

Parameterized Algebraic Protocols

Andreia Mordido¹, Janek Spaderna², Peter Thiemann², and Vasco T. Vasconcelos¹

¹ LASIGE, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal

² University of Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany

Abstract. We propose algebraic protocols that enable the definition of protocol templates and session types analogous to the definition of domain-specific types with algebraic datatypes. Parameterized algebraic protocols subsume all regular as well as most context-free and nested session types and, at the same time, replace the expensive superlinear algorithms for type checking by a nominal check that runs in linear time. Algebraic protocols in combination with polymorphism increase expressiveness and modularity by facilitating new ways of parameterizing and composing session types.

1 Introduction

The advantages of modeling data with algebraic datatypes (ADTs) have been recognised since the 80s Burstall [1977], Burstall et al. [1980]. ADTs are easy to define and use, they enable the construction of domain-specific types, and are amenable to efficient nominal type checking. Functional programming languages quickly embraced ADTs along with the concept of pattern matching which is still gaining momentum.

Algebraic datatypes integrate recursive types, sum types, product types, and generativity (each ADT definition creates a new type) in a single declaration. The smooth integration of different typing concepts makes ADTs easy to learn and use. It also simplifies the implementation of type checkers because they can elide superlinear algorithms for checking equivalence of equirecursive types (where recursive types are considered equal to their unfolding) in favor of a linear comparison of nominal types.

We show that the ADT approach for defining recursive datatypes can be carried over to *algebraic protocols* (AP), a novel method for defining a large class of recursive protocols. Analogous to ADTs, APs integrate concepts from the theory of session types Honda [1993], Takeuchi et al. [1994] (recursive types, choice types, and sequence types) and generativity in a single declaration. Analogous to ADTs, APs are easy to use and are amenable to efficient type checking.

We develop APs by analogy to ADTs. Consider the following ADT for lists of integers.

```
data IntList = Nil | Cons Int IntList
```

The datatype `IntList` comes with two data constructors, `Nil` to construct an empty list and `Cons` to construct a list from an element of type `Int` and a list of type `IntList`. The alternative between the constructors corresponds to a sum type and the two arguments of `Cons` give rise to a product type. Clearly, `IntList` is a recursive type. Moreover, its definition introduces `IntList` as a new type, different from any other. Type equivalence is simple: we just compare ADTs by name.

Although `IntList` specifies a (static) data type, it carries an implicit dynamics and it should be quite natural for the reader to imagine elements of this type as finite sequences of messages between two communication partners: if there are further elements, the sender selects the constructor `Cons`,

sends a value of type `Int` and then recurses. If there are no further elements, the sender selects `Nil` and stops the transmission. On the other end, the receiver awaits a constructor. On receiving a `Cons` it receives an `Int` and recurses. It stops on receiving a `Nil`.

This view has striking parallels to the theory of binary session types Honda [1993], Honda et al. [1998], Takeuchi et al. [1994]. Session types provide a rich type discipline for communication channels that statically guarantees protocol fidelity as well as type soundness across communication channels. Here is a session type for the protocol associated to the `IntList` ADT, written in the syntax of existing systems Almeida et al. [2022], Gay and Vasconcelos [2010], Lindley and Morris [2017] and as seen from the sender’s perspective:³

```
type IntListS =  $\mu\alpha.$   $\oplus$ {Cons: !Int. $\alpha$ , Nil: End!}
```

The leading $\mu\alpha\dots$ constructs an equirecursive type. The body is an internal choice type \oplus with two alternatives indicated by the tags `Cons` and `Nil`. If the sender selects `Cons`, it must continue according to `!Int. α` , which means it must send an integer and then recurse. If the sender selects `Nil`, then the protocol comes to an end as indicated by the type `End!`. Type `End!` represents a channel endpoint ready to be closed. The dual type, `End?`, represents the other endpoint, waiting to be closed. As the name suggests, a session type describes a full session of interactions between the communication partners up to the end.

Like this example, most session type systems rely on structural typing and equirecursion; this way, unfolding does not give rise to communication. Traditional session type systems restrict recursion to the tail position (as in `IntListS`), so that types are effectively finite automata with regular trace languages. Consequently, type equivalence and subtyping for such systems are decidable in polynomial time. Recently, richer forms of recursion have been considered that lift the restriction to tail recursion, so that types are akin to, e.g., deterministic context-free grammars Almeida et al. [2022], Das et al. [2021], Padovani [2017, 2019], Thiemann and Vasconcelos [2016]. Unfortunately, when types are endowed with richer forms of recursion, type equivalence gets more complex (doubly-exponential Das et al. [2021]). The implementation of a type equivalence algorithm for these systems is nontrivial Almeida et al. [2020]; incomplete algorithms have been used to speed up type equivalence Das et al. [2021]; annotations have been proposed Padovani [2019] that make type checking effective. But the algorithms for type equivalence remain asymptotically superlinear in all these works.

The sad truth is that structural session types are quite verbose and too complex for the average programmer, thus hampering their adoption. While equirecursive types are expressive, understanding their equivalence is hard for programmers and inefficient in language implementations.

What if programming with expressive recursive protocols were as easy as programming with ADTs? The theory and practice of algebraic protocols that we propose in this paper delivers exactly such an approach. Enhanced with parameters and polymorphism in the style of System F, APs provide a uniquely simple and efficient approach to modularity and abstraction when defining and implementing communication protocols.

Here is the declaration of an algebraic protocol corresponding to the session type `IntListS`:⁴

```
protocol IntListP = Nil | Cons Int IntListP
```

The keyword `protocol`, in place of `data`, denotes an algebraic *protocol* type rather than an algebraic *data* type. A protocol type is like a template that describes a composable segment of a session.

³ Writing `IntListS` for the session type corresponding to `IntList`.

⁴ Writing `IntListP` for the protocol type corresponding to `IntList`.

It neither describes a full session, nor is it committed to a particular direction of communication. Rather, a protocol type has to be *materialized* into a session type by assigning a direction and specifying a continuation session: we write `!IntListP.S` to send a sequence of integers and continue with session type `S` or `?IntListP.S` to receive a sequence of integers and continue with `S`, so that the session type `IntListS` corresponds to `!IntListP.End!`. Hence, protocol types relate to session types just like composable continuations relate to continuations Danvy and Filinski [1992], Felleisen [1988]: the former describe a segment of interaction (execution) while the latter describe interaction (execution) to the end.

Just like ADTs, we can equip APs with parameters as in `ListP a`:

```
protocol ListP a = Nil | Cons a ListP
```

While parameters range over types in ADT definitions, they range over *protocols* in AP definitions! This facility is key to the modularity of APs. For example, the protocol `ListP Q` repeats the protocol `Q`. It is also possible to flip the direction of `Q` by considering the protocol `ListP -Q`: repeat the protocol `Q` but with reversed roles of sender and receiver (more in section 2.2). With this modular design, we can define finite streams of anything expressible as an algebraic protocol. The external and internal choices in previous session type systems are captured by the sum-of-product nature of algebraic types—the sum type replaced by internal/external choice and the product type replaced by sequencing as in the linear logic interpretation of session types Caires et al. [2016].

Algebraic protocol types are nominal and isorecursive. This combination of features reduces the complexity of type equivalence from asymptotically doubly-exponential Almeida et al. [2020], Das et al. [2021] to linear. Notably, the expressivity of algebraic protocols is on par with that of session types with non-regular recursion Das et al. [2021], Thiemann and Vasconcelos [2016], so all protocols expressible in such theories can be adapted to algebraic protocols (without paying the price of hosting complex or incomplete algorithms in the compiler). Interestingly, types are now also iso-associative, thus saving us from defining hard-coded associativity laws, due to the basic properties of sequential composition Almeida et al. [2022], Thiemann and Vasconcelos [2016].

Contributions

- Algebraic protocols (AP). We propose a new approach for defining recursive protocols compositionally inspired by parameterized algebraic datatypes. This approach combines naming, recursion, and choice-of-sequence types analogously to algebraic datatypes. It adds a novel notion of direction to the component protocols of a tag. Checking type equivalence becomes simple and efficient (worst case linear in the size of the types) as APs are nominal.
- Algebraic session types (AlgST). We define a core calculus that is based on linear System F with (non-linear) recursion and features session types based on APs. Type checking for AlgST is specified by bidirectional typing rules that have a direct algorithmic reading. We prove type soundness via preservation and progress.
- Full implementation as a publicly available artifact Spaderna et al. [2023], including practical extensions (cf. section 5).

Overview

Section 2 contains an informal introduction of algebraic protocols with examples; we illustrate the gain in expressivity and modularity with respect to other work in section 2.3. Section 3 discusses the

type structure of AlgST and establishes key results for efficient type checking: correctness of type normalization and worst case complexity of type equivalence. Section 4 defines statics and dynamics of expressions and processes followed by a presentation of the metatheoretical results. Section 5 discusses the implementation; since all rules are algorithmic, their appropriate reading leads directly to a type checker and an interpreter. Sections 6 and 7 discuss related work and conclude. Proofs, auxiliary results, further examples, an informal outline of an embedding of context-free session types to AlgST, and further discussion are provided as supplementary material. The implementation is publicly available Spaderna et al. [2023].

2 Algebraic Protocols and session types

This section provides a programmer’s view of algebraic session types (AlgST). It is driven by examples and introduces the concepts of algebraic protocols and session types. Our syntax is inspired by Haskell, as implemented in our artifact. Examples make liberal use of practical extensions of the formal system (cf. section 5).

2.1 Algebraic datatypes as protocols

Suppose we want to transmit abstract syntax trees for a language with integers and addition. Their type might be defined by an algebraic datatype definition as in Haskell or ML.

```
data Ast = Con Int | Add Ast Ast
```

This declaration defines the type `Ast` along with the types of the constructor functions, which can be used to construct `Ast` values as well as for pattern matching on them:

```
Con :      Int → Ast
Add : Ast → Ast → Ast
```

The type `Ast` is recursive and its `Add` constructor takes two `Ast` values as arguments. To define a protocol for transmitting values of type `Ast`, we merely change the keyword `data` to `protocol` as in

```
protocol AstP = ConP Int | AddP AstP AstP
```

This declaration defines the protocol type `AstP` along with tags `ConP` and `AddP`, which serve to introduce and eliminate branching in the protocol. The resulting `AstP` protocol can be used in two directions, `!AstP` for sending and `?AstP` for receiving data.⁵ Protocol types only describe behavior, they do not classify run-time values. They inhabit a dedicated kind `P`.

We illustrate the `AstP` protocol with a function to send an `Ast` value. We write functions in *channel passing style*, which takes a channel as its argument and returns it after processing some prefix of the channel’s session type. The function’s type is universally quantified over the continuation type `s` of the unexplored part of the channel. The argument type adds some prefix to `s` that describes the part of the session performed by the function. In our example the prefix is `!AstP`.

```
sendAst : Ast → ∀(s:S). !AstP.s → s
sendAst t [s] c = case t of {
  Con x   → select ConP [s] c ▷ sendInt [s] x,
  Add l r → select AddP [s] c ▷ sendAst l [!AstP.s] ▷ sendAst r [s] }
```

⁵ The implementation allows us to reuse a `data` declaration as a `protocol` declaration, thus overloading the constructors.

We use the \triangleright operator for reverse function application. Defined by $x \triangleright f = f x$, the operator associates to the left and features low priority, so that $x \triangleright f \triangleright g$ means $g (f x)$. The square brackets indicate type abstraction (on the left) and type application (in expressions). The predefined `sendInt` operation has type $\forall(s:S). \text{Int} \rightarrow !\text{Int}.s \rightarrow s$. The use of pattern matching with `case` on algebraic datatypes is standard. As usual in session type systems, channel values of session type are linear and the `select` operation makes an internal choice between alternatives. Selecting a protocol constructor sends an encoding of the corresponding tag and “pushes” the transmission of the fields on the channel type. That is:

```
select ConP [s] : !AstP.s → !Int.s
select AddP [s] : !AstP.s → !AstP.!AstP.s
```

A function to process the receiver end of this protocol must take an argument of type `?AstP.s`.

```
recvAst : ∀(s:S). ?AstP.s → (Ast, s)
recvAst [s] c = match c with {
  ConP c → let (x, c) = receiveInt [s] c in (Con x, c),
  AddP c → let (t1, c) = recvAst [?AstP.s] c in
    let (tr, c) = recvAst [s] c in (Add t1 tr, c) }
```

The `match` on a session-typed channel receives a tag and branches according to it. Branching also “pushes” transmission of the fields on the channel type analogous to the `select` operation:

```
c : ?AstP.s ⊢ match c with { ConP c → ... -- c : ?Int.s
                          AddP c → ... } -- c : ?AstP.?AstP.s
```

Left of the turnstile \vdash , we write the typing of c before the `match`. In the body of the `match`, we write the typing of c after matching against the selectors `ConP` and `AddP`, respectively. The `match c` (with the type on the left) consumes the linear binding for channel c . The pattern `ConP c` reintroduces variable c , binds it with the channel after processing the selection and gives it an updated type (on the right) for the body of the corresponding branch. The consideration for pattern `AddP c` is analogous. The choice of the branch is external and depends on the received selector tag.

The protocol in this subsection goes beyond the reach of most session type systems because they only support tail recursive session types. Thus, functions like `sendAst` and `recvAst` have no meaningful type in traditional session type systems Gay and Vasconcelos [2010], Lindley and Morris [2017]. However, they can be written using context-free or nested session types Almeida et al. [2022], Das et al. [2021], Thiemann and Vasconcelos [2016]. We discuss the differences in section 6.

2.2 Simple protocols with polarities

The protocol type `AstP` from section 2.1 describes unidirectional communication. This section extends protocol types with *polarities* to model bidirectional communication. The protocol type `Arith` of an arithmetic server (cf. Gay and Hole [1999]) serves as an example. The server takes a command, `Neg` or `Add`, accepts one or two inputs to the commands and produces its output.

```
protocol Arith = Neg Int -Int | Add Int Int -Int
```

The new element in this declaration is the *polarity* “-” which indicates a reversal of the direction of communication. A client would use this protocol in “forward direction”, that is, in a session type of the form `!Arith.s` whereas the server would implement `?Arith.t`, for some session type t dual to s . On `!Arith.s`, selection of a tag works as in section 2.1, but negative polarities flip the direction:

```

select Neg [s] : !Arith.s → !Int.?Int.s
select Add [s] : !Arith.s → !Int.!Int.?Int.s

```

Branching operates analogously on types in the assumption:

```

c : ?Arith.s ⊢ match c with { Neg c → ... -- c : ?Int.!Int.s
                          Add c → ... } -- c : ?Int.?Int.!Int.s

```

The implementation of the server is straightforward. (We leave the client code to the reader.)

```

serveArith : ∀(s:S). ?Arith.s → s
serveArith [s] c = match c with {
  Neg c → let (x, c) = receiveInt [!Int.s] c in
           sendInt [s] (0-x) c,
  Add c → let (x, c) = receiveInt [?Int.!Int.s] c in
           let (y, c) = receiveInt [!Int.s] c in
           sendInt [s] (x+y) c }

```

The tag declaration `Neg Int -Int` shows that the tag arguments are protocols themselves, rather than plain types. This fact is witnessed by the use of `AstP` in a tag argument for `AstP` as well as by the use of `-Int` in a tag argument for `Arith`. Ordinary types like `Int` are promoted to protocol types.

2.3 Parameterized protocols and modularity

Algebraic protocols can have protocol parameters, just like algebraic data types have type parameters. This facility provides a powerful and versatile approach for declaring modular protocols. As a first example, we declare a protocol that repeatedly runs another protocol:

```

protocol Stream a = Next a (Stream a)

```

Using this protocol we define a process that sends infinitely many ones on a channel:

```

ones : !Stream Int.End! → Unit
ones c = select Next [Int,End!] c ▷ sendInt [!Stream Int.End!] 1 ▷ ones

```

When using the `Stream` protocol, the continuation session type `End!` does not matter because the protocol never reaches the continuation. For a parameterized protocol, `select` takes type parameters corresponding to the protocol parameters (`Int`) as well as the continuation session (`End!`). Algebraic protocols sidestep issues with contractiveness of recursive definitions and thus guardedness of the protocols: we always have to make explicit progress by selecting the `Next` tag.

Up to this point, the examples we presented are definable with some effort in previous work on session types. The following examples exploit features that make AlgST stand out:

- Traditional session types lack composability in the sense that abstraction over behavior is only possible in the tail position. Polymorphic context-free session types Almeida et al. [2022] lift this restriction, but at the price of a type equivalence algorithm that takes doubly exponential time in the worst-case. AlgST allows abstraction of any part of a protocol while providing a linear-time algorithm for type equivalence.
- The protocol kind is a unique feature of AlgST that enables abstraction over entire subprotocols and their orientation at any place in a protocol. This facility enables us to define a toolbox of generic protocol operators, inspired by regular language operations, and flip between client and server views using the negation operator.

Generic servers Parametric protocols enable the construction of generic servers that abstract over the subsidiary protocols. Our first example created a stream of integers, but what if we wanted a server for `Stream Arith` that runs the `Arith` protocol ad infinitum? To this end we write a generic server, `stream`, that implements the `Stream a` protocol, for any `a`, and invokes a subsidiary server for the sub-protocol `a`. We abstract the type of this sub-server with a parameterized type alias:

```
type Service a =  $\forall(s:S). ?a.s \rightarrow s$ 
```

Thus armed, we can write the generic server and use it to run `Stream Arith`.

```
stream :  $\forall(a:P). Service\ a \rightarrow ?Stream\ a.End_! \rightarrow Unit$ 
stream [a] serve c = match c with {
  Next c  $\rightarrow$  serve [?Stream a.End_!] c  $\triangleright$  stream [a] serve }

streamArith : ?Stream Arith.End_!  $\rightarrow Unit$ 
streamArith = stream [Arith] serveArith
```

We call the server constructed in this way *passive* as it waits to receive a `Next` tag before running the subsidiary protocol. Dually, we can define an *active* server.

Active servers — an exercise in duality and negation An active server offers the `Next` tag to its client, indicating its readiness to accept a request. Such a server generalizes the `ones` server. All we need to do is flip two bits in the type:

```
streamAct :  $\forall(a:P). Service\ a \rightarrow !Stream\ -a.End_! \rightarrow Unit$ 
streamAct [a] svc c =
  select Next [-a, End_!] c  $\triangleright$  svc [!Stream -a.End_!]  $\triangleright$  streamAct [a] svc
```

Why do we have to write `!Stream -a` in the type? One might expect the active server to run on a channel whose type is the dual of `?Stream a.End_!`, which is `!Stream a.End_?`. But this change of direction also affects the subsidiary protocol in parameter `a` as illustrated by the typing of `select`:

```
c : !Stream Arith.End_!  $\vdash$ 
select Next [Arith, End_!] c : !Arith.!Stream a. End_!
```

But this type is not an instance of the type `Service Arith = $\forall(s:S). ?Arith.s$` . Thanks to polarities, we can adapt to `c : !Stream -Arith` which switches the direction to an output:

```
select Next [-Arith, End_!] c : ?Arith.!Stream -Arith. End_!
```

This way, we can reuse `serveArith` as follows.

```
streamActArith : !Stream -Arith.End_!  $\rightarrow Unit$ 
streamActArith = streamAct [Arith] serveArith
```

The same active server can also serve the infinite stream of ones:

```
streamActOnes : !Stream Int.End_!  $\rightarrow Unit$ 
streamActOnes = streamAct [-Int] (sendInt 1)
```

Interestingly, the typing of `streamActOnes` involves *double negation of polarities*. Observe that `sendInt 1 : Service -Int`, so that the transmitted stream is in fact `Stream -(-Int) \equiv Stream Int`.

