Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Chapters... Motivation and Intuition

How to communicate Syntax of CT Semantics of CTL

Some examples of what we can say

More about semantics
Equivalences

Improving our

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

October 21, 2015

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters... Motivation and Intuition

Intuition
How to
communicate
Syntax of CTI
Semantics of
CTL

Some examples of what we can say

More about semantics Equivalences

Equivalences Improving our

- 1 In previous chapters...
- 2 Motivation and Intuition
- 3 How to communicate
 - Syntax of CTL
 - Semantics of CTL
- 4 Some examples of what we can say
- 5 More about semantics
 - Equivalences
- 6 Improving our language

Previously on Temporal Logic Week... Temporal Logic

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...

Motivation and Intuition How to communicate

Semantics of CTL

Some examples of what we can say

semantics Equivalences

Motivation

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and Intuition

Semantics of CTL what we can say

■ Needing of uncertainty;

Motivation

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous

Motivation and

Intuition How to communicate Syntax of CT

communicate Syntax of CT Semantics of CTL

Some examples of what we can say

More about semantics Equivalences

Improving our language

- Needing of uncertainty;
- Different paths of the future;

Intuition

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and Intuition

Semantics of CTL

what we can sav

In Computation Tree Logic (CTL) the model of time is a tree-like structure. This way, we cannot use Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) to express the existence of a certain path of time in which some event occurs.

Syntax Definition

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...

Intuition

communicate

Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL

Some examples o what we can say

More about semantics Equivalences

Improving ou language The syntax of CTL consists on the syntax of temporal logic plus some path operators. The class of formulas can be defined in Backus-Naur form. If ϕ is a formula:

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...

Intuition

How to

Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL

Some examples of what we can say

More about semantics

Improving ou language The syntax of CTL consists on the syntax of temporal logic plus some path operators. The class of formulas can be defined in Backus-Naur form. If ϕ is a formula:

$$\begin{split} \phi ::= \bot \mid \top \mid \rho \mid \neg \phi \mid \phi \land \phi \mid \phi \lor \phi \mid \phi \to \phi \mid \mathsf{AX}\phi \mid \mathsf{EX}\phi \mid \\ \mathsf{AF}\phi \mid \mathsf{EF}\phi \mid \mathsf{AG}\phi \mid \mathsf{EG}\phi \mid \mathsf{A}[\phi \mathsf{U}\phi] \mid \mathsf{E}[\phi \mathsf{U}\phi] \end{split}$$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters... Motivation an

How to

communicate Syntax of CTL

Semantics of CTL

what we can say

semantics Equivalences

Improving our

The syntax of CTL consists on the syntax of temporal logic plus some path operators. The class of formulas can be defined in Backus-Naur form. If ϕ is a formula:

$$\phi ::= \bot \mid \top \mid \rho \mid \neg \phi \mid \phi \land \phi \mid \phi \lor \phi \mid \phi \rightarrow \phi \mid \mathsf{AX}\phi \mid \mathsf{EX}\phi \mid$$

$$\mathsf{AF}\phi \mid \mathsf{EF}\phi \mid \mathsf{AG}\phi \mid \mathsf{EG}\phi \mid \mathsf{A}[\phi\mathsf{U}\phi] \mid \mathsf{E}[\phi\mathsf{U}\phi]$$

With p as a literal (atomic formula), AX, EX, AF, EF, AG e EG unary operators.

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Syntax of CTL

Semantics of CTL

what we can sav

The propositional operators: $\neg, \lor, \land, \rightarrow$ have the same meaning of in the propositional logic.

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...
Motivation and

How to communicate Syntax of CTL

Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL

what we can say

More about
semantics

Equivalences

The propositional operators: $\neg, \lor, \land, \rightarrow$ have the same meaning of in the propositional logic.

The temporal operators can be read (if φ is a formula) as follows:

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...
Motivation and

communicate
Syntax of CTL

Semantics of CTL Semantics of CTL

what we can say

More about
semantics

semantics Equivalences The propositional operators: \neg , \lor , \land , \rightarrow have the same meaning of in the propositional logic.

The temporal operators can be read (if φ is a formula) as follows:

■ $A\varphi$: φ is true in all possible paths;

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...
Motivation and

Syntax of CTL

Semantics of CTL

More about semantics

Equivalences Improving our The propositional operators: \neg , \lor , \land , \rightarrow have the same meaning of in the propositional logic.

