On Non-local Propositional and Local One-variable Quantified CTL^*

Sebastian Bauer
Institut für Informatik,
Universität Leipzig,
Augustus-Platz 10–11,
04109 Leipzig, Germany
bauer@informatik.uni-leipzig.de

Ian Hodkinson
Department of Computing,
Imperial College,
180 Queen's Gate,
London SW7 2BZ, U.K.
imh@doc.ic.ac.uk

Frank Wolter
Institut für Informatik,
Universität Leipzig,
Augustus-Platz 10–11,
04109 Leipzig, Germany
wolter@informatik.uni-leipzig.de

Michael Zakharyaschev
Department of Computer Science,
King's College,
Strand,
London WC2R 2LS, U.K.
mz@dcs.kcl.ac.uk

Abstract

We prove decidability of 'non-local' propositional CTL^**, where truth values of atoms may depend on the branch of evaluation. This result is then used to show decidability of the 'weak' one-variable fragment of first-order (local)* CTL^**, in which all temporal operators and path quantifiers except 'tomorrow' are applicable only to sentences. Various spatio-temporal logics based on combinations of* CTL^* *and* RCC-8 *can be embedded into this fragment, and so are decidable.*

1 Introduction

This paper continues the investigation of the computational behaviour of first-order branching time temporal logics started in [6]. A 'negative' result obtained in [6] is the undecidability of the one-variable fragment of quantified computational tree logic CTL^* (both bundled [1, 10] and 'unbundled' versions, and even with sole temporal operator 'some time in the future'). On the other hand, it was shown that by restricting applications of first-order quantifiers to *state* (i.e., path-independent) formulas, and applications of temporal operators and path quantifiers to formulas with at most one free variable, decidable fragments can be obtained.

Here we prove decidability of another kind of fragment of first-order CTL^*, the so-called *weak one-variable fragment*, in which quantifiers are not restricted to state formulas, but only the next-time operator may be applied to open formulas, while all other temporal operators and path quantifiers are applicable only to sentences. The main technical instrument is the method of quasimodels [4]. We first show decidability of the non-local version of propositional CTL^*, where truth values of atoms may depend on the branch of evaluation.[1] We then show that this logic can express the existence of a certain quasimodel associated with a given formula of the weak one-variable fragment. Since this existence is equivalent to the satisfiability of the formula, the decidability of the weak fragment follows. This decidability result is not only of interest *per se*, but also because it can be used to obtain decidability results for certain spatio-temporal logics based on CTL^* and the region connection calculus RCC-8 (see the survey papers [5, 9]). All omitted details of proofs can be found in the full draft version of the paper at `http://www.dcs.kcl.ac.uk/staff/mz`.

2 Decidability of non-local PCTL^*

The propositional language PCTL^* [3, 7] extends propositional logic with temporal connectives U, S ('until,' 'since') and a path quantifier E ('there exists a branch (or history)'). The dual path quantifier A ('for all branches (or histories)') is defined as an abbreviation: $\mathsf{A}\varphi = \neg\mathsf{E}\neg\varphi$. Other standard abbreviations we need are: $\Diamond_F\varphi = \top\,\mathsf{U}\,\varphi$, $\Box_F\varphi = \neg\Diamond_F\neg\varphi$, $\Diamond_P\varphi = \top\,\mathsf{S}\,\varphi$, $\bigcirc\varphi = \bot\,\mathsf{U}\,\varphi$, $\bigcirc_P\varphi = \bot\,\mathsf{S}\,\varphi$ ('some time in the future,' 'always in the future,' 'some time

[1] This contrasts with the behaviour of process logic, the local version of which is decidable, while the non-local one is undecidable [2].

Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium on Temporal Representation and Reasoning (TIME'02)
1530-1311/02 $17.00 © 2002 **IEEE**

in the past,' 'at the next moment' and 'at the previous moment'). We write $\mathcal{P}$ for the underlying set of propositional atoms.

PCTL^* is interpreted in (bundled and unbundled) models based on ω-trees. A *tree* is a strict partial order $\mathfrak{T} = \langle T, < \rangle$ such that for all $w \in T$, the set $\{v \in T : v < w\}$ is linearly ordered by $<$. When we write $\mathfrak{T}$ for a tree, it will be implicit that $\mathfrak{T} = \langle T, < \rangle$. For $t \in T$, let $ht(t) = |\{u \in T : u < t\}|$. A *full branch* of $\mathfrak{F}$ is a maximal linearly-ordered subset of T. In this paper we are only concerned with ω-trees. An ω*-tree* is a rooted tree whose full branches, ordered by $<$, are all order-isomorphic to the natural numbers $\langle \mathbb{N}, < \rangle$. A *bundle* on $\mathfrak{T}$ is a set $\mathcal{H}$ of full branches of $\mathfrak{T}$ with $\bigcup \mathcal{H} = T$.

In this paper we deal with the 'non-local' variant of PCTL^* in which truth values of atoms can depend on the branch of evaluation. Thus, a *bundled model* has the form $\mathfrak{M} = \langle \mathfrak{T}, \mathcal{H}, h \rangle$, where $\mathfrak{T}$ is an ω-tree, $\mathcal{H}$ is a bundle on $\mathfrak{T}$, and $h : \mathcal{P} \to \wp(\{(\beta,t) : t \in \beta \in \mathcal{H}\})$. $\mathfrak{M}$ is a *full tree model* if $\mathcal{H}$ is the set of all full branches of $\mathfrak{T}$. The semantics of PCTL^* is now defined as follows, where $t \in \beta \in \mathcal{H}$:

- for an atom p, $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta, t) \models p$ iff $(\beta, t) \in h(p)$;
- the booleans are defined as usual;
- $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta, t) \models \varphi \mathsf{U} \psi$ iff there is $u > t$ such that $u \in \beta$, $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta, u) \models \psi$, and $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta, v) \models \varphi$ for all $v \in (t,u)$, where $(t,u) = \{v \in T : t < v < u\}$;
- $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta, t) \models \varphi \mathsf{S} \psi$ iff there is $u < t$ with $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta, u) \models \psi$ and $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta, v) \models \varphi$ for all $v \in (u,t)$;
- $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta, t) \models \mathsf{E}\varphi$ iff $(\mathfrak{M}, \gamma, t) \models \varphi$ for some $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}$ with $t \in \gamma$.

REMARK 1. By requiring that $(\beta,t) \in h(p)$ if and only if $(\beta',t) \in h(p)$ for all p, t, β, β' with $t \in \beta \cap \beta'$, we obtain the traditional *local* semantics in which the truth values of atoms do not depend on the branch of evaluation. For an atom p, this independence is expressible (at the root of an ω-tree) in the non-local semantics by

$$\lambda(p) = (\mathsf{E}p \to \mathsf{A}p) \wedge \mathsf{A}\Box_F(\mathsf{E}p \to \mathsf{A}p).$$

Thus, a formula φ is satisfiable in the local semantics iff

$$(\varphi \vee \Diamond_F \varphi) \wedge \neg \Diamond_P \top \wedge \bigwedge_{p \in \Phi} \lambda(p)$$

is satisfiable in the non-local semantics, where Φ denotes the set of atoms occurring in φ. Hence, local satisfiability is reducible to non-local satisfiability.