A toolbox for generic servers Inspired by the protocols `Stream a` and `ListP a` (from section 1), we can build a library of parameterized protocols with generic servers for them. These protocols reify the standard type constructors, reminiscent of regular language operators.

```
protocol Seq a b    = Seq a b                -- product
protocol Either a b = Left a | Right b      -- sum
protocol Repeat a   = More a (Repeat a) | Quit -- iteration
```

We leave the straightforward implementation of the corresponding passive generic servers, `seq`, `either`, and `repeat`, as well as their active variants, to the reader.

These protocol types and their generic servers are sufficient to construct skeleton servers for all protocols whose flow can be described by regular languages. For example, we can build the server for `Repeat Arith` by combination of generic servers with the servers for negation and addition.

```
type Neg    = Seq Int -Int
type Add    = Seq Int (Seq Int -Int)
type Arith  = Either Neg Add

serveNeg : Service Neg
serveNeg [s] c = match c with {
  Seq c → let (x, c) = receiveInt [!Int.s] c in
    sendInt [s] (0-x) c }

serveAdd : Service Add
serveAdd [s] c = match c with {
  Seq c → let (x, c) = receiveInt [?Seq Int -Int.s] c in
    match c with {
      Seq c → let (y, c) = receiveInt [!Int.s] c in
        sendInt [s] (x+y) c }}

serveArith : Service Arith
serveArith = either [Neg] serveNeg [Add] serveAdd

serveAriths : Service (Repeat Arith)
serveAriths = repeat [Arith] serveArith
```

There is some overhead compared to the arithmetic server shown in section 2.2. Previously, a client only had to handle the tags `Neg` and `Add` besides the `Repeat` protocol. Here, `Neg` and `Add` are replaced by `Left` and `Right` and the client has to handle the `Seq` tags on top. Thus the protocol constructed from the generic parts has some overheads, as we discuss in supplement A.6. We provide further examples of generic servers in supplement B.

3 Types

The type structure underlying AlgST comprises three parts: the kind structure, the type language and protocol definitions. The type language and protocol definitions are mutually recursive. To simplify the exposition, the formalized language is based on linear System F. While we formalize protocol definitions, we do not formalize the standard treatment of (linear) algebraic datatypes and pattern matching, although we use it in examples.

The type language encompasses types with different features (as illustrated in section 2). For a correct type abstraction, we need to endow the system with a classification of types through kinds. AlgST distinguishes three kinds.

- s** classifies session types, which in turn classify endpoints of communication channels.
- t** classifies all types that classify run-time values.
- p** classifies protocol types. The kind **p** subsumes any other kind by an implicit lifting that associates a type with a protocol suitable to transmit it. A protocol type per se classifies pure behavior, but no run-time values.

Kinds are linearly ordered in a subkinding relation, which is the reflexive transitive closure of the strict ordering $\mathbf{s} < \mathbf{t} < \mathbf{p}$. Type formation includes a standard kind subsumption rule.

Here is the grammar of types:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 S, T, U ::= \mathbf{Unit} \mid T \rightarrow U \mid T \otimes U \mid \forall \alpha: \kappa. T \mid \alpha \mid & \text{functional types} \\
 ?T.S \mid !T.S \mid \mathbf{End}_? \mid \mathbf{End}_! \mid \mathbf{Dual} S \mid & \text{session types} \\
 \rho \bar{T} \mid -T & \text{protocol types}
 \end{array}$$

We mostly use the metavariable S to range over session types (kind **s**). Metavariables T, U range over functional types (kind **t**) and protocol types (kind **p**). Functional types comprise the usual types of linear System F: unit, function, product, universal quantification, and type variables. The session type operators are receiving, sending, passive and active termination, and the dual operator. The dual operator swaps the direction of all communications in the spine of a session type. Thus, a session type is a sequence of communications either terminated by $\mathbf{End}_?$ or by $\mathbf{End}_!$, or extensible with a type variable α of kind **s**.

The protocol type $\rho \bar{T}$ refers to the protocol declared as ρ with parameters \bar{T} . The operator “ $-$ ” reverses the direction of communication of its protocol parameter. While duality transforms session types outside-in, the reverse operator transforms protocols inside-out.

A kind context Δ maps type variables to kinds and protocol names to first-order arrow kinds that determine the number of parameters of the protocol. Formally, we should write $\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbf{p}$ for the kind of a protocol constructor without parameters, but we often abbreviate it to **p**.

$$\Delta ::= \cdot \mid \Delta, \alpha: \kappa \mid \Delta, \rho: \bar{\mathbf{p}} \rightarrow \mathbf{p}$$

Figure 1 contains the type formation rules. We present them in algorithmic form from the beginning. The judgment $\Delta \vdash T \Rightarrow \kappa$ assigns to type T its minimal kind κ under kind context Δ . The corresponding checking judgment $\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \kappa$ takes inputs T and κ and checks if the synthesized kind is a subkind of the expected one.

The types for unit (T-UNIT), functions (T-ARROW), pairs (T-PAIR), and universal polymorphism (T-POLY) have kind **t** like their constituents. Variables have any kind that has been assigned to them (T-VAR). AlgST’s notion of session type distinguishes passive $\mathbf{End}_?$ and active $\mathbf{End}_!$ termination of a session (T-END?, T-END!), and the dual operator (T-DUAL). Conventional session types require types for the values exchanged in messages; here we ask for protocols instead (T-IN and T-OUT). Rule T-PROTOCOL builds a protocol type from a protocol name ρ . We assume that the kind context contains a binding for ρ that determines its arity. All parameters to a protocol must be protocols themselves. The latter constitutes no restriction because any type can be lifted to a protocol. A protocol type can change direction using the reverse operator (rule T-MSGNEG).

Type formation (synthesis, check-against)

$$\boxed{\Delta \vdash T \Rightarrow \kappa, \quad \Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \kappa}$$

T-UNIT $\frac{}{\Delta \vdash \mathbf{Unit} \Rightarrow \mathbf{t}}$	T-ARROW $\frac{\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{t} \quad \Delta \vdash U \Leftarrow \mathbf{t}}{\Delta \vdash T \rightarrow U \Rightarrow \mathbf{t}}$	T-PAIR $\frac{\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{t} \quad \Delta \vdash U \Leftarrow \mathbf{t}}{\Delta \vdash T \otimes U \Rightarrow \mathbf{t}}$	T-VAR $\frac{\alpha: \kappa \in \Delta}{\Delta \vdash \alpha \Rightarrow \kappa}$
T-POLY $\frac{\Delta, \alpha: \kappa \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{t}}{\Delta \vdash \forall \alpha: \kappa. T \Rightarrow \mathbf{t}}$	T-IN $\frac{\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{p} \quad \Delta \vdash S \Leftarrow \mathbf{s}}{\Delta \vdash ?T.S \Rightarrow \mathbf{s}}$	T-OUT $\frac{\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{p} \quad \Delta \vdash S \Leftarrow \mathbf{s}}{\Delta \vdash !T.S \Rightarrow \mathbf{s}}$	T-END? $\Delta \vdash \mathbf{End}_? \Rightarrow \mathbf{s}$
T-DUAL $\frac{\Delta \vdash S \Leftarrow \mathbf{s}}{\Delta \vdash \mathbf{Dual} S \Rightarrow \mathbf{s}}$	T-PROTOCOL $\frac{\rho: \bar{\mathbf{p}} \rightarrow \mathbf{p} \in \Delta \quad \Delta \vdash \bar{T} \Leftarrow \bar{\mathbf{p}}}{\Delta \vdash \rho \bar{T} \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}}$	T-MSGNEG $\frac{\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{p}}{\Delta \vdash -T \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}}$	T-SUB $\frac{\Delta \vdash T \Rightarrow \kappa \quad \kappa \leq \kappa'}{\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \kappa'}$
			T-END! $\Delta \vdash \mathbf{End}_! \Rightarrow \mathbf{s}$

Fig. 1: Algorithmic type formation rules

Algebraic protocol types $\rho \bar{\alpha}$ are defined analogously to algebraic datatypes.

$$\text{protocol } \rho \bar{\alpha} = \{C_i \bar{T}_i\}_{i \in I}$$

This declaration defines the protocol type constructor ρ that takes as many parameters as indicated by $\bar{\alpha}$. The protocol has choices indexed by $i \in I$. Each choice is tagged by a *selector tag* C_i that guards a sequence of subprotocols \bar{T}_i , to be processed in that order. We assume that selector tags are globally unique. Program may use any full application $\rho \bar{U}$ as a protocol type. We check a single protocol declaration using the formation rules where Δ may refer to previously defined protocols:⁶

$$\frac{\text{protocol } \rho \bar{\alpha} = \{C_i \bar{T}_i\}_{i \in I} \quad \Delta, \rho: \bar{\mathbf{p}} \rightarrow \mathbf{p}, \bar{\alpha}: \bar{\mathbf{p}} \vdash \bar{T}_i \Leftarrow \bar{\mathbf{p}} \quad (\forall i \in I)}{\Delta \vdash \rho \Rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{p}} \rightarrow \mathbf{p}}$$

Types obey a kind-indexed conversion relation. Figure 2 presents the declarative rules. Conversion is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive (C-REFL, C-SYM, C-TRANS). We define duality as a conversion on session types. The rules entail that duality changes the direction of transmissions from the outside (C-DUALEND?, C-DUALEND!, C-DUALIN, C-DUALOUT) and that duality is involutory (C-DUALINV). Kind subsumption is lifted to conversion (C-SUB). The last line governs the interaction between the reverse operator and the session type constructors: reverse flips the direction from the inside (C-NEGIN, C-NEGOUT). Reverse is also involutory (C-NEGINV). We omit the standard congruence rules.

While type formation is algorithmic, the declarative definition of type conversion is more perspicuous. For the upcoming algorithmic expression typing relation we define a normalization algorithm for types, which is sound and complete with respect to the declarative rules.

In a type in normal form, the reverse operator can only occur at most once at the top level (of a type of kind \mathbf{p}) and at the top level of the parameters of a protocol type. The \mathbf{Dual} operator only appears on type variables, at the end of the spine of a session type. Thus an algorithm to compute

⁶ For mutually recursive protocols $\bar{\rho}$, we add the assumptions for all $\bar{\rho}$ when checking each individual ρ_i .

Type conversion

$$\boxed{\Delta \vdash T \equiv T : \kappa}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{C-REFL} \\
\frac{\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \kappa}{\Delta \vdash T \equiv T : \kappa} \\
\\
\text{C-DUALEND?} \\
\Delta \vdash \text{Dual End}_? \equiv \text{End}_! : \mathbf{s} \\
\\
\text{C-DUALOUT} \\
\frac{\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{p} \quad \Delta \vdash S \Leftarrow \mathbf{s}}{\Delta \vdash \text{Dual} (!T.S) \equiv ?T.(Dual S) : \mathbf{s}} \\
\\
\text{C-NEGIN} \\
\frac{\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{p} \quad \Delta \vdash S \Leftarrow \mathbf{s}}{\Delta \vdash ?(-T).S \equiv !T.S : \mathbf{s}} \\
\\
\text{C-SYM} \\
\frac{\Delta \vdash T_1 \equiv T_2 : \kappa}{\Delta \vdash T_2 \equiv T_1 : \kappa} \\
\\
\text{C-DUALEND!} \\
\Delta \vdash \text{Dual End}_! \equiv \text{End}_? : \mathbf{s} \\
\\
\text{C-NEGOUT} \\
\frac{\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{p} \quad \Delta \vdash S \Leftarrow \mathbf{s}}{\Delta \vdash !(-T).S \equiv ?T.S : \mathbf{s}} \\
\\
\text{C-TRANS} \\
\frac{\Delta \vdash T_1 \equiv T_2 : \kappa \quad \Delta \vdash T_2 \equiv T_3 : \kappa}{\Delta \vdash T_1 \equiv T_3 : \kappa} \\
\\
\text{C-DUALIN} \\
\frac{\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{p} \quad \Delta \vdash S \Leftarrow \mathbf{s}}{\Delta \vdash \text{Dual} (?T.S) \equiv !T.(Dual S) : \mathbf{s}} \\
\\
\text{C-DUALINV} \\
\frac{\Delta \vdash S \Leftarrow \mathbf{s}}{\Delta \vdash \text{Dual} (Dual S) \equiv S : \mathbf{s}} \\
\\
\text{C-SUB} \\
\frac{\Delta \vdash T_1 \equiv T_2 : \kappa \quad \kappa \leq \kappa'}{\Delta \vdash T_1 \equiv T_2 : \kappa'} \\
\\
\text{C-NEGINV} \\
\frac{\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{p}}{\Delta \vdash -(-T) \equiv T : \mathbf{p}}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 2: Type conversion (congruence rules omitted)

normal forms must push all **Dual** operators down the spine of a session type by applying the conversion rules C-DUALIN, C-DUALOUT, C-DUALEND?, and C-DUALEND! from left to right. If it encounters another **Dual** operator along the spine, it applies rule C-DUALINV. We cannot further resolve **Dual** α , hence it is a normal form.

The reverse operator only applies to protocol types. So it can only occur in a message type like $?(-T).S$ and in the parameter of a protocol type. In a message type, normalization must apply rules C-NEGIN and C-NEGOUT exhaustively from left to right, which removes the reverse operator from message types. In the parameter of a protocol type, normalization applies rule C-NEGINV exhaustively. Starting with an odd number of reverse operators, a single operator remains; starting with an even number, all reverse operators are removed.

Following this intuition normalization is defined in fig. 3 by two mutually recursive functions $\text{nrm}^+(-)$ and $\text{nrm}^-(-)$ along with three auxiliary functions. Positive normalization $\text{nrm}^+(-)$ traverses and reconstructs all non-session type constructs. It also gets invoked on the type of the transmitted value for session types, i.e., on T in type $!T.S$. Normalizing the **Dual** operator switches forth and back between positive and negative normalization, $\text{nrm}^+(-)$ and $\text{nrm}^-(-)$.

Negative normalization with superscript $-$ indicates a pending **Dual** type constructor, so that the function $\text{nrm}^-(-)$ is only used for session types. Normalization pushes the pending dual constructor along the spine of a session type to implement rules C-DUALIN, C-DUALOUT, C-DUALEND?, and C-DUALEND!. The pending dualization gets reified on a type variable.

Normalizing a reversed protocol $-T$ invokes the negative directional function $-(-T')$ on T 's normal form to enforce the conversion rule C-DUALINV.

Type normalization

$$\boxed{\text{nrm}^+(T) = T \quad \text{nrm}^-(T) = T}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{nrm}^+(\mathbf{Unit}) = \mathbf{Unit} & \text{nrm}^+(\mathbf{Dual} \ T) = \text{nrm}^-(T) \\
\text{nrm}^+(T \rightarrow U) = \text{nrm}^+(T) \rightarrow \text{nrm}^+(U) & \text{nrm}^+(\rho \bar{T}) = \rho \overline{\text{nrm}^+(T)} \\
\text{nrm}^+(T \otimes U) = \text{nrm}^+(T) \otimes \text{nrm}^+(U) & \text{nrm}^+(-T) = -(\text{nrm}^+(T)) \\
\text{nrm}^+(\forall \alpha: \kappa.T) = \forall \alpha: \kappa.\text{nrm}^+(T) & \text{nrm}^-(\mathbf{Dual} \ T) = \text{nrm}^+(T) \\
\text{nrm}^+(\alpha) = \alpha & \text{nrm}^-(\alpha) = \mathbf{Dual} \ \alpha \\
\text{nrm}^+(?T.S) = \S(-(\text{nrm}^+(T))).\text{nrm}^+(S) & \text{nrm}^-(?T.S) = \S(+(\text{nrm}^+(T))).\text{nrm}^-(S) \\
\text{nrm}^+(!T.S) = \S(+(\text{nrm}^+(T))).\text{nrm}^+(S) & \text{nrm}^-(!T.S) = \S(-(\text{nrm}^+(T))).\text{nrm}^-(S) \\
\text{nrm}^+(\mathbf{End}_?) = \mathbf{End}_? & \text{nrm}^-(\mathbf{End}_?) = \mathbf{End}_! \\
\text{nrm}^+(\mathbf{End}_!) = \mathbf{End}_! & \text{nrm}^-(\mathbf{End}_!) = \mathbf{End}_?
\end{array}$$

Materialization and the directional operators

$$\boxed{\S(T).T = T \quad -(T) = T \quad +(T) = T}$$

$$\begin{array}{lll}
\S(-T).U = ?T.U & -(-T) = +(T) & +(-T) = -(T) \\
\S(T).U = !T.U & -(T) = -T & +(T) = T
\end{array}$$

In the second line $T \neq -U$ in all cases.

Fig. 3: Type normalization and auxiliary metafunctions on session types and protocol types

Here is an example of a step-by-step computation of the positive normal form of $\mathbf{Dual} \ (?(-\mathbf{Int}).\alpha)$.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{nrm}^+(\mathbf{Dual} \ (?(-\mathbf{Int}).\alpha)) & \\
= \text{nrm}^-(?(-\mathbf{Int}).\alpha) & \text{negative normalization remembers pending } \mathbf{Dual} \\
= \S(+(\text{nrm}^+(-\mathbf{Int}))).\text{nrm}^-(\alpha) & \text{nrm}^+(-) \text{ on the payload, } \text{nrm}^-(-) \text{ on the spine} \\
= \S(+(-(\text{nrm}^+(\mathbf{Int}))).\mathbf{Dual} \ \alpha) & \text{negative normalization reifies } \mathbf{Dual} \text{ on type variable} \\
= \S(-\mathbf{Int}).\mathbf{Dual} \ \alpha & \text{materialization applied to normal form } \dots \\
= ?\mathbf{Int}.\mathbf{Dual} \ \alpha & \dots \text{ fixes the direction}
\end{array}$$

To test whether a type equivalence goal $\Delta \vdash T \equiv U : \kappa$ holds, we compute *algorithmic type equivalence*, notation $T \equiv_A U$, which is defined by comparison of normal forms: $\text{nrm}^+(T) = \text{nrm}^+(U)$ up to α -equivalence. The following propositions establish soundness and completeness of the normalization algorithm, as well as its worst case running time.

