[International Journal of Approximate Reasoning](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2018.04.010) ••• (••••) •••-•••



1 Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](http://www.ScienceDirect.com/) 1

# **International Journal of Approximate Reasoning**  $4 \rightarrow 2$   $111$   $111$   $111$   $111$   $111$   $111$   $111$   $11$



# [www.elsevier.com/locate/ijar](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/ijar) 8 8

9 9  $10$ 

 $18$ 19 19

### $^{11}$  Disimulations for furny transition systems revisited  $\frac{1}{12}$  Bisimulations for fuzzy transition systems revisited

 $13$  13 <sup>14</sup> Hengyang Wu<sup>a</sup>, Taolue Chen<sup>b, c,∗</sup>, Tingting Han<sup>b</sup>, Yixiang Chen<sup>a</sup> and the mass of the mass o

15<br>- ^ MoE Engineering Center for Software/Hardware Co-Design Technology and Application, East China Normal University, Shanghai, China

16 16 <sup>b</sup> *Department of Computer Science and Information Systems, Birkbeck, University of London, London, UK*

17 17 <sup>c</sup> *State Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology, Nanjing University, Nanjing, China*

# 20 ARTICLE INFO ABSTRACT 20

21 21 *Article history:*

Received 11 October 2017 Received in revised form 14 February 2018 Accepted 26 April 2018 Available online xxxx

- *Keywords:*
- Bisimulation

Fuzzy transition system

- Modal logic
- Logical characterization

<sub>22</sub> Article history: **Article history: Example 22** Bisimulation is a well-known behavioral equivalence for discrete event systems, and has 22 23 Received II October 2017 11 Theory 2019 extently been adopted and developed in fuzzy systems. In this paper, we propose a  $_{23}$ exerved in tensed only 14 rebulaty 2016 head heav bisimulation, i.e., the *group-by-group fuzzy bisimulation*, for fuzzy transition systems. 24 accepted 26 arcil 2018 Exercise the fully matching requirement of the bisimulation definition proposed by<br>25 Available online xxxx 26 26 equivalent intuitively, but which cannot be equated in previous definitions. We carry out a 27 Reywords.<br>Bisimulation and the systematic investigation on this new notion of bisimulation. In particular, a fixed point <sup>28</sup> <sup>Fuzzy</sup> transition system **characterization** of the group-by-group fuzzy bisimilarity is given, based on which, we <sup>28</sup> <sup>29</sup> Modal logic **provide a polynomial-time algorithm to check** whether two states in a fuzzy transition  $^{29}$ 30 30 system are group-by-group fuzzy bisimilar. Moreover, a modal logic, which is an extension 31 31 of the Hennessy–Milner logic, is presented to completely characterize the group-by-group 32 32 Cao et al.  $(2010)$   $[2]$ , and can equate more pairs of states which are deemed to be fuzzy bisimilarity.

33 33 © 2018 Published by Elsevier Inc.

 $34$ 35 35

### $37$  37  $\frac{38}{38}$  38  $\frac{38}{38}$  38 **1. Introduction**

зэрэг тоо хотоос тоо хотоос тогтоос за<br>Заранта тогтоос тогтоо 40 40 Bisimulations are well-established forms of behavioral equivalences for discrete event systems, and have become a central <sub>41</sub> notion in, for instance, process algebras, automata theory, etc. They are widely used in many areas of computer science, in 41 <sub>42</sub> particular, in verification where they are crucial to reduce the state space of the system under consideration.

36 36

 43 Recently, bisimulations have been developed in fuzzy systems as well. For example, Cao et al. [\[2,4\]](#page--1-0) considered bisimula- 44 tions for *fuzzy transition systems* (FTS) where both fuzzy transitions and nondeterministic transitions co-exist. This model is 45 further studied under fuzzy automata by Cao et al. [\[3\]](#page--1-0) and Pan et al. [\[15\]](#page--1-0). Ćirić et al. [\[5\]](#page--1-0) investigated bisimulations for fuzzy 45 46 automata. Qiu and Deng [\[9\]](#page--1-0), and Xing et al. [\[19\]](#page--1-0) studied (bi)simulations for fuzzy discrete event systems. Fan [\[10\]](#page--1-0) discussed 47 fuzzy bisimulations for Gödel logic. Wu et al. [\[16–18\]](#page--1-0) investigated algorithms and logical characterizations of bisimulations 48 for FTS. For more information about fuzzy (bi)simulations, we also refer the readers to [\[6,7,11\]](#page--1-0). In addition, model checking 49 for fuzzy systems was also studied [\[12–14\]](#page--1-0).

