

Computing unsatisfiable cores for LTL_f specifications

Marco Roveri

*University of Trento,
Via Sommarive 9, Trento, Italy*

MARCO.ROVERI@UNITN.IT

Claudio Di Ciccio

*Sapienza University of Rome,
Viale Regina Elena 295, 00161 Rome, Italy*

CLAUDIO.DICICCIO@UNIROMA1.IT

Chiara Di Francescomarino

Chiara Ghidini

*FBK IRST,
Via Sommarive 18, Trento, Italy*

DFMCHIARA@FBK.EU

GHIDINI@FBK.EU

Abstract

Linear-time temporal logic on finite traces (LTL_f) is rapidly becoming a de-facto standard to produce specifications in many application domains (e.g., planning, business process management, run-time monitoring, reactive synthesis). Several studies approached the respective satisfiability problem. In this paper, we investigate the problem of extracting the unsatisfiable core in LTL_f specifications. We provide four algorithms for extracting an unsatisfiable core leveraging the adaptation of state-of-the-art approaches to LTL_f satisfiability checking. We implement the different approaches within the respective tools and carry out an experimental evaluation on a set of reference benchmarks, restricting to the unsatisfiable ones. The results show the feasibility, effectiveness, and complementarities of the different algorithms and tools.

1. Introduction

A growing body of literature evidences the adoption of linear-time temporal logic on finite traces (LTL_f) (De Giacomo & Vardi, 2013) to produce systems specifications (De Giacomo, De Masellis, & Montali, 2014). Its widespread use spans across several application domains, including business process management (BPM) for declarative process modeling (De Giacomo, De Masellis, Grasso, Maggi, & Montali, 2014; Montali et al., 2010) and mining (Cecconi, Di Ciccio, De Giacomo, & Mendling, 2018; R aim, Di Ciccio, Maggi, Mecella, & Mendling, 2014), run-time monitoring and verification (Bauer, Leucker, & Schallhart, 2010; De Giacomo, De Masellis, Grasso, et al., 2014; De Giacomo, De Masellis, Maggi, & Montali, 2020), and AI planning (Calvanese, De Giacomo, & Vardi, 2002; Camacho, Baier, Muise, & McIlraith, 2018; Camacho & McIlraith, 2019; Sohrabi, Baier, & McIlraith, 2011).

When it comes to verification techniques and tool support for LTL_f , several studies approach the LTL_f satisfiability problem via reduction to LTL (Pnueli, 1977) satisfiability on infinite traces (De Giacomo, De Masellis, & Montali, 2014), or via specific propositional satisfiability approaches (Fionda & Greco, 2018; Li, Pu, Zhang, Vardi, & Rozier, 2020). However, no efforts have been devoted thus far to the identification of the formulas that lead to unsatisfiability in LTL_f specifications, with the consequence that no support has been offered for modelers and system designers to single out the causes of possible inconsistencies.

In this paper, we tackle the challenge of extracting unsatisfiable cores (UCs) from LTL_f specifications. Investigating this problem is interesting both from practical and theoretical viewpoints. On the practical side, if unsatisfiability signals that a specification is defective, the identification of unsatisfiable cores provides the users with the opportunity to isolate the source of inconsistency and leads them to a consequent debugging. Notice that determining a reason for unsatisfiability without automated support may reveal unfeasible for a number of reasons that range from the sheer size of the formula to the lack of time and skills of the user (Schuppan, 2012, 2018). On the theoretical side, we remark that dealing with the extraction of UCs in LTL_f specifications is far from trivial. Indeed, there is neither a default pathway to move from the support provided for LTL to the one that has to be provided for LTL_f nor a default algorithm upon which this transition could be based. Concerning the *pathway*, there are two clear alternatives to address this problem: the first one extends techniques for the extraction of UCs in LTL to the case of LTL_f ; the second one exploits algorithms that directly compute satisfiability in LTL_f to provide support for the extraction of UCs. Concerning the specific *algorithms* from which to start, the two approaches present different scenarios. In the first pathway, it is easy to observe that several techniques for the extraction of UCs in LTL exist, and could be extended to the case of LTL_f . Since recent works show that a single universal best algorithm does not exist and often the systems exhibit behaviors that complement each other (Li et al., 2020; Li, Zhu, Pu, Zhang, & Vardi, 2019), choosing a single algorithm from which to start is less than obvious. In the second pathway, instead, the number of works on satisfiability in LTL_f is still rather limited.

In this work, we explore both the above pathways. For the LTL pathway, in particular, we consider algorithms belonging to two reference approaches: one based on model-checking, and the other one based on theorem proving. For the LTL_f pathway, we consider a reference state-of-the-art specific reduction to propositional satisfiability. We believe that leveraging reference state-of-the-art approaches provides a rich starting point for the investigation of the problem and the provision of effective tools for the extraction of UCs in LTL_f specifications. Our comparative evaluation shows a complementary behavior of the different algorithms.

Our contributions consist of the following:

1. Four algorithms that allow for the computation of an unsatisfiable core through the adaptation of the main reference state-of-the-art approaches for LTL and LTL_f satisfiability checking (Section 3). For the LTL pathway, we consider two satisfiability checking algorithms: one based on Binary Decision Diagrams (BDDs) (Clarke, Grumberg, & Hamaguchi, 1997), and the other based on propositional satisfiability (Biere, Heljanko, Junttila, Latvala, & Schuppan, 2006), and a theorem proving algorithm based on temporal resolution (Hustadt & Konev, 2003; Schuppan, 2016). For the native LTL_f pathway we consider the reference work of (Li et al., 2020) based on explicit search and propositional satisfiability. Note that, the techniques based on propositional satisfiability (that is, based on (Biere et al., 2006) and (Li et al., 2020)) aim at extracting an UC, which may not necessarily be the minimum one. The BDD and temporal-resolution based algorithms already allow for the extraction of a minimum unsatisfiable core.

2. An implementation of the proposed four algorithms (Section 4.1). Three implementations extend existing tools for the corresponding original algorithms; the implementation of the algorithm based on temporal resolution, instead, resorts to a pre-processing of the formula to reduce the input to the language restrictions of the original tool.
3. An experimental evaluation on a large set of reference benchmarks taken from (Li et al., 2020), restricted to the unsatisfiable ones (Sections 4.2 and 4.3). The results show an overall better time efficiency of the algorithm based on the native LTL_f pathway (Li et al., 2020). However, the cardinality of the UC extracted by the fastest approach is the smallest one in only about half of the cases. The experimental findings exhibit a complementarity of the proposed approaches on different specifications: depending on the varying number of propositional variables, number of conjuncts and degree of nesting of the temporal operators in the benchmarks, it is not rare that some of the implemented techniques achieve a noticeable performance when the other ones terminate with no result and vice-versa.

Since popular usages of LTL_f leverage past temporal operators (see e.g., the DECLARE language (van der Aalst, Pesic, & Schonenberg, 2009)), we also provide a way to handle LTL_f with past temporal operators (see Definition 2 and all the respective technical parts). This results in the same expressive power as that of pure future version, though allowing for exponentially more succinct specifications (Gabbay, 1987; Laroussinie, Markey, & Schnoebelen, 2002) and more natural encodings of LTL_f based modeling languages that make use of these operators. This objective is pursued by leveraging algorithms already supporting LTL with past temporal operators, or through a reduction to LTL_f with only future temporal operators to use existing approaches for LTL_f satisfiability checking.

The contributions highlighted above are complemented with sections where we illustrate relevant background knowledge (Section 2), related works (Section 5), conclusions and future work (Section 6).

2. Background

2.1 LTL_f Syntax and Semantics

We assume that a finite set of propositional variables \mathcal{V} is given.

A *state* μ over propositional variables in \mathcal{V} is a complete assignment of a Boolean value to variables in \mathcal{V} .

Definition 1. We say that variable $x \in \mathcal{V}$ holds in μ iff x is assigned the true value in μ , and we denote this as $\mu \models_p x$.

A *finite trace* over propositional variables in \mathcal{V} is a sequence $\pi = \mu_0, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_{n-1}$ of states. The length of a trace $\pi = \mu_0, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_{n-1}$, denoted $\text{len}(\pi)$, is n . We denote with $\pi[i]$ the i -th state μ_i , and with $\pi[i : -]$ the suffix of the finite trace starting at state i , i.e., $\pi[i : -] = \mu_i, \dots, \mu_{n-1}$. An *infinite trace* over propositional variables in \mathcal{V} is a sequence $\pi = \mu_0, \mu_1, \dots$ of states such that $\pi \in (2^{\mathcal{V}})^{\omega}$. Given two finite traces π_1 and π_2 , we indicate with $\pi_1 \pi_2^{\omega}$ the infinite *lazo-shaped* trace with prefix π_1 and trace π_2 repeated indefinitely (intuitively, to indicate that π_2 is repeated within an infinite loop).

An *LTL_f* formula φ is built over the propositional variables in \mathcal{V} by using the classical Boolean connectives “ \wedge ”, “ \vee ”, and “ \neg ”, complemented with the future temporal operators “**X**” (next), “**N**” (weak next), “**G**” (always/globally), “**F**” (eventually/finally), “**U**” (until) and “**R**” (release), and with the past temporal operators “**Y**” (yesterday), “**Z**” (weak yesterday), “**H**” (historically), “**O**” (once), “**S**” (since), and “**T**” (trigger). The **N** (resp. **Z**) operator is similar to **X** (**Y**) and solely differs in the way the final (resp. initial) state is dealt with: In the last (resp. initial) state, **X** φ (**Y** φ) is false, while **N** φ (resp. **Z** φ) is true. The grammar for building LTL_f formulas is:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi ::= & x \mid (\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2) \mid (\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) \mid \neg\varphi_1 \mid \\ & \textit{Future temporal operators} \\ & (\mathbf{X}\varphi_1) \mid (\mathbf{N}\varphi_1) \mid (\mathbf{F}\varphi_1) \mid (\mathbf{G}\varphi_1) \mid (\varphi_1 \mathbf{U}\varphi_2) \mid (\varphi_1 \mathbf{R}\varphi_2), \\ & \textit{Past temporal operators} \\ & (\mathbf{Y}\varphi_1) \mid (\mathbf{Z}\varphi_1) \mid (\mathbf{H}\varphi_1) \mid (\mathbf{O}\varphi_1) \mid (\varphi_1 \mathbf{S}\varphi_2) \mid (\varphi_1 \mathbf{T}\varphi_2), \end{aligned}$$

where $x \in \mathcal{V}$ is a propositional variable, φ_1 and φ_2 are LTL_f formulas. Classical implication and equivalence connectives can be obtained in standard ways in terms of the \wedge, \vee, \neg connectives.

Definition 2. *Given a finite trace π , the LTL_f formula φ is true in π at state $\pi[i]$ s.t. $i \in [0..\text{len}(\pi) - 1]$, denoted with $\pi, i \models \varphi$, iff:*

- $\pi, i \models x$ iff $\pi[i] \models_p x$;
- $\pi, i \models \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$ iff $\pi, i \models \varphi_1$ and $\pi, i \models \varphi_2$;
- $\pi, i \models \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$ iff $\pi, i \models \varphi_1$ or $\pi, i \models \varphi_2$;

Future temporal operators:

- $\pi, i \models \mathbf{X}\varphi$ iff $i < \text{len}(\pi) - 1$ and $\pi, i + 1 \models \varphi$;
- $\pi, i \models \mathbf{N}\varphi$ iff $i < \text{len}(\pi) - 1$ and $\pi, i + 1 \models \varphi$, or $i = \text{len}(\pi) - 1$;
- $\pi, i \models \mathbf{F}\varphi$ iff $\exists j$ with $i \leq j < \text{len}(\pi)$ such that $\pi, j \models \varphi$;
- $\pi, i \models \mathbf{G}\varphi$ iff $\forall j$ with $i \leq j < \text{len}(\pi)$ it holds $\pi, j \models \varphi$;
- $\pi, i \models \varphi_1 \mathbf{U}\varphi_2$ iff $\exists j$ with $i \leq j < \text{len}(\pi)$ such that $\pi, j \models \varphi_2$ and $\forall k$ with $i \leq k < j$ it holds that $\pi, k \models \varphi_1$;
- $\pi, i \models \varphi_1 \mathbf{R}\varphi_2$ iff $\forall j$ with $i \leq j < \text{len}(\pi)$ it holds that $\pi, j \models \varphi_2$, or $\exists j$ with $i \leq j < \text{len}(\pi)$ such that $\pi, j \models \varphi_1$ and $\forall k$ with $i \leq k \leq j$ it holds that $\pi, k \models \varphi_2$;

Past temporal operators:

- $\pi, i \models \mathbf{Y}\varphi$ iff $1 \leq i$ and $\pi, i - 1 \models \varphi$;
- $\pi, i \models \mathbf{Z}\varphi$ iff $0 = i$ or $\pi, i - 1 \models \varphi$;
- $\pi, i \models \mathbf{O}\varphi$ iff $\exists j$ with $0 \leq j \leq i$ such that $\pi, j \models \varphi$;

- $\pi, i \models \mathbf{H} \varphi$ iff $\forall j$ with $0 \leq j \leq i$ it holds that $\pi, j \models \varphi$;
- $\pi, i \models \varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2$ iff $\exists k$ with $0 \leq k \leq i$ such that $\pi, k \models \varphi_2$ and $\forall j$ with $k < j \leq i$ it holds that $\pi, j \models \varphi_1$;
- $\pi, i \models \varphi_1 \mathbf{T} \varphi_2$ iff $\forall k$ with $0 \leq k \leq i$ such that $\pi, k \models \varphi_2$ or $\exists j$ with $k < j \leq i$ such that $\pi, j \models \varphi_1$;

We say that π is a model of φ whenever $\pi, 0 \models \varphi$, and we say that φ is satisfiable, whenever there exists a π such that $\pi, 0 \models \varphi$.