Theorem 1 (Soundness). *Let $\Delta \vdash T \Rightarrow \kappa$ and $\Delta \vdash U \Rightarrow \kappa$.*

1. *If $\text{nrm}^+(T) =_\alpha \text{nrm}^+(U)$, then $\Delta \vdash T \equiv U : \kappa$.*
2. *If $\kappa = \mathbf{s}$ and $\text{nrm}^-(T) =_\alpha \text{nrm}^-(U)$, then $\Delta \vdash T \equiv U : \mathbf{s}$.*

Theorem 2 (Completeness). *Let $\Delta \vdash T \equiv U : \kappa$.*

1. *$\text{nrm}^+(T) =_\alpha \text{nrm}^+(U)$.*
2. *If $\kappa = \mathbf{s}$, then $\text{nrm}^-(T) =_\alpha \text{nrm}^-(U)$.*

Types for constants

$$\boxed{\text{typeof}(c) = T}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{typeof}(\ast) &= \mathbf{Unit} & \text{typeof}(\mathbf{fork}) &= (\mathbf{Unit} \rightarrow \mathbf{Unit}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Unit} \\ \text{typeof}(\mathbf{new}) &= \forall \alpha: \mathbf{s}.\alpha \otimes \mathbf{Dual} \ \alpha & \text{typeof}(\mathbf{terminate}) &= \mathbf{End}_! \rightarrow \mathbf{Unit} \\ \text{typeof}(\mathbf{receive}) &= \forall \alpha: \mathbf{t}.\forall \beta: \mathbf{s}.\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \alpha \otimes \beta & \text{typeof}(\mathbf{wait}) &= \mathbf{End}_? \rightarrow \mathbf{Unit} \\ \text{typeof}(\mathbf{send}) &= \forall \alpha: \mathbf{t}.\forall \beta: \mathbf{s}.\alpha \rightarrow !\alpha.\beta \rightarrow \beta \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{typeof}(\mathbf{select} \ C_k) = \forall \bar{\alpha}: \bar{\mathbf{p}}.\forall \beta: \mathbf{s}.\!(\rho \ \bar{\alpha}).\beta \rightarrow \S(+(\bar{T}_k)).\beta \text{ if } \mathbf{protocol} \ \rho \ \bar{\alpha} = \{C_i \ \bar{T}_i\}_{i \in I} \text{ and } k \in I$$

Fig. 4: Types for constants

Theorem 3 (Time complexity of type equivalence). *The test for $T \equiv_A U$ runs in $O(|T| + |U|)$.*

4 Expressions and Processes

This section introduces the notions of expressions and processes, algorithmic typing for expressions, and operational semantics for expressions and processes based on labelled transition relations. The syntax of constants c , values v , expressions e and processes p is defined by the grammar below.

$$\begin{aligned} c &::= \ast \mid \mathbf{fork} \mid \mathbf{new} \mid \mathbf{receive} \mid \mathbf{send} \mid \mathbf{select} \ C \mid \mathbf{wait} \mid \mathbf{terminate} \\ v &::= c \mid x \mid \lambda x: T.e \mid \mathbf{rec} \ x: T.v \mid \Lambda \alpha: \kappa.v \mid \langle v, v \rangle \mid \mathbf{rec} \ x: T.v \mid \mathbf{receive}[T] \\ &\quad \mathbf{receive}[T][T] \mid \mathbf{send}[T] \mid \mathbf{send}[T][T] \mid \mathbf{send}[T][T] \ v \mid \mathbf{select} \ C[\bar{T}] \\ e &::= v \mid ee \mid e[T] \mid \mathbf{let} \ \ast = e \ \mathbf{in} \ e \mid \langle e, e \rangle \mid \mathbf{let} \ \langle x, x \rangle = e \ \mathbf{in} \ e \mid \\ &\quad \mathbf{match} \ e \ \mathbf{with} \ \{C_i \ x_i \rightarrow e_i\}_{i \in I} \\ p &::= \langle e \rangle \mid p \mid p \mid (\nu xy) p \end{aligned}$$

All constructors are standard either in linear functional languages or in session type languages. From functional languages we find function introduction and elimination ($\lambda x: T.e$ and $e_1 \ e_2$), linear pair introduction and elimination ($\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle$ and $\mathbf{let} \ \langle x, y \rangle = e_1 \ \mathbf{in} \ e_2$), linear unit introduction and elimination (\ast and $\mathbf{let} \ \ast = e_1 \ \mathbf{in} \ e_2$). From session languages we find most of the constructors in the form of constants, including \mathbf{fork} to spawn a new thread, \mathbf{new} to create a new channel, $\mathbf{receive}$ to receive a value on a given channel, \mathbf{send} to send a value on a given channel, \mathbf{wait} to wait for a channel to be closed, $\mathbf{terminate}$ to force channel closing, and $\mathbf{select} \ C$ to exercise a choice on a given channel indicated by selector name C . The operator to offer a choice on some channel cannot be captured by a type in our type language, hence we have made it an expression ($\mathbf{match} \ e \ \mathbf{with} \ \{C_i \ x_i \rightarrow e_i\}_{i \in I}$). At the level of processes, we have expressions as threads $\langle e \rangle$, parallel composition $p_1 \mid p_2$, and introduction of a channel by declaring its two ends x, y : $(\nu xy) p$.

Expression typing is again mostly standard with respect to (linear) functional or session type languages. The definitions for typing assume a set of protocol declarations as an implicit argument. The typings of $\mathbf{select} \ C$ (fig. 4) and \mathbf{match} (fig. 5, E-MATCH) access these protocol declarations. The typeof operator in fig. 4 returns the types for constants in normal form. The typing rules for expressions are defined in fig. 5. The type system is algorithmic, implemented with two mutually

Type synthesis

$$\boxed{\Delta \mid \Gamma \vdash e \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{E-CONST} \\
\frac{}{\Delta \mid \Gamma \vdash c \Rightarrow \text{typeof}(c) \mid \Gamma} \\
\\
\text{E-LET}^* \\
\frac{\frac{\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 \Leftarrow \mathbf{Unit} \mid \Gamma_2 \quad \Delta \mid \Gamma_2 \vdash e_2 \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_3}{\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash \mathbf{let}^* = e_1 \text{ in } e_2 \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_3}}{} \\
\\
\text{E-APP} \\
\frac{\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 \Rightarrow T \rightarrow U \mid \Gamma_2 \quad \Delta \mid \Gamma_2 \vdash e_2 \Leftarrow T \mid \Gamma_3}{\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 e_2 \Rightarrow U \mid \Gamma_3} \\
\\
\text{E-PAIR} \\
\frac{\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2 \quad \Delta \mid \Gamma_2 \vdash e_2 \Rightarrow U \mid \Gamma_3}{\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash \langle e_1, e_2 \rangle \Rightarrow T \otimes U \mid \Gamma_3} \\
\\
\text{E-REC} \\
\frac{\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{t} \quad \text{norm}^+(T \rightarrow U) = V \quad \Delta \mid \Gamma, x: {}^*V \vdash v \Leftarrow V \mid \Gamma, x: {}^*V}{\Delta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{rec} x: T \rightarrow U.v \Rightarrow V \mid \Gamma} \\
\\
\text{E-TABS} \\
\frac{\Delta, \alpha: \kappa \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash v \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2}{\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash \Lambda \alpha: \kappa.v \Rightarrow \forall \alpha: \kappa.T \mid \Gamma_2} \\
\\
\text{E-TAPP} \\
\frac{\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e \Rightarrow \forall \alpha: \kappa.U \mid \Gamma_2 \quad \Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \kappa}{\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e[T] \Rightarrow \text{norm}^+(U[T/\alpha]) \mid \Gamma_2} \\
\\
\text{E-LET} \\
\frac{\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 \Rightarrow T \otimes U \mid \Gamma_2 \quad \Delta \mid \Gamma_2, x: \text{norm}^+(T), y: \text{norm}^+(U) \vdash e_2 \Rightarrow V \mid \Gamma_3 \quad x, y \notin \Gamma_3}{\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash \mathbf{let} \langle x, y \rangle = e_1 \text{ in } e_2 \Rightarrow V \mid \Gamma_3} \\
\\
\text{E-MATCH} \\
\frac{\forall i \in I: \quad \text{protocol } \rho \bar{\alpha} = \{C_i \bar{T}_i\}_{i \in I} \quad \Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e \Rightarrow ?(\rho \bar{U}).S \mid \Gamma_2}{\Delta \mid \Gamma_2, x_i: \S(-(\bar{T}_i[\bar{U}/\bar{\alpha}])).S \vdash e_i \Rightarrow V_i \mid \Gamma_i \quad x_i \notin \Gamma_i \quad V =_\alpha V_i \quad \Gamma_3 =_\alpha \Gamma_i}{\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash \mathbf{match} e \text{ with } \{C_i x_i \rightarrow e_i\}_{i \in I} \Rightarrow V \mid \Gamma_3}
\end{array}$$

Type against

$$\boxed{\Delta \mid \Gamma \vdash e \Leftarrow T \mid \Gamma}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{E-CHECK} \\
\frac{\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e \Rightarrow U \mid \Gamma_2 \quad T =_\alpha U}{\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e \Leftarrow T \mid \Gamma_2}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 5: Algorithmic typing rules for expressions

recursive judgments: one to synthesize a type of an expression, the other to check an expression against a type. The typing rules rely on type variable contexts Δ introduced in section 3, on term variable contexts Γ assigning types T to term variables x . There are two sorts of entries in term variable contexts: linear entries, noted $x: T$, and unrestricted entries, noted $x: {}^*T$. The latter are used for recursive functions only (cf. rules E-VAR* and E-REC) and are inspired by work on quantitative type theory Atkey [2018], Bernardy et al. [2018], McBride [2016].

The type system maintains the invariant that entries in term variable contexts are always normalized: the rules that write into contexts, namely E-ABS, E-REC and E-LET, normalize the new entry. Judgments are of the form $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$ or $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e \Leftarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$, where Γ_2 represents the part of context Γ_1 Walker [2005] that is not consumed by e and T is in normal form. The axioms (E-CONST and E-VAR) mostly copy the input context to the output. Rule E-APP is a good example of context threading: to type expression $e_1 e_2$, expression e_1 is given the input context Γ_1 , produces Γ_2 which is given to e_2 , which turn produces Γ_3 that constitutes the outgoing context of application $e_1 e_2$. The rules that add linear entries to the context (E-ABS, E-LET and E-MATCH) all check that the new variables are not present in the outgoing context, thus ensuring that the corresponding values are fully consumed. Rule E-TAPP explicitly normalizes the output type for normalization is not preserved by substitution; all rules that introduce new entries in the context (E-ABS, E-REC, E-LET, and E-MATCH) make sure that types are normalized, thus ensuring that contexts contain only normalized types.

Rules E-REC and E-VAR \star govern the typing of recursive functions. Rule E-REC binds the recursive function x using an unrestricted binding $x:\star$ so that any number of recursive calls is possible in the body via E-VAR \star . Unrestricted bindings provide for termination of recursive functions. Such functions cannot use linear variables from the environment, which we enforce by requiring the incoming context Γ to be equal to the outgoing context.

The truly new rule is E-MATCH, which indicates that all rules are parametric with respect to an implicit set of protocol declarations: there is a declaration for each protocol ρ which has a kinding in Δ . The rule starts by synthesizing the input type of the expression to be matched; the type is $?(\rho \bar{U}). S$ for some protocol constructor ρ . At this point, the declaration of protocol ρ is looked up in the implicit set of declarations. The **match** branch for each choice of selector C_i is then typed in turn. The parameters $\bar{\alpha}$ of the protocol are instantiated with the arguments \bar{U} to produce a sequence of types $\bar{T}_i[\bar{U}/\bar{\alpha}]$. This sequence of types is converted to a normalized session type as described in section 3, which is assigned to variable x_i . Now, each branch synthesizes a type V_i and context Γ_i , for $i \in I$. In all branches, the output types and the contexts must coincide (up to α equivalence) with the output type and context of the **match**, i.e., V and Γ_3 . In practice, the implementation selects one branch, say $k \in I$, and compares all other output types and contexts with V_k and Γ_k . In this rule, and also in the type for **select** in fig. 4, we extend the directional operators and materialization (from fig. 3) to sequences of parameters by mapping: $\pm(\bar{T}) = \pm(T)$ as well as $\S(\varepsilon).S = S$ and $\S(T\bar{T}).S = \S(T).\S(\bar{T}).S$.

Rule E-CHECK relies on the previous judgement to check expression e against type T , up to α -equivalence. This simple comparison is sufficient because synthesis outputs U in normal form and checking must be invoked with T in normal form.

The operational semantics for expressions and processes is defined via a transition relation labelled by the below actions.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \sigma ::= x?v \mid x!v \mid x?C \mid x!C \mid x? \mid x! & \text{labels for session operations} \\
 \lambda ::= \sigma \mid \beta \mid \mathbf{fork} v \mid (\nu xx): T & \text{labels for expressions} \\
 \pi ::= \sigma \mid \tau \mid (\nu xx)x!x \mid (\pi \mid \pi) & \text{labels for processes}
 \end{array}$$

The σ labels capture the six operations on sessions: **receive**, **send**, **match**, **select**, **wait** and **terminate**. Labels λ are for expressions: β is for internal actions and the remaining two for **fork** and **new**. Labels π are for processes: τ is for silent actions (the counterpart of β for expressions), $(\nu ab)x!a$ or $(\nu ab)x!b$ is for opening the scope of a (νab) binding, and $\pi \mid \pi$ for parallel composition.

Labelled transition system for expressions

$$e \xrightarrow{\lambda} e$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{ACT-APP} \quad \text{ACT-TAPP} \quad \text{ACT-LET} \\
(\lambda x: T.e) v \xrightarrow{\beta} e[v/x] \quad (\Lambda \alpha: \kappa.v)[T] \xrightarrow{\beta} v[T/\alpha] \quad \text{let } \langle x, y \rangle = \langle u, v \rangle \text{ in } e \xrightarrow{\beta} e[u/x][v/y] \\
\text{ACT-LET}^* \quad \text{ACT-REC} \quad \text{ACT-FORK} \quad \text{ACT-NEW} \\
\text{let } * = * \text{ in } e \xrightarrow{\beta} e \quad (\text{rec } x: T.v) u \xrightarrow{\beta} (v[\text{rec } x: T.v/x]) u \quad \text{fork } v \xrightarrow{\text{fork } v} * \quad \text{new}[T] \xrightarrow{(\nu xy): T} \langle x, y \rangle \\
\text{ACT-RCV} \quad \text{ACT-SEND} \quad \text{ACT-MATCH} \\
\text{receive}[T][U] x \xrightarrow{x?v} \langle v, x \rangle \quad \text{send}[T][U] v x \xrightarrow{x!v} x \quad \text{match } x \text{ with } \{C_i y_i \rightarrow e_i\}_{i \in I} \xrightarrow{x?C_k} e_k[x/y_k] \\
\text{ACT-SEL} \quad \text{ACT-WAIT} \quad \text{ACT-TERM} \\
\text{select } C[\bar{T}] x \xrightarrow{x!C} x \quad \text{wait } x \xrightarrow{x?} * \quad \text{terminate } x \xrightarrow{x!} *
\end{array}$$

Fig. 6: Labelled transition system for expressions (selected rules). The full version, including call-by-value structural rules, is presented in supplement D, fig. 11

Labelled transition system for processes

$$p \xrightarrow{\pi} p$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{ACT-SESSION} \quad \text{ACT-BETA} \quad \text{ACT-FORK} \quad \text{ACT-NEW} \quad \text{ACT-JOINL} \\
\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{\sigma} e_2}{\langle e_1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\sigma} \langle e_2 \rangle} \quad \frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{\beta} e_2}{\langle e_1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle e_2 \rangle} \quad \frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{\text{fork } v} e_2}{\langle e_1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle e_2 \rangle \mid \langle v * \rangle} \quad \frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu xy): T} e_2}{\langle e_1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu xy) \langle e_2 \rangle} \quad \frac{p_1 \xrightarrow{\pi_1} q_1 \quad p_2 \xrightarrow{\pi_2} q_2}{p_1 \mid p_2 \xrightarrow{\pi_1 \mid \pi_2} q_1 \mid q_2} \\
\text{ACT-JOINR} \quad \text{ACT-MSG} \quad \text{ACT-BRA} \quad \text{ACT-WAIT} \\
\frac{p_1 \xrightarrow{\pi_1} q_1 \quad p_2 \xrightarrow{\pi_2} q_2}{p_1 \mid p_2 \xrightarrow{\pi_2 \mid \pi_1} q_1 \mid q_2} \quad \frac{p_1 \xrightarrow{x?v|y!v} p_2}{(\nu xy) p_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu xy) p_2} \quad \frac{p_1 \xrightarrow{x?C|y!C} p_2}{(\nu xy) p_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu xy) p_2} \quad \frac{p_1 \xrightarrow{x?!y!} p_2}{(\nu xy) p_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} p_2} \\
\text{ACT-PARL} \quad \text{ACT-PARR} \quad \text{ACT-RES} \quad \text{ACT-OPENL} \\
\frac{p_1 \xrightarrow{\pi} p_2}{p_1 \mid q_1 \xrightarrow{\pi} p_2 \mid q_1} \quad \frac{q_1 \xrightarrow{\pi} q_2}{p_1 \mid q_1 \xrightarrow{\pi} p_1 \mid q_2} \quad \frac{p_1 \xrightarrow{\pi} p_2 \quad x, y \notin \text{fv}(\pi)}{(\nu xy) p_1 \xrightarrow{\pi} (\nu xy) p_2} \quad \frac{p_1 \xrightarrow{x!a} p_2 \quad x \neq a, b}{(\nu ab) p_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu ab)x!a} p_2} \\
\text{ACT-OPENR} \quad \text{ACT-CLOSEL} \quad \text{ACT-CLOSER} \\
\frac{p_1 \xrightarrow{x!b} p_2 \quad x \neq a, b}{(\nu ab) p_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu ab)x!b} p_2} \quad \frac{p_1 \xrightarrow{x?a|(\nu ab)y!a} p_2}{(\nu xy) p_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu xy) (\nu ab) p_2} \quad \frac{p_1 \xrightarrow{x?b|(\nu ab)y!b} p_2}{(\nu xy) p_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu xy) (\nu ab) p_2}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 7: Labelled transition system for processes

The axioms of the labelled transition system for expressions is defined by the rules in fig. 6 (supplement D, fig. 11, contains the whole set). We group under label β the common reduction rules of the polymorphic lambda calculus. Rules Act-Fork and Act-New record in the label the value forked and the names and types of the channel ends created. These two transitions will then be handled at the process level. Then we have the six transitions for the common session operations.

Typing rules for processes

 $\boxed{\Gamma \vdash p}$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{P-EXP} \\
\frac{\cdot \mid \Gamma \vdash e \Leftarrow \mathbf{Unit} \mid \cdot}{\Gamma \vdash \langle e \rangle}
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{P-PAR} \\
\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash p_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash p_2}{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash p_1 \mid p_2}
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{P-NEW} \\
\frac{\cdot \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{s} \quad \Gamma, x: \text{nm}^+(T), y: \text{nm}^-(T) \vdash p}{\Gamma \vdash (\nu xy)p}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 8: Typing rules for processes

The labelled transition system for processes is defined by the rules in fig. 7. The rules are adapted from Fowler et al. [2021a,b] which in turn are inspired by Montesi and Peressotti [2021]. The first four rules convert expression transitions into process transitions: the session transitions σ are passed directly from expressions to processes (rule Act-Session). The next three rules all yield silent (τ) transitions: Act-Fork launches a new thread and Act-New creates a new channel. Rules Act-JoinL and Act-JoinR account for the commutative nature of parallel composition. Rules Act-ParL, Act-ParR and Act-Res allow transitions underneath parallel composition and scope restriction. The rules for opening and closing a scope (left and right versions) are adapted to the double binder scheme from the labelled transitions systems for the π -calculus Milner et al. [1992]. These rules are required for we work with free output, unlike the above cited works Fowler et al. [2021a,b], Montesi and Peressotti [2021] that work with bound output.

Reduction underneath a prefix (rule Act-Res) can only occur if the channels ends x and y (two bound variables) do not capture the free variables in the label. For this purpose, we define the free variables of a process label π as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{fv}(x?v) &= \text{fv}(x!v) = \{x\} \cup \text{fv}(v) & \text{fv}(x?C) &= \text{fv}(x!C) = \text{fv}(x?) = \text{fv}(x!) = \{x\} \\
\text{fv}(\tau) &= \emptyset & \text{fv}((\nu wx)y!z) &= \{y, z\} \setminus \{w, x\} & \text{fv}(\pi \mid \pi') &= \text{fv}(\pi) \cup \text{fv}(\pi')
\end{aligned}$$

We complete section with the main results of our language. Towards this end we need to talk about context and process typing. Type formation (fig. 1) is lifted pointwise to contexts in judgement $\Delta \vdash \Gamma \Leftarrow \kappa$. The rules for typing processes are in fig. 8. The rule for threads requires the expression e to consume all resources given in context Γ . Rule P-Par splits the context in two parts and gives each to one of the parallel processes. The rule is not algorithmic but we plan to type check expressions only; processes are a runtime artefact. Rule P-New guesses a type T for channel end x , then channel end y gets the type $\mathbf{Dual} T$, both in normal form. Again, this rule is not algorithmic and need not be. The labelled transitions convey behaviour in their labels. Because we use an algorithmic typing system with leftovers, we require a labelled transition system for typing contexts to account for the impact of the behaviour of labels in the contexts. The statement of preservation relies on the labelled transition system for contexts, defined in supplement D (fig. 12).

Theorem 4 (Preservation).

