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Spot is a model checking library centered around the automata approach, and can be used to verify properties expressed using LTL (Linear Temporal Logic) formulae on models represented as TGBA (Transition-based Generalized Büchi automata). The library offers two translation algorithms from LTL formulae to TGBA, one of the main stages of the approach. We present an extension of one of these algorithms to an extended LTL where operators are represented by finite automata, allowing Spot to verify properties that were not expressible before. We also present how we could add some features of PSL (Property Specification Language) in our extension.

Spot est une bibliothèque de model checking qui permet de vérifier des propriétés exprimées en logique temporelle à temps linéaire (LTL) sur des modèles représentés par des automates de Büchi généralisés basés sur les transitions (TGBA). Spot propose actuellement deux algorithmes de traduction de LTL en TGBA, une des étapes principales de l’approche automate. Nous présentons une nouvelle traduction en TGBA d’une LTL étendue dont les opérateurs sont représentés par des automates finis, permettant ainsi à Spot de vérifier des propriétés qui n’étaient pas exprimables auparavant. Nous présenterons aussi de quelles façons nous pourrions ajouter certaines fonctionnalités de PSL (Property Specification Language) à notre extension.
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Introduction

Model checking is a formal method for verifying finite-state concurrent systems. Typically, the user provides a high-level representation of the system (the model) and the specification to be checked. Specifications about the system are expressed as temporal logic formulæ, and efficient algorithms are used to traverse the model and check if the specification holds or not. Compared to traditional approaches based on simulation, testing, or deductive reasoning, model checking has a number of advantages. In particular, it is automatic and produces a counter-example in case of failure.

The Spot (Duret-Lutz and Poitrenaud, 2004) project aims at producing a flexible and efficient model checking library centered around the automata theoretic approach (Vardi, 1986). In this approach, an execution of the system is seen as an infinite word, where letters are successive configurations of the system. Thus, the whole set of possible executions is seen as the set of infinite words recognized by a finite automaton on infinite words (also called $\omega$-automaton). In this context, the verification is split as follow:

- The high-level model is translated into a state graph automaton whose language is the set of all possible execution of the system modeled. (This step is not offered by Spot.)
- The formula to verify is also translated into an automaton whose language is the set of all executions that would invalidate the formula. So this is actually the automaton for the negated formula.
- The above two automata are combined, using a synchronized product, to create a third automaton whose language is the intersection of the languages of the two automata.
- A last operation, called emptiness check, tells whether the language of the synchronized product is empty. If it is not, it contains a sequence of execution that is allowed by the model, but that does invalidate the formula: this is a counter-example. Otherwise the formula holds for all possible execution of the modeled system.

Usually, Büchi automata, which define exactly the $\omega$-regular languages, are used. In Spot we use a special kind of $\omega$-automata called Transition-based Generalized Büchi Automata (TGBA) and a Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) formula is used to specify properties about the system. Unfortunately, these two formalisms are not equivalent, and thus we cannot verify as many properties as the model can hold. In fact, even the simple assertion that “the proposition $p$ holds at least in every other state on a path” is not expressible in LTL (Wolper et al., 1983), but can be represented by the $\omega$-regular expression $(p^\top)^\omega$.

Vardi and Wolper (1994) investigated extensions of LTL able to express all $\omega$-regular languages, and we present formally one of these extensions and explain how we integrated it in Spot, including an adaptation of the LaCIM translation algorithm to TGBA for this extended LTL (the second stage of the approach given before) based on Couvreur (2000). This allows Spot to verify properties that were not expressible before.
Outline This paper is organized as follows. In Chapter 1, we introduce formally LTL and the extended LTL (ELTL) we use, also provide an extensive definition of TGBA and how they can be represented symbolically – which is going to be useful in Chapter 2 where the LaCIM translation algorithm is presented. Chapter 3 summarizes what has been done for Spot to support ELTL formulae, including benchmarks of our implementation of LaCIM for ELTL, and finally Chapter 4 presents some interesting features of PSL that could be integrated in our ELTL.

Everything that will be presented is available in the latest development version of Spot which can obtained using: http://lrde.epita.fr/~adl/git/spot.git/. A snapshot in which all our modifications are included can also be found at the following location: http://lrde.epita.fr/dload/spot/spot-snapshot.tar.gz
Chapter 1

Preliminaries

1.1 Linear Temporal Logics

Temporal logics have proved to be useful for specifying concurrent systems, because they can describe the ordering of events in time without introducing time explicitly. In LTLs, properties like eventually or never are specified using special temporal operators.

In Spot, we use LTLs to describe sequences of transitions between states of the system, i.e. specifications about the system – as SPIN (Holzmann, 1990, 2003).

