

Model Checking Logical Actions in Magic Tricks

Weijun ZHU

School of Computer and Artificial Intelligence, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou, 450001, China

Abstract: Some Magic Tricks (MT), such as many kinds of Card Magic (CM), consisting of human computational or logical actions. How to ensure the logical correctness of these MTs? In this paper, the Model Checking (MC) technique is employed to study a typical CM via a case study. First, computational operations of a CM called "shousuigongcishi" can be described by a Magic Algorithm (MAR). Second, the logical correctness is portrayed by a temporal logic formula. On the basis of it, this MT logical correctness problem is reduced to the model checking problem. As a result, the Magic Trick Model Checking (MTMC) technique aims to verify whether a designed MT meets its architect's anticipation and requirements, or not, in terms of logic and computations.

Keywords: Magic Tricks; Card Magic; Magic Automaton; Magic Turing Machine; Magic Algorithm; Magic Trick Model Checking; Computational Magic Tricks

1 Introduction

On a famous magic show on TV, Mr. Qian Liu, who is a well-known magician, showed his interesting CM, called "shousuigongcishi" [1]. A wonderful story, theatrics, perfect interaction, and other factors, enhanced the charm of this MT show. However, its key is a series of designed computational actions and a magic algorithm dealing with cards. The algorithm can be executed by a sole magician, and it can also be executed parallelly by countless television audience. In short, they were persons instead of computers, execute a magic algorithm, at that time.

The question is: are there logical bugs in the computational actions of the designed CM? Can we ensure that a magic algorithm, such as "shousuigongcishi", will never encounter unexpected situations at any time and in any state? According to media reports, a great number of viewers had already watched Mr. Liu's show [2], and the magician called on everyone to follow him and do it together on scene [1]. It is clear that, the designer must guarantee the logical correctness of this CM in advance, so that the use of formal verification and model checking are sound, in this case.

2 MTM, Automaton and Algorithm for the Magician's Actions

Definition 1, a finite word in an alphabet is defined as $\bar{a} = a_1a_2\dots$

Definition 2, a transition table is a quadruple (Σ, S, S_0, E) .

- Σ is a finite alphabet.
- S is a finite state set.
- $S_0 \subseteq S$ is a start state set.
- $E \subseteq S \times S \times \Sigma$ is a set of transition rules, where $\langle s \times s \times a \rangle \in E$ is a state transition.

Definition 3, a finite run of a transition table (Σ, S, S_0, E) on a word \bar{a} is a state sequence.

$$r : s_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} s_1 \xrightarrow{a_2} \dots \xrightarrow{a_n} s_n$$

Definition 4, a finite state automaton A is a quintuple (Σ, S, S_0, E, F) , where (Σ, S, S_0, E) is a transition table, and F is a set of final states.

Definition 5, a finite state automaton (Σ, S, S_0, E, F) runs on a finite word, and this running is accepted if and only if

$$r : s_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} s_1 \xrightarrow{a_2} \dots \xrightarrow{a_n} s_n \text{ and } \bar{a} = a_1a_2\dots a_n \text{ and } s_n \in F$$

Definition 6, a regular language $L(A)$ is accepted by a finite state automaton A if and only if $L(A) = \{\bar{a} | \text{there are accepting running } r \text{ on } \bar{a} \text{ in } A\}$

Definition 7, if each word a means a magic action, a finite state automaton A which is defined by from

definition 1 to definition 5, is called a magic automaton.

Definition 8, a finite running Turing machine can be specified as a quadruple $A = (Q, \Sigma, s, \delta)$ [3], where

- Σ is a finite alphabet.
- Q is a finite state set.
- s is the initial state $s \in Q$
- δ is a transition function determining the next move: $\delta : (Q \times \Sigma) \rightarrow (\Sigma \times \{L, R\} \times Q)$

Definition 9, If each action of a Turing machine is a magic action, such a Turing machine is a magic Turing machine.

