Errata

in "Abstract Interpretation and Partition Refinement for Model Checking"

11th October 1996

See `http://www.win.tue.nl/win/cs/fm/Dennis.Dams/errata.html` for an updated version of this list. Contributions and other comments may be sent to `wsindd@win.tue.nl`.

- page viii, line -8: kew → replace by: knew
- page 27, Definition 2.4.2.6, line 2: term → replace by: terms
- page 35, last line in main text: *safe*^{6} → replace by: *safe*^{6} *for c* ; in the corresponding footnote: → remove: for c
- page 61, line -3: the singleton → drop
- page 77, Definition 4.4.0.1, point 3: $a \in I'$ → replace by: $a' \in I'$
- page 102, line 16: was → replace by: is
- page 165, Definition 6.4.0.5, point 2, line 2 → add: *and for every* $t \to t'$*, there exists* $s \to s'$ *such that* $s' \equiv^n_{\text{bis}} t'$
- page 171, proof of Lemma 6.5.1.2, point 2 of the induction step → replace by:

  2. $\varphi = \exists \mathsf{U}(p, \varphi')$. Assume that $s \models \varphi$. By Definition 2.4.1.1, this means that there exists an s-path $\bar{s}$ and $n \geq 0$ such that $\bar{s}(n) \models \varphi'$ and for every $0 \leq i < n$, $\bar{s}(i) \models p$. From $s \equiv_{\text{flat}^-} t$ and clause 3 in Definition 6.5.0.3, we can prove that there exists a t-path $\bar{t}$ and $m \geq 0$ such that $\bar{s}(n) \equiv_{\text{flat}^-} \bar{t}(m)$ and for every $0 \leq j < m$, there exists $0 \leq i < n$ such that $\bar{t}(j) \equiv^0 \bar{s}(i)$. By the induction hypothesis, it follows from $\bar{s}(n) \models \varphi'$ and $\bar{s}(n) \equiv_{\text{flat}^-} \bar{t}(m)$ that $\bar{t}(m) \models \varphi'$. Because for every $0 \leq j < m$, $\bar{t}(j)$ is $\equiv^0$-equivalent to some $\bar{s}(i)$ with $0 \leq i < n$, and for every such i we have $\bar{s}(i) \models p$, we also have $\bar{t}(j) \models p$ for every $0 \leq j < m$. Hence, $t \models \exists \mathsf{U}(p, \varphi')$.