



**HAL**  
open science

## **LTL under reductions with weaker conditions than stutter-invariance**

Emmanuel Paviot-Adet, Denis Poitrenaud, Etienne Renault, Yann  
Thierry-Mieg

► **To cite this version:**

Emmanuel Paviot-Adet, Denis Poitrenaud, Etienne Renault, Yann Thierry-Mieg. LTL under reductions with weaker conditions than stutter-invariance. 2021. hal-03414753v1

**HAL Id: hal-03414753**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03414753v1>**

Preprint submitted on 4 Nov 2021 (v1), last revised 6 Jan 2023 (v2)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# LTL under reductions with weaker conditions than stutter-invariance

Emmanuel Paviot-Adet<sup>1,2</sup>, Denis Poitrenaud<sup>1,2</sup>, Etienne Renault<sup>3</sup>, Yann Thierry-Mieg<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sorbonne Université, CNRS, LIP6, F-75005 Paris, France  
first.last@lip6.fr

<sup>2</sup> Université de Paris, F-75005 Paris, France

<sup>3</sup> EPITA, LRDE, Kremlin-Bicêtre, France  
renault@lrde.epita.fr

**Abstract.** Verification of properties expressed as  $\omega$ -regular languages such as LTL can benefit hugely from stutter-insensitivity, using a diverse set of reduction strategies. However properties that are not stutter-insensitive, for instance due to the use of the neXt operator of LTL or to some form of counting in the logic, are not covered by these techniques in general.

We propose in this paper to study a weaker property than stutter-insensitivity. In a stutter insensitive language both adding and removing stutter to a word does not change its acceptance, any stuttering can be abstracted away; by decomposing this equivalence relation into two implications we obtain weaker conditions. We define a shortening insensitive language where any word that stutters less than a word in the language must also belong to the language. A lengthening insensitive language has the dual property. A semi-decision procedure is then introduced to reliably prove shortening insensitive properties or deny lengthening insensitive properties while working with a *reduction* of a system. A reduction has the property that it can only shorten runs. Lipton's transaction reductions or Petri net agglomerations are examples of eligible structural reduction strategies.

An implementation and experimental evidence is provided showing most non-random properties sensitive to stutter are actually shortening or lengthening insensitive. Performance of experiments on a large (random) benchmark from the model-checking competition indicate that despite being a semi-decision procedure, the approach can still improve state of the art verification tools.

## 1 Introduction

Model checking is an automatic verification technique for proving the correctness of systems that have finite state abstractions. Properties can be expressed using the popular Linear-time Temporal Logic (LTL). To verify LTL properties, the automata-theoretic approach [24] builds a product between a Büchi automaton representing the LTL formula and the reachable state graph of the system (seen as a set of infinite runs). Even if this approach has been used successfully to verify both hardware and software components, it suffers from the so called "state explosion problem": as the number of state variables in the system increases, the size of the system state space grows exponentially.

One way to tackle this issue is to consider *structural reductions*. Structural reductions take their roots in the work of Lipton [14] and Berthelot [1]. Nowadays, these reductions

are still considered as an attractive way to alleviate the state explosion problem [13, 2]. Structural reductions strive to fuse structurally "adjacent" events into a single atomic step, leading to less interleaving of independent events and less observable behaviors in the resulting system. An example of such a structural reduction is shown on Figure 1 where actions are progressively grouped (see section 3.1 for a more detailed presentation). It can be observed that the Kripke structure representing the state space of the program is significantly simplified.

Traditionally structural reductions construct a smaller system that preserves properties such as deadlock freedom, liveness, reachability [9], and *stutter insensitive* temporal logic [19] such as  $LTL_{\setminus \chi}$ . The verification of a *stutter insensitive* property on a given system does not depend on whether non observable events (i.e. that do not update atomic propositions) are abstracted or not. On Fig 1 both instructions " $z = 40;$ " and " $chan.send(z)$ " of thread  $\beta$  are non observable.




Fig. 1: Example of reductions. (1) describes a program composed of two threads and 3 integer variables. The  $chan$  variable designates a communication channel where  $send(int)$  insert a message and  $int recv()$  consumes a message with a blocking semantic if the channel is empty. We consider that the logic only observes whether  $x$  or  $y$  is zero noted  $p$  and  $q$ . (2) depicts the state-space represented as a Kripke structure. Each node is labelled by the value of atomic propositions  $p$  and  $q$ . When an instruction is executed the value of these propositions *may* evolve. (3) represents the state-space of (1) if actions of thread  $\beta$  " $z = 40; chan.send(z);$ " are fused into a single atomic operation. (4) represents the state-space of (1) after further considering that the three actions of the original program " $z = 40; chan.send(z); y = chan.recv();$ " are now a single atomic step.

This paper shows that structural reductions can in fact be used even for fragments of LTL that are *not* stutter insensitive. We identify two fragments that we call *shortening insensitive* (if a word is accepted, any version that stutters less also) or *lengthening insensitive* (if a word is accepted, any version that stutters more also). Based on this classification we introduce two semi-decision procedures that provide a reliable verdict only in one direction: e.g. presence of counter examples is reliable for lengthening insensitive properties, but absence is not.

The paper is structured as follows, section 2 presents the definitions and notations relevant to our setting in an abstract manner, focusing on the level of description of a language. Section 3 instantiates these definitions in the more concrete setting of LTL verification. Section 4 provides experimental evidence supporting the claim that the method is both applicable to many formulae and can significantly improve state of the art model-checkers. Some related work is presented in section 5 before concluding.

## 2 Definitions

In this section we first introduce in 2.1 a "shorter than" partial order relation on infinite runs, based on the number of repetitions or stutter in the run. This partial order gives us in 2.2 the notions of shortening and lengthening insensitive language, which are shown to be weaker versions of classical stutter-insensitivity in 2.3. We then define in 2.4 the *reduction of a language* which contains a shorter representative of each run in the original language. Finally we show that we can use a semi-decision procedure to verify shortening or lengthening insensitive properties using a reduction of a system.

