Measuring the robustness of dynamical systems

Manon BLANC, Olivier BOURNEZ

[Introduction](#page-1-0)

- Motivated by the field of verification.
- Informal conjecture: undecidability in verification does not happen for robust systems.
- Approach: Asarin and Bouajjani (LICS '01).
- Our goal:
	- go from computability to complexity,
	- quantifying the robustness to characterise FPSPACE.

Introduction

Frame : We want to talk about discrete- and continuous-time dynamical systems. We first use the frame of Turing machines

(seen as a particular dynamical system).

[Space-perturbation of a Dynamical](#page-6-0) [System](#page-6-0)

Let \mathcal{M}_n , the *n*-space-perturbed version of TM \mathcal{M} : the idea is that the *n*-perturbed version of the machine M is unable to remain correct at a distance more than n from the head of the machine.

Let $L_n(\mathcal{M})$ be the *n*-perturbed language of \mathcal{M} .

• a word accepted by M is also recognised by all the M_n 's.

Let $L_n(\mathcal{M})$ be the *n*-perturbed language of M.

- a word accepted by M is also recognised by all the M_n 's.
- $L_{n+1}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq L_n(\mathcal{M}).$

Let $L_n(\mathcal{M})$ be the *n*-perturbed language of M.

- a word accepted by M is also recognised by all the M_n 's.
- $L_{n+1}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq L_n(\mathcal{M}).$
- $L_{\omega}(\mathcal{M}) = \bigcap_{n} L_{n}(\mathcal{M})$: this is the set of words accepted by $\mathcal M$ when subject to arbitrarily "small" perturbations.

Let $L_n(\mathcal{M})$ be the *n*-perturbed language of M.

- a word accepted by M is also recognised by all the M_n 's.
- $L_{n+1}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq L_n(\mathcal{M}).$
- $L_{\omega}(\mathcal{M}) = \bigcap_{n} L_{n}(\mathcal{M})$: this is the set of words accepted by $\mathcal M$ when subject to arbitrarily "small" perturbations.
- $L(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq L_{\omega}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq L_2(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq L_1(\mathcal{M}).$

Theorem (Perturbed reachability is co-c.e., from Asarin-Bouajjani 01)

$L_{\omega}(\mathcal{M}) \in \Pi_1^0.$

Say L is robust if $L = L_{\omega}$:

L robust \Rightarrow L decidable.

- Definition of the notion of perturbation of a TM
- Some properties

[A Characterisation of](#page-14-0) PSPACE

Definition For $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, we write $L_{\{f\}}(\mathcal{M})$ the set of words accepted by $\mathcal M$ with a "space-perturbation" f : $L_{\{f\}}(\mathcal{M}) = \{w \mid w \in L_{f(\ell(w))}(\mathcal{M})\}.$

Theorem (Polynomial precision robust ⇔ PSPACE)

 $L \in PSPACE$ iff for some M and some polynomial p, $L = L(\mathcal{M}) = L_{\{p\}}(\mathcal{M}).$

• Characterisation of PSPACE with space-perturbated TMs

[Reachability Relations](#page-18-0)

To each rational discrete time dynamical system P is associated its reachability relation $R^\mathcal{P}(\cdot,\cdot)$ on $\mathbb{Q}^d\times\mathbb{Q}^d$.

 \rightarrow two rational points **x** and **y**, $R^\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ holds iff there exists a trajectory of P from x to y .

Reachability Relation With Small Perturbations

- Consider now a discrete-time dynamical system P with function f Lipschitz on a compact domain: For $\epsilon > 0$ we consider the ϵ -perturbed system P_{ϵ} .
- Its trajectories are defined as sequences x_t satisfying $d(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_t)) < \varepsilon$ for all t.

• We denote reachability in the system $\mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon}$ by $R_{\varepsilon}^{\mathcal{P}}(\cdot,\cdot).$

•
$$
R^{\mathcal{P}}_{\omega} = \bigcap_{\epsilon} R^{\mathcal{P}}_{\epsilon}(\cdot, \cdot)
$$
 is co-c.e..