LEMMA 2. *If a PCTL^*-formula φ is satisfiable in a full (bundled) tree model, then φ is satisfiable in a full (respectively, bundled) tree model based on a countable ω-tree.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{M} = \langle \mathfrak{T}, \mathcal{H}, h \rangle$ be a tree model. We may view $\mathfrak{M}$ as a two-sorted first-order structure, the two sorts being $\mathfrak{T}$ and $\mathcal{H}$. Taking a countable elementary substructure of this yields a *bundled* tree model $\mathfrak{N} = \langle \mathfrak{T}_0, \mathcal{H}_0, h_0 \rangle$ whose tree $\mathfrak{T}_0$ and bundle $\mathcal{H}_0$ are countable. Here,

$$h_0(p) = h(p) \cap \{(\beta,t) : t \in \beta \in \mathcal{H}_0\}$$

for any atom p. It is easy to translate PCTL^*-formulas to two-sorted first-order formulas with the same meaning. It follows that for any $\beta \in \mathcal{H}_0$, $t \in \beta$, and any formula ψ, we have $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta, t) \models \psi$ iff $(\mathfrak{N}, \beta, t) \models \psi$. This completes the proof for the bundled case.

Suppose now that $\mathcal{H}$ contains all full branches of $\mathfrak{T}$ and let $\overline{\mathfrak{N}} = \left\langle \mathfrak{T}_0, \overline{\mathcal{H}}_0, \overline{h}_0 \right\rangle$ be the full tree model based on $\mathfrak{N}$, where $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_0 \supseteq \mathcal{H}_0$ is the set of all full branches of $\mathfrak{T}_0$, and $\overline{h}_0(p) = h(p) \cap \{(t,\beta) : t \in \beta \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}_0\}$, for an atom p. We claim that for all PCTL^*-formulas ψ, all full branches γ of $\mathfrak{T}_0$ and all $t \in \gamma$, we have

$$(\mathfrak{M}, \gamma, t) \models \psi \quad \text{iff} \quad (\overline{\mathfrak{N}}, \gamma, t) \models \psi.$$

The proof is by induction on ψ. The atomic, boolean, and temporal cases are trivial. Consider the case $\mathsf{E}\psi$ and inductively assume the result for ψ.

If $(\mathfrak{M}, \gamma, t) \models \mathsf{E}\psi$, pick $\beta \in \mathcal{H}_0$ containing t. Clearly, $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta, t) \models \mathsf{E}\psi$, so $(\mathfrak{N}, \beta, t) \models \mathsf{E}\psi$. Then there is $\beta' \in \mathcal{H}_0$ with $(\mathfrak{N}, \beta', t) \models \psi$. Thus, $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta', t) \models \psi$. Inductively, $(\overline{\mathfrak{N}}, \beta', t) \models \psi$. So $(\overline{\mathfrak{N}}, \gamma, t) \models \mathsf{E}\psi$, as required. The converse implication is easy. $\Box$

Fix a PCTL^*-formula φ.

DEFINITION 3. Let $sub(\varphi)$ denote the set of subformulas of φ and their negations. A *type* for φ is a subset σ of $sub(\varphi)$ such that $\psi \wedge \chi \in \sigma$ iff $\psi \in \sigma$ and $\chi \in \sigma$, for every $\psi \wedge \chi$ in $sub(\varphi)$, and $\neg\psi \in \sigma$ iff $\psi \notin \sigma$, for every $\neg\psi \in sub(\varphi)$. A set Σ of types is said to be *coherent* if it is non-empty and for all $\mathsf{E}\psi \in sub(\varphi)$, the conditions $\mathsf{E}\psi \in \bigcap \Sigma$, $\mathsf{E}\psi \in \bigcup \Sigma$, and $\psi \in \bigcup \Sigma$ are equivalent.

Fix an ω-tree $\mathfrak{T} = \langle T, < \rangle$.

DEFINITION 4. Given a non-empty set Σ_t of types for each $t \in T$, and a full branch β of $\mathfrak{T}$, a *run in* β is a map

$$r : \beta \to \bigcup_{t \in \beta} \Sigma_t$$

such that

- $r(t) \in \Sigma_t$ for each $t \in \beta$,
- for all $\psi \mathsf{U} \chi \in sub(\varphi)$ and $t \in \beta$, we have $\psi \mathsf{U} \chi \in r(t)$ iff there is $u > t$ with $u \in \beta$, $\chi \in r(u)$, and $\psi \in r(v)$ for all $v \in (t,u)$,

- for all $\psi \mathsf{S} \chi \in sub(\varphi)$ and $t \in \beta$, we have $\psi \mathsf{S} \chi \in r(t)$ iff there is $u < t$ with $\chi \in r(u)$ and $\psi \in r(v)$ for all $v \in (u,t)$.

DEFINITION 5. A family $(\Sigma_t : t \in T)$ of coherent sets of types is said to be an *unbundled quasimodel for* φ *over* $\mathfrak{T}$ if

1. $\varphi \in \sigma \in \Sigma_t$ for some $t \in T$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma_t$,
2. for all $t \in T$, $\sigma \in \Sigma_t$, there is a full branch β of $\mathfrak{T}$ containing t and there is a run r in β such that $r(t) = \sigma$,
3. for each full branch β of $\mathfrak{T}$, there exists a run in β.

$(\Sigma_t : t \in T)$ is a *bundled quasimodel for* φ *over* $\mathfrak{T}$ if it satisfies conditions 1 and 2.

LEMMA 6. φ *is satisfied in a (bundled) model iff there is a (bundled) quasimodel for* φ *over a countable* ω*-tree.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{M} = \langle \mathfrak{T}, \mathcal{H}, h \rangle$ be such that $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta_0, t_0) \models \varphi$ for some $\beta_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ and $t_0 \in \beta_0$. By Lemma 2, we can assume that $\mathfrak{T}$ is countable. For $\beta \in \mathcal{H}$, $t \in \beta$ and $t \in T$, let

$$\mathrm{tp}(t,\beta) = \{\psi \in sub(\varphi) : (\mathfrak{M},\beta,t) \models \psi\},$$
$$\Sigma_t = \{\mathrm{tp}(t,\beta) : t \in \beta \in \mathcal{H}\}.$$

Clearly, $\mathrm{tp}(t,\beta)$ is a type for φ and Σ_t is coherent. For any $\beta \in \mathcal{H}$, the map $r_\beta : t \mapsto \mathrm{tp}(t,\beta)$ is then a run in β. We claim that $(\Sigma_t : t \in T)$ is a quasimodel for φ over $\mathfrak{T}$ (a bundled one if $\mathfrak{M}$ is bundled, and an unbundled one otherwise). As $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta_0, t_0) \models \varphi$, we have $\varphi \in \mathrm{tp}(t_0, \beta_0) \in \Sigma_{t_0}$. For each $t \in T$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma_t$, we have $\sigma = \mathrm{tp}(t,\beta)$ for some $\beta \in \mathcal{H}$ containing t, so $r_\beta(t) = \sigma$ and condition 2 of Definition 5 holds. Finally, for all $\beta \in \mathcal{H}$, r_β is a run in β, so if $\mathfrak{M}$ is a full tree model, it is clear that condition 3 holds.

