

# Logical characterisations and compositionality of input-output conformance simulation<sup>\*</sup>

Luca Aceto<sup>1</sup>, Ignacio Fábregas<sup>1,2</sup>, Carlos Gregorio-Rodríguez<sup>2</sup>, and Anna Ingólfssdóttir<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ICE-TCS, School of Computer Science, Reykjavik University, Iceland

<sup>2</sup> Departamento de Sistemas Informáticos y Computación, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

**Abstract.** Input-output conformance simulation ( $\text{ioco}_{\Sigma}$ ) has been proposed by Gregorio-Rodríguez, Llana and Martínez-Torres as a simulation-based behavioural preorder underlying model-based testing. This relation is inspired by Tretman’s classic  $\text{ioco}$  relation, but has better worst-case complexity than  $\text{ioco}$  and supports stepwise refinement. The goal of this paper is to develop the theory of  $\text{ioco}_{\Sigma}$  by studying logical characterisations of this relation and its compositionality. More specifically, this article presents characterisations of  $\text{ioco}_{\Sigma}$  in terms of modal logics and compares them with an existing logical characterisation for  $\text{ioco}$  proposed by Beohar and Mousavi. A precongruence rule format for  $\text{ioco}_{\Sigma}$  and a rule format ensuring that operations take quiescence properly into account are also given. Both rule formats are based on the GSOS format by Bloom, Istrail and Meyer.

## 1 Introduction

Model-based testing (MBT) is an increasingly popular technique for validation and verification of computing systems, and provides a compromise between formal verification approaches, such model checking, and manual testing. MBT uses a model to describe the aspects of system behaviour that are considered to be relevant at some suitable level of abstraction. This model is employed to generate test cases automatically, while guaranteeing that some coverage criterion is met. Such test cases are then executed on the actual system in order to check whether its behaviour complies with that described by the model.

A formal notion of compliance relation between models (specifications) and systems (implementations) provides a formal underpinning for MBT. The de-facto standard compliance relation underlying MBT for labelled transition systems with input and output actions is the classic  $\text{ioco}$  relation proposed by

---

<sup>\*</sup> Research partially supported by the Spanish projects DArDOS (TIN2015-65845-C3-1-R), TRACES (TIN2015-67522-C3-3-R) and SICOMORo-CM (S2013/ICE-3006), the project 001-ABEL-CM-2013 within the NILS Science and Sustainability Programme and the project Nominal SOS (project nr. 141558-051) of the Icelandic Research Fund.

Tretmans, for which a whole MBT framework and tools have been developed. (See, for instance, [16] and the references therein.)

An alternative conformance relation that can be used to underlie MBT is *input-output conformance simulation* ( $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$ ). This relation shares with  $\text{ioco}$  many of its ideas and rationale. However,  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$  is a branching-time semantics based on simulation, whereas  $\text{ioco}$  is a trace-based semantics.  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$  has been introduced, motivated and proved to be an adequate conformance relation for MBT in [8,9,10].

Since  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$  has been proposed as an alternative, branching-time touchstone relation for MBT, it is natural to investigate its theory in order to understand its properties. The goal of this paper is to contribute to this endeavour by studying the discriminating power of  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$  and its compositionality. More precisely, in Section 3, we provide modal characterisations of  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$  in the style of Hennessy and Milner [11]. We offer two modal characterisations of  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$ , which are based on the use of either a ‘non-forcing diamond modality’ (Theorem 1) or of a ‘forcing box modality’ (Theorem 2), and compare them with an existing logical characterisation for  $\text{ioco}$  proposed by Beohar and Mousavi in [3] (Section 4). We also show, by means of an example, that, contrary to what is claimed in [13, Theorem 2],  $\text{ioco}$  and  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$  do *not* coincide even when implementations are input enabled (Section 4.1).

As argued in [2,17] amongst other references, MBT can benefit from a compositional approach whose goal is to increase the efficiency of the testing activity. The above-mentioned references study compositionality of  $\text{ioco}$  with respect to a small collection of well-chosen operations. Here we take a general approach to the study of compositionality of  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$ , which is based on the theory of rule formats for structural operational semantics [1]. In Section 5, we present a congruence rule format for  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$  based on the GSOS format proposed by Bloom, Istrail and Meyer [5] (Theorem 4). Since operations preserving  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$  need to take quiescence properly into account, we also propose a rule format guaranteeing that operations preserve coherent quiescent behaviour (Theorem 5 in Section 5.1).

Section 6 concludes the paper and presents avenues for future research.

## 2 Preliminaries

The input-output conformance simulation preorder presented in [8,9,10,13] (henceforth referred to as  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$ ) is a semantic relation developed under the assumption that systems have two kinds of transitions: input actions, namely those that the systems are willing to admit or respond to, and output actions, which are those produced by the system and that can be seen as responses or results.

