

A note on the reduction from LTL_f to LTL

Alexandre Duret-Lutz

2026-08-31

Abstract

LTL_f , a finite word variant of LTL, can be reduced to LTL by introducing a new atomic proposition indicating the prefix of the infinite words that correspond to the finite words that the original LTL_f formula was considering. Such a reduction was originally proposed by De Giacomo and Vardi [2].

However, while any LTL formula reduced from LTL_f describes an *obligation property* in the hierarchy of Manna and Pnueli [5], the aforementioned reduction does not provide an LTL formula that belongs to the *syntactic obligation* fragment of LTL.

This note shows how the reduction was fixed in Spot in order to ensure that the resulting LTL formula is always a syntactic obligation. Doing so allows algorithms specialized to syntactic obligation to be used on LTL_f formulas. For instance, in previous work [4] we described a specialized translation from syntactic obligations to minimal, weak, deterministic Büchi automata that would not be usable with the original reduction.

1 Preliminaries

We assume that the reader is familiar with Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) over infinite words and with LTL_f , one of its restrictions to finite words [2]. We use the standard temporal operators F (eventually), G (always), X (weak next), $X^{[!]}$ (strong next), U (until), W (weak until), R (release), and M (strong release). In LTL_f all operators are interpreted on nonempty *finite* words: strong operators (F, U, M) have to fulfill their promise before the end of the finite word, Xf is vacuously true at the last position, and $X^{[!]}f$ requires a next position.

Satisfaction. We write $(w, i) \models \varphi$ to mean that the infinite word w satisfies the LTL formula φ at position $i \geq 0$, and $w \models_{\text{fin}} f$ to mean that the finite word w satisfies the LTL_f formula f (at its first position).

Syntactic hierarchy. We recall the syntactic hierarchy of Manna and Pnueli [5]. The hierarchy classifies LTL formulas into classes (Safety: φ_S ; Guarantee: φ_G ; Obligation: φ_O ; Persistence; Recurrence; Reactivity) that correspond to automata-theoretic classes. The precise definition of the syntactic sub-classes most relevant to this paper is given by the following grammars, where v ranges over atomic propositions:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_B &::= \perp \mid \top \mid v \mid \neg\varphi_B \mid \varphi_B \wedge \varphi_B \mid \varphi_B \vee \varphi_B \mid \varphi_B \rightarrow \varphi_B \mid \varphi_B \leftrightarrow \varphi_B \mid \varphi_B \oplus \varphi_B \mid X\varphi_B \\ \varphi_G &::= \varphi_B \mid \neg\varphi_S \mid \varphi_G \wedge \varphi_G \mid \varphi_G \vee \varphi_G \mid \varphi_S \rightarrow \varphi_G \mid X\varphi_G \mid F\varphi_G \mid \varphi_G \text{ U } \varphi_G \mid \varphi_G \text{ M } \varphi_G \\ \varphi_S &::= \varphi_B \mid \neg\varphi_G \mid \varphi_S \wedge \varphi_S \mid \varphi_S \vee \varphi_S \mid \varphi_G \rightarrow \varphi_S \mid X\varphi_S \mid G\varphi_S \mid \varphi_S \text{ R } \varphi_S \mid \varphi_S \text{ W } \varphi_S \\ \varphi_O &::= \varphi_G \mid \varphi_S \mid \neg\varphi_O \mid \varphi_O \wedge \varphi_O \mid \varphi_O \vee \varphi_O \mid \varphi_O \rightarrow \varphi_O \mid \varphi_O \leftrightarrow \varphi_O \mid \varphi_O \oplus \varphi_O \mid X\varphi_O \\ &\quad \mid \varphi_O \text{ U } \varphi_G \mid \varphi_O \text{ R } \varphi_S \mid \varphi_S \text{ W } \varphi_O \mid \varphi_G \text{ M } \varphi_O \end{aligned}$$

Let LTL_B , LTL_G , LTL_S , and LTL_O denote the sets of LTL formulas generated by φ_B , φ_G , φ_S , and φ_O , respectively. Intuitively:

- LTL_B (Bottom) contains propositional formulas plus X.
- LTL_G (Guarantee) contains no weak operators (G, W, R).