1. If $e_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} e_2$ and $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3 \vdash e_1 \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_3$ and $\Gamma_2 \xrightarrow{\lambda} \Gamma'_2$ and $\Delta \vdash \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3 \Leftarrow \mathbf{t}$, then $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma'_2, \Gamma_3 \vdash e_2 \Rightarrow T' \mid \Gamma_3$ and $T' \equiv_A T$.
2. If $e_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} e_2$ and $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3 \vdash e_1 \Leftarrow T \mid \Gamma_3$ and $\Gamma_2 \xrightarrow{\lambda} \Gamma'_2$ and $\Delta \vdash \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3 \Leftarrow \mathbf{t}$, then $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma'_2, \Gamma_3 \vdash e_2 \Leftarrow T \mid \Gamma_3$.
3. If $p_1 \xrightarrow{\pi} p_2$ and $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash p_1$ and $\Gamma_2 \xrightarrow{\pi} \Gamma'_2$ and $\cdot \vdash \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \Leftarrow \mathbf{t}$, then $\Gamma_1, \Gamma'_2 \vdash p_2$.

To the below set of labels we call the *progress set* for x, y :

$$\{\tau, (x?v \mid y!v), (x?C \mid y!C), (x? \mid y!), (x?a \mid (\nu ab)y!a), (x?b \mid (\nu ab)y!b)\}$$

Completed processes are of the form $\langle * \mid \dots \mid * \rangle$. A process is a *deadlock* if, for all its subterms of the form $(\nu xy)p$ and all transitions $p \xrightarrow{\pi} p'$, we have π not in the progress set for channel x, y . To identify a deadlocked process we find all its ν subterms, and for each subterm we find all its transitions. Then, if all transitions fall outside the progress set, the process is deadlocked. When the kind context Δ is apparent from the context, we write Γ^s to denote a typing context composed solely of session types, that is, such that $x: T \in \Gamma$ implies $\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow s$.

Theorem 5 (Progress possibly leading to deadlock).

1. If $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1^s \vdash e_1 \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$, then either e_1 is a value or $e_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} e_2$.
2. If $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1^s \vdash e_1 \Leftarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$, then either e_1 is a value or $e_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} e_2$.
3. If $\Gamma^s \vdash p_1$, then p_1 is completed, $p_1 \xrightarrow{\pi} p_2$, or p_1 is a deadlock.

5 Implementation

The implementation of AlgST consists of a type checker and an interpreter, both written in Haskell. Aiming at supporting more realistic programs, the implementation features pragmatic extensions, including extensions to the formal system and a simple module system for name space management.

Type checking The syntax of the implementation closely matches the examples in this paper. Some places need additional kind annotations because the type system of the implementation is not restricted to linear types. Its kind structure distinguishes between linear and unrestricted variants of the kinds s and t . Subkinding allows us to subsume unrestricted versions of types to linear ones, that is, $t^{\text{un}} < t^{\text{lin}}$. This subkinding generates a simple subtyping relation that essentially allows us to provide an unrestricted value where a linear one is expected. The protocol kind p does not split in two versions, but still any type can be lifted to a protocol type. Almeida et al. [2022] investigate the metatheory of a system with a similar kind structure (without the kind p).

The type checker implementation closely follows the bidirectional rules given in the paper. It necessarily contains an implementation of the type normalization algorithm shown in fig. 3. This algorithm is extended to cater for the type isomorphism $\forall\alpha.(T \rightarrow U) \cong T \rightarrow \forall\alpha.U$ (if α not free in T). In this way, type applications can be placed more liberally as long as their sequence is preserved.

The normalization algorithm is invoked exactly as indicated by the algorithmic typing rules in fig. 5. By design, the rules keep the typing assumptions and the outcome of inference in normal form to minimize the number of times normalization is invoked.

The type checker includes further checking rules to enable writing some lambda abstractions without type annotations. These rules are adaptations of well-known rules Dunfield and Krishnaswami [2021]. For example:

$$\frac{\text{E-ABS}' \quad \Delta \mid \Gamma_1, x: T \vdash e \Leftarrow U \mid \Gamma_2 \quad x \notin \Gamma_2}{\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash \lambda x.e \Leftarrow T \rightarrow U \mid \Gamma_2} \quad \frac{\text{E-APP}' \quad \Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e_2 \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2 \quad \Delta \mid \Gamma_2 \vdash e_1 \Leftarrow T \rightarrow U \mid \Gamma_3}{\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 e_2 \Leftarrow U \mid \Gamma_3}$$

```

--- protocol and type in AlgST syntax ---
protocol Repeat x = More x (Repeat x) | Quit
?Repeat Int . !(Char, End!) . End!
--- corresponding type in FreeST syntax ---
(rec repeat0 : 1S . &{More : ?Int ; repeat0 ; Skip,
    Quit : Skip}) ; (!(Char, End) ; End)
--- example of an equivalent AlgST type ---
Dual (!Repeat Int . ?(Char, End!) . Dual End!)
--- example of a non-equivalent AlgST type ---
?Repeat String . !(Char, End!) . End!

```

Fig.9: An AlgST type instance, its FreeST counterpart and examples of equivalent and non-equivalent AlgST types, following the rules of our test suite generator.

The implementation fully supports the overloaded use of data constructors as protocol operators. We can perform pattern matching against the constructors of a `List` datatype and use the same constructors in selecting alternatives of the `!List` protocol. Moreover, the `case` operator is also overloaded to serve as the `match` operator.

Interpretation The interpreter employs standard techniques for the functional part and for representing values at run time. It uses one universal type with constructors for each type in the language. Processes in AlgST are mapped to Haskell threads. A fork in the language is implemented using `forkIO` in Haskell. The interpreter is invoked recursively for the new thread.

Communication channels are implemented using shared-memory abstractions from Haskell’s `Control.Concurrent` library. Synchronous communication (as in this paper) is implemented by pairs of `MVars`, a semaphore-like concurrent datastructure Jones et al. [1996] that behaves like a buffer of size one. The implementation has an option to switch to asynchronous channels using bounded queues (`TBQueue`) from the `stm` library.

As channels are implemented in shared memory, the `send` primitive is naturally polymorphic. Internally, the interpreter mediates values of the universal type mentioned above between `send` and `receive` operations.

Benchmarking We substantiate our claim that replacing a worst-case superlinear algorithm for type equivalence by a linear one yields actual run-time improvements with an experiment. We compare AlgST’s type equivalence algorithm with FreeST, a freely available FreeST programming language containing an implementation of type equivalence for polymorphic context-free session types Almeida et al. [2020, 2022]. As the type checker regularly requires type equivalence checks, the performance of the equivalence algorithm should be understood as a lower bound of the type checker performance.

To create a collection of equivalent and non-equivalent test cases, we implemented a generator of instances of AlgST types. An instance comprises a set of mutually recursive algebraic protocols and a session type referring to them. We carefully restrict protocols and types so that a translation from AlgST instances to FreeST types is possible: the generator avoids polymorphic and nested recursion and restricts the occurrences of the negation operator to the top level of protocol constructor arguments. For each instance T , we randomly apply the properties of normalization to generate an equivalent AlgST type T' (see fig. 3). The pairs (T, T') constitute our test suite of equivalent




Fig. 10: Execution time of the AlgST and FreeST type equivalence algorithms on the equivalent and non-equivalent test cases, represented in log scale as a function of the number of AlgST nodes in the AST.

types. Non-equivalent tests are obtained from each T by either introducing an additional quantifier, or changing a sub-part of the type to something of the same kind. Possible replacements are the quantified type variables and the types built into AlgST, such as `Int` or `String`. The AlgST type is translated to a session type in FreeST. Protocols are translated inline at every point of use as recursive branch or choice types, depending on whether it appears in a sending or receiving context. For single constructor types, the translation omits the constructor tag. The arguments of the constructors are translated into nested sequences of single interactions. See fig. 9 for an example.

Benchmarks were run using the gauge package v0.2.5 O’Sullivan [(last accessed March 2023)] with a timeout of 2 minutes. AlgST was compiled using GHC 9.2.7, FreeST used GHC 8.10.7. Each test suite comprises 324 tests. FreeST incurred 69 timeouts for the positive tests and 77 timeouts for the negative tests. Figure 10 compares the execution time of the AlgST and FreeST type equivalence algorithms for the equivalent and non-equivalent test cases. The plots substantiate the differences in the execution time of FreeST and AlgST, distinguishing the linear evolution of AlgST and the exponential behavior of FreeST as a function of the number of nodes in the abstract syntax tree of the AlgST type.

6 Related Work

This survey of related work concentrates on binary session types and their treatment of recursion. Many works in the area concentrate on different aspects and treat recursion informally as an add-on. In particular, the early work of Honda [1993], Takeuchi et al. [1994] did not consider recursive types. The school of session types that takes its foundations from the sequent calculus for dual intuitionistic logic Caires and Pfenning [2010], Caires et al. [2016] initially focuses on finite behaviors. While recursion would break the logical consistency of their system, they consider dependently typed variants that include replication Pfenning et al. [2011].

Session type systems with recursion. Generally, recursive types come in two flavors, equirecursive and isorecursive Abadi and Fiore [1996], and the impact of these different approaches on type

checking is well-studied Pierce [2002]. They have been found to be equally expressive Patrignani et al. [2021]. Most session type systems in the literature support equirecursive session types restricted to tail recursion and treat them informally.

Recursive types have first been introduced to session types by Honda et al. [1998] in the context of π -calculus. Their system relies on equirecursion and is syntactically restricted to tail recursion. Gay and Hole [1999, 2005] study subtyping in the same setting using a coinductive definition. Castagna et al. [2009] consider recursive session types as infinite regular trees. Their types are tagless in the sense that choices are made according to the set of accepted values and the viability of the continuation. The functional session type calculus of Gay and Vasconcelos [2010] includes subtyping and equirecursive types, but the latter are restricted to tail-recursive session types. Fundamentals of session types Vasconcelos [2012] proposes a range of π -calculus-based systems with increasing complexity. One particular focus is the treatment of replication and unrestricted channel ends, which requires recursive types. In this work, recursive types are modeled by infinite regular trees, represented using the familiar μ notation with contractive, tail recursive bodies.

Toninho et al. [2013] extend the linear-logic based line of work and focus on the combination of functions and processes including recursive processes and consequently recursive types for processes and functions. The examples indicate the equirecursive variant. Apparently, there is no restriction in the use of recursion and sequencing is implemented using the tensor \otimes . Toninho et al. [2014] cover a different aspect of equirecursion. They consider corecursive protocol definitions and analyze their productivity. The main question they pursue is when a corecursive protocol produces the next value after finitely many internal steps. SILL Pfenning and Griffith [2015] is a process-based language design that integrates linear and affine types as well as synchronous and asynchronous communication. It builds directly on the linear logic interpretation of session types. Its examples make use of polymorphism and equirecursive types in the form of tail recursive type equations, neither of which are reflected in the type theoretical presentation. Bartoletti et al. [2014] offer a semantic analysis of session types on the basis of labeled transition systems. Their system features equirecursion in tail position.

Lindley and Morris [2016] define two functional session type systems with recursion, μ GV and μ CP, and show that they are related by typing- and semantics-preserving translations. So we only compare to μ GV in the following. μ GV is based on a simply-typed linear lambda calculus extended with notions of recursion and corecursion. These are defined as least and greatest (respectively) fixed points of strictly positive functors — analogous to a logically meaningful version of algebraic (co-) datatypes — with generic fold and unfold operators. Finally, they lift this isorecursive treatment of recursive data to the level of session types by encoding branching and recursion, mapping the corresponding data functors over session types and wrapping them in promises. We conclude that μ GV features session types with isorecursion and that it could be used to encode the simply-typed fragment of AlgST, but without parameterized data types and without the over direction. Where μ GV uses promises (i.e., a separate channel) to encode the argument to the fold of the recursive type (i.e., the constructor arguments of an algebraic datatype), AlgST transmits the body of the fold on the same channel, thus avoiding the overhead of channel creation. Moreover, μ GV is mainly a theoretical contribution whereas a full implementation of AlgST is available.

Context-free and nested session type systems. Thiemann and Vasconcelos [2016] proposed context-free session types to enable the type-safe encoding of non-regular protocols like the serialization of tree structures or the stack protocol from the introduction without incurring the overhead of session initiation. They changed the asymmetric structure of the traditional session type syntax $?T.S$ and $!T.S$, where an item of type T is communicated and the session continues with S , to a symmetric

structure where session types can be built from the atomic transmissions, $?T$ and $!T$, choice and branching, $S_1 \oplus S_2$ and $S_1 \& S_2$, and a monoidal sequential composition operator $S_1; S_2$ with unit **Skip**. This design, together with equirecursive sessions, leads to a number of technical problems. First, types come with a non-trivial equational theory: sequential composition forms a monoid with unit **Skip** and it distributes over choice and branching. Second, polymorphic recursion is needed as a recursive call may have to be instantiated with different continuation sessions. Third, the interaction between equirecursion and the omission of the restriction to tail recursion gives rise to a difficult, but decidable, type equivalence relation. Subsequent work investigated tractable algorithms for type equivalence Almeida et al. [2019, 2020]. Almeida et al. [2022] integrate context-free session types with explicit polymorphism in the style of System F. Recent work extends this approach with higher-order types Costa et al. [2022].

Padovani [2017, 2019] proposes a different approach to context-free session types embodied in a functional session calculus called $\text{FuSe}^{\{\}}_c$. This calculus uses the type language of context-free session types, but sidesteps the problems with the sequencing operator and type equivalence by introducing a resumption operator $\{e\}_c$ that deconstructs a sequence of sessions on channel $c : S_1; S_2$. It does so by retyping the channel to $c : S_1$ for evaluating e , which must return the same channel after finishing S_1 . More formally, the resumption obeys some kind of frame rule: if $c : S_1 \vdash e : T \times \mathbf{1}$, then $c : S_1; S_2 \vdash \{e\}_c : T \times S_2$. The resumption temporarily removes the continuation S_2 from the session type and sticks it back on afterwards. The type system has means to make sure that the channel returned by e is identical to c , which is required for soundness. The type $\mathbf{1}$ does not signify the end of the session, but rather that some known part of the session has been processed and the session will be continued in the context (of the resumption). The management of the choice and branch operations is very close to AlgST. $\text{FuSe}^{\{\}}$ implements choice by transmitting the constructor tag in a variant type that selects the different continuations. Its branch operator matches on the received constructor and thus selects the desired continuation. However, the handling of protocol constructors in AlgST includes the construction of the continuation type from the types and directions given in the protocol declaration. $\text{FuSe}^{\{\}}$ has no equivalent to a protocol declaration nor to the type operator $-$ to swap the direction of a transmission. Padovani [2019] implements $\text{FuSe}^{\{\}}$ in OCaml and demonstrates that context-free session types are amenable to type inference, if the programmer helps with judicious placement of resumptions. Support for equirecursion is already built into OCaml’s type inference engine. It is also shown that subtyping is undecidable.

Das et al. [2021] propose the metatheory of nested session types featuring parametrized definitions of session types with nested polymorphic recursion. At first glance, the nested session type $\text{List}[\alpha] = \oplus\{\text{nil} : \text{end}, \text{cons} : \alpha \otimes \text{List}[\alpha]\}$ is very similar to the algebraic protocol $\text{protocol List } \alpha = \text{Nil} \mid \text{Cons } \alpha (\text{List } \alpha)$, but there are significant differences. On the algebraic side, we can materialize the **List** protocol in a type that sends or receives a list of integers, while the nested type **List** is already committed to a concrete direction. Although type nesting enables to capture the modularity characterizing algebraic sessions, there are several features that distinguish AlgST from nested session types: Das et al. propose a structural and equirecursive, rather than a nominal, view of type definitions, and interpret types coinductively, rather than inductively. These features have significant impact on the complexity of the equivalence problem for nested session types and on its implementation: Das et al. present a sound but incomplete algorithm for type equivalence. By considering a nominal interpretation of algebraic session types, we reduced the complexity of the equivalence problem from doubly-exponential Das et al. [2021] to linear and designed a sound and complete algorithm to verify type equivalence. The examples in section 2 of Das et al. [2021] translate into AlgST and type check with our implementation.

Gay et al. [2022] consider equirecursive protocols defined by different kinds of systems of equations (with and without parameters). Imposing different restrictions on the parameterization yields different classes of protocols with decision problems for type equivalence ranging from polytime to undecidable. Their largest decidable class of pushdown session types is shown to be equivalent to nested session types, which we can model with AlgST.

Compared to all competing systems Almeida et al. [2022], Das et al. [2021], Padovani [2019], Thiemann and Vasconcelos [2020], AlgST’s materialization and directional operators are unique. These operators enable the construction of protocols without committing to a particular direction.

Linear and unrestricted types. Our calculus is mostly linear, except that we allow unrestricted bindings for recursive functions, which would be rendered useless otherwise. Our implementation goes well beyond that in allowing fully fledged unrestricted computations besides ensuring that session typed channels are treated linearly. There is some work on recursion and linearity in the context of lambda calculus Alves et al. [2010] adding iterators on linear natural numbers to the calculus, thereby avoiding the need for a rule like E-VAR \star .

System F $^\circ$ Mazurak et al. [2010] extends System F with kinds to integrate polymorphism with linear and unrestricted types. This work serves as a blueprint for much subsequent work in this area including LFST and FreeST (see below), as well as our implemented language. They categorize all objects, including functions, into one-use or many-use resources. This style can be traced back to Walker [2005]. LFST Lindley and Morris [2017] formalizes the session type system of Links, which features a mix of linear and unrestricted types, embedding a standard functional programming language. The substructural behavior of types is specified by a sophisticated kind structure. The kinding used in our implementation is inspired by LFST, though LFST has additional kinds to describe row types that we do not support. Almeida et al. [2022] consider an integration of context-free session types with System F. Their type system includes a kinding discipline that manages linear and unrestricted versions of ordinary types and message types (possible payloads for the send and receive operations). Our implemented system extends the kind structure in a similar way.

Linear Haskell (LH) Bernardy et al. [2018] is a proposal to integrate linear types with stock functional programming. While the work discussed so far characterizes resources, LH supports the lollipop type $S \multimap T$ which classifies functions that use their argument exactly once. Originally, LH forced the programmer to allocate resources using continuations. This restriction has been fixed in subsequent work Spiwack et al. [2022]. There is further work on integrating linear and dependent types (e.g., Krishnaswami et al. [2015]) which relies on bifurcating the language in two calculi connected by an adjunction.

7 Conclusion

Algebraic protocols combine naming and recursion with choice and sequence type constructors known from session types. Like algebraic datatypes, they offer parameterization and mutual recursion. Unlike previous work on session types, algebraic protocols do not commit to a particular direction of communication, even if direction reversal can be specified at the type level. Algebraic protocols and session types subsume the expressive power of context-free and nested session type systems while reducing the complexity of type checking from doubly-exponential to linear time.

Acknowledgements

We thank the reviewers for their suggestions that greatly contributed to a more solid version of the paper. Support for this research was provided by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia through project SafeSessions, ref. PTDC/CCI-COM/6453/2020, and the LASIGE Research Unit, ref. UIDB/00408/2020 and ref. UIDP/00408/2020, and by the COST Action EuroProofNet (CA20111).

Software Availability

The proposed system and implementation are publicly available as an artifact Spaderna et al. [2023]. The interested reader can follow the steps in the artifact documentation to set up a pre-built docker image or a self-built docker image. Besides the implementation of the type checker and the interpreter, we provide programs for all the examples in the paper and examples that establish a comparison with related work Das et al. [2021], Thiemann and Vasconcelos [2016]. In the artifact, the reader can also find instructions on how to reproduce our benchmarking results for type equivalence.

