

THE COMPLEXITY OF BIDIRECTED REACHABILITY IN VALENCE SYSTEMS

MOSES GANARDI, RUPAK MAJUMDAR, AND GEORG ZETZSCHE

ABSTRACT. We study the complexity of *bidirected* reachability problems arising in many areas of program analysis. We formulate the problem abstractly in terms of bidirected valence automata over graph monoids, an algebraic framework that generalizes many models of automata with storage, including CFL-reachability, interleaved Dyck reachability, vector addition systems over naturals or integers, and models involving complex combinations of stacks and counters. Our main result is a characterization of the decidability and complexity of the bidirected reachability problem for different graph classes. In particular, we characterize the complexity of bidirected reachability for every graph class for which reachability is known to be decidable. We show that there is a remarkable drop in complexity in going from the reachability to the bidirected reachability problems for many natural models studied previously. Our techniques are algebraic, and exploit the underlying group structure of the bidirected problem. As a consequence of our results, we characterize the complexity of bidirectional reachability of a number of open problems in program analysis, such as the complexity of different subcases of bidirectional interleaved Dyck reachability.

1. INTRODUCTION

Many problems in static program analysis can be abstractly formulated as the reachability problem in an edge-labeled finite graph with an additional *storage mechanism*. For example, when the storage mechanism is a stack, we get the pushdown reachability (or CFL reachability) problem, which pervades program analysis [33]. When the storage mechanism consists of counters over natural numbers or integers, we get a Petri net or a counter automaton, which underlies many analysis problems for concurrent software. In general, the storage mechanism can be more complex, involving combinations of stacks and counters. Characterizing the complexity of reachability of these models is at the core of algorithmic techniques in verification and program analysis.

An interesting special case of the reachability problem is that on *bidirected* (or reversible) graphs, where for each edge $p \xrightarrow{a} q$, there is a reverse edge $q \xrightarrow{\bar{a}} p$ where, intuitively, the action \bar{a} “reverts” the action of a on the storage. For example, in pushdown reachability, a push of a symbol on the forward edge is reverted by the pop of the symbol on the backward edge, and in a vector addition system, incrementing a counter is reverted by decrementing it by the same amount. Bidirectional reachability is a problem of both theoretical and practical interest. Theoretically, (logically and physically) bidirected computation has the potential to perform useful computation while dissipating less energy [18]. Practically, many problems of program analysis are naturally structured as bidirected reachability. For example, many context- and field-sensitive alias analyses can be formulated or practically approximated as bidirected pushdown reachability [4, 42] or bidirected interleaved pushdown reachability [36, 37, 41, 22, 23]. Bidirectional process algebras are natural models for biochemical networks and workflows with backtracking [9, 8].

In this paper, we systematically characterize the decidability and complexity of bidirected reachability problem in the general algebraic framework of bidirected *valence automata* [26, 40]. Valence automata consist of a finite-state machine and a (typically infinite) monoid that represents a storage mechanism. Each edge of the automaton consist of an input word and an element of the monoid. A computation of the automaton is

accepting if, upon reading the input word, it arrives at a final state and composing all the monoid elements along the path yields the neutral element. By choosing different monoids, valence automata can model many different storage mechanisms. In particular, valence automata over *graph monoids* can model known storage mechanisms in the literature, including multiple pushdown stores, counters over naturals or integers, and their combinations.

A specific instance of valence automata is the bidirected reachability problem for pushdown Petri nets (PPNs). In the non-bidirected case, the decidability status for pushdown Petri nets is a long-standing open problem. The bidirected subcase seems to also be interesting and hard, and we do not provide a solution here. However, we provide a complexity characterization for every graph that avoids this case.

Our classification follows that of the classification of (non-bidirected) reachability problems on valence automata [40]. There, Zetzsche characterizes a class of graphs that precisely capture PPNs with one Petri net place. Then, he shows that for every graph monoid arising out of graphs that avoid PPN graphs as induced subgraphs, reachability is decidable iff the graph is a transitive forest. In this paper, we prove a *dichotomy result* for this class of graphs. For every PPN-free graph that forms a transitive forest (the largest class of graphs for which reachability is known to be decidable), we prove that bidirected reachability is either LOGSPACE-complete or P-complete. More generally, we consider the setting where the graph is part of the input and drawn from a class of graphs. Even in this general setting, we obtain an almost complete complexity picture: We show that under mild assumptions, bidirected reachability falls within five possible categories: LOGSPACE-complete, ILD-complete, P-complete, in EXPTIME, or EXPSPACE-complete. Here, the complexity class ILD captures problems logspace reducible to the feasibility problem for integer linear Diophantine equations. On the negative side, we show that whenever a graph has an induced 4-cycle, bidirected reachability is undecidable.

In many situations, the complexity of the bidirected reachability problem reduces dramatically from that of reachability: bidirected pushdown reachability can be solved in almost linear time [4] whereas a truly subcubic algorithm for pushdown reachability is a long-standing open problem [5]; bidirected reachability in Petri nets is EXPSPACE-complete [29, 20] whereas reachability is Ackermann-complete [7].

Our results show that there is a remarkable drop in complexity in many other cases. For example, the reachability problems for integer vector addition systems and for pushdown machines and integer counters are both known to be NP-complete [13, 15]. We show that the bidirected version is in P (even if we have integer counters together with a fixed number of ordinary VASS counters). Our results also apply to machines where one has stacks where each entry contains several counter values. Moreover, in addition to such stacks, one can have integer counters, then build stacks of such configurations, etc. Our characterization implies that when the number of alternations between building stacks and adding integer counters is not fixed, then bidirected reachability can still be solved in EXPTIME; however, the reachability problem is NEXPTIME-complete [14].

Our techniques are quite different from usual techniques used in program analysis. Bidirectedness imposes a group structure on the problem, and therefore, our results make heavy use of techniques from computational problems on graph groups. We observe that bidirected reachability for valence automata is logspace-equivalent to subgroup membership for graph groups when the underlying graph has self loops. This allows us to “translate” problems about reachability to problems about groups and vice versa. For example, from undecidability results on subgroup membership for $F_2 \times F_2$, where F_2 is the free group of rank 2 [31], we deduce undecidability of corresponding bidirected reachability problems, answering an open question from [23]. Despite the insights from groups, our upper bound proofs are technically complicated, and introduces new ideas to reduce reachability to the emptiness problem for bidirected grammars, and eventually to feasibility of integer linear equation systems. A central ingredient in our translation to integer linear equation systems is an “equational analogue” of a well-known result of Verma, Seidl, and Schwentick [34]: They show that given a context-free grammar, one can construct in polynomial time an existential Presburger formula for its Parikh image. While existential Presburger arithmetic is equivalent to systems

of integer linear *inequalities* (where feasibility is NP-complete), we show that for bidirected grammars, the Parikh image can, in some appropriate sense, be described using only equations. This leads to a polynomial time algorithm, since feasibility systems of integer linear equations is decidable in P [6]. In the analogue of the result of Verma, Seidl, and Schwentick [34], a key concept we introduce is that of a *Kirchhoff graph*, which collects a set of derivations in a bidirected grammar. These derivations satisfy a condition corresponding to Kirchhoff's equation on voltage drops in electrical networks. Roughly speaking, the existence of these graphs allows us to drop a connectedness condition that is responsible for the inequalities in the approach of Verma et al.

Bidirectional Dyck reachability and interleaved Dyck reachability problems have recently received a lot of attention as natural formulations or approximations of pointer analysis problems [4, 42, 23]. However, many complexity questions remained open. Our main result provides an almost full classification of the complexity landscape of these problems. For example, while Chatterjee, Choudhary, and Pavlogiannis [4] show an almost linear time algorithm for bidirected Dyck reachability, it was open if the problem was P-complete. By reducing from subgroup membership for the free group with two generators, we show it is, and therefore one cannot hope to efficiently parallelize pointer analysis. Li, Zhang, and Reps [23] performed a systematic study of bidirected interleaved Dyck reachability problems.¹ They showed that bidirected $D_2 \odot D_2$ -reachability NP-hard, and state that the decidability of the problem is an important open question. We show that the problem is undecidable. They showed the n -fold $D_1 \odot \dots \odot D_1$ reachability problem is NP-hard, leaving its decidability open. We show the problem is EXPSPACE-complete. They also show a polynomial time algorithm for bidirected $D_1 \odot D_1$ -reachability. We show that this problem is LOGSPACE-complete. The only remaining case, bidirected $D_2 \odot D_1$ -reachability remains open: this is equivalent to the reachability problem for bidirected pushdown Petri nets.

Our techniques also imply a new result in computational group theory: For graph groups defined by transitive forests, subgroup membership is decidable in polynomial time.

Acknowledgment. The authors are grateful to Markus Lohrey for discussions about the algorithm for subgroup membership for graph groups over chordal graphs from [26].

2. BIDIRECTED VALENCE SYSTEMS

2.1. Algebraic Preliminaries. We assume familiarity with basic notions of monoids, groups, etc. (see, e.g., [19]). A *monoid* is a set equipped with an associative binary operation \cdot and an identity element (i.e., an element 1 such that for all elements a in the set, $a \cdot 1 = 1 \cdot a = a$). A *group* is a monoid where each element additionally has an inverse, i.e., for each a there is an element \bar{a} such that $a \cdot \bar{a} = 1$. A group is commutative if $x \cdot y = y \cdot x$ for all x, y . A *subgroup* of a group G is a subset of the elements of G that themselves form a group; i.e., it is a subset of elements closed under the binary operation as well as inverses. A subgroup H of a group G can be used to decompose the underlying set of G into disjoint equal-size subsets called *cosets*. The *left cosets* (resp. *right cosets*) of H in G are the sets obtained by multiplying each element of H by a fixed element g of G : $gH = \{g \cdot h \mid h \in H\}$ (resp. $Hg = \{h \cdot g \mid h \in H\}$). For a subset S , we write $\langle S \rangle$ for the smallest subgroup containing S ; this is the set of all elements of G that can be written as finite products of elements from S and their inverses. If $\langle S \rangle = G$, we say S *generates* G and call the elements of S the *generators* of G .

A *presentation* $(\Sigma \mid R)$ of a monoid is a description of a monoid in terms of a set Σ of generators and a set of binary relations $R \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*$ on the free monoid Σ^* generated by Σ . For a set $R \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*$ define the step relation \rightarrow_R by $sut \rightarrow_R svt$ for all $(u, v) \in R$ and $s, t \in \Sigma^*$. Define \equiv_Γ to be the smallest equivalence

¹Interleaved Dyck reachability is the generalization of CFL reachability where there are multiple stacks over disjoint sets of parentheses. Using the notation of [23], the $D_m \odot D_n$ bidirected reachability problem is the problem with two interleaved Dyck languages D_m and D_n , with m and n pairs of parentheses.

relation $\leftrightarrow_{\Gamma}^*$ containing \rightarrow_{Γ} . The monoid is then presented as the quotient of Σ^* by the congruence \equiv_R . For a word $w \in \Sigma^*$, we write $[w]_{\equiv_R}$ for the equivalence class of w under \equiv_R . It is known that $w \equiv_{\Gamma} \varepsilon$ is witnessed by a derivation $w = w_0 \rightarrow_R w_1 \rightarrow_R \cdots \rightarrow_R w_n = \varepsilon$ [38, Equation (8.2)].

A *commutative semigroup presentation* is a presentation $(\Sigma \mid R)$ where $(xy, yx) \in R$ for all $x \neq y \in \Sigma$. The *word problem for commutative semigroups* asks, given a commutative semigroup presentation $(\Sigma \mid R)$ and two words $u, v \in \Sigma^*$, does $u \equiv_R v$ hold? This problem is known to be EXPSPACE-complete [29].

Graph Monoids. A *graph* is a tuple $\Gamma = (V, I)$, where V is a finite set of vertices and $I \subseteq \{e \subseteq V \mid 1 \leq |e| \leq 2\}$ is a finite set of undirected edges, which can be self-loops. Thus, if $\{v\} \in I$, we say that v is *looped*; otherwise, v is *unlooped*. The edge relation is also called an *independence relation*. We also write uIv for $\{u, v\} \in I$. A subset $U \subseteq V$ is a *clique* if uIv for any two distinct $u, v \in U$. If in addition, all $v \in U$ are looped, then U is a *looped clique*. If U is a clique and all $v \in U$ are unlooped, then U is an *unlooped clique*. We say that $U \subseteq V$ is an *anti-clique* if we do not have uIv for any distinct $u, v \in U$. Given a graph Γ , we define a monoid as follows. We define the alphabet $X_{\Gamma} = V \cup \bar{V}$ where $\bar{V} = \{\bar{v} \mid v \in V\}$. We define $R_{\Gamma} = \{(v\bar{v}, \varepsilon) \mid v \in V\} \cup \{(xy, yx) \mid x \in \{u, \bar{u}\}, y \in \{v, \bar{v}\}, uIv\}$. We write \rightarrow_{Γ} instead of $\rightarrow_{R_{\Gamma}}$ and \equiv_{Γ} for the smallest equivalence relation $\leftrightarrow_{\Gamma}^*$ containing \rightarrow_{Γ} . In particular, if v has a self-loop, then $\bar{v}v \equiv_{\Gamma} \varepsilon$. We define the monoid $\mathbb{M}\Gamma := X_{\Gamma}^* / \equiv_{\Gamma}$. We write $[w]$ for the equivalence class of w under \equiv_{Γ} and 1 for $[\varepsilon]$. For each word $w \in X_{\Gamma}^*$, we define its *inverse* \bar{w} as follows. If $w = v$ for some $v \in V$, then \bar{w} is just the letter \bar{v} . If $w = \bar{v}$ for $v \in V$, then $\bar{w} = v$. Finally, if $w = w_1 \cdots w_n$ with $w_1, \dots, w_n \in X_{\Gamma}^*$, then $\bar{w} = \bar{w}_n \cdots \bar{w}_1$.

2.2. (Bidirected) Valence Systems and Reachability. Valence systems are an abstract model for studying finite-state transition systems with “storage.” It consists of a state transition system on a finite set of states, as well as a monoid that represents an auxiliary storage and determines which paths in the automata form valid computations in the presence of the auxiliary storage. For example, if the underlying storage is a stack, the monoid can encode push and pops on to the stack and determine computations that produce an empty stack. In the following, we shall consider graph monoids as the underlying monoids; as we shall see, they are expressive enough for common storage mechanisms such as counters and stacks.

Given a graph Γ , a *valence system* \mathcal{A} over Γ consists of a finite set of states Q , and a transition relation $\rightarrow_{\subseteq} Q \times X_{\Gamma}^* \times Q$ where a transition (p, u, q) is written as $p \xrightarrow{u} q$. A *run* is a sequence of transitions $(q_0, u_1, q_1)(q_1, u_2, q_2) \cdots (q_{n-1}, u_n, q_n)$, which is also abbreviated as $q_0 \xrightarrow{u_1 \cdots u_n} q_n$.

The *reachability problem* (REACH) for valence systems is the following:

Given: A valence system \mathcal{A} and states s, t in \mathcal{A} .

Question: Is there a run $s \xrightarrow{w} t$ for some $w \in X_{\Gamma}^*$ with $[w] = 1$?

If the reachability problem is restricted to valence systems over a particular graph Γ , then we denote the problem by $\text{REACH}(\Gamma)$. If we restrict the input systems to a class \mathcal{G} of graphs, then we write $\text{REACH}(\mathcal{G})$. For example, if \mathcal{V} is the class of all unlooped cliques, then $\text{REACH}(\mathcal{V})$ is the reachability problem for vector addition systems with states (VASS).

A valence system \mathcal{A} is called *bidirected* if for any transition $p \xrightarrow{u} q$, we also have $q \xrightarrow{\bar{u}} p$. The *bidirected reachability problem* (BIREACH) is the reachability problem where the input system \mathcal{A} is restricted to bidirected valence systems. As above, we will consider the case where the system is over a particular graph Γ , denoted $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$, or the graph is drawn from a class \mathcal{G} , denoted $\text{BIREACH}(\mathcal{G})$.

2.3. Examples. We provide some concrete examples of valence automata and graph monoids; for more general examples, see [38].

Consider the simplest case in which the graph is a single node v without a loop. Then the presentation R_{Γ} has one rule $(v\bar{v}, \varepsilon)$. We call the resulting monoid \mathbb{B} (the notation coming from the *bicyclic monoid*). One can view \mathbb{B} as an \mathbb{N} -counter, i.e., a counter that takes values in the natural numbers and has to be 0 at the end of the computation, by considering a multiplication by v as an increment, and a multiplication by

\bar{v} as a decrement. The identity element is the value 0. Alternately, \mathbb{B} can be seen as a pushdown stack with only one symbol. A multiplication by v adds the symbol to the top of stack, and a multiplication by \bar{v} pops the stack (if nonempty). A computation is accepted on empty stack. If the sole vertex v is looped, then $\mathbb{M}\Gamma$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} and represents a \mathbb{Z} -counter: a counter that can go below zero and is zero-tested at the end of the computation.

Now assume Γ consists of n vertices but no edges or self loops. By a similar reasoning, the monoid $\mathbb{M}\Gamma$ represents a pushdown stack with n symbols. We interpret each vertex v as a push of the corresponding symbol and \bar{v} as the pop of the symbol, and we notice that $w \equiv_{\Gamma} \varepsilon$ iff w transforms the empty stack to the empty stack (i.e., all pushes are matched by a corresponding pop).

For a fixed language L over an alphabet Σ , the L -reachability problem takes as input a directed graph G whose edges are labeled with Σ and two nodes s and t of G , and asks, is there a path from s to t such that the word formed by concatenating the labels along the edges in the path belongs to L ? Let D_k denote the Dyck language with k kinds of parentheses. The D_k -reachability problem, for $k \geq 1$, is a fundamental problem in interprocedural dataflow analysis [30, 33].² From the above discussion, D_k -reachability is a special case of reachability in valence automata, where the graph Γ consists of k vertices and no edges.

The graph with two vertices u and v , with a single edge $\{u, v\}$ (but without self loops) represents a storage mechanism with two independent partially blind counters and, in general, an unlooped clique with n vertices represents n partially blind counters. Thus, vector addition systems with states of dimension n (or Petri nets) are a special case of valence automata, where the graph consists of an unlooped clique of n nodes. If the graph is looped, then we get multicounter automata, where the counters can become negative along the computation but are zero tested as the end.

By mixing and matching graph monoids, we can in fact get more complex combinations of storage mechanisms, such as stacks of counters, see [38]. A particular instance of the problem is in fact reachability in pushdown Petri nets, which is a well-known open problem even in the bidirectional case.

Let us show a particular case, that of *interleaved Dyck reachability* [23]. Given two Dyck languages D_m and D_n (over disjoint alphabets), the *interleaved Dyck language* $D_m \odot D_n$ is defined as the language of all words w such that the projection of w on to the alphabet of D_m belongs to D_m and the projection on to the alphabet of D_n belongs to D_n . That is, a word belongs to $D_m \odot D_n$ if it is obtained by shuffling a word from D_m with a word from D_n . Li, Zhang, and Reps [23] study interleaved Dyck reachability and its restriction to bidirected graphs, and show its connection to a large number of problems arising from program analysis. Interleaved Dyck reachability is a special case of reachability in valence automata; we show some instances in Table 1.

2.4. Decidability Landscape for Reachability.






PPN-graphs. A graph Γ is a *PPN-graph* if it is isomorphic to one of the following three graphs:



We say that the graph Γ is *PPN-free* if it has no PPN-graph as an induced subgraph. Observe that a graph Γ is PPN-free if and only if in the neighborhood of each unlooped vertex, any two vertices are adjacent. The abbreviation ‘PPN’ refers to ‘pushdown Petri nets’. This is because if Γ is a PPN-graph then $\text{REACH}(\Gamma)$ is inter-reducible with reachability for pushdown Petri nets [40]. Whether the (general) reachability problem is decidable for these is a long-standing open problem [21].

²The program analysis literature formulates the problem as “context-free reachability” and allows L to be an arbitrary context free language, and not necessary a Dyck language. By the Chomsky-Schützenberger theorem, every context-free reachability problem is reducible to D_2 -reachability.

TABLE 1. Reachability problems, their valence automata encoding, and complexity results for bidirectional reachability. Other than PPN, the complexity results improve the state-of-the-art.

L -Reachability problem	Corresponding graph	Complexity of BIREACH(Γ)
D_1		LOGSPACE-complete
$D_1 \odot D_1$		LOGSPACE-complete
D_2		P-complete
N -fold D_1	unlooped N -clique	EXPSPACE-complete
$D_1 \odot D_2$		open: PPN
$D_2 \odot D_2$	 (C4)	undecidable

Transitive forests. A graph Γ is a *transitive forest* if it can be constructed in the following way. We define the class of *transitive forests* inductively. First, every isolated vertex is a transitive forest. Moreover, if Γ_1 and Γ_2 are transitive forests, then (i) the disjoint union of Γ_1 and Γ_2 is a transitive forest and (ii) if Γ is the graph obtained by adding one vertex v to Γ_1 so that v is adjacent to every vertex in Γ_1 , then Γ is also a transitive forest.

We also need a measure of transitive forests that essentially captures the height of the trees in a transitive forest. Formally, every non-empty transitive forest is either (i) a disjoint union of connected transitive forests, or (ii) has a *universal vertex*, i.e. a vertex that is adjacent to all other vertices (take the root of the underlying tree). This induces a successive decomposition of the transitive forest into smaller ones: For a disjoint union, take the disjoint connected transitive forests. If there is a universal vertex, remove that vertex to obtain a smaller transitive forest.

The decomposition is unique up to isomorphism: This is obvious in the case of a disjoint union. In the case of several universal vertices, note that all possible removals result in isomorphic graphs. This allows us to define the *height* $h(\Gamma)$ of a transitive forest $\Gamma = (V, I)$: If $V = \emptyset$, then $h(\Gamma) = 0$. If Γ is a disjoint union of connected transitive forests $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_n$, then $h(\Gamma) = \max\{h(\Gamma_i) \mid i \in [1, n]\} + 1$. If Γ has a universal vertex u and removing u leaves Γ' , then $h(\Gamma) = h(\Gamma')$.

For the class of PPN-free graphs, it is well-understood whether reachability is decidable. For a graph Γ , let Γ^- be obtained from Γ by removing all self loops.


Theorem 2.1. [40] *Let Γ be a PPN-free graph. Then REACH(Γ) is decidable if and only if Γ^- is a transitive forest.*

By SC^\pm , we denote the class of PPN-free graphs Γ where Γ^- is a transitive forest. This is because valence systems over SC^\pm are equivalent to *stacked counter machines*, as explained in Section 3. Hence, we know that for every graph in SC^\pm , the reachability problem is decidable. Moreover, for every graph Γ outside of SC^\pm , either Γ contains a PPN-graph (meaning decidability of REACH(Γ) is subject to a long-standing open problem) or REACH(Γ) is undecidable. Therefore, SC^\pm is the largest class of graphs Γ for which REACH(Γ) is currently known to be decidable.

3. MAIN RESULTS

Our first result is an undecidability result, which provides a negative answer to the open problem from [23] of whether BIREACH(C4) is decidable.

Theorem 3.1. *If Γ^- contains C4 as an induced subgraph, then BIREACH(Γ) is undecidable.*

FIGURE 1. The graphs C_4 , C_4^o , and Γ_3

We assume familiarity with the basic complexity classes LOGSPACE (deterministic logspace), P (deterministic polynomial time), NP (non-deterministic polynomial time), EXPTIME (deterministic exponential time), NEXPTIME (non-deterministic exponential time), and EXPSPACE (exponential space). By ILD, we denote the class of problems that are logspace-interreducible to the problem of solvability of integer linear Diophantine equations (ILD):

Given: A matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$ and a vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^m$.

Question: Is there a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ with $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b}$?

It is well known that ILD is solvable in polynomial time.

Theorem 3.2 ([6]). *ILD is solvable in polynomial time.*

In particular, the class ILD lies in between LOGSPACE and P. However, the exact complexity of ILD seems to be open [1]. Thus, it is conceivable that ILD coincides with LOGSPACE or P or that it lies strictly in between. Hence, we have the inclusions $\text{LOGSPACE} \subseteq \text{ILD} \subseteq \text{P} \subseteq \text{NP} \subseteq \text{EXPTIME} \subseteq \text{NEXPTIME} \subseteq \text{EXPSPACE}$.

In order to formulate our main result about the complexity of BIREACH, we need some terminology. We say that \mathcal{G} is *UC-bounded* if there is a k such that for every Γ in \mathcal{G} , every unlooped clique in Γ has size at most k . Otherwise, it is called *UC-unbounded*. Similarly, *LC-bounded* (*LC-unbounded*, respectively) if the same condition holds for looped cliques. We say that \mathcal{G} is *height-bounded* if there is a k with $h(\Gamma) \leq k$ for every Γ in \mathcal{G} . Otherwise, \mathcal{G} is *height-unbounded*. We now present an almost complete complexity classification of $\text{BIREACH}(\mathcal{G})$, where \mathcal{G} is a subclass of SC^\pm . Here, we assume that \mathcal{G} is closed under taking induced subgraphs. This is a mild assumption that only rules out some pathological exceptions.

Theorem 3.3 (Classification Theorem for BIREACH). *Let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \text{SC}^\pm$ be closed under induced subgraphs. Then $\text{BIREACH}(\mathcal{G})$ is*

- (1) LOGSPACE-complete if \mathcal{G} consists of cliques of bounded size,
- (2) ILD-complete if \mathcal{G} consists of cliques, is UC-bounded, and LC-unbounded,
- (3) P-complete if \mathcal{G} contains a graph that is not a clique, and \mathcal{G} is UC-bounded and height-bounded,
- (4) in EXPTIME if \mathcal{G} is UC-bounded and height-unbounded, and
- (5) EXPSPACE-complete otherwise.

From Theorem 3.3, we can deduce our dichotomy for individual graphs Γ : Take as \mathcal{G} the set of graphs containing Γ and its induced subgraphs. Then \mathcal{G} is UC-bounded, LC-bounded, and height-bounded and thus falls into case (1) or into case (3) above.

