

On the Expressivity of Typed Concurrent Calculi

Joseph William Neal Paulus

August 16, 2024

(Full version, with appendices)

Typeset with L^AT_EX
Printed by Gildeprint
Cover designed by Jessica Moss
Copyright © Joseph Paulus, 2024

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Summary | 1 |
| Samenvatting (Summary in Dutch) | 3 |
| 1 Introduction | 5 |
| 1.1 Context and Research Question | 5 |
| 1.2 Background | 8 |
| 1.3 Approach | 12 |
| 1.3.1 Sequential Models: Resource λ -Calculi | 12 |
| 1.3.2 Concurrent Models: Session-Typed π -Calculi | 16 |
| 1.4 Outline of Contributions | 20 |
| 1.5 Associated Publications | 24 |
| 2 Non-Deterministic Functions as Non-Deterministic Processes | 27 |
| 2.1 Overview of Key Ideas | 30 |
| 2.2 λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} : A λ -calculus with Non-Determinism and Failure | 34 |
| 2.2.1 Syntax | 35 |
| 2.2.2 Reduction Semantics | 36 |
| 2.2.3 Well-formed λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} -Expressions | 41 |
| 2.3 A Resource Calculus With Sharing | 49 |
| 2.3.1 Syntax | 49 |
| 2.3.2 Reduction Semantics | 51 |
| 2.3.3 Non-Idempotent Intersection Types | 56 |
| 2.3.4 From λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} into $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ | 61 |
| 2.4 A Session-Typed Calculus | 64 |
| 2.4.1 Syntax and Semantics | 65 |
| 2.4.2 Operational Semantics | 66 |
| 2.4.3 Type System | 68 |
| 2.5 A Correct Encoding | 70 |
| 2.5.1 Encodability Criteria | 71 |
| 2.5.2 Correctness of $(\cdot)^{\circ}$ | 72 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 2.5.3 | From $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\ell}$ to $s\pi$ | 78 |
| 2.6 | A Motivating Example | 101 |
| 2.7 | Related Work | 103 |
| 2.8 | Concluding Remarks | 106 |
| 3 | Unrestricted Resources in Encoding Functions as Processes | 109 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 109 |
| 3.2 | Unrestricted Resources, Non-Determinism, and Failure | 112 |
| 3.3 | Intersection Types | 121 |
| 3.4 | A Translation into Processes | 127 |
| 3.4.1 | Session-Typed Calculus | 127 |
| 3.4.2 | An Auxiliary Calculus With Sharing | 130 |
| 3.4.3 | First Step | 132 |
| 3.4.4 | Second Step | 133 |
| 3.4.5 | A Motivating Example | 141 |
| 3.5 | Concluding Remarks | 142 |
| 4 | Typed Non-determinism in Functional and Concurrent Calculi | 145 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 145 |
| 4.2 | A Typed π -calculus with Non-deterministic Choice | 148 |
| 4.2.1 | Syntax and Semantics | 148 |
| 4.2.2 | Resource Control for $s\pi^+$ via Session Types | 154 |
| 4.3 | A Non-deterministic Resource λ -calculus | 157 |
| 4.3.1 | Syntax and Reduction Semantics | 157 |
| 4.3.2 | Resource Control for $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}^{\ell}$ via Intersection Types | 159 |
| 4.4 | A Typed Translation of $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}^{\ell}$ into $s\pi^+$ | 161 |
| 4.5 | Summary and Related Work | 165 |
| 5 | Termination in Concurrency, Revisited | 167 |
| 5.1 | Introduction | 167 |
| 5.2 | The Class \mathcal{S} of Session Processes | 170 |
| 5.2.1 | The Process Model $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ | 170 |
| 5.2.2 | Session Types | 171 |
| 5.3 | A Weight-based Approach to Terminating Processes | 176 |
| 5.3.1 | Processes | 176 |
| 5.3.2 | Types | 177 |
| 5.3.3 | Termination by Typing | 181 |
| 5.4 | \mathcal{W} : A Class of Terminating Processes | 182 |
| 5.4.1 | The Typed Translation | 183 |
| 5.4.2 | Results | 187 |
| 5.5 | Propositions as Sessions | 187 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 5.6 | \mathcal{L} : A Class of Terminating Processes | 189 |
| 5.6.1 | The Typed Translation | 192 |
| 5.6.2 | Results | 197 |
| 5.7 | Closing Remarks | 198 |
| 6 | Conclusions | 201 |
| | Bibliography | 205 |
| A | Appendix of Chapter 2 | 213 |
| A.1 | Appendix to § 2.2.3 | 213 |
| A.2 | Appendix to § 2.3.3 | 220 |
| A.3 | Appendix to § 2.5.2 | 230 |
| A.3.1 | Encoding $(\cdot)^\bullet$ | 230 |
| A.3.2 | Completeness and Soundness | 237 |
| A.3.3 | Success Sensitiveness | 246 |
| A.4 | Appendix to § 2.5.3 | 248 |
| A.4.1 | Type Preservation | 248 |
| A.4.2 | Completeness and Soundness | 256 |
| A.4.3 | Success Sensitiveness | 269 |
| B | Appendix of Chapter 3 | 273 |
| B.1 | Appendix to § 3.2 | 273 |
| B.1.1 | Diamond Property for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{1/2}$ | 273 |
| B.2 | Appendix to § 3.3 | 273 |
| B.2.1 | Examples | 279 |
| B.3 | Appendix to § 3.4.1 | 280 |
| B.4 | Appendix to § 3.4.2 | 281 |
| B.4.1 | Well-formedness rules for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{1/2}$ | 284 |
| B.5 | Appendix to § 3.4.3 | 291 |
| B.5.1 | Encodability Criteria | 291 |
| B.5.2 | Correctness of $(\cdot)^\circ$ | 292 |
| B.5.3 | Success Sensitiveness of $(\cdot)^\circ$ | 300 |
| B.6 | Appendix to § 3.4.4 | 302 |
| B.6.1 | Type Preservation | 302 |
| B.6.2 | Operational Correspondence: Completeness and Soundness | 314 |
| B.6.3 | Success Sensitiveness of $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^{1/2}$ | 330 |
| C | Appendix of Chapter 4 | 333 |
| C.1 | Full $\text{st}\pi^+$: Replicated Servers and Clients | 333 |
| C.2 | An Alternative Eager Semantics for $\text{st}\pi^+$ | 334 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| C.3 | Beyond Linear Resources | 338 |
| C.4 | Extensions in Detail: Eager Semantics and Unrestricted Resources | 340 |
| C.4.1 | λ_C : An Extension of λ_C^l with Unrestricted Bags | 340 |
| C.4.2 | Translating λ_C into (Full) $s\pi^+$ | 342 |
| C.5 | Proofs of Type Preservation and Deadlock-freedom for (Full) $s\pi^+$ | 344 |
| C.5.1 | Eager Semantics | 344 |
| C.5.2 | Lazy Semantics | 354 |
| C.6 | Proofs of Subject Reduction and Subject Expansion for λ_C | 360 |
| C.6.1 | Subject Reduction | 361 |
| C.6.2 | Subject Expansion | 366 |
| C.7 | Proof of Tight Correctness of the Translation under the Lazy Semantics | 372 |
| C.7.1 | Type Preservation | 372 |
| C.7.2 | Completeness | 381 |
| C.7.3 | Soundness | 387 |
| C.7.4 | Success Sensitivity | 399 |
| C.8 | Proof of Loose Correctness of the Translation under the Eager Semantics | 401 |
| C.8.1 | Completeness | 401 |
| C.8.2 | Soundness | 406 |
| C.8.3 | Success Sensitivity | 418 |
| C.9 | Proof of Separation of Lazy and Eager Semantics | 419 |
| D | Appendix of Chapter 5 | 421 |
| D.1 | Proofs of Section 5.3 | 421 |
| D.2 | Proofs of Section 5.4 | 422 |
| D.3 | Proofs of Section 5.6 | 429 |
| D.3.1 | Proving that linear logic typing induces levels | 436 |
| D.3.2 | Proof for Theorem 5.10 | 492 |
| D.4 | Operational Correspondence | 495 |

Summary

This thesis embarks on a comprehensive exploration of formal computational models that underlie typed programming languages. We focus on programming calculi, both functional (sequential) and concurrent, as they provide a compelling rigorous framework for evaluating program semantics and for developing analyses and program verification techniques.

More concretely, this thesis addresses the following research question: *how exactly does interactive behavior generalize sequential computation?* We seek to gauge the expressivity of the π -calculus—the paradigmatic calculus of concurrency and interaction—with respect to sequential computation as captured by the λ -calculus. Building upon Milner’s seminal work on ‘functions as processes’, our approach contrasts these two fundamental computational models via *correct translations*, which formally explain how sequential terms in λ can be codified into concurrent processes in π . The main novelty is the use of *behavioral types*, advanced type systems for terms (in λ) and processes (in π), to define the calculi, establish the properties of typed terms/processes, and to prove the correctness of our translations.

We delve into our research question along several dimensions. First, we consider *non-deterministic* computations, whereby reductions may have branching behaviors. Non-determinism brings flexibility and generality in specifications; it may be *confluent* or *non-confluent*: in the former case, reductions may be independent taken within alternative branches, in a non-committal way; in the latter case committing to one branch discards other alternatives. As another dimension, we also consider *resource-aware* computation whereby resources are *linear* (usable exactly once) or *unrestricted* (usable zero or many times). In turn, resource-awareness paves the way to a principled, explicit treatment of *failures* in computations, which may occur when there is a lack or excess of resources or when they are misused.

One key insight is that *intersection types* in the λ -calculus can precisely specify quantitative information of a term as it evolves through computation. By providing tight, type-preserving translations between intersection types (in λ) and session types (in π) we provide an original connection between these two important and widely-studied type disciplines along the dimensions of interest. Finally, we contrast models of sequential and concurrent computation by considering type systems

for concurrency that guarantee *termination* (strong normalization): this is a well-studied and fundamental property for sequential computation models, which is actively studied in the concurrent setting.

Samenvatting

Deze scriptie begint aan een uitgebreide verkenning van formele computationele modellen die ten grondslag liggen aan getypeerde programmeertalen. We richten ons op programmeercalculi, zowel functioneel (sequentieel) als concurrent, omdat zij een overtuigend rigoureuus kader bieden voor het evalueren van programmamantiek en voor het ontwikkelen van analyses en programmaverificatie.

Concreter richt deze scriptie zich op de volgende onderzoeksvraag: *hoe generaliseert interactief gedrag precies sequentiële berekening?* We proberen de expressiviteit van de π -calculus—de paradigmatische calculus van gelijktijdigheid en interactie—te meten met betrekking tot de sequentiële berekening zoals vastgelegd door de λ -calculus. Voortbouwend op Milner's baanbrekende werk over 'functies als processen', contrasteert onze benadering deze twee fundamentele computationele modellen via *correcte vertalingen*, die formeel uitleggen hoe sequentiële termen in λ kunnen worden gecodificeerd in gelijktijdige processen in π . Onze belangrijkste bijdrage is het gebruik van *gedragstypes*, geavanceerde typesystemen voor termen (in λ) en processen (in π), om de calculi te definiëren, de eigenschappen van getypeerde termen/processen vast te stellen en om de correctheid van onze vertalingen te bewijzen.

We benaderen deze onderzoeksvraag vanuit verschillende dimensies. Ten eerste beschouwen we *niet-deterministische* berekeningen, waarbij reducties vertakkingsgedrag kunnen vertonen. Niet-determinisme brengt flexibiliteit en algemeenheid in specificaties; het kan *confluent* of *niet-confluent* zijn: in het eerste geval kunnen reducties onafhankelijk binnen alternatieve vertakkingen worden genomen, op een niet-committerende manier; in het laatste geval sluit het kiezen voor een vertakking andere alternatieven uit. Als een andere dimensie beschouwen we ook *resourcebewuste* berekeningen waarbij bronnen *lineair* (exact één keer bruikbaar) of *onbeperkt* (nul of meerdere keren bruikbaar) zijn. Resource-bewustzijn maakt op zijn beurt de weg vrij voor een principiële, expliciete behandeling van *fouten* in berekeningen, die kunnen optreden wanneer er een tekort of overschot aan middelen is of wanneer ze verkeerd worden gebruikt.

Een belangrijk inzicht is dat *intersectietypes* in de λ -calculus kwantitatieve informatie van een term nauwkeurig kunnen specificeren naarmate deze door de be-

rekening evolueert. Door strakke, type-behoudende vertalingen te bieden tussen intersectietypes (in λ) en sessietypes (in π) leggen we een originele verbinding tussen deze twee belangrijke en veel bestudeerde typedisciplines langs de genoemde dimensies. Ten slotte contrasteren we modellen van sequentiële en gelijktijdige berekening door typesystemen voor gelijktijdigheid te beschouwen die *terminatie* garanderen (sterke normalisatie): dit is een goed bestudeerde en fundamentele eigenschap voor sequentiële berekeningsmodellen, die actief wordt bestudeerd in de gelijktijdige setting.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Context and Research Question

This thesis embarks on a comprehensive exploration of formal computational models that underlie typed programming languages. We focus on functional programming calculi with concurrency, as they provide a compelling rigorous framework for evaluating program semantics and for developing analyses and program verification techniques.

Alonzo Church's λ -calculus is the most significant model for sequential computing; a long-standing and firm basis for program development and verification, particularly within the functional paradigm. On the concurrent side, our investigation centers on the π -calculus by Robin Milner, Joachim Parrow, and David Walker (Milner et al. (1992)). The π -calculus is widely accepted to be the paradigmatic model for interactive computation. This computational model transcends the expressivity of traditional input-output behaviors by modelling interactions through *message passing*; this offers a flexible yet rigorous framework for expressing and reasoning about programming constructs in higher-order, functional, and object-oriented paradigms.

Contrasting sequential computation in the λ -calculus and interactive behaviour as present in the π -calculus is a natural question of great significance. The first formal comparison is due to Milner himself (Milner (1992)), who showed that the π -calculus subsumes functional behaviors in the λ -calculus. More precisely, by giving a *translation* (or *encoding*) of terms in λ into processes in π , Milner showed that λ -calculus describes a specific class of well-behaved interactions, whereas processes may exhibit more diverse and fine-grained computational phenomena.

Milner's seminal work on *functions-as-processes* was developed in the *untyped* setting, adopting untyped formulations of both the λ -calculus (with different reduction strategies) and the π -calculus. Later on, as type systems for the π -calculus

started to emerge, this line of work was extended to consider *typed* languages, thus showing how well-typed terms in λ can be codified by well-typed processes in π . Adding types is useful, in particular to establish the correctness properties of the translation; it is also insightful, as types provide an abstract yet complementary perspective on the fundamental connections between sequential and concurrent computation.

Explored by a number of authors in the last decades, the line of work on ‘functions-as-processes’ is motivated by the question: *how exactly does interactive behaviour generalize sequential computation?* In this thesis, we continue this line of work, and extend it significantly by exploring two *dimensions* not studied until now. As we explain next, the first dimension concerns *phenomena and properties* relevant across sequential and concurrent programming models; the second dimension concerns different (*behavioral*) *type systems* that statically enforce them.

Phenomena and Properties We consider three relevant and intertwined aspects:

- First, *non-determinism* is an important phenomenon across computational models. Non-determinism (and non-deterministic choice) is intrinsically tied to the specification and analysis of concurrent programs; it is also relevant in the sequential setting. One may distinguish between *confluent* and *non-confluent* forms of non-determinism. In the latter formulation, selecting one of the branches discards the rest; in the former, the different branches may coexist independently. Both formulations have different merits; the distinction between the two is related to different forms of *commitment* expressible in specifications.
- We also investigate forms of *resource control* between the two paradigms. In λ , the resources are the terms to which functions can be applied; in π , the resources are the channels (or *names*) on which interactions may occur. In either case, following Girard’s *linear logic*, a resource can be either *linear* (usable exactly once) or *unrestricted* (usable zero or infinite times). This classification immediately gives computational steps a quantitative dimension. Moreover, such a detailed accounting of computational entities is naturally related to *failures*, which, informally speaking, arise when resources are not used as intended, as in, e.g., a process that uses a linear channel twice.
- Finally, we study *termination* (also known as *strong normalization*). Termination is a cornerstone of sequential programming models: a term is terminating if all its reduction sequences are finite. Termination is also an important property in concurrency in general, and in message-passing programs in particular. In such a setting, infinite sequences of internal steps are rather undesirable,

as they could jeopardize the reliable interaction between a process and its environment.

Type Systems As famously stated by Milner, “well-typed programs cannot go wrong” (Milner (1978)). Indeed, typing enforces computations to be “well behaved”; the way in which typing systems induce or restrict behaviors has been extensively studied. Here we study two distinct, sophisticated typing disciplines.

- On the sequential side, we consider *intersection types*, which offer a fruitful perspective at resource-awareness (see, e.g., Gardner (1994); Kfoury (2000); Kfoury & Wells (2004); Neergaard & Mairson (2004); Bucciarelli et al. (2017)). By now, intersection types have consolidated into a well-established type discipline for functional languages, but also for concurrent models (see, e.g., Bono & Dezani-Ciancaglini (2020) for a survey). In particular, we adopt *non-idempotent* intersection types, which offer a convenient tool for tracking resources, as the lack of idempotency intuitively enables us to “count” available resources.
- On the concurrent side, we consider *session types* (Honda (1993); Honda et al. (1998a)), which (statically) enforce communication correctness in message-passing programs by organizing their interactions into structures called *sessions*. In particular, we are interested in formulations derived the *Curry-Howard correspondence* between session types and linear logic (Caires & Pfenning (2010); Wadler (2012)). In a nutshell, this correspondence defines a solid bridge in three layers:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \textit{linear logic propositions} & \textit{as} & \textit{session types} \\ & \textit{proofs} & \textit{as} & \textit{message-passing processes} \\ \textit{proof normalization} & \textit{as} & \textit{process communication} \end{array}$$

Due to its deep logical foundations, this correspondence ensures key properties for processes, in particular *deadlock-freedom* (processes do not get stuck) and termination / strong normalization.

Intersection types and session types can be considered as *behavioural*, in the sense that their influence on computation surely goes beyond than that of simple types for λ and π , respectively. As we will see, the developments on ‘functions-as-processes’ enable us to connect intersection types and session types in a brand new light.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket x \rrbracket_u &= \bar{x}(u).\mathbf{0} \\
\llbracket \lambda x.M \rrbracket_u &= u(x).u(v).\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \\
\llbracket MN \rrbracket_u &= (v\nu)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \mid \bar{v}(x).\bar{v}(u).\llbracket N \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket x := M \rrbracket &= !x(w).\llbracket M \rrbracket_w
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 1.1: Translation of λ into π as first presented by Milner (1992)

Research Question Clearly, these two dimensions (these being type systems and phenomena/properties) are related to each other, in the sense that type systems enforce the declared properties and provide consistency for the intended phenomena. The interplay between the two highlights the breadth of our study and the need for precise comparisons between the sequential and concurrent paradigms. This discussion brings us to the *research question* addressed in this thesis:

Can we relate formal models of sequential computation and interactive behaviors, both governed by behavioural types, considering phenomena little considered so far, such as *non-determinism* and *failures*, while accounting with essential properties such as *deadlock-freedom*, *confluence*, and *termination (strong normalization)*?

Before elaborating further on our approach to this research questions and on the contributions of this thesis, we find it useful to introduce some technical background on ‘functions-as-processes’ as well as essential notions on translation correctness.

1.2 Background

We start by giving a high-level presentation of the functions-as-processes approach pioneered by Milner (1992), who considers the λ -calculus with two different reduction strategies (the lazy λ -calculus and the call-by-value λ -calculus) and a very simple π -calculus, which is sufficient for modelling standard sequential behaviors.

The translation is defined inductively on the structure of terms; it is denoted $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u$, where u denotes a channel on which the behaviour of a translated term will be provided. The translation consists of four parts; we explain the π -calculus notation as we go:

- A variable x is translated as the process $\bar{x}(u).\mathbf{0}$, i.e., an output action on x in which u is communicated, followed by the inactive process.
- An abstraction $\lambda x.M$ is translated by the process $u(x).u(v).\llbracket M \rrbracket_v$, i.e., two consecutive inputs on u precede (i.e., block) the translation of M . The first input receives a reference to the parameter x , whereas the second receives v ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\lambda x.x)N \longrightarrow_{\lambda} N \\
\llbracket (\lambda x.x)N \rrbracket_u &= (\nu v)(v(x).v(w).\bar{x}(w).\mathbf{0} \mid \bar{v}(x).\bar{v}(u).\llbracket x := N \rrbracket) \\
&\longrightarrow_{\pi} (\nu v)(\nu x)(v(w).\bar{x}(w).\mathbf{0} \mid \bar{v}(u).\llbracket x := N \rrbracket) \\
&\longrightarrow_{\pi} (\nu v)(\nu x)(\bar{x}(u).\mathbf{0} \mid \llbracket x := N \rrbracket) \\
&= (\nu v)(\nu x)(\bar{x}(u).\mathbf{0} \mid !x(w).\llbracket N \rrbracket_w) \\
&\longrightarrow_{\pi} (\nu v)(\nu x)(\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \mid !x(w).\llbracket N \rrbracket_w) \\
&\sim \llbracket N \rrbracket_u \tag{*}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 1.2: Example reduction from Milner (1992)

a reference to the argument of the function; both x and v are bound to process $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v$.

- The translation of MN is interesting because it shows how functional application is assimilated to process synchronisation: the resulting process is $(\nu v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \mid \bar{v}(x).\bar{v}(u).\llbracket x := N \rrbracket)$, which represents the parallel execution of the translations of the function M and its argument N . Actually, N is not immediately enabled, but is embedded in a so-called *environment* $x := M$, which is blocked by two outputs that will synchronize with the inputs in the translation of abstraction.
- The translation of $x := M$ is the process $!x(w).\llbracket M \rrbracket_w$, which denotes a replicated server, able to provide copies of process $\llbracket M \rrbracket_w$ upon output requests on channel x . Intuitively, a server is appropriate in order to provide arguments for the multiple occurrences (possibly zero) of a variable parameter in an abstraction's body.

To further illustrate how the translation uses fine-grained synchronization in names to represent β -reduction, Milner gives the example shown in Figure 1.2, where we use $\longrightarrow_{\lambda}$ and \longrightarrow_{π} to denote reduction in each language.

As the figure shows, input and output actions synchronise across the same channel, as in a handshake, sending and receiving references between each other. The relation \sim denotes a binary relation on processes (a combination of structural congruence and behavioural equivalence), which acts as a ‘garbage-collector’: it allows us to abstract away from the replicated server (which can no longer be invoked). Overall, this example provides evidence to the fact that the translation induces a strong form of *operational correspondence* between terms and processes.

Having translations such as Milner’s is significant for several reasons. Besides their conceptual merit, they allow us to transfer results across different paradigms. A salient example is the work of Sangiorgi (1993), who showed how behavioral equivalences for λ -terms can be studied in terms of behavioral equivalences defined for processes, leveraging the translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u$ given above.

The results in Milner (1992) led to a fruitful avenue of research in the formal comparison of sequential and concurrent calculi. As mentioned above, Milner’s translation was in the untyped setting, and developed well before the appearance of several key ingredients in this thesis, namely: (i) the emergence of rich type disciplines for the π -calculus; (ii) the discovery of a *Curry-Howard correspondence* for concurrency; and (iii) the development of criteria and techniques for the study of *correct translations*.

It is insightful to briefly elaborate on (ii) and (iii) above. Given the Curry-Howard correspondence for concurrency, the next meaningful step in extending the relationship between concurrent and sequential models comes from the viewpoint of logic. This begs the question: can one encode the Curry-Howard interpretation of the λ -calculus into the Curry-Howard interpretation of the π -calculus? This question is addressed by the work of Toninho et al. (2012), who show that proof-theoretical principles induce logically motivated translations of well-typed terms into well-typed processes. Not only are terms translated but also types themselves are transformed. Their methodology involves first giving a translation from the λ -calculus into the linear λ -calculus, a stepping stone towards a translation into the session-typed π -calculus. This second translation turns out to be very much related to that in Milner (1992).

A natural question at this point is how to assess the correctness of translations such as Milner’s. What methods do we use to ensure that translations between languages are non-trivial or meaningful? In fact, the possibility of transferring techniques between languages hinges very much on such a form of correctness. This question underpins the notion of *relative expressiveness*, a much-studied topic in Concurrency Theory. In this respect, a widely adopted proposal is the set of correctness criteria identified by Gorla (2010). In a nutshell, this proposal allows us to argue for the correctness of translations and to reason about relations of expressive power between a *source language* (such as λ) and a *target language* (such as π) connected by a given translation.

Because translation and their correctness constitute a recurring topic in this thesis, we dwell upon the definitions of different *correctness criteria*. To describe them, we must define languages and translations:

Definition 1.1 Language

A language \mathcal{L}_1 is a triple $(\mathcal{P}_1, \rightarrow_1, \simeq_1)$, where:

- \mathcal{P}_1 represents the set of terms (or processes) of the language (its syntax);
- $\rightarrow_1 \subset \mathcal{P}_1^2$ represents the operational semantics of the language (typically, a reduction relation)s;
- $\simeq_1 \subset \mathcal{P}_1^2$ is an equivalence relation.

Moreover, \rightarrow^* represents the reflexive, transitive closure of \rightarrow_1 ; also, $P \rightarrow_1^\omega$ means that there exists an infinite number of transitions emanating from P . \square

Definition 1.2 Translation

Given a source language \mathcal{L}_S and a target language \mathcal{L}_T , a translation from \mathcal{L}_S to \mathcal{L}_T is a function of the form $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket : \mathcal{P}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_T$. \square

We shall be interested in *correct* translations, i.e., translations $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ that satisfy certain criteria that attest to their quality. Following Gorla, we consider all of the following criteria:

- **Compositionality:** We say $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ is compositional when the translation of a composite term is defined in by composing the translation of its sub-terms. In process calculi, a classic instance of this criterion arises in the homomorphic treatment of parallel composition, i.e., $\llbracket P \mid Q \rrbracket = \llbracket P \rrbracket \mid \llbracket Q \rrbracket$. As we have seen, translations from sequential to concurrent programming models usually translate an application MN as a process involving the parallel composition of $\llbracket M \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket N \rrbracket$. Intuitively, compositionality ensures that actors interacting with the term do not influence the translation of the term itself.
- **Operational Correspondence:** This criterion ensures that the translation preserves and reflect the behavior of source terms. It is divided into *completeness* and *soundness* requirements.
 - Completeness says that all reductions in the source language are respected by the translated term. That is, $\forall S \in \mathcal{P}_S$ such that $S \rightarrow_S^* S'$ then $\exists T \in \mathcal{P}_T$ with $\llbracket S \rrbracket \rightarrow_T^* T \wedge \llbracket S' \rrbracket \simeq_T T$.
 - Soundness says that the translation does not introduce reductions not already present in the source language. That is, $\forall S \in \mathcal{P}_S \wedge T \in \mathcal{P}_T$ such that $\llbracket S \rrbracket \rightarrow_T^* T$ then $\exists S' \in \mathcal{P}_S$ with $S \rightarrow_S^* S' \wedge \llbracket S' \rrbracket \simeq_T T$.
Often, operational soundness is too strict as the target language may not match source reductions with a one-to-one correspondence and rather needs multiple reduction steps to simulate the given source behavior.
- **Name Invariance:** This criterion ensures that the translation is not dependent of a specific choice of free names/variables. This allows for operations such as α -conversion to not interfere with the intended behaviour of the translation.
- **Divergence Reflection:** This criterion ensures that the translation does not introduce divergence behaviour. That is, divergence behavior emanating from translated terms correspond to divergent behavior already present in the source term. More precisely: $\forall P \in \mathcal{P}_S. \llbracket P \rrbracket \rightarrow_T^\omega \implies P \rightarrow_S^\omega$.

- **Success Sensitiveness:** This criterion presupposes that \mathcal{L}_S and \mathcal{L}_T are both equipped with an abstract notion of success, denoted \checkmark . The criterion ensures that a source term reduces in multiple steps to \checkmark if and only if its corresponding translation does the same. This condition is closed under reductions.

The literature on relative expressiveness has sometimes considered *full abstraction* as another correctness criterion for translations. This requirement ensures that $P \approx_S Q$ if and only if $\llbracket P \rrbracket \approx_T \llbracket Q \rrbracket$. Full abstraction is significant, as it allows to transfer reasoning techniques between source and target languages. However, as [Gorla & Nestmann \(2016\)](#) convincingly explain, it does not represent a good criterion for assessing the quality of translations. For this reason, we do not consider it in our developments.

To close this section, we mention that the state of the art on the relation between sequential computation in λ and concurrent programming in π is arguably given by the work of [Toninho & Yoshida \(2018\)](#). They present a type-preserving translation from a linear variant of System F (Linear-F) into a polymorphic session-typed π -calculus first studied by [Berger et al. \(2005\)](#). Surprisingly, a translation in the reverse direction is also given. Their translation enjoys full abstraction for relevant typed congruences in λ and π , respectively. Their work does not consider non-determinism, confluence, and failures in the sense described above.

1.3 Approach

Having covered essential background material, here we discuss selected aspects of the approach that we adopt to address the research question stated at the end of Section 1.1. We divide our presentation along sequential and concurrent programming models, highlighting novelties and paving the way to the outline of contributions to be given in Section 1.4.

1.3.1 Sequential Models: Resource λ -Calculi

As already said, we consider *resource λ -calculi*. A key idea in these calculi is that applications are generalized to terms of the form MB , where the argument B is a *resource* of possibly limited availability. Resources can be linear or unrestricted; non-determinism (confluent and non-confluent) and failures arise from the (mis)use of these resources during computations. These notions of resource control and non-determinism come from a number of works in the literature, including [Boudol \(1993\)](#); [Boudol & Laneve \(2000\)](#); [Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca \(2010\)](#); [Dominici et al. \(2012\)](#).

Non-Determinism and Explicit Failure In resource λ -calculi there are three syntactic categories: terms, bags, and expressions. We have applications of the form MB , where B denotes a finite *bag* of resources (terms); non-determinism arises from the *fetching* of a term from B . That is, in reducing the redex $(\lambda x.M)B$ a resource N_i is “fetched” from B and substituted into an occurrence of x in M . Crucially, this fetch operation is non-deterministic: the selection of the resource from B to be used induces non-deterministic behavior.

In this setting, reductions may fail, depending on the nature of the resource. A linear failure arises when there is a mismatch between required and available (linear) resources; that is, because linear resources must be completely consumed during computation, an excess or lack of these resources is deemed undesirable. An unrestricted failure arises when a specific (unrestricted) resource is not available. In either case, failure is *explicit*, as is expressed by a term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$, where \tilde{x} denotes a sequence of variables—intuitively, these are the variables involved in the failed computation.

Resources. As we have seen, resources play a key role: they are the source of non-deterministic behavior but can also trigger failures. Computations can only be considered to be successful when the available linear resources match exactly the occurrences of variables consuming them. In the case of purely linear resources, our treatment of bags (and the associated notion of substitution) follows closely previous work by Boudol (1993); Boudol & Laneve (2000); Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010). More precisely, we adopt a weak/lazy reduction semantics, which only substitutes resources when the head variable of a term may be substituted. This reduction strategy closely matches the corresponding translation in the π -calculus, which allows us to obtain direct operational correspondence results.

To illustrate our semantics, consider the identity function $\lambda x.x$ applied to a bag containing only a term N ; this bag is denoted $\uparrow N \downarrow$. In our calculi, rather than evaluating the redex via the (usual) β -reduction $(\lambda x.x) \uparrow N \downarrow \longrightarrow N$ (as in Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010); Dominici et al. (2012)), we first perform a weak β -reduction, which leads to a term with an *explicit substitution*, namely $x \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle$. Clearly, here there is no mismatch in resources: the abstraction contains a single occurrence of x and the bag contains only the linear resource N . Therefore, the reduction is successful.

In the case of unrestricted resources, we adopt a strategy that allows us to express more fine-grained resource control than prior work. We start with a simple example. Consider the following terms expressible in previous literature:

$$(\lambda x.M \uparrow x^! \downarrow) \uparrow N \downarrow$$

Here we have an abstraction on x with an unrestricted occurrence of x within a bag. This term is being applied to a bag containing the linear resource N . As such, N

must be used exactly once; however the above term says that N may be substituted into an unrestricted bag and be arbitrarily used. This not only breaks the intended linearity of N but also makes failure difficult to track, as we can no longer predict resource behaviour. One solution presented by [Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca \(2010\)](#) and [Dominici et al. \(2012\)](#) is the following: when N is substituted into the unrestricted bag, a new linear resource is spawned so that N is substituted into the freshly spawned (linear) copy. This changes the behaviour of the bag λx within the term $M \lambda x$ from being used arbitrarily many times to being used *at least once*.

We choose to distinguish between *linear* and *unrestricted* resources, at both the bag and the variable level. Bags are composed of two parts, one linear and the other unrestricted. This design choice allows us to easily split the bag syntactically. Variables denote the type of resource they expect to consume, which is beneficial for two reasons. First, we may count linear occurrences; second, we can enforce linearity by typing by disallowing linear occurrences of variables in unrestricted behaviours. As mentioned above, considering unrestricted resources entails an additional source of failure, i.e., when a variable must be substituted with an unrestricted resource and no such resource is available.

In line with this design, we also formulate a separation at the level of explicit substitutions. We consider both linear and unrestricted explicit substitutions in the syntax of terms; this is different from the formulation of [Boudol \(1993\)](#); [Boudol & Laneve \(2000\)](#), where a single construct for explicit substitution handles both linear and unrestricted resources.

Two Flavors of Non-determinism. Non-determinism is prevalent in many models of computation, allowing for richer and more expressive forms of computation. In the resource λ -calculus, non-determinism arises when a resource is fetched from the bag. As we reduce lazily, this non-deterministic choice is made when we have an explicit substitution that acts on a variable and such a variable is at the head of the term.

We consider both confluent and non-confluent formulations of non-determinism. To elaborate on this distinction, let us consider purely linear resources, so that non-deterministic behaviour is only due to the fetching of linear resources. Consider a term $M \langle \langle M_1, M_2 \rangle / x \rangle$, where M has two linear occurrences of x , one of these being the head variable x . A linear *explicit substitution* on x acts on M , involving the linear bag containing M_1 and M_2 . (We write $M \{M_1/x\}$ to denote the usual (head) substitution of M_1 for x in M .)

- The *confluent* formulation of non-deterministic fetching enables the following reduction:

$$M \langle \langle M_1, M_2 \rangle / x \rangle \longrightarrow M \{M_1/x\} \langle \langle M_2 \rangle / x \rangle + M \{M_2/x\} \langle \langle M_1 \rangle / x \rangle$$

That is, the term reduces to an *expression*, consisting of a nondeterministic sum of the two possibilities, i.e., to substitute M_1 and leave M_2 in the bag (left branch) and to substitute M_2 and leave M_1 in the bag (right branch). This reduction dictates a choice of resources being substituted, similarly to the reductions given in prior works (Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010); Dominici et al. (2012)).

- The *non-confluent* formulation of fetching is as follows:

$$M\langle\langle\{M_1, M_2\}/x\rangle\rangle \begin{array}{l} \nearrow M\{\{M_1/x\}\}\langle\langle\{M_2\}/x\rangle\rangle \\ \searrow M\{\{M_2/x\}\}\langle\langle\{M_1\}/x\rangle\rangle \end{array}$$

That is, the reduction of the term expresses commitment: choosing one between M_1 and M_2 entails discarding the other branches, similarly to the reductions given in Boudol (1993); Boudol & Laneve (2000).

What we have discussed thus far can be considered as an *implicit* non-deterministic choice, as it is induced by the fetching of resources. There is also an *explicit* non-deterministic operator, denoted ‘+’, present at the level of expressions, denoting an explicit choice between terms—such an operator is also present in the languages in Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010); Dominici et al. (2012).

It follows naturally from the previous discussion that reductions may be confluent or non-confluent. In the confluent setting, we obtain the expected *diamond property*, illustrated below (left-hand side). It allows terms to reduce independently within non-deterministic branches, ensuring that we are not discarding not manipulating choices within other branches. This property is strong and also convenient when considering operational correspondence properties. In contrast, in the non-confluent setting we obtain the situation illustrated in the right-hand side, which is the typical form of non-determinism in process calculi:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & M' + N & \\ & \nearrow \quad \searrow & \\ M + N & & M' + N' \\ & \searrow \quad \nearrow & \\ & M + N' & \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} & & M' \\ & & \nearrow \\ M + N & & \\ & & \searrow \\ & & N' \end{array}$$

Failure and Typing As we have discussed, a central question is how failure arises and how it relates to linearity. In some prior works (Boudol (1993); Boudol & Laneve (2000)), failure only arises when there is no resource to be fetched, a situation referred to as a “deadlock”. Still, the failure is not explicitly expressed syntactically.

Also, because in those works linear resources are to be used *at most once*, failure cannot arise if there is an excess of linear resources.

In some other works, in particular the framework in [Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca \(2010\)](#), failure is present via a term ‘0’, which denotes a neutral element. As hinted at before, here we explicitly incorporate within the syntax of terms. We follow the approach to failure in [Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca \(2010\)](#) by decreeing that linear resources must be used exactly once. Similarly, both ours and their approach to failure is consuming, in the sense that all computation in a non-deterministic branch is disappears when failure arises.

There is a difference, however: the failure term in [Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca \(2010\)](#) does not preserve linearity, as variables are discarded. In our failure term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$, the multiset \tilde{x} retains the linear variables that are captured by failure. For example $(\lambda x.x \wr x)1 \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{x,x}$ denotes a redex in our calculus, in which two linear occurrences of x cannot be substituted as the (linear) bag is empty. As there is a mismatch in resources the term fails, and the two linear occurrences of x are preserved.

Using intersection types for typing of terms, bags and expressions is a common approach the literature; see, e.g., [Boudol \(1993\)](#); [Boudol & Laneve \(1996\)](#); [Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca \(2010\)](#) and the related differential λ -calculus of [Ehrhard & Regnier \(2003\)](#). We use non-idempotent intersection types as they match structurally to resources; also, intersection types are *quantitative* in the sense we may infer the number of occurrences of a variable (or the size of a linear bag) via its type.

The status of the failure term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ with respect to typing deserves explanation. As we express failure explicitly at the syntax level, it is reasonable to assume that failure should somehow be typable. To account for this, our design consists of two systems: we use intersection types to define both *well-typed* terms and *well-formed* terms. Our definition of well-typedness disallows failure, i.e., if M is well-typed then $M \neq \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$. In contrast, well-formedness admits the failure term and assigns it an arbitrary type. In other words, $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ is not well-typed, but it is well-formed.

1.3.2 Concurrent Models: Session-Typed π -Calculi

Interactions in concurrency are intrinsically non-deterministic. Accordingly, non-determinism (and non-deterministic choice) plays an important role in formulating the formal semantics for calculi for concurrency—this is the case even in formalisms such as CCS ([Milner \(1989\)](#)). The non-deterministic choice operator ‘+’ is typically non-confluent, as it expresses commitment to one branch while discarding behaviours in other branches.

Confluent Non-Determinism Our focus will be on typed process calculi with non-determinism that can provide an appropriate framework, in the sense of ‘functions-as-processes’, for the resource λ -calculi just motivated. Non-determinism, in particular in its non-confluent variant, is often at odds with resource-control—discarding not chosen branches breaks linearity. Considering this, we shall adopt the work of [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#) as reference in our developments: it introduces a *session-typed* π -calculus, which supports both (confluent) *non-determinism* and *failure* in a linearly-typed setting. In this framework, types arise from a Curry-Howard correspondence between session types and an extension of classical linear logic. Important properties for processes, such as session fidelity and deadlock-freedom, follow from the fundamental connection between cut-elimination and process synchronization. It may then be easy to see that confluence in [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#) is a natural consequence of the underlying Curry-Howard foundations .

A salient feature of the framework in [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#) is the possibility of typing behaviors that are *non-deterministically available*, i.e., session protocols that can perform as stipulated, but may also fail. There is a non-trivial balancing act involved, in order to accommodate failures while adhering to resource control via linearity.

We illustrate this point by discussing processes and their operational semantics. In session-typed languages, the communication actions performed on channels can be structured into *sessions*, which streamline analysis. In the framework of [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#), there are two special actions along a channel x : process ‘ $\bar{x}.\text{some}; P$ ’ confirms that the behavior along x can be made available as intended and then continues as P , whereas the process ‘ $\bar{x}.\text{none}$ ’ expresses a failure to provide a behavior on x . These two processes are meant to interact with a process of the form ‘ $x.\text{some}_{\tilde{w}}; P$ ’, which denotes a process P that declares its *dependency* on behaviors that are non-deterministically available on x , with \tilde{w} exposing the sequence of channels that depend on the availability of x . This sequence is crucial to hereditarily propagate a potential failure of x .

We postpone a formal presentation of the reduction rules for these constructs, and illustrate it instead by means of the following example:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{v}x)(x.\text{some}_{(y)}; \bar{y}.\text{some}; P \mid \bar{x}.\text{some}; Q) &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{y}.\text{some}; P \mid Q) \\ (\mathbf{v}x)(x.\text{some}_{(y)}; \bar{y}.\text{some}; P \mid \bar{x}.\text{none}) &\longrightarrow \bar{y}.\text{none} \end{aligned}$$

In the first case, the process on the left of the parallel expects to synchronize with a non-deterministic session x , with another session y depending on it. The process on the right of the parallel confirms the availability of x , and so the two processes may synchronize along x and proceed further. Differently, in the second case, the process on the left is the same as before, but the process on the right signals the

failure to provide x . Because y is dependent on the availability of x , the process P is cancelled. As we will see, typing ensures that non-deterministic availability is appropriately handled across different branching behaviours.

In this typed π -calculus, one may think of resources as the protocol that is provided along a channel. Channels may provide *linear* or *unrestricted* behaviour, with the latter being assimilated to the operation of *clients* that invoke *servers* (persistently available processes). These server-client interactions are typed with the exponentials $!A$ and $?A$ in linear logic.

Non-Confluent Non-Determinism The typed calculus in Caires & Pérez (2017) provides a convenient target language for a concurrent translation of resource λ -calculi under the confluent regime, with a compositional treatment of non-determinism in λ as non-determinism in π . However, in the non-confluent case the situation is different: there is no satisfying literature explicitly outlining the role of non-confluent non-determinism, in a typed setting, despite it being commonplace.

Considering this gap, we introduce a variant of the typed π -calculus in Caires & Pérez (2017) with a non-confluent non-determinism operator, denoted $\#$. We propose two different operational semantics for $\#$, which express the level of commitment involved in selecting a branch. In the *eager* semantics, the commitment of choice is determined by the branches that are performing synchronization. This is shown in the following three reductions possible from P_0 :

$$P_0 = (\mathbf{v}x)(x.\text{some}_{(y)}; P \mid (\bar{x}.\text{some}; Q_1 \# \bar{x}.\text{some}; Q_2 \# \bar{x}.\text{none})) \begin{array}{l} \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(P \mid Q_1) \\ \searrow (\mathbf{v}x)(P \mid Q_2) \\ \searrow \mathbf{0} \end{array}$$

Intuitively, these process matches our expectation about usual, non-confluent determinism: a synchronization along channel x selects one branch and discards the other two. Alternatively, a *lazy* semantics realizes a more gradual approach: in such a semantics, branches of choice are grouped based on their top-level prefixes; the ‘collapsing’ of choices is based on branches that may synchronise. In our previous for P_0 , we have:

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(x.\text{some}; P \mid (\bar{x}.\text{some}; Q_1 \# \bar{x}.\text{some}; Q_2 \# \bar{x}.\text{none})) \begin{array}{l} \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(P \mid (Q_1 \# Q_2)) \\ \searrow \mathbf{0} \end{array}$$

As the first two branches both confirm their behaviour along x the choice between them is postponed. Notice that the placing of the choice is also preserved, i.e., the choice is not distributed, as in, e.g., $(\mathbf{v}x)(P \mid Q_1) \# (\mathbf{v}x)(P \mid Q_2)$.

Termination Termination is a property relevant across sequential and concurrent programming models. It has been widely studied for sequential programming mod-

els, where type systems for (variants of) the λ -calculus can guarantee different *normalization* properties. Termination is also relevant in concurrency, as normalization properties can play a crucial role in the verification of interacting systems. Also here we find type systems that ensure termination of (variants of) the π -calculus by typing.

As already discussed, concurrency offers a broader range of behaviours than purely sequential models; as a result, we find a wider range of typing systems governing interaction and concurrency. Specifically, different type systems for termination in the π -calculus have been developed, following vastly diverse underlying approaches.

We give the first comparative study of type systems that enforce termination for message-passing processes in the π -calculus. In this context, interesting forms of non-terminating behavior arise when a *server* process, represented by a replicated input process of the form $!x(y).P$, is invoked an infinite number of times. This sequence of infinite reductions can be caused by, e.g., a server that calls itself or a cycle of server calls to each other. Type systems that ensure termination use different methods to statically rule out such infinite reduction sequences.

Our work concerns three type systems. The first one concerns the class of processes typable with Vasconcelos’s session type system ([Vasconcelos](#)), which we denote \mathcal{S} . We use this calculus as a tool for comparison due to its liberal type discipline. In fact, this type system offers no termination guarantees; it only ensures session fidelity (i.e., channels always respect their protocols), and hence it may describe a vast array or “well-behaved” session respecting processes.

When it comes to type systems that do ensure termination by typing, we focus on comparing the following two systems:

1. We consider \mathcal{W} , the class of processes induced by the type system in [Deng & Sangiorgi \(2004\)](#). In this discipline, termination is enforced by *weights* (or *levels*) associated to channel types; roughly speaking, servers should not contain outputs that invoke a server of a “greater” level.
2. We consider \mathcal{L} , the class of processes induced by Caires and Pfenning’s Curry-Howard correspondence between linear logic and session types ([Caires & Pfenning \(2010\)](#)). Here termination is induced via proof-theoretical principles, similar to the way the simply-typed λ -calculus rules out infinite reduction sequences.

Because both the types and syntax of these languages are formulated differently, in order to enable comparisons between them (correct) translations are needed. Using these translations we may show that both $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{S}$ hold as expected, due to \mathcal{S} not ensuring termination. More interestingly, we prove $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{W} \not\subset \mathcal{L}$, thus explicitly determining the exact relationship between these two

classes of terminating languages. Formally, we show that there are terminating processes that belong to the class \mathcal{W} but are outside the class \mathcal{L} .

1.4 Outline of Contributions

The contributions in this thesis address our research question by showing how typed sequential computation (in resource λ -calculi with intersection types) is subsumed by typed concurrent behaviour (in session-typed π -calculi), in the style of “functions as processes”. In the context of these languages, we provide correct translations accounting for an array of different features. The technical results are presented in four chapters (Chapter 2 – Chapter 5), which we briefly describe:

Chapter 2 We give a correct translation from a resource λ -calculus to the session-typed π -calculus in [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#). The focus here is on confluent non-determinism and purely linear resources. The translation is type preserving; as mentioned earlier, we encode both well-typed (fail-free) terms and well-formed (fail-prone) terms into well-typed processes.

Confluence plays a key role in proving operational soundness, one of the two parts of the operational correspondence criterion. To illustrate this point, consider the λ -term $M\langle\langle M_1, M_2 \rangle/x\rangle$, i.e., a term M subject to an explicit substitution involving a bag with two resources, M_1 and M_2 . Let us assume that M has a two occurrences of variable x . [Figure 1.3](#) illustrates the relationship between the source terms and their corresponding translations; for pedagogical purposes, we provide a simplified description of the translation, using *contexts* $C[-]$ in π to abstract away from details of the translation unimportant at this point.

As discussed earlier, in the confluent regime M reduces into a sum involving the different possibilities for choosing a term from the bag. In our translation, we use two names, denoted x_1, x_2 , to represent the two occurrences of x in M . Process P' represents the (simplified) translation of $M\{M_1/x\}\langle\langle M_2 \rangle/x\rangle$; similarly, process Q' represents the translation of $M\{M_2/x\}\langle\langle M_1 \rangle/x\rangle$. In this example, we may reduce the left branch (P to P') or the right branch (Q to Q') independently. We use dotted arrows to represent possible other reductions available; this way, e.g., after reducing to $P' + Q$ we may reduce Q or we may reduce further P' . The key point in the analysis of soundness is that, due to confluence, we may freely decide on the order in which reductions are performed without interfering with the overall behaviour of the processes.

Chapter 3 We extend the framework of [Chapter 2](#) by considering a resource λ -calculus with both linear and unrestricted resources as source language.





Figure 1.3: Soundness under a confluent regime (Chapter 2)

This entails extending the definitions of the source language as well as generalizing the translation into typed processes and its corresponding proofs of correctness. Extending the language with unrestricted resources is non-trivial due to the challenge of correctly catching sources of failure. Also, a naive extension may lead to ambiguities in the consumption of resources, which in turn leads to the unpredictability of failure. We identify a syntax and semantics for unrestricted resources that builds upon the developments in Chapter 2 by exploiting client and server behaviors in typed processes.

Chapter 4 Having covered the case of confluent non-determinism, here we shift our attention of the case of non-confluent nondeterminism, with source and target languages including both linear and unrestricted resources. This requires innovations on the sequential side, but also on the concurrent side, as we now describe.

On the concurrent side, we abandon the setting of Caires & Pérez (2017), and introduce a session-typed π -calculus with a non-confluent non-deterministic choice operator, denoted ' $P \# Q$ '. For this calculus, we give two new operational semantics, dubbed *lazy* and *eager*. Intuitively, they differ on how gradually they “collapse” branches of a non-deterministic choice in order to express commitment. It turns out that the same translation can be used in either case, and we give two proofs of correctness, one for each semantics.

The lazy semantics allows us to prove what we call *tight* correctness for our translation, whereas the eager semantics induces a *loose* form of correctness. Hence, we establish a tight soundness result, in which operational correspondence closely matches the computations in the sequential side, and a loose soundness result, in which non-deterministic choice is too eagerly pruned




$$\begin{aligned}
 P_1 &= (\nu x_1, x_2)(C[\dagger_{i \in I} \llbracket M_i \rrbracket_u, \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{x_1}, \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{x_2}]) & P_3 &= (\nu x_2)(C[\llbracket M\{M_1/x_1\} \rrbracket_u, \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{x_2}]) \\
 P_2 &= (\nu x_1, x_2)(C[\dagger_{i \in I} \llbracket M'_i \rrbracket_u, \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{x_1}, \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{x_2}]) & P_4 &= (\nu x_1)(C[\llbracket M\{M_2/x_2\} \rrbracket_u, \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{x_1}])
 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 1.4: Soundness under a non-confluent regime: the tight case (Chapter 4)

with respect to the given sequential computation.

Figure 1.4 illustrates the situation for the case of tight soundness, with the same initial source term as in Figure 1.3. Process P_1 is the translation of the source term: it includes the process $\dagger_{i \in I} \llbracket M_i \rrbracket_u$, which expresses a non-confluent non-deterministic choice of all the permutations of M with each occurrence of x replaced with x_1, x_2 . Process P_1 may reduce to P_2 , which is an intermediate step needed to mimic the corresponding reduction in λ . From P_2 , we may now reduce to P_3 or P_4 (representing the commitment to M_1 and M_2 , respectively), or perform further unrelated reduction steps. Because the reduction that leads to P_3, P_4 can be performed independently from any other available synchronisations, we choose to prioritise these reductions first. In this setting we cannot use the path to soundness that we exploit in Chapters 2 and 3; our lazy semantics makes use of the delayed commitment (process P_2) to match the non-confluent fetching of resources from bags—this is important in establishing our soundness result.

Figure 1.5 illustrates the case of loose soundness, associated to the eager semantics, which is less obvious and requires reconsidering the proof method. We look at sets of reductions available and show that we may group them and relate them to choices in the sequential setting, almost inducing a confluence-like behaviour within the proof. This is essential, as the proof proceeds by induction on the number of reduction steps taken by the translated process; this grouping is key to apply the induction hypotheses. In the figure, P_2 reduces to one of P_3, \dots, P_6 ; we use M', \dots, M'''' to denote M with a specific permutation of each occurrence of x replaced with x_1, x_2 . We can group the alternatives P_3, \dots, P_6 into sets of “similar” substitutions; when P_2 realizes commitment, the corresponding choice discards branches eagerly—this cor-



$$\begin{aligned}
 P_1 &= (\nu x_1, x_2)(C[\dagger_{i \in I} \llbracket M_i \rrbracket_u, \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{x_1}, \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{x_2}]) & P_3 &= (\nu x_2)(C[\llbracket M' \{M_1/x_1\} \rrbracket_u, \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{x_2}]) \\
 P_2 &= (\nu x_1, x_2)(C[\dagger_{i \in I} \llbracket M'_i \rrbracket_u, \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{x_1}, \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{x_2}]) & P_4 &= (\nu x_2)(C[\llbracket M'' \{M_1/x_1\} \rrbracket_u, \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{x_2}]) \\
 & & P_5 &= (\nu x_1)(C[\llbracket M''' \{M_2/x_2\} \rrbracket_u, \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{x_1}]) \\
 & & P_6 &= (\nu x_1)(C[\llbracket M'''' \{M_2/x_2\} \rrbracket_u, \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{x_1}])
 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 1.5: Soundness under a non-confluent regime: the loose case (Chapter 4)

responds to steps in the sequential side in which not only a resource is fetched but actually the entire order for fetching resources is decided. In the example, P_3, P_4, \dots represent processes that synchronise across x_1 ; processes in this group are related to the translation of $M\{M_1/x\}\langle\langle M_2 \rangle/x\rangle$ (i.e., where M_1 is substituted for x_1). Similarly, P_5, P_6, \dots represent processes that synchronise across x_2 and are related to the translation of $M\{M_2/x\}\langle\langle M_1 \rangle/x\rangle$.

Chapter 5 In the final chapter, we turn our attention to the termination property. We consider two different type systems that enforce termination of π -calculus processes by typing, and compare them using (correct) translations: one is the logically motivated system of Caires & Pfenning (2010), the other is the type system by Deng & Sangiorgi (2004), which exploits approaches from rewriting systems to exclude processes with infinite reduction sequences.

Rather than translating one system into the other directly, we find it convenient to fix a reference framework for comparisons. For this purpose, we use the session-typed framework by Vasconcelos (2012), which is a liberal discipline that provides a convenient, broad framework for rigorous comparisons. A key technical aspect in this chapter is proving that the system of Caires and Pfenning's induces a class of typable processes that is a strict subset of the class induced by Deng and Sangiorgi's. To this end, we show that typability under the Curry-Howard correspondences induces a strict partial order on processes, a sort of hierarchy on names that excludes infinite reductions

by construction. Because Deng and Sangiorgi’s strictly subsumes these strict partial orders, the strict inclusion between the classes follows.

Appendix A to Appendix D contain omitted proofs to Chapter 2 to Chapter 5 respectively. Appendix B also contains examples in well-formed derivations and auxiliary definitions. Appendix C gives the full π -calculus utilising client and server behaviour along with an alternative eager semantics and the application of unrestricted bags in the resource λ -calculus. Appendix D contains the auxiliary definitions needed to construct strict partial orders on processes that are essential to the proofs within Appendix D.3.1.

1.5 Associated Publications

Most of the material of this thesis has been previously reported in the following peer-reviewed publications.

The content reported in Chapter 2 is derived from the following papers:

- Paulus, Nantes-Sobrinho, & Pérez (2021a) *Non-deterministic functions as non-deterministic processes*, in: Kobayashi, N., ed., 6th International Conference on Formal Structures for Computation and Deduction, **FSCD 2021**, July 17-24, 2021, Buenos Aires, Argentina (Virtual Conference), vol. 195 of LIPIcs, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, pp. 21:1–21:22. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.FSCD.2021.21>
- Paulus, Nantes-Sobrinho, & Pérez (2023a) *Non-deterministic functions as non-deterministic processes (Extended Version)*, **Logical Methods in Computer Science**, 19(4). [https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-19\(4:1\)2023](https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-19(4:1)2023)

The content reported in Chapters 3 to 5 is derived from the following papers:

- Paulus, Nantes-Sobrinho, & Pérez (2021b) *Types and terms translated: Unrestricted resources in encoding functions as processes*, in: Basold, H., J. Cockx, S. Ghilezan, eds., 27th International Conference on Types for Proofs and Programs, **TYPES 2021**, June 14-18, 2021, Leiden, The Netherlands (Virtual Conference), vol. 239 of LIPIcs, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, pp. 11:1–11:24. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.TYPES.2021.11>
- van den Heuvel, Paulus, Nantes-Sobrinho, & Pérez (2023) *Typed non-determinism in functional and concurrent calculi*, in: Hur, C., ed., Programming Languages and Systems - 21st Asian Symposium, **APLAS 2023**, Taipei,

Taiwan, November 26-29, 2023, Proceedings, vol. 14405 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, pp. 112–132.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-8311-7_6

- Paulus, Pérez, & Nantes-Sobrinho (2023b) *Termination in concurrency, revisited*, in: Escobar, S., V. T. Vasconcelos, eds., International Symposium on Principles and Practice of Declarative Programming, **PPDP 2023**, Lisboa, Portugal, October 22-23, 2023, ACM, pp. 3:1–3:14.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3610612.3610615>

The following paper reports complementary developments to the content in Chapter 4 by developing an *eager* semantics:

- van den Heuvel, Nantes-Sobrinho, Paulus, & Pérez (2024) *Typed non-determinism in concurrent calculi: The eager way*, in: Conference on Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics, **MFPS 2024**, Oxford, UK, June 19–21, 2024.

Chapter 2

Non-Deterministic Functions as Non-Deterministic Processes

We study encodings of the λ -calculus into the π -calculus in the unexplored case of calculi with *non-determinism* and *failures*. On the sequential side, we consider $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, a new non-deterministic calculus in which intersection types control resources (terms); on the concurrent side, we consider $s\pi$, a π -calculus in which non-determinism and failure rest upon a Curry-Howard correspondence between linear logic and session types. We present a typed encoding of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ into $s\pi$ and establish its correctness. Our encoding precisely explains the interplay of non-deterministic and fail-prone evaluation in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ via typed processes in $s\pi$. In particular, it shows how failures in sequential evaluation (absence/excess of resources) can be neatly codified as interaction protocols.

Introduction

Milner’s seminal work on encodings of the λ -calculus into the π -calculus [Milner \(1992\)](#) explains how *interaction* in π subsumes *evaluation* in λ . It opened a research strand on formal connections between sequential and concurrent calculi, covering untyped and typed regimes (see, e.g., [Sangiorgi \(1999\)](#); [Boudol & Laneve \(2000\)](#); [Berger et al. \(2003\)](#); [Toninho et al. \(2012\)](#); [Honda et al. \(2014\)](#); [Orchard & Yoshida \(2016\)](#); [Toninho & Yoshida \(2018\)](#)). This chapter extends this line of work by tackling a hitherto unexplored angle, namely encodability of calculi in which computation is *non-deterministic* and may be subject to *failures*—two relevant features in sequential and concurrent programming models.

We focus on *typed* calculi and study how non-determinism and failures interact with *resource-aware* computation. In sequential calculi, *non-idempotent intersection types* offer one fruitful perspective at resource-awareness (see, e.g., [Gardner](#)

(1994); Kfoury (2000); Kfoury & Wells (2004); Neergaard & Mairson (2004); Buc-ciarelli et al. (2017)). Because non-idempotency amounts to distinguish between types σ and $\sigma \wedge \sigma$, this class of intersection types can “count” different resources and enforce quantitative guarantees. In concurrent calculi, resource-awareness has been much studied using *linear types*. Linearity ensures that process actions occur exactly once, which is key to enforce protocol correctness. In particular, *session types* Honda (1993); Honda et al. (1998a) specify the protocols that channels must respect; this typing discipline exploits linearity to ensure absence of communication errors and stuck processes. To our knowledge, connections between calculi adopting these two distinct views of resource-awareness via types are still to be established. We aim to develop such connections by relating models of sequential and concurrent computation.

On the sequential side, we introduce λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} : a λ -calculus with resources, non-determinism, and failures, which distills key elements from λ -calculi studied in Boudol (1993); Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010). Evaluation in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} considers *bags* of resources, and determines alternative executions governed by non-determinism. Failure results from a lack or excess of resources (terms), and is captured by the term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$, where \tilde{x} denotes a sequence of variables. Non-determinism in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} is *non-collapsing* (i.e., confluent): intuitively, given M and N with reductions $M \longrightarrow M'$ and $N \longrightarrow N'$, the non-deterministic sum $M + N$ reduces to $M' + N'$. In contrast, under a *collapsing* (i.e., non-confluent) approach, as in, e.g., Dezani-Ciancaglini et al. (1993), the non-deterministic sum $M + N$ reduces to either M or N .

On the concurrent side, we consider $s\pi$: a session-typed π -calculus with (non-collapsing) non-determinism and failure, proposed in Caires & Pérez (2017). $s\pi$ rests upon a Curry-Howard correspondence between session types and (classical) linear logic, extended with modalities that express *non-deterministic protocols* that may succeed or fail. Non-determinism in $s\pi$ is non-collapsing, which ensures confluent process reductions.

Contributions This chapter presents the first formal connection between a λ -calculus with non-idempotent intersection types and a π -calculus with session types. Specifically, the chapter presents the following contributions:

1. **The resource calculus** λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} , a new calculus that distills the distinctive elements from previous resource calculi Boudol & Laneve (2000); Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010), while offering an explicit treatment of failures in a setting with non-collapsing non-determinism.

We develop the syntax, semantics, and essential meta-theoretical results for λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} . In particular, using intersection types, we define *well-typed* (fail-free) expressions and *well-formed* (fail-prone) expressions in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} and establish their properties.

2. **An encoding of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} into $\mathfrak{s}\pi$** , proven correct following established criteria in the realm of relative expressiveness for concurrency [Gorla \(2010\)](#); [Kouzapas et al. \(2019\)](#). These criteria attest to an encoding’s quality; we consider *type preservation*, *operational correspondence* (including completeness and soundness), *success sensitiveness*, and *compositionality*.

Thanks to these correctness properties, our encoding precisely describes how typed interaction protocols (given by session types) can codify sequential evaluation in which absence and excess of resources leads to failures (as governed by intersection types).

These contributions entail different challenges. The first is bridging the different mechanisms for resource-awareness involved (i.e., intersection types in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} , session types in $\mathfrak{s}\pi$). A direct encoding of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} into $\mathfrak{s}\pi$ is far from obvious, as multiple occurrences of a variable in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} must be accommodated into the linear setting of $\mathfrak{s}\pi$. To overcome this challenge, we introduce a variant of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} , dubbed $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$. The distinctive feature of $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ is a *sharing* construct, which we adopt following the *atomic* λ -calculus presented in [Gundersen et al. \(2013\)](#). Our encoding of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} expressions into $\mathfrak{s}\pi$ processes is then in two steps. We first define a correct encoding from λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} to $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$, which relies on the sharing construct to “atomize” occurrences of the same variable. Then, we define another correct encoding, from $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ to $\mathfrak{s}\pi$, which extends Milner’s with constructs for non-determinism.

Another challenge is framing failures in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} (undesirable computations) as well-typed $\mathfrak{s}\pi$ processes. Using intersection types, we define *well-formed* λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} expressions, which can fail, in two stages. First, we consider λ_{\oplus} , the sub-language of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} without `fail \bar{x}` . We give an intersection type system for λ_{\oplus} to regulate fail-free evaluation. Well-formed expressions are then defined on top of well-typed λ_{\oplus} expressions. We show that $\mathfrak{s}\pi$ can correctly encode the fail-free λ_{\oplus} but, more interestingly, also well-formed λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} expressions, which are fail-prone.

[Fig. 2.1](#) summarizes our approach: the encoding from λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} to $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ is denoted $(\cdot)^{\circ}$, whereas the encoding from $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ to $\mathfrak{s}\pi$ is denoted $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^{\zeta}$.

Organization Next, [§ 2.1](#) informally discusses key ideas in our work. [§ 2.2](#) introduces the syntax and semantics of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} , and defines its intersection type system. [§ 2.3](#) introduces $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$, the variant of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} with sharing. It also presents its associated intersection type system, and defines an encoding from λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} to $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$. In [§ 2.4](#) we summarize the syntax, semantics, and session type system of $\mathfrak{s}\pi$, following [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#). [§ 2.5](#) establishes the correctness of the encoding of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} into $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ and presents and proves correct the encoding of $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ into $\mathfrak{s}\pi$. [§ 2.7](#) presents comparisons with related works. [§ 2.8](#) closes with a discussion about our approach and results.




Figure 2.1: Overview of our approach.

2.1 Overview of Key Ideas

Before embarking into our technical developments, we discuss some key ideas in the definition of λ_{\oplus}^{ξ} and its correct encodability into $s\pi$.

Non-determinism. Our source language λ_{\oplus}^{ξ} has three syntactic categories: terms (M, M') , bags (B, B') and expressions (\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{L}) . Terms can be variables, abstractions $\lambda x.M$, applications $(M B)$, explicit substitutions $M\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$, or the explicit failure term `fail` (see below). Bags are multisets of terms (the resources); this way, e.g., $B = \{M_1, M_1, M_2\}$ is a bag with three resources (M_1 , M_1 , and M_2). Expressions are sums of terms, written $M_1 + M_2$; they denote a non-deterministic choice between different ways of *fetching* resources from the bag.

In λ_{\oplus}^{ξ} , reduction is lazy: first, a β -reduction evolves to an explicit substitution, which will then fetch the elements in the bag to be substituted for the corresponding variable, when some conditions are satisfied: we interpret this as “consuming a resource”. For instance, given a λ_{\oplus}^{ξ} -term M with head variable x and two occurrences of x , we have the reduction:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda x.M \{M_1, M_2\} &\longrightarrow M\langle\langle \{M_1, M_2\}/x \rangle\rangle \\ &\longrightarrow M\{M_1/x\}\langle\langle \{M_2\}/x \rangle\rangle + M\{M_2/x\}\langle\langle \{M_1\}/x \rangle\rangle = M(2.1) \end{aligned}$$

The resulting expression M' is a sum that gathers two alternative computations: it may reduce by either (i) first fetching M_1 from the bag and linearly substituting it for x in the head position of M (this is denoted with $M\{M_1/x\}$) and then continue with the rest of the bag (M_2 , wrapped in an explicit substitution), or (ii) fetching and linearly substituting M_2 in head position, leaving M_1 in an explicit substitution.

Successful Reductions We consider a computation as successful only when the number of elements in the bag matches the number of occurrences of the variable to be substituted; otherwise the computation fails. As an example, consider the

previous example, now with $M = x \lambda x \lambda I \int \int$ where $I = \lambda z.z$ is the identity. The reduction in (2.1) is then

$$(\lambda x.x \lambda x \lambda I \int \int) \lambda M_1, M_2 \int \longrightarrow^* M_1 \lambda x \lambda I \int \int \langle \langle \lambda M_2 \int / x \rangle \rangle + M_2 \lambda x \lambda I \int \int \langle \langle \lambda M_1 \int / x \rangle \rangle$$

Hence, when $\lambda x.M$ is applied to a bag with two resources, it evolves successfully. However, if $\lambda x.M$ is applied to a bag with less (or more) than two resources, the computation evolves to the *explicit failure* term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{z}}$, where \tilde{z} is a multiset of variables, as we explain next.

Explicit Failure. A construct for failure is present in the resource λ -calculus in Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010). In this formulation, the failure term ‘0’ is consumed by sums and disappears at the end of the computation; as such, it gives no information about the failed computation and its origins.

Following Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010), a design decision in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\dot{\lambda}}$ is to have $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ in the syntax of terms. The sequence \tilde{x} denotes the variables captured by failure; this provides useful information on the origins of a failure. As an example, consider a term M with free variables \tilde{y} and in which the number of occurrences of x is different from 2. Given a bag $B = \lambda M_1, M_2 \int$, reduction leads to a failure, as follows:

$$(\lambda x.M)B \longrightarrow M \langle \langle \lambda M_1, M_2 \int / x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(\lambda M_1, M_2 \int)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} = M'$$

In this case, M' is the sum $\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} + \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$, which has as many summands as the permutations of the elements of B . Intuitively, it means that it does not matter if one replaces the occurrence(s) of x first with M_1 (or M_2), then the other occurrence (if any), with M_2 (or M_1), the result will be the same, i.e., $\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$. Here again both possibilities are expressed in a sum. The precise semantics of failure will be presented in § 2.2.2.

Typability and Well-formedness We define an intersection type system for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\dot{\lambda}}$. This choice follows a well-established tradition of coupling resource λ -calculi with intersection types Boudol (1993); Boudol & Laneve (1996); Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010). Intersection types are also adopted in related calculi Ehrhard & Regnier (2003). Intersection types are a natural typing structure for resources: they have similar mathematical properties of non-idempotency and commutativity, and can help to “count” the number of occurrences of a variable in a term, as well as the number of components in a bag.

In our type systems, each element of a bag must have the same type. This way, e.g., a well-typed bag $B = \lambda M_1, M_2, M_3 \int$ has type $\sigma \wedge \sigma \wedge \sigma$, where σ is a strict type (cf. Def. 2.6). Then, an application $M B$ is well-typed, say, with type τ , only if

$M : \sigma \wedge \sigma \wedge \sigma \rightarrow \tau$. We shall write σ^k to denote the intersection type $\sigma \wedge \dots \wedge \sigma$, with $k \geq 0$ copies of σ . Notice that σ^0 denotes the empty type ω . The typing rule for application is then as expected:

$$[\text{T : app}] \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma^k \rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma \vdash MB : \tau}$$

where Γ is a type context assigning types to variables.

We chose to express explicit failing terms and computation. To properly account for these computations, we define a separate type system with so-called *well-formedness* rules, with notation ‘ \models ’. Unlike rules for typability, rules for well-formedness capture computations that fail due to a mismatch of resources (lack or excess). This entails some increased flexibility in selected rules. This way, e.g, the following is the well-formedness rule for application:

$$[\text{F : app}] \frac{\Gamma \models M : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma \models B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma \models MB : \tau}$$

Here the added flexibility is that we do not require $k = j$; hence, the rule can capture successful *and* failing computations, depending on whether $k = j$ or not. As expected, the term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{z}}$ is not well-typed, but it is well-formed: the judgement $\Gamma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} : \tau$ holds for an arbitrary type τ and a Γ consisting of variable assignments for the variables in \tilde{z} .

Therefore, we consider two intersection type systems: one captures exclusively successful computations (see Fig. 2.3); the other, which we call the well-formedness system (see Fig. 2.4), subsumes the first one by admitting both successful and failing computations. The weakening rule is admissible in both systems (see below). Both systems enjoy subject reduction, whereas only well-typed terms satisfy subject expansion.

Controlling resources via sharing In order to better control the use of resources, i.e., substituting variables for terms with a careful form of duplication, we borrow ideas from the *sharing graphs* by Guerrini (1999); Guerrini et al. (2003) and define the calculus $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$. The key idea is as follows: whenever a bound variable x occurs multiple times within a term, these occurrences, say x_1, \dots, x_n , are temporarily assigned new names (think aliases). This assignment is indicated with the *sharing construct* $[x_1, \dots, x_n \leftarrow x]$, which we adopt following Gundersen et al. (2013). This way, for instance, the $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -term $\lambda x.x \lambda x \lambda x$ would correspond to $\lambda x.x_1 \lambda x_2 \lambda x_3 [x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x]$ in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$.

We also carefully treat the “erasing” of resources: if a term has vacuous abstractions, this is also indicated with the sharing construct, where the bound variable maps to “empty”. Hence, the $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -term $\lambda x.y \lambda z$ is expressed as $\lambda x.y \lambda z [z \leftarrow x]$ in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$.

The tight control of resources in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ turns out to be very convenient to encode λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} into $s\pi$, as we discuss next.

Encoding λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} into $s\pi$. The central result of our work is a correct translation of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} into $s\pi$. In defining our translation we use $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ as a stepping stone. This is advantageous, because (i) the relation between $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ is fairly direct and (ii) the sharing construct in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ makes it explicit the variable occurrences that should be treated as linear names in $s\pi$.

The encoding of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} into $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ is denoted $(\cdot)^{\bullet}$ and given in § 2.3.4. The encoding of $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ into $s\pi$, denoted $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^{\zeta}$ and presented in § 2.5.3, is arguably more interesting—we discuss it below.

The definition of $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^{\zeta}$ considers well-formed source terms in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ which are translated into well-typed $s\pi$ processes. As usual, the translation is parametric on a channel name u , which is used to provide the behavior of the source term.

