

Alleviating State-space Explosion in Component-based Systems with Distributed, Parallel Reachability Analysis Algorithm

Vasumathi Narayanan

Abstract

In this work, we alleviate the well-known *State-Space Explosion (SSE)* problem in *Component Based Systems (CBS)*. We consider CBS that can be specified as a system of n *Communicating Finite State Machines (CFSMs)* interacting by *rendezvous/handshake* method. In order to avoid the SSE incurred by the traditional product machine composition of the given input CFSMs based on interleaving semantics, we construct a *sum machine* composition based on state-oriented partial-order semantics. The sum machine consists of a set of n unfolded CFSMs. By storing statically, just a small subset of global state vectors at *synchronization points*, called the *synchronous environment vectors* and generating the rest of the global-state vectors dynamically on need basis depending on the reachability to be verified, the sum machine alleviates the SSE of the product machine. We demonstrate the implementation of checking the reachability of global state vector from the checking of local reachabilities of the components of the given state vector, through a parallel, distributed algorithm. Parallel and distributed algorithms to generate the sum machine and verifying the reachability in it both without exponential complexity are the contributions of this work.

Keywords: interleaving semantics, partial-order semantics, sum machine, product machine, synchronization points, synchronous environment state vectors, reachability.

1. Introduction

CBS design is a method of constructing systems with multiple benefits, particularly decreasing the complexity of system design[1]. Model-checking CBS is one of the reliable methods that automatically and systematically analyses the functional correctness of a given system. Nevertheless, model checking is limited by a critical problem so-called State Space Explosion (SSE). To benefit from model checking, appropriate methods to reduce SSE, is required. In the last two decades, a number of methods[7], [8], [9] to mitigate the state space explosion have been proposed but they all incur in the worst case, exponential complexity (in the number of components) of the reachability analysis or some heuristics based.

The computational model of the system is conceptual to represent and describe a system. In model checking, a system model originally is represented by Kripke structure, but it can use other graph like representation such as state chart, and Petri net [2]. Using graph like representation by individual states is one of the main representation paradigms in model checking so-called *explicit-state model checking*. Another representation paradigm is *implicit model checking*. In implicit model checking states are not individually represented, but a quantified propositional logic formula is used to represent the graph. In this paper, we focus on only explicit-state model-checking in CBS.

SSE problem is a bottleneck in model checking. The amount of a system's state space (even a finite system) strongly depends on its components and prone to increase in size exponentially. Consequently, it quickly exceeds the memory capacity of the computer and restricts the size that a

model checker can check. In the review paper [1], the state-space reduction is classified into many categories. Ours is the combination of *scaling down the state-space* and *divide-and-conquer* approach. The general conclusion for this research is that despite proposing many methods for solving the bottleneck of model checking, the SSE still remains an obstacle in worst case and have not been solved completely yet[1]. We claim in our work in all cases the bottleneck due to SSE is completely alleviated which we rigorously show in our computational model.

In the sequel, section 2 explains the computational model of the CBS, we consider. The computational model and consequently many definitions are the same as the ones we considered in our previous work[3],[4],[5]. Section 3 shows the relationship between sum machine and product machine mathematically and thus more rigorously than any of our previous work cited above. Section 4 explains the reachability analysis of an arbitrary global state-vector using sum machine and discusses the complexity of the distributed, parallel algorithm we propose. Section 5 concludes the paper with some pointers to future work. The Appendix lists the pseudo code of the sum machine generation which is again parallel and distributed refinement of our previous work [3], [4].

2. The Computational Model of our CBS

Our model is based on *partial-order semantics* as opposed to *interleaving semantics* which is the cause for exponential SSE in the model. We unfold each of the finite CFSM graphs into infinite computation trees (which can be finitely truncated for reachability analysis beyond some *cut-off states* to be defined in the sequel). Each local state of every unfolded CFSM tree stores its *synchronous environment vector*, whose local component is the given state itself and the $(n-1)$ non-local components are the most recent synchronization points from the $(n-1)$ non-local unfolded trees. The state node from which a transition occurs is called the *input state* and synonymously *source state* or *predecessor state*. The state to which the transition occurs is called the *output state* and synonymously *destination state* or *successor state*. The synchronous transitions occur pairwise and the corresponding two *synchronous output states* are also known as *synchronization points*.

2.1 The CFSMs Specification

The CFSM specification is based on Hoare's CSP model [6]. We assume a set of n communicating and non-terminating FSMs. Each CFSM is defined as a 6-tuple:

Definition 1 A CFSM $F_i = (s_{0fi}, S_{fi}, A_{fi}, R_{tfi}, R_{syncfi}, R_{sync0fi}) \forall i \in \{1..n\}$ where,

- S_{fi} is the *finite set of states* of CFSM F_i , $s_{0fi} \in S_{fi}$ being the *initial state*.
- A_{fi} is the *finite set of asynchronous and synchronous actions* of F_i .
- If $a_{fi} \in A_{fi}$ is a *synchronous action*, the list of indices $[j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k]$, $k \leq n$ of the partner CFSMs are also specified in the square brackets along with a_{fi} .
- R_{tfi} is a *ternary transition relation* such that: $R_{tfi} \subseteq S_{fi} \times A_{fi} \times S_{fi}$. In a so-called *i-transition* $(s_{fi}, a_{fi}, s'_{fi}) \in R_{tfi}$, s_{fi} is called the *input state* and s'_{fi} the *output state*. An *i-transition* $(s_{fi}, a_{fi}, s'_{fi}) \in R_{tfi}$ is called *synchronous* if $a_{fi}[j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k]$, is a *synchronous action* such that : \exists a set of *j-transitions* $(s_{jf}, a_{jf}, s'_{jf}) \in R_{tjf}$, $\forall j \in \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k\}$ $j \neq i$ where $a_{fi} = a_{jf}$ and $(s'_{fi}, s'_{jf}) \in R_{syncfi}$
- $R_{syncfi} \subseteq S_{fi} \times S_{jf}$, $i \neq j$, $j \in \{1..n\}$, is a binary relation which relates the *output states* of *synchronous transitions*.
- $R_{sync0fi} \subseteq R_{syncfi}$ relates the set of pairs of initial states: $R_{sync0fi} = \{(s_{0fi}, s_{0jf}), \forall j \in \{1..n\}, i \neq j\}$. All the initial states are assumed to be in pairwise synchrony with each other to begin with.




Fig 1. Specification of 3 CFMS Graphs.




Fig 2. The unfolded set of 3 CFMS Trees.

2.2 The Simulation of Non-terminating CFMSs into Finitely Terminating , unfolded CFMSs

The given set of CFMSs represented as *cyclic, rooted, directed graphs* is simulated in their respective *global environments* into a corresponding set of unfoldings, each represented by a *directed, rooted tree* structure.