Corollary 3.4 (Dichotomy for BIREACH). *Let $\Gamma \in \text{SC}^\pm$ be a graph. Then $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$ is LOGSPACE-complete if Γ is a clique and P-complete otherwise.*

Intuition on graph classes. We now provide some intuition on the graph classes mentioned in Theorem 3.3. In (1), we have graphs that are cliques of bounded size. Hence, for some number d , \mathcal{G} consists of all cliques of size $\leq d$, which may contain looped and unlooped nodes. As explained above, valence systems over \mathcal{G} are

counter machines with a bounded number of counters, some of them \mathbb{N} -counters (unlooped nodes) and some \mathbb{Z} -counters (looped nodes).

Similarly, in (2), for some d , valence systems over \mathcal{G} correspond to counter machines with at most d many \mathbb{N} -counters and an arbitrary number of \mathbb{Z} -counters. In (3), we go beyond just counters. A graph in SC^\pm always has a tree structure: It is either an unlooped clique or it can be recursively decomposed, because it is always obtained from smaller transitive forests by taking their disjoint union and then adding a looped vertex adjacent to all other vertices. In terms of machine models, taking a disjoint union is the same as *building stacks*: One obtains a machine model with a stack, where each entry of the stack is a configuration of the previous machine model. Moreover, adding a universal vertex corresponds to *adding a \mathbb{Z} -counter* [39, 38]: In addition to the configuration of the previous model, we also have a new \mathbb{Z} -counter. Therefore, valence systems over SC^\pm are called *stacked counter machines*³. Here, the height $h(\Gamma)$ is the number of alternations between these two types of steps (building stacks and adding \mathbb{Z} -counters).

For example, if Γ_k has two non-adjacent nodes v_1, v_2 and looped nodes u_1, \dots, u_k such that each u_i is adjacent to all other vertices (see Fig. 1 for Γ_3), then valence systems over Γ_k are machines with access to a pushdown stack and, in addition, k many \mathbb{Z} -counters. Then, we have $h(\Gamma_k) \leq 1$ and thus we show that bidirected reachability is in P , even if k is part of the input. In fact, case (3) shows this for every fixed number of alternations between building stacks and adding \mathbb{Z} -counters.

Comparison to general reachability. It is worth comparing our results on bidirected reachability with the complexity results on general reachability. Of course, there is the extreme difference exhibited in the case of unlooped cliques: For general reachability, the case of unbounded unlooped cliques is the reachability problem for vector addition systems, which was recently shown to be Ackermann-complete [7]. Moreover, even for bounded cliques, the problem is known to be non-elementary [7]. In the bidirected case, reachability is LOGSPACE -complete for a bounded clique size and EXSPACE -complete for an unbounded clique size. However, in the special case of unlooped cliques, this was all known before.

What our results show is that there is a *striking drop in complexity* in the other cases as well. The first example is the case (2). If \mathcal{G} is the class of looped cliques, then $\text{REACH}(\mathcal{G})$ is the reachability problem for *integer vector addition systems*, which is NP -complete [13]. We show that bidirected reachability is solvable in polynomial time, even in the presence of a fixed number of ordinary VASS counters (i.e. unlooped nodes).

Secondly, in (3), we observe a drop from NP to P . The machines with pushdown and \mathbb{Z} -counters (corresponding to Γ_k) mentioned above have an NP -complete general reachability problem [15], and NP -hardness holds already for a pushdown with a single \mathbb{Z} -counter. Our result implies that bidirected reachability is in P . Moreover, this still holds (i) with a fixed number of further alternations of building stacks and adding \mathbb{Z} -counters and (ii) if initially (before building stacks), we even allow a fixed number of \mathbb{N} -counters.

Third, in (4), we show that if the number of alternations (between building stacks and adding \mathbb{Z} -counters) is not fixed (but part of the input), bidirected reachability is still solvable in EXPTIME . This is again in contrast to general reachability: Even if there are no \mathbb{N} -counters, it was recently shown by Haase and Zetsche [14] that general reachability is NEXPTIME -complete.

4. BIDIRECTED REACHABILITY AND SUBGROUP MEMBERSHIP

Subgroup membership. If Γ is looped, then $\text{M}\Gamma$ is a group. The groups of the form $\text{M}\Gamma$ are called *graph groups* or *right-angled Artin groups* and have been studied intensively over the last decades [27, 10, 25, 28], in part due to their rich subgroup structure (see, e.g. [35]). The *subgroup membership problem* is the following.

Given: A graph Γ where every vertex is looped, words $w_1, \dots, w_k, w \in X_\Gamma^*$.

³Here, the \pm indicates that we begin with \mathbb{N} -counters (which stay non-negative) and after building stacks for the first time, we add \mathbb{Z} -counters (which can become negative).

Question: Does $[w] \in \langle [w_1], \dots, [w_k] \rangle$?

We denote this problem as **SUBMEM**. If the input graph Γ is fixed, we write **SUBMEM**(Γ). If Γ is drawn from a class \mathcal{G} , then we write **SUBMEM**(\mathcal{G}). Surprisingly, describing the class of graphs Γ for which **SUBMEM**(Γ) is decidable is a longstanding open problem [24].

4.1. BIREACH and subgroup membership. Our first observation is that if Γ is looped, then the complexity of **BIREACH**(Γ) matches that of subgroup membership over $\mathbb{M}\Gamma$. The connection between subgroups and bidirected valence automata (albeit under different names) is a prominent theme in group theory. It is implicit in the well-known concept of Stallings graphs and was used by Lohrey and Steinberg [26] in decidability results. We show that the conversion can be done in logspace, in both directions.

Theorem 4.1. *If Γ is looped, then **BIREACH**(Γ) and **SUBMEM**(Γ) are logspace inter-reducible.*

Let Γ be a looped graph. Reducing **SUBMEM**(Γ) to **BIREACH**(Γ) is easy: To test whether $[w]$ is contained in $\langle [w_1], \dots, [w_k] \rangle$ we construct a bidirected valence system \mathcal{A} with two states s, t and the transitions $s \xrightarrow{w_i} t$ and $t \xrightarrow{w_i} s$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, and the reverse transitions. Then $[w] \in \langle [w_1], \dots, [w_k] \rangle$ holds if and only if there exists $u \in X_\Gamma^*$ with $s \xrightarrow{u} t$ and $[u] = 1$. Conversely, by the following lemma we can compute in logspace a coset representation $\{[w] \in \mathbb{M}\Gamma \mid s \xrightarrow{w} t\} = [w_0]\langle [w_1], \dots, [w_n] \rangle$. Then it remains to test whether $[w_0] \in \langle [w_1], \dots, [w_n] \rangle$.

Theorem 4.2. *Given a looped graph Γ , a bidirected valence system \mathcal{A} over Γ and two states s, t from \mathcal{A} , one can compute words $w_0, w_1, \dots, w_n \in X_\Gamma^*$ in logspace such that $\{[w] \in \mathbb{M}\Gamma \mid s \xrightarrow{w} t\} = [w_0]\langle [w_1], \dots, [w_n] \rangle$*

To show Lemma 4.2, we compute in logspace a spanning tree of the automaton (which is possible by using [32]). Then w_0 is obtained from the unique path from s to t in the tree. The words w_1, \dots, w_n are obtained as *fundamental cycles*: These are cycles consisting of one edge outside the tree and a path inside the tree.

The connection between **BIREACH** and **SUBMEM** can be used to show the existence of a graph for which **REACH**(Γ) is undecidable but **BIREACH**(Γ) is decidable: Let Γ be the graph



By [27], **REACH**(Γ) is undecidable, but as Γ is looped and chordal, **SUBMEM**(Γ) is decidable [16] (with a simpler proof by Lohrey and Steinberg [26]).

4.2. Undecidability. We now prove our first main result: Theorem 3.1. We shall use the following result shown by Mikhailova [31]. The graphs **C4** and **C4**^o are shown in Figure 1.

Theorem 4.3 (Mikhailova). ***SUBMEM**(**C4**^o) is undecidable.*

Via Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.1, this implies that **BIREACH**(**C4**^o) is undecidable. We will extend this to prove Theorem 3.1.

The observation behind our proof is that using two non-adjacent vertices we can simulate a free group of rank two, i.e. $\mathbb{M}\Gamma_2$ where Γ_2 consists of two non-adjacent looped vertices a and b . The P-hardness in Theorem 3.3 also follows from this observation. Suppose that u, v are non-adjacent vertices in Γ . If both u and v are looped, then they already generate a free group of rank two. Now suppose that u is unlooped. We first simulate a pushdown over four letters using the words $W = \{uv^i \mid i \in [1, 4]\}$, i.e. for all $x \in (W \cup \bar{W})^*$ we have $x \equiv_\Gamma \varepsilon$ if and only if $x \leftrightarrow_R^* \varepsilon$ where $R = \{(w_i \bar{w}_i, \varepsilon) \mid i \in [1, k]\}$, see Lemma A.1. Then we can transform a bidirected valence system \mathcal{A} over Γ_2 into a bidirected valence system \mathcal{B} over Γ as follows, which guesses whether an element a (or b) is canceled by a previous or a later occurrence of \bar{a} (or \bar{b}) in the run: Every edge $p \xrightarrow{a} q$ is translated into two edges $p \xrightarrow{w_1} q$ and $p \xrightarrow{w_2} q$, whereas every edge $p \xrightarrow{\bar{a}} q$ is translated into two edges $p \xrightarrow{\bar{w}_1} q$ and $p \xrightarrow{\bar{w}_2} q$. Similarly b -edges and \bar{b} -edges are translated using w_3 and w_4 .

If Γ^- contains $C4^\circ$ as an induced subgraph then we have two pairs u_1, v_1 and u_2, v_2 of non-adjacent vertices where vertices from different pairs commute. Applying the above reduction to every pair, we can reduce $\text{BIREACH}(C4^\circ)$ to $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$, and obtain undecidability of $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$.

5. LOWER BOUNDS

In this section, we prove the lower bounds in Theorem 3.3.

LOGSPACE-hardness. For any graph Γ we can reduce from the reachability on undirected graphs to $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$ by replacing each undirected edge $\{p, q\}$ by transitions $p \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} q$ and $q \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} p$. Since the former problem is LOGSPACE-complete under AC^0 many-one reductions [2, 32], so is $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$.

ILD-hardness. Next, we show that, if \mathcal{G} is LC-unbounded then $\text{BIREACH}(\mathcal{G})$ is ILD-hard under logspace many-one reductions. Given a system of linear Diophantine equations $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b}$ where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$ has columns $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n \in \mathbb{Z}^m$. Since \mathcal{G} is LC-unbounded it contains a looped clique Γ_m with m nodes v_1, \dots, v_m . Let $\varphi: \mathbb{Z}^m \rightarrow X_{\Gamma_m}^*$ be the function $\varphi(k_1, \dots, k_m) = v_1^{k_1} \dots v_m^{k_m}$. Then we construct the valence system \mathcal{A} over Γ_m with two states p and q and the transitions $p \xrightarrow{\varphi(\mathbf{a}_i)} p$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $p \xrightarrow{\overline{\varphi(\mathbf{b})}} q$, and their reverse transitions. Then $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b}$ has a solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ if and only if there exists $w \in \Gamma_m^*$ with $[w] = 1$ and $p \xrightarrow{w} q$.

P-hardness. Now assume that Γ contains two non-adjacent vertices u and v ; let us assume that they are the only two vertices. Then we can show that $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$ is P-hard: Subgroup membership in the free group over two generators is P-hard by [3], and hence also $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma^\circ)$ by Theorem 4.1. In Section 4.2 we have observed that $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma^\circ)$ is log-space reducible to $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$, and hence $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$ is P-hard.

EXPSPACE-hardness. We reduce from the word problem over commutative semigroups, known to be EXPSPACE-hard [29]. Since \mathcal{G} is UC-unbounded and closed under induced subgraphs, it contains an unlooped clique Γ of size $|\Sigma|$. We can assume that Σ is its node set. Let \mathcal{A} be the bidirected valence system over Γ with three states q_0, q_1, q_2 , the transitions $q_0 \xrightarrow{xy} q_1$, $q_1 \xrightarrow{yx} q_2$, and the transitions $q \xrightarrow{xy} q$ for all $(x, y) \in R$, and their reverse transitions. Then $u \equiv_R v$ holds if and only if $q_0 \xrightarrow{w} q_2$ for some $w \in X_\Gamma^*$ with $[w] = 1$.

6. UPPER BOUNDS I: LOGSPACE AND ILD

In this section we will study $\text{BIREACH}(\mathcal{G})$ for classes \mathcal{G} of cliques, and prove the LOGSPACE and ILD upper bounds from Theorem 3.3. If Γ is an unlooped clique then $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$ is the reachability problem over *reversible vector addition systems with states* or, equivalently, the word problem for commutative semigroups [29].

Fix a clique $\Gamma = (V, I)$ where U and L are the sets of unlooped and looped vertices in Γ , respectively. Furthermore, we are given a bidirected valence system $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \rightarrow)$ over Γ , and two states $s, t \in Q$. Intuitively, the unlooped vertices in U represent \mathbb{N} -counters, that may not fall below zero, and the looped vertices in L represent \mathbb{Z} -counters. $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$ asks whether there is a path between s and t where the all counters are zero in the beginning and in the end. More formally, the graph monoid $\mathbb{M}\Gamma$ is a direct product of copies of the group of integers \mathbb{Z} and the bicyclic monoid \mathbb{B} . The *bicyclic monoid* \mathbb{B} contains all pairs $a = (a^-, a^+) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ and is equipped with the associative operation $(a^-, a^+) \oplus (b^-, b^+) = (a^- + b^- - \min(a^+, b^-), a^+ + b^+ - \min(a^+, b^-))$. We identify $(0, a^+)$ with the nonnegative integer a^+ , and $(a^-, 0)$ with the nonpositive integer $-a^-$.

Let $Y \subseteq V$ be a set of vertices in Γ . Let $\Phi_Y: X_\Gamma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^Y$ be the morphism defined by $\Phi_Y(w)(y) = |w|_y - |w|_{\bar{y}}$. Let $\Psi_Y: X_\Gamma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^Y$ be the morphism defined by $\Psi_Y(v)(v) = 1$ and $\Psi_Y(\bar{v})(v) = -1$ for all $v \in V$, and $\Psi_Y(x)(v) = 0$ for all $x \in V \cup \bar{V}$ with $x \notin \{v, \bar{v}\}$. Observe that the definition of Ψ_Y is consistent with our previous definition of $\Psi_\Sigma: \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^\Sigma$. The graph monoid $\mathbb{M}\Gamma$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{B}^U \times \mathbb{Z}^L$ via $[w] \mapsto (\Psi_U(w), \Phi_L(w))$.

6.1. Unlooped vertices. For now let us focus on the paths from $s \xrightarrow{w} t$ with $\Psi_U(w) = \mathbf{0}$. By translating \mathcal{A} into an “equivalent” commutative semigroup presentation $(\Sigma \mid R)$, we obtain the following result from Proposition and Lemma 3 in [29]:

Theorem 6.1. *One can decide in deterministic space $2^{O(|U|)} \cdot \log \|\mathcal{A}\|$ whether there exists a path $s \xrightarrow{w} t$ with $\Psi_U(w) = \mathbf{0}$ and, if so, return such a path.*

Let us define $\text{Reach}_{\mathcal{A}}(p, q) = \{\Psi_U(w) \mid p \xrightarrow{w} q\} \cap \mathbb{N}^U$ for any states $p, q \in Q$. The following lemma states that U can be partitioned into bounded components B and *simultaneously* unbounded components $U \setminus B$, i.e. $\text{Reach}_{\mathcal{A}}(p, q)$ contains vectors which are arbitrarily large in all $(U \setminus B)$ -components. The bounded components are bounded exponentially in $|U|$ and linearly in $\|\mathcal{A}\|$.

Theorem 6.2. *One can compute in deterministic space $2^{O(|U|)} \cdot \log \|\mathcal{A}\|$ a set $B \subseteq U$ and a number $b \leq 2^{O(|U|)} \cdot \|\mathcal{A}\|$ such that for all $q \in Q$ we have:*

- $\mathbf{v}(u) \leq b$ for all $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Reach}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, q)$ and $u \in B$,
- for every $c \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Reach}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, q)$ with $\mathbf{v}(u) \geq c$ for all $u \in U \setminus B$.

Lemma 6.2 follows from [17, Lemma 17], which states that for any commutative semigroup presentation $(\Sigma \mid R)$ and any $u \in \Sigma^*$, the equivalence class $[u]_{\equiv_R}$ can be represented as a *hybrid linear set* $\bigcup_{i=1}^m \{\mathbf{b}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \lambda_j \mathbf{p}_j \mid \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}\}$ for some $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_m, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}^{\Sigma}$. Here a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^{\Sigma}$ is viewed as a commutative word over Σ . Observe that the hybrid linear set is bounded in a certain Σ -component if and only if all period vectors \mathbf{p}_j are zero in that component. In all other components, the set is simultaneously unbounded.

6.2. General cliques. Our approach to decide $\text{BIREACH}(\mathcal{G})$ is as follows. We will compute a representation for

$$\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t) = \{\Phi_L(w) \mid s \xrightarrow{w} t, \Psi_U(w) = \mathbf{0}\}.$$

Since $[w] = 1$ if and only if $\Psi_U(w) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\Phi_L(w) = \mathbf{0}$ we only need to test $\mathbf{0} \in \text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t)$ using a system of integer linear Diophantine equations. Observe that $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t)$ is either empty or a coset $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t) = \mathbf{u} + \text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, s)$ for any $\mathbf{u} \in \text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t)$. Using Lemma 6.1 we can test whether there exists a path $s \xrightarrow{w} t$ with $\Psi_U(w) = \mathbf{0}$, witnessing $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t) \neq \emptyset$, and, if so, we find $\mathbf{u} := \Phi_L(w) \in \text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t)$. It remains to compute a representation of the subgroup $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, s)$.

Proposition 6.3. *One can compute in deterministic space $2^{O(|U|)} \cdot \log \|\mathcal{A}\|$ vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \in \mathbb{Z}^{L'}$ where $L \subseteq L'$ and $|L'| \leq |\Gamma|$ such that $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, s) = \{\mathbf{v}|_L \mid \mathbf{v} \in \langle \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \rangle, \mathbf{v}|_{L' \setminus L} = \mathbf{0}\}$.*

Let us sketch the proof for Proposition 6.3. We will simulate \mathcal{A} by a bidirected valence system \mathcal{A}' over a looped clique Γ' , i.e. a \mathbb{Z} -VASS. By applying Lemma 4.2 on \mathcal{A}' we can then obtain the representation of $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, s)$. For the simulation let $B \subseteq U$ be the set and the number $b = \|\mathcal{A}\| \cdot 2^{O(|U|)}$ from Lemma 6.2. The idea is to maintain the B -counters in the finite state and the $(U \setminus B)$ -counters using \mathbb{Z} -counters. Clearly, every valid \mathcal{A} -run translates into a valid \mathcal{A}' -run. Conversely, in a valid \mathcal{A}' -run the $(U \setminus B)$ -counters can take negative values. We can prepend a cycle run which takes sufficiently large values in the components from $U \setminus B$, and append the reverse cycle run to cancel its effect. This ensures that all counters remain nonnegative throughout the run and can therefore be translated into a \mathcal{A} -run.

The following provides the upper bounds for cases (1) and (2) in Theorem 3.3.

Proposition 6.4. *If \mathcal{G} is a UC-bounded class of cliques then $\text{BIREACH}(\mathcal{G})$ belongs to ILD. If \mathcal{G} is a class of cliques of bounded size then $\text{BIREACH}(\mathcal{G})$ belongs to LOGSPACE.*

Proof. Given a clique $\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ and a bidirected valence system $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \rightarrow)$ over Γ , and states $s, t \in Q$. As explained above we can test in exponential space (logarithmic space if \mathcal{G} consists of cliques of bounded size) whether $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t)$ is nonempty and, if so compute a vector $\mathbf{u} \in \text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t)$. By Proposition 6.3 we can compute a representation $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, s) = \{\mathbf{v}|_L \mid \mathbf{v} \in \langle \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \rangle, \mathbf{v}|_{L' \setminus L} = \mathbf{0}\}$ for some $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \in \mathbb{Z}^{L'}$ where $L \subseteq L'$ and $|L'| \leq |\Gamma|$. We need to test whether $\mathbf{0} \in \text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t)$, which is equivalent to $-\mathbf{u} \in \text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, s)$. This holds if and only if there exists $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \mathbf{v}_i(u) = -\mathbf{u}(u)$ for all $u \in L$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \mathbf{v}_i(u) = 0$ for all $u \in L' \setminus L$, which is a system of $|\Gamma|$ equations. This can be solved in ILD. If $|\Gamma|$ is bounded then this is in LOGSPACE (even TC^0) [11, Theorem 13]. \square

Similarly we can prove the following result, which will be used in Section 7.

Theorem 6.5. *Given a clique $\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}$, a bidirected valence system $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \rightarrow)$ over Γ , and states $s, t \in Q$, one can test in exponential space (polynomial time if \mathcal{G} is UC-bounded) if $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t)$ is nonempty and, if so, compute a coset representation $\mathbf{u} + \langle \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \rangle$ for $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t)$.*

7. UPPER BOUNDS II: POLYNOMIAL TIME, EXPONENTIAL TIME, AND EXPONENTIAL SPACE

In this section, we prove the upper bounds of (3) and (4 in Theorem 3.3. More precisely, let SC_d^{\pm} be the class of graphs in SC^{\pm} where each unlooped clique has size at most d . Moreover, let $\text{SC}_{d,\ell}^{\pm}$ be the class of those graphs Γ in SC_d^{\pm} with $h(\Gamma) \leq \ell$. In this section, we prove that for every d , $\text{BIREACH}(\text{SC}_d^{\pm})$ is in EXPTIME and for every $\ell \geq 0$, the problem $\text{BIREACH}(\text{SC}_{d,\ell}^{\pm})$ is in P.

Key ideas and outline. Let us outline the main ideas in our upper bounds. The starting point are the methods that have been used to decide the ordinary reachability problem for the graphs in SC_1^{\pm} , i.e. PPN-free transitive graphs with at most one unlooped node in each clique. As explained above, viewed as models of computations, valence systems over such graphs correspond to storage mechanisms that are obtained by *building stacks* and *adding \mathbb{Z} -counters*. Here, building stacks corresponds to taking the disjoint union of two graphs, and adding a \mathbb{Z} -counter corresponds to adding a looped vertex that is adjacent to all other vertices.

Roughly speaking, this viewpoint was used in the first decidability result for $\text{REACH}(\text{SC}_1^{\pm})$ by Lohrey and Steinberg [27]: Relying on Parikh's theorem on context-free languages, they observed that both these transformations preserve semilinearity of the languages accepted by such machines. This resulted in a non-elementary decision procedure. About a decade later, it was shown that $\text{REACH}(\text{SC}_1^{\pm})$ is NEXPTIME-complete and for every fixed ℓ , $\text{REACH}(\text{SC}_{1,\ell}^{\pm})$ is NP-complete [14]. This generalizes the fact that reachability for pushdown systems with \mathbb{Z} -counters is NP-complete (these correspond to a subset of $\text{SC}_{1,1}^{\pm}$) as shown by Hague and Lin [15]. In the algorithms from [15, 14], a critical ingredient is that given a context-free grammar, one constructs an existential formula in Presburger arithmetic for the Parikh image, as shown by Verma, Seidl, and Schwentick [34]. This permits a translation of the reachability problem to (an extension of) existential Presburger arithmetic, which can be decided in NP.

Our core observation is that in the bidirected case, one can reduce to solvability of systems of integer linear Diophantine *equations* (existential Presburger arithmetic, in contrast, is equivalent to solving systems of integer linear Diophantine *inequalities*). Like the algorithm of Haase and Zetsche [14], we first translate the reachability problem into a problem on a certain type of grammars. However, this translation requires new ideas, because we prove that here, the resulting grammars are *bidirected*, meaning they satisfy a carefully chosen set of symmetry conditions. For example, in some appropriate sense, these allow productions to be applied in reverse. We then prove an analogue (Theorem 7.6) of the translation of Verma, Seidl, and Schwentick [34], which relies on those symmetry conditions and produces a system of Diophantine *equations* instead of an existential Presburger formula. In the end, for given graphs in $\text{SC}_{d,\ell}^{\pm}$, this results in systems of linear Diophantine equations, which are exponential-sized in ℓ , but polynomial-sized for fixed ℓ .

In addition, we have to deal with a fixed number of \mathbb{N} -counters (i.e. cliques of unlooped nodes) during the construction of our grammar. Here, we rely on Theorem 6.5 to eliminate these \mathbb{N} -counters.

The proof involves the following steps. First, in Section 7.1, we translate the bidirected reachability problem to checking emptiness of bidirected grammars. After proving properties of bidirected grammars in Section 7.2, we proceed in Section 7.3 to characterize emptiness of bidirected grammars in terms of cosets of groups \mathbb{Z}^Y . Then in Section 7.4, we show that these cosets can be computed by newly introduced circuits that have gates for the addition and intersection of cosets. Finally, in Section 7.5, we translate these coset circuits into equation systems.

7.1. From valence systems to grammars. We begin with the translation of valence systems over graphs in SC_d^\pm into grammars. As mentioned above, the approach to translate such systems into grammars is not new. However, if we want to do this while preserving an appropriate notion of bidirectedness, we have to be much more careful.

The idea behind all these grammar translations is to simulate the runs of valence systems over disjoint unions of graphs: Such a run is always obtained by starting from a run with neutral effect over one component, then inserting a run with neutral effect over a different component, then again inserting a run from some component, etc. Here, a key trick is to use a nonterminal symbol $a_{p,q}$ for each pair of states that represents a run from p to q . Then, inserting a run from p to q for $a_{p,q}$ yields a new run. For general reachability, this works even if we introduce nonterminals $a_{p,q}$ for which there does not exist a run: Such an $a_{p,q}$ will never be replaced and causes no issues.

However, if we want to guarantee that our grammar is bidirected (we will define this later precisely), we always have to make sure that every derivation can be reverted. In particular, every nonterminal that can be produced should be able to derive something. This property will be captured in our notion of “realizable placeholder runs” which we define next.

