

Question 1

A. Code can be found in problem-1.smv

B. We use the following LTL property:

$\text{LTLSPEC } G ((\text{up0} = \text{start} \rightarrow F (\text{up0} = \text{stop})) \ \& \ (\text{up1} = \text{start} \rightarrow F (\text{up1} = \text{stop})) \ \& \ (\text{down0} = \text{start} \rightarrow F (\text{down0} = \text{stop})) \ \& \ (\text{down1} = \text{start} \rightarrow F (\text{down1} = \text{stop})))$

This property holds if any communication that is started (with a start signal) is finished (with a stop signal)

When we run problem-1.smv with NuSMV, we obtain that the specified property is false as demonstrated by the following execution sequence

Trace Description: LTL Counterexample

Trace Type: Counterexample

-> State: 1.1 <-

 busy[0] = FALSE

 busy[1] = FALSE

 counter = 0

 up0 = start

 down0 = start

 up1 = start

 down1 = start

-> Input: 1.2 <-

 _process_selector_ = operator_1

 running = FALSE

 operator_4.running = FALSE

 operator_3.running = FALSE

 operator_2.running = FALSE

 operator_1.running = TRUE

-> State: 1.2 <-

 busy[0] = TRUE

-> Input: 1.3 <-

 _process_selector_ = operator_2

 operator_2.running = TRUE

 operator_1.running = FALSE

-> State: 1.3 <-

 busy[1] = TRUE

-> Input: 1.4 <-

 _process_selector_ = operator_3

 operator_3.running = TRUE

 operator_2.running = FALSE

-> State: 1.4 <-

 up0 = ack

-> Input: 1.5 <-

 _process_selector_ = operator_4

 operator_4.running = TRUE

 operator_3.running = FALSE

-> State: 1.5 <-

 up1 = ack

-> Input: 1.6 <-

```

    _process_selector_ = operator_2
    operator_4.running = FALSE
    operator_2.running = TRUE
-> State: 1.6 <-
    down0 = data
-> Input: 1.7 <-
-> State: 1.7 <-
    counter = 1
-> Input: 1.8 <-
    _process_selector_ = operator_1
    operator_2.running = FALSE
    operator_1.running = TRUE
-> State: 1.8 <-
    down1 = data
-> Input: 1.9 <-
    _process_selector_ = operator_2
    operator_2.running = TRUE
    operator_1.running = FALSE
-> State: 1.9 <-
    counter = 2
-> Input: 1.10 <-
    _process_selector_ = operator_3
    operator_3.running = TRUE
    operator_2.running = FALSE
-> State: 1.10 <-
    up0 = data
-> Input: 1.11 <-
    _process_selector_ = operator_4
    operator_4.running = TRUE
    operator_3.running = FALSE
-> State: 1.11 <-
    up1 = data
-> Input: 1.12 <-
    _process_selector_ = main
    running = TRUE
    operator_4.running = FALSE
-> State: 1.12 <-
-> Input: 1.13 <-
    _process_selector_ = operator_1
    running = FALSE
    operator_1.running = TRUE
-- Loop starts here
-> State: 1.13 <-
    counter = 3
-> Input: 1.14 <-
    _process_selector_ = operator_2
    operator_2.running = TRUE
    operator_1.running = FALSE

```

```
-- Loop starts here
-> State: 1.14 <-
-> Input: 1.15 <-
  _process_selector_ = operator_3
  operator_3.running = TRUE
  operator_2.running = FALSE
-- Loop starts here
-> State: 1.15 <-
-> Input: 1.16 <-
  _process_selector_ = operator_4
  operator_4.running = TRUE
  operator_3.running = FALSE
-- Loop starts here
-> State: 1.16 <-
-> Input: 1.17 <-
  _process_selector_ = main
  running = TRUE
  operator_4.running = FALSE
-- Loop starts here
-> State: 1.17 <-
-> Input: 1.18 <-
  _process_selector_ = operator_1
  running = FALSE
  operator_1.running = TRUE
-- Loop starts here
-> State: 1.18 <-
-> Input: 1.19 <-
  _process_selector_ = operator_2
  operator_2.running = TRUE
  operator_1.running = FALSE
-- Loop starts here
-> State: 1.19 <-
-> Input: 1.20 <-
  _process_selector_ = operator_3
  operator_3.running = TRUE
  operator_2.running = FALSE
-- Loop starts here
-> State: 1.20 <-
-> Input: 1.21 <-
  _process_selector_ = operator_4
  operator_4.running = TRUE
  operator_3.running = FALSE
-- Loop starts here
-> State: 1.21 <-
-> Input: 1.22 <-
  _process_selector_ = main
  running = TRUE
  operator_4.running = FALSE
```

-> State: 1.22 <-

Question 2

A. Code can be found in problem-2.smv

In order to verify that the solution preserves mutual exclusion, we use the following LTL property:

`LTLSPEC G!((proc_1.key = TRUE) & (proc_2.key = TRUE))`

When we run problem-2.smv with NuSMV, we obtain that the specified property is true.

