AMBLARD, Julien (ja1616)

Imperial College London

Department of Computing
Academic Year 2019-2020
Page created Thu Feb 20 02:15:20 GMT 2020

CATE

499 fbelard 6
c4 ja1616 v1

0 0 1 1 9 0 0 3 3 1 5 1

Electronic submission

Mon - 17 Feb 2020 17:45:05

ja1616

Exercise Information

Module: 499 Modal Logic for Strategic Reasoning in AI
Exercise: 6 (CW)
Title: Coursework2
FAO: Belardinelli, Francesco (fbelard)

Issued: Wed - 05 Feb 2020
Due: Wed - 19 Feb 2020
Assessment: Individual
Submission: Electronic

Student Declaration - Version 1

- I declare that this final submitted version is my unaided work.

Signed: (electronic signature) Date: 2020-02-05 09:01:57

For Markers only: (circle appropriate grade)

AMBLARD, Julien (ja1616)	01204941	c4	2020-02-05 09:01:57	**A* A B C D E F**

Coursework 2

1) (a) Let q be an arbitrary initial state in M, where π is a path from q.

$\pi \models \varphi R \psi$ iff $\pi[j..\infty] \models \psi$ for all $0 \leq j \leq i$ if $\pi[i..\infty] \models \varphi$ for some $i \geq 0$,

otherwise $\pi[k..\infty] \models \psi$ for all $k \geq 0$

2

(b) $\varphi R \psi \stackrel{?}{\equiv} [\psi \wedge (X\psi) U \varphi] \vee [\neg F\varphi \wedge G\psi]$

1

Solution could have been simplified futher

(c) $\pi \models [\psi \wedge (X\psi) U \varphi] \vee [\neg F\varphi \wedge G\psi]$ iff $\pi \models \psi \wedge (X\psi) U \varphi$ or $\pi \models \neg F\varphi \wedge G\psi$

iff $\pi \models \psi$, and $\pi \models (X\psi) U \varphi$;

or $\pi \models \neg F\varphi$, and $\pi \models G\psi$

iff $\pi \models \psi$, and $\pi[i..\infty] \models \varphi$ for some $i \geq 0$, and

$\pi[j..\infty] \models X\psi$ for all $0 \leq j < i$;

or $\pi \not\models F\varphi$, and $\pi[k..\infty] \models \psi$ for all $k \geq 0$

iff $\pi \models \psi$, and $\pi[i..\infty] \models \varphi$ for some $i \geq 0$, and

$\pi[j..\infty][1..\infty] \models \psi$ for all $0 \leq j < i$;

or $\pi[l..\infty] \not\models \varphi$ for any $l \geq 0$, and

$\pi[k..\infty] \models \psi$ for all $k \geq 0$

iff $\pi[j..\infty] \models \psi$ for all $0 \leq j \leq i$, and

$\pi[i..\infty] \models \varphi$ for some $i \geq 0$;

or $\pi[l..\infty] \not\models \varphi$ for any $l \geq 0$, and

$\pi[k..\infty] \models \psi$ for all $k \geq 0$

iff $\pi[j..\infty] \models \psi$ for all $0 \leq j \leq i$

if $\pi[i..\infty] \models \varphi$ for some $i \geq 0$,

otherwise $\pi[k..\infty] \models \psi$ for all $k \geq 0$

iff $\pi \models \varphi R \psi$

3

Solution correct and very well explained

(d) $\pi \models \perp R \psi$ iff $\pi[j..\infty] \models \psi$ for all $0 \leq j \leq i$ if $\pi[i..\infty] \models \perp$ for some $i \geq 0$,

otherwise $\pi[k..\infty] \models \psi$ for all $k \geq 0$

iff $\pi[j..\infty] \models \psi$ for all $0 \leq j \leq i$ if $\pi[i..\infty] \not\models true$ for some $i \geq 0$,

otherwise $\pi[k..\infty] \models \psi$ for all $k \geq 0$

iff $\pi[k..\infty] \models \psi$ for all $k \geq 0$ [as $\lambda \models true$ for any path λ]

iff $\pi \models G\psi$

3

Solution correct and very well explained, all steps given adequate reasoning

2

2

2

path

for not λ ~~not~~ O, [M,

for Fr

∀y.A≡∀

2

3

Therefore CTL is a syntactic fragment of CTL*.