We use  $I$  to denote the alphabet of input actions, which are written with a question mark ( $a?, b?, c? \dots$ ). We call  $O$  the alphabet of output actions, which are annotated with an exclamation mark ( $a!, b!, \delta! \dots$ ). In many cases we want to name actions in a general sense, inputs and outputs indistinctly. We will consider the set  $L = I \cup O$  and we will omit the exclamation or question marks when naming generic actions,  $a, b, x, y, z \in L$ .

A state with no output actions cannot proceed autonomously; such a state is called *quiescent*. Following Tretmans (see, for instance, [14,16]), we directly introduce the event of quiescence as a special output action denoted by  $\delta! \in O$  in the definition of our models.

**Definition 1.** A labelled transition system with inputs and outputs, *LTS* for short, is a quadruple  $(S, I, O, \rightarrow)$  such that

- $S$  is a set of states, processes, or behaviours.
  - $I$  and  $O$  are disjoint sets of input and output actions, respectively. Output actions include the quiescence symbol  $\delta! \in O$ . We define  $L = I \cup O$ .
  - $\rightarrow \subseteq S \times L \times S$  is the transition relation. As usual we write  $p \xrightarrow{x} q$  instead of  $(p, x, q) \in \rightarrow$  and  $p \xrightarrow{x}$ , for  $x \in L$ , if there exists some  $q \in S$  such that  $p \xrightarrow{x} q$ . Analogously, we will write  $p \not\xrightarrow{x}$ , for  $x \in L$ , if there is no  $q$  such that  $p \xrightarrow{x} q$ .
- In order to allow only for coherent quiescent systems, the set of transitions  $\rightarrow$  should also satisfy the following requirement:  $p \xrightarrow{\delta!} p'$  iff  $p = p'$  and  $p \not\xrightarrow{o!}$  for each  $o! \in O \setminus \{\delta!\}$ .

The extension of the transition relation to sequences of actions is defined as usual.

Contrary to the classic *ioco* testing theory, in the theory of *iocos* presented in [8,9,10], all actions are assumed to be observable. In this paper, we follow those references and consider only concrete actions.

In general we use  $p, q, p', q' \dots$  for states or behaviours, but also  $i, i', s$  and  $s'$  when we want to emphasise the concrete role of a behaviour as an implementation or a specification, respectively. We consider implementations and specifications, or, more generally, behaviours under study, as states of the same LTS.

The following functions over states of an LTS will be used in the remainder of the paper:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{outs}(p) &= \{o! \mid o! \in O, p \xrightarrow{o!}\}, \text{ the set of initial outputs of a state } p. \\ \text{ins}(p) &= \{a? \mid a? \in I, p \xrightarrow{a?}\}, \text{ the set of initial inputs of a state } p. \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 2.** We say that a binary relation  $R$  over states in an LTS is an *iocos*-relation if, and only if, for each  $(p, q) \in R$  the following conditions hold:

1.  $\text{ins}(q) \subseteq \text{ins}(p)$ .
2. For all  $a? \in \text{ins}(q)$  and  $p' \in S$ , if  $p \xrightarrow{a?} p'$  then there exists some  $q'$  such that  $q \xrightarrow{a?} q'$  with  $(p', q') \in R$ .
3. For all  $o! \in O$  and  $p' \in S$ , if  $p \xrightarrow{o!} p'$  then there exists some  $q'$  such that  $q \xrightarrow{o!} q'$  with  $(p', q') \in R$ .

We define the input-output conformance simulation (*iocos*) as the largest *iocos*-relation. We write  $p \text{ iocos } q$  instead of  $(p, q) \in \text{iocos}$ . As proven in [8], *iocos* is a preorder.

*Example 1.* Consider the following processes:

$$\delta! \stackrel{a}{\hookrightarrow} i \stackrel{a}{\hookrightarrow} a? \quad s \stackrel{a}{\hookrightarrow} \delta!$$

It is easy to see that  $i \text{ iocos } s$ . Indeed,  $\text{ins}(s) = \emptyset$  and therefore the specification  $s$  does not prevent the implementation  $i$  from offering the input transition  $i \xrightarrow{a?} i$ .

Throughout the paper we make extensive use of modal logics. A logic over processes is defined by a language to express the formulae and a satisfaction relation that defines when a process (that is, a state of an LTS) has the property described by some formula. A classic example and a reference for the rest of the paper is Hennessy-Milner Logic [11].

