Name-passing calculi: from fusions to preorders and types (Appendix)

Daniel Hirschkoﬀ, Jean-Marie Madiot

ENS Lyon, U. de Lyon, CNRS, INRIA, UCBL
{daniel.hirschkoﬀ, jeanmarie.madiot}@ens-lyon.fr

Davide Sangiorgi

University of Bologna and INRIA
davide.sangiorgi@cs.unibo.it

This is the appendix of the paper “Name-passing calculi: from fusions to preorders and types” (D Hirschkoﬀ, JM. Madiot, D. Sangiorgi), to appear in LICS’2013.

APPENDIX

A. Reduction-closed barbed congruence (Section II)

Definition 28 (Reduction-closed barbed congruence). *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a process calculus, in which a reduction relation $\longrightarrow_{\mathcal{L}}$ and barb predicates $\downarrow_a^{\mathcal{L}}$, for each a in a given set of names, have been defined.*

A relation $\mathcal{R}$ on the processes of $\mathcal{L}$ is context-closed if PRQ implies $C[P]RC[Q]$, for each context C of $\mathcal{L}$; the relation is barb-preserving if for any name a , $P \downarrow_a^{\mathcal{L}}$ implies $Q \downarrow_a^{\mathcal{L}}$; it is reduction-closed if whenever $P \longrightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} P'$, there is Q' s.t. $Q \longrightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} Q'$ and $P'RQ'$.

Then reduction-closed barbed congruence in $\mathcal{L}$, written $\simeq_{\mathcal{L}}$, is the largest symmetric relation on the processes of $\mathcal{L}$ that is context-closed, reduction-closed, and barb-preserving.

B. Proofs of impossibility results (Section III)

Statement of Theorem 3: *A typed calculus with fusions that is plain and supports narrowing has trivial subtyping.*

Proof Sketch: We define the following active context:

$$E \triangleq (\nu cb)(\bar{u}b \mid uc \mid \bar{v}a \mid vc \mid [\cdot]) .$$

Note that in E we only use b as an output object. The intention is that, given some process P , and u, v, c some fresh names, $E[P]$ should reduce to $P\{a/b\}$. Indeed, by applying hypothesis (2) twice, we have

$$E[P] = (\nu bc)(\bar{u}b \mid \bar{v}a \mid uc \mid vc \mid P) \quad (1)$$

$$\implies (\nu b)(\bar{v}a \mid vb \mid P\{b/c\}) \quad (2)$$

$$= (\nu b)(\bar{v}a \mid vb \mid P) \quad (3)$$

$$\implies P\{a/b\} . \quad (4)$$

Suppose $U \leq T$, we show $\Gamma, a : T \vdash P$ iff $\Gamma, a : U \vdash P$. The implication from left to right is narrowing. To prove the right to left implication, suppose $\Gamma, a : U \vdash P$, and prove $\Gamma, a : T \vdash P$. By injective name substitution we have $\Gamma, b : U \vdash P\{b/a\}$ for some fresh b .

In the typing environment $\Gamma, b : U, u : \sharp T, v : \sharp T, c : T, a : T$ the process $\bar{u}b$ is well-typed thanks to narrowing and weakening, hence so is $(\bar{u}b \mid uc \mid \bar{v}a \mid vc \mid P\{b/a\})$. By the restriction rule we get $\Gamma, a : T, u : \sharp T, v : \sharp T \vdash E[P\{b/a\}]$, the latter reducing to $P\{b/a\}\{a/b\}$ by (4). Since b has been taken fresh, $P\{b/a\}\{a/b\} = P$. Hence, by Subject Reduction, $\Gamma, a : T, u : \sharp T, v : \sharp T \vdash P$. We finally deduce $\Gamma, a : T \vdash P$ by Strengthening. ■

Statement of Theorem 4: *Suppose a typed calculus with fusions is plain and there is at least one prefix α with object b , different from the subject, and there are two types S and T such that $S \leq T$ and one of the following forms of narrowing holds for all Γ :*

- 1) *whenever $\Gamma, b : T \vdash \alpha. \mathbf{0}$, we also have $\Gamma, b : S \vdash \alpha. \mathbf{0}$;*
- 2) *whenever $\Gamma, b : S \vdash \alpha. \mathbf{0}$, we also have $\Gamma, b : T \vdash \alpha. \mathbf{0}$.*

Then S and T are interchangeable in all typing judgements.

Proof Sketch: For all Δ we prove that $\Delta, x : T \vdash P$ iff $\Delta, x : S \vdash P$. Let x_1, x_2, a_1 and a_2 be fresh names.

$$\Delta_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Delta, x_i : T, x_{3-i} : S$$

We will prove that $\Delta_i \vdash P\{x_1/x\}$ implies $\Delta_i \vdash P\{x_2/x\}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$. From there it is enough to conclude using weakening, strengthening and injective substitutions. We use $D = \bar{a}_1 x_1 \mid \bar{a}_2 x_2 \mid a_1 y \mid a_2 y$ to simulate a substitution:

$$(\nu x_1 y)(D \mid P\{x_1/x\}) \Rightarrow P\{x_2/x\}$$

We have to prove that $\Delta' = \Delta_i, a_1 : T_{a_1}, a_2 : T_{a_2}, y : T_y \vdash D$ for some types T_{a_1}, T_{a_2}, T_y . We note a the subject of α . Using the plainness of the subtyping, we can suppose that a is any of a_1 or a_2 and that b is any of x_1, x_2 or y , so to apply the hypothesis on different cases. There are eight subcases, along the cases from the hypothesis, i , and the form of α .

- (1), $i = 1$, $\alpha = \bar{a}_2 x_2$: $T_{a_1} = T_{a_2} = \sharp T, T_y = T$;
- (1), $i = 1$, $\alpha = a_1 y$: $T_{a_1} = \sharp T, T_{a_2} = \sharp S, T_y = S$;
- (2), $i = 1$, $\alpha = \bar{a}_1 x_1$: $T_{a_1} = T_{a_2} = \sharp S, T_y = S$;
- (2), $i = 1$, $\alpha = a_2 y$: $T_{a_1} = \sharp T, T_{a_2} = \sharp S, T_y = T$;
- (1), $i = 2$, $\alpha = \bar{a}_2 x_2$: $T_{a_1} = T_{a_2} = \sharp T, T_y = T$;
- (1), $i = 2$, $\alpha = a_2 y$: $T_{a_1} = \sharp S, T_{a_2} = \sharp T, T_y = S$;
- (2), $i = 2$, $\alpha = \bar{a}_1 x_1$: $T_{a_1} = T_{a_2} = \sharp S, T_y = S$;

- (2), $i = 2$, $\alpha = a_1y$: $T_{a_1} = \sharp S$, $T_{a_2} = \sharp T$, $T_y = T$.

In all these cases we prove that $\Delta' \vdash D$ using plainness and the hypothesis on α . Plainness also give us $\Delta' \vdash P\{x_1/x\}$. We use rules from (3) and Subject Reduction to get that $\Delta' \vdash P\{x_2/x\}$ from which strengthening is enough to conclude. ■

C. Structural congruence in πP (Section IV-A)

Definition 29 (Structural congruence). *Structural congruence on πP , written $\equiv$, is the smallest congruence containing the associativity and commutativity of $|$ and the following rules:*

$$P \mid 0 \equiv P \quad \nu a 0 \equiv 0 \quad \nu a \nu b P \equiv \nu b \nu a P$$

$$\nu a(P \mid Q) \equiv (\nu a P) \mid Q \text{ if } a \notin \text{fn}(Q)$$

D. Alternative definition of γ (Section V-A)

Given an active context E , the set of *captured names* of E , $\text{cn}(E)$, is defined as follows: $c \in \text{cn}(E)$ iff the hole occurs in the scope of a restriction on c in E ($\text{cn}(E)$ is included in the set of names that are bound in E , but might be distinct from it).

