

# Applications of Interval-based Temporal Separation: the Reactivity Normal Form, Inverse $\Pi$ , Craig Interpolation and Beth Definability

Dimitar P. Guelev<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Algebra and Logic, Institute of Mathematics and Informatics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Compiled December 10, 2025

## ABSTRACT

We show how interval-based temporal separation on the extension of Moszkowski's discrete time interval temporal logic (Moszkowski, 1986) by the neighbourhood modalities (ITL-NL) and a lemma which is key in establishing this form of separation in (Guelev and Moszkowski, 2022) can be used to obtain concise proofs of an interval-based form of the reactivity normal form as known from (Manna and Pnueli, 1990), the inverse of the temporal projection operator from (Halpern, Manna and Moszkowski, 1983), the elimination of propositional quantification in ITL-NL and, consequently, uniform Craig interpolation and Beth definability for ITL-NL.

## KEYWORDS

interval temporal logic · Gabbay separation · temporal reactivity temporal form · temporal projection · Craig interpolation · Beth definability

## Introduction

In [GM22] we established a separation theorem for the extension of Moszkowski's discrete time ITL Interval Temporal Logic (ITL, [HMM83, Mos85, Mos86, CMZ]) by the neighbourhood modalities, which are known from Halpern-Shoham logic (HS, [HS86]) and Neighbourhood Logics (NLs). The latter are systems of interval-based temporal logic with them as the only temporal operators, cf. e.g., [MGMS11]. The separation theorem was formulated on the model of Gabbay's separation theorem for Linear Temporal Logic with past PLTL [Gab89]. We have since ported the result to a subset of the Duration Calculus (DC) [Gue22], which is an interval-based real-time logic based on a related *chop* operator [ZHR91, ZH04]. In [GM24] we applied separation to establish the expressive completeness of ITL-NL, the considered extension of ITL, wrt the monadic theory of  $\langle \mathbb{Z}, < \rangle$ . This is the first order theory for ITL-NL with just  $\bigcirc$ , *chop* and the neighbourhood modalities as the temporal connectives, and the second order theory, if *chop-star*, the iterative form of *chop* of ITL, is included. The expressive completeness proof in [GM24] is established on the model of the proof of expressive completeness of PLTL from [GHR94], which is a major improvement on the proof of the seminal result of Kamp [Kam68]. The expressive completeness of the subset of DC from [Gue22] was established in [Rab00] well before separation was established, by another method.

In this paper we show how separation helps establish some more results in ITL-NL, whose variants in point-based discrete time propositional temporal logics are known for their many uses. This includes the normal form for reactivity properties from the hierarchy of temporal properties of Manna and Pnueli [MP90], and the companion theorems of Craig interpolation and Beth definability.

The hierarchy of Manna and Pnueli in PLTL [MP90] is the inclusion ordering of a finite number of classes of  $\omega$ -languages also termed (*temporal*) *properties*. In ascending order, the classes are known as *safety* and its dual *guarantee*, aka *reachability*, followed by the intermediate class of *obligation* properties, which are finite combinations of safety and guarantee ones by  $\cup$  and  $\cap$ , followed by the classes of *recurrence*, aka *response*, and *persistence* properties, which are about an event occurring infinitely many times or ultimately always, respectively, followed by their finitary combinations by  $\cup$  and  $\cap$ , which form the top class, which is called *reactivity*. In [MP90], the hierarchy is given in the notation of topology, involving up to  $G_\delta$ -sets and  $F_\sigma$ -sets in the topological space of infinite sequences, the notation of regular  $\omega$ -languages, and PLTL. Normal forms of the regular expressions and PLTL formulas are known for the properties of each of the classes, in case these properties are  $\omega$ -regular or expressible in PLTL, respectively. Further insight on the study can be found in [CMP93], where earlier results about the individual classes such as [Lan69, Wag79] on the definability of recurrence and reactivity by their corresponding types of  $\omega$ -automata have been both referred to and included for the sake of self-containedness. In this paper we use interval-based separation to establish an interval-based normal form for the top class of *reactivity* in ITL-NL. The scope of this normal form is greater than that of the PLTL ones and equals the scope of the regular expression normal form because the expressiveness ITL-NL matches  $\omega$ -regular languages.

The  $\Pi$  operator was introduced in [HMM83]. Given temporal formulas  $A$  and  $B$ ,  $A\Pi B$  means that  $B$  is true in the interval obtained by selecting some of the states of a reference interval, namely the states which satisfy  $A$ .  $\Pi$  has proven to have multiple applications, including some we made in [MG17], stemming from the fact that interleaving concurrency is about partitioning processing time between concurrent processes, and that the first operand  $A$  of  $A\Pi \dots$  can be used to select the time allocated to a process.  $\Pi$  is known to not increase the ultimate expressive power of ITL: every formula in ITL with  $\Pi$  has an equivalent one without, and the latter can be obtained by a compositional translation. In terms of our application to concurrency, that translation can be seen as giving an explicit and therefore much more verbose and lower-level account of how interleaving works.

In this paper we introduce the inverse  $\Pi^{-1}$  of  $\Pi$  wrt its second operand  $B$ , while assuming the first operand to be fixed. Intuitively,  $\sigma \models A\Pi^{-1}B$  means that  $\sigma$ , which is supposed to satisfy  $A$  in all of its suffix subintervals, can be expanded by inserting non- $A$  states to obtain an interval which satisfies  $B$ . This can be seen as determining whether the reference  $\sigma$  consists of the ‘observable’ states of a longer interval that accommodates a process which fits the description  $B$ . We stick to the case of  $A$  being a *state* formula, that is a temporal connective-free formula, in this paper for the sake of simplicity.

We use separation to show that  $\Pi^{-1}$  is expressible in ITL too. Along with that, we use separation to obtain a specific normal form of propositional ITL formulas. We find this normal form interesting because, given an arbitrary formula  $B$ , the normal form makes it easy to read the conditions that an interval  $\sigma$  satisfying  $B$  must satisfy in terms of the properties of the subintervals of  $\sigma$  that are maximal either wrt the condition of satisfying  $w$  all along, or the condition of satisfying  $\neg w$  all along.

A logic has the *Craig interpolation property* if, for any valid implication  $A \supset B$ , there exists an *interpolating* formula  $C$  built using only the non-logical symbols that appear in both  $A$  and  $B$  such that  $A \supset C$  and  $C \supset B$  are valid too. First order predicate logic is known to have this property. Despite being expressively equivalent to a monadic first-order theory, propositional Linear Temporal Logic (LTL, cf. e.g., [Pnu77]) does not have Craig interpolation [Mak91] but some subsets of LTL have it [GtC09]. ITL and ITL-NL have these theorems thanks to the possibility to express propositional quantification using *chop-star*. Since propositional quantification enables writing *strongest consequences*, which are also uniform interpolants, temporal logics with point-based Kripke semantics where propositional quantification is either present or expressible as in, e.g., the propositional  $\mu$ -calculus [Koz83, GtC09], have the properties too. The linear time  $\mu$ -calculus (cf. e.g., [Kai95]) and ITL have it too thanks to the expressibility of propositional quantification. Interpolants  $C$  can be derived from just one of the given  $A$  and  $B$  in these logics. This stronger form of interpolation is called *uniform*. (To the best of our knowledge, first-order predicate logic does not have uniform interpolation.) In logics with Kripke semantics, uniform interpolation is generally closely related to bisimulation as seen on the example of the propositional  $\mu$ -calculus again [DH00].

Craig interpolation is closely related to two more model-theoretic properties: *Robinson consistency* and *explicit (Beth) definability*, both enjoyed by first order predicate logic, cf. e.g., [Sho67]. Once a logic is shown to have one of the three properties, the other two often follow by standard arguments. Let  $[p'/p]A$  stand for the substitution of  $p'$  for  $p$  in  $A$ . Sentence  $A$  *implicitly defines* non-logical symbol  $p$ , which is assumed to appear in  $A$ , if, given some fresh symbol  $p'$  of the type of  $p$ ,  $A \wedge [p'/p]A$  implies that  $p$  and  $p'$  are semantically equivalent. For  $p$  being a predicate letter in first order predicate logic this can be written as

$$\models A \wedge [p'/p]A \supset (p(\bar{x}) \equiv p'(\bar{x})) \quad (1)$$

where  $\bar{x}$  is a sequence of individual variables. Beth's work shows that *implicit* definability implies the existence of a predicate formula  $C$  with  $\bar{x}$  as the list of free variables such that

$$\models A \supset (p(\bar{x}) \equiv C),$$

that is, the existence of a  $C$  which *explicitly* defines  $p$  so that  $A$  is satisfied.

