

Important equivalences between LTL formulas

Let $M = (S, \rightarrow, L)$ be a CTL model, s be a state in M , and π be a computation path beginning with state s_0 .

We define satisfaction relations for state and path formulas:

1. (a) $M, s \models p$ iff $p \in L(s)$.
- (b) $M, s \models \neg\phi$ iff $M, s \not\models \phi$.
- (c) $M, s \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ iff $M, s \models \phi_1$ and $M, s \models \phi_2$.
- (d) $M, s \models A[\alpha]$ iff for all paths τ beginning at s we have $M, \tau \models \alpha$.
- (e) $M, s \models E[\alpha]$ iff for some path τ beginning at s we have $M, \tau \models \alpha$.
2. (a) $M, \pi \models \phi$ iff $M, s_0 \models \phi$.
- (b) $M, \pi \models \neg\alpha$ iff $M, \pi \not\models \alpha$.
- (c) $M, \pi \models \alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2$ iff $M, \pi \models \alpha_1$ and $M, \pi \models \alpha_2$.
- (d) $M, \pi \models X\alpha$ iff $M, \pi_2 \models \alpha$.
- (e) $M, \pi \models G\alpha$ iff, for all $i \geq 1$, $M, \pi_i \models \alpha$.
- (f) $M, \pi \models F\alpha$ iff, for some $i \geq 1$, $M, \pi_i \models \alpha$.
- (g) $M, \pi \models \alpha_1 U\alpha_2$ iff for some $i \geq 1$, $M, \pi_i \models \alpha_2$ while $M, \pi_j \models \alpha_1$ for all $j < i$.

where p ranges over atomic descriptions, α over path formulas, and ϕ over state formulas.