Weight Assignment Logic

Vitaly Perevoshchikov(✉)

Institut für Informatik, Universität Leipzig, 04109 Leipzig, Germany
perev@informatik.uni-leipzig.de

Abstract. We introduce a weight assignment logic for reasoning about quantitative languages of infinite words. This logic is an extension of the classical MSO logic and permits to describe quantitative properties of systems with multiple weight parameters, e.g., the ratio between rewards and costs. We show that this logic is expressively equivalent to unambiguous weighted Büchi automata. We also consider an extension of weight assignment logic which is expressively equivalent to nondeterministic weighted Büchi automata.

Keywords: Quantitative omega-languages · Quantitative logic · Multi-weighted automata · Büchi automata · Unambiguous automata

1 Introduction

Since the seminal Büchi theorem [5] about the expressive equivalence of finite automata and monadic second-order logic, a significant field of research investigates logical characterizations of language classes appearing from practically relevant automata models. In this paper we introduce a new approach to the logical characterization of quantitative languages of infinite words where every infinite word carries a value, e.g., a real number.

Quantitative languages of infinite words and various weighted automata for them were investigated by Chatterjee, Doyen and Henzinger in [7] as models for verification of quantitative properties of systems. Their weighted automata are automata with a single weight parameter where a computation is evaluated using measures like the limit average or discounted sum. Recently, the problem of analysis and verification of systems with multiple weight parameters, e.g. time, costs and energy consumption, has received much attention in the literature [3,5,16,17,20]. For instance, the setting where a computation is evaluated as the ratio between accumulated rewards and costs was considered in [3,5,17]. Another example is a model of energy automata with several energy storages [16].

Related Work. Droste and Gastin [9] introduced weighted MSO logic on finite words with constants from a semiring. In the semantics of their logic (which is a quantitative language of finite words) disjunction is extended by the sum operation of the semiring and conjunction is extended by the product. They show

Supported by DFG Research Training Group 1763 (QuantLA).

I. Potapov (Ed.): DLT 2015, LNCS 9168, pp. 413–425, 2015.
DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-21500-6_33

that weighted MSO logic is more expressive than weighted automata [10] (the unrestricted use of weighted conjunction and weighted universal quantifiers leads to unrecognizability) and provide a syntactically restricted fragment which is expressively equivalent to weighted automata. This result was extended in [15] to the setting of infinite words. A logical characterization of the quantitative languages of Chatterjee, Doyen and Henzinger was given in [12] (again by a restricted fragment of weighted MSO logic). In [13], a multi-weighted extension of weighted MSO logic of [12] with the multiset-based semantics was considered.

Our Contribution. In this paper, we introduce a new approach to logic for quantitative languages, different from [9,12,13,15]. We develop a so-called *weight assignment logic* (WAL) on infinite words, an extension of the classical MSO logic to the quantitative setting. This logic allows us to assign weights (or multi-weights) to positions of an ω-word. Using WAL, we can, for instance, express that whenever a position of an input word is labelled by letter a, then the weight of this position is 2. As a weighted extension of the logical conjunction, we use the *merging* of partially defined ω-words. In order to evaluate a partially defined ω-word, we introduce a *default weight*, assign it to all positions with undefined weight, and evaluate the obtained totally defined ω-word, e.g., as the reward-cost ratio or discounted sum.

As opposed to the weighted MSO logic of [9], the weighted conjunction-like operators of WAL capture recognizability by weighted Büchi automata. We show that WAL is expressively equivalent to *unambiguous* weighted Büchi automata where, for every input ω-word, there exists at most one accepting computation. Unambiguous automata are of considerable interest for automata theory as they can have better decidability properties. For instance, in the setting of finite words, the equivalence problem for unambiguous max-plus automata is decidable [18] whereas, for nondeterministic max-plus automata, this problem is undecidable [19].

We also consider an extended version of WAL which captures nondeterministic weighted Büchi automata. In extended WAL we allow existential quantification over first-order and second-order variables in the prefix of a formula. The structure of extended WAL is similar to the structure of unweighted logics for, e.g., timed automata [22] and data automata [4].

For the proof of our expressiveness equivalence result, we establish a Nivat decomposition theorem for nondeterministic and unambiguous weighted Büchi automata. Recall that Nivat's theorem [21] is one of the fundamental characterizations of rational transductions and shows a connection between rational transductions and rational language. Recently, Nivat's theorem was proved for semiring-weighted automata on finite words [11], weighted multioperator tree automata [22] and weighted timed automata [14]. We obtain similar decompositions for WAL and extended WAL and deduce our results from the classical Büchi theorem [6]. Our proof is constructive and hence decidability properties for WAL and extended WAL can be transferred into decidability properties of weighted Büchi automata. As a side application of our Nivat theorem, we can easily show that weighted Büchi automata and weighted Muller automata are expressively equivalent.

Outline. In Sect. 2 we introduce a general framework for weighted Büchi automata and consider several examples. In Sect. 3 we prove a Nivat decomposition theorem for weighted Büchi automata. In Sect. 4 we define weight assignment logic and its extension. In Sect. 5 we state our main result and give a sketch of its proof for the unambiguous and nondeterministic cases.

2 Weighted Büchi Automata

Let $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, ...\}$ denote the set of all natural numbers. For an arbitrary set X, an *ω-word* over X is an infinite sequence $(x_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ where $x_i \in X$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Let X^ω denote the set of all ω-words over X. Any set $\mathcal{L} \subseteq X^\omega$ is called an *ω-language* over X.

A *Büchi automaton* over an alphabet Σ is a tuple $\mathcal{A} = (Q, I, T, F)$ where Q is a finite set of states, Σ is an alphabet (i.e. a finite non-empty set), $I, F \subseteq Q$ are sets of initial resp. accepting states, and $T \subseteq Q \times \Sigma \times Q$ is a transition relation. An (accepting) *run* $\rho = (t_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in T^\omega$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is defined as an infinite sequence of matching transitions which starts in an initial state and visits some accepting state infinitely often, i.e., $t_i = (q_i, a_i, q_{i+1})$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $q_0 \in I$ and $\{q \in Q \mid q = q_i \text{ for infinitely many } i \in \mathbb{N}\} \cap F \neq \emptyset$. Let $\text{label}(\rho) := (a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma^\omega$, the *label* of ρ. We denote by $\text{Run}_\mathcal{A}$ the set of all runs of $\mathcal{A}$ and, for each $w \in \Sigma^\omega$, we denote by $\text{Run}_\mathcal{A}(w)$ the set of all runs ρ of $\mathcal{A}$ with $\text{label}(\rho) = w$. Let $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) = \{w \in \Sigma^\omega \mid \text{Run}_\mathcal{A}(w) \neq \emptyset\}$, the ω-language *accepted* by $\mathcal{A}$. We call an ω-language $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Sigma^\omega$ *recognizable* if there exists a Büchi automaton $\mathcal{A}$ over Σ such that $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}$.