**Definition 3.** *Hennessy-Milner Logic over the set of actions  $L$  (abbreviated to HML) is the collection of formulae defined by the following BNF grammar:*

$$\phi ::= \mathbf{tt} \mid \mathbf{ff} \mid \phi \wedge \phi \mid \phi \vee \phi \mid [a]\phi \mid \langle a \rangle \phi,$$

where  $a \in L$ . HML is interpreted over an LTS by defining a satisfaction relation  $\models$  relating states to formulae. The semantics of the boolean constants  $\mathbf{tt}$  and  $\mathbf{ff}$  and of the boolean connectives  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$  is defined as usual. The satisfaction relation for the modalities  $\langle a \rangle$  and  $[a]$  is as follows:

- $p \models \langle a \rangle \varphi$  iff there exists some  $p'$  such that  $p \xrightarrow{a} p'$  and  $p' \models \varphi$ .
- $p \models [a]\varphi$  iff  $p' \models \varphi$  for all  $p'$  such that  $p \xrightarrow{a} p'$ .

Every subset of HML naturally induces a preorder on a given set of behaviours.

**Definition 4.** *Given a logic  $\mathcal{L}$  included in HML and a set  $S$  of states in an LTS, we define  $\leq_{\mathcal{L}}$  as the binary relation over  $S$  given by*

$$p \leq_{\mathcal{L}} q \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall \phi \in \mathcal{L} \ (p \models \phi \Rightarrow q \models \phi).$$

*Remark 1.* Since the logics we use in this paper to give modal characterisations of  $\text{iocos}$  have binary conjunctions and disjunctions, in what follows we will consider only *image-finite* LTSs, that is, LTSs where for each  $p$  and each  $a \in I \cup O$  there are only finitely many  $p'$  such that  $p \xrightarrow{a} p'$ . Also, we will consider both  $I$  and  $O$  to be finite sets.

### 3 Logic for $\text{iocos}$

In this section we present a logic that characterises the  $\text{iocos}$  relation. This logic is a subset of Hennessy-Milner Logic (HML) and is rather minimal, but is convenient to characterize clearly the discriminating power of the  $\text{iocos}$  relation.

**Definition 5.** *The syntax of the logic for  $\text{iocos}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{iocos}}$ , is defined by the following BNF grammar:*

$$\phi ::= \mathbf{tt} \mid \mathbf{ff} \mid \phi \wedge \phi \mid \phi \vee \phi \mid \langle a? \rangle \phi \mid \langle x! \rangle \phi,$$

where  $a? \in I$  and  $x! \in O$ . The semantics of the constants **tt** and **ff**, of the boolean connectives  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$ , and of the modality  $\langle x! \rangle$  is defined as usual. The satisfaction relation for the modality  $\langle a? \rangle$  is given below:

$$- p \models \langle a? \rangle \phi \text{ iff } p \xrightarrow{a?} \not\rightarrow \text{ or } p' \models \phi \text{ for some } p \xrightarrow{a?} p'.$$

The new modal operator  $\langle a? \rangle$  can be read as a *non forcing* diamond modality: if the action specified in the modality is not possible in a given state then the formula is satisfied. This operator can be expressed with the classic modalities in HML; indeed,  $\langle a? \rangle \phi$  is equivalent to  $\langle a? \rangle \phi \vee [a?] \mathbf{ff}$ . The need for this special modality arises because, in order for  $i \text{ ioco}_{\underline{s}}$  to hold,  $s$  need only match the input transitions of  $i$  that are labelled with input actions that  $s$  affords.

According to Definition 4, the logic  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}}$  induces the preorder  $\leq_{\mathcal{L}_{\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}}}$ . Next we prove that this logical preorder coincides with the input output conformance simulation preorder,  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$ , over an arbitrary (image-finite) LTS.

**Theorem 1.** *For all states  $i, s$  in some LTS,*

$$i \text{ ioco}_{\underline{s}} s \text{ iff } i \leq_{\mathcal{L}_{\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}}} s.$$

The logic for  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$  we have presented in Definition 5 follows a standard approach to the logical characterisation of simulation semantics; see, for instance, [6,18]. However, the  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$  relation originated in the model-based testing environment where the natural reading for a logical characterisation would be ‘*every property satisfied by the specification should also hold in the implementation*’. Next we define an alternative logic that better matches this specification/implementation view.

**Definition 6.** *The syntax of the logic  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}}$  is defined by the following BNF grammar:*

$$\phi ::= \mathbf{tt} \mid \mathbf{ff} \mid \phi \wedge \phi \mid \phi \vee \phi \mid \llbracket a? \rrbracket \phi \mid [x!] \phi,$$

where  $a? \in I$  and  $x! \in O$ . The semantics of the constants **tt** and **ff**, of the boolean connectives  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$ , and of the modality  $[x!]$  is defined as usual. The satisfaction relation for the modalities  $\llbracket a? \rrbracket$  is as follows:

$$- p \models \llbracket a? \rrbracket \phi \text{ iff } p \xrightarrow{a?} \text{ and } p' \models \phi, \text{ for each } p \xrightarrow{a?} p'.$$

The new modal operator, denoted by  $\llbracket a? \rrbracket$ , can be read as a *forcing* box modality: the action specified in the modality must be possible in order for a process to satisfy the formula. This operator can be described with the classic modalities in HML:  $\llbracket a? \rrbracket \phi$  is equivalent to  $\langle a? \rangle \mathbf{tt} \wedge [a?] \phi$ .