The temporal operators can be read (if φ is a formula) as follows:

- $A\varphi$: φ is true in all possible paths;
- $\mathbf{E}\varphi$: φ exists a path in which ϕ is true;

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...
Motivation and

Syntax of CTL Semantics of

Semantics of CTL Some examples of what we can say

More about semantics Equivalences

Improving our language

The propositional operators: \neg , \lor , \land , \rightarrow have the same meaning of in the propositional logic.

The temporal operators can be read (if φ is a formula) as follows:

- A φ : φ is true in all possible paths;
- lacksquare E arphi: arphi exists a path in which ϕ is true;

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...
Motivation and

Syntax of CTL

Semantics of CTL

What we can say
More about
semantics
Equivalences

Improving our language

The propositional operators: \neg , \lor , \land , \rightarrow have the same meaning of in the propositional logic.

The temporal operators can be read (if φ is a formula) as follows:

- A φ : φ is true in all possible paths;
- lacksquare E arphi: arphi exists a path in which ϕ is true;

The path-specific operators can be read, considering φ and ψ formulas, as:

■ $\mathbf{X}\varphi : \varphi$ is true until next state;

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...
Motivation and

Syntax of CTL

Semantics of CTL

What we can say
More about
semantics
Equivalences

Improving our language

The propositional operators: \neg , \lor , \land , \rightarrow have the same meaning of in the propositional logic.

The temporal operators can be read (if φ is a formula) as follows:

- $A\varphi$: φ is true in all possible paths;
- lacksquare E arphi: arphi exists a path in which ϕ is true;

- $\mathbf{X}\varphi : \varphi$ is true until next state;
- $F\varphi$: There is some state in the future where φ is true;

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...
Motivation and

Syntax of CTL Semantics of

Semantics of CTL

What we can say
More about
semantics
Equivalences

Improving our

The propositional operators: \neg , \lor , \land , \rightarrow have the same meaning of in the propositional logic.

The temporal operators can be read (if φ is a formula) as follows:

- A φ : φ is true in all possible paths;
- lacksquare E arphi: arphi exists a path in which ϕ is true;

- $X\varphi$: φ is true until next state;
- $F\varphi$: There is some state in the future where φ is true;
 - $G\varphi$: Globally (in all future states) φ is true;

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...
Motivation and

How to communicate Syntax of CTL

Semantics of CTL

More about semantics

Improving our language

The propositional operators: \neg , \lor , \land , \rightarrow have the same meaning of in the propositional logic.

The temporal operators can be read (if φ is a formula) as follows:

- A φ : φ is true in all possible paths;
- lacksquare E arphi: arphi exists a path in which ϕ is true;

- $\mathbf{X}\varphi : \varphi$ is true until next state;
- $F\varphi$: There is some state in the future where φ is true;
- $G\varphi$: Globally (in all future states) φ is true;
- $\blacksquare \varphi U \psi$: φ is true at least until ψ becomes true;

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...
Motivation and

How to communicate

Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL

what we can say

More about
semantics

Equivalences

■ Notice that, in CTL, the combination of path specific operators and temporal operators are atomic, i.e., AF is a operator that can be read as "In all paths in the future there is some state where..."

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...
Motivation and

How to

Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL

CTL Some examples of

What we can say
More about
semantics
Equivalences

Improving ou language

- Notice that, in CTL, the combination of path specific operators and temporal operators are atomic, i.e., AF is a operator that can be read as "In all paths in the future there is some state where..."
- Notice as well that the binary operators $A[\varphi U\psi]$ and $E[\varphi U\psi]$ can be represented as AU

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters... Motivation and Intuition

communicate Syntax of CTL

Semantics of CTL

what we can say

More about semantics

Equivalences Improving our language

- Notice that, in CTL, the combination of path specific operators and temporal operators are atomic, i.e., AF is a operator that can be read as "In all paths in the future there is some state where..."
- Notice as well that the binary operators $A[\varphi U\psi]$ and $E[\varphi U\psi]$ can be represented as AU
- We assume that, similarly to the ¬ operator, the "new" unary operators (AX, EX, AF, EF, AG, and EG) have the first precedence. Next comes the ∧ and ∨ operators. And at last the →, AU and EU

