

# Structured Acyclic Nets

Mohammed Alahmadi, Salma Alharbi, Talal Alharbi, Nadiyah Almutairi, Tuwailaa Alshammari, Anirban Bhattacharyya, Maciej Koutny, Bowen Li, and Brian Randell

School of Computing, Newcastle University  
Urban Sciences Building, 1 Science Square, Newcastle Helix  
Newcastle upon Tyne, NE4 5TG, United Kingdom  
January 17, 2024

**Abstract.** The concept of structured occurrence nets is an extension of that of occurrence nets which are directed acyclic graphs that represent causality and concurrency information concerning a single execution of a distributed system. The formalism of structured occurrence nets has been introduced to facilitate the portrayal and analysis of the behaviours, and in particular failures, of complex evolving systems. Such systems are composed of a large number of sub-systems which may proceed concurrently and interact with each other and with the external environment while their behaviour is subject to modification by other systems. The purpose of this paper is to provide an extension of structured occurrence nets to include models built up of acyclic nets rather than occurrence nets.

## 1 Introduction

The concept of structured occurrence nets [16,20] is an extension of that of occurrence nets [11] which are directed acyclic graphs (a subclass of Petri nets) that represent causality and concurrency information concerning a single execution of a distributed system. The formalism of structured occurrence nets has been introduced to facilitate the portrayal and analysis of the behaviours, and in particular failures, of complex evolving systems. Examples include a large hardware system which suffers component break-downs, reconfigurations and replacements, a large distributed system whose software is being continually updated (or patched), a gang of criminals whose membership is changing, and an operational railway system that is being extended. (In these latter cases we are regarding crimes and accidents as types of failure.) The underlying idea of a structured occurrence net is to combine multiple related occurrence nets by using various formal relationships (in particular, abstractions) in order to express dependencies among the component occurrence nets. By means of these relations, a structured occurrence net is able to portray a more explicit view of system activity, involving various types of communication between subsystems, and of system upgrades, reconfigurations and replacements than is possible with an occurrence net, so allowing one to document and exploit behavioural knowledge of (actual or envisaged) complex evolving systems.

Communication structured occurrence nets are a basic variant of structured occurrence nets that enable the explicit representation of synchronous and asynchronous interaction between communicating subsystems. A communication structured occurrence net is composed of a set of distinct component occurrence nets representing separate

subsystems. When it is determined that there is a potential for an interaction between subsystems, an asynchronous or synchronous communication link can be made between events in the different subsystems' occurrence nets via a channel/buffer place.

Another variant of structured occurrence nets, behavioural structured occurrence nets, conveys information about the evolution of individual systems. They use a two level view to represent an execution history, with the lower level providing details of its behaviours during the different evolution stages represented in the upper level view. Thus a behavioural structured occurrence net gives information about the evolution of an individual system, and the phases of the overall activity are used to represent each successive stage of the evolution of this system.

This document extends and systematises the ideas contained in [16], after allowing backward non-determinism and forward non-determinism in the representation of the components of a complex evolving system. This is achieved by replacing occurrence nets with more general acyclic nets. As a result, it leads to communication structured acyclic nets and behavioural structured acyclic nets generalising previously introduced models.

## 2 Preliminaries

All sets used in the relational structures considered in this paper are finite which simplifies some of the definitions and results. For two sets  $X$  and  $Y$ ,  $X \subset Y$  means that  $X$  is a proper subset of  $Y$ , i.e.,  $X \subseteq Y$  and  $X \neq Y$ . The disjoint union of  $X$  and  $Y$  is denoted by  $X \uplus Y$ , and nonempty sets  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  form a partition of a sets  $X$  if  $X = X_1 \uplus \dots \uplus X_k$ .

For a binary relation  $R$ ,  $xRy$  means that  $(x, y) \in R$ . The *composition* of two binary relations,  $R$  and  $Q$ , is a binary relation given by  $R \circ Q \triangleq \{(x, y) \mid \exists z : xRz \wedge zQy\}$ . Moreover, for every  $k \geq 1$ , we define:

$$R^k \triangleq \begin{cases} R & \text{if } k = 1 \\ R \circ R^{k-1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The first definition introduces notions related to partial orders which can be used, e.g., to capture causality in concurrent behaviours.

**Definition 1 (relations and orderings).** *Let  $X$  be a set and  $R \subseteq X \times X$ .*

1.  $id_X \triangleq \{(x, x) \mid x \in X\}$  is the identity relation on  $X$ .
2.  $R$  is reflexive if  $id_X \subseteq R$ .
3.  $R$  is irreflexive if  $R \cap id_X = \emptyset$ .
4.  $R$  is transitive if  $R \circ R \subseteq R$ .
5.  $(X, R)$  is a partial order if  $R$  is irreflexive and transitive.
6.  $R^+ \triangleq R^1 \cup R^2 \cup \dots$  is the transitive closure of  $R$ .
7.  $R$  is acyclic if  $R^+ \cap id_X = \emptyset$ . ◇

The following facts follow directly from the definitions.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $X$  be a set and  $R \subseteq X \times X$ .*

1. *If  $(X, R)$  is a partial order then  $R$  is acyclic.*

2. If  $R$  is acyclic then  $(X, R^+)$  is a partial order.
3.  $R$  is acyclic iff there are no  $x_1, \dots, x_k (= x_1) \in X$  ( $k \geq 2$ ) such that  $x_1 R x_2, \dots, x_{k-1} R x_k$ .

Rather than using sequences of events to represent possible executions of concurrent systems, we will use sequences of sets of events. The following definition introduces two useful notions related to such sequences.

**Definition 2 (sequence of sets).** Let  $\sigma = X_1 \dots X_k$  be a sequence of sets and  $X$  be a set.

1.  $\bigcup \sigma \triangleq X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_k$  denotes the set of elements occurring in  $\sigma$ .
2.  $\sigma|_X \triangleq (X_1 \cap X) \dots (X_k \cap X)$  denotes the restriction of  $\sigma$  to the elements of  $X$ .
3.  $\sigma \setminus_X$  is obtained from  $\sigma|_X$  by deleting all the occurrences of the empty set.  $\diamond$

*Example 1.* For  $\sigma = \{a, b\}\{a, c\}\{d\}$ ,  $\bigcup \sigma = \{a, b, c, d\}$ ,  $\sigma|_{\{a, b\}} = \{a, b\}\{a\}\emptyset$ , and  $\sigma \setminus_{\{a, b\}} = \{a, b\}\{a\}$ .  $\diamond$

When defining or proving properties of the elements of a set  $X$  for which we are given an acyclic relation  $R$ , one can apply the principle of mathematical induction. Typical patterns are as follows:

**defining property  $P_x$  for every  $x \in X$**

First define  $P_x$  for every  $x$  such that  $\{y \mid yRx\} = \emptyset$ . Then, for every other  $x \in X$ , define  $P_x$  assuming that  $P_x$  has been defined for each element  $y \in X$  such that  $yR^+x$ .

**proving property  $P_x$  for every  $x \in X$**

First prove  $P_x$  for every  $x$  such that  $\{y \mid yRx\} = \emptyset$ . Then, for every other  $x \in X$ , prove  $P_x$  assuming that  $P$  holds for each element  $y \in X$  such that  $yR^+x$ .

### 3 Acyclic nets

This section is concerned with Petri nets which generalise occurrence nets and can provide a direct support for causality analysis.

The following are intuitive explanations of the main concepts defined in this and subsequent sections using terminology based on accident/crime investigations:

**acyclic net**

A basic fragment of ‘database’ of all facts (both actual or hypothetical represented using places, transitions, and arcs linking them) accumulated during an investigation. Transitions (events) and places (conditions/local states) are related through arrows representing causal and/or temporal dependencies. Hence, the representation is required to be acyclic (this is a minimal requirement). Acyclic nets can represent alternative ways of interpreting what has happened, and so may exhibit (backward and forward) non-determinism.

**backward deterministic acyclic net**

An acyclic net such that for each event it is possible to state precisely which other events must have preceded it.

**occurrence net**

An acyclic net providing a complete record of all causal dependencies between events involved in a single ‘causal history’.




Fig. 1. Acyclic nets with initial markings.

**Definition 3 (acyclic net).** An acyclic net is a triple  $acnet = (P, T, F)$ , where  $P$  and  $T$  are disjoint finite sets of places and transitions respectively, and  $F \subseteq (P \times T) \cup (T \times P)$  is the flow relation such that:

1.  $P$  is nonempty and  $F$  is acyclic.
2. For every  $t \in T$ , there are  $p, q \in P$  such that  $pFt$  and  $tFq$ .

Notation:  $AN$  is the set of all acyclic nets. ◇

Graphically, places are represented by circles, transitions by boxes, and arcs between the nodes (i.e., places and transitions) represent the flow relation. If it is important to indicate explicitly  $acnet$ , we denote  $P, T, F$  by  $P_{acnet}, T_{acnet}, F_{acnet}$ , respectively.

In addition to the acyclicity of  $F$ , it is required that each event has at least one pre-condition (pre-place) and at least one post-condition (post-place). Acyclic net can exhibit backward non-determinism (more than one arrow incoming to a place) as well as forward non-determinism (more than one arrow outgoing from a place).

**Notation 1 (direct precedence in acyclic net)** Let  $acnet$  be an acyclic net. To indicate relationships between different nodes, for all  $x \in P_{acnet} \cup T_{acnet}$  and  $X \subseteq P_{acnet} \cup T_{acnet}$ , we denote the directly preceding and directly following nodes as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \bullet x &= \text{pre}_{acnet}(x) \triangleq \{z \mid zF_{acnet}x\} & \bullet X &= \text{pre}_{acnet}(X) \triangleq \bigcup \{\bullet z \mid z \in X\} \\ x^\bullet &= \text{post}_{acnet}(x) \triangleq \{z \mid xF_{acnet}z\} & X^\bullet &= \text{post}_{acnet}(X) \triangleq \bigcup \{z^\bullet \mid z \in X\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the initial and final places are respectively given by:

$$P_{acnet}^{init} \triangleq \{p \in P \mid \bullet p = \emptyset\} \text{ and } P_{acnet}^{fin} \triangleq \{p \in P \mid p^\bullet = \emptyset\}.$$

Note that having the notations like  $\bullet x$  in addition to more explicit  $\text{pre}_{acnet}(x)$  helps to keep some of the subsequent formulas short.

**Proposition 2.**  $P_{acnet} = P_{acnet}^{init} \uplus \text{post}_{acnet}(T_{acnet}) = P_{acnet}^{fin} \uplus \text{pre}_{acnet}(T_{acnet})$ , for every acyclic net  $acnet$ .

*Proof.* It follows directly from the definitions.  $\square$

*Example 2.* In Figure 1(a),  $acnet_1$  is an acyclic net such that  $\bullet p_5 = \text{pre}_{acnet_1}(p_5) = \{c, d\}$  and  $a^\bullet = \text{post}_{acnet_1}(a) = \{p_2, p_3\}$ . Moreover,  $P_{acnet_1}^{init} = \{p_1\}$  and  $P_{acnet_1}^{fin} = \{p_4, p_5\}$ .  $\diamond$

### 3.1 Subnets of acyclic nets

It is often desirable to analyse substructures of records represented by nets where only some of the events are included.

**Definition 4 (subnet of acyclic net).** A triple net  $(P, T, F)$  is a subnet of an acyclic net  $acnet$  if  $\emptyset \neq P \subseteq P_{acnet}$ ,  $T \subseteq T_{acnet}$ ,  $F = F_{acnet}|_{(P \times T) \cup (T \times P)}$ , and, for every  $t \in T$ :

$$\{p \mid (p, t) \in F\} = \text{pre}_{acnet}(t) \text{ and } \{p \mid (t, p) \in F\} = \text{post}_{acnet}(t).$$

*Notation:*  $net \subseteq acnet$ .  $\diamond$

Note that a transition included in a subnet retains its pre-places and post-places; in other words, it retains its local environment.

**Proposition 3.** A subnet of an acyclic net is also an acyclic net.

*Proof.* It follows directly from the definitions and the fact that a subset of an acyclic relation is also an acyclic relation.  $\square$

The next notion captures not only a structural inclusion between acyclic nets, but it is also intended to correspond to inclusion of the behaviours they capture.

**Definition 5 (co-initial subnet of acyclic net).** An acyclic net  $acnet$  is a co-initial subnet of an acyclic net  $acnet'$  if  $acnet \subseteq acnet'$  and  $P_{acnet}^{init} = P_{acnet'}^{init}$ .

*Notation:*  $acnet \sqsubseteq acnet'$ .  $\diamond$

**Proposition 4.** Let  $acnet \sqsubseteq acnet'$  be acyclic nets.

1.  $P_{acnet} = P_{acnet'}^{init} \uplus \text{post}_{acnet'}(T_{acnet})$ .
2.  $acnet = acnet'$  iff  $T_{acnet} = T_{acnet'}$ .