Obviously, the formal model portraying sousuigongcishi has a stronger expressive power than an automaton, so that sousuigongcishi can be modeled by a MTM instead of a magic automaton. Thus, a magic algorithm is proposed for describing sousuigongcishi as follows.

Algorithm 1 shousuigongcishi

```

/* this algorithm is mainly executed by magician and/or audience rather than computers.
Input: a sequential list of cards  $A = (a, b, c, d, a, b, c, d)$ 
Output: yes or no
Begin
  If your name has n1 words, then the first n1 cards of A is moved to the end of A, one by one. /*
  ①
  The first three cards of A is bodily moved to anywhere of A, except for the begin and/or the end.
  /* ②
  The first card is denoted as x1, and  $A := \text{tail}(A)$ . /* ③
  /* tail(A) means a new list of cards consisting of the all cards of A except for the first one.
  Select case your native place
    [case southerner
      [n2:=1]]
    [case northerner
      [n2:=2]]
    [case unknown
      [n2:=3]]
  End select
  The first n2 cards of A is bodily moved to anywhere of A, except for the begin and/or the end.
  /* ④
  Select case your gender
    [case male
      [n3:=1]]
    [case female
      [n3:=2]]
  End select
  For k:= 1 to n3, do
    A:=tail(A)
  End for /* ⑤
  For k:= 1 to 7, do
    the first card of A is moved to the end of A
  End for /* ⑥
  For k:= 1 to 4, do
    the first card of A is moved to the end of A
    A:=tail(A)
  End for /* ⑦
  If your gender is male
    the first card of A is moved to the end of A
    A:=tail(A)
  End if /* ⑧

```

```

If the only card in A = x1
  return "yes"
else
  return "no"
End if /* ⑨
End

```

Algorithm 1

Theorem 1 the algorithm 1 has a time complexity of $O(n)$.

Proof there are nine steps in this algorithm. And each step has a complexity of $O(n1)$, $O(3)$, $O(2)$, $O(n2)$, $O(n3)$, $O(7)$, $O(8)$, $O(2)$, $O(1)$, respectively. Thus, the total time is a sum of the time of these steps, i.e., $O(n)$. \square

3 The Model Checking Algorithm

Does a formal model satisfy some temporal properties? This is magic model checking problem. On the one hand, an automaton can describe magic tricks. On the other hand, temporal logics such as linear temporal logic (LTL)[4], computational tree logic (CTL) [4] and interval temporal logic (ITL)[5], are employed to portray some temporal properties. Classical model checking algorithms [4][6] can be employed to verify whether these automata satisfy these properties. In addition, some personalized ways can also be considered for model checking some MTMs. For example, in terms of the algorithm for shousuigongcishi, algorithm 2 ensures the correctness of this magic design, while algorithm 3, algorithm 4, algorithm 5, and algorithm 6 ensure some temporal properties. It should be noted that the atomic proposition p means the two half cards are matched with each other.

```

Algorithm 2 verify the correctness of shousuigongcishi
/* whether the last half card in hand match with the hidden half card or not?
/* this algorithm is executed by persons (especially for designers), or computers
Input: a sequential list of cards  $A = (a, b, c, d, a, b, c, d)$ 
Output: yes or no, true or false
Begin
  flag:=0;
  For i=1:m
    /* the combination of the values of n1, n2, n3, and anywhere in step 2 and 4, has num(paths)=m
different values
    If your name has n1 words, then the first n1 cards of A is moved to the end of A, one by one.
/* ①
    The first three cards of A is bodily moved to anywhere of A, except for the begin and/or the
end. /* ②
    The first card is denoted as x1, and  $A:=tail(A)$ . /* ③
    /* tail(A) means a new list of cards consisting of the all cards of A except for the first one.
    /* from step 3 to step 9, we will model checking  $AF(p \wedge empty)$ , which is a ITL formula [5]
    Select case your native place
      [case southerner
        [n2:=1]]
      [case northerner
        [n2:=2]]
      [case unknown
        [n2:=3]]
    End select
    The first n2 cards of A is bodily moved to anywhere of A, except for the begin and/or the end.
/* ④
    Select case your gender