The calculus $s\pi$ includes a non-deterministic choice operator $P \oplus Q$ and formalizes sessions which are *non-deterministically available*. Intuitively, this means that a given session protocol along a name can either be available and proceed as prescribed by the corresponding session type, or fail to be available. Clearly, such a failure may have repercussions on other sessions that depend on it. To this end, $s\pi$ includes prefixes $x.\overline{\text{some}}$ and $x.\overline{\text{none}}$, which are used to confirm the availability of x and to signal its failure, respectively. Process $x.\text{some}_{(w_1, \dots, w_k)}; Q$ declares the dependency of sessions w_1, \dots, w_k in Q on an external session along x . The corresponding reduction rules are then:

$$\begin{aligned} x.\overline{\text{some}} \mid x.\text{some}_{(w_1, \dots, w_k)}; Q &\longrightarrow Q \\ x.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\text{some}_{(w_1, \dots, w_k)}; Q &\longrightarrow w_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid w_k.\overline{\text{none}} \end{aligned}$$

Following Milner, $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^{\zeta}$ maps computation in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ into session communication in $s\pi$; non-deterministic sessions are used to codify the non-deterministic fetching of resources in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$. This way, the translation of $(\lambda x.M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x])B$ will enable synchronizations between the translations of $M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x]$ and B . More in details, the translation of a bag $B = \wr M_1, M_2 \wr$ is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \wr M_1 \wr \cdot \wr M_2 \wr \rrbracket_x^{\zeta} &= x.\text{some}_{\widetilde{z}_1, \widetilde{z}_2}; x(y_i).x.\text{some}_{y_i, \widetilde{z}_1, \widetilde{z}_2}; x.\overline{\text{some}}; \\ &\quad \bar{x}(x_i).(x_i.\text{some}_{\widetilde{z}_1}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\zeta} \mid \llbracket \wr M_2 \wr \rrbracket_x^{\zeta} \mid y_i.\overline{\text{none}}) \end{aligned}$$

where \widetilde{z}_1 and \widetilde{z}_2 denote the free variables of M_1 and M_2 , respectively. Process $\llbracket \wr M_1 \wr \cdot \wr M_2 \wr \rrbracket_x^{\zeta}$ first expects confirmation of session x ; then, the translation of each resource M_i is made available in a dedicated name x_i , which will be communicated to other processes. Accordingly, the translation of $\llbracket M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^{\zeta}$ is expected to synchronize with the translation of the bag B : indeed, it confirms behavior along

x , before receiving the names, one for each shared copy of x that should be used throughout the synchronizations:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^{\not\downarrow} &= x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_1). \left(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, x_2\})}; \right. \\ &\quad x(x_1) \dots x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_2). (y_2.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_2.\text{close} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; \\ &\quad x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_2\})}; x(x_2).x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(y). (y.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; \\ &\quad \left. \left. y.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\not\downarrow} \mid x.\overline{\text{none}} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Several confirmations take place along the channel names involved in the synchronizations; see § 2.5.3 for details.

Non-determinism plays a key role in the translation of an application $M'B$. In this case, we consider the permutations of the elements of B using non-deterministic choice in π . When $B = \wr M_1, M_2 \wr$, the translation is:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M'B \rrbracket_u^{\not\downarrow} &= (\nu v)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v^{\not\downarrow} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket \wr M_1, M_2 \wr \rrbracket_x^{\not\downarrow})) \\ &\quad \oplus \\ &\quad (\nu v)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v^{\not\downarrow} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket \wr M_2, M_1 \wr \rrbracket_x^{\not\downarrow})) \end{aligned}$$

A synchronization occurs when process $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v^{\not\downarrow}$ can confirm its behavior along v . For instance, when $M' = \lambda x.M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x]$ the translation is as

$$\llbracket \lambda x.M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^{\not\downarrow} = v.\overline{\text{some}}; v(x). \llbracket M[x_2, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^{\not\downarrow}$$

and the synchronization may be possible; it depends on the translations of M , M_1 , and M_2 .

We close this section by observing that our translations $(\cdot)^\bullet$ and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^{\not\downarrow}$ satisfy well-known correctness criteria, as formulated by Gorla (2010) and Kouzapas et al. (2019) (see § 2.5.1 for details).

2.2 $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\not\downarrow}$: A λ -calculus with Non-Determinism and Failure

We define the syntax and reduction semantics of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\not\downarrow}$, our new resource calculus with non-determinism and failure. We then equip it with non-idempotent session types, and establish the subject reduction property for well-typed and well-formed expressions (Theorems 2.1 and 2.3, respectively). We also consider the subject expansion property, which holds for well-typed expressions (Theorem 2.2) but not for well-formed ones (Theorem 2.4).

2.2.1 Syntax

The syntax of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} combines elements from calculi introduced and studied by [Boudol & Laneve \(2000\)](#) and by [Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca \(2010\)](#). We use x, y, \dots to range over the set of *variables*. We write \tilde{x} to denote the sequence of pairwise distinct variables x_1, \dots, x_k , for some $k \geq 0$. We write $|\tilde{x}|$ to denote the length of \tilde{x} .

Definition 2.1 Syntax of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ}

The λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} calculus is defined by the following grammar:

| | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|-------|---|
| (Terms) | M, N, L | $::=$ | $x \mid \lambda x.M \mid (M B) \mid M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \mid \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ |
| (Bags) | A, B | $::=$ | $1 \mid \wr M \wr \mid A \cdot B$ |
| (Expressions) | $\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{L}$ | $::=$ | $M \mid \mathbb{M} + \mathbb{N}$ |

□

We have three syntactic categories: *terms* (in functional position); *bags* (in argument position), which denote multisets of resources; and *expressions*, which are finite formal sums that represent possible results of a computation. Terms are unary expressions: they can be variables, abstractions, and applications. Following [Boudol \(1993\)](#); [Boudol & Laneve \(2000\)](#), the *explicit substitution* of a bag B for a variable x in a term M , written $M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$, is also a term. The term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ results from a reduction in which there is a lack or excess of resources to be substituted, where \tilde{x} denotes a multiset of free variables that are encapsulated within failure.

The empty bag is denoted 1 . The bag enclosing the term M is $\wr M \wr$. The concatenation of bags B_1 and B_2 is denoted as $B_1 \cdot B_2$; the concatenation operator ‘ \cdot ’ is associative and commutative, with 1 as its identity. To ease readability, we rely on a shorthand notation for bags: we often write $\wr N_1, N_2 \wr$ rather than $\wr N_1 \wr \cdot \wr N_2 \wr$.

We treat expressions as *sums*, and use notations such as $\sum_i^n N_i$ for them. Sums are associative and commutative; reordering of the terms in a sum is performed silently.

Example 2.1

We give some examples of terms and expressions in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} :

- $M_1 = (\lambda x.x) \wr y \wr$
- $M_4 = (\lambda x.y) 1$
- $M_2 = (\lambda x.x) (\wr y, z \wr)$
- $M_5 = \text{fail}^0$
- $M_3 = (\lambda x.x) 1$
- $M_6 = (\lambda x.x) \wr y \wr + (\lambda x.x) \wr z \wr$

Terms M_1 , M_2 , and M_3 illustrate the application of the identity function $I = \lambda x.x$ to bags with different formats: a bag with one component, two components, and

the empty bag, respectively. Special attention should be given to the fact that the x has only one occurrence in I , whereas the bags contain zero or more components (resources). This way:

- M_1 represents a term with a *correct* number of resources;
- M_2 denotes a term with an *excess* of resources; and
- M_3 denotes a term with a *lack* of resources

This resource interpretation will become clearer once the reduction semantics is introduced in the next subsection (cf. Example 2.2).

Term M_4 denotes the application of a vacuous abstraction on x to the empty bag 1. Term M_5 denotes a failure term with no associated variables. Expression M_6 denotes the non-deterministic sum between two terms, each of which denotes an application of I to a bag containing one element. \square

Notation 2.2.1 (Expressions) *Notation $N \in \mathbb{M}$ denotes that N is part of the sum denoted by \mathbb{M} . Similarly, we write $N_i \in B$ to denote that N_i occurs in the bag B , and $B \setminus N_i$ to denote the bag that is obtained by removing one occurrence of the term N_i from B .*

2.2.2 Reduction Semantics

Reduction in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ is defined in terms of the relation \longrightarrow , defined in Fig. 2.2; it operates lazily on expressions, and will be described after introducing some auxiliary notions.

Notation 2.2.2 *We write $\text{PER}(B)$ to denote the set of all permutations of bag B . Also, $B_i(n)$ denotes the n -th term in the (permuted) B_i . We define $\text{size}(B)$ to denote the number of terms in bag B . That is, $\text{size}(1) = 0$ and $\text{size}(\lambda M \cdot B) = 1 + \text{size}(B)$.*

Definition 2.2 Set and Multiset of Free Variables

The set of free variables of a term, bag, and expression, is defined as

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \text{fv}(x) = \{x\} & \text{fv}(1) = \emptyset \\
 \text{fv}(\lambda x.M) = \text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x\} & \text{fv}(\lambda M) = \text{fv}(M) \\
 \text{fv}(M \cdot B) = \text{fv}(M) \cup \text{fv}(B) & \text{fv}(B_1 \cdot B_2) = \text{fv}(B_1) \cup \text{fv}(B_2) \\
 \text{fv}(M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle) = (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x\}) \cup \text{fv}(B) & \text{fv}(\text{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_n}) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \\
 & \text{fv}(\mathbb{M} + \mathbb{N}) = \text{fv}(\mathbb{M}) \cup \text{fv}(\mathbb{N})
 \end{array}$$

We use $\text{mfv}(M)$ or $\text{mfv}(B)$ to denote a multiset of free variables, defined similarly. We sometimes treat the sequence \tilde{x} as a (multi)set. We write $\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}$ to denote the multiset union of \tilde{x} and \tilde{y} and $\tilde{x} \setminus y$ to express that every occurrence of y is removed

from \tilde{x} . A term M is *closed* if $\text{fv}(M) = \emptyset$ (and similarly for expressions). As usual, we shall consider λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} -terms modulo α -equivalence. \square

Notation 2.2.3 $\#(x, M)$ denotes the number of (free) occurrences of x in M . Similarly, we write $\#(x, \tilde{y})$ to denote the number of occurrences of x in the multiset \tilde{y} .

Definition 2.3 Head

Given a term M , we define $\text{head}(M)$ inductively as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{head}(x) &= x & \text{head}(\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}) &= \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \\ \text{head}(\lambda x.M) &= \lambda x.M & \text{head}(M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle) &= \begin{cases} \text{head}(M) & \text{if } \#(x, M) = \text{size}(B) \\ \text{fail}^{\emptyset} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \text{head}(M B) &= \text{head}(M) \end{aligned}$$

\square

Definition 2.4 Linear Head Substitution

Let M be a term such that $\text{head}(M) = x$. The *linear head substitution* of a term N for x in M , denoted $M\{N/x\}$, is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} x\{N/x\} &= N \\ (M B)\{N/x\} &= (M\{N/x\}) B \\ (M \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle)\{N/x\} &= (M\{N/x\}) \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle \quad \text{where } x \neq y \end{aligned}$$

\square

Finally, we define contexts for terms and expressions and convenient notations:

Definition 2.5 Term and Expression Contexts

Contexts for terms (CTerm) and expressions (CEXpr) are defined by the following grammar:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(CTerm)} \quad C[\cdot], C'[\cdot] &::= ([\cdot])B \mid ([\cdot])\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \\ \text{(CEXpr)} \quad D[\cdot], D'[\cdot] &::= M + [\cdot] \mid [\cdot] + M \end{aligned}$$

\square

The reduction relation on λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} is defined by the rules in Fig. 2.2. Intuitively, reductions in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} work as follows: A β -reduction induces an explicit substitution of a bag B for a variable x in a term M , denoted $M\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$. In the case the head of the term M is x and the size of the bag B coincides with the number of occurrences of x in M , this explicit substitution is expanded into a sum of terms, each of which features a *linear head substitution* $M\{N_i/x\}$, where N_i is a term in B , which will replace the variable x occurring in the head of M ; the rest of the bag ($B \setminus N_i$) is kept in an explicit substitution. However, if there is a mismatch between the number of occurrences of the variable to be substituted and the number of resources available, then the reduction leads to the failure term. Formally,

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[R : Beta]} \frac{}{(\lambda x.M)B \longrightarrow M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle} \\
\text{[R : Fetch]} \frac{\text{head}(M) = x \quad B = \{N_1, \dots, N_k\}, \quad k \geq 1 \quad \#(x, M) = k}{M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow M\{[N_1/x]\} \langle\langle (B \setminus N_1)/x \rangle\rangle + \dots + M\{[N_k/x]\} \langle\langle (B \setminus N_k)/x \rangle\rangle} \\
\text{[R : Fail]} \frac{\#(x, M) \neq \text{size}(B) \quad \tilde{y} = (\text{mfv}(M) \setminus x) \uplus \text{mfv}(B)}{M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}} \\
\text{[R : Cons}_1\text{]} \frac{\tilde{y} = \text{mfv}(B)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} B \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}}} \\
\text{[R : Cons}_2\text{]} \frac{\text{size}(B) = k \quad \#(z, \tilde{x}) + k \neq 0 \quad \tilde{y} = \text{mfv}(B)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \langle\langle B/z \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{(\tilde{x} \setminus z) \uplus \tilde{y}}} \\
\text{[R : TCont]} \frac{M \longrightarrow M'_1 + \dots + M'_k}{C[M] \longrightarrow C[M'_1] + \dots + C[M'_k]} \qquad \text{[R : ECont]} \frac{M \longrightarrow M'}{D[M] \longrightarrow D[M']}
\end{array}$$

Figure 2.2: Reduction Rules for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$

- **Rule** [R : Beta] is standard and admits a bag (possibly empty) as parameter.
- **Rule** [R : Fetch] transforms a term into an expression: it opens up an explicit substitution into a sum of terms with linear head substitutions, each denoting the partial evaluation of an element from the bag, considering all the possible choices for substituting an element N_i of the bag for x . Hence, the size of the bag will determine the number of summands in the resulting expression.

There are three rules reduce to the failure term: their objective is to accumulate all (free) variables involved in failed reductions.

- **Rule** [R : Fail] formalizes failure in the evaluation of an explicit substitution $M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$, which occurs if there is a mismatch between the resources (terms) present in B and the number of occurrences of x to be substituted. The resulting failure preserves all free variables in M and B within its attached multiset \tilde{y} , and all possible computations that could have failed, via permutation of the bags, are captured in a non-deterministic sum.
- **Rules** [R : Cons₁] and [R : Cons₂] describe reductions that lazily consume the failure term, when a term has $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ at its head position. The former rule consumes bags attached to it whilst preserving all its free variables. The latter

rule is similar but for the case of explicit substitutions; its second premise ensures that either (i) the bag in the substitution is not empty or (ii) the number of occurrences of z in the current multiset of accumulated variables is not zero.

Notice that our Rule [R:Fail] rule evolves to a sum of failure terms, where each summand accounts for a permutation of the elements of the bag. As our reduction strategy fails eagerly this may not be evident at first; however, there is still a non-deterministic choice of elements in B that are waiting to be substituted at the point of failure (see Example 2.3).

Finally, we describe the contextual rules:

- **Rule** [R: TCont] describes the reduction of sub-terms within an expression; in this rule, summations are expanded outside of term contexts.
- **Rule** [R: ECont] says that reduction of expressions is closed by expression contexts.

Notation 2.2.4 As standard, \longrightarrow denotes one step reduction; \longrightarrow^+ and \longrightarrow^* denote the transitive and the reflexive-transitive closure of \longrightarrow , respectively. We write $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow_{[R]} \mathbb{M}$ to denote that [R] is the last (non-contextual) rule used in inferring the step from \mathbb{N} to \mathbb{M} .

Example 2.2 Cont. Example 2.1

We show how the terms in Example 2.1 can reduce:

- Reduction of the term M_1 with an adequate number of resources:

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda x.x) \wr y \wr &\longrightarrow_{[R:\text{Beta}]} x \langle \langle \wr y \wr / x \rangle \rangle \\ &\longrightarrow_{[R:\text{Fetch}]} y \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle \quad \text{since } \#(x,x) = \text{size}(\wr y \wr) = 1 \end{aligned}$$

- Reduction of term M_2 with excess of resources:

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda x.x)(\wr y, z \wr) &\longrightarrow_{[R:\text{Beta}]} x \langle \langle (\wr y, z \wr) / x \rangle \rangle \\ &\longrightarrow_{[R:\text{Fail}]} \text{fail}^{y,z} + \text{fail}^{y,z}, \quad \text{since } \#(x,x) = 1 \neq \text{size}(\wr y, z \wr) = 2 \end{aligned}$$

- Reduction of term M_3 with lack of resources:

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda x.x)1 &\longrightarrow_{[R:\text{Beta}]} x \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle \\ &\longrightarrow_{[R:\text{Fail}]} \text{fail}^0, \quad \text{since } \#(x,x) = 1 \neq \text{size}(1) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

- Reduction of term M_4 which is a vacuous abstraction applied to an empty bag:

$$(\lambda x.y)1 \longrightarrow_{[R:\text{Beta}]} y \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle$$

- $M_5 = \text{fail}^0$ is unable to perform any reductions, i.e., it is irreducible.
- Reductions of the expression $M_6 = (\lambda x.x) \wr y \wr + (\lambda x.x) \wr z \wr$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & x \langle \langle \wr y \rangle / x \rangle + (\lambda x.x) \wr z \wr & \\
 & \swarrow & \searrow \\
 (\lambda x.x) \wr y \wr + (\lambda x.x) \wr z \wr & & x \langle \langle \wr y \rangle / x \rangle + x \langle \langle \wr z \rangle / x \rangle \\
 & \searrow & \swarrow \\
 & (\lambda x.x) \wr y \wr + x \langle \langle \wr z \rangle / x \rangle &
 \end{array}$$

□

The following example illustrates the use of $\text{PER}(B)$ in Rule $[\text{R} : \text{Fail}]$: independently of the order in which the resources in the bag are used, the computation fails.

Example 2.3

Let $M = (\lambda x.x \wr x \wr y \wr \wr) B$, with $B = \wr z_1, z_2, z_1 \wr$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 M &\longrightarrow_{[\text{R} : \text{Beta}]} x \wr x \wr y \wr \wr \langle \langle \wr z_1, z_2, z_1 \rangle / x \rangle \\
 &\longrightarrow_{[\text{R} : \text{Fail}]} \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{y, z_1, z_2, z_1}
 \end{aligned}$$

The number of occurrences of x in the term obtained after β -reduction (2) does not match the size of the bag (3). Therefore, the reduction leads to failure. Notice that $\sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{y, z_1, z_2, z_1}$ expands to a sum between six instances of $\text{fail}^{y, z_1, z_2, z_1}$, corresponding to permutation of 3 elements of the bag B . □

Notice that the left-hand sides of the reduction rules in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} do not interfere with each other. Therefore, reduction in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} satisfies a *diamond property*:

Proposition 2.2.1 (Diamond Property for λ_{\oplus}^{ζ}) For all $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{N}_2$ in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} s.t. $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}_2$ with $\mathbb{N}_1 \neq \mathbb{N}_2$ then there exists \mathbb{M} such that $\mathbb{N}_1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{N}_2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$.

Proof: [Proof (Sketch)] By inspecting the rules of Fig. 2.2 one can check that the left-hand sides only clash in a non-variable position with Rules $[\text{R} : \text{Fail}]$ and $[\text{R} : \text{Cons2}]$. The clash does not generate a critical pair: in fact, when applied to the λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} -term $\text{fail}^{z, \tilde{x}} \langle \langle 1/z \rangle \rangle$ both rules reduce to $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$. For all the other rules, whenever they have the same shape, the side conditions of the rules determine which rule can be applied. Therefore, an expression can only perform a choice of reduction steps when it is a sum of terms in which multiple summands can perform independent reductions. Without loss of generality, consider an expression $\mathbb{N} = N + M$ such that $N \longrightarrow N'$ and $M \longrightarrow M'$. Then we let $\mathbb{N}_1 = N' + M$ and $\mathbb{N}_2 = N + M'$ by Rule $[\text{R} : \text{ECont}]$. The result follows for $\mathbb{M} = N' + M'$, since $\mathbb{N}_1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$ and $\mathbb{N}_2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$. □

Remark 2.2.1 (A Sub-calculus without Failure (λ_{\oplus})) We find it convenient to define λ_{\oplus} , the sub-calculus of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ without explicit failure. The syntax of λ_{\oplus} is obtained from Definition 2.1 by excluding $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ from the syntax of terms. Accordingly, the reduction relation for λ_{\oplus} is given by Rules [R : Beta], [R : Fetch], [R : ECont], and [R : TCont] in Fig. 2.2. Finally, Definition 2.3 is kept unchanged with the provision that $\text{head}(M\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle)$ is undefined when $\#(x, M) \neq \text{size}(B)$.

2.2.3 Well-formed $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -Expressions

As mentioned in § 2.1, we define a notion of *well-formed expressions* for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ by relying on a non-idempotent intersection type system, similar to the one given by Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010). Our system for well-formed expressions will be defined in two stages:

1. First we define an intersection type system for the sub-language λ_{\oplus} (cf. Rem. 2.2.1), given in Fig. 2.3. Unlike the system in Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010), our type system includes a weakening rule and a rule for typing explicit substitutions.
2. Second, we define well-formed expressions for the full language $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, via Def. 2.10.

We say that we check for “well-formedness” (of terms, bags, and expressions) to stress that, unlike standard type systems, our system is able to account for terms that may reduce to the failure term.

Intersection Types

Intersection types allow us to reason about types of resources in bags but also about every occurrence of a variable. That is, non-idempotent intersection types enable us to distinguish expressions not only by measuring the size of a bag but also by counting the number of times a variable occurs within a term.

Definition 2.6 Types for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$

We define *strict* and *multiset types* by the grammar:

$$\text{(Strict)} \quad \sigma, \tau, \delta ::= \mathbf{unit} \mid \pi \rightarrow \sigma \qquad \text{(Multiset)} \quad \pi ::= \sigma^k \mid \omega$$

where σ^k stands for $\sigma \wedge \dots \wedge \sigma$ (k times, for some $k > 0$). □

A strict type can be the unit type \mathbf{unit} or a functional type $\pi \rightarrow \sigma$, where π is a multiset type and σ is a strict type. Multiset types can be either an intersection of strict types σ^k (if $k > 0$) or the empty type ω , which would correspond to σ^k with

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[T : var]} \frac{}{x : \sigma \vdash x : \sigma} \quad \text{[T : 1]} \frac{}{\vdash 1 : \omega} \quad \text{[T : weak]} \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma}{\Gamma, x : \omega \vdash M : \sigma} \\
\text{[T : abs]} \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x. M : \sigma^k \rightarrow \tau} \quad \text{[T : bag]} \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma \quad \Delta \vdash B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \vdash \{M\} \cdot B : \sigma^{k+1}} \\
\text{[T : app]} \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \pi \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \pi}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \vdash M B : \tau} \quad \text{[T : ex-sub]} \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \vdash M : \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \vdash M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau} \\
\text{[T : sum]} \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma \quad \Gamma \vdash N : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash M + N : \sigma}
\end{array}$$

Figure 2.3: Typing Rules for λ_{\oplus}

$k = 0$. Hence, σ^k denotes an intersection; the operator \wedge is commutative, associative, and non-idempotent, that is, $\sigma \wedge \sigma \neq \sigma$. The empty type is the type of the empty bag; it acts as the identity element to \wedge .

Definition 2.7

Type contexts Γ, Δ, \dots are sets of type assignments $x : \pi$, as defined by the grammar:

$$\Gamma, \Delta = - \mid \Gamma, x : \pi$$

The set of variables in Γ is denoted as $\text{dom}(\Gamma)$. In writing $\Gamma, x : \pi$ we assume that $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$. We generalize the operator \wedge from types to contexts, and define $\Gamma \wedge \Delta$ as follows:

$$(\Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2)(x) = \begin{cases} x : \pi_1 \wedge \pi_2 & x : \pi_i \in \Gamma_i, \pi_i \neq \omega, i \in \{1, 2\} \\ x : \pi_i & x : \pi_i \in \Gamma_i, x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma_j), i \neq j, i, j \in \{1, 2\} \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

□

Type judgements are of the form $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$, where Γ is a type context. We write $\vdash M : \sigma$ to denote $- \vdash M : \sigma$.

Definition 2.8 Well-typed Expressions

An expression $M \in \lambda_{\oplus}$ is *well-typed* (or *typable*) if there exist Γ and τ such that $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ is entailed via the rules in Fig. 2.3. □

The rules are standard. We only consider intersections of the same strict type, say σ , since the current objective is to count the number of occurrences of a variable in a term, and measure the size of a bag. We now give a brief description of the rules in Fig. 2.3:

- **Rules** [T:var], [T:1] **and** [T:weak] are as expected: the first assigns a type to a variable, the second assigns the empty bag 1 the empty type ω , and the third introduces a useful weakening principle.
- **Rule** [T:abs] types an abstraction $\lambda x.M$ with $\sigma^k \rightarrow \tau$, as long as the variable assignment $x : \sigma^k$ has an intersection type with σ occurring exactly k times.
- **Rule** [T:bag] types a bag B with a type σ^{k+1} as long as every component of B is typed with same type σ , a defined amount of times.
- **Rule** [T:app] types an application $M B$ with τ as long as M and B match on the multiset type π , i.e., $M : \pi \rightarrow \tau$ and $B : \pi$. Intuitively, this means that M expects a fixed amount of resources, and B has exactly this number of resources.
- **Rule** [T:ex-sub] types an explicit substitution $M\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$ with τ as long as the bag B consists of elements of the same type as x and the size of B matches the number of times x occurs in M , i.e., $B : \sigma^k$ and $x : \sigma^k$ types the assignment of $M : \tau$.
- **Rule** [T:sum] types an expression (a sum) with a type σ , if each summand has type σ .

Notice that with the typing rules for λ_{\oplus} the failure term `fail` cannot be typed. We could consider this set of rules as a type system for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, i.e. the extension of λ_{\oplus} with failure, in which failure can be expressed but not typed.

Example 2.4 Cont. Example 2.2

We explore the typability of some of the terms given in previous examples:

1. Term $M_1 = (\lambda x.x) \{y\}$ is typable, as we have:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{[T:var] \frac{}{x : \sigma \vdash x : \sigma}}{[T:abs] \vdash \lambda x.x : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma} \quad \frac{\frac{[T:var] \frac{}{y : \sigma \vdash y : \sigma} \quad [T:1] \frac{}{\vdash 1 : \omega}}{[T:bag] y : \sigma \vdash \{y\} \cdot 1 : \sigma}}{[T:app] \frac{}{y : \sigma \vdash (\lambda x.x) \{y\} : \sigma}}{y : \sigma \vdash (\lambda x.x) \{y\} : \sigma}}$$

2. Term $M_2 = (\lambda x.x)(\{y, z\})$ is not typable.

- The function $\lambda x.x$ has a functional type $\sigma \rightarrow \sigma$;
- The bag has an intersection type of size two: $y : \sigma, z : \sigma \vdash (\{y, z\}) : \sigma^2$;
- Rule [T:app] requires a match between the type of the bag and the left of the arrow: it can only consume a bag of type σ .

3. Similarly, $M_3 = (\lambda x.x)1$ is not typable: since $\lambda x.x$ has type $\sigma \rightarrow \sigma$, to apply the Rule [T : app] the bag must have a type σ , but the empty bag 1 can only be typed with ω .
4. Term $M_4 = (\lambda x.y)1$ is typable, as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{[T : \text{var}] \frac{}{y : \sigma \vdash y : \sigma}}{[T : \text{weak}] \frac{}{y : \sigma, x : \omega \vdash y : \sigma}}{[T : \text{abs}] \frac{}{y : \sigma \vdash \lambda x.y : \omega \rightarrow \sigma}} \quad [T : 1] \frac{}{\vdash 1 : \omega}}{[T : \text{app}] \frac{}{y : \sigma \vdash (\lambda x.y)1 : \sigma}}$$

□

Our typing system for λ_{\oplus} satisfies standard properties, such as subject reduction, which follows from the *Linear Substitution Lemma*. We stress ‘linearity’ because the lemma is stated in terms of the head linear substitution $\{\cdot/x\}$.

Lemma 2.2.1 (Linear Substitution Lemma for λ_{\oplus}) *If $\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \vdash M : \tau$ (with $k \geq 1$), $\text{head}(M) = x$, and $\Delta \vdash N : \sigma$ then $\Gamma \wedge \Delta, x : \sigma^{k-1} \vdash M\{N/x\} : \tau$.*

Proof: Standard, by induction on the rule applied in $\Gamma, x : \sigma \vdash M : \tau$. □

Theorem 2.1 (Subject Reduction for λ_{\oplus}) *If $\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M} : \tau$ and $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}'$ then $\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M}' : \tau$.*

Proof: By induction on the reduction rule (Fig. 2.2) applied in \mathbb{M} . □

Lemma 2.2.2 (Linear Anti-substitution Lemma for λ_{\oplus}) *Let M and N be λ_{\oplus} -terms such that $\text{head}(M) = x$, then we have:*

- $\Gamma, x : \sigma^{k-1} \vdash M\{N/x\} : \tau$, with $k > 1$, then there exist Γ_1, Γ_2 such that $\Gamma_1, x : \sigma^k \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$, where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$.
- $\Gamma \vdash M\{N/x\} : \tau$, with $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then there exist Γ_1, Γ_2 such that $\Gamma_1, x : \sigma \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$, where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$.

Proof: Standard, by structural induction. □

Theorem 2.2 (Subject Expansion for λ_{\oplus}) *If $\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M}' : \tau$ and $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}'$ then $\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M} : \tau$.*

Proof: Standard, by structural induction. See App. A.2 for details. □

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[F : wf-expr]} \frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M} : \tau}{\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau} \quad \text{[F : wf-bag]} \frac{\Gamma \vdash B : \pi}{\Gamma \models B : \pi} \quad \text{[F : weak]} \frac{\Delta \models M : \tau}{\Delta, x : \omega \models M : \tau} \\
\text{[F : abs]} \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma^n \models M : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \models \lambda x.M : \sigma^n \rightarrow \tau} \quad \text{[F : bag]} \frac{\Gamma \models M : \sigma \quad \Delta \models B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \models \lambda M \cdot B : \sigma^{k+1}} \\
\text{[F : sum]} \frac{\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \sigma \quad \Gamma \models \mathbb{N} : \sigma}{\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} + \mathbb{N} : \sigma} \quad \text{[F : fail]} \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma^{\dagger}) = \tilde{x}}{\Gamma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} : \tau} \\
\text{[F : ex-sub]} \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \models M : \tau \quad \Delta \models B : \sigma^j \quad k, j \geq 0}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \models M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau} \\
\text{[F : app]} \frac{\Gamma \models M : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta \models B : \sigma^k \quad k, j \geq 0}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \models M B : \tau}
\end{array}$$

Figure 2.4: Well-Formed Rules for λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} **Well-formed Expressions (in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ})**

Building upon the type system for λ_{\oplus} , we now define a type system for checking *well-formed* λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} -expressions. This approach enables us to admit expressions with a failing computational behavior, may it be due to the mismatch in the number of resources required and available, or be due to consumption of a failing behavior by another expression. Such definition relies on the *core context* which is the key to the well-formedness of failure terms: free variables that are result of weakening will be disregarded in the typing of the failure term.

Definition 2.9 Core Context

Given a context Γ , the associated *core context* is defined as $\Gamma^{\dagger} = \{x : \pi \in \Gamma \mid \pi \neq \omega\}$. \square

Definition 2.10 Well-formed λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} expressions

An expression \mathbb{M} is *well-formed* if there exist Γ and τ such that $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ is entailed via the rules in Fig. 2.4. \square

Below we give a brief description of the rules in Fig. 2.4. Essentially, they differ from the ones in Fig. 2.3, by allowing mismatches between the number of copies of a variable in a functional position and the number of components in a bag.

- **Rules [F:wf-expr] and [F:wf-bag]** derive that well-typed expressions and bags in λ_{\oplus} are well-formed.
- **Rules [F:abs], [F:bag], and [F:sum]** are as in the type system for λ_{\oplus} , but extended to the system of well-formed expressions.

- **Rules** $[F:\text{ex-sub}]$ **and** $[F:\text{app}]$ differ from the similar typing rules as the size of the bags (as declared in their types) is no longer required to match the number of occurrences of the variable assignment in the typing context ($[F:\text{ex-sub}]$), or the type of the term in the functional position ($[F:\text{app}]$).
- **Rule** $[F:\text{fail}]$ has no analogue in the type system: we allow $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ to be well-formed with any strict type, provided that the core context contains the types of the variables in \tilde{x} (i.e., none of the variables in \tilde{x} is typed with ω).

Clearly, the set of well-typed expressions is strictly included in the set of well-formed expressions. Take, e.g., $M = x\langle\langle\lambda N_1, N_2\rangle/x\rangle$, where both N_1 and N_2 are well-typed. It is easy to see that M is well-formed. However, M is not well-typed.

Example 2.5 Cont. Example 2.4

We explore the well-formedness of some of the terms motivated in previous examples:

1. Term $M_1 = (\lambda x.x)\lambda y$ is well-typed and also well-formed, as we have:

$$[F:\text{wf-expr}] \frac{y:\sigma \vdash (\lambda x.x)\lambda y : \sigma}{y:\sigma \models (\lambda x.x)\lambda y : \sigma}$$

2. We saw that term $M_2 = (\lambda x.x)(\lambda y,z)$ is not typable; however, it is well-formed:

$$[F:\text{wf-expr}] \frac{\frac{\vdash \lambda x.x : \sigma^1 \rightarrow \sigma}{\models \lambda x.x : \sigma^1 \rightarrow \sigma} [F:\text{wf-bag}] \frac{y:\sigma, z:\sigma \vdash \lambda y,z : \sigma^2}{y:\sigma, z:\sigma \models \lambda y,z : \sigma^2}}{y:\sigma, z:\sigma \models (\lambda x.x)(\lambda y,z) : \sigma} [F:\text{app}]$$

Notice that both $\vdash \lambda x.x : \sigma^1 \rightarrow \sigma$ and $\Gamma \vdash \lambda y,z : \sigma^2$ are well-typed as $1, 2 \geq 0$.

3. Similarly, the term $M_3 = (\lambda x.x)1$ is also well-formed. The corresponding derivation is as above, but uses an empty context as well as the well-formedness rule for bags:

$$[F:\text{wf-bag}] \frac{\vdash 1 : \sigma^0}{\models 1 : \sigma^0}$$

Notice how $\sigma^0 = \omega$ and that $\models 1 : \omega$.

4. Term $M_4 = (\lambda x.y)1$ is well-typed and also well-formed.
5. Interestingly, term $M_5 = \text{fail}^0$ is well-formed as:

$$[F : \text{fail}] \frac{}{\models \text{fail}^{\emptyset} : \tau}$$

□

Example 2.6

Let us consider an expression that is not well-formed:

$$\lambda x.x \{ \lambda y.y, \lambda z.z_1 \{ z_1 \{ z_2 \} \} \}.$$

Notice that $\lambda x.x$ is applied to bags of two different types:

- The first bag containing $\lambda y.y$ is well-typed, thus well-formed. Consider the derivation Π_1 :

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{[T : \text{var}]}{y : \sigma \vdash y : \sigma} \quad [T : \text{abs}]}{\vdash \lambda y.y : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma} \quad [T : 1]}{\vdash \{ \lambda y.y \} \cdot 1 : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma} \quad [F : \text{wf-bag}]}{\models \{ \lambda y.y \} \cdot 1 : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma}$$

In the rest of the example we will omit the labels of rule applications, and concatenations with the empty bag 1 (i.e., $\{ \lambda y.y \} \cdot 1$ will be written simply as $\{ \lambda y.y \}$) and corresponding sub-derivations consisting of applications of Rule [T : 1].

- The second bag contains $\lambda z.z_1 \{ z_1 \{ z_2 \} \}$ contains an abstraction that acts as a weakening as z does not appear within $z_1 \{ z_1 \{ z_2 \} \}$. Consider the derivation Π_2 :

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{z_2 : \sigma \vdash z_2 : \sigma}{z_1 : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma \vdash z_1 : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma} \quad z_2 : \sigma \vdash \{ z_2 \} : \sigma}{z_1 : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma, z_2 : \sigma \vdash z_1 \{ z_2 \} : \sigma}}{z_1 : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma, z_2 : \sigma \vdash \{ z_1 \{ z_2 \} \} : \sigma}}{z_1 : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma \wedge \sigma \rightarrow \sigma, z_2 : \sigma \vdash z_1 \{ z_1 \{ z_2 \} \} : \sigma}}{z_1 : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma \wedge \sigma \rightarrow \sigma, z_2 : \sigma, z : \omega \vdash z_1 \{ z_1 \{ z_2 \} \} : \sigma}}{z_1 : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma \wedge \sigma \rightarrow \sigma, z_2 : \sigma \vdash \lambda z.z_1 \{ z_1 \{ z_2 \} \} : \omega \rightarrow \sigma}}{z_1 : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma \wedge \sigma \rightarrow \sigma, z_2 : \sigma \models \lambda z.z_1 \{ z_1 \{ z_2 \} \} : \omega \rightarrow \sigma}}{\underbrace{z_1 : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma \wedge \sigma \rightarrow \sigma, z_2 : \sigma}_{\Gamma} \models \lambda z.z_1 \{ z_1 \{ z_2 \} \} : \omega \rightarrow \sigma}$$

- The concatenation of these two bags is not well-formed since each component has a different type: $\sigma \rightarrow \sigma$ and $\omega \rightarrow \sigma$. Therefore, $\lambda x.x \{ \lambda y.y, \lambda z.z_1 \{ z_1 \{ z_2 \} \} \}$ is not well-formed.

Notice that if we change $\lambda y.y$ to $\lambda y.y_1$ in the first bag, we would have a derivation Π'_1 for $y_1 : \sigma \models \lambda y.y_1 : \omega \rightarrow \sigma$. This would allow us to concatenate the bags with derivation Π_3 :

$$\frac{\frac{\Pi'_1 \quad \Gamma \models \lambda z.z_1 \lambda z_1 \lambda z_2 \lambda z_3 : \omega \rightarrow \sigma \quad \overline{1 : \omega}}{y_1 : \sigma \models \lambda y.y_1 : \omega \rightarrow \sigma} \quad \Gamma \models \lambda z.z_1 \lambda z_1 \lambda z_2 \lambda z_3 : \omega \rightarrow \sigma}{\Gamma, y_1 : \sigma \models \lambda y.y_1 \lambda z.z_1 \lambda z_1 \lambda z_2 \lambda z_3 : (\omega \rightarrow \sigma)^2} \Pi_2$$

Thus, the whole term becomes well-formed:

$$\frac{\frac{x : \omega \rightarrow \sigma \vdash x : \omega \rightarrow \sigma}{\vdash \lambda x.x : (\omega \rightarrow \sigma) \rightarrow \omega \rightarrow \sigma} \quad \Gamma, y_1 : \sigma \models \lambda y.y_1, \lambda z.z_1 \lambda z_1 \lambda z_2 \lambda z_3 : (\omega \rightarrow \sigma)^2}{\Gamma, y_1 : \sigma \models \lambda x.x \lambda y.y_1, \lambda z.z_1 \lambda z_1 \lambda z_2 \lambda z_3 : \omega \rightarrow \sigma} \Pi_3$$

□

Well-formedness rules satisfy subject reduction with respect to the rules in Fig. 2.2 and relies on the linear substitution lemma for λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} :

Lemma 2.2.3 (Substitution Lemma for λ_{\oplus}^{ζ}) *If $\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \models M : \tau$ (with $k \geq 1$), $\text{head}(M) = x$, and $\Delta \models N : \sigma$ then $\Gamma \wedge \Delta, x : \sigma^{k-1} \models M\{N/x\}$.*

We now show subject reduction on well formed expressions in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} . We use our results of subject reduction for well-typed λ_{\oplus} (Theorem 2.1) and extend them to λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} .

Theorem 2.3 (Subject Reduction in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ}) *If $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ and $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}'$ then $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M}' : \tau$.*

Proof: [Proof (Sketch)] By structural induction on the reduction rules. See App. A.1 for details. □

Differently from λ_{\oplus} , subject expansion fails for λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} . This is due to the possibility of failure in the use of resources. In λ_{\oplus} , if a resource is substituted within a term it is always done once, hence the term substituted must always be well-typed; however, in reductions that lead to the failure term, resources within a bag may be discarded before ever being substituted and hence, there is no requirement to be well-formed. Formally, we have:

Theorem 2.4 (Failure of Subject Expansion in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ}) *If $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M}' : \tau$ and $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}'$ then it is not necessarily the case that $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$.*

Proof: A counter-example suffices here. Consider the term fail^0 , which is well-formed but not well-typed, and let Ω' be the term $(\lambda x.x \lambda x \lambda x) \lambda x.x \lambda x \lambda x$. Notice that $- \models \text{fail}^0 : \tau$ and $\text{fail}^x \langle \langle \Omega' \rangle / x \rangle \longrightarrow \text{fail}^0$, but $\text{fail}^x \langle \langle \Omega' \rangle / x \rangle$ is not well-formed (nor well-typed). □

2.3 $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$: A Resource Calculus With Sharing

We define $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, a variant of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ with a sharing construct, which we adopt following the atomic λ -calculus in [Gundersen et al. \(2013\)](#). In $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, a variable is only allowed to appear once in a term: multiple occurrences of the same variable are atomized, i.e., they are given new different variable names. The “atomization” of variable occurrences realized in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ via sharing will turn out to be very convenient to define our encoding into \mathfrak{sp} .

Our language $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, defined in § 2.3.1, includes also a form of explicit substitution, called *explicit linear substitution*, which enables a refined analysis of the consumption of linear resources. Later, in § 2.3.2, we introduce the reduction semantics that implements a lazy evaluation. In § 2.3.3, we present a non-idempotent intersection type system to control the use of resources. Finally, in § 2.3.4 we give an encoding from $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ into $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, denoted $(\cdot)^{\circ}$, whose correctness is established in § 2.5.

2.3.1 Syntax

The syntax of $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ only modifies the syntax of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -terms, which is defined by the grammar below; the syntax of bags B and expressions \mathbb{M} is as in Def. 2.1.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(Terms)} \quad M, N, L ::= & x \mid \lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \mid (M B) \mid M \langle \! \langle N/x \rangle \! \rangle \mid \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \\ & \mid M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \mid (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \! \langle B/x \rangle \! \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Distinctive aspects are the *sharing construct* $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ and the *explicit linear substitution* $M \langle \! \langle N/x \rangle \! \rangle$. The term $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ defines the sharing of variables \tilde{x} occurring in M using x . We shall refer to x as *sharing variable* and to \tilde{x} as *shared variables*. Notice that \tilde{x} can be empty: $M[\leftarrow x]$ expresses that x does not share any variables in M . The sharing construct $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ binds the variables in \tilde{x} ; the occurrence of x_i can appear within the fail term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$, if $x_i \in \tilde{y}$. In the explicit linear substitution $M \langle \! \langle N/x \rangle \! \rangle$ binds x in M . As in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, the term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ explicitly accounts for failed attempts at substituting the variables \tilde{x} , due to an excess or lack of resources. A variable that is not explicitly sharing/shared is called *independent*.

Example 2.7

The following are examples of $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -terms.

- (Shared identity) $\hat{\mathbf{I}} = \lambda x. x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x]$
- (Independent variables) An independent variable x applied to a 1-component bag (another independent variable): $x \wr_{x_1} \mathfrak{J}$
- $\hat{\mathbf{I}}$ applied to a 1-component bag: $\hat{\mathbf{I}} \wr_{y_1} \mathfrak{J}[y_1 \leftarrow y]$

- $\hat{\mathbf{I}}$ applied to a 2-component bag: $\hat{\mathbf{I}}(\lambda y_1, y_2 \int)[y_1, y_2 \leftarrow y]$
- Shared vacuous abstraction: $(\lambda y. x_1 \int x_2 \int [\leftarrow y])[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x]$
- $\hat{\mathbf{I}}$ applied to a bag containing an explicit substitution of a failure term that does not share the variable y : $\hat{\mathbf{I}} \int \text{fail}^0 [\leftarrow y] \langle \langle \int N \int / y \rangle \rangle \int$
- An abstraction on x of two shared occurrences of x : $\hat{D} = \lambda x. x_1 \int x_2 \int [x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x]$

□

The syntax of terms is subject to some natural conditions on variable occurrences and on the structure of the sharing construct and the explicit linear substitution. We formalize these conditions as *consistency*, defined as follows:

Definition 2.11 Consistent Terms, Bags, and Expressions

We say that the expression \mathbb{M} is *consistent* if each subterm M_0 of \mathbb{M} satisfies the following conditions:

1. If $M_0 = M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ then: (i) \tilde{x} contains pairwise distinct variables; (ii) every $x_i \in \tilde{x}$ must occur exactly once in M ; (iii) x_i is not a sharing variable; (iv) M is consistent.
2. If $M_0 = M \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle$ then: (i) the variable x must occur exactly once in M ; (ii) x cannot be a sharing variable; (iii) M and N are consistent; (iv) $\text{fv}(M) \cap \text{fv}(N) = \emptyset$.
3. Otherwise, for other forms of M_0 , variables must occur exactly once, i.e.,:
 - If $M_0 = \lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])$ then: $x \notin \text{fv}(M)$; \tilde{x} contains pairwise distinct variables; every $x_i \in \tilde{x}$ must occur exactly once in M and is not a sharing variable; M is consistent.
 - If $M_0 = (M B)$ then $\text{fv}(M) \cap \text{fv}(B) = \emptyset$ and M and B are consistent.
 - If $M_0 = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ then \tilde{x} contains pairwise distinct variables.
 - If $M_0 = (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$ then: $x \notin \text{fv}(M)$; \tilde{x} contains pairwise distinct variables; every $x_i \in \tilde{x}$ must occur exactly once in M and is not a sharing variable; $\text{fv}(M) \cap \text{fv}(B) = \emptyset$; and M and B are consistent.

Consistency extends to bags as follows. The bag 1 is always consistent. The bag $\int M \int$ is consistent if M is consistent. The bag $A \cdot B$ is consistent if (i) A and B are consistent and (ii) $\text{fv}(A) \cap \text{fv}(B) = \emptyset$. □

We now discuss the consistency conditions for the sharing construct $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$. Condition 1(ii) enforces that variables cannot have more than one linear occurrence in the subject of a sharing construct: this condition rules out terms such as $x_1 \{x_1 \} y \} [x_1 \leftarrow x]$. Condition 1(iii), which rules out terms of the form $x_1 \{x_2 \} x_3 \{y \} \} [x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x'] [x', x_3 \leftarrow x]$, is for convenience: by requiring that sharing occurrences appear at the top level in bindings, we can easily deduce the number of occurrences of a variable by measuring the size of \tilde{x} in $[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$, rather than inductively having to measure the occurrences of each $x' \in \tilde{x}$ in multiple sharing constructs.

Conditions on the explicit linear substitution $M\langle N/x \rangle$ formalize our design choice: an explicit linear substitution is defined when the number of variables to be substituted coincides with the number of available resources. In particular, Condition 2(i) rules out terms of the form $y\langle M/x \rangle$, where an explicit linear substitution has no variable to perform a substitution. Condition 2(ii) rules out terms such as $M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x]\langle M/x \rangle$, in which a term is to be linearly substituted for a single variable x ; however, as the variable is shared twice within M , there are less available terms to be substituted than it is necessary.

Finally, Condition 3 enforces that each variable occurs only once in a consistent term, and also that in $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$, the \tilde{x} denotes a set of variables (rather than a multiset), as variables can appear at most once within consistent terms. Thus, consistent terms also excludes terms such as $\text{fail}^{x,x}$.

In what follows, we shall be working with consistent terms only, which we will call simply terms in our definitions and results. As we will see, consistency will be preserved by reduction (Theorem 2.5) and ensured by typing (Theorem 2.10) and a structural congruence on terms (Theorem 2.17).

2.3.2 Reduction Semantics

Similarly to λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} , the reduction semantics of $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ is given by a relation \longrightarrow , defined by the rules in Fig. 2.5; it consists of an extension of reductions in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} that deals with the sharing construct $[\cdot \leftarrow \cdot]$ and with the explicit linear substitution $\langle \cdot / \cdot \rangle$. In order to define the reduction rules formally, we require some auxiliary notions: the free variables of an expression/term, the head of a term, linear head substitution, and contexts.

Definition 2.12 Free Variables

The set of free variables of a term, bag and expressions in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$, is defined inductively as

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{fv}(x) &= \{x\} & \text{fv}(\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}) &= \{\tilde{x}\} \\
\text{fv}(\lambda M) &= \text{fv}(M) & \text{fv}(B_1 \cdot B_2) &= \text{fv}(B_1) \cup \text{fv}(B_2) \\
\text{fv}(M B) &= \text{fv}(M) \cup \text{fv}(B) & \text{fv}(1) &= \emptyset \\
\text{fv}(M \langle N/x \rangle) &= (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x\}) \cup \text{fv}(N) & \text{fv}(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) &= (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{\tilde{x}\}) \cup \{x\} \\
\text{fv}(\lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])) &= \text{fv}(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \setminus \{x\} & \text{fv}(\mathbb{M} + \mathbb{N}) &= \text{fv}(\mathbb{M}) \cup \text{fv}(\mathbb{N}) \\
\text{fv}((M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle) &= (\text{fv}(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \setminus \{x\}) \cup \text{fv}(B)
\end{aligned}$$

As usual, a term M is *closed* if $\text{fv}(M) = \emptyset$. □

Definition 2.13 Head

The head of a term M , denoted $\text{head}(M)$, is defined inductively:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{head}(x) &= x & \text{head}(\lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])) &= \lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \\
\text{head}(M B) &= \text{head}(M) & \text{head}(M \langle N/x \rangle) &= \text{head}(M) \\
\text{head}(\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}) &= \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \\
\text{head}(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) &= \begin{cases} x & \text{If } \text{head}(M) = y \text{ and } y \in \tilde{x} \\ \text{head}(M) & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\text{head}((M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle) &= \begin{cases} \text{fail}^0 & \text{If } |\tilde{x}| \neq \text{size}(B) \\ \text{head}(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) & \text{If } \tilde{x} = \emptyset \text{ and } B = 1 \\ (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

□

The most notable difference between $\text{head}(\cdot)$ in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\tilde{x}}$ (cf. Definition 2.3) and in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\tilde{x}}$ concerns explicit substitution. Both definitions return fail^0 in a mismatch of resources; in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\tilde{x}}$, the head term of an explicit substitution is only defined in the case of empty sharing (weakening). As we will see, this allows us to prioritize explicit substitution reductions over fetch reductions, as the head variable will block until an explicit substitution is separated into its linear component.

Definition 2.14 Linear Head Substitution

Given a term M with $\text{head}(M) = x$, the linear substitution of a term N for x in M , written $M\{N/x\}$ is inductively defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}
x\{N/x\} &= N \\
(M B)\{N/x\} &= (M\{N/x\}) B \\
(M \langle L/y \rangle)\{N/x\} &= (M\{N/x\}) \langle L/y \rangle & x \neq y \\
((M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]) \langle \langle B/y \rangle \rangle)\{N/x\} &= (M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]\{N/x\}) \langle \langle B/y \rangle \rangle & x \neq y \\
(M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y])\{N/x\} &= (M\{N/x\})[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] & x \neq y
\end{aligned}$$

□

We now define contexts for terms and expressions in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\beta}$. Term contexts involve an explicit linear substitution, rather than an explicit substitution: this is due to the reduction strategy we have chosen to adopt (cf. Rule [RS : Ex-Sub] in Fig. 2.5), as we always wish to evaluate explicit substitutions first. Expression contexts can be seen as sums with holes.

Definition 2.15 **Term and Expression Contexts in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\beta}$**

Let $[\cdot]$ denote a hole. Contexts for terms and expressions are defined by the following grammar:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{(Term Contexts)} & C[\cdot], C'[\cdot] ::= ([\cdot])B \mid ([\cdot])\langle N/x \rangle \mid ([\cdot])[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \mid \\ & \quad ([\cdot])[\leftarrow x]\langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle \\ \text{(Expression Contexts)} & D[\cdot], D'[\cdot] ::= M + [\cdot] \mid [\cdot] + M \end{array}$$

The substitution of a hole with a term M in a context $C[\cdot]$, denoted $C[M]$, must be a $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\beta}$ -term. \square

We assume that the terms that fill in the holes respect consistency (i.e., variables appear in a term only once, shared variables must occur in the context).

Example 2.8

This example illustrates that certain contexts cannot be filled with certain terms. Consider the hole in context $C[\cdot] = ([\cdot])\langle N/x \rangle$.

- The hole cannot be filled with y , since $C[y] = y\langle N/x \rangle$ is not a consistent term. Indeed, $M\langle N/x \rangle$ requires that x occurs exactly once within M .
- Similarly, the hole cannot be filled with fail^z with $z \neq x$, since $C[\text{fail}^z] = (\text{fail}^z)\langle N/x \rangle$ and x does not occur in the fail^z , thus, the result is not a consistent term.

\square

Now we are ready to describe the rules in Fig. 2.5. Intuitively, the lazy reduction relation \longrightarrow on expressions works as follows: a β -reduction in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\beta}$ results into an explicit substitution $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]\langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$, which then evolves, as an intermediate step, to an expression consisting of explicit linear substitutions, which are the ones reducing to a linear head substitution $\{[N/x]\}$ (with $N \in B$) when the size of B coincides with the number of occurrences of x in M . The term reduces to failure when there is a mismatch between the size of B and the number of shared variables to be substituted. More in details, we have:

- **Rule** [RS:Beta] is standard and reduces to an explicit substitution.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[RS:Beta]} \frac{}{(\lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B \longrightarrow M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle} \\
\text{[RS:Ex-Sub]} \frac{B = \{M_1\} \dots \{M_k\} \quad k \geq 1 \quad M \neq \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}}{M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} M\langle\langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle\rangle \dots \langle\langle B_i(k)/x_k \rangle\rangle} \\
\text{[RS:Lin-Fetch]} \frac{\text{head}(M) = x}{M\langle\langle N/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow M\{N/x\}} \\
\text{[RS:Fail]} \frac{k \neq \text{size}(B) \quad \tilde{y} = (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}) \cup \text{fv}(B)}{M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}} \\
\text{[RS:Cons}_1] \frac{\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(B)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}B \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(\tilde{\text{fail}}^{\tilde{x} \cup \tilde{y}})} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \cup \tilde{y}}} \quad \text{[RS:Cons}_2] \frac{\text{size}(B) = k \quad k + |\tilde{x}| \neq 0 \quad \tilde{z} = \text{fv}(B)}{(\text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \cup \tilde{y}}[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(\tilde{\text{fail}}^{\tilde{y} \cup \tilde{z}})} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \cup \tilde{z}}} \\
\text{[RS:Cons}_3] \frac{\tilde{z} = \text{fv}(N)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \cup x}\langle\langle N/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \cup \tilde{z}}} \\
\text{[RS:TCont]} \frac{M \longrightarrow M'_1 + \dots + M'_k}{C[M] \longrightarrow C[M'_1] + \dots + C[M'_k]} \quad \text{[RS:ECont]} \frac{M \longrightarrow M'}{D[M] \longrightarrow D[M']}
\end{array}$$

Figure 2.5: Reduction Rules for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$.

- **Rule** [RS:Ex-Sub] applies when the size k of the bag coincides with the length of the list $\tilde{x} = x_1, \dots, x_k$. Intuitively, this rule “distributes” an explicit substitution into a sum of terms involving explicit linear substitutions; it considers all possible permutations of the elements in the bag among all shared variables.
- **Rule** [RS:Lin-Fetch] specifies the evaluation of a term with an explicit linear substitution into a linear head substitution.

We have three rules that reduce to the failure term—their objective is to accumulate all (free) variables involved in failed reductions. Accordingly:

- **Rule** [RS:Fail] formalizes failure in the evaluation of an explicit substitution $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$, which occurs if there is a mismatch between the resources (terms) present in B and the number of occurrences of x to be substituted. The resulting failure term preserves all free variables in M and B within its attached set \tilde{y} .
- **Rules** [RS:Cons₁] **and** [RS:Cons₂] describe reductions that lazily consume the failure term, when a term has $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ at its head position. The former rule

consumes bags attached to it whilst preserving all its free variables.

- **Rule** [RS:Cons₃] accumulates into the failure term the free variables involved in an explicit linear substitution.

The contextual Rules [RS:TCont] and [RS:Econt] are standard.

Example 2.9

We show how a term $M = (\lambda x.x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x]) \wr \text{fail}^0[\leftarrow y] \langle \langle \wr N \rangle / y \rangle \rangle \wr$ can reduce using Rule [RS:Cons₂].

$$\begin{aligned}
M &\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Beta}]} x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x] \langle \langle \wr \text{fail}^0[\leftarrow y] \langle \langle \wr N \rangle / y \rangle \rangle \rangle \wr / x \rangle \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Ex-Sub}]} x_1 \langle \langle \wr \text{fail}^0[\leftarrow y] \langle \langle \wr N \rangle / y \rangle \rangle \rangle \wr / x_1 \rangle \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Lin-Fetch}]} \text{fail}^0[\leftarrow y] \langle \langle \wr N \rangle / y \rangle \rangle \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Cons}_2]} \text{fail}^{\text{fv}(N)}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Example 2.10

We illustrate how Rule [RS:Fail] can introduce $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ into a term. It also shows how Rule [RS:Cons₃] consumes an explicit linear substitution:

$$\begin{aligned}
x_1[\leftarrow y] \langle \langle \wr N \rangle / y \rangle \rangle [x_1 \leftarrow x] \langle \langle \wr M \rangle / x \rangle \rangle &\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Ex-Sub}]} x_1[\leftarrow y] \langle \langle \wr N \rangle / y \rangle \rangle \langle \langle \wr M \rangle / x_1 \rangle \rangle \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Fail}]} \text{fail}^{\{x_1\} \cup \text{fv}(N)} \langle \langle \wr M \rangle / x_1 \rangle \rangle \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Cons}_3]} \text{fail}^{\text{fv}(M) \cup \text{fv}(N)}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Similarly to λ_{\oplus}^{\wr} , reduction in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\wr}$ satisfies a *diamond property*. Therefore, we have the analogue of Proposition 2.2.1:

Proposition 2.3.1 (Diamond Property for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\wr}$) For all $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{N}_2$ in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\wr}$ s.t. $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}_2$ with $\mathbb{N}_1 \neq \mathbb{N}_2$ then there exists \mathbb{M} such that $\mathbb{N}_1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$ and $\mathbb{N}_2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$.

Proof: The thesis follows as in λ_{\oplus}^{\wr} since the left-hand sides of the reduction rules in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\wr}$ do not interfere with each other. □

Remark 2.3.1 (A Calculus with Sharing but Without Failure ($\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\wr}$)) As we did in Remark 2.2.1, we define a sub-calculus of $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\wr}$ in which failure is not explicit. The calculus $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\wr}$ is obtained from the syntax of $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\wr}$ by disallowing the term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$. The relevant reduction rules from Fig. 2.5 are [RS:Beta], [RS:Ex-Sub], [RS:Lin-Fetch], and the two contextual rules. We keep Def. 2.13 unchanged with the provision that $\text{head}(M \langle \langle \wr B \rangle / x \rangle \rangle)$ is undefined when $|\tilde{x}| \neq \text{size}(B)$.

2.3.3 Non-Idempotent Intersection Types

Similarly to $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, we now define *well-formed* $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ expressions and a system of rules for checking well-formedness by modifying the rules in Fig. 2.4. The grammar of strict and multiset types, the notions of typing assignments, and judgements are the same as in Section 2.2.3. We need an extension to the notion of typing context: whereas in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ variables were only assigned to multiset types, now sharing variables are assigned to multiset types, shared and independent variables are assigned to strict types.

Definition 2.16

We extend the definition of typing contexts (Def. 2.7) as follows:

$$\Gamma, \Delta = - \mid \Gamma, x : \pi \mid \Gamma, x : \sigma$$

The definition of core contexts is extended accordingly, and also denoted as Γ^{\dagger} . \square

The presentation is in two phases:

1. We consider the intersection type system given in Fig. 2.6 for which we consider the sub-calculus $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}$, the sharing calculus excluding failure (cf. Rem. 2.3.1).
2. We define well-formed expressions for the full language $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, via Def. 2.18 (see below).

To avoid ambiguities, we write $x : \sigma^1$ to make it explicit that the type assignment involves an intersection type (and a sharing variable), rather than a strict type.

Well-typed Expressions (in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}$)

The typing rules in Fig. 2.6 are essentially the same as the ones in Fig. 2.3, but now taking into account the sharing construct $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ and the explicit linear substitution. We discuss selected rules:

- **Rules** [TS:var], [TS:1], [TS:bag], [TS:app], **and** [TS:sum] are the same as in Fig. 2.3, considering sharing within the terms and bags.
- **Rule** [TS:weak] deals with $k = 0$, typing the term $M[\leftarrow x]$, when there are no occurrences of x in M , as long as M is typable.
- **Rule** [TS:abs-sh] is as expected: it requires that the sharing variable is assigned the k -fold intersection type σ^k .
- **Rule** [TS:ex-lin-sub] supports explicit linear substitutions and consumes one occurrence of $x : \sigma$ from the context.

- **Rule** [TS:ex-sub] types explicit substitutions where a bag must consist of both the same type and length of the shared variable it is being substituted for.
- **Rule** [TS:share] requires that the shared variables x_1, \dots, x_k have the same type as the sharing variable x , for $k \neq 0$. This rule justifies the need for the extension of contexts with assignments of the form $x : \sigma$. This way, e.g., Example 2.11 below gives an application of Rule [TS : share] with $k = 1$).

Definition 2.17 Well-typed Expressions

An expression $M \in \widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ is *well-typed* (or *typable*) if there exist Γ and τ such that $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ is entailed via the rules in Fig. 2.6. \square

Again, the failure term `fail` in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ is not typable via this typing system. The following examples illustrate the typing rules.

Example 2.11

The term $((\lambda x.x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x]) \wr y_1 \wr)[y_1 \leftarrow y]$ is well-typed, as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{[TS:var] \frac{}{x_1 : \sigma \vdash x_1 : \sigma}}{[TS:share] \frac{}{x : \sigma^1 \vdash x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x] : \sigma}}{[TS:abs-sh] \frac{}{\vdash \lambda x.x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x] : \sigma^1 \rightarrow \sigma}}{[TS:app-sh] \frac{}{y_1 : \sigma \vdash ((\lambda x.x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x]) \wr y_1 \wr) : \sigma}}{[TS:share] \frac{}{y : \sigma^1 \vdash ((\lambda x.x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x]) \wr y_1 \wr)[y_1 \leftarrow y] : \sigma}}{\frac{[TS:var] \frac{}{y_1 : \sigma \vdash y_1 : \sigma} \quad [TS:1] \frac{}{\vdash 1 : \omega}}{[TS:bag] \frac{}{y_1 : \sigma \vdash \wr y_1 \wr : \sigma^1}}{[TS:share] \frac{}{y_1 : \sigma \vdash ((\lambda x.x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x]) \wr y_1 \wr) : \sigma}}{[TS:share] \frac{}{y : \sigma^1 \vdash ((\lambda x.x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x]) \wr y_1 \wr)[y_1 \leftarrow y] : \sigma}}}$$

\square

Theorem 2.5 (Consistency Stability Under \longrightarrow) *If M is a consistent $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -expression and $M \longrightarrow M'$ then M' is consistent.*

Proof: By structural induction, and analyzing the reduction rules applied in M . See Appendix A.2 for details. \square

As expected, the typing system satisfies the subject reduction property w.r.t. the reduction relation given in Fig. 2.5, excluding rules for failure.

Theorem 2.6 (Subject Reduction in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$) *If $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ and $M \longrightarrow M'$ then $\Gamma \vdash M' : \tau$.*

Proof: Standard by induction on the rule applied in M . \square

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[TS:var]} \frac{}{x : \sigma \vdash x : \sigma} \quad \text{[TS:1]} \frac{}{\vdash 1 : \omega} \quad \text{[TS:weak]} \frac{\Delta \vdash M : \tau}{\Delta, x : \omega \vdash M[\leftarrow x] : \tau} \\
\\
\text{[TS:abs-sh]} \frac{\Delta, x : \sigma^k \vdash M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau}{\Delta \vdash \lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) : \sigma^k \rightarrow \tau} \quad \text{[TS:app]} \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \pi \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \pi}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash M B : \tau} \\
\\
\text{[TS:bag]} \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma \quad \Delta \vdash B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash \langle M \rangle \cdot B : \sigma^{k+1}} \quad \text{[TS:ex-lin-sub]} \frac{\Delta \vdash N : \sigma \quad \Gamma, x : \sigma \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash M \langle N/x \rangle : \tau} \\
\\
\text{[TS:ex-sub]} \frac{\Delta \vdash B : \sigma^k \quad \Gamma, x : \sigma^k \vdash M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle : \tau} \quad \text{[TS:sum]} \frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M} : \sigma \quad \Gamma \vdash \mathbb{N} : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M} + \mathbb{N} : \sigma} \\
\\
\text{[TS:share]} \frac{\Delta, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \vdash M : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Delta) \quad k \neq 0}{\Delta, x : \sigma^k \vdash M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau}
\end{array}$$

Figure 2.6: Typing Rules for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}$.

Lemma 2.3.1 (Linear Anti-substitution Lemma for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}$) Let M and N be $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}$ -terms such that $\text{head}(M) = x$. The following hold:

- If $\Gamma, x : \sigma^{k-1} \vdash M\{[N/x]\} : \tau$, with $k > 1$, then there exist Γ_1, Γ_2 such that $\Gamma_1, x : \sigma^k \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$, where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$.
- If $\Gamma \vdash M\{[N/x]\} : \tau$, with $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then there exist Γ_1, Γ_2 such that $\Gamma_1, x : \sigma \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$, where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$.

Proof: By structural induction on the reduction rule from Fig. 2.6. See App. A.2 for details. \square

Theorem 2.7 (Subject Expansion for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}$) If $\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M}' : \tau$ and $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}'$ then $\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M} : \tau$.

Proof: Standard, by induction on the reduction rule applied. See App. A.2 for details. \square

Well-formed Expressions (in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\not\leftarrow}$)

On top of the intersection type system for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}$, we define well-formed expressions: $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\not\leftarrow}$ -terms whose computation may lead to failure.

Definition 2.18 Well-formedness in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\not\leftarrow}$

An expression \mathbb{M} is well formed if there exist Γ and τ such that $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ is entailed via the rules in Fig. 2.7. \square

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[FS:wf-expr]} \frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M} : \tau}{\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau} \quad \text{[FS:wf-bag]} \frac{\Gamma \vdash B : \pi}{\Gamma \models B : \pi} \quad \text{[FS:weak]} \frac{\Gamma \models M : \tau}{\Gamma, x : \omega \models M[\leftarrow x] : \tau} \\
\text{[FS:abs-sh]} \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \models \lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) : \sigma^k \rightarrow \tau} \quad \text{[FS:fail]} \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma^\dagger) = \tilde{x}}{\Gamma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} : \tau} \\
\text{[FS:app]} \frac{\Gamma \models M : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta \models B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma, \Delta \models M B : \tau} \quad \text{[FS:bag]} \frac{\Gamma \models M : \sigma \quad \Delta \models B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma, \Delta \models \wr M \wr \cdot B : \sigma^{k+1}} \\
\text{[FS:ex-lin-sub]} \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma \models M : \tau \quad \Delta \models N : \sigma}{\Gamma, \Delta \models M \langle N/x \rangle : \tau} \quad \text{[FS:sum]} \frac{\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \sigma \quad \Gamma \models \mathbb{N} : \sigma}{\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} + \mathbb{N} : \sigma} \\
\text{[FS:ex-sub]} \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad \Delta \models B : \sigma^j}{\Gamma, \Delta \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle : \tau} \\
\text{[FS:share]} \frac{\Gamma, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models M : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma) \quad k \neq 0}{\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \models M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau}
\end{array}$$

Figure 2.7: Well-formedness Rules for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$.

Rules [FS:wf-expr] and [FS:wf-bag] guarantee that every well-typed expression and bag, respectively, is well-formed. Since our language is expressive enough to account for failing computations, we include rules for checking the structure of these ill-behaved terms—terms that can be well-formed, but not typable. For instance,

- **Rules [FS:ex-sub] and [FS:app]** differ from similar typing rules in Fig. 2.6: the size of the bags (as declared in their types) is no longer required to match.
- **Rule [FS:fail]** has no analogue in the type system: we allow the failure term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ to be well-formed with any type, provided that the core context contains types for the variables in \tilde{x} .

The other rules are similar to their corresponding ones in Fig. 2.4 and Fig. 2.6.

The following example illustrates a $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ expression that is well-formed but not well-typed.

Example 2.12 Cont. Example 2.12

The $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ expression consisting of an application of \hat{I} to a bag containing a failure term $\lambda x.x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x] \wr \text{fail}^0[\leftarrow y] \langle \langle 1/y \rangle \rangle \wr$ is well-formed with type σ . The derivation, with omitted rule labels, is the following:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{x_1 : \sigma \vdash x_1 : \sigma}{x_1 : \sigma \models x_1 : \sigma} \quad \frac{\frac{\overline{\models \text{fail}^0 : \sigma}}{y : \omega \models \text{fail}^0[\leftarrow y] : \sigma} \quad \frac{\overline{\vdash 1 : \omega}}{\vdash 1 : \omega}}{\vdash \text{fail}^0[\leftarrow y]\langle\langle 1/y \rangle\rangle : \sigma} \quad \frac{\overline{\vdash 1 : \omega}}{\vdash 1 : \omega}}{\vdash \lambda x.x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x] : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma} \quad \frac{\overline{\vdash \lambda \text{fail}^0[\leftarrow y]\langle\langle 1/y \rangle\rangle \int : \sigma^1}}{\vdash \lambda x.x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x] \lambda \text{fail}^0[\leftarrow y]\langle\langle 1/y \rangle\rangle \int : \sigma}}$$

Besides, we have $\lambda x.x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x] \lambda \text{fail}^0[\leftarrow y]\langle\langle 1/y \rangle\rangle \int \longrightarrow^* \text{fail}^0[\leftarrow y]\langle\langle 1/y \rangle\rangle \int$. \square

Well-formed $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ expressions satisfy the subject reduction property; as usual, the proof relies on a linear substitution lemma for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$.

Lemma 2.3.2 (Substitution Lemma for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$) *If $\Gamma, x : \sigma \models M : \tau$, $\text{head}(M) = x$, and $\Delta \models N : \sigma$ then $\Gamma, \Delta \models M\{N/x\} : \tau$.*

Proof: By structural induction on M . See App. A.2 for details. \square

Theorem 2.8 (Subject Reduction in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$) *If $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ and $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}'$ then $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M}' : \tau$.*

Proof: By structural induction on the reduction rule from Fig. 2.5. See App. A.2 for details. \square

We close this part by stating the failure of subject expansion for well-formed expressions.

Theorem 2.9 (Failure of Subject Expansion in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$) *If $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M}' : \tau$ and $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}'$ then it is not necessarily the case that $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$.*

Proof: We adapt the counter-example from the proof of Theorem 2.4. Consider the term fail^0 , which is well-formed but not well-typed, and let $\Omega^l = (\lambda x.x_1 \lambda x_2 \int [x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x]) \lambda x.x_1 \lambda x_2 \int [x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \int$. Notice that $\text{fail}^{x_1}[x_1 \leftarrow x] \langle\langle \int \Omega^l \int / x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \text{fail}^0$ and $\vdash \text{fail}^0 : \tau$, but $\text{fail}^{x_1}[x_1 \leftarrow x] \langle\langle \int \Omega^l \int / x \rangle\rangle$ is not well-formed (nor well-typed). \square

Theorem 2.10 (Consistency enforced by typing) *Let \mathbb{M} be a $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ -expression. If $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M}$ then \mathbb{M} is consistent.*

Proof: By induction on the type derivation. See Appendix A.2 for details. \square

Taking Stock

Up to here, we have presented our source language λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} —a new resource λ -calculus with failure—and its fail-free sub-calculus λ_{\oplus} . Based on them we defined well-typed and well-formed expressions. Similarly, we defined the intermediate calculus $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ and its sub-calculus $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}$. We now move on to define a translation of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} into $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$.

2.3.4 From λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} into $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$

Borrowing inspiration from translations given in [Gundersen et al. \(2013\)](#) for the atomic λ -calculus, we now define a translation $(\cdot)^{\circ}$ from well-formed expressions in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} into $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$. It relies on an auxiliary translation $(\cdot)^{\bullet}$ on λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} -terms, which depends on the notion of (simultaneous) linear substitution (Def. 2.19) which, intuitively, forces all bound variables in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} to become shared variables in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$. The correctness of $(\cdot)^{\circ}$ will be addressed in § 2.5.2.