1.1.1 Definitions

A state of the system can be seen as the valuation of a set AP of atomic propositions. For example, the state of a traffic light can be modeled by the three propositions r (red), o (orange), and g (green) which tell whether the corresponding light is on: AP = \{r, o, g\}. The possible executions of the system (state sequences) are infinite even though the systems we consider have a finite number of states, therefore we use infinite words to represent them.

Definition 1 An infinite word over an alphabet Σ is a function \(\sigma : [0, n] \rightarrow \Sigma\), where \(n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\omega\}\) is an ordinal number.

The \(i^{th}\) letter of an infinite word \(\sigma\) is thus \(\sigma(i)\).

Definition 2 The suffix of an infinite word \(\sigma\) starting at the position \(i\) is the word denoted by \(\sigma^i\) such that \(\forall j \in [0, n - i], \sigma^i(j) = \sigma(i + j)\).

We will only consider infinite words over \(\Sigma = 2^{AP}\), the power set of AP. An element of \(2^{AP}\) represents a system configuration (a state) while an infinite word on \(2^{AP}\) describes the systems evolution over the times.

Example 1 Let’s consider a traffic light model using three propositions to describe the state of the three lights. AP = \{r, o, g\}, and \(2^{AP}\) is thus the set \(\Sigma = \{rog, ro\bar{g}, r\bar{o}g, \bar{r}o\bar{g}, \bar{r}\bar{o}g, \bar{r}\bar{o}\bar{g}\}\). For example, the infinite word \(\bar{r}o\bar{g} \cdot \bar{r}o\bar{g} \cdot \bar{r}o\bar{g} \cdot \bar{r}o\bar{g} \cdot \bar{r}o\bar{g} \cdot \bar{r}o\bar{g} \cdots\) corresponds to a traffic light blinking orange, and matches the \(\omega\)-regular expression \((\bar{r}o\bar{g} \cdot \bar{r}o\bar{g})^{\omega}\).

The meaning of a (E)LTL formula will always be determined with respect to an infinite word.

\(^1\)Because an element of \(2^{AP}\) can be seen as a list of propositions, for example here \(\{r, o\}\) is equivalent to \(ro\bar{g}\).
1.1.2 LTL

Syntax  LTL formulæ are defined inductively from temporal operators $X$ (next) and $U$ (until) as follows:

- Every proposition $p \in AP$ is a formula.
- If $f_1$ and $f_2$ are formulæ, then $\neg f_1$, $X f_1$, $f_1 \land f_2$ and $f_1 U f_2$ are formulæ.

Semantics  Satisfaction of a LTL formula $f$ w.r.t. the infinite word $\sigma$ is denoted $\sigma \models f$.

- $\sigma \models p$ iff $p \in \sigma(0)$.
- $\sigma \models \neg f_1$ iff not $\sigma \models f_1$.
- $\sigma \models f_1 \land f_2$ iff $\sigma \models f_1$ and $\sigma \models f_2$.
- $\sigma \models X f_1$ iff $\sigma_1 \models f_1$.
- $\sigma \models f_1 U f_2$ iff $\exists i \geq 0$ such that $\sigma_i \models f_2$ and $\forall j \in [0, i - 1]$, $\sigma_j \models f_1$.

Usual temporal operators $F$ (eventually), $G$ (always), and $R$ (release) are defined as the following abbreviations:

$$
F f_1 = \top U f_1 \quad (1.1)
$$

$$
f_1 R f_2 = \neg(\neg f_1 U \neg f_2) \quad (1.2)
$$

$$
G f_1 = \neg F \neg f_1 = \neg(\top U \neg f_1) = \bot R f_1 \quad (1.3)
$$

Example 2  Here are some LTL formulæ based on the traffic light model.

1. The traffic light is not always red.
   $\neg G(r \land \neg o \land \neg g)$

2. Every orange configuration is followed by a red one.
   $G((\neg r \land o \land \neg g) \rightarrow X(r \land \neg o \land \neg g))$

3. The system is infinitely often in the green configuration.
   $G(\neg r \land \neg o \land g)$

Because LTL and TGBA are not expressively equivalent, LTL might not be enough to specify all the properties we would like about our model like “the traffic light blinks orange” here.

1.1.3 ETL

Vardi and Wolper (1994) described different extensions of LTL where the temporal operators are defined by finite automata similarly to the extended LTL of Wolper et al. (1983).