### 2.1 A "Shorter than" relation for infinite runs

**Definition 1 (Run).** : A run over a finite alphabet  $\Sigma$  is an infinite sequence of symbols in  $\Sigma$ . We canonically denote a run  $r$  using one of the two forms:

- (plain run)  $r = w_0^{n_0} w_1^{n_1} w_2^{n_2} \dots$  with for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $w_i \in \Sigma$ ,  $n_i \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $w_i \neq w_{i+1}$ , or
- ( $\omega$ -run)  $r = w_0^{n_0} w_1^{n_1} \dots w_k^\omega$  with  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and for all  $0 \leq i < k$ ,  $w_i \in \Sigma$ , and for  $i < k$ ,  $n_i \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $w_i \neq w_{i+1}$ .  $w_k^\omega$  represents an infinite stutter on the final symbol  $w_k$  of the run.

The set of all runs over alphabet  $\Sigma$  is noted  $\Sigma^\omega$ .

These notations using a power notation for repetitions of a symbol in a run are introduced to highlight stuttering. We force the symbols to alternate to ensure we have a canonical representation: with  $\sigma$  a suffix, the run  $aab\sigma$  must be represented as  $a^2b^1\sigma$  and not  $a^1a^1b^1\sigma$ . To represent a run of the form  $aabbcccccc\dots$  we use an  $\omega$ -run:  $a^2b^2c^\omega$ .

**Definition 2 (Shorter than).** : A plain run  $r = w_0^{n_0} w_1^{n_1} w_2^{n_2} \dots$  is shorter than a plain run  $r' = w_0^{n'_0} w_1^{n'_1} w_2^{n'_2} \dots$  if and only if for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n_i \leq n'_i$ . For two  $\omega$ -runs  $r = w_0^{n_0} \dots w_k^\omega$  and  $r' = w_0^{n'_0} \dots w_k^\omega$ ,  $r$  is shorter than  $r'$  if and only if for all  $i < k$ ,  $n_i \leq n'_i$ .

We note this relation on runs  $r \preceq r'$ .

For instance, for any given suffix  $\sigma$ ,  $ab\sigma \leq a^2b\sigma$ . Note that  $ab\sigma \leq ab^2\sigma$  as well, but that  $a^2b\sigma$  and  $ab^2\sigma$  are incomparable.  $\omega$ -runs are incomparable with plain runs.

*Property 1.* The  $\leq$  relation is a partial order on runs.

*Proof.* The relation is clearly reflexive ( $\forall r \in \Sigma^\omega, r \leq r$ ), anti-symmetric ( $\forall r, r' \in \Sigma^\omega$  with  $r \neq r', r \leq r' \Leftrightarrow \neg(r' \leq r)$ ) and transitive ( $\forall r, r', r'' \in \Sigma^\omega, r \leq r' \wedge r' \leq r'' \Rightarrow r \leq r''$ ). The order is partial since some runs (such as  $a^2b\sigma$  and  $ab^2\sigma$  presented above) are incomparable.  $\square$

**Definition 3.** [*Stutter equivalence*]: a run  $r$  is stutter equivalent to  $r'$ , noted  $r \sim r'$  if and only if there exists a shorter run  $r''$  such that  $r'' \leq r \wedge r'' \leq r'$ . This relation  $\sim$  is an equivalence relation thus partitioning runs of  $\Sigma^\omega$  into equivalence classes.

We denote  $\hat{r}$  the equivalence class of a run  $r$  and denote  $\hat{r}$  the shortest run in that equivalence class.

For any given run  $r = w_0^{n_0} w_1^{n_1} w_2^{n_2} \dots$  there is a shortest representative in  $\hat{r}$  that is the run  $\hat{r} = w_0 w_1 w_2 \dots$  where no symbol is ever consecutively repeated more than once (until the  $\omega$  for an  $\omega$ -run). By definition all runs that are comparable to  $\hat{r}$  are stutter equivalent to each other, since  $\hat{r}$  can play the role of  $r''$  in the definition of stutter equivalence, giving us an equivalence relation: it is reflexive, symmetric and transitive.

For instance, with  $\sigma$  denoting a suffix,  $\hat{r} = ab\sigma$  would be the shortest representative of any run of  $\hat{r}$  of the form  $a^{n_0} b^{n_1} \sigma$ . We can see by this definition that despite being incomparable,  $a^2b\sigma \sim ab^2\sigma$  since  $ab\sigma \leq a^2b\sigma$  and  $ab\sigma \leq ab^2\sigma$ .

## 2.2 Sensitivity of a language to the length of runs

**Definition 4 (Language).** : a language  $\mathcal{L}$  over a finite alphabet  $\Sigma$  is a set of runs over  $\Sigma$ , hence  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Sigma^\omega$ . We note  $\bar{\mathcal{L}} = \Sigma^\omega \setminus \mathcal{L}$  the complement of a language  $\mathcal{L}$ .

In the literature, most studies are focused on *stutter insensitive* languages [18, 23, 17, 8, 9]. In a stutter-insensitive language  $\mathcal{L}$ , duplicating any letter (also called stuttering) or removing any duplicate letter from a run of  $\mathcal{L}$  must produce another run of  $\mathcal{L}$ . In other words, all stutter equivalent runs in a class  $\hat{r}$  must be either in the language or outside of it. Let us introduce weaker variants of this property, original in this paper.

**Definition 5.** [*Shortening insensitive*]: a language  $\mathcal{L}$  is shortening insensitive if and only if for any run  $r$  it contains, all shorter runs  $r'$  such that  $r' \leq r$  are also in  $\mathcal{L}$ .

For instance, a shortening insensitive language  $\mathcal{L}$  that contains the run  $a^3b\sigma$  must also contain shorter runs  $a^2b\sigma$ , and  $ab\sigma$ . If it contains  $a^2b^2\sigma$  it also contains  $a^2b\sigma$ ,  $ab^2\sigma$  and  $ab\sigma$ .

**Definition 6.** [*Lengthening insensitive*]: a language  $\mathcal{L}$  is lengthening insensitive if and only if for any run  $r$  it contains, all longer runs  $r'$  such that  $r \leq r'$  are also in  $\mathcal{L}$ .

For instance, a lengthening insensitive language  $\mathcal{L}$  that contains the run  $a^2b\sigma$  must also contain all longer runs  $a^3b\sigma, a^2b^2\sigma \dots$ , and more generally runs of the form  $a^n b^{n'} \sigma$  with  $n \geq 2$  and  $n' \geq 1$ . If it contains  $\hat{f} = ab\sigma$  the shortest representative of an equivalence class, it contains all runs in the stutter equivalence class.