(b) We can find a counter-example: From definition 1 we have that $EXXp$ is a state formula in CTL*, but it does not belong to CTL because every temporal operator (such as X) must be immediately preceeded by exactly one path quantifier (A or E).

2

7) In CTL: $\Phi ::= a \mid \neg\Phi \mid \Phi \wedge \Phi \mid EX\Phi \mid AX\Phi \mid E(\Phi U \Phi) \mid A(\Phi U \Phi)$

We can reason inductively over the syntax of CTL formulas, using definition 2, to show tha restricting definition 2 to CTL formulas gives us the same truth conditions as in definitions 1.7/1.8.

<u>Base case:</u> $(M,s) \models p$ iff $s \in V(p)$ is the same in CTL

<u>Inductive step:</u> Assume the property we want to show holds for some arbitrary Φ, Φ'.

In the case of $\neg\Phi$: $(M,s) \models \neg\Phi$ iff $(M,s) \not\models \Phi$ is the same in CTL

In the case of $\Phi \wedge \Phi'$: $(M,s) \models \Phi \wedge \Phi'$ iff $(M,s) \models \Phi$ and $(M,s) \models \Phi'$ is the same in CTL

In the case of $EX\Phi$: $(M,s) \models EX\Phi$ iff for some path π from s, $(M,\pi) \models X\Phi$ [From rule 4]

iff for some path π from s, $(M,\pi[1..\infty][0]) \models \Phi$

iff for some path π from s, $(M,\pi[1..\infty]) \models \Phi$ [From rules 6 and 9]

which is the same in CTL, as a state formula

In the case of $AX\Phi$: $(M,s) \models AX\Phi$ iff for all paths π from s, $(M,\pi) \models X\Phi$ [From rule 5]

iff for all paths π from s, $(M,\pi[1..\infty][0]) \models \Phi$

iff for all paths π from s, $(M,\pi[1..\infty]) \models \Phi$ [From rules 6 and 9]

which is the same in CTL, as a state formula

In the case of $E(\Phi U \Phi')$: $(M,s) \models E(\Phi U \Phi')$ iff for some path π from s, $(M,\pi) \models \Phi U \Phi'$ [From rule 4]

iff for some path π from s, $(M,\pi[i..\infty][0]) \models \Phi'$ for some $i \geq 0$, and $(M,\pi[j..\infty][0]) \models \Phi$ for all $0 \leq j < i$

[From rules 6 and 10]

iff for some path π from s, $(M,\pi[i..\infty]) \models \Phi'$ for some $i \geq 0$, and $(M,\pi[j..\infty]) \models \Phi$ for all $0 \leq j < i$

which is the same in CTL, as a state formula

In the case of $A(\Phi U \Phi')$: $(M,s) \models A(\Phi U \Phi')$ iff for all paths π from s, $(M,\pi) \models \Phi U \Phi'$ [From rule 5]

iff for all paths π from s, $(M,\pi[i..\infty][0]) \models \Phi'$ for some $i \geq 0$, and $(M,\pi[j..\infty][0]) \models \Phi$ for all $0 \leq j < i$

[From rules 6 and 10]

iff for all paths π from s, $(M,\pi[i..\infty]) \models \Phi'$ for some $i \geq 0$, and $(M,\pi[j..\infty]) \models \Phi$ for all $0 \leq j < i$

which is the same in CTL, as a state formula

Hence restricting definition 2 to formulas in CTL gives us the same truth conditions as definitions 1.7 and 1.8 of lecture 5.

5

(a) Take an arbitrary formula Φ of CTL, and arbitrary model M and initial state s.
From part (3) we know CTL is a syntactic fragment of CTL*, so Φ is also a CTL* formula.
From part (4) we know the truth conditions for formulas in CTL are exactly the same as those for CTL* (restricted to formulas of CTL), so $(M,s) \models \Phi$ in CTL iff $(M,s) \models \Phi$ in CTL*.
Hence we can find a CTL* formula $\Phi' \equiv \Phi$, equivalent for any CTL formula Φ, as required.