Now with this logic, we can define a preorder  $\leq_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}}}$  in terms of the formulae that the specification satisfies:  $s \leq_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}}} i$  iff  $\forall \phi \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}} (s \models \phi \Rightarrow i \models \phi)$ .

We note that the logics  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}}$  are dual. In fact, there exist mutual transformations between both sets of formulae such that a behaviour satisfies one formula if, and only if, it does *not* satisfy the transformed formula. These statements are at the heart of the proof of the following result.

**Theorem 2.** *For all states  $i, s$  in some LTS,  $i \text{ ioco}_{\underline{s}} s$  iff  $s \leq_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}}} i$ .*

## 4 The relation with a logic for ioco

Input-output conformance (**ioco**) was introduced by Tretmans in [15]. The intuition behind **ioco** is that a process  $i$  is a correct implementation of a specification  $s$  if, for each sequence of actions  $\sigma$  allowed by the specification, all the possible outputs from  $i$  after having performed  $\sigma$  are allowed by the specification. This is formalized below in a setting in which all actions are observable.

**Definition 7.** Let  $(S, I, O, \rightarrow)$  be an LTS with inputs and outputs. We define the traces of a state  $p \in S$  as  $\text{traces}(p) = \{\sigma \mid \exists p'. p \xrightarrow{\sigma} p'\}$ . Given a trace  $\sigma$ , we define  $p$  after  $\sigma = \{p' \mid p' \in S, p \xrightarrow{\sigma} p'\}$ . For each  $T \subseteq S$ , we set  $\text{Out}(T) = \bigcup_{p \in T} \text{outs}(p)$ . Finally, the relation  $\text{ioco} \in S \times S$  is defined as:

$$i \text{ ioco } s \text{ iff } \text{Out}(i \text{ after } \sigma) \subseteq \text{Out}(s \text{ after } \sigma), \text{ for all } \sigma \in \text{traces}(s).$$

As shown in [8, Theorem 1], **ioco<sub>g</sub>** is included in **ioco**.

In the setting of Tretmans' standard **ioco** theory [15], only input-enabled implementations are considered. A state  $i$  in an LTS is input enabled if every state  $i'$  that is reachable from  $i$  is able to perform every input action, that is,  $i' \xrightarrow{a?}$  holds for each  $a? \in I$  and for each state  $i'$  that is reachable from  $i$ .

In [3] Beohar and Mousavi introduced an explicit logical characterization of **ioco**. This characterization uses a non-standard modal operator reminiscent of our  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ , denoted by  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^3$ . However, output actions can also be used as labels of  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ . This modality can be extended to traces  $\sigma$  as follows:  $p \models \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \phi$  if, and only if,  $p \xrightarrow{\sigma}$  and  $p' \models \phi$ , for each  $p'$  such that  $p \xrightarrow{\sigma} p'$ . (Note that, for the particular case of input actions  $a?$ , the semantics of  $\llbracket a? \rrbracket$  coincides with that of  $\llbracket a? \rrbracket$ .)

The explicit logical characterization of **ioco** given in [3] is defined by means of two different subclasses of logical formulae. The first subclass permits only formulae of the form  $\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket [b] \mathbf{ff}$ , where  $\sigma$  is a trace and  $b$  is an output action.

For the second subclass of formulae, Beohar and Mousavi consider an extension of the operator  $[\cdot]$  to traces, defined as:  $p \models [\sigma] \phi$  if, and only if,  $p' \models \phi$  for each  $p'$  such that  $p \xrightarrow{\sigma} p'$ . This second subclass permits only formulae of the form  $[\sigma] [b] \mathbf{ff}$ , where  $\sigma$  is a trace and  $b$  is an output action.

The formulae in each of these two subclasses characterize one defining property of the **ioco**-relation. This intuition is made precise in the following lemma.

**Lemma 1 ([3]).** For each sequence of actions  $\sigma$ , output action  $b$  and process  $p$  the following statements hold:

1.  $\sigma \in \text{traces}(p)$  and  $b \notin \text{Out}(p \text{ after } \sigma)$  iff  $p \models \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket [b] \mathbf{ff}$ .
2.  $b \notin \text{Out}(p \text{ after } \sigma)$  iff  $p \models [\sigma] [b] \mathbf{ff}$ .

The resulting logical characterization theorem for **ioco** is as follows,

**Theorem 3 ([3]).**  $i \text{ ioco } s$  iff, for all  $\sigma \in L^*$ ,  $b \in O$ , if  $s \models \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket [b] \mathbf{ff}$ , then  $i \models [\sigma] [b] \mathbf{ff}$ .


