# Normal and Sinkless Petri Nets* 

Rodney R. Howell<br>Department of Computing and Information Sciences, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506

Louis E. Rosier ${ }^{\dagger}$

Department of Computer Sciences, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712

AND<br>Hsu-Chun Yen<br>Department of Electrical Engineering, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China

Received December 12, 1988; revised May 22, 1991


#### Abstract

We examine both the modeling power of normal and sinkless Petri nets and the computational complexities of various classical decision problems with respect to these two classes. We argue that although neither normal nor sinkless Petri nets are strictly more powerful than persistent Petri nets, they nonetheless are both capable of modeling a more interesting class of problems. On the other hand, we give strong evidence that normal and sinkless Petri nets are easier to analyze than persistent Petri nets. In so doing, we apply techniques originally developed for conflict-free Petri nets-a class defined solely in terms of the structure of the net-to sinkless Petri nets-a class defined in terms of the behavior of the net. As a result, we give the first comprehensive complexity analysis of a class of potentially unbounded Petri nets defined in terms of their behavior. © 1993 Academic Press, Inc.


## 1. Introduction

Many aspects of the fundamental nature of computation are often studied via formal models, such as Turing machines, finite-state machines, and push-down automata (see, e.g., [HU79]). One formalism that has been used to model parallel computations is the Petri net (PN) [Pet81, Rei85]. As a means of gaining a better understanding of the PN model, the decidability and computational complexity of

[^0]typical automata theoretic problems concerning PNs have been examined. These problems include boundedness, reachability, containment, and equivalence. Lipton [Lip76] and Rackoff [Rac78] have shown exponential space lower and upper bounds, respectively, for the boundedness problem. Also, Rabin [Bak73] and Hack [Hac76] have shown the containment and equivalence problems, respectively, to be undecidable. No tight bounds, however, have yet been established for the complexity of the reachability problem. The best lower bound known for this problem is exponential space [Lip76], but the only known algorithm is nonprimitive recursive [May84]. (See also [Kos82, Lam87].) Even the decidability of this problem was an open question for many years.

Early efforts to show the reachability problem to be decidable included the study of various restricted subclasses of PNs [CLM76, CRM75, GY80, Gra80, HP79, LR78, May81, MM81, MM82, Mul81, VVN81]. The only classes for which completeness results have been given concerning all four of the problems mentioned above are one-conservative PNs [JLL77], one-conservative free choice PNs [JLL77], symmetric PNs [CLM76, MM82, Huy85], and conflict-free PNs [JLL77, HRY87, HR88] (the proofs in [JLL77] also apply to one-bounded PNs and elementary nets). Of these classes only symmetric and conflict-free PNs are potentially unbounded, and both symmetric and conflict-free PNs are defined only in terms of their structure, not in terms of their behavior. Thus, until now there has been no class of potentially unbounded PNs defined in terms of their behavior for which a comprehensive complexity analysis has been given.

Of all of the PN classes for which completeness results have been shown concerning all four of the problems mentioned above, the class for which the decision procedures are most efficient is that of conflict-free PNs. In particular, the boundedness problem is complete for polynomial time [HRY87], the reachability problem is NP-complete [JLL77, HR88], and the containment and equivalence problems are $\prod_{2}^{P}$-complete [HR88], where $\prod_{2}^{P}$ is the set of all languages whose complements are in the second level of the polynomial-time hierarchy [Sto77]. However, since conflict-free PNs comprise such a simple class, their modeling power is very limited. In particular, as we show in this paper, conflict-free PNs cannot model the producer/consumer problem if more than one consumer is involved and the actions of each consumer are to be modeled by separate transitions. Furthermore, the obvious generalization of conflict-free PNs to persistent PNs (see [LR78]) is not very helpful: not only is it impossible to model the above problem with persistent PNs, but the complexities of the various problems regarding persistent PNs appear to be worse than for conflict-free PNs. In particular, all four problems are PSPACE-hard [JLL77]. The known upper bounds are much worse: the best upper bound known for boundednes is exponential space [ Rac 78 ], and no primitive recursive algorithms are known for the other three problems, although they are known to be decidable [Gra80, May81, Mul81]. Even the problem of recognizing a persistent PN, although known to be decidable [Gra80, May81, Mul81], is not known to be primitive recursive, and is PSPACE-hard [JLL77].

More recently, Yamasaki [Yam84] has defined two other generalizations of conflict-free PNs, normal PNs and sinkless PNs. The relationship of normal PNs to sinkless PNs is analogous to the relationship of conflict-free PNs to persistent PNs; i.e., normal PNs are those PNs that are sinkless for every initial marking [Yam84], just as conflict-free PNs are those PNs that are persistent for every initial marking [LR78]. In addition, normal PNs, like conflict-free PNs, are defined in terms of the structure of the net, whereas sinkless PNs, like persistent PNs, are defined in terms of the behavior of the net. However, both normal and sinkless PNs are incomparable to the class of peristent PNs; i.e., there are persistent PNs that are not sinkless, and normal PNs that are not persistent. In this paper, we examine both the modeling power of normal and sinkless PNs and the computational complexities of the four problems mentioned above with respect to these two classes. We show that both in terms of modeling power and ease of analysis, normal and sinkless PNs compare very favorably to conflict-free and persistent PNs.

Concerning the modeling power, we first show that the producer/consumer problem mentioned above, which cannot be modeled by persistent PNs, can be modeled by normal PNs. We then examine the mutual exclusion problem. We show that although this problem cannot be modeled by sinkless PNs, a version in which a bounded number of exclusions takes place can be modeled by normal PNs (persistent PNs cannot even model one exclusion). We therefore conclude that although not all persistent PNs are sinkless, the class of problems that can be modeled by sinkless (or even normal) PNs is somewhat more interesting than that class modeled by persistent PNs.

We then examine whether the more "useful" nature of sinkless PNs causes a corresponding increase in the complexities of the classical problems (as compared to persistent PNs). We show that this is not the case; i.e., we show that for both normal and sinkless PNs, the boundedness problem is co-NP-complete, the reachability problem is NP-complete, and the containment and equivalence problems are $\Pi_{2}^{P}$-complete. Note that with the exception of the boundedness problem, the complexities of these problems are identical to those for conflict-free PNs-an extremely simple class. In fact, the techniques used in deriving these results for normal and sinkless PNs are simply more sophisticated applications of the techniques developed in [HR88] for conflict-free PNs. Thus, techniques originally developed for analyzing problems involving conflict-free PNs-a class defined solely in terms of the structure of the net - have been generalized to apply not only to normal PNs, but also to sinkless PNs-- a class defined in terms of the behavior of the net. Furthermore, these results represent the first comprehensive complexity analysis of the classical problems concerning a class of potentially unbounded PNs defined in terms of their behavior.

We also examine the question of how much easier it is to recognize a normal PN than to recognize a sinkless PN. Recall that the problem of recognizing a persistent PN is not known to be primitive recursive, and is at least PSPACE-hard [JLL77], whereas a conflict-free PN can easily be recognized in polynomial time. The main problem in deciding persistence is that some sort of reachability analysis is
necessary due to the fact that persistence is a behavioral property. Since sinkless PNs are likewise defined in terms of their behavior, whereas normal PNs are defined solely in terms of their structure, one might suppose that normal PNs would be easier to recognize than sinkless PNs. However, in order to determine whether a PN is normal, a rather complex property of the graphical representation of the PN must be tested. The end result is that both the problem of determining whether a PN is normal and the problem of determining whether a PN is sinkless are co-NP-complete. We therefore conclude that in most applications, one might as well consider the entire class of sinkless PNs rather than the more restricted class of normal PNs.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we formally define the concepts used throughout the paper. In Section 3, we compare the modeling power of normal and sinkless PNs with that of persistent PNs. Finally, in Section 4, we examine the complexities of the various problems regarding normal and sinkless PNs.

## 2. Definitions

Let $N$ denote the set of nonnegative integers, $R$ the set of rational numbers, $N^{k}$ ( $R^{k}$ ) the set of vectors of $k$ nonnegative integers (rational numbers, respectively), and $N^{k \times m}\left(R^{k \times m}\right)$ the set of $k \times m$ matrices of nonnegative integers (rational numbers, respectively). For a $k$-dimensional vector $v$, let $v(i), 1 \leqslant i \leqslant k$, denote the $i$ th component of $v$. For a $k \times m$ matrix $A$, let $A(i, j), 1 \leqslant i \leqslant k, 1 \leqslant j \leqslant m$, denote the clement in the $i$ th row and the $j$ th column of $A$, and let $a_{j}$ denote the $j$ th column of $A$. For a given value of $k$, let $\mathbf{0}$ denote the vector of $k$ zeros (i.e., $\mathbf{0}(i)=0$ for $i=1, \ldots, k$ ). Given $k$-dimensional vectors, $u, v$, and $w$, we say:

- $v=w$ iff $v(i)=w(i)$ for $i=1, \ldots, k$;
- $v \geqslant w$ iff $v(i) \geqslant w(i)$ for $i=1, \ldots, k$;
- $v>w$ iff $v \geqslant w$ and $v \neq w$; and
- $u=v+w$ iff $u(i)=v(i)+w(i)$ for $i=1, \ldots, k$.

A Petri net ( PN , for short) is a tuple $\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$, where $P$ is a finite set of places, $T$ is a finite set of transitions, $\varphi$ is a flow function $\varphi:(P \times T) \cup(T \times P) \rightarrow N$, and $\mu_{0}$ is the initial marking $\mu_{0}: P \rightarrow N$ (in this paper, we only consider PNs for which the range of $\varphi$ is $\{0,1\}$ ). A marking is a mapping $\mu: P \rightarrow N$. A transition $t \in T$ is enabled at a marking $\mu$ iff for every $p \in P, \varphi(p, t) \leqslant \mu(p)$. A transition $t$ may fire at a marking $\mu$ if $t$ is enabled at $\mu$. We then write $\mu \xrightarrow{t} \mu^{\prime}$, where $\mu^{\prime}(p)=\mu(p)-\varphi(p, t)+\varphi(t, p)$ for all $p \in P$. A sequence of transitions $\sigma=t_{1} \cdots t_{n}$ is a firing sequence from $\mu_{0}$ (or a firing sequence of $\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ ) iff $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{t_{1}} \mu_{1} \xrightarrow{t_{2}} \ldots \xrightarrow{t_{n}} \mu_{n}$ for some sequence of markings $\mu_{1}, \ldots, \mu_{n}$. We also write $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mu_{n}$. For $\sigma, \sigma^{\prime} \in T^{*}, \sigma^{\prime}=t_{1} \cdots t_{n}$, let $\sigma-\sigma^{\prime}$ be inductively defined as follows: Let $\sigma_{0}$ be $\sigma$. If $t_{i} \in \sigma_{i-1}$, let $\sigma_{i}$ be $\sigma_{i-1}$ with the last occurrence of $t_{i}$ dcleted; otherwise, let $\sigma_{i}=\sigma_{i-1}$. Finally, let $\sigma \doteq \sigma^{\prime}=\sigma_{n}$.