Definition.2 An unfolded CFMS is a 10-tuple $(S_i, E_i, \delta_i, E_{ij}, \delta_{ij}, env_i, R_i, Rsync_i, Rsync_{0i}, s_{0i})$ $\forall i \in \{1..n\}$ where,

Countably infinite sets of states S_i and events E_i of unfolded CFMS M_i are generated as instances of corresponding finite sets S_{fi} and A_{fi} respectively of CFMS $F_i, \forall i \in \{1..n\}$.

$$S_i \subseteq S_{fi} \times \mathbb{N}, \quad E_i \subseteq A_{fi} \times \mathbb{N} \quad \text{where,}$$

\mathbb{N} is the set of natural numbers with $s_{0i} = (s_{f0i}, 0), \forall i \in \{1..n\}$. Thus,

- S_i is the set of states of unfolding M_i ,
- E_i is the set of asynchronous events,
- $\delta_i : S_i \times E_i \rightarrow S_i$, is the *asynchronous transition function* such that $\delta_i(s_i, e_i) = s'_i$ implies that $(s_i R_i s'_i)$ where s_i is the *asynchronous input state* and s'_i is the *asynchronous output state*.
- E_{ij} is the set of synchronous events such that for every $e_{ij} \in E_{ij}, \exists e_{ji} \in E_{ji}$ such that $e_{ij} = e_{ji}$.
- $\delta_{ij} : S_i \times S_j \times E_{ij} \rightarrow S_i \times S_j$, is the *synchronous transition function* such that $\delta_{ij}(s_i, s_j, e_{ij}) = (s'_i, s'_j)$ implies that $(s'_i Rsync_i s'_j), (s_i R_i s'_i)$ and $(s_j R_j s'_j)$ where s_i, s_j are the *synchronous input states* and s'_i, s'_j are the *synchronous output states*.
- $env_i : S_i \rightarrow \times_{k=1..n} S_k$, is the *environment function*, to be explained in a sequel subsection.
- $R_i \subseteq S_i \times S_i, i \in \{1..n\}$ is the *binary relation which relates the input and output states*.
- $Rsync_i \subseteq S_i \times S_j, i \neq j, j \in \{1..n\}$, is a binary relation which relates the *output states of synchronous transitions*.
- $Rsync_{0fi} \subseteq Rsync_{fi}$ relates the set of pairs of initial states: $Rsync_{0fi} = \{(s_{0fi}, s_{0fj}), \forall j \in \{1..n\}, i \neq j\}$. All the initial states are assumed to be in pairwise synchrony with each other to begin with.
- The initial states are all synchronous output states such that $(s_{i0} Rsync_{0i} s_{j0}), i \neq j, i \in \{1..n\}$.

2.3 Well-founded, Partially-Ordered Causality order among unfolded CFMS states and their Synchronous environment vectors

We unwind the finite CFSM graphs in their mutual global environments into infinite unfolded CFSM *trees* by simulating each of the former in their respective non-local environments.

Definition 3 The global, temporal causality order is composed using the binary relations R_{sync_i} and R_i , where $i \in \{1..n\}$ as follows:

$$\leq ::= \bigcup_{i=\{1..n\}} (R_i \cup R_{sync_i})^*$$

The binary relation \leq represents the *partially ordered, well-founded causality* relation among the *states* of unfolded CFSMs ordering their *points of entry in time*.

The R_{sync_i} relations capture the *simultaneity/equality in time* of the *synchronous output states* they relate.

We assume a given specification of n CFSMs that are non-terminating. The CFSMs interact by *synchronous message-passing/rendezvous* through pairwise lossless channels, based on the seminal work of CSPs (Communicating Sequential Processes) [10]. Fig 1 shows an example specification of a set of three CFSMs. In Fig 1, a is a synchronous action between states b to c of CFSM F_1 and states q to s of CFSM F_2 .

3. Sequence, Conflict and Concurrency among unfolded CFSM States

Definition 4 The three fundamental binary relations *viz.* *sequence (seq)*, *conflict (conf)* and *concurrency (co)* are defined using R_i , $i \in \{1..n\}$ and \leq relations, the latter propagating the local sequence and conflict relations globally across all unfolded CFSMs.

- **Sequence:** $\forall s_i \in S_i, s_j \in S_j, (s_i \text{ seq } s_j)$ iff:

$$\exists s'_i \in S_i : (s_i R_i s'_i) \wedge (s'_i \leq s'_j), i, j \in \{1..n\}, \text{ possibly, } i=j$$
- **Local choice/Conflict:** $\forall s_i, s'_i \in S_i, (s_i \text{ conf } s'_i)$ iff: $(s_i, s'_i) \notin R_i^* \wedge (s'_i, s_i) \notin R_i^*, i \in \{1..n\}$
- **Global Choice/Conflict:** $\forall s_i \in S_i, s_j \in S_j, (s_i \text{ conf } s_j)$ iff: $\exists s'_k, s''_k \in S_k : (s'_k \text{ conf } s''_k) \wedge (s'_k \leq s_i) \wedge (s''_k \leq s_j), i, j, k \in \{1..n\}, i \neq j, \text{ possibly } k = i \text{ or } k = j.$
- **Concurrency:** $(s_i \text{ co } s_j)$ iff: $(s_i, s_j) \notin \text{seq} \wedge (s_j, s_i) \notin \text{seq} \wedge (s_i, s_j) \notin \text{conf}, i \neq j.$
- Thus **(seq \cup conf \cup co)** is a *total* relation.

The above deduction of total relation is a very important result in *state-oriented*, partial-order semantics as opposed to *event-based* systems like Petrinets. In Petrinets the partial-ordered causality among events captures *happened-before* relation, the complement of which is concurrency relation. Since the *causality* and *concurrency* are complementary, their union is a total relation. This means, *choice/non-determinism* in the specification cannot be modeled on par with sequence and concurrency, sequence being the same as causality.

3.1. Properties satisfied by the interaction of Causality, Sequence, Conflict and Concurrency

The causality relation, \leq , defined above is a *partial-order (reflexive, transitive and antisymmetric)*. The sequence relation, *seq*, defined above is *reflexive* (due to Kleene closure of causality), *transitive* and *asymmetric* which follows from its definition. Conflict relation *conf* and concurrency relation *co* are *irreflexive*, and *symmetric*.

From its definition, it is clear that *sequence* relation is a subset of *causality*, $\text{seq} \subseteq \leq$. The concurrency relation, *co* is either unrelated or related by the causality relation, \leq . Thus the set

($co \cap \leq$) is a non-empty subset. The members of this subset represent *strong concurrency*, with *necessary co-existence*. On the other hand, those members of co which are unrelated by causality are *weakly concurrent*, which is *possible co-existence*. It is also true that sequence relation seq has a non-null intersection with *causality*. That is, ($seq \cap \leq$) is a non empty set.

3.2 The Environment state vectors and cut-off vectors

The structure of an unfolded CFSM state along with its synchronous environment vector plays an important role in model-checking. We exploit the fact that ($co \cap \leq$) is a non-empty subset.