Definition 2.19 Linear substitution

Suppose given a λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} -term M , a variable x , and a sequence of variables $\widetilde{w} = y, \widetilde{z}$. When $\#(x, M) = |\widetilde{w}|$ and $\{y\} \cap \widetilde{z} = \emptyset$, the *linear substitution* $M\langle y, \widetilde{z}/x \rangle$ of variable x for variables \widetilde{w} in M is defined inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
x\langle y/x \rangle &= y \\
(\lambda z.M)\langle y/x \rangle &= \lambda z.(M\langle y/x \rangle) \quad \text{if } x \in \text{fv}(M) \\
(MB)\langle y/x \rangle &= \begin{cases} (M\langle y/x \rangle)B & \text{if } x \in \text{fv}(M) \\ M(B\langle y/x \rangle) & \text{if } x \notin \text{fv}(M), x \in \text{fv}(B) \end{cases} \\
\text{fail}^{\widetilde{z}}\langle y/x \rangle &= \text{fail}^{\widetilde{z}, y} \quad \text{if } x \in \widetilde{z} \text{ and } \widetilde{z} = \widetilde{z}', x \\
(M\langle\langle B/z \rangle\rangle)\langle y/x \rangle &= \begin{cases} (M\langle y/x \rangle)\langle\langle B/z \rangle\rangle & \text{if } x \in \text{fv}(M) \\ M\langle\langle B\langle y/x \rangle/z \rangle\rangle & \text{if } x \notin \text{fv}(M), x \in \text{fv}(B) \end{cases} \\
1\langle y/x \rangle &= \text{undefined} \\
\lambda M \int \langle y/x \rangle &= \lambda M\langle y/x \rangle \int \quad \text{if } x \in \text{fv}(M) \\
(A \cdot B)\langle y/x \rangle &= \begin{cases} (A\langle y/x \rangle) \cdot B & \text{if } x \in \text{fv}(A) \\ A \cdot (B\langle y/x \rangle) & \text{if } x \notin \text{fv}(A), x \in \text{fv}(B) \end{cases} \\
M\langle y, \widetilde{z}/x \rangle &= (M\langle y/x \rangle)\langle\widetilde{z}/x \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, in all other cases, the substitution is undefined. We write $M\langle z_1, z_2, \dots, z_k/x \rangle$ to stand for $(\dots((M\langle z_1/x \rangle)\langle z_2/x \rangle)\dots\langle z_k/x \rangle)$. \square

Notice that for a λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} -term with multiple occurrences of the variable to be substituted for, this linear substitution fixes an ordering of instantiation. For example,

$\lambda x.y \{y, x\} \langle z_1, z_2/y \rangle$ results in $\lambda x.z_1 \{z_2, x\}$, and a permutation of variables as in $\lambda x.z_2 \{z_1, x\}$ is not accounted for. This is not restrictive; actually it is enough for our purposes since this substitution will only be used in Def. 2.20 and the variables being substituted will be bound by sharing, and therefore could be α -renamed.

Definition 2.20 From λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} to $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$

Let $M \in \lambda_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$. Suppose $\Gamma \models M : \tau$, with $\text{dom}(\Gamma) = \text{fv}(M) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and $\#(x_i, M) = j_i$. We define $\langle M \rangle^{\circ}$ as

$$\langle M \rangle^{\circ} = \langle M \langle \widetilde{y}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \widetilde{y}_k/x_k \rangle \rangle^{\bullet} [\widetilde{y}_1 \leftarrow x_1] \cdots [\widetilde{y}_k \leftarrow x_k]$$

where $\widetilde{y}_i = y_{i_1}, \dots, y_{i_{j_i}}$ and the translation $\langle \cdot \rangle^{\bullet} : \lambda_{\oplus}^{\zeta} \rightarrow \widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ is defined in Fig. 2.8. The translation $\langle \cdot \rangle^{\circ}$ extends homomorphically to expressions. \square

As already mentioned, the translation $\langle \cdot \rangle^{\circ}$ “atomizes” occurrences of variables, in the spirit of Gundersen et al. (2013): it converts n occurrences of a variable x in a term into n distinct variables y_1, \dots, y_n . The sharing construct coordinates the occurrences of these variables by constraining each to occur exactly once within a term. We proceed in two stages:

1. First, we use $\langle \cdot \rangle^{\bullet}$ to ensure that each free variable (say, y) is replaced by a shared variable (say, $y_i \in \widetilde{y}$), which is externally bound by the y in $[\widetilde{y} \leftarrow y]$.
2. Second, we apply the auxiliary translation $\langle \cdot \rangle^{\bullet}$ on the corresponding to the sharing of bound variables.

We now describe the two cases of Fig. 2.8 that are noteworthy.

- In $\langle \lambda x.M \rangle^{\bullet}$, the occurrences of x are replaced with fresh shared variables that only occur once in M .
- The definition of $\langle M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^{\bullet}$ considers two possibilities. If the bag being translated is non-empty and the explicit substitution would not lead to failure (the number of occurrences of x and the size of the bag coincide) then we translate the explicit substitution as a sum of explicit linear substitutions. Otherwise, the explicit substitution will lead to a failure, and the translation proceeds inductively. As we will see, doing this will enable a tight operational correspondence result with π .

Example 2.13 Cont. Example 2.1

We illustrate the translation $\langle \cdot \rangle^{\circ}$ on previously discussed examples. In all cases, we start by ensuring that the free variables are shared. This explains the occurrence of $[y_1 \leftarrow y]$ in the translation of M_1 as well as $[y_1 \leftarrow y]$ and $[z_1 \leftarrow z]$ in the translation

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle x \rangle^\bullet &= x & \langle 1 \rangle^\bullet &= 1 & \langle \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \rangle^\bullet &= \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \\
\langle M B \rangle^\bullet &= \langle M \rangle^\bullet \langle B \rangle^\bullet & \langle \lambda M \rangle^\bullet \langle B \rangle^\bullet &= \lambda \langle M \rangle^\bullet \langle B \rangle^\bullet \\
\langle \lambda x.M \rangle^\bullet &= \lambda x. (\langle M \langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x]) \quad \#(x, M) = n, \text{ each } y_i \in \tilde{y} \text{ is fresh} \\
\langle M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\bullet &= \begin{cases} \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(\langle B \rangle^\bullet)} \langle M \langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet \langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle B_i(k)/x_k \rangle & (*) \\ \langle M \langle y_1 \cdots y_k/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B \rangle^\bullet /x \rangle & (**) \end{cases} \\
(*) & \#(x, M) = \text{size}(B) = k \geq 1 \\
(**) & \text{ otherwise, } \#(x, M) = k \geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 2.8: Auxiliary Translation: $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\hat{z}}$ into $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\hat{z}}$.

of M_2 . Then, the auxiliary translation $\langle \cdot \rangle^\bullet$ ensures that bound variables that are guarded by an abstraction are shared. This explains, e.g., the occurrence of $[x_1 \leftarrow x]$ in the translation of M_1 .

- The translation of a $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\hat{z}}$ -term with one occurrence of a bound variable and one occurrence of a free variable: $M_1 = (\lambda x.x) \lambda y \}. \}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle M_1 \rangle^\bullet &= \langle (\lambda x.x) \lambda y \}. \} \rangle^\bullet \\
&= \langle (\lambda x.x) \lambda y_1 \}. \} \rangle^\bullet [y_1 \leftarrow y] \\
&= ((\lambda x.x_1 [x_1 \leftarrow x]) \lambda y_1 \}. \}) [y_1 \leftarrow y]
\end{aligned}$$

- The translation of a $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\hat{z}}$ -term with one bound and two different free variables: $M_2 = (\lambda x.x) (\lambda y.z) \}. \}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle M_2 \rangle^\bullet &= \langle (\lambda x.x) (\lambda y.z) \}. \} \rangle^\bullet \\
&= \langle (\lambda x.x) (\lambda y_1.z_1) \}. \} \rangle^\bullet [y_1 \leftarrow y] [z_1 \leftarrow z] \\
&= ((\lambda x.x_1 [x_1 \leftarrow x]) (\lambda y_1.z_1 \}. \})) [y_1 \leftarrow y] [z_1 \leftarrow z]
\end{aligned}$$

- The translation of a $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\hat{z}}$ -term with a vacuous abstraction: $M_4 = (\lambda x.y) 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle M_4 \rangle^\bullet &= \langle (\lambda x.y) 1 \rangle^\bullet \\
&= \langle (\lambda x.y_1) 1 \rangle^\bullet [y_1 \leftarrow y] \\
&= ((\lambda x.y_1 [\leftarrow x]) 1) [y_1 \leftarrow y]
\end{aligned}$$

- The translation of a $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\hat{z}}$ -expression: $M_6 = (\lambda x.x) \lambda y \}. \} + (\lambda x.x) \lambda z \}. \}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle M_6 \rangle^\bullet &= \langle (\lambda x.x) \lambda y \}. \} + (\lambda x.x) \lambda z \}. \} \rangle^\bullet \\
&= \langle (\lambda x.x) \lambda y \}. \} \rangle^\bullet + \langle (\lambda x.x) \lambda z \}. \} \rangle^\bullet \\
&= ((\lambda x.x_1 [x_1 \leftarrow x]) \lambda y_1 \}. \}) [y_1 \leftarrow y] + ((\lambda x.x_1 [x_1 \leftarrow x]) \lambda z_1 \}. \}) [z_1 \leftarrow z]
\end{aligned}$$

□

Example 2.14

The translation of a $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -term with two occurrences of a bound variable and two occurrences of a free variable: $M = (\lambda x.x \lambda x \lambda y.f)(\lambda y.f)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle M \rangle^{\circ} &= \langle \langle (\lambda x.x \lambda x \lambda y.f)(\lambda y.f) \rangle \rangle^{\circ} \\ &= \langle \langle (\lambda x.x \lambda x \lambda y.f)(\lambda y_1.f_2) \rangle \rangle^{\circ} [y_1, y_2 \leftarrow y] \\ &= \langle \langle (\lambda x.x_1 \lambda x_2.f [x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x])(\lambda y_1.f_2) \rangle \rangle [y_1, y_2 \leftarrow y] \end{aligned}$$

□

Example 2.15

Now consider the translation of $y \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$, with $\text{fv}(B) = \emptyset$ and $y \neq x$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle y \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^{\circ} &= \langle y_0 \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^{\circ} [y_0 \leftarrow y] \\ &= y_0 [\leftarrow x] \langle \langle \langle B \rangle^{\circ} / x \rangle \rangle [y_0 \leftarrow y]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the translation induces (empty) sharing on x , even if x does not occur in the term y . □

Proposition 2.3.2 ($\langle \cdot \rangle^{\circ}$ Preserves Consistency) *Let M be a $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -expression. Then $\langle M \rangle^{\circ}$ is a consistent $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -expression.*

Proof: By induction on the structure of M . See App. A.2 for details. □

2.4 $s\pi$: A Session-Typed π -Calculus with Non-Determinism

The π -calculus [Milner et al. \(1992\)](#) is a model of concurrency in which *processes* interact via *names* (or *channels*) to exchange values, which can be themselves names. Here we overview $s\pi$, introduced by [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#), in which *session types* [Honda \(1993\)](#); [Honda et al. \(1998a\)](#) ensure that the two endpoints of a channel perform matching actions: when one endpoint sends, the other receives; when an endpoint closes, the other closes too. Following [Caires & Pfenning \(2010\)](#); [Wadler \(2012\)](#), $s\pi$ defines a Curry-Howard correspondence between session types and a linear logic with two dual modalities ($\&A$ and $\oplus A$), which define *non-deterministic* sessions. In $s\pi$, cut elimination corresponds to process communication, proofs correspond to processes, and propositions correspond to session types.

| | | |
|------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| $P, Q ::=$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | (inaction) |
| | $\bar{x}(y).P$ | (output) |
| | $x(y).P$ | (input) |
| | $(P \mid Q)$ | (parallel) |
| | $(\nu x)P$ | (restriction) |
| | $[x \leftrightarrow y]$ | (forwarder) |
| | $x.\overline{\text{close}}$ | (session close) |
| | $x.\text{close};P$ | (complementary close) |
| | $x.\overline{\text{some}};P$ | (session confirmation) |
| | $x.\overline{\text{none}}$ | (session failure) |
| | $x.\text{some}_{(w_1, \dots, w_n)};P$ | (session dependency) |
| | $P \oplus Q$ | (non-deterministic choice) |

Figure 2.9: Syntax of $\mathfrak{s}\pi$.

2.4.1 Syntax and Semantics

We use $x, y, z, w \dots$ to denote names implementing the (*session*) *endpoints* of protocols specified by session types. We consider the sub-language of [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#) without labeled choices and replication, which is actually sufficient to encode $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$.

Definition 2.21 Processes

The syntax of $\mathfrak{s}\pi$ processes is given by the grammar in Fig. 2.9. □

As standard, $\mathbf{0}$ is the inactive process. Session communication is performed using the pair of primitives output and input: the output process $\bar{x}(y).P$ sends a fresh name y along session x and then continues as P ; the input process $x(y).P$ receives a name z along x and then continues as $P\{z/y\}$, which denotes the capture-avoiding substitution of z for y in P . Process $P \mid Q$ denotes the parallel execution of P and Q . Process $(\nu x)P$ denotes the process P in which name x has been restricted, i.e., x is kept private to P . The forwarder process $[x \leftrightarrow y]$ denotes a bi-directional link between sessions x and y . Processes $x.\overline{\text{close}}$ and $x.\text{close};P$ denote complementary actions for closing session x .

The following constructs introduce non-deterministic sessions which, intuitively, *may* provide a session protocol *or* fail.

- Process $x.\overline{\text{some}};P$ confirms that the session on x will execute and continues as P .
- Process $x.\overline{\text{none}}$ signals the failure of implementing the session on x .
- Process $x.\text{some}_{(w_1, \dots, w_n)};P$ specifies a dependency on a non-deterministic session x . This process can either (i) synchronize with an action $x.\overline{\text{some}}$ and

continue as P , or (ii) synchronize with an action $x.\overline{\text{none}}$, discard P , and propagate the failure on x to (w_1, \dots, w_n) , which are sessions implemented in P . When x is the only session implemented in P , the tuple of dependencies is empty and so we write simply $x.\text{some}; P$.

- $P \oplus Q$ denotes a *non-deterministic choice* between P and Q . We shall often write $\bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i$ to stand for $P_1 \oplus \dots \oplus P_n$.

In $(\nu y)P$ and $x(y).P$ the distinguished occurrence of name y is binding, with scope P . The set of free names of P is denoted by $fn(P)$. We identify process up to consistent renaming of bound names, writing \equiv_α for this congruence. We omit trailing occurrences of $\mathbf{0}$; this way, e.g., we write $x.\text{close}$ instead of $x.\text{close}; \mathbf{0}$.

Structural congruence, denoted \equiv , expresses basic identities on the structure of processes and the non-collapsing nature of non-determinism.

Definition 2.22 Structural Congruence

Structural congruence is defined as the least congruence relation on processes such that:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 P \mid \mathbf{0} \equiv \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \oplus \mathbf{0} \equiv \mathbf{0} \\
 P \mid Q \equiv Q \mid P & P \oplus Q \equiv Q \oplus P \\
 (P \mid Q) \mid R \equiv P \mid (Q \mid R) & (P \oplus Q) \oplus R \equiv P \oplus (Q \oplus R) \\
 [x \leftrightarrow y] \equiv [y \leftrightarrow x] & (\nu x)\mathbf{0} \equiv \mathbf{0} \\
 ((\nu x)P) \mid Q \equiv (\nu x)(P \mid Q), x \notin fn(P) & (\nu x)(\nu y)P \equiv (\nu y)(\nu x)P \\
 (\nu x)(P \mid (Q \oplus R)) \equiv (\nu x)(P \mid Q) \oplus (\nu x)(P \mid R) & P \equiv_\alpha Q \implies P \equiv Q
 \end{array}$$

□

2.4.2 Operational Semantics

The operational semantics of $\mathfrak{s}\pi$ is given by a reduction relation, denoted $P \longrightarrow Q$, which is the smallest relation on processes generated by the rules in Fig. 2.10. These rules specify the computations that a process performs on its own. We now explain each rule.

- **Rule [Comm]** formalizes communication, which concerns bound names only (internal mobility): name y is bound in both $\bar{x}(y).Q$ and $x(y).P$.
- **Rule [Forw]** implements the forwarder process that leads to a name substitution.
- **Rule [Close]** formalizes session closure and is self-explanatory.

| | | | |
|-----------|---|-------------------|---|
| [Comm] | $\bar{x}(y).Q \mid x(y).P$ | \longrightarrow | $(\nu y)(Q \mid P)$ |
| [Forw] | $(\nu x)([x \leftrightarrow y] \mid P)$ | \longrightarrow | $P\{y/x\} \quad (x \neq y)$ |
| [Close] | $x.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{close}; P$ | \longrightarrow | P |
| [Some] | $x.\overline{\text{some}}; P \mid x.\text{some}_{(w_1, \dots, w_n)}; Q$ | \longrightarrow | $P \mid Q$ |
| [None] | $x.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\text{some}_{(w_1, \dots, w_n)}; Q$ | \longrightarrow | $w_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid w_n.\overline{\text{none}}$ |
| [Cong] | $P \equiv P' \wedge P' \longrightarrow Q' \wedge Q' \equiv Q$ | \implies | $P \longrightarrow Q$ |
| [Par] | $Q \longrightarrow Q'$ | \implies | $P \mid Q \longrightarrow P \mid Q'$ |
| [Res] | $P \longrightarrow Q$ | \implies | $(\nu y)P \longrightarrow (\nu y)Q$ |
| [NChoice] | $Q \longrightarrow Q'$ | \implies | $P \oplus Q \longrightarrow P \oplus Q'$ |

Figure 2.10: Reduction for π .

- **Rule [Some]** describes the synchronization of a process, that is dependent on a non-deterministic session x , with the complementary process $x.\overline{\text{some}}$ that confirms the availability of such non-deterministic session.
- **Rule [None]** applies when the non-deterministic session is not available, prefix $x.\overline{\text{none}}$ triggers this failure to all dependent sessions w_1, \dots, w_n ; this may in turn trigger further failures (i.e., on sessions that depend on w_1, \dots, w_n).
- **Rule [NChoice]** defines the closure of reduction with respect to non-collapsing non-deterministic choice.
- **Rules [Cong], [Par] and [Res]** are standard and formalize that reduction is closed under structural congruence, and also contextual closure of parallel and restriction constructs.

Example 2.16

We illustrate confluent reductions starting in a non-deterministic process R which will fail during communication due to unavailability of a session:

$$\begin{aligned}
R &= (\nu x)(x.\text{some}_{(y_1, y_2)}; y_1(z).y_2(w).\mathbf{0} \mid (x.\overline{\text{some}}; P \oplus x.\overline{\text{none}})) \\
&\equiv (\nu x)(x.\text{some}_{(y_1, y_2)}; y_1(z).y_2(w).\mathbf{0} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; P) \\
&\quad \oplus (\nu x)(x.\text{some}_{(y_1, y_2)}; y_1(z).y_2(w).\mathbf{0} \mid x.\overline{\text{none}})
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $Q = y_1(z).y_2(w).\mathbf{0}$, we have:

$$\begin{array}{c}
(\nu x)(x.\text{some}_{(y_1, y_2)}; Q \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; P) \oplus (y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid y_2.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
\swarrow \qquad \searrow \\
R = \begin{array}{cc}
(\nu x)(x.\text{some}_{(y_1, y_2)}; Q \mid & (\nu x)(Q \mid P) \oplus \\
(x.\overline{\text{some}}; P \oplus x.\overline{\text{none}})) & (y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid y_2.\overline{\text{none}})
\end{array} \\
\searrow \qquad \swarrow \\
(\nu x)(Q \mid P) \oplus (\nu x)(x.\text{some}_{(y_1, y_2)}; Q \mid x.\overline{\text{none}})
\end{array}$$

Observe that reduction is confluent. The resulting term $(\nu x)(Q \mid P) \oplus (y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid y_2.\overline{\text{none}})$ includes both alternatives for the interaction on x , namely the successful one (i.e., $(\nu x)(Q \mid P)$) but also the failure of x , which is then propagated to y_1 and y_2 , i.e., $y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid y_2.\overline{\text{none}}$. \square

2.4.3 Type System

The type discipline for $\mathcal{S}\pi$ is based on the type system given in [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#), which contains modalities $\&A$ and $\oplus A$, as dual types for non-deterministic sessions.

Definition 2.23 Session Types

Session types are given by

$$A, B ::= \perp \mid \mathbf{1} \mid A \otimes B \mid A \wp B \mid \&A \mid \oplus A$$

\square

Types are assigned to names: an *assignment* $x : A$ enforces the use of name x according to the protocol specified by A . The multiplicative units \perp and $\mathbf{1}$ are used to type terminated (closed) endpoints. $A \otimes B$ types a name that first outputs a name of type A before proceeding as specified by B . Similarly, $A \wp B$ types a name that first inputs a name of type A before proceeding as specified by B . Then we have the two modalities introduced in [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#). We use $\&A$ as the type of a (non-deterministic) session that *may produce* a behavior of type A . Dually, $\oplus A$ denotes the type of a session that *may consume* a behavior of type A .

The two endpoints of a session must be *dual* to ensure absence of communication errors. The dual of a type A is denoted \overline{A} . Duality corresponds to negation $(\cdot)^\perp$ in linear logic:

Definition 2.24 Duality

The duality relation on types is given by:

$$\overline{\mathbf{1}} = \perp \quad \overline{\perp} = \mathbf{1} \quad \overline{A \otimes B} = \overline{A} \wp \overline{B} \quad \overline{A \wp B} = \overline{A} \otimes \overline{B} \quad \overline{\&A} = \oplus \overline{A} \quad \overline{\oplus A} = \&\overline{A}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[T}\cdot\text{]} \frac{}{\mathbf{0} \vdash} \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{[Tid]} \frac{}{[x \leftrightarrow y] \vdash x:A, y:\bar{A}} \\
\text{[T}\otimes\text{]} \frac{P \vdash \Delta, y:A \quad Q \vdash \Delta', x:B}{\bar{x}(y).(P \mid Q) \vdash \Delta, \Delta', x:A \otimes B} \qquad \text{[T}\wp\text{]} \frac{P \vdash \Gamma, y:C, x:D}{x(y).P \vdash \Gamma, x:C \wp D} \\
\text{[T}\mathbf{1}\text{]} \frac{}{x.\text{close} \vdash x:\mathbf{1}} \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{[T}\perp\text{]} \frac{P \vdash \Delta}{x.\text{close}; P \vdash x:\perp, \Delta} \\
\text{[T}\parallel\text{]} \frac{P \vdash \Delta \quad Q \vdash \Delta'}{P \mid Q \vdash \Delta, \Delta'} \qquad \text{[Tcut]} \frac{P \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A} \quad Q \vdash \Delta', x:A}{(vx)(P \mid Q) \vdash \Delta, \Delta'} \\
\text{[T}\&_{\text{d}}^x\text{]} \frac{P \vdash \Delta, x:A}{x.\text{some}; P \vdash \Delta, x:\&A} \qquad \text{[T}\oplus_{\tilde{w}}^x\text{]} \frac{P \vdash \tilde{w} : \&\Delta, x:A}{x.\text{some}_{\tilde{w}}; P \vdash \tilde{w} : \&\Delta, x:\oplus A} \\
\text{[T}\&^x\text{]} \frac{}{x.\text{none} \vdash x:\&A} \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{[T}\&\text{]} \frac{P \vdash \&\Delta \quad Q \vdash \&\Delta}{P \oplus Q \vdash \&\Delta}
\end{array}$$

Figure 2.11: Typing rules for $s\pi$.

□

Typing judgments are of the form $P \vdash \Delta$, where P is a process and Δ is a context of the form $x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_n : A_n$, which defines the assignment of type A_i to name x_i (with $1 \leq i \leq n$); all names x_i must be distinct. The context Δ is *linear* in that it is subject to exchange (the ordering of assignments does not matter), but not to weakening and contraction. In writing ' $\Delta, x:A$ ', we assume that x does not occur in Δ ; also, in writing ' Δ_1, Δ_2 ', we assume that the names in Δ_1 are distinct from those in Δ_2 . The empty context is denoted ' \cdot '. We write $\&\Delta$ to denote that all assignments in Δ have a non-deterministic type, i.e., $\&\Delta = w_1 : \&A_1, \dots, w_n : \&A_n$, for some A_1, \dots, A_n . The typing judgment $P \vdash \Delta$ corresponds to the logical sequent $\vdash \Delta$ for classical linear logic, which can be recovered by erasing processes and name assignments.

Typing rules for processes correspond to proof rules in the logic; see Fig. 2.11. This way, Rule [T \cdot] allows us to introduce the inactive process $\mathbf{0}$. Rule [Tid] interprets the identity axiom using the forwarder process. Rules [T \otimes] and [T \wp] type output and input of a name along a session, respectively. Rules [T $\mathbf{1}$] and [T \perp] type the process constructs for session termination. Rules [Tcut] and [T \parallel] define cut and mix principles in the logic, which induce typing rules for independent and dependent parallel composition, respectively.

The last four rules in Fig. 2.11 are used to type process constructs related to non-determinism and failure. Rules [T $\&_{\text{d}}^x$] and [T $\&^x$] introduce a session of type $\&A$, which may produce a behavior of type A : while the former rule covers the case

in which $x : A$ is indeed available, the latter rule formalizes the case in which $x : A$ is not available (i.e., a failure). Rule $[T\oplus_{\tilde{w}}^x]$, accounts for the possibility of not being able to consume the session $x : A$ by considering sessions, the sequence of names $\tilde{w} = w_1, \dots, w_n$, different from x as potentially not available. Rule $[T\&]$ expresses non-deterministic choice of processes P and Q that implement non-deterministic behaviors only.

The type system enjoys type preservation, a result that follows directly from the cut elimination property in the underlying logic; it ensures that the observable interface of a system is invariant under reduction. The type system also ensures other properties for well-typed processes (e.g. global progress and confluence); see [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#) for details.

Theorem 2.11 (Type Preservation [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#)) *If $P \vdash \Delta$ and $P \longrightarrow Q$ then $Q \vdash \Delta$.*

Having defined $s\pi$, we now move on to define a correct translation from λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} to $s\pi$.

2.5 A Correct Encoding

Having introduced the typed sequential calculi λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ (as well as the translation $(\cdot)^{\circ} : \lambda_{\oplus}^{\zeta} \rightarrow \widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$) and the typed concurrent calculus $s\pi$, in this section we show how to correctly translate λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} into $s\pi$, using $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ as a stepping stone.

Before delving into technical details, we briefly discuss the significance of our encoding. As in Milner’s seminal work, our translation explains how interaction in π provides a principled interpretation of evaluation in λ . We tackle the challenging case in which evaluation and interaction are fail-prone and non-deterministic, effectively generalizing previous translations. Because our encoding preserves types, our developments also delineate a new connection between non-idempotent intersection types and logically motivated session types—indeed, our translation of functions as processes goes hand-in-hand with a translation on types (Fig. 2.17), which reveals a new protocol-oriented interpretation of the non-idempotent intersections that govern functional resources.

As already mentioned, we shall proceed in two steps. We rely on the translation $(\cdot)^{\circ}$ from well-formed expressions in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} to well-formed expressions in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ given in § 2.3.4. As λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ share the same syntax of types, in this case the translation of types is the identity. Then, the translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^{\zeta}$ (for some name u) transforms well-formed expressions in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ to well-typed processes in $s\pi$ (cf. Fig. 2.12). We first define *encodability criteria* for translations, which include type preservation; these criteria lead to the notion of *correct encoding* (§ 2.5.1). Then, in § 2.5.2 we




Figure 2.12: Summary of our approach.

establish the correctness of the translation $(\cdot)^{\circ}$ (Corollary 2.5.1); finally, in § 2.5.3, we present the translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^{\zeta}$ and establish its correctness (Corollary 2.5.2).

2.5.1 Encodability Criteria

We follow most of the criteria defined by Gorla (2010), a widely studied abstract framework for establishing the *quality* of translations. A *language* \mathcal{L} is defined as a pair containing a set of terms \mathcal{M} and a reduction semantics \longrightarrow on terms (with reflexive, transitive closure denoted \longrightarrow^*). A behavioral equivalence on terms, denoted \approx , is also assumed. Then, a *correct encoding*, defined next, concerns a translation of terms of a source language \mathcal{L}_1 into terms of a target language \mathcal{L}_2 that respects certain criteria. The criteria in Gorla (2010) concern *untyped* languages; because we consider *typed* languages, we follow Kouzapas et al. (2019) in requiring also that translations preserve typability.

Definition 2.25 Correct Encoding

Let $\mathcal{L}_1 = (\mathcal{M}, \longrightarrow_1)$ and $\mathcal{L}_2 = (\mathcal{P}, \longrightarrow_2)$ be two languages and let \approx_1 be a behavioral equivalence on terms in \mathcal{M} . We use M, M', \dots and P, P', \dots to range over elements in \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{P} . We say that a translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ is a *correct encoding* if it satisfies the following criteria:

1. *Type preservation*: For every well-typed M , it holds that $\llbracket M \rrbracket$ is well-typed.
2. *Operational Completeness*: For every M, M' , and M'' such that $M \xrightarrow{*}_1 M' \approx_1 M''$, it holds that $\llbracket M \rrbracket \xrightarrow{*}_2 \llbracket M'' \rrbracket$.
3. *Operational Soundness*: For every M and P such that $\llbracket M \rrbracket \xrightarrow{*}_2 P$, there exist M' and M'' such that $M \xrightarrow{*}_1 M' \approx_1 M''$ and $P \xrightarrow{*}_2 \llbracket M'' \rrbracket$.
4. *Success Sensitiveness*: Let \checkmark_1 and \checkmark_2 denote a success predicate in \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{P} , respectively. For every M , it holds that $M\checkmark_1$ if and only if $\llbracket M \rrbracket\checkmark_2$.

□

We briefly describe the criteria. First, type preservation is a natural requirement and a distinguishing aspect of our work, given that we always consider source and target calculi with types. Operational completeness formalizes how reduction steps

of a source term are mimicked by its corresponding translation in the target language; \approx_1 conveniently abstracts away from source terms useful in the translation but which are not meaningful in comparisons. Operational soundness concerns the opposite direction: it formalizes the correspondence between (i) the reductions of a target term obtained via the translation and (ii) the reductions of the corresponding source term. The role of \approx_1 can be explained as in completeness. Our use of the equivalence \approx_1 for \mathcal{M}_1 , rather than of an equivalence on \mathcal{M}_2 , is a minor difference with respect to [Gorla \(2010\)](#). Finally, success sensitiveness complements completeness and soundness, which concern reductions and therefore do not contain information about observable behaviors. The so-called success predicates \checkmark_1 and \checkmark_2 serve as a minimal notion of *observables*; the criterion then says that observability of success of a source term implies observability of success in the corresponding target term, and vice versa.

Besides these semantic criteria, we also consider *compositionality*, a syntactic criterion that requires that a composite source term is translated as the combination of the translations of its sub-terms.

2.5.2 Correctness of $(\cdot)^\circ$

We prove that the translation $(\cdot)^\circ$ from $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ into $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ in § 2.3.4 is a correct encoding, in the sense of Def. 2.25. Because our translation $(\cdot)^\circ$ is defined in terms of $(\cdot)^\bullet$, it satisfies *weak compositionality*, in the sense of [Parrow \(2008\)](#).

Type Preservation

We now prove that $(\cdot)^\circ$ translates well-formed $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ -expressions into well-formed expressions $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ -expressions (Theorem 2.12). Notice that because $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ share the same type syntax, there is no translation on types/contexts involved (i.e., an identity translation applies).

Next we define well formed preservation in the translation $(\cdot)^\bullet$ from $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ to $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$. We rely on the prerequisite proof of type preservation in the translation $(\cdot)^\bullet$ on the sub-calculi from λ_{\oplus} to $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}$, and also on syntactic properties of the translation such as: (i) the property below guarantees that the translation $(\cdot)^\bullet$ commutes with the linear head substitution; (ii) preservation of typability/well-formedness w.r.t. linear substitutions in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$.

Proposition 2.5.1 *Let M, N be $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ -terms. We have:*

1. $(M\{N/x\})^\bullet = (M)^\bullet\{(N)^\bullet/x\}$.
2. $(M\langle\tilde{x}/x\rangle)^\bullet = (M)^\bullet\langle\tilde{x}/x\rangle$, where $\tilde{x} = x_1, \dots, x_k$ is sequence of pairwise distinct fresh variables.

Proof: By induction of the structure of M . \square

Lemma 2.5.1 (Preservation under Linear Substitutions in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$) Let $M \in \widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$.

1. *Typing:* If $\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \vdash M : \tau$ then $\Gamma, x_i : \sigma^{k-1} \vdash M\langle x_i/x \rangle : \tau$.
2. *Well-formedness:* If $\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \models M : \tau$ then $\Gamma, x_i : \sigma^{k-1} \models M\langle x_i/x \rangle : \tau$.

Proof: Standard by induction on the rules from Fig. 2.6 for item (1), and Fig. 2.7 for item (2). \square

The following example illustrates that the translation of a well-formed expression in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} is a well-formed $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ -expression.

Example 2.17 Cont. Example 2.5

Term $M_2 = (\lambda x.x)(\lambda y.z\zeta)$ is well-formed with a well-formedness judgment $y : \sigma, z : \sigma \models (\lambda x.x)(\lambda y.z\zeta) : \sigma$. In Example 2.13 we showed that:

$$(M_2)^{\circ} = ((\lambda x.x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x])(\lambda y_1.z_1\zeta))[y_1 \leftarrow y][z_1 \leftarrow z]$$

which is well-formed with translated well-formed judgment $y : \sigma^1, z : \sigma^1 \models (M_2)^{\circ} : \sigma$. The derivation is given below (using rules from Fig. 2.7); we omit the labels of rule applications and concatenations with the empty bag, i.e., we write $\lambda y_1\zeta$ instead of $\lambda y_1\zeta \cdot 1$.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{x_1 : \sigma \vdash x_1 : \sigma}{x_1 : \sigma \models x_1 : \sigma} \quad \frac{y_1 : \sigma \vdash y_1 : \sigma}{y_1 : \sigma \models y_1 : \sigma} \quad \frac{z_1 : \sigma \vdash z_1 : \sigma}{z_1 : \sigma \models z_1 : \sigma}}{x : \sigma^1 \models x[x_1 \leftarrow x] : \sigma \quad y_1 : \sigma^1 \models \lambda y_1\zeta : \sigma^1 \quad z_1 : \sigma^1 \models \lambda z_1\zeta : \sigma^1}}{\models \lambda x.(x[x_1 \leftarrow x]) : \sigma \rightarrow \sigma \quad y_1 : \sigma^1, z_1 : \sigma^1 \models \lambda y_1\zeta \cdot \lambda z_1\zeta : \sigma^2}}{\frac{y_1 : \sigma^1, z_1 : \sigma^1 \models \lambda x.(x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x]) \lambda y_1, z_1\zeta : \sigma}{y : \sigma^1, z_1 : \sigma^1 \models \lambda x.(x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x]) \lambda y_1, z_1\zeta [y_1 \leftarrow y] : \sigma}}{y : \sigma^1, z : \sigma^1 \models \lambda x.(x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x]) \lambda y_1, z_1\zeta [y_1 \leftarrow y][z_1 \leftarrow z] : \sigma}}$$

\square

As the translation $(\cdot)^{\circ}$ for λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} -terms is defined in terms of $(\cdot)^{\bullet}$, it is natural that preservation of well-formedness under $(\cdot)^{\circ}$ (Theorem 2.12) relies on the preservation of well-formedness under $(\cdot)^{\bullet}$, given next.

To state well-formedness preservation, we use Γ^{\dagger} , the core context of Γ (Def. 2.16). In the following property, we use an additional condition on Γ^{\dagger} , which reflects the fact that intersection types get “flattened” by virtue of the translation. The condition, denoted $\widehat{\Gamma}^{\dagger}$, is defined whenever Γ^{\dagger} contains only unary multisets as follows: if $x : \sigma^1 \in \Gamma^{\dagger}$ for all $x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma^{\dagger})$, then $x : \sigma \in \widehat{\Gamma}^{\dagger}$.

Lemma 2.5.2 (Well-formedness preservation for $\langle \cdot \rangle^\bullet$) *Let B and \mathbb{M} be a bag and an expression in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, respectively. Also, let Γ be a context such that $\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger$ is defined. We have:*

1. *If $\Gamma \models B : \pi$ then $\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \models \langle B \rangle^\bullet : \pi$.*
2. *If $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \sigma$ then $\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \models \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\bullet : \sigma$.*

Proof: [Proof (Sketch)] By mutual induction on the typing derivations $\Gamma \models B : \sigma$ and $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \sigma$. The proof of item (1) follows mostly by induction hypothesis, by analyzing the rule applied (Fig. 2.4). The proof of item (2), also follows by analyzing the rule applied, but it is more delicate, especially when treating cases involving Rules [FS : app] or [FS : ex-sub], for which the size of the bag does not match the number of occurrences of variables in the expression. See App. A.3.1 for full details. \square

Theorem 2.12 (Well-formedness Preservation for $\langle \cdot \rangle^\circ$) *Let B and \mathbb{M} be a bag and an expression in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, respectively.*

1. *If $\Gamma \models B : \pi$ then $\Gamma^\dagger \models \langle B \rangle^\circ : \pi$.*
2. *If $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \sigma$ then $\Gamma^\dagger \models \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ : \sigma$.*

Proof: [Proof (Sketch)] By mutual induction on the typing derivations $\Gamma \models B : \sigma$ and $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \sigma$. Note that for a bag B , since the first part of translation consists in sharing the free variables of B , we will work with the translated bag:


$$\langle B \rangle^\circ = \langle B \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \dots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle \rangle^\bullet [\tilde{x}_1 \leftarrow x_1] \dots [\tilde{x}_k \leftarrow x_k]$$

and the rest of the proof depends on Proposition 2.5.1 that moves linear substitutions outside $\langle \cdot \rangle^\bullet$, then Lemma 2.5.1 that guarantees preservation of typability/well-formedness under linear substitutions, and Lemma 2.5.2 for treating the closed translation. The dependency extends to the proof of item (2), for expressions. The full proof can be found in App. A.3.1. \square

Operational Correspondence: Completeness and Soundness

Def. 2.25 states operational completeness and soundness over the reflexive, transitive closure of the reduction rules. However, in the case of $\langle \cdot \rangle^\circ$, we prove completeness and soundness for a single reduction step (cf. Fig. 2.14). This is sufficient: by the diamond property (Proposition 2.2.1) a result stated for \longrightarrow can be extended easily to \longrightarrow^* , by induction on the length of the reduction sequence. (The result is immediate when the length is zero.)

$$\begin{aligned}
M\langle\langle 1/x \rangle\rangle &\equiv_\lambda M && (\text{if } x \notin \text{fv}(M)) \\
MB_1\langle\langle B_2/x \rangle\rangle &\equiv_\lambda (M\langle\langle B_2/x \rangle\rangle)B_1 && (\text{if } x \notin \text{fv}(B_1)) \\
M\langle\langle B_1/y \rangle\rangle\langle\langle B_2/x \rangle\rangle &\equiv_\lambda (M\langle\langle B_2/x \rangle\rangle)\langle\langle B_1/y \rangle\rangle && (\text{if } x \neq y, x \notin \text{fv}(B_1) \text{ and } y \notin \text{fv}(B_2)) \\
M \equiv_\lambda M' &\Rightarrow C[M] \equiv_\lambda C[M'] \\
\mathbb{M} \equiv_\lambda \mathbb{M}' &\Rightarrow D[\mathbb{M}] \equiv_\lambda D[\mathbb{M}']
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 2.13: Congruence in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} Figure 2.14: Operational correspondence for $(\cdot)^\circ$

We rely on a *structural equivalence* over λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} -expressions, denoted \equiv_λ , which is the least congruence satisfying α -conversion and satisfying the identities in Fig. 2.13. This congruence allows us to move explicit substitutions to the right of the term and to ignore explicit substitutions of a variable x for empty bags in a term that does not contain x .

Example 2.18

Consider the failure term $M = \text{fail}^{y,y,z}\langle\langle 1/x \rangle\rangle$. Since $\text{size}(1) = 0$, the term M cannot reduce using Rule $[\text{R} : \text{Cons}_2]$, which requires that the size of the bag is greater than 0. Instead, we use the structural equivalence identity in Fig. 2.13: $\text{fail}^{y,y,z}\langle\langle 1/x \rangle\rangle \equiv_\lambda \text{fail}^{y,y,z}$. \square

Theorem 2.13 (Operational Completeness) *Let \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{N} be well-formed λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} expressions. Suppose $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow_{[\text{R}]} \mathbb{M}$.*

1. If $[\text{R}] = [\text{R} : \text{Beta}]$ then $(\mathbb{N})^\circ \rightarrow^{\leq 2} (\mathbb{M})^\circ$;
2. If $[\text{R}] = [\text{R} : \text{Fetch}]$ then $(\mathbb{N})^\circ \rightarrow^+ (\mathbb{M}')^\circ$, for some \mathbb{M}' such that $\mathbb{M} \equiv_\lambda \mathbb{M}'$.
3. If $[\text{R}] \neq [\text{R} : \text{Beta}]$ and $[\text{R}] \neq [\text{R} : \text{Fetch}]$ then $(\mathbb{N})^\circ \rightarrow (\mathbb{M})^\circ$.

Proof: [Proof (Sketch)] By induction on the rules from Figure 2.2 applied to infer $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow_{[R]} \mathbb{M}$. We analyse the reduction depending on whether $[R]$ is either $[R : \text{Beta}]$, or $[R : \text{Fetch}]$, or neither. In the case the rule applied is $[\text{Beta}]$, then $\mathbb{N} = (\lambda x. M') \langle B \rangle$ and $\mathbb{M} = M' \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$. When applying the translation $(\cdot)^\circ$ to \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{M} we obtain:

- $(\mathbb{N})^\circ = ((\lambda x. (M'' \langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle)^\bullet [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x]) \langle (B')^\bullet \rangle) [\tilde{x}_1 \leftarrow x_1] \dots [\tilde{x}_k \leftarrow x_k]$
- $(\mathbb{M})^\circ = (M'' \langle \langle B'/x \rangle \rangle)^\bullet [\tilde{x}_1 \leftarrow x_1] \dots [\tilde{x}_k \leftarrow x_k]$

where B' and M'' stand for the renamings of B and M' , respectively, after sharing the multiple occurrences of their free/bound variables (Def. 2.20). Note that

$$(\mathbb{N})^\circ \longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Beta}]} ((M'' \langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle)^\bullet [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle (B')^\bullet /x \rangle \rangle) [\tilde{x}_1 \leftarrow x_1] \dots [\tilde{x}_k \leftarrow x_k] := \mathbb{L},$$

and according to rules in Fig. 2.5, the remaining reduction depends upon the characteristics of the bag $\langle (B')^\bullet \rangle$:

- (i) $\text{size}(\langle (B')^\bullet \rangle) = \#(x, M'') = k \geq 1$. Then, $(\mathbb{N})^\circ \longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Beta}]} \mathbb{L} \longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:ex-sub}]} (\mathbb{M})^\circ$.
- (ii) Otherwise, \mathbb{L} can be further expanded, the “otherwise case” of the translation of explicit substitutions, such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{N})^\circ &\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Beta}]} ((M'' \langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle)^\bullet [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle (B')^\bullet /x \rangle \rangle) [\tilde{x}_1 \leftarrow x_1] \dots [\tilde{x}_k \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \mathbb{L} = (\mathbb{M})^\circ \end{aligned}$$

In the case the rule applied is $[R : \text{Fetch}]$, the proof depends on the size n of the bag. The interesting case is when the bag B has only one component (i.e., $n = 1$): from $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow_{[\text{F:Fetch}]} \mathbb{N}$ we have that $\mathbb{N} = M \langle \langle \langle N_1 \rangle /x \rangle \rangle$ and $\mathbb{M} = M \{ \langle N_1/x \rangle \} \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle$. We need to use the congruence \equiv_λ to obtain $\mathbb{M} = M \{ \langle N_1/x \rangle \} \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle \equiv_\lambda M \{ \langle N_1/x \rangle \} := \mathbb{M}'$ and then conclude that $(\mathbb{N})^\circ \longrightarrow (\mathbb{M}')^\circ$. The analysis for the other cases is also done by inspecting the structure of expressions and bags. The full proof can be found in App. A.3.2. \square

We establish soundness for a single reduction step. As we discussed for completeness, the property generalizes to multiple steps.

Theorem 2.14 (Operational Soundness) *Let \mathbb{N} be a well-formed λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} expression. Suppose $(\mathbb{N})^\circ \longrightarrow \mathbb{L}$. Then, there exists \mathbb{N}' such that $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow_{[R]} \mathbb{N}'$ and*

1. If $[R] = [R : \text{Beta}]$ then $\mathbb{L} \longrightarrow^{\leq 1} (\mathbb{N}')^\circ$;
2. If $[R] \neq [R : \text{Beta}]$ then $\mathbb{L} \longrightarrow^* (\mathbb{N}'')^\circ$, for \mathbb{N}'' such that $\mathbb{N}' \equiv_\lambda \mathbb{N}''$.

Proof: [Proof (Sketch)] By induction on the structure of \mathbb{N} and inspecting the rules from Fig. 2.5 that can be applied in $(\mathbb{N})^\circ$. The interesting cases happen when \mathbb{N} is either an application $\mathbb{N} = (M B)$ or an explicit substitution $\mathbb{N} = M\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$. The former is reducible when \mathbb{N} is an instance of $[R : \text{Beta}]$ or when $M = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ and \mathbb{N} is an instance of $[R : \text{Cons}_1]$. The latter, for $\mathbb{N} = M\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$, the proof is split in several subcases depending whether: (i) size of the bag $\text{size}(B) = \#(x, M) \geq 1$, and three possible reductions can take place $[RS : \text{lin-fetch}]$, $[RS : \text{Cons}_3]$ and $[RS : \text{Cont}]$, depending if M is a failing term or not; (ii) $\text{size}(B) \neq \#(x, M)$ or $\text{size}(B) = 0$, and the proof follows either applying Rule $[RS : \text{Fail}]$ or by induction hypothesis. The full proof can be found in App. A.3.2. \square

Success Sensitiveness

We now consider success sensitiveness, a property that complements (and relies on) operational completeness and soundness. For the purposes of the proof, we consider the extension of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ with dedicated constructs and predicates that specify success.

Definition 2.26

We extend the syntax of terms for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ with the same \checkmark construct. In both cases, we assume \checkmark is well formed. Also, we define $\text{head}(\checkmark) = \checkmark$ and $(\checkmark)^\bullet = \checkmark$ \square

An expression \mathbb{M} has success, denoted $\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$, when there is a sequence of reductions from \mathbb{M} that leads to an expression that includes a summand that contains an occurrence of \checkmark in head position.

Definition 2.27 Success in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$

In $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$, we define

$$\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark} \iff \exists M_1, \dots, M_k. \mathbb{M} \longrightarrow^* M_1 + \dots + M_k \text{ and } \text{head}(M_j) = \checkmark,$$

for some $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. \square

Definition 2.28 Head of an expression

We extend Def. 2.13 from terms to expressions as follows:

$$\text{head}_{\Sigma}(\mathbb{M}) = \begin{cases} \text{head}(M_i) & \text{if } \text{head}(M_i) = \text{head}(M_j) \text{ for all } M_i, M_j \in \mathbb{M} \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

\square

Proposition 2.5.2 (Preservation of head term) *The head of a term is preserved when applying the translation $(\cdot)^\circ$, i.e.,*

$$\forall M \in \lambda_{\oplus}^{\zeta}. \text{head}(M) = \checkmark \iff \text{head}_{\Sigma}((M)^\circ) = \checkmark.$$

Proof: [Proof (Sketch)] By induction on the structure of M considering the extension of the language established in Def. 2.26. See App. A.3.3 for details. \square

Theorem 2.15 (Success Sensitivity) *Let \mathbb{M} be a well-formed λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} -expression. Then,*

$$\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark} \iff (\mathbb{M})^\circ \Downarrow_{\checkmark}.$$

Proof: [Proof (Sketch)] By induction on the structure of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ expressions. The if-case follows from operational soundness (Thm. 2.14) by analyzing a reductions starting from $(\mathbb{M})^\circ$. Reciprocally, the only-if-case follows by operational completeness (Thm. 2.13), analyzing reductions starting from \mathbb{M} . See App. A.3.3 for details. \square

We have the corollary below, which follows from Theorems 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, and 2.15:

Corollary 2.5.1 *Our translation $(\cdot)^\circ$ is a correct encoding, in the sense of Def. 2.25.*

2.5.3 From $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ to $\mathfrak{s}\pi$

We now define our translation of $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ into $\mathfrak{s}\pi$, denoted $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^{\zeta}$, and establish its correctness. As usual in translations of λ into π , we use a name u to provide the behavior of the translated expression. In our case, u is a non-deterministic session: the translated expression can be available or not; this is signalled by prefixes ‘ $u.\overline{\text{some}}$ ’ and ‘ $u.\overline{\text{none}}$ ’, respectively. Notice that every (free) variable x in a $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ -term M becomes a name x in its corresponding process $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\zeta}$ and is assigned an appropriate session type.

An Auxiliary Translation

Before introducing $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^{\zeta}$, we first discuss the translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u : \widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus} \rightarrow \mathfrak{s}\pi$, i.e., the translation in which the source language does not include failures. This auxiliary translation, shown in Fig. 2.15, is given for pedagogical purposes: it allows us to gradually discuss several key design decisions in $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^{\zeta}$.

We describe each of the cases from the translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u$, focusing on the role of non-deterministic sessions (expressed using prefixes ‘ $x.\overline{\text{some}}$ ’ and ‘ $x.\text{some}_{(w_1, \dots, w_n)}$ ’ in $\mathfrak{s}\pi$):

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket x \rrbracket_u &= x.\overline{\text{some}}; [x \leftrightarrow u] \\
\llbracket \lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u &= u.\overline{\text{some}}; u(x).\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \\
\llbracket M B \rrbracket_u &= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).(x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i)}; \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\
\llbracket M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u &= x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x_1) \dots x(x_k).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \\
\llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u &= x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \\
\llbracket \llbracket M \rrbracket \cdot B \rrbracket_x &= \bar{x}(x_1).(x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B)}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_1} \mid \llbracket B \rrbracket_x) \\
\llbracket 1 \rrbracket_x &= x.\overline{\text{close}} \\
\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \rrbracket_u &= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu x)(\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i)}; \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x) \\
\llbracket M \langle N/x \rangle \rrbracket_u &= (\nu x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N)}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_x) \\
\llbracket M + N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \oplus \llbracket N \rrbracket_u
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 2.15: An auxiliary translation of $\widehat{\lambda}_\oplus$ into $\text{s}\pi$, without failures

- $\llbracket x \rrbracket_u$: Because sessions are non-deterministically available, the translation first confirms that the behavior along x is available; subsequently, the forwarder process induces a substitution $\{x/u\}$.
- $\llbracket \lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u$: As in the case of variables, the translation first confirms the behavior along u before receiving a name, which will be used in the translation of $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$, discussed next.
- $\llbracket M B \rrbracket_u$: This process models the application of M to bag B as a non-deterministic choice in the order in which the elements of B are substituted into M . Substituting each B_i involves a protocol in which the translation of a term $\lambda x.M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ within M confirms its own availability, before and after the exchange of the name x , on which the translation of B_i is spawned. This protocol uses the fact that $M B$ does not reduce to failure, i.e., there is no lack or excess of resources in B .
- $\llbracket M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u$: The translation first confirms the availability of the behavior along x . Then, it receives along x a name for each x_i ; these received names will be used to synchronize with the translation of bags (see below). Subsequently, the protocol on x safely terminates and the translation of M is executed.
- $\llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u$: When there are no variables to be shared with x , the translation simply confirms the behavior on x , close the protocol immediately after, and executes the translation of M .

- $\llbracket \lambda M \int \cdot B \rrbracket_x$: The translation of a non-empty bag essentially makes each element available in its corresponding order. This way, for the first element M a name x_1 is sent over x ; the translation of $M[x_1, \dots, x_n \leftarrow x]$, discussed above, must send a confirmation on x_1 before the translation of M is executed. After these exchanges, the translation of the rest of the bag is spawned.
- $\llbracket 1 \rrbracket_x$: In line with the previous item, the translation of the empty bag simply closes the name x ; this signals that there are no (further) elements in the bag and that all synchronizations are complete.
- $\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u$: In this case, the translation is a sum involving the parallel composition of (i) the translation of each element B_i in the bag and (ii) the translation of M . Observe that a fresh name x is created to enable synchronization between these two processes. Also, as in previous cases, notice how the translation of B_i must first confirm its availability along x .
- $\llbracket M \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u$: This translation essentially executes the translations of M and N in parallel, with a caveat: the translation of N depends on the availability of a behavior along x , to be produced within the translation of M .
- $\llbracket M + N \rrbracket_u$: This translation homomorphically preserves the non-determinism between M and N .

Example 2.19

Consider the $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}$ -term $M_0 = (\lambda x.M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x]) \int N_1, N_2 \int$. Writing $\text{fv}(B)$ to denote the free variables in N_1 and N_2 , the process $\llbracket M_0 \rrbracket_u$ is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \llbracket (\lambda x.M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x]) \int N_1, N_2 \int \rrbracket_u \\
&= (\nu v) \left(\llbracket \lambda x.M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \mid \underbrace{v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).(x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B)}; \llbracket \int N_1, N_2 \int \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])}}_{P_1} \right) \\
&\oplus \\
&(\nu v) \left(\llbracket \lambda x.M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \mid \underbrace{v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).(x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B)}; \llbracket \int N_2, N_1 \int \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])}}_{P_2} \right) \\
&= (\nu v) (v.\overline{\text{some}}; v(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x_1).x(x_2).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_v \mid P_1) \\
&\oplus \\
&(\nu v) (v.\overline{\text{some}}; v(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x_1).x(x_2).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_v \mid P_2)
\end{aligned}$$

The translation immediately opens up a non-deterministic choice with two alternatives, corresponding to the bag of size 2. Because of non-collapsing non-determinism, after some reductions, this amounts to accounting for the two different orders in which N_1 and N_2 can be extracted from the bag.

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M_0 \rrbracket_u &\longrightarrow^* (\nu x)(x(x_1).x(x_2).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket \{N_1, N_2\} \rrbracket_x) \\ &\oplus \\ &(\nu x)(x(x_1).x(x_2).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket \{N_2, N_1\} \rrbracket_x) \end{aligned}$$

We show further reductions for one of the processes, which we will denote R , for $R = (\nu x)(x(x_1).x(x_2).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket \{N_1, N_2\} \rrbracket_x)$, in the resulting sum (reductions for the other process are similar):

$$\begin{aligned} R &= (\nu x)(x(x_1).x(x_2).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket \{N_1, N_2\} \rrbracket_x) \\ &= (\nu x)(x(x_1).x(x_2).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid \bar{x}(x_1).(x_1.\text{some}_{fV(N_1)}; \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket_{x_1} \mid \\ &\quad \bar{x}(x_2).(x_2.\text{some}_{fV(N_2)}; \llbracket N_2 \rrbracket_{x_2} \mid x.\text{close}))) \\ &\longrightarrow^* (\nu x_1, x_2)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid x_1.\text{some}_{fV(N_1)}; \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket_{x_1} \mid x_2.\text{some}_{fV(N_2)}; \llbracket N_2 \rrbracket_{x_2}) \end{aligned}$$

□

The Translation

The translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_x$ leverages non-deterministic sessions in $s\pi$ to give a concurrent interpretation of $\hat{\lambda}_\oplus$, the non-deterministic (but fail-free) sub-calculus of $\hat{\lambda}_\oplus^\zeta$. In a nutshell, non-deterministic sessions entail the explicit confirmation of the availability of a name's behavior, via synchronizations of a prefix ' $x.\text{some}_{(w_1, \dots, w_n)}$ ' with a corresponding prefix ' $x.\overline{\text{some}}$ '. Clearly, $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_x$ under-utilizes the expressivity of $s\pi$: in processes resulting from $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_x$, no prefix ' $x.\text{some}_{(w_1, \dots, w_n)}$ ' will ever synchronize with a prefix ' $x.\overline{\text{none}}$ '. Indeed, because terms in $\hat{\lambda}_\oplus$ never reduce to failure, $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_x$ should not account for such failures.

We may now introduce $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^\zeta$, our translation of the fail-prone calculus $\hat{\lambda}_\oplus^\zeta$ into $s\pi$. It builds upon the structure of $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_x$ to account for failures in expressions due to the lack or excess of resources. To this end, as we will see, $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^\zeta$ does exploit prefixes ' $x.\overline{\text{none}}$ ' to signal failures.

Translating Expressions We introduce the translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^\zeta$, which will be shown to be a correct encoding, according to the criteria given in § 2.5.1.

Definition 2.29 From $\hat{\lambda}_\oplus^\zeta$ into $s\pi$: Expressions

Let u be a name. The translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^\zeta : \hat{\lambda}_\oplus^\zeta \rightarrow s\pi$ is defined in Fig. 2.16. □

We discuss the most interesting aspects of the translation in Fig. 2.16, in particular how the possibility of failure (lack or excess of resources in bags) induces differences with respect to the translation in Fig. 2.15.

Most salient differences can be explained by looking at the translation of the application MB . Indeed, the sources of failure in $\hat{\lambda}_\oplus^\zeta$ concern a mismatch between

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket x \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= x.\overline{\text{some}}; [x \leftrightarrow u] \\
\llbracket \lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= u.\overline{\text{some}}; u(x).\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \\
\llbracket MB \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp)) \\
\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu x)(\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \\
\llbracket M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_1). \left(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, x_2\})}; \right. \\
&\quad \left. x(x_1).x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_2). (y_2.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_2.\text{close} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_2\})}; \right. \\
&\quad \left. x(x_2).x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(y). (y.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \right) \\
\llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y). (y.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
\llbracket \llbracket M \rrbracket \cdot B \rrbracket_x^\sharp &= x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\llbracket M \rrbracket \cdot B)}; x(y_i).x.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(\llbracket M \rrbracket \cdot B)}; x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(x_i) \\
&\quad .(x_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M)}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp \mid \llbracket B \rrbracket_x^\sharp \mid y_i.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
\llbracket 1 \rrbracket_x^\sharp &= x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y). (y.\overline{\text{some}}; y.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
\llbracket \text{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_k} \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid x_k.\overline{\text{none}} \\
\llbracket M \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= (\nu x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N)}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \\
\llbracket M + N \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \oplus \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 2.16: Translating $\widehat{\lambda}_\oplus^\sharp$ expressions into $\mathfrak{s}\pi$ processes.

the number of variable occurrences in M and the number of resources present in B . Both M and B can fail on their own, and our translation into $\mathfrak{s}\pi$ must capture this mutual dependency. Let us recall the translation given in Fig. 2.15:

$$\llbracket MB \rrbracket_u = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).(x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i)}; \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u]))$$

The corresponding translation in Fig. 2.16 is seemingly simpler:

$$\llbracket MB \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp))$$

Indeed, the main difference is the prefix ' $x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i)}$ ', which is present in process $\llbracket MB \rrbracket_u$ but is not explicit in process $\llbracket MB \rrbracket_u^\sharp$. Intuitively, such a prefix denotes the dependency of B on M ; because terms in $\widehat{\lambda}_\oplus^\sharp$ do not fail, we can be certain that a corresponding confirming prefix ' $x.\overline{\text{some}}$ ' will be available to spawn every $\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x$. When moving to $\widehat{\lambda}_\oplus^\sharp$, however, this is not the case: $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\sharp$ may fail to provide the expected number of corresponding confirmations. For this reason, the role of prefix

‘ $x.\text{some}_{fV(B_i)}$ ’ in $\llbracket MB \rrbracket_u$ is implemented within process $\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\dagger$. As a consequence, the translations for sharing terms ($M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ and $M[\leftarrow x]$) and for bags ($\langle M \rangle \cdot B$ and 1) are more involved in the case of failure.

With this motivation for $\llbracket MB \rrbracket_u^\dagger$ in mind, we discuss the remaining entries in Fig. 2.16:

- Translations for x and $\lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ are exactly as in Fig. 2.15:

$$\llbracket x \rrbracket_u^\dagger = x.\overline{\text{some}}; [x \leftrightarrow u] \quad \llbracket \lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\dagger = u.\overline{\text{some}}; u(x). \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\dagger$$

- Similarly as $\llbracket MB \rrbracket_u^\dagger$, discussed above, the translation of $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$ is more compact than the one in Fig. 2.15, because confirmations for each of the elements of the bag are handled within their respective translations:

$$\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \rrbracket_u^\dagger = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\text{vx})(\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\dagger)$$

- As anticipated, the translation of $M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]$ is more involved than before. For simplicity, let us discuss the representative case when $k = 2$ (two shared variables):

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\dagger = & x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_1). \left(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; \right. \\ & x.\text{some}_{u, (fV(M) \setminus \{x_1, x_2\})}; x(x_1).x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_2). \\ & \left. (y_2.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_2.\text{close} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (fV(M) \setminus \{x_2\})}; \right. \\ & \left. x(x_2).x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(y). (y.\text{some}_{u, fV(M)}; \right. \\ & \left. \left. y.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid x.\overline{\text{none}} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

This process is meant to synchronize with the translation of a bag. After confirming the presence of a behavior on name x , an auxiliary name y_i is sent to signal that there are elements to be substituted. This name implements a short protocol that allows us to check for lack of resources in the bag. These steps on y_i are followed by another confirmation and also a request for confirmation of behavior along x ; this represents that the name can fail in one of two ways, capturing the mutual dependency between M and the bag mentioned above. Once these two steps on x have succeeded, it is finally safe for the process to receive a name x_i . This process is repeated for each shared variable to ensure safe communication of the elements of the bag. The last line shows the very final step: a name y is communicated to ensure that there are no further elements in the bag; in such a case, y fails and the failure is propagated to $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\dagger$. The prefix ‘ $x.\overline{\text{none}}$ ’ signals the end of the shared variables, and is

meant to synchronize with the translation of 1, the last element of the bag. If the bag has elements that still need to be synchronized then the failure along x is propagated to the remaining resources within the translation of the bag.

- The translation of $M[\leftarrow x]$ corresponds to the final step in the translation just discussed:

$$\llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^{\not\leftarrow} = x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y).(y.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\not\leftarrow} \mid x.\overline{\text{none}})$$

- The translation of the non-empty bag $\lambda M \cdot B$ is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \lambda M \cdot B \rrbracket_x^{\not\leftarrow} &= x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\lambda M \cdot B)}; x(y_i).x.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(\lambda M \cdot B)}; x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(x_i) \\ &\quad .(x_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M)}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\not\leftarrow} \mid \llbracket B \rrbracket_x^{\not\leftarrow} \mid y_i.\overline{\text{none}}) \end{aligned}$$

Notice how this process operates hand in hand with the translation of $M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]$. The process first waits for its behavior to be confirmed; then, the auxiliary name y_i is received from the translation of $M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]$. The name y_i fails immediately to signal that there are more resources in the bag. Name x then confirms its behavior and awaits its behavior to be confirmed. Subsequently, a name x_i is sent: this is the name on which the translation of M will be made available to the application. After that, name x is used in the translation of B , the rest of the bag.

- The translation of 1 operates aligned with the translations just discussed, exploiting the fact that in fail-free reductions the last element of the bag must be 1:

$$\llbracket 1 \rrbracket_x^{\not\leftarrow} = x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y).(y.\overline{\text{some}}; y.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}})$$

This process relays the information that the translated empty bag is no longer able to provide resources for further substitutions. It first waits upon a correct behavior followed by the reception of a name y . The process then confirms its behavior along y : this signals that there are no further resources. Concurrently, name x waits for a confirmation of a behavior and ends with ' $x.\overline{\text{none}}$ ', thus signaling the failure of producing further behaviors.

- The explicit failure term $\text{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_k}$ is not part of $\widehat{\lambda}_\oplus$ and so it was not covered in Fig. 2.15. Its translation is straightforward:

$$\llbracket \text{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_k} \rrbracket_u^{\not\leftarrow} = u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid x_k.\overline{\text{none}}$$

The failure term is translated as the non-availability of a behavior along name u , composed with the non-availability of sessions along the names/variables x_1, \dots, x_n encapsulated by the source failure term.

- The translations for $M\langle N/x \rangle$ and $\mathbb{M} + \mathbb{N}$ are exactly as before:

$$\llbracket M\langle N/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\zeta = (\mathbf{v}x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \mid x.\mathbf{some}_{\mathbf{fv}(N)}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\zeta) \quad \llbracket \mathbb{M} + \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\zeta = \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\zeta \oplus \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\zeta$$

Examples

Before presenting the session types associated to our translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^\zeta$, we present a series of examples that illustrate different possibilities in a step-by-step fashion:

- No failure: an explicit substitution that is provided an adequate amount of resources;
- Failure due to excess of resources in the bag;
- Failure due to lack of resources in the bag.

We first discuss the translation of a term in which there is no failure. In that follows, we refer to a specific reduction by adding a number as in, e.g., ‘ $\longrightarrow_{[3]}$ ’.

Example 2.20 No Failure

Let us consider the well-formed $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^\zeta$ -term $N[x_1 \leftarrow x]\langle\langle \mathcal{M} \rangle/x \rangle$, where, for simplicity, we assume that $\mathbf{fv}(N) \setminus \{x_1\} = \mathbf{fv}(M) = \emptyset$. As we have seen, $N[x_1 \leftarrow x]\langle\langle \mathcal{M} \rangle/x \rangle \longrightarrow N\langle M/x \rangle$. We discuss reduction steps for $\llbracket N[x_1 \leftarrow x]\langle\langle \mathcal{M} \rangle/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\zeta$, highlighting in blue relevant prefixes. First, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N[x_1 \leftarrow x]\langle\langle \mathcal{M} \rangle/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\zeta &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\llbracket N[x_1 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\zeta \mid \llbracket \mathcal{M} \rrbracket_x^\zeta) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(x.\overline{\mathbf{some}}.\bar{x}(y_1).(y_1.\mathbf{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\mathbf{close} \mid x.\overline{\mathbf{some}}; x.\mathbf{some}_u; \\ &\quad .x(x_1).x.\overline{\mathbf{some}}; \bar{x}(y).(y.\mathbf{some}_{u,x_1}; y.\mathbf{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\zeta \mid x.\overline{\mathbf{none}})) \\ &\quad \mid x.\mathbf{some}_\emptyset; x(y_1).x.\mathbf{some}_{y_1}; x.\overline{\mathbf{some}}; \bar{x}(x_1) \\ &\quad .(x_1.\mathbf{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_1}^\zeta \mid y_1.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid x.\mathbf{some}_\emptyset; x(y).(y.\overline{\mathbf{some}}; y.\overline{\mathbf{close}} \\ &\quad \mid x.\mathbf{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\mathbf{none}}))) \end{aligned}$$

A detailed description of the reduction steps follows:

- Reduction $\longrightarrow_{[1]}$ concerns the name x confirming its behavior (see highlighted prefixes above), and reduction $\longrightarrow_{[2]}$ concerns the communication of

name y_1 :

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N[x_1 \leftarrow x] \langle \langle M \rangle / x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp &\longrightarrow_{[1]} (\nu x) (\bar{x}(y_1). (y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_u; x(x_1). \\
&\quad .x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(y). (y.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y.\text{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
&\quad \mid x(y_1).x.\text{some}_{y_1}; x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(x_1). (x_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \\
&\quad \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y). (y.\overline{\text{some}}; y.\overline{\text{close}} \mid \\
&\quad x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}})) \\
&\longrightarrow_{[2]} (\nu x, y_1) (y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_u; x(x_1). \\
&\quad .x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(y). (y.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y.\text{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
&\quad \mid x.\text{some}_{y_1}; x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(x_1). (x_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \\
&\quad \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y). (y.\overline{\text{some}}; y.\overline{\text{close}} \mid \\
&\quad x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}})) \\
&:= P
\end{aligned}$$

- Reduction $\longrightarrow_{[3]}$ concerns x confirming its behavior, which signals that there are variables free for substitution in the translated term. In the opposite direction, reduction $\longrightarrow_{[4]}$ signals that there are elements in the bag which are available for substitution in the translated term.

$$\begin{aligned}
P &\longrightarrow_{[3]} (\nu x, y_1) (y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close} \mid x.\text{some}_u; x(x_1). \\
&\quad .x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(y). (y.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y.\text{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
&\quad \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(x_1). (x_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y). \\
&\quad (y.\overline{\text{some}}; y.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}})) \\
&\longrightarrow_{[4]} (\nu x, y_1) (y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close} \mid x(x_1).x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(y). (y.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y.\text{close}; \\
&\quad \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \bar{x}(x_1). (x_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \\
&\quad \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y). (y.\overline{\text{some}}; y.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}})) \quad (:= Q)
\end{aligned}$$

- Given the confirmations in the previous two steps, reduction $\longrightarrow_{[5]}$ can now safely communicate a name x_1 . This reduction synchronizes the shared variable x_1 with the first element in the bag.

$$\begin{aligned}
Q &\longrightarrow_{[5]} (\nu x, y_1, x_1) (y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(y). (y.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y.\text{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp \\
&\quad \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid x_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y). (y.\overline{\text{some}}; y.\overline{\text{close}} \\
&\quad \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}})) \quad (:= R)
\end{aligned}$$

- Reduction $\longrightarrow_{[6]}$ concerns x confirming its behavior. At this point, we could have alternatively performed a reduction on name y_1 . We chose to discuss all reductions on x first; thanks to confluence this choice has no effect on the

overall behavior. Reduction $\longrightarrow_{[7]}$ communicates name y along x .

$$\begin{aligned}
R &\longrightarrow_{[6]} (\nu x, y_1, x_1)(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\overline{\text{close}} \mid \overline{x}(y).(y.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y.\overline{\text{close}}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\dagger \\
&\quad \mid x.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_1}^\dagger \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x(y).(y.\overline{\text{some}}; y.\overline{\text{close}} \\
&\quad \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}})) \\
&\longrightarrow_{[7]} (\nu x, y, y_1, x_1)(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\overline{\text{close}} \mid y.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y.\overline{\text{close}}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid x.\overline{\text{none}} \\
&\quad \mid x_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_1}^\dagger \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid y.\overline{\text{some}}; y.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
&:=S
\end{aligned}$$

- Reduction $\longrightarrow_{[8]}$ cancels the behavior along x , meaning that there are no more free variables to synchronize with. Subsequently, reduction $\longrightarrow_{[9]}$ cancels the behavior along y_1 : at the beginning, when y_1 was received, the encoded bag had the element M left to be synchronized; at this point, the failure on y_1 signals that the bag still has elements to be synchronized with.

$$\begin{aligned}
S &\longrightarrow_{[8]} (\nu y, y_1, x_1)(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\overline{\text{close}} \mid y.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y.\overline{\text{close}}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid x_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_1}^\dagger \\
&\quad \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid y.\overline{\text{some}}; y.\overline{\text{close}}) \\
&\longrightarrow_{[9]} (\nu y, x_1)(y.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y.\overline{\text{close}}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid x_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_1}^\dagger \mid y.\overline{\text{some}}; y.\overline{\text{close}}) \\
&:=T
\end{aligned}$$

- Finally, reductions $\longrightarrow_{[10]}$ and $\longrightarrow_{[11]}$ concern name y : the former signals that the bag has no more elements to be synchronized for substitution; the latter closes the session, as it has served its purpose of correctly synchronizing the translated term. The resulting process corresponds to the translation of $N\langle M/x \rangle$.

$$\begin{aligned}
T &\longrightarrow_{[10]} (\nu y, x_1)(y.\overline{\text{close}}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid x_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_1}^\dagger \mid y.\overline{\text{close}}) \\
&\longrightarrow_{[11]} (\nu x_1)(\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid x_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_1}^\dagger) = \llbracket N\langle M/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\dagger
\end{aligned}$$

□

We now discuss the translation of a term that fails due to an excess of resources.

Example 2.21 Excess of Resources

Let us consider the well-formed $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^\dagger$ -term that does not share occurrences of x , i.e., $N[\leftarrow x]\langle\langle \lambda M \rangle/x\rangle$, where M, N are closed (i.e. $\text{fv}(N) = \text{fv}(M) = \emptyset$). This term's translation is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N[\leftarrow x]\langle\langle \lambda M \rangle/x\rangle \rrbracket_u^\dagger &= (\nu x)(\llbracket N[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid \llbracket \lambda M \rrbracket_x^\dagger) \\
&= (\nu x)(x.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_u; y_1.\overline{\text{close}}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; \\
&\quad x(y_1).x.\text{some}_{y_1}; x.\overline{\text{some}};\overline{x}(x_i).(x_i.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_x^\dagger \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}}))
\end{aligned}$$

- Reductions $\longrightarrow_{[1]}$ and $\longrightarrow_{[2]}$ follow as in Example 2.20.