We only consider Petri nets $\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ such that the range of $\varphi$ is $\{0,1\}$; hence, we may view them from two different perspectives. The first perspective is graph-theoretical: $P \cup T$ forms the set of vertices of a directed graph, and $(u, v)$ is an edge iff $\varphi(u, v)=1$. Since $\varphi$ is a function on $(P \times T) \cup(T \times P)$, the graph representation of the PN is bipartite. This graph theoretic perspective yields a natural pictorial representation for PNs. In such pictures, we adopt the convention of denoting a place by a circle and a transition by a bar; the marking $\mu$ is represented by $\mu(p)$ dots (or tokens) in the circle denoting each place $p$. The other perspective is algebraic. Suppose $P$ contains $k$ elements and $T$ contains $m$ elements. By establishing an ordering on the elements of $P$ and $T$ (i.e., $P=\left\{p_{1}, \ldots, p_{k}\right\}$ and $T=\left\{t_{1}, \ldots, t_{m}\right\}$ ), we define the $k \times m$ addition matrix $\bar{T}$ of $\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ so that $\bar{T}(i, j)=\varphi\left(t_{j}, p_{i}\right)-\varphi\left(p_{i}, t_{j}\right)$. Thus, if we view a marking $\mu$ as a $k$-dimensional column vector in which the $i$ th component is $\mu\left(p_{i}\right)$, each column $\bar{t}_{j}$ of $\bar{T}$ is then a $k$-dimensional vector such that if $\mu \xrightarrow{t_{j}} \mu^{\prime}$, then $\mu^{\prime}=\mu+\bar{t}_{j}$. (Note that by this convention, the notations $\mu\left(p_{i}\right)$ and $\mu(i)$ are interchangeable.) For a given alphabet $\Sigma$, let $\Psi: \Sigma^{*} \rightarrow(\Sigma \rightarrow N)$ be the Parikh mapping so that for $\sigma \in \Sigma^{*}, a \in \Sigma, \Psi(\sigma)(a)$ is the number of occurrences of $a$ in $\sigma$. For $\Sigma=T$, we can view $\Psi(\sigma)$ as an $m$-dimensional column vector in which the $j$ th component is $\Psi(\sigma)\left(t_{j}\right)$. Then if $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mu, \mu_{0}+\bar{T} \cdot \Psi(\sigma)=\mu$ (note that the converse does not necessarily hold).

Let $\mathscr{P}=\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ be a PN. The reachability set of $\mathscr{P}$ is the set $R(\mathscr{P})=$ $\left\{\mu \mid \mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mu\right.$ for some $\left.\sigma\right\}$. Let $c=u_{1}, u_{2}, \ldots, u_{n}, u_{1}$ be a circuit in the graph of $\mathscr{P}$, and let $\mu$ be a marking of $\mathscr{P}$. For convenience, we will always assume $u_{1}$ is a place. Let $\operatorname{pl}(c)=\left\{u_{1}, u_{3}, \ldots, u_{n-1}\right\}$ denote the set of places in $c$, and let $\operatorname{tr}(c)=u_{2} u_{4} \cdots u_{n}$ denote the sequence of transitions in $c$. We define $\mu(c)=\sum_{p_{i} \in \mathrm{pl}(c)} \mu(i)$. We say $c$ is token-free in $\mu$ iff $\mu(c)=0 . c$ is said to be minimal iff $\mathrm{pl}(c)$ does not properly include the set of places in any other circuit. (Note that the transitions in $c$ are ignored in this definition.) $c$ is said to have a sink iff for some $\mu \in R(\mathscr{P})$ and some $\sigma$ and $\mu^{\prime}$ such that $\mu \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mu^{\prime}, \mu(c)>0$, but $\mu^{\prime}(c)=0$. $c$ is said to be sinkless iff it does not have a sink. $\mathscr{P}$ is said to be sinkless iff each minimal circuit of $\mathscr{P}$ is sinkless. $\mathscr{P}$ is said to be normal iff for every minimal circuit $c$ and each transition $t_{j}$, $\sum_{p_{i} \in \mathrm{pl}(c)} \bar{T}(i, j) \geqslant 0$; i.e., no transition can decrease the token count of a minimal circuit by firing at any marking. We say $\mathscr{P}$ is persistent if for every $\mu \in R(\mathscr{P})$, when any pair of distinct transitions $t_{1}$ and $t_{2}$ are both enabled at $\mu, t_{1} t_{2}$ is a firing sequence from $\mu$; i.e., no enabled transition can ever be disabled by firing some other transition. $\mathscr{P}$ is said to be conflict-free iff for every place $p$ for which there are two or more transitions $t$ such that $\varphi(p, t)=1$, for each such transition, $\varphi(t, p)=1$. (This definition of conflict-freedom was given in [LR78] for PNs whose flow function has a range of $\{0,1\}$; see [CRM75, HRY87, HR88, HR89] for somewhat more general definitions.) As was shown in [Yam84], the relationship of normal PNs to sinkless PNs is analogous to the relationship of conflict-frec PNs to persistent PNs: normal PNs are those PNs that are sinkless for every initial marking [Yam84], while conflict-free PNs are those PNs that are persistent for every initial marking [LR78].

Part of this paper is dedicated to comparing the modeling power of sinkless PNs
with that of other classes of PNs. In order to formalize the notion of a PN modeling a particular problem, such as the producer/consumer problem or the mutual exclusion problem, we adopt a language-theoretic approach (see also [Hac75]). A modeling problem $Q$ is given by an action language $L(Q)$ over a finite alphabet $\Sigma$ of actions such that if $\alpha \in L(Q)$ and $\alpha^{\prime}$ is a prefix of $\alpha$, then $\alpha^{\prime} \in L(Q)$. Thus, the action language gives all possible finite sequences of actions to be modeled. Let $\Sigma_{1}$ and $\Sigma_{2}$ be two finite alphabets, and let $h: \Sigma_{1}^{*} \rightarrow \Sigma_{2}^{*}$. If for any strings $\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma_{1}^{*}, h(\alpha \beta)=h(\alpha) h(\beta)$, then we say that $h$ is a homomorphism. A labeled Petri net is a tuple $\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}, \Sigma, h\right)$, where $\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ is a $\mathrm{PN}, \Sigma$ is a finite alphabet, and $h$ is a homomorphism $h: T^{*} \rightarrow \Sigma^{*}$ such that for any $t \in T$, the length of $h(t)$ is at most 1 ; we call $h$ the labeling function. We define the language of a labeled $\mathrm{PN}, L\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}, \Sigma, h\right)=\left\{h(\sigma) \mid \sigma\right.$ is a firing sequence of $\left.\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)\right\}$. In order to formally define what it means for a PN to model a problem, we would like to identify the language of a labeled PN with the action language of the problem. However, we must also ensure that for any firing sequence $\sigma$ that models a sequence of actions that can be extended, $\sigma$ can also be extended in the same manner. Therefore, we say a PN $\mathscr{P}$ models a modeling problem $Q$ with action alphabet $\Sigma$ iff there is a labeled $\mathrm{PN} \mathscr{P}^{\prime}=(\mathscr{P}, \Sigma, h)$ such that $L\left(\mathscr{P}^{\prime}\right)=L(Q)$ and for any string $\alpha_{1} \alpha_{2} \in L(Q)$, if $\sigma_{1}$ is a firing sequence of $\mathscr{P}$ such that $h\left(\sigma_{1}\right)=\alpha_{1}$, then there is a firing sequence $\sigma_{1} \sigma_{2}$ of $\mathscr{P}$ such that $h\left(\sigma_{2}\right)=\alpha_{2}$.

Aside from examining the modeling power of various classes of PNs, we also examine the computational complexities of a number of problems concerning normal and sinkless PNs. Given a marking $\mu$ of a given PN $\mathscr{P}$, the reachability problem (RP) is to determine whether $\mu \in R(\mathscr{P})$. The boundedness problem (BP) is to determine whether $R(\mathscr{P})$ is finite. The sink-detection problem is the problem of determining whether there is a minimal circuit of $\mathscr{P}$ with a sink. Given two PNs $\mathscr{P}$ and $\mathscr{P}^{\prime}$, the containment and equivalence problems (CP and EP, respectively) are to determine whether $R(\mathscr{P}) \subseteq R\left(\mathscr{P}^{\prime}\right)$ and whether $R(\mathscr{P})=R\left(\mathscr{P}^{\prime}\right)$, respectively. In examining the latter two problems, we use concepts from linear algebra and the theory of semilinear sets. For any vector $v_{0} \in N^{k}$ and any finite set $V=\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{m}\right\} \subseteq N^{k}$, the set $\mathscr{L}\left(v_{0}, V\right)=\left\{x \mid \exists c_{1}, \ldots, c_{m} \in N\right.$ such that $\left.x=v_{0}+\sum_{i=1}^{m} c_{i} \cdot v_{i}\right\}$ is called the linear set with base $v_{0}$ over the set of periods $V$. A finite union of linear sets is called a semilinear set (SLS for short). If $x=\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{i} \cdot v_{i}$ for some $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{m} \in R$, then $x$ is a linear combination of the vectors in $V$. If $a_{i} \geqslant 0$ for all $i$, then $x$ is a nonnegative linear combination of the vectors in $V$. If in addition for some $i, a_{i}>0$, then $x$ is a positive linear combination of the vectors in $V$.

## 3. Modeling Power

In this section, we examine the modeling power of normal and sinkless PNs, comparing it with that of conflict-free and persistent PNs. It has already been shown that the class of conflict-free PNs is properly contained in both the classes


Fig. 3.1. A persistent PN that is not sinkless.
of persistent PNs [LR78] and sinkless PNs [Yam84]. Furthermore, it is clear from the definitions that the class of sinkless PNs properly includes the class of normal PNs (see also [Yam84]). On the other hand, it is not hard to see that the class of persistent PNs is incomparable to both the class of normal PNs and the class of sinkless PNs; i.e., there is a persistent PN that is not sinkless (Fig. 3.1), and there is a normal PN that is not persistent (Fig. 3.2; see also [Yam84]). These relationships are summarized by the Venn diagram in Fig. 3.3.

One of the shortcomings of conflict-free and persistent PNs is that their modeling power is severely limited. By the definition of persistence, only a very limited type of nondeterminism is allowed: if more than one transition is enabled, the next transition to fire may be nondeterministically chosen, but the firing of this transition


Fig. 3.2. A normal PN that is not persistent.


Fig. 3.3. Relationships between Petri net classes.
cannot disable any others. Although there are modeling problems, such as a simple version of the producer/consumer problem, that can be modeled by conflict-free PNs, the severely restricted version of nondeterminism prohibits even persistent PNs from modeling many "interesting" problems. In particular, we show that neither a more general producer/consumer problem nor the mutual exclusion problem can be modeled by persistent PNs. Given these limitations of persistent PNs and the fact that there are normal PNs that are not persistent, it is natural to ask whether normal PNs can model some of the classical modeling problems that persistent PNs cannot. In this section, we show that although the mutual exclusion problem cannot be modeled even by sinkless PNs, the generalized producer/consumer problem and a version of the mutual exclusion problem in which the total number of exclusions in any computation is bounded by a fixed constant both can be modeled by normal PNs (and, hence, by sinkless PNs). On the other hand, we show that persistent PNs cannot even model one exclusion. In the next section, we will present evidence that sinkles PNs may be significantly easier to analyze than persistent PNs, but not significantly more difficult to analyze than normal PNs. These results suggest that sinkless PNs may be a more useful class of PNs than many of the classes that have been studied in the past.

We first introduce a simple version of the well-known producer/consumer problem $P C_{1.1}$. Informally, the problem involves two processes, the producer and the consumer, and an unbounded buffer. The producer iterates a loop consisting of a sequence of two actions, produce (denoted $p$ ) followed by send (denoted $s$ ). Thus, in any computation, the number of produces is never less than the number sends and never exceeds the number of sends by more than one. Meanwhile, the consumer iterates a loop consisting of a sequence of two actions, receive (denoted $r$ ) followed by consume (denoted $c$ ). Finally, the number of receives can never exceed the number of sends. Thus, the action alphabet of $P C_{1,1}$ is $\Sigma_{1,1}=\{p, s, r, c\}$. Recalling
that $\Psi(\alpha)(a)$ denotes the number of occurrences of $a$ in $\alpha$, we then define $L\left(P C_{1,1}\right)$ as the set of all strings in $\Sigma_{1,1}^{*}$ such that for any prefix $\alpha$,

- $\Psi(\alpha)(s) \leqslant \Psi(\alpha)(p) \leqslant \Psi(\alpha)(s)+1 ;$
- $\Psi(\alpha)(c) \leqslant \Psi(\alpha)(r) \leqslant \Psi(\alpha)(c)+1 ;$ and
- $\Psi(\alpha)(r) \leqslant \Psi(\alpha)(s)$.