Remark. Notice that the following equivalences hold: $(\varphi_1 \mathbf{T} \varphi_2) \leftrightarrow \neg(\neg\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \neg\varphi_2)$, $(\mathbf{Z} \varphi) \leftrightarrow \neg(\mathbf{Y} \neg\varphi)$, and $(\varphi_1 \mathbf{R} \varphi_2) \leftrightarrow \neg(\neg\varphi_1 \mathbf{U} \neg\varphi_2)$. In the following we leverage these equivalences whenever needed to simplify the presentation and the proofs.

The language of an LTL_f formula φ over the set of \mathcal{V} is defined as the set $\mathcal{L}(\varphi) := \{\pi \mid \pi, 0 \models \varphi\}$. Thus, the satisfiability problem for an LTL_f formula φ can be reduced to checking that $\mathcal{L}(\varphi) \neq \emptyset$.

Let us consider the formula $\mathbf{G}(a \rightarrow \mathbf{N} b)$. Trace $\pi^1 = \mu_0^1, \mu_1^1, \mu_2^1, \mu_3^1$ of length 4 such that $\mu_0^1 = \{a = \perp, b = \top\}$, $\mu_1^1 = \{a = \top, b = \perp\}$, $\mu_2^1 = \{a = \top, b = \top\}$, $\mu_3^1 = \{a = \top, b = \top\}$ satisfies the formula, while $\pi^2 = \mu_0^2, \mu_1^2, \mu_2^2, \mu_3^2$ of length 4 such that $\mu_0^2 = \{a = \perp, b = \top\}$, $\mu_1^2 = \{a = \top, b = \perp\}$, $\mu_2^2 = \{a = \top, b = \top\}$, $\mu_3^2 = \{a = \top, b = \perp\}$ is not a model since $\mu_2^2 \models_p a$ but in the next state $\mu_3^2 \not\models_p b$. On the other hand, the LTL_f formula $\mathbf{G}(a \rightarrow \mathbf{X} b)$ does not hold for both traces: π_1 does not satisfy the formula because in the last state $\mu_3^1 \models_p a$ and there is no next state; as for π_2 , $\mu_2^2 \models_p a$ but in the next state $\mu_3^2 \not\models_p b$, and $\mu_3^2 \models_p a$ but that is the last state, so no next state exists.

2.1.1 UNSATISFIABLE CORE

Given a set $\Gamma = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N\}$ of LTL_f formulas φ_i (considered in implicit conjunction, i.e. $\Gamma = \bigwedge_{i=0}^N \varphi_i$), such that Γ is not satisfiable, we say that a formula $\Phi \subseteq \Gamma$ is an *unsatisfiable core* of Γ iff Φ is unsatisfiable. A *minimal unsatisfiable core* Φ is such that each LTL_f formula $\Phi_i = \Phi \setminus \{\varphi_i\}$ for $\varphi_i \in \Phi$ is satisfiable. A *minimum unsatisfiable core* is a minimal unsatisfiable core with the smallest possible cardinality.

2.2 Checking Satisfiability of an LTL_f Formula

Checking the satisfiability of an LTL_f formula φ can be reduced to checking language emptiness of a Nondeterministic Finite state Automaton (NFA) (De Giacomo, De Masellis, & Montali, 2014). Alternative approaches for LTL_f formulas without past temporal operators (De Giacomo, De Masellis, & Montali, 2014; De Giacomo & Vardi, 2013; Fionda & Greco, 2018) address this problem by checking the satisfiability of an equi-satisfiable LTL formula over infinite traces¹ leveraging on existing well established techniques (e.g (Biere et al., 2006; Clarke et al., 1997)). These approaches proceed as follows: (i) they introduce a new fresh propositional variable $\text{end} \notin \mathcal{V}$ used to denote the trace has ended; (ii) they require that end eventually holds (i.e., $\mathbf{F} \text{end}$); (iii) they require that once end becomes true, it stays true forever (i.e. $\mathbf{G}(\text{end} \rightarrow \mathbf{X} \text{end})$); (iv) they translate the LTL_f formula φ into

1. We refer the reader to (Pnueli, 1977; Tsay & Vardi, 2021) for the semantics of LTL over infinite traces.

an LTL formula by means of a translation function $f2l(\varphi)$ that is defined recursively on the structure of the LTL_f formula φ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
f2l(x) &\mapsto x \\
f2l(\neg\varphi) &\mapsto \neg f2l(\varphi) \\
f2l(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2) &\mapsto f2l(\varphi_1) \wedge f2l(\varphi_2) \\
f2l(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) &\mapsto f2l(\varphi_1) \vee f2l(\varphi_2) \\
f2l(\mathbf{X}\varphi) &\mapsto \mathbf{X}(f2l(\varphi) \wedge \neg\text{end}) \\
f2l(\mathbf{N}\varphi) &\mapsto \mathbf{X}(f2l(\varphi) \vee \text{end}) \\
f2l(\mathbf{F}\varphi) &\mapsto \mathbf{F}(f2l(\varphi) \wedge \neg\text{end}) \\
f2l(\mathbf{G}\varphi) &\mapsto \mathbf{G}(f2l(\varphi) \vee \text{end}) \\
f2l(\varphi_1 \mathbf{U} \varphi_2) &\mapsto f2l(\varphi_1) \mathbf{U}(f2l(\varphi_2) \wedge \neg\text{end}) \\
f2l(\varphi_1 \mathbf{R} \varphi_2) &\mapsto (f2l(\varphi_1) \wedge \neg\text{end}) \mathbf{R}(f2l(\varphi_2) \vee \text{end})
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1 ((De Giacomo, De Masellis, & Montali, 2014)). *Any LTL_f formula without past temporal operators φ is satisfiable iff the LTL formula*

$$\mathbf{F}\text{end} \wedge \mathbf{G}(\text{end} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}\text{end}) \wedge f2l(\varphi) \tag{1}$$

is satisfiable.

Hereafter, we denote with $LTLf2LTL(\varphi)$ the equation (1) resulting from applying Theorem 1, i.e., $LTLf2LTL(\varphi) := \mathbf{F}\text{end} \wedge \mathbf{G}(\text{end} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}\text{end}) \wedge f2l(\varphi)$. The resulting LTL formula can then be checked for satisfiability with any state of the art LTL satisfiability checker as discussed in (De Giacomo, De Masellis, & Montali, 2014; Li et al., 2020).

Finally, there are SAT based frameworks for LTL_f satisfiability checking like e.g. (Li et al., 2020), where propositional SAT solving techniques are used to construct a transition system T_φ for a given LTL_f formula φ , and LTL_f satisfiability checking is reduced to a path search problem over the constructed transition system.

Theorem 2 ((Li et al., 2020)). *Let φ be an LTL_f formula without past temporal operators. φ is satisfiable iff there is a final state in T_φ .*

A *final state* for T_φ is any state satisfying the Boolean formula $\text{end} \wedge (\text{xnf}(\varphi))^p$, where (i) end is a new propositional atom to identify the last state of satisfying traces (similarly to (De Giacomo, De Masellis, & Montali, 2014)); (ii) $\text{xnf}(\varphi)$ is the *neXt Normal Form* of φ , an equi-satisfiable formula such that there are no Until/Release sub-formulas in the propositional atoms of $\text{xnf}(\varphi)$, built linearly from φ ; and (iii) $(\text{xnf}(\varphi))^p$ is a propositional formula over the propositional atoms of $\text{xnf}(\varphi)$. This approach uses a conflict driven algorithm, leveraging on propositional unsatisfiable cores, to perform the explicit path-search. We report hereafter some useful definitions.

Definition 3 (Conflict Sequence (Li et al., 2020)). *Given an LTL_f formula φ , a conflict sequence \mathcal{C} for the transition system T_φ is a finite sequence of sets of states such that:*

- *The initial state $s_0 = \{\varphi\}$ is in $\mathcal{C}[i]$ for $0 \leq i < |\mathcal{C}|$;*

- Every state in $\mathcal{C}[0]$ is not a final state;
- For every state $s \in \mathcal{C}[i+1]$ ($0 \leq i < |\mathcal{C}| - 1$), all the one-transition next states of s are included in $\mathcal{C}[i]$.

We call each $\mathcal{C}[i]$ a frame, and i is the frame level.

For a given conflict sequence \mathcal{C} , the set $\bigcap_{0 \leq j < i} \mathcal{C}[j]$ (for $0 \leq i < |\mathcal{C}|$) represents a set of states that cannot reach a final state of T_φ in up to i steps.

Theorem 3 ((Li et al., 2020)). *The LTL_f formula φ is unsatisfiable iff there is a conflict sequence \mathcal{C} and an $i \geq 0$ such that $\bigcap_{0 \leq j < i} \mathcal{C}[j] \subseteq \mathcal{C}[i+1]$.*

We refer the reader to (Li et al., 2020) for further details about the construction of T_φ , for the SAT based algorithm to check for the existence of a final state in T_φ , and for the correctness and termination of such algorithm.

2.2.1 SYMBOLIC APPROACHES TO CHECK LANGUAGE EMPTINESS FOR LTL

The standard symbolic approaches to check language emptiness for a given LTL formula φ (Clarke et al., 1997) consists in (i) building a Symbolic Non-Deterministic Büchi automaton for the formula φ ; (ii) compute on this automaton the set of fair states; and (iii) intersect it with the set of initial states. The resulting set, denoted with $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$, is a propositional formula whose models represent all states that are the initial state of some infinite trace that accepts φ . More precisely, let \mathcal{M}_φ be a symbolic fair transition system over a set of Boolean variables \mathcal{V}_φ that encodes the formula φ as discussed for instance in (Clarke et al., 1997). In this setting, $\mathcal{V}_\varphi = \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{V}_{B(\varphi)}$ contains all the propositional variables \mathcal{V} and the Boolean variables $\mathcal{V}_{B(\varphi)}$ (such that $\mathcal{V}_{B(\varphi)} \cap \mathcal{V} = \emptyset$) needed to encode a symbolic fair transition system representing the Büchi automaton for φ .² Let $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$ be a set of states of such symbolic fair transition system such that:

- (A1) All states in $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$ are the starting point of some path accepting φ ;
- (A2) All words accepted by φ are accepted by some path starting from $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$.

We remark that, this approach is suitable both for BDD based and for SAT based approaches to LTL satisfiability.

2.2.2 TEMPORAL RESOLUTION APPROACHES FOR LTL SATISFIABILITY

LTL satisfiability can also be addressed with temporal resolution (Fisher, 1991; Fisher, Dixon, & Peim, 2001). Temporal resolution extends classical propositional resolution with specific inference rules for each temporal operator. Temporal resolution has been implemented in solvers like e.g. TRP++ (Hustadt & Konev, 2003) showing effectiveness in analyzing unsatisfiable LTL formulas (Schuppan & Darmawan, 2011). We refer the reader to (Fisher, 1991; Fisher et al., 2001; Hustadt & Konev, 2003) for further details. We remark that, in (Schuppan, 2016), it was showed how the temporal resolution proof graph constructed to prove unsatisfiability of an LTL formula without past temporal operators could be used to compute a minimal unsatisfiable core for the respective LTL formula.

2. We refer the reader to (Clarke et al., 1997) for (i) the formal definition of symbolic fair transition system and (ii) the details on a construction of a symbolic fair transition system \mathcal{M}_φ for a given LTL formula φ .

3. Extracting unsat cores for LTL_f

We present here how four complementary state-of-the-art algorithms can be leveraged to extract unsatisfiable cores for a given set of LTL_f formulas, following two different pathways. The first pathway comprises algorithms that extend approaches originally developed for LTL, either relying on satisfiability checking or on temporal resolution; the second pathway instead extends a reference approach developed for LTL_f in a native manner.

3.1 Preliminary results

This section presents three results that enable the use of the different frameworks we will adopt in the two different pathways for LTL_f unsat core extraction: (i) the extension of the translation function $f2l(\varphi)$ presented in Section 2 to handle LTL_f past temporal operators; (ii) a translation that allows to transform any LTL_f formula with past temporal operators in an equi-satisfiable one with only future temporal operators; (iii) the use of an activation variable associated to each LTL_f formula in Γ to extract unsatisfiable cores from existing frameworks for LTL/ LTL_f satisfiability frameworks. The first enables the use of any framework for LTL satisfiability checking that supports both past and future temporal operators. The second enables the use of any framework for LTL/ LTL_f satisfiability checking that supports only future temporal operators. Finally, the latter enables for obtaining the unsatisfiable cores of Γ leveraging existing LTL/ LTL_f satisfiability frameworks by building an equi-satisfiable formula with these activation variables and looking at the activation variables that will make such equi-satisfiable formula unsatisfiable.