*Proof.* (1) By Proposition 3,  $acnet$  is an acyclic net, and so, by Proposition 2, we have  $P_{acnet} = P_{acnet}^{init} \uplus \text{post}_{acnet}(T_{acnet})$ . Hence, by Definitions 4 and 5,  $P_{acnet} = P_{acnet'}^{init} \uplus \text{post}_{acnet'}(T_{acnet})$ .

(2) The  $(\implies)$  implication is obvious. To show the  $(\impliedby)$  implication, suppose that  $T_{acnet} = T_{acnet'}$ . Then, by part (1) and Proposition 2,

$$P_{acnet} = P_{acnet'}^{init} \uplus \text{post}_{acnet'}(T_{acnet}) = P_{acnet'}^{init} \uplus \text{post}_{acnet'}(T_{acnet'}) = P_{acnet'}.$$

Moreover, by Definition 4,  $F_{acnet} = F_{acnet'}$ . Hence  $acnet = acnet'$ .  $\square$

### 3.2 Subclasses of acyclic nets

The next definition introduces acyclic nets which will represent individual causal histories.

**Definition 6 (occurrence net).** *An occurrence net is an acyclic net such that  $|\bullet p| \leq 1$  and  $|p^\bullet| \leq 1$ , for every place  $p$ .*

*Notation: ON is the set of all occurrence nets.*  $\diamond$

Occurrence nets exhibit both backward determinism and forward determinism. We also consider acyclic nets where only the forward non-determinism is allowed.

**Definition 7 (backward deterministic acyclic net).** *A backward deterministic acyclic net is an acyclic net such that  $|\bullet p| \leq 1$ , for every place  $p$ .*

*Notation: BDAN is the set of all backward deterministic acyclic nets.*  $\diamond$

In the literature, backward deterministic acyclic nets are sometimes called *non-deterministic occurrence nets* or even *occurrence nets* (in which case occurrence nets as defined above are called *deterministic occurrence nets*).

*Example 3.* In Figure 1,  $bdanet_1$  is a backward deterministic acyclic net, while  $ocnet_1$  and  $ocnet_2$  are both occurrence nets.  $\diamond$

**Proposition 5.**  $ON \subset BDAN \subset AN$ .

*Proof.* The inclusions  $ON \subseteq BDAN \subseteq AN$  follow directly from the definitions. Moreover, in Figure 1,  $acnet_1 \in AN \setminus BDAN$  and  $bdanet_1 \in BDAN \setminus ON$ .  $\square$

## 4 Step sequence semantics of acyclic nets

We now introduce notions related to the behaviour of acyclic nets. The intuition behind them is as follows:

### marking

A global state of a possible execution history of the system modelled by a net.

### initial and final markings

There is always a single initial global state. In general, there is more than one final global state, which corresponds to the fact that a single net may capture alternative execution histories.

### step


A set of events which might have occurred simultaneously and effected a move from one global state to another.

### enabled step

A step which can be executed at a global state thanks to all its input places being present/marked.

### mixed step sequence

An alternating sequence of global states and executed steps transforming one global state into another.



**Fig. 2.** Executing mixed step sequence  $\{p_1\}[\{a\}]\{p_2, p_3\}[\{b\}]\{p_4, p_3\}[\{c\}]\{p_4, p_5\}$  and showing the consecutive snapshots  $(i) \rightarrow (ii) \rightarrow (iii) \rightarrow (iv)$ .

### reachable marking

A global state which can be obtained by executing a sequence of steps starting from the initial marking.

### scenario

An occurrence net providing a representation of a system history.

### well-formed acyclic net

An acyclic net where each execution history from the initial state has an unambiguous interpretation in terms of causality and concurrency.

**Definition 8 (step and marking of acyclic net).** Let  $acnet$  be an acyclic net.


1.  $steps(acnet) \triangleq \{U \in \mathbb{P}(T_{acnet}) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \mid \forall t \neq u \in U : \bullet t \cap \bullet u = \emptyset\}$  are the steps.
2.  $markings(acnet) \triangleq \mathbb{P}(P_{acnet})$  are the markings.
3.  $M_{acnet}^{init} \triangleq P_{acnet}^{init}$  is the initial marking. ◇

Graphically, markings are indicated by black tokens placed inside the corresponding circles.

Note that in a step no two transitions can share a pre-place.

*Example 4.* For the acyclic nets  $acnet_1$  and  $bdanet_1$  depicted in Figure 1(a,b), we have  $steps(acnet_1) = steps(bdanet_1) = \{U \in \mathbb{P}(\{a, b, c, d\}) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \mid c \notin U \vee d \notin U\}$  and  $M_{acnet_1}^{init} = M_{bdanet_1}^{init} = \{p_1\}$ . ◇

**Definition 9 (enabled and executed step of acyclic net).** Let  $M$  be a marking of an acyclic net  $acnet$ .



**Fig. 3.** Executing mixed step sequence  $\{p_1\} \{a\} \{p_2, p_3\} \{b, c\} \{p_4, p_5\}$  and showing the consecutive snapshots (i)  $\rightarrow$  (ii)  $\rightarrow$  (iii).

1.  $\text{enabled}_{acnet}(M) \triangleq \{U \in \text{steps}(acnet) \mid \bullet U \subseteq M\}$  are the steps enabled at  $M$ .
  2. A step  $U \in \text{enabled}_{acnet}(M)$  can be executed and yield  $M' \triangleq (M \cup U^\bullet) \setminus \bullet U$ .
- Notation:  $M[U]_{acnet} M'$ . ◇

Enabling a step in a global state amounts to having all its pre-places marked. The execution of such a step adds tokens to all its post-places and then removes tokens from all its pre-places. Note that in the standard Petri net semantics the execution of a step leads to  $M' = (M \setminus \bullet U) \cup U^\bullet$ , which yields a different result unless  $\bullet U \cap U^\bullet = \emptyset$ . However, the latter always holds when the acyclic net is well-formed, as defined later in this paper.

**Definition 10 (mixed step sequence and step sequence of acyclic net).** Let  $M_0, \dots, M_k$  ( $k \geq 0$ ) be markings and  $U_1, \dots, U_k$  be steps of an acyclic net  $acnet$  such that we have  $M_{i-1}[U_i]_{acnet} M_i$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .

1.  $\mu = M_0 U_1 M_1 \dots M_{k-1} U_k M_k$  is a mixed step sequence from  $M_0$  to  $M_k$ .
2.  $\sigma = U_1 \dots U_k$  is a step sequence from  $M_0$  to  $M_k$ .

The above two notions are denoted by  $M_0[\mu]_{acnet} M_k$  and  $M_0[\sigma]_{acnet} M_k$ , respectively. Moreover,  $M_0[\sigma]_{acnet}$  denotes that  $\sigma$  is a step sequence enabled  $M_0$ , and  $M_0[\ ]_{acnet} M_k$  denotes that  $M_k$  is reachable from  $M_0$ . ◇

If  $k = 0$  then  $\mu = M_0$  and the corresponding step sequence  $\sigma$  is the *empty* sequence denoted by  $\lambda$ .



In the last definition, the starting point of an execution is an arbitrary marking. The next definition introduces a number of behavioural notions, assuming in each case that the starting point of system executions is the default initial marking.

**Definition 11 (behaviour of acyclic net).** *The following sets capture various behavioural notions related to step sequences and reachable markings of an acyclic net  $acnet$ .*

1.  $sseq(acnet) \triangleq \{\sigma \mid M_{acnet}^{init}[\sigma]_{acnet} M\}$  step sequences.
2.  $mixsseq(acnet) \triangleq \{\mu \mid M_{acnet}^{init}[\mu]_{acnet} M\}$  mixed step sequences.
3.  $maxsseq(acnet) \triangleq \{\sigma \in sseq(acnet) \mid \neg \exists U : \sigma U \in sseq(acnet)\}$  maximal step sequences.
4.  $maxmixsseq(acnet) \triangleq \{\mu \in mixsseq(acnet) \mid \neg \exists U, M : \mu U M \in mixsseq(acnet)\}$  maximal mixed step sequences.
5.  $reachable(acnet) \triangleq \{M \mid M_{acnet}^{init}[\ ]_{acnet} M\}$  reachable markings.
6.  $finreachable(acnet) \triangleq \{M \mid \exists \sigma \in maxsseq(acnet) : M_{acnet}^{init}[\sigma]_{acnet} M\}$  final reachable markings.
7.  $fseq(acnet) = \{U_1 \dots U_k \in sseq(acnet) \mid k \geq 1 \implies |U_1| = \dots = |U_k| = 1\}$  firing sequences.

◇

We can treat individual transitions as singleton steps; for instance, a step sequence  $\{t\}\{u\}\{w, v\}\{z\}$  can be denoted by  $tu\{w, v\}z$ .

*Example 5.* The following hold for the acyclic net in Figure 1(b).

1.  $sseq(bdanet_1) = \{\lambda, a, ab, ac, ad, abc, acb, abd, adb, a\{b, c\}, a\{b, d\}\}$ .
2.  $mixsseq(bdanet_1) = \{\{p_1\}, \{p_1\}a\{p_2, p_3\}, \{p_1\}a\{p_2, p_3\}\{b, c\}\{p_4, p_5\}, \dots\}$ .
3.  $maxsseq(bdanet_1) = \{abc, acb, a\{b, c\}, abd, adb, a\{b, d\}\}$ .
4.  $maxmixsseq(bdanet_1) = \{\{p_1\}a\{p_2, p_3\}\{b, c\}\{p_4, p_5\}, \dots\}$ .
5.  $reachable(bdanet_1) = \{\{p_1\}, \{p_2, p_3\}, \{p_2, p_5\}, \{p_2, p_6\}, \{p_4, p_3\}, \dots\}$ .
6.  $finreachable(bdanet_1) = \{\{p_4, p_5\}, \{p_4, p_6\}\}$ .
7.  $fseq(bdanet_1) = \{\lambda, a, ab, ac, ad, abc, acb, abd, adb\}$ .

Moreover, Figures 2 and 3 show consecutive snapshots of acyclic nets involved in mixed step sequences. ◇

The next result shows that it is always possible to arbitrarily serialise an enabled step and, as a result, relate the step sequence based semantics and the firing sequence based semantics.

**Proposition 6.** *Let  $acnet$  be an acyclic net and  $U = \{t_1, \dots, t_k\}$  be a step enabled at a marking  $M$ .*

1. *If  $U'$  and  $U''$  form a partition of  $U$ , then  $M[U'U'']_{acnet}$ .*
2.  $M[\{t_1\} \dots \{t_k\}]_{acnet}$ .

*Proof.* (1) Clearly,  $U'$  is a step enabled at  $M$ . Let  $M[U']_{acnet} M'$ . We observe that  $U''$  is enabled at  $M'$  which follows from  $\bullet U \cup \bullet U'' \subseteq M$  (see Definition 9(1)),  $\bullet U' \cap \bullet U'' = \emptyset$  (see Definition 8(1)), and Definition 9(2). Hence  $M[U'U'']_{acnet}$ .

(2) As for  $k = 1$  there is nothing to show, suppose that  $k > 1$ . Then  $U' = \{t_1\}$  and  $U'' = \{t_2, \dots, t_k\}$  form a partition of  $U$ . Hence, by part (1),  $M[\{t_1\}\{t_2, \dots, t_k\}]_{acnet}$ . By repeating the same argument  $k - 1$  times, we obtain  $M[\{t_1\} \dots \{t_k\}]_{acnet}$ . □

#### 4.1 Behaviour of subnets of acyclic nets

The structural inclusion of acyclic nets sharing the initial marking implies inclusion of the behaviours they generate.

**Proposition 7.** *Let  $acnet \sqsubseteq acnet'$  be acyclic nets. Then  $f(acnet) \subseteq f(acnet')$ , for  $f = \text{mixsseq}, \text{sseq}, \text{reachable}, \text{fseq}$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that  $\text{mixsseq}(acnet) \subseteq \text{mixsseq}(acnet')$ .

Let  $\mu = M_0 U_1 M_1 \dots M_{k-1} U_k M_k \in \text{mixsseq}(acnet)$ . Then  $\mu \in \text{mixsseq}(acnet')$  which follows from  $M_{acnet}^{init} = M_0 = M_{acnet'}^{init}$  (see Definition 5) and, for every  $0 \leq i < k$ , we have  $M_i[U_{i+1}]_{acnet'} M_{i+1}$  which follows from  $M_i[U_{i+1}]_{acnet} M_{i+1}$  and Definition 4.  $\square$

Due to being both backward-deterministic and forward-deterministic, occurrence nets exhibit additional useful behavioural properties.

**Proposition 8.** *Let  $\sigma = U_1 \dots U_k$  ( $k \geq 0$ ) be a sequence of nonempty sets of transitions of an occurrence net  $ocnet$ , and  $M$  be a reachable marking of  $ocnet$ . Moreover, let  $T = \bigcup \sigma$ .*

1.  $\sigma \in \text{sseq}(ocnet)$  iff for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $U_i \cap (U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_{i-1}) = \emptyset$  and

$$\bullet(\bullet U_i) \subseteq U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_{i-1},$$

where  $U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_{i-1} = \emptyset$  for  $i = 1$ .