The PN shown in Fig. 3.4 is easily seen to model $P C_{1,1}$ and to be conflict-free.
Suppose we wish to generalize the above problem to $m$ producers and $n$ consumers. In order to be able to differentiate between actions of individual producers and individual consumers, we must define the action alphabet as $\Sigma_{m, n}=$ $\left\{p_{i}, s_{i}, r_{j}, c_{j} \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m, 1 \leqslant j \leqslant n\right\}$. We then define $L\left(P C_{m, n}\right)$ as the set of all strings in $\Sigma_{m, n}^{*}$ such that for any prefix $\alpha$,

- $\Psi(\alpha)\left(s_{i}\right) \leqslant \Psi(\alpha)\left(p_{i}\right) \leqslant \Psi(\alpha)\left(s_{i}\right)+1$, for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$;
- $\Psi(\alpha)\left(c_{j}\right) \leqslant \Psi(\alpha)\left(r_{j}\right) \leqslant \Psi(\alpha)\left(c_{j}\right)+1$, for $1 \leqslant j \leqslant n$; and
- $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \Psi(\alpha)\left(r_{j}\right) \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{m} \Psi(\alpha)\left(s_{i}\right)$.

We will now show that there is no persistent PN that models $P C_{1,2}$. We first reproduce the following easily shown lemma from [LR78].

Lemma 3.1 (from [LR78]). If $\sigma$ and $\sigma^{\prime}$ are firing sequences of some persistent $P N$, then $\sigma\left(\sigma^{\prime} \doteq \sigma\right)$ is also a firing sequence of that $P N$.

Theorem 3.1. There is no persistent $P N$ that models $P C_{1,2}$.
Proof. Suppose some persistent PN $\mathscr{P}$ models $P C_{1,2}$ with labeling function $h$. Since $p_{1} s_{1} r_{1}$ and $p_{1} s_{1} r_{2}$ are both in $L\left(P C_{1,2}\right)$, there must be firing sequences $\sigma \sigma_{1}$ and $\sigma \sigma_{2}$ of $\mathscr{P}$ such that $h(\sigma)=p_{1} s_{1}, h\left(\sigma_{1}\right)=r_{1}$, and $h\left(\sigma_{2}\right)=r_{2}$. Since $\mathscr{P}$ is persistent, from Lemma 3.1, $\sigma \sigma_{1}\left(\sigma_{2} \doteq \sigma_{1}\right)$ must also be a firing sequence of $\mathscr{P}$. Since there is no transition labeled $r_{2}$ in $\sigma_{1}, h\left(\sigma \sigma_{1}\left(\sigma_{2} \doteq \sigma_{1}\right)\right)=p_{1} s_{1} r_{1} r_{2}$, which is not in $L\left(P C_{1,2}\right)$-a contradiction.


Fig. 3.4. A conflict-free $\mathbf{P N}$ to model $P C_{1,1}$.

The above theorem clearly demonstrates the limitations of persistent PNs as modeling tools. We will now show that these limitations are, at least in part, eliminated by normal PNs. Consider the PN in Fig. 3.5. It is not hard to see that this PN models $P C_{m, n}$. Furthermore, it is obvious by inspection of the graph that no transition can decrease the token count of any minimal circuit, so the PN must be normal. We therefore have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. For each positive $m$ and $n$, there is a normal $P N$ to model $P C_{m, n}$.
We have therefore seen an example of a well-known modeling problem that can be modeled by a normal PN, but not by a persistent PN. One of the fundamental building blocks for many modeling problems (e.g., readers/writers, dining philosophers) is the mutual exclusion problem. We will now examine the question of whether normal or sinkless PNs can model mutual exclusion. Informally, the $n$-process mutual exclusion problem $M E_{n}$ consists of $n$ processes, each of which has a critical region. Each process $P_{i}$ iterates a loop consisting of a sequence of two actions: entering its critical region (denoted $e n_{i}$ ) followed by exiting its critical region (denoted $e x_{i}$ ). Furthermore, no two processes may be in their respective


Fig. 3.5. A normal PN to model $P C_{m, n}$.
critical regions simultaneously. Thus, the action alphabet of $M E_{n}$ is $\Sigma_{n}=$ $\left\{e n_{i}, e x_{i} \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\right\}$. We then define $L\left(M E_{n}\right)$ to be the set of all strings in $\sum_{n}^{*}$ such that for any prefix $\alpha$,

- $\Psi(\alpha)\left(e x_{i}\right) \leqslant \Psi(\alpha)\left(e n_{i}\right) \leqslant \Psi(\alpha)\left(e x_{i}\right)+1$, for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$; and
- $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\Psi(\alpha)\left(e n_{i}\right)-\Psi(\alpha)\left(e x_{i}\right)\right) \leqslant 1$.

Figure 3.6 shows a PN that models $M E_{n}$ for any $n \geqslant 2$. It can be shown that this PN is neither persistent nor sinkless. In fact, the following theorem can be shown in a manner similar to Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 3.3. There is no persistent $P N$ that models $M E_{2}$.
We now show that there is also no sinkless PN to model $M E_{2}$. We first reproduce the following lemma from [Yam84].

Lemma 3.2 (from [Yam84]). Let $\mathscr{P}=\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ be a $P N$ with $k$ places and $m$ transitions. For each $w \in N^{m}$, there is some firing sequence $\sigma$ of $\mathscr{P}$ with $\Psi(\sigma)=w$ if

1. $\mu_{0}+\bar{T} \cdot w \geqslant 0$, and
2. for each firing sequence $\sigma^{\prime}$ of $\mathscr{P}$ and each circuit $c$, if $\Psi\left(\sigma^{\prime} \operatorname{tr}(c)\right) \leqslant w$, then $\mu(c)>0$, where $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma^{\prime}} \mu$.

## Theorem 3.4. There is no sinkless $P N$ that models $M E_{2}$.

Proof. Let $\mathscr{P}=\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ be any PN that models $M E_{2}$ with labeling function $h$. Since $\left(e n_{1} e x_{1}\right)^{*} \subseteq L\left(M E_{2}\right)$, for each positive $k$ there must exist a $\sigma_{k}$ such that $h\left(\sigma_{k}\right)=e n_{1} e x_{1}$ and $\sigma_{1} \cdots \sigma_{k}$ is a firing sequence of $\mathscr{P}$. Consider the infinite sequence of markings $\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}, \ldots$, where $\mu_{k-1} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{k}} \mu_{k}$. As was shown in [KM69], it follows from König's infinity lemma [Kon36] that there exist positive $i$ and $j$ such that $i<j$ and $\mu_{i} \leqslant \mu_{j}$. Let $\tau_{1}=\sigma_{1} \cdots \sigma_{i}, \tau_{2}=\sigma_{i+1} \cdots \sigma_{j}$, and $w=\Psi\left(\tau_{2}\right)$. Then $\bar{T} \cdot w \geqslant 0$. Since $\left(e n_{1} e x_{1}\right)^{j} e n_{2} \in L\left(M E_{2}\right)$, there must be a $\tau_{3}$ such that $h\left(\tau_{3}\right)=e n_{2}$ and $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\tau_{1} \tau_{2} \tau_{3}} \mu^{\prime}$ for some $\mu^{\prime}$. Since $h\left(\tau_{1} \tau_{2} \tau_{3}\right) \in\left(e n_{1} e x_{1}\right)^{*} e n_{2}$ and $h\left(\tau_{2}\right) \in\left(e n_{1} e x_{1}\right)^{+}$, there is no $\sigma$ firable at $\mu^{\prime}$ such that $\Psi(\sigma)=w$. Therefore, either condition (1) or condition


Fig. 3.6. A PN to model $M E_{n}$.
(2) of Lemma 3.2 must fail for ( $P, T, \varphi, \mu^{\prime}$ ) and $w$. Since $\bar{T} \cdot w \geqslant 0$, condition (1) must hold. Thus, there must be a $\sigma^{\prime}$ and a circuit $c$ such that $\Psi\left(\sigma^{\prime} \operatorname{tr}(c)\right) \leqslant w$ and $\mu(c)=0$, where $\mu^{\prime} \xrightarrow{\sigma^{\prime}} \mu$. Consider the firing sequence $\tau=\tau_{1} \tau_{2} \tau_{3} \sigma^{\prime}$ of $\mathscr{P}$. Clearly, $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mu$. Since $\mu(c)=0$, some subset of $\mathrm{pl}(c)$ is the set of places on a minimal circuit with a token count of 0 in $\mu$. However, since $\Psi(\operatorname{tr}(c)) \leqslant w=\Psi\left(\tau_{2}\right)$, and since $\tau_{2}$ has already fired in $\tau$, each of the places in $\operatorname{pl}(c)$ must have had a positive token count at one time in $\tau$. Thus, $\tau$ decreases the token count of some minimal circuit to 0 , and $\mathscr{P}$ is not sinkless.

We conclude this section by noting that by using a proof similar to that of Theorem 3.1, it can be shown that there is no persistent PN to model the problem whose action language is all prefixes of $e n_{1} e x_{1}$ and $e n_{2} e x_{2}$. In contrast, there is a normal PN to model this problem. In fact, Fig. 3.7 shows a normal PN to model the problem $M E_{n}^{k}$, for any positive $k$ and $n$, defined so that $L\left(M E_{n}^{k}\right)=$ $\left\{\alpha \mid \alpha \in L\left(M E_{n}\right)\right.$ and $\left.\sum_{i=1}^{n} \Psi(\alpha)\left(e n_{i}\right) \leqslant k\right\}$. Thus, normal PNs can be used to model mutual exclusion if the total number of exclusions is bounded by a fixed constant. We therefore have the following theorems.


Fig. 3.7. A normal PN to model $M E_{n}^{k}$.

TABLE I

| Problem | Modeled by <br> persistent? | Modeled by <br> normal/sinkless? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $P C_{1,2}$ | No | Yes |
| $P C_{m, n}$ | No | Yes |
| $M E_{2}$ | No | No |
| $M E_{2}^{1}$ | No | Yes |
| $M E_{n}^{k}$ | No | Yes |

Theorem 3.5. There is no persistent $P N$ to model $M E_{2}^{1}$.
Theorem 3.6. For each positive $k$ and $n$, there is a normal $P N$ to model $M E_{n}^{k}$.
The results of this section, summarized in Table I serve to demonstrate that even though the modeling power of sinkless PNs is still quite limited, even normal PNs provide a more usable version of nondeterminism than persistent PNs.

## 4. Complexity Results

In this section, we examine the complexities of various problems involving normal and sinkless PNs. In [HR88], we developed several techniques for analyzing conflict-free PNs. These techniques relied heavily upon the structural property of conflict-freedom. In this section, we show that these same techniques also apply, albeit in a more sophisticated manner, to sinkless PNs, a class defined not in terms of structure, but in terms of behavior.

