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Abstract

In this paper, we study model-checking of linear-time properties in multi-valued systems. Safety property, invariant property, liveness property, persistence and dual-persistence properties in multi-valued logic systems are introduced. Some algorithms related to the above multi-valued linear-time properties are discussed. The verification of multi-valued regular safety properties and multi-valued \( \omega \)-regular properties using lattice-valued automata are thoroughly studied. Since the law of non-contradiction (i.e., \( a \land \neg a = 0 \)) and the law of excluded-middle (i.e., \( a \lor \neg a = 1 \)) do not hold in multi-valued logic, the linear-time properties introduced in this paper have the new forms compared to those in classical logic. Compared to those classical model checking methods, our methods to multi-valued model checking are more directly accordingly. A new form of multi-valued model checking with membership degree is also introduced. In particular, we show that multi-valued model-checking can be reduced to the classical model checking. The related verification algorithms are also presented. Some illustrative examples and case study are also provided.
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1. Introduction

In the last four decades, computer scientists have systematically developed theories of correctness and safety as well as methodologies, techniques and even automatic tools for correctness and safety verification of computer systems; see for example [1, 27, 32]. Of which, model checking has become established as one of the most effective automated techniques for analyzing correctness of software and hardware designs. A model checker checks a finite-state system against a correctness property expressed in a propositional temporal logic such as LTL or CTL. These logics can express safety (e.g., No two processes can be in the critical
section at the same time) and liveness (e.g., Every job sent to the printer will eventually print) properties. Model-checking has been effectively applied to reasoning about correctness of hardware, communication protocols, software requirements, etc. Many industrial model checkers have been developed, including SPIN [18], SMV [33].

Despite their variety, existing model-checkers are typically limited to reasoning in classical logic. However, there are a number of problems for which classical logic is insufficient. One of these is reasoning under uncertainty. This can occur either when complete information is not known or cannot be obtained (e.g., during requirements analysis), or when this information has been removed (abstraction). Classical model-checkers typically deal with uncertainty by creating extra states, one for each value of the unknown variable and each feasible combination of values of known variables. However, this approach adds significant extra complexity to the analysis. Classical reasoning is also insufficient for models that contain inconsistency. Models may be inconsistent because they combine conflicting points of view, or because they contain components developed by different people. Conventional reasoning systems cannot cope with inconsistency because the presence of a single contradiction results in trivialization – anything follows from $A \land \neg A$. Hence, faced with an inconsistent description and the need to perform automated reasoning, we must either discard information until consistency is achieved again, or adopt a nonclassical logic. Multi-valued logic (mv-logic, in short) provides a solution to both reasoning under uncertainty and under inconsistency. For example, we can use unknown and no agreement as logic values. In fact, model-checkers based on three-valued and four-valued logics have already been studied. For example, [7] used a three-valued logic for interpreting results of model-checking with abstract interpretation, whereas [17] used four-valued logics for reasoning about abstractions of detailed gate or switch-level designs of circuits. For reasoning about dynamic properties of systems, we need to extend existing modal logics to the multi-valued case. Fitting [14] explores two different approaches for doing this: the first extends the interpretation of atomic formulae in each world to be multi-valued; the second also allows multi-valued accessibility relations between worlds. The latter approach is more general, and can readily be applied to the temporal logics used in model checking [10]. We use different multi-valued logics to support different types of analysis. For example, to model information from multiple sources, we may wish to keep track of the origin of each piece of information, or just the majority vote, etc. Thus, rather than restricting ourselves to any particular multi-valued logic, our approach is to extend classical symbolic model-checking to arbitrary multi-valued logics, as long as conjunction, disjunction and negation of the logical values are well defined. M. Chechik and her colleagues have done many excellent work along this line, see [7–11].

Our purpose is to develop automata-based model-checking techniques in multi-
valued setting. More precisely, the major design decision of this paper is as fol-

A lattice-valued automaton is adopted as the model of the systems. This is
reasonable since classical automata (or equivalent transition systems) are the com-
mon system models in classical model-checking. Linear-time properties of multi-
valued systems are checked in this paper. They are defined to be infinite sequences
of sets of atomic propositions, as in the classical case, with truth-values in a given
lattice. The key idea of the automata-based approach to model-checking is that we
use an auxiliary automaton to recognize the properties to be checked, and then
it is combined with the system under checking so that the problem of checking the
safety or $\omega$-properties of the system is reduced to checking some simpler (invari-
ant or persistence) properties of the larger system composed by the systems under
checking and the auxiliary automaton. A difference between the classical case
and the multi-valued case deserves a careful explanation. Since the law of non-
contradiction (i.e., $a \land \neg a = 0$) and the law of excluded middle (i.e., $a \lor \neg a = 1$)
do not hold in multi-valued logic, the present forms of many classical properties
in multi-valued logic must have some new forms, and some distinct constructions
need to be given in multi-valued logic.

As said in Ref. [2], the equivalences and preorders between transition sys-
tems that “corresponding” to linear temporal logic are based on traces inclusion
and equality, whereas for branching temporal logic such relations are based on
simulation and bisimulation relations. That is to say, the model checking of a
transition system $TS$ which represents the model of a system satisfying a linear
temporal formula $\varphi$, i.e., $TS \models \varphi$ is equivalent to checking the inclusion relation
$Traces(TS) \subseteq P$, where $Traces(TS)$ is the trace function of the transition system
$TS$ and $P$ is the temporal property representing the formula $\varphi$. In classical logic,
we know that $a \leq b$ if and only if $a \land \neg b = 0$ holds. Therefore, $TS \models \varphi$ if and only
if $Traces(TS) \cap \neg P = \emptyset$. Then, instead of checking $TS \models \varphi$ directly using the in-
clusion relation $Traces(TS) \subseteq P$, it is equivalent to the checking the emptiness of
the language $L(A) \cap L(A_{\neg \varphi})$ indirectly, where $A$ is a Büchi automaton repre-
senting the trace function of the transition system $TS$ (i.e., $L(A) = Traces(TS)$), and
$A_{\neg \varphi}$ is a Büchi automaton related to temporal property $\neg \varphi$ (i.e., $L(A_{\neg \varphi}) = \neg P$).

On the other hand, in mv-logic, $a \leq b$ is in general not equivalent to the
condition $a \land \neg b = 0$, the classical method to solve model checking of linear-time
properties does not universally apply to the multi-valued model checking. The
available methods of multi-valued model checking ([8]) still used the classical
method with some minor correction. That is, instead of checking of $TS \models P$
for a multi-valued linear time property $P$ using the inclusion of the trace function
$Traces(TS) \subseteq P$, the available method only checked the membership degree of the
language $L(A) \cap L(A_{\neg \varphi})$, where $A_{\neg \varphi}$ is a multi-valued Büchi automaton such that
$L(A_{\neg \varphi}) = \neg P$. As we know, these two methods are not equivalent in mv-logic.
Then, some new methods to apply multi-valued model checking of linear-time properties based on trace inclusion relations need to be developed.

We provide new results along this line. In fact, we shall give a method of multi-valued model checking of linear-time property directly using the inclusion of the trace function of $TS$ into a linear-time property $P$. In propositional logic, we know that we can use the implication connective $\rightarrow$ to represent the inclusion relation. In fact, in classical logic, we know that the implication connective can be represented by conjunction and negation connectives, that is, $a \rightarrow b = \neg a \lor b$. In this case, we know that $a \leq b$ if and only if $\neg a \lor b = 1$, if and only if $a \land \neg b = 0$, if and only if $a \rightarrow b = 1$. Then a natural problem arises: how to define implication connective in multi-valued logic? By the above analysis, it is not appropriate to use the implication connective defined in the form $a \rightarrow b = \neg a \lor b$ to represent the inclusion relation in multi-valued logic. In order to use implication connective to reflect the inclusion relation in $\text{mv}$-logic, we shall use implication connective $\rightarrow$ as a primitive connective in multi-valued logic as done in [16]. In this case, we will have that $a \leq b$ is equivalent to $a \rightarrow b = 1$ semantically. Then we can use implication connective to present the inclusion relation in multi-valued logic. This view will give a new idea to study linear-time properties in multi-valued model checking. Furthermore, we also show that we can use the classical model checking methods (such as SPIN and SMV) to solve the multi-valued model checking problem. In particular, some special and important multi-valued linear-time properties are introduced, which include safety, invariant, persistence and dual-persistence properties, and the related verification algorithms are also presented. In multi-valued systems, the verification of the mentioned properties have some different structures compared to their classical counterpart. In particular, since the law of non-contradiction and the law of excluded middle do not hold in multi-valued logic, the auxiliary automata used in the verification of multi-valued regular safety property and multi-valued $\omega$-regular property need to be deterministic, whereas nondeterministic automata do suffice for the classical cases.

There are at least two advantages of the method used in this paper. First, we use the implication connective as a primitive connective which can reflect the “trace inclusion” in multi-valued logic, i.e., $a \leq b$ if and only if $a \rightarrow b = 1$. Second, since there is a well-established multi-valued logic frame using the implication connective as a primitive connective ([16]), there will be a nice theory of multi-valued model checking, especially, model checking of linear-time property in $\text{mv}$-logic. Of course, this approach can be seen as another view on the study of multi-valued model checking.

The content of this paper is arranged as follows. We first recall some notions and notations in multi-valued logic systems in Section 2. In Section 3, the multi-valued linear-time properties are introduced. In particular, multi-valued regular safety property and multi-valued liveness property are introduced, then the reduc-
tion of model-checking of multi-valued invariant into classical one is presented. The verification of multi-valued regular safety property is discussed in Section 4. In Section 5, the verification of multi-valued \( \omega \)-regular property is shown. Some general consideration about the multi-valued model checking is discussed in Section 6, in which truth-valued degree of an mv-transition system satisfying a multi-valued linear-time property is introduced. Examples and case study illustrating the method of this article are presented in Section 7. The summary, comparisons and the future work are included in the conclusion part. We place some proofs of the propositions in this article in the Appendix parts for readability.

2. Multi-valued logic: some preliminaries

Let us first recall some notions and notations of multi-valued logic, which can be found in the literature [3, 4, 9, 16].

We start by presenting ordered sets and lattices which play a very important role in multi-valued logic.

**Definition 1.** A partial order, \( \leq \), on a set \( l \) is a binary relation on \( l \) such that for all \( x, y, z \in l \) the following conditions hold:

1. (reflexivity) \( x \leq x \).
2. (anti-symmetry) \( x \leq y \) and \( y \leq x \) implies \( x = y \).
3. (transitivity) \( x \leq y \) and \( y \leq z \) implies \( x \leq z \).

A partially ordered set, \((l, \leq)\), has a bottom (or the least) element if there exists \( 0 \in l \) such that \( 0 \leq x \) for any \( x \in l \). The bottom element is also denoted by \( \bot \). Dually, \((l, \leq)\) has a top (or the largest) element if there exists \( 1 \in l \) such that \( x \leq 1 \) for all \( x \in l \). The top element is also denoted as \( \top \).

**Definition 2.** A partially ordered set, \((l, \leq)\), is a lattice if the greatest lower bound and the least upper bound exist for any finite subset of \( l \).

Given lattice elements \( a \) and \( b \), their greatest lower bound is referred to as meet and denoted \( a \land b \), and their least upper bound is referred to as join and denoted \( a \lor b \). By Definition 2, a lattice \((l, \leq)\) has a top element 1 and a bottom element 0.

**Remark 1.** A complete lattice is a partially ordered set, \((l, \leq)\), in which the greatest lower bound and the least upper bound exist for any subset of \( l \). For a subset \( X \) of \( l \), its greatest lower bound and least upper bound are denoted by \( \land X \) or \( \lor X \), respectively.

**Definition 3.** A lattice \( l \) is distributive if and only if (in short, iff) one of the following (equivalent) distributivity laws holds,

\[
x \land (y \lor z) = (x \land y) \lor (x \land z), \quad x \lor (y \land z) = (x \lor y) \land (x \lor z).
\]
The join-irreducible elements are crucial for the use of distributive lattices in this article.

**Definition 4.** Let \( l \) be a lattice. Then \( x \in l \) is called *join-irreducible* if \( x \neq 0 \) and \( x = y \lor z \) implies \( x = y \) or \( x = z \) for all \( y, z \in l \).

If \( l \) is a distributive lattice, then a non-zero element \( x \in l \) is join-irreducible iff \( x \leq y \lor z \) implies that \( x \leq y \) or \( x \leq z \) for any \( y, z \in l \). We use \( JI(l) \) to denote the set of join-irreducible elements in \( l \). It is well-known that \( l \) is join-irreducible elements generated if \( l \) is a finite distributive lattice, that is, for any \( a \in l \), there exists a subset \( A \) of \( JI(l) \) such that \( a = \bigvee A \). In other words, every element of \( l \) can be written as a join of finite join-irreducible elements.

Furthermore, we present the definition of de Morgan algebra, also called quasi-Boolean algebra as in [9].

**Definition 5.** A *de Morgan algebra* is a tuple \((l, \leq, \land, \lor, \neg, 0, 1)\), such that \((l, \leq, \land, \lor, 0, 1)\) is a distributive lattice, and the negation \( \neg \) is a function \( l \to l \) such that \( x \leq y \) implies \( \neg y \leq \neg x \) and \( \neg \neg x = x \) for any \( x, y \in l \), \( \neg x \) is also called the (quasi-)complement of \( x \).

In a de Morgan algebra, the de Morgan laws hold, that is, \( \neg(x \lor y) = \neg x \land \neg y \) and \( \neg(x \land y) = \neg x \lor \neg y \). As well known, a Boolean algebra is a de Morgan algebra \( B \) with the additional conditions that for every element \( x \in B \),

- Law of Non-Contradiction: \( x \land \neg x = 0 \).
- Law of Excluded Middle: \( x \lor \neg x = 1 \).

**Example 2.** In Fig. 1, we present some examples of de Morgan algebras, where \( B_2, l_3 \) and \( l_5 \) are in linear order.

1. The lattice \( B_2 \) in Fig.1, with \( \neg 0 = 1 \) and \( \neg 1 = 0 \), gives us classical logic.
2. The three-valued logic \( l_3 \) is defined in Fig.1, where \( \neg F = T, \neg M = M \) and \( \neg T = F \).
3. The lattice \( B_2 \times B_2 \) in Fig. 1 shows the product algebra, where \( \neg(0, 0) = (1, 1), \neg(1, 0) = (0, 1), \neg(0, 1) = (1, 0) \) and \( \neg(1, 1) = (0, 0) \). This logic can be used for reasoning about disagreement between two knowledge sources.
4. The lattice \( l_3 \) in Fig.1 shows a five-valued logic and possible interpretations of its value as, \( T = \) Definitely true, \( L = \) Likely or weak true, \( M = \) Maybe or unknown, \( U = \) Unlikely or weak false, and \( F = \) Definitely false, where \( \neg T = F, \neg L = U, \neg M = M, \neg U = L, \) and \( \neg F = T \).
5. The lattice \( l_3 \times l_3 \) in Fig.1 shows a nine-valued logic constructed as the product algebra. Like \( B_2 \times B_2 \), this logic can be used for reasoning about disagreements between two sources, but also allows missing information in each source.
In the following, we always assume that $l$ is a de Morgan algebra, and it is also called an algebra.

Given an algebra $l$, now we can define multi-valued sets and multi-valued relations, which are sets or relations whose membership functions are multi-valued (take values in $l$). Multi-valued sets and multi-valued relations are basic data structures in multi-valued model checking introduced later in this paper.

**Definition 6.** Given an algebra $l$ and a classical set $X$, an $l$-valued set on $X$, referred as $f$, is a function $X \rightarrow l$.

When the underlying algebra $l$ is clear from context, we refer to an $l$-valued set just as multi-valued set (mv-set, in short). For an mv-set $f$ and an element $x$ in $X$, we will use $f(x)$ to define the membership degree of $x$ in $X$. In the classical case, this amounts to representing a set by its characteristic function.

Some operations on the mv-sets are defined in the following manners:
- **mv-intersection:** $(f \cap g)(x) \triangleq f(x) \land g(x)$.
- **mv-union:** $(f \cup g)(x) \triangleq f(x) \lor g(x)$.
- **set inclusion:** $f \subseteq g \triangleq \forall x. (f(x) \leq g(x))$.
- **extensional equality:** $f = g \triangleq \forall x. (f(x) = g(x))$.
- **mv-complement:** $\lnot f(x) \triangleq \lnot (f(x))$.

**Definition 7.** For a given algebra $l$, an $l$-valued relation $R$ on two sets $X$ and $Y$ is an $l$-valued set on $X \times Y$.

For any $l$-valued set $f : X \rightarrow l$, and for any $m \in l$, the $m$-cut of $f$ is defined as a subset $f_m$ of $X$, where
The support of $f$, denoted $\text{supp}(f)$, is a subset of $X$, where $\text{supp}(f) = \{ x \in X \mid f(x) > 0 \}$.

Then we have a resolution of $f$ by its cuts presented in the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.** For any $l$-valued set $f : X \to l$, we have

$$f = \bigcup_{m \in l} m \land f_m,$$

where $m \land f_m$ is an $l$-valued set defined as $m \land f_m(x) = m$ if $x \in f_m$ and $0$ in other cases. Furthermore, if $l$ is finite, then

$$f = \bigcup_{m \in \text{JI}(l)} m \land f_m.$$

The verification is simple, we omit its proof here. As a corollary, we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.** Given two $l$-valued sets $f, g : X \to l$, $f \leq g$ if and only if $f_m \subseteq g_m$ for every $m \in l$. Furthermore, if $l$ is finite, $f \leq g$ if and only if $f_m \subseteq g_m$ for every $m \in \text{JI}(l)$.