We say that a monoid $\mathbb{K} = (K, +, \mathbb{0})$ is *complete* (cf., e.g., [15]) if it is equipped with infinitary sum operations $\sum_I : K^I \to K$ for any index set I, such that, for all I and all families $(k_i)_{i\in I}$ of elements of K, the following hold:

- $\sum_{i\in\emptyset} k_i = \mathbb{0}$, $\sum_{i\in\{j\}} k_i = k_j$, $\sum_{i\in\{p,q\}} k_i = k_p + k_q$ for $p \neq q$;
- $\sum_{j\in J}(\sum_{i\in I_j} k_i) = \sum_{i\in I} k_i$, if $\bigcup_{j\in J} I_j = I$ and $I_j \cap I_{j'} = \emptyset$ for $j \neq j'$.

Let $\overline{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$. Then, $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ equipped with infinitary operations like *infinum* or *supremum* forms a complete monoid. Now we introduce an algebraic structure for weighted Büchi automata which is an extension of totally complete semirings [15] and valuation monoids [12] and covers various multi-weighted measures.

Definition 2.1. *A* valuation structure $\mathbb{V} = (M, \mathbb{K}, \text{val})$ *consists of a non-empty set* M*, a complete monoid* $\mathbb{K} = (K, +, \mathbb{0})$ *and a mapping* $\text{val} : M^\omega \to K$ *called henceforth a* valuation function*.*

In the definition of a valuation structure we have two weight domains M and K. Here M is the set of transition weights which in the multi-weighted examples can be tuples of weights (e.g., a reward-cost pair) and K is the set of weights of computations which can be single values (e.g., the ratio between rewards and costs).

Definition 2.2. *Let Σ be an alphabet and $\mathbb{V} = (M, (K, +, \mathbb{0}), \mathrm{val})$ a valuation structure. A* weighted Büchi automaton *(WBA) over $\mathbb{V}$ is a tuple $\mathcal{A} = (Q, I, T, F, \mathrm{wt})$ where (Q, I, T, F) is a Büchi automaton over Σ and* $\mathrm{wt} : T \to M$ *is a transition weight function.*

The behavior of WBA is defined as follows. Given a run ρ of this automaton, we evaluate the ω-sequence of transition weights of ρ (which is in M^ω) using the valuation function val and then resolve the nondeterminism on the weights of runs using the complete monoid $\mathbb{K}$. Formally, let $\rho = (t_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in T^\omega$ be a run of $\mathcal{A}$. Then, the *weight* of ρ is defined as $\mathrm{wt}_\mathcal{A}(\rho) = \mathrm{val}((\mathrm{wt}(t_i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) \in K$. The *behavior* of $\mathcal{A}$ is a mapping $[\![\mathcal{A}]\!] : \Sigma^\omega \to K$ defined for all $w \in \Sigma^\omega$ by $[\![\mathcal{A}]\!](w) = \sum(\mathrm{wt}_\mathcal{A}(\rho) \mid \rho \in \mathrm{Run}_\mathcal{A}(w))$. Note that the sum in the equation above can be infinite. Therefore we consider a complete monoid $(K, +, \mathbb{0})$. A mapping $\mathbb{L} : \Sigma^\omega \to K$ is called a *quantitative ω-language*. We say that $\mathbb{L}$ is (nondeterministically) *recognizable* over $\mathbb{V}$ if there exists a WBA $\mathcal{A}$ over Σ and $\mathbb{V}$ such that $[\![\mathcal{A}]\!] = \mathbb{L}$.

We say that a WBA $\mathcal{A}$ over Σ and $\mathbb{V}$ is *unambiguous* if $|\mathrm{Run}_\mathcal{A}(w)| \leq 1$ for every $w \in \Sigma^\omega$. We call a quantitative ω-language $\mathbb{L} : \Sigma^\omega \to K$ *unambiguously recognizable* over $\mathbb{V}$ if there exists an unambiguous WBA $\mathcal{A}$ over Σ and $\mathbb{V}$ such that $[\![\mathcal{A}]\!] = \mathbb{L}$.

Example 2.3. (a) The ratio measure was introduced in [5], e.g., for the modeling of the average costs in timed systems. In the setting of ω-words, we consider the model with two weight parameters: the *cost* and the *reward*. The rewards and costs of transitions are accumulated along every finite prefix of a run and their ratio is taken. Then, the weight of an infinite run is defined as the limit superior (or limit inferior) of the sequence of the computed ratios for all finite prefixes. To describe the behavior of these double-priced ratio Büchi automata, we consider the valuation structure $\mathbb{V}^{\text{Ratio}} = (M, \mathbb{K}, \mathrm{val})$ where $M = \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ models the reward-cost pairs, $\mathbb{K} = (\overline{\mathbb{R}}, \sup, -\infty)$ and $\mathrm{val} : M^\omega \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is defined for every sequence $u = ((r_i, c_i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in M^\omega$ by $\mathrm{val}(u) = \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{r_1 + \ldots + r_n}{c_1 + \ldots + c_n}$. Here, we assume that $\frac{r}{0} = -\infty$.

(b) *Discounting* [1,7] is a well-known principle which is used in, e.g., economics and psychology. In this example, we consider WBA with transition-dependent discounting, i.e., are two weight parameters: the cost and the discounting factor (which is not fixed and depends on a transition). In order to define WBA with discounting formally, we consider the valuation structure $\mathbb{V}^{\text{Disc}} = (M, \mathbb{K}, \mathrm{val})$ where $M = \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \times ((0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q})$ models the pairs of a cost and a discounting factor, $\mathbb{K} = (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}, \inf, \infty)$, and val is defined for all $u = ((c_i, d_i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in M^\omega$ as $\mathrm{val}(u) = c_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i \cdot \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} d_j$.

(c) Since a valuation monoid $(K, (K, +, \mathbb{0}), \mathrm{val})$ of Droste and Meinecke [12] is a special case of valuation structures, all examples considered there also fit into our framework. □

3 Decomposition of WBA

In this section, we establish a Nivat decomposition theorem for WBA. We will need it for the proof of our main result. However, it also could be of independent interest.