Syntax  The set of ELTL formulæ is defined inductively as follows:

- Every proposition $p \in AP$ is a formula.
- If $f_1$ and $f_2$ are formulæ, then $\neg f_1$ and $f_1 \land f_2$ are formulæ.
- If $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ are formulæ, then $A(f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ is a formula, for every nondeterministic finite automaton (NFA) $A = (\Sigma, Q, I, F, \delta)$, where $\Sigma = \{\top, f_1, \ldots, f_n\}$, $Q$ is the set a states, $I \subseteq Q$ is the set of initial sets, $F \subseteq Q$ is the set of accepting states, and $\delta \subseteq Q \times \Sigma \times Q$ is the transition relation. We call $A(f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ an automaton operator.
Semantics  By analogy with Section 1.1.2, we define the satisfaction of a ELTL formula.

- $\sigma \models p$ iff $p \in \sigma(0)$.
- $\sigma \models \neg f_1$ iff $\neg \sigma \models f_1$.
- $\sigma \models f_1 \land f_2$ iff $\sigma \models f_1$ and $\sigma \models f_2$.
- $\sigma \models A(f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ iff $\exists$ an accepting run $r = s_0, s_1, \ldots$ of $A(f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ over $\sigma$.

Depending on how we define the accepting runs of $A(f_1, \ldots, f_n)$, we get different versions of the logic. The different possible acceptances are: repeating acceptance when some state $s \in F$ occurs infinitely often in $r$, finite acceptance when some state $s \in F$ occurs in $r$, and looping acceptance when $s$ is infinite. These three logics are independently as expressive as $\omega$-regular expressions, and thus as Büchi automata (Vardi and Wolper, 1994), but they do not provide the same ease of expression of properties. Currently, Spot only recognizes ELTL with finite acceptance and looping acceptance, the difference being made depending on whether a given automaton operator has accepting states or not, and for now on we will only consider this ELTL.

Usual LTL temporal operators next, until, and globally can be defined by the ELTL automaton operators on Figure 1.1 below. $G$ is loop accepting while $U$ and $X$ are finite accepting.

![Figure 1.1: Automaton operators for LTL operators next, until and globally.](image)

Example 3  The formula $f = G F (\neg r \land \neg o \land g)$ based on the traffic light model can be represented in ELTL using automaton operators. Indeed, $f = G(\top U (\neg r \land \neg o \land g))$ in LTL (using Equation 1.1) which is perfectly valid in ELTL considering the automaton operators for $U$ and $G$ given above.

Example 4  The assertion that “the proposition $p$ holds at least in every other state on a path” can be represented by the automaton operator Blink on Figure 1.2 and is thus expressible in ELTL.

![Figure 1.2: Automaton operator Blink(p) equivalent to ($p \top$)$^\omega$.](image)
1.2 TGBA

Vardi (1986) introduced the automata theoretic approach to model checking of LTL formulae based on Büchi automata – a special kind of ω-automaton. A Büchi automaton accepts an infinite input sequence iff there exists a run of the automaton which visits (at least) one of the final states infinitely often.

1.2.1 Definition

Spot uses TGBA, which are Büchi-automata with labels on transitions, and multiple acceptance sets of transitions. Compared to Büchi Automata with acceptance sets of states, TGBA allow LTL formulæ to be represented more concisely.

**Definition 3** A TGBA is a quintuplet $A = (\Sigma, Q, I, F, \delta)$, where $\Sigma$ is an alphabet, $Q$ is the set of states, $I \subseteq Q$ is the set of initial states, $F$ is a finite set of acceptance conditions, and $\delta \subseteq Q \times (2^\Sigma \setminus \{\emptyset\}) \times 2^F \times Q$ is the transition relation. (Each transition is labeled by a set of acceptance conditions.)

The acronym TGBA (Transition-based Generalized Büchi Automaton) was first introduced by Giannakopoulou and Lerda (2002). A TGBA accepts a run if it passes through (at least) one transition of every set of accepting transitions infinitely often.

We use elements of $2^\Sigma = 2^{AP}$ to represent labels which is legitimate because there is a bijection between this set and the set of formulæ on AP. Indeed, $\{\{a, b\}, \{a\}\}$ can be seen as $(a \land b) \lor (a \land \neg b)$ or also simply as $a$ which may seem more natural for an automaton.

**Example 5** The TGBA $\langle 2^{\{a,b\}}, \{q\}, \{f, g\}, \delta \rangle$, where

$$\delta = \{(q, 2^{\{a,b\}}, \emptyset, q), (q, \{\{a, b\}, \{a\}\}, f, q), (q, \{\{a, b\}, \{b\}\}, g, q)\}$$

accepts the same language that the LTL formula $\text{GF } a \land \text{GF } b$.

The two acceptance conditions $f$ and $g$, represented on Figure 1.3 by “○” and “●”, ensure that every path passes infinitely often accepted by both of these transitions.