2

(b) From lecture 5 we know $F(a \wedge Xa)$ is an LTL formula but cannot be expressed in CTL, i.e. there is no CTL formula equivalent to $F(a \wedge Xa) \equiv \text{true}\, U\, (a \wedge Xa)$.
Take an arbitrary model M and initial state q.

[in LTL] $(M,q) \models F(a \wedge Xa)$ iff $\lambda \models F(a \wedge Xa)$ for every path λ in M from q
iff for every path λ in M from q, for some $i \geq 0$, $\lambda[i..\infty] \models a \wedge Xa$
iff for every path λ in M from q, for some $i \geq 0$, $\lambda[i..\infty] \models a$ and $\lambda[i..\infty] \models Xa$
iff for every path λ in M from q, for some $i \geq 0$, $\lambda[i..\infty] \models a$ and $\lambda[i+1..\infty] \models a$

[in CTL*] $(M,q) \models AF(\text{true}\, U\, (a \wedge Xa))$ iff for every path λ from q, $(M,\lambda) \models F(\text{true}\, U\, (a \wedge Xa))$
iff for every path λ from q, for some $i \geq 0$, $(M,\lambda[i..\infty]) \models \text{true}\, U\, (a \wedge Xa)$
iff for every path λ from q, for some $i \geq 0$, $(M,\lambda[i..\infty][j..\infty]) \models a \wedge Xa$ for some $j \geq 0$, and $(M,\lambda[i..\infty][k..\infty]) \models \text{true}$ for all $0 \leq k < j$
iff for every path λ from q, for some $i \geq 0$, for some $j \geq 0$ $(M,\lambda[i+j..\infty]) \models a$ and $(M,\lambda[i+j+1..\infty]) \models a$, [as true is valid]
iff for every path λ from q, for some $i \geq 0$, $(M,\lambda[i..\infty]) \models a$ and $(M,\lambda[i+1..\infty]) \models a$

From these derivations we can see that the LTL formula $F(a \wedge Xa)$ is equivalent to the CTL* formula $AF(\text{true}\, U\, (a \wedge Xa))$.
Since there is no CTL formula equivalent to the LTL formula $F(a \wedge Xa)$, we have shown that there is a CTL* formula $\Phi = AF(\text{true}\, U\, (a \wedge Xa))$ for which there is no equivalent formula Φ' in CTL.

2

Solution correct and very well explained, all steps given adequate reasoning

5) We will prove by mutual induction on the structure of Φ and ψ that $(M,t) \models \Phi$ iff $(M',t') \models \Phi$ and $(M,\pi) \models \psi$ iff $(M',\pi') \models \psi$.
We assume that (M,t) and (M',t') are bisimilar, and so are (M,π) and (M',π').
Base case: $\Phi = p$

$(M,t) \models p$ iff $t \in V(p)$ [by definition 2]
iff $t' \in V'(p)$ [as (M,t) and (M',t') are bisimilar]
iff $(M',t') \models p$ [by definition 2]

Also we do not have $(M,\pi) \models p$, nor $(M',\pi') \models p$ (by definition 2).

Inductive hypotheses: If (M_0, t_0) and (M_0', t_0') are bisimilar, then $(M_0, t_0) \models \Phi$ iff $(M_0', t_0') \models \Phi$ (Φ state formula)
If (M_0, π_0) and (M_0', π_0') are bisimilar, then $(M_0, \pi_0) \models \psi$ iff $(M_0', \pi_0') \models \psi$ (ψ path formula)

Inductive case: $\Phi = \neg \Phi_1$ / $\psi = \neg \psi_1$

$(M, t) \models \neg \Phi_1$ iff $(M, t) \not\models \Phi_1$ [by definition 2]
iff $(M, t) \models \Phi_1$ is not true
iff $(M', t') \models \Phi_1$ is not true [by IH (induction hypothesis), (M,t) and (M',t') bisimilar]
iff $(M', t') \models \neg \Phi_1$ [by definition 2]