<sup>3</sup> In fact, the symbol used to denote the operator  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$  in [3] is  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ , but we prefer to use an alternative notation in order to avoid confusion with our modal operator  $\langle \cdot \rangle$ .

The above result is the counterpart of Theorem 2 in the setting of  $\text{ioco}$ . Note, however, that Theorem 3 is not a classic modal characterization result (as it is the case of, for example, Theorem 2) where if the implementation  $i$  is correct with respect to the specification  $s$  and  $s$  satisfies a formula, then also  $i$  satisfies it. Here the implementation does not need to satisfy the properties that hold for the specification. By way of example, implementations need not exhibit all the traces of a specification they correctly implement.

#### 4.1 Relation with $\text{iocos}$

Theorem 2 in [13] states that if  $i$  is input enabled,  $i \text{ ioco } s$  implies  $i \text{ iocos } s$ . This means that, when restricted to input-enabled implementations,  $\text{ioco}$  and  $\text{iocos}$  coincide, and therefore the logics characterizing  $\text{iocos}$  presented in this paper also characterize  $\text{ioco}$  over that class of LTSs. Unfortunately, however, Theorem 2 in [13] does *not* hold, as shown in the following example.

*Example 2.* Let  $s$  and  $i$  be defined as follows, where we assume that  $I = \{a?, b?\}$ .



Note that  $i$  is input-enabled, as required by the theory of  $\text{ioco}$ . It is easy to see that  $i \text{ ioco } s$ . On the other hand,  $i \not\text{ iocos } s$  because each  $\text{iocos}$  relation containing the pair  $(i, s)$  would also have to contain the pair  $(i', s_1)$  or the pair  $(i', s_2)$ . However, no relation including either of those pairs is an  $\text{iocos}$ -relation because  $i' \xrightarrow{a!}$  and  $i' \xrightarrow{b!}$ , but  $s_1 \not\xrightarrow{a!}$  and  $s_2 \not\xrightarrow{b!}$ .

As we will now argue, the logics for  $\text{ioco}$  and  $\text{iocos}$  are incomparable in terms of their expressive power. First of all, note that, if we consider only input-enabled implementations, the formulae of the form  $[\sigma][b]\mathbf{ff}$ , with  $\sigma$  a trace, can be expressed in  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{iocos}}$  since in an input-enabled scenario  $\llbracket a? \rrbracket$  has the same semantics as  $[a?]$ . On the other hand, it is not possible to define a formula  $\phi \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{iocos}}$  that captures Lemma 1(1). Indeed, by way of example, consider  $\phi = \llbracket x! \rrbracket [b!]\mathbf{ff}$ . Any specification  $s$  would have to satisfy  $\phi$  iff  $s \xrightarrow{x!}$  and  $s' \models [b!]\mathbf{ff}$ , for all  $s \xrightarrow{x!} s'$ . Now, assume that we have in  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{iocos}}$  a formula  $\psi$  whose semantics coincides with that of  $\llbracket x! \rrbracket [b!]\mathbf{ff}$ . Let

$$a! \overset{\circlearrowleft}{\curvearrowright} s \overset{\circlearrowright}{\curvearrowleft} x! \qquad a! \overset{\circlearrowleft}{\curvearrowright} i$$

It is easy to see that  $i \text{ ioco}_{\underline{s}} s$ , but  $s \models \psi$  and  $i \not\models \psi$ . In other words,  $\psi$  is a formula that distinguishes processes related by  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$ . Hence, such a formula  $\psi$  cannot be in any logic that characterizes  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$ .

On the other hand, let us consider the two processes of Example 2 and the formula  $\phi = \llbracket a? \rrbracket ([a!] \mathbf{ff} \vee [b!] \mathbf{ff}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}}$ . As we already stated in Example 2,  $i \text{ ioco} s$ , but  $s \models \phi$  and  $i \not\models \phi$ . Hence,  $\phi$  can distinguish processes that are  $\text{ioco}$ -related.

## 5 A rule format for $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$

In this section we study compositionality for  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{s}}$  and present a congruence rule format for the input-output conformance simulation preorder based on the GSOS format proposed by Bloom, Istrail and Meyer [5]. The restriction to GSOS rules is partly justified by our wish to have a purely syntactic rule format and by the undecidability results presented in [12]. In what follows, we assume that the reader is familiar with the standard notions of signature and of term over a signature.