Beth definability can be formulated in LTL as follows. Propositional variable  $p$  is *implicitly defined by formula  $A$* , if

$$\models \Box A \wedge \Box [p'/p]A \supset \Box (p \equiv p'). \quad (2)$$

The  $\Box$  of  $\Box A$  corresponds to the requirement on  $A$  of the predicate logic case to be a sentence. The  $\Box$  of  $\Box (p \equiv p')$  states that  $p$  and  $p'$  are equivalent at all times, that is, the unary predicates on time they stand for are equivalent. The corresponding first order case  $\forall \bar{x}$  is omitted because it can be derived by generalization, and the  $\Box$  of  $\Box (p \equiv p')$  can be omitted for the same reason too. The counterexample from [Mak91] indicates that  $p$  which ‘count’ can be implicitly defined, whereas ‘counting’ is known to be not expressible in LTL (cf. e.g. [Zuc86]); hence a formula  $C$  such that  $\models \Box A \supset \Box (p \equiv C)$  is not bound to exist. Hence companion Craig property fails too.

Surveys on interval-based temporal logics can be found in [GMS04, MGMS11]. In

ITL, formulas generally define properties of sequences of consecutive states, which are called intervals, but atomic propositions are restricted to depend only on the initial state of the reference interval. This convention is known as the *locality principle*. It bridges the gap between ITL’s interval-based semantics and state-based models such as sequences of observations, and Kripke models. ITL’s temporal connectives  $\circ$ , *chop* and *chop-star* provide reference only to the subintervals of the reference interval. To indicate this, these connectives are called *introspective*, unlike many of the connectives in Halpern-Shoham logic (HS, [HS86]), which provide access outside the reference interval and are therefore called *expanding*. In introspective ITL,  $\Box$  stands for *in all suffix subintervals*, and the *universal modality* [GP92] can be defined by combining  $\Box$  with  $\Box A \triangleq \neg(\neg A; \text{true})$ , which means *A in all prefix subintervals*.

The locality principle restricts the class of properties which an atomic proposition  $p$  can be defined to express explicitly by putting  $\Box\Box(p \equiv C)$  for a temporal  $C$  with introspective connectives only to properties of the initial states of reference intervals (which is also a degenerate 1-state intervals). The use of introspective connectives is vacuous in such intervals because they are their only own subintervals: e.g.,  $C'; C''$  simplifies to  $C' \wedge C''$ . Hence the scope of Beth’s theorem is very limited. The neighbourhood modalities are expanding. They are written  $\langle A \rangle$  and  $\langle \bar{A} \rangle$  in HS, whose modalities have Allen’s system of binary relations on time intervals [All83] as their Kripke semantics.  $\langle A \rangle$  and  $\langle \bar{A} \rangle$  evaluate their operand in adjacent intervals on the left and on the right of the reference one, respectively. Nested occurrences enable properties of the entire time-line to be specified from the viewpoint of a single (degenerate) time interval. With the *neighbourhood modalities* allowed in ITL-NL explicit definitions  $p \equiv C$ , the expressive completeness of ITL-NL implies that atomic propositions  $p$  can be defined to stand for (the ITL-NL-translation of) any unary predicate that is definable in  $MSO(\mathbb{Z}, <)$ .

As mentioned above, systems based on  $\langle A \rangle$  and/or  $\langle \bar{A} \rangle$  only are known as Neighbourhood Logics (NLs). Importantly *chop*, which is binary, and is basic in systems such as Venema’s CDT [Ven91], Signed Interval Logic [Ras99], Moszkowski’s ITL and its extension by the neighbourhood modalities in this paper, is not expressible in propositional HS and NL. Together with *chop-star*, also available in ITL, *chop* is key to the result in this paper. Hence the results in this paper, simple to establish separation as they are, assert the choice to work in ITL-NL as we did by establishing separation after Gabbay [Gab89] and expressive completeness of the extension of ITL by the neighbourhood modalities in [GM22, GM24].

**Structure of the paper:** Section 1 overviews propositional ITL-NL, the extension of ITL by the neighbourhood modalities, and separation for ITL-NL as known from [GM22]. . . .

In this paper we first show that Craig interpolation propagates to ITL-NL together with the expressibility of propositional quantification, and then derive from it Beth definability by an appropriate modification of the standard argument, which uses ITL-NL separation for getting around the use of  $\Box$  in  $\Box(p \equiv p')$ . Our main technical tool is our separation theorem for ITL-NL and some auxiliary propositions used for establishing it from [GM22].

## 1. Preliminaries

**Reactivity as in the hierarchy of temporal properties from [MP90]** Given a statespace  $\Sigma$ , a discrete time temporal *property* is a set of infinite sequences  $\sigma : \omega \rightarrow \Sigma$ . Such sequences are also called  $\omega$ -words, and a properties are also called  $\omega$ -languages over  $\Sigma$  as the alphabet. The set of all  $\omega$ -words over  $\Sigma$  is written  $\Sigma^\omega$ . (In general  $^\omega$  is a unary operation from finite-or-infinite word languages to  $\omega$ -ones that generalizes Kleene star  $*$ : given  $M \subseteq \Sigma^*$ ,  $M^\omega$  is the set of the infinite concatenations  $\sigma_0 \cdot \sigma_1 \cdot \dots$  of words from  $M$ .) The notion of *regularity* as known about finite word formal languages has been generalized to  $\omega$ -languages (cf. e.g. [Tho90]) and has since become a cornerstone in the verification of reactive systems. *Reactivity* is the top class of the hierarchy of temporal properties which was proposed in [MP90]. Given a  $\sigma \in \Sigma^\omega$ ,  $\text{pref}(\sigma) \triangleq \{\sigma^0 \dots \sigma^k : k < \omega\}$  is the set of its (finite) prefixes. The properties from that hierarchy are defined in terms of  $\text{pref}(\cdot)$  on the  $\omega$ -words  $\sigma$  of the respective languages. Let  $L \subseteq \Sigma^\omega$ .  $L$  is a *reactivity* property, if

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{there exist some finite number of pairs of finite word languages } M'_n, M''_n, \\ &n = 1, \dots, N \text{ such that } \sigma \in L \text{ iff, for some } n \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \text{pref}(\sigma) \setminus M'_n \text{ is} \quad (3) \\ &\text{finite and } \text{pref}(\sigma) \cap M''_n \text{ is infinite.} \end{aligned}$$

In case  $M'_n, M''_n$  are regular, this definition implies that  $L$  is  $\omega$ -regular. Using the De Morgan laws and the closedness of the classes of all  $\omega$ -regular languages and all (finite word) regular languages under complementation, the above definition can be formulated as a conjunction on conditions on some finite number of (some possibly different) finite word languages  $M'_n, M''_n$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{There exist some finite number of pairs of finite word languages } M'_n, M''_n, \\ &n = 1, \dots, N \text{ such that } \sigma \in L \text{ iff, for all } n \in \{1, \dots, N\} \text{ such that } \text{pref}(\sigma) \cap M''_n \quad (4) \\ &\text{is finite } \text{pref}(\sigma) \cap M'_n \text{ is finite too.} \end{aligned}$$

In the notation of formal languages,  $\omega$ -regular properties of the various classes from the hierarchy admit *normal forms*, which are obtained by showing that the languages of finite words involved in the classes' definitions are *regular*. LTL-definable properties admit normal forms in LTL with past according to their belonging to the respective classes of the hierarchy too. The forms are given in [MP90]. Detailed proofs can be found in [CMP93]. The proofs start from the assumption that an  $\omega$ -regular language  $L$  is accepted by an appropriate Streett automaton. Then it is shown that, for each of the classes, a Streett automaton accepting  $L$  with its accepting condition appropriately specialized exists. Finally, the relevant regular languages  $M, M'_1, M''_1, \dots, M'_N, M''_N$ , are defined as the sets of words which take the specialized Streett automaton to a state from one of the sets used to formulate its specialized accepting condition.

**ITL with the neighbourhood modalities** An in-depth introduction to propositional ITL, which has  $\bigcirc$ , *chop* and *chop-star* as the temporal operators, can be found in [Mos86, CMZ]. In ITL, formulas are evaluated at finite or right-infinite sequences  $\sigma = \sigma^0 \sigma^1 \dots$  of subsets  $\sigma^k$  of the chosen vocabulary  $V$  of *propositional variables*, which are called *states*. The term *intervals* is used for such sequences in ITL its extensions.

ITL-NL's *neighbourhood modalities* are written  $\langle \bar{A} \rangle$  and  $\langle A \rangle$  in Halpern-Shoham logic HS and its subsets such as propositional NL. In this paper we avoid overloading  $A$  by adopting the symbols  $\Diamond_l$  and  $\Diamond_r$  from the predicate real-time logics based on the

neighbourhood modalities in [CH97, BRZ00] in ITL-NL:

$$A ::= \text{false} \mid p \mid A \supset A \mid \bigcirc A \mid A; A \mid A^* \mid \Diamond_l A \mid \Diamond_r A$$

where  $p$  stands for a propositional variables. We write  $\text{Var}(A)$  for the set of propositional variables occurring in formula  $A$ .