With these preliminaries, we can introduce some simple fact about multi-valued logic (mv-logic, in short).

Similar to that of classical first-order logic, the syntax of multi-valued or $l$-valued logic has three primitive connectives $\lor$ (disjunction), $\neg$ (negation) and $\to$ (implication), and one primitive quantifier $\exists$ (existential quantifier). In addition, we need to use some set-theoretical formulas. Let $\in$ (membership) be a binary (primitive) predicate symbol. Then $\subseteq$ and $\equiv$ (equality) can be defined with $\in$ as usual. The semantics of multi-valued logic is given by interpreting the connectives $\lor$ and $\neg$ as the operations $\lor$ and $\neg$ on $l$, respectively, and interpreting the quantifier $\exists$ as the least upper bound in $l$. Moreover, the truth value of set-theoretical formula $x \in A$ is $\left[ x \in A \right] = A(x)$. In the multi-valued logic, $1$ is the unique designated truth value; a formula $\phi$ is valid iff $[\phi] = 1$, and denoted by $\models_l \phi$.

In order to distinguish the symbols representing languages and the symbols representing lattices, we use symbol $l$ to represent a lattice. We use the symbols $a, b, c, d, k$ to represent the elements of $l$.

In this article, we only use multi-valued proposition formulae. We give their formal definition here.

**Definition 8.** Given a set of atomic proposition $AP$, multi-valued proposition formula (mv-proposition formula, in short) generated by $AP$ is defined as in BNF form:

$$\phi ::= A[r\phi_1 \lor \phi_2] \phi_1 \to \phi_2][\neg \phi,$$

where $r \in l$ and $A \in AP$.

The set of mv-proposition formulae is denoted by $l - AP$. 
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The induced operation on \( \text{mv-proposition formulae} \) are defined as follows,
\[
\phi_1 \land \phi_2 = \neg(\neg\phi_1 \lor \neg\phi_2), \quad \phi_1 \leftrightarrow \phi_2 = (\phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2) \land (\phi_2 \rightarrow \phi_1).
\]

For any valuation of atomic propositions \( v : \text{AP} \rightarrow l \), the truth-value of an \( \text{mv-proposition formula} \ \phi \) under \( v \) is an element in \( l \), denoted \( v(\phi) \), which is defined inductively as follows,
\[
v(\phi) = v(A) \text{ if } \phi = A \in \text{AP};
v(\phi) = r \text{ if } \phi = r \in l;
v(\phi_1 \lor \phi_2) = v(\phi_1) \lor v(\phi_2);
v(\neg\phi) = \neg v(\phi);
v(\phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2) = v(\phi_1) \rightarrow v(\phi_2) \) (see its definition as follows).
\]

To define the semantics of the implication in Definition 8, it needs the algebra \( l \) has an implication operator on it. There are at least two methods to determine the implication operator. First, it can be defined by other primitive connectives in \( \text{mv-logic system} \). For example, we can use \( a \rightarrow b = \neg a \lor b \) as a material implication to define the implication operator. In fact, in Ref.\[8, 9\], the implication operator is chosen in this form. The second choice of implication operator is chosen as a primitive connective in \( \text{mv-logic} \) which satisfies the condition \( a \rightarrow b = 1 \) whenever \( a \leq b \). In this paper, we shall use the second method to define the implication operator. Then we need \( l \) to be a residual lattice or Heyting algebra defined as follows.

**Definition 9.** Let \( l \) be a lattice. For any \( a, b \in l \), if there is an element \( a \rightarrow b \) in \( l \) satisfies the following condition,
\[
x \leq a \rightarrow b \text{ iff } x \land a \leq b,
\]
for any \( x \in l \), then \( l \) is called a residual lattice or Heyting algebra, and the operator \( \rightarrow \) is called the implication or the residual operator in \( l \).

For any complete lattice satisfying the infinite distributive law, i.e.,
\[
x \land (\vee_{i \in I} a_i) = \vee_{i \in I}(x \land a_i),
\]
l is a residual lattice, and the implication operator is defined as follows,
\[
a \rightarrow b = \vee \{c \in l | a \land c \leq b\}.
\]

For example, if \( l \) is in linear order, then \( a \rightarrow b = 1 \) if \( a \leq b \) and \( a \rightarrow b = b \) if \( a \geq b \); if \( l \) is a Boolean algebra, then \( a \rightarrow b = \neg a \lor b \). In particular, finite distributive lattice is a residual lattice.

In this case, the algebra \( l \) in this paper is also required to be a residual lattice, i.e., there is an additional implication operator \( \rightarrow \in l \) satisfying \( a \rightarrow b = 1 \) iff \( a \leq b \). This is the main difference of our method from those used in \[7-11\]. We shall give some analysis why we use the implication operator in the second form in Section 6.

For a set of proposition formulae \( \Phi \subseteq \text{AP} \), the characterization function of \( \Phi \) is a valuation \( v \) on \( \text{AP} \) such that \( v(A) = 1 \) if \( A \in \Phi \) and 0 otherwise. In this case, we write \( v(\phi) \) as \( \phi(\Phi) \).
Multi-valued temporal logic formulae have also been defined in some literatures. For further reading, we refer to [9].

3. Linear-time properties in multi-valued systems

In this section, we shall introduce several notions of linear-time properties in mv-logic, including multi-valued safety property, multi-valued invariant, multi-valued persistence property, dual multi-valued persistence property, and multi-valued liveness property. As the started point, let us first give the notion of multi-valued transition system, which is used to model the system under consideration.

3.1. Multi-valued transition systems and their trace functions

Transition systems or Kripke structures are the key models for model checking. Corresponding to multi-valued model checking, we shall have notion of multi-valued transition systems, which is defined as follows (for the notion of multi-valued Kripke structures, we refer to [9]).

**Definition 10.** A multi-valued transition system (mv-TS, for short) is a 6-tuple $TS = (S, Act, \rightarrow, I, AP, L)$, where (1) $S$ denotes a set of states; (2) $Act$ is a set of the names of actions; (3) $\rightarrow \subseteq S \times Act \times S \times l$ is a transition relation; (4) $I : S \rightarrow l$ is mv-initial states; (5) $AP$ is a set of (classical) atomic propositions, and (6) $L : S \rightarrow 2^{AP}$ is a labeling function.

$TS$ is called finite if $S$, $Act$, and $AP$ are finite.

We always assume that an mv-TS is finite in this paper.

Here, the labeling function $L$ is the same as that in classical case. In Ref. [9], it required that the labeling function was also multi-valued, that is, $L$ is a function from states set $S$ into $l^{AP}$, the later set denotes all $l$-valued sets of $AP$, also called $l$-powerset of $AP$. We shall show that they are equivalent as trace functions in Appendix I.

For convenience, we use $\eta(s, r, s') = r$ to represent $(s, \alpha, s', r) \in \rightarrow$. Intuitively, $\eta(r, \sigma, r')$ stands for the truth value of the proposition that action $\alpha$ causes the current state $r$ to become the next state $r'$. The intuitive behavior of an mv-transition system can be described as follows. The transition system starts in some initial state $s_0 \in I$ (in multi-valued logic) and evolves according to the transition relation $\rightarrow$. That is, if $s$ is the current state, then a transition $(s, \alpha, s', r) \in \rightarrow$ originating from $s$ is selected in mv-logic sense and taken, i.e., the action $\alpha$ is performed and the transition system evolves from state $s$ into the state $s'$ with truth value $r$. This selection procedure is repeated in state $s'$ and finishes once a state is encountered that has no outgoing transitions. (Note that $I$ may be empty; in that case, the transition system has no behavior at all as no initial state can be selected.) It is important to realize that in case a state has more than one outgoing transition,
next transition is chosen in a purely mv-logic fashion. That is, the outcome of this selection process is known with some truth-value prior, and, hence, the degree with which a certain transition is selected is given prior in mv-logic sense.

Let \( TS = (S, Act, \to, I, AP, L) \) be a transition system. A finite execution fragment (or a run) \( \varrho \) of \( TS \) is an alternating sequence of states and actions ending with a state

\[
\varrho = s_0\alpha_1s_1\alpha_2\cdots\alpha ns_n \text{ such that } \eta(s_i, \alpha_{i+1}, s_{i+1}) = r_{i+1} \text{ for all } 0 \leq i < n,
\]

where \( n \geq 0 \), with truth value \( v(\varrho) = I(s_0) \land r_1 \land r_2 \land \cdots \land r_n \). We refer to \( n \) as the length of the execution fragment \( \varrho \). An infinite execution fragment \( \rho \) of \( TS \) is an infinite, alternating sequence of states and actions:

\[
\rho = s_0\alpha_1s_1\alpha_2\cdots \text{ such that } \eta(s_i, \alpha_{i+1}, s_{i+1}) = r_{i+1} \text{ for all } 0 \leq i,
\]

with truth value \( v(\rho) = \bigwedge_{i \geq 0} r_i \), where \( r_0 = I(s_0) \).

For a finite executing fragment \( \varrho \) or an infinite execution fragment \( \rho \) of \( TS \), the corresponding finite sequence or infinite sequence of states, denoted \( \pi(\varrho) = s_0s_1\cdots s_n \) or \( \pi(\rho) = s_0s_1\cdots \), respectively, is called a path of \( TS \) corresponding to \( \varrho \) or \( \rho \).

In general, an infinite path or a computation of an mv-TS, \( TS \), is an infinite sequence of states (i.e., \( s_0s_1\cdots \)) such that \( s_0 \in I \) and \( \eta(s_i, \alpha_i, s_{i+1}) > 0 \) for some \( \alpha_i \). In order to describe an infinite sequence of states, we will use the function \( \pi : \mathbb{N} \to S \) defined as: \( \pi(i) \) is the \( i \)-th state in the sequence \( s_0s_1\cdots \). In the following, \( \pi \) will denote a path of mv-TS and \( \pi[i] \) will denote the actual sequence of states, that is, \( \pi[i] = \pi(i)\pi(i+1)\cdots \). We use \( \overline{\pi} \) to denote a finite fragment of \( \pi \).

Let \( TS = (S, Act, \to, I, AP, L) \) be an mv-TS, then for each \( s \in S \),

\[
\text{Paths}_{TS}(s) = \{ \pi : \mathbb{N} \to S |(\pi(0) = s)(\forall i \in \mathbb{N})(\exists \alpha_i \in Act)(\eta(\pi(i), \alpha_i, \pi(i+1)) > 0) \},
\]

which is the set of all infinite paths starting at state \( s \).

For \( T \subseteq S \), we write \( \text{Paths}_{TS}(T) = \bigcup_{s \in T} \text{Paths}_{TS}(s) \). Let \( \text{Paths}(TS) = \text{Paths}_{TS}(S) \).

Also, we define \( S_{inf} = \{ s \in S |\text{Paths}_{TS}(s) \neq \emptyset \} \). If the transition relation \( \to \) is total, that is, for all \( s \in S \), there exists \( \alpha \in Act \) and \( s' \in S \) such that \( \eta(s, \alpha, s') > 0 \), then we also call this \( TS \) without terminal state. In this case, \( S_{inf} = S \).

A trace is the sequence of labeling (or observation) corresponding to a path \( \pi \), \( L(\pi(0))L(\pi(1))\cdots \) which will be again denoted by \( L(\pi) \) or \( \text{trace}(\pi) \). The definition of the trace as function will be the composition of the map \( L \) and \( \pi \), i.e., the map \( L \circ \pi : \mathbb{N} \to 2^{AP} \). Let \( \text{Lang}(TS) = \{ L(\pi) | \pi \in \text{Paths}(TS) \} \). The \( l \)-language or multi-valued language (mv-language, in short) of the transition system \( TS \) over \( 2^{AP} \), which is also called the multi-valued trace function of \( TS \), is defined as a function from \( \text{Lang}(TS) \) into \( l \) as follows,

\[
\text{Traces}(TS)(L(\pi)) = \bigvee \{ v(\rho) | \text{the state sequence of } \rho \text{ is } \pi(\rho) \}.
\]

In fact, \( \text{Traces}(TS) \) registers sequence of the set of atomic propositions \( L(\pi) \) that are valid along the execution with truth value \( \text{Traces}(TS)(L(\pi)) \).
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Then we define a multi-valued trace function \( Traces(TS) : (2^{AP})^\omega \rightarrow l \), which is a multi-valued linear-time property over \( 2^{AP} \).

**Definition 11.** An *mv-linear-time property* (LT-property, in short) over the set of atomic propositions \( AP \) is an mv-subset of \( (2^{AP})^\omega \), i.e., \( P : (2^{AP})^\omega \rightarrow l \).

Mv-LT properties specify the traces that an mv-TS should exhibit. Informally speaking, one could say that an mv-LT property specifies the admissible (or desired) behavior of the system under consideration.

The fulfillment of an mv-LT property by an mv-TS is defined as follows.

**Definition 12.** For an mv-TS, \( TS \), and an mv-linear-time property \( P \), \( TS \models P \) if \( Traces(TS) \subseteq P \).

In mv-logic, even if \( TS \models P \) does not hold, i.e., \( Traces(TS) \subseteq P \) does not hold, we still have membership degree of the inclusion relation, denoted \( lMC(TS, P) \), which presents the degree of the inclusion of \( Traces(TS) \) into \( P \). The study of \( lMC(TS, P) \) is more general complex, we leave it in Section 6.

In the following, we will define several mv-linear-time properties including safety and liveness properties.

### 3.2. Multi-valued safety property

Safety properties are often characterized as “nothing bad should happen”. Formally, in classical case, safety property is defined as an LT property over \( AP \) such that any infinite word \( \sigma \) where \( P \) does not hold contains a bad prefix. Since it is difficult to define the notion of bad prefix in multi-valued logic, we use the dual notion of good prefixes to define multi-valued safety property here. Of course, they are equivalent in classical case. We need \( l \) to be complete in the following.

**Definition 13.** For an mv-linear-time property \( P : (2^{AP})^\omega \rightarrow l \), define an mv-language \( GPref(P) : (2^{AP})^* \rightarrow l \) as,

\[
GPref(P)(\theta) = \bigvee \{ P(\theta \sigma) | \sigma \in (2^{AP})^\omega \}
\]

for any \( \theta \in (2^{AP})^* \), which is called the good prefixes of \( P \).

\( P \) is called a safety property if

\[
\bigwedge \{ GPref(P)(\theta) | \theta \in Pref(\sigma) \} \leq P(\sigma)
\]

for any \( \sigma \in (2^{AP})^\omega \), where \( Pref(\sigma) = \{ \theta \in (2^{AP})^* | \sigma = \theta \sigma' \text{ for some } \sigma' \in (2^{AP})^\omega \} \) is called the prefix set of \( \sigma \).

Informally, mv-safety property can be characterized as “anything always good must happen”, which is equivalent to the saying “nothing bad should happen”.

Mv-safety property can be characterized by closure operator which is formally defined as follows.
**Definition 14.** For an mv-linear-time property $P$, the closure $\text{Closure}(P)$ of $P$ is an mv-linear-time property over $(2^\text{AP})^\omega$ defined as follows,

$$\text{Closure}(P)(\sigma) = \bigwedge \{ \lor_{\tau \in (2^\text{AP})^\omega} P(\theta \tau) | \theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma) \},$$

for any $\sigma \in (2^\text{AP})^\omega$.

By the definition of good prefixes, the following equality holds for any $\sigma$,

$$\text{Closure}(P)(\sigma) = \bigwedge \{ \text{GPre}_f(P)(\theta) | \theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma) \}.$$

**Proposition 5.** For mv-linear-time properties $P, P_1$ and $P_2$, we have (1) $P \subseteq \text{Closure}(P)$, (2) If $\text{Im}(P_1)$ and $\text{Im}(P_2)$ are finite subsets of $\text{I}$, then $\text{Closure}(P_1 \cup P_2) = \text{Closure}(P_1) \cup \text{Closure}(P_2)$, and (3) $\text{Closure} (\text{Closure}(P)) = \text{Closure}(P)$.

The proof is placed in Appendix II.

**Proposition 6.** For an mv-linear-time property $P$, $P$ is a safety property if and only if $P = \text{Closure}(P)$.

The proof is placed in Appendix III.

Another useful characterization of mv-safety property using finite trace function is as follows.

**Theorem 7.** Assume that $P$ is a safety property and $\text{TS}$ is an mv-TS, then $\text{TS} \models P$ if and only if $\text{Traces}_{\text{fin}}(\text{TS}) \subseteq \text{GPre}_f(P)$, where $\text{Traces}_{\text{fin}}(\text{TS}) : (2^\text{AP})^* \rightarrow \text{I}$ is defined by, $\text{Traces}_{\text{fin}}(\text{TS})(\theta) = \lor \{ \text{Traces}(\text{TS})(\theta \tau) | \tau \in (2^\text{AP})^\omega \}$ for any $\theta \in (2^\text{AP})^\omega$. $\text{Traces}_{\text{fin}}(\text{TS})$ is also called the finite trace function of $\text{TS}$.