Let Σ be an alphabet and $\mathbb{V} = (M, (K, +, \mathbb{0}), \mathrm{val})$ a valuation structure. For a (possibly different from Σ) alphabet Γ, we introduce the following operations. Let Δ be an arbitrary non-empty set and $h : \Gamma \to \Delta$ a mapping called henceforth a *renaming*. For any ω-word $u = (\gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Gamma^\omega$, we let $h(u) = (h(\gamma_i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Delta^\omega$. Now let $h : \Gamma \to \Sigma$ be a renaming and $\mathbb{L} : \Gamma^\omega \to K$ a quantitative ω-language. We define the *renaming* $h(\mathbb{L}) : \Sigma^\omega \to K$ for all $w \in \Sigma^\omega$ by $h(\mathbb{L})(w) = \sum \big(\mathbb{L}(u) \mid u \in \Gamma^\omega \text{ and } h(u) = w\big)$. For a renaming $g : \Gamma \to M$, the *composition* $\mathrm{val} \circ g : \Gamma^\omega \to K$ is defined for all $u \in \Gamma^\omega$ by $(\mathrm{val} \circ g)(u) = \mathrm{val}(g(u))$. Given a quantitative ω-language $\mathbb{L} : \Gamma^\omega \to K$ and an ω-language $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Gamma^\omega$, the intersection $\mathbb{L} \cap \mathcal{L} : \Gamma^\omega \to K$ is defined for all $u \in \mathcal{L}$ as $(\mathbb{L} \cap \mathcal{L})(u) = \mathbb{L}(u)$ and for all $u \in \Gamma^\omega \setminus \mathcal{L}$ as $(\mathbb{L} \cap \mathcal{L})(u) = \mathbb{0}$. Given a renaming $h : \Gamma \to \Sigma$, we say that an ω-language $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Gamma^\omega$ is *h-unambiguous* if for all $w \in \Sigma^\omega$ there exists at most one $u \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $h(u) = w$.

Our Nivat decomposition theorem for WBA is the following.

Theorem 3.1. *Let Σ be an alphabet, $\mathbb{V} = (M, (K, +, \mathbb{0}), \mathrm{val})$ a valuation structure, and $\mathbb{L} : \Sigma^\omega \to K$ a quantitative ω-language. Then*

(a) $\mathbb{L}$ is unambiguously recognizable over $\mathbb{V}$ iff there exist an alphabet Γ, renamings $h : \Gamma \to \Sigma$ and $g : \Gamma \to M$, and a recognizable and h-unambiguous ω-language $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Gamma^\omega$ such that $\mathbb{L} = h((\mathrm{val} \circ g) \cap \mathcal{L})$.
(b) $\mathbb{L}$ is nondeterministically recognizable over $\mathbb{V}$ iff there exist an alphabet Γ, renamings $h : \Gamma \to \Sigma$ and $g : \Gamma \to M$, and a recognizable ω-language $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Gamma^\omega$ such that $\mathbb{L} = h((\mathrm{val} \circ g) \cap \mathcal{L})$.

The proof idea is the following. To prove the recognizability of $h((\mathrm{val} \circ g) \cap \mathcal{L})$, one can show that recognizable quantitative ω-languages are closed under renaming, composition and intersection. For the converse direction, i.e., a decomposition of the behavior $[\![\mathcal{A}]\!]$ of a WBA $\mathcal{A}$, one can use a similar idea as in [11]. We let Γ be the set of all transitions of $\mathcal{A}$, h and g mappings assigning labels and weights, resp., to each transition and let $\mathcal{L}$ be the regular ω-language of words over Γ describing runs of $\mathcal{A}$.

Since Büchi automata are not determinizable, the most challenging part of the proof of Theorem 3.1 is to show that recognizable ω-languages are stable under intersection with ω-languages. To show this, we apply the result of [8] which states that every ω-recognizable language is accepted by an unambiguous Büchi automaton.

As a first application of Theorem 3.1 we show that WBA are equivalent to *weighted Muller automata* which are defined as WBA with the difference that a set of accepting states $F \subseteq Q$ is replaced by a set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^Q$ of sets of accepting states. Then, for an accepting run ρ, the set of all states, which are visited in ρ infinitely often, must be in $\mathcal{F}$. Our expressiveness equivalence result extends the result of [15] for totally complete semirings. Whereas the proof of [15] was given by direct non-trivial automata transformation, our proof is based on the fact that weighted Muller automata permit the same decomposition as stated in Theorem 3.1 for WBA.

4 Weight Assignment Logic

4.1 Partial ω-words

Before we give a definition of the syntax and semantics of our new logic, we introduce some auxiliary notions about partial ω-words. Let X be an arbitrary non-empty set. A *partial ω-word* over X is a partial mapping $u : \mathbb{N} \dashrightarrow X$, i.e., $u : U \to X$ for some $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}$. Let $\text{dom}(u) = U$, the *domain* of u. We denote by $X^{\uparrow}$ the set of all partial ω-words over X. Clearly, $X^{\omega} \subseteq X^{\uparrow}$. A *trivial ω-word* $\top \in X^{\uparrow}$ is the partial ω-word with $\text{dom}(\top) = \emptyset$. For $u \in X^{\uparrow}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in X$, the *update* $u[i/x] \in X^{\uparrow}$ is defined as $\text{dom}(u[i/x]) = \text{dom}(u) \cup \{i\}$, $u[i/x](i) = x$ and $u[i/x](i') = u(i')$ for all $i' \in \text{dom}(u) \setminus \{i\}$. Let $\theta = (u_j)_{j \in J}$ be an arbitrary family of partial ω-words $u_j \in X^{\uparrow}$ where J is an arbitrary index set. We say that θ is *compatible* if, for all $j, j' \in J$ and $i \in \text{dom}(u_j) \cap \text{dom}(u_{j'})$, we have $u_j(i) = u_{j'}(i)$. If θ is compatible, then we define the *merging* $u := (\bigsqcap_{j \in J} u_j) \in X^{\uparrow}$ as $\text{dom}(u) = \bigcup_{j \in J} \text{dom}(u_j)$ and, for all $i \in \text{dom}(u)$, $u(i) = u_j(i)$ whenever $i \in \text{dom}(u_j)$ for some $j \in J$. Let $\theta = \{u_j\}_{j \in \{1,2\}}$ be compatible. Then, we write $u_1 \uparrow u_2$. Clearly, the relation $\uparrow$ is reflexive and symmetric. In the case $u_1 \uparrow u_2$, for $\bigsqcap_{j \in \{1,2\}} u_j$ we will also use notation $u_1 \sqcap u_2$.