We begin by developing an important lemma (Lemma 4.3) which will be used in deriving most of the upper bounds in this section. In [HR88], we showed that for any conflict-free PN $\mathscr{P}$ and any marking $\mu$ of $\mathscr{P}$, there is an instance of integer linear programming that has a solution iff $\mu$ is reachable in $\mathscr{P}$. Furthermore, we showed that this instance of integer linear programming can be guessed in polynomial time. It therefore followed that the reachability problem for conflict-free PNs is in NP. We will show in Lemma 4.3 that a similar fact holds for sinkles PNs. In so doing, we make use of the following lemma which follows immediately from Lemma 3.2 and was first stated in [Yam84].

Lemma 4.1 (from [Yam84]). If a $P N \mathscr{P}=\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ has no token-free circuits in every reachable marking, then $R(\mathscr{P})=\left\{\mu \mid \mu=\mu_{0}+\bar{T} \cdot x \geqslant 0\right.$ for some $\left.x \in N^{m}\right\}$, where $m$ is the number of transitions in $T$.

The above lemma gives an instance of integer linear programming whose solution set gives the reachability set of a PN. The only requirement is that no reachable marking can have a token-free circuit. In order to enable us to work with PNs
whose reachability sets contain no markings with token-free circuits, we give the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. Let $\mathscr{P}=\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ be a sinkless $P N$, and let $\mathscr{P}^{\prime}=\left(P, T^{\prime}, \varphi^{\prime}, \mu\right)$ be such that $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mu$ in $\mathscr{P}$ for some $\sigma, T^{\prime} \subseteq T$ such that each $t \in T^{\prime}$ is enabled at some point in the firing of $\sigma$ from $\mu_{0}$, and $\varphi^{\prime}$ is the restriction of $\varphi$ to $\left(P \times T^{\prime}\right) \cup\left(T^{\prime} \times P\right)$. Then $\mathscr{P}^{\prime}$ has no token-free circuits in every reachable marking.

Proof. Suppose $\mathscr{P}^{\prime}$ has some reachable marking $\mu^{\prime}$ with a token-free circuit $c^{\prime}$. Since $\mu^{\prime}$ is reachable in $\mathscr{P}^{\prime}$, it must also be reachable from $\mu$ in $\mathscr{P}$. Let $\sigma \sigma^{\prime}$ be a firing sequence of $\mathscr{P}$ such that $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mu \xrightarrow{\sigma^{\prime}} \mu^{\prime}$. Also, since $c^{\prime}$ is a circuit in $\mathscr{P}^{\prime}$, it must also be a circuit in $\mathscr{P}$. Thus, there must be a minimal circuit $c$ of $\mathscr{P}$ such that $\mathrm{pl}(c) \subseteq \mathrm{pl}\left(c^{\prime}\right)$. Clearly, $\mu^{\prime}(c)=0$. Let $p$ be any place in $c$, and let $t$ be the transition following $p$ in $c^{\prime}$. Since $t \in T^{\prime}, t$ must have been enabled at some marking $\mu^{\prime \prime}$ reached in the firing of $\sigma$ from $\mu_{0}$ in $\mathscr{P}$. Thus, $\mu^{\prime \prime}(p)>0$, so $\mu^{\prime \prime}(c)>0$. Since $\mu^{\prime}(c)=0$ and $\mu^{\prime}$ is reachable from $\mu^{\prime \prime}, c$ has a sink-a contradiction.

Given the above two lemmas, we can now outline our strategy for showing the RP to be in NP, and the BP to be in co-NP. This strategy will then be the basis for most of the other upper bounds shown in this paper. Let $\mathscr{P}=\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ be a sinkless PN, and consider the sequence $\mathscr{P}_{1}, \ldots, \mathscr{P}_{n}$, where each $\mathscr{P}_{h}=$ ( $P, T_{h}, \varphi_{h}, \mu_{h-1}$ ) such that $T_{0}=\varnothing$, and for $1 \leqslant h \leqslant n$,

- $T_{h}=T_{h-1} \cup\left\{t_{j_{h}}\right\}$ for some $t_{j_{h}} \notin T_{h-1}$ enabled at $\mu_{h-1}$, for $1 \leqslant h \leqslant n$;
- $\varphi_{h}$ is the restriction of $\varphi$ to $\left(P \times T_{h}\right) \cup\left(T_{h} \times P\right)$, for $0 \leqslant h \leqslant n$; and
- $\mu_{h-1} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{h-1}} \mu_{h}$ for some $\sigma_{h-1} \in T_{h}^{*}, 1 \leqslant h \leqslant n$.

From Lernma 4.2, no $\mathscr{P}_{h}$ contains a token-free circuit for any marking in $R\left(\mathscr{P}_{h}\right)$. Thus, from Lemma 4.1, there is an instance of integer linear programming $S_{h}$ whose solution set describes the reachability set of $\mathscr{P}_{h}$. Furthermore, $S_{h}$ can clearly be constructed from $\mathscr{P}_{h}$ in polynomial time. Also note that the initial marking of $\mathscr{P}_{h}$ is given by a solution to $S_{h-1}$. Thus, a portion of $R(\mathscr{P})$ can be given by the solution set of a system $S$ of linear inequalities over the integers, where $S$ is constructed in polynomial time from $P$ and a sequence of distinct transitions of $\mathscr{P}$. To formalize these ideas, let $P=\left\{p_{1}, \ldots, p_{k}\right\}, T=\left\{t_{1}, \ldots, t_{m}\right\}$, and let $\tau=t_{j_{1}} \cdots t_{j_{n}}$ be any sequence of distinct transitions from $T$. We define the characteristic system of inequalities for $\mathscr{P}$ and $\tau$ as $S(\mathscr{P}, \tau)=S_{0} \cup \cdots \cup S_{n}$, where $S_{0}=\left\{x_{0}=\mu_{0}\right\}, S_{h}=\left\{x_{h-1}(i) \geqslant\right.$ $\left.\varphi\left(p_{i}, t_{j_{h}}\right), x_{h}=x_{h-1}+A_{h} \cdot y_{h} \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant k\right\}$, and $A_{h}$ is the $k \times h$ matrix whose columns are $\bar{t}_{j_{1}}, \ldots, \bar{t}_{j_{h}}$ for $1 \leqslant h \leqslant n$. The variables in $S$ are the components of the $k$-dimensional column vectors $x_{0}, \ldots, x_{n}$ and the $h$-dimensional column vectors $y_{h}, 1 \leqslant h \leqslant n$. We will now show that for any marking $\mu, \mu \in R(\mathscr{P})$ iff there is a sequence of distinct transitions $\tau=t_{j_{1}} \cdots t_{j_{n}}$ such that $S(\mathscr{P}, \tau)$ has a nonnegative integer solution in which $x_{n}=\mu$. It is precisely this fact that allows us to apply the techniques of [HR88], developed specifically for the structurally defined conflict-free PNs, to the behaviorally defined sinkless PNs.

Lemma 4.3. Let $\mathscr{P}=\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ be a sinkless $P N$, and let $\mu$ be any marking of $\mathscr{P}$. Then there is some $\sigma \in T^{*}$ such that $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mu$ iff there is some sequence $\tau=t_{j_{1}} \cdots t_{j_{n}}$ of distinct transitions in $T$ such that $S(\mathscr{P}, \tau)$ has a nonnegative integer solution in which $x_{n}=\mu$. Furthermore, $\sigma$ and $\tau$ can be chosen such that $\sigma=\sigma_{1} \cdots \sigma_{n}$, where $\mu_{0}=x_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{1}} x_{1} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{2}} \ldots \xrightarrow{\sigma_{n}} x_{n}=\mu, t_{j_{h}}$ is enabled at $x_{h-1}, \sigma_{h} \in\left\{t_{j_{1}}, \ldots, t_{j_{h}}\right\}^{*}$, and $y_{h}\left(h^{\prime}\right)$ gives the number of times $t_{j_{h^{\prime}}}$ occurs in $\sigma_{h}$, for $1 \leqslant h^{\prime} \leqslant h \leqslant n$.

Proof. $\quad(\Rightarrow)$ Let $\mu \in R(\mathscr{P})$. Then for some $\sigma \in T^{*}, \mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mu$. Let $\sigma=\sigma_{1} \cdots \sigma_{n}$ such that for $1 \leqslant h \leqslant n, \sigma_{h}$ begins with some transition $t_{j_{h}}$ that does not occur in $\sigma_{1} \cdots \sigma_{h-1}$, and $\sigma_{h}$ contains only transitions from the set $\left\{t_{j_{1}}, \ldots, t_{j_{h}}\right\}$. Let $\tau=t_{j_{1}} \cdots t_{j_{n}}$. By letting $y_{h}\left(h^{\prime}\right)$ be the number of times $t_{j_{h}}$ occurs in $\sigma_{h}, 1 \leqslant h^{\prime} \leqslant h \leqslant n$, it is easily seen that $S(\mathscr{P}, \tau)$ has a nonnegative integer solution for which $\mu_{0}=x_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{1}} x_{1} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{2}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\sigma_{n}} x_{n}=\mu$.
$(\Leftarrow)$ We will show by induction on $n$ that for any sequence $\tau_{n}=t_{j_{1}} \cdots t_{j_{n}}$ of $n$ distinct transitions from $T$ and any marking $\mu$, if $S\left(\mathscr{P}, \tau_{n}\right)$ has a nonnegative integer solution for which $x_{n}=\mu$, then $\mu_{0}=x_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{1}} x_{1} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{2}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\sigma_{n}} x_{n}=\mu$ such that $t_{j_{h}}$ is enabled at $x_{h-1}, \sigma_{h} \in\left\{t_{j_{1}}, \ldots, t_{j_{h}}\right\}^{*}$, and $t_{j^{\prime} h^{\prime}}$ occurs $y_{h}\left(h^{\prime}\right)$ times in $\sigma_{h}$ for $1 \leqslant h^{\prime} \leqslant h \leqslant n$. The lemma will then follow.

Base. Let $n=0$. Then $S\left(\mathscr{P}, \tau_{0}\right)=\left\{x_{0}=\mu_{0}\right\}$. Clearly, the only solution to $S$ is $\mu_{0}$, and $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mu_{0}$.

Induction hypothesis. Let $n$ be some positive integer, and assume that for any sequence of distinct transitions $\tau_{n-1}=t_{j_{1}} \cdots t_{j_{n-1}}$ from $T$ and any marking $\mu$, if $S\left(\mathscr{P}, \tau_{n-1}\right)$ has a nonnegative integer solution in which $x_{n-1}=\mu$, then $\mu_{0}=$ $x_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{1}} x_{1} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{2}} \ldots \xrightarrow{\sigma_{n-}} x_{n-1}=\mu$ such that $t_{j_{h}}$ is enabled at $x_{h-1}, \sigma_{h} \in\left\{t_{j_{1}}, \ldots, t_{j_{h}}\right\}^{*}$, and $t_{j h^{\prime}}$ occurs $y_{h}\left(h^{\prime}\right)$ times in $\sigma_{h}$ for $1 \leqslant h^{\prime} \leqslant h \leqslant n-1$.