![Figure 1.3: TGBA corresponding to $\text{GF } a \land \text{GF } b$.](image)

1.2.2 Symbolic representation

This section explains how a TGBA can be represented in a symbolic way—instead of the usual explicit representation—using binary decision diagrams (BDDs) (Andersen, 1997; Bryant, 1992). That is interesting because the LaCIM algorithm presented in Chapter 2 constructs directly a
TGBA in a symbolic way from a (E)LTL formula. There is some advantages to have a symbolic representation (among others): first, it is less memory-consuming (because of BDDs) and second, some algorithms can be directly applied on the Boolean functions representing the TGBA instead of doing a traversal in the explicit case.

A BDD is a data structure providing a canonical and efficient way to represent and manipulate Boolean formulae, i.e. \( a \rightarrow (b \land c) \) and \( (\neg a) \lor (b \land c) \) have the same BDD representation. They have been used in numerous symbolic model checking algorithms (Burch et al., 1990).

Symbolically the transition relation \( \delta \) and the sets of states \( Q \) and \( I \) of a TGBA are seen as Boolean formulæ (and efficiently represented as BDDs) by identifying states and acceptance conditions by vectors of Boolean variables. We use as many Boolean variables as necessary to have each state unique, and for each Boolean variable \( b \) we define another variable named \( b' \) which is used to represent destination states in transitions. We also use as many Boolean variables as necessary to have each acceptance condition unique.

**Example 6** The TGBA on Figure 1.4 has three states and one acceptance condition, so we need two Boolean variables for the states \((b_1, b_2)\), and one for the acceptance condition \((a_1)\).

- The set of states is \( Q = b_1b_2 \lor \bar{b}_1b_2 \lor b_1b_2 \),
- The set of initial states is \( I = b_1b_2 \),
- The transition relation \( \delta \) is represented by two Boolean formulæ: \( T \) for the transitions and \( Acc \) for the acceptance conditions which are as follows:
  \[
  T = b_1b_2p_1b'_1 \lor b_1b_2p_1b'_1 \lor b_1b_2p_2b'_2,
  \]
  \[
  Acc = b_1b_2a_1.
  \]

![Figure 1.4: A TGBA where states are vectors of Booleans.](image)

This symbolic representation completely defines a TGBA and can be used to do whatever we want on it using BDD operations. For example on the example above, we can do the following:

- \( T \land I = b_1b_2p_1b'_1b'_2 \) gives the outgoing transitions of the initial state,
- \( (\exists b_1 \exists b_2 \exists p_1 (b_1b_2p_1b'_1b'_2))[b_1/b'_1][b_2/b_2] = b_1b_2 \) gives the destination state of the previous transition, where \( f[x/y] \) denotes the Boolean formula obtained by substituting every free occurrence of \( y \) by \( x \) in the Boolean formula \( f \),
- \( \exists b_1 \exists b_2 \exists p_1 ((b_1b_2p_1b'_1b'_2) \land Acc = a_1) \) gives its acceptance conditions.
Chapter 2

LaCIM Algorithm

Many articles deal with the construction of $\omega$-automata from a LTL formula, and very good states of the art can be found in Duret-Lutz (2007) and Wolper (2000).

In Spot, two translations of LTL formulæ into TGBA are implemented: FM (Couvreur, 1999) and LaCIM (Couvreur, 2000). This algorithm also having an ELTL version we decided to implement it in Spot, and the next two sections present that algorithm for both logics.

2.1 LTL

This version uses a set $el(f)$ which characterises elementary formulæ of the LTL formula $f$, i.e. subformulæ of $f$ (including $f$ itself) involved in the translation, and is defined as follows:

$$el(f) = \{f\} \cup \{g U h \mid g U h \in \text{sub}(f)\} \cup \{g \mid X g \in \text{sub}(f)\},$$

where $\text{sub}(f)$ denotes the set of subformulæ of $f$ which is trivially defined inductively.

LaCIM is based the following assertion: it is possible to construct a TGBA representing $f$ by using states labeled by conjunction of elementary formulæ. More precisely, this TGBA can be (naively) constructed from a LTL formula as follows:

1. Represent all possible states, i.e. those labeled by a conjunction of compatible elementary subformulæ.

2. Represent all compatible transitions between states, i.e. states labeled by $X g$ can only have successors labeled by $g$, and states labeled by an $g U h$ can have only successors labeled by $g U h$ (if $g$ is true now) or labeled by anything (if $h$ is true now).

3. Define initial states, i.e. those labeled by (at least) the input formula.

4. Define accepting transitions, i.e. those respecting the premises made by until operators.

A full example for the formula $f = X(p U q)$, with the four steps detailed, is available next page on Figure 2.1, where $p U q$ is denoted $g$ in order to simplify.