**Proof:**

“If” part: We show $\text{Traces}(\text{TS}) \models P$ by contradiction. Assume that $\text{Traces}(\text{TS}) \not\models P$, then there exists $\sigma \in (2^\text{AP})^\omega$ such that $\text{Traces}(\text{TS})(\sigma) \not\models P(\sigma)$. Since $\text{Traces}(\text{TS})(\sigma) \leq \text{Traces}_{\text{fin}}(\text{TS})(\theta)$ for any $\theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma)$, it follows that $\text{Traces}_{\text{fin}}(\text{TS})(\theta) \not\models P(\sigma)$ for any $\theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma)$. On the other hand, since $P$ is safe, we have $\lor_{\theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma)} \text{GPre}_f(P)(\theta) \leq P(\sigma)$. Thus, it follows that $\text{Traces}(\text{TS})(\sigma) \not\models \lor_{\theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma)} \text{GPre}_f(P)(\theta)$. Then there is $\theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma)$ satisfying that $\text{Traces}(\text{TS})(\sigma) \not\models \text{GPre}_f(P)(\theta)$. By assumption, $\text{Traces}_{\text{fin}}(\text{TS}) \subseteq \text{GPre}_f(P)$, it follows that $\text{Traces}(\text{TS})(\sigma) \not\models \text{Traces}_{\text{fin}}(\text{TS})(\theta)$, a contradiction occurs.

“Only if” part: Assume that the relation $\text{Traces}_{\text{fin}}(\text{TS}) \subseteq \text{GPre}_f(P)$ does not hold. Then there exists $\theta \in (2^\text{AP})^*$ such that $\text{Traces}_{\text{fin}}(\text{TS})(\theta) \not\models \text{GPre}_f(P)(\theta)$. Since $\text{GPre}_f(P)(\theta) = \lor \{ P(\theta \tau) | \tau \in (2^\text{AP})^\omega \} = \lor \{ P(\sigma) | \theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma) \}$, it follows that $\text{Traces}(\text{TS})(\theta) \not\models P(\sigma)$ for any $\sigma \in (2^\text{AP})^\omega$ satisfying $\theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma)$. Noting that $\text{Traces}_{\text{fin}}(\text{TS})(\theta) = \lor \{ \text{Traces}(\text{TS})(\sigma) | \theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma) \}$, then there is $\sigma \in (2^\text{AP})^\omega$ satisfying $\theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma)$ such that $\text{Traces}(\text{TS})(\sigma) \not\models P(\sigma)$. This contradicts with the assumption that $\text{TS} \models P$. The proof is completed.

Let us introduce an important mv-safety property, which is called mv-invariant defined in the following manner.
Definition 15. Let $\varphi$ be an mv-proposition formula generated by atomic propositions in $AP$. A property $P : (2^{AP})^\omega \to I$ is said to be an invariant with respect to $\varphi$, if $P(A_0A_1A_2 \cdots) = \bigwedge_{i \geq 0} \varphi(A_i)$ for any $A_0A_1A_2 \cdots \in (2^{AP})^\omega$.

To make clarity, if $P$ is an invariant with respect to $\varphi$, we also write $P$ as $inv(\varphi)$.

If $P$ is an invariant with respect to $\varphi$, then $G Pref(P) : (2^{AP})^\omega \to I$ is defined by, $G Pref(P)(A_0A_1 \cdots A_k) = \bigvee \{P(A_0A_1 \cdots A_k \tau) | \tau \in (2^{AP})^\omega \} = \bigvee \{ \bigwedge_{i \geq 0} \varphi(A_i) \land P(\tau) | \tau \in (2^{AP})^\omega \}$. Hence, $\bigwedge_{\theta \in Pref(\varphi)} G Pref(P)(\theta) = P(\sigma) \land \bigvee \{P(\tau) | \tau \in (2^{AP})^\omega \} \leq P(\sigma)$ for any $\sigma \in (2^{AP})^\omega$. Therefore, an invariant must be a safety property.

Corollary 8. Mv-invariant is an mv-safety property.

For an mv-invariant $P = inv(\varphi)$, and a finite mv-TS, $TS = (S, Act, \rightarrow, I, AP, L)$, we give an approach to reduce the model checking $TS \models inv(\varphi)$ into several classical model checking of invariant properties.

For the given finite mv-TS, $TS = (S, Act, \rightarrow, I, AP, L)$, let $X = Im(I) \cup Im(\eta)$ and $l_1 = \langle X \rangle$, that is, $l_1$ is the subalgebra of $l$ generated by $X$, then $l_1$ is finite as a set ([28]). It is obvious that the behavior of $TS$ only takes values in $l_1$. For this reason, we can assume that $l = l_1$ is a finite lattice in the following section. As just said in Section 2, every element in $l$ can be represented as a join of some join-irreducible elements of $l$.

For the given transition system $TS = (S, Act, \rightarrow, I, AP, L)$ and for any $m \in II(I)$, write $TS_m = (S, Act, \rightarrow_m, I_m, AP, L)$, where $\rightarrow_m$ is the $m$-cut of $\rightarrow$, i.e., $\rightarrow_m = \{(s, \alpha, s') | \langle s, \alpha, s' \rangle \geq m \}$ and $I_m$ is the $m$-cut of $I$. Then $TS_m$ is a classical transition system. By Proposition[3] we have $Traces(TS) = \bigcup_{m \in II(I)} m \land Traces(TS_m)$.

For an mv-proposition formula $\varphi$ generated by atomic proposition set $AP$, if we take $q_m = \bigvee \{ A \in 2^{AP} | \varphi(A) \geq m \}$, then $q_m$ is a classical proposition formula. The classical safety property corresponding to $q_m$, denoted $inv(\varphi_m)$, is, $inv(\varphi_m) = \{A_0A_1 \cdots | \forall i. A_i \models inv(\varphi) \} = \{A_0A_1 \cdots \models \bigwedge_{i \geq 0} \varphi(A_i) \geq m \}$. Noting that $inv(\varphi)_m = \{A_0A_1 \cdots | \forall i. \varphi(A_i) \geq m \} = \{A_0A_1 \cdots \models \bigwedge_{i \geq 0} \varphi(A_i) \geq m \} = \{A_0A_1 \cdots \models \forall i. \varphi(A_i) \geq m \}$, thus $inv(\varphi)_m = inv(\varphi_m)$. In this case, by Proposition[3] we have $inv(\varphi) = \bigcup_{m \in II(I)} m \land inv(\varphi)_m = \bigcup_{m \in II(I)} m \land inv(\varphi_m)$.

By Proposition[3], we have the following observations:

$TS \models inv(\varphi)$ iff $Traces(TS) \subseteq inv(\varphi)$ iff for all $m \in II(I)$, $Traces(TS)_m \subseteq inv(\varphi)_m$, iff for all $m \in II(I)$, $TS_m \models inv(\varphi)_m$, iff for all $m \in II(I)$, $s \models inv(\varphi)_m$ for all states $s \in Reach(TS_m)$, iff for all $m \in II(I)$, $L(s) \models inv(\varphi)_m$ (in proposition logic) for all states $s \in Reach(TS_m)$, where Reach($TS_m$) denotes all the states reachable from the initial state in $l_m$. 14
There are classical algorithms based on depth-first or width-first graph search to realize $TS_m \models \text{inv}(\varphi_m)$ in Ref. [2], and since $JI(l)$ is finite, then we can reduce the mv-model checking $TS \models \varphi$ into finite (in fact, at most $|JI(l)|$) times of classical model-checking.

**Remark 9.** The algorithm that implements the above reduction procedure is placed in Algorithm 1. The classical model checker of invariant properties is applied at most $|JI(l)|$ times. It might seem that the worst running time occurs when the lattice $I$ is in linear order, but even in that case we can optimize by performing binary search. That is, we first check the element in the middle of the lattice and then we recurse on the upper and lower half according to the result. In this case, the algorithm will apply the model checker $O(\log(|JI(l)|))$ times.

```
Algorithm 1: (Algorithm for the multi-valued model checking of an invariant)
Input: An mv-transition system TS and an mv-proposition formula $\varphi$.
Output: return true if $TS \models \text{inv}(\varphi)$. Otherwise, return a maximal element $x$ plus a counterexample for $\varphi_x$.
Set $A := JI(l)$ (*The initial $A$ is the set of join-irreducible elements of $I$*)
While ($A \neq \emptyset$) do
  $x \leftarrow$ the maximal element of $A$ (*$x$ is one of the maximal element of $A$*)
  if $TS_x \models \text{inv}(\varphi_x)$, (*check if $TS_x \models \text{inv}(\varphi_x)$ (using classical algorithm) is satisfied *)
    then
      $C := \{y \in A | y \leq x\}$
      $A := A - C$
      else
        Return $x$ plus a counterexample for $\varphi_x$ (*if $TS_x \not\models \text{inv}(\varphi_x)$, then there is a counterexample for $\varphi_x$ *)
  fi
od
Return true
```

3.3. *Multi-valued liveness properties*

Compared to safety properties, “liveness” properties state that something good will happen in the future. Whereas safety properties are violated in finite time, i.e., by a finite system run, liveness properties are violated in infinite time, i.e., by infinite system runs. Related to multi-valued safety property, we have multi-valued liveness property here.
**Definition 16.** An mv-linear-time property $P : (2^AP)^\omega \rightarrow l$ is called a liveness property if supp($\text{Closure}(P)$) = $(2^AP)^\omega$.

Similar to classical liveness property, we have the following proposition linking mv-safety and mv-liveness.

**Proposition 10.** For any mv-linear-time property $P : (2^AP)^\omega \rightarrow l$, there exist mv-safety property $P_{safe}$ and mv-liveness property $P_{live}$ such that $P = P_{safe} \cap P_{live}$.

**Proof:** In fact, if we let $P_{safe} = \text{Closure}(P)$, and $P_{live} = P \cup ((2^AP)^\omega - \text{supp}(\text{Closure}(P)))$, then $P = P_{safe} \cap P_{live}$ and supp($\text{Closure}(P_{live})$) = $(2^AP)^\omega$.

In the following, let us give some useful mv-liveness property used in this paper.

**Definition 17.** Let $\varphi$ be an mv-proposition formula generated by atomical proposition formulae $AP$, then the mv-persistence property over $AP$ with respect to $\varphi$ is an mv-linear time property $P : (2^AP)^\omega \rightarrow l$ defined by,

$$P(A_0A_1\cdots) = \bigvee_{i \geq 0} \bigwedge_{j \geq 1} \varphi(A_i).$$

Formula $\varphi$ is called a persistence (or state) condition of $P$. To emphasize the formula $\varphi$, $P$ is also denoted by $\text{pers}(P)$, i.e.,

$$\text{pers}(\varphi)(A_0A_1\cdots) = \bigvee_{i \geq 0} \bigwedge_{j \geq 1} \varphi(A_i).$$

Since we will use temporal modalities to characterize the mv-persistence property, let us recall the semantics of two temporal modalities $\Diamond$ (“eventually”, sometimes in the future) and $\square$ (“always”, from now on forever) which are defined as follows, for $A_0A_1\cdots \in (2^AP)^\omega$, and a proposition formula $\psi$ generated by atomic formulae $AP$,\n
$$A_0A_1\cdots \models \Diamond \psi \text{ iff } \exists j \geq 0.A_j \models \psi;$$

$$A_0A_1\cdots \models \square \psi \text{ iff } \forall j \geq 0.A_j \models \psi;$$

$$A_0A_1\cdots \models \Diamond \Diamond \psi \text{ iff } \forall i \geq 0.\exists j \geq i.A_j \models \psi;$$

$$A_0A_1\cdots \models \Diamond \square \psi \text{ iff } \exists i \geq 0.\forall j \geq i.A_j \models \psi.$$

Now we give a characterization of mv-persistence property by its cuts. As the cut of $\text{pers}(\varphi)$, it is readily to verify that, for any $m \in JI(l)$,

$$\text{pers}(\varphi)_m = \text{pers}(\varphi_m).$$

where $\text{pers}(\varphi_m)$ is the classical persistence property w.r.t. proposition formula $\varphi_m$ generated by atomic propositions $AP$, i.e.,

$$\text{pers}(\varphi_m) = \{A_0A_1\cdots \in ((2^AP)^\omega | \exists i \geq 0.\forall j \geq i.A_j \models \varphi_m\}.$$

Using the temporal operators, the above equality can be written as

$$\text{pers}(\varphi_m) = \{\sigma \in (2^AP)^\omega | \sigma \models \Diamond \Diamond \varphi_m\}.$$

By Proposition[3], we have the following resolution:

$$\text{pers}(\varphi) = \bigcup_{m \in JI(l)} m \land \text{pers}(\varphi_m).$$

Then for an mv-TS, $TS$, by Proposition[4] we have,
TS ⊨ pers(ϕ) iff \( \text{Traces}(TS) \subseteq \text{pers}(\varphi) \) iff \( \forall m \in JI(l) \), \( \text{Traces}(TS) \subseteq \text{pers}(\varphi_m) \), iff \( \forall m \in JI(l) \), \( TS \models \text{pers}(\varphi_m) \).

Then the mv-model checking \( TS \models \text{pers}(\varphi) \) can be reduced to at most \(|JI(l)|\) times of classical model checking \( TS_m \models \text{pers}(\varphi_m) \) for any \( m \in JI(l) \). There are a nested depth-first search algorithm to verify \( TS_m \models \text{pers}(\varphi_m) \) ([2]). Then the mv-model checking \( TS \models \text{pers}(\varphi) \) can be reduced to classical model checking.

We present the above reduction procedure in Algorithm 2. For simplicity, we only write the different part of Algorithm 2 compared to Algorithm 1. Remark 9 is also applied to Algorithm 2.

**Algorithm 2**: (Algorithm for the multi-valued model checking of a persistence property)

- **Input**: An mv-transition system \( TS \) and an mv-proposition formula \( \varphi \).
- **Output**: return true if \( TS \models \text{pers}(\varphi) \). Otherwise, return a maximal element \( x \) plus a counterexample for \( \varphi_x \).

Replace \( TS_x \models \text{inv}(\varphi_x) \) by \( TS_x \models \text{pers}(\varphi_x) \) in the body of Algorithm 1.

Mv-persistence property \( \text{pers}(\varphi) \) is an mv-liveness property. In fact, by Proposition 5 (2), \( \text{Closure}(\text{pers}(\varphi)) = \text{Closure}(\bigcup_{m \in JI(l)} m \land \text{pers}(\varphi_m)) = \bigcup_{m \in JI(l)} m \land \text{Closure}(\text{pers}(\varphi_m)) = \bigcup_{m \in JI(l)} m \land (2^{\text{AP}}) \omega = (2^{\text{AP}}) \omega \).

The dual notion of mv-persistence property is called mv-dual persistence property, which is defined as follows.

**Definition 18.** Let \( \varphi \) be an mv-proposition formula generated by atomic proposition formulae \( \text{AP} \), then the mv-dual persistence property over \( \text{AP} \) with respect to \( \varphi \) is an mv-linear time property \( P : (2^{\text{AP}}) \omega \rightarrow l \) defined by,

\[
P(A_0 A_1 \cdots) = \bigwedge_{i \geq 0} \bigvee_{j \geq i} \varphi(A_j).
\]

Formula \( \varphi \) is called a dual-persistence (or state) condition of \( P \). To emphasize the formula \( \varphi \), \( P \) is also denoted by \( \text{dpers}(P) \), i.e.,

\[
\text{dpers}(\varphi)(A_0 A_1 \cdots) = \bigwedge_{i \geq 0} \bigvee_{j \geq i} \varphi(A_j).
\]

The dual of \( \text{pers} \) and \( \text{dpers} \) is shown in the following proposition, which can be checked by a simple calculation.

**Proposition 11.** \( \text{dpers}(\varphi) = \neg \text{pers}(\neg \varphi) \).

Similarly to the property of \( \text{pers}(\varphi) \), we have some observations on the property of mv-dual persistence.

As the cuts of \( \text{dpers}(\varphi) \), it is readily to verify that, for any \( m \in JI(l) \),

\[
\text{dpers}(\varphi)_m = \text{dpers}(\varphi_m)
\]

where \( \text{dpers}(\varphi_m) \) is the dual of the notion of persistence property w.r.t. proposition formula \( \varphi_m \) generated by atomic propositions \( \text{AP} \), i.e.,
\[
dpers(\varphi_m) = \{A_0A_1 \cdots \in (2^{\mathbb{AP}})^{\omega} | \forall i \geq 0. \exists j \geq i. A_j \models \varphi_m \}.
\]
Then \( \text{dpers}(\varphi_m) = \neg \text{pers}(\neg \varphi_m) \). Using the temporal operators, we have
\[
dpers(\varphi_m) = \{ \sigma \in (2^{\mathbb{AP}})^{\omega} | \sigma \models \Box \Diamond \varphi_m \}.
\]
By Proposition 3, it follows that
\[
dpers(\varphi) = \bigcup_{m \in J(I[l])} m \land \text{dpers}(\varphi_m).
\]
Then for an mv-TS, TS, by Proposition 4, we have,
\[
\text{TS} \models \text{dpers}(\varphi) \iff \text{Traces}(\text{TS}) \subseteq \text{dpers}(\varphi) \iff \forall m \in J(I[l]), \text{Traces}(\text{TS}_m) \subseteq \text{dpers}(\varphi_m) \iff \forall m \in J(I[l]), \text{TS}_m \models \text{dpers}(\varphi_m).
\]
Then the mv-model checking \( \text{TS} \models \text{dpers}(\varphi) \) can be reduced to at most \( |J(I[l])| \) times of classical model checking \( \text{TS}_m \models \text{dpers}(\varphi_m) \) for any \( m \in J(I[l]) \). As is well known, to check \( \text{TS}_m \models \text{dpers}(\varphi_m) \), it suffices to analyze the bottom strongly connected components (BSCCs) in \( \text{TS}_m \) as a graph, which will be done in linear time. That is to say, \( A_0A_1 \cdots \models \Box \Diamond B \) for a state subset \( B \subseteq S \), iff \( T \cap B \neq \emptyset \) for each BSCC \( T \) that is reachable from \( s_0 \), where \( L(s_0) = A_0 \) and \( s_0 \in I_m \). For the detail, we refer to Ref. [2].