2.  $\sigma \in \text{sseq}(ocnet)$  implies  $M_{ocnet}^{init}[\sigma]_{ocnet} (M_{ocnet}^{init} \cup T^\bullet) \setminus \bullet T$ .
3.  $T_{ocnet} = \bigcup \{ \bigcup \xi \mid \xi \in \text{sseq}(ocnet) \}$ .
4.  $M[U]_{ocnet} M'$  implies  $U' \in \text{enabled}_{ocnet}(M')$ , for every  $U' \in \text{enabled}_{ocnet}(M)$  such that  $U \cap U' = \emptyset$ .
5.  $\text{maxsseq}(ocnet) = \{ \xi \in \text{sseq}(ocnet) \mid \bigcup \xi = T_{ocnet} \}$ .
6.  $\text{finreachable}(ocnet) = \{ P_{ocnet}^{fin} \}$ .
7. If  $t \in \text{enabled}_{ocnet}(M)$ , then  $t \in \text{enabled}_{ocnet}(M')$  and  $M_{ocnet}^{init}[\ ]_{ocnet} M'[\ ]_{ocnet} M$ , where  $M' = (P_{ocnet}^{init} \cup V^\bullet) \setminus \bullet V$  for  $V = \{ u \in T_{ocnet} \mid u F^+ t \}$ .

*Proof.* It follows from the standard properties of occurrence nets.  $\square$

That is, an occurrence net is deterministic in the sense that each transition has a fixed set of direct or indirect predecessors which have to occur first before the transition is executed (see Proposition 8(1,7)), and once it is enabled no other transition can disable it (see Proposition 8(4)). Moreover, all the transitions can be executed (see Proposition 8(3)), the order in which transitions are executed does not influence the resulting marking (see Proposition 8(2)), the maximal step sequences are those which use all the transitions, and there is exactly one final marking (see Proposition 8(6)).

## 5 Causality in acyclic nets


There is a straightforward way of introducing causality in acyclic nets by looking at their *step sequences*. The idea can be explained as follows.

Let  $t$  and  $u$  be two transitions of an acyclic net  $acnet$ . Then  $u$  is a *cause* of  $t$  if, for every step sequence  $\sigma U \in sseq(acnet)$  such that  $t \in U$ , it is the case that  $u$  occurs in  $\sigma$ .

One can check that if  $u$  is a cause of  $t$  in the above sense, then  $uF_{acnet}^+t$ . In other words, if  $u$  is a cause of  $t$  then there must be a direct path from  $u$  to  $t$  in the graph of  $acnet$ . The converse, however, does not hold. For instance, Figure 4(a) depicts an acyclic net in which there is a directed path from  $a$  to  $c$ , but there is also a step sequence  $\{b\}\{c\}$  in which  $c$  is not preceded by an occurrence of  $a$ .

However, when  $acnet$  is a backward deterministic acyclic net, then  $uF_{acnet}^+t$  implies that  $u$  is a cause of  $t$ . This is often referred to as backward determinism. Forward determinism is an additional property enjoyed by occurrence nets. It means, for example, that an enabled transition cannot be disabled by executing another transition. Also, after executing an arbitrary step sequence, it is possible to continue the execution until all the transitions have been executed.

A conclusion of the above short discussion is that causality can be investigated by using purely graph theoretic concepts (in this case, directed paths in the graphs of acyclic nets).



**Fig. 4.** An acyclic net (a) and its two maximal scenarios (b, c), with their initial markings.

## 6 Well-formed acyclic nets

A fundamental consistency criterion applied to acyclic nets is well-formedness. Its essence is to ensure an unambiguous representation of causality in behaviours they represent. The definition of a well-formed acyclic net is derived from the notion of a well-formed step sequence.

**Definition 12 (well-formed step sequence of acyclic net).** A step sequence  $U_1 \dots U_k$  of an acyclic net is well-formed if the following hold:

1.  $t^\bullet \cap u^\bullet = \emptyset$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$  and all  $t \neq u \in U_i$ .
2.  $U_i^\bullet \cap U_j^\bullet = \emptyset$ , for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ . ◇

In a well-formed step sequence of an acyclic net, no place receives a token more than once. It then follows, eg.g., that in such a step sequence no place is a pre-place of an executed step more than once, the order of execution of transitions does not influence the resulting marking, and each step sequence can be sequentialised to a firing sequence.

**Proposition 9.** *Let  $\sigma = U_1 \dots U_k$  be a well-formed step sequence of an acyclic net  $acnet$ , and  $M_{acnet}^{init} = M_0 U_1 M_1 \dots M_{k-1} U_k M_k$  be the corresponding mixed step sequence. Moreover, let  $T = \bigcup \sigma$  and  $U_i = \{t_i^1, \dots, t_i^{m_i}\}$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .*

1.  ${}^\bullet U_i \cap U_i^\bullet = \emptyset$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .
2.  ${}^\bullet U_i \cap {}^\bullet U_j = \emptyset$  and  $U_i \cap U_j = \emptyset$ , for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ .
3.  $M_k = M_{acnet}^{init} \cup T^\bullet \setminus {}^\bullet T$ .
4.  $t_1^1 \dots t_1^{m_1} \dots t_k^1 \dots t_k^{m_k} \in fseq(acnet)$ .
5.  $enabled_{acnet}(M_i) \cap enabled_{acnet}(M_m) \subseteq enabled_{acnet}(M_j)$ , for all  $1 \leq i < j < m \leq n$ .

*Proof.* (1) Suppose that  $p \in {}^\bullet U_i \cap U_i^\bullet$ . Then  $p \notin M_{acnet}^{init}$ , and so there is  $j < i$  such that  $p \in U_j^\bullet$ , contradicting Definition 12(2).

(2)  $U_i \cap U_j = \emptyset$  follows from Definition 12(2).

Suppose that  $p \in {}^\bullet U_i \cap {}^\bullet U_j$ . Then, by Definition 9(2) and part (1),  $p \in M_{i-1} \cap M_{j-1}$  and  $p \notin M_i$ . Thus  $p \notin M_0 = M_{acnet}^{init}$  and there are  $t \in U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_{i-1}$  and  $u \in U_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup U_{j-1}$  such that  $p \in t^\bullet \cap u^\bullet$ , contradicting Definition 12(2).

(3) It follows from the fact that, for a given place  $p$ , at most one transition  $t_i^j$  belongs to  ${}^\bullet p$  (see Definition 12), at most one transition  $t_i^j$  belongs to  $p^\bullet$  (see part (2) and Definition 8(1)), and if  $p \notin M_{acnet}^{init}$  then there must exist  $t_l^m \in {}^\bullet p$  with  $l < j$ .

(4) Let  $\tau_i = t_i^1 \dots t_i^{m_i}$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . It suffices to observe that if  $0 \leq i < k$  and  $\tau_0 \dots \tau_i \in fseq(acnet)$ , where  $\tau_0 = \lambda$ , then  $\tau_0 \dots \tau_{i+1} \in fseq(acnet)$ . Indeed, since  $\sigma$  is well-formed, so is  $\tau_0 \dots \tau_i$ . Hence, by part (3),  $M_0[\tau_0 \dots \tau_i]_{acnet} M_i$ . Thus, by Proposition 6(2),  $\tau_0 \dots \tau_{i+1} \in fseq(acnet)$ .

(5) Suppose that  $t \in enabled_{acnet}(M_i) \cap enabled_{acnet}(M_m) \setminus enabled_{acnet}(M_j)$ . Then there is  $p \in {}^\bullet t$  such that  $p \in M_i \cap M_m \setminus M_j$ . Hence  $p \notin P_{acnet}^{init}$ ,  $p \in (U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_i)^\bullet$  and  $p \in (U_{j+1} \cup \dots \cup U_m)^\bullet$ , contradicting Definition 12(2). □

To develop a sound treatment of causality in an acyclic net, it is required that all step sequences are well-formed. Moreover, it is required that a well-formed acyclic net has no redundant transitions which can never be executed from the initial marking.

**Definition 13 (well-formed acyclic net).** *An acyclic net is well-formed if each transition occurs in at least one step sequence and all the step sequences are well-formed.*

*Notation:*  $WFAN$  is the set of all well-formed acyclic nets. ◇

*Example 6.* The acyclic nets in Figure 1(a,b) are well-formed, but the acyclic net in Figure 4(a) is not.

The reason why the acyclic net in Figure 4(a) is not well-formed can be explained in terms of *OR-causality* which it exhibits. Intuitively, one can execute  $a$  and  $b$  first, and then  $c$ . It is, however, impossible to state in such a case whether  $c$  was caused by  $a$  or by

$b$  (we know, by looking at Figure 4( $b, c$ )) that only one of  $a$  and  $b$  is needed to cause  $c$ ). In the context of an investigation, one would presumably attempt to ‘repair’ the acyclic net in Figure 4( $a$ ) to resolve the problem. Two possible outcomes of such an attempt are depicted in Figure 5.  $\diamond$

Checking that an acyclic net is well-formed can be done by looking just at its firing sequences.

**Proposition 10.** *An acyclic net  $acnet$  is well-formed iff each transition occurs in at least one firing sequence and all the firing sequences are well-formed.*

*Proof.* ( $\implies$ ) Since  $fseq(acnet) \subseteq sseq(acnet)$ , it suffices to show that each transition occurs in at least one firing sequence. This, however, follows from  $acnet$  being well-formed and Proposition 9(4).

( $\impliedby$ ) Since  $fseq(acnet) \subseteq sseq(acnet)$ , it suffices to show that each step sequence is well-formed. If this is not the case, then there is  $U_1 \dots U_k \in sseq(acnet)$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) such that  $U_1 \dots U_{k-1}$  is well-formed and  $U_1 \dots U_k$  is not well-formed. Let  $U_i = \{t_i^1, \dots, t_i^{m_i}\}$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Then, by Propositions 6(2) and 9(3,4),  $\tau = t_1^1 \dots t_1^{m_1} \dots t_k^1 \dots t_k^{m_k} \in fseq(acnet)$ . Hence, since  $\tau$  is well-formed,  $\sigma$  is also well-formed, yielding a contradiction.  $\square$

Well-formedness is ensured when backward non-determinism is not allowed.

**Proposition 11.** *All step sequences of a backward deterministic acyclic net are well-formed.*

*Proof.* If the result does not hold then, by Propositions 6(2) and 9(4), there is  $t_1 \dots t_k \in fseq(acnet)$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) such that  $t_1 \dots t_k$  is well-formed and  $t_1 \dots t_k t$  is not well-formed. Hence there is  $i \leq k$  such that  $t_i^\bullet \cap t^\bullet \neq \emptyset$ . Take any  $p \in \bullet t$ . Since  $acnet$  is backward deterministic,  $t_i = t$ . Hence  $i < k$  and there is  $i < j \leq k$  such that  $p \in t_j^\bullet$ . As  $p \notin M_{acnet}^{init}$  and  $p \in \bullet t_i$ , there is  $1 \leq m < i$  such that  $p \in t_m^\bullet$ . This, however, contradicts  $t_1 \dots t_k$  being well-formed.  $\square$

All occurrence nets are well-formed.

**Proposition 12.**  $ON \subset WFAN \subset AN$ .

*Proof.* Clearly,  $WFAN \subseteq AN$ . Moreover,  $ON \subseteq WFAN$  follows from  $ON \subseteq BDAN$  and Propositions 8(3) and 11. Moreover,  $bdanet_1 \in WFAN \setminus ON$  in Figure 4, and the acyclic net in Figure 4( $a$ ) is not well-formed.  $\square$

## 7 Scenarios in acyclic nets

An acyclic net may exhibit both forward and backward nondeterminism and, as a result, represent several different possible execution histories. The role of the next notion is to identify structurally all such execution histories which can then be inspected, simulated, and analysed.




Fig. 5. Well-formed acyclic nets.

Scenarios of an acyclic net are acyclic subnets which start at the same initial marking and are both backward and forward deterministic. As a result, each scenario represents a distinct execution history with clearly determined causal relationships. Scenarios are much more abstract than (mixed) step sequences, as one scenario will in general correspond to many step sequences.

**Definition 14 (scenario and maximal scenario of acyclic net).** A scenario of an acyclic net  $acnet$  is an occurrence net  $ocnet$  such that  $ocnet \sqsubseteq acnet$ . Moreover,  $ocnet$  is maximal if there is no scenario  $ocnet' \neq ocnet$  such that  $ocnet \sqsubseteq ocnet' \sqsubseteq acnet$ . Notation:  $scenarios(acnet)$  and  $maxscenarios(acnet)$  are respectively the sets of all scenarios and maximal scenarios of  $acnet$ .  $\diamond$

Intuitively, scenarios represent possible executions (concurrent histories), which are both deterministic and consistent with the dependencies implied by the flow relation. Maximal scenarios are complete in the sense that they cannot be extended.

