








WEAK SIMPLICIAL BISIMILARITY AND MINIMISATION FOR POLYHEDRAL MODEL CHECKING

NICK BEZHANISHVILI ^a, LAURA BUSSI ^b, VINCENZO CIANCIA ^b, DAVID GABELAIA ^c,
MAMUKA JIBLADZE ^c, DIEGO LATELLA ^d, MIEKE MASSINK ^b, AND ERIK P. DE VINK ^e

^a Institute for Logic, Language and Computation, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands
e-mail address: n.bezhanishvili@uva.nl

^b Istituto di Scienza e Tecnologie dell'Informazione "A. Faedo", Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche,
Pisa, Italy
e-mail address: Laura.Bussi@cnr.it, Vincenzo.Ciancia@cnr.it, Mieke.Massink@cnr.it

^c Andrea Razmadze Mathematical Institute, I. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia
e-mail address: gabelaia@gmail.com, mamuka.jibladze@gmail.com

^d Formerly with Istituto di Scienza e Tecnologie dell'Informazione "A. Faedo", Consiglio Nazionale
delle Ricerche, Pisa, Italy. Retired
e-mail address: diego.latella@actiones.eu

^e Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands
e-mail address: evink@win.tue.nl

Key words and phrases: Bisimulation relations; Spatial bisimilarity; Spatial logics; Logical equivalence;
Spatial model checking; Polyhedral models; Model minimisation.

* This paper is an extended version of [BCG⁺24a].

The authors are listed in alphabetical order, as they equally contributed to the work presented in this
paper.

ABSTRACT. The work described in this paper builds on the polyhedral semantics of the *Spatial Logic for Closure Spaces (SLCS)* and the geometric spatial model checker *PolyLogicA*. Polyhedral models are central in domains that exploit mesh processing, such as 3D computer graphics. A discrete representation of polyhedral models is given by cell poset models, which are amenable to geometric spatial model checking on polyhedral models using the logical language SLCS_η , a weaker version of SLCS . In this work we show that the mapping from polyhedral models to cell poset models preserves and reflects SLCS_η . We also propose weak simplicial bisimilarity on polyhedral models and weak \pm -bisimilarity on cell poset models. Weak \pm -bisimilarity leads to a stronger reduction of models than its counterpart \pm -bisimilarity that was introduced in previous work.

We show that the proposed bisimilarities enjoy the Hennessy-Milner property, i.e. two points are weakly simplicial bisimilar iff they are logically equivalent for SLCS_η . Similarly, two cells are weakly \pm -bisimilar iff they are logically equivalent in the poset-model interpretation of SLCS_η . Furthermore we present a procedure, and prove that it correctly computes the minimal model with respect to weak \pm -bisimilarity, i.e. with respect to logical equivalence of SLCS_η . The procedure works via an encoding into LTSs and then exploits branching bisimilarity on those LTSs. This allows one to use in the implementation the minimization capabilities as included in the mCRL2 toolset. Various experiments are included to show the effectiveness of the approach.

1. INTRODUCTION AND RELATED WORK

Spatial and spatio-temporal model checking have recently been successfully employed in a variety of application areas, including Collective Adaptive Systems [CLM⁺16, CGG⁺18, AAV24, ADT24], signal analysis [NBC⁺18], image analysis [CLLM16, HJK⁺15, BBC⁺20] and polyhedral modelling [BCG⁺22, CGL⁺23a, BCG⁺24a, BCG⁺24b]. Interest in these methods for spatial analysis is increasing in Computer Science and in other domains, including initially unanticipated ones, such as medical imaging [BCLM19b, BBC⁺21].

Spatial model checking is a global technique: it comprises the automatic verification of properties, expressed in a suitable spatial logic, such as the Spatial Logic for Closure Spaces (SLCS) [CLLM14, CLLM16], on each point of a spatial model. The logic SLCS has been defined originally for closure models, i.e. models based on Čech closure spaces [Čech66], a generalisation of topological spaces, and model checking algorithms have been developed for finite closure models also in combination with discrete time, leading to spatio-temporal model checking [CGG⁺18]. The spatial model checker *VoxLogicA*, proposed in [BCLM19b], is very efficient in checking properties of large images – represented as symmetric finite closure models – expressed in SLCS [BCLM19b, BCLM19a, BBC⁺21]. For example, the automatic segmentation via a suitable SLCS formula characterising the white matter of the brain in a 3D MRI image consisting of circa 12M voxels (i.e. $256 \times 256 \times 181$), requires approximately 10 seconds, using *VoxLogicA* on a desktop computer [BCLM19a].¹

In [CLMV22, CLMV23] several bisimulations for finite closure spaces have been studied, with the aim to improve the efficiency of model checking via model minimisation. These notions cover a spectrum from CM-bisimilarity, an equivalence based on *proximity* — similar to and inspired by topo-bisimilarity for topological models [vBB07] — to CMC-bisimilarity, its specialisation for quasi-discrete closure models, and CoPa-bisimilarity, an equivalence

¹Intel Core i9-9900K processor (with 8 cores and 16 threads) and 32GB of RAM. Note that *VoxLogicA* checks such logical specifications for *every* point in the model exploiting parallel execution, memoization, and state-of-the-art imaging libraries [BCLM19b].

based on *conditional reachability*. Each of these bisimilarities has been equipped with its logical characterisation.

The spatial model checking techniques mentioned above, targeting grid-based structures, have been extended to *polyhedral models* [BCG⁺22, LQ23]. Polyhedra are subsets in \mathbb{R}^n generated by simplicial complexes, i.e. finite collections of simplexes satisfying certain conditions. A simplex is the convex hull of a set of affinely independent points. Given a set PL of proposition letters, a polyhedral model is obtained from a polyhedron by assigning a polyhedral subset to each proposition letter $p \in \text{PL}$, namely those points that “satisfy” proposition p . Polyhedral models in \mathbb{R}^3 can be used for (approximately) representing objects in continuous 3D space. This is typical of many 3D visual computing techniques, where an object is split into suitable geometric parts of different size. Such ways of splitting of an object are known as mesh techniques and include triangular surface meshes or tetrahedral volume meshes (see [LPZ12]).

Interestingly, polyhedral models can conveniently be represented by discrete structures, the so-called *cell poset models*: each point of the polyhedron is mapped to a (unique) “cell”, i.e. an element of the associated cell poset model. Cell poset models, being a particular case of Kripke models, are amenable to discrete model-checking.

In [BCG⁺22] a version of SLCS, called SLCS_γ in the sequel, has been proposed for expressing spatial properties of points lying in polyhedral models, and, in particular, *conditional reachability* properties. Besides negation and conjunction, the particular logic provides the γ reachability operator. Informally, a point x in a polyhedral model satisfies the conditional reachability formula $\gamma(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ if there is a topological path starting from x , ending in a point y satisfying Φ_2 , and such that all the intermediate points of the path between x and y satisfy Φ_1 . Note that neither x nor y is required to satisfy Φ_1 . Many other interesting properties, such as proximity (in the topological sense, i.e. “being in the topological closure of”) or “being surrounded by” can be expressed using reachability (see [BCG⁺22]).

Moreover, in [BCG⁺22] *simplicial bisimilarity* has been proposed for (points of) polyhedral models and it has been shown that it enjoys the Hennessy-Milner Property (HMP) with respect to SLCS_γ , and a geometric model checking algorithm as well as its related model checker, PolyLogicA, have been presented. In [CGL⁺23a] \pm -bisimilarity has been proposed for (cells of) cell poset models, that also enjoyed the HMP with respect to SLCS_γ .

In this paper we introduce a weaker version of conditional reachability, denoted by η . A point x in a polyhedral model satisfies the conditional reachability formula $\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ if there is a topological path starting from x , ending in a point y satisfying Φ_2 , and x and all the intermediate points of the path between x and y satisfy Φ_1 . Thus now x is required to satisfy Φ_1 . The operator η can easily be expressed using γ and we will show that the logic where γ has been replaced by η (SLCS_η , in the sequel), is strictly weaker than SLCS_γ , in the sense that it distinguishes fewer points than SLCS_γ . Furthermore, as mentioned above, SLCS_γ can express proximity — that boils down to the standard *possibility* modality \diamond in the poset model interpretation — whereas SLCS_η cannot. Nevertheless, many interesting reachability properties can be expressed in SLCS_η and, more importantly, the latter characterises bisimilarities (in the polyhedral model and the associated poset model) that are coarser than simplicial bisimilarity and \pm -bisimilarity, respectively.

We show that SLCS_η can be interpreted on cell poset models so that the mapping from a polyhedral model into its cell poset model preserves and reflects the logic: a point satisfies

a formula of SLCS_η if and only if the cell which it is mapped to satisfies the formula². This result paves the way to the definition and implementation of model checking techniques for SLCS_η on polyhedral models, by working on their discrete representations.

In this paper we introduce *weak simplicial bisimilarity* on polyhedral models (\approx_Δ) and show that it enjoys the HMP with respect to SLCS_η , i.e. \approx_Δ coincides with logical equivalence \equiv_η as induced by SLCS_η . As in the case of traditional (temporal) model checking, efficiency of spatial model checking can be improved by suitable model minimisation techniques. In particular, we are interested in techniques based on spatial bisimilarity. We propose a notion of bisimulation equivalence for cell poset models, namely *weak \pm -bisimilarity* (\approx_\pm , to be read as ‘weak plus-minus’ bisimilarity) such that two points in the polyhedral model are weakly simplicial bisimilar if and only if their cells are weakly \pm -bisimilar. We show that on cell poset models \approx_\pm coincides with \equiv_η .

Building upon these theoretical results we introduce a minimisation procedure based on weak \pm -bisimilarity, namely *weak \pm -minimisation*. The procedure uses an encoding of cell poset models into labelled transition systems (LTSs) following an approach that is similar to that presented in [CGL⁺23b] for finite closure models. More precisely, in the case of cell poset models, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the states of the LTS and the cells of the poset model. It is shown that two cells are weakly \pm -bisimilar in the poset model if and only if they are — as states of the encoded LTS — branching bisimulation equivalent. This provides an effective way for computing the equivalence classes for the set of cells, from which the minimal model is built, on which SLCS_η model checking can be safely performed. Efficient LTS minimisation tools are available for branching bisimulation, such as the one provided by the `mCRL2` toolset [GJKW17]. As we will see in Section 7, this can bring to a drastic reduction of the size of the spatial model, thus increasing the practical efficiency of spatial model checking. For instance, Figure 1 shows a large example of a cube structure, composed of 6,154 cells of three colours: white, green and grey. This model is reduced to an LTS consisting of only 38 states, which is a reduction of two orders of magnitude. The different white, green and grey states of the minimised LTS represent the various equivalence classes of cells in the original polyhedral model. Even if this is a synthetic example, chosen on purpose for its symmetry properties, it illustrates the potential of the approach. Figure 1 only gives a first visual impression of spatial minimisation for polyhedra. We postpone the discussion of the details to Section 7.

Summarising, the main original contributions in this paper are:

- Presentation of SLCS_η , a spatial logic for polyhedral models which is weaker than SLCS_γ ;
- Introduction of *weak simplicial bisimilarity* on polyhedral models (\approx_Δ) and showing that it enjoys the HMP with respect to SLCS_η ;
- Introduction of *weak \pm -bisimilarity* on cell poset models (\approx_\pm), with the corresponding HMP result;
- Introduction of a novel cell poset model minimisation procedure based on weak \pm -bisimilarity, including the formal proof of its correctness;
- Proof-of-concept of the practical potential and effectiveness of this approach through a prototype toolchain and spatial model checking examples. It is shown that the cell poset models can be drastically reduced by several orders of magnitude.

The paper is structured as follows. We provide a summary of necessary background information in Section 2. Section 3 introduces SLCS_η and addresses its relationship with SLCS_γ .

²A similar feature was shown to hold for SLCS_γ in [BCG⁺22].




FIGURE 1. Cube (Fig. 1a) and its respective minimal LTS (1b).

It is also shown that SLCS_η is preserved and reflected by the mapping \mathbb{F} from polyhedral models to finite poset models. Weak simplicial bisimilarity and weak \pm -bisimilarity are defined in Section 4 where it is also shown that they enjoy the HMP with respect to the interpretation of SLCS_η on polyhedral models and on finite poset models, respectively. The minimisation procedure, based on weak \pm -bisimilarity and exploiting its relationship with branching bisimulation equivalence, is defined in Section 5 where its correctness is also addressed. The procedure is currently implemented by means of an experimental toolchain using `mCRL2` and is discussed in Section 6. Examples of use of the toolchain are presented in Section 7. Conclusions and a discussion on future work are reported in Section 8.

Finally, in Appendix A the proofs for some auxiliary lemmas are provided and, in Appendix B, some additional minimisation examples are shown.

2. BACKGROUND AND NOTATION

In this section we introduce notation and recall necessary background information, the relevant details of the language SLCS_γ , its polyhedral and poset models, and the truth-preserving map \mathbb{F} between these models.

For sets X and Y , a function $f : X \rightarrow Y$, and subsets $A \subseteq X$ and $B \subseteq Y$ we define $f(A)$ and $f^{-1}(B)$ as $\{f(a) \mid a \in A\}$ and $\{a \mid f(a) \in B\}$, respectively. The *restriction* of f on A is denoted by $f|_A$. The powerset of X is denoted by 2^X . For a binary relation $R \subseteq X \times X$ we let $R^- = \{(y, x) \mid (x, y) \in R\}$ denote its converse and let R^\pm denote $R \cup R^-$. For partial orders \preceq we will use the standard notation \succeq for \preceq^- and $x \prec y$ whenever $x \preceq y$ and $x \neq y$ (and similarly for $x \succ y$). If R is an equivalence relation on A , we let A/R denote the *quotient* of A via R . In the remainder of the paper we assume that a set `PL` of *proposition letters* is fixed. The sets of natural numbers and of real numbers are denoted by \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{R} , respectively. We use the standard interval notation: for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ we let $[x, y]$ be the set $\{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid x \leq r \leq y\}$, $[x, y) = \{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid x \leq r < y\}$, and so on. Intervals of \mathbb{R} are equipped with the Euclidean topology inherited from \mathbb{R} . We use a similar notation for intervals over \mathbb{N} :

for $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $[m; n]$ denotes the set $\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid m \leq i \leq n\}$, $[m; n) = \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid m \leq i < n\}$, and so on.

Below we recall some basic notions, assuming that the reader is familiar with topological spaces, Kripke models, and posets.

2.1. Polyhedral Models and Cell Poset Models. A *simplex* σ of dimension d is the convex hull of a set $\{\mathbf{v}_0, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d\}$ of $d+1$ affinely independent points in \mathbb{R}^m , with $d \leq m$, i.e. $\sigma = \{\lambda_0 \mathbf{v}_0 + \dots + \lambda_d \mathbf{v}_d \mid \lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_d \in [0, 1] \text{ and } \sum_{i=0}^d \lambda_i = 1\}$. For instance, a segment AB together with its end-points A and B is a simplex in \mathbb{R}^m , for $m \geq 1$. Any subset of the set $\{\mathbf{v}_0, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d\}$ of points characterising a simplex σ induces a simplex σ' in turn, and we write $\sigma' \sqsubseteq \sigma$, noting that \sqsubseteq is a partial order, e.g. $A \sqsubseteq A \sqsubseteq AB$, $B \sqsubseteq B \sqsubseteq AB$ and $AB \sqsubseteq AB$. The *barycentre* b_σ of σ is defined as follows: $b_\sigma = \sum_{i=0}^d \frac{1}{d+1} \mathbf{v}_i$.

The *relative interior* $\tilde{\sigma}$ of a simplex σ is the same as σ “without its borders”, i.e. the set $\{\lambda_0 \mathbf{v}_0 + \dots + \lambda_d \mathbf{v}_d \mid \lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_d \in (0, 1] \text{ and } \sum_{i=0}^d \lambda_i = 1\}$. For instance, the open segment \widetilde{AB} , without the end-points A and B is the relative interior of segment AB . The relative interior of a simplex is often called a *cell* and is equal to the topological interior taken inside the affine hull of the simplex.³ The partial order \sqsubseteq is reflected on cells: $\tilde{\sigma}_1 \preceq \tilde{\sigma}_2$ if and only if $\sigma_1 \sqsubseteq \sigma_2$. Note that $\tilde{\sigma}_1 \preceq \tilde{\sigma}_2$ if and only if $\tilde{\sigma}_1 \in \mathcal{C}_T(\tilde{\sigma}_2)$, where \mathcal{C}_T is the topological closure operator. Obviously, \preceq is a partial order. In the above example, we have $\tilde{A} \preceq \tilde{A} \preceq \widetilde{AB}$, $\tilde{B} \preceq \tilde{B} \preceq \widetilde{AB}$, and $\widetilde{AB} \preceq \widetilde{AB}$.

A *simplicial complex* K is a finite collection of simplexes of \mathbb{R}^m such that: (i) if $\sigma \in K$ and $\sigma' \sqsubseteq \sigma$ then also $\sigma' \in K$; (ii) if $\sigma, \sigma' \in K$ and $\sigma \cap \sigma' \neq \emptyset$, then $\sigma \cap \sigma' \sqsubseteq \sigma$ and $\sigma \cap \sigma' \sqsubseteq \sigma'$. The *cell poset* of simplicial complex K is (\widetilde{K}, \preceq) where \widetilde{K} is the set $\{\tilde{\sigma} \mid \sigma \in K\}$, and \preceq is the union of the partial orders on the cells of the simplexes of K . It is easy to see that \preceq itself is a partial order, due to the geometrical nature of cells.

The polyhedron $|K|$ of K is the set-theoretic union of the simplexes in K . Note that $|K|$ inherits the topology of \mathbb{R}^m and that \widetilde{K} forms a partition of polyhedron $|K|$. Note furthermore that different simplicial complexes can give rise to the same polyhedron.

A *polyhedral model* is a pair $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{P})$ where $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{P} : \text{PL} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^{|K|}$ maps every proposition letter $p \in \text{PL}$ to the set of points of $|K|$ satisfying p . It is required that, for all $p \in \text{PL}$, $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{P}(p)$ is always a union of cells in \widetilde{K} . Similarly, a poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{F})$ is a poset (W, \preceq) equipped with a valuation function $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{F} : \text{PL} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^W$. Given a polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{P})$, we say that $\mathcal{F} = (\widetilde{K}, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{F})$ is the *cell poset model* of \mathcal{P} if and only if (\widetilde{K}, \preceq) is the cell poset of K and, for all $\tilde{\sigma} \in \widetilde{K}$, we have: $\tilde{\sigma} \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{F}(p)$ if and only if $\tilde{\sigma} \subseteq \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{P}(p)$. For all $x \in |K|$, we let $\mathbb{F}(x)$ denote the unique cell $\tilde{\sigma}$ such that $x \in \tilde{\sigma}$. Note that $\mathbb{F}(x)$ is well defined, since \widetilde{K} is a partition of $|K|$ and that $\mathbb{F} : |K| \rightarrow \widetilde{K}$ is a continuous function [BMMP18, Corollary 3.4]. With slight overloading, we let $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P})$ denote the cell poset model of \mathcal{P} . Finally, note that poset models are a subclass of Kripke models. In the following, when we say that \mathcal{F} is a cell poset model, we mean that there exists a polyhedral model \mathcal{P} such that $\mathcal{F} = \mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P})$.

Fig. 2 shows a polyhedral model. There are three proposition letters, **red**, **green**, and **gray**, shown by different colours (2a). The model is “unpacked” into its cells in Fig. 2b. The latter are collected in the cell poset model, whose Hasse diagram is shown in Fig. 2c.

³But note that the relative interior of a simplex composed of just a single point is the point itself and not the empty set.




FIGURE 2. A polyhedral model \mathcal{P} (2a) with its cells (2b) and the Hasse diagram of the related cell poset (2c).

2.2. Paths. In a topological space (X, τ) , a *topological path* from $x \in X$ is a total, continuous function $\pi : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ such that $\pi(0) = x$. We call $\pi(0)$ and $\pi(1)$ the *starting point* and *ending point* of π , respectively, while $\pi(r)$ is an *intermediate point* of π , for all $r \in (0, 1)$. Fig. 3a shows a path from a point x in the open segment \overline{AB} in the polyhedral model of Fig 2a.

Topological paths relevant for our work are represented in cell posets by so-called \pm -paths, a subclass of undirected paths [BCG⁺22]. For technical reasons⁴ in this paper we extend the definition given in [BCG⁺22] to general Kripke frames.

Given a Kripke frame (W, R) , an *undirected path* of length $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ from w is a total function $\pi : [0; \ell] \rightarrow W$ such that $\pi(0) = w$ and, for all $i \in [0; \ell)$, $R^\pm(\pi(i), \pi(i+1))$. The *starting point* and *ending point* are $\pi(0)$ and $\pi(\ell)$, respectively, while $\pi(i)$ is an intermediate point, for all $i \in (0; \ell)$. For an undirected path π of length ℓ we often use the sequence notation $(w_i)_{i=0}^\ell$ where $w_i = \pi(i)$ for $i \in [0; \ell]$.

