \text{Opt}_A(\llbracket \mathcal{T} \rrbracket)$ . Instead, we use the following result to reduce the average price problem on PTA to that over the corresponding boundary region graph.

**Lemma 22.** *If  $(G, B) \models \text{Opt}_A(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}})$ , then  $\tilde{G} = \text{EAvg}_{\llbracket \mathcal{T} \rrbracket}^*$ .*

The proof of this result follows from Lemma 24 and Corollary 26 below.

**Lemma 23.** *For an arbitrary priced MDP  $\mathcal{M} = (S, A, p, \pi)$  and state  $s \in S$ , the following inequality holds:*

$$\inf_{\sigma \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \cdot \mathbb{E}_s^\sigma \{ \sum_{i=1}^n \pi(X_{i-1}, Y_i) \} \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\sigma \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}} \frac{1}{n} \cdot \mathbb{E}_s^\sigma \{ \sum_{i=1}^n \pi(X_{i-1}, Y_i) \}$$

**Lemma 24.** *For every state  $s \in S_{\top}$  we have  $\text{EAvg}_{\llbracket \mathcal{T} \rrbracket}^*(s) \geq \text{EAvg}_{\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}}}^*(s, [s])$ .*

*Proof.* Consider any  $s \in S_{\top}$ , using Lemma 23 we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{EAvg}_{\llbracket \mathcal{T} \rrbracket}^*(s) &\geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\sigma \in \Sigma_{\llbracket \mathcal{T} \rrbracket}} \frac{1}{n} \cdot \mathbb{E}_s^\sigma \{ \sum_{i=1}^n \pi(X_{i-1}, Y_i) \} \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \cdot \text{ETotal}_{\llbracket \mathcal{T} \rrbracket}^*(n)(s) && \text{by definition of } \text{ETotal}_{\llbracket \mathcal{T} \rrbracket}^*(n) \\ &\geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \cdot \text{ETotal}_{\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}}}^*(n)((s, [s])) && \text{by Lemma 20 and Proposition 4} \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \cdot \inf_{\sigma \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}}}} \mathbb{E}_{(s, [s])}^\sigma \{ \sum_{i=1}^n \pi(X_{i-1}, Y_i) \} && \text{by definition} \\ &= \inf_{\sigma \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}}}} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(s, [s])}^\sigma \{ \sum_{i=1}^n \pi(X_{i-1}, Y_i) \} && \text{since } [\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}}, (s, [s])] \text{ is finite} \\ &= \text{EAvg}_{\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}}}^*(s, [s]) && \text{as required } \square \end{aligned}$$

Using the Lipschitz-continuity of price functions and a slight variant of Lemma 3 of [7] we show that the following proposition and corollary hold.

**Proposition 25.** *For every  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}}}$  and  $s \in S_{\top}$ , there exists  $\sigma_\varepsilon \in \Sigma_{\llbracket \mathcal{T} \rrbracket}$  such that  $|\text{ETotal}_{\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}}}(N)((s, [s]), \sigma) - \text{ETotal}_{\llbracket \mathcal{T} \rrbracket}(N)(s, \sigma_\varepsilon)| \leq N \cdot \varepsilon$  for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

**Corollary 26.** *For every  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $s \in S_{\top}$  we have  $\text{EAvg}_{\llbracket \mathcal{T} \rrbracket}^*(s) \leq \text{EAvg}_{\mathcal{T}_{\text{BRG}}}^*(s, [s]) + \varepsilon$ .*

## 7 Complexity

To show EXPTIME-hardness we present a reduction to the EXPTIME-complete problem of solving countdown games [17]. The lemma concerns only expected reachability price problem as similar reductions follow for the other problems.



- the boundary region graph has exponential-size and can be constructed in exponential time in the size of the PTA;
- on the boundary region graph (a finite state MDP) we can solve each minimisation problem using a polynomial-time algorithm (see, e.g., [27]) in the size of the graph.

For *one clock* concavely-priced PTAs expected reachability, discounted, and average-price problems are PTIME-hard as these problems are PTIME-complete [26] even for finite MDPs (i.e. PTAs with no clocks). To show PTIME-membership one can adapt the construction of [22]—which shows the NLOGSPACE-membership of the reachability problem for one clock timed automata—to obtain an abstraction similar to the boundary region graph whose size is polynomial in the size of probabilistic timed automata, and then run polynomial-time algorithms to solve this finite MDP.

**Theorem 28.** *The exact complexity of solving expected reachability, discounted and average price problems is EXPTIME-complete for concavely-priced PTA with two or more clocks and PTIME-complete for concavely-priced PTA with one clock.*

## 8 Conclusion

We presented a probabilistic extension of the boundary region graph originally defined in the case of timed automata for PTAs. We characterize expected total (finite horizon), reachability, discounted and average price using optimality equations. By analysing properties of the solutions of these optimality equations on boundary region graphs, we demonstrated that solutions on the boundary region graph are also solutions to the corresponding optimality equations on the original priced PTA. Using this reduction, we then showed that the exact complexity of solving expected reachability, discounted, and average optimisation problems on concavely-priced PTAs is EXPTIME-complete.