Extending $f2l()$ to handle past temporal operators. We make the following observation: the semantics for past temporal operators over finite traces coincides with the respective semantics on infinite traces (it refers to the prefix of the path). Thus, we can extend the $f2l(\varphi)$ encoding to handle LTL_f past temporal operators as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f2l(\mathbf{Y} \varphi) &\mapsto \mathbf{Y}(f2l(\varphi)) & f2l(\mathbf{Z} \varphi) &\mapsto \mathbf{Z}(f2l(\varphi)) \\ f2l(\mathbf{O} \varphi) &\mapsto \mathbf{O}(f2l(\varphi)) & f2l(\mathbf{H} \varphi) &\mapsto \mathbf{H}(f2l(\varphi)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f2l(\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2) &\mapsto f2l(\varphi_1) \mathbf{S} f2l(\varphi_2) \\ f2l(\varphi_1 \mathbf{T} \varphi_2) &\mapsto f2l(\varphi_1) \mathbf{T} f2l(\varphi_2) \end{aligned}$$

Basically, for past temporal operators the encoding is propagated recursively to the subformulas without modifications on the past operator itself. This extension together with Theorem 1 allows us to prove the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Any LTL_f formula φ is satisfiable iff the LTL formula*

$$\mathbf{F} \text{end} \wedge \mathbf{G}(\text{end} \rightarrow \mathbf{X} \text{end}) \wedge f2l(\varphi) \tag{2}$$

is satisfiable.

This corollary enables the use of any framework for LTL satisfiability checking that supports both past and future temporal operators.

Removing past temporal operators. Given an LTL_f formula with past operators, we can build an equi-satisfiable LTL_f formula over only future operators using the function $P2F(\varphi, \emptyset) = \langle \varphi', \Upsilon \rangle$ that takes an LTL_f formula with past operators, and builds a new formula φ' and a set of formulas Υ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
P2F(x, \Upsilon) &\mapsto \langle x, \Upsilon \rangle \\
P2F(\sim \varphi, \Upsilon) &\mapsto \langle \sim \varphi', \Upsilon' \rangle \text{ where } \langle \varphi', \Upsilon' \rangle = P2F(\varphi, \Upsilon) \\
&\text{and } \sim \in \{\neg, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G}\} \\
P2F(\varphi_1 \oplus \varphi_2, \Upsilon) &\mapsto \langle \varphi'_1 \oplus \varphi'_2, \Upsilon' \rangle \text{ where } \langle \varphi'_1, \Upsilon_1 \rangle = P2F(\varphi_1, \Upsilon), \\
&\langle \varphi'_2, \Upsilon_2 \rangle = P2F(\varphi_2, \Upsilon), \Upsilon' = \Upsilon_1 \cup \Upsilon_2, \text{ and} \\
&\oplus \in \{\wedge, \vee, \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{R}\} \\
P2F(\mathbf{Z} \varphi, \Upsilon) &\mapsto P2F(\neg \mathbf{Y} \neg \varphi, \Upsilon) \\
P2F(\mathbf{Y} \varphi, \Upsilon) &\mapsto \langle (\mathbf{Y} \varphi)^p, \Upsilon'' \rangle \text{ where } \langle \varphi', \Upsilon' \rangle = P2F(\varphi, \Upsilon), \\
&\Upsilon'' = \Upsilon' \cup \{\neg(\mathbf{Y} \varphi)^p, \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{Y} \varphi)^p \leftrightarrow \varphi')\} \\
P2F(\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2, \Upsilon) &\mapsto \langle \varphi'_2 \vee (\varphi'_1 \wedge (\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p), \Upsilon' \rangle \text{ where} \\
&\langle \varphi'_1, \Upsilon_1 \rangle = P2F(\varphi_1, \Upsilon), \langle \varphi'_2, \Upsilon_2 \rangle = P2F(\varphi_2, \Upsilon), \\
&\Upsilon' = \Upsilon_1 \cup \Upsilon_2 \cup \{\neg(\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p\} \cup \\
&\{\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}(\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p \leftrightarrow (\varphi_2 \vee (\varphi_1 \wedge (\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p)))\} \\
P2F(\varphi_1 \mathbf{T} \varphi_2, \Upsilon) &\mapsto P2F(\neg(\neg \varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \neg \varphi_2), \Upsilon)
\end{aligned}$$

Intuitively, $P2F(\varphi)$ recursively replaces each sub-formula of φ with a past temporal operator with a new fresh propositional variable, and accumulates in Υ formulas capturing the semantics of the substituted past temporal sub-formulas (e.g., a kind of monitor). In light of this translation, the following theorem follows.

Theorem 4. *Any LTL_f formula φ is satisfiable if and only if the LTL_f formula $\phi' \wedge \bigwedge_{\rho \in \Upsilon} \rho$, where $\langle \phi', \Upsilon \rangle = P2F(\varphi, \emptyset)$, is satisfiable.*

Proof. The proof is by cases on the structure of the formula. We consider only the \mathbf{Y} and \mathbf{S} past temporal operators since in all the other cases, the $P2F()$ preserves the formula and/or rewrites it leveraging on equivalences of temporal operators w.r.t. these two past operators.

- $\mathbf{Y} \varphi$.
 \implies Let's assume that there exists a path π such that $\pi, i \models \mathbf{Y} \varphi$ and $i \geq 1$ (i.e. such that $\pi, i-1 \models \varphi$). We can construct a new path π' extending the path π to consider a new fresh variable $(\mathbf{Y} \varphi)^p$ such that for $\pi'[0] \models \neg(\mathbf{Y} \varphi)^p$ and $\forall i \geq 1. \pi'[i] \models (\mathbf{Y} \varphi)^p$ iff $\pi', i-1 \models \varphi$. Thus, $\pi' \models \neg(\mathbf{Y} \varphi)^p \wedge \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{Y} \varphi)^p \leftrightarrow \varphi)$, and is such that at $i \geq 1$ it holds $\pi'[i] \models (\mathbf{Y} \varphi)^p$ by construction, thus $\pi', i \models (\mathbf{Y} \varphi)^p$.
 \Leftarrow Let's assume that there exists a path π such that $\pi \models \neg(\mathbf{Y} \varphi)^p \wedge \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{Y} \varphi)^p \leftrightarrow \varphi)$ and there exists an $i \geq 1$ such that $\pi, i \models (\mathbf{Y} \varphi)^p$. This path will be such that $\pi[0] \models \neg(\mathbf{Y} \varphi)^p$ and $\forall i. i \geq 1. \pi[i] \models (\mathbf{Y} \varphi)^p$ iff $\pi, i-1 \models \varphi$. Thus, $\pi, i \models \mathbf{Y} \varphi$.
- $\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2$
 \implies Let's assume that there exists a path π such $\pi, i \models \varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2$. This path is such

that $\exists k$ with $0 \leq k \leq i$ such that $\pi, k \models \varphi_2$ and $\forall j$ with $k < j \leq i$ it holds that $\pi, j \models \varphi_1$. We can build a new path π' extending the path π to consider a new fresh variable $(\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p$ such that $\pi'[0] \models \neg(\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p$, and $\forall i \geq 1. \pi'[i] \models (\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p$ iff $\pi', i-1 \models \varphi_2$ or $\pi', i-1 \models \varphi_1 \wedge (\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p$. Thus, $\pi' \models \neg(\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p \wedge \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}(\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p \leftrightarrow (\varphi_2 \vee (\varphi_1 \wedge (\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p)))$, and it is such that at $i \geq 0$ it holds that $\pi', i \models \varphi_2$ or $\pi', i \models \varphi_1 \wedge (\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p$ by construction, and thus $\pi', i \models \varphi_2 \vee (\varphi_1 \wedge (\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p)$.

\Leftarrow Let's assume there is a path π such that $\pi \models \neg(\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p \wedge \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}(\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p \leftrightarrow (\varphi_2 \vee (\varphi_1 \wedge (\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p)))$ and there exists an i such that $\pi, i \models (\varphi_2 \vee (\varphi_1 \wedge (\varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2)^p))$. This path will be such that $\exists k$ with $0 \leq k \leq i$ such that $\pi, k \models \varphi_2$ and $\forall j$ with $k < j \leq i$ it holds that $\pi, j \models \varphi_1$, thus $\pi, i \models \varphi_1 \mathbf{S} \varphi_2$.

□

This result enables the use of any framework for LTL/LTL_f satisfiability checking that does not support past temporal operators.

Activation variables. To compute the unsatisfiable core for a given set $\Gamma = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N\}$ of LTL_f formulas we proceed as follows. For each LTL_f formula $\varphi_i \in \Gamma$ we introduce an *activation* variable A_i , i.e., a fresh propositional variable $A_i \notin \mathcal{V}$. We then define the LTL_f formula $\Psi = \bigwedge_i (A_i \rightarrow \varphi_i)$. Let $A = \{A_1, \dots, A_N\}$ be the set of activation variables, thus the formula Ψ is over $\mathcal{V} \cup A$.

We make the following observation: the satisfiability of Γ is conditioned by the activation variables A , and we have the following theorems.

Theorem 5. *Let $\Gamma = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N\}$ be a set of LTL_f formulas over \mathcal{V} , $A = \{A_1, \dots, A_N\}$ be a set of propositional variables such that $A \cap \mathcal{V} = \emptyset$, and $\Psi = \bigwedge_i (A_i \rightarrow \varphi_i)$. Γ is unsatisfiable if and only if $\Psi \wedge \bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i$ is unsatisfiable.*

Proof. \implies Let us assume Γ unsatisfiable, this means that $\bigwedge_{\varphi_i \in \Gamma} \varphi_i$ is unsatisfiable. Let's now consider $\Psi \wedge \bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i$, and let us assume it is satisfiable. This means that there exists a path π such that all $A_i \in A$ should be true in the initial state $\pi[0]$, and as a consequence also that all $A_i \rightarrow \varphi_i$ should be satisfiable by such path π , and also that the conjunction of all φ_i should be so. However, this contradicts the hypothesis that Γ is unsatisfiable.

\Leftarrow Let's assume $\Psi \wedge \bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i$ being unsatisfiable. This means that for all subset $A' \subseteq A$ such that each $A_i \in A'$ is true and all the other variables in $A \setminus A'$ are set to false, the conjunction $\bigwedge_{\varphi_i \in \Gamma} \varphi_i$ is unsatisfiable. Let's consider Γ , and let us assume Γ is satisfiable. This means that there exists a path π such that $\pi, 0 \models \bigwedge_{\varphi_i \in \Gamma} \varphi_i$, and also that for all $\varphi_i \in \Gamma$ $\pi, 0 \models \varphi_i$. This contradicts the hypothesis that $\Psi \wedge \bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i$ is unsatisfiable. □

Theorem 6. *Let UC be a subset of A. Then the set $\Phi_{\text{UC}} = \{\varphi_i | A_i \in \text{UC}\}$ is an unsatisfiable core for Ψ iff the formula $\Psi \wedge \bigwedge_{A_i \in \text{UC}} A_i$ is unsatisfiable.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 5. □

This theorem allows us to obtain the unsatisfiable cores (UCs) of Γ by looking at the activation variables that will make Ψ unsatisfiable.

3.2 LTL_f Unsatisfiable Core Extraction via Reduction to LTL

This section provides details of how we compute LTL_f unsat core extraction via reduction to LTL satisfiability checking over infinite traces and via LTL temporal resolution. The first two algorithms we present leverage two different state-of-the-art techniques for LTL satisfiability checking, namely, (i) Binary Decision Diagrams (BDDs) (Bryant, 1992) approaches such as e.g., (Clarke et al., 1997); and (ii) SAT based approaches such as e.g., (Biere et al., 2006). The third algorithm instead is based on temporal resolution for LTL (Hustadt & Konev, 2003; Schuppan, 2016), extended to support past temporal operators.

We leverage Theorem 6 to obtain the unsatisfiable cores (UCs) of $\Gamma = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N\}$ by looking at the activation variables $A = \{A_1, \dots, A_N\}$, with $A \cap \mathcal{V} = \emptyset$, that will make the formula $\bigwedge_i (A_i \rightarrow \varphi_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i$ unsatisfiable. In the following, we show how to obtain UCs using different solving techniques.

3.2.1 BDD BASED LTL_f UNSATISFIABLE CORE EXTRACTION

Given the set $\Gamma = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N\}$ of LTL_f formulas, we build the formula Ψ as discussed in Theorem 5. Then we consider the following LTL formula built leveraging Corollary 1:

$$\Psi' = \mathbf{F} \text{end} \wedge \mathbf{G}(\text{end} \rightarrow \mathbf{X} \text{end}) \wedge \text{f2l}(\Psi) \quad (3)$$

The set $\llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket$ resulting from applying language emptiness algorithms on Ψ' (i.e. BDDTLSAT(Ψ') in Algorithm 1) is a propositional formula whose models encode all states that are the initial state of some infinite trace that accepts Ψ' , and it contains both the activation variables A and the variables \mathcal{V} together with the variables $\mathcal{V}_{\Psi'}$ needed to encode the symbolic Büchi automaton for Ψ' .

