

Verification : Summary

Marius

07/01

Definition

TL(AP,SU,SS) is a temporal logic with all the past and future quantifiers.
FO(AP,i) is the first-order logic.

Intuition

$w, i \models \phi \mathbf{SS} \psi \Leftrightarrow$ Il y a eu un instant passé auquel ψ était vrai et après lequel ϕ était vrai jusqu'à aujourd'hui.

$w, i \models \phi \mathbf{SU} \psi \Leftrightarrow$ Il y aura un instant futur auquel ψ sera vrai et jusqu'auquel ϕ sera vrai.

Les operateurs **SS** and **SU** permettent de recréer tout les quantificateurs usuels.

Theorems

$\mathbf{TL} \subseteq \mathbf{FO}$ [Using the model \mathbb{N}]

Definition

CTL*(**AP**,**SU**) is a temporal logic enabling path quantifiers **E** and **A** .

CTL(**AP**,**SU**) is a temporal logic restricting *CTL** where all path quantifiers are followed by exactly one temporal operator.

MSO(**AP**,**i**) is the monadic second-order logic [enabling quantifying over sets]

Intuition

$\mathcal{M}, \lambda \models \phi \Leftrightarrow \phi$ est vrai dans le chemin λ .

Theorems

$\text{CTL} \subseteq \text{MSO}$ [Using the model \mathbb{N}]

$\text{CTL}^* \subseteq \text{MSO}$ [Using the model \mathbb{N}]

Definition

Büchi-automaton is NFA where a ω -word is recognized if it goes infinitely many times through F .

General Büchi-automaton is a BA where a ω -word is recognized if it goes infinitely many times through all the F_i .

Some properties

Büchi-automata are closed under boolean operations.

[intersection : go from a copy of the cartesian product to another when meeting a target state]

$$\text{LTL} \subseteq L(BA)$$

Büchi – automata and General Büchi – automata where are the same

Büchi – automata and Deterministic Büchi – automata are NOT the same

$$\text{CTL}^* \subseteq \text{MSO} \text{ [Using the model } \mathbb{N}]$$

Definition

A **labelled Kripke structure** is extended with actions.

An **independence relation** over actions is irreflexive, symmetric and confluent [if both actions can be chosen, they can be done in both orders]

A set of actions is **invisible** if it never change the truth of a AP.

The **stuttering-equivalence** of sequences is "equality modulo multiplicity"

Some properties

Any LTL without **X** is invariant under stuttering.

Ample set method

Idea : build a set of explored actions $red(s)$ following conditions :

1. Keep at least one action by state when possible [Avoid adding deadlocks]
2. Actions depending on $red(s)$ occurs after $red(s)$ in a concrete path starting with s .
- 2bis. In particular, all actions not from $red(s)$ are independent with all actions from $red(s)$
3. Keep all actions or only an invisible subset [Preserve stuttering equivalence].
4. An abstract action in a state s in a cycle is in $red(cycle)$ [No starving].

Definition

A **fair kripke structure** is extended states set visited infinitely often.

Can be simulated in CTL* with $\bigwedge GF F_i$

Cannot be simulated in CTL.

Complexity

LTL satisfiability is **PSPACE**-complete.

CTL* model checking is **PSPACE**-complete.

CTL model checking is decidable in time $O(|M| \cdot |\phi|)$ CTL model checking is decidable in time $O(|M| \cdot |\phi|)$

Binary Decision Diagrams

Definition

A **Binary Decision Graph** is a DAG labelling by variables and strictly ordering them. Leaves are labelled 0 and 1.

A **Binary Decision Diagram** is a BDG with no subgraphs isomorphic and no redundant nodes.

A **Binary Decision Diagram with complement arcs** is a BDD with potential filled circle on edges inverting the meaning

Simplification

One can merge nodes with the same successors and neglect the leaf labelled 0.

Theorem

Given a function $\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^n$, there is a unique BDD up to isomorphism.

E

quivalence problem can be solved through isomorphic test

Negation can be solved through exchange of leaves

Conjunction can be solved through the following formula :

$ite(x, F[x := 1] \wedge G[x := 1], F[x := 0] \wedge G[x := 0])$

Disjunction can be solved in the same way

CBDD are unique only if we prohibit negated 0-labelled edges

Pushdown Systems

Definition

A **Pushdown system** is basically the transition system of a nested stack automaton without any input.

The **P-Automaton** is the true notion of automaton with qw as inputs.

Intuition

Replacing the last item pushed \sim classical instruction

Pushing a new item \sim procedure call

Poping the last item \sim return

Property

Reachability from a configuration to another is decidable

Definition

A **Petri Net** is a tuple P, T, F, W, wm_0 , where :

- P is the set of places
- T is the set of transitions
- $F \subseteq P \times T \cup T \times P$ is the flow relations
- T is the set of transitions

The **P-Automaton** is the true notion of automaton with qw as inputs.

Intuition

Replacing the last item pushed \sim classical instruction

Pushing a new item \sim procedure call

Poping the last item \sim return

Property

Reachability from a configuration to another is decidable