The Central Weakness

Intuitively, FOL allows us to ask “local” queries about an automatic structure. For example, given an automatic graph $\langle V, E \rangle$ we can describe the local neighborhood of any vertex. We can also assert that there are paths of a certain, fixed length. But we cannot express more global properties such as connectivity: we cannot handle paths of arbitrary length. This and other limitations makes it natural to try to look for stronger logics and hope they might still admit algorithms for model checking.

Exercise

*Use the compactness theorem for FOL to show that connectivity is not first-order definable.*

Calculus

For example, suppose you are doing calculus and want to say something along the lines of

$$\text{For every differentiable function } f, \text{ yarglebargle } f \text{ bargleblargh.}$$

Even if we assume that the underlying structure is $\mathbb{R}$, this is not expressible. Things get worse when we try to make statements about some class of higher order functions, say, measures on some space. Things get worse yet if we try to have this discussion over a tame structure like $\mathbb{N}$.

We simply need more expressive power.

Higher Order Logic

In first-order logic quantification takes place only over individuals. Sets of individuals, and more generally relations and functions on the domain, are given by an appropriate first-order structure but cannot be quantified at the syntactical level.

And, of course, there is no way to quantify over, higher type objects such as families of functions.

This suggests a generalization: how about allowing quantification over all these objects? For example, rewritten in terms of set theory we would like to be able to make assertions

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{P}(A) \ldots x \ldots$$

When $A = \mathbb{N}$, this would allow us to talk about sets of reals, a perfectly natural thing to do.

HOL light

J. Harrison has developed an HOL theorem prover, written in OCaml, that is surprisingly powerful and freely available.

http://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~jrh13/hol-light/

As we will see in a moment, no such prover can be complete. However, this one is capable of proving lots of interesting theorems and has had considerable success in the verification of fairly complicated fragments of math. It has also been used to verify floating-point algorithms for Intel.
1994: Pentium FDIV Bug

Floating Point Error

Second-Order Logic

Aside: Begriffsschrift

The Worst Notation System, Ever

Translated
Arities

When writing SOL formulae (in modern notation), it is sometimes helpful to indicate the arity of relation and function symbols by a superscript. So, for example,

$$\forall R^2 (\ldots R(x, y) \ldots)$$

is a statement about all binary relations.

Note that one can get by without function symbols. For example, we can fake unary functions like so. Instead of $$\exists f^1 \ldots$$ we write

$$\exists R^2 (\forall x \exists y R(x, y) \land \forall x, y, z (R(x, y) \land R(x, z) \implies y = z) \land \ldots)$$

Equality

We could also get rid of equality on individuals:

$$x = y \iff \forall R^1 (R(x) \iff R(y))$$

The importance of this idea was first recognized by Leibniz and is enshrined in his principium identitatis indiscernibilium: if we cannot tell two entities apart, they are identical.

Killing Non-Standard Models

With second-order quantification one can avoid the effects of the compactness theorem for first-order.

For example, suppose we use the standard Peano axioms to describe arithmetic. Then add the following axiom:

$$\forall x \forall X \left( X(0) \land \forall z (X(z) \implies X(z + 1)) \implies X(x) \right)$$

Here $$X$$ is a subset of the universe.

In other words, every set containing 0 and closed under successors is already the whole universe: this rules out the non-standard, “infinite” elements.

In fact, SOL can be used to produce a finite axiomatization of arithmetic that has only one model (categoricity).

Aside: Two Uses of Axioms

One standard application of axioms is to describe all examples of some particular kind of structure.

For example, the standard (first-order) axioms for groups describe the whole, large and very complex class of all groups.

The other standard application is to construct a set of axioms with the goal of pinning down one particular structure precisely.

For example, the Peano axioms form an attempt to give a precise and complete description of the natural numbers. Alas, if first-order this attempt fails, there are non-standard models.

