Abstract. Finite-state models are widely used in software engineering, especially in control systems development. Commonly, in control applications such models are developed manually, hence, keeping them up-to-date requires extra effort. To simplify the maintenance process, an automatic approach may be used, allowing to infer models from behavior examples and temporal properties. As an example of a specific control systems development application we focus on inferring finite-state models of function blocks (FBs) defined by the IEC 61499 international standard for distributed automation systems.

In this paper we propose a method for FB model inference from behavior examples, based on reduction to Boolean satisfiability problem (SAT). Additionally, we take into account linear temporal properties using counterexample-guided synthesis. In contrast to existing approaches, suggested method is more efficient and produce minimal finite-state models both in terms of number of states and guard conditions. We also present the developed tool fbSAT which implements the proposed method, and evaluate it in two case studies: inference of a finite-state model of a Pick-and-Place manipulator, and reconstruction of randomly generated automata.
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1 Introduction

The non-trivial process of industrial control system development may be reduced to the development of a finite-state automaton or a system of interconnected automata. The behavior of the controller may be represented using the deterministic finite-state model, allowing to describe how the system reacts to input actions and which output actions it produces. Such models are extensively used in program testing [2, 26] and verification [6, 24]. One practical example of the finite-state models usage is the international standard for distributed automation systems development IEC 61499 [38], which defines the control systems as networks of interconnected function blocks (FBs), specified by their interfaces and
implementations (control algorithms). Since the standard uses an event-driven execution model, the FB interface contains input/output events in addition to input/output data.

In practice, most finite-state models for control applications are developed manually – this is a tedious and error-prone approach. Furthermore, there is a problem of maintaining the models up-to-date and consistent during the changes in system parameters, architecture, and logic. An alternative to the manual process is automatic synthesis from the given execution scenarios and/or temporal properties \([3, 7, 17, 20, 22, 34, 35]\). Inferred models can be used for model-based testing, verification and can even replace the original controller.

In this paper we propose a method for automatic inference of minimal finite-state FB models from execution scenarios and linear temporal logic (LTL) properties \([25]\). The proposed approach is based on the reduction of the original problem to the Boolean satisfiability problem (SAT) \([5]\).

2 Problem Statement

A function block (FB) is characterized by its interface and control algorithm. The interface defines input/output events (sets \(E^I\) and \(E^O\)) and input/output variables (sets \(X\) and \(Z\)) which can be, e.g., Boolean, integer or real-valued (Fig. 1). In this paper we consider Boolean input/output variables only. The control algorithm is represented by a Moore finite-state machine, extended with guard conditions, and called execution control chart (ECC). A complete formal definition of an ECC can be found in \([15]\). Here we use a simplified one: each state is associated with an output event from \(E^O\) and an algorithm that defines modification of output variable values, and each transition is marked with an input event from \(E^I\) and a guard condition – a Boolean formula over input variables. Later we will refer to such a machine simply as an automaton.

An execution scenario is a sequence of scenario elements \(s_i = (e^I[\bar{x}], e^O[\bar{z}])\), where each element consists of an input action \(e^I[\bar{x}]\) and an output action \(e^O[\bar{z}]\). An input action is a pair of an input event \(e^I \in E^I\) and a tuple of input variable values \(\bar{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{|X|})\) \((x_i \in X)\) later called input, whereas an output action is a pair of an output event \(e^O \in E^O \cup \{\varepsilon\}\) and a tuple of output variable values \(\bar{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_{|Z|})\) \((z_i \in Z)\) later called output. An empty output event \(\varepsilon\) is necessary to represent the absence of an output action, e.g., in the case when an automaton does not react to the input action. A positive scenario is an execution scenario representing a desired behavior of an automaton. Commonly, such scenarios are obtained by simulating an existing model. An example of a set \(\mathcal{S}\) of two scenarios \(s_1\) and \(s_2\) is shown below:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{S} = \{ & (R[10], \varepsilon[0]) ; (R[01], B[1]) ; (R[11], A[0]) ; (R[11], A[1]) ; (R[01], B[1]) , \\
& (R[01], B[1]) ; (R[01], \varepsilon[1]) ; (R[11], A[0]) ; (R[00], \varepsilon[0]) ; (R[01], A[1]) \}.
\end{align*}
\] (1)
An automaton is said to satisfy the scenario \( s \in \mathcal{S} \) if, while sequentially receiving input actions from the scenario elements of \( s \), the automaton produces exactly the same sequence of output actions as in \( s \).

An LTL specification \( \mathcal{L} \) is a set of LTL formulas describing the temporal properties of a finite-state model. An LTL formula is an expression which may contain propositional variables (in our case – input/output events/variables of the ECC), logical operators (e.g., \( \land, \lor, \neg, \rightarrow \)), and temporal operators (e.g., \( \mathcal{X} \) – “next”, \( \mathcal{U} \) – “until”, \( \mathcal{G} \) – “globally”, \( \mathcal{F} \) – “in future”). An LTL specification can be verified using a model checker tool. In order to take into account liveness properties we use a closed loop [37] verification with formal model of a plant [8].

Ultimately, the problem addressed in this paper is to find the most general automaton that satisfies all positive scenarios from a given set \( \mathcal{S}^+ \) and complies with a given LTL specification \( \mathcal{L} \). Commonly, high generalization of models is achieved through minimizing their number of states and/or transitions [3, 22, 34]. In this work we additionally explicitly consider complexity of guard conditions: generalization is achieved by minimizing the sought automaton in terms of its size and the total complexity of its guard conditions. We define the size of an automaton as the number of its states, and the guard condition complexity as the size of the parse tree of the corresponding Boolean formula.

### 3 Related Work

There exists a large body of work on SAT-based synthesis of circuits, bit-vector programs, domain-specific programs, etc. However, in this work we are interested specifically in synthesis of finite-state machines: state-based models are comprehensible, their formal verification is relatively simple, and they can be directly used in control applications for controller logic implementation.

The problem of finding a minimal deterministic finite-state machine from behavior examples is known to be NP-complete [21], and the complexity of the LTL synthesis problem is double exponential in the length of the LTL specification [31]. Despite this, synthesis of various types of finite-state models from behavior examples and/or formal specification has been addressed by many researchers including [3, 6, 7, 17, 20, 22, 28, 30, 33, 34, 40] with methods based on heuristic state merging, evolutionary algorithms and SAT-solvers. In the context of this paper we are interested in exact methods, so we direct our attention to SAT-based methods.

Extended Finite-State Machine (EFSM) is the model most similar to the ECC considered in this paper – it combines a Mealy and a Moore automaton extended with conditional transitions. Transitions are labeled with input events and Boolean formulas over the input variables, and automaton states have associated sequences of output actions. Several approaches based on translation to SAT [34, 39] have been proposed for inferring EFSMs from behavior examples and LTL properties. In [34] LTL properties are accounted for via an iterative counterexample prohibition approach.