Example 4.1. Let $X = \{a, b\}$ with $a \neq b$ and $u_1 = a^{\omega} \in X^{\uparrow}$. Let $u_2 \in X^{\uparrow}$ be the partial ω-word whose domain $\text{dom}(u_2)$ is the set of all odd natural numbers and $u_2(i) = a$ for all $i \in \text{dom}(u_2)$. Let $u_3 \in X^{\uparrow}$ be the partial ω-word such that $\text{dom}(u_3)$ is the set of all even natural numbers and $u_3(i) = b$ for all $i \in \text{dom}(u_3)$. Then $u_1 \uparrow u_2$ and $u_2 \uparrow u_3$, but $\neg(u_1 \uparrow u_3)$. This shows in particular that the relation $\uparrow$ is not transitive if X is not a singleton set. Then, $u_1 \sqcap u_2 = a^{\omega}$ and $u_2 \sqcap u_3 = (ba)^{\omega}$.

4.2 WAL: Syntax and Semantics

Let V_1 be a countable set of *first-order variables* and V_2 a countable set of *second-order variables* such that $V_1 \cap V_2 = \emptyset$. Let $V = V_1 \cup V_2$. Let Σ be an alphabet and $\mathbb{V} = (M, (K, +, \mathbb{0}), \text{val})$ a valuation structure. We also consider a designated element $\mathbb{1} \in M$ which we call the *default weight*. We denote the pair $(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{1})$ by $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}}$. The set $\mathbf{WAL}(\Sigma, \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}})$ of formulas of *weight assignment logic* over Σ and $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}}$ is given by the grammar

$$\varphi \ ::= \ P_a(x) \mid x = y \mid \ x < y \mid X(x) \mid x \mapsto m \mid \varphi \Rightarrow \varphi \mid \varphi \sqcap \varphi \mid \sqcap x.\varphi \mid \sqcap X.\varphi$$

where $a \in \Sigma$, $x, y \in V_1$, $X \in V_2$ and $m \in M$. Such a formula φ is called a *weight assignment formula*.

Table 1. The auxiliary semantics of **WAL**-formulas

$$\langle\!\langle P_a(x)\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma) = \begin{cases} \top, & a_{\sigma(x)} = a \\ \bot, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\langle\!\langle x = y\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma) = \begin{cases} \top, & \sigma(x) = \sigma(y) \\ \bot, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\langle\!\langle x < y\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma) = \begin{cases} \top, & \sigma(x) < \sigma(y) \\ \bot, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\langle\!\langle X(x)\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma) = \begin{cases} \top, & \sigma(x) \in \sigma(X) \\ \bot, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\langle\!\langle x \mapsto m\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma) = \top[\sigma(x)/m]$$

$$\langle\!\langle \varphi_1 \Rightarrow \varphi_2\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma) = \begin{cases} \langle\!\langle \varphi_2\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma), & \langle\!\langle \varphi_1\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma) = \top \\ \top, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\langle\!\langle \varphi_1 \sqcap \varphi_2\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma) = \langle\!\langle \varphi_1\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma) \sqcap \langle\!\langle \varphi_2\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma)$$

$$\langle\!\langle \sqcap x.\varphi\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma) = \textstyle\bigsqcap_{i\in \mathrm{dom}(w)} \langle\!\langle \varphi\rangle\!\rangle(w_{\sigma[x/i]})$$

$$\langle\!\langle \sqcap X.\varphi\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma) = \textstyle\bigsqcap_{I\subseteq \mathrm{dom}(w)} \langle\!\langle \varphi\rangle\!\rangle(w_{\sigma[X/I]})$$

Let $\varphi \in \mathbf{WAL}(\Sigma, \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}})$. We denote by $\textsc{Const}(\varphi) \subseteq M$ the set of all weights $m \in M$ occurring in φ. The set $\textsc{Free}(\varphi) \subseteq V$ of *free variables* of φ is defined to be the set of all variables $\mathcal{X} \in V$ which appear in φ and are not bound by any quantifier $\sqcap\mathcal{X}$. We say that φ is a *sentence* if $\textsc{Free}(\varphi) = \emptyset$.

Note that the merging as defined before is a partially defined operation, i.e., it is defined only for compatible families of partial ω-words. In order to extend it to a totally defined operation, we fix an element $\bot \notin M^\uparrow$ which will mean the undefined value. Let $M^\uparrow_\bot = M^\uparrow \cup \{\bot\}$. Then, for any family $\theta = (u_j)_{j\in J}$ with $u_j \in M^\uparrow_\bot$, such that either $\theta \in (M^\uparrow)^J$ is not compatible or $\theta \in (M^\uparrow_\bot)^J \setminus (M^\uparrow)^J$, we let $\bigsqcap_{j\in J} u_j = \bot$.

For any ω-word $w \in \Sigma^\omega$, a *w-assignment* is a mapping $\sigma : V \to \mathrm{dom}(w) \cup 2^{\mathrm{dom}(w)}$ mapping first-order variables to elements in $\mathrm{dom}(w)$ and second-order variables to subsets of $\mathrm{dom}(w)$. For a first-order variable x and a position $i \in \mathbb{N}$, the w-assignment $\sigma[x/i]$ is defined on $V \setminus \{x\}$ as σ, and we let $\sigma[x/i](x) = i$. For a second-order variable X and a subset $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, the w-assignment $\sigma[X/I]$ is defined similarly. Let Σ^ω_V denote the set of all pairs (w, σ) where $w \in \Sigma^\omega$ and σ is a w-assignment. We will denote such pairs (w, σ) by w_σ.

The semantics of **WAL**-formulas is defined in two steps: by means of the auxiliary and proper semantics. Let $\varphi \in \mathbf{WAL}(\Sigma, \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}})$. The *auxiliary semantics* of φ is the mapping $\langle\!\langle \varphi\rangle\!\rangle : \Sigma^\omega_V \to M^\uparrow_\bot$ defined for all $w_\sigma \in \Sigma^\omega_V$ with $w = (a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ as shown in Table 1. Note that the definition of $\langle\!\langle ..\rangle\!\rangle$ does not employ $+$ and val. The *proper semantics* $[\![\varphi]\!] : \Sigma^\omega_V \to K$ operates on the auxiliary semantics $\langle\!\langle \varphi\rangle\!\rangle$ as follows. Let $w_\sigma \in \Sigma^\omega_V$. If $\langle\!\langle \varphi\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma) \in M^\uparrow$, then we assign the default weight to all undefined positions in $\mathrm{dom}(\langle\!\langle \varphi\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma))$ and evaluate the obtained sequence using val. Otherwise, if $\langle\!\langle \varphi\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma) = \bot$, we put $[\![\varphi]\!](w_\sigma) = \mathbb{0}$. Note that if $\varphi \in \mathbf{WAL}(\Sigma, \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}})$ is a sentence, then the values $\langle\!\langle \varphi\rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma)$ and $[\![\varphi]\!](w_\sigma)$ do not depend on σ and we consider the auxiliary semantics of φ as the mapping $\langle\!\langle \varphi\rangle\!\rangle : \Sigma^\omega \to M^\uparrow_\bot$ and the proper semantics of φ as the quantitative ω-language $[\![\varphi]\!] : \Sigma^\omega \to K$. Note that $+$ was not needed for the semantics of **WAL**-formulas. This operation will be needed in the next section for the extension of **WAL**. We say that a quantitative ω-language $\mathbb{L} : \Sigma^\omega \to K$ is **WAL**-*definable* over $\mathbb{V}$ if there exist a default weight $\mathbb{1} \in M$ and a sentence $\varphi \in \mathbf{WAL}(\Sigma, \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}})$ such that $[\![\varphi]\!] = \mathbb{L}$.

