# CS 512, Spring 2014

# **Assignment 5**

#### Shan Sikdar

## 1 Problem 1

- (a)  $\phi = \mathbf{G}a$ 
  - (i) the path  $q_3 \to q_4 \to q_3 \to q_4 \to q_3....$  ( $q_3$  and  $q_4$  keep repeating) will satisfy Ga
  - (ii) No because there are other paths do not satisfy Ga
- (b)  $\phi = a\mathbf{U}b$ 
  - (i) the path  $q_3 \rightarrow q_2....$  ( $q_2$  goes on forever) will statisfy  $\phi = a \mathbf{U} b$
  - (ii) No because there are other paths that do not satisfy  $\phi = a\mathbf{U}b$
- (c)  $\phi = a\mathbf{U}X(a \wedge \neg b)$ 
  - (i) the path  $q_3 \rightarrow q_4 \rightarrow q_3 \rightarrow q_4 \rightarrow q_3$ .... ( $q_3$  and  $q_4$  keep repeating) will satisfy  $\phi = a\mathbf{U}X(a \wedge \neg b)$
  - (ii) No because not all of the other paths satisfy  $\phi = a\mathbf{U}X(a \wedge \neg b)$
- (d)  $\phi = \mathbf{X} \neg b \wedge \mathbf{G}(\neg a \vee \neg b)$ 
  - (i) the path  $q_3 \to q_1 \to q_2....$  will satisfy  $\phi = \mathbf{X} \neg b \wedge \mathbf{G}(\neg a \vee \neg b)$
  - (ii) No because all the other paths do not satisfy  $\phi = \mathbf{X} \neg b \wedge \mathbf{G}(\neg a \lor \neg b)$
- (e)  $\mathbf{X}(a \wedge b) \wedge F(\neg a \wedge \neg b)$ 
  - (i) the path  $q_3 \rightarrow q_4 \rightarrow q_3 \rightarrow q_1 \rightarrow q_2$ ...

- (ii) No
- (f)  $a \wedge \mathbf{F}b$ 
  - (i) All possible paths satisfy  $a \wedge \mathbf{F}b$ .
  - (ii) Yes all paths satisfy  $a \wedge \mathbf{F}b$

- (a)  $\mathbf{FG}\varphi$  and  $\varphi \to \mathbf{X}\varphi$ The path  $p \to \neg p \to \neg p \to p \to p \to p \to p \dots$  (p goes on forever) satisfies  $\mathbf{FG}\varphi$  but not  $\varphi \to \mathbf{X}\varphi$
- (b)  $\mathbf{FG}\varphi$  and  $\neg\varphi\mathbf{UG}\varphi$ The path  $\neg p\to \neg p\to p\to \neg p\to p\to p\to p\to p\dots$ (p go on forever) satisfies  $\mathbf{FG}$  but not  $\neg\varphi\mathbf{UG}\varphi$
- (c)  $\mathbf{G}(\varphi \to \mathbf{X}\varphi)$  and  $\neg \varphi \mathbf{U} \mathbf{G} \varphi$  The path  $p \to p \to p$ ... (p goes on forever), satsisfies  $\mathbf{G}(\varphi \to \mathbf{X}\varphi)$  but not  $\neg \varphi \mathbf{U} \mathbf{G} \varphi$ .
- (d)  $\mathbf{F}(\varphi \wedge \psi)$  and  $(\mathbf{F}\varphi \wedge \mathbf{F}\psi)$  The path  $p \to q \to p \to q \to p$ ...(have p, q alternate forever). This satisfies  $(\mathbf{F}\varphi \wedge \mathbf{F}\psi)$  but not  $\mathbf{F}(\varphi \wedge \psi)$
- (e) (a) One implication has shown to be false in part a. To see why the implication is false going the other way, note that the path  $\neg p \rightarrow \neg p \rightarrow \neg p \dots (\neg p \text{ goes on forever})$  will satisfy  $\varphi \rightarrow \mathbf{X}\varphi$  but not  $\mathbf{FG}\varphi$ .
  - (b)  $\neg \varphi \mathbf{U} \mathbf{G} \varphi$  implies  $\mathbf{F} \mathbf{G} \varphi$ , Because in the first case you wil have  $\mathbf{G} \varphi$  after some  $\neg \varphi$  which implies sometime in the future you will have globally  $\varphi$ . The implication does not exist the other way from the counter example shown in part b.
  - (c)  $\neg \varphi \mathbf{U} \mathbf{G} \varphi$  implies  $\mathbf{G}(\varphi \to \mathbf{X} \varphi)$ Because once you have globally  $\varphi$ , then you know that if you see  $\varphi$  the next state must also have  $\varphi$ . The implication does not exist the other way from the counter example shown in part c.

(d)  $\mathbf{F}(\varphi \wedge \psi)$  implies  $(\mathbf{F}\varphi \wedge \mathbf{F}\psi)$ 

Since if we know  $\varphi \wedge \psi$  will be true at some point in the future, at that point both  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  have to be true seperately as well. (otherwise the  $\wedge$  could not be true. Then we know sometime in the future  $(\mathbf{F}\varphi \wedge \mathbf{F}\psi)$ 

$$\varphi \mathbf{U} \psi \equiv \varphi \mathbf{W} \psi \wedge \mathbf{F} \psi$$
 proof.

