TUTORIAL
Temporal Representation and Reasoning in Interval Temporal Logics

Angelo Montanari
Dept. of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Udine, Italy

Pietro Sala
Dept. of Computer Science, University of Verona, Italy

Dario Della Monica
ICE-TCS, School of Computer Science, Reykjavik University, Iceland

ECAI 2014
Prague, August 18th, 2014

Temporal Representation and Reasoning in Interval Temporal Logics

Part I: a road map

- interval temporal logics
- the logic of Allen's relations: Halpern and Shoham's modal logic of time intervals (HS)
- decidable fragments of HS
- undecidable fragments of HS
- latest developments

Angelo Montanari
Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Udine, Italy

Origins and application areas

- Philosophy and ontology of time, e.g., the choice between time instants and time intervals as the primary objects of a temporal ontology
- Linguistics: analysis of progressive tenses, semantics and processing of natural languages
- Artificial intelligence: temporal knowledge representation, systems for time planning and maintenance, theory of events
- Computer science: temporal databases, specification and design of hardware components, concurrent real-time processes, bioinformatics

Interval temporal logics and temporal ontologies

Interval temporal reasoning is subject to the same ontological dilemmas as the point-based temporal reasoning, viz., should the time structure be assumed:

- *linear or branching?*
- *discrete or dense?*
- *with or without beginning/end?*

Interval temporal logics and temporal ontologies

Interval temporal reasoning is subject to the same ontological dilemmas as the point-based temporal reasoning, viz., should the time structure be assumed:

- *linear or branching?*
- *discrete or dense?*
- *with or without beginning/end?*

New dilemmas arise regarding the nature of the intervals:

- *How are points and intervals related? Which is the primary concept? Should an interval be identified with the set of points in it, or there is more into it?*
- *Can intervals be unbounded?*
- *Are intervals with coinciding endpoints admissible or not?*

The distinctive features of interval temporal logics

Truth of formulae is defined over intervals (not points).



The distinctive features of interval temporal logics

Truth of formulae is defined over intervals (not points).



Interval temporal logics are very expressive (compared to point-based temporal logics)

In particular, formulas of interval logics express properties of pairs of time points rather than of single time points, and are evaluated as sets of such pairs, i.e., as binary relations

The distinctive features of interval temporal logics

Truth of formulae is defined over intervals (not points).



Interval temporal logics are very expressive (compared to point-based temporal logics)

In particular, formulas of interval logics express properties of pairs of time points rather than of single time points, and are evaluated as sets of such pairs, i.e., as binary relations

Thus, in general there is no reduction of the satisfiability/validity in interval logics to monadic second-order logic, and therefore Rabin's theorem is not applicable here

Binary ordering relations over intervals

The thirteen binary ordering relations between two intervals on a linear order (those below and their inverses) form the set of *Allen's interval relations*:



HS: the modal logic of Allen's interval relations

Allen's interval relations give rise to corresponding unary modalities over frames where intervals are primitive entities:
Halpern and Shoham's modal logic of time intervals HS (LICS 1986), interpreted over interval structures (not to be confused with Allen's Interval Algebra)

HS: the modal logic of Allen's interval relations

Allen's interval relations give rise to corresponding unary modalities over frames where intervals are primitive entities: Halpern and Shoham's modal logic of time intervals HS (LICS 1986), interpreted over interval structures (not to be confused with Allen's Interval Algebra)

The satisfiability/validity problem for HS is highly undecidable over all standard classes of linear orders. What about its fragments?

HS: the modal logic of Allen's interval relations

Allen's interval relations give rise to corresponding unary modalities over frames where intervals are primitive entities:
Halpern and Shoham's modal logic of time intervals HS (LICS 1986), interpreted over interval structures (not to be confused with Allen's Interval Algebra)

The satisfiability/validity problem for HS is highly undecidable over all standard classes of linear orders. What about its fragments?