- LTL_S (Safety) contains no strong operators (F, U, M).
- LTL_O (Obligation) is the closure of $LTL_G \cup LTL_S$ under Boolean connectives, X, and four *mixed* temporal operators: $\varphi_O \cup \varphi_G$, $\varphi_O \text{ R } \varphi_S$, $\varphi_S \text{ W } \varphi_O$, and $\varphi_G \text{ M } \varphi_O$. These additional grammar rules are due to Chang et al. [1].

Note that LTL_G and LTL_S are *not* closed under $\oplus$ and $\leftrightarrow$; however, LTL_B and LTL_O are.

We will also need a variant of LTL_B that includes the strong-next operator $X^{[!]}$ of LTL_f . Let LTL_{fB} denote the set of LTL_f formulas generated by φ_B extended with the production $| X^{[!]} \varphi_B$.

The alive encoding. Following De Giacomo and Vardi [2], a nonempty finite word $w = w_0 \cdots w_{n-1}$ over an alphabet 2^{AP} can be encoded as an infinite word $w' = w'_0 w'_1 \cdots$ over $2^{AP \cup \{alive\}}$ where

$$w'_i = w_i \cup \{alive\} \text{ for } i < n, \quad alive \notin w'_i \text{ for } i \geq n.$$

The proposition *alive* marks the *live* prefix of the infinite word; positions $i \geq n$ are *dead*.

Equivalence at alive positions. We say that two LTL formulas ψ_1 and ψ_2 are *equivalent at alive positions*, written $\psi_1 \equiv_{\text{fin}} \psi_2$, if for every infinite word w' conforming to the alive encoding and every alive position i of w' , $(w', i) \models \psi_1$ if and only if $(w', i) \models \psi_2$.

2 The Original Reduction from LTL_f to LTL

De Giacomo and Vardi [2] define t and prove that, for any LTL_f formula f and any nonempty finite word w , if w' is the alive encoding of w , then

$$\text{from_ltlf}(f) = t(f) \wedge alive \wedge (alive \cup G\neg alive) \quad (1)$$

is satisfied by w' if and only if $w \models_{\text{fin}} f$. Consequently, $\text{from_ltlf}(f)$ is satisfiable by an alive-encoded word if and only if f is satisfied by some nonempty finite word. The function t is defined by the following equations. For Boolean operators and atomic propositions, t is the identity (applied homomorphically). For temporal operators, live-prefix constraints are injected:

$$\begin{aligned} t(\perp) &= \perp, & t(\top) &= \top, & t(v) &= v \\ t(\neg f) &= \neg t(f) \\ t(f \odot g) &= t(f) \odot t(g) \quad \text{for any } \odot \in \{\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow, \oplus\} \\ t(X^{[!]} f) &= X(alive \wedge t(f)) && \text{[strong next: target must be alive]} \\ t(Xf) &= X(\neg alive \vee t(f)) && \text{[weak next: trivially true past the end]} \\ t(Ff) &= F(alive \wedge t(f)) && \text{[eventuality must land alive]} \\ t(Gf) &= G(\neg alive \vee t(f)) && \text{[universality trivially holds at dead positions]} \\ t(f \cup g) &= t(f) \cup (alive \wedge t(g)) \\ t(f \text{ R } g) &= t(f) \text{ R } (\neg alive \vee t(g)) \\ t(f \text{ W } g) &= (\neg alive \vee t(f)) \text{ W } t(g) \\ t(f \text{ M } g) &= (alive \wedge t(f)) \text{ M } t(g) \end{aligned}$$

Strong operators (F, U, M, $X^{[!]}$) require the target position to be alive; weak operators (G, R, W, X) allow a dead position as a trivial escape.

The definition above was used to implement from_ltlf in Spot [3] from version 2.2.2 to version 2.15.1.

The translation is not a syntactic obligation. Using `from_ltlf`, every LTL_f formula translates to an LTL formula whose language is an obligation property in [5] hierarchy. However, the output of `from_ltlf` is generally *not* in LTL_O . There are two issues.