```

```

    [case male
      [n3:=1]]
    [case female
      [n3:=2]]
  End select
  For k:= 1 to n3, do
    A:=tail(A)
  End for /* ⑤
  For k:= 1 to 7, do
    the first card of A is moved to the end of A
  End for /* ⑥
  For k:= 1 to 4, do
    the first card of A is moved to the end of A
    A:=tail(A)
  End for /* ⑦
  If your gender is male
    the first card of A is moved to the end of A
    A:=tail(A)
  End if /* ⑧
  If the only card in A = x1
    return "yes"
    flag:=flag+1;
  else
    return "no"
  End if /* ⑨
End for
If flag=m, then MC result of  $AF(p \wedge empty)$  is "true", else MC result of  $AF(p \wedge empty)$  is "false"
End

```

Algorithm 2

Theorem 2 the algorithm 2 has a time complexity of $O(m*n)$.

Proof The algorithm has a loop. The loop is executed m times. There are nine steps in the loop body. Each loop consumes the following time: $O(n1)+O(3)+O(2)+O(n2)+O(n3)+O(7)+O(8)+O(2)+O(2)=O(n)$. Thus, the total time is $O(m*n)$. \square

Algorithm 3 MC AFp for shousuigongcishi

```

/* whether the last half card in the sequence in hand is equal to the hidden half one in one step
(after step 3) for every playing.
/* this algorithm is executed by persons (especially for designers), or computers
Input: a sequential list of cards  $A = (a, b, c, d, a, b, c, d)$ 
Output: yes or no, true or false
Begin
  flag:=0;
  For i=1:m
    /* the combination of the values of n1, n2, n3, and anywhere in step 2 and 4, has num(paths)=m
different values
    If your name has n1 words, then the first n1 cards of A is moved to the end of A, one by one.
/* ①
    The first three cards of A is bodily moved to anywhere of A, except for the begin and/or the
end. /* ②
    The first card is denoted as x1, and  $A:=tail(A)$ . /* ③
    /* tail(A) means a new list of cards consisting of the all cards of A except for the first one.
    /* from step 3 to step 9, we will model checking  $AFp$ , which is a CTL formula [4]
    Select case your native place

```

```

[case southerner
  [n2:=1]]
[case northerner
  [n2:=2]]
[case unknown
  [n2:=3]]
End select
The first n2 cards of A is bodily moved to anywhere of A, except for the begin and/or the end.
If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag:=1 /* ④
Select case your gender
  [case male
    [n3:=1]]
  [case female
    [n3:=2]]
End select
For k:= 1 to n3, do
  A:=tail(A)
End for
If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag:=1 /* ⑤
For k:= 1 to 7, do
  the first card of A is moved to the end of A
End for
If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag:=1 /* ⑥
For k:= 1 to 4, do
  the first card of A is moved to the end of A
  A:=tail(A)
End for
If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag:=1 /* ⑦
If your gender is male
  the first card of A is moved to the end of A
  A:=tail(A)
End if
If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag:=1 /* ⑧
If the only card in A = x1
  return "yes"
  flag:=1;
else
  return "no"
End if /* ⑨
End for
flag:=flag+1;
If flag=m, then MC result of AFp is "true", else MC result of AFp is "false"
End

```

Algorithm 3

Theorem 3 the algorithm 3 has a time complexity of $O(m*n)$.

Proof This is the similar way with the process of proving theorem 2. \square

Algorithm 4 MC AGp for shousuigongcishi

/* whether the last half card in the sequence in hand is equal to the hidden half one in each step (after step 3) for every playing.