Definition 30 (Reachability / Joinability of names). *We introduce $\varphi ::= a \leq b \mid a \gamma b$ in which $a \leq b$ is read “ b is reachable from a ”, and $a \gamma b$ is read “ a and b are joinable”. In both cases, we have $\text{n}(\varphi) = \{a, b\}$. We first define a judgement $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \vdash \varphi$, as follows:*

$$\frac{}{a \leq b, b \leq c \vdash a \leq c} \quad \frac{}{a \leq c, b \leq c \vdash a \gamma b}$$

$$\frac{}{a \gamma b, c \leq a \vdash c \gamma b} \quad \frac{}{a \gamma b, c \leq b \vdash a \gamma c} \quad \frac{\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \vdash \varphi}{\varphi_2, \varphi_1 \vdash \varphi}$$

We exploit this judgement to define how $a \leq b$ and $a \gamma b$ can be derived according to a process, or to an active context (we use $A ::= P \mid E$):

$$\frac{\text{REFL}}{A \triangleright a \leq a} \quad \frac{\text{DEDUCT} \quad A \triangleright \varphi_1 \quad A \triangleright \varphi_2 \quad \varphi_1, \varphi_2 \vdash \varphi}{A \triangleright \varphi}$$

Then we define $\triangleright$ for processes:

$$\frac{}{b/a \triangleright a \leq b} \quad \frac{P \triangleright \varphi}{P \mid R \triangleright \varphi} \quad \frac{P \triangleright \varphi}{R \mid P \triangleright \varphi}$$

$$\frac{P \triangleright \varphi \quad a \notin \text{n}(\varphi)}{(\nu a)P \triangleright \varphi}$$

and for contexts (symmetrically for $E \mid P$):

$$\frac{P \triangleright \varphi \quad \text{n}(\varphi) \cap \text{cn}(E) = \emptyset}{P \mid E \triangleright \varphi} \quad \frac{E \triangleright \varphi}{P \mid E \triangleright \varphi} \quad \frac{E \triangleright \varphi}{(\nu a)E \triangleright \varphi}$$

Lemma 31. *If P is a πP process, the relation $\leq_P$ defined by $\{(a, b) \mid P \triangleright a \leq b\}$ is a preorder.*

Proof: Thanks to the rule REFL, $\leq_P$ is reflexive and thanks to the rule DEDUCT and the fact that $a \leq b, b \leq c \vdash a \leq c$, $\leq_P$ is transitive, hence it is a preorder. ■

E. Coincidence of eager and by-need equivalences in $\pi P1$ (Section VII)

Statement of Theorem 24: $\approx_{\pi P1bn} = \approx_{\pi P1ea}$.

Proof Sketch: The result follows from reflexivity of a relation we define below, between processes in the eager semantics and processes in the by-need semantics.

Lemma 32. *For $P \in \pi P1$, we write $Eq(P)$ for the relation between names defined by $Eq(P)(a, b)$ iff $P \triangleright a \gamma b$.*

Then $Eq(P)$ is an equivalence relation.

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be the relation such that $P \mathcal{R} Q$ iff

$$P, Q \in \pi P1 \wedge Eq(P) = Eq(Q) = \varphi \wedge P =_{\varphi} Q$$

where $P =_{\varphi} Q$ iff P is obtained from Q by replacing some subjects in active prefixes with names related by $Eq(P)$.

We prove that $P \mathcal{R} Q$ entails the following:

- 1) if $C[P], C[Q] \in \pi P1$ then $C[P] \mathcal{R} C[Q]$,
- 2) $P \Downarrow_a^{\text{ea}}$ iff $Q \Downarrow_a^{\text{bn}}$,
- 3) if $P \Rightarrow_{\text{ea}} P'$ then $Q \Rightarrow_{\text{bn}} Q'$ with $P' \mathcal{R} Q'$,
- 4) if $Q \Rightarrow_{\text{bn}} Q'$ then $P \Rightarrow_{\text{ea}} P'$ with $P' \mathcal{R} Q'$.

We call the union of relations satisfying these properties the *eager/by-need weak reduction-closed barbed congruence* for $\pi P1$, written $\stackrel{\text{ea}}{\approx}_1 \stackrel{\text{bn}}{\approx}_1$.

- 1) $\mathcal{R}$ is clearly context-closed in $\pi P1$.
- 2) $P \Downarrow_a^{\text{bn}}$ implies $P \Downarrow_a^{\text{ea}}$ as each arc involved in the joinability condition generates a $\rightarrow_{\text{ea}}$ reduction, and $P \Downarrow_a^{\text{ea}}$ implies $P \Downarrow_a^{\text{bn}}$, as $P \rightarrow_{\text{ea}} P'$ implies $P \rightarrow_{\text{bn}} P'$.
- 3) By induction we suppose $P \rightarrow_{\text{ea}} P'$. If this is a renaming then $P =_{\varphi} P'$. If this is a communication then the corresponding subjects are equated by φ in Q , which means they are joinable i.e. the by need reduction is possible.
- 4) Again we suppose $Q \rightarrow_{\text{bn}} Q'$, with a communication on a and b with $a \gamma b$. The corresponding names a', b' in P are such that $a' \gamma a \gamma b \gamma b'$ i.e. $a' \gamma b'$ so a' and b' can be rewritten into a common name, letting the communication happen.

Since $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \stackrel{\text{ea}}{\approx}_1 \stackrel{\text{bn}}{\approx}_1$, for all $P \in \pi P1$ we have $P \stackrel{\text{ea}}{\approx}_1 \stackrel{\text{bn}}{\approx}_1 P$ which implies that $P \approx_{\pi P1bn} Q$ iff $P \approx_{\pi P1ea} Q$. ■

F. The Fusion calculus

Definition 33. *The syntax of the polyadic Fusion calculus [6] without matching and choice is the following. Structural congruence is defined as usual (Definition 29).*

$$P ::= 0 \mid P \mid P \mid \tilde{a}\tilde{x}.P \mid a\tilde{x}.P \mid \nu a P$$

We follow the reduction semantics of the Fusion calculus, from [22]. The side conditions for (5) are that $\tilde{x}$ and $\tilde{y}$ are of the same arity, that $\text{dom}(\sigma) = \tilde{z}$ and that $\sigma(x_i) = \sigma(y_i)$. Note that (2), from Section II, holds.

$$\frac{P \equiv P_1 \quad P_1 \rightarrow_F Q_1 \quad Q_1 \equiv Q}{P \rightarrow_F Q} \quad \frac{P \rightarrow_F Q}{E[P] \rightarrow_F E[Q]}$$

$$(\nu \tilde{z})(R \mid a\tilde{x}.P \mid \tilde{a}\tilde{y}.Q) \rightarrow_F (R \mid P \mid Q)\sigma \quad (5)$$

G. Auxiliary results

a) Results involving name preorders:

Lemma 34. *If $P \triangleright a \curlyvee b$ and $\{a, b\} \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$, then $P \equiv P'$ implies $P' \triangleright a \curlyvee b$.*