We recall that a deduction rule for an operator  $f$  of arity  $n$  in some signature  $\Sigma$  is in the *GSOS format* if, and only if, it has the following form:

$$\frac{\{x_i \xrightarrow{a_{ij}} y_{ij} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m_i\} \cup \{x_i \xrightarrow{b_{ik}} \not\rightarrow \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq k \leq \ell_i\}}{f(\mathbf{x}) \xrightarrow{a} C[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} \quad (1)$$

where the  $x_i$ 's and the  $y_{ij}$ 's ( $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $1 \leq j \leq m_i$ ) are all distinct variables,  $m_i$  and  $\ell_i$  are natural numbers,  $C[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]$  is a term over  $\Sigma$  with variables including at most the  $x_i$ 's and  $y_{ij}$ 's, and the  $a_{ij}$ 's,  $b_{ik}$ 's and  $a$  are actions from  $L$ . The above rule is said to be *f-defining* and *a-emitting*. Its *positive trigger for variable  $x_i$*  is the set  $\{a_{ij} \mid 1 \leq j \leq m_i\}$  and its *negative trigger for variable  $x_i$*  is the set  $\{b_{ik} \mid 1 \leq k \leq \ell_i\}$ . The *source of the conclusion* of the rule is  $f(\mathbf{x})$ .

A GSOS language is a triple  $(\Sigma, L, D)$  where  $\Sigma$  is a finite signature,  $L$  is a finite set of labels and  $D$  is a finite set of deduction rules in the GSOS format. In what follows, we assume, without loss of generality, that all  $f$ -defining rules have the same source of their conclusions.

A GSOS language naturally defines a set of transitions over the variable-free terms over  $\Sigma$  by structural induction: for vectors of such terms  $\mathbf{p}$  (with typical entry  $p_i$ ) and  $\mathbf{q}$  (with entries  $q_{ij}$ ), there is a transition  $f(\mathbf{p}) \xrightarrow{a} C[\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}]$  if, and only if, there is an  $f$ -defining rule of the form (1) such that

$$\begin{aligned} & - p_i \xrightarrow{a_{ij}} q_{ij} \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq m_i \text{ and} \\ & - p_i \xrightarrow{b_{ik}} \not\rightarrow \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } 1 \leq k \leq \ell_i. \end{aligned}$$

Note that GSOS rules define operations over states in an arbitrary LTS with inputs and outputs. In what follows, we apply derived operations built over the



signature of a GSOS language to states in the collection of LTSs with input and output actions.

**Definition 8.** An operation  $f$  in a GSOS language is in  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{\sigma}}$ -format if the collection of  $f$ -defining rules satisfies the following conditions:

1. Each  $a?$ -emitting rule, where  $a?$  is an input action, has only output actions as labels of negative premises and input actions as labels of positive premises.
2. For each input action  $a?$  and each pair of rules  $r = \frac{H}{f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \xrightarrow{a?} t}$  and  $r' = \frac{H'}{f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \xrightarrow{a?} t'}$ , there is a rule  $r'' = \frac{H''}{f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \xrightarrow{a?} t'}$  such that
  - (a) for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , the positive trigger for variable  $x_i$  in  $r''$  is included in the positive trigger for variable  $x_i$  in  $r$ ;
  - (b) for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , the negative trigger for variable  $x_i$  in  $r''$  is included in the negative trigger for variable  $x_i$  in  $r$ ;
  - (c) if  $x_i \xrightarrow{b?} z$  is contained in  $H''$  and  $z$  occurs in  $t'$ , then  $x_i \xrightarrow{b?} z$  is also contained in  $H'$ .
3. Each  $a!$ -emitting rule, where  $a!$  is an output action, has only input actions as labels of negative premises and output actions as labels of positive premises.

A GSOS language is in  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{\sigma}}$ -format if so is each of its operations.

**Theorem 4.**  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{\sigma}}$  is a precongruence for each GSOS language in  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{\sigma}}$  format.

As an example of application of the above result, we show that the merge operator from [2] can be expressed in our rule format.

*Example 3.* Merge, or conjunction, is a composition operator from the theory of  $\text{ioco}$ . It acts as a logical conjunction of requirements, that is, it describes systems by a conjunction of sub-systems, or sub-specifications. We denote by  $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n s_i$  the result of the merge of the states  $s_i$ , with  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . In [2] it is noted that, in general, the merge of two systems can lead to invalid states (for example the merge of a quiescent state with another with some output). The solution is to add a pruning algorithm after calculating the merge. Here we just show the merge operator and not that pruning algorithm. (See also Example 4.)

The merge operator can be formalized using the following GSOS rules (one such rule for each  $a \in L$ ):

$$\frac{\{x_i \xrightarrow{a} y_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}}{\bigwedge_{i=1}^n x_i \xrightarrow{a} \bigwedge_{i=1}^n y_i}.$$

It is immediate to check that the above rules are in  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{\sigma}}$ -format. Therefore the above theorem yields that the merge operator preserves  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{\sigma}}$ .