We present the above reduction procedure in Algorithm 3. Remark 9 is also applied to Algorithm 3.

**Algorithm 3**: (Algorithm for the multi-valued model checking of a dual-persistence property)

Input: An mv-transition system \( \text{TS} \) and an mv-proposition formula \( \varphi \).

Output: return true if \( \text{TS} \models \text{dpers}(\varphi) \). Otherwise, return a maximal element \( x \) plus a counterexample for \( \varphi \).

Replace \( \text{TS}_x \models \text{inv}(\varphi_x) \) by \( \text{TS}_x \models \text{dpers}(\varphi_x) \) in the body of Algorithm 1.

### 4. The verification of mv-regular safety property

In this and the next section, we shall give some methods of model checking of multi-valued safety properties. We shall introduce an automata approach to check mv-regular safety property by reducing it to checking some invariant properties of certain large system. In order to do this, let us first introduce the notion of finite automaton in multi-valued logic systems, which are also called lattice-valued finite automaton in this paper, please refer to Ref. [29–31].

**Definition 19.** An \( l \)-valued finite automaton (\( l \)-VFA for short) is a 5-tuple \( \mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, I, F) \), where \( Q \) denotes a finite set of states, \( \Sigma \) a finite input alphabet, and \( \delta \) an \( l \)-valued subset of \( Q \times \Sigma \times Q \), that is, a mapping from \( Q \times \Sigma \times Q \) into \( l \), and it is called the \( l \)-valued transition relation. Intuitively, \( \delta \) is an \( l \)-valued (ternary) predicate over \( Q, \Sigma \) and \( Q \), and for any \( p, q \in Q \) and \( \sigma \in \Sigma \), \( \delta(p, \sigma, q) \) stands for the truth value of the proposition that input \( \sigma \) causes state \( p \) to become \( q \). \( I \) and \( F \)
are \( l \)-valued subsets of \( Q \); that is, a mapping from \( Q \) into \( l \), which represent the initial state and final state, respectively. For each \( q \in Q \), \( I(q) \) indicates the truth value (in the underlying \( \text{mv-logic} \)) of the proposition that \( q \) is an initial state, \( F(q) \) expresses the truth value of the proposition that \( q \) is a final state.

The language accepted by an \( l \)-VFA \( \mathcal{A} \), which is an \( \text{mv-language} \) \( L(\mathcal{A}) : \Sigma^* \to l \), is defined as follows, for any word \( w = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_k \in \Sigma^* \),

\[
L(\mathcal{A})(w) = I(q_0) \land \bigwedge_{i=0}^{k-1} \delta(q_i, \sigma_{i+1}, q_{i+1}) \land F(q_k) \land q_i \in Q \text{ for any } i \leq k.
\]

For an \( l \)-language \( f : \Sigma^* \to l \), if there exists an \( l \)-VFA \( \mathcal{A} \) such that \( f = L(\mathcal{A}) \), then \( f \) is called an \( l \)-valued regular language or \( \text{mv-regular language} \) over \( \Sigma \).

**Definition 20.** (c.f. [29]) An \( l \)-valued deterministic finite automaton (\( l \)-VDFA for short) is a 5-tuple \( \mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F) \), where \( Q, \Sigma \) and \( F \) are the same as those in an \( l \)-valued finite automaton, \( q_0 \in Q \) is the initial state, and the lattice-valued transition relation \( \delta \) is crisp and deterministic; that is, \( \delta \) is a mapping from \( Q \times \Sigma \) into \( Q \).

The language accepted by an \( l \)-VDFA \( \mathcal{A} \) has a simple form, that is, for any word \( w = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_k \in \Sigma^* \), let \( q_{i+1} = \delta(q_i, \sigma_{i+1}) \) for any \( 0 \leq i \leq k-1 \), then

\[
L(\mathcal{A})(w) = F(q_k).
\]

Note that our definition of \( l \)-VDFA differs from the usual definition of a deterministic finite automaton only in that the final states form an \( l \)-valued subset of \( Q \). This, however, makes it possible to accept words to certain truth degrees (in the underlying \( \text{mv-logic} \)), and thus to recognize \( \text{mv-languages} \).

**Proposition 12.** ([29–31]) \( l \)-VFA and \( l \)-VDFA are equivalent.

For an mv-safety property \( P \), if its good prefixes \( \text{GPre} f(P) \) is an \( \text{mv-regular language} \) over \( 2^{\text{AP}} \), then \( P \) is called an \( \text{mv-regular safety property} \). For an \( \text{mv-regular safety property} \) \( P \), we assume that \( \mathcal{A} \) is an \( l \)-VFA accepting the good prefixes of \( P \), i.e., \( L(\mathcal{A}) = \text{GPre} f(P) \). This is a main difference with the traditional setting of transition systems where nondeterministic (finite-state or Büchi) automata do suffice. The main reason is that we do not have the following implication in multi-valued logic,

\[
A \leq B \text{ iff } A \land \neg B = \emptyset.
\]

So we need to verify \( A \leq B \) directly instead of checking \( A \land \neg B = \emptyset \) as in classical case.

Now we give an approach to construct a new \( \text{mv-TS} \) from an \( \text{mv-TS} \) and an \( l \)-VFA.

**Definition 21.** Let \( TS = (S, \text{Act}, \rightarrow, I, AP, L) \) be an \( \text{mv-transition system} \) without terminal states and \( \mathcal{A} = (Q, 2^{\text{AP}}, \delta, q_0, F) \) be an \( l \)-VFA with alphabet \( 2^{\text{AP}} \), the \text{product transition system} \( TS \otimes \mathcal{A} \) is defined as follows:
$TS \otimes \mathcal{A} = (S', \text{Act}, \rightarrow', \ell', AP', L')$,
where $S' = S \times Q$, $\rightarrow'$ is the smallest relation defined by the rule: if $(s, \alpha, t, r) \in \rightarrow$ (i.e., $\eta(s, \alpha, t) = r$) and $\delta(q, L(t)) = p$, then $((s, q), \alpha, (t, p), r) \in \rightarrow'$ (i.e., $\eta'(((s, q), \alpha, (t, p))) = r$); $I'(s_0, q) = I(s_0)$ if $\delta(q_0, L(s_0)) = q$; $AP' = Q$ and $L' : S' \rightarrow 2^{AP'}$ is given by $L'(s, q) = \{q\}$.

Then for any $m \in I(l)$, it can be readily verified that $(TS \otimes \mathcal{A})_m = TS_m \otimes \mathcal{A}$.

Since $\mathcal{A}$ is deterministic, $TS \otimes \mathcal{A}$ can be viewed as the unfolding of $TS$ where the automaton component $q$ of the state $(s, q)$ in $TS \otimes \mathcal{A}$ records the current state in $\mathcal{A}$ for the path fragment taken so far. More precisely, for each (finite or infinite) path fragment $\pi = s_0s_1 \cdots$ in $TS$, there exists a unique run $q_0q_1 \cdots$ in $\mathcal{A}$ for $\text{trace}(\pi) = L(s_0)L(s_1) \cdots$ and $\pi' = (s_0, q_1)(s_1, q_2) \cdots$ is a path fragment in $TS \otimes \mathcal{A}$. Vice versa, every path fragment in $TS \otimes \mathcal{A}$ which starts in state $(s, \delta(q_0, L(s)))$ arises from the combination of a path fragment in $TS$ and a corresponding run in $\mathcal{A}$. Note that the $l$-V DFA $\mathcal{A}$ does not affect the degree of trace function. That is, for each path $\pi'$ in $TS \otimes \mathcal{A}$ and its corresponding path $\pi$ in $TS$, $\text{Traces}(TS \otimes \mathcal{A}) (\text{trace}(\pi')) = \text{Traces}(TS)(\text{trace}(\pi))$. Then we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 13.** (The verification of mv-regular safety property) For an mv-TS, $TS$, over $AP$, let $P$ be an mv-regular safety property over $AP$ such that $L(\mathcal{A}) = \text{GPre}_f(P)$ for an l-V DFA $\mathcal{A}$ with alphabet $2^{AP}$. The following statements are equivalent:

1. $TS \models P$;
2. $\text{Traces}_{\text{fin}}(TS) \subseteq L(\mathcal{A})$;
3. $TS \otimes \mathcal{A} \models \text{inv}(\varphi)$, where $\varphi = \bigvee_{q \in Q} F(q)q$.

**Proof:** The equivalence of (1) and (2) has been shown. To the end, it suffices to prove (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) and (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1).

For the (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1) part. If $TS \not\models P$. Then there exists a path $\pi = s_0s_1s_2 \cdots$ in $TS$ with finite fragment $\overline{\pi} = s_0 \cdots s_n$ such that $\text{Traces}(TS)(\sigma) \not\subseteq \text{GPre}_f(\overline{\sigma}) = L(\mathcal{A})(\overline{\sigma})$, where $\sigma = \text{trace}(\pi) = L(\pi)$ and $\overline{\sigma} = \text{trace}(\overline{\pi})$. Then there is an accepting run $q_0 \cdots q_{n+1}$ in $\mathcal{A}$ for $\overline{\sigma}$. Accordingly, $\delta(q_i, L(s_i)) = q_{i+1}$ for any $i \geq 0$ and $L(\mathcal{A})(\overline{\sigma}) = F(q_{n+1})$. Thus, $\text{Traces}(TS)(\sigma) \not\subseteq F(q_{n+1})$. It follows that $\pi' = (s_0, q_1)(s_1, q_2) \cdots (s_n, q_{n+1}) \cdots$ is an infinite path in $TS \otimes \mathcal{A}$ with $\text{inv}(\varphi)(L'(\pi')) = \text{inv}(\varphi)([q_1][q_2] \cdots) = \bigwedge_{i \geq 1} F(q_i) \not\subseteq F(q_{n+1})$. Since $\text{Traces}(TS)(\sigma) \not\subseteq F(q_{n+1})$ and $\text{Traces}(TS \otimes \mathcal{A})(L'(\pi')) = \text{Traces}(TS)(\sigma)$, it follows that $\text{Traces}(TS \otimes \mathcal{A})(L'(\pi')) \not\subseteq \text{inv}(\varphi)(L'(\pi'))$. Hence, $TS \otimes \mathcal{A} \not\models \text{inv}(\varphi)$.

For the (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) part. Assume that $TS \otimes \mathcal{A} \not\models \text{inv}(\varphi)$. Then there exists a path $\pi' = (s_0, q_1)(s_1, q_2) \cdots$ such that $TS \otimes \mathcal{A}(L'(\pi')) \not\subseteq \text{inv}(\varphi)(L'(\pi')) = \bigwedge_{i \geq 1} F(q_i)$. Then there exists $n$ such that $TS \otimes \mathcal{A}(L'(\pi')) \not\subseteq F(q_{n+1}) = L(\mathcal{A})(\overline{\pi})$, where $\overline{\pi} = s_0 \cdots s_n$ is a finite fragment of $\pi = s_0s_1 \cdots$ in $TS$ corresponding to $\pi'$. Furthermore, $\delta(q_i, L(s_i)) = q_{i+1}$ for all $i \geq 0$. It follows that $q_0 \cdots q_{n+1}$ is an accepting run
for the trace \((s_0 \cdots s_n) = L(s_0) \cdots L(s_n) = L(\overline{\pi})\) and \(\text{Traces}(TS)(L(s_0)L(s_1) \cdots) = \text{Traces}(TS \otimes A)(L(s_0, q_1)L'(s_1, q_2) \cdots) \not\subseteq F(q_{n+1}) = L(A)(L(s_0) \cdots L(s_n))\). Hence, \(\text{Traces}_{\text{fin}}(TS)(L(\overline{\pi})) \not\subseteq L(A)(L(\overline{\pi}))\). This shows that \(\text{Traces}_{\text{fin}}(TS) \not\subseteq L(A)\). \(\square\)

**Remark 14.** By Theorem 13, for a regular safety property \(P\), it suffices to check \(TS \not\models P\), where \(A\) is an \(\omega\)-V DFA satisfying \(L(A) = G^{\text{Pre}}_{\omega}(P)\), and \(\varphi = \bigvee F(q)q\). For the latter verification, we can use Algorithm 1 presented in this paper.

### 5. The verification of \(\omega\)-regular property

Now we further study some methods of model checking of multi-valued \(\omega\)-regular properties. We need the notion of Büchi automata in multi-valued logic, which can be found in Ref. [25]. We present this notion with some minor changes.

**Definition 22.** An \((\omega\)-Büchi automaton \((\omega\)-V BA, in short) is a 5-tuple \(A = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, I, F)\) which is the same as an \((\omega\)-VFA, the difference is the language accepted by \(A\), which is an \(\omega\)-language \(L_\omega(A) : \Sigma^\omega \to I\) defined as follows for any infinite sequence \(w = \sigma_1\sigma_2 \cdots \in \Sigma^\omega\),

\[
L_\omega(A)(w) = \bigvee \{l(q_0) \land \bigwedge_{i \geq 0} \delta(q_i, \sigma_{i+1}, q_{i+1}) \land \bigwedge_{i \in J} F(q_i) | q_i \in Q \text{ for any } i \geq 0, \text{ and } J \subseteq \mathbb{N} \text{ is an infinite subset of non-negative integers}\}.
\]

For an \(\omega\)-language \(f : \Sigma^\omega \to I\), if there exists an \(\omega\)-VBA \(A\) such that \(f = L_\omega(A)\), then \(f\) is called an \(\omega\)-regular language over \(\Sigma\).

In an \(\omega\)-VBA \(A = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, I, F)\), if \(\delta\) and \(I\) are crisp, i.e., the image set of \(\delta\) and \(I\), denoted \(Im(\delta)\) and \(Im(I)\) respectively, is a subset of \(\{0, 1\}\), i.e., \(Im(\delta) \subseteq \{0, 1\}\) and \(Im(I) \subseteq \{0, 1\}\), then \(A\) is called simple. In this case, we also write \(Q_0 = \{q \in Q | l(q) = 1\}\) and \(\delta(q, \sigma) = \{q \in Q | \delta(q, \sigma, p) = 1\}\).

If \(A\) is a simple \(\omega\)-VBA, then for any input \(w = \sigma_1\sigma_2 \cdots \in \Sigma^\omega\), we have

\[
L_\omega(A)(w) = \bigvee \{l(q_0) \land \bigwedge_{j \geq 0} \delta(q_j, \sigma_{j+1}, q_{j+1}) \land \bigwedge_{j \in J} F(q_j) | q_j \in Q_0, q_j \in \delta(q_{j-1}, \sigma_j) \text{ for any } j \geq 1, \text{ and } J \subseteq \mathbb{N} \text{ is an infinite subset}\}.
\]

We shall show that \(\omega\)-VBA is equivalent to a simple \(\omega\)-VBA in the following.

Assume that \(A = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, I, F)\) is an \(\omega\)-VBA. Let \(X = Im(I) \cup Im(\delta)\), which is finite subset of \(l\), and write \(l_1\) the sublattice of \(l\) generated by \(X\). Then \(l_1\) is finite as a set since \(l\) is a distributive lattice. Construct a simple \(\omega\)-VBA as, \(A' = (Q', \Sigma, \delta', Q_0', F')\), where \(Q' = Q \times l_1\), and \(\delta' : Q' \times \Sigma \to 2^{Q'}\) is defined as,

\[
\delta'((q, r), \sigma) = \{(p, s) | s = r \land \delta(q, \sigma, p) \neq 0 \text{ for } p \in Q\};
\]

\(Q_0' = \{(q, r) | r \in l(q) \neq 0\}\), and \(F' : Q' \to I\) is, \(F'(q, r) = r \land F(q)\) for any \((q, r) \in Q'\).

For the new \(\omega\)-VBA, \(A'\), for any input \(w = \sigma_1\sigma_2 \cdots\),

\[
L_\omega(A')(w) = \bigvee \{l(q_0, r_0) \land \bigwedge_{j \geq 1} F'(q_j, r_j) | (q_0, r_0) \in Q_0', (q_j, r_j) \in \delta'((q_{j-1}, r_{j-1}), \sigma_j) \text{ for any } j \geq 1, \text{ and } J \subseteq \mathbb{N} \text{ is an infinite subset}\}.
\]

By a simple calculation, we can obtain that
\[ L_\omega(\mathcal{A})(w) = \bigvee \{ \bigwedge_{j \in I} I(q_0) \wedge \delta(q_0, \sigma_1, q_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge \delta(q_{i-1}, \sigma_j, q_j) \wedge F(q_j) \mid q_i \in Q \text{ for any } i \geq 0 \text{ and } J \subseteq N \text{ is an infinite subset} \} = \bigvee \{ I(q_0) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \geq 0} \delta(q_i, \sigma_{i+1}, q_{i+1}) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \geq 0} F(q_i) \mid q_i \in Q \text{ for any } i \geq 0 \text{ and } J \subseteq N \text{ is an infinite subset of non-negative integers} \} = L_\omega(\mathcal{A})(w). \]

Therefore, \( L_\omega(\mathcal{A}) = L_\omega(\mathcal{A}') \), \( \mathcal{A} \) and \( \mathcal{A}' \) are equivalent.

A simple l-VBA is called deterministic, if \( Q_0 = \{ q_0 \} \) is a single set and \( \delta : Q \times \Sigma \to Q \) is deterministic. As in classical case, there is an l-VBA which is not equivalent to any deterministic l-VBA.