Proof: The predicate $P \triangleright \varphi$ only depends on the occurrences of arcs in P ; those occurrences are trivially preserved by structural congruence, except that to keep track of alpha-conversion one must consider that P 's binders also bind φ 's names. Hence the statement only holds for free names. ■

Lemma 35. *If $P \simeq_{\text{bn}} Q$ and $P \triangleright a \curlyvee b$. Then $Q \triangleright a \curlyvee b$.*

Proof: We characterise joinability using the context $E = (- \mid \bar{a}.f \mid b.g)$ where f and g are fresh: we easily prove that $R \triangleright a \curlyvee b$ iff $E[R] \rightarrow_{\text{bn}} R_1$ where $R_1 \downarrow_f^{\text{bn}}$ and $R_1 \downarrow_g^{\text{bn}}$. By definition of $\simeq_{\text{bn}}$ we know that $E[P] \simeq_{\text{bn}} E[Q]$ and we conclude playing the bisimulation game of $\simeq_{\text{bn}}$. ■

Lemma 36. *If $P \mathcal{R} Q$ and $\mathcal{R}$ preserves $\curlyvee$ and parallel composition of arcs (in particular if $\mathcal{R}$ is a $\sim_{\text{bn}}$ -relation), then $P \triangleright a \leq b$ iff $Q \triangleright a \leq b$.*

Proof: Let P and Q be processes and f be a fresh name. Then $P \triangleright a \leq b$ iff $(P \mid f/b) \triangleright a \curlyvee f$ and similarly for Q . Thanks to the second hypothesis on $\mathcal{R}$ we have $(P \mid f/b) \mathcal{R} (Q \mid f/b)$ and we conclude with the second one. ■

b) Basic tools: Prefixes delimit the action of structural congruence.

Lemma 37. *Suppose π_1, π_2 are prefixes.*

- 1) *If $E[\pi_1.P_1] \equiv P'$ then there exist E' and P'_1 such that $P_1 \equiv P'_1$, $P' = E'[\pi_1.P'_1]$ and $E \triangleright a \curlyvee b$ iff $E' \triangleright a \curlyvee b$. Moreover for all Q_1 such that all names of $\text{fn}(Q_1)$ are either in $\text{fn}(P_1)$ or not captured by E then the latter are not captured by E' and $E[Q_1] \equiv E'[Q_1]$.*
- 2) *If $G[\pi_1.P_1][\pi_2.P_2] \equiv P'$ then there exist G' , P'_1 and P'_2 such that $P_1 \equiv P'_1$, $P_2 \equiv P'_2$ and $P' = G'[\pi_1.P_1][\pi_2.P_2]$ or $P' = G'[\pi_2.P_2][\pi_1.P_1]$ and $G \triangleright a \curlyvee b$ iff $G' \triangleright a \curlyvee b$.*

Proof: Structural congruence can act under prefixes only using the fact that $\equiv$ is a congruence, i.e. using the rule “if $P \equiv P'$ then $C[P] \equiv C[P']$ ” for some arbitrary context C containing a prefix. For this rule we work an induction on C to get the same cutting as $E[\pi_1.P_1]$; all the other rules deriving $\equiv$ are handled by the corresponding case analysis on the context E . Note that the statement also holds when E is an arbitrary context. ■

Lemma 38. *If $P \equiv Q$ then $P \sim_{\text{bn}} Q$.*

Proof: We show that $\equiv$ is a $\sim_{\text{bn}}$ -bisimulation. (The proof is not by induction over the derivation of $P \equiv Q$ because the fact that $\equiv$ is a congruence is not easy to handle.) The clauses 1), 2), 4) are easy – respectively handled by the fact that $\equiv$ is a congruence, Lemma 34 and the fact that $\equiv$ is symmetric – as is the clause 3) when $\mu = \tau$ – since $\xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{bn}} = \rightarrow_{\text{bn}}$ is stable by $\equiv$. For the remaining labels we examine the case where $\mu = \hat{b}$,

the other case being similar. We know that $P = E[ac.P_1]$ with $E \triangleright a \curlyvee b$ and $P' = E[d/c \mid P_1]$. We use Lemma 37 to get $Q = E'[ac.P_1]$ which implies $Q \xrightarrow{bd}_{\text{bn}} E'[d/c \mid P_1] \equiv P'$. ■

c) Proof techniques:

Definition 39 (By-need bisimulation up to $\sim_{\text{bn}}$ and restriction). *A relation $\mathcal{R}$ is a by-need bisimulation up to $\sim_{\text{bn}}$ and restriction if $P \mathcal{R} Q$ implies:*

- 1) $P \mid a/b \mathcal{R} Q \mid a/b$, for all names a, b ;
- 2) if a and b appear free in P , then $P \triangleright a \curlyvee b$ implies $Q \triangleright a \curlyvee b$;
- 3) if $P \xrightarrow{\mu}_{\text{bn}} P'$ (where the object part of μ is fresh, whenever $\mu \neq \tau$), then $Q \xrightarrow{\mu}_{\text{bn}} Q'$ and there are $P'', Q'', \tilde{x}$ s.t. $P' \sim_{\text{bn}} \nu \tilde{x} P''$, $Q' \sim_{\text{bn}} \nu \tilde{x} Q''$, and $P'' \mathcal{R} Q''$,
- 4) the converse of clauses (2) and (3).

Lemma 40. *If $\mathcal{R}$ is a by-need bisimulation up to $\sim_{\text{bn}}$ and restriction then $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \sim_{\text{bn}}$.*

H. Soundness of $\sim_{\text{bn}}$ (Section V-C)

We now move to the proof that $\sim_{\text{bn}}$ is a congruence. What is missing is closure by parallel composition, which is rather delicate. This is because we defined the semantics of τ -actions with a reduction semantics. (The standard schema is to define a pure SOS semantics, show that it coincides with the reduction semantics, and then work with the SOS.)

For the proof of congruence we introduce *communication contexts*. These are, intuitively, the composition of two active contexts, one used for an input, the other for an output; such input and output may produce a τ -action. Communication contexts, ranged over by G , have two holes, each occurring exactly once.

$$G ::= P \mid G \mid P \mid \nu a G \mid E_1 \mid E_2 .$$

By convention the leftmost hole is the first one, the other is the second one. We write $P = G[ac.Q][\bar{b}d.R]$ if P is obtained from G with $ac.Q$, and the second hole with $\bar{b}d.R$.

Communication contexts can be used to decompose a $\xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{bn}}$ transition:

Lemma 41. *Suppose $P \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{bn}} P'$ (that is, $P \rightarrow_{\text{bn}} P'$). Then one of the following statements holds:*

- $P = G[\bar{a}b.Q][cd.R]$ and $P' \sim_{\text{bn}} \nu f(G[b/f \mid Q][f/d \mid R])$,
- $P = G[cd.R][\bar{a}b.Q]$ and $P' \sim_{\text{bn}} \nu f(G[f/d \mid R][b/f \mid Q])$,

where $P \triangleright a \curlyvee c$ and f is fresh.

Proof: The two cases are similar, the main difficulty is to keep track of the structural congruence operations. If $P \rightarrow_{\text{bn}} P'$ it means that, $P \equiv E[\bar{a}b.Q_1 \mid ac.R_1]$ and $P' \equiv E[b/c \mid Q_1 \mid R_1]$. From the first relation we can get G such that $P = G[\bar{a}b.Q][cd.R]$ (with $G \triangleright a \curlyvee c$, $Q \equiv Q_1$ and $R \equiv R_1$), ignoring the symmetric case for which the output is the left argument of G . We extract the potential restrictions $\nu \hat{b}$ and $\nu \hat{d}$ ($\hat{b} = \emptyset$ if b is not bound and $\hat{b} = \{b\}$ if is captured by G) from G , yielding the much alike context G' (and $G \equiv (\nu \hat{b} \hat{d})G'$).