The BoSy tool [16, 17] implements bounded synthesis of a transition system (a type of automaton similar to EFSM and ECC) from given LTL properties.
Synthesis is bounded in the sense that the number of states does not exceed a given bound. Apart from the SAT-based approach, a more efficient solution based on a Quantified SAT (QSAT) encoding is developed. Transition systems inferred with the SAT-based encoding are explicit (guard conditions include all input variables), whereas the QSAT-based encodings yield symbolic models (guard conditions are Boolean formulas over input variables). BoSy ensures that found solutions are minimal w.r.t. the number of states, however it does not allow minimizing guard conditions, which tend to be large and incomprehensible. An approach to make generated solutions simpler is suggested in [18], where the SAT-based encoding is augmented with constraints for minimizing the number of cycles in the transition system. However, guard conditions complexity is not addressed. Furthermore, BoSy does not support behavior examples. Though they can be modeled with LTL formulas, this approach is inefficient even for behavior examples of moderate size. Other LTL synthesis techniques, e.g. G4LTL-ST [7] and Strix [27], have the same drawbacks in application to the considered problem: no guard conditions minimization and lack of support for behavior examples.

In [9], the fbCSP method is proposed for inferring an FB model from given execution scenarios by means of translation to the Constraint Satisfaction Problem (CSP). However, fbCSP has the following restrictions. Guard conditions are generated in complete form – corresponding Boolean formulas depend on all input variables. Such models do not generalize to unseen data. This is countered by greedy guard conditions minimization, but it does not guarantee the result minimality. In [8] fbCSP is extended with a counterexample prohibition procedure similar to [34] to account for LTL properties. Guard conditions are represented with fixed-size conjunctions of positive/negative literals of input variables. The drawback of this approach is that it does not allow constructing models when temporal properties are poorly covered with behavior examples.

In [10] the two-stage approach of fbCSP is developed further: on the first stage, a base model is inferred with a translation to SAT, and on the second stage its guard conditions are minimized via a CSP-based approach, in which guard condition Boolean formulas are represented with parse trees. By introducing a total bound on the number of nodes in these parse trees and solving a series of CSP problems, the method finds a model with minimal guard conditions w.r.t. the base model identified on the first stage. Global minimality of guard conditions is not guaranteed due to the two-stage implementation: minimal guards may correspond to another base model, not the one found on the first stage. The same argument applies against any approach based on state machine minimization [23]. In addition, LTL properties are not supported.

Overall, none of the existing methods allow simultaneously and efficiently accounting for (1) behavior examples, (2) LTL properties, and (3) minimality of synthesized automata in terms of both number of states and guard conditions complexity. The approach proposed in this paper extends [10] and contributes to the state-of-the-art SAT-based state machine synthesis: it supports positive behavior examples, realizes counterexample-guided synthesis to account for LTL properties, and produces models minimal both in terms of the number of states
Proposed Approach

In this section we develop our framework for inferring minimal FB models from a given set of positive scenarios and an LTL specification. In Sect. 4.1 we describe a convenient storage structure for execution scenarios – scenario tree. In Sect. 4.2 we describe the process of verifying an LTL specification using a model checker tool, which produces a counterexample for each violated LTL formula. Obtained counterexamples are converted into negative scenarios representing the undesired behavior, which we want to prohibit. In Sect. 4.3 we describe the reduction of the FB model inference problem to SAT. The proposed reduction consists of three parts: encoding of the automaton structure, encoding of the guard conditions structure, and encoding of the mapping between the negative scenario tree and the automaton. Additionally, we supplement the proposed reduction with cardinality constraints allowing to bound the guard conditions complexity. In Sect. 4.4 we describe the process of inferring a minimal FB model both in terms of the number of states and guard conditions complexity.

4.1 Scenario Tree Construction

A scenario tree $T$ is a prefix tree that contains all scenarios from the given set $S$. A path from the root to a leaf corresponds to a scenario from $S$. Each tree node and its incoming edge correspond to a scenario element: a node is marked with an output action, while an edge is marked with an input action. The only exception for this is the root of the tree, marked only with an auxiliary output action consisting of auxiliary output event $\text{INITO}$ and zero output. An example of a scenario tree constructed from scenarios (1) is shown in Fig. 2, where $E^I = \{R\}$, $E^O = \{A, B\}$, $|X| = 2$, $|Z| = 1$. Further, we will refer to the key features of a scenario tree as follows: $V$ is a set of tree nodes; $\rho \in V$ – root of the tree; $tp(v) \in V$ – parent of node $v \neq \rho$; $\text{tie}(v) \in E^I$ – input event on the incoming edge of node $v \neq \rho$; $\text{toe}(v) \in E^O \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ – output event in node $v$, $\varepsilon$ is an empty event; $V^{(active)} = \{v \in V \setminus \{\rho\} \mid \text{toe}(v) \neq \varepsilon\}$ – set of active tree nodes; $V^{(passive)} = \{v \in V \setminus \{\rho\} \mid \text{toe}(v) = \varepsilon\}$ – set of passive tree nodes; $U$ – set of unique inputs encountered in scenarios; $\text{tin}(v) \in U$ – input on the incoming edge of node $v \neq \rho$; $\text{tov}(v, z) \in \{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$ – value of output variable $z$ in node $v$. The root $\rho$ has no parent, thus $tp(\rho)$, $\text{tie}(\rho)$, and $\text{tin}(\rho)$ are undefined. A positive scenario tree is a scenario tree built from positive scenarios, without any extension to the above definition.

4.2 Negative Scenarios

Recall that an LTL specification can be verified using a model checker tool, which produces a counterexample for each violated LTL formula. We use a symbolic model checker NuSMV [13]. For safety properties, a counterexample is a finite
sequence of states. For liveness properties, a counterexample is an infinite but periodic sequence of states, which can be represented in a lasso-shaped form as a finite prefix followed by a loop, i.e. a finite sequence of states ending with a *loop-back* [14]. Each state is associated with a set of variables and their values. Note that output-related variables in each state relate to the input in the previous state, e.g., if the first counterexample state is associated with \((e_1[x_1], o_1[z_1])\) and second with \((e_2[x_2], o_2[z_2])\), then \(o_2[z_2]\) is a reaction to \(e_1[x_1]\).

A **negative scenario** is an execution scenario representing an undesired behavior. A counterexample can be flattened into a negative scenario by merging the input and output actions from the successive states into scenario elements. Note that an output action of the first state remain unused, as it is assumed that it unconditionally zeroes all output variables and does not produce output event. Fig. 3 shows a counterexample and corresponding negative scenario.
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**Fig. 2.** Scenario tree constructed from scenarios (1)

A **negative scenario tree** is a scenario tree built from negative scenarios. The key difference from a positive scenario tree is that it is **non-deterministic** and contains *loop-backs* – unmarked edges to ancestral nodes, representing an undesired looping behavior. Note that node can have multiple loop-backs, from different negative scenarios. We denote all loop-backs from the node \(v\) as \(\hat{v}(v)\). All other tree features are the same as defined in Sect. 4.1, but marked with a hat symbol, e.g., \(\hat{v} \in \hat{V}\), \(\hat{fp}(v)\), \(\hat{tie}(v)\).