Example 4.2. Consider a valuation structure $\mathbb{V} = (M, (K, +, \mathbb{0}), \text{val})$ and a default weight $\mathbb{1} \in M$. Consider an alphabet $\Sigma = \{a, b, ...\}$ of actions. We assume that the cost of a is $c(a) \in M$, the cost of b is $c(b) \in M$, and the costs of all other actions x in Σ are equal to $c(x) = \mathbb{1}$ (which can mean, e.g., that these actions do not invoke any costs). Then every ω-word w induces the ω-word of costs. We want to construct a sentence of our WAL which for every such an ω-word will evaluate its sequence of costs using val. The desired sentence $\varphi \in \mathbf{WAL}(\Sigma, \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}})$ is $\varphi = \sqcap x.([P_a(x) \Rightarrow (x \mapsto c(a))] \sqcap [P_b(x) \Rightarrow (x \mapsto c(b))])$. Then, for every $w = (a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma^\omega$, the auxiliary semantics $\langle\langle \varphi \rangle\rangle(w)$ is the partial ω-word over M where all positions $i \in \mathbb{N}$ with $a_i = a$ are labelled by $c(a)$, all positions with $a_i = b$ are labelled by $c(b)$, and the labels of all other positions are undefined. Then, the proper semantics $[\![\varphi]\!](w)$ assigns $\mathbb{1}$ to all positions with undefined labels and evaluates it by means of val.

4.3 WAL: Relation to MSO Logic

Let Σ be an alphabet. We consider monadic second-order logic $\mathbf{MSO}(\Sigma)$ over ω-words to be the set of formulas

$$\varphi \ ::= \ P_a(x) \mid x = y \mid x < y \mid X(x) \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \neg\varphi \mid \forall x.\varphi \mid \forall X.\varphi$$

where $a \in \Sigma$, $x, y \in V_1$ and $X \in V_2$. For $w_\sigma \in \Sigma_V^\omega$, the satisfaction relation $w_\sigma \models \varphi$ is defined as usual. The usual formulas of the form $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$, $\exists \mathcal{X}.\varphi$ with $\mathcal{X} \in V$, $\varphi_1 \Rightarrow \varphi_2$ and $\varphi_1 \Leftrightarrow \varphi_2$ can be expressed using **MSO**-formulas.

For any formula $\varphi \in \mathbf{MSO}(\Sigma)$, let $W(\varphi)$ denote the **WAL**-formula obtained from φ by replacing $\wedge$ by $\sqcap$, $\forall \mathcal{X}$ (with $\mathcal{X} \in V$) by $\sqcap \mathcal{X}$, and every subformula $\neg\psi$ by $\psi \Rightarrow$ **false**. Here **false** can be considered as abbreviation of the sentence $\sqcap x.(x < x)$. Note that $W(\varphi)$ does not contain any assignment formulas $x \mapsto m$ and $\langle\langle W(\varphi) \rangle\rangle(w_\sigma) \in \{\top, \bot\}$ for every $w_\sigma \in \Sigma_V^\omega$. Moreover, it can be easily shown by induction on the structure of φ that, for all $w_\sigma \in \Sigma_V^\omega$: $w_\sigma \models \varphi$ iff $\langle\langle W(\varphi) \rangle\rangle(w_\sigma) = \top$. This shows that MSO logic on infinite words is subsumed by **WAL**. For the formulas which do not contain any assignments of the form $x \mapsto m$, the merging $\sqcap$ can be considered as the usual conjunction and the merging quantifiers $\sqcap \mathcal{X}$ as the usual universal quantifiers $\forall \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, $\top$ corresponds to the boolean true value and $\bot$ to the boolean false value. For a **WAL**-formula φ, we will consider $\neg\varphi$ as abbreviation for $\varphi \Rightarrow$ **false**.

4.4 Extended WAL

Here we extend **WAL** with weighted existential quantification over free variables in **WAL**-formulas. Let Σ be an alphabet, $\mathbb{V} = (M, (K, +, \mathbb{0}), \text{val})$ a valuation structure and $\mathbb{1} \in M$ a default weight. The set $\mathbf{eWAL}(\Sigma, \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}})$ of formulas of *extended weight assignment logic* over Σ and $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}}$ consists of all formulas of the form $\sqcup \mathcal{X}_1. \, ... \, \sqcup \mathcal{X}_k.\varphi$ where $k \geq 0$, $\mathcal{X}_1, ..., \mathcal{X}_k \in V$ and $\varphi \in \mathbf{WAL}(\Sigma, \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}})$. Given a formula $\varphi \in \mathbf{eWAL}(\Sigma, \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}})$, the *semantics* of φ is the mapping $[\![\varphi]\!] : \Sigma_V^\omega \to K$ defined inductively as follows. If $\varphi \in \mathbf{WAL}(\Sigma, \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}})$, then $[\![\varphi]\!]$ is defined as the proper semantics for **WAL**. If φ contains a prefix $\sqcup x$ with $x \in V_1$ or $\sqcup X$ with $X \in V_2$, then, for all $w_\sigma \in \Sigma_V^\omega$, $[\![\varphi]\!](w_\sigma)$ is defined inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}[\![\sqcup x.\varphi]\!](w_\sigma) &= \sum \big([\![\varphi]\!](w_{\sigma[x/i]}) \mid i \in \mathrm{dom}(w)\big)\\ [\![\sqcup X.\varphi]\!](w_\sigma) &= \sum \big([\![\varphi]\!](w_{\sigma[X/I]}) \mid I \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(w)\big)\end{aligned}$$

Again, if φ is a sentence, then we can consider its semantics as the quantitative ω-language $[\![\varphi]\!] : \Sigma^\omega \to K$. We say that a quantitative ω-language $\mathbb{L} : \Sigma^\omega \to K$ is **eWAL**-*recognizable* over $\mathbb{V}$ if there exist a default weight $\mathbb{1} \in M$ and a sentence $\varphi \in \mathbf{eWAL}(\Sigma, \mathbb{V}_\mathbb{1})$ such that $[\![\varphi]\!] = \mathbb{L}$.

