WS 2011-2012 28.11.2011

Exercises to the Lecture FSVT

Prof. Dr. Klaus Madlener

sheet 7

Exercise 1:

Let specifications ELEMENT and NAT be given as:

```
ELEMENT
         BOOL
uses
         Е
sorts
         eq: E, E \to Bool
opns
         x, y, z :\rightarrow E
vars
eqns
         eq(x, x) = true
         eq(x, y) = eq(y, x)
         eq(x, y) = true \text{ and } eq(y, z) = true \text{ implies } eq(x, z) = true
spec
         NAT
uses
         BOOL
         Ν
sorts
         0 :\to N
opns
         s:N\to N
         equal: N, N \rightarrow Bool
         n, m : \rightarrow N
vars
eqns
         equal(0,0) = true
         equal(0, s(n) = false
         equal(s(n), 0) = false
         equal(s(n), s(m)) = equal(n, m)
```

Give a parametrized specification for sets over ELEMENT with the operations INSERT and REMOVE and prove:

- 1. The signature morphism $\sigma : \text{ELEMENT} \to \text{NAT}$ given by $\sigma(E) = N$ and $\sigma(eq = equal)$ is no specification morphism.
- 2. $(T_{\text{NAT}})|\sigma$ is a model of ELEMENT, i.e. it is a correct parameter assignment.
- 3. Does your specification satisfy $(T_{\text{VALUE}})|_{\text{NAT}} \cong T_{\text{NAT}}$, i.e. is VALUE an extension of NAT? Is it an enrichment?

Exercise 2:

Consider the mu-calculus with the following rules for arbitrary $X, Y \in \{m, i, u\}^*$:

$$\{\frac{Xi}{Xiu}, \frac{mY}{mYY}, \frac{XiiiY}{XuY}, \frac{XuuY}{XY}\}$$

- 1. Is the reduction system it is based on terminating?
- 2. Do $mi \to mu, \, mu \to mi$ resp. hold? Prove your claim.

Exercise 3:

Prove the properties of the muiltiset ordering following definition 8.22 on slide 284.

Exercise 4:

Prove that the proof ordering from slide 285 is noetherian.

Delivery: until 04.12.2011,

by E-Mail to huechting@informatik.uni-kl.de