$(M, \pi) \models \neg \psi_1$ iff $(M, \pi) \models \psi_1$ is not true [by definition 2].
iff $(M', \pi') \models \psi_1$ is not true [by IH]
iff $(M', \pi') \models \neg \psi_1$ [by definition 2]

Inductive case: $\Phi = \Phi_1 \wedge \Phi_2$ / $\psi = \psi_1 \wedge \psi_2$

$(M, t) \models \Phi_1 \wedge \Phi_2$ iff $(M, t) \models \Phi_1$ and $(M, t) \models \Phi_2$ [by definition 2]
iff $(M', t') \models \Phi_1$ and $(M', t') \models \Phi_2$ [by IH, (M,t) and (M',t') bisimilar]
iff $(M', t') \models \Phi_1 \wedge \Phi_2$ [by definition 2]

The proof for $(M, \pi) \models \psi_1 \wedge \psi_2$ iff $(M', \pi') \models \psi_1 \wedge \psi_2$ is analogous.

Inductive case: $\psi = \Phi_1$

$(M, t) \models \Phi_1$ iff $(M', t') \models \Phi_1$ [by IH]

$(M, \pi) \models \Phi_1$ iff $(M, \pi[0]) \models \Phi_1$ [by definition 2]
iff $(M', \pi'[0]) \models \Phi_1$ [IH, definition 3, (M, π) and (M', π') are bisimilar]
iff $(M', \pi') \models \Phi_1$ [by definition 2]

Inductive case: $\Phi = E\psi_1$

$(M, t) \models E\psi_1$ iff for some π_0 from t, $(M, \pi_0) \models \psi_1$ [by definition 2]
iff for some π_0' from t', $(M', \pi_0') \models \psi_1$ [IH, definition 3, (M,t) and (M',t') bisimilar]
iff $(M', t') \models E\psi_1$ [by definition 2]

We do not have either $(M, \pi) \models E\psi_1$ or $(M', \pi') \models E\psi_1$ from definition 2.

Inductive case: $\Phi = A\psi_1$

$(M, t) \models A\psi_1$ iff for all π_0 from t, $(M, \pi_0) \models \psi_1$ [by definition 2]
iff for all π_0' from t, $(M', \pi_0') \models \psi_1$ [IH, definition 3, (M,t) and (M',t') bisimilar]
iff $(M', t') \models E\psi_1$ [by definition 2]

We do not have either $(M, \pi) \models A\psi_1$ or $(M', \pi') \models A\psi_1$ from definition 2.

Inductive case: $\psi = X\psi_1$

We do not have either $(M,t) \models X\psi_1$ or $(M',t') \models X\psi_1$ from definition 3.

$(M,\pi) \models X\psi_1$ iff $(M,\pi[1..\infty]) \models \psi_1$ [by definition 2]

iff $(M',\pi'[1..\infty]) \models \psi_1$ [by IH, using forth/back properties with (M,π) and (M',π') bisimilar]

iff $(M',\pi') \models X\psi_1$ [by definition 2]

Inductive case: $\psi = \psi_1 U \psi_2$

We do not have either $(M,t) \models \psi_1 U \psi_2$ or $(M',t') \models \psi_1 U \psi_2$ from definition 3.

$(M,t) \models \psi_1 U \psi_2$ iff $(M,\pi[i..\infty]) \models \psi_2$ for some $i \geq 0$, and $(M,\pi[j..\infty]) \models \psi_1$ for all $0 \leq j < i$ [definition 2]

iff $(M',\pi'[i..\infty]) \models \psi_2$ for some $i \geq 0$, and $(M',\pi'[j..\infty]) \models \psi_1$ for all $0 \leq j < i$

[since $(M,\pi[i])$ and $(M',\pi'[i])$ bisimilar, by IH]

iff $(M',\pi') \models \psi_1 U \psi_2$ [by definition 2]

6

We have shown that for arbitrary M, M', t, t', π, π', if (M,t) and (M',t') are bisimilar and (M,π) and (M',π') are bisimilar, then $(M,t) \models \Phi$ iff $(M',t') \models \Phi$ and $(M,\pi) \models \psi$ iff $(M',\pi') \models \psi$.
Since formulas in CTL* are all and only the state formulas, we can conclude that bisimulations preserve formula truth.