Example 4.3. Let $\Sigma = \{a\}$ be a singleton alphabet, $\mathbb{V} = \mathbb{V}^{\textsc{Disc}}$ as defined in Example 2.3(b). Assume that, for every position of an ω-word, we can either assign to this position the cost 5 and the discounting factor 0.5 or we assign the cost the smaller cost 2 and the bigger discounting factor 0.75. After that we compute the discounted sum using the valuation function of $\mathbb{V}^{\textsc{Disc}}$. We are interested in the infimal value of this discounted sum. We can express it by means of the **eWAL**-formula $\varphi = \sqcup X.\sqcap x.([X(x) \Rightarrow (x \mapsto (5, 0.5))] \sqcap [(\neg X(x)) \Rightarrow (x \mapsto (2, 0.75))])$ i.e. $[\![\varphi]\!]$ (a^ω) is the desired infimal value.

5 Expressiveness Equivalence Result

In this section we state and prove the main result of this paper.

Theorem 5.1. *Let Σ be an alphabet, $\mathbb{V} = (M, (K, +, \mathbb{0}), \mathrm{val})$ a valuation structure and $\mathbb{L} : \Sigma^\omega \to K$ a quantitative ω-language. Then*

(a) $\mathbb{L}$ is **WAL**-*definable over $\mathbb{V}$ iff $\mathbb{L}$ is unambiguously recognizable over $\mathbb{V}$.*
(b) $\mathbb{L}$ is **eWAL**-*definable over $\mathbb{V}$ iff $\mathbb{L}$ is recognizable over $\mathbb{V}$.*

5.1 Unambiguous Case

In this subsection, we sketch the proof of Theorem 5.1 (a). First we show **WAL**-definability implies unambiguous recognizability. We establish a decomposition of **WAL**-formulas in a similar manner as it was done for unambiguous WBA in Theorem 3.1 (a). Assume that $\mathbb{L} = [\![\varphi]\!]$ where $\varphi \in \mathbf{WAL}(\Sigma, \mathbb{V}_\mathbb{1})$. We show that there exist an alphabet Γ, renamings $h : \Gamma \to \Sigma$ and $g : \Gamma \to M$, and a sentence $\beta \in \mathbf{MSO}(\Gamma)$ such that $[\![\varphi]\!] = h((\mathrm{val} \circ g) \cap \mathcal{L}(\beta))$ where $\mathcal{L}(\beta) \subseteq \Gamma^\omega$ is the h-unambiguous ω-language defined by β. Then, applying the classical Büchi theorem (which states that $\mathcal{L}(\beta)$ is recognizable) and our Nivat Theorem 3.1(a), we obtain that $\mathbb{L}$ is recognizable over $\mathbb{V}$. Let $\# \notin M$ be a symbol which we will use to mark all positions whose labels are undefined in the auxiliary semantics of **WAL**-formulas. Let $\Delta_\varphi = \textsc{Const}(\varphi) \cup \{\#\}$. Then our extended alphabet will be $\Gamma = \Sigma \times \Delta_\varphi$. We define the renamings h, g as follows. For all $u = (a, b) \in \Gamma$, we let $h(u) = a$, $g(u) = b$ if $b \in M$, and $g(u) = \mathbb{1}$ if $m = \#$. The main difficulty is to construct the sentence β. For any ω-word $w = (a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma^\omega$ and any partial ω-word $\eta \in (\textsc{Const}(\varphi))^\uparrow$, we encode the pair (w, η) as the ω-word $\text{code}(w,\eta) = ((a_i, b_i))_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in \Gamma^\omega$ where, for all $i \in \text{dom}(\eta)$, $b_i = \eta(i)$ and, for all $i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \text{dom}(\eta)$, $b_i = \#$. In other words, we will consider ω-words of Γ as convolutions of ω-words over Σ with the encoding of the auxiliary semantics of φ.

Lemma 5.2. *For every subformula ζ of φ, there exists a formula $\Phi(\zeta) \in \mathbf{MSO}(\Sigma \times \Delta_\varphi)$ such that $\textsc{Free}(\Phi(\zeta)) = \textsc{Free}(\zeta)$ and, for all $w_\sigma \in \Sigma_V^\omega$ and $\eta \in (\textsc{Const}(\varphi))^\uparrow$, we have: $\langle\!\langle \zeta \rangle\!\rangle(w_\sigma) = \eta$ iff $(\text{code}(w,\eta))_\sigma \models \Phi(\zeta)$.*

Proof (Sketch). Let $Y \in V_2$ be a fresh variable which does not occur in φ. First, we define inductively the formula $\Phi_Y(\zeta) \in \mathbf{MSO}(\Gamma)$ with $\textsc{Free}(\Phi_Y(\zeta)) = \textsc{Free}(\zeta) \cup \{Y\}$ which describes the connection between the input ω-word w and the output partial ω-word η; here the variable Y keeps track of the domain of η.

- For $\zeta = P_a(x)$, we let $\Phi_Y(\zeta) = \bigvee_{b\in\Delta_\varphi} P_{(a,b)}(x) \wedge Y(\emptyset)$ where $Y(\emptyset)$ is abbreviation for $\forall y.\neg Y(y)$. Here we demand that the first component of the letter at position x is a and the second component is an arbitrary letter from Δ_φ and that the auxiliary semantics of ζ is the trivial partial ω-word $\top$.
- Let ζ be one of the formulas of the form $x = y$, $x < y$ or $X(x)$. Then, we let $\Phi_Y(\zeta) = \zeta \wedge Y(\emptyset)$.
- For $\zeta = (x \mapsto m)$, we let $\Phi_Y(\zeta) = \bigvee_{a\in\Sigma} P_{(a,m)}(x) \wedge \forall y.(Y(y) \Leftrightarrow x = y)$. This formula describes that position x of η must be labelled by m and all other positions are unlabelled.
- Let $\zeta = (\zeta_1 \Rightarrow \zeta_2)$. Let $Z \in V_2$ be a fresh variable. Consider the formula $\kappa = \exists Z.[\Phi_Z(\zeta_1) \wedge Z(\emptyset)]$ which checks whether the value of the auxiliary semantics of ζ_1 is $\top$. Then, we let $\Phi_Y(\zeta) = (\kappa \wedge \Phi_Y(\zeta_2)) \vee (\neg\kappa \wedge Y(\emptyset))$.
- Let $\zeta = \zeta_1 \sqcap \zeta_2$. Let $Y_1, Y_2 \in V_2$ be two fresh distinct variables. Then, we let $\Phi_Y(\zeta) = \exists Y_1.\exists Y_2.(\Phi_{Y_1}(\zeta_1) \wedge \Phi_{Y_2}(\zeta_2) \wedge [Y = Y_1 \cup Y_2])$. Note that the property $Y = Y_1 \cup Y_2$ is MSO-definable.
- The most interesting case is a formula of the form $\zeta = \sqcap\mathcal{X}.\zeta'$ with $\mathcal{X} \in V$. Here, every value of $\mathcal{X}$ induces its own value of $Y(\mathcal{X})$ and we have to merge infinitely many partial ω-words, i.e., to express that Y is the infinite union of $Y(\mathcal{X})$ over all sets $\mathcal{X}$. We can show that Y must be the minimal set which satisfies the formula $\xi(Y) = \forall\mathcal{X}.\exists Y'.(\Phi_{Y'}(\zeta') \wedge (Y' \subseteq Y))$ where $Y' \in V_2$ is a fresh variable. Then, we let $\Phi_Y(\zeta) = \xi(Y) \wedge \forall Z.(\xi(Z) \Rightarrow (Y \subseteq Z))$.