Although scenarios represent behaviours of acyclic nets in a different way than (mixed) step sequences, there is a close relationship between these two approaches. In particular, scenarios do not generate executions which are not generated by the original acyclic net.

**Proposition 13.**  $\bigcup f(scenarios(acnet)) \subseteq f(acnet)$ , for every acyclic net  $acnet$  and  $f = \text{mixsseq}, \text{sseq}, \text{reachable}, \text{fseq}$ .

*Proof.* It follows from Definition 14 and Proposition 7.  $\square$

The inclusions in the above result cannot be reversed.

*Example 7.* Consider the (non-well-formed) acyclic net  $acnet$  in Figure 4(a) which generates step sequence  $\sigma = \{a, b\}\{c\}$ . It has exactly two maximal scenarios shown in Figure 4(b, c), neither of which can execute  $\sigma$ .  $\diamond$

Definition 14 introduced scenarios in a structural way. An alternative is to do this behaviourally, through well-formed step sequences.

**Definition 15 (scenario of well-formed step sequence of acyclic net).** The scenario induced by a well-formed step sequence  $\sigma$  of an acyclic net  $acnet$  is the triple:

$$\text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma) \triangleq (P, T, F_{acnet}|_{(P \times T) \cup (T \times P)})$$

where  $T = \bigcup \sigma$  and  $P = P_{acnet}^{init} \cup \text{post}_{acnet}(T)$ .  $\diamond$

*Example 8.* In Figure 1,  $ocnet_1 = \text{scenario}_{acnet_1}(\{a\}\{b,c\})$ . Note that  $ocnet_1$  can also be derived as  $\text{scenario}_{acnet_1}(\{a\}\{b\}\{c\})$  or  $\text{scenario}_{acnet_1}(\{a\}\{c\}\{b\})$ .  $\diamond$

Scenarios induced by well-formed step sequences are also scenarios in the structural sense. Moreover, maximal step sequences induce maximal scenarios.

**Proposition 14.** *Let  $\sigma$  be a well-formed step sequence of an acyclic net  $acnet$ .*

1.  $\text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma) \in \text{scenarios}(acnet)$  and  $\sigma \in \text{maxsseq}(\text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma))$ .
2.  $\sigma \in \text{maxsseq}(acnet)$  implies  $\text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma) \in \text{maxscenarios}(acnet)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\sigma$ ,  $P$ , and  $T$  be as in Definition 15. Moreover, let  $ocnet = \text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma)$ , and  $\mu = M_0U_1M_1 \dots M_{k-1}U_kM_k \in \text{mixsseq}(acnet)$  be such that  $\sigma = U_1 \dots U_k$ .

(1) By Definitions 9, 11, 10, and 15, we have  $P = M_0 \cup \dots \cup M_k$  and  $\text{pre}_{acnet}(T) \subseteq P$ . Hence, by Definitions 4 and 5,  $ocnet$  is an acyclic net such that  $ocnet \sqsubseteq acnet$ . Moreover, by Definitions 12 and 8(1), and Proposition 9(2),  $ocnet$  is an occurrence net. Hence  $ocnet \in \text{scenarios}(acnet)$ . It then follows from Proposition 8(1), Definition 10(1), and  $ocnet \in ON$  that Proposition 8(1,5) can be applied to conclude that  $\sigma \in \text{maxsseq}(\text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma))$ .

(2) By part (1),  $ocnet \in \text{scenarios}(acnet)$ . If  $ocnet \notin \text{maxscenarios}(acnet)$ , then there is  $ocnet' \in ON$  such that  $ocnet \sqsubseteq ocnet' \sqsubseteq acnet$  and  $T = T_{ocnet} \subset T_{ocnet'}$ . By Proposition 7,  $\sigma \in \text{sseq}(ocnet')$ . Hence, by Proposition 8(5),  $\sigma \notin \text{maxsseq}(ocnet')$ . This produces a contradiction with  $\sigma \in \text{maxsseq}(acnet)$  and Proposition 7.  $\square$

Following an observation made in Example 8, two well-formed step sequences induce the same scenario iff they involve exactly the same transitions.

**Proposition 15.** *Let  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$  be well-formed step sequences of an acyclic net  $acnet$ . Then  $\text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma) = \text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma')$  iff  $\bigcup \sigma = \bigcup \sigma'$ .*

*Proof.* It follows directly from Definition 15.  $\square$

Well-formedness of acyclic nets can be re-phrased in terms of their scenarios.

**Proposition 16.** *The following statements are equivalent, for every acyclic net.*

1. *The acyclic net is well-formed.*
2. *Each transition occurs in at least one scenario, and each step sequence is a step sequence of at least one scenario.*
3. *Each transition occurs in at least one scenario, and each firing sequence is a firing sequence of at least one scenario.*

*Proof.* Let  $acnet$  be an acyclic net.

(1)  $\implies$  (2) Suppose that  $\sigma \in \text{sseq}(acnet)$ . Since  $\sigma$  is well-formed, by Proposition 14(1),  $\text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma) \in \text{scenarios}(acnet)$  and  $\sigma \in \text{sseq}(\text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma))$ .

Suppose now that  $t \in T_{acnet}$ . Since  $acnet$  is well-formed, there is  $\sigma \in \text{sseq}(acnet)$  in which  $t$  occurs. Moreover, as just shown,  $\sigma \in \text{sseq}(\text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma))$ .

(2)  $\implies$  (3) Obvious.

(3)  $\implies$  (1) Suppose that not all step sequences of  $acnet$  are well-formed. Then there is  $\sigma U \in \text{sseq}(acnet)$  such that  $\sigma$  is well-formed and  $\sigma U$  is not. Hence, by Propositions 6(2) and 9(3,4), there is a firing sequence  $\tau\tau' \in \text{fseq}(acnet)$  such that  $\bigcup \sigma = \bigcup \tau$  and  $U = \bigcup \tau'$ . Clearly,  $\tau\tau'$  is not well-formed. On the other hand, there is  $ocnet \in \text{scenarios}(acnet)$  such that  $\tau\tau' \in \text{sseq}(ocnet)$ , contradicting Proposition 11.  $\square$

Each (maximal) step sequence of a well-formed acyclic net induces a (maximal) scenario and, conversely, each (maximal) scenario is induced by a (maximal) step sequence. Therefore, the structurally and behaviourally defined scenarios coincide.

**Proposition 17.** *Let  $acnet$  be a well-formed acyclic net.*

1.  $\text{scenarios}(acnet) = \text{scenario}_{acnet}(\text{sseq}(acnet))$ .
2.  $\text{maxscenarios}(acnet) = \text{scenario}_{acnet}(\text{maxsseq}(acnet))$ .

*Proof.* The  $(\supseteq)$  inclusions follow from Proposition 14.

(1) To show the  $(\subseteq)$  inclusion, suppose that  $ocnet \in \text{scenarios}(acnet)$ , and take any  $\sigma \in \text{maxsseq}(ocnet)$ . By Propositions 8(5) and 13,  $\bigcup \sigma = T_{ocnet}$  and  $\sigma \in \text{sseq}(acnet)$ . Hence  $\text{scenario}_{ocnet}(\sigma) = ocnet$  and  $\text{scenario}_{ocnet}(\sigma) = \text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma)$ . As a result,  $ocnet \in \text{scenario}_{acnet}(\text{sseq}(acnet))$ .

(2) To show the  $(\subseteq)$  inclusion, suppose that  $ocnet \in \text{maxscenarios}(acnet)$ , and take any  $\sigma \in \text{maxsseq}(ocnet) \subseteq \text{sseq}(acnet)$ . By the proof of part (1), we have  $ocnet \in \text{scenario}_{acnet}(\text{sseq}(acnet))$ . Suppose that  $\sigma \notin \text{maxsseq}(acnet)$ . Then there is  $t \in T_{acnet}$  such that  $\sigma t \in \text{sseq}(acnet)$ . We then observe that  $ocnet \sqsubseteq \text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma t)$  and  $ocnet \neq \text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma t)$ , contradicting the maximality of  $ocnet$ .  $\square$

Behaviours of acyclic nets correspond to the joint behaviour of their scenarios.

**Proposition 18.** *Let  $acnet$  be a well-formed acyclic net.*

1.  $f(acnet) = \bigcup f(\text{scenarios}(acnet))$ , *for*  $f = \text{sseq}, \text{mixsseq}, \text{reachable}, \text{fseq}$ .
2.  $f(acnet) = \bigcup f(\text{maxscenarios}(acnet))$ ,  
*for*  $f = \text{maxsseq}, \text{maxmixsseq}, \text{finreachable}$ .

*Proof.* (1) The  $(\supseteq)$  inclusions follow from Proposition 13. The  $(\subseteq)$  inclusion for  $f = \text{sseq}$  follows from the second part of Proposition 14(1). The remaining inclusions follow from this and Definition 5.

(2) It suffices to consider  $f = \text{maxsseq}$ .

To show the  $(\subseteq)$  inclusions, suppose that  $\sigma \in \text{maxsseq}(acnet)$ . Then, by Proposition 14(2),  $\text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma) \in \text{maxscenarios}(acnet)$ . Moreover, by Proposition 14(1),  $\sigma \in \text{maxsseq}(\text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma))$ .

To show the  $(\supseteq)$  inclusions, suppose that  $ocnet \in \text{maxscenarios}(acnet)$  and  $\sigma \in \text{maxsseq}(ocnet) \subseteq \text{sseq}(acnet)$ . If  $\sigma \notin \text{maxsseq}(acnet)$ , then there is  $t \in T_{acnet}$  such that  $\sigma t \in \text{sseq}(acnet)$ . Hence  $ocnet \sqsubseteq \text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma t)$  and  $ocnet \neq \text{scenario}_{acnet}(\sigma t)$ , contradicting the maximality of  $ocnet$ .  $\square$

In well-formed acyclic nets, all parts of their structure are relevant as they are covered by the scenarios in a graph-theoretic way.



**Proposition 19.**  $X_{acnet} = \bigcup \{X_{ocnet} \mid ocnet \in \text{scenarios}(acnet)\}$ , for every well-formed acyclic net  $acnet$  and  $X = P, T, F$ .

*Proof.* The  $(\supseteq)$  inclusions follow from Definitions 4 and 5. The  $(\subseteq)$  inclusions follow from Proposition 16 and Definitions 4 and 5.  $\square$

**Proposition 20.**  $\text{scenarios}(acnet) \subseteq \text{scenarios}(acnet')$ , for all acyclic nets  $acnet$  and  $acnet'$  satisfying  $acnet \sqsubseteq acnet'$ .

*Proof.* It follows directly from the definitions.  $\square$

The next result shows that an occurrence net has exactly one maximal scenario (itself), which can be interpreted as saying it is a precise representation of a single execution history.

**Proposition 21.**  $\text{maxscenarios}(ocnet) = \{ocnet\}$ , for every occurrence  $ocnet$ .

*Proof.* By Definition 14,  $ocnet \in \text{maxscenarios}(ocnet)$ .

Suppose that  $ocnet' \in \text{maxscenarios}(ocnet) \setminus \{ocnet\}$ . Then,  $ocnet' \sqsubseteq ocnet \sqsubseteq ocnet'$  and  $ocnet' \neq ocnet$ . This, however, yields a contradiction with Definition 14.  $\square$

## 8 Communication structured acyclic nets

Communication Structured Acyclic Nets (CSA-nets) are a generalisation of Communication Structured Occurrence Nets (CSO-nets) introduced and discussed in [20,22,16]. In [23,14], CSO-nets were used to deal with cybercrime and major accidents, and [17] demonstrated CSO-nets can be used as a framework for visualising and analysing behaviour of complex evolving systems. Other works on CSO-nets were related to provenance [19] and timed behaviours [13]. This section introduces nets which generalise CSO-nets by being based on acyclic nets rather than occurrence nets.

The following are intuitive explanations of the main concepts:

### communication structured acyclic net (CSA-net)

A ‘database’ consisting of a number of disjoint acyclic nets which communicate through special buffer/channel places. CSA-nets can exhibit backward and forward non-determinism. They can contain cycles restricted to the buffer places.

### buffer place

A place allowing synchronous or asynchronous transfer of tokens. A cycle involving only buffer places ‘implements’ synchronous communication.

### communication structured occurrence net (CSO-net)

A CSA-net providing full and unambiguous record of all causal dependencies between the events involved in a single ‘causal history’.

### backward deterministic CSA-net (BDCSA-net)

A CSA-net providing unambiguous record of causal dependencies.

### scenario

A CSO-net providing a representation of a system history.

**well-formed CSA-net**


A CSA-net where each execution history from the initial state has an unambiguous interpretation in terms of causality and concurrency.

**projected mixed step sequence**

A mixed step sequence restricted to the nodes of a component acyclic net.

**projected step sequence**

A step sequence restricted to the transitions of a component acyclic.



