Software Foundations

Siddharth Bhat

Spring 2020

Contents

1	Introduction	5
2	System composition	7
3	Control 3.1 Modelling loops	-
4	Modelling feedback: modularizing feedback	11

4 CONTENTS

Introduction

Let $S = \langle X_s, X_s^0, U_s, \xrightarrow{s}, Y_s, h_s \rangle$ be a transition system.

A *finite run* originating from $x_0 \in X^0$ is a finite sequence $(x_0, u_0, x_1, u_1, \dots u_{n-1}, x_n)$ such that $\forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}, \ x_i \xrightarrow{s}_{u_i} x_{i+1}$. This is sometimes denoted as $x_0 \xrightarrow{s}_{u_0} x_1 \xrightarrow{s}_{u_1} \dots \xrightarrow{s}_{u_{n-1}} x_n$. In the notation of Tabuada, this is called as the *finite internal behaviour*. A run has information about both states and transitions.

 $\langle x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle$ is a *finite trajectory* iff $\exists u_0, \dots u_{n-1}$ such that $x_0 \xrightarrow{u_0} x_1 \xrightarrow{u_1} \dots \xrightarrow{u_{n-1}} x_n$ is a finite run. The trajectory has information only about states.

 $\langle y_0, y_1, \dots, y_n \rangle$ is a *finite trace* iff there exists a finite trajectory $\langle x_0 \dots x_n \rangle$ and $\forall i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, $y_i = h_s(x_i)$. The finite trace has information only about projections of a state.

The *finite behaviour* of a system S is defined as the union of all finite traces of S. This is notated as $\mathcal{B}(S)$.

The infinite behaviour of a system S is the union of all infinite traces of S, notated as $\mathcal{B}^{\omega}(S)$. The questions we are interested in answering are:

- What is the algebra of systems? How do we compose systems?
- Can we look at the definition of a system and predict its behaviour? (Simulation and Bisimulation). This is different from extensionally looking at traces of the system.

System composition

- Run: sequences of internal states
- Trace: sequences of external states

Definition 1 Let A and B be two transition systems. The interconnect \mathcal{I} between A and B is any relation between x_a, u_a, x_b, u_b (u_a, u_b are the action spaces of A and B):

$$\mathcal{I} \subseteq X_A \times U_A \times X_B \times U_B$$

If we want to feed both systems the same input, we can have $\mathcal{I} \equiv U_a = U_b$.

If we want to have both systems produce the same output, then we should have $\mathcal{I} \equiv h_a(x_a) = h_b(x_b)$

Intuitively, the relation \mathcal{I} provides constraints on the direct product of the two systems that we want to enforce.

If we want to have feedback, $\mathcal{I} \equiv u_b = h_a(x_a) \wedge u_a = h_b(x_b)$

Definition 2 *If* A, B *are systems and* \mathcal{I} *is the interconnect, then we have* $A \times_{\mathcal{I}} B \equiv \langle X_c, X_c^0, U_c, \xrightarrow{c} , Y_c, h_c \rangle$:

$$X_{c} \equiv \{(x_{a}, x_{b}) : x_{a} \in X_{a}, x_{b} \in X_{b} \land (\exists u_{a} \in U_{A}, u_{b} \in U_{B}, (x_{a}, u_{a}, x_{b}, u_{b}) \in \mathcal{I})\}$$

$$X_{c}^{0} \equiv \{(x_{a}, x_{b}) \in X_{c} : x_{a} \in X_{a}^{0}, x_{b} \in X_{b}^{0}\}$$

$$U_{c} \equiv U_{a} \times U_{b}$$

$$(x_a, x_b) \xrightarrow{(u_a, u_b)} (x'_a, x'_b) \equiv x_a \xrightarrow{u_a} x'_a, x_b \xrightarrow{u_b} x'_b, (x_a, u_a, x_b, u_b) \in \mathcal{I}$$
$$h_c((x_a, x_b)) \equiv (h_a(x_a), h_b(x_b))$$

Question: why not define $U_c \equiv \{(u_a, u_b) : \exists x_a \in X_a, x_b \in X_b, (x_a, u_a, x_b, u_b) \in \mathcal{I} \}$

Control

We have a classical plant-controller system, as in control theory. We can model this as:

$$x_c = f_c(x_p)$$
 $x'_p = f_p(x_p, x_c)$

That is, we have x_p^0 . We find $x_c^0 = f_c(x_p^0)$. Then, $x_p^1 = f_p(x_p^0, x_c^0)$, $x_c^1 = f_c(x_p^1)$ and the whole process continues.

3.1 Modelling loops

Note that we can model a while loop as a pure controller (the predicate) controlling the body of the function.

while
$$(C(x)) \{ x = F(x) \}$$

This becomes, as a feedback system:

$$F'(c,x) = \begin{cases} F(x) & \text{if } c = 1 \\ x & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
 $C(x) = \dots$

3.2 Modelling loops with external feedback

while
$$(C(x, e)) \{ x = F(x) \}$$

$$x_c = f_c(x_p, e)$$
 $x'_p = f_p(x_p, x_c)$

Modelling feedback: modularizing feedback

Clock: $\langle X_T, X_T^0, U_T, \xrightarrow{T}, Y_T, h_T \rangle$

$$egin{aligned} X_T \equiv \mathsf{bool} & X_T^0 \equiv \{(1,0),(0,1)\} \ \ U_T \equiv \{\mathsf{next}\} & (x_1,x_2) & \xrightarrow{T} (\neg x_1, \neg x_2) \ \ Y_T \equiv X_T & h_T \equiv id \end{aligned}$$

Now we look at a while loop:

while(
$$g(x)$$
) { $x = f(x)$ }

$$x' \equiv F(x, cond, clk)$$

 $F(x, cond, 0) \equiv x$
 $F(x, 0, 1) \equiv x$
 $F(x, 1, 1) \equiv f(x)$
 $cond' \equiv G(x, cond, clk)$
 $G(x, cond, 0) \equiv cond$
 $F(x, cond, 1) \equiv g(x)$