Decomposition into tree. First, we want to make the tree structure in the input graphs $\Gamma \in \text{SC}_d^\pm$ explicit. We may assume that our input graph has an unlooped vertex that is adjacent to all other vertices: Otherwise, we can just add such a vertex. Our graph $\Gamma = (V, I)$ in SC_d^\pm has a tree structure. We decompose its vertices into a tree t accordingly:

- (1) Consider the set $U \subseteq V$ of vertices in Γ that are adjacent to all other vertices.
- (2) If U is a strict subset of V , then $\Gamma \setminus U$ has at least two connected components. Then we construct the tree for each connected component. The tree for Γ is obtained by taking these trees and adding a parent node containing U .
- (3) Otherwise, Γ is a clique with $\leq d$ unlooped vertices. Then t contains one node with all of Γ .

Placeholder runs. Given a valence system \mathcal{A} over Γ , a *placeholder* is a triple (p, s^Δ, q) or (p, s^Δ, q) , where p and q are states in \mathcal{A} and s is a subtree of t . Intuitively, a placeholder (p, s^Δ, q) represents a run from p to q that is neutral and only uses operations belonging to s . A placeholder (p, s^Δ, q) also represents such a run, but without the restriction that it has to cancel in the vertices belonging to the root of s . Hence s^Δ can be thought of as representing the whole subtree s , whereas s^Δ represents the set of subtrees directly under s . The set of placeholders is denoted by $\rho(\mathcal{A})$.

We say that r^x is *above* s^y if either (i) r strictly contains s as a subtree or if (ii) $r^x = r^\Delta$ and $s^y = r^\Delta$. For each $s^x \in \{s^\Delta, s^\Delta\}$, we define two sets of vertices:

- (1) $V_s \subseteq V$ consists of all vertices belonging to the subtree s or to an ancestor of the root of s .
- (2) $\check{V}_{s^\Delta} \subseteq V$ consists of all vertices in Γ that belong to the subtree s .
- (3) $\check{V}_{s^\Delta} \subseteq V$ consists of all vertices in Γ that belong to the subtree of s , but not to the root of s .
- (4) $\hat{V}_{s^x} = V_s \setminus \check{V}_{s^x}$ for $s^x = s^\Delta$ or $s^x = s^\Delta$.

Given a subtree s of t , the automaton \mathcal{A}_s is obtained from \mathcal{A} by deleting all edges labeled with $v \in \Gamma$ that are incomparable to s . For each $s^x \in \{s^\Delta, s^\triangleleft\}$, we will use the two projection maps $\hat{\pi}_{s^x}: X_\Gamma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{\hat{V}_{s^x}}$ and $\check{\pi}_{s^x}: X_\Gamma^* \rightarrow \text{M}\Gamma_{\check{V}_{s^x}}$, which project a string over X_Γ to the symbols belonging to the nodes in \hat{V}_{s^x} and \check{V}_{s^x} , respectively, and return their image in $\mathbb{Z}^{\hat{V}_{s^x}}$ or $\text{M}\Gamma_{\check{V}_{s^x}}$, respectively. Here Γ_U is the subgraph of Γ induced by a vertex set U .

A *run in* (p, s^x, q) is a sequence $(q_0, w_1, q_1) \cdots (q_{m-1}, w_m, q_m)$ of transitions in \mathcal{A}_s such that $q_0 = p$, $q_m = q$, and $\check{\pi}_{s^x}(w_1 \cdots w_m) = 1$. Let $R \subseteq \rho(\mathcal{A})$ be a subset. An *R -placeholder run in* (p, s^x, q) is a sequence

$$(1) \quad \sigma_0(p_1, s_1^{x_1}, q_1) \sigma_1 \cdots (p_m, s_m^{x_m}, q_m) \sigma_m$$

where (i) $p = q_0$ and $q = p_{m+1}$, (ii) for $i \in [1, m]$, $s_i^{x_i}$ is above s^x and $(p_i, s_i^{x_i}, q_i) \in R$, (iii) $\sigma_i: q_i \xrightarrow{w_i} p_{i+1}$ is a run in \mathcal{A}_s for each $i \in [0, m]$ and (iv) $\check{\pi}_{s^x}(w_1 \cdots w_m) = 1$. An *almost R -placeholder run* is such a R -placeholder run where we also allow $s_i^{x_i} = s^x$ and only impose that $\hat{\pi}_{s^\Delta}(w_1 \cdots w_m) = 1$.

The *effect* of the R -placeholder run in (1) is $(p_1, s_1^{x_1}, q_1) + \cdots + (p_m, s_m^{x_m}, q_m) + \hat{\pi}_{s^x}(w_1 \cdots w_m) \in \mathbb{N}^{\rho(\mathcal{A})} + \mathbb{Z}^V$. The set of effects of R -placeholder runs in (p, s^x, q) is denoted $E_{(p, s^x, q)}^R \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\rho(\mathcal{A})} + \mathbb{Z}^V$. The effect of an almost R -placeholder runs is defined as $(p_1, s_1^{x_1}, q_1) + \cdots + (p_m, s_m^{x_m}, q_m) + \hat{\pi}_{s^\Delta}(w_1 \cdots w_m) \in \mathbb{N}^{\rho(\mathcal{A})} + \mathbb{Z}^V$. By $E_{(p, s^x, q)}^{\prime R}$, we denote the set of effects of almost R -placeholder runs in (p, s^x, q) .

We now inductively define which placeholders and which placeholder runs are realizable:

- An R -placeholder in τ is *realizable* if all $\tau' \in R$ are realizable.
- A placeholder τ is *realizable* if there exists a realizable placeholder run in τ .

In particular, all ordinary runs in τ are realizable (set $R = \emptyset$). The set of realizable placeholder runs in $\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})$ is denoted by U_τ . Every realizable placeholder run is of the form (1) (even those that are ordinary runs, which just have $m = 0$). Hence, they have a well-defined effect. The set of effects of realizable placeholder runs in (p, s^x, q) is denoted $E_{(p, s^x, q)} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\rho(\mathcal{A})} + \mathbb{Z}^V$.

The notion of realizable placeholder run achieves what we mentioned above: A realizable placeholder run can only use realizable placeholders, for which we have already established the existence of a run. Clearly, a placeholder run in (p, t^Δ, q) is just a neutral run in (p, t^Δ, q) . Thus:

Theorem 7.1. *There exists a neutral run from p to q in \mathcal{A} if and only if $E_{(p, t^\Delta, q)} \neq \emptyset$.*

Our goal is to describe the sets E_τ using grammars. For this, it will be useful to have a characterization of E_τ that describes how to “build up” elements of E_τ successively. This is the purpose of the sets W_τ , which we define next. For this, we need to define the subsets $Y_{r^x}, Z_{r^x} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\rho(\mathcal{A})} + \mathbb{Z}^V$:

$$Z_{r^x} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^{\rho(\mathcal{A})} + \mathbb{Z}^V \mid \mathbf{x}(v) = 0 \text{ for every } v \in \check{V}_{r^x} \\ \text{and } \mathbf{x}(p, s^y, q) = 0 \text{ for every } p, q \in Q \text{ and every } s^y \text{ below } r^x \text{ or equal to } r^x\}$$

and Y_{r^x} is the intersection of all Z_{s^y} where s^y is below r^x . To simplify notation, if $\tau = (p, r^x, q)$, we also write Z_τ for Z_{r^x} (analogously for Y_τ). Let us inductively define the tuple $(W_\tau)_{\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})}$, where for $W_{(p, s^x, q)} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\rho(\mathcal{A})} + \mathbb{Z}^V$. It is the smallest tuple such that

- (1) If s is a leaf and $R \subseteq \{\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A}) \mid W_\tau \cap Z_\tau \neq \emptyset\}$ then $E_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}^{\prime R} \subseteq W_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}$.
- (2) If r^x is above s^y and $W_{(p, s^y, q)} \cap Z_{s^y} \neq \emptyset$, then $W_{(p, s^y, q)} \cap Y_{r^x} \subseteq W_{(p, r^x, q)}$.
- (3) If r^x is above s^y and $W_{(p, r^x, q)} \cap Z_{r^x} \neq \emptyset$, then $(p, r^x, q) \in W_{(p, s^y, q)}$.
- (4) If $(p', r^x, q') + \mathbf{u} \in W_{(p, r^x, q)}$ and $\mathbf{v} \in W_{(p', r^x, q')}$, then $\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u} \in W_{(p, r^x, q)}$.

Once the notion of realizable placeholder runs and the sets W_τ is established, it only requires standard arguments that E_τ and $W_\tau \cap Z_\tau$ agree.

Proposition 7.2. *For every $\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})$, we have $W_\tau \cap Z_\tau = E_\tau$.*

A saturation procedure. Consider the definition of W_τ . In order to argue that an element belongs to W_τ , we need to apply two kinds of steps alternatingly: (i) produce new elements in W_τ using rules (1)–(4) and (ii) observe that $W_\tau \cap Z_\tau$ has become non-empty so as to enable more rules among (1)–(4). Here, our key idea is to use grammars to decide if applying rules (1)–(4) proves a set $W_\tau \cap Z_\tau$ non-empty. Hence, we assume that for a certain set $R \subseteq \rho(\mathcal{A})$ we have already established that $W_\tau \cap Z_\tau \neq \emptyset$ for every $\tau \in R$. Then, we construct grammars and decide their emptiness to check if this leads to more τ such that $W_\tau \cap Z_\tau$ is non-empty.

Let us make this formal. Let $R \subseteq \rho(\mathcal{A})$ be a subset. We inductively define the tuple $(W_\tau^R)_{\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})}$, where $W_\tau^R \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\rho(\mathcal{A})} + \mathbb{Z}^V$ for every $\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})$. It is the smallest tuple such that

- (1) If s is a leaf, then $E_{(p,s^\Delta,q)}^R \subseteq W_{(p,s^\Delta,q)}^R$.
- (2) If r^x is above s^y and $(p, s^y, q) \in R$, then $W_{(p,s^y,q)}^R \cap Y_{r^x} \subseteq W_{(p,r^x,q)}^R$.
- (3) If r^x is above s^y and $(p, r^x, q) \in R$, then $(p, r^x, q) \in W_{(p,s^y,q)}^R$.
- (4) If $(p', r^x, q') + \mathbf{u} \in W_{(p',r^x,q')}^R$ and $\mathbf{v} \in W_{(p',r^x,q')}^R$, then $\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u} \in W_{(p',r^x,q')}^R$.

We now perform the procedure outlined above: We start with $R^{(0)} = \emptyset$ and then set $R^{(i+1)} = \{\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A}) \mid W_\tau^{R^{(i)}} \cap Z_\tau \neq \emptyset\}$. Then we clearly have $R^{(0)} \subseteq R^{(1)} \subseteq \dots$ and thus there is some n with $R^{(n+1)} = R^{(n)}$. The following is immediate from the definition of W_τ .

Proposition 7.3. *For every $\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})$, we have $W_\tau^{R^{(n)}} = W_\tau$.*

Thus, in order to decide BIREACH in polynomial time, it suffices to decide, given a set $R^{(i)}$ as above, whether $W_\tau^{R^{(i)}} \cap Z_\tau$ is empty for each $\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})$. To do this, we will construct certain grammars for which we will show that emptiness can be decided in polynomial time. Here, we will use the fact that each $R^{(i)}$ is obtained from the process above: We will assume that $R \subseteq \rho(\mathcal{A})$ is *admissible*, meaning that there exists some i with $R = R^{(i)}$.

Grammars. Traditionally, grammars are used to derive strings, whereas our grammar model derives vectors. We could also develop our theory using grammars that generate strings, but since we are only interested in the generated strings up to reordering of letters, the exposition is simpler if our grammars directly work with vectors. More specifically, our grammars have a set N of nonterminal symbols (which can be rewritten by a grammar rule) and a set T of terminal symbols (which can not be rewritten). Moreover, we allow the letters in T to occur negatively, whereas the letters in N can only occur non-negatively. Hence, we can derive vectors in $\mathbb{N}^N + \mathbb{Z}^T$: In other words, these are vectors $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{N \cup T}$, where $\mathbf{u}(a) \geq 0$ for each $a \in N$. We say that a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^N$ *occurs* in such a \mathbf{u} if $\mathbf{u}(a) \geq \mathbf{v}(a)$ for every $a \in N$. A *k-grammar* is a tuple $G = (N, T, P)$, where

- N is a finite alphabet of *nonterminals*, which is a disjoint union $N = \bigcup_{i=0}^k N_i$,
- T is a finite alphabet of *terminals*, which is a disjoint union $T = \bigcup_{i=0}^k T_i$,
- P is a finite set of *productions* of one of two forms:
 - $a \rightarrow b$ with $a \in N_i, b \in N_j, i \neq j$.
 - $a \rightarrow \mathbf{u}$ with $a \in N_0$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^{N_0} + \mathbb{Z}^T$.

In this setting, we use the notation $N_{[i,j]} = \bigcup_{i \leq r \leq j} N_r$, and analogously for $T_{[i,j]}$. Moreover, we define $R \subseteq N$ as the subset of $a \in N$ that appear on some right-hand side of the grammar. We then also write $R_i = R \cap N_i$ and use the notation $R_{[i,j]}$ as for N and T .

In these grammars, derivations produce vectors in $\mathbb{N}^N + \mathbb{Z}^T$ instead of words. A *configuration* is a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^N + \mathbb{Z}^T$. For $i \in [0, k]$, we define the *i-derivation relation* \Rightarrow_i as follows. For configurations $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}' \in \mathbb{N}^N + \mathbb{Z}^T$, we have $\mathbf{v} \Rightarrow_0 \mathbf{v}'$ if there is some $a \in N_0$ and a production $a \rightarrow \mathbf{u}$ with $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{N_{[0,k]} \cup T}$




FIGURE 2. Example for choosing the level of s^Δ and s^Δ for each subtree s of t . The division of the looped nodes into $\bigcup_{i \in [1, k]} T_i$ is obtained by placing each looped node into T_i , where i is the level of the s^Δ directly above it.

such that $\mathbf{v}(a) > 0$ and $\mathbf{v}' = \mathbf{v} - a + \mathbf{u}$. Given \Rightarrow_i , by $\overset{*}{\Rightarrow}_i$ we denote the reflexive transitive closure of \Rightarrow_i . Moreover, we define the generated set $L(a)$ for each $a \in N_i$:

$$L(a) = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^{N_{[i+1, k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i+1, k]}} \mid a \overset{*}{\Rightarrow}_i \mathbf{u}\}.$$

We now define \Rightarrow_i based on all relations $\Rightarrow_{i'}$ for $i' < i$: We have $\mathbf{v} \Rightarrow_i \mathbf{v}'$ if there is an $a \in N_i$ with $\mathbf{v}(a) > 0$ and a production $a \rightarrow a'$ for some $a' \in N_{i'}$ for some $i' < i$, and a $\mathbf{u} \in L(a') \cap \mathbb{N}^{N_{[i, k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i, k]}}$ such that $\mathbf{v}' = \mathbf{v} - a + \mathbf{u}$.

The grammar construction. Let us now show how to construct a grammar $G = (N, T, P)$ such that $N = \rho(\mathcal{A})$ and $L(\tau) = W_\tau^R$ for every $\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})$. Recall that $\Gamma = (V, I)$. The set T will consist of the looped vertices of Γ , but also some auxiliary letters defined as follows. We pick an arbitrary linear order \ll on Q . Then we have the letters $\Theta = \{z_{p, s^\Delta, q} \mid p \ll q, s \text{ is a leaf of } t\}$. In other words, for any two states in Q and each leaf s of t , we create one letter in Θ . We set $T = \{v \in V \mid vIv\} \cup \Theta$.

First, we divide the sets $N = \rho(\mathcal{A})$ and T into levels. The idea is that types (p, s^Δ, q) with leaves s have level 0 and the higher a subtree s is in t , the higher its level. Moreover, a type (p, s^Δ, q) should have strictly higher level than (p, s^Δ, q) . Since $\Gamma \in \text{SC}_{d, \ell}^\pm$, we know that the height of t is $h(\Gamma) \leq \ell$. We choose a map $\iota: \{s^\Delta, s^\Delta \mid s \text{ is a subtree of } t\} \rightarrow [0, k]$ such that (i) for every leaf s of t , we have $\iota(s^\Delta) = 0$, (ii) if r^x is above s^y , then $\iota(r^x) > \iota(s^y)$. This can clearly be defined with some $k \leq 2\ell$. Here, we need 2ℓ , because s^Δ and s^Δ must be on different levels. See Fig. 2 for an example of how to choose the levels for each s^x . This yields the partition $N = \bigcup_{i=0}^k N_i$ with $N_i = \{(p, s^x, q) \in \rho(\mathcal{A}) \mid \iota(s^x) = i\}$. Moreover, we set $T = \bigcup_{i=0}^k T_i$ where for $i \in [1, k]$, we have $v \in T_i$ if and only if $\iota(s^\Delta) = i$, where s is the subtree whose root node contains v . Moreover, $T_0 = \Theta$.

We begin by describing the productions $a \rightarrow \mathbf{u}$ for $a \in N_0$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^{N_0} + \mathbb{Z}^T$. For this, we pick some leaf s of t . Our goal is to guarantee $L(p, s^\Delta, q) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $W_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}^R \cap Z_{s^\Delta} \neq \emptyset$ for any $p, q \in Q$.

To achieve this, we use Theorem 6.5. We construct a valence system $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_s$ over a graph $\tilde{\Gamma}_s$ as follows. The graph $\tilde{\Gamma}_s = (\tilde{V}_s, \tilde{I}_s)$ has vertices $\tilde{V}_s = U_s \uplus L_s \uplus R_s$, where U_s (L_s) is the set of unlooped (looped) vertices in V that belong to s and $R_s = \{(p', s^\Delta, q') \in R \mid p', q' \in Q\}$. Moreover, $\tilde{\Gamma}_s$ is a clique, and a vertex is looped if and only if it is in $L_s \uplus R_s$. In other words, $\tilde{\Gamma}_s$ is constructed by taking the vertices belonging to s (which already form a clique) and adding for each $(p', s^\Delta, q') \in R_s$ another looped vertex. Then $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_s$ is obtained from \mathcal{A}_s by adding, for any $(p', s^\Delta, q') \in R_s$, an edge from p' to q' labeled by (p', s^Δ, q') , and an

edge from q' to p' labeled $-(p', s^\Delta, q')$. Now Theorem 6.5 allows us to compute $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n \in \mathbb{Z}^{L_s \cup R_s}$ such that $\mathbf{v} + \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n \rangle = \text{Eff}_{\hat{\lambda}_s}(p, q)$. We now want to turn this coset representation into productions for the grammar. For this, we need some notation. Then, given a vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{U_s \cup R_s}$, define $\alpha(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{N}^{R_s} + \mathbb{Z}^U$ by $\alpha(\mathbf{u})(p', s^\Delta, q') = x + y$, where

$$x = \begin{cases} \mathbf{u}(p', s^\Delta, q') & \text{if } \mathbf{u}(p', s^\Delta, q') \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{and } y = \begin{cases} -\mathbf{u}(q', s^\Delta, p') & \text{if } \mathbf{u}(q', s^\Delta, p') < 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Note that then $\alpha(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{N}^{R_s} + \mathbb{Z}^{U_s}$ and moreover, for any $p', q' \in Q$, we have $\alpha(\mathbf{u})(p', s^\Delta, q') - \alpha(\mathbf{u})(q', s^\Delta, p') = \mathbf{u}(p', s^\Delta, q') - \mathbf{u}(q', s^\Delta, p')$.

Now we include the productions

$$(2) \quad (p, s^\Delta, q) \rightarrow \alpha(\mathbf{v}), \quad (p, s^\Delta, q) \rightarrow (p, s^\Delta, q) + \alpha(\mathbf{u}_j), \quad (p, s^\Delta, q) \rightarrow (p, s^\Delta, q) + \alpha(-\mathbf{u}_j),$$

$$(3) \quad (q, s^\Delta, p) \rightarrow \alpha(-\mathbf{v}), \quad (q, s^\Delta, p) \rightarrow (q, s^\Delta, p) + \alpha(\mathbf{u}_j), \quad (q, s^\Delta, p) \rightarrow (q, s^\Delta, p) + \alpha(-\mathbf{u}_j),$$

for every $j \in [1, n]$. Moreover, we include the production

$$(4) \quad (p, s^\Delta, q) \rightarrow (p, s^\Delta, q) + (p, s^\Delta, q) + (q, s^\Delta, p)$$

for every $(p, s^\Delta, q) \in R$. Finally, we will need productions that allow us to eliminate a pair (p, s^Δ, q) and (q, s^Δ, p) . If $p \ll q$, we add the two productions

$$(5) \quad (p, s^\Delta, q) \rightarrow z_{p, s^\Delta, q}, \quad (q, s^\Delta, p) \rightarrow -z_{p, s^\Delta, q}.$$

In addition to these level-0 productions, we also add the following for every r^y and s^x :

(C1) If r^x is above s^y and $(p, s^y, q) \in R$, then we have a production $(p, r^x, q) \rightarrow (p, s^y, q)$.

(C2) If r^x is above s^y and $(p, r^x, q) \in R$, then we have a production $(p, s^y, q) \rightarrow (p, r^x, q)$.

Bidirected grammars. We are now ready to present the symmetry conditions of bidirected grammars. If G is a k -grammar, then an *involution* is a map $\cdot^\dagger: N \rightarrow N$ with such that for $a \in N_i$, we have $a^\dagger \in N_i$ for $i \in [0, k]$ and $(a^\dagger)^\dagger = a$. In this case, for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{N \cup T}$, we define $\mathbf{u}^\dagger \in \mathbb{Z}^{N \cup T}$ as $\mathbf{u}^\dagger(a) = \mathbf{u}(a^\dagger)$ for $a \in N$ and $\mathbf{u}^\dagger(a) = -\mathbf{u}(a)$ for $a \in T$. Here, \mathbf{u}^\dagger can be thought of as the inverse of \mathbf{u} .

Let G be a k -grammar. We define the relation \rightsquigarrow on N as follows. For $a \in N_i$ and $b \in N_{[i, k]}$, we have $a \rightsquigarrow b$ if and only if there is a configuration $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{N_{[i, k]} \cup T_{[i, k]}}$ with $a \Rightarrow_i b + \mathbf{u}$. For each $a \in N_i$, we define the monoid Δ_a , which is generated by all $b + b^\dagger$ with $b \in N_{[i+1, k]}$ and $a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow} b$. Hence, $\Delta_a \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{N_{[i+1, k]}}$. Intuitively, the elements of Δ_a are vectors that are produced on level i and can only be eliminated later, on higher levels. The latter will be possible because they consist of pairs of “inverse” nonterminals. We therefore often describe what is derivable “up to differences in Δ_a ”. This motivates the following equivalence: For $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}' \in \mathbb{N}^{N_{[i+1, k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i+1, k]}}$, we have $\mathbf{u} \approx_a \mathbf{u}'$ if and only if there are $\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d}' \in \Delta_a$ with $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{u}' + \mathbf{d}'$.

We say that G is *bidirected* if there is an involution $\cdot^\dagger: N \rightarrow N$ such that

- (1) for every production $a \rightarrow \mathbf{u}$ in P , we have a production $a^\dagger \rightarrow \mathbf{u}^\dagger$ in P and
- (2) for every $b \in R$ and production $a \rightarrow b$, there is also a production $b \rightarrow a$, and
- (3) if $a \in R_0$, then $a \overset{\neq_0}{\rightsquigarrow} a + a + a^\dagger$.
- (4) for every $a \in R$, we have $L(a) \neq \emptyset$,
- (5) for every $a \in R_0$ and every production $a \rightarrow b + \mathbf{u}$ with $b \in R_0$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^{R_0} + \mathbb{Z}^T$, there is a $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^R + \mathbb{Z}^T$ such that $\mathbf{x} \approx_a a + \mathbf{u}^\dagger$ and $b \overset{\neq_0}{\rightsquigarrow} \mathbf{x}$,

We show that the grammar that we construct above is in fact bidirected. Here, the involution is given by $(p, s^x, q)^\dagger = (q, s^x, p)$. Intuitively, a bidirected grammar has two aspects of *reversibility*: Each nonterminal $a \in N$ has an inverse a^\dagger . Moreover, productions can be reversed in two ways: By rule (1) we can invert every letter, and by rules (5) and (2), we can apply it backwards. Furthermore, we guarantee that we can produce

pairs of inverse letter by rule (3) and that every nonterminal that appears on a right-hand side produces some vector. We prove the following:

Proposition 7.4. *Given a graph Γ in $\text{SC}_{d,\ell}^\pm$ and a valence system \mathcal{A} over Γ , and an admissible $R \subseteq \rho(\mathcal{A})$, we can construct in polynomial time a bidirected k -grammar $G = (N, T, P)$ with $k \leq 2\ell$ such that $N = \rho(\mathcal{A})$ and $L(\tau) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $W_\tau^R \cap Z_\tau \neq \emptyset$ for each $\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})$ with $\tau \in N_i$.*

Let us sketch why the grammar is bidirected. The conditions Items 1 to 3 are obvious from the construction. Moreover, the condition Item 4 follows from $L(\tau) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $W_\tau^R \cap Z_\tau \neq \emptyset$ for every $\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})$. Finally, the condition Item 5 is clear for all productions except those in (2) and (3). For the latter, this follows essentially from the bidirectedness of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_s$ and from the property (4).

7.2. Properties of bidirected grammars. In this section, we establish several properties of bidirected grammars that will help us later to express emptiness using linear integer Diophantine equations. Here, the main property is that in a bidirected grammar, we can, in some sense, reverse each production.

First, note that in a k -grammar, we allow productions $a \rightarrow b$ such that $a \in N_i$ and $b \in N_j$ for arbitrary $i \neq j$. In what follows, it will be convenient to assume that the k -grammar is in *normal form*, meaning that for such productions, with $i \neq j$, we always have $j \in \{i-1, i+1\}$, hence we only ever go to neighboring levels. This can easily be achieved by adding “intermediate” nonterminals and productions that cross levels successively. If a grammar is in normal form, the derivation relation has a simplified formulation: We have $\mathbf{u} \Rightarrow_i \mathbf{v}$ if there is an $a \in N_{i-1}$ and $\mathbf{w} \in L(a)$ with $\mathbf{u}(a) \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u} - a + \mathbf{w}$ (hence, we can drop the requirement $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}^{N_{[i,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i,k]}}$).