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N[\leftarrow x] \langle \langle M \rangle / x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp &\longrightarrow_{[1]} (\nu x)(\bar{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_u; y_1.\text{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid x(y_1). \\ &\quad x.\text{some}_{y_1}; x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(x_i).(x_i.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_x^\sharp \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}})) \\ &\longrightarrow_{[2]} (\nu x, y_1)(y_1.\text{some}_u; y_1.\text{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \\ &\quad x.\text{some}_{y_1}; x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(x_i).(x_i.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_x^\sharp \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}})) \\ &:= P \end{aligned}$$

Notice how the translation of the term first triggers the failure: prefix $x.\overline{\text{none}}$ (highlighted in red) signals that there are no (more) occurrences of x within the process; nevertheless, the translation of the bag is still trying to communicate the translation of M . This failure along x causes the chain reaction of the failure along y_1 , which eventually triggers across the translation of N .

- Reduction $\longrightarrow_{[3]}$ differs from $\longrightarrow_{[3]}$ in Example 2.20, as the translation of the shared variable is empty, we abort along the name x ; as the translated bag still contains elements to synchronize, the abortion of the bag triggers that failure of the dependant name y_1 .

$$\begin{aligned} P &\longrightarrow_{[3]} (\nu y_1)(y_1.\text{some}_u; y_1.\text{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \longrightarrow y_1.\overline{\text{none}}) \\ &\longrightarrow_{[4]} u.\overline{\text{none}} = \llbracket \text{fail}^0 \rrbracket_u^\sharp \end{aligned}$$

- Reduction $\longrightarrow_{[4]}$ differs from that of $\longrightarrow_{[9]}$ and $\longrightarrow_{[10]}$ from Example 2.20: the name y_1 fails signaling that there was an element in the bag that was to be sent; as the translation of the term N is guarded by the confirmation along y_1 , it aborts.

□

Finally, we illustrate how $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^\sharp$ acts on a term that fails due to lack of resources in a bag.

Example 2.22 Lack of Resources

Consider the well-formed $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^\sharp$ -term $N[x_1 \leftarrow x] \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle$, where N is a closed term (i.e. $\text{fv}(N) = \emptyset$). This term's translation is:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N[x_1 \leftarrow x] \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= (\nu x)(\llbracket N[x_1 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \\ &= (\nu x)(x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_u; \\ &\quad x(x_1).x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_{u, x_1}; y_2.\text{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\ &\quad x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y_1).(y_1.\overline{\text{some}}; y_1.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}})) \quad (:= P) \end{aligned}$$

Notice how the translation of the empty bag 1 triggers the failure: prefix ' $x.\overline{\text{none}}$ ' signals that there are no (more) elements in the bag; however, the translated term aims to synchronize, as it (still) requires resources.

- Reductions $\longrightarrow_{[1]}$ and $\longrightarrow_{[2]}$ follow from Example 2.20.

$$\begin{aligned}
P &\longrightarrow_{[1]} (\nu x)(\bar{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_u; x(x_1). \\
&\quad x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y_2.\text{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\
&\quad x(y_1).(y_1.\overline{\text{some}}; y_1.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}})) \\
&\longrightarrow_{[2]} (\nu x, y_1)(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_u; x(x_1). \\
&\quad x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y_2.\text{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\
&\quad y_1.\overline{\text{some}}; y_1.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}})
\end{aligned}$$

- Reductions $\longrightarrow_{[3]}$ and $\longrightarrow_{[4]}$ follow from that of $\longrightarrow_{[9]}$ and $\longrightarrow_{[10]}$ in Example 2.20; as the term contains the element x_1 for synchronization, the encoding of N is not guarded by y_1 .

$$\begin{aligned}
Q &\longrightarrow_{[3]} (\nu x, y_1)(y_1.\text{close} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_u; x(x_1). \\
&\quad x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y_2.\text{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\
&\quad y_1.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
&\longrightarrow_{[4]} (\nu x)(x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_u; x(x_1).x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y_2.\text{close}; \\
&\quad \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
&\longrightarrow_{[5]} (\nu x)(x.\text{some}_u; x(x_1).x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y_2.\text{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\
&\quad x.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
&\longrightarrow_{[6]} u.\overline{\text{none}} = \llbracket \text{fail}^0 \rrbracket_u^\sharp
\end{aligned}$$

- Reduction $\longrightarrow_{[5]}$ follows from reduction $\longrightarrow_{[3]}$ in Example 2.20.
- Reduction $\longrightarrow_{[6]}$ differs from that of $\longrightarrow_{[4]}$ from Example 2.20: the bag contains no elements, and signals this by aborting along the name x ; still, the term expects to receive an element of the bag, and prematurely aborts.

□

Translating Types In describing our translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^\sharp$ we have informally referred to (non-deterministic) session protocols in $\mathfrak{s}\pi$ that implement (non-deterministic) expressions in $\widehat{\lambda}_\oplus^\sharp$. We are actually able to make these intuitions precise and give a translation of intersection types (for $\widehat{\lambda}_\oplus^\sharp$, cf. Def. 2.6) into session types (for $\mathfrak{s}\pi$, cf. Def. 2.23). This provides the protocol-oriented interpretation of intersections mentioned earlier. Intuitively speaking, given an intersection type π , we will have a corresponding session type $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket_u^\sharp$ that determines a protocol tied to the evaluation of a (fail-prone, non-deterministic) expression with type π .

Definition 2.30 From $\widehat{\lambda}_\oplus^\sharp$ into $\mathfrak{s}\pi$: Types

The translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^\sharp$ on types is defined in Fig. 2.17. Let $\Gamma = x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_m : \sigma_k, \nu_1 : \pi_1, \dots, \nu_n : \pi_n$ be as in Def. 2.16.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbf{unit} \rrbracket^\sharp &= \& \mathbf{1} \\
\llbracket \pi \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp &= \& (\overline{\llbracket \pi \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)}^\sharp} \wp \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp) \quad (\text{for some strict type } \sigma, \text{ with } i \geq 0) \\
\llbracket \sigma \wedge \pi \rrbracket_{(\tau, i)}^\sharp &= \overline{\& ((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\& \oplus ((\& \overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp} \wp (\overline{\llbracket \pi \rrbracket_{(\tau, i)}^\sharp}))))} \\
&= \oplus ((\& \mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp} \otimes (\overline{\llbracket \pi \rrbracket_{(\tau, i)}^\sharp})))) \\
\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)}^\sharp &= \begin{cases} \overline{\& ((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\& \oplus \perp))} & \text{if } i = 0 \\ \& ((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\& \oplus ((\& \overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp} \wp (\overline{\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i-1)}^\sharp})))) & \text{if } i > 0 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 2.17: Translating intersection types as session types.

For some strict types τ_1, \dots, τ_n and $i_1, \dots, i_n \geq 0$ we define:

$$\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\sharp = x_1 : \& \overline{\llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket^\sharp}, \dots, x_k : \& \overline{\llbracket \sigma_k \rrbracket^\sharp}, v_1 : \& \overline{\llbracket \pi_1 \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, i_1)}^\sharp}, \dots, v_n : \& \overline{\llbracket \pi_n \rrbracket_{(\tau_n, i_n)}^\sharp}$$

□

As we will see, given a well-formedness judgement $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$, with the translations on types and assignments defined above, we will have $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp$; this is the content of the *type preservation* property (Theorem 2.16).

The translation of types in Fig. 2.17 leverages non-deterministic session protocols (typed with ‘&’) to represent non-deterministic fetching and fail-prone evaluation in $\widehat{\lambda}_\oplus^\sharp$. Notice that the translation of the multiset type π depends on two arguments (a strict type τ and a number $i \geq 0$) which are left unspecified above, but are appropriately specified in Proposition 2.5.3. This is crucial to represent mismatches in $\widehat{\lambda}_\oplus^\sharp$ (i.e., sources of failures) as typable processes in $s\pi$. For instance, in Fig. 2.7, Rule [FS:app] admits a mismatch between $\sigma^j \rightarrow \tau$ and σ^k , for it allows $j \neq k$. In our proof of type preservation, these two arguments are instantiated appropriately, enabling typability as session-typed processes.

We are now ready to consider correctness for $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^\sharp$, in the sense of Def. 2.25. First, the compositionality property follows directly from Fig. 2.16. In the following sections, we state the remaining properties in Def. 2.25: type preservation, operational correspondence, and success sensitiveness.

Type Preservation

We prove that our translation from $\widehat{\lambda}_\oplus^\sharp$ to $s\pi$ maps well-formed $\widehat{\lambda}_\oplus^\sharp$ expressions to session-typed processes in $s\pi$. First, we show that translated multiset types can be “lengthened” by setting appropriate parameters to the encoding.

Proposition 2.5.3 *Suppose σ^j and σ^k are arbitrary strict types (Def. 2.6), for some $j, k \geq 0$. Following Fig. 2.17, consider their encoding into session types $\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, m)}^\zeta$ and $\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}^\zeta$, respectively, where τ_1, τ_2 are strict types and $n, m \geq 0$.*

We have $\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, m)}^\zeta = \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}^\zeta$ under the following conditions:

1. *If $j > k$ then we take τ_1 to be an arbitrary strict type and $m = 0$; also, we take τ_2 to be σ and $n = j - k$.*
2. *If $j < k$ then we take τ_1 to be σ and $m = k - j$; also, we take τ_2 to be an arbitrary strict type and $n = 0$.*
3. *Otherwise, if $j = k$ then we take $m = n = 0$. Also, τ_1, τ_2 are arbitrary strict types.*

Proof: Immediate by unfolding the translation. The full analysis can be found in App. A.4.1. \square

Given Proposition 2.5.3 we now show that the translation preserves types:

Theorem 2.16 (Type Preservation for $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^\zeta$) *Let B and \mathbb{M} be a bag and an expression in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^\zeta$, respectively.*

1. *If $\Gamma^\dagger \models B : \pi$ then $\llbracket B \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \pi \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)}^\zeta$, for some strict type σ and index $i \geq 0$.*
2. *If $\Gamma^\dagger \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ then $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta$.*

Proof: By mutual induction on the typing derivation of B and \mathbb{M} , with an analysis of the last rule applied in $\Gamma \models B : \pi$ and in $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$. One key aspect of this proof is the application of Proposition 2.5.3 to ensure duality of types. Intuitively, the conditions given by Proposition 2.5.3 are used to instantiate the parameters in the encoding of intersection types, so as to ensure that when intersection types have different types the smaller type can be correctly “padded” to match the size of the larger type—Example 2.23, given below, illustrates this padding. The full proof can be found in App. A.4.1. \square

Example 2.23 Parameters in the encoding of types

We give the dual types when encoding intersection types, namely the case of $\llbracket \sigma \wedge \pi \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)}^\zeta$, to express the encoding of intersection typed behavior into session typed behavior. The application of dual types is most evident in the application of a bag into an abstraction: the bag providing the intersection type and the abstraction consuming it. In session types the interaction between these is expressed by dual session types where one channel provides a behavior and the dual channel provides the dual session type behavior via the cut rule. Let us consider the term $(\lambda x. M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x])B$ typed with the well-formedness rules by:

$$[\text{FS:app}] \frac{\Gamma \models \lambda x.M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] : (\sigma \wedge \sigma) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta \models B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma, \Delta \models (\lambda x.M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x])B : \tau}$$

When applying the translation of Fig. 2.16 to the term we obtain:

$$\bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v)(\llbracket \lambda x.M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp))$$

By appealing to Type Preservation (Theorem 2.16) we obtain both $\llbracket \lambda x.M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\sharp, v : \llbracket (\sigma \wedge \sigma) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp$ and $\llbracket B \rrbracket_x^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\delta_2, i_2)}^\sharp$. We give the typing for one non-deterministic branch where we take an arbitrary permutation of B is as follows by applying the rules of Fig. 2.11 and that Π_1 is derived to be:

$$\begin{array}{c} [\text{Tid}] \frac{}{[v \leftrightarrow u] \vdash v : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp \quad \llbracket B \rrbracket_x^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\delta_2, i_2)}^\sharp} \\ [\text{T}\otimes] \frac{}{\bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\sharp, v : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\delta_2, i_2)}^\sharp \wp \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp} \\ [\text{T}\oplus_{\bar{w}}^x] \frac{}{v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\sharp, v : \llbracket (\sigma^k) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp} \end{array}$$

Hence we obtain the derivation applying the [Tcut] rule:

$$\frac{\llbracket \lambda x.M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\sharp, v : \llbracket (\sigma \wedge \sigma) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp \quad \Pi_1}{(\nu v)(\llbracket \lambda x.M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B \rrbracket_x^\sharp)) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\sharp, \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp}$$

Now we shall focus on the typing of the channel v and x in this process as these channel describes the behavior of the encoded intersection type which we are trying to match via duality. By the translation on types from Fig. 2.17 we have that

$$\llbracket (\sigma \wedge \sigma) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp = \&(\overline{\llbracket (\sigma \wedge \sigma) \rrbracket_{(\delta_1, i_1)}^\sharp}) \wp \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp$$

- When $B = 1$ we have derivation:

$$\llbracket 1 \rrbracket_x^\sharp \models \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\delta_2, i_2)}^\sharp$$

To obtain duality from Rule [Tcut] we must have that $\llbracket \sigma^2 \rrbracket_{(\delta_1, i_1)}^\sharp = \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\delta_2, i_2)}^\sharp$. By Proposition 2.5.3 we can take δ_1 to be an arbitrary strict type, $i_1 = 0, i_2 = 2$, $\delta_2 = \sigma$. We have $\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, 2)}^\sharp$ evaluated as:

$$\begin{aligned} &= \&(\overline{(\oplus \perp)} \otimes (\& \oplus ((\& \overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, 1)}^\sharp)))) \\ &= \&(\overline{(\oplus \perp)} \otimes (\& \oplus ((\& \overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}) \wp (\& (\oplus \perp) \otimes (\& \oplus ((\& \overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, 0)}^\sharp))))))) \\ &= \llbracket \sigma^2 \rrbracket_{(\delta_1, i_1)}^\sharp \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll}
M[\leftarrow x]\langle\langle 1/x \rangle\rangle & \equiv_{\lambda} M \\
MB\langle\langle N/x \rangle\rangle & \equiv_{\lambda} (M\langle\langle N/x \rangle\rangle)B & \text{with } x \notin \text{fv}(B) \\
MA[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle & \equiv_{\lambda} (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle)A & \text{with } x_i \in \tilde{x} \Rightarrow x_i \notin \text{fv}(A) \\
M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]\langle\langle A/y \rangle\rangle[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle & \equiv_{\lambda} (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle)[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]\langle\langle A/y \rangle\rangle & \text{with } x_i \in \tilde{x} \Rightarrow x_i \notin \text{fv}(A) \\
M\langle\langle N_2/y \rangle\rangle\langle\langle N_1/x \rangle\rangle & \equiv_{\lambda} M\langle\langle N_1/x \rangle\rangle\langle\langle N_2/y \rangle\rangle & \text{with } x \notin \text{fv}(N_2), y \notin \text{fv}(N_1) \\
C[M] & \equiv_{\lambda} C[M'] & \text{with } M \equiv_{\lambda} M' \\
D[\mathbb{M}] & \equiv_{\lambda} D[\mathbb{M}'] & \text{with } \mathbb{M} \equiv_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}'
\end{array}$$

Figure 2.18: Congruence in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$.

- When $B = \langle N_1, N_2 \rangle$ we have derivation:

$$\llbracket \langle N_1, N_2 \rangle \rrbracket_x^{\dagger} \models \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^{\dagger}, x : \llbracket \sigma^2 \rrbracket_{(\delta_2, i_2)}^{\dagger}$$

To obtain duality from Rule [Tcut] we must have that $\llbracket \sigma^2 \rrbracket_{(\delta_1, i_1)}^{\dagger} = \llbracket \sigma^2 \rrbracket_{(\delta_2, i_2)}^{\dagger}$. By Proposition 2.5.3 we can take δ_1 and δ_2 to be an arbitrary strict type and $i_1 = i_2 = 0$. We then obtain $\llbracket \sigma^2 \rrbracket_{(\delta_1, 0)}^{\dagger} = \llbracket \sigma^2 \rrbracket_{(\delta_2, 0)}^{\dagger}$, as $\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\delta_1, 0)}^{\dagger} = \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\delta_2, 0)}^{\dagger}$ for any two strict types δ_1, δ_2 .

- When $B = \langle N_1, N_2, N_3 \rangle$ we have derivation:

$$\llbracket \langle N_1, N_2, N_3 \rangle \rrbracket_x^{\dagger} \models \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^{\dagger}, x : \llbracket \sigma^3 \rrbracket_{(\delta_2, i_2)}^{\dagger}$$

To obtain duality from Rule [Tcut] we must have that $\llbracket \sigma^2 \rrbracket_{(\delta_1, i_1)}^{\dagger} = \llbracket \sigma^3 \rrbracket_{(\delta_2, i_2)}^{\dagger}$. By Proposition 2.5.3 we can take δ_2 to be an arbitrary strict type, $i_2 = 0, i_1 = 2, \delta_1 = \sigma$. Then the case proceeds similarly to when $B = 1$.

□

Operational Correspondence: Completeness and Soundness

We now state our operational correspondence results (completeness and soundness, cf. Fig. 2.19).

A Congruence We will identify some $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$ -terms such as $M[\leftarrow x]\langle\langle 1/x \rangle\rangle$ and M . The identification is natural, as the former is a term M with no occurrences of x in which x is going to be replaced with 1, which clearly describes a substitution that “does nothing”, and would result in M itself. With this intuition, other terms are identified via a *congruence* (denoted \equiv_{λ}) on terms and expressions that is formally defined in Fig. 2.18.




Figure 2.19: Operational Correspondence for $[[\cdot]]^z$

Example 2.24 Cont. Example 2.12

We illustrate the congruence in case of failure:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\lambda x.x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x]) \wr \text{fail}^0[\leftarrow y]\langle\langle 1/y \rangle\rangle &\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Beta}]} x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x]\langle\langle \text{fail}^0[\leftarrow y]\langle\langle 1/y \rangle\rangle \rangle/x_1 \rangle \\
 &\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Ex-Sub}]} x_1 \langle \text{fail}^0[\leftarrow y]\langle\langle 1/y \rangle\rangle/x_1 \rangle \\
 &\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Lin-Fetch}]} \text{fail}^0[\leftarrow y]\langle\langle 1/y \rangle\rangle \\
 &\equiv_{\lambda} \text{fail}^0
 \end{aligned}$$

In the last step, Rule $[\text{RS:Cons}_2]$ cannot be applied: y is sharing with no shared variables and the explicit substitution involves the bag 1. \square

Theorem 2.17 (Consistency Stability Under \equiv) Let M be a consistent $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^z$ -expression. If $M \equiv M'$ then M' is consistent.

Proof: By induction on the structure of M ; see Appendix A.4.2 for details. \square

Definition 2.31 Partially Open Terms

We say that a $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^z$ -term M is *partially open* if $\forall x \in \text{fv}(M)$ (cf. Def. 2.12) implies that x is not a sharing variable. \square

Notice that the class of open terms (no conditions on free variables) subsumes the class of partially open terms, which in turn subsumes the class of closed terms. Consider the following example.

Example 2.25 Partially Open Terms

We give three examples of well-formed $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -terms:

$$M_1 = \lambda x.x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x] \quad M_2 = \lambda x.(x_1 \wr y)[x_1 \leftarrow x] \quad M_3 = (x_1 \wr y)[x_1 \leftarrow x]$$

Here the only closed term is M_1 as M_2 has one free variable (i.e., y) and M_3 has two free variables (y and x). While M_2 is partially open, M_3 is not because x is a sharing variable. \square

The following proposition will be used in the proof of operational completeness (Theorem 2.18) and operational soundness (Theorem 2.19). The proposition relies on well-formed partially open terms; however, in the proof of operational correspondence we only consider closed terms rather than partially open terms.

Proposition 2.5.4 *Suppose N is a well-formed, partially open $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -term with $\text{head}(N) = x$. Then, there exist an index set I , names \tilde{y} and n , and processes P_i such that the following four conditions hold:*

1.

$$\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^{\downarrow} \longrightarrow^* \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(\llbracket x \rrbracket_n^{\downarrow} \mid P_i)$$

2. *There exists a $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -term N' such that $N \equiv_{\lambda} N'$ and:*

$$\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u^{\downarrow} = \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(\llbracket x \rrbracket_n^{\downarrow} \mid P_i)$$

3. *For any well-formed and partially open $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -term M :*

$$\llbracket N\{M/x\} \rrbracket_u^{\downarrow} \longrightarrow^* \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(\llbracket M \rrbracket_n^{\downarrow} \mid P_i)$$

4. *There exists a $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -term M' such that $M' \equiv_{\lambda} N\{M/x\}$ and:*

$$\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u^{\downarrow} = \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(\llbracket M \rrbracket_n^{\downarrow} \mid P_i)$$

Proof: By induction on the structure of N . We briefly sketch the strategy for proving it case below, but the complete proof can be found in App. A.4.2.

1. The interesting cases are for $N = M\langle N'/x \rangle$ and $N = M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$, when $\text{size}(B) = \text{size}(\tilde{y}) = 0$ and $\text{head}(M) = x$. Notice that $N = M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$ is not a case, because of the definition of partially open term: y is a sharing variable in N and $y \in \text{fv}(N)$. The other cases follow easily by the induction hypothesis.

2. Reductions are only introduced by explicit weakening, which can be eliminated via the precongruence.
3. Follows from (1) and the fact that linear head substitution can be placed deeper within the term until it reaches the head variable.
4. Follows from (2) and (3).

□

Because of the diamond property (Proposition 2.3.1), it suffices to consider a completeness result based on a single reduction step in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$:

Theorem 2.18 (Operational Completeness) *Let \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{M} be well-formed, partially open $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ expressions. If $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$ then there exist Q and \mathbb{M}' such that $\mathbb{M}' \equiv_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}$, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\downarrow} \longrightarrow^* Q = \llbracket \mathbb{M}' \rrbracket_u^{\downarrow}$.*

Proof: By induction on the reduction rule applied to infer $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$. The case in which $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Lin- Fetch}]} \mathbb{M}$ happens for $\mathbb{N} = M\langle N'/x \rangle$ with $\text{head}(M) = x$, and $\mathbb{M} = M\{N'/x\}$. The translation of \mathbb{N} is of the form (omitting details):

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\downarrow} &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\downarrow} \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\downarrow}) \\ &\longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket x \rrbracket_n^{\downarrow} \mid P_i) \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\downarrow}), \text{ by Proposition 2.5.4} \\ &\longrightarrow^* \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(P_i \mid \llbracket N' \rrbracket_n^{\downarrow}) = \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\downarrow} \end{aligned}$$

The other cases follow by analyzing reductions from the translation of \mathbb{N} . The full proof can be found in App. A.4.2. □

Notice how Proposition 2.5.4 requires a term to be partially open; however, we prove operational correspondence for closed terms. The reason for this is that we start from a source closed term in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, which is translated by $(\cdot)^{\circ}$ into a closed $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -term.

Example 2.26 Cont. Example 2.21

Recall that M and N are well-formed with $\text{fv}(N) = \text{fv}(M) = \emptyset$, we can verify that $N[\leftarrow x]\langle\langle \lambda M \rangle/x \rangle$ and $\text{fail}^{\text{fv}(N) \cup \text{fv}(M)}$ are also well-formed. We have

$$N[\leftarrow x]\langle\langle \lambda M \rangle/x \rangle \longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Fail}]} \text{fail}^{\text{fv}(N) \cup \text{fv}(M)}$$

In $\mathfrak{s}\pi$, this reduction is mimicked as

$$\llbracket N[\leftarrow x]\langle\langle \lambda M \rangle/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^{\downarrow} \longrightarrow^* \llbracket \text{fail}^{\text{fv}(N) \cup \text{fv}(M)} \rrbracket_u^{\downarrow}.$$

In fact,

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N[\leftarrow x] \langle \langle \lambda M \rangle / x \rangle \rangle \llbracket_u^{\hat{\lambda}} &= (\nu x) (\llbracket N[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^{\hat{\lambda}} \mid \llbracket \lambda M \rrbracket_x^{\hat{\lambda}}) \\
&= (\nu x) (x.\overline{\text{some}}_u.\bar{x}(y_i).(y_i.\text{some}_u; y_i.\text{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^{\hat{\lambda}} \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\
&= x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y_i).x.\text{some}_{y_i}; x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(x_i). \\
&\quad (x_i.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\hat{\lambda}} \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_x^{\hat{\lambda}} \mid y_i.\overline{\text{none}})) \\
\longrightarrow (\nu x) (\bar{x}(y_i).(y_i.\text{some}_u; y_i.\text{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^{\hat{\lambda}} \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\
&\quad x(y_i).x.\text{some}_{y_i}; x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(x_i).(x_i.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\hat{\lambda}} \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_x^{\hat{\lambda}} \mid y_i.\overline{\text{none}})) \\
\longrightarrow (\nu x) (y_i.\text{some}_u; y_i.\text{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^{\hat{\lambda}} \mid x.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \\
&\quad x.\text{some}_{y_i}; x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(x_i).(x_i.\text{some}_\emptyset; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\hat{\lambda}} \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_x^{\hat{\lambda}} \mid y_i.\overline{\text{none}})) \\
\longrightarrow (\nu x) (y_i.\text{some}_u; y_i.\text{close}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^{\hat{\lambda}} \mid y_i.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
\longrightarrow u.\overline{\text{none}} \\
&= \llbracket \text{fail}^{\text{fv}(N) \cup \text{fv}(M)} \rrbracket_u^{\hat{\lambda}}
\end{aligned}$$

□

To state soundness we rely on the congruence relation \equiv_λ , given in Fig. 2.18.

Notation 2.5.1 Recall the congruence \equiv_λ for $\widehat{\lambda}_\oplus^{\hat{\lambda}}$, given in Figure 2.18. We write $N \longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda} N'$ iff $N \equiv_\lambda N_1 \longrightarrow N_2 \equiv_\lambda N'$, for some N_1, N_2 . Then, $\longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^*$ is the reflexive, transitive closure of $\longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}$. We use the notation $M \longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^i N$ to state that M performs i steps of $\longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}$ to N in $i \geq 0$ steps. When $i = 0$ it refers to no reduction taking place.

Theorem 2.19 (Operational Soundness) Let \mathbb{N} be a well-formed, partially open $\widehat{\lambda}_\oplus^{\hat{\lambda}}$ expression. If $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\hat{\lambda}} \longrightarrow^* Q$ then there exist Q' and \mathbb{N}' such that $Q \longrightarrow^* Q'$, $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^* \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^{\hat{\lambda}} = Q'$.

Proof: [Proof (Sketch)] By induction on the structure of \mathbb{N} with sub-induction on the number of reduction steps in $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\hat{\lambda}} \longrightarrow^* Q$. The cases in which $\mathbb{N} = x$, or $\mathbb{N} = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$, or $\mathbb{N} = \lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$, are easy since there are no reductions starting from $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\hat{\lambda}}$, i.e., $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\hat{\lambda}} \longrightarrow^0 Q$ which implies $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\hat{\lambda}} = \llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^{\hat{\lambda}} = Q = Q'$ and the result follows trivially. The analysis for some cases are exhaustive, for instance, when $\mathbb{N} = (M B)$ or $\mathbb{N} = M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$, there are several sub-cases to be considered: (i) B being equal to 1 or not; (ii) $\text{size}(B)$ matching the number of occurrences of the variable in M or not; (iii) M being a failure term or not.

We now discuss one of these cases to illustrate the recurring idea used in the proof: let $\mathbb{N} = (M B)$ and suppose that we are able to perform $k > 1$ steps to a process Q , i.e.,

$$\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = \llbracket (M B) \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^{\sharp})) \longrightarrow^k Q \quad (2.2)$$

Then there exist an π process R and integers n, m such that $k = m + n$ and

$$\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow^m \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v) (R \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).(\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^{\sharp} \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \longrightarrow^n Q$$

where the first $m \geq 0$ reduction steps are internal to $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp}$; type preservation in π ensures that, if they occur, these reductions do not discard the possibility of synchronizing with $v.\text{some}$. Then, the first of the $n \geq 0$ reduction steps towards Q is a synchronization between R and $v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}$.

We will consider the case when $m = 0$ and $n \geq 1$. Then $R = \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow^0 \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp}$ and there are two possibilities of having an unguarded $v.\overline{\text{some}}$ or $v.\overline{\text{none}}$ without internal reductions:

- (i) $M = (\lambda x.M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \quad (p \geq 0)$
- (ii) $M = \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}}$

Firstly we use case (i) to express the need for the reduction $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow_{\equiv_{\lambda}}^* \mathbb{N}'$. In this case $\mathbb{N} = ((\lambda x.M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle B)$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u$ may perform synchronizations where both $\llbracket \lambda x.M' \rrbracket_v$ and $\llbracket B \rrbracket_x$ synchronize across their shared channel. Here we use the congruence relation as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{N} &= ((\lambda x.M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle B) \\ &\equiv_{\lambda} ((\lambda x.M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) B) \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \end{aligned}$$

This enables the abstraction $\lambda x.M'$ to synchronize with the bag B .

Now we will develop case (ii):

$$\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} = \llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} = \llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} = v.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{z}.\overline{\text{none}}$$

With this shape for M , the translation and reductions from (2.2) become

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} &= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).(\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^{\sharp} \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\ &= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v) (v.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{z}.\overline{\text{none}} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).(\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^{\sharp} \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \quad (2.3) \\ &\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{z}.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \text{fv}(B).\overline{\text{none}} \end{aligned}$$

We also have that $\mathbb{N} = \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} B \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}\text{fv}(B)} = \mathbb{M}$. Furthermore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\zeta &= \llbracket \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}\text{fv}(B)} \rrbracket_u^\zeta \\ &= \bigoplus_{\text{PER}(B)} \llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}\text{fv}(B)} \rrbracket_u^\zeta \\ &= \bigoplus_{\text{PER}(B)} u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{z}.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \text{fv}(B).\overline{\text{none}} \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

From reductions in (2.3) and (2.4) one has $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\zeta \longrightarrow \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\zeta$, and the result follows with $n = 1$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\zeta = Q = Q'$. The full proof can be found in App. A.4.2. \square

Success Sensitiveness

Finally, we consider success sensitiveness. This requires extending $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^\zeta$ and $s\pi$ with success predicates.

Definition 2.32

We extend the syntax of $s\pi$ processes (Definition 2.21) with the \checkmark construct, which we assume well typed. Also, we extend Definition 2.29 by defining $\llbracket \checkmark \rrbracket_u^\zeta = \checkmark$ \square

Definition 2.33

We say that a process occurs *guarded* when it occurs behind a prefix (input, output, closing of channels and non-deterministic session behavior). That is, P is guarded if $\alpha.P$ or $\alpha;P$, where $\alpha = \bar{x}(y), x(y), x.\overline{\text{close}}, x.\text{close}, x.\overline{\text{some}}, x.\text{some}_{(w_1, \dots, w_n)}$. We say it occurs *unguarded* if it is not guarded for any prefix. \square

Definition 2.34 Success in $s\pi$

We extend the syntax of $s\pi$ processes with the \checkmark construct, which we assume well-typed. We define $P \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$ to hold whenever there exists a P' such that $P \longrightarrow^* P'$ and P' contains an unguarded occurrence of \checkmark . \square

Proposition 2.5.5 (Preservation of Success) *The \checkmark at the head of a partially open term is preserved to an unguarded occurrence of \checkmark when applying the translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^\zeta$ up to reductions and vice-versa. That is to say:*

1. $\forall M \in \widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^\zeta$: $\text{head}(M) = \checkmark \implies \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \longrightarrow^* (P \mid \checkmark) \oplus Q$
2. $\forall M \in \widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^\zeta$: $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta = (P \mid \checkmark) \oplus Q \implies \text{head}(M) = \checkmark$

Proof: [Proof (Sketch)] By induction on the structure of M . For item (1), consider the case $M = (N B)$ and $\text{head}(N B) = \text{head}(N) = \checkmark$. This term's translation is

$$\llbracket N B \rrbracket_u^\zeta = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v)(\llbracket N \rrbracket_v^\zeta \mid v.\overline{\text{some}}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\zeta)).$$

By the induction hypothesis, \checkmark is unguarded in $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark}$ after a sequence of reductions, i.e., $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} \longrightarrow^* (\checkmark \mid P') \oplus Q'$, for some π processes P' and Q' . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N B \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} &\longrightarrow^* \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v)((\checkmark \mid P') \oplus Q' \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^{\checkmark})) \\ &\equiv \checkmark \mid (\nu v)(P' \oplus Q' \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_j \rrbracket_x^{\checkmark})) \\ &\quad \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{B_i \in (\text{PER}(B) \setminus B_j)} \checkmark \mid (\nu v)(P' \oplus Q' \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^{\checkmark})) \right) \\ &\equiv (\checkmark \mid P) \oplus Q \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows by taking $P = (\nu v)(P' \oplus Q' \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_j \rrbracket_x^{\checkmark}))$ and $Q = \bigoplus_{B_i \in (\text{PER}(B) \setminus B_j)} \checkmark \mid (\nu v)(P' \oplus Q' \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^{\checkmark}))$. The analysis for the other cases are similar; see App. A.4.3 for details. \square

The translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} : \widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\checkmark} \rightarrow \pi$ is success sensitive on well-formed closed expressions.

Theorem 2.20 (Success Sensitivity) *Let \mathbb{M} be a closed well-formed $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ -expression. Then,*

$$\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark} \iff \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} \Downarrow_{\checkmark} .$$

Proof: [Proof (Sketch)] Suppose $\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$. By Definition 2.27 there exists $\mathbb{M}' = M_1 + \dots + M_k$ such that $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow^* \mathbb{M}'$ and $\text{head}(M_j) = \checkmark$, for some $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and M_j . By operational completeness (Theorem 2.18), there exists Q such that $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} \longrightarrow^* Q = \llbracket \mathbb{M}' \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark}$. Due to compositionality of $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark}$ and the homomorphic preservation of non-determinism, we have:

- $Q = \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} \oplus \dots \oplus \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark}$
- $\llbracket M_j \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} = C[\llbracket \checkmark \rrbracket_v^{\checkmark}] = C[\checkmark]$

By Proposition 2.5.5, item (1), since $\text{head}(M_j) = \checkmark$ it follows that $\llbracket M_j \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} \longrightarrow^* P \mid \checkmark \oplus Q'$. Hence Q reduces to a process that has an unguarded occurrence of \checkmark . The proof of the converse is similar and can be found in App. A.4.3. \square

As main result of this sub-section, we have the corollary below, which follows from the previously stated Theorems 2.16, 2.18, 2.19, and 2.20:

Corollary 2.5.2 *Our translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark}$ is a correct encoding, in the sense of Def. 2.25.*

Together, Corollary 2.5.1 and Corollary 2.5.2 ensure that $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ can be correctly translated into π , using $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ as a stepping stone.

2.6 A Motivating Example

We motivate the expressivity of the calculi with a novel example, illustrating the use of linearity within resource consumption where we assume access to a specification of a programming language that implements the resource λ -calculus $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$. The underlying process model given via the correct encoding presented we may assume access to some implementation of the semantics. Consider the following protocol for a movie review company: The company sends early issues of three movies ('Jaws', 'Dune', 'Elf') to three reviewers ('reviewer1', 'reviewer2', 'reviewer3') and receive their reviews as the sum of their scores. As the movies are not publicly available, therefore each movie should be watched only once to ensure it is not copied or distributed (hence considering them as linear resources to be consumed exactly once) and wish not to overwork the reviewers by only allow them to watch and review one movie each. Assuming we have access to a function 'review(x, y)', which takes a reviewer x and a film y , returning the reviewers score for the given movie:

$$M = ((\lambda x_1, x_2, x_3. \lambda y_1, y_2, y_3. \text{review}(x_1, y_1) + \text{review}(x_2, y_2) + \text{review}(x_3, y_3)) \\ (\text{reviewer1} \oplus \text{reviewer2} \oplus \text{reviewer3})) (\text{Jaws} \oplus \text{Dune} \oplus \text{Elf})$$

The behaviour of M can be distilled into three parts. First, the term $\lambda x_1, x_2, x_3. \lambda y_1, y_2, y_3. \text{review}(x_1, y_1) + \text{review}(x_2, y_2) + \text{review}(x_3, y_3)$, where two abstractions take place, the first being on x_1, x_2, x_3 and the second on y_1, y_2, y_3 . The notation $\lambda x_1, x_2, x_3. M$ denotes a function taking three linear arguments. Hence we interpret these two abstractions to both take three linear resources each and apply them within the predefined function $\text{review}(x, y)$. Second, this abstraction is applied to a nondeterministic choice of three linear resources (denoted by \oplus), which are represented by the reviewers. This allows the following reduction:

$$\begin{aligned} M &= (\lambda x_1, x_2, x_3. \lambda y_1, y_2, y_3. \text{review}(x_1, y_1) + \text{review}(x_2, y_2) + \text{review}(x_3, y_3)) \\ &\quad (\text{reviewer1} \oplus \text{reviewer2} \oplus \text{reviewer3}) \\ &\longrightarrow (\lambda x_2, x_3. \lambda y_1, y_2, y_3. \text{review}(\text{reviewer1}, y_1) + \text{review}(x_2, y_2) + \text{review}(x_3, y_3)) \\ &\quad (\text{reviewer2} \oplus \text{reviewer3}) \\ &\quad + (\lambda x_2, x_3. \lambda y_1, y_2, y_3. \text{review}(\text{reviewer2}, y_1) + \text{review}(x_2, y_2) + \text{review}(x_3, y_3)) \\ &\quad (\text{reviewer1} \oplus \text{reviewer3}) \\ &\quad + (\lambda x_2, x_3. \lambda y_1, y_2, y_3. \text{review}(\text{reviewer3}, y_1) + \text{review}(x_2, y_2) + \text{review}(x_3, y_3)) \\ &\quad (\text{reviewer1} \oplus \text{reviewer2}) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the term is then also applied to the non-deterministic choice between

the three movies, just as before. The term will then reduce as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
M \longrightarrow^* & (\text{review}(\text{reviewer1}, \text{Jaws}) + \text{review}(\text{reviewer2}, \text{Dune}) + \text{review}(\text{reviewer3}, \text{Elf})) \\
& \oplus (\text{review}(\text{reviewer1}, \text{Jaws}) + \text{review}(\text{reviewer2}, \text{Elf}) + \text{review}(\text{reviewer3}, \text{Dune})) \\
& \oplus (\text{review}(\text{reviewer1}, \text{Dune}) + \text{review}(\text{reviewer2}, \text{Jaws}) + \text{review}(\text{reviewer3}, \text{Elf})) \\
& \oplus (\text{review}(\text{reviewer1}, \text{Dune}) + \text{review}(\text{reviewer2}, \text{Elf}) + \text{review}(\text{reviewer3}, \text{Jaws})) \\
& \oplus (\text{review}(\text{reviewer1}, \text{Elf}) + \text{review}(\text{reviewer2}, \text{Jaws}) + \text{review}(\text{reviewer3}, \text{Dune})) \\
& \oplus (\text{review}(\text{reviewer1}, \text{Elf}) + \text{review}(\text{reviewer2}, \text{Dune}) + \text{review}(\text{reviewer3}, \text{Jaws}))
\end{aligned}$$

This example shows that we can non-deterministically compute any combination of reviewers to scores. Modifications to this implementation can be incorporated easily. For instance, suppose that the protocol changes and that we now wish one reviewer to review all three movies. In that case, the application is applied to the resources containing three instances of a single reviewer.

As we have provided a correct encoding from sequential to concurrent computation with both sound and complete correctness results, we can exploit aspects of concurrent calculi to extend the programming language with sequencing, which is a primitive construct in \mathfrak{SP} .

Consider now the protocol that makes a decision on what movie to watch. Suppose we have a function called ‘ $\text{decide}(x)$ ’ that receives a movie x and makes a decision on whether or not to watch the movie, writing the result boolean result into a database. If a movie has already been decided to be watched then all future movies return false (the tracking of this may be decided by some global variable). Suppose that the decision is to watch either ‘Jaws’ or ‘Elf’ but not ‘Dune’; then we can define the function

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda x. \text{decide}(x)(\text{Jaws} \oplus \text{Dune} \oplus \text{Elf}) \longrightarrow^* & \text{decide}(\text{Jaws}); \text{decide}(\text{Dune}); \text{decide}(\text{Elf}) \\
& + \text{decide}(\text{Jaws}); \text{decide}(\text{Elf}); \text{decide}(\text{Dune}) \\
& + \text{decide}(\text{Dune}); \text{decide}(\text{Jaws}); \text{decide}(\text{Elf}) \\
& + \text{decide}(\text{Dune}); \text{decide}(\text{Elf}); \text{decide}(\text{Jaws}) \\
& + \text{decide}(\text{Elf}); \text{decide}(\text{Jaws}); \text{decide}(\text{Dune}) \\
& + \text{decide}(\text{Elf}); \text{decide}(\text{Dune}); \text{decide}(\text{Jaws})
\end{aligned}$$

Here we interpret the abstractions $\lambda x. \text{decide}(x)$ to consume linear resources x and apply them non-deterministically in sequence, as represented by the rule:

$$(\lambda x. M)(N_1 \oplus N_2) \longrightarrow (\lambda x. M)N_1; (\lambda x. M)N_2 + (\lambda x. M)N_2; (\lambda x. M)N_1$$

The first three choices result in the decision ‘Jaws’ and the last three results in ‘Elf’. This is a high-level example, but sufficient to show that we may exhibit more interesting non-deterministic behavior by extending functional calculi with

sequencing constructs from concurrent calculi, motivating the need for our correct encodings. We can mimic this type of behavior within the resource λ -calculus with:

$$(\lambda x. \text{sequence3 } \{ \text{decide}(x), \text{decide}(x), \text{decide}(x) \}) \{ \text{Jaws}, \text{Dune}, \text{Elf} \}$$

where ‘sequence3’ is a function that takes three elements in a bag and runs them one at a time in sequence (using mechanisms from into concurrent computation) and then terminating.

2.7 Related Work

Closely related works have been already discussed in the introduction and throughout the chapter; here we mention other related literature.

Intersection Types

The first works on intersection types date back to the late 70s (see, e.g., [Coppo & Dezani-Ciancaglini \(1978\)](#); [Pottinger \(1980\)](#)) and consider intersections with the *idempotence* property (i.e., $\sigma \wedge \sigma = \sigma$). This formulation enables the analysis of *qualitative* properties of λ -calculi, such as (strong) normalization and solvability. By dropping idempotence, intersection types can characterize *quantitative* properties, such as, e.g., bounds on the number of steps needed to reach a normal form. Early works on non-idempotent intersection types include [Gardner \(1994\)](#); [Kfoury \(2000\)](#); [Kfoury & Wells \(2004\)](#). The paper [Bono & Dezani-Ciancaglini \(2020\)](#) overviews the origins, development, and applications of intersection types.

Our work formally connects non-idempotent intersection types and classical linear logic extended with the modalities $\&$ and \oplus , interpreted in [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#) as session types for non-deterministically available protocols. To the best of our knowledge, this is an unexplored angle. Prior connections between (non-idempotent) intersection types and linear logic arise in very different settings (see [Mazza et al. \(2018\)](#) and references therein). They include [Neergaard & Mairson \(2004\)](#), which presents a connection based on a correspondence between normalization and type inference; the work [de Carvalho \(2009, 2018\)](#), which shows a correspondence between the *relational model* of linear logic and an non-idempotent intersection type system; and [Ehrhard \(2020\)](#), which concerns *indexed* linear logic (cf. [Bucciarelli & Ehrhard \(2000, 2001\)](#)).

The work [Lago et al. \(2019\)](#) develops a type system for the π -calculus based on non-idempotent intersections. The type system ensures that processes are “well-behaved”—they never produce run-time errors, and can always reduce to an idle process. Remarkably, they show that their type system is *complete*: every well-behaved process is typable. Although their type system does not consider session

types, it is related to our work for it builds upon Mazza et al.’s correspondence between linear logic and intersection types, given in terms of *polyadic approximations* (Mazza et al. (2018)).

Other Resource λ -calculi

A fine-grained treatment of duplication and erasing—similar to our design for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ —is present in Kesner and Lengrand’s λ_{LXR} -calculus (Kesner & Lengrand (2007)), a simply-typed, deterministic λ -calculus that is in correspondence with proof nets. The λ_{LXR} -calculus includes operators called weakening $\mathcal{W}'(-)$ and contraction $\mathcal{C}'_{-}(-)$ to deal with empty and non-empty sharing, respectively. In this approach, our terms $\lambda x.x \{x\}$ and $\lambda x.y \{z\}$ would be expressed as $\mathcal{C}'_x^{x_1|x_2}(\lambda x.x_1 \{x_2\})$ and $\mathcal{W}'_x(\lambda x.y \{z\})$, respectively.

Our approach is convenient when expressing the sharing of more than two occurrences of a variable in a term; as in, e.g., the $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -term $\lambda x.(x \{x, x\})$ which would correspond to $\lambda x.(x_1 \{x_2, x_3\})[x_1, x_2, x_3 \leftarrow x]$ in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$. In the λ_{LXR} -calculus, contractions are binary, and so representing $\lambda x.(x \{x, x\})$ requires the composition of two binary contractions.

More substantial differences appear at the level of types. As we have seen, in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ we use intersection types to define well-typed and well-formed expressions (see Fig. 2.6 and Fig. 2.7, respectively). In particular, recall the well-formedness rule for the sharing construct:

$$[\text{FS : share}] \frac{\Gamma, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \Vdash M : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma) \quad k \neq 0}{\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \Vdash M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau}$$

where, as mentioned above, σ^k denotes the intersection type $\sigma \wedge \dots \wedge \sigma$. Differently, the typing rule for contraction in the λ_{LXR} -calculus involves an arbitrary (simple) type A :

$$(\text{Cont}) \frac{\Gamma, y : A, z : A \vdash M : B}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash \mathcal{C}'_x^{y|z}(M) : B}$$

Our weakening rule $[\text{FS : weak}]$ types the empty sharing term $M[\leftarrow x]$ as follows:

$$[\text{FS : weak}] \frac{\Gamma \Vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma, x : \omega \Vdash M[\leftarrow x] : \tau}$$

Hence, the context Γ is weakened with a variable assignment $x : \omega$, where ω denotes the empty type. In contrast, weakening in the λ_{LXR} -calculus involves a (simple) type A :

$$(\text{Weak}) \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : A}{\Gamma, x : B \vdash \mathcal{W}'_x(M) : A}$$

Hence, the context can be weakened with an assignment $x : B$, where B is a simple type.

Inspired by the multiplicative exponential fragment of linear logic, [Kesner & Renaud \(2011\)](#) define the so-called *prismoid of resources*, a parametric framework of simply-typed λ -calculi in which each language incorporates different choices for contraction, weakening, and substitution operations. The prismoid defines a uniform and general setting for establishing key properties of typed terms, including simulation of β -reduction, confluence, and strong normalization. One of the languages included in the prismoid is a minor variant of the λ_{LXR} -calculus, which we have just mentioned.

There are some similarities between $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ and the differential λ -calculus, introduced in [Ehrhard & Regnier \(2003\)](#). Both express non-deterministic choice via sums and use linear head reduction for evaluation. In particular, our fetch rule, which consumes non-deterministically elements from a bag, is related to the derivation (which has similarities with substitution) of a differential term. However, the focus of [Ehrhard & Regnier \(2003\)](#) is not on typability nor encodings to process calculi; instead they relate the Taylor series of analysis to the linear head reduction of λ -calculus.

Functions as Processes

A source of inspiration for our developments is the work by [Boudol & Laneve \(2000\)](#). As far as we know, this is the only prior study that connects λ and π from a resource-oriented perspective, via an encoding of a λ -calculus with multiplicities into a π -calculus without sums. The goal of [Boudol & Laneve \(2000\)](#) is different from ours, as they study the discriminating power of semantics for λ as induced by encodings into π . In contrast, we study how typability delineates the encodability of resource-awareness across sequential and concurrent realms. The source and target calculi in [Boudol & Laneve \(2000\)](#) are untyped, whereas we consider typed calculi and our encodings preserve typability. As a result, the encoding in [Boudol & Laneve \(2000\)](#) is conceptually different from ours; remarkably, our encoding respects linearity and homomorphically translates sums.

Prior works have studied encodings of typed λ -calculi into typed π -calculi; see, e.g., [Sangiorgi \(1999\)](#); [Boudol & Laneve \(2000\)](#); [Sangiorgi & Walker \(2001\)](#); [Berger et al. \(2003\)](#); [Toninho et al. \(2012\)](#); [Honda et al. \(2014\)](#); [Toninho & Yoshida \(2018\)](#). None of these works consider non-determinism and failures; the one exception is the encoding in [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#), which involves a λ -calculus with exceptions and failures (but without non-determinism due to bags, as in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$) for which no reduction semantics is given. As a result, the encoding in [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#) is different from ours, and is only shown to preserve typability: properties

such as operational completeness, operational soundness, and success sensitivity—important in our developments—are not considered.

2.8 Concluding Remarks

Summary

We developed a correct encoding of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} , a new resource λ -calculus in which expressions feature non-determinism and explicit failure, into $s\pi$, a session-typed π -calculus in which behavior is non-deterministically available: session protocols may perform as stipulated but also fail. Our encodability result is obtained by appealing to $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$, an intermediate language with a *sharing construct* that simplifies the treatment of variables in expressions. To our knowledge, we are the first to relate typed λ -calculi and typed π -calculi encompassing non-determinism and failures, while connecting intersection types and session types, two different mechanisms for resource-awareness in sequential and concurrent settings, respectively.

Design of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} (and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$)

The design of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} has been influenced by the logically justified treatment of non-determinism and explicit failure in $s\pi$. Our correct encoding of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} into $s\pi$ makes this influence precise by connecting terms and processes but also their associated intersection types and linear logic propositions. We have also adopted features from previous resource λ -calculi, in particular those in Boudol (1993); Boudol & Laneve (2000); Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010). Major similarities between λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} and these calculi include: as in Boudol & Laneve (2000), our semantics performs lazy evaluation and linear substitution on the head variable; as in Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010), our reductions lead to non-deterministic sums. A distinctive feature of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} is its lazy treatment of failures via the term $\text{fail}^{\bar{x}}$. In contrast, in Boudol (1993); Boudol & Laneve (2000) there is no dedicated term to represent failure. The non-collapsing semantics for non-determinism is another distinctive feature of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} .

Our design for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ has been informed by the atomic λ -calculus introduced in Gundersen et al. (2013). Also, our translation from λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} into $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ (Def. 2.20) borrows insights from translations given in Gundersen et al. (2013). The calculus $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ is also loosely related to the λ -calculus with sharing in Ghilezan et al. (2011), which considers (idempotent) intersection types. Notice that the calculi in Gundersen et al. (2013); Ghilezan et al. (2011) do not consider explicit failure nor non-determinism. We distinguish between *well-typed* and *well-formed* expressions: this allows us to make fail-prone evaluation in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} explicit. It is interesting that explicit failures can

be elegantly encoded as protocols in $s\pi$ —this way, we make the most out of $s\pi$'s expressivity.

Bags in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} have *linear* resources, which are used exactly once. In Chapter 3, we have defined an extension of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} in which bags contain both linear and *unrestricted* resources, as in [Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca \(2010\)](#), and established that our approach to encodability into $s\pi$ extends to such an enriched language. This development requires the full typed process framework in [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#), with replicated processes and labeled choices (not needed to encode λ_{\oplus}^{ζ}).

Future Work

The approach and results developed here enable us to tackle open questions that go beyond the scope of this work. We comment on some of them:

- It would be useful to investigate the *relative expressiveness* of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} with respect to other resource calculi, such as those in [Boudol & Laneve \(2000\)](#); [Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca \(2010\)](#). Derived encodability (and non-encodability) results could potentially unlock transfer of reasoning techniques between different calculi.
- Besides transfer of techniques, one application of encodings between sequential and concurrent calculi is in the design of functional concurrent languages with advanced features. In this respect, it should be feasible to develop a variant of Wadler's GV ([Wadler \(2012\)](#)) with non-determinism, resources, explicit failure, and session communication by exploiting our correct encodings from λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} to $s\pi$.
- It would be relevant to investigate *decidability properties* of the intersection type systems for λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$. Our translation is proven correct under the assumption that we consider only well-formed λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} -terms. The type assignment problem for intersection type systems is, in general, undecidable [Leivant \(1983\)](#); it would be interesting to consider decidable fragments of intersection type systems via, for instance, ranking restrictions [van Bakel \(1995\)](#).
- It would be insightful to establish *full abstraction* for our translation of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} into $s\pi$. We choose not to consider it because, as argued in [Gorla & Nestmann \(2016\)](#), full abstraction is not an informative criterion when it comes to an encoding's quality. Establishing full abstraction requires developing the behavioral theory of λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} and $s\pi$, which is relevant and challenging in itself.

Chapter 3

Unrestricted Resources in Encoding Functions as Processes

Type-preserving translations are effective rigorous tools in the study of core programming calculi. In this chapter, we develop a new typed translation that connects sequential and concurrent calculi; it is governed by type systems that control *resource consumption*. Our main contribution is the source language, a new resource λ -calculus with non-determinism and failures, dubbed $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$. In $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, resources are split into linear and unrestricted; failures are explicit and arise from this distinction. We define a type system based on intersection types to control resources and fail-prone computation. The target language is $s\pi$, an existing session-typed π -calculus that results from a Curry-Howard correspondence between linear logic and session types. Our typed translation subsumes our prior work; interestingly, it treats unrestricted resources in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ as client-server session behaviours in $s\pi$.

3.1 Introduction

Context *Type-preserving translations* are effective rigorous tools in the study of core programming calculi. They can be seen as an abstract counterpart to the type-preserving compilers that enable key optimisations in the implementation of programming languages. The goal of this chapter is to develop a new typed translation that connects sequential and concurrent calculi, and is governed by type systems that control *resource consumption*.

A central idea in the resource λ -calculus is to consider that in an application MN the argument N is a *resource* of possibly limited availability. This generalisation of the λ -calculus triggers many fascinating questions, such as typability, solvability, expressiveness power, etc., which have been studied in different settings (see, e.g., [Boudol \(1993\)](#); [Boudol & Laneve \(2000\)](#); [Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca](#)

(2010); Dominici et al. (2012)).

In established resource λ -calculi, such as those by Boudol (1993) and by Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010), a more general form of application is considered: a term can be applied to a bag of resources $B = \wr N_1 \wr \cdot \dots \cdot \wr N_k \wr$, where N_1, \dots, N_k denote terms; then, an application $M B$ must take into account that each N_i may be reusable or not. Thus, non-determinism is natural in resource λ -calculi, because a term has now multiple ways of consuming resources from the bag. This bears a strong resemblance with process calculi such as the π -calculus Milner et al. (1992), in which concurrent interactions are intrinsically non-deterministic.

There are different flavors of non-determinism. Over two decades ago, Boudol & Laneve (1996, 2000) explored connections between a resource λ -calculus and the π -calculus. In their setting, an application $M B$ would branch, i.e., M could consume a resource N_j in B (with $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$) and discard the other $k - 1$ resources in a non-confluent manner; this is what we call a *collapsing* approach to non-determinism. On a different direction, Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010) proposed λ^r , a resource λ -calculus that implements *non-collapsing* non-determinism, whereby all the possible alternatives for resource consumption are retained together in a sum, ensuring confluence. They investigated typability and characterisations of solvability in λ^r , but no connection with the π -calculus was established. In an attempt to address this gap, Chapter 2 identified $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, a resource λ -calculus with non-collapsing non-determinism, explicit failure, and *linear* resources (to be used exactly once), and developed a correct typed translation into a session typed π -calculus Caires & Pérez (2017). The calculus $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, however, does not include *unrestricted* resources (to be used zero or many times).

Chapter Overview Here we introduce a new λ -calculus, dubbed $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, its intersection type system, and its translation into session-typed processes. Our motivation is twofold: to elucidate the status of unrestricted resources in a functional setting with non-collapsing non-determinism, and to characterise unrestricted resources within a translation of functions into processes. Unlike its predecessors, $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ distinguishes between linear and unrestricted resources. This distinction determines the semantics of terms and especially the deadlocks (*failures*) that arise due to mismatches in resources. This way, $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ subsumes $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, which is purely linear and cannot express failures related to unrestricted resources.

Distinguishing linear and unrestricted resources is not a new insight. This idea goes back to Boudol's λ -calculus with multiplicities (Boudol (1993)), where arguments can be tagged as unrestricted. What is new about $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ is that the distinction between linear and unrestricted resources leads to two main differences. First, occurrences of a variable can be linear or unrestricted, depending on the kind of resources they should be substituted with. This way, e.g., a linear occurrence of

variable must be substituted with a linear resource. In $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, a variable can have linear and unrestricted occurrences in the same term. (Notice that we use the adjective ‘linear’ in connection to resources used exactly once, and not to the number of occurrences of a variable in a term.) Second, failures depend on the nature of the involved resource(s). In $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, a linear failure arises from a mismatch between required and available (linear) resources; an unrestricted failure arises when a specific (unrestricted) resource is not available.

Accordingly, the syntax of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ incorporates linear and unrestricted resources, enabling their consistent separation, within non-collapsing non-determinism. The calculus allows for linear and unrestricted occurrences of variables, as just discussed; bags comprise two separate zones, linear and unrestricted; and the *failure term* $\text{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_n}$ explicitly mentions the linear variables x_1, \dots, x_n . The (lazy) reduction semantics of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ includes two different rules for “fetching” terms from bags, and for consistently handling the failure term.

We equip $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ with non-idempotent intersection types, extending the approach in Chapter 2: in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, intersection types account for more than resource multiplicity, since the elements of the unrestricted bag can have different types. Using intersection types, we define a class of *well-formed* $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ expressions, which includes terms that correctly consume resources but also terms that may reduce to the failure term. Well-formed expressions thus subsume the *well-typed* expressions that can be defined in a sub-language of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ without the failure term.

The calculus $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ can express terms whose dynamic behaviour is not captured by prior works. This way, e.g., the identity function \mathbf{I} admits two formulations, depending on whether the variable occurrence is linear or unrestricted. One can have $\lambda x.x$, as usual, but also the unrestricted variant $\lambda x.x[i]$, where ‘ $[i]$ ’ is an index annotation (similar to a qualifier or a tag), which indicates that x should be replaced by the i -th element of the unrestricted zone of the bag. The behaviour of these functions will depend on the bags that are provided as their arguments. Similarly, we can express variants of $\Delta = \lambda x.xx$ and $\Omega = \Delta\Delta$ whose behaviours again depend on linear or unrestricted occurrences of variables and bags. Consider the term $\Delta_7 = \lambda x.(x[2](1 * \wr x[1] \wr^! \diamond \wr x[1] \wr^!))$, where we use ‘ $*$ ’ to separate linear and unrestricted resources in the bag, and ‘ \diamond ’ denotes concatenation of unrestricted resources. Term Δ_7 is an abstraction on x of an application of an unrestricted occurrence of x , which aims to consume the second component of an unrestricted bag, to a bag with an empty linear zone (denoted 1) and an unrestricted zone with resources $\wr x[1] \wr^!$ and $\wr x[1] \wr^!$. The self-application $\Delta_7\Delta_7$ produces a non-terminating behaviour and yet Δ_7 itself is well-formed (see Example 3.8).

Both $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ and $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ are *logically motivated* resource λ -calculi, in the following sense: their design has been strongly influenced by π , a typed π -calculus resulting from the Curry-Howard correspondence between linear logic and session types

in Caires & Pérez (2017), where proofs correspond to processes and cut elimination to process communication. As demonstrated in Caires & Pérez (2017), providing primitive support for explicit failures is key to expressing many useful programming idioms (such as exceptions); this insight is a leading motivation in our design for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$.

To attest to the logical underpinnings of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, we develop a typed translation (or *encoding*) of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ into $s\pi$ and establish its correctness with respect to well-established criteria Gorla (2010); Kouzapas et al. (2019). As in Crefch2, we encode $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ into $s\pi$ by relying on an intermediate language with *sharing* constructs Gundersen et al. (2013); Ghilezan et al. (2011); Kesner & Lengrand (2007). A key idea in encoding $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ is to codify the behaviour of unrestricted occurrences of a variable and their corresponding resources in the bag as *client-server connections*, leveraging the copying semantics for the exponential “!A” induced by the Curry-Howard correspondence. This typed encoding into $s\pi$ justifies the semantics of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ in terms of precise session protocols (i.e., linear logic propositions, because of the correspondence).

In summary, the **main contributions** of this chapter are: (1) The resource calculus $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ of linear and unrestricted resources, and its associated intersection type system. (2) A typed encoding of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ into $s\pi$, which connects well-formed expressions (disciplined by intersection types) and well-typed concurrent processes (disciplined by session types, under the Curry-Howard correspondence with linear logic), subsuming the results in Chapter 2.

Additional Material The appendices contain omitted material. App. B.1 collects technical details on $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$. App. B.2 details the proof of subject reduction for well-formed $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ expressions. App. B.3–App. B.6 collect omitted definitions and proofs for our encoding of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ into $s\pi$.

3.2 $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$: Unrestricted Resources, Non-Determinism, and Failure

Syntax. We shall use x, y, \dots to range over *variables*, and i, j, \dots , as positive integers, to range over *indices*. Variable occurrences will be *annotated* to distinguish the kind of resource they should be substituted with (linear or unrestricted). With a slight abuse of terminology, we may write ‘linear variable’ and ‘unrestricted variable’ to refer to linear and unrestricted occurrences of a variable. As we will see, a variable’s annotation will be inconsequential for binding purposes. We write \tilde{x} to abbreviate x_1, \dots, x_n , for $n \geq 1$ and each x_i distinct.

Definition 3.1 $\lambda_{\oplus}^{!}$

We define *terms* (M, N) , *bags* (A, B) , and *expressions* (\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{N}) as:

$$\text{(Annotations)} \quad [*] ::= [i] \mid [\ell] \quad i \in \mathbb{N} \quad (3.1)$$

$$\text{(Terms)} \quad M, N ::= x[*] \mid \lambda x.M \mid (M B) \mid M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \mid \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \quad (3.2)$$

$$\text{(Terms)} \quad M, N ::= x \mid x[i] \mid \lambda x.M \mid (M B) \mid M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \mid \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \quad (3.3)$$

$$\text{(Linear Bags)} \quad C, D ::= 1 \mid \wr M \wr \cdot C \quad (3.4)$$

$$\text{(Unrestricted Bags)} \quad U, V ::= 1^! \mid \wr M \wr^! \mid U \diamond V \quad (3.5)$$

$$\text{(Bags)} \quad A, B ::= C * U \quad (3.6)$$

$$\text{(Expressions)} \quad \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{N} ::= M \mid \mathbb{M} + \mathbb{N} \quad (3.7)$$

To lighten up notation, we shall omit the annotation for linear variables. This way, e.g., we write $(\lambda x.x)B$ rather than $(\lambda x.x[\ell])B$. \square

Definition 3.1 introduces three syntactic categories: *terms* (in functional position); *bags* (multisets of resources, in argument position), and *expressions*, which are finite formal sums that denote possible results of a computation. Below we describe each category in details.

- Terms (unary expressions):
 - Variables: We write $x[\ell]$ to denote a *linear* occurrence of x , i.e., an occurrence that can only be substituted for linear resources. Similarly, $x[i]$ denotes an *unrestricted* occurrence of x , i.e., an occurrence that can only be substituted for a resource located at the i -th position of an unrestricted bag.
 - Abstractions $\lambda x.M$ of a variable x in a term M , which may have contain linear or unrestricted occurrences of x . This way, e.g., $\lambda x.x$ and $\lambda x.x[i]$ are linear and unrestricted versions of the identity function. Notice that the scope of x is M , as usual, and that $\lambda x.(\cdot)$ binds both linear and unrestricted occurrences of x .
 - Applications of a term M to a bag B (written $M B$) and the explicit substitution of a bag B for a variable x (written $\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$) are as expected (cf. Boudol (1993); Boudol & Laneve (2000)). Notice that in $M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$ the occurrences of x in M , linear and unrestricted, are bound. Some conditions apply to B : this will be evident later on, after we define our operational semantics (cf. Fig. 3.1).
 - The failure term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ denotes a term that will result from a reduction in which there is a lack or excess of resources, where \tilde{x} denotes a multiset of free linear variables that are encapsulated within failure.

- A bag B is defined as $C * U$: the concatenation of a bag of linear resources C with a bag (actually, a list) of unrestricted resources U . We write $\wr M$ to denote the linear bag that encloses term M , and use $\wr M^!$ in the unrestricted case.
 - Linear bags (C, D, \dots) are multisets of terms. The empty linear bag is denoted 1 . We write $C_1 \cdot C_2$ to denote the concatenation of C_1 and C_2 ; this is a commutative and associative operation, where 1 is the identity.
 - Unrestricted bags (U, V, \dots) are ordered lists of terms. The empty unrestricted bag is denoted as $1^!$. The concatenation of U_1 and U_2 is denoted by $U_1 \diamond U_2$; this operation is associative but not commutative. Given $i \geq 1$, we write U_i to denote the i -th element of the unrestricted (ordered) bag U .
- Expressions are sums of terms, denoted as $\sum_i^n N_i$, where $n > 0$. Sums are associative and commutative; reordering of the terms in a sum is performed silently.

Example 3.1

Consider the term $M := \lambda x.(x[1] \wr x * \wr y[1]^!)$, which has linear and unrestricted occurrences of the same variable. This is an abstraction of an application that contains two bound occurrences of x (one unrestricted with index 1, and one linear) and one free unrestricted occurrence of $y[1]$, occurring in an unrestricted bag. As we will see, in $M (C * U)$, the unrestricted occurrence ‘ $x[1]$ ’ should be replaced by the first element of U . \square

The salient features of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{!}$ —the explicit construct for failure, the index annotations on unrestricted variables, the ordering of unrestricted bags—are *design choices* that will be responsible for interesting behaviours, as the following examples illustrate.

Example 3.2

As already mentioned, $\lambda_{\oplus}^{!}$ admits different variants of the usual λ -term $\mathbf{I} = \lambda x.x$. We could have one in which x is a linear variable (i.e., $\lambda x.x$), but also several possibilities if x is unrestricted (i.e., $\lambda x.x[i]$, for some positive integer i). Interestingly, because $\lambda_{\oplus}^{!}$ supports failures, non-determinism, and the consumption of arbitrary terms of the unrestricted bag, these two variants of \mathbf{I} can have behaviours that may differ from the usual interpretation of \mathbf{I} . In Example 3.4 we will show that the six terms below give different behaviours:

- $M_1 = (\lambda x.x)(\lambda N \int *U)$
- $M_2 = (\lambda x.x)(\lambda N_1 \int \cdot \lambda N_2 \int *U)$
- $M_3 = (\lambda x.x[1])(\lambda N \int *1^!)$
- $M_4 = (\lambda x.x[1])(1 * \lambda N \int^! \diamond U)$
- $M_5 = (\lambda x.x[1])(1 * 1^! \diamond U)$
- $M_6 = (\lambda x.x[i])(C \diamond U)$

We will see that M_1, M_4, M_6 reduce without failures, whereas M_2, M_3, M_5 reduce to failure. \square

Example 3.3

Similarly, $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \int}$ allows for several forms of the standard λ -terms such as $\Delta := \lambda x.xx$ and $\Omega := \Delta\Delta$, depending on whether the variable x is linear or unrestricted:

1. $\Delta_1 := \lambda x.(x(\lambda x \int *1^!))$ consists of an abstraction of a linear occurrence of x applied to a linear bag containing another linear occurrence of x . There are two forms of self-applications of Δ_1 , namely: $\Delta_1(\lambda \Delta_1 \int *1^!)$ and $\Delta_1(1 * \lambda \Delta_1 \int^!)$.
2. $\Delta_4 := \lambda x.(x[1](\lambda x \int *1^!))$ consists of an unrestricted occurrence of x applied to a linear bag (containing a linear occurrence of x) that is composed with an empty unrestricted bag. Similarly, there are two self-applications of Δ_4 , namely: $\Delta_4(\lambda \Delta_4 \int *1^!)$ and $\Delta_4(1 * \lambda \Delta_4 \int^!)$.
3. We show applications of an unrestricted variable occurrence ($x[2]$ or $x[1]$) applied to an empty linear bag composed with a non-empty unrestricted bag (of size two):

- $\Delta_3 = \lambda x.(x[1](1 * \lambda x[1] \int^! \diamond \lambda x[1] \int^!))$
- $\Delta_5 := \lambda x.(x[2](1 * \lambda x[1] \int^! \diamond \lambda x[2] \int^!))$
- $\Delta_6 := \lambda x.(x[1](1 * \lambda x[1] \int^! \diamond \lambda x[2] \int^!))$
- $\Delta_7 := \lambda x.(x[2](1 * \lambda x[1] \int^! \diamond \lambda x[1] \int^!))$

Applications between these terms express behaviour, similar to a lazy evaluation of Ω :

- $\Omega_5 := \Delta_5(1 * \lambda \Delta_5 \int^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_5 \int^!)$
- $\Omega_{6,5} := \Delta_6(1 * \lambda \Delta_5 \int^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_6 \int^!)$
- $\Omega_{5,6} := \Delta_5(1 * \lambda \Delta_5 \int^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_6 \int^!)$
- $\Omega_7 := \Delta_7(1 * \lambda \Delta_7 \int^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_7 \int^!)$

The behaviour of these terms will be made explicit later on (see Examples 3.6 and 3.7). \square

Semantics. The semantics of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \int}$ captures that linear resources can be used only once, and that unrestricted resources can be used *ad libitum*. Thus, the evaluation of a function applied to a multiset of linear resources produces different possible

behaviours, depending on the way these resources are substituted for the linear variables. This induces non-determinism, which we formalise using a *non-collapsing* approach, in which expressions keep all the different possibilities open, and do not commit to one of them. This is in contrast to *collapsing* non-determinism, in which selecting one alternative discards the rest.

We define a reduction relation \longrightarrow , which operates lazily on expressions. Informally, a β -reduction induces an explicit substitution of a bag $B = C * U$ for a variable x , denoted $\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$, in a term M . This explicit substitution is then expanded depending on whether the head of M has a linear or an unrestricted variable. Accordingly, in $\lambda_{\oplus}^!$ there are *two sources of failure*: one concerns mismatches on linear resources (required vs available resources); the other concerns the unavailability of a required unrestricted resource (an empty bag $1^!$).

To formalise reduction, we require a few auxiliary notions.

Definition 3.2

The multiset of free linear variables of \mathbb{M} , denoted $\text{mlfv}(\mathbb{M})$, is defined below. We denote by $[x]$ the multiset containing the linear variable x and $[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ denotes the multiset containing x_1, \dots, x_n . We write $\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}$ to denote the multiset union of \tilde{x} , and \tilde{y} and $\tilde{x} \setminus y$ to express that every occurrence of y is removed from \tilde{x} .

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{mlfv}(x) = [x] & \text{mlfv}(x[i]) = \text{mlfv}(1) = \emptyset \\
\text{mlfv}(C * U) = \text{mlfv}(C) & \text{mlfv}(M B) = \text{mlfv}(M) \uplus \text{mlfv}(B) \\
\text{mlfv}(\lambda M) = \text{mlfv}(M) & \text{mlfv}(\lambda x.M) = \text{mlfv}(M) \setminus \{x\} \\
\text{mlfv}(M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle) = (\text{mlfv}(M) \setminus \{x\}) \uplus \text{mlfv}(B) & \text{mlfv}(\lambda M \cdot C) = \text{mlfv}(M) \uplus \text{mlfv}(C) \\
\text{mlfv}(\mathbb{M} + \mathbb{N}) = \text{mlfv}(\mathbb{M}) \uplus \text{mlfv}(\mathbb{N}) & \text{mlfv}(\text{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_n}) = [x_1, \dots, x_n]
\end{array}$$

A term M (resp. expression \mathbb{M}) is called *linearly closed* if $\text{mlfv}(M) = \emptyset$ (resp. $\text{mlfv}(\mathbb{M}) = \emptyset$). \square

Notation 3.2.1 *We shall use the following notations.*

- $N \in \mathbb{M}$ means that N occurs in the sum \mathbb{M} . Also, we write $N_i \in C$ to denote that N_i occurs in the linear bag C , and $C \setminus N_i$ to denote the linear bag obtained by removing one occurrence of N_i from C .
- $\#(x, M)$ denotes the number of (free) linear occurrences of x in M . Also, $\#(x, \tilde{y})$ denotes the number of occurrences of x in the multiset \tilde{y} .
- $\text{PER}(C)$ is the set of all permutations of a linear bag C and $C_i(n)$ denotes the n -th term in the (permuted) C_i .
- $\text{size}(C)$ denotes the number of terms in a linear bag C . That is, $\text{size}(1) = 0$ and $\text{size}(\lambda M \cdot C) = 1 + \text{size}(C)$. Given a bag $B = C * U$, we define $\text{size}(B)$ as $\text{size}(C)$.