### 5.1 A rule format for coherent quiescent behaviour

Operators for constructing LTSs with inputs and outputs should ensure ‘coherent quiescent behaviour’ in the sense of Definition 1. This means that each operator  $f$ , when applied to a vector of states  $\mathbf{p}$  in an LTS, should satisfy the following property:

$$f(\mathbf{p}) \xrightarrow{\delta!} p' \text{ iff } p' = f(\mathbf{p}) \text{ and, for each } a! \in O \setminus \{\delta!\}, f(\mathbf{p}) \not\xrightarrow{a!}. \quad (2)$$

In what follows, we will isolate sufficient conditions on the GSOS rules that define  $f$  that guarantee the above-mentioned property.

**Definition 9.** *We say that the following sets of formulae contradict each other:*

- $\{x \xrightarrow{a} y\}$  and  $\{x \not\xrightarrow{a}\}$  for  $a \in L$ ,
- $\{x \xrightarrow{b!} y\}$  and  $\{x \xrightarrow{\delta!} z\}$  for  $b! \in O \setminus \{\delta!\}$ , and
- $H$  and  $H'$  when  $H$  and  $H'$  are non-empty and  $H \cup H' = \{x \not\xrightarrow{b!} \mid b! \in O\}$ .

Formulae  $x \xrightarrow{a} y$  and  $x \not\xrightarrow{a}$  are said to negate each other.

We say that two sets of formulae  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  are contradictory if there are  $H'_1 \subseteq H_1$  and  $H'_2 \subseteq H_2$  such that  $H'_1$  and  $H'_2$  contradict each other.

Intuitively, two sets of contradictory formulae cannot be both satisfied by states in an LTS. For example, in the light of the requirement on quiescent behaviour in Definition 1, there is no state  $p$  in an LTS such that  $p \not\xrightarrow{b!}$  for each  $b! \in O$ . This observation motivates the third requirement in Definition 9.

**Definition 10.** *We say that an operation  $f$  is quiescent consistent if the set of rules for  $f$  satisfies the following two constraints:*

- [ $\delta_1$ ] *If  $H/f(\mathbf{x}) \xrightarrow{\delta!} t$  is a rule for  $f$  then*
1. *for each  $f$ -defining rule  $H'/f(\mathbf{x}) \xrightarrow{b!} t'$  with  $b! \in O \setminus \{\delta!\}$ , the sets  $H$  and  $H'$  are contradictory, and*
  2.  *$t = f(\mathbf{y})$  for some vector of variables  $\mathbf{y}$  such that, for each index  $i$ , either  $y_i = x_i$  or  $x_i \xrightarrow{\delta!} y_i \in H$ .*
- [ $\delta_2$ ] *Let  $\{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$  be the set of output-emitting rules for  $f$  not having  $\delta!$  as label of their conclusions. Then the set of rules for  $f$  contains all rules of the form  $\{l_1, \dots, l_n\}/f(\mathbf{x}) \xrightarrow{\delta!} f(\mathbf{x})$ , where  $l_i$  negates some premise of  $r_i$  and no two sets of formulae included in  $\{l_1, \dots, l_n\}$  contradict each other.*

A GSOS language is quiescent consistent if so is each operation in it.

**Theorem 5.** *If  $f$  is quiescent consistent then Equation 2 holds for  $f$ .*

*Example 4.* Consider the merge, or conjunction, operator from [2] described in Example 3. As remarked in [2, Example 2], the merge operator may produce an invalid LTS when applied to states from an LTS. Note that the set of rules for the  $n$ -ary merge operator satisfy constraint [ $\delta_1$ ] in Definition 10, but not

constraint  $[\delta_2]$ . Constraint  $[\delta_2]$  also suggests how to add rules to those of the merge operator so that it preserves consistent quiescent behaviour. By way of example, consider the binary version of the merge operator, and assume that  $a!$  and  $b!$  are the only two output actions different from  $\delta!$ . Then one should add the following four rules to those for the binary merge given in Example 3:

$$\frac{\{x_1 \xrightarrow{a!} y_1, x_2 \xrightarrow{b!} y_2\}}{x_1 \wedge x_2 \xrightarrow{\delta!} x_1 \wedge x_2} \quad (a! \neq b!) .$$

The resulting operation is quiescent consistent and, by Theorem 5, satisfies Equation 2.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we have developed the theory of  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{\delta}}$  [8,9,10] by studying logical characterisations of this relation and its compositionality. We have also compared the proposed logical characterisation of  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{\delta}}$  with an existing logical characterisation for  $\text{ioco}$  proposed by Beohar and Mousavi. The article also offers a precongruence rule format for  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{\delta}}$  and a rule format ensuring that operations take quiescence properly into account. Both rule formats are based on the GSOS format by Bloom, Istrail and Meyer.

