

Composition of choreography automata

(TECHNICAL REPORT)

Franco Barbanera¹, Ivan Lanese², Emilio Tuosto³

¹ Dept. of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Catania (Italy)

² Focus Team, University of Bologna/INRIA (Italy)

³ Gran Sasso Science Institute (Italy)

Abstract. Coreography automata are an automata-based model of choreographies, that we show to be a compositional one. Choreography automata represent global views of choreographies (and rely on the well-known model of communicating finite-state machines to model local behaviours). The projections of well-formed global views are live as well as lock- and deadlock-free. In the class of choreography automata we define an internal operation of *composition*, which connects two global views via roles acting as interfaces. We show that under mild conditions the composition of well-formed choreography automata is well-formed. The composition operation enables for a flexible modular mechanism at the design level.


1 Introduction

Choreographic approaches to the modelling, analysis, and programming of message-passing applications abound. Several models based on behavioural types have been proposed to analyse properties such as liveness or deadlock-freedom (e.g., [33,18,12] and the survey [20] to mention but few) while other approaches have considered syntax-free models [35]. Abstract models have also been advocated to verify and debug choreographic specifications [23,2] using modelling languages such as BPMN [30]. At a programming level, choreographic programming has been explored in [25,28]. The ICT industrial sector is also starting to acknowledge the potential of choreographies [8,36].

A distinguished feature of choreographies is the coexistence of two distinct yet related views of a distributed system: the *global* and the *local* views. The former is an abstraction that yields a description of the system from a *holistic* point of view. A global view indeed describes the coordination necessary among the various components of the system “altogether”. In contrast, the local view of a choreography specifies the behaviour of the single components in “isolation”. In the so called top-down approach to choreographies, the local view can be derived by *projecting* the global one on each single component. This yields results that typically guarantee that the execution of the local components reflects the specification of the global one without spoiling communication soundness (e.g., deadlock freedom, liveness, etc.). These results do not hold in general and require to restrict to *well-formed* global views.

The composition of local views is simple. The local components just execute in parallel on a specific communication infrastructure. The situation is more complex for global views and, despite some attempts (cf. Section 6.1), the problem of composing global views of choreographies is still open.

This paper, after recalling the choreographic model proposed in [6], describes a proposal for the global views composition problem via a composition operation over *interfaces*. The modelling language of global views of [6] are *choreography automata* (c-automata for short), which are basically finite-state automata whose transitions are labelled with *interactions* expressing communications between some participants (also called roles). More precisely, an interaction $A \rightarrow B: m$ represents the fact that participant A sends message m to participant B and participant B receives it. For instance, consider the following c-automata



where the left-most c-automaton C_1 represents a system where A sends B message m once it receives a *tick* from an external “cron” service H . Participant A acknowledges the completion of the exchange with B by sending H message *tock*. The right-most c-automaton C_2 specifies that the cron service C repeatedly sends message *tick* and receives message *tock* from K .

Our model of *local views* are a variant of communicating systems [9] in which we adopt the synchronous semantics defined in [6].


For us, an *interface* is a designated role of a c-automaton representing behaviour “scattered in the environment”, namely provided by other c-automata. For instance, H is an interface of C_1 in (1) whereby we “delegate” the cron service; this outsourced behaviour is provided by another system in the execution environment of C_1 such as the c-automaton C_2 .

The composition of c-automata, say CA and CB , over their interfaces, say H for CA and K for CB , is the result of the combination of two operations:

- (i) the first operation is simply the product $CA \times CB$ of the two automata and
- (ii) the second operation is (*interface*) *blending*, namely the removal of the interfaces transforming participants H and K into “forwarders”.

More precisely, if the first transition t of two consecutive transitions in the product $CA \times CB$ has an interface role as the receiver of a message m and the second, say t' , the other interface role as sender of m , then t and t' are replaced with a transition where the sender of t and the receiver of t' exchange m . Any transition involving H or K that is not replaced is then removed.

Let us illustrate how to compose the c-automata in (1). The product of C_1 and C_2 and their blending on H and K are respectively the c-automata



where the dotted and the dashed transitions in the product automaton on the left form the consecutive transitions to blend because one interface participant receives a message and the other interface participant sends it.

As shown in this simple example, blending enables modular design of choreographies. We note that modularity can be attained also with other mechanisms. For instance, in the approach in [29] one can specify partial designs and then check that their combination enjoys properties of interest, without explicitly building a composed choreography. Another example is the use of refinement of global views as suggested in [14]. Choreography automata instead are equipped with an internal operation of composition that given two c-automata yields another one. Composition preserves the interesting behaviours of the components and guarantees communication soundness (liveness and deadlock freedom) of the resulting c-automaton under mild conditions. We argue that blending-based composition is more flexible an approach to modularity than other proposals; for instance, the result of the composition of two c-automata is another c-automaton that provides a global specification of the composition. Also, the blending operation allows one to “self-compose” a c-automaton and this corresponds to a sort of refinement operation where blending two roles H and K of a c-automaton amounts to consider them as “forwarders” that are then made implicit and removed. We will further demonstrate the flexibility of blending-based composition on a non-trivial working example where more systems can be composed together.

Structure & Contributions of the paper The basic notions used through the paper are surveyed in Section 2. Section 3 recalls c-automata and their projections; the former model is essentially borrowed from [6] and the latter are basically the communicating systems of [9]. Choreography automata yield a simple yet very expressive language for global views. Sections 4 and 5 report our main results.

Well-formedness The notion of well-formedness and its relations with the projection operation [6] are recalled in Section 4. The projection is correct (cf. Theorem 4.12), and guarantees liveness as well as lock- and deadlock-freedom (cf. Propositions 4.13, 4.15 and 4.17).

Composition The composition of c-automata is defined in Section 5 as a refinement of the product of c-automata through the blending operation. This operation is inspired by one of the composition approaches in [4,5]. The composition of arbitrary c-automata may not preserve well-formedness (and hence the behaviour at the local level).

Properties We identify a class of c-automata that, imposing mild conditions (cf. Definition 5.15) on interfaces, guarantees that our notion of composition preserves well-formedness (cf. Corollary 5.26). Moreover, interface blending ensures that the composition does not add new behaviours to the roles not in the interface (cf. Proposition 5.7) for all c-automata, while for *reflective* c-automata we can also prove that behaviours are preserved (cf. Theorem 5.12).

Compatibility Finally, the notion of *compatibility* of interfaces (cf. Definition 5.27, borrowed from [4]) is sufficient to establish reflectiveness (Theorem 5.29).

Besides being based on the well-known theory of formal languages, c-automata are also technically convenient as they allow us to reuse the rich theory of automata. Section 6 discusses these points more extensively together with other concluding remarks, related work, and future lines of research.

2 Preliminaries

We recall some basic notions of finite-state automata (FSAs). A *finite-state automaton* is a tuple $A = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}, \rightarrow, s_0 \rangle$ where

- \mathcal{S} is a finite set of states (ranged over by s, q, \dots),
- \mathcal{L} is a finite set of labels (ranged over by l, λ, \dots) and $\epsilon \notin \mathcal{L}$,
- $\rightarrow \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times (\mathcal{L} \cup \{\epsilon\}) \times \mathcal{S}$ is a set of transitions (where ϵ represents the empty word), and
- $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ is the initial state.

We use the usual notation \rightarrow^* for the reflexive and transitive closure of \rightarrow . The set of *reachable states* of A is $\mathcal{R}(A) = \{s \mid s_0 \rightarrow^* s\}$. For $t = (s_1, \lambda, s_2)$ we write $s_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} s_2$ and occasionally $t \in A$ when $t \in \rightarrow$.

Remark 2.1. Our definition of FSA omits the set of *accepting* states since we consider only FSAs where each state is accepting. We discuss this point further at the end of the paper. \diamond

We define on FSAs traces, trace equivalence, and bisimilarity.

Definition 2.2 (Trace equivalence). A run of an FSA $A = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}, \rightarrow, s_0 \rangle$ is a (possibly empty or infinite) sequence of consecutive transitions starting at s_0 . The trace (or word) w of a run $(s_{i-1} \xrightarrow{\lambda_{i-1}} s_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ is⁴ obtained by concatenating

⁴ Assume $n = \infty$ if the run is infinite.

the labels of the run, namely $w = \lambda_0 \cdot \lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_n$; if the run is empty then $w = \epsilon$. The language of A , written $\mathcal{L}(A)$, is the set of traces of A . Two FSAs A and B are trace equivalent iff $\mathcal{L}(A) = \mathcal{L}(B)$. We say that A accepts w from s if $w \in \mathcal{L}(\langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}, \rightarrow, s \rangle)$.

Since we have to deal with possibly infinite traces, it is natural to use *coinduction* as the main logical tool. We recall the notion of bisimulation.

Definition 2.3 (Bisimilarity). A bisimulation on two FSAs $A = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}, \rightarrow, s_0 \rangle$ and $A' = \langle \mathcal{S}', \mathcal{L}', \rightarrow', s'_0 \rangle$ is a relation $R \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}'$ such that if $(s, s') \in R$ then

- if $s \xrightarrow{\lambda} s_1$ then $s' \xrightarrow{\lambda} s'_1$ and $(s_1, s'_1) \in R$,
- if $s' \xrightarrow{\lambda} s'_1$ then $s \xrightarrow{\lambda} s_1$ and $(s_1, s'_1) \in R$.

Bisimilarity is the largest bisimulation.

Recall that trace equivalence and bisimulation equivalence coincide on deterministic labelled transition systems (see e.g., [16, Theorem 2.3.12]).

In this paper we adopt communicating finite-state machines (CFSMs) [9] to model the local behaviour of distributed components. The following definitions are borrowed from [9] and adapted to our context.

Let \mathcal{P} be a set of *participants* (or *roles*, ranged over by A, B , etc.) and \mathcal{M} a set of *messages* (ranged over by m, x , etc.). We take \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{M} disjoint.

Definition 2.4 (Communicating system). A communicating finite-state machine (CFSM) is an FSA M on the set

$$\mathcal{L}_{act} = \{AB!m, AB?m \mid A, B \in \mathcal{P}, m \in \mathcal{M}\}$$

of actions. The subject of an output (resp. input) action $AB!m$ (resp. $AB?m$) is A (resp. B). Machine M is A -local if all its transitions have subject A .

A (communicating) system is a map $S = (M_A)_{A \in \mathcal{P}}$ assigning a A -local CFSM M_A to each participant $A \in \mathcal{P}$.

We consider the synchronous semantics for communicating systems as a transition system labelled in a set of *interactions*

$$\mathcal{L}_{int} = \{A \rightarrow B : m \mid A \neq B \in \mathcal{P}, m \in \mathcal{M}\}$$

defined as follows.

Definition 2.5 (Synchronous semantics). Let $S = (M_A)_{A \in \mathcal{P}}$ be a communicating system where $M_A = \langle \mathcal{S}_A, \mathcal{L}_{act}, \rightarrow_A, q_{0A} \rangle$ for each participant $A \in \mathcal{P}$. A (synchronous) configuration for S is a map $\vec{q} = (q_A)_{A \in \mathcal{P}}$ assigning a local state $q_A \in \mathcal{S}_A$ to each participant $A \in \mathcal{P}$. We denote q_A with $\vec{q}(A)$.

The (synchronous) semantics of S is the transition system $\llbracket S \rrbracket = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}_{int}, \rightarrow, \vec{q}_0 \rangle$ defined as follows

- \mathcal{S} is the set of synchronous configurations and $\vec{q}_0 = (q_{0A})_{A \in \mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{S}$ is the initial configuration
- $\vec{q}_1 \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow B : m} \vec{q}_2 \in \rightarrow$ if

- $\vec{q}_1(\mathbf{A}) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}!m} \vec{q}_2(\mathbf{A})$ and $\vec{q}_1(\mathbf{B}) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}?m} \vec{q}_2(\mathbf{B})$, and
- for all $\mathbf{C} \neq \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$, $\vec{q}_1(\mathbf{C}) = \vec{q}_2(\mathbf{C})$

In this case, we say that $\vec{q}_1(\mathbf{A}) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}!m} \vec{q}_2(\mathbf{A})$ and $\vec{q}_1(\mathbf{B}) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}?m} \vec{q}_2(\mathbf{B})$ are component transitions of $\vec{q}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}: m} \vec{q}_2$.

- $\vec{q}_1 \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \vec{q}_2 \in \rightarrow$ if $\vec{q}_1(\mathbf{A}) \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \vec{q}_2(\mathbf{A})$, and for all $\mathbf{B} \neq \mathbf{A}$, $\vec{q}_1(\mathbf{B}) = \vec{q}_2(\mathbf{B})$

If $\vec{q}_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} \vec{q}_2$, we say that \vec{q}_2 is (synchronously) reachable from the configuration \vec{q}_1 by firing the transition α .

3 Choreography Automata

We introduce *choreography automata* (c-automata) as an expressive and flexible model of global specifications, following the styles of choreographies [10,21,30], global graphs [35] and multiparty session types [17,19]. As customary in choreographic frameworks, we show how to project c-automata on local specifications. As anticipated, our projections yield CFSMs formalising the local behaviour of the participants of a choreography.

C-automata (ranged over by CA, CB, etc.) are FSAs with labels in \mathcal{L}_{int} .

Definition 3.1 (Choreography automata). A choreography automaton (*c-automaton*) is an ϵ -free FSA on the alphabet \mathcal{L}_{int} . Elements of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}^*$ are choreography words, subsets of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}^*$ are choreography languages.

Admitting ϵ -transitions in c-automata would force us to deal with specifications where participants may take inconsistent decisions. For instance, consider the following patterns



At state q , \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} should locally decide which message to exchange; for instance, \mathbf{A} may decide for message \mathbf{m} while \mathbf{B} may choose for message \mathbf{n} leading to miscommunications. Note that we still admit non-determinism in c-automata.

Example 3.2 (Working Example). We consider a publication system S_P and a validation system S_V in combination with a cron system S_C (alike the one in Section 1). The c-automata CC, CP, and CV in Fig. 1 formalise the overall behaviour of S_C , S_P , and S_V , respectively.

System S_C is composed of participants \mathbf{R} , \mathbf{D} , \mathbf{S} , and \mathbf{F} ; it repeatedly ticks \mathbf{D} to execute some tasks; before starting, \mathbf{D} informs \mathbf{S} on the number of tasks, and \mathbf{F} informs \mathbf{R} with message `tock` that the tasks are completed.

System S_V is composed of participants \mathbf{C} , \mathbf{Q} , \mathbf{H} , and \mathbf{I} as follows.

