

# Computer-Aided Formal Verification (Sheet #2)

Marius Gavrilescu

1. If  $\varphi \models \diamond\psi$ ,  $\varphi[i..] \models \psi$ . Then  $\varphi[i..] \models (\phi \cup \psi)$ , so  $\varphi \models \diamond(\phi \cup \psi)$ .

If  $\varphi \models \diamond(\phi \cup \psi)$ ,  $\varphi[i..] \models (\phi \cup \psi)$ . Then  $\varphi[(i+j)..] \models \psi$ , so  $\varphi \models \diamond\psi$ .

Hence the formulae are equivalent.

Suppose  $\phi = a$ ,  $\psi = b$  and the trace we are looking at is  $ac^\omega$ .

Then  $ac^\omega \not\models \square\diamond\phi$  so  $ac^\omega \models \square\diamond\phi \rightarrow \square\diamond\psi$ .

However,  $ac^\omega \models \phi$  and  $ac^\omega \not\models \diamond\psi$  so  $ac^\omega \not\models \phi \rightarrow \diamond\psi$  therefore  $ac^\omega \not\models \square(\phi \rightarrow \diamond\psi)$ .

$ac^\omega \models LHS$  but  $ac^\omega \not\models RHS$ .

Hence the formulae are not equivalent.

If  $\varphi \models (\diamond\square\phi_1) \wedge (\diamond\square\phi_2)$  then  $\varphi[i..] \models \square\phi_1$  and  $\varphi[j..] \models \square\phi_2$ . But then  $\varphi[\max(i,j)..] \models \square\phi_1 \wedge \square\phi_2$ , so  $\varphi \models \diamond(\square\phi_1 \wedge \square\phi_2)$ .

If  $\varphi \models \diamond(\square\phi_1 \wedge \square\phi_2)$  then  $\varphi[i..] \models \square\phi_1$  and  $\varphi[i..] \models \square\phi_2$ . But then  $\varphi \models \diamond\square\phi_1$  and  $\varphi \models \diamond\square\phi_2$ , so  $\varphi \models (\diamond\square\phi_1) \wedge (\diamond\square\phi_2)$ .

Hence the formulae are equivalent.

If  $\varphi \models \phi_1 \cup \phi_2$ , then  $\varphi \models \diamond\phi_2$  so  $\varphi \models true \cup \phi_2$  which means (by assumption)  $\varphi \models (\phi_1 \cup \phi_2) \cup \phi_2$ .

If  $\varphi \models (\phi_1 \cup \phi_2) \cup \phi_2$  then either  $\varphi \models \phi_1 \cup \phi_2$  or  $\varphi \models \phi_2$  (which implies  $\varphi \models \phi_1 \cup \phi_2$ ).

Hence the formulae are equivalent.

2.  $TS \not\models \phi_1$  due to the path  $s_1(s_4s_5)^\omega$ .

$TS \models \phi_2$  because  $s_1$  can never be reached after the first move, and the only other state that is not labelled  $c$  (that is,  $s_4$ ) does not have a self-loop (so we can't even obtain two consecutive non- $c$ 's after the first move).

$TS \models \phi_3$ . Assume it was false, then  $\exists$  a path in  $TS$  called  $\varphi$  such that  $\varphi \models \circ\neg c$  and  $\varphi \not\models \circ\circ c$ . The first statement implies the second element in the path is  $s_4$  (the only state reachable in one step that is not labelled  $c$ ), and note that all states that can come after  $s_4$  are labelled  $c$ . Contradiction.

$TS \not\models \phi_4$  due to the path  $s_1(s_4s_5)^\omega$ , note that  $s_4$  is not labelled  $a$ .

$TS \models \phi_5$ : every state that is not  $s_1$  satisfies  $b \vee c$ ;  $s_1$  cannot be reached after the first step, so any path will satisfy  $\square(b \vee c)$  from the second step onwards. Paths that satisfy  $\square(b \vee c)$  from the first step are fine, and paths that do not satisfy it from the first step must start with  $s_1$  which satisfies  $a$ .

