

Revisiting the specification decomposition for synthesis based on LTL solvers^{*}

Josu Oca¹, Montserrat Hermo¹, and Alexander Bolotov²

¹ University of the Basque Country, San Sebastián, Spain

² University of Westminster, London, UK

Abstract. Recently, several algorithms have been proposed for decomposing reactive synthesis specifications into independent and simpler sub-specifications. Being inspired by one of the approaches, developed by Antonio Iannopollo (2018), who designed the so-called *DecomposeContract* (*DC*) algorithm, we present here our solution that takes his ideas further and provides mathematical formalisation of the strategy behind *DC*. We rigorously define the main notions involved in the algorithm, explain the technique, and demonstrate its application on examples. The core technique of *DC* is based on the detection of independent variables in linear temporal logic formulae by exploiting the power and efficiency of a model checker.

Although the *DC* algorithm is sound, it is not complete, as its author already pointed out. In this paper, we provide a counterexample that shows this fact and propose relevant changes to adapt the original *DC* strategy to ensure its correctness. The modification of *DC* and the detailed proof of its soundness and completeness are the main contributions of this work.

Keywords: Linear temporal logic · Reactive synthesis · Independent variables · Soundness · Completeness.

1 Introduction

Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) [19] is a modal logic widely used to express properties of reactive systems. In these systems, the atomic variables are divided into those controlled by the environment and the rest controlled by the system itself. Given an LTL-based reactive system specification, the realisability problem decides whether there exists an implementation that satisfies the specification for all possible behaviors of the environment. Subsequently, the synthesis process returns one implementation if it exists. The major drawback of both problems is that they are 2EXPTIME-complete [18], which has led to the development of alternatives to improve the performance of the algorithms underlying their

^{*} This work was funded in part by the European Union (ERDF funds) under grant PID2020-112581GB-C22, European COST Action CA20111 EuroProofNet (European Research Network on Formal Proofs), and by the University of the Basque Country under project LoRea GIU21/044.

solutions. One of these options is to split an LTL specification into smaller ones, process them separately, and finally, combine the results to decide whether the original specification is realisable. In case of a positive answer here, one implementation is synthesised [6, 20].

There are many studies in this scenario. Some of them are *compositional* algorithms that apply when LTL specifications are conjunctions of LTL sub-specifications. For instance, a compositional synthesis method for small conjuncts is shown in [2]. Although this method does not work for general LTL formulae, it is effective for a popular fragment of LTL - so called *safety* LTL [14]. Additionally, a later work ([8]) provides compositional algorithms for full LTL synthesis. Another technique is introduced in [13], utilising a game framework. Here, a given specification is divided into two sub-specifications, to which a game-theoretic approach is applied - winning regions for the sub-games are constructed from these sub-specifications, where the computation is fully parallelised. Recently, the latter has been improved in [12] to include an arbitrary number of sub-specifications instead of just a pair. Other compositional methods [7, 15] give good results for LTL fragments such as GR(1) [5, 17].

Among all the different approaches, we would like to highlight those proposed in [9] and [10]. The first is precise enough to prove the soundness and completeness of the decomposition method. That is, if an LTL specification is divided into smaller ones, the method guarantees that the original specification is realisable if and only if, each sub-specification is realisable. Furthermore, the sub-specifications are independent in the sense that completely separate synthesis tasks can be performed for them. The authors define the notion of independent sub-languages, which captures, in an abstract way, the situation when the sub-specifications are independent of each other. Next, this notion of independent sub-languages is considered in the context of nondeterministic Büchi automata (NBA) and the decomposition algorithm for specifications is formulated in terms of NBA. However, the algorithm is unfeasible for large automata due to operations like automata complementation [22]. This leads the authors to propose an approximate decomposition algorithm for the specifications given as LTL formulae, which works very well in practice. The bad news is that although the approximate algorithm is sound, it loses completeness and does not necessarily find the *optimal* decomposition.

We find the second approach [10] particularly interesting because the author aims to define an efficient decomposition algorithm, \mathcal{DC} , (also presented in [11]) that applies to LTL-based Assume/Guarantee contracts [3, 16]. The hard work in \mathcal{DC} is done by a model checker that helps in dividing the initial specification - an LTL formula - into simpler sub-specifications. The method is based on identifying, in the initial formula, sets of variables controlled by the system that are *independent* of each other. The algorithm runs in polynomial time without counting queries to the model checker. We find this proposal very powerful, as model checkers like NuSMV [1] have become very efficient tools. Algorithm \mathcal{DC} , with respect to the notion of independence, defined as in [10], is indeed sound but not complete. As an example, consider the following LTL formula. For simplicity,

we omit brackets separating conjunctions in the scope of the \Box operator.

$$\Box((p \rightarrow \bigcirc(v \wedge \neg t)) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow \bigcirc(\neg v \wedge t)) \wedge (v \rightarrow \bigcirc(\neg w \wedge z)) \wedge (\neg v \rightarrow \bigcirc(w \wedge \neg z)))$$

In this example, variable p is controlled by the environment while t, v, w, z are controlled by the system. The \mathcal{DC} algorithm might return $\{t, v, w, z\}$ as the only set of independent variables. However, the correct decomposition would identify two subsets of independent variables: $\{v, w, z\}$ and $\{t\}$. We will study this formula in detail in Example 9 of Section 3.

In this paper, We revisit the \mathcal{DC} algorithm by introducing some important changes that not only preserve its efficiency but also allow us to ensure the soundness and completeness of the new algorithm. We prove that the sets of independent variables returned by our algorithm are indeed independent (soundness) and that they are minimal, i.e. if a set of variables is classified as independent, no proper subsets except the empty set are independent (completeness). The method we have developed is for the full LTL logic. All our work focuses on the correctness of the proposal from a mathematical point of view: we give the semantics to several concepts that already appeared in [10] and prove in detail the properties that guarantee the correctness.

2 Formalisation

Reactive systems are specified in the language of LTL. We assume the reader is familiar with the syntax and semantics of LTL [4].

For the purpose of specification, the set of atomic propositions (or propositional variables) in LTL formulae is divided into two disjoint subsets: \mathcal{E} , controlled by the environment, and \mathcal{S} , controlled by the system. From now on, any LTL formula is formed over variables ($\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{S}$).

Checking the realisability of a specification can be seen as a game-theoretic problem with two players, the environment and the system, which choose, in turns, Boolean values for their variables \mathcal{E} or \mathcal{S} over an infinite duration. A specification is realisable if there is a winning strategy for the system.

For the Definitions 1 - 7 we assume that we are dealing with some specification of a reactive system which is formalised in LTL language.

Definition 1 (Winning strategy). *Given φ is an LTL formula over variables from $\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{S}$, a winning strategy for the system is a function $\sigma : (2^{\mathcal{E}})^* \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{S}}$, such that for every infinite environment-string (usually called an environment play) $E = E_0 \cdot E_1 \cdot E_2 \cdots \in (2^{\mathcal{E}})^\omega$ and a system play $\sigma(E_0), \sigma(E_0 \cdot E_1), \sigma(E_0 \cdot E_1 \cdot E_2), \dots$ we have $E_0 \cup \sigma(E_0), E_1 \cup \sigma(E_0 \cdot E_1), E_2 \cup \sigma(E_0 \cdot E_1 \cdot E_2), \dots$ is a model of φ .*

We abbreviate $E_0 \cup \sigma(E_0), E_1 \cup \sigma(E_0 \cdot E_1), E_2 \cup \sigma(E_0 \cdot E_1 \cdot E_2), \dots$ as σ^E . Thus, σ^E is an infinite trace over variables $\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{S}$ according to E . We will also write these traces as $\sigma^E = \sigma_0^E, \sigma_1^E, \dots$ to make the states explicit. Note that for any $i \geq 0$, we have $\sigma_i^E = E_i \cup S_i$, where $E_i \subseteq \mathcal{E}$, $S_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and $S_i = \sigma(E_0 \cdot E_1 \cdots E_i)$. When σ^E models (or is a model of) φ , we will say that $\sigma^E \models \varphi$.