Induction step. Let $\tau_{n}=t_{j_{1}} \cdots t_{j_{n}}$ be a sequence of distinct transitions in $T, \mu$ be any marking of $\mathscr{P}, \tau_{n-1}=t_{j_{1}} \cdots t_{j_{n-1}}$, and $T^{\prime}=\left\{t_{j_{1}}, \ldots, t_{j_{n}}\right\}$. Then $S\left(\mathscr{P}, \tau_{n}\right)=$ $S\left(\mathscr{P}, \tau_{n-1}\right) \cup\left\{x_{n-1}(i) \geqslant \varphi\left(p_{i}, t_{j_{n}}\right), x_{n}=x_{n-1}+\bar{T}^{\prime} \cdot y_{n} \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant k\right\}$. Suppose $S\left(\mathscr{P}, \tau_{n}\right)$ has a nonnegative integer solution in which the value of $x_{n}$ is $\mu$. Since any solution to $S\left(\mathscr{P}, \tau_{n}\right)$ is clearly a solution to $S\left(\mathscr{P}, \tau_{n-1}\right)$, from the induction hypothesis, $\mu_{0}=x_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{1}} x_{1} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{2}} \ldots \xrightarrow{\sigma_{n-1}} x_{n-1}$ such that $t_{j_{h}}$ is enabled at $x_{h-1}, \sigma_{h} \in\left\{t_{j_{1}}, \ldots, t_{j_{h}}\right\}^{*}$, and $t_{j^{\prime}}$ occurs $y_{h}\left(h^{\prime}\right)$ times in $\sigma_{h}$ for $1 \leqslant h^{\prime} \leqslant h \leqslant n-1$. Let $\sigma^{\prime}=\sigma_{1} \cdots \sigma_{n-1}$. Since $x_{n-1}(i) \geqslant \varphi\left(p_{i}, t_{j_{n}}\right)$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant k, t_{j_{n}}$ is enabled at $x_{n-1}$. Thus, each $t \in T^{\prime}$ is enabled at some point in the firing of $\sigma^{\prime}$ from $\mu_{0}$, so from Lemma 4.2, $\left(P, T^{\prime}, \varphi^{\prime}, x_{n-1}\right)$ has no token-free circuits in every reachable marking, where $\varphi^{\prime}$ is the restriction of $\varphi$ to $\left(P \times T^{\prime}\right) \cup\left(T^{\prime} \times P\right)$. Since $\mu=x_{n}=x_{n-1}+\bar{T}^{\prime} \cdot y_{n}$ for some $y_{n} \in N^{n}$, from Lemma 3.2, $x_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{n}} x_{n}=\mu$ for some $\sigma_{n} \in T^{* *}$ containing $y_{n}\left(h^{\prime}\right)$ occurrences of $t_{j_{k^{\prime}}}$ for $1 \leqslant h^{\prime} \leqslant n$. Thus, $\mu_{0}=x_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{1}} x_{1} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{2}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\sigma_{n}} x_{n}=\mu$ such that $t_{j_{h}}$ is enabled at $x_{h-1}$, $\sigma_{h} \in\left\{t_{j_{1}}, \ldots, t_{j_{h}}\right\}^{*}$, and $t_{j_{h^{\prime}}}$ occurs $y_{h}\left(h^{\prime}\right)$ times in $\sigma_{h}$ for $1 \leqslant h^{\prime} \leqslant h \leqslant n$.

The following corollary follows from Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 and the proof of Lemma 4.3.

Corollary 4.1. Let $\mathscr{P}=\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ be a sinkless $P N, \tau$ be a sequence of $n$ distinct transitions from $T, T^{\prime}$ be the set of transitions in $\tau, \varphi^{\prime}$ be the restriction of $\varphi$ to $\left(P \times T^{\prime}\right) \cup\left(T^{\prime} \times P\right)$, and $\mu$ be any marking of $\mathscr{P}$ such that for some nonnegative integer solution of $S(\mathscr{P}, \tau), x_{n}=\mu$. Then $R\left(P, T^{\prime}, \varphi^{\prime}, \mu\right)=\left\{\mu^{\prime} \mid \mu^{\prime}=\mu+\bar{T}^{\prime} \cdot x\right.$ for some $\left.x \in N^{n}\right\}$.

Lemma 4.3 can now be coupled with the fact that integer linear programming is in NP [BT76] to show that the RP for sinkless PNs is in NP. Since the RP is NP-hard for conflict-free PNs [JLL77], it will then follow that the RP for sinkless (normal) PNs is NP-complete. We therefore have the following theorem.

## Theorem 4.1. The RP for sinkless (normal) PNs is NP-complete.

Proof. From [JLL77], the RP for conflict-free PNs is NP-hard. Since any conflict-free PN is normal [Yam84], it follows that the RP for normal PNs is NP-hard. Since any normal PN is sinkless, we need only show that the RP for sinkless PNs is in NP. We use the following nondeterministic algorithm to decide the RP for any given $\mathrm{PN} \mathscr{P}=\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ and any marking $\mu$ of $\mathscr{P}$. First, guess a sequence $\tau$ of $n$ distinct transitions from $T$. Then construct $S(\mathscr{P}, \tau)$ in polynomial time. Next, construct $S=S(\mathscr{P}, \tau) \cup\left\{x_{n}=\mu\right\}$. Since integer linear programming is in NP [BT76], we can guess a solution to $S$ and verify it in polynomial time. Clearly, $S$ has a nonnegative integer solution iff $S(\mathscr{P}, \tau)$ has a nonnegative integer solution in which $x_{n}=\mu$. From Lemma 4.3, there is a $\tau$ such that $S(\mathscr{P}, \tau)$ has a nonnegative integer solution in which $x_{n}=\mu$ iff $\mu \in R(\mathscr{P})$. Therefore, the RP for sinkless (normal) PNs is NP-complete.

In [HRY87], we showed the BP to be PTIME-complete for conflict-free PNs. However, we will now show the problem to be co-NP-complete for both normal and sinkless PNs.

Theorem 4.2. The BP for sinkless (normal) PNs is co-NP-complete.
Proof. We first show the BP for sinkless PNs to be in co-NP. We use the following nondeterministic algorithm to decide, for any given $\mathrm{PN} \mathscr{P}=\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$, whether $\mathscr{P}$ is unbounded. First, guess a sequence $\tau$ of $n$ distinct transitions from $T$. Then construct $S(\mathscr{P}, \tau)$ in polynomial time. Next, construct $S=S(\mathscr{P}, \tau) \cup$ $\left\{\bar{T}^{\prime} \cdot z>0\right\}$, where $T^{\prime}$ is the set of rules in $\tau$. As in Theorem 4.1, we can guess a solution to $S$ and verify it in polynomial time. Suppose $S$ has a nonnegative integer solution, and let $\mu$ be the value of $x_{n}$ and $\psi$ be the value of $z$ in that solution. From Lemma 4.3, $\mu \in R(\mathscr{P})$, and from Corollary 4.1, $\mu+\bar{T}^{\prime} \cdot \psi$ is reachable from $\mu$. Thus, since $\bar{T}^{\prime} \cdot \psi>0, \mathscr{P}$ must be unbounded. On the other hand, suppose $\mathscr{P}$ is unbounded. From [KM69], there is a firing sequence $\sigma \sigma^{\prime}$ of $\mathscr{P}$ such that $\bar{T} \cdot \Psi\left(\sigma^{\prime}\right)>\mathbf{0}$. Let $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma \sigma^{\prime}} \mu$. From Lemma 4.3, there is a choice of $\tau$ for which there is a nonnegative integer solution of $S(\mathscr{P}, \tau)$ in which $x_{n}$ has the value $\mu$, and for which all transitions in $\sigma \sigma^{\prime}$ appear in $\tau$. Thus, we can clearly set $z$ to a value that gives us a nonnegative integer solution to $S$. Therefore, there is a choice of $\tau$ for
which $S$ has a nonnegative solution iff $\mathscr{P}$ is unbounded. It follows that the $\dot{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{P}$ is in co-NP.

We now show that the BP for normal PNs is co-NP-hard. We show this by reducing 3SAT to the complement of BP. Let $C=\left\{C_{1}, \ldots, C_{m}\right\}$ be the set of clauses and $V=\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right\}$ be the set of variables in an arbitrary instance of 3SAT, where $C_{i}=\left\{\alpha_{i 1}, \alpha_{i 2}, \alpha_{i 3}\right\}$ and $\alpha_{i j} \in\{x, \bar{x} \mid x \in V\}$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m, 1 \leqslant j \leqslant 3$. We construct a normal PN $\mathscr{P}=\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ (shown in Fig. 4.1) such that $\mathscr{P}$ is unbounded iff $C$ is satisfiable (i.e., if there is an assignment of truth values to $V$ such that $\wedge_{i=1}^{m} \bigvee_{j=1}^{3} \alpha_{i j}$ is true). For each variable $x_{j}$, let $a_{j}$ be a place for which $\mu_{0}\left(a_{j}\right)=1$. We then define transitions $t_{j}$ and $f_{j}$ for $1 \leqslant j \leqslant n . t_{j}$ and $f_{j}$ both have $a_{j}$ as an input place; thus, since $a_{j}$ will not be the output place of any transition, $t_{j}$ and $f_{j}$ cannot both fire in any firing sequence. For each clause $C_{i}$, let $c_{i}$ be a place such that $\mu_{0}\left(c_{i}\right)=0$. For $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$ and $1 \leqslant j \leqslant n, t_{j}$ will have $c_{i}$ as an output place iff $x_{j} \in C_{i}$, and $f_{j}$ will have $c_{i}$ as an output place iff $\bar{x}_{j} \in C_{i}$. Since no $c_{i}$ will be an output place for any other transitions, all of the $c_{i} s$ can become simultaneously positive iff $C$ is satisfiable. Finally, we define the transitions $s_{1}$ and $s_{2}$ and the places $p_{1}$ and $p_{2}$ as shown in Fig. 4.1. The resulting PN is clearly normal, and is unbounded iff $C$ is satisfiable. Therefore, the BP is co-NP-complete for sinkless (normal) PNs.

We can also use Lemma 4.3 to show the sink detection problem for PNs to be NP-complete.


Fig. 4.1. The lower bound for BP.

Theorem 4.3. The sink detection problem for $P N s$ is $N P$-complete.
Proof. Our nondeterministic algorithm for this problem is similar to those for the RP and the BP. Given $\mathscr{P}=\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$, we guess $\tau=t_{j_{1}} \cdots t_{j_{n}}$ and a minimal circuit $c$. We can clearly verify in polynomial time that $c$ is a circuit. Furthermore, we can verify that $c$ is minimal by verifying for each pair of places $p$ and $p^{\prime}$ in $\mathrm{pl}(c)$ and each transition $t$ in $T$ that $\varphi(p, t)=\varphi\left(t, p^{\prime}\right)=1$ only if $p, t, p^{\prime}$ is a segment of $c$; this verification can clearly be done in polynomial time. We then guess an integer $m, 1 \leqslant m \leqslant n$, and a marking $\mu$ such that $\mu(c)=1$ and $\mu(p)=0$ for all $p \notin \mathrm{pl}(c)$. We then construct $S=S(\mathscr{P}, \tau) \cup\left\{x_{n}(c)=0, y \leqslant y_{m}, x_{m-1}+A_{m} \cdot y \geqslant \mu\right\}$, where $A_{m}$ is the matrix whose columns are $\bar{i}_{j_{1}}, \ldots, \bar{t}_{j_{m}}$. We claim that there is some choice of $\tau, c, m$, and $\mu$ for which $S$ has a nonnegative integer solution iff $\mathscr{P}$ has a sink.