1. Participant \mathbf{H} repeatedly checks if texts received from \mathbf{Q} can be accepted or not, accordingly informing \mathbf{Q} by means of messages `ack` or `nack`;




Fig. 1. Three sample c-automata

- refusal (**nack**): **Q** sends the text to participant **I** which modifies it and sends it back to **Q** for resubmission to **H**;
 - acceptance (**ack**): **Q** informs **I** that her help is not needed.
2. Each cycle of the above protocol can start only when **Q** does receive a **tick** message from participant **C**.

System S_P is composed of participants **A**, **B**, **K**, and **E** as follows.

1. Participant **K** repeatedly sends text messages to, alternately, participants **A** and **B** (starting with **A**), who can accept or refuse the texts, sending back a message **ack** or **nack**, respectively;
 - in case of acceptance (**ack**): the participant who received the text sends the message **go** to the other receiver in order to inform her that it is her turn to get a text message from **K**;
 - in case of refusal (**nack**): the participant who received the text, say **A**, sends an **alt** to the other receiver **B** in order to inform her that it is not her turn yet to get a text message from **K**, since **A** will keep on receiving texts from **K** until one is accepted;
2. Participants **A** and **B** inform participant **E**, by means of a message **tock**, that one of their cycles has been completed. \diamond

Given a c-automaton, our projection operation builds the corresponding communicating system consisting of the set of projections of the c-automaton on each participant, which yields a CFSM.

Definition 3.3 (Projection). The projection on A of a transition $t = s \xrightarrow{\alpha} s'$ of a c -automaton, written $t \downarrow_A$, is defined by:

$$t \downarrow_A = \begin{cases} s \xrightarrow{A C!m} s' & \text{if } \alpha = B \rightarrow C: m \wedge B = A \\ s \xrightarrow{B A?m} s' & \text{if } \alpha = B \rightarrow C: m \wedge C = A \\ s \xrightarrow{\epsilon} s' & \text{if } \alpha = B \rightarrow C: m \wedge B, C \neq A \\ s \xrightarrow{\epsilon} s' & \text{if } \alpha = \epsilon \end{cases}$$

The projection of a c -automaton $CA = \langle S, \mathcal{L}_{int}, \rightarrow, s_0 \rangle$ on a participant $A \in \mathcal{P}$, denoted $CA \downarrow_A$, is obtained by minimising up-to-language equivalence the intermediate automaton

$$A_A = \langle S, \mathcal{L}_{act}, \{ s \xrightarrow{t \downarrow_A} s' \mid s \xrightarrow{t} s' \in \rightarrow \}, s_0 \rangle$$

The projection of CA , written $CA \downarrow$, is the communicating system $(CA \downarrow_A)_{A \in \mathcal{P}}$.

Remark 3.4. The projection with respect to A of a c -automaton is A -local. \diamond


Notably, minimisation also removes ϵ -transitions. For technical reasons, we assume the process of minimisation to be performed through the partition refinement algorithm [31]. In fact, to establish the correspondence between runs of a c -automaton and the ones of its blending (e.g., c.f Theorem 5.12) we need to map the states of the former on the states of the latter. This correspondence is immediate in the partition refinement algorithm (a state of the c -automaton corresponds to the equivalence class containing it in the minimised automaton). Our results do not depend on the use of the partition refinement algorithm, however, adopting a different algorithm might require to explicitly track this correspondence. Therefore, given $CA = \langle S, \mathcal{L}_{int}, \rightarrow, s_0 \rangle$ and $A \in \mathcal{P}$, the states of $CA \downarrow_A$, as well as the components of $\llbracket CA \downarrow \rrbracket$, are subsets of S .

Besides, by construction, we have

Fact 1. Let $CA = \langle S, \mathcal{L}, \rightarrow, s_0 \rangle$ be a c -automaton.

- i) Given $s \in \mathcal{R}(CA)$, there is a unique configuration $\vec{q} \in \mathcal{R}(\llbracket CA \downarrow \rrbracket)$ such that $s \in \vec{q}(A)$ for each $A \in \mathcal{P}$.
- ii) For any configuration $\vec{q} \in \mathcal{R}(\llbracket CA \downarrow \rrbracket)$, there exists $s \in \mathcal{R}(CA)$ such that for each $A \in \mathcal{P}$ we have $s \in \vec{q}(A)$.

Example 3.5 (Working example: projections). The projections of C are



Note that the states are subsets of states of CC due to minimisation and that all projections do not have ϵ -transitions. \diamond

The projection operation is well-behaved with respect to trace equivalence.

Proposition 3.6. *If CA and CA' are trace-equivalent c-automata then $CA \downarrow_A = CA' \downarrow_A$ for each participant $A \in \mathcal{P}$.*

Proof. Let us consider the intermediate automata A_A and $A_{A'}$ in the projection of CA and CA' , respectively. If A_A and $A_{A'}$ are trace-equivalent then their minimal automaton up to trace equivalence is of course the same. We have to show that A_A and $A_{A'}$ are trace equivalent. Take a word w_A in the language of A_A . It is obtained from some computation that accepts a word w_{CA} in CA . By trace equivalence, the same word is accepted in CA' . Executing the computation generating it in $A_{A'}$ will produce w_A . This proves the thesis. \square

Thanks to the result above, without loss of generality, we can assume that c-automata are minimal up-to language equivalence (in particular, they do not have ϵ -transitions and they are deterministic).

The following proposition relates the language of the projection with the language of the original automaton.

Proposition 3.7. *For all c-automata CA and $A \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{L}(CA \downarrow_A) = \mathcal{L}(CA) \downarrow_A$.*

Proof. Let A_A be the intermediate automaton built in the first step in the projection of CA on A . We have

$$\mathcal{L}(CA \downarrow_A) = \mathcal{L}(A_A) = \mathcal{L}(CA) \downarrow_A$$

where the first equality follows since $CA \downarrow_A$ and A_A are trace-equivalent by definition, and the second equality follows since A_A is obtained transition per transition by projecting the labels of CA on A . \square

4 Well-formed Choreography Automata


In order to ensure that the projection of a c-automaton on a communicating system is well-behaved we require some conditions on the c-automaton. We first define the notion of concurrent transitions.

Definition 4.1 (Concurrent transitions). *Let $CA = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}, \rightarrow, s_0 \rangle$. Two transitions $s \xrightarrow{l_1} s_1$ and $s \xrightarrow{l_2} s_2$ are concurrent iff there is a state $s_3 \in \mathcal{S}$ and transitions $s_1 \xrightarrow{l_2} s_3$ and $s_2 \xrightarrow{l_1} s_3$.*

We can now define the key notion of well-branchedness, which intuitively states that each participant is aware of “what it needs to do in the current state”. In other words, each participant is aware of choices made by others when its behaviour depends on those choices. The awareness of choice is checked on *spans*, namely runs that may constitute alternative branches of choices. Spans are formalised as follows.

Definition 4.2 (*s*-span). Given a state s of a c -automaton CA , a pair of runs (π_1, π_2) is an s -span if π_1 and π_2 are coinitial at s , transition-disjoint, acyclic, and either π_1 and π_2 are cofinal otherwise they are both maximal in CA and share only the state s .

Example 4.3 (Working example: spans). In the c -automaton CV the only state with spans is state 2. The unique 2-span is (π, π') where



Indeed, π and π' are coinitial, cofinal, acyclic, and transition disjoint. Note that any other pair of paths from 2 is not a 2-span since the transition from 0 to 1 of CV would make the paths non-cofinal and either make the paths non transition-disjoint or have the state 0 on both paths. \diamond

Intuitively, a choice is well-branched when it has a determined selector, and the other participants either behave uniformly in each branch, or can ascertain which branch has been chosen from the messages they receive.

Definition 4.4 (Well-branchedness). A c -automaton CA is well-branched if for each state s in CA and participant $B \in \mathcal{P}$ sender in a transition from s :

- (1) all transitions from s involving B , have sender B and pairwise distinct labels;
- (2) for each transition t from s whose sender is not B and each transition t' from s whose sender is B , t and t' are concurrent
- (3) for each participant $A \neq B \in \mathcal{P}$ and s -span (π_1, π_2) , the first pair of different actions in $\pi_1 \downarrow_A$ and $\pi_2 \downarrow_A$ (if any) is of the form $(CA?m, DA?n)$ with $C \neq D$ or $m \neq n$.

We dub B a selector at s .

Example 4.5 (Working example: well-branchedness). In CV all the states satisfy the conditions of Definition 4.4; the only non-trivial case is state 2. Condition (1) holds for H , which is the selector of the choice at 2; condition (2) holds vacuously, and condition (3) holds for both Q and I in the unique 2-span (π, π') , described in Example 4.3. Indeed, the first actions of Q on π and π' are the input from H which have different messages; likewise, the first actions of I on π and π' are the inputs from Q , which have different messages as well. \diamond

Condition (2), vacuously true in the example, is needed when multiple participants act as sender in the same state: this ensures that the only possibility is that actions of different participants are concurrent so that possible choices at a state are not affected by independent behaviour.

We also rule out c -automata having consecutive transitions involving disjoint participants and not independent of each other.

Definition 4.6 (Well-sequencedness). A c -automaton CA is well-sequenced if each pair of consecutive transitions $s \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow B: m} s' \xrightarrow{C \rightarrow D: n} s''$ either

- share a participant, that is $\{A, B\} \cap \{C, D\} \neq \emptyset$, or
- are part of a diamond, i.e. there is s''' such that $s \xrightarrow{C \rightarrow D: n} s''' \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow B: m} s''$.


Notation. For the sake of readability, a well-sequenced c-automaton CA can be represented by omitting, for each diamond, two of its consecutive transitions. We call such representation *compact*. Notice that, given a compact representation, it is always possible to recover the original c-automaton. So far and hereafter we assume that all c-automata are compactly represented.

Example 4.7 (Working example). Both CV and CP are well-sequenced because they enjoy the first condition of Definition 4.6. Instead, the participants on the transitions from 1 to 2 and from 2 to 0 in CC are disjoint; in fact, we assume CC to be compactly represented. \diamond


Well-sequencedness is necessary to establish a precise correspondence between the language of a c-automaton and its corresponding communicating system (cf. Theorem 4.12) as well as to ensure the applicability of the blending operation (and hence systems composition to work).

Definition 4.8 (Well-formedness). A c-automaton is well-formed if it is both well-branched and well-sequenced.


Remark 4.9. Not any c-automaton can be “completed” to a well-sequenced automaton, as shown by the following example. Let us consider the following c-automaton




The above c-automaton is not well sequenced because of the transitions 0 – 1 and 1 – 2. So we complete the diamond.



The resulting automaton is still not well-sequenced, because of the transitions 3 – 2 and 2 – 0. So we complete the diamond.



The resulting automaton is still not well-sequenced, because of the transitions $4 - 0$ and $0 - 3$. So we complete the diamond.



The resulting automaton is still not well-sequenced, because of the transitions $5 - 3$ and $3 - 4$. So we complete the diamond.... And we can go on forever.

The impossibility to complete the initial c -automaton depends on the fact that the intended completed automaton should generate a non regular language (since we should generate strings with a number of $C \rightarrow D: c$ interaction which is, roughly, double of the number of $A \rightarrow B: a$ interactions. It would hence be interesting to know whether, in case the expected completed interaction language of a c -automaton is regular and prefix-closed, it is possible to generate it also by means of a well-formed c - automaton. It would be also interesting to know whether a condition can be given on cycles such that the completion of a c -automaton is possible. \diamond

4.1 Languages and well-formedness

We show a closure property of the language of well-sequenced c -automata.

Definition 4.10 (Commutation of independent interactions). *Two choreography words w and w' are equal up-to-commutation of independent interactions, written $w \sim w'$, if one can be obtained from the other by repeatedly swapping consecutive interactions with disjoint sets of participants.*

Given a choreography language L


$$\text{close}(L) = \{ w \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} \mid \exists w' \in L. w \sim w' \}$$

is the closure under commutation of independent interactions of L .

Proposition 4.11. *Let CA be a well-sequenced c-automaton. Then $\mathcal{L}(\text{CA})$ is closed under commutation of independent actions, i.e. $\mathcal{L}(\text{CA}) = \text{close}(\mathcal{L}(\text{CA}))$.*

Proof. Let us assume $\mathcal{L}(\text{CA}) \neq \text{close}(\mathcal{L}(\text{CA}))$. Clearly, $\mathcal{L}(\text{CA}) \subseteq \text{close}(\mathcal{L}(\text{CA}))$. Then there exist $w' \in \text{close}(\mathcal{L}(\text{CA}))$ such that $w' \notin \mathcal{L}(\text{CA})$. By definition of closure, there is $w \in \mathcal{L}(\text{CA})$ such that $w \sim w'$. By definition of \sim , there exist two choreographic words w_1 and w_2 such that $w \sim w_1 \cdot (\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}: \mathbf{b}) \cdot (\mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}: \mathbf{c}) \cdot w_2 \in \mathcal{L}(\text{CA})$ and $w_1 \cdot (\mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}: \mathbf{c}) \cdot (\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}: \mathbf{b}) \cdot w_2 \notin \mathcal{L}(\text{CA})$, where $\{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}\} \cap \{\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}\} = \emptyset$. This implies that CA is not well-sequenced. In fact, if that were not the case, let s and s' be the states of CA from which the subwords $(\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}: \mathbf{b}) \cdot (\mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}: \mathbf{c})$ and w_2 are, respectively, generated. By well-sequencedness, there is also a path from s to s' generating $(\mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}: \mathbf{c}) \cdot (\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}: \mathbf{b})$, so implying that $w_1 \cdot (\mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}: \mathbf{c}) \cdot (\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}: \mathbf{b}) \cdot w_2 \in \mathcal{L}(\text{CA})$, which is a contradiction. \square

Notice that the converse of the above proposition does not hold without the assumption of implicit diamonds. In fact, consider the following c-automaton



we can check that $\mathcal{L}(\text{CA}) = \text{close}(\mathcal{L}(\text{CA}))$ but CA is not well-sequenced.

The next result establishes that the language of a well-formed c-automaton coincides with the language of the communicating system made of its projection. This provides a correctness criterion for our projection operation. The proof requires to reason coinductively to account for possibly infinite runs. In particular, we adopt the coinduction style advocated in [22] which, without any loss of formal rigour, promotes readability and conciseness.

Theorem 4.12. *If CA is a well-formed c-automaton then $\mathcal{L}(\llbracket \text{CA} \downarrow \rrbracket) = \mathcal{L}(\text{CA})$.*

Proof. We first show that $\mathcal{L}(\text{CA}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\llbracket \text{CA} \downarrow \rrbracket)$.

