#### Luís Soares Barbosa



#### Interaction & Concurrency Course Unit (Lcc)

Universidade do Minho, 04.II.2019

## Reactive systems

Reactive system

system that computes by reacting to stimuli from its environment along its overall computation

 in contrast to sequential systems whose meaning is defined by the results of finite computations, the behaviour of reactive systems is mainly determined by interaction and mobility of non-terminating processes, evolving concurrently.

- observation  $\equiv$  interaction
- behaviour  $\equiv$  a structured record of interactions

### Reactive systems

Concurrency vs interaction

$$x := 0;$$
  
 $x := x + 1 | x := x + 2$ 

- both statements in parallel could read x before it is written
- which values can x take?
- which is the program outcome if exclusive access to memory and atomic execution of assignments is guaranteed?

#### Definition

A LTS over a set N of names is a tuple  $\langle S, N, \downarrow, \longrightarrow \rangle$  where

- *S* = {*s*<sub>0</sub>, *s*<sub>1</sub>, *s*<sub>2</sub>, ...} is a set of states
- $\downarrow \subseteq S$  is the set of terminating or final states

$$\downarrow s \equiv s \in \downarrow$$

•  $\longrightarrow \subseteq S \times N \times S$  is the transition relation, often given as an *N*-indexed family of binary relations

$$s \stackrel{a}{\longrightarrow} s' \equiv \langle s', a, s \rangle \in \longrightarrow$$

#### Morphism

A morphism relating two LTS over N,  $\langle S, N, \downarrow, \longrightarrow \rangle$  and  $\langle S', N, \downarrow', \longrightarrow' \rangle$ , is a function  $h : S \longrightarrow S'$  st

$$s \stackrel{a}{\longrightarrow} s' \Rightarrow hs \stackrel{a}{\longrightarrow}' hs'$$
  
 $s \downarrow \Rightarrow hs \downarrow'$ 

morphisms preserve transitions and termination

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

#### System

Given a LTS  $(S, N, \downarrow, \longrightarrow)$ , each state  $s \in S$  determines a system over all states reachable from s and the corresponding restrictions of  $\longrightarrow$  and  $\downarrow$ .

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

### LTS classification

- deterministic
- non deterministic
- finite
- finitely branching
- image finite
- ...

# Reachability

#### Definition

The reachability relation,  $\longrightarrow^* \subseteq S \times N^* \times S$ , is defined inductively

•  $s \xrightarrow{\epsilon} s$  for each  $s \in S$ , where  $\epsilon \in N^*$  denotes the empty word;

• if 
$$s \xrightarrow{a} s''$$
 and  $s'' \xrightarrow{\sigma} s'$  then  $s \xrightarrow{a\sigma} s'$ , for  $a \in N, \sigma \in N^*$ 

#### Reachable state $t \in S$ is reachable from $s \in S$ iff there is a word $\sigma \in N^*$ st $s \xrightarrow{\sigma}^* t$

Alternative characterization (coalgebraic)

A morphism  $h: \langle S, \text{next} \rangle \longrightarrow \langle S', \text{next}' \rangle$  is a function  $h: S \longrightarrow S'$  st the following diagram commutes



i.e.,

$$\mathcal{P}h \cdot \text{next} = \text{next}' \cdot (h \times id)$$

or, going pointwise,

$$\{h \ x \mid x \in \text{next} \langle s, a \rangle\} = \text{next}' \langle h \ s, a \rangle$$

Alternative characterization (coalgebraic) A morphism  $h: \langle S, next \rangle \longrightarrow \langle S', next' \rangle$ 

• preseves transitions:

$$s' \in \mathsf{next} \langle s, a \rangle \Rightarrow h \ s' \in \mathsf{next}' \langle h \ s, a \rangle$$

reflects transitions:

$$r' \in \mathsf{next}' \ \langle h \ s, a 
angle \Rightarrow \langle \exists \ s' \in S \ : \ s' \in \mathsf{next} \ \langle s, a 
angle : \ r' = h \ s' 
angle$$

(why?)