Conversely, let $(\Sigma_t : t \in T)$ be a quasimodel for φ over a countable ω-tree $\mathfrak{T}$. Let ${}^{<\omega}2$ denote the set of finite sequences of 0s and 1s. For $\eta \in {}^{<\omega}2$, $|\eta|$ denotes the length of η. By replacing $\mathfrak{T}$ with

$$\mathfrak{T} \otimes {}^{<\omega}2 =_{\mathrm{def}} \{(t,\eta) : t \in T, \eta \in {}^{<\omega}2, ht(t) = |\eta|\},$$

i.e., a countable ω-tree when ordered by $(t,\eta) < (u,\xi)$ iff $t < u$ in T and η is an initial segment (a prefix) of ξ, and by letting $\Sigma_{(t,\eta)} = \Sigma_t$ for all t, η, we can assume that $(*)$ for each $t \in T$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma_t$, there are 2^ω full branches β of $\mathfrak{T}$ containing t such that there is a run r in β with $r(t) = \sigma$.

Each Σ_t is finite, so there are countably many pairs (t,σ) with $t \in T$, $\sigma \in \Sigma_t$. Enumerate them as (t_n, σ_n), $n < \omega$. Inductively, using $(*)$, choose a full branch $\beta_n \ni t_n$ for each $n < \omega$, such that (i) there is a run r_{β_n} in β_n with $r_{\beta_n}(t_n) = \sigma_n$, and (ii) $\beta_n \neq \beta_m$ for all $m < n$. If we have a bundled quasimodel, let $\mathcal{H} = \{\beta_n : n < \omega\}$. This is clearly a bundle on $\mathfrak{T}$. If we have an unbundled quasimodel, let $\mathcal{H}$ be the set of all full branches of $\mathfrak{T}$, and further choose for each $\beta \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{\beta_n : n < \omega\}$ a run r_β in β; this can be done by condition 3 of Definition 5. So we have defined a run r_β in β, for each $\beta \in \mathcal{H}$. Now define a model $\mathfrak{M} = \langle \mathfrak{T}, \mathcal{H}, h \rangle$ by taking $h(p) = \{(\beta,t) : t \in \beta \in \mathcal{H},\ p \in r_\beta(t)\}$ for $p \in \mathcal{P}$.

CLAIM. For all $\beta \in \mathcal{H}$, all $t \in \beta$, and all $\psi \in sub(\varphi)$, we have $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta, t) \models \psi$ iff $\psi \in r_\beta(t)$.

PROOF OF CLAIM. The proof is by induction on ψ. For atomic $\psi = p$, we have $(\mathfrak{M},\beta,t) \models p$ iff $(\beta,t) \in h(p)$, iff $p \in r_\beta(t)$ as required. The boolean cases are trivial. For $\psi \mathsf{U} \chi \in sub(\varphi)$, we have $(\mathfrak{M},\beta,t) \models \psi \mathsf{U} \chi$ iff there is $u \in \beta$ such that $u > t$, $(\mathfrak{M},\beta,u) \models \chi$, and $(\mathfrak{M},\beta,v) \models \psi$ for all $v \in (t,u)$. Inductively, this holds iff there is $u \in \beta$ with $u > t$, $\chi \in r_\beta(u)$, and $\psi \in r_\beta(v)$ for all $v \in (t,u)$. Since r_β is a run in β, this is iff $\psi \mathsf{U} \chi \in r_\beta(t)$, as required. The case of S is similar.

Finally, for $\mathsf{E}\psi \in sub(\varphi)$, we have $(\mathfrak{M},\beta,t) \models \mathsf{E}\psi$ iff $(\mathfrak{M},\gamma,t) \models \psi$ for some $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}$ with $t \in \gamma$. Inductively, this is iff $\psi \in r_\gamma(t)$ for some $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}$ with $t \in \gamma$. But evidently, $\Sigma_t = \{r_\gamma(t) : \gamma \in \mathcal{H},\ t \in \gamma\}$, so this is iff $\psi \in \bigcup \Sigma_t$. Since Σ_t is coherent, this is iff $\mathsf{E}\psi \in r_\beta(t)$, as required. The claim is proved.

Now let $t \in T$ be such that $\varphi \in \sigma$ for some $\sigma \in \Sigma_t$. We may choose $n < \omega$ with $(t,\sigma) = (t_n, \sigma_n)$. Then $t \in \beta_n \in \mathcal{H}$ and $r_{\beta_n}(t) = \sigma$, so by the claim, $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta_n, t) \models \varphi$. Thus, φ has a model. $\square$

LEMMA 7. *Given a* PCTL^**-formula* φ*, it is decidable whether* φ *has an unbundled quasimodel over a countable* ω*-tree. The same holds for bundled quasimodels.*

Proof. We will express the existence of a quasimodel in *monadic second-order logic*. Given φ, we can effectively construct the set C of all coherent sets of types. A quasimodel over an ω-tree $\mathfrak{T}$ has the form $(\Sigma_t : t \in T)$ where $\Sigma_t \in C$ for each t; we will express this by unary relation variables P_Σ for each $\Sigma \in C$, the aim being that P_Σ is true at t iff $\Sigma_t = \Sigma$. We then express the stipulations of Definition 5 in terms of the P_Σ, as follows. Let R_ψ ($\psi \in sub(\varphi)$) be unary relation variables. For a type σ for φ, let

$$\chi_\sigma(x) \quad = \quad \bigwedge_{\psi \in \sigma} R_\psi(x) \ \wedge \bigwedge_{\psi \in sub(\varphi) \setminus \sigma} \neg R_\psi(x).$$

The formula $\chi_\sigma(x)$ says that the $R_\psi(x)$ define the type σ at x. For a unary relation variable B, let ρ be the conjunction of:

- $\bigwedge_{\Sigma \in C} \forall x \big(B(x) \wedge P_\Sigma(x) \to \bigvee_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \chi_\sigma(x)\big)$,
- $\forall x \big(R_{\psi_1 \mathsf{U} \psi_2}(x) \leftrightarrow \exists y (B(y) \wedge x < y \wedge R_{\psi_2}(y) \wedge \forall z (x < z < y \to R_{\psi_1}(z)))\big)$, for all $\psi_1 \mathsf{U} \psi_2 \in sub(\varphi)$,
- $\forall x \big(R_{\psi_1 \mathsf{S} \psi_2}(x) \leftrightarrow \exists y (y < x \wedge R_{\psi_2}(y) \wedge \forall z (y < z < x \to R_{\psi_1}(z)))\big)$, for all $\psi_1 \mathsf{S} \psi_2 \in sub(\varphi)$.