This algorithm is well suited for symbolical representations, and the following formally present it as directly constructing a symbolical TGBA.
The symbolical algorithm uses two Boolean variables for each elementary formula $g$: one denoted $\text{Now}\[g\]$ (which means that $g$ is true at the current moment), and one denoted $\text{Next}\[g\]$ (which means that $g$ is true at the next moment). It also uses one Boolean variable per acceptance condition (i.e. per subformula like $g \text{ U } h$) denoted $\text{Acc}\[g \text{ U } h\]$; those variables are then used to construct the Boolean function $\text{Acc}$ (this part is not explained here to simplify). Only $\text{Now}$ variables are used to represent the different states.

The resulting constructed TGBA from an LTL formula $f$ is defined as follows:

- $I = \text{Now}\[f\],$
- $T = \bigwedge_{g \in \text{el}(f)} (\text{Now}\[g \text{ U } h\] \Leftrightarrow (\phi(h) \lor (\phi(g) \land \text{Next}\[g \text{ U } h\]))) \land \bigwedge_{g \in \text{el}(f)} \text{Now}\[g\] \Leftrightarrow \phi(g),$
- $\forall g \text{ U } h \in \text{el}(f), \text{Acc}\[g \text{ U } h\] = \neg\text{Now}\[g \text{ U } h\] \lor \phi(h).$

The Boolean function $\phi$ being defined inductively as follows:

- $\phi(p) = p$, for every proposition $p \in \text{AP}$.
- $\phi(\neg f_1) = \neg\phi(f_1)$
- $\phi(f_1 \land f_2) = \phi(f_1) \land \phi(f_2)$
- $\phi(\text{X} f_1) = \text{Next}\[f_1\]$  
- $\phi(f_1 \text{ U } f_2) = \text{Now}\[f_1 \text{ U } f_2\]$

Figure 2.1: Construction of a TGBA for $f = \text{X}(p \text{ U } q)$. 
The Boolean formulae $T$ constrains the possible transitions in order to respect the semantics of $X$ and $U$ in LTL (step 2), while $Acc$ constrains the acceptance conditions of the resulting TGBA in order to respect the fact that for every subformula $g U h$, $h$ has to be true at a present or future moment (step 4).

**Example 7** Here is the TGBA corresponding to the formula $f = p U q$.

- $I = \text{Now}[f]$
- $T = \text{Now}[f] \leftrightarrow q \lor (p \land \text{Next}[f])$
- $Acc[f] = \neg\text{Now}[f] \lor q$

*Figure 2.2* gives a graphic representation of the automaton. But we do not need this explicit representation to perform operations on that automaton (as we have seen in *Section 1.2.2*).

\[\text{Figure 2.2: TGBA corresponding to } f = p U q.\]

### 2.2 ELTL

This version is based on the same assertion as the previous one but elementary formulæ are defined as follows:

\[el(f) = \{A_s \mid A \in \text{automatop}(f), s \in Q\},\] where $\text{automatop}(f)$ denotes the set of automaton operators appearing in $f$ and $Q$ denotes the set of states of $A$.

The naive construction can be modified as follows:

2. Represent all compatible transitions between states, i.e. states labeled by $A_s$ can only have successors labeled by $A_r$ (if $r$ is a successor of $s$ in $A$ labeled by a formula $f$ which is true now) or labeled by anything (if there exists a final state $r$ successor of $s$ in $A$ labeled by a formula $f$ which is true now).

4. Define accepting transitions, i.e those respecting premises made by automaton operators (an accepting run has to be found).
The symbolic algorithm uses four Booleans variables for each elementary formula \( A \): one denoted \( \text{Now}[A] \) (which means that the automaton operator \( A \) is currently in the state \( s \)), and one denoted \( \text{Next}[A] \) (which means that the automaton operator \( A \) is in the state \( s \) at the next moment), plus two denoted \( \text{Now}[A^\alpha] \) and \( \text{Next}[A^\alpha] \). It also uses one Boolean per acceptance condition (i.e. per automaton operator \( A \)) denoted \( \text{Acc}[A] \). As in the LTL version, only \( \text{Now} \) variables are used to represent the different states.

As we have seen in Section 1.1.3, there is (in the ELTL we consider) two possible acceptances for automaton operators: finite and looping, and we have to ensure that accepting conditions are well defined in both cases, i.e. to make sure that an accepting run is found. In the finite case, when an accepting run is found, it is valid to be accepting afterwards because we are not trying to find one anymore. In order to do that, we use the alpha variables defined above: we use \( \text{Now}[A^\alpha] \) as meaning “we are not verifying \( A \)” which is always false but in states which have a predecessor labeled by \( A^r \) where \( r \) is a final state. The looping case being defined dually.