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters... Motivation and Intuition

communicate Syntax of CTL

Semantics of CTL

what we can say

More about semantics

Equivalences Improving our language

- Notice that, in CTL, the combination of path specific operators and temporal operators are atomic, i.e., AF is a operator that can be read as "In all paths in the future there is some state where..."
- Notice as well that the binary operators $A[\varphi U\psi]$ and $E[\varphi U\psi]$ can be represented as AU
- We assume that, similarly to the ¬ operator, the "new" unary operators (AX, EX, AF, EF, AG, and EG) have the first precedence. Next comes the ∧ and ∨ operators. And at last the →, AU and EU

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Syntax of CTL

Semantics of CTL

- Examples of well-formed formulas:
 - $AG(p \lor EFq)$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL

what we can sav

- Examples of well-formed formulas:
 - \blacksquare AG($p \lor EFq$)
 - $\blacksquare \ \mathtt{AX}(q \to \mathtt{E}[(p \lor q)\mathtt{U}r])$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...
Motivation and

Motivation ar Intuition

How to

Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL

Some examples of what we can say More about

semantics Equivalences ■ Examples of well-formed formulas:

- $AG(p \lor EFq)$
- $\blacksquare \ \mathtt{AX}(q \to \mathtt{E}[(p \lor q)\mathtt{U}r])$
- EFEGp o AFr Note that this is binded as (EFEGp) o AFr, not as EFEG(p o AFr)

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...

Intuition

How to

Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL

Some examples o what we can say More about semantics

semantics Equivalences ■ Examples of well-formed formulas:

- $AG(p \lor EFq)$
- $\blacksquare \ \mathtt{AX}(q \to \mathtt{E}[(p \lor q)\mathtt{U}r])$
- EFEGp o AFr Note that this is binded as (EFEGp) o AFr, not as EFEG(p o AFr)
- Example of formulas that are not well-formed:
 - A \neg G \neg p

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...

Motivation an

How to

Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL

Some examples o what we can say

More about semantics Equivalences

Improving ou language

- Examples of well-formed formulas:
 - $\blacksquare \ \operatorname{AG}(p \vee \operatorname{EF}q)$
 - $\blacksquare \ \mathtt{AX}(q \to \mathtt{E}[(p \lor q)\mathtt{U}r])$
 - $ext{EFEG}p o ext{AF}r$ Note that this is binded as $(ext{EFEG}p) o ext{AF}r$, not as $ext{EFEG}(p o ext{AF}r)$
- Example of formulas that are not well-formed:
 - A \neg G \neg p
 - \blacksquare F[pUs]

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...

Motivation as Intuition

How to

Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL

Some examples o what we can say More about

More about semantics Equivalences

Improving ou language

- Examples of well-formed formulas:
 - $AG(p \lor EFq)$
 - $\blacksquare \ \mathtt{AX}(q \to \mathtt{E}[(p \lor q)\mathtt{U}r])$
 - EFEG $p oup ext{AF}r$ Note that this is binded as (EFEGp) $oup ext{AF}r$, not as EFEG $(p oup ext{AF}r)$
- Example of formulas that are not well-formed:
 - A¬G¬p
 - **F**[pUs]
 - $A[pUs \land qUs]$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...
Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate
Syntax of CT
Semantics of CTL

Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL Some examples of what we can say

More about semantics Equivalences Different from usual logics, CTL formulas are interpreted by a transition system. Given an set of atoms:

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters... Motivation and Intuition

How to communicate Syntax of CT Semantics of CTL

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics Equivalences

Different from usual logics, CTL formulas are interpreted by a transition system. Given an set of atoms:

Definition (1)

A transition system \mathcal{M} is a triple $\mathcal{M} = (S, \to, L)$ in which S is a set of states, \to is a binary relation over S ($\to \subseteq S \times S$) and $L: S \to \mathcal{P}(Atoms)$ is a labelling function.

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...
Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate

communicate
Syntax of CTL
Semantics of
CTL
Some examples
what we can say

what we can say
More about
semantics
Equivalences
Improving our
language

Different from usual logics, CTL formulas are interpreted by a transition system. Given an set of atoms:

Definition (1)

A transition system \mathcal{M} is a triple $\mathcal{M}=(S,\to,L)$ in which S is a set of states, \to is a binary relation over S ($\to\subseteq S\times S$) and $L:S\to\mathcal{P}(Atoms)$ is a labelling function.

