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Abstract—Inspired by privacy problems where the behavior of a system should not be revealed to an external curious observer, we investigate event concealment and concealability enforcement in discrete event systems modeled as non-deterministic finite automata under partial observation. Given a subset of secret events in a given system, concealability holds if the occurrence of all secret events remains hidden to a curious observer (an eavesdropper). A secret event is said to be (at least under some executions) unconcealable (inferable) if its occurrence can be indirectly determined with certainty after a finite number of observations. When concealability of a system does not hold (i.e., one or more secret events are unconcealable), we analyze how a defender, placed at the interface of the system with the eavesdropper, can be used to enforce concealability. The defender takes as input each observed event of the system and produces an event sequence (seen by the eavesdropper) using event deletion, insertion, or replacement. The defender is said to be C-enforceable if, following the occurrence of the secret events and regardless of subsequent activity generated by the system, it can always deploy a strategy to manipulate observations and conceal the events perpetually. We discuss systematic procedures to detect the presence of unconcealable secret events and verify C-Enforceability using techniques from state estimation and event diagnosis. We also propose a polynomial complexity construction for obtaining one necessary and one sufficient condition for C-Enforceability.

I. INTRODUCTION

Security and privacy are vital to emerging cyber-physical systems due to the increasing reliance of many applications on shared cyber infrastructures [1], [2]. In the framework of discrete event systems (DESs) [3], [4], [5], where the underlying system is usually modeled as a finite automaton or a Petri net [6], [7], [8], [9], the problems of security and privacy have been widely investigated in terms of an information flow property called opacity [10]. Opacity characterizes the ability of a system to hide a secret from an external observer, i.e., a curious eavesdropper (or simply eavesdropper in the sequel) who is assumed to have full knowledge of the system’s structure and partial observation capability.

In a typical opacity setting, secrets are represented as subsets of states or strings (sequences of events), leading respectively to stated-based and language-based opacity. Specifically, Saboori and Hadjicostis introduced in [11] a state-based verification approach for the notion of current-state opacity in a finite automaton. This approach aims to deduce if the eavesdropper can infer whether the current state of the system is a secret state or not, based on its observations. Later on, the notion of current-state opacity was extended to initial-state opacity [12], initial-and-final-state opacity [13], K-step opacity [14], and infinite-step opacity [15]. Lin proposed a notion of language-based opacity in [16]. Regardless of the definition of opacity that is proposed, an opacity property holds if, for any string that reveals a secret, there exists at least another string that does not reveal the secret and appears identical to the eavesdropper (i.e., it generates the same sequence of observations); this implies that the eavesdropper’s estimate never reveals the system’s secrets.

Opacity enforcement becomes necessary when a system is not opaque, and has been extensively studied mainly following two approaches: supervisory control strategies that restrict the system’s behavior in order to avoid opacity violations [17], or enforcement via output obfuscation [18], [19], [20], [21], [22]. More specifically, Wu and Lafortune [18], [19] first proposed a novel opacity enforcement mechanism based on the use of insertion functions, where the insertion function takes as input the sequence of observable events of the system and outputs a modified sequence to the eavesdropper via the insertion of additional strings of observable events before each observable event. Subsequently, they proposed edit functions [20], which are similar to insertion functions, but more powerful as they can alter the output behavior of the system by inserting, deleting, or replacing events. Ji et al. [21], [22] extended insertion and edit functions, respectively, into a more general setting where the insertion and edit functions may become known to the intruder. The developments for both of the above works are based on a game theoretical approach that has also been used in [23], [24].

The notion of opacity is inversely related to that of event diagnosis, which tries to determine if certain (not directly observable) events have occurred or not [3], [5]. This decision (event diagnosis) is based on observable events (occurring before and after the event in question) and on knowledge of the system model. More specifically, researchers have modeled faults of a system as unobservable events and considered how to determine whether one of these events has occurred.
that we use to enforce concealability is related to prior works on state-based opacity [11] and opacity enforcement based on insertion and edit functions. More specifically, by reducing event concealability to a current-state opacity problem (by introducing additional absorbing secret states after the system executes a secret event) and using the obfuscation techniques in [18], [19], [20], [21], one can verify whether event concealability is $C$-enforceable or not via a necessary and sufficient condition that can be obtained with exponential complexity. Unlike these approaches, our dual aim is to obtain, with polynomial complexity, one necessary condition and one sufficient condition respectively for enforcing event concealability in the system. If the necessary condition is not satisfied, then we reach the same conclusion as by using the above more complex approaches (i.e., that concealability is not $C$-enforceable); alternatively, we are certain that event concealability is $C$-enforceable if the sufficient condition is satisfied. Overall, the main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

1) The privacy of a system is considered in terms of concealing secret events and the concept of event concealment is proposed. A formal description of secret events and concealability is provided, and a diagnoser-based approach is developed to verify concealability of the system. The relationship between event concealment and event diagnosis is also characterized precisely.

2) The problem of concealability enforcement is formulated if a system is unconcealable. We briefly discuss how enforceability of defensive functions can be verified with exponential complexity using the approaches inspired by state estimation and diagnosis. Moreover, we propose a polynomial complexity construction that can be used to obtain one necessary and one sufficient condition for event concealability, depending on whether the defender operates under constraints or not.

II. Preliminaries

A. System model

Let $E$ be a finite set of events and $E^*$ be the set of all finite length strings (finite sequences of events) over $E$ including the empty string $\varepsilon$. For a string $\lambda \in E^*$, we denote its length by $|\lambda|$ (the length of the empty string is defined as $|\varepsilon| = 0$). A language $L \subseteq E^*$ is a subset of finite-length strings. A prefix of a string $\lambda \in E^*$ is a string $u \in E^*$ for which there exists a string $v \in E^*$ such that $uv = \lambda$, where $uv$ denotes the concatenation of strings $u$ and $v$. The prefix closure of $\lambda$ is the set of all of its prefixes denoted by $\lambda^* = \{ u \in E^* | \exists v \in E^*, uv = \lambda \}$. We denote by $L \setminus \lambda$ the postlanguage of $L$ after $\lambda$, i.e., $L \setminus \lambda = \{ u \in E^* | \lambda u \in L \}$. Given $\alpha \in E$ and $\lambda \in E^*$, we say that $\lambda$ contains $\alpha$, written as $\alpha \in \lambda$, if there exist $u, v \in E^*$ such that $\lambda = u\alpha v$.

In this paper, we model a DES as a non-deterministic finite automaton (NFA) $G = (X, E, f, X_0)$, where $X$ is the finite set of states, $E$ is the finite set of events, $f : X \times E \rightarrow 2^X$ is the state transition function, and $X_0 \subseteq X$ is the set of possible initial states. The transition function
f can be extended to $X \times E^* \rightarrow 2^X$ in the usual manner: $f(x, \alpha\lambda) = \bigcup_{x' \in f(x, \alpha)} f(x', \lambda)$ for $x \in X$, $\alpha \in E$, and $\lambda \in E^*$, with $f(x, \varepsilon) = \{x\}$. The generated language of NFA $G$, denoted by $L(G)$, is defined as $L(G) = \{ \lambda \in E^* \mid \exists x \in X_0, f(x, \lambda) \neq \emptyset \}$. The language $L(G)$ is said to be live if for all $\lambda \in L(G)$, there exists at least one event $\alpha \in E$ such that $\lambda\alpha \in L(G)$. Note that without loss of generality, we assume that the set $X_0$ is a singleton.

A deterministic finite automaton (DFA) is a special case of an NFA, denoted by $G_d = (X, E, f, x_0)$, where $X$ and $E$ have the same interpretations as in an NFA, $x_0 \in X$ is the initial state, and the state transition function is captured by a possibly partially defined deterministic function $f : X \times E \rightarrow X$. Transition function $f$ can be extended to $X \times E^* \rightarrow X$ in the usual manner: $f(x, \alpha\lambda) = f(f(x, \alpha), \lambda)$ for $x \in X$, $\alpha \in E$, and $\lambda \in E^*$, with $f(x, \varepsilon) = x$ (note that $f(x, \alpha\lambda)$ is undefined if $f(x, \alpha)$ is undefined).

The generated language of DFA $G_d$, denoted by $L(G_d)$, is defined as $L(G_d) = \{ \lambda \in E^* \mid f(x_0, \lambda) \}$, where $f(x_0, \lambda)$! means that $f(x_0, \alpha\lambda)$ is defined.

The event set $E$ in an NFA or DFA can be partitioned into a set of observable events $E_o$ and a set of unobservable events $E_{uo} = E - E_o$ due to partial observation of a system. For a sequence $\lambda \in L(G)$, the natural projection (with respect to the set of observable events $E_o$) is defined as $P : E^* \rightarrow E_o^*$, where $P(\alpha) = \alpha$, if $\alpha \in E_o$, $P(\alpha) = \varepsilon$, if $\alpha \in E_u \cup \{\varepsilon\}$; and $P(\lambda\alpha) = P(\lambda)P(\alpha)$, where $\alpha \in E$, and $\lambda \in E^*$. Essentially, the natural projection strips out the unobservable events from a given sequence of events (and presents the sequence of observable events). The inverse projection of $P$ is defined as $P^{-1} : E_o^* \rightarrow E^*$ with $P^{-1}(\omega) = \{ \lambda \in E^* \mid P(\lambda) = \omega \in E_o^* \}$. For state $x \in X$, we denote by $E_o(x) = \{ \sigma \in E_o \mid f(x, \sigma) \neq \emptyset \}$ the set of observable events defined at state $x$.