Theorem 7. *There exists a state $s \in \llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket$ and a set $C \subseteq A$ such that $s \models \bigwedge_{A_i \in C} A_i$ if and only if $\bigwedge_{i, A_i \in C} \varphi_i$ is satisfiable.*

Proof. \implies Suppose there exists a state s in $\llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket$ such that $s \models \bigwedge_{A_i \in C} A_i$. For (A1) there exists a path π starting from s satisfying Ψ' . Since $s \models A_i$ for all $A_i \in C$. Then the path π also satisfies $\bigwedge_{i, A_i \in C} \varphi_i$.

\impliedby Suppose that $\bigwedge_{i, A_i \in C} \varphi_i$ is satisfiable by some word w over the alphabet $2^{\mathcal{V}}$. We extend w to w' such that $w' \models \bigwedge_{A_i \in C} A_i$. Then w' satisfies Ψ' . For (A2) there exists a path π starting from $\llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket$ satisfying w' . Then $\pi[0]$ satisfies $\bigwedge_{A_i \in C} A_i$. \square

This theorem allows for the extraction from $\llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket$ of all possible subsets of the implicants $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N$ that are consistent or inconsistent. In particular, given the set of states $\llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket$ corresponding to the assignments to variables A , \mathcal{V} and $\mathcal{V}_{\Psi'}$, the set $\{s \in 2^A \mid \bigwedge_{i, s \in \llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket, s \models A_i} \varphi_i \text{ is unsat}\}$ can be obtained from $\llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket$ by quantifying existentially (projecting) the variables corresponding to \mathcal{V} and $\mathcal{V}_{\Psi'}$ and negating (complementing) the result.

$$\text{UCS}_{\Gamma}(A) = \neg(\exists \mathcal{V}. \exists \mathcal{V}_{\Psi'}. \llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket) \quad (4)$$

$\text{UCS}_{\Gamma}(A)$ is a propositional formula over variables in A where each satisfying assignment corresponds to an unsatisfiable core for Γ .

Algorithm 1 BDD LTL UC Extraction with (Clarke et al., 1997)

Input: Ψ', A **Output:** UC or \emptyset

- 1: $\llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket \leftarrow \text{BDDLTL SAT}(\Psi')$
 - 2: $\text{UCS} \leftarrow \neg(\exists \mathcal{V}. \exists \mathcal{V}_{\Psi'}. \llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket)$
 - 3: **if** $(\text{UCS} = \emptyset)$ **then return** \emptyset
 - 4: $\text{UC} \leftarrow \text{PICKONE}(\text{UCS})$
 - 5: **return** UC
-

Corollary 2. $SAT_{\Gamma}(A) = (\exists \mathcal{V}. \exists \mathcal{V}_{\Psi'}. \llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket) = \{s \in 2^A \mid \bigwedge_{i, s \models A_i} \varphi_i \text{ is satisfiable}\}$.
 $\text{UCS}_{\Gamma}(A) = \neg(\exists \mathcal{V}. \exists \mathcal{V}_{\Psi'}. \llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket) = \{s \in 2^A \mid \bigwedge_{i, s \models A_i} \varphi_i \text{ is unsatisfiable}\}$.

Equation (4) can be easily implemented with BDDs through the respective existential quantification and negation BDD operations (Bryant, 1992; Cimatti, Roveri, Schuppan, & Tonetta, 2007).

Algorithm 1 computes all the unsatisfiable cores UCS for a set of LTL_f formulas Γ leveraging the BDD based approach discussed in (Clarke et al., 1997). It takes in input a rewritten formula Ψ' , and it returns the empty set (\emptyset) if the formula is satisfiable, otherwise it returns an $\text{UC} \in \text{UCS} \subseteq 2^A$ such that $\forall s \in \text{UCS}. \bigwedge_{i, A_i \in s} \varphi_i$ is unsatisfiable. It uses BDDLTL SAT algorithm (Clarke et al., 1997) to compute $\llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket$. See Section 2.2.1 and (Clarke et al., 1997) for a more thorough discussion on how the check for language emptiness is performed.

Theorem 8. *Algorithm 1 returns \emptyset if the set of LTL_f formulas Γ is satisfiable, otherwise it computes an $\text{UCS} \neq \emptyset$ such that the $\forall \text{UC} \in \text{UCS}$ is $\Phi_{\text{UC}} = \{\varphi_i \mid A_i \in \text{UC}\}$ an unsatisfiable core for Γ , and then it returns an $\text{UC} \in \text{UCS}$.*

Proof. The proof is a direct consequence of Theorem 7 and Corollary 2. Indeed, BDDLTL SAT(Ψ') computes $\llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket$, i.e. the set of states such that are the starting point of some path satisfying Ψ' . If Γ is satisfiable, it means that any of its subset will be satisfiable as well, thus any possible assignment to A_i will be such that Ψ' will be satisfiable, and the set $SAT_{\Gamma}(A) \neq \emptyset$, and thus (line 3 of Algorithm 1) $\text{UCS}_{\Gamma}(A) = \emptyset$. On the other hand, if Γ is unsatisfiable, Equation 4 extracts the formula over variables A_i such that each satisfying assignment for such formula corresponds to an unsatisfiable core for Ψ' , and this in turn is an unsatisfiable core for Γ . \square

3.2.2 SAT BASED LTL_f UNSATISFIABLE CORE EXTRACTION

Determining language emptiness of an LTL formula can also be performed leveraging any off-the-shelf SAT-based bounded model checking technique equipped with completeness check (Biere et al., 2006; Claessen & Sörensson, 2012). We observe that, all these approaches can be easily extended to extract an unsatisfiable core from a conjunction of temporal constraints leveraging the ability of propositional SAT solvers to check the satisfiability of a propositional formula ψ under a set of assumptions specified in form of literals $L = \{l_j\}$, i.e., checking the satisfiability of the formula $\psi' = \psi \wedge \bigwedge_{l_j \in L} l_j$. If ψ' turns out to be

Algorithm 2 SAT BMC LTL UC Extraction with (Biere et al., 2006)

Input: Ψ', A **Output:** UC or \emptyset

```
1:  $k \leftarrow 0$ 
2: while (True) do
3:    $res, UC \leftarrow \text{SAT\_ASSUME}(\text{EncC}(\Psi', k), A^{[0]})$ 
4:   if ( $res = \text{UNSAT}$ ) then return UC
5:    $res \leftarrow \text{SAT}(\text{EncP}(\Psi', k) \wedge \bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i^{[0]})$ 
6:   if ( $res = \text{SAT}$ ) then return  $\emptyset$ 
7:    $k \leftarrow k + 1$ 
```

unsatisfiable, then the SAT solver can return a subset $UC \subseteq L$ such that $\psi \wedge \bigwedge_{l_j \in UC} l_j$ is still unsatisfiable. SAT-based bounded model checking (Biere, Cimatti, Clarke, Strichman, & Zhu, 2003) encodes a finite path of length k with a propositional formula over the set of variables representing the \mathcal{V} at each time step from 0 to k . To check for completeness, they typically encode the fact that the path cannot be extended with states not yet visited (Biere et al., 2006). We remark that, in model checking one considers both a transition system (i.e. a model) and a temporal logic formula. However, since we are concerned on satisfiability of LTL formulas only, we consider it the universal model (i.e. if \mathcal{V} is the set of propositional variables, the initial set of states is $2^{\mathcal{V}}$, and the transitions relation is equal to $2^{\mathcal{V}} \times 2^{\mathcal{V}}$), which corresponds to encode symbolically both the initial set of states, and the transitions relation with \top .

The approach proceeds as illustrated in Algorithm 2 that takes in input the rewritten formula Ψ' and computes an unsatisfiable core for a set of LTL_f formulas Γ leveraging the bounded model checking encoding defined in (Biere et al., 2006). It uses a *completeness formula* $EncC(\phi, k)$ that is unsatisfiable iff ϕ is unsatisfiable, and a *witness formula* $EncP(\phi, k)$ that is satisfiable iff the LTL formula ϕ is satisfiable by a path of length k .³ For increasing value of k , we submit the SAT solver a propositional encoding up to the considered k of a path satisfying the formula Ψ' under the assumption that all the literals in A are true in the initial time step ($A^{[0]} = \bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i^{[0]}$). This is achieved through the call $\text{SAT_ASSUME}(\text{EncC}(\Psi', k), A^{[0]})$ that checks the satisfiability of $EncC(\Psi', k)$ under the assumptions that the literals in $A^{[0]}$ are true. When this call proves the formula unsatisfiable, it is straightforward to get the corresponding unsatisfiable core from the SAT solver in terms of a subset of the variables in $A^{[0]}$, and we are done with the search. On the other hand, if this call returns SAT, we cannot conclude the LTL formula being unsatisfiable. In this case, we need to check if it is satisfiable, i.e. if there exists a lasso-shaped path of length k that satisfies the propositional formula $EncP(\Psi', k) \wedge \bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i^{[0]}$. This is achieved with the simple call $\text{SAT}(\text{EncP}(\Psi', k) \wedge \bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i^{[0]})$. If such call returns SAT the LTL formula is satisfiable, and we are done. Otherwise, we increase k and we iterate.

The Algorithm 2 takes in input the rewritten formula Ψ' and returns the empty set (\emptyset) if the formula is satisfiable, otherwise it returns a subset $UC \subseteq A$ such that $\bigwedge_{i, A_i \in UC} \varphi_i$ is unsatisfiable.

3. We refer the reader to (Biere et al., 2006) for details on how the $EncP(\phi, k)$ and $EncC(\phi, k)$ propositional formulas are constructed.

Lemma 1. $EncP(\Psi', k) \wedge \bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i^{[0]}$ is satisfiable iff there exists a lasso shaped witness $\pi[0, l-1]\pi[l, k]^\omega$ such that $\pi \models \bigwedge_{i, A_i \in A} \varphi_i$.

Proof. \implies Let $\pi[0, k]$ be a finite path corresponding to a satisfying assignment for $EncP(\Psi', k) \wedge \bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i^{[0]}$. From assumption (A1) such path should be such that $\exists l$ s.t. $0 \leq l \leq k \wedge \pi[0, l-1]\pi[l, k]^\omega \models \Psi'$. With $\bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i^{[0]}$ and the construction of Ψ' we conclude that the projection of $\pi[0, l-1]\pi[l, k]^\omega$ onto \mathcal{V} satisfies $\bigwedge_{i, A_i \in A} \varphi_i$.

\impliedby Let us assume a lasso shaped witness $\pi[0, l-1]\pi[l, k]^\omega$ for $\bigwedge_{i, A_i \in A} \varphi_i$. Any extension to $\pi[0, l-1]\pi[l, k]^\omega$ such that $\bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i^{[0]}$ is a witness for Ψ' . As a consequence, $EncP(\Psi', k) \wedge \bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i^{[0]}$ is satisfiable. \square

Lemma 2. Let $UC \subseteq A$, if $EncC(\Psi', k)$ is unsatisfiable under assumption $\bigwedge_{A_i \in UC} A_i^{[0]}$, then $\bigwedge_{i, A_i \in UC} \varphi_i$ is unsatisfiable.

Proof. Let $EncC(\Psi', k)$ be unsatisfiable under assumption $\bigwedge_{A_i \in UC} A_i^{[0]}$. Let's assume there exists a witness π of $\bigwedge_{i, A_i \in UC} \varphi_i$. We can extend such path π to a path π' over variables $\mathcal{V} \cup A$ such that $\bigwedge_{A_i \in UC} A_i^{[0]}$ is a witness for Ψ' , and this contradicts the assumption (A2). \square

Theorem 9. Algorithm 2 returns \emptyset if the set of LTL_f formulas Γ is satisfiable, otherwise it returns an $UC \neq \emptyset$ such that the set $\Phi_{UC} = \{\varphi_i | A_i \in UC\}$ is an unsatisfiable core for Γ .

Proof. The proof is a direct consequence of Lemma 1 and Lemma 2. \square

The algorithm above uses the (Biere et al., 2006) encoding for both $EncC(\Psi', k)$ and $EncP(\Psi', k)$. We remark that the schema can also be easily adapted to leverage other algorithms e.g. based on k -liveness (Claessen & Sörensson, 2012) or liveness to safety (Biere, Artho, & Schuppan, 2002) both relying on the IC3 (Bradley, 2011) algorithm. What intuitively changes is the propositional encoding of the LTL formula and the calls to the SAT solver to reflect the IC3 algorithm.

3.2.3 TEMPORAL RESOLUTION BASED LTL_f UNSATISFIABLE CORE EXTRACTION

We can extract the unsat core of a set of LTL_f formulas $\Gamma = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N\}$ via LTL temporal resolution (Hustadt & Konev, 2003) (TR) leveraging the results previously discussed in this paper and existing LTL temporal resolution engines equipped for temporal unsat core extraction (Schuppan, 2016). The approach is as follows. First we build the formula $\Psi = \bigwedge_i (A_i \rightarrow \varphi_i)$. Second, we apply Theorem 4 to remove the past temporal operators. Third, we leverage Theorem 1 to convert the LTL_f formula into an equi-satisfiable LTL formula. Finally, the resulting LTL formula is given in input to any LTL temporal resolution solver suitable to extract a temporal unsatisfiable core (e.g. TRP++ (Schuppan, 2016)) by enforcing the activation variables to hold (i.e. enforcing $\bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i$ in conjunction with the resulting LTL formula). If the LTL temporal resolution solver responds UNSAT, looking at the activation variables in the extracted temporal unsatisfiable core we get an unsat core of the original set of LTL_f formulas.