Let us take a trace $\sigma \in \mathcal{L}(\text{CA})$. We need to show that $\sigma \in \mathcal{L}(\llbracket \text{CA} \downarrow \rrbracket)$. We shall actually prove a stronger thesis:

if CA accepts σ starting from a state s , then $\llbracket \text{CA} \downarrow \rrbracket$ accepts σ starting from the unique (by Fact 1(i)) state $\vec{q} = (q_{\mathbf{A}})_{\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{P}}$ such that for each $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{P}$ we have $s \in \vec{q}(\mathbf{A})$.

The proof is by coinduction. If σ is empty, there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, let σ be $(\mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}: \mathbf{m}) \cdot \sigma'$, where $\mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}: \mathbf{m}$ is accepted through a transition $s \xrightarrow{\mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}: \mathbf{m}} s'$ and where σ' is accepted by CA starting from s' .

Consider now the intermediate automata built in the first step of the projection of CA (Definition 3.3). By construction, $s \xrightarrow{\text{BC!m}} s'$ in A_B , $s \xrightarrow{\text{BC?m}} s'$ in A_C and $s \xrightarrow{\epsilon} s'$ in A_D for each $D \neq B, C$. By coinduction, σ' is accepted by $\llbracket \text{CA} \downarrow \rrbracket$ starting from the unique state $\vec{q}' = (q'_A)_{A \in \mathcal{P}}$ such that for each $A \in \mathcal{P}$ we have $s' \in \vec{q}'(A)$. Hence, by definition of minimization and by definition of $\llbracket \text{CA} \downarrow \rrbracket$, we get that $\llbracket \text{CA} \downarrow \rrbracket$ accepts σ starting from the state $\vec{q} = (q_A)_{A \in \mathcal{P}}$ such that for each $A \in \mathcal{P}$ we have $s \in \vec{q}(A)$.

We now show that $\mathcal{L}(\llbracket \text{CA} \downarrow \rrbracket) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\text{CA})$. As before, we consider a stronger thesis:

if $\llbracket \text{CA} \downarrow \rrbracket$ accepts σ starting from a state $\vec{q} = (q_A)_{A \in \mathcal{P}}$, then CA accepts σ starting from any state s such that for each $A \in \mathcal{P}$ we have $s \in \vec{q}(A)$.

The thesis will follow since by definition of synchronous semantics $s_0 \in \vec{q}_0(A)$ for each $A \in \mathcal{P}$.

The proof is by coinduction. If σ is empty, there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, let σ be $(B \rightarrow C : m) \cdot \sigma'$, where $B \rightarrow C : m$ is accepted by a transition $\vec{q} \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow C : m} \vec{q}'$. Hence, by definition of synchronous semantics, there are transitions $\vec{q}(\text{B}) \xrightarrow{\text{BC!m}} \vec{q}'(\text{B})$ and $\vec{q}(\text{C}) \xrightarrow{\text{BC?m}} \vec{q}'(\text{C})$. Moreover, $\vec{q}(D) = \vec{q}'(D)$ for each $D \neq B, C$.

Let now s be any state such that for each $A \in \mathcal{P}$ we have $s \in \vec{q}(A)$ (by Fact 1(ii)). Hence, in the intermediate automata built in the first step of the projection of CA (Definition 3.3), by definition of minimization up-to language equivalence, we have

$$s \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \dots \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \hat{s}_B \xrightarrow{\text{BC!m}} s'_B \text{ in } A_B \text{ and } s \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \dots \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \hat{s}_C \xrightarrow{\text{BC?m}} s'_C \text{ in } A_C. \quad (2)$$

The two transitions $\hat{s}_B \xrightarrow{\text{BC!m}} s'_B$ and $\hat{s}_C \xrightarrow{\text{BC?m}} s'_C$ may be both obtained from the projection of the same transition of CA or not. Let us consider the two cases separately.

$\hat{s}_B \xrightarrow{\text{BC!m}} s'_B$ and $\hat{s}_C \xrightarrow{\text{BC?m}} s'_C$ are both obtained from the projection of some transition $t : \hat{s} \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow C : m} s'$ of CA, with $\hat{s} = \hat{s}_B = \hat{s}_C$ and $s' = s'_B = s'_C$.

In a such a case we will show that t is enabled in s , that is t is of the form $s \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow C : m} s'$, with $s' = s'_B = s'_C$. By contradiction, let us assume that not to be the case, and let π_1 be one of the runs with minimal length $n > 0$ from s to a state \hat{s} such that $\hat{s} \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow C : m} s'$. Let us call t' the last transition in π_1 . By well-sequencedness (Definition 4.6) t' involves either B or C , or it is concurrent to t .

- If t' is concurrent with t , then there is a transition with label $B \rightarrow C : m$ coinitial with t' . This implies the existence of a run shorter than π_1 , which was assumed to be minimal, and hence a contradiction.
- If t' is not concurrent with t , then t' should involve either B or C . Let us assume it to involve B but not C , the other cases are analogous. By (2),

we know that there is a run $s \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \dots \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \hat{s}_B$ in A_B and a run $s \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \dots \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \hat{s}_C$ in A_C both with all labels ϵ and such that $\hat{s}(= \hat{s}_B = \hat{s}_C)$ enables t in CA . Because of the projection on B , there exists a run π_2 , in CA , not involving B . We can assume that the last transition of π_2 is not concurrent to t , as above. Thus, thanks to well-sequencedness, it necessarily ends with a transition involving C . We can also assume π_2 to have minimal length. Note that π_1 and π_2 are coinitial, cofinal, and different since one contains transitions involving B but not C and the other one contains transitions involving C but not B . Since we assumed that they are minimal they are also acyclic. By removing common transitions and selecting any of the remaining run fragments π'_1 of π_1 involving B and the corresponding fragment π'_2 of π_2 (which does not involve B) we obtain runs which are coinitial, cofinal, acyclic and transition disjoint. By construction, $\pi'_1 \downarrow_B$ and $\pi'_2 \downarrow_B$ accept different words (since the second is empty while the first is not) and the first pair of different characters is not an input for B in both the cases (since in π'_2 no such character exists). However, this contradicts well-branchedness hence this case can never happen.

Thus, there is a transition $s \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow C: m} s'$ in CA . The state s' is such that $s' \in \bar{q}'(A)$ for each $A \in \mathcal{P}$, thanks to the properties of s and of the definition of synchronous semantics. By coinduction, this state accepts σ' , and the thesis follows.

$\hat{s}_B \xrightarrow{B \downarrow C: m} \hat{s}'_B$ and $\hat{s}_C \xrightarrow{B \downarrow C: m} \hat{s}'_C$ are obtained by projecting two different transitions t_1 and t_2 in CA with the same label $B \rightarrow C: m$.

Since CA s are deterministic (Definition 3.1), there are two different runs π_1 and π_2 in CA , the former ending with t_1 and the latter ending with t_2 . We consider now two possible subcases.

- If $\pi_1 \downarrow_B = \pi_2 \downarrow_B$ and $\pi_1 \downarrow_C = \pi_2 \downarrow_C$,
then the two runs project to the same run in $CA \downarrow_B$ and $CA \downarrow_C$. As a result, any of the two transitions can be used to answer the challenge, and the thesis follows by coinduction as above.
- If instead the projections on either B or C are different,
then we can remove common transitions and cycles and select any of the pairs of run fragments (which are coinitial, transition disjoint and acyclic) highlighting the difference in the projection. If they are not the final fragments, then they are also cofinal, otherwise we can extend them till they become cofinal or both maximal. By well-branchedness the first action involving the role on which the projections differ should be an input on both the runs, and the two inputs should be different. If the projection is different on B , since we assumed that $B \rightarrow C: m$ is the first action involving B , then we have a contradiction (since it is an output). If the projection is different on C , then $B \rightarrow C: m$ is the first action involving C , and it is the same on both runs, against the hypothesis that the two projections on C were different.

Anyway, this case cannot happen. □

4.2 Communication soundness and well-formedness

In this section we show that the projection of well-formed choreography automata enjoys relevant correctness properties.

The projection of a well-formed c-automaton is live [33]: if there is a participant willing to take a transition, there is a computation executing such transition.

Proposition 4.13 (Liveness). *Let CA be a well-formed c-automaton. For each $\vec{q} \in \mathcal{R}(\llbracket CA \downarrow \rrbracket)$, if there is $A \in \mathcal{P}$ with an outgoing transition t from $\vec{q}(A)$ in $CA \downarrow_A$, then there exists a run of $\llbracket CA \downarrow \rrbracket$ including a transition which has t as component transition.*

Proof. Since \vec{q} is reachable, there is a run to \vec{q} producing some word w . Consider the unique state q_s of CA such that $q_s \in \vec{q}(A)$ for each $A \in \mathcal{P}$. The c-automaton CA_s obtained from CA by setting q_s as initial state is well-formed. Now, assume there exists A such that $\vec{q}(A)$ has an outgoing transition t . Thanks to the definition of projection, there is a transition t' in CA_s involving A and another participant, say B . Such a transition is on a run with word w' . A run with word w' exists also in $\llbracket CA \downarrow \rrbracket$ thanks to Theorem 4.12, it goes through \vec{q} , since the state reached is fully determined by the label (since participants are deterministic), and it executes t as desired. This proves the thesis. \square

Proposition 4.15 below shows that the projection of a well-formed c-automaton is lock-free [19], namely that enabled transitions of a participant are sooner or later fired. We formalise locks first. (Recall that the transitions of projected CFSMs are minimal up-to language equivalence and hence deterministic.)

Definition 4.14 (Lock). *Let CA be a c-automaton. A state $\vec{q} \in \mathcal{R}(\llbracket CA \downarrow \rrbracket)$ is a lock if there is $A \in \mathcal{P}$ with an outgoing transition t from $\vec{q}(A)$ in $CA \downarrow_A$, yet in all runs of $\llbracket CA \downarrow \rrbracket$ starting from \vec{q} there is no transition t' involving A .*

Proposition 4.15 (Lock freedom). *Let CA be a well-formed c-automaton. For each $\vec{q} \in \mathcal{R}(\llbracket CA \downarrow \rrbracket)$, \vec{q} is not a lock.*

Proof. Since \vec{q} is reachable, there is a run to \vec{q} producing some word w . Consider the unique state q_s of CA such that $q_s \in \vec{q}(A)$ for each $A \in \mathcal{P}$. The c-automaton CA_s obtained from CA by setting q_s as initial state is well-formed. Now, assume there exists A such that $\vec{q}(A)$ has an outgoing transition t . Thanks to the definition of projection, there is a transition t' in CA_s involving A and another participant, say B . Transition t' is on a run with word w' in CA_s , and thanks to Theorem 4.12 also in $\llbracket CA_s \downarrow \rrbracket$. We have to show that each run in $\llbracket CA_s \downarrow \rrbracket$ has a transition involving A . This will imply the thesis.

Assume towards a contradiction that there is a run not involving A . Such a run and the one including t' are coinital. By removing common transitions they can be made transition disjoint, and by removing cycles they can also be taken cycle free. Thanks to well-branchedness, since one of the two paths contains a transition with A , the other one also need to include a transition with A , against the hypothesis. This proves the thesis. \square

Interestingly, Proposition 4.15 does not require any notion of fairness like in frameworks that syntactically constrain loops (eg., in behavioural types loops do not have continuations). Instead, look-freedom requires some notion of fairness in frameworks admitting continuations after loops (eg., [35]). In our case, fairness is not required since well-branchdness imposes that each participant involved in a continuation after a loop should also be involved within the loop.

The next proposition shows that the projections of a well-formed c-automaton form a deadlock-free communicating system. We first define *deadlock* configurations as those of communicating systems with no outgoing transitions, yet with at least one component willing to take a transition. Definition 4.16 adapts the ones in [26,35] to a synchronous setting.

Definition 4.16 (Deadlock). *A state $\vec{q} \in \mathcal{R}(S)$ reachable in a communicating system $S = (M_A)_{A \in \mathcal{P}}$ is a deadlock if \vec{q} has no outgoing transitions, yet there exists $A \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\vec{q}(A)$ has an outgoing transition in the CFSM of $S(A) = M_A$.*

Proposition 4.17 (Deadlock freedom). *If CA is a well-formed c-automaton and $\vec{q} \in \mathcal{R}(\llbracket CA \downarrow \rrbracket)$, \vec{q} is not a deadlock.*

Proof. We prove the contrapositive. If participant $A \in \mathcal{P}$ has an outgoing transition t from $\vec{q}(A)$ in $CA \downarrow_A$, then (Proposition 4.15) there is a run involving \vec{q} where a transition $\vec{q}(A)$ is fired. \square

5 Composition of Choreography Automata

In this section we study how to compose two or more (well-formed) c-automata into a single c-automaton. Composition is obtained by means of two operations:

1. the product of c-automata, building a c-automaton corresponding to the concurrent execution of the two original c-automata;
2. a *blending* operation that, given two roles of a c-automaton, removes them and adjusts the c-automaton as if they became two “coupled” forwarders.

For instance, blending H and K removes participants H and K and sends each message m originally sent to H to whoever K used to send m , and vice versa.

5.1 The blending algorithm

We present and discuss the blending operation, which will then be used for defining c-automata composition. We start by giving an informal algorithmic presentation of the blending operation on two roles H and K in a given c-automaton. (A more formal presentation of the algorithm is in Appendix A.2.)

THE (INFORMAL) BLENDING ALGORITHM

Input: a c-automaton and two roles, H and K .

Output: a c-automaton.

begin

- I) each transition with $p \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow H: m} q$ (resp. $p \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow K: m} q$) is removed, and for each transition $q \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow B: m} r$ (resp. $q \xrightarrow{H \rightarrow B: m} r$) a transition $p \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow B: m} r$ (resp. $p \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow B: m} r$) is added provided that $A \neq B$; if $A = B$ the blending is not defined;
- II) transitions involving neither H nor K are preserved, whereas all other transitions are removed;
- III) states and transitions unreachable from the initial state are removed.

end

Notice how the blending operation can be interpreted as a sort of “self-composition” of a single system. It is worth remarking that self-composition is a relevant operation per-se; it can be used, for instance, to get rid of two participants H and K by transforming them into a “hidden” bidirectional forwarder, letting their partners in the interaction to communicate directly. Of course, blending H and K could cause the overall behaviour of the system to drastically change, unless some conditions are satisfied (see the notion of reflectiveness in Definition 5.10 and Theorem 5.12). Conditions essentially require that if a message is forwarded from H to K then K expects it, and vice versa.