No Free Lunch

Full SOL is quite powerful, but also quite unwieldy. In particular proof theory breaks down in the following sense: we cannot construct a proof system for SOL in a way that it satisfies the three standard requirements:

- **Sound**: only valid formulae are provable.
- **Complete**: all valid formulae are provable.
- **Effective**: the collection of all proofs is decidable.

This has lead some people like Willard Quine to deny that SOL is “a logic” at all. In their view it’s just a branch of set theory.

Incompleteness

The reason there can be no adequate notion of proof for SOL is the following: for every sentence $$\varphi$$ of arithmetic in FOL, one can effectively construct a sentence $$\hat{\varphi}$$ of SOL such that

$$\hat{\varphi} \text{ valid} \iff \mathcal{N} \models \varphi.$$  

Since proofs are always semidecidable (r.e.), the existence of a deduction system for SOL would immediately imply that the LHS is also semidecidable.

But Gödel and Tarski have shown that the RHS is far from being semidecidable.

In fact, validity of SOL as a decision problem is hideously complicated.
Monadic Second-Order Logic (MSOL)

Often it suffices to consider a weak subsystem for full SOL where quantification is restricted to just two kinds:

- individuals, and
- sets of individuals (relations of type $R^i$).

Notation:

```
$\exists X \forall X$
```

$\forall X \exists z (X(z) \Rightarrow z \leq x) \Rightarrow$

$\exists x (\forall z (X(z) \Rightarrow (z \leq x) \land \forall y (\forall z (X(z) \Rightarrow z \leq y) \Rightarrow x \leq y)))$

This is the critical property of the reals and cannot be expressed in FOL.

Example: Least Upper Bounds

Assuming a binary total order $\leq$, we can express the assertion that every bounded set has a least upper bound:

```
\forall X (\exists z X(z) \land \exists x (X(z) \Rightarrow z \leq x))
```

Example: Well-Order

Again assume a binary total order $\leq$. We can express the assertion that we have a well-order in terms of the least-element principle: every non-empty set has a least element.

```
\forall X (\exists z X(z) \Rightarrow \\
\exists x (X(x) \land \forall z (X(z) \Rightarrow x \leq z))
```

This is the critical property of the natural numbers with the standard order, and cannot be expressed in FOL.

Example: Reachability

Lastly, consider a digraph, a single binary edge relation $\rightarrow$.

We can express the assertion that there is a path from $s$ to $t$ as follows:

```
\forall X (X(s) \land \forall x,y (X(x) \land x \rightarrow y \Rightarrow X(y)) \Rightarrow X(t))
```

Again, FOL is not strong enough to express path existence in general (and thus other concepts like connectivity).

Words as Structures

So far we have considered structures whose elements are words, and whose relations are synchronous.

**Wild Idea:** Can be think of a single word as a structure?

And, of course, use logic to describe the properties of the structure?

This may seem a bit weird, but bear with me. First, we need to fix an appropriate language for our logic. As always, we want at least propositional logic.

```
⊥, ⊤ constants false, true
¬ not, negation
∧ and, conjunction
∨ or, disjunction
⇒ implication
⇔ equivalence
```
Variables and Atomic Formulae

We will have variables \( x, y, z, \ldots \) that range over positions in a word, integers in the range 1 through \( n \) where \( n \) is the length of the word.

We allow the following basic predicates between variables:

- \( x < y \)
- \( x = y \)

Of course, we can get, say, \( x \geq y \) by Boolean operations.

Most importantly, we write

\[ Q_a(x) \]

for "there is a letter \( a \) in position \( x \)."

Monadic Second-Order

We also have second-order variables \( X, Y, Z, \ldots \) that range over sets of positions in a word.

- \( \exists X \varphi \) 
- \( \forall X \varphi \) 
- \( X(x) \)

Sets of positions are all there is; we do not have variables in our language for, say, binary relations on positions (we do not use full SOL).

This system is called monadic second-order logic (with less-than), written MSO\(<\).