The interesting part is that we can write the reduction with the arc at the top, then use Lemma 44 and then structural congruence to put back b and d inside G .

$$\begin{aligned}
P &\equiv (\nu \hat{b} \hat{d}) G'[\bar{a}b. Q][cd. R] \\
&\longrightarrow_{\text{bn}} (\nu \hat{b} \hat{d})(b/d \mid G'[Q][R]) \\
&\sim_{\text{bn}} (\nu \hat{b} \hat{d})((\nu f)(b/f \mid f/d) \mid G'[Q][R]) \\
&\equiv (\nu f)(\nu \hat{b} \hat{d})(G'[b/f \mid Q][f/d \mid R]) \\
&\equiv (\nu f)G[b/f \mid Q][f/d \mid R].
\end{aligned}$$

To conclude we need to relate this last process to P' which is done by proving that $E[b/d \mid Q_1 \mid R_1] \equiv (\nu \hat{b} \hat{d})(b/d \mid G'[Q][R])$, which is done by keeping tracks of the derivation of $E[\bar{a}b. Q_1 \mid cd. R_1] \equiv P$. ■

Lemma 42. Suppose $Q \xrightarrow{bf}_{\text{bn}} Q'$ and suppose b is not captured by E . Then $Q \mid E[\bar{b}d. R_1] \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{bn} \sim_{\text{bn}}} \nu f(E[d/f \mid R_1])$.

Lemma 43 (Congruence for restriction). If $P \sim_{\text{bn}} Q$ then for all c , $\nu c P \sim_{\text{bn}} \nu c Q$.

Proof: Given a relation $\mathcal{R}$, we define

$$(\mathcal{R})^{\text{Sub}} = \{(P \mid \sigma, Q \mid \sigma). PRQ \text{ and } \sigma \text{ is a parallel composition of arcs}\}.$$

We show that $(\{\nu c P, \nu c Q\}, P \sim_{\text{bn}} Q)^{\text{Sub}}$ is a bisimulation up to $\equiv$. This is a consequence of the following observations:

- For any u, v, c, P such that $\{u, v\} \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$ and $c \notin \{u, v\}$, we have $P \triangleright u \curlyvee v$ iff $\nu c P \triangleright u \curlyvee v$.
- The visible transitions of our labelled transition system do not involve name extrusion, and we have that $P \xrightarrow{\alpha}_{\text{bn}} P'$ iff $\nu c P \xrightarrow{\alpha}_{\text{bn}} \nu c P'$ for $c \notin n(\alpha)$.
- Suppose now $\nu c P \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{bn}} P'$. This means $P \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{bn}} P_0$ for some P_0 s.t. $P' \equiv \nu c P_0$. But then $Q \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{bn}} Q_0$, $P_0 \sim_{\text{bn}} Q_0$ and $\nu c Q \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{bn}} \nu c Q_0$. ■

Lemma 44 (Transitivity of arcs). For all active context E we have: $E[a/c] \sim_{\text{bn}} E[\nu b(a/b \mid b/c)]$.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{R}$ be the corresponding relation. We show that $\mathcal{R}$ is a $\sim_{\text{bn}}$ -bisimulation up to $\equiv$. Of course the relation is stable by parallel composition of arcs, since E can be an arbitrary active context. Concerning the $\curlyvee$ condition, the left-to-right implication is rather clear. From right to left, we must prove that we cannot get more from $\nu b(a/b \mid b/c)$ than from a/c which is achieved by the restriction νb . Now concerning the transitions we know from the $\curlyvee$ condition that the same names will be joinable through the preorder, independently of $\equiv$ or the context. The resulting processes will still stay in $\mathcal{R}$, up to $\equiv$. ■

Lemma 45 (Congruence for parallel composition). If $P \sim_{\text{bn}} Q$ then also $P \mid R \sim_{\text{bn}} Q \mid R$.

Proof (Sketch): **Special case:** we first suppose that all arcs in R occur under at least one prefix. We show that

$\{(P \mid R, Q \mid R), P \sim_{\text{bn}} Q \text{ and } R \text{ does not contain active arcs}\}$ by contexts. ■

is a bisimulation up to restriction and up to bisimilarity.

Suppose then $P \mid R \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{bn}} U$, in which both P and R contribute (the other possibilities are easier).

Suppose P makes the input (the case of output is symmetric). In this case we have, using Lemma 41:

$$P = E[ac. P_1] \quad R = F[\bar{b}d. R_1]$$

where $E \triangleright a \curlyvee b$ (since R has no arc) and with $P' = E[f/c \mid P_1]$ and $R' = F[d/f \mid R_1]$:

$$U \sim_{\text{bn}} \nu f(P' \mid R').$$

Using rule EN-INP, we also have $P \xrightarrow{bf}_{\text{bn}} P'$. Hence, since $P \sim_{\text{bn}} Q$, $Q \xrightarrow{bf}_{\text{bn}} Q'$ and $P' \sim_{\text{bn}} Q'$ for some Q' , which gives $Q' = E'[a'c'. Q_1]$ for some a' s.t. $E' \triangleright a' \curlyvee b$, and $Q' = E'[f/c' \mid Q_1]$. From this, Lemma 42 gives us directly:

$$Q \mid R \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{bn} \sim_{\text{bn}}} \nu f(Q' \mid R')$$

We can now extract the arc from R' :

$$R' \equiv \nu \tilde{n}(R'' \mid \sigma),$$

where σ is a parallel composition of arcs and R'' contains no active arc. We then have

$$P' \mid R' \equiv (\nu \tilde{n})(P' \mid \sigma \mid R''),$$

and similarly for $Q' \mid R'$. We can conclude by remarking that $P' \sim_{\text{bn}} Q'$ entails $P' \mid \sigma \sim_{\text{bn}} Q' \mid \sigma$, and using up to restriction to remove the topmost restrictions.

General case: Consider now the case where R is an arbitrary process. We reason by induction on R , to show that $P \sim_{\text{bn}} Q$ implies $P \mid R \sim_{\text{bn}} Q \mid R$. The cases where R is a prefixed process or $R = \mathbf{0}$ are treated by the result above.

The case where $R = u/v$ holds by definition of $\sim_{\text{bn}}$: $P \sim_{\text{bn}} Q$ implies $P \mid u/v \sim_{\text{bn}} Q \mid u/v$.

If $R = R_1 \mid R_2$, then by induction $P \mid R_1 \sim_{\text{bn}} Q \mid R_1$, which gives, by induction again, $(P \mid R_1) \mid R_2 \sim_{\text{bn}} (Q \mid R_1) \mid R_2$, hence the result by associativity of $\mid$.

Suppose now $R = \nu c R'$. We can suppose w.l.o.g. $c \notin \text{fn}(P) \cup \text{fn}(Q)$. Then by induction $P \mid R' \sim_{\text{bn}} Q \mid R'$, which gives, by Lemma 43, $(\nu c)(P \mid R') \sim_{\text{bn}} (\nu c)(Q \mid R')$. Lemma 38 gives $(\nu c)(P \mid R') \sim_{\text{bn}} P \mid \nu c R'$, and similarly for Q , hence $P \mid R \sim_{\text{bn}} Q \mid R$. This concludes the proof. ■

Statement of Theorem 20: Bisimilarity is a congruence.