# Comparison

• Both definitions coincide at the object level:

$$\langle s, a, s' 
angle \in \mathcal{T} \; \equiv \; s' \in \mathsf{next} \; \langle s, a 
angle$$

• Wrt morphisms, the relational definition is more general, corresponding, in coalgebraic terms to

$$\mathcal{P}h \cdot \text{next} \subseteq \text{next}' \cdot (h \times id)$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

## Automata

### Back to old friends?

automaton behaviour  $\ \equiv \$  accepted language

Recall that finite automata recognize regular languages, i.e. generated by

• 
$$L_1 + L_2 \cong L_1 \cup L_2$$
 (union)

- $L_1 \cdot L_2 \cong \{ st \mid s \in L_1, t \in L_2 \}$  (concatenation)
- $L^* \cong \{\epsilon\} \cup L \cup (L \cdot L) \cup (L \cdot L \cdot L) \cup ...$  (iteration)

## Automata

There is a syntax to specify such languages:

 $E ::= \epsilon \mid a \mid E + E \mid EE \mid E^*$ 

where  $a \in \Sigma$ .

- which regular expression specifies {*a*, *bc*}?
- and {*ca*, *cb*}?

and an algebra of regular expressions:

$$(E_1 + E_2) + E_3 = E_1 + (E_2 + E_3)$$
$$(E_1 + E_2) E_3 = E_1 E_3 + E_2 E_3$$
$$E_1 (E_2 E_1)^* = (E_1 E_2)^* E_1$$

## Automata

There is a syntax to specify such languages:

 $E ::= \epsilon \mid a \mid E + E \mid EE \mid E^*$ 

where  $a \in \Sigma$ .

- which regular expression specifies {*a*, *bc*}?
- and {*ca*, *cb*}?

and an algebra of regular expressions:

$$(E_1 + E_2) + E_3 = E_1 + (E_2 + E_3)$$
$$(E_1 + E_2) E_3 = E_1 E_3 + E_2 E_3$$
$$E_1 (E_2 E_1)^* = (E_1 E_2)^* E_1$$

# After thoughts

... need more general models and theories:

- Several interaction points ( $\neq$  functions)
- Need to distinguish normal from anomolous termination (eg deadlock)
- Non determinisim should be taken seriously: the notion of equivalence based on accepted language is blind wrt non determinism
- Moreover: the reactive characters of systems entail that not only the generated language is important, but also the states traversed during an execution of the automata.



#### Aims

- To become familiar with reactive systems, emphasising their concurrent composition and continuous interaction with their environment
- To introduce techniques for (formal) specification, analysis and verification of reactive systems

## The course

- 1. Basic models for reactive systems (state, behaviour, interaction, concurrency)
  - 1.1 Labelled transition systems
  - 1.2 Similarity and bisimilarity
- 2. Process algebra
  - 2.1 Processes and behaviour
  - 2.2 CCS and mCRL2
- 3. Logics for reactive systems
  - 3.1 Hennessy-Milner logic and its extensions
  - 3.2 Modal, hybrid and temporal logics
  - 3.3 Specification and verification of logic constraints
- 4. Quantum processes
  - 4.1 Introduction to the quantum computation model
  - 4.2 Quantum processes and algorithms

# Bibliography

#### Basic

- 1. Luca Aceto, Anna Inglfsdttir, Kim G. Larsen, Jiri Srba. *Reactive Systems: Modelling, Specification and Verification*. CUP, 2007.
- 2. Jan Friso Groote, Mohammad Reza Mousavi. *Modeling and Analysis of Communicating Systems*. MIT Press, 2008.
- 3. Noson Yanofsky, Mirco Mannucci. *Quantum Computing for Computer Scientists*. CUP, 2008.

### Complementary

- 1. J. C. M. Baeten, T. Basten, M. A. Reniers. *Process Algebra: Equational Theories of Communicating Processes.* CUP, 2010.
- 2. Robin Milner. *Communicating and Mobile Systems: The Pi Calculus.* CUP, 1999.
- 3. Christel Baier, Joost-Pieter Katoen. Principles of Model Checking. MIT Press, 2008

# Pragmatics

### Assessment

- Training assignments (20% each): 4 June
- Written test (80%): 28 May

#### Interaction

. . .

- web: arca.di.uminho.pt/ic-1819/
- contact: lsb@di.uminho.pt

- Week 25 Feb  $\longrightarrow$  3 Jun
- Week 8 April  $\longrightarrow$  tba