Example 1 (Environment play and winning strategy). Let $\mathcal{E} = \{p\}$, $\mathcal{S} = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$, and the following LTL formula.

$$\varphi = \Box(p \rightarrow (a \vee (b \wedge c))) \wedge \Diamond(p \rightarrow (d \vee e)) \wedge \Diamond(\neg p \rightarrow \neg e)$$

Let E be an environment play $E = E_0 \cdot E_1 \cdots$ such that for any $i \geq 0$, $E_i = \{p\}$. In other words, $E = \{p\}^\omega$. Let σ be a system strategy such that for any $i \geq 0$, $\sigma_i^E = \{p, a, d\}$, i.e., $\sigma^E = \{p, a, d\}^\omega$. Then $\sigma^E \models \varphi$. If for any possible environment play E , $\sigma^E = E_0 \cup \{a, d\}, \cdots E_i \cup \{a, d\} \cdots$, then σ is a winning strategy for the system.

Definition 2 (Realisability). *An LTL formula is realisable if there is a winning strategy for the system.*

Targeting the definition of independent variables, we introduce traces following [10], where the notion of independence is defined in terms of traces and not in terms of winning strategies.

Definition 3 (Traces corresponding to environment plays). *Let $\alpha = \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \cdots$ be an infinite trace where for all $i \geq 0$, $\alpha_i \in 2^{\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{S}}$. Let $E = E_0, E_1, \cdots$ be an environment play in $(2^\mathcal{E})^\omega$. We say that α corresponds to E when for any $i \geq 0$, $\alpha_i \cap \mathcal{E} = E_i$. We denote traces that correspond to a particular environment play E as α^E . For any $i \geq 0$, the environment (respectively, system) variables in α_i^E are denoted as $\mathcal{E}(\alpha_i^E)$ (respectively, $\mathcal{S}(\alpha_i^E)$).*

Definition 4 (Traces that model LTL formulae). *Let φ be an LTL formula. Let $E \in (2^\mathcal{E})^\omega$. We denote the set of traces corresponding to E that are models of φ as Σ_φ^E . That is, $\Sigma_\varphi^E = \{\alpha^E : \alpha^E \models \varphi\}$.*

Remark 1. For any environment plays E and E' with $E \neq E'$, $\Sigma_\varphi^E \cap \Sigma_\varphi^{E'} = \emptyset$.

Definition 5 (Set of models for an LTL formula). *Let φ be an LTL formula. The set of traces that model φ is denoted by Σ_φ . That is, $\Sigma_\varphi = \bigcup_{E \in (2^\mathcal{E})^\omega} \Sigma_\varphi^E$.*

Given a trace, we can define the classical projection operator (from relational algebra) only over system variables.

Definition 6 (Trace projection). *Let α be a trace and let $W \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. The projection of α over W , denoted by $\alpha \upharpoonright W$, is the trace such that for all $i \geq 0$, $(\alpha \upharpoonright W)_i = \mathcal{E}(\alpha_i) \cup (\mathcal{S}(\alpha_i) \cap W)$.*

Example 2. Recall that considering $\varphi = \Box(p \rightarrow (a \vee (b \wedge c))) \wedge \Diamond(p \rightarrow (d \vee e)) \wedge \Diamond(\neg p \rightarrow \neg e)$ with $\mathcal{E} = \{p\}$, $\mathcal{S} = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$, in Example 1, we built an environment play $E = \{p\}^\omega$. Then we let σ^E be such that $\sigma^E = \{p, a, d\}^\omega$. Thus, the following facts hold: $\sigma^E \models \varphi$ and hence, $\sigma^E \in \Sigma_\varphi^E$ and $\sigma^E \in \Sigma_\varphi$. Furthermore, $\sigma^E \upharpoonright \{a\} = \{p, a\}^\omega$.

Now we can extend Definition 6 to sets of traces.

Definition 7 (Set of traces projection). Let $W \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and let Σ be a set of traces. We define the projection of Σ over W , denoted by $(\Sigma \upharpoonright W)$, as the set $\{\alpha \upharpoonright W : \alpha \in \Sigma\}$.

Lemma 1. Let φ be an LTL formula and let $W \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. Then the following holds.

$$(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) = \bigcup_{E \in (2^\mathcal{E})^\omega} (\Sigma_\varphi^E \upharpoonright W)$$

Proof. For short denote $\bigcup_{E \in (2^\mathcal{E})^\omega} (\Sigma_\varphi^E \upharpoonright W)$ as $U\Sigma_\varphi$. We first prove that $(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \subseteq U\Sigma_\varphi$. By Definition 7, $(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) = \{\alpha \upharpoonright W : \alpha \in \Sigma_\varphi\}$. Take a trace $\beta \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W)$, there must exist a trace $\alpha \in \Sigma_\varphi$, which is an extension of β , such that β and α correspond to the same environment play E and $\beta = \alpha \upharpoonright W$. Since $\alpha \in \Sigma_\varphi^E$, $\alpha \upharpoonright W \in (\Sigma_\varphi^E \upharpoonright W)$ and $\beta \in U\Sigma_\varphi$.

Now we prove that $U\Sigma_\varphi \subseteq (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W)$. Take a trace β in $U\Sigma_\varphi$. Suppose that E is the environment play that corresponds to β . Then $\beta \in (\Sigma_\varphi^E \upharpoonright W)$. By Definition 7, there exists $\alpha \in \Sigma_\varphi^E$ such that $\beta = \alpha \upharpoonright W$. Using Definition 5, $\alpha \in \Sigma_\varphi$ and therefore, $\beta \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W)$. \square

Definition 8 introduces the join operator (also from relational algebra).

Definition 8 (Join). Let $W_1, W_2 \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. Let Σ_1 (respectively Σ_2) be sets of traces over $(\mathcal{E} \cup W_1)$ (respectively $(\mathcal{E} \cup W_2)$). We define the join of Σ_1 and Σ_2 , denoted by $\Sigma_1 \bowtie \Sigma_2$, to be the following set, where traces α are over variables $(\mathcal{E} \cup W_1 \cup W_2)$.

$$\{\alpha \mid (\alpha \upharpoonright W_1) \in \Sigma_1\} \cap \{\alpha \mid (\alpha \upharpoonright W_2) \in \Sigma_2\}$$

Example 3. Let φ be an LTL formula $\varphi = \Box((p \rightarrow (a \vee b)) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow (\neg a \wedge b))) \wedge c$. To determine that $\{p, c\}^\omega \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{b, c\}) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{a\})$, note that $\alpha = \{p, a, c\}^\omega$ and $\beta = \{p, b, c\}^\omega$ are models of φ . Moreover, $\alpha \upharpoonright \{b, c\} = \{p, c\}^\omega$ and $\beta \upharpoonright \{a\} = \{p\}^\omega$. Thus, $\{p, c\}^\omega \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{b, c\})$ and $\{p\}^\omega \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{a\})$. Since $\{p\}^\omega$ can be extended to $\{p, c\}^\omega$, this trace is in $(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{b, c\}) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{a\})$.