### 4.3 FB Model Inference Using SAT Solver

We propose a method for inferring an FB model based on the reduction to SAT. The reduction consists in formally describing a deterministic automaton \(A\) of size \(C\) by constructing a Boolean formula in conjunctive normal form that is satisfiable if and only if there exists an automaton which satisfies given positive scenarios \(S^+\) and does not satisfy given negative scenarios \(S^-\). Note, that for all constraints presented not in CNF we apply a Tseytin transform, and to encode integer variables in SAT we use a sparse encoding [19].

The proposed reduction consists of three parts. First, we declare an encoding for the structure of an automaton of size \(C\) and for the mapping between the
positive scenario tree $T^+$ and the automaton $A$. Constraints described here ensure that the sought automaton is (1) deterministic and (2) satisfies the positive scenarios. Second, we encode the guard conditions structure, i.e. the structure of parse trees of corresponding Boolean formulas. Additionally, we declare cardinality constraints allowing to bound the guard conditions complexity, i.e. the total number of meaningful parse tree nodes. Third, we encode the mapping between the negative scenario tree $T^-$ and the automaton $A$, and prohibit the undesired behaviors represented by $T^-$. 

**Automaton Structure Encoding.** The goal is to infer an automaton with $C$ states. We assume that each automaton state has at most $K$ outgoing transitions. Further in this section we assume that $c \in [1..C]$, $k \in [1..K]$, $e \in E^I$, $o \in E^O$, $u \in U$, $p \in [1..P]$, unless stated otherwise. Further, we assume that $K = C$, because it is the safest minimum value that does not prohibit the inference of an automaton, which may happen for smaller values of $K$ due to over-constraining. However, lowering this value greatly reduces the size of the reduction, which is likely to significantly increase the solving efficiency.

To begin with, we declare a variable $\tau_{c,k} \in [0..C]$ denoting the destination state of the $k$-th transition from the state $c$. Note, that $\tau_{c,k} = 0$ denotes the absence of a transition. W.l.o.g. we state that absent transitions are last:

$$\tau_{c,k} = 0 \implies \tau_{c,k+1} = 0$$

Additionally, we emulate an automaton transition function by declaring a variable $\lambda_{c,e,u} \in [0..C]$, which denotes the state into which the automaton jumps from the state $c$ upon receiving an input action $e[u]$. Note, that $\lambda_{c,e,u} = 0$ means that automaton stays in the same state. Formally, this variable is defined as follows:

$$\bigvee_{k \in [1..K]} \left( \lambda_{c,e,u} = \tau_{c,k} \land \xi_{c,k} = e \land \text{ff}_{c,u} = k \right)$$

Each transition is marked with an input event. Variable $\xi_{c,k} \in E^I \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ denotes an input event on the $k$-th transition from the state $c$. Note, that $\xi_{c,k} = \varepsilon$ denotes the absence of an input event, which happens only when transition is absent, i.e.:

$$\tau_{c,k} = 0 \iff \xi_{c,k} = \varepsilon.$$

Also, each transition has an associated guard condition represented by a Boolean formula over input variables. When the Boolean formula evaluates to True on some input $u$, we call this situation “guard condition fires on input $u$”. Variable $\vartheta_{c,k,u}^p$ denotes whether the $k$-th transition from state $c$ fires on $u$. According to the IEC 61499 standard, each state has a transitions priority: the automaton follows the first fired transition or remains in the same state if no transition fired. Variable $\text{ff}_{c,u} \in [0..K]$ denotes the number of a transition from the state $c$, which fires first on input $u$. Note, that $\text{ff}_{c,u} = 0$ denotes that no transition has fired at all. Additionally, we declare variables $n_{f,c,k,u}$ indicating
that transitions 1..k from the state c have not fired on input u. The relations between those variables are defined by following constraints:

$$\text{ff}_{c,u} = k \iff \vartheta^p_{c,k,u} \land \text{nf}_{c,k-1,u}$$
$$\text{nf}_{c,k,u} \iff \neg \vartheta^p_{c,k,u} \land \text{nf}_{c,k-1,u}$$
$$\neg \text{nf}_{c,k,u} \iff \neg \text{nf}_{c,k+1,u}$$
$$\text{ff}_{c,u} = 0 \iff \text{nf}_{c,C,u}$$

Each state has an associated output action. Recall that each output action consists of an output event and an algorithm that can change output variable values. Variable $\omega_c \in E^O$ denotes an output event in the state $c$. It is defined to be the same as in all active tree nodes mapped into this state:

$$\omega_{1,\text{toe}(p)} \land \bigwedge_{v \in V(\text{active})} (\mu_{v,c} \implies \omega_{c,\text{toe}(v)})$$

Values of output variables are not defined by each state, but may be changed by each state’s algorithm. Note that we consider simple algorithms where new output variable values depend only on their previous values and the state, and therefore, for each output variable, an algorithm has two branches – what the outcome will be if the previous value was False (variables $d^0_{c,z}$) or True (variables $d^1_{c,z}$). The initial state zeroes all output variables, while the other states ($c \in [2..C]$) mimic the behavior from the tree:

$$\neg d^0_{1,z} \land \neg d^1_{1,z} \land \bigwedge_{v \in V(\text{active})} c_{v,c} \rightarrow \begin{cases} 
\neg d^0_{c,z}, & \text{if } \neg \text{tov}(tp(v),z) \land \neg \text{tov}(v,z) \\
\neg d^1_{c,z}, & \text{if } \neg \text{tov}(tp(v),z) \land \text{tov}(v,z) \\
d^0_{c,z}, & \text{if } \text{tov}(tp(v),z) \land \neg \text{tov}(v,z) \\
d^1_{c,z}, & \text{if } \text{tov}(tp(v),z) \land \text{tov}(v,z)
\end{cases}$$

Additionally, we declare auxiliary symmetry-breaking constraints [35], which force the automaton states to be enumerated in the order they are visited by the breadth-first search (BFS) algorithm launched from the initial state. Variable $t_{i,j}^{\text{bfs}}$ ($i, j \in [1..C]$) indicates the existence of transition from the state $i$ to $j$. Variable $p_{c}^{\text{bfs}} \in [0..C]$ denotes the “parent” of the state $c$ in the BFS traverse tree. We omit an in-depth description of BFS constraints defined as follows:

$$\bigwedge_{i,j \in [1..C]} \left( t_{i,j}^{\text{bfs}} \iff \bigwedge_{k} \varphi_{i,k} = j \right) \land \bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq C} \left( p_{j}^{\text{bfs}} = i \iff \bigwedge_{1 < q < i} \neg q_{q,j}^{\text{bfs}} \right)$$

**Positive Scenario Tree Mapping Encoding.** Roughly speaking, the goal is to organize a mapping between the positive scenario tree $T^+$ and the automaton $A$ – specifically, a surjective mapping of tree nodes into automaton states. Figure 4 shows a local mapping of three tree nodes, one of which is passive (white), i.e. has an empty output event $\varepsilon$, into two automaton states. Dashed lines connecting nodes with states represent the described mapping.
Consider an automaton of size $C$, where states are enumerated from 1 to $C$. In order to represent a mapping between a tree node $v \in V$ and an automaton state $c \in [1..C]$, we introduce the notion of “color” by saying that “tree node $v$ is colored in $c$”. Conceptually, this mapping denotes a satisfying state in which the automaton finishes processing the sequence of scenario elements formed by the path from $\rho$ to $v$.