The first issue is the wrapper itself: syntactically, $alive \cup G \neg alive$ is a persistence formula, not in LTL_O . This is a minor problem and is easily fixed: on alive-encoded words, $alive \cup G \neg alive$ is equivalent to $F \neg alive \wedge (alive \cup G \neg alive)$, which is in LTL_O .

The second, deeper issue is that even the inner formula $t(f)$ is generally not in LTL_O .

Example 1. Consider $t(G(Fa)) = G(\neg alive \vee F(alive \wedge a))$, or its dual $t(F(Ga)) = F(alive \wedge G(\neg alive \vee a))$. Neither result is in LTL_O .

The failure in Example 1 is structural: t uses the same recursive call in both the “ φ_G -context” (inside F , right of $\cup$, left of $\cap$) and the “ φ_S -context” (inside G , right of $\cap$, left of $\cup$), producing a formula of mixed class in each case. The new translation in Section 3 addresses this by introducing two auxiliary functions that produce LTL_G and LTL_S formulas, respectively, and using them in the appropriate positions.

3 The New Reduction from LTL_f to Syntactic Obligation

We define three mutually recursive functions t_G , t_S , and t_O , supported by an auxiliary function t_B , with the following invariants established by structural induction:

- For any LTL_f formula f , $t_G(f) \in LTL_G$ and $t_G(f) \equiv_{fin} t(f)$;
- For any LTL_f formula f , $t_S(f) \in LTL_S$ and $t_S(f) \equiv_{fin} t(f)$;
- For any LTL_f formula f , $t_O(f) \in LTL_O$ and $t_O(f) \equiv_{fin} t(f)$.

The auxiliary function t_B is simply a restriction of t to inputs that are in LTL_{tB} . So it also naturally follows that

- If $f \in LTL_{tB}$ then $t_B(f) \in LTL_B$ and $t_B(f) \equiv_{fin} t(f)$

3.1 Revised top-level wrapper

The wrapper $alive \cup G \neg alive$ from (1) is not in LTL_O . We replace it with an LTL_O formula equivalent to it on alive-encoded words:

$$F \neg alive \wedge (alive \cup G \neg alive),$$

The new wrapper is therefore:

$$\text{from_ltlf}_O(f) = \underbrace{t_O(f)}_{\in LTL_O} \wedge \underbrace{alive}_{\in LTL_B} \wedge \underbrace{F \neg alive}_{\in LTL_G} \wedge \underbrace{(alive \cup G \neg alive)}_{\in LTL_S}. \quad (2)$$

All four conjuncts belong to LTL_O or its subclasses, so the full formula belongs to LTL_O .

3.2 The function t_B

The function t_B translates formulas of LTL_{tB} (the bottom class extended with $X^{[1]}$) into formulas of LTL_B . This restriction of the translation uses the same rules as the original $t(\cdot)$ function.

$$\begin{aligned} t_B(\perp) &= \perp, & t_B(\top) &= \top, & t_B(v) &= v \\ t_B(\neg f) &= \neg t_B(f) & & & [\neg \varphi_B \in LTL_B] \\ t_B(f \odot g) &= t_B(f) \odot t_B(g) \quad \text{for any } \odot \in \{\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow, \oplus\} & & & [\varphi_B \odot \varphi_B \in LTL_B] \\ t_B(Xf) &= X(\neg alive \vee t_B(f)) & & & [X\varphi_B \in LTL_B] \\ t_B(X^{[1]}f) &= X(alive \wedge t_B(f)) & & & [X\varphi_B \in LTL_B] \end{aligned}$$

In the implementation, t_B is used by t_G and t_S to avoid expanding $\oplus$ and $\leftrightarrow$ when their operands belong to LTL_B .