Satisfaction in the form  $\sigma \models A$  as in ITL does not account for the possibility that time extends beyond the endpoints of  $\sigma$  as necessary to define  $\Diamond_l$  and  $\Diamond_r$ . Therefore, with  $\sigma : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \Sigma$  satisfaction has the form  $\sigma, i, j \models A$ . Here  $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $i \leq j$ , define a *reference interval* within  $\sigma$ . This is equivalent to  $\sigma^i \dots \sigma^j \models A$  in the standard ITL notation for  $A$  with no neighbourhood modalities. For the sake of simplicity we fix  $\text{dom } \sigma = \mathbb{Z}$  and rule out infinite reference intervals, where  $i = -\infty$ , or  $j = \infty$ , in this paper. Generalizing the results to  $\text{dom } \sigma$  being any interval in  $\mathbb{Z}$  and allowing infinite reference intervals as in [GM22] can be achieved by straightforward modifications, which, however, would make the presentation more complicated.

The defining clauses for  $\models$  are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma, i, j &\not\models \text{false} \\ \sigma, i, j &\models p && \text{iff } p \in \sigma^i \\ \sigma, i, j &\models A \supset B && \text{iff } \sigma, i, j \models B \text{ or } \sigma, i, j \not\models A \\ \sigma, i, j &\models \bigcirc A && \text{iff } i < j \text{ and } \sigma, i+1, j \models A \\ \sigma, i, j &\models A; B && \text{iff } \sigma, i, k \models A \text{ and } \sigma, k, j \models B \text{ for some } k \in \{i, \dots, j\} \\ \sigma, i, j &\models \Diamond_l A && \text{iff there exists a } k \leq i \text{ such that } \sigma, k, i \models A \\ \sigma, i, j &\models \Diamond_r A && \text{iff there exists a } k \geq j \text{ such that } \sigma, j, k \models A \end{aligned}$$

The definitions of  $\models$  for  $A^*$  (*chop-star*) and propositional quantification  $\exists p A$ , whose interplay is key to establishing uniform Craig interpolation for ITL-NL in this paper, are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma, i, j &\models A^* && \text{iff } i = j, \text{ or there exists a sequence } k_0 = i < k_1 < \dots < k_N = j \\ &&& \text{such that } \sigma, k_n, k_{n+1} \models A \text{ for } n = 0, \dots, N-1. \\ \sigma, i, j &\models \exists p A && \text{iff there exists a } \sigma' : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \Sigma \text{ such that } \sigma^k \setminus \{p\} = (\sigma')^k \setminus \{p\} \\ &&& \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } \sigma', i, j \models A \end{aligned}$$

The connectives of ITL-NL include *chop-star* but quantification, which is shown to be expressible below, is not included. Formula  $A$  is *valid*, written  $\models A$ , if  $\sigma, i, j \models A$  for all  $\sigma$  and all pairs  $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ , such that  $i \leq j$ . We write ITL-NL for ITL with  $\Diamond_l$  and  $\Diamond_r$ .

The definitions of *true*,  $\neg$ ,  $\wedge$ ,  $\vee$  and  $\equiv$  are as usual in ITL-NL. We use the following defined temporal constants and derived operators below:

$\text{empty} \triangleq \neg \bigcirc \text{true}$	- a single state interval
$\text{skip} \triangleq \bigcirc \text{empty}$	- a length 1 (2 states)
$\ominus A \triangleq A; \text{skip}$	$A$ at the interval minus the last state
$\Diamond A \triangleq \text{true}; A, \quad \Diamond A \triangleq A; \text{true}$	$A$ in some suffix subinterval, $A$ in some prefix subinterval
$\Box A \triangleq \neg \Diamond \neg A, \quad \Box A \triangleq \neg \Diamond \neg A$	$A$ in all suffix subintervals, $A$ in all prefix subintervals
$\Box_l A \triangleq \neg \Diamond_l \neg A, \quad \Box_r A \triangleq \neg \Diamond_r \neg A$	$A$ in all adjacent intervals on the left, resp. on the right
$\text{fin } A \triangleq \Box(\text{empty} \supset A)$	$A$ in the single state suffix subinterval, i.e., at the last state

Here are the ITL-NL connectives, basic and derived, listed in decreasing order of their

binding strength:

$$\neg, \bigcirc, \ominus, \Diamond_l, \Diamond_r, \Box_l, \Box_r, \Diamond, \Box, \text{ and } (\cdot)^*; (\cdot; \cdot); \wedge; \vee; \supset \text{ and } \equiv .$$

**Expressiveness of ITL and ITL-NL** The expressive completeness of introspective ITL on finite intervals was investigated in [Mos83]. With either *chop-star* or propositional quantification, or both, introspective ITL is expressively complete wrt the monadic second order theory of finite sequences, or  $\langle \omega, < \rangle$ , if infinite intervals are allowed. With none of these connectives, expressive completeness holds wrt the respective monadic *first* order theories. The same holds about ITL-NL wrt  $\langle \mathbb{Z}, < \rangle$  [GM24], where infinite intervals are included. Other results on ITL-NL such as separation apply to its  $\exists$ - and *chop-star*-free subset too as shown in [GM22]. However, our proof of Craig interpolation as a corollary to the existence of strongest consequence formulas in this paper hinges on the expressibility of quantification with the use of *chop-star*. We do not have this result for the *chop-star*-free subset.

**Guarded Normal Form (GNF)** Temporal logics and process algebras commonly admit *guarded normal forms* which are case distinctions featuring a full system of first state/initial process step options and the respective possible continuations. In both LTL and ITL the form of formula  $A$  reads

$$A_e \wedge \text{empty} \vee \bigvee_k A_k \wedge \bigcirc A'_k , \quad (5)$$

the key difference being that temporal connectives that, unlike  $\bigcirc$ , are not shared by LTL and ITL can appear in the designated formulas.  $A_e$  and the  $A_k$ -s are supposed to be *state*, i.e., modality-free, pairwise inconsistent, and can be guaranteed to be a full system, which we assume below, possibly at the cost of writing a  $\bigcirc \perp$  as the  $\bigcirc A_{K+1}$

for an  $A_{K+1} \triangleq \neg \left( \bigvee_{k=1}^K A_k \right)$ . The finest (and costliest to process) GNF commences, if every conjunction of the form  $\bigwedge_{p \in \text{Var}(A)} \varepsilon_p p$  appears as an  $A_k$ . Here  $\varepsilon_p$  is the optional negation allowed to precede  $p$ . The coarsest GNF satisfies the additional condition that no two  $A'_k$ s are equivalent. This GNF can be obtained by any other one by merging disjuncts with equivalent  $A_k$ s. It is unique up to equivalence of the  $A_k$ s and the  $A'_k$ s. Since the  $A_k$ -s form a full system, the equivalence of (5) to  $A$  implies

$$\models A \equiv (\text{empty} \supset A_e) \wedge \bigwedge_k (A_k \wedge \neg \text{empty}) \supset \bigcirc A'_k \quad (6)$$

**Optional Negations** In the sequel, given an optional negation  $\varepsilon$ , we write  $\bar{\varepsilon}$  for its alternative optional negation.

**Reversing (aka mirroring) time** Observe that  $\ominus$  is the time inverse of  $\bigcirc$  because:

$$\sigma, i, j \models A; \text{skip} \text{ iff } i < j \text{ and } \sigma, i, j-1 \models A.$$

This kind of symmetry lets us avoid repeats by referring to the *time inverses*  $A^{-1}$  of ITL-NL formulas  $A$  after Section 6 from [Ras99]. By definition,  $\dots \sigma^{k-1} \sigma^k \sigma^{k+1} \dots, i, j \models A^{-1}$  iff  $\dots \sigma^{k+1} \sigma^k \sigma^{k-1} \dots, j, i \models A$ . Hence  $\models A$  and  $\models A^{-1}$  are equivalent. In ITL-NL,  $A^{-1}$  can be expressed by replacing in  $A$  the occurrences of  $\bigcirc$  and  $\Diamond_r$ , by  $\ominus$ , and  $\Diamond_l$ , respectively, and vice versa, exchanging the operands

of *chop*, and replacing propositional variables  $p$  by  $\text{fin } p$  to account of the fact that propositional variables are evaluated at the leftmost state of reference intervals, and  $\text{fin } p$  refers to  $p$ 's value at the rightmost state.

**The separation theorem for ITL-NL [GM22]** Formulas with no occurrences of  $\Diamond_l$  or  $\Diamond_r$  are called *introspective* in ITL-NL. Along with introspective formulas, this theorem refers to past and future ITL-NL formulas.

**Definition 1.1.** An ITL-NL formula  $F$  is (non-strictly) *future* if it has the syntax

$$F ::= C \mid \neg F \mid F \vee F \mid \Diamond_r F$$

where  $C$  denotes the class of introspective, that is, ITL, formulas. The syntax of non-strictly *past* formulas is similar, with  $\Diamond_r$  replaced by  $\Diamond_l$ .

*Strictly* future and *strictly* past formulas have designated occurrences of *skip* to restrict the conditions on adjacent intervals they express not to refer to the end-states of the reference interval:

**Definition 1.2.** An ITL-NL formula is *strictly future* (*past*), if it has the form  $\Diamond_r(\text{skip}; F)$  ( $\Diamond_l(P; \text{skip})$ ) where  $F$  is future ( $P$  is past).