Definition (2)

A **model** is a duple \mathcal{M}, s in which \mathcal{M} is a transition system and s is a state.

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...
Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics Equivalences

Different from usual logics, CTL formulas are interpreted by a transition system. Given an set of atoms:

Definition (1)

A **transition system** \mathcal{M} is a triple $\mathcal{M}=(S,\to,L)$ in which S is a set of states, \to is a binary relation over S ($\to\subseteq S\times S$) and $L:S\to\mathcal{P}(Atoms)$ is a labelling function.

Definition (2)

A **model** is a duple \mathcal{M}, s in which \mathcal{M} is a transition system and s is a state.

Notation: we will use $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \varphi$ to denote that the model \mathcal{M}, s satisfies the formula φ

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and Intuition How to communicate Syntax of CTL Semantics of

what we can say
More about
semantics
Equivalences

Take an arbitrary model \mathcal{M} . Let s, s_1, s_2, s_3 be states in S. Let $\varphi, \varphi_1, \varphi_2$ be well-formed formulas of CTL. And let p be an atom. The satisfaction of CTL formulas can be defined as follows:

■ \mathcal{M} , $s \vDash \top$ and \mathcal{M} , $s \not\vDash \bot$ for all $s \in S$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and Intuition How to communicate Syntax of CTL Semantics of

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics Equivalences

Take an arbitrary model \mathcal{M} . Let s, s_1, s_2, s_3 be states in S. Let $\varphi, \varphi_1, \varphi_2$ be well-formed formulas of CTL. And let p be an atom. The satisfaction of CTL formulas can be defined as follows:

- $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \top$ and $\mathcal{M}, s \not\vDash \bot$ for all $s \in S$
- \mathcal{M} , $s \models p$ iff $p \in L(S)$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics

semantics Equivalences Improving our Take an arbitrary model \mathcal{M} . Let s, s_1, s_2, s_3 be states in S. Let $\varphi, \varphi_1, \varphi_2$ be well-formed formulas of CTL. And let p be an atom. The satisfaction of CTL formulas can be defined as follows:

- $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \top$ and $\mathcal{M}, s \not\vDash \bot$ for all $s \in S$
- $\blacksquare \mathcal{M}, s \vDash p \text{ iff } p \in L(S)$
- $\blacksquare \mathcal{M}, s \vDash \neg \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{M}, s \not\vDash \varphi$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and Intuition How to communicate Syntax of CTL Semantics of

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics Equivalences

Improving our language

Take an arbitrary model \mathcal{M} . Let s, s_1, s_2, s_3 be states in S. Let $\varphi, \varphi_1, \varphi_2$ be well-formed formulas of CTL. And let p be an atom. The satisfaction of CTL formulas can be defined as follows:

- $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \top$ and $\mathcal{M}, s \not\vDash \bot$ for all $s \in S$
- \mathcal{M} , $s \models p$ iff $p \in L(S)$
- \mathcal{M} , $s \vDash \neg \varphi$ iff \mathcal{M} , $s \not\vDash \varphi$
- $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \varphi_1 \land \varphi_2$ iff $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \varphi_1$ AND $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \varphi_2$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate
Syntax of CTI
Semantics of

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics

Improving our

- \blacksquare $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \top$ and $\mathcal{M}, s \not\vDash \bot$ for all $s \in S$
- \mathcal{M} , $s \models p$ iff $p \in L(S)$
- $\blacksquare \mathcal{M}, s \vDash \neg \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{M}, s \nvDash \varphi$
- $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \varphi_1 \land \varphi_2$ iff $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \varphi_1$ AND $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \varphi_2$
- $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \varphi_1 \lor \varphi_2$ iff $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \varphi_1$ OR $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \varphi_2$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and Intuition How to communicate Syntax of CTL Semantics of