While stutter insensitive languages have been heavily studied, there is to our knowledge no study on what reductions are possible if only one direction holds, i.e. the language is shortening or lengthening insensitive, but not both. A shortening insensitive language is essentially asking for something to happen *before* a certain deadline or stuttering "too much". A lengthening insensitive language is asking for something to happen *at the earliest* at a certain date or after having stuttered at least a certain number of times. Figure 2 represents these situations graphically.

### 2.3 Relationship to stutter-insensitive logic

The relationship between the notions of shortening and lengthening insensitive languages introduced in this paper and classical definitions of stutter insensitive languages is already apparent in [15]. We formalize it in the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.** *A language is both shortening and lengthening insensitive if and only if it is stutter-insensitive.*

*Proof.* Because the language is shortening insensitive it contains the minimum  $\hat{f}$  of each equivalence class  $\hat{f}$  that it intersects with. Because the language is also lengthening insensitive, this is enough to force inclusion of the whole equivalence class  $\hat{f}$ . Hence any given class of stutter-equivalent runs  $\hat{f}$  is either inside or outside the language.

Conversely, duplicating any letter or removing any duplicate letter from a run directly correspond to lengthening or shortening the run, thus ensuring that the language is both shortening and lengthening insensitive.  $\square$

*Property 2.* A language  $\mathcal{L}$  is stutter-insensitive if and only if the complement language  $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$  is stutter-insensitive.

*Proof.* Because the language is shortening insensitive, it must be the case for any stutter-equivalent class of runs  $\hat{f}$  that intersects  $\mathcal{L}$  that  $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{L}$ , and because  $\mathcal{L}$  is also lengthening insensitive this means that all runs in  $\hat{f}$  must also belong to  $\mathcal{L}$ . So any equivalence class of runs  $\hat{f}$  must entirely belong to  $\mathcal{L}$  or (conversely) belong to its complement  $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ .  $\square$

This property is already proved in [15] using a different formalization.

If we look at sensitivity to length and how it interacts with the complement operation, we find a dual relationship where the complement of a shortening insensitive language is lengthening insensitive and vice versa. This is because every equivalence class of runs that is not entirely inside or outside the language is separated along a frontier that is consistent with the shorter than ordering relation.

*Property 3.* A language  $\mathcal{L}$  is shortening-insensitive if and only if the complement language  $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$  is lengthening insensitive.




Fig. 2:  $\Sigma^\omega$  is represented as a circle that is partitioned into equivalence classes of runs  $(\hat{r}_0, \hat{r}_1 \dots)$ . Each point in the space is a run, and some of the  $\leq$  relations are represented as arrows; the red point is the shortest run  $\hat{r}$  in the equivalence class. Gray areas are inside the language, white are outside of it. Four languages are depicted:

$L_a$ : equivalence classes are entirely inside or outside a **stutter insensitive language**,  
 $L_b$ : the "bottom" of an equivalence class may belong to a **shortening insensitive language**,

$L_c$ : the "top" of an equivalence class may belong to a **lengthening insensitive language**,

$L_d$ : some languages are neither lengthening insensitive nor shortening insensitive. This can be because the "top" of some equivalence classes are in the language but for other classes the "bottom" is in the language, or because in a given class there are runs outside the language such that some shorter and some longer runs are in the language, or vice versa.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be shortening-insensitive. Let  $r \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$  be a run in the complement of  $\mathcal{L}$ . Any run  $r'$  such that  $r \preceq r'$  must also belong to  $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ , since if it belonged to the shortening insensitive  $\mathcal{L}$ ,  $r$  would also belong to  $\mathcal{L}$ . Hence  $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$  is lengthening insensitive. The converse implication can be proved using the same reasoning.  $\square$

If we look at figure 2, the frontier in languages  $\mathcal{L}_b$  and  $\mathcal{L}_c$  is apparent. The dual effect of complement on the sensitivity of the language to length is also apparent: if gray and white are switched we can see  $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_b$  is lengthening insensitive and  $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_c$  shortening insensitive.

## 2.4 When is visiting shorter runs enough ?

**Definition 7.** [Reduction] Let  $I$  be a reduction function  $\Sigma^\omega \mapsto \Sigma^\omega$  such that  $\forall r, I(r) \preceq r$ . The reduction by  $I$  of a language  $\mathcal{L}$  is  $Red_I(\mathcal{L}) = \{I(r) \mid r \in \mathcal{L}\}$ .

Note that the  $\preceq$  partial order is not strict so that the image of a run may be the run itself, hence identity is a reduction function. In most cases, the reduction function is expected to be injective so that a single shorter run  $r'$  of the reduced language corresponds to many runs  $r$  of the original language.

Note that given any two reduction functions  $I$  and  $I'$ ,  $Red_I(Red_{I'}(\mathcal{L}))$  is still a reduction of  $\mathcal{L}$ . Hence chaining reduction rules still produces a reduction. As we will discuss in section 3.1 structural reductions of a specification such as Lipton's transaction reduction [14, 13] or Petri net agglomerations [1, 22] induce a reduction at the language level.

**Theorem 2.** [Reduced Shortening Insensitive Emptiness Check] Given two languages  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{L}'$ , if  $\mathcal{L}$  is shortening insensitive, then  $\mathcal{L} \cap Red(\mathcal{L}') = \emptyset \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{L}' = \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* The fact that the intersection with the reduced language is empty indicates that none of the shorter runs of  $Red(\mathcal{L}')$  are in  $\mathcal{L}$ . Because the language  $\mathcal{L}$  is shortening insensitive this means none of the longer words of  $\mathcal{L}'$  can be part of  $\mathcal{L}$  either.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.** [Reduced Lengthening Insensitive Emptiness Check] Given two languages  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{L}'$ , if  $\mathcal{L}$  is lengthening insensitive, then  $\mathcal{L} \cap Red(\mathcal{L}') \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{L}' \neq \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* At least one run  $r'$  is in  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $Red(\mathcal{L}')$ . Therefore the longer run  $r$  of  $\mathcal{L}'$  that  $r'$  represents is also in  $\mathcal{L}$  since the language is lengthening insensitive.  $\square$

With these two theorems original to this paper we now can build a semi-decision procedure that is able to prove *some* lengthening or shortening insensitive properties using a reduction of a system.

## 3 Application to Verification

We now introduce the more concrete setting of LTL verification to exploit the theoretical results on languages and their shortening/lengthening sensitivity developed in section 2.