Proof: Follows from Lemmas 43 and 45, closure by prefixes being immediate. ■

Theorem 46 (Soundness). If $P \sim_{\text{bn}} Q$ then $P \simeq_{\text{bn}} Q$.

Proof: Preservation of fresh barbs: when f does not appear in any arc, $P \downarrow_f^{\text{bn}}$ is equivalent to $P \xrightarrow{\alpha}$ where α is an input or output label with subject f .

Preservation of general barbs: $P \downarrow_a^{\text{bn}}$ is equivalent to $(P \mid \alpha. f) \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{bn} \downarrow_f^{\text{bn}}}$ for some α whose subject is a .

Closure under reduction holds trivially since $\longrightarrow_{\text{bn}}$ coincides with $\xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{bn}}$ and finally, Theorem 20 guarantees closure

by contexts. ■

I. Completeness of $\sim_{\text{bn}}$ (Section V-C)

For a prefix α we write $\bar{\alpha}$ for the dual prefix, i.e. $\bar{ab} = ab$ and $\overline{ab} = \bar{a}b$. Any prefix α can be also seen as a label.

Lemma 47. *Let P and P' be processes and f a name fresh w.r.t. P and such that $P' \downarrow_f^{\text{bn}}$. Then $P \xrightarrow{\alpha}_{\text{bn}} P'$ if and only if there exists a process P_1 such that $P_1 \downarrow_f^{\text{bn}}$ and*

$$P \mid \bar{\alpha}.(\bar{f} \mid f) \xrightarrow{\text{bn}} P_1 \xrightarrow{\text{bn}} P'.$$

Proof: Let us consider the case where α is an input prefix bd , the output case being similar.

Left to right: since $\xrightarrow{\text{bn}}$ is stable by $\equiv$ we directly suppose that $P \xrightarrow{\alpha}_{\text{bn}} P'$. Then $P = E[ac.Q]$ with $E \triangleright a \vee b$ and $P' = E[d/c \mid Q]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} P_\alpha &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P \mid \bar{\alpha}.(\bar{f} \mid f) \\ &\equiv E[ac.Q \mid \bar{b}d.(\bar{f} \mid f)] \\ &\xrightarrow{\text{bn}} E[d/c \mid Q \mid \bar{f} \mid f] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_1 \\ &\xrightarrow{\text{bn}} E[d/c \mid Q] = P'. \end{aligned}$$

Right to left: since P_1 and f is fresh in P we know that $\bar{\alpha}$ has been triggered, that is, $P_\alpha \equiv E[ac.Q \mid \bar{b}d.(\bar{f} \mid f)]$ and $P' \equiv E[d/c \mid Q]$ since P' has no f barb. This means that P is of the form $P \equiv E[ac.Q]$. Hence $P \xrightarrow{\alpha}_{\text{bn}} P'$. ■

Theorem 48 (Completeness). *If $P \simeq_{\text{bn}} Q$ then $P \sim_{\text{bn}} Q$.*

Proof: We show that $\simeq_{\text{bn}}$ is a $\sim_{\text{bn}}$ -bisimulation up to $\equiv$. The clause for preservation of $\vee$ is treated with Lemma 35. The one about parallel composition of arcs is trivial, as well as the symmetry and the clause for the τ -transition. We are left with the case for an input or output transition α .

Suppose $P \xrightarrow{\alpha}_{\text{bn}} P'$ and let f be a name fresh wrt to P , P' and Q . Lemma 47 provides us P_1 such that $P_1 \downarrow_f^{\text{bn}}$ and a reduction scheme that we can transport to Q :

$$Q \mid \bar{\alpha}.(\bar{f} \mid f) \xrightarrow{\text{bn}} Q_1 \xrightarrow{\text{bn}} Q_2.$$

We know that $P_1 \simeq_{\text{bn}} Q_1$ and $P' \simeq_{\text{bn}} Q_2$, hence $Q_1 \downarrow_f^{\text{bn}}$ and $Q_2 \downarrow_f^{\text{bn}}$ (since f is fresh for P'). Another application of Lemma 47 directly gives us $Q \xrightarrow{\alpha}_{\text{bn}} P'$. ■

Statement of Theorem 21: *In πP , relations $\sim_{\text{bn}}$ and $\simeq_{\text{bn}}$ coincide.*

Proof: Consequence of Theorems 48 and 46. ■

J. Encoding $A\pi$ in πP

1) *Operational correspondence results:* We say that $P \in \pi P$ is *asynchronous* if the continuation of all outputs in P is $\mathbf{0}$. We can remark that the encoding of a process in $A\pi$ is an asynchronous πP process.

We use the following properties of the encoding, where $\xrightarrow{\pi}$ is the reduction in the π -calculus. Barbs in the π -calculus are defined in the standard way: $P \downarrow_a$ iff $P \equiv (\nu \tilde{c})(\alpha.P \mid R)$ where α is a prefix whose subject is a . (It is equivalent to $P = E[\alpha.P_1]$ for some active context E .)

Lemma 49. *Let P be any π -calculus process.*

- 1) *If $P \equiv Q$ then $\llbracket P \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket Q \rrbracket$;*
- 2) *if $\llbracket P \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket Q \rrbracket$ then $P \equiv Q$;*
- 3) *if $\llbracket P \rrbracket \equiv E_1[\bar{a}b.Q_1 \mid ax.R_1]$ then $Q_1 \equiv \llbracket Q \rrbracket$, $R_1 \equiv \llbracket R \rrbracket$ and $P \equiv E[\bar{a}b.Q \mid a(x).R]$ with $\llbracket E \rrbracket[\nu x[\cdot]] \equiv E_1[\cdot]$;*
- 4) *if $P \xrightarrow{\pi} P'$ then $\llbracket P \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\text{bn} \simeq_{\text{bn}}} \llbracket P' \rrbracket$;*
- 5) *conversely, if $\llbracket P \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\text{bn}} P_1$ then there is P' such that $P \xrightarrow{\pi} P'$ and $P_1 \simeq_{\text{bn}} \llbracket P' \rrbracket$;*
- 6) *$P \downarrow_a$ iff $\llbracket P \rrbracket \downarrow_a$.*

Proof:

- 1) Straightforward.
- 2) We prove tediously but straightforwardly the following refined statement: if $\llbracket P \rrbracket \equiv R_1$ then there exist R such that $P \equiv R$ and we can obtain R_1 from $\llbracket R \rrbracket$ such that $R_1 \equiv \llbracket R \rrbracket$ but only by moving restrictions of input objects. In the case where $R_1 \equiv \llbracket Q \rrbracket$ we prove that R is necessarily Q (the restrictions of input objects have only one possible position).
- 3) We combine techniques used in the previous item to get back the fact Q_1 and R_1 are structurally congruent to encoding of processes, and techniques from the proof of Lemma 37 to separate the transformations of $\equiv$ in the subterms Q_1 , R_1 guarded by the prefixes $\bar{a}b$, ax from those in the rest of the term.
- 4) The reduction $\xrightarrow{\pi}$ is quotiented by structural congruence, so in the induction proof there is a case handling the rule “if $P \equiv P_1 \xrightarrow{\pi} P'_1 \equiv P'$ then $P \xrightarrow{\pi} P'$ ”. Since $\llbracket P \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket P_1 \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket P'_1 \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket P' \rrbracket$ we only need to know that $\llbracket P_1 \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\text{bn} \simeq_{\text{bn}}} \llbracket P'_1 \rrbracket$ by induction. We also need to know that $(\equiv \xrightarrow{\text{bn} \simeq_{\text{bn}}} \equiv) \subseteq (\xrightarrow{\text{bn} \simeq_{\text{bn}}})$ which is true by definition of $\xrightarrow{\text{bn}}$ and $\simeq_{\text{bn}}$. Similarly since the reduction in π is also quotiented by active contexts we also remark that the encoding is compositional, and the encoding of an active context is still active. Also we have to prove that if $P \xrightarrow{\text{bn} \simeq_{\text{bn}}} Q$ then $P \xrightarrow{\text{bn} \simeq_{\text{bn}}} Q$ which is true by definition of $\xrightarrow{\text{bn}}$ and because $\simeq_{\text{bn}}$ is a congruence.
- We now focus on the simple case of $\bar{a}b.P \mid a(x).Q \xrightarrow{\pi} P \mid Q\{b/x\}$. The encoding of the left-hand side reduces into $\nu x(\llbracket P \rrbracket \mid b/x \mid \llbracket Q \rrbracket)$ and we know that x has no negative occurrence in $\llbracket Q \rrbracket$ so by Lemma 19 this process is equivalent to $\llbracket P \rrbracket \mid \llbracket Q \rrbracket\{b/x\}$ which is of the expected shape.
- 5) If $\llbracket P \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\text{bn}} Q$, since $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ does not have any arc, the reduction comes from a communication between two prefixes on the same name a : $\llbracket P \rrbracket \equiv E_1[\bar{a}b.\llbracket Q \rrbracket \mid ax.\llbracket R \rrbracket]$ with E binding x , and then keeping track of all actions operated by $\equiv$ we know that P_1 is of the form $P_1 \equiv E_1[\llbracket Q \rrbracket \mid b/x \mid \llbracket R \rrbracket]$. We can recover $P \equiv E[\bar{a}b.Q \mid a(x).R] \xrightarrow{\pi} E[Q \mid R\{b/x\}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P'$. Then $\llbracket P' \rrbracket = \llbracket E \rrbracket[\llbracket Q \rrbracket \mid \llbracket R \rrbracket\{b/x\}] \equiv E_1[\llbracket Q \rrbracket \mid \llbracket R \rrbracket\{b/x\}] \simeq_{\text{bn}} P_1$.
- 6) The implication from left to right is straightforward by induction, but one has to remark that to test the input barb, one needs a synchronous tester $\bar{a}b.\omega$. (Note that input barbs are not tested in the *asynchronous* version of

behavioural equivalences.) The other implication follows from the fact that there is no arc in $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ so $\llbracket P \rrbracket \downarrow_a$ if and only if $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ contains a prefix whose subject is a (which is equivalent to the fact P does, too).

Lemma 50 (Label-syntax correspondence). *If P is only contains trivial arcs (of the form e/e) and α is a prefix ac or $\bar{a}c$ then $P \xrightarrow{\alpha}_{\text{bn}} P'$ iff $P \equiv E[\alpha.P_1]$ and $P' \equiv E[c/c \mid P_1]$, with E binding neither a nor c (and P' has only trivial arcs).*

Moreover $P \downarrow_a^{\text{bn}}$ iff $P \xrightarrow{\alpha}_{\text{bn}}$ iff $P \equiv E[\alpha.P_1]$.

In addition if $\sigma \triangleright a \vee b$ then $P \xrightarrow{ac}_{\text{bn}} P'$ implies $P \mid \sigma \xrightarrow{bc}_{\text{bn}} P' \mid \sigma$ (resp. $\bar{a}c, \bar{b}c$).

Lemma 51 (Label correspondences). *Let P be any π process and f a fresh name.*

- 1) *If $P \xrightarrow{\bar{a}c}_{\pi} P'$ then $\llbracket P \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\bar{a}f}_{\text{bn}} c/f \mid \llbracket P' \rrbracket$.*
- 2) *If $P \xrightarrow{\bar{a}(c)}_{\pi} P'$ then $\llbracket P \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\bar{a}f}_{\text{bn}} \nu c(c/f \mid \llbracket P' \rrbracket)$.*
- 3) *If $P \xrightarrow{a(x)}_{\pi} P'$ then $\llbracket P \rrbracket \xrightarrow{af}_{\text{bn}} \nu x(f/x \mid \llbracket P' \rrbracket)$.*
- 4) *If $\llbracket P \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\bar{a}f}_{\text{bn}} P_1$ then*
  - a) *either $P \xrightarrow{\bar{a}c}_{\pi} P'$ with $P_1 \equiv c/f \mid \llbracket P' \rrbracket$,*
  - b) *or $P \xrightarrow{\bar{a}(c)}_{\pi} P'$ with $P_1 \equiv \nu c(c/f \mid \llbracket P' \rrbracket)$*
- 5) *If $\llbracket P \rrbracket \xrightarrow{af}_{\text{bn}} P_1$ then*

$$P \xrightarrow{a(x)}_{\pi} P' \text{ with } P_1 \equiv \nu x.(f/x \mid \llbracket P' \rrbracket)$$

Lemma 52 (Decomposition of transitions, asynchronous πP). *Let P be an asynchronous πP term without visible arc, σ a parallel composition of arcs, and f, g some fresh names.*

- 1) *If $P \mid \sigma \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{bn}} P_t$ then $P \xrightarrow{\bar{a}f}_{\text{bn}} P_1 \xrightarrow{bg}_{\text{bn}} P_2$ with $P_t \sim_{\text{bn}} (\nu fg)(P_2 \mid f/g) \mid \sigma$ and $\sigma \triangleright a \vee b$.*
- 2) *Suppose $P \xrightarrow{\bar{a}f}_{\text{bn}} P_1 \xrightarrow{ag}_{\text{bn}} P_2$ and $\sigma \triangleright a \vee b$. Then $P \mid \sigma \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{bn}} \sim_{\text{bn}} (\nu fg)(P_2 \mid f/g) \mid \sigma$.*

This result is directly a consequence of the syntax of asynchronous πP as for similar results in $A\pi$. We use $\sim_{\text{bn}}$ for renaming and concatenating fresh names using Lemma 44.

2) *Full abstraction for the encoding of $A\pi$:* One inclusion in the full abstraction result actually holds for the whole π -calculus:

Lemma 53. *Let P and Q be π terms. Then $\llbracket P \rrbracket \simeq_{\text{bn}} \llbracket Q \rrbracket$ implies $P \simeq_{\pi} Q$.*

Proof: The relation $\{(P, Q) \mid \llbracket P \rrbracket \simeq_{\text{bn}} \llbracket Q \rrbracket\}$ is reduction-closed (consequence of Lemma 49), barb-preserving (consequence of Lemma 49), and context-closed: if C is a π context then there exists a πP context C_1 such that $\llbracket C[P] \rrbracket = C_1[\llbracket P \rrbracket]$, similarly for Q ; hence $\llbracket P \rrbracket \simeq_{\text{bn}} \llbracket Q \rrbracket$ implies $\llbracket C[P] \rrbracket \simeq_{\text{bn}} \llbracket C[Q] \rrbracket$. ■

Lemma 54. *Let P and Q be asynchronous π -terms. Then $P \simeq_{\pi} Q$ implies $\llbracket P \rrbracket \simeq_{\text{bn}} \llbracket Q \rrbracket$.*

Proof: Thanks to Theorem 46 and to the characterisation of barbed congruence by ground bisimilarity in the asynchronous π -calculus [5], we only have to prove that $P \sim_{\text{g}} Q$

implies $\llbracket P \rrbracket \sim_{\text{bn}} \llbracket Q \rrbracket$. We do so by showing that the following relation is a $\sim_{\text{bn}}$ -bisimulation up to restriction and $\sim_{\text{bn}}$:

$$\mathcal{R} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\sim_{\text{g}})^{\text{Sub}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(\llbracket P \rrbracket \mid \sigma, \llbracket Q \rrbracket \mid \sigma) \mid P \sim_{\text{g}} Q\}$$

where σ stands for any parallel composition of arcs. In order to do that, we rely on Lemma 51 ($\llbracket P \rrbracket$ is arc-free) to relate non- τ transitions in π and πP , as well as on Lemma 52 to decompose τ -transitions into visible transitions.