Syntactically, *strictly* future (past) formulas are not future (past) in the sense of Definition (1.1). However, every *strictly* future (past) formula is equivalent to a future (past) one [GM22].

A *strictly separated formula* is a Boolean combination of strictly past, introspective and strictly future formulas.

**Theorem 1.3** (Corollary 2.6 in [GM22]). *Let  $A$  be an ITL-NL formula. Then there exists a strictly separated  $S$  such that  $\models A \equiv S$ .*

Importantly, the proof of Theorem 1.3 in [GM22] is based on syntactical transformations by means of valid equivalences. Hence the equivalence of any given formula and its separated form can be easily made part of a proof in any complete proof system for ITL-NL. These transformations are valid in this paper's variant of ITL-NL where infinite reference intervals are excluded too. Therefore the theorem applies without change.

Along with Theorem 1.3, in this paper we use one more proposition from [GM22], which can be described as an *introspective* form of separation as it is about writing an ITL, that is,  $\Diamond_l$ - and  $\Diamond_r$ -free, formula as a combination of conditions on the possible choppings of reference intervals into prefix and suffix parts, with these conditions written in ITL too. Formulas  $A_1, \dots, A_n$  form a *full system*, if  $\models \bigvee_{k=1}^n A_k$  and, if  $1 \leq k_1 < k_2 \leq n$ , then  $\models \neg(A_{k_1} \wedge A_{k_2})$ .

**Proposition 1.4** (Lemma 3.2 in [GM22]). *Let  $A$  be an ITL formula. Then there exists a  $K < \omega$  and some ITL formulas  $A_k, A'_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , such that  $A_1, \dots, A_K$  is a full system and*

$$\models A \equiv \bigvee_{k=1}^K A_k; A'_k \quad \models A \equiv \bigwedge_{k=1}^K \neg(A_k; \neg A'_k). \quad (7)$$



The time-inverse statement holds too:

**Proposition 1.5** (Lemma 3.4 in [GM22]). *Let  $A$  be an ITL formula. Then there exists an  $K < \omega$  and some ITL formulas  $A_k, A'_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , such that  $A_1, \dots, A_K$  is a full system and*

$$\models A \equiv \bigvee_{k=1}^K A'_k; A_k \quad \models A \equiv \bigwedge_{k=1}^K \neg(\neg A'_k; A_k).$$

In [GM22], these two propositions are part of the proof of Theorem 1.3, which covers expanding modalities. Importantly, the equivalence (7) from Proposition 1.4 admits the following *strict* form:

$$\models A \equiv A_e \wedge \text{empty} \vee \bigvee_{k=1}^K A_k; \text{skip}; A'_k \quad \models A \equiv (\text{empty} \supset A_e) \wedge \bigwedge_{k=1}^K \neg(A_k; \text{skip}; \neg A'_k). \quad (8)$$

A similar form can be derived from Proposition 1.5. The strict form (8) of (7) avoids both  $A_k$  and  $A'_k$  imposing a condition on the state that is shared by the prefix and suffix chop witness intervals. Using some arbitrary GNFs

$$G_{k,e} \wedge \text{empty} \vee \bigvee_{l_k=1}^{L_k} G_{k,l} \wedge \bigcirc G'_{k,l}$$

of the  $A'_k$ s,  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , a strict variant (8) of (7) can be written as

$$\text{empty} \wedge \left( \bigvee_{k=1}^K G_{k,e} \right) \vee \bigvee_{k=1}^K \bigvee_{l_k=1}^{L_k} (A_k \wedge \text{fin } G_{k,l_k}); \text{skip}; G_{k,l_k}.$$

**The Projection Operator  $\Pi$  in ITL [HMM83]** Given a sequence  $\sigma$  of type  $I \rightarrow \Sigma$ ,  $\Sigma \triangleq \mathcal{P}(V)$ , and  $S \subseteq \Sigma$ , we write  $\sigma|_S$  for the sequence obtained by deleting the states  $\sigma^i \notin S$ ,  $i \in I$  from  $\sigma$  and organizing the remaining states into a sequence with its elements' subscripts ranging over some (generally shorter) interval  $I'$  such that  $\min I' = \min I$ . For state formulas  $s$ ,  $\sigma|_s \triangleq \sigma|_{\{x \in \Sigma : x \models s\}}$ . Given a state formula  $s$  and an ITL formula  $A$ ,

$$\sigma \models s\Pi A \text{ if } \sigma|_s \models A.$$

This tacitly implies that  $\sigma \not\models s\Pi A$  for  $\sigma$  with no  $s$ -states in them. With its left operand  $s$  fixed,  $\Pi$  is a  $\mathbf{D_c}$ -modality (cf. e.g. [HC96]) because  $\sigma \mapsto \sigma|_s$  is a partial function. It admits a *weak* dual  $s\bar{\Pi}A \triangleq \neg(s\Pi(\neg A))$ , which is trivially true, if  $\sigma|_s$  is the empty sequence.

## 2. A Normal Form for Reactivity in ITL-NL

This is one of the most straightforward applications of Proposition 1.4. It is known that given an  $\omega$ -regular language  $L \subseteq \Sigma^\omega$ ,  $\Sigma \triangleq \mathcal{P}(V)$  there exists an ITL formula

$F \triangleq F_L$  in the vocabulary  $V$  such that  $L = \{\sigma \in \Sigma^\omega : \sigma \models F\}$ , and vice versa. The same applies to languages of nonempty finite words and ITL on finite intervals. Given the regular language form (3) for reactivity from [MP90], we can assume that there exist some ITL formulas  $F'_{L,1}, \dots, F'_{L,N}$  and  $F''_{L,1}, \dots, F''_{L,N}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma \in L \text{ iff } & \text{for some } n = 1, \dots, N, \\ & \text{there exist only finitely many } l \text{ such that } \sigma^{0..l} \models \neg F'_{l,n} \\ & \text{and infinitely many } l \text{ such that } \sigma^{0..l} \models F''_{l,n}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $C$  be any ITL formula, and let  $\bigvee_{k=1}^K C_k; C'_k$  meet the requirements of Proposition 1.4. Then

**Proposition 2.1.** *The number of the prefixes of a  $\sigma : \omega \rightarrow \Sigma$  which satisfy  $F$  is finite iff any extension  $\sigma' : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \Sigma$  of  $\sigma$  satisfies  $\sigma', 0, 0 \models \Diamond_r \bigvee_{k=1}^K (C_k \wedge \Box_r \neg C'_k)$ .*

**Proof.** Observe that, if  $\sigma^{0..l} \models C_k$ , then, for any  $l' \geq l$  to satisfy  $\sigma^{0..l'} \models C$ , it is necessary that  $\sigma^{l..l'} \models C'_k$ , and this is denied by  $\Box_r \neg C'_k$ . On the other hand, since  $C_1, \dots, C_K$  form a full system, for any  $l \geq 0$ , a unique  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  exists such that  $\sigma^{0..l} \models C_k$ .  $\square$

In the setting of Proposition 2.1, we need  $\sigma'$  here just to conform with the definition of  $\models$  in ITL-NL; no reference to the states in  $\sigma$  on the left of 0 is to be made. Given a regular language of nonempty words  $X$ , we let

$$Fin(X) \triangleq \Diamond_r \bigvee_{k=1}^K (C_{X,k} \wedge \Box_r \neg C'_{X,k})$$

where  $C_X$  is some arbitrary fixed ITL formula which defines  $X$  and  $C_{X,k}$  and  $C'_{X,k}$  are as above. Using this notation, the form (3) translates into the following defining equivalence for the considered  $\omega$ -regular  $L$  by an ITL-NL formula:

$$\sigma \in L \text{ iff } \sigma', 0, 0 \models \bigvee_{n=1}^N Fin(\Sigma^* \setminus M'_n) \wedge \neg Fin(M''_n)$$

where  $\sigma'$  is an arbitrary extension of  $\sigma$  as in Proposition 2.1. Similarly (4) translates into

$$\sigma \in L \text{ iff } \sigma', 0, 0 \models \bigwedge_{n=1}^N Fin(M''_n) \supset Fin(M'_n). \quad (9)$$

### 3. The Finiteness of Closing under Separation

Consider sets  $\mathcal{F}$  of ITL formulas which satisfy the following condition:

If  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ , then there exist some  $A'_1, \dots, A'_K$  which, together with some  $A_e, A_1, \dots, A_K$  satisfy (8) and the condition on  $A_1, \dots, A_K$  to be a full system, and, furthermore,

$$A'_1, \dots, A'_K \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Let  $Cl(B)$  stand for an arbitrary fixed minimal  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  $B \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $F$  has the above closedness condition.