### 3.1 Kripke Structure

From the point of view of LTL verification with a state-based logic, executions of a system are seen as runs over the alphabet  $\Sigma = 2^{\text{AP}}$ , where AP is a set of atomic propositions that may be true or false in each state. So each symbol in a run gives the truth value of all of the atomic propositions in that state of the execution, and each time an action happens we progress in the run to the next symbol. Some actions of the system update the truth value of atomic propositions, but some actions can leave them unchanged which corresponds to stuttering.

**Definition 8 (Kripke Structure Syntax).** *Let AP designate a set of atomic propositions. A Kripke structure  $KS_{\text{AP}} = \langle S, R, \lambda, s_0 \rangle$  over AP is a tuple where  $S$  is the finite set of states,  $R \subseteq S \times S$  is the transition relation,  $\lambda : S \mapsto 2^{\text{AP}}$  is the state labeling function, and  $s_0 \in S$  is the initial state.*

**Definition 9 (Kripke Structure Semantics).** *The language  $\mathcal{L}(KS_{\text{AP}})$  of a Kripke structure  $KS_{\text{AP}}$  is defined over the alphabet  $2^{\text{AP}}$ . It contains all runs of the form  $r = \lambda(s_0)\lambda(s_1)\lambda(s_2) \dots$  where  $s_0$  is the initial state of  $KS_{\text{AP}}$  and  $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}$ , either  $(s_i, s_{i+1}) \in R$ , or if  $s_i$  is a deadlock state such that  $\forall s' \in S, (s_i, s') \notin R$  then  $s_{i+1} = s_i$ .*

All system executions are considered maximal, so that they are represented by infinite runs. If the system can deadlock or terminate in some way, we can extend these finite words by an  $\omega$  stutter on a particular symbol in  $\Sigma$  to obtain a run.

Subfigure (1) of Figure 1 depicts a program where each thread ( $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ) has three reachable positions (we consider that each instruction is atomic). In this example we consider that the logic only observes two atomic propositions  $p$  (true when  $x = 0$ ) and  $q$  (true when  $y = 0$ ). The variable  $z$  is not observed.

Subfigure (2) of Figure 1 depicts the reachable states of this system as a Kripke structure. Actions of thread  $\beta$  (which do not modify the value of  $p$  or  $q$ ) are horizontal while actions of thread  $\alpha$  are vertical. While each thread has 3 reachable positions, the emission of the message by  $\beta$  must precede the reception by  $\alpha$  so that some situations are unreachable. Based on Definition 9 that extends by an infinite stutter runs that end in a deadlock, we can compute the language  $\mathcal{L}_A$  of this system. It consists in three parts: when thread  $\beta$  goes first  $pq^3 \bar{p}q \bar{p}\bar{q}^\omega$ , when thread  $\alpha$  goes first  $pq \bar{p}q^3 \bar{p}\bar{q}^\omega$ , and with an interleaving  $pq^2 \bar{p}q^2 \bar{p}\bar{q}^\omega$ .

In subfigure (3) of Figure 1, the actions " $z = 40; \text{chan.send}(z);$ " of thread  $\beta$  are fused into a single atomic operation. This is possible because action  $z = 40$  of thread  $\beta$  is stuttering (it cannot affect either  $p$  or  $q$ ) and is non-interfering with other events (it neither enables nor disables any event other than subsequent instruction " $\text{chan.send}(z)$ "). The language of this smaller KS is a reduction of the language of the original system. It contains two runs: thread  $\alpha$  goes first  $pq \bar{p}q^2 \bar{p}\bar{q}^\omega$  and thread  $\beta$  goes first  $pq^2 \bar{p}q \bar{p}\bar{q}^\omega$ .

In subfigure (4) of Figure 1, the already fused action " $z = 40; \text{chan.send}(z);$ " of thread  $\beta$  is further fused with the  $\text{chan.recv}()$ ; action of thread  $\alpha$ . This leads to a smaller KS whose language is still a reduction of the original system now containing a single run:  $pq \bar{p}q \bar{p}\bar{q}^\omega$ . This simple example shows the power of structural reductions when they are applicable, with a drastic reduction of the initial language.

### 3.2 Automata theoretic LTL verification

Let us consider the problem of model-checking of an  $\omega$ -regular property  $\varphi$  (such as LTL) on a system using the automata-theoretic approach [24]. In this approach, we wish to answer the problem of language inclusion: do all runs of the system  $\mathcal{L}(KS)$  belong to the language of the property  $\mathcal{L}(\varphi)$ ? To do this, when the property  $\varphi$  is an omega-regular language (e.g. an LTL or PSL formula), we first negate the property  $\neg\varphi$ , then build a (variant of) a Büchi automaton  $A_{\neg\varphi}$  whose language<sup>4</sup> consists in runs that are not in the property language  $\mathcal{L}(A_{\neg\varphi}) = \Sigma^\omega \setminus \mathcal{L}(\varphi)$ . We then perform a synchronized product between this Büchi automaton and the Kripke structure  $KS$  corresponding to the system's state space  $A_{\neg\varphi} \otimes KS$  (where  $\otimes$  is defined by  $\mathcal{L}(A \otimes B) = \mathcal{L}(A) \cap \mathcal{L}(B)$ ). Either the language of the product is empty  $\mathcal{L}(A_{\neg\varphi} \otimes KS) = \emptyset$ , and the property  $\varphi$  is thus true of this system, or the product is non empty, and from any run in the language of the product we can build a counter-example to the property.

We will consider in the rest of the paper that the shortening or lengthening insensitive language of definitions 5 and 6 is given as an omega-regular language or Büchi automaton typically obtained from the negation of an LTL property, and that the reduction of definition 7 is applied to a language that corresponds to all runs in a Kripke structure typically capturing the state space of a system.

**LTL verification with reductions.** With theorem 2, a shortening insensitive property shown to be true on the reduction (empty intersection with the language of the negation of the property) is also true of the original system. With theorem 3, a lengthening insensitive property shown to be false on the reduction (non-empty intersection with the language of the negation of the property, hence counter-examples exist) is also false in the original system. Unfortunately, our procedure cannot prove using a reduction that a shortening insensitive property is false, or that a lengthening insensitive property is true. We offer a semi-decision procedure.