Variable $\mu_v \in [1..C]$ ($v \in V$) denotes the color of the tree node $v$. Since the tree root $\rho$ maps into the initial automaton state, variable $\mu_\rho$ must be True. Coloring of active vertices forces the automaton to have the corresponding transition:

$$\bigwedge_{i,j \in [1..C]} (\mu_{tp(v)} = i \land \mu_v = j \implies \lambda_{t,te(v),tn(v)} = j)$$

Additionally, we declare a “reverse” constraint:

$$\bigvee_{k \in [1..K]} (\tau_{t,k} = j) \iff \bigvee_{v \in V^{\text{active}}} (\mu_{tp(v)} = i \land \mu_v = j)$$  \hspace{2cm} (2)

Note, that (2) forces the automaton transitions to be covered by the positive scenario tree, and forbids the uncovered ones. This greatly speeds up the solution process by reducing the search space, but in some cases, e.g., during the CEGIS, we deliberately search for the uncovered transitions, so we turn off (2).

**Basic Algorithm.** Constraints declared so far already allow to infer a computational automaton, i.e. able to process input actions and react on them by emitting output actions. Denote by $\text{basic}(S^+, C)$ the procedure of inferring an automaton of size $C$ satisfying positive scenarios $S^+$. The procedure consists of (1) building a positive scenario tree, (2) declaring constraints encoding the automaton structure and scenario tree mapping, and (3) delegating to the SAT-solver.

**Guard Conditions Structure Encoding.** So far, guard conditions were represented in the form of truth tables, which are not easily human-interpretable, and are not usable in control system development software such as nxtSTUDIO, where guard conditions must be represented with Boolean formulas. Therefore, we supplement the reduction with an encoding of parse trees of arbitrary Boolean formulas over input variables as described further.

We define each parse tree to have $P$ nodes, each either a Boolean operator node, a terminal node representing an input variable, or a none-typed node. Note that we define the size of the parse tree as the number of typed nodes in it. Variable $\delta_{c,k,p} \in \{\alpha, \land, \lor, \neg, \oplus\}$ denotes the type of the $p$-th parse tree node on the $k$-th transition from the state $c$, where $t = \alpha$ denotes a terminal node, $\land$, $\lor$, and $\neg$ denote logic operators, and $\oplus$ denotes a none-typed node. The latter are needed to represent nodes not included in the tree. Only terminal nodes have an associated terminal number, represented by a variable $\theta_{c,k,p} \in [0..X]$:

$$\delta_{c,k,p} = \alpha \iff \theta_{c,k,p} \neq 0$$
Variables $\pi_{c,k,p} \in [0..(p-1)]$ and $\sigma_{c,k,p} \in [0..(p+1)..P]$ denote the parent/child of the $p$-th node in the parse tree on the $k$-th transition from the state $c$. For "∧" and "∨" nodes we assume that the second child is adjacent to the first one:

$$\delta_{c,k,p} \in \{\land, \lor\} \land \sigma_{c,k,p} = ch \implies \pi_{c,k,ch+1} = p$$

Only typed nodes, expect the root, have a parent:

$$\bigwedge_{p \in [2..P]} (\delta_{c,k,p} = \emptyset \iff \pi_{c,k,p} \neq 0)$$

Parent and child variables are connected by the following constraint:

$$\bigwedge_{1 \leq p < ch \leq P} (\sigma_{c,k,p} = ch \implies \pi_{c,k,ch} = p)$$

Each parse tree node has a Boolean value represented by variable $\vartheta_{c,k,p,u}$.

Variable $\vartheta_{c,k,u}$ defined earlier is just a shortcut for the root node value:

$$\vartheta_{c,k,u} \equiv \vartheta_{c,k,1,u}$$

None-typed nodes have False values:

$$\delta_{c,k,p} = \emptyset \implies \bigwedge_{u \in U} \neg \vartheta_{c,k,p,u}$$

Terminals have values from the associated input variables:

$$\theta_{c,k,p} = x \implies \bigwedge_{u \in U} (\vartheta_{c,k,p,u} \iff \text{tiv}(u,x))$$

Values of non-terminal nodes are calculated according to their types and children values:

$$\delta_{c,k,p} = \text{"\land"} \land \sigma_{c,k,p} = ch \implies \bigwedge_{u \in U} (\vartheta_{c,k,p,u} \iff \vartheta_{c,k,ch,u} \land \vartheta_{c,k,ch+1,u})$$

$$\delta_{c,k,p} = \text{"\lor"} \land \sigma_{c,k,p} = ch \implies \bigwedge_{u \in U} (\vartheta_{c,k,p,u} \iff \vartheta_{c,k,ch,u} \lor \vartheta_{c,k,ch+1,u})$$

$$\delta_{c,k,p} = \text{"\neg"} \land \sigma_{c,k,p} = ch \implies \bigwedge_{u \in U} (\vartheta_{c,k,p,u} \iff \neg \vartheta_{c,k,ch,u})$$

Additionally, we declare other auxiliary symmetry-breaking constraints, which force parse tree nodes to be enumerated in BFS order. Essentially, they are almost identical to BFS constraints for automaton states, but declared for each parse tree separately, and the main definition is $t_{bfs,j,i} \iff \pi_{c,k,j} = i$, and for brevity we omit their complete definition.

**Cardinality Constraints.** Additionally, we declare an upper bound for the total size of all guard conditions, i.e. the total number of typed parse tree nodes $N$, by imposing a cardinality constraint on the nodetype variable: $\sum_{c \in [1..C], k \in [1..K], p \in [1..P]} \neg \delta_{c,k,p,u} \leq N$.

In order to encode this relation in SAT, we use a technique from [4]. Briefly, this technique consists in declaring a totalizer, which encodes the sum in unary form, and a comparator, which bounds this sum. For brevity, we omit formal definitions of resulting constraints which can be found in [4].
**Extended Algorithm.** Denote by EXTENDED\((S^+, C, P, N)\) the procedure for inferring an automaton which has \(C\) states, \(P\) nodes in each guard condition parse tree and at most \(N\) total nodes in all parse trees, and satisfies positive scenarios \(S^+\). The procedure consists of (1) building a positive scenario tree, (2) declaring constraints encoding the automaton structure, scenario tree mapping an guard conditions structure, and, if parameter \(N\) is specified, a totalizer and a comparator encoding the relation “total size of guard conditions is less than or equal to \(N\)' and (3) delegating to the SAT-solver.