$TS \not\models \phi_6$  due to the path  $s_1s_4s_2..$  which satisfies neither  $\circ\circ b$  nor  $b \vee c$ .

3. 1. are not equivalent: take the TS having states  $s_1, s_2, s_3$  labelled  $q, q, p$  respectively, with initial state  $s_1$ , transitions from  $s_1$  to  $s_2, s_3$ , from  $s_2$  to itself, and from  $s_3$  to itself. Clearly  $s_1 \models LHS$  because the path  $s_1 s_3^\omega$  satisfies  $\diamond p$ , and the path  $s_1 s_2^\omega$  satisfies  $\square q$ . However  $s_1 \not\models RHS$  because no suffix of the path  $s_1 s_2^\omega$  satisfies  $\exists \square q$ , and no suffix of  $s_1 s_3^\omega$  satisfies  $p$ .
2. are not equivalent: take the TS having states  $s_1, s_2$  labelled  $r, p + q$  respectively, with initial state  $s_1$ , transitions from  $s_1$  to  $s_2$  and from  $s_2$  to itself. The only paths starting from the beginning are therefore  $s_1 s_2^\omega$ . Here  $s_1 \models RHS$  because  $\pi[1..]$  satisfies  $p \wedge \forall \square q$  but  $s_1 \not\models LHS$  because it does not satisfy  $\forall \square q$ .
3. are not equivalent: take the TS having states  $s_1, s_2$  labelled  $p + q, q$  respectively with the initial state  $s_1$  and same transitions as before. Paths are as before:  $s_1 s_2^\omega$ . Here  $s_1 \models LHS$  because all paths start with  $p$  (hence satisfying  $\diamond p$ ) and every state is labelled  $q$ ; but  $s_1 \not\models RHS$  because  $\pi[1..] \not\models \forall \diamond p$  (there is no way to reach  $p$  from the second step onwards).
4. are equivalent. LHS says that any path starting from the beginning reaches a subtree of all  $ps$ , and any path starting from the beginning reaches a subtree of all  $qs$ . From here we can determine that any path starting from the beginning reaches a subtree of all  $ps$  AND reaches a subtree of all  $qs$  (i.e.  $\forall(\diamond(\forall \square p) \wedge \diamond(\forall \square q))$ ).
- But if a path can reach a subtree of all  $ps$  we know it must also be able to reach a subtree of all  $qs$ . So from this subtree of all  $ps$  we must be able to reach a subtree of all  $qs$ . Of course, this second subtree is included in the subtree of all  $ps$  so we just found a subtree of all  $p + qs$ . Hence if the LHS is true then from all paths starting from the beginning we can reach a subtree of all  $ps$  AND a subtree of all  $qs$ , which means we can reach a subtree of all  $p + qs$ , which is the RHS.
5. and 6. are not equivalent: Take the two-state TS having states  $s_1, s_2$  labelled  $p, r$  respectively with the initial state  $s_1$  and the same transitions as in 3. Here  $s_1 \models RHS$  but  $s_1 \not\models LHS$  because no path starting from  $s_1$  satisfies  $q \cup r$  as there is no state labelled  $q$  and  $s_1$  is not labelled  $r$ .
4. Not equivalent. Take a two-state TS having states  $s_1$  labelled  $b$  and  $s_2$  labelled  $a$ , with transitions from each state to both states and initial state  $s_1$ , then take  $r = b \wedge \circ a$  and  $a = a$ .
- Now observe that  $s_1 \models \forall \square(b \wedge \circ a \rightarrow \diamond a)$  because every path starting somewhere in the tree (not necessarily at the beginning) where  $b \wedge \circ a$  is true (that is, the path starts with  $s_1 s_2$ ) satisfies  $\diamond a$  (because the second element of the path is labelled  $a$ ).
- However,  $s_1 \not\models \forall \square(b \wedge \circ a \rightarrow \forall \diamond a)$  because paths which start  $s_1 s_2$  do not satisfy  $\forall \diamond a$  since one of the paths starting from  $s_1$  is  $s_1^\omega$  which does not satisfy  $\diamond a$ .