Definition 3.3 Head

Given a term M , we define $\text{head}(M)$ inductively as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{head}(x) &= x & \text{head}(M B) &= \text{head}(M) & \text{head}(\lambda x.M) &= \lambda x.M \\ \text{head}(x[i]) &= x[i] & \text{head}(\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}) &= \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \\ \text{head}(M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle) &= \begin{cases} \text{head}(M) & \text{if } \#(x, M) = \text{size}(B) \\ \text{fail}^{\emptyset} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 3.4 Head Substitution

Let M be a term such that $\text{head}(M) = x$. The *head substitution* of a term N for x in M , denoted $M\{N/x\}$, is inductively defined as follows (where $x \neq y$):

$$\begin{aligned} x\{N/x\} &= N & (M B)\{N/x\} &= (M\{N/x\}) B \\ (M \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle)\{N/x\} &= (M\{N/x\}) \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle \end{aligned}$$

□

When $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$, the head substitution $M\{N/x[i]\}$ works as expected: $x[i]\{N/x[i]\} = N$ as the base case of the definition. Finally, we define contexts for terms and expressions:

Definition 3.5 Evaluation Contexts

Contexts for terms (CTerm) and expressions (CEXpr) are defined by the following grammar:

$$\text{(CTerm)} \quad C[\cdot], C'[\cdot] ::= ([\cdot])B \mid ([\cdot])\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \quad \text{(CEXpr)} \quad D[\cdot], D'[\cdot] ::= M + [\cdot]$$

□

Reduction is defined by the rules in Fig. 3.1. Rule [R : Beta] induces explicit substitutions. Resource consumption is implemented by two fetch rules, which open up explicit substitutions:

- Rule [R : Fetch^ℓ], the *linear fetch*, ensures that the number of required resources matches the size of the linear bag C . It induces a sum of terms with head substitutions, each denoting the partial evaluation of an element from C . Thus, the size of C determines the summands in the resulting expression.
- Rule [R : Fetch¹], the *unrestricted fetch*, consumes a resource occurring in a specific position of the unrestricted bag U via a linear head substitution of an unrestricted variable occurring in the head of the term. In this case,

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[R : Beta]} \frac{}{(\lambda x.M)B \longrightarrow M\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle} \\
\\
\text{[R : Fetch}^\ell] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x \quad C = \lambda N_1 \dots \lambda N_k \quad , \quad k \geq 1 \quad \#(x, M) = k}{M\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow M\{N_1/x\}\langle\langle (C \setminus N_1) * U/x \rangle\rangle + \dots + M\{N_k/x\}\langle\langle (C \setminus N_k) * U/x \rangle\rangle} \\
\\
\text{[R : Fetch}^!] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x[i] \quad \#(x, M) = \text{size}(C) \quad U_i = \lambda N \quad !}{M\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow M\{N/x[i]\}\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle} \\
\\
\text{[R : Fail}^\ell] \frac{\#(x, M) \neq \text{size}(C) \quad \tilde{y} = (\text{mlfv}(M) \setminus x) \uplus \text{mlfv}(C)}{M\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}} \\
\\
\text{[R : Fail}^!] \frac{\#(x, M) = \text{size}(C) \quad U_i = 1^! \quad \text{head}(M) = x[i]}{M\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow M\{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\}\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle} \\
\\
\text{[R : Cons}_1] \frac{\tilde{y} = \text{mlfv}(C)}{(\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}) C * U \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}}} \\
\\
\text{[R : Cons}_2] \frac{\#(z, \tilde{x}) = \text{size}(C) \quad \tilde{y} = \text{mlfv}(C)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \langle\langle C * U/z \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{(\tilde{x} \setminus z) \uplus \tilde{y}}} \\
\\
\text{[R : ECont]} \frac{M \longrightarrow M'}{D[M] \longrightarrow D[M']} \quad \text{[R : TCont]} \frac{M \longrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^k M'_i}{C[M] \longrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^k C[M'_i]}
\end{array}$$

Figure 3.1: Reduction rules for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$.

reduction results in an explicit substitution with U kept unaltered. Note that we check for the size of the linear bag C : in the case $\#(x, M) \neq \text{size}(C)$, the term evolves to a linear failure via Rule $[\text{R : fail}^\ell]$ (see Example 3.5). This is another design choice: linear failure is prioritised in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$.

Four rules show reduction to failure terms, and accumulate free variables involved in failed reductions. Rules $[\text{R : Fail}^\ell]$ and $[\text{R : Fail}^!]$ formalise the failure to evaluate an explicit substitution $M\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle$. The former rule targets a linear failure, which occurs when the size of C does not match the number of occurrences of x . The multiset \tilde{y} preserves all free linear variables in M and C . The latter rule targets an *unrestricted failure*, which occurs when the head of the term is $x[i]$ and U_i (i.e., the i -th element of U) is empty. In this case, failure preserves the free linear variables in M and C excluding the head unrestricted occurrence $x[i]$ which is replaced by fail^0 .

Rules $[\text{R : Cons}_1]$ and $[\text{R : Cons}_2]$ describe reductions that lazily consume the failure term, when a term has $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ at its head position. The former rule consumes

bags attached to it whilst preserving all its free linear variables; the latter rule consumes explicit substitution attached to it whilst also preserving all its free linear variables. The side condition $\#(z, \tilde{x}) = \text{size}(C)$ is necessary in Rule $[\mathbb{R} : \text{Cons}_2]$ to avoid a clash with the premise of Rule $[\mathbb{R} : \text{Fail}^\ell]$. Finally, Rules $[\mathbb{R} : \text{ECont}]$ and $[\mathbb{R} : \text{TCont}]$ state closure by the C and D contexts (cf. Def. 3.5).

Notice that the left-hand sides of the reduction rules in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$ do not interfere with each other. As a result, reduction in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$ satisfies a *diamond property*: for all $\mathbb{M} \in \lambda_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$, if there exist $\mathbb{M}_1, \mathbb{M}_2 \in \lambda_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$ such that $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}_1$ and $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}_2$, then there exists $\mathbb{N} \in \lambda_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$ such that $\mathbb{M}_1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{N} \longleftarrow \mathbb{M}_2$ (see App. B.1).

Notation 3.2.2 *As usual, \longrightarrow^* denotes the reflexive-transitive closure of \longrightarrow . We write $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow_{[\mathbb{R}]} \mathbb{M}$ to denote that $[\mathbb{R}]$ is the last (non-contextual) rule used in the step from \mathbb{N} to \mathbb{M} .*

Example 3.4 Cont. Example 3.2

We illustrate different reductions for $\lambda x.x$ and $\lambda x.x[i]$.

1. $M_1 = (\lambda x.x)(\lambda N \int *U)$ concerns a linear variable x with an linear bag containing one element. This is similar to the usual meaning of applying an identity function to a term:

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda x.x)(\lambda N \int *U) &\longrightarrow_{[\mathbb{R}:\text{Beta}]} x \langle \langle \lambda N \int *U / x \rangle \rangle \\ &\longrightarrow_{[\mathbb{R}:\text{Fetch}^\ell]} x \{ \lambda N / x \} \langle \langle 1 * U / x \rangle \rangle = N \langle \langle 1 * U / x \rangle \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

with a ‘‘garbage collector’’ that collects unused unrestricted resources.

2. $M_2 = (\lambda x.x)(\lambda N_1 \int \cdot \lambda N_2 \int *U)$ concerns the case in which a linear variable x has a single occurrence but the linear bag has size two. Term M_2 reduces to a sum of failure terms:

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda x.x)(\lambda N_1 \int \cdot \lambda N_2 \int *U) &\longrightarrow_{[\mathbb{R}:\text{Beta}]} x \langle \langle \lambda N_1 \int \cdot \lambda N_2 \int *U / x \rangle \rangle \\ &\longrightarrow_{[\mathbb{R}:\text{Fail}^\ell]} \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \end{aligned}$$

for $C = \lambda N_1 \int \cdot \lambda N_2 \int$ and $\tilde{y} = \text{mlfv}(C)$.

3. $M_3 = (\lambda x.x[1])(\lambda N \int *1^1)$ represents an abstraction of an unrestricted variable, which aims to consume the first element of the unrestricted bag. Because this bag is empty, M_3 reduces to failure:

$$(\lambda x.x[1])(\lambda N \int *1^1) \longrightarrow_{[\mathbb{R}:\text{Beta}]} x[1] \langle \langle \lambda N \int *1^1 / x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow_{[\mathbb{R}:\text{fail}^\ell]} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}},$$

for $\tilde{y} = \text{mlfv}(N)$. Notice that $0 = \#(x, x[1]) \neq \text{size}(\lambda N \int) = 1$, since there are no linear occurrences of x in $x[1]$.

□

Example 3.5

To illustrate the need to check ‘size(C)’ in $[\mathbb{R}:\text{Fail}^!]$, consider the term $x[1]\langle\langle\lambda M \int *1^!/x\rangle\rangle$, which features both a mismatch of linear bags for the linear variables to be substituted and an empty unrestricted bag with the need for the first element to be substituted. We check the size of the linear bag because we wish to prioritise the reduction of Rule $[\mathbb{R}:\text{Fail}^\ell]$. Hence, in case of a mismatch of linear resources we wish not to perform a reduction via Rule $[\mathbb{R}:\text{Fail}^!]$. This is a design choice: our semantics collapses linear failure at the earliest moment it arises. \square

Example 3.6 Cont. Example 3.3

Self-applications of Δ_1 do not behave as an expected variation of a lazy reduction from Ω . Both $\Delta_1(\lambda \Delta_1 \int *1^!)$ and $\Delta_1(1 * \lambda \Delta_1 \int^!)$ reduce to failure since the number of linear occurrences of x does not match the number of resources in the linear bag: $\Delta_1(\lambda \Delta_1 \int *1^!) \longrightarrow (x(\lambda x \int *1))\langle\langle\lambda \Delta_1 \int *1^!/x\rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \text{fail}^0$.

The term $\Delta_4(1 * \lambda \Delta_4 \int^!)$ also fails: the linear bag is empty and there is one linear occurrence of x in Δ_4 . Note that $\Delta_4(\lambda \Delta_4 \int * \lambda \Delta_4 \int^!)$ reduces to another application of Δ_4 before failing:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_4(\lambda \Delta_4 \int * \lambda \Delta_4 \int^!) &= (\lambda x.(x[1](\lambda x \int *1^!)))(\lambda \Delta_4 \int * \lambda \Delta_4 \int^!) \\ &\longrightarrow_{[\mathbb{R}:\text{Beta}]} (x[1](\lambda x \int *1^!))\langle\langle\lambda \Delta_4 \int * \lambda \Delta_4 \int^!/x\rangle\rangle \\ &\longrightarrow_{[\mathbb{R}:\text{Fetch}^!]} (\Delta_4(\lambda x \int *1^!))\langle\langle\lambda \Delta_4 \int * \lambda \Delta_4 \int^!/x\rangle\rangle \\ &\longrightarrow^* \text{fail}^0 \langle\langle\lambda x \int *1^!/y\rangle\rangle \langle\langle\lambda \Delta_4 \int * \lambda \Delta_4 \int^!/x\rangle\rangle \end{aligned}$$

\square

Differently from Chapter 2, there are terms in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \frac{1}{2}}$ that when applied to each other behave similarly to Ω , namely $\Omega_{5,6}$, $\Omega_{6,5}$, and Ω_7 (Example 3.3).

Example 3.7 Cont. Example 3.3

The following reductions illustrate different behaviours provided that subtle changes are made within $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \frac{1}{2}}$ -terms:

- An interesting behaviour of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \frac{1}{2}}$ is that variations of Δ can be applied to each other and appear alternately (highlighted in blue) in the functional position throughout the computation—this behaviour is illustrated in Fig. 3.2:




Figure 3.2: An Ω -like behaviour in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{!z}$ (cf. Example 3.7).

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_{5,6} &= \Delta_5(1 * \lambda \Delta_5 f^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_6 f^!) \\
&= (\lambda x.(x[2](1 * \lambda x[1] f^! \diamond \lambda x[2] f^!)))(1 * \lambda \Delta_5 f^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_6 f^!) \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{R:Beta}]} (x[2](1 * \lambda x[1] f^! \diamond \lambda x[2] f^!)) \langle \langle 1 * \lambda \Delta_5 f^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_6 f^!/x \rangle \rangle \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{R:Fetch}^!]} (\Delta_6(1 * \lambda x[1] f^! \diamond \lambda x[2] f^!)) \langle \langle 1 * \lambda \Delta_5 f^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_6 f^!/x \rangle \rangle \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{R:Beta}]} (y[1](1 * \lambda y[1] f^! \diamond \lambda y[2] f^!)) \langle \langle (1 * \lambda x[1] f^! \diamond \lambda x[2] f^!)/y \rangle \rangle \langle \langle 1 * \lambda \Delta_5 f^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_6 f^!/x \rangle \rangle \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{R:Fetch}^!]} (x[1](1 * \lambda y[1] f^! \diamond \lambda y[2] f^!)) \langle \langle (1 * \lambda x[1] f^! \diamond \lambda x[2] f^!)/y \rangle \rangle \langle \langle 1 * \lambda \Delta_5 f^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_6 f^!/x \rangle \rangle \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{R:Fetch}^!]} (\Delta_5(1 * \lambda y[1] f^! \diamond \lambda y[2] f^!)) \langle \langle (1 * \lambda x[1] f^! \diamond \lambda x[2] f^!)/y \rangle \rangle \langle \langle 1 * \lambda \Delta_5 f^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_6 f^!/x \rangle \rangle \\
&\longrightarrow \dots
\end{aligned}$$

- Applications of Δ_7 into two unrestricted copies of Δ_7 behave as Ω producing a non-terminating behaviour. Letting $B = 1 * \lambda x[1] f^! \diamond \lambda x[1] f^!$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_7 &= (\lambda x.(x[2](1 * \lambda x[1] f^! \diamond \lambda x[1] f^!)))(1 * \lambda \Delta_7 f^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_7 f^!) \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{R:Beta}]} (x[2](1 * \lambda x[1] f^! \diamond \lambda x[1] f^!)) \langle \langle 1 * \lambda \Delta_7 f^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_7 f^!/x \rangle \rangle \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{R:Fetch}^!]} (\Delta_7(1 * \lambda x[1] f^! \diamond \lambda x[1] f^!)) \langle \langle 1 * \lambda \Delta_7 f^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_7 f^!/x \rangle \rangle \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{R:Beta}]} (y[2](1 * \lambda y[1] f^! \diamond \lambda y[1] f^!)) \langle \langle B/y \rangle \rangle \langle \langle 1 * \lambda \Delta_7 f^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_7 f^!/x \rangle \rangle \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{R:Fetch}^!]} (x[1](1 * \lambda y[1] f^! \diamond \lambda y[1] f^!)) \langle \langle B/y \rangle \rangle \langle \langle 1 * \lambda \Delta_7 f^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_7 f^!/x \rangle \rangle \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{R:Fetch}^!]} (\Delta_7(1 * \lambda y[1] f^! \diamond \lambda y[1] f^!)) \langle \langle B/y \rangle \rangle \langle \langle 1 * \lambda \Delta_7 f^! \diamond \lambda \Delta_7 f^!/x \rangle \rangle \\
&\longrightarrow \dots
\end{aligned}$$

Later on we will show that this term is well-formed (see Example 3.8) with respect to the intersection type system introduced in § 3.3.

□

3.3 Well-Formed Expressions via Intersection Types

We define *well-formed* $\lambda_{\oplus}^{!z}$ -expressions by relying on a non-idempotent intersection type system, based on the system by [Bucciarelli et al. \(2017\)](#). Our system for well-formed expressions subsumes the one in Chapter 2 it uses *strict* and *multiset* types to

check linear bags; moreover, it uses *list* and *tuple* types to check unrestricted bags. As in Chapter 2, we write “well-formedness” (of terms, bags, and expressions) to stress that, unlike usual type systems, our system can account for terms that may reduce to the failure term (cf. Remark 3.3.2).

Definition 3.6 Types for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$

We define *strict*, *multiset*, *list*, and *tuple* types.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{(Strict)} & \sigma, \tau, \delta ::= \mathbf{unit} \mid (\pi, \eta) \rightarrow \sigma \\ \text{(Multiset)} & \pi, \zeta ::= \bigwedge_{i \in I} \sigma_i \mid \omega \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ll} \text{(List)} & \eta, \varepsilon ::= \sigma \mid \varepsilon \diamond \eta \\ \text{(Tuple)} & (\pi, \eta) \end{array}$$

□

A strict type can be the **unit** type or a functional type $(\pi, \eta) \rightarrow \sigma$, where (π, η) is a tuple type and σ is a strict type. Multiset types can be either the empty type ω or an intersection of strict types $\bigwedge_{i \in I} \sigma_i$, with I non-empty. The operator \wedge is commutative, associative, non-idempotent, that is, $\sigma \wedge \sigma \neq \sigma$, with identity ω . The intersection type $\bigwedge_{i \in I} \sigma_i$ is the type of a linear bag; the cardinality of I corresponds to its size.

A list type can be either a strict type σ or the composition $\varepsilon \diamond \eta$ of two list types ε and η . We use the list type $\varepsilon \diamond \eta$ to type the concatenation of two unrestricted bags. A tuple type (π, η) types the concatenation of a linear bag of type π with an unrestricted bag of type η . Notice that a list type $\varepsilon \diamond \eta$ can be recursively unfolded into a finite composition of strict types $\sigma_1 \diamond \dots \diamond \sigma_n$, for some $n \geq 1$. In this case the length of $\varepsilon \diamond \eta$ is n and that σ_i is its i -th strict type, for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Notation 3.3.1 Given $k \geq 0$, we write σ^k to stand for $\sigma \wedge \dots \wedge \sigma$ (k times, if $k > 0$) or for ω (if $k = 0$). Similarly, $\hat{x} : \sigma^k$ stands for $x : \sigma, \dots, x : \sigma$ (k times, if $k > 0$) or for $x : \omega$ (if $k = 0$). Given $k \geq 1$, we write $x^! : \eta$ to stand for $x[1] : \eta_1, \dots, x[k] : \eta_k$.

Notation 3.3.2 ($\eta \sim \varepsilon$) Let ε and η be two list types, with the length of ε greater or equal to that of η . Let us write ε_i and η_i to denote the i -th strict type in ε and η , respectively. We write $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ meaning the initial sublist, whenever there exist ε' and ε'' such that: i) $\varepsilon = \varepsilon' \diamond \varepsilon''$; ii) the size of ε' is that of η ; iii) for all i , $\varepsilon'_i = \eta_i$.

Linear contexts range over Γ, Δ, \dots and unrestricted contexts range over Θ, Υ, \dots . They are defined by the following grammar:

$$\Gamma, \Delta ::= - \mid x : \sigma \mid \Gamma, x : \sigma \quad \Theta, \Upsilon ::= - \mid x^! : \eta \mid \Theta, x^! : \eta$$

The empty linear/unrestricted type assignment is denoted ‘-’. Linear variables can occur more than once in a linear context; they are assigned only strict types. For instance, $x : (\tau, \sigma) \rightarrow \tau, x : \tau$ is a valid context: it means that x can be of both

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[F:var}^\ell\text{]} \frac{}{\Theta; x : \sigma \models x : \sigma} \quad \text{[F:var}^!\text{]} \frac{\Theta, x^! : \eta; x : \eta_i, \Delta \models x : \sigma}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Delta \models x[i] : \sigma} \quad \text{[F:1}^\ell\text{]} \frac{}{\Theta; - \models 1 : \omega} \\
\\
\text{[F:1}^!\text{]} \frac{}{\Theta; - \models 1^! : \sigma} \quad \text{[F:abs]} \frac{\Theta, z^! : \eta; \Gamma, \hat{z} : \sigma^k \models M : \tau \quad z \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \lambda z. M : (\sigma^k, \eta) \rightarrow \tau} \\
\\
\text{[F:app]} \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \models M : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models M B : \tau} \quad \text{[F:ex-sub]} \frac{\Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau} \\
\\
\text{[F:bag]} \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \models C : \sigma^k \quad \Theta; - \models U : \eta}{\Theta; \Gamma \models C * U : (\sigma^k, \eta)} \quad \text{[F:bag}^\ell\text{]} \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \sigma \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C : \sigma^k}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models \wr M \wr . C : \sigma^{k+1}} \\
\\
\text{[F:bag}^!\text{]} \frac{\Theta; - \models M : \sigma}{\Theta; - \models \wr M \wr^! : \sigma} \quad \text{[F:\diamond bag}^!\text{]} \frac{\Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon \quad \Theta; - \models V : \eta}{\Theta; - \models U \diamond V : \varepsilon \diamond \eta} \\
\\
\text{[F:fail]} \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma^\dagger) = \tilde{x}}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \text{fail}_{\tilde{x}} : \tau} \\
\\
\text{[F:sum]} \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \sigma \quad \Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{N} : \sigma}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M} + \mathbb{N} : \sigma} \quad \text{[F:weak]} \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \sigma \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)}{\Theta; \Gamma, x : \omega \models M : \sigma}
\end{array}$$

Figure 3.3: Well-formedness rules for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \ell}$ (cf. Def. 3.8). In Rules [F:app] and [F:ex-sub]: $k, j \geq 0$.

type $(\tau, \sigma) \rightarrow \tau$ and τ . In contrast, unrestricted variables can occur at most once in unrestricted contexts; they are assigned only list types. The multiset of linear variables in Γ is denoted as $\text{dom}(\Gamma)$; similarly, $\text{dom}(\Theta)$ denotes the set of unrestricted variables in Θ .

Judgements are of the form $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \sigma$, where the left-hand side contexts are separated by “;” and $\mathbb{M} : \sigma$ means that \mathbb{M} has type σ . We write $\models \mathbb{M} : \sigma$ to denote $-; - \models \mathbb{M} : \sigma$.

As in Chapter 2 we rely on core contexts, here only linear free variables that are result of weakening will be disregarded in the typing of the failure term as unrestricted variables are not captured by failure.

Definition 3.7 Core Context

Given a linear context Γ , the associated *core context* is defined as $\Gamma^\dagger = \{x : \pi \in \Gamma \mid \pi \neq \omega\}$. \square

Definition 3.8 Well-formed $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \ell}$ expressions

An expression \mathbb{M} is well-formed (wf, for short) if there exist Γ , Θ and τ such that $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ is entailed via the rules in Fig. 3.3. \square

We describe the well-formedness rules in Fig. 3.3.

- Rules $[F : \text{var}^\ell]$ and $[F : \text{var}^!]$ assign types to linear and unrestricted variables, respectively.
- Rule $[F : \text{var}^!]$ resembles the *copy* rule Caires & Pfenning (2010) where we use a linear copy of an unrestricted variable $x[i]$ of type σ , typed with $x^! : \eta$, and type the linear copy with the corresponding strict type η_i which in this case the linear copy x would have type equal to σ .
- Rules $[F : 1^\ell]$ and $[F : 1^!]$ assign types to the empty linear/unrestricted bag: 1 has type ω , whereas $1^!$ has an arbitrary strict type σ . Arbitrariness is allowed since the substitution of an unrestricted variable for $1^!$ leads to a `fail` term (Rule $[R : \text{Fail}^!]$), which has an arbitrary strict type.
- Rule $[F : \text{abs}]$ assigns type $(\sigma^k, \eta) \rightarrow \tau$ to an abstraction $\lambda z.M$, provided that the unrestricted occurrences of z may be typed by the unrestricted context containing $z^! : \eta$, the linear occurrences of z are typed with the linear context containing $\hat{z} : \sigma^k$, for some $k \geq 0$, and there are no other linear occurrences of z in the linear context Γ .
- Rules $[F : \text{app}]$ and $[F : \text{ex-sub}]$ (for application and explicit substitution, resp.) use the condition $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ (cf. Notation 3.3.2), which captures the portion of the unrestricted bag that is effectively used in a term: it ensures that ε can be decomposed into some ε' and ε'' , such that each type component ε'_i matches with η_i . If this requirement is satisfied, Rule $[F : \text{app}]$ types an application $M B$ given that M has a functional type in which the left of the arrow is a tuple type (σ^j, η) whereas the bag B is typed with tuple (σ^k, ε) . Similarly, Rule $[F : \text{ex-sub}]$ types the term $M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$ provided that B has the tuple type (σ^k, ε) and M is typed with the variable x having linear type assignment σ^j and unrestricted type assignment η .

Remark 3.3.1 *Differently from intersection type systems Bucciarelli et al. (2017); Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010), in Rules $[F : \text{app}]$ and $[F : \text{ex-sub}]$ there is no equality requirement between j and k , as we would like to capture terms that fail due to a mismatch in resources: we only require that the linear part of the tuples are composed of the same strict type, say σ . As a term can take an unrestricted bag with arbitrary size we only require that the elements of the unrestricted bag that are used have a “consistent” type, i.e., the type of the unrestricted bag satisfies the relation \sim with the unrestricted fragment of the corresponding tuple type.*

There are four rules for bags:

- Rule $[F : \text{bag}^!]$ types an unrestricted bag $\lambda M^!$ with the type σ of M . Note that $\lambda x^!$, an unrestricted bag containing a linear variable x , is not well-formed, whereas $\lambda x[i]^!$ is well-formed.
- Rule $[F : \text{bag}]$ assigns the tuple type (σ^k, η) to the concatenation of a linear bag of type σ^k with an unrestricted bag of type η .
- Rules $[F : \text{bag}^\ell]$ and $[F : \diamond \text{bag}^!]$ type the concatenation of linear and unrestricted bags.
- Rule $[F : 1^!]$ allows an empty unrestricted bag to have an arbitrary σ type since it may be referred to by a variable for substitution: we must be able to compare its type with the type of unrestricted variables that may consume the empty bag (this reduction would inevitably lead to failure).

As in Chapter 2, Rule $[F : \text{fail}]$ handles the failure term, and is the main difference with respect to standard type systems. Rules for sums and weakening ($[F : \text{sum}]$ and $[F : \text{weak}]$) are standard.

Example 3.8 Cont. Example 3.7

Term $\Delta_7 := \lambda x.x[2](1 * \lambda x[1]^! \diamond \lambda x[1]^!)$ is well-formed, as ensured by the judgement $\Theta; - \models \Delta_7 : (\omega, \sigma' \diamond (\sigma^j, \sigma' \diamond \sigma') \rightarrow \tau) \rightarrow \tau$, whose derivation is given below:

- Π_3 is the derivation of $\Theta, x^! : \eta; - \models \lambda x[1]^! : \sigma'$, for $\eta = \sigma' \diamond (\sigma^j, \sigma' \diamond \sigma') \rightarrow \tau$.
- Π_4 is the derivation: $\Theta, x^! : \eta; - \models x[2] : (\sigma^j, \sigma' \diamond \sigma') \rightarrow \tau$
- Π_5 is the derivation: $\Theta, x^! : \eta; x : \omega \models (1 * \lambda x[1]^! \diamond \lambda x[1]^!) : (\omega, \sigma' \diamond \sigma')$

Therefore,

$$\frac{[F:\text{app}] \frac{\Pi_5 \ \Pi_4 \ \sigma' \diamond \sigma' \sim \sigma' \diamond \sigma'}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; x : \omega \models x[2](1 * \lambda x[1]^! \diamond \lambda x[1]^!) : \tau}}{[F:\text{abs}] \frac{\Theta; - \models \lambda x.(x[2](1 * \lambda x[1]^! \diamond \lambda x[1]^!)) : (\omega, \eta) \rightarrow \tau}{\Theta; - \models \lambda x.x[2](1 * \lambda x[1]^! \diamond \lambda x[1]^!) : (\omega, \eta) \rightarrow \tau}}{\Delta_7}$$

□

Well-formed expressions satisfy subject reduction (SR); see App. B.2 for a proof.

Theorem 3.1 (SR in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$) *If $\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \tau$ and $M \longrightarrow M'$ then $\Theta; \Gamma \models M' : \tau$.*

Proof: By structural induction on the reduction rules. We proceed by analysing the rule applied in \mathbb{M} . An interesting case occurs when the rule is $[F : \text{Fetch}^!]$: Then $\mathbb{M} = M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle$, where $U = \lambda N_1 \mathcal{J}^! \diamond \dots \diamond \lambda N_l \mathcal{J}^!$ and $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$. The reduction is as follows:

$$[R : \text{Fetch}^!] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x[i] \quad U_i = \lambda N_i \mathcal{J}^!}{M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow M\{\lambda N_i/x[i]\} \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle}$$

By hypothesis, one has the derivation:

$$[F : \text{ex-sub}] \frac{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma', \hat{x} : \sigma^j \models M : \tau \quad \frac{\text{[F:bag]} \quad \frac{\text{[F:bag]} \quad \frac{\Theta; \cdot \models U : \varepsilon \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C : \sigma^k}{\Theta; \Delta \models C * U : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon)} \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M\{\lambda N_i/x[i]\} : \tau}}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

where Π has the form

$$[F : \diamond \text{bag}^!] \frac{\frac{\text{[F:bag}^!] \quad \Theta; \cdot \models N_1 : \varepsilon_1}{\Theta; \cdot \models \lambda N_1 \mathcal{J}^! : \varepsilon_1} \quad \dots \quad \frac{\text{[F:bag}^!] \quad \Theta; \cdot \models N_l : \varepsilon_l}{\Theta; \cdot \models \lambda N_l \mathcal{J}^! : \varepsilon_l}}{\Theta; \cdot \models \lambda N_1 \mathcal{J}^! \diamond \dots \diamond \lambda N_l \mathcal{J}^! : \varepsilon}}$$

with $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. Notice that if $\varepsilon_i = \delta$ and $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ then $\eta_i = \delta$. By Lemma B.2.2, there exists a derivation Π_1 of $\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma', \hat{x} : \sigma^j \models M\{\lambda N_i/x[i]\} : \tau$. Therefore, we have:

$$[F : \text{ex-sub}] \frac{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma', \hat{x} : \sigma^j \models M\{\lambda N_i/x[i]\} : \tau \quad \frac{\text{[F:bag]} \quad \frac{\Theta; \cdot \models U : \varepsilon \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C : \sigma^k}{\Theta; \Delta \models C * U : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon)} \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M\{\lambda N_i/x[i]\} \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M\{\lambda N_i/x[i]\} \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

□

Remark 3.3.2 (Well-Formed vs Well-Typed Expressions) *Our type system (and Theorem 3.1) can be specialised to the case of well-typed expressions that do not contain (and never reduce to) the failure term. In particular, Rules $[F : \text{app}]$ and $[F : \text{ex-sub}]$ would need to check that $\sigma^k = \sigma^j$, as failure can be caused due to a mismatch of linear resources. A difference between well typed and well formed expressions is that the former satisfy subject expansion, but the latter do not: expressions that lead to failure can be ill-typed yet failure itself is well-formed.*




Figure 3.4: Our two-step approach to encode $\lambda_{\oplus}^{!z}$ into $s\pi$.

3.4 A Typed Encoding of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{!z}$ into Concurrent Processes

We encode $\lambda_{\oplus}^{!z}$ into $s\pi$, a session π -calculus that stands on a Curry-Howard correspondence between linear logic and session types (§ 3.4.1). We extend the two-step approach that we devised in Chapter 2 for the sub-calculus λ_{\oplus}^z (with linear resources only) (cf. Fig. 3.4). First, in § 3.4.3, we define an encoding $(\cdot)^{\circ}$ from well-formed expressions in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{!z}$ to well-formed expressions in a variant of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{!z}$ with *sharing*, dubbed $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{!z}$ (§ 3.4.2). Then, in § 3.4.4, we define an encoding $[\cdot]_u$ (for a name u) from well-formed expressions in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{!z}$ to well-typed processes in $s\pi$.

We prove that $(\cdot)^{\circ}$ and $[\cdot]_u$ satisfy well-established correctness criteria Gorla (2010); Kouzapas et al. (2019): *type preservation*, *operational completeness*, *operational soundness*, and *success sensitiveness* (cf. App. B.5.1). Because $\lambda_{\oplus}^{!z}$ includes unrestricted resources, the results given here strictly generalise those in Chapter 2.

3.4.1 $s\pi$: A Session-Typed π -Calculus

$s\pi$ is a π -calculus with *session types* Honda (1993); Honda et al. (1998a), which ensure that the endpoints of a channel perform matching actions. We consider the full process framework in Caires & Pérez (2017), including constructs for specifying labelled choices and client/server connections; they will be useful to codify unrestricted resources and variables in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{!z}$. Following Caires & Pfenning (2010); Wadler (2012), $s\pi$ stands on a Curry-Howard correspondence between session types and a linear logic with dual modalities/types ($\&A$ and $\oplus A$), which define *non-deterministic* session behaviour. As in Caires & Pfenning (2010); Wadler (2012), in $s\pi$, cut elimination corresponds to communication, proofs to processes, and propositions to session types.

Syntax. Names $x, y, z, w \dots$ denote the endpoints of protocols specified by session types. We write $P\{x/y\}$ for the capture-avoiding substitution of x for y in process P .

Definition 3.9 Processes

The syntax of $s\pi$ processes is given by the grammar below.

$$P, Q ::= \mathbf{0} \mid \bar{x}(y).P \mid x(y).P \mid x.l_i;P \mid x.\text{case}_{i \in I}\{l_i : P_i\} \mid x.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{close};P \\ \mid (P \mid Q) \mid [x \leftrightarrow y] \mid (\nu x)P \mid !x(y).P \mid \bar{x}?(y).P$$

$$| x.\overline{\text{some}};P \mid x.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\text{some}_{(w_1, \dots, w_n)};P \mid (P \oplus Q)$$

□

Process $\mathbf{0}$ denotes inaction. Process $\bar{x}(y).P$ sends a fresh name y along x and then continues as P . Process $x(y).P$ receives a name z along x and then continues as $P\{z/y\}$. Process $x.\text{case}_{i \in I}\{1_i : P_i\}$ is a branching construct, with labelled alternatives indexed by the finite set I : it awaits a choice on x with continuation P_j for each $j \in I$. Process $x.1_i;P$ selects on x the alternative indexed by i before continuing as P . Processes $x.\overline{\text{close}}$ and $x.\text{close};P$ are complementary actions for closing session x . We sometimes use the shorthand notations $\bar{y}[]$ and $y[];P$ to stand for $y.\overline{\text{close}}$ and $y.\text{close};P$, respectively. Process $P \mid Q$ is the parallel execution of P and Q . The forwarder process $[x \leftrightarrow y]$ denotes a bi-directional link between sessions x and y . Process $(\nu x)P$ denotes the process P in which name x is kept private (local) to P . Process $!x(y).P$ defines a server that spawns copies of P upon requests on x . Process $\bar{x}?(y).P$ denotes a client that connects to a server by sending the fresh name y on x .

The remaining constructs come from [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#) and introduce non-deterministic sessions which *may* provide a session protocol *or* fail. Process $x.\overline{\text{some}};P$ confirms that the session on x will execute and continues as P . Process $x.\overline{\text{none}}$ signals the failure of implementing the session on x . Process $x.\text{some}_{(w_1, \dots, w_n)};P$ specifies a dependency on a non-deterministic session x . This process can either (i) synchronise with an action $x.\overline{\text{some}}$ and continue as P , or (ii) synchronise with an action $x.\overline{\text{none}}$, discard P , and propagate the failure on x to (w_1, \dots, w_n) , which are sessions implemented in P . When x is the only session implemented in P , there is no tuple of dependencies (w_1, \dots, w_n) and so we write simply $x.\text{some};P$. Finally, process $P \oplus Q$ denotes a non-deterministic choice between P and Q . We shall often write $\bigoplus_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} P_i$ to stand for $P_1 \oplus \dots \oplus P_n$. In $(\nu y)P$ and $x(y).P$ the occurrence of name y is binding, with scope P . The set of free names of P is denoted by $fn(P)$.

Semantics. The *reduction relation* of $\mathfrak{s}\pi$ specifies the computations that a process performs on its own (cf. Fig. 3.5). It is closed by *structural congruence*, denoted \equiv , which expresses basic identities for processes and the non-collapsing nature of non-determinism (cf. App. B.3).

The first reduction rule formalises communication, which concerns bound names only (internal mobility), as y is bound in $\bar{x}(y).Q$ and $x(y).P$. Reduction for the forwarder process leads to a substitution. The reduction rule for closing a session is self-explanatory, as is the rule in which prefix $x.\overline{\text{some}}$ confirms the availability of a non-deterministic session. When a non-deterministic session is not available, $x.\overline{\text{none}}$ triggers this failure to all dependent sessions w_1, \dots, w_n ; this may in turn

$$\begin{array}{l}
\bar{x}(y).Q \mid x(y).P \longrightarrow (\nu y)(Q \mid P) \qquad x.\overline{\text{some}};P \mid x.\text{some}_{(w_1, \dots, w_n)};Q \longrightarrow P \mid Q \\
Q \longrightarrow Q' \Rightarrow P \oplus Q \longrightarrow P \oplus Q' \qquad x.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{close};P \longrightarrow P \\
x.l_i;Q \mid x.\text{case}_{i \in I}\{l_i : P_i\} \longrightarrow Q \mid P_i \qquad !x(y).Q \mid \bar{x}?(y).P \longrightarrow (\nu x)(!x(y).Q \mid (\nu y)(Q \mid P)) \\
(\nu x)([x \leftrightarrow y] \mid P) \longrightarrow P\{y/x\} \quad (x \neq y) \quad P \equiv P' \wedge P' \longrightarrow Q' \wedge Q' \equiv Q \Rightarrow P \longrightarrow Q \\
Q \longrightarrow Q' \Rightarrow P \mid Q \longrightarrow P \mid Q' \qquad P \longrightarrow Q \Rightarrow (\nu y)P \longrightarrow (\nu y)Q \\
x.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\text{some}_{(w_1, \dots, w_n)};Q \longrightarrow w_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid w_n.\overline{\text{none}}
\end{array}$$

Figure 3.5: Reduction for $s\pi$

trigger further failures (i.e., on sessions that depend on w_1, \dots, w_n). The remaining rules define contextual reduction with respect to restriction, composition, and non-deterministic choice.

Type System Session types govern the behaviour of the names of a process. An assignment $x : A$ enforces the use of name x according to the protocol specified by A .

Definition 3.10 Session Types

Session types are given by

$$A, B ::= \perp \mid \mathbf{1} \mid A \otimes B \mid A \wp B \mid \oplus_{i \in I}\{l_i : A_i\} \mid \&_{i \in I}\{l_i : A_i\} \mid !A \mid ?A \mid \&A \mid \oplus A$$

□

The multiplicative units \perp and $\mathbf{1}$ are used to type closed session endpoints. We use $A \otimes B$ to type a name that first outputs a name of type A before proceeding as specified by B . Similarly, $A \wp B$ types a name that first inputs a name of type A before proceeding as specified by B . Then, $!A$ types a name that repeatedly provides a service specified by A . Dually, $?A$ is the type of a name that can connect to a server offering A . Types $\oplus_{i \in I}\{l_i : A_i\}$ and $\&_{i \in I}\{l_i : A_i\}$ are assigned to names that can select and offer a labelled choice, respectively. Then we have the two modalities introduced in [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#). We use $\&A$ as the type of a (non-deterministic) session that *may produce* a behaviour of type A . Dually, $\oplus A$ denotes the type of a session that *may consume* a behaviour of type A .

The two endpoints of a session should be *dual* to ensure absence of communication errors. The dual of a type A is denoted \bar{A} . Duality corresponds to negation $(\cdot)^\perp$ in linear logic [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#).

Definition 3.11 Duality

Duality on types is given by:

$$\begin{array}{llll}
\bar{\mathbf{1}} = \perp & \bar{\perp} = \mathbf{1} & \overline{A \otimes B} = \bar{A} \wp \bar{B} & \overline{\oplus_{i \in I}\{l_i : A_i\}} = \&_{i \in I}\{l_i : \bar{A}_i\} & \overline{\oplus A} = \&\bar{A} \\
\overline{!A} = ?A & \overline{?A} = !A & \overline{A \wp B} = \bar{A} \otimes \bar{B} & \overline{\&_{i \in I}\{l_i : A_i\}} = \oplus_{i \in I}\{l_i : \bar{A}_i\} & \overline{\&A} = \oplus \bar{A}
\end{array}$$

□

Judgements are of the form $P \vdash \Delta; \Theta$, where P is a process, Δ is the linear context, and Θ is the unrestricted context. Both Δ and Θ contain assignments of types to names, but satisfy different substructural principles: while Θ satisfies weakening, contraction and exchange, Δ only satisfies exchange. The empty context is denoted ‘.’. We write $\&\Delta$ to denote that all assignments in Δ have a non-deterministic type, i.e., $\Delta = w_1:\&A_1, \dots, w_n:\&A_n$, for some A_1, \dots, A_n . The typing judgement $P \vdash \Delta$ corresponds to the logical sequent for classical linear logic, which can be recovered by erasing processes and name assignments.

Typing rules for processes in Fig. 3.6 correspond to proof rules in linear logic; we discuss some of them. Rule [Tid] interprets the identity axiom using the forwarder process. Rules [T1] and [T⊥] type the process constructs for session termination. Rules [T⊗] and [T⊗] type output and input of a name along a session, resp. The last four rules are used to type process constructs related to non-determinism and failure. Rules [T&_d^x] and [T&^x] introduce a session of type $\&A$, which may produce a behaviour of type A : while the former rule covers the case in which $x : A$ is indeed available, the latter rule formalises the case in which $x : A$ is not available (i.e., a failure). Given a sequence of names $\tilde{w} = w_1, \dots, w_n$, Rule [T⊕_w^x] accounts for the possibility of not being able to consume the session $x : A$ by considering sessions different from x as potentially not available. Rule [T⊕] expresses non-deterministic choice of processes P and Q that implement non-deterministic behaviours only. Finally, Rule [T⊕_i] and [T&] correspond, resp., to selection and branching: the former provides a selection of behaviours along x as long as P is guarded with the i -th behaviour; the latter offers a labelled choice where each behaviour A_i is matched to a corresponding P_i .

The type system enjoys type preservation, a result that follows from the cut elimination property in linear logic; it ensures that the observable interface of a system is invariant under reduction. The type system also ensures other properties for well-typed processes (e.g. global progress, strong normalisation, and confluence); see [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#) for details.

Theorem 3.2 (Type Preservation [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#)) *If $P \vdash \Delta; \Theta$ and $P \longrightarrow Q$ then $Q \vdash \Delta; \Theta$.*

3.4.2 $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$: An Auxiliary Calculus With Sharing

To facilitate the encoding of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ into $\mathfrak{s}\pi$, we define $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$: an auxiliary calculus whose constructs are inspired by the work of [Gundersen et al. \(2013\)](#), [Ghilezan et al. \(2011\)](#), and [Kesner & Lengrand \(2007\)](#). The syntax of $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ only modifies the syntax of terms, which is defined by the grammar below; variables $x[*]$, bags B , and

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[Tid]} \frac{}{[x \leftrightarrow y] \vdash x:A, y:\bar{A}; \Theta} \quad \text{[T1]} \frac{}{x.\text{close} \vdash x : \mathbf{1}; \Theta} \quad \text{[T}\perp] \frac{P \vdash \Delta; \Theta}{x.\text{close}; P \vdash x : \perp, \Delta; \Theta} \\
\text{[T}\otimes] \frac{P \vdash \Delta, y : A; \Theta \quad Q \vdash \Delta', x : B; \Theta}{\bar{x}(y).(P \mid Q) \vdash \Delta, \Delta', x : A \otimes B; \Theta} \quad \text{[T}\wp] \frac{P \vdash \Delta, y : C, x : D; \Theta}{x(y).P \vdash \Delta, x : C \wp D; \Theta} \\
\text{[T}\oplus_{\tilde{w}}^x] \frac{P \vdash \tilde{w} : \&\Delta, x : A; \Theta}{x.\text{some}_{\tilde{w}}; P \vdash \tilde{w} : \&\Delta, x : \oplus A; \Theta} \quad \text{[T}\&_{\tilde{d}}^x] \frac{P \vdash \Delta, x : A; \Theta}{x.\text{some}; P \vdash \Delta, x : \&A; \Theta} \\
\text{[T}\&^x] \frac{}{x.\text{none} \vdash x : \&A; \Theta} \quad \text{[T}\oplus] \frac{P \vdash \&\Delta; \Theta \quad Q \vdash \&\Delta; \Theta}{P \oplus Q \vdash \&\Delta; \Theta} \\
\text{[T}\oplus_i] \frac{P \vdash \Delta, x : A_i; \Theta}{x.\mathbf{1}_i; P \vdash \Delta, x : \oplus_{i \in I} \{\mathbf{1}_i : A_i\}; \Theta} \quad \text{[T}\&] \frac{P_i \vdash \Delta, x : A_i; \Theta \quad (\forall i \in I)}{x.\text{case}_{i \in I} \{\mathbf{1}_i : P_i\} \vdash \Delta, x : \&_{i \in I} \{\mathbf{1}_i : A_i\}; \Theta} \\
\text{[T?]} \frac{P \vdash \Delta, x : A, \Theta}{P \vdash \Delta, x : ?A; \Theta} \quad \text{[T!]} \frac{P \vdash y : A; \Theta}{!x(y).P \vdash x : !A; \Theta} \quad \text{[Tcopy]} \frac{P \vdash \Delta, y : A; x : A, \Theta}{\bar{x}?(y).P \vdash \Delta, x : A, \Theta}
\end{array}$$

Figure 3.6: Typing rules for $\mathfrak{s}\pi$.

expressions \mathbb{M} are as in Definition 3.1.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(Terms)} \quad M, N, L ::= & x[*] \mid \lambda x.(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \mid (M B) \mid M \langle N/x \rangle \mid M \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket \\
& \mid \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \mid M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \mid (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

We consider the *sharing construct* $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ and two kinds of explicit substitutions: the *explicit linear substitution*, written $M \langle N/x \rangle$, and the *explicit unrestricted substitution*, written $M \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket$. The term $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ defines the sharing of variables \tilde{x} occurring in M using the linear variable x . We shall refer to x as *sharing variable* and to \tilde{x} as *shared variables*. A linear variable is only allowed to appear once in a term. Notice that \tilde{x} can be empty: $M[\leftarrow x]$ expresses that x does not share any variables in M . As in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\frac{1}{2}}$, the term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ explicitly accounts for failed attempts at substituting the variables in \tilde{x} .

We summarise some requirements. In $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$, we require: (i) every $x_i \in \tilde{x}$ occurs exactly once in M and that (ii) x_i is not a sharing variable. The occurrence of x_i can appear within the fail term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$, if $x_i \in \tilde{y}$. In the explicit linear substitution $M \langle N/x \rangle$, we require: the variable x has to occur in M ; x cannot be a sharing variable; and x cannot be in an explicit linear substitution occurring in M ; all free *linear* occurrences of x in M are bound. In the explicit unrestricted substitution $M \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket$, we require: all free *unrestricted* occurrences of x in M are bound; $x^!$ cannot be in an explicit unrestricted substitution occurring in M . This way, e.g., $M' \langle L/x \rangle \langle N/x \rangle$ and $M' \langle U'/x^! \rangle \langle U/x^! \rangle$ are not valid terms in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\frac{1}{2}}$. We consider consistent terms as defined in Definition 2.11. As consistency applies to linear variables and does not concern unrestricted variables the results of reduction preservation, ensured by typ-

ing and structural congruence on terms follow analogously. When we refer to terms we will be referring to consistent terms.

The following congruence will be important when proving encoding correctness.

Definition 3.12

The congruence \equiv_λ for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$ on terms and expressions is given by the identities below.

$$\begin{aligned}
M \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket &\equiv_\lambda M, x \notin M \\
(MB) \langle N/x \rangle &\equiv_\lambda (M \langle N/x \rangle) B, x \notin \text{fv}(B) \\
(MB) \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket &\equiv_\lambda (M \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket) B, x \notin \text{fv}(B) \\
(MA) [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle &\equiv_\lambda (M [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle) A, x_i \in \tilde{x} \Rightarrow x_i \notin \text{fv}(A) \\
M [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \langle \langle A/y \rangle \rangle [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle &\equiv_\lambda (M [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle) [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \langle \langle A/y \rangle \rangle, \\
&\quad x_i \in \tilde{x} \Rightarrow x_i \notin \text{fv}(A), \\
&\quad y_i \in \tilde{y} \Rightarrow y_i \notin \text{fv}(B) \\
M \langle N_2/y \rangle \langle N_1/x \rangle &\equiv_\lambda M \langle N_1/x \rangle \langle N_2/y \rangle, x \notin \text{fv}(N_2), y \notin \text{fv}(N_1) \\
M \llbracket U_2/y^! \rrbracket \llbracket U_1/x^! \rrbracket &\equiv_\lambda M \llbracket U_1/x^! \rrbracket \llbracket U_2/y^! \rrbracket, x \notin \text{fv}(U_2), y \notin \text{fv}(U_1) \\
C[M] &\equiv_\lambda C[M'], \text{ with } M \equiv_\lambda M' \\
D[\mathbb{M}] &\equiv_\lambda D[\mathbb{M}'], \text{ with } \mathbb{M} \equiv_\lambda \mathbb{M}'
\end{aligned}$$

□

The first rule states that we may remove unneeded unrestricted substitutions when the variable in concern does not appear within the term. The next three identities enforce that bags can always be moved in and out of all forms of explicit substitution, which are useful manipulate expressions and to form a redex for Rule [R : Beta]. The other rules deal with permutation of explicit substitutions and contextual closure.

Well-formedness for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$, based on intersection types, is defined as in § 3.3; see App. B.4.

3.4.3 Encoding $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$ into $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$

We define an encoding $(\cdot)^\circ$ from well-formed terms in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$ into $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$. This encoding relies on an intermediate encoding $(\cdot)^\bullet$ on $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$ -terms.

Notation 3.4.1 Given a term M such that $\#(x, M) = k$ and a sequence of pairwise distinct fresh variables $\tilde{x} = x_1, \dots, x_k$ we write $M \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle$ or $M \langle x_1, \dots, x_k/x \rangle$ to stand for $M \langle x_1/x \rangle \dots \langle x_k/x \rangle$, i.e., a simultaneous linear substitution whereby each distinct linear occurrence of x in M is replaced by a distinct $x_i \in \tilde{x}$. Notice that each x_i has the same type as x . We use (simultaneous) linear substitutions to force all bound linear variables in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$ to become shared variables in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$.

$$\begin{array}{l}
(x)^\bullet = x \qquad (x[i])^\bullet = x[i] \qquad (1)^\bullet = 1 \\
(1^!)^\bullet = 1^! \qquad (\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}})^\bullet = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \qquad (MB)^\bullet = (M)^\bullet (B)^\bullet \\
(\lambda M \int^!)^\bullet = \lambda M \int^! \qquad (\lambda M \int \cdot C)^\bullet = \lambda (M)^\bullet \int \cdot (C)^\bullet \qquad (C * U)^\bullet = (C)^\bullet * (U)^\bullet \\
(U \diamond V)^\bullet = U \diamond V \qquad (M \langle N/x \rangle)^\bullet = (M)^\bullet \langle (N)^\bullet /x \rangle \qquad (M \ll U/x^! \rrangle)^\bullet = (M)^\bullet \ll (U)^\bullet /x^! \rrangle \\
(\lambda x.M)^\bullet = \lambda x.((M \langle x_1, \dots, x_n/x \rangle)^\bullet [x_1, \dots, x_n \leftarrow x]) \quad \#(x, M) = n, \text{ each } x_i \text{ is fresh} \\
(M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle)^\bullet = \begin{cases} \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C \rangle^\bullet)} (M \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle)^\bullet \langle C_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \dots \langle C_i(k)/x_k \rangle \ll U/x^! \rrangle, (*) \\ (M \langle x_1, \dots, x_k/x \rangle)^\bullet [x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle C * U \rangle^\bullet /x \rangle, (**) \end{cases} \\
(*) \text{ if } \#(x, M) = \text{size}(C) = k \qquad (**) \text{ if } \#(x, M) = k \geq 0
\end{array}$$

Figure 3.7: Auxiliary Encoding: $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ into $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ **Definition 3.13** From $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ to $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$

Let $M \in \lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$. Suppose $\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \tau$, with $\text{dom}(\Gamma) = \text{lfv}(M) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and $\#(x_i, M) = j_i$. We define $(M)^\circ$ as

$$(M)^\circ = (M \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \dots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle)^\bullet [\tilde{x}_1 \leftarrow x_1] \dots [\tilde{x}_k \leftarrow x_k]$$

where $\tilde{x}_i = x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{j_i}}$ and the encoding $(\cdot)^\bullet : \lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow} \rightarrow \widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ is defined in Fig. 3.7 on $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -terms. The encoding $(\cdot)^\circ$ extends homomorphically to expressions. \square

The encoding $(\cdot)^\circ$ converts n occurrences of x in a term into n distinct variables x_1, \dots, x_n . The sharing construct coordinates them by constraining each to occur exactly once within a term. We proceed in two stages. First, we share all linear free linear variables using $(\cdot)^\bullet$: this ensures that free variables are replaced by shared variables which are then bound by the sharing construct. Second, we apply the encoding $(\cdot)^\circ$ on the corresponding term. The encoding is presented in Fig. 3.7: $(\cdot)^\bullet$ maintains $x[i]$ unaltered, and acts homomorphically over concatenation of bags and explicit substitutions. The encoding renames bound variables with bound shared variables. As we will see, this will enable a tight operational correspondence result with $\text{s}\pi$. In App. B.5 we establish the correctness of $(\cdot)^\circ$.

Example 3.9

We apply the encoding $(\cdot)^\bullet$ in some of the $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ -terms from Example 3.2: for simplicity, we assume that N and U have no free variables.

$$\begin{aligned}
((\lambda x.x) \lambda N \int * U)^\bullet &= ((\lambda x.x)^\bullet (\lambda N \int * U)^\bullet) = \lambda x.x_1 [x_1 \leftarrow x] \lambda (N)^\bullet \int * (U)^\bullet \\
((\lambda x.x[1]) * \lambda N \int^! \diamond U)^\bullet &= ((\lambda x.x[1])^\bullet (1 * \lambda N \int^! \diamond U)^\bullet) = (\lambda x.x[1] [\leftarrow x]) 1 * \lambda (N)^\bullet \int^! \diamond (U)^\bullet
\end{aligned}$$

 \square **3.4.4 Encoding $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ into $\text{s}\pi$**

We now define our encoding of $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ into $\text{s}\pi$, and establish its correctness.

Notation 3.4.2 *To help illustrate the behaviour of the encoding, we use the names x , x^ℓ , and $x^!$ to denote three distinct channel names: while x^ℓ is the channel that performs the linear substitution behaviour of the encoded term, channel $x^!$ performs the unrestricted behaviour.*

Definition 3.14 From $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{!z}$ into $s\pi$: Expressions

Let u be a name. The encoding $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u : \widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{!z} \rightarrow s\pi$ is defined in Fig. 3.8. \square

Every (free) variable x in an $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{!z}$ expression becomes a name x in its corresponding $s\pi$ process. As customary in encodings of λ into π , we use a name u to provide the behaviour of the encoded expression. In our case, u is a non-deterministic session: the encoded expression can be effectively available or not; this is signalled by prefixes $u.\overline{\text{som}}e$ and $u.\overline{\text{non}}e$, respectively.

We discuss the most salient aspects of the encoding in Fig. 3.8.

- While linear variables are encoded as in Chapter 2, the encoding of an unrestricted variable $x[j]$, not treated in Chapter 2, is much more interesting: it first connects to a server along channel x via a request $x^!(x_i)$ followed by a selection on $x_i.l_j$, which takes the j -th branch.
- The encoding of $\lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ confirms its behaviour first followed by the receiving of a channel x . The channel x provides a linear channel x^ℓ and an unrestricted channel $x^!$ for dedicated substitutions of the linear and unrestricted bag components.
- We encode $M(C * U)$ as a non-deterministic sum: an application involves a choice in the order in which the elements of C are substituted.
- The encoding of $C * U$ synchronises with the encoding of $\lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$. The channel x^ℓ provides the linear behaviour of the bag C while $x^!$ provides the behaviour of U ; this is done by guarding the encoding of U with a server connection such that every time a channel synchronises with $!x^!(x_i)$ a fresh copy of U is spawned.
- The encoding of $\lambda M \}.C$ synchronises with the encoding of $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$, just discussed. The name y_i is used to trigger a failure in the computation if there is a lack of elements in the encoding of the bag.
- The encoding of $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ first confirms the availability of the linear behaviour along x^ℓ . Then it sends a name y_i , which is used to collapse the process in the case of a failed reduction. Subsequently, for each shared variable, the encoding receives a name, which will act as an occurrence of the shared variable. At the end, a failure prefix on x is used to signal that there is no further information to send over.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket x \rrbracket_u &= x.\overline{\text{some}}; [x \leftrightarrow u] \\
\llbracket x[j] \rrbracket_u &= \bar{x}^1?(x_i).x_i.l_j; [x_i \leftrightarrow u] \\
\llbracket \lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u &= u.\overline{\text{some}}; u(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \\
\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle \rrbracket_u &= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu x)(x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x) \\
\llbracket M(C * U) \rrbracket_u &= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x)) \\
\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x &= x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}(x^\ell).(\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \bar{x}(x^1).(!x^1(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid x.\overline{\text{close}})) \\
\llbracket \langle M \rangle \cdot C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} &= x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\langle M \rangle \cdot C)}; x^\ell(y_i).x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(\langle M \rangle \cdot C)}; x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}^\ell(x_i). \\
&\quad (x_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M)}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid y_i.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
\llbracket \mathbf{1} \rrbracket_{x^\ell} &= x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell(y_n).(y_n.\overline{\text{some}}; y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
\llbracket \mathbf{1}^! \rrbracket_x &= x.\overline{\text{none}} \\
\llbracket \langle N \rangle^! \rrbracket_x &= \llbracket N \rrbracket_x \\
\llbracket U \rrbracket_x &= x.\text{case}_{U_i \in U} \{ \mathbf{1}_i : \llbracket U_i \rrbracket_x \} \\
\llbracket M \langle N/x \rangle \rrbracket_u &= (\nu x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N)}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_x) \\
\llbracket M \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket \rrbracket_u &= (\nu x^!)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid !x^!(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
\llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u &= x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}^\ell(y_i).(y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_i.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
\llbracket M[x_1, \dots, x_n \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u &= x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}^\ell(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid \\
&\quad x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_n\})}; x^\ell(x_1). \llbracket M[x_2, \dots, x_n \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u) \\
\llbracket \mathbb{M} + \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u \oplus \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u \\
\llbracket \text{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_k} \rrbracket_u &= u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid x_k.\overline{\text{none}}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 3.8: Encoding $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^! \lambda$ into $s\pi$ (cf. Def. 3.14).

- The encoding of U synchronises with the last half encoding of $x[j]$; the name x_i selects the j -th term in the unrestricted bag.
- The encoding of $M \langle N/x \rangle$ is the composition of the encodings of M and N , where we await a confirmation of a behaviour along the variable that is being substituted.
- $M \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket$ is encoded as the composition of the encoding of M and a server guarding the encoding of U : in order for $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u$ to gain access to $\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}$ it must first synchronise with the server channel $x^!$ to spawn a fresh copy of U .
- The encoding of $\mathbb{M} + \mathbb{N}$ homomorphically preserves non-determinism. Finally, the encoding of $\text{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_k}$ simply triggers failure on u and on each of x_1, \dots, x_k .

Example 3.10

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbf{unit} \rrbracket &= \& \mathbf{1} \\
\llbracket \eta \rrbracket &= \&_{\eta_i \in \eta} \{ \mathbf{1}_i; \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket \} \\
\llbracket (\sigma^k, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket &= \&(\overline{\llbracket (\sigma^k, \eta) \rrbracket}_{(\sigma, i)}} \wp \llbracket \tau \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket (\sigma^k, \eta) \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)} &= \oplus((\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)} \otimes (!\llbracket \eta \rrbracket) \otimes (\mathbf{1}))) \\
\llbracket \sigma \wedge \pi \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)} &= \overline{\&((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\& \oplus ((\& \overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}) \wp (\overline{\llbracket \pi \rrbracket}_{(\sigma, i)}))))} \\
&= \oplus((\& \mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket) \otimes (\llbracket \pi \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)})))) \\
\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)} &= \begin{cases} \overline{\&((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\& \oplus \perp))} & \text{if } i = 0 \\ \overline{\&((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\& \oplus ((\& \overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i-1)}))))} & \text{if } i > 0 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 3.9: Encoding of intersection types into session types (cf. Def. 3.15)

[Cont. example 3.2] We illustrate the encoding $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ on the $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$ -terms/bags occurring in $M_1 = \lambda x. x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x](\llbracket (N) \rrbracket \cdot \int * \llbracket (U) \rrbracket \cdot)$ as below:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \lambda x. x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v &= v. \overline{\text{some}}; v(x). x. \overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell). x(x^1). x[]; \llbracket x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \\
\llbracket \llbracket (N) \rrbracket \cdot \int * \llbracket (U) \rrbracket \cdot \rrbracket_x &= x. \text{some}_{\text{fv}(\llbracket (N) \rrbracket \cdot \int)}; \bar{x}(x^\ell). (\llbracket (N) \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \bar{x}(x^1). (!x^1(x_i). \llbracket (U) \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \bar{x}[])) \\
\llbracket (M_1) \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket \lambda x. x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x] \llbracket (N) \rrbracket \cdot \int * \llbracket (U) \rrbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u \\
&= (v\nu)(\llbracket \lambda x. x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \mid v. \text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(\llbracket (N) \rrbracket \cdot \int)}; \bar{v}(x). ([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket \llbracket (N) \rrbracket \cdot \int * \llbracket (U) \rrbracket \cdot \rrbracket_x)) \\
&= (v\nu)(v. \overline{\text{some}}; v(x). x. \overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell). x(x^1). x[]; x^\ell. \overline{\text{some}}. x^\ell(y_1). (y_1. \text{some}_\emptyset; y_1[]; \mathbf{0} \mid \\
&\quad x^\ell. \overline{\text{some}}; x^\ell. \text{some}_u; x^\ell(x_1). x^\ell. \overline{\text{some}}. x^\ell(y_2). (y_2. \text{some}_{u, x_1}; y_2[]; \llbracket x_1 \rrbracket_v \mid x^\ell. \overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\
&\quad v. \text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(\llbracket (N) \rrbracket \cdot \int)}; \bar{v}(x). ([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \\
&\quad x. \text{some}_{\text{fv}(\llbracket (N) \rrbracket \cdot \int)}; \bar{x}(x^\ell). (x^\ell. \text{some}_{\text{fv}(\llbracket (N) \rrbracket \cdot \int)}; x^\ell. \text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(\llbracket (N) \rrbracket \cdot \int)}); \\
&\quad x^\ell. \overline{\text{some}}; x^\ell(x_1). (x_1. \text{some}_{\text{fv}(\llbracket (N) \rrbracket \cdot \int)}; \llbracket (N) \rrbracket_{x_1} \mid y_1. \overline{\text{none}} \mid x^\ell. \text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell(y_2). \\
&\quad (y_2. \overline{\text{some}}; y_2[] \mid x^\ell. \text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell. \overline{\text{none}}) \mid \bar{x}(x^1). (!x^1(x_i). \llbracket (U) \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \bar{x}[]))) \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

We now encode intersection types (for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$) into session types (for π).

Definition 3.15 From $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$ into π : Types

The translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ in Figure 3.9 extends as follows to a context $\Gamma = x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_m : \sigma_m, v_1 : \pi_1, \dots, v_n : \pi_n$ and a context $\Theta = x_1^! : \eta_1, \dots, x_k^! : \eta_k$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket &= x_1 : \& \overline{\llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket}, \dots, x_m : \& \overline{\llbracket \sigma_m \rrbracket}, v_1 : \overline{\llbracket \pi_1 \rrbracket}_{(\sigma, i_1)}, \dots, v_n : \overline{\llbracket \pi_n \rrbracket}_{(\sigma, i_n)} \\
\llbracket \Theta \rrbracket &= x_1^! : \overline{\llbracket \eta_1 \rrbracket}, \dots, x_k^! : \overline{\llbracket \eta_k \rrbracket}
\end{aligned}$$

□

This encoding formally expresses how non-deterministic session protocols (typed with ‘&’) capture linear and unrestricted resource consumption in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$. Notice that

the encoding of the multiset type π depends on two arguments (a strict type σ and a number $i \geq 0$) which are left unspecified above. This is crucial to represent failures in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{!z}$ as typable processes in $s\pi$. For instance, given $(\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau$ and (σ^k, η) , the well-formedness rule for application admits a mismatch ($j \neq k$, cf. Rule [FS:app] in Fig. B.3, App. B.4). In our proof of type preservation, the two arguments of the encoding are instantiated appropriately. Notice also how the client-server behaviour of unrestricted resources appears as ‘! $\llbracket \eta \rrbracket$ ’ in the encoding of the tuple type (σ^k, η) . With our encodings of expressions and types in place, we can now define our encoding of judgements:

Definition 3.16

If \mathbb{M} is an $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{!z}$ expression such that $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ then we define the encoding of the judgement to be: $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$.

□

The correctness of our encoding $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u : \widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{!z} \rightarrow s\pi$, stated in Theorem 3.3 (and detailed in App. B.6), relies on a notion of *success* for both $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{!z}$ and $s\pi$, given by the \checkmark construct:

Definition 3.17

We extend the syntax of terms for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{!z}$ and processes for $s\pi$ with \checkmark :

- (**In $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{!z}$**) $\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$ iff there exist M_1, \dots, M_k such that $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow^* M_1 + \dots + M_k$ and $\text{head}(M_j) = \checkmark$, for some $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and term M'_j such that $M_j \equiv_{\lambda} M'_j$.
- (**In $s\pi$**) $P \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$ holds whenever there exists a P' such that $P \longrightarrow^* P'$ and P' contains an unguarded occurrence of \checkmark (i.e., an occurrence that does not occur behind a prefix).

□

We now state operational correctness. Fig. 3.10 illustrates the relation between completeness and soundness that the encoding satisfies: solid arrows denote reductions assumed, dashed arrows denote the application of $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u$, and dotted arrows denote the existing reductions that can be implied from the results.

We remark that since $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{!z}$ satisfies the diamond property, it suffices to consider completeness based on a single reduction ($\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$). Soundness uses the congruence \equiv_{λ} in Def. 3.12. We write $N \longrightarrow_{\equiv_{\lambda}} N'$ iff $N \equiv_{\lambda} N_1 \longrightarrow N_2 \equiv_{\lambda} N'$, for some N_1, N_2 . Then, $\longrightarrow_{\equiv_{\lambda}}^*$ is the reflexive, transitive closure of $\longrightarrow_{\equiv_{\lambda}}$. For success sensitivity, we decree $\llbracket \checkmark \rrbracket_u = \checkmark$. We have:

Theorem 3.3 (Operational Correctness) *Let \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{M} be well-formed $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{!z}$ closed expressions.*




Figure 3.10: An overview of operational soundness and completeness for $[\cdot]_u$.

(a) (Type Preservation) Let B be a bag. We have:

- (i) If $\Theta; \Gamma \models B : (\sigma^k, \eta)$ then $[B]_u \models [\Gamma], u : [(\sigma^k, \eta)]_{(\sigma, i)}; [\Theta]$.
- (ii) If $\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \tau$ then $[M]_u \models [\Gamma], u : [\tau]; [\Theta]$.

(b) (Completeness) If $N \rightarrow M$ then there exists Q such that $[N]_u \rightarrow^* Q \equiv_{\lambda} [M]_u$.

(c) (Soundness) If $[N]_u \rightarrow^* Q$ then $Q \rightarrow^* Q'$, $N \rightarrow_{\equiv_{\lambda}}^* N'$ and $[N']_u \equiv Q'$, for some Q', N' .

(d) (Success Sensitivity) $M \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$ if, and only if, $[M]_u \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$.

Proof: Below we illustrate the most interesting case of the proof of soundness. Detailed proof can be found in App. B.6. \square

Proof: All items are proven by structural induction; a detailed proof can be found in App. B.6.

Below we present the most interesting case in the proof of *soundness*: the case when $N = M(C * U)$. Then,

$$[N]_u = [M(C * U)]_u = \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v)([M]_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid [C_i * U]_x)).$$

The proof then proceeds by induction on the number of reduction steps k that can be taken from $[N]_u$, i.e. $[N]_u \rightarrow^k Q$. We will consider the case when $k \geq 1$, where for some process R and non-negative integers n, m such that $k = n + m$, we have the following:

$$[N]_u \rightarrow^m \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v)(R \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid [C_i * U]_x)) \rightarrow^n Q$$

There are several cases to analyse depending on the values of m and n , and the shape of M . We consider $m = 0$, $n \geq 1$ and $M = (\lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow$

$x]]\langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^! \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^! \rrbracket$, where $p, q \geq 0$. Then, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u$ can perform the following reduction:

$$\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u \longrightarrow^* \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}, x)(x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^l).x(x^l).x[]; \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid Q'' \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x) \quad (:= Q_3)$$

where Q'' defines the encoding of explicit substitutions within the encoded subterm M . Notice that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{N} &= (\lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]))\langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^! \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^! \rrbracket (C * U) \\ &\equiv_{\lambda} (\lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])(C * U))\langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^! \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^! \rrbracket \\ &\longrightarrow M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle (C * U)/x \rangle \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^! \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^! \rrbracket = \mathbb{M} \end{aligned}$$

where the congruence holds assuming the necessary α -renaming of variables. Finally, one can verify that $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u = Q_3$, and the result follows. \square

Example 3.11

Recall again term M_1 from Example 3.2. It can be shown that $(M_1)^\bullet \longrightarrow^* (N)^\bullet \llbracket (U)^\bullet / x^! \rrbracket$. To illustrate operational completeness, we can verify preservation of reduction, via $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$: reductions below use the rules for π in Figure 3.5—see Figure 3.11. \square

$$\begin{aligned}
& \llbracket (M_1)^\bullet \rrbracket = \\
& (\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v})(\mathbf{v}.\overline{\text{some}}; \mathbf{v}(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x[]; x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1[]; \mathbf{0} \mid \\
& \quad x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; x^\ell.\text{some}_u; x^\ell(x_1).x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y_2.[]; \llbracket x_1 \rrbracket_v \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\
& \quad \mathbf{v}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; \overline{\mathbf{v}}(x).([\mathbf{v} \leftrightarrow u] \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; \overline{x}(x^\ell).(x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; x^\ell(y_1). \\
& \quad x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(x_1).(x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; \llbracket \langle N \rangle^\bullet \rrbracket_{x_1} \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; \\
& \quad x^\ell(y_2).(y_2.\overline{\text{some}}; \overline{y_2}[] \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \overline{x}(x^1).(!x^1(x_i).\llbracket \langle U \rangle^\bullet \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \overline{x}[]))) \\
& \longrightarrow^3 (\mathbf{v}x)(x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x[]; x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1[]; \mathbf{0} \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; x^\ell.\text{some}_u; \\
& \quad x^\ell(x_1).x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y_2.[]; \llbracket x_1 \rrbracket_u \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid (x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; \overline{x}(x^\ell). \\
& \quad (x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; x^\ell(y_1).x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(x_1).(x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; \llbracket \langle N \rangle^\bullet \rrbracket_{x_1} \mid \\
& \quad y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell(y_2).(y_2.\overline{\text{some}}; \overline{y_2}[] \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\
& \quad \overline{x}(x^1).(!x^1(x_i).\llbracket \langle U \rangle^\bullet \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \overline{x}[]))) \\
& \longrightarrow^2 (\mathbf{v}x, x^\ell)(x(x^1).x.[]; x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1[]; \mathbf{0} \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; x^\ell.\text{some}_u; x^\ell(x_1). \\
& \quad x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y_2.[]; \llbracket x_1 \rrbracket_u \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid (x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; x^\ell(y_1). \\
& \quad x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(x_1).(x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; \llbracket \langle N \rangle^\bullet \rrbracket_{x_1} \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell(y_2). \\
& \quad (y_2.\overline{\text{some}}; \overline{y_2}[] \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \overline{x}(x^1).(!x^1(x_i).\llbracket \langle U \rangle^\bullet \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \overline{x}[]))) \\
& \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x, x^\ell, x^1)(x[]; x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1[]; \mathbf{0} \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; x^\ell.\text{some}_u; x^\ell(x_1).x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}. \\
& \quad \overline{x^\ell}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y_2.[]; \llbracket x_1 \rrbracket_u \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid (x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; x^\ell(y_1).x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; \\
& \quad x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(x_1).(x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; \llbracket \langle N \rangle^\bullet \rrbracket_{x_1} \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \\
& \quad x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell(y_2).(y_2.\overline{\text{some}}; \overline{y_2}[] \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid !x^1(x_i).\llbracket \langle U \rangle^\bullet \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \overline{x}[])) \\
& \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^\ell, x^1)(x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.[]; \mathbf{0} \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; x^\ell.\text{some}_u; x^\ell(x_1). \\
& \quad x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y_2.[]; \llbracket x_1 \rrbracket_u \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid (x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; x^\ell(y_1). \\
& \quad x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(x_1).(x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; \llbracket \langle N \rangle^\bullet \rrbracket_{x_1} \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \\
& \quad x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell(y_2).(y_2.\overline{\text{some}}; \overline{y_2}[] \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid !x^1(x_i).\llbracket \langle U \rangle^\bullet \rrbracket_{x_i})) \\
& \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^\ell, y_1, x^1)(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.[]; \mathbf{0} \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; x^\ell.\text{some}_u; x^\ell(x_1).x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_2). \\
& \quad (y_2.\text{some}_{u,x_1}; y_2.[]; \llbracket x_1 \rrbracket_u \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid (x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(x_1).(x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; \\
& \quad \llbracket \langle N \rangle^\bullet \rrbracket_{x_1} \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell(y_2).(y_2.\overline{\text{some}}; \overline{y_2}[] \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\
& \quad !x^1(x_i).\llbracket \langle U \rangle^\bullet \rrbracket_{x_i})) \\
& \longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x_1, x^1)(x_1.\overline{\text{some}}; [x_1 \leftrightarrow u] \mid x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\langle N \rangle^\bullet)}; \llbracket \langle N \rangle^\bullet \rrbracket_{x_1} \mid !x^1(x_i).\llbracket \langle U \rangle^\bullet \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
& \longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket \langle N \rangle^\bullet \rrbracket_u \mid !x^1(x_i).\llbracket \langle U \rangle^\bullet \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
& = \llbracket \langle N \rangle^\bullet \llbracket \langle U \rangle^\bullet / x^1 \rrbracket_u
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 3.11: Illustrating operational correspondence, following Example 3.11.