7) Consider that the sets St, St' in models M and M' are finite, and take arbitrary $t \in M$, $t' \in M'$.
We need to show that if t and t' are CTL-equivalent, then (M,t) and (M',t') are bisimilar.
We shall thus prove that there is a bisimulation B between M and M' such that $B(t,t')$.
Condition 1 of definition 3 is trivially true: equivalent worlds satisfy the same atoms.
For condition 2, assume that $B(t,t')$ and $t \to v$ for some $v \in St$.
Now assume for a contradiction that for no $v' \in St'$, $t' \to v'$ and $B(v,v')$.
Let $S' = \{u_i \in St' \mid t' \to u_i\}$; S' is non-empty (by CTL-equivalence of M, M') and finite.
Now by assumption, for every $u_i \in S'$, there is a formula Φ_i such that $(M,v) \models \Phi_i$ but $(M,u_i) \not\models \Phi_i$.

$\bigwedge_i (M,v) \models \Phi_i$ implies $(M,v) \models \Phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Phi_n$ [by definition 1.7]

implies $(M,\pi[1]) \models \Phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Phi_n$ for some path π from t [since $t \to v$, v arbitrary]

implies $(M,\pi) \models X(\Phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Phi_n)$ for some path π from t [by definition 1.8]

implies $(M,t) \models EX(\Phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Phi_n)$ [by definition 1.7]

Similarly, we can show $\bigwedge_i (M',u_i) \not\models \Phi_i$ implies $(M',t') \not\models EX(\Phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Phi_n)$.
But t and t' are assumed to be equivalent, so we arrive at a contradiction.
Thus there is a $v' \in St'$ with $t' \to v'$ and $B(v,v')$, so condition 2 is satisfied.
Condition 3 can be shown similarly.
Therefore $B(t,t')$, and hence (M,t) and (M',t') are bisimilar.

5

Correct methodology but no actual attempt is seen to prove the back relation

⑧ To show the $\Rightarrow$ direction, assume (M,t) and (M',t') satisfy the same CTL formulas.
From part (7) this means that (M,t) and (M',t') are bisimilar.
But then from part (6) bisimulation preserves the truth of CTL* formulas, so (M,t) and (M',t') must also satisfy the same CTL* formulas.

For the $\Leftarrow$ direction, assume (M,t) and (M',t') satisfy the same CTL* formulas.
For each CTL* formula Φ satisfied by (M,t) and (M',t'), we know from part (3) that either Φ is also a CTL formula or not, because CTL is a syntactic fragment of CTL*.
Also, from part (5) we know each Φ that is a CTL formula has an equivalent CTL* formula Φ'.
But since restricting the truth conditions of CTL* to formulas in CTL gives the same truth conditions as CTL itself, by part (4), we can conclude that $\Phi = \Phi'$.
Therefore (M,t) and (M',t') satisfy the same CTL formulas.

To elaborate on this, we can say that CTL* builds on CTL by allowing any number of path quantifiers and temporal operators within a state formula, making it more expressive than CTL. However we have seen that the subset of CTL* that follows CTL syntax also has identical semantics (equivalence of formulas), so it makes sense that the two logics would have the same distinguishing power.
We can use this to our advantage, given that satisfiability checking in CTL is PSPACE-complete but 2EXPTIME-complete in CTL*. (For a given model, if our formula to check (SAT) is CTL, we can get better performance using a solver, while obtaining the same result as with CTL*. For those that are only CTL*, it will still be slower though.

5

47 **Out of** **49**

1			
a/**2**	b/**2**	c/**3**	d/**3**
2	Solution correct and in fully simplified form 1	Solution correct and extremely well explained 3	Solution correct and very well explained, all steps given adequate reasoning 3

2			
a/**2**	b/**2**	c/**2**	d/**2**
2	2	2	2

3	
a/**3**	b/**2**
3	2

4
/5
5

5	
a/**2**	b/**2**
2	Example well justified 2

6	7	8
/6	**/6**	**/5**
6	Correct methodology but no actual attempt is seen to prove the back relation 5	5