Remark 2. Using Lemma 1, it is easy to establish that

$$(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W_1) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W_2) = \bigcup_{E \in (2^\mathcal{E})^\omega} (\Sigma_\varphi^E \upharpoonright W_1) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi^E \upharpoonright W_2)$$

The following properties of the projection and join operators can be easily proved [24]. Let $U, W, W_1, W_2 \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. Let $\Sigma, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2$ be three sets of traces, with traces over $\mathcal{E} \cup W$, $\mathcal{E} \cup W_1$, and $\mathcal{E} \cup W_2$, respectively. Then the following holds:

- (a) Commutativity, associativity, and monotonicity.
- $\Sigma_1 \bowtie \Sigma_2 = \Sigma_2 \bowtie \Sigma_1$
 - $(\Sigma_1 \bowtie \Sigma_2) \bowtie \Sigma = \Sigma_1 \bowtie (\Sigma_2 \bowtie \Sigma)$
 - If $\Sigma_1 \subseteq \Sigma'_1$, then $\Sigma_1 \bowtie \Sigma \subseteq \Sigma'_1 \bowtie \Sigma$. Here, Σ'_1 with traces over $\mathcal{E} \cup W_1$.

- (b) Idempotency of join.
 - $\Sigma \bowtie (\Sigma \upharpoonright W) = \Sigma$ and $(\Sigma \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma \upharpoonright W) = (\Sigma \upharpoonright W)$
- (c) Distributivity of projection over join.
 - $\Sigma \upharpoonright (U \cup W) \subseteq (\Sigma \upharpoonright U) \bowtie (\Sigma \upharpoonright W)$
- (d) Distributivity of join over projection.
 - Let $X \subseteq W_1$ and $Y \subseteq W_2$ with $W_1 \cap W_2 = \emptyset$.
 - $(\Sigma_1 \bowtie \Sigma_2) \upharpoonright (X \cup Y) = (\Sigma_1 \upharpoonright X) \bowtie (\Sigma_2 \upharpoonright Y)$

Now we are ready to define the notion of *independence*.

Definition 9 (Independent set of variables). *Let φ be an LTL formula and let $W \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. The set W is independent in φ , if and only if,*

$$(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W)) = \Sigma_\varphi$$

Example 4. Take φ from Example 3: $\Box((p \rightarrow (a \vee b)) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow (\neg a \wedge b))) \wedge c$. The join $(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{b, c\}) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{a\})$ contains the trace $\{p, c\}^\omega$, which is not a model of φ . Hence, the set $\{a\}$ is dependent in φ and the set $\{b, c\}$ is dependent in φ .

The author of [10] introduced the notion of independent variables using what we call projection formulae. Given an LTL formula φ , we obtain a projection formula of φ over a set $W \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ by renaming each variable $w \in W$ in φ with a new variable w' .

Definition 10 (Projection formulae). *Let $\varphi(\bar{e}, w_1, \dots, w_k, v_1, \dots, v_r)$ be an LTL formula, where \bar{e} denotes the variables from \mathcal{E} . Let $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, and $\mathcal{S} \setminus W = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$. The projection formula of φ over W , denoted as φ'_W , is the formula $\varphi(\bar{e}, w'_1, \dots, w'_k, v_1, \dots, v_r)$, where w'_i ($1 \leq i \leq k$) is a new variable.*

Example 5. Let $\varphi = \Box(p \rightarrow (a \vee (b \wedge c))) \wedge \Diamond(p \rightarrow (d \vee e)) \wedge \Diamond(\neg p \rightarrow \neg e)$. Hence, picking new variables a', b', c', d', e'

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi'_{\{a,b\}} &= \Box(p \rightarrow (a' \vee (b' \wedge c))) \wedge \Diamond(p \rightarrow (d \vee e)) \wedge \Diamond(\neg p \rightarrow \neg e) \\ \varphi'_{\{c,d,e\}} &= \Box(p \rightarrow (a \vee (b \wedge c'))) \wedge \Diamond(p \rightarrow (d' \vee e')) \wedge \Diamond(\neg p \rightarrow \neg e'). \end{aligned}$$

Properties of the independent sets and projection formulae - Lemmas.

Lemmas 2 and 3 show the close relationship between traces that are models for projection formulae over sets and traces that are models for formulae restricted to those sets, i.e. between φ'_W and $\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W$.

Lemma 2. *Let φ be an LTL formula and $U, W \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ with $U \cap W = \emptyset$. Let α be a trace. If $\alpha \models (\varphi'_U \wedge \varphi'_W)$, then $\alpha \upharpoonright (U \cup W) \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright U) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W)$.*

Proof. Suppose $\alpha \models \varphi'_U$. Then there exists a trace $\delta \in \Sigma_\varphi$ which behaves similar to α in relation to the variables in U' and $\mathcal{S} \setminus U$. Formally, for any state $i \geq 0$, if $u \in U$: $u \in \delta_i \leftrightarrow u' \in \alpha_i$ and if $v \in \mathcal{S} \setminus U$: $v \in \delta_i \leftrightarrow v \in \alpha_i$. Similarly, if $\alpha \models \varphi'_W$ then there exists a trace $\gamma \in \Sigma_\varphi$ which behaves similar to α in relation to the variables in W' and $\mathcal{S} \setminus W$. Obviously, $\alpha \upharpoonright U = \gamma \upharpoonright U$ and $\alpha \upharpoonright W = \delta \upharpoonright W$. Since $\gamma \upharpoonright U \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright U)$ and $\delta \upharpoonright W \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W)$, we conclude that $\alpha \upharpoonright (U \cup W) \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright U) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W)$. \square

Lemma 3. *Let $\varphi(\bar{e}, u_1, \dots, u_{k_u}, w_1, \dots, w_{k_w}, y_1, \dots, y_{k_y})$ be an LTL formula defined over system variables $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_{k_u}\}$, $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_{k_w}\}$, and $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_{k_y}\}$. If $\alpha \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (U \cup Y)) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (Y \cup W))$, then there exists an extension of α , denoted by $\hat{\alpha}$, such that $\hat{\alpha} \models (\varphi'_U \wedge \varphi'_W)$.*

Proof. Let α be in $(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (U \cup Y)) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (Y \cup W))$. Since $\alpha \upharpoonright (U \cup Y) \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (U \cup Y))$, there must exist an extension of $\alpha \upharpoonright (U \cup Y)$, denoted by α_w , which is a model of φ . Similarly, since $\alpha \upharpoonright (Y \cup W) \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (Y \cup W))$, there must exist an extension of $\alpha \upharpoonright (Y \cup W)$, denoted by α_u , which is a model of φ . Then we can extend α to $\hat{\alpha}$ as follows. For any state $i \geq 0$,

$$\hat{\alpha}_i = \alpha_i \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq k_u} \{u'_j : u_j \in (\alpha_u)_i\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq k_w} \{w'_j : w_j \in (\alpha_w)_i\}$$

From the above we can see that $\hat{\alpha}$ models $\varphi(\bar{e}, u_1, \dots, u_{k_u}, w'_1, \dots, w'_{k_w}, y_1, \dots, y_{k_y}) = \varphi'_W$ and $\hat{\alpha}$ models $\varphi(\bar{e}, u'_1, \dots, u'_{k_u}, w_1, \dots, w_{k_w}, y_1, \dots, y_{k_y}) = \varphi'_U$ \square

Lemma 4 shows how to extend traces for projection formulae.

Lemma 4. *Let $U, W \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ with $U \cap W = \emptyset$ and let φ be an LTL formula. If there exists a trace α such that $\alpha \models (\varphi'_U \wedge \varphi'_W)$, then there exists a trace $\hat{\alpha}$, an extension of α , such that $\hat{\alpha} \models (\varphi'_U \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus U})$.*

Proof. Assume that φ is defined over system variables $\mathcal{S} = U \cup W \cup Y$, where $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_{k_u}\}$, $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_{k_w}\}$, and $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_{k_y}\}$. Since $\alpha \models (\varphi'_U \wedge \varphi'_W)$, the following holds.