Given paths $\pi' = (w'_i)_{i=0}^{\ell'}$ and $\pi'' = (w''_i)_{i=0}^{\ell''}$, with $w'_{\ell'} = w''_0$, the *sequentialisation* $\pi' \cdot \pi'' : [0; \ell' + \ell''] \rightarrow W$ of π' with π'' is the path from w'_0 defined as follows:

$$(\pi' \cdot \pi'')(i) = \begin{cases} \pi'(i), & \text{if } i \in [0; \ell'], \\ \pi''(i - \ell'), & \text{if } i \in [\ell'; \ell' + \ell'']. \end{cases}$$

For a path $\pi = (w_i)_{i=0}^\ell$ and $k \in [0; \ell]$ we define the k -shift of π , denoted by $\pi \uparrow k$, as follows: $\pi \uparrow k = (w_{j+k})_{j=0}^{\ell-k}$ and, for $0 < m \leq \ell$, we let $\pi \leftarrow m$ denote the path obtained from π by inserting a copy of $\pi(m)$ immediately before $\pi(m)$ itself. In other words, we have: $\pi \leftarrow m = (\pi \upharpoonright [0; m]) \cdot ((\pi(m), \pi(m)) \cdot (\pi \uparrow m))$. Finally, any path $\pi \upharpoonright [0; k]$, for some $k \in [0; \ell]$, is a (*non-empty*) *prefix* of π .

An undirected path $\pi : [0; \ell] \rightarrow W$ is a \pm -path if and only if $\ell \geq 2$, $R(\pi(0), \pi(1))$ and $R^-(\pi(\ell-1), \pi(\ell))$.

The \pm -path $(\overline{AB}, \overline{ABC}, \overline{BC}, \overline{BCD}, \overline{D})$, drawn in blue in Fig. 3b, faithfully represents the path from x shown in Fig. 3a. Note that a path π such that, say, $\pi(0) \in \overline{CD}$, $\pi(1) = E$ and $\pi((0, 1)) \subseteq \overline{CDE}$, i.e. a path that “jumps immediately” to \overline{CDE} after starting in \overline{CD} cannot be represented in the poset by any undirected path π' , of some length $\ell \geq 2$ such that $\pi'(0) \succ \pi'(1)$ (or $\pi'(\ell-1) \prec \pi'(\ell)$, for symmetry reasons), while it is correctly represented by the \pm -path $(\overline{CD}, \overline{CDE}, \overline{E})$, where $\overline{CD} \prec \overline{CDE} \succ \overline{E}$.

In the context of this paper it is often convenient to use a generalisation of \pm -paths, so-called “down paths”, \downarrow -paths for short: a \downarrow -path from w , of length $\ell \geq 1$, is an undirected

⁴We are interested in model-checking structures resulting from the minimisation, via bisimilarity, of cell poset models, and such structures are often just (reflexive) Kripke models rather than poset models.




FIGURE 3. (3a) A topological path from a point x to vertex D in the polyhedral model \mathcal{P} of Figure 2a. (3b) The corresponding \pm -path (in blue) in the Hasse diagram of the cell poset model $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P})$.

path π from w of length ℓ such that $R^-(\pi(\ell - 1), \pi(\ell))$. Finally, it is also convenient to use a subclass of \pm -paths, namely \updownarrow -paths (to be read “up-down paths”): an \updownarrow -path from w , of length 2ℓ , for $\ell \geq 1$, is a \pm -path π of length 2ℓ such that $R(\pi(2i), \pi(2i + 1))$ and $R^-(\pi(2i + 1), \pi(2i + 2))$, for all $i \in [0; \ell)$.

Clearly, every \updownarrow -path is also a \pm -path and every \pm -path is also a \downarrow -path. The following lemmas ensure that in *reflexive* Kripke frames \updownarrow -, \pm -, and \downarrow -paths can be safely used interchangeably since for every \pm -path there is an \updownarrow -path with the same starting and ending points and with the same set of intermediate points, occurring in the same order (Lemma 2.1 below). Furthermore, for every \downarrow -path there is a \updownarrow -path with the same starting and ending points and with the same set of intermediate points, occurring in the same order (Lemma 2.2 below). Finally, for every \downarrow -path there is a \pm -path with the same starting and ending points and with the same set of intermediate points, occurring in the same order (Lemma 2.3 below).

Lemma 2.1. *Given a reflexive Kripke frame (W, R) and a \pm -path $\pi : [0; \ell] \rightarrow W$, there is a \updownarrow -path $\pi' : [0; \ell'] \rightarrow W$, for some ℓ' , and a total, surjective, monotonic non-decreasing function $f : [0; \ell'] \rightarrow [0; \ell]$ such that $\pi'(j) = \pi(f(j))$ for all $j \in [0; \ell']$. \square*

Lemma 2.2. *Given a reflexive Kripke frame (W, R) and a \downarrow -path $\pi : [0; \ell] \rightarrow W$, there is a \updownarrow -path $\pi' : [0; \ell'] \rightarrow W$, for some ℓ' , and a total, surjective, monotonic non-decreasing function $f : [0; \ell'] \rightarrow [0; \ell]$ such that $\pi'(j) = \pi(f(j))$ for all $j \in [0; \ell']$. \square*

Lemma 2.3. *Given a reflexive Kripke frame (W, R) and a \downarrow -path $\pi : [0; \ell] \rightarrow W$, there is a \pm -path $\pi' : [0; \ell'] \rightarrow W$, for some ℓ' , and a total, surjective, monotonic, non-decreasing function $f : [0; \ell'] \rightarrow [0; \ell]$ with $\pi'(j) = \pi(f(j))$ for all $j \in [0; \ell']$. \square*

In [BCG⁺22], SLCS_γ , a version of SLCS for polyhedral models, has been presented that consists of predicate letters, negation, conjunction, and the single modal operator γ , expressing conditional reachability. The satisfaction relation for $\gamma(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$, for a polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$ and $x \in |K|$, as defined in [BCG⁺22], is recalled below:

$$\mathcal{P}, x \models \gamma(\Phi_1, \Phi_2) \Leftrightarrow \begin{array}{l} \text{a topological path } \pi : [0, 1] \rightarrow |K| \text{ exists such that } \pi(0) = x, \\ \mathcal{P}, \pi(1) \models \Phi_2, \text{ and } \mathcal{P}, \pi(r) \models \Phi_1 \text{ for all } r \in (0, 1). \end{array}$$

We also recall the interpretation of SLCS_γ on poset models. The satisfaction relation for $\gamma(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$, for a poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ and $w \in W$, is as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}, w \models \gamma(\Phi_1, \Phi_2) \Leftrightarrow \begin{array}{l} \text{a } \pm\text{-path } \pi : [0; \ell] \rightarrow W \text{ exists such that } \pi(0) = w, \\ \mathcal{F}, \pi(\ell) \models \Phi_2, \text{ and } \mathcal{F}, \pi(i) \models \Phi_1 \text{ for all } i \in (0; \ell). \end{array}$$

In [BCG⁺22] it has also been shown that, for all $x \in |K|$ and SLCS_γ formulas Φ , we have: $\mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi$ if and only if $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \Phi$. In addition, *simplicial bisimilarity*, a novel notion of bisimilarity for polyhedral models, has been defined that uses a subclass of topological paths and it has been shown to enjoy the classical Hennessy-Milner property: two points $x_1, x_2 \in |K|$ are simplicial bisimilar, written $x_1 \sim_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{P}} x_2$, if and only if they satisfy the same SLCS_γ formulas, i.e. they are equivalent with respect to the logic SLCS_γ , written $x_1 \equiv_{\gamma}^{\mathcal{P}} x_2$.

The result has been extended to \pm -bisimilarity on finite poset models, a notion of bisimilarity based on \pm -paths: $w_1, w_2 \in W$ are \pm -bisimilar, written $x_1 \sim_{\pm}^{\mathcal{F}} x_2$, if and only if they satisfy the same SLCS_γ formulas, i.e. $x_1 \equiv_{\gamma}^{\mathcal{F}} x_2$ (see [CGL⁺23a] for details). In summary, we have:

$$x_1 \sim_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{P}} x_2 \text{ iff } x_1 \equiv_{\gamma}^{\mathcal{P}} x_2 \text{ iff } \mathbb{F}(x_1) \equiv_{\gamma}^{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P})} \mathbb{F}(x_2) \text{ iff } \mathbb{F}(x_1) \sim_{\pm}^{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P})} \mathbb{F}(x_2).$$

In Section 4 we show a similar result for a weaker logic introduced in the next section, and originally presented in [BCG⁺24a]. We close this section by a small example. With reference to Figure 2a, we have that no red point, call it y , in the open segment CD is simplicial bisimilar to the red point C . In fact, although both y and C satisfy $\gamma(\mathbf{green}, \mathbf{true})$, we have that C satisfies also $\gamma(\mathbf{gray}, \mathbf{true})$, which is not the case for y . Similarly, with reference to Figure 2c, cell \tilde{C} satisfies $\gamma(\mathbf{gray}, \mathbf{true})$, which is not satisfied by \widetilde{CD} .

2.3. Labelled Transition Systems and Bisimilarities.

Definition 2.4. A *labelled transition system*, LTS for short, is a tuple (S, L, \longrightarrow) where S is a non-empty set of *states*, L is a non-empty set of *transition labels* and $\longrightarrow \subseteq S \times L \times S$ is the transition relation. •

For $\tau \in L$ denoting the “silent” action we let $t \xrightarrow{\tau^*} t'$ whenever $t = t'$ or there are t_0, \dots, t_n , for $n > 0$ such that $t_0 = t$, $t_n = t'$ and $t_i \xrightarrow{\tau} t_{i+1}$ for $i \in [0; n)$.

Definition 2.5 (Strong Bisimulation and Strong Equivalence). Given LTS $\mathbb{S} = (S, L, \longrightarrow)$ a binary relation $B \subseteq S \times S$ is a *strong bisimulation* if, for all $s_1, s_2 \in S$, if $B(s_1, s_2)$ then the following holds:

- (1) if $s_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} s'_1$ for some λ and s_1 , then s'_2 exists such that $s_2 \xrightarrow{\lambda} s'_2$ and $B(s'_1, s'_2)$, and
- (2) if $s_2 \xrightarrow{\lambda} s'_2$ for some λ and s_2 , then s'_1 exists such that $s_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} s'_1$ and $B(s'_1, s'_2)$.

We say that s_1 and s_2 are *strongly equivalent* in \mathbb{S} , written $s_1 \sim^{\mathbb{S}} s_2$ if a strong bisimulation B exists such that $B(s_1, s_2)$. •

It has been shown that $\sim^{\mathbb{S}}$ is the union of all strong bisimulations in \mathbb{S} , it is the largest strong bisimulation and it is an equivalence relation [Mil89].

Definition 2.6 (Branching Bisimulation and Equivalence). Given LTS $\mathbb{S} = (S, L, \longrightarrow)$ such that $\tau \in L$ a binary relation $B \subseteq S \times S$ is a *branching bisimulation* iff, for all $s, t, s' \in S$, and $\lambda \in L$, whenever $B(s, t)$ and $s \xrightarrow{\lambda} s'$, it holds that: (i) $B(s', t)$ and $\lambda = \tau$, or (ii) $B(s, \bar{t}), B(s', t')$ and $t \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \bar{t}, \bar{t} \xrightarrow{\lambda} t'$, for some $\bar{t}, t' \in S$.

Two states $s, t \in S$ are called *branching equivalent* in \mathbb{S} , written $s \leftrightarrow_b^{\mathbb{S}} t$ if $B(s, t)$ for some branching bisimulation B for S . •

It has been shown that $\leftrightarrow_b^{\mathbb{S}}$ is the union of all branching bisimulations in \mathbb{S} , it is the largest branching bisimulation and it is an equivalence relation [vGW96].

We will omit the superscript \mathbb{S} in $\sim^{\mathbb{S}}$ and $\leftrightarrow_b^{\mathbb{S}}$ when this will not cause confusion.

3. WEAK SLCS ON POLYHEDRAL MODELS

In this section we introduce SLCS_η , a logic for polyhedral models that is weaker than SLCS_γ , yet is still capable of expressing interesting conditional reachability properties. We present also an interpretation of the logic on finite poset models.

Definition 3.1 (Weak SLCS on polyhedral models - SLCS_η). The abstract language of SLCS_η is the following:

$$\Phi ::= p \mid \neg\Phi \mid \Phi_1 \wedge \Phi_2 \mid \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2).$$

The satisfaction relation of SLCS_η with respect to a given polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$, SLCS_η formula Φ , and point $x \in |K|$ is defined recursively on the structure of Φ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}, x \models p & \Leftrightarrow x \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}}(p); \\ \mathcal{P}, x \models \neg\Phi & \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi \text{ does not hold}; \\ \mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi_1 \wedge \Phi_2 & \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi_1 \text{ and } \mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi_2; \\ \mathcal{P}, x \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2) & \Leftrightarrow \text{a topological path } \pi : [0, 1] \rightarrow |K| \text{ exists such that} \\ & \pi(0) = x, \mathcal{P}, \pi(1) \models \Phi_2, \text{ and } \mathcal{P}, \pi(r) \models \Phi_1 \text{ for all } r \in [0, 1]. \quad \bullet \end{aligned}$$

As usual, disjunction (\vee) is derived as the dual of \wedge . Note that the only difference between $\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ and $\gamma(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ is that the former requires that *also the first element* of a path witnessing the formula satisfies Φ_1 , hence the use of the left closed interval $[0, 1)$ here. Although this might seem at first sight only a very minor difference, it has considerable consequences of both theoretical and practical nature, as we will see in what follows.

Definition 3.2 (SLCS_η Logical Equivalence). Given a polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$ and $x_1, x_2 \in |K|$, we say that x_1 and x_2 are *logically equivalent* with respect to SLCS_η , written $x_1 \equiv_\eta^{\mathcal{P}} x_2$, if and only if, for all SLCS_η formulas Φ , it holds that $\mathcal{P}, x_1 \models \Phi$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}, x_2 \models \Phi$. \bullet

In the following, we will refrain from indicating the model \mathcal{P} explicitly as a superscript of $\equiv_\eta^{\mathcal{P}}$ when it is clear from the context. Below, we show that SLCS_η can be encoded into SLCS_γ so that the latter is at least as expressive as the former.

Definition 3.3. We define the encoding \mathcal{E} of SLCS_η into SLCS_γ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(p) &= p & \mathcal{E}(\Phi_1 \wedge \Phi_2) &= \mathcal{E}(\Phi_1) \wedge \mathcal{E}(\Phi_2) \\ \mathcal{E}(\neg\Phi) &= \neg\mathcal{E}(\Phi) & \mathcal{E}(\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)) &= \mathcal{E}(\Phi_1) \wedge \gamma(\mathcal{E}(\Phi_1), \mathcal{E}(\Phi_2)) \quad \bullet \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma is easily proven by structural induction on Φ .

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$ be a polyhedral model, $x \in |K|$, and Φ a SLCS_η formula. Then $\mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}, x \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi)$. \square*

A direct consequence of Lemma 3.4 is that SLCS_η is weaker than SLCS_γ .

Proposition 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$ be a polyhedral model. For all $x_1, x_2 \in |K|$ the following holds: if $x_1 \equiv_\eta x_2$ then $x_1 \equiv_\gamma x_2$. \square*




FIGURE 4. A polyhedral model (4a) and its cell poset model (4b)

Remark 3.6. The converse of Proposition 3.5 does *not* hold, as shown by the example polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$ of Figure 4a. It is easy to see that, for all $x \in \widetilde{ABC}$, we have $A \not\equiv_{\gamma} x$ and $A \equiv_{\eta} x$. Let $x \in \widetilde{ABC}$. Clearly, $A \not\equiv_{\gamma} x$ since $\mathcal{P}, A \models \gamma(\mathbf{red}, \mathbf{true})$ whereas $\mathcal{P}, x \not\models \gamma(\mathbf{red}, \mathbf{true})$. It can easily be shown, by induction on the structure of formulas, that $A \equiv_{\eta} x$ for all $x \in \widetilde{ABC}$. *

Remark 3.7. The example of Figure 4a is useful also for showing that the classical topological interpretation of the modal logic operator \diamond cannot be expressed in SLCS_{η} . We recall that

$$\mathcal{P}, x \models \diamond \Phi \Leftrightarrow x \in \mathcal{C}_T(\{x' \in |K| \mid \mathcal{P}, x' \models \Phi\}).$$

Clearly, in the model of the figure, we have $\mathcal{P}, A \models \diamond \mathbf{red}$ while $\mathcal{P}, x \not\models \diamond \mathbf{red}$ for no $x \in \widetilde{ABC}$. On the other hand, $A \equiv_{\eta} x$ holds for all $x \in \widetilde{ABC}$, as we have just seen in Remark 3.6. So, if \diamond were expressible in SLCS_{η} , then A and x should have agreed on $\diamond \mathbf{red}$ for each $x \in \widetilde{ABC}$. Note that \diamond can be expressed in SLCS_{γ} as $\gamma(\Phi, \mathbf{true})$, see [BCG⁺22]. *

Below we re-interpret SLCS_{η} on finite poset models instead of polyhedral models. The only difference from Definition 3.1 is, of course, the fact that η -formulas are defined for \pm -paths instead of topological ones.

Definition 3.8 (SLCS $_{\eta}$ on finite poset models). The satisfaction relation of SLCS_{η} with respect to a given finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$, an SLCS_{η} formula Φ , and an element $w \in W$, is defined recursively on the structure of Φ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}, w \models p &\Leftrightarrow w \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}(p); \\ \mathcal{F}, w \models \neg \Phi &\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{F}, w \not\models \Phi; \\ \mathcal{F}, w \models \Phi_1 \wedge \Phi_2 &\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{F}, w \models \Phi_1 \text{ and } \mathcal{F}, w \models \Phi_2; \\ \mathcal{F}, w \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2) &\Leftrightarrow \text{a } \pm\text{-path } \pi : [0; \ell] \rightarrow W \text{ exists such that} \\ &\quad \pi(0) = w, \mathcal{F}, \pi(\ell) \models \Phi_2, \text{ and } \mathcal{F}, \pi(i) \models \Phi_1 \text{ for all } i \in [0; \ell]. \quad \bullet \end{aligned}$$

The following result states that to evaluate an SLCS_{η} formula $\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ in a poset model, it does not matter whether one considers \pm -paths or \downarrow -paths.

Proposition 3.9. *Given a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$, $w \in W$, and SLCS_{η} formulas Φ_1 and Φ_2 , the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *There exists a \pm -path $\pi : [0; \ell] \rightarrow W$ for some ℓ with $\pi(0) = w$, $\mathcal{F}, \pi(\ell) \models \Phi_2$, and $\mathcal{F}, \pi(i) \models \Phi_1$ for all $i \in [0; \ell]$.*

- (2) *There exists a \downarrow -path $\pi : [0; \ell'] \rightarrow W$ for some ℓ' with $\pi(0) = w$, $\mathcal{F}, \pi(\ell') \models \Phi_2$, and $\mathcal{F}, \pi(i) \models \Phi_1$ for all $i \in [0; \ell']$.* \square

Definition 3.10 (Logical Equivalence). Given a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ and elements $w_1, w_2 \in W$ we say that w_1 and w_2 are *logically equivalent* with respect to SLCS_{η} , written $w_1 \equiv_{\eta}^{\mathcal{F}} w_2$, if and only if, for all SLCS_{η} formulas Φ , it holds that $\mathcal{F}, w_1 \models \Phi$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \Phi$. \bullet

Again, in the following, we will refrain from indicating the model \mathcal{F} explicitly in $\equiv_{\eta}^{\mathcal{F}}$ when it is clear from the context. It is useful to define a “characteristic” SLCS_{η} formula $\chi(w)$ that is satisfied by all and only those elements w' with $w' \equiv_{\eta} w$.