3.3 The function t_G

The function t_G produces a LTL_G formula equivalent to $t(f)$ at alive positions. It converts every weak temporal operator into an equivalent U-based form (since U stays in LTL_G) and recurses with t_S wherever a LTL_S subformula is needed (e.g. as the negated argument or the antecedent of an implication).

$$\begin{aligned}
t_G(\perp) &= \perp, & t_G(\top) &= \top, & t_G(v) &= v \\
t_G(\neg f) &= \neg t_S(f) & & & & [\neg \varphi_S \in LTL_G] \\
t_G(f \Delta g) &= t_G(f) \Delta t_G(g) & \text{for any } \Delta \in \{\wedge, \vee\} & & & [\varphi_G \Delta \varphi_G \in LTL_G] \\
t_G(f \rightarrow g) &= t_S(f) \rightarrow t_G(g) & & & & [\varphi_S \rightarrow \varphi_G \in LTL_G] \\
t_G(f \oplus g) &= \begin{cases} t_B(f \oplus g) & \text{if } f \oplus g \in LTL_B \\ (t_G(f) \wedge \neg t_S(g)) \vee (\neg t_S(f) \wedge t_G(g)) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} & & & & [LTL_G \text{ not closed under } \oplus] \\
t_G(f \leftrightarrow g) &= \begin{cases} t_B(f \leftrightarrow g) & \text{if } f \leftrightarrow g \in LTL_B \\ (t_G(f) \wedge t_G(g)) \vee (\neg t_S(f) \wedge \neg t_S(g)) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} & & & & [LTL_G \text{ not closed under } \leftrightarrow] \\
t_G(Xf) &= X(\neg \text{alive} \vee t_G(f)) & & & & [X\varphi_G \in LTL_G] \\
t_G(X^{[1]}f) &= X(\text{alive} \wedge t_G(f)) & & & & [X\varphi_G \in LTL_G] \\
t_G(Ff) &= F(\text{alive} \wedge t_G(f)) & & & & [F\varphi_G \in LTL_G] \\
t_G(Gf) &= t_G(f) \text{ U } \neg \text{alive} & & & & [\varphi_G \text{ U } \varphi_G \in LTL_G; \text{ see below}] \\
t_G(f \text{ U } g) &= t_G(f) \text{ U } (\text{alive} \wedge t_G(g)) & & & & [\varphi_G \text{ U } \varphi_G \in LTL_G] \\
t_G(f \text{ M } g) &= (\text{alive} \wedge t_G(f)) \text{ M } t_G(g) & & & & [\varphi_G \text{ M } \varphi_G \in LTL_G] \\
t_G(f \text{ R } g) &= t_G(g) \text{ U } (\neg \text{alive} \vee (t_G(f) \wedge t_G(g))) & & & & [LTL_G; \text{ derived below}] \\
t_G(f \text{ W } g) &= t_G(f) \text{ U } (\neg \text{alive} \vee t_G(g)) & & & & [LTL_G; \text{ derived below}]
\end{aligned}$$

Derivations.

- Under the alive prefix, $t_G(f) \text{ U } \neg \text{alive} \equiv_{\text{fin}} Gf$: the U holds iff $t_G(f)$ holds at every alive position (the “exit” branch of U is triggered at the first $\neg \text{alive}$ position). Hence $t_G(Gf) = t_G(f) \text{ U } \neg \text{alive}$.
- $f \text{ W } g \equiv (f \text{ U } g) \vee Gf$, so its encoding is

$$\begin{aligned}
& (t_G(f) \text{ U } (\text{alive} \wedge t_G(g))) \vee (t_G(f) \text{ U } \neg \text{alive}) \\
&= t_G(f) \text{ U } ((\text{alive} \wedge t_G(g)) \vee \neg \text{alive}) = t_G(f) \text{ U } (\neg \text{alive} \vee t_G(g)).
\end{aligned}$$

- $f \text{ R } g \equiv g \text{ W } (f \wedge g)$, giving $t_G(g) \text{ U } (\neg \text{alive} \vee (t_G(f) \wedge t_G(g)))$.

3.4 The function t_S

The function t_S is the dual of t_G : it produces a LTL_S formula equivalent to $t(f)$ at alive positions. It converts every strong temporal operator into an R-based form and recurses with t_G wherever a LTL_G subformula is needed.