### 3.3 Detection of language sensitivity

We now present a strategy to decide if a given property expressed as a Büchi automaton is shortening insensitive, lengthening insensitive, or both. We avoid repeating in this subsection the formal definitions of TGBA and their transformations  $sl$  and  $cl$  originally found in [15]. We simply reuse their operations in this work to build our language sensitivity test.

[15] introduces two syntactic transformations of a transition-based generalized Büchi automaton  $A_\varphi$  that can be built from any LTL formula  $\varphi$  to represent its language  $\mathcal{L}(\varphi) = \mathcal{L}(A_\varphi)$ . The  $cl$  closure operation *decreases stutter*, it adds to the language any run  $r' \in \Sigma^\omega$  that is shorter than a run  $r$  in the language, The  $sl$  self-loopization operation *increases stutter*, it adds to the language any run  $r' \in \Sigma^\omega$  that is longer than a run  $r$  in the language. More formally  $\mathcal{L}(cl(A_\varphi)) = \{r' \mid \exists r \in \mathcal{L}(A_\varphi), r' \preceq r\}$  and  $\mathcal{L}(sl(A_\varphi)) = \{r' \mid \exists r \in \mathcal{L}(A_\varphi), r \preceq r'\}$ .

<sup>4</sup> Because computing the complement  $\bar{A}$  of an automaton  $A$  is exponential in the worst case, syntactically negating  $\varphi$  and producing an automaton  $A_{\neg\varphi}$  is preferable when  $A$  is derived from e.g. an LTL formula.

[15] then shows that there are several possible ways to test if an omega-regular language (encoded as a Büchi automaton) is stutter insensitive: essentially applying either of the operations  $cl$  or  $sl$  should leave the language unchanged. This allows to recognize that a property is stutter-insensitive even though it syntactically contains e.g. the  $neXt$  operator of LTL.

For instance  $A_\varphi$  is stutter insensitive if and only if  $\mathcal{L}(sl(cl(A_\varphi)) \otimes A_{\neg\varphi}) = \emptyset$ . The full test is thus simply reduced to a language emptiness check testing that both  $sl$  and  $cl$  operations leave the language of the automaton unchanged.

Indeed for stutter insensitive languages, all or none of the runs belonging to a given stutter-equivalence class of runs  $\hat{r}$  must belong to the language  $\mathcal{L}(A_\varphi)$ . In other words, if shortening or lengthening a run can make it switch from belonging to  $A_\varphi$  to belonging to  $A_{\neg\varphi}$ , the language is stutter sensitive. This is apparent on figure 2

We want weaker conditions here, but we can reuse the  $sl$  and  $cl$  operations developed for testing stutter insensitivity. Indeed for an automaton  $A$  encoding a shortening insensitive language,  $\mathcal{L}(cl(A)) = \mathcal{L}(A)$  should hold. Conversely if  $A$  encodes a lengthening insensitive language,  $\mathcal{L}(sl(A)) = \mathcal{L}(A)$  should hold. We express these tests as emptiness checks on a product in the following way.

**Theorem 4 (Testing sensitivity).** *Let  $A$  designate a Büchi automaton, and  $\bar{A}$  designate its complement.*

$\mathcal{L}(cl(A) \otimes \bar{A}) = \emptyset$ , if and only if  $A$  defines a shortening insensitive language.

$\mathcal{L}(sl(A) \otimes \bar{A}) = \emptyset$  if and only if  $A$  defines a lengthening insensitive language.

*Proof.* Despite adding all shorter runs to the language, we still do not intersect the complement of the language, this means all shorter runs were already in the language and the transformation did not add any words. Conversely, if  $A$  is shortening insensitive, for any run it contains all shorter runs must also be in the language. The reasoning is exactly the same for the lengthening insensitive test.  $\square$

Thanks to property 3, and in the spirit of [15] we could also test the complement of a language for the dual property if that is more efficient, i.e.  $\mathcal{L}(sl(\bar{A}) \otimes A) = \emptyset$  if and only if  $A$  defines a shortening insensitive language and similarly  $\mathcal{L}(cl(\bar{A}) \otimes A) = \emptyset$  iff.  $A$  is lengthening insensitive. We did not really investigate these alternatives as the complexity of the test was already negligible in all of our experiments.

### 3.4 Agglomeration of events produces shorter runs

Among the possible strategies to reduce the complexity of analyzing a system are structural reductions. Depending on the input formalism the terminology used is different, but the main results remain stable.

Let us reason at the level of a Kripke Structure. The goal of such reductions is to structurally detect the following situation in language  $\mathcal{L}$ : let  $r = w_0^{n_0} w_1^{n_1} w_2^{n_2} \dots$  designate a run (not necessarily in the language), there must exist two indexes  $a$  and  $b$  such that for any natural number  $j$ ,  $a \leq j \leq b$ ,  $r_j = w_0^{n_0} \dots w_a^{n_a} \dots w_j^{n_j+1} \dots w_b^{n_b} \dots$  is in the language. In other words, the set of runs described as :  $\{r_j = w_0^{n_0} \dots w_a^{n_a} \dots w_j^{n_j+1} \dots w_b^{n_b} \dots \mid a \leq j \leq b\}$  must belong to the language.

This corresponds to an event that does not impact the truth value of atomic propositions (it stutters) and can be freely commuted with any event that occurs between indexes  $a$  and  $b$  in the run. This event is simply constrained to occur at the earliest at index  $a$  in the run and at the latest at index  $b$ .

Note that these runs are all stutter-equivalent, but are incomparable by the shorter than relation. In this situation, a *reduction* can choose to only represent the run  $r$  instead of any of these runs. This run was not originally in the language in general, but it is indeed shorter than any of the  $r_j$  runs so it matches definition 7 for a reduction. Note that  $\hat{r}$  does contain all these longer runs so that in a stutter insensitive context, examining  $r$  is enough to conclude for any of these runs. This is why usage of structural reductions is compatible with verification of a logic such as  $LTL_{\setminus X}$  and has been proposed for that express purpose in the literature [9, 13].

For instance both pre-agglomeration and post-agglomeration of Petri nets produce a net whose language is a reduction of the language of the original net. More powerful variants of Berthelot's rules have been defined e.g. in [19, 6, 9, 22] for Petri nets, and for a "modern" overview of Lipton's transaction reductions see [13]. For lack of space, in this paper we decided not to provide proofs that these structural transformation rules induce reductions at the language level. A formal definition involves a) introducing the syntax of a formalism and b) its semantics in terms of language, then c) defining the reduction rule, and d) proving its effect is a reduction at the language level. The exercise is not particularly difficult, and the definition of reduction rules mostly fall into the category above, where a non observable event that happens at the earliest at point  $a$  and at the latest at point  $b$  is abstracted from the trace.