/* this algorithm is executed by persons (especially for designers), or computers

Input: a sequential list of cards $A = (a, b, c, d, a, b, c, d)$

Output: yes or no, true or false

Begin

flag:=0;

For i=1:m

/* the combination of the values of n1, n2, n3, and anywhere in step 2 and 4, has num(paths)=m different values

If your name has n1 words, then the first n1 cards of A is moved to the end of A, one by one.

/* ①

The first three cards of A is bodily moved to anywhere of A, except for the begin and/or the end. /* ②

The first card is denoted as x1, and A:=tail(A). /* ③

/* tail(A) means a new list of cards consisting of the all cards of A except for the first one.

/* from step 3 to step 9, we will model checking AGp , which is a CTL formula [4]

Select case your native place

[case southerner

[n2:=1]]

[case northerner

[n2:=2]]

[case unknown

[n2:=3]]

End select

The first n2 cards of A is bodily moved to anywhere of A, except for the begin and/or the end.

If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag:=flag+1 /* ④

Select case your gender

[case male

[n3:=1]]

[case female

[n3:=2]]

End select

For k:= 1 to n3, do

A:=tail(A)

End for

If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag:=flag+1 /* ⑤

For k:= 1 to 7, do

the first card of A is moved to the end of A

End for

If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag:=flag+1 /* ⑥

For k:= 1 to 4, do

the first card of A is moved to the end of A

A:=tail(A)

End for

If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag:=flag+1 /* ⑦

If your gender is male

the first card of A is moved to the end of A

A:=tail(A)

End if

If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag:=flag+1 /* ⑧

If the only card in A = x1

return "yes"

flag:=flag+1;

else

return "no"

End if /* ⑨

End for

If flag=6*m, then MC result of AGp is "true", else MC result of AGp is "false"

End

Algorithm 4

Theorem 4 the algorithm 4 has a time complexity of $O(m*n)$.

Proof This is the similar way with the process of proving theorem 3. \square

Algorithm 5 MC EFp for shousuigongcishi

/* whether the last half card in the sequence in hand is equal to the hidden half one in one step (after step 3) for one playing.

/* this algorithm is executed by persons (especially for designers), or computers

Input: a sequential list of cards $A = (a, b, c, d, a, b, c, d)$

Output: yes or no, true or false

Begin

flag:=0;

For i=1:m

/* the combination of the values of n1, n2, n3, and anywhere in step 2 and 4, has num(paths)=m different values

If your name has n1 words, then the first n1 cards of A is moved to the end of A, one by one.

/* ①

The first three cards of A is bodily moved to anywhere of A, except for the begin and/or the end. /* ②

The first card is denoted as x1, and $A:=tail(A)$. /* ③

/* tail(A) means a new list of cards consisting of the all cards of A except for the first one.

/* from step 3 to step 9, we will model checking *EFp*, which is a CTL formula [4]

Select case your native place

[case southerner

[n2:=1]]

[case northerner

[n2:=2]]

[case unknown

[n2:=3]]

End select

The first n2 cards of A is bodily moved to anywhere of A, except for the begin and/or the end.

If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag:=1 /* ④

Select case your gender

[case male

[n3:=1]]

[case female

[n3:=2]]

End select

For k:= 1 to n3, do

A:=tail(A)

End for

If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag:=1 /* ⑤

For k:= 1 to 7, do

the first card of A is moved to the end of A

End for

If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag:=1 /* ⑥

For k:= 1 to 4, do

the first card of A is moved to the end of A

A:=tail(A)

End for

If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag:=1 /* ⑦

If your gender is male

the first card of A is moved to the end of A

A:=tail(A)

End if

If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag:=1 /* ⑧

```

    If the only card in A = x1
      return "yes"
    flag:=1;
  else
    return "no"
  End if /* ⑨
End for
flag:=flag+1;
If flag>0, then MC result of EFp is "true", else MC result of EFp is "false"
End

```

Algorithm 5

Theorem 5 the algorithm 5 has a time complexity of $O(m*n)$.