$t_S(\perp) = \perp, \quad t_S(\top) = \top, \quad t_S(v) = v$	
$t_S(\neg f) = \neg t_G(f)$	$[\neg \varphi_G \in LTL_S]$
$t_S(f \Delta g) = t_S(f) \Delta t_S(g) \quad \text{for any } \Delta \in \{\wedge, \vee\}$	$[\varphi_S \Delta \varphi_S \in LTL_S]$
$t_S(f \rightarrow g) = t_G(f) \rightarrow t_S(g)$	$[\varphi_G \rightarrow \varphi_S \in LTL_S]$
$t_S(f \oplus g) = \begin{cases} t_B(f \oplus g) & \text{if } f \oplus g \in LTL_{IB} \\ (t_S(f) \wedge \neg t_G(g)) \vee (\neg t_G(f) \wedge t_S(g)) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$[LTL_S \text{ not closed under } \oplus]$
$t_S(f \leftrightarrow g) = \begin{cases} t_B(f \leftrightarrow g) & \text{if } f \leftrightarrow g \in LTL_{IB} \\ (t_S(f) \wedge t_S(g)) \vee (\neg t_G(f) \wedge \neg t_G(g)) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$[LTL_S \text{ not closed under } \leftrightarrow]$
$t_S(Xf) = X(\neg \text{alive} \vee t_S(f))$	$[X\varphi_S \in LTL_S]$
$t_S(X^{[!]}f) = X(\text{alive} \wedge t_S(f))$	$[X\varphi_S \in LTL_S]$
$t_S(Gf) = G(\neg \text{alive} \vee t_S(f))$	$[G\varphi_S \in LTL_S]$
$t_S(Ff) = t_S(f) \text{ R } \text{alive}$	$[\varphi_S \text{ R } \varphi_S \in LTL_S; \text{ key case}]$
$t_S(f \text{ R } g) = t_S(f) \text{ R } (\neg \text{alive} \vee t_S(g))$	$[\varphi_S \text{ R } \varphi_S \in LTL_S]$
$t_S(f \text{ W } g) = (\neg \text{alive} \vee t_S(f)) \text{ W } t_S(g)$	$[\varphi_S \text{ W } \varphi_S \in LTL_S]$
$t_S(f \text{ U } g) = t_S(g) \text{ R } (\text{alive} \wedge (t_S(f) \vee t_S(g)))$	$[LTL_S; \text{ derived below}]$
$t_S(f \text{ M } g) = t_S(f) \text{ R } (\text{alive} \wedge t_S(g))$	$[LTL_S; \text{ derived below}]$

Derivations.

- Under the alive prefix, $F(\text{alive} \wedge t_S(f)) \equiv_{\text{fin}} t_S(f) \text{ R } \text{alive}$: the R holds iff $t_S(f)$ holds at some alive position (the “forever” branch of R is ruled out by *alive* eventually becoming false). Hence $t_S(Ff) = t_S(f) \text{ R } \text{alive}$.
- $f \text{ U } g \equiv \neg((\neg f) \text{ R } (\neg g))$, so by duality with t_G : expanding with the t_G rule for R and simplifying gives $t_S(f \text{ U } g) = t_S(g) \text{ R } (\text{alive} \wedge (t_S(f) \vee t_S(g)))$.
- $f \text{ M } g \equiv \neg((\neg f) \text{ W } (\neg g))$, similarly yielding $t_S(f) \text{ R } (\text{alive} \wedge t_S(g))$.