Algorithm 3 TR LTL UC Extraction with (Schuppan, 2016)

Input: Ψ', A **Output:** UC or \emptyset

- 1: $\langle \phi', \Gamma \rangle \leftarrow \text{P2F}(\Psi', \emptyset)$
 - 2: $\psi \leftarrow \phi' \wedge \bigwedge_{\varphi \in \Gamma} \varphi \wedge \bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i$
 - 3: $res, UC \leftarrow \text{TRP}++(\psi)$
 - 4: **if** ($res = \text{UNSAT}$) **then return** $UC|_A$
 - 5: **return** \emptyset
-

Algorithm 3 computes an unsatisfiable core for a set of LTL_f formulas Γ leveraging a LTL temporal resolution prover equipped for extracting an unsatisfiable core like, e.g., TRP++ (Schuppan, 2016). It takes in input the formula Ψ' and returns the empty set (\emptyset) if the formula is satisfiable, otherwise it returns a subset $UC \subseteq A$ such that $\bigwedge_{i, A_i \in UC} \varphi_i$ is unsatisfiable. It uses the TRP++ algorithm (Schuppan, 2016) to compute the unsatisfiable core UC, and then it extracts from this only the formulas corresponding to $A_i \in A$ (denoted in the algorithm with $UC|_A$). The TRP++(ψ) algorithm discussed in (Schuppan, 2016) first converts the LTL formula ψ into an equi-satisfiable set of Separated Normal Form (SNF) (Fisher, 1991) clauses C , and then it checks whether this set is satisfiable or not, and in case of unsatisfiability it computes an unsatisfiable core $C^{uc} \subseteq C$ and returns it by applying a reconstruction w.r.t. the original set of LTL formulas. We refer the reader to (Schuppan, 2016) for the details of the algorithm and for the respective proof of correctness of the TRP++ algorithm.

Theorem 10. *Algorithm 3 returns \emptyset if the set of LTL_f formulas Γ is satisfiable, otherwise it returns an $UC \neq \emptyset$ such that the set $\Phi_{UC} = \{\varphi_i | A_i \in UC\}$ is an unsatisfiable core for Γ .*

Proof. If the set Γ is satisfiable, then the formula $\psi = \phi' \wedge \bigwedge_{\varphi \in \Gamma} \varphi \wedge \bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i$ where $\langle \phi', \Gamma \rangle = \text{P2F}(\Psi', \emptyset)$, is satisfiable since it leverages on transformations that preserve satisfiability (as proved in Theorems 4,1 and 6). Thus also TRP++(ψ) returns sat, and the algorithm returns \emptyset to indicate the formula is satisfiable.

On the other hand, if Γ is unsatisfiable, then also $\psi = \phi' \wedge \bigwedge_{\varphi \in \Gamma} \varphi \wedge \bigwedge_{A_i \in A} A_i$ is unsatisfiable. Thus TRP++(ψ) returns UNSAT, together with an unsatisfiable core for the formula ψ . We remark that, given the structure of ψ , each A_i will be then converted into an SNF clause $c_{A_i} = A_i$ which thus will be part of the set of SNF clauses C used internally by TRP++. Since this formula is unsatisfiable, the TRP++ algorithm will extract an unsat core $UC = C^{uc} \subseteq C$ such that C^{uc} is unsatisfiable. C^{uc} among other clauses will contain some c_{A_i} for $A_i \in A$ that will correspond to the respective formulas in Γ (thanks also to Theorem 6), and thus this set will represent an unsatisfiable core for Γ . \square

3.3 LTL_f Unsatisfiable Core Extraction via Native SAT

We adapted the native SAT based LTL_f satisfiability approach discussed in (Li et al., 2020) to extract the unsatisfiable core. Since the original approach for LTL_f satisfiability checking in (Li et al., 2020) was not supporting past temporal operators, we rely on Theorem 4 to

Algorithm 4 SAT LTL_f UC Extraction with (Li et al., 2020)

Input: Ψ, A **Output:** UC or \emptyset

- 1: $\langle \phi', \Upsilon \rangle \leftarrow \text{P2F}(\Psi, \emptyset)$
 - 2: $\psi \leftarrow \phi' \wedge \bigwedge_{\rho \in \Upsilon} \varphi$
 - 3: $res \leftarrow \text{SATLTLF}(\psi, A)$
 - 4: **if** ($res = \text{UNSAT}$) **then return** $\text{SAT}_{\text{SOLVER}}.\text{GET_UC}(A)$
 - 5: **return** \emptyset
-

get rid of the past temporal operators obtaining an equi-satisfiable LTL_f formula without past temporal operators.

The algorithm originally discussed in (Li et al., 2020) can be extended to extract the unsat core of a set $\Gamma = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N\}$ of LTL_f formulas as follows (see Algorithm 4). First, we build the LTL_f formula $\Psi = \bigwedge_i (A_i \rightarrow \varphi_i)$. Then, we apply Theorem 4 to get an equi-satisfiable formula. The resulting formula (without past temporal operators) is then passed in input to the algorithm SATLTLF discussed in (Li et al., 2020). The SATLTLF algorithm in (Li et al., 2020) has been modified to enforce that each call to the SAT solver under assumption performed in the algorithm assumes also that the activation variables A are all true. We refer the reader to (Li et al., 2020) for a thorough description of the algorithm (which is out of the scope of this paper). We remark that, the only modifications performed to the algorithm consists in adding the assumptions on the activation variables to the already considered assumptions in each call to satisfiability under assumption already performed within the algorithm itself. Intuitively, the algorithm in (Li et al., 2020) constructs a *conflict sequence* $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}[0], \dots, \mathcal{C}[k]$ (i.e., sequences of states that cannot reach a final state of the transition system T_ϕ constructed from the formula ϕ given in input) extracted from the unsat cores resulting from different propositional unsatisfiable queries performed in the algorithm itself. As per Theorem 3 the input LTL_f formula is unsatisfiable iff there exists a conflict sequence \mathcal{C} and an integer $i \geq 0$ such that $\bigcap_{0 \leq j \leq i} \mathcal{C}[j] \subseteq \mathcal{C}[i+1]$. When the SATLTLF algorithm returns UNSAT, we extract from the last element of the computed conflict sequence (i.e. $\mathcal{C}[i+1]$) the unsat core $\text{UC} \subseteq A$, and the set $\Gamma' = \{\varphi_i \mid A_i \in \text{UC}\}$ is an unsat core for Γ leveraging on Theorem 3.

Theorem 11. *Algorithm 4 returns \emptyset if the set of LTL_f formulas Γ is satisfiable, otherwise it returns an $\text{UC} \neq \emptyset$ such that the set $\Phi_{\text{UC}} = \{\varphi_i \mid A_i \in \text{UC}\}$ is an unsatisfiable core for Γ .*

Proof. If the set Γ is satisfiable, then the formula $\psi = \phi' \wedge \bigwedge_{\rho \in \Upsilon} \varphi$, where $\langle \phi', \Upsilon \rangle = \text{P2F}(\Psi, \emptyset)$, is also satisfiable since it leverages on transformations that preserve satisfiability (as proved in Theorems 4,1 and 6). Thus leveraging the correctness and completeness of the SATLTLF (Li et al., 2020), then SATLTLF will report sat, and in turn the Algorithm 4 will report \emptyset to indicate the set Γ is satisfiable.

On the other hand, if Γ is unsatisfiable, then also the formula $\psi = \phi' \wedge \bigwedge_{\rho \in \Upsilon} \varphi$ will be unsatisfiable. From Theorem 3, then the SATLTLF algorithm will build a conflict sequence \mathcal{C} and there exists an integer $i \geq 0$ such that $\bigcap_{0 \leq j \leq i} \mathcal{C}[j] \subseteq \mathcal{C}[i+1]$, $\mathcal{C}[i+1]$ will represent the states such that from there it is not possible to reach a final state for T_ψ , i.e. there is no path starting from these states that will satisfy ψ , i.e. all the paths from this states will not satisfy ψ .

Thus, for all state $s \in \mathcal{C}[i + 1]$ there exists a set $C \subseteq A$ such that $s \models \bigwedge_{A_i \in C} A_i$, and the formula $\bigwedge_{i, A_i \in C} \varphi_i$ will be unsatisfiable, and the set C corresponds to an unsat core extracted from $\mathcal{C}[i + 1]$ by construction of the SATLTLF algorithm (see (Li et al., 2020) for further details). \square

3.4 Discussion

We observe that all the described approaches extract one unsat core, though not necessarily a minimum/minimal one. Algorithm 1 could also be easily extended to get the minimal UC from the UCS set of all possible unsatisfiable cores for the given formula. For the SAT based approaches, a minimum/minimal unsat core could be extracted by leveraging the ability of the SAT solver to get a minimum/minimal propositional unsat core. Similarly, the temporal resolution solver could be instrumented to get a minimum/minimal core. In all cases, it might be possible to get a minimum/minimal one with specialized solvers and/or with additional search. However, this is left for future work.

4. Experimental Evaluation

In this section, we provide details on the implementations of the proposed algorithms (Section 4.1), and then we describe the setup and the data sets used for the experimental evaluation (Section 4.2). We conclude with a report on the results alongside an examination thereof (Section 4.3).

4.1 Implementation of the Algorithms

We implemented Algorithms 1 and 2 as extensions of the NUSMV model checker (Cimatti et al., 2002) exploiting the built-in support for past temporal operators, the $f2l(\varphi)$ conversion, and Eq. (2). In particular, we enhanced (i) the BDD-based algorithm for LTL language emptiness (Clarke et al., 1997) and (ii) the SAT-based approaches (Biere et al., 2006). We shall henceforth refer to these tools as NUSMV-B and NUSMV-S, respectively. The source code for the extended version of NUSMV with these implementations is available at <https://github.com/roveri-marco/ltlfuc>.

We implemented Algorithm 4 within an extended version of the AALTAF tool (Li et al., 2020), with a novel dedicated extension to support past temporal operators through $P2F(\varphi, \emptyset)$. The source code for our extended version of AALTAF is available at <https://github.com/roveri-marco/aaltaf-uc>.

We implemented Algorithm 3 as a toolchain. First, it calls our variant of AALTAF to generate a file that is suitable for the TRP++ temporal resolution solver (Hustadt & Konev, 2003) using the $f2l(\varphi)$ conversion as per Eq. (2) and $P2F(\varphi, \emptyset)$. Then, the resulting file is submitted to TRP++, and finally the generated UC is post-processed to extract the auxiliary variables A . For the experiments, we used the latest version of TRP++ downloadable from <http://www.schuppan.de/viktor/trp++uc/>.

Table 1: Benchmarks

Family	Problems	Clauses			Family	Problems	Clauses		
		Min.	Max.	Avg.			Min.	Max.	Avg.
LTL-as-LTLf/acacia/demo-v3/demo-v3:cl	11	9	49	29.00	LTL-as-LTLf/anzu/genbuf/genbuf:cl	20	58	461	231.50
LTL-as-LTLf/alaska/lift/lift	17	13	29	21.00	LTL-as-LTLf/forobots	38	6	6	6.00
LTL-as-LTLf/alaska/lift/lift:b	17	12	32	22.47	LTL-as-LTLf/rozier/counter/counter	19	6	24	15.00
LTL-as-LTLf/alaska/lift/lift:b:f	17	12	32	22.47	LTL-as-LTLf/rozier/counter/counterCarry	19	8	26	17.00
LTL-as-LTLf/alaska/lift/lift:b:f:l	17	14	50	32.47	LTL-as-LTLf/rozier/counter/counterCarryLinear	19	8	8	8.00
LTL-as-LTLf/alaska/lift/lift:b:l	17	14	50	32.47	LTL-as-LTLf/rozier/counter/counterLinear	18	6	6	6.00
LTL-as-LTLf/alaska/lift/lift:f	17	13	29	21.00	LTL-as-LTLf/rozier/formulas/n	30	1	4	1.33
LTL-as-LTLf/alaska/lift/lift:f:l	17	15	47	31.00	LTL-as-LTLf/schuppan/O1formula	27	4	1002	224.00
LTL-as-LTLf/alaska/lift/lift:l	17	15	47	31.00	LTL-as-LTLf/schuppan/O2formula	27	2	1000	222.00
LTL-as-LTLf/anzu/amba/amba:c	17	75	351	213.47	LTL-as-LTLf/schuppan/phlrl	13	5	101	30.85
LTL-as-LTLf/anzu/amba/amba:cl	17	77	369	223.47	LTLf-specific/benchmarks:ltlf/LTLfRandomConjunction/C100	500	118	154	131.50
LTL-as-LTLf/anzu/genbuf/genbuf	20	1	1	1.00	LTLf-specific/benchmarks:ltlf/LTLfRandomConjunction/V20	425	13	146	81.54
LTL-as-LTLf/anzu/genbuf/genbuf:c	20	57	441	221.00	Overall	1377	1	1002	97.63

4.2 The Experimental Setup

For the experimental evaluation, we considered all the unsatisfiable problems reported in (Li et al., 2020), for a total of 1377 problems. To select the specifications of interest to our analysis out of the original testbed, we included only those for which at least one solver declared the set was unsatisfiable and no other tool contradicted the result, as per the experimental data reported by Li et al. To compute the Γ set, we considered all the top-level conjuncts of each formula in the benchmark set. For every benchmark, we used the variant of the formula in the AALTAF format as an input. For the other tools but AALTAF, we implemented within AALTAF dedicated converters to the respective tool input format.