Semantics

We need some notion of satisfaction

\[ w \models \varphi \]

where \( w \) is a word and \( \varphi \) a sentence in MSO\(<\).

We won’t give a formal definition, but the basic idea is simple. Let \(|w| = n\):

- the first order variables range over \([n] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}\),
- the second-order variables range over \( \mathcal{P}([n]) \).

The basic predicates \( x < y \) and \( x = y \) have their obvious meaning. For the \( Q_a(x) \) predicate we let

\[ Q_a(x) \iff w_x = a \]

Less-Than or Successor

In applications, the atomic relation \( x < y \) is slightly more useful than \( y = x + 1 \), but either one would have the same expressiveness.

On the one hand

\[ y = x + 1 \iff x < y \land \forall z (x < z \Rightarrow y \leq z) \]

On the other hand write closed(\( X \)) for the formula \( \forall z (X(z) \Rightarrow X(z + 1)) \). Then

\[ x < y \iff x \neq y \land \forall X (X(x) \land \text{closed}(X) \Rightarrow X(y)) \]

This is sometimes written as MSO\(<\) = MSO\([+1]\).
Factors and Subwords

Example
We can hardwire factors. For example, to obtain a factor abc let

\[ \varphi \equiv \exists x, y, z \ (y = x + 1 \land z = y + 1 \land Q_a(x) \land Q_b(y) \land Q_c(z)) \]

Then \( w \models \varphi \iff w \in \Sigma^*a\Sigma^*b\Sigma^*c\Sigma^* \).

Example
Scattered subwords are very similar in this setting:

\[ \varphi \equiv \exists x, y, z \ (x < y \land y < z \land Q_a(x) \land Q_b(y) \land Q_c(z)) \]

Then \( w \models \varphi \iff w \in \Sigma^*a\Sigma^*b\Sigma^*c\Sigma^* \).

Some Stars

Example
We can split a word into two parts as in

\[ \varphi \equiv \exists x, y \ (y = x + 1 \land z = y + 1 \land Q_a(x) \land Q_b(y) \land Q_c(z)) \]

Then \( w \models \varphi \iff w \in a^*b^* \).

Example
Let first(\( x \)) be shorthand for \( \forall z \ (x \leq z) \), and last(\( x \)) shorthand for \( \forall z \ (x \geq z) \).

Then

\[ \varphi \equiv \exists x, y \ (\text{first}(x) \land Q_a(x) \land \text{last}(y) \land Q_b(y)) \]

Then \( w \models \varphi \iff w \in a^*b \).

The Language of a Sentence

The examples suggest that, for any sentence \( \varphi \), we should consider the collection of all words that satisfy \( \varphi \):

\[ L(\varphi) = \{ w \in \Sigma^* \mid w \models \varphi \} \]

One cannot fail to notice that, in the examples so far, \( L(\varphi) \) is always regular. Needless to say, this is no coincidence.

Also note that we have not used the second-order part of our language yet.

Even/Even

Example
Write even(\( X \)) to mean that \( X \) has even cardinality and consider

\[ \varphi \equiv \exists X \ (\forall x \ (Q_a(x) \iff X(x)) \land \text{even}(X)) \]

Then \( w \models \varphi \iff \text{the number of } a\text{'s in } w \text{ is even.} \)

We’re cheating, of course; we need to show that the predicate even(\( X \)) is definable in our setting. This is tedious but not really hard:

\[ \text{even}(X) \iff \exists Y, Z \ (X = Y \cup Z \land \emptyset = Y \cap Z \land \text{alt}(Y, Z)) \]

Here \( \text{alt}(Y, Z) \) is supposed to express that the elements of \( Y \) and \( Z \) strictly alternate as in

\[ y_1 < z_1 < y_2 < z_2 < \ldots < y_k < z_k \]