- (1)  $\pi \models \varphi \mathbf{U} \psi$  iff By definintion:
- (2)  $(\exists i \geq 1)[\pi^i \models \psi \land \pi^1 \models \varphi, ...., \pi^{i-1} \models \varphi]$  iff since we know  $(\exists i \geq 1)\pi^i \models \psi$  is true, and using properties of  $\land$ :
- (3)  $((\exists i \geq 1)\pi^i \models \psi) \land (\exists i \geq 1)[\pi^i \models \psi \land \pi^1 \models \varphi, ...., \pi^{i-1} \models \varphi]$  iff Since we know that this statment is true, using properties of  $\lor$ :
- (4)  $((\exists i \geq 1)\pi^i \models \psi) \land (\exists i \geq 1)[\pi^i \models \psi \land \pi^1 \models \varphi, ...., \pi^{i-1} \models \varphi] \lor \forall k\pi^k \models \varphi \text{ iff}$  by definitions of **F** and **W**:
- (5)  $\mathbf{F}\psi \wedge \varphi \mathbf{W}\psi$
- (6)  $\pi \models \mathbf{F}\psi \wedge \varphi \mathbf{W}\psi$

Since we have iff at every line we know that implications work both ways. So they are equivelent.

$$\varphi \mathbf{W} \psi \equiv \varphi \mathbf{U} \psi \vee \mathbf{G} \varphi$$
 proof.

- (1)  $\pi \models \varphi \mathbf{W} \psi$  iff By definition:
- (2)  $(\exists i \geq 1)[\pi^i \models \psi \land \pi^1 \models \varphi, ...., \pi^{i-1} \models \varphi] \lor \forall k \ \pi^k \models \varphi \text{ iff}$ By definition of **G**:
- (3)  $(\exists i \geq 1)[\pi^i \models \psi \land \pi^1 \models \varphi, ...., \pi^{i-1} \models \varphi] \lor \mathbf{G}\varphi$  iff by Definition of **U**:
- (4)  $\varphi \mathbf{U} \psi \vee \mathbf{G} \varphi$
- (5)  $\pi \models \varphi \mathbf{U} \psi \vee \mathbf{G} \varphi$

Since we have iff at every line we know that implications work both ways. So they are equivelent.

```
function NNF(\phi):
\phi is a literal: return \phi
\phi is \neg\neg\phi_1: return NNF(\phi_1)
\phi is \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2: return NNF(\phi_1) \wedge NNF(\phi_2)
\phi is \phi_1 \vee \phi_2: return NNF(\phi_1) \vee NNF(\phi_2)
\phi is \neg(\phi_1 \land \phi_2): return NNF(\neg\phi_1) \lor NNF(\neg\phi_2)
\phi is \neg(\phi_1 \lor \phi_2): return NNF(\neg\phi_1) \land NNF(\neg\phi_2)
\phi is \mathbf{G}\phi_1: return \mathbf{G}NNF(\phi_1)
\phi is \neg \mathbf{G}\phi_1: return \mathbf{F}NNF(\neg \phi_1)
\phi is \mathbf{F}\phi_1: return \mathbf{F}NNF(\phi_1)
\phi is \neg \mathbf{F}\phi_1: return \mathbf{G}NNF(\neg \phi_1)
\phi is \mathbf{X}\phi_1: return \mathbf{X}NNF(\phi_1)
\phi is \neg \mathbf{X}\phi_1: return \mathbf{X}NNF(\neg \phi_1)
\phi is \phi_1 \cup \phi_2: return NNF(\phi_1) \cup NNF(\phi_2)
\phi is \neg(\phi_1 \mathbf{U} \phi_2): return NNF(\neg \phi_1) \mathbf{R} NNF(\neg \psi)
\phi is \phi_1 \mathbf{R} \phi_2: return NNF(\phi_1) \mathbf{R} NNF(\phi_2)
\phi is \neg(\phi_1 \mathbf{R} \phi_2): return NNF(\neg \phi_1) \mathbf{U} NNF(\neg \psi)
\phi is \phi_1 \mathbf{W} \phi_2: return NNF(\phi_1)\mathbf{U} NNF(\phi_2) \vee G NNF(\phi)
\phi is \neg(\phi_1 \mathbf{W} \phi_2): return NNF(\neg(\phi_1 U \phi_2)) \wedge NNF(\neg \mathbf{G} \phi_1)
```

- (a) No, take the path  $s_2 \to s_4 \to s_2 \to s_4 \to s_2 \to s_4$ ... When you have  $s_2$ , r is true, when you have  $s_4$  r is false. So this cannot satisfy **FG**r
- (b) Yes,

If you start from  $s_1$  there are two ways to go  $s_3$  and  $s_4$ .  $s_3$  has an r so thats okay. If we then follow a path to  $s_4$  we see that from  $s_4$  any state that we move to will have an r. If you start from  $s_2$ , the next state is  $s_4$  which like before any state you move to from there will have an r.

(c) Yes,

If  $X \neg r$  then you know the next state has to be  $s_4$ . Every state that you can move to from  $s_4$  will have r as true. Then you know that in the next state, r will be true. So XXr

- (d) No, take the path  $s_2 \to s_4 \to s_2 \to s_4 \to s_2 \to s_4$ ... When you have  $s_2$ , q is false, when you have  $s_4$  q is true. So this cannot satisfy  $\mathbf{G}q$
- (e) Yes.

If you start from  $s_1$  you have p and the next states contain a q or r. If you start from  $s_2$  you start with r and then you have already staisfied the condition  $q \vee r$  of the U.

(f) No.

If you take the path  $s_1 \rightarrow s_4 \rightarrow s_2...$  then this doesn't work.