Definition 5 The *environment vector* $env_i(s_i)$ of an unfolded state s_i is the vector of size n , that should *necessarily/minimally* be reached according to *causality order* \leq in order to guarantee the entry of state s_i in question. The i^{th} component of the environment vector of a state s_i is itself. That is, $env_{ii}(s_i) = s_i, \forall i \in \{1..n\}$. The non-local components of the environment vector of a state are all synchronous output states, with $env_i(s_{0i}) = (s_{01}, s_{02}, \dots, s_{0n}), \forall i \in \{1..n\}$.

The implication of the above definition is that unfolding of one CFSM calls for the unfolding of the other non-local CFSMs in order to satisfy the possible causal chain of synchronization requirements.

Every state of the unfolded CFSM stores its *synchronous environment state vector*, or simply, the *environment vector*, consisting of its local state, and $(n-1)$ non-local components that are synchronous output states. Hence the name synchronous environment state vector. Initial environment vector of all the n unfolded component CFSMs is the initial state vector of all the n unfoldings. After every *synchronous* transition, the environment vector is updated, with the local component which is a synchronous output state and $(n-1)$ non-local components also synchronous output states, that are either most recent *ancestors* or *partners* in the causality order \leq . After an *asynchronous* local transition, the *successor* state simply inherits the environment vector of its *predecessor* and more importantly represented independently in its component unfolding as opposed to being interleaved with other independent, non-local asynchronous transitions. Thus we achieve *true concurrency* instead of mimicking it by *non-deterministic interleavings*.

A typical state a_1 of M_1 , the unfolded CFSM₁, will have its environment vector as follows:

$$a_1 \begin{array}{c} \geq \\ co \end{array} a_2 \begin{array}{c} \geq \\ co \end{array} a_3 \begin{array}{c} \geq \\ co \end{array} a_4$$

The above example shows that the unfolded CFSM₁ state a_1 has its environment vector (a_2, a_3, a_4) with number of CFSMs $n=4$, which are mutually related both by causality order \geq and concurrency relation, co . a_2, a_3, a_4 are synchronous output states that are members of unfolded CFSMs M_2, M_3 and M_4 respectively. The state a_4 must precede a_3 which must precede a_2 which in turn must precede a_1 . Because of this chain like causal precedences of a_1 , the unfolded CFSMs are also known as CMPMs, (*Communicating Minimal Prefix Machines*). Henceforth, the terms unfolded CFSM and CMPM will be used synonymously.

The causality order \leq is the *partial-order*, as opposed to the *total-order* of interleaving semantics. It is a binary relation relating or unrelating all the states of the n unfolded computation *trees* of the corresponding CFSM *graphs*. It is derived from the local transition relations $R_i, i=1..n$ which accounts for the local *causal precedence* and global synchronous relation R_{sync} , which accounts for the *causal simultaneity* or *strong concurrency*. Uniting the two together, we derive the causality order. It is interesting to note that two states particularly from two different unfolded trees, can be related by causal order and still be concurrent. That is, the causal order need not necessarily mean sequential order of the two states. The \leq relation captures the ‘*entered before*’ order among the two states, while the sequential order seq captures the stronger relation than \leq , in the sense that if two states s_i and s_j are related by seq , s_i has to exit before the entry of s_j .

The environment state vectors serve two significant purposes: 1) They form the *statically* saved set of all possible synchronous state vectors that are necessary and sufficient, from which all other unsaved, asynchronous state vectors can be generated *dynamically* on need basis depending on the reachability query of a state vector to be checked. It is precisely the enumeration of asynchronous state vectors which give rise to multiple interleavings, that result in SSE, which we alleviate in our model by storing only the synchronous environment vectors statically and the rest of the state vectors dynamically as demanded by the reachability query. 2) The other purpose is checking the *concurrency* represented by the *co* relation of two different states. The set of environment vectors are necessary and sufficient to generate all other global-state vectors whose reachability needs to be verified, which can be proved by induction trivially by virtue of the generation of unfolded CFSM trees by simulating the given set of CFSM graphs.

3.2.1 Cut-off vectors of CMPMs

We define a function *fvec*: $\times_{i=1..n} S_i \rightarrow \times_{i=1..n} S_{fi}$ that maps the unfolded state vectors into corresponding CFSM-state vectors with the instance numbers dropped/omitted.

The *fvec* function is used to map the environment vectors into corresponding CFSM-state vectors, to identify the *cut-off states* of the CMPMs as well.

For example in Fig 2, the state d_0 of CMPM M_1 (corresponding to state d of CFSM F_1) is reachable only if its non-local components u_0 and z_0 are reachable in addition to its local predecessor c_0 . Recursively extending this idea, the state d_0 of M_1 can be reached only if the non-local paths of states p_0 to u_0 of M_2 and x_0 to z_0 of M_3 are reachable in addition to the local path a_0 to c_0 of itself (M_1).

If a given state of a CFSM F_i cannot be reachable say due to *communication deadlock*, it is reflected in its corresponding unfolding CMPM M_i . Since we assume finite state systems, eventually as the unfolding proceeds, *fvec*(*env*(s_i)) repeats. For example, the vector $fvec(a_0p_0x_0) = fvec(a_1p_3x_2) = (apx)$. From then on, the behavior of the CMPM repeats and so we have reached a *cut-off* state-vector, forming a leaf in the CMPM tree. Leaves corresponding to *non-cutoff* state vectors are *dead states* representing a *communication deadlock*.

3.2.2 Concurrent path sets of Sum machine

Definition 5 A *concurrent path set* consists of a set of n paths one from each unfolding, such that every pair of states arbitrarily taken from the path set are related either by *seq* relation or *co* relation and there is no *conflict* among them:

$$\forall s_i, s'_i, s_j \in S \text{ it is the case that, } (s_i \text{ seq } s'_i) \vee (s_i \text{ co } s_j), i \neq j, \forall i, j \in \{1..n\}.$$

A set of n finite concurrent paths $\Pi = (\Pi_1, \Pi_2 \dots \Pi_n)$ is given by the set of paths formed by the sequence of state transitions such that $\Pi_i = (s_{0i} R_i s_i R_i \dots s'_i)$, $i = \{1..n\}$ and $\forall s_i \in \Pi_i, s_j \in \Pi_j, \neg (s_i \text{ conf } s_j) \forall i, j \in \{1..n\}, i \neq j$.

Recall ($\text{seq} \cup \text{conf} \cup \text{co}$) is a *total* relation by definition. The set of n finite concurrent paths have their *initial configuration* which is given by $(s_{01}, s_{02}, \dots s_{0n})$ and *final configuration* given by $(s'_1, s'_2, \dots s'_n)$, let us say. A final configuration of a given set of n concurrent paths is in general a dynamic configuration. The set of all configurations of a sum machine correspond to the set of all reachable state vectors of the unfolded CFSMs. The set of all *env-vectors* correspond to the set of all *static configurations* of unfolded CFSMs, which is a subset of the set of all reachable configurations.