We carried out the experimental evaluation considering the four implementations provided by NUSMV-B, NUSMV-S, our variant of AALTAF, and the TRP++ toolchain. We ran all experiments on an Ubuntu 18.04.5 LTS machine, 8-Core Intel([®]) Xeon([®]) at 2.2 GHz, equipped with 64 GB of RAM. We set a memory occupation limit of 4 GB, and a CPU usage limit of 10 min. Additionally, we considered $k = 50$ as the maximum depth for NUSMV-S, and we ran NUSMV-B with the BDD dynamic variable reordering mode active (Felt, York, Brayton, & Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, 1993) to dynamically reduce the size of the BDDs and thus save space over time.⁴ Whenever the wall-clock timing reported by the implemented technique fell under the lowest sensitivity of the tool (thus being represented as 3,500,565,600.000), we replaced the timing with the minimum non-zero timing reported overall (3.78×10^{-4}).

Finally, we have categorized the benchmarking specifications into 25 families, according to their characteristics and provenance. Table 1 shows the number of specifications per family, along with the minimum, maximum and average number of clauses within. In particular, the *LTLf-specific/benchmarks/LTLfRandomConjunction/V20* and *LTLf-specific/benchmarks/LTLfRandomConjunction/C100* benchmarks are conjunctions of formulas, each selected randomly from standard patterns. They are characterized by a *temporal depth* (i.e., the maximum nesting of temporal operators) of up to 3, with 20 propositional variables. The number of conjunctions ranges from 20 to 100 for the former, and from 10 to 100 for the latter. The *LTL-as-LTLf/rozier/counter/** benchmarks are characterized by

4. These settings are motivated by similar choices performed in the experimental evaluations carried out in (Cimatti et al., 2007; Schuppan, 2016).




Figure 1: Cactus plots for the whole experimental evaluation.

having a small number of propositional variables, and temporal formulas of different temporal depths (from 2 to 20). The benchmarks in *LTL-as-LTLf/schuppan/O1Formula* are characterized by a large number of propositional variables (from 1 to 1000) with temporal formulas of small depths (2 to 3) and different operators. The benchmarks in *LTL-as-LTLf/schuppan/O2Formula* are big conjunctions of formulas of the form $\mathbf{GF} a_i \leftrightarrow a_j$ with $a_i \neq a_j$.

All the material to reproduce the experiments reported hereafter is available at <https://github.com/roveri-marco/ltlfuc/archive/refs/tags/jair-release-v0.zip>.

4.3 The Results

In the experimental evaluation, we considered the following evaluation metrics: (i) the result of the check (expecting all the tools to return unsatisfiability and extract an unsatisfiable core if no resource limit is reached); (ii) the search time to compute and return an unsatisfiable core; (iii) the size of the computed unsatisfiable core. We remark that none of the presented algorithms strives for finding a minimum unsatisfiable core. The approach based on TRP++ may be used to that end, and NuSMV-B could in principle be easily adapted to select from the intermediate computed set UCS a minimum unsatisfiable core (as discussed previously). Nevertheless, we pick the first returned UC for all tools so as to have a fair comparison among them.

The first result is that, as expected, all the tools reported consistent output when terminating without reaching a resource limit (being it memory, time or search-space depth). In other words, for all the considered benchmarks it was never the case that an algorithm declared the specification as satisfiable. This outcome is in line with the original findings in (Li et al., 2020). However, we remark that individual algorithms could extract different unsatisfiable cores among the diverse possible ones.

Concerning the computation time, Fig. 1(a) shows the number of problems solved by each algorithm by the 10 min timeout on the abscissae and the time taken to solve them cumulatively on the ordinates. Alongside the aforementioned tools, the figure illustrates the performance of the *virtual best*, that is the minimum time required for each solved instance among the four implementations. Fig. 1(b) is similar to Fig. 1(a), although it excludes the timings for the NuSMV-S runs that reached $k = 50$ albeit being unable to prove




Figure 2: Scatter plots comparing search timings for each algorithm pair.

unsatisfiability (*unknown* answer) and thus construct an unsatisfiable core. In this figure, then, the virtual best considers only the cases where the tool computed an unsatisfiable core. Both plots show that AALTAF outperforms the other implementations in the majority of cases, although the tail of the virtual-best curve on the right-hand side of both plots exhibits an influence from TRP++ and NuSMV-B, thus witnessing complementarity of the proposed approaches. In the remainder of this section, we investigate the comparative assessment more in depth. The overall minimum, maximum, average, and median best timings to return an UC are 0.0004 s, 198.5054 s, 1.4931 s and 0.0282 s, respectively.




Figure 3: Pie chart reporting how the different solvers contributed to the virtual best (a); Contribution of each solver to the virtual best per benchmark family (b), i.e. for each family we report the number of times each algorithm was performing best.

Figure 2 illustrates pairwise comparisons of time efficiency of the considered tools. In particular, Fig. 2(a) compares AALTAF with NUSMV-B, Fig. 2(b) compares AALTAF with NUSMV-S, Fig. 2(c) compares AALTAF with TRP++, Fig. 2(d) compares NUSMV-B with NUSMV-S, Fig. 2(e) compares NUSMV-B with TRP++, and finally Fig. 2(f) compares NUSMV-S with TRP++. Figure 2(c), for instance, shows that AALTAF outperforms TRP++: most of the points, indeed, are located above the diagonal, thus indicating that AALTAF requires less time than TRP++ to return the unsatisfiable cores. The plot also shows that TRP++ exceeds the timeout in several cases (points on the red line marked with “600 sec. timeout”). Furthermore, we observe that TRP++ operates a pre-processing phase on the input specification prior to the actual identification of UCs. If it manages to reduce the given set of conjuncts to false at that stage, it stops the computation and raises an alert. The points lying on the line marked with “Input formula simplified to False” indicate those cases. Notice that, this simplification occurred in 26 cases overall, as depicted in Figs. 2(c), (e) and (f). Moreover, NUSMV-B, TRP++, NUSMV-S, and AALTAF reached the timeout overall in 1158, 624, 358 and 85 cases, respectively. NUSMV-S was able to conclude that the formula was unsatisfiable only in 53 cases, and returned an unknown answer (i.e., it reached $k = 50$ without being able to decide on unsatisfiability) in 985 cases. We can conclude that, in terms of computation time, AALTAF outperforms the other three tools, NUSMV-B requires less computation time than NUSMV-S and TRP++ in the majority of cases, and TRP++ reveals slightly faster and less subject to timeouts than NUSMV-S.




Figure 4: Number of conjuncts in Γ and respective computation time (in seconds) for each algorithm.

Henceforth, we consider the sole cases in which the tools were able to return an UC within the given resource limits – thus excluding timeouts, unknown answers and simplifications to false. Figure 3 focuses on computation time: (i) the pie chart in Fig. 3(a) gives an overview of the number of tests in which a tool was the fastest, and (ii) the stacked bar chart in Fig. 3(b) illustrates the results grouped by benchmark family.

The pie chart in Fig. 3(b) confirms that AALTAF is the most time-efficient tool as evidenced by its 1260 fastest runs, followed by NuSMV-B (81), and NuSMV-S (8). In 28 cases, no tool was able to return an unsatisfiable core. As shown by Fig. 3(b), NuSMV-B turned out to find the UC in minimum time with the *LTL-as-LTLf/rozier/counter/**, benchmark families. Moreover, the plot also shows that the problems of the *LTL-as-LTLf/schuppan/O2Formula* benchmark family are the most challenging ones for all the implemented techniques. Indeed, 14 out of the 28 problems that were not solved by any tools belong to this benchmark family. Moreover, the analysis per benchmark family (see Fig. 3(b)) confirms the superiority in terms of time efficiency of AALTAF in many benchmark families.

In order to further inspect the correlation between the time performance of the tools and the type of problems solved, we analyzed the relationship between the number of conjuncts of the problems and the corresponding computation time. Figure 4 plots the number of conjuncts in Γ (i.e., its cardinality) against the respective computation time (in seconds) for each of the considered algorithms. Figure 5 isolates the points stemming from three families in particular: *LTLf-specific/benchmarks/LTLFRandomConjunction/V20* (Fig. 5(a)), *LTLf-specific/benchmarks/LTLFRandomConjunction/C100* (Fig. 5(b)), and *LTL-as-LTLf/schuppan/O1Formula* (Fig. 5(c)). The plots show that a relationship exists between the number of LTL_f clauses and the computation time for all the four tools: the required time overall increases when the number of clauses increases. However, the number of clauses is not the only factor affecting the computation time. For instance, for the *LTLf-specific/benchmarks/LTLFRandomConjunction/C100* benchmark family (Fig. 5(b)), the computation time varies independently of the number of conjuncts, which ranges in a short interval (118 to 154 clauses, as per Table 1). Also, we can observe that, with this




Figure 5: Number of conjuncts in Γ and respective computation time (in seconds) for each algorithm for three categories: (a) *LTLf-specific/benchmarks/LTLFRandomConjunction/V20*, (b) *LTLf-specific/benchmarks/LTLFRandomConjunction/C100*, and (c) *LTL-as-LTLf/schuppan/O1Formula*.

benchmark family, neither NuSMV-S nor NuSMV-B could return an UC under the imposed experimental resource constraints, while AALTAF appears to be faster than TRP++, following the general trend. Figures 5(a) and 5(c) illustrate the different rapidity with which curves increase with the number of conjuncts: the sharpest one is associated to NuSMV-B, followed by TRP++ and NuSMV-S (the latter performing better than the former with smaller sets of conjuncts, though, as depicted in Fig. 5(c)). The most gradual upward trend belongs to the curve of AALTAF.

As far as the cardinality of the extracted UCs is concerned, Fig. 6 depicts the result of our analysis in the different benchmarks families. As shown in the pie chart of Fig. 6, we report that AALTAF, TRP++, NuSMV-B, and NuSMV-S extract UCs that are the smallest in size⁵ in 690, 543, 104 and 12 cases, respectively. The overall minimum, maximum, average, and median cardinality of the smallest computed UCs were 1, 74, 6.615, and 4, respectively.

We observe that for the *LTL-as-LTLf/rozier/counter/** benchmarks, NuSMV-B computes the unsatisfiable core with the smallest size in the majority of cases. Notice that, it is also the one that most often performs best in terms of search time (see Fig. 3(b)). NuSMV-B is also able to obtain the smallest UC with most of the benchmarks within the *LTL-as-LTLf/schuppan/O2formula* family. On all other benchmarks, AALTAF outperforms the other algorithms, and with the *LTLf-specific/** benchmarks, TRP++ is the second best solver to find the smallest UCs after AALTAF. These results suggest that NuSMV-B could be preferred on benchmarks with fewer propositional variables and larger temporal depth. However, the SAT based approaches seem to work better on benchmarks with a higher number of propositional variables that are not always directly correlated with one another. Indeed, in these last cases, BDDs may suffer a blow-up in size due to the canonicity of the representation (BDD dynamic variable ordering could help though to a limited extent (Felt

5. Notice that, by “smallest” we mean the unsatisfiable core of smallest cardinality among the ones computed by the solvers. Notice that, the smallest UC does not necessarily correspond to the minimum one, as discussed when presenting the algorithms. Also, we remark that when two solvers return an UC of the same size, we associate the best result to the tool that took the lowest time to return it.




Figure 6: Number of benchmarks in which the solver returned an unsatisfiable core of the smallest size (a) for the entire set of benchmarks, and (b) per benchmarks family.

et al., 1993)). Notice that, all solvers were not capable of dealing with most of the the big conjunctions of formulas in *LTL-as-LTLf/schuppan/O2Formula* (the corresponding tallest stacked bar in Fig. 6 is labeled as “None”, indeed).

Figure 7 plots the pairwise comparison between different tools on the subset of the cases where both approaches were able to compute the UC. For instance, Fig.7(a) compares the cardinality of the UCs returned by AALTAF and the cardinality of the UCs returned by NuSMV-B. The plot shows that NuSMV-B UCs are smaller than the ones returned by AALTAF: most of the points are indeed located below the diagonal. The intensity of the points represents the number of cases for which the two algorithms returned UCs with the specific cardinalities corresponding to the coordinates of the point in the plot. Overall, we can observe that when a solution is returned, the cardinality of the UCs returned by TRP++ and NuSMV-B is often lower than the cardinality of the UCs returned by AALTAF.

To conclude, we remark that these results (i) evidence an overall better performance of AALTAF both in terms of time efficiency and cardinality of the extracted UCs, and (ii) emphasise a complementarity of the proposed approaches. Table 2 summarizes the findings above. Observe that none of the algorithms outperforms all the others on every benchmark. For example, NuSMV-S and NuSMV-B end up in a timeout and return an unknown answer in considerably many cases, so that a number of problems are solved by only one of them. AALTAF does not always turn out to return the smallest UC: in a number of cases, TRP++, NuSMV-B and NuSMV-S extract UCs of a lower cardinality, excelling




Figure 7: Scatter plots comparing the cardinality of computed UCs for each algorithm pair.

in particular in those cases in which AALTAF ends in a timeout. A deeper investigation of the characteristics that lead to such behaviors paves the path for future work.