3.5 The function t_O

The function t_O is the main translation. Boolean operators are treated homomorphically (since LTL_O is closed under all Boolean connectives). Temporal operators use t_G or t_S on the operand that requires a constrained syntactic class, and t_O recursively on the unconstrained operand.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
t_0(\perp) = \perp, & t_0(\top) = \top, \quad t_0(v) = v \\
t_0(\neg f) = \neg t_0(f) & [\neg \varphi_O \in LTL_O] \\
t_0(f \odot g) = t_0(f) \odot t_0(g) & \text{for any } \odot \in \{\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow, \oplus\} \quad [\varphi_O \odot \varphi_O \in LTL_O] \\
t_0(Xf) = X(\neg \text{alive} \vee t_0(f)) & [X\varphi_O \in LTL_O] \\
t_0(X^{[l]}f) = X(\text{alive} \wedge t_0(f)) & [X\varphi_O \in LTL_O] \\
t_0(Ff) = F(\text{alive} \wedge t_G(f)) & [F\varphi_G \in LTL_G \subseteq LTL_O] \\
t_0(Gf) = G(\neg \text{alive} \vee t_S(f)) & [G\varphi_S \in LTL_S \subseteq LTL_O] \\
t_0(f \cup g) = t_0(f) \cup (\text{alive} \wedge t_G(g)) & [\varphi_O \cup \varphi_G \in LTL_O] \\
t_0(f \text{ R } g) = t_0(f) \text{ R } (\neg \text{alive} \vee t_S(g)) & [\varphi_O \text{ R } \varphi_S \in LTL_O] \\
t_0(f \text{ W } g) = (\neg \text{alive} \vee t_S(f)) \text{ W } t_0(g) & [\varphi_S \text{ W } \varphi_O \in LTL_O] \\
t_0(f \text{ M } g) = (\text{alive} \wedge t_G(f)) \text{ M } t_0(g) & [\varphi_G \text{ M } \varphi_O \in LTL_O]
\end{array}$$

Example 2. Revisiting Example 1:

$$t_0(G(Fa)) = G(\neg \text{alive} \vee t_S(Fa)) = G(\neg \text{alive} \vee (a \text{ R } \text{alive})).$$

Here, the whole formula is in $LTL_S \subseteq LTL_O$.

$$t_0(F(Ga)) = F(\text{alive} \wedge t_G(Ga)) = F(\text{alive} \wedge (a \cup \neg \text{alive})).$$

Here, the whole formula is in $LTL_G \subseteq LTL_O$.

3.6 Correctness

Syntactic-class membership. By structural induction: every rule for t_B produces a formula in LTL_B , every rule for t_G produces a formula in LTL_G , every rule for t_S produces a formula in LTL_S , and every rule for t_O produces a formula in LTL_O , as annotated above. The only non-obvious cases are $\oplus$ and $\leftrightarrow$ in t_G and t_S : because LTL_G (respectively LTL_S) is closed under $\oplus$ and $\leftrightarrow$ only when both operands are in LTL_{t_B} , we delegate to t_B for LTL_{t_B} formulas. Otherwise, we expand those connectives into $\wedge / \vee / \neg$ combinations of t_G and t_S results, which are closed under $\wedge$ and $\vee$.

Proof sketch: semantic equivalence. By simultaneous structural induction on f , with all formulas evaluated on an alive-encoded word at an alive position, covering t_G , t_S , and t_O (and their mutual recursion), we show:

- $t_G(f) \equiv_{\text{fin}} t(f)$: the key case is Gf . At alive position i , $t_G(f) \cup \neg \text{alive}$ holds iff $t_G(f)$ (which agrees with $t(f)$ by induction) holds at all alive positions $j \geq i$, which is exactly the meaning of $G(\neg \text{alive} \vee t(f))$ at i .
- $t_S(f) \equiv_{\text{fin}} t(f)$: the key case is Ff . At alive position i , $t_S(f) \text{ R } \text{alive}$ holds iff $t_S(f)$ holds at some alive position $j \geq i$ (the “forever” branch of R is ruled out by the live prefix being finite), matching $F(\text{alive} \wedge t(f))$.
- $t_O(f) \equiv_{\text{fin}} t(f)$: each mixed temporal rule uses t_G (resp. t_S) on the constrained operand; by the above, those agree with t at alive positions, so $t_O(f)$ and $t(f)$ agree at every alive position.

The invariant for t_B follows because t_B is simply the restriction of t to inputs in LTL_{t_B} : since t_B uses the same homomorphic rules as t for the common operators, $t_B(f) \equiv_{\text{fin}} t(f)$ holds for $f \in LTL_{t_B}$ by the same structural induction.