So assuming that B defines a full branch, ρ says that the R_ψ define a run in B. Let $\beta(B)$ be a monadic second-order formula expressing that B is a full branch (a maximal linearly-ordered set):

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \lambda(X) & = & \forall xy\,(X(x) \wedge X(y) \rightarrow x = y \vee x < y \vee y < x), \\ X \subseteq Y & = & \forall x\,(X(x) \rightarrow Y(x)), \\ \beta(B) & = & \lambda(B) \wedge \forall X\,(\lambda(X) \wedge B \subseteq X \rightarrow X \subseteq B). \end{array}$$

Thus, the following monadic second-order formula μ is effectively constructible from φ:

$$\exists_{\Sigma \in C} P_\Sigma \Bigg(\forall x \bigvee_{\Sigma \in C} \Big[P_\Sigma(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{\substack{\Sigma' \in C \\ \Sigma \neq \Sigma'}} \neg P_{\Sigma'}(x) \Big] \wedge \; \exists x \bigvee_{\substack{\Sigma \in C \\ \varphi \in \bigcup \Sigma}} P_\Sigma(x)$$

$$\wedge \quad \forall B \Big[\beta(B) \rightarrow \exists_{\psi \in sub(\varphi)} R_\psi \, \rho \Big] \quad \wedge$$

$$\forall x \bigwedge_{\substack{\Sigma \in C \\ \sigma \in \Sigma}} \Big[P_\Sigma(x) \rightarrow \exists B \Big(\beta(B) \wedge B(x) \wedge \exists_{\psi \in sub(\varphi)} R_\psi (\rho \wedge \chi_\sigma(x)) \Big) \Big] \Bigg).$$

Here, $\exists_{\Sigma \in C} P_\Sigma$ denotes $\exists P_{\Sigma_1} \dots \exists P_{\Sigma_k}$, for $C = \{\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_k\}$, and similarly for the other $\exists$s. If we are dealing with bundled models, the conjunct $\forall B[\beta(B) \rightarrow \exists_{\psi \in sub(\varphi)} R_\psi \, \rho]$ on the second line should be omitted.

It should be clear that for any ω-tree $\mathfrak{T}$, we have $\mathfrak{T} \models \mu$ iff there is a quasimodel for φ over $\mathfrak{T}$ (bundled or unbundled, as appropriate). It follows from decidability of S2S [8] that it is decidable whether a given monadic second-order sentence is true in some countable ω-tree. The lemma now follows. □

As a consequence of Lemmas 6 and 7 we finally obtain

THEOREM 8. *It is decidable whether a* PCTL**-formula has a full tree model in the non-local semantics. The same holds for bundled models.*

3 Decidability of the weak one-variable fragment of quantified PCTL*

Fix an individual variable x and denote by QPCTL_1^* the one-variable fragment of first-order PCTL^*, which can be defined as the closure of the sets $\{P_0(x), P_1(x), \dots\}$ of unary predicates and $\{p_0, p_1, \dots\}$ of propositional variables under the operators $\exists x$, $\wedge$, $\neg$, E, $\bigcirc$, U and S. Note that now $\bigcirc$ is regarded as a primitive operator. The *weak one-variable fragment* QPCTL_w^* of QPCTL^* consists of all $\mathsf{QPCT}L_1^*$-formulas in which the temporal operators U and S and the path-quantifier E are applied to sentences only. Thus, $\bigcirc$ is the only temporal operator which can be applied to open formulas.

A QPCTL_1^*-*model* is a quadruple $\mathfrak{M} = \langle \mathfrak{T}, \mathcal{H}, D, I \rangle$, where $\mathfrak{T} = \langle T, < \rangle$ is an ω-tree, $\mathcal{H}$ is a bundle on $\mathfrak{T}$, D is a non-empty set, the *domain* of $\mathfrak{M}$, and I is a function associating with every time point $w \in T$ a usual first-order structure

$$I(w) = \left\langle D, P_0^{I(w)}, \dots, p_0^{I(w)}, \dots \right\rangle$$

in the signature of QPCTL_1^*—the *state* of $\mathfrak{M}$ at w. As before, $\mathfrak{M}$ is called a *full* model if $\mathcal{H}$ contains all full branches of $\mathfrak{T}$. An *assignment* in $\mathfrak{M}$ is a function $\mathfrak{a} : \{x\} \rightarrow D$. Let $w \in \beta \in \mathcal{H}$ and let φ be a formula. The *truth-relation* $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta, w) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \varphi$ (or $(\beta, w) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \varphi$ if $\mathfrak{M}$ is understood, or $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta, w) \models \varphi[d]$, where $\mathfrak{a}(x) = d$) is defined inductively by taking:

- $(\beta, w) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \alpha$ iff $I(w) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \alpha$, for atomic α;
- $(\beta, w) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \exists x \psi$ iff $(\beta, w) \models^{\mathfrak{b}} \psi$ for some assignment $\mathfrak{b}$;

for the temporal operators and path quantifiers, the definition is the same as in the propositional case. Note that we have returned to the traditional '*local*' semantics in which truth values of atoms do not depend on the branch β of evaluation.

The main result we prove in the remainder of this section is the following

THEOREM 9. *The satisfiability problem for* QPCTL_w^**-formulas in both bundled and full models is decidable.*

REMARK 10. (1) We remind the reader that the satisfiability problem for the full one variable fragment QPCTL_1^* in both bundled and full models is undecidable [6].

(2) Actually, using somewhat more sophisticated machinery (in particular, a mosaic technique) one can generalise Theorem 9 to the two variable, monadic, and guarded fragments of QPCTL in which $\bigcirc$ can be applied to formulas with at most one free variable and the other temporal operators and path quantifiers only to sentences.

(3) Theorem 9 and its generalisation above still hold if we extend QPCTL_w^* with individual constants; however, functional symbols and equality may lead to undecidability, cf. [4].

We will prove this result in two steps. First, we show that a QPCTL_w^*-formula is satisfiable iff it is satisfiable in certain quasimodels. Then we will reduce satisfiability in quasimodels to non-local propositional satisfiability. We begin the proof of Theorem 9 by recalling that the bundled case is reducible to the 'unbundled' one [6]. So it is enough to consider satisfiability in full models $\mathfrak{M} = \langle \mathfrak{T}, D, I \rangle$.

Fix a QPCTL_w^*-sentence φ. For simplicity we may assume that any *subsentence* $\bigcirc\psi$ of φ is replaced by $\bot \, \mathsf{U} \, \psi$. Thus, $\bigcirc$ is only applied to formulas with free variable x.