**Negative Scenario Tree Mapping Encoding.** The mapping of the negative scenario tree is similar to the positive case, but the key difference is in the influence flow – the positive tree affects the automaton structure, which in turn defines the satisfaction of negative tree nodes.

In order to distinguish between the positive and negative mapping, we declare variable \(\hat{\mu}_v \in [1..C] \quad (v \in \hat{V})\) representing the satisfying states of the negative tree nodes (a sequence of satisfying states corresponds to a possible behavior of the automaton), where \(\hat{\mu}_v = 0\) denotes the absence of such satisfying state. The negative tree root is satisfied by the initial automaton state: \(\hat{\mu}_{\hat{\rho}} = 1\). For other nodes we declare the following propagation rules. Consider an active node \(v \in \hat{V}^{(active)}\) and its parent \(\hat{tp}(v)\) satisfied by state \(i \in [1..C]\) – node \(v\) is satisfied by the state, into which the automaton jumps upon receiving an input action from node \(v\):

\[
\hat{\mu}_{\hat{tp}(v)} = i \implies \left( \hat{\mu}_v = j \iff \lambda_{i,\hat{tie}(v),\hat{tin}(v)} = j \right)
\]

Consider a passive node \(v \in \hat{V}^{(passive)}\) and its parent \(\hat{tp}(v)\) satisfied by state \(c \in [1..C]\) – node \(v\) is satisfied by \(c\) only if the automaton stays in the same state upon receiving an input action from node \(v\):

\[
\hat{\mu}_{\hat{tp}(v)} = c \land \lambda_{c,\hat{tie}(v),\hat{tin}(v)} = 0 \implies \hat{\mu}_v = c \\
\hat{\mu}_{\hat{tp}(v)} = c \land \lambda_{c,\hat{tie}(v),\hat{tin}(v)} \neq 0 \implies \hat{\mu}_v = 0
\]

If some node \(v\) is not satisfied, then its children are also not satisfied: \(\hat{\mu}_{\hat{tp}(v)} = 0 \implies \hat{\mu}_i = 0\). Finally, in order to prohibit the undesired behavior represented by loopbacks, we simply force the start and the end of each loop to be colored in different colors:

\[
\bigwedge_{l \in \hat{tl}(v)} (\hat{\mu}_v = c \implies \hat{\mu}_l \neq c)
\]

Another important caveat is that the negative tree may contain inputs that are missing in the positive tree. Denote the set of such inputs as \(\hat{U}^+ = \hat{U} \setminus U\). To take them into account, we redeclare all variables and constraints involving \(u \in U\) to use \(\hat{u} \in \hat{U}\) instead. New variables are marked with a hat symbol, e.g., \(\hat{\mu}, \lambda, \hat{\varphi}\). For brevity, we omit definition of these constraints, as they are essentially the same as already defined.
**COMPLETE Algorithm.** Let us denote by $\text{complete}(S^+, S^-, C, P, N)$ the procedure for inferring an automaton which has $C$ states, guard conditions represented with parse trees of size at most $P$ and with total number of parse tree nodes $N$, and satisfies both positive and negative scenarios $S^+$ and $S^-$. The procedure consists of (1) building both positive and negative scenario trees, (2) declaring all described constraints, including cardinality constraints if parameter $N$ is specified, and (3) delegating to the SAT-solver.

**Counterexample-Guided Inductive Synthesis.** In order to make the inferred automaton not only satisfy given positive scenarios, but also comply with LTL specification, we use a counterexample-guided inductive synthesis (CEGIS) iterative approach [1]. Each CEGIS iteration consists of inferring an automaton $A$, verifying an LTL specification $L$ using a model checker, and supplementing the negative scenario tree with obtained counterexamples, if any. The process shown in Fig. 5 repeats until there are no more counterexamples, thus the inferred automaton is said to comply with the given LTL specification. Denote by $\text{complete-cegis}(S^+, C, P, N)$ the procedure implementing CEGIS, where arguments are the same as in the complete algorithm.

**4.4 Minimal Model Inference**

The proposed method requires automaton parameters – number of states $C$, maximal size of each guard condition parse tree $P$ and total size of guard conditions $N$ – to be known a priori. To automate the inference of minimal models we use an iterative approach.

**Basic-min Algorithm.** In order to quickly estimate the minimal number of states, we iterate $C$ starting from 1 and use $\text{basic}(S^+, C)$ algorithm until we find a solution – satisfying automaton $A$ with $C_{\text{min}}$ states. Let us denote this process as $\text{basic-min}(S^+)$ (Algorithm 1).

**Extended-min Algorithm.** Assuming that parameter $P$ is known and $C$ is estimated using the basic-min algorithm, we minimize the automaton in terms of $N$ as follows. We declare an upper bound for the total number of parse tree nodes $N$ and use the extended algorithm, decreasing $N$ successively until there is no smaller solution. The last inferred automaton has $C_{\text{min}}$ states and its guard conditions have $N_{\text{min}}$ parse tree nodes in total. Let us denote this process as $\text{extended-min}(S^+, P)$ (Algorithm 2).
**Extended-min-ub Algorithm.** Ultimately, an automatic way of determining an appropriate value of parameter $P$ is desirable. The solution exists when $P$ is large enough to capture the necessary guard conditions complexity. The simplest strategy is to iterate $P$ starting from 1 and use $\text{extended-min}(S^+,P)$ until the solution, i.e. the automaton with $N = N_{\text{min}}^*$, is found for some $P^*$. However, there may exist some value $P' > P^*$ for which the corresponding $N_{\text{min}}'$ is even smaller than $N_{\text{min}}$. Therefore, in order to obtain the globally minimal automaton in terms of $N$, we shall continue the search process for $P > P^*$ up to a theoretical upper bound as described in Appendix A, where we define the $\text{extended-min-ub}(S^+,w)$ algorithm, which allows to automatically infer the minimal automaton in terms of $C$, $P$ and $N$ from the given set of positive scenarios $S^+$. Parameter $w \geq 0$ is a heuristic threshold plateau width. When $w = 0$, the algorithm is equivalent to the simplest strategy of searching $P$ until the first SAT. When $w = \infty$, the algorithm continues to iterate $P$ until an upper bound, resulting in the globally minimal $N_{\text{min}}$. Other values enable a heuristic providing a trade-off between minimality and execution time.

**Complete-min-cegis Algorithm.** Consider an automaton $A$ produced by the complete-cegis algorithm. If we start minimizing the total size of guard conditions $N$, the automaton will most likely stop complying with the LTL specification, though the already obtained negative scenarios will still not be satisfied. Therefore, we propose to maintain a minimal model on each CEGIS iteration. We begin with a model produced by $\text{extended-min-ub}(w = 2)$ and start a CEGIS loop. The UNSAT result indicates that $N$ is tool small for an automaton to comply with the given LTL specification, hence we increase it and continue the CEGIS. Let us denote this process as $\text{complete-min-cegis}(S^+)$. 