Definition 3.11. Given a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$, $w_1, w_2 \in W$, define SLCS_{η} formula δ_{w_1, w_2} as follows: if $w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$, then set $\delta_{w_1, w_2} = \mathbf{true}$, otherwise pick some SLCS_{η} formula ψ such that $\mathcal{F}, w_1 \models \psi$ and $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \neg\psi$, and set $\delta_{w_1, w_2} = \psi$. For $w \in W$ define $\chi(w) = \bigwedge_{w' \in W} \delta_{w, w'}$. \bullet

Proposition 3.12. *Given a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$, for $w_1, w_2 \in W$, it holds that $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \chi(w_1)$ if and only if $w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$.* \square

The following lemma is the poset model counterpart of Lemma 3.4:

Lemma 3.13. *Let $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ be a finite poset model, $w \in W$, and Φ an SLCS_{η} formula. Then $\mathcal{F}, w \models \Phi$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}, w \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi)$.* \square

Thus we get, as for the interpretation on polyhedral models, that SLCS_{η} on finite poset models is weaker than SLCS_{γ} :

Proposition 3.14. *Let $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ be a finite poset model. For all $w_1, w_2 \in W$ the following holds: if $w_1 \equiv_{\gamma} w_2$ then $w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$.* \square

Remark 3.15. As expected, the converse of Proposition 3.14 does not hold, as shown by the poset model \mathcal{F} of Figure 4b. Clearly, $\tilde{A} \not\equiv_{\gamma} \widetilde{ABC}$. In fact $\mathcal{F}, \tilde{A} \models \gamma(\mathbf{red}, \mathbf{true})$ whereas $\mathcal{F}, \widetilde{ABC} \not\models \gamma(\mathbf{red}, \mathbf{true})$. On the other hand, it can be easily shown, by induction on the structure of formulas, that $\tilde{A} \equiv_{\eta} \widetilde{ABC}$. \ast

Remark 3.16. As for the case of the continuous interpretation of SLCS_{η} , the example of Figure 4b is useful also for showing that the classical modal logic operator \diamond cannot be expressed in SLCS_{η} . We recall that:

$$\mathcal{F}, w \models \diamond\Phi \iff w' \in W \text{ exists such that } w \preceq w' \text{ and } \mathcal{F}, w' \models \Phi.$$

Clearly, in the model of the figure, we have $\mathcal{F}, \tilde{A} \models \diamond\mathbf{red}$ while $\mathcal{F}, \widetilde{ABC} \not\models \diamond\mathbf{red}$. On the other hand $\tilde{A} \equiv_{\eta} \widetilde{ABC}$ holds, as we have just seen in Remark 3.15. So, if \diamond were expressible in SLCS_{η} , then \tilde{A} and \widetilde{ABC} should have agreed on $\diamond\mathbf{red}$. Note that \diamond can be expressed in SLCS_{γ} as $\gamma(\Phi, \mathbf{true})$, see [BCG⁺22]. \ast

The following result is useful to set up a bridge between the continuous and the discrete interpretations of SLCS_{η} .

Lemma 3.17. *Given a polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$, for all $x \in |K|$ and formulas Φ of SLCS_{η} the following holds: $\mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi$ if and only if $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi)$.* \square

As a direct consequence of Lemma 3.13 and Lemma 3.17 we get the bridge between the continuous and the discrete interpretations of SLCS_η .

Theorem 3.18. *Given a polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{P})$, for all $x \in |K|$ and formulas Φ of SLCS_η it holds that: $\mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi$ if and only if $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \Phi$. \square*

This theorem allows one to go back and forth between the polyhedral model and the corresponding poset model without losing anything expressible in SLCS_η .

4. WEAK SIMPLICIAL BISIMILARITY

In this section, we introduce weak versions of simplicial bisimilarity and \pm -bisimilarity and we show that they coincide with logical equivalence induced by SLCS_η in polyhedral and poset models, respectively.

Definition 4.1 (Weak Simplicial Bisimulation). Given a polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{P})$, a symmetric relation $B \subseteq |K| \times |K|$ is a *weak simplicial bisimulation* if, for all $x_1, x_2 \in |K|$, whenever $B(x_1, x_2)$, it holds that:

- (1) $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{P}^{-1}(\{x_1\}) = \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{P}^{-1}(\{x_2\})$;
- (2) for each topological path π_1 from x_1 , there is a topological path π_2 from x_2 such that $B(\pi_1(1), \pi_2(1))$ and for all $r_2 \in [0, 1)$ there is $r_1 \in [0, 1)$ such that $B(\pi_1(r_1), \pi_2(r_2))$.

Two points $x_1, x_2 \in |K|$ are weakly simplicial bisimilar, written $x_1 \approx_\Delta^\mathcal{P} x_2$, if there is a weak simplicial bisimulation B such that $B(x_1, x_2)$. \bullet

For example, the open segments AB , BC , and AC in Figure 4a are mutually weakly simplicial bisimilar and every point in set $\widetilde{ABC} \cup \widetilde{A} \cup \widetilde{B} \cup \widetilde{C}$ is weakly simplicial bisimilar to every other point in the same set.

Definition 4.2 (Weak \pm -bisimulation). Given a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{F})$, a symmetric binary relation $B \subseteq W \times W$ is a weak \pm -bisimulation if, for all $w_1, w_2 \in W$, whenever $B(w_1, w_2)$, it holds that:

- (1) $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\{w_1\}) = \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\{w_2\})$;
- (2) for each $u_1, d_1 \in W$ such that $w_1 \preceq^\pm u_1 \succ d_1$ there is a \pm -path $\pi_2 : [0; \ell_2] \rightarrow W$ from w_2 such that $B(d_1, \pi_2(\ell_2))$ and, for all $j \in [0; \ell_2)$, it holds that $B(w_1, \pi_2(j))$ or $B(u_1, \pi_2(j))$.

We say that w_1 is weakly \pm -bisimilar to w_2 , written $w_1 \approx_\pm^\mathcal{F} w_2$ if there is a weak \pm -bisimulation B such that $B(w_1, w_2)$. \bullet

For example, all red cells in the Hasse diagram of Figure 4b are weakly \pm -bisimilar and all blue cells are weakly \pm -bisimilar.

The following lemma shows that, in a polyhedral model \mathcal{P} , weak simplicial bisimilarity $\approx_\Delta^\mathcal{P}$, as given by Definition 4.1, is stronger than \equiv_η – logical equivalence with respect to SLCS_η :

Lemma 4.3. *Given a polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{P})$, for all $x_1, x_2 \in |K|$, the following holds: if $x_1 \approx_\Delta^\mathcal{P} x_2$ then $x_1 \equiv_\eta x_2$. \square*

Proof. By induction on the structure of the formulas. We consider only the case $\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. Suppose $x_1 \approx_\Delta^\mathcal{P} x_2$ and $\mathcal{P}, x_1 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. Then there is a topological path π_1 from x_1 such that $\mathcal{P}, \pi_1(1) \models \Phi_2$ and $\mathcal{P}, \pi_1(r_1) \models \Phi_1$ for all $r_1 \in [0, 1)$. Since $x_1 \approx_\Delta^\mathcal{P} x_2$, then there is a topological path π_2 from x_2 such that $\pi_1(1) \approx_\Delta^\mathcal{P} \pi_2(1)$ and for each $r_2 \in [0, 1)$ there is

$r'_1 \in [0, 1)$ such that $\pi_1(r'_1) \approx_{\Delta} \pi_2(r_2)$. By the Induction Hypothesis, we get $\mathcal{P}, \pi_2(1) \models \Phi_2$ and, for each $r_2 \in [0, 1)$ $\mathcal{P}, \pi_2(r_2) \models \Phi_1$. Thus $\mathcal{P}, x_2 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. \square

Furthermore, logical equivalence induced by SLCS_{η} is stronger than weak simplicial-bisimilarity, as implied by Lemma 4.7 below, which uses the following auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 4.4. *Given a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ and weak \pm -bisimulation $B \subseteq W \times W$, for all w_1, w_2 such that $B(w_1, w_2)$, the following holds: for each \downarrow -path $\pi_1 : [0; k_1] \rightarrow W$ from w_1 there is a \downarrow -path $\pi_2 : [0; k_2] \rightarrow W$ from w_2 such that $B(\pi_1(k_1), \pi_2(k_2))$ and, for each $j \in [0; k_2)$, exists $i \in [0; k_1)$ such that $B(\pi_1(i), \pi_2(j))$. \square*

Lemma 4.5. *Given a polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$, and associated cell poset model $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}) = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P})})$, for any \downarrow -path $\pi : [0; \ell] \rightarrow W$, there is a topological path $\pi' : [0, 1] \rightarrow |K|$ such that: (i) $\mathbb{F}(\pi'(0)) = \pi(0)$, (ii) $\mathbb{F}(\pi'(1)) = \pi(\ell)$, and (iii) for all $r \in (0, 1)$ exists $i < \ell$ such that $\mathbb{F}(\pi'(r)) = \pi(i)$. \square*

Lemma 4.6. *Given a polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$ and associated cell poset model $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}) = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P})})$, for any topological path $\pi : [0, 1] \rightarrow |K|$ the following holds: $\mathbb{F}(\pi([0, 1]))$ is a connected subposet of W and there are $k > 0$ and a \downarrow -path $\hat{\pi} : [0; k] \rightarrow W$ from $\mathbb{F}(\pi(0))$ to $\mathbb{F}(\pi(1))$ such that, for all $i \in [0; k)$, $r \in [0, 1)$ exists with $\hat{\pi}(i) = \mathbb{F}(\pi(r))$. \square*

Lemma 4.7. *In a given polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$, it holds that \equiv_{η} is a weak simplicial bisimulation.*

Proof. Let $x_1, x_2 \in |K|$ be such that $x_1 \equiv_{\eta} x_2$. The first condition of Definition 4.1 is clearly satisfied since $x_1 \equiv_{\eta} x_2$. Suppose π_1 is a topological path from x_1 . By Lemma 4.6, $\mathbb{F}(\pi_1([0, 1]))$ is a connected subposet of \widetilde{K} and a \downarrow -path $\hat{\pi}_1 : [0; k_1] \rightarrow \widetilde{K}$ from $\mathbb{F}(\pi_1(0))$ to $\mathbb{F}(\pi_1(1))$ exists such that, for all $i \in [0; k_1)$, $r_1 \in [0, 1)$ exists with $\hat{\pi}_1(i) = \mathbb{F}(\pi_1(r_1))$. We also know that $\mathbb{F}(x_1) \equiv_{\eta} \mathbb{F}(x_2)$, as a consequence of Theorem 3.18, since $x_1 \equiv_{\eta} x_2$. In addition, due to Lemma 4.10 below, we also know that $\mathbb{F}(x_1) \approx_{\pm} \mathbb{F}(x_2)$. By Lemma 4.4, we get that there is a \downarrow -path $\hat{\pi}_2 : [0; k_2] \rightarrow \widetilde{K}$ such that $\hat{\pi}_1(k_1) \equiv_{\eta} \hat{\pi}_2(k_2)$ and, for each $j \in [0; k_2)$, $i \in [0; k_1)$ exists such that $\hat{\pi}_1(i) \equiv_{\eta} \hat{\pi}_2(j)$. By Lemma 4.5, it follows that there is topological path π_2 from x_2 satisfying the three conditions of the lemma and, again by Theorem 3.18, we have that $\pi_2(1) \equiv_{\eta} \pi_1(1)$. In addition, for any $r_2 \in [0, 1)$, since $\mathbb{F}(\pi_2(r_2)) = \hat{\pi}_2(j)$ for $j \in [0; k_2)$ (condition (ii) of Lemma 4.5) there is $i \in [0; k_1)$ such that $\hat{\pi}_1(i) \equiv_{\eta} \hat{\pi}_2(j)$. Finally, by construction, there is $r_1 \in [0, 1)$ such that $\mathbb{F}(\pi_1(r_1)) = \hat{\pi}_1(i)$. By Theorem 3.18, we arrive at $\pi_1(r_1) \equiv_{\eta} \pi_2(r_2)$. \square

On the basis of Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.7, we have that the largest weak simplicial bisimulation exists, it is a weak simplicial bisimilarity, it is an equivalence relation, and it coincides with logical equivalence in the polyhedral model induced by SLCS_{η} , thus establishing the HMP for $\approx_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{P}}$ with respect to SLCS_{η} :

Theorem 4.8. *Given a polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$, $x_1, x_2 \in |K|$, the following holds: $x_1 \equiv_{\eta}^{\mathcal{P}} x_2$ if and only if $x_1 \approx_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{P}} x_2$. \square*

Similar results can be obtained for poset models. The following lemma shows that, in every finite poset model \mathcal{F} , weak \pm -bisimilarity (Definition 4.2) is stronger than logical equivalence with respect to SLCS_{η} , i.e. $\approx_{\pm}^{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \equiv_{\eta}^{\mathcal{F}}$:

Lemma 4.9. *Given a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$, for all $w_1, w_2 \in W$, if $w_1 \approx_{\pm}^{\mathcal{F}} w_2$ then $w_1 \equiv_{\eta}^{\mathcal{F}} w_2$.*




FIGURE 5. The minimal model, modulo weak \pm -bisimilarity, of the model of Fig. 2.

Proof. By induction on formulas. We consider only the case $\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. Suppose $w_1 \approx_{\pm} w_2$ and $\mathcal{F}, w_1 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. Then, there is (a \pm -path and so) a \downarrow -path π_1 from w_1 of some length k_1 such that $\mathcal{F}, \pi_1(k_1) \models \Phi_2$ and for all $i \in [0; k_1)$ it holds that $\mathcal{F}, \pi_1(i) \models \Phi_1$. By Lemma 4.4, we know that a \downarrow -path π_2 from w_2 exists of some length k_2 such that $\pi_1(k_1) \approx_{\pm} \pi_2(k_2)$ and for all $j \in [0; k_2)$ exists $i \in [0; k_1)$ such that $\pi_1(i) \approx_{\pm} \pi_2(j)$. By the Induction Hypothesis, we then get that $\mathcal{F}, \pi_2(k_2) \models \Phi_2$ and for all $j \in [0; k_2)$ we have $\mathcal{F}, \pi_2(j) \models \Phi_1$. This implies that $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. \square

Furthermore, logical equivalence induced by SLCS_{η} is stronger than weak \pm -bisimilarity, i.e. $\equiv_{\eta}^{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \approx_{\pm}^{\mathcal{F}}$, as implied by the following:

Lemma 4.10. *In a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$, $\equiv_{\eta}^{\mathcal{F}}$ is a weak \pm -bisimulation.*

Proof. If $w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$, then the first requirement of Definition 4.2 is trivially satisfied. We prove that \equiv_{η} satisfies the second requirement of Definition 4.2. Suppose $w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$ and let u_1, d_1 be as in the above-mentioned requirement. This implies that $\mathcal{F}, w_1 \models \eta(\chi(w_1) \vee \chi(u_1), \chi(d_1))$, where, we recall, $\chi(w)$ is the ‘characteristic formula’ for w as in Definition 3.11. Since $w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$, we also have that $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \eta(\chi(w_1) \vee \chi(u_1), \chi(d_1))$ holds. This in turn means that a \downarrow -path π_2 of some length k_2 from w_2 exists such that $\mathcal{F}, \pi_2(k_2) \models \chi(d_1)$ and for all $j \in [0; k_2)$ we have $\mathcal{F}, \pi_2(j) \models \chi(w_1) \vee \chi(u_1)$, i.e. $\mathcal{F}, \pi_2(j) \models \chi(w_1)$ or $\mathcal{F}, \pi_2(j) \models \chi(u_1)$. Consequently, by Proposition 3.12, we have: $\pi_2(k_2) \equiv_{\eta} d_1$ and, for all $j \in [0; k_2)$, $\pi_2(j) \equiv_{\eta} w_1$ or $\pi_2(j) \equiv_{\eta} u_1$, so that the second condition of the definition is fulfilled. \square

On the basis of Lemma 4.9 and Lemma 4.10, we have that the largest weak \pm -bisimulation exists, it is a weak \pm -bisimilarity, it is an equivalence relation, and it coincides with logical equivalence in the finite poset induced by SLCS_{η} :

Theorem 4.11. *For every finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$, $w_1, w_2 \in W$, the following holds: $w_1 \equiv_{\eta}^{\mathcal{F}} w_2$ if and only if $w_1 \approx_{\pm}^{\mathcal{F}} w_2$.* \square

By this we have established the HMP for \approx_{\pm} with respect to SLCS_{η} .

Recalling that, by Theorem 3.18, given polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$ for all $x \in |K|$ and SLCS_{η} formula Φ , we have that $\mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi$ if and only if $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \Phi$, we get the following final result:

Corollary 4.12. *For all polyhedral models $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$, $x_1, x_2 \in |K|$:*

$$x_1 \approx_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{P}} x_2 \text{ iff } x_1 \equiv_{\eta}^{\mathcal{P}} x_2 \text{ iff } \mathbb{F}(x_1) \equiv_{\eta}^{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P})} \mathbb{F}(x_2) \text{ iff } \mathbb{F}(x_1) \approx_{\pm}^{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P})} \mathbb{F}(x_2). \quad \square$$

Saying that SLCS_η -equivalence in a polyhedral model is the same as weak simplicial bisimilarity, which maps by \mathbb{F} to the weak \pm -bisimilarity in the corresponding poset model, where the latter coincides with the SLCS_η -equivalence.

Fig. 5 shows the minimal model $\min(\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}))$, modulo \approx_{\pm} , of $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P})$ (see Fig. 2c). We have the equivalence classes $\mathbb{C}_1 = \{\tilde{A}\}$, $\mathbb{C}_2 = \{\tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \widetilde{AB}, \widetilde{AC}, \widetilde{BC}, \widetilde{BD}, \widetilde{CD}, \widetilde{ABC}, \widetilde{BCD}\}$, $\mathbb{C}_3 = \{\tilde{D}, \tilde{E}, \tilde{F}, \widetilde{CE}, \widetilde{DE}, \widetilde{DF}, \widetilde{EF}, \widetilde{DEF}\}$ and, finally, $\mathbb{C}_4 = \{\widetilde{CDE}\}$. Note that the minimal model is not a poset model, but it is a reflexive Kripke model.⁵

As a proof-of-concept and demonstration of the feasibility we show a larger example of a 3D polyhedral structure composed of one white "room" and 26 green "rooms" connected by grey "corridors" as shown in Fig. 6a. In turn, each room is composed of 33 vertices, 122 edges, 150 triangles and 60 tetrahedra, i.e. it is composed of a total of 365 cells. Each corridor is composed of 8 edges, 12 triangles and 5 tetrahedra, i.e. it consists of 25 cells. The corridors are connected to rooms via the four points of the side of a room. In total, the structure consists of 11,205 cells. We have chosen a large, but symmetric structure on purpose. This makes it easy to interpret the various equivalence classes present in the minimal Kripke model of this structure shown in Fig. 6b. Observe that, for this example, the minimal model is also a poset model and, in particular, a cell poset model representing a polyhedron, as shown in Fig. 6c. The latter can be seen as a minimised version of the original polyhedral structure. Note also the considerable reduction that was obtained: from 11,205 cells to just 7 in the minimal model.

In Fig. 6b we have indicated the various equivalence classes with a letter. Those indicated with a "C" correspond to classes of (cells of) corridors, those with an "R" correspond to classes of (cells of) rooms. For reasons of space and clarity, in the following we will not list all the individual cells that are part of a certain class, but instead we will indicate those cells by speaking about certain rooms and corridors, intending the cells that they are composed of.

There is one white class containing all white cells of the white room. Furthermore, there are three green classes corresponding to three types of green rooms, and three grey classes corresponding to three kinds of corridors. The green class R2 is composed of the (cells in) the six green rooms situated in the middle of each side of the cube structure. Those in R3 are the cells in the twelve green rooms situated in the middle of each 'edge' of the cube structure. Those in R4 are the cells in the eight green rooms situated at the corners of the cube structure. It is not difficult to find SLCS_η formulas that distinguish, for instance, the various green classes. For example, the cells in R2 satisfy $\Phi_1 = \eta(\mathbf{green} \vee \eta(\mathbf{grey}, \mathbf{white}), \mathbf{white})$, whereas no cell in R3 or R4 satisfies Φ_1 . To distinguish class R3 from R4 one can observe that cells in R3 satisfy $\Phi_2 = \eta(\mathbf{green} \vee \eta(\mathbf{grey}, \Phi_1), \Phi_1)$ whereas those in R4 do not satisfy Φ_2 .

In this symmetric case of this synthesised example, it was rather straightforward to find the various equivalence classes. In the general case it is much harder and one would need a suitable minimisation algorithm for SLCS_η . This is the topic of the next sections.

⁵It is worth noting that for model-checking purposes we can safely interpret SLCS_η over (reflexive) Kripke models. The satisfaction relation is defined as in Def. 3.8 where \mathcal{F} is a Kripke model instead of a poset model (recall that \pm -paths are defined on Kripke frames).




FIGURE 6. (6a) A simplicial complex of a 3D structure composed of rooms and corridors. (6b) Its minimal Kripke structure. (6c) Its minimal polyhedron.

5. BUILDING THE MINIMAL MODEL MODULO LOGICAL EQUIVALENCE

In this section we present a minimisation procedure for finite poset models modulo weak \pm -bisimilarity or, equivalently, modulo \equiv_η . Given a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{F})$, the procedure consists of three steps:

Step 1: The poset model \mathcal{F} is encoded as an LTS denoted $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$. The set of states of $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$ is W . The encoding is such that it is ensured that logically equivalent points are mapped to branching bisimilar states. Thus, for points $w_1, w_2 \in W$ that are logically equivalent with respect to SLCS_η in the poset model \mathcal{F} , i.e. $w_1 \equiv_\eta^\mathcal{F} w_2$, we have that they are branching bisimilar as states in the LTS $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$, i.e. $w_1 \leftrightarrow_b^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_2$.