### B. Event Diagnosis

Consider a system to be diagnosed that is modeled as an NFA $G = (X, E, f, X_0)$ with $E = E_o \cup E_{uo}$. Let $E_f \subseteq E_{uo}$ denote the set of fault events to be diagnosed. For the sake of simplicity, we consider a single type of faults, i.e., $E_f = \{f\}$. In this perspective, the notion of diagnosability (defined below) is the ability to detect every fault occurrence in the system, where a necessary and sufficient condition for diagnosability is provided in [25].

**Definition 1:** Given a system $G$ and its generated language $L(G)$, $G$ is diagnosable w.r.t. a natural projection $P$ and a set of fault events $E_f$ if for all $f \in E_f$, and all $\lambda = \lambda_1 f \in L(G)$, where $\lambda_1 \in E^*$, there exists a finite number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $\lambda_2 \in L(G) \setminus \lambda$ with $|\lambda_2| \geq n$, and all $\lambda' \in P^{-1}(P(\lambda_2)) \cap L(G)$, $\lambda' \neq \emptyset$ holds.

In plain words, the notion of diagnosability considers a fault to be diagnosable if it can be detected with certainty within a finite number of observable events after its occurrence. Naturally, a system is diagnosable if it is able to detect any fault occurrence with a finite delay using the record of observed events.

### III. Event Concealment Formulation

Since online services and network communications are increasingly significant to our daily life, the privacy of users may be exposed to potentially malicious eavesdroppers through the process of information transmission. For this reason, secrets have been well defined as a subset of states or sequences of events in various opacity formulation in DESs [11], [12], [14], [15], [16]. In this work, we are interested in a scenario where a subset of events is deemed as the secret of a given system, and define the corresponding problem of event concealment for secret events of the system under partial observation. More specifically, we consider a system modeled as an NFA $G = (X, E, f, X_0)$ with event set $E = E_o \cup E_{uo}$, where $E_o$ and $E_{uo}$ are the sets of observable events and unobservable events, respectively. We assume, without loss of generality, that the set of secret events $E_S$ is a subset of $E_{uo}$ (i.e., $E_S \subseteq E_{uo}$) since observable secret events will be trivially revealed. For the sake of simplicity, we consider a single type of secrets, i.e., $E_s = \{s\}$. We make the following assumptions (similar to [25]) for the NFA $G$:

1. The language of $G$ is live, which means that there is at least one event defined at each state $x \in X$;
2. There exists no cycle of unobservable events in $G$;
3. Every secret event is unobservable ($E_S \subseteq E_{uo}$).

**Definition 2:** Given a system $G$ and its generated language $L(G)$, the occurrence of secret event $s \in E_S$ is said to be concealable in $L(G)$ w.r.t. a natural projection $P$ if for each $\lambda = \lambda_1 s \lambda_2 \in L(G)$, where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in E^*$, there exists $\lambda' \in P^{-1}(P(\lambda)) \cap L(G)$ such that $s \notin \lambda'$ holds. The system $G$ is concealable w.r.t. $P$ and $E_S$ if for all $s \in E_S$, $s$ is concealable.

Suppose that a secret event $s \in E_S$ occurs after a sequence $\lambda_1$. Event $s$ is said to be concealable if after any indefinitely extendible continuation $\lambda_2 \in E^*$, there exists a sequence $\lambda'$ that has the same observation as that of $\lambda = \lambda_1 s \lambda_2$ but contains no secret event $s$; this implies that the secret event $s$ cannot be detected.

**Definition 3:** Given a system $G$ and its generated language $L(G)$, the occurrence of secret event $s \in E_S$ is said to be unconcealable in $L(G)$ w.r.t. a natural projection $P$ if there exists $\lambda_s = \lambda_1 s \lambda_2 \in L(G)$, where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in E^*$, and for all $\lambda' \in P^{-1}(P(\lambda_s)) \cap L(G)$, $s \notin \lambda'$ holds. Such a sequence $\lambda_s$ is called an $s$-revealing sequence. The system $G$ is concealing w.r.t. $P$ and $E_S$ if there exists at least one unconcealable secret event $s \in E_S$.

Note that, even if the secret event $s \in E_S$ is assumed to be unobservable, the secret can be indirectly detected following some observations after its occurrence, i.e., $P(\lambda_s)$ may lead to the conclusion that $s$ has occurred. Apparently, a system is concealable if all secret events are concealable, whereas the system is unconcealable if some (at least one) secret events are unconcealable.

### A. Comparison between Event Diagnosis and Event Concealment

From Definition 1, a fault is said to be diagnosable if it can be detected within a finite number of observable events.
after its occurrence. In order to detect the fault accurately, one should ensure that the fault can be detected for any execution after the occurrence of the fault. When considering a secret event, once it gets revealed under *some* execution after its occurrence, it means that the privacy of the system has been compromised (since there is a possibility for the secrecy of the event to be compromised). Thus, there is clearly an inverse relationship between event diagnosis and event concealment. However, the two notions are not exactly the opposite of each other as clarified by the following proposition. For the sake of comparison, we assume that the set of secret events is exactly the same as the set of fault events, i.e., the set of particular events $E_p = E_S = E_f$.

**Proposition 1:** Given a system $G = (X, E, f, X_0)$ and its generated language $L(G)$, $G$ is not diagnosable w.r.t. a natural projection $P$, and a set of particular events $E_p = E_S = E_f$ if $G$ is concealable w.r.t. $P$ and $E_p$.

The proof of Proposition 1 is omitted since it follows directly from Definitions 1, 2, and 3. Consider a system $G$ with its generated language $L(G)$. From Definition 1, one can deduce that $G$ is not diagnosable if for some $\lambda_1 f \in L(G)$, there exists a subsequent finite sequence $\lambda_2$ of arbitrary length such that $\lambda = \lambda_1 f \lambda_2 \in L(G)$ and we can find $X' \subseteq P^{-1}(P(\lambda))$ with $f \notin X'$. Hence, we can conclude that if $G$ is concealable, then $G$ is not diagnosable with respect to $P$ and $f$ by following Definition 2; however, the reverse is not necessarily true. The following example is provided to illustrate the differences between event diagnosis and event concealment.

**Example 1:** Consider the system modeled as the NFA $G = (X, E, f, X_0)$ shown in Fig. 1, where $X = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $X_0 = \{1\}$, and $E = E_o \cup E_uo$ with set of observable events $E_o = \{a, b\}$ and set of unobservable events $E_uo = \{\sigma\}$. Event $\sigma$ is a special event (fault or secret event). If the dotted cycle of event $a$ at state 4 is not present, event $\sigma$ is not diagnosable since the occurrence of $\sigma$ is indistinguishable regardless of the executions of event $a$ or $b$. In this case, event $\sigma$ is concealable according to Definition 2 while it is not diagnosable according to Definition 1. On the other hand, if the dotted cycle of event $a$ at state 4 is considered, event $\sigma$ is still not diagnosable since the system may execute the sequence $ab$ repeatedly any number of times. However, it is unconcealable since the occurrence of event $a$ at state 4 may lead to disclosure of event $\sigma$ (i.e., following the occurrence of $(ab)^n$ for some $n$, we subsequently observe event $a$).

**B. Problem formulation**

In the remainder of this paper, we consider a system modeled as an NFA $G = (X, E, f, X_0)$ with a set of initial states $X_0 = \{x_0\}$ and a set of secret events $E_S = \{s\} \subseteq E_uo$, where $E = E_o \cup E_uo$ (with $E_o$ being the set of observable events and $E_uo$ being the set of unobservable events). We are interested in hiding from an external observer (a curious eavesdropper) confidential information of the system that is represented as the occurrence of events from a subset of $E_uo$, i.e., $E_S \subseteq E_uo$, which is called the secret set. Accordingly, the privacy of the system is the concealment of the occurrence of the secret events. Although the secret events are unobservable, they may be revealed following a finite number of observations after their occurrences. The problem of event concealment is stated as follows, where the goal is to determine whether the secret events of the system are concealed.

**Problem 1:** Given an NFA $G = (X, E, f, X_0)$ with $E = E_o \cup E_uo$ ($E_o$ being the sets of observable events and $E_uo$ being the set of unobservable events), determine whether or not $G$ is concealable w.r.t. a natural projection $P$ and a set of secret events $E_S \subseteq E_uo$.

**IV. DIAGNOSER AND VERIFYER CONSTRUCTIONS**

There are two ways to systematically verify diagnosability (i.e., the property that a fault will be diagnosed under any system behavior), namely the construction of a diagnoser as proposed in [25], or the construction of a verifier as presented in [26], [27]. Note that in order to detect/identify secret events, in this section we also present diagnoser and verifier constructions with some modifications.

We first define a secret label $l \in \{N, S\}$ to capture the diagnostic information at each state of the system, where label $S$ is associated with a state that can be reached via a sequence of events that contains the secret event $s \in E_S$, whereas label $N$ is associated with a state that can be reached via a sequence of events that does not contain the secret event.