The algorithm is thus slightly different depending on the acceptance: \( \text{Acc} \) variables are not constrained in the same way, and the operator \( \odot \) used below is actually \( \Rightarrow \) in the finite case and \( \Leftarrow \) in the looping case.

The resulting constructed TGBA from an LTL formula \( f \) is defined as follows:

- \( I = \text{Now}[f] \),
- \( T = \bigwedge_{A_s} (\text{Now}[A_s] \Leftrightarrow \bigvee_{s \in F} (\phi[g] \land \text{Next}[A_s]) \lor \bigvee_{s \in F} \phi[g]) \land \)
  \( \bigwedge_{A_s} (\text{Now}[A^\alpha_s] \odot \bigvee_{s \in F} (\phi[g] \land \text{Next}[A^\alpha_s]) \lor \bigvee_{s \in F} \phi[g]) \land \)
  \( \bigwedge_{A_s} (\text{Acc}[A] \Rightarrow \bigwedge_{s \in Q} (\text{Next}[A^\alpha_s] \Leftrightarrow \text{Next}[A_s])) \),

For finite automaton operators:

- \( \forall A, \text{Acc}[A] = \bigwedge_{s \in F} (\neg \text{Now}[A^\alpha_s] \lor \bigvee_{s \in F} \phi[g]), \)

For looping automaton operators:

- \( \forall A, \text{Acc}[A] = \bigwedge_{s \in F} (\text{Now}[A^\alpha_s] \lor \neg \bigvee_{s \in Q} \phi[g]). \)

The Boolean function \( \phi \) being defined inductively as follows:

- \( \phi(p) = p \), for every proposition \( p \in AP \).
- \( \phi(\neg f_1) = \neg \phi(f_1) \)
- \( \phi(f_1 \land f_2) = \phi(f_1) \land \phi(f_2) \)
- \( \phi(A) = \text{Now}[A_i] \), where \( i \) is the initial state of \( A \). There is an abuse here (and before) because we implicitly consider the arguments as part of the automaton operators but it actually simplifies the notations.
Chapter 3

Implementation

The first part of the implementation was to integrate ELTL formulæ in Spot, which means first write AST (Abstract Syntax Tree) classes to represent them in memory, and secondly a parser that instanciates an AST from a formula given in a file or by a string, as it was already the case for LTL formulæ. Then we could implement LaCIM for ELTL to make our extended LTL actually usable in Spot. This is presented in the following sections. Spot is a C++ library, and thus everything here might be considered from a C++ point of view.

3.1 AST

LTL and ELTL formulæ only differ in the way temporal operators are defined, and thus we wanted to maximize sharing between LTL and ELTL ASTs.

A first idea was to define two specific ASTs which cannot be instanciated in any way to represent invalid formulæ. But in that case, it is not straightforward to share classes which are used in both logics, for example the class representing binary operators in LTL cannot be used directly because \( U \) is not \( per se \) a valid binary operator in ELTL (it’s an automaton operator). In order to solve this, we wrote generic versions of existing LTL nodes that are also present in ELTL using templates, which was a lot of rewriting. Furthermore, this brought us new issues: first, some parts of the library were broken by the use of templates like the python wrapper which uses SWIG. Second, considering that ELTL ASTs have one more node (for automaton operators), we were not able to share visitors between both logics directly either. We finally decided to drop this idea and to revert all modifications.

Instead, we decided to integrate our new node in the existing LTL AST hierarchy, which is now able to represent both logics. We just had to handle the cases in visitors and algorithms where a given node is not possible for either of the logics. Only few modifications where made without breaking anything.

3.2 Parser

The parser reads formulæ from a file in a specific format, and is implemented using Bison in the src/eltlparse directory of Spot. A few tests were also written in src/eltlttest.

Define an ELTL formula means two things: first, define all automaton operators we want to use and second, define the actual ELTL formula using those automaton operators. Automaton operators are basically NFAs which alphabet is the set of all arguments of that operator plus
the constant \textit{true} (cf. Section 1.1.3), which means that we need to abstract the arguments in the definition of automaton operators.

A ELTL file is split in two parts delimited by the ‘\%' character: the definition of the automaton operators and the ELTL formula. The Figure 3.1 below shows a simple file for the constant \textit{true} without any automaton operators defined. Comments are available using ‘\#’.

```plaintext
# Automaton operators definition.
%
# ELTL Formula.

1
```

Figure 3.1: Simple file for the constant \textit{true}.