5. Related work

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first research endeavour aimed at extracting unsatisfiable cores for LTL_f . In the following, we review the most relevant literature concerning LTL/LTL_f satisfiability, and LTL SAT-based UC extraction.

The LTL satisfiability problem has been addressed through tableau-based methods (e.g., (Janssen, 1999)), temporal resolution (e.g., (Fisher et al., 2001)), and reduction to model checking (e.g., (Cimatti et al., 2007; Rozier & Vardi, 2010, 2011)). In (Rozier & Vardi, 2010), a reduction of the LTL satisfiability problem to a model checking problem, and a comparison of different model checkers (explicit/symbolic) has been carried out, resulting in better performance and quality for symbolic approaches. A thorough comparison of the main tools dealing with the LTL satisfiability problem is reported in (Schuppan & Darmawan, 2011). The paper considers also tableau and temporal resolution based solvers, revealing a complementary behaviour between some of the considered solvers.

The problem of checking the satisfiability of LTL_f properties has been the subject of several works (Fionda & Greco, 2018; Li et al., 2020; Li, Zhang, Pu, Vardi, & He, 2014). Li et al. (2014), leverage the finite semantics of traces for introducing a propositional SAT based algorithm for the LTL_f satisfiability problem together with some heuristics to guide the search. The approach has been implemented in the AALTA-FINITE tool, which has been shown to outperform other existing approaches based on the reduction to the LTL

Table 2: Best results as per the cardinality of UCs and wall-clock timings.

Family	Total	AALTAF		TRP++		NuSMV-S		NuSMV-B		None
		min.UC	min.time	min.UC	min.time	min.UC	min.time	min.UC	min.time	
Overall	1377	690 (50.11%)	1260 (91.50%)	543 (39.43%)	0 (0.00%)	12 (0.87%)	8 (0.58%)	104 (7.55%)	81 (5.88%)	28 (2.03%)
LTL-as-LTLf/acacia/demo-v3/demo-v3:cl	11	7 (63.64%)	11 (100.00%)	4 (36.36%)						
LTL-as-LTLf/alaska/lift/lift	17	16 (94.12%)	17 (100.00%)	1 (5.88%)						
LTL-as-LTLf/alaska/lift/lift:b	17	16 (94.12%)	17 (100.00%)	1 (5.88%)						
LTL-as-LTLf/alaska/lift/lift:b:f	17	16 (94.12%)	17 (100.00%)	1 (5.88%)						
LTL-as-LTLf/alaska/lift/lift:b:fl	17	15 (88.24%)	16 (94.12%)	1 (5.88%)						1 (5.88%)
LTL-as-LTLf/alaska/lift/lift:b:cl	17	14 (82.35%)	17 (100.00%)	3 (17.65%)						
LTL-as-LTLf/alaska/lift/lift:f	17	16 (94.12%)	17 (100.00%)	1 (5.88%)						
LTL-as-LTLf/alaska/lift/lift:fl	17	15 (88.24%)	16 (94.12%)	1 (5.88%)						1 (5.88%)
LTL-as-LTLf/alaska/lift/lift:cl	17	16 (94.12%)	17 (100.00%)	1 (5.88%)						
LTL-as-LTLf/anzu/amba/amba:c	17	15 (88.24%)	15 (88.24%)							2 (11.76%)
LTL-as-LTLf/anzu/amba/amba:cl	17	16 (94.12%)	16 (94.12%)							1 (5.88%)
LTL-as-LTLf/anzu/genbuf/genbuf	20	20 (100.00%)	20 (100.00%)							
LTL-as-LTLf/anzu/genbuf/genbuf:c	20	20 (100.00%)	20 (100.00%)							
LTL-as-LTLf/anzu/genbuf/genbuf:cl	20	18 (90.00%)	18 (90.00%)							2 (10.00%)
LTL-as-LTLf/forobots	38	38 (100.00%)	38 (100.00%)							
LTL-as-LTLf/rozier/counter/counter	19							14 (73.68%)	14 (73.68%)	5 (26.32%)
LTL-as-LTLf/rozier/counter/counterCarry	19			6 (31.58%)				12 (63.16%)	18 (94.74%)	1 (5.26%)
LTL-as-LTLf/rozier/counter/counterCarryLinear	19			6 (31.58%)				13 (68.42%)	19 (100.00%)	
LTL-as-LTLf/rozier/counter/counterLinear	18		1 (5.56%)					18 (100.00%)	17 (94.44%)	
LTL-as-LTLf/rozier/formulas/n	30	12 (40.00%)	24 (80.00%)			8 (26.67%)	4 (13.33%)	10 (33.33%)	2 (6.67%)	
LTL-as-LTLf/schuppan/O1formula	27	20 (74.07%)	20 (74.07%)			4 (14.81%)	4 (14.81%)	3 (11.11%)	3 (11.11%)	
LTL-as-LTLf/schuppan/O2formula	27	5 (18.52%)	5 (18.52%)					8 (29.63%)	8 (29.63%)	14 (51.85%)
LTL-as-LTLf/schuppan/phltl	13	12 (92.31%)	12 (92.31%)							1 (7.69%)
LTLf-specific/benchmarks:tlf/.../C100	500	255 (51.00%)	500 (100.00%)	245 (49.00%)						
LTLf-specific/benchmarks:tlf/.../V20	425	127 (29.88%)	425 (100.00%)	272 (64.00%)				26 (6.12%)		

satisfiability problem. This work has been then extended in (Li et al., 2020) to leverage a transition system (TS) for the input LTL_f formula, and reducing satisfiability checking to a SAT based path-search problem over this TS. This approach, also implemented in AALTA-FINITE, has been shown to provide the best results in checking unsatisfiable formulae and comparable results for satisfiable ones. Fionda and Greco (2018) investigate the complexity of some fragments of LTL_f , and present a SAT based algorithm that outperforms the AALTA-FINITE version in (Li et al., 2014). Algorithm 3 presented here exploits the work in (Li et al., 2020) as state-of-the-art tool for checking the satisfiability of LTL_f properties.

The UC extraction for LTL has also been the subject of several studies (Awad, Goré, Thomson, & Weidlich, 2011; Goré, Huang, Sergeant, & Thomson, 2013; Narizzano, Pulina, Tacchella, & Vuotto, 2018; Schuppan, 2016). Goré et al. (2013) presents a BDD based approach that leverages a method to determine minimal UCs for SAT (Huang, 2005) to find minimal UCs in LTL. In (Awad et al., 2011), UCs are extracted by leveraging a tableau-based solver to obtain an initial subset of unsatisfiable LTL formulae and then applying a deletion-based minimization to the subset. The approach, implemented in PROCMINE is part of a tool for the synthesis of business process templates. In (Schuppan, 2016) fine-grained UCs are extracted constructing and optimizing resolution graphs for temporal resolution. Finally, Narizzano et al. (2018) presents a SAT based encoding suitable for the unsat core extraction of LTL-based property specification patterns (Dwyer, Avrunin, & Corbett, 1999) extended with inequality statements on Boolean and numeric variables.

Algorithm 4 presented here starts from the work in (Schuppan, 2016) to compute UCs using temporal resolution.

In the context of process mining, the works in (Di Ciccio, Maggi, Montali, & Mendling, 2017) and (Corea & Delfmann, 2019) identify inconsistencies for specific LTL_f -based constraints contained in the Declare (van der Aalst et al., 2009) modeling language. They rely on automata language and language inclusion techniques to identify the inconsistencies, and are specific to the precise structure of Declare. Thus they cannot be generalized to address generic LTL_f -based specifications.

Finally, works on propositional UC extraction (e.g., (Goldberg & Novikov, 2003; Huang, 2005; Marques-Silva & Janota, 2014)) could be used to improve the quality of the computed cores but we leave this investigation for future developments.

6. Conclusions and future work

In this paper, we have addressed the problem of LTL_f unsatisfiable core extraction, presenting four algorithms based on different state-of-the-art techniques for LTL and LTL_f satisfiability checking. We have implemented each of them based on existing tools, and we have carried out an experimental evaluation on a set of reference benchmarks for unsatisfiable temporal formulas. The results have shown feasibility and complementarities of the proposed algorithms.

For future work, we envisage the following research endeavours. We (i) will address the problem of extracting minimal UCs, (ii) plan to extend the approach to other LTL/ LTL_f algorithms based on k -liveness (Claessen & Sörensson, 2012), liveness to safety (Biere et al., 2002), or tableau constructions (Geatti, Gigante, Montanari, & Reynolds, 2021), (iii) intend to extend the problems set with benchmarks from emerging domains (e.g., AI Planning, or BPM), (iv) want to correlate structural information (e.g., \mathcal{V} cardinality, temporal depth, number of operators) with solving algorithms, (v) aim to investigate the extension to the infinite state case exploiting SMT techniques (Barrett, Sebastiani, Seshia, & Tinelli, 2009; Daniel, Cimatti, Griggio, Tonetta, & Mover, 2016).

References

- Awad, A., Goré, R., Thomson, J., & Weidlich, M. (2011). An iterative approach for business process template synthesis from compliance rules. In H. Mouratidis & C. Roland (Eds.), *Advanced information systems engineering - 23rd international conference, caise 2011, london, uk, june 20-24, 2011. proceedings* (Vol. 6741, pp. 406–421). Springer. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-21640-4_31 doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-21640-4_31
- Barrett, C. W., Sebastiani, R., Seshia, S. A., & Tinelli, C. (2009). Satisfiability modulo theories. In A. Biere, M. Heule, H. van Maaren, & T. Walsh (Eds.), *Handbook of satisfiability* (Vol. 185, pp. 825–885). IOS Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3233/978-1-58603-929-5-825> doi: 10.3233/978-1-58603-929-5-825
- Bauer, A., Leucker, M., & Schallhart, C. (2010). Comparing ltl semantics for runtime verification. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 20(3), 651–674. doi: 10.1093/logcom/exn075
- Biere, A., Artho, C., & Schuppan, V. (2002). Liveness checking as safety checking. *Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 66(2), 160–177. doi: 10.1016/S1571-0661(04)80410-9
- Biere, A., Cimatti, A., Clarke, E. M., Strichman, O., & Zhu, Y. (2003). Bounded model checking. *Adv. Comput.*, 58, 117–148. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2458\(03\)58003-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2458(03)58003-2) doi: 10.1016/S0065-2458(03)58003-2
- Biere, A., Heljanko, K., Junttila, T. A., Latvala, T., & Schuppan, V. (2006). Linear encodings of bounded LTL model checking. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 2(5). Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-2\(5:5\)2006](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-2(5:5)2006) doi: 10.2168/LMCS-2(5:5)2006
- Bradley, A. (2011). SAT-Based Model Checking without Unrolling. In *Vmcai* (Vol. 6538, p. 70–87). Springer.
- Bryant, R. E. (1992). Symbolic boolean manipulation with ordered binary-decision diagrams. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 24(3), 293–318. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1145/136035.136043> doi: 10.1145/136035.136043
- Calvanese, D., De Giacomo, G., & Vardi, M. Y. (2002). Reasoning about actions and planning in LTL action theories. In D. Fensel, F. Giunchiglia, D. L. McGuinness, & M. Williams (Eds.), *Proceedings of the eighth international conference on principles and knowledge representation and reasoning (kr-02), toulouse, france, april 22-25, 2002* (pp. 593–602). Morgan Kaufmann.
- Camacho, A., Baier, J. A., Muise, C. J., & McIlraith, S. A. (2018). Finite LTL synthesis as planning. In M. de Weerd, S. Koenig, G. Röger, & M. T. J. Spaan (Eds.), *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth international conference on automated planning and scheduling, ICAPS 2018, delft, the netherlands, june 24-29, 2018* (pp. 29–38). AAAI Press. Retrieved from <https://aaai.org/ocs/index.php/ICAPS/ICAPS18/paper/view/17790>
- Camacho, A., & McIlraith, S. A. (2019). Strong fully observable non-deterministic planning with LTL and ltlf goals. In S. Kraus (Ed.), *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth international joint conference on artificial intelligence, IJCAI 2019, macao, china, august 10-16, 2019* (pp. 5523–5531). ijcai.org. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2019/767> doi: 10.24963/ijcai.2019/767
- Cecconi, A., Di Ciccio, C., De Giacomo, G., & Mendling, J. (2018). Interestingness of traces