References

- Martín Abadi and Marcelo P. Fiore. Syntactic considerations on recursive types. In *11th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 242–252, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA, 1996. IEEE Computer Society. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.1996.561324>.
- Bernardo Almeida, Andreia Mordido, and Vasco T. Vasconcelos. Freest: Context-free session types in a functional language. In Francisco Martins and Dominic Orchard, editors, *PLACES@ETAPS 2019*, volume 291 of *EPTCS*, pages 12–23, Prague, Czech Republic, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.291.2>.
- Bernardo Almeida, Andreia Mordido, and Vasco T. Vasconcelos. Deciding the bisimilarity of context-free session types. In Armin Biere and David Parker, editors, *TACAS 2020*, volume 12079 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 39–56, Dublin, Ireland, 2020. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45237-7_3.
- Bernardo Almeida, Andreia Mordido, Peter Thiemann, and Vasco T. Vasconcelos. Polymorphic lambda calculus with context-free session types. *Information and Computation*, 2022. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2022.104948>.
- Sandra Alves, Maribel Fernández, Mário Florido, and Ian Mackie. Linearity and iterator types for gödel’s system. *High. Order Symb. Comput.*, 23(1):1–27, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10990-010-9060-x>.
- Robert Atkey. Syntax and semantics of quantitative type theory. In Anuj Dawar and Erich Grädel, editors, *LICS 2018*, pages 56–65, Oxford, UK, 2018. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3209108.3209189>. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3209108.3209189>.
- Stephanie Balzer and Frank Pfenning. Manifest sharing with session types. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 1(ICFP):37:1–37:29, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3110281>.
- Massimo Bartoletti, Alceste Scalas, and Roberto Zunino. A semantic deconstruction of session types. In Paolo Baldan and Daniele Gorla, editors, *CONCUR 2014*, volume 8704 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 402–418, Rome, Italy, 2014. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-44584-6_28.

- Giovanni Bernardi and Matthew Hennessy. Using higher-order contracts to model session types (extended abstract). In *CONCUR*, volume 8704 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 387–401, Rome, Italy, 2014. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-44584-6_27.
- Giovanni Bernardi and Matthew Hennessy. Using higher-order contracts to model session types. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 12(2), 2016. [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-12\(2:10\)2016](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-12(2:10)2016).
- Jean-Philippe Bernardy, Mathieu Boespflug, Ryan R. Newton, Simon Peyton Jones, and Arnaud Spiwack. Linear haskell: practical linearity in a higher-order polymorphic language. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 2(POPL):5:1–5:29, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3158093>. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3158093>.
- Rod M. Burstall. Design considerations for a functional programming language. In *Infotech State of the Art Conference: The Software Revolution*, Copenhagen, October 1977.
- Rod M. Burstall, David B. MacQueen, and Donald Sannella. HOPE: an experimental applicative language. In *Proceedings of the 1980 LISP Conference*, pages 136–143, Stanford, California, USA, 1980. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/800087.802799>.
- Luís Caires and Frank Pfenning. Session types as intuitionistic linear propositions. In Paul Gastin and François Laroussinie, editors, *CONCUR 2010*, volume 6269 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 222–236, Paris, France, 2010. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15375-4_16.
- Luís Caires, Frank Pfenning, and Bernardo Toninho. Linear logic propositions as session types. *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.*, 26(3):367–423, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129514000218>.
- Giuseppe Castagna, Mariangiola Dezani-Ciancaglini, Elena Giachino, and Luca Padovani. Foundations of session types. In António Porto and Francisco Javier López-Fraguas, editors, *PPDP 2009*, pages 219–230, Coimbra, Portugal, 2009. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1599410.1599437>.
- Diana Costa, Andreia Mordido, Diogo Poças, and Vasco T. Vasconcelos. Higher-order context-free session types in system F. In Marco Carbone and Rumyana Neykova, editors, *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Programming Language Approaches to Concurrency and Communication-cEntric Software, PLACES@ETAPS 2022, Munich, Germany, 3rd April 2022*, volume 356 of *EPTCS*, pages 24–35, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.356.3>. URL <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.356.3>.
- Olivier Danvy and Andrzej Filinski. Representing control: A study of the CPS transformation. *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.*, 2(4):361–391, 1992. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129500001535>.
- Ankush Das, Henry DeYoung, Andreia Mordido, and Frank Pfenning. Nested session types. In Nobuko Yoshida, editor, *Programming Languages and Systems - 30th European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2021*, volume 12648 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 178–206, Luxembourg City, Luxembourg, 2021. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72019-3_7.
- Jana Dunfield and Neel Krishnaswami. Bidirectional typing. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 54(5):98:1–98:38, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3450952>.
- Matthias Felleisen. The theory and practice of first-class prompts. In Jeanne Ferrante and Peter Mager, editors, *POPL*, pages 180–190, San Diego, California, USA, 1988. ACM Press. <https://doi.org/10.1145/73560.73576>.
- Simon Fowler, Wen Kokke, Ornela Dardha, Sam Lindley, and J. Garrett Morris. Separating sessions smoothly. In Serge Haddad and Daniele Varacca, editors, *32nd International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2021, August 24-27, 2021*, volume 203 of *LIPIcs*, pages 36:1–36:18, Virtual Conference, 2021a. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2021.36>.

- Simon Fowler, Wen Kokke, Ornela Dardha, Sam Lindley, and J. Garrett Morris. Separating sessions smoothly. *CoRR*, abs/2105.08996, 2021b. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2105.08996>.
- FreeST. The freest programming language. <http://rss.di.fc.ul.pt/tools/freest/>, (last accessed March 2023).
- Simon J. Gay and Malcolm Hole. Types and subtypes for client-server interactions. In S. Doaitse Swierstra, editor, *Programming Languages and Systems, 8th European Symposium on Programming, ESOP'99*, volume 1576 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 74–90, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1999. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-49099-X_6.
- Simon J. Gay and Malcolm Hole. Subtyping for session types in the pi calculus. *Acta Informatica*, 42(2-3):191–225, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00236-005-0177-z>.
- Simon J. Gay and Vasco Thudichum Vasconcelos. Linear type theory for asynchronous session types. *J. Funct. Program.*, 20(1):19–50, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956796809990268>.
- Simon J. Gay, Diogo Poças, and Vasco T. Vasconcelos. The different shades of infinite session types. In Patricia Bouyer and Lutz Schröder, editors, *FOSSACS 2022*, volume 13242 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 347–367, Munich, Germany, 2022. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-99253-8_18.
- Cordelia V. Hall, Kevin Hammond, Simon L. Peyton Jones, and Philip Wadler. Type classes in haskell. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 18(2):109–138, 1996. <https://doi.org/10.1145/227699.227700>.
- Kohei Honda. Types for dyadic interaction. In Eike Best, editor, *CONCUR '93*, volume 715 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 509–523, Hildesheim, Germany, 1993. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-57208-2_35.
- Kohei Honda, Vasco Thudichum Vasconcelos, and Makoto Kubo. Language primitives and type discipline for structured communication-based programming. In Chris Hankin, editor, *Programming Languages and Systems - ESOP'98, 7th European Symposium on Programming*, volume 1381 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 122–138, Lisbon, Portugal, 1998. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0053567>.
- Simon L. Peyton Jones, Andrew D. Gordon, and Sigbjørn Finne. Concurrent Haskell. In Hans-Juergen Boehm and Guy L. Steele Jr., editors, *POPL'96*, pages 295–308, St. Petersburg Beach, Florida, USA, 1996. ACM Press. <https://doi.org/10.1145/237721.237794>.
- Steve Klabnik, Carol Nichols, and Rust Community. The Rust programming language. <https://doc.rust-lang.org/book/>, 2018.
- Neelakantan R. Krishnaswami, Pierre Pradic, and Nick Benton. Integrating linear and dependent types. In Sriram K. Rajamani and David Walker, editors, *POPL 2015*, pages 17–30, Mumbai, India, 2015. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2676726.2676969>.
- Sam Lindley and J. Garrett Morris. Talking bananas: structural recursion for session types. In Jacques Garrigue, Gabriele Keller, and Eijiro Sumii, editors, *Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming, ICFP 2016*, pages 434–447, Nara, Japan, 2016. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2951913.2951921>.
- Sam Lindley and J. Garrett Morris. Lightweight functional session types. In Simon Gay and António Ravara, editors, *Behavioural Types: from Theory to Tools*. River Publishers, Gistrup, Denmark, 2017. Extended version at <https://homepages.inf.ed.ac.uk/slindley/papers/fst-extended.pdf>.
- Karl Mazurak, Jianzhou Zhao, and Steve Zdancewic. Lightweight linear types in system fdegree. In Andrew Kennedy and Nick Benton, editors, *TLDI 2010*, pages 77–88, Madrid, Spain, 2010.

- ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1708016.1708027>. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1708016.1708027>.
- Conor McBride. I got plenty o' nuttin'. In Sam Lindley, Conor McBride, Philip W. Trinder, and Donald Sannella, editors, *A List of Successes That Can Change the World - Essays Dedicated to Philip Wadler on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, volume 9600 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 207–233, Edinburgh, Scotland, 2016. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-30936-1_12. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-30936-1_12.
- Robin Milner, Joachim Parrow, and David Walker. A calculus of mobile processes, II. *Inf. Comput.*, 100(1):41–77, 1992. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401\(92\)90009-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(92)90009-5).
- Fabrizio Montesi and Marco Peressotti. Linear logic, the π -calculus, and their metatheory: A recipe for proofs as processes. *CoRR*, abs/2106.11818, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.11818>.
- Martin Odersky, Olivier Blanvillain, Fengyun Liu, Aggelos Biboudis, Heather Miller, and Sandro Stucki. Simplicity: foundations and applications of implicit function types. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 2(POPL):42:1–42:29, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3158130>.
- Bryan O'Sullivan. gauge: small framework for performance measurement and analysis. <https://hackage.haskell.org/package/gauge-0.2.5/>, (last accessed March 2023).
- Luca Padovani. Context-free session type inference. In Hongseok Yang, editor, *Programming Languages and Systems - 26th European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2017*, volume 10201 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 804–830, Uppsala, Sweden, 2017. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-54434-1_30.
- Luca Padovani. Context-free session type inference. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 41(2):9:1–9:37, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3229062>.
- Marco Patrignani, Eric Mark Martin, and Dominique Devriese. On the semantic expressiveness of recursive types. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 5(POPL):1–29, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3434302>.
- Frank Pfenning and Dennis Griffith. Polarized substructural session types. In Andrew M. Pitts, editor, *FoSSaCS 2015*, volume 9034 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 3–22, London, UK, 2015. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-46678-0_1.
- Frank Pfenning, Luís Caires, and Bernardo Toninho. Proof-carrying code in a session-typed process calculus. In Jean-Pierre Jouannaud and Zhong Shao, editors, *CPP 2011*, volume 7086 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 21–36, Kenting, Taiwan, 2011. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-25379-9_4.
- Benjamin C. Pierce. *Types and Programming Languages*. MIT Press, 2002. ISBN 978-0-262-16209-8.
- Janek Spaderna, Peter Thiemann, Andreia Mordido, and Vasco T. Vasconcelos. Parametrized algebraic protocols: Artifact. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7804667>, mar 2023.
- Arnaud Spiwack, Csongor Kiss, Jean-Philippe Bernardy, Nicolas Wu, and Richard A. Eisenberg. Linearly qualified types: generic inference for capabilities and uniqueness. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 6(ICFP):137–164, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3547626>.
- Kaku Takeuchi, Kohei Honda, and Makoto Kubo. An interaction-based language and its typing system. In Constantine Halatsis, Dimitris G. Maritsas, George Philokyprou, and Sergios Theodoridis, editors, *PARLE '94*, volume 817 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 398–413, Athens, Greece, 1994. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-58184-7_118.
- Peter Thiemann and Vasco T. Vasconcelos. Context-free session types. In Jacques Garrigue, Gabriele Keller, and Eijiro Sumii, editors, *Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGPLAN International*

- Conference on Functional Programming, ICFP 2016*, pages 462–475, Nara, Japan, 2016. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2951913.2951926>.
- Peter Thiemann and Vasco T. Vasconcelos. Label-dependent session types. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 4(POPL):67:1–67:29, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3371135>.
- Bernardo Toninho, Luís Caires, and Frank Pfenning. Higher-order processes, functions, and sessions: A monadic integration. In Matthias Felleisen and Philippa Gardner, editors, *Programming Languages and Systems - 22nd European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2013*, volume 7792 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 350–369, Rome, Italy, 2013. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-37036-6_20.
- Bernardo Toninho, Luís Caires, and Frank Pfenning. Corecursion and non-divergence in session-typed processes. In Matteo Maffei and Emilio Tuosto, editors, *Trustworthy Global Computing - 9th International Symposium, TGC 2014*, volume 8902 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 159–175, Rome, Italy, 2014. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-45917-1_11.
- Vasco T. Vasconcelos. Fundamentals of session types. *Inf. Comput.*, 217:52–70, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2012.05.002>.
- David Walker. *Advanced Topics in Types and Programming Languages*, chapter Substructural Type Systems, pages 3–44. The MIT Press, 2005.

A Frequently Asked Questions

A.1 Session types vs. protocol types

A session type can be assigned to a channel end to describe the entire communication behavior of this channel up to its closing. Thus, a session type classifies a run-time value, namely a channel end. A protocol type does not correspond to any run-time value. It describes composable behavior for bidirectional communication. A protocol type becomes part of a session type by binding it to a particular direction with the ! and ? operators.

In a sense, a protocol type describes a composable part of a communication protocol or the difference between two session types. This view is emphasized by our pervasive use of channel passing style.

A.2 Negated recursion

It is possible to define an algebraic protocol that negates the polarity of its recursive use. Such a protocol is fine, though unusual as it changes direction with every unfolding of the recursion. Here is an example:

```
protocol Flipper = Flipper -Int -Flipper
```

A server for Flipper can be implemented with a pair of mutually recursive functions or even with just one function:

```
flipper : !Flipper.End! → Unit
flipper c = let c = select Flipper [End!] c in
  let (x, c) = receive [Int, ?Flipper.End!] c in
  match c with {
    Flipper c → send [Int, !Flipper.End!] x c ▷ flipper }
```

A.3 Mutual recursion

Mutually recursive protocols pose no problem. In general, the server would be implemented by mutually recursive functions.

```
protocol Flip = Flip -Int Flop
protocol Flop = Flop Int Flip

flip : !Flip.End! → Unit
flip c = select Flip [End!] c ▷ receive [Int, !Flop.End!] ▷ flop

flop : (Int, !Flop.End!) → Unit
flop p = let (x, c) = p in
  select Flop [End!] c ▷ send [Int, !Flip.End!] x ▷ flip
```

A.4 Duality vs. polarities

The `Dual` operator works on *session types* and it inverts the direction of communication from the outside. Intuitively, the `Dual` operator traverses the spine of a session type and flips all `!` to `?` and vice versa. It does **not** enter the type of the message “payload”. For example (with T the payload type and S the continuation session):

$$\text{Dual } (?T.S) \equiv !T.\text{Dual } S \qquad \text{Dual } (!T.S) \equiv ?T.\text{Dual } S$$

In contrast, the polarity operator `-` works on *protocol types* and inverts the direction of communication from the inside. This inversion happens at the boundary where a protocol type ρ is turned into a payload type for a session:

$$?(-P).S \equiv !P.S \qquad !(-P).S \equiv ?P.S$$

The soundness of the type system guarantees that the direction of communication is finally settled by the time we get to a primitive sending or receiving operation.

Like `Dual`, the `-` operator is involutory:

$$\text{Dual } (\text{Dual } S) \equiv S \qquad -(-T) \equiv T$$

A.5 Recursion and duality

Bernardi and Hennessy [2014, 2016] discovered a problem in the interaction between duality and recursive session types, which is exposed most concisely by the recursive type $T = \mu X. !X.X$. The dual of this type is $\text{Dual } (\mu X. !X.X) = \mu X. ?(\mu X. !X.X).X$, which can be seen by dualizing the type’s expansion

$$\text{Dual } (\mu X. !X.X) = \text{Dual } (!(\mu X. !X.X).(\mu X. !X.X)) = ?(\mu X. !X.X).\text{Dual } (\mu X. !X.X)$$

Using equations we could define the type T by $T = !T.T$. Translated to algebraic session types, the protocol underlying T is as follows:

```

protocol X = Mu T X
type T = !X.End

selectMu : T → !T.T
selectMu c = select Mu [End,] c

dualT : Dual T → ?X.End
dualT c = c

matchMu : Dual T → ?T.(Dual T)
matchMu c' = match c' with { Mu c' → c' }

```

This behavior matches exactly the outcome for T according to Bernardi and Hennessy [2016]. The function `selectMu` performs the unfolding of T whereas `matchMu` performs the unfolding of $\text{Dual } T$. The type of the identity function `dualT` shows that $\text{Dual } T = ?X.\text{End}$.

A.6 Efficiency of generic servers

In section 2.3, we explore an example with generic servers to showcase the expressivity of the proposed parametric protocols. The example has a significant overhead as there are many tagging operations compared to a manually crafted version.

The present work is a first step and does not offer a solution supported by formal theorems. But, let us call a protocol ρ *tagless* if it is non-recursive and declares a single constructor tag $C T_1 \dots T_n$. In analogy to Haskell’s `newtype`, an implementation can reduce the run-time cost of a tagless protocol to zero by omitting the select and match operations.

A.7 Equirecursive vs. isorecursive session types

Most work on session types is using equirecursive types for two reasons. One is historic: Gay and Hole [1999, 2005] were the first to study coinductively defined relations on (tail-) recursive session types. They defined the (by now) standard notion of subtyping and showed that it is decidable. Subsequent work has built on top of their results. The other reason is that “The equirecursive interpretation of a session type guarantees that no message is required for the unfolding of a recursive type.” (Balzer and Pfenning [2017])

Algebraic protocols conflate the unfolding of the recursion with the branching, just like algebraic datatypes do. For protocols that have finite runs, algebraic protocols do not cause extra messages. As such protocols use recursion guarded by branching, a message to decide the branching is needed anyway.

The protocol `Stream a` in section 2.3 does cause extra messages as it (roughly) corresponds to an isorecursive reading of the type $\mu X. !a.X$.

A.8 Subtyping, type classes, type inference

Subtyping is undecidable for context-free session types Padovani [2019]. However, as AlgST’s session typing relies mostly on nominal types, there is scope for decidable subtyping. We have a concrete proposal, but it is not implemented and its metatheory has not been checked, yet.

The types `Send a` and `Recv a` for sending and receiving data of type `a` in `??` look like types for a dictionary in a language with type classes or traits Hall et al. [1996], Klabnik et al. [2018]. In future work we plan to explore the addition of implicit arguments as in Scala Odersky et al. [2018].

Type inference is future work.

A.9 Settling of direction

It might be confusing to see a type like $?T.S$ and $!T.S$, but with the possibility that the direction changes later on. However, this behavior is completely predictable. As long as T is a protocol type variable $\alpha : \mathbf{p}$, the direction can change because α could be substituted by some protocol $-T'$. As soon as T is an ordinary type of kind \mathbf{t} (even if T is a variable), the direction is fixed. For example, in the type of primitive send $\forall(a:\mathbf{M}). \forall(s:\mathbf{S}). a \rightarrow !a.s \rightarrow s$, the payload type `a` has kind \mathbf{m} , so the direction is fixed.

B A Toolbox for Generic Servers

Analogously to the `Stream` protocol, we can define a protocol and a generic server for finite repetition of a subsidiary protocol:

```

protocol Repeat x = More x (Repeat x) | Quit

repeat : ∀(p:P). Service p → Service (Repeat p)
repeat [p] serveP [s] c = match c of {
  Quit c → c,
  More c → serveP [Repeat p.s] c ▷ repeat [p] serveP [s]
}

```

This protocol may then be used similarly to `Stream`:

```
repeatArith = repeat [Arith] serveArith
```

We can define an active version that offers the subprotocol n times and use that with `Arith`, too:

```

repeatActive : Int → ∀(p:P). Service p → Service -(Repeat -p)
repeatActiveArith : Int → Service -(Repeat -Arith)

```

While the implementation is straightforward, the astute reader might ask why we provide the negative parameter to `Service` in `Service -(Repeat -p)`. In particular, could we not use the `Dual` operator to switch the direction of the service?