Missing Pieces

\[ X = Y \cup Z \iff \forall u \ (X(u) \leftrightarrow Y(u) \lor Z(u)) \]

\[ \emptyset = Y \cap Z \iff \exists u \ (Y(u) \land Z(u)) \]

\[ \text{alt}(Y, Z) \iff \exists y \ (Y \cap x < y \land \neg Z(x)) \land \]

\[ \exists z \ (Z \cap x > z \land \neg Y(x)) \land \]

\[ \forall y \ (Y \cap z < y \land \forall x \ (y < x < z \Rightarrow \neg Y(x) \land \neg Z(x))) \land \]

\[ \forall z \ (Z \cap y < z \land \forall x \ (y < x < z \Rightarrow \neg Z(x) \land \neg Y(x))) \]

Exercise
The alt formula above does not handle the case where \( Y \) and \( Z \) are empty; fix this.

Show that one can check if the number of \( a\)'s is a multiple of \( k \), for any fixed \( k \).

The Link

Definition
A language \( L \) is MSO[<] definable (or simply MSO[<]) if there is some sentence \( \varphi \) such that

\[ L = L(\varphi) = \{ w \in \Sigma^* \mid w \models \varphi \}. \]

Our examples suggest the following theorem.

Theorem (Buechi 1960, Elgot 1961)
A language is regular if, and only if, it is MSO[<] definable.

The theorem connects complexity with definability: we can recognize a set of strings in constant space if, and only if, the set can be described by a formula in our logic.
Obviously, the proof comes in two parts:

- For every regular language $L$ we need to construct a sentence $\varphi$ such that $L = L(\varphi)$.
- For every sentence $\varphi$ we have to show that the language $L(\varphi)$ is regular.

We should expect part (1) to be harder since there is no good inductive structure to exploit.

Part (2) is by straightforward induction on $\varphi$, but there is the usual technical twist: we need to deal not just with sentences but also with free variables. Since we don’t have a formal semantics we will not give details of this construction, it is very similar to the argument for automatic structures.

### The Partition

In order to express this in a MSO[$\prec$] formula, we partition the set positions $[m]$ into $n = |Q|$ blocks $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$ such that

$$X_p(x) \iff \delta(q_0, w_1 \ldots w_x) = p$$

Some of these blocks may be empty, but note that the number of blocks is always exactly $n$ (which we can express as a formula).

But given state $p$ in position $x$ we can determine the state in position $x + 1$ given $w_{x+1}$ by a table lookup – which table lookup can be hardwired in a formula.

### Expressing Transitions

Now consider the big conjunction of $\Phi_{p,a}$ where $p \in Q$ and $a \in \Sigma$. Add formulae that pin down the first and last state to arrive at a formula of the form

$$\varphi \equiv \exists X_1, \ldots, X_n \Psi$$

where $\Psi$ is first-order as indicated above.

Note that in conjunction with the opposite direction of Büchi’s theorem, this result has the surprising consequence that every MSO[$\prec$] formula is equivalent to a MSO[$\prec$] formula containing only one block of existential second-order quantifiers.

Exercise

Fill in all the details in the last proof.

### First-Order

It is natural to ask whether the languages defined by the first-order fragment of MSO[$\prec$] have some natural characterization.

A language $L \subseteq \Sigma^\ast$ is star-free if it can be generated from $\emptyset$ and the singletons $\{a\}$, $a \in \Sigma$, using only operations union, concatenation and complement (but not Kleene star).

Note well: $a \cdot b \cdot a^\ast$ is star-free.

Theorem

A language $L \subseteq \Sigma^\ast$ is FOL[$\prec$] definable if, and only if, $L$ is star-free.
Schützenberger’s Theorem

While we’re at it: star-free languages are quite interesting since they admit a purely algebraic characterization in terms of their syntactic semigroups.

A semigroup is aperiodic if it contains only trivial subgroups (the idempotents of the semigroup).

Theorem (Schützenberger 1965)

A regular language is star-free if, and only if, its syntactic semigroup is aperiodic.