A k -grammar is called *i -bidirected* if for every $a \in R_i$ and every derivation $a \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}$ with $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{R_i}$, $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^{R_{[i,k]} \cup T_{[i,k]}}$, then $\mathbf{u} \xrightarrow{*}_i a + \mathbf{v}'$ for some \mathbf{v}' with $\mathbf{v}' \approx_a \mathbf{v}^\dagger$. In other words, if we can derive a vector with level- i nonterminals \mathbf{u} and level- i terminals \mathbf{v} , then from \mathbf{u} , we can derive $a + \mathbf{v}^\dagger$, up to a difference in Δ_a . In short, up to differences in Δ_a , we can reverse derivations on level i that start in nonterminals that appear on some right-hand side. Note that if G is i -bidirected, then on R_i , $\xrightarrow{*}_i$ is symmetric and thus an equivalence. We establish the following.

Theorem 7.5. *If G is bidirected, then it is i -bidirected for each $i \in [0, k]$.*

Proof sketch. We first claim that G is i -bidirected if and only if it is “step-wise” i -bidirected in the following sense: for every $a \in R_i$ and every step $a \Rightarrow_i b + \mathbf{v}$ with $b \in R_i$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^{R_i} + \mathbb{Z}^T$, there is a $\mathbf{v}' \in \mathbb{N}^{R_i} + \mathbb{Z}^T$ with $b \xrightarrow{*}_i a + \mathbf{v}'$ and $\mathbf{v}' \approx_a \mathbf{v}^\dagger$. While “only if” is clear, we prove the converse by writing a derivation $a \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}$ with $\mathbf{u} = b + \mathbf{u}'$ as a sequence of steps $a_j \Rightarrow_i a_{j+1} + \mathbf{x}_j$, so that $a_0 = a$ and $a_n = b$, plus some other derivation steps that derive $\mathbf{x}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{x}_n \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}' + \mathbf{v}$. We then apply the condition to reverse each step $a_j \Rightarrow_i a_{j+1} + \mathbf{x}_j$. This leads to $b \xrightarrow{*}_i a + \mathbf{y}$ for some $\mathbf{y} \approx_a \mathbf{x}_1^\dagger + \dots + \mathbf{x}_n^\dagger$. Using condition (1) of bidirected grammars, we can then argue that $\mathbf{y} \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{z}$ for some $\mathbf{z} \approx_a (\mathbf{u}' + \mathbf{v})^\dagger$. Putting these together yields the desired derivation.

Once the claim is established, the lemma follows by induction on i : i -bidirectedness implies the step-wise condition on level $i+1$. Furthermore, bidirected grammars are 0-bidirected. \square

7.3. Expressing emptiness in terms of cosets. In this section, we will see how to express emptiness of bidirected grammar in terms of certain cosets of $\mathbb{Z}^{N \cup T}$. This will allow us to reduce the emptiness check to systems of integer linear Diophantine equations. In order to express emptiness in terms of cosets, we need to prove a correspondence between derivations in G on level i and those cosets. We begin by defining the cosets used in our characterization. A central role will be played by the group H_a , which we define for each $a \in R_i$:

$$(6) \quad H_a = \langle -b + \mathbf{u} \mid b \in R_i \text{ and } b \Rightarrow_i \mathbf{u} \text{ and } a \xrightarrow{*}_i b \rangle$$

Hence, H_a is the group generated by all differences that are added when applying derivation steps $b \Rightarrow_i \mathbf{u}$ for $a \rightsquigarrow^* b$. Note that if $a \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}$, then $-a + \mathbf{u} \in H_a$. We will need a coset to express that in such a derivation, there are no level- i letters left. We will do this by intersecting with

$$S_i = \mathbb{Z}^{N_{[i+1,k]} \cup T_{[i+1,k]}} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{N \cup T} \mid \mathbf{u}(b) = 0 \text{ for every } b \in N_{[0,i]} \cup T_{[0,i]}\}.$$

We sometimes use the variant $S'_i = \mathbb{Z}^{N_{[i+1,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i,k]}}$ if we only want to make sure there are no more level- i nonterminals. Using H_a and S_i , we can now define the coset that will (essentially) characterize the language $L(a)$. For $a \in R_i$, we set

$$(7) \quad L_a = (a + H_a) \cap S_i.$$

One of the main results of this section will be that for $a \in R_i$, we can describe $L(a)$ in terms of L_a . Following the theme that we can do things only “up to differences in Δ_a ” on each level, we need a group version of Δ_a . For every $a \in N_i$, we have the subgroup $D_a \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^{N_{i+1}}$, which we define next. If $a \in N_i$ with $i \in [0, k-1]$, we set $D_a = \langle b + b^\dagger \mid b \in N_{i+1}, a \rightsquigarrow^* b \rangle$. For $a \in N_k$, we define $D_a = \{\mathbf{0}\}$. Thus, D_a is the group generated by Δ_a , for every $a \in N$. With this terminology, we prove that $L_a = L(a) + D_a$, i.e. L_a describes $L(a)$ up to a difference in D_a . By our observations above about H_a , it is obvious that $L(a)$ is included in L_a . The core argument in our proof is that $L_a \subseteq L(a) + D_a$.

However, the purpose of our translation is to check whether $L(a)$ is empty for $a \in N_i$ that do not necessarily belong to R_i : Those are the nonterminals for which we do not know whether $L(a)$ is empty. Such sets $L(a)$ do not directly correspond to cosets. However, we will be able to use cosets to characterize when $L(a)$ is empty. Here, we use the cosets K_a . For $a \in N_i$, $i \in [0, k-1]$, we define

$$K_a = (L_a + \langle -b + M_b \mid b \in R_{i+1}, a \rightsquigarrow^* b \rangle) \cap S_{i+1},$$

where M_b is to be defined later. We shall see that the coset K_a corresponds to those vectors in $\mathbb{N}^{N_{[i+1,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i+1,k]}}$ that can be derived using a . The cosets M_b will correspond to the set of vectors that are derivable, but may still contain level- i terminals:

$$M(a) = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^{N_{[i+1,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i,k]}} \mid a \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}\}.$$

Thus, $M(a)$ differs from $L(a)$ by collecting all derivable $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^{N_{[i+1,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^T$, where all level- i nonterminals have been eliminated, but not necessarily all level- i terminals. Thus, we have $L(a) = M(a) \cap S_i$. Just as L_a is a coset analogue of $L(a)$, we have a coset analogue M_a of $M(a)$. We define:

$$M_a = (a + H_a) \cap S'_i.$$

The cosets K_b for $b \in N_{[0,k-1]}$, we will be able to characterize emptiness of $L(a)$ for $a \in N_{[1,k]}$. In order to do the same for $a \in N_0$, we need a final type of cosets. For each production $a \rightarrow \mathbf{u}$ with $\mathbf{u} = b_1 + \dots + b_n + \mathbf{v}$ in our grammar with $b_1, \dots, b_n \in N_0$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^T$, we define

$$K_{a \rightarrow \mathbf{u}} = (M_{b_1} + \dots + M_{b_n} + \mathbf{v}) \cap S_0.$$

The goal of this section is to show the following analogue of the translation of Verma, Seidl, and Schwentick [34] to Presburger arithmetic. Here, we express the set $L(a)$ of derivable vectors of a nonterminal a as a coset. Recall that a subset of $\mathbb{Z}^{N \cup T}$ is a coset if and only if it is some projection of a set of solutions to a system of integer linear Diophantine equations.

Theorem 7.6. *If $G = (N, T, P)$ is bidirected, then for every $a \in R$, we have $M(a) + D_a = M_a$. In particular, $L(a) + D_a = L_a$.*

Let us compare the proof of Theorem 7.6 with the construction of Verma, Seidl, and Schwentick [34]. In their translation (which is based on a characterization of reachability in certain VASS due to Esparza [12]), they show that if we assign to each production p in a context-free grammar a number $\mathbf{x}(p)$ saying how often

p is applied, then there exists a derivation consistent with this choice if and only if two conditions are met: First, the number of times each nonterminal is produced by productions coincides with the number of times it is consumed (except for the start-symbol: it is consumed once more than it is produced). Second, the set of nonterminals that are produced and consumed (i.e. for which $\mathbf{x}(p) > 0$) must be *connected*: For each nonterminal, it must be possible to reach its consumed nonterminal by way of the used productions. The last condition is crucial: Otherwise, if we pick each of the the productions $a \rightarrow u$ and $b \rightarrow bv$ once, where u and v only contain terminal symbols and a, b are nonterminals, then these do not constitute a derivation with start-symbol a , because the production $b \rightarrow bv$ cannot be applied. However, if we had also chosen productions $a \rightarrow b$ and $b \rightarrow a$ once each, there would be a derivation.

Roughly speaking, we show that in the case of bidirected grammars, one can drop the connectedness requirement: Then, the requirement that each nonterminal be produced and consumed equally often is expressible using equations. However, we cannot drop connectedness entirely: Instead, we observe that independently of a particular derivation, the set of nonterminals decomposes into connected components: Those induced by $\overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow}$. Then, instead of stipulating connectedness of the set of used nonterminals, we merely have to require that all used nonterminals belong to the same $\overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow}$ -component. This guarantees that there exists *some* “connecting derivation” involving any two used nonterminals, which may not be part of the vector \mathbf{x} . In the example above, this corresponds to allowing ourselves to use $a \rightarrow b$ and $b \rightarrow a$.

We then show that this indeed gives rise to a complete derivation: By using the connecting derivations and their *reverse applications*, we can construct a derivation. These connecting derivations and their reverses are formalized in the concept of what we call “Kirchhoff graphs”.

Let $a \in R_i$. A *Kirchhoff graph for a* is a directed graph whose set of vertices is $\{b \in R_i \mid a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow} b\}$, that has an edge (b, c) for any $b, c \in R_i$ with $a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow} b$ and $a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow} c$, and where an edge (b, c) is weighted by an element $\mathbf{g}_{b,c} \in \mathbb{N}^{N^{[i+1,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T^{[i+1,k]}}$ such that (i) $b \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow}_i c + \mathbf{g}_{b,c}$ for every b, c , and (ii) $\mathbf{g}_{b,b} = \mathbf{0}$ for every b , and (iii) for any vertices b, c, d , we have $\mathbf{g}_{b,c} + \mathbf{g}_{c,d} \approx_a \mathbf{g}_{b,d}$. Let us observe that in a Kirchhoff graph for a , we have

$$\mathbf{g}_{e,f} + \mathbf{g}_{e',f'} \approx_a (\mathbf{g}_{e,e'} + \mathbf{g}_{e',f}) + (\mathbf{g}_{e',e} + \mathbf{g}_{e,f'}) \approx_a (\mathbf{g}_{e,e'} + \mathbf{g}_{e',e}) + (\mathbf{g}_{e',f} + \mathbf{g}_{e,f'}) \approx_a \mathbf{g}_{e',f} + \mathbf{g}_{e,f'}.$$

This implies, more generally, that if π is a permutation of $\{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and $e_1, \dots, e_\ell, f_1, \dots, f_\ell \in R_i$ are nodes in the Kirchhoff graph, then

$$\mathbf{g}_{e_1, f_1} + \dots + \mathbf{g}_{e_\ell, f_\ell} \approx_a \mathbf{g}_{e_1, f_{\pi(1)}} + \dots + \mathbf{g}_{e_\ell, f_{\pi(\ell)}}.$$

The term stems from the fact that these graphs satisfy (up to \approx_a) a condition like Kirchhoff’s law on voltage drops: The weight sum of every cycle is zero.

Theorem 7.7. *If G is i -bidirected, then for each $a \in R_i$, there exists a Kirchhoff graph for a .*

Proof. Write $\{b \in R_i \mid a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow} b\} = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$. To simplify notation, we write $\mathbf{g}_{r,s}$ instead of \mathbf{g}_{b_r, b_s} . We have to pick $\mathbf{g}_{j,j} = \mathbf{0}$. Since G is i -bidirected, we know that $\overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow}$ is symmetric. In particular, for any $j \in [1, n-1]$, there exists a $\mathbf{g}_{j,j+1}$ such that $b_j \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow}_i b_{j+1} + \mathbf{g}_{j,j+1}$. Moreover, i -bidirectedness of G guarantees that there exists a $\mathbf{g}_{j+1,j}$ with $\mathbf{g}_{j+1,j} \approx_{b_j} \mathbf{g}_{j,j+1}^\dagger$ such that $b_{j+1} \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow}_i b_j + \mathbf{g}_{j+1,j}$. Note that since $a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow} b_j$ and $\overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow}$ is symmetric, we have $\Delta_{b_j} = \Delta_a$ and thus $\mathbf{g}_{j+1,j} \approx_a \mathbf{g}_{j,j+1}^\dagger$. Finally, for $r, s \in [1, n]$ with $r < s$, we pick $\mathbf{g}_{r,s} = \mathbf{g}_{r,r+1} + \dots + \mathbf{g}_{s-1,s}$ and similarly $\mathbf{g}_{s,r} = \mathbf{g}_{s,s-1} + \dots + \mathbf{g}_{r+1,r}$.

Let us now show that this is indeed a Kirchhoff graph for a . We clearly have $b_r \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow}_i b_s + \mathbf{g}_{r,s}$ for any $r, s \in [1, n]$. It remains to show that $\mathbf{g}_{r,s} + \mathbf{g}_{s,t} \approx_a \mathbf{g}_{r,t}$ for any $r, s, t \in [1, n]$. It suffices to do this in the case that $|s-t| = 1$, because the other cases follow by induction. Consider the case $t = s+1$ (the case $s = t+1$ is analogous). We have to show that $\mathbf{g}_{r,s} + \mathbf{g}_{s,s+1} \approx_a \mathbf{g}_{r,s+1}$. If $r \leq s$, then both sides are identical by definition. If $r > s$, then $\mathbf{g}_{r,s}$ is defined as $\mathbf{g}_{r,s} = \mathbf{g}_{r,s+1} + \mathbf{g}_{s+1,s}$. By the choice of $\mathbf{g}_{s+1,s}$, we know that $\mathbf{g}_{s+1,s} \approx_a \mathbf{g}_{s,s+1}^\dagger$ and thus $\mathbf{g}_{s+1,s} + \mathbf{g}_{s,s+1} \approx_a \mathbf{0}$. Therefore, we have $\mathbf{g}_{r,s} + \mathbf{g}_{s,s+1} = \mathbf{g}_{r,s+1} + \mathbf{g}_{s+1,s} + \mathbf{g}_{s,s+1} \approx_a \mathbf{g}_{r,s+1}$. \square

To prove Theorem 7.6, we need two simple lemmas. The first is a simple consequence of the properties shown in Section 7.2.

Theorem 7.8. *If $G = (N, T, P)$ is bidirected and $a \in R_i$, then $D_a \subseteq H_a$.*

Next observe that in L_a , we also have vectors that are obtained by *subtracting* the effect of a derivation step. We now show that if our grammar is i -bidirected, then each such subtraction can be realized by a sequence of ordinary derivation steps: The lemma says that every element of H_a can be written as a positive sum of derivation effects (up to a difference in D_a).

Theorem 7.9. *If $G = (N, T, P)$ is i -bidirected, then for $a \in R_i$, we have*

$$H_a = \{-b + \mathbf{u} \mid \exists b \in R_i: b \Rightarrow_i \mathbf{u} \text{ and } a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow} b\}^* + D_a.$$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 7.6.

Proof of Theorem 7.6. We begin with the inclusion “ \subseteq ”. A simple induction on the length of a derivation shows that every element of $M(a)$ belongs to M_a . Lemma 7.8 tells us that $D_a \subseteq H_a$, and since $D_a \subseteq S_i$, this implies $M_a + D_a \subseteq M_a$, hence $M(a) + D_a \subseteq M_a$. We now prove “ \supseteq ”. An element of M_a is of the form $a + \mathbf{v}$ with $\mathbf{v} \in H_a$ and $a + \mathbf{v} \in S'_i$. We claim that then $a + \mathbf{v}$ belongs to $M(a) + D_a$. Since $\mathbf{v} \in H_a$, Lemma 7.9 tells us that $\mathbf{v} = \sum_{j=1}^n -b_j + \mathbf{u}_j + \mathbf{x}_j$ with $b_j \in R_i$, $a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow} b_j$, $\mathbf{u}_j \in \mathbb{N}^{R_i}$, $\mathbf{x}_j \in \mathbb{N}^{N_{[i+1, k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i, k]}}$ where $b_j \Rightarrow_i \mathbf{u}_j + \mathbf{x}_j$ for $j \in [1, n]$.

Since G is i -bidirected by Lemma 7.5, Lemma 7.7 yields a Kirchhoff graph for a with weights $\mathbf{g}_{b,c}$ for any $b, c \in R_i$ with $a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow} b$ and $a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow} c$. Let us now construct a derivation in G . Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_\ell \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{u}_{\ell+1} = \dots = \mathbf{u}_n = \mathbf{0}$. For each $j \in [1, \ell]$, we pick some nonterminal $c_j \in R_i$ such that $c_1 = a$ and $\mathbf{u}_{j-1}(c_j) > 0$ for $j \in [2, \ell]$. By our choice of the \mathbf{g} 's, we can now derive as follows. We use the derivation steps $b_j \Rightarrow_i \mathbf{u}_j + \mathbf{x}_j$. But since it is possible that $b_{j+1} \Rightarrow_i \mathbf{u}_{j+1} + \mathbf{x}_{j+1}$ cannot be applied after $b_j \Rightarrow_i \mathbf{u}_j + \mathbf{x}_j$, we use derivations $c_j \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow}_i b_j + \mathbf{g}_{c_j, b_j}$ as connecting derivations. Here, we think of the \mathbf{g}_{c_j, b_j} as “garbage” that we produce in order to use the connecting derivations. Afterwards, we will use additional steps, to cancel out these garbage elements. We begin with a connecting derivation in order to apply $b_1 \Rightarrow_i \mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{x}_1$:

$$a = c_1 \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow}_i b_1 + \mathbf{g}_{c_1, b_1} \Rightarrow_i \mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{g}_{c_1, b_1} = a + (-c_1 + \mathbf{u}_1) + \mathbf{g}_{c_1, b_1}.$$

Now c_2 must occur in $a + (-c_1 + \mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{x}_1) + \mathbf{g}_{c_1, b_1}$ and thus we can apply $c_2 \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow}_i b_2 + \mathbf{g}_{c_2, b_2}$, etc. If we repeat this ℓ times, we arrive at:

$$a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow}_i a + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} -c_j + \mathbf{u}_j + \mathbf{x}_j + \mathbf{g}_{c_j, b_j}.$$

Let us denote the sum on the right-hand side by \mathbf{y} . Since want to derive $a + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} (-b_j + \mathbf{u}_j + \mathbf{x}_j)$ instead of $a + \mathbf{y}$, we now need to correct two aspects: (i) Our derivation subtracted c_1, \dots, c_ℓ instead of b_1, \dots, b_ℓ , so we need to add c 's and subtract b 's and (ii) we need to cancel out the garbage elements \mathbf{g}_{c_j, b_j} . When replacing b 's by c 's, it could be that some c 's are equal to b 's, so for (i), we don't have to change those. So we pick a permutation π of $\{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and a number $r \in [1, \ell]$ so that (a) $c_j = b_{\pi(j)}$ for $j \in [1, r]$ and (b) $\{b_{\pi(r+1)}, \dots, b_{\pi(\ell)}\}$ and $\{c_{r+1}, \dots, c_\ell\}$ are disjoint. Now observe that the nonterminals $\{b_{\pi(r+1)}, \dots, b_{\pi(\ell)}\}$ are never consumed in the derivation arriving at $a + \mathbf{y}$. However, since $a + \mathbf{v} \in S_i$, we know that $b_1 + \dots + b_\ell$ must occur in $\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \mathbf{u}_j$. Therefore, in particular $b_{\pi(r+1)} + \dots + b_{\pi(\ell)}$ must occur in \mathbf{y} . But this means we

can, for each $j \in [r+1, \ell]$, apply the derivation $b_{\pi(j)} \xrightarrow{*}_i c_j + \mathbf{g}_{b_{\pi(j)}, c_j}$ to \mathbf{y} (in any order). Then we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} a &\xrightarrow{*}_i a + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} -c_j + \mathbf{u}_j + \mathbf{x}_j + \mathbf{g}_{c_j, b_j} + \sum_{j=r+1}^{\ell} -b_{\pi(j)} + c_j + \mathbf{g}_{b_{\pi(j)}, c_j} \\ &= a + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} -b_j + \mathbf{u}_j + \mathbf{x}_j + \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \mathbf{g}_{c_j, b_j} + \sum_{j=r+1}^{\ell} \mathbf{g}_{b_{\pi(j)}, c_j} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $a + \mathbf{v} \in S_i$, we know that $b_{\ell+1} + \dots + b_n$ must occur in $\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} -b_j + \mathbf{u}_j + \mathbf{x}_j$, and so we can just apply the steps $b_j \Rightarrow_i \mathbf{u}_j + \mathbf{x}_j$ for $j \in [\ell+1, n]$ in any order to obtain:

$$a \xrightarrow{*}_i a + \sum_{j=1}^n -b_j + \mathbf{u}_j + \mathbf{x}_j + \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \mathbf{g}_{c_j, b_j} + \sum_{j=r+1}^{\ell} \mathbf{g}_{b_{\pi(j)}, c_j} \right).$$

Now since $a + \mathbf{v} \in S'_i$, the right-hand side contains no more level- i nonterminals. Hence, the right-hand side belongs to $M(a)$. Finally, since $\pi(j) = j$ for $j \in [1, r]$ and $\mathbf{g}_{c_j, c_j} \approx \mathbf{0}$ for $j \in [1, \ell]$, the term in parentheses belongs to D_a . Hence, we have $a + \mathbf{v} \in M(a) + D_a$.

Finally, note that $L(a) + D_a = L_a$ follows from $M(a) + D_a = M_a$, because $D_a \subseteq S_i$ and thus $L(a) + D_a = (M(a) \cap S_i) + D_a = (M(a) + D_a) \cap S_i = M_a \cap S_i = L_a$. \square

While Theorem 7.6 describes what nonterminals $a \in R_i$ can derive, we also need an analogue that at least characterizes emptiness of $L(a)$ for $a \in N_i$. The following is a straightforward consequence of the previous steps.

Corollary 7.10. *Suppose G is i -bidirected and $a \in N_i$ for $i \in [2, k]$. Then $L(a) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if there is some $a' \in N_{i-1}$ and a production $a \rightarrow a'$ such that $K_{a'} \neq \emptyset$.*

Since Corollary 7.10 applies only to $a \in N_{[1, k]}$, we also need an analogue for $a \in N_0$, which follows directly from the definition of k -grammars and previous lemmas.

Corollary 7.11. *Suppose G is bidirected and $a \in N_0$. Then $L(a) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if there is some production $a \rightarrow \mathbf{u}$ with $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^{N_0} + \mathbb{Z}^T$ such that $K_{a \rightarrow \mathbf{u}} \neq \emptyset$.*

7.4. Constructing coset circuits. In our algorithm, we will compute matrix representations for each of the cosets defined in the last section. As an intermediate step towards the matrix representations, we compute a representation of the cosets in terms of “coset circuits”, which can be seen as compressed matrix representations.

Let Y be a finite set. A *matrix representation* of a coset $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^Y$ is a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{X \times Z}$ and a vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^X$ such that $Y \subseteq Z$ and $S = \{\pi_Y(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}\}$, where $\pi_Y: \mathbb{Z}^Z \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^Y$ is the projection onto \mathbb{Z}^Y . Note that if we have a coset S represented as $S = \mathbf{v} + \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n \rangle$, we can easily compute a matrix representation for it, since $S = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^Y \mid \exists x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{Z}: \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{v} + x_1 \cdot \mathbf{u}_1 + \dots + x_n \cdot \mathbf{u}_n\}$.

A *coset circuit* over \mathbb{Z}^Y is a directed acyclic graph C , whose vertices will be called *gates*, where

- (1) every gate g with in-degree-0 is labeled by a matrix representation of a coset $C(g)$ and
- (2) every gate with in-degree > 0 is labeled either by $+$ or by \cap .

In a coset circuit, each gate g evaluates to a coset $C(g)$ of \mathbb{Z}^Y : The in-degree-0 gates evaluate to their labels. Moreover, a gate g with incoming edges from g_1, \dots, g_m , $m \geq 1$, evaluates to either $C(g_1) + \dots + C(g_m)$ or $C(g_1) \cap \dots \cap C(g_m)$ depending on whether v is labeled by $+$ or \cap .

We now show how to construct a coset circuit that contains a gate for each of the cosets used in Section 7.3. The definition of these cosets does not tell us directly how to compute the cosets using sums and intersections.

In fact, H_a is even defined using a (potentially infinite) generating set. Therefore, the first step is to show that H_a is generated by finitely many cosets on the same level.

Theorem 7.12. *Let $G = (N, T, P)$ be a k -bidirected grammar. For every $a \in N_i$, $i \in [2, k]$, we have $H_a = \langle -b + L_c \mid b \in N_i, c \in N_{i-1}, a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow} b, b \rightarrow c \in P \rangle$.*

This is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 7.6. We have now described each coset in terms of other cosets using sum, intersection, and generated subgroup. In order to describe cosets only using sums and intersections, we need a simple lemma.