Proof This is the similar way with the process of proving theorem 4. \square

Algorithm 6 MC EGp for shousuigongcishi

```

/* whether the last half card in the sequence in hand is equal to the hidden half one in each step
(after step 3) for one playing.
/* this algorithm is executed by persons (especially for designers), or computers
Input: a sequential list of cards  $A = (a, b, c, d, a, b, c, d)$ 
Output: yes or no, true or false
Begin
  flag2:=0;
  For i=1:m
    /* the combination of the values of n1, n2, n3, and anywhere in step 2 and 4, has num(paths)=m
different values
    flag1:=0;
    If your name has n1 words, then the first n1 cards of A is moved to the end of A, one by one.
/* ①
    The first three cards of A is bodily moved to anywhere of A, except for the begin and/or the
end. /* ②
    The first card is denoted as x1, and  $A:=tail(A)$ . /* ③
    /* tail(A) means a new list of cards consisting of the all cards of A except for the first one.
    /* from step 3 to step 9, we will model checking EGp, which is a CTL formula [4]
    Select case your native place
      [case southerner
        [n2:=1]]
      [case northerner
        [n2:=2]]
      [case unknown
        [n2:=3]]
    End select
    The first n2 cards of A is bodily moved to anywhere of A, except for the begin and/or the end.
    If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag1:=flag1+1 /* ④
    Select case your gender
      [case male
        [n3:=1]]
      [case female
        [n3:=2]]
    End select
    For k:= 1 to n3, do
      A:=tail(A)
    End for
    If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag1:=flag1+1 /* ⑤

```



```

For k:= 1 to 7, do
  the first card of A is moved to the end of A
End for
If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag1:=flag1+1 /* ⑥
For k:= 1 to 4, do
  the first card of A is moved to the end of A
  A:=tail(A)
End for
If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag1:=flag1+1 /* ⑦
If your gender is male
  the first card of A is moved to the end of A
  A:=tail(A)
End if
If last card of A is equal to x1, then flag1:=flag1+1 /* ⑧
If the only card in A = x1
  return "yes"
  flag1:=flag1+1;
else
  return "no"
End if /* ⑨
If flag1=6 then flag2:=1
End for
flag:=flag+1;
If flag2=1, then MC result of EGp is "true", else MC result of EGp is "false"
End

```

Algorithm 6

Theorem 6 the algorithm 6 has a time complexity of $O(m*n)$.

Proof This is the similar way with the process of proving theorem 5. \square

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Platform

- CPU: i9 10900, 2.80 Ghz;
- Memory: 32GB;
- OS: windows 10;
- Tool: Matlab 2017.

4.2 Experimental Procedure

- (1) algorithm 2 is encoded via matlab, before running and getting the running results of *shousuigongcishi*, MC results of $AF(p \wedge empty)$ and running time.
- (2) algorithm 3 is encoded via matlab, before running and getting MC results of AFp and time.
- (3) algorithm 4 is encoded via matlab, before running and getting MC results of AGp and time.
- (4) algorithm 5 is encoded via matlab, before running and getting MC results of EFp and time.
- (5) algorithm 6 is encoded via matlab, before running and getting MC results of EGp and time.

4.3 Experimental Results

As shown in fig.1 and fig.2, we get some experimental results.

The program runs 144 times, covering all 144 paths, and getting 0 unexpected results. So, the accuracy reaches 1.

It takes 0.578 seconds. And the average time for running once is 0.0040139 seconds.

Fig. 1. MC results of $AF(p \wedge empty)$ and running time

The program runs 144 times, covering all 144 paths, where 144 paths have reached the state p , in which the hidden half card matches with the last half one of a queue of half cards in the hand after step 3. So, the MC result about AF is true.