We define $sub(\varphi)$ and types for φ as in Definition 3. For every formula $\theta(x) = \bigcirc\psi(x) \in sub(\varphi)$ we reserve fresh unary predicates $P^i_\theta(x)$, and for every θ of the form $\mathsf{E}\psi$, $\psi_1 \mathsf{U} \psi_2$, or $\psi_1 \mathsf{S} \psi_2$ in $sub(\varphi)$ we reserve fresh propositional variables p^i_θ, where $i = 0, 1, \ldots$. The $P^i_\theta(x)$ and p^i_θ are called the *i-surrogates* of $\theta(x)$ and θ, respectively. For $\psi \in sub(\varphi)$, denote by ψ^i the result of replacing in ψ all its subformulas of the form $\bigcirc\psi$, $\psi \mathsf{U} \chi$, $\psi \mathsf{S} \chi$, or $\mathsf{E}\psi$ that are not within the scope of another occurrence of a non-classical operator by their i-surrogates. Thus, ψ^i is a purely first-order (non-temporal) formula. Let $\Gamma^i = \{\chi^i : \chi \in \Gamma\}$ for any set $\Gamma \subseteq sub(\varphi)$.

The idea behind these definitions is as follows. The formulas χ^i abstract from the temporal component of χ and can be evaluated in a first-order structure without taking into account its temporal evolution. Of course, later we have to be able to reconstruct the truth value of χ in temporal models from the truth value of the χ^i. In contrast to the linear time case, we need a list of abstractions $\chi^0, \chi^1, \ldots$, since the temporal evolution depends on branches. So, intuitively, each $i < \omega$ represents a branch. (Actually, we will see that finitely many $i < \omega$ are enough, since we have to represent branches only up to a certain equivalence relation).

Let $\rho(\varphi) = 4^{4^{|sub(\varphi)|}}$.

DEFINITION 11. A *state candidate* for φ is a pair of the form $\Theta = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$ in which:

(i) $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \ldots, S_k\}$, where each S_i is a set of types for φ such that, for every sentence ψ, we have $\psi \in \sigma$ iff $\psi \in \sigma'$, for any $\sigma, \sigma' \in S_i$, and for every $\mathsf{E}\psi \in sub(\varphi)$,

$$\mathsf{E}\psi \in \bigcap_{i \leq k} \bigcap S_i \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathsf{E}\psi \in \bigcup_{i \leq k} \bigcap S_i \quad \text{iff} \quad \psi \in \bigcup_{i \leq k} \bigcap S_i.$$

Lest this be confusing, we note that $\bigcap S_i$ is the set of formulas occurring in every type in S_i.

(ii) $\mathcal{T}$ is a set of maps $\tau : \{1, \ldots, n_\Theta\} \to \bigcup_{i \leq k} S_i$, called *traces*, where $n_\Theta \leq \rho(\varphi)$ is a natural number depending on Θ and such that $\{\{\tau(i) : \tau \in \mathcal{T}\} : i \leq n_\Theta\} = \mathcal{S}$.

The set of sentences in $\bigcap\{\tau(i) : \tau \in \mathcal{T}\}$ will be denoted by $\Theta(i)$. For a trace τ, we set

$$\overline{\tau} = \bigcup_{i \leq n_\Theta} (\tau(i))^i, \qquad \overline{\mathcal{T}} = \{\overline{\tau} : \tau \in \mathcal{T}\}.$$

DEFINITION 12. Let $\Theta = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be a state candidate for φ and

$$\mathfrak{D} = \langle D, P_0^{\mathfrak{D}}, \ldots, p_0^{\mathfrak{D}}, \ldots \rangle$$

a first-order structure in the signature of QPCTL^*_1. For every $a \in D$ we define the *trace* of a (with respect to Θ) as

$$tr(a) = \{\psi \in \bigcup_{i \leq n_\Theta} (sub(\varphi))^i : \mathfrak{D} \models \psi[a]\}.$$

We say that $\mathfrak{D}$ *realises* Θ if $\overline{\mathcal{T}} = \{tr(a) : a \in D\}$.

State candidates represent states w of temporal models. The intuition behind this definition will be clear from the proof of the theorem below. Here we only say that, roughly, the components S_i of a state candidate $\Theta = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T} \rangle$ represent the states of a moment w in different branches, and each trace $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ shows the types of one element of the domain of w in these states (i.e., its possible states in different histories).

It follows immediately from the definition that we have:

LEMMA 13. *A state candidate $\Theta = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T} \rangle$ for φ is realisable iff the first-order sentence*

$$\alpha_\Theta = \bigwedge_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \exists x \overline{\tau} \wedge \forall x \bigvee_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \overline{\tau}$$

is satisfiable.

DEFINITION 14. A *connection* is a quadruple (Δ, Θ, R, N) consisting of two realisable state candidates $\Delta = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$ and $\Theta = (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$, a relation $R \subseteq \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{V}$ with domain $\mathcal{T}$ and range $\mathcal{V}$, and a relation $N \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n_\Delta\} \times \{1, \ldots, n_\Theta\}$ with range $\{1, \ldots, n_\Theta\}$, such that for all $(i, j) \in N$, all $(\tau, \tau') \in R$, and all $\bigcirc\psi \in sub(\varphi)$, we have $\bigcirc\psi \in \tau(i)$ iff $\psi \in \tau'(j)$.

A connection describes how (the abstract representation Θ of) a state w is related to (the abstract representation Δ of) its immediate predecessor. To this end, the relation R between the traces in both representations is fixed.

For an ω-tree $\mathfrak{T} = \langle T, < \rangle$ and $w \in T$, denote by $B(w)$ the set of full branches coming through w.

DEFINITION 15. A *quasimodel* for φ over $\mathfrak{T}$ is a map f associating with the root w_0 of $\mathfrak{T}$ a pair $f(w_0) = (\Theta_{w_0}, g_{w_0})$, where Θ_{w_0} is a realisable state candidate, and with every non-root point $w \in T$ a pair $f(w) = (C_w, g_w)$, where $C_w = (\Delta_w, \Theta_w, R_w, N_w)$ is a connection, and all g_w, for $w \in T$, are functions from $B(w)$ onto $\{1, \ldots, n_{\Theta_w}\}$ such that the following hold:

1. if v is the immediate predecessor of w in $\mathfrak{T}$, then $\Theta_v = \Delta_w$ and $N_w = \{(g_v(\beta), g_w(\beta)) : \beta \in B(w)\}$;

2. for all $\beta \in B(w)$, $\chi \mathsf{U} \psi \in \Theta_w(g_w(\beta))$ iff there exists $u > w$ with $u \in \beta$, $\psi \in \Theta_u(g_u(\beta))$ and $\chi \in \Theta_v(g_v(\beta))$, for all $v \in (w, u)$ ($\Theta(i)$ was defined after Definition 11);

3. for all $\beta \in B(w)$, $\chi \mathsf{S} \psi \in \Theta_w(g_w(\beta))$ iff there exists $u < w$ with $\psi \in \Theta_u(g_u(\beta))$ and $\chi \in \Theta_v(g_v(\beta))$ for all $v \in (u, w)$.

We say that f *satisfies* φ if there exists $w \in T$ such that $\Theta_w = (\mathcal{S}_w, \mathcal{T}_w)$ and $\varphi \in \bigcup S$ for some $S \in \mathcal{S}_w$.