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\models \varphi(\bar{e}, u'_1, \dots, u'_{k_u}, w_1, \dots, w_{k_w}, y_1, \dots, y_{k_y}) = \varphi'_U \\ \alpha &\models \varphi(\bar{e}, u_1, \dots, u_{k_u}, w'_1, \dots, w'_{k_w}, y_1, \dots, y_{k_y}) = \varphi'_W \end{aligned}$$

Define an extension of α , $\hat{\alpha}$, such that for any state $i \geq 0$,

$$\hat{\alpha}_i = \alpha_i \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq k_y} \{y'_j : y_j \in \alpha_i\}$$

Hence, $\hat{\alpha}$ models $\varphi(\bar{e}, u'_1, \dots, u'_{k_u}, w_1, \dots, w_{k_w}, y_1, \dots, y_{k_y}) = \varphi'_U$ and $\hat{\alpha}$ models $\varphi(\bar{e}, u_1, \dots, u_{k_u}, w'_1, \dots, w'_{k_w}, y'_1, \dots, y'_{k_y}) = \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus U}$, which means that $\hat{\alpha} \models (\varphi'_U \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus U})$. \square

A characterisation of independent sets of system variables in an LTL formula is given in Lemma 5.

Lemma 5. *Let φ be an LTL formula and let $W \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. Then W is independent in φ if and only if for any set $U \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ with $U \cap W = \emptyset$, it holds that $\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (U \cup W) = (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright U) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W)$.*

Proof. For the forward direction, assume that W is independent in φ . Then

$$\Sigma_\varphi = (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W)) \quad (1)$$

is obtained by Definition 9. Projecting in (1) over $U \cup W$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (U \cup W) &= [(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W))] \upharpoonright (U \cup W) = \\ &\text{by distributivity (see (d)) with } \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W, \Sigma_2 = \Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W), X = W, \text{ and } Y = U \\ &(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie ((\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W)) \upharpoonright U) = (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright U) = (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright U) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W). \end{aligned}$$

For the reverse direction, take $U = \mathcal{S} \setminus W$. Then $\Sigma_\varphi = (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W))$ and W is independent in φ . \square

Lemma 6 characterises the notion of independent system variables as defined in [10], where the author used this characterisation as a procedural mechanism for searching independent sets of variables with the help of a model checker.

Lemma 6. *Let $\varphi(\bar{e}, w_1, \dots, w_k, v_1, \dots, v_r)$ be an LTL formula. The set $W \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ is independent in φ if, and only if, for any trace α , if $\alpha \models (\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus W})$, then $\alpha \upharpoonright \mathcal{S} \in \Sigma_\varphi$.*

Proof. By Definition 9, variables in W are independent in φ if and only if

$$(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W)) = \Sigma_\varphi \quad (2)$$

We first prove the forward direction. Assume Equation (2). If there is no trace which is a model of $(\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus W})$ then we are done. Alternatively, let α be such a trace that it is a model of $(\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus W})$. By Lemma 2,

$\alpha \upharpoonright \mathcal{S} \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W))$. Applying Equation (2), it holds that $\alpha \upharpoonright \mathcal{S} \in \Sigma_\varphi$.

We now prove the reverse direction. Assume that for any trace α , which is a model for $(\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus W})$, it holds that $\alpha \upharpoonright \mathcal{S}$ is a model of φ . Let γ be in $(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W))$ (again, if there is no such γ , we are done). By Lemma 3, where U is now W , $Y = \emptyset$, and W is now $\mathcal{S} \setminus W$, we can ensure that there exists an extension of γ , $\hat{\gamma}$, which is a model of $(\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus W})$. Then, by the initial assumption, $\hat{\gamma} \upharpoonright \mathcal{S}$ is a model of φ . As $\hat{\gamma} \upharpoonright \mathcal{S} = \gamma$, it holds that $\gamma \in \Sigma_\varphi$. Therefore, $(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W)) \subseteq \Sigma_\varphi$. The other inclusion is trivial by the distributive property (c), which ensures that $\Sigma_\varphi \subseteq (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W))$. Hence, Equation (2) holds. \square

Actually, for the correctness proof, we will use the contrapositive of Lemma 6 as indicated in the following Corollary 1.

Corollary 1. *Let φ be an LTL formula. Let $W \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. The set W is dependent in φ if and only if there exists a trace α such that $\alpha \models (\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus W} \wedge \neg\varphi)$.*

Example 6. Let $\mathcal{E} = \{p\}$, $\mathcal{S} = \{a, b, c\}$, and $\varphi = \diamond((p \rightarrow (a \vee b) \wedge c)) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow \neg c)$. Let α^E be the trace that for the play $E = \{p\}^\omega$, $\alpha^E = \{p, a, c'\}, \{p, a', c\}, \{p, c\}^\omega$. Clearly, $\alpha^E \models \varphi'_{\{a,b\}} \wedge \varphi'_{\{c\}}$, where $\varphi'_{\{a,b\}} = \diamond((p \rightarrow (a' \vee b') \wedge c)) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow \neg c)$ and $\varphi'_{\{c\}} = \diamond((p \rightarrow (a \vee b) \wedge c')) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow \neg c')$. However, $\alpha^E \not\models \varphi$. Hence, by Corollary 1, both $\{a, b\}$ and $\{c\}$ are dependent in φ .

Actually, $(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{a, b\}) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{c\}) \not\subseteq \Sigma_\varphi$ because if $E = \{p\}^\omega$, $\delta^E = \{p, a, c\}, \{p, c\}^\omega$, and $\beta^E = \{p\}, \{p, b, c\}, \{p\}^\omega$, then $\delta^E \models \varphi$; $\beta^E \models \varphi$; $\delta^E \upharpoonright \{a, b\} = \{p, a\}, \{p\}^\omega$; and $\beta^E \upharpoonright \{c\} = \{p\}, \{p, c\}, \{p\}^\omega$. Obviously, $\delta^E \upharpoonright \{a, b\}$ belongs to $\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{a, b\}$ as well as $\beta^E \upharpoonright \{c\}$ belongs to $\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{c\}$. Hence, there exists a trace $\gamma^E \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{a, b\}) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{c\})$ such that $\gamma^E \upharpoonright \{a, b\} = \delta^E \upharpoonright \{a, b\}$ and $\gamma^E \upharpoonright \{c\} = \beta^E \upharpoonright \{c\}$. So $\gamma^E = \{p, a\}, \{p, c\}, \{p\}^\omega$, but $\gamma^E \not\models \varphi$.

Lemma 7 shows a syntactic property of the projection formulae, which is necessary to ensure that a set of system variables is dependent in a formula.

Lemma 7. *Let $\varphi(\bar{e}, w_1, \dots, w_k, v_1, \dots, v_r)$ be an LTL formula and let W be the set $\{w_1, \dots, w_k\}$. If W is dependent in φ then there exists a trace α , a state $i \geq 0$, and $v \in \mathcal{S} \setminus W$ such that $\alpha \models (\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus W} \wedge \neg\varphi)$ and $v' \in \alpha_i \leftrightarrow v \notin \alpha_i$.*

Proof. The proof is straightforward. If W is dependent in φ , by Corollary 1, there exists a trace α such that $\alpha \models (\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus W} \wedge \neg\varphi)$. It remains to prove that there exists a state $i \geq 0$ and $v \in \mathcal{S} \setminus W$ such that $v' \in \alpha_i \leftrightarrow v \notin \alpha_i$. The trace α satisfies the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\models \varphi(\bar{e}, w'_1, w'_2, \dots, w'_k, v_1 \dots v_r) = \varphi'_W \\ \alpha &\models \varphi(\bar{e}, w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k, v'_1 \dots v'_r) = \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus W} \\ \alpha &\not\models \varphi(\bar{e}, w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k, v_1 \dots v_r) = \varphi \end{aligned}$$

To prove the conclusion suppose the contrary: for any $i \geq 0$, and for any $v \in \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$ it holds that $v' \in \alpha_i \leftrightarrow v \in \alpha_i$. Then, we would obtain that $\alpha \models \varphi(\bar{e}, w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k, v_1 \dots v_r)$ and $\alpha \not\models \varphi(\bar{e}, w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k, v_1 \dots v_r)$, which is a contradiction. \square

Set dependence on a variable.