Step 2: The LTS $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$ is reduced modulo branching bisimilarity using available software tools, such as `mCRL2` [GJKW17]. This step yields the set of equivalence classes of W for $\leftrightarrow_b^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})}$. Because of the correspondence of logical equivalence and branching bisimilarity, we obtain $W/\equiv_\eta^\mathcal{F}$.

Step 3: The minimal model is built. It turns out that this model is not necessarily a poset model (see the example in Fig. 9 in Section 7). However, it is a reflexive Kripke model of the form $(W/\equiv_\eta^\mathcal{F}, R, \mathcal{V})$ where R is a relation induced by the ordering \preceq of \mathcal{F} .

In the remainder of this section we focus on Step 1 and Step 3.

5.1. The Encoding of \mathcal{F} as $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$. We obtain the LTS $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$ from the poset \mathcal{F} as follows.

Definition 5.1. For a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{F})$ and symbols $\tau, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d} \notin \text{PL}$, the LTS $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$ is defined by $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F}) = (S, L, \rightarrow)$ where

- the set of states S is the set W ;
- the set of labels L consists of $\text{PL} \cup \{\tau, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}\}$;




FIGURE 7. (7a) A polyhedral model \mathcal{P}' ; (7b) poset model $\mathcal{F}' = \mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}')$; (7c) minimal Kripke model \mathcal{F}'_{min} ; (7d) the LTS $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F}')$ obtained from \mathcal{F}' by the encoding of Def. 5.1; (7e) The LTS $\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F}')$ obtained from \mathcal{F}' by the encoding of Def. 5.4. Note that whenever $s \xrightarrow{\ell} s'$ and $s' \xrightarrow{\ell} s$ a “double transition” $s \xleftrightarrow{\ell} s'$ is drawn in the figure between s and s' .

- the transition relation \rightarrow is the smallest relation on $S \times L \times S$ induced by the following transition rules.

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{(PLC)} \quad \frac{w \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}(p)}{w \xrightarrow{p} w} \qquad \text{(TAU)} \quad \frac{w \preceq^{\pm} w' \quad \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'\})}{w \xrightarrow{\tau} w'} \\
 \text{(CNG)} \quad \frac{w \preceq^{\pm} w' \quad \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w\}) \neq \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'\})}{w \xrightarrow{c} w'} \qquad \text{(DWN)} \quad \frac{w \succ w'}{w \xrightarrow{d} w'} \bullet
 \end{array}$$

Fig. 7a shows an example of a simple polyhedral model \mathcal{P}' . The LTS $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F}')$ associated with the poset model \mathcal{F}' of \mathcal{P}' is shown in Fig. 7d.⁶

In order to show that the above definition establishes that $w_1 \equiv_{\eta}^{\mathcal{F}} w_2$ if and only if $w_1 \xleftrightarrow{b}^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_2$, it is convenient to consider an intermediate structure, that is an LTS too. We denote this second LTS by $\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})$. This structure helps in the proofs to separate concerns related to the various equivalences that are involved. Suppose that points w_1 and w_2 in \mathcal{F} are encoded by the states s_1 and s_2 in $\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})$, respectively. We will have that points w_1 and w_2 are logically equivalent in \mathcal{F} with respect to SLCS_{η} if and only if states s_1 and s_2 are strongly bisimilar (in the classical sense [Mil89]) in $\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})$, written $s_1 \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} s_2$. Furthermore, it will

⁶Note that τ self-loops in LTSs are irrelevant since we are working modulo branching bisimilarity. In this paper we focus mainly on correctness, while in future work we will address optimisation of the encoding procedures.

hold that s_1 and s_2 are strongly bisimilar in $\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})$ if and only if w_1 and w_2 are branching bisimilar in $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$, thus providing the correctness of the construction.

LTS $\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})$ is more abstract than $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$. Define $\Theta = \{ \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w\}) \mid w \in W \}$ and consider, for $\alpha \in \Theta$, the α -connected components of \mathcal{F} . Then, each state s of $\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})$ is an α -connected component of \mathcal{F} , for some α as above. So, we group together all the points in W that can reach one another only via a path in \mathcal{F} composed of elements all satisfying exactly the same proposition letters.

The above intuition is formalised by the following definition.

Definition 5.2. Given finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$, we define relation $\equiv \subseteq W \times W$ as the set of pairs (w_1, w_2) such that an undirected path π of some length ℓ exists with $\pi(0) = w_1, \pi(\ell) = w_2$, and $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{\pi(i)\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{\pi(j)\})$, for all $i, j \in [0; \ell]$. •

The relevant definitions lead straightforwardly to the following observation.

Proposition 5.3. Let $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ be a finite poset model. Then \equiv is an equivalence relation on W . ◻

We are ready to actually define the encoding to the more “abstract” LTS.

Definition 5.4. Given a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$, and $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{d} \notin \text{PL}$, we define the LTS $\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F}) = (S, L, \rightarrow)$ where

- the set S of states is the quotient W/\equiv of W modulo \equiv ;
- the set L of labels is $\mathbf{2}^{\text{PL}} \cup \{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{d}\}$;
- the transition relation is the smallest relation on $W \times L \times W$ induced by the following transition rules:

$$\text{(PL)} \quad [w]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w\})} [w]_{\equiv}$$

$$\text{(Step)} \quad \frac{w \preceq^{\pm} w'}{[w]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{s}} [w']_{\equiv}} \quad \text{(Down)} \quad \frac{w \succ w'}{[w]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} [w']_{\equiv}}$$

An example of $\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})$ is shown in Fig. 7e. The following theorem ensures that any two elements w_1 and w_2 of a finite poset model \mathcal{F} are logically equivalent in \mathcal{F} with respect to SLCS_{η} if and only if their equivalence classes $[w_1]_{\equiv}$ and $[w_2]_{\equiv}$ are strongly bisimilar in $\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})$. The theorem uses the following lemma:

Lemma 5.5. Given a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ and $w_1, w_2 \in W$ the following holds: if $w_1 \equiv w_2$, then $w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$. ◻

Theorem 5.6. Let $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ be a finite poset model. For all $w_1, w_2 \in W$ it holds that $w_1 \equiv_{\eta}^{\mathcal{F}} w_2$ if and only if $[w_1]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_2]_{\equiv}$.

Proof. We first prove that if $[w_1]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_2]_{\equiv}$ then $w_1 \equiv_{\eta}^{\mathcal{F}} w_2$. We proceed by induction on SLCS_{η} formulas and consider only the case $\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$, since the other cases are straightforward. Suppose $[w_1]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_2]_{\equiv}$ and $\mathcal{F}, w_1 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. Since $\mathcal{F}, w_1 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$, there is (a \pm -path, and so, by Proposition 3.9) a \downarrow -path π_1 from w_1 of some length $\ell_1 \geq 1$ such that $\mathcal{F}, \pi_1(\ell_1) \models \Phi_2$ and $\mathcal{F}, \pi_1(i) \models \Phi_1$ for all $i \in [0; \ell_1)$. At this point, we use induction on ℓ_1 , together with structural induction on the formulas, for showing that also $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$

holds.

Base case: $\ell_1 = 1$.

In this case we have $\mathcal{F}, w_1 \models \Phi_1$ and $\mathcal{F}, \pi_1(1) \models \Phi_2$, with $w_1 \succcurlyeq \pi_1(1)$. Moreover, by the Induction Hypothesis on formulas, we also have $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \Phi_1$. In addition, by Rule (Down), we get $[w_1]_{\models} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} [\pi_1(1)]_{\models}$. Since $[w_1]_{\models} \sim [w_2]_{\models}$ by hypothesis, we also get $[w_2]_{\models} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} [w'_2]_{\models}$, for some $[w'_2]_{\models}$ with $[w'_2]_{\models} \sim [\pi_1(1)]_{\models}$. Note that, by definition of \models and since $[w_2]_{\models} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} [w'_2]_{\models}$, there is a path π'_2 from w_2 of some length ℓ'_2 such that $\pi'_2(j) \models w_2$ for all $j \in [0; \ell'_2]$ and $\pi'_2(\ell'_2) \succcurlyeq w'_2$, with $w'_2 \in [w'_2]_{\models}$. Recalling that $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \Phi_1$, by Lemma 5.5, we also get that $\mathcal{F}, \pi'_2(j) \models \Phi_1$ for all $j \in [0; \ell'_2]$. Recalling also that $\mathcal{F}, \pi_1(1) \models \Phi_2$, again by the Induction Hypothesis on formulas, from $[w'_2]_{\models} \sim [\pi_1(1)]_{\models}$, we get $\mathcal{F}, w'_2 \models \Phi_2$ and, by Lemma 5.5, we also get $\mathcal{F}, w'_2 \models \Phi_2$. Consider now path $\pi_2 : [0; \ell'_2 + 1] \rightarrow W$ defined as follows:

$$\pi_2(j) = \begin{cases} \pi'_2(j) & \text{if } j \in [0; \ell'_2], \\ w'_2 & \text{if } j = \ell'_2 + 1. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, π_2 is a \downarrow -path from w_2 since π'_2 is an undirected path and $\pi_2(\ell'_2) \succcurlyeq \pi_2(\ell'_2 + 1)$. Furthermore, we have shown above that $\mathcal{F}, \pi_2(\ell'_2 + 1) \models \Phi_2$ and $\mathcal{F}, \pi_2(j) \models \Phi_1$ for all $j \in [0; \ell'_2 + 1)$.

Thus, we have that $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$, witnessed by π_2 .

Induction step: We assume the assertion holds for $\ell_1 = n$, for $n \geq 1$ and we show it holds for $\ell_1 = n + 1$.

Since $w_1 \preccurlyeq^\pm \pi_1(1)$, by Rule (Step), we have that $[w_1]_{\models} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{s}} [\pi_1(1)]_{\models}$, and since, by hypothesis, $[w_1]_{\models} \sim [w_2]_{\models}$, we also know that $[w_2]_{\models} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{s}} [w'_2]_{\models}$ for some w'_2 such that $[w'_2]_{\models} \sim [\pi_1(1)]_{\models}$. Furthermore, $\mathcal{F}, \pi_1(1) \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ since $\ell_1 \geq 2$ and that this is witnessed by $\pi_1 \uparrow 1$, which is a \downarrow -path of length n . Thus, by the Induction Hypothesis on ℓ_1 , we get that $\mathcal{F}, w'_2 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ since $[w'_2]_{\models} \sim [\pi_1(1)]_{\models}$ (see above). From $[w_2]_{\models} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{s}} [w'_2]_{\models}$, by Rule (Step), we know that $w \in [w_2]_{\models}$ and $w' \in [w'_2]_{\models}$ exist such that $w \preccurlyeq^\pm w'$. Since $w \in [w_2]_{\models}$ an undirected path π'_2 exists from w_2 to w , of some length ℓ'_2 , such that $\pi'_2(j) \models w_2$ for all $j \in [0; \ell'_2]$. By the Induction Hypothesis on formulas, we know that $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \Phi_1$, and so, by Lemma 5.5, we get also $\mathcal{F}, \pi'_2(j) \models \Phi_1$ for all $j \in [0; \ell'_2]$. Moreover, since $\mathcal{F}, w'_2 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ (see above) and $w' \models w'_2$, again by Lemma 5.5, we get $\mathcal{F}, w' \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. This means that there is a \pm -path π''_2 from w' of some length ℓ''_2 witnessing $\mathcal{F}, w' \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. Define π_2 as follows: $\pi_2 = \pi'_2 \cdot (w, w') \cdot \pi''_2$. It is easy to see that π_2 is a \downarrow -path witnessing $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$.

Now we prove that if $w_1 \equiv_\eta^{\mathcal{F}} w_2$ then $[w_1]_{\models} \sim^{\mathcal{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_2]_{\models}$. We do this by showing that the following binary relation B on W is a strong bisimulation:

$$B = \{(s_1, s_2) \in S \times S \mid \text{there are } w_1 \in s_1, w_2 \in s_2 \text{ such that } w_1 \equiv_\eta w_2\}.$$

Let, without loss of generality, $s_1 = [w_1]_{\models}$ and $s_2 = [w_2]_{\models}$, for some $w_1, w_2 \in W$ with $w_1 \equiv_\eta w_2$ and suppose $B([w_1]_{\models}, [w_2]_{\models})$, with $w_1 \equiv_\eta w_2$. We distinguish three cases:

Case A: $[w_1]_{\models} \xrightarrow{\alpha} [w'_1]_{\models}$ with $\alpha \in \mathbf{2}^{\text{PL}}$.

If $[w_1]_{\models} \xrightarrow{\alpha} [w'_1]_{\models}$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbf{2}^{\text{PL}}$ and $w'_1 \in W$, then, by Rule (PL), we know that $[w'_1]_{\models} = [w_1]_{\models}$. Furthermore, since $w_1 \equiv_\eta w_2$, we also know that $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_2\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\}) = \alpha$. In addition, again by Rule (PL), we get that $[w_2]_{\models} \xrightarrow{\alpha} [w_2]_{\models}$ and, by hypothesis $B([w_1]_{\models}, [w_2]_{\models})$.

Case B: $[w_1]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} [w'_1]_{\equiv}$

If $[w_1]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} [w'_1]_{\equiv}$ for some $w'_1 \in W$, then, by Rule (Down) there are $w \in [w_1]_{\equiv}$ and $w' \in [w'_1]_{\equiv}$ such that $w \succ w'$. Note that (w, w') is a \downarrow -path witnessing $\mathcal{F}, w \models \eta(\chi(w), \chi(w'))$, where χ is as in Definition 3.11 on page 12. Since $w \equiv w_1$, we have that $\mathcal{F}, w_1 \models \eta(\chi(w), \chi(w'))$ holds, by Lemma 5.5. Moreover, since, by hypothesis, $w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$, we also have $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \eta(\chi(w), \chi(w'))$. Then a \pm -path $\pi : [0; \ell] \rightarrow W$ exists from w_2 such that $\mathcal{F}, \pi(\ell) \models \chi(w')$ and $\mathcal{F}, \pi(j) \models \chi(w)$ for all $j \in [0; \ell)$. This in turn, by Proposition 3.12, means that $\pi(\ell) \equiv_{\eta} w'$ and $\pi(j) \equiv_{\eta} w$ for all $j \in [0; \ell)$. By Lemma 5.5, since $w' \equiv w'_1$, we get $w' \equiv_{\eta} w'_1$, and by transitivity, since $\pi(\ell) \equiv_{\eta} w'$ (see above), we also have $\pi(\ell) \equiv_{\eta} w'_1$. Similarly, we get $\pi(j) \equiv_{\eta} w \equiv_{\eta} w_1$, which implies $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{\pi(j)\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\})$, for all $j \in [0; \ell)$. Recall that $w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$, which implies $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(w_2) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\})$ and so we get also $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{\pi(j)\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_2\})$, for all $j \in [0; \ell)$. In addition, for all $j \in [0; \ell)$ we have that $\pi|_{[0; j]}$ connects $\pi(0) = w_2$ to $\pi(j)$. This means that, for all $j \in [0; \ell)$, $\pi(j) \in [w_2]_{\equiv} = [\pi(\ell - 1)]_{\equiv}$ and since $\pi(\ell - 1) \succ \pi(\ell)$, by Rule (Down) we deduce $[\pi(\ell - 1)]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} [\pi(\ell)]_{\equiv}$, that is $[w_2]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} [\pi(\ell)]_{\equiv}$. Recall that $\pi(\ell) \equiv_{\eta} w'_1$, so that, by definition of relation B , we finally get $B([w'_1]_{\equiv}, [\pi(\ell)]_{\equiv})$.

Case C: $[w_1]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{s}} [w'_1]_{\equiv}$

Suppose, finally, that $[w_1]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{s}} [w'_1]_{\equiv}$ for some $w'_1 \in W$. We distinguish two cases:

Case C1: $w'_1 \in [w_1]_{\equiv}$. In this case, by Lemma 5.5, we have also $w'_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_1$. Furthermore, $w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$ by hypothesis, thus we get $w'_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$. But then, since $w_2 \preceq^{\pm} w'_1$, by Rule (Step), we know that $[w_2]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{s}} [w'_1]_{\equiv}$ and since $w'_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$, by definition of relation B , we finally get $B([w'_1]_{\equiv}, [w_2]_{\equiv})$.

Case C2: $w'_1 \notin [w_1]_{\equiv}$. We know there are $w \in [w_1]_{\equiv}$ and $w' \in [w'_1]_{\equiv}$ such that $w \preceq^{\pm} w'$. Since $w \equiv w_1$, then $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\})$ and since $w' \equiv w'_1$, then $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'_1\})$. Furthermore, since $w \preceq^{\pm} w'$, there is path (w, w') connecting w with w' . So there is a path connecting w_1 to w'_1 and if $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'_1\})$ would hold, it could not be that $w'_1 \notin [w_1]_{\equiv}$. Consequently, it must be $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\}) \neq \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'_1\})$, which in turn implies $w_1 \not\equiv_{\eta} w'_1$. We note that the following holds:

$$\mathcal{F}, w_1 \models \eta(\chi(w_1), \eta(\chi(w_1) \vee \chi(w'_1), \chi(w'_1)))$$

and, since $w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$ we also have

$$\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \eta(\chi(w_1), \eta(\chi(w_1) \vee \chi(w'_1), \chi(w'_1))).$$

Let π be a \pm -path from w_2 witnessing the above formula and let k be the first index such that $\mathcal{F}, \pi(k) \models \chi(w'_1)$. We have that, for all $j \in [0; k)$, $\mathcal{F}, \pi(j) \models \chi(w_1)$ and $\pi|_{[0; j]}$ connects $\pi(0) = w_2$ to $\pi(j)$. Furthermore, for all such j , we have $\pi(j) \equiv_{\eta} w_1$, by Proposition 3.12, which entails $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{\pi(j)\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\})$. Thus $\pi(j) \in [w_2]_{\equiv}$ for all $j \in [0; k)$ and since $\pi(k - 1) \preceq^{\pm} \pi(k)$ we have, by Rule (Step) $[w_2]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{s}} [\pi(k)]_{\equiv}$. Finally, recalling that, again by Proposition 3.12, $w'_1 \equiv_{\eta} \pi(k)$, we get $B([w'_1]_{\equiv}, [\pi(k)]_{\equiv})$. \square

The following theorem ensures that $[w_1]_{\equiv}$ and $[w_2]_{\equiv}$ are strongly bisimilar in $\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})$ if and only if w_1 and w_2 are branching bisimilar in $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$. The theorem uses the following:

Lemma 5.7. *Consider a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$. Then for all $w_1, w_2 \in W$ the following holds: if $[w_1]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_2]_{\equiv}$, then $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_2\})$. \square*

Theorem 5.8. *Let $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ be a finite poset model. For all $w_1, w_2 \in W$ it holds that $[w_1]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_2]_{\equiv}$ if and only if $w_1 \leftrightarrow_b^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_2$.*

Proof. We first prove that if $[w_1]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_2]_{\equiv}$ then $w_1 \leftrightarrow_b^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_2$. We show that the following relation is a branching bisimulation:

$$B_C = \{(w_1, w_2) \in W \times W \mid [w_1]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_2]_{\equiv}\}.$$

Let us assume $B_C(w_1, w_2)$. We have to consider a few cases:

Case A: $w_1 \xrightarrow{p} w_1$.

If $w_1 \xrightarrow{p} w_1$, then, by Rule (PLC), we have $p \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\})$. By definition of B_C and by hypothesis we know that $[w_1]_{\equiv} \sim [w_2]_{\equiv}$ and so, by Lemma 5.7, we get $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_2\})$. It follows then that $p \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_2\})$ and, again by Rule (PLC), we finally get $w_2 \xrightarrow{p} w_2$, which is the required mimicking step since $B(w_1, w_2)$.

Case B: $w_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} w'_1$.

If $w_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} w'_1$ for some $w'_1 \in W$, then, by Rule (TAU), we know that $w_1 \preceq^{\pm} w'_1$, with $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'_1\})$, which, by definition of \equiv , means $[w'_1]_{\equiv} = [w_1]_{\equiv}$ and since $[w_1]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_2]_{\equiv}$ by definition of B_C , given that $B_C(w_1, w_2)$, we get $[w'_1]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_2]_{\equiv}$. This, in turn, again by definition of B_C , means $B_C(w'_1, w_2)$.

Case C: $w_1 \xrightarrow{c} w'_1$.