Theorem 7.13. *Let A be an abelian group, $g_1, \dots, g_n \in A$, and U and S subgroups such that $(g_i + U) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ for each $i \in [1, n]$. Then we have $\langle (g_1 + U) \cap S, \dots, (g_n + U) \cap S \rangle = \langle (g_1, \dots, g_n) + U \rangle \cap S$.*

Using Lemma 7.13, we can now express each coset in terms of sums and intersections of previous cosets. To simplify notation, write $P_a = \{(b, c) \mid b \in N_i, c \in N_{i-1}, a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow} b, b \rightarrow c \in P\}$. Note that

$$H_a = \langle -b + \mathbf{u} \mid a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow} b, b \rightarrow \mathbf{u} \in P \rangle \text{ for } a \in N_0, \quad H_a = \langle -b + L_c \mid (b, c) \in P_a \rangle \text{ for } a \in N_{[1, k]}.$$

Thus, for $a \in N_0$, we have a finite generating set for H_a given explicitly in the grammar and can thus create a leaf gate for H_a labeled by an explicit matrix representation for H_a . However, for $a \in N_{[1, k]}$, we need to eliminate the $\langle \cdot \rangle$ operator. To this end, we write

$$(8) \quad H_a = \langle -b + L_c \mid (b, c) \in P_a \rangle = \sum_{(b, c) \in P_a} \langle (-b + c + H_c) \cap S_{i-1} \rangle = \sum_{(b, c) \in P_a} \langle (-b + c) + H_c \rangle \cap S_{i-1}$$

where in the first step, we plug in the definition of L_c and in the second step, we apply Lemma 7.13. Here, the sum on the right only uses those $(b, c) \in P_a$ for which $\langle (-b + c) + H_c \rangle \cap S_{i-1} \neq \emptyset$. Now, each $\langle -b + c \rangle$ is a group for which we can create a gate with an explicit representation. We also need to express K_a in terms of sum and intersection. First note that for $b \in N_{i+1}$,

$$(9) \quad \langle -b + M_b \rangle = \langle -b + ((b + H_b) \cap S'_{i+1}) \rangle = \langle (-b + S'_{i+1}) \cap H_b \rangle = H_b \cap \langle -b + S'_{i+1} \rangle$$

provided that $(-b + S'_{i+1}) \cap H_a \neq \emptyset$; otherwise, $\langle -b + M_b \rangle$ is the trivial group $\{\mathbf{0}\}$. In the first equality, we plug in the definition of M_a . The second is due to the definition of S'_{i+1} , and the third applies Lemma 7.13, relying on $(-b + S'_{i+1}) \cap H_b$ being non-empty. This implies that for $a \in R_i$,

$$(10) \quad K_a = (L_a + \langle -b + M_b \mid b \in R_{i+1}, a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow} b \rangle) \cap S_{i+1} = \left(L_a + \sum_{b \in R_{i+1}, a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow} b} \langle -b + M_b \rangle \right) \cap S_{i+1} \\ = \left(L_a + \sum_{b \in R_{i+1}, a \overset{*}{\rightsquigarrow} b} H_b \cap \langle -b + S'_{i+1} \rangle \right) \cap S_{i+1},$$

where the last sum only uses those $H_b \cap \langle -b + S'_{i+1} \rangle$ for which $(-b + S'_{i+1}) \cap H_b \neq \emptyset$. The equality follows from the definition of K_a and (9). Note that for $-b + S'_{i+1}$, it is again easy to construct a matrix representation. Finally, observe that all these coset definitions rely on the relation \rightsquigarrow . On N_0 , we can compute \rightsquigarrow directly. On $N_{[1, k]}$, we have to rely on cosets. To this, note that for $a, b \in N_i$, we have $a \rightsquigarrow b$ if and only if there is a $c \in R_{i-1}$ with a production $a \rightarrow c$ and some $\mathbf{u} \in L_c$ with $\mathbf{u}(b) = 1$. In other words, if and only if $L_c \cap O_b \neq \emptyset$, where O_b is the coset $\{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{N \cup T} \mid \mathbf{u}(b) = 1\}$.

We observe that the constructed coset circuit has depth $\leq ck$ for some constant c : The gates for H_a , L_a , M_a only depend on gates created in the last iteration of the for-loop. Moreover, each of them only adds a constant depth to the gates produced before. The gates K_a depend on gates H_b created in the same iteration, thus also adding only constant depth. Finally, note that the entries in the matrices in the labels

Algorithm 1: Construction of coset circuit for a bidirected k -grammar

Input: Bidirected k -grammar $G = (N, T, P)$
 Create gates for $S_i, S'_i, O_a,$ and $\langle -a + b \rangle$ for each $i \in [1, k], a, b \in N$
 Compute \rightsquigarrow on N_0
 Create gates for $H_a, L_a,$ and M_a for each $a \in R_0$
 Create gates for $K_{a \rightarrow \mathbf{u}}$ for productions $a \rightarrow \mathbf{u}, a \in N_0, \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^{N_0} + \mathbb{Z}^T$
for $i = 1, \dots, k$ **do**
 Create gate for $L_c \cap O_b$ for each $c \in N_{i-1}, b \in N_i$
 Compute the relation \rightsquigarrow on N_i based on non-emptiness of $L_c \cap O_b$ with $c \in N_{i-1}, b \in N_i$
 Compute \rightsquigarrow^* on N_i and then P_a for each $a \in N_i$
 Create gate for $H_a,$ then for $L_a,$ then for M_a for each $a \in R_i$ according to (7), (8) and (10)
 Create gate for K_a for each $a \in R_{i-1}$

of the leaves require at most polynomially many bits: The gates for $S_i, S'_i, O_a, \langle -a + b \rangle$ and for $H_a, L_a,$ and M_a for $a \in R_0$ are obtained directly from the productions of G . The numbers in those, in turn, have at most polynomially many bits as they are computed using the polynomial time algorithm from Theorem 6.5.

7.5. From coset circuits to linear Diophantine equations. In each of our three algorithms for BIREACH, we use the same basic procedure to check emptiness of coset circuits. Let $n = |Y|$. We compute, for each gate g , a matrix $\mathbf{A}_g \in \mathbb{Z}^{s_g \times t_g}$ and a vector $\mathbf{b}_g \in \mathbb{Z}^{s_g}$ such that $C(g) = \{\pi_n(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{t_g}, \mathbf{A}_g \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}_g\}$, where for any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, by π_n , we denote the projection $\mathbb{Z}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ onto the last n coordinates for any $r \geq n$. If g has in-degree 0, then g is already labeled with such a matrix \mathbf{A} and vector \mathbf{b} . Now suppose g has incoming gates g_1, \dots, g_r . Let $\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_r$ and $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r$ with $\mathbf{A}_i \in \mathbb{Z}^{s_i \times t_i}, \mathbf{b}_i \in \mathbb{Z}^{s_i}$, denote the matrices and vectors constructed for the gates g_1, \dots, g_r . Then the matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{s \times t}$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^s$ for g have the shape

$$\mathbf{A} = \left(\begin{array}{ccc|c} \mathbf{A}_1 & & & \mathbf{0} \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \mathbf{A}_r & \\ \hline & & \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{C} \end{array} \right), \quad \mathbf{b} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{b}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{b}_r \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}$$

where \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{C} are chosen depending on whether g is labeled with $+$ or \cap .

If the label is $+$, then $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times (t_1 + \dots + t_r)}, \mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$, are chosen so that $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{c}$ expresses that in \mathbf{x} , the last n coordinates are the sum of $\mathbf{y}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{y}_r$, where for each $i \in [1, r]$, the vector $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ contains the coordinates $t_1 + \dots + t_i - n, \dots, t_1 + \dots + t_i$, i.e. the last n coordinates corresponding to \mathbf{A}_i . Hence, we have $s = s_1 + \dots + s_r + n$ and $t = t_1 + \dots + t_r + n$. If the label is \cap , then $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{Z}^{rn \times (t_1 + \dots + t_r)}, \mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{Z}^{rn \times rn}$ are chosen so that $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{c}$ expresses that for each $i \in [1, r]$, the last n coordinates of \mathbf{x} agree with coordinates $t_1 + \dots + t_i - n, \dots, t_1 + \dots + t_i$ of \mathbf{x} , i.e. the last n coordinates corresponding to \mathbf{A}_i . Thus, we obtain $s = s_1 + \dots + s_r + rn$ and $t = t_1 + \dots + t_r + n$.

Thus, in any case, we have $\max\{s, t\} \leq (r+1) \cdot \max_i \max\{s_i, t_i\}$. Moreover, the magnitude does not grow at all: We have $\|\mathbf{A}\| \leq \max\{\|\mathbf{A}_i\| \mid i \in [1, r]\}$ and $\|\mathbf{b}\| \leq \max\{\|\mathbf{b}_i\| \mid i \in [1, r]\}$. Suppose m is an upper bound on the number of rows and columns of the matrices in the leafs of C , and M is an upper bound on their magnitude. Then for any gate g of depth i , the resulting matrix $\mathbf{A}_g \in \mathbb{Z}^{s_g \times t_g}$ and vector $\mathbf{b}_g \in \mathbb{Z}^{s_g}$ satisfy $\max\{s_g, t_g\} \leq (r+1)^i \cdot m$ and $\|\mathbf{A}_g\|, \|\mathbf{b}_g\| \leq M$.

Theorem 7.14. *For every fixed $d, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$, the problem $\text{BIREACH}(\text{SC}_{d,\ell}^\pm)$ is in P.*

Proof. According to Lemma 7.1, we have to decide whether $E_{(p,s\Delta,q)} \neq \emptyset$. By Proposition 7.2, this is equivalent to $W_{(p,t\Delta,q)} \cap Z_{t\Delta} \neq \emptyset$. In order to decide the latter, we apply the saturation procedure described

after Proposition 7.3. For this, we need to compute the set $R^{(i+1)}$ from $R^{(i)}$. Now Proposition 7.4 allows us to construct in polynomial time a k -grammar G with $k \leq 2\ell$ such that $a \in R^{(i+1)}$ if and only if $L(a) \neq \emptyset$. Given this grammar, we construct a coset circuit C as described above in polynomial time. As noted above, the circuit has depth $\leq ck$ for some constant $c \in \mathbb{N}$. For each gate g in this coset circuit, we compute a matrix representation for the coset $C(g)$. The resulting matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{s \times t}$ and vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^s$ will satisfy $s, t \leq (r+1)^{ck} \leq (r+1)^{2\ell}$, where r is the largest in-degree of a gate in C . Since ℓ is fixed, s and t are bounded polynomially in the input. Moreover, the magnitude of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{b} is at most the magnitude of the matrices in the leaves of C , which means the entries of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{b} only require polynomially many bits. Therefore, we can check emptiness of $C(g)$ using Theorem 3.2. \square

Theorem 7.15. *For every fixed $d \in \mathbb{N}$, the problem $\text{BIREACH}(\text{SC}_d^\pm)$ is in EXPTIME.*

Proof. We use the same algorithm as in Theorem 7.14. Since now ℓ is part of the input, the depth $ck \leq 2c\ell$ of the coset circuit is no longer fixed. Thus, the bound $(r+1)^{2c\ell}$ on the number of rows and columns of the matrix, is now exponential. The entries in the matrix are, however, still polynomial. We can therefore check emptiness of $C(g)$ by using Theorem 3.2, which now results in an exponential time bound. \square

For the last result, we again use the same algorithm. However, now the algorithm of Theorem 6.5 runs in exponential space and causes the of matrix entries to use exponentially many bits. However, the coset circuits can still be checked for emptiness in exponential time, resulting overall in an EXPSPACE algorithm.

Theorem 7.16. *The problem $\text{BIREACH}(\text{SC}^\pm)$ is in EXPSPACE.*

REFERENCES

- [1] Eric Allender, Robert Beals, and Mitsunori Ogihara. “The Complexity of Matrix Rank and Feasible Systems of Linear Equations”. In: *Comput. Complex.* 8.2 (1999), pp. 99–126. DOI: 10.1007/s000370050023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s000370050023>.
- [2] Carme Àlvarez and Raymond Greenlaw. “A compendium of problems complete for symmetric log-arithmic space”. In: *Comput. Complex.* 9.2 (2000), pp. 123–145. DOI: 10.1007/PL00001603. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/PL00001603>.
- [3] Jürgen Avenhaus and Klaus Madlener. “The Nielsen reduction and P-complete problems in free groups”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 32.1-2 (1984), pp. 61–76.
- [4] Krishnendu Chatterjee, Bhavya Choudhary, and Andreas Pavlogiannis. “Optimal Dyck Reachability for Data-Dependence and Alias Analysis”. In: *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 2.POPL (Dec. 2018). DOI: 10.1145/3158118. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3158118>.
- [5] Swarat Chaudhuri. “Subcubic algorithms for recursive state machines”. In: *POPL ’08*. ACM, 2008, pp. 159–169.
- [6] Tsu-Wu J. Chou and George E. Collins. “Algorithms for the Solution of Systems of Linear Diophantine Equations”. In: *SIAM J. Comput.* 11.4 (1982), pp. 687–708. DOI: 10.1137/0211057. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/0211057>.
- [7] Wojciech Czerwiński and Lukasz Orlikowski. “Reachability in Vector Addition Systems is Ackermann-complete”. In: *CoRR* abs/2104.13866 (2021). arXiv: 2104.13866. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.13866>.
- [8] Vincent Danos and Jean Krivine. “Formal Molecular Biology Done in CCS-R”. In: *Electron. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.* 180.3 (2007), pp. 31–49. DOI: 10.1016/j.entcs.2004.01.040. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2004.01.040>.
- [9] Vincent Danos and Jean Krivine. “Reversible Communicating Systems”. In: *CONCUR 2004 - Concurrency Theory*. Ed. by Philippa Gardner and Nobuko Yoshida. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2004, pp. 292–307.
- [10] Volker Diekert and Anca Muscholl. “Solvability of Equations in Graph Groups Is Decidable”. In: *Int. J. Algebra Comput.* 16.6 (2006), pp. 1047–1070. DOI: 10.1142/S0218196706003372.
- [11] Michael Elberfeld, Andreas Jakoby, and Till Tantau. “Algorithmic Meta Theorems for Circuit Classes of Constant and Logarithmic Depth”. In: *29th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS 2012, February 29th - March 3rd, 2012, Paris, France*. Ed. by Christoph Dürr and Thomas Wilke. Vol. 14. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2012, pp. 66–77. DOI: 10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2012.66. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2012.66>.
- [12] Javier Esparza. “Petri nets, commutative context-free grammars, and basic parallel processes”. In: *Fundamenta Informaticae* 31.1 (1997), pp. 13–25.
- [13] Christoph Haase and Simon Halfon. “Integer Vector Addition Systems with States”. In: *Reachability Problems - 8th International Workshop, RP 2014, Oxford, UK, September 22-24, 2014. Proceedings*. Ed. by Joël Ouaknine, Igor Potapov, and James Worrell. Vol. 8762. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2014, pp. 112–124. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-11439-2_9. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-11439-2_9.
- [14] Christoph Haase and Georg Zetsche. “Presburger arithmetic with stars, rational subsets of graph groups, and nested zero tests”. In: *34th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 24-27, 2019*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–14. DOI: 10.1109/LICS.2019.8785850.
- [15] Matthew Hague and Anthony Widjaja Lin. “Model Checking Recursive Programs with Numeric Data Types”. In: *Computer Aided Verification - 23rd International Conference, CAV 2011, Snowbird, UT, USA, July 14-20, 2011. Proceedings*. Ed. by Ganesh Gopalakrishnan and Shaz Qadeer. Vol. 6806. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2011, pp. 743–759. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-22110-1_60.
- [16] Ilya Kapovich, Richard Weidmann, and Alexei Myasnikov. “Foldings, graphs of groups and the membership problem”. In: *International Journal of Algebra and Computation* 15.01 (2005), pp. 95–128.

- [17] Ulla Koppenhagen and Ernst W. Mayr. “The Complexity of the Coverability, the Containment, and the Equivalence Problems for Commutative Semigroups”. In: *Fundamentals of Computation Theory, 11th International Symposium, FCT '97, Kraków, Poland, September 1-3, 1997, Proceedings*. Ed. by Bogdan S. Chlebus and Ludwik Czaaja. Vol. 1279. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 1997, pp. 257–268. DOI: 10.1007/BFb0036189. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0036189>.
- [18] R. Landauer. “Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process”. In: *IBM Journal of Research and Development* 5.3 (1961), pp. 183–191.
- [19] Serge Lang. *Algebra*. Revised Third Edition. Springer-Verlag, 2005.
- [20] Jérôme Leroux. “Vector Addition System Reversible Reachability Problem”. In: *CONCUR 2011 – Concurrency Theory*. Ed. by Joost-Pieter Katoen and Barbara König. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 327–341. ISBN: 978-3-642-23217-6.
- [21] Jérôme Leroux, Grégoire Sutre, and Patrick Totzke. “On the Coverability Problem for Pushdown Vector Addition Systems in One Dimension”. In: *Automata, Languages, and Programming - 42nd International Colloquium, ICALP 2015, Kyoto, Japan, July 6-10, 2015, Proceedings, Part II*. Ed. by Magnús M. Halldórsson et al. Vol. 9135. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2015, pp. 324–336. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-662-47666-6_26.
- [22] Yuanbo Li, Qirun Zhang, and Thomas W. Reps. “Fast graph simplification for interleaved Dyck-reachability”. In: *Proceedings of the 41st ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2020, London, UK, June 15-20, 2020*. Ed. by Alastair F. Donaldson and Emina Torlak. ACM, 2020, pp. 780–793. DOI: 10.1145/3385412.3386021. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3385412.3386021>.
- [23] Yuanbo Li, Qirun Zhang, and Thomas W. Reps. “On the complexity of bidirected interleaved Dyck-reachability”. In: *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 5.POPL (2021), pp. 1–28. DOI: 10.1145/3434340. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3434340>.
- [24] Markus Lohrey. “The rational subset membership problem for groups: a survey”. In: *Groups St Andrews*. Vol. 422. 2013, pp. 368–389.
- [25] Markus Lohrey and Géraud Sénizergues. “When is a graph product of groups virtually-free?” In: *Communications in Algebra* 35.2 (2007), pp. 617–621.
- [26] Markus Lohrey and Benjamin Steinberg. “An automata theoretic approach to the generalized word problem in graphs of groups”. In: *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 138.2 (2010), pp. 445–453.
- [27] Markus Lohrey and Benjamin Steinberg. “The submonoid and rational subset membership problems for graph groups”. In: *Journal of Algebra* 320.2 (2008), pp. 728–755.
- [28] Markus Lohrey and Georg Zetsche. “Knapsack in Graph Groups”. In: *Theory Comput. Syst.* 62.1 (2018), pp. 192–246. DOI: 10.1007/s00224-017-9808-3.
- [29] Ernst W Mayr and Albert R Meyer. “The complexity of the word problems for commutative semigroups and polynomial ideals”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 46.3 (1982), pp. 305–329. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8708\(82\)90048-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8708(82)90048-2). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii>
- [30] David Melski and Thomas Reps. “Interconvertibility of a class of set constraints and context-free-language reachability”. In: *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 248(1-2) (2000), pp. 29–98.
- [31] K. A. Mikhailova. “The occurrence problem for direct products of groups”. In: *Matematicheskii Sbornik (Novaya Seriya)* 70(112) (2 1966), pp. 241–251.
- [32] Omer Reingold. “Undirected connectivity in log-space”. In: *J. ACM* 55.4 (2008), 17:1–17:24. DOI: 10.1145/1391289.1391291. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1391289.1391291>.
- [33] T. Reps, S. Horwitz, and M. Sagiv. “Precise interprocedural dataflow analysis via graph reachability”. In: *POPL 95: Principles of Programming Languages*. ACM, 1995, pp. 49–61.

- [34] Kumar Neeraj Verma, Helmut Seidl, and Thomas Schwentick. “On the Complexity of Equational Horn Clauses”. In: *Automated Deduction - CADE-20, 20th International Conference on Automated Deduction, Tallinn, Estonia, July 22-27, 2005, Proceedings*. Ed. by Robert Nieuwenhuis. Vol. 3632. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2005, pp. 337–352. DOI: 10.1007/11532231_25.
- [35] D. Wise. *From Riches to RAAGs: 3-manifolds, right-angled Artin groups, and cubical geometry*. American Mathematical Society, 2012.
- [36] Guoqing Xu, Atanas Rountev, and Manu Sridharan. “Scaling CFL-Reachability-Based Points-To Analysis Using Context-Sensitive Must-Not-Alias Analysis”. In: *ECOOP 2009 - Object-Oriented Programming, 23rd European Conference, Genoa, Italy, July 6-10, 2009. Proceedings*. Ed. by Sophia Drossopoulou. Vol. 5653. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2009, pp. 98–122. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-03013-0_6. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-03013-0_6.
- [37] Dacong Yan, Guoqing Xu, and Atanas Rountev. “Demand-driven context-sensitive alias analysis for Java”. In: *Proceedings of the 20th International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis, ISSTA 2011, Toronto, ON, Canada, July 17-21, 2011*. Ed. by Matthew B. Dwyer and Frank Tip. ACM, 2011, pp. 155–165. DOI: 10.1145/2001420.2001440. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2001420.2001440>.
- [38] Georg Zetsche. “Monoids as Storage Mechanisms”. PhD thesis. Technische Universität Kaiserslautern, 2016.
- [39] Georg Zetsche. “Monoids as Storage Mechanisms”. In: *Bull. EATCS* 120 (2016). URL: <http://eatcs.org/beatcs/index.php?id=120.104583>.
- [40] Georg Zetsche. “The emptiness problem for valence automata over graph monoids”. In: *Inf. Comput.* 277 (2021), p. 104583. DOI: 10.1016/j.ic.2020.104583.
- [41] Qirun Zhang and Zhendong Su. “Context-sensitive data-dependence analysis via linear conjunctive language reachability”. In: *Proceedings of the 44th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2017, Paris, France, January 18-20, 2017*. Ed. by Giuseppe Castagna and Andrew D. Gordon. ACM, 2017, pp. 344–358. DOI: 10.1145/3009837.3009848. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3009837.3009848>.
- [42] Qirun Zhang et al. “Fast algorithms for Dyck-CFL-reachability with applications to alias analysis”. In: *ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI '13, Seattle, WA, USA, June 16-19, 2013*. Ed. by Hans-Juergen Boehm and Cormac Flanagan. ACM, 2013, pp. 435–446. DOI: 10.1145/2491956.2462159. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2491956.2462159>.

APPENDIX A. ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FOR SECTION 4.2

A.1. BIREACH and subgroup membership.

Theorem 4.2. *Given a looped graph Γ , a bidirected valence system \mathcal{A} over Γ and two states s, t from \mathcal{A} , one can compute words $w_0, w_1, \dots, w_n \in X_\Gamma^*$ in logspace such that $\{[w] \in \text{M}\Gamma \mid s \xrightarrow{w} t\} = [w_0]\langle [w_1], \dots, [w_n] \rangle$*

Proof. Consider a bidirected valence system \mathcal{A} over Γ with state set Q and two states $s, t \in Q$. Let (Q, E) be the undirected graph where $E = \{\{p, q\} \mid p \xrightarrow{x} q\}$. First we compute a spanning forest $F \subseteq E$ in logspace: Let e_1, \dots, e_m be an enumeration of the edges in E . Then we include an edge $e_i = (p, x, q)$ in F if and only if there exists no path between p and q in the subgraph $(Q, \{e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}\})$. This can be tested in deterministic logspace [32]. If s and t are contained in distinct components of F , we can return any no-instance of SUBMEM(Γ). Otherwise we restrict \mathcal{A} and F to the connected component of s . Then we compute a set of transitions T which contains for every edge $\{p, q\} \in F$ a transition $p \xrightarrow{x} q$ and its reverse transition $q \xrightarrow{\bar{x}} p$. Observe that the undirected version of T is a tree. Between any two states p, q there is a unique simple path using only transitions from T . Any other path from p to q which uses only transitions from T has the same effect since it is obtained from the simple path from p to q by repeatedly inserting loops $r \xrightarrow{x} r' \xrightarrow{\bar{x}} r$. Let w_0 be the label of the unique simple path from s to t using transitions from T .

Let $C = \{[w] \in \text{M}\Gamma \mid s \xrightarrow{w} t\}$ and $S = \{[w] \in \text{M}\Gamma \mid t \xrightarrow{w} t\}$. Clearly S is a subgroup of $\text{M}\Gamma$ and C is a left coset of S in $\text{M}\Gamma$, namely $C = [w_0]S$. It remains to compute a generating set for S . For any transition $\tau = (p, x, q)$ of \mathcal{A} with $\tau \notin T$ consider the unique cycle $\gamma_\tau: t \xrightarrow{w} p \xrightarrow{x} q \xrightarrow{v} t$ where the paths $t \xrightarrow{w} p$ and $q \xrightarrow{v} t$ are simple and only use transitions from T . We claim that the effects of the cycles γ_τ for all $\tau \in E \setminus T$ generates S . Consider any cycle $\gamma: q_0 \xrightarrow{x_1} q_1 \xrightarrow{x_2} \dots \xrightarrow{x_n} q_n$ in E where $q_0 = q_n = t$. We show that $x_1 \dots x_n$ can be written as the product of effects of cycles γ_τ and their inverses by induction on the number of transitions in γ not contained in T . If the cycle only uses transitions from T then we must have $x_1 \dots x_n = 1$. Otherwise, suppose that i is minimal with $\tau = (q_{i-1}, x_i, q_i) \notin T$. Let $\gamma_\tau: t \xrightarrow{w} q_{i-1} \xrightarrow{x_i} q_i \xrightarrow{v} t$, which satisfies $[w] = [x_1 \dots x_{i-1}]$. We can replace γ by the cycle

$$t \xrightarrow{w} q_{i-1} \xrightarrow{x_i} q_i \xrightarrow{v} t \xrightarrow{\bar{v}} q_i \xrightarrow{x_{i+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{x_n} q_n$$

without changing its effect. Since $t \xrightarrow{\bar{v}} q_i \xrightarrow{x_{i+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{x_n} q_n$ uses strictly fewer transitions not contained in T than γ we can write $[\bar{v}x_{i+1} \dots x_n]$ as a product of effects of cycles γ_τ and their inverses. This concludes the proof. \square

Theorem 4.1. *If Γ is looped, then BIREACH(Γ) and SUBMEM(Γ) are logspace inter-reducible.*

Proof. Let Γ be a looped graph. Reducing SUBMEM(Γ) to BIREACH(Γ) is easy: To test $[w] \in \langle [w_1], \dots, [w_k] \rangle$ we construct a bidirected valence system \mathcal{A} with two states s, t and the transitions $s \xrightarrow{w_i} t$ and $t \xrightarrow{w_i} s$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, and the reverse transitions. Then $[w] \in \langle [w_1], \dots, [w_k] \rangle$ holds if and only if there exists $u \in X_\Gamma^*$ with $s \xrightarrow{u} t$ and $[u] = 1$.

Conversely, we can compute in logspace a coset representation $\{[w] \in \text{M}\Gamma \mid s \xrightarrow{w} t\} = [w_0]\langle [w_1], \dots, [w_n] \rangle$ by Lemma 4.2. Then it remains to test whether $[\bar{w}_0] \in \langle [w_1], \dots, [w_n] \rangle$. \square

A.2. Undecidability.