**Fig. 6.** Communication structured acyclic nets.

**Definition 16 (CSA-net).** A communication structured acyclic net (or CSA-net) is a tuple  $csan = (acnet_1, \dots, acnet_n, Q, W)$  ( $n \geq 1$ ) such that:

1.  $acnet_1, \dots, acnet_n$  are well-formed acyclic nets with disjoint sets of nodes (i.e., places and transitions). We also denote:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{csan} &\triangleq P_{acnet_1} \cup \dots \cup P_{acnet_n} & Q_{csan} &\triangleq Q \\ T_{csan} &\triangleq T_{acnet_1} \cup \dots \cup T_{acnet_n} & W_{csan} &\triangleq W \\ F_{csan} &\triangleq F_{acnet_1} \cup \dots \cup F_{acnet_n} & net_{csan,i} &\triangleq acnet_i \quad (\text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n). \end{aligned}$$

2.  $Q$  is a finite set of buffer places disjoint from  $P_{csan} \cup T_{csan}$ .  
 3.  $W \subseteq (Q \times T_{csan}) \cup (T_{csan} \times Q)$  is a set of arcs.  
 4. For every buffer place  $q$ :  
 (a) There is at least one transition  $t$  such that  $tWq$ .  
 (b) If  $tWq$  and  $qWu$  then transitions  $t$  and  $u$  belong to different component acyclic nets.

Notation: CSAN is the set of all CSA-nets. ◇

That is, in addition to requiring the disjointness of the component acyclic nets and the buffer places, it is required that buffer places pass tokens between different acyclic nets. Hence, if  $n = 1$ , then  $csan = (acnet_1, \emptyset, \emptyset)$  and so the CSA-net  $csan$  can be identified with its only component acyclic net  $acnet_1$  (not only structurally, but also syntactically, as will be shown later).

**Notation 2 (direct precedence in CSA-net)** Let  $csan = (acnet_1, \dots, acnet_n, Q, W)$  be a CSA-net,  $x \in P_{csan} \cup T_{csan} \cup Q_{csan}$ , and  $X \subseteq P_{csan} \cup T_{csan} \cup Q_{csan}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pre}_{csan}(x) &\triangleq \{y \mid yF_{csan}x \vee yW_{csan}x\} & \text{pre}_{csan}(X) &\triangleq \bigcup \{\text{pre}_{csan}(z) \mid z \in X\} \\ \text{post}_{csan}(x) &\triangleq \{y \mid xF_{csan}y \vee xW_{csan}y\} & \text{post}_{csan}(X) &\triangleq \bigcup \{\text{post}_{csan}(z) \mid z \in X\} \end{aligned}$$

denote direct predecessors and successors of  $x$  and  $X$ , respectively. Moreover,

$$P_{csan}^{init} \triangleq P_{acnet_1}^{init} \cup \dots \cup P_{acnet_n}^{init} \quad \text{and} \quad P_{csan}^{fin} \triangleq P_{acnet_1}^{fin} \cup \dots \cup P_{acnet_n}^{fin} \cup (Q_{csan} \setminus \text{pre}_{csan}(T_{csan}))$$

are the initial and final places of  $csan$ , respectively. ◇

Note that no buffer place is an initial place.

**Proposition 22.**  $P_{csan} \uplus Q_{csan} = P_{csan}^{init} \uplus \text{post}_{csan}(T_{csan}) = P_{csan}^{fin} \uplus \text{pre}_{csan}(T_{csan})$ , for every CSA-net  $csan$ .

*Proof.* It follows directly from the definitions. □

*Example 9.* Figure 6(a) depicts a CSA-net  $csan_1$  such that  $\text{pre}_{csan_1}(p_4) = \{b, d\}$  and  $\text{post}_{csan_1}(e) = \{q_1, p_6\}$ . Moreover,  $P_{csan_1}^{init} = \{p_1, p_5\}$ . ◇

### 8.1 Subnets in CSA-nets

The next notion captures a structural inclusion between CSA-nets.

**Definition 17 (subnet of CSA-net).** Let  $csan = (acnet_1, \dots, acnet_n, Q, W)$  and  $csan' = (acnet'_1, \dots, acnet'_n, Q', W')$  be CSA-nets. Then  $csan$  is included in  $csan'$  if the following hold:

1.  $acnet_i \subseteq acnet'_i$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .
2.  $Q \subseteq Q'$ .
3.  $\text{pre}_{csan}(t) = \text{pre}_{csan'}(t)$  and  $\text{post}_{csan}(t) = \text{post}_{csan'}(t)$ , for every  $t \in T_{csan}$ .

Notation:  $csan \subseteq csan'$ . ◇

Note that a transition included in a subnet retains its pre-places and post-places, including the buffer places; in other words, it retains its local environment.

**Proposition 23.** Let  $csan \subseteq csan'$  be CSA-nets. Then  $Q_{csan} \subseteq Q_{csan'}$  and  $W_{csan} \subseteq W_{csan'}$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to show  $Q_{csan} \subseteq Q_{csan'}$ . Let  $q \in Q_{csan}$ . By Definition 16(4a), there is  $t \in T_{csan}$  such that  $tW_{csan}q$ . Hence, by Definition 17(2),  $tW_{csan'}q$ . Thus  $q \in Q_{csan'}$ . □

The next notion captures not only a structural inclusion between CSA-nets, but it is also intended to correspond to inclusion of the behaviours they capture.

**Definition 18 (co-initial subnet of CSA-net).** A CSA-net  $csan$  is a co-initial subnet of a CSA-net  $csan'$  if  $csan \subseteq csan'$  and  $P_{csan}^{init} = P_{csan'}^{init}$ .

Notation:  $csan \sqsubseteq csan'$ . ◇

Note that if  $csan$  and  $csan'$  are as in Definition 17, then  $csan \sqsubseteq csan'$  iff  $acnet_i \sqsubseteq acnet'_i$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

**Proposition 24.** Let  $csan \sqsubseteq csan'$  be CSA-nets.

1.  $P_{csan} = P_{csan'}^{init} \uplus \text{post}_{csan'}(T_{csan})$ .
2.  $csan = csan'$  iff  $T_{csan} = T_{csan'}$ .

*Proof.* (1) It follows from Proposition 4(1) as well as Definitions 16(4a) and 17(2).

(2) The ( $\implies$ ) implication is obvious, and the ( $\impliedby$ ) implication follows from Proposition 4(2) as well as Definitions 16(4a), 17(2), and 18. □

### 8.2 Subclasses of CSA-nets

The next definition introduces CSA-nets representing individual causal histories.

**Definition 19 (CSO-net).** A communication structured occurrence net (or CSO-net) is  $cson \in CSAN$  such that:

1. The component acyclic nets belong to ON.
2.  $|\text{pre}_{cson}(q)| = 1$  and  $|\text{post}_{cson}(q)| \leq 1$ , for every  $q \in Q_{cson}$ .
3. No place in  $P_{cson}$  belongs to a cycle in the graph of  $F_{cson} \cup W_{cson}$ .

*Notation: CSON is the set of all CSO-nets.*  $\diamond$

That is, only cycles involving buffer places are allowed. CSO-nets exhibit backward determinism and forward determinism.

*Example 10.* Figure 6(b,c,d) depict CSO-nets.  $\diamond$

We also consider CSA-nets with only forward nondeterminism.

**Definition 20 (BDCSA-net).** A backward deterministic communication structured acyclic net (or BDCSA-net) is  $bdcсан \in CSAN$  such that:

1. The component acyclic nets belong to BDAN.
2.  $|\text{pre}_{bdcсан}(q)| = 1$ , for every  $q \in Q_{bdcсан}$ .

*Notation: BDCSAN is the set of all BDCSA-nets.*  $\diamond$

BDCSA-nets exhibit backward determinism, but forward determinism is not required.

**Proposition 25.**  $CSON \subset BDCSAN \subset CSAN$ .

*Proof.* It follows directly from Proposition 5 and the definitions.  $\square$

## 9 Step sequence semantics of CSA-nets

The intuition behind the step sequence semantics of CSA-net is similar as in the case of acyclic nets, and so the terminology used will also be similar.

**Definition 21 (step and marking of CSA-net).** Let  $csan$  be a CSA-net.

1.  $\text{steps}(csan) \triangleq \{U \in \mathbb{P}(T_{csan}) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \mid \forall t \neq u \in U : \text{pre}_{csan}(t) \cap \text{pre}_{csan}(u) = \emptyset\}$  are the steps.
2.  $\text{markings}(csan) \triangleq \mathbb{P}(P_{csan} \cup Q_{csan})$  are the markings.
3.  $M_{csan}^{init} \triangleq P_{csan}^{init}$  is the initial marking.  $\diamond$

*Example 11.*  $\text{steps}(csan_1) = \{U \in \mathbb{P}(\{a, b, c, d, e, f\}) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \mid a \notin U \vee c \notin U\}$ , for the CSA-net in Figure 6(a).  $\diamond$

**Definition 22 (enabled and executed step of CSA-net).** Let  $M$  be a marking of a CSA-net  $csan$ .

1.  $\text{enabled}_{csan}(M) \triangleq \{U \in \text{steps}(csan) \mid \text{pre}_{csan}(U) \subseteq M \cup (\text{post}_{csan}(U) \cap Q)\}$  are the steps enabled at  $M$ .
2. A step  $U \in \text{enabled}_{csan}(M)$  can be executed yielding a new marking

$$M' \triangleq (M \cup \text{post}_{csan}(U)) \setminus \text{pre}_{csan}(U).$$

*Notation:  $M[U]_{csan} M'$ .*  $\diamond$

Enabling a step in a CSA-net amounts to having all input places belonging to the component acyclic nets present/marked in a global state. Moreover, if an input buffer place is not present, then it must be an output place of a transition belonging to the step. Such a mechanism allows one to synchronise transitions coming from different component acyclic nets. The same mechanism of simultaneous output to and input from a place is not available within the component acyclic nets, and so in Definition 22(1) we have  $\text{pre}_{csan}(U) \subseteq M \cup (\text{post}_{csan}(U) \cap Q)$  rather than  $\text{pre}_{csan}(U) \subseteq M \cup \text{post}_{csan}(U)$ .

**Definition 23 (mixed step sequence and step sequence of CSA-net).** Let  $M_0, \dots, M_k$  ( $k \geq 0$ ) be markings and  $U_1, \dots, U_k$  be steps of a CSA-net  $csan$  such that  $M_{i-1}[U_i]_{csan} M_i$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .

1.  $\mu = M_0 U_1 M_1 \dots M_{k-1} U_k M_k$  is a mixed step sequence from  $M_0$  to  $M_k$ .
2.  $\sigma = U_1 \dots U_k$  is a step sequence from  $M_0$  to  $M_k$ .

The above two notions are denoted by  $M_0[\mu]_{csan} M_k$  and  $M_0[\sigma]_{csan} M_k$ , respectively. Moreover,  $M_0[\sigma]_{csan}$  denotes that  $\sigma$  is a step sequence enabled  $M_0$ , and  $M_0[]_{csan} M_k$  denotes that  $M_k$  is reachable from  $M_0$ .  $\diamond$

If  $k = 0$  then  $\mu = M_0$  and the corresponding step sequence  $\sigma$  is the *empty* sequence denoted by  $\lambda$ .

In the last definition, the starting point is an arbitrary marking. The next definition assumes that the starting point is the default initial marking.

**Definition 24 (behaviour of CSA-net).** The following sets capture various behavioural notions related to step sequences and reachable markings of a CSA-net  $csan$ .

1.  $\text{sseq}(csan) \triangleq \{\sigma \mid M_{csan}^{init}[\sigma]_{csan} M\}$  step sequences.
2.  $\text{mixsseq}(csan) \triangleq \{\mu \mid M_{csan}^{init}[\mu]_{csan} M\}$  mixed step sequences.
3.  $\text{maxsseq}(csan) \triangleq \{\sigma \in \text{sseq}(csan) \mid \neg \exists U : \sigma U \in \text{sseq}(csan)\}$  maximal step sequences.
4.  $\text{maxmixsseq}(csan) \triangleq \{\mu \in \text{mixsseq}(csan) \mid \neg \exists U, M : \mu U M \in \text{mixsseq}(csan)\}$  maximal mixed step sequences.
5.  $\text{reachable}(csan) \triangleq \{M \mid M_{csan}^{init}[]_{csan} M\}$  reachable markings.
6.  $\text{finreachable}(csan) \triangleq \{M \mid \exists \sigma \in \text{maxsseq}(csan) : M_{csan}^{init}[\sigma]_{csan} M\}$  final reachable markings.

$\diamond$

Note that if a CSA-net has only one component acyclic net,  $acnet$ , then  $f(csant) = f(acnet)$ , for  $f = \text{sseq}, \text{mixsseq}, \text{maxsseq}, \text{reachable}, \text{finreachable}$ .

*Example 12.* The following hold for the CSA-net in Figure 6(a).