If $w_1 \xrightarrow{c} w'_1$ for some $w'_1 \in W$, then, by Rule (CNG), we know that $w_1 \preceq^{\pm} w'_1$, with $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\}) \neq \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'_1\})$, and, by Rule (Step), we have $[w_1]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{s} [w'_1]_{\equiv}$. Since, by definition of B_C and by hypothesis, $[w_1]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_2]_{\equiv}$, we also have $[w_2]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{s} [w'_2]_{\equiv}$ for some $[w'_2]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w'_1]_{\equiv}$. From $[w_2]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{s} [w'_2]_{\equiv}$, by Rule (Step), we know there are $w_3 \in [w_2]_{\equiv}$ and $w'_3 \in [w'_2]_{\equiv}$ such that $w_3 \preceq^{\pm} w'_3$. By Lemma 5.7, since $[w_1]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_2]_{\equiv}$ by hypothesis and $[w'_1]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w'_2]_{\equiv}$ (see above), we have $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_2\})$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'_1\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'_2\})$ and since $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\}) \neq \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'_1\})$ (see above), we get $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_2\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\}) \neq \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'_1\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'_2\})$. Consequently, since $w_3 \in [w_2]_{\equiv}$ and $w'_3 \in [w'_2]_{\equiv}$, we also finally get that $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_3\}) \neq \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'_3\})$. Thus, by rule (CNG), we know that $w_3 \xrightarrow{c} w'_3$. Now, since $w_3 \in [w_2]_{\equiv}$, by definition of \equiv and by construction of $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$ we know there are $s_0, \dots, s_n \in W$ with $s_0 = w_2$, $s_n = w_3$ such that $s_i \xrightarrow{\tau} s_{i+1}$ and $s_{i+1} \xrightarrow{\tau} s_i$, for all $i \in [0; n)$. We note that $B_C(w_1, s_i)$ for all $i \in [0; n]$. In fact for each $i \in [0; n]$ we have that $[s_i]_{\equiv} = [w_2]_{\equiv}$ by definition of \equiv and we also know that $[w_2]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_1]_{\equiv}$, since $B_C(w_1, w_2)$ by hypothesis. Thus we get $[s_i]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_1]_{\equiv}$, i.e. $B_C(w_1, s_i)$. Furthermore, we also note that $B_C(w'_1, w'_3)$. In fact $[w'_3]_{\equiv} = [w'_2]_{\equiv}$, since $w'_3 \in [w'_2]_{\equiv}$. Furthermore, $[w'_2]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w'_1]_{\equiv}$ (see above). So, we get $[w'_3]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w'_1]_{\equiv}$, i.e. $B_C(w'_1, w'_3)$. In conclusion, we have that if $w_1 \xrightarrow{c} w'_1$ for some $w'_1 \in W$, then $w_2 = s_0 \xrightarrow{\tau} s_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} \dots \xrightarrow{\tau} s_n = w_3 \xrightarrow{c} w'_3$ with $B_C(w'_1, w'_3)$ and $B_C(w_1, s_i)$ for all $i \in [0; n]$.

Case D: $w_1 \xrightarrow{d} w'_1$.

If $w_1 \xrightarrow{d} w'_1$ for some $w'_1 \in W$, then, by Rule (DWN), we know that $w_1 \succ w'_1$, and, by Rule (Down), we have $[w_1]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{d} [w'_1]_{\equiv}$. Since, by definition of B_C and by hypothesis,

$[w_1]_{\rightleftharpoons} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_2]_{\rightleftharpoons}$, we also have $[w_2]_{\rightleftharpoons} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} [w'_2]_{\rightleftharpoons}$ for some $[w'_2]_{\rightleftharpoons} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w'_1]_{\rightleftharpoons}$. From $[w_2]_{\rightleftharpoons} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} [w'_2]_{\rightleftharpoons}$, by Rule (Down), we know there are $w_3 \in [w_2]_{\rightleftharpoons}$ and $w'_3 \in [w'_2]_{\rightleftharpoons}$ such that $w_3 \succ w'_3$ and, by Rule (DWN) we know that $w_3 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} w'_3$. Now, since $w_3 \in [w_2]_{\rightleftharpoons}$, by definition of \rightleftharpoons and by construction of $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$ we know there are $s_0, \dots, s_n \in W$ with $s_0 = w_2$, $s_n = w_3$ such that $s_i \xrightarrow{\tau} s_{i+1}$ and $s_{i+1} \xrightarrow{\tau} s_i$, for all $i \in [0; n)$. We note that $B_C(w_1, s_i)$ for all $i \in [0; n]$. In fact for each $i \in [0; n]$ we have that $[s_i]_{\rightleftharpoons} = [w_2]_{\rightleftharpoons}$ by definition of \rightleftharpoons and we also know that $[w_2]_{\rightleftharpoons} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_1]_{\rightleftharpoons}$, since $B_C(w_1, w_2)$ by hypothesis. Thus we get $[s_i]_{\rightleftharpoons} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_1]_{\rightleftharpoons}$, i.e. $B_C(w_1, s_i)$. Furthermore, we also note that $B_C(w'_1, w'_3)$. In fact $[w'_3]_{\rightleftharpoons} = [w'_2]_{\rightleftharpoons}$, since $w'_3 \in [w'_2]_{\rightleftharpoons}$. In addition, $[w'_2]_{\rightleftharpoons} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w'_1]_{\rightleftharpoons}$ (see above). So, we get $[w'_3]_{\rightleftharpoons} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w'_1]_{\rightleftharpoons}$, i.e. $B_C(w'_1, w'_3)$. In conclusion, we have that if $w_1 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} w'_1$ for some $w'_1 \in W$, then $w_2 = s_0 \xrightarrow{\tau} s_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} \dots \xrightarrow{\tau} s_n = w_3 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} w'_3$ with $B_C(w'_1, w'_3)$ and $B_C(w_1, s_i)$ for all $i \in [0; n]$.

We now prove that if $w_1 \xleftrightarrow{b}^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_2$, then $[w_1]_{\rightleftharpoons} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_2]_{\rightleftharpoons}$. We show that the following relation is a strong bisimulation:

$$B_A = \{(s_1, s_2) \in S \times S \mid \text{there are } w_1 \in s_1, w_2 \in s_2 \text{ such that } w_1 \xleftrightarrow{b}^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_2\}.$$

Let, without loss of generality, $s_1 = [w_1]_{\rightleftharpoons}$ and $s_2 = [w_2]_{\rightleftharpoons}$ for some $w_1, w_2 \in W$ with $w_1 \xleftrightarrow{b}^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_2$, and suppose $B_A([w_1]_{\rightleftharpoons}, [w_2]_{\rightleftharpoons})$. We distinguish three cases:

Case A: $[w_1]_{\rightleftharpoons} \xrightarrow{\alpha} [w'_1]_{\rightleftharpoons}$ with $\alpha \in \mathbf{2}^{\text{PL}}$:

By Rule (PL), if $[w_1]_{\rightleftharpoons} \xrightarrow{\alpha} [w'_1]_{\rightleftharpoons}$ for $\alpha \in \mathbf{2}^{\text{PL}}$ and $w'_1 \in W$, then $[w'_1]_{\rightleftharpoons} = [w_1]_{\rightleftharpoons}$ and $\alpha = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\})$. On the one hand, if $p \in \alpha$ then $w_1 \xrightarrow{p} w_1$ by rule (PLC). Since $w_2 \xleftrightarrow{b}^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_1$ it follows that $w_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} \dots \xrightarrow{\tau} \bar{w}_2 \xrightarrow{p} w'_2$ for $\bar{w}_2, w'_2 \in W$ such that $p \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{\bar{w}_2\})$, $\bar{w}_2 \xleftrightarrow{b}^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_1$, and $w'_2 \xleftrightarrow{b}^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_1$. By rule (TAU), $p \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_2\})$. Thus, $\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_2\})$. On the other hand, if $p \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_2\})$ then $w_2 \xrightarrow{p} w_2$ by rule (PLC). Since $w_1 \xleftrightarrow{b}^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_2$ we have that $w_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} \dots \xrightarrow{\tau} \bar{w}_1 \xrightarrow{p} w'_1$ for $\bar{w}_1, w'_1 \in W$ such that $p \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{\bar{w}_1\})$, $\bar{w}_1 \xleftrightarrow{b}^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_2$, $w'_1 \xleftrightarrow{b}^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_2$. By rule (TAU) we obtain that $p \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\})$. Thus, $p \in \alpha$. Hence, $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_2\}) \subseteq \alpha$. So, $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_2\}) = \alpha$. Therefore, $[w_2]_{\rightleftharpoons} \xrightarrow{\alpha} [w_2]_{\rightleftharpoons}$ by rule (PL). By assumption, $B_A([w_1]_{\rightleftharpoons}, [w_2]_{\rightleftharpoons})$ for target states $[w_1]_{\rightleftharpoons}$ and $[w_2]_{\rightleftharpoons}$ as required.

Case B: $[w_1]_{\rightleftharpoons} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} [w'_1]_{\rightleftharpoons}$

If $[w_1]_{\rightleftharpoons} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} [w'_1]_{\rightleftharpoons}$ for some $w'_1 \in W$, then, by Rule (Down), we know that there are $w_3 \in [w_1]_{\rightleftharpoons}$ and $w'_3 \in [w'_1]_{\rightleftharpoons}$ such that $w_3 \succ w'_3$. This implies, by Rule (DWN), that $w_3 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} w'_3$. By definition of \rightleftharpoons and by construction of $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$ we know that there are $m \geq 0$ and $t_0, \dots, t_m \in W$ with $t_0 = w_1$, $t_m = w_3$ such that $t_i \xrightarrow{\tau} t_{i+1}$ and $t_{i+1} \xrightarrow{\tau} t_i$, for all $i \in [0; m)$. This implies that $w_1 \xleftrightarrow{b}^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_3$, and consequently $w_2 \xleftrightarrow{b}^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_3$, since $w_1 \xleftrightarrow{b}^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_2$ by hypothesis. Furthermore, since $w_3 \xleftrightarrow{b}^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_2$, there are $n \geq 0$ and $v_0, \dots, v_n, v_{n+1} \in W$ with $w_2 = v_0 \xrightarrow{\tau} \dots \xrightarrow{\tau} v_n \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} v_{n+1}$, such that $w'_3 \xleftrightarrow{b}^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} v_{n+1}$ and $w_3 \xleftrightarrow{b}^{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} v_i$ for all $i \in [0; n]$. Moreover, by Rule (DWN), we have $v_n \succ v_{n+1}$ which

imples, by Rule (Down), that $[v_n]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} [v_{n+1}]_{\equiv}$. Note that, by construction of $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$ we also have $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(w_2) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(v_0) = \dots = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(v_n)$ and so $[v_i] = [w_2]_{\equiv}$ for all $i \in [0; n]$. Thus, $[w_2]_{\equiv} = [v_n]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} [v_{n+1}]_{\equiv}$. Furthermore, $B_A([w'_3]_{\equiv}, [v_{n+1}]_{\equiv})$ holds, since $w'_3 \xleftrightarrow{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} v_{n+1}$ (see above) and, recalling that $[w'_3]_{\equiv} = [w'_1]_{\equiv}$, we also know that $B_A([w'_1]_{\equiv}, [v_{n+1}]_{\equiv})$.

Case C: $[w_1]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{s}} [w'_1]_{\equiv}$

If $[w_1]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{s}} [w'_1]_{\equiv}$ for some $w'_1 \in W$, then, by Rule (Step), we know that there are $w_3 \in [w_1]_{\equiv}$ and $w'_3 \in [w'_1]_{\equiv}$ such that $w_3 \preceq^{\pm} w'_3$. We distinguish two cases:

Case C1: $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_3\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'_3\})$.

If $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_3\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'_3\})$, then, by Rule (TAU), we know $w_3 \xrightarrow{\tau} w'_3$. But then, by definition of \equiv , we get $[w_3]_{\equiv} = [w'_3]_{\equiv}$ and since $[w_3]_{\equiv} = [w_1]_{\equiv}$ and $[w'_3]_{\equiv} = [w'_1]_{\equiv}$ (see above), we get $[w'_1]_{\equiv} = [w_1]_{\equiv}$. On the other hand, since, trivially, $w_2 \preceq^{\pm} w_2$, by Rule (Step), we also get that $[w_2]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{s}} [w_2]_{\equiv}$. Moreover, since by hypothesis, we also have $B_A([w_1]_{\equiv}, [w_2]_{\equiv})$, we finally get that also $B_A([w'_1]_{\equiv}, [w_2]_{\equiv})$.

Case C2: $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_3\}) \neq \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'_3\})$.

If $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_3\}) \neq \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w'_3\})$, then, by Rule (CNG), we know $w_3 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{c}} w'_3$. By definition of \equiv and by construction of $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$ we know that there are $m \geq 0$ and $t_0, \dots, t_m \in W$ with $t_0 = w_1$, $t_m = w_3$ such that $t_i \xrightarrow{\tau} t_{i+1}$ and $t_{i+1} \xrightarrow{\tau} t_i$, for all $i \in [0; m)$. This implies that $w_1 \xleftrightarrow{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_3$, and consequently $w_2 \xleftrightarrow{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_3$, since $w_1 \xleftrightarrow{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_2$ by hypothesis. Furthermore, since $w_3 \xleftrightarrow{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_2$, there are $n \geq 0$ and $v_0, \dots, v_n, v_{n+1} \in W$ with $w_2 = v_0 \xrightarrow{\tau} \dots \xrightarrow{\tau} v_n \xrightarrow{\mathbf{c}} v_{n+1}$, such that $w'_3 \xleftrightarrow{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} v_{n+1}$ and $w_3 \xleftrightarrow{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} v_i$ for all $i \in [0; n]$. Moreover, by Rule (CNG), we have $v_n \preceq^{\pm} v_{n+1}$ which implies, by Rule (Step), that $[v_n]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{s}} [v_{n+1}]_{\equiv}$. Note that, by construction of $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$ we also have $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(w_2) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(v_0) = \dots = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(v_n)$ and so $[v_i] = [w_2]_{\equiv}$ for all $i \in [0; n]$. Thus, $[w_2]_{\equiv} = [v_n]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{s}} [v_{n+1}]_{\equiv}$. Furthermore, $B_A([w'_3]_{\equiv}, [v_{n+1}]_{\equiv})$ holds, since $w'_3 \xleftrightarrow{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} v_{n+1}$ (see above) and, recalling that $[w'_3]_{\equiv} = [w'_1]_{\equiv}$, we also know that $B_A([w'_1]_{\equiv}, [v_{n+1}]_{\equiv})$. \square

From Theorems 5.6 and 5.8 we finally obtain our claim:

Corollary 5.9. *Let $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ be a finite poset model. For all $w_1, w_2 \in W$ the following holds: $w_1 \equiv_{\eta}^{\mathcal{F}} w_2$ if and only if $w_1 \xleftrightarrow{\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})} w_2$.* \square

Now that we have characterised logical equivalence \equiv_{η} for SLCS_{η} for the elements of a finite poset model \mathcal{F} in terms of branching bisimilarity \xleftrightarrow{b} for the LTS $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$, we can compute the minimal LTS modulo branching bisimilarity with standard techniques available, such as branching equivalence minimisation provided by the mCRL2 toolset.

5.2. Building the Minimal Model. Via the correspondence of SLCS_{η} logical equivalence for a poset model and branching bisimilarity of its encoding, one can obtain the equivalence classes of \equiv_{η} by identifying the branching bisimilar states in the LTS. With the equivalence classes modulo \equiv_{η} for the poset model available, we can consider the ensued quotient model. We obtain a Kripke model that is minimal with respect to \equiv_{η} , but which is not necessarily a poset model.

Definition 5.10 (\mathcal{F}_{\min}). For a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ let the Kripke model $\mathcal{F}_{\min} = (W_{\min}, R_{\min}, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}_{\min}})$ have

- set of nodes $W_{\min} = W/\equiv_{\eta}$, the equivalence classes of W with respect to \equiv_{η} ,
- accessibility relation $R_{\min} \subseteq W_{\min} \times W_{\min}$ satisfying

$$R([w_1], [w_2]) \text{ if and only if } w'_1 \preceq w'_2 \text{ for some } w'_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_1 \text{ and } w'_2 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$$

for $w_1, w_2 \in W$, and

- valuation $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}_{\min}} : \text{PL} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^{W_{\min}}$ such that

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}_{\min}}(p) = \{ [w] \in W_{\min} \mid w' \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}(p) \text{ for some } w' \equiv_{\eta} w \}$$

for $p \in \text{PL}$. •

Clearly, \mathcal{F}_{\min} is a reflexive Kripke model. Reflexivity of the accessibility relation R_{\min} is immediate from reflexivity of the ordering \preceq . Furthermore, it is minimal with respect to SLCS_{η} by definition of \equiv_{η} and W/\equiv_{η} . An example of the minimal Kripke model of the polyhedral model in Fig. 7a is shown in Fig. 7c. The following theorem ensures that the model defined above is sound and complete with respect to the logic, so that the minimisation procedure is correct.

Theorem 5.11. *Given a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ let \mathcal{F}_{\min} be defined as in Definition 5.10. Then, for each $w \in W$ and SLCS_{η} formula Φ the following holds: $\mathcal{F}, w \models \Phi$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}_{\min}, [w]_{\equiv_{\eta}} \models \Phi$.*

Proof. We first prove that $\mathcal{F}, w \models \Phi$ implies $\mathcal{F}_{\min}, [w]_{\equiv_{\eta}} \models \Phi$. We proceed by induction on the structure of Φ and we show the proof only for $\Phi = \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ the other cases being straightforward. Suppose $\mathcal{F}, w \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. This means there is a \pm -path π of some length $\ell \geq 2$ such that $\pi(0) = w$, $\mathcal{F}, \pi(\ell) \models \Phi_2$, and $\mathcal{F}, \pi(i) \models \Phi_1$ for all $i \in [0; \ell)$. Now define $\pi_{\min} : [0; \ell] \rightarrow W_{\min}$ with $\pi_{\min}(i) = [\pi(i)]$ for all $i \in [0; \ell]$. We show that π_{\min} is a \pm -path with respect to R_{\min} . We have that $R_{\min}(\pi_{\min}(0), \pi_{\min}(1))$ by definition of R_{\min} because $\pi(0) \in [\pi(0)] = \pi_{\min}(0)$, $\pi(1) \in [\pi(1)] = \pi_{\min}(1)$ and $\pi(0) \preceq \pi(1)$ by assumption. Similarly, we have that $R_{\min}^-(\pi_{\min}(\ell-1), \pi_{\min}(\ell))$ and also that $R_{\min}^{\pm}(\pi_{\min}(i), \pi_{\min}(i+1))$ for all $i \in (0; \ell-1)$. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{F}, \pi(\ell) \models \Phi_2$, by the Induction Hypothesis, we have that $\mathcal{F}_{\min}, \pi_{\min}(\ell) \models \Phi_2$. Similarly, we have that $\mathcal{F}_{\min}, \pi_{\min}(i) \models \Phi_1$ for all $i \in [0; \ell)$ since $\mathcal{F}, \pi(i) \models \Phi_1$. So $\mathcal{F}_{\min}, [w]_{\equiv_{\eta}} \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$.

Now we prove that $\mathcal{F}_{\min}, [w]_{\equiv_{\eta}} \models \Phi$ implies $\mathcal{F}, w \models \Phi$. Also in this case we proceed by induction on the structure of Φ and we show the proof only for $\Phi = \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. Suppose $\mathcal{F}_{\min}, [w]_{\equiv_{\eta}} \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. Hence there is a \pm -path π_{\min} such that $\pi_{\min}(0) = [w]_{\equiv_{\eta}}$, $\mathcal{F}_{\min}, \pi_{\min}(\ell_{\min}) \models \Phi_2$, and $\mathcal{F}_{\min}, \pi_{\min}(i) \models \Phi_1$ for all $i \in [0; \ell_{\min})$. Since R_{\min} is reflexive, using Lemma 2.1, we know that there is also an $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path $\hat{\pi}_{\min}$ from $[w]_{\equiv_{\eta}}$ of some length $2k$, for $k \geq 1$, with the same starting-/ending points and the same intermediate points as π_{\min} and that obviously witnesses $\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ for $[w]_{\equiv_{\eta}}$. By induction on k , in the sequel, we show that there is a \pm -path π from w witnessing $\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$.

Base case: $k = 1$.

In this case, we have that $\hat{\pi}_{\min}(0) = [w]_{\equiv_{\eta}}$, $\mathcal{F}_{\min}, \hat{\pi}_{\min}(0) \models \Phi_1$, $\mathcal{F}_{\min}, \hat{\pi}_{\min}(1) \models \Phi_1$, and $\mathcal{F}_{\min}, \hat{\pi}_{\min}(2) \models \Phi_2$. Furthermore, since $\hat{\pi}_{\min}$ is an $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path with respect to R_{\min} , we know that

$$\hat{\pi}_{\min}(0) = [w]_{\equiv_{\eta}}, R_{\min}(\hat{\pi}_{\min}(0), \hat{\pi}_{\min}(1)), R_{\min}^-(\hat{\pi}_{\min}(1), \hat{\pi}_{\min}(2))$$

and, by definition of R_{\min} , there are $w_0 \in \hat{\pi}_{\min}(0) = [w]_{\equiv_{\eta}}$, $w'_1, w''_1 \in \hat{\pi}_{\min}(1)$, and $w_2 \in \hat{\pi}_{\min}(2)$ such that $w_0 \preceq w'_1$ and $w'_1 \succ w_2$. Moreover, by the Induction Hypothesis with

respect to the structure of formulas, we have that $\mathcal{F}, w_0 \models \Phi_1$, $\mathcal{F}, w'_1 \models \Phi_1$, $\mathcal{F}, w''_1 \models \Phi_1$, and $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \Phi_2$. Note that $\mathcal{F}, w'_1 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$, witnessed by the following \pm -path: (w''_1, w'_1, w_2) . But then we have that also $\mathcal{F}, w'_1 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ holds since $w'_1 \equiv_\eta w''_1$, recalling that $w'_1, w''_1 \in \hat{\pi}_{\min}(1) \in W / \equiv_\eta$. There is then a \pm -path $\pi' : [0; \ell'] \rightarrow W$ from w'_1 of some length ℓ' such that $\mathcal{F}, \pi'(\ell') \models \Phi_2$ and $\mathcal{F}, \pi'(i) \models \Phi_1$ for all $i \in [0; \ell']$. Furthermore, $w_0 \preceq w'_1$ by hypothesis and so $\pi = (w_0, w'_1) \cdot \pi' : [0; \ell' + 1] \rightarrow W$ is a \pm -path from w_0 witnessing $\mathcal{F}, w_0 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. Finally, recalling that $w, w_0 \in \hat{\pi}_{\min}(0) \in W / \equiv_\eta$, we know that $w \equiv_\eta w_0$ and so we have proven the assertion $\mathcal{F}, w \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$.