**A. Diagnoser Construction**

The diagnoser $G_d$ of a given system $G = (X, E, f, X_0)$ is a DFA $G_d = (X_d, E_o, f_d, x_{d0})$ determined from $G$ [25], where $X_d \subseteq 2^X \times \{N, S\}$ is the set of states, $x_{d0} = \{(x, S)\} \cup \{(x, N)\}$ is the initial state, and $f_d$ is the transition function constructed in a manner similar to the transition function of an observer [28], which includes attaching secret labels $l$ to the states and propagating these labels from state to state. Note that the resulting state space $X_d$ is a subset of $2^X \times \{N, S\}$ composed of the states of the diagnoser that are reachable from $x_{d0}$ under $f_d$.

Given a system $G = (X, E, f, X_0)$ and its diagnoser $G_d = (X_d, E_o, f_d, x_{d0})$, a state $x_d$ in $X_d$ is of the form.
$x_d = \{(x_1, l_1), (x_2, l_2), \ldots, (x_n, l_n)\}$, where $x_i \in X$ and $l_i \in \{N, S\}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. A state $x_d = \{(x_1, l_1), (x_2, l_2), \ldots, (x_n, l_n)\}$ is called a normal state if $l_i = N$ for all $(x_i, l_i) \in x_d$, $x_d$ is called a secret state if $l_i = S$ for all $(x_i, l_i) \in x_d$; and $x_d$ is called an uncertain state if there exist $(x_i, l_i), (x_j, l_j) \in x_d$ such that $l_i = N$ and $l_j = S$, where $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$.

The state space $X$ can be accordingly partitioned into three disjoint sets $X_o = X_{N_o} \cup X_{S_o} \cup X_{NS_o}$, where $X_{N_o}$ is the set of normal states, $X_{S_o}$ is the set of secret states, and $X_{NS_o}$ is the set of uncertain states.

### B. Verifier Construction

Given a system $G = (X, E, f, X_0)$, its verifier is proposed in [26] and its construction can be obtained via the following two steps:

1) First, we construct an NFA $G_o = (X_o, E_o, f_o, x_o^0)$ from $G$ with $L(G_o) = P(L(G))$, where $X_o = \{(x_i, l_i)|x_i \in X, l_i \in \{N, S\}\}$ is the finite set of states, $E_o$ is the set of observable events, $x_o^0 = (x_0, N)$ is the initial state, and $f_o : X_o \times E_o \rightarrow 2^{X_o}$ is the transition function for $x \in X_o$, $e \in E_o$, defined as follows:

$$f_o((x, l), e) = \begin{cases} \{(x', N)|\exists t \in (E - E_o)^*, P(t) = e, x' = f(x, t)\}, & \text{if } l = N, \\ \{(x', S)|\exists u = u'Su' \in E^*, P(u) = e, x' = f(x, u)\}, & \text{if } l = N, \\ \{(x', S)|\exists u \in E^*, P(v) = e, x' = f(x, v)\}, & \text{if } l = S. \end{cases}$$

2) Then, a verifier, captured by $G_o$, can be obtained by composing $G_o$ with itself. It is defined as $G_v = (X_v, E_v, f_v, x_v^0)$, where $X_v = X_o \times X_o$ is the set of states, $E_v$ is the set of observable events, $f_v : X_v \times E_v \rightarrow 2^{X_v}$ is the transition function defined by $f_v((x_i, l_i)(x_j, l_j), e) = (f_o((x_i, l_i), e), f_o((x_j, l_j), e))$ for all $e \in E_v$ if only if both $f_o((x_i, l_i), e)$ and $f_o((x_j, l_j), e)$ are defined, and $x_v^0 = x_o^0 \times x_o^0 = \{(x_0, N), (x_0, N)\} \in X_v$ is the initial state.

Since the secret label $l$ is attached to each state in the verifier, we can partition $X_v$ into three disjoint sets in a similar manner as done for the diagnoser. Each state $x_v \in X_v$ can be seen as a pair $(\{x_i, l_i\}, \{x_j, l_j\})$, where $x_i, x_j \in X$ and $l_i, l_j \in \{N, S\}$. State $x_v = \{(x_i, l_i), (x_j, l_j)\}$ is called a normal state if $l_i = l_j = N$; it is called a secret state if $l_i = l_j = S$; and it is called an uncertain state if $l_i \neq l_j$. The state space $X_v$ can be partitioned into three disjoint sets $X_v = X_{N_v} \cup X_{S_v} \cup X_{NS_v}$, where $X_{N_v}$ is the set of normal states, $X_{S_v}$ is that of secret states, and $X_{NS_v}$ is that of uncertain states.

Since the diagnoser $G_d$ and $G_v$ are driven by the observable events of system $G$, we have $P(L(G)) = L(G_d) = L(G_v)$. Also, since the verifier $G_v$ is obtained from composing $G_o$ with itself, we have $L(G_v) = L(G_o) \cap L(G_o) = L(G_v)$. Therefore, one can capture the fact that $P(L(G)) = L(G_d) = L(G_v)$, which means that both $G_d$ and $G_v$ can track the observable sequences of the system $G$ to infer the specific unobservable events, i.e., the secret events.

**Example 2:** Consider the system $G = (X, E, f, X_0)$ as shown in Fig. 2(a) where $X = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$, $X_0 = \{1\}$, and $E = E_o \cup E_u$ with $E_o = \{a, b, c, d\}$ and $E_u = \{s\}$. Assume that the set of secret events $E_s$ equals $E_u$, i.e., $E_s = E_u = \{s\}$. If we observe event $c$, we are not sure if $s$ has happened since there are two paths resulting in the observation of event $c$ but only the first one (so) contains $s$. If we observe sequence $cb$, then we know for sure that event $s$ has occurred since the string $cb$ enables the identification of the occurrence of event $s$. Two diagnostic models are proposed next to capture diagnostic information in accordance to system activity.

The diagnoser $G_d$ (shown in Fig. 2(b)) and $G_v$ (shown in Fig. 2(c)) are driven by the observable events in $G$. The verifier $G_v$ shown in Fig. 2(d) is constructed by the composition $G_o$ with itself. For the sake of simplicity, each state $(x, l)$ is written as $xl$. As mentioned above, if any observable event is generated by $G$, the diagnoser assembles all possible states that the system might reach whereas the verifier tracks pairs. For instance, if event $c$ occurs from the initial state, $G_d$ will reach state $\{3S, 5N, 6S\}$, whereas $G_v$ will reach one of four possible states $\{\{3S, 3S\}, \{5N, 5N\}, \{3S, 5N\}, \{5N, 3S\}\}$. Note that since states $\{5N, 3S\}$ and $\{3S, 5N\}$ are the same in terms of labels, we only reserve state $\{3S, 5N\}$ in the remainder of the paper. An external observer can detect the occurrence of the secret event $s$ via the diagnoser $G_d$ or the verifier $G_v$, i.e., as long as an observable sequence $da^s$ is captured. A formal approach to verify concealability of the system is presented in the next section.

**Remark 1:** (Computational complexity of a diagnoser and a verifier) Given a system $G$, its diagnoser $G_d$ can be constructed via the method in [25] with exponential complexity of $O(2^{|X|} \times 2^{|E_o|} \times |E_o|) = O(2^{|X|} \times |E_o|)$; and its verifier $G_v$ can be constructed via the method in [26] with polynomial complexity of $O((|X| \times 2^{|E_u|})^2 \times |E_o|) = O(4|X|^2 \times |E_o|)$.

### V. Verification of Concealability

This section presents a necessary and sufficient condition for concealability based on a diagnoser construction. The idea is that a secret event is concealable if and only if for each arbitrarily long sequence in which the secret event occurs at least once, we can find at least one other arbitrarily long sequence in which the secret event does not appear and the two sequences have the same observable projection. To proceed, several definitions are provided below.

**Definition 4:** Given a system $G = (X, E, f, X_0)$ and its diagnoser $G_d = (X_d, E_d, f_d, x_{d_0})$, a set of states $\{x_{d_1}, x_{d_2}, \ldots, x_{d_{n+1}}\} \subseteq X_d$ is said to form a cycle $C_d$ w.r.t. an observable sequence $\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \ldots \lambda_n \in E_o^*$ if $f_d(x_{d_i}, \lambda_i) = x_{d_{i+1}}$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, and $x_{d_{n+1}} = x_{d_1}$.

**Definition 5:** A cycle $C_d$ formed by a set of states $\{x_{d_1}, x_{d_2}, \ldots, x_{d_{n+1}}\} \subseteq X_d$ is said to be a normal cycle, denoted by $C_{N_d}$, if for all $x_{d_i} \in \{x_{d_1}, x_{d_2}, \ldots, x_{d_{n+1}}\}$,
Fig. 2: Illustration of diagnoser and verifier constructions of a given system.

Fig. 2 provides an example of a system that is not concealable. Specifically, one can notice that there are two secret cycles represented as \( C_{S_{d_1}} \) formed by \{4S\} and \( C_{S_{d_2}} \) formed by \{7S\} in \( G_d \) as shown in Fig. 2(b). Hence, system \( G \) is unconcealable since an eavesdropper is able to detect the occurrence of the secret event if cycles \( C_{S_{d_1}} \) and \( C_{S_{d_2}} \) are reached.