 50 A central question regarding any notion of bisimulation (or in general, any equivalence) is its distinguishing power. 51 Namely, to which extent it will distinguish a pair of states. As a simple example, we presented two FTS in Fig. [1.](#page-1-0) Assuming that states  $s_i$  and  $t_i$  are equal for  $i = 4, 5, 6$  (i.e., they cannot be distinguished in this case), and thus one can be easily  $52$ 53 convinced that  $s_i$  and  $t_i$  are also equal for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , and  $s_i$  and  $t_j$  are *not* equal for  $1 \le i \ne j \le 3$  since they have different 53 54 enabled actions. We are mainly interested in whether states *s* and *t* can be related by the bisimulation under consideration. 55 55

58 58 *E-mail addresses:* [hywu@sei.ecnu.edu.cn](mailto:hywu@sei.ecnu.edu.cn) (H. Wu), [taolue@dcs.bbk.ac.cn](mailto:taolue@dcs.bbk.ac.cn) (T. Chen), [tingting@dcs.bbk.ac.uk](mailto:tingting@dcs.bbk.ac.uk) (T. Han), [yxchen@sei.ecnu.edu.cn](mailto:yxchen@sei.ecnu.edu.cn) (Y. Chen).

59 59 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2018.04.010>

 $^{60}$   $^{0888-613\chi/\odot}$  2018 Published by Elsevier Inc.  $^{60}$ 

56 56 61 61

<sup>57</sup> 57 \* Corresponding author at: Department of Computer Science and Information Systems, Birkbeck, University of London, London, UK.

## 2 *H. Wu et al. / International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* ••• *(*••••*)* •••*–*•••

<span id="page-1-0"></span>

2 and  $S$  and  $S$  and  $I$  and 3 3 and  $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha$  and  $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha$  3 4 and  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\begin{pm$ 5 6 6  $\sim 0.3$  6  $\sim 0.3$  6  $\sim 0.5$  6  $\sim 0.5$  6  $\sim 0.5$  6  $\sim 5$  5  $\sim 5$  6 6 7 and  $\mathbb{Y} \setminus \mathbb{Y}$  and  $\mathbb{Y} \setminus \mathbb{Y}$ 8 and  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$   $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$   $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$   $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$   $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ 9 9 10  $\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array}$   $\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array}$  $\frac{1}{1}$  11



15 15 **Fig. 1.** *s* and *t* are group-by-group fuzzy bisimilar.

The bisimulation proposed by Cao et al. [\[4\]](#page--1-0) will distinguish them. To see this, the transition  $s \frac{a}{s_1} + \frac{0.5}{s_2}$  cannot be 18  $s_1$  18 19 matched by either  $t \to \frac{m}{t_1} + \frac{m}{t_2}$ , or  $t \to \frac{m}{t_1} + \frac{m}{t_2}$ , or  $t \to \frac{m}{t_2} + \frac{m}{t_2}$ . However, arguably the two states should not be 19 <sup>20</sup> distinguished from the following perspective. The transition of s<sup>q</sup> 0.3 + 0.5 can be respectively matched by t<sup>q</sup> 0.3 + 0.5 = 20 21 21  $\frac{31}{2}$   $\frac{32}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{32}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$  $_{22}$  (the central transition) when considering the group of states enabling only action b,  $l \to \frac{1}{l_2} + \frac{1}{l_3}$  (the righthlost transition)  $_{22}$ 23 when considering the *group* of *states* enabling only action *c*, and the *t*  $\frac{a}{t_1} + \frac{0.5}{t_2} + \frac{0.3}{t_1}$  (the leftmost transition) when considering  $\frac{23}{24}$ <sup>24</sup> the *group* of *states* enabling action *b* or *c*. The other transitions from *s* can be analyzed similarly. From this point of view, *s* <sup>24</sup> 25 25 and *t* ought *not* be distinguished. Indeed, in [\[4\]](#page--1-0) the bisimilar states must stepwise behave the same along two *fully matching* 26 26 *resolutions*, which in this case unnecessary and should be relaxed. matched by either  $t\frac{a}{\rightarrow}\frac{0.5}{t_1}+\frac{0.3}{t_2}$ , or  $t\frac{a}{\rightarrow}\frac{0.3}{t_1}+\frac{0.5}{t_3}$ , or  $t\frac{a}{\rightarrow}\frac{0.5}{t_2}+\frac{0.3}{t_3}$ . However, arguably the two states should not be distinguished from the following perspective. The transition of  $s \xrightarrow{a} \frac{0.3}{s_1} + \frac{0.5}{s_2}$  can be respectively matched by  $t \xrightarrow{a} \frac{0.3}{t_1} + \frac{0.5}{t_3}$ <br>(the central transition) when considering the *group of stat* 