Finally, we construct $\Phi(\zeta)$ from $\Phi_Y(\zeta)$ by labelling all positions not in Y by #: $\Phi(\zeta) = \exists Y.(\Phi_Y(\zeta) \wedge \forall x.(Y(x) \vee \bigvee_{a\in\Sigma} P_{(a,\#)}(x)))$. □

Now we apply Lemma 5.2 to the case $\zeta = \varphi$. Then, $\Phi(\varphi)$ is a sentence and $\mathcal{L}(\Phi(\varphi)) = \{\text{code}(w,\eta) \mid \langle\!\langle \varphi \rangle\!\rangle(w) = \eta \neq \bot\}$. Note that $\mathcal{L}(\Phi(\varphi))$ is h-unambiguous, since for every $w \in \Sigma^\omega$ there exists at most one $u \in \mathcal{L}(\Phi(\varphi))$ with $h(u) = w$. If we let $\beta = \Phi(\varphi)$, then we obtain the desired decomposition $[\![\varphi]\!] = h((\text{val} \circ g) \cap \mathcal{L}(\beta))$. Hence **WAL**-definability implies unambiguous recognizability.

Now we show the converse part of Theorem 5.1 (a), i.e., we show that unambiguous recognizability implies **WAL**-definability. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, I, T, F, \text{wt})$ be an unambiguous WBA over Σ and $\mathbb{V}$. First, using the standard approach, we describe runs of $\mathcal{A}$ by means of MSO-formulas. For this, we fix an enumeration $(t_i)_{1\leq i\leq m}$ of T and associate with every transition t_i a second-order variable X_i which keeps track of positions where t is taken. Then, a run of $\mathcal{A}$ can be described using a formula $\beta \in \mathbf{MSO}(\Sigma)$ with $\text{Free}(\beta) = \{X_1, ..., X_m\}$ which demands that values of the variables $X_1, ..., X_m$ form a partition of the domain of an input word, the transitions of a run are matching, the labels of transitions of a run are compatible with an input word, a run starts in I and visits some state in F infinitely often. Let $\mathbb{1} \in M$ be an arbitrary default weight. Consider the $\mathbf{WAL}(\Sigma, \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}})$-sentence

$$\varphi = W(\exists X_1 ... \exists X_m.\beta) \sqcap \left(\sqcap X_1 ... \sqcap X_m.[W(\beta) \Rightarrow \sqcap x. \textstyle\bigsqcap_{i=1}^{m} X_i(x) \Rightarrow (x \mapsto \text{wt}(t_i))]\right).$$

It can be shown that $[\![\varphi]\!] = [\![\mathcal{A}]\!]$. Hence unambiguous recognizability implies **WAL**-definability.

5.2 Nondeterministic Case

Now we sketch of the proof of Theorem 5.1 (b). First we show that **eWAL**-definability implies nondeterministic recognizability. The idea of our proof is similar to the unambiguous case, i.e., via a decomposition of a **eWAL**-sentence. Let $\mathbb{1} \in M$ be a default weight and $\psi \in \mathbf{eWAL}(\Sigma, \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}})$ a sentence. We may assume that $\psi = \sqcup x_1 ... \sqcup x_k . \sqcup X_1 ... \sqcup X_l . \varphi$ where $\varphi \in \mathbf{WAL}(\Sigma, \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}})$ and $x_1, ..., x_k$, X_1, ..., X_l are pairwise distinct variables. Again, we will establish a decomposition $[\![\varphi]\!] = h((\text{val} \circ g) \cap \mathcal{L}(\beta))$ for some alphabet Γ, renamings $h : \Gamma \to \Sigma$ and $g : \Gamma \to M$, and an MSO-sentence β over Γ. Note that, as opposed to the unambiguous case, the ω-language $\mathcal{L}(\beta)$ is not necessarily h-unambiguous. Then, the quantitative ω-language $\mathbb{L}$ is recognizable over $\mathbb{V}$ by Theorem 3.1 (b) and the classical Büchi theorem (which states that $\mathcal{L}(\beta)$ is a recognizable ω-language). As opposed to the unambiguous case, the extended alphabet Γ must also keep track of the values of the variables $x_1, ..., x_k, X_1, ..., X_l$. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{x_1, ..., x_k, X_1, ..., X_l\}$ and Δ_φ be defined as in the unambiguous case. Then we let $\Gamma = \Sigma \times \Delta_\varphi \times 2^{\mathcal{V}}$ and define h, g as in the unambiguous case ignoring the new component $2^{\mathcal{V}}$. Finally we construct the MSO-sentence β over Γ. The construction of β will be based on Lemma 5.2. Let $\Phi(\varphi) \in \mathbf{MSO}(\Sigma \times \Delta_\varphi)$ be the formula constructed in Lemma 5.2 for $\zeta = \varphi$. By simple manipulations with the predicates $P_{(a,b)}(x)$ of $\Phi(\varphi)$ (describing that the $2^{\mathcal{V}}$-component is arbitrary), we transform $\Phi(\varphi)$ to the formula $\overline{\Phi(\varphi)} \in \mathbf{MSO}(\Gamma)$. Using the standard Büchi encoding technique we construct a formula $\phi \in \mathbf{MSO}(\Gamma)$ which encodes the values of $\mathcal{V}$-variables in the $2^{\mathcal{V}}$-component of an ω-word over Γ. Then we let $\beta = \exists x_1 ... \exists x_k . \exists X_1 ... \exists X_l . (\phi \wedge \overline{\Phi(\varphi)})$. It can be shown that $[\![\varphi]\!] = h((\text{val} \circ g) \cap \mathcal{L}(\beta))$. Hence **eWAL**-definability implies recognizability.