Together with the corrected wrapper (2), the new translation therefore has the same satisfiability behavior as the original on alive-encoded words.

3.7 Why Replace t by Four Functions?

As mentioned at the top of section 3, $t(f)$, $t_S(f)$, $t_G(f)$, and $t_O(f)$ all produce formulas that are equivalent under the *alive* prefix. For instance:

$$\begin{aligned} t(FGa) &= F(\text{alive} \wedge G(\neg \text{alive} \vee a)) && [\notin LTL_O] \\ t_O(FGa) = t_G(FGa) &= F(\text{alive} \wedge (a \cup \neg \text{alive})) && [\in LTL_G] \\ t_S(FGa) &= G(\neg \text{alive} \vee a) \text{ R } \text{alive} && [\in LTL_S] \end{aligned}$$

These LTL formulas are not equivalent in general, but are equivalent at the *alive* position of alive-encoded words.

The wrapper (2) adds a combination of terms that are in LTL_S and in LTL_G in every case, so choosing t_O , t_S , or t_G does not change the class of the resulting formula.

The reason we prefer to use t_O is that it will change fewer temporal operators when possible (e.g., if the LTL_f formula already syntactically belongs to LTL_O , it will only add the *alive* proposition, as in the original t function). Furthermore, compared to t_S and t_G , it can also deal with $\oplus$ and $\leftrightarrow$ naturally.

Function t_B was added as an optimization to recover subcases where $\oplus$ and $\leftrightarrow$ can be supported without blowup.

4 Availability in Spot

The new `from_ltlfO` function has been implemented in Spot, and is intended to be available in the upcoming Spot 2.16 release:

```
% ltlfilt --from-ltlf -f 'GFa'
alive & G(!alive | (a R alive)) & F!alive & (alive W G!alive)
% ltlfilt --from-ltlf -f 'GFa' --syntactic-obligation -c
1
```

In Spot 2.16, the old reduction, which does not produce syntactic obligations, can still be obtained by setting the `SPOT_FROM_LTLF` environment variable to `0`.

```
% export SPOT_FROM_LTLF=0
% ltlfilt --from-ltlf -f 'GFa'
alive & G(!alive | F(a & alive)) & (alive U G!alive)
% ltlfilt --from-ltlf -f 'GFa' --syntactic-obligation -c
0
```

On this last example, the third command shows that the result of the second one is not a syntactic obligation.

References

- [1] Edward Y. Chang, Zohar Manna, and Amir Pnueli. Characterization of temporal property classes. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP'92)*, pages 474–486, London, UK, 1992. Springer-Verlag. doi:10.1007/3-540-55719-9_97.
- [2] Giuseppe De Giacomo and Moshe Y. Vardi. Linear temporal logic and linear dynamic logic on finite traces. In Francesca Rossi, editor, *Proceedings of the 23rd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI'13)*, pages 854–860, August 2013. doi:10.5555/2540128.2540252.

- [3] Alexandre Duret-Lutz, Etienne Renault, Maximilien Colange, Florian Renkin, Alexandre Gbaguidi Aisse, Philipp Schlehuber-Caissier, Thomas Medioni, Antoine Martin, Jérôme Dubois, Clément Gillard, and Henrich Lauko. From Spot 2.0 to Spot 2.10: What’s new? In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV’22)*, volume 13372 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 174–187. Springer, August 2022. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-13188-2_9.
- [4] Alexandre Duret-Lutz, Giuseppe De Giacomo, Marcin Jurdzinski, Nir Piterman, Moshe Y. Vardi, and Shufang Zhu. Fast obligation translation and synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV’26)*, volume 16682 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 322–339. Springer, July 2026. doi:10.1007/978-3-032-32519-8_17. Distinguished paper award.
- [5] Zohar Manna and Amir Pnueli. A hierarchy of temporal properties. In *Proceedings of the sixth annual ACM Symposium on Principles of distributed computing (PODC’90)*, pages 377–410, New York, NY, USA, 1990. ACM. doi:10.1145/93385.93442.