While the connections take care of the truth values of 'local' formulas of the form $\bigcirc\chi$, quasimodels take care of the remaining 'global' temporal operators.

THEOREM 16. *φ is satisfiable in a QPCTL_1^*-model iff there exists a quasimodel satisfying φ.*

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) Suppose that φ is satisfied in some model. We may replace its tree $\mathfrak{T}$ by $\mathfrak{T}^+ = \mathfrak{T} \otimes {}^{<\omega}\omega$, as in the proof of Lemma 6; ${}^{<\omega}\omega$ denotes the set of finite sequences of natural numbers. Every branch of $\mathfrak{T}$ is 'duplicated' ω times in $\mathfrak{T}^+$ at each node, and φ is still satisfied in the resulting model $\mathfrak{M} = \langle \mathfrak{T}^+, D, I\rangle$. Thus $(\mathfrak{M}, \sigma, v) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \varphi$ for some $v \in T^+$, $\sigma \in B(v)$ (defined with respect to $\mathfrak{T}^+$) and some assignment $\mathfrak{a}$. If $w \in T^+$ and $\beta \in B(w)$, let

$$S(\beta, w) = \{\mathrm{tp}(\beta, w, a) : a \in D\},$$

where

$$\mathrm{tp}(\beta, w, a) = \{\psi \in sub(\varphi) : (\mathfrak{M}, \beta, w) \models \psi[a]\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{S}_w = \{S(\beta, w) : \beta \in B(w)\}$. We extract from $\mathfrak{T}^+$ a subtree $\mathfrak{T}' = \langle T', <'\rangle$ in which every node has at most $\xi(\varphi) = 2^{2^{|sub(\varphi)|}}$ immediate successors. To this end, we inductively define $T'_n \subseteq T^+$ with this property. Set $T'_0 = \{w_0\}$, where w_0 is the root of $\mathfrak{T}^+$. Given T'_n, for each $w \in T'_n$ with $ht(w) = n$, and each $S \in \mathcal{S}_w$, we pick $\beta_S \in B(w)$ such that $S(\beta_S, w) = S$, and (we use the form of $\mathfrak{T}^+ = \mathfrak{T} \otimes {}^{<\omega}\omega$ here) $\beta_S \cap T'_n = \beta_S \cap \beta_{S'} = \{t \in T^+ : t \leq w\}$ for distinct $S, S' \in \mathcal{S}_w$. Let $B_w = \{\beta_S : S \in \mathcal{S}_w\}$, and $T_w = \bigcup B_w$. We can assume that $\sigma \in B_{w_0}$. Note that $|B_w| \leq \xi(\varphi)$. Now set $T'_{n+1} = T'_n \cup \bigcup\{T_w : w \in T'_n,\ ht(w) = n\}$. Finally define $T' = \bigcup_{n<\omega} T'_n$. Note that $\sigma \subseteq T'$ and $v \in T'$.

Let $\mathfrak{M}' = \langle \mathfrak{T}', D, I'\rangle$ and $\mathfrak{T}'$ be the restrictions of $\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{T}^+$ to T'. One can easily show by induction on the construction of $\psi \in sub(\varphi)$ that $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta, w) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \psi$ iff $(\mathfrak{M}', \beta, w) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \psi$, for all full branches β in $\mathfrak{T}'$ and all $w \in \beta$. (For example, suppose $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta, w) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \mathsf{E}\psi$. Then there is $\beta' \in B(w)$ in $\mathfrak{T}^+$ such that $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta', w) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \psi$. Pick a full branch γ in $\mathfrak{T}'$ for which $S(\beta', w) = S(\gamma, w)$. Since ψ is a sentence, we have $(\mathfrak{M}, \gamma, w) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \psi$. It follows by IH that $(\mathfrak{M}', \gamma, w) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \psi$ and so $(\mathfrak{M}', \beta, w) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \mathsf{E}\psi$.)

Thus $\mathfrak{M}'$ satisfies φ and we can work with this model instead of $\mathfrak{M}$. Define an equivalence relation $\sim_w$ on $B(w)$ (defined in $\mathfrak{T}'$ now), for $w \in T'$, by taking $\beta \sim_w \beta'$ when $(\mathfrak{M}', \beta, w) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \psi$ iff $(\mathfrak{M}', \beta', w) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \psi$, for every $\psi \in sub(\varphi)$ and every assignment $\mathfrak{a}$. The $\sim_w$-equivalence class generated by β will be denoted by $[\beta]_w$.

Since only $\bigcirc$ is applied to open formulas, we can show that the number of $\sim_w$-equivalence classes is bounded by $\rho(\varphi)$. To show this, for $w \in T'$, full branches β and β' in $B(w)$, and $d < \omega$, we put $\beta \sim_w^d \beta'$ if for all $t \in T'$ with $t \geq w$ and $ht(t) \leq ht(w) + d$, we have

1. $t \in \beta$ iff $t \in \beta'$,
2. if $t \in \beta$, then for all assignments $\mathfrak{a}$ and all $\psi \in sub(\varphi)$ with at most $ht(w) + d - ht(t)$ occurrences of $\bigcirc$, we have $(\beta, t) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \psi$ iff $(\beta', t) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \psi$.

An induction on d shows that the number $\sharp(d)$ of $\sim_w^d$-classes is at most $\xi(\varphi)^d \cdot 2^{(d+1)|sub(\varphi)|}$ (for any w). For $d = 0$, one may check that if $(\beta, w) \models \psi$ iff $(\beta', w) \models \psi$ for each sentence $\psi \in sub(\varphi)$, then $\beta \sim_w^0 \beta'$. So $\sharp(0) \leq 2^{|sub(\varphi)|}$. Assume the result for d. One may check that if $\beta, \beta' \in B(w)$ contain a common immediate successor v of w, $(\beta, w) \models \psi$ iff $(\beta', w) \models \psi$ for each sentence $\psi \in sub(\varphi)$, and $\beta \sim_v^d \beta'$, then $\beta \sim_w^{d+1} \beta'$. Both checks involve an induction on ψ in (2) above. It follows that $\sharp(d+1) \leq \xi(\varphi) \cdot 2^{|sub(\varphi)|} \cdot \sharp(d)$, and hence that $\sharp(d) \leq \xi(\varphi)^d \cdot 2^{(d+1)|sub(\varphi)|}$ for all d, as required. Finally observe that if $\beta \sim_w^{|sub(\varphi)|} \beta'$ then $\beta \sim_w \beta'$, so that $\sim_w$ has at most $\sharp(|sub(\varphi)|) \leq \rho(\varphi)$ classes.

