

## HML with Recursive Formulas

- Two basic temporal properties

$\text{Inv}(F)$  : always (in time) we have  $F$

$\text{Pos}(F)$  : it is possible to get an state where  $F$

- Capturing  $\text{Inv}$  and  $\text{Pos}$  by "infinite" HML formulas :

$\text{Inv}$  by  $\bigwedge_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \underbrace{[\text{Act}] \dots [\text{Act}]}_n F$

$\text{Pos}$  by  $\bigwedge_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \underbrace{\langle \text{Act} \rangle \dots \langle \text{Act} \rangle}_n F$

- Representing "regular" infinite formulas by recursive formulas

$\text{Inv}(F)$  by  $X_{\text{Inv}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F \wedge [\text{Act}] F$

$\text{Pos}(F)$  by  $X_{\text{Pos}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F \vee \langle \text{Act} \rangle X$

## Interlude on Fixed Points Theory

- Partially Ordered Sets :  $\sqsubseteq$

Algebraically structured via  $\sup(\sqcup)$  and  $\inf(\sqcap)$

Complete lattices :  $\sqcup X, \sqcap X$  always exist

Monotonic functions  $f: D \rightarrow D$  Fixed points  $f(d) = d$

Largest  $Z_{\max}$ , and Least  $Z_{\min}$

$$f(Z_{\min}) = Z_{\min} ; f(Z) = Z \Rightarrow Z_{\min} \sqsubseteq Z$$

$$D \text{ finite} : Z_{\min} = \sqcup f^n(\perp) \quad \perp = \sqcap D$$

- Bisimulation is a Fixed Point

$$\sim = \bigcup \{ R \mid R \text{ is a bisimulation} \}$$

Lattice of Relations :  $\mathcal{P}(\text{Proc} \times \text{Proc})$

$$\text{Bisimilarity operator} : (s, t) \in \mathcal{F}_{\sim}(R) \Leftrightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} s \xrightarrow{a} s' \Rightarrow t \xrightarrow{a} t' \\ t \xrightarrow{a} t' \Rightarrow s \xrightarrow{a} s' \end{array} \right\} (s', t') \in R$$

$\mathcal{F}_{\sim}$  is monotonic ;  $R \text{ bisim} \Leftrightarrow R \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\sim}(R)$

$$\sim = \bigcup \{ R \mid R \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\sim}(R) \} = \text{gfp}(\mathcal{F}_{\sim})$$

## HML with a single Variable

- Syntax : Simply we add  $X$  as basic formula
- Semantics : In open formulas (where  $X$  is still "undefined")  $X$  is interpreted as a "mathematical" variable

Interpretation of  $X$  by  $\text{Proc}_X \subseteq \text{Proc}$

Semantics of  $F$  by  $\Theta_F : \mathcal{P}(\text{Proc}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{Proc})$

meaning of  $X$   $\nearrow$

$\nearrow$  meaning of  $F(X)$

Extending  $\Theta_X = \text{Id}_{\text{Proc}}$  by HML operators.

$\Theta_X$  is monotonic Because we have not negation !

- Semantics of Recursive Formulas

$X = F(X)$  Two! natural candidates  $\begin{cases} \text{gfp}(\Theta_F) \\ \text{lfp}(\Theta_F) \end{cases}$

For  $\text{Inv}(F)$  we expect  $\text{gfp}$  }  $X_{\text{Inv}}^{\text{max}} = F \wedge [\text{Act}] F$   
For  $\text{Pos}(F)$  we expect  $\text{lfp}$  }  $X_{\text{Pos}}^{\text{min}} = F \vee \langle \text{Act} \rangle F$

$\vee$  cannot be delayed forever  $\nearrow$

- Games for the satisfaction relation  $S \stackrel{?}{\models} F$

The attacker wins disproving it

The defender wins proving it

The attacker plays at  $\wedge$  and  $[c]$  formulas

The defender plays at  $\vee$  and  $\langle a \rangle$  formulas

When  $\begin{cases} X^{\text{max}} = F(X) \\ X^{\text{min}} = F(X) \end{cases}$  the  $\begin{cases} \text{defender} \\ \text{attacker} \end{cases}$  wins any infinite play

Minimal formula = Inductive meaning = Finite proofs

Maximal formula = Coinductive meaning = Possible "infinite"  
(coinductive) proofs



## • Some interesting examples

Safeness : there is some path along which  $F$  is preserved

Safe ( $F$ ) :  $X_{\text{safe}}^{\text{max}} = F \wedge ([\text{Act}] \nexists v \langle \text{Act} \rangle F)$   
 any finite path is broken  $\nearrow$  termination is good  $\nwarrow$  must be preserved by some continuation

Liveness :  $F$  will be satisfied at some time along any path...

Even ( $F$ ) :  $X_{\text{even}}^{\text{min}} = F \vee (\langle \text{Act} \rangle \text{tt} \wedge [\text{Act}] X_{\text{even}})$   
 we need to get it finitely  $\nearrow$  we get it if we initially have it  $\nwarrow$  we fail if we cannot continue  $\nwarrow$  we must get it for any continuation  
 otherwise we need to look for it in the (finite) future

Getting  $G$  through  $F$   $\swarrow$  We get  $G$  or  $\nwarrow$  We have  $F$   
 $F U^w G : X_w^{\text{max}} = G \vee (F \wedge [\text{Act}] X_w)$   $\nwarrow$  We continue in the same way

$F U^s G : X_s^{\text{min}} = G \vee (F \wedge \langle \text{Act} \rangle \text{tt} \wedge [\text{Act}] X_s)$   
 we need to get  $G$  finitely  $\nearrow$  we need to have  $F$  in the meantime  $\nwarrow$  we fail if we cannot continue  $\nwarrow$  We continue in the same way

## • Meaning of Formulas with Several Variables

No problem if all of them are either min or max

No problem if there is not mutual recursion

The semantics of variables are obtained in the adequate order

No semantics ! if there is mutual recursion combining both min and max.