The *DC* algorithm presented in [10] looks for sets of dependent variables incrementally, starting with a single variable and adding new ones that depend on the previous set. But it is important to consider the following fact: if $z \notin W$ and $(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{z\}) \neq (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \cup \{z\}))$ we can be sure that W depends in φ (see Lemma 5) and this dependence is related to the variable z . However, W could somehow depend on z but $(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{z\}) = (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \cup \{z\}))$. The following example illustrates this.

Example 7. Let $\varphi = \Box(p \rightarrow (a \vee (b \wedge c)))$, where $p \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \{a, b, c\}$. The set $\{b\}$ is dependent in φ because $(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{b\}) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{a\}) \neq (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{a, b\})$ (see Lemma 5). The set $\{a, b\}$ is dependent in φ because $(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{a, b\}) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{c\}) \neq \Sigma_\varphi$. Consequently, the only independent set in φ is $\{a, b, c\}$. Actually, $\{b\}$ depends on variable a and $\{a, b\}$ depends on variable c . However, $(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{b\}) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{c\}) = \Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{b, c\}$ and this fact does not mean that $\{b\}$ is independent of c .

The next definition determines whether it is certain that a set depends on a new variable. Only if we are absolutely sure about this fact, we will add a new variable to a set. This is the main difference between the *DC* algorithm and ours.

Definition 11 (Set dependence on a variable). Let φ be an LTL formula, let $W \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ be a nonempty set, and $z \in \mathcal{S} \setminus W$. If $(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{z\}) \neq (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \cup \{z\}))$, we say that the dependence of W on variable z in φ is certified.

Lemma 8 provides a sufficient condition to certify that W depends on z . This condition is based on Lemma 6 and gives us the procedural mechanism we need to develop the algorithm.

Lemma 8. Let φ be an LTL formula, let $\mathcal{S} = W \cup U \cup Y$, with W, U, Y pairwise disjoint, W, Y as nonempty sets and U as independent in φ . Let $z \in Y$. Then, considering statements (i) and (ii) below, we have (i) implies (ii).

- (i) (i₁) There exists a trace β such that $\beta \models (\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_Y \wedge \neg\varphi)$
and
(i₂) for any trace α such that $z \in \alpha_i \leftrightarrow z' \in \alpha_i$ for any $i \geq 0$, it is always the case that if $\alpha \models (\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_Y)$, then $\alpha \upharpoonright \mathcal{S} \models \varphi$.
- (ii) The dependence of W on z in φ is certified.

Proof. Assume statement (i₁) of (i), i.e. there exists $\beta \models (\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_Y \wedge \neg\varphi)$. Then, by Lemma 4 (where now $U = W$ and $W = Y$), there exists $\widehat{\beta}$ such that $\widehat{\beta} \models (\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus W} \wedge \neg\varphi)$. Hence, by Definition 9 and Corollary 1, W is dependent in φ and the following holds.

$$(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W)) \neq \Sigma_\varphi \quad (3)$$

On the other hand, statement (i₂) allows us to ensure the following claim.

Claim. For any trace α such that $z \in \alpha_i \leftrightarrow z' \in \alpha_i$, for any $i \geq 0$, it is always the case that if $\alpha \models (\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus W})$, then $\alpha \upharpoonright \mathcal{S} \models \varphi$.

Proof. Let α be such that $z \in \alpha_i \leftrightarrow z' \in \alpha_i$ for any $i \geq 0$, and $\alpha \models (\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus W})$. Since $\mathcal{S} \setminus W = U \cup Y$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha \models (\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_{U \cup Y}) \text{ with } \mathcal{S} = U \cup W \cup Y \text{ and } W, U, Y \text{ pairwise disjoint} \\ & \text{by Lemma 2} \Rightarrow \alpha \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (U \cup Y)) \\ & \text{since } U \text{ is independent in } \varphi, \text{ using Lemma 5} \Rightarrow \\ & \alpha \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright U) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright Y) \Rightarrow \\ & \alpha \in ((\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright U)) \bowtie ((\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright U) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright Y)) \\ & \text{using again that } U \text{ is independent in } \varphi \Rightarrow \alpha \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \cup U)) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (U \cup Y)) \\ & \text{by Lemma 3 where now } U = W, Y = U, \text{ and } W = Y \Rightarrow \alpha \models (\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_Y) \\ & \text{using item (i}_2\text{)} \Rightarrow \alpha \upharpoonright \mathcal{S} \models \varphi \quad \triangleleft \end{aligned}$$

Using this claim we are going to prove the following:

$$(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \cup \{z\})) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W)) = \Sigma_\varphi \quad (4)$$

Our argumentation here is as follows. Let $\gamma \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \cup \{z\})) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W))$. By Lemma 3, where U is now W , $Y = \{z\}$, and W is now $\mathcal{S} \setminus (W \cup \{z\})$, there exists an extension of γ , $\widehat{\gamma}$, such that $\widehat{\gamma}$ is a model of $(\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus (W \cup \{z\})})$. Moreover, from Lemma 4, there is also an extension of $\widehat{\gamma}$, $\widehat{\widehat{\gamma}}$, which is a model of $(\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus W})$ and where $z' \in \widehat{\widehat{\gamma}}_i \leftrightarrow z \in \widehat{\gamma}_i \leftrightarrow z \in \gamma$ for any $i \geq 0$. Then, by the claim, γ is a model of φ . Therefore, Equation (4) holds.

It remains to certify that W depends on z in φ . By contradiction suppose

$$(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{z\}) = \Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \cup \{z\}) \quad (5)$$

By the idempotency property (b) of the join operator,

$$(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W)) = (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W)) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{z\})$$

By the associativity of \bowtie and Equation (5) the latter is equivalent to,

$$(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \cup \{z\})) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (\mathcal{S} \setminus W)),$$

which is reduced to Σ_φ by Equation (4). This contradicts Equation (3). Hence, $(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{z\}) \neq \Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \cup \{z\})$ and the dependence of W on z is certified. \square

To conclude this section we show two more properties of independent sets.

Lemma 9. *Let φ be an LTL formula, let $W \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ be a nonempty set, and $z \in \mathcal{S} \setminus W$. Let $r \geq 0$ and $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_r$ be r literals of system variables (i.e. variables themselves or their negations) in $\mathcal{S} \setminus (W \cup \{z\})$. Let $\Lambda_r = \square(\ell_1 \wedge \ell_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \ell_r)$ ³. Then the following hold.*

- (i) *If W is independent in φ , then W is independent in $(\varphi \wedge \Lambda_r)$.*
- (ii) *If the dependence of W on variable z in $(\varphi \wedge \Lambda_r)$ is certified, then the dependence of W on variable z in φ is certified.*

Proof. We prove statement (i) by contradiction. Suppose W is dependent in $(\varphi \wedge \Lambda_r)$. By Corollary 1, there exists α such that $\alpha \models (\varphi \wedge \Lambda_r)'_W \wedge (\varphi \wedge \Lambda_r)'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus W} \wedge \neg(\varphi \wedge \Lambda_r)$. This means that α is a model of $(\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus W} \wedge \neg\varphi)$. Again, by Corollary 1, we would obtain that W is dependent in φ , which contradicts the initial assumption. The proof of statement (ii) is again by contradiction. Suppose we do not have the certification that W depends on z in φ , then

$$(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{z\}) = \Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \cup \{z\}) \quad (6)$$