First, suppose that for some choice of $\tau, c, m$, and $\mu, S$ has a nonnegative integer solution. In order to derive a contradiction, assume $\mathscr{P}$ is sinkless. From Lemma 4.3, there is a nonnegative integer solution of $S$ such that $\mu_{0}=x_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{1}} x_{1} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{2}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\sigma_{n}} x_{n}$ and each $t_{j_{h}}$ is enabled at $x_{h}$, for some $\sigma_{1} \cdots \sigma_{n} \in T^{*}$. Consider $\mathscr{P P}^{\prime}=$ $\left(P, T^{\prime}, \varphi^{\prime}, x_{m-1}\right)$, where $T^{\prime}=\left\{t_{j_{1}}, \ldots, t_{j_{m}}\right\}$ and $\varphi^{\prime}$ is the restriction of $\varphi$ to $\left(P \times T^{\prime}\right) \cup$ ( $T^{\prime} \times P$ ). Since each transition in $T^{\prime}$ is enabled at some point in the firing of $\sigma_{1} \cdots \sigma_{m-1}$ from $\mu_{0}$, from Lemma 4.2, $\mathscr{P}^{\prime}$ has no token-free circuits in every reachable marking. Thus, from Lemma 4.1, there is some $\sigma \in T^{* *}$ such that $x_{m-1} \xrightarrow{\sigma} x_{m-1}+\bar{T}^{\prime} \cdot y=\mu^{\prime}$ for some $\mu^{\prime}$. Since $\bar{T}^{\prime}=A_{m}, \mu^{\prime} \geqslant \mu$, and hence, $\mu^{\prime}(c)>0$. Since $y \leqslant y_{m}$, Lemma 4.2 also guarantees that there is some $\sigma^{\prime} \in T^{*}$ such that $\mu^{\prime} \xrightarrow{\sigma^{\prime}} \mu^{\prime}+\bar{T}^{\prime} \cdot\left(y_{m}-y\right)=x_{m}$. Thus, $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{1} \cdots \sigma_{m-1} \sigma} \mu^{\prime} \xrightarrow{\sigma^{\prime} \sigma_{m+1} \cdots \sigma_{n}} x_{n}$, where $x_{n}(c)=0$. Thus, $\mathscr{P}$ has a sink -a contradiction. Therefore, if there is some choice of $\tau, c, m$, and $\mu$ such that $S$ has a nonnegative solution, $\mathscr{P}$ must have a sink.

Now suppose $\mathscr{P}$ has a sink. Then there exist $\mu^{\prime}$ and $\mu^{\prime \prime}$ and a minimal circuit $c$ such that $\mu^{\prime}(c)>0, \mu^{\prime \prime}(c)=0$, and $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mu^{\prime} \xrightarrow{\sigma^{\prime}} \mu^{\prime \prime}$ for some $\sigma \sigma^{\prime} \in T^{*}$. From Lemma 4.3, there is a $\tau_{1}$ of $m$ transitions, $m \geqslant 0$, such that $S\left(\mathscr{P}, \tau_{1}\right)$ has a nonnegative integer solution in which $x_{m}=\mu^{\prime}$. We may assume without loss of generality that $m \geqslant 1$, since at least one transition $t$ must be enabled at $\mu_{0}$ (because $\left.\mu^{\prime} \neq \mu^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Since $\mu^{\prime}(c)>0, x_{m}(c) \geqslant \mu$ for some $\mu$ such that $\mu(c)=1$ and $\mu(p)=0$ for all $p \notin \mathrm{pl}(c)$. By proceeding as in Lemma 4.3, it is not hard to see that there is a $\tau_{2}$ of $n-m$ transitions, $n \geqslant 1$, such that $S\left(\mathscr{P}, \tau_{1} \tau_{2}\right)$ has a nonnegative solution in which $x_{n}=\mu^{\prime \prime}$ and $x_{m-1}+A_{m} \cdot y=\mu^{\prime}$, where $A_{m}$ is the addition matrix formed from the transitions in $\tau_{1}$ and $y \leqslant y_{m}$. Thus, $S=S\left(\mathscr{P}, \tau_{1} \tau_{2}\right) \cup\left\{x_{n}(c)=0, y \leqslant y_{m}\right.$, $\left.x_{m-1}+A_{m} \cdot y \geqslant \mu\right\}$ has a nonnegative integer solution. Therefore, there is some choice of $\tau, c, m$, and $\mu$ for which $S$ has a nonnegative integer solution iff $\mathscr{P}$ has a sink.

We will now show the sink detection problem to be NP-hard. We again use a reduction from 3SAT. Let $C=\left\{C_{1}, \ldots, C_{m}\right\}$ be the set of clauses and $V=\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right\}$ be the set of variables in an arbitrary instance of 3 SAT. Consider again the PN $\mathscr{P}$ constructed in the proof of Theorem 4.2 (Fig. 4.1). We construct $\mathscr{P}^{\prime}$ from $\mathscr{P}$ by adding a transition $s_{3}$ with input place $p_{1}$ and no output places. Thus $\mathscr{P}^{\prime}$ has a sink iff $p_{1}$ can become positive iff $C$ is satisfiable. Therefore, the sink detection problem is NP-hard.

Theorem 4.4. The problem of determining whether a $P N$ is normal is co-NPcomplete.

Proof. In order to show that a given $\mathrm{PN} \mathscr{P}=\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ is not normal, we need to find a minimal circuit $c$ and a transition $t_{j}$ such that $\sum_{p_{i} \in \operatorname{pl}(c)} \bar{T}(i, j)<0$. The proof of Theorem 4.3 shows how we can guess a minimal circuit $c$ and verify that it is minimal in polynomial time. Clearly, we can also guess a transition $t_{j}$ and verify that $\sum_{\left.p_{i} \in \mathrm{pltc}\right)} \bar{T}(i, j)<0$ in polynomial time. Thus, the problem is in co-NP.

We will now show the problem to be co-NP-hard. We do this via a reduction from 3 UNSAT (the complement of 3 SAT ). Let $C=\left\{C_{1}, \ldots, C_{m}\right\}$ be the set of clauses and $V=\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right\}$ be the set of variables in an arbitrary instance of 3 UNSAT, where $C_{i}=\left\{\alpha_{i 1}, \alpha_{i 2}, \alpha_{i 3}\right\}$ and $\alpha_{i j} \in\{x, \bar{x} \mid x \in V\}$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m, 1 \leqslant j \leqslant 3$. We construct a PN $\mathscr{P}=\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ (shown in Fig. 4.2) that is normal iff $C$ is not


Fig. 4.2. The lower bound for Theorem 4.4.
satisfiable. In considering whether a PN is normal or not, it is convenient to view the PN as simply a directed bipartite graph; places and transitions are differentiated only in connection with their respective roles regarding minimal circuits. The initial marking is therefore irrelevant and will be chosen to be the zero marking. The graph will contain a special place $z$ such that $\mathscr{P}$ will be normal iff $z$ is not on a minimal circuit. Our objective will then be to show that $z$ is on a minimal circuit iff $C$ is satisfiable. The graph will consist of three components $Q, R$, and $S$, each of which will be acyclic. Furthermore, the three components will be interconnected in such a manner that any cycle in the graph must contain vertices from each of the three components. We will first describe each of the three components, then describe how they are interconnected.
$Q$ is the simplest of the three components, consisting of only a single transition $s_{1}$. Component $R$ is defined in terms of the set $V$. For each $x_{j} \in V, R$ contains the places $p_{j}^{t}, p_{j}^{f}, q_{j}^{t}$, and $q_{j}^{f}$, and the transitions $x_{j}^{t}, x_{j}^{f}$, and $y_{j}$. These places and transitions are interconnected as shown in Fig. 4.2 so that $R$ is acyclic, and any path within $R$ contains at most one of the two transitions $x_{j}^{t}$ and $x_{j}^{f}$ for each $j$. Component $S$ is defined in terms of the set $C$. For each $C_{i} \in C, S$ contains the places $a_{i}^{1}, a_{i}^{2}$, and $a_{i}^{3}$, plus the transition $c_{i}$. In addition, $S$ contains the place $z$ and the transition $s_{2}$. The places and transitions are interconnected as shown in Fig. 4.2 so that $S$ is acyclic, and any path within $S$ contains at most one of the places $a_{i}^{1}, a_{i}^{2}$, and $a_{i}^{3}$ for each $i$.

We now add edges to the graph to interconnect the three components. We first add the edges $\left(s_{1}, p_{1}^{t}\right),\left(s_{1}, p_{1}^{f}\right),\left(y_{n}, z\right),\left(a_{m}^{1}, s_{1}\right),\left(a_{m}^{2}, s_{1}\right)$, and $\left(a_{m}^{3}, s_{1}\right)$. These edges have the effect of creating a number of circuits, each of which contains $s_{1}, z$, exactly one of $x_{j}^{t}$ or $x_{j}^{f}$ for each variable $x_{j}$, and exactly one of $a_{i}^{1}, a_{i}^{2}$, or $a_{i}^{3}$ for each clause $C_{i}$. Next, we add additional edges from $R$ to $S$, each of which "short-circuits" some of the previously created circuits. For each literal $\alpha_{i k}$ in each clause in $C$, we add the edge $\left(x_{j}^{f}, a_{i}^{k}\right)$ if $\alpha_{i k}=x_{j}$, or the edge $\left(x_{j}^{t}, a_{i}^{k}\right)$ if $\alpha_{i k}=\bar{x}_{j}$. Thus, none of these newly created circuits contains $z$, but ail contain $s_{1}$.

We will now show that the PN $\mathscr{P}$ constructed above is normal iff $z$ is not on a minimal circuit. If $\mathscr{P}$ is normal, $z$ clearly must not be on any minimal circuit $c$, since transition $s_{2}$ would then have an input place in $\mathrm{pl}(c)$ but no output place in $\mathrm{pl}(c)$. On the other hand, suppose $z$ is not on a minimal circuit. In order to derive a contradiction, assume there is some minimal circuit $c$ and some transition $t$ such that $t$ has an input place in $\operatorname{pl}(c)$ but no output place in $\mathrm{pl}(c)$. Notice that $z$ is the only place in $\mathscr{P}$ that is an input place to more than one transition. Since $z \notin \operatorname{pl}(c)$, this implies that $t$ is in the circuit $c$. Therefore, $t$ must have an output place in $\mathrm{pl}(c)$ a contradiction. Thus, $\mathscr{P}$ is normal iff $z$ is not on a minimal circuit.

We conclude the proof by showing that $z$ is on a minimal circuit iff $C$ is satisfiable; it will then follow that $\mathscr{P}$ is normal iff $C$ is not satisfiable. First suppose $z$ is on a minimal circuit $c$. Since any circuit containing $z$ must contain exactly one of $x_{j}^{t}$ or $x_{j}^{f}$ for each variable $x_{j}$, consider the truth assignment such that $x_{j}$ is true iff $x_{j}^{t}$ is in $c$. Let $c_{i}$ be an arbitrary clause in $C$. Since any circuit containing $z$ contains exactly one of $a_{i}^{1}, a_{i}^{2}$, or $a_{i}^{3}$, let $a_{i}^{k}$ be on $c$. Suppose $\alpha_{i k}=x_{j}$ (the case in
which $\alpha_{i k}=\bar{x}_{j}$ is symmetric). Then there is an edge from $x_{j}^{f}$ to $a_{i}^{k}$. Since $c$ is a minimal circuit, $x_{j}^{t}$ must be on $c$, so $\alpha_{i k}$ has been assigned a value of true. Thus, each clause evaluates to true, so $C$ is satisfiable. Conversely, suppose $C$ is satisfiable. Then for any satisfying assignment, there must be some circuit containing $x_{j}^{t}$ if $x_{j}$ is true in that assignment, $x_{j}^{f}$ if $x_{i}$ is false in that assignment, some place $a_{i}^{k}$ such that $\alpha_{i k}$ is true with that assignment for each clause $C_{i}$, and the place $z$. In order to derive a contradiction, assume $c$ is not minimal. Then there must be some edge from a transition in $R$, say (without loss of generality) $x_{j}^{t}$, to some place in $S$, say $a_{i}^{k}$, such that $p_{j}^{t}$ (and hence $x_{j}^{t}$ ) and $a_{i}^{k}$ are both on $c$. Since $x_{j}^{t}$ and $a_{i}^{k}$ are both on $c, x_{j}$ and $\alpha_{i}$ must both evaluate to true. However, since there is an edge from $x_{j}^{t}$ to $a_{i}^{k}, \alpha_{i}=\bar{x}_{j}$-a contradiction. Therefore, $z$ is on a minimal circuit iff $C$ is satisfiable, and hence, $\mathscr{P}$ is normal iff $C$ is not satisfiable.