3.2.3 The Sum machine properties of importance in Model-checking

Here we deduce certain properties satisfied by the states of the unfoldings from the definition of various relations above:

Property 1 Concurrency checking:

$$a_i \text{ co } b_j \text{ iff: } env_{ji}(b_j) \text{ seq } a_i \wedge env_{ij}(a_i) \text{ seq } b_j.$$


In other words, a_i is reachable from the i^{th} component of environment vector of b_j and similarly b_j can be reached from the j^{th} component of the environment vector of a_i .

Proof: The proof follows from the structure of the states and their respective environment vectors.

The proof has to be in two parts: (i) $(a_i \text{ co } b_j) \Rightarrow env_{ji}(b_j) \text{ seq } a_i \wedge env_{ij}(a_i) \text{ seq } b_j$
(ii) $env_{ji}(b_j) \text{ seq } a_i \wedge env_{ij}(a_i) \text{ seq } b_j \Rightarrow (a_i \text{ co } b_j)$

Consider the following example which consists of proving :

- (i) $(a_1 \text{ co } b_2) \Rightarrow (b_1 \text{ seq } a_1) \wedge (a_2 \text{ seq } b_2)$
(ii) $(b_1 \text{ seq } a_1) \wedge (a_2 \text{ seq } b_2) \Rightarrow (a_1 \text{ co } b_2)$



Proof of (i): The state a_1 is from CPM M_1 and state b_2 belongs to CPM M_2 and $n = 4$, the number of CFSMs and their corresponding unfoldings. The vector (a_2, a_3, a_4) is the environment vector of a_1 and similarly (b_1, b_3, b_4) is the environment vector of the state b_2 . It is interesting to note that all the components from a_1 to a_4 are pairwise concurrent and are also related by causality, as shown above. Similarly the components b_1 to b_4 .

Now, it is given that $(a_1 \text{ co } b_2)$. By definition of concurrent paths, a_1 to a_4 and b_2 to b_4 , no two states of these path segments are in conflict. Thus a_1 and b_1 can only be related by *seq* and so can a_2 and b_2 . If $(b_2 \text{ seq } a_2)$ were to be true, $(b_2 \text{ seq } a_1)$ will be the consequence, contradicting $(b_2 \text{ co } a_1)$. Thus $(a_2 \text{ seq } b_2)$ will be the case, which is nothing but, $((a_2 = env_{12}) \text{ seq } b_2)$. Similarly it can be proved that $(b_1 \text{ seq } a_1)$, which is nothing but $((b_1 = env_{21}) \text{ seq } a_1)$.


Proof of (ii): It is given that, $(a_2 \text{ seq } b_2) \wedge (b_1 \text{ seq } a_1)$. We need to show that $(a_1 \text{ co } b_2)$. This is trivially true because, $(a_2 \text{ seq } b_2)$ implies that, a_2 exits and entry of b_2 fills the place of a_2 which was in concurrence with a_1 . Thus, $(a_1 \text{ co } b_2)$ holds. Similarly we can show from $(b_1 \text{ seq } a_1)$, $(b_2 \text{ co } a_1)$ is true. Hence the result. In addition, $\neg(a_3 \text{ conf } b_3)$ and $\neg(a_4 \text{ conf } b_4)$ can be proved by contradiction since if they were in conflict, $(a_2 \text{ conf } b_2)$ and $(a_1 \text{ conf } b_1)$ will result by causal dependence, $(a_2 \geq a_3 \geq a_4)$ and $(b_2 \geq b_1 \geq b_3 \geq b_4)$ in addition to being pairwise concurrent. We exploit this property in model-checking.

Property 2 Restricted transitivity of the *co* relation:

If $a_i \text{ co } a_j$, and $a_j \text{ co } a_k$, then $a_i \text{ co } a_k$ where a_i, a_j, a_k are respectively the states of unfoldings M_i, M_j and M_k respectively, $i \neq j \neq k$.

Proof:

Consider the following example with 4 components i.e, $n=4$



The arrows indicate sequential dependency, with $(a_2 \text{ seq } b_2)$, $(b_1 \text{ seq } a_1)$, $(b_3 \text{ seq } c_3)$ and $(c_2 \text{ seq } b_2)$ since it is given that, $(a_1 \text{ co } b_2)$ and $(b_2 \text{ co } c_3)$. We need to show that $(a_1 \text{ co } c_3)$.

In order to show that $(a_1 \text{ co } c_3)$, using **property 1**, it is enough to show that $(a_3 \text{ seq } c_3)$ and $(c_1 \text{ seq } a_1)$.

a_1). Now, it is true that b_1 and c_1 cannot be in conflict because if they were in conflict, it would propagate to make $(b_2 \text{ conf } c_3)$, which is not the case. Also $(b_1 \text{ seq } c_1)$ is not possible, since in that case, together with $(c_2 \text{ seq } b_2)$, and $(c_2 \geq c_1)$ it would follow that $(b_1 \text{ seq } b_2)$ which is a contradiction because $(b_2 \text{ co } b_1)$. Therefore, $(c_1 \text{ seq } b_1)$ is the only possibility and since $(b_1 \text{ seq } a_1)$ is true, $(c_1 \text{ seq } a_1)$ is true. Very similarly it can be shown that, if $(b_3 \text{ seq } a_3)$ were to be true, it would violate $(b_3 \text{ co } b_2)$ and so it is only true that $(a_3 \text{ seq } b_3)$ and since $(b_3 \text{ seq } c_3)$, it follows that $(a_3 \text{ seq } c_3)$. Thus, it follows from $(a_3 \text{ seq } c_3)$ and $(c_1 \text{ seq } a_1)$ that $(a_1 \text{ co } c_3)$, by **property 1**.

4. Set of unfolded CFSMS is a Sum machine as opposed to the conventional Product machine of CFSMs

The set of CFSM unfoldings represent a concurrent set of Kripke structures. Together, they constitute a sum machine comprising the union of all the states of the set of unfolded trees. By virtue of its construction, the sum machine simulates the entire product machine by randomly and sequentially moving across one component unfolded CFSM to the other, through the synchronization points.

Definition 6 A *sum machine* consisting of n CMPMs (unfolded CFSMs) can be defined as below:

$(M_{i,i=\{1..n\}}, \leq, \text{seq}, \text{conf}, \text{co})$ where,

- M_i is i^{th} component of the set of CMPMs, $\forall i = \{1..n\}$,
- \leq is the global causality order,
- seq is the global sequence relation,
- conf is the global conflict relation and,
- co is the concurrency relation.

4.1 Mapping between Product machine and Sum Machine

Definition 7 A *configuration* s of sum machine is a vector of n CMPM states (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n) such that the component states are pairwise concurrent. That is, $(s_i \text{ co } s_j)$ for all $i, j \in \{1..n\}, i \neq j$.

The initial configuration of sum machine is $s_0 = (s_{01}, s_{02}, \dots, s_{0n})$, the vector of all the n initial states of unfolded CFSMs. These initial states are by default pairwise synchronous output states to begin with. That is, $(s_{0i} \text{ Rsync } s_{0j})$, for all $i, j \in \{1..n\}, i \neq j$. Also, $\text{env}_i(s_{0i}) = (s_{01}, s_{02}, \dots, s_{0n}), i \in \{1..n\}$. Thus the initial configuration is the same as the env-vector of all the initial states that are pairwise synchronous and so trivially concurrent.