1.  $\text{sseq}(csan_1) = \{\lambda, \{a, e\}, \{a, e\}b, \dots\}$ .
2.  $\text{mixsseq}(csan_1) = \{\{p_1, p_5\}, \{p_1, p_5\}\{a, e\}\{p_2, p_6, q_1\}, \dots\}$ .
3.  $\text{maxsseq}(csan_1) = \{\{ab, aeb, abe, \{a, e\}b, a\{b, e\}, ec\{d, f\}, \{e, c\}\{d, f\}\}$ .
4.  $\text{maxmixsseq}(csan_1) = \{\{p_1, p_5\}\{a, e\}\{p_2, p_6, q_1\}b\{p_4, p_6, q_1\}, \dots\}$ .
5.  $\text{reachable}(csan_1) = \{\{p_1, p_5\}, \{p_2, p_6, q_1\}, \dots\}$ .

$$6. \text{finreachable}(csan_1) = \{\{p_4, p_6, q_1\}, \{p_4, p_7\}\}. \quad \diamond$$

Projecting step sequences and mixed step sequences of a CSA-net onto a component acyclic net yields sequences, mixed step sequences and scenarios of the latter.

**Definition 25 (projected (mixed) step sequence of CSA-net).** Let  $\sigma$  be a step sequence of a CSA-net  $csan$ ,  $\mu$  be a mixed step sequence of  $csan$ , and  $acnet$  be one of the component acyclic nets of  $csan$ .

1.  $\text{proj}_{acnet}(\sigma) = \sigma \upharpoonright_{T_{acnet}}$ .
2.  $\text{proj}_{acnet}(\mu)$  is obtained from  $\mu \upharpoonright_{P_{acnet} \cup T_{acnet}}$  by deleting consecutive duplicate sets.

*Example 13.* For  $csan_1$  in Figure 6(a),  $\text{proj}_{acnet_1}(\{a, e\}b) = ab$ ,  $\text{proj}_{acnet_2}(\{a, e\}b) = e$ , and  $\text{proj}_{acnet_2}(\{p_1, p_5\}a\{p_2, p_5\}b\{p_4, p_5\}) = \{p_5\}$ .  $\diamond$

Projected step sequences are step sequences of the component acyclic nets.

**Proposition 26.** For every component acyclic net  $acnet$  of a CSA-net  $csan$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{proj}_{acnet}(\text{sseq}(csan)) &\subseteq \text{sseq}(acnet) \\ \text{proj}_{acnet}(\text{mixsseq}(csan)) &\subseteq \text{mixsseq}(acnet). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* It suffices to demonstrate that we have  $\text{proj}_{acnet}(\mu) \in \text{mixsseq}(acnet)$ , where  $\mu = M_0 U_1 M_1 \dots M_{k-1} U_k M_k$ . We observe that in such a case the enabledness and calculations of the results of step executions in  $csan$  and  $acnet$  are fully consistent except that if  $U_i \cap T_{acnet} = \emptyset$ , then  $M_{i-1} \cap P_{acnet} = M_i \cap P_{acnet}$  (since  $acnet$  is well-formed, this is the only situation that  $M_{i-1} \cap P_{acnet} = M_i \cap P_{acnet}$ ). But then the construction of  $\text{proj}_{acnet}(\mu)$  then deletes multiple neighbouring copies of the same marking.  $\square$

### 9.1 Behaviour of subnets of CSA-nets

The structural inclusion of CSA-nets implies the inclusion of the behaviours they generate.

**Proposition 27.** Let  $csan \sqsubseteq csan'$  be CSA-nets. Then we have  $f(csans) \subseteq f(csan')$ , for  $f = \text{mixsseq}, \text{sseq}, \text{reachable}$ .

*Proof.* Similar to the proof of Proposition 7.  $\square$

Due to being both backward-deterministic and forward-deterministic, CSO-nets enjoy several useful behavioural properties similar to those satisfied by occurrence nets. For example, each CSO-net has a step sequence which uses all the transitions. This and other properties are gathered together in the next result.

**Proposition 28.** Let  $\sigma = U_1 \dots U_k$  ( $k \geq 0$ ) be a sequence of nonempty sets of transitions of CSO-net  $cson$ . Moreover, let  $M$  be a reachable marking of  $cson$  and  $T = \bigcup \sigma$ .

1.  $\sigma \in \text{sseq}(cson)$  iff for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $U_i \cap (U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_{i-1}) = \emptyset$  and

$$\text{pre}_{cson}(\text{pre}_{cson}(U_i)) \subseteq U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_{i-1} \cup U_i \cap \text{pre}_{cson}(Q \cap \text{pre}_{cson}(U_i)).$$

2.  $\sigma \in \text{sseq}(cson)$  implies  $M_{cson}^{init}[\sigma]_{cson} (M_{cson}^{init} \cup \text{post}_{cson}(T)) \setminus \text{pre}_{cson}(T)$ .
3.  $T_{cson} = \bigcup \{ \bigcup \xi \mid \xi \in \text{sseq}(cson) \}$ .
4.  $M[U]_{cson} M'$  implies  $U' \in \text{enabled}_{cson}(M')$ , for every  $U' \in \text{enabled}_{cson}(M)$  such that  $U \cap U' = \emptyset$ .
5.  $\text{maxsseq}(cson) = \{ \xi \in \text{sseq}(cson) \mid \bigcup \xi = T_{cson} \}$ .
6.  $\text{finreachable}(cson) = \{ P_{cson}^{fin} \}$ .

*Proof.* It follows from the results proved in [16]. □

In general, the step sequences of CSO-nets cannot be fully sequentialised (or linearised) due to the presence of synchronous communications which cannot be split. The next definition captures this notion formally.

**Definition 26 (syn-cycle).** A synchronous cycle (or syn-cycle) of a CSO-net  $cson$  is a maximal set of transitions  $S \subseteq T_{cson}$  such that, for all  $t \neq u \in S$ ,  $(t, u) \in W_{cson}^+$ . The set of all sync-cycles is denoted by  $\text{syncycles}(cson)$ . ◇

The idea behind the notion of syn-cycles is to identify ‘tight’ synchronous communications which cannot be executed in stages.

*Example 14.* For  $cson_3$  in Figure 6(d),  $\text{syncycles}(cson_3) = \{ \{c\}, \{e\}, \{d, f\} \}$ . ◇

Syn-cycles are nonempty and form a partition of the set of transitions.

**Proposition 29.**  $\text{syncycles}(cson)$  forms a partition of  $T_{cson}$ , for every CSO-net  $cson$ .

*Proof.* It follows from results proved in [16]. □

Each step occurring in a step sequence of a CSO-net can be partitioned into syn-cycles (in a unique way).

**Proposition 30.** Let  $M$  be a reachable marking of a CSO-net  $cson$  and  $M[U]_{cson} M'$ . Then there are syn-cycles  $S_1, \dots, S_k \in \text{syncycles}(cson)$  such that  $U = S_1 \uplus \dots \uplus S_k$  and  $M[S_1 \dots S_k]_{cson} M'$ .

*Proof.* It follows from results proved in [16]. □

This means, for example, that all reachable markings of a CSO-net can be generated by executing syn-cycles rather than all potential steps.

## 10 Well-formed CSA-nets

A basic consistency criterion applied to CSA-nets is well-formedness. Its essence is to ensure a clean representation of causality in behaviours they represent. The definition of a well-formed CSA-net is derived from the notion of a well-formed step sequence.

**Definition 27 (well-formed step sequence of CSA-net).** A step sequence  $U_1 \dots U_k$  of a CSA-net  $csan$  is well-formed if the following hold:



1.  $\text{post}_{csan}(t) \cap \text{post}_{csan}(u) = \emptyset$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$  and all  $t \neq u \in U_i$ .
2.  $\text{post}_{csan}(U_i) \cap \text{post}_{csan}(U_j) = \emptyset$ , for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ . ◇

Intuitively, in a well-formed step sequence of a CSA-net, no place is filled by a token more than once.

It then follows, e.g., that in a well-formed step sequence, no token is consumed more than once, no transition is executed more than once, the order of execution of transitions does not influence the resulting marking.

**Proposition 31.** *Let  $\sigma = U_1 \dots U_k$  be a well-formed step sequence of a CSA-net  $csan$ , and  $M_{csan}^{init} = M_0 U_1 M_1 \dots M_{k-1} U_k M_k$  be the corresponding mixed step sequence. Moreover, let  $T = \bigcup \sigma$ .*

1.  $\text{pre}_{csan}(U_i) \cap \text{post}_{csan}(U_i) \subseteq Q_{csan}$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .
2.  $\text{pre}_{csan}(U_i) \cap \text{pre}_{csan}(U_j) = \emptyset$  and  $U_i \cap U_j = \emptyset$ , for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ .
3.  $M_k = M_{csan}^{init} \cup \text{post}_{csan}(T) \setminus \text{pre}_{csan}(T)$ .

*Proof.* Similar to the proof of Proposition 9(1,2,3). □

Well-formedness is ensured when backward non-determinism is not allowed.

To develop a sound treatment of causality in CSA-nets, it is required that all step sequences are well-formed. Moreover, it is required that a well-formed acyclic nets has no redundant transitions which can never be executed from the initial marking.

**Definition 28 (well-formed CSA-net).** *A CSA-net is well-formed if each transition occurs in at least one step sequence and all step sequences are well-formed.*

*Notation:*  $WFCSAN$  is the set of all well-formed CSA-nets. ◇

Intuitively, the executions of syn-cycles in CSA-nets correspond to the executions of individual transitions in acyclic nets.

**Proposition 32.** *All step sequences of a BDCSA-net are well-formed.*

*Proof.* Similar to the proof of Proposition 11 using Proposition 30. □

**Proposition 33.**  $CSON \subset BDCSAN \subset WFCSAN \subset CSAN$ .

*Proof.* It follows from Proposition 12. □

## 11 Scenarios in CSA-nets

Scenarios of CSA-net start at the same initial marking and are both backward and forward deterministic. As a result, they represent potential executions with clearly determined causal relationships. They are also more abstract than (mixed) step sequences, as one scenario will in general correspond to many step sequences.

**Definition 29 (scenario and maximal scenario of CSA-net).** *A scenario of a CSA-net  $csan$  is a CSO-net  $cson$  such that  $cson \sqsubseteq csan$ . Moreover,  $cson$  is maximal if there is no scenario  $cson' \neq cson$  such that  $cson \sqsubseteq cson'$ .*

*Notation:*  $\text{scenarios}(csan)$  and  $\text{maxscenarios}(csan)$  are respectively the sets of all scenarios and maximal scenarios of  $csan$ . ◇

Intuitively, scenarios represent possible executions (concurrent histories) consistent with the dependencies imposed by the flow relation. This, in particular, means that all the transitions have been executed and places marked at some point during an execution. Maximal scenarios are complete in the sense that they cannot be extended any further.

Although scenarios represent behaviours of CSA-nets in a different way than step sequences, markings and related notions, there is a close relationship between these two approaches. First, we can see that scenarios do not generate step sequences nor markings which were not generated by the original acyclic net.

**Proposition 34.**  $\bigcup f(\text{scenarios}(csan)) \subseteq f(csan)$ , for every well-formed CSA-net  $csan$  and  $f = \text{mixsseq}, \text{sseq}, \text{reachable}$ .

*Proof.* It follows from Definition 29 and Proposition 27. □

**Definition 30 (scenario of well-formed step sequence of CSA-net).** Let  $\sigma$  be a well-formed step sequence of a CSA-net  $csan = (acnet_1, \dots, acnet_n, Q_{csan}, W_{csan})$ . Moreover, let  $T = \bigcup \sigma$  and  $ocnet_i = \text{scenario}_{acnet_i}(\text{proj}_{T_{acnet_i}}(\sigma))$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Then

$$\text{scenario}_{csan}(\sigma) \triangleq (ocnet_1, \dots, ocnet_n, \text{post}_{csan}(T) \cap Q_{csan}, W_{csan} |_{(Q \times T) \cup (T \times Q)})$$

is the scenario of  $csan$  generated by  $\sigma$ . ◇

Scenarios of well-formed step sequences are scenarios in the original structural sense.

**Proposition 35.** Let  $\sigma$  be a well-formed step sequence of a CSA-net  $csan$ .

1.  $\text{scenario}_{csan}(\sigma) \in \text{scenarios}(csan)$  and  $\sigma \in \text{maxsseq}(\text{scenario}_{csan}(\sigma))$ .
2.  $\sigma \in \text{maxsseq}(csan)$  implies  $\text{scenario}_{csan}(\sigma) \in \text{maxscenarios}(csan)$ .

*Proof.* Similar to the proof of Proposition 14. □

Two well-formed step sequences generate the same scenario iff they execute exactly the same transitions.

**Proposition 36.** Let  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$  be well-formed step sequences of a CSA-net  $csan$ . Then  $\text{scenario}_{csan}(\sigma) = \text{scenario}_{csan}(\sigma')$  iff  $\bigcup \sigma = \bigcup \sigma'$ .

*Proof.* It follows directly from Definition 15. □

The well-formedness of CSA-nets can also be expressed in terms of scenarios.