4.5 The fbSAT Tool

We implemented all proposed methods in a command-line tool fbSAT written in Kotlin. The source code as well as sample input data are available online [12] (www.github.com/ctlab/fbSAT). fbSAT takes as input the scenarios and the parameters necessary for the specified method, and infers an automaton satisfying given scenarios. As a backend, fbSAT is able to use any SAT solver. In our work we use the CryptoMiniSat [32] SAT solver, utilizing its ability in incremental SAT solving, greatly decreasing total solving time, as our minimization problems are inherently incremental.

5 Case study: Pick-and-Place manipulator

The experimental evaluation of proposed methods was done on a case study devoted to the inference of a finite-state model of the controller for a Pick-and-Place (PnP) manipulator [29] shown in Fig. 6. We also performed an evaluation on random automata (Appendix C). Experiments were conducted on a computer with an Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-7200U CPU @ 2.50 GHz and 8 GB of RAM.
The PnP manipulator consists of two horizontal pneumatic cylinders (I, II), one vertical cylinder (III), and a suction unit (IV) for picking up work pieces. When a work piece appears on one of the input sliders (1, 2, 3), the horizontal cylinders position the suction unit on top of the work piece, the vertical cylinder lowers the suction unit where it picks up the work piece and then moves in to the output slider (V). The control system is implemented using IEC 61499 FBs in nxtSTUDIO. The controller is a basic FB with 10 input and 7 output variables. A more detailed description of the system is given in Appendix B. The purpose of this case study was to infer a finite-state model of this controller FB. The process of capturing scenarios for the Pick-and-Place manipulator controller is described in [9]. We used sets of scenarios of various sizes: 1, 10, 39 and 49 scenarios in each.

Inference of automata with minimal guard conditions from scenarios.

In the first set of experiments we compare methods that infer models from scenarios with explicit regard of guard conditions size. Our method was compared to the two-stage approach from [10], where on the first stage a basic automaton model is inferred with a SAT solver, and then this model’s guard conditions are minimized with a CSP solver w.r.t. given scenarios. Note that the two-stage method has already been shown in [10] to be superior to EFSM-tools [34].

We apply the proposed extended-min-ub method to infer an automaton with the minimal number of states \( C_{\min} \) and total size of guard conditions \( N_{\sum} \). Three values of the \( w \) parameter are used: \( w = 0 \) for the case when first solution found is considered final, \( w = 2 \) for the case with the proposed heuristic applied, and \( w = \infty \) for the “without heuristic” case. Results are summarized in Table 1, where for the two-stage method from [10]: \( C_{\min} \) – minimal number of states, \( T_{\min} \) – minimal number of transitions, \( N_{\sum} \) – size of guard conditions; and for extended-min-ub: \( w \) – maximum local minima width, \( P \) – maximum guard condition size, \( T \) – number of transitions, \( N_{\min} \) – minimal total size of guard conditions. Results indicate that extended-min-ub produces compact automata.

| \( S \) | \( |T| \) | Two-stage [10] \( w = 0 \) | \( w = 2 \) | \( w = \infty \) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| \( S^{(1)} \) | 24 | 8 \( t \), 6 \( s \), 8 \( c \), 15 \( T_{\min} \) \( N_{\sum} \) | 3 \( t \), 3 \( s \), 8 \( c \), 14 \( T_{\min} \) \( N_{\sum} \) | 4 \( t \), 3 \( s \), 8 \( c \), 14 \( T_{\min} \) \( N_{\sum} \) |
| \( S^{(10)} \) | 234 | 3.4 \( t \), 8 \( s \), 17 \( c \), 36 \( T_{\min} \) \( N_{\sum} \) | 16 \( t \), 3 \( s \), 18 \( c \), 38 \( T_{\min} \) \( N_{\sum} \) | 78 \( t \), 5 \( s \), 16 \( c \), 25 \( T_{\min} \) \( N_{\sum} \) |
| \( S^{(39)} \) | 960 | 13 \( t \), 8 \( s \), 15 \( c \), 32 \( T_{\min} \) \( N_{\sum} \) | 26 \( t \), 3 \( s \), 18 \( c \), 38 \( T_{\min} \) \( N_{\sum} \) | 138 \( t \), 5 \( s \), 16 \( c \), 25 \( T_{\min} \) \( N_{\sum} \) |
| \( S^{(49)} \) | 2939 | 36 \( t \), 8 \( s \), 18 \( c \), 60 \( T_{\min} \) \( N_{\sum} \) | 396 \( t \), 5 \( s \), 18 \( c \), 44 \( T_{\min} \) \( N_{\sum} \) | 6335 \( t \), 6 \( s \), 16 \( c \), 39 \( T_{\min} \) \( N_{\sum} \) |

Comparison with LTL synthesis tools. We considered LTL synthesis tools BoSy [17] and G4LTL-ST [7], which accept LTL specifications as input. Comparison was only done for synthesis from scenarios, which were converted to LTL formulas. For BoSy we considered a simplified version of scenario \( S^{(1)} \), for
which passive elements were removed, leaving only 8 scenario elements. The
input-symbolic version of BoSy was the only one that worked for this example,
generating a solution with 9 states and 17 transitions in 273 sec. For G4LTL-ST
we selected the number of unroll steps equal to the length of the largest sce-
nario. For $S^{(1)}$ a solution with 10 states (though with verbose guard conditions)
was found in 10 sec. Larger sets of scenarios required 16 unroll steps, and runs
failed with a memory limit of 8 GB. As expected, experiments showed that
LTL synthesis tools are not well-suited for inference of models from finite-length
scenarios. Experiments with LTL properties were not considered due to (1) poor
performance on scenarios, and (2) lack of support for general-form NuSMV plant
model, which is crucial for synthesis from liveness properties.

Inference of automata from scenarios and LTL properties. The third
set of experiments is devoted to CEGIS. In order to enable use of liveness LTL
properties, verification of candidate models with NuSMV was performed in
closed loop [37] with a manually prepared formal model of the plant – PnP
manipulator. This model defines plant state and its actions implied by controller
commands. The set of considered LTL properties (see Appendix B ) includes
safety properties $\varphi_1$–$\varphi_6$ (controller does not lead the system to an unsafe state)
and liveness properties $\varphi_7$ – $\varphi_{10}$ (something useful eventually happens). Properties
$\varphi_1$–$\varphi_7$ are fixed and used in all experiments, while use of $\varphi_8$–$\varphi_{10}$ varies. We
concentrate on these last properties, which define that whenever a WP is placed
on some input slider, it will eventually be removed. Note that for the original
PnP system [29] only $\varphi_8$ is satisfied, and $\varphi_9$–$\varphi_{10}$ are false (the controller is not
wait-free for sliders 2 and 3 – if a WP is always present on slider 1, WPs from
sliders 2 and 3 will never be picked up). Therefore, we consider the property for
each input slider separately, assuming that WPs never appear on other input
sliders.