Descriptive Complexity Theory

The Büchi/Elgot theorem establishes a connection between a very low complexity class (constant space) and MSO[+1]. In fact, there is the whole area of descriptive complexity that characterizes complexity classes in terms of logic and finite structures:

- $\mathbb{NP}$ corresponds to existential SOL (Fagin 1974).
- $\mathbb{PH}$ corresponds to SOL.
- $\mathbb{PSPACE}$ corresponds to SOL plus a transitive closure operator.

Exercise

Figure out the details of Fagin’s theorem.

Upcoming Attractions

We have seen that there is a deep connection between regular languages and certain weak logics, notably monadic second-order logic.

Büchi’s result may seem a bit odd and of no practical value.

However, it also holds for infinite words and in that version it is extremely useful.

Next goal: push our theory to infinite words.

Describing State

We have a collection $P$ of atomic properties $p_1, p_2, \ldots$ that may or may not hold at any specific state $s \in S$. The exact nature of these properties depends on the system in question, think about:

- printer is busy
- register $R_0$ is initialized to 0
- process 2 is in its critical state

The details don’t matter, but we have to be able to check easily whether property $p$ holds in state $s$. We do this formally via a map $L : S \to 2^P$ (the property map).

Exercise

Explain how these CTL structures can be construed as specialized first order structures. What is the appropriate first order language here?

Designing Models

Definition

A computation tree logic (CTL) structure for $P$ has the form

$$A = \langle S, \rightarrow, L \rangle$$

where $\rightarrow$ is a binary relation on $S$ and $L : S \to 2^P$ is a property map.

To avoid special cases we require that $\forall s \exists t (s \rightarrow t)$.

One can think of such a structure as a digraph on $S$ whose nodes have out-degree at least 1 and are labeled by subset of $P$.

These structures will model the systems whose properties we are trying to verify.

Exercise

Explain how these CTL structures can be construed as specialized first order structures. What is the appropriate first order language here?
The CTL Language

Definition
In addition to the propositional part from above, the language for CTL also allows the constructs
- $\exists s \phi$: there exists a state $s$
- $\forall s \phi$: for all states $s$

Unfortunately, this is less helpful than one might think. For example, we would like to be able to say something like:

*If the current state $s$ has property $p$, then there is a path to some state that has property $q$."

We could write down a formula along the lines of

$$(s, p) \Rightarrow \exists s_1, s_2 (s \rightarrow s_1 \rightarrow s_2 \land (s_2, q))$$

to indicate that in two steps we can get to a state with $q$ but that’s much too weak.

Quantifiers

To obtain the right notion of quantifiers, recall that we are dealing with systems that evolve via state transitions:

$$s_0 \rightarrow s_1 \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow s_n \rightarrow \ldots$$

Since the relation $\rightarrow$ is not required to be deterministic, the evolution may be branching: for any $s \in S$ there may be several "next" states. Since we want to be able to make assertions about next states, their next states, and so on, it makes sense to introduce path quantifiers that refer to whole paths in the digraph:

- $A$: for all paths (starting at some state)
- $E$: there exists a path (starting at some state)

The last one is a bit more complicated and combines two subformulae as we will see in a minute.

The CTL Language

Definition
In addition to the propositional part from above, the language for CTL also allows the constructs

- $EX\phi, AX\phi$,
- $EG\phi, AG\phi$,
- $EF\phi, AF\phi$,
- $E(sU\phi), A(sU\phi)$.

So there are 8 (in words: eight) quantifiers in this logic. Each involves quantification over paths and some temporal assertion. For the $U$ quantifier the matrix consists of two formulae, not just one as usual.

This may seem a whole lot more complicated than ordinary first-order logic (which has just a universal and an existential quantifier), but it isn’t.

Where Are We?

We have a way to express a system (CTL structures) and we have a way to express specifications (CTL formulae).