Although the computational complexity is very high, we feel motivated by the success of quantitative analysis tools like UPPAAL [4] and PRISM [14]. We wish to develop more efficient symbolic zone-based algorithms for the problems considered in this paper. Another direction for future work is to consider more involved objectives like price-per-reward average [7,18] and multi-objective optimisation [25].

**Acknowledgments.** The authors are supported in part by EPSRC grants EP/D076625 and EP/F001096.

## References

1. R. Alur and D. Dill. A theory of timed automata. In *Theoretical Computer Science*, volume 126, 1994.
2. R. Alur, S. La Torre, and G. Pappas. Optimal paths in weighted timed automata. In *Proc. HSCC'01*, volume 2034 of *LNCS*. Springer, 2001.
3. D. Beauquier. Probabilistic timed automata. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 292(1), 2003.
4. G. Behrmann, A. David, K. Larsen, O. Möller, P. Pettersson, and W. Yi. UPPAAL - present and future. In *Proc. CDC'01*, volume 3. IEEE, 2001.
5. J. Berendsen, T. Chen, and D. Jansen. Undecidability of cost-bounded reachability in priced probabilistic timed automata. In *Proc. TAMC'09*, volume 5532 of *LNCS*, 2009.

6. J. Berendsen, D. Jansen, and J-P. Katoen. Probably on time and within budget - on reachability in priced probabilistic timed automata. In *Proc. QEST'06*. IEEE, 2006.
7. P. Bouyer, E. Brinksma, and K. Larsen. Optimal infinite scheduling for multi-priced timed automata. *Formal Methods in System Design*, 32(1), 2008.
8. S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. CUP, 2004.
9. L. de Alfaro. Computing minimum and maximum reachability times in probabilistic systems. In *Proc. CONCUR'99*, volume 1664 of *LNCS*. Springer, 1999.
10. E. Dynkin and A. Yushkevich. *Controlled Markov Processes*. Springer, 1979.
11. J. Falk and J. Horowitz. Critical path problems with concave cost-time curves. *Management Science*, 19(4), 1972.
12. Y. Feng and B. Xiao. A Continuous-Time Yield Management Model with Multiple Prices and Reversible Price Changes. *Management Science*, 46(5), 2000.
13. T. Henzinger, Z. Manna, and A. Pnueli. What good are digital clocks? In *Proc. ICALP'92*, volume 623 of *LNCS*. Springer, 1992.
14. A. Hinton, M. Kwiatkowska, G. Norman, and D. Parker. PRISM: A tool for automatic verification of probabilistic systems. In *Proc. TACAS'06*, volume 3920 of *LNCS*. Springer, 2006.
15. H. Jensen. Model checking probabilistic real time systems. In *Proc. 7th Nordic Workshop on Programming Theory*, Report 86:247–261. Chalmers University of Technology, 1996.
16. M. Jurdzinski, M. Kwiatkowska, G. Norman, and A. Trivedi. Concavely-priced probabilistic timed automata. Technical Report RR-09-06, Oxford University Computing Laboratory, 2009.
17. M. Jurdziński, J. Sproston, and F. Laroussinie. Model checking probabilistic timed automata with one or two clocks. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 4(3), 2008.
18. M. Jurdziński and A. Trivedi. Concavely-priced timed automata. In *Proc. FORMATS'08*, volume 5215 of *LNCS*. Springer, 2008.
19. M. Kwiatkowska, G. Norman, D. Parker, and J. Sproston. Performance analysis of probabilistic timed automata using digital clocks. *Formal Methods in System Design*, 29, 2006.
20. M. Kwiatkowska, G. Norman, R. Segala, and J. Sproston. Automatic verification of real-time systems with discrete probability distributions. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 282, 2002.
21. M. Kwiatkowska, G. Norman, J. Sproston, and F. Wang. Symbolic model checking for probabilistic timed automata. *Information and Computation*, 205(7), 2007.
22. F. Laroussinie, N. Markey, and P. Schnoebelen. Model checking timed automata with one or two clocks. In *Proc. CONCUR'04*, volume 3170 of *LNCS*. Springer, 2004.
23. F. Laroussinie and J. Sproston. State explosion in almost-sure probabilistic reachability. *Information Processing Letters*, 102(6), 2007.
24. K. Larsen, G. Behrmann, E. Brinksma, A. Fehnker, T. Hune, P. Pettersson, and J. Romijn. As cheap as possible: Efficient cost-optimal reachability for priced timed automata. In *Proc. CAV'01*, volume 2102 of *LNCS*. Springer, 2001.
25. K. Larsen and J. Rasmussen. Optimal reachability for multi-priced timed automata. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 390(2-3), 2008.
26. C. Papadimitriou and J. Tsitsiklis. The complexity of Markov decision processes. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 12, 1987.
27. M. Puterman. *Markov Decision Processes: Discrete Stochastic Dynamic Programming*. Wiley, 1994.
28. E. Torres, J. Dominguez, L. Valdes, and R. Aza. Passenger waiting time in an airport and expenditure carried out in the commercial area. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 11(6), 2005.
29. S. Tripakis. Verifying progress in timed systems. In *Proc. ARTS'99*, volume 1601 of *LNCS*. Springer, 1999.