In the case of deterministic l-VBA, the product of an mv-TS and a deterministic l-VBA can also defined as before for the product of mv-TS and an l-VDFA. The technique for mv-regular safety properties can be roughly adopted.

**Theorem 15.** *(The verification of mv-\( \omega \)-regular property using persistence)* Let \( TS \) be an mv-TS without terminal states over \( AP \) and let \( P \) be an mv-\( \omega \)-regular property over \( AP \) such that \( L_\omega(\mathcal{A}) = \neg P \) for a deterministic l-VBA \( \mathcal{A} \) with the alphabet \( 2^\omega \). Then the following statements are equivalent:

1. \( TS \models P \);
2. \( TS \otimes \mathcal{A} \models \text{pers}(\varphi) \), where \( \varphi = \bigvee_{q \in Q} \neg F(q) q \).

**Proof** For an infinite path \( s_0s_1 \cdots \) in \( TS \), since \( \mathcal{A} \) is deterministic, \( q_{i+1} = \delta(q_i, L(s_i)) \) is unique for any \( i \geq 0 \). Then it follows that \( P(L(s_0)L(s_1) \cdots) = \neg L_\omega(\mathcal{A})(L(s_0)L(s_1) \cdots) = \neg(\bigvee_{i \geq 0} \bigwedge_{j \geq i} F(q_j)) = \bigvee_{i \geq 0} \bigwedge_{j \geq i} \neg F(q_j) \). On the other hand, \( \text{pers}(\varphi)(L(s_0, q_1) L(s_1, q_2) \cdots) = \text{pers}(\varphi)(q_1 q_2 \cdots) = \bigvee_{i \geq 1} \bigwedge_{j \geq i} \neg F(q_i) = \bigvee_{i \geq 0} \bigwedge_{j \geq i} \neg F(q_i) \). This shows that \( P = \text{pers}(\varphi) \). Noting that \( \text{Traces}(TS)(L(s_0) L(s_1) \cdots) = \text{Traces}(TS \otimes \mathcal{A})(L(s_0, q_1) L(s_1, q_2) \cdots) \), it follows that \( \text{Traces}(TS) = \text{Traces}(TS \otimes \mathcal{A}) \). Hence, condition (1) and condition (2) are equivalent. \( \square \)

Dual to the above theorem, we can solve \( TS \models P \) using an mv-dual persistence property.

**Theorem 16.** *(The verification of mv-\( \omega \)-regular property using dual-persistence)* Let \( TS \) be an mv-TS without terminal states over \( AP \) and let \( P \) be an mv-\( \omega \)-regular property over \( AP \) which can be recognized by a deterministic l-VBA \( \mathcal{A} \) with the alphabet \( 2^\omega \). Then the following statements are equivalent:

1. \( TS \models P \);
2. \( TS \otimes \mathcal{A} \models \text{dpers}(\varphi) \), where \( \varphi = \bigvee_{q \in Q} F(q) q \).

**Remark 17.** Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 can be used for the verification \( TS \models P \) as presented in Theorem 15 and Theorem 16.

Since there are mv-\( \omega \)-regular properties which are not recognized by any deterministic l-VBA, the above theorem does not apply to the verification of all mv-\( \omega \)-regular properties. To relax this restriction, we shall introduce another approach to the verification of mv-\( \omega \)-regular properties. For this purpose, we first introduce...

---
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the notion of mv-deterministic Rabin automaton, which is called l-valued determin-
ministic Rabin automaton here.

**Definition 23.** An l-valued deterministic Rabin automaton (l-VDRA, in short) is
a tuple $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, \mathcal{F})$, where $Q$ is a finite set of states, $\Sigma$ an alphabet, $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \to Q$ the transition function, $q_0 \in Q$ the starting state, and $\mathcal{F} : 2^Q \times 2^Q \to l$.

A run for $\sigma = A_0 A_1 \cdots \in \Sigma^\omega$ denotes an infinite sequence $\rho = q_0 q_1 \cdots$ for states in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\delta(q_i, A_i) = q_{i+1}$ for $i \geq 0$. The run $\rho$ is accepting if there exists a pair $(H, K) \in 2^Q \times 2^Q$ such that $\mathcal{F}(H, K) > 0$ and

$$\exists n \geq 0. \forall m \geq n.q_m \notin H \land (\forall n \geq 0. \exists m \geq n.q_m \in K).$$

The accepted language of $\mathcal{A}$ is a mapping $L_\omega(\mathcal{A}) : \Sigma^\omega \to l$, for any $\sigma = A_0 A_1 \cdots \in \Sigma^\omega$.

$$L_\omega(\mathcal{A})(\sigma) = \{ \mathcal{F}(H, K) \mid \text{there exists an accepting run } \rho = q_0 q_1 \cdots \text{ such that } (\exists n \geq 0. \forall m \geq n.q_m \notin H) \land (\forall n \geq 0. \exists m \geq n.q_m \in K).$$

**Theorem 18.** The class of mv-$\omega$-languages accepted by l-VDRAs is equal to the
class of mv-$\omega$-regular languages (those accepted by l-VBAs).

We place the proof of this theorem at Appendix IV.

Assume that $\text{supp}(\mathcal{F}) = \{(H_1, K_1), \cdots, (H_m, K_m)\}$ in the following.

For an mv-transition system $TS = (S, Act, \to, I, AP, L)$ and an mv-VDRA $\mathcal{A} = (Q, 2^{AP}, \delta, q_0, \mathcal{F})$, the product transition system $TS \otimes \mathcal{A}$ is defined as follows:

$$TS \otimes \mathcal{A} = (S', Act, \to', I', AP', L'),$$

where $S' = S \times Q$, $\to'$ is the smallest relation defined by the rule: if $(s, \alpha, t, r) \in \to$ (i.e., $\eta(s, \alpha, t) = r$) and $\delta(q, L(t)) = p$, then $((s, q), \alpha, (t, p), r) \in \to'$ (i.e., $\eta'((s, q), \alpha, (t, p)) = r)$; $I'(s_0, q) = I(s_0)$ if $\delta(q_0, L(s_0)) = q$; $AP' = 2^Q$ and $L' : S' \to 2^{AP'}$ is
given by $L'(s, q) = \{H \in AP' \mid q \in H \}$. In the following, we write $\uparrow q = \{H \in AP' \mid q \in H\}$. Let

$$\{r_1, \cdots, r_m\} \text{ if } \mathcal{F}_{[r_i]} = \{(H, K) \mid \mathcal{F}(H, K) = r_i\} \left\{ \{H_{j_1}, K_{j_1}\}, \cdots, \{H_{j_m}, K_{j_m}\} \right\},$$

A related mv-($\tau$-)proposition formula about $\mathcal{A}$ is,

$$\varphi = \bigvee_{i=1}^m r_i \land \left( \bigvee_{i=1}^m [\varphi \square K_{j_i}] \land (\varphi \square K_{j_i}) \right).$$

The corresponding mv-linear-time property over $2^{AP'}$ is a mapping $d(\mathcal{A}) : (2^{AP'})^\omega \to l$, which is defined as,

$$d(\mathcal{A})(A_0 A_1 \cdots) = \bigvee \langle r_i \rangle [\exists i. (1 \leq i \leq m_i). (A_0 A_1 \cdots [\varphi \square H_{j_i}] \land (\varphi \square K_{j_i})) = \bigvee \langle r_i \rangle [\exists i. (1 \leq i \leq m_i). (\exists n \geq 0. \forall m \geq n. A_m \not\models H_{j_i}) \land (\forall n \geq 0. \exists m \geq n. A_m \models K_{j_i}) = \bigvee \langle r_i \rangle [\exists i. (1 \leq i \leq m_i). (\exists n \geq 0. \forall m \geq n. H_{j_i} \not\models A_m) \land (\forall n \geq 0. \exists m \geq n. K_{j_i} \models A_m)] \right\}.$$

**Theorem 19.** (Verification of mv-$\omega$-regular property)

Let $TS$ be an mv-transition system over $AP$ without terminal states, and let $P$
be an mv-$\omega$-regular property over $AP$ such that $L_\omega(\mathcal{A}) = P$ for some mv-VDRA $\mathcal{A}$. Then the following statements are equivalent:
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(1) $TS \models P$.
(2) $TS \otimes \mathcal{A} \models d(\mathcal{A})$.

**Proof** For a path $\pi' = (s_0, q_1)(s_1, q_2) \cdots$ in $TS \otimes \mathcal{A}$, its projection to its first com-
ponent $\pi = s_0s_1 \cdots$ is a path in $TS$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is deterministic, the corresponding
from $\pi'$ to $\pi$ is a one-to-one and onto mapping from the set $\text{Paths}(TS \otimes \mathcal{A})$ to
the set $\text{Paths}(TS)$. To finish the proof, it suffices to show that the following two
equations hold.

(i) $\text{Traces}(TS \otimes \mathcal{A})(L'(\pi')) = \text{Traces}(TS)(L(\pi))$.

(ii) $d(\mathcal{A})(L'(\pi')) = L_\omega(\mathcal{A})(L(\pi))$.

Let us prove the first equality. By the definition of $TS \otimes \mathcal{A}$, we know

$\text{Traces}(TS \otimes \mathcal{A})(L'(\pi')) = \bigvee_i [\lambda \geq 0 r_i] \text{ there exists } \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \cdots \in \text{Act}_i, \pi_i = (s_0, q_1)(s_1, q_2) \cdots \in (Q')^\omega, r_0 = I(s_0)$ and $\eta'(\langle s_i, q_i'\rangle, \alpha_{i+1}, (s_{i+1}, q_{i+2})) = r_{i+1}$ for any $i \geq 0$ and $L'(\pi') = L(\pi_i)$.

Noting that $L'(\pi') = L'(\pi_i)$ if and only if $\uparrow q_i \uparrow q'_i$ for any $i$ and $d(q_0, L(s_0)) = q_1$. Since $\uparrow q_i \uparrow q'_i$ if and only if $q_i = q'_i$ by the definition of the operation $\uparrow$, it follows that the run $\pi'$ is unique defined by the project run $\pi = s_0s_1 \cdots$. By the definition of $TS \otimes \mathcal{A}$, we know $r_0 = I(s_0) = I'(s_0q_1)$, and $r_{i+1} = \eta'(\langle s_i, q_i+1\rangle, \alpha_{i+1}, (s_{i+1}, q_{i+2})) = \eta(s_i, \alpha_{i+1}, s_{i+1})$. Hence,

$\text{Traces}(TS \otimes \mathcal{A})(L'(\pi')) = \bigvee_i [\lambda \geq 0 r_i] \text{ there exists } \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \cdots \in \text{Act}_i, \pi_i = s_0s_1 \cdots \in S_0^\omega, r_0 = I(s_0)$ and $\eta(s_i, \alpha_{i+1}, s_{i+1}) = r_{i+1}$ for any $i \geq 0$ and $L(\pi) = L(\pi_i)$.

Therefore, $\text{Traces}(TS \otimes \mathcal{A})(L'(\pi')) = \text{Traces}(TS)(L(\pi))$.

For the second equation, we know that

$d(\mathcal{A})(L'(\pi')) = \bigvee_i [r_i] \text{ there exists } i, 1 \leq i \leq m, L'(\pi') \models \diamondsquare H_{ji} \land \square \diamond K_{ji} = \bigvee_i [F(H_{ji}, K_{ji})] L'(\pi') \models \diamondsquare H_{ji} \land \square \diamond K_{ji} = \bigvee_i [F(H, K)] L'(\pi') \models \diamondsquare H \land \square \diamond K$.

Noting that $L'(\pi') = \uparrow q_1 \uparrow q_2 \cdots$ and $d(q_0, L(s_0)) = q_1$. Then $L'(\pi') \models \diamondsquare H \land \square \diamond K$ if and only if $\uparrow q_1 \uparrow q_2 \cdots \models \diamondsquare H \land \square \diamond K$ if and only if $\exists n \geq 0.4m \geq n. \uparrow q_m \models H \land \forall n \geq 0.3m \geq n. \uparrow q_m \models K$ if and only if $\exists n \geq 0.4m \geq n. q_m \not\in H \land \forall n \geq 0.3m \geq n. q_m \in K$ if and only if $\forall \uparrow q_m \models H \land \forall q_m \in K$ if and only if $\forall \uparrow q_m \models H \land \forall q_m \not\in K$ for any $m \geq n \not\in H$.

Hence, $\text{Traces}(TS \otimes \mathcal{A})(L'(\pi')) = L_\omega(\mathcal{A})(L(\pi))$.

Therefore, $d(\mathcal{A})(L'(\pi')) = L_\omega(\mathcal{A})(L(\pi))$. $\square$

The verification of $TS \otimes \mathcal{A} \models d(\mathcal{A})$ can also be reduced to the classical model checking. Since $d(\mathcal{A})(L'(\pi')) = \bigvee [F(H, K)] L'(\pi') \models \diamondsquare H \land \square \diamond K$. It follows that $TS \otimes \mathcal{A} \models d(\mathcal{A})$ iff, for any $m \in J(I)$, $(TS \otimes \mathcal{A})_m \models \diamondsquare H \land \square \diamond K$ for those $(H, K)$ such that $m \leq F(H, K)$.

Then the verification of $TS \otimes \mathcal{A} \models d(\mathcal{A})$ reduces to finite times of classical model checking.
As is well known ([2]), \((TS \otimes A)_m \models \diamond \Box \neg H \land \Box \diamond K \text{ iff } (s, q_s) \models \diamond U\), where \(q_s = \delta(q_0, L(s))\) for some \(q_0 \in I_m\), and \(U\) is the union of all accepting BSCCs in the graph of \((TS \otimes A)_m\). A BSCC \(T\) in \((TS \otimes A)_m\) is accepting if it fulfills the acceptance condition \(\mathcal{F}\). More precisely, \(T\) is accepting iff there exists some \((H, K) \in \mathcal{F}_m\) such that

\[
T \cap (S \times H) = \emptyset \text{ and } T \cap (S \times K) \neq \emptyset.
\]

Stated in words, there is no state \((s, q) \in T\) such that \(q \in H\) and for some state \((t, q') \in T\) it holds that \(q \in K\).

This result suggests determining the BSCCs in the product transition system \((TS \otimes A)_m\) to check which BSCC is accepting (i.e. determine \(U\)). This can be performed by a standard graph analysis. To check whether a BSCC is accepting amounts to check all \((H, K) \in \mathcal{F}_m\). The overall complexity of this procedure is \(O(|JI(l)| \times \text{poly}(\text{size}(TS), \text{size}(A)))\) where \(\text{size}(TS) = |S| + |\text{supp}(\eta)|\), and \(\text{size}(A) = |Q| + |\text{supp}(\delta)|\).

The related algorithm is presented in Algorithm 4. Remark [9] is also applied to Algorithm 4.

**Algorithm 4:** (Algorithm for the multi-valued model checking of an mv-\(\omega\)-regular property)

Input: An mv-transition system \(TS\) and an mv-\(\omega\)-regular property \(P\) which can be accepted by an \(l\)-VDRA \(A\).

Output: return true if \(TS \models P\). Otherwise, return a maximal element \(x\) plus a counterexample for \(P_x\).

Set \(A := JI(l)\) (*The initial \(A\) is the set of join-irreducible elements of \(l^*\)*) While \((A \neq \emptyset)\) do

\[
x \leftarrow \text{the maximal element of } A\quad (*x\text{ is one of the maximal element of } A^*\)
\]

\[
\mathcal{F}_x = \{(H, K) \mid \mathcal{F}((H, K)) \geq x\} \quad (**\mathcal{F}_x\text{ is the }x\text{-cut of }\mathcal{F}**)\)

if \((TS \otimes A)_x \models \bigwedge_{(H, K) \in \mathcal{F}_x} \diamond \Box \neg H \land \Box \diamond K\), then

\[
C := \{y \in A \mid y \leq x\}
\]

\[A := A - C\]

else

Return \(x\) plus a counterexample for \((TS \otimes A)_x \not\models \diamond \Box \neg H \land \Box \diamond K\) for some \((H, K) \in \mathcal{F}_x\) (*if \((TS \otimes A)_x \not\models \bigwedge_{(H, K) \in \mathcal{F}_x} \diamond \Box \neg H \land \Box \diamond K\), then there is a counterexample for \((TS \otimes A)_x \not\models \diamond \Box \neg H \land \Box \diamond K\) for some \((H, K) \in \mathcal{F}_x^*\)*)

fi

Return true

However, as in classical model checking, we have the following corollary.
Corollary 20. The mv-model checking problem for mv-transition systems is PSPACE-complete.

6. Truth-valued degree of multi-valued model-checking

Another view and a more general picture of mv-model checking is focused on the membership degree of mv-model checking as studied in Ref. [8]. Let us recall its formal definition as follows.

Definition 24. Let \( P \) be an mv-linear-time property, and \( TS \) an mv-TS. Then the multi-valued model checking function is defined as,

\[
lMC(TS, P) = \bigcap_{\sigma \in (2^\mathbb{AP})^\omega}(\sigma \in \text{Traces}(TS) \rightarrow \sigma \in P),
\]

where \( \rightarrow \) is the implication operator in mv-logic.