Let $\beta_1^w, \dots \beta_{n_w}^w$ be some minimal list of full branches such that $\{[\beta_1^w]_w, \dots, [\beta_{n_w}^w]_w\}$ is the set of all $\sim_w$-equivalence classes. With each $a \in D$ we associate a trace

$$\tau_a^w : \{1, \dots, n_w\} \to \bigcup \mathcal{S}_w$$

by taking $\tau_a^w(i) = \mathrm{tp}(\beta_i^w, w, a)$. Denote the resulting set of traces by $\mathcal{T}_w$. Let $\Theta_w = (\mathcal{S}_w, \mathcal{T}_w)$ for all $w \in T'$. We are now in a position to define a quasimodel f over $\mathfrak{T}'$ satisfying φ. If w is not the root, then set $f(w) = ((\Theta_v, \Theta_w, R_w, N_w), g_w)$, where v is the immediate predecessor of w, and for root w_0 let $f(w_0) = (\Theta_{w_0}, g_{w_0})$, where

- $g_w(\beta) = i$ iff $\beta \in [\beta_i^w]_w$,
- $R_w = \{(\tau_a^v, \tau_a^w) : a \in D\}$,
- $N_w = \{(g_v(\beta), g_w(\beta)) : \beta \in B(w)\}$.

It is not hard to check that f is a quasimodel satisfying φ.

($\Leftarrow$) Now suppose that f is a quasimodel for φ over $\mathfrak{T} = \langle T, <\rangle$ with root w_0. Let $f(w_0) = (\Theta_{w_0}, g_{w_0})$ and $f(w) = (C_w, g_w) = ((\Delta_w, \Theta_w, R_w, N_w), g_w)$ for non-root $w \in T$. Let $\Theta_w = (\mathcal{S}_w, \mathcal{T}_w)$ and $n_w = n_{\Theta_w}$.

A *run* r in f is a function associating with any $w \in T$ a trace $r(w) \in \mathcal{T}_w$ such that $(r(v), r(w)) \in R_w$ for any non-root w with immediate predecessor v. Using the condition that the range and domain of R_w coincide with $\{1, \dots, n_w\}$ and $\{1, \dots, n_v\}$, respectively, it is not difficult to see that, for any w and any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_w$, there exists a run r with $r(w) = \tau$. Let $\mathcal{R}$ be the set of all runs.

For every $w \in T$ we find a first-order structure $I(w)$ with domain $D = \mathcal{R}$ realising $\Theta_w = (\mathcal{S}_w, \mathcal{T}_w)$ and such that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n_w\}$, $r \in D$, and $\psi \in sub(\varphi)$,

$$\psi \in r(w)(i) \quad \text{iff} \quad I(w) \models \psi^i[r].$$

Let $\mathfrak{M} = \langle \mathfrak{T}, D, I\rangle$ and let $\mathfrak{a}$ be any assignment in D. One can show by induction that for all $\psi \in sub(\varphi)$, all $w \in T$, and all $\beta \in B(w)$ with $g_w(\beta) = i$, say, we have

$$I(w) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \psi^i \quad \text{iff} \quad (\mathfrak{M}, \beta, w) \models^{\mathfrak{a}} \psi.$$

Since $\varphi \in r(w)(g_w(\sigma))$ for some $w \in T$, $\sigma \in B(w)$ and $r \in \mathcal{R}$, we finally obtain $(\mathfrak{M}, \sigma, w) \models \varphi$. $\square$

Now we construct a reduction of QPCTL^*_w to non-local PCTL^* by means of encoding quasimodels in non-local propositional tree models. Suppose again that a QPCTL^*_w-sentence φ is fixed.

With every realisable state candidate $\Theta = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$ for φ, every connection C, every $i \leq \rho(\varphi)$, and every sentence $\chi \in sub(\varphi)$, which either is a propositional variable or starts with an existential quantifier $\exists x$, we associate propositional variables p_Θ, p_C, p_i, and p_χ, respectively. Let $\cdot^\sharp$ be a translation from the set of QPCTL^*_w-sentences into the set of PCTL^*-formulas which distributes over the booleans, temporal operators and path quantifiers, and $\chi^\sharp = p_\chi$, where χ is a propositional variable or a sentence of the form $\exists x \vartheta$. Clearly, $\varphi^\sharp$ is a PCTL^*-formula. Then the following formula $\varphi^\star$ is effectively constructable from φ:

$$\varphi^\star = \varphi^\sharp \wedge \big((\chi \wedge \neg\Diamond_P \top) \vee \Diamond_P(\chi \wedge \neg\Diamond_P \top)\big),$$

where χ is the conjunction of the formulas (1)–(11) defined below.

$$\bigvee_{\Theta \in \mathcal{R}(\varphi)} \mathsf{A} p_\Theta \wedge \bigwedge_{\Theta \neq \Theta'} \mathsf{A}(p_\Theta \rightarrow \neg p_{\Theta'}), \tag{1}$$

$$\mathsf{A}\Box_F \Big(\bigvee_{C \in C(\varphi)} \mathsf{A} p_C \wedge \bigwedge_{C \neq C'} \mathsf{A}(p_C \rightarrow \neg p_{C'})\Big). \tag{2}$$

Here $\mathcal{R}(\varphi)$ and $C(\varphi)$ are the sets of realisable state candidates and connections for φ, respectively. The formulas in (1) say that the p_Θ and p_C are 'local' (so we can write $w \models p_\Theta$ and $w \models p_C$) and that precisely one p_Θ holds at the root and precisely one p_C holds at each non-root point.

Intuitively, $w \models p_C$ means that $f(w) = (C, g)$, for some g. Say that a pair of connections (C_1, C_2) is *suitable* if the second state candidate of C_1 coincides with the first state candidate of C_2. The set of all suitable pairs of connections is denoted by $C_s(\varphi)$. A pair (Θ, C) is *suitable* if the first state candidate of C coincides with Θ. The set of all suitable pairs of this form is denoted by $\mathcal{R}_s(\varphi)$. The following formulas say that the pair induced by a point and its immediate predecessor is suitable:

$$\mathsf{A} \bigvee_{(\Theta,C) \in \mathcal{R}_s(\varphi)} (p_\Theta \wedge \bigcirc p_C), \tag{3}$$

$$\mathsf{A}\Box_F \bigvee_{(C_1,C_2) \in C_s(\varphi)} (p_{C_1} \wedge \bigcirc p_{C_2}). \tag{4}$$

Intuitively, for i such that $1 \leq i \leq \rho(\varphi)$, $(\beta, w) \models p_i$ is intended to mean $g_w(\beta) = i$. This is ensured by the formulas

$$\mathsf{A} \bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq \rho(\varphi)} (p_i \rightarrow \neg p_j), \tag{5}$$

$$\mathsf{A}\Box_F \bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq \rho(\varphi)} (p_i \rightarrow \neg p_j), \tag{6}$$

$$\bigwedge_{\Theta \in \mathcal{R}(\varphi)} \Big(p_\Theta \rightarrow \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq n_\Theta} \mathsf{E} p_i \wedge \mathsf{A} \bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq n_\Theta} p_i\Big), \tag{7}$$

$$\mathsf{A}\Box_F \bigwedge_{C \in C(\varphi)} \Big(p_C \rightarrow \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq n_\Theta} \mathsf{E} p_i \wedge \mathsf{A} \bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq n_\Theta} p_i\Big). \tag{8}$$