Remark 5.1. The blending operation can be performed in time $O(n^2)$ where n is the number of transitions in the c-automaton, see Proposition A.1 in Appendix A.2. \diamond

Before proceeding with the formalisation of the blending operation, it is convenient to introduce some notations. Let \widehat{CA} denote the c-automaton obtained by removing the states unreachable from the initial state of the c-automaton CA . The set of transitions of CA involving participants in $P \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ is

$$CA_{@P} = \{p \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow B: m} q \in CA \mid \{A, B\} \cap P \neq \emptyset\}$$

Given two participants H and K ,

$$CA_{(H,K)} = \{p \xrightarrow[H \ K]{A \rightarrow B: m} q \mid \exists r \in \mathcal{S} : p \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow H: m} r, r \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow B: m} q \in CA\}$$

is the set of *blended*⁵ transitions of CA with respect to H and K .

Definition 5.2 (Blending). *Given two participants H and K , the blending in a c-automaton $CA = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}_{int}, \rightarrow, s_0 \rangle$ of H and K , written $CA^{H \bowtie K}$, is the c-automaton*

$$CA^{H \bowtie K} = \begin{cases} \langle \mathcal{S}, \widehat{\mathcal{L}_{int}}_{\rightarrow_{\bowtie}}, s_0 \rangle, & \text{if } \forall p \xrightarrow[H \ K]{A \rightarrow B: m} q \in \rightarrow_{\bowtie} : A \neq B \\ \perp, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\rightarrow_{\bowtie} = (\rightarrow \cup CA_{(H,K)} \cup CA_{(K,H)}) \setminus CA_{@ \{H,K\}}$.

⁵ The decoration (H, K) is pleonastic; it is a convenience for Definition 5.5 and some proofs.

Example 5.3. In Section 1, the construction in Definition 5.2 is used to perform the blending on H and K of the product automaton on the left, producing the automaton on the right.

The blending operation enjoys two different forms of commutativity.

Lemma 5.4. *Given a c-automaton CA and participants H, K, I, and J, we have*

1. $CA^{H \bowtie K} = CA^{K \bowtie H}$
2. $(CA^{H \bowtie K})^{I \bowtie J} = (CA^{I \bowtie J})^{H \bowtie K}$

Proof. The proof of (1) straightforwardly follows from Definition 5.2 since

$$\rightarrow_{\bowtie} = (\rightarrow \cup CA_{(H,K)} \cup CA_{(K,H)}) \setminus CA_{\@ \{H,K\}} = (\rightarrow \cup CA_{(K,H)} \cup CA_{(H,K)}) \setminus CA_{\@ \{K,H\}}$$

To prove (2) we show that the c-automata on the two sides of the equality have the same set of transitions. By Definition 5.2, the transitions of $CA^{H \bowtie K}$ are

$$\rightarrow_1 = (\rightarrow \cup CA_{(H,K)} \cup CA_{(K,H)}) \setminus CA_{\@ \{H,K\}}$$

where \rightarrow are the transitions of CA. Hence, again by Definition 5.2,

$$\rightarrow_2 = (\rightarrow_1 \cup CA_{(I,J)}^{H \bowtie K} \cup CA_{(J,I)}^{H \bowtie K}) \setminus CA_{\@ \{I,J\}}$$

are the transitions of $(CA^{H \bowtie K})^{I \bowtie J}$. Similarly, we have that

$$\rightarrow'_2 = (\rightarrow'_1 \cup CA_{(H,K)}^{I \bowtie J} \cup CA_{(K,H)}^{I \bowtie J}) \setminus CA_{\@ \{I,J\}}$$

are the transitions of $(CA^{I \bowtie J})^{H \bowtie K}$ provided that \rightarrow'_1 are the transitions of $CA^{I \bowtie J}$.

We prove $\rightarrow_2 = \rightarrow'_2$. Let $t \in \rightarrow_2$ be a transition with label $A \rightarrow B: m$. It is a simple observation that $\{A, B\} \cap \{I, J\} = \emptyset$ (by construction any transition where participants are those in the interface are removed). Hence we have three cases:

- If $t \in \rightarrow_1$
- If $t \in CA_{(I,J)}^{H \bowtie K}$ then we also have $\{A, B\} \cap \{H, K\} = \emptyset$. And, assuming $t = p \xrightarrow[H \ K]{A \rightarrow B: m} q$, there is r such that $p \xrightarrow[A \rightarrow I: m]{A \rightarrow I: m} r \xrightarrow[J \rightarrow B: m]{J \rightarrow B: m} q$ are in \rightarrow_1 . We proceed by case analysis:
 - Both $p \xrightarrow[A \rightarrow I: m]{A \rightarrow I: m} r$ and $r \xrightarrow[J \rightarrow B: m]{J \rightarrow B: m} q$ are in CA. In this case, $p \xrightarrow[I \ J]{A \rightarrow I: m} q$ is in $CA^{I \bowtie J}$ and hence in \rightarrow'_2 since $\{A, B\} \cap \{I, J\} = \emptyset$. This implies that $p \xrightarrow[I \ J]{A \rightarrow B: m} q$ is in $(CA^{I \bowtie J})^{H \bowtie K}$ since $\{A, B\} \cap \{H, K\} = \emptyset$.
 - Only one between $p \xrightarrow[A \rightarrow I: m]{A \rightarrow I: m} r$ and $r \xrightarrow[J \rightarrow B: m]{J \rightarrow B: m} q$ is in CA. With no loss of generality, assume that only $r \xrightarrow[J \rightarrow B: m]{J \rightarrow B: m} q$ is in CA. Then $p \xrightarrow[A \rightarrow I: m]{A \rightarrow I: m} r$ is in $CA^{H \bowtie K}$ and therefore there is r' such that $p \xrightarrow[A \rightarrow H: m]{A \rightarrow H: m} r' \xrightarrow[K \rightarrow I: m]{K \rightarrow I: m} r$ in CA (the case $p \xrightarrow[A \rightarrow K: m]{A \rightarrow K: m} r' \xrightarrow[H \rightarrow I: m]{H \rightarrow I: m} r$ is CA is similar). Therefore, $r' \xrightarrow[K \rightarrow B: m]{K \rightarrow B: m} q$ in $CA^{I \bowtie J}$ which in turn implies that $t \in (CA^{I \bowtie J})^{H \bowtie K}$.

- None of $p \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow I: m} r$ and $r \xrightarrow{J \rightarrow B: m} q$ is in CA. Applying twice the argument in the previous item we get the thesis.
- If $t \in \text{CA}_{(J,I)}^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}}$ we proceed as in the previous case.

The inclusion $\rightarrow'_2 \subseteq \rightarrow_2$ is proved similarly. \square

Whereas it is quite natural to expect property (1) to hold – due to the perfect symmetry between **H** and **K** in the definition of blending – property (2) sounds less natural. In fact, one could imagine that blending on **H** and **K** could affect the behaviour of the other participants of CA, including **I** and **J**. Remarkably, blending is such that property (2) holds. Such result, besides being interesting on its own, will be used also to prove associativity of the composition. This is quite relevant if one takes into account that the development of systems in a modular way is one of the main goals of our framework for choreographies composition. In fact modularity naturally requires the composition operation to be insensitive on the order of application.

We provide a condition ensuring that blending does not essentially affect the behaviour of participants, namely that the only difference between CA and $\text{CA}^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}}$ is that some messages sent/received by **H** or **K** in CA are sent/received by other participants in $\text{CA}^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}}$. The following definition is instrumental to formally establish the informal property above; it casts the projection operation on c-automata where some interfaces have been blended.

Definition 5.5 (Up-to-interface projection). *The projection on participant **A** up-to-interface (**H**, **K**) of a c-automaton $\text{CA} = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}, \rightarrow, s_0 \rangle$ is the automaton $\text{CA} \downarrow_{\text{A}}^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}} = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}_{\text{act}}, \rightarrow', s_0 \rangle$ where*

$$\rightarrow' = \{t \downarrow_{\text{A}}\}_{t \in \rightarrow} \cup \{p \xrightarrow{A \times I: m} q \mid p \xrightarrow[A \times Y]{A \rightarrow B: m} q \in \rightarrow\} \cup \{p \xrightarrow{Y \text{A}?: m} q \mid p \xrightarrow[X \text{Y}]{B \rightarrow A: m} q \in \rightarrow\}$$

Lemma 5.6. *If $\text{CA}^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}}$ is defined, its states are included in the states of CA.*

Proof. By construction, since the first two steps do not change the set of states, and the last one may only remove states. \square

Proposition 5.7 (Simulation). *If $\text{CA}^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}}$ is defined then for each participant $\text{A} \neq \text{H}, \text{K}$ we have that $\text{CA} \downarrow_{\text{A}}$ simulates $\text{CA}^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}} \downarrow_{\text{A}}^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}}$.*

Proof. Recall that states of projection are equivalence classes of states of the projected automata up to trace equivalence. Let us consider the relation

$$\mathcal{R} = \{(S', S) \mid S \cap S' \neq \emptyset, S \in \text{CA} \downarrow_{\text{A}}, S' \in \text{CA}^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}} \downarrow_{\text{A}}^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}}\}$$

The proof is by coinduction. Take any transition $S' \xrightarrow{\alpha} S'_1$ in $\text{CA}^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}} \downarrow_{\text{A}}^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}}$. By definition of projection there is a transition $t' = s' \xrightarrow[X \text{Y}]{\alpha'} s'_1$ in $\text{CA}^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}}$ with $s'_1 \in S'_1$ whose projection up-to-interface on **A** yields label α . By definition of blending, transition t' is derived by transitions of CA. There are a few cases:

- if t' involves neither H nor K then $s' \xrightarrow{\alpha} s'_1$ is in CA , and $[s'] \xrightarrow{\alpha'} [s'_1]$ is in $CA \downarrow_A$ as desired since the two target states are \mathcal{R} -related;
- if $t' = s' \xrightarrow[H, K]{A \rightarrow B: m} s'_1$ then CA has transitions

$$s' \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow H: m} s'_2 \quad \text{and} \quad s'_2 \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow B: m} s'_1$$

hence in $CA \downarrow_A$ we have $[s'] \xrightarrow{AH!m} [s'_2] = [s'_1]$ as desired.

The case where A is the receiver is analogous to the last case above. \square

One would hope the operation of blending to affect *only* the participants that are blended; however, this is not the case in general as shown by the following example.

Example 5.8. Consider the following well-formed c-automaton and its (empty) blending on H and K :

$$CA \rightarrow \textcircled{1} \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow B: m} \textcircled{2} \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow D: n} \textcircled{3} \quad CA^{H \bowtie K} \rightarrow \textcircled{1}$$

Trivially, D behaves differently in CA than in $CA^{H \bowtie K}$. \diamond

Remark 5.9. The above example highlights an undesirable feature of blending. We therefore identify a condition on c-automata that avoids that blending modifies the behaviour on non-interface participants. \diamond


Definition 5.10 (Reflective c-automata). *Let H, K be two participants. A c-automaton CA is H -to- K reflective if*

- (1) for each input transition $S \xrightarrow{AH?m} S'$ in $CA \downarrow_H$ we have:
 - (a) there is $S'' \xrightarrow{KB!m} S'''$ in $CA \downarrow_K$ with $S' \cap S'' \neq \emptyset$;
 - (b) for each $S'' \xrightarrow{KX!m} S'''$ in $CA \downarrow_K$, there are states $s \in S, s' \in S' \cap S'', s''' \in S'''$ such that $s \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow H: m} s' \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow X: m} s'''$ in CA .
- (2) for each output transition $S \xrightarrow{HA!m} S'$ in $CA \downarrow_H$ we have:
 - (a) there is $S'' \xrightarrow{BK?m} S'''$ in $CA \downarrow_K$ with $S''' \cap S \neq \emptyset$;
 - (b) for each $S'' \xrightarrow{XK?m} S'''$ in $CA \downarrow_K$, there are states $s'' \in S'', s''' \in S''' \cap S, s' \in S'$ such that $s'' \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow K: m} s''' \xrightarrow{H \rightarrow A: m} s'$ in CA .

If CA is H -to- K reflective and K -to- H reflective then we say that CA is reflective on H and K .

A non-trivial example of reflective c-automaton is given below.

Example 5.11. The c-automaton below is reflective on H and K .



For instance, the three inner states on the dashed path would collapse in the same equivalence class when projecting on H .

Instead, the c-automaton CA in Example 5.8 is not reflective on H and K (in particular it is not K -to- H reflective). In fact, on the projections



condition (1a) of Definition 5.10 does not hold. \diamond

We now formally show that reflectiveness on H and K does guarantee that the behaviour of any participant $A \neq H, K$ is not “affected” by the blending H and K .

Theorem 5.12 (Bisimulation). *If CA is reflective on H and K then $CA \downarrow_A$ and $CA^{\text{H} \times \text{K}} \downarrow_A^{\text{H} \times \text{K}}$ are bisimilar, for each participant $A \neq H, K$.*


Proof. Fix the participant $A \in \mathcal{P}$. Let us consider the relation \mathcal{R} defined as follows: $\mathcal{R} = \{(S', S) \mid S \cap S' \neq \emptyset, S \in CA \downarrow_A, S' \in CA^{\text{H} \times \text{K}} \downarrow_A^{\text{H} \times \text{K}}\}$

The proof is by coinduction. One direction follows from Proposition 5.7. Let us consider the other direction, namely that $CA^{\text{H} \times \text{K}} \downarrow_A^{\text{H} \times \text{K}}$ simulates $CA \downarrow_A$. Take any transition $S \xrightarrow{\alpha} S'$ in $CA \downarrow_A$. There are a few cases depending on the transition:


- If the transition does not involve H nor K then by definition of projection in CA there is $s \in S$ such that $s \xrightarrow{\alpha'} s'$ for some $s' \in S'$ such that the projection of α' on A is α . Also, in $CA^{\text{H} \times \text{K}}$ $s \xrightarrow{\alpha'} s'$, and in $CA^{\text{H} \times \text{K}} \downarrow_A^{\text{H} \times \text{K}}$ $[s] \xrightarrow{\alpha'} [s']$ as desired. The two target states are in the relation hence we are done.
- If the transition is $S \xrightarrow{\text{AH}?m} S'$ then by (2a) in Definition 5.10 there is a transition $S'' \xrightarrow{\text{KB}!m} S'''$ in $CA \downarrow_K$ with $S' \cap S'' \neq \emptyset$. By the (2b) in Definition 5.10, there are states $s \in S, s' \in S' \cap S'', s'' \in S'''$ such that $s \xrightarrow{\text{A} \rightarrow \text{H}: m} s' \xrightarrow{\text{K} \rightarrow \text{B}: m} s''$ in CA . As a consequence in $CA^{\text{H} \times \text{K}}$ we have $s \xrightarrow{\text{A} \rightarrow \text{B}: m}_{\text{H K}} s''$. Thus, in $CA \downarrow_A^{\text{H} \times \text{K}}$ we have $[s] \xrightarrow{\text{AH}?m} [s''']$. The thesis follows since $[s'''] = [s'']$ given that in the projection on A they are connected by an ϵ -transition and $[s''] \cap [s'] \neq \emptyset$.