More than 4000 fragments of HS (over the class of all linear orders) can be identified by choosing a different subset of the set of basic modal operators. However, 1347 genuinely different ones exist only

D. Della Monica, V. Goranko, A. Montanari, and G. Sciavicco, *Expressiveness of the Interval Logics of Allen's Relations on the Class of all Linear Orders: Complete Classification*, IJCAI 2011

(Un)decidability of HS fragments: main parameters

Research agenda:

- search for maximal decidable HS fragments
- search for minimal undecidable HS fragments

(Un)decidability of HS fragments: main parameters

Research agenda:

- search for maximal decidable HS fragments
- search for minimal undecidable HS fragments

The large majority of HS fragments turns out be undecidable, but some meaningful exceptions exist

(Un)decidability of HS fragments: main parameters

Research agenda:

- search for maximal decidable HS fragments
- search for minimal undecidable HS fragments

The large majority of HS fragments turns out be undecidable, but some meaningful exceptions exist

(Un)decidability of HS fragments depends on two factors:

(Un)decidability of HS fragments: main parameters

Research agenda:

- search for maximal decidable HS fragments
- search for minimal undecidable HS fragments

The large majority of HS fragments turns out be undecidable, but some meaningful exceptions exist

(Un)decidability of HS fragments depends on two factors:

- the set of interval modalities

(Un)decidability of HS fragments: main parameters

Research agenda:

- search for maximal decidable HS fragments
- search for minimal undecidable HS fragments

The large majority of HS fragments turns out be undecidable, but some meaningful exceptions exist

(Un)decidability of HS fragments depends on two factors:

- the set of interval modalities
- the class of interval structures (linear orders) over which the logic is interpreted

A real character: the logic D

The logic D of the subinterval relation (Allen's relation *during*) is quite interesting from the point of view of (un)decidability

A real character: the logic D

The logic D of the subinterval relation (Allen's relation *during*) is quite interesting from the point of view of (un)decidability

The satisfiability problem for D, interpreted over the class of dense linear orders, is PSPACE-complete

I. Shapirovsky, On PSPACE-decidability in Transitive Modal Logic, Advances in Modal Logic 2005

A real character: the logic D

The logic D of the subinterval relation (Allen's relation *during*) is quite interesting from the point of view of (un)decidability

The satisfiability problem for D, interpreted over the class of dense linear orders, is PSPACE-complete

I. Shapirovsky, On PSPACE-decidability in Transitive Modal Logic, Advances in Modal Logic 2005

It is undecidable, when D is interpreted over the classes of finite and discrete linear orders

J. Marcinkowski and J. Michaliszyn, *The Ultimate Undecidability Result for the Halpern-Shoham Logic*, LICS 2011

A real character: the logic D

The logic D of the subinterval relation (Allen's relation *during*) is quite interesting from the point of view of (un)decidability

The satisfiability problem for D, interpreted over the class of dense linear orders, is PSPACE-complete

I. Shapirovsky, On PSPACE-decidability in Transitive Modal Logic, Advances in Modal Logic 2005

It is undecidable, when D is interpreted over the classes of finite and discrete linear orders

J. Marcinkowski and J. Michaliszyn, *The Ultimate Undecidability Result for the Halpern-Shoham Logic*, LICS 2011

It is unknown, when D is interpreted over the class of all linear orders

An easy case: the logic $\mathrm{B\overline{B}}$

Consider the fragment $\mathrm{B\overline{B}}$.



An easy case: the logic $\mathrm{B\overline{B}}$

Consider the fragment $\mathrm{B\overline{B}}$.



The decidability of $\mathrm{B\overline{B}}$ can be shown by embedding it into the propositional temporal logic of linear time LTL$[\mathrm{F},\mathrm{P}]$: formulas of $\mathrm{B\overline{B}}$ can be translated into formulas of LTL$[\mathrm{F},\mathrm{P}]$ by replacing $\langle \mathrm{B} \rangle$ with P (sometimes in the past) and $\langle \overline{\mathrm{B}} \rangle$ with F (sometimes in the future):

LTL$[\mathrm{F},\mathrm{P}]$ has the small (pseudo)model property and is decidable

The case of $\mathrm{E\overline{E}}$ is similar

A well-behaved fragment: the logic $A\overline{A}$

Formulas of the logic $A\overline{A}$ of Allen's relations *meets* and *met by* are recursively defined by the following grammar:

$$\varphi ::= p \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \langle A\rangle\varphi \mid \langle\overline{A}\rangle\varphi \; ([A] = \neg\langle A\rangle\neg; \text{ same for } [\overline{A}])$$

A well-behaved fragment: the logic $A\overline{A}$

Formulas of the logic $A\overline{A}$ of Allen's relations *meets* and *met by* are recursively defined by the following grammar:

$$\varphi ::= p \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \langle A\rangle\varphi \mid \langle\overline{A}\rangle\varphi \ \ ([A] = \neg\langle A\rangle\neg;\text{ same for } [\overline{A}])$$