Induction step: $k = n+1$ assuming the assertion holds for $k = n$, for $n > 0$.

Since $k > 1$, we know that $\mathcal{F}_{\min}, \hat{\pi}_{\min}(1) \models \Phi_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\min}, \hat{\pi}_{\min}(2) \models \Phi_1 \wedge \neg\Phi_2$. Furthermore,

$$\hat{\pi}_{\min}(0) = [w]_{\equiv_\eta}, R_{\min}(\hat{\pi}_{\min}(0), \hat{\pi}_{\min}(1)), R_{\min}^-(\hat{\pi}_{\min}(1), \hat{\pi}_{\min}(2))$$

because $\hat{\pi}_{\min}$ is an $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path. By definition of R_{\min} , there are $w_0 \in \hat{\pi}_{\min}(0) = [w]_{\equiv_\eta}$, $w'_1, w''_1 \in \hat{\pi}_{\min}(1)$ and $w_2 \in \hat{\pi}_{\min}(2)$ such that $w_0 \preceq w'_1$ and $w'_1 \succ w_2$. By the Induction Hypothesis with respect to the structure of the formula, we get that $\mathcal{F}, w_0 \models \Phi_1$, $\mathcal{F}, w'_1 \models \Phi_1$, $\mathcal{F}, w''_1 \models \Phi_1$, and $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \Phi_1 \wedge \neg\Phi_2$. We consider now the $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path $\hat{\pi}_{\min} \uparrow 2$ from $\hat{\pi}_{\min}(2)$ of length $2n$, noting that it witnesses $\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$, since so does $\hat{\pi}_{\min}$ and $k > 1$. In other words, we have that $\mathcal{F}_{\min}, \hat{\pi}_{\min}(2) \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ with $w_2 \in \hat{\pi}_{\min}(2)$. By the Induction Hypothesis with respect to k , we then have that $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. So there is a $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path $\pi_2 : [0; \ell_2] \rightarrow W$ from w_2 of some length ℓ_2 such that $\mathcal{F}, \pi_2(\ell_2) \models \Phi_2$ and $\mathcal{F}, \pi_2(i) \models \Phi_1$ for $i \in [0; \ell_2]$. Note that $\mathcal{F}, \pi_2(0) \models \Phi_1$ as well, since $\pi_2(0) = w_2$ and $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \Phi_1 \wedge \neg\Phi_2$ (see above). Let us consider now the path $\pi'' = (w''_1, w'_1, w_2) \cdot \pi_2$. Such a path is an $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path since so is π_2 , and $w''_1 \succ w_2$ by hypothesis. Note that $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path π'' witnesses $\mathcal{F}, w''_1 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. But then we have that also $\mathcal{F}, w'_1 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ holds since $w'_1 \equiv_\eta w''_1$, recalling that $w'_1, w''_1 \in \hat{\pi}_{\min}(1) \in W / \equiv_\eta$. Thus, we have that the following holds: $\mathcal{F}, w'_1 \models \Phi_1 \wedge \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. There is then a \pm -path $\pi' : [0; \ell'] \rightarrow W$ from w'_1 of some length ℓ' such that $\mathcal{F}, \pi'(\ell') \models \Phi_2$ and $\mathcal{F}, \pi'(i) \models \Phi_1$ for all $i \in [0; \ell']$. Furthermore, $w_0 \preceq w'_1$ by hypothesis and so $\pi = (w_0, w'_1) \cdot \pi' : [0; \ell' + 1] \rightarrow W$ is a \pm -path from w_0 witnessing $\mathcal{F}, w_0 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. Finally, recalling that $w, w_0 \in \hat{\pi}_{\min}(0) \in W / \equiv_\eta$, we know that $w \equiv_\eta w_0$ and so we have proven the assertion $\mathcal{F}, w \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. \square

Finally, the following theorem turns out to be useful for simplifying the procedure for the effective construction of \mathcal{F}_{\min} :

Theorem 5.12. *For any poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ and \mathcal{F}_{\min} as of Definition 5.10 and for all $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in W_{\min}$, it holds that $R_{\min}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ if and only if $\alpha_2 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} \alpha_1$ is a transition of the minimal LTS obtained from $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$ via branching equivalence.*

Proof. In the sequel, we let $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F}) / \simeq_b$ denote the minimal LTS obtained from $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$ via branching equivalence. First of all, by Corollary 5.9, W_{\min} coincides with the quotient of the set of states W of $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$ modulo branching equivalence. Now, suppose that $\alpha_2 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} \alpha_1$ is a transition of $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F}) / \simeq_b$. By standard construction of the minimal LTS modulo an equivalence on its state set, we know that $w_1 \in \alpha_1$ and $w_2 \in \alpha_2$ exist such that $w_2 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} w_1$ is a transition of $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$. But then, by Rule (DWN), we get that $w_1 \preceq w_2$ and so, by definition of \mathcal{F}_{\min} , we finally get $R(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$. If, on the other hand, $R(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ holds, then we know that there exist $w_1 \in \alpha_1$ and $w_2 \in \alpha_2$ such that $w_1 \preceq w_2$, by definition of \mathcal{F}_{\min} . But then, by Rule (DWN), we get that $w_2 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{d}} w_1$ is a transition of $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})$. Again, by standard construction

of the minimal LTS modulo an equivalence on its state set, we know that $\alpha_2 \xrightarrow{d} \alpha_1$ is a transition of $\mathbb{S}_C(\mathcal{F})/\simeq_b$. \square

6. AN EXPERIMENTAL MINIMISATION TOOLCHAIN

In this section we provide a brief overview of an experimental toolchain to study the minimisation procedure for polyhedral models and to illustrate the practical potential of the theory presented in the previous section. The further development and a thorough analysis of the toolchain will be the subject of future work. Fig. 8 illustrates the elements of the toolchain that, starting from a polyhedral model in `json` format, produces the set of equivalence classes and the minimal Kripke model. The former may serve as input for the `PolyVisualizer` tool⁷ [BCG⁺22], a polyhedra visualizer, to inspect the results, whereas the latter can be used for spatial model checking through an adapted version of `PolyLogicA` that can check spatial properties on Kripke models using \pm -*paths* instead of regular paths. The toolchain is also able to map the results obtained on the minimal Kripke model back to the original polyhedral model, because of the direct correspondence between the states of the Kripke model and the equivalence classes.




FIGURE 8. Toolchain for polyhedral model minimisation. Parts in green are command line operations of the `mCRL2` toolset. Parts in blue are developed in Python in the context of the current paper.

The toolchain uses several command line operations provided by the `mCRL2` toolset [BGK⁺19] (shown in green in Fig. 8) and a number of operations developed in the context of this paper (shown in blue in Fig. 8). The prototype aims to demonstrate the feasibility of our approach from a qualitative perspective, providing support for examples that illustrate the practical usefulness of the theory. Further performance issues, computational complexity, and a full implementation of the approach will be addressed in future work. The operation `Poly2Poset` transforms the polyhedral model into a poset model. The operation `Poset2mcr12` encodes the poset model into a `mCRL2` specification of an LTS following the procedure defined in Definition 5.1. The operations `mcr12lps` and `lps2lts` transform the encoding into a linearised LTS-representation which is then minimised (`ltsMinimise`) via branching bisimulation. The operation `lps2lpspp` provides a textual version of the linear process which is used to obtain the correspondence between internal state labels of the minimised LTS and the cells of the original polyhedral model present in the equivalence classes. The latter, in turn, are essential for the generation of the result files of model checking the minimised model and form the input to the `PolyVisualizer` (together with the original polyhedral model and a colour definition file). Figs. 10 and 11 in the next section

⁷http://ggrilletti2.scienceontheweb.net/polyVisualizer/polyVisualizer_static_maze.html

show an example.⁸ Maintaining the relation between internal state labels of the minimised LTS and the original states of the poset and polyhedral model is the most tricky part of the toolchain as such internal state labels are assigned dynamically in the `lps2lts` procedure. This aspect is dealt with by the `findStates` and `renameLps` procedures.

7. MINIMISATION AT WORK

Fig. 9a shows the model which was presented in Fig. 2a. Its poset representation is shown in Fig. 9b with equivalence classes indicated in different colours.⁹ The minimal Kripke model is shown in Fig. 9c. In the latter, the colours of the borders of the elements (red, green, and grey) recall the original atomic propositions used in Fig. 9a, whereas the colour of the interior reflects the colour of the equivalence class as used in Fig. 9b. Note that vertex A is not part of the equivalence class of the other grey points. It can be distinguished from, for example, grey point D because D satisfies SLCS_η -formula $\psi_1 = \eta(\mathbf{grey} \vee \mathbf{green}, \mathbf{green})$ whereas point A does *not* satisfy ψ_1 . Note also that formula $\psi_2 = \eta(\mathbf{grey} \vee \mathbf{red}, \mathbf{red})$ is satisfied by D , but also by point E (actually by any grey point, including A).

Recall that in the minimal model the Kripke states represent equivalence classes modulo \equiv_η . There is a transition in the Kripke model (Fig. 9c) between two states, say x and y , respectively, if and only if there is a cell in the class related to x and one in class related to y that are connected in the poset (see Fig. 9b). This is the standard way to build such minimal models (see Def. 5.10). In Fig. 9b it is easy to see that cell \tilde{D} (brown) is a face of \tilde{CD} (cyan) and \tilde{C} (cyan) is a face of \tilde{CE} (brown), so they are mutually ‘below’ each other. This explains the presence of a loop in the minimal Kripke structure between the brown and the cyan class (see Fig. 9c).




FIGURE 9. Polyhedral model (9a), its classes in the poset (9b) and its minimised Kripke model (9c).

The example in Fig. 10a shows a simple symmetric 3D cube composed of one white ‘room’ in the middle surrounded by 26 green ‘rooms’ in a snapshot of the `PolyVisualizer`

⁸The software and examples are available at <https://github.com/VoxLogicA-Project/Polyhedra-minimisation>.

⁹Note that such colours have only an illustrative purpose. In particular, they are not related to the colours expressing the evaluation of proposition letters.

tool. Rooms are connected by grey ‘corridors’ as shown in the figure. In total, the structure consists of 2,620 cells. Fig. 10b shows the minimal LTS with respect to branching bisimilarity as produced by `mCRL2`. (The numbering of the states is as generated by `mCRL2`). It has 7 states: one white state $C1$, three grey ones ($C3$, $C0$, and $C5$) and three green states ($C4$, $C2$, and $C6$). The white state represents the class of all the cells of the white room. Transition labels chg and dwn denote \mathbf{c} and \mathbf{d} , whereas ap_X denotes atomic proposition X . Green state $C4$ (visualised on the original polyhedron in Fig. 10d) represents the class of green rooms that are directly connected to the white room by a corridor. Green state $C2$ (visualised in Fig. 10e) represents the class of green rooms situated on the edges of the cube. Green state $C6$ (visualised in Fig. 10f) represents the class of green rooms situated at the corners of the cube. Fig. 10c shows the minimal Kripke model modulo \equiv_η .




FIGURE 10. Cube with 27 rooms: 26 green and one white in the middle.

It is not difficult to find $SLCS_\eta$ formulas that distinguish the various green classes. For example, the cells in $C4$ satisfy $\phi_1 = \eta(\mathbf{green} \vee \eta(\mathbf{grey}, \mathbf{white}), \mathbf{white})$, whereas no cell in $C2$ or $C6$ satisfies ϕ_1 . To distinguish class $C2$ from $C6$ and $C4$, one can observe that cells in $C2$ satisfy $\phi_2 = \eta(\mathbf{green} \vee \eta(\mathbf{grey}, \phi_1), \phi_1)$ whereas those in $C3$ do not satisfy ϕ_2 . Figure 11 shows the result of PolyLogicA model checking for the formulas ϕ_1 (see Fig. 11b) and ϕ_2 (see Fig. 11c).¹⁰

Table 1 provides a more detailed insight in the time performance of the various components of the toolchain on models of the cube of different sizes, all with green rooms forming the outer frame of the cube and white rooms positioned inside the cube, and formulas ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 (both formulas during the same model checking session). Note the substantial reduction in size (several orders of magnitude) of the minimised model, where the number

¹⁰All tests were performed on a workstation equipped with an Intel(R) Core(TM) i9-9900K CPU @ 3.60 GHz (8 cores, 16 threads).




FIGURE 11. (11a) The 3D cube. Results of `PolyLogicA` model checking of the formulas ϕ_1 (11b) and ϕ_2 (11c) on the minimised model mapped back onto the full 3D cube with `PolyVisualizer`.

TABLE 1. Performance for 3D cube example. All times are in seconds.

	Cube 3x3x3	Cube 3x5x3	Cube 3x5x4	Cube 5x5x5
Nr. of classes	7	21	38	21
Nr. of cells	2,619	3,568	6,145	13,375
Nr. of vertices	216	288	480	1,000
<code>poly2poset</code>	0.35	0.34	0.43	1.10
<code>loadData</code>	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02
<code>poset2mcrl2</code>	0.16	0.30	0.42	0.95
<code>mcrl2lps</code>	1.71	3.51	5.42	23.72
<code>lps2lpspp</code>	0.24	0.41	0.57	1.95
<code>findStates</code>	0.17	0.31	0.41	4.18
<code>renamelps</code>	0.54	0.95	1.34	4.47
<code>lps2lts</code>	21.41	78.26	135.22	794.33
<code>ltsMinimise</code>	0.06	0.23	0.24	0.35
<code>createJsonFiles</code>	6.35	51.37	160.53	587.99
<code>createModelFile</code>	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03
Model checking original model	8.76	24.90	64.50	671.30
Model checking minimised model	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03

of states corresponds to the number of equivalence classes, compared to the full model (number of cells). This leads to a similar reduction in model checking time (see last two lines of Table 1). However, regarding the minimisation procedure itself, there seems to be a bottleneck of performance in `lps2lts`, whereas the time to encode and minimise the model (see `ltsMinimise`) is actually very small. Note that the minimised model, once obtained, can be used for multiple model checking sessions. Future work will address further improvements of the efficiency of the constituents of the minimisation procedure, even if the current results are already very encouraging. More specifically, the `lps2lts` step might be avoided by implementing our encoding directly into the binary `mCRL2 LTS` format. This requires usage of the `mCRL2 C++ application programming interface`, and is left as future work.

8. CONCLUSIONS

Polyhedral models are widely used in domains that exploit mesh processing such as 3D computer graphics. These models are typically huge, consisting of very many cells. Spatial model checking of such models is an interesting, novel approach to verify properties of

such models and visualise the results in a graphically appealing way. In previous work the polyhedral model checker `PolyLogicA` was developed for this purpose [BCG⁺22].

In [BCG⁺22] simplicial bisimilarity was proposed for polyhedral models — i.e. models of continuous space — while \pm -bisimilarity, the corresponding equivalence for cell-poset models — discrete representations of polyhedral models — was first introduced in [CGL⁺23a]. In order to support large model reductions, in this paper the novel notions of weak simplicial bisimilarity and weak \pm -bisimilarity have been proposed, and the correspondence between the two has been studied. We have also proposed SLCS_η , a weaker version of the Spatial Logic for Closure Spaces on polyhedral models, and we have shown that simplicial bisimilarity enjoys the Hennessy-Milner property (Thm. 4.8). Furthermore, we have proven that the property holds for \pm -bisimilarity on poset models and the interpretation of SLCS_η on such models (Thm. 4.11). SLCS_η can be used in the geometric spatial model checker `PolyLogicA` for checking spatial reachability properties of polyhedral models. Model checking results can be visualised by projecting them onto the original polyhedral structure, showing in a specific colour all the cells satisfying the property of interest.

In order to reduce model checking time and computing resources, we have proposed an effective procedure that computes the minimal model, modulo logical equivalence with respect to the logic SLCS_η , of a polyhedral model. Such minimised models are also amenable to model checking with `PolyLogicA`. The procedure has been formalised and proven correct. A prototype implementation of the procedure has been developed in the form of a toolchain, that also involves operations provided by the `mCRL2` toolset, to study the practical feasibility of the approach and to identify possible bottlenecks. We have also shown how the model checking results of the minimal model can be projected back onto the original polyhedral model. This provides a direct 3D visual inspection of the results through a polyhedra visualizer.

In future work we aim at a more sophisticated implementation of the procedure, possibly using in a more direct way the minimisation operations provided by `mCRL2` and integrating the various steps in the procedure. Furthermore, we would be interested in extending SLCS_η with further operators, for example those concerning notions of distance, and applying the method on a larger number of case studies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Research partially supported by bilateral project between CNR (Italy) and SRNSFG (Georgia) “Model Checking for Polyhedral Logic” (#CNR-22-010); European Union – Next GenerationEU – National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP), Investment 1.5 Ecosystems of Innovation, Project “Tuscany Health Ecosystem” (THE), CUP: B83C22003930001; European Union – Next-GenerationEU – National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP) – MISSION 4 COMPONENT 2, INVESTMENT N. 1.1, CALL PRIN 2022 D.D. 104 02-02-2022 – (Stendhal) CUP N. B53D23012850006; MUR project PRIN 2020TL3X8X “T-LADIES”; CNR project "Formal Methods in Software Engineering 2.0", CUP B53C24000720005; Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia grant #FR-22-6700.

REFERENCES

- [AAV24] Gianluca Aguzzi, Giorgio Audrito, and Mirko Viroli. Optimising aggregate monitors for spatial logic of closure spaces properties. In Davide Ancona and Giorgio Audrito, editors, *Proceedings*

- of the 7th ACM International Workshop on Verification and Monitoring at Runtime Execution, *VORTEX 2024, Vienna, Austria, 19 September 2024*, pages 25–31. ACM, 2024.
- [ADT24] Giorgio Audrito, Ferruccio Damiani, and Gianluca Torta. Real-time guarantees for SLCS monitors in XC. In Davide Ancona and Giorgio Audrito, editors, *Proceedings of the 7th ACM International Workshop on Verification and Monitoring at Runtime Execution, VORTEX 2024, Vienna, Austria, 19 September 2024*, pages 32–37. ACM, 2024.
- [BBC⁺20] Fabrizio Banci Buonamici, Gina Belmonte, Vincenzo Ciancia, Diego Latella, and Mieke Massink. Spatial logics and model checking for medical imaging. *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transf.*, 22(2):195–217, 2020.
- [BBC⁺21] Gina Belmonte, Giovanna Broccia, Vincenzo Ciancia, Diego Latella, and Mieke Massink. Feasibility of spatial model checking for nevus segmentation. In Simon Blidze, Stefania Gnesi, Nico Plat, and Laura Semini, editors, *9th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Formal Methods in Software Engineering, FormaliSE@ICSE 2021, Madrid, Spain, May 17-21, 2021*, pages 1–12. IEEE, 2021.
- [BCG⁺22] Nick Bezhanišvili, Vincenzo Ciancia, David Gabelaia, Gianluca Grilletti, Diego Latella, and Massink Massink. Geometric Model Checking of Continuous Space. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 18(4):7:1–7:38, 2022. DOI 10.46298/LMCS-18(4:7)2022. Published on line: Nov 22, 2022. ISSN: 1860-5974.
- [BCG⁺24a] Nick Bezhanišvili, Vincenzo Ciancia, David Gabelaia, Mamuka Jibladze, Diego Latella, Mieke Massink, and Erik P. de Vink. Weak simplicial bisimilarity for polyhedral models and $SLCS_{\eta}$. In Valentina Castiglioni and Adrian Francalanza, editors, *Formal Techniques for Distributed Objects, Components, and Systems - 44th IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference, FORTE 2024, Held as Part of the 19th International Federated Conference on Distributed Computing Techniques, DisCoTec 2024, Groningen, The Netherlands, June 17-21, 2024, Proceedings*, volume 14678 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 20–38. Springer, 2024.
- [BCG⁺24b] Nick Bezhanišvili, Vincenzo Ciancia, David Gabelaia, Mamuka Jibladze, Diego Latella, Mieke Massink, and Erik P. de Vink. Weak simplicial bisimilarity for polyhedral models and $SLCS_{\eta}$ — extended version. *CoRR*, abs/2404.06131, 2024.
- [BCLM19a] Gina Belmonte, Vincenzo Ciancia, Diego Latella, and Mieke Massink. Innovating medical image analysis via spatial logics. In Maurice H. ter Beek, Alessandro Fantechi, and Laura Semini, editors, *From Software Engineering to Formal Methods and Tools, and Back - Essays Dedicated to Stefania Gnesi on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*, volume 11865 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 85–109. Springer, 2019.
- [BCLM19b] Gina Belmonte, Vincenzo Ciancia, Diego Latella, and Mieke Massink. VoxLogicA: A spatial model checker for declarative image analysis. In Tomás Vojnar and Lijun Zhang, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems - 25th International Conference, TACAS 2019, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2019, Prague, Czech Republic, April 6-11, 2019, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 11427 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 281–298. Springer, 2019.
- [BGK⁺19] Olav Bunte, Jan Friso Groote, Jeroen J. A. Keiren, Maurice Laveaux, Thomas Neele, Erik P. de Vink, Wieger Wesselink, Anton Wijs, and Tim A. C. Willemse. The mCRL2 toolset for analysing concurrent systems - improvements in expressivity and usability. In Tomás Vojnar and Lijun Zhang, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems - 25th International Conference, TACAS 2019, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2019, Prague, Czech Republic, April 6-11, 2019, Proceedings, Part II*, volume 11428 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 21–39. Springer, 2019.
- [BMMP18] Nick Bezhanišvili, Vincenzo Marra, Daniel McNeill, and Andrea Pedrini. Tarski’s theorem on intuitionistic logic, for polyhedra. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 169(5):373–391, 2018.
- [Čech66] Eduard Čech. Topological Spaces. In Vlastimil Pták, editor, *Topological Spaces*, chapter III, pages 233–394. Publishing House of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences/Interscience Publishers, John Wiley & Sons, Prague/London-New York-Sydney, 1966. Revised edition by Zdeněk Frolic and Miroslav Katětov. Scientific editor, Vlastimil Pták. Editor of the English translation, Charles O. Junge. MR0211373.