Remark 2: (A verifier cannot be used to verify concealability) The reason why a verifier cannot have the same functionality as the diagnoser is because it tracks the behavior of system \( G \) in a pairwise manner which does not allow us to be conclusive about concealability. One can consider that the diagnoser \( G_d \) tracks all possible diagnostic information when it observes the behavior of \( G \), while the verifier \( G_v \) tracks only two strings in \( L(G) \) that look identical under projection \( P \). To verify concealability, one needs to check whether the occurrence of secret events has been detected in all diagnostic states of a diagnoser construction. Intuitively, the presence of a secret cycle \( C_{S_{d_1}} \) in \( G_d \) leads to the conclusion that the occurrence of secret events has been detected; that is, the system \( G \) is unconcealable. However, the presence of a secret cycle in a verifier \( G_v \) does not necessarily imply the violation of concealability. For example, if the occurrence of observable sequence \( \lambda \in P(L(G)) \) can reach an uncertain cycle \( C_{NS_d} \) in \( G_d \), then there exist at least one secret cycle, one normal cycle, and one uncertain cycle in \( G_v \) via the
same execution $\lambda$. Thus, a verifier cannot be used to verify the concealability of a system. Nevertheless, as we argue later in the paper, the verifier can still be used to obtain necessary and/or sufficient conditions for $C$-Enforceability.

VI. MANIPULATION OF OBSERVATIONS UNDER DEFENSE

Suppose that an eavesdropper aims to determine whether the secret events have occurred or not by tracking observable sequences of a given system $G = (X, E, f, X_0)$. From the previous section, concealability of a system is violated if, under some system behavior, the occurrence of any one secret event can be detected, i.e., there exists a secret cycle $C_s$ in $G$. To enforce concealability of a system, we allow an external defender at the interface of the system to manipulate actual observations generated by the system such that a different diagnostic state is perceived at the eavesdropper.

We assume that each output event of the system can be manipulated via the operations of replacement, insertion, or deletion. Note that only one output event of the system can be manipulated at a time. In other words, a given event is not allowed to be replaced and simultaneously has an event inserted before it. More specifically, given any single observation $t \in E_o$, we assume that the defender has the capability to replace $t$ with any other observable event in the set of replaced events $E_R \subseteq E_o \cup \{\varepsilon\}$, or insert before it any single event in the set of inserted events $E_I \subseteq E_o$. Such an event in $E_R$ or $E_I$ appears to the intruder to be identical to the events generated by the system.

We introduce the notation $t^o$/$t^e$ used to represent defensive operations, so that defensive actions can be distinguished from events generated by a system. Given an observable event $t \in E_o$ generated by the system, a defender is implemented by a defensive function $D : E_o \rightarrow 2^{E_o/E_o'}$, where $E_o/E_o' = \{t^o \mid t \in E_o, o \in E_o \cup \{t \mid e \in E_I\}\}$. The defensive function is defined as $D(t) = \{t^o \mid t^o \in E_o/E_o'\}$ and captures the set of possible defensive actions for the given $t$. Note that $t^o$ indicates event $t$ is replaced with event $o$ (with $o = \varepsilon$ implying a deletion operation and $o = t$ implying no operation), and $o = t$ is used to indicate that event $e$ is inserted before event $t$.

For an observable sequence $u = t_1t_2\ldots t_n \in E_o$, $D(t_i)$ can be treated differently according to each observable event $t_i$, depending on the time instant it is observed ($i$ is related to the position of the observable event in the observable sequence of length $|u| = n$, i.e., $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |u|\}$). Moreover, we require that every defensive function $D(t_i)$ should be causal: when dealing with the observable sequence $u$ of the system, $D(t_i)$ should manipulate observations step by step, i.e., $D(t_i)$ defined at observation $t_i$ is determined by the current observation $t_i$, the previous observations $t_1t_2\ldots t_i-1$ and the previous alterations $D(t_1)D(t_2)\ldots D(t_{i-1})$.

In order to record the defensive actions easily for the observation sequence $u = t_1t_2\ldots t_n \in E_o^*$, a string-based defensive function that can capture the set of possible sequences of defensive actions is introduced, denoted by $D^* : E_o^* \rightarrow 2^{(E_o/E_o')}^*$ and defined as $D^*(u) = D^*(t_1t_2\ldots t_{n-1})D(t_n)$ for the observation sequence $u$. Recall that notation $/ \tau$ is added into the defensive actions, which should be stripped out from $D^*$ such that a defensive observable sequence can be recognized and transmitted to the eavesdropper. Therefore, we introduce a defensive projection $P_D : (E_o/E_o')^* \rightarrow E_o'$, which is defined recursively as

$$P_D(\sigma) = \begin{cases} a, & \sigma = t/o \\ e_t, & \sigma = t/e_t \end{cases}$$

where $t \in E_o$, $o \in E_R$, $e \in E_I$, and $P_D(\omega\sigma) = P_D(\omega)P_D(\sigma)$ for $\omega \in (E_o/E_o')^*$ and $\sigma \in E_o/E_o'$.

Remark 3: The defensive function can be viewed as an interface at the system output that is used to confuse the eavesdropper. In order to consider how the defensive function works under some constraints, the following two scenarios are presented in the developments of this paper:

1) $\forall t \in E_o$, $D(t)$ is defined with $E_R = E_o \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ and $E_I = E_o$;
2) $\forall t \in E_o$, $D(t)$ is defined with $E_R = E_o \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ and/or $E_I = E_o$, where $E_o \subseteq E_o$ and $E_o \subseteq E_o$.

Scenario (1) is called the unconstrained case, i.e., each event $t$ in $E_o$ that is produced by the system can be replaced with any other event in $E_o$, and the event $t$ can be inserted before the output of event $t$. Scenario (2) is the constrained case, i.e., each event $t$ in $E_o$ that is generated by the system can be replaced with some of the other events in $E_o$, but not necessarily all events, and/or only some events in $E_o$ (but not all events) can be inserted before the output of event $t$.

One problem of interest is to identify whether the constructed defender has the capability under all possible system activity to conceal secret events before they are revealed, namely, enforce the concealment of secret events. Such a problem can be addressed using the enforcement framework of event concealment proposed in the next section.

VII. CONCEALABILITY ENFORCEMENT FORMULATION

In this section, the notion of $C$-Enforceability is introduced, which characterizes the ability of a defender to manipulate the observations of output events such that the occurrence of secret events can be concealed to the eavesdropper regardless of system activity. To deal with the enforcement of concealability, we assume that a considered system is unconcealable in the remainder of this paper.

Definition 6: Given a system $G$ and its generated language $L(G)$, a string-based defensive function $D^*$ is said to be $C$-enforceable w.r.t. a natural projection $P$ and a set of secret events $E_S$ if the following conditions hold:

1) for all $\lambda \in L(G)$, $D^*(P(\lambda))$ is defined;
2) for each $s$-revealing sequence $s = \lambda_1s\lambda_2 \in L(G)$, where $s \in E_S$, $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in E^*$, there exists at least one sequence $u = t_1t_2\ldots t_n \in L(G)$ with $t_i \notin E_S$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, such that $P(u) \in P_D(D^*(P(\lambda_1)))$; furthermore, for each continuation $\lambda' \in E^*$ such that $\lambda_\lambda' \in L(G)$, we can find $u' = t_1t_2\ldots t_{n'} \in L(G)$
with \( t'_i \notin E_{S_1} \), such that \( P(u') \in P(D^*(P(\lambda x'))) \) and \( P(u) \in P(u') \).

Intuitively, concealability requires that for each sequence containing secret events (including an \( s \)-revealing sequence \( \lambda_s \)), there should exist a sequence that contains no secret event in a system, such that they can be observationally indistinguishable following defensive actions. In this case, a defender can manipulate actual observations and make the sequence without secret event appear feasible to the eavesdropper. The first condition requires that, as the interface of the system, the string-based defensive function should be able to react to every observable sequence of events that can be generated by the system, such that defensive actions (replacements, or insertions, or deletions) can be utilized. In other words, in order to retain the privacy of a system, for each \( s \)-revealing sequence \( \lambda_s \), the corresponding defensive actions should include a feasible one that does not disclose the occurrence of the secret event as described in the second condition of Definition 6. Furthermore, for the sake of maintaining accuracy and completeness of defensive actions, the last part of the second condition guarantees that for each subsequent activity, defensive actions can retain the concealment of the occurrence of secret events indefinitely. If both conditions are satisfied, one says that concealability of the system can be enforced by a \( C \)-enforceable string-based defensive function.

**Definition 7:** Given a system \( G \) and its generated language \( L(G) \), \( G \) is said to be \( C \)-enforcing w.r.t. a natural projection \( P \) and a set of secret events \( E_S \) if there exists a \( C \)-enforceable string-based defensive function \( D^* \).