<sup>27</sup> The aim of this paper is to define a new bisimulation for an FTS, dubbed group-by-group fuzzy bisimulation. This <sup>28</sup> bisimulation is different from the one proposed by Cao et al. [\[4\]](#page--1-0) in two aspects: (1) The bisimulation in [4] considers  $\frac{28}{10}$ 29 29 each equivalence class of some equivalence relation *R*, while ours considers each subset of equivalence classes; this is why 30 it is called a group-by-group fuzzy bisimulation, and (2) for a transition  $s \stackrel{a}{\rightarrow} \mu$ , the bisimulation in [\[4\]](#page--1-0) requires that there 31 31 <sub>32</sub> exists a transition *t* <sup>*a*</sup> *ν* such that *μ* and *ν* are equal at all equivalence classes of some equivalence relation *R*, i.e., the a<sub>32</sub>  $_{33}$  definition requires fully matching. In contrast, our definition requires that for each subset G of the equivalence classes and  $_{\rm 33}$ a transition *s*  $\stackrel{a}{\rightarrow}$  *μ*, there exists a transition *t*  $\stackrel{a}{\rightarrow}$  *ν* such that *μ* and *ν* are equal for the union of *G*. We note that for *G*<sub>1</sub>, *ν*<sub>1</sub> 34 as exists such that *μ* and *ν*<sub>1</sub> are equal for the union of  $G_1$ , but for different  $G_2$ , it is possible that *ν*<sub>2</sub> exists such that *μ* and as 36 36 *ν*<sup>2</sup> are equal for the union of G2. Loosely speaking, our new bisimulation allows *partially matching resolutions*.

37 37 We perform a systematic study on this new bisimulation by giving its characterization in different machinery, as follows.

- 38 38 39 39 1. We use a fixed point method to characterize group-by-group fuzzy bisimulation. This characterization shows that a 40 40 group-by-group fuzzy bisimulation is a post-fixed point of some suitable monotonic function over a complete lattice, 41 41 while a group-by-group fuzzy bisimilarity, the greatest group-by-group fuzzy bisimulation, is the greatest fixed point of 42 42 this monotonic function.
- 43 43 2. We give a polynomial time algorithm to computing group-by-group fuzzy bisimilarity. Our algorithm follows the stan-44 44 dard partition-refinement framework which is the cornerstone for the computation of almost all bisimulations in 45 45 conventional labeled transition systems, and their various probabilistic and fuzzy extensions. In the current setting, 46 46 while an exponential-time algorithm can be obtained almost for free, designing a polynomial-time algorithm turns out <sup>47</sup> to be difficult simply because of the universal quantification over all subsets of the state space (cf. Definition [3\)](#page--1-0). As a <sup>47</sup> 48 48 witness, for probabilistic systems considered in [\[1\]](#page--1-0), a similar group-by-group probabilistic bisimulation is proposed, but <sup>49</sup> eludes a polynomial-time algorithm.<sup>1</sup> In contrast, we show that in the fuzzy setting, a polynomial-time algorithm does  $49$ <sup>50</sup> exist, owing to that, essentially, the operations of max and min instead of addition and multiplication respectively are <sup>50</sup> 51 51 used.
- <sup>52</sup> 3. We provide a logical characterization of a group-by-group fuzzy bisimilarity, which states that two states are group-by-53 53 group fuzzy bisimilar if and only if they satisfy the same logical formulae. 54 54

<sup>55</sup> These characterizations suggest the robustness of our new definition of bisimulation of FTS. As mentioned, this work <sup>55</sup> <sup>56</sup> is inspired by the work in [\[1\]](#page--1-0), where a group-by-group probabilistic bisimulation is investigated in probabilistic systems. <sup>56</sup>  $57$  However, it is probably noteworthy that our work is different from that in [\[1\]](#page--1-0) in two aspects: (1) neither the fixed point  $57$  $^{58}$  characterization nor the algorithm was discussed in [\[1\]](#page--1-0), and (2) [1] has given a logical characterization of group-by-group  $^{58}$ 

59 59 60 60

<sup>61</sup> 61 <sup>1</sup> We conjecture such a polynomial-time algorithm does not exist.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6858767>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/6858767>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com/)