A well-behaved fragment: the logic $A\overline{A}$

Formulas of the logic $A\overline{A}$ of Allen's relations *meets* and *met by* are recursively defined by the following grammar:

$$\varphi ::= p \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \langle A\rangle\varphi \mid \langle\overline{A}\rangle\varphi \ \ ([A] = \neg\langle A\rangle\neg;\ \text{same for } [\overline{A}])$$



A well-behaved fragment: the logic $A\overline{A}$

Formulas of the logic $A\overline{A}$ of Allen's relations *meets* and *met by* are recursively defined by the following grammar:

$$\varphi ::= p \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \langle A\rangle\varphi \mid \langle \overline{A}\rangle\varphi \ \ ([A] = \neg\langle A\rangle\neg; \text{ same for } [\overline{A}])$$



We cannot abstract way from any of the endpoints of intervals:

- contradictory formulas may hold over intervals with the same right endpoint and a different left endpoint

$\langle A\rangle[A]p \wedge \langle A\rangle[A]\neg p$ is satisfiable: for any $d > d_3$, p holds over $[d_2, d]$ and $\neg p$ holds over $[d_3, d]$



The importance of the past in $A\overline{A}$

Unlike what happens with point-based linear temporal logic, $A\overline{A}$ is strictly more expressive than its future fragment A (proof technique: invariance of modal formulas with respect to bisimulation)

There is a log-space reduction from the satisfiability problem for $A\overline{A}$ over $\mathbb{Z}$ to its satisfiability problem over $\mathbb{N}$, that turns out to be much more involved than the corresponding reduction for point-based linear temporal logic

$A\overline{A}$ is able to separate $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{R}$, while A is not

D. Della Monica, A. Montanari, and P. Sala, The importance of the past in interval temporal logics: the case of Propositional Neighborhood Logic, in A. Artikis et al. (Eds.), Sergot Festschrift, LNAI 7360, Springer, 2012

Expressive completeness of $A\overline{A}$ with respect to $\mathrm{FO}^2[<]$

Expressive completeness of $A\overline{A}$ with respect to the two-variable fragment of first-order logic for binary relational structures over various linearly-ordered domains $\mathrm{FO}^2[<]$

M. Otto, Two Variable First-order Logic Over Ordered Domains, Journal of Symbolic Logic, 2001

Expressive completeness of $A\overline{A}$ with respect to $\mathrm{FO}^2[<]$

Expressive completeness of $A\overline{A}$ with respect to the two-variable fragment of first-order logic for binary relational structures over various linearly-ordered domains $\mathrm{FO}^2[<]$

M. Otto, Two Variable First-order Logic Over Ordered Domains, Journal of Symbolic Logic, 2001

Remark. The two-variable property is a sufficient condition for decidability, but it is not a necessary one (for instance, D is decidable over dense linear orders, but it does not satisfy the two-variable property - three variables are needed)

Decidability of $A\overline{A}$

As a by-product, decidability (in fact, NEXPTIME-completeness) of $A\overline{A}$ over all linear orders, well-orders, finite linear orders, and the linear order on the natural numbers

D. Bresolin, V. Goranko, A. Montanari, and G. Sciavicco, Propositional Interval Neighborhood Logics: Expressiveness, Decidability, and Undecidable Extensions, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, 2009

Decidability of $A\overline{A}$

As a by-product, decidability (in fact, NEXPTIME-completeness) of $A\overline{A}$ over all linear orders, well-orders, finite linear orders, and the linear order on the natural numbers

D. Bresolin, V. Goranko, A. Montanari, and G. Sciavicco, Propositional Interval Neighborhood Logics: Expressiveness, Decidability, and Undecidable Extensions, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, 2009

This was not the end of the story ..

Decidability of $A\overline{A}$

As a by-product, decidability (in fact, NEXPTIME-completeness) of $A\overline{A}$ over all linear orders, well-orders, finite linear orders, and the linear order on the natural numbers

D. Bresolin, V. Goranko, A. Montanari, and G. Sciavicco, Propositional Interval Neighborhood Logics: Expressiveness, Decidability, and Undecidable Extensions, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, 2009

This was not the end of the story ..

- It was/is far from being trivial to extract a decision procedure from Otto's proof

Decidability of $A\overline{A}$

As a by-product, decidability (in fact, NEXPTIME-completeness) of $A\overline{A}$ over all linear orders, well-orders, finite linear orders, and the linear order on the natural numbers

D. Bresolin, V. Goranko, A. Montanari, and G. Sciavicco, Propositional Interval Neighborhood Logics: Expressiveness, Decidability, and Undecidable Extensions, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, 2009

This was not the end of the story ..