By virtue of the fact that, on  $\sigma$  with  $\text{dom } \sigma = [0; \infty)$ , ITL, and the  $\diamond_l$ -free subset of ITL-NL, define languages which are definable by  $\omega$ -automata, it follows that, given an  $A$ , finite  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  exist. The details are as follows. Consider a deterministic  $\omega$ -automaton  $\mathcal{A} \triangleq \langle Q, q_0, \delta, Acc \rangle$  with  $\Sigma$  as the input alphabet which defines the language of the  $\omega$ -words  $\sigma \in \Sigma^\omega$  such that  $\sigma \models A$  for ITL formula  $A$ . The form of  $\mathcal{A}$ 's acceptance condition  $Acc$  may vary depending on the precise type of  $\omega$ -automaton, cf., e.g., [Far01]. Given any  $q \in Q$ ,  $A_q$  can be chosen to be the (finite time) ITL formula which defines  $L_{q_0, q} \triangleq \{\sigma \in \Sigma^+ : q = \delta(q_0, \sigma)\}$ . Here  $\delta$  is overloaded to denote the function which maps a source states such as  $q_0$  and a finite input word such as  $\sigma$  to the unique destination state  $q$  where  $\mathcal{A}$  arrives if fed  $\sigma$  starting from the source state. Let  $L_q$  similarly denote the set of the  $\omega$ -words accepted by  $\mathcal{A}_q \triangleq \langle Q, q, \delta, Acc \rangle$ . Then, since  $\mathcal{A}$  is deterministic, we can conclude that  $L_{q_0, q}$ ,  $q \in Q$  are pairwise disjoint. Furthermore,  $\bigcup_{q \in Q} L_{q_0, q} = \Sigma^*$ , and the  $\omega$ -language  $L_{q_0}$ , which  $\mathcal{A}$  accepts, can be expressed as  $\bigcup_{q \in Q} L_{q_0, q} \cdot L_q$ . Hence we can write

$$\models A \equiv A_e \wedge \text{empty} \vee \bigvee_{q \in Q} A_q; \text{skip}; A'_q \quad (10)$$

where  $A_e$  is a state formula which defines all the single state  $\sigma$  satisfied by  $A$ ,  $A_q$  is some ITL formula which defines  $L_{q_0, q}$  and  $A'_q$  is some ITL formula which defines the  $\omega$ -language  $L_q$ . Since  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{q_0}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_q$ ,  $q \in Q$ , are the same, except possibly for their initial states,  $A$ , which is equivalent to  $A'_{q_0}$ , (10) can be written with any of the formulas  $A'_q$  in the position of  $A$  using the same automaton  $\mathcal{A}$ , and therefore the same set of tail formulas on the RHS of  $\text{skip};$ . Hence we can put  $\mathcal{F} \triangleq \{A'_q : q \in Q\}$ .

#### 4. Separation with Additional Conditions

Now consider (8) with a focus on  $(A_k; \text{skip}; A'_k)$ . Let, given some state  $w$ ,  $A_k$  be additionally restricted to be satisfied in a  $\Box w$ -interval and  $A'_k$  is restricted to be satisfied at an interval where  $\neg w$  holds (initially). Then we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \models A \wedge w &\equiv A^{\Box w} \wedge \Box w \vee \bigvee_{k=1}^K (A_k^w \wedge \Box w); \text{skip}; (A_k^{w, '} \wedge \neg w) \\ \models A \wedge w &\equiv (\Box w \supset A^{\Box w}) \wedge \bigwedge_{k=1}^K \neg \left( (A_k^w \wedge \Box w); \text{skip}; \neg(A_k^{w, '} \wedge \neg w) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The equivalences (11) can be written with  $\neg w$  in the role of  $w$  too. Then the RHS of the equivalences can be used in  $\models A \equiv A \wedge w \vee A \wedge \neg w$  to obtain an expression for  $A$ . Considerations that are similar to the ones allowing to conclude the existence of finite closures wrt (8) lead to concluding that equivalences of the form (11) can be written for any  $A$ , and finite closures with respect to (11) taken for both  $w$  and  $\neg w$  in the position of  $w$  together exist too. To this end, starting with an  $\omega$ -automaton  $\mathcal{A}$  which

defines the same  $\omega$ -language as the given formula  $A$ , we can define the automaton  $\mathcal{A}^w \triangleq \langle Q^w, \langle q_0, \neg w \rangle, \delta^w, Acc^w \rangle$  where every state  $\langle q, \varepsilon w \rangle \in Q^w \triangleq Q \times \{w, \neg w\}$  is meant to keep record of the possible occurrence of letters which satisfy  $w$  in the input words which take the automaton to it. We omit the details of how the rest of the components of  $\mathcal{A}^w$  are derived from the respective components of  $\mathcal{A}$ . The use of such transformations can be seen in, e.g., [SVW87], on the example of the much more demanding objective of complementing  $\omega$ -automata.

Indeed, given an  $A$ , we can conclude the finiteness of a pair of closures of  $\{A\}$  under (11) for  $w$  as written and  $\neg w$  in the position of  $w$ . We denote these closures by  $Cl^w(A)$  and  $Cl^{\neg w}(A)$ , respectively. Sometimes we only need  $A \in Cl^w(A)$  and not necessarily  $A \in Cl^{\neg w}(A)$ , and, for arbitrary  $B$ ,  $B \in Cl^{\varepsilon w}(A)$  has its  $B_k^{\varepsilon w, '}$   $\in Cl^{\bar{\varepsilon} w}(A)$ . Now consider  $A$  and an arbitrary  $B \in Cl^{\varepsilon w}(A)$ .

$$\models B \wedge \varepsilon w \equiv B^{\square \varepsilon w} \wedge \square \varepsilon w \vee \bigvee_{k=1}^{K_B^\varepsilon} (B_k^{\varepsilon w} \wedge \square \varepsilon w); skip; (B_k^{\varepsilon w, '} \wedge \bar{\varepsilon} w) \quad (12)$$

be the instance of the first equivalence of (11), about  $\varepsilon w$ , with  $\varepsilon w$  appearing on the left of  $\equiv$  instead of  $\bar{\varepsilon} w$  appearing on the right as in (11). Let (12) be such that  $B_k^{\varepsilon, '}$   $\in Cl^{\bar{\varepsilon} w}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K_B^\varepsilon$ . Without loss of generality, the  $B_k^{\varepsilon w} \wedge \square \varepsilon w$  appearing in (12) can be assumed to be satisfiable.

These equivalences can be used much like canonical equations to derive a formula which is equivalent to  $A$  and has the syntax:

$$\begin{aligned} H &::= B^{\square \varepsilon w} \wedge \square \varepsilon w \\ R_0 &::= H; skip \mid R_0 \vee R_0 \mid (R_0; R_0) \mid R_0^* \\ R &::= H \mid R_0; H \mid R \vee R \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where  $H$  ranges over the  $(B^{\square \varepsilon w} \wedge \square \varepsilon w)$ s from the equivalences (12) involved in identifying the members of  $Cl^w(A)$  and  $Cl^{\neg w}(A)$ . To obtain such a formula for  $A$ , along with formulas of the same form for all  $B \wedge \varepsilon w$ ,  $B \in Cl^{\varepsilon w}(A)$ , the system (12),  $B \in Cl^{\varepsilon w}(A)$ , needs to be solved with respect to the tail occurrences of the formulas  $B \wedge \varepsilon w$ ,  $B \in Cl^{\varepsilon w}(A)$ , respectively. Then we can use  $\models A \equiv A \wedge w \vee A \wedge \neg w$  to obtain an equivalent to  $A$ .

Clearly, a result like the above can be obtained without resorting to separation, if there is no requirement on the formulas involved to feature the conditions to be satisfied by the *maximal*  $w$ -subintervals and  $\neg w$ -subintervals of the respective reference intervals. This can be done by, e.g., using GNFs with the guard state formulas written in the forms  $w \wedge \dots$  and  $\neg w \wedge \dots$  instead of using (11). With this maximality condition, the following specialized syntax can be claimed to be achieved for an arbitrary ITL  $A$ . Consider

$$\begin{aligned} H^\varepsilon &::= B^{\square \varepsilon w} \wedge \square \varepsilon w \\ R_0^{\varepsilon, \varepsilon} &::= H^\varepsilon; skip \mid R_0^{\varepsilon, \varepsilon} \vee R_0^{\varepsilon, \varepsilon} \mid (R_0^{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'}; R_0^{\bar{\varepsilon}, \varepsilon}) \\ R_0^{\varepsilon, \bar{\varepsilon}} &::= R_0^{\varepsilon, \bar{\varepsilon}} \vee R_0^{\varepsilon, \bar{\varepsilon}} \mid (R_0^{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'}; R_0^{\bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{\varepsilon}}) \mid (R_0^{\varepsilon, \bar{\varepsilon}})^* \\ R^{\varepsilon, \varepsilon} &::= H^\varepsilon \mid R_0^{\varepsilon, \bar{\varepsilon}}; H^\varepsilon \mid R^{\varepsilon, \varepsilon} \vee R^{\varepsilon, \varepsilon} \\ R^{\varepsilon, \bar{\varepsilon}} &::= R_0^{\varepsilon, \varepsilon}; H^{\bar{\varepsilon}} \mid R^{\varepsilon, \bar{\varepsilon}} \vee R^{\varepsilon, \bar{\varepsilon}} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where  $\varepsilon$  and  $\varepsilon'$  are arbitrary optional negations. The intended use of  $X^{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'}$  is to denote formulas of the syntax  $X \in \{R_0, R\}$  which define sets of intervals with an  $\varepsilon w$  prefix and an  $\varepsilon' w$  suffix. Then an arbitrary  $A$  can be written in the form  $w \wedge (A^{\neg, \neg} \vee A^{\neg, \neg}) \vee \neg w \wedge (A^{\neg, \neg} \vee A^{\neg, \neg})$  where  $\neg$  stands for ‘no negation’ and  $A^{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'}$  has the syntax  $R^{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'}$ .