Our experimental section 4.2 uses the rules of [22] for (potentially partial) pre and post-agglomeration. That paper presents 22 structural reductions rules from which we selected the rules valid in the context of LTL verification. Only one rule preserving stutter-insensitive LTL was not compatible with our approach since it does not produce a reduction at the language level: rule 3 "Redundant transitions" proposes that if two transitions  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  have the same combined effect as a transition  $t$ , and firing  $t_1$  enables  $t_2$ ,  $t$  can be discarded from the net. This reduces the number of edges in the underlying  $KS$  representing the state space, but does not affect reachability of states. However, it selects as representative a run involving both  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  that is longer than the one using  $t$  in the original net, it is thus not legitimate to use in our strategy (although it remains valid for  $LTL_{\setminus X}$ ). Rules 14 "Pre agglomeration" and 15 "Post agglomeration" are the most powerful rules of [22] that we are able to apply in our context. They are known to preserve  $LTL_{\setminus X}$  (but not full LTL) and their effect is a reduction at the language level, hence we *can* use them when dealing with shortening/lengthening insensitive formulae.

## 4 Experimentation

### 4.1 A Study of Properties

This section provides an empirical study of the applicability of the techniques presented in this paper to LTL properties found in the literature. To achieve this we explored several LTL benchmarks:

- Some work [5, 20] summarises the typical properties that users express in LTL. The formulae of this benchmark have been extracted directly from the literature.
- Dwyer et al. [4] proposes property specification patterns, expressed in several logics including LTL. These patterns have been extracted by analysing 447 formulae coming from real world projects.
- The RERS challenge [10] presents generated formulae inspired from real world reactive systems.
- The MCC [12] benchmark establishes a huge database of 45152 LTL formulae in the form of 1411 Petri net models coming from 114 origins with for each one 32 random LTL formulae. These formulae use up to 5 state-based atomic propositions, limit the nesting depth of temporal operators to 5 and are filtered in order to be non trivial. Since these formulae come with a concrete system we were able to use this benchmark to also provide performance results for our approach in section 4.2. We retained 43989 model/formula pairs from this benchmark, the missing 1163 were rejected due to parse limitations of our tool when the model size is excessive ( $> 10^7$  transitions).

This set of roughly 2200 human-like formulae and 44k random formulae shows how common the shortening/lengthening fragment of LTL that we consider in this work actually is in practice. Table 1 summarizes, for each benchmark, the number and percentage of formulae that are either stuttering insensitive, lengthening insensitive, or shortening insensitive. The sum of both shortening and lengthening formulae represents more than one third (and up to 60 percent) of the formulae of these benchmarks.

Concerning the polarity, although lengthening insensitive formulae seem to appear more frequently, most of these benchmarks actually contain each formula in both positive and negative forms (we retained only one) so that the summed percentage might be more relevant as a metric since lengthening insensitivity of  $\varphi$  is equivalent to shortening insensitivity of  $\neg\varphi$ .

Analysis of the human-like Dwyer patterns [4] reveals that shortening/lengthening insensitive formulae mostly come from the patterns *precedence chain*, *response chain* and *constrained chain*. These properties specify causal relation between events, that are observable as causal relations between *observably different* states (that might be required to strictly follow each other), but this causality chain is not impacted by non observable events.

Benchmark	Stutter Insens.	Length. Insens.	Short. Insens.	Others	Total
Spot [5, 4, 20]	63 (67%)	17 (18%)	11 (1%)	3 (3%)	94
Dwyer et al. [4]	32 (58%)	13 (23%)	9 (16%)	1 (1.81%)	55
RERS [10].	714 (35%)	777 (38%)	559 (28%)	0	2050
MCC [12]	24462 (56%)	6837 (14%)	5390 (12%)	7300 (16%)	43989

Table 1: Sensitivity to length of properties measured using several LTL benchmarks.

## 4.2 A Study of Performances

**Benchmark Setup.** Among the LTL benchmarks presented in Table 1, we opted for the MCC benchmark to evaluate the techniques presented in this paper. This benchmark seems relevant since (1) it contains both academic and industrial models, (2) it has a huge set of (random) formulae and (3) includes models so that we could measure the effect of the approach in a model-checking setting. The model-checking competition (MCC) is an annual event in its 10<sup>th</sup> edition in 2021 where competing tools are evaluated on a large benchmark. We use the formulae and models from the latest 2021 edition of the contest, where Tapaal [3] was awarded the gold medal and ITS-Tools [21] was silver in the LTL category of the contest. We evaluate both of these tools in the following performance measures, showing that our strategy is agnostic to the back-end analysis engine. Our experimental setup consists in two steps.

1. Parse the model and formula pair, and analyze the sensitivity of the formula. When the formula is shortening or lengthening insensitive (but not both) output two model/formula pairs : reduced and original. The "original" version does also benefit from reduction rules, but we apply only rules that are compatible with full LTL. The "reduced" version additionally benefits from rules that are reductions at the language level, i.e. mainly pre and post agglomeration (but enacting these rules can cause further simplifications). The original and reduced model/formula pairs that result from this procedure are then exported in the same format the contest uses. This step was implemented within ITS-tools.
2. Run an MCC compatible tool on both the reduced and original versions of each model/formula pair and record the time performance and the verdict.

For the first step, using Spot [15], detecting that a formula is either shortening or lengthening is straightforward since 99.81% of formulae are processed in less than 1 second. After this analysis, we obtain 12 227 model/formula pairs where the formula is either shortening insensitive or lengthening insensitive (but not both). Among these pairs, in 3005 cases (24.6%) the model was resistant to the structural reduction rules we use. Since our strategy is not applicable when the model cannot be structurally reduced, we retain the remaining 9 222 (75.4%) model/formula pairs in the performance plots of figure 3. We measured that on average 34.19% of places and 32.69% of the transitions of the models were discarded by reduction rules, though the spread is high as there are models that are almost fully reducible and some that are barely so. Application of reduction rules remains in complexity related to the size of the structure of the net so that it takes less than 20 seconds for 95.5% of the models to compute. These 9222 examples where our strategy is applicable constitute a significant portion (21%) of the original 43989 model/formula pairs of the MCC. All these example are formulae for which, until now, there was no existing reduction technique to ease model-checking.