**Example 3:** Recall that system \( G \) as shown in Fig. 2(a) is unenforceable by Theorem 1 since there exist two secret cycles \( C_{S_{11}} \) formed by \( \{4S\} \) and \( C_{S_{12}} \) formed by \( \{7S\} \) in \( G_d \) as shown in Fig. 2(b) accordingly, one can capture two \( s \)-revealing sequences \( \lambda_1 = sda^* \) and \( \lambda_2 = cd^*sbda^* \) and a sequence containing no secret event \( \lambda = cd^* \), where their natural projections are \( P(\lambda_1) = da^* \), \( P(\lambda_2) = cd^*bd^* \), and \( P(\lambda) = cd^* \), respectively. Since \( cd^* \in P_D(D^*(da^*)) \) (by replacing event \( \lambda_1 \) with \( d \) and by replacing event \( a \) with \( d \) indefinitely) and \( cd^* \in P_D(D^*(cd^*bd^*)) \) (by replacing event \( b \) with \( d \) once), we conclude that the string-based defensive function \( D^* \) is \( C \)-enforceable following Definition 6 and \( G \) is \( C \)-enforcing following Definition 7. 

Note here that it is important to be able to determine what action to take at each time an observable event is generated (in this case we can distinguish between the two strings, and take corresponding defensive actions, based on the very first observable event).

Consider a system modeled as an NFA \( G = (X, E, f, X_0) \), where \( E = E_o \cup E_{uo} \) with \( E_o \) and \( E_{uo} \) being the sets of observable and unobservable events, respectively, and \( E_S \subseteq E_{uo} \) being the set of secret events. We consider the case that the system is unenforceable. Then, under some system behavior, the eavesdropper can indirectly detect the occurrence of the secret events by utilizing its knowledge of the system model and by analyzing the observable behavior of the system. The defender proposed in this section can alter observable output events of the system \( G \) by replacement, insertion, or deletion. The problem of enforcing concealability of the system aims to determine whether concealability is \( C \)-enforceable if it is violated, which equivalently identifies whether the defender can conceal the occurrence of the secret events before they are revealed. It can be formalized as follows.

**Problem 2:** Given an NFA \( G = (X, E, f, X_0) \) with \( E = E_o \cup E_{uo} \) \( (E_o \) being the set of observable events and \( E_{uo} \) being the set of unobservable events), determine whether or not \( G \) is \( C \)-enforcing w.r.t. a natural projection \( P \) and a set of secret events \( E_S \subseteq E_{uo} \).

**VIII. Verification of C-Enforceability**

Recall that two scenarios about defensive functions are considered: one involves constraints on how outputs are modified, and the other does not involve such constraints. In this section, considering defensive functions without constraints, we first propose a necessary and sufficient condition for a string-based defensive function to be \( C \)-enforceable; this condition can be checked in polynomial time based on a verifier construction, an approach that has lower complexity compared to the one based on the diagnoser. Then, a defensive verifier is constructed to capture all desirable defensive actions following system activity. Finally, an \( E \)-verifier is built by a special synchronization mechanism between a verifier and a defensive verifier to verify the \( C \)-Enforceability of the defender in the scenario, where the defensive function has to operate under constraints.

Specifically, the \( E \)-verifier can be used to obtain, with polynomial complexity, one necessary and one sufficient condition for \( C \)-Enforceability; in case that the sufficient condition is satisfied, the \( E \)-verifier allows us to obtain a strategy to enforce concealability, also with polynomial complexity; these will be contrasted against the approach using constructions with exponential complexity [18] (the latter however, provides a necessary and sufficient condition).

**A. Necessary and Sufficient Condition for C-Enforceability of Defensive Functions without Constraints**

A malicious entity (eavesdropper) that aims to detect the occurrence of secret events can do so by observing and analyzing the behavior of a given system (via a diagnoser or a verifier). Since a string-based defensive function can create a perturbed output sequence that causes a different interpretation from the eavesdropper’s point of view, we aim to find an observable sequence including no secret event in a system.

**Definition 8:** Given an NFA \( G = (X, E, f, X_0) \) and its verifier \( G_v = (X_v, E_v, f_v, X_{v_0}) \), a set of states \( \{x_{v_1}, x_{v_2}, \ldots, x_{v_n+1}\} \subseteq X_v \) is said to form a cycle \( C_v \) w.r.t. an observable sequence \( \lambda = \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \ldots \lambda_n \in E_o \) if \( x_{v_{i+1}} \in f_v(x_{v_i}, \lambda_i) \) for \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \) and \( x_{v_{n+1}} = x_{v_1} \).

**Definition 9:** A set of states \( \{x_{v_1}, x_{v_2}, \ldots, x_{v_n+1}\} \subseteq X_v \) is said to be a normal cycle, denoted by \( C_{N_v} \), w.r.t. an observable sequence \( \lambda = \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \ldots \lambda_n \in E_o \) if for all \( x_{v_i} \in \{x_{v_1}, x_{v_2}, \ldots, x_{v_n+1}\} \), \( x_{v_i} \in X_{N_v} \); it is said to be
a secret cycle, denoted by $C_{S_v}$, if for all $x_{v_1}, x_{v_2} \in X_{S_v}$; and it is said to be an uncertain cycle, denoted by $C_{NS_v}$, if for all $x_{v_1}, x_{v_2} \in X_{NS_v}$.

**Definition 10:** Consider an indefinitely extendible sequence $\lambda = \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \ldots \lambda_k \ldots \in L(G_v)$. Sequence $\lambda$ is said to be safe (denoted as $\lambda_{safe}$) if there exists a set of states $\{x_{v_{i_1}}, x_{v_{i_2}}, \ldots, x_{v_{i_n}}\}$ such that $x_{v_i} \in f_{v_i}(x_{v_{i-1}})$ with $x_{v_i} \in (X_{N} \cup X_{NS})$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$.

Note that for large enough $k$, there exists $n \leq k$ such that $\{x_{v_{i_1}}, x_{v_{i_2}}, \ldots, x_{v_{i_n}}\}$ forms a normal cycle $C_N$, or an uncertain cycle $C_{NS_v}$, where $x_{v_n} = x_{v_1}$.

**Theorem 2:** Consider an NFA $G = (X, E, f, X_0)$ and its verifier $G_v = (X_v, E_v, f_v, x_{v_0})$. Under the defensive functions without constraints, a string-based defensive function $D^*$ is $C$-enforceable if and only if there exists an indefinitely extendible safe sequence $\lambda_{safe} \in L(G_v)$.

**Proof:** Necessity: Obviously, if a string-based defensive function $D^*$ is $C$-enforceable, then there exists at least one indefinitely extendible safe sequence $\lambda_{safe} \in L(G_v)$ according to Definition 6.

Sufficiency: If there exists a safe sequence $\lambda_{safe} \in L(G_v)$, then it holds that for all $\lambda_{safe} \in P(\lambda_{safe})$, $\lambda_{safe}$ is safe, i.e., we have $f_v(x_{v_0}, \lambda_{safe}) \cap (X_N \cup X_{NS}) \neq \emptyset$. For each $s$-revealing sequence $\lambda = \lambda_1 \ldots \lambda_k \in L(G_v)$, there always exists a defensive observable sequence $\lambda \in P(\lambda_{safe})$ such that $\lambda = \lambda_{safe}'$, with the length of $\lambda$ being equal to that of $\lambda_{safe}'$ (e.g., by replacing the first observable event in $P(\lambda_{safe})$ with the first observable event in $\lambda_{safe}$, the second observable event in $P(\lambda_{safe})$ with the second observable event in $\lambda_{safe}$, etc.). This can be retained for any continuation $\lambda' \in E_v$ (i.e., $\lambda' \in L(G_v)$) by considering appropriate continuations of $\lambda_{safe}'$, such that the eavesdropper observes a prefix of the sequence $\lambda_{safe}$. Therefore, $D^*$ is $C$-enforceable.

**Example 4:** As shown in Fig. 2(c), there exists a safe sequence $\lambda_{safe} = \epsilon d^*$ in the verifier $G_v$. An uncertain cycle $C_{NS_v}$ formed by $\{3S, 5N\}$, a normal cycle $C_N$ formed by $\{5N, 5N\}$, or a secret cycle $C_{NS_v}$ formed by $\{3S, 3S\}$ will be eventually reached from the initial state via the occurrence of $\lambda_{safe}$, which leads to the fact that the occurrence of the secret event can be concealed perpetually. Once $\lambda_{safe}$ is identified, the defender could trick the eavesdropper into thinking that the system is executing the safe sequence $\lambda_{safe}$ regardless of the system activity. Thus, one can infer that the string-based defensive function $D^*$ is $C$-enforceable following Theorem 2 and $G$ is $C$-enforcing.

**Remark 4:** (A verifier can be used to verify $C$-Enforceability in the unconstrained case) Recall that a string-based defensive function is said to be $C$-enforceable if, regardless of what event is generated by a given system, it can manipulate observations and output a sequence that does not reveal the occurrence of secret events. Thus, in the unconstrained case, one can use a verifier construction to verify $C$-Enforceability with low complexity. Note that existence of the safe sequence $\lambda_{safe}$ can be found via Breadth-First Search [29] on the verifier with complexity $O(|X_v| \times |E_v|)$. Hence, concealability enforcement can be verified with complexity $O(|X_v| \times |E_v|) = O(4|X|^2 \times |E_v|)$.

**B. Defensive Verifier**

The eavesdropper can utilize its knowledge of the system model to determine the authenticity of the received observation according to the transition structure of a system. It is essential for a defender to generate a modified observation that matches a valid observation, i.e., one that can be generated by the system. When the actions of the defender have some constraints, a defensive verifier that captures all admissible defensive actions is proposed.