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics Equivalences

Improving our

- \blacksquare $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \top$ and $\mathcal{M}, s \not\vDash \bot$ for all $s \in S$
- \mathcal{M} , $s \models p$ iff $p \in L(S)$
- $\blacksquare \mathcal{M}, s \vDash \neg \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{M}, s \nvDash \varphi$
- \mathcal{M} , $s \vDash \varphi_1 \land \varphi_2$ iff \mathcal{M} , $s \vDash \varphi_1$ AND \mathcal{M} , $s \vDash \varphi_2$
- \mathcal{M} , $s \vDash \varphi_1 \lor \varphi_2$ iff \mathcal{M} , $s \vDash \varphi_1$ OR \mathcal{M} , $s \vDash \varphi_2$
- $\blacksquare \mathcal{M}, s \vDash \varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \text{ iff } \mathcal{M}, s \not\vDash \varphi_1 \text{ OR } \mathcal{M}, s \vDash \varphi_2$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...
Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate Syntax of CTI Semantics of

Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL Some examples what we can say

More about semantics Equivalences Take an arbitrary model \mathcal{M} . Let s, s_1, s_2, s_3 be states in S. Let $\varphi, \varphi_1, \varphi_2$ be well-formed formulas of CTL. And let p be an atom. The satisfaction of CTL formulas can be defined as follows:

■ $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \mathsf{AX}\varphi$ iff for all s_1 that $s \to s_1$ and $\mathcal{M}, s_1 \vDash \varphi$. Thus, AX says: "in every next state..."

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...
Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate
Syntax of CTI
Semantics of

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics Equivalences

- $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \mathtt{AX}\varphi$ iff for all s_1 that $s \to s_1$ and $\mathcal{M}, s_1 \vDash \varphi$. Thus, AX says: "in every next state..."
- $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \mathsf{EX}\varphi$ iff exists s_1 that $s \to s_1$ and $\mathcal{M}, s_1 \vDash \varphi$. Thus, EX says: "in some next state…"

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate
Syntax of CTI
Semantics of

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics
Equivalences

- $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \mathsf{AX}\varphi$ iff for all s_1 that $s \to s_1$ and $\mathcal{M}, s_1 \vDash \varphi$. Thus, AX says: "in every next state..."
- $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \mathtt{EX}\varphi$ iff exists s_1 that $s \to s_1$ and $M, s_1 \vDash \varphi$. Thus, EX says: "in some next state..."
- $M, s, \models AG\varphi$ iff for all paths $s_1 \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow s_3 \rightarrow ...$ in which $s = s_1$, for all s_i , $M, s_i \models \varphi$. Thus, AG says: "In all possible paths from now on in all next states..."

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...
Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate
Syntax of CTI
Semantics of

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics Equivalences Improving our

- $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \mathtt{AX}\varphi$ iff for all s_1 that $s \to s_1$ and $\mathcal{M}, s_1 \vDash \varphi$. Thus, AX says: "in every next state..."
- $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \mathtt{EX}\varphi$ iff exists s_1 that $s \to s_1$ and $M, s_1 \vDash \varphi$. Thus, EX says: "in some next state..."
- $M, s, \models AG\varphi$ iff for all paths $s_1 \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow s_3 \rightarrow ...$ in which $s = s_1$, for all s_i , $M, s_i \models \varphi$. Thus, AG says: "In all possible paths from now on in all next states..."
- $M, s, \models AG\varphi$ iff exists some path $s_1 \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow s_3 \rightarrow ...$ in which $s = s_1$, for all s_i , $M, s_i \models \varphi$ Thus, EG says: "Exists a path from now on in all next states..."

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...
Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate
Syntax of CTI
Semantics of

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics Equivalences Improving our

- $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \mathtt{AX}\varphi$ iff for all s_1 that $s \to s_1$ and $\mathcal{M}, s_1 \vDash \varphi$. Thus, AX says: "in every next state..."
- $\mathcal{M}, s \vDash \mathtt{EX}\varphi$ iff exists s_1 that $s \to s_1$ and $M, s_1 \vDash \varphi$. Thus, EX says: "in some next state..."
- $M, s, \models AG\varphi$ iff for all paths $s_1 \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow s_3 \rightarrow ...$ in which $s = s_1$, for all s_i , $M, s_i \models \varphi$. Thus, AG says: "In all possible paths from now on in all next states..."
- $M, s, \models AG\varphi$ iff exists some path $s_1 \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow s_3 \rightarrow ...$ in which $s = s_1$, for all s_i , $M, s_i \models \varphi$ Thus, EG says: "Exists a path from now on in all next states..."