Theorem A.1. *Let Γ be a graph with two non-adjacent vertices u and v where u is unlooped. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_k\} \subseteq \{u, v\}^*$ such that for all $x \in (W \cup \bar{W})^*$ we have $x \equiv_\Gamma \varepsilon$ if and only if $x \leftrightarrow_R^* \varepsilon$ where $R = \{(w_i \bar{w}_i, \varepsilon) \mid i \in [1, k]\}$.*

Proof. First we claim that, if $x \equiv_\Gamma \varepsilon$ where $x \in X_\Gamma^*$ then x does not contain any factor of the form $uv^i\bar{u}$ or $\bar{v}^i\bar{u}$ with $i \geq 1$. This is true because such a factor in x cannot be eliminated by deletions of $u\bar{u}$, $v\bar{v}$ or $\bar{v}v$.

Define $w_i = uv^i$ and let $W = \{w_i \mid i \in [1, k]\}$. We clearly have $\equiv_R \subseteq \equiv_\Gamma$. For the converse we prove the following stronger statement: For all $x \in (W \cup \bar{W})^*$ with $x \equiv_\Gamma \varepsilon$ we have $x \equiv_R \varepsilon$ and any occurrence of $w_i \bar{w}_j$ in x satisfies $i = j$. We proceed by induction on $|x|$ where the case $|x| = 0$ is clear. If $|x| > 0$ then x must contain either $u\bar{u}$, $v\bar{v}$, or, if v is looped, $\bar{v}v$. Since any occurrence of u in a word from W is followed by v , and any occurrence of \bar{v} in a word from W is followed by \bar{v} or \bar{u} , it must be the case that $v\bar{v}$ occurs in x . Again by the definition of W , the word x is of the form $x = suv^m \bar{v}^n \bar{u}t$ where $m, n \in [1, k]$ and $s, t \in (W \cup \bar{W})^*$. We have $x \equiv_\Gamma suv^{m-1} \bar{v}^{n-1} \bar{u}t$. By the remark from the beginning we must have $m = n = 1$ or $m, n \geq 2$. If $m = n = 1$ then $x \equiv_\Gamma st$. If $m, n \geq 2$ then $x \equiv_\Gamma sw_{m-1} \bar{w}_{n-1} t \in (W \cup \bar{W})^*$ and, by induction hypothesis, we obtain $m-1 = n-1$, which also implies $x \equiv_\Gamma st$. In both cases we obtain by the induction hypothesis that $x \equiv_R st \equiv_R \varepsilon$ and that any occurrence of $w_i \bar{w}_j$ in st satisfies $i = j$. Hence also occurrence of $w_i \bar{w}_j$ in $x = sw_n \bar{w}_n t$ satisfies $i = j$. This concludes the proof. \square

Theorem A.2. *Let Γ be a graph with two non-adjacent vertices u and v . There exists a finite set $W \subseteq \{u, v\}^*$ and a morphism $\varphi: (W \cup \bar{W})^* \rightarrow X_\Gamma^*$ such that for all $y \in X_\Gamma^*$ we have $y \equiv_{\Gamma^\circ} \varepsilon$ if and only if there exists $x \in (W \cup \bar{W})^*$ such that $x \equiv_\Gamma \varepsilon$ and $\varphi(x) = y$. Furthermore, $\varphi(w) \in X_\Gamma$ for all $w \in W$ and $\varphi(\bar{w}) = \overline{\varphi(w)}$ for all $w \in W$ (it respects inverses).*

Proof. If $\Gamma = \Gamma^\circ$, i.e. both u and v are looped, then we set $W = V$ and φ to be the identity. Now assume that u is unlooped and let $W = \{w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4\}$ be a set from Lemma A.1, satisfying $x \equiv_\Gamma \varepsilon$ if and only if $x \leftrightarrow_R^* \varepsilon$ where $R = \{(w_i \bar{w}_i, \varepsilon) \mid i \in [1, k]\}$. Let $\varphi: (W \cup \bar{W})^* \rightarrow X_\Gamma^*$ be the morphism defined by

$$\begin{array}{cccc} w_1 \mapsto u & w_2 \mapsto v & w_3 \mapsto \bar{u} & w_4 \mapsto \bar{v} \\ \bar{w}_1 \mapsto \bar{u} & \bar{w}_2 \mapsto \bar{v} & \bar{w}_3 \mapsto u & \bar{w}_4 \mapsto v \end{array}$$

We claim that for all $y \in X_\Gamma^*$ we have $y \equiv_{\Gamma^\circ} \varepsilon$ if and only if there exists $x \in (W \cup \bar{W})^*$ such that $x \leftrightarrow_R^* \varepsilon$ and $\varphi(x) = y$. For the “if”-direction observe that any derivation $x \leftrightarrow_R x_1 \leftrightarrow_R \dots \leftrightarrow_R x_n = \varepsilon$ can be translated into a derivation $\varphi(x) \leftrightarrow_{\Gamma^\circ} \varphi(x_1) \leftrightarrow_{\Gamma^\circ} \dots \leftrightarrow_{\Gamma^\circ} \varphi(x_n) = \varphi(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$ since $\varphi(w_i) \varphi(\bar{w}_i) \equiv_\Gamma \varepsilon$.

For the “only if”-direction consider a derivation $y \rightarrow_{\Gamma^\circ} y_1 \rightarrow_{\Gamma^\circ} \dots \rightarrow_{\Gamma^\circ} y_n = \varepsilon$. We prove by induction over n that there exists $x \in (W \cup \bar{W})^*$ with $x \rightarrow_R^* \varepsilon$ and $\varphi(x) = y$. By induction hypothesis there exists $x_1 \in (W \cup \bar{W})^*$ with $x_1 \rightarrow_R^* \varepsilon$ and $\varphi(x_1) = y_1$. There exist $s, t \in (W \cup \bar{W})^*$ such that $x_1 = st$, $y_1 = \varphi(s) \varphi(t)$ and $y_1 = \varphi(s) z \varphi(t)$ where $z \in \{u\bar{u}, v\bar{v}, \bar{u}u, \bar{v}v\}$. We need to choose $x \in (W \cup \bar{W})^*$ such that $x \rightarrow_R x_1$ and $\varphi(x) = y$:

- If $z = u\bar{u}$ then set $x = sw_1 \bar{w}_1 t$.
- If $z = v\bar{v}$ then set $x = sw_2 \bar{w}_2 t$.
- If $z = \bar{u}u$ then set $x = sw_3 \bar{w}_3 t$.
- If $z = \bar{v}v$ then set $x = sw_4 \bar{w}_4 t$.

This concludes the proof. \square

Theorem 3.1. *If Γ^- contains C4 as an induced subgraph, then $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$ is undecidable.*

Proof. Let us assume that $\Gamma^- \cong \text{C4}$. We want to show that $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$ is undecidable by a reduction from $\text{BIREACH}(\text{C4}^\circ)$, which is undecidable by Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.1.

Let the vertex set of Γ^- be $V = \{u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2\}$ with edges $\{u_1, u_2\}$, $\{u_1, v_2\}$, $\{v_1, u_2\}$, $\{v_1, v_2\}$. Let Γ_1 and Γ_2 be the subgraphs of Γ induced by $V_1 = \{u_1, v_1\}$ and $V_2 = \{u_2, v_2\}$, respectively. By Lemma A.2 there exist finite sets $W_1 \subseteq V_1^*$, $W_2 \subseteq V_2^*$ and morphisms $\varphi_1: (W_1 \cup \bar{W}_1)^* \rightarrow (V_1 \cup \bar{V}_1)^*$, $\varphi_2: (W_2 \cup \bar{W}_2)^* \rightarrow (V_2 \cup \bar{V}_2)^*$ such that for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $y \in (V_i \cup \bar{V}_i)^*$ we have $y \equiv_{\Gamma_i^\circ} \varepsilon$ if and only if there exists $x \in (W_i \cup \bar{W}_i)^*$ such that $x \equiv_{\Gamma_i} \varepsilon$ and $\varphi_i(x) = y$. Let $W = W_1 \cup W_2$ and let $\varphi: (W \cup \bar{W})^* \rightarrow (V \cup \bar{V})^*$ be the unique morphism that extends φ_1 and φ_2 . For all $y \in (V \cup \bar{V})^*$ it satisfies $y \equiv_{\Gamma^\circ} \varepsilon$ if and only if there exists $x \in (W \cup \bar{W})^*$ with $x \equiv_\Gamma \varepsilon$ and $\varphi(x) = y$. Furthermore, the morphism satisfies $\varphi(\bar{w}) = \overline{\varphi(w)}$ for all $w \in W$ by Lemma A.2.

Given a valence system \mathcal{A} over $\mathbb{C}4^\circ \cong \Gamma^\circ$, and states s, t we want to test whether there exists a run $s \xrightarrow{y}_{\mathcal{A}} t$ with $y \equiv_{\Gamma^\circ} \varepsilon$. We can assume that every transition in \mathcal{A} is labeled by a single symbol from $V \cup \bar{V}$, by splitting transitions. Construct the valence system \mathcal{B} over Γ obtained by replacing every transition $p \xrightarrow{v} q$ by transitions $p \xrightarrow{w} q$ for all $w \in W$ with $\varphi(w) = v$. Observe that \mathcal{B} is bidirected because the morphism respects inverses. Moreover, there exists a run $s \xrightarrow{x}_{\mathcal{B}} t$ with $x \equiv_{\Gamma} \varepsilon$ if and only if there is a run $s \xrightarrow{y}_{\mathcal{A}} t$ with $y \equiv_{\Gamma^\circ} \varepsilon$. This concludes the proof. \square

APPENDIX B. ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FOR SECTION 5

Theorem B.1. $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$ is LOGSPACE-hard under AC^0 many-one reductions for every Γ .

Proof. We need to reduce from the reachability on undirected graphs to $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$ since the former problem is LOGSPACE-complete under AC^0 many-one reductions [2, 32]. To do so, we simply replace every undirected edge between nodes p and q by transitions $p \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} q$ and $q \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} p$. \square

Theorem B.2. If \mathcal{G} is closed under subgraphs and LC-unbounded then $\text{BIREACH}(\mathcal{G})$ is ILD-hard under logspace many-one reductions

Proof. Given a system of linear Diophantine equations $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b}$ where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$ has columns $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n \in \mathbb{Z}^m$. Since \mathcal{G} is LC-unbounded and closed under induced subgraphs it contains a looped clique Γ_m with m nodes v_1, \dots, v_m . Let $\varphi: \mathbb{Z}^m \rightarrow X_{\Gamma_m}^*$ be the function $\varphi(k_1, \dots, k_m) = v_1^{k_1} \dots v_m^{k_m}$. Then we construct the valence system \mathcal{A} over Γ_m with two states p and q and the transitions $p \xrightarrow{\varphi(\mathbf{a}_i)} p$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $p \xrightarrow{\varphi(\mathbf{b})} q$, and their reverse transitions. Then $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b}$ has a solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ if and only if there exists $w \in \Gamma_m^*$ with $[w] = 1$ and $p \xrightarrow{w} q$. \square

Theorem B.3. If Γ has two non-adjacent vertices then $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$ is P-hard.

Proof. We can assume that Γ only consists of two non-adjacent vertices u and v . Observe that $\text{M}\Gamma^\circ$ is a free group over u and v . Subgroup membership in the free group over two generators is P-hard by [3], and hence also $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma^\circ)$ by Theorem 4.1. We can reduce from $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma^\circ)$ to $\text{BIREACH}(\Gamma)$ using Lemma A.2, similarly to the proof Theorem 3.1: There exists a finite set $W \subseteq \{u, v\}^*$ and a morphism $\varphi: (W \cup \bar{W})^* \rightarrow X_\Gamma^*$ such that for all $y \in X_\Gamma^*$ we have $y \equiv_{\Gamma^\circ}$ if and only if there exists $x \in (W \cup \bar{W})^*$ with $x \equiv_{\Gamma} \varepsilon$ and $\varphi(x) = y$. Hence reachability in a bidirected valence system over Γ° can be logspace reduced to reachability in a bidirected valence system over Γ by replacing each transition $p \xrightarrow{v} q$, $v \in X_\Gamma$ by transitions $p \xrightarrow{w} q$ for all $w \in W$ with $\varphi(w) = v$. \square

Theorem B.4. If \mathcal{G} is closed under induced subgraphs and UC-unbounded then $\text{BIREACH}(\mathcal{G})$ is EXPSPACE-hard under logspace many-one reductions.

Proof. We reduce from the word problem over commutative semigroups, known to be EXPSPACE-hard [29]. Since \mathcal{G} is UC-unbounded and closed under induced subgraphs, it contains an unlooped clique Γ of size $|\Sigma|$. We can assume that Σ is its node set. Let \mathcal{A} be the bidirected valence system over Γ with three states q_0, q_1, q_2 , the transitions $q_0 \xrightarrow{\bar{x}} q_1$, $q_1 \xrightarrow{y} q_2$, and the transitions $q \xrightarrow{xy} q$ for all $(x, y) \in R$, and their reverse transitions. Then $u \equiv_R v$ holds if and only if $q_0 \xrightarrow{w} q_2$ for some $w \in X_\Gamma^*$ with $[w] = 1$. \square

APPENDIX C. ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FOR SECTION 6

We need the following result. Let $\Psi_\Sigma: \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^\Sigma$ be the function where $\Psi_\Sigma(w)(x)$ is the number of occurrences of x in w .

Theorem C.1. Let $(\Sigma \mid R)$ be a commutative semigroup presentation.

- (1) If $u \equiv_R v$ then there exists a derivation $u = u_0 \rightarrow_R u_1 \rightarrow_R \cdots \rightarrow_R u_n = v$ such that $|u_i| \leq \max\{|u|, |v|\} + \|R\|^{2^{|\Sigma|}} + \|R\|$ where $\|R\| = |R| \cdot \max_{(x,y) \in R} |xy|$. In particular, we can test whether $u \equiv_R v$ and, if so, compute such a witnessing derivation in deterministic space $2^{O(|\Sigma|)} \log(\|R\| + |u| + |v|)$.
- (2) For all $u \in \Sigma^*$ there exist vectors $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_m, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_\ell \in \mathbb{N}^\Sigma$ such that

$$\Psi_\Sigma([u]_{\equiv_R}) = \bigcup_{i=1}^m \{ \mathbf{b}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \lambda_j \mathbf{p}_j \mid \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell \in \mathbb{N} \}$$

and $\|\mathbf{b}_1\|, \dots, \|\mathbf{b}_\ell\| \leq (|u| + \|R\|) \cdot 2^{O(|\Sigma|)}$.

Proof. The bound on the lengths $|u_i|$ follows from Proposition and Lemma 3 in [29]. To compute the path we use Reingold's logspace algorithm for undirected connectivity, which also computes a path between two given vertices [32]. Let G be the graph with vertex set $[0, N]^\Sigma$ where $N = \max\{|u|, |v|\} + \|R\|^{2^{|\Sigma|}} + \|R\|$ and edges between any two vectors \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} if and only if there exists $(x, y) \in R$ with $\mathbf{u} \geq \Psi_\Sigma(x)$ and $\mathbf{u} - \Psi_\Sigma(x) + \Psi_\Sigma(y) = \mathbf{v}$. Then $u \equiv_R v$ if and only if $\Psi_\Sigma(u)$ and $\Psi_\Sigma(v)$ are connected in G , and any path from $\Psi_\Sigma(u)$ to $\Psi_\Sigma(v)$ is easily translated into a derivation from u to v . The second part is shown in [17, Lemma 17]. \square

C.1. Unlooped vertices. Fix a clique $\Gamma = (V, I)$ where U and L are the sets of unlooped and looped vertices in Γ , respectively. Furthermore, we are given a bidirected valence system $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \rightarrow)$ over Γ , and two states $s, t \in Q$. For $Y \subseteq V$ let $\pi_Y : X_\Gamma^* \rightarrow (Y \cup \bar{Y})^*$ be the projection to the alphabet $Y \cup \bar{Y}$.

To transfer the results from Lemma C.1 to the valence system \mathcal{A} , we need to translate \mathcal{A} into an equivalent commutative semigroup presentation. Without loss of generality let the state set of \mathcal{A} be $Q = \{1, \dots, k\}$. Furthermore, we can ensure that each transition $p \xrightarrow{u} q$ is of the form $w = \overline{w^-} w^+$ for some $w^-, w^+ \in U^*$, by splitting transitions and adding intermediate states. Let $U' = U \cup \{\alpha, \beta\}$ where α, β are fresh symbols. Define the commutative semigroup presentation (U', R) by

$$R = \{(\alpha^p \beta^{k-p} \pi_U(w^-), \alpha^q \beta^{k-q} \pi_U(w^+)) \mid p \overline{w^-} w^+ q\} \cup \{(xy, yx) \mid x, y \in U'\}.$$

Any path $p \xrightarrow{u} q$ with $\Psi_U(w) = \mathbf{0}$ can be translated into a derivation in R from $\alpha^p \beta^{k-p}$ to $\alpha^q \beta^{k-q}$, and vice versa.

Theorem 6.1. *One can decide in deterministic space $2^{O(|U|)} \cdot \log \|\mathcal{A}\|$ whether there exists a path $s \xrightarrow{u} t$ with $\Psi_U(w) = \mathbf{0}$ and, if so, return such a path.*

Proof. By Lemma C.1 one can determine in deterministic space $2^{O(|\Sigma|)} \log(\|R\| + |u| + |v|)$ if there is a derivation in R from $\alpha^p \beta^{k-p}$ to $\alpha^q \beta^{k-q}$ and, if so, compute such a derivation, which can then be translated into a path $s \xrightarrow{u} t$ in \mathcal{A} with $\Psi_U(w) = \mathbf{0}$. \square

Theorem 6.2. *One can compute in deterministic space $2^{O(|U|)} \cdot \log \|\mathcal{A}\|$ a set $B \subseteq U$ and a number $b \leq 2^{O(|U|)} \cdot \|\mathcal{A}\|$ such that for all $q \in Q$ we have:*

- $\mathbf{v}(u) \leq b$ for all $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Reach}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, q)$ and $u \in B$,
- for every $c \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Reach}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, q)$ with $\mathbf{v}(u) \geq c$ for all $u \in U \setminus B$.

Proof. By Lemma C.1 there exist vectors $\mathbf{b}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}'_m, \mathbf{p}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}'_\ell \in \mathbb{N}^{U'}$ such that

$$\Psi_{U'}([\alpha^s \beta^{k-s}]_{\equiv_R}) = \bigcup_{i=1}^m \{ \mathbf{b}'_i + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \lambda_j \mathbf{p}'_j \mid \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell \in \mathbb{N} \}$$

and $\|\mathbf{b}'_1\|, \dots, \|\mathbf{b}'_\ell\| \leq \|\mathcal{A}\| \cdot 2^{O(|U|)}$. By setting $J_q = \{i \in [1, m] \mid \mathbf{b}'_i(x) = q, \mathbf{b}'_i(y) = k - q\}$ we obtain

$$\text{Reach}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, q) = \bigcup_{i \in J_t} \{\mathbf{b}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \lambda_j \mathbf{p}_j \mid \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

where \mathbf{b}_i and \mathbf{p}_j are the restrictions of \mathbf{b}'_i and \mathbf{p}'_j to U , respectively.

We set $B = \{u \in U \mid \mathbf{p}_j(u) = 0 \text{ for all } j \in [1, \ell]\}$ and $b = \|\mathcal{A}\| \cdot 2^{O(|U|)}$, which satisfy the properties claimed by the lemma. It remains to show how to compute B . Observe that $u \in B$ if and only if there exists $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Reach}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, s)$ with $\mathbf{v}(u) > 0$. This can be decided as follows: Let \mathcal{A}_u be obtained from \mathcal{A} by adding a new state \perp , loops $\perp \xrightarrow{u} \perp$ and $\perp \xrightarrow{\bar{u}} \perp$, and transitions $q \xrightarrow{\bar{u}} \perp$ and $\perp \xrightarrow{u} q$ for all states $q \in Q$ and $v \in U$. Then there exists $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Reach}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, s)$ with $\mathbf{v}(u) > 0$ if and only if there exists $w \in X_\Gamma^*$ with $s \xrightarrow{w} \perp$ in \mathcal{A}_u and $\Psi_U(w) = \mathbf{0}$. The latter can be decided in deterministic space $2^{O(|U|)} \cdot \log \|\mathcal{A}\|$ by Lemma 6.1. \square

C.2. General cliques.

Proposition 6.3. *One can compute in deterministic space $2^{O(|U|)} \cdot \log \|\mathcal{A}\|$ vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \in \mathbb{Z}^{L'}$ where $L \subseteq L'$ and $|L'| \leq |\Gamma|$ such that $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, s) = \{\mathbf{v}|_L \mid \mathbf{v} \in \langle \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \rangle, \mathbf{v}|_{L' \setminus L} = \mathbf{0}\}$.*

Proof. Let $B \subseteq U$ be the set and the number $b = \|\mathcal{A}\| \cdot 2^{O(|U|)}$ from Lemma 6.2. The idea is to maintain the B -counters in the state and the $(U \setminus B)$ -counters using \mathbb{Z} -counters. Let Γ' be the looped clique with vertex set $L' = (U \setminus B) \cup L$. Let \mathcal{A}' be the valence system over Γ' with the state set $Q \times [0, b]^B$. For every transition $p \xrightarrow{u} q$ in \mathcal{A} and vectors $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in [0, b]^B$ we add a transition $(p, \mathbf{a}) \xrightarrow{\pi_L \cdot \mathbf{u}} (q, \mathbf{b})$ to \mathcal{A}' if $\mathbf{a} \oplus \Psi_B(w) = \mathbf{b}$. Clearly \mathcal{A}' is bidirected. In the following we will prove that

$$(11) \quad \text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, s) = \{\Phi_L(w') \mid (s, \mathbf{0}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{A}'} (s, \mathbf{0}), \Phi_{U \setminus B}(w') = \mathbf{0}\}.$$

If this is proven then by Lemma 4.2 we can compute vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \in \mathbb{Z}^{L'}$ such that $\langle \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \rangle = \{\Phi_{L'}(w') \mid (s, \mathbf{0}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{A}'} (s, \mathbf{0})\}$. Therefore $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, s) = \{\mathbf{v}|_L \mid \mathbf{v} \in \langle \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \rangle, \mathbf{v}|_{L' \setminus L} = \mathbf{0}\}$.

It remains to prove (11). If $s = s_0 \xrightarrow{w_1} s_1 \xrightarrow{w_2} \dots \xrightarrow{w_n} s_n = s$ is a run in \mathcal{A} with $\Psi_U(w_1 \dots w_n) = \mathbf{0}$ then $(s_0, \mathbf{b}_0) \xrightarrow{\pi(\mathbf{u}_1)} (s_1, \mathbf{b}_1) \xrightarrow{\pi(\mathbf{u}_2)} \dots \xrightarrow{\pi(\mathbf{u}_n)} (s_n, \mathbf{b}_n)$ is a run in \mathcal{A}' where $\mathbf{b}_i = \Psi_B(w_1 \dots w_i)$ for all $i \in [0, n]$ and $\mathbf{b}_n = \mathbf{0}$. Observe that $\Psi_U(w_1 \dots w_i) \in \text{Reach}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, s_i)$ and hence $\mathbf{b}_i \in [0, b]^B$ by Lemma 6.2. Furthermore we have $\Phi_L(\pi(w_1) \dots \pi(w_n)) = \Phi_L(w_1 \dots w_n)$ and $\Phi_{U \setminus B}(\pi(w_1) \dots \pi(w_n)) = \Phi_{U \setminus B}(w_1 \dots w_n) = \mathbf{0}$.

Conversely, suppose there is a run $(s_0, \mathbf{b}_0) \xrightarrow{\pi(\mathbf{u}_1)} (s_1, \mathbf{b}_1) \xrightarrow{\pi(\mathbf{u}_2)} \dots \xrightarrow{\pi(\mathbf{u}_n)} (s_n, \mathbf{b}_n)$ in \mathcal{A}' with $s_0 = s$ and $s_n = s$ for some run $s_0 \xrightarrow{w_1} \dots \xrightarrow{w_n} s_n$ satisfying $\mathbf{b}_i = \bigoplus_{j=1}^i \Psi_B(w_j) = \Psi_B(w_1 \dots w_i)$ and $\mathbf{b}_n = \mathbf{0}$. Furthermore we have $\Phi_{U \setminus B}(w_1 \dots w_n) = \Phi_{U \setminus B}(\pi(w_1) \dots \pi(w_n)) = \mathbf{0}$. Let $\mathbf{u}_i = \Psi_{U \setminus B}(w_1 \dots w_i)$ for all $i \in [0, n]$. Let $c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $c \oplus \mathbf{u}_i(u) \in \mathbb{N}$ for all $i \in [0, n]$ and $u \in U \setminus B$. By assumption there exists a run $s \xrightarrow{w} s$ in \mathcal{A} such that $\Psi_U(w) \in \mathbb{N}^U$ and $\Psi_U(w)(u) \geq c$ for all $u \in U \setminus B$. Then $s \xrightarrow{w} s \xrightarrow{w_1 \dots w_n} s \xrightarrow{\bar{w}} s$ is a run in \mathcal{A} with $\Phi_L(w w_1 \dots w_n \bar{w}) = \Phi_L(w_1 \dots w_n) = \Phi_L(\pi(w_1) \dots \pi(w_n))$. It remains to prove that $\Psi_U(w w_1 \dots w_n \bar{w}) = \mathbf{0}$. Observe that

$$\Psi_B(w w_1 \dots w_n \bar{w}) = \Psi_B(w) \oplus \Psi_B(w_1 \dots w_n) \oplus \Psi_B(\bar{w}) = \Psi_B(w) \oplus \Psi_B(\bar{w}) = \mathbf{0}.$$

where the second equality follows from $\mathbf{b}_n = \Psi(w_1 \dots w_n) = \mathbf{0}$ and the third equality follows from $\Psi_B(w) \in \mathbb{N}^B$. To show $\Psi_{U \setminus B}(w w_1 \dots w_n \bar{w}) = \mathbf{0}$, we only need to prove that $\Psi_{U \setminus B}(w w_1 \dots w_i) \in \mathbb{N}^{U \setminus B}$ for all $i \in [0, n]$ since $\Phi_{U \setminus B}(w_1 \dots w_n) = \mathbf{0}$. This holds because $\Psi_{U \setminus B}(w w_1 \dots w_i)(u) = \Psi_{U \setminus B}(w)(u) \oplus \Psi_{U \setminus B}(w_1 \dots w_i)(u)$, $\Psi_{U \setminus B}(w)(u) \geq c$ and $c \oplus \Psi_{U \setminus B}(w_1 \dots w_i)(u) \in \mathbb{N}$ for all $u \in U \setminus B$. This concludes the proof. \square

Theorem 6.5. *Given a clique $\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}$, a bidirected valence system $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \rightarrow)$ over Γ , and states $s, t \in Q$, one can test in exponential space (polynomial time if \mathcal{G} is UC-bounded) if $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t)$ is nonempty and, if so, compute a coset representation $\mathbf{u} + \langle \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \rangle$ for $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t)$.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Proposition 6.4. To compute a generating set for $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, s)$ we compute the vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \in \mathbb{Z}^{L'}$ with $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, s) = \{\mathbf{v}|_L \mid \mathbf{v} \in \langle \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \rangle, \mathbf{v}|_{L' \setminus L} = \mathbf{0}\}$, which is a projection of a solution set of a linear Diophantine system. By [6] we can compute in polynomial time $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m \in \mathbb{Z}^L$ with $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, s) = \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m \rangle$. Using Lemma 6.1 we can test whether $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t) \neq \emptyset$, and, if so, find $\mathbf{u} \in \text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t)$ in exponential space (log-space if \mathcal{G} is UC-bounded). This gives us the representation $\mathbf{u} + \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m \rangle$ for $\text{Eff}_{\mathcal{A}}(s, t)$. \square

APPENDIX D. ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FOR SECTION 7

D.1. Placeholder runs. In this section, we prove Proposition 7.2.