Suppose that the defensive functions have some constraints, i.e., observable events generated by the system can only be replaced with some events in the set of replaced events $E_R$ (with $E_R \cap E_o \neq E_o$) or inserted events need to belong to the set of inserted events $E_I$ (with $E_I \cap E_o \neq E_o$). More precisely, we can impose constraints differently on the defensive functions for each observable event generated by the system, as illustrated in the following example.

**Example 5:** Consider the system $G$ as shown in Fig. 2(a) when the defensive function is under constraints. We use the verifier $G_v$ to capture observable behavior of the system $G$. For the set of observable events $E_o = \{a, b, c, d\}$, we impose constraints on corresponding defensive actions as follows: $D(a) = \{a/a, a/b, a/c\}$, $D(b) = \{b/b\}$, $D(c) = \{c/c\}$, and $D(d) = \{d/d, d/cd, d/\epsilon\}$. Note that, apart from these constraints, the defender should guarantee that each defensive action is consistent with the system structure and previous defensive actions (so that the eavesdropper cannot realize that the system is under defense). For instance, even though $d/\epsilon d \in D(d)$ holds, if we insert event $a$ before event $d$ at the initial state $\{1N, 1N\}$ in $G_v$, then the eavesdropper will be able to infer that something has been altered since sequence $a/d$ is not defined at the initial state.

Here we denote the set of possible defensive actions of the system $G$ by $E_D$, which is defined as $E_D = \bigcup_{v \in E_v} D(v)$. A defensive verifier $G_D$ is defined below to capture all admissible defensive actions, i.e., the set of defensive actions with given constraints $E_D$.

**Definition 11:** Given an NFA $G = (X, E, f, X_0)$ and its verifier $G_v = (X_v, E_v, f_v, x_{v_0})$, a defensive verifier is an NFA $G_D = (X_D, E_D, f_D, x_{D_0})$, where $X_D = X_o - X_{NS_v}$ is the state space, $x_{D_0} = x_{v_0}$ is the initial state (assumed to be outside $X_{NS_v}$), $E_D$ is the set of defensive actions with constraints, and $f_D$ is the transition function that implements defensive actions for $t/o \in E_D$, and $x_D \in X_D$:

$$f_D(x_D, t/o) =
\begin{cases}
  f_v(x_D, \epsilon) & \text{if } P_D(t/o) = \epsilon \ (\text{deletion}), \\
  f_v(x_D, t') \cap X_D & \text{if } P_D(t/o) = t' \ (\text{replacement}), \\
  (\bigcup_{v' \in E_D} f_{v'}(x_D, t')) \cap X_D & \text{if } P_D(t/o) = t' \ (\text{insertion}).
\end{cases}$$

Without loss of generality, we can consider $X_D$ to be the set of states in $G_D$ that are accessible from the initial state $X_{D_0}$. Note that $f_D$ is defined such that $f_D(x, t/o) = f_v(x, P_D(t/o))$ if $f_v(x, P_D(t/o)) \cap X_{S_v} = \emptyset$ (otherwise, the states in $X_{S_v}$ are excluded). Informally, the defensive verifier $G_D$ can be constructed by cloning $G_v$ and pruning...
away all secret states and all original events while adding defensive events, and then taking the accessible part of the resulting automaton. For each state \( x_D \in X_D \), we denote by \( E_D(x_D) = \{ t/o \in E_D | f_D(x_D, t/o) \neq \emptyset \} \) the set of possible defensive actions at state \( x_D \). An example is provided below to demonstrate the defensive verifier.

![Diagram of Defensive Verifier GD](image)

**Fig. 3: Defensive Verifier GD.**

**Example 6:** Consider the system \( G \) and its verifier \( G_v \) as shown in Fig. 2 with \( E_D \) as described in Example 5. Its defensive verifier \( G_D \) is built from the verifier \( G_v \) in Fig. 2(d) via Definition 11. The defensive verifier demonstrates all possible defensive actions (including replacements, insertions, and deletions) with constraints. For instance, the defensive actions that can be taken at the initial state \((1N, 1N)\) in \( G_D \) are \( E_D((1N, 1N)) = \{ c/c, d/\varepsilon, d/cd \} \).

More specifically, defensive action \( d/\varepsilon \) or \( d/cd \) can be implemented if observable event \( d \) is generated by the system, while defensive action \( c/c \) can be implemented if observable event \( c \) is generated by the system.

**Remark 5:** The defensive verifier can be regarded as a defender that tracks the defensive actions in an effort to conceal the secret events and confuse the eavesdropper. Since the set of states of \( G_D \) is identical to (or a subset of) the set of states of \( G_v \), we can also classify the states of \( G_D \) in two disjoint sets: the set of normal states \( X_{NS} \), and the set of uncertain states \( X_{NS} \) (recall that the set of secret states has been pruned away).

**C. Verification of C-Enforceability under Defensive Functions with Constraints**

A C-enforceable string-based defensive function should ensure that all possible defensive actions keep the eavesdropper confused regardless of system activity. Thus, when the defensive function is subject to constraints, we propose a new construction by composing a verifier and a defensive verifier of a given system to capture all admissible defensive actions following system activity. To capture the observable behavior of the verifier, we use \( E_o(x_v) = \{ \sigma \in E_o | f_o(x_v, \sigma) \neq \emptyset \} \) to denote the set of observable events defined at state \( x \) for \( x \in X_v \).

**Definition 12:** Given an NFA \( G = (X, E, f, X_0) \) with its verifier \( G_v = (X_v, E_o, f_o, x_{v_0}) \) and its defensive verifier \( G_D = (X_D, E_D, f_D, x_{D_0}) \), the E-verifier is an NFA that captures the composition of \( G_v \) and \( G_D \), denoted by \( V_E = (X_E, E_D, f_E, x_{E_0}) \), satisfying the following:

1. \( X_E = \{(x_v, x_D) | x_v \in X_v, x_D \in X_D \} \) is the state space;
2. \( x_{E_0} = (x_{v_0}, x_{D_0}) \) is the initial state;
3. \( E_D \) is the set of defensive actions;
4. \( f_E \) is the transition function defined as follows:
   \[
   f_E((x_v, x_D), t/o) = f_v(x_v, t) \times f_D(x_D, t/o)
   \]
   where \( t \in E_o(x_v) \), \( t/o \in D(t) \).

Note that given a state \((x_v, x_D) \in X_E \) and an event \( t \in E_o(x_v) \), if we have only one defensive action, e.g., \( D(t) = \{ t/o \} \), it may evolve in multiple ways via \( f_v(x_v, t) \) and/or \( f_D(x_D, t/o) \) (i.e., the E-verifier is non-deterministic).

**Definition 13:** Consider an E-verifier \( V_E = (X_E, E_D, f_E, x_{E_0}) \). Defensive action \( t/o \in E_D \) is said to be feasible if and only if \( f_E((x_v, x_D), t/o) \neq \emptyset \).

**Lemma 2:** Given an NFA \( G = (X, E, f, X_0) \) with its verifier \( G_v = (X_v, E_o, f_o, x_{v_0}) \) and its defensive verifier \( G_D = (X_D, E_D, f_D, x_{D_0}) \), the E-verifier \( V_E = (X_E, E_D, f_E, x_{E_0}) \) enumerates feasible defensive actions following system activity.

The proof of the above lemma follows directly from Definition 12 and is thus omitted. The main idea underlying Definition 12 is to compute a parallel composition of \( G_v \) and \( G_D \), where the event synchronization is performed with respect to \( E_o \) from \( G_v \) and \( E_D \) from \( G_D \).

**Example 7:** Consider the NFA G in Fig. 2(a) with verifier \( G_v \) and defensive verifier \( G_D \) as shown in Fig. 3. The E-verifier of \( G \) is constructed following Definition 12 as depicted in Fig. 4 (for convenience, states have been renamed as \( A, B, C, D, E \) and \( F \) as shown in the figure). Since the E-verifier is non-deterministic, it may reach different states under the same defensive action for a given event, e.g., event \( c \) is inserted before event \( d \) at state \((A, A)\) such that we can reach states \((B, D)\) and \((B, C)\) via the defensive action \( d/cd \).

Note that we draw dotted arrows corresponding to infeasible defensive actions in response to event \( a \) and \( b \), denoted by \( a' \) and \( b' \), on states \((B, A), (C, C)\), and \((C, D)\). This is done in order to visualize infeasible defensive actions in response to particular events: if we look at states \{4S, 4S\} (represented as \( B \) in Fig. 4) and \{5N, 5N\} (represented as \( C \) in Fig. 4) in the verifier \( G_v \), event \( a \) should be defined at state \( B \) and event \( b \) should be defined at state \( C \); however, there is no feasible defensive action that can be taken at states \{1N, 1N\}, \{5N, 5N\}, and \{3S, 5N\} (represented as \( A, C \), and \( D \) respectively in Fig. 4) in the defensive verifier \( G_D \). Thus, the dotted arrow labeled \( a' \) at state \((B, A)\) is used to indicate that there is no corresponding defensive action for event \( a \), and the dotted arrow labeled \( b' \) at states \((C, C)\) and \((C, D)\) is used to indicate that there is no corresponding defensive action for event \( b \). Next, we consider the problem of verifying C-enforceability of a string-based defensive function in terms of the construction of \( V_E \), where a necessary condition is provided below.