3.4.5 A Motivating Example

We use a cyclic task scheduler for automated maintenance as a motivating example. Consider a server that is running a maintenance routine; the user wants the server to be able to run independently in the background without having to worry about its condition. The server has a list of operations that it must perform, such as running virus checks (VC), clearing memory (CM), and defragmenting its storage (DS). These tasks must be run periodically throughout while the server is running and hence they must be called multiple times. Finally, these tasks are run cyclically, with each task being executed in sequence, and the cycle repeats until a stop notification is received.

We sketch the design of functions of this nature, which we are able to conceive due to the underlying encoding including client-server behaviours, given in this chapter. Consider the reduction in the binary case:

$$\frac{x \in \text{fv}(M)}{(\lambda x.M)(N_1 \succ N_2) \longrightarrow (\lambda x.M\{N_1/x\})(N_2 \succ N_1)}$$

Above, $M\{N_1/x\}$ represents a substitution of N_1 for a single occurrence of the left-most x in the term M . Also, $N_1 \succ N_2$ denotes the non-deterministic choice interpreted as N_1 is the resource that must be used first then N_2 ; that is, the resources N_1 and N_2 can be seen as queued. Then this reduction substitutes the N_1 for x and moves N_1 to the end of the queue. We can consider this behaviour a subset of the behaviour expressible in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$ as $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \downarrow}$ allows for the substitution of resources in any order rather than cycling through each resource in turn. Our correct encoding gives us guideline that allow for the underlying process model to give semantics to this function.

Now consider the following function:

$$M = (\lambda x.\text{sequence8}(\text{execute}(x)))(\text{VC} \succ \text{CM} \succ \text{DS})$$

Here we assume access to the function ‘execute(x)’, which takes in a task such as VC and executes it, and ‘sequenceN’, which is a function that takes N elements and runs them one at a time in sequence and then terminates (similar to sequence3 in Section 2.6). In this term, ‘execute(x)’ is the only resource applied to ‘sequence8’ and hence the order does not matter in this substitution. In other words, we could consider ‘sequence8(execute(x))’ to be equivalent to:

$$\text{execute}(x); \text{execute}(x); \text{execute}(x); \text{execute}(x); \text{execute}(x); \text{execute}(x); \text{execute}(x); \text{execute}(x)$$

In the underlying process model both ‘execute’ and our tasks VC, CM and DS can be considered *servers*. In fact ‘execute’ can be called an arbitrary number of times and hence must be readily available. From our encoding we know that unrestricted

resources act as servers within the concurrent paradigm; hence, we may interpret that the tasks (for example DS) are invoked via a server call when the task needs to be performed. Similarly, `execute` behaves as a server providing the corresponding behaviour. Given this, we can have reductions of the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
M &= (\lambda x. \text{sequence8}(\text{execute}(x)))(VC \succ CM \succ DS) \\
&\longrightarrow (\lambda x. \text{execute}(x); \text{execute}(x); \text{execute}(x); \text{execute}(x); \dots)(CM \succ DS \succ VC) \\
&= (\lambda x. \text{execute}(VC); \text{execute}(x); \text{execute}(x); \text{execute}(x); \dots)(CM \succ DS \succ VC) \\
&\longrightarrow (\lambda x. \text{execute}(VC); \text{execute}(CM); \text{execute}(x); \text{execute}(x); \dots)(DS \succ VC \succ CM) \\
&\longrightarrow (\lambda x. \text{execute}(VC); \text{execute}(CM); \text{execute}(DS); \text{execute}(x); \dots)(VC \succ CM \succ DS) \\
&\longrightarrow \dots
\end{aligned}$$

After eight iterations of executing tasks, the term M terminates. The reduction of M will run the given tasks in sequence until terminating, allowing for each task to be used an arbitrary amount of times.

The extension of the calculus $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ with sequencing as in Section 2.6 with the following function also allows us to express this behaviour:

$$(\lambda x. \text{execute}(x[1]); \text{execute}(x[2]); \text{execute}(x[3]); \text{execute}(x[1]); \dots) \wr VC, CM, DS \wr^!$$

where ‘ $\text{execute}(x[1]); \text{execute}(x[2]); \text{execute}(x[3]); \text{execute}(x[1]); \dots$ ’ denotes the finite sequence of executions that occurs before terminating. Each execution takes the argument $x[i]$ and each subsequent call increases the index i , thus mimicking the behaviour of the unrestricted resources in $\wr VC, CM, DS \wr^!$ being called in sequence.

3.5 Concluding Remarks

Summary We have extended the line of work we developed in Chapter 2, on resource λ -calculi with firm logical foundations via typed concurrent processes. We presented $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, a resource calculus with non-determinism and explicit failures, with dedicated treatment for linear and unrestricted resources. By means of examples, we illustrated the expressivity, (lazy) semantics, and design decisions underpinning $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, and introduced a class of well-formed expressions based on intersection types, which includes fail-prone expressions. To bear witness to the logical foundations of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, we defined and proved correct a typed encoding into the concurrent calculus π , which subsumes the one in Chapter 2. We plan to study key properties for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ (such as solvability and normalisation) by leveraging our typed encoding into π .

Related Work With respect to previous resource calculi, a distinctive feature of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$ is its support of explicit failures, which may arise depending on the interplay

between (i) linear and unrestricted occurrences of variables in a term and (ii) associated resources in the bag. This feature allows $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$ to express variants of usual λ -terms (\mathbf{I} , Δ , Ω) not expressible in other resource calculi.

Related to $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$ is Boudol's work on a λ -calculus in which multiplicities can be infinite [Boudol \(1993\)](#); [Boudol & Laneve \(2000\)](#). An intersection type system is used to prove *adequacy* with respect to a testing semantics. However, failing behaviours as well as typability are not explored. Multiplicities can be expressed in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$: a linear resource is available m times when the linear bag contains m copies of it; the term fails if the corresponding number of linear variables is different from m .

Also related is the resource λ -calculus by [Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca \(2010\)](#), which includes linear and reusable resources; the latter are available in multisets, also called bags. In their setting, $M[N^1]$ denotes an application of a term M to a resource N that can be used *ad libitum*. Standard terms such as \mathbf{I} , Δ and Ω are expressed as $\lambda x.x$, $\Delta := \lambda x.x[x^1]$, and $\Omega := \Delta[\Delta^1]$, respectively; different variants are possible but cannot express the desired behaviour. A lazy reduction semantics is based on *baby* and *giant* steps: whereas the first consume one resource at each time, the second comprises several baby steps; combinations of the use of resources (by permuting resources in bags) are considered. A (non-idempotent) intersection type system is proposed: normalisation and a characterisation of solvability are investigated. Unlike our work, encodings into the π -calculus are not explored in [Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca \(2010\)](#).

Chapter 4

Typed Non-determinism in Functional and Concurrent Calculi

We study functional and concurrent calculi with non-determinism, along with type systems to control resources based on linearity. The interplay between non-determinism and linearity is delicate: careless handling of branches can discard resources meant to be used exactly once. Here we go beyond prior work by considering non-determinism in its standard sense: once a branch is selected, the rest are discarded. Our technical contributions are three-fold. First, we introduce a π -calculus with non-deterministic choice, governed by session types. Second, we introduce a resource λ -calculus, governed by intersection types, in which non-determinism concerns fetching of resources from bags. Finally, we connect our two typed non-deterministic calculi via a correct translation.

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, we present new formulations of typed programming calculi with *non-determinism*. A classical ingredient of models of computation, non-determinism brings flexibility and generality in specifications. In process calculi such as CCS and the π -calculus, one source of non-determinism is choice, which is typically *non-confluent*: that is, given $P + Q$, we have either $P + Q \longrightarrow P$ or $P + Q \longrightarrow Q$. Thus, committing to a branch entails discarding the rest.

We study non-determinism as a way of increasing the expressivity of typed calculi in which resource control is based on *linearity*. The interplay between non-determinism and linearity is delicate: a careless discarding of branches can jeopardize resources meant to be used exactly once. On the concurrent side, we consider

the π -calculus, the paradigmatic model of concurrency [Sangiorgi & Walker \(2001\)](#). We focus on π -calculi with *session types* [Honda \(1993\)](#); [Honda et al. \(1998a\)](#), in which linear logic principles ensure communication correctness: here the resources are names that perform session protocols; they can be *unrestricted* (used multiple times) and *linear* (used exactly once). To properly control resources, non-confluent non-determinism is confined to unrestricted names; linear names can only perform deterministic choices.

In this context, considering *confluent* forms of non-determinism can be appealing. Intuitively, such formulations allow all branches to proceed independently: given $P_1 \longrightarrow Q_1$ and $P_2 \longrightarrow Q_2$, then $P_1 + P_2 \longrightarrow Q_1 + P_2$ and $P_1 + P_2 \longrightarrow P_1 + Q_2$. Because confluent non-determinism does not discard branches, it is compatible with a resource-conscious view of computation.

Confluent non-determinism has been studied mostly in the functional setting; it is present, e.g., in Pagani and Ronchi della Rocca’s resource λ -calculus ([Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca \(2010\)](#)) and in Ehrhard and Regnier’s differential λ -calculus ([Ehrhard & Regnier \(2003\)](#)). In [Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca \(2010\)](#), non-determinism resides in the application of a term M to a *bag* of available resources C ; a β -reduction applies M to a resource *non-deterministically fetched* from C . Confluent non-deterministic choice is also present in the session-typed π -calculus by [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#), where it expresses a choice between different implementations of the same session protocols, which are all *non-deterministically available*—they may be available but may also *fail*. In their work, a Curry-Howard correspondence between linear logic and session types (*‘propositions-as-sessions’* [Caires & Pfenning \(2010\)](#); [Wadler \(2012\)](#)) ensures confluence, protocol fidelity, and deadlock-freedom. Chapters 2 and 3 relate functional and concurrent calculi with confluent non-determinism: they give a translation of a resource λ -calculus into the session π -calculus from [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#), in the style of Milner’s *‘functions-as-processes’* ([Milner \(1990\)](#)).

Although results involving confluent non-determinism are most significant, usual (non-confluent) non-determinism remains of undiscussed convenience in formal modeling; consider, e.g., specifications of distributed protocols [Berger & Honda \(2000\)](#); [Nestmann et al. \(2003\)](#) in which commitment is essential. Indeed, non-confluent non-deterministic choice is commonplace in verification frameworks such as mCRL2 [Groote & Mousavi \(2014\)](#). It is also relevant in functional calculi; a well-known framework is [de’Liguoro & Piperno \(1995\)](#) (untyped) non-deterministic λ -calculus (see also [Dezani-Ciancaglini \(1996\)](#) and references therein).

To further illustrate the difference between confluent and non-confluent non-determinism, we consider an example adapted from [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#): a movie server that offers a choice between buying a movie or watching its trailer. In $s\pi^+$, the typed π -calculus that we present in this chapter, this server can be specified as

follows:

$$\text{Server}_s = s.\text{case} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{buy} : s(\text{title}); s(\text{paym}); \bar{s}[\text{movie}]; \bar{s}[] \\ \text{peek} : s(\text{title}); \bar{s}[\text{trailer}]; \bar{s}[] \end{array} \right\} \begin{array}{l} -\text{Server}_s^{\text{buy}} \\ -\text{Server}_s^{\text{peek}} \end{array}$$

where $s(-)$ and $\bar{s}[-]$ denote input and output prefixes on a name/channel s , respectively, and ‘movie’ and ‘trailer’ denote references to primitive data. Also, the free names of a process are denoted with subscripts. Process Server_s offers a choice on name s ($s.\text{case}\{-\}$) between labels buy and peek. If buy is received, process $\text{Server}_s^{\text{buy}}$ is launched: it receives the movie’s title and a payment method, sends the movie, and closes the session on s ($\bar{s}[]$). If peek is received, it proceeds as $\text{Server}_s^{\text{peek}}$: the server receives the title, sends the trailer, and closes the session.

Using the non-deterministic choice operator of $s\pi^+$, denoted ‘ \ddagger ’, we can specify a process for a client Alice who is interested in the movie ‘Jaws’ but is undecided about buying the film or just watching its trailer for free:

$$\text{Alice}_s := \begin{array}{l} \bar{s}.\text{buy}; \bar{s}[\text{Jaws}]; \bar{s}[\text{mcard}]; s(\text{movie}); s(); \mathbf{0} \\ \ddagger \bar{s}.\text{peek}; \bar{s}[\text{Jaws}]; s(\text{trailer}); s(); \mathbf{0} \end{array} \begin{array}{l} -\text{Alice}_s^{\text{buy}} \\ -\text{Alice}_s^{\text{peek}} \end{array}$$

If Alice_s selects the label buy ($\bar{s}.\text{buy}$), process $\text{Alice}_s^{\text{buy}}$ is launched: it sends title and payment method, receives the movie, waits for the session to close ($s()$), and then terminates ($\mathbf{0}$). If Alice_s selects peek, process $\text{Alice}_s^{\text{peek}}$ is launched: it sends a title, receives the trailer, waits for the session to close, and terminates. Then, process $\text{Sys} := (\mathbf{v}s)(\text{Server}_s \mid \text{Alice}_s)$ denotes the composition of client and server, connected along s (using $(\mathbf{v}s)$). Our semantics for $s\pi^+$, denoted \rightsquigarrow , enforces non-confluent non-determinism, as Sys can reduce to separate processes, as expected:

$$\text{Sys} \rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}s)(\text{Server}_s^{\text{buy}} \mid \text{Alice}_s^{\text{buy}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Sys} \rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}s)(\text{Server}_s^{\text{peek}} \mid \text{Alice}_s^{\text{peek}})$$

In contrast, the confluent non-deterministic choice from [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#), denoted ‘ \oplus ’, behaves differently: in their confluent semantics, Sys reduces to a *single* process including *both alternatives*, i.e., $\text{Sys} \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}s)(\text{Server}_s^{\text{buy}} \mid \text{Alice}_s^{\text{buy}}) \oplus (\mathbf{v}s)(\text{Server}_s^{\text{peek}} \mid \text{Alice}_s^{\text{peek}})$.

Contributions. We study new concurrent and functional calculi with usual (non-confluent) forms of non-determinism. Framed in the typed (resource-conscious) setting, we strive for definitions that do not exert a too drastic discarding of branches (as in the non-confluent case) but also that do not exhibit a lack of commitment (as in the confluent case). Concretely, we present:

(§ 4.2) $s\pi^+$, a variant of the session-typed π -calculus in [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#), now with non-confluent non-deterministic choice. Its semantics adapts to the

typed setting the usual semantics of non-deterministic choice in the untyped π -calculus [Sangiorgi & Walker \(2001\)](#). Well-typed processes enjoy type preservation and deadlock-freedom (Theorems 4.1 and 4.2).

(§ 4.3) λ_C^ℓ , a resource λ -calculus with non-determinism, enhanced with constructs for expressing resource usage and failure. Its non-idempotent intersection type system provides a quantitative measure of the need/usage of resources. Well-typed terms enjoy subject reduction and subject expansion (Theorems 4.3 and 4.4).

(§ 4.4) A typed translation of λ_C^ℓ into $\mathsf{s}\pi^+$, which provides further validation for our non-deterministic calculi, and casts them in the context of ‘functions-as-processes’. We prove that our translation is *correct*, i.e., it preserves types and satisfies tight operational correspondences (Theorems 4.5 and 4.6).

Moreover, § 4.5 closes by discussing related works. Appendices contain (i) omitted material (in particular, proofs of technical results); (ii) an alternative *eager* semantics for $\mathsf{s}\pi^+$, which we compare against the lazy semantics; and (iii) extensions of $\mathsf{s}\pi^+$ and λ_C^ℓ with *unrestricted* resources.

4.2 A Typed π -calculus with Non-deterministic Choice

We introduce $\mathsf{s}\pi^+$, a session-typed π -calculus with non-deterministic choice. Following [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#), session types express protocols to be executed along channels. These protocols can be *non-deterministic*: sessions may succeed but also fail. The novelty in $\mathsf{s}\pi^+$ is the non-deterministic choice operator ‘ $P \parallel Q$ ’, whose *lazily committing semantics* is compatible with linearity. We prove that well-typed processes satisfy two key properties: *type preservation* and *deadlock-freedom*.

4.2.1 Syntax and Semantics

We use P, Q, \dots to denote processes, and x, y, z, \dots to denote *names* representing channels. Figure 4.1 (top) gives the syntax of processes. $P\{y/z\}$ denotes the capture-avoiding substitution of y for z in P . Process $\mathbf{0}$ denotes inaction, and $[x \leftrightarrow y]$ is a forwarder: a bidirectional link between x and y . Parallel composition appears in two forms: while the process $P | Q$ denotes communication-free concurrency, process $(\mathbf{v}x)(P | Q)$ uses restriction $(\mathbf{v}x)$ to express that P and Q implement complementary behaviors on x and do not share any other names.

Process $P \parallel Q$ denotes the non-deterministic choice between P and Q : intuitively, if one choice can perform a synchronization, the other option may be discarded if it cannot. Since \parallel is associative, we often omit parentheses. Also, we write $\prod_{i \in I} P_i$ for the non-deterministic choice between each P_i for $i \in I$.

Our output construct integrates parallel composition and restriction: process $\bar{x}[y]; (P | Q)$ sends a fresh name y along x and then continues as $P | Q$. The type sys-

| | | | |
|--|--|--|-----------------|
| $P, Q ::= \mathbf{0}$ | inaction | $ [x \leftrightarrow y]$ | forwarder |
| $ (\mathbf{v}x)(P Q)$ | connect | $ P \# Q$ | non-determinism |
| $ \bar{x}[y]; (P Q)$ | output | $ x(y); P$ | input |
| $ \bar{x}.\ell; P$ | select | $ x.\text{case}\{i : P\}_{i \in I}$ | branch |
| $ \bar{x}[]$ | close | $ x(); P$ | wait |
| $ x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n}; P$ | expect | $ \bar{x}.\text{some}; P$ | available |
| $ P Q$ | parallel | $ \bar{x}.\text{none}$ | unavailable |
| | | | |
| $P \equiv P' [P \equiv_\alpha P']$ | $[x \leftrightarrow y] \equiv [y \leftrightarrow x]$ | $P \mathbf{0} \equiv P$ | |
| $(P Q) R \equiv P (Q R)$ | $P Q \equiv Q P$ | $(\mathbf{v}x)(P Q) \equiv (\mathbf{v}x)(Q P)$ | |
| $P \# P \equiv P$ | $P \# Q \equiv Q \# P$ | $(P \# Q) \# R \equiv P \# (Q \# R)$ | |
| $(\mathbf{v}x)((P Q) R) \equiv (\mathbf{v}x)(P R) Q$ | $[x \notin \text{fn}(Q)]$ | | |
| $(\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}y)(P Q) R) \equiv (\mathbf{v}y)((\mathbf{v}x)(P R) Q)$ | $[x \notin \text{fn}(Q), y \notin \text{fn}(R)]$ | | |

Figure 4.1: $s\pi^+$: syntax (top) and structural congruence (bottom).

tem will ensure that behaviors on y and x are implemented by P and Q , respectively, which do not share any names—this separation defines communication-free concurrency and is key to ensuring deadlock-freedom. The input process $x(y); P$ receives a name z along x and continues as $P\{z/y\}$, which does not require the separation present in the output case. Process $x.\text{case}\{i : P_i\}_{i \in I}$ denotes a branch with labeled choices indexed by the finite set I : it awaits a choice on x with continuation P_j for each $j \in I$. The process $\bar{x}.\ell; P$ selects on x the choice labeled ℓ before continuing as P . Processes $\bar{x}[]$ and $x(); P$ are dual actions for closing the session on x . We omit replicated servers $!x(y); P$ and corresponding client requests $?x[y]; P$, but they can be easily added (cf. § C.1).

The remaining constructs define non-deterministic sessions which may provide a protocol or fail, following [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#). Process $\bar{x}.\text{some}; P$ confirms the availability of a session on x and continues as P . Process $\bar{x}.\text{none}$ signals the failure to provide the session on x . Process $x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n}; P$ specifies a dependency on a non-deterministic session on x (names w_1, \dots, w_n implement sessions in P). This process can either (i) synchronize with a ‘ $\bar{x}.\text{some}$ ’ and continue as P , or (ii) synchronize with a ‘ $\bar{x}.\text{none}$ ’, discard P , and propagate the failure to w_1, \dots, w_n . To reduce eye strain, in writing $x.\text{some}$ we freely combine names and sets of names. This way, e.g., we write $x.\text{some}_{y, \text{fn}(P), \text{fn}(Q)}$ rather than $x.\text{some}_{\{y\} \cup \text{fn}(P) \cup \text{fn}(Q)}$.

Name y is bound in $(\mathbf{v}y)(P | Q)$, $\bar{x}[y]; (P | Q)$, and $x(y); P$. We write $\text{fn}(P)$ and $\text{bn}(P)$ for the free and bound names of P , respectively. We adopt Barendregt’s convention.

Structural Congruence. Reduction defines the steps that a process performs on its own. It relies on *structural congruence* (\equiv), the least congruence relation on processes induced by the rules in Figure 4.1 (bottom). Like the syntax of processes, the definition of \equiv is aligned with the type system (defined next), such that \equiv preserves typing (subject congruence, cf. Theorem 4.1). Differently from Caires & Pérez (2017), we do not allow distributing non-deterministic choice over parallel and restriction. As shown in § C.2, the position of a non-deterministic choice in a process determines how it may commit, so changing its position affects commitment.

Reduction: Intuitions and Prerequisites. Barring non-deterministic choice, our reduction rules arise as directed interpretations of proof transformations in the underlying linear logic. We follow Caires & Pfenning (2010) and Wadler (2012) in interpreting cut-elimination in linear logic as synchronization in $\mathfrak{s}\pi^+$.

Before delving into our reduction rules (Figure 4.2), it may be helpful to consider the usual reduction axiom for the (untyped) π -calculus (e.g., Milner et al. (1992); Sangiorgi & Walker (2001)):

$$(\bar{x}[z]; P_1 + M_1) \mid (x(y); P_2 + M_2) \longrightarrow P_1 \mid P_2\{z/y\} \quad (4.1)$$

This axiom captures the interaction of two (binary) choices: it integrates the commitment of choice in synchronization; after the reduction step, the two branches not involved in the synchronization, M_1 and M_2 , are discarded. Our semantics of $\mathfrak{s}\pi^+$ is defined similarly: when a prefix within a branch of a choice synchronizes with its dual, that branch reduces and the entire process commits to it.

The key question at this point is: when and to which branches should we commit? In (4.1), a communication commits to a single branch. For $\mathfrak{s}\pi^+$, we define a *lazy semantics* that minimizes commitment as much as possible.

The intuitive idea is that multiple branches of a choice may contain the same prefix, and so all these branches represent possibilities for synchronization (“possible branches”). Other branches with different prefixes denote different possibilities (“impossible branches”). When one synchronization is chosen, the possible branches are maintained while the impossible ones are discarded.

Example 4.1

To distinguish possible and impossible branches, consider:

$$P := (\mathbf{v}s)(s.\text{case}\{\text{buy} : \dots, \text{peek} : \dots\} \mid (\bar{s}.\text{buy}; \dots \# \bar{s}.\text{buy}; \dots \# \bar{s}.\text{peek}; \dots))$$

The branch construct (case) provides the context for the non-deterministic choice. When the case synchronizes on the ‘buy’ label, the two branches prefixed by ‘ $\bar{s}.\text{buy}$ ’ are possible, whereas the branch prefixed by ‘ $\bar{s}.\text{peek}$ ’ becomes impossible, and can be discarded. The converse occurs when the ‘peek’ label is selected. \square

To formalize these intuitions, our reduction semantics (Figure 4.2) relies on some auxiliary definitions. First, we define contexts.

Definition 4.1

We define *ND-contexts* (\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{M}) as follows:

$$\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{M} ::= [\cdot] \mid \mathbf{N} \mid P \mid (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N} \mid P) \mid \mathbf{N} \# P$$

The process obtained by replacing $[\cdot]$ in \mathbf{N} with P is denoted $\mathbf{N}[P]$. We refer to ND-contexts that do not use the clause ' $\mathbf{N} \# P$ ' as *D-contexts*, denoted \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D} . \square

Using D-contexts, we can express that, e.g., $\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}]$ and $\prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[x(); Q_j]$ should match. To account for reductions with impossible branches, we define a pre-congruence on processes, denoted \succeq_S , where the parameter S denotes the subject(s) of the prefix in the possible branches. Our semantics is closed under \succeq_S . Hence, e.g., anticipating a reduction on x , the possible branch $\mathbf{C}_1[x(y); P]$ can be extended with an impossible branch to form $\mathbf{C}_1[x(y); P] \# \mathbf{C}_2[z(); Q]$.

Before defining \succeq_S (Definition 4.3), we first define prefixes (and their subjects). Below, we write \bar{x} to denote a finite tuple of names x_1, \dots, x_k .

Definition 4.2

Prefixes are defined as follows:

$$\alpha, \beta ::= \bar{x}[y] \mid x(y) \mid \bar{x}.\ell \mid x.\text{case} \mid \bar{x}[] \mid x() \mid \bar{x}.\text{some} \mid \bar{x}.\text{none} \mid x.\text{some}_{\bar{w}} \mid [x \leftrightarrow y]$$

The subjects of α , denoted $\text{subj}\{\alpha\}$, are $\{x, y\}$ in case of $[x \leftrightarrow y]$, or $\{x\}$. By abuse of notation, we write $\alpha; P$ even when α takes no continuation (as in $\bar{x}[]$, $\bar{x}.\text{none}$, and $[x \leftrightarrow y]$) and for $\bar{x}[y]$ which takes a parallel composition as continuation. \square

Definition 4.3

Let \bowtie denote the least relation on prefixes (Def. 4.2) defined by:

(i) $\bar{x}[y] \bowtie \bar{x}[z]$, (ii) $x(y) \bowtie x(z)$, and (iii) $\alpha \bowtie \alpha$ otherwise.

Given a non-empty set $S \subseteq \{x, y\}$, the pre-congruence $P \succeq_S Q$ holds when both following conditions hold:

1. $S = \{x\}$ implies

$$P = \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\alpha_i; P_i] \right) \# \left(\prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{C}_j[\beta_j; Q_j] \right) \text{ and } Q = \prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\alpha_i; P_i], \text{ where}$$

(i) $\forall i, i' \in I. \alpha_i \bowtie \alpha_{i'}$ and $\text{subj}\{\alpha_i\} = \{x\}$, and

(ii) $\forall i \in I. \forall j \in J. \alpha_i \not\bowtie \beta_j \wedge x \in \text{fn}(\beta_j; Q_j)$;

2. $S = \{x, y\}$ implies

$$P = \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[[x \leftrightarrow y]] \right) \# \left(\prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{C}_j[[x \leftrightarrow z_j]] \right) \# \left(\prod_{k \in K} \mathbf{C}_k[\alpha_k; P_k] \right)$$

and $Q = \prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[[x \leftrightarrow y]]$, where

(i) $\forall j \in J. z_j \neq y$, and (ii) $\forall k \in K. x \in \text{fn}(\alpha_k; P_k) \wedge \forall z. \alpha_k \not\bowtie [x \leftrightarrow z]$.

□

Intuitively, \bowtie allows us to equate output/input prefixes with the same subject (but different object). The rest of Definition 4.3 accounts for two kinds of reduction, using S to discard “impossible” branches. In case S is $\{x\}$ (Item 1), it concerns a synchronization on x ; in case S is $\{x, y\}$, it concerns forwarding on x and y (Item 2). In both cases, P and Q contain matching prefixes on x , while P may contain additional branches with different or blocked prefixes on x ; x must appear in the hole of the contexts in the additional branches in P (enforced with $x \in fn(\dots)$), to ensure that no matching prefixes are discarded.

Example 4.2

Recall process P from Example 4.1. To derive a synchronization with the ‘buy’ alternative of the case, we can use \succeq_S to discard the ‘peek’ alternative, as follows: $\bar{s}.buy; \dots \# \bar{s}.buy; \dots \# \bar{s}.peek; \dots \succeq_S \bar{s}.buy; \dots \# \bar{s}.buy; \dots$ □

Reduction Rules. Figure 4.2 gives the rules for the (lazy) reduction semantics, denoted \rightsquigarrow_S , where the set S contains the names involved in the interaction. We omit the curly braces in this annotation; this way, e.g., we write ‘ $\rightsquigarrow_{x,y}$ ’ instead of ‘ $\rightsquigarrow_{\{x,y\}}$ ’. Also, we write \rightsquigarrow_S^k to denote a sequence of $k \geq 0$ reductions.

The first six rules in Figure 4.2 formalize forwarding and communication: they are defined on choices containing different D-contexts (cf. Definition 4.1), each with the same prefix but possibly different continuations; these rules preserve the non-deterministic choices. Rule $[\rightsquigarrow_{ID}]$ fixes S to the forwarder’s two names, and the other rules fix S to the one involved name. In particular, Rule $[\rightsquigarrow_{\otimes_S}]$ formalizes name communication: it involves multiple senders and multiple receivers (grouped in choices indexed by I and J , respectively). Because they proceed in lock-step, reduction leads to substitutions involving the same (fresh) name w ; also, the scopes of the choice and the contexts enclosing the senders is extended.

Rule $[\rightsquigarrow_{\succeq_S}]$ is useful to derive a synchronization that discards groups of choices. Rule $[\rightsquigarrow_{\vee\#}]$ allows inferring reductions when non-deterministic choices are not top-level: e.g., $(\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}[] \mid (\mathbf{v}y)((x(); Q_1 \# x(); Q_2) \mid R)) \rightsquigarrow_x (\mathbf{v}y)(Q_1 \mid R) \# (\mathbf{v}y)(Q_2 \mid R)$. The last four rules formalize that reduction is closed under structural congruence, restriction, parallel composition, and non-deterministic choice.

As mentioned earlier, a key motivation for our work is to have non-deterministic choices that effectively enforce commitment, without a too drastic discarding of alternatives. Next we illustrate this intended form of *gradual commitment*.

Example 4.3 A Modified Movie Server

Consider the following variant of the movie server from the introduction, where

$$\begin{aligned}
& [\rightsquigarrow_{\text{ID}}] (\mathbf{v}x) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i [x \leftrightarrow y] \mid Q \right) \rightsquigarrow_{x,y} \prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i [Q\{y/x\}] \\
& [\rightsquigarrow_{\otimes \otimes}] (\mathbf{v}x) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i [\bar{x}[y_i]; (P_i \mid Q_i)] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j [x(z); R_j] \right) \\
& \quad \rightsquigarrow_x \prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i \left[(\mathbf{v}x) (Q_i \mid (\mathbf{v}w) (P_i \{w/y_i\} \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j [R_j \{w/z\}])) \right] \\
& [\rightsquigarrow_{\oplus \&}] (\mathbf{v}x) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i [\bar{x}.k'; P_i] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j [x.\text{case}\{k : Q_j^k\}_{k \in K}] \right) \\
& \quad \rightsquigarrow_x (\mathbf{v}x) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i [P_i] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j [Q_j^{k'}] \right) \quad [k' \in K] \\
& [\rightsquigarrow_{1\perp}] (\mathbf{v}x) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i [\bar{x}[]] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j [x(); Q_j] \right) \rightsquigarrow_x \prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i [\mathbf{0}] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j [Q_j] \\
& [\rightsquigarrow_{\text{some}}] (\mathbf{v}x) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i [\bar{x}.\text{some}; P_i] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j [x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n}; Q_j] \right) \\
& \quad \rightsquigarrow_x (\mathbf{v}x) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i [P_i] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j [Q_j] \right) \\
& [\rightsquigarrow_{\text{none}}] (\mathbf{v}x) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i [\bar{x}.\text{none}] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j [x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n}; Q_j] \right) \\
& \quad \rightsquigarrow_x \prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i [\mathbf{0}] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j [\bar{w}_1.\text{none} \mid \dots \mid \bar{w}_n.\text{none}] \\
& [\rightsquigarrow_{\succeq_S}] \frac{x \in S \quad P \succeq_S P' \quad Q \succeq_S Q' \quad (\mathbf{v}x)(P' \mid Q') \rightsquigarrow_S R}{(\mathbf{v}x)(P \mid Q) \rightsquigarrow_S R} \\
& [\rightsquigarrow_{\mathbf{v}\parallel}] \frac{(\mathbf{v}x)(P \mid \mathbf{N}[\mathbf{C}[Q_1] \parallel \mathbf{C}[Q_2]]) \rightsquigarrow_S R}{(\mathbf{v}x)(P \mid \mathbf{N}[\mathbf{C}[Q_1 \parallel Q_2]]) \rightsquigarrow_S R} \quad [\rightsquigarrow_{\equiv}] \frac{P \equiv P' \quad P' \rightsquigarrow_S Q' \quad Q' \equiv Q}{P \rightsquigarrow_S Q} \\
& [\rightsquigarrow_{\mathbf{v}}] \frac{P \rightsquigarrow_S P'}{(\mathbf{v}x)(P \mid Q) \rightsquigarrow_S (\mathbf{v}x)(P' \mid Q)} \quad [\rightsquigarrow_{\mid}] \frac{P \rightsquigarrow_S P'}{P \mid Q \rightsquigarrow_S P' \mid Q} \quad [\rightsquigarrow_{\parallel}] \frac{P \rightsquigarrow_S P'}{P \parallel Q \rightsquigarrow_S P' \parallel Q}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 4.2: Reduction semantics for π^+ .

the handling of the payment is now modeled as a branch:

$$\text{NewServer}_s := s(\text{title}); s.\text{case} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{buy} : s.\text{case} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{card} : s(\text{info}); \bar{s}[\text{movie}]; \bar{s}[], \\ \text{cash} : \bar{s}[\text{movie}]; \bar{s}[] \end{array} \right\}, \\ \text{peek} : \bar{s}[\text{trailer}]; \bar{s}[] \end{array} \right\}$$

Consider a client, Eve, who cannot decide between buying ‘Oppenheimer’ or watching its trailer. In the former case, she has two options for payment method:

$$\text{Eve}_s := \bar{s}[\text{Oppenheimer}]; \left(\begin{array}{l} \bar{s}.\text{buy}; \bar{s}.\text{card}; \bar{s}[\text{visa}]; s(\text{movie}); s(); \mathbf{0} \\ \parallel \\ \bar{s}.\text{buy}; \bar{s}.\text{cash}; s(\text{movie}); s(); \mathbf{0} \\ \parallel \\ \bar{s}.\text{peek}; s(\text{link}); s(); \mathbf{0} \end{array} \right)$$

Let $\text{Sys}^* := (\mathbf{v}s)(\text{NewServer}_s \mid \text{Eve}_s)$. After sending the movie’s title, Eve’s choice

(buying or watching the trailer) enables gradual commitment. We have:

$$\text{Sys}^* \xrightarrow{s}^2 (\mathbf{vs})(s.\text{case}\{\text{card} : \dots, \text{cash} : \dots\} | (\bar{s}.\text{card}; \dots \parallel \bar{s}.\text{cash}; \dots)) =: \text{Sys}_1^*$$

$$\text{and} \quad \text{Sys}^* \xrightarrow{s}^2 (\mathbf{vs})(\bar{s}[\text{trailer}]; \dots | s(\text{trailer}); \dots) =: \text{Sys}_2^*$$

Process Sys_1^* represents the situation for Eve after selecting buy, in which case the third alternative $(\bar{s}.\text{peek}; \dots)$ can be discarded as an impossible branch. Process Sys_2^* represents the dual situation. From Sys_1^* , the selection of payment method completes the commitment to one alternative; we have: $\text{Sys}_1^* \xrightarrow{s} (\mathbf{vs})(s(\text{info}); \dots | \bar{s}[\text{visa}]; \dots)$ and $\text{Sys}_1^* \xrightarrow{s} (\mathbf{vs})(\bar{s}[\text{movie}]; \dots | s(\text{movie}); \dots)$. \square

In Appendix C.2 we discuss an alternative *eager* semantics that commits to a single branch upon communication, as in (4.1).

4.2.2 Resource Control for $s\pi^+$ via Session Types

We define a session type system for $s\pi^+$, following ‘propositions-as-sessions’ [Caires & Pfenning \(2010\)](#); [Wadler \(2012\)](#). As already mentioned, in a session type system, resources are names that perform protocols: the *type assignment* $x : A$ says that x should conform to the protocol specified by the session type A . We give the syntax of types:

$$A, B ::= \mathbf{1} \mid \perp \mid A \otimes B \mid A \wp B \mid \oplus\{i : A\}_{i \in I} \mid \&\{i : A\}_{i \in I} \mid \&A \mid \oplus A$$

The units $\mathbf{1}$ and \perp type closed sessions. $A \otimes B$ types a name that first outputs a name of type A and then proceeds as B . Similarly, $A \wp B$ types a name that inputs a name of type A and then proceeds as B . Types $\oplus\{i : A_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\&\{i : A_i\}_{i \in I}$ are given to names that can select and offer a labeled choice, respectively. Then, $\&A$ is the type of a name that *may produce* a behavior of type A , or fail; dually, $\oplus A$ types a name that *may consume* a behavior of type A .

For any type A we denote its *dual* as \bar{A} . Intuitively, dual types serve to avoid communication errors: the type at one end of a channel is the dual of the type at the opposite end. Duality is an involution, defined as follows:

$$\begin{array}{llll} \bar{\mathbf{1}} = \perp & \overline{A \otimes B} = \bar{A} \wp \bar{B} & \overline{\oplus\{i : A_i\}_{i \in I}} = \&\{i : \bar{A}_i\}_{i \in I} & \overline{\&A} = \oplus \bar{A} \\ \bar{\perp} = \mathbf{1} & \overline{A \wp B} = \bar{A} \otimes \bar{B} & \overline{\&\{i : A_i\}_{i \in I}} = \oplus\{i : \bar{A}_i\}_{i \in I} & \overline{\oplus A} = \&\bar{A} \end{array}$$

Judgments are of the form $P \vdash \Gamma$, where P is a process and Γ is a context, a collection of type assignments. In writing $\Gamma, x : A$, we assume $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$. We write $\text{dom}(\Gamma)$ to denote the set of names appearing in Γ . We write $\&\Gamma$ to denote that $\forall x : A \in \Gamma. \exists A'. A = \&A'$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[TCUT]} \frac{P \vdash \Gamma, x:A \quad Q \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A}}{(\mathbf{v}x)(P|Q) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \quad \text{[TMIX]} \frac{P \vdash \Gamma \quad Q \vdash \Delta}{P|Q \vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \quad \text{[T\#]} \frac{P \vdash \Gamma \quad Q \vdash \Gamma}{P \# Q \vdash \Gamma} \\
\\
\text{[EMPTY]} \frac{}{\mathbf{0} \vdash \emptyset} \quad \text{[TID]} \frac{}{[x \leftrightarrow y] \vdash x:A, y:\bar{A}} \quad \text{[T1]} \frac{}{\bar{x}[] \vdash x:\mathbf{1}} \quad \text{[T\perp]} \frac{P \vdash \Gamma}{x(); P \vdash \Gamma, x:\perp} \\
\\
\text{[T\otimes]} \frac{P \vdash \Gamma, y:A \quad Q \vdash \Delta, x:B}{\bar{x}[y]; (P|Q) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta, x:A \otimes B} \quad \text{[T\wp]} \frac{P \vdash \Gamma, y:A, x:B}{x(y); P \vdash \Gamma, x:A \wp B} \\
\\
\text{[T\oplus]} \frac{P \vdash \Gamma, x:A_j \quad j \in I}{\bar{x}.j; P \vdash \Gamma, x:\oplus\{i:A_i\}_{i \in I}} \quad \text{[T\&]} \frac{\forall i \in I. P_i \vdash \Gamma, x:A_i}{x.\text{case}\{i:P_i\}_{i \in I} \vdash \Gamma, x:\&\{i:A_i\}_{i \in I}} \\
\\
\text{[T\&some]} \frac{P \vdash \Gamma, x:A}{\bar{x}.\text{some}; P \vdash \Gamma, x:\&A} \quad \text{[T\&none]} \frac{}{\bar{x}.\text{none} \vdash x:\&A} \\
\\
\text{[T\oplussome]} \frac{P \vdash \&\Gamma, x:A}{x.\text{some}_{\text{dom}(\Gamma)}; P \vdash \&\Gamma, x:\oplus A}
\end{array}$$

Figure 4.3: Typing rules for $\text{s}\pi^+$.

Figure 4.3 gives the typing rules: they correspond to the rules in Curry-Howard interpretations of classical linear logic as session types (cf. Wadler (2012)), with the rules for $\&A$ and $\oplus A$ extracted from Caires & Pérez (2017), and the additional Rule [T\#] for non-confluent non-deterministic choice, which modifies the confluent rule in Caires & Pérez (2017).

Most rules follow Wadler (2012), so we focus on those related to non-determinism. Rule [T\&some] types a process with a name whose behavior can be provided, while Rule [T\&none] types a name whose behavior cannot. Rule [T\oplussome] types a process with a name x whose behavior may not be available. If the behavior is not available, all the sessions in the process must be canceled; hence, the rule requires all names to be typed under the $\&A$ monad.

Rule [T\#] types our new non-deterministic choice operator; the branches must be typable under the same typing context. Hence, all branches denote the same sessions, which may be implemented differently. In context of a synchronization, branches that are kept are able to synchronize, whereas the discarded branches are not; nonetheless, the remaining branches still represent different implementations of the same sessions. Compared to the rule for non-determinism in Caires & Pérez (2017), we do not require processes to be typable under the $\&A$ monad.

Example 4.4

Consider again process Eve_s from Example 4.3. The three branches of the non-deterministic choice give *different implementations of the same session*: assuming

primitive, self-dual data types C , M , and L , all three branches on s are typable by $\oplus\{\text{buy} : \oplus\{\text{card} : C \otimes M \wp \perp, \text{cash} : M \wp \perp\}, \text{peek} : L \wp \perp\}$. \square

Example 4.5 Unavailable Movies

Consider now a modified movie server, which offers movies that may not be yet available. We specify this server using non-deterministic choice and non-deterministically available sessions:

$$\text{BuyServ}_s := s(\text{title}); (\bar{s}.\text{none} \parallel \bar{s}.\text{some}; s(\text{paym}); \bar{s}[\text{movie}]; \bar{s}[]) \vdash s : T \wp (\&(P \wp M \otimes \mathbf{1})),$$

where T, P, M denote primitive, self-dual data-types. While the branch ‘ $\bar{s}.\text{none}$ ’ signals that the movie is not available, the branch ‘ $\bar{s}.\text{some}; \dots$ ’ performs the expected protocol. We now define a client Ada who buys a movie for Tim, using session s ; Ada only forwards it to him (using session u) if it is actually available:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ada}_{s,u} &:= \bar{s}[\text{Barbie}]; s.\text{some}_u; \bar{s}[\text{visa}]; s(\text{movie}); s(); \bar{u}.\text{some}; \bar{u}[\text{movie}]; \bar{u}[] \\ &\vdash s : T \otimes (\oplus(P \otimes M \wp \perp)), u : \&(M \otimes \mathbf{1}) \\ \text{Tim}_u &:= u.\text{some}; u(\text{movie}); u(); \mathbf{0} \vdash u : \oplus(M \wp \mathbf{1}) \end{aligned}$$

Let $\text{BuySys} := (\mathbf{v}s)(\text{BuyServ}_s \mid (\mathbf{v}u)(\text{Ada}_{s,u} \mid \text{Tim}_u))$. Depending on whether the server has the movie ‘Barbie’ available, we have the following reductions:

$$\text{BuySys} \rightsquigarrow_s^2 (\mathbf{v}u)(\bar{u}.\text{none} \mid \text{Tim}_u) \text{ or } \text{BuySys} \rightsquigarrow_s^5 (\mathbf{v}u)(\bar{u}.\text{some}; \dots \mid \text{Tim}_u)$$

\square

Our type system ensures *session fidelity* and *communication safety*, but not confluence: the former says that processes correctly follow their ascribed session protocols, and the latter that no communication errors/mismatches occur. Both properties follow from the fact that typing is consistent across structural congruence and reduction. See Appendix C.5.2 for details.

Theorem 4.1 (Type Preservation) *If $P \vdash \Gamma$, then both $P \equiv Q$ and $P \rightsquigarrow_s Q$ (for any Q and S) imply $Q \vdash \Gamma$.*

Another important, if often elusive, property in session types is *deadlock-freeness*, which ensures that processes can reduce as long as they are not inactive. Our type system satisfies deadlock-freeness for processes with fully connected names, i.e., typable under the empty context. See Appendix C.5.2 for details.

Theorem 4.2 (Deadlock-freeness) *If $P \vdash \emptyset$ and $P \neq \mathbf{0}$, then there are Q and S such that $P \rightsquigarrow_s Q$.*

| | | | |
|--|-------------|---|---------------------|
| $M, N, L ::= x$ | variable | $M \langle \langle C/x \rangle \rangle$ | intermediate subst. |
| $ (M C)$ | application | $M \langle \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle \rangle$ | explicit subst. |
| $ \lambda x. M$ | abstraction | $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ | failure |
| $ M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ | sharing | | |
| $C, D ::= 1 \mid \wr M \wr \cdot C$ | | | bag |
| $C ::= [\cdot] \mid C[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \mid (C C) \mid C \langle \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle \rangle$ | | | context |

Figure 4.4: Syntax of $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}^{\ell}$: terms, bags, and contexts.

4.3 A Non-deterministic Resource λ -calculus

We present $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}^{\ell}$, a resource λ -calculus with non-determinism and lazy evaluation. In $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}^{\ell}$, non-determinism is non-confluent and *implicit*, as it arises from the fetching of terms from bags of *linear* resources. This is different from $\mathfrak{s}\pi^{+}$, where the choice operator ‘ $\#$ ’ specifies non-determinism *explicitly*. A mismatch between the number of variable occurrences and the size of the bag induces *failure*.

In $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}^{\ell}$, the *sharing* construct $M[x_1, \dots, x_n \leftarrow x]$, expresses that x may be used in M under “aliases” x_1, \dots, x_n . Hence, it atomizes n occurrences of x in M , via an explicit pointer to n variables. This way, e.g., the λ -term $\lambda x.(x x)$ is expressed in $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}^{\ell}$ as $\lambda x.(x_1 \wr x_2 \wr [x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x])$, where $\wr x_2 \wr$ is a bag containing x_2 .

4.3.1 Syntax and Reduction Semantics

Syntax. We use x, y, z, \dots for variables, and write \tilde{x} to denote a finite sequence of pairwise distinct x_i ’s, with length $|\tilde{x}|$. Figure 4.4 gives the syntax of terms (M, N, L) and bags (C, D). The empty bag is denoted 1 . We use C_i to denote the i -th term in C , and $\text{size}(C)$ denotes the number of elements in C . To ease readability, we often write, e.g., $\wr N_1, N_2 \wr$ as a shorthand notation for $\wr N_1 \wr \cdot \wr N_2 \wr$.

In $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$, we say that \tilde{x} are the *shared variables* and that x is the *sharing variable*. We require for each $x_i \in \tilde{x}$: (i) x_i occurs exactly once in M ; (ii) x_i is not a sharing variable. The sequence \tilde{x} can be empty: $M[\leftarrow x]$ means that x does not share any variables in M . Sharing binds the shared variables in the term.

An abstraction $\lambda x.M$ binds occurrences of x in M . Application $(M C)$ is as usual. The term $M \langle \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle \rangle$ is the *explicit substitution* of a bag C for \tilde{x} in M . We require $\text{size}(C) = |\tilde{x}|$ and for each $x_i \in \tilde{x}$: (i) x_i occurs in M ; (ii) x_i is not a sharing variable; (iii) x_i cannot occur in another explicit substitution in M . The term $M \langle \langle C/x \rangle \rangle$ denotes an intermediate explicit substitution that does not (necessarily) satisfy the conditions for explicit substitutions.

The term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ denotes failure; the variables in \tilde{x} are “dangling” resources, which cannot be accounted for after failure. We write $\text{fv}(M)$ to denote the free

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[RS:Beta]} \\
\frac{}{(\lambda x.M)C \longrightarrow M\langle\langle C/x \rangle\rangle} \\
\\
\text{[RS:Fetch}^\ell] \\
\frac{\text{head}(M) = x_j \quad 0 < i \leq \text{size}(C)}{M\langle\langle C/\tilde{x}, x_j \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow M\{C_i/x_j\}\langle\langle C \setminus C_i \rangle/\tilde{x}\rangle} \\
\\
\text{[RS:Ex-Sub]} \\
\frac{\text{size}(C) = |\tilde{x}| \quad M \neq \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}}{(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])\langle\langle C/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow M\langle\langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle\rangle} \\
\\
\text{[RS:Fail}^\ell] \\
\frac{\text{size}(C) \neq |\tilde{x}| \quad \tilde{y} = (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{\tilde{x}\}) \cup \text{fv}(C)}{(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])\langle\langle C/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}} \\
\\
\text{[RS:Cons}_1] \\
\frac{\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(C)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} C \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \cup \tilde{y}}} \\
\\
\text{[RS:Cons}_2] \\
\frac{\text{size}(C) = |\tilde{x}| \quad \tilde{z} = \text{fv}(C)}{(\text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \cup \tilde{y}}[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])\langle\langle C/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \cup \tilde{z}}} \\
\\
\text{[RS:Cons}_3] \\
\frac{\tilde{z} = \text{fv}(C)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \cup \tilde{x}}\langle\langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \cup \tilde{z}}}
\end{array}$$

where $\text{head}(M)$ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l}
\text{head}(x) = x \qquad \text{head}(\lambda x.M) = \lambda x.M \qquad \text{head}((M C)) = \text{head}(M) \\
\text{head}(\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}) = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \quad \text{head}(M\langle\langle C/x \rangle\rangle) = M\langle\langle C/x \rangle\rangle \quad \text{head}(M\langle\langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle\rangle) = \text{head}(M) \\
\text{head}(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) = \begin{cases} x & \text{head}(M) = y \text{ and } y \in \tilde{x} \\ \text{head}(M) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\end{array}$$

Figure 4.5: Reduction rules for λ_C^ℓ .

variables of M , defined as expected. Term M is *closed* if $\text{fv}(M) = \emptyset$.

As in Chapters 2 and 3 we assume that all terms are consistent (Definition 2.11).

Semantics. Figure 4.5 gives the reduction semantics, denoted \longrightarrow , and the *head variable* of term M , denoted $\text{head}(M)$. Rule [RS : Beta] induces an intermediate substitution. Rule [RS : Ex-Sub] reduces an intermediate substitution to an explicit substitution, provided the size of the bag equals the number of shared variables. In case of a mismatch, the term evolves into failure via Rule [RS : Fail^ℓ].

An explicit substitution $M\langle\langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle\rangle$, where the head variable of M is $x_j \in \tilde{x}$, reduces via Rule [R : Fetch^ℓ]. The rule extracts a C_i from C (for some $0 < i \leq \text{size}(C)$) and substitutes it for x_j in M ; this is how fetching induces a non-deterministic choice between $\text{size}(C)$ possible reductions. Rules [RS : Cons_j] for $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ consume terms when they meet failure. Finally, Rule [RS : TCont] closes reduction under contexts. The following example illustrates reduction.

Example 4.6

Consider the term $M_0 = (\lambda x.x_1 \wr x_2 \wr x_3 \wr 1 \wr [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \wr \text{fail}^0, y, I$, where $I =$

$\lambda x.(x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x])$ and $\tilde{x} = x_1, x_2, x_3$. First, M_0 evolves into an intermediate substitution (4.2). The bag can provide for all shared variables, so it then evolves into an explicit substitution (4.3):

$$M_0 \longrightarrow (x_1 \lambda x_2 \lambda x_3 1 \int \int [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle \lambda \text{fail}^0, y, I \int / x \rangle \rangle \quad (4.2)$$

$$\longrightarrow (x_1 \lambda x_2 \lambda x_3 1 \int \int) \langle \langle \lambda \text{fail}^0, y, I \int / \tilde{x} \rangle \rangle = M \quad (4.3)$$

Since $\text{head}(M) = x_1$, one of the three elements of the bag will be substituted. M represents a non-deterministic choice between the following three reductions:

$$\begin{aligned} & \nearrow (\text{fail}^0 \lambda x_2 \lambda x_3 1 \int \int) \langle \langle \lambda y, I \int / x_2, x_3 \rangle \rangle = N_1 \\ M & \longrightarrow (y \lambda x_2 \lambda x_3 1 \int \int) \langle \langle \lambda \text{fail}^0, I \int / x_2, x_3 \rangle \rangle = N_2 \\ & \searrow (I \lambda x_2 \lambda x_3 1 \int \int) \langle \langle \lambda \text{fail}^0, y \int / x_2, x_3 \rangle \rangle = N_3 \end{aligned}$$

□

4.3.2 Resource Control for $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}^{\ell}$ via Intersection Types

Our type system for $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}^{\ell}$ is based on non-idempotent intersection types. As in prior works [Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca \(2010\)](#); [Boudol & Laneve \(2000\)](#), intersection types account for available resources in bags, which are unordered and have all the same type. Because we admit the term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ as typable, we say that our system enforces *well-formedness* rather than *well-typedness*. As we will see, well-typed terms form the sub-class of well-formed terms that does not include $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ (see the text after Theorem 4.3).

Strict types (σ, τ, δ) and multiset types (π, ζ) are defined as follows:

$$\sigma, \tau, \delta ::= \mathbf{unit} \mid \pi \rightarrow \sigma \quad \pi, \zeta ::= \bigwedge_{i \in I} \sigma_i \mid \omega$$

Given a non-empty I , multiset types $\bigwedge_{i \in I} \sigma_i$ are given to bags of size $|I|$. This operator is associative, commutative, and non-idempotent (i.e., $\sigma \wedge \sigma \neq \sigma$), with identity ω . Notation σ^k stands for $\sigma \wedge \dots \wedge \sigma$ (k times, if $k > 0$) or ω (if $k = 0$).

Judgments have the form $\Gamma \models M : \tau$, with contexts defined as follows:

$$\Gamma, \Delta ::= - \mid \Gamma, x : \pi \mid \Gamma, x : \sigma$$

where $-$ denotes the empty context. We write $\text{dom}(\Gamma)$ for the set of variables in Γ . For $\Gamma, x : \pi$, we assume $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$. To avoid ambiguities, we write $x : \sigma^1$ to denote that the assignment involves a multiset type, rather than a strict type. Given Γ , its *core context* Γ^{\dagger} concerns variables with types different from ω ; it is defined as $\Gamma^{\dagger} = \{x : \pi \in \Gamma \mid \pi \neq \omega\}$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{[\text{FS:var}^\ell]}{x : \sigma \models x : \sigma} \quad \frac{[\text{FS:1}^\ell]}{- \models 1 : \omega} \quad \frac{[\text{FS:bag}^\ell]}{\Gamma \models N : \sigma \quad \Delta \models C : \sigma^k}{\Gamma, \Delta \models \langle N \rangle \cdot C : \sigma^{k+1}} \quad \frac{[\text{FS:fail}]}{\text{dom}(\Gamma^\dagger) = \tilde{x}}{\Gamma^\dagger \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} : \tau} \\
\\
\frac{[\text{FS:weak}]}{\Gamma \models M : \tau}{\Gamma, x : \omega \models M[\leftarrow x] : \tau} \quad \frac{[\text{FS:shar}]}{\Gamma, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models M : \tau \quad k \neq 0}{\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \models M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau} \\
\\
\frac{[\text{FS:abs-sh}]}{\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau}{\Gamma \models \lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) : \sigma^k \rightarrow \tau} \quad \frac{[\text{FS:app}]}{\Gamma \models M : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta \models C : \sigma^k}{\Gamma, \Delta \models M C : \tau} \\
\\
\frac{[\text{FS:Esub}]}{\Gamma, x : \sigma^j \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad \Delta \models C : \sigma^k}{\Gamma, \Delta \models (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle C/x \rangle \rangle : \tau} \quad \frac{[\text{FS:Esub}^\ell]}{\Gamma, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models M : \tau \quad \Delta \models C : \sigma^k}{\Gamma, \Delta \models M \langle \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle \rangle : \tau}
\end{array}$$

Figure 4.6: Well-Formedness Rules for $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}^\ell$.**Definition 4.4** Well-formedness in $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}^\ell$

A term M is *well-formed* if there exists a context Γ and a type τ such that the rules in Figure 4.6 entail $\Gamma \models M : \tau$. \square

In Figure 4.6, Rule [FS : var^ℓ] types variables. Rule [FS : 1^ℓ] types the empty bag with ω . Rule [FS : bag^ℓ] types the concatenation of bags. Rule [FS : fail] types the term $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ with a strict type τ , provided that the domain of the core context coincides with \tilde{x} (i.e., no variable in \tilde{x} is typed with ω). Rule [FS : weak] types $M[\leftarrow x]$ by weakening the context with $x : \omega$. Rule [FS : shar] types $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ with τ , provided that there are assignments to the shared variables in \tilde{x} .

Rule [FS : abs-sh] types an abstraction $\lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])$ with $\sigma^k \rightarrow \tau$, provided that $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau$ can be entailed from an assignment $x : \sigma^k$. Rule [FS : app] types $(M C)$, provided that M has type $\sigma^j \rightarrow \tau$ and C has type σ^k . Note that, unlike usual intersection type systems, j and k may differ. Rule [FS : Esub] types the intermediate substitution of a bag C of type σ^k , provided that x has type σ^j ; again, j and k may differ. Rule [FS : Esub^ℓ] types $M \langle \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle \rangle$ as long as C has type $\sigma^{|\tilde{x}|}$, and each $x_i \in \tilde{x}$ is of type σ .

Well-formed terms satisfy subject reduction (SR), whereas *well-typed* terms, defined below, satisfy also subject expansion (SE). See § C.6.1 and § C.6.2 for details.

Theorem 4.3 (SR in $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}^\ell$) *If $\Gamma \models M : \tau$ and $M \longrightarrow M'$, then $\Gamma \models M' : \tau$.*

From our system for well-formedness we can extract a system for *well-typed* terms, which do not include $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$. Judgments for well-typedness are denoted

$\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$, with rules copied from Figure 4.6 (the rule name prefix FS is replaced with TS), with the following modifications: (i) Rule $[\text{TS:fail}]$ is removed; (ii) Rules $[\text{TS:app}]$ and $[\text{TS:Esub}]$ are modified to disallow a mismatch between variables and resources, i.e., multiset types should match in size. Well-typed terms are also well-formed, and thus satisfy SR. Moreover, as a consequence of adopting (non-idempotent) intersection types, they also satisfy SE:

Theorem 4.4 (SE in $\lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^{\ell}$) *If $\Gamma \vdash M' : \tau$ and $M \longrightarrow M'$, then $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$.*

4.4 A Typed Translation of $\lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^{\ell}$ into $\mathfrak{s}\pi^+$

While $\mathfrak{s}\pi^+$ features non-deterministic choice, $\lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^{\ell}$ is a prototypical programming language in which implicit non-determinism implements fetching of resources. Resources are controlled using different type systems (session types in $\mathfrak{s}\pi^+$, intersection types in $\lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^{\ell}$). To reconcile these differences and illustrate the potential of $\mathfrak{s}\pi^+$ to precisely model non-determinism as found in realistic programs/protocols, we give a translation of $\lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^{\ell}$ into $\mathfrak{s}\pi^+$. This translation preserves types (Theorem 4.5) and respects well-known criteria for dynamic correctness Gorla (2010); Peters (2012, 2019) (Theorem 4.6).

The Translation. Given a $\lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^{\ell}$ -term M , its translation into $\mathfrak{s}\pi^+$ is denoted $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\ddagger}$ and given in Figure 4.7. As usual, every variable x in M becomes a name x in process $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\ddagger}$, where name u provides the behavior of M . A peculiarity is that, to handle failures in $\lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^{\ell}$, u is a non-deterministically available session: the translated term can be available or not, as signaled by prefixes $\bar{u}.\text{some}$ and $\bar{u}.\text{none}$, respectively. As a result, reductions from $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\ddagger}$ include synchronizations that codify M 's behavior but also synchronizations that confirm a session's availability.

At its core, our translation follows Milner's. This way, e.g., the process $\llbracket (\lambda x.M) C \rrbracket_u$ enables synchronizations between $\llbracket \lambda x.M \rrbracket_v$ and $\llbracket C \rrbracket_x$ along name v , resulting in the translation of an intermediate substitution. The *key novelty* is the role and treatment of non-determinism. Accommodating non-confluent non-determinism is non-trivial, as it entails translating explicit substitutions and sharing in $\lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^{\ell}$ using the non-deterministic choice operator \sharp in $\mathfrak{s}\pi^+$. Next we discuss these novel aspects, while highlighting differences with respect to a translation by Chapters 2 and 3, which is given in the confluent setting (see § 4.5).

In Figure 4.7, non-deterministic choices occur in the translations of $M \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle$ (explicit substitutions) and $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ (non-empty sharing). Roughly speaking, the position of \sharp in the translation of $M \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle$ represents the most desirable way of mimicking the fetching of terms from a bag. This use of \sharp is a central idea in our

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket x \rrbracket_u &= \bar{x}.\text{some}; [x \leftrightarrow u] \\
\llbracket \lambda x.M \rrbracket_u &= \bar{u}.\text{some}; u(x); \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \\
\llbracket (MC) \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\
\llbracket M \langle\langle C/x \rangle\rangle \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C \rrbracket_x) \\
\llbracket \{N\} \cdot C \rrbracket_x &= x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C), \text{fv}(N)}; x(y_i); x.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(C), \text{fv}(N)}; \bar{x}.\text{some}; \bar{x}[z_i]; \\
&\quad (z_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N)}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_{z_i} \mid \llbracket C \rrbracket_x \mid \bar{y}_i.\text{none}) \\
\llbracket 1 \rrbracket_x &= x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y_n); (\bar{y}_n.\text{some}; \bar{y}_n \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; \bar{x}.\text{none}) \\
\llbracket M \langle\{N_1, N_2\} / x_1, x_2 \rangle \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N_1)}; \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid (\mathbf{v}z_2)(z_2.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N_2)}; \llbracket N_2 \rrbracket_{z_2} \\
&\quad \mid \prod_{x_i \in \{x_1, x_2\}} \prod_{x_j \in \{x_1, x_2\} \setminus x_i} \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_i\} \{z_2/x_j\})) \\
\llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u &= \bar{x}.\text{some}; \bar{x}[y_i]; (y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_i(); \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid \bar{x}.\text{none}) \\
\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u &= \bar{x}.\text{some}; \bar{x}[y_i]; (y_i.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_i(); \mathbf{0} \mid \bar{x}.\text{some}; x.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M) \setminus \tilde{x}}; \\
&\quad \prod_{x_i \in \tilde{x}} x(x_i); \llbracket M[(\tilde{x} \setminus x_i) \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u) \\
\llbracket \text{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_k} \rrbracket_u &= \bar{u}.\text{none} \mid \bar{x}_1.\text{none} \mid \dots \mid \bar{x}_k.\text{none}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 4.7: Translation of λ_C^ℓ into π^+ .

translation: as we explain below, it allows for appropriate commitment in non-deterministic choices, but also for *delayed* commitment when necessary.

For simplicity, we consider explicit substitutions $M \langle\langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle\rangle$ where $C = \{N_1, N_2\}$ and $\tilde{x} = x_1, x_2$. The translation $\llbracket M \langle\langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle\rangle \rrbracket_u$ uses the processes $\llbracket N_i \rrbracket_{z_i}$, where each z_i is fresh. First, each bag item confirms its behavior. Then, a variable $x_i \in \tilde{x}$ is chosen non-deterministically; we ensure that these choices consider all variables. Note that writing $\prod_{x_i \in \{x_1, x_2\}} \prod_{x_j \in \{x_1, x_2\} \setminus x_i}$ is equivalent to non-deterministically assigning x_i, x_j to each permutation of x_1, x_2 . The resulting choice involves $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u$ with x_i, x_j substituted by z_1, z_2 . Commitment here is triggered only via synchronizations along z_1 or z_2 ; synchronizing with $z_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N_i)}; \llbracket N_i \rrbracket_{z_i}$ then represents fetching N_i from the bag. The size of the translated term $\llbracket M \langle\langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle\rangle \rrbracket_u$ is exponential with respect to the size of C .

The process $\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u$ proceeds as follows. First, it confirms its behavior along x . Then it sends a name y_i on x , on which a failed reduction may be handled. Next, the translation confirms again its behavior along x and non-deterministically receives a reference to an $x_i \in \tilde{x}$. Each branch consists of $\llbracket M[(\tilde{x} \setminus x_i) \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u$. The possible choices are permuted, represented by $\prod_{x_i \in \tilde{x}}$. Synchronizations with $\llbracket M[(\tilde{x} \setminus x_i) \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u$ and bags delay commitment in this choice (we return to this point below). The process $\llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u$ is similar but simpler: here the name x fails, as it cannot take further elements to substitute.

In case of a failure (i.e., a mismatch between the size of the bag C and the

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbf{unit} \rrbracket &= \& \mathbf{1} & \llbracket \sigma^k \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket &= \& (\overline{\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket}_{(\sigma,i)}} \wp \llbracket \tau \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \sigma \wedge \pi \rrbracket_{(\tau,i)} &= \oplus ((\& \mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket) \otimes (\llbracket \pi \rrbracket_{(\tau,i)})))) \\
\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)} &= \begin{cases} \oplus ((\& \mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \& \mathbf{1})) & \text{if } i = 0 \\ \oplus ((\& \mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket) \otimes (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i-1)})))) & \text{if } i > 0 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 4.8: Translation of intersection types into session types (cf. Def. 4.5).

number of variables in M), our translation ensures that the confirmations of C will not succeed. This is how failure in λ_C^ℓ is correctly translated to failure in $s\pi^+$.

Translation Correctness. The translation is typed: intersection types in λ_C^ℓ are translated into session types in $s\pi^+$ (Figure 4.8). This translation of types abstractly describes how non-deterministic fetches are codified as non-deterministic session protocols. It is worth noting that this translation of types is the same as in Chapter 3. This is not surprising: as we have seen, session types effectively abstract away from the behavior of processes, as all branches of a non-deterministic choice use the same typing context. Still, it is pleasant that the translation of types remains unchanged across different translations with our (non-confluent) non-determinism (in Figure 4.7) and with confluent non-determinism (in Chapter 3).

To state *static* correctness, we require the following definition:

Definition 4.5

Let $\Gamma = x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_m : \sigma_m, v_1 : \pi_1, \dots, v_n : \pi_n$ be a context. The translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ in Figure 4.8 extends to contexts as follows:

$$\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket = x_1 : \& \llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket, \dots, x_m : \& \llbracket \sigma_m \rrbracket, v_1 : \overline{\llbracket \pi_1 \rrbracket}_{(\sigma,i_1)}}, \dots, v_n : \overline{\llbracket \pi_n \rrbracket}_{(\sigma,i_n)}}$$

□

Well-formed terms translate into well-typed processes:

Theorem 4.5 *If $\Gamma \models M : \tau$, then $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket$.*

To state *dynamic* correctness, we rely on established notions that (abstractly) characterize *correct translations*. A language $\mathcal{L} = (L, \rightarrow)$ consists of a set of terms L and a reduction relation \rightarrow on L . Each language \mathcal{L} is assumed to contain a success constructor \checkmark . A term $T \in L$ has *success*, denoted $T \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$, when there is a sequence of reductions (using \rightarrow) from T to a term satisfying success criteria.

Given $\mathcal{L}_1 = (L_1, \rightarrow_1)$ and $\mathcal{L}_2 = (L_2, \rightarrow_2)$, we seek translations $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ that are correct: they satisfy well-known correctness criteria Gorla (2010); Peters (2012, 2019). We state the set of correctness criteria that determine the correctness of a translation.

Definition 4.6 Correct Translation

Let $\mathcal{L}_1 = (\mathcal{M}, \rightarrow_1)$ and $\mathcal{L}_2 = (\mathcal{P}, \rightarrow_2)$ be two languages. Let \simeq_2 be an equivalence over \mathcal{L}_2 . We use M, M' (resp. P, P') to range over terms in \mathcal{M} (resp. \mathcal{P}). Given a translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$, we define:

Completeness: For every M, M' such that $M \rightarrow_1^* M'$, there exists P such that $\llbracket M \rrbracket \rightarrow_2^* P \simeq_2 \llbracket M' \rrbracket$.

Weak Soundness: For every M and P such that $\llbracket M \rrbracket \rightarrow_2^* P$, there exist M', P' such that $M \rightarrow_1^* M'$ and $P \rightarrow_2^* P' \simeq_2 \llbracket M' \rrbracket$.

Success Sensitivity: For every M , we have $M \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$ if and only if $\llbracket M \rrbracket \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$.

□

Let us write Λ to denote the set of well-formed λ_c^ℓ terms, and Π for the set of all well-typed $\text{s}\pi^\dagger$ processes, both including \checkmark . We have our final result:

Theorem 4.6 (Translation correctness under \rightsquigarrow) *The translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_-^{\checkmark} : (\Lambda, \longrightarrow) \rightarrow (\Pi, \rightsquigarrow)$ is correct (cf. Definition 4.6) using equivalence \equiv (Figure 4.1).*

The proof of Theorem 4.6 involves instantiating/proving each of the parts of Def. 4.6. Among these, *weak soundness* is the most challenging to prove. Our prior work on translations of typed λ into π with confluent non-determinism Chapters 2 and 3 rely critically on confluence to match a behavior in π with a corresponding behavior in λ . Because in our setting confluence is lost, we must resort to a different proof.

As already discussed, our translation makes the implicit non-determinism in a λ_c^ℓ -term M explicit by adding non-deterministic choices in key points of $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u$. Our reduction \rightsquigarrow preserves those branches that simultaneously have the same prefix available (up to \bowtie). In proving weak soundness, we exploit the fact that reduction entails delayed commitment. To see this, consider the following terms:

$$(\mathbf{v}x)((\alpha_1; P_1 \# \alpha_2; P_2) \mid Q) \tag{4.4}$$

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(\alpha_1; P_1 \mid Q) \# (\mathbf{v}x)(\alpha_2; P_2 \mid Q) \tag{4.5}$$

In (4.4), commitment to a choice relies on whether $\alpha_1 \bowtie \alpha_2$ holds (cf. Definition 4.3). If $\alpha_1 \not\bowtie \alpha_2$, a choice is made; otherwise, commitment is delayed, and depends on P_1 and P_2 . Hence, in (4.4) the possibility of committing to either branch is kept open. In contrast, in (4.5) commitment to a choice is independent of $\alpha_1 \bowtie \alpha_2$.