- If the transition is $S \xrightarrow{HA!m} S'$ then by (1a) in Definition 5.10 there is $S'' \xrightarrow{BK?m} S'''$ in $CA \downarrow_K$ with $S''' \cap S \neq \emptyset$. Also, by (1b) in Definition 5.10 there are states $s'' \in S''$, $s''' \in S''' \cap S$, $s' \in S'$ such that $s'' \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow K: m} s''' \xrightarrow{H \rightarrow A: m} s'$ in CA. As a consequence in $CA^{H \times K}$ we have $s'' \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow A: m}_{H \ K} s'$. Thus, in $CA \downarrow_A^{H \times K}$ we have $[s''] \xrightarrow{HA!M} [s']$ as desired. \square

Remark 5.13. The blending operation is sensitive with respect to the representation of c-automata, as shown in the following example. If we apply the blending operation on participants H and K directly on the canonical automaton below




then we get the empty automaton, whereas a “correct” blending should give



since the interaction $C \rightarrow D: b$ is independent from both $A \rightarrow H: a$ and $K \rightarrow B: a$.

Let us consider now a well-sequenced c-automaton producing the language $close(\mathcal{L}(CA))$, i.e. where the independent interactions were made “visible” by the presence of “diamonds”, and precisely




The blending of H and K in CA' yields exactly the expected c-automaton (3). \diamond

We show that blending preserves well-formedness. This means that c-automata obtained by blending can be correctly projected. We begin with well-sequencedness.


Proposition 5.14 (Blending preserves well-sequencedness). *If CA is a well-sequenced c-automaton then so is $CA^{H \times K}$ (if defined).*

Proof. By contradiction, let us assume $CA^{H \bowtie K}$ not to be well-sequenced. So there exist in it a pair of transitions of the following form




such that

- $\{C, D\} \cap \{A, B\} = \emptyset$; and there is no state q' such that




Moreover by definition of Blending,

- the transitions correspond, in CA, to




- $H \notin \{C, D\}$ (otherwise the p -to- q transition would have been dropped by the blending procedure)

By well-sequencedness of CA, it follows that there exist diamonds in it enabling to go from p to q following all possible combinations of transitions with labels in $\{C \rightarrow D: c, A \rightarrow H: a, K \rightarrow B: a\}$. This implies that, by the blending procedure, in $CA^{H \bowtie K}$ we have actually




Contradiction. □

Well-branchedness, unfortunately, is not generally preserved by blending, as shown by the following counterexample. Consider



which can be checked to be well-branched. By blending H and K in CA we get



which is not well-branched. We therefore restrict to the class of A -univocal c -automata.

Definition 5.15 (A-univocity). A c-automaton CA is A-univocal if for any transitions $p \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow A: m} q$ and $p \xrightarrow{Y \rightarrow C: m} q'$ in CA, $C = A$ and for any transitions $p \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow X: m} q$ and $p \xrightarrow{C \rightarrow Y: m} q'$ in CA, $C = A$

It is immediate to check that CA in (4) above is not H-univocal.

Lemma 5.16. If $CA^{H \times K}$ is defined then for each run π in $CA^{H \times K}$ there is a run $\hat{\pi}$ in CA such that if t precedes t' in π and both occur in CA then t precedes t' in $\hat{\pi}$.

Proof. It suffices to observe that for any transition $t'' = p \xrightarrow[A \rightarrow B: m]{H \ K} q$ in π which is not in CA there is a state r such that transitions $p \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow H: m} r \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow B: m} q$ are in CA (and likewise for any $t'' = p \xrightarrow[A \rightarrow B: m]{K \ H} q$ in π which is not in CA). Hence, π' is obtained by replacing t'' with such transitions. \square

Corollary 5.17. If $CA^{H \times K}$ is defined then for each acyclic run π in $CA^{H \times K}$ there is an acyclic run $\hat{\pi}$ in CA such that if t precedes t' in π and t and t' occur in CA then t precedes t' in $\hat{\pi}$.

Proof. Observe that the construction in the proof of Lemma 5.16 never uses a same transition to replace different transitions on π . \square

The next results establish that blending preserves well-branchedness on univocal and reflective c-automata.

Proposition 5.18. Fix two participants H and K and a well-branched c-automaton CA such that $CA^{H \times K}$ is defined. If CA is H- and K-univocal then conditions (1) and (2) of Definition 4.4 hold on $CA^{H \times K}$. If moreover CA is H- and K-reflective then condition (3) of Definition 4.4 holds on $CA^{H \times K}$.

Proof. By *reductio ad absurdum*. Let p be a state in $CA^{H \times K}$ with no selector. Then one of the following must hold for each participant B of $CA^{H \times K}$ (note that $B \neq H$ and $B \neq K$):

1. there are transitions $t = p \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow A: m} q$ and $t' = p \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow A: m} q'$ with $q \neq q'$, or
2. there are transitions $t = p \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow A: m} q$ and $t' = p \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow Y: n} q'$ such that $X \neq B$ and t and t' are not concurrent, or else
3. there are a participant $X \neq B$ and a p -span (π_1, π_2) in $CA^{H \times K}$ such that (i) $\pi_1 \downarrow_X \neq \pi_2 \downarrow_X$ and (ii) the first pair of characters where $\pi_1 \downarrow_X$ and $\pi_2 \downarrow_X$ differ are not both inputs.

We derive a contradiction in each of the cases above.

Case (1) Not both t and t' can be transitions of CA otherwise CA would not be well-branched. With no loss of generality, suppose that t is not in CA. There must be r such that

$$p \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow H: m} r \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow A: m} q \quad \text{or} \quad p \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow K: m} r \xrightarrow{H \rightarrow A: m} q \quad \text{in CA}; \quad (5)$$


Then $t' \notin \text{CA}$ otherwise CA would not be **H**- or **K**-univocal. Hence, there is r' s.t.

$$p \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow H: m} r' \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow A: m} q' \quad \text{or} \quad p \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow K: m} r' \xrightarrow{H \rightarrow A: m} q' \quad \text{in CA};$$

If $p \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow H: m} r \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow A: m} q$ and $p \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow H: m} r' \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow A: m} q'$ are in CA then p would have two transitions with the same label violating the well-branchedness of CA. If $p \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow H: m} r \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow A: m} q$ and $p \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow K: m} r' \xrightarrow{H \rightarrow A: m} q'$ are in CA then, contrary to our hypothesis, CA would not be **H**- and **K**-univocal. Swapping **H** and **K** would yield similar contradictions in the other cases.

Case (2) Not both t and t' can be transitions of CA otherwise CA would not be well-branched.


If $t \notin \text{CA}$, there is r such that (5) holds. By the well-branchedness of CA, there is r' such that



for a q'' where the diamond $r-q-r'-q''$ exists by the well-branchedness of CA. Therefore, in $\text{CA}^{\text{H} \times \text{K}}$ there is a diamond $p-q-q'-q''$ with labels $B \rightarrow H: m$ and $X \rightarrow Y: n$, contrary to our hypothesis.

If $p \xrightarrow{B \rightarrow K: m} r \xrightarrow{H \rightarrow A: m} q$ the proof is similar.

If $t' \notin \text{CA}$, there is r such that



where the diamond $r'-r-q'-q''$ exists by the well-branchedness of CA and the thesis follows as before.

Case (3) The assumption $\pi_1 \downarrow_{\mathbf{X}} \neq \pi_2 \downarrow_{\mathbf{X}}$ implies that

- (a) \mathbf{X} is the sender in a transition of π_1 or of π_2 (otherwise both projections would be the automaton accepting the empty word), or
- (b) \mathbf{X} is the receiver in a transition of π_1 or of π_2 , but not both (otherwise either the inputs should be different by well-branchedness of CA contrary to our hypothesis).

With no loss of generality, suppose that \mathbf{X} is the sender or the receiver of a transition in π_1 .

Case (a) Let π'_1 be the longest prefix of π_1 whose projection on \mathbf{X} is also the projection of a prefix of π_2 , and t the first transition in π_1 after π'_1 . Then, for some π''_1 , π'_2 , and π''_2 we have

$$\pi_1 = \pi'_1, t, \pi''_1, \quad \pi_2 = \pi'_2, \pi''_2, \quad \pi'_1 \downarrow_{\mathbf{X}} = \pi'_2 \downarrow_{\mathbf{X}}, \quad \text{and} \quad (t, \pi''_1) \downarrow_{\mathbf{X}} \neq \pi''_2 \downarrow_{\mathbf{X}}$$

Using the construction of the proof of Lemma 5.16, we have two co-initial runs $\hat{\pi}_1$ and $\hat{\pi}_2$ in CA such that, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $\hat{\pi}_i$ has the transitions of CA occurring in π_i preserving the order they have in π_i . Note that the construction guarantees that $\hat{\pi}_1$ and $\hat{\pi}_2$ are transition disjoint and Corollary 5.17 ensures that they are acyclic. Moreover, if $\hat{\pi}_1$ and $\hat{\pi}_2$ are not co-final, then they can be extended to form a span adding transition from the maximal states of π_1 and π_2 . Let $\hat{\pi}'_1$ and $\hat{\pi}'_2$ be the part of $\hat{\pi}_1$ and $\hat{\pi}_2$ which include the transitions of π'_1 and π'_2 ; then \mathbf{X} cannot behave uniformly $\hat{\pi}'_1$ and $\hat{\pi}'_2$ (otherwise the first action of \mathbf{X} distinguishing its behaviour on the two runs would be the output at t and this is not possible by the well-branchedness of CA). This implies that the first actions distinguishing the behaviour of \mathbf{X} on $\hat{\pi}'_1$ and $\hat{\pi}'_2$ should be labelled with $\mathbf{H} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}: \mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{K} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}: \mathbf{m}$ (obtained through the construction of Lemma 5.16 which should have replaced a transition in π'_1 and in π'_2 with receiver \mathbf{X}). Then the univocity of CA is violated.

Case (b) As in the previous case, we can use the construction of Lemma 5.16 to extend runs π_1 and π_2 to two cointial runs π'_1 and π'_2 in CA. Notice that this construction cannot yield a transition with receiver \mathbf{X} in π'_2 since it at most adds transitions where receivers are either \mathbf{H} or \mathbf{K} . Then, the span (π_1, π_2) cannot be cofinal, otherwise we would violate the well-branchedness of CA. Let q and q' the states reached by π_1 and π_2 (and hence the states reached by π'_1 and π'_2). By the well-branchedness of CA, π'_2 cannot be maximal, hence there should be a transition from q' involving an interface which the blending operation cuts away (otherwise q' would not be the last state on π_2) because it cannot be blended with a forwarding transition involving the other interface. Call such transition t and assume that its arrival state is q'' and, with no loss of generality, that it involves \mathbf{H} .

If \mathbf{H} is the receiver of t then, by reflectiveness (condition (1) in Definition 5.10), we can find a transition $q'' \xrightarrow{\mathbf{H} \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}: \mathbf{m}} q'''$ which violates the maximality of π_2 in $\mathbf{CA}^{\mathbf{H} \times \mathbf{K}}$. Likewise, if \mathbf{H} is the receiver of t then, by reflectiveness

(condition (2) in Definition 5.10), we can find a transition $q'' \xrightarrow{H \rightarrow Y: m} q'''$ which violates the maximality of π_2 in $CA^{H \bowtie K}$.

In all the cases we obtain a contradiction, which gives the thesis. \square

The following result is immediate from Proposition 5.18.

Corollary 5.19. *Given a well-branched c-automaton CA and participants H and K such that CA is H- and K-univocal and reflective on H and K, then $CA^{H \bowtie K}$, if defined, is well-branched.*

5.2 Modular development of choreographies

In the previous section we studied blending in isolation. Now, as informally described at the beginning of Section 5, we show how to combine blending with product to provide a composition operator, which is the basis of our modular development of choreographies.

We first define the product of c-automata. The product will be defined on c-automata having disjoint sets of participants. We wish in fact the systems we compose to interact only through the interfaces.

Definition 5.20 (Product of c-automata). *The product of two c-automata is the standard product of FSA if the automata have disjoint sets of participants and it is undefined otherwise.*

We can now define the composition operation.

Definition 5.21 (Composition). *Let CA and CB be two c-automata, H and K be participants respectively in CA and in CB. The composition of CA and CB via H and K is*

$$CA_{H \bowtie K} CB = (CA \times CB)^{H \bowtie K}$$

provided that CA and CB have disjoint participants.

A reasonable modular development of systems must rely on composition operations that do not “break” the relevant properties that modules separately possess. The relevant properties are those considered in Section 4.2, that are guaranteed by projecting well-formed c-automata. Thus, we will show below that composition preserves well-formedness.

We begin by showing that composition does preserve well-branchedness and in order to do that the following definition will be handy.

Notation. We shall often denote by $A \in CA$ the fact that p is a participant in the c-automaton CA and denote the set of its participants by $\mathcal{P}(CA)$

Definition 5.22. *Let π be a run in $CA \times CB^{H \bowtie K}$. We define the restriction of π to CA, dubbed $\pi|_{CA}$, as follows*

$$\varepsilon|_{CA} = \varepsilon \quad (\text{where } \varepsilon \text{ is the empty string})$$

$$(t \pi')|_{CA} = \begin{cases} t \pi'|_{CA} & \text{if } t \in CA \\ \pi'|_{CA} & \text{if } t \in CB \\ p \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow H: m} r \pi'|_{CA} & \text{if } t = p \xrightarrow[A \bowtie K]{A \rightarrow B: m} q \\ & \text{where } (*) \end{cases}$$

(*) r is such that $p \xrightarrow[\text{H K}]{\text{A} \rightarrow \text{B}: \text{m}} q$ has been obtained by blending $p \xrightarrow{\text{A} \rightarrow \text{H}: \text{m}} r$ and $r \xrightarrow{\text{K} \rightarrow \text{B}: \text{m}} q$ in $\text{CA} \times \text{CB}$.

Similarly for the definition of $\pi|_{\text{CB}}$.