- It was/is far from being trivial to extract a decision procedure from Otto's proof
- Some meaningful cases were missing (dense linear orders, weakly discrete linear orders, real numbers)

Tableau-based decision procedures for $A\overline{A}$ - 1

An optimal tableau-based decision procedure for the future fragment of $A\overline{A}$ (the future modality $\langle A \rangle$ only) over the natural numbers

D. Bresolin and A. Montanari, A Tableau-based Decision Procedure for Right Propositional Neighborhood Logic, TABLEAUX 2005 (extended and revised version in *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 2007)

Later extended to full $A\overline{A}$ over the integers (it can be tailored to natural numbers and finite linear orders)

D. Bresolin, A. Montanari, and P. Sala, An Optimal Tableau-based Decision Algorithm for Propositional Neighborhood Logic, STACS 2007

Tableau-based decision procedures for $A\overline{A}$ - 2

Recently, optimal tableau-based decision procedures for $A\overline{A}$ over all, dense, and weakly-discrete linear orders have been developed

D. Bresolin, A. Montanari, P. Sala, and G. Sciavicco, Optimal Tableau Systems for Propositional Neighborhood Logic over All, Dense, and Discrete Linear Orders, TABLEAUX 2011

Finally, an optimal tableau-based decision procedure for $A\overline{A}$ over the reals has been devised

A. Montanari and P. Sala, An optimal tableau system for the logic of temporal neighborhood over the reals, TIME 2012

Maximal decidable fragments

Issue: can we add other modalities from the HS repository to the logic of temporal neighborhood $A\overline{A}$ or to the logic of the subinterval relation D preserving decidability?

The search for maximal decidable fragments of HS benefitted from a natural geometrical interpretation of interval logics proposed by Venema

In the following, we restrict our attention to $A\overline{A}$

We illustrate the basic ingredients of such a geometrical interpretation, and we summarize the main results

A geometrical account of interval logic: intervals



Every interval can be represented by a point in the second octant (in general, in the half plane $y \geqslant x$)

A geometrical account of interval logic: interval relations



$$d_b < d'_e < d_e$$

Every interval relation has a spatial counterpart

A geometrical account of interval logic: models



We can give a spatial interpretation to models of a formula φ as compass structures:
points of a compass structure are colored with the set of subformulas of φ that are true over the corresponding intervals



The maximal decidable fragment $AB\overline{BA}$









$AB\overline{BA}$ is NONPRIMITIVE RECURSIVE-hard over finite linear orders, the rationals, and the class of all linear orders; undecidable over the natural numbers and the reals, and the class of all Dedekind-complete linear orders

The maximal decidable fragment $AB\overline{B}\overline{L}$









Replace $\langle \overline{A}\rangle$ by $\langle \overline{L}\rangle$: $AB\overline{B}\overline{L}$ is EXSPACE-complete over the classes of all, dense, and (weakly) discrete linear orders

Maximal decidable fragments: references

Decidability of $AB\overline{B}\overline{A}$ over finite linear orders

A. Montanari, G. Puppis, and P. Sala, Maximal decidable fragments of Halpern and Shoham's modal logic of intervals, ICALP 2010

Decidability of $AB\overline{B}\overline{A}$ over the rationals and all linear orders

A. Montanari, G. Puppis, and P. Sala, Decidability of the interval temporal logic $AB\overline{B}\overline{A}$, over the rationals, MFCS 2014

Decidability of $AB\overline{B}\overline{L}$ over all, dense, and discrete linear orders

D. Bresolin, A. Montanari, P. Sala, and G. Sciavicco, What's decidable about Halpern and Shoham's interval logic? The maximal fragment $AB\overline{B}\overline{L}$, LICS 2011

The case of the logic $\mathsf{AB\overline{B}}$

A. Montanari, G. Puppis, P. Sala, G. Sciavicco, Decidability of the interval temporal logic $\mathsf{AB\overline{B}}$ over the natural numbers, STACS 2010









A color is an Hittinka set constructed on the extended closure of the formula φ.