**Proposition 37.** The following statements are equivalent, for every CSA-net.

1. The CSA-net is well-formed.
2. Each transition occurs in at least one scenario, and each step sequence is a step sequence of at least one scenario.

*Proof.* Similar to the proof of Proposition 16. □

Each (maximal) step sequence of a well-formed CSA-net generates a (maximal) scenario and, conversely, each (maximal) scenario is generated by a (maximal) step sequence.

**Proposition 38.** *Let  $csan$  be a well-formed CSA-net.*

1.  $\text{scenarios}(csan) = \text{scenario}_{csan}(\text{sseq}(csan))$ .
2.  $\text{maxscenarios}(csan) = \text{scenario}_{csan}(\text{maxsseq}(csan))$ .

*Proof.* Similar to the proof of Proposition 17. □

There is a close correspondence between scenarios and step sequences of a well-formed CSA-net  $csan$ . In particular, the behaviour of the CSA-net corresponds to the joint behaviour of its scenarios.

**Proposition 39.** *Let  $csan$  be a well-formed CSA-net.*

1.  $f(csane) = \bigcup f(\text{scenarios}(csane))$ , for  $f = \text{sseq}, \text{mixsseq}, \text{reachable}$ .
2.  $f(csane) = \bigcup f(\text{maxscenarios}(csane))$ , for  $f = \text{maxsseq}, \text{maxmixsseq}, \text{finreachable}$ .

*Proof.* Similar to the proof of Proposition 18. □

*Example 15.* Consider the CSA-net  $csan_1$  in Figure 6(a). Then  $\text{scenario}_{csan_1}(\{a, e\}) = cson_1$ ,  $\text{scenario}_{csan_1}(eab) = cson_2$ , and  $\text{scenario}_{csan_1}(\{c, e\}\{d, f\}) = cson_3$ . ◇

**Definition 31 (syn-cycle of CSA-net).** *The syn-cycles of a well-formed CSA-net  $csan$  are given by  $\text{syncycles}(csane) = \bigcup \{\text{syncycles}(cson) \mid cson \in \text{scenarios}(csane)\}$ .*

*Notation:*  $\text{syncycles}(csane)$  is the set of all sync-cycles of  $csane$ . ◇

*Example 16.* For  $csan_1$  in Figure 6(a),  $\text{syncycles}(cson_3) = \{\{a\}, \{b\}, \{c\}, \{e\}, \{d, f\}\}$ . ◇

Each step occurring in a step sequence of a CSA-net can be partitioned into syn-cycles (in a unique way).

**Proposition 40.** *Let  $M$  be a reachable marking of a well-formed CSA-net  $csane$  and  $M[U]_{csane} M'$ . Then there are syn-cycles  $S_1, \dots, S_k \in \text{syncycles}(csane)$  such that  $U = S_1 \uplus \dots \uplus S_k$  and  $M[S_1 \dots S_k]_{csane} M'$ .*

*Proof.* It follows directly from Propositions 30 and 39. □

This means, for example, that all reachable markings of a well-formed CSA-net can be generated by executing syn-cycles rather than all the potential steps.

The next result can be interpreted as stating that no part of a well-formed CSA-net is semantically irrelevant.

**Definition 32 (coverability and non-redundancy).** *A well-formed CSA-net is covered by scenarios if  $X_{csane} = \bigcup \{X_{cson} \mid cson \in \text{maxscenarios}(csane)\}$ , for  $X = P, T, F, Q, W$ . Moreover,  $csane$  has non-redundant transitions if each transition of  $csane$  occurs in at least one step sequence.* ◇

**Proposition 41.** *Let  $csan$  be a well-formed CSA-net.*

1.  $csan$  is covered by scenarios iff it has non-redundant transitions.
2. CSO-nets have non-redundant transitions.

The two ways of capturing the idea that there are no irrelevant components in  $csan$  are equivalent, and CSO-nets have no redundant components.

The next result shows that an occurrence net has exactly one maximal scenario (itself), which can be interpreted as saying it is a precise representation of a single execution history.

**Proposition 42.**  $\text{maxscenarios}(cson) = \{cson\}$ , for every CSO-net  $cson$ .

*Proof.* By Definitions 5(1,2) and 29(1), we have  $cson \in \text{scenarios}(cson)$ . Hence, by Definition 29(2),  $cson \in \text{maxscenarios}(cson)$ .

Suppose now that  $cson' \in \text{maxscenarios}(ocnet) \setminus \{cson\}$ . Then, we have  $cson' \sqsubseteq cson$  and  $cson' \neq cson$ . This yields a contradiction with Definition 29(2).  $\square$

## 12 Behavioural structured acyclic nets

Behavioural Structured Acyclic Nets (BSA-nets) extend the model of BSO-nets introduced and discussed in [16,23,22,17,5,19]. They can be seen as a way of capturing the evolution of CSA-nets, by providing a mechanism to abstract parts of a complex activity by another (simpler) system. The behaviour in this case is expressed at two levels, namely the upper-level and lower-level. The former provides a simple view and hides unimportant details of the behaviour, while the latter shows the full details of behaviour during different evolution stages.

**Definition 33 (BSA-net).** A behavioural structured acyclic net (or BSA-net) is a triple  $bsan \triangleq (lcsan, hcsan, \beta)$  such that:

$$lcsan = (lanet_1, \dots, lanet_n, lQ, lW) \quad \text{and} \quad hcsan = (hanet_1, \dots, hanet_n, hQ, hW)$$

are well-formed CSA-nets ( $n \geq 1$ ) with disjoint sets of nodes, and


$$\beta \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n P_{lanet_i} \times P_{hanet_i}$$

is a relation satisfying the following, for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $t \in T_{hanet_i}$  (below  $\beta_p = \beta_{\{p\}} \triangleq \{r \mid r\beta p\}$ , for every  $p \in P_{hcsan}$ ):

1.  $|M_{hanet_i}^{init}| = 1$  and  $|\text{pre}_{hanet_i}(t)| = |\text{post}_{hanet_i}(t)| = 1$ .
2.  $\beta_{M_{hanet_i}^{init}} = M_{lanet_i}^{init}$  and  $\beta_{\text{pre}_{hanet_i}(t)} \upharpoonright_{lanet_i} \beta_{\text{post}_{hanet_i}(t)}$ .

*Notation:*  $BSAN$  is the set of all BSA-nets.  $\diamond$

Intuitively,  $lcsan$  provides a ‘lower-level’ view and  $hcsan$  provides a ‘upper-level’ of a record of system behaviour. The role of  $\beta$  is to identify in the lower-level view the divisions of behaviours into ‘phases’, and each  $\beta_p$  indicates a ‘boundary’ between two consecutive phases.



**Fig. 7.** Behavioural structured acyclic net  $bsan_0$  with  $n = 1$  (i.e., there is one lower-level acyclic net and one upper-level acyclic net and so graphically there is no difference between  $lcsan$  and  $lanet_1$  as well as between  $hcsan$  and  $hanet_1$ ).

**Proposition 43.** Let  $bsan$  be a BSA-net as in Definition 33, and let  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

1.  $reachable(hanet_i) = \{\{p\} \mid p \in P_{hanet_i}\}$ .
2.  $|M \cap P_{hanet_i}| = 1$ , for every  $M \in reachable(hcsan)$ .
3.  $\beta_p \in reachable(lanet_i)$ , for every  $p \in P_{hanet_i}$ .

That is, a reachable marking of the upper-level CSA-net includes exactly one place from each of its component acyclic nets. Moreover, all the boundaries between different phases are reachable markings of the lower-level acyclic nets.

A BSA-net is underpinned by a CSA-net combining the two different views of a database.

**Definition 34 (CSA-net underlying BSA-net).** Let  $bsan$  be a BSA-net as in Definition 33,

$$csan(bsan) \triangleq (lanet_1, \dots, lanet_n, hanet_1, \dots, hanet_n, lQ \cup hQ, lW \cup hW).$$

is the CSA-net underlying  $bsan$ . ◇

**Proposition 44.**  $csan(bsan)$  is a well-formed CSA-net.

*Proof.* It follows directly from the definitions. □

### 13 Semantics of BSA-nets

The notions concerning the structure and semantics of BSA-nets introduced below are based on similar notions defined their underlying CSA-nets.

**Definition 35 (notation for BSA-net).** *Let  $bsan$  be a BSA-net as in Definition 33.*

1.  $X_{bsan} \triangleq X_{csan(bsan)}$ , for  $X = P, T, F, Q, W$ .
2.  $\text{pre}_{bsan}() \triangleq \text{pre}_{csan(bsan)}()$  and  $\text{post}_{bsan}() \triangleq \text{post}_{csan(bsan)}()$ .
3.  $\text{steps}(bsan) \triangleq \text{steps}(csan(bsan))$ .
4.  $\text{markings}(bsan) \triangleq \text{markings}(csan(bsan))$ .
5.  $M_{bsan}^{init} \triangleq M_{csan(bsan)}^{init}$  and  $M_{bsan}^{fin} \triangleq M_{csan(bsan)}^{fin}$ . ◇

The notion of enabled step is different. It is based on the phases of lower-level acyclic nets induced by the phase boundaries induced by the relation  $\beta$ .

**Definition 36 (phase and phase-consistent marking of BSA-net).** *Let  $bsan$  be a BSA-net as in Definition 33.*

1. *The phase of a place  $p \in P_{hanet_i}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ) is given by:*

$$\text{phase}(p) \triangleq \{\beta_p\} \cup \{M \mid \exists t \in \text{post}_{hanet_i}(p) : \beta_p \setminus \setminus_{lanet_i} M \setminus \setminus_{lanet_i} \beta_{\text{post}_{hanet_i}(t)}\}.$$

2. *A marking  $M \in \text{reachable}(csan(bsan))$  is phase-consistent if, for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$ :*

$$M \cap P_{lanet_i} \in \text{phase}(\beta_{M \cap P_{hanet_i}}).$$

*Notation:*  $\text{phcmarkings}(bsan)$  is the set of all phase-consistent markings. ◇

Intuitively,  $\text{phase}(p)$  is a contiguous ‘chunk’ of  $lanet_i$  delimited by the marking corresponding to  $p$  (start) and all markings (ends) corresponding to the places obtained by executing one output transition of  $p$  (such a transition indicates a ‘phase change’). All markings in-between belong to the delimited phase. Moreover, phase-consistency means that the markings of the lower-level acyclic nets belong to the phases corresponding to the markings of the upper-level acyclic nets.

*Example 17.* Figure 7 depicts a BSA-net  $bsan_0$ . We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{phase}(p_1) &= \{\{r_1, r_2\}, \{r_1, r_5\}, \{r_3, r_2\}, \{r_3, r_5\}, \{r_1, r_8\}, \{r_4, r_2\}, \{r_4, r_5\}, \\ &\quad \{r_4, r_8\}, \{r_7, r_2\}, \{r_7, r_5\}, \{r_7, r_8\}\} \\ \text{phase}(p_2) &= \{\{r_3, r_5\}, \{r_3, r_8\}, \{r_3, r_{11}\}, \{r_6, r_5\}, \{r_6, r_8\}, \{r_6, r_{11}\}, \\ &\quad \{r_9, r_5\}, \{r_9, r_8\}, \{r_9, r_{11}\}\} \\ \text{phase}(p_3) &= \{\{r_7, r_8\}, \{r_7, r_{11}\}, \{r_{10}, r_8\}, \{r_{10}, r_{11}\}\} \\ \text{phase}(p_4) &= \{\{r_9, r_{11}\}\} \\ \text{phase}(p_4) &= \{\{r_{10}, r_{11}\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The marking  $\{r_1, r_{11}\} \in \text{reachable}(lanet_1)$  does not belong to any phase of the places of  $hanet_1$ . The marking  $\{p_1, r_9, r_{11}\} \in \text{reachable}(csan(bsan))$  is not phase-consistent, and the marking  $\{p_4, r_9, r_{11}\} \in \text{reachable}(csan(bsan))$  is phase-consistent. ◇

The execution semantics of BSA-nets is restricted to the phase-consistent markings.

**Definition 37 (enabled and executed step of BSA-net).** Let  $M, M' \in \text{markings}(bsan)$  be markings of a BSA-net  $bsan$ , and  $U \in \text{steps}(bsan)$  be a step. Then

$$U \in \text{enabled}_{bsan}(M) \quad \text{and} \quad M[U]_{bsan} M'$$

if  $M, M' \in \text{phcmarkings}(bsan)$  and  $M[U]_{csan(bsan)} M'$ .  $\diamond$

Intuitively,  $bsan$  is executed in exactly the same way as its underlying CSA-net provided that the the markings involved are phase-consistent.

**Definition 38 (mixed step sequence and step sequence of BSA-net).** Let  $bsan$  be a BSA-net and  $\mu = M_0 U_1 M_1 \dots M_{k-1} U_k M_k$  ( $k \geq 0$ ) be a sequence such that  $M_0, \dots, M_k \in \text{markings}(bsan)$  and  $U_1, \dots, U_k \in \text{steps}(bsan)$ .