Lemma 5.23. *Let π be a run in $\text{CA} \times \text{CB}^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}}$. Then $\pi|_{\text{CA}}$ (resp. $\pi|_{\text{CB}}$) is a run in CA (resp. CB).*

Proof. Easy, by definition of product, blending and restriction $(\cdot)|_{(\cdot)}$. \square

Proposition 5.24 (Composition preserves well-branchedness). *Given two participants $\text{H} \in \text{CA}$ and $\text{K} \in \text{CB}$, where CA and CB are well-branched, $(\text{CA} \times \text{CB})^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}}$ is well-branched.*

Proof. By *reductio ad absurdum*. Let p be a state in $(\text{CA} \times \text{CB})^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}}$ with no selector. Then one of the following must hold for each participant B of $(\text{CA} \times \text{CB})^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}}$ (note that $\text{B} \neq \text{H}$ and $\text{B} \neq \text{K}$):

1. there are transitions $t = p \xrightarrow{\text{B} \rightarrow \text{A}: \text{m}} q$ and $t' = p \xrightarrow{\text{B} \rightarrow \text{A}: \text{m}} q'$ with $q \neq q'$, or
2. there are transitions $t = p \xrightarrow{\text{B} \rightarrow \text{A}: \text{m}} q$ and $t' = p \xrightarrow{\text{X} \rightarrow \text{Y}: \text{n}} q'$ such that $\text{X} \neq \text{B}$ and t and t' are not concurrent, or else
3. there are a participant $\text{X} \neq \text{B}$ and a p -span (π_1, π_2) in $(\text{CA} \times \text{CB})^{\text{H} \bowtie \text{K}}$ such that (i) $\pi_1 \downarrow_{\text{X}} \neq \pi_2 \downarrow_{\text{X}}$ and (ii) the first pair of labels where $\pi_1 \downarrow_{\text{X}}$ and $\pi_2 \downarrow_{\text{X}}$ differ are not of the form $(\text{CX}? \text{m}, \text{DX}? \text{n})$ with $\text{C} \neq \text{D}$ or $\text{m} \neq \text{n}$

We derive a contradiction in each of the cases above. In the following we can assume, without any loss of generality, that $\text{B} \in \text{CA}$.


Case (1) It is impossible that $\text{A} \in \text{CA}$, otherwise CA would not be well-branched. So, necessarily there must be r and r' such that $r \neq r'$ and

$$p \xrightarrow{\text{B} \rightarrow \text{H}: \text{m}} r \xrightarrow{\text{K} \rightarrow \text{A}: \text{m}} q \quad \text{and} \quad p \xrightarrow{\text{B} \rightarrow \text{H}: \text{m}} r' \xrightarrow{\text{K} \rightarrow \text{A}: \text{m}} q' \quad (6)$$

then p would have two transitions in CA with the same label violating the well-branchedness of CA .

Case (2) Not both t and t' can be transitions of CA , otherwise CA would not be well-branched.

If $t \notin \text{CA}$ and $t' \in \text{CB}$, there is r such that the first conjunct of (6) holds. Moreover, by definition of product we can infer that there is r' and q'' such that



are in $CA \times CB$, and hence

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & q & \\
 B \rightarrow A: m \nearrow & & \searrow X \rightarrow Y: n \\
 p & & q'' \\
 X \rightarrow Y: n \searrow & & \nearrow B \rightarrow A: m \\
 & q' &
 \end{array} \tag{7}$$

is in $(CA \times CB)^{H \times K}$. Contradiction.

If $t \notin CA$ and $t' \in CA$, then we would have

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & r & \\
 B \rightarrow H: m \nearrow & & \\
 p & & q' \\
 X \rightarrow Y: n \searrow & &
 \end{array}$$

both in CA . Now, since we assumed that $X \neq B$, by well-branchedness of CA we would have

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & r & \\
 B \rightarrow H: m \nearrow & & \searrow X \rightarrow Y: n \\
 p & & q'' \\
 X \rightarrow Y: n \searrow & & \nearrow B \rightarrow H: m \\
 & q' &
 \end{array}$$

and hence

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & q & & \\
 & & K \rightarrow A: m \nearrow & & \searrow X \rightarrow Y: n \\
 & r & & & q'' \\
 B \rightarrow H: m \nearrow & & X \rightarrow Y: n \searrow & & \\
 p & & r' & & \\
 X \rightarrow Y: n \searrow & & B \rightarrow H: m \nearrow & & \nearrow K \rightarrow A: m \\
 & q' & & &
 \end{array}$$

are in $CA \times CB$, where $r-q$ is in CB and hence $q-q''$ and $r'-q''$ exist by definition of product. So, we can obtain that (7) is in $(CA \times CB)^{H \times K}$ and we get a contradiction since we assumed t and t' not to be concurrent.

If $t \notin CA$ and $X \in CB$ and $t' \notin CB$, then, by reasoning similarly to the case ($t \notin CA$ and $t' \in CB$) we would arrive to conclude (7) to be in $(CA \times CB)^{H \times K}$. Contradiction.

If $t \in CA$ and $X \in CA$ and $t' \notin CA$, then, we would have

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & q & \\
 B \rightarrow A: m \nearrow & & \\
 p & & r \\
 X \rightarrow H: n \searrow & &
 \end{array}$$

both in CA. Now, since we assumed that $X \neq B$, by the well-branchedness of CA there exists also the rest of the diamond and we can reason similarly to what done for the case ($t \notin CA$ and $t' \in CA$), getting to a contradiction with t and t' not concurrent.

If $t \in CA$ and $t' \in CB$, then, we would infer the existence of (7) by definition of product, getting a contradiction with t and t' not concurrent.

Case (3) Without loss of generality, we can assume $X \in CA$ (recall that we have also that $X \neq H$).

The assumptions for the present case implies that the p -span (π_1, π_2) is such that there exist $t_1, t_2 \notin CB$ such that

- a) either $t_1, t_2 \in CA$ or $[t_1 \in CA \text{ and } t_2 \notin CA]$ or $[t_2 \in CA \text{ and } t_1 \notin CA]$;
- b) $\pi_1 = \pi'_1 t_1 \pi''_1$ and $\pi_2 = \pi'_2 t_2 \pi''_2$, for some π'_1, π'_2 , and π''_2 ;
- c) $\pi'_1 \downarrow_X = \pi'_2 \downarrow_X$
- d) $(t_1 \downarrow_X, t_2 \downarrow_X) \neq (CX^?m, DX^?n)$ with $C \neq D$ or $m \neq n$;
- e) π'_1 and π'_2 with the above properties have maximal length.

Without loss of generality we can assume $t_1 \in CA$. Let now $\hat{\pi}_1$ and $\hat{\pi}_2$ be the runs of CA defined out of π_1 and π_2 as in Lemma 5.23. It is not difficult to check that $\hat{\pi}_1$ and $\hat{\pi}_2$ are co-initial. Note that the construction guarantees that $\hat{\pi}_1$ and $\hat{\pi}_2$ are transition disjoint and acyclic. Moreover, if $\hat{\pi}_1$ and $\hat{\pi}_2$ are not co-final, then π_1 and π_2 can be extended (by adding transition from the maximal states of π_1 and π_2) in such a way

$$\hat{\pi}_1 = \hat{\pi}'_1 ((t_1|_{CA}) \downarrow_X) \hat{\pi}''_1 \hat{\pi}'''_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\pi}_2 = \hat{\pi}'_2 ((t_2|_{CA}) \downarrow_X) \hat{\pi}''_2 \hat{\pi}'''_2$$

So that $(\hat{\pi}'_1, \hat{\pi}'_2)$ forms a p -span of CA. Besides, by (c) above, it is possible to infer that

$$\hat{\pi}'_1 = \hat{\pi}'_2 \tag{8}$$

We proceed now by considering the two possible cases:

$t_1, t_2 \in CA$

By definition of restriction, we get $t_{i|CA} = t_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Hence the above properties (8) and (d) of the p -span $(\hat{\pi}_1, \hat{\pi}_2)$ immediately contradict the well-branchedness of CA.

$t_1 \in CA$ and $t_2 \notin CA$

We consider two further possibilities

t_2 has been obtained by blending $p' \xrightarrow{X \rightarrow H: m} r$ and $r \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow Y: m} q$ in $CA \times CB$.

Since $t_1 \in CA$, by definition of restriction we have $t_{1|CA} = t_1$. Moreover, by definition, $(t_2|_{CA}) \downarrow_X = XH!m$. Then the p -span $(\hat{\pi}_1, \hat{\pi}_2)$ contradicts the well-branchedness of CA both in case $t_1 \downarrow_X$ is an input and in case it is an output.

t_2 has been obtained by blending $p' \xrightarrow{Y \rightarrow K: m} r$ and $r \xrightarrow{H \rightarrow X: m} q$ in $CA \times CB$.

In case $t_1 \downarrow_X$ is an output, we get a contradiction with the well-branchedness of CA.

In case, instead, $t_1 \downarrow_X$ is an input, we have necessarily that t_1 is of the

form $q' \xrightarrow{C \rightarrow X: n} q''$ with $C \in CA$. Since we have also that, necessarily, $Y \in CB$, it follows that $(t_1 \downarrow_X, t_2 \downarrow_X) = (CX?n, YX?m)$ with $Y \neq C$. This, however, is impossible. In fact in the present main case we are assuming condition (3) – stated at the beginning of the proof – to hold, according to which the first pair of labels where $\pi_1 \downarrow_X$ and $\pi_2 \downarrow_X$ differ are not of the form $(CX?m, DX?n)$ with $C \neq D$ or $m \neq n$. \square

It is worth noticing that composition can be proven to preserve well-branchedness without any univocity assumptions, which has been instead necessary to prove well-branchedness preservation by blending in Proposition 5.18. This is due to the fact that Proposition 5.18 deals with blending on general c-automata, not those obtained from product.

For what concerns well-sequencedness, since we already know that blending preserve well-sequencedness (see Proposition 5.14), it is enough to show well-sequencedness to be preserved by product.

Lemma 5.25 (Product preserves well-sequencedness). *Let CA and CB be two well-sequenced c-automata. Then $CA \times CB$ is well-sequenced (if defined).*

Proof. Let us have two consecutive transitions in $CA \times CB$ with disjoint sets of participants. If the two transitions belong both to CA or both to CB , we have a diamond by well-sequencedness of CA and CB . Otherwise we have a diamond by definition of product. \square

Well-formedness preservation by composition can hence be obtained as a corollary.

Corollary 5.26 (Composition preserves well-formedness). *Given two participants $H \in CA$ and $K \in CB$, where CA and CB are well-formed c-automata, $CA_{H \times K}CB$ is well-formed.*

Proof. Well sequencedness of $CA_{H \times K}CB$ is a consequence of Lemma 5.25 and Proposition 5.14, while its well branchedness is proved in Proposition 5.24. \square

In order to show that composition does not lose behaviours (that is, that Theorem 5.12 holds) we also need to show that $CA \times CB$ is reflective on H and K . We will show below that in the special case of product automata, reflectiveness can be proved using a simpler criterion, called compatibility, which is checked on the behaviour of the projections on H and K .

Informally, two CFSMs M_1 and M_2 are *compatible* if M_1 is bisimilar to the dual of M_2 if the communicating partners are abstracted away.

In order to define compatibility, a few simple definitions are handy. Let $\mathcal{L}_{i/o} = \{ ?m, !m \mid m \in \mathcal{M} \}$ and define the functions

$$(\cdot)^{\mathcal{P}} : \mathcal{L}_{act} \cup \{ \epsilon \} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{i/o} \cup \{ \epsilon \} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{(\cdot)} : \mathcal{L}_{i/o} \cup \{ \epsilon \} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{i/o} \cup \{ \epsilon \}$$

by the following clauses

$$\begin{aligned} (AB?m)^{\mathcal{P}} &= ?m & (AB!m)^{\mathcal{P}} &= !m & \epsilon^{\mathcal{P}} &= \epsilon \\ \overline{?m} &= !m & \overline{!m} &= ?m & \bar{\epsilon} &= \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

which extend to CFSMs in the obvious way: given a CFSM $M = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}_{\text{act}}, \rightarrow, q_0 \rangle$, we define $M^{\setminus \mathcal{P}} = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}_{i/o}, \rightarrow^{\setminus \mathcal{P}}, q_0 \rangle$ where $\rightarrow^{\setminus \mathcal{P}} = \{ p \xrightarrow{\alpha^{\setminus \mathcal{P}}} q \mid p \xrightarrow{\alpha} q \in \rightarrow \}$; and likewise for \overline{M} .

Definition 5.27 (Compatibility). *Two CFSMs M_1 and M_2 are compatible if $M_1^{\setminus \mathcal{P}}$ is bisimilar to $\overline{M_2^{\setminus \mathcal{P}}}$. Given CA and CB, participants \mathbf{H} of CA and \mathbf{K} of CB are compatible if $\text{CA} \downarrow_{\mathbf{H}}$ and $\text{CB} \downarrow_{\mathbf{K}}$ are compatible.*

In general, reflectiveness implies compatibility, but, in the special case of product automaton, compatibility of the components implies reflectiveness of the product.

Proposition 5.28 (Reflectiveness implies compatibility). *If a c-automaton CA is reflective on \mathbf{H} and \mathbf{K} , then $\text{CA} \downarrow_{\mathbf{H}}$ and $\text{CA} \downarrow_{\mathbf{K}}$ are compatible.*

Proof. We have to show that $\text{CA} \downarrow_{\mathbf{H}}$ and $\text{CA} \downarrow_{\mathbf{K}}$ are compatible, namely that $\text{CA} \downarrow_{\mathbf{H}}^{\setminus \mathcal{P}}$ is bisimilar to $\overline{\text{CA} \downarrow_{\mathbf{K}}^{\setminus \mathcal{P}}}$.

Remember that the states of the projections are sets of states of the original c-automata.

Let us consider the relation $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\text{CA} \downarrow_{\mathbf{H}}) \times \mathcal{R}(\text{CA} \downarrow_{\mathbf{K}})$ defined as:

$$\mathcal{R} = \{(S_{\mathbf{H}}, S_{\mathbf{K}}) \mid S_{\mathbf{H}} \in \mathcal{R}(\text{CA} \downarrow_{\mathbf{H}}), S_{\mathbf{K}} \in \mathcal{R}(\text{CA} \downarrow_{\mathbf{K}}), S_{\mathbf{H}} \cap S_{\mathbf{K}} \neq \emptyset\}$$

By definition it relates the two initial states. Also, consider a challenge from $\text{CA} \downarrow_{\mathbf{H}}$ (the other case is analogous), that is a transition $S_{\mathbf{H}} \xrightarrow{\alpha} S'_{\mathbf{H}}$. Let us consider the case $\alpha = ?m$ (the case $\alpha = !m$ is analogous), that is we have a transition $S_{\mathbf{H}} \xrightarrow{\text{AH}?m} S'_{\mathbf{H}}$ in $\text{CA} \downarrow_{\mathbf{H}}$.