For the remaining of the proof, we will show that $(\Sigma_{(\varphi \wedge \Lambda_r)} \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_{(\varphi \wedge \Lambda_r)} \upharpoonright \{z\}) = (\Sigma_{(\varphi \wedge \Lambda_r)} \upharpoonright (W \cup \{z\}))$, which contradicts the initial assumption. Take α such that $\alpha \upharpoonright W \in (\Sigma_{(\varphi \wedge \Lambda_r)} \upharpoonright W)$ and $\alpha \upharpoonright \{z\} \in (\Sigma_{(\varphi \wedge \Lambda_r)} \upharpoonright \{z\})$. Clearly, for any state $i \geq 0$: $\alpha_i \models (\ell_1 \wedge \ell_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \ell_r)$, $\alpha \upharpoonright W \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W)$, and $\alpha \upharpoonright \{z\} \in (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{z\})$. By Equation (6) we get $\alpha \in \Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \cup \{z\})$. Moreover, as α is a model of Λ_r , $\alpha \in \Sigma_{(\varphi \wedge \Lambda_r)} \upharpoonright (W \cup \{z\})$. So

$$(\Sigma_{(\varphi \wedge \Lambda_r)} \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_{(\varphi \wedge \Lambda_r)} \upharpoonright \{z\}) \subseteq \Sigma_{(\varphi \wedge \Lambda_r)} \upharpoonright (W \cup \{z\})$$

Since the other inclusion always holds, the equality of the two sets is obtained. This contradicts the existence of a certification that W depends on z in $(\varphi \wedge \Lambda_r)$. \square

³ Note that for all LTL formulae φ and ψ , $\square(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ is logically equivalent to $\square\varphi \wedge \square\psi$.

3 Algorithm

Algorithm 1: Partition

Input : \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{S} , an LTL formula φ over $\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{S}$
Output: a partition of \mathcal{S} into sets that are independent in φ

```

1 if  $\mathcal{S} = \emptyset$  then
2    $\lfloor$  return  $\emptyset$ ;
3 else
4   Choose  $x \in \mathcal{S}$ ;
5   Let  $\Phi = (\varphi'_{\{x\}} \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus \{x\}} \wedge \neg\varphi)$ ;
6   Ask an LTL solver for a model of  $\Phi$  and keep its answer in  $\mu$ ;
7   // if  $\Phi$  is UNSAT, then  $\mu = \emptyset$ 
8   if  $\mu \neq \emptyset$  then
9      $Z = \{z \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{x\} : z \in \mu_i \leftrightarrow z' \notin \mu_i \text{ at some state } i \geq 0\}$ ;
10     $W := \text{Look\_for\_dependent\_variables}(\varphi, \Phi, Z, \{x\}, \mathcal{S} \setminus \{x\})$ ;
11  return  $\{W\} \cup \text{Partition}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{S} \setminus W, \varphi)$ ;

```

Algorithm 2: Look_for_dependent_variables

Input : φ, Φ, Z, W, Y
Output: W

```

1 // Requires:  $W$  is dependent in  $\varphi$  and no proper subsets in  $W$  are independent in  $\varphi$ ,
  // except the empty set
2 // Ensures: no proper subsets in  $W$  are independent in  $\varphi$ , except the empty set
3  $model := true$ ;
4 while  $model$  do
5   // Invariant:  $model \Rightarrow Z \neq \emptyset$ . This invariant is preserved by Lemma 7
6    $z := \text{any element in } Z$ ;
7    $\Phi := \Phi \wedge \Box(z \leftrightarrow z')$ ;
8   Ask an LTL solver for a model of  $\Phi$  and keep its answer in  $\nu$ ;
9   if  $\nu = \emptyset$  then
10     $model := false$ 
11  else
12     $Z = \{z \in Y : z \in \nu_i \leftrightarrow z' \notin \nu_i \text{ at some state } i \geq 0\}$ ;
13   $W, Y := W \cup \{z\}, Y \setminus \{z\}$ ;
14   $\Phi := (\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_Y \wedge \neg\varphi)$ ;
15  Ask an LTL solver for a model of  $\Phi$  and keep its answer in  $\nu$ ;
16  if  $\nu \neq \emptyset$  then
17     $Z = \{z \in Y : z \in \nu_i \leftrightarrow z' \notin \nu_i \text{ at some state } i \geq 0\}$ ;
18    return  $\text{Look\_for\_dependent\_variables}(\varphi, \Phi, Z, W, Y)$ ;
19 else
20    $\lfloor$  return  $W$ 

```

We present an algorithm called **Partition** that identifies the sets of dependent variables of an LTL formula φ over variables $\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{S}$. The output of the algorithm is a partition of \mathcal{S} into sets that are independent in φ . We prove the algorithm is correct, i.e. sound and complete, and provide an upper bound on its running time. The soundness would require to establish that each set W of the partition returned by the algorithm is independent in φ and the completeness would require to show that W is minimal, i.e. no proper subset of W , other than the empty set, is independent in φ .

Partition does not use a model checker but an LTL solver. This aspect is not important because LTL satisfiability checking can be reduced to model checking [21]. When an LTL solver decides that a formula ψ is satisfiable, a model checker does the same deciding that the *universal* model does not satisfy $\neg\psi$.

We explain the algorithm through two examples.

Example 8. Let $\mathcal{E} = \{p\}$, $\mathcal{S} = \{a, b\}$, and $\varphi = \diamond(p \rightarrow \bigcirc(a \wedge b)) \wedge \Box\neg b$. The function **Partition** could start by selecting $a \in \mathcal{S}$ (line 4). Next (line 5), the function Φ is constructed: $\Phi = (\varphi'_{\{a\}} \wedge \varphi'_{\{b\}} \wedge \neg\varphi)$. When the function asks the LTL solver about Φ (line 6), the answer is UNSAT. So $\{a\}$ is added as a subset of the partition (line 11). Next, a recursive call is made to **Partition** with $\mathcal{S} = \{b\}$ ⁴, where the answer to the formula $(\varphi'_{\{b\}} \wedge \varphi'_{\emptyset} \wedge \neg\varphi)$ is UNSAT. So, the function returns that both $\{a\}$ and $\{b\}$ are independent in φ .

Example 9. This is the example mentioned in Section 1. Let $\mathcal{E} = \{p\}$, $\mathcal{S} = \{t, v, w, z\}$, and φ be the following LTL formula.

$$\Box((p \rightarrow \bigcirc(v \wedge \neg t)) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow \bigcirc(\neg v \wedge t)) \wedge (v \rightarrow \bigcirc(\neg w \wedge z)) \wedge (\neg v \rightarrow \bigcirc(w \wedge \neg z)))$$

Partition could start by selecting $w \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\Phi = (\varphi'_{\{w\}} \wedge \varphi'_{\{t, v, z\}} \wedge \neg\varphi)$. Assume the solver returns $\mu = \{p, v', t'\}, \{v, v', w', z'\}, \{t, t', z, z'\}, \{t, t', w, w'\}^\omega$. Then, **Partition** (line 10) calculates $Z = \{t, v, z\}$. At this point, we know that $\{w\}$ is dependent in φ and the function **Look_for_dependent_variables** is called. This function is responsible for finding the set of variables on which $\{w\}$ depends. The iteration of the function starts in line 4, where $t \in Z$ (line 6) could be selected. Next, the function constructs $\Phi \wedge \Box(t \leftrightarrow t')$ (line 7). A possible response of the LTL solver to this formula could be $\nu = \{v'\}, \{t, t', w', z'\}, \{t, t', w, w'\}^\omega$ and a new iteration is made with $Z = \{v, z\}$. If the function chooses $v \in Z$, the answer of the LTL solver to $\Phi \wedge \Box(t \leftrightarrow t') \wedge \Box(v \leftrightarrow v')$ is UNSAT. Then, the iterations stops updating $W = \{w, v\}$ and $Y = \{t, z\}$ (line 13). The formula $(\varphi'_{\{w, v\}} \wedge \varphi'_{\{t, z\}} \wedge \neg\varphi)$ is constructed (line 14). Suppose the LTL solver responds to this formula by returning again $\{p, v', t'\}, \{v, v', w', z'\}, \{t, t', z, z'\}, \{t, t', w, w'\}^\omega$. At that point, the function makes a recursive call (line 18) with the initial φ , $(\varphi'_{\{w, v\}} \wedge \varphi'_{\{t, z\}} \wedge \neg\varphi)$, $Z = \{t, z\}$, $W = \{w, v\}$, and $Y = \{t, z\}$. The iteration of this call starts and if $t \in Z$ is chosen, so that the answer of the solver