Proof of Proposition 7.2. Proof. We say that an almost R -placeholder run in τ is *realizable* if all $\tau' \in R$ are realizable. Let E'_τ be the set of all effects of an almost placeholder run in τ . Observe that $E'_\tau \cap Z_\tau = E_\tau$. Hence it remains to show that $W_\tau = E'_\tau$. Since the sets W_τ and E'_τ are defined inductively it is natural to prove both inclusions of $W_\tau = E'_\tau$ by inductions on the number of rules needed to witness that an element belongs to the sets.

First we prove $W_\tau \subseteq E'_\tau$ for all $\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})$. Let $W_\tau^{(0)} \subseteq W_\tau^{(1)} \subseteq \dots$ be the smallest sets satisfying:

- (1) If s is a leaf and $R \subseteq \{\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A}) \mid W_\tau^{(k)} \cap Z_\tau \neq \emptyset\}$ then $E'^{R}_{(p, s^\Delta, q)} \subseteq W_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}^{(k+1)}$.
- (2) If r^x is above s^y and $W_{(p, s^y, q)}^{(k)} \cap Z_{s^y} \neq \emptyset$, then $W_{(p, s^y, q)}^{(k)} \cap Y_{r^x} \subseteq W_{(p, r^x, q)}^{(k+1)}$.
- (3) If r^x is above s^y and $W_{(p, r^x, q)}^{(k)} \cap Z_{r^x} \neq \emptyset$, then $(p, r^x, q) \in W_{(p, s^y, q)}^{(k+1)}$.
- (4) If $(p', r^x, q') + \mu \in W_{(p, r^x, q)}^{(k)}$ and $\nu \in W_{(p', r^x, q')}^{(k)}$, then $\nu + \mu \in W_{(p, r^x, q)}^{(k+1)}$.

We prove $W_\tau^{(k)} \subseteq E'_\tau$ for all $\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})$ by induction on k .

- (1) Let $R \subseteq \{\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A}) \mid W_\tau^{(k)} \cap Z_\tau \neq \emptyset\}$. Since $E'^{R}_{(p, s^\Delta, q)} \subseteq W_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}^{(k+1)}$ we need to show that $E'^{R}_{(p, s^\Delta, q)} \subseteq E'_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}$. By induction hypothesis we know that $W_\tau^{(k)} \cap Z_\tau \subseteq E'_\tau \cap Z_\tau = E_\tau$ for all $\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})$. Therefore all $\tau \in R$ are realizable, which implies $E'^{R}_{(p, s^\Delta, q)} \subseteq E'_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}$.
- (2) Suppose that r^x is above s^y and $W_{(p, s^y, q)}^{(k)} \cap Z_{s^y} \neq \emptyset$. Take $\kappa \in W_{(p, s^y, q)}^{(k)} \cap Y_{r^x}$. The goal is to show that $\kappa \in E'_{(p, r^x, q)}$. By induction hypothesis $\kappa \in E'_{(p, s^y, q)}$, i.e. κ is the effect of a realizable almost placeholder run

$$\sigma: (q_0 \xrightarrow{w_1} p_1)(p_1, s_1^{x_1}, q_1)(q_1 \xrightarrow{w_2} p_2) \cdots (p_m, s_m^{x_m}, q_m)(q_m \xrightarrow{w_{m+1}} p_{m+1})$$

in (p, s^y, q) . In particular, all $s_i^{x_i}$ are above or equal to s^y . Indeed, all such $s_i^{x_i}$ are above r^x or equal to r^x since $\kappa \in Y_{r^x}$. Furthermore we have $\tilde{\pi}_{r^\Delta}(w_1 \cdots w_m) = 1$: First all runs $q_i \xrightarrow{w_i} p_{i+1}$ are in \mathcal{A}_s . We know $\tilde{\pi}_{s^\Delta}(w_1 \cdots w_m) = 1$ and $\hat{\pi}_{s^\Delta}(w_1 \cdots w_m)(v) = 0$ for all $v \in \check{V}_{r^\Delta}$ because $\kappa \in Y_{r^x}$. Hence σ is a realizable almost placeholder run in (p, r^x, q) and therefore $\kappa \in E'_{(p, r^x, q)}$.

- (3) Suppose that r^x is above s^y and $W_{(p, r^x, q)}^{(k)} \cap Z_{r^x} \neq \emptyset$. The goal is to show that $(p, r^x, q) \in E'_{(p, s^y, q)}$. By induction hypothesis there exists $\kappa \in E'_{(p, r^x, q)} \cap Z_{r^x}$, which is the effect of a realizable almost placeholder run σ in (p, r^x, q) . In fact σ is a realizable placeholder run since $\kappa \in Z_{r^x}$. Therefore (p, r^x, q) is realizable, and thus (p, r^x, q) is a realizable almost placeholder run in (p, s^y, q) , with effect $(p, r^x, q) \in E'_{(p, s^y, q)}$.
- (4) Suppose that $(p', r^x, q') + \mu \in W_{(p, r^x, q)}^{(k)}$ and $\nu \in W_{(p', r^x, q')}^{(k)}$. The goal is to show that $\nu + \mu \in E'_{(p, r^x, q)}$. By induction hypothesis $(p', r^x, q') + \mu \in E'_{(p, r^x, q)}$ and $\nu \in E'_{(p', r^x, q')}$, i.e. $(p', r^x, q') + \mu$ is the effect of a realizable almost placeholder run σ_1 in (p, r^x, q) and ν is the effect of a realizable almost placeholder

run σ_2 in (p', r^x, q') . Let σ be obtained from σ_1 by replacing any occurrence of the placeholder (p', r^x, q') by σ_2 . Observe that σ is a realizable almost placeholder run in (p, r^x, q) with effect $\nu + \mu$, and hence $\nu + \mu \in E'_{(p, r^x, q)}$.

For the converse direction, we show for all $\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})$ and all realizable almost placeholder runs σ that its effect belongs to W_τ , by lexicographic induction, where we first order by the *weight* of σ and then by the “below” order on the node descriptions s^x in τ . For every realizable almost placeholder run σ in τ we inductively define a *weight*: If $\sigma = \sigma_0(p_1, s_1^{x_1}, q_1)\sigma_1 \cdots (p_m, s_m^{x_m}, q_m)\sigma_m$ then its weight is $|\sigma_0 \cdots \sigma_m| + \sum_{i=1}^m \omega_i$ where $|\sigma_0 \cdots \sigma_m|$ is the total number of edges used in the runs σ_i , and ω_i is the minimal weight of a realizable placeholder run in $(p_i, s_i^{x_i}, q_i)$.

For the induction base we consider a realizable almost placeholder run consisting of a single transition (p, w, q) in (p, s^Δ, q) for some leaf s . Its effect is contained in $E'^{\emptyset}_{(p, s^\Delta, q)} \subseteq W_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}$ by (1).

For the induction step consider a realizable almost placeholder run

$$\sigma = \sigma_0(p_1, s_1^{x_1}, q_1)\sigma_1 \cdots (p_m, s_m^{x_m}, q_m)\sigma_m$$

in (p, s^x, q) , i.e. (i) $p = q_0$ and $q = p_{m+1}$, (ii) for $i \in [1, m]$, $s_i^{x_i}$ is above or equal to s^x and $(p_i, s_i^{x_i}, q_i)$ is realizable, (iii) $\sigma_i: q_i \xrightarrow{w_i} p_{i+1}$ is a run in \mathcal{A}_s for each $i \in [0, m]$ and (iv) $\tilde{\pi}_{s^\Delta}(w_1 \cdots w_m) = 1$.

- (1) If $s^x = s^\Delta$ then σ is a realizable placeholder run in (p, s^Δ, q) . By induction hypothesis the effect κ of σ is contained in $W_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}$. From $\kappa \in Z_{s^\Delta} = Y_{s^\Delta}$ and (2) we obtain $\kappa \in W_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}$.
- (2) Now assume that $s^x = s^\Delta$ and let t_1, \dots, t_k be the immediate subtrees of s . Let u be the projection of $w_1 \cdots w_m$ to the alphabet $\check{V}_{s^\Delta} \cup \check{\check{V}}_{s^\Delta}$, which satisfies $u \equiv_\Gamma \varepsilon$. We can uniquely factorize $u = u_1 \cdots u_n$ where $u_i \in (\check{V}_{t_{i_j}^\Delta} \cup \check{\check{V}}_{t_{i_j}^\Delta})^+$ for some $i_1, \dots, i_n \in [1, k]$ with $i_j \neq i_{j+1}$ for all $j \in [1, n-1]$.
 - (a) If $n = 1$ then $u \in (\check{V}_{t_{i_1}^\Delta} \cup \check{\check{V}}_{t_{i_1}^\Delta})^*$ and hence the runs $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_m$ are runs in $\mathcal{A}_{t_{i_1}^\Delta}$. Therefore σ is a realizable placeholder run in $(p, t_{i_1}^\Delta, q)$. By induction hypothesis the effect κ of σ is contained in $W_{(p, t_{i_1}^\Delta, q)}$. From $\kappa \in Z_{t_{i_1}^\Delta} \subseteq Y_{s^\Delta}$ and (2) we obtain $\kappa \in W_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}$.
 - (b) If $n > 2$ then there exists $\ell \in [1, n]$ such that $u_\ell \equiv_\Gamma \varepsilon$ by properties of a free product of monoids. There exists a placeholder run σ' contained in σ of the form

$$\sigma' = \sigma'_i(p_i, s_i^{x_i}, q_i)\sigma_{i+1} \cdots \sigma_{j-1}(p_j, s_j^{x_j}, q_j)\sigma'_j,$$

where $\sigma'_i: q'_{i-1} \xrightarrow{w'_i} p_i$ is a suffix of σ_i , and $\sigma'_j: q_j \xrightarrow{w'_j} p'_{i+1}$ is a prefix of σ_j , and u_ℓ is the projection of $w'_i w_{i+1} \cdots w_{j-1} w'_j$ to $\check{V}_{s^\Delta} \cup \check{\check{V}}_{s^\Delta}$. Since σ is a realizable almost placeholder run in (p, s^Δ, q) , σ' is a realizable almost placeholder run in $(q'_{i-1}, s^\Delta, p'_{i+1})$. Observe that $(q'_{i-1}, s^\Delta, p'_{i+1})$ is realizable since we can replace in σ' all placeholders of the form (p_h, s^Δ, q_h) by realizable placeholder runs in (p_h, s^Δ, q_h) to obtain a realizable placeholder run in $(q'_{i-1}, s^\Delta, p'_{i+1})$. Let ν be the effect of σ' and μ be the effect of σ without σ' . We can then replace σ' in σ by the realizable placeholder $(q'_{i-1}, s^\Delta, p'_{i+1})$ to obtain an almost placeholder run σ'' in (p, s^Δ, q) with effect $(q'_{i-1}, s^\Delta, p'_{i+1}) + \mu$. Observe that σ' and σ'' have smaller weight than σ . By induction hypothesis we know that $\nu \in W_{(q'_{i-1}, s^\Delta, p'_{i+1})}$ and $(q'_{i-1}, s^\Delta, p'_{i+1}) + \mu \in W_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}$. By (4) the effect $\nu + \mu$ of σ belongs to $W_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}$, as desired. □

D.2. Languages generated by the constructed grammar. In this section, we prove that $L(\tau) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $W_\tau^R \neq \emptyset$. We prove that $L(\tau) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $W_\tau^R \cap Z_\tau \neq \emptyset$ by showing that (i) $W_\tau^R \cap Z_\tau \subseteq L(\tau)$ for every $\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})$ and that (ii) for every $\mathbf{u} \in L(\tau)$ with $\tau \in N_i$, there exists a $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_i$ such that $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{d} \in W_\tau^R \cap Z_\tau$. □

Here, Δ_i is defined as follows. For $i \in [0, k-1]$, we define $\Delta_i \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\rho(\mathcal{A})}$ as the submonoid generated by all $a + a^\dagger$ with $a \in R_{[i+1, k]}$. Moreover, Δ_k consists just of $\mathbf{0}$. Thus, we establish the following two facts.

Proposition D.1. *For every $\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})$, we have $W_\tau^R \cap Z_\tau \subseteq L(\tau)$.*

Proposition D.2. *For every $\tau \in \rho(\mathcal{A})$ with $\tau \in N_i$ and every $\mathbf{u} \in L(\tau)$, there exists a $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_i$ such that $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{d} \in W_\tau^R \cap Z_\tau$.*

Observe that Propositions D.1 and D.2 together imply that $L(\tau) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $W_\tau^R \neq \emptyset$.

We begin with Proposition D.1. We show Proposition D.1 by proving that for every $\mathbf{u} \in W_\tau^R$ with $\mathbf{u} \in N_i$, we have $\tau \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}$ in the grammar. This implies that $W_\tau^R \cap Z_\tau \subseteq L(\tau)$. We first prove two auxiliary lemmas.

Theorem D.3. *For every $a \in R_0$, we have $a + a^\dagger \xrightarrow{*}_0 \mathbf{0}$.*

Proof. Let $a = (p, s^\Delta, q)$ for some leaf s of t and states $p, q \in Q$ and suppose $p \ll q$ (the other case is symmetric). We use each of the productions in (5) once to obtain

$$a + a^\dagger = (p, s^\Delta, q) + (q, s^\Delta, p) \Rightarrow_0 z_{p, s^\Delta, q} + (q, s^\Delta, p) \Rightarrow_0 z_{p, s^\Delta, q} - z_{p, s^\Delta, q} = \mathbf{0}.$$

□

Theorem D.4. *For any $p, q \in Q$ and every leaf s with $a = (p, s^\Delta, q) \in R$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \text{Eff}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}_s}(p, q)$, we have $(p, s^\Delta, q) \xrightarrow{*}_0 \mathbf{x}$.*

Proof. Suppose s is a leaf of t and $\mathbf{x} \in \text{Eff}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}_s}(p, q)$. In the construction of the grammar, we compute $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n \in \mathbb{Z}^{R_s \cup L_s}$ so that $\text{Eff}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}_s}(p, q) = \mathbf{v} + \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n \rangle$. Therefore, we can write $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{v} + x_1 \cdot \mathbf{u}_1 + \dots + x_n \cdot \mathbf{u}_n + x'_1 \cdot (-\mathbf{u}_1) + \dots + x'_n \cdot (-\mathbf{u}_n)$ for some $x_1, \dots, x_n, x'_1, \dots, x'_n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that we can derive

$$(p, s^\Delta, q) \xrightarrow{*}_0 \alpha(\mathbf{v}) + \sum_{j=1}^n x_j \cdot \alpha(\mathbf{u}_j) + x'_j \cdot \alpha(-\mathbf{u}_j)$$

by using each production $(p, s^\Delta, q) \rightarrow (p, s^\Delta, q) + \alpha(\mathbf{u}_j)$ exactly x_j -times, then each production $(p, s^\Delta, q) \rightarrow (p, s^\Delta, q) + \alpha(-\mathbf{u}_j)$ exactly x'_j -times and finally the production $(p, s^\Delta, q) \rightarrow \alpha(\mathbf{v})$ once. Let us denote the derived vector by \mathbf{y} .

Now observe that the vector $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}$ can be written as a sum of vectors $c + c^\dagger$ with $c \in R_0$. By Lemma D.3, we can derive $c + c^\dagger \xrightarrow{*}_0 \mathbf{0}$ for each such c . This implies that $\mathbf{y} \xrightarrow{*}_0 \mathbf{x}$. □

The first step is to prove this for $\tau = (p, s^\Delta, q)$, where s is a leaf. In this case, we have to show the following.

Theorem D.5. *For every leaf s of t and every $p, q \in Q$ and every $\mathbf{x} \in E'_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}{}^R$, we have $\tau \xrightarrow{*}_0 \mathbf{x}$.*

Proof. Let

$$(q_0, w_1, p_1)(p_1, s_1^{x_1}, q_1)(q_1, w_2, p_2) \cdots (p_m, s_m^{x_m}, q_m)(q_m, w_m, p_{m+1})$$

be an almost R -placeholder run in (p, s^Δ, q) . We want to show that its effect $\mathbf{x} = (p_1, s_1^{x_1}, q_1) + \dots + (p_m, s_m^{x_m}, q_m) + \hat{\pi}_{s^\Delta}(w_1 \cdots w_m) \in \mathbb{N}^{\rho(\mathcal{A})} + \mathbb{Z}^T$ satisfies $\tau \xrightarrow{*}_0 \mathbf{x}$.

Since this is an almost R -placeholder run, we have $(p_j, s_j^{x_j}, q_j) \in R$ for $j \in [1, m]$ and since R is admissible, this implies that $(p_j, s^\Delta, q_j) \in R$ for each $j \in [1, m]$. Therefore, the sequence

$$(q_0, w_1, p_1)(p_1, s^\Delta, q_1)(q_1, w_2, p_2) \cdots (p_m, s^\Delta, q_m)(q_m, w_m, p_{m+1})$$

is also an almost R -placeholder run. By definition of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_s$, this implies that $\mathbf{y} := (p_1, s^\Delta, q_1) + \dots + (p_m, s^\Delta, q_m) + \hat{\pi}_{s^\Delta}(w_1 \cdots w_m)$ belongs to $\text{Eff}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}_s}(p, q)$. According to Lemma D.4, we have $(p, s^\Delta, q) \xrightarrow{*}_0 \mathbf{y}$.

Since furthermore, we have a production $(p_j, s^\Delta, q_j) \rightarrow (p_j, s_j^{x_j}, q_j)$ for each $j \in [1, m]$, we can derive $\mathbf{y} \xrightarrow{*}_0 \mathbf{x}$. Hence we have $(p, s^\Delta, q) \xrightarrow{*}_0 \mathbf{x}$. \square

We are now ready to prove Proposition D.1.

Proof of Proposition D.1. As mentioned above, we prove that for every $\mathbf{u} \in W_\tau^R$ with $\tau \in N_i$, we have $\tau \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}$.

We proceed by induction on the number of rule applications used to conclude that $\mathbf{u} \in W_\tau^R$. In other words, we proceed by induction on n and we assume that $\tau \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}$ if \mathbf{u} 's membership in W_τ^R can be derived in $< n$ steps. And we prove that then every \mathbf{u}' , whose membership can be derived in n steps, also satisfies $\tau \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}'$.

The induction base is done in Lemma D.5. So suppose \mathbf{u} belongs to W_τ^R and can be derived in n steps. We consider each rule in the definition of W_τ^R :

- (1) Suppose r^x is above s^y and $(p, s^y, q) \in R$ and $\mathbf{u} \in W_{(p, s^y, q)}^R \cap Y_{r^x}$. Then since $\mathbf{u} \in W_{(p, s^y, q)}^R$ and can be derived in $< n$ steps, we know by induction that $(p, s^y, q) \xrightarrow{*}_{i'} \mathbf{u}$, where i' is the level of s^y .
Since $(p, s^y, q) \in R$, there is a production $(p, r^x, q) \rightarrow (p, s^y, q)$. Moreover, the fact that $\mathbf{u} \in Y_{r^x}$ allows us to conclude $(p, r^x, q) \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}$.
- (2) Suppose r^x is above s^y and $(p, r^x, q) \in R$. Then there is a production $(p, s^y, q) \rightarrow (p, r^x, q)$ in the grammar and hence we have $(p, s^y, q) \Rightarrow_i (p, r^x, q)$, where i the level of s^y .
- (3) Suppose $(p', r^x, q') + \mathbf{u} \in W_{(p', r^x, q')}^R$ and $\mathbf{v} \in W_{(p', r^x, q')}^R$, where the memberships $(p', r^x, q') + \mathbf{u} \in W_{(p', r^x, q')}^R$ and $\mathbf{v} \in W_{(p', r^x, q')}^R$ can be derived in $< n$ steps. We have to show that then $(p, r^x, q) \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}$, where i the level of r^x .
By induction, we know that $(p, r^x, q) \xrightarrow{*}_i (p', r^x, q') + \mathbf{u}$ and that $(p', r^x, q') \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{v}$. By applying these derivations one after the other, we obtain $(p, r^x, q) \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}$.

This establishes that indeed for every $\mathbf{u} \in W_\tau^R$ with $\tau \in N_i$, we have $\tau \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}$. This implies the inclusion $W_\tau^R \cap Z_\tau \subseteq L(\tau)$: If $\mathbf{u} \in W_\tau^R$, then we know $\tau \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}$. Since furthermore $\mathbf{u} \in Z_\tau$, we even have $\mathbf{u} \in L(\tau)$. \square

Our next step is to prove Proposition D.2. We begin with the case that $\tau = (p, s^\Delta, q)$ for some leaf s of t .

Theorem D.6. *Let s be a leaf of t and $p, q \in Q$. For every $\mathbf{u} \in L(p, s^\Delta, q)$, there exists a $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_0$ such that $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{d} \in W_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}^R \cap Z_{s^\Delta}$.*

Proof. We first observe that if $(p, s^\Delta, q) \xrightarrow{*}_0 \mathbf{u}'$ using only productions (2) to (4) and Item (C1), then $\mathbf{u}' \in E_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}^{R}$. This follows by induction from the construction of the productions (2) to (4). For this, also note that each element $\alpha(\mathbf{u}_j)$ and $\alpha(-\mathbf{u}_j)$ in (2) and (3) belongs to $\text{Eff}_{\hat{A}_s}(p, p)$.

Now let $\mathbf{u} \in L(p, s^\Delta, q)$. Then \mathbf{u} is obtained using both (i) productions (2) to (4) and Item (C1) and (ii) the productions in (5). This means, there is a \mathbf{u}' obtained from (p, s^Δ, q) using (2) to (4) and Item (C1) with $(p, s^\Delta, q) \xrightarrow{*}_0 \mathbf{u}'$, such that \mathbf{u} is obtained from \mathbf{u}' by applying productions in (5). Since $\mathbf{u} \in L(p, s^\Delta, q)$ contains no level-0 terminal symbols, the productions in (5) must have been applied pairwise. This means, we have $\mathbf{u}' = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{d}'$ for some $\mathbf{d}' = (b_1 + b_1^\dagger) + \dots + (b_r + b_r^\dagger)$ with $b_1, \dots, b_r \in R_0$. Since R is admissible, this implies that for each $j \in [1, r]$, we have $W_{b_j}^R \cap Z_{b_j} \neq \emptyset$ and also $W_{b_j^\dagger}^R \cap Z_{b_j^\dagger} \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, we can replace in \mathbf{d}' each b_j by the effect \mathbf{u}_j of an R -placeholder run in b_j and we can replace b_j^\dagger by \mathbf{u}_j^\dagger : Note that \mathbf{u}_j^\dagger is the effect of an R -placeholder run in b_j^\dagger . Let \mathbf{d} be the resulting vector in $\mathbb{N}^{\rho(\mathcal{A})}$. Then clearly $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_0$. Moreover, we have $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{d} \in W_{(p, s^\Delta, q)}^R \cap Z_{s^\Delta}$. \square

We are now ready to prove Proposition D.2.

Proof of Proposition D.2. We prove the statement by induction on i : Lemma D.6 is the case $i = 0$. Now suppose the statement holds for all $i' < i$. To prove the statement for i , we apply another induction by the number of derivation steps to derive an element of $L(\tau)$. More precisely, we show that for any $n \geq 1$, if $\tau \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}$ in at most n steps, then there exists a $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_i$ such that $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{d} \in W_\tau^R$. Suppose this holds for all step counts $< n$.

Let $\tau \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}$ in n steps with $\tau \in N_i$. We distinguish two cases.

- (1) Suppose $n = 1$. Then there is a $\tau' \in N_{i'}$ for some $i' < i$ such that $\tau' \xrightarrow{*}_{i'} \mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{u} \in L(\tau') \cap S_{i-1}$. Since $\mathbf{u} \in L(\tau')$, our induction hypothesis on i' yields some $\mathbf{d}' \in \Delta_{i'}$ such that $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{d}' \in W_{\tau'}^R \cap Z_{\tau'}$.

Since $\mathbf{u} \in S_{i-1}$, we also have $\mathbf{u}' \in Y_\tau$.

Therefore, it follows from the definition of W_τ^R that there is a $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_i$ with $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{d} \in W_\tau^R$.

- (2) Suppose $n > 1$ and write $\tau = (p, r^x, q)$. Then there is a \mathbf{u}' such that $(p, r^x, q) \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}'$ in $< n$ steps and $\mathbf{u}' = (p', r^x, q') + \mathbf{v}$ and some \mathbf{x} with $(p', r^x, q') \Rightarrow_i \mathbf{x}$ so that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}$. By our induction hypothesis, we know that there is a $\mathbf{d}' \in \Delta_i$ such that $\mathbf{u}' + \mathbf{d}' \in W_{(p', r^x, q')}^R$. Moreover, there is a $\tilde{\mathbf{d}} \in \Delta_i$ with $\mathbf{x} + \tilde{\mathbf{d}} \in W_{(p', r^x, q')}^R$. According to the last rule in the definition of W_τ^R , this implies that $\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{d}' + \mathbf{x} + \tilde{\mathbf{d}} \in W_{(p, r^x, q)}^R$. In particular, we have $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{d}' + \tilde{\mathbf{d}} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d}' + \tilde{\mathbf{d}} \in W_\tau^R$. Since $\mathbf{d}' + \tilde{\mathbf{d}} \in \Delta_i$, this proves our claim. \square

D.3. Reversibility of the constructed grammar. We have already verified conditions Items 1 to 4. It remains to show the following.