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Chapters...
Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate

Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL Some examples of what we can sav

More about semantics Equivalences Take an arbitrary model \mathcal{M} . Let s, s_1, s_2, s_3 be states in S. Let $\varphi, \varphi_1, \varphi_2$ be well-formed formulas of CTL. And let p be an atom. The satisfaction of CTL formulas can be defined as follows:

■ $M, s, \models AF\varphi$ iff for all paths $s_1 \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow s_3 \rightarrow ...$ in which $s = s_1$, exists s_i , $M, s_i \models \varphi$. Thus, AF says: "In all possible paths from now on, in some next state..."

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and Intuition How to communicate Syntax of CTL

Semantics of CTL

Some examples of what we can say

More about

More about semantics Equivalences Improving our language

- $M, s, \models AF\varphi$ iff for all paths $s_1 \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow s_3 \rightarrow ...$ in which $s = s_1$, exists s_i , $M, s_i \models \varphi$. Thus, AF says: "In all possible paths from now on, in some next state..."
- $M, s, \models \text{EF}\varphi$ iff exists some path $s_1 \to s_2 \to s_3 \to ...$ in which $s = s_1$, that exists s_i , $M, s_i \models \varphi$. Thus, EF says: "In some path from now on, in some next state..."

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate
Syntax of CTI
Semantics of

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics
Equivalences

semantics Equivalences Improving our language

- $M, s, \models AF\varphi$ iff for all paths $s_1 \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow s_3 \rightarrow ...$ in which $s = s_1$, exists s_i , $M, s_i \models \varphi$. Thus, AF says: "In all possible paths from now on, in some next state..."
- $M, s, \models \text{EF}\varphi$ iff exists some path $s_1 \to s_2 \to s_3 \to ...$ in which $s = s_1$, that exists s_i , $M, s_i \models \varphi$. Thus, EF says: "In some path from now on, in some next state..."
- $M, s, \models A[\varphi_1 U \varphi_2]$ iff for all paths $s_1 \to s_2 \to s_3 \to ...$ in which $s = s_1$, this path satisfies $\varphi_1 U \varphi_2$, i.e., exists s_i in the path such that $M, s_i \models \varphi_2$ and, for all j < i, $M, s_j \models \varphi_1$. Thus, AU says: "For all paths from now on, until some state..."

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate Syntax of CT Semantics of

what we can say
More about
semantics
Equivalences

- $M, s, \models AF\varphi$ iff for all paths $s_1 \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow s_3 \rightarrow ...$ in which $s = s_1$, exists s_i , $M, s_i \models \varphi$. Thus, AF says: "In all possible paths from now on, in some next state..."
- $M, s, \models \text{EF}\varphi$ iff exists some path $s_1 \to s_2 \to s_3 \to ...$ in which $s = s_1$, that exists s_i , $M, s_i \models \varphi$. Thus, EF says: "In some path from now on, in some next state..."
- $M, s, \models A[\varphi_1 U \varphi_2]$ iff for all paths $s_1 \to s_2 \to s_3 \to ...$ in which $s = s_1$, this path satisfies $\varphi_1 U \varphi_2$, i.e., exists s_i in the path such that $M, s_i \models \varphi_2$ and, for all j < i, $M, s_j \models \varphi_1$. Thus, AU says: "For all paths from now on, until some state..."
- $M, s, \models E[\varphi_1 U \varphi_2]$ iff exists some path $s_1 \mapsto s_2 \mapsto s_3 \mapsto \ldots \circ s_2 \mapsto s_3 \mapsto s$

Examples

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...
Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate
Syntax of CTL
Semantics of

Some examples of what we can say

More about semantics Equivalences ■ "It's possible to get to a state where something has started but it's not ready": $EF(started \land \neg ready)$

Examples

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and Intuition How to communicate Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL

Some examples of what we can say

More about semantics Equivalences

- "It's possible to get to a state where something has started but it's not ready": EF(started ∧ ¬ready)
- "A certain process is enabled infinitely often on every computation path": AG(AFenabled)

Examples

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...
Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate
Syntax of CTL
Semantics of

Some examples of what we can say

More about semantics Equivalences Improving our "It's possible to get to a state where something has started but it's not ready": EF(started ∧ ¬ready)

- "A certain process is enabled infinitely often on every computation path": AG(AFenabled)
- "An upwards travelling lift at the second floor does not change its direction when it has passengers wishing to go to the fifth floor":