The set of *static configurations* of sum machine is the set of all *env-vectors* of all the component CMPMs, since they are statically stored. The set of all configurations that are not statically represented are *dynamic configurations*, reachable on need basis dynamically, depending on the property to be verified.

4.1.1 Paths (of product machine) and concurrent set of local paths (of sum machine) correspond respectively to Interleavings and Runs

Consider a *concurrent local path set* of the sum machine $\Pi = (\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \dots, \Pi_n)$ with $\Pi_1 = (s_{01} R_1 s^1_1 R_1 s^2_1, \dots)$, $\Pi_2 = (s_{02} R_2 s^1_2 R_2 s^2_2, \dots)$..., $\Pi_n = (s_{0n} R_n s^1_n R_n s^2_n, \dots)$. Without loss of generality, let us assume all transitions of all the paths above are asynchronous (purely local). The initial, global state-vector is given by $s_0 = (s_{01}, s_{02}, \dots, s_{0n})$.

Let us now define a *global path* P of the state-vectors generated from concurrent local path set Π as

follows: $P = (s_0 R_1 s^1 R_2 s^2 R_3 \dots R_n s^n \dots)$ where, $s^1 = (s^1_1, s_{02}, \dots, s_{0n})$, $s^2 = (s^2_1, s^2_2, \dots, s_{0n})$, $\dots, s^n = (s^n_1, s^n_2, \dots, s^n_n)$, and $R = \cup_{i=\{1..n\}} R_i$. P is the global path traversed by the successive configurations with the initial configuration s_0 . The first transition is that of CMPM M_1 of R denoted by R_1 , the second is from M_2 represented by R_2 and so on until the n^{th} transition from M_n by R_n . The superscript denotes the position of the configuration from the initial one and the subscript denotes the index of the unfolded CFSM whose transition is made. The global path P represents the path traversed by the configurations starting from s_0 and making successive transitions of all n unfolded CFSMs in the order of their indices, $i = \{1..n\}$. In general, global paths can be formed by traversing the n unfolded CFSMs in any arbitrary order. Thus a given concurrent local path set Π can be used to generate/trace multiple global paths depending on the order in which the component unfoldings are traversed. Each global path traced corresponds to an *interleaving* of the *run* corresponding to the concurrent path set Π . The size of conflict relation $|conf|$ decides the number of *runs* and the size of concurrency relation $|co|$, controls the number of *interleavings* of a given *run*.

We do depth-first search of all the n component unfoldings of the sum machine in parallel to find instances of local reachable state components. The next step is to show that those states are concurrent to each other. Two states s_i and s_j belonging to CMPMs M_i , M_j respectively can be checked for their *concurrency* by testing if their respective env-vector components i and j are reachable from each other, (in the sense that s_i must be reachable from $env_{ji}(s_j)$ and s_j from $env_{ij}(s_i)$).

4.2. Bisimulation of Product machine and the Sum machine

4.2.1. Equivalence classes of configurations of Sum machine

Consider an unfolded CFSM state s_i of M_i . The set of all configurations with s_i as their i^{th} component form an equivalence class whose representative is $env_i(s_i)$ which is a static configuration. Thus there are as many equivalence classes as there are sum machine states. $[env_i(s_i)]$ is the equivalence class of $env_i(s_i)$ given by all the reachable configurations s , whose i^{th} component is s_i . Using these equivalence classes we can define *bisimulation equivalence* between product machine and sum machine and also between sum machine and its *quotient transition system*.

Definition 8 The transition system of CMPM M_i is defined as $TS(M_i) = (S_i, R_i, AP_i, L_i, s_{oi})$ where,

- S_i is the set of local states of CMPM M_i ,
- R_i is the local transition relation,
- AP_i is the set of atomic propositions,
- $L_i : S_i \rightarrow 2^{AP_i}$ is the labelling function mapping atomic propositions to each state, and
- s_{oi} is the initial state.

Based on configurations and transitions among them, a single transition system corresponding to a product machine simulated by the sum machine can be defined as follows :

Definition 9 The transition system of *sum machine* M is defined as $TS(M) = (S, R, AP, L, s_o)$ where,

- S is the set of all configurations,
- $R = \cup_{i=\{1..n\}} R_i$ is the transition relation,
- $AP = \cup_{i=\{1..n\}} AP_i$ is the set of all atomic propositions,
- $L : S \rightarrow 2^{AP}$ is the labelling function mapping atomic propositions to each configuration, and
- s_o is the initial configuration.

Definition 10 The conventional transition system of the *product machine* of given set of CFSMs is given by $TS(M_f) = (S_f, R_f, AP_f, L_f, s_{of})$ where,

- S_f is the set of all CFSM state vectors
- $R_f \subseteq S_f \times S_f$ is the transition relation among state vectors,
- $AP_f = \times_{i=1..n} AP_{fi}$ is the set of all atomic propositions,
- $L_f : S_f \rightarrow 2^{AP_f}$ is the labelling function mapping atomic propositions to each configuration,

- and
- s_{of} is the initial CFSM-state vector

Definition 11 Consider two transition systems $TS_1 = (S_1, R_1, AP_1, L_1, s_{o1})$ and $TS_2 = (S_2, R_2, AP_2, L_2, s_{o2})$. A relation $\sim \subseteq S_1 \times S_2$ is a *bisimulation relation* iff: ($s_{o1} \sim s_{o2}$) and,

$$\forall (s_1 \sim s_2), \text{ it holds: } L_1(s_1) = L_2(s_2) \text{ and,}$$

$$\text{if } (s_1 R_1 s'_1) \text{ then } (s_2 R_2 s'_2) \text{ where } (s'_1 \sim s'_2) \text{ and,}$$

$$\text{if } (s_2 R_2 s'_2) \text{ then } (s_1 R_1 s'_1) \text{ where } (s'_1 \sim s'_2).$$

Two transition systems TS_1 and TS_2 are *bisimilar* denoted $TS_1 \sim TS_2$ iff: there is a *bisimulation relation* between them.

It can be shown that the transition system of product machine, $TS(M_f)$ and $TS(M)$, the transition system of sum machine are *bisimilar* by *construction* and induction since there is a *bisimulation relation* \sim between them as follows:

$$\sim \subseteq S \times S_f \text{ such that } (s \sim s_f) \text{ and,}$$

$$\forall (s \sim s_f), \text{ it holds: } L(s) = L_f(s_f) \text{ and,}$$

$$\text{if } (s R s') \text{ then } (s_f R_f s'_f) \text{ where } (s' \sim s'_f) \text{ and,}$$

$$\text{if } (s_f R_f s'_f) \text{ then } (s R s') \text{ where } (s' \sim s'_f).$$

4.2.2 The Bisimulation Quotient transition system of sum machine

The *quotient transition system* of sum machine $TS(M/\sim) = (S/\sim, R/\sim, AP, L/\sim, s_{o/\sim})$ where, S/\sim is the set of equivalence classes with arbitrary members $[s]$ and $[s']$, R/\sim is *defined* as: $[s] R/\sim [s']$ iff: $s R s'$ such that $[s], [s'] \in S/\sim, s \in [s], s' \in [s']$. L/\sim is defined as $L/\sim([s]) = L(s)$. and $s_{o/\sim} = [s_0]$.