⁴ In fact, if $|\mathcal{S}| = 1$, there is no need to call **Partition**, since \mathcal{S} is clearly independent in φ .

about $(\varphi'_{\{w,v\}} \wedge \varphi'_{\{t,z\}} \wedge \neg\varphi) \wedge \Box(t \leftrightarrow t')$ is $\nu = \{v\}, \{t, t', w', z'\}, \{t, t', w, w'\}^\omega$, a second iteration is executed. Now, $Z = \{z\}$ and the LTL solver with the query $(\varphi'_{\{w,v\}} \wedge \varphi'_{\{t,z\}} \wedge \neg\varphi \wedge \Box(t \leftrightarrow t') \wedge \Box(z \leftrightarrow z'))$ responses UNSAT. The function adds z to W and asks the LTL solver about $(\varphi'_{\{v,w,z\}} \wedge \varphi'_{\{t\}} \wedge \neg\varphi)$. The answer is now UNSAT and $W = \{v, w, z\}$ is returned. `Partition` divides the variables into two subsets: $\{v, w, z\}$ and $\{t\}$.

4 Correctness of the Algorithm

Theorem 1 proves the correctness of the algorithm.

Theorem 1. *The function `Look_for_dependent_variables` returns W guaranteeing that W is independent in the input formula and for any proper subsets $U \subset W$ with $U \neq \emptyset$ it holds that $\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W \neq (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright U) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \setminus U))$.*

Note that the statement of the theorem ensures, by Lemma 5, that no proper subsets in W , except the empty set, are independent in the input formula.

Proof. Suppose that `Look_for_dependent_variables` is called the first time on input $(\varphi, \Phi, Z, W, \mathcal{S} \setminus W)$ where $W = \{x\}$. The *requires* is fulfilled because the trace μ is a model of $\Phi = (\varphi'_{\{x\}} \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus \{x\}} \wedge \neg\varphi)$ (see Corollary 1) and there are no proper subsets in $\{x\}$, except the empty set.

The iteration of the function is responsible for finding a variable z on which $\{x\}$ depends. We can ensure it thanks to Lemma 8: assume that we exit the while loop at iteration $r + 1$ with $r \geq 0$. Then, a model ν of the formula in Equation (7) is provided by the function.

$$((\varphi'_{\{x\}} \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus \{x\}} \wedge \neg\varphi) \wedge \Box(z_1 \leftrightarrow z'_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \Box(z_r \leftrightarrow z'_r)) \quad (7)$$

Equation (7) implies that there exist r literals ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_r for variables z_1, \dots, z_r in such a way that ν models the formula:

$$((\varphi \wedge \Box(\ell_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \ell_r))'_{\{x\}} \wedge (\varphi \wedge \Box(\ell_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \ell_r))'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus \{x\}} \wedge \neg(\varphi \wedge \Box(\ell_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \ell_r))) \quad (8)$$

Denoting by A_r the formula $\Box(\ell_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \ell_r)$, we know that at iteration $r + 1$, a variable $z \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{x\}$ has been selected satisfying the following: for any α such that $z \in \alpha_i \leftrightarrow z' \in \alpha_i$, for any $i \geq 0$

$$\alpha \models (\varphi \wedge A_r)'_{\{x\}} \wedge (\varphi \wedge A_r)'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus \{x\}} \text{ implies } \alpha \upharpoonright \mathcal{S} \models (\varphi \wedge A_r) \quad (9)$$

The trace ν that models the formula of Equations (8) ensures statement (i_1) of Lemma 8 when φ is now $(\varphi \wedge A_r)$. Equation (9) ensures statement (i_2) when $W = \{x\}$, $U = \emptyset$, and $Y = Z$. By Lemma 8, the dependence of $\{x\}$ on z in the formula $(\varphi \wedge A_r)$ is certified. Now, by applying Lemma 9 (statement (ii)), the dependence of $\{x\}$ on z in the formula φ is also certified, i.e.

$$(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{x\}) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{z\}) \neq (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{x, z\}) \quad (10)$$

When the iteration ends, z is added to $\{x\}$. We have two possibilities here. The query to the LTL solver with $\Phi = (\varphi'_{\{x,z\}} \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus \{x,z\}} \wedge \neg\varphi)$ gets, as the solver's response, either UNSAT or a model, ν . In the first case, $\{x, z\}$ is independent in φ and Equation (10) guarantees the *ensures* of the function.

In the second case, a new recursive call is made, but now the input formula Φ is of the form $(\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_Y \wedge \neg\varphi)$, where the cardinality of W is greater than one and $W \cup Y$ is not the initial set \mathcal{S} . All we know is that the set of variables removed from the initial \mathcal{S} is independent in φ . The situation is as follows.

$$\mathcal{S} = W \cup U \cup Y \text{ with } U \text{ independent in } \varphi \text{ and } W, U, Y \text{ pairwise disjoint.} \quad (11)$$

Based on this, we will show that each call to `Look_for_dependent_variables` (φ, Φ, Z, W, Y) fulfills the *requires*. The trace ν provided by the LTL solver is a model of $(\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_Y \wedge \neg\varphi)$ and by Lemma 4, there exists $\hat{\nu} \models (\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_{\mathcal{S} \setminus W} \wedge \neg\varphi)$. Again by Corollary 1, W is dependent in φ . Furthermore, the *ensures* of the previous recursive call guarantees that no proper subsets in W are independent, except the empty set (note that this corresponds to the induction hypothesis).

Now, we prove that the current recursive call guarantees the *ensures*. When we exit the while loop at iteration $r+1$, there exists $\nu \models ((\varphi'_W \wedge \varphi'_Y \wedge \neg\varphi) \wedge \Box(z_1 \leftrightarrow z'_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \Box(z_r \leftrightarrow z'_r))$. Thus, there are r literals ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_r for variables z_1, \dots, z_r such that

$$\nu \models ((\varphi \wedge A_r)'_W \wedge (\varphi \wedge A_r)'_Y \wedge \neg(\varphi \wedge A_r)) \text{ with } A_r = \Box(\ell_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \ell_r) \quad (12)$$

Furthermore, a variable $z \in Y$ has been selected satisfying the following: for any trace α such that $z \in \alpha_i \leftrightarrow z' \in \alpha_i$, for any $i \geq 0$

$$\alpha \models (\varphi \wedge A_r)'_W \wedge (\varphi \wedge A_r)'_Y \text{ implies } \alpha \upharpoonright \mathcal{S} \models (\varphi \wedge A_r) \quad (13)$$

At this point, with the premise established in Equation (11), we use Lemma 8 that now applies to the formula $(\varphi \wedge A_r)$. Statement (i_1) (respectively, (i_2)) of the lemma holds by Equation (12) (respectively, by Equation (13)). Hence, the dependence of W on variable z in $(\varphi \wedge A_r)$ is certified and, by Lemma 9 (item (ii)), so is the dependence in φ . That means,

$$(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright \{z\}) \neq (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \cup \{z\})) \quad (14)$$

When the iteration ends, z is added to W . It remains to prove that $W \cup \{z\}$ fulfills the *ensures*, i.e., for all proper subsets $U \subset (W \cup \{z\})$ with $U \neq \emptyset$ it holds that $\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \cup \{z\}) \neq (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright U) \bowtie \Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright ((W \cup \{z\}) \setminus U)$. If $U = \{z\}$, the *ensures* holds by Equation (14), and if $U \subset W$ by the induction hypothesis. If U is of the form $(Y \cup \{z\})$ with $Y \subset W$, the proof is by contradiction: Suppose that

$$\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \cup \{z\}) = (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (Y \cup \{z\})) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \setminus Y))$$

which implies that $\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright W = [(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (Y \cup \{z\})) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \setminus Y))] \upharpoonright W$. However, by the distributivity of join over projection, the latter is equal to $(\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright Y) \bowtie (\Sigma_\varphi \upharpoonright (W \setminus Y))$, which is impossible by the induction hypothesis. \square

Complexity of the algorithm.