By reflectiveness we have a transition $S''_{\mathbf{K}} \xrightarrow{\text{KB}!m} S'''_{\mathbf{K}}$ in $\text{CA} \downarrow_{\mathbf{K}}$ with $S'_{\mathbf{H}} \cap S'''_{\mathbf{K}} \neq \emptyset$.

Also, in CA we have transitions $s \xrightarrow{\text{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{H}: m} s'$ and $s' \xrightarrow{\mathbf{K} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}: m} s''$. By projecting to \mathbf{H} we get $s'' \in S'_{\mathbf{H}}$ (since the second transition projects to ϵ) as well as $s'' \in S'''_{\mathbf{K}}$ and $S_{\mathbf{K}} = S''_{\mathbf{K}}$ (since the first transition projects to ϵ).

As a result, \mathbf{K} can answer the challenge with $S_{\mathbf{K}} \xrightarrow{!m} S'''_{\mathbf{K}}$ with $S'_{\mathbf{H}} \cap S'''_{\mathbf{K}} \supseteq \{s''\} \neq \emptyset$ as desired. \square

Theorem 5.29 (Compatibility implies reflectiveness of products). *If $\text{CA} = \text{CB} \times \text{CC}$ and $\text{CB} \downarrow_{\mathbf{H}}$ and $\text{CC} \downarrow_{\mathbf{K}}$ are compatible then CA is reflective on \mathbf{H} and \mathbf{K} .*

Proof. For each $S \xrightarrow{\text{AH}?m} S'$ in $\text{CA} \downarrow_{\mathbf{H}}$ we have that $S = X \times Q_C$ and $S' = X' \times Q_C$ with $X, X' \subseteq Q_B$. Hence, $X \xrightarrow{\text{AH}?m} X'$ in $\text{CB} \downarrow_{\mathbf{H}}$. Thanks to the bisimilarity condition there is $S_1 \xrightarrow{\text{KB}!m} S'_1$ in $\text{CC} \downarrow_{\mathbf{K}}$. Hence, $Q_B \times S_1 \xrightarrow{\text{KB}!m} Q_B \times S'_1$ in $\text{CA} \downarrow_{\mathbf{K}}$. Since $X' \times Q_C \cap Q_B \times S_1 \neq \emptyset$ the first condition follows. The proofs of the other conditions are similar. \square


As a corollary, if H in CA and K in CB are compatible, then roles different from H and K behave the same in the original c-automata and in the composition.

Corollary 5.30. *If H in CA and K in CB are compatible then $CA \downarrow_A$ and $CA_{H \times K} CB \downarrow_A^{H \times K}$ are bisimilar, for each participant $A \neq H, K$.*

Proof. From Theorem 5.12, where the condition of reflectiveness on $CA \times CB$ holds thanks to Theorem 5.29. \square


We show now, step by step, how composition works in a simple example.

Example 5.31 (Composition at work). Let us compose the c-automata below on the interfaces H and K .



Note that CA and CB are well-formed, CA is H -univocal and CB is K -univocal. As discussed, we shall first compute $CA \times CB$ and then blending the two roles H and K in $CA \times CB$. The resulting c-automaton is well-formed thanks to Corollary 5.26.

To save space, we represent these steps in the following decorated c-automaton.



where the decorations have the following interpretation:

- the transitions of $CA \times CB$ are all the transitions except the dotted ones, that from state $(0, 0)$ go to state $(1, 1)$ and to state $(2, 2)$, which are added by blending of the dashed transitions and the doubly-lined ones, respectively;
- the grey transitions are the ones removed either because of blending (like the dashed and doubly-lined ones) or removal of unreachable states (like those involving greyed states $(2, 1)$ and $(1, 2)$);

- the non-grey transitions (regardless if they are solid or dotted) form the final result of the composition.

We now apply step by step the blending algorithm on $CA \times CB$ and H and K .

step I: Each transition $p \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow H: m} q$ is removed, and for each transition $q \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow B: m} r$ a transition $p \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow B: m} r$ is added provided that $A \neq B$; and similarly, by swapping H and K .

In this step, the dashed and the doubly-lined transitions are replaced by the blended transitions, represented by the dotted arrows.

step II: Transitions involving neither H nor K are preserved, whereas all other transitions are removed.

This step gets rid of grey transitions, but for the ones outgoing from the greyed states, which are removed in the next step.

step III: States and transitions unreachable from state $(0, 0)$ are removed.

This last step hence removes the greyed states and their outgoing transitions, obtaining the overall composition of CA and CB through H and K . \diamond


It is worth pointing out that the composition operation can be performed on any pair of roles, that is any role can be chosen as an interface. However, if the conditions discussed above are not verified, then the composition may not be well-behaved. In particular, it may happen that the behaviour of some participants in the original systems (different from H and K) will change, in particular some transitions may be disabled.

This can be seen on the simple example below.

$CA \rightarrow \textcircled{0} \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow H: m} \textcircled{1}$ and $CB \rightarrow \textcircled{0} \xrightarrow{D \rightarrow K: m} \textcircled{1}$ are well-formed and, respectively H - and K - univocal.

Their composition $CA_{H \times K} CB$ yields the empty automaton, which is well-formed (thanks to Corollary 5.26). However, participants A and D lose their transitions. This is due to the fact that H in CA and K in CB are not compatible, hence $CA \times CB$ is not reflective.

Remark 5.32. Compatibility does not ensure reflectiveness when taking into account c-automata which are not products, as the following example shows.



It is easy to check that the c-automata CA is well-formed and that $CA \downarrow_H$ and $CA \downarrow_K$ are compatible. Nonetheless CA is not H - K -reflective; in particular requirement (1b) of Definition 5.10 does not hold. \diamond

Our composition operator is associative and commutative up-to isomorphism. We first show that our composition operation commutes with the product of c -automata.

Lemma 5.33. *If CA , CB and CC are c -automata with pairwise disjoint sets of participants then $(CA_{H \times K} CB) \times CC = ((CA \times CB) \times CC)^{H \times K}$.*

Proof. We show that each run in $((CA \times CB)^{H \times K}) \times CC$ is also a run in $((CA \times CB) \times CC)^{H \times K}$ and viceversa.

For each blended transition $t = ((p, q), r) \xrightarrow[H \ K]{A \rightarrow B: m} ((p', q'), r')$ on a run π in $((CA \times CB)^{H \times K}) \times CC$ there is a state $((p'', q''), r'')$ in $(CA \times CB) \times CC$ such that

$$((p, q), r) \xrightarrow[H \ K]{A \rightarrow B: m} ((p'', q''), r'') \xrightarrow{A \rightarrow B: m} ((p', q'), r') \text{ in } (CA \times CA) \times CC \quad (9)$$

Note that any of transitions above may be in CC by hypothesis. By replacing each t in π with the corresponding transitions in (9) we obtain a run in $(CA \times CB) \times CC$ and therefore π is also a run in $((CA \times CB) \times CC)^{H \times K}$. The other direction is similar. \square

The following result establishes that our operation of composition commutative and associative, modulo the structure of the states of the c -automaton resulting from composition.

Corollary 5.34. *If CA , CB and CC are c -automata with pairwise disjoint sets of participants then*

1. $CA_{H \times K} CB$ is isomorphic to $CB_{K \times H} CA$ (commutativity up-to isomorphism)
2. $(CA_{H \times K} CB)_{I \times J} CC$ is isomorphic to $CA_{H \times K} (CB_{I \times J} CC)$ (associativity up-to isomorphism).

Proof. For commutativity, it is a trivial observation that there is a label-preserving bijection between the runs in $CA_{H \times K} CB$ and those in $CB_{K \times H} CA$. Since the blending operation does not depend on the structure of the states of a c -automaton then we have thesis.

For associativity we have

$$\begin{aligned} (CA_{H \times K} CB)_{I \times J} CC &= ((CA_{H \times K} CB) \times CC)^{I \times J} && \text{by def. 5.21} \\ &= (((CA \times CB) \times CC)^{H \times K})^{I \times J} && \text{by cor. 5.33} \\ &\equiv ((CA \times (CB \times CC))^{H \times K})^{I \times J} && \text{by assoc. of } _ \times _ \\ &= (CA_{H \times K} (CB \times CC))^{I \times J} && \text{by def. 5.21} \\ &= CA_{H \times K} (CB_{I \times J} CC) && \text{by def. 5.21} \end{aligned}$$

where \equiv is the up-to isomorphism equality on FSAs. \square

By Corollary 5.34, the operation of composition basically induces a sort of commutative monoidal algebraic structure on the class of c -automata. The term-algebra of this structure are trees that represent compositions of automata. We can picture those terms as a binary tree, dubbed *composition tree*, where leaves




Fig. 2. A compact representation of the composition of CP and CV via H and K.

are c-automata and edges are labelled with participants; a node n with children n_1 and n_2 such that the edge from n to n_1 is labelled **H** and the edge from n to n_2 is labelled **K** represents $n_{1\mathbf{H}\bowtie\mathbf{K}}n_2$. Corollary 5.34 is relevant for the use of our choreographic framework for a modular development of systems as it guarantees that the order of composition is immaterial.

Composition trees composition cannot produce “circular” compositions. However, combining composition and blending allows us to produce arbitrary graph structures. This can be attained through the following alternative representation. A *composition graph* is a labelled undirected graph where nodes are c-automata and edges between CA and CB labelled with (\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{K}) iff there is a blending between role **H** of CA and role **K** of CB. For instance, Example 5.35 shows how we can produce working example to produce a “triangle-shaped” circular composition.

Example 5.35 (Working example cont’d). A compact representation of the composition of CP and CV via **H** and **K** is in Fig. 2. (The full automaton $CP_{\mathbf{H}\bowtie\mathbf{K}}CV$ is in Appendix A.1.)

The above c-automaton can be composed with CC via **C** and **D**. Then, in the resulting automaton, **E** and **F**, originally belonging to different c-automata, can be blended. A compact representation of $((CP_{\mathbf{H}\bowtie\mathbf{K}}CV)_{\mathbf{C}\bowtie\mathbf{D}}CC)^{\mathbf{E}\bowtie\mathbf{F}}$ is in Fig. 3. In this way we connect systems S_p , S_v and S_c in a triangle shaped structure. \diamond

In case we intended to compose a number of c-automata, it would be helpful that the compatibility checks of the various interfaces we would like connect could actually were all made at the very beginning. This fact, relevant for the modular composition of system is guaranteed by the following result.

Notation. Below we denote by $A \in CA$ the fact that p is a participant in the c-automaton CA.




Fig. 3. A compact representation of $((CP_{H \times K} CV)_{C \times D} CC)^{E \times F}$.

Proposition 5.36. *Let CA , CB and CC be c -automata with pairwise disjoint sets of participants and such that $H \in CA$, $K, I \in CB$ and $J \in CC$.*

If $CA \downarrow_H$ is compatible with $CB \downarrow_K$, and $CB \downarrow_I$ is compatible with $CC \downarrow_J$, then $(CA_{H \times K} CB) \downarrow_I$ is compatible with $CC \downarrow_J$.

Proof (Sketch). By Theorem 5.12 $(CA_{H \times K} CB \downarrow_I)$ is bisimilar with $CC \downarrow_J$. The thesis follows by checking that compatibility is a subrelation of bisimilarity. \square

Remark 5.37. In general, compatibility is not a sufficient condition to guarantee that several choreographies can be composed in a circular structure as we managed to do in Example 5.35. In fact, the possibility of obtaining “sound” systems out of a circular composition is equivalent to the following property


If CA is a c -automaton with participants containing $\{I, J, H, K\}$, then compatibility of I and J is preserved by blending H and K

This however, does not hold. The intuitive reason is that a “circular” sequence of compositions is “sound” if they do not introduce deadlocks; the absence of these particular form of deadlocks cannot be guaranteed simply by compliance. The following counterexample make this intuition more evident. Let us consider the following c -automata with disjoint sets of participants.



We can immediately check that $CA \downarrow_J$ and $CB \downarrow_I$ are compatible as well as $CA \downarrow_H$ and $CB \downarrow_K$. By Theorem 5.29, compatibility of $CA \downarrow_H$ and $CB \downarrow_K$ guarantees that

the composition of CA and CB through H and K preserves the behaviour outside the interfaces. Namely, the construction of the blended automaton $(CA \times CB)^{H \bowtie K}$ does not affect the behaviour of the participants other than H and K . In fact,



where the product $CA \times CB$ consists of all the transitions above but the dotted ones and the result of the composition is made of the solid and dotted transitions.

Now we notice that the following c-automata



are trivially compatible (as they were before the composition). Nonetheless $(CA \times CB)^{H \bowtie K}$ is not reflective on I and J . We have in fact that $((CA \times CB)^{H \bowtie K})^{\downarrow I \downarrow J}$ is the empty c-automaton.

So, in order to safely compose choreography in a circular way, reflectiveness must be checked on the participants whose blending “completes the circle”, namely I and J .

It is worth remarking that providing a condition for sound circular connections is a complex problem. This has been already recognised in the literature. Tree-like composition is the most adopted safe form of composition. For instance, [24] discusses the problem (on page 2, paragraph 3) and provides a generalisation of acyclic architectures by considering so-called “disjoint circular wait free component systems”. In the context of session types, a similar problem arises when processes work on more than one session at the same time as in [12], where an “interaction type system” is used to control the dependencies among roles.

6 Related and Future Work

We introduced a compositional model of choreographies and demonstrated its suitability to cope with modular descriptions of global specifications of message-passing applications. The operation that we devise is basically the composition of

classical automata product and of the blending operation introduced here. Our notion of composition preserves well-formedness under mild conditions that, in practice, do not hinder its applicability.

The adoption of an automata-based model brings in two main benefits. Firstly, the constructions that we provided are based on basic notions and mainly *syntax-independent*. In fact, it is often the case that syntax-driven models (such as behavioural type systems) introduce complex constructions and constraints to define well-formedness that restrict [20] their applicability. Secondly, we can re-use well-known results of the theory of automata (e.g., we used notions of bisimulation, product and minimization) and related tools.

6.1 Related work

The present paper includes two main contributions: (i) the definition of a choreography model based on FSAs and (ii) the definition of a notion of composition of choreographies. We comment related work according to these contributions.

Composing choreographies While choreographies have been deeply explored in the literature, the problem of their composition has not. Indeed, only a few works consider the issue of composition.