**Definition 14:** Consider an NFA \( G = (X, E, f, X_0) \) and its E-verifier \( V_E = (X_E, E_D, f_E, x_{E_0}) \). Let \( X_{C_{x_v}} \subseteq X_E \)
denote the set of co-relative states for state \( x_v \in X_v \), defined as \( X_{C_{x_v}} = \{ (x_v, x_{D_v}) \in X_E | x_{D_v} \in X_D \} \). The set of states \( X_{C_{x_v}} \) is said to be legal if for all \( t \in E_o(x_v) \), there exists \( (x_v, x_{D_v}) \in X_{C_{x_v}} \) and defensive action \( t/o \in E_D \) such that \( f_E((x_v, x_{D_v}), t/o) \) is defined; \( X_{C_{x_v}} \) is said to be illegal otherwise.

Recall that for state \( (x_v, x_{D_v}) \) in the \( E \)-verifier, the first component represents a pair of possible actual states that the system can be in at current time, whereas the second one represents a pair of possible fake states perceived by the eavesdropper after defensive actions. Since the \( E \)-verifier is nondeterministic, multiple state of the form \( (x_v, x_{D_v}) \) might be allowable at current time following a sequence of observations. Thereby, the set of states \( X_{C_{x_v}} \) for state \( x_v \) can be regarded as a set that contains all possible fake states (perhaps not all of them simultaneously reachable following a particular sequence of observations) if the verifier is at state \( x_v \). Therefore, for the defensive function to be able to react to system activity, we need that for each \( t \in E_o(x_v) \), we can find among all states in \( X_{C_{x_v}} \), at least one defensive action \( t/o \) that is feasible. If we cannot find any defensive action, the correlative state set \( X_{C_{x_v}} \) is problematic since it means that at state \( x_v \) in the verifier (which is certainly reachable under some sequence of observations) we will have no way of maintaining secrecy following observable events generated by the system.

**Theorem 3:** Consider an NFA \( G = (X, E, f, X_0) \) with its verifier \( G_v = (X_v, E_o, f_v, x_{v_0}) \), its defensive verifier \( G_D = (X_D, E_D, f_D, x_{D_0}) \), and its \( E \)-verifier \( V_E = (X_E, E_D, f_E, x_{E_0}) \). If a string-based defensive function \( D^* \) is \( C \)-enforceable, then for all \( x_v \in X_v \), the corresponding set of co-relative states \( X_{C_{x_v}} \) is legal.

**Proof:** By contradiction, if for some \( x_v \in X_v \), the set of co-relative states \( X_{C_{x_v}} \) is illegal, then it means that for a system action \( t \in E_o \) that is defined at state \( x_v \), there exists state \( (x_v, x_{D_v}) \in X_{C_{x_v}} \) such that \( f_E((x_v, x_{D_v}), t/o) = \emptyset \). In this case, there is no defensive action that can be taken corresponding to the system action \( t \), which violates the first condition of Definition 6. In other words, for any sequence that takes us to \( x_v \) in the verifier, there is at least one continuation of this sequence that cannot be protected, which violates the second condition of Definition 6. Therefore, if a string-based defensive function \( D^* \) is \( C \)-enforceable, then for all \( x_v \in X_v \), its set of co-relative states \( X_{C_{x_v}} \) is legal.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Necessary condition for \( C \)-Enforceability of a string-based defensive function

**Input:** \( E \)-verifier \( V_E = (X_E, E_D, f_E, x_{E_0}) \), where \( X_E = \{ (x_v, x_D) | x_v \in X_v, x_D \in X_D \} \).

1. for \( x_v \in X_v \) do
2.    Let \( X_{C_{x_v}} \) be the set of co-relative states for state \( x_v \), i.e., \( X_{C_{x_v}} = \{ (x_v, x_{D_v}) | (x_v, x_{D_v}) \in X_E \} \);
3.    for \( t \in E_o(x_v) \) do
4.      if \( \#(x_v, x_{D_v}) \in X_{C_{x_v}}, t/o \in D(t) \) such that \( f_E((x_v, x_{D_v}), t/o) \neq \emptyset \) then
5.        return Not \( C \)-enforceable.
6. return \( C \)-enforceable.

---

Given an \( E \)-verifier, we can check the necessary condition for the string-based defensive function to be \( C \)-enforceable by following Algorithm 1. For each state \( x_v \in X_v \), the set of co-relative states \( X_{C_{x_v}} \) is computed in Line 2. Then, in Lines 3–5, we check whether there exist no states in \( X_{C_{x_v}} \) that can respond to event \( t \in E_o(x_v) \). If there exists at least one state, then the set of co-relative states \( X_{C_{x_v}} \) is legal and has been examined; otherwise, we can conclude that the string-based defensive function is not \( C \)-enforceable. In the end, the necessary condition is satisfied if co-relative states for each state in the verifier are legal.

Note that Theorem 3 provides a necessary condition for \( C \)-Enforceability. Even though the condition might be satisfied, it is possible that a string-based defensive function may not be \( C \)-enforceable. Next, a notion of \( E \)-forbidden state is defined below and such states are removed from the \( E \)-verifier. Based on the reduced version of \( E \)-verifier, a sufficient condition for \( C \)-enforceability is obtained.

**Definition 15:** Given a system \( G = (X, E, f, X_0) \) and its \( E \)-verifier \( V_E = (X_E, E_D, f_E, x_{E_0}) \), a state \( (x_v, x_D) \in X_E \) is said to be \( E \)-forbidden if for some \( t \in E_o(x_v) \), we have \( f_E((x_v, x_D), t/o) = \emptyset \) for all \( t/o \in D(t) \).

A state \( (x_v, x_D) \in X_E \) is said to be \( E \)-forbidden if
there is no subsequent state that can be reached for some \( t \) generated by the system, i.e., for some \( t \in E_o(x_v) \), there is no defensive action that can be taken in response to system execution \( t \). Note that when the same defensive action evolves from some originating \( E \)-verifier state to multiple destination states (on account of the nondeterminism of the \( E \)-verifier), if one of the multiple destination states is \( E \)-forbidden, then only that state needs to be avoided.

Assume that for a given state \((x_v, x_D) \in X_E \) and an event \( t \in E_o(x_v) \), there is a defensive action \( t/o \in D(t) \) such that \( f_E((x_v, x_D), t/o) = \{(x_{v1}, x_{D1}), (x_{v2}, x_{D2})\} \), where state \((x_{v1}, x_{D1})\) is \( E \)-forbidden. In this case, the removal of state \((x_{v1}, x_{D1})\) will not make state \((x_v, x_D)\) \( E \)-forbidden: since state \((x_{v2}, x_{D2})\) is retained, it can be reached from state \((x_v, x_D)\) via the defensive action \( t/o \). In order to ensure that the \( E \)-verifier captures only feasible defensive actions following system activity, a formal procedure for constructing the reduced \( E \)-verifier by removing \( E \)-forbidden states, denoted by \( RV_E \), is presented in Algorithm 2 below.

A sufficient condition for \( C \)-enforceability is obtained subsequently.

**Algorithm 2: Construction of reduced \( E \)-verifier**

**Input:** \( E \)-verifier \( V_E = (X_E, E_D, f_E, x_{E0}) \), where \( X_E = \{(x_v, x_D) \mid x_v \in X_v, x_D \in X_D\} \).

**Output:** Reduced \( E \)-verifier \( RV_E = (X_{ER}, E_D, f_E, x_{E0}) \).

1. \( X_{EF} = \emptyset \), where \( X_{EF} \) denotes the set of \( E \)-forbidden states;
2. for \((x_v, x_D) \in X_E - X_{EF} \) do
   
   3. if \( \forall t/o \in D(t), f_E((x_v, x_D), t/o) \cap (X_{E} - X_{EF}) = \emptyset \) then
      
      4. \( X_{EF} := X_{EF} \cup \{(x_v, x_D)\} \);
   
6. Go back to Step 2 until no more new \( E \)-forbidden states are produced;
7. \( X_{ER} = X_E - X_{EF} \);
8. return \( RV_E \).

Next we briefly explain how Algorithm 2 works. Given an \( E \)-verifier, the states are marked as \( E \)-forbidden if they have no subsequent states for some event \( t \) that is defined in the verifier, as shown in Lines 3–5. Nevertheless, once certain states are pruned away, new forbidden states may be created. Then, the reduced \( E \)-verifier \( RV_E \) is constructed by pruning away all \( E \)-forbidden states in an iterative manner until no more such states are generated.

**Theorem 4:** Given an NFA \( G = (X, E, f, X_0) \) with its verifier \( G_o = (X_v, E_o, f_v, x_{v0}) \), its defensive verifier \( G_D = (X_D, E_D, f_D, x_{D0}) \), and its reduced \( E \)-verifier \( RV_E = (X_{ER}, E_D, f_E, x_{E0}) \), a string-based defensive function \( D^* \) is \( C \)-enforceable if for all \( x_v \in X_v \), there exists \((x_v, x_D) \in X_{ER} \) where \( X_{ER} \) is the state space of the reduced \( E \)-verifier.