We analyse all possible transitions from $\llbracket P \rrbracket \mid \sigma$. We omit intermediate steps to focus on the relevant details.

- 1) $\llbracket P \rrbracket \mid \sigma \xrightarrow{af}_{\text{bn}} \sim_{\text{bn}} \nu x(f/x \mid \llbracket P' \rrbracket \mid \sigma)$ with $P \xrightarrow{b(x)}_{\pi} P'$ for some b such that $\sigma \triangleright a \vee b$. Drawing the $\sim_{\text{g}}$ -diagram yields eventually $\llbracket Q \rrbracket \xrightarrow{bf}_{\text{bn}} \sim_{\text{bn}} \nu x(f/x \mid \llbracket Q' \rrbracket)$. We add σ to derive a transition along the original label af , and relate in $\mathcal{R}$ the resulting processes.
- 2) $\llbracket P \rrbracket \mid \sigma \xrightarrow{\bar{a}f}_{\text{bn}} \sim_{\text{bn}} \nu \hat{c}(c/f \mid \llbracket P' \rrbracket)$ with $P \xrightarrow{\nu \hat{c}bc}_{\pi} P'$ with $\hat{c} \in \{\emptyset, \{c\}\}$ and $\sigma \triangleright a \vee b$. The reasoning is similar to the previous case.
- 3) $\llbracket P \rrbracket \mid \sigma \xrightarrow{\tau}_{\text{bn}} P_t \mid \sigma$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket P \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\bar{a}f}_{\text{bn}} \xrightarrow{bg}_{\text{bn}} \nu \hat{c}x(c/f \mid g/x \mid \llbracket P'' \rrbracket) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_2 \\ P &\xrightarrow{\nu \hat{c}ac}_{\pi} \xrightarrow{b(x)}_{\pi} P'' \end{aligned}$$

such that $\sigma \triangleright a \vee b$ and $P_t \sim_{\text{bn}} \nu fg(P_2 \mid f/g)$. We can again play the ground bisimilarity game and use Lemma 52 to get the same relations on the Q side, to finally get $P \sim_{\text{g}} Q$ and thus:

$$(\llbracket P'' \rrbracket \mid \sigma') \mathcal{R} (\llbracket Q'' \rrbracket \mid \sigma')$$

with $\sigma' = \sigma \mid c/f \mid f/g \mid g/x$. We use the up to restriction technique on f, g, x , and $\hat{c}$.

The relation $\mathcal{R}$ is symmetric, and clearly satisfies the clause about joinability and the clause about the addition of arcs. Thus $\mathcal{R}$ is a $\sim_{\text{bn}}$ -bisimulation up to restriction and $\sim_{\text{bn}}$. ■

Theorem 55 (Full abstraction). *Suppose P, Q are processes from the asynchronous π -calculus, $A\pi$. Then $P \simeq_{A\pi} Q$ iff $\llbracket P \rrbracket \simeq_{\text{bn}} \llbracket Q \rrbracket$.*

K. Encoding of Explicit Fusions

Definition 56. *Let $P \triangleright a = b$ be the judgement conjunction of $P \triangleright a \leq b$ and $P \triangleright b \leq a$.*

In the following we note φ_P the relation $\{(a, b) \mid P \triangleright a \varphi b\}$, e.g. $a \vee_P b$ for the joinability $a \leq_P b$ for the reachability or $a =_P b$ for the equality. We will note $P =_{a,b} Q$ iff $P\{b/a\} = Q\{b/a\}$ i.e. if the only difference between P and Q is the exchange of some a and b . We will also write $a = b$ for $\llbracket a = b \rrbracket$ which is $a/b \mid b/a$.

Lemma 57. *If $P =_{a,b} Q$ then $\varphi_{P|a=b} = \varphi_{Q|a=b}$.*

Proof: By symmetry we only consider inclusion. We use induction on the derivation of $(P \mid a = b) \triangleright \varphi$ along Definition 30. Only the base case is interesting, when P and Q are arcs and φ is of the form $d \leq e$. Then if $n(\varphi) \subseteq \{a, b\}$

then $(a = b) \triangleright \varphi$; if $P \neq Q$ then (P, Q) can only be of the form $(a_1/c, a_2/c)$ (or, resp., $(c/a_1, c/a_2)$) where $a_i \in \{a, b\}$. In this last case φ must be $c \leq a_i$ (resp. $a_i \leq c$) which is easily achieved by $(a_2/c \mid a = b)$ (resp. $(a_2/c \mid a = b)$). ■

We extend the definition of $=_{a,b}$ to predicates: $\varphi =_{a,b} \psi$ iff φ and ψ differ only by a, b swaps. Lemma 57 can be slightly generalised:

Lemma 58. *If $P =_{a,b} Q$, $\varphi =_{a,b} \psi$ then $\varphi_{P|a=b} = \psi_{Q|a=b}$.*

Proof: By Lemma 57 we only have to prove that if $R = S \mid a = b$ then $R \triangleright \varphi$ implies $R \triangleright \psi$, which is easy, since for each case there is a rule of Definition 30 that uses either a/b or b/a to replace one a with a b or vice versa. ■

Lemma 59. *If $P =_{a,b} Q$ then $(P \mid a = b) \sim_{bn} (Q \mid a = b)$.*

Proof: Let $\mathcal{R}$ be the corresponding relation, quantifying over every P and Q . We prove that $\mathcal{R}$ is a $\sim_{bn}$ -bisimulation:

- 1) invariance under arcs is trivial;
- 2) is implied by Lemma 57;
- 3) we use Lemma 58 to ensure the communication is possible (when $\mu = \tau$) or that the subject of μ can be related to the subject of the prefix (when $\mu \neq \tau$). The resulting processes are still related through $=_{a,b}$ since this relation commutes with $\equiv$ and contexts.