To see the problem with this proposal, let's expand the two candidates:

```
Dual (Service (Repeat -p)) = Dual (∀(s:S). ?Repeat -p.s → s)
```

This proposal is doomed because the use of `Dual` on the right side is not well-kinded, as neither the universal type nor the function types are session types in our system.

```

Service -(Repeat -p) = ∀(s:S). ?-(Repeat -p). s → s
                    = ∀(s:S). !Repeat -p. s → s

```

The negative parameter swaps the receiving operator in `Service` to sending with surgical precision.

C Proofs for Types

Example 1. We generalize the example from the introduction to a parametric stack protocol.

```
protocol Stack a = Pop -a | Push a (Stack a) (Stack a)
```

We set $\Delta = \text{Neg} : \mathbf{p} \rightarrow \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{a} : \mathbf{p}$ and obtain the straightforward derivation

$$\frac{
 \frac{
 \frac{\Delta \vdash \mathbf{a} \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}}{\Delta \vdash \mathbf{a} \Leftarrow \mathbf{p}} \quad
 \frac{\Delta \vdash \mathbf{a} \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}}{\Delta \vdash \mathbf{a} \Leftarrow \mathbf{p}}
 }{\Delta \vdash -\mathbf{a} \Leftarrow \mathbf{p}} \quad
 \frac{
 \frac{\Delta \vdash \mathbf{a} \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}}{\Delta \vdash \mathbf{a} \Leftarrow \mathbf{p}} \quad
 \frac{\Delta \vdash \mathbf{a} \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}}{\Delta \vdash \mathbf{a} \Leftarrow \mathbf{p}}
 }{\Delta \vdash \text{Stack } \mathbf{a} \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}} \quad
 \frac{
 \text{Stack} : \mathbf{p} \rightarrow \mathbf{p} \in \Delta \quad
 \frac{\Delta \vdash \mathbf{a} \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}}{\Delta \vdash \mathbf{a} \Leftarrow \mathbf{p}}
 }{\Delta \vdash \text{Stack } \mathbf{a} \Leftarrow \mathbf{p}}
 }{\Delta \vdash \text{Stack } \mathbf{a} \Rightarrow \mathbf{p} \rightarrow \mathbf{p}}$$

The three subderivations correspond to the arguments of the protocol constructors. We conclude that the definition of the protocol `Stack a` is well-formed.

Lemma 1 (Properties of the materialization and directional operators).

1. $\Delta \vdash \mathit{Dual} (\S(T).S) \equiv \S(-T).\mathit{Dual} S : \mathbf{s}$
2. $-(+(T)) = -(T)$
3. $-(-T) = +(T)$

Proof.

1. By case analysis on the definition of the \S operator (fig. 3).
 Case $T = -U$. Since $\S(-U).S = ?U.S$, rule C-DUALIN gives $\Delta \vdash \mathit{Dual} (\S(-U).S) \equiv !U.\mathit{Dual} S : \mathbf{s}$. Observing that $-(-U) = +(U) = U$ we conclude that $\S(-(-U)).\mathit{Dual} S = !U.\mathit{Dual} S$.
 Case $T \neq -U$. Since $\S(T).S = !T.S$, rule C-DUALOUT gives $\Delta \vdash \mathit{Dual} (\S(T).S) \equiv ?T.\mathit{Dual} S : \mathbf{s}$. Conclude observing that $-(T) = -T$.
2. The proof follows by case analysis on the definition of the directional operators.
 Case $T = -U$. We have: $-(+(-U)) = -(-U) = -(-U)$.
 Case $T \neq -U$. We have: $-(+(T)) = -(T)$.
3. The proof follows by case analysis on the definition of the directional operators.
 Case $T = -U$. We have: $-(-(-U)) = -(+(U)) = -(U) = -U = +(-U)$.
 Case $T \neq -U$. We have: $-(-T) = -(-T) = +(T)$.

Lemma 2 (Agreement for type conversion). *If $\Delta \vdash T \equiv U : \kappa$, then $\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \kappa$ and $\Delta \vdash U \Leftarrow \kappa$.*

Proof. By rule induction on the hypothesis.

We start by specifying the syntax of types in normal form. Normal forms for well-formed types are Q as defined by the following grammar:

$Q ::= R \mid -R$

$R ::= \mathit{Unit} \mid R \rightarrow R \mid R \otimes R \mid \forall \alpha : \kappa. R \mid \alpha \mid ?R.R \mid !R.R \mid \mathit{End}_? \mid \mathit{End}_! \mid \mathit{Dual} \alpha \mid \rho \overline{Q}$

Proposition 1 (Kind preservation).

1. For all $\Delta \vdash T \Rightarrow \kappa$, $\Delta \vdash \mathit{norm}^+(T) \equiv T : \kappa$.
2. For all $\Delta \vdash T \Rightarrow \mathbf{s}$, $\Delta \vdash \mathit{norm}^-(T) \equiv \mathit{Dual} T : \mathbf{s}$.

Proof. See Agda development `nf-sound+` and `nf-sound-`.

Proof (Proof of theorem 1 (Soundness)). Item 1. Suppose that $\mathit{norm}^+(T) =_{\alpha} \mathit{norm}^+(U)$. From proposition 1, we have $\Delta \vdash \mathit{norm}^+(T) \equiv T : \kappa$ and $\Delta \vdash \mathit{norm}^+(U) \equiv U : \kappa$. Conclude by symmetry and transitivity of conversion as type equality is in \equiv . The proof for item 2 is analogous.

Proof (Proof of theorem 2 (Completeness)). See Agda development `nf-complete` and `nf-complete-`.

To obtain a complexity bound for the computation of a normal form, we exploit its syntactic form.

Lemma 3. *If $\mathit{norm}^{\pm}(T) = T'$, then T' is described by Q .*

Proof. See Agda development `nf-normal`.

Proposition 2. *For each $\Delta \vdash T \Rightarrow \kappa$, the worst case running time of $\mathit{norm}^{\pm}(T)$ is in $O(|T|)$.*

Proof. A run of $\mathit{norm}^{\pm}(T)$ visits each of the $|T|$ nodes in the input type once. At each node, it either reconstructs the type from the normal forms of the sub-terms in $O(1)$ time, or (in the transmission rules) it applies polarity correction to normal forms. By Lemma 3, a normal form starts with at most one negative polarity, so correction takes at most two steps, at cost $O(1)$.

Proof (Proof of theorem 3 (Time complexity of type equivalence)). A corollary of lemma 3.

Labelled transition system for expressions

$$e \xrightarrow{\lambda} e$$

<p>ACT-APP $(\lambda x: T.e) v \xrightarrow{\beta} e[v/x]$</p>	<p>ACT-TAPP $(\Delta \alpha: \kappa.v)[T] \xrightarrow{\beta} v[T/\alpha]$</p>	<p>ACT-LET $\text{let } \langle x, y \rangle = \langle u, v \rangle \text{ in } e \xrightarrow{\beta} e[u/x][v/y]$</p>		
<p>ACT-LET* $\text{let } * = * \text{ in } e \xrightarrow{\beta} e$</p>	<p>ACT-REC $(\text{rec } x: T.v) u \xrightarrow{\beta} (v[\text{rec } x: T.v/x]) u$</p>	<p>ACT-FORK $\text{fork } v \xrightarrow{\text{fork } v} *$</p>		
<p>ACT-NEW $\text{new}[T] \xrightarrow{(\nu xy): T} \langle x, y \rangle$</p>	<p>ACT-RCV $\text{receive}[T][U] x \xrightarrow{x?v} \langle v, x \rangle$</p>	<p>ACT-SEND $\text{send}[T][U] v x \xrightarrow{x!v} x$</p>		
<p>ACT-MATCH $\text{match } x \text{ with } \{C_i y_i \rightarrow e_i\}_{i \in I} \xrightarrow{x?C_k} e_k[x/y_k]$</p>	<p>ACT-SEL $\text{select } C[\bar{T}] x \xrightarrow{x!C} x$</p>	<p>ACT-WAIT $\text{wait } x \xrightarrow{x?} *$</p>		
<p>ACT-TERM $\text{terminate } x \xrightarrow{x!} *$</p>	<p>ACT-APPL $\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} e_2}{e_1 e_3 \xrightarrow{\lambda} e_2 e_3}$</p>	<p>ACT-APPR $\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} e_2}{v e_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} v e_2}$</p>	<p>ACT-TAPPE $\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} e_2}{e_1[T] \xrightarrow{\lambda} e_2[T]}$</p>	<p>ACT-PAIRL $\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} e_2}{\langle e_1, e_3 \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda} \langle e_2, e_3 \rangle}$</p>
<p>ACT-PAIRR $\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} e_2}{\langle v, e_1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda} \langle v, e_2 \rangle}$</p>	<p>ACT-MATCHE $\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} e_2}{\text{match } e_1 \text{ with } \{C_i x_i \rightarrow e_i\}_{i \in I} \xrightarrow{\lambda} \text{match } e_2 \text{ with } \{C_i x_i \rightarrow e_i\}_{i \in I}}$</p>			
<p>ACT-LETE $\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} e_2}{\text{let } \langle x, y \rangle = e_1 \text{ in } e_3 \xrightarrow{\lambda} \text{let } \langle x, y \rangle = e_2 \text{ in } e_3}$</p>		<p>ACT-LETE* $\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} e_2}{\text{let } * = e_1 \text{ in } e_3 \xrightarrow{\lambda} \text{let } * = e_2 \text{ in } e_3}$</p>		

Fig. 11: Labelled transition system for expressions

D Proofs for expressions and processes

Lemma 4.

1. If $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$ and $\Delta \vdash \Gamma_1 \Leftarrow \mathbf{t}$, then $\Delta \vdash \Gamma_2 \Leftarrow \mathbf{t}$ and T is in normal form.
2. If $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e \Leftarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$ and $\Delta \vdash \Gamma_1 \Leftarrow \mathbf{t}$ and T is in normal form, then $\Delta \vdash \Gamma_2 \Leftarrow \mathbf{t}$.

Proof.

1. By rule induction on the first hypothesis.
2. Using item 1 and observing that a type U such that $U =_{\alpha} T$ is also in normal form.

Lemma 5 (Properties of normalization).

1. If $\Delta \vdash \text{norm}^+(T) \Rightarrow \kappa$, then $\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \kappa$.
2. If $\Delta \vdash \text{norm}^-(T) \Rightarrow \kappa$, then $\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{s}$.
3. If $\Delta \vdash \S(T).S \Rightarrow \kappa$, then $\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{p}$ and $\Delta \vdash S \Leftarrow \mathbf{s}$.
4. If $\Delta \vdash \pm(T) \Rightarrow \kappa$, then $\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \kappa$.

Labelled transition system for contexts

$$\boxed{\Gamma \xrightarrow{\lambda} \Gamma \quad \Gamma \xrightarrow{\pi} \Gamma}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{L-RCV} \\
\frac{\cdot \mid \Gamma \vdash v \Leftarrow T \mid \cdot}{x: ?T.S \xrightarrow{x?v} \Gamma, x: S} \\
\\
\text{L-SEND} \\
\frac{\cdot \mid \Gamma \vdash v \Leftarrow T \mid \cdot}{\Gamma, x: !T.S \xrightarrow{x!v} x: S} \\
\\
\text{L-MATCH} \\
\frac{\text{protocol } \rho \bar{\alpha} = \{C_i \bar{T}_i\}_{i \in I}}{x: ?(\rho \bar{U}).S \xrightarrow{x?C_k} x: \S(-(\bar{T}_k[\bar{U}/\bar{\alpha}])).S} \\
\\
\text{L-SEL} \\
\frac{\text{protocol } \rho \bar{\alpha} = \{C_i \bar{T}_i\}_{i \in I}}{x: !(\rho \bar{U}).S' \xrightarrow{x!C_k} x: \S(+(\bar{T}_k[\bar{U}/\bar{\alpha}])).S'} \\
\\
\text{L-WAIT} \\
x: \text{End?} \xrightarrow{x?} \cdot \\
\\
\text{L-TERM} \\
x: \text{End!} \xrightarrow{x!} \cdot \\
\\
\text{L-BETA} \\
\cdot \xrightarrow{\beta} \cdot \\
\\
\text{L-FORK} \\
\frac{\cdot \mid \Gamma \vdash v \Leftarrow \text{Unit} \rightarrow \text{Unit} \mid \cdot}{\Gamma \xrightarrow{\text{fork } v} \cdot} \\
\\
\text{L-NEW} \\
\cdot \xrightarrow{(\nu xy): T} x: \text{nrm}^+(T), y: \text{nrm}^-(T) \\
\\
\text{L-TAU} \\
\cdot \xrightarrow{\tau} \cdot \\
\\
\text{L-OPENL} \\
x: !T.S \xrightarrow{(\nu ab)x!a} b: \text{nrm}^-(T), x: S \\
\\
\text{L-OPENR} \\
x: !T.S \xrightarrow{(\nu ab)x!b} a: \text{nrm}^-(T), x: S \\
\\
\text{L-PAR} \\
\frac{\Gamma_1 \xrightarrow{\pi_1} \Gamma_3 \quad \Gamma_2 \xrightarrow{\pi_2} \Gamma_4}{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \xrightarrow{\pi_1 \mid \pi_2} \Gamma_3, \Gamma_4}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 12: Labelled transition system for typing contexts

Proof. The proof is by mutual induction on the various hypotheses. Most cases follow by a straightforward induction. We detail the case for $\text{nrm}^-(?T.S) = \S(+(\text{nrm}^+(T))).\text{nrm}^-(S)$. Item 3 gives $\Delta \vdash +(\text{nrm}^+(T)) \Leftarrow \mathbf{p}$ and $\Delta \vdash \text{nrm}^-(S) \Leftarrow \mathbf{s}$. Rule T-SUB gives $\Delta \vdash +(\text{nrm}^+(T)) \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}$ and $\Delta \vdash \text{nrm}^-(S) \Rightarrow \mathbf{s}$. Item 4 gives $\Delta \vdash \text{nrm}^+(T) \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}$. Again rule T-SUB gives $\Delta \vdash \text{nrm}^+(T) \Leftarrow \mathbf{p}$. Item 1 gives $\Delta \vdash T \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}$. Once again, rule T-SUB gives $\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{p}$. From $\Delta \vdash \text{nrm}^-(S) \Leftarrow \mathbf{s}$, induction gives $\Delta \vdash S \Rightarrow \mathbf{s}$ and T-SUB gives $\Delta \vdash S \Leftarrow \mathbf{s}$. Finally, rule T-IN gives $\Delta \vdash ?T.S \Rightarrow \mathbf{s}$ and rule T-SUB yields $\Delta \vdash ?T.S \Leftarrow \mathbf{s}$.

Lemma 6 (Substitution).

1. If $\Delta, \alpha: \kappa \vdash T \Rightarrow \kappa'$ and $\Delta \vdash U \Leftarrow \kappa$, then $\Delta \vdash T[U/\alpha] \Rightarrow \kappa'$.
2. If $\Delta, \alpha: \kappa \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$ and $\Delta \vdash U \Leftarrow \kappa$, then $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e[U/\alpha] \Rightarrow \text{nrm}^+(T[U/\alpha]) \mid \Gamma_2$.
3. If $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, x: U \vdash e \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$ and $\Delta \mid \Gamma_3 \vdash v \Leftarrow U \mid \cdot$, then $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_3 \vdash e[v/x] \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$.
4. If $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, x: *U \vdash e \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2, x: *U$ and $\Delta \mid \Gamma_3 \vdash v \Leftarrow U \mid \cdot$, then $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_3 \vdash e[v/x] \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$.

Proof. The proof follows by mutual induction on the first hypothesis.

Lemma 7 (Agreement). Let $\Delta \vdash \Gamma_1 \Leftarrow \mathbf{t}$.

1. If $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, x: T \vdash e \Rightarrow U \mid \Gamma_2$, then $\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \kappa$.
2. If $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$, then $\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \kappa$.
3. If $\Gamma_1, x: T \vdash p$, then $\cdot \vdash T \Leftarrow \kappa$.

Proof.

1. By rule induction on the first hypothesis.
2. By rule induction on the first hypothesis, using lemma 6 and lemma 2.

3. By rule induction on the first hypothesis, using E-CHECK and item 1.

Monotonicity tells us that resources are not created during the process of type checking.

Lemma 8 (Monotonicity). *If $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash v \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$, then $\Gamma_2 \subseteq \Gamma_1$.*

Proof. A straightforward rule induction on the hypothesis. The base cases are E-Const and E-Var. The cases for E-Abs, E-TAbs, E-Pair and E-TApp follow by induction and transitivity of the subset relation.

Lemma 9 (Strengthening).

1. *If $\Delta, \alpha: \kappa \vdash T \Rightarrow \kappa'$ and $\alpha \notin \text{fv}(T)$, then $\Delta \vdash T \Rightarrow \kappa'$.*
2. *If $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, x: U \vdash e \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2, x: U$, then $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$.*

Proof.

1. The proof is by induction hypothesis on the first hypothesis, using T-SUB.
2. The proof is by induction hypothesis on the first hypothesis.

Lemma 10 (Weakening). *If $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$, then $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, x: U \vdash e \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2, x: U$.*

Proof. The proof follows by induction on the hypothesis.

Preservation and progress We now prove the main results.

Proof (Proof of theorem 4 (Preservation)).

The proof follows by mutual rule induction on the first hypothesis.

1. Rule Act-App. In this case, $(\lambda x: U.e)v \xrightarrow{\beta} e[v/x]$ and $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma'_2 = \cdot$. Inversion of E-APP on $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_3 \vdash (\lambda x: U.e)v \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_3$ yields (a) $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_3 \vdash \lambda x: U.e \Rightarrow V \rightarrow T \mid \Gamma'$ and (b) $\Delta \mid \Gamma' \vdash v \Leftarrow V \mid \Gamma_3$. By monotonicity (lemma 8), we know that $\Gamma_3 \subseteq \Gamma'$; say that $\Gamma' = \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_3$. Applying inversion of E-ABS on (a) and strengthening (lemma 9) on (b), we get $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_3, x: \text{nrm}^+(U) \vdash e \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_3$ and $\Delta \mid \Gamma'_1 \vdash v \Leftarrow V \mid \cdot$ (and $V = \text{nrm}^+(U)$). By C-REFL and agreement (lemma 7) on the second hypothesis, we know that $T \equiv_A T$. Conclude applying the substitution lemma (lemma 6, item 3) and weakening (lemma 10).
 Rule Act-TApp. Again, $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma'_2 = \cdot$. Apply inversion of E-TAPP on the second hypothesis, followed by inversion of E-TABS and conclude with lemma 6, item 2, using $T' = T$.
 Rule Act-Let. Apply inversion of E-LET to the second hypothesis, followed by inversion of E-PAIR, then apply substitution (lemma 6, item 3) and conclude using $T' = T$.
 Rule Act-Let*. In this case, $\text{let } * = * \text{ in } e \xrightarrow{\beta} e$ and $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma'_2 = \cdot$. Using inversion of E-CONST and E-CHECK for $*$, we know that premises to E-LET* include $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_3 \vdash e \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_3$, which is what we want to prove, since $T \equiv_A T$.
 Rule Act-Rec. Again, $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma'_2 = \cdot$. Premises to rule E-APP are $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_3 \vdash \text{rec } x: V.v \Rightarrow U \rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_3$ and $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_3 \vdash u \Leftarrow U \mid \Gamma_3$. Applying inversion of E-REC on the former, conclude that $\text{nrm}^+(V) = U \rightarrow T$ and then apply inversion of E-CHECK and the substitution lemma (lemma 6) to get $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_3 \vdash v[\text{rec } x: V.v/x] \Rightarrow U \rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_3$. Conclude applying E-APP and using the fact that $T \equiv_A T$.
 Rule Act-Fork. Inversion of E-APP yields $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3 \vdash \text{fork} \Rightarrow U \rightarrow T \mid \Gamma'$ and $\Delta \mid \Gamma' \vdash v \Leftarrow U \mid \Gamma_3$. Applying E-CONST on the former we know that $\Gamma' = \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3, U = \text{Unit} \rightarrow \text{Unit}$

and $T = \mathbf{Unit}$. By L-Fork we know that $\Delta \mid \Gamma_2 \vdash v \Leftarrow \mathbf{Unit} \rightarrow \mathbf{Unit} \mid \cdot$ and $\Gamma_1 = \cdot$ in this case. By applying E-CONST for $*$ we conclude that $\Delta \mid \Gamma_3 \vdash * \Rightarrow \mathbf{Unit} \mid \Gamma_3$, as we wanted.