The next step is to define the semantics. The appropriate setting here is to choose a state $s$ and define

$${\mathcal A}, s \models \phi$$

meaning: the formula $\phi$ holds along the paths starting at $s$. And, of course, ultimately we want to solve the decision problem:

**Problem:** CTL Validity

**Instance:** A CTL formula $\phi$, a CTL structure $\mathcal A$ and a state $s$ in $\mathcal A$.

**Question:** Does $\mathcal A, s \models \phi$ hold?
For the propositional part of CTL the semantics are no different from ordinary propositional logic. For the quantifiers we define:

- $\text{EX}\varphi$: for some $s'$ such that $s \rightarrow s'$: $A, s' \models \varphi$.
- $\text{AX}\varphi$: for all $s'$ such that $s \rightarrow s'$: $A, s' \models \varphi$.
- $\text{EG}\varphi$: there exists a path $(s_i)$ starting at $s$ such that $A, s_i \models \varphi$ for all $i$.
- $\text{AG}\varphi$: for all paths $(s_i)$ starting at $s$ we have $A, s_i \models \varphi$ for all $i$.
- $\text{EF}\varphi$: there exists a path $(s_i)$ starting at $s$ such that $A, s_i \models \varphi$ for some $i$.
- $\text{AF}\varphi$: for all paths $(s_i)$ starting at $s$ we have $A, s_i \models \varphi$ for some $i$.
- $\text{E}(\varphi \text{U} \psi)$: there exists a path $(s_i)$ starting at $s$ and some $i$ such that $A, s_i \models \varphi$ and for all $j < i A, s_j \models \psi$.
- $\text{A}(\varphi \text{U} \psi)$: for all paths $(s_i)$ starting at $s$ there is some $i$ such that $A, s_i \models \varphi$ and for all $j < i A, s_j \models \psi$.

That's it.

A good way to visualize the meaning of CTL formulae is to unfold the digraph into a tree, something like:

```
      s1
     /  \
    s2   s3
   /     \
 s4     s5
```

One can then trace the paths in this tree.

Here are some important assertions one can make in this language.

- $A, s \models \text{EX}\varphi$ means there is a neighbor of $s$ with property $\varphi$.
- $A, s \models \text{AX}\varphi$ means that all neighbors of $s$ have property $\varphi$.
- $A, s \models \text{EF}\varphi$ means there is a path from $s$ to $t$ provided that $t$ is the only state with property $\varphi$.

As is clear from the last example, the labeling (the assignment of atomic properties) is crucial here.

Also note that we can only make statements about the weakly connected component of $s$ in $\mathcal{A}, s \models \varphi$: none of the other states play any role in the evaluation of the formula.

The following assertions are all valid in the structure $\mathcal{A}$ from the last slide.

- $A, s_1 \models \text{EX}(q \land r)$
- $A, s_1 \models \text{AX}(q \land r)$
- $A, s_1 \models \text{EX}(r \land q)$
- $A, s_2 \models \text{EX}(q \land r)$
- $A, s_2 \models \text{EX}(r \land q)$
- $A, s_3 \models \text{EX}(r \land q)$
- $A, s_3 \models \text{EX}(q \land r)$
- $A, s_3 \models \text{EX}(r \land q)$
- $A, s_4 \models \text{EX}(q \land r)$

**Exercise**

Verify that all these assertions are indeed valid in $\mathcal{A}$.

**Exercise**

Find more valid and invalid assertions for this structure.
Recall from our discussion of propositional and predicate logic that equivalence is an important way to rewrite and simplify formulae.

How would we define equivalence here?

\[ \psi \equiv \varphi \iff \forall A, s (A, s \models \psi \iff A, s \models \varphi) \]

Here are some easy equivalences for CTL.