- [CGG⁺18] Vincenzo Ciancia, Stephen Gilmore, Gianluca Grilletti, Diego Latella, Michele Loreti, and Mieke Massink. Spatio-temporal model checking of vehicular movement in public transport systems. *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transf.*, 20(3):289–311, 2018.
- [CGL⁺23a] Vincenzo Ciancia, David Gabelaia, Diego Latella, Mieke Massink, and Erik P. de Vink. On bisimilarity for polyhedral models and SLCS. In Marieke Huisman and António Ravara, editors, *Formal Techniques for Distributed Objects, Components, and Systems - 43rd IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference, FORTE 2023, Held as Part of the 18th International Federated Conference on Distributed Computing Techniques, DisCoTec 2023, Lisbon, Portugal, June 19-23, 2023, Proceedings*, volume 13910 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 132–151. Springer, 2023.
- [CGL⁺23b] Vincenzo Ciancia, Jan Friso Groote, Diego Latella, Mieke Massink, and Erik P. de Vink. Minimisation of spatial models using branching bisimilarity. In Marsha Chechik, Joost-Pieter Katoen, and Martin Leucker, editors, *25th International Symposium, FM 2023, Lübeck, March 6–10, 2023, Proceedings*, volume 14000 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 263–281. Springer, 2023.
- [CLLM14] Vincenzo Ciancia, Diego Latella, Michele Loreti, and Mieke Massink. Specifying and verifying properties of space. In Josep Díaz, Ivan Lanese, and Davide Sangiorgi, editors, *Theoretical Computer Science - 8th IFIP TC 1/WG 2.2 International Conference, TCS 2014, Rome, Italy, September 1-3, 2014. Proceedings*, volume 8705 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 222–235. Springer, 2014.
- [CLLM16] Vincenzo Ciancia, Diego Latella, Michele Loreti, and Mieke Massink. Model checking spatial logics for closure spaces. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 12(4), 2016.
- [CLM⁺16] Vincenzo Ciancia, Diego Latella, Mieke Massink, Rytis Paškauskas, and Andrea Vandin. A tool-chain for statistical spatio-temporal model checking of bike sharing systems. In Tiziana Margaria and Bernhard Steffen, editors, *Leveraging Applications of Formal Methods, Verification and Validation: Foundational Techniques - 7th International Symposium, ISoLA 2016, Imperial, Corfu, Greece, October 10-14, 2016, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 9952 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 657–673, 2016.
- [CLMV22] Vincenzo Ciancia, Diego Latella, Mieke Massink, and Erik P. de Vink. Back-and-forth in space: On logics and bisimilarity in closure spaces. In Niels Jansen, Marielle Stoelinga, and Petra van de Bos, editors, *A Journey From Process Algebra via Timed Automata to Model Learning – A Festschrift Dedicated to Frits Vaandrager on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, volume 13560 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 98–115. Springer, 2022.
- [CLMV23] Vincenzo Ciancia, Diego Latella, Mieke Massink, and Erik P. de Vink. On bisimilarity for quasi-discrete closure spaces. *CoRR*, abs/2301.11634, 2023.
- [GJKW17] Jan Friso Groote, David N. Jansen, Jeroen J. A. Keiren, and Anton Wijs. An $O(m \log n)$ algorithm for computing stuttering equivalence and branching bisimulation. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.*, 18(2):13:1–13:34, 2017.
- [HJK⁺15] Iman Haghghi, Austin Jones, Zhaodan Kong, Ezio Bartocci, Radu Grosu, and Calin Belta. Spatel: a novel spatial-temporal logic and its applications to networked systems. In Antoine Girard and Sriram Sankaranarayanan, editors, *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control, HSCC’15, Seattle, WA, USA, April 14-16, 2015*, pages 189–198. ACM, 2015.
- [LPZ12] Joshua A. Levine, Rasmus R. Paulsen, and Yongjie Zhang. Mesh processing in medical-image analysis – a tutorial. *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications*, 32(5):22–28, 2012.
- [LQ23] Michele Loreti and Michela Quadrini. A spatial logic for simplicial models. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 19(3), 2023.
- [Mil89] Robin Milner. *Communication and Concurrency*. PHI Series in Computer Science. Prentice Hall, 1989.
- [NBC⁺18] Laura Nenzi, Luca Bortolussi, Vincenzo Ciancia, Michele Loreti, and Mieke Massink. Qualitative and quantitative monitoring of spatio-temporal properties with SSTL. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 14(4), 2018.
- [vBB07] Johan van Benthem and Guram Bezhanishvili. Modal logics of space. In Marco Aiello, Ian Pratt-Hartmann, and Johan van Benthem, editors, *Handbook of Spatial Logics*, pages 217–298. Springer, 2007.

[vGW96] Rob J. van Glabbeek and W. P. Weijland. Branching time and abstraction in bisimulation semantics. *J. ACM*, 43(3):555–600, 1996.

APPENDIX A. DETAILED PROOFS

A.1. Proof of Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 2.1. *Given a reflexive Kripke frame (W, R) and a \pm -path $\pi : [0; \ell] \rightarrow W$, there is a $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path $\pi' : [0; \ell'] \rightarrow W$, for some ℓ' , and a total, surjective, monotonic non-decreasing function $f : [0; \ell'] \rightarrow [0; \ell]$ such that $\pi'(j) = \pi(f(j))$ for all $j \in [0; \ell']$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the length ℓ of \pm -path π .

Base case: $\ell = 2$.

In this case, by definition of \pm -path, we have $R(\pi(0), \pi(1))$ and $R^-(\pi(1), \pi(2))$, which, by definition of $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path, implies that π itself is an $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path and $f : [0; \ell] \rightarrow [0; \ell]$ is just the identity function.

Induction step. We assume the assertion holds for all \pm -paths of length ℓ and we prove it for $\ell + 1$. Let $\pi : [0; \ell + 1] \rightarrow W$ be a \pm -path. Then $R^-(\pi(\ell), \pi(\ell + 1))$, since π is a \pm -path. We consider the following cases:

Case A: $R^-(\pi(\ell - 1), \pi(\ell))$ and $R^-(\pi(\ell), \pi(\ell + 1))$.

In this case, consider the prefix $\pi_1 = \pi|_{[0; \ell]}$ of π , noting that π_1 is a \pm -path of length ℓ . By the Induction Hypothesis there is an $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path π'_1 of some length ℓ'_1 and a total, surjective, monotonic non-decreasing function $g : [0; \ell'_1] \rightarrow [0; \ell]$ such that $\pi'_1(j) = \pi_1(g(j)) = \pi(g(j))$ for all $j \in [0; \ell'_1]$. Note that $\pi'_1(\ell'_1) = \pi(\ell)$ so that the sequentialisation of π'_1 with the two-element path $(\pi(\ell), \pi(\ell + 1))$ is well-defined. Consider path $\pi' = (\pi'_1 \cdot (\pi(\ell), \pi(\ell + 1))) \leftarrow \ell'_1$, of length $\ell'_1 + 2$ consisting of π'_1 followed by $\pi(\ell)$ followed in turn by $\pi(\ell + 1)$. In other words, $\pi' = (\pi'_1(0) \dots \pi'_1(\ell'_1), \pi(\ell), \pi(\ell + 1))$, with $\pi'_1(\ell'_1) = \pi(\ell)$ — recall that R is reflexive. It is easy to see that π' is an $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path and that function $f : [0; \ell'_1 + 2] \rightarrow [0; \ell + 1]$, with $f(j) = g(j)$ for $j \in [0; \ell'_1]$, $f(\ell'_1 + 1) = \ell$ and $f(\ell'_1 + 2) = \ell + 1$, is total, surjective, and monotonic non-decreasing.

Case B: $R(\pi(\ell - 1), \pi(\ell))$ and $R^-(\pi(\ell), \pi(\ell + 1))$.

In this case the prefix $\pi|_{[0; \ell]}$ of π is *not* a \pm -path. We then consider the path consisting of prefix $\pi|_{[0; \ell - 1]}$ where we add a copy of $\pi(\ell - 1)$, i.e. the path $\pi_1 = (\pi|_{[0; \ell - 1]}) \leftarrow (\ell - 1)$ — we can do that because R is reflexive. Note that π_1 is a \pm -path and has length ℓ . By the Induction Hypothesis there is an $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path π'_1 of some length ℓ'_1 and a total, surjective, monotonic non-decreasing function $g : [0; \ell'_1] \rightarrow [0; \ell]$ such that $\pi'_1(j) = \pi_1(g(j)) = \pi(g(j))$ for all $j \in [0; \ell'_1]$. Consider path $\pi' = \pi'_1 \cdot (\pi(\ell - 1), \pi(\ell), \pi(\ell + 1))$, of length $\ell'_1 + 2$, that is well defined since $\pi'_1(\ell'_1) = \pi(\ell - 1)$ by definition of π_1 . In other words, $\pi' = (\pi'_1(0), \dots, \pi'_1(\ell'_1), \pi(\ell), \pi(\ell + 1))$, with $\pi'_1(\ell'_1) = \pi(\ell - 1)$. Path π' is an $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path. In fact $\pi'|_{[0; \ell'_1]} = \pi'_1$ is an $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path. Furthermore, $\pi'(\ell'_1) = \pi(\ell - 1)$, $R(\pi(\ell - 1), \pi(\ell))$, $R^-(\pi(\ell), \pi(\ell + 1))$ and $\pi(\ell + 1) = \pi'(\ell'_1 + 2)$. Finally, function $f : [0; \ell'_1 + 2] \rightarrow [0; \ell + 1]$, with $f(j) = g(j)$ for $j \in [0; \ell'_1]$, $f(\ell'_1 + 1) = \ell$ and $f(\ell'_1 + 2) = \ell + 1$, is total, surjective, and monotonic non-decreasing. \square

A.2. Proof of Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 2.2. *Given a reflexive Kripke frame (W, R) and a \downarrow -path $\pi : [0; \ell] \rightarrow W$, there is an $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path $\pi' : [0; \ell'] \rightarrow W$, for some ℓ' , and a total, surjective, monotonic non-decreasing function $f : [0; \ell'] \rightarrow [0; \ell]$ such that $\pi'(j) = \pi(f(j))$ for all $j \in [0; \ell']$.*

Proof. The proof is carried out by induction on the length ℓ of π .

Base case. $\ell = 1$. Suppose $\ell = 1$, i.e. $\pi : [0; 1] \rightarrow W$ with $R^-(\pi(0), \pi(1))$. Then let $\pi' : [0; 2] \rightarrow W$ be such that $\pi'(0) = \pi'(1) = \pi(0)$ and $\pi'(2) = \pi(1)$ — we can do that since R is reflexive — and $f : [0; 2] \rightarrow [0; 1]$ be such that $f(0) = f(1) = 0$ and $f(2) = 1$. Clearly π' is an $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path and $\pi'(j) = \pi(f(j))$ for all $j \in [0; 2]$.

Induction step. We assume the assertion holds for all \downarrow -paths of length ℓ and we prove it for $\ell + 1$. Let $\pi : [0; \ell + 1] \rightarrow W$ a \downarrow -path and suppose the assertion holds for all \downarrow -paths of length ℓ . In particular, it holds for $\pi \uparrow 1$, i.e., there is an $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path π'' of some length ℓ'' with $\pi''(0) = \pi(1)$, and total, monotonic non-decreasing surjection $g : [0; \ell'''] \rightarrow W$ such that $\pi''(j) = \pi(g(j))$ for all $j \in [0; \ell''']$. Suppose $R(\pi(0), \pi(1))$ does not hold. Then, since R is reflexive, we let $\pi' = (\pi(0), \pi(0), \pi(1)) \cdot \pi''$ and $f : [0; \ell''' + 2] \rightarrow [0; \ell + 1]$ with $f(0) = f(1) = 0$ and $f(j) = g(j - 2)$ for all $j \in [2; \ell''' + 2]$. If instead $R(\pi(0), \pi(1))$, then we let $\pi' = (\pi(0), \pi(1), \pi(1)) \cdot \pi''$ and $f : [0; \ell''' + 2] \rightarrow [0; \ell + 1]$ with $f(0) = 0, f(1) = 1$ and $f(j) = g(j - 2)$ for all $j \in [2; \ell''' + 2]$. \square

A.3. Proof of Lemma 2.3.

Lemma 2.3. *Given a reflexive Kripke frame (W, R) and a \downarrow -path $\pi : [0; \ell] \rightarrow W$, there is a \pm -path $\pi' : [0; \ell'] \rightarrow W$, for some ℓ' , and a total, surjective, monotonic, non-decreasing function $f : [0; \ell'] \rightarrow [0; \ell]$ with $\pi'(j) = \pi(f(j))$ for all $j \in [0; \ell']$.*

Proof. The assertion follows directly from Lemma 2.2 since every $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path is also a \pm -path. \square

A.4. Proof of Lemma 3.4.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$ be a polyhedral model, $x \in |K|$ and Φ a SLCS_{η} formula. Then $\mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi$ iff $\mathcal{P}, x \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi)$.*

Proof. By induction on the structure of Φ . We consider only the case $\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. Suppose $\mathcal{P}, x \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. By definition there is a topological path π such that $\mathcal{P}, \pi(1) \models \Phi_2$ and $\mathcal{P}, \pi(r) \models \Phi_1$ for all $r \in [0, 1)$. By the Induction Hypothesis this is the same to say that $\mathcal{P}, \pi(1) \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_2)$ and $\mathcal{P}, \pi(r) \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_1)$ for all $r \in [0, 1)$, i.e. $\mathcal{P}, x \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_1)$, $\mathcal{P}, \pi(1) \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_2)$ and $\mathcal{P}, \pi(r) \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_1)$ for all $r \in (0, 1)$. In other words, we have $\mathcal{P}, x \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_1) \wedge \gamma(\mathcal{E}(\Phi_1), \mathcal{E}(\Phi_2))$ that, by Definition 3.3 on page 10 means $\mathcal{P}, x \models \mathcal{E}(\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2))$.

Suppose now $\mathcal{P}, x \models \mathcal{E}(\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2))$, i.e. $\mathcal{P}, x \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_1) \wedge \gamma(\mathcal{E}(\Phi_1), \mathcal{E}(\Phi_2))$, by Definition 3.3 on page 10. Since $\mathcal{P}, x \models \gamma(\mathcal{E}(\Phi_1), \mathcal{E}(\Phi_2))$, there is a path π such that $\mathcal{P}, \pi(1) \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_2)$ and $\mathcal{P}, \pi(r) \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_1)$ for all $r \in (0, 1)$. Using the Induction Hypothesis we know the following holds: $\mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi_1$, $\mathcal{P}, \pi(1) \models \Phi_2$, and $\mathcal{P}, \pi(r) \models \Phi_1$ for all $r \in (0, 1)$, i.e. $\mathcal{P}, \pi(1) \models \Phi_2$ and $\mathcal{P}, \pi(r) \models \Phi_1$ for all $r \in [0, 1)$. So, we get $\mathcal{P}, x \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. \square

A.5. Proof concerning the example of Remark 3.6.

The assertion can be proven by induction on the structure of formulas. The case for proposition letters, negation and conjunction are straightforward and omitted.

Suppose $\mathcal{P}, A \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. Then there is a topological path $\pi_A : [0, 1] \rightarrow |K|$ from A such that $\mathcal{P}, \pi_A(1) \models \Phi_2$ and $\mathcal{P}, \pi_A(r) \models \Phi_1$ for all $r \in [0, 1]$. Since $\mathcal{P}, A \models \Phi_1$, by the Induction Hypothesis, we have that $\mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi_1$ for all $x \in \overline{ABC}$. For each $x \in \overline{ABC}$, define $\pi_x : [0, 1] \rightarrow |K|$ as follows, for arbitrary $v \in (0, 1)$:

$$\pi_x(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{r}{v}A + \frac{v-r}{v}x, & \text{if } r \in [0, v), \\ \pi_A(\frac{r-v}{1-v}), & \text{if } r \in [v, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Function π_x is continuous. Furthermore, for all $y \in [0, v)$, we have that $\mathcal{P}, \pi_x(y) \models \Phi_1$, since $\pi_x(y) \in \overline{ABC}$. Also, for all $y \in [v, 1)$ we have that $\mathcal{P}, \pi_x(y) \models \Phi_1$, since $\pi_x(y) = \pi_A(\frac{y-v}{1-v})$, $0 \leq \frac{y-v}{1-v} < 1$ and for $y \in [0, 1)$ we have that $\mathcal{P}, \pi_A(y) \models \Phi_1$. Thus $\mathcal{P}, \pi_x(r) \models \Phi_1$ for all $r \in [0, 1)$. Finally, $\pi_x(1) = \pi_A(1)$ and $\mathcal{P}, \pi_A(1) \models \Phi_2$ by hypothesis. Thus, π_x is a topological path that witnesses $\mathcal{P}, x \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$.

The proof of the converse is similar, using instead function $\pi_A : [0, 1] \rightarrow |K|$ defined as follows, for arbitrary $v \in (0, 1)$:

$$\pi_A(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{r}{v}p + \frac{v-r}{v}A, & \text{if } r \in [0, v), \\ \pi_p(\frac{r-v}{1-v}), & \text{if } r \in [v, 1]. \end{cases}$$

A.6. Proof of Proposition 3.9.

Proposition 3.9. *Given a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$, $w \in W$, and SLCS $_{\eta}$ formulas Φ_1 and Φ_2 , the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *There exists a \pm -path $\pi : [0; \ell] \rightarrow W$ for some ℓ with $\pi(0) = w$, $\mathcal{F}, \pi(\ell) \models \Phi_2$ and $\mathcal{F}, \pi(i) \models \Phi_1$ for all $i \in [0; \ell)$.*
- (2) *There exists a \downarrow -path $\pi : [0; \ell'] \rightarrow W$ for some ℓ' with $\pi(0) = w$, $\mathcal{F}, \pi(\ell') \models \Phi_2$ and $\mathcal{F}, \pi(i) \models \Phi_1$ for all $i \in [0; \ell)$.*

Proof. The equivalence of statements (1) and (2) follows directly from Lemma 2.3 and the fact that \pm -paths are also \downarrow -paths. \square

A.7. Proof of Proposition 3.12.