We conclude this section by showing the CP and EP for normal and sinkless PNs to be $\Pi_{2}^{P}$-complete, where $\Pi_{2}^{P}$ is the class of languages whose complements are in the second level of the polynomial-time hierarchy (see, e.g, [Sto77]). The strategy we use is again similar to that developed in [HR88] (see also [HRHY86, Huy86]). Recall that sinkless PNs have effectively computable semilinear reachability sets [Yam84]. We use Lemma 4.3 to give an upper bound on the size of the SLS representation of the reachability set of a given sinkless PN. Although the CP and EP for SLSs are known to be $\Pi_{2}^{P}$-complete [Huy82], the bound on the size of the SLS representation of the reachability set must be at least exponential in the sizes of the PNs even for conflict-free PNs (see [HR88]). However, as is the case with conflict-free PNs [HR88], we can show that for sinkless PNs the SLS representation can be chosen to have a high degree of symmetry. Proceeding as in [HR88], we use this symmetry to show the CP (and, hence, the EP) to be in $\Pi_{2}^{P}$. Since the EP is known to be $\Pi_{2}^{P}$-hard for conflict-free PNs [HR88], the CP and EP will have then been shown to be $\Pi_{2}^{P}$-complete for sinkless and normal PNs. The following lemma gives an SLS representation of the reachability set of a sinkless PN. The strategy follows that developed in [HR88].

Lemma 4.4. Let $\mathscr{P}=\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ be a sinkless $P N$ with $k$ places and $m$ transitions such that no component of $\mu_{0}$ is larger than $n \geqslant 1$. Then there exist constants $c_{1}, c_{2}, d_{1}$, and $d_{2}$, independent of $k, m$, and $n$, such that $R(\mathscr{P})=\bigcup_{\mu \in \beta} \mathscr{L}\left(\mu, \rho_{\mu}\right)$, where $\beta$ is the set of all reachable markings with no component larger than $\left(c_{1} \cdot k \cdot m \cdot n\right)^{c_{2} \cdot k \cdot m}$, and $\rho_{\mu}$ is the set of all $\delta \in N^{k}$ such that:

1. for some $\sigma \in T^{*}, \mu \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mu+\delta$;
2. $\delta$ has no component larger than $\left(d_{1} \cdot k \cdot m \cdot n\right)^{d_{2} \cdot k \cdot m}$;
3. if $\mu(i)=0$, then $\delta(i)=0$, for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant k$; and
4. $\delta \neq 0$.

Proof. Clearly, $U_{\mu \in \beta} \mathscr{L}\left(\mu, \rho_{\mu}\right) \subseteq R(\mathscr{P})$. We therefore only need to show that $R(\mathscr{P}) \subseteq \bigcup_{\mu \in \beta} \mathscr{L}\left(\mu, \rho_{\mu}\right)$. Let $\mu$ be an arbitrary marking in $R(\mathscr{P})$. We define $\mu^{\prime}$ so
that $\mu^{\prime}(i)=0$ if $\mu(i)=0, \mu^{\prime}(i)=1$ otherwise. From Lemma 4.3, there is some sequence $\tau$ of $m^{\prime} \leqslant m$ distinct transitions from $T$ such that $S(\mathscr{P}, \tau)$ has a solution in which $x_{m^{\prime}}=\mu$. Let $\hat{x}$ denote this solution, and let $T^{\prime}$ be the set of transitions in $\tau$. Clearly, the system $S=S(\mathscr{P}, \tau) \cup\left\{x_{m^{\prime}} \geqslant \mu^{\prime}\right\}$ must have $\hat{x}$ in its solution set. Let $\mu$, be the value of $x_{m^{\prime}}$ in some minimal solution $\hat{y} \leqslant \hat{x}$. Also, let $\sigma \in T^{*}$ be the firing sequence given by $\hat{x}$ according to Lemma 4.3 , and let $\sigma_{0} \in T^{\prime *}$ be the firing sequence likewise given by $\hat{y}$. Thus, $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{0}} \mu_{1} \leqslant \mu$, each transition in $T^{\prime}$ is enabled at some point in $\sigma_{0}$, and $\Psi\left(\sigma_{0}\right) \leqslant \Psi(\sigma)$ (in this proof, $\Psi$ is defined in terms of $T^{\prime}$, not $T$ ). Furthermore, since $\mu^{\prime} \leqslant \mu_{1} \leqslant \mu, \mu_{1}(i)=0$ iff $\mu(i)=0,1 \leqslant i \leqslant k$. From results in [Huy82, VzGS78] involving integer linear programming, there exist constants $c_{1}$ and $c_{2}$ such that no component of $\mu_{1}$ is larger than $\left(c_{1} \cdot k \cdot m \cdot n\right)^{c_{2} \cdot k \cdot m}$. Note that since $n \geqslant 1, c_{1}$ and $c_{2}$ are independent of $\mu^{\prime}$, and hence of $\mu$. If we now assign the values of $c_{1}$ and $c_{2}$ to the constants (of the same name) in the definition of $\beta$ given in the statement of the lemma, then $\mu_{1} \in \beta$.

We will now show that $\mu \in \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{1}, \rho_{\mu_{1}}\right)$; i.e., we will exhibit a series of vectors $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{j}$ such that each $\delta_{j} \in \rho_{\mu_{1}}$ and $\mu_{1}+\sum_{i=1}^{j} \delta_{i}=\mu$. Since each $\delta_{i} \in \rho_{\mu_{i}}$, there will be some firing sequence $\sigma_{i}$ from $\mu_{1}$ such that $\bar{T}^{\prime} \cdot \Psi\left(\sigma_{i}\right)=\delta_{i}$. Furthermore, since each $\delta_{i}>0$, it will be the case that $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{0}} \mu_{1} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\sigma_{i}} \mu_{j+1}=\mu$. We already have that $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mu$ and $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{0}} \mu_{1}$, where $\Psi\left(\sigma_{0}\right) \leqslant \Psi(\sigma)$ and $\mu_{1} \leqslant \mu$. It will therefore be sufficient to show that for any $i \geqslant 1$, if $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{0}} \mu_{1} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\sigma_{i-1}} \mu_{i}<\mu$, where $\mu_{1} \leqslant \mu_{i}$ and $\sum_{h=0}^{i-1} \Psi\left(\sigma_{h}\right)<\Psi(\sigma)$, then there is a $\delta_{i} \in \rho_{\mu_{1}}$ and a $\sigma_{i}$ in $T^{* *}$ such that $\mu_{i} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{i}} \mu_{i}+\delta_{i}=\mu_{i+1} \leqslant \mu$ and $\sum_{h=0}^{i} \Psi\left(\sigma_{h}\right) \leqslant \Psi(\sigma)$. We use the fact that every transition in $T^{\prime}$ is enabled at some point in the firing of $\sigma_{0}$ from $\mu_{0}$; thus, from Lemma 4.2, no marking reached from $\mu_{1}$ via transitions from $T^{\prime}$ has a token-free circuit whose transitions all belong to $T^{\prime}$. Let $\mu_{i}$ be such that $\mu_{0} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{0}} \mu_{1} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\sigma_{i-1}} \mu_{i}<\mu$, where $\mu_{1} \leqslant \mu_{i}$ and $\sum_{h=0}^{i-1} \Psi\left(\sigma_{h}\right)<\Psi(\sigma)$; i.e., $\mu_{i}$ is reached from $\mu_{1}$ via transitions in $T^{\prime}$. It therefore follows from Lemma 4.2 that no marking reachable from $\mu_{i}$ via transitions in $T^{\prime}$ has a token-free circuit whose transitions all belong to $T^{\prime}$. Since $\mu=\mu_{0}+\bar{T}^{\prime} \cdot \Psi(\sigma)$ and $\mu_{i}=\mu_{0}+\bar{T}^{\prime}$. $\left(\sum_{h=0}^{i-1} \Psi\left(\sigma_{h}\right)\right), \quad \mu=\mu_{i}+\bar{T}^{\prime} \cdot\left(\Psi(\sigma)-\sum_{h=1}^{i}\left(\Psi\left(\sigma_{h}\right)\right)\right)$. Hence, from Lemma 3.2, $\mu_{i} \xrightarrow{\sigma^{\prime}} \mu$, where $\Psi\left(\sigma^{\prime}\right)=\Psi(\sigma)-\sum_{h=1}^{i}\left(\Psi\left(\sigma_{h}\right)\right)$. Since $\mu>\mu_{i}, \bar{T}^{\prime} \cdot \Psi\left(\sigma^{\prime}\right)>0$. Thus, $\hat{z}=\left\langle x=\Psi\left(\sigma^{\prime}\right), \quad y=\mu-\mu_{t}\right\rangle$ is a nonnegative integer solution to the system $S^{\prime}=\left\{\bar{T}^{\prime} \cdot x=y, y>0\right\}$. Let $\hat{z}^{\prime} \leqslant \hat{z}$ be some minimal solution to $S^{\prime}$, and let $\psi_{i}$ be the value of $x$ and $\delta_{i}$ be the value of $y$ in $\hat{z}^{\prime}$. From [Huy82, VzGS78], no component of $\delta_{i}$ exceeds $\left(d_{1} \cdot k \cdot m \cdot n\right)^{d_{2} \cdot k \cdot m}$ for some constants $d_{1}$ and $d_{2}$ independent of $k, m$, and $n$. Let $d_{1}$ and $d_{2}$ be the values of the constants (of the same name) in the definition of $\rho_{\mu}$ given in the lemma. From Lemma 3.2, there exist $\sigma_{i}$ and $\mu_{i+1}$ such that $\mu_{i} \xrightarrow{\sigma_{i}} \mu_{i+1}=\mu_{i}+\delta_{i} \leqslant \mu$, and $\Psi\left(\sigma_{i}\right)=\psi_{i} \leqslant \Psi\left(\sigma^{\prime}\right)=\Psi(\sigma)-\sum_{h=1}^{i-1} \Psi\left(\sigma_{h}\right)$. Thus, $\sum_{h=1}^{i} \Psi\left(\sigma_{h}\right) \leqslant \Psi(\sigma)$, and since $\mu_{1} \leqslant \mu_{i}, \delta_{i} \in \rho_{\mu i}$. It therefore follows that $\mu \in \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{1}, \rho_{\mu_{1}}\right)$.

The property of conflict-free PN reachability sets that allowed the CP to be shown to be in $\Pi_{2}^{P}$ in [HR88] is that their SLS representations have a certain symmetry. In particular, for any two markings $\mu$ and $\mu^{\prime}$ of a conflict-free

PN $\mathscr{P}=\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ such that $\mu(i)=0$ iff $\mu^{\prime}(i)=0$, if $\mu \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mu+v$ for some $\sigma \in T^{*}$ and some $v \geqslant 0$, then there is some $\sigma^{\prime} \in T^{*}$ such that $\mu^{\prime} \xrightarrow{\sigma^{\prime}} \mu^{\prime}+v$. The following lemma shows that a similar symmetry extends to sinkless PNs.

Lemma 4.5. Let $\mu$ and $\mu^{\prime}$ be reachable markings of a sinkless $P N \mathscr{P}=$ $\left(P, T, \varphi, \mu_{0}\right)$ with $k$ places such that $\mu(i)=0$ iff $\mu^{\prime}(i)=0$. For any vector $v \in N^{k}$ such that $v(i)=0$ if $\mu(i)=0$, if there is a $\sigma \in T^{*}$ such that $\mu \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mu+v$, then there is a $\sigma^{\prime} \in T^{*}$ such that $\mu^{\prime} \xrightarrow{\sigma^{\prime}} \mu^{\prime}+v$.