**Automaton operators** Syntactically, an empty meaningless automaton operator is simply defined by ‘A=()’, and used in the formula with ‘A()’. Transitions composed of a source state, a destination state and a label need to be added to define actual automaton operators. States are represented as integers and labels are either arguments of the automaton operator (denoted by $0, 1, \ldots$) or the constant \textit{true}. Thus, a transition from the state 0 to the state 1 labeled by the first argument is defined by ‘0 1 $0$’. A state \textit{s} can be defined as accepting by adding the line ‘accept \textit{s}’, in this case the operator is no longer \textit{finite accepting} but \textit{loop accepting} as discussed in Section 1.1.3. A complete example is represented on Figure 3.2 below.

```plaintext
A=(
  0 1 $0$
  1 2 \textit{true}
  0 0 $1$
  \textbf{accept} 2
)
%
A(f,g)
```

Figure 3.2: ELTL formula file, with ‘A (f,g)’ representation.

The source state of the first transition becomes the initial state, and there is no default accepting state. All binary operators can also be used in infix notation like $U$ in Figure 3.4.

**Aliases** As it was already said, some temporal operators are defined as abbreviations of other ones like $F a = \top U a$ (cf. Equation 1.1). It seems natural to be able to define them this way as well in ELTL files. Thus we implemented the possibility to define aliases of automaton operators as shown on Figure 3.3.

**ELTL formula** All usual logical connectives can be used in a ELTL formula, and this part of the parser is greatly inspired from the LTL parser of Spot. The only major difference is that unary operators cannot be used without parenthesis around their argument, which would be ambiguous for the ELTL parser considering the fact that operators’ names are unknown.
Include  In order to avoid having to redefine common temporal operators, as those present in LTL, the parser provides an include directive. The ltl_defs file Figure 3.3 defines usual LTL operators (cf. Figure 1.1) while Figure 3.4 uses some of them.

```plaintext
# Finite acceptance.
X=(
  0 1 true
  1 2 $0
  accept 2
)
U=(
  0 0 $0
  0 1 $1
  accept 1
)

# Looping acceptance.
G=(
  0 0 $0
)

# Aliases.
F=U(true, $0)
R=!U(!$0, !$1)
Weak=G(F($0))
Strong=G(F($0))->G(F($1))
```

Figure 3.3: Usual LTL temporal operators file: ltl_defs.

```plaintext
include ltl_defs
%
X(f) & f U g | Strong(f,h)
```

Figure 3.4: ELTL file using ltl_defs.

We could also have defined \( G \) as an alias (\( G = R(\texttt{false},$0) \)) which would have given us exactly the same translated TGBA for any ELTL formula using \( G \).

### 3.3 LaCIM

LaCIM (ELTL) is implemented – like its LTL equivalent – as a const visitor but on ELTL formulæ and is available in `src/tgbaalgos/eltl2tgba_lacim.hh`.

Correctness  LaCIM is a rather short but a very complex algorithm and to be sure that we implemented it correctly, we included it with other translation algorithms in tests using LBTT in Spot. Indeed, LBTT (Tauriainen and Heljanko, 2002) is a tool to check and compare translation algorithms from LTL to Büchi automata. It works by comparing results of each algorithm with each other on random formulæ, and by using them to model check randomly generated states.
spaces. It is very useful to find errors, and we managed to make our implementation correct with it after a lot of rewriting.

**Benchmarks**  The Table 3.1 below presents benchmarks between the different translation algorithms available in Spot. LBTT was used to make those measurements on random formulae which were obtained by using the script `src/tgbatest/spotlbtt.test` of Spot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>Automaton states</th>
<th>Automaton transitions</th>
<th>Product states</th>
<th>Product transitions</th>
<th>Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>11377</td>
<td>48805</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaCIM (LTL)</td>
<td>1304</td>
<td>6364</td>
<td>25172</td>
<td>154034</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaCIM (ELTL)</td>
<td>24917</td>
<td>80642</td>
<td>336166</td>
<td>2317071</td>
<td>12.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Benchmarks between translation algorithms in Spot

**Optimizations**  Clearly LaCIM for ELTL is far behind other algorithms. We have some ideas to improve it which are not yet implemented by lack of time; it is some future work to do.
Chapter 4

ELTL & PSL

LTL is not as expressive as we would like it to be; that was our first motivation to implement ELTL in Spot. But LTL was extended in a different fashion in PSL, and this chapter investigates the similarities between those extensions.

PSL (Property Specification Language) is a property specification language developed by Accellera and recently standardized by the IEEE. It includes as its temporal layer a linear temporal logic that enhances LTL with regular expressions and other useful features (PSL, 2004). This temporal layer uses so-called SEREs (Sequential Extended Regular Expressions) to define sequences (such as repetitions) built from Boolean expressions. Considering that ELTL temporal operators are based on NFAs, we thought it might be possible to integrate in it some SERE operators, something that is not possible in LTL where sequences cannot be actually defined. The following sections present some interesting SERE operators and how we can integrate them in our ELTL.