Informally, the possibility of an mv-TS satisfying an mv-linear-time property \( P \), i.e., \( lMC(TS, P) \), is the inclusion degree of \( \text{Traces}(TS) \) into \( P \) as two mv-linear-time properties. In the definition of \( lMC(TS, P) \), the choice of the implication operator \( \rightarrow \) is in its first importance. As we said in the end of Section 2, there are two methods to determine the implication operator. First, it can be defined by primitive connectives in mv-logic system. For example, we can use \( a \rightarrow b = \neg a \vee b \) to define the implication operator. In fact, in Ref. [8], the implication operator is chosen in this form. They had some nice algebraic properties. However, this definition can not grasp the essential of the function \( lMC(TS, P) \) as indicating the inclusion degree of \( \text{Traces}(TS) \) into \( P \) as two trace functions. In fact, intuitively, if \( TS \models P \), we should have \( lMC(TS, P) = 1 \). But if we choose \( a \rightarrow b = \neg a \vee b \), we would not get \( lMC(TS, P) = 1 \) even if \( TS \models P \). For example, in 3-valued logic, \( l \) is \( l_3 \) as shown in Fig. 1 if we choose \( \text{Traces}(TS) = P \equiv \frac{1}{2} \), where \( P \equiv \frac{1}{2} \) means that \( P(\sigma) = \frac{1}{2} \) for any \( \sigma \in (2^\mathbb{AP})^\omega \), then \( TS \models P \). However, since \( \frac{1}{2} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} = \neg \frac{1}{2} \vee \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \), we would get \( lMC(TS, P) = \frac{1}{2} \) but not \( lMC(TS, P) = 1 \). The second choice of implication operator is chosen \( \rightarrow \) as a primitive connective in mv-logic which satisfies the condition \( a \rightarrow b = 1 \) whenever \( a \leq b \) as we adopt in the paper. In this case, we need that \( l \) is also a residual lattice. As said in Section 2, this is not the restricted case. In fact, any finite De Morgan algebra is a residual lattice with implication operator defined as,

\[
a \rightarrow b = \bigvee \{ c | a \wedge c \leq b \}.
\]

For example, if \( l \) is in linear order, then \( a \rightarrow b = 1 \) if \( a \leq b \) and \( a \rightarrow b = b \) if \( a > b \); if \( l \) is a Boolean algebra, then \( a \rightarrow b = \neg a \vee b \) as in the first case.

In particular, if \( l = 2 \), then 

\[ MC(TS, P) = lMC(TS, P). \]

The following proposition is simple, we present it here without proof.
Proposition 21. Let $TS_1, TS_2$ be two mv-TS, $P_1, P_2$ are two mv-linear-time properties. Then

1. $lMC(TS, P) = 1$ if and only if $TS \models P$.
2. $lMC(TS, P_1 \cap P_2) = lMC(TS, P_1) \cap lMC(TS, P_2)$.
3. $lMC(TS, P_1) \lor lMC(TS, P_2) \leq lMC(TS, P_1 \cup P_2)$.
4. $lMC(TS_1 + TS_2, P) = lMC(TS_1, P) \land lMC(TS_2, P)$, where, for $TS_i = (S_i, Act, \rightarrow_i, I_i, L_i) (i = 1, 2)$, $TS_1 + TS_2$ is $(S, Act, \rightarrow, I, L)$. In $TS_1 + TS_2$, $S = S_1 \times [1] \cup S_2 \times [2]$.

\[
\eta((s, i), \alpha, (t, j)) = \begin{cases} 
\eta(s, \alpha, t), & \text{if } i = j \\
0, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
I_i((s, j)) = \begin{cases} 
I_i(s), & \text{if } i = j \\
0, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

and $L_i((s, i)) = L_i(s)(i = 1, 2)$.

We give an approach to calculate $lMC(TS, P)$. Since $lMC(TS, P) = \bigwedge\{m \in JI(l) | m \leq lMC(TS, P)\}$, to calculate $lMC(TS, P)$, it suffices to decide whether $lMC(TS, P) \geq m$ for $m \in l$. Some analysis is presented as follows.

For $m \in l$, to decide $lMC(TS, P) \geq m$. Observing that $lMC(TS, P) \geq m$

to decide $m \leq lMC(TS, P)$. Since

\[
lMC(TS, P) \geq m \iff \\
\bigwedge\{Traces(TS)(\sigma) \rightarrow P(\sigma) | \sigma \in (2^AP)^{\omega}\} \geq m,
\]

iff

\[
\forall \sigma (2^AP)^{\omega}, m \leq Traces(TS)(\sigma) \rightarrow P(\sigma),
\]

iff

\[
\forall \sigma (2^AP)^{\omega}, m \land Traces(TS)(\sigma) \leq P(\sigma).
\]

For $TS = (S, Act, \rightarrow, I, AP, L)$ and $m \in L$, let $m \land TS = (S, Act, \rightarrow, I \land m, AP, L)$, where $I \land m : Q \rightarrow l$ is defined as, $I \land m(q) = I(q) \land m$ for any $q \in Q$. Then we have

$Traces(m \land TS) = Traces(TS) \land m$.

Hence, we have the following observation:

\[
\forall \sigma (2^AP)^{\omega}, m \leq Traces(TS)(\sigma) \rightarrow P(\sigma)
\]

iff

$Traces(m \land TS) \subseteq P$

iff

$m \land TS \models P$.

Thus, $lMC(TS, P) \geq m$ iff $m \land TS \models P$. We have presented algorithms to decide $m \land TS \models P$ in Section 4 and Section 5, then it is decidable whether $lMC(TS, P) \geq m$ holds for any $m \in JI(l)$.
The related algorithm for the calculating of $lMC(TS, P)$ is presented as follows.

**Algorithm 5:** (Algorithm for calculating $lMC(TS, P)$)

Input: An mv-transition system $TS$ and an mv-linear-time property $P$.
Output: the value of $lMC(TS, P)$.

Set $A := JI(l)$ (*The initial $A$ is the set of join-irreducible elements of $l*$)
$B := \emptyset$

While ($A \neq \emptyset$) do
  $x \leftarrow$ the maximal element of $A$ (*$x$ is one of the maximal element of $A$*)
  if $x \land TS \models P$, (*check if $x \land TS \models P$ (using Algorithm 1-4) is satisfied *)
    then
      $C := \{ y \in A \mid y \leq x \}$
      $B := B \cup C$
      $A := A - C$
    else
      $A := A - \{ x \}$
  fi
od

Return "$lMC(TS, P) = " \lor B"

7. Illustrative examples and case study

Up to now, we have presented the theoretical part of model-checking of linear-time properties in multi-valued logic. In this section, we give some examples to illustrate the methods of this article. First, we give an example to illustrate the constructions of this article. Then a case study is given.

7.1. An example

We now give an example to illustrate the construction of this article. Note that this is a demonstrative rather than a case study aimed at showing the scalability of our approach or the quality of the engineering.

Consider the example of mv-transition system (in fact, mv-Kripke structure, which can be considered as an mv-transition system with only one internal action $\tau$) of the abstracted module Button introduced in Ref.[9, 11] in 3-valued logic, which is presented in Fig. 2, where $l$ is the $l_3$ in Fig. 1. This transition system has five states, $s_0, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4$, and the transition function is classical, i.e., with values in Boolean algebra $B_2 = \{0, 1\}$, here 0=F, 1=T. For convenience, we only give those transitions with non-zero membership values (as labels of the edge of the graph) in the following graph representations of mv-transition systems and
l-VDFA. For simplicity, we only write those values of the labels of the edges (corresponding to mv-transition) which is M. If there is no label of the edges in the mv-transition systems, its value is T. The labeling function of mv-transition system is multi-valued, and there is only one internal action $\tau$, the atomic propositions set is $AP = \{\text{button, pressed, reset}\}$.

First, we transform this transition into its equivalent mv-TS with ordinary labeling function as we have done in Appendix I, which is presented in Fig. 3. In Fig. 3, $b, p$ and $r$ are short for the atomic propositions “button”, “pressed”, and “reset”, respectively.

An mv-linear-time property $P : (2^{AP})^\omega \rightarrow l$ is defined by, for any $A_0A_1 \cdots \in (2^{AP})^\omega$,

$$P(A_0A_1 \cdots) = \begin{cases} T, & \text{if } A_0 = \emptyset, A_1 = \{b\} \text{ and } A_i \neq \{b, p, r\} \text{ for any } i > 1 \\ M, & \text{if } A_0 = \emptyset, A_1 = \{b\} \text{ and } A_i = \{b, p, r\} \text{ for some } i > 1 \\ F, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then the good prefixes of $P$, $GPref(P) : (2^{AP})^\ast \rightarrow l$, is,

$$GPref(P)(A_1 \cdots A_k) = \begin{cases} T, & \text{if } k = 0 \text{ or } k = 1 \text{ and } A_1 = \emptyset \\ T, & \text{if } k \geq 2, A_1 = \emptyset, A_2 = \{b\} \text{ and } A_i \neq \{b, p, r\} \\ & \text{for any } i \leq k \\ M, & \text{if } k > 2 \text{ and } A_1 = \emptyset, A_2 = \{b\} \text{ and } A_i = \{b, p, r\} \\ & \text{for some } i \leq k \\ F, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It can be readily verified that $\bigwedge\{GPref(P)(\theta) | \theta \in Pref(\sigma)\} = P(\sigma)$ for any $\sigma \in (2^{AP})^\omega$, so $P$ is an mv-safety property. $GPref(P)$ is regular since it can be recognized by an l-VDFA $\mathcal{A}$ as presented in Fig. 4. In $\mathcal{A}$, the mv-final state $F$ is defined as, $F(q_0) = F(q_1) = F(q_2) = F(q_3) = T$, and $F(q_4) = M$, as shown in Fig. 4.

![Figure 2: State machine of the abstracted module Button in Ref. 9](image-url)
Figure 3: Equivalent state machine $T$ in Fig. 2 with ordinary labeling function

Figure 4: An $l$-VDFA $\mathcal{A}$ which can recognize $GPref(P)$
Then the product transition system $TS \otimes \mathcal{A}$ is presented in Fig. 5.

In the product transition system $TS \otimes \mathcal{A}$, the labeling function is defined by $L'(s, q) = \{q\}$ for any state $(s, q)$, and $\varphi = q_1 \lor q_2 \lor q_3 \lor M_q$. It can be observed that $L'(\text{Reach}(TS \otimes \mathcal{A})_M) = \{q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4\}$, $L'(\text{Reach}(TS \otimes \mathcal{A})_T) = \{q_1, q_2, q_3\}$, $\varphi_M = q_1 \lor q_2 \lor q_3 \lor q_4$ and $\varphi_T = q_1 \lor q_2 \lor q_3$. It is easily checked that, for any $\alpha = M$ or $T$, for any $(s, q) \in \text{Reach}(TS \otimes \mathcal{A})_s$, $L'(s, q) = \{q\} \models \varphi_s$. By Theorem [13] it follows that $TS \otimes \mathcal{A} \models inv(\varphi)$ and thus $TS \models P$.

However, if we take $P' = P \land M$, that is, $P'(\sigma) = P(\sigma) \land M$ for any $\sigma \in (\mathcal{A})^\omega$, $P'$ is also an mv-safety property. If we change $F$ in the above $\mathcal{A}$ into $F'$, where $F'(q) = M$ for any state $q$, and remain the other parts unchanged, then we obtain a new $l$-VDFA $\mathcal{A}'$ such that $L(\mathcal{A}') = GPref(P')$. In this case, the proposition formula $\varphi$ changes into $\varphi' = M_{q_0} \lor M_{q_1} \lor M_{q_2} \lor M_{q_3} \lor M_{q_4}$ in $TS \otimes \mathcal{A}'$. Then $TS_M \models inv(\varphi'_M)$ but $TS_T \not\models inv(\varphi'_T)$. Since $\varphi'_T = \bot$ and $(s_1, q_3) \in \text{Reach}(TS \otimes \mathcal{A'})_T$ but $L'(s_1, q_3) = \{q_3\} \not\models \bot = \varphi'_T$, which is a counterexample for the mv-model checking $TS \not\models P'$.

On the other hand, it is readily verified that $M \land TS \models P'$ but $TS \not\models P'$. Hence $lMC(TS, P') = M$ (by Algorithm 5).

To apply Algorithm 4, we modify the $l$-VDFA in Fig. 4 to make it an $l$-VDRA $\mathcal{B}$, where $F : \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F} \rightarrow l$ is defined as, $F(\emptyset, \{q_1, q_2, q_3\}) = T$, $F(\{q_4\}, \{q_1, q_2, q_3\}) = M$, and $\bot$ in other cases. Then $F_{[T]} = (\emptyset, \{q_1, q_2, q_3\}) = \{(H_1, K_1)\}$, $F_{[M]} = (\{q_4\}, \{q_1, q_2, q_3\}) = \{(H_2, K_2)\}$. The corresponding mv-$\omega$-regular property $P'' = L_\omega(\mathcal{B})$ is defined as follows, for $\sigma = A_0A_1 \cdots$,
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\[
P''(\sigma) = \begin{cases} 
T, & \text{if } A_0 = \emptyset, A_1 = \{b\} \text{ and } A_2 = \{b, p, r\} \\
T, & \text{if } A_0 = \emptyset, A_1 = \{b\}, \text{and there exists } k \geq 2 \text{ such that } A_j \neq \{b, p, r\} \\
M, & \text{if } A_0 = \emptyset, A_1 = \{b\} \text{ and } A_i = \{b, p, r\} \text{ for any } i \geq 2 \\
F, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

The structure of the product \(TS \otimes B\) is the same as those in Fig. 5 except the labeling function.

Using Algorithm 4, it is easily checked that \((TS \otimes B)_T \models \Diamond \Box \neg H_1 \land \Box \Diamond K_1\) but \((TS \otimes B)_M \not\models \Diamond \Box \neg H_2 \land \Box \Diamond K_2\), which is a counterexample for the model checking \(TS \models P''\).

In fact, using Algorithm 5, we have \(lMC(TS, P'') = M\).

7.2. Case study

In this section, we study how to verify a cache coherence protocol with the above methods. Usually, in many distributed file systems, servers store files and clients store local copies of these files in their caches. Clients communicate with servers by exchanging messages and data (e.g., files) and clients do not communicate with each other. Moreover, each file is associated with exactly one authorized server. There are two ways to ensure cache coherence. One is the client asks the server whether its copy is valid and the other is the server tells the client when the client’s copy is no longer valid. Therefore, in a distributed system using a well cache coherence protocol, if a client believes that a cached file is valid, then the server that is the authority on the file believes the client’s copy is valid.

In this case study, we verify AFS2 ([20]) that is a cache coherence protocol, which works as follows.

In the server, the initial state is \(s_0\) at which the server believes the file is invalid. When the server receives the message validate from the client and the file is valid, the server will transfer from \(s_0\) to \(s_1\) at which the server believes the file is valid, otherwise if the file is invalid, the server will still stay at \(s_0\). Furthermore, the server will transfer from \(s_0\) to \(s_1\) when it receives the message fetch from the client. In addition, the server will transfer from \(s_1\) to \(s_0\) when it receives the message update from the client or the message failure, which respectively means that the client update the file copy and the server need to notify the other clients having the copy to update accordingly and there is something wrong in the communications between the client and server and they should check again the coherence of the file. It is represented in Fig.6.

For the client, its initial states set are composed of \(s_0, s_1\) and \(s_2\). The state \(s_0\) \((s_1)\) represents that the client has no file copy in its cache and believes that the file is valid (invalid). The state \(s_2\) describes that the client has a file copy and believes
it is invalid. Therefore, if the client starts as state $s_2$, it will send the message `val` to ask the server whether or not the file copy in its cache is valid; while if the client starts as state $s_0$ or $s_1$, it will send the message `fetch` to get the valid file directly from the server. In addition, the state $s_3$ means that the client has a file copy and believes the file copy is valid. When the client receives the message `invalid` from the server, it will transfer from $s_3$ ($s_2$) to $s_0$ or $s_1$, which means that the server notifies the client that the copy is no longer valid and the client should discard the copy in its cache (As there is no file copy, so the validity of the file is unknown, i.e., the variable `belief` equals either `true` or `false`). When the client receives the message `failure` from the system, it will transfer from $s_3$ to $s_2$, which means there is something wrong in the communications between the client and server and they should check again the coherence of the file. The transition system of a client is represented in Fig. 7.

In this case study, the pair of states $\{s_0, s_1\}$ of the client (indicated by dashed line in Fig. 7) has a symmetric relation and this can be abstracted. This corresponds to the value of the variable `belief` being irrelevant when the variable `file` is $F$. Thus we can model the transition relation of the client by a 3-valued variable as shown in Fig. 8. When this model is composed with the rest of the AFS2 model, we get a 3-valued model-checking which cannot be directly verified using a classical model-checking.

In addition, because it might happen that the server sends an `invalid` message to some client that believes that its copy is valid. During the transmission, a property may hold since the client believes that its copy is valid while the server does not. Therefore, this transmission delay must be taken into account. We model the delay with the shared variable `time`.