Example:

$\psi = \langle A \rangle \langle B \rangle p$

closure

$$\mathcal{C}l(\psi) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p, \neg p, \langle B \rangle p, [B] \neg p, \\ \langle A \rangle \langle B \rangle p, [A][B] \neg p \end{array} \right\}$$

extended closure

$$\mathcal{E}\mathcal{C}l(\psi) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p, \neg p, \langle B \rangle p, [B] \neg p, \\ \langle A \rangle p, [A] \neg p, \langle \overline{B} \rangle p, [\overline{B}] \neg p, \\ \langle A \rangle \langle B \rangle p, [A][B] \neg p, \\ \langle B \rangle \langle B \rangle p, [B][B] \neg p, \\ \langle \overline{B} \rangle \langle B \rangle p, [\overline{B}][B] \neg p \end{array} \right\}$$



A color is an Hittinka set constructed on the extended closure of the formula φ.

Example:

$\psi = \langle A \rangle \langle B \rangle p$

closure

$$\mathcal{C}l(\psi) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p, \neg p, \langle B \rangle p, [B]\neg p, \\ \langle A \rangle \langle B \rangle p, [A][B]\neg p \end{array} \right\}$$

extended closure

$$\mathcal{EC}l(\psi) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p, \neg p, \langle B \rangle p, [B]\neg p, \\ \langle A \rangle p, [A]\neg p, \langle \overline{B} \rangle p, [\overline{B}]\neg p, \\ \langle A \rangle \langle B \rangle p, [A][B]\neg p, \\ \langle B \rangle \langle B \rangle p, [B][B]\neg p, \\ \langle \overline{B} \rangle \langle B \rangle p, [\overline{B}][B]\neg p \end{array} \right\}$$



A color is an Hittinka set constructed on the extended closure of the formula φ.

Example:

$\psi = \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle p$

closure

$$\mathcal{C}l(\psi) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p, \neg p, \langle B\rangle p, [B]\neg p, \\ \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle p, [A][B]\neg p \end{array} \right\}$$

extended closure

$$\mathcal{E}\mathcal{C}l(\psi) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p, \neg p, \langle B\rangle p, [B]\neg p, \\ \langle A\rangle p, [A]\neg p, \langle \overline{B}\rangle p, [\overline{B}]\neg p, \\ \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle p, [A][B]\neg p, \\ \langle B\rangle\langle B\rangle p, [B][B]\neg p, \\ \langle \overline{B}\rangle\langle B\rangle p, [\overline{B}][B]\neg p \end{array} \right\}$$



A color is an Hittinka set constructed on the extended closure of the formula φ.

Example:

$\psi = \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle p$

closure

$$\mathcal{C}l(\psi) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p, \neg p, \langle B\rangle p, [B]\neg p, \\ \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle p, [A][B]\neg p \end{array} \right\}$$

extended closure

$$\mathcal{E}\mathcal{C}l(\psi) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p, \neg p, \langle B\rangle p, [B]\neg p, \\ \langle A\rangle p, [A]\neg p, \langle \overline{B}\rangle p, [\overline{B}]\neg p, \\ \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle p, [A][B]\neg p, \\ \langle B\rangle\langle B\rangle p, [B][B]\neg p, \\ \langle \overline{B}\rangle\langle B\rangle p, [\overline{B}][B]\neg p \end{array} \right\}$$



A color is an Hittinka set constructed on the extended closure of the formula φ.

Example:

$\psi = \langle A \rangle \langle B \rangle p$

closure

$$\mathcal{C}l(\psi) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p, \neg p, \langle B \rangle p, [B] \neg p, \\ \langle A \rangle \langle B \rangle p, [A][B] \neg p \end{array} \right\}$$

extended closure

$$\mathcal{E}\mathcal{C}l(\psi) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p, \neg p, \langle B \rangle p, [B] \neg p, \\ \langle A \rangle p, [A] \neg p, \langle \overline{B} \rangle p, [\overline{B}] \neg p, \\ \langle A \rangle \langle B \rangle p, [A][B] \neg p, \\ \langle B \rangle \langle B \rangle p, [B][B] \neg p, \\ \langle \overline{B} \rangle \langle B \rangle p, [\overline{B}][B] \neg p \end{array} \right\}$$


$\langle \overline{B} \rangle \psi_2$
$\langle B \rangle \psi_1$


$\langle B\rangle\psi_1, \langle B\rangle\psi_2$
ψ_2
$\langle B\rangle\psi_1$
$\langle\overline{B}\rangle\psi_2$
$\langle B\rangle\psi_1$
$\langle\overline{B}\rangle\psi_2$
ψ_1
$\langle\overline{B}\rangle\psi_1, \langle\overline{B}\rangle\psi_2$