For the sake of self-containedness, we do the details of solving the system. The general form of the equations in the systems obtained at various stages of solving the system (12) is

$$B \wedge \varepsilon w \equiv R \vee \bigvee_{l=1}^L R_l; (B_l \wedge \varepsilon_l w) \quad (15)$$

where  $B \wedge \varepsilon w \in Cl^{\varepsilon w}(A)$ ,  $R$  has the form  $R^{\varepsilon, \neg} \mid R^{\varepsilon, \neg}$ ,  $R_l$  have the forms  $R_0^{\varepsilon_l, \neg} \mid R_0^{\varepsilon_l, \neg}$ , and  $B_l \wedge \varepsilon_l w \in Cl^{\varepsilon_l w}(A)$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, L$ .

Consider a particular equation of the form (15).

In case none of the  $B_l \wedge \varepsilon_l w$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, L$ , is  $B \wedge \varepsilon w$ , this equation can be used to write the formula for  $B \wedge \varepsilon w$  in terms of whatever formulas are eventually obtained for  $B_l \wedge \varepsilon_l w$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, L$ . It imposes no conditions on the rest of the unknowns. Therefore it can be used to eliminate  $B_l \wedge \varepsilon_l w$  from the system. Observe that, by virtue of the distributivity of *chop* over  $\vee$ , plugging the RHS of the equation wherever its LHS occurs as the second operand of a *chop* can be followed by regrouping the disjuncts that restores the form (15) for the rest of the equations as follows. Let  $B \wedge \varepsilon w$  be  $B'_{l'} \wedge \varepsilon'_{l'} w$  in

$$B' \wedge \varepsilon' w \equiv R' \vee \bigvee_{l'=1}^{L'} R'_{l'}; (B'_{l'} \wedge \varepsilon'_{l'} w) \quad (16)$$

Then plugging the RHS of (15) for  $B \wedge \varepsilon w$  in (16) and applying distributivity in the disjunct for  $l' = 1$  thus affected gives

$$B' \wedge \varepsilon' w \equiv R' \vee R'_1; R \vee \bigvee_{l=1}^L R'_1; R_l; (B_l \wedge \varepsilon_l w) \vee \bigvee_{l'=2}^{L'} R'_{l'}; (B'_{l'} \wedge \varepsilon'_{l'} w) \quad (17)$$

For the sake of notational convenience, (17) can be rewritten as

$$B' \wedge \varepsilon' w \equiv R' \vee R'_1; R \vee \bigvee_{B \in Cl^w(A)} R'_1; S_{B, \neg}; (B \wedge w) \vee \bigvee_{B \in Cl^{\neg w}(A)} R'_1; S_{B, \neg}; (B \wedge \neg w) \vee \bigvee_{B \in Cl^w(A)} T_{B, \neg}; (B \wedge w) \vee \bigvee_{B \in Cl^{\neg w}(A)} T_{B, \neg}; (B \wedge \neg w)$$

with  $S_{B, \varepsilon} \triangleq \text{false}$  for  $B, \varepsilon$  such that no disjunct of the form  $R'_1; R_l; (B \wedge \varepsilon w)$  is present in (17), and  $T_{B, \varepsilon} \triangleq \text{false}$ , if no disjunct of the form  $R'_{l'}; (B \wedge \varepsilon w)$ . Now combining the

disjuncts which have the same unknown as the rightmost operand of *chop* gives

$$B' \wedge \varepsilon' w \equiv R' \vee R'_1; R \vee \bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{C}l^w(A)} ((R'_1; S_{B,-}) \vee T_{B,-}); (B \wedge w) \vee \bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{C}l^{-w}(A)} ((R'_1; S_{B,-}) \vee T_{B,-}); (B \wedge \neg w),$$

which has the form (15).

In case, e.g.,  $B_1 \wedge \varepsilon_1 w$  is  $B \wedge \varepsilon w$ , (15) can be replaced by the equation

$$B \wedge \varepsilon w \equiv (R_1)^*; R \vee \bigvee_{l=2}^L (R_l)^*; R_l; (B_l \wedge \varepsilon_l w) \quad (18)$$

this new equation no longer has  $B \wedge \varepsilon w$  on the RHS of  $\equiv$  and therefore can be used to define this unknown in terms of  $B_l \wedge \varepsilon_l w$ ,  $l = 2, \dots, L$ . Therefore it can be treated like in the case of an equation with no  $B \wedge \varepsilon w$  on the RHS of  $\equiv$ .

## 5. The Inverse of $\Pi$

Let the *inverse of  $\Pi$  wrt its second operand* be defined as follows:

$$\sigma \models w\Pi^{-1}A, \text{ if there exists a } \sigma' \text{ such that } \sigma' \models A \text{ and } \sigma'|_w = \sigma$$

where  $\sigma|_w$  is as in the definition of  $\Pi$  in the Preliminaries section. In words,  $\sigma \models w\Pi^{-1}A$ , if  $\sigma$  can be obtained by erasing the non- $w$  states from some sequence  $\sigma'$  which satisfies the second operand  $A$ . It can easily be shown that

$$\models w\Pi^{-1}(w\Pi A) \equiv A \text{ and } \models A \supset w\Pi(w\Pi^{-1}A) .$$

$w\Pi(w\Pi^{-1}A) \supset A$  is not valid because  $w\Pi(w\Pi^{-1}A)$  is true in all intervals whose  $w$ -states form an interval that satisfies  $w\Pi^{-1}A$  whereas  $A$  may impose conditions on the  $\neg w$ -parts of such intervals as well.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Given an ITL formula  $A$  and a state formula  $w$ , a  $\Pi^{-1}$ -free ITL formula  $A'$  that is equivalent to  $w\Pi^{-1}A$  of the syntax (13) with  $\varepsilon$  standing for no negation can be found.*

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $w$  denote a state formula. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \models w\Pi^{-1}(B \wedge \Box w) \equiv B \wedge \Box w \\ & \models \neg(w\Pi^{-1}(B \wedge \Box \neg w)) \\ & \models w\Pi^{-1}(B \wedge \Box \neg w; \text{skip}; (A \wedge w)) \equiv \begin{cases} \text{false, if } \models \neg(B \wedge \Box \neg w); \\ w\Pi^{-1}(A \wedge w), \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases} \\ & \models w\Pi^{-1}(A_1 \vee A_2) \equiv (w\Pi^{-1}A_1) \vee (w\Pi^{-1}A_2) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

**Proof of Theorem 5.1.** Consider the system of canonical equations of the form (12) for  $A$ . To obtain a system of equations for  $(\varepsilon w)\Pi^{-1}A$  from that system, we apply  $(\varepsilon w)\Pi^{-1}$ . and  $(\bar{\varepsilon} w)\Pi^{-1}$ . to all the equations.

Applying  $(\varepsilon w)\Pi^{-1}$ . and the relevant valid equivalences from (19) to (12), gives equations of the form

$$(\varepsilon w)\Pi^{-1}(B \wedge \varepsilon w) \equiv B_e^{\square \varepsilon w} \wedge \square \varepsilon w \vee \bigvee_k (B_k \wedge \square \varepsilon w); \text{skip}; (\varepsilon w)\Pi^{-1}(B'_k \wedge \bar{\varepsilon} w),$$

where the unknowns are  $(\varepsilon w)\Pi^{-1}F$  for  $F$  which appear on the LHS of some equation of the form (12).

Applying  $(\bar{\varepsilon} w)\Pi^{-1}$ . gives

$$(\bar{\varepsilon} w)\Pi^{-1}(B \wedge \varepsilon w) \equiv \bigvee_k (\bar{\varepsilon} w)\Pi^{-1}(B'_k \wedge \bar{\varepsilon} w),$$

that is, for  $B \in Cl^{\varepsilon w}(A)$ , we obtain that  $(\bar{\varepsilon} w)\Pi^{-1}(B \wedge \varepsilon w)$  is equivalent to a disjunction of formulas of the form  $(\bar{\varepsilon} w)\Pi^{-1}(B' \wedge \bar{\varepsilon} w)$  where  $B' \in Cl^{\bar{\varepsilon} w}(A)$ . To conclude this, recall our assumption that the  $B'_k$ s in the considered equation are all satisfiable. (This degenerate form of the equations for unknowns of the form  $(\bar{\varepsilon} w)\Pi^{-1}(B \wedge \varepsilon w)$  allows such unknowns to be eliminated almost trivially.)