Our translation exploits the delayed commitment of non-determinism illustrated by (4.4) to mimic commitment to non-deterministic choices in λ_c^ℓ , which manifests

in fetching resources from bags. The fact that this delayed commitment preserves information about the different branches (e.g., P_1 and P_2 in (4.4)) is essential to establish weak soundness, i.e., to match a behavior in $s\pi^+$ with a corresponding step in λ_C^ℓ . In contrast, forms of non-determinism in $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u$ that resemble (4.5) are useful to characterize behaviors different from fetching.

4.5 Summary and Related Work

We studied the interplay between resource control and non-determinism in typed calculi. We introduced $s\pi^+$ and λ_C^ℓ , two calculi with non-confluent non-determinism, both with type systems for resource control. Inspired by the untyped π -calculus, non-determinism in $s\pi^+$ is lazy and explicit, with session types defined following ‘propositions-as-sessions’ Caires & Pérez (2017). In λ_C^ℓ , non-determinism arises in the fetching of resources, and is regulated by intersection types. A correct translation of λ_C^ℓ into $s\pi^+$ precisely connects their different forms of non-determinism.

Related Work Integrating (non-confluent) non-determinism within session types is non-trivial, as carelessly discarding branches would break typability. Work by Caires & Pérez (2017), already mentioned, develops a confluent semantics by requiring that non-determinism is only used inside the monad $\&A$; our non-confluent semantics drops this requirement. This allows us to consider non-deterministic choices not possible in Caires & Pérez (2017), such as, e.g., selections of different labels. We stress that linearity is not jeopardized: the branches of ‘ $\#$ ’ do not represent *different sessions*, but *different implementations* of the same sessions.

Atkey et al. (2016) and Kokke et al. (2020) extend ‘propositions-as-sessions’ with non-determinism. Their approaches are very different (conflation of the additives and bounded linear logic, respectively) and support non-determinism for unrestricted names only. Also, Atkey et al. (2016); Kokke et al. (2020) do not connect with typed λ -calculi, as we do. Rocha & Caires (2021) also consider non-determinism, relying on confluence and on unrestricted names. Casal et al. (2022); Vasconcelos et al. (2020) develop a type system for *mixed sessions* (sessions with mixed choices), which can express non-determinism but does not ensure deadlock-freedom. Ensuring deadlock-freedom by typing is a key feature of the ‘propositions-as-sessions’ approach that we adopt for $s\pi^+$.

Our language λ_C^ℓ is most related to calculi by Boudol (1993), Boudol & Laneve (2000), and by Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010). Non-determinism in the calculi in Boudol (1993); Boudol & Laneve (2000) is committing and implicit; their linear resources can be consumed *at most* once, rather than *exactly* once. The work Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010) considers non-committing non-determinism that is both implicit (as in λ_C^ℓ) and explicit (via a sum operator on

terms). Both [Boudol \(1993\)](#); [Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca \(2010\)](#) develop (non-idempotent) intersection type systems to regulate resources. In our type system, all terms in a bag have the same type; the system in [Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca \(2010\)](#) does not enforce this condition. Unlike these type systems, our system for well-formedness can type terms with a lack or an excess of resources.

[Boudol & Laneve \(2000\)](#) and Chapters 2 and 3 give translations of resource λ -calculi into π . The translation in [Boudol & Laneve \(2000\)](#) is used to study the semantics induced upon λ -terms by a translation into π ; unlike ours, it does not consider types. As already mentioned in § 4.4, Chapters 2 and 3 relate calculi with *confluent* non-determinism: a resource λ -calculus with sums on terms, and the session π -calculus from [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#). Our translation of terms in this chapter and that in Chapters 2 and 3 are very different: while here we use non-deterministic choice to mimic the sharing construct, the translation in Chapters 2 and 3 uses it to translate bags. Hence, our Theorem 4.6 cannot be derived from Chapters 2 and 3.

The last decade of work on ‘propositions-as-sessions’ has delivered insightful connections with typed λ -calculi—see, e.g., [Wadler \(2012\)](#); [Toninho et al. \(2012\)](#); [Toninho & Yoshida \(2018\)](#). Excepting Chapters 2 and 3, already discussed, none of these works consider non-deterministic λ -calculi.

Chapter 5

Termination in Concurrency, Revisited

Termination is a central property in sequential programming models: a term is terminating if all its reduction sequences are finite. Termination is also important in concurrency in general, and for message-passing programs in particular. A variety of type systems that enforce termination by typing have been developed. In this chapter, we rigorously compare several type systems for π -calculus processes from the unifying perspective of termination. Adopting *session types* as reference framework, we consider two different type systems: one follows Deng and Sangiorgi’s weight-based approach; the other is Caires and Pfenning’s Curry-Howard correspondence between linear logic and session types. Our technical results precisely connect these very different type systems, and shed light on the classes of client/server interactions they admit as correct.

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the first comparative study of type systems that enforce *termination* for message-passing processes in the π -calculus, the paradigmatic model of concurrency.

Termination is a cornerstone of sequential programming models: a term is terminating if all its reduction sequences are finite. Termination is also an important property in concurrency in general, and in message-passing programs in particular. In such a setting, infinite sequences of internal steps are rather undesirable, as they could jeopardize the reliable interaction between a process and its environment. That is, we would like processes that exhibit *infinite* sequences of observable actions, possibly intertwined with *finite* sequences of internal/unobservable steps (i.e., reductions).

In the (un)typed π -calculus, infinite behavior can be expressed via operators for recursion (or recursive definitions) or replication. We are interested in replication, and in particular in *input-guarded* replication, denoted $!x(y).P$. Input-guarded replication neatly captures the essence of *servers* that are persistently available to spawn interactive behavior upon invocations by concurrent *clients*. This way, it precisely expresses the controlled invocation of (shared) resources. To understand its operation, let us write $x\langle z \rangle$ to denote an output prefix, intended as an invocation to a server such as $!x(y).P$. The corresponding reduction rule is then roughly as follows:

$$!x(y).P \mid x\langle z \rangle.Q \longrightarrow !x(y).P \mid P[z/y] \mid Q$$

Thus, after a synchronization on x , the server $!x(y).P$ continues to be available, and a copy of P is spawned (where $[z/y]$ denotes the substitution of y with z , as usual), enabling interaction with Q .

In this setting, an obvious source of non-terminating behaviors is when clients and servers invoke each other indefinitely. This situation arises, in particular, when client invocations occur in the body of a server, which can easily trigger infinite “ping-pong” reductions, as in the following process (where $\mathbf{0}$ denotes inaction):

$$!x(y).x\langle y \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid x\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0} \longrightarrow !x(y).x\langle y \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid x\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \mathbf{0} \longrightarrow \dots \quad (5.1)$$

The challenge of statically ruling out processes such as (5.1) while enabling expressive client/server interactions has been addressed by multiple authors via various type systems, see, e.g., Yoshida et al. (2001); Deng & Sangiorgi (2004); Sangiorgi (2006); Demangeon et al. (2010); Kobayashi & Sangiorgi (2010); Piccolo (2012); Toninho et al. (2014); Lago et al. (2019). Their underlying approaches are vastly diverse. For instance, Yoshida et al. (2001) adopt a type-theoretical approach based on logical relations and linear action types. Deng & Sangiorgi (2004) transport ideas from rewriting systems (well-founded measures) into a π -calculus with simple types. Caires and Pfenning’s Curry-Howard correspondence between linear logic and session types (Caires & Pfenning (2010)) represents yet another approach: their type system enforces termination based purely on proof-theoretical principles, by interpreting the exponential ‘!A’ as the type of a server and by connecting cut elimination with process synchronization. Several natural questions arise. How do these type disciplines compare? What are their relative strengths? More concretely, are there terminating processes detected as such by one type system but not by some other? If so, where is the difference?

As inviting and intriguing these questions are, a technical approach to a formal comparison is far from obvious. An immediate obstacle concerns the underlying formal models: all the type systems mentioned above operate on *different dialects* of the π -calculus, involving, e.g., synchronous/asynchronous communication, and monadic/polyadic message passing. These differences quickly escalate at the level

of the respective type systems, with the presence/absence of *linearity* unsurprisingly playing a key distinguishing role. How do we even start formulating the intended comparison?

We frame our formal comparison as follows. As baseline for comparison we take the π -calculus processes typable with Vasconcelos's session type system (Vasconcelos (2012)). This is a quite liberal type system, which induces a broad class of session processes (including non-terminating ones), which is convenient for our purposes. In the following, this baseline class of processes is denoted \mathcal{S} .

We then consider two representative classes of processes, both terminating by typing. One is based on Deng and Sangiorgi's *weight-based* type system; the other is Caires and Pfenning's linear-logic type system. Because these type systems are so different from Vasconcelos's, to connect them with \mathcal{S} we require typed translations. This leads to two classes of terminating processes:

- \mathcal{W} contains all processes in \mathcal{S} (i.e., typable under Vasconcelos's type system) which are also typable (up to a translation) under the weight-based type system.
- \mathcal{L} contains all processes in \mathcal{S} which are also typable (up to another translation) by the Curry-Howard correspondence.

This way, because Vasconcelos's system can type non-terminating processes, both $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{S}$ hold by definition. Our technical contributions are two-fold.

1. Because the type systems by Vasconcelos and by Deng and Sangiorgi are so different, to define \mathcal{W} we develop a *new weight-based type system* that combines elements from both: it ensures termination by enforcing well-founded measures (as Deng and Sangiorgi's) while accounting for linearity and sessions (as Vasconcelos's). The translation involved in bridging \mathcal{S} and this new type system determines a technique for ensuring termination of session-typed processes, which is new and of independent interest.
2. We prove that $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{W}$ but $\mathcal{W} \not\subset \mathcal{L}$, thus determining the exact relationship between these classes of typed processes. Our discovery is that there are terminating session-typed processes that are typable with the weight-based approach but not under the Curry-Howard correspondence. In other words, techniques based on well-founded measures turn out to be more powerful for enforcing termination than proof-theoretical foundations.

Next, we introduce the class \mathcal{S} . Section 5.3 develops the new weight-based type system and Section 5.4 studies its corresponding class \mathcal{W} . The Curry-Howard correspondence for concurrency is recalled in Section 5.5, and its corresponding class \mathcal{L} is presented in Section 5.6. Finally, Section 5.7 collects concluding remarks.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|
| $P, Q ::=$ | (Processes) | | |
| $\bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P$ | (output) | $q x(y).P$ | (input) |
| $P \mid Q$ | (composition) | $(\mathbf{v}xy)P$ | (restriction) |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | (inaction) | | |
| $q ::=$ | (Qualifiers) | | |
| lin | (linear) | un | (unrestricted) |
| $v ::=$ | (Values) | | |
| x | (variables) | | |

Figure 5.1: Syntax of the session π -calculus $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$

5.2 The Class \mathcal{S} of Session Processes

We present the process language that we shall consider as reference in our comparisons, and its corresponding session type system. We distinguish between (i) the processes induced by this process model and (ii) the class of well-typed processes (Definition 5.8); in the following, these classes are denoted by $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ and \mathcal{S} , respectively. We consider the type system by Vasconcelos (2012), which ensures communication safety and session fidelity, but not progress/deadlock-freedom nor termination. Our presentation closely follows Vasconcelos (2012), pointing out differences where appropriate.

5.2.1 The Process Model $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$

Definition 5.1 Processes

Let x, y, \dots range over *variables*, denoting *channel names* (or *session endpoints*), and v, v', \dots over *values*; for simplicity, the sets of values and variables coincide. Also, let P, Q, \dots range over *processes*, defined by the grammar of Figure 5.1, which induces the class $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$. \square

The output process $\bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P$ sends value v across channel x and then continues as P . In the input process $q x(y).P$, the qualifier q can be either lin (denoting a linear input) or un (denoting an unrestricted input, i.e., a replicated server). In either case, x expects to receive a value that will replace free occurrences of y in P . Parallel composition $P \mid Q$ denotes the concurrent execution of processes P and Q . The process $(\mathbf{v}xy)P$ denotes the restriction of the *co-variables* x and y with scope P . This declares them as dual endpoints, which are expected to behave complementarily to each other. We write $(\mathbf{v}zv : S)P$ when either z or v have session type S in P . As we will see, a synchronization always occurs across a pairs of co-variables. Finally, the inactive process is denoted as $\mathbf{0}$.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
P \mid Q \equiv Q \mid P & P \mid \mathbf{0} \equiv P \\
(P \mid Q) \mid R \equiv P \mid (Q \mid R) & (\mathbf{v}xy)\mathbf{0} \equiv \mathbf{0} \\
(\mathbf{v}xy)(\mathbf{v}zw)P \equiv (\mathbf{v}zw)(\mathbf{v}xy)P & (\mathbf{v}xy)P \equiv (\mathbf{v}yx)P \\
((\mathbf{v}xy)P) \mid Q \equiv (\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q) [x, y \notin \text{fv}(Q)] &
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l}
(\text{R-LINCOM}) \quad (\mathbf{v}xy)(\bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P \mid \text{lin } y(z).Q \mid R) \\
\quad \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q[v/z] \mid R) \\
(\text{R-UNCOM}) \quad (\mathbf{v}xy)(\bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P \mid \text{un } y(z).Q \mid R) \\
\quad \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q[v/z] \mid \text{un } y(z).Q \mid R) \\
(\text{R-PAR}) \quad P \longrightarrow Q \Longrightarrow P \mid R \longrightarrow Q \mid R \\
(\text{R-RES}) \quad P \longrightarrow Q \Longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)P \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)Q \\
(\text{R-STR}) \quad P \equiv P', P \longrightarrow Q, Q' \equiv Q \Longrightarrow P' \longrightarrow Q'
\end{array}$$

Figure 5.2: Reduction semantics for $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$

As usual, the set of free variables in a process P is denoted $\text{fv}(P)$, and similarly $\text{bv}(P)$ for bound variables. The capture-free substitution of the variable z by the value v is denoted as $[v/z]$. We adopt Barendregt's variable convention.

With respect to Vasconcelos (2012), the above the process syntax leaves out boolean values, conditional expressions, and labeled choices, which are all inessential for our comparative study of termination.

Definition 5.2 Reduction Semantics

The reduction relation \longrightarrow of $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ is defined in Figure 5.2. \square

The reduction semantics for $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ follows standard lines for (session) π -calculus; it is closed under a structural congruence, denoted \equiv , which captures expected principles for parallel composition and restriction. The reduction rule (R-LINCOM) captures the linear communication across co-variables x and y , appropriately declared by restriction, in which value v is exchanged. Similarly, rule (R-UNCOM) denotes unrestricted communication across co-variables; in this case, the input prefix is persistent, and remains ready for further synchronizations after reduction. The contextual rules (R-PAR) and (R-RES) express that concurrent processes can reduce within the scope of parallel composition and restriction. Finally, rule (R-STR) denotes that reductions are closed under structural congruence.

5.2.2 Session Types

We endow $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ with the session type system by Vasconcelos (2012), which ensures that well-typed processes respect their protocols but does not ensure deadlock-freedom nor termination guarantees. With respect to the syntax of types in Vas-

| | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|------------|-------------------|
| $q ::=$ | (Qualifiers) | $T, S ::=$ | (Types) |
| lin | (linear) | end | (termination) |
| un | (unrestricted) | $q p$ | (pretypes) |
| $p ::=$ | (Pretypes) | a | (type variable) |
| $?T.S$ | (receive) | $\mu a.T$ | (recursive types) |
| $!T.S$ | (send) | | |
| $\Gamma ::=$ | (Contexts) | | |
| \emptyset | (empty) | | |
| $\Gamma, x : T$ | (assumption) | | |

Figure 5.3: Session Types of π_S

concelos (2012), we only consider channel endpoint types (no ground types such as bool).

Definition 5.3 Session Types

The syntax of session types (T, S, \dots) is given in Figure 5.3. □

Session types T, S describe protocols as *sequences* of actions for an endpoint; they do not admit the parallel usage of an endpoint. They have the following forms:

1. Type **end** is given to an endpoint with a completed protocol.
2. Type $q p$ denotes pre-type p with qualifier q , which indicates either a linear or an unrestricted behavior (lin and un, respectively). The pre-type $?T.S$ is given to an endpoint that first receives a value of type T and then continues according to type S . Dually, the pre-type $!T.S$ is intended for an endpoint that first outputs a value of type T and then continues according to S .
3. Type $\mu a.T$ is a recursive type, with type variable a . A recursive type is required to be *contractive*, i.e., it contains no subexpression of type $\mu a_1. \dots \mu a_n. a_1$; and a is bound with scope T . Notions of bound and free type variables, alpha-conversion and capture-avoiding substitutions (denoted $[S/a]$) is defined as usual. Type equality is based on regular infinite trees Vasconcelos (2012).

Recursive types that are *tail-recursive* are expressive enough to type servers and clients; we have a dedicated notation for them.

Notation 5.2.1 (Server and Client Types) We shall write $*?T$ to denote the server type $\mu a. \text{un } ?T.a$, where variable a does not occur in T . Similarly, we write $*!T$ to denote the client type $\mu a. \text{un } !T.a$

In the following, we shall work with tail-recursive types only. A central notion in session-based concurrency is *duality*, which relates session types offering opposite (i.e., complementary) behaviors; it stands at the basis of communication safety and session fidelity.

Definition 5.4 Duality

Given a (tail-recursive) session type T , its dual type \bar{T} is defined as follows:

$$\begin{array}{llll} \overline{\mathbf{end}} & = & \mathbf{end} & \overline{!T.\bar{S}} & = & ?T.\bar{S} & \overline{*\bar{T}} & = & *!T \\ \overline{q\bar{p}} & = & q\bar{p} & \overline{?T.\bar{S}} & = & !T.\bar{S} & \overline{*\bar{T}} & = & *!T \end{array}$$

□

We now collect definitions and results from [Vasconcelos \(2012\)](#) that will lead to state the main properties of typable processes.

Definition 5.5 Predicates on Types/Contexts

We consider two predicates on types, denoted $\text{lin}(T)$ and $\text{un}(T)$, defined as follows:

- $\text{un}(T)$ if and only if $T = \mathbf{end}$ or $T = \text{un } p$.
- $\text{lin}(T)$ if and only if true.

The definition extends to contexts as follows: we write $q(\Gamma)$ if and only if $x : T \in \Gamma$ implies $q(T)$. □

This way, to express that T defines strictly linear behavior we write $\neg\text{un}(T)$ (and similarly for a context Γ). The following notation is useful to separate the linear and unrestricted portions of a context:

Notation 5.2.2 We write $\Gamma \otimes \Gamma'$ if $\text{un}(\Gamma) \wedge \neg\text{un}(\Gamma')$.

Definition 5.6 Context Split and Update

The split and update operations on contexts, denoted \circ and $+$, are defined as follows.

$$\emptyset \circ \emptyset = \emptyset \quad \frac{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 = \Gamma \quad \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma, x : T = (\Gamma_1, x : T) \circ (\Gamma_2, x : T)} \quad \frac{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 = \Gamma}{\Gamma, x : \text{lin } p = (\Gamma_1, x : \text{lin } p) \circ \Gamma_2}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 = \Gamma}{\Gamma, x : \text{lin } p = \Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma_2, x : \text{lin } p)} \quad \frac{x : U \notin \Gamma}{\Gamma + x : T = \Gamma, x : T}$$

$$\frac{\text{un}(T)}{(\Gamma, x : T) + x : T = (\Gamma, x : T)}$$

□

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[S:Var]} \frac{\text{un}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma, x : T \vdash_s x : T} \quad \text{[S:Nil]} \frac{\text{un}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash_s \mathbf{0}} \quad \text{[S:Par]} \frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s P \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash_s Q}{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \vdash_s P \mid Q} \\
\text{[S:Res]} \frac{\Gamma, x : T, y : \bar{T} \vdash_s P}{\Gamma \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)P} \quad \text{[S:In]} \frac{q_1(\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2) \quad \Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : q_2?T.S \quad (\Gamma_2 + x : S), y : T \vdash_s P}{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \vdash_s q_1 x(y).P} \\
\text{[S:Out]} \frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : q!T.S \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash_s v : T \quad \Gamma_3 + x : S \vdash_s P}{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \circ \Gamma_3 \vdash_s \bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P}
\end{array}$$

Figure 5.4: Typing rules for π_S (cf. Vasconcelos (2012)).

The typing system considers two kinds of judgments, for processes and for variables, denoted $\Gamma \vdash_s P$ and $\Gamma \vdash_s x : T$, respectively. We write $\vdash_s P$ when Γ is empty. The typing rules are given in Figure 5.4. We will explain Rule [S:In]: it is parametric on the qualifiers q_1 and q_2 and covers three different behaviours depending on whether q_i is *lin* or *un*, for $i = 1, 2$. In the case $q_1 = \text{lin}$, to prove $\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \vdash_s \text{lin } x(y).P$, we need to prove $\Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : q_2?T.S$ and $(\Gamma_2 + x : S), y : T \vdash_s P$; note that $\text{lin}(\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2)$ is true, by Definition 5.5. In the case $q_2 = \text{lin}$, both judgments hold if $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma'_1, x : \text{lin}?T.S$, the assignment $x : \text{lin}?T.S$ does not occur in Γ_2 , by Definition 5.6, and $x : S$ is added to Γ_2 for the continuation. Differently, when $q_2 = \text{un}$, both judgments hold if $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma'_1, x : *?T$, the assignment $x : *?T$ also occurs in Γ_2 which with the addition of $x : S$ in Γ_2 implies $S = *?T$. Notice that the case $q_1 = \text{un}$ and $q_2 = \text{lin}$ is not possible since $\text{un}(\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2)$ implies that all assignments in $\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2$ have types **end** or with ‘un’; thus, in that case we cannot prove $\Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : \text{lin}?T.S$.

Similarly, Rule [S:Out] is parametric on the qualifier q .

The main property of the type system concerns *well-formed* processes, which are defined next.

Definition 5.7 Redexes and Well-formedness

A *redex* is a process of the form $q x(v).P \mid \bar{y}\langle z \rangle.Q$. Processes of the form $q x(v).P$ and $\bar{y}\langle z \rangle.Q$ have prefix x and y , respectively.

A process is *well-formed* if, for each of its structurally congruent processes of the form $(\mathbf{v}x_1y_1) \cdots (\mathbf{v}x_ny_n)(P \mid Q \mid R)$, the following conditions hold. (1) If P and Q are processes prefixed at the same variable, then they are of the same nature (input, output). (2) If P is prefixed at x_1 and Q is prefixed at y_1 then $P \mid Q$ is a redex. \square

Theorem 5.1 (Properties of the Type System) *The type system satisfies the following properties (see Vasconcelos (2012) for details):*

- If $\Gamma \vdash_s P$ and $P \equiv Q$, then $\Gamma \vdash_s Q$.
- If $\Gamma \vdash_s P$ and $P \longrightarrow Q$, then $\Gamma \vdash_s Q$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[S:Lin - In}_1\text{]} \\
\frac{\Gamma_1, x : \text{lin?}T.S \vdash_s x : \text{lin?}T.S \quad \Gamma_2, x : S, y : T \vdash_s P}{\Gamma_1, x : \text{lin?}T.S \circ \Gamma_2 \vdash_s \text{lin } x(y).P} \\
\\
\text{[S:Lin - In}_2\text{]} \quad \frac{\Gamma_1, x : *?T \vdash_s x : *?T \quad \Gamma_2, x : *?T, y : T \vdash_s P}{(\Gamma_1, x : *?T) \circ (\Gamma_2, x : *?T) \vdash_s \text{lin } x(y).P} \\
\\
\text{[S:Un - In]} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash_s x : *?T \quad \Gamma, y : T \vdash_s P}{\Gamma \vdash_s \text{un } x(y).P} \\
\\
\text{[S:Un - Out]} \quad \frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : *!T \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash_s v : T \quad \Gamma_3 \vdash_s P}{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \circ \Gamma_3 \vdash_s \bar{x}(v).P} \\
\\
\text{[S:Lin - Out]} \\
\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : \text{lin } !T.S \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash_s v : T \quad \Gamma_3, x : S \vdash_s P}{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \circ \Gamma_3 \vdash_s \bar{x}(v).P}
\end{array}$$

Figure 5.5: Refined typing rules for input and output.

- If $\Gamma, x : T \vdash_s P$ and $x \notin \text{fn}(P)$, then $\Gamma \vdash_s P$.
- If $\vdash_s P$ then P is well-formed.

For technical convenience, we rely on the *refined* typing rules for input and output in Figure 5.5, which are equivalent (but more fine-grained) than those in Figure 5.4.

We close this section by defining the class of processes \mathcal{S} .

Definition 5.8 \mathcal{S}

We define $\mathcal{S} = \{P \in \pi_{\mathcal{S}} \mid \exists \Gamma \text{ s.t. } \Gamma \vdash_s P\}$. □

Example 5.1 A Non-Terminating Process in \mathcal{S}

Consider the process $P_{5.1} = (\mathbf{v}xy)(\bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \text{un } x(z).\bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0})$, which invokes itself ad infinitum. Process $P_{5.1}$ is in \mathcal{S} because $w : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s P_{5.1}$ holds with the following derivation:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\text{un}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash_s x : *?\mathbf{end}} \quad \Pi}{\text{[S:Un - In]} \quad \Gamma \vdash_s \text{un } x(z).\bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}} \quad \Pi}{\text{[S:Par]} \quad \Gamma \vdash_s \bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \text{un } x(z).\bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}}}{\text{[S:Res]} \quad w : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)(\bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \text{un } x(z).\bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0})}
\end{array}$$

with $\Gamma = x : *? \mathbf{end}, y : *! \mathbf{end}, w : \mathbf{end}$ and Π is the derivation

$$[\mathbf{S:Un} - \mathbf{Out}] \frac{\frac{\text{un}(\Gamma')}{\Gamma' \vdash_s y : *! \mathbf{end}} \quad \frac{\text{un}(\Gamma')}{\Gamma' \vdash_s w : \mathbf{end}} \quad \frac{\text{un}(\Gamma')}{\Gamma' \vdash_s \mathbf{0}}}{\Gamma' \vdash_s \bar{y}\langle w \rangle. \mathbf{0}}$$

with $\Gamma' = x : *? \mathbf{end}, y : *! \mathbf{end}, w : \mathbf{end}, z : \mathbf{end}$. \square

5.3 A Weight-based Approach to Terminating Processes

We move on to consider a type system that ensures termination for a class of π -calculus processes. Following [Deng & Sangiorgi \(2006\)](#), the type system uses *weights* (or *levels*) to avoid infinite reduction sequences. This type system will induce a class of terminating $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ processes, denoted \mathcal{W} ([Definition 5.19](#)), obtained via appropriate translations on processes and types. To ease the definition of such translations, here we define a type system that mildly modifies the system of [Deng & Sangiorgi \(2006\)](#) to account for linearity and synchronous/polyadic (tuple-based) communication. Our main result is that the weight-based system ensures termination ([Theorem D.1](#)).

5.3.1 Processes

We introduce a process model for the weight-based type system, denoted $\pi_{\mathcal{W}}$, formally defined next. In the following, we write \tilde{y} to stand for the finite tuple y_1, \dots, y_n .

Definition 5.9 Processes

The syntax of $\pi_{\mathcal{W}}$ processes is given by the grammar in [Figure 5.7](#) (top). \square

$\pi_{\mathcal{W}}$ is designed to stand in between $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ and the process model in [Deng & Sangiorgi \(2006\)](#). Communication in $\pi_{\mathcal{W}}$ is polyadic, i.e., exchanges involve a tuple of names, rather than a single name as in [Definition 5.1](#) and [Deng & Sangiorgi \(2006\)](#). We shall often consider tuples of length two (i.e., dyadic communication), as this suffices for a continuation-passing encoding of sessions [Dardha et al. \(2012\)](#). Another difference with respect to [Deng & Sangiorgi \(2006\)](#) is that inputs can be linear or unrestricted; this will facilitate the formal connection with $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ and its type system. The role of linearity is more prominent at the level of types, defined later on.

We give the operational semantics of $\pi_{\mathcal{W}}$ in terms of the (early) labeled transition system (LTS), with the following labels for input, output, bound output, and silent transitions (synchronizations):

$$\alpha ::= x(\tilde{v}) \mid \bar{x}\langle \tilde{y} \rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}y, \tilde{b})\bar{x}\langle \tilde{v} \rangle \mid \tau$$

The rules, given in Figure 5.6, are standard. Rules [W:Par] and [W:Tau] can be applied symmetrically across parallel composition.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{[W:In]}{x(\tilde{y}).P \xrightarrow{x(\tilde{v})} P[v_1/y_1][v_2/y_2]} \qquad \frac{[W:Par] \quad P \xrightarrow{\alpha} P' \quad bn(\alpha) \cap fn(Q) = \emptyset}{P \mid Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} P' \mid Q} \\
\\
\frac{[W:Res] \quad P \xrightarrow{\alpha} P' \quad x \notin n(\alpha)}{(\mathbf{v}x)P \xrightarrow{\alpha} (\mathbf{v}x)P'} \qquad \frac{[W:Rep]}{!x(\tilde{y}).P \xrightarrow{x(\tilde{v})} !x(\tilde{y}).P \mid P[v_1/y_1]} \\
\\
\frac{[W:Out]}{\bar{x}(\tilde{y}).P \xrightarrow{\bar{x}(\tilde{y})} P} \qquad \frac{[W:Tau] \quad P \xrightarrow{(\mathbf{v}\tilde{b})\bar{x}(\tilde{v})} P' \quad Q \xrightarrow{x(\tilde{v})} Q' \quad \tilde{b} \cap fn(Q) = \emptyset}{P \mid Q \xrightarrow{\tau} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{b})(P' \mid Q')} \\
\\
\frac{[W:Open] \quad P \xrightarrow{(\mathbf{v}\tilde{b})\bar{x}(\tilde{v})} P' \quad y \in (fn(v_1) \cup fn(v_2)) - \{\tilde{b}, x\}}{(\mathbf{v}y)P \xrightarrow{(\mathbf{v}y.\tilde{b})\bar{x}(\tilde{v})} P'}
\end{array}$$

Figure 5.6: An LTS for π_W

5.3.2 Types

Definition 5.10 Types for π_W

The syntax of weight-based types for π_W is given by the grammar in Figure 5.7 (bottom). \square

As in [Deng & Sangiorgi \(2006\)](#), our link types for π_W are *simple*, i.e., they do not admit the sequencing of actions enabled by session types. Our syntax of types extends that in [Deng & Sangiorgi \(2006\)](#) to account for (i) dyadic communication and (ii) explicit types for clients and servers. Concerning (ii), we purposefully adopt the tail-recursive types for clients and servers defined for π_S , rather than more general recursive types.

We introduce some notions borrowed from the type system from Section 5.2.2: duality, contexts, predicates on types, operations on contexts.

Definition 5.11 Duality

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|
| $P, Q ::=$ | (Processes) | | |
| $\bar{x}\langle y_1, y_2 \rangle.P$ | (output) | $x(y_1, y_2).P$ | (linear input) |
| $P \mid Q$ | (parallel) | $!x(y_1, y_2).P$ | (server) |
| $(\mathbf{v}x)P$ | (restriction) | $\mathbf{0}$ | (inaction) |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| $S, T, V, L ::=$ | (Link Types) | | |
| $\#^n(V_1, V_2)$ | (linear input type) | | |
| $\#^n\langle V_1, V_2 \rangle$ | (linear output type) | | |
| $*\#^n(V)$ | (unrestricted server type) | | |
| $*\#^n\langle V \rangle$ | (unrestricted client type) | | |
| \mathbf{unit} | (termination) | | |
| $n ::= 1, 2, \dots$ | (weights) | | |

Figure 5.7: Syntax of processes and types for π_W .

Duality on linked types is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\#^n(V_1, V_2)} &= \#^n\langle \bar{V}_1, \bar{V}_2 \rangle & \overline{\#^n\langle V_1, V_2 \rangle} &= \#^n(\bar{V}_1, \bar{V}_2) & \overline{\mathbf{unit}} &= \mathbf{unit} \\ \overline{*\#^n(V)} &= *\#^n\langle \bar{V} \rangle & \overline{*\#^n\langle V \rangle} &= *\#^n(\bar{V}) \end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 5.12 Contexts

Contexts are given by the grammar:

$$\Gamma, \Delta ::= \cdot \mid \Gamma, x : V \mid \Gamma, x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle$$

where $\Gamma, x : L$ and $\Gamma, x : \langle L, \bar{L} \rangle$ imply $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$.

Following the sorts of [Honda et al. \(1998b\)](#), the assignment $x : \langle L, \bar{L} \rangle$ denotes the pairing of x with two complementary protocols, where $\langle L, \bar{L} \rangle = \langle \bar{L}, L \rangle$. We use $x :: L$ to stand for $x : \langle L, \bar{L} \rangle$ when L is the main object of interest. We write $x \diamond T$ if either $x : T$ or $x :: T$ holds (i.e., $\diamond \in \{:, ::\}$). □

Definition 5.13 Unrestricted Types

Predicate $\text{un}(T)$ holds if $T = *\#^n(V)$, $T = *\#^n\langle V \rangle$, $T = \mathbf{unit}$, or $x : \langle L, \bar{L} \rangle$ with $\text{un}(L)$. We write $\text{un}(\Gamma)$ if $\text{un}(T)$ holds for every $x \diamond T \in \Gamma$. □

Following [Definition 5.6](#), the following definitions gives a relation to split contexts into two parts.

Definition 5.14 Split Relation on Contexts

The relation \circ on contexts is defined in [Figure 5.8](#). □

$$\begin{array}{c}
\emptyset \circ \emptyset = \emptyset \\
\frac{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 = \Gamma \quad \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma, x : T = (\Gamma_1, x : T) \circ (\Gamma_2, x : T)} \\
\frac{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 = \Gamma \quad \text{un}(V)}{\Gamma, x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle = (\Gamma_1, x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle) \circ (\Gamma_2, x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle)} \quad \frac{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 = \Gamma \quad \neg \text{un}(V)}{\Gamma, x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle = (\Gamma_1, x : V) \circ (\Gamma_2, x : \bar{V})} \\
\frac{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 = \Gamma \quad \neg \text{un}(V)}{\Gamma, x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle = (\Gamma_1, x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle) \circ \Gamma_2} \quad \frac{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 = \Gamma \quad \neg \text{un}(V)}{\Gamma, x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle = \Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma_2, x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle)} \\
\frac{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 = \Gamma \quad \neg \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma, x : T = (\Gamma_1, x : T) \circ \Gamma_2} \quad \frac{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 = \Gamma \quad \neg \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma, x : T = \Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma_2, x : T)}
\end{array}$$

Figure 5.8: Splitting of Contexts for $\pi_{\mathbb{W}}$

We now introduce notions on processes that are essential to Deng and Sangiorgi's approach to termination by typing.

Definition 5.15 Level Function, $l(x)$

Let \mathcal{N} denote the set of all names. We define the function $l(\cdot) : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ to map names of a process (free and bound) to naturals. We assume α -conversion is silently used to avoid name capture and ensure uniqueness of bound names. Given a (typed) process, we define this function as follows:

$$l(x) = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } x : T \text{ or } x :: T \\ & \text{with } T \in \{\#^n(V_1, V_2), \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle, * \#^n(V), * \#^n \langle V \rangle\} \\ m & \text{if } x : \mathbf{unit}, \text{ for any } m \in \mathbb{N} \end{cases}$$

□

Definition 5.16 Active Outputs, $\text{os}(\cdot)$

Given a process P , the set of names with active outputs $\text{os}(P)$ is defined inductively:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{os}(\bar{x}(\bar{y}).P) = \{x\} \cup \text{os}(P) & \text{os}(x(\bar{y}).P) = \text{os}(P) \\
\text{os}(P \mid Q) = \text{os}(P) \cup \text{os}(Q) & \text{os}(\mathbf{v}x.P) = \text{os}(P) \\
\text{os}(\mathbf{0}) = \emptyset & \text{os}(!x(\bar{y}).P) = \emptyset
\end{array}$$

□

Typing judgments are of the form $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbb{W}} P$, with corresponding typing given in Figure 5.9. Typability is contingent on a level function: we say a process P is well-typed if there exists a level function $l(\cdot)$ such that a typing derivation $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathbb{W}} P$ holds, for some Γ .

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[W:Var}_1\text{]} \\
\frac{\text{un}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma, x : V \vdash_w x : V}
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[W:Var}_2\text{]} \\
\frac{\text{un}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma, x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle \vdash_w x : V}
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[W:Nil]} \\
\frac{\text{un}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash_w \mathbf{0}}
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[W:Par]} \\
\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_w P \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash_w Q}{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \vdash_w P \mid Q}
\end{array}
\\
\\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[W:Res]} \\
\frac{\Gamma, x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle \vdash_w P}{\Gamma \vdash_w (\mathbf{v}x)P}
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[W:Lin - In}_1\text{]} \\
\frac{\Gamma_1, x : \#^n(V_1, V_2) \vdash_w x : \#^n(V_1, V_2) \quad \Gamma_2, y_1 : V_1, y_2 : V_2 \vdash_w P \quad l(x) = l(y_2)}{\Gamma_1, x : \#^n(V_1, V_2) \circ \Gamma_2 \vdash_w x(y_1, y_2).P}
\end{array}
\\
\\
\text{[W:Lin - In}_2\text{]} \frac{\Gamma_1, x : \#^n(V) \vdash_w x : \#^n(V) \quad \Gamma_2, x : \#^n(V), y_1 : V, y_2 : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w P}{(\Gamma_1, x : \#^n(V)) \circ (\Gamma_2, x : \#^n(V)) \vdash_w x(y_1, y_2).P}
\\
\\
\text{[W:Lin - In}_3\text{]} \frac{\Gamma, x :: \#^n(V) \vdash_w x : \#^n(V) \quad \Gamma, x : \#^n(V), y_1 : V, y_2 : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w P}{\Gamma, x :: \#^n(V) \vdash_w x(y_1, y_2).P}
\\
\\
\text{[W:Lin - Out]} \frac{\Gamma_1, x : \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle \vdash_w x : \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle \quad \Gamma_2, y_1 : V_1 \vdash_w y_1 : V_1 \quad \Gamma_3, y_2 : V_2 \vdash_w P \quad l(x) = l(y_2)}{(\Gamma_1, x : \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle) \circ (\Gamma_2, y_1 : V_1) \circ (\Gamma_3, y_2 : V_2) \vdash_w \bar{x}(y_1, y_2).P}
\\
\\
\text{[W:Un - Out}_1\text{]} \frac{\Gamma_1, x : \#^n \langle V \rangle \vdash_w x : \#^n \langle V \rangle \quad \Gamma_2, x : \#^n \langle V \rangle, y : V \vdash_w y : V \quad \Gamma_3, x : \#^n \langle V \rangle, y_2 : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w P}{(\Gamma_1, x : \#^n \langle V \rangle) \circ (\Gamma_2, x : \#^n \langle V \rangle, y : V) \circ (\Gamma_3, x : \#^n \langle V \rangle) \vdash_w \bar{x}(y_1, y_2).P}
\\
\\
\text{[W:Un - Out}_2\text{]} \frac{\Gamma_1, x :: \#^n \langle V \rangle \vdash_w x : \#^n \langle V \rangle \quad \Gamma_2, x :: \#^n \langle V \rangle, y : V \vdash_w y : V \quad \Gamma_3, x :: \#^n \langle V \rangle, y_2 : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w P}{(\Gamma_1, x :: \#^n \langle V \rangle) \circ (\Gamma_2, x :: \#^n \langle V \rangle, y : V) \circ (\Gamma_3, x :: \#^n \langle V \rangle) \vdash_w \bar{x}(y_1, y_2).P}
\\
\\
\text{[W:Un - In}_1\text{]} \frac{\Gamma, x : \#^n(V) \vdash_w x : \#^n(V) \quad \Gamma, x : \#^n(V), y_1 : V, y_2 : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w P \quad \forall b \in \text{os}(P), l(b) < n}{\Gamma, x : \#^n(V) \vdash_w !x(y_1, y_2).P}
\\
\\
\text{[W:Un - In}_2\text{]} \frac{\Gamma, x :: \#^n(V) \vdash_w x : \#^n(V) \quad \Gamma, x :: \#^n(V), y_1 : V, y_2 : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w P \quad \forall b \in \text{os}(P), l(b) < n}{\Gamma, x :: \#^n(V) \vdash_w !x(y_1, y_2).P}
\end{array}$$

Figure 5.9: Typing rules for π_W

We comment on some of the rules in Figure 5.9 for π_W , contrasting them with those in Figure 5.4 for π_S . Rule [W:Var₁] is similar to rule [S:Var]. Rule [W:Var₂] is the corresponding rule for complementary interaction: if $x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle$, then we can assign the type $x : V$. Intuitively, name x encapsulates the types of its two endpoints, denoted as V and \bar{V} . As long as x respects one of these types, the channel is considered correctly typed.

Rule $[W:\text{Lin} - \text{In}_1]$ acts as the linear counterpart to $[S:\text{In}]$. Importantly, there is no direct counterpart for x as a linear complementary interaction. Instead, the context split $\Gamma, x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle = (\Gamma_1, x : V) \circ (\Gamma_2, x : \bar{V})$ allows for the application of rule $[W:\text{Lin} - \text{In}_1]$. This structural mechanism operates silently within the rules where V is linear, achieved through context split. As a result, this disallows linear channels from consuming linear complementary interactions.

Rules $[W:\text{Lin} - \text{In}_2]$ and $[W:\text{Lin} - \text{In}_3]$, the first with ‘:’ and the second with ‘::’, are counterparts to rule $[S:\text{In}]$ for unrestricted types with linear qualifier. Similarly, $[W:\text{Lin} - \text{Out}]$, $[W:\text{Un} - \text{Out}_1]$, and $[W:\text{Un} - \text{Out}_2]$ represent the rule $[S:\text{Out}]$. Furthermore, $[W:\text{Un} - \text{In}_1]$ and $[W:\text{Un} - \text{In}_2]$ are the unrestricted counterparts to rule $[S:\text{In}]$ with unrestricted qualifier. These rules adopt the main condition from [Deng & Sangiorgi \(2006\)](#), i.e., the weight of types of the active outputs must be strictly less than the weight of the type of the channel of the server providing them. Finally, rule $[W:\text{Res}]$ types a restricted channel through a complementary interaction.

We state the type preservation property:

Theorem 5.2 (Type Preservation) *Suppose $\Gamma \vdash_w P$ for a level function l . If $P \xrightarrow{\tau} P'$ then $\Gamma \vdash_w P'$ for the same level function l .*

5.3.3 Termination by Typing

A process terminates if all its reduction sequences are finite. We show that our formulation of the type system in [Deng & Sangiorgi \(2006\)](#) also enforces termination by typing. The proof follows the same lines as in [Deng & Sangiorgi \(2006\)](#): a weight is associated with a well-typed process; this weight is then shown to strictly reduce when the process synchronizes. The weight is actually a *vector* constructed from the observable active outputs of a channel within a typed process.

Definition 5.17 Vectors

We define vectors and their operations:

- Given $k \geq 1$, we write 0_i to denote the vector $\langle n_k, n_{k-1}, \dots, n_1 \rangle$ where $n_i = 1$ and $n_j = 0$ for every other j . Also, 0 denotes the zero vector where $n_i = 0$ for every i .
- Given vectors $v_1 = \langle n_k, n_{k-1}, \dots, n_1 \rangle$ and $v_2 = \langle m_l, m_{l-1}, \dots, m_1 \rangle$, with $k \geq l$, the sum $v_1 + v_2$ is defined in two steps. Firstly, if $k > l$ then the shorter vector v_2 is extended into v'_2 by adding zeroes to match the size of v_1 , i.e., $v'_2 = \langle m_k, m_{k-1}, \dots, m_l, \dots, m_1 \rangle$, with $\langle m_k, m_{k-1}, \dots, m_{l+1} \rangle = 0$. Then, addition of v_1 and v'_2 is applied pointwise.
- Given vectors $v_1 = \langle n_k, n_{k-1}, \dots, n_1 \rangle$ and $v_2 = \langle m_k, m_{k-1}, \dots, m_1 \rangle$ of equal size k , the ordering $v_1 \prec v_2$ is defined iff $\exists i \leq k, n_i < m_i$ and $\forall j > i, n_j = m_j$.

□

Using vectors, we define the weight of a well-typed process:

Definition 5.18 Weights

Given a well-typed process P with level function l , the weight of P is the vector defined inductively as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{wt}(\mathbf{0}) &= 0 & \text{wt}(!x(\tilde{y}).P) &= 0 \\ \text{wt}(x(\tilde{y}).P) &= \text{wt}(P) & \text{wt}(\bar{x}(\tilde{y}).P) &= \text{wt}(P) + \mathbf{0}_{l(x)} \\ \text{wt}(P \mid Q) &= \text{wt}(P) + \text{wt}(Q) & \text{wt}(\mathbf{v}x)P &= \text{wt}(P) \end{aligned}$$

□

We have the following results, whose proof is as in [Deng & Sangiorgi \(2006\)](#):

Proposition 5.3.1 *If $\Gamma \vdash_w P$ and $P \xrightarrow{\tau} P'$ then $\text{wt}(P') \prec \text{wt}(P)$.*

Theorem 5.3 (Termination) *If $\Gamma \vdash_w P$ then P terminates.*

5.4 \mathcal{W} : A Class of Terminating Processes

Here we define and study \mathcal{W} , a class of terminating π_S processes induced by the weight-based type system given in Section 5.3, which leverages translations on processes and types/contexts, denoted $\langle \cdot \rangle$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle_l$, respectively. Concretely, \mathcal{W} is defined as follows:

Definition 5.19 \mathcal{W}

We define:

$$\mathcal{W} = \{P \in \pi_S \mid \exists \Gamma, l \text{ s.t. } (\Gamma \vdash_s P) \wedge \langle \Gamma \rangle_l \vdash_w \langle P \rangle\}$$

□

Hence, \mathcal{W} contains those processes from \mathcal{S} (Definition 5.8) whose translation gives typable π_W processes. By Theorem D.1, \mathcal{W} thus provides a characterization of terminating processes in \mathcal{S} . In the following we formally define the translations $\langle \cdot \rangle$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle_l$, and establish their main properties. Our main result is that $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{S}$ (Theorem 5.6): there are typable processes in \mathcal{S} which are not terminating under the weight-based approach.

5.4.1 The Typed Translation

Our translation is *typed*, i.e., the translation of a π_S process depends on its associated (session) types. We first present the translation on processes and types separately; then, we combine them to define the translation of a typing judgment.

Definition 5.20 Translating Processes

The translation $\langle \cdot \rangle : \pi_S \rightarrow \pi_W$ is given in Figure 5.10 (top), where we assume z is fresh. \square

We discuss some interesting cases in the translation of processes:

- The shape of process $\langle \text{lin } x(y).P \rangle$ depends on whether x has a linear or an unrestricted type: this is due to rule [S:In] (Figure 5.4) which depends on a qualifier q_2 that can be linear or unrestricted. If $x : \text{lin}?T.S$ then the translation is $x(y,z).\langle P[z/x] \rangle$, with the continuation along z ; otherwise, in case $x : *?T$, the translation is $x(y,z).\langle P \rangle$, since there is no continuation in x , as explained in the description of rule [S:In] in Figure 5.4.
- The process $\langle \text{un } x(y).P \rangle$ is simply an unrestricted input process $!x(y,z).\langle P \rangle$.
- The process $\langle \bar{x}(y).P \rangle$, the translation of a bound send, also depends on the type of x and the justification for it is similar to the translation of linear inputs described above.
- The process $\langle (\mathbf{v}xy)P \rangle$ is simply $(\mathbf{v}z)\langle P[z/x][z/y] \rangle$: the co-variables x, y are replaced by the restricted (fresh) name z . The duality between the types of x and y , say $x : L$ and $y : \bar{L}$, must be preserved by the type of z in π_W . This correspondence will become evident when discussing the translation of judgements (Definition 5.22).

Definition 5.21 Translating Types/Contexts

The translation $\langle - \rangle_l$ of session types and contexts is given in Figure 5.10 (bottom). The translation of contexts is parametric on a level function l . In particular, the translation of a type assignment $\langle x : T \rangle_l$, relies on an auxiliary translation $x : \langle T \rangle_l^x$, which is deemed to be assigned a level $l(x)$ in the translated type $\langle T \rangle_l^x$, depending on the shape of T . Other names, denoted $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \dots$, are necessary when translating within types. \square

The translation $\langle - \rangle_l$ follows the continuation-passing approach of [Dardha et al. \(2012\)](#) to encode session types into link types. The translation of tail-recursive types is rather direct, and self-explanatory.

By combining the translations of types and processes in Figure 5.10 we obtain a translation of type judgements / derivations in π_S into type judgements / derivations in π_W . We use an auxiliary notation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbf{0} \rangle &= \mathbf{0} \\
\langle P \mid Q \rangle &= \langle P \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle \\
\langle (\mathbf{v}xy)P \rangle &= (\mathbf{v}z) \langle P[z/x][z/y] \rangle \\
\langle \text{lin } x(y).P \rangle &= \begin{cases} x(y, z). \langle P[z/x] \rangle & \text{If } x : \text{lin?}T.S \\ x(y, z). \langle P \rangle & \text{If } x : *?T \end{cases} \\
\langle \text{un } x(y).P \rangle &= !x(y, z). \langle P \rangle \\
\langle \bar{x}(y).P \rangle &= \begin{cases} (\mathbf{v}z)\bar{x}(y, z). \langle P[z/x] \rangle & \text{If } x : \text{lin!}T.S \\ \bar{x}(y, z). \langle P \rangle & \text{If } x : *!T \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \Gamma \rangle_l &= (x_1 : T_1)_l, \dots, (x_n : T_n)_l \\
(x : T)_l &= x : \langle T \rangle_l^x \\
\langle \text{end} \rangle_l^x &= \text{unit} \\
\langle \text{lin ?}T.S \rangle_l^x &= \#^{l(x)} \langle \langle T \rangle_l^\alpha, \langle S \rangle_l^x \rangle \\
\langle \text{lin !}T.S \rangle_l^x &= \#^{l(x)} \langle \langle T \rangle_l^\beta, \langle S \rangle_l^x \rangle \\
\langle *?T \rangle_x^l &= * \#^{l(x)} \langle \langle T \rangle_x^? \rangle \\
\langle *!T \rangle_x^l &= * \#^{l(x)} \langle \langle T \rangle_x^! \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 5.10: From π_S to π_W (Definitions 5.20 and 5.21)

Definition 5.22 Translating Judgements/Derivations

The translation of a type judgment for π_S into a type judgment for π_W is parametric on the level function $l : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s P \rrbracket_l &= \langle \Gamma \rangle_l \vdash_w \langle P \rangle \\
\llbracket \Gamma, x : T \vdash_s x : T \rrbracket_l &= \langle \Gamma \rangle_l, x : \langle T \rangle_l^x \vdash_w x : \langle T \rangle_l^x
\end{aligned}$$

This translation induces an inductive construction of the translation of type derivations in π_W from type derivations in π_S , denoted as:

$$\left[\left[\text{[S:Rule]} \frac{\Upsilon_i \quad \forall i \in I}{\Gamma \vdash_s P} \right] \right]_l = \left[\text{[W:Rule]} \frac{\llbracket \Upsilon_i \rrbracket_l \quad \forall i \in I}{\langle \Gamma \rangle_l \vdash_w \langle P \rangle} \right]$$

where Υ_i denotes a set of derivations used to prove $\Gamma \vdash_s P$.

The translation, of which Figure 5.10 gives an excerpt, relies on analyzing the last rule [S:Rule] applied in the derivation $\Gamma \vdash_s P$ and the unfolding of the translation of judgements, mapping to a derivation $\langle \Gamma \rangle_l \vdash_w \langle P \rangle$ in π_W , in which the last rule applied is [W:rule]. \square

Case: Input

$$\left[\frac{[\text{S:Lin} - \text{In}_1]}{\frac{\Gamma'_1 \vdash_s x : \text{lin}?T.S \quad \Gamma_2, x : S, y : T \vdash_s P}{\Gamma'_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \vdash_s \text{lin } x(y).P}} \right]_l = [\text{W:Lin} - \text{In}_1] \frac{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle_l \vdash_w x : \#^{l(x)}(\langle T \rangle_l^y, \langle S \rangle_l^z) \quad \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle_l, y : \langle T \rangle_l^y, z : \langle S \rangle_l^z \vdash_w \langle P[z/x] \rangle \quad l(x) = l(z)}{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle_l \circ \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle_l \vdash_w x(y, z). \langle P[z/x] \rangle}$$

where $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma_1, x : \text{lin}?T.S$ where $\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle_l = \langle \Gamma_1 \rangle_l, x : \#^{l(x)}(\langle T \rangle_l^y, \langle S \rangle_l^z)$

$$\left[\frac{[\text{S:Lin} - \text{In}_2]}{\frac{\Gamma'_1 \vdash_s x : *?T \quad \Gamma'_2, y : T \vdash_s P}{\Gamma'_1 \circ \Gamma'_2 \vdash_s \text{lin } x(y).P}} \right]_l = [\text{W:Lin} - \text{In}_2] \frac{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle_l \vdash_w x : \#^{l(x)}(\langle T \rangle_l^y) \quad \langle \Gamma'_2 \rangle_l, z : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w \langle P \rangle}{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle_l \circ \langle \Gamma'_2 \rangle_l \vdash_w x(y, z). \langle P \rangle}$$

where $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma_1, x : *?T$ and $\Gamma'_2 = \Gamma_2, x : *?T$ where $\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle_l = \langle \Gamma_1 \rangle_l, x : \#^{l(x)}(\langle T \rangle_l^y)$ and $\langle \Gamma'_2 \rangle_l = \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle_l, x : \#^{l(x)}(\langle T \rangle_l^y)$

$$\left[\frac{[\text{S:Un} - \text{In}]}{\frac{\Gamma' \vdash_s x : *?T \quad \Gamma', y : T \vdash_s P}{\Gamma, x : *?T \vdash_s \text{un } x(y).P}} \right]_l = [\text{W:Un} - \text{In}_1] \frac{\langle \Gamma' \rangle_l \vdash_w x : \#^{l(x)}(\langle T \rangle_l^y) \quad \langle \Gamma' \rangle_l, y : \langle T \rangle_l^y, z : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w \langle P \rangle \quad \forall b \in \text{os}(\langle P \rangle), l(b) < l(x)}{\langle \Gamma \rangle_l, x : \#^{l(x)}(\langle T \rangle_l^y) \vdash_w !x(y, z). \langle P \rangle}$$

where $\Gamma' = \Gamma, x : *?T$ where $\langle \Gamma' \rangle_l = \langle \Gamma \rangle_l, x : \#^{l(x)}(\langle T \rangle_l^y)$

Case: Output

$$\left[\frac{[\text{S:Lin} - \text{Out}]}{\frac{\Gamma'_1 \vdash_s x : \text{lin}!T.S \quad \Gamma'_2 \vdash_s y : T \quad \Gamma_3, x : S \vdash_s P}{\Gamma'_1 \circ \Gamma'_2 \circ \Gamma_3 \vdash_s \bar{x}(y).P}} \right]_l = [\text{W:Lin} - \text{Out}] \frac{\frac{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle_l \vdash_w x : \#^{l(x)} \langle (T) \rangle_l^y, \langle (S) \rangle_l^z \rangle \quad \langle \Gamma'_2 \rangle_l \vdash_w y : \langle (T) \rangle_l^y \quad \langle \Gamma_3 \rangle_l, z : \langle (S) \rangle_l^z \vdash_w \langle P[z/x] \rangle \quad l(x) = l(z)}{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle_l \circ \langle \Gamma'_2 \rangle_l \circ \langle \Gamma_3 \rangle_l, z :: \langle (S) \rangle_l^z \vdash_w \bar{x}(y, z). \langle \langle P[z/x] \rangle \rangle}}{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle_l \circ \langle \Gamma'_2 \rangle_l \circ \langle \Gamma_3 \rangle_l \vdash_w (\mathbf{v}z)\bar{x}(y, z). \langle \langle P[z/x] \rangle \rangle}}$$

where $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma_1, x : \text{lin}!T.S$ and $\Gamma'_2 = \Gamma_2, y : T$ where $\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle_l = \langle \Gamma_1 \rangle_l, x : \#^{l(x)} \langle (T) \rangle_l^y, \langle (S) \rangle_l^z \rangle$ and $\langle \Gamma'_2 \rangle_l = \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle_l, y : \langle (T) \rangle_l^y$

$$\left[\frac{[\text{S:Un} - \text{Out}]}{\frac{\Gamma'_1 \vdash_s x : *!T \quad \Gamma'_2 \vdash_s y : T \quad \Gamma'_3 \vdash_s P}{\Gamma'_1 \circ \Gamma'_2 \circ \Gamma'_3 \vdash_s \bar{x}(y).P}} \right]_l = [\text{W:Un} - \text{Out}_1] \frac{\frac{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle_l \vdash_w x : \#^{l(x)} \langle (T) \rangle_l^y \quad \langle \Gamma'_2 \rangle_l \vdash_w y : \langle (T) \rangle_l^y \quad \langle \Gamma'_3 \rangle_l, z : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w \langle P \rangle}{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle_l \circ \langle \Gamma'_2 \rangle_l \circ \langle \Gamma'_3 \rangle_l \vdash_w \bar{x}(y, z). \langle P \rangle}}{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle_l \circ \langle \Gamma'_2 \rangle_l \circ \langle \Gamma'_3 \rangle_l \vdash_w \bar{x}(y, z). \langle P \rangle}}$$

where $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma_1, x : *!T$, $\Gamma'_2 = \Gamma_2, x : *!T, y : T$ where $\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle_l = \langle \Gamma_1 \rangle_l, x : \#^{l(x)} \langle (T) \rangle_l^y$, $\langle \Gamma'_2 \rangle_l = \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle_l, x : \#^{l(x)} \langle (T) \rangle_l^y, y : \langle (T) \rangle_l^y$
 $\Gamma'_3 = \Gamma_3, x : *!T$ where $\langle \Gamma'_3 \rangle_l = \langle \Gamma_3 \rangle_l, x : \#^{l(x)} \langle (T) \rangle_l^y$

Figure 5.10: From derivations in π_S to derivations in π_W (excerpt, cf. Definition 5.22)

5.4.2 Results

In general, the translation of a $P \in \mathcal{S}$ is not necessarily typable in $\pi_{\mathcal{W}}$; this occurs when, e.g., P is non-terminating. We focus on processes in \mathcal{S} that are typable in $\pi_{\mathcal{W}}$, and therefore, are terminating.

Notation 5.4.1 We write $(\Gamma)_l \vdash_{\mathcal{W}} \langle P \rangle$ if $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} P \rrbracket_l$ holds, for some l .

Our translations are correct, in the following sense:

Theorem 5.4 (Operational Completeness) Let $P \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $(\Gamma)_l \vdash_{\mathcal{W}} \langle P \rangle$, for some level function l . Then there exists $R \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $P \longrightarrow Q \implies \langle P \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle R \rangle$ and $R \equiv Q$.

Theorem 5.5 (Operational Soundness) Let $P \in \mathcal{W}$ with $(\Gamma)_l \vdash_{\mathcal{W}} \langle P \rangle$, for some level function l . If $\langle P \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} U$ Then there exists $R, Q \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $P \longrightarrow Q \wedge R \equiv Q \wedge U = \langle R \rangle$.

An immediate corollary of Theorem 5.4 is that our translation preserves (non-)terminating behaviour, i.e., does not map non-terminating processes in \mathcal{S} into terminating processes in $\pi_{\mathcal{W}}$.

Corollary 5.4.1 $\langle \cdot \rangle$ preserves (non-)terminating behaviour.

The following result corroborates our informal intuitions about \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{W} . It also precisely characterizes a class of terminating processes based on our correct translations $\langle \cdot \rangle$ and $(\cdot)_l$.

Theorem 5.6 $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{S}$.

Proof: [Proof (Sketch)] The inclusion $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ is immediate by definition. To prove that the inclusion is strict, we consider a counterexample, i.e., a process P typable in $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ but not typable in $\pi_{\mathcal{W}}$. Process $P_{5.1}$ from Example 5.1 suffices for this purpose. \square

5.5 Propositions as Sessions

We now introduce π_{DILL} , the process model induced by the Curry-Howard correspondence between linear types and session types (*propositions-as-sessions*) [Caires & Pfenning \(2010\)](#). π_{DILL} is a synchronous π -calculus extended with (binary) guarded choice and forwarding.

| | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| $P, Q ::=$ | (Processes) | | |
| $x\langle y \rangle.P$ | (output) | $x(y).P$ | (linear input) |
| $!x(y).P$ | (server) | $P \mid Q$ | (composition) |
| $(\mathbf{v}x)P$ | (restriction) | $\mathbf{0}$ | (inaction) |
| $x.\mathbf{case}(P, Q)$ | (branching) | $x.\mathbf{inr}; P$ | (select right) |
| $x.\mathbf{inl}; P$ | (select left) | $[x \leftrightarrow y]$ | (forwarding) |

| | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| $A, B ::=$ | (Types) | | |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | (Termination) | $!A$ | (Shared) |
| $A \multimap B$ | (Receive) | $A \otimes B$ | (Send) |
| $A \oplus B$ | (Selection) | $A \& B$ | (Branching) |

Figure 5.11: Processes and types of the session π -calculus π_{DILL}

$$\begin{aligned}
P \mid \mathbf{0} &\equiv P & P &\equiv_{\alpha} Q \implies P \equiv Q & P \mid Q &\equiv Q \mid P \\
(\mathbf{v}x)\mathbf{0} &\equiv \mathbf{0} & P \mid (Q \mid R) &\equiv (P \mid Q) \mid R & (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{v}y)P &\equiv (\mathbf{v}y)(\mathbf{v}x)P \\
x \notin \text{fn}(P) &\implies P \mid (\mathbf{v}x)Q &\equiv (\mathbf{v}x)(P \mid Q)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{R}\leftrightarrow) & \quad (\mathbf{v}x)([x \leftrightarrow y] \mid P) \longrightarrow P[y/x] \quad \text{if } x \neq y \\
(\mathbf{R}C) & \quad x\langle y \rangle.P \mid x(z).Q \longrightarrow P \mid Q[y/z] \\
(\mathbf{R}!) & \quad x(y).P \mid !x(z).Q \longrightarrow P \mid Q[y/z] \mid !x(z).Q \\
(\mathbf{R}L) & \quad x.\mathbf{inl}; P \mid x.\mathbf{case}(Q, R) \longrightarrow P \mid Q \\
(\mathbf{R}R) & \quad x.\mathbf{inr}; P \mid x.\mathbf{case}(Q, R) \longrightarrow P \mid R \\
(\mathbf{R}\mid) & \quad Q \longrightarrow R \implies P \mid Q \longrightarrow P \mid R \\
(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{v}) & \quad P \longrightarrow Q \implies (\mathbf{v}x)P \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)Q \\
(\mathbf{R}\equiv) & \quad P \equiv P' \wedge P' \longrightarrow Q' \wedge Q' \equiv Q \implies P \longrightarrow Q
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 5.12: Structural congruence and reductions for π_{DILL}

Definition 5.23 Processes and Types

Processes in π_{DILL} are given by the grammar in Figure 5.11 (top). Types coincide with linear logic propositions, as given in the grammar in Figure 5.11 (bottom). \square

Definition 5.24 Reduction in π_{DILL}

The reduction semantics of π_{DILL} is defined in Figure 5.12 (bottom), relying on structural congruence, the least congruence relation defined in Figure 5.12 (top). \square

Notation 5.5.1 (Process Abbreviations) *We adopt the following abbreviations for bound outputs and replicated forwarders:*

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{x}(z).P &= (\mathbf{v}z)x\langle z \rangle.P \\ ![x \leftrightarrow y] &= !y(z).\bar{x}(k).[k \leftrightarrow z]\end{aligned}$$

As usual, a type environment is a collection of type assignments $x : A$ where x is a name and A a type, the names being pairwise disjoint. The empty environment is denoted ‘ \cdot ’. We consider *unrestricted* environments (denoted Γ, Γ') and *linear* environments (denoted as Δ, Δ'); while the former satisfy weakening and contraction, the latter do not.

We denote by $\text{dom}(\Gamma)$, the *domain of* Γ , the set of names whose type assignments are in Γ , i.e., $\text{dom}(\Gamma) = \{x \mid x : A \in \Gamma\}$. Also, $\Gamma(x)$ denotes the type of the name $x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, i.e., $\Gamma(x) = A$, if $x : A \in \Gamma$. The domain of Δ and $\Delta(x)$ are similarly defined.

Typing judgments for π_{DILL} are of the form $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash_{\ell} P :: x : A$. Such a judgment is intuitively read as: “ P provides protocol A along x by using the protocols described in the assignments in Γ and Δ ”. The domains of Γ , Δ and $x : A$ are pairwise disjoint. The corresponding type rules are given in Figure 5.13. Each logical operator is represented by right and left rules: the former explains how to *offer* a behavior (according to the operator’s interpretation, cf. Figure 5.11 (bottom)); the latter explains how to *make use* of a behavior typed with the operator. In particular, the behavior of clients and servers is governed by four typing rules: $[\text{L}:\text{cut}^!]$, $[\text{L}:\text{copy}]$, $[\text{L}:\text{!L}]$, and $[\text{L}:\text{!R}]$.

The Curry-Howard correspondence connects the logical principle of cut elimination with process synchronization. As a result, we have the fundamental property ensured by typing:

Theorem 5.7 (Type Preservation) *If $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash_{\ell} P :: x : A$ and $P \longrightarrow Q$ then $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash_{\ell} Q :: x : A$.*

The type system enforces also progress and termination. The latter property can be proven using logical relations [Pérez et al. \(2014\)](#).

5.6 \mathcal{L} : A Class of Terminating Processes

We now study \mathcal{L} , another class of terminating $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ processes. This class is induced by the Curry-Howard system given in Section 5.5, which leverages translations on processes and types/contexts, denoted $\langle \cdot \rangle$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle$, respectively. Roughly, \mathcal{L} is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = \{P \in \pi_{\mathcal{S}} \mid \Gamma \otimes \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} P \wedge (\Gamma); \langle \Delta \rangle \vdash_{\ell} \langle P \rangle :: u : \langle \bar{S} \rangle\}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[L:1L]} \frac{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash_\ell P :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta, x : \mathbf{1} \vdash_\ell P :: T} \qquad \text{[L:1R]} \frac{}{\Gamma; \cdot \vdash_\ell \mathbf{0} :: x : \mathbf{1}} \\
\text{[L:fld]} \frac{}{\Gamma; x : A \vdash_\ell [x \leftrightarrow y] :: y : A} \qquad \text{[L:\otimes L]} \frac{\Gamma; \Delta, y : A, x : B \vdash_\ell P :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta, x : A \otimes B \vdash_\ell x(y).P :: T} \\
\text{[L:\otimes R]} \frac{\Gamma; \Delta_1 \vdash_\ell P :: y : A \quad \Gamma; \Delta_2 \vdash_\ell Q :: x : B}{\Gamma; \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash_\ell \bar{x}(y).(P \mid Q) :: x : A \otimes B} \\
\text{[L:cut]} \frac{\Gamma; \Delta_1 \vdash_\ell P :: x : A \quad \Gamma; \Delta_2, x : A \vdash_\ell Q :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash_\ell (\mathbf{v}x)(P \mid Q) :: T} \\
\text{[L:cut!]} \frac{\Gamma; \cdot \vdash_\ell P :: y : A \quad \Gamma, u : A; \Delta \vdash_\ell Q :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash_\ell (\mathbf{v}u)(!u(y).P \mid Q) :: T} \\
\text{[L:copy]} \frac{\Gamma, u : A; \Delta, y : A \vdash_\ell P :: T}{\Gamma, u : A; \Delta \vdash_\ell \bar{u}(y).P :: T} \qquad \text{[L:!L]} \frac{\Gamma, u : A; \Delta \vdash_\ell P[u/x] :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta, x : !A \vdash_\ell P :: T} \\
\text{[L:!R]} \frac{\Gamma; \cdot \vdash_\ell Q :: y : A}{\Gamma; \cdot \vdash_\ell !x(y).Q :: x : !A} \qquad \text{[L:&L}_1\text{]} \frac{\Gamma; \Delta, x : A \vdash_\ell P :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta, x : A \& B \vdash_\ell x.\mathbf{inl}; P :: T} \\
\text{[L:\oplus L]} \frac{\Gamma; \Delta, x : A \vdash_\ell P :: T \quad \Gamma; \Delta, x : B \vdash_\ell P :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta, x : A \oplus B \vdash_\ell x.\mathbf{case}(P, Q) :: T} \\
\text{[L:\oplus R}_2\text{]} \frac{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash_\ell P :: x : B}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash_\ell x.\mathbf{inr}; P :: x : A \oplus B}
\end{array}
\end{array}$$

Figure 5.13: Type rules for π_{DILL} (selection)

Definition 5.31 will give a formal definition. In the following we define the translations $\langle \cdot \rangle$ and (\cdot) , and establish their properties. Our main result is that $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{W}$ but $\mathcal{W} \not\subset \mathcal{L}$ (Theorems 5.9 and 5.10): there are terminating processes detected as such by the weight-based approach but not by the Curry-Howard correspondence.

We require some auxiliary definitions. The following predicates say whether a session type contains client or server behaviors.

Definition 5.25

Given a session type T , we define predicates $\text{svr}(T)$ and $\text{cli}(T)$ as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{svr}(*?T) & = \text{true} & \text{cli}(*!T) & = \text{true} \\
\text{svr}(\mathbf{end}) & = \text{false} & \text{cli}(\mathbf{end}) & = \text{false} \\
\text{svr}(q!S.T) & = \text{svr}(T) & \text{cli}(q!S.T) & = \text{cli}(T) \\
\text{svr}(q?S.T) & = \text{svr}(T) & \text{cli}(q?S.T) & = \text{cli}(T) \\
\text{svr}(*!T) & = \text{svr}(T) & \text{cli}(*?T) & = \text{cli}(T)
\end{array}$$

These predicates extend to contexts Γ as expected. This way, e.g., $\text{svr}(\Gamma)$ stands for $\bigwedge_{x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)} \Gamma(x)$. Also, we write $\text{svr}(\Gamma; P)$ to stand for $\bigwedge_{x \in (\text{fn}(P) \cap \text{dom}(\Gamma))} \text{svr}(\Gamma(x))$, returning true when $(\text{fn}(P) \cap \text{dom}(\Gamma)) = \emptyset$. Analogous definitions for $\text{cli}(\cdot)$, $\neg \text{svr}(\cdot)$, and $\neg \text{cli}(\cdot)$ arise similarly. \square

This way, intuitively:

- $\neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$ means that T is an always-linear behavior, i.e., it does not contain server and client actions.
- $\text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$ means that T contains some server behavior and that it does not contain client behaviors.
- $\neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T)$ means that T will at some point exhibit client behaviors and that it does not contain server behaviors.

Also, $\text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T)$ means that T contains both server and client actions; this combination, however, is excluded by typing.