$\overline{B}_R$
B_R
$\cap|$
$\cup|$
$\overline{B}_R$
B_R
$\cap|$
$\cup|$
$\overline{B}_R$
B_R
$\cap|$
$\cup|$
$\overline{B}_R$
B_R
$\cap|$
$\cup|$
$\overline{B}_R$
B_R




y


y


y
Sh(y) = { , , }



y'
$Sh(y') = \{$, , $\}$
y
$Sh(y) = \{$, , $\}$


y'
$Sh(y') = \{$, , $\}$
y
$Sh(y) = \{$, , $\}$



y'
$Sh(y') = \{ , , \}$
y
$Sh(y) = \{ , , \}$


y'
$Sh(y') = \{$, , $\}$
y
$Sh(y) = \{$, , $\}$


y'
$Sh(y') = \{ , , \}$
y
$Sh(y) = \{ , , \}$


y'
$Sh(y') = \{$, , $\}$
$Sh(y) = \{$, , $\}$
y


y′
Sh(y′) = { , , }
Sh(y) = { , , }
y


y'
$Sh(y') = \{$, , $\}$
$Sh(y) = \{$, , $\}$
y


y'
Sh(y') = {, , }
Sh(y) = {, , }
y


y'
$Sh(y') = \{$, , $\}$
$Sh(y) = \{$, , $\}$
y

Paths to undecidability - 1

Undecidability results for HS fragments have been obtained by means of reductions from several undecidable problems:

- reduction from the non-halting problem for Turing machines (e.g., HS over all meaningful classes of linear orders, and BE over dense linear orders – that of BE over all linear orders immediately follows)

J. Halpern and Y. Shoham, A propositional modal logic of time intervals, Journal of the ACM, 1991

K. Lodaya, Sharpening the Undecidability of Interval Temporal Logic, ASIAN 2000

Paths to undecidability - 2

- reductions from several variants of the tiling problem, like the octant tiling problem and the finite tiling problem (O, $\overline{\mathrm{O}}$, AD, $\overline{\mathrm{A}}\mathrm{D}$, $\mathrm{A}\overline{\mathrm{D}}$, $\overline{\mathrm{AD}}$, BE, $\overline{\mathrm{B}}\mathrm{E}$, $\mathrm{B}\overline{\mathrm{E}}$, and $\overline{\mathrm{BE}}$ over any class of linear orders that contains, for each $n > 0$, at least one linear order with length greater than n)

D. Bresolin, D. Della Monica, V. Goranko, A. Montanari, and G. Sciavicco, The dark side of Interval Temporal Logics: marking the undecidability border, Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence, 2014

- reduction from the halting problem for two-counter automata (D over finite and discrete linear orders)

J. Marcinkowski and J. Michaliszyn, The Ultimate Undecidability Result for the Halpern-Shoham Logic, LICS 2011

The case of the logic O

Regularities and (wrong) conjectures: are there necessary and sufficient conditions for the decidability of the satisfiability problem for HS fragments?

The case of the logic O

Regularities and (wrong) conjectures: are there necessary and sufficient conditions for the decidability of the satisfiability problem for HS fragments?

- Claim 1: all and only those HS fragments that can be translated into $\mathrm{FO}^2[<]$ are decidable

The case of the logic O

Regularities and (wrong) conjectures: are there necessary and sufficient conditions for the decidability of the satisfiability problem for HS fragments?

- Claim 1: all and only those HS fragments that can be translated into $\mathrm{FO}^2[<]$ are decidable

Counterexample: $\mathsf{D}\overline{\mathsf{D}}$, AB

The case of the logic O

Regularities and (wrong) conjectures: are there necessary and sufficient conditions for the decidability of the satisfiability problem for HS fragments?

- Claim 1: all and only those HS fragments that can be translated into $\mathrm{FO}^2[<]$ are decidable

  Counterexample: $\mathsf{D}\overline{\mathsf{D}}$, AB

- Claim 2: all one-modality fragments are decidable

The case of the logic O

Regularities and (wrong) conjectures: are there necessary and sufficient conditions for the decidability of the satisfiability problem for HS fragments?

- Claim 1: all and only those HS fragments that can be translated into $\mathrm{FO}^2[<]$ are decidable

  Counterexample: $\mathsf{D}\overline{\mathsf{D}}$, AB

- Claim 2: all one-modality fragments are decidable

  Counterexample: O over discrete linear orders

The case of the logic O

Regularities and (wrong) conjectures: are there necessary and sufficient conditions for the decidability of the satisfiability problem for HS fragments?