Three algorithms are compared: proposed COMPLETE-MIN-CEGIS, COMPLETE-
CEGIS (without minimization of N), and the CEGIS-extension of rbcsp [8].
EFSM-tools [34], BoSy [17] and G4LTL-ST [7] were not considered here, first of
all due to poor performance on scenarios only. Apart from running time $t$ and $N$
we measure $N_{sc}$ (for the automaton built from scenarios using COMPLETE-MIN-UB
with $w = 2$) and the number of CEGIS-iterations ($\#\text{iter}$). Inferred solutions were
checked in simulation testing with nxtSTUDIO: uploaded to the simulation model
of the system and checked for compliance with desired behavior. Experimental
results are summarized in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTL properties</th>
<th>Scenarios $N_{sc}$</th>
<th>COMPLETE-MIN-CEGIS</th>
<th>COMPLETE-MIN-CEGIS</th>
<th>fbCSP+LTL [8]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t$, s.</td>
<td>$#\text{iter}$</td>
<td>$t$, s.</td>
<td>$#\text{iter}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G(pp1 $\rightarrow$ F(vp1)) $S^{(1)}$</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G(pp2 $\rightarrow$ F(vp2)) $S^{(2)}$</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G(pp3 $\rightarrow$ F(vp3)) $S^{(3)}$</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Solutions found with CEGIS methods are always larger than ones constructed from scenarios only (in terms of $N$). Then, COMPLETE-MIN-CEGIS always finds the smallest solutions and is always faster than [8]. Most interestingly, COMPLETE-MIN-CEGIS allows efficiently constructing models for scenarios $S^{(1)}$, $S^{(2)}$, $S^{(3)}$ — these scenarios do not “cover” corresponding liveness properties of interest (e.g. $G(pp1 \rightarrow F(vp1))$) in the sense that the scenario describes only a single processing of a WP. The existing method [8] failed on these cases, while the proposed approach succeeds with ease. Lastly, COMPLETE-CEGIS allows constructing models fast, but loosing the guard conditions minimality.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

We have proposed a SAT-based approach for inference of minimal FB models from execution scenarios and LTL properties, and implemented it in the tool fbSAT. The proposed approach is the only one that allows direct minimization of guard conditions complexity of synthesized automata. In particular, the EXTENDED-MIN-UB algorithm is guaranteed to find the solution with globally minimum complexity of guard conditions. Experiments showed that the suggested approach outperforms existing ones and demonstrates predictable scalability on random instances. Additionally, we have reimplemented BASIC reduction for SMT, and the initial results have shown that SMT solvers are not efficient when solving naively encoded SAT problems. Nevertheless, the use of more sophisticated encoding under the $\text{QF}_\text{UF}$ theory looks promising from the look to others work in this field.

Future research may include synthesis of modular automata, applying other encodings of integer variables and cardinality constraints, and using SMT encodings for high-order abstractions.
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Appendix A  Automatic search for best value of $P$

In this appendix we describe in detail the process of searching for the best value of $P$ in the sense of minimizing the corresponding $N_{\text{min}}$ obtained using extended-min algorithm.

Consider $P = P'$; ideally, we expect that all guard conditions will be of size 1, and only one of them will be of size $P'$. Also, ideally, there are exactly $T_{\text{min}}$ guards, therefore, the ideal minimal total size of guard conditions is $N'_{\text{min}} = T_{\text{min}} + P'$. Let us denote by $N_{\text{best}}'_{\text{min}}$ the best, i.e. the most minimal value found so far. Ultimately, we are looking for $N'_{\text{min}} < N_{\text{best}}'_{\text{min}}$, from where the upper bound for $P$ is $P' < N_{\text{best}}'_{\text{min}}$, from which the upper bound for $P$ is $P' < N_{\text{best}}'_{\text{min}} - T_{\text{min}}$.

The process of searching $P$ up to the upper bound can take an extensive amount of time. Hence, we propose the following heuristic. Consider the two successive values $P'$ and $P'' = P' + 1$, and the corresponding values $N'_{\text{min}}$ and $N''_{\text{min}}$. The equality $N'_{\text{min}} = N''_{\text{min}}$ indicates the local minimum (plateau). As we go further by incrementing the value of $P''$, the remaining equality extends the plateau width. By choosing the critical plateau width $w$, on which to stop incrementing $P$, we provide a trade-off between the execution time and global minimality of the solution. In practice, an arbitrary choice of $w = 2$ showed good performance in our initial studies. It is worth noting that with this heuristic applied, our proposed method remains exact in the sense that inferred automata still satisfy given positive scenarios $S^+$. Let us denote by extended-min-ub($S^+$, $w$) the minimization process described above. It is depicted by Algorithm 3 and consists of two stages. First, we estimate the automaton parameters $C_{\text{min}}$ and $T_{\text{min}}$ using basic-min algorithm. Note that by basic-min$^*$ we denote the algorithm which combines the basic-min and the minimization of $T$ using the same technique as in extended-min for $N$. Second, we iterate $P$ starting from 1 and use the extended-min algorithm to infer an automaton. We stop the search in two cases: if current $P$ is greater than the upper bound ($N'_{\text{best}}_{\text{min}} - T_{\text{min}}$), or if current local minimum width is greater than the arbitrary threshold $w$.

Algorithm 3: extended-min-ub

```
Input: positive scenarios $S^+$, maximum plateau width $w$
Output: automaton $A$ with minimal number of states $C_{\text{min}}$ and guard
conditions size $N_{\text{min}}$

$A_{\text{basic}} \leftarrow$ basic-min($S$)

$T_{\text{min}} \leftarrow$ getNumberOfTransitions($A_{\text{basic}}$)

$C_{\text{min}} \leftarrow$ getNumberOfStates($A_{\text{basic}}$)

$N_{\text{best}}'_{\text{min}} \leftarrow N_{\text{min}} \leftarrow P_{\text{low}} \leftarrow \infty$

for $P = 1$ to $\infty$ do
  if $P > (N'_{\text{best}}_{\text{min}} - T_{\text{min}})$ then break // up bound reached
  if $(P - P_{\text{low}}) > w$ then break // max width reached
  $A \leftarrow$ extended-min($S, C_{\text{min}}, P$)
  if $A \neq \text{null}$ then
    $N_{\text{min}} \leftarrow$ getTotalGuardsSize($A$)
    if $N_{\text{min}} < N_{\text{best}}'_{\text{min}}$ then $N_{\text{best}}'_{\text{min}} \leftarrow N_{\text{min}}$ // update best found $N$
    if $N_{\text{min}} \neq N_{\text{prev}}$ then $P_{\text{low}} \leftarrow P$ // update local minimum
  $N_{\text{prev}} \leftarrow N_{\text{min}}$

return $A$
```
Appendix B  Description of Pick-and-Place manipulator variables and properties

The controller of the PnP system uses the following signals from the plant represented by Boolean input variables:

- \( c1\text{Home}/c1\text{End} \) – is horizontal cylinder I in fully retracted/extended position;
- \( c2\text{Home}/c2\text{End} \) – is horizontal cylinder II in fully retracted/extended position;
- \( vc\text{Home}/vc\text{End} \) – is vertical cylinder III in fully retracted/extended position;
- \( pp1pp2/pp3 \) – is a WP present on input slider 1/2/3;
- \( \text{vac} \) – is the vacuum unit IV on.