4.1 SERE operators

In LTL vocabulary, we can see SEREs operators as temporal operators which are defined from atomic propositions and formula built from them like usual LTL operators. PSL is a complex language and saying that might be considered as an abuse but from our LTL viewpoint we are only interested here by SEREs as temporal operators. That is why we will consider infinite paths here as in LTL, and hold on a path shall thus be understood as hold on a path when it makes sense. We will see how we could easily handle that problem in our integration in the next section.

**Concatenation (·)** The expression: $a; b$ holds on a path iff there is a future position $i$ such that $a$ holds on the path up to and including the position $i$ and $b$ holds on the path starting at the position $i + 1$. For example, the expression $aUb; Xc$ holds on $aaabac...$

When $a$ and $b$ are simple atomic propositions, $a; b$ is equivalent to the LTL formula $a \land Xb$.

But when $a$ does not hold on only one position, it is not possible anymore to define the concatenation in LTL because we would need to know the position $i$ to write the proper number of $X$ before $b$.

**Fusion (:)** The expression: $a : b$ holds on a path iff there is a future position $i$ such that $a$ holds on the path up to and including the $i^{th}$ position and $b$ holds on the path starting at the $i^{th}$ position. One can note that $a : Xb$ is the same as $a ; b$. 

Length-matching and (\&\&)

The expression: \(a \&\& b\) holds on a path iff both \(a\) and \(b\) hold at the current position, and furthermore both complete at the same position.

Within

The expression: \(a\) within \(b\) holds iff \(b\) holds at the current position, and \(a\) starts at or after the position in which \(b\) starts, and completes at or before the position in which \(b\) completes.

Consecutive repetition (\(*\))

This operator constructs repeated consecutive concatenation. For example \(a;a;a\) is equivalent to \(a[*3]\). The number of repetition can also be a range as in: \(a[*n:m]\) which holds on a path iff the path can be partitioned into between \(n\) and \(m\) parts, inclusive, where \(a\) holds on each part. It is also possible not to specify any number: \(a[*]\).

More operators do exist but are either already present in LTL or not adaptable at our context (like those using PSL clocks).

4.2 Integration in ELTL

Intuitively, if we want to express SERE operators in our ELTL, we need to be able to know if a given formula just completed; something which is not possible so far in our format. Let \(\mathcal{F}(a)\), be the formula saying that \(a\) just finished (i.e. completed), which can be defined as follows:

\[
\mathcal{F}(a) = \begin{cases} 
\bigvee_{s \in \mathcal{F}} (\text{Now}[A_s] \land \phi[g]), & \text{if } a \text{ is an automaton operator} \\
\top, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

With that formula, SERE operators can be defined as the following automaton operators:

![Figure 4.1: a;b](image1.png)

![Figure 4.2: a:b](image2.png)
In order to be able to express those automaton operators, a \textit{finish} keyword (representing $\mathcal{F}$) was added to the ELTL parser. The Figure 4.5 below shows an example using it.

Because conjunctions of arguments are not possible directly in the definition of an automaton operator – but only in aliases – it is not straightforward to define PSL operators in ELTL. There is thus some future work to do to actually integrate them in our ELTL in Spot.

Also, even if the consecutive repetition operator can be easily defined as an automaton operator when \( n \) and \( m \) are known \((a[^*n:m])\) or when no number is specified \((a[^*])\), this operator does not fit very well in our ELTL format because of those integers \( n \) and \( m \). Considering that a \textit{generic} version doesn’t seem possible, another future work is thus to investigate how we could integrate it anyway.
Conclusion

The work we presented allows Spot to verify properties express in an extended temporal linear logic (ELTL). In order to do that, we first wrote AST (Abstract Syntax Tree) classes to represent this new logic in memory. Then, we implemented a parser that reads an ELTL formula given in a file or by a string. Finally, the LaCIM translation algorithm to TGBA for this extended logic was written. Everything which has been done is based on the existing LTL implementation, making the library consistent. As mentioned before, there is still some work to do on LaCIM for ELTL to reduce the size of the TGBA produced.

A simple test program which uses everything we have implemented was also written in the following file: src/tgbaalgos/eltl2tgba.cc. It reads an ELTL formula from a string or a file, and outputs the TGBA corresponding to the formula constructed by LaCIM in the DOT language.

Similarities between ELTL and the temporal layer of PSL which enhances LTL with regular expressions were also investigated. We showed how some PSL operators using regular expressions could be defined in ELTL with automaton operators. However, this definition in ELTL is not easy to write because PSL operators do not fit very well in our ELTL format, and another future work is thus to investigate how we could integrate it more nicely.

One can use what has been done to check specifications of finite-state systems that were not expressible before with Spot.
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