Proposition 1 states the cost of the algorithm which depends on the LTL-satisfiability problem for the full LTL; the latter is PSPACE-complete [23].

Proposition 1. *The function `Partition` always terminates and the running time of the algorithm is polynomial in the number of variables in \mathcal{S} times the cost of each query made to the LTL solver.*

5 Conclusion and Future Work

This paper illustrates how one can verify the functional properties of algorithms by constructing a rigorous mathematical formalism. The case of \mathcal{DC} is an illustrative example: we have incorporated semantics into the concept of independence introduced in [10] and extensively examined its properties. Consequently, we have acquired sufficient tools to find out how to modify \mathcal{DC} to ensure correctness.

Our work will benefit the field of LTL-based Assume/Guarantee contracts, where the \mathcal{DC} algorithm is applied. It is also important to emphasize that the entire developments in this paper rely on the concept of independence as defined in [10], which was articulated in terms of traces. Traces are connected to the satisfiability problem, while strategies are associated with the problems of realisability and synthesis.

If we denote the set of winning (system) strategies for an LTL formula φ , as $\Sigma_\varphi^{\mathcal{W}}$, all traces encompassed by this set are also encompassed by $\Sigma\varphi$. However, the converse does not hold. Let $\varphi = \Box((\neg p \rightarrow \neg d) \wedge (p \rightarrow ((a\mathcal{U}(a \wedge \Box d)) \vee \Box a)))$, where p is the only environment variable. The subformula $a\mathcal{U}(a \wedge \Box d)$ means that $(a \wedge \Box d)$ must be true in some state and meanwhile, it must be true a . For instance, the strategy where for any environment play E , the system always does $\{a\}^\omega$, is a winning strategy for φ . Now, define the trace $\alpha = \{p, a, d\}, \{p, d\}^\omega$. Certainly, $\alpha \in \Sigma\varphi$, but no winning strategy for φ can include α as a trace. Let us assume that instead of $\{p\}^\omega$, the environment selects $\{p\}, \{p\}, \{\}^\omega$. Since both environment plays start in the same manner, the system is compelled to respond with $\{a, d\}, \{d\}$ in the first and second states respectively, followed by any set without d from the second state onwards. Clearly, the resulting trace fails to satisfy φ . Therefore, $\Sigma\varphi \not\subseteq \Sigma_\varphi^{\mathcal{W}}$.

This raises two questions. First, in case of synthesis, rather than satisfiability, does our our algorithm really generate a partition into sets of system-independent variables? Second, are these sets minimal? While we can answer positively to the first question (since $\Sigma_\varphi^{\mathcal{W}} \subset \Sigma\varphi$), we cannot confirm the answer to the second question. The winning strategies for φ must include a in all states regardless of d , but our algorithm classifies the variables a and d from the above φ as dependent. Thus, the second question is hard and is the subject of future work.

References

1. The NuSMV website (last accessed 01 July 2023), <http://nusmv.fbk.eu/>
2. Bansal, S., De Giacomo, G., Di Stasio, A., Li, Y., Vardi, M.Y., Zhu, S.: Compositional safety LTL synthesis. In: *Verified Software. Theories, Tools and Experiments*. p. 1–19. Springer-Verlag (2023)
3. Benveniste, A., Caillaud, B., Ferrari, A., Mangeruca, L., Passerone, R., Sofronis, C.: Multiple viewpoint contract-based specification and design. In: *Formal Methods for Components and Objects, FMCO*. p. 200–225. Springer-Verlag (2008)
4. Ber-Ari, M.: *Mathematical Logic for Computer Science* (Third edition). Springer (2012)
5. Bloem, R., Jobstmann, B., Piterman, N., Pnueli, A., Sa’ar, Y.: Synthesis of reactive(1) designs. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* **78**(3), 911–938 (2012)
6. Clarke, E., Long, D., McMillan, K.: Compositional model checking. In: *Fourth Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science. LICS, IEEE Computer Society*. pp. 353–362 (1989)
7. Dathathri, S., Murray, R.M.: Decomposing gr(1) games with singleton liveness guarantees for efficient synthesis. In: *IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control*. pp. 911–917 (2017)
8. Filiot, E., Jin, N., Raskin, J.F.: Compositional algorithms for LTL synthesis. In: *International Symposium on Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis*. p. 112–127. Springer-Verlag (2010)
9. Finkbeiner, B., Geier, G., Passing, N.: *Specification decomposition for reactive synthesis. Innovations in Systems and Software Engineering*. Springer-Verlag (2022)
10. Iannopolo, A.: *A Platform-Based Approach to Verification and Synthesis of Linear Temporal Logic Specifications*. Ph.D. thesis, UC Berkeley (2018)
11. Iannopolo, A., Tripakis, S., Vincentelli, A.: Specification decomposition for synthesis from libraries of LTL assume/guarantee contracts. In: *Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*. pp. 1574–1579 (2018)
12. Ito, S., Osari, K., Shimakawa, M., Hagihara, S., Yonezaki, N.: Efficient realizability checking by modularization of ltl specifications. *The Computer Journal* **65**(10), 2801–2814 (2021)
13. Kulkarni, A.N., Fu, J.: A compositional approach to reactive games under temporal logic specifications. In: *Annual American Control Conference (ACC)*. pp. 2356–2362 (2018)
14. Kupferman, O., Vardi, M.Y.: Model checking of safety properties. *Formal Methods in System Design* **19**, 291–314 (2001)
15. Livingston, S.C., Prabhakar, P.: Decoupled formal synthesis for almost separable systems with temporal logic specifications. In: *Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems*. pp. 371–385. Springer Japan (2016)
16. Nuzzo, P., Iannopolo, A., Tripakis, S., Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, A.: Are interface theories equivalent to contract theories? In: *Formal Methods and Models for Code-sign. ACM/IEEE Conference*. pp. 104–113 (2014)
17. Piterman, N., Pnueli, A., Sa’ar, Y.: Synthesis of reactive(1) designs. In: *Conf. on Verification, Model Checking, And Abstract Interpretation. LNCS, Springer*. vol. 3855, p. 364–380 (2006)
18. Pnueli, A., Rosner, R.: On the synthesis of a reactive module. In: *ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages*. p. 179–190 (1989)
19. Pnueli, A.: The temporal logic of programs. In: *18th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. pp. 46–57 (1977)

20. Roever, W.P., Langmaack, H., Pnueli, A.: Compositionality: the significant difference. In: COMPOS, LNCS, Springer. vol. 1536 (1998)
21. Rozier, K.Y., Vardi, M.Y.: LTL satisfiability checking. *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer* **12**, 123–137 (2010)
22. Safra, S.: On the complexity of omega-automata. In: 29th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science. pp. 319–327 (1988)
23. Sistla, A., Clarke, E.: The complexity of propositional linear temporal logics. *Journal of the ACM* **32**, 733–749 (1985)
24. Yannakakis, M., Papadimitriou, C.H.: Algebraic dependencies. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* **25**(1), 2–41 (1982)