 $AG(floor2 \land directionUp \land button5 \rightarrow A[directionUp Ufloor5])$

Equivalences

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...
Motivation ar

How to communicate Syntax of CT Semantics of CTL

Some examples of what we can say

Equivalences

Improving ou language

Definition

Two CTL formulas φ and ψ are said to be **semantically equivalent** if any state in any model which satisfies one of them also satisfies the other;

Equivalences

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...
Motivation ar

How to communicate Syntax of CT Semantics of CTL

Some examples o what we can say More about

Equivalences

Definition

Two CTL formulas φ and ψ are said to be **semantically equivalent** if any state in any model which satisfies one of them also satisfies the other;

Notation: we denote the equivalence of φ and ψ by $\varphi \equiv \psi$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters... Motivation and

How to communicate Syntax of CT Semantics of

Semantics of CTL Some examples of what we can say

More about semantics Equivalences

Improving our language

$$\quad \ \, \neg \mathrm{AF} \varphi \equiv \mathrm{EG} \neg \varphi$$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and

Semantics of CTL

what we can sav

Equivalences

- $\blacksquare \neg AF\varphi \equiv EG\neg \varphi$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...

Motivation and

How to communicate Syntax of CT

Semantics of CTL
Some examples

what we can say

More about

Equivalences

Improving ou language

$$\quad \blacksquare \ \neg \mathtt{AF} \varphi \equiv \mathtt{EG} \neg \varphi$$

$$\quad \ \, \neg \mathrm{EF} \varphi \equiv \mathrm{AG} \neg \varphi$$

$$\quad \blacksquare \ \neg \mathtt{AX} \varphi \equiv \mathtt{EX} \neg \varphi$$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...

Motivation an

How to communicate Syntax of CT

Syntax of CTI Semantics of CTL

what we can say

Equivalences

Improving our language

$$\quad \blacksquare \ \neg \mathtt{AF} \varphi \equiv \mathtt{EG} \neg \varphi$$

$$\quad \blacksquare \ \neg \mathrm{EF} \varphi \equiv \mathrm{AG} \neg \varphi$$

$$\blacksquare \ \mathsf{AF}\varphi \equiv \mathsf{A}[\top \mathsf{U}\varphi]$$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...

Motivation an

How to communicate Syntax of CT Semantics of CTL

Some examples of what we can say

More about

Equivalences

Improving ou language

$$\quad \blacksquare \ \neg \mathtt{AF} \varphi \equiv \mathtt{EG} \neg \varphi$$

$$\quad \blacksquare \ \neg \mathrm{EF} \varphi \equiv \mathrm{AG} \neg \varphi$$

$$\blacksquare \ \mathsf{AF}\varphi \equiv \mathsf{A}[\top \mathsf{U}\varphi]$$

$$\blacksquare \ \mathrm{EF}\varphi \equiv \mathrm{E}[\top \mathrm{U}\varphi]$$

Minimum set of CTL connectives

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...
Motivation and
Intuition
How to
communicate
Syntax of CTI
Semantics of

Some examples of what we can say

semantics
Equivalences

Improving ou language Because of the equivalences shown and the ones in propositional logic, we can have some minimum sets of conectives for the CTL syntax. One of them is defined in Backus-Naur formalism below:

$$\phi ::= \top \mid \boldsymbol{\rho} \mid \neg \phi \mid \phi \rightarrow \phi \mid \mathtt{AX}\phi \mid \mathtt{A}[\phi \mathtt{U}\phi] \mid \mathtt{E}[\phi \mathtt{U}\phi]$$

That's all we need?

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters... Motivation an Intuition

How to communicate Syntax of CTI Semantics of CTL

Some examples of what we can say

More about semantics Equivalences

Improving our language Even if CTL allow explicit quantification over paths, it cannot allow some expressions to be formed. For example, we cannot say, as in LTL: "All paths in which have p on them, also have q on them".

This expression can be translated in LTL as follows:

$$Fp \rightarrow Fq$$

That's all we need?

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...
Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate
Syntax of CTL
Semantics of CTL

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics

More about semantics
Equivalences

Improving our language

We can try expressing it as $AFp \to AFq$ but it does not have the same meaning. This one statement means "If all paths have a p along them, then all paths have a q along then"

That's all we need?