Rule Act-New. In this case, $\mathbf{new}[U] \xrightarrow{(\nu xy): U} \langle x, y \rangle$. By L-New, we know that $\Gamma_2 = \cdot$ and $\Gamma'_2 = x: \text{nrm}^+(U), y: \text{nrm}^-(U)$. Inversion of E-TAPP and E-CONST on the second hypothesis yields $T = \text{nrm}^+(U) \otimes \text{nrm}^-(U)$ and $\Gamma_1 = \cdot$. Using E-VAR and E-PAIR we conclude that $\Delta \mid \Gamma_3, x: \text{nrm}^+(U), y: \text{nrm}^-(U) \vdash \langle x, y \rangle \Rightarrow \text{nrm}^+(U) \otimes \text{nrm}^-(U) \mid \Gamma_3$.

Rule Act-Rev. In this case, $\mathbf{receive}[U][V] x \xrightarrow{x?v} \langle v, x \rangle$. By L-Rcv, $\Gamma_2 = x: ?U.S$ and $\Gamma'_2 = x: S, \Gamma$, where Γ is such that $\cdot \mid \Gamma \vdash v \Leftarrow U \mid \cdot$. Inversion of E-APP on the second hypothesis yields $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, x: ?U.S, \Gamma_3 \vdash \mathbf{receive}[U][V] \Rightarrow W \rightarrow T \mid \Gamma'_1$ and $\Delta \mid \Gamma'_1 \vdash x \Leftarrow W \mid \Gamma_3$. Inversion of E-VAR on the latter yields $\Gamma'_1 = x: ?U.S, \Gamma_3$ and $W = ?U.S$. Inversion of E-TAPP applied twice, followed by E-CONST enables us to conclude that $\Gamma_1 = \cdot$ and $T = U \otimes S$. Using L-Rcv, E-CHECK and weakening we know that $\Delta \mid x: S, \Gamma, \Gamma_3 \vdash v \Rightarrow U \mid x: S, \Gamma_3$, using E-VAR and weakening we get $\Delta \mid x: S, \Gamma_3 \vdash x \Rightarrow S \mid \Gamma_3$. Conclude applying E-PAIR and recalling that $U \otimes S = T \equiv_A T$.

Rule Act-Send. In this case, $\mathbf{send}[U][S] v x \xrightarrow{x!v} x$. By L-Send, $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma, x: !U.S$ where Γ is such that $\cdot \mid \Gamma \vdash v \Leftarrow U \mid \cdot$. Proceed similarly to the previous case, applying inversion of E-APP twice, followed by E-TAPP and then inversion of E-CONST over \mathbf{send} to conclude that $S = T$. On the other hand, invert E-VAR and L-Send with weakening applied to the other premises to conclude that $\Gamma_1 = \cdot$. The result follows applying E-VAR and weakening with $\Gamma'_2 = x: T$, and knowing that $T \equiv_A T$.

Rule Act-Match. In this case, $\mathbf{match} x \text{ with } \{C_i y_i \rightarrow e_i\}_{i \in I} \xrightarrow{x?C_k} e_k[x/y_k]$. By L-Match, we have $\Gamma_2 = x: ?(P \bar{U}).S'$ for protocol $\rho \bar{\alpha} = \{C_i \bar{T}_i\}_{i \in I}$. Premises to E-MATCH include (a) $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, x: ?(P \bar{U}).S', \Gamma_3 \vdash x \Rightarrow ?(P \bar{U}).S' \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_3$, (b) $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_3, y_i: \S(-(\bar{T}_i[\bar{U}/\bar{\alpha}])).S \vdash e_i \Rightarrow V_i \mid \Gamma_3$ and (c) $T =_\alpha V_i$. By L-Match we know that $\Gamma'_2 = x: \S(-(\bar{T}_k[\bar{U}/\bar{\alpha}])).S$. Applying E-VAR and E-CHECK we get (d) $\Delta \mid x: \S(-(\bar{T}_k[\bar{U}/\bar{\alpha}])).S \vdash x \Leftarrow \S(-(\bar{T}_k[\bar{U}/\bar{\alpha}])).S \mid \cdot$. Conclude applying the substitution lemma (lemma 6) to (b) and (d).

Rule Act-Sel. We have $\mathbf{select} C[\bar{U}] x \xrightarrow{x!C} x$. Using L-Sel, we know that $\Gamma_2 = x: !(P \bar{U}).S'$ for protocol $\rho \bar{\alpha} = \{C_i \bar{T}_i\}_{i \in I}$. Use inversion of E-APP and E-TAPP on the second hypothesis to conclude that $T = \S(+(\bar{T}_k[\bar{U}/\bar{\alpha}])).S'$. Using inversion of E-VAR conclude that $\Gamma_1 = \cdot$. Finally, use E-VAR and weakening (lemma 10) to get $\Delta \mid x: \S(+(\bar{T}_k[\bar{U}/\bar{\alpha}])).S', \Gamma_3 \vdash x \Rightarrow \S(+(\bar{T}_k[\bar{U}/\bar{\alpha}])).S' \mid \Gamma_3$. Conclude observing that $\S(+(\bar{T}_k[\bar{U}/\bar{\alpha}])).S' = T \equiv_A T$.

Rule Act-Wait. In this case, $\Gamma_2 = x: \mathbf{End}_?$ and $\Gamma'_2 = \cdot$. Inversion of E-APP on the second hypothesis yields $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, x: \mathbf{End}_?, \Gamma_3 \vdash \mathbf{wait} \Rightarrow U \rightarrow T \mid \Gamma'$ and $\Delta \mid \Gamma' \vdash x \Leftarrow U \mid \Gamma_3$. Apply E-CONST to the former and E-VAR to the latter to conclude that $\Gamma_1 = \cdot$, $U = \mathbf{End}_?$ and $T = \mathbf{Unit}$. The result follows using E-CONST on $*$ and weakening (lemma 10), using $T' = T$.

Rule Act-Term is similar.

Rule Act-AppR. In this case, $v e_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} v e_2$. Using the second hypothesis and rule E-APP we know that (a) $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3 \vdash v \Rightarrow U \rightarrow T \mid \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3$ and (b) $\Delta \mid \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3 \vdash e_1 \Leftarrow U \mid \Gamma_3$. By induction hypothesis on item 2, using (b), we get $\Delta \mid \Gamma'_1, \Gamma'_2, \Gamma_3 \vdash e_2 \Leftarrow U \mid \Gamma_3$. Applying weakening and strengthening to (a) we get $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma'_2, \Gamma_3 \vdash v \Rightarrow U \rightarrow T \mid \Gamma'_1, \Gamma'_2, \Gamma_3$. Apply E-App to conclude that $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma'_2, \Gamma_3 \vdash v e_2 \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_3$.

Rules Act-AppL, Act-TAppE, Act-LetE, Act-LetE*, Act-PairL, Act-PairR, Act-MatchE are similar.

2. Inversion of E-CHECK on the second hypothesis yields $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3 \vdash e_1 \Rightarrow U \mid \Gamma_3$ and $U =_\alpha T$. By induction hypothesis on item 1 we know that $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma'_2, \Gamma_3 \vdash e_2 \Rightarrow U' \mid \Gamma'_3$ with

$U' \equiv_A U$. By C-SYM and C-TRANS we know that $T \equiv_A U'$. Using E-CHECK we conclude that $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma'_2, \Gamma_3 \vdash e_2 \Leftarrow T \mid \Gamma'_3$.

3. Rule Act-Session. Inversion of Act-Session yields $e_1 \xrightarrow{\sigma} e_2$ and inversion of P-Exp on the second hypothesis implies $\cdot \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash e_1 \Leftarrow \mathbf{Unit} \mid \cdot$. Applying induction hypothesis on item 2 we get $\cdot \mid \Gamma_1, \Gamma'_2 \vdash e_2 \Leftarrow \mathbf{Unit} \mid \cdot$. Conclude applying P-Exp.

Rule Act-Beta is similar, considering $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma'_2 = \cdot$, as prescribed by L-Tau and L-Beta.

Rule Act-Fork. Inversion of Act-Fork on the first hypothesis and of P-Exp on the second hypothesis yields (a) $e_1 \xrightarrow{\text{fork } v} e_2$ and (b) $\cdot \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 \Leftarrow \mathbf{Unit} \mid \cdot$. By L-Fork we know that (c) $\Gamma_1 \xrightarrow{\text{fork } v} \cdot$ and (d) $\cdot \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash v \Leftarrow \mathbf{Unit} \rightarrow \mathbf{Unit} \mid \cdot$. Applying induction hypothesis on item 2 to (a), (b) and (c) we get $\cdot \mid \cdot \vdash e_2 \Leftarrow \mathbf{Unit} \mid \cdot$. Inversion of E-CHECK on (d) and E-CONST for $*$ enables the application of E-APP to deduce $\cdot \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash v * \Rightarrow \mathbf{Unit} \mid \cdot$. Conclude using E-CHECK, P-Exp and P-Par.

Rule Act-New. By L-Tau, $\Gamma_2 = \cdot$. Inversion of P-Exp on the second hypothesis yields $\cdot \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 \Leftarrow \mathbf{Unit} \mid \cdot$. Applying inversion of Act-New and induction hypothesis on item 2 we get $\cdot \mid \Gamma_1, x : \text{nrn}^+(T), y : \text{nrn}^-(T) \vdash e_2 \Leftarrow \mathbf{Unit} \mid \cdot$. Using P-Exp we know that $\Gamma_1, x : \text{nrn}^+(T), y : \text{nrn}^-(T) \vdash \langle e_2 \rangle$. Conclude using P-New.

Rule Act-JoinL. Inversion of P-Par dictates a context split: $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2^1 \vdash p_1$ and $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2^2 \vdash p_2$. Using inversion of L-Par and applying induction hypothesis on item 3 we get $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_3 \vdash q_1$ and $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_4 \vdash q_2$, where $\Gamma_2^i = \Gamma_3, \Gamma_4$. Conclude with P-Par and L-Par.

Rule Act-JoinR is similar.

Rule Act-Msg. In this case, $(\nu xy) p_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu xy) p_2$. By inversion of Act-Msg, we know that $p_1 \xrightarrow{x?v|y!v} p_2$. For a τ -transition, the second hypothesis reads as $\Gamma_1 \vdash (\nu xy) p_1$ (recall rule L-Tau). By P-New, we have $\Gamma, x : \text{nrn}^+(T), y : \text{nrn}^-(T) \vdash p_1$. By L-Par, L-Rcv and L-Send, we know that $\text{nrn}^+(T) = ?U.S$ and $\Gamma_1, x : ?U.S, y : !U.\text{nrn}^-(S) \xrightarrow{x?v|y!v} \Gamma_1, x : S, y : \text{nrn}^-(S)$ and $\cdot \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash v \Leftarrow U \mid \cdot$. Applying induction hypothesis on item 3 we get $\Gamma_1, x : S, y : \text{nrn}^-(S) \vdash p_2$. Conclude applying P-New.

Rule Act-Bra. Premises to P-New include (a) $\Gamma_1, x : \text{nrn}^+(T), y : \text{nrn}^-(T) \vdash p_1$. By L-Match, L-Sel and L-Par we know that $\text{nrn}^+(T) = ?(P \bar{U}).S'$ where $\text{protocol } \rho \bar{\alpha} = \{C_i \bar{T}_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $C = C_k$ for some $k \in I$. Thus, we can rewrite (a) as $\Gamma_1, x : ?(P \bar{U}).S', y : !(P \bar{U}).\text{nrn}^-(S') \vdash p_1$.

Inversion of Act-Bra yields $p_1 \xrightarrow{x?C|y!C} p_2$. Applying induction hypothesis on item 3 we get $\Gamma_1, x : \S(-(\bar{T}_k[\bar{U}/\bar{\alpha}])).S, y : \S(+(\bar{T}_k[\bar{U}/\bar{\alpha}])).\text{nrn}^-(S') \vdash p_2$. Apply lemma 1, item 1 and P-New to conclude.

Rule Act-Wait. Premises to P-New include $\Gamma_1, x : \text{nrn}^+(T), y : \text{nrn}^-(T) \vdash p_1$. By L-Par, L-Wait and L-Term, we know that $\text{nrn}^+(T) = \mathbf{End}?$. Applying induction hypothesis on item 3 we get $\Gamma_1 \vdash p_2$.

Rule Act-ParL. Inversion of Act-ParL yields $p_1 \xrightarrow{\pi} p_2$. Premises to P-Par are (a) $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2^1 \vdash p_1$ and (b) $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2^2 \vdash q_1$, where $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma_2^1, \Gamma_2^2$. Applying induction hypothesis on item 3 to (a) we get $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_3 \vdash p_2$, where $\Gamma_2^1 \xrightarrow{\pi} \Gamma_3$. Conclude using (b) and applying P-Par.

Rule Act-ParR is similar.

Rule Act-Res. Premises to Act-Res are $p_1 \xrightarrow{\pi} p_2$ and $x, y \notin \text{fv}(\pi)$. Since $x, y \notin \text{fv}(\pi)$, we know that $\cdot \xrightarrow{\pi} \cdot$. Premises to P-New include $\Gamma_1, x : \text{nrn}^+(T), y : \text{nrn}^-(T) \vdash p_1$. Induction hypothesis on item 3 yields $\Gamma_1, x : \text{nrn}^+(T), y : \text{nrn}^-(T) \vdash p_2$. Conclude using P-New.

Rule Act-OpenL. By L-OpenL we know that $\Gamma_2 = x : !T.S$. Inversion of P-New yields $\Gamma_1, x : !T.S, a : \text{nrn}^+(U), b : \text{nrn}^-(U) \vdash p_1$. Inversion of L-Send, E-CHECK and E-VAR yields $\text{nrn}^+(U) = T$. By induction hypothesis on item 3, conclude that $\Gamma_1, x : S, b : \text{nrn}^-(U) \vdash p_2$.

Rule Act-OpenR is similar.

Rule Act-CloseL. By L-Tau, $\cdot \xrightarrow{\tau} \cdot$. Inversion of P-New yields $\Gamma_1, x: \text{nrm}^+(T), y: \text{nrm}^-(T) \vdash p_1$. By L-Rcv, we know that $\text{nrm}^+(T) = ?U.S$. By L-Rcv, L-OpenL, L-Par and induction hypothesis on item 3 we get $\Gamma_1, x: S, y: \text{nrm}^-(S), b: \text{nrm}^-(U), \Gamma \vdash p_2$ where $\cdot \mid \Gamma \vdash a \Leftarrow U \mid \cdot$. Applying E-CHECK and E-VAR we know that $\Gamma = a: U$. Conclude applying P-New twice.

Rule Act-CloseR is similar.

Canonical forms tell us the form of values from the form of types.

Lemma 11 (Canonical forms). *Let $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash v \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$.*

1. If $T = \text{Unit}$, then $v = *$.
2. If $T = U \rightarrow V$, then $v = \lambda x: U. e$ or $v = \text{rec } x: T. e$ or $v = \text{fork}$ or $v = \text{wait}$ or $v = \text{terminate}$ or $v = \text{receive}[W][X]$ or $v = \text{send}[W][X]$ or $v = \text{send}[W][X] u$ or $v = \text{select } C[\overline{W}]$.
3. If $T = U \otimes V$, then $v = \langle u, w \rangle$.
4. If $T = \forall \alpha: \kappa. U$, then $v = \Lambda \alpha: \kappa. u$ or $v = \text{receive}$ or $v = \text{receive}[V]$ or $v = \text{send}$ or $v = \text{send}[V]$ or $v = \text{select } C[\overline{V}]$ or $v = \text{select } C$ or $v = \text{new}$.
5. If $\Delta \vdash T \Leftarrow \mathbf{s}$, then $v = x$.

Proof. A straightforward analysis of the rules that apply to judgement $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1 \vdash v \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$. The cases for $T = U \rightarrow V$ and $T = \forall \alpha: \kappa. U$ come from rules E-ABS, E-TABS as well as from the constants that bear these two types. The only values for session types (types of kind \mathbf{s}) are variables (representing channel ends).

Lemma 12 (Completed processes are closed). *If p is completed, then $\cdot \vdash p$.*

Proof (Proof of theorem 5 (Progress)). By mutual rule induction in the first hypothesis, in each case.

Rules E-CONST, E-VAR, E-ABS and E-TABS. Constants, variables, lambda abstractions and type abstractions are values.

Rule E-LET*. Since $e = \text{let } * = e_1 \text{ in } e_2$ is not a value it must reduce. Distinguish two cases. When e_1 is a value, canonical forms (lemma 11) give $e_1 = *$ and e has a transition by rule Act-Let*. Otherwise, the premises to rule E-LET* include $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1^s \vdash e_1 \Leftarrow \text{Unit} \mid \Gamma_2$ and induction gives $e_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} e'_1$ (because e_1 is not a value). Hence e reduces by rule Act-LetE*.

Rule E-REC. Expression $\text{rec } x: T. v$ is a value

Rule E-APP. Since $e = e_1 e_2$ is not a value it must reduce. Distinguish two cases. When e_1 is not a value, by induction e_1 reduces and so does e (by rule ActAppL). When e_1 is a value, canonical forms (lemma 11) give a series of cases that we analyse in turn. When e_1 is an abstraction we further distinguish two cases. If e_2 is a value, then e reduces by rule Act-App. Otherwise monotonicity (lemma 8) gives $\Gamma_2 \subseteq \Gamma_1^s$ hence Γ_2^s . The induction hypothesis allow concluding that e reduces by rule Act-AppR. The case for rec is similar to that of λ . When $e_1 = \text{fork}$, we further distinguish two cases. When e_2 is a value, e reduces by rule Act-Fork. Otherwise, using induction expression e reduces by rule Act-AppR. When $e_1 = \text{wait}$, we further distinguish two cases. When e_2 is a value, canonical forms give $e_2 = x$, hence e reduces by rule Act-Wait. Otherwise, monotonicity (lemma 8) places us in the induction hypothesis, hence e_2 reduces (because it is not a value), and e reduces by rule Act-AppR. The subcase for terminate is similar. When $e_1 = \text{receive}[W][X]$, we further distinguish two cases. When e_2 is a value, canonical forms give $e_2 = x$, hence e reduces by rule Act-Rcv. Otherwise, monotonicity (lemma 8) places us in the induction hypothesis, hence e_2

reduces (because it is not a value), and e reduces by rule Act-AppR. The subcases for $\text{send}[W][X]$ and $\text{send}[W][X]u$ and $\text{select } C[\overline{W}]$ are similar.

Rule E-TAPP. These cases are analogous to those of rule E-APP.

Rule E-PAIR. Distinguish three cases for $e = \langle e_1, e_2 \rangle$. When both e_1 and e_2 are values, e is a value. When e_1 is not a value, induction ensures that e_1 reduces and thus e has a transition by rule Act-PairL. Finally, when e_1 alone is a value, the premises to rule E-PAIR include $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1^s \vdash e_1 \Rightarrow T \mid \Gamma_2$. Monotonicity (lemma 8) gives $\Gamma_2 \subseteq \Gamma_1^s$, hence Γ_2^s and we are in the induction hypothesis. Conclude with rule Act-PairR.

Rule E-LET. Similar to E-LET*.

