

- bisimulation as a fixed point
- Hennessy-Milner logic with recursively defined variables
- game semantics and temporal properties of reactive systems
- characteristic property

### Tarski's Fixed Point Theorem – Summary

Let  $(D, \sqsubseteq)$  be a **complete lattice** and let  $f : D \rightarrow D$  be a **monotonic function**.

Tarski's Fixed Point Theorem

Then  $f$  has a unique **largest fixed point**  $z_{max}$  and a unique **least fixed point**  $z_{min}$  given by:

$$z_{max} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqcup \{x \in D \mid x \sqsubseteq f(x)\}$$

$$z_{min} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqcap \{x \in D \mid f(x) \sqsubseteq x\}$$

#### Computing Fixed Points in Finite Lattices

If  $D$  is a finite set then there exist integers  $M, m > 0$  such that

- $z_{max} = f^M(\top)$
- $z_{min} = f^m(\perp)$

### Definition of Strong Bisimulation

Let  $(Proc, Act, \{\xrightarrow{a} \mid a \in Act\})$  be an LTS.

#### Strong Bisimulation

A binary relation  $R \subseteq Proc \times Proc$  is a **strong bisimulation** iff whenever  $(s, t) \in R$  then for each  $a \in Act$ :

- if  $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$  then  $t \xrightarrow{a} t'$  for some  $t'$  such that  $(s', t') \in R$
- if  $t \xrightarrow{a} t'$  then  $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$  for some  $s'$  such that  $(s', t') \in R$ .

Two processes  $p, q \in Proc$  are **strongly bisimilar** ( $p \sim q$ ) iff there exists a strong bisimulation  $R$  such that  $(p, q) \in R$ .

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

### Strong Bisimulation as a Greatest Fixed Point

Function  $\mathcal{F} : 2^{(Proc \times Proc)} \rightarrow 2^{(Proc \times Proc)}$

Let  $S \subseteq Proc \times Proc$ . Then we define  $\mathcal{F}(S)$  as follows:

$(s, t) \in \mathcal{F}(S)$  if and only if for each  $a \in Act$ :

- if  $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$  then  $t \xrightarrow{a} t'$  for some  $t'$  such that  $(s', t') \in S$
- if  $t \xrightarrow{a} t'$  then  $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$  for some  $s'$  such that  $(s', t') \in S$ .

#### Observations

- $(2^{(Proc \times Proc)}, \subseteq)$  is a complete lattice and  $\mathcal{F}$  is monotonic
- $S$  is a strong bisimulation if and only if  $S \subseteq \mathcal{F}(S)$

Strong Bisimilarity is the Greatest Fixed Point of  $\mathcal{F}$

$$\sim = \bigcup \{S \in 2^{(Proc \times Proc)} \mid S \subseteq \mathcal{F}(S)\}$$

### HML with One Recursively Defined Variable

#### Syntax of Formulae

Formulae are given by the following abstract syntax

$$F ::= X \mid tt \mid ff \mid F_1 \wedge F_2 \mid F_1 \vee F_2 \mid \langle a \rangle F \mid [a]F$$

where  $a \in Act$  and  $X$  is a distinguished variable with a definition

- $X \stackrel{\text{min}}{=} F_X$ , or  $X \stackrel{\text{max}}{=} F_X$

such that  $F_X$  is a formula of the logic (can contain  $X$ ).

#### How to Define Semantics?

For every formula  $F$  we define a function  $O_F : 2^{Proc} \rightarrow 2^{Proc}$  s.t.

- if  $S$  is the set of processes that satisfy  $X$  then
- $O_F(S)$  is the set of processes that satisfy  $F$ .

### Definition of $O_F : 2^{Proc} \rightarrow 2^{Proc}$ (let $S \subseteq Proc$ )

$$O_X(S) = S$$

$$O_{tt}(S) = Proc$$

$$O_{ff}(S) = \emptyset$$

$$O_{F_1 \wedge F_2}(S) = O_{F_1}(S) \cap O_{F_2}(S)$$

$$O_{F_1 \vee F_2}(S) = O_{F_1}(S) \cup O_{F_2}(S)$$

$$O_{\langle a \rangle F}(S) = \langle \cdot a \cdot \rangle O_F(S)$$

$$O_{[a]F}(S) = [\cdot a \cdot] O_F(S)$$

$O_F$  is monotonic for every formula  $F$

$$S_1 \subseteq S_2 \Rightarrow O_F(S_1) \subseteq O_F(S_2)$$

Proof: easy (structural induction on the structure of  $F$ ).