The quotient transition system of sum machine $TS(M/\sim)$ is what is generated *statically* using which the rest of the states and transitions of sum machine $TS(M)$ can be dynamically generated on need basis depending on the requirements of reachability analysis.

5. Syntax and Semantics of CDTL logic over sum machine and CTL over product machine

Backus-Naur form of CDTL Logic Syntax is the following:

$$\phi_i ::= p_i \mid \neg\phi_i \mid \phi_i \wedge \psi_i \mid \phi_i \vee \psi_i \mid \phi_i \rightarrow \psi_i \mid A_i X_i \phi_i \mid E_i X_i \phi_i \mid A_i F_i \phi_i \mid E_i F_i \phi_i \mid A_i G_i \phi_i$$

$$\mid E_i G_i \phi_i \mid A_i [\phi_i U \psi_i] \mid E_i [\phi_i U \psi_i].$$

Semantics of Local CDTL formulas over sum machine components

- $M_i, s_i \models p_i$ iff: $p_i \in L_i(s_i)$
- $M_i, s_i \models \neg\phi_i$ iff: $M_i, s_i \not\models \phi_i$
- $M_i, s_i \models \phi_i \wedge \psi_i$ iff: $(M_i, s_i \models \phi_i) \wedge (M_i, s_i \models \psi_i)$
- $M_i, s_i \models \phi_i \vee \psi_i$ iff: $(M_i, s_i \models \phi_i) \vee (M_i, s_i \models \psi_i)$
- $M_i, s_{i1} \models A_i F_i \phi_i$ iff: $\forall \pi_i = (s_{i1} R_i s_{i2} R_i s_{i3} R_i \dots s_{ik} R_i s_{ik+1}, \dots) M_i, s_{ik} \models \phi_i$
- $M_i, s_{i1} \models E_i F_i \phi_i$ iff: $\exists \pi_i = (s_{i1} R_i s_{i2} R_i s_{i3} R_i \dots s_{ik} R_i s_{ik+1}, \dots) M_i, s_{ik} \models \phi_i$

- $M_i, s_{i1} \models A_i[\phi_i \cup \psi_i]$ iff: $\forall \pi_i = (s_{i1} R_i s_{i2} R_i s_{i3} R_i \dots s_{ik} R_i s_{ik+1}, \dots)$ $M_i, s_{ik} \models \psi_i$ and $\forall j < k$
 $M_i, s_{ij} \models \phi_i$
- $M_i, s_{i1} \models E_i[\phi_i \cup \psi_i]$ iff: $\exists \pi_i = (s_{i1} R_i s_{i2} R_i s_{i3} R_i \dots s_{ik} R_i s_{ik+1}, \dots)$ $M_i, s_{ik} \models \psi_i$ and $\forall j < k$
 $M_i, s_{ij} \models \phi_i$

Backus-Naur form of CTL Logic Syntax is the following:

$$\phi ::= p_i \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi \wedge \psi \mid \phi \vee \psi \mid \phi \rightarrow \psi \mid AX\phi \mid EX\phi \mid AF\phi \mid EF\phi \mid AG\phi \\ \mid EG\phi \mid A[\phi \cup \psi] \mid E[\phi \cup \psi].$$

Semantics of Local CTL formulas over product machine

- $M_f, s_f \models p_f$ iff: $p_f \in L_f(s_f)$
- $M_f, s_f \models \neg\phi$ iff: $M_f, s_f \not\models \phi$
- $M_f, s_f \models \phi \wedge \psi$ iff: $(M_f, s_f \models \phi) \wedge (M_f, s_f \models \psi)$
- $M_f, s_f \models \phi \vee \psi$ iff: $(M_f, s_f \models \phi) \vee (M_f, s_f \models \psi)$
- $M_f, s_{f1} \models AF\phi$ iff: $\forall \pi = (s_{f1} R_f s_{f2} R_f s_{f3} R_f \dots s_{fk} R_f s_{fk+1}, \dots)$ $M_f, s_{fk} \models \phi$
- $M_f, s_{f1} \models EF\phi$ iff: $\exists \pi = (s_{f1} R_f s_{f2} R_f s_{f3} R_f \dots s_{fk} R_f s_{fk+1}, \dots)$ $M_f, s_{fk} \models \phi$
- $M_f, s_{f1} \models A[\phi \cup \psi]$ iff: $\forall \pi = (s_{f1} R_f s_{f2} R_f s_{f3} R_f \dots s_{fk} R_f s_{fk+1}, \dots)$ $M_f, s_{fk} \models \psi$ and $\forall j < k$
 $M_f, s_{fj} \models \phi$
- $M_f, s_{f1} \models E[\phi \cup \psi]$ iff: $\exists \pi = (s_{f1} R_f s_{f2} R_f s_{f3} R_f \dots s_{fk} R_f s_{fk+1}, \dots)$ $M_f, s_{fk} \models \psi$ and $\forall j < k$
 $M_f, s_{fj} \models \phi$

5.1 Deduction of Global formulas of CTL's product machine from Local Formulas of CDTL's sum machine

Following equivalences between global and local formulae follow from the definition of *configurations*, *global paths*, *concurrent local path sets* and their relationship as explained in a previous subsection.

- $M, s \models q \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{i=\{1..n\}} (M_i, s_i \models q_i)$ where, $(s_i \text{ co } s_j), i \neq j, i, j = \{1..n\}$.
- $M, s \models AX(\bigwedge_{i=\{1..n\}} q_i) \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{i=\{1..n\}} (M_i, s_i \models A_i X_i q_i)$, where $(s_{oi} R_i s_i)$, such that $M_i, s_i \models q_i \forall i = \{1..n\}$ and $(s_1 \text{ co } s_2 \text{ co } \dots \text{ co } s_n)$.
- $M, s \models AF(\bigwedge_{i=\{1..n\}} q_i) \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{i=\{1..n\}} (M_i, s_i \models A_i F_i q_i)$, where $(s_{oi} R_i^+ s_i), s_i \models q_i \forall i = \{1..n\}$ and $(s_1 \text{ co } s_2 \text{ co } \dots \text{ co } s_n)$.

From the above equivalences, (\leftrightarrow is the equivalence operator) it follows that in order to check the property of a global product machine formula, it is enough to search the corresponding component CPM trees depending on the property to be verified, and then check the concurrency of local

states to deduce the global property.

5.2 Global Reachability from Local Reachabilities with parallel and distributed Algorithm

We do depth-first search of all the n component unfoldings of the sum machine in parallel to find instances of local components of the state s whose reachability is to be analysed.