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...
Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate
Syntax of CTL
Semantics of

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics

Improving our language

We can try expressing it as $AFp \to AFq$ but it does not have the same meaning. This one statement means "If all paths have a p along them, then all paths have a q along then" We can try to translate it as $AG(p \to AFq)$ which is closer, but not exactly the same. This one means "for all paths, in all states on the future, if they hold p then, all paths will eventually hold q"

Presenting CTL*

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

in previous chapters... Motivation ar Intuition How to

How to communicate Syntax of CT Semantics of CTL

Some examples o what we can say More about semantics

semantics Equivalences Improving our language For this, we can extend the CTL by dropping the constraint that every temporal operator $(X,\,U,\,F,\,G)$ has to be associated with an unique path quantifier $(A,\,E)$.

Presenting CTL*

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters... Motivation an Intuition How to

How to communicate Syntax of CT Semantics of CTL

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics

Improving our language

For this, we can extend the CTL by dropping the constraint that every temporal operator (X, U, F, G) has to be associated with an unique path quantifier (A, E).

This allows us to generate some statements:

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

chapters...
Motivation and
Intuition
How to
communicate
Syntax of CTI

Semantics of CTL Some examples of what we can say

More about semantics

Improving our language

■ "In all possible paths, q is true until r is true or p is true until r is true": $A[qUr \lor pUr]$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters...
Motivation a

How to communicate Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL

More about semantics

Improving our language

- "In all possible paths, q is true until r is true or p is true until r is true": $A[qUr \lor pUr]$
- "There is a path in which p eventually occurring will occur in all states": E[GFp]

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and Intuition How to communicate Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL

More about semantics

Improving our language

- "In all possible paths, q is true until r is true or p is true until r is true": $A[qUr \lor pUr]$
- "There is a path in which p eventually occurring will occur in all states": E[GFp]
- "In all paths, p will occur in the next state or in the next of the next": $A[Xp \lor XXp]$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and Intuition How to communicate Syntax of CTL Semantics of CTL

More about semantics

Improving our language

- "In all possible paths, q is true until r is true or p is true until r is true": $A[qUr \lor pUr]$
- "There is a path in which p eventually occurring will occur in all states": E[GFp]
- "In all paths, p will occur in the next state or in the next of the next": $A[Xp \lor XXp]$

CTL* syntax

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

Motivation and Intuition
How to communicate
Syntax of CT

Semantics of CTL Some examples of what we can say

More about semantics

Improving our

The syntax of CTL* can be defined with the BNF bellow:

$$\phi ::= \bot \mid \top \mid \mathbf{p} \mid \neg \phi \mid \phi \land \phi \mid \phi \lor \phi \mid \phi \rightarrow \phi \mid \mathtt{A}[\alpha] \mid \mathtt{E}[\alpha] \mid$$

$$\alpha ::= \phi | \ \neg \alpha \ | \ \alpha \wedge \alpha \ | \ \alpha \vee \alpha \ | \ \alpha \to \alpha \ | \ \alpha \mathsf{U}\alpha \ | \ \mathsf{G}\alpha \ | \ \mathsf{F}\alpha \ | \ \mathsf{X}\alpha |$$

With the same meanings of each operator.

$\mathsf{LTL} \subset \mathsf{CTL}^*$ and $\mathsf{CTL} \subset \mathsf{CTL}^*$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters... Motivation an Intuition How to

How to communicate Syntax of CT Semantics of CTL

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics

Improving our language

Although we don't define path operators to LTL we can assume that it consider in all paths. Therefore, we can say that a formula ϕ in LTL is a formula $\mathbb{A}[\phi]$ in CTL*;

$\mathsf{LTL} \subset \mathsf{CTL}^*$ and $\mathsf{CTL} \subset \mathsf{CTL}^*$

Computation Tree Logic

Luis Tertulino & Ronaldo Silveira

In previous chapters... Motivation an Intuition How to

How to communicate Syntax of CT Semantics of CTL

Some examples of what we can say More about semantics

Equivalences Improving our language Although we don't define path operators to LTL we can assume that it consider in all paths. Therefore, we can say that a formula ϕ in LTL is a formula $\mathbb{A}[\phi]$ in CTL*;

For CTL, it is trivial;