- Claim 1: all and only those HS fragments that can be translated into $\mathrm{FO}^2[<]$ are decidable

  Counterexample: $\mathsf{D}\overline{\mathsf{D}}$, AB

- Claim 2: all one-modality fragments are decidable

  Counterexample: O over discrete linear orders

In the following, we briefly consider the case of O over discrete linear orders

Proof overview

Reduction from the Octant Tiling Problem

The Octant Tiling Problem is the problem of establishing whether a given finite set of tile types $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, \ldots, t_k\}$ can tile the octant $\mathcal{O} = \{(i, j) : i, j \in \mathbb{N} \wedge 0 \leqslant i \leqslant j\}$ respecting the color constraints



Proof overview

Reduction from the Octant Tiling Problem

The Octant Tiling Problem is the problem of establishing whether a given finite set of tile types $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, \ldots, t_k\}$ can tile the octant $\mathcal{O} = \{(i, j) : i, j \in \mathbb{N} \wedge 0 \leqslant i \leqslant j\}$ respecting the color constraints



Proof overview

Reduction from the Octant Tiling Problem

The Octant Tiling Problem is the problem of establishing whether a given finite set of tile types $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, \ldots, t_k\}$ can tile the octant $\mathcal{O} = \{(i, j) : i, j \in \mathbb{N} \wedge 0 \leqslant i \leqslant j\}$ respecting the color constraints



Proof overview

Reduction from the Octant Tiling Problem

The Octant Tiling Problem is the problem of establishing whether a given finite set of tile types $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, \ldots, t_k\}$ can tile the octant $\mathcal{O} = \{(i, j) : i, j \in \mathbb{N} \wedge 0 \leqslant i \leqslant j\}$ respecting the color constraints



by König's Lemma

$\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathcal{O}$

Proof overview (cont'd)

Logic O over discrete linear orderings

We build a formula $\phi_{\mathcal{T}} \in O$ s.t.

$$\phi_{\mathcal{T}} \text{ is satisfiable} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathcal{T} \text{ can tile the octant}$$

(over discrete linear orderings)

Op.	Semantics	
$\langle O \rangle$	$M, [a, b] \Vdash \langle O \rangle \phi \Leftrightarrow \exists c, d (a < c < b < d . M, [c, d] \Vdash \phi)$	

Encoding the Octant

Encoding the Octant





Encoding the Octant



Encoding the Octant



Encoding the Octant





Encoding the Octant (u- and k-intervals of length 2)



Encoding the Octant (u- and k-intervals of length 2)



inside$_u$-intervals **cannot overlap** inside$_u$-intervals starting inside the same u-interval

Encoding the Octant (u- and k-intervals of length 2)



inside$_u$-intervals **cannot overlap** inside$_u$-intervals starting inside the same u-interval

Encoding the Octant (u- and k-intervals of length 2)



inside$_u$-intervals **cannot overlap** inside$_u$-intervals starting inside the same u-interval

Encoding the Above-Neighbour Relation

. . . .

t^5_1	t^5_2	t^5_3	t^5_4	t^5_5
t^4_1	t^4_2	t^4_3	t^4_4	
t^3_1	t^3_2	t^3_3		
t^2_1	t^2_2			
t^1_1				



Encoding the Above-Neighbour Relation





Encoding the Above-Neighbour Relation



Encoding the Above-Neighbour Relation



Encoding the Above-Neighbour Relation



Encoding the Above-Neighbour Relation



Encoding the Above-Neighbour Relation



Encoding the Above-Neighbour Relation



Encoding the Above-Neighbour Relation



$up\_rel^{bw} \rightarrow \neg\langle O\rangle up\_rel^{bw}$

$up\_rel^{fw} \rightarrow \neg\langle O\rangle up\_rel^{fw}$



Theorem

Theorem [O and $\overline{\mathrm{O}}$ undecidability over discrete structures]

The satisfiability problem for the HS fragment O (resp., $\overline{\mathrm{O}}$) is undecidable over any class of discrete linear orders that contains at least one linear order with an infinite ascending (resp., descending) sequence

D. Bresolin, D. Della Monica, V. Goranko, A. Montanari, and G. Sciavicco, Undecidability of the Logic of Overlap Relation over Discrete Linear Orderings, M4M 2009

The (almost) complete picture



Latest developments

- Aceto et al. extended the expressiveness classification result for the family of HS fragments to the classes of dense, finite, and discrete linear orders

L. Aceto, D. Della Monica, A. Ingolfsdottir, A. Montanari, G. Sciavicco, A complete classification of the expressiveness of interval logics of Allen's relations over dense linear orders, TIME 2013

L. Aceto, D. Della Monica, A. Ingolfsdottir, A. Montanari, G. Sciavicco, On the expressiveness of the interval logic of Allen's relations over finite and discrete linear orders, JELIA 2014 (to appear)

The only missing cases are those of the relations *overlaps* and *overlapped by* over finite and discrete linear orders.

