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Lecture 7: Formal Methods for Requirements Engineering
Slide 44, ‘Consistency in the Collecting Semantics’
The conflict axiom has to be considered negatively (the effects of decision table $T$ have to ensure action consistency only under the condition that the conflict axiom does not hold). That is, the formula needs to read

$$\models F_{coll}(T) \land \neg \varphi_{conf} \rightarrow \bigwedge_{(a_1,a_2) \in \mathcal{I}} \neg (a_1 \land a_2).$$

Lecture 8: Use Cases and Scenarios (NEW)
Slide 32, ‘From Concrete to Abstract Syntax’
The message labelled with event $E$ induces the partial order

$$l_{3,3} \prec l_{1,4}$$

(and $l_{1,4}$ is not a direct successor of $l_{3,2}$).

Lecture 8: Use Cases and Scenarios
Slide 42, ‘Language of LSC Body: Example’
The condition of the loop at TBA state $q_3$ needs to read $\neg F!$.  
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