- in declarative process mining: The janus ltlp-f approach. In M. Weske, M. Montali, I. Weber, & J. vom Brocke (Eds.), *Business process management - 16th international conference, BPM 2018, sydney, nsw, australia, september 9-14, 2018, proceedings* (Vol. 11080, pp. 121–138). Springer. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-98648-7_8 doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-98648-7_8
- Cimatti, A., Clarke, E. M., Giunchiglia, E., Giunchiglia, F., Pistore, M., Roveri, M., ... Tacchella, A. (2002). NuSMV 2: An OpenSource Tool for Symbolic Model Checking. In E. Brinksma & K. G. Larsen (Eds.), *Computer aided verification, 14th international conference, CAV 2002, copenhagen, denmark, july 27-31, 2002, proceedings* (Vol. 2404, pp. 359–364). Springer. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45657-0_29 doi: 10.1007/3-540-45657-0_29
- Cimatti, A., Roveri, M., Schuppan, V., & Tonetta, S. (2007). Boolean abstraction for temporal logic satisfiability. In W. Damm & H. Hermanns (Eds.), *Computer aided verification, 19th international conference, CAV 2007, berlin, germany, july 3-7, 2007, proceedings* (Vol. 4590, pp. 532–546). Springer. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-73368-3_53 doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-73368-3_53
- Claessen, K., & Sörensson, N. (2012). A liveness checking algorithm that counts. In G. Cabodi & S. Singh (Eds.), *Fmcad* (p. 52-59). IEEE.
- Clarke, E. M., Grumberg, O., & Hamaguchi, K. (1997). Another look at LTL model checking. *Formal Methods Syst. Des.*, 10(1), 47–71. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008615614281> doi: 10.1023/A:1008615614281
- Corea, C., & Delfmann, P. (2019). Quasi-inconsistency in declarative process models. In T. T. Hildebrandt, B. F. van Dongen, M. Röglinger, & J. Mendling (Eds.), *Business process management forum - BPM forum 2019, vienna, austria, september 1-6, 2019, proceedings* (Vol. 360, pp. 20–35). Springer. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-26643-1_2 doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-26643-1_2
- Daniel, J., Cimatti, A., Griggio, A., Tonetta, S., & Mover, S. (2016). Infinite-state liveness-to-safety via implicit abstraction and well-founded relations. In S. Chaudhuri & A. Farzan (Eds.), *Computer aided verification - 28th international conference, CAV 2016, toronto, on, canada, july 17-23, 2016, proceedings, part I* (Vol. 9779, pp. 271–291). Springer. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-41528-4_15 doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-41528-4_15
- De Giacomo, G., De Masellis, R., Grasso, M., Maggi, F. M., & Montali, M. (2014). Monitoring business metaconstraints based on LTL and LDL for finite traces. In S. W. Sadiq, P. Soffer, & H. Völzer (Eds.), *Business process management - 12th international conference, BPM 2014, haifa, israel, september 7-11, 2014. proceedings* (Vol. 8659, pp. 1–17). Springer. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10172-9_1 doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-10172-9_1
- De Giacomo, G., De Masellis, R., Maggi, F. M., & Montali, M. (2020). Monitoring constraints and metaconstraints with temporal logics on finite traces. *CoRR*, abs/2004.01859. Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.01859>
- De Giacomo, G., De Masellis, R., & Montali, M. (2014). Reasoning on LTL on finite traces: Insensitivity to infiniteness. In C. E. Brodley & P. Stone (Eds.), *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth AAAI conference on artificial intelligence, july 27 -31, 2014, québec city, québec, canada* (pp. 1027–1033). AAAI Press. Retrieved from <http://>

- www.aaai.org/ocs/index.php/AAAI/AAAI14/paper/view/8575
- De Giacomo, G., & Vardi, M. Y. (2013). Linear temporal logic and linear dynamic logic on finite traces. In F. Rossi (Ed.), *IJCAI 2013, proceedings of the 23rd international joint conference on artificial intelligence, beijing, china, august 3-9, 2013* (pp. 854–860). IJCAI/AAAI. Retrieved from <http://www.aaai.org/ocs/index.php/IJCAI/IJCAI13/paper/view/6997>
- Di Ciccio, C., Maggi, F. M., Montali, M., & Mendling, J. (2017, March). Resolving inconsistencies and redundancies in declarative process models. *Information Systems*, *64*, 425–446. doi: 10.1016/j.is.2016.09.005
- Dwyer, M. B., Avrunin, G. S., & Corbett, J. C. (1999). Patterns in property specifications for finite-state verification. In B. W. Boehm, D. Garlan, & J. Kramer (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 1999 international conference on software engineering, icse'99, los angeles, ca, usa, may 16-22, 1999* (pp. 411–420). ACM. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1145/302405.302672> doi: 10.1145/302405.302672
- Felt, E., York, G., Brayton, R. K., & Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, A. L. (1993). Dynamic variable reordering for BDD minimization. In *EURO-DAC* (pp. 130–135). IEEE Computer Society.
- Fionda, V., & Greco, G. (2018). LTL on finite and process traces: Complexity results and a practical reasoner. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, *63*, 557–623. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.1.11256> doi: 10.1613/jair.1.11256
- Fisher, M. (1991). A resolution method for temporal logic. In J. Mylopoulos & R. Reiter (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 12th international joint conference on artificial intelligence. sydney, australia, august 24-30, 1991* (pp. 99–104). Morgan Kaufmann. Retrieved from <http://ijcai.org/Proceedings/91-1/Papers/017.pdf>
- Fisher, M., Dixon, C., & Peim, M. (2001). Clausal temporal resolution. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.*, *2*(1), 12–56. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1145/371282.371311> doi: 10.1145/371282.371311
- Gabbay, D. M. (1987). The declarative past and imperative future: Executable temporal logic for interactive systems. In B. Banieqbal, H. Barringer, & A. Pnueli (Eds.), *Temporal logic in specification, altrincham, uk, april 8-10, 1987, proceedings* (Vol. 398, pp. 409–448). Springer. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-51803-7_36 doi: 10.1007/3-540-51803-7_36
- Geatti, L., Gigante, N., Montanari, A., & Reynolds, M. (2021). One-pass and tree-shaped tableau systems for TPTL and TPTL_D+Past. *Inf. Comput.*, *278*, 104599. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2020.104599> doi: 10.1016/j.ic.2020.104599
- Goldberg, E. I., & Novikov, Y. (2003). Verification of proofs of unsatisfiability for CNF formulas. In *2003 design, automation and test in europe conference and exposition (DATE 2003), 3-7 march 2003, munich, germany* (pp. 10886–10891). IEEE Computer Society. Retrieved from <http://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/DATE.2003.10008> doi: 10.1109/DATE.2003.10008
- Goré, R., Huang, J., Sergeant, T., & Thomson, J. (2013). *Finding minimal unsatisfiable subsets in linear temporal logic using bdds*. https://www.timsergeant.com/files/pltlmup/gore_huang_sergeant_thomson_mus_pltl.pdf. (Accessed: 30-08-2021)
- Huang, J. (2005). MUP: a minimal unsatisfiability prover. In T. Tang (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 2005 conference on asia south pacific design automation, ASP-DAC 2005*,

- shanghai, china, january 18-21, 2005 (pp. 432–437). ACM Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1145/1120725.1120907> doi: 10.1145/1120725.1120907
- Hustadt, U., & Konev, B. (2003). TRP++2.0: A temporal resolution prover. In F. Baader (Ed.), *Automated deduction - cade-19, 19th international conference on automated deduction miami beach, fl, usa, july 28 - august 2, 2003, proceedings* (Vol. 2741, pp. 274–278). Springer. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-45085-6_21 doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-45085-6_21
- Janssen, G. (1999). *Logics for digital circuit verification : theory, algorithms, and applications* (Doctoral dissertation, Electrical Engineering). doi: 10.6100/IR520460
- Laroussinie, F., Markey, N., & Schnoebelen, P. (2002). Temporal logic with forgettable past. In *17th IEEE symposium on logic in computer science (LICS 2002), 22-25 july 2002, copenhagen, denmark, proceedings* (pp. 383–392). IEEE Computer Society. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2002.1029846> doi: 10.1109/LICS.2002.1029846
- Li, J., Pu, G., Zhang, Y., Vardi, M. Y., & Rozier, K. Y. (2020). Sat-based explicit ltl satisfiability checking. *Artif. Intell.*, 289, 103369. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2020.103369> doi: 10.1016/j.artint.2020.103369
- Li, J., Zhang, L., Pu, G., Vardi, M. Y., & He, J. (2014). Ltl satisfiability checking. In T. Schaub, G. Friedrich, & B. O’Sullivan (Eds.), *ECAI 2014 - 21st european conference on artificial intelligence, 18-22 august 2014, prague, czech republic - including prestigious applications of intelligent systems (PAIS 2014)* (Vol. 263, pp. 513–518). IOS Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3233/978-1-61499-419-0-513> doi: 10.3233/978-1-61499-419-0-513
- Li, J., Zhu, S., Pu, G., Zhang, L., & Vardi, M. Y. (2019). Sat-based explicit LTL reasoning and its application to satisfiability checking. *Formal Methods Syst. Des.*, 54(2), 164–190. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10703-018-00326-5> doi: 10.1007/s10703-018-00326-5
- Marques-Silva, J., & Janota, M. (2014). Computing minimal sets on propositional formulae I: problems & reductions. *CoRR*, abs/1402.3011. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1402.3011>
- Montali, M., Pesic, M., van der Aalst, W. M. P., Chesani, F., Mello, P., & Storari, S. (2010). Declarative specification and verification of service choreographies. *ACM Trans. Web*, 4(1), 3:1–3:62. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1145/1658373.1658376> doi: 10.1145/1658373.1658376
- Narizzano, M., Pulina, L., Tacchella, A., & Vuotto, S. (2018). Consistency of property specification patterns with boolean and constrained numerical signals. In A. Dutle, C. A. Muñoz, & A. Narkawicz (Eds.), *NASA formal methods - 10th international symposium, NFM 2018, newport news, va, usa, april 17-19, 2018, proceedings* (Vol. 10811, pp. 383–398). Springer. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77935-5_26 doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-77935-5_26
- Pnueli, A. (1977). The temporal logic of programs. In *18th annual symposium on foundations of computer science, providence, rhode island, usa, 31 october - 1 november 1977* (pp. 46–57). IEEE Computer Society. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1977.32> doi: 10.1109/SFCS.1977.32
- Räim, M., Di Ciccio, C., Maggi, F. M., Mecella, M., & Mendling, J. (2014). Log-

- based understanding of business processes through temporal logic query checking. In R. Meersman et al. (Eds.), *On the move to meaningful internet systems: OTM 2014 conferences - confederated international conferences: Coopis, and ODBASE 2014, amantea, italy, october 27-31, 2014, proceedings* (Vol. 8841, pp. 75–92). Springer. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-45563-0_5 doi: 10.1007/978-3-662-45563-0_5
- Rozier, K. Y., & Vardi, M. Y. (2010). LTL satisfiability checking. *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transf.*, 12(2), 123–137. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-010-0140-3> doi: 10.1007/s10009-010-0140-3
- Rozier, K. Y., & Vardi, M. Y. (2011). A multi-encoding approach for LTL symbolic satisfiability checking. In M. J. Butler & W. Schulte (Eds.), *FM 2011: Formal methods - 17th international symposium on formal methods, limerick, ireland, june 20-24, 2011. proceedings* (Vol. 6664, pp. 417–431). Springer. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-21437-0_31 doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-21437-0_31
- Schuppan, V. (2012). Towards a notion of unsatisfiable and unrealizable cores for LTL. *Sci. Comput. Program.*, 77(7-8), 908–939. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scico.2010.11.004> doi: 10.1016/j.scico.2010.11.004
- Schuppan, V. (2016). Extracting unsatisfiable cores for LTL via temporal resolution. *Acta Informatica*, 53(3), 247–299. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00236-015-0242-1> doi: 10.1007/s00236-015-0242-1
- Schuppan, V. (2018). Enhanced unsatisfiable cores for QBF: weakening universal to existential quantifiers. In L. H. Tsoukalas, É. Grégoire, & M. Alamaniotis (Eds.), *IEEE 30th international conference on tools with artificial intelligence, ICTAI 2018, 5-7 november 2018, volos, greece* (pp. 81–89). IEEE. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICTAI.2018.00023> doi: 10.1109/ICTAI.2018.00023
- Schuppan, V., & Darmawan, L. (2011). Evaluating LTL satisfiability solvers. In T. Bultan & P. Hsiung (Eds.), *Automated technology for verification and analysis, 9th international symposium, ATVA 2011, taipei, taiwan, october 11-14, 2011. proceedings* (Vol. 6996, pp. 397–413). Springer. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-24372-1_28 doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-24372-1_28
- Sohrabi, S., Baier, J. A., & McIlraith, S. A. (2011). Preferred explanations: Theory and generation via planning. In W. Burgard & D. Roth (Eds.), *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth AAAI conference on artificial intelligence, AAAI 2011, san francisco, california, usa, august 7-11, 2011*. AAAI Press. Retrieved from <http://www.aaai.org/ocs/index.php/AAAI/AAAI11/paper/view/3568>
- Tsay, Y.-K., & Vardi, M. Y. (2021). From linear temporal logics to büchi automata: The early and simple principle. In E.-R. Olderog, B. Steffen, & W. Yi (Eds.), *Model checking, synthesis, and learning: Essays dedicated to bengt jonsson on the occasion of his 60th birthday* (pp. 8–40). Cham: Springer International Publishing. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-91384-7_2 doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-91384-7_2
- van der Aalst, W. M. P., Pesic, M., & Schonenberg, H. (2009). Declarative workflows: Balancing between flexibility and support. *Comput. Sci. Res. Dev.*, 23(2), 99–113.