Proposition 3.12. *Given a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$, for $w_1, w_2 \in W$, it holds that*

$$\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \chi(w_1) \text{ if and only if } w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2.$$

Proof. Suppose $w_1 \not\equiv_{\eta} w_2$, then we have $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \not\models \delta_{w_1, w_2}$, and so $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \not\models \bigwedge_{w \in W} \delta_{w_1, w}$. If, instead, $w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$, then we have: $\delta_{w_1, w_1} \equiv \delta_{w_1, w_2} \equiv \mathbf{true}$ by definition, since $w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_1$ and $w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$. Moreover, for any other w , we have that, in any case, $\mathcal{F}, w_1 \models \delta_{w_1, w}$ holds and since $w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$, also $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \delta_{w_1, w}$ holds. So, in conclusion, $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \bigwedge_{w \in W} \delta_{w_1, w}$. \square

A.8. Proof of Lemma 3.13.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ be a finite poset model, $w \in W$ and Φ a SLCS_{η} formula. Then $\mathcal{F}, w \models \Phi$ iff $\mathcal{F}, w \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi)$.*

Proof. Similar to that of Lemma 3.4, but with reference to the finite poset interpretation of the logic. \square

A.9. Proof concerning the example of Remark 3.15.

We prove the assertion by induction on the structure of formulas. The case for atomic proposition letters, negation and conjunction are straightforward and omitted. Suppose $\mathcal{F}, \tilde{A} \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. Then, there is a \pm -path π of some length $\ell \geq 2$ such that $\pi(0) = \tilde{A}$, $\pi(\ell) \models \Phi_2$ and $\pi(i) \models \Phi_1$ for all $i \in [0; \ell)$. Since $\mathcal{F}, \tilde{A} \models \Phi_1$, by the Induction Hypothesis, we have that $\mathcal{F}, \widetilde{ABC} \models \Phi_1$. Consider then path $\pi' = (\widetilde{ABC}, \widetilde{ABC}, \tilde{A}) \cdot \pi$. Path π' is a \pm -path and it witnesses $\mathcal{F}, \widetilde{ABC} \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$.

Suppose now $\mathcal{F}, \widetilde{ABC} \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ and let π be a \pm -path witnessing it. Then, path $(\tilde{A}, \widetilde{ABC}, \widetilde{ABC}) \cdot \pi$ is a \pm -path witnessing $\mathcal{F}, \tilde{A} \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$.

A.10. Proof of Lemma 3.17.

Lemma 3.17. *Given a polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$, for all $x \in |K|$ and formulas Φ of SLCS_{η} the following holds: $\mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi$ if and only if $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi)$.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on the structure of Φ . We consider only the case $\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. Suppose $\mathcal{P}, x \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. By Lemma 3.4 we get $\mathcal{P}, x \models \mathcal{E}(\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2))$ and then, by Definition 3.3, we have $\mathcal{P}, x \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_1) \wedge \gamma(\mathcal{E}(\Phi_1), \mathcal{E}(\Phi_2))$, that is $\mathcal{P}, x \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_1)$ and $\mathcal{P}, x \models \gamma(\mathcal{E}(\Phi_1), \mathcal{E}(\Phi_2))$. Again by Lemma 3.4 on page 10, we get also $\mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi_1$ and so, by the Induction Hypothesis, we have $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_1)$. Furthermore, by Theorem 4.4 of [BCG⁺22] we also get $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \gamma(\mathcal{E}(\Phi_1), \mathcal{E}(\Phi_2))$. Thus we get $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_1) \wedge \gamma(\mathcal{E}(\Phi_1), \mathcal{E}(\Phi_2))$, that is $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \mathcal{E}(\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2))$.

Suppose now $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \mathcal{E}(\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2))$. This means $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_1) \wedge \gamma(\mathcal{E}(\Phi_1), \mathcal{E}(\Phi_2))$, that is $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_1)$ and $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \gamma(\mathcal{E}(\Phi_1), \mathcal{E}(\Phi_2))$. By the Induction Hypothesis we get that $\mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi_1$. Furthermore, by Theorem 4.4 of [BCG⁺22] we also get $\mathcal{P}, x \models \gamma(\mathcal{E}(\Phi_1), \mathcal{E}(\Phi_2))$. This means that there is topological path π such that $\mathcal{P}, \pi(1) \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_2)$ and $\mathcal{P}, \pi(r) \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi_1)$ for all $r \in (0, 1)$. Using Lemma 3.4 we also get $\mathcal{P}, \pi(1) \models \Phi_2$ and $\mathcal{P}, \pi(r) \models \Phi_1$ for all $r \in (0, 1)$ and since also $\mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi_1$ (see above), we get $\mathcal{P}, \pi(1) \models \Phi_2$ and $\mathcal{P}, \pi(r) \models \Phi_1$ for all $r \in [0, 1)$, that is $\mathcal{P}, x \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. \square

A.11. Proof of Theorem 3.18.

Theorem 3.18. *Given a polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$, for all $x \in |K|$ and formulas Φ of SLCS_{η} it holds that: $\mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi$ if and only if $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \Phi$.*

Proof. Using Lemma 3.17, we know that $\mathcal{P}, x \models \Phi$ if and only if $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi)$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.13, we know that $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \mathcal{E}(\Phi)$ if and only if $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbb{F}(x) \models \Phi$, which brings us to the result. \square

A.12. Proof of Lemma 4.4.

Lemma 4.4. *Given a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ and weak \pm -bisimulation $B \subseteq W \times W$, for all w_1, w_2 such that $B(w_1, w_2)$, the following holds: for each \downarrow -path $\pi_1 : [0; k_1] \rightarrow W$ from w_1 there is a \downarrow -path $\pi_2 : [0; k_2] \rightarrow W$ from w_2 such that $B(\pi_1(k_1), \pi_2(k_2))$ and for each $j \in [0; k_2)$ there is $i \in [0; k_1)$ such that $B(\pi_1(i), \pi_2(j))$.*

Proof. Let $\pi_1 : [0; k_1] \rightarrow W$ be a \downarrow -path from w_1 . By Lemma 2.2 on page 8 we know that there is an $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path $\hat{\pi}_1 : [0; 2h] \rightarrow W$ and total, monotonic non-decreasing surjection $f : [0; 2h] \rightarrow [0; k_1]$ such that $\hat{\pi}_1(j) = \pi_1(f(j))$ for all $j \in [0; 2h]$. Furthermore, by Lemma A.1 below, we know that there is a \downarrow -path $\pi_2 : [0; k_2] \rightarrow W$ from w_2 such that $B(\hat{\pi}_1(2h), \pi_2(k_2))$ and for each $j \in [0; k_2)$ there is $i \in [0; 2h)$ such that $B(\hat{\pi}_1(i), \pi_2(j))$. In addition, $\hat{\pi}_1(0) = \pi_1(0) = w_1$, $B(\pi_1(k_1), \pi_2(k_2))$ since $B(\hat{\pi}_1(2h), \pi_2(k_2))$ and $\hat{\pi}_1(2h) = \pi_1(k_1)$. Finally, for each $j \in [0; k_2)$ there is $i \in [0; k_1)$ such that $B(\pi_1(i), \pi_2(j))$, since there is $n \in [0; 2h)$ such that $B(\hat{\pi}_1(n), \pi_2(j))$ and $f(n) = i$ for some $i \in [0; k_1)$. \square

Lemma A.1. *Given a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ and a weak \pm -bisimulation $B \subseteq W \times W$, for all w_1, w_2 such that $B(w_1, w_2)$, the following holds: for each $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path $\pi_1 : [0; 2h] \rightarrow W$ from w_1 there is a \downarrow -path $\pi_2 : [0; k] \rightarrow W$ from w_2 such that $B(\pi_1(2h), \pi_2(k))$ and for each $j \in [0; k)$ there is $i \in [0; 2h)$ such that $B(\pi_1(i), \pi_2(j))$.*

Proof. We prove the assertion by induction on h .

Base case. $h = 1$.

If $h = 1$, the assertion follows directly from Definition 4.2 on page 13 where $w_1 = \pi_1(0)$, $u_1 = \pi_1(1)$ and $d_1 = \pi_1(2)$.

Induction step. We assume the assertion holds for $\uparrow\downarrow$ -paths of length $2h$ or less and we prove it for $\uparrow\downarrow$ -paths of length $2(h + 1)$.

Suppose π_1 is a $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path of length $2h + 2$ and consider $\uparrow\downarrow$ -path $\pi'_1 = \pi_1 \upharpoonright [0; 2h]$. By the Induction Hypothesis, we know that there is a \downarrow -path $\pi'_2 : [0; k'] \rightarrow W$ from w_2 such that $B(\pi'_1(2h), \pi'_2(k'))$ and for each $j \in [0; k')$ there is $i \in [0; 2h)$ such that $B(\pi'_1(i), \pi'_2(j))$. Clearly, this means that $B(\pi_1(2h), \pi'_2(k'))$ and for each $j \in [0; k')$ there is $i \in [0; 2h)$ such that $B(\pi_1(i), \pi'_2(j))$. Furthermore, since $B(\pi_1(2h), \pi'_2(k'))$ and B is a weak \pm -bisimulation, we also know that there is a \downarrow -path $\pi''_2 : [0; k''] \rightarrow W$ from $\pi'_2(k')$ such that $B(\pi_1(2h + 2), \pi''_2(k''))$ and for each $j \in [0; k'')$ there is $i \in [2h; 2h + 2)$ such that $B(\pi_1(i), \pi''_2(j))$. Let $\pi_2 : [0; k' + k''] \rightarrow W$ be defined as $\pi_2 = \pi'_2 \cdot \pi''_2$. Clearly π_2 is a \downarrow -path, since so is π'_2 . Furthermore $B(\pi_1(2h + 2), \pi_2(k' + k''))$ since $B(\pi_1(2h + 2), \pi''_2(k''))$ and $\pi''_2(k'') = \pi_2(k' + k'')$. Finally, it is straightforward to check for all $j \in [0; k' + k'')$ there is $i \in [0; 2h + 2)$ such that $B(\pi_1(i), \pi_2(j))$. \square

A.13. Proof of Lemma 4.5.

Lemma 4.5. *Given a polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$, and associated cell poset model $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}) = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P})})$, for any \downarrow -path $\pi : [0; \ell] \rightarrow W$, there is a topological path $\pi' : [0, 1] \rightarrow |K|$ such that: (i) $\mathbb{F}(\pi'(0)) = \pi(0)$, (ii) $\mathbb{F}(\pi'(1)) = \pi(\ell)$, and (iii) for all $r \in (0, 1)$ there is $i < \ell$ such that $\mathbb{F}(\pi'(r)) = \pi(i)$.*

Proof. Since π is a \downarrow -path, we have that either $\mathcal{C}_T(\mathbb{F}^{-1}(\pi(k-1))) \sqsubseteq \mathcal{C}_T(\mathbb{F}^{-1}(\pi(k)))$ or $\mathcal{C}_T(\mathbb{F}^{-1}(\pi(k))) \sqsubseteq \mathcal{C}_T(\mathbb{F}^{-1}(\pi(k-1)))$, for each $k \in (0; \ell]$ ¹¹. It follows that there is a continuous map $\pi'_k : [\frac{k-1}{\ell}, \frac{k}{\ell}] \rightarrow |K|$ such that, in the first case, $\mathbb{F}(\pi'_k(\frac{k-1}{\ell})) = \pi(k-1)$ and $\pi'_k([\frac{k-1}{\ell}, \frac{k}{\ell}]) \sqsubseteq \mathcal{C}_T(\mathbb{F}^{-1}(\pi(k)))$, while in the second case, $\pi'_k([\frac{k-1}{\ell}, \frac{k}{\ell}]) \sqsubseteq \mathcal{C}_T(\mathbb{F}^{-1}(\pi(k-1)))$ and $\mathbb{F}(\pi'_k(\frac{k}{\ell})) = \pi(k)$. In fact π'_k can be realised as a linear bijection to the line segment connecting the barycenters in the corresponding cell, either in $\mathbb{F}^{-1}(\pi(k))$ or in $\mathbb{F}^{-1}(\pi(k-1))$, respectively.

For each $k \in (0; \ell)$, both $\pi'_k(\frac{k}{\ell})$ and $\pi'_{k+1}(\frac{k}{\ell})$ coincide with the barycenter of $\mathbb{F}^{-1}(\pi(k))$, so that defining $\pi'(r) = \pi'_k(r)$ for $r \in [\frac{k-1}{\ell}, \frac{k}{\ell}]$ correctly defines a topological path (actually a piece-wise linear path), satisfying (i) and (ii). Finally since π is a \downarrow -path, $\pi(\ell) \preceq \pi(\ell-1)$, so that $\pi'([\frac{\ell-1}{\ell}, 1]) \sqsubseteq \mathbb{F}^{-1}(\pi(\ell-1))$. This implies (iii) above. \square

A.14. Proof of Lemma 4.6.

Lemma 4.6. *Given a polyhedral model $\mathcal{P} = (|K|, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}})$, and associated cell poset model $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P}) = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{P})})$, for any topological path $\pi : [0, 1] \rightarrow |K|$ the following holds: $\mathbb{F}(\pi([0, 1]))$ is a connected subposet of W and there is $k > 0$ and a \downarrow -path $\hat{\pi} : [0; k] \rightarrow W$ from $\mathbb{F}(\pi(0))$ to $\mathbb{F}(\pi(1))$ such that for all $i \in [0; k)$ there is $r \in [0, 1)$ with $\hat{\pi}(i) = \mathbb{F}(\pi(r))$.*

Proof. Continuity of $\mathbb{F} \circ \pi$ ensures that $\mathbb{F}(\pi([0, 1]))$ is a connected subposet of W . Thus there is an undirected path $\hat{\pi} : [0; k] \rightarrow W$ from $\mathbb{F}(\pi(0))$ to $\mathbb{F}(\pi(1))$ of some length $k > 0$. In particular, $\hat{\pi}(k-1) \succ \hat{\pi}(k)$, as shown in the sequel, by contradiction. Suppose that $\hat{\pi}(k-1) \prec \hat{\pi}(k)$. This would mean that there is $\epsilon < 1$, with $\pi(\epsilon) \in \mathbb{F}(\pi(\epsilon)) = \hat{\pi}(k-1)$, such that $\pi(r') \in \hat{\pi}(k) = \mathbb{F}(\pi(1))$ for no $r' \in (\epsilon, 1)$ — otherwise $\hat{\pi}(k-1) = \hat{\pi}(k)$ would hold. But the fact that no such an r' exists contradicts the fact that π is continuous, since continuity requires that for each neighbourhood $N_1(\pi(1))$ of $\pi(1)$ there is a neighbourhood $N_2(1) \subseteq [0, 1]$ of 1 such that $\pi(t) \in N_1(\pi(1))$ whenever $t \in N_2(1)$. We thus conclude that $\hat{\pi}(k-1) \succ \hat{\pi}(k)$, and so $\hat{\pi}_1$ is a \downarrow -path. By definition and connectedness of $\mathbb{F}(\pi([0, 1]))$ we finally get that for all $i \in [0; k)$ there is $r \in [0, 1)$ with $\hat{\pi}(i) = \mathbb{F}(\pi(r))$. \square

A.15. Proof of Lemma 5.5.

Lemma 5.5. *Given a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$ and $w_1, w_2 \in W$ the following holds: if $w_1 \rightleftharpoons w_2$, then $w_1 \equiv_{\eta} w_2$.*

Proof. By induction on the structure of SLCS_{η} formulas. We show only the case for $\eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ since the others are straightforward. Suppose $\mathcal{F}, w_1 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. Then there is a \pm -path π from w_1 of some length ℓ such that $\mathcal{F}, \pi(\ell) \models \Phi_2$ and $\mathcal{F}, \pi(i) \models \Phi_1$ for all $i \in [0; \ell)$. In particular, we have that $\mathcal{F}, w_1 \models \Phi_1$. So, by the Induction Hypothesis, since $w_1 \rightleftharpoons w_2$, we get that also $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \Phi_1$. In addition, by definition of \rightleftharpoons , and given that $w_2 \rightleftharpoons w_1$,

¹¹We recall here that $\sigma_1 \sqsubseteq \sigma_2$ iff $\tilde{\sigma}_1 \preceq \tilde{\sigma}_2$ and that $\sigma = \mathcal{C}_T(\tilde{\sigma})$.




FIGURE 12. A blue triangle with red vertex and a red side (12a), its poset model (12b), poset model with equivalence classes (12c) and minimal Kripke model (12d).

there is an undirected path π' of some length ℓ' such that $\pi'(0) = w_2, \pi(\ell') = w_1$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{\pi'(i)\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{\pi'(j)\})$, for all $i, j \in [0; \ell']$. Note that, by definition of \equiv , we have that $\pi'(k) \equiv w_1$ for all $k \in [0; \ell']$. Thus, again by the Induction Hypothesis, we also get $\mathcal{F}, \pi'(k) \models \Phi_1$ for all $k \in [0; \ell']$. Clearly, the sequentialisation $\pi' \cdot \pi$ of π' with π is a \downarrow -path since π is a \pm -path. Furthermore, by Lemma 2.3, there is a \pm -path π'' with the same starting and ending points as $\pi' \cdot \pi$, and with the same set of intermediate points, occurring in the same order. Thus π'' witnesses $\mathcal{F}, w_2 \models \eta(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. \square

A.16. Proof of Lemma 5.7.

Lemma 5.7. *Consider a finite poset model $\mathcal{F} = (W, \preceq, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}})$. Then for all $w_1, w_2 \in W$ the following holds: if $[w_1]_{\equiv} \sim^{\mathbb{S}_A(\mathcal{F})} [w_2]_{\equiv}$, then $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_2\})$.*

Proof. By Rule (PL), we have $[w_1]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\})} [w_1]_{\equiv}$ and, by hypothesis, we also have $[w_2]_{\equiv} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\})} [w'_2]_{\equiv}$, for some $[w'_2]_{\equiv} \sim [w_1]_{\equiv}$. But then, using again Rule (PL), we get $[w'_2]_{\equiv} = [w_2]_{\equiv}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_1\}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(\{w_2\})$. \square

APPENDIX B. ADDITIONAL EXAMPLES

B.1. Further Minimisation Example. Fig. 12a shows an example of a blue triangle with one red edge and one red vertex. Its cell poset model is shown in Fig. 12b. In Fig. 12c the nodes of the poset model that are in the same equivalence class modulo \equiv_{η} are given the same colour.¹² The minimal Kripke model is shown in Fig. 12d. The colours of the borders of the nodes in Fig. 12d correspond to the proposition letters of the model in Fig. 12a whereas the interior colours of the nodes correspond to the colours of the corresponding equivalence classes in Fig. 12c. Note that the minimal model itself is not a poset.

¹²Note that such colours have only an illustrative purpose. In particular, they have nothing to do with the colours expressing the evaluation of proposition letters.

B.2. Cube Example of Sect. 7. Below the spatial logic specification in `ImgQ1` is shown, that was used for model checking the various cube-variants in Table 1 in Sect. 7 with `PolyLogicA`. `ImgQ1` is the input language of `PolyLogicA` in which spatial logic properties of SLCS_η can be expressed. In the specification below, first the polyhedral model is loaded in json format. Then the definition of the operator η follows, which can be expressed in terms of the built-in reachability operator `through`, which, in turn, represents operator γ . After that, the atomic propositions `green`, `white` and `corridor` are defined. This is followed by a number of properties for the cube that should be self-explanatory. They include the formulas for ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 that were introduced in Sect. 7. Finally, the lines starting by `save` are defining which results to save in a file. Such files contain the name of a property and for each property a list of true/false items, one for each cell in the polyhedral model and in the order in which these cells are defined in that polyhedral model.

```
load model = "mazeG1W3x3Model.json"

// Define eta in terms of gamma (through):
let eta(x,y) = x & through(x,y)

let green      = ap("G")
let white      = ap("W")
let corridor   = ap("corridor")

let greenOrWhite = (green | white)

let oneStepToWhite = eta((green | eta(corridor,white)),white)
let twoStepsToWhite = eta((green | eta(corridor,oneStepToWhite)), oneStepToWhite) & (!oneStepToWhite)
let threeStepsToWhite = eta((green | eta(corridor,twoStepsToWhite)), twoStepsToWhite) &
                          (!twoStepsToWhite) & (!oneStepToWhite)

let phi1 = eta((green | eta(corridor,white)),white)
let phi2 = eta((green | eta(corridor,oneStepToWhite)), oneStepToWhite)

let greenThree = green & (!oneStepToWhite) & (!twoStepsToWhite)


//save "greenOrWhite"  greenOrWhite

save "phi1" phi1
save "phi2" phi2


save "oneStepToWhite" oneStepToWhite
save "twoStepsToWhite" twoStepsToWhite
save "threeStepsToWhite" threeStepsToWhite

//save "greenOneStepToWhite" green & oneStepToWhite
//save "greenTwoStepsToWhite" green & twoStepsToWhite
//save "greenThreeStepsToWhite" green & threeStepsToWhite
//save "greenThree" greenThree
```

Figure 13 shows the $3 \times 5 \times 3$ cube and its minimised LTS. Note that in the LTS not all transition labels are shown in order to avoid cluttering of the image. However, states corresponding to corridors, green rooms and white rooms, are shown in grey, green and white, respectively.



(A) Cube 3x5x3



(B) Minimised LTS

FIGURE 13. Cube of dimension 3x5x3 (Fig. 13a) and its respective minimal LTSs (Figs. 13b).