• Say
$$
R^{\mathcal{P}}
$$
 is robust when $R^{\mathcal{P}}_{\omega} = R^{\mathcal{P}}$:
 $R^{\mathcal{P}}$ robust $\Rightarrow R^{\mathcal{P}}$ computable.

Proposition (Robust \Leftrightarrow reachability true or ϵ -far from being true)

We have $R^{\mathcal{P}}_{\omega} = R^{\mathcal{P}}$ iff for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Q}^d$, either $R^{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is true or $R^{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ is false and there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that it is ϵ -far from being true.

 \Rightarrow relation with δ -reachability (Gao, Kong, Chen, Clarke '06).

Input:

- A point **x**
- \bullet A set B
- A dynamic given by the function f
- The promise that the dynamics starting from x never ends up on the border of B.

Input:

- A point x
- \bullet A set B
- A dynamic given by the function **f**
- The promise that the dynamics starting from x never ends up on the border of B.

Output: Does the dynamics starting from x reach B ?

Theorem (Polynomially robust to precision \Rightarrow PSPACE)

Take a Lipschitz system on a compact, with f poly. time computable, whose domain X is a closed rational box, and that for all rational **x**, $R^\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x})$ is closed and $R^\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x})=R^\mathcal{P}_{\set{\rho}}(\mathbf{x})$ for a polynomial p. Then the ball decision problem is in PSPACE.

Theorem (Polynomially robust to precision \Leftarrow PSPACE)

Any PSPACE language is reducible to PAM's reachability relation: $R^{\mathcal{P}} = R^{\mathcal{P}}_{\{p\}}$, for some polynomial p.

- Perturbated reachability relation for rational dynamical systems
- Characterisation of PSPACE in that framework (with additionnal properties)

[Alternative view: Drawability](#page-28-0)

But we could also see it as a relation over the reals and use the framework of CA, regarding subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Definition

A closed subset of \mathbb{R}^d is said c.e. closed if we can effectively enumerate the rational open balls intersecting it.

From the statements of CA, the following holds:

Theorem

Consider a computable discrete time system P whose domain is a computable compact. For all **x**, $\mathsf{cls}(R^\mathcal{P}(x)) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a c.e. closed subset.

Theorem (Perturbed reachability is co-c.e.)

Consider a dynamical system, with f locally Lipschitz, computable, whose domain is a computable compact, then, for all x , $cls(R_{\omega}^{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x})) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d}$ is a co-c.e. closed subset.

Say $R^{\mathcal{P}}$ is robust when $R^{\mathcal{P}}_{\omega}=R^{\mathcal{P}}\colon R^{\mathcal{P}}$ robust $\Rightarrow R^{\mathcal{P}}$ computable.

From CA, Computable \Leftrightarrow can be plotted.

Theorem Assume $\mathsf{R}^\mathcal{P}$ is closed and can be plotted effectively in a name of $\mathsf{f}.$ Then the system is robust, i.e. $R^{\mathcal{P}}_{\omega} = R^{\mathcal{P}}$.

• We have a nice extension to geometric properties

[Time-perturbation](#page-34-0)

Definition Given $f: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, we write $L^{\{f\}}(\mathcal{M})$ for the set of words accepted by M with time perturbation f : $L^{\{f\}}(\mathcal{M}) = \{w \mid w \in L^{f(\ell(w))}(\mathcal{M})\}.$

Theorem (Polynomially robust to time \Leftrightarrow PTIME)

- A language $L \in \text{PTIME}$ iff for some M and some polynomial p, $L = L(\mathcal{M}) = L^{\{p\}}(\mathcal{M}).$
- Any PTIME language is reducible to PAM's reachability: $R^{\mathcal{P}} = R^{\mathcal{P},(p)}$ for some polynomial p.

Theorem (Polynomially length robust \Rightarrow PTIME)

Assume distance d is time metric and $R^\mathcal{P}=R^{\mathcal{P},(p)}$ for some polynomial p. Then $R^{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathsf{PTIME}$.

- Definition of another type of perturbation
- Characterisation of PTIME

[Conclusion](#page-39-0)

- Characterisation of FPSPACE with the suitable notion of perturbation.
- Characterisation ot PTIME with the suitable notion of perturbation.
- Extension to drawability.