It takes 0.469 seconds.

the following paths are counterexamples:

none

fx >>

(a) AF

The program runs 144 times, covering all 144 paths, where 648 paths*states in 864 paths*states satisfy p , in which the hidden half card matches with the last half one of a queue of half cards in the hand after step 3. So, the MC result about AG is false.

It takes 0.453 seconds.

the following paths are counterexamples:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60
61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90
91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120
fx 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 >>

(b) AG

The program runs 144 times, covering all 144 paths, where 144 paths have reached the state p , in which the hidden half card matches with the last half one of a queue of half cards in the hand after step 3. So, the MC result about EF is true.

It takes 0.484 seconds.

the following paths are counterexamples:

in this situation, no counterexample is needed

fx >>

(c) EF

The program runs 144 times, covering all 144 paths. And in 0 paths, each state satisfies p , in which the hidden half card matches with the last half one of a queue of half cards in the hand after step 3. So, the MC result about EG is false.

It takes 0.484 seconds.

the following paths are counterexamples:

all paths

fx >>

(d) EG

Fig. 2. MC results

Table 1: some differences

Formal mechanisms	Presented in this study	The classical ones
Automata / TM	Executed by persons/computers, and modeling/verifying some magicians' actions	Executed by computers / modeling/verifying some computers' actions
Algorithms		
Model checking		

5 Discussions

In short, table 1 can help us understanding the proposed models and methods. In addition, the proposed models and methods have the similar expressing forms in terms of syntax and semantics with the classical ones. It is clear that, the experiments in the previous section can also be executed by human rather than computers.

Technically speaking / from a computer science standpoint / perhaps in a manner of speaking, Mr. Liu called on countless audience to "execute the algorithm" parallelly at that time [1][2]. Theoretically, he only needs 144 viewers and six minutes so that they can check all 144 paths to verify the correctness of the logic design of this magic trick, supposing each audience's name has two or three words. More importantly, many people derived pleasure in the process of this magic show, at that time.

It should be noted that, a magic algorithm maybe has some unnecessary steps, if we only need computational results. For example, shousuigongcishi's computational function is finding two matched half cards. We can archive this goal before step 3. However, the following "redundant" steps make the thing more interesting. After all, it is a magic trick. If time complexity is very vital in traditional computing theory, entertainment rather than time is more vital in "computing" theory of computational magic tricks.

6 Conclusion

In this study, some formal concept about magic formal models, magic algorithms and magic model checking are presented, and they are formal mechanisms for magicians' logic actions. In this case, there is another method, i.e., theorem proving, in verifying the correctness of this CM. Whatever theorem proving or model checking, formal verification and computational magic can be expected to help architects in the process of designing some interesting, attractive and wonderful logic/computational tricks, especially for more complex, stronger and more safe running large scale CM.

References

- [1] Qian Liu, a magic trick: shousuigongcishi, CCTV Spring Festival gala 2024, <http://tv.cctv.com/2024/02/10/VIDERxczVUdIf1FNeLEDruco240210.shtml>, 2024-02-10.
- [2] 26.7 billion times! The dissemination data of the 2024 CCTV Spring Festival Gala set a new record, CCTV, <https://www.cctv.cn/2024/02/10/ARTI3a15M3SnSc6a0JrJ3hJh240210.shtml>, 2024-02-10.
- [3] <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/turing-machine/#DefiForm>
- [4] Edmund M. Clarke Jr., Orna Grumberg, Daniel Kroening, Doron Peled and Helmut Veith, Model Checking, Second Edition, The MIT Press, 2018.
- [5] Ben Moszkowski. Reasoning about Digital Circuits. PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science, Stanford University, June 1983. Technical report STAN-CS-83-970.
- [6] Ben Moszkowski. An automata-theoretic completeness proof for Interval Temporal Logic (extended abstract). In Ugo Montanari, José Rolim, and Emo Welzl, editors, Proc. 27th Int'l. Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP 2000), volume 1853 of Lect. Notes in Comp. Sci., pages 223-234. Springer, July 2000.