The following commands can be issued by the controller to the plant:

- \( c1\text{Extend}/c1\text{Retract} \) – extend/retract cylinder I;
- \( c2\text{Extend}/c2\text{Retract} \) – extend/retract cylinder II;
- \( vc\text{Extend} \) – extend cylinder III;
- \( \text{vacuum} _\text{on}/\text{vacuum} _\text{off} \) – turn the vacuum unit on/off.

Considered LTL properties for the controller use additional predicates depending on input and output variables:

- \( vp1 = c1\text{Home} \land c2\text{Home} \land vc\text{End} \land \text{vac} \land pp1 \) – a WP has been picked up from input slider 1;
- \( vp2 = c1\text{Home} \land c2\text{End} \land vc\text{End} \land \text{vac} \land pp2 \) – a WP has been picked up from input slider 2;
- \( vp3 = c1\text{End} \land c2\text{End} \land vc\text{End} \land \text{vac} \land pp3 \) – a WP has been picked up from input slider 3;
- \( \text{lifed} \) – becomes true when \( vp1 \lor vp2 \lor vp3 \), turns false when \( \text{dropped} \);
- \( \text{dropped} = \text{lifed} \land c1\text{Home} \land c2\text{Home} \land vc\text{End} \land \neg \text{vacuum} _\text{on} \land \neg \text{vacuum} _\text{off} \) – indicates that a previously lifted WP has been dropped to the output slider;
- \( \text{allHome} = c1\text{Home} \land c2\text{Home} \land vc\text{Home} \) – all cylinders are in home position.

The set of considered temporal properties is described in Table 3. An example of an automaton generated from scenarios \( S^{(1)} \) and LTL specification \( \varphi_1 - \varphi_8 \) is shown in Fig. 8.

Appendix C  Case Study: Random Automata

In order to test our framework fbSAT on more instances, we perform an evaluation on randomly generated automata in this case study.

The first step is to generate random automata. We chose the automaton parameters similar to the parameters of the model inferred in the “Case Study: PnP Manipulator” (Sect. 5): number of states \( C = 8 \), number of transitions \( T \) up to \( C^2 \), one input and one output event, \(|X| = 10\) input and \(|Z| = 7\) output variables. Also, we selected an additional value \(|X| = 5\) to compare with simpler models.

The second step is to simulate execution scenarios. We start in the initial automaton state and consequently choose a random input event and random input variable values. The automaton reacts on these input actions and produces
Table 3. Temporal properties for the Pick-and-Place system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi_1$</td>
<td>$G(\neg (c1\text{Extend} \land c1\text{Retract}))$ cylinder I must not be issued commands to extend and retract simultaneously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi_2$</td>
<td>$G(\neg (c2\text{Extend} \land c2\text{Retract}))$ similar property for cylinder II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi_3$</td>
<td>$G(\neg (\text{vacuum}<em>{\text{on}} \land \text{vacuum}</em>{\text{off}}))$ similar property for the vacuum unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi_4$</td>
<td>$G(\neg \text{vcHome} \land \neg \text{vcEnd} \rightarrow c1\text{Home} \lor c1\text{End})$ if the vertical cylinder is in the intermediate position, cylinder I must be either in home or end position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi_5$</td>
<td>$G(\neg \text{c1Home} \land \neg \text{c1End} \rightarrow \text{vcHome} \lor \text{vcEnd})$ if cylinder I is in the intermediate position, the vertical cylinder must be either in home or end position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi_6$</td>
<td>$G(\text{all_home} \land \neg \text{pp1} \land \neg \text{pp2} \land \neg \text{pp3} \land \neg \text{all_lifted} \rightarrow X(\neg c1\text{Extend} \land \neg c2\text{Extend} \land \neg \text{vcExtend}))$ if all cylinders are in home position and no WP should be processed, no commands to move any cylinders should be issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi_7$</td>
<td>$G(\text{lifted} \rightarrow F(\text{dropped}))$ if a WP is lifted from the input slider it must eventually be dropped to the output slider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\psi_8$</td>
<td>$G(\text{pp1} \rightarrow F(\text{vp1}))$ if a WP appears on input slider 1 it must be eventually lifted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\psi_9$</td>
<td>$G(\text{pp2} \rightarrow F(\text{vp2}))$ if a WP appears on input slider 2, it must be eventually lifted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\psi_{10}$</td>
<td>$G(\text{pp3} \rightarrow F(\text{vp3}))$ if a WP appears on input slider 3, it must be eventually lifted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

output actions, forming an execution scenario. We performed a simulation of two sets of scenarios: (1) 10 scenarios of length 100 each, and (2) 50 scenarios of length 50 each. Note that this random walk corresponds to a situation when the plant has random dynamics. Hence, these randomly simulated instances are most likely harder than real-world instances, since real-world plants (such as the PnP manipulator) do not have random dynamics.

The next step is to infer the minimal automaton from the simulated scenarios using the EXTENDED-MIN algorithm. And the final step is to validate the inferred automaton. We use the “forward check” validation approach from [36] consisting in generating a large validation set of scenarios and checking whether the inferred automaton satisfies them. The metric here is the percentage $p$ of satisfied scenarios. We expect to confirm that high coverage of target automata by scenarios leads to good validation results.

Table 4. Results for the Random Automata Case Study

| $|S|$ | $|s|$ | $|X|$ | $t \pm \sigma$ | $\bar{p}$, % | 100%$\bar{p}$ |
|-----|-----|-----|-------|--------|--------|
| 10  | 100 | 5   | 48 $\pm$ 38 | 72     | 7 of 30 |
| 10  | 100 | 10  | 535 $\pm$ 692 | 30     | 0 of 31 |
| 50  | 50  | 5   | 148 $\pm$ 54  | 98     | 41 of 56 |
| 50  | 50  | 10  | 991 $\pm$ 702 | 95     | 5 of 10 |
The results are presented in Table 4, where $|S|$ is the number of scenarios, $|s|$ – length of each scenario, $|X|$ – number of input variables, $t$ – mean solving time (in seconds), $\sigma$ – standard deviation, $\bar{p}$ – mean “forward check” validation percentage, $100\% p$ – number of instances with 100% validation. Additionally, the results are shown in Fig. 7, where on the left the distribution of execution time is shown, and on the right – the distribution of “forward check” percentage. Both plots are grouped by number of scenarios $|S|$ and number of input variables $|X|$.

Experimental results (Fig. 7) indicate that with sufficient coverage of the target automaton by execution scenarios (in this case, 50 scenarios of length 50 each), our approach allows to identify the exact behavior of the automaton with high probability. However, inference from large sets of scenarios requires sufficient computational resources.

![Fig. 7. Distribution plots for Random Automata Case Study](image-url)
Fig. 8. Generated automaton example; "flip" indicates flip of corresponding output variable