## Semantics

### Observation

We know that  $(2^{Proc}, \subseteq)$  is a **complete lattice** and  $O_F$  is **monotonic**, so  $O_F$  has a unique **greatest and least fixed point**.

### Semantics of the Variable $X$

- If  $X \stackrel{\max}{=} F_X$  then

$$\llbracket X \rrbracket = \bigcup \{S \subseteq Proc \mid S \subseteq O_{F_X}(S)\}.$$

- If  $X \stackrel{\min}{=} F_X$  then

$$\llbracket X \rrbracket = \bigcap \{S \subseteq Proc \mid O_{F_X}(S) \subseteq S\}.$$

## Game Characterization

Intuition: the attacker claims  $s \not\models F$ , the defender claims  $s \models F$ .

Configurations of the game are of the form  $(s, F)$

- $(s, tt)$  and  $(s, ff)$  have no successors
- $(s, X)$  has one successor  $(s, F_X)$
- $(s, F_1 \wedge F_2)$  has two successors  $(s, F_1)$  and  $(s, F_2)$  (selected by the attacker)
- $(s, F_1 \vee F_2)$  has two successors  $(s, F_1)$  and  $(s, F_2)$  (selected by the defender)
- $(s, [a]F)$  has successors  $(s', F)$  for every  $s'$  s.t.  $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$  (selected by the attacker)
- $(s, \langle a \rangle F)$  has successors  $(s', F)$  for every  $s'$  s.t.  $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$  (selected by the defender)

## Who is the Winner?

**Play** is a maximal sequence of configurations formed according to the rules given on the previous slide.

### Finite Play

- The **attacker** is the winner of a finite play if the defender gets stuck or the players reach a configuration  $(s, ff)$ .
- The **defender** is the winner of a finite play if the attacker gets stuck or the players reach a configuration  $(s, tt)$ .

### Infinite Play

- The **attacker** is the winner of an infinite play if  $X$  is defined as  $X \stackrel{\min}{=} F_X$ .
- The **defender** is the winner of an infinite play if  $X$  is defined as  $X \stackrel{\max}{=} F_X$ .

## Game Characterization

### Theorem

- $s \models F$  if and only if the defender has a universal winning strategy from  $(s, F)$
- $s \not\models F$  if and only if the attacker has a universal winning strategy from  $(s, F)$

## Selection of Temporal Properties

- $Inv(F)$ :  $X \stackrel{\max}{=} F \wedge [Act]X$
- $Pos(F)$ :  $X \stackrel{\min}{=} F \vee \langle Act \rangle X$
- $Safe(F)$ :  $X \stackrel{\max}{=} F \wedge ([Act]ff \vee \langle Act \rangle X)$
- $Even(F)$ :  $X \stackrel{\min}{=} F \vee (\langle Act \rangle tt \wedge [Act]X)$
- $F \mathcal{U}^w G$ :  $X \stackrel{\max}{=} G \vee (F \wedge [Act]X)$
- $F \mathcal{U}^s G$ :  $X \stackrel{\min}{=} G \vee (F \wedge \langle Act \rangle tt \wedge [Act]X)$

Using until we can express e.g.  $Inv(F)$  and  $Even(F)$ :

$$Inv(F) \equiv F \mathcal{U}^w ff \quad Even(F) \equiv tt \mathcal{U}^s F$$

## Examples of More Advanced Recursive Formulae

### Nested Definitions of Recursive Variables

$$X \stackrel{\min}{=} Y \vee \langle Act \rangle X \quad Y \stackrel{\max}{=} \langle a \rangle tt \wedge \langle Act \rangle Y$$

**Solution:** compute first  $\llbracket Y \rrbracket$  and then  $\llbracket X \rrbracket$ .

### Mutually Recursive Definitions

$$X \stackrel{\max}{=} [a]Y \quad Y \stackrel{\max}{=} \langle a \rangle X$$

**Solution:** consider a complete lattice  $(2^{Proc} \times 2^{Proc}, \sqsubseteq)$  where  $(S_1, S_2) \sqsubseteq (S'_1, S'_2)$  iff  $S_1 \subseteq S'_1$  and  $S_2 \subseteq S'_2$ .

### Theorem (Characteristic Property for Finite-State Processes)

Let  $s$  be a process with finitely many reachable states. There exists a property  $X_s$  s.t. for all processes  $t$ :  $s \sim t$  **if and only if**  $t \in \llbracket X_s \rrbracket$ .