For the second step, we measured the solution time for both reduced and original model/formula pairs using the two best tools according to the MCC'2021 contest on this benchmark. A full tool using our strategy could first run on the reduced model/formula pair hoping for a definitive answer, then if inconclusive run the normal decision procedure on the original model. Or perhaps use a portfolio approach where the first reliable answer is kept.

Instead in these experiments we more neutrally measured the time for taking a semi-decision on the reduced model vs. the time for taking a (complete) decision on the original model. We then classify the results into two sets, decidable instances are shown on the left of Fig. 3 and instances that are not decidable (by our procedure) are on the right. On "decidable instances" our semi-decision procedure could have concluded reliably because the formula is true and the property shortening insensitive or the formula is false and the property lengthening insensitive. Non decidable instances shown on the right are those where the verdict on the reduced model is not to be trusted (or both the original and reduced procedures timed out).

With this workflow we show that our approach is generic and can be easily implemented on top of any MCC compatible model-checking tool. All experiments were run with a 950 seconds timeout (close to 15 minutes, which is generous when the contest offers 1 hour for 16 properties). We used a heterogeneous cluster of machines with four cores allocated to each experiment. We ensured that experiments concerning reduced and original versions of a given model/formula were run on the same physical machine so that they are comparable.

Figure 3 presents the results of these experiments. The results are all presented as log-log scatter plots opposing a run on the original to a run on the reduced model/formula pair. Each dot represents an experiment on a model/formula pair; a dot below the diagonal indicates that the reduced version was faster to solve, while a point above it indicates a case where the reduced model actually took longer to solve than the original (fortunately there are relatively few). Points that timeout for one (or both) of the approaches are plotted on the line at 950 seconds, we also indicate the number of points that are in this line (or corner) next to it.

The plots on the left (a) and (c) correspond to "decidable instances" while those on the right are not decidable by our procedure. The two plots on the top correspond to the performance of ITS-tools, while those on the bottom give the results with Tapaal. The general form of the results with both tools is quite similar confirming that our strategy is indeed responsible for the measured gains in performance and that they are reproducible. Reduced problems *are* generally easier to solve than the original. This gain is in the best case exponential as is visible through the existence of spread of points reaching out horizontally in this log-log space (particularly on the Tapaal plots).

The colors on the decidable instances reflect whether the verdict was true or false. For false properties a counter-example was found by both procedures interrupting the search, and while the search space of a reduced model is a priori smaller, heuristics and even luck can play a role in finding a counter-example early. True answers on the other hand generally require a full exploration of the state space so that the reductions should play a major role in reducing the complexity of model-checking. The existence of True answers where the reduction fails is surprising and might deserve further investigation. On the other hand the points aligned to the right of the plots a) and c) (189 for ITS-tools and 119 for Tapaal) correspond to cases where our procedure improved these state of the art tools, allowing to reach a conclusion when the original method fails.

The plots on the right use orange to denote cases where the verdict on the reduced and original models were the same; on these points the procedures had comparable behaviors (either exploring a whole state space or exhibiting a counter-example). The blue color




Fig. 3: Experiments on the MCC'2021 LTL benchmark using the two best tool of the MCC contest: Tapaal and ITS-tools. Figures (a) and (c) contain the cases where the verdict of the semi-decisions procedures is reliable, and distinguish cases where the output is True (empty product) and False (non empty product). (b) and (d) display the cases where the verdict is not reliable and distinguish cases where the output is inconsistent with the ground truth from cases where they agree.

denotes points where the two procedures disagree, with several blue points above the diagonal reflecting cases where the reduced procedure explored the whole state space and thought the property was true while the original procedure found a counter-example (this is the worst case). Surprisingly, even though on these non decidable plots (b) and



d) our procedure should not be trusted, it mostly agrees (in 95% of the cases) with the decision reached on the original.

Out of the 9222 experiments in total, for ITS-tools 5901 runs reached a trusted decision (64 %), 2227 instances reached an untrusted verdict (32 %), and the reduced procedure timed out in 394 instances (4 %). Tapaal reached a trusted decision in 5866 instances (64 %), 2884 instances reached an untrusted verdict (31 %), and the reduced procedure timed out in 472 instances (5 %). On this benchmark of formulae we thus reached a trusted decision in almost two thirds of the cases using the reduced procedure.

## 5 Related Work

**Partial order vs structural reductions.** Partial order reduction (POR) [18, 23, 17, 8] is a very popular approach to combat state explosion for *stutter insensitive* formulae. These approaches use diverse strategies (stubborn sets, ample sets, sleep sets. . .) to consider only a subset of events at each step of the model-checking while still ensuring that at least one representative of each stutter equivalent class of runs is explored. Because the preservation criterion is based on equivalence classes of runs, this family of approaches is limited only to the stutter insensitive fragment of LTL (see Fig.2). However the structural reduction rules used in this paper are compatible and can be stacked with POR when the formula is stutter insensitive; this is the setting in which most structural reduction rules were originally defined.

**Structural reductions in the literature.** The structural reductions rules we used in the performance evaluation are defined on Petri nets where the literature on the subject is rich [1, 19, 6, 9, 2, 22]. However there are other formalism where similar reduction rules have been defined such as [16] using "atomic" blocks in Promela, transaction reductions for the widely encompassing intermediate language PINS of LTSmin [13], and even in the context of multi-threaded programs [7]. All these approaches are structural or syntactic, they are run prior to model-checking per se.

**Non structural reductions in the literature.** Other strategies have been proposed that instead of structurally reducing the system, dynamically build an abstraction of the Kripke structure where less observable stuttering occurs. These strategies build a *KS* whose language *is* a reduction of the language of the original *KS* (in the sense of Def. 7), that can then be presented to the emptiness check algorithm with the negation of the formula. They are thus also compatible with the approach proposed in this paper. Such strategies include the Covering Step Graph (CSG) construction of [25] where a "step" is performed (instead of firing a single event) that includes several independent transitions. The Symbolic Observation Graph of [11] is another example where states of the original *KS* are computed (using BDDs) and aggregated as long as the atomic proposition values do not evolve; in practice it exhibits to the emptiness check only shortest runs in each equivalence class hence it is a reduction.