1.  $\mu$  is a mixed step sequence from  $M_0$  to  $M_k$  if  $M_{i-1}[U_i]_{bsan} M_i$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .
2. If  $\mu$  is a mixed step sequence from  $M_0$  to  $M_k$ , then  $\sigma = U_1 \dots U_k$  is a step sequence from  $M_0$  to  $M_k$ .

This is denoted by  $M_0[\mu]_{bsan} M_k$  and  $M_0[\sigma]_{bsan} M_k$ , respectively. Also,  $M_0 \downarrow_{bsan} M_k$  denotes that  $M_k$  is reachable from  $M_0$ .  $\diamond$

In the last definition, the starting point is an arbitrary marking. The next definition assumes that the starting point is the default initial marking.

**Definition 39 (behaviour of BSA-net).** The following sets capture various behavioural notions related to step sequences and reachable markings of a BSA-net  $bsan$ .

1.  $\text{sseq}(bsan) \triangleq \{\sigma \mid M_{bsan}^{init}[\sigma]_{bsan} M\}$  step sequences.
2.  $\text{mixsseq}(bsan) \triangleq \{\mu \mid M_{bsan}^{init}[\mu]_{bsan} M\}$  mixed step sequences.
3.  $\text{maxsseq}(bsan) \triangleq \{\sigma \in \text{sseq}(bsan) \mid \neg \exists U : \sigma U \in \text{sseq}(bsan)\}$  maximal step sequences.
4.  $\text{maxmixsseq}(bsan) \triangleq \{\mu \in \text{mixsseq}(bsan) \mid \neg \exists U, M : \mu U M \in \text{mixsseq}(bsan)\}$  maximal mixed step sequences.
5.  $\text{reachable}(bsan) \triangleq \{M \mid M_{bsan}^{init} \downarrow_{bsan} M\}$  reachable markings.
6.  $\text{finreachable}(bsan) \triangleq \{M \mid \exists \sigma \in \text{maxsseq}(bsan) : M_{bsan}^{init}[\sigma]_{bsan} M\}$  final reachable markings.

$\diamond$

*Example 18.* A maximal mixed step sequence of the BSA-net depicted in Figure 7 is:

$$\mu = \{p_1, r_1, r_2\} \{g, k\} \{p_1, r_4, r_5\} \{h, l\} \{p_1, r_7, r_8\} \{c, m\} \\ \{p_3, r_7, r_{11}\} \{j\} \{p_3, r_{10}, r_{11}\} \{d\} \{p_5, r_{10}, r_{11}\},$$

and the corresponding maximal step sequence is  $\sigma = \{g, k\}\{h, l\}\{c, m\}\{j\}\{d\}$ .  $\diamond$

As before, we single out nets with forward and backward determinism.

**Definition 40 (BSO-net).** A BSA-net  $bson = (lcsn, hcsn, \beta)$  is a behavioural structured occurrence net (or BSO-net) if  $lcsn, hcsn \in CSON$  and there is  $\sigma \in sseq(bson)$  such that  $\bigcup \sigma = T_{bson}$ .

Notation:  $BSON$  is the set of all BSO-nets.  $\diamond$

Note that in BSO-nets, the upper-level acyclic nets are ‘line-like’ occurrence nets.

As before, what really matters is to identify in a BSA-net all the deterministic behaviours (scenarios).

**Definition 41 (scenario and maximal scenario of BSA-net).** Let  $bsan$  be a BSA-net as in Definition 33.

1. A scenario of  $bsan$  is a BSO-net  $bson = (lcsn, hcsn, \beta')$  such that:
  - (a)  $lcsn \in scenarios(lcsan)$  and  $hcsn \in scenarios(hcsan)$ .
  - (b)  $\beta' = \beta \cap (P_{lcsn} \times P_{hcsn})$ .
2. A maximal scenario of  $bsan$  is a scenario  $bson$  such that there is no scenario  $bson'$  satisfying  $T_{bson} \subset T_{bson'}$ .

Notation:  $scenarios(bsan)$  and  $maxscenarios(bsan)$  are respectively the sets of all scenarios and maximal scenarios of  $bsan$ .  $\diamond$

*Example 19.* Figure 8 depicts the only two maximal scenarios of the BSA-net in Figure 7.

## 14 Well-formed BSA-nets

The general definition of BSA-net given above does not guarantee that the step sequences of  $bsan$  cover all possible scenarios of the lower-level CSA-net. Indeed, in the extreme case, we can take  $hcsan$  which contains no transitions at all, and the resulting BSA-net generates then only the empty step sequence. It is therefore crucial to identify cases where  $bsan$  generates at least one step sequence for every scenario of  $lcsan$ . As a result, the definition of a well-formed BSA-net is more demanding than the definition of a well-formed CSA-net.

**Definition 42 (well-formed BSA-net).** A BSA-net  $bsan$  is well-formed if:

1.  $sseq(bsan) = \bigcup sseq(scenarios(bsan))$ .
2. For every scenario  $bson \in maxscenarios(bsan)$ , there is  $\sigma \in maxsseq(bsan)$  such that  $\sigma \upharpoonright_{T_{bson}} \in maxsseq(bson)$ .

Notation:  $WFBSAN$  is the set of all well-formed BSA-nets.  $\diamond$






Fig. 8. Maximal scenarios for the BSA-net in Figure 7.

### 15 Concluding remarks

This paper provides formalisation and basic properties for the nine classes of nets listed in the diagram below.

<i>backward &amp; forward det</i>	occurrence net	CSO-net	BSO-net
<i>backward det</i>	backward det acyclic net	BDCSA-net	BDBSA-net
<i>no restriction</i>	acyclic net	CSA-net	BSA-net

The following are some published works on the topics concerned with or related to the material presented above [16,23,8,22,19,18,15,21,20,13,9,5,17,2,1,6,4,10,7,3,12].

## References

1. M. Alahmadi. Master channel places for communication structured acyclic nets. In M. Köhler-Bussmeier, E. Kindler, and H. Rölke, editors, *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Petri Nets and Software Engineering 2021 co-located with the 42nd International Conference on Application and Theory of Petri Nets and Concurrency (PETRI NETS 2021), Paris, France, June 25th, 2021 (due to COVID-19: virtual conference)*, volume 2907 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, pages 233–240. CEUR-WS.org, 2021.
2. M. Alahmadi. Parametrisation of csa-nets. In M. Köhler-Bussmeier, D. Moldt, and H. Rölke, editors, *Petri Nets and Software Engineering 2022 co-located with the 43rd International Conference on Application and Theory of Petri Nets and Concurrency (PETRI NETS 2022), Bergen, Norway, June 20th, 2022*, volume 3170 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, pages 215–216. CEUR-WS.org, 2022.
3. M. Alahmadi. Parameterised csa-nets. In M. Köhler-Bussmeier, D. Moldt, and H. Rölke, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 International Workshop on Petri Nets and Software Engineering (PNSE 2023) co-located with the 44th International Conference on Application and Theory of Petri Nets and Concurrency (PETRI NETS 2023), June 27, 2023, Lisbon, Portugal*, volume 3430 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, pages 167–182. CEUR-WS.org, 2023.
4. S. Alharbi. Hierarchical simulation of timed behaviours of structured occurrence nets. In M. Köhler-Bussmeier, D. Moldt, and H. Rölke, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 International Workshop on Petri Nets and Software Engineering (PNSE 2023) co-located with the 44th International Conference on Application and Theory of Petri Nets and Concurrency (PETRI NETS 2023), June 27, 2023, Lisbon, Portugal*, volume 3430 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, pages 143–166. CEUR-WS.org, 2023.
5. T. Alharbi. *Analysing and visualizing big data sets of crime investigations using Structured Occurrence Nets*. PhD thesis, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, 2020.
6. N. Almutairi. Probabilistic communication structured acyclic nets. In M. Köhler-Bussmeier, D. Moldt, and H. Rölke, editors, *Petri Nets and Software Engineering 2022 co-located with the 43rd International Conference on Application and Theory of Petri Nets and Concurrency (PETRI NETS 2022), Bergen, Norway, June 20th, 2022*, volume 3170 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, pages 168–187. CEUR-WS.org, 2022.
7. N. Almutairi. Probabilistic behavioural acyclic nets. In M. Köhler-Bussmeier, D. Moldt, and H. Rölke, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 International Workshop on Petri Nets and Software Engineering (PNSE 2023) co-located with the 44th International Conference on Application and Theory of Petri Nets and Concurrency (PETRI NETS 2023), June 27, 2023, Lisbon, Portugal*, volume 3430 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*. CEUR-WS.org, 2023.
8. N. Almutairi and M. Koutny. Verification of communication structured acyclic nets using SAT. In M. Köhler-Bussmeier, E. Kindler, and H. Rölke, editors, *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Petri Nets and Software Engineering 2021 co-located with the 42nd International Conference on Application and Theory of Petri Nets and Concurrency (PETRI NETS 2021), Paris, France, June 25th, 2021 (due to COVID-19: virtual conference)*, volume 2907 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, pages 175–194. CEUR-WS.org, 2021.
9. T. Alshammari. Towards automatic extraction of events for SON modelling. In M. Köhler-Bussmeier, D. Moldt, and H. Rölke, editors, *Petri Nets and Software Engineering 2022 co-located with the 43rd International Conference on Application and Theory of Petri Nets and Concurrency (PETRI NETS 2022), Bergen, Norway, June 20th, 2022*, volume 3170 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, pages 188–201. CEUR-WS.org, 2022.

10. T. Alshammari. Integrating NLP and structured occurrence nets for crime modelling: A pattern-based approach. In M. Köhler-Bussmeier, D. Moldt, and H. Rölke, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 International Workshop on Petri Nets and Software Engineering (PNSE 2023) co-located with the 44th International Conference on Application and Theory of Petri Nets and Concurrency (PETRI NETS 2023), June 27, 2023, Lisbon, Portugal*, volume 3430 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*. CEUR-WS.org, 2023.
11. E. Best and R. R. Devillers. Sequential and concurrent behaviour in petri net theory. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 55(1):87–136, 1987.
12. A. Bhattacharyya and M. Koutny. Confusion-tolerant computation of probability in acyclic nets. *Trans. Petri Nets Other Model. Concurr.*, 17:212–245, 2023.
13. A. Bhattacharyya, B. Li, and B. Randell. Time in structured occurrence nets. In L. Cabac, L. M. Kristensen, and H. Rölke, editors, *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Petri Nets and Software Engineering 2016, Toruń, Poland, June 20-21, 2016*, volume 1591 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, pages 35–55. CEUR-WS.org, 2016.
14. R. Bruni, H. C. Melgratti, and U. Montanari. Concurrency and probability: Removing confusion, compositionally. *CoRR*, abs/1710.04570, 2017.
15. J. Kleijn and M. Koutny. Causality in structured occurrence nets. In C. B. Jones and J. L. Lloyd, editors, *Dependable and Historic Computing - Essays Dedicated to Brian Randell on the Occasion of His 75th Birthday*, volume 6875 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 283–297. Springer, 2011.
16. M. Koutny and B. Randell. Structured occurrence nets: A formalism for aiding system failure prevention and analysis techniques. *Fundam. Inform.*, 97(1-2):41–91, 2009.
17. B. Li. *Visualisation and Analysis of Complex Behaviours using Structured Occurrence Nets*. PhD thesis, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom, 2017.
18. B. Li, B. Randell, A. Bhattacharyya, T. Alharbi, and M. Koutny. Soncraft: A tool for construction, simulation, and analysis of structured occurrence nets. In *18th International Conference on Application of Concurrency to System Design, ACS D 2018, Bratislava, Slovakia, June 25-29, 2018*, pages 70–74. IEEE Computer Society, 2018.
19. P. Missier, B. Randell, and M. Koutny. Modelling provenance using structured occurrence networks. In P. Groth and J. Frew, editors, *Provenance and Annotation of Data and Processes - 4th International Provenance and Annotation Workshop, IPAW 2012, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, June 19-21, 2012, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 7525 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 183–197. Springer, 2012.
20. B. Randell. Occurrence nets then and now: The path to structured occurrence nets. In L. M. Kristensen and L. Petrucci, editors, *Applications and Theory of Petri Nets*, pages 1–16. Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
21. B. Randell. Incremental construction of structured occurrence nets. Technical Report 1384, School of Computing Science, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, 2013.
22. B. Randell and M. Koutny. Failures: Their definition, modelling and analysis. In C. B. Jones, Z. Liu, and J. Woodcock, editors, *Theoretical Aspects of Computing - ICTAC 2007, 4th International Colloquium, Macau, China, September 26-28, 2007, Proceedings*, volume 4711 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 260–274. Springer, 2007.
23. B. Randell and M. Koutny. Structured occurrence nets: Incomplete, contradictory and uncertain failure evidence. Technical Report 1170, School of Computing Science, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, 2009.