The closest to our approach are [3] and [4], which inspired the present work. The former introduces the idea of connecting choreographies via forwarders, but did not provide a way to compute the corresponding choreography, that is composition was performed only at the level of systems. The latter provides a composition at the choreography level, but has stronger well-formedness conditions than ours (e.g., in choices all interactions should have the same pair of participants), and did not allow for self-connections. As a result, only tree structures could be created.

Modularity of choreographies has been considered in [29]. There, one can specify partial choreographies where some roles are not supposed to be fully specified. Partial choreographies give some support to modular development, although with some limitations. For instance, complete choreographies cannot be composed, while in our case any choreography can be composed by selecting one of its roles as an interface. In fact, a type system can check if partial choreographies are consistent with respect to global types (using a “dually incomplete” typing principle), but no composition of partial choreographies is actually defined in [29].


Approaches to choreography composition in the setting of adaptive systems has been discussed in [32] and in [11]. In [32], choreographies form a programming language and are executable, and composition is obtained by replacing a choreography component CC_1 inside a choreography context CA with a new choreography component CC_2 from outside the system. Notably, the only allowed interactions between the component and the context are auxiliary interactions introduced by the projection and needed to ensure well-formedness conditions at the border between the component and the context. In [11] instead, adaptiveness

is handled at the type level rather than in a choreographic programming language. There the main limitation is that adaptiveness only allows one to switch inside a number of pre-defined behaviours (in a kind of context-driven choice), and new behaviours cannot be introduced.

Expressiveness of c-automata First, we note that the use of automata-based models for specifying the local behaviour of distributed components is commonplace in the literature [9,13], less so for the global specifications of choreographies. To the best of our knowledge, the automata model used in the line of work in [7] (and references therein) is the only one in the literature. The main difference between models like in [7] and c-automata (besides some constraints on the usage of messages in interactions that c-automata do not have), is that in this context the realisability of choreographies has been studied (using e.g., model checking) while compositionality is not considered in this line of research. Moreover, as shown in [15] some of the main decidability results were flawed.

While the main aim of c-automata is to provide a choreography model based on FSAs, we remark here that it is rather expressive and complements existing models of choreographies or multiparty session types.


In particular, the expressive power of c-automata is not comparable with the one of the multiparty session types in [33], which subsumes most systems in the literature. More precisely, the c-automaton




cannot be syntactically written in [33] due to the two entangled loops. The example (10) cannot be expressed in global graphs [35] either, again due to the intersecting loops. We note that the infinite unfolding of the c-automaton (10) is regular and therefore it fits in the session type system considered in [34]. However, this type system has not been conceived for choreographies (it is binary session type system) and does not allow non-determinism.

On the other side, examples such as [33, Ex. 2, Fig. 4] cannot be written in our model (since we expect the same roles to occur in branches which are coinitial, branches inside loops require that all participants in a loop are notified when the loop ends). We conjecture that a refinement of well-branchedness is possible to address this limitation. An advantage of global graphs is that they feature parallel composition of global specifications, which c-automata lack. We note however that the product of c-automata allows one to model parallel composition in the case where the two branches have disjoint sets of participants (as typically assumed in multiparty session types with parallel composition). Mapping global graphs without parallel composition into c-automata is trivial. The same considerations apply to choreography languages where possible behaviours are defined by a suitable process algebra with parallel composition such as [25,10].


Future work We leave as future work the extension of our theory to *asynchronous* communications. While the general approach should apply, well-formedness and the conditions ensuring a safe composition should be refined. Indeed, our blending operation does not work for asynchronous semantics as it is, as the following example shows. Consider




whose produce is the automaton in Example 5.11. The interfaces H and K are compatible, so let us compute $(CA \times CB)^{H \bowtie K}$



If we now compute $((CA \times CB)^{H \bowtie K})^{I \bowtie J}$, we obtain



which is precisely the expected choreography under the synchronous semantics. If, instead, the asynchronous semantics was considered, we should have obtained



An interesting future development is to adopt Büchi automata as c -automata. This extension is technically straightforward (we just add a set of final states in the definition of c -automata and define ω -languages accordingly), but it probably impacts greatly on our underlying theory. For instance, it would be interesting, yet not trivial, to devise well-formedness conditions on this generalised class of c -automata that guarantee a precise correspondence with the ω -languages of the projections. In this new setting, one can then explore milder forms of liveness where, for instance, it is not the case that all participants have to terminate (as the *termination awareness* condition of [35]).

The interplay between FSAs and formal languages could lead to a theory of projection and composition of choreographies based on languages instead of automata. For instance, one could try to characterise the languages accepted by well-formed c -automata, similarly to what done in [1,27,35]. In those approaches global specifications are rendered as partial orders and the distributed realisability is characterised in terms of some closure properties of languages instead of using well-formedness conditions.

References

1. Rajeev Alur, Kousha Etessami, and Mihalis Yannakakis. Inference of Message Sequence Charts. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, 29(7):623–633, 2003.

2. Marco Autili, Amleto Di Salle, Francesco Gallo, Claudio Pompilio, and Massimo Tivoli. Chorevolution: Automating the realization of highly-collaborative distributed applications. In *Coordination Models and Languages - 21st IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference, COORDINATION 2019, Held as Part of the 14th International Federated Conference on Distributed Computing Techniques, DisCoTec 2019, Kongens Lyngby, Denmark, June 17-21, 2019, Proceedings*, pages 92–108, 2019.
3. Franco Barbanera, Ugo de'Liguoro, and Rolf Hennicker. Global types for open systems. In Massimo Bartoletti and Sophia Knight, editors, *ICE*, volume 279 of *EPTCS*, pages 4–20, 2018.
4. Franco Barbanera and Mariangiola Dezani-Ciancaglini. Open multiparty sessions. In Massimo Bartoletti, Ludovic Henrio, Anastasia Mavridou, and Alceste Scalas, editors, *ICE*, volume 304 of *EPTCS*, pages 77–96, 2019.
5. Franco Barbanera, Mariangiola Dezani-Ciancaglini, Ivan Lanese, and Emilio Tuosto. Composition and decomposition of multiparty sessions. *J. Log. Algebraic Methods Program.*, 119:100620, 2021.
6. Franco Barbanera, Ivan Lanese, and Emilio Tuosto. Choreography automata. In Simon Bliudze and Laura Bocchi, editors, *Coordination Models and Languages - 22nd IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference, COORDINATION 2020, Held as Part of the 15th International Federated Conference on Distributed Computing Techniques, DisCoTec 2020, Valletta, Malta, June 15-19, 2020, Proceedings*, volume 12134 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 86–106. Springer, 2020.
7. Samik Basu, Tevfik Bultan, and Meriem Ouederni. Deciding choreography realizability. In *Proceedings of the 39th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2012, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, January 22-28, 2012*, pages 191–202, 2012.
8. Jonas Bonér. *Reactive Microsystems - The Evolution Of Microservices At Scale*. O'Reilly, 2018.
9. Daniel Brand and Pitro Zafiropulo. On communicating finite-state machines. *J. ACM*, 30(2):323–342, 1983.
10. Mario Bravetti and Gianluigi Zavattaro. Towards a unifying theory for choreography conformance and contract compliance. In Markus Lumpe and Wim Vanderperren, editors, *Software Composition, 6th International Symposium, SC 2007, Braga, Portugal, March 24-25, 2007, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 4829 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 34–50. Springer, 2007.
11. Mario Coppo, Mariangiola Dezani-Ciancaglini, and Betti Venneri. Self-adaptive multiparty sessions. *Service Oriented Computing and Applications*, 9(3-4):249–268, 2015.
12. Mario Coppo, Mariangiola Dezani-Ciancaglini, Nobuko Yoshida, and Luca Padovani. Global progress for dynamically interleaved multiparty sessions. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 26(2):238–302, 2016.
13. Luca de Alfaro and Thomas A. Henzinger. Interface automata. In *Proceedings of the 8th European Software Engineering Conference held jointly with 9th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Foundations of Software Engineering 2001, Vienna, Austria, September 10-14, 2001*, pages 109–120, 2001.
14. Ugo de'Liguoro, Hernán C. Melgratti, and Emilio Tuosto. Towards refinable choreographies. In Julien Lange, Anastasia Mavridou, Larisa Safina, and Alceste Scalas, editors, *Proceedings 13th Interaction and Concurrency Experience, ICE 2020, Online, 19 June 2020*, volume 324 of *EPTCS*, pages 61–77, 2020.
15. Alain Finkel and Étienne Lozes. Synchronizability of communicating finite state machines is not decidable. In *ICALP*, pages 122:1–122:14, 2017.

16. Jan Friso Groote and Mohammad Reza Mousavi. *Modeling and Analysis of Communicating Systems*. MIT Press, 2014.
17. K. Honda, N. Yoshida, and M. Carbone. Multiparty asynchronous session types. In *POPL*, pages 273–284. ACM Press, 2008.
18. Kohei Honda, Nobuko Yoshida, and Marco Carbone. Multiparty asynchronous session types. *Journal of the ACM*, 63(1):9:1–9:67, 2016. Extended version of a paper presented at POPL08.
19. H. Hüttel, I. Lanese, V. T. Vasconcelos, L. Caires, M. Carbone, P.-M. Deniérou, D. Mostrous, L. Padovani, A. Ravara, E. Tuosto, H. T. Vieira, and G. Zavattaro. Foundations of session types and behavioural contracts. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 49(1):3:1–3:36, 2016.
20. Hans Hüttel, Ivan Lanese, Vasco T. Vasconcelos, Luís Caires, Marco Carbone, Pierre-Malo Deniérou, Dimitris Mostrous, Luca Padovani, António Ravara, Emilio Tuosto, Hugo Torres Vieira, and Gianluigi Zavattaro. Foundations of session types and behavioural contracts. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 49(1):3:1–3:36, 2016.
21. Nickolas Kavantzias, David Burdett, Gregory Ritzinger, Tony Fletcher, Yves Lafon, and Charlton Barreto. Web services choreography description language version 1.0. Technical report, W3C, 2005. <http://www.w3.org/TR/ws-cd1-10/>.
22. Dexter Kozen and Alexandra Silva. Practical Coinduction. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 27(7):1132–1152, 2017.
23. Ajay Krishna, Pascal Poizat, and Gwen Salaün. Checking business process evolution. *Sci. Comput. Program.*, 170:1–26, 2019.
24. Christian Lambertz and Mila E. Majster-Cederbaum. Efficient deadlock analysis of component-based software architectures. *Sci. Comput. Program.*, 78(12):2488–2510, 2013.
25. Ivan Lanese, Claudio Guidi, Fabrizio Montesi, and Gianluigi Zavattaro. Bridging the gap between interaction- and process-oriented choreographies. In *Software Engineering and Formal Methods, SEFM 2008*, pages 323–332, 2008.
26. Julien Lange, Emilio Tuosto, and Nobuko Yoshida. From communicating machines to graphical choreographies. In Sriram K. Rajamani and David Walker, editors, *POPL*, pages 221–232. ACM, 2015.
27. Markus Lohrey. Safe Realizability of High-Level Message Sequence Charts. In Luboš Brim, Mojmir Křetínský, Antonín Kučera, and Petr Jančár, editors, *CONCUR*, LNCS, pages 177–192. Springer, 2002.
28. Fabrizio Montesi. *Choreographic Programming*. PhD thesis, University of Copenhagen, 2013.
29. Fabrizio Montesi and Nobuko Yoshida. Compositional choreographies. In *CONCUR*, volume 8052 of *LNCS*, pages 425–439. Springer, 2013.
30. OMG. *Business Process Model and Notation (BPMN), Version 2.0*, January 2011. <https://www.omg.org/spec/BPMN>.
31. Robert Paige and Robert Tarjan. Three Partition Refinement Algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 16(6):973–989, December 1987.
32. Mila Dalla Preda, Maurizio Gabbriellini, Saverio Giallorenzo, Ivan Lanese, and Jacopo Mauro. Dynamic choreographies: Theory and implementation. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 13(2), 2017.
33. Alceste Scalas and Nobuko Yoshida. Less is more: multiparty session types revisited. *PACMPL*, 3(POPL):30:1–30:29, 2019.
34. Paula Severi, Luca Padovani, Emilio Tuosto, and Mariangiola Dezani-Ciancaglini. On sessions and infinite data. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 13(2), 2017.
35. Emilio Tuosto and Roberto Guanciale. Semantics of global view of choreographies. *J. Log. Algebr. Meth. Program.*, 95:17–40, 2018.

36. C. Dunlop W. Ariola. Testing in the API Economy. Top 5 Myths.
<https://alm.parasoft.com/api-testing-myths>.

A On blending

A.1 Composition in the working example

The composition of CP and CV on H and K of Example 3.2 is in Fig. 4.




Fig. 4. The c-automaton $CP_{H<K}CV$

A.2 Blending algorithm

The blending algorithm is given by the following pseudo-code.

Listing 1. The blending algorithm

```

1 Input: CA c-automaton, roles H and K
2 Output: CAH▷K (cf. Definition 5.2)
3
4 def forwarding(CX, U, V):
5   Caux = CX # Caux is an auxiliary c-automaton
6   for each t = p  $\xrightarrow{A \rightarrow U: m}$  q in CX:
7     Caux = Caux \ {t} # remove transitions involving interfaces
8   for each q  $\xrightarrow{V \rightarrow B: m}$  r in CX:
9     if A ≠ B: # if interfaces are forwarders,
10      Caux = Caux ∪ {p  $\xrightarrow{A \rightarrow B: m}$  r} # blend the transitions in a unique one
11    else: throw("Undefined") # otherwise blending is not defined
12  return Caux
13
14 Ctmp = forwarding(forwarding(CA, H, K), K, H)
15 Ctmp = Ctmp \ {p  $\xrightarrow{X \rightarrow Y: m}$  r in Ctmp | {X, Y} ∩ {H, K} ≠ ∅}
16 return Ctmp \ {state and transitions in Ctmp not reachable from the initial state}

```

Lines-6-14 correspond to Step I of the informal presentation of the blending algorithm in Section 5.1, line-15 corresponds to step II, and line-16 corresponds to step III.

Proposition A.1 (Complexity of blending). *The complexity of Algorithm 1 is $O(n^2)$ where n is the number of transitions of input c-automaton CA.*

Proof. We assume that the c-automaton, seen as a graph, is stored as an array of nodes (the states), each one with an unordered list of outgoing edges (the transitions). Step I has complexity $O(n^2)$. After the step, the number of nodes is unchanged and the number of edges is at most $O(n^2)$. Step II has linear cost on the new size. Step III requires to visit nodes and edges at most once, but since in the worst case the number of edges is larger, it also has linear complexity. The thesis follows. \square