Just like the original, non- $\Pi^{-1}$ , system of equations, the system about  $(\varepsilon' w)\Pi^{-1}(B \wedge \varepsilon w)$ , for  $B \in Cl^{\varepsilon w}(A)$  and any pair of optional negations  $\varepsilon, \varepsilon'$ , admits a solution of the syntax (13), with  $\varepsilon$  from (13) matching the optional negation  $\varepsilon'$  from the unknown. For  $w\Pi^{-1}A$ , this solution includes the required  $A'$ .  $\square$

## 6. Expressing Propositional Quantification and Craig Interpolation in ITL-NL

As stated in the introduction, uniform Craig interpolation can be derived using the expressibility of existential quantification on the non-logical symbols that may happen not to be shared between the formulas  $A$  and  $B$  on the two sides of  $\supset$  in the considered implication  $A \supset B$ . Propositional quantification is known to be expressible at the cost of introducing occurrences of *chop-star* in introspective ITL. This can be demonstrated using that, on finite and right-infinite intervals, ITL formulas define regular and, respectively,  $\omega$ -regular languages with the powerset  $\Sigma = \mathcal{P}(V)$  of the vocabulary  $V$ , which is also the set of states in models, as the alphabet. These two classes languages are known to be closed under alphabet homomorphisms, and  $\exists p$  is expressed by the homomorphism  $h_p : s \mapsto s \setminus \{p\}$ . Finally given the language  $L_A$  defined by formula  $A$ , a regular expression for  $h_p(L_A)$  in terms of single-letter languages, set theoretic  $\cup$ , and formal language operations of concatenation  $\cdot$  and Kleene star  $*$  and, for the case of  $\omega$ -languages, Kleene star's 'infinite-interval' variant  $^\omega$ , can be translated back to ITL by means of ITL's  $\circ$ , *chop* and *chop-star*. This plan requires some significant changes to work for ITL-NL. We first need to prove that that strictly future ITL-NL formulas  $F$ , where  $\Diamond_r$  can occur along with *chop* and *chop-star*, define  $\omega$ -regular languages  $L_F$  to apply  $h_p$  to. A transition from the  $\omega$ -regular language  $h_p(L_F)$  back to the temporal language is possible by a straightforward translation only if infinite intervals are allowed. We do not have infinite intervals in the system of ITL-NL in this paper. Therefore we take the opportunity to use the fact that, with the neighbourhood modalities available, infinite intervals are not essential for the definability of arbitrary  $\omega$ -regular languages in ITL-NL. This follows from the availability of the normal form (9) for reactivity.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $A$  be an ITL-NL formula and  $p$  be a propositional variable. Then  $\exists pA$  is equivalent to an ITL-NL formula.*

**Proof.** By separation, we can assume that  $A$  is a Boolean combination of strictly past, introspective and future formulas. A disjunctive normal form (DNF) of such an  $A$  can be written as

$$\bigvee_k P_k \wedge C_k \wedge F_k \quad (20)$$

where  $P_k$ ,  $C_k$  and  $F_k$  are formulas of these three forms, respectively. Then  $\exists pA$  is equivalent to

$$\bigvee_k \exists pP_k \wedge \exists pC_k \wedge \exists pF_k.$$

$\exists p$  can be distributed over conjunction as above because, given a reference interval  $i, j$  and  $\sigma : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \Sigma$ ,  $\sigma, i, j \models P_k$ ,  $\sigma, i, j \models C_k$  and  $\sigma, i, j \models F_k$  is determined from  $\sigma|_{(-\infty, i-1]}$ ,  $\sigma|_{[i, j]}$  and  $\sigma|_{[j+1, \infty)}$ , respectively, and these parts of  $\sigma$  are disjoint. Since the existence of an  $\exists$ -free equivalent to  $\exists pC_k$  is known from the literature, and  $\exists pP_k$  is the time reversal of  $\exists pF_k$ , it is sufficient to show how an  $\exists$ -free equivalent can be found for  $\exists pF$  where  $F$  is a conjunction of possibly negated strictly future formulas such as  $F_k$ .

To find an  $\exists$ -free equivalent to  $\exists pF$ , we first show that the  $\omega$ -language

$$L_F \triangleq \{\sigma|_{[0, \infty)} : \sigma \in (\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \Sigma), 0 \leq j, \sigma, 0, j \models F\}$$

is regular for arbitrary future  $F$  by a satisfaction-preserving translation  $\mathbf{t}(\cdot)$  of the future subset of ITL-NL (see Definition 1.1) into ITL with (right-)infinite intervals, which is known to have the same expressiveness as  $\omega$ -regular languages. The translation satisfies the correspondence

$$\sigma', 0, 0 \models F \leftrightarrow \sigma \models \mathbf{t}(F)$$

for arbitrary Boolean combinations  $F$  of future  $\Diamond_r$ -formulas, all  $\sigma : \omega \rightarrow \Sigma$  and  $\sigma' : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \Sigma$  such that  $\sigma'|_{[0, \infty)} = \sigma$ . The defining clauses for  $\mathbf{t}(\cdot)$  below are sufficient for translating formulas which are disjunctions of conjunctions of introspective and possibly negated  $\Diamond_r$ -formulas. This form can be achieved just as the common disjunctive normal form, if formulas whose main connective is a temporal one are treated as atomic propositions. The clauses are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{t}(F_1 \vee F_2) &\triangleq \mathbf{t}(F_1) \vee \mathbf{t}(F_2) \\ \mathbf{t}(C \wedge \bigwedge_{n=1}^N \varepsilon_n \Diamond_r F_n) &\triangleq C; \left( \bigwedge_{n=1}^N \varepsilon_n \mathbf{t}(F_n) \right) \end{aligned}$$

In case  $N = 0$  in the last clause, it is supposed to read  $\mathbf{t}(C) \triangleq C; \text{true}$ .

Now, knowing that  $\mathbf{t}(F)$ , an ITL formula, defines some  $\omega$ -regular language  $L_F$ , it remains to observe that the language defined by  $\exists p\mathbf{t}(F)$ , which is equivalent to  $\exists pF$ , is  $\omega$ -regular too. Indeed, this language is obtained by subjecting the words from  $L_F$  to the *alphabet homomorphism*  $h_p : s \mapsto s \setminus \{p\}$ ,  $s \in \Sigma$ , which renders states  $s$  that satisfy  $p$  indiscernible from those which do not. The class of  $\omega$ -regular languages is known to



be closed under such homomorphisms. Having observed this, we can use an ITL-NL formula of the form (9) for  $h_p(L_F)$  to express  $\exists pF$ . The same can be done using time reversal for  $\exists pP$  for whatever past formulas  $P$  appear in (20).  $\square$

**Corollary 6.2** (Strongest Consequence in ITL-NL). *Let  $A$  be a formula in ITL-NL and  $p_1, \dots, p_N$  be some propositional variables. Then there exists an ITL-NL formula  $C$  such that  $\text{Var}(C) \subseteq \text{Var}(A) \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_N\}$  and  $\models A \supset B$  is equivalent to  $\models C \supset B$  for every ITL-NL formula  $B$  such that  $\text{Var}(B) \subseteq \text{Var}(A) \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_N\}$ .*

A formula satisfying the above requirement on  $C$  is called the *strongest consequence* of  $A$  in terms of  $\text{Var}(A) \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_N\}$ .

**Proof.**  $C$  can be chosen to be an  $\exists$ -free equivalent to  $\exists p_1 \dots \exists p_N A$  such as what is guaranteed to exist by Theorem 6.1.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.3** (Uniform Craig Interpolation for ITL-NL). *Given ITL-NL formulas  $A$  and  $B$ , if  $\models A \supset B$ , then there exists a formula  $C$  such that  $\text{Var}(C) \subseteq \text{Var}(A) \cap \text{Var}(B)$  and  $\models A \supset C$ ,  $\models C \supset B$ .  $C$  can be determined from  $A$  only, and satisfy the requirement for all  $B$  which produce the same  $\text{Var}(A) \cap \text{Var}(B)$ .*

**Proof.**  $C$  can be chosen to be any strongest consequence of  $A$  in terms of  $\text{Var}(A) \cap \text{Var}(B)$ .  $\square$

## 7. Beth Definability for ITL-NL

In (2)  $\square$  works as the *universal modality* [GP92] in (future only) LTL. To access an arbitrary finite interval in a  $\sigma : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \Sigma$ , one can use  $\diamond_a \triangleq \diamond_r \diamond_r \diamond_l \diamond_l$ . Its universal dual  $\square_a \triangleq \neg \diamond_a \neg$  is the universal modality in ITL-NL and enables the same plain formulation of ITL-NL formula  $A$  implicitly defines propositional variable  $p$ :

$$\models \square_a A \wedge \square_a [p'/p] A \supset \square_a (p \equiv p') . \quad (21)$$

**Corollary 7.1** (Beth Definability for ITL-NL). *Given ITL-NL formula  $A$  such that (21) holds, there exists a formula  $C$  such that  $\text{Var}(C) \subseteq \text{Var}(A) \setminus \{p\}$  and*

$$\models \square_a A \supset \square_a (p \equiv C).$$

**Proof.** Since  $\models \square_a A \wedge \square_a [p'/p] A \supset \square_a (p \equiv p')$  and  $\models \square_a A \wedge \square_a [p'/p] A \supset (p \equiv p')$  are equivalent, we can apply interpolation to  $\models (\square_a A \wedge p) \supset (\square_a [p'/p] A \supset p')$  and obtain the desired  $p$ - and  $p'$ -free  $C$ , just the way it works for the archetype case of predicate logic.  $\square$

## Concluding Remarks

We have shown how interval-based temporal separation on ITL-NL and a lemma which is key in establishing this form of separation in [GM22] can be used to obtain concise proofs of an interval-based form of the reactivity normal form as known from [MP90], the inverse of the temporal projection operator from ([HMM83], the elimination of

propositional quantification in ITL-NL and, consequently, uniform Craig interpolation and Beth definability for ITL-NL.