## 6 Conclusion

To combat the state space explosion problem that LTL model-checking meets, structural reductions have been proposed that syntactically compact the model so that it exhibits

less interleaving of non observable actions. Prior to this work, all of these approaches were limited to the stutter-insensitive fragment of the logic. We bring a semi-decision procedure that widens the applicability of these strategies to formulae which are *shortening insensitive* or *lengthening insensitive*. The experimental evidence presented shows that the fragment of the logic covered by these new categories is quite useful in practice. An extensive measure using the models, formulae and the two best tools of the model-checking competition 2021 shows that our strategy can improve the decision power of state of the art tools, and confirm that in the best case an exponential speedup of the decision procedure can be attained. We also identified several other strategies that are compatible with our approach since they construct a reduced language. In further work we are investigating how non trusted counter-examples of the reduced model could be confirmed on the original model.

## References

1. Berthelot, G.: Checking properties of nets using transformation. In: Applications and Theory in Petri Nets. LNCS, vol. 222, pp. 19–40. Springer (1985)
2. Berthomieu, B., Le Botlan, D., Dal Zilio, S.: Counting Petri net markings from reduction equations. International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer (Apr 2019)
3. David, A., Jacobsen, L., Jacobsen, M., Jørgensen, K.Y., Møller, M.H., Srba, J.: Tapaal 2.0: Integrated development environment for timed-arc petri nets. In: Flanagan, C., König, B. (eds.) Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems. pp. 492–497. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2012)
4. Dwyer, M.B., Avrunin, G.S., Corbett, J.C.: Property specification patterns for finite-state verification. In: Ardis, M. (ed.) Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Formal Methods in Software Practice (FMSP’98). pp. 7–15. ACM Press (Mar 1998). <https://doi.org/10.1145/298595.298598>
5. Etesami, K., Holzmann, G.J.: Optimizing Büchi automata. In: Palamidessi, C. (ed.) Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Concurrency Theory (Concur’00). LNCS, vol. 1877, pp. 153–167. Springer-Verlag, Pennsylvania, USA (2000)
6. Evangelista, S., Haddad, S., Pradat-Peyre, J.: Syntactical colored Petri nets reductions. In: ATVA. LNCS, vol. 3707, pp. 202–216. Springer (2005)
7. Flanagan, C., Qadeer, S.: A type and effect system for atomicity. In: PLDI. pp. 338–349. ACM (2003)
8. Godefroid, P., Wolper, P.: A partial approach to model checking. Inf. Comput. **110**(2), 305–326 (1994)
9. Haddad, S., Pradat-Peyre, J.: New efficient Petri nets reductions for parallel programs verification. Parallel Processing Letters **16**(1), 101–116 (2006)
10. Howar, F., Jasper, M., Mues, M., Schmidt, D., Steffen, B.: The rers challenge: towards controllable and scalable benchmark synthesis. International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer pp. 1–14 (06 2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-021-00617-z>
11. Klai, K., Poitrenaud, D.: MC-SOG: an LTL model checker based on symbolic observation graphs. In: van Hee, K.M., Valk, R. (eds.) Applications and Theory of Petri Nets, 29th International Conference, PETRI NETS 2008, Xi’an, China, June 23-27, 2008. Proceedings. LNCS, vol. 5062, pp. 288–306. Springer (2008)
12. Kordon, F., Bouvier, P., Garavel, H., Hillah, L.M., Hulin-Hubard, F., Amat, N., Amparore, E., Berthomieu, B., Biswal, S., Donatelli, D., Galla, F., Dal Zilio, S., Jensen, P., He, C., Le Botlan, D., Li, S., Srba, J., Thierry-Mieg, Y., Walner, A., Wolf, K.: Complete Results for the 2021 Edition of the Model Checking Contest. <http://mcc.lip6.fr/2021/results.php> (June 2021)

13. Laarman, A.: Stubborn transaction reduction. In: NFM. LNCS, vol. 10811, pp. 280–298. Springer (2018)
14. Lipton, R.J.: Reduction: A method of proving properties of parallel programs. *Commun. ACM* **18**(12), 717–721 (1975)
15. Michaud, T., Duret-Lutz, A.: Practical stutter-invariance checks for  $\omega$ -regular languages. In: SPIN. LNCS, vol. 9232, pp. 84–101. Springer (2015)
16. Pajault, C., Pradat-Peyre, J., Rousseau, P.: Adapting petri nets reductions to promela specifications. In: FORTE. LNCS, vol. 5048, pp. 84–98. Springer (2008)
17. Peled, D.A.: Combining partial order reductions with on-the-fly model-checking. In: CAV. LNCS, vol. 818, pp. 377–390. Springer (1994)
18. Peled, D.A., Pratt, V.R., Holzmann, G.J. (eds.): *Partial Order Methods in Verification, Proceedings of a DIMACS Workshop, Princeton, New Jersey, USA, July 24-26, 1996*, DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, vol. 29. DIMACS/AMS (1996)
19. Poitrenaud, D., Pradat-Peyre, J.: Pre- and post-agglomerations for LTL model checking. In: ICATPN. LNCS, vol. 1825, pp. 387–408. Springer (2000)
20. Somenzi, F., Bloem, R.: Efficient Büchi automata for LTL formulæ. In: *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV'00)*. LNCS, vol. 1855, pp. 247–263. Springer-Verlag, Chicago, Illinois, USA (2000)
21. Thierry-Mieg, Y.: Symbolic model-checking using its-tools. In: TACAS. LNCS, vol. 9035, pp. 231–237. Springer (2015)
22. Thierry-Mieg, Y.: Structural reductions revisited. In: *Petri Nets*. LNCS, vol. 12152, pp. 303–323. Springer (2020)
23. Valmari, A.: A stubborn attack on state explosion. In: CAV. LNCS, vol. 531, pp. 156–165. Springer (1990)
24. Vardi, M.Y.: Automata-theoretic model checking revisited. In: VMCAI. LNCS, vol. 4349, pp. 137–150. Springer (2007)
25. Vernadat, F., Michel, F.: Covering step graph preserving failure semantics. In: Azéma, P., Balbo, G. (eds.) *Application and Theory of Petri Nets 1997*, 18th International Conference, ICATPN '97, Toulouse, France, June 23-27, 1997, Proceedings. LNCS, vol. 1248, pp. 253–270. Springer (1997)