Now we show that recognizability implies **eWAL**-definability. Our proof is a slight modification of our proof for the unambiguous case. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, I, T, F, \text{wt})$ be a nondeterministic WBA. Adopting the notations from the corresponding proof of Subsect. 5.1, we construct the $\mathbf{eWAL}(\Sigma, \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{1}})$-sentence

$$\varphi = \sqcup X_1 ... \sqcup X_m . \big(W(\beta) \Rightarrow \sqcap x. \textstyle\prod_{i=1}^{m} X_i(x) \Rightarrow (x \mapsto \mathrm{wt}(t_i)) \big).$$

It can be shown that $[\![\varphi]\!] = [\![\mathcal{A}]\!]$. Hence recognizabilty implies **eWAL**-definability.

6 Discussion

In this paper we introduced a weight assignment logic which is a simple and intuitive logical formalism for reasoning about quantitative ω-languages. Moreover, it works with arbitrary valuation functions whereas in weighted logics of [12], [14] some additional restrictions on valuation functions were added. We showed that WAL is expressively equivalent to unambiguous weighted Büchi automata. We also considered an extension of WAL which is equivalent to nondeterministic Büchi automata. Our expressiveness equivalence results can be helpful to obtain decidability properties for our new logics. The future research should investigate decidability properties of nondeterministic and unambiguous weighted Büchi automata with the practically relevant valuation functions. Although the weighted ω-automata models [7] do not have a Büchi acceptance condition, it seems likely that their decidability results about the threshold problems hold for Büchi acceptance condition as well. It could be also interesting to study our weight assignment technique in the context of temporal logic like LTL. Our results obtained for ω-words can be easily adopted to the structures like finite words and trees.

References

1. Andersson, D.: Improved combinatorial algorithms for discounted payoff games. Master's thesis, Uppsala University, Department of Information Technology (2006)
2. Bloem, R., Greimel, K., Henzinger, T.A., Jobstmann, B.: Synthesizing robust systems. In: FMCAD 2009, pp. 85–92. IEEE (2009)
3. Bouyer, P.: A logical characterization of data languages. Inf. Process. Lett. **84**(2), 75–85 (2002)
4. Bouyer, P., Brinksma, E., Larsen, K.G.: Optimal infinite scheduling for multi-priced timed automata. Formal Methods in System Design **32**, 3–23 (2008)
5. Büchi, J.R.: Weak second-order arithmetic and finite automata. Z. Math. Logik und Grundl. Math. **6**, 66–92 (1960)
6. Chatterjee, K., Doyen, L., Henzinger, T.A.: Quantitative languages. In: Kaminski, M., Martini, S. (eds.) CSL 2008. LNCS, vol. 5213, pp. 385–400. Springer, Heidelberg (2008)
7. Carton, O., Michel, M.: Unambiguous Büchi automata. In: Gonnet, G.H., Viola, A. (eds.) LATIN 2000. LNCS, vol. 1776, pp. 407–416. Springer, Heidelberg (2000)
8. Droste, M., Gastin, P.: Weighted automata and weighted logics. Theoret. Comp. Sci. **380**(1–2), 69–86 (2007)
9. Droste, M., Kuich, W., Vogler, H. (eds.): Handbook of Weighted Automata. EATCS Monographs on Theoretical Computer Science. Springer (2009)

10. Droste, M., Kuske, D.: Weighted automata. In: Pin, J.-E. (ed.) Handbook: "Automata: from Mathematics to Applications". European Mathematical Society (to appear)
11. Droste, M., Meinecke, I.: Weighted automata and weighted MSO logics for average and long-time behaviors. Inf. Comput. **220–221**, 44–59 (2012)
12. Droste, M., Perevoshchikov, V.: Multi-weighted automata and MSO logic. In: Bulatov, A.A., Shur, A.M. (eds.) CSR 2013. LNCS, vol. 7913, pp. 418–430. Springer, Heidelberg (2013)
13. Droste, M., Perevoshchikov, V.: A Nivat theorem for weighted timed automata and weighted relative distance logic. In: Esparza, J., Fraigniaud, P., Husfeldt, T., Koutsoupias, E. (eds.) ICALP 2014, Part II. LNCS, vol. 8573, pp. 171–182. Springer, Heidelberg (2014)
14. Droste, M., Rahonis, G.: Weighted automata and weighted logics on infinite words. In: Ibarra, O.H., Dang, Z. (eds.) DLT 2006. LNCS, vol. 4036, pp. 49–58. Springer, Heidelberg (2006)
15. Fahrenberg, U., Juhl, L., Larsen, K.G., Srba, J.: Energy games in multiweighted automata. In: Cerone, A., Pihlajasaari, P. (eds.) ICTAC 2011. LNCS, vol. 6916, pp. 95–115. Springer, Heidelberg (2011)
16. Filiot, E., Gentilini, R., Raskin, J.-F.: Quantitative languages defined by functional automata. In: Koutny, M., Ulidowski, I. (eds.) CONCUR 2012. LNCS, vol. 7454, pp. 132–146. Springer, Heidelberg (2012)
17. Hashiguchi, K., Ishiguro, K., Jimbo, S.: Decidability of the equivalence problem for finitely ambiguous finance automata. Int. Journal of Algebra and Computation **12**(3), 445–461 (2002)
18. Krob, D.: The equality problem for rational series with multiplicities in the tropical semiring is undecidable. International Journal of Algebra and Computation **4**(3), 405–425 (1994)
19. Larsen, K.G., Rasmussen, J.I.: Optimal conditional reachability for multi-priced timed automata. In: Sassone, V. (ed.) FOSSACS 2005. LNCS, vol. 3441, pp. 234–249. Springer, Heidelberg (2005)
20. Nivat, M.: Transductions des langages de Chomsky. Ann. de l'Inst. Fourier **18**, 339–456 (1968)
21. Stüber, T., Vogler, H., Fülöp, Z.: Decomposition of weighted multioperator tree automata. Int. J. Foundations of Computer Sci. **20**(2), 221–245 (2009)
22. Wilke, T.: Specifying timed state sequences in powerful decidable logics and timed automata. In: Langmaack, H., de Roever, W.-P., Vytopil, J. (eds.) FTRTFT 1994 and ProCoS 1994. LNCS, vol. 863, pp. 694–715. Springer, Heidelberg (1994)