For the completeness, we provide the models of the (abstract) client and server of AFS2 module as follows, where the model client using 3-valued variable is denoted by MODULE Abstract client, its state machine model is shown in Fig. 8.
Figure 7: The transition system of the client

Figure 8: The abstracted transition system of the client
MODULE server (input1, failure1, time1, input2, failure2, time2)
VAR
valid-file1, valid-file2: boolean;
out1, out2: {0, val, inval};
belief1, belief2: {fileT_beliefT, fileT_beliefF};
ASSIGN
next(valid-file1) := valid-file1;
next(valid-file2) := valid-file2;
init(belief1) := fileT_beliefF;
next(belief1) :=
case
  failure1 : fileT_beliefF;
  (belief1 = fileT_beliefF) & ((input1 = fetch) | ((input1 = valid) & valid-file1)): fileT_beliefT;
  (belief1 = fileT_beliefF) & ((input1 = validate) & !valid-file1) : fileT_beliefF;
  (belief1 = fileT_beliefT) & ((input2 = update)) : fileT_beliefF;
  TRUE : belief1 ;
esac;
init(out1) := 0;
next(out1) :=
case
  failure1 : 0;
  (belief1 = fileT_beliefF) & ((input1 = fetch) | ((input1 = valid) & valid-file1)): val;
  (belief1 = fileT_beliefF) & ((input1 = validate) & !valid-file1): inval;
  (belief1 = fileT_beliefT) & ((input2 = update)) : inval;
  TRUE : out1 ;
esac;
next(time1) := time1 is a global variable
and init(time1) := FALSE;
case
  failure1 : FALSE;
  (belief1 = fileT_beliefT) & ((input2 = update)) : FALSE;
  (belief1 = fileT_beliefF) & ((input1 = validate) & !valid-file1): FALSE;
  TRUE : time1 ;
esac;
init(belief2) := fileT_beliefF;

...---the statements on belief2, out2 and time2 are similar
to that on belief1, out1 and time1

FAIRNESS

running

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

MODULE client (input, failure, time)
VAR
    out: {0, fetch, validate, update};
    belief: {fileT_beliefT, fileT_beliefF, fileF_beliefT,
                fileF_beliefF};
ASSIGN
    init(belief):={fileF_beliefT, fileF_beliefF, fileT_beliefF};
    next(belief):=
        case
        ((belief =fileF_beliefT)|(belief =fileF_beliefF))
          & (input = val) : fileT_beliefT;
        (belief = fileT_beliefF) & (input = val) :
          fileT_beliefT;
        (belief = fileT_beliefF) & (input = inval) :
          fileF_beliefF;
        (belief = fileT_beliefT) & (input = inval) :
          {fileF_beliefT, fileF_beliefF};
        (belief = fileT_beliefT) & failure : fileT_beliefF;
        TRUE : belief;
        esac;
    init(out) := 0;
    next(out) :=
        case
        ((belief = fileF_beliefT)|(belief = fileF_beliefF))
          & (input = 0): {fetch, 0};
        (belief = fileT_beliefF) & (input = 0):
          {validate, 0};
        (belief = fileT_beliefT) &
          ((input = inval )| failure): 0;
        (belief = fileT_beliefT) & (input != inval): update;
        TRUE : out;
        esac;
    next(time):= -------------- time is a global variable
    case
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FAIRNESS running

MODULE Abstracted client (input, failure, time)
VAR
  out: {0, fetch, validate, update};
  belief: {fileT_beliefT, fileT_beliefF, fileF_beliefM};
ASSIGN
  init(belief):={fileF_beliefM, fileT_beliefF};
  next(belief):=
    case
      (belief = fileF_beliefM) & (input = val) : fileT_beliefT;
      (belief = fileT_beliefF) & (input = val) : fileT_beliefT;
      (belief = fileT_beliefF) & (input = inval) : fileF_beliefM;
      (belief = fileT_beliefT) & (input = inval) : fileF_beliefM;
      (belief = fileT_beliefT) & failure : fileT_beliefF;
    TRUE : belief ;
  esac;
  init(out) := 0;
  next(out) :=
    case
      (belief = fileF_beliefM) & (input = 0) : {fetch,0};
      (belief = fileT_beliefF) & (input = 0) : {validate,0};
      (belief = fileT_beliefT) & (input != inval) : update;
      (belief = fileT_beliefT) &
The linear-time properties of AFS2 system we verified appeared as follows.

**P1**: If a client believes that a cached file is valid, then the server that is the authority on the file believes the client’s copy is valid.

This property can be represented by a linear-temporal logic formulae as follows.

For one client:
\[ \Box (Client_i.\text{belief} \land Client_i.\text{file} \rightarrow (server.belief_i \land Server.file_i) \lor \neg time_i) \land (Server.out_i = val \rightarrow Server.belief_i \land Sever.file_i). \]

For \( N \) clients:
\[ \Box (\bigwedge_{i=1}^{N} (Client_i.\text{belief} \land Client_i.\text{file} \rightarrow (server.belief_i \land Server.file_i) \lor \neg time_i) \land (Server.out_i = val \rightarrow Server.belief_i \land Sever.file_i)). \]

**P2**: if a server believes that the client’s copy is valid, then the client believes the cached file on the client is valid.

This property can be written as a linear-temporal logic formulae as follows.

For one client:
\[ \Box (server.belief_i \land Server.file_i \rightarrow ((Client_i.\text{belief} \land Client_i.\text{file}) \lor \neg time_i) \land (Server.out_i = (validate \land valid - file) \lor fetch \rightarrow Server.belief_i \land Sever.file_i). \]

For \( N \) clients:
\[ \Box (\bigwedge_{i=1}^{N} (server.belief_i \land Server.file_i \rightarrow ((Client_i.\text{belief} \land Client_i.\text{file}) \lor \neg time_i) \land (Server.out_i = (validate \land valid - file) \lor fetch \rightarrow Server.belief_i \land Sever.file_i)). \]

The results are summarized in Fig.9, Table 1 and Table 2. The property P1 is correct, while the property P2 is wrong and a counterexample is given. There
are several linear-temporal logic symbolic model checking tools as explained in Ref. [34]. The tool NuSMV 2.5.4 running on Pentium (R) Dual-Core E5800 with 3.20GHz processor and 2.00GB RAM, under ubuntu-11.04-desktop-i386, is used for the verification in this case study.

In this case study, we use classical model-checking two times to verify model-checking of linear-time property in mv-logic. On the other hand, in classical model-checking of the original problem, the state space of the model is more complex than the abstracted model represented by mv-logic (as shown in Table 1 and Table 2). The overall time complexity of mv-logic is smaller than that in classical case as shown in Fig. 9, Table 1 and Table 2.

8. Conclusions

Multi-valued model checking is a multi-valued extension to the classical model checking. Both the model of the system and the specification take values over a de Morgan algebra. Such an extension enhances the expressive power of temporal logic and allows reasoning under uncertainty. Some of the applications that can take advantage of the multi-valued model checking are abstract techniques, reasoning about conflicting viewpoints and temporal logic query checking. In this paper, we studied several important multi-valued linear-time properties and the multi-valued model checking corresponding to them. Concretely, we introduced the notions of safety property, invariant property, liveness, persistence and dual-persistence property in multi-valued logic system. Since the law of non-contradiction (i.e., $a \land \neg a = 0$) and the law of excluded-middle (i.e., $a \lor \neg a = 1$) do not hold in multi-valued logic, the linear-time properties introduced in this paper have the new forms compared to those in classical logic. For example, safety property in mv-logic is defined using good prefixes instead of bad prefixes. In which, model checking of multi-valued invariant property and persistence property can be reduced to their classical counterparts, the related algorithms were also

![Figure 9: The running times of the multi-valued and classical model checking for AFS2](image-url)
Table 1: The results of the classical model checking for AFS2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clients</th>
<th>User Time</th>
<th>BDD Node</th>
<th>Transition Rule</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.184s</td>
<td>33667</td>
<td>7^2</td>
<td>(2×4)^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.917s</td>
<td>310383</td>
<td>7^3</td>
<td>(2×4)^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.845s</td>
<td>1299115</td>
<td>7^4</td>
<td>(2×4)^4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>322.224s</td>
<td>235026</td>
<td>7^5</td>
<td>(2×4)^5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4054.901s</td>
<td>443001</td>
<td>7^6</td>
<td>(2×4)^6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17885.806s</td>
<td>1852283</td>
<td>7^7</td>
<td>(2×4)^7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The results of the multi-valued model checking for AFS2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clients</th>
<th>User Time</th>
<th>BDD Node</th>
<th>Transition Rule</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1724s</td>
<td>33667</td>
<td>5^2</td>
<td>(2×3)^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.889s</td>
<td>1061221</td>
<td>5^3</td>
<td>(2×3)^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.521s</td>
<td>1360904</td>
<td>5^4</td>
<td>(2×3)^4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>253.944s</td>
<td>223831</td>
<td>5^5</td>
<td>(2×3)^5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2353.939s</td>
<td>612687</td>
<td>5^6</td>
<td>(2×3)^6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14065.975s</td>
<td>1318587</td>
<td>5^7</td>
<td>(2×3)^7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

presented. Furthermore, we introduced lattice-valued finite automata including Büchi and Rabin automata. With these notions, we gave the verification methods of multi-valued regular safety properties and multi-valued \( \omega \)-regular properties. Since the law of non-contradiction and the law of excluded middle do not hold in multi-valued logic, the verification methods gave here were direct and not the direct extension of classical methods, which were also the complementary to the classical verification methods. A new form of multi-valued model checking with membership degree (compared to that in \[8\]) was also introduced. The related verification algorithms were presented.

There were many work on multi-valued model checking, for example, \[5–12, 15, 21, 25\]. As we said in the introduction part, we adopted a direct method to model checking of multi-valued linear-time properties instead of those existing indirectly methods. Precisely, the existing methods of mv-model checking still used the classical method with some minor correction. That is, instead of checking of \( TS \models P \) for an mv-linear time property \( P \) using the inclusion of the trace function \( \text{Traces}(TS) \subseteq P \), the existing method only checked the membership degree of the language \( \text{Traces}(TS) \cap L(\mathcal{A}_{\neg P}) \), where \( \mathcal{A}_{\neg P} \) is an mv-Büchi automaton such that \( L(\mathcal{A}_{\neg P}) = \neg P \). However, as said in Ref. \[2\], the equivalences and preorders between transitions systems that “corresponding” to linear temporal logic are based on traces inclusion and equality. In this paper, we adopted the multi-valued model checking \( TS \models P \) by using directly the inclusion relation \( \text{Traces}(TS) \subseteq P \). In gen-
eral, we used implication connective as a primitive connective in mv-logic which satisfies $a \leq b$ iff $a \rightarrow b = 1$ to define the membership degree of the inclusion of $\text{Traces}(TS)$ into $P$. We give further comments on the comparison of our method to the existing approaches as follows.

Since we chose $\rightarrow$ as a primitive connective in mv-logic, classical logic could not be embedded into mv-logic in a unique way as done in [11]. For example, $a \rightarrow b$ and $\neg a \lor b$ are equivalent in classical logic, but not in mv-logic. This is one of the main differences of our method to those existing approaches. Since this difference, we verify that the system model $TS$ satisfies the specified linear-time property $P$, i.e., $TS \models P$ directly using the inclusion $\text{Traces}(TS) \subseteq P$ instead of $L(A) \cap L(A_{\neg P}) = \emptyset$, where $A_{\neg P}$ is a multi-valued Büchi automaton such that $L(A_{\neg P}) = \neg P$. Regarding expressiveness, we mainly studied the model-checking of linear-time properties in mv-logic systems, compared with the work [8], we use more general lattices instead of finite total order lattice in [8] to represent the truth values in mv-logic. All the properties studied in [8] can be tackled using our method, and another different view can be given. For the multi-valued model of CTL, etc, as done in [7, 9–11], our method could be also applied which forms one of the future work.

Therefore, the approach proposed in this paper can be thought of as a complementary to those mentioned multi-valued model checking. The examples and case study show the validity and performance of the method posed in this article. As one of the future work, we shall give some further comparison of our method with those available methods in multi-valued model checking and give some experiments. Another direction is to extend the method used in this paper to multi-valued LTL or CTL.
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Appendix I: The equivalent definition of multi-valued transition system

In an mv-TS, \( TS = (S, Act, \rightarrow, I, AP, L) \), if the labeling function is \( L : S \rightarrow I^{AP} \) or \( L : S \times AP \rightarrow I \), then we have another form of mv-TS. The later is used in Ref. [9] (which is called mv-Kripke structure). Where \( L(s, A) \) represents the truth-value of the atomic proposition \( A \) at state \( s \).

In this case, the trace function of \( TS \) needs to redefine as follows.

Since \( TS \) is finite, we can assume that \( Im(L) = \{d_1, \cdots, d_l\} \). For any \( d \in Im(L) \), define \( L_d : S \rightarrow 2^{AP} \) as follows,

\[
L_d(s) = \{A \in AP | L(s, A) \geq d\}
\]

Then \( Traces(TS) : (2^{AP})^l \rightarrow I \) is defined as in the following manner. Let \( A_0A_1 \cdots \in (2^{AP})^l, \rho = s_0\alpha_1s_1\alpha_2 \cdots \) a run of \( TS \) with states sequence \( \pi = s_0s_1 \cdots \), such that \( \eta(s_i, \alpha_{i+1}, s_{i+1}) = r_{i+1} \) and \( L_{d(\rho)}(s_i) = A_i \), for any \( i \geq 0 \), where \( d(\rho) \) is an element of \( Im(L) \) with \( \phi(i) \in \{1, \cdots, l\} \). Then,

\[
Traces(TS)(A_0A_1 \cdots) = \bigvee \{r_0 \land d(\rho(0)) \land r_1 \land d(\rho(1)) \land \cdots | \rho = s_0\alpha_1s_1\alpha_2 \cdots \}
\]

Thus, \( \bigwedge_{i \geq 0} r_i \equiv r_0 \land d(\rho(0)) \land r_1 \land d(\rho(1)) \land \cdots \) and \( \bigwedge_{i \geq 0} r_i = L'(s_i) = L(\rho(s_i)) \), which is the same as those in the definition of \( Traces(TS)(A_0A_1 \cdots) \).

Hence, \( Traces(TS')(A_0A_1 \cdots) = Traces(TS)(A_0A_1 \cdots) \) for any \( A_0A_1 \cdots \in (2^{AP})^l \). It follows that \( Traces(TS') = Traces(TS) \). \( TS' \) is equivalent to \( TS \) in the sense of trace function.

\[\square\]
Appendix II: The proof of Proposition 5

(1) is obvious.

(2) The inclusion \( \text{Closure}(P_1) \cup \text{Closure}(P_2) \subseteq \text{Closure}(P_1 \cup P_2) \) is obvious. Conversely, let \( X = \text{Im}(P_1) \cup \text{Im}(P_2) \), and let \( l_1 \) be the sublattice generated by \( X \), then \( l_1 \) is a finite distributive lattice (3.28). Observing that three sets \( \text{Im}(\text{Closure}(P_1)), \text{Im}(\text{Closure}(P_2)) \) and \( \text{Im}(\text{Closure}(P_1 \cup P_2)) \) are subsets of \( l_1 \), to show \( \text{Closure}(P_1) \cup \text{Closure}(P_2) \subseteq \text{Closure}(P_1 \cup P_2) \), it suffices to show that, for any \( m \in \|l_1\| \) and \( \sigma \in (2^{AP})^\omega \), \( m \leq \text{Closure}(P_1 \cup P_2)(\sigma) \) implies that \( m \leq \text{Closure}(P_1)(\sigma) \) or \( m \leq \text{Closure}(P_2)(\sigma) \). By the definition of \( \text{Closure} \) operator, \( m \leq \text{Closure}(P_1 \cup P_2)(\sigma) \) implies that, for any \( \theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma) \), there exists \( \tau \in (2^{AP})^\omega \) such that \( m \leq (P_1(\theta \tau) \lor P_2(\theta \tau)) \); it follows that \( m \leq (P_1(\theta \tau) \lor P_2(\theta \tau)) \). Let \( \text{Pref}_1 = \{ \theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma) \mid m \leq (P_1(\theta \tau)) \) for some \( \tau \in (2^{AP})^\omega \), and \( \text{Pref}_2 = \{ \theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma) \mid m \leq (P_2(\theta \tau)) \) for some \( \tau \in (2^{AP})^\omega \). Then \( \text{Pref}_1 \cup \text{Pref}_2 = \text{Pref}(\sigma) \). Since \( \text{Pref}(\sigma) \) is infinite as a set, it follows that \( \text{Pref}_1 \) or \( \text{Pref}_2 \) is infinite. Without loss of generality, let us assume that \( \text{Pref}_1 \) is infinite. Then, for any \( \theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma) \), since \( \text{Pref}_1 \) is infinite, there is \( \theta_1 \in \text{Pref}_1 \) such that \( \theta = \text{Pref}(\theta_1) \), and \( m \leq (P_1(\theta_1 \tau_1)) \) for some \( \tau_1 \in (2^{AP})^\omega \). In this case, there exists \( \tau \in (2^{AP})^\omega \) such that \( \theta \tau_1 = \theta \tau \) and \( m \leq (P_1(\theta_1 \tau_1)) = P_1(\theta \tau) \). Hence, by the definition of \( \text{Closure}(P_1) \), it follows that \( m \leq \text{Closure}(P_1)(\sigma) \).

(3) By condition (1), we have \( \text{Closure}(P) \subseteq \text{Closure}(\text{Closure}(P)) \). Conversely, for any \( \sigma \in (2^{AP})^\omega \), we have
\[
\text{Closure}(\text{Closure}(P))(\sigma) = \bigwedge \{ \bigvee_{\tau \in (2^{AP})^\omega} \text{Closure}(P)(\theta \tau) \mid \theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma) \}.
\]
On the other hand, for \( \text{Closure}(P)(\theta \tau) \), since \( \theta \in \text{Pref}(\theta \tau) \), we have
\[
\text{Closure}(P)(\theta \tau) = \bigwedge \{ \bigvee_{\tau_1 \in (2^{AP})^\omega} P(\theta_1 \tau_1) \mid \theta_1 \in \text{Pref}(\theta) \} \leq \bigvee_{\tau_1 \in (2^{AP})^\omega} P(\theta \tau_1).
\]
Hence, we have
\[
\text{Closure}(\text{Closure}(P))(\sigma) = \bigwedge \{ \bigvee_{\tau \in (2^{AP})^\omega} \text{Closure}(P)(\theta \tau) \mid \theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma) \} \leq \bigwedge \{ \bigvee_{\tau \in (2^{AP})^\omega} P(\theta \tau) \mid \theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma) \} = \text{Closure}(P)(\sigma).
\]
This shows that \( \text{Closure}(\text{Closure}(P)) \subseteq \text{Closure}(P) \).
Therefore, \( \text{Closure}(\text{Closure}(P)) = \text{Closure}(P) \).