Avenues for future research we are currently pursuing include an extension of the logic for  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{\delta}}$  with fixed points, a characteristic formula construction for finite-state behaviours with respect to  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{\delta}}$ , an application of the divide and congruence approach from [7] to the definition of a congruence rule format for  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{\delta}}$  (as done in [4] for the  $XY$ -simulation preorder) and a compositionality result for the logic characterising  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{\delta}}$  over languages in  $\text{ioco}_{\underline{\delta}}$  format.

## References

1. Luca Aceto, Wan Fokkink, and Chris Verhoef. *Handbook of Process Algebra*, chapter Structural operational semantics, pages 197–292. Elsevier, 2001.
2. Nikola Benes, Przemyslaw Daca, Thomas A. Henzinger, Jan Kretínský, and Dejan Nickovic. Complete composition operators for  $\text{ioco}$ -testing theory. In *Proceedings of the 18th International ACM SIGSOFT Symposium on Component-Based Software Engineering, CBSE 2015*, pages 101–110, 2015.
3. Harsh Beohar and Mohammad Reza Mousavi. Two logical characterizations for input-output conformance. In *Preproceedings of EXPRESS/SOS’14 (Short paper)*, July 2014.
4. Harsh Beohar and Mohammad Reza Mousavi. A pre-congruence format for  $XY$ -simulation. In *Fundamentals of Software Engineering - 6th International Conference, FSEN 2015 Tehran, Iran, April 22–24, 2015, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 9392 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 215–229. Springer, 2015.
5. Bard Bloom, Sorin Istrail, and Albert R. Meyer. Bisimulation can’t be traced. *J. ACM*, 42(1):232–268, 1995.

6. David de Frutos-Escrig, Carlos Gregorio-Rodríguez, Miguel Palomino, and David Romero-Hernández. Unifying the linear time-branching time spectrum of process semantics. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 9(2:11):1–74, 2013.
7. Wan Fokkink, Rob J. van Glabbeek, and Paulien de Wind. Compositionality of Hennessy-Milner logic by structural operational semantics. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 354(3):421–440, 2006.
8. Carlos Gregorio-Rodríguez, Luis Llana, and Rafael Martínez-Torres. Input-output conformance simulation (iocos) for model based testing. In Dirk Beyer and Michele Boreale, editors, *FMOODS/FORTE*, volume 7892 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 114–129. Springer, 2013.
9. Carlos Gregorio-Rodríguez, Luis Llana, and Rafael Martínez-Torres. Effectiveness for input output conformance simulation iocos. In Erika Ábrahám and Catuscia Palamidessi, editors, *FORTE*, volume 8461 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 100–116. Springer, 2014.
10. Carlos Gregorio-Rodríguez, Luis Llana, and Rafael Martínez-Torres. Extending mCRL2 with ready simulation and iocos input-output conformance simulation. In Roger L. Wainwright, Juan Manuel Corchado, Alessio Bechini, and Jiman Hong, editors, *Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing, Salamanca, Spain, April 13-17, 2015*, pages 1781–1788. ACM, 2015.
11. Matthew Hennessy and Robin Milner. Algebraic laws for nondeterminism and concurrency. *Journal of the ACM*, 32:137–161, 1985.
12. Bartek Klin and Beata Nachyła. Some undecidable properties of SOS specifications. *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming*, 2016. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jlamp.2016.08.005>.
13. Luis Llana and Rafael Martínez-Torres. IOCO as a simulation. In Steve Counsell and Manuel Núñez, editors, *Software Engineering and Formal Methods - SEFM 2013 Collocated Workshops: BEAT2, WS-FMDS, FM-RAIL-Bok, MoKMaSD, and OpenCert, Madrid, Spain, September 23-24, 2013, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 8368 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 125–134. Springer, 2013.
14. Gerjan Stokkink, Mark Timmer, and Mariëlle Stoelinga. Talking quiescence: a rigorous theory that supports parallel composition, action hiding and determinisation. In Alexander K. Petrenko and Holger Schlingloff, editors, *MBT*, volume 80 of *EPTCS*, pages 73–87, 2012.
15. Jan Tretmans. Test generation with inputs, outputs and repetitive quiescence. *Software - Concepts and Tools*, 17(3):103–120, 1996.
16. Jan Tretmans. Model based testing with labelled transition systems. In Robert M. Hierons, Jonathan P. Bowen, and Mark Harman, editors, *Formal Methods and Testing*, volume 4949 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–38. Springer, 2008.
17. Machiel van der Bijl, Arend Rensink, and Jan Tretmans. Compositional testing with ioco. In *Formal Approaches to Software Testing, Third International Workshop on Formal Approaches to Testing of Software, FATES 2003, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, October 6th, 2003*, volume 2931 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 86–100. Springer, 2003.
18. Rob J. van Glabbeek. *Handbook of Process Algebra*, chapter The Linear Time – Branching Time Spectrum I: The Semantics of Concrete, Sequential Processes, pages 3–99. Elsevier, 2001.