Rule E-MATCH. In this case $e = \text{match } e' \text{ with } \{C_i x_i \rightarrow e_i\}_{i \in I}$. The premises to the rule include $\Delta \mid \Gamma_1^s \vdash e' \Rightarrow S \mid \Gamma_2$ and $\text{norm}^+(S) = ?(P \overline{U}).S'$. Agreement (lemma 7) gives $\Delta \vdash S \Leftarrow \kappa$. Distinguish two cases. When e' is value, normalization of session types (lemma 5) and canonical forms (lemma 11) give $e' = x$ and e reduces by rule Act-Match. Otherwise, the result follows by induction followed by rule Act-MatchE.

Rule P-Exp. In this case $p = \langle e \rangle$. Distinguish two cases. When e is a value, canonical forms give $e = *$ and p is completed. Otherwise, by induction $e \xrightarrow{\lambda} e'$ and we further distinguish three cases according to label λ :

λ	LTS rule
$\text{fork } v$	Act-Fork
$(\nu xy): T$	Act-New
σ	Act-Session
β	Act-Beta

Rule P-Par. In this case $p = p_1 \mid p_2$. By induction each p_i is either completed, reduces or is a deadlock. We must analyse eight cases. When both p_i are completed, p is completed. When one of the p_i is a deadlock, then so is p . In case both p_i reduce, then p reduces by ACT-JoinR (or Act-JoinL). Otherwise, when p_1 reduces (and p_2 is completed), p reduces with rule Act-ParL. Finally, hen p_2 reduces (and p_1 is completed), p reduces with rule Act-ParR.

Rule P-New. In this case $p = (\nu xy) p_1$. The premise to the rule is $\Gamma, x: \text{norm}^+(T), y: \text{norm}^-(T) \vdash p_1$. Agreement (lemma 7) and the fact that duality is defined on session types alone establish that $(\Gamma, x: \text{norm}^+(T), y: \text{norm}^-(T))^s$. By induction p_1 is completed, reduces or is a deadlock. Because completed processes are closed (lemma 12), p_1 cannot be completed. If p_1 is deadlocked, then so is p , by definition. It remains to check the case when p is not a deadlock and reduces. Suppose that $p_1 \xrightarrow{\pi} p_2$, with π in the progress set for x, y . Then p reduces according to the table below.

π	LTS rule
σ	Act-Session
$\text{fork } v$	Act-Fork
$(\nu ab): T$	Act-New
$x?v \mid y!v$	Act-Msg
$x?C \mid y!C$	Act-Bra
$x? \mid y!$	Act-Wait
$x?a \mid (\nu ab)y!a$	Act-CloseL
$x?b \mid (\nu ab)y!b$	Act-CloseR

E Embedding context-free session types

This section presents an informal investigation of two questions that relate AlgST and context-free session types (CFST Almeida et al. [2022]): can we map any AlgST program into an equivalent CFST program? And: can we map any CFST program to an equivalent AlgST program?

This investigation is necessarily informal because the features of AlgST and CFST do not line up. AlgST is a minimalist mostly linear version of System F with products, sessions, and algebraic protocols. CFST is also based on System F, but has a richer kind structure that enables unrestricted as well as linear features, variant and record types, and the full slate of context-free session primitives.

To enable a meaningful comparison, we focus on the linear fragment of CFST Almeida et al. [2022] using the notation of Costa et al. [2022], restricted to pairs and ignoring De Bruijn indices. In AlgST, we only consider types that are not polymorphic in protocols because CFST has no equivalent. We add linear algebraic datatypes to cope with variant types in CFST.

Non-parameterized algebraic sessions into (linear) context-free sessions The translation from algebraic session types that do not parameterize over protocol types (AlgST₀) to context-free session types (CFST) is given by $\wr T \wr$, which is defined on types in normal form, only:

$$\begin{aligned} \wr \mathbf{Unit} \wr &= \mathbf{unit} & \wr T \rightarrow U \wr &= \wr T \wr \rightarrow \wr U \wr & \wr T \otimes U \wr &= \wr T \wr \times \wr U \wr & \wr \forall \alpha : \mathbf{t}. T \wr &= \forall \alpha : \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{lin}}. \wr T \wr \\ \wr \alpha \wr &= \alpha & \wr ?T.U \wr &= ?\wr T \wr ; \wr U \wr & \wr !T.U \wr &= !\wr T \wr ; \wr U \wr & \wr \mathbf{End}_! \wr &= \mathbf{skip} & \wr \mathbf{End}_? \wr &= \mathbf{skip} \\ \wr ?P \bar{U}.S \wr &= P_U ; \wr S \wr \text{ where } P_U \doteq \&\{C_i : \wr \S(-(\overline{T_i[\bar{U}/\bar{\alpha}]})\mathbf{End}_! \wr)\}_{i \in I} \text{ for protocol } \rho \bar{\alpha} = \{C_i \bar{T}_i\}_{i \in I} \\ \wr !P \bar{U}.S \wr &= P_U ; \wr S \wr \text{ where } P_U \doteq \oplus\{C_i : \wr \S(+(\overline{T_i[\bar{U}/\bar{\alpha}]})\mathbf{End}_! \wr)\}_{i \in I} \text{ for protocol } \rho \bar{\alpha} = \{C_i \bar{T}_i\}_{i \in I} \end{aligned}$$

Functional types and message exchanges are naturally mapped onto their counterparts. The end of a session is mapped to **skip**, whereas algebraic protocols are translated to type names defined as internal choices or branches, depending on whether they appear in sending or receiving positions. The choice labels coincide with the protocol constructors.

We claim that if $T \equiv_A U$, then $\wr T \wr \simeq \wr U \wr$.

Linear context-free sessions embedded into algebraic sessions In this direction, we omit polymorphism to obtain a lighter, more perspicuous notation. Our comparative approach scales to the polymorphic setting, but at the price of high notational overhead.

The translation of the *linear* and *monomorphic* fragment of CFST to AlgST is split between the functional and the session typed fragments, which are mutually defined and presented in fig. 13. The translation of a context-free session type T to the algebraic setting is given by $\llbracket T \rrbracket$. The functional operators have natural counterparts in the algebraic side. When translated to the isorecursive setting, functional recursive types are represented by a datatype enclosed with an explicit unfold. Variant types are mapped to datatypes whose constructors are the respective labels. Session types are materialized by protocol definitions: each session type originates a protocol emerging from the conversion of a sequential composition of types into a sequence of (algebraic) types with kind **p**. This conversion is governed by function $(\cdot)_\#$ that maps **skip** to the empty sequence and uses polarities to enforce the direction of communication. In the session typed fragment, recursive types

CFST to AlgST: Translation of the functional fragment

$$\boxed{\llbracket T : \mathbb{T}^{\text{lin}} \rrbracket = T : \mathbf{t}}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{unit} \rrbracket &= \mathbf{Unit} & \llbracket T \rightarrow U \rrbracket &= \llbracket T \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket U \rrbracket & \llbracket T \times U \rrbracket &= \llbracket T \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket U \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \langle \ell : T_\ell \rangle_{\ell \in L} \rrbracket &= X_L \text{ where } \mathbf{data} X_L = \{ \ell \llbracket T_\ell \rrbracket \}_{\ell \in L} \\ \llbracket X : \kappa \rrbracket &= X \text{ for } X \doteq T \text{ and } \kappa \neq \mathbf{S}^{\text{lin}} \text{ where } \mathbf{data} X = \mathbf{Unfold}_X \llbracket T \rrbracket \\ \llbracket T : \mathbf{S}^{\text{lin}} \rrbracket &= !X_T.\mathbf{End}_! \text{ where } \mathbf{protocol} X_T = X_T (T) \text{ and } X_T \text{ is a fresh name.} \end{aligned}$$

CFST to AlgST: Translation of the session typed fragment

$$\boxed{\llbracket T : \mathbf{S}^{\text{lin}} \rrbracket = \overline{T : \mathbf{p}}}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{skip} \rrbracket &= \varepsilon & \llbracket !T \rrbracket &= \llbracket T \rrbracket & \llbracket ?T \rrbracket &= -\llbracket T \rrbracket & \llbracket (T; U) \rrbracket &= \llbracket T \rrbracket \llbracket U \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \oplus \{ \ell : T_\ell \}_{\ell \in L} \rrbracket &= X_L \text{ where } \mathbf{protocol} X_L = \{ \ell \llbracket T_\ell \rrbracket \}_{\ell \in L} \\ \llbracket \&\{ \ell : T_\ell \}_{\ell \in L} \rrbracket &= -X_L \text{ where } \mathbf{protocol} X_L = \{ \ell \llbracket \mathbf{dual} T_\ell \rrbracket \}_{\ell \in L} \\ \llbracket X : \mathbf{S}^{\text{lin}} \rrbracket &= X \text{ for } X \doteq T \text{ where } \mathbf{protocol} X = \mathbf{Unfold}_X (T) \end{aligned}$$

Fig. 13: Translation of linear context-free session types to algebraic session types

and choices are represented by protocol definitions. Type names are considered generative and we relax AlgST to admit overloaded constructor names that can be reused across protocol definitions.

It remains to define suitable adapters in the places where CFST relies on type equivalence of equirecursive types. To this end we generate isomorphisms as witnesses of equivalence proofs using the rule system proposed by Costa et al. [2022]. The tricky part of constructing such an isomorphism is its extension into session types. For simplicity, we consider just one side of the isomorphism $\text{iso} : \llbracket T \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket U \rrbracket$ where $T \simeq U$ are session types:

```
iso t u = let (u, u') = new [U] in fork $ \delta t u' \triangleright u
```

This definition relies on a process $\delta : \llbracket T \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathbf{Dual} \llbracket U \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathbf{Unit}$ that consumes two (dual) channel ends and implements a forwarder that compensates for the differences between T and U . The witness processes δ are defined for each pair of equivalent session types, according to the rules. We sketch some witness processes in table 1 and provide a more detailed analysis of the isomorphism.

For the sake of simplicity, in all cases in table 1, we elide an initial administrative **match** and **select** step resulting from the definition of $\llbracket T : \mathbf{S}^{\text{lin}} \rrbracket$. The case for $T \simeq U$ where $T = \mathbf{Skip}$ and $U = \mathbf{Skip}$ would be formally defined by:

```
\delta t u = match u with {
  XU u \to let t = select XT t in
    wait u
  \triangleright terminate t }
```

Process δ **matches** with X_U on channel u and **selects** X_T on channel t , as prescribed by the protocol definitions resulting from $\llbracket \mathbf{Skip} \rrbracket$ (see fig. 13). According to the definition of $\llbracket \mathbf{Skip} \rrbracket$ and E-MATCH, we are left with type $\mathbf{End}_?$ on u and $\mathbf{End}_!$ on t , so we **wait** on u and **terminate** on t .

In general, δ inserts the explicit unfolds imposed by the translation to the isorecursive setting. We showcase our approach for the equivalence $Y \simeq U$ where type Y is defined by T , $Y \doteq T$. The definition of δ follows the equivalence rule of Costa et al. [2022] as shown below. A witness process δ for the embedding $\text{iso} : \llbracket Y \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket U \rrbracket$ builds on a process δ_1 witnessing $T \simeq U$ and is defined by:

$$\delta \ y \ u = \text{match } u \ \text{with } \{ \begin{array}{l} XU \ u \rightarrow \text{let } y = \text{select } XY \ y \ \text{in} \\ \quad \text{let } t = \text{select } \text{Unfold}_Y \ y \ \text{in} \\ \quad \delta_1 \ t \ u \} \end{array} \quad \frac{Y \doteq T \quad T \text{ contr} \quad \delta_1 : T \simeq U}{\delta : Y \simeq U}$$

As a result of the definition of $\llbracket Y : S^{\text{lin}} \rrbracket$, process δ **matches** with X_U on channel u and **selects** X_Y on channel y , as prescribed by the protocol definitions resulting from $\llbracket Y \rrbracket$ (see fig. 13). Then, **selects** the explicit Unfold_Y introduced by $\langle Y \rangle$ and uses δ_1 to consume the leftovers at t and u . In the case $X \simeq U$ where $X \doteq T$, we are provided with a witness δ_1 for $T \simeq U$. We **select** the explicit Unfold_X introduced by $\langle X \rangle$ and then use δ_1 to consume the leftovers at t and u .

For the case of $!T; V \simeq !U; W$, we are provided not only with a witness δ_1 to consume the remainder of channels v and w , but also with a function $\theta : \llbracket T \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket U \rrbracket$ that witnesses the isomorphism resulting from $T \simeq U$. The functions witnessing the isomorphism between types in the functional fragment are presented in table 2. Given δ_1 and θ , after the initial administrative **match** and **select**, process δ **receives** u on channel w , transforms u with θ^{-1} and sends the result through channel v . Process δ_1 consumes the remainder of v and w .

To witness the isomorphism corresponding to $!T; V \simeq !U$ where V is a terminated session (see Costa et al. [2022] for further details), we are given a process σ that consumes the explicit unfolds resulting from the isorecursive interpretation of V . The *consumer* processes σ for terminated sessions are presented in table 3.

The other cases in tables 1 to 3 follow a similar reasoning. The omitted cases for monomorphic types also fit the same approach. For the polymorphic fragment, we would need to consider a *reader monad* where one could store a map from type variables to the processes that consume the corresponding channels or transform the corresponding values, depending on whether the type variables are of kind **s** or not. In the axiom for polymorphic (non-session typed) variables $n \simeq n$, for instance, we could think of θ as the identity function, but we wouldn't know which type to assign to the bound variable: $\theta = \lambda x : ?.x$. Whereas to consume two channels typed with a polymorphic session-typed variable, we would need to know how to consume both endpoints. Processes to consume or transform values typed with polymorphic variables would need to be provided to δ . For the translation of types in the polymorphic fragment, we would need to collect the free variables occurring in the type and use a parametrized **data** or **protocol** definition:

$$\llbracket X : \kappa \rrbracket = X \ \bar{\alpha} \ \text{for } X \doteq T \ \text{and } \kappa \neq S^{\text{lin}} \ \text{where } \text{data } X \ \bar{\alpha} = \text{Unfold}_X \ \llbracket T \rrbracket \ \text{and } \text{fv}(T) = \bar{\alpha}$$

$$\langle X : S^{\text{lin}} \rangle = X \ \bar{\alpha} \ \text{for } X \doteq T \ \text{where } \text{protocol } X \ \bar{\alpha} = \text{Unfold}_X \ \langle T \rangle \ \text{and } \text{fv}(T) = \bar{\alpha}$$

Although we believe that polymorphic types do not pose any problem to this analysis, we decided to keep the notation simple and focus on the monomorphic fragment.

In this analysis we only provided witnesses for the isomorphism in one direction. For the other direction of the isomorphism, we could follow a similar approach for defining $\text{iso}^{-1} : \llbracket U \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket T \rrbracket$ and then prove that iso and iso^{-1} compose giving the identity.

Equivalence rule $T \simeq U : S^{\text{lin}}$	Isomorphism witness $\llbracket T \rrbracket \rightarrow \text{Dual } \llbracket U \rrbracket \rightarrow \text{Unit}$
$\delta : \text{Skip} \simeq \text{Skip}$	$\delta \ t \ u = \text{wait } u$ $\triangleright \text{terminate } t$
$\frac{X \doteq T \quad T \text{ contr} \quad \delta_1 : T \simeq U}{\delta : X \simeq U}$	$\delta \ x \ u = \text{let } t = \text{select UnfoldX } x \text{ in}$ $\delta_1 \ t \ u$
$\frac{X \doteq T \quad T \text{ contr} \quad \delta_1 : T; V \simeq U}{\delta : X; V \simeq U}$	$\delta \ x \ u = \text{let } t = \text{select UnfoldX } x \text{ in}$ $\delta_1 \ t \ u$
$\frac{\theta : T \simeq U \quad \delta_1 : V \simeq W}{\delta : !T; V \simeq !U; W}$	$\delta \ v \ w = \text{let } (u, w) = \text{receive } w \text{ in}$ $\text{let } t = \theta^{-1} \ u$ $\text{let } v = \text{send } t \ v \text{ in}$ $\delta_1 \ v \ w$
$\frac{\theta : T \simeq U \quad \sigma : V \simeq W}{\delta : !T; V \simeq !U}$	$\delta \ t \ u = \text{let } (u', u) = \text{receive } u \text{ in}$ $\text{let } t' = \theta^{-1} \ u'$ $\text{let } v = \text{send } t' \ t \text{ in}$ $\text{let } v = \sigma \ v \text{ in}$ $\text{wait } u$ $\triangleright \text{terminate } v$
$\frac{\theta : T \simeq U}{\delta : !T \simeq !U}$	$\delta \ t \ u = \text{let } (u', u) = \text{receive } u \text{ in}$ $\text{let } t' = \theta^{-1} \ u' \text{ in}$ $\text{let } t = \text{send } t' \ t \text{ in}$ $\text{wait } u$ $\triangleright \text{terminate } t$
$\frac{\delta_\ell : T_\ell \simeq U_\ell \quad (\forall \ell \in L)}{\delta : \oplus \{\ell : T_\ell\}_{\ell \in L} \simeq \oplus \{\ell : U_\ell\}_{\ell \in L}}$	$\delta \ t \ u = \text{match } u \text{ with } \{$ $\quad k \ u \rightarrow \text{let } t = \text{select } k \ t \text{ in}$ $\quad \delta_k \ t \ u \}$
$\frac{\delta_1 : \oplus \{\ell : T_\ell; U\}_{\ell \in L} \simeq V}{\delta : \oplus \{\ell : T_\ell\}_{\ell \in L}; U \simeq V}$	$\delta \ t \ u = \delta_1 \ t \ u$
$\frac{\delta_1 : T \simeq U}{\delta : \text{Skip}; T \simeq U}$	$\delta \ t \ u = \delta_1 \ t \ u$

Table 1: Processes that consume two dual session endpoints.

Equivalence rule $T \simeq U : \kappa$ with $\kappa \neq S^{\text{lin}}$	Isomorphism witness $\theta : \llbracket T \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket U \rrbracket$
$\theta : ()_{\text{in}} \simeq ()_{\text{in}}$	$\theta = \lambda \ x : \text{Unit}.x$
$\frac{\theta_1 : T \simeq U \quad \theta_2 : V \simeq W}{\theta : T \rightarrow V \simeq U \rightarrow W}$	$\theta \ t = \lambda \ x : \llbracket U \rrbracket . \theta_2 \ \$ \ t \ \$ \ \theta^{-1} \ x$
$\frac{\theta_1 : T \simeq U \quad \theta_2 : V \simeq W}{\theta : T \otimes V \simeq U \otimes W}$	$\theta \ t = \langle \theta_1 \ \$ \ \text{fst } t, \theta_2 \ \$ \ \text{snd } t \rangle$
$\frac{X \doteq T \quad T \text{ contr} \quad \theta_1 : T \simeq U}{\theta : X \simeq U}$	$\theta \ x = \text{let } t = \text{select UnfoldX } x \text{ in}$ $\text{let } u = \theta_1 \ t \ \text{in}$ u

Table 2: Transformation of non-session typed expressions.

Is terminated predicate	Witness
$T: S^{\text{fin}}$	$\sigma: \llbracket T \rrbracket \rightarrow \text{End}_!$
$\sigma: \text{Skip}\checkmark$	$\sigma \mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}$
$\frac{\sigma_1: T\checkmark \quad \sigma_2: U\checkmark}{\sigma: T;U\checkmark}$	$\sigma \mathbf{t} = \text{let } \mathbf{t}' = \sigma_1 \mathbf{t} \text{ in } \sigma_2 \mathbf{t}'$
$\frac{T \doteq U \quad \sigma_1: T\checkmark}{\sigma: X\checkmark}$	$\sigma \mathbf{x} = \text{let } \mathbf{t} = \text{select UnfoldX } \mathbf{x} \text{ in } \sigma_1 \mathbf{t}$

Table 3: Processes that consume the explicit unfolds created by the translation.