Appendix III: The proof of Proposition 6

“If” part: It suffices to prove that \( \bigwedge_{\theta \in \text{Pref}(P)} \text{G Pref}(P)(\theta) \leq P(\sigma) \) for any \( \sigma \in (2^{AP})^\omega \). Otherwise, there exists \( \sigma \in (2^{AP})^\omega \) such that \( \bigwedge_{\theta \in \text{Pref}(P)} \text{G Pref}(P)(\theta) \not\leq P(\sigma) \). Noting that \( P(\sigma) = \text{Closure}(P)(\sigma) = \bigwedge_{\theta \in \text{Pref}(P)} \bigvee_{\tau \in (2^{AP})^\omega} P(\theta \tau) \), it follows that \( \bigwedge_{\theta \in \text{Pref}(P)} \text{G Pref}(P)(\theta) \not\leq \bigvee_{\tau \in (2^{AP})^\omega} P(\theta \tau) \) for some \( \theta' \in \text{Pref}(P) \). Hence, \( \text{G Pref}(P)(\theta') \not\leq \bigvee_{\tau \in (2^{AP})^\omega} P(\theta' \tau) \). This contradicts with the definition of \( \text{G Pref}(P) \), i.e., we should have \( \text{G Pref}(P)(\theta') \leq \bigvee_{\tau \in (2^{AP})^\omega} P(\theta' \tau) \).

“Only if” part: \( P \subseteq \text{Closure}(P) \) holds by Proposition 5 (1). The left is
to prove that Closure(P) ⊆ P. Otherwise, there exists \( \sigma \in (2^\mathbb{AP})^\omega \) such that Closure(P)(\( \sigma \)) \( \not\subseteq P(\sigma) \). It follows that Closure(P)(\( \sigma \)) \( \not\subseteq \bigwedge_{\theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma)} \text{GPre}_f(P)(\theta) \). Thus, there exists \( \theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma) \) such that \( (\bigwedge_{\theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma)} \text{GPre}_f(P)(\theta) \mid \theta \in \text{Pref}(\sigma)) = (\text{Closure}(P)(\sigma) \not\subseteq \text{GPre}_f(P)(\theta) = \bigwedge_{\theta \in (2^\mathbb{AP})^\omega} \text{GPre}_f(P(\theta)) \), which contradicts with the definitions of Closure(P) and GPre_f(P).

\[ \square \]

**Appendix IV: The proof of Theorem 18**

As a preliminary to show Theorem 18 we need a proposition to characterize mv-\( \omega \)-regular languages.

**Proposition 22.** For an mv-\( \omega \) language \( f : \Sigma^\omega \to l \), the following statements are equivalent:

1. \( f \) is an mv-\( \omega \)-regular language, i.e., \( f \) can be accepted by an l-VBA.
2. \( \text{Im}(f) \) is finite and \( f_a \) is a \( \omega \)-regular language (which can be accepted by a Büchi automaton) over \( \Sigma \), for any \( a \in \text{Im}(f) \).
3. There exist finite elements \( m_1, \ldots, m_k \) in \( l \) and finite \( \omega \)-regular languages \( L_1, \ldots, L_k \) over \( \Sigma \) such that \( f = \bigcup_{i=1}^k m_i \land L_i \).

**Proof:**

(1) \( \implies \) (2): Assume that \( f \) is accepted by an l-VBA, \( \mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, I, F) \). Let \( X = \text{Im}(I) \cup \text{Im}(\delta) \cup \text{Im}(F) \). Since \( Q \) and \( \Sigma \) are finite as two sets, \( X \) is finite as a subset of \( l \). Let \( l_1 \) be the sublattice of \( l \) generated by \( X \), then \( l_1 \) is a finite distributive lattice ([28]), and any element of \( l_1 \) can be represented as a finite join of join-irreducible elements of \( l_1 \). For any \( m \in \text{Im}(l_1) \), let \( \mathcal{A}_m = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, I_m, F_m) \). Then \( \mathcal{A}_m \) is a classical Büchi automaton and thus \( L_\omega(\mathcal{A}_m) \) is \( \omega \)-regular.

Let us show that \( L_\omega(\mathcal{A})_m = L_\omega(\mathcal{A}_m) \). This is because, for any \( w = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \in \Sigma^\omega \),

\[ w \in L_\omega(\mathcal{A}_m) \]

iff

for any \( i \geq 0 \), there exists \( q_i \in Q \) such that \( q_0 \in I_m \), \( (q_i, \sigma_{i+1}, q_{i+1}) \in \delta_m \), and \( J = \{ q_i \in F_m \} \) is an infinite subset of \( \mathbb{N} \);

iff

for any \( i \geq 0 \), there exists \( q_i \in Q \) such that \( I(q_0) \geq m \), \( \delta(q_i, \sigma_{i+1}, q_{i+1}) \geq m \), and there exists an infinite subset \( J \) of \( \mathbb{N} \) such that \( F(q_j) \geq m \) for any \( j \in J \);

iff

for any \( i \geq 0 \), there exists \( q_i \in Q \) and infinite subset \( J \) of \( \mathbb{N} \) such that \( I(q_0) \geq m \) and \( \bigwedge_{i \geq 0} \delta(q_i, \sigma_{i+1}, q_{i+1}) \land \bigwedge_{j \in J} F(q_j) \geq m \);

iff

\[ \bigvee I(q_0) \land \bigwedge_{i \geq 0} \delta(q_i, \sigma_{i+1}, q_{i+1}) \land \bigwedge_{j \in J} F(q_j) \mid q_i \in Q \text{ for any } i \geq 0 \text{ and } J \text{ is an infinite subset of } \mathbb{N} \] \( \geq m \);
iff

\( L_\omega(\mathcal{A})(w) \geq m \)

iff

\( w \in L_\omega(\mathcal{A})_m. \)

Hence, \( L_\omega(\mathcal{A})_m \) is \( \omega \)-regular for any \( m \in \operatorname{II}(l_1). \)

Furthermore, for any \( a \in \operatorname{Im}(f) = \operatorname{Im}(L_\omega(\mathcal{A})) \), there exists finite join-irreducible elements \( m_1, \ldots, m_k \) in \( l_1 \) such that \( a = \bigvee_{i=1}^k m_i. \) Then

\[
f_a = \bigcap_{i=1}^k f_{m_i}.
\]

Since \( f_m \) is \( \omega \)-regular and \( \omega \)-regular languages are closed under finite intersection, it follows that \( f_a \) is \( \omega \)-regular.

(2) \( \implies \) (3) is obvious.

(3) \( \implies \) (1). Since \( L_i \) is \( \omega \)-regular, there exists a Büchi automaton \( \mathcal{A}_i = (Q_i, \Sigma, \delta_i, I_i, F_i) \) such that \( L_\omega(\mathcal{A}_i) = L_i \), for any \( i = 1, \ldots, k \). If we let \( Q = \bigcup\{i\} \times Q_i \), and define \( I, F : Q \to l \) and \( \delta : Q \times \Sigma \times Q \to l \) as,

\[
I(i, q) = \begin{cases} m_i, & \text{if } q \in I_i \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}
\]

\[
F(i, q) = \begin{cases} m_i, & \text{if } q \in F_i \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}
\]

\[
\delta((i, q), \sigma, (j, p)) = \begin{cases} m_i, & \text{if } i = j \text{ and } (q, \sigma, p) \in \delta_i \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}
\]

for any \((i, q), (j, p) \in Q\). This constructs a new \( \text{mv-}\omega \)-Büchi automaton \( \mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, I, F) \). Let us show that \( L_\omega(\mathcal{A}) = f. \)

In fact, for any \( w = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \in \Sigma^\omega \), for any \( i \geq 0 \), if there exist \( q'_i \in Q \) and infinite subset \( J \) of \( N \) such that \( I(q'_0) \wedge \bigwedge_{j \geq 0} \delta(q'_j, \sigma_{i+1}, q'_i+1) \wedge \bigwedge_{j \in J} F(q'_j) > 0 \). By definitions of \( I, F \) and \( \delta \), there exists \( j_i, 1 \leq j_i \leq k \) and \( q_i \in Q \) such that \( q'_i = (j_i, q_i) \) and \( q_0 \in I_{j_i}, (q_i, \sigma_{i+1}, q_{i+1}) \in \delta_{j_i}, \) and for any \( j \in J, q_j \in F_{j_i}. \) It follows that \( w \in L_{j_i}. \)

Hence, by the definition of \( L_\omega(\mathcal{A}) \), we have

\[
L_\omega(\mathcal{A})(w) = \bigvee \{|m_i| w \in L_{j_i} \} = f(w).
\]

Hence, \( f \) is \( \text{mv-}\omega \)-regular. \( \square \)

**Proposition 23.** Let \( f_1, \ldots, f_k \) \((k \geq 2)\) be finite \( \text{mv-}\omega \)-languages from \( \Sigma^\omega \) into \( l \) which can be accepted by some \( l \)-VDRA. Then their join \( f_1 \cup \cdots \cup f_k \) can also be accepted by an \( l \)-VDRA.
Proof: For simplicity, we give the proof for the case $k = 2$. The other case can be proved by induction on $k$.

Assume that $f_i$ can be recognized by an $l$-VDRA $\mathcal{A}_i = (Q_i, \Sigma, \delta_i, q_{i0}, F_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$, respectively. Let us show that $f = f_1 \cup f_2$ can also be accepted by some $l$-VDRA. We explicitly construct such $l$-VDRA, $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$, as follows, where $Q = Q_1 \times Q_2$, $\delta = \delta_1 \times \delta_2$ (that is, $\delta((q_1, q_2), \sigma) = (\delta(q_1, \sigma), \delta(q_2, \sigma))$, $q_0 = (q_{10}, q_{20})$, and $F : 2^{Q_1 \times Q_2} \times 2^{Q_1 \times Q_2} \rightarrow l$ is defined by,

$$
F((H, K)) = \begin{cases} 
F_1((H_1, K_1)), & \text{if } H = H_1 \times Q_2 \text{ and } K = K_1 \times Q_2 \\
F_2((H_2, K_2)), & \text{if } H = Q_1 \times H_2 \text{ and } K = Q_1 \times K_2 \\
F_1((H_1, K_1)) \lor F_2((H_2, K_2)), & \text{if } H = H_1 \times Q_2 \cup Q_1 \times H_2 \text{ and } K = K_1 \times K_2 \\
0, & \text{otherwise,}
\end{cases}
$$

By the definition of $L_w(\mathcal{A}_1), L_w(\mathcal{A}_2)$ and $L_w(\mathcal{A})$, it is obvious that $L_w(\mathcal{A}_1) \cup L_w(\mathcal{A}_2) \subseteq L_w(\mathcal{A})$.

Conversely, let $X = \text{Im}(F_1) \cup \text{Im}(F_1)$ and $l_1$ be the sublattice generated by $X$, then $l_1$ is a finite distributive lattice. The inclusion $\text{Im}(F) \subseteq l_1$ is obvious and thus $\text{Im}(L_w(\mathcal{A})) \subseteq l_1$. To show $L_w(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq L_w(\mathcal{A}_1) \cup L_w(\mathcal{A}_2)$, it suffices to show that, for any $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ and for any $m \in \text{Im}(l_1)$, if $m \leq L_w(\mathcal{A})(\sigma)$, then $m \leq L_w(\mathcal{A}_1)(\sigma)$ or $m \leq L_w(\mathcal{A}_2)(\sigma)$. By the definition of $L_w(\mathcal{A})(\sigma)$, if $m \leq L_w(\mathcal{A}_1)(\sigma)$, then there exists $(H, K) \in 2^Q \times 2^Q$ such that $m \leq F((H, K))$, and if we let $q_{i+1} = (q_{1,i+1}, q_{2,i+1}) = (\delta(q_i, \sigma), \delta_2(q_i, \sigma))$ for $i = 0, 1, \cdots$, such that $(\exists n \geq 0. \forall m \geq n, q_m \notin H) \land (\forall n \geq 0. \exists m \geq n, q_m \in K)$. By the definition of $F$, we have three cases to consider:

Case 1: $H = H_1 \times Q_2, K = K_1 \times Q_2$. In this case, we have $m \leq F((H, K)) = F((H_1, K_1))$.

Then the sequence $q_0 q_1 \cdots$ satisfies the condition $(\exists n \geq 0. \forall m \geq n, q_m = (q_{1m}, q_{2m}) \notin H_1 \times Q_2 \land (\forall n \geq 0. \exists m \geq n, q_m = (q_{1m}, q_{2m}) \in K_1 \times Q_2)$. The latter condition implies that $(\exists n \geq 0. \forall m \geq n, q_{1m} \notin H_1) \land (\forall n \geq 0. \exists m \geq n, q_{1m} \in K_1)$. By the definition of $L_w(\mathcal{A}_1)(\sigma)$, it follows that $F_1((H_1, K_1)) \leq L_w(\mathcal{A}_1)(\sigma)$. Hence, $m \leq L_w(\mathcal{A}_1)(\sigma)$.

Case 2: $H = Q_1 \times H_2, K = Q_1 \times K_2$. Similar to Case 1, we can prove that $m \leq L_w(\mathcal{A}_2)(\sigma)$.

Case 3: $H = H_1 \times Q_2 \cup Q_1 \times H_2$ and $K = K_1 \times K_2$. In this case, we have $m \leq F((H, K)) = F((H_1, K_1)) \lor F((H_2, K_2))$. Since $m \in \text{Im}(l_1)$, it follows that $m \leq F((H_1, K_1))$ or $m \leq F((H_2, K_2))$. Consider the sequence $q_0 q_1 \cdots$, it satisfies the condition $(\exists n \geq 0. \forall m \geq n, q_m = (q_{1m}, q_{2m}) \notin H_1 \times Q_2 \cup Q_1 \times H_2 \land (\forall n \geq 0. \exists m \geq n, q_m = (q_{1m}, q_{2m}) \in K_1 \times K_2)$. The latter condition implies that $(\exists n \geq 0. \forall m \geq n, q_{1m} \notin H_1) \land (\forall n \geq 0. \exists m \geq n, q_{1m} \in K_1) \land (\exists n \geq 0. \forall m \geq n, q_{2m} \notin H_2) \land (\forall n \geq 0. \exists m \geq n, q_{2m} \in K_2)$. It follows that $F_1((H_1, K_1)) \leq L_w(\mathcal{A}_1)(\sigma)$ and $F_2((H_2, K_2)) \leq L_w(\mathcal{A}_2)(\sigma)$. Hence, $m \leq L_w(\mathcal{A}_1)(\sigma)$ or $m \leq L_w(\mathcal{A}_2)(\sigma).$
This concludes that \( L_\omega(\mathcal{A}) = L_\omega(\mathcal{A}_1) \cup L_\omega(\mathcal{A}_2) \).

**The proof of Theorem 18:**

Let \( f : \Sigma^* \rightarrow l \) be an mv-language accepted by an \( l \)-VDRA \( \mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F) \). By the definition of \( L_\omega(\mathcal{A}) \), it follows that \( \text{Im}(f) = \text{Im}(L_\omega(\mathcal{A})) \subseteq \text{Im}(F) \) and thus \( \text{Im}(f) = \text{Im}(L_\omega(\mathcal{A})) \) is a finite subset of \( l \). For any \( a \in \text{Im}(f) \), \( f_a \) is obvious accepted by the classical Rabin automaton \( \mathcal{A}_a = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F_a) \), and thus \( f = L_\omega(\mathcal{A}) \) is a \( \omega \)-regular language. Hence, condition (2) in Proposition 22 holds for \( f \), \( f \) can be accepted by an \( l \)-VBA.

Conversely, if \( f \) can be accepted by an \( l \)-VBA, then, by Proposition 22(3), there are finite elements \( m_1, \ldots, m_k \) in \( l \) and finite \( \omega \)-regular languages \( \mathcal{L}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_k \) over \( \Sigma \) such that \( f = \bigcup_{i=1}^k m_i \land \mathcal{L}_i \).

For any \( i \), since \( \mathcal{L}_i \) is \( \omega \)-regular, there exists a deterministic Rabin automaton \( \mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, \text{ACC}) \) accepting \( \mathcal{L}_i \), i.e., \( L_\omega(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}_i \). Construct an \( l \)-VDRA \( \mathcal{A}' \) from \( \mathcal{A} \) as, \( \mathcal{A}' = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F) \), where \( F : 2^Q \times 2^Q \rightarrow l \) is,

\[
F((H, K)) = \begin{cases} 
m_i, & \text{if } (H, K) \in \text{ACC} \\
0, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

By a simple calculation, we have \( L(\mathcal{A}') = m_i \land \mathcal{L}_i \). This shows that \( m_i \land \mathcal{L}_i \) can be accepted by an \( l \)-VDRA for any \( i \). By Proposition 23 and the equality \( f = \bigcup_{i=1}^k m_i \land \mathcal{L}_i \), it follows that \( f \) can be accepted by an \( l \)-VDRA.

\[\square\]