- \( AX\varphi \equiv \neg EX\neg \varphi \)
- \( EF\varphi \equiv \neg AG\neg \varphi \)
- \( AF\varphi \equiv \neg EG\neg \varphi \)
- \( AF\varphi \equiv A(\top U \varphi) \)
- \( EF\varphi \equiv E(\top U \varphi) \)

For \( n \) can be done in time linear in \( A \) the size of the digraph. We then determine all nodes from which such SCC is reachable. All of this requires \( O(n^2) \) time processing each such operator except for the last two cases is linear in \( n + e \), the number of transitions.

The last two cases, \( \varphi = AF\psi \) and \( \varphi = E(\psi U \psi_2) \) require time \( O(n(n+e)) \): we have to repeat the basic operation until no changes occur (which might take \( n-1 \) rounds).

This performance is sufficient for small structures but becomes a problem when \( A \) is large.
Even the fast model checking algorithm is often not good enough: in practical applications the size of the structure is often enormous. Its size is often exponential in the number of variables, so the adding one Boolean variable to the system doubles the size of the CTL structure.

There is no silver bullet for this problem, but a number of methods exist to deal with state explosion.

- Highly efficient data structures such as ordered binary decision diagrams (OBDDs).
- Abstraction: Shrinking the model by removing variables that are not relevant for the formula in question.
- Reduction: for asynchronous systems many different traces may be equivalent as far as the formula in question is concerned.
- Induction: if there is a large number of similar components some type of induction may be used to deal with them.
- Composition: try to break the problem into a number of smaller ones.

We can fix the Liveness problem by splitting state $s_4$.

Suppose we have 2 processes that share are resource and we want to make sure that at any time only one of them can be in a critical section where the resource is used.

We think of each of the processes as being in one of three states:

- $n$: non-critical,
- $t$: waiting to enter its critical state, and
- $c$: in its critical section.

For example, the protocol insists that at every step one of the state properties $n$, $t$, or $c$ holds. Otherwise the other process never gets a chance.

This leads to the issue of fairness.

We can fix the Liveness problem by splitting state $s_4$.

### Example: Mutual Exclusion

Suppose we have 2 processes that share a resource and we want to make sure that at any time only one of them can be in a critical section where the resource is used.

We think of each of the processes as being in one of three states:

- $n$: non-critical,
- $t$: waiting to enter its critical state, and
- $c$: in its critical section.

For example, the protocol insists that at every step one of the state properties $n$, $t$, or $c$ holds. Otherwise the other process never gets a chance.

This leads to the issue of fairness.

We can fix the Liveness problem by splitting state $s_4$.

### A Protocol

Instead of spelling out the protocol in words we give the corresponding CTL structure $cA$.

### Specification

What properties should one demand from the protocol?

- Safety: only one process can be in its critical section at any time.
  \[ \Psi_1 = \text{AG}(\neg(c_1 \land c_2)) \]
- Liveness: any process waiting to enter its critical section will ultimately do so.
  \[ \Psi_2 = \text{AG}((t_1 \rightarrow \text{AF}c_1) \land (t_2 \rightarrow \text{AF}c_2)) \]
- Non-Blocking: Any process can always request to move into its critical section.
  \[ \Psi_3 = \text{AG}((n_1 \rightarrow \text{EX}t_1) \land (n_2 \rightarrow \text{EX}t_2)) \]
- Sequencing: processes need not enter their critical sections in alternating fashion.
  \[ \Psi_4 = \text{EF}(c_1 \land \text{E}(c_1 \land \text{E}(\neg c_1 \land \text{E}(\neg c_2 \land \text{U}(c_1))))) \land \ldots \]

**Claim**

Properties Safety, Non-Blocking and Sequencing are satisfied but Liveness is not.

### A Better Protocol

We can fix the Liveness problem by splitting state $s_4$.

**Claim**

The second protocol satisfies all four properties.

It is still not ideal, though.

For example, the protocol insists that at every step one of the state properties changes. But we cannot just let a process stay in its critical section, either: otherwise the other process never gets a chance.

This leads to the issue of fairness.

**Exercise**

Verify that the second model really satisfies $\Psi_1$ through $\Psi_4$. 