Notably, the LTL-based forms of these results, along with separation on its own, are well-understood and have shown to be very useful in the literature. Uniform Craig interpolation and Beth definability are an exception; LTL does not have them as pointed out in [Mak91]. They hold in ITL (without the neighbourhood modalities) too. However, the availability of the neighbourhood modalities, which make it possible to use  $\Diamond_a \triangleq \Diamond_r \Diamond_l \Diamond_l$  as the universal modality, greatly enhance the scope of explicit definitions  $\Box_a(p \equiv C)$ : the restriction on the semantics of atomic propositions  $p$  imposed by the locality principle in ITL can be largely compensated for by letting  $\Diamond_l$  and  $\Diamond_r$  occur in  $C$ .

## References

- [All83] James F. Allen. Maintaining knowledge about temporal intervals. *Commun. ACM*, 26(11):832–843, 1983.
- [BRZ00] Rana Barua, Suman Roy, and Chaochen Zhou. Completeness of neighbourhood logic. *J. Log. Comput.*, 10(2):271–295, 2000.
- [CH97] Zhou Chaochen and Michael R. Hansen. An adequate first order interval logic. In Willem P. de Roeper, Hans Langmaack, and Amir Pnueli, editors, *COMPOS’97. Revised Lectures*, volume 1536 of *LNCS*, pages 584–608. Springer, 1997.
- [CMP93] Edward Chang, Zohar Manna, and Amir Pnueli. The safety-progress classification. In Friedrich L. Bauer, Wilfried Brauer, and Helmut Schwichtenberg, editors, *Logic and Algebra of Specification*, pages 143–202, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1993. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [CMZ] Antonio Cau, Ben Moszkowski, and Hussein Zedan. ITL web pages. URL: <http://www.antonio-cau.co.uk/ITL/>.
- [DH00] Giovanna D’Agostino and Marco Hollenberg. Logical questions concerning the mu-calculus: Interpolation, Lyndon and Los-Tarski. *J. Symb. Log.*, 65(1):310–332, 2000.
- [Far01] Berndt Farwer.  $\omega$ -Automata. In Erich Grädel, Wolfgang Thomas, and Thomas Wilke, editors, *Automata, Logics, and Infinite Games: A Guide to Current Research*, volume 2500 of *LNCS*, pages 3–20. Springer, 2001.
- [Gab89] Dov M. Gabbay. Declarative Past and Imperative Future: Executable Temporal Logic for Interactive Systems. In *Proceedings of the Colloquium of Temporal Logic in Specification*, volume 398 of *LNCS*, pages 67–89. Springer, 1989.
- [GHR94] Dov Gabbay, Ian Hodkinson, and Mark Reynolds. *Temporal Logic: Mathematical Foundations and Computational Aspects. Volume I*. Oxford University Press, 1994.
- [GM22] Dimitar P. Guelev and Ben C. Moszkowski. A separation theorem for discrete-time interval temporal logic. *J. Appl. Non Class. Logics*, 32(1):28–54, 2022.
- [GM24] Dimitar P. Guelev and Ben Moszkowski. Expressive completeness by separation for discrete time interval temporal logic with expanding modalities. *Information Processing Letters*, 186:106480, 2024.
- [GMS04] Valentin Goranko, Angelo Montanari, and Guido Sciavicco. A road map of interval temporal logics and duration calculi. *J. Appl. Non Class. Logics*,

- 14(1-2):9–54, 2004.
- [GP92] Valentin Goranko and Solomon Passy. Using the universal modality: Gains and questions. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 2(1):5–30, 03 1992.
- [GtC09] Amélie Gheerbrant and Balder ten Cate. Craig interpolation for linear temporal languages. In Erich Grädel and Reinhard Kahle, editors, *Proceedings of CSL 2009*, volume 5771 of *LNCS*, pages 287–301. Springer, 2009.
- [Gue22] Dimitar P. Guelev. Gabbay separation for the duration calculus. In Alexander Artikis, Roberto Posenato, and Stefano Tonetta, editors, *Proceedings of TIME 2022*, volume 247 of *LIPICs*, pages 10:1–10:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [HC96] G.E. Hughes and M.J. Cresswell. *A New Introduction to Modal Logic*. Routledge, 1996.
- [HMM83] Joseph Y. Halpern, Zohar Manna, and Ben C. Moszkowski. A hardware semantics based on temporal intervals. In Josep Díaz, editor, *ICALP 1983, Proceedings*, volume 154 of *LNCS*, pages 278–291. Springer, 1983.
- [HS86] J. Y. Halpern and Y. Shoham. A Propositional Logic of Time Intervals. In *Proceedings of LICS’86*, pages 279–292. IEEE Computer Society Press, 1986.
- [Kai95] Roope Kaivola. Axiomatising linear time mu-calculus. In Insup Lee and Scott A. Smolka, editors, *Proceedings of CONCUR ’95*, volume 962 of *LNCS*, pages 423–437. Springer, 1995.
- [Kam68] J. A. W. Kamp. *Tense Logic and the Theory of Linear Order*. Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, 1968.
- [Koz83] Dexter Kozen. Results on the propositional  $\mu$ -calculus. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 27:333–354, 1983.
- [Lan69] Lawrence H. Landweber. Decision problems for omega-automata. *Math. Syst. Theory*, 3(4):376–384, 1969.
- [Mak91] Larissa L. Maksimova. Absence of interpolation and of beth’s property in temporal logics with “the next” operation. *Siberian Mathematical Journal*, 32(6):989 – 993, 1991.
- [MG17] Ben C. Moszkowski and Dimitar P. Guelev. An application of temporal projection to interleaving concurrency. *Formal Aspects Comput.*, 29(4):705–750, 2017.
- [MGMS11] Dario Della Monica, Valentin Goranko, Angelo Montanari, and Guido Sciavicco. Interval temporal logics: a journey. *Bull. EATCS*, 105:73–99, 2011.
- [Mos83] Benjamin C. Moszkowski. *Reasoning about Digital Circuits*. Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University, Stanford, 1983.
- [Mos85] Ben Moszkowski. Temporal Logic For Multilevel Reasoning About Hardware. *IEEE Computer*, 18(2):10–19, 1985.
- [Mos86] Ben Moszkowski. *Executing Temporal Logic Programs*. Cambridge University Press, 1986. URL: <http://www.antonio-cau.co.uk/ITL/publications/reports/tempura-book.pdf>.
- [MP90] Zohar Manna and Amir Pnueli. A Hierarchy of Temporal Properties. In *9th Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 377–408. ACM Press, 1990.
- [Pnu77] Amir Pnueli. The Temporal Logic of Programs. In *Proceedings of the 18th IEEE Symposium Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 46–57. IEEE, 1977.
- [Rab00] Alexander Moshe Rabinovich. Expressive completeness of duration calcu-

- lus. *Inf. Comput.*, 156(1-2):320–344, 2000.
- [Ras99] Thomas Mathredal Rasmussen. Signed interval logic. In Jörg Flum and Mario Rodríguez-Artalejo, editors, *CSL '99, Proceedings*, volume 1683 of *LNCIS*, pages 157–171. Springer, 1999.
- [Sho67] Joseph Shoenfield. *Mathematical Logic*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts, 1967.
- [SVW87] A. Prasad Sistla, Moshe Y. Vardi, and Pierre Wolper. The complementation problem for büchi automata with applications to temporal logic. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 49:217–237, 1987.
- [Tho90] Wolfgang Thomas. Automata on infinite objects. In Jan van Leeuwen, editor, *Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science, Volume B: Formal Models and Semantics*, pages 133–191. Elsevier and MIT Press, 1990.
- [Ven91] Yde Venema. A modal logic for chopping intervals. *J. Log. Comput.*, 1(4):453–476, 1991.
- [Wag79] Klaus W. Wagner. On omega-regular sets. *Inf. Control.*, 43(2):123–177, 1979.
- [ZH04] Zhou Chaochen and Michael R. Hansen. *Duration Calculus - A Formal Approach to Real-Time Systems*. Monographs in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series. Springer, 2004.
- [ZHR91] Zhou Chaochen, C. A. R. Hoare, and Anders P. Ravn. A Calculus of Durations. *Information Processing Letters*, 40(5):269–276, 1991.
- [Zuc86] Lenore Zuck. *Past Temporal Logic*. Ph.D. thesis, Weizmann Institute of Science, 1986.