Theorem D.7. *The constructed grammar satisfies Item 5 of the reversibility conditions.*

Proof. The property Item 5 is clear immediately except for the productions in (2) and (3). Let us first prove the property for a production $(p, s^\Delta, q) \rightarrow \mathbf{u}$ with $\mathbf{u} = \alpha(\mathbf{v})$ on the left of (2). Write $\mathbf{u} = b + \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}$ for $b \in R_0$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^{R_0}$, and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^T$.

The vector \mathbf{u} is chosen so that $\mathbf{u} = \alpha(\mathbf{v})$ with $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Eff}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}_s}(p, q)$. By construction of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_s$, this implies that there is a run

$$(12) \quad (q_0, w_1, p_1)(p_1, s_1^\Delta, q_1)(q_1, w_2, p_2) \cdots (p_m, s_m^\Delta, q_m)(q_m, w_m, p_{m+1})$$

with $p = p_0$, $q = p_{m+1}$ and $(p_j, s_j^\Delta, q_j) \in R_s$ for $j \in [1, m]$ and there is a run $q_j \xrightarrow{w_j} p_{j+1}$ in \mathcal{A}_s and $[\pi_{s^\Delta}(w_1 \cdots w_m)] = 1$, and $(p_1, s_1^\Delta, q_1) + \cdots + (p_m, s_m^\Delta, q_m) = \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y} = [\hat{\pi}_{s^\Delta}(w_1 \cdots w_m)]$. Let $a = (p, s^\Delta, q)$. Moreover, we assume $b = (p_1, s_1^\Delta, q_1)$: If $b = (p_j, s_j^\Delta, q_j)$, the proof is analogous.

Observe that $(p_1, s_1^\Delta, q_1) \in R_s$ by construction of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_s$. Moreover, consider the sequence

$$(13) \quad (p_1, \bar{w}_1, q_0)(p, s^\Delta, q)(p_{m+1}, \bar{w}_m, q_m)(q_m, s^\Delta, p_m) \cdots (q_2, s^\Delta, p_2)(p_2, \bar{w}_2, q_1).$$

Since $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_s$ is also bidirected, this corresponds to a run in $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_s$ from p_1 to q_1 . Therefore, there is a vector $\mathbf{u}' \in \text{Eff}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}_s}(p_1, q_1)$ with $\mathbf{u}' = (\mathbf{u} - (p_1, s_1^\Delta, q_1))^\dagger + (p, s^\Delta, q)$. According to Lemma D.4, there is a \mathbf{u}'' with $(p_1, s_1^\Delta, q_1) \xrightarrow{*}_0 \mathbf{u}''$ and $\mathbf{u}'' \approx_b \mathbf{u}'$. Since $a \xrightarrow{*} b$, this implies $\mathbf{u}'' \approx_a \mathbf{u}'$. We can therefore derive

$$\mathbf{u} \Rightarrow_0 \mathbf{u} + (p, s^\Delta, q) + (q, s^\Delta, p) \xrightarrow{*}_0 \mathbf{u} - (p_1, s_1^\Delta, p_1) + \mathbf{u}''.$$

Since

$$\mathbf{u}''' := \mathbf{u} - (p_1, s_1^\Delta, q_1) + \mathbf{u}'' \approx_a \mathbf{u} - (p_1, s_1^\Delta, q_1) + (\mathbf{u} - (p_1, s_1^\Delta, q_1))^\dagger + (p, s^\Delta, q) \approx_a \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}^\dagger + (p, s^\Delta, q),$$

the vector \mathbf{u}''' is obtained from $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}^\dagger + (p, s^\Delta, q)$ by adding an element from Δ_a . Finally, Lemma D.3 allows us to derive $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}^\dagger$ to an element that is $\approx_a \mathbf{0}$. In particular, we obtain some \mathbf{u}'''' with $\mathbf{u}''' \xrightarrow{*}_0 \mathbf{u}''''$ with $\mathbf{u}'''' \approx_a (p, s^\Delta, q)$. This concludes the proof for the production $(p, s^\Delta, q) \rightarrow \alpha(\mathbf{v})$.

For productions $(p, s^\Delta, q) \rightarrow \alpha(\mathbf{u}_j)$, we can note that if $\mathbf{v} + \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n \rangle = \text{Eff}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}_s}(p, q)$, then each \mathbf{u}_j belongs to $\text{Eff}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}_s}(p, p)$ and then argue as above. \square

D.4. Properties of bidirected grammars. We begin with some simple observations.

Theorem D.8. *If $G = (N, T, P)$ is bidirected, and $a \in R_i$, then $a \xrightarrow{*}_i a + a + a^\dagger$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on i . For $i = 0$, this is one of the conditions of bidirectedness. For $i > 0$ and $a \in R_i$, we know that there is some $a' \in R_{i-1}$ such that there are productions $a \rightarrow a'$ and $a' \rightarrow a$. By induction, we have $a' \xrightarrow{*}_{i-1} a' + a' + a'^\dagger$. Moreover, since there is a production $a'^\dagger \rightarrow a^\dagger$ and $a \in R_i$ guarantees a production $a' \rightarrow a$, we obtain $a \xrightarrow{*}_i a + a + a^\dagger$. \square

Theorem D.9. *If G is i -bidirected and $a \in R_i$ with $a \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}'$ for some $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}' \in \mathbb{N}^{R_{[i,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i,k]}}$ with $\mathbf{u}' \approx_a \mathbf{u}$, then there is a $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_a$ with $a \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{d}$.*

Proof. First, we claim that for any $a, b \in R_i$ with $a \rightsquigarrow b$, there exists a $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_a$ such that $a \xrightarrow{*}_i a + b + b^\dagger + \mathbf{d}$. If $a \rightsquigarrow b$, there is a $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^{R_{[i,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i,k]}}$ with $a \xrightarrow{*}_i b + \mathbf{v}$ such that $a \Rightarrow_i b + \mathbf{v}$. Since G is i -bidirected, we have $b \xrightarrow{*}_i a + \mathbf{v}'$ for some $\mathbf{v}' \approx_a \mathbf{v}^\dagger$. By Lemma D.8, we have $b \xrightarrow{*}_i b + b + b^\dagger$ and thus $a \xrightarrow{*}_i b + \mathbf{v} \xrightarrow{*}_i b + b + b^\dagger + \mathbf{v} \xrightarrow{*}_i a + \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v}' + b + b^\dagger$. Since $\mathbf{v}' \approx_a \mathbf{v}^\dagger$, we have $\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v}' \in \Delta_a$. This proves our claim.

Now consider $a \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}'$. Since $\mathbf{u}' \approx_a \mathbf{u}$, we know that there exist $\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d}' \in \Delta_a$ with $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{u}' + \mathbf{d}'$. By our claim, we know that there is a $\mathbf{d}'' \in \Delta_a$ such that $a \xrightarrow{*}_i a + \mathbf{d}' + \mathbf{d}''$. Thus, we have $a \xrightarrow{*}_i a + \mathbf{d}' + \mathbf{d}'' \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}' + \mathbf{d}' + \mathbf{d}'' = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{d}$. \square

The following lemma tells us that i -bidirectedness can be checked as a property of each derivation step.

Theorem D.10. *If G is bidirected, then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) G is i -bidirected.
- (2) for every $a \in R_i$ and every step $a \Rightarrow_i b + \mathbf{v}$ with $b \in R_i$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^{R_i} + \mathbb{Z}^T$, there is a $\mathbf{v}' \in \mathbb{N}^{R_i} + \mathbb{Z}^T$ with $b \xrightarrow{*}_i a + \mathbf{v}'$ and $\mathbf{v}' \approx_a \mathbf{v}^\dagger$.

Proof. Clearly, if G is i -bidirected, then the second condition is satisfied, so let us show the converse. First, observe that if the second condition holds, then \rightsquigarrow is symmetric: Indeed, if $a \rightsquigarrow b$, then the condition implies that $b \rightsquigarrow a$. Second, we claim that for any $a, b \in R_i$ with $a \rightsquigarrow b$, there exists a $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_a$ such that $a \xrightarrow{*}_i a + b + b^\dagger + \mathbf{d}$. It clearly suffices to show this in the case $a \rightsquigarrow b$, the general case then follows by induction. If $a \rightsquigarrow b$, there is a $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^{R_{[i,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i,k]}}$ such that $a \Rightarrow_i b + \mathbf{u}$. Since the second condition holds, this implies that $b \xrightarrow{*}_i a + \mathbf{u}'$ for some $\mathbf{u}' \approx_a \mathbf{u}^\dagger$. By Lemma D.8, we have $b \xrightarrow{*}_i b + b + b^\dagger$ and thus $a \xrightarrow{*}_i b + \mathbf{u} \xrightarrow{*}_i b + b + b^\dagger + \mathbf{u} \xrightarrow{*}_i a + \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}' + b + b^\dagger$. Since $\mathbf{u}' \approx_a \mathbf{u}^\dagger$, we have $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}' \in \Delta_a$. Third, our claim implies that if $a \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}'$ for some $\mathbf{u}' \approx_a \mathbf{u}$, then there exists a $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_a$ with $a \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{d}$.

Now suppose $a \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}$ with $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^{R_i}$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^{R_{[i,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i,k]}}$. We pick one letter $b \in R_i$ occurring in \mathbf{u} and write $\mathbf{u} = b + \mathbf{u}'$ for some $\mathbf{u}' \in \mathbb{N}^{R_i}$. In the derivation $a \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}$, we choose the chain a_0, \dots, a_n of nonterminals that leads to b , i.e. $a_0 = a, a_n = b$ and such that a_{j+1} is created by replacing a_j for $j \in [0, n-1]$. Hence, there are vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathbb{N}^{R_{[i,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i,k]}}$ so that we use the productions $a_j \Rightarrow_i a_{j+1} + \mathbf{x}_{j+1}$ for $j \in [0, n-1]$ to obtain b . Then, we have $a_0 \Rightarrow_i a_1 + \mathbf{x}_1 \Rightarrow_i a_2 + \mathbf{x}_2 + \mathbf{x}_1 \Rightarrow_i \dots \Rightarrow_i a_n + \mathbf{x}_n + \dots + \mathbf{x}_1$ and also $\mathbf{x}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{x}_n \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}' + \mathbf{v}$. By the second condition and our observations at the beginning, for each $j \in [1, n]$, there exists a $\mathbf{d}_j \in \Delta_a$ such that $a_j \xrightarrow{*}_i a_{j-1} + \mathbf{x}_j^\dagger + \mathbf{d}_j$. Putting these together, we obtain

$$b = a_n \xrightarrow{*}_i a_0 + \mathbf{x}_1^\dagger + \mathbf{d}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{x}_n^\dagger + \mathbf{d}_n = a + \mathbf{x}_1^\dagger + \dots + \mathbf{x}_n^\dagger + \mathbf{d},$$

where we define $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{d}_n$. Since $\mathbf{x}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{x}_n \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}' + \mathbf{v}$, we therefore have $b \xrightarrow{*}_i a + (\mathbf{u}' + \mathbf{v})^\dagger + \mathbf{d}$ and thus

$$\mathbf{u} = b + \mathbf{u}' \xrightarrow{*}_i a + (\mathbf{u}' + \mathbf{v})^\dagger + \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{u}' = a + \mathbf{u}' + \mathbf{u}'^\dagger + \mathbf{v}^\dagger + \mathbf{d}.$$

Finally, since $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^{R_i}$ and thus $L(c) \neq \emptyset$ for every c occurring in \mathbf{u} (and also $a \rightsquigarrow c$), we know that there is some $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{N}^{R_{[i+1,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i+1,k]}}$ with $\mathbf{u} \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{e}$. But then we have $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}^\dagger \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{e}^\dagger$, where $\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{e}^\dagger \in \Delta_a$. Thus, we have $\mathbf{u} \xrightarrow{*}_i a + \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{e}^\dagger + \mathbf{v}^\dagger + \mathbf{d}$. Now with $\mathbf{v}' = \mathbf{v}^\dagger + \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{e}^\dagger + \mathbf{d}$, we clearly have $\mathbf{v}' \approx_a \mathbf{v}^\dagger$. Thus, G is i -bidirected. \square

Theorem 7.5. *If G is bidirected, then it is i -bidirected for each $i \in [0, k]$.*

Proof. According to Lemma D.10, it suffices to show that for $a \Rightarrow_i b + \mathbf{v}$ with $a, b \in R_i$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^{R_{[i,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i,k]}}$, there exists a $\mathbf{v}' \approx_a \mathbf{v}^\dagger$ with $b \xrightarrow{*}_i a + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}$. If $a \Rightarrow_i b + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}$, then this is due to a production $a \rightarrow \tilde{a}$ for some $\tilde{a} \in R_{i-1}$, a derivation $\tilde{a} \xrightarrow{*}_{i-1} \tilde{b} + \mathbf{v}$, and a production $\tilde{b} \rightarrow b$. Since G is $(i-1)$ -bidirected, there exists a $\mathbf{v}' \approx_{\tilde{a}} \mathbf{v}^\dagger$ and a derivation $\tilde{b} \xrightarrow{*}_{i-1} \tilde{a} + \mathbf{v}'$. Since $\tilde{a} + \mathbf{v}' \approx_{\tilde{a}} \tilde{a} + \mathbf{v}^\dagger$, we know from Lemma D.9 that we can derive $\tilde{b} \xrightarrow{*}_i \tilde{a} + \mathbf{v}^\dagger + \tilde{\mathbf{d}}$ for some $\tilde{\mathbf{d}} \in \Delta_{\tilde{a}}$. Moreover, since $\tilde{\mathbf{d}} \in \Delta_{\tilde{a}}$, there is a $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_a$ with $\tilde{\mathbf{d}} \xrightarrow{*}_{i-1} \mathbf{d}$. Hence, we have $\tilde{b} \xrightarrow{*}_{i-1} \tilde{a} + \mathbf{v}^\dagger + \mathbf{d}$.

Note that since $a, b \in R_i$, we also have productions $b \rightarrow \tilde{b}$ and $\tilde{a} \rightarrow a$, so that we also have $b \Rightarrow_i a + \mathbf{v}^\dagger + \mathbf{d}$. \square

D.5. Expressing emptiness in terms of cosets.

Theorem D.11. *If $G = (N, T, P)$ is i -bidirected, and $a \in R_i$ and $b \in R_i$ with $a \rightsquigarrow b$. Then there is some $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_a$ such that $a \xrightarrow{*}_i a + b + b^\dagger + \mathbf{d}$.*

Proof. Since $a \rightsquigarrow b$, there is some $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{N}^{N_{[i,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i,k]}}$ with $a \xrightarrow{*}_i b + \mathbf{u}$. Since G is i -bidirected, this implies $b \xrightarrow{*}_i a + \mathbf{u}'$ with $\mathbf{u}' \approx_a \mathbf{u}^\dagger$. By Lemma D.8, we know that $b \xrightarrow{*}_i b + b + b^\dagger$. Hence, we have $a \xrightarrow{*}_i b + \mathbf{u} \xrightarrow{*}_i b + b + b^\dagger + \mathbf{u} \xrightarrow{*}_i a + \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}' + b + b^\dagger$. Now observe that since $\mathbf{u}' \approx_a \mathbf{u}^\dagger$, we have $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}' \in \Delta_a$. \square

Theorem 7.8. *If $G = (N, T, P)$ is bidirected and $a \in R_i$, then $D_a \subseteq H_a$.*

Proof. Consider some $b \in R_{i+1}$ with $a \rightsquigarrow b$. Then there must be an $a' \in R_i$ with $a \rightsquigarrow a'$ and a production $a' \rightarrow b$. By Lemma D.8, we have $a' \xrightarrow{*}_i a' + a' + a'^\dagger$ and thus $a' \xrightarrow{*}_i a' + b + b^\dagger$. Therefore, we have $b + b^\dagger \in H_a$. \square

Theorem 7.9. *If $G = (N, T, P)$ is i -bidirected, then for $a \in R_i$, we have*

$$H_a = \{-b + \mathbf{u} \mid \exists b \in R_i: b \Rightarrow_i \mathbf{u} \text{ and } a \rightsquigarrow b\}^* + D_a.$$

Proof. Since G is bidirected, we know that $D_a \subseteq H_a$. Thus, the inclusion “ \supseteq ” is clear. For the the converse, it suffices to show that for every $b \in R_i$ with $a \rightsquigarrow b$ and $b \Rightarrow_i \mathbf{u}$, the vector $-(-b + \mathbf{u})$ belongs to the right-hand side. We write $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{x}$ with $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^{R_i}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^{N_{[i+1,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^T$. Since G is i -bidirected, we know that $\mathbf{v} \xrightarrow{*}_i b + \mathbf{x}'$ such that $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbf{x}^\dagger + D_b$. But this implies $-\mathbf{v} + b + \mathbf{x}'$ belongs to the monoid on the right-hand side. Moreover, the two elements $(-b + \mathbf{u})$ and $-\mathbf{v} + b + \mathbf{x}'$ differ in

$$-(-b + \mathbf{u}) - (-\mathbf{v} + b + \mathbf{x}') = -\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}' \in -\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^\dagger + D_b \subseteq D_b$$

and since $a \rightsquigarrow b$ and G is i -bidirected, we also have $b \rightsquigarrow a$ and thus $D_b = D_a$. Thus $-(-b + \mathbf{u})$ belongs to the right-hand side. \square

Corollary 7.10. *Suppose G is i -bidirected and $a \in N_i$ for $i \in [2, k]$. Then $L(a) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if there is some $a' \in N_{i-1}$ and a production $a \rightarrow a'$ such that $K_{a'} \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Suppose $L(a) \neq \emptyset$. Then there is a derivation $a \Rightarrow_i \mathbf{u}_1 \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}$ with $\mathbf{u} \in S_i$. In particular, the first derivation step must be due to some production $a \rightarrow a'$ with $\mathbf{u}_1 \in L(a')$. This means $a' \in R_{i-1}$ and thus $\mathbf{u}_1 \in L_{a'}$ according to Theorem 7.6. Write $\mathbf{u}_1 = b_1 + \dots + b_n + \mathbf{v}$, where $b_1, \dots, b_n \in R_i$ and

$\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^{N_{[i+1,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i,k]}}$. Since $\mathbf{u}_1 \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}$, we know that for each $j \in [1, n]$, we have $b_j \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{v}_j$ for some $\mathbf{v}_j \in \mathbb{N}^{N_{[i+1,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i,k]}}$ such that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{v}_n + \mathbf{v}$. This means in particular that $\mathbf{v}_j \in M(b_j)$ and thus

$$S_i \ni \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 + (-b_1 + \mathbf{v}_1) + \cdots + (-b_n + \mathbf{v}_n) \in L_{a'} + \langle -b_1 + M_{b_1} \rangle + \cdots + \langle -b_n + M_{b_n} \rangle.$$

Moreover, since $b_1 + \cdots + b_n + \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}_1 \in L(a')$, the nonterminals b_1, \dots, b_n satisfy $a' \xrightarrow{*} b_j$ for $j \in [1, n]$. Thus, \mathbf{u} belongs to $K_{a'}$.

Conversely, suppose $K_{a'} \neq \emptyset$ for some production $a \rightarrow a'$. Then $a' \in R_{i-1}$ and thus $L_{a'} = L(a') + D_{a'}$ according to Theorem 7.6. Consider some $\mathbf{u} \in K_{a'}$ and write $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{v}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{v}_n$ with $\mathbf{u}_1 \in L_{a'}$ and $\mathbf{v}_j = (-1)^{\varepsilon_j}(-b_j + \mathbf{x}_j)$ for some $b_j \in R_i$, $a' \xrightarrow{*} b_j$, and $\mathbf{x}_j \in M_{b_j}$.

In order to construct a derivation, we have to eliminate those summands \mathbf{v}_j with $\varepsilon_j = 1$, because they do not directly correspond to derivation steps. Hence, we define $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_n$ as follows. For $j \in [1, n]$, if $\varepsilon_j = 0$, then $\hat{b}_j = b_j$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_j = \mathbf{x}_j$; if $\varepsilon_j = 1$, then $\hat{b}_j = b_j^\dagger$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_j = \mathbf{x}_j^\dagger$. Then $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_j = -\hat{b}_j + \hat{\mathbf{x}}_j$. Then each difference $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_j - \mathbf{v}_j$ is either $\mathbf{0}$ or $(-b_j^\dagger + \mathbf{x}_j^\dagger) - (-1)(-b_j + \mathbf{x}_j) = -b_j^\dagger - b_j + \mathbf{x}_j^\dagger + \mathbf{x}_j$. Therefore, with $\mathbf{b} = b_1 + b_1^\dagger + \cdots + b_n + b_n^\dagger$ and $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{x}_1^\dagger + \cdots + \mathbf{x}_n + \mathbf{x}_n^\dagger$, we have

$$\mathbf{u}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1 + \cdots + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_n + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{v}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{v}_n + \mathbf{g}.$$

Since $\mathbf{u}_1 \in L(a') + D_{a'}$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \Delta_{a'}$, we have $\mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{b} \in L(a') + D_{a'}$, so that Lemma D.11 implies that we can write $\mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{d}$ with some $\mathbf{y} \in L(a')$ and $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_{a'}$. This implies

$$(14) \quad \mathbf{y} + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1 + \cdots + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_n = \mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{v}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{v}_n + \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{d}.$$

Now notice that since $\mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{d}$, we know that \mathbf{b} must occur in \mathbf{y} . In particular, $\hat{b}_1 + \cdots + \hat{b}_n$ must occur in \mathbf{y} . Hence, we have a derivation $a' \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{y} + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1 + \cdots + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_n$. By (14), we have thus derived $\mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{v}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{v}_n + \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{d}$. Since $\mathbf{u} \in S_i$ and $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{N}^{N_{[i+1,k]}} \subseteq S_i$, it remains to eliminate the level- i nonterminals in \mathbf{d} . However, since $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{N}^{R_i}$, we can pick for each f occurring in \mathbf{d} some $\mathbf{e}_f \in L(e)$, $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{N}^{N_{[i+1,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i+1,k]}}$. Then, if $\mathbf{d} = f_1 + \cdots + f_r$, then we have $a \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{e}_{f_1} + \cdots + \mathbf{e}_{f_r} \in \mathbb{N}^{N_{[i+1,k]}} + \mathbb{Z}^{T_{[i+1,k]}}$. We therefore have $L(a) \neq \emptyset$. \square

D.6. Constructing coset circuits.

Theorem 7.13. *Let A be an abelian group, $g_1, \dots, g_n \in A$, and U and S subgroups such that $(g_i + U) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ for each $i \in [1, n]$. Then we have $\langle (g_1 + U) \cap S, \dots, (g_n + U) \cap S \rangle = \langle (g_1, \dots, g_n) + U \rangle \cap S$.*

Proof. The inclusion “ \subseteq ” is obvious because U and S are subgroups.

Suppose $h = x_1 g_1 + \cdots + x_n g_n + u \in S$ for some $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $u \in U$. Since $(g_i + U) \cap S \neq \emptyset$, we can choose $u_i \in U$ for each $i \in [1, n]$ such that $g_i + u_i \in S$. We compute in the quotient A/S . Note that since $h \in S$ and $g_i + u_i \in S$, we have $[u] = -[x_1 g_1 + \cdots + x_n g_n] = [x_1 u_1 + \cdots + x_n u_n]$ and thus $u - x_1 u_1 - \cdots - x_n u_n \in S$. Therefore, we have

$$(15) \quad h = \underbrace{x_1(g_1 + u_1)}_{\in \langle (g_1 + U) \cap S \rangle} + \cdots + \underbrace{x_n(g_n + u_n)}_{\in \langle (g_n + U) \cap S \rangle} + \underbrace{u - x_1 u_1 - \cdots - x_n u_n}_{\in U \cap S}.$$

This proves that h belongs to the left-hand side of the equation in the lemma, since it is closed under adding $U \cap S$. \square

Theorem 7.12. *Let $G = (N, T, P)$ be a k -bidirected grammar. For every $a \in N_i$, $i \in [2, k]$, we have $H_a = \langle -b + L_c \mid b \in N_i, c \in N_{i-1}, a \xrightarrow{*} b, b \rightarrow c \in P \rangle$.*

Proof. By definition, we have $H_a = \langle -b + L(c) \mid b \in R_i, c \in R_{i-1}, a \xrightarrow{*} b, b \rightarrow c \in P \rangle$. Since Theorem 7.6 tells us that $L_c = L(c) + D_c$, the inclusion “ \subseteq ” is immediate. For “ \supseteq ”, because of $L(c) + D_c$, we shall prove that $D_c \subseteq H_a$. For this, it suffices to prove that every generator $e + e^\dagger$ with $e \in R_i$, $c \xrightarrow{*} e$, of D_c belongs to H_a . Since $c \xrightarrow{*} e$, e appears on a right-hand side of a production and thus $L(e) \neq \emptyset$. Hence, there is some

$\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{N_{[i+1,k]} \cup T}$ with $e \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u}$. This implies that $e + e^\dagger \xrightarrow{*}_i \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}^\dagger$. Since $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}^\dagger \in D_a \subseteq H_a$ (by Lemma D.8) and $e + e^\dagger - (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}^\dagger) \in H_a$, this proves that $e + e^\dagger \in H_a$. \square

D.7. From coset circuits to linear Diophantine equations.

Theorem 7.16. *The problem BIREACH(SC $^\pm$) is in EXPSPACE.*

Proof. We again proceed as in Theorem 7.14 and in Theorem 7.15. However, since now even d is part of the input, when we construct the grammar, the algorithm from Theorem 6.5 runs in exponential space. However, the dimensions of all vectors in the grammar are still polynomial. Therefore, our coset circuit has linear depth and the matrices labeling its leaves have entries that require exponentially many bits. The resulting matrix for each gate therefore has an exponential number of rows and columns and its entries require at most exponentially many bits. Thus, we can again apply Theorem 3.2 to check emptiness of the gate in exponential time. All together, we obtain an exponential space algorithm. \square