Proof. Suppose there is a $\sigma \in T^{*}$ such that $\mu \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mu+v$, but no $\sigma^{\prime} \in T^{*}$ such that $\mu^{\prime} \xrightarrow{\sigma^{\prime}} \mu^{\prime}+v$. From Lemma 3.2, therc is a $\sigma^{\prime \prime} \in T^{*}$ and a circuit $c$ in $\mathscr{P}$ such that $\Psi\left(\sigma^{\prime \prime} \operatorname{tr}(c)\right) \leqslant \Psi(\sigma)$ and $\mu^{\prime \prime}(c)=0$, where $\mu^{\prime} \xrightarrow{\sigma^{\prime \prime}} \mu^{\prime \prime}$, Let $c^{\prime}$ be a minimal circuit of $\mathscr{P}$ such that $\mathrm{pl}\left(c^{\prime}\right) \subseteq \mathrm{pl}(c)$, and let $p_{i} \in \operatorname{pl}\left(c^{\prime}\right)$. Since $\mu^{\prime \prime}\left(c^{\prime}\right)=0$ and $\mathscr{P}$ is sinkless, $\mu^{\prime}\left(c^{\prime}\right)=0$, and hence, $\mu\left(c^{\prime}\right)=0$ and $(\mu+v)\left(c^{\prime}\right)=0$. Since each transition in $\operatorname{tr}\left(c^{\prime}\right)$ occurs in $\sigma, p_{i}$ must have been nonzero at some point in the firing of $\sigma$ from $\mu$. At this point, $c^{\prime}$ is not token free. Therefore, $\mathscr{P}$ has a sink-a contradiction.

Now that we have given a convenient SLS representation of the reachability set of a sinkless PN and shown the symmetry therein, we can outline our strategy for showing the CP and EP to be in $\Pi_{2}^{P}$. Again, this strategy was first developed for the structurally defined conflict-free PNs in [HR88], borrowing some techniques from [Huy86]; we will use Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 to show that this strategy also applies to the behaviorally defined sinkless PNs. Let $S L_{1}=\bigcup_{\mu \in \beta_{1}} \mathscr{L}\left(\mu, \rho_{\mu}^{1}\right)$ and $S L_{2}=\bigcup_{\mu \in \beta_{2}} \mathscr{L}\left(\mu, \rho_{\mu}^{2}\right)$ be the SLS representations given by Lemma 4.4 for the sinkless PNs $\mathscr{P}_{1}$ and $\mathscr{P}_{2}$, respectively. In order to show that $R\left(\mathscr{P}_{1}\right) \nsubseteq R\left(\mathscr{P}_{2}\right)$, our algorithm will prove the existence of a $\mu \in S L_{1}-S L_{2}$. (Note that since the SLS representations are exponential in the sizes of the PN representations, the SLS representations cannot be generated by the algorithm.) Let $\mu \in S L_{1}$. Then $\mu \in \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{1}, \rho_{\mu_{1}}^{1}\right)$ for some $\mu_{1} \in \beta_{1}$. If, in addition, $\mu \in S L_{2}$, then $\mu \in \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{2}, \rho_{\mu_{2}}^{2}\right)$ for some $\mu_{2} \in \beta_{2}$. Note from the definition of the SLS representations in Lemma 4.4 that for any place $p_{i}, \mu_{1}(i)=0$ iff $\mu(i)=0$ iff $\mu_{2}(i)=0$. Furthermore, we may assume without loss of generality that $\mu_{1} \in R\left(\mathscr{P}_{2}\right)$; otherwise, we will have found a witness to the fact that $R\left(\mathscr{P}_{1}\right) \nsubseteq R\left(\mathscr{P}_{2}\right)$. Thus, from Lemma $4.5, \rho_{\mu_{2}}^{2}=\rho_{\mu_{1}}^{2}$, where $\rho_{\mu_{1}}^{2}$ is as defined in Lemma 4.4. So to show the existence of a $\mu \in S L_{1}-S L_{2}$, it is sufficient to show the existence of a $\mu \in \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{1}, \rho_{\mu_{1}}^{1}\right) \quad \bigcup_{\mu_{2} \in \beta_{2}^{\prime}} \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{2}, \rho_{\mu_{1}}^{2}\right)$ for some $\mu_{1} \in \beta_{1}$, where $\beta_{2}^{\prime}=\left\{\mu^{\prime} \in \beta_{2} \mid \mu^{\prime}(i)=0\right.$ iff $\left.\mu_{1}(i)=0\right\}$. Note that once $\mu_{1}$ is chosen, we are only concerned with two period sets, $\rho_{\mu_{1}}^{1}$ and $\rho_{\mu_{1}}^{2}$.

Consider two sets $\mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{1}, \rho_{1}\right)$ and $\bigcup_{\mu_{2} \in \beta} \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{2}, \rho_{2}\right)$. In order to show the existence of a $\mu \in \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{1}, \rho_{1}\right)-\bigcup_{\mu_{2} \in \beta} \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{2}, \rho_{2}\right)$, we will consider two cases. First, suppose that every vector in $\rho_{1}$ is a positive linear combination of the vectors in $\rho_{2}$. In [HR88], we showed that in this case there must be a $\mu \in \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{1}, \rho_{1}\right)-$ $\bigcup_{\mu_{2} \in \beta} \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{2}, \rho_{2}\right)$ whose size is polynomial in the sizes of the elements of $\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}, \beta$, and $\mu_{1}$ and exponential in the dimension of these vectors; i.e., the witness is small enough to be written down in space polynomial in the sizes of the representations of the PNs from which the SLSs are derived. On the other hand, suppose some
vector in $\rho_{1}$ is not a linear combination of the vectors in $\rho_{2}$. We also showed in [HR88] that in this case, $\mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{1}, \rho_{1}\right)$ cannot be contained in $\bigcup_{\mu_{2} \in \beta} \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{2}, \rho_{2}\right)$. We now reproduce the relevant lemmas from [HR88].

Lemma 4.6 (from [HR88]). Let $\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}$, and $\beta$ be finite subsets of $N^{k}, \mu_{1} \in N^{k}$, and $n \in N$ such that no integer in $\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}, \beta$, or $\mu_{1}$ exceeds $n$. If every vector in $\rho_{1}$ is a positive linear combination of vectors in $\rho_{2}$ and $\mu \in \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{1}, \rho_{1}\right)-\bigcup_{\mu_{2} \in \beta} \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{2}, \rho_{2}\right)$, then there is a $\mu^{\prime}$ with no component larger than $k(n+1)^{2 k+1}+n$ such that $\mu^{\prime} \in \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{1}, \rho_{1}\right)-\bigcup_{\mu_{2} \in \beta} \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{2}, \rho_{2}\right)$.

Lemma 4.7 (from [HR88]). Let $\delta, \mu_{1} \in N^{k}$ such that $\delta \neq \mathbf{0}$, and let $\rho$ and $\beta$ be finite subsets of $N^{k}$. If $\delta$ is not a positive linear combination of the vectors in $\rho$, then there is an $n \in N$ such that $\mu_{1}+n \delta \notin \bigcup_{\mu \in \beta} \mathscr{L}(\mu, \rho)$.

We are now ready to show the CP and EP for sinkless and normal PNs to be $\Pi_{2}^{P}$-complete.

Theorem 4.5. The CP and EP for sinkless (normal) PNs are $\Pi_{2}^{P}$-complete.
Proof. Since these problems for conflict-free PNs are known to be $\Pi_{2}^{P}$-hard, we need only show the problems for sinkless PNs to be in $\Pi_{2}^{P}$. Recall that $\Pi_{2}^{P}$ is the set of all complements of languages that can be recognized by a polynomial-timebounded nondeterministic Turing machine with an NP oracle (see [Sto77]). We will now briefly describe an algorithm for noncontainment; a similar algorithm works for inequivalence. The algorithm we describe is exactly that given in [HR88] for conflict-free PNs; the fact that it works for sinkless PNs, as we will now show, follows from Lemmas 4.4-4.7.

Let $\mathscr{P}_{1}$ and $\mathscr{P}_{2}$ be two given sinkless PNs, each having $k$ places, and let $S L_{1}=\bigcup_{\mu_{1} \in \beta_{1}} \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{1}, \rho_{\mu_{1}}^{1}\right)$ and $S L_{2}=\bigcup_{\mu_{2} \in \beta_{2}} \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{2}, \rho_{\mu_{2}}^{2}\right)$ be their respective SLS representations given by Lemma 4.4. We wish to establish whether there is a $\mu \in S L_{1}-S L_{2}$. Consider any $\mu \in S L_{1}$; i.e., there is a $\mu_{1} \in \beta_{1}$ such that $\mu \in \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{1}, \rho_{\mu_{1}}^{1}\right)$. Let $\beta_{2}^{\prime}=\left\{\mu \mid \mu \in \beta_{2}\right.$ and $\mu(i)=0$ iff $\left.\mu_{1}(i)=0\right\}$. Since for any $\delta \in \rho_{\mu_{2}}^{2}, \delta(i)=0$ if $\mu_{2}(i)=0$, if $\mu \in S L_{2}, \mu$ must be in $\bigcup_{\mu_{2} \in \beta_{2}} \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{2}, \rho_{\mu_{2}}^{2}\right)$. Likewise, we can conclude that $\mu_{1}(i)=0$ iff $\mu(i)=0$ iff $\mu_{2}(i)=0$ for any $\mu_{2} \in \beta_{2}^{\prime}$. Without loss of generality, assume $\mu_{1} \in S L_{2}$ (otherwise, we have $\mu_{1} \in S L_{1}-S L_{2}$ ). From Lemma 4.5, for any $\mu_{2} \in \beta_{2}^{\prime}$, $\rho_{\mu_{2}}^{2}=\rho_{\mu_{1}}^{2}$. Thus, in order to show that $\mu \notin S L_{2}$, it suffices to show that $\mu \notin \bigcup_{\mu_{2} \in \beta_{2}^{\prime}} \mathscr{L}\left(\mu_{2}, \rho_{\mu_{1}}^{2}\right)$.

Our algorithm for noncontainment therefore operates as follows. We first nondeterministically choose one of two cases. In the first case, we guess a vector $\mu$ subject to the size constraints given by Lemmas 4.4 and 4.6. Since the RP is in NP, we can verify that $\mu \in R\left(\mathscr{P}_{1}\right)$. Using an NP oracle, we can then verify that $\mu \notin R\left(\mathscr{P}_{2}\right)$. In the other case, we guess $\mu_{1}$ and $\delta$ subject to the size constraints given in Lemma 4.4. Again, we can verify that $\mu_{1} \in R\left(\mathscr{P}_{1}\right)$. Using the techniques of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 , it is easily seen that membership in $\rho_{\mu_{1}}^{1}$ is in NP; hence, we can verify that $\delta \in \rho_{\mu_{1}}^{1}$. From Caratheodory's theorem for cones (see, e.g., [SW70]),
if $\delta$ is a positive linear combination of vectors in $\rho_{\mu,}^{2}$, then it is a positive linear combination of at most $k$ linearly independent vectors from $\rho_{\mu_{1}}^{2}$. The question of whether $\delta$ is a positive linear combination of vectors in $\rho_{\mu_{1}}^{2}$ is therefore in NP. Hence, we use an NP oracle to verify that $\delta$ is not a positive linear combination of vectors in $\rho_{\mu i 1}^{2}$. From Lemmas 4.6 and 4.7, this algorithm has an accepting computation iff $R\left(\mathscr{P}_{1}\right) \nsubseteq R\left(\mathscr{P}_{2}\right)$.
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