Latest developments (cont'd)

- Montanari et al. studied the effects of the addition of one or more equivalence relations to (Metric) $A\overline{A}$ (since $A\overline{A}$ is expressively complete with respect to $\mathrm{FO}^2[<]$, the results obtained for the former can be immediately transferred to the latter)

  They first showed that finite satisfiability for $A\overline{A}$ extended with an equivalence relation $\sim$ is still NEXPTIME-complete. Then, they proved that finite satisfiability for Metric $A\overline{A}$ can be reduced to the decidable 0-0 reachability problem for vector addition systems and vice versa (EXPSPACE-hardness immediately follows)

A. Montanari, M. Pazzaglia, P. Sala, Metric Propositional Neighborhood Logic with an Equivalence Relation, TIME 2014

Latest developments (cont'd)

- They also proved that AB extended with an equivalence relation is decidable (non-primitive recursive) on the class of finite linear orders and undecidable over the natural numbers.

A. Montanari,P. Sala, Adding an equivalence relation to the interval logic $AB\overline{B}$: complexity and expressiveness, LICS 2013

Finally, they showed that the addition of two or more equivalence relations makes finite satisfiability for AB undecidable

A. Montanari, M. Pazzaglia, P. Sala, Adding two equivalence relations to the interval temporal logic AB, ICTCS 2014

Latest developments (cont'd)

- Montanari and Sala established an original connection between interval temporal logics and classes of extended regular and ω-regular languages.

  First, they gave a logical characterization of regular (resp., ω-regular) languages in the interval logic $\mathsf{AB\overline{B}}$ of Allen's relations *meets*, *begun by*, and *begins* over finite linear orders (resp., $\mathbb{N}$).

  Then, they lift such a correspondence to $\omega\mathrm{B}$-regular languages (extended ω-languages that make it possible to constrain the distance between consecutive occurrences of a given symbol to be bounded) by substituting $\mathsf{AB\overline{B}\overline{A}}$ for $\mathsf{AB\overline{B}}$.

A. Montanari,P. Sala, Interval logics and $\omega\mathrm{B}$-regular languages, LATA 2013

Latest developments (cont'd)

- Finally, they showed that the addition of an equivalence relation $\sim$ to $A B \overline{B}$ makes the resulting logic expressive enough to define ωS-regular languages (strongly unbounded ω-regular languages).

A. Montanari, P. Sala, Adding an equivalence relation to the interval logic $A B \overline{B}$: complexity and expressiveness, LICS 2013

Latest developments (cont'd)

- Montanari et al. gave a formalization of the model checking problem in an interval logic setting by providing an interpretation of HS formulas over a Kripke structure, which makes it possible to check interval properties of computations.

  They proved that the model checking problem for HS against Kripke structures is decidable, and they outlined a PSPACE decision procedure for the fragments $A\mathrm{B}\overline{\mathrm{B}}\overline{A}$ and $A\mathrm{E}\overline{\mathrm{E}}\overline{A}$.

A. Montanari, A. Murano, G. Perelli G., and A. Peron, Checking Interval Properties of Computations, TIME 2014

Latest developments (cont'd)

- Montanari and Sala formally stated the synthesis problem for HS extended with an equivalence relation $\sim$. Given an $\mathrm{HS}\sim$ formula φ and a finite set $\Sigma_{\Box}^{\mathrm{T}}$ of proposition letters and temporal requests, the problem consists of establishing whether or not, for all possible evaluations of elements in $\Sigma_{\Box}^{\mathrm{T}}$ in every interval structure, there is an evaluation of the remaining proposition letters and temporal requests such that the resulting structure is a model for φ

  They proved that the synthesis problem for $\mathrm{AB\overline{B}}\sim$ over finite linear orders is decidable (non-primitive recursive hard), while $\mathrm{AB\overline{BA}}$ turns out to be undecidable. Moreover, they showed that if one replaces finite linear orders by natural numbers, then the problem becomes undecidable even for $\mathrm{AB\overline{B}}$

A. Montanari, P. Sala, Interval-based Synthesis, GandALF 2014