Software Model Checking

Equivalence Hierarchy

Moonzoo Kim

CS Dept. KAIST

Outline

- Equivalence semantics and SW design
- Preliminary
- Hierarchy Diagram
- Trace-based Semantics
  - Trace EQ
  - Complete Trace EQ
  - Failure EQ
- Branching-based Semantics
  - Simulation EQ
  - Bisimulation EQ

Equivalence Preserving Refinement and SW Design

- Design can start with a very abstract specification, representing the requirements
- Then, using equivalence-preserving transformations, this specification can be gradually refined into an implementation-oriented specification.
- Maintenance may require to replace some components with others, while maintaining the same system behavior (congruence property)

Semantic Mapping

- An example of small language
  - Syntax
    - F := 0 | 1 | F + 1 | 1 + F
    - Ex. 0, 0+1+1, 1+0+1, but not 0+0
  - Possible semantics
    - 1 + 1 == 1 + 1 + 0 ?
      - Yes (interpreting formula as a natural #),
        - $[1 + 1]_{N1} = 2, [1 + 1 + 0]_{N1} = 2 \rightarrow 1 + 1 =_{N1} 1 + 1 + 0$
      - No (interpreting formula as string),
        - $[1+1]_S =$"1+1", $[1+1+0]_S =$"1+1+0" $\rightarrow 1+1 \; !=_S \; 1+1+0$
      - No (interpreting formula as a natural # of string length)
        - $[1 + 1]_{N2} = 3, [1 + 1 + 0]_{N2} = 5 \rightarrow 1 + 1 \; !=_{N2} \; 1 + 1 + 0$

Semantic Mapping (cont.)



Relation between (Equivalence) Semantics



$0+1 =_{EO} 1+2$
$1+1 =_{EO} 2+2$

$0+1 !=_{NA} 1+2$

$P =_{NA} Q \rightarrow P =_{EO} Q$ but not vice versa

Therefore, $=_{EO} < =_{NA}$



Labeled Transition System

- Process Theory
  - A *process* represents behavior of a system
  - Two main activities of process theory are *modeling* and *verification*
    - The semantics of equalities is required to verify system
    - Determine which semantics is suitable for which applications
- Labeled Transition System (LTS)
  - *Act*: a set of actions which process performs
  - LTS: $(P,\rightarrow)$
    - Where P is a set of processes and $\rightarrow \subseteq P \times Act \times P$
  - In this presentation, we deal with only *finitely branching, concrete, sequential processes*
- Useful notations
  - Equivalence notation for each semantics
    - $=_T$, $=_{CT}$, $=_F$, $=_R$, $=_{FT}$, $=_{RT}$,$=_S$,$=_{RS}$,$=_B$
    - I(p) is $\{a \in Act \mid \exists q.\ p \text{ -a->} q\}$

Trace v.s. Complete Trace

- Trace semantics (T)
  - $\sigma \in Act^*$ is a *trace* of a process *p* if there is a process *q* s.t. *p* -σ-> *p*
  - T(*p*) is a set of traces of a process *p*
  - $p =_T q$ iff T(*p*) = T(*q*)
- Complete trace semantics (CT)
  - $\sigma \in Act^*$ is a *complete trace* of a process *p* if there is a process *q* s.t. *p* -σ-> *q* and I(*q*) = $\varnothing$
  - CT(*p*) is a set of complete traces of a process *p*
  - $p =_{CT} q$ iff T(*p*) = T(*q*) and CT(*p*) = CT(*q*)
  - Note that CT(p) = CT(q) does not imply T(p) = T(q)



- $=_T < =_{CT}$
  - $p =_{CT} q$ implies $p =_T q$, but not vice versa

Counter Example 1



- $p =_T q$
  - T(p) = {coin.cola, coin}
  - T(q) = {coin.cola, coin}
- $p \neq_{CT} q$
  - CT(p) = {coin.cola}
  - CT(q) = {coin.cola, coin}

Failure Semantics

- Failure Semantics (F)
  - $<\sigma, X> \in Act^* \times \mathcal{P}(Act)$ is a failure pair of p if $\exists$ q s.t. p $-\sigma->$ *q* and I(*q*) $\cap$ *X* = $\varnothing$
  - F(*p*) is a set of failure pairs of *p*
  - $p =_F$ q iff F(p) = F(q)

- $=_{CT} < =_F$
  - $p =_F q$ implies $p =_{CT} q$
    - $\sigma \in$ CT(*p*) iff $<\sigma, Act> \in$ F(p)
    - $\sigma \in$ T(*p*) iff $<\sigma, X> \in$ F(p) for some X s.t. X $\cap$ I(q) = $\varnothing$
      Where $p -\sigma-> q$
  - not vice versa

Counter Example 2



- $p =_{CT} q$
  - CT(p)={coin.cola, coin.juice}
  - CT(q)={coin.cola, coin.juice}
- $p \neq_{F} q$
  - {<coin,{coin,cola}>} $\in$ F(p)
  - {<coin,{coin,cola}>} $\notin$ F(q)

Simulation Semantics

- The set F_s of simulation formulas over Act is defined inductively by
  - $True \in F_s$
  - If $\Phi, \Psi \in F_s$ then $\Phi \wedge \Psi \in F_s$
  - If $\Phi \in F_s$ and $a \in Act$, then $a.\Phi \in F_s$
- The satisfaction relation $\models \subseteq P \times F_s$ is defined inductively by
  - $p \models True$ for all $p \in P$
  - $p \models \Phi \wedge \Psi$ if $p \models \Phi$ and $p \models \Psi$
  - $p \models a.\Phi$ if for some $q \in P$: $p \text{ –}a\text{->} q$ and $q \models \Phi$
- $p =_S q$ iff $S(p) = S(q)$ where $S(p)=\{\Phi \in F_s | p \models \Phi\}$

- $=_T < =_S$
  - $p =_S q$ implies $p =_T q$
    - $=_T < =_S$ by $\sigma \in T(p)$ iff $\sigma.True \in S(p)$
  - not vice versa



- $p \neq_S q$
  - S(p)= {*True*, coin.*True*, coin.cola.*True*, coin.juice.*True*, …, coin.cola.*True* ∧ coin.juice.*True*}
  - S(q) = {*True*, coin.*True*, coin.cola.*True*, coin.cola.*True*, …, coin.cola.*True* ∧ coin.juice.*True*, coin.(cola.*True* ∧ juice.*True*) }

Simulation v.s. Bisimulation

- A simulation is a binary relation R on processes satisfying for a $\in$ *Act*
  - If *p*R*q* and *p*-a->*p'* , then $\exists$ *q'*:*q*-a->*q'* and *p'*R*q'*
- $p =_S q$ iff there exist simulation relations R_1 and R_2 such that pR_1q and qR_2p
- A bisimulation is a binary relation R on processes satisfying for a $\in$ *Act*
  - If *p*R*q* and *p*-a->*p'* , then $\exists$ *q'*:*q*-a->*q'* and *p'*R*q'*
  - If *p*R*q* and *q*-a->*q'* , then $\exists$ *p'*:*p*-a->*p'* and *p'*R*q'*
- $P =_B q$ if there exists a bisimulation R with *p*R*q*

Counter Example 3

$p =_B q$

$p =_s q$





$p \neq_B q$

$p =_s q$