We conclude by symmetry of $=_{a,b}$. ■

Lemma 60. *If P and Q are prefix-free, and if their preorders coincide on free names, then $P \sim_{bn} Q$.*

Proof: The corresponding relation is a $\sim_{bn}$ -bisimulation: all condition checks are straightforward, even when we add arcs since Definition 30 is compositional: $\text{preor}(P \mid Q)$ only depends on $\text{preor}(P)$ and $\text{preor}(Q)$. ■

Lemma 61. *For every fusion process P if $\llbracket P \rrbracket \triangleright a \leq b$ or $\llbracket P \rrbracket \triangleright a \vee b$ then $\llbracket P \rrbracket \triangleright a = b$ and $P \equiv P \mid a = b$ (i.e. a and b are related through P 's fusions).*

Proof: First we prove that $\llbracket P \rrbracket \triangleright a \leq b$ implies $\llbracket P \rrbracket \triangleright b \leq a$ by induction on the derivation of the first judgement. The only interesting case is when we use an arc b/a : then we know that there is the other arc a/b next to b/a , so this is enough. We also know that this is coming from $a = b$ in the original process. Now if the hypothesis is about $a \vee b$ we know that there is a name u such that $a \leq u$ and $b \leq u$ and we use the first part of the proof to prove $u \leq a$ and $u \leq b$ which you can compose to get $a \leq b$ and $b \leq a$. ■

Statement of Theorem 22: *Suppose P and Q are processes of the fusion calculus.*

- 1) *If $P \equiv Q$ then $\llbracket P \rrbracket \sim_{bn} \llbracket Q \rrbracket$;*
- 2) *if $P \rightarrow_{EF} P'$ then $\llbracket P \rrbracket \rightarrow_{bn} \llbracket P' \rrbracket$;*
- 3) *conversely, if $\llbracket P \rrbracket \rightarrow_{bn} \llbracket Q \rrbracket$, then $Q \approx_{bn} \llbracket P' \rrbracket$ for some P' such that $P \rightarrow_{EF} P'$.*

Proof: 1) Thanks to Theorem 21, it is enough to prove $\llbracket P \rrbracket \sim_{bn} \llbracket Q \rrbracket$, which we do by induction on the derivation of $P \equiv Q$. The standard base cases like associativity are translated directly into structural congruent processes that are

therefore related through $\sim_{bn}$. The other base cases that those dedicated to fusions:

- $\llbracket a = b \mid P \rrbracket \sim_{bn} \llbracket a = b \mid P\{a/b\} \rrbracket$ by Lemma 59,
- $\llbracket a = b \mid b = c \rrbracket \sim_{bn} \llbracket a = c \mid b = c \rrbracket$ by Lemma 59,
- $\llbracket a = b \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket b = a \rrbracket$ by commutativity of $\mid$,
- $\llbracket a = a \rrbracket \sim_{bn} \llbracket 0 \rrbracket$ by Lemma 60,
- $\llbracket (\nu a)a = b \rrbracket \sim_{bn} \llbracket 0 \rrbracket$ by Lemma 60.

We conclude thanks to the fact that $\sim_{bn}$ is a congruence and an equivalence relation.

2) Thanks to 1) and the fact $\rightarrow_{bn}$ is stable by active contexts we only consider the base case of the reduction relation: $R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bar{a}b.P \mid ac.Q \rightarrow_{EF} b = c \mid P \mid Q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R'$. Since $\approx_{bn}$ is stable by $\equiv$ and active contexts, we just have to consider the following: $\llbracket R \rrbracket \rightarrow_{bn} (\nu wy)(b/c \mid w/y \mid wb. \llbracket P \rrbracket \mid \bar{y}\langle c \rangle. \llbracket Q \rrbracket)$ which has only one deterministic reduction to $\llbracket R' \rrbracket \mid (\nu wy)(w/y)$ which is strongly bisimilar to $\llbracket R' \rrbracket$ by Lemma 60.

3) In $\llbracket R \rrbracket$ the only visible prefixes $\pi.P$ are the form $\llbracket \pi'. P' \rrbracket$. Suppose that $\llbracket R \rrbracket \rightarrow_{bn} S$ comes from the communication between $\pi_1.P$ and $\pi_2.Q$ of subjects a and b . We know that $\llbracket R \rrbracket \triangleright a \vee b$ which means thanks to Lemma 61 that the communication is possible between $\pi'_1.P'$ and $\pi'_2.Q'$: for some $R', R \rightarrow_{EF} R'$. The process S is then one step away to create the next step and free arcs (corresponding to the encoding of the fusion just created) the continuations $\llbracket P' \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket Q' \rrbracket$ which places us into a situation similar to 2). ■

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Pierce and D. Sangiorgi, "Typing and subtyping for mobile processes," *Math. Str. in Comp. Sci.*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 409–453, 1996.
- [2] N. Kobayashi, "Type systems for concurrent programs," in *10th Anniversary Colloquium of UNU/IIST*, ser. LNCS, vol. 2757. Springer, 2003, pp. 439–453.
- [3] —, "A new type system for deadlock-free processes," in *CONCUR*, ser. LNCS, vol. 4137. Springer, 2006, pp. 233–247.
- [4] K. Honda, V. T. Vasconcelos, and M. Kubo, "Language primitives and type discipline for structured communication-based programming," in *ESOP*, ser. LNCS, vol. 1381. Springer, 1998, pp. 122–138.
- [5] D. Sangiorgi and D. Walker, *The Pi-Calculus: a theory of mobile processes*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [6] J. Parrow and B. Victor, "The fusion calculus: expressiveness and symmetry in mobile processes," in *LICS*. IEEE, 1998, pp. 176–185.
- [7] —, "The update calculus (extended abstract)," in *AMAST*, ser. LNCS, vol. 1349. Springer, 1997, pp. 409–423.
- [8] L. Wischik and P. Gardner, "Explicit fusions," *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 340, no. 3, pp. 606–630, 2005.
- [9] Y. Fu, "The χ -calculus," in *APDC*. IEEE Comp. Soc., 1997, pp. 74–81.
- [10] C. Laneve and B. Victor, "Solos in concert," *Math. Str. in Comp. Sci.*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 657–683, 2003.
- [11] P. Gardner and L. Wischik, "Explicit fusions," in *MFCS*, ser. LNCS, vol. 1893. Springer, 2000, pp. 373–382.
- [12] J. Parrow and B. Victor, "The tau-laws of fusion," in *CONCUR*, ser. LNCS, vol. 1466. Springer, 1998, pp. 99–114.
- [13] G. L. Ferrari, U. Montanari, E. Tuosto, B. Victor, and K. Yemane, "Modelling Fusion Calculus using HD-Automata," in *CALCO*, ser. LNCS, vol. 3629. Springer, 2005, pp. 142–156.
- [14] F. Bonchi, M. G. Buscemi, V. Ciancia, and F. Gadducci, "A presheaf environment for the explicit fusion calculus," *J. Autom. Reasoning*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 161–183, 2012.
- [15] M. Boreale, M. G. Buscemi, and U. Montanari, "A general name binding mechanism," in *TGC*, ser. LNCS, vol. 3705. Springer, 2005, pp. 61–74.
- [16] N. Kobayashi, B. Pierce, and D. Turner, "Linearity and the pi-calculus," *TOPLAS*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 914–947, 1999.
- [17] K. Honda and N. Yoshida, "On reduction-based process semantics," *Theor. Comp. Sci.*, vol. 152, no. 2, pp. 437–486, 1995.

- [18] R. De Nicola and M. Hennessy, "Testing equivalences for processes," *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 34, pp. 83–133, 1984.
- [19] D. Sangiorgi, "Pi-calculus, internal mobility, and agent-passing calculi," *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 167, no. 1&2, pp. 235–274, 1996.
- [20] M. Merro, "Locality in the pi-calculus and applications to distributed objects," Ph.D. dissertation, École des Mines, France, 2000.
- [21] J. Bengtson, M. Johansson, J. Parrow, and B. Victor, "Psi-calculi: Mobile processes, nominal data, and logic," in *LICS*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 39–48.
- [22] B. Victor, "The fusion calculus : Expressiveness and symmetry in mobile processes," Ph.D. thesis, Uppsala University, 1998.
- [23] Web appendix to this paper, available at <http://hal.inria.fr/hal-00818068>, 2013.
- [24] H. Hüttel, "Typed ψ -calculi," in *CONCUR*, ser. LNCS, vol. 6901. Springer, 2011, pp. 265–279.