The next step is to show that those states are concurrent to each other. Two states s_i and s_j belonging to unfolded CFSMs M_i, M_j respectively can be checked for their concurrency by testing if their respective environment-vector components are reachable from each other, anchored at s_i and s_j (in the sense that s_i must be reachable from $env_{ji}(s_j)$ and s_j from $env_{ij}(s_i)$).

Step 1. The procedure for *depth-first searches* of $M_i, \{i=1..n\}$ each, is same as the traditional product machine search[11] but can be done in parallel, with n processors, one for each unfolded CFSM (sum machine component). This step results in the complexity of N , the size of a component unfolding, which is given by $(d*N_j)$, where d is a constant, depending on the *interdependency/degree of coupling* among the CFSMs given, dictated by the size of $|Rsync|$ relation and *conflict* due to non-determinism in the given CFSMs specification. We generally consider *loosely-coupled CBS*.

Step 2. The next step is to find the concurrency among the locally reached states, found as a result of *step 1*. Checking of concurrency between two states s_i and s_j , that is, checking if $(s_i \text{ co } s_j)$ is satisfied, follows from **property 1**.

State s_i must be reachable from $env_{ji}(s_j)$, the i^{th} component of *environment vector* of s_j and state s_j must be reachable from $env_{ij}(s_i)$. If either of these conditions is not satisfied, it means that s_i and s_j must be in *sequence or conflict*, and *not concurrent*.

5.3 Discussion of Complexity of Distributed, Reachability Analysis



In each unfolding $M_i, i=\{1..n\}$ we find the local reachabilities of up to k states that are in conflict stemming from k different runs. Now for global reachability, we have to check the satisfaction of concurrency among these state instances that are mutually in conflict, each representing a run. We can map this problem to a satisfiability problem as follows say, with $n=4$ and $k=3$:

$$(a_1 \vee b_1 \vee c_1) \wedge (a_2 \vee b_2 \vee c_2) \wedge (a_3 \vee b_3 \vee c_3) \wedge (a_4 \vee b_4 \vee c_4) \text{ where,}$$

a_1, b_1, c_1 are the 3 states in *conflict*, representing 3 different *runs* satisfying the local reachability in M_1 and similarly a_2, b_2, c_2 in M_2 , a_3, b_3, c_3 in M_3 and a_4, b_4, c_4 in M_4 .

Each comparison involves $2\log N$ operations where $\log N$ is the height of the unfolded tree, N being the number of states in the tree, $\log N$ representing the *maximum path length* to check the two reachabilities of the concerned states from their respective components of the environment vectors, to check their concurrency according to **property 1**. Total number of operations = $k^2 * 2\log N =$

$O(k^2 \log N)$ per tree.

5.3.1 Chain of Transitivity

The chain of transitivity follows from the concurrency between states a_1, b_1, c_1 of M_1 and states a_2, b_2 and c_2 of M_2 according to **property 2**. Similarly concurrency between M_2 and M_3 . Put together, in general, the chain of transitivity applied n times to give rise to the conjunction $(x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_3 \wedge \dots \wedge x_n)$ where x_i represents one or more of a_i, b_i and $c_i, i=\{1..n\}$. Conjunction translates to concurrency just as conflicts to disjunction.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total time complexity of Step 1 and Step 2} &= n*N + nk^2 \log N \\ &= n*N + nk^2 \log N \\ &= O(n*N + nk^2 \log N) \end{aligned}$$

If we use n processors in parallel, $O(N + k^2 \log N)$ becomes the result.

5.3.2 Complexity of the Sum machine generation

If N_f is the maximum number of states per CFSM and if there are n interacting CFSMs the worst case size of the traditional synchronous product machine is $(N_f)^n$, which is *exponential* in the number of CFSMs. On the other hand, the size of sum machine/set of unfolded CFSMs in the worst case is only $(n*N_f*d)$. Again using n number of processors in *parallel*, we can generate the n unfolded CFSMs comprising the sum machine in $(d*N_f)$ time.

5.3.4. Expressiveness of CDTL

CDTL over sum machine adopts features of CTL over product machine by virtue of concurrent local path sets and global paths. In addition CDTL also adopts features of LTL over local path formulae so that nesting of linear-time operators X_i, F_i and U_i are possible. The possibility of nested linear-time operators stems from the fact that we have the concept of sets of n -concurrent local paths of CMPMs. For instance, we can specify and verify the formula such as $A((G_1 F_1 p_1 \wedge G_2 F_2 p_2 \dots \wedge G_n F_n p_n) \rightarrow Fq)$ where q is a fairness property and p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n are local propositions of n CMPM/CFSM states using the concurrent set of global paths of configurations over Π . Here, identifying the satisfiability of p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n can be done on paths $\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \dots, \Pi_n$ respectively, given the sum machine structure. The formulas such as AXp corresponding to $(A_1 X_1 p_1 \wedge A_2 X_2 p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge A_n X_n p_n)$ can be specified and verified easily with the concurrent path-set Π . Nesting of branching-time operators such as in the formulae $AXEFp, E_i F_i A_i G_i q_i$ are possible as well, as in CTL*.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Given a CBS, specified as a set of n CFSMs, as opposed to the traditional composition into a product machine which incurs a huge state-space explosion, we construct the sum machine, the quotient system of product machine whose synchronous state vectors alone are statically generated, and the rest are generable dynamically on need basis depending on the property to be verified.

We have proposed a *distributed version of branching-time logic* CDTL over sum machine structure using which model-checking can be performed efficiently. The model-checking complexity is $(n*N + nk^2 \log N)$ in the number of CFSMs n with $N = d*N_f$, the maximum number of states per CFSM and d , a constant depending on degree of coupling, $|R_{sync}|$ given in the specification. We can easily parallelize the model-checking algorithm with n processors, thereby reducing the complexity to $(N + k^2 \log N)$. CTL model-checking can be encoded as a *satisfiability problem* which is proved to be NP-complete. But our polynomial complexity result makes us wonder if $P = NP$.

Appendix

The Sum machine construction (Pseudo code)

Algorithm:

Input: Set of n CFSMs specification in the form of n graphs, $F_i, i=\{1..n\}$.

Output: Set of n unfolded CFSMs in the form of n trees, $M_i, i = \{1..n\}$

The algorithm given below unfolds the given CFSMs into unfolded trees by recursive simulation of CFSM states and transitions in parallel. Due to their inter-dependencies, every path generation of a given unfolded CFSM M_i causally leads to the generation of certain paths of non-local CFSMs as well. Thus the unfoldings are generated as a group concurrently according to synchronization requirements instead of one at a time sequentially. The pseudocode mostly uses C style and Java style, for implementing the inter-thread *waiting* and *notification*.

The main data structures are *env-vectors* and *waitlist*. The latter is a two-dimensional array with thread i adding into the *waitlist*[i,j], $\forall j=1..n$, its \langle state, transition \rangle pairs, in sync with and read by thread j .