Here and below we assume that $C = (\Delta, \Theta, R, N)$. Now we write down a formula which says that N in C is determined by the functions g_w:

$$\mathsf{A}\Box_F \bigwedge_{C \in C(\varphi)} \Big(p_C \rightarrow \big(\bigwedge_{(i,j) \in N} \mathsf{E}(p_j \wedge \bigcirc_P p_i) \wedge \mathsf{A} \bigvee_{(i,j) \in N} (p_j \wedge \bigcirc_P p_i)\big)\Big). \tag{9}$$

Finally, we have to ensure that the set of sentences true at (β, w) corresponds to the set of sentences in $\Theta_w(g_w(\beta))$. Let $\Theta'_w(i)$ be the set of sentences in $sub(\varphi) \setminus \Theta_w(i)$. Then we include:

$$\mathsf{A} \bigwedge_{\Theta \in \mathcal{R}(\varphi), 1 \leq i \leq n_\Theta} \Big((p_\Theta \wedge p_i) \rightarrow \big(\bigwedge_{\chi \in \Theta(i)} \chi^\sharp \wedge \bigwedge_{\chi \in \Theta'(i)} \neg\chi^\sharp\big)\Big), \tag{10}$$

$$\mathsf{A}\Box_F \bigwedge_{C \in \mathcal{S}(\varphi), 1 \leq i \leq n_\Theta} \Big((p_C \wedge p_i) \rightarrow \big(\bigwedge_{\chi \in \Theta(i)} \chi^\sharp \wedge \bigwedge_{\chi \in \Theta'(i)} \neg\chi^\sharp\big)\Big). \tag{11}$$

THEOREM 17. *A* QPCTL^*_w*-sentence* φ *is satisfiable in a full model iff the* PCTL^**-formula* $\varphi^\star$ *is satisfiable in a full non-local model.*

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) If φ is satisfiable, then it is satisfied in a quasimodel f for φ based on an ω-tree $\mathfrak{T} = \langle T, < \rangle$. Let $f(w) = (C_w, g_w) = ((\Delta_w, \Theta_w, N_w, R_w), g_w)$ if w is not the root and $f(w_0) = (\Delta_{w_0}, g_{w_0})$ for root w_0 of $\mathfrak{T}$. Define a (propositional) valuation h in $\mathfrak{T}$ by taking, for all $w \in T$ and $\beta \in B(w)$:

- $(\beta, w) \in h(p_\Theta)$ iff $\Theta = \Theta_w$, for every realisable state candidate Θ;
- $(\beta, w) \in h(p_C)$ iff $C = C_w$, for every connection C;
- $(\beta, w) \in h(p_i)$ iff $g_w(\beta) = i$, for all $i < \rho(\varphi)$;
- $(\beta, w) \in h(p_\chi)$ iff $\chi \in \Theta_w(g_w(\beta))$, for all sentences χ in $sub(\varphi)$.

It is not hard to prove that the full model $\mathfrak{M} = \langle \mathfrak{T}, h \rangle$ is as required.

($\Leftarrow$) Conversely, suppose $\mathfrak{M} = \langle \mathfrak{T}, h \rangle$ satisfies $\varphi^\star$. Then χ is true at the root w_0 of $\mathfrak{T}$. Define a quasimodel f by taking $f(w) = (C_w, g_w) = ((\Delta_w, \Theta_w, N_w, R_w), g_w)$ if $w \neq w_0$, and $f(w_0) = (\Theta_{w_0}, g_{w_0})$, where

- Θ_{w_0} is the unique Θ for which $w_0 \models p_\Theta$ (this is independent of the branch of evaluation);
- for $w \neq w_0$, C_w is the unique C such that $w \models p_C$;
- $g_w(\beta) = i$ for the unique i for which $(\beta, w) \models p_i$.

The reader can check that f is a quasimodel satisfying φ. $\square$

4 Conclusion

The decidability of the weak one-variable fragment of first-order CTL^* can be used to obtain decidability results for certain spatio-temporal logics based on CTL^* and the region connection calculus RCC-8 (see the survey papers [5, 9]). From this viewpoint it has sufficient expressive power to be useful. However, there is still a gap between the undecidability of the one-variable fragment of first-order CTL^* and the decidability of its weak one-variable fragment. In particular, the following problems are still open.

1. What happens if the path-quantifier E is applied to open formulas as well?
2. Or, what happens if all temporal operators are applied to open formulas, but E only to sentences?
3. Another open problem is the computational complexity of the logics considered above.

The reduction proofs presented in this paper provide only non-elementary decision procedures (simply because the complexity of *S2S* is non-elementary). We do not believe that this is optimal.

Acknowledgements

The work of the second and forth authors was partially supported by UK EPSRC grant GR/R45369/01 "Analysis and mechanisation of decidable first-order temporal logics;" the fourth author was also partially supported by UK EPSRC grant GR/R42474/01 "Complexity analysis of reasoning in combined knowledge representation systems." The work of the third author was partially supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) grant Wo583/3-1. We are grateful to Szabolcs Mikulás for helpful discussions and Colin Stirling who attracted our attention to the non-local version of CTL^*. Thanks are also due to the anonymous referees for useful suggestions and comments on the first version of this paper.

References

[1] J. Burgess. Logic and time. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 44:566–582, 1979.

[2] A. Chandra, J. Halpern, A. Meyer, and R. Parikh. Equations between regular terms and an application to process logic. In *STOC*, pages 384–390, 1981.

[3] E. Emerson and J. Halpern. "sometimes" and "not never" revisited: on branching versus linear time. *Journal of the ACM*, 33:151–178, 1986.

[4] I. Hodkinson, F. Wolter, and M. Zakharyaschev. Decidable fragments of first-order temporal logics. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 106:85–134, 2000.

[5] I. Hodkinson, F. Wolter, and M. Zakharyaschev. Monodic fragments of first-order temporal logics: 2000–2001 a.d. In R. Nieuwenhuis and A. Voronkov, editors, *Logic for Programming, Artificial Intelligence and Reasoning*, volume 2250 of *LNAI*, pages 1–23. Springer-Verlag, 2001.

[6] I. Hodkinson, F. Wolter, and M. Zakharyaschev. Decidable and undecidable fragments of first-order branching temporal logics. In *Proc. Logic in Computer Science (LICS'02)*. IEEE Computer Science Press, 2002 (in print). (Draft available at `http://www.dcs.kcl.ac.uk/staff/mz`.)

[7] F. Laroussinie and P. Schnoebelen. A hierarchy of temporal logics with past. Volume 775 of *LNCS*, pages 47–58. Springer-Verlag, 1994.

[8] M. O. Rabin. Decidability of second order theories and automata on infinite trees. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 141:1–35, 1969.

[9] F. Wolter and M. Zakharyaschev. Qualitative spatio-temporal representation and reasoning: a computational perspective. In *Exploring Artificial Intelligence in the New Millenium*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, 2002 (in print).

[10] A. Zanardo. A finite axiomatization of the set of strongly valid ockamist formulas. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 14:447–468, 1985.

1530-1311/02 $17.00 © 2002 **IEEE**