**Proof:** State \((x_v, x_D) \in X_{ER} \) contains two components, where the first one satisfies \( x_v \in X_v \) and the second one satisfies \( x_D \in X_D \) (i.e., \( x_v \) and \( x_D \) are states from the state spaces of the verifier \( G_o \) and the defensive verifier \( G_D \), respectively.) If for all \( x_v \in X_v \), there exists \((x_v, x_D) \in X_{ER} \). This means that each observable event generated by the verifier has at least one defensive action such that the first condition for Definition 6 holds. Moreover, each subsequently visited state in \( x_{ER} \) has the same property (otherwise, it would have been pruned away). For each state \((x_v, x_D) \in X_{ER} \), the case that \( x_v \in X_S \) while \( x_D \in X_s \) is not possible since secret states are pruned away in \( G_D \) (in fact \( x_D \notin X_S \) regardless of \( x_v \)). Thus, the second condition for Definition 6 holds. Moreover, for long enough sequences a cycle is reached regardless of the execution in \( RV_E \) by virtue of Algorithm 2 (there remains no \( E \)-forbidden state at the end of Algorithm 2). This implies that the diagnostic information in \( x_v \) can be concealed indefinitely, which satisfies the second part of the second condition of Definition 6. Therefore, one can conclude that the string-based defensive function \( D^* \) is \( C \)-enforceable.

**Remark 6:** Note that Theorem 4 provides a sufficient condition for \( C \)-Enforceability. If the condition holds, the reduced \( E \)-verifier can be used to take defensive action in response to system activity (any action that is feasible at the present state —or one of the present states— of the \( E \)-verifier can be taken since there will always be a feasible action in all of the future states).

**Example 8:** Consider the \( E \)-verifier \( V_E \) shown in Fig. 4. First, we check whether the necessary condition in Theorem 3 is violated via Algorithm 1. For instance, the set of correlative states for state \( B \) denoted by \( X_{C_B} = \{(B, A), (B, D), (B, C)\} \). By \( E_o(B) = \{a\} \), we only need to check if a defensive action for \( a \) is possible among \((B, A), (B, D), \) and \((B, C) \). Since there are subsequent defensive actions from \((B, D) \) and \((B, C) \), the set of correlative states for state \( B \) is legal and retained. Similarly, we check the set of correlative states for state \( C \) denoted by \( X_{C_C} = \{(C, C), (C, D)\} \). Note that \( E_o(C) = \{b, d\} \), but there exists no defensive actions for \( b \). Thus, the set of correlative states for state \( C \) is illegal and Algorithm 1 stops. At this point, we know that the string-based defensive function is not \( C \)-enforceable.

One can also check whether the sufficient condition in Theorem 4 is violated via the reduced \( E \)-verifier \( RV_E \) constructed by following Algorithm 2 (of course, in this case we already know that the sufficient condition will be violated since the necessary condition is not satisfied; nevertheless, we provide the discussion below for illustration purposes). Since state \((B, A) \) has no continuation (there is no defensive action for event \( a \)), it is marked as \( E \)-forbidden. For states \((C, C) \) and \((C, D) \), we have that the set of observable events is \( E_o(C) = \{b, d\} \). They are marked as \( E \)-forbidden since there is no defensive action for event \( b \). For state \((A, A) \), there is an observable event \( d \in E_o(A) \) with two defensive actions \( D(d) = \{d/e, d/cd\} \). Even though \( f_E((A, A), d/e) \) leads to an \( E \)-forbidden state \((B, A) \), there exists a feasible defensive action \( d/cd \); therefore, state \((A, A) \) is not marked.
as $E$-forbidden.

The reduced $E$-verifier $RV_E$ can be directly obtained by removing states $(B, A), (C, C),$ and $(C, D).$ Thus, one concludes that the string-based defensive function is not $C$-enforceable since the sufficient condition in Theorem 4 is violated (there is no state composed with $C$ and $F$ in $RV_E$), which confirms that concealability of the system cannot be enforced by the string-based defensive functions under the given constraints. The important aspect of the above discussions is that both conditions (sufficient and necessary) can be checked with polynomial complexity.

Remark 7: Consider a system $G = (X, E, f, X_0),$ where the number of states is $|X|$ and the number of secret events is $|E_S| = 1.$ Recall that the state space of the verifier $G_v$ has $|X_v| = (|X| \times 2^{|E|})^2 = 4|X|^2$ states; identical complexity is exhibited by the defensive verifier, i.e., $|X_D| = 4|X|^2.$ Then, the number of states of $RV_E$ is bounded by $|X_{ER}| = |X_v| \times |X_D| = 16|X|^4.$ Overall, the structural complexity of $RV_E$ is $O(|X|^4).$

IX. DISCUSSION: CONNECTIONS WITH OPACITY ENFORCEMENT PROBLEMS

In prior works such as [18], [19], [20], [21], the current state opacity enforcement problem is considered based on insertion and edit functions. Since the enforcement technique using insertion functions is similar to that of using edit functions, we only recall the one using insertion functions here. More specifically, a desired estimator is proposed to generate safe system actions and a feasible estimator is proposed to enumerate all possible insertion operations in [18]. Then, the construction of the so-called All Insertion Structure (AIS) is proposed to depict a game scenario between a given system and a defender; the AIS is constructed by synchronizing the desired estimator and the feasible estimator. The notion of $i$-enforceability is used to verify whether the opacity of the system is enforceable based on insertion functions. Note that the AIS allows us to obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for $i$-enforceability but it is constructed in exponential time w.r.t. the number of states of the system.

In this work, we utilize similar obfuscation techniques (named defensive functions) to solve the problem of event concealment. Clearly, concealability enforcement can be converted to a current state opacity problem (e.g., special states reached after the occurrence of secret events can be treated as secret states) and one can subsequently use an $E$-diagnoser (an AIS-like structure) to verify concealability enforcement. Nonetheless, our focus is not on constructions with exponential complexity (which can provide one necessary and sufficient condition) but on constructions with polynomial complexity, which can provide one necessary condition and one sufficient condition. The following example is proposed to explain the gap between the two different methods.

Example 9: Recall that Theorem 3 provides a necessary condition, whereas Theorem 4 provides a sufficient condition for $C$-Enforceability. Based on the sufficient condition and the necessary condition proposed in the previous section, we can try to verify whether a string-based defensive function may be $C$-enforceable via Theorem 3 at first (if the necessary condition is not satisfied then $C$-Enforceability is not possible). If the necessary condition is satisfied, we can construct a reduced $E$-verifier via Algorithm 2 to check if the sufficient condition holds: if it holds, then $C$-Enforceability is possible (and the construction can also be used to enumerate possible defensive actions).

The issue is that there might exist systems where the necessary condition in Theorem 3 is satisfied whereas the sufficient condition in Theorem 4 is not. To reach a definite conclusion, for the same example (the same system and the same constraints imposed in the defensive functions) as we described in Example 8, we can use a diagnoser-based approach to track observable behavior of the system and verify concealability.

Specifically, we can construct a defensive diagnoser and an $E$-diagnoser (composition of the diagnoser and the defensive diagnoser) in a similar manner as done using the verifiers, as shown in Fig. 5. Note that there are also dotted arrows corresponding to $a/\alpha$ and $b/\beta$ at states $(\{3S, 5N, 6S\}, \{3S, 5N, 6S\})$ and $(\{4S\}, \{1N, 2S\}),$ which means that there is no defensive action from such states. After removing the above problematic states iteratively, to facilitate presentation, we denote the reduced construction by $RD_E.$ One can obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for $C$-Enforceability in terms of $RD_E$: a string-based defensive function is $C$-enforceable if and only if the $RD_E$ is not empty. Apparently, in this case, state $(\{4S\}, \{1N, 2S\})$ has no subsequent defensive action and should be removed in $D_E.$ Also state $(\{3S, 5N, 6S\}, \{3S, 5N, 6S\})$ has no subsequent defensive action for event $b$ and should be removed in $D_E.$ Then, the initial state $(\{1N, 2S\}, \{1N, 2S\})$ also turns out to be problematic since there is only one defensive action ($c/\alpha$) for event $c$ leading to a problematic state (that has been removed). Thus, state $(\{1N, 2S\}, \{1N, 2S\})$ should also be removed. In other words, the $RD_E$ for this system is empty and concealability cannot be enforced.

X. CONCLUSIONS

This paper deals with the problem of event concealment for concealing secret events in a system modeled as an NFA under partial observation. We formally define concealable and unconcealable secret events. A necessary and sufficient condition is given to verify whether the system is concealable or not. If concealability of the system does not hold, then we deal with the problem of concealability enforcement. The notion of $C$-enforceability characterizes whether an external defender has the capability to use an obfuscation strategy that manipulates the outputs generated by the system such that the occurrence of unconcealable events cannot be revealed. Note that two scenarios about defensive functions are considered, one without constraints and one with constraints. It is worth mentioning that our focus of this paper is on the use of reduced complexity constructions (with polynomial complexity) to provide one necessary condition and one sufficient condition for $C$-enforceability. Future work will touch upon the scenario where each type of defensive operations is
assigned with a positive cost and will address the synthesis of a concealing mechanism under a given upper bound on the total cost.
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