Main()

```
{
  Create and initialize n threads 1..n;
  for threads i= 1..n do in parallel
  {
    for j= {1..n , j≠i} do waitlist[i,j] := Null;
    /*waitlist of thread i with all other threads
    initialized*/
    for all  $s_{fi} \in S_{fi}$  ins#( $s_{fi}$ )++ = 0; /*instance number
    initialized*/
     $s_{i0} := \langle s_{fi0}, 0 \rangle$ ;
     $env_i(s_{i0}) := (s_{10}, s_{20}, \dots, s_{n0})$ ;
    Generate-unfolding( $F_i, s_i$ );
  } /* for */
} /*Main()*/
```

/*The pseudocode below simulates CFSM F_i in global environment to generate unfolded CFSM M_i in a depth-first recursive manner.*/

Generate_unfolding (F_i, s_i)

```
{
  if  $s_i$  is a cut-off state return; /* If  $s_i$  has an ancestor
   $s'_i$  such that  $fvec(env_i(s'_i)) = fvec(env_i(s_i))$  then  $s_i$ 
  is cut-off state.*/
  for all transitions  $r_{fi}=(fstate_i(s_i), a_i, s'_{fi})$  in  $F_i$  do
  {
     $s'_i :=$  Process-transition( $s_i, r_{fi}$ );
    Generate-unfolding( $F_i, s'_i$ );
  }
} /*Generate-unfolding()*/
```

Process-transition(s_i, r_{fi})

```
{
  if  $a_i$  of  $r_{fi}$  is local/asynchronous action
   $s'_i :=$  Gen-nextstate-async( $s_i, r_{fi}$ );
```

```

else if  $a_i$  is send/receive action in sync with
      thread j
       $s'_i := \text{Handle-nextstate-sync}(s_i, r_{\bar{n}}, j)$ ;
return( $s'_i$ );
}/*Process_transition()*/

```

```

Handle-nextstate-sync( $s_i, r_{\bar{n}}, j$ )
{
  if  $\langle s_j, r_{\bar{n}} \rangle \in \text{waitlist}[j,i]$  /*If thread j has already
      added the partner  $\langle s_j, r_{\bar{n}} \rangle$  in its waitlist[j, i]
      and is waiting for thread i for notification */
  {
     $\langle s'_i, s'_j \rangle := \text{Gen-nextstate-sync}(s_i, s_j, r_{\bar{n}}, r_{\bar{n}})$ ;
    Notify(thread j,  $s'_j$ ); /* Thread j is notified by
      thread i to continue from  $s'_j$  on */
  }
  else
  {
    waitlist[i,j] = waitlist[i,j]  $\cup \langle s_i, r_{\bar{n}} \rangle$ ;
    /* Add  $\langle s_i, r_{\bar{n}} \rangle$  in waitlist[i,j] */
     $s'_i := \text{Wait(for thread j)}$ ; /* thread i waits
      for thread j for Notification*/
  }
  return( $s'_i$ );
}/*Handle-nextstate-sync()*/

```

```

Gen-nextstate-async( $s_i, r_{\bar{n}}$ )
{
   $s'_i := \langle s'_{\bar{n}}, \text{ins}\#(s_{\bar{n}}++) \rangle$ ;
  for  $k=1..n$  such that  $k \neq i$ 
     $\text{env}_{ik}(s'_i) := \text{env}_{ik}(s_i)$ ;
   $\text{env}_{ii}(s'_i) := s'_i$ ; /* We generate  $s'_i$  and its env-vector*/
   $R_i := R_i \cup (s_i, s'_i)$ ;
  return( $s'_i$ );
}/*Gen-nextstate-async()*/

```

```

Gen-nextstate-sync( $s_i, s_j, r_{\bar{n}}, r_{\bar{n}}$ )
{
   $s'_i := \langle s'_{\bar{n}}, \text{ins}\#(s'_{\bar{n}}++) \rangle$ ;
   $s'_j := \langle s'_{\bar{n}}, \text{ins}\#(s'_{\bar{n}}++) \rangle$ ;
  for  $k=1..n$  such that  $k \ll i, j$ 
     $(\text{env}_{ik}(s'_i) = \text{env}_{jk}(s'_j)) := \text{desc}(\text{env}_{ik}(s_i), \text{env}_{jk}(s_j))$ ;
    /* The function desc returns the descendent of the two states in the local causality order
       $R_k$ */
   $\text{env}_{ii}(s'_i) = \text{env}_{ji}(s'_j) := s'_i$ ;
   $\text{env}_{jj}(s'_j) = \text{env}_{ji}(s'_i) := s'_j$ ;
   $R_i := R_i \cup (s_i, s'_i)$ ;
   $R_j := R_j \cup (s_j, s'_j)$ ;
   $R_{\text{sync}_i} := R_{\text{sync}_i} \cup (s'_i, s'_j)$ ;
   $R_{\text{sync}_j} := R_{\text{sync}_j} := \wedge (s'_j, s'_i)$ ;
  return( $\langle s'_i, s'_j \rangle$ );
}/* Gen-nextstate-sync()*/

```

References

- [1] F. Nejati et al., "Handling State-space Explosion in Component-based systems : A review", Logical Methods in Computer science, 2017.
- [2] Liu, G., and Jiang, C. "Petri net based model checking for the collaborative-ness of multiple processes systems", In Networking, Sensing, and Control (ICNSC), 2016 IEEE 13th International Conference on (2016), IEEE, pp. 1–6.
- [3] Sungeetha Dakshinamurthy and Vasumathi Narayanan, "A Model-checking Algorithm for Formal verification of Peer-to-peer Fault-Tolerant Networks", (LNIT ISSN 2301-3788) Lecture Notes on Information Theory, Vol. 1 No:3,pp 128-131,Sep 2013 .
- [4] Sungeetha Dakshinamurthy and Vasumathi Narayanan, "A Component-based Approach to Verification of Formal Software Models to Check Safety Properties of Distributed Systems" (LNSE ISSN 2301-3559) Lecture Notes on Software Engineering, Vol. 1 No:2,pp 186-189, Apr 2013 .
- [5] Vasumathi Narayanan, "A state-oriented partial-order model and Logic for Distributed Systems", Ph.D Thesis, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada, 1997.
- [6] C.A.R. Hoare, "Communicating Sequential Processes" , 1984.
- [7] Peled, D. "Combining partial order reductions with on-the-fly model-checking". In International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (1994), Springer, pp. 377–390.
- [8] Flanagan, C., and Godefroid, P. "Dynamic partial-order reduction for model checking software". In ACM Sigplan Notices (2005), vol. 40, ACM, pp. 110–121.
- [9] Gabmeyer, S., Brosch, P., and Seidl, M. A classification of model checking-based verification approaches for software models. In Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on the Verification of Model Transformation (VOLT) (2013).
- [10] E.A. Emerson, et al., "Deciding Full Branching-time Logic (CTL*)", Information and Control, Volume 61, Issue 3, June 1984, Pages 175-201.
- [11] E.M. Clarke et al, "Automatic verification of Temporal logic specifications", ACM transactions on Programming languages and systems, Vol 8, NO:2, 1986.