B. This solution is not a good solution to the mutual exclusion problem as livelock/deadlock can occur. In order to verify this, we use the following LTL property:

`LTLSPEC G(F(proc_1.key = TRUE) & F(proc_2.key = TRUE))`

When we run problem-2.smv with NuSMV, we obtain that the specified property is false as demonstrated by the following execution sequence

Trace Description: LTL Counterexample

Trace Type: Counterexample

-> State: 1.1 <-

lock = TRUE

proc_1.key = FALSE

proc_2.key = FALSE

-> Input: 1.2 <-

_process_selector_ = proc_1

running = FALSE

proc_2.running = FALSE

proc_1.running = TRUE

-- Loop starts here

-> State: 1.2 <-

lock = FALSE

-> Input: 1.3 <-

_process_selector_ = proc_2

proc_2.running = TRUE

proc_1.running = FALSE

-- Loop starts here

-> State: 1.3 <-

-> Input: 1.4 <-

_process_selector_ = main

running = TRUE

proc_2.running = FALSE

-- Loop starts here

-> State: 1.4 <-

-> Input: 1.5 <-

_process_selector_ = proc_1

running = FALSE

proc_1.running = TRUE

-- Loop starts here

-> State: 1.5 <-

-> Input: 1.6 <-

_process_selector_ = proc_2

proc_2.running = TRUE

```

    proc_1.running = FALSE
-- Loop starts here
-> State: 1.6 <-
-> Input: 1.7 <-
    _process_selector_ = main
    running = TRUE
    proc_2.running = FALSE
-> State: 1.7 <-

```

This solution is also not a good solution to the mutual exclusion problem as starvation can occur.

In order to verify this, we use the following LTL property:

LTLSPEC $G(F(\text{proc_1.key} = \text{TRUE}) \mid F(\text{proc_2.key} = \text{TRUE}))$

When we run problem-2.smv with NuSMV, we obtain that the specified property is false as demonstrated by the following execution sequence

Trace Description: LTL Counterexample

Trace Type: Counterexample

```

-> State: 2.1 <-
    lock = TRUE
    proc_1.key = FALSE
    proc_2.key = FALSE
-> Input: 2.2 <-
    _process_selector_ = proc_1
    running = FALSE
    proc_2.running = FALSE
    proc_1.running = TRUE
-- Loop starts here
-> State: 2.2 <-
    lock = FALSE
-> Input: 2.3 <-
    _process_selector_ = proc_2
    proc_2.running = TRUE
    proc_1.running = FALSE
-- Loop starts here
-> State: 2.3 <-
-> Input: 2.4 <-
    _process_selector_ = main
    running = TRUE
    proc_2.running = FALSE
-- Loop starts here
-> State: 2.4 <-
-> Input: 2.5 <-
    _process_selector_ = proc_1
    running = FALSE
    proc_1.running = TRUE
-- Loop starts here
-> State: 2.5 <-
-> Input: 2.6 <-
    _process_selector_ = proc_2
    proc_2.running = TRUE

```

```

    proc_1.running = FALSE
-- Loop starts here
-> State: 2.6 <-
-> Input: 2.7 <-
    _process_selector_ = main
    running = TRUE
    proc_2.running = FALSE
-> State: 2.7 <-

```

Question 3

- A. Code can be found in problem-3.smv

In order to verify that the solution preserves mutual exclusion, we use the following LTL property:

```

LTLSPEC G !((flag[0] = TRUE & (turn = 0 | flag[1] = FALSE)) & (flag[1] = TRUE & (turn = 1 | flag[0] = FALSE)))

```

When we run problem-3.smv with NuSMV, we obtain that the specified property is true.

- B. In order to verify that the solution is starvation-free, we use the following LTL property:

```

LTLSPEC G(((turn = 1 | flag[0] = FALSE) & flag[1] = TRUE) -> F(turn = 0 | flag[1] = FALSE) & (((turn = 0 | flag[1] = FALSE) & flag[0] = TRUE) -> F(turn = 1 | flag[0] = FALSE)))

```

When we run problem-3.smv with NuSMV, we obtain that the specified property is true.

This is because all processes that enter the loop eventually exit it (assuming they don't stay in the critical section indefinitely).