Example 5.2 W

e further illustrate Definition 5.25 by example:

| | T | $\text{svr}(T)$ | $\text{cli}(T)$ |
|---|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 | $*!(\text{lin} !(*!S).(\text{lin} ?(*?R).(*?T_0)))$ | true | true |
| 2 | $\text{lin} !(*!S).(\text{lin} ?(*?R).(*?T_0))$ | true | false |
| 3 | $*!(\text{lin} !(*!S).(\text{lin} ?(*?R).\mathbf{end}))$ | false | true |
| 4 | $\text{lin} !(*!S).(\text{lin} ?(*?R).\mathbf{end})$ | false | false |

Both (1) and (2) return true for $\text{svr}(T)$ because of their final behavior (i.e., ‘ $*?T_0$ ’), whereas (3) and (4) return false , because their final behavior is \mathbf{end} . Both (1) and (3) return true for $\text{cli}(T)$ as their initial type behavior (i.e., ‘ $*!T'$ ’) is that of a client, whereas (2) and (4) return false as they do not contain any client behavior. \square

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle\langle \bar{x}(y).P \rangle\rangle &= \begin{cases} \bar{x}(z).(y \leftrightarrow z) \mid \langle\langle P \rangle\rangle & \text{If } x : \text{lin}!(T).S \wedge \neg \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T). \\ \bar{x}(z).(![y \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle\langle P \rangle\rangle) & \text{If } x : \text{lin}!(T).S \wedge \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T). \\ \bar{x}(z).\bar{z}(w).(y \leftrightarrow w) \mid \langle\langle P \rangle\rangle & \text{If } x : *!T \wedge \neg \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T) \\ \bar{x}(z).\bar{z}(w).(![y \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle\langle P \rangle\rangle) & \text{If } x : *!T \wedge \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T) \\ \bar{x}(z).z.\mathbf{inl}; \bar{z}(w).(![y \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle\langle P \rangle\rangle) & \text{If } x : *!T \wedge \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T) \\ \bar{x}(z).z.\mathbf{inl}; \bar{z}(w).(y \leftrightarrow w) \mid \langle\langle P \rangle\rangle & \text{If } x : *!T \wedge \neg \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T) \end{cases} \\
\langle\langle (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(y).P \rangle\rangle &= \begin{cases} \bar{z}(x).x.\mathbf{inr}; \langle\langle P \rangle\rangle & \text{If } z : *!T \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T). \\ \bar{z}(x).\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle & \text{If } z : *!T \wedge \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T). \end{cases} \\
\langle\langle (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P \mid Q) \rangle\rangle &= \bar{z}(y).(\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q \rangle\rangle) \quad \text{If } z : \text{lin}!T.S \wedge z \notin \text{fn}(P) \wedge y \notin \text{fn}(Q) \\
\langle\langle \text{lin } x(y).P \rangle\rangle &= x(y).\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle \quad \text{If } x : \text{lin}?T.S \\
\langle\langle \text{un } x(y).P \rangle\rangle &= \begin{cases} !x(z).\langle\langle P[z/y] \rangle\rangle & \text{If } x : *?T \wedge \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T). \\ !x(z).z(y).\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle & \text{If } x : *?T \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T). \\ !x(z).z.\mathbf{case}(z(y).\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle, \langle\langle P[z/y] \rangle\rangle) & \text{If } x : *?T \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T). \end{cases} \\
\langle\langle (\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q) \rangle\rangle &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q \rangle\rangle[x/y]) \quad \text{If } y \notin \text{fn}(P) \wedge x \notin \text{fn}(Q) \\
\langle\langle P \mid Q \rangle\rangle &= (\mathbf{v}w)(\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q \rangle\rangle) \quad \text{With } w \text{ fresh} \\
\langle\langle \mathbf{0} \rangle\rangle &= \mathbf{0}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 5.14: Translating processes in π_S into π_{DILL}

5.6.1 The Typed Translation

Definition 5.26 Translating Processes

The translation $\langle\langle \cdot \rangle\rangle : \pi_S \rightarrow \pi_{\text{DILL}}$ is given in Figure 5.14. \square

The translation of processes relies on type information; in particular, the translation of outputs and unrestricted inputs depends on whether the overall behavior of channels exhibits server or client behaviors (cf. Definition 5.25). In translating outputs, we check whether the output is free or bound. The translation of free outputs is further influenced by whether the sender is associated with a linear connection or acts as a client connected to a server. There are 5 cases to consider, and the translated processes are designed to preserve typability. Similar conditions apply to the translation of bound outputs.

Remark 5.6.1 *To ensure typability of the translated process, we explain some of the choices in Figure 5.14:*

1. In a free output $\bar{x}(z).P$ the value z cannot have a server behavior. In Figure 5.14, this is ensured using the predicate $\neg \text{svr}(T)$.
2. In an unrestricted bound output $(\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(y).P$, the value y cannot have a client behavior. In Figure 5.14, this is ensured using the predicate $\neg \text{cli}(T)$.

We illustrate what we mean by “client behavior” above. Consider the process $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)((\mathbf{v}wv)\bar{x}\langle v \rangle.\text{un } w(a).\mathbf{0} \mid \text{un } y(c).\bar{c}\langle b \rangle.\mathbf{0})$. In P , the output action on x is an unrestricted bound output, whose object v has a client behavior: after one reduction, an output on v will be ready to invoke the server on w . Notice that $P \in \mathcal{S}$, as P is typable with $b : \mathbf{end} \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} P$ and $x : *!(\ast! \mathbf{end}), y : *?(\ast! \mathbf{end}), w : *? \mathbf{end}$ and $v : *! \mathbf{end}$.

We want a typable translation of the judgement $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} P \rrbracket_u$. Consider the partial translation of P , i.e., $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle\langle P_1 \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q_1 \rangle\rangle[x/y])$, where we use the abbreviations

- $P_1 = (\mathbf{v}wv)\bar{x}\langle v \rangle.\text{un } w(a).\mathbf{0}$, and
- $Q_1 = \text{un } y(c).\bar{c}\langle b \rangle.\mathbf{0}$.

Suppose we can apply $[\mathcal{L}:\text{cut}]$, then there are derivations Π_1 and Π_2 such that

$$\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{b : \mathbf{1}; \cdot \vdash_{\ell} \langle\langle Q_1 \rangle\rangle[x/y] :: y : !(\mathbf{1} \multimap \mathbf{1})} \quad \frac{\Pi_2}{b : \mathbf{1}; x : !(\mathbf{1} \multimap \mathbf{1}) \vdash_{\ell} \langle\langle P_1 \rangle\rangle :: u : T}}{b : \mathbf{1}; \cdot \vdash_{\ell} (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle\langle P_1 \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q_1 \rangle\rangle[x/y]) :: u : T}$$

Consider the partial translation $\langle\langle (\mathbf{v}wv)\bar{x}\langle v \rangle.\text{un } w(a).\mathbf{0} \rangle\rangle = \bar{x}(w).(!w(a').P'_1)$ for some P'_1 that we will leave opaque for now. Notice, however, that the following derivation is not possible: to type $!w(a').P'_1$ we would need $u = w$ to apply $[\mathcal{L}:\mathbf{!R}]$ (above the application of $[\mathcal{L}:\text{copy}]$), but w already occurs in the context and this contradicts the domain restriction of \vdash_{ℓ} judgements.

$$[\mathcal{L}:\mathbf{!L}] \frac{[\mathcal{L}:\text{copy}] \frac{b : \mathbf{1}, x : (\mathbf{1} \multimap \mathbf{1}); w : (\mathbf{1} \multimap \mathbf{1}) \not\vdash_{\ell} !w(a).\mathbf{0} :: u : T}{b : \mathbf{1}, x : (\mathbf{1} \multimap \mathbf{1}); \cdot \vdash_{\ell} !w(a').P'_1 :: u : T}}{b : \mathbf{1}; x : !(\mathbf{1} \multimap \mathbf{1}) \vdash_{\ell} \bar{x}(w).(!w(a').P'_1) :: u : T}$$

A similar argument and example can be used to justify the first item of this remark.

While the translation of linear inputs is straightforward, in translating unrestricted inputs we check whether the synchronization concerns a bound or free output. When the unrestricted input cannot discern the client or server behavior from the type, it offers both behaviors using a branching construct; the synchronizing party (i.e. the translation of output, free or bound) then determines the desired behavior using a corresponding selection construct.

Example 5.3

Consider $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)(\text{un } x(z).\mathbf{0} \mid \bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0})$, a $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ process that implements a simple server-client communication. As in Example 5.1, one can verify that $x : *? \mathbf{end}, y : *! \mathbf{end}, w : \mathbf{end}$ and $z : \mathbf{end}$, which entail $w : \mathbf{end} \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} P$. Since $y \notin \text{fn}(\text{un } x(z).\mathbf{0})$ and $x \notin \text{fn}(\bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0})$, the translation of P is as:

$$\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle\langle \text{un } x(z).\mathbf{0} \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle \bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0} \rangle\rangle)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbf{end} \rangle &= !\mathbf{1} \\
\langle \text{lin}!S.T \rangle &= \langle S \rangle \multimap \langle T \rangle \\
\langle \text{lin}?S.T \rangle &= \langle S \rangle \otimes \langle T \rangle \\
\langle *?T \rangle &= \begin{cases} \langle !T \rangle & \text{If } \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T). \\ \langle !(T) \otimes \mathbf{1} \rangle & \text{If } \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T). \\ \langle !((T) \otimes \mathbf{1}) \oplus \langle T \rangle \rangle & \text{If } \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T). \end{cases} \\
\langle *!T \rangle &= \begin{cases} \langle !\overline{T} \rangle & \text{If } \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T). \\ \langle !(T) \multimap \mathbf{1} \rangle & \text{If } \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T). \\ \langle !((T) \multimap \mathbf{1}) \& \langle \overline{T} \rangle \rangle & \text{If } \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T). \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 5.15: Translating session types into logical propositions

Note that $\neg \text{cli}(\mathbf{end}) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(\mathbf{end}) \wedge \text{un}(\mathbf{end})$ holds (cf. Definition 5.5 and Definition 5.25). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \text{un } x(z).\mathbf{0} \rangle &= !x(v).v.\text{case}(v(z).\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) \\
\langle \bar{x}(w).\mathbf{0} \rangle &= \bar{x}(z).z.\text{inl}; \bar{z}(v).(![w \leftrightarrow v] \mid \mathbf{0})
\end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 5.27

Given a session type/linear logic proposition A , we write $\dagger(A)$ to denote A without top-level occurrences of ‘!’’, i.e., $\dagger(!A) = A$ and is the identity function otherwise.

□

Definition 5.28 Translating Types/Context

The translation $\langle \cdot \rangle$ from session types in π_S to logic propositions in π_{DILL} is given in Figure 5.15. The translation of types extends to contexts as expected; we shall write $\langle \Gamma \rangle^\dagger$ to stand for $\dagger(\langle \Gamma \rangle)$.

□

The translation of \mathbf{end} and linear input/output types is standard. As for client and servers, the translation of types follows the translation of processes. When the type of the client or server exhibits a server behavior, the type is encoded into an unrestricted type. Notice that a client type $*!T$ is translated into its dual behavior $!\langle \overline{T} \rangle$, but a server is not. This has to do with the left/right interpretation of judgments in π_{DILL} : servers always occur on the right-hand side; to provide a dual behavior, the client should itself be dual.

Example 5.4 Cont. Example 5.3

Consider the type assignments $x : *? \mathbf{end}, y : *! \mathbf{end}, w : \mathbf{end}$ and $z : \mathbf{end}$. Since $\neg \text{cli}(\mathbf{end}) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(\mathbf{end})$, the translation in Figure 5.15 gives:

- $x : (*?end) = !(((end) \otimes \mathbf{1}) \oplus (end)) = !((! \mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{1}) \oplus \mathbf{1});$
- $y : (*!end) = !(((end) \multimap \mathbf{1}) \& (\overline{end})) = !((! \mathbf{1} \multimap \mathbf{1}) \& \mathbf{1})$

The translations to $z : \mathbf{1}$ and $w : \mathbf{1}$ are trivial. \square

Armed with the translations of processes and types given in Figure 5.14 and Figure 5.15, we are now ready to translate a judgment $\Gamma, \Delta \vdash_s P$ into $(\Gamma)^\dagger; (\Delta) \vdash_\ell \langle P \rangle : u :: A$, for some name u . This translation requires that $\text{un}(\Gamma)$ and $\neg \text{un}(\Delta)$, i.e., Γ is unrestricted and Δ is ‘not’ unrestricted; this is the abbreviation $\Gamma \otimes \Delta$ (Notation 5.2.2).

The following auxiliary notion relates contexts that may differ in exactly one assignment:

Definition 5.29 \mathbf{G}

Given contexts Γ, Γ' , we write $\Gamma \simeq_T^z \Gamma'$ if $(\Gamma = \Gamma' \wedge z \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)) \vee (\Gamma = \Gamma', z : T)$ for some type T . \square

Definition 5.30 **Translating Judgements**

Given a judgment $\Gamma \otimes \Delta \vdash_s P$ and a name u , its translation $\llbracket \Gamma \otimes \Delta \vdash_s P \rrbracket_u$ is defined as

$$(\Gamma')^\dagger; (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \langle P \rangle :: u : A$$

where Γ', Δ' , and A are subject to one of the following conditions:

- $A = (\overline{T})$ when $\{u : T\} \subset \Gamma, \Delta$ with $(\Gamma \simeq_T^u \Gamma') \wedge (\Delta \simeq_T^u \Delta')$; or
- $A = \mathbf{1}$ when $u \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ with $(\Gamma = \Gamma') \wedge (\Delta = \Delta')$.

Table 5.1 defines the translation by induction on P , assuming that the contexts satisfy the appropriate requirements, i.e., $\text{un}(\Gamma, \Gamma') \wedge \neg \text{un}(\Delta, \Delta_1, \Delta')$ and A, Γ' and Δ' are as one of the cases above. \square

Using this translation of judgments, a translation of derivations can be defined exactly as in Definition 5.22.

We discuss some entries in Table 5.1 with the following example.

Example 5.5 **Cont. Example 5.3**

The translation of judgments defined in Table 5.1 relies on the typability in the source language (\mathcal{S}) to determine the exact conditions to the typability of the translated process in π_{DILL} . First, the type derivation of $w : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s$

$(\mathbf{v}xy)(\text{un } x(z).\mathbf{0} \mid \bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0})$ is essential to build a type derivation for the translated judgment (if one exists):

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma \vdash_s x : * \text{?end} \quad \Gamma, z : \text{end} \vdash_s \mathbf{0}}{\Gamma \vdash_s \text{un } x(z).\mathbf{0}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash_s y : * \text{!end} \quad \Gamma \vdash_s w : \text{end} \quad \Gamma \vdash_s \mathbf{0}}{\Gamma \vdash_s \bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}}}{\Gamma \vdash_s \text{un } x(z).\mathbf{0} \mid \bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}} \quad \frac{}{w : \text{end} \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)(\text{un } x(z).\mathbf{0} \mid \bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0})}$$

where $\Gamma = x : * \text{?end}, y : * \text{!end}, w : \text{end}$

Second, the translation $\llbracket w : \text{end} \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)(\text{un } x(z).\mathbf{0} \mid \bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \rrbracket_u$ corresponds to entry 3 of Table 5.1,

$$w : \mathbf{1}; \cdot \vdash_\ell (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle \text{un } x(z).\mathbf{0} \rangle \mid \langle \bar{x}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0} \rangle) :: u : A$$

and we have previously observed that the side conditions hold. Since u is not in the type context, we have $A = \mathbf{1}$. Now we proceed to build a type derivation for the translated judgment by applying rule [L:cut]:

$$\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{w : \mathbf{1}; \cdot \vdash_\ell \langle \text{un } x(z).\mathbf{0} \rangle :: x : \text{!}B} \quad \frac{\Pi_2}{w : \mathbf{1}; x : \text{!}B \vdash_\ell \langle \bar{x}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0} \rangle :: u : \mathbf{1}}}{w : \mathbf{1}; \cdot \vdash_\ell (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle \text{un } x(z).\mathbf{0} \rangle \mid \langle \bar{x}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0} \rangle) :: u : \mathbf{1}}$$

and we will show that there exist derivations Π_1 and Π_2 such that the derivation holds. We recall the translations $\langle \text{un } x(z).\mathbf{0} \rangle$ and $\langle \bar{x}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0} \rangle$ in Example 5.3.

Third, the left premise is the translation $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s \text{un } x(z).\mathbf{0} \rrbracket_x$ and corresponds to entry (4) of the Table 5.1. We recall Example 5.4 for $(\Gamma)^\dagger = w : \mathbf{1}, x : ((\mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{1}) \oplus \mathbf{1}), y : ((\mathbf{1} \multimap \mathbf{1}) \& \mathbf{1})$ and use the abbreviation $B = ((\mathbf{1} \multimap \mathbf{1}) \& \mathbf{1})$ and strengthening of $(\Gamma)^\dagger$. The derivation Π_1 is as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{w : \mathbf{1}; \cdot \vdash_\ell \mathbf{0} :: v : \mathbf{1}}{w : \mathbf{1}; z : \mathbf{1} \vdash_\ell \mathbf{0} :: v : \text{!}\mathbf{1}}}{w : \mathbf{1}; \cdot \vdash_\ell v(z).\mathbf{0} :: v : \text{!}\mathbf{1} \multimap \mathbf{1}} \quad w : \mathbf{1}; \cdot \vdash_\ell \mathbf{0} :: v : \mathbf{1}}{\text{[L:\&R]} \quad \frac{}{w : \mathbf{1}; \cdot \vdash_\ell v.\text{case}(v(z).\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) :: v : (\text{!}\mathbf{1} \multimap \mathbf{1}) \& \mathbf{1}}}{\text{[L:!R]} \quad \frac{}{w : \mathbf{1}; \cdot \vdash_\ell !x(v).v.\text{case}(v(z).\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) :: x : \text{!}((\text{!}\mathbf{1} \multimap \mathbf{1}) \& \mathbf{1})}}$$

Fourth, the right premise is the translation $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s \bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}[x/y] \rrbracket_u$ and corresponds to the entry (11a) of the Table 5.1. The derivation Π_2 is as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{(\Gamma')^\dagger; \cdot \vdash_\ell ! [w \leftrightarrow v] :: v : \text{!}\mathbf{1} \quad (\Gamma')^\dagger; z : \mathbf{1} \vdash_\ell \mathbf{0} :: u : \mathbf{1}}{(\Gamma')^\dagger; z : (\text{!}\mathbf{1} \multimap \mathbf{1}) \vdash_\ell \bar{z}(v).(! [w \leftrightarrow v] \mid \mathbf{0}) :: u : \mathbf{1}}}{(\Gamma')^\dagger; z : (\text{!}\mathbf{1} \multimap \mathbf{1}) \& \mathbf{1} \vdash_\ell z.\text{inl}; \bar{z}(v).(! [w \leftrightarrow v] \mid \mathbf{0}) :: u : \mathbf{1}}}{\text{[L:copy]} \quad \frac{}{(\Gamma')^\dagger; \cdot \vdash_\ell \bar{y}(z).z.\text{inl}; \bar{z}(v).(! [w \leftrightarrow v] \mid \mathbf{0}) :: u : \mathbf{1}}}$$

where we strengthen $(\Gamma)^\dagger$ to $(\Gamma')^\dagger = y : ((\mathbf{1} \multimap \mathbf{1}) \& \mathbf{1}), w : \mathbf{1}$. \square

We have the following property, which holds by definition of the entries of Table 5.1:

Theorem 5.8 (Type preservation) *If $\Gamma \otimes \Delta \vdash_s P$ then $(\Gamma')^\dagger; (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \langle P \rangle :: u : A$ is well-typed in π_{DILL} , with A, Γ' and Δ' as in Definition 5.30.*

Notice that the translations of typable $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ processes are not necessarily typable in π_{DILL} . We shall concentrate on processes in \mathcal{S} that are typable in π_{DILL} :

Notation 5.6.1 *We write $(\Gamma')^\dagger; (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \langle P \rangle :: u : (\bar{S})$ whenever $\llbracket \Gamma, \Delta \vdash_s P \rrbracket_u$ holds, with $\Gamma \asymp_{\mathcal{S}}^u \Gamma'$ and $\Delta \asymp_{\mathcal{S}}^u \Delta'$.*

We can finally define \mathcal{L} :

Definition 5.31 \mathcal{L}

Let u be a name. We define:

$$\mathcal{L} = \{P \in \pi_{\mathcal{S}} \mid \Gamma \otimes \Delta \vdash_s P \wedge \Gamma \asymp_{\mathcal{S}}^u \Gamma' \wedge \Delta \asymp_{\mathcal{S}}^u \Delta' \\ \wedge (\Gamma')^\dagger; (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \langle P \rangle :: u : (\bar{S})\}$$

where contexts and types mentioned are existentially quantified. \square

5.6.2 Results

Theorem 5.9 ($\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{W}$) *Let $P \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\Gamma \vdash_s P$, for some context Γ . If there exists u such that $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s P \rrbracket_u$ holds, then there exists l such that $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s P \rrbracket_l$ holds.*

The proof of Theorem 5.9 is by induction on the structure of P . We exploit a number of invariant properties for the type systems for π_{DILL} and $\pi_{\mathcal{W}}$, including:

- In π_{DILL} , judgments for typed processes never exhibit servers on the left-hand side.
- In $\pi_{\mathcal{W}}$, levels for types that do not exhibit server behavior can be decreased at will.
- The type system of π_{DILL} ensures that the name on the right-hand side is not guarded by servers.

Theorem 5.10 ($\mathcal{W} \not\subset \mathcal{L}$) $\exists P \in \mathcal{W}$ with $\Gamma \vdash_s P$ and $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s P \rrbracket_l$ for some l such that $\nexists z$ s.t. $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s P \rrbracket_z$.

To prove Theorem 5.10, it suffices to consider the π_5 process

$$P = (\mathbf{v}xy)(\text{lin } x(z).\text{un } z(w).\mathbf{0} \mid (\mathbf{v}st)\bar{y}\langle s\rangle.((\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u\rangle.\mathbf{0}) \mid \mathbf{0}))$$

Clearly, P is terminating:

$$P \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}st)(\text{un } s(w).\mathbf{0} \mid (\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u\rangle.\mathbf{0})) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}st)\text{un } s(w).\mathbf{0}$$

Process P can be typed so as to establish $P \in \mathcal{S}$. Also, there is a level function that makes its translation into $\pi_{\mathcal{W}}$ typable. Hence, $P \in \mathcal{W}$. However, its translation into π_{DILL} is not typable, so $P \notin \mathcal{L}$.

5.7 Closing Remarks

We presented a comparative study of type systems for concurrent processes in the π -calculus, from the unifying perspective of termination and session types. To our knowledge, this is the first study of its kind. Even by focusing on only three different type systems, we were confronted with technical challenges connected with the intrinsic differences between them. The typed process model π_5 Vasconcelos (2012), focused on session-based concurrency, admits a rather broad class of processes, exploiting a clear distinction between linear and unrestricted resources, implemented via context splitting. The typed process model $\pi_{\mathcal{W}}$ combines features from type systems that target the termination property Deng & Sangiorgi (2006) and type systems for sessions. Finally, the typed process model π_{DILL} Caires & Pfenning (2010) rests upon a firm logical foundation, and its control of clients and servers is directly inherited from the logical principles of the exponential $!A$. Notice that π_{DILL} is unique among type systems for the π -calculus in that it ensures protocol fidelity, deadlock-freedom, confluence, and strong normalization/termination for typed processes.

The main take-away message is that the Curry-Howard correspondence is strictly weaker than weight-based approaches for enforcing the termination property. Hence, the control of server/client interactions that is elegantly enabled by the copying semantics of $!A$ turns out to be rather implicit when contrasted to weight-based techniques. Interestingly, Dardha & Pérez (2015, 2022) arrived to a similar conclusion in their comparative study of type systems focused on the deadlock-freedom property: type systems based on the Curry-Howard correspondence can detect strictly less deadlock-free processes than other, more sophisticated type systems. Notice that the study in Dardha & Pérez (2015, 2022) considers only finite processes, without input-guarded replication (so all process are terminating).

Immediate items for current and future work include incorporating other type systems into our formal comparisons. The type systems by Sangiorgi (2006) and by Yoshida et al. (2001) are very appealing candidates. Also, Deng and Sangiorgi

proposed several type systems for termination. Here we considered only the simplest variant, which induces the class \mathcal{W} and is already different from \mathcal{L} ; it would be interesting to consider the other variants.

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| | $\frac{\Gamma \otimes \Delta \vdash_{\mathfrak{S}} P}{(\Gamma)^{\dagger}; (\Delta) \vdash_{\ell} \langle P \rangle :: u : A}$ | | | | | | |
| 1 | $\frac{\Gamma \otimes \vdash_{\mathfrak{S}} \mathbf{0}}{(\Gamma)^{\dagger}; \cdot \vdash_{\ell} \mathbf{0} :: u : \mathbf{1}}$ | | | | | | |
| 2 | $\frac{\Gamma \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta \vdash_{\mathfrak{S}} P \mid Q}{(\Gamma')^{\dagger}; (\Delta_1), (\Delta') \vdash_{\ell} (\mathbf{vw})(\langle P \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle) :: u : A \quad \text{if } w \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma, \Delta_1, \Delta) \wedge u \notin \text{fn}(P)}$ | | | | | | |
| 3 | $\frac{\Gamma \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta \vdash_{\mathfrak{S}} (\mathbf{vzv} : V)(P \mid Q)}{\text{If } (u \notin \text{fn}(P)) \wedge ((\neg \text{un}(V)) \vee (\text{un}(V) \wedge v \notin \text{fn}(P) \wedge z \notin \text{fn}(Q)))}{(\Gamma')^{\dagger}; (\Delta_1), (\Delta') \vdash_{\ell} (\mathbf{vz})(\langle P \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle[z/v]) :: u : A}$ | | | | | | |
| 4 | $\frac{\Gamma, x : *?T \otimes \cdot \vdash_{\mathfrak{S}} \text{un } x(y).P}{\text{If } u = x \wedge x \notin \text{fn}(P) \text{ and one of the following holds:}}$ <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px dashed black; padding: 2px;">$(\Gamma)^{\dagger}; \cdot \vdash_{\ell} !x(w).w.\text{case}(w(y).\langle P \rangle, \langle P[w/y] \rangle) :: u : !((\langle T \rangle \multimap \mathbf{1}) \& \langle \bar{T} \rangle)$</td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px dashed black; padding: 2px;">if $\neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px dashed black; padding: 2px;">$(\Gamma)^{\dagger}; \cdot \vdash_{\ell} !x(w).\langle P[w/y] \rangle :: u : !\langle \bar{T} \rangle$</td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px dashed black; padding: 2px;">if $\text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">$(\Gamma)^{\dagger}; \cdot \vdash_{\ell} !x(w).w(y).\langle P \rangle :: u : !(\langle T \rangle \multimap \mathbf{1})$</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">if $\neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T)$</td> </tr> </table> | $(\Gamma)^{\dagger}; \cdot \vdash_{\ell} !x(w).w.\text{case}(w(y).\langle P \rangle, \langle P[w/y] \rangle) :: u : !((\langle T \rangle \multimap \mathbf{1}) \& \langle \bar{T} \rangle)$ | if $\neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$ | $(\Gamma)^{\dagger}; \cdot \vdash_{\ell} !x(w).\langle P[w/y] \rangle :: u : !\langle \bar{T} \rangle$ | if $\text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$ | $(\Gamma)^{\dagger}; \cdot \vdash_{\ell} !x(w).w(y).\langle P \rangle :: u : !(\langle T \rangle \multimap \mathbf{1})$ | if $\neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T)$ |
| $(\Gamma)^{\dagger}; \cdot \vdash_{\ell} !x(w).w.\text{case}(w(y).\langle P \rangle, \langle P[w/y] \rangle) :: u : !((\langle T \rangle \multimap \mathbf{1}) \& \langle \bar{T} \rangle)$ | if $\neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$ | | | | | | |
| $(\Gamma)^{\dagger}; \cdot \vdash_{\ell} !x(w).\langle P[w/y] \rangle :: u : !\langle \bar{T} \rangle$ | if $\text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$ | | | | | | |
| $(\Gamma)^{\dagger}; \cdot \vdash_{\ell} !x(w).w(y).\langle P \rangle :: u : !(\langle T \rangle \multimap \mathbf{1})$ | if $\neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T)$ | | | | | | |
| 5 | $\frac{\Gamma \otimes x : \text{lin}?T.S, \Delta \vdash_{\mathfrak{S}} \text{lin } x(y).P}{(\Gamma)^{\dagger}; (\Delta) \vdash_{\ell} x(y).\langle P \rangle :: u : (\langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \bar{S} \rangle) \quad \text{if } u = x}$ <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> $(\Gamma')^{\dagger}; (\Delta'), x : (\langle T \rangle \otimes \langle \bar{S} \rangle) \vdash_{\ell} x(y).\langle P \rangle :: u : A \quad \text{otherwise}$ | | | | | | |
| 6 | $\frac{\Gamma, z : *!T \otimes \Delta \vdash_{\mathfrak{S}} (\mathbf{vxy})\bar{z}(y).P}{\text{If } (\neg \text{un}(T)) \vee (y \notin \text{fn}(P) \wedge \text{un}(T)) \text{ and:}}$ <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px dashed black; padding: 2px;">$(\Gamma')^{\dagger}, z : (\langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle \& \langle \bar{T} \rangle); (\Delta') \vdash_{\ell} \bar{z}(x).x.\text{inr}; \langle P \rangle :: u : A$</td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px dashed black; padding: 2px;">if $\neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">$(\Gamma')^{\dagger}, z : \langle \bar{T} \rangle; (\Delta') \vdash_{\ell} \bar{z}(x).\langle P \rangle :: u : A$</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">if $\text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$</td> </tr> </table> | $(\Gamma')^{\dagger}, z : (\langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle \& \langle \bar{T} \rangle); (\Delta') \vdash_{\ell} \bar{z}(x).x.\text{inr}; \langle P \rangle :: u : A$ | if $\neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$ | $(\Gamma')^{\dagger}, z : \langle \bar{T} \rangle; (\Delta') \vdash_{\ell} \bar{z}(x).\langle P \rangle :: u : A$ | if $\text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$ | | |
| $(\Gamma')^{\dagger}, z : (\langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle \& \langle \bar{T} \rangle); (\Delta') \vdash_{\ell} \bar{z}(x).x.\text{inr}; \langle P \rangle :: u : A$ | if $\neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$ | | | | | | |
| $(\Gamma')^{\dagger}, z : \langle \bar{T} \rangle; (\Delta') \vdash_{\ell} \bar{z}(x).\langle P \rangle :: u : A$ | if $\text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$ | | | | | | |
| 7 | $\frac{\Gamma \otimes z : \text{lin}?T.S, \Delta_1, \Delta \vdash_{\mathfrak{S}} (\mathbf{vxy})\bar{z}(x).(P \mid Q)}{\text{If } (\neg \text{un}(T)) \vee (x \notin \text{fn}(P) \cup \text{fn}(Q) \wedge \text{un}(T)) \text{ and:}}$ <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px dashed black; padding: 2px;">$(\Gamma)^{\dagger}; (\Delta_1), (\Delta) \vdash_{\ell} \bar{z}(y).(\langle P \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle) :: z : (\langle T \rangle \otimes \langle \bar{S} \rangle)$</td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px dashed black; padding: 2px;">if $z = u \wedge u, z \notin \text{fn}(P) \wedge y \notin \text{fn}(Q)$</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">$(\Gamma')^{\dagger}; (\Delta_1), (\Delta'), z : (\langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \bar{S} \rangle) \vdash_{\ell} \bar{z}(y).(\langle P \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle) :: u : A$</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">if $z \neq u \wedge u, z \notin \text{fn}(P) \wedge y \notin \text{fn}(Q)$</td> </tr> </table> | $(\Gamma)^{\dagger}; (\Delta_1), (\Delta) \vdash_{\ell} \bar{z}(y).(\langle P \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle) :: z : (\langle T \rangle \otimes \langle \bar{S} \rangle)$ | if $z = u \wedge u, z \notin \text{fn}(P) \wedge y \notin \text{fn}(Q)$ | $(\Gamma')^{\dagger}; (\Delta_1), (\Delta'), z : (\langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \bar{S} \rangle) \vdash_{\ell} \bar{z}(y).(\langle P \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle) :: u : A$ | if $z \neq u \wedge u, z \notin \text{fn}(P) \wedge y \notin \text{fn}(Q)$ | | |
| $(\Gamma)^{\dagger}; (\Delta_1), (\Delta) \vdash_{\ell} \bar{z}(y).(\langle P \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle) :: z : (\langle T \rangle \otimes \langle \bar{S} \rangle)$ | if $z = u \wedge u, z \notin \text{fn}(P) \wedge y \notin \text{fn}(Q)$ | | | | | | |
| $(\Gamma')^{\dagger}; (\Delta_1), (\Delta'), z : (\langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \bar{S} \rangle) \vdash_{\ell} \bar{z}(y).(\langle P \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle) :: u : A$ | if $z \neq u \wedge u, z \notin \text{fn}(P) \wedge y \notin \text{fn}(Q)$ | | | | | | |
| 8 | $\frac{\Gamma \otimes v : T, x : \text{lin}!(T).S, \Delta \vdash_{\mathfrak{S}} \bar{x}(v).P}{(\Gamma)^{\dagger}; v : (\langle T \rangle), (\Delta) \vdash_{\ell} \bar{x}(y).([v \leftrightarrow y] \mid \langle P \rangle) :: u : (\langle T \rangle \otimes \langle \bar{S} \rangle) \quad \text{if } u = x \wedge \neg \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T)}$ <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> $(\Gamma')^{\dagger}; v : (\langle T \rangle), (\Delta'), x : (\langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \bar{S} \rangle) \vdash_{\ell} \bar{x}(y).([v \leftrightarrow y] \mid P) :: u : \langle \bar{R} \rangle \quad \text{if } \neg \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T)$ | | | | | | |
| 9 | $\frac{\Gamma, v : T \otimes x : \text{lin}!(T).S, \Delta \vdash_{\mathfrak{S}} \bar{x}(v).P}{(\Gamma)^{\dagger}, v : (\langle T \rangle); (\Delta) \vdash_{\ell} \bar{x}(y).(![v \leftrightarrow y] \mid \langle P \rangle) :: x : (\langle T \rangle \otimes \langle \bar{S} \rangle) \quad \text{if } u = x \wedge \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T)}$ <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> $(\Gamma')^{\dagger}, v : T; (\Delta'), x : (\langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \bar{S} \rangle) \vdash_{\ell} \bar{x}(y).(![v \leftrightarrow y] \mid P) :: u : A \quad \text{if } \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T)$ | | | | | | |
| 10 | $\frac{\Gamma, x : *!T \otimes v : T, \Delta \vdash_{\mathfrak{S}} \bar{x}(v).P}{\text{If } \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T) \wedge \neg \text{un}(T) \wedge z \notin \text{fn}(P)}$ $(\Gamma')^{\dagger}, x : (\langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle \& \langle \bar{T} \rangle); v : (\langle T \rangle), (\Delta') \vdash_{\ell} \bar{x}(z).z.\text{inl}; \bar{z}(w).([v \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle P \rangle) :: u : A$ <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> $\text{If } \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T) \wedge \neg \text{un}(T) \wedge z \notin \text{fn}(P)$ $(\Gamma')^{\dagger}, x : (\langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle); v : (\langle T \rangle), (\Delta') \vdash_{\ell} \bar{x}(z).\bar{z}(w).([v \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle P \rangle) :: u : A$ | | | | | | |
| 11 | $\frac{\Gamma, x : *!T, v : T \otimes \Delta \vdash_{\mathfrak{S}} \bar{x}(v).P}{\text{If } \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T) \wedge \text{un}(T) \wedge z \notin \text{fn}(P)}$ $(\Gamma')^{\dagger}, x : (\langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle \& \langle \bar{T} \rangle); v : (\langle T \rangle); (\Delta') \vdash_{\ell} \bar{x}(z).z.\text{inl}; \bar{z}(w).(![v \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle P \rangle) :: u : A$ <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> $\text{If } \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T) \wedge \text{un}(T) \wedge z \notin \text{fn}(P)$ $(\Gamma')^{\dagger}, x : (\langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle); v : (\langle T \rangle); (\Delta') \vdash_{\ell} \bar{x}(z).\bar{z}(w).(![v \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle P \rangle) :: u : A$ | | | | | | |

Table 5.1: From judgments in $\pi_{\mathfrak{S}}$ to judgments in π_{DILL} (Definition 5.30).

Chapter 6

Conclusions

We first remind the reader of the research question that we have strived to answer (Section 1.1):

Can we relate formal models of sequential computation and interactive behaviors, both governed by behavioural types, considering phenomena little considered so far, such as *non-determinism* and *failures*, while accounting with essential properties such as *deadlock-freedom*, *confluence*, and *termination (strong normalization)*?

To answer this question simply: Yes, we have shown that the intended relationships between sequential and concurrent models of computation can be obtained by capitalising on the extensive literature on *relative expressiveness* that has been developed within the fields of concurrency theory and process calculi. Our technical approach has advanced the study of relative expressiveness by considering advanced *type systems*.

One leading idea in our work is considering intersection types as the sequential analog of the behavioural types that discipline computation in the concurrent paradigm. On the sequential side we have considered our source calculi to be λ -calculi with *resource control*, *non-determinism*, and *failure*. We introduce and study new resource λ -calculi that distill and articulate key features from other similar languages proposed in the literature. For these calculi, (non-idempotent) intersection types govern the control and behaviour of resources within a term and their evaluation/substitution; due to their quantitative nature, intersection types can capture the evolution of a term.

On the concurrent side, the target calculi we consider are based on a session-typed π -calculus with client server interactions, non-determinism and failure, proposed by [Caires & Pérez \(2017\)](#). Session types arise from a concurrent interpretation of classical linear logic, in the style of the Curry-Howard isomorphism

(‘propositions-as-types’). This reduces the intrinsic expressivity for processes, but ensures strong behavioural properties directly derived from the logical foundations (in particular, from the connection between cut-elimination and process synchronization). By encoding resource λ -calculi into session-typed π -calculi, we demonstrated how not only non-determinism and explicit failures can be handled within a logically-motivated framework but also the precise connection between intersection types and session types themselves.

To establish our formal relationships we follow the well-known framework by Gorla (2010); in fact, the definition of our source languages and their type system is strongly guided by Gorla’s correctness criteria. In particular, we purposefully aimed at source and target languages for which translations can enjoy strong formulations of the *soundness* property, which captures how the behaviour of the encoded term (in π) reflects the behaviour of the source term (in λ). In the literature we can find different formulations of soundness, with varying levels of flexibility and strength. In our work we have strived to obtain a very general/flexible formulation of soundness, for which formal proofs are technically challenging; important for our proofs are properties of *determinacy* and *confluence* that come directly from the logically-motivated process model. We have also considered the case in which source and target languages abandon confluent reductions, which further increases the complexity of this endeavour.

Finally, our comparative analysis of type systems that enforce termination for concurrent processes illuminated the strengths and limitations of various approaches, providing valuable insights for future research. Also in this context, our approach to comparison relied heavily on techniques from relative expressiveness, once again framed in the typed setting, which requires translations of processes/terms but also of their corresponding types and type judgments.

Our research not only sheds light on these intricate relationships but also lays the groundwork for further advancements in this area. More in details, we have been led to several significant insights and contributions as follows:

- *Encoding Resource λ -calculi in Session-Typed π -Calculus (Chapter 2):*
We developed a correct translation of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, a resource λ -calculus featuring non-determinism and explicit failure, into $s\pi$, a session-typed π -calculus, which not only illustrates the compatibility of these two formalisms but also provides a robust framework for modelling non-determinism and explicit failures. This encoding establishes a precise connection between terms, processes, intersection types, and linear logic propositions, providing a logical foundation for handling non-deterministic behaviors and failures. This work stands as the first to draw such connections, thereby opening new avenues for the application of intersection types and session types in understanding resource-aware computing in both sequential and concurrent settings.

- *Encoding Resource λ -calculi with Linear and Unrestricted Resources (Chapter 3):*

We extended our previous work on resource λ -calculi by introducing $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \ell}$, a calculus in which bags of resources consist of two sorts: a linear and an unrestricted component. Separating the bag in this way is influenced by linear logic and ensures that the behaviour that a resource allows (linear or unrestricted) does not change during computation. This is important to enable the predictability of failures within computation. The motivation for unrestricted resources stems from the desire to capitalize on the expressivity of the target model that already includes unrestricted behaviors in the form of *client-server* interactions, related to the concurrent interpretation of the exponentials $?$ and $!$ in linear logic. We aim to demonstrate what the target process model allows us to express at the source level, exploring the extent to which we can expand our sequential model and the behaviors we can extract from the underlying target process calculus. Although other formulations of resource calculi with unrestricted resources exist (see, e.g., Boudol & Laneve (2000); Pagani & Ronchi Della Rocca (2010)), our formulation is novel in that it is directed from the viewpoint of encodability with flexible correctness results and the extraction of target language behaviours.

- *Exploration of Non-Confluent Non-Determinism in Typed Calculi (Chapter 4):*

In this chapter, we shift our focus from confluent to non-confluent non-determinism. Our investigation into $s\pi^+$ and λ_c^ℓ showcased calculi integrating resource control with non-confluent non-determinism yielded significant insights. We examined lazy and explicit non-determinism within session types, emphasizing the role of intersection types in regulating resource fetching we demonstrate the feasibility of integrating different forms of non-determinism. The correct translation of λ_c^ℓ into $s\pi^+$ highlights the compatibility and interplay between different forms of non-determinism across calculi.

Furthermore, this exploration opens new avenues for future research, including the refinement of type systems to better manage non-determinism and the extension of these principles to other computational models. By addressing the challenges posed by non-confluent non-determinism, our work contributes to the broader goal of developing reliable and efficient concurrent systems that can handle unpredictability in a controlled manner.

- *Comparative Study of Type Systems for Concurrent Processes (Chapter 5):*

We conducted a comparative analysis of type systems for the π -calculus, focusing on termination. While in the λ -calculus the study of termination properties via types is well-understood in general, the situation for the π -calculus

is different. Indeed, because reductions in a concurrent setting allow for a wider spectrum of behaviors, we find several advanced type systems enforcing termination at different levels of completeness, i.e., by analysing client-server interactions in various different ways. Still, formal comparisons between these advanced type systems were not studied before our work.

The comparative analysis of type systems rests upon the idea of classifying different classes of terms induced by the typing disciplines as well as by relations of relative expressiveness, in which soundness and completeness properties play a crucial role. Although this chapter may seem slightly unrelated to the previous chapters, we argue we that there is a significant relationship between them. The concepts in the sequential world mirror those in the concurrent world, with types on one side corresponding to types on the other, maintaining a cohesive framework across both paradigms. This study revealed intrinsic differences between typed process models such as π_S , π_W , and π_{DILL} . The Curry-Howard correspondence, while fundamental, demonstrates limitations in enforcing termination when compared to previously developed approaches based on weights/measures, yet also inducing a strict partial order that we can consider a subclass of the weights/measures system of π_W .

In conclusion, our exploration has contributed insights into formal models of computation that incorporate non-determinism, failures, and resource control. By establishing connections between different calculi and type systems, we provide a foundational framework that can be further explored. This foundational framework should ultimately enhance the further development the theoretical underpinnings and practical applications of concurrent programming paradigms.

Moving forward, we aim to deepen our understanding of key properties like solvability within the resource calculus (pertaining to the work in chapters Chapters 2 to 4) and termination in the π -calculus (Chapter 5). Immediate items for future work in the latter include incorporating other type systems into our formal comparisons. The type systems proposed by [Sangiorgi \(2006\)](#) and by [Yoshida et al. \(2001\)](#) are particularly promising candidates. This future research would further solidify the theoretical contributions we have presented.

All in all, our work serves as a stepping stone toward a more integrated understanding of how non-determinism, resource control, and type systems can jointly enhance the robustness and predictability of computational models in different paradigms.

Bibliography

- Atkey, R., S. Lindley, J. G. Morris (2016) Conflation confers concurrency, in: Lindley, S., C. McBride, P. W. Trinder, D. Sannella, eds., *A List of Successes That Can Change the World - Essays Dedicated to Philip Wadler on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, vol. 9600 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 32–55.
- Berger, M., K. Honda (2000) The two-phase commitment protocol in an extended pi-calculus, in: Aceto, L., B. Victor, eds., *7th International Workshop on Expressiveness in Concurrency, EXPRESS 2000, Satellite Workshop of CONCUR 2000, State College, PA, USA, August 21, 2000*, vol. 39 of *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, Elsevier, pp. 21–46.
- Berger, M., K. Honda, N. Yoshida (2003) Genericity and the pi-calculus, in: Gordon, A. D., ed., *Foundations of Software Science and Computational Structures, 6th International Conference, FOSSACS 2003 Held as Part of the Joint European Conference on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2003, Warsaw, Poland, April 7-11, 2003, Proceedings*, vol. 2620 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 103–119.
- Berger, M., K. Honda, N. Yoshida (2005) Genericity and the π -calculus, *Acta Informatica*, 42, pp. 83–141.
- Bono, V., M. Dezani-Ciancaglini (2020) A tale of intersection types, in: Hermanns, H., L. Zhang, N. Kobayashi, D. Miller, eds., *LICS '20: 35th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Saarbrücken, Germany, July 8-11, 2020*, ACM, pp. 7–20.
- Boudol, G. (1993) The lambda-calculus with multiplicities (abstract), in: Best, E., ed., *CONCUR '93, Hildesheim, Germany, August 23-26, 1993, Proceedings*, vol. 715 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 1–6.
- Boudol, G., C. Laneve (1996) The discriminating power of multiplicities in the lambda-calculus, *Inf. Comput.*, 126(1), pp. 83–102.
- Boudol, G., C. Laneve (2000) lambda-calculus, multiplicities, and the pi-calculus, in: *Proof, Language, and Interaction, Essays in Honour of Robin Milner*, pp. 659–690.
- Bucciarelli, A., T. Ehrhard (2000) On phase semantics and denotational semantics in multiplicative-additive linear logic, *Ann. Pure Appl. Log.*, 102(3), pp. 247–282.
- Bucciarelli, A., T. Ehrhard (2001) On phase semantics and denotational semantics: the exponentials, *Ann. Pure Appl. Log.*, 109(3), pp. 205–241.

- Bucciarelli, A., D. Kesner, D. Ventura (2017) Non-idempotent intersection types for the lambda-calculus, *Logic Journal of the IGPL*, 25(4), pp. 431–464.
- Caires, L., J. A. Pérez (2017) Linearity, control effects, and behavioral types, in: Yang, H., ed., *Programming Languages and Systems - 26th European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2017, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2017, Uppsala, Sweden, April 22-29, 2017, Proceedings*, vol. 10201 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 229–259.
- Caires, L., F. Pfenning (2010) Session types as intuitionistic linear propositions, in: *CONCUR 2010 - Concurrency Theory, 21th International Conference, CONCUR 2010, Paris, France, August 31-September 3, 2010. Proceedings*, pp. 222–236.
- Casal, F., A. Mordido, V. T. Vasconcelos (2022) Mixed sessions, *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 897, pp. 23–48.
- Coppo, M., M. Dezani-Ciancaglini (1978) A new type assignment for λ -terms, *Arch. Math. Log.*, 19(1), pp. 139–156.
- Dardha, O., E. Giachino, D. Sangiorgi (2012) Session types revisited, in: *PPDP'12*, ACM, pp. 139–150.
- Dardha, O., J. A. Pérez (2015) Comparing deadlock-free session typed processes, in: *Combined 22th International Workshop on Expressiveness in Concurrency and 12th Workshop on Structural Operational Semantics, and 12th Workshop on Structural Operational Semantics, EXPRESS/SOS*, vol. 190 of *EPTCS*, pp. 1–15.
- Dardha, O., J. A. Pérez (2022) Comparing type systems for deadlock freedom, *J. Log. Algebraic Methods Program.*, 124, p. 100717.
- de Carvalho, D. (2009) Execution time of lambda-terms via denotational semantics and intersection types, *CoRR*, abs/0905.4251.
- de Carvalho, D. (2018) Execution time of λ -terms via denotational semantics and intersection types, *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.*, 28(7), pp. 1169–1203.
- de'Liguoro, U., A. Piperno (1995) Non deterministic extensions of untyped lambda-calculus, *Inf. Comput.*, 122(2), pp. 149–177.
- Demangeon, R., D. Hirschhoff, D. Sangiorgi (2010) Termination in impure concurrent languages, in: Gastin, P., F. Laroussinie, eds., *CONCUR 2010 - Concurrency Theory, 21th International Conference, CONCUR 2010, Paris, France, August 31-September 3, 2010. Proceedings*, vol. 6269 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 328–342.

- Deng, Y., D. Sangiorgi (2004) Ensuring termination by typability, in: Lévy, J., E. W. Mayr, J. C. Mitchell, eds., *Exploring New Frontiers of Theoretical Informatics, IFIP 18th World Computer Congress, TC1 3rd International Conference on Theoretical Computer Science (TCS2004), 22-27 August 2004, Toulouse, France*, vol. 155 of *IFIP*, Kluwer/Springer, pp. 619–632.
- Deng, Y., D. Sangiorgi (2006) Ensuring termination by typability, *Information and Computation*, 204(7), pp. 1045–1082.
- Dezani-Ciancaglini, M. (1996) *Logical Semantics for Concurrent Lambda-Calculus*, Ph.D. thesis, Nijmegen University.
- Dezani-Ciancaglini, M., U. de'Liguoro, A. Piperno (1993) Filter models for a parallel and non deterministic lambda-calculus, in: Borzyszkowski, A. M., S. Sokolowski, eds., *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 1993, 18th International Symposium, MFCS'93, Gdansk, Poland, August 30 - September 3, 1993, Proceedings*, vol. 711 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 403–412.
- Dominici, M., S. Ronchi Della Rocca, P. Tranquilli (2012) Standardization in resource lambda-calculus, in: *Proceedings 2nd International Workshop on Linearity, LINEARITY 2012, Tallinn, Estonia, 1 April 2012.*, pp. 1–11.
- Ehrhard, T. (2020) Non-idempotent intersection types in logical form, in: Goubault-Larrecq, J., B. König, eds., *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures - 23rd International Conference, FOSSACS 2020, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2020, Dublin, Ireland, April 25-30, 2020, Proceedings*, vol. 12077 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 198–216.
- Ehrhard, T., L. Regnier (2003) The differential lambda-calculus, *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 309(1-3), pp. 1–41.
- Gardner, P. (1994) Discovering needed reductions using type theory, in: Hagiya, M., J. C. Mitchell, eds., *Theoretical Aspects of Computer Software, International Conference TACS '94, Sendai, Japan, April 19-22, 1994, Proceedings*, vol. 789 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 555–574.
- Ghilezan, S., J. Ivetic, P. Lescanne, S. Likavec (2011) Intersection types for the resource control lambda calculi, in: *Theoretical Aspects of Computing - ICTAC 2011 - 8th International Colloquium, Johannesburg, South Africa, August 31 - September 2, 2011. Proceedings*, pp. 116–134.
- Gorla, D. (2010) Towards a unified approach to encodability and separation results for process calculi, *Inf. Comput.*, 208(9), pp. 1031–1053.

- Gorla, D., U. Nestmann (2016) Full abstraction for expressiveness: history, myths and facts, *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.*, 26(4), pp. 639–654.
- Groote, J. F., M. R. Mousavi (2014) *Modeling and Analysis of Communicating Systems*, MIT Press.
- Guerrini, S. (1999) A general theory of sharing graphs, *Theoretical Computer Science*, 227(1), pp. 99–151.
- Guerrini, S., S. Martini, A. Masini (2003) Coherence for sharing proof-nets, *Theoretical Computer Science*, 294(3), pp. 379–409, linear Logic.
- Gundersen, T., W. Heijltjes, M. Parigot (2013) Atomic lambda calculus: A typed lambda-calculus with explicit sharing, in: *28th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2013, New Orleans, LA, USA, June 25-28, 2013*, pp. 311–320.
- Honda, K. (1993) Types for dyadic interaction, in: Best, E., ed., *CONCUR '93, Hildesheim, Germany, August 23-26, 1993, Proceedings*, vol. 715 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 509–523.
- Honda, K., V. T. Vasconcelos, M. Kubo (1998a) Language primitives and type discipline for structured communication-based programming, in: Hankin, C., ed., *Programming Languages and Systems - ESOP'98, 7th European Symposium on Programming, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on the Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS'98, Lisbon, Portugal, March 28 - April 4, 1998, Proceedings*, vol. 1381 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 122–138.
- Honda, K., V. T. Vasconcelos, M. Kubo (1998b) Language primitives and type discipline for structured communication-based programming, in: *ESOP'98*, vol. 1381, Springer, pp. 122–138.
- Honda, K., N. Yoshida, M. Berger (2014) Process types as a descriptive tool for interaction - control and the pi-calculus, in: Dowek, G., ed., *Rewriting and Typed Lambda Calculi - Joint International Conference, RTA-TLCA 2014, Held as Part of the Vienna Summer of Logic, VSL 2014, Vienna, Austria, July 14-17, 2014. Proceedings*, vol. 8560 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 1–20.
- Kesner, D., S. Lengrand (2007) Resource operators for lambda-calculus, *Inf. Comput.*, 205(4), pp. 419–473.
- Kesner, D., F. Renaud (2011) A prismoid framework for languages with resources, *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 412(37), pp. 4867–4892.

- Kfoury, A. J. (2000) A linearization of the lambda-calculus and consequences, *J. Log. Comput.*, 10(3), pp. 411–436.
- Kfoury, A. J., J. B. Wells (2004) Principality and type inference for intersection types using expansion variables, *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 311(1-3), pp. 1–70.
- Kobayashi, N., D. Sangiorgi (2010) A hybrid type system for lock-freedom of mobile processes, *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 32(5), pp. 16:1–16:49.
- Kokke, W., J. G. Morris, P. Wadler (2020) Towards Races in Linear Logic, *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, Volume 16, Issue 4.
- Kouzapas, D., J. A. Pérez, N. Yoshida (2019) On the relative expressiveness of higher-order session processes, *Inf. Comput.*, 268.
- Lago, U. D., M. de Visme, D. Mazza, A. Yoshimizu (2019) Intersection types and runtime errors in the pi-calculus, *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 3(POPL), pp. 7:1–7:29.
- Leivant, D. (1983) Polymorphic type inference, in: Wright, J. R., L. Landweber, A. J. Demers, T. Teitelbaum, eds., *Conference Record of the Tenth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, Austin, Texas, USA, January 1983*, ACM Press, pp. 88–98.
- Mazza, D., L. Pellissier, P. Vial (2018) Polyadic approximations, fibrations and intersection types, *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 2(POPL), pp. 6:1–6:28.
- Milner, R. (1978) A theory of type polymorphism in programming, *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 17(3), pp. 348–375.
- Milner, R. (1989) *Communication and concurrency*, PHI Series in computer science, Prentice Hall.
- Milner, R. (1990) Functions as processes, Research Report 1154, INRIA, Sophia Antipolis, final version appeared as [Milner \(1992\)](#).
- Milner, R. (1992) Functions as processes, *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 2(2), pp. 119–141.
- Milner, R., J. Parrow, D. Walker (1992) A calculus of mobile processes, I, *Inf. Comput.*, 100(1), pp. 1–40.
- Neergaard, P. M., H. G. Mairson (2004) Types, potency, and idempotency: why nonlinearity and amnesia make a type system work, in: Okasaki, C., K. Fisher, eds., *Proceedings of the Ninth ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming, ICFP 2004, Snow Bird, UT, USA, September 19-21, 2004*, ACM, pp. 138–149.

- Nestmann, U., R. Fuzzati, M. Merro (2003) Modeling consensus in a process calculus, in: Amadio, R. M., D. Lugiez, eds., *CONCUR 2003 - Concurrency Theory, 14th International Conference, Marseille, France, September 3-5, 2003, Proceedings*, vol. 2761 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 393–407.
- Orchard, D. A., N. Yoshida (2016) Effects as sessions, sessions as effects, in: *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2016, St. Petersburg, FL, USA, January 20 - 22, 2016*, ACM, pp. 568–581.
- Pagani, M., S. Ronchi Della Rocca (2010) Solvability in resource lambda-calculus, in: Ong, C. L., ed., *Foundations of Software Science and Computational Structures, 13th International Conference, FOSSACS 2010, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2010, Paphos, Cyprus, March 20-28, 2010. Proceedings*, vol. 6014 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 358–373.
- Parrow, J. (2008) Expressiveness of process algebras, *Electron. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 209, pp. 173–186.
- Paulus, J. W. N., D. Nantes-Sobrinho, J. A. Pérez (2021a) Non-deterministic functions as non-deterministic processes, in: Kobayashi, N., ed., *6th International Conference on Formal Structures for Computation and Deduction, FSCD 2021, July 17-24, 2021, Buenos Aires, Argentina (Virtual Conference)*, vol. 195 of *LIPICs*, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, pp. 21:1–21:22.
- Paulus, J. W. N., D. Nantes-Sobrinho, J. A. Pérez (2021b) Types and terms translated: Unrestricted resources in encoding functions as processes, in: Basold, H., J. Cockx, S. Ghilezan, eds., *27th International Conference on Types for Proofs and Programs, TYPES 2021, June 14-18, 2021, Leiden, The Netherlands (Virtual Conference)*, vol. 239 of *LIPICs*, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, pp. 11:1–11:24.
- Paulus, J. W. N., D. Nantes-Sobrinho, J. A. Pérez (2023a) Non-deterministic functions as non-deterministic processes (extended version), *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 19(4).
- Paulus, J. W. N., J. A. Pérez, D. Nantes-Sobrinho (2023b) Termination in concurrency, revisited, in: Escobar, S., V. T. Vasconcelos, eds., *International Symposium on Principles and Practice of Declarative Programming, PPDP 2023, Lisboa, Portugal, October 22-23, 2023*, ACM, pp. 3:1–3:14.

- Pérez, J. A., L. Caires, F. Pfenning, B. Toninho (2014) Linear logical relations and observational equivalences for session-based concurrency, *Inf. Comput.*, 239, pp. 254–302.
- Peters, K. (2012) *Translational Expressiveness. Comparing Process Calculi using Encodings*, Ph.D. thesis, Berlin Institute of Technology.
- Peters, K. (2019) Comparing process calculi using encodings, in: Pérez, J. A., J. Rot, eds., *Proceedings Combined 26th International Workshop on Expressiveness in Concurrency and 16th Workshop on Structural Operational Semantics, EXPRESS/SOS 2019, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 26th August 2019*, vol. 300 of *EPTCS*, pp. 19–38.
- Piccolo, M. (2012) Strong normalization in the π -calculus with intersection and union types, *Fundam. Informaticae*, 121(1-4), pp. 227–252.
- Pottinger, G. (1980) A type assignment for the strongly normalizable λ -terms, in: *To H. B. Curry: Essays on Combinatory Logic, Lambda Calculus, and Formalism*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 561–577.
- Rocha, P., L. Caires (2021) Propositions-as-types and shared state, *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 5(ICFP), pp. 79:1–79:30.
- Sangiorgi, D. (1993) *Expressing mobility in process algebras : first-order and higher-order paradigms*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh, UK.
- Sangiorgi, D. (1999) From lambda to pi; or, rediscovering continuations, *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.*, 9(4), pp. 367–401.
- Sangiorgi, D. (2006) Termination of processes, *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.*, 16(1), pp. 1–39.
- Sangiorgi, D., D. Walker (2001) *The Pi-Calculus - a theory of mobile processes*, Cambridge University Press.
- Toninho, B., L. Caires, F. Pfenning (2012) Functions as session-typed processes, in: Birkedal, L., ed., *Foundations of Software Science and Computational Structures - 15th International Conference, FOSSACS 2012, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2012, Tallinn, Estonia, March 24 - April 1, 2012. Proceedings*, vol. 7213 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 346–360.
- Toninho, B., L. Caires, F. Pfenning (2014) Corecursion and non-divergence in session-typed processes, in: Maffei, M., E. Tuosto, eds., *Trustworthy Global Computing - 9th International Symposium, TGC 2014, Rome, Italy, September*

- 5-6, 2014. *Revised Selected Papers*, vol. 8902 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 159–175.
- Toninho, B., N. Yoshida (2018) On polymorphic sessions and functions - A tale of two (fully abstract) encodings, in: Ahmed, A., ed., *27th European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2018, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2018, Thessaloniki, Greece, April 14-20, 2018, Proceedings*, vol. 10801 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 827–855.
- van Bakel, S. (1995) Intersection type assignment systems, *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 151(2), pp. 385–435.
- van den Heuvel, B., D. Nantes-Sobrinho, J. W. N. Paulus, J. A. Pérez (2024) Typed non-determinism in concurrent calculi: The eager way.
- van den Heuvel, B., J. W. N. Paulus, D. Nantes-Sobrinho, J. A. Pérez (2023) Typed non-determinism in functional and concurrent calculi, in: Hur, C., ed., *Programming Languages and Systems - 21st Asian Symposium, APLAS 2023, Taipei, Taiwan, November 26-29, 2023, Proceedings*, vol. 14405 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 112–132.
- Vasconcelos, V. T. (2012) Fundamentals of session types, *Inf. Comput.*, 217, pp. 52–70.
- Vasconcelos, V. T., F. Casal, B. Almeida, A. Mordido (2020) Mixed sessions, in: Müller, P., ed., *Programming Languages and Systems - 29th European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2020, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2020, Dublin, Ireland, April 25-30, 2020, Proceedings*, vol. 12075 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 715–742.
- Wadler, P. (2012) Propositions as sessions, in: Thiemann, P., R. B. Findler, eds., *ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming, ICFP'12, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 9-15, 2012*, ACM, pp. 273–286.
- Yoshida, N., M. Berger, K. Honda (2001) Strong normalisation in the pi-calculus, in: *16th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Boston, Massachusetts, USA, June 16-19, 2001, Proceedings*, IEEE Computer Society, pp. 311–322.

Appendix A

Appendix of Chapter 2

A.1 Appendix to § 2.2.3

Lemma 2.2.2 (Linear Anti-substitution Lemma for λ_{\oplus}) *Let M and N be λ_{\oplus} -terms such that $\text{head}(M) = x$, then we have:*

- $\Gamma, x : \sigma^{k-1} \vdash M\{N/x\} : \tau$, with $k > 1$, then there exist Γ_1, Γ_2 such that $\Gamma_1, x : \sigma^k \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$, where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$.
- $\Gamma \vdash M\{N/x\} : \tau$, with $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then there exist Γ_1, Γ_2 such that $\Gamma_1, x : \sigma \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$, where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$.

Proof: By induction on the structure of M :

- 1) When $M = x$ then we have $x\{N/x\} = N$ and may derive the derivation of $\Gamma \vdash N : \tau$ with $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$. By taking $\Gamma_1 = \emptyset$ and $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma$ as $\Gamma = \emptyset \wedge \Gamma$ the case follows as $\Gamma \vdash N : \tau$ and

$$[\text{T : var}] \frac{}{x : \sigma \vdash x : \sigma}$$

- 2) When $M = (M B)$ then we have that $(M B)\{N/x\} = (M\{N/x\}) B$. Let us consider two cases:

I) When $x \in \text{fv}(M\{N/x\})$

$$[\text{T : app}] \frac{\Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1} \vdash M\{N/x\} : \pi \rightarrow \tau' \quad \Delta \vdash B : \pi}{(\Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1}) \wedge \Delta \vdash (M\{N/x\}) B : \tau'}$$

By the IH we have that $\Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1} \vdash M\{N/x\} : \pi \rightarrow \tau'$ implies that $\exists \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2$ such that $\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$ with $\Gamma' = \Gamma'_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$.

$$[\text{T : app}] \frac{\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k \vdash M : \pi \rightarrow \tau' \quad \Delta \vdash B : \pi}{(\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k) \wedge \Delta \vdash M B : \tau'}$$

II) When $x \notin \text{fv}(M\{N/x\})$

$$[\text{T : app}] \frac{\Gamma' \vdash M\{N/x\} : \pi \rightarrow \tau' \quad \Delta \vdash B : \pi}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \vdash (M\{N/x\}) B : \tau'}$$

By the IH we have that $\Gamma' \vdash M\{N/x\} : \pi \rightarrow \tau'$ implies that $\exists \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2$ such that $\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$ with $\Gamma' = \Gamma'_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$.

$$[\text{T : app}] \frac{\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma \vdash M\{N/x\} : \pi \rightarrow \tau' \quad \Delta \vdash B : \pi}{(\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma) \wedge \Delta \vdash M B : \tau'}$$

3) When $M = M\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$ then we have that $(M\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle)\{N/x\} = (M\{N/x\})\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$ where $x \neq y$

I) When $x \in \text{fv}(M\{N/x\})$

$$[\text{T : ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1}, y : \delta^j \vdash (M\{N/x\}) : \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \delta^j}{\Gamma', y : \delta^j \wedge \Delta \vdash (M\{N/x\})\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

By the IH we have that $\Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1}, y : \delta^j \vdash (M\{N/x\}) : \tau$ implies that $\exists \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2$ such that $\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k, y : \delta^j \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$ with $\Gamma', y : \delta^j = (\Gamma'_1, y : \delta^j) \wedge \Gamma_2$.

$$[\text{T : ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k, y : \delta^j \vdash M : \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \delta^j}{\Gamma'_1 \wedge \Delta \vdash M\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

II) When $x \notin \text{fv}(M\{N/x\})$

$$[\text{T : ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma', y : \delta^k \vdash (M\{N/x\}) : \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \delta^k}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \vdash (M\{N/x\})\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

By the IH we have that $\Gamma', y : \delta^k \vdash (M\{N/x\}) : \tau$ implies that $\exists \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2$ such that $\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$ with $\Gamma', y : \delta^k = (\Gamma'_1, y : \delta^k) \wedge \Gamma_2$.

$$[\text{T : ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma, y : \delta^k \vdash M : \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \delta^k}{\Gamma'_1 \wedge \Delta \vdash M\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

4) When $M = \lambda y.M$ then linear head substitution is undefined on this term as $\text{head}(M) \neq x$.

5) When $M = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ then M is not well typed.

□

Theorem 2.2 (Subject Expansion for λ_{\oplus}) *If $\Gamma \vdash M' : \tau$ and $M \rightarrow M'$ then $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$.*

Proof: By induction on the reduction rule applied. There are four possible cases.

1) When M' is reduced to via the Rule [R : Beta]

$$[\text{R : Beta}] \frac{}{(\lambda x.M)B \rightarrow M\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle}$$

Then $M' = M\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$ can be type as follows:

$$[\text{T : ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \vdash M : \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \vdash M\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

From the typing of M' we can deduce that $M = (\lambda x.M)B$ may be typed by:

$$\begin{array}{l} [\text{T : abs}] \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x. M : \sigma^k \rightarrow \tau} \quad \Delta \vdash B : \pi \\ [\text{T : app}] \frac{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x. M : \sigma^k \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \pi}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \vdash (\lambda x. M) B : \tau} \end{array}$$

2) When M' is reduced to via the Rule [R : Fetch]

$$[\text{R : Fetch}] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x \quad B = \{N_1, \dots, N_k\}, \quad k \geq 1 \quad \#(x, M) = k}{M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow M\{N_1/x\} \langle\langle (B \setminus N_1)/x \rangle\rangle + \dots + M\{N_k/x\} \langle\langle (B \setminus N_k)/x \rangle\rangle}$$

Let us consider two cases:

I) The bag B has k elements where $k > 1$, then we type $M\{N_i/x\} \langle\langle (B \setminus N_i)/x \rangle\rangle$ with the derivation Π_i to be:

$$[\text{T : ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma^{k-1} \vdash M\{N_1/x\} : \tau \quad \Delta \vdash (B \setminus N_1) : \sigma^{k-1}}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \vdash M\{N_1/x\} \langle\langle (B \setminus N_1)/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

We can type the sum with each derivation Π_i to be

$$\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \vdash M\{N_1/x\} \langle\langle (B \setminus N_1)/x \rangle\rangle : \tau} \quad \frac{\frac{\Pi_k}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \vdash M\{N_k/x\} \langle\langle (B \setminus N_k)/x \rangle\rangle : \tau} \quad \vdots}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \vdash M\{N_1/x\} \langle\langle (B \setminus N_1)/x \rangle\rangle + \dots + M\{N_k/x\} \langle\langle (B \setminus N_k)/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}}$$

By the anti-substitution lemma (Lemma 2.2.2) we have that $\exists \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$ such that $\Gamma_1, x : \sigma^k \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N_i : \sigma$ with $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$ and finally we have:

$$[\text{T : ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma_1, x : \sigma^k \vdash M : \tau \quad \Delta \wedge \Gamma_2 \vdash B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \vdash M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

notice that we make use that $\Gamma_2 \vdash N_i : \sigma$ to ensure that the bag B is well typed.

II) The bag B has one element, then we type $M\{N_i/x\} \langle\langle 1/x \rangle\rangle$ with the derivation Π to be:

$$[\text{T : ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma \vdash M\{N_1/x\} : \tau \quad \Delta \vdash 1 : \omega}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \vdash M\{N_1/x\} \langle\langle 1/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

By the anti-substitution lemma (Lemma 2.2.2) we have that $\exists \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$ such that $\Gamma_1, x : \sigma \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N_1 : \sigma$ with $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$ and finally we have:

$$[\text{T : ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma_1, x : \sigma \vdash M : \tau \quad \Delta \wedge \Gamma_2 \vdash \{N_1\} : \sigma}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \vdash M\{N_1/x\} \langle\langle N/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

3) When M' is reduced to via the Rule [R : TCont]

$$[\text{R : TCont}] \frac{M \longrightarrow M'_1 + \dots + M'_k}{C[M] \longrightarrow C[M'_1] + \dots + C[M'_k]}$$

Hence the proof follows by the IH on M .

4) When M' is reduced to via the Rule [R : ECont]

$$[\mathbf{R} : \mathbf{ECont}] \frac{\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}'}{D[\mathbb{M}] \longrightarrow D[\mathbb{M}]'}$$

Hence the proof follows by the IH on M .

□

Lemma 2.2.3 (Substitution Lemma for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$) *If $\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \models M : \tau$ (with $k \geq 1$), $\text{head}(M) = x$, and $\Delta \models N : \sigma$ then $\Gamma \wedge \Delta, x : \sigma^{k-1} \models M\{N/x\}$.*

Proof: By structural induction on M with $\text{head}(M) = x$. There are three cases to be analyzed:

1) $M = x$.

This case follows trivially. First, $x : \sigma \models x : \sigma$ and $\Gamma = \emptyset$. Second, $x\{N/x\} = N$, by definition. Since $\Delta \models N : \sigma$, by hypothesis, the result follows.

2) $M = M' B$.

In this case, $\text{head}(M' B) = \text{head}(M') = x$, and by inversion of the typing derivation one has the following derivation:

$$[\mathbf{F}:\mathbf{app}] \frac{\Gamma_1, x : \sigma^m \models M' : \delta^j \rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma_2 \models B : \delta^l}{(\Gamma_1, x : \sigma^m) \wedge \Gamma_2 \models M' B : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma, x : \sigma^k = (\Gamma_1, x : \sigma^m) \wedge \Gamma_2$, δ is a strict type, and j, l, m are non-negative integers, possibly different with $m \geq 1$.

By IH, we get $\Gamma_1 \wedge \Delta, x : \sigma^{m-1} \models M'\{N/x\} : \delta^j \rightarrow \tau$, which gives the following derivation:

$$[\mathbf{F}:\mathbf{app}] \frac{\Gamma_1 \wedge \Delta, x : \sigma^{m-1} \models M'\{N/x\} : \delta^j \rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma_2 \models B : \delta^l}{(\Gamma_1 \wedge \Delta, x : \sigma^{m-1}) \wedge \Gamma_2 \models (M'\{N/x\})B : \tau}$$

Therefore, from Def. 2.4, one has $\Gamma \wedge \Delta, x : \sigma^{k-1} \models (M' B)\{N/x\} : \tau$, and the result follows.

3) $M = M'\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$.

In this case, $\text{head}(M'\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle) = \text{head}(M') = x$, with $x \neq y$, and by inversion of the typing derivation one has the following derivation:

$$[\mathbf{F}:\mathbf{ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma_1, y : \delta^l, x : \sigma^m \models M' : \tau \quad \Gamma_2 \models B : \delta^j}{(\Gamma_1, x : \sigma^m) \wedge \Gamma_2 \models M'\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma, x : \sigma^k = (\Gamma_1, x : \sigma^m) \wedge \Gamma_2$, δ is a strict type and j, l, m are positive integers with $m \geq 1$.

By IH, we get $(\Gamma_1, y : \delta^l, x : \sigma^{m-1}) \wedge \Delta \models M'\{N/x\} : \tau$ and

$$[\mathbf{F}:\mathbf{ex-sub}] \frac{(\Gamma_1, y : \delta^l, x : \sigma^{m-1}) \wedge \Delta \models M'\{N/x\} : \tau \quad \Gamma_2 \models B : \delta^j}{(\Gamma_1, y : \delta^l, x : \sigma^{m-1}) \wedge \Delta \wedge \Gamma_2 \models M'\{N/x\}\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

From Def. 2.4, $M'\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle\{N/x\} = M'\{N/x\}\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$, therefore, $\Gamma \wedge \Delta, x : \sigma^{k-1} \models (M'\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle)\{N/x\} : \tau$ and the result follows. □

Theorem 2.3 (Subject Reduction in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$) *If $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ and $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}'$ then $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M}' : \tau$.*

Proof: By structural induction on the reduction rules. We proceed by analysing the rule applied in \mathbb{M} . There are seven cases:

1) Rule [R : Beta].

Then $\mathbb{M} = (\lambda x.M)B \rightarrow M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle = \mathbb{M}'$.

Since $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$, by inversion of the typing derivation one has the following derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{[\text{F:abs}]}{\Gamma' \models \lambda x.M : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau} \frac{\Gamma', x : \sigma^j \models M : \tau}{\Gamma' \models \lambda x.M : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau} \Delta \models B : \sigma^k}{[\text{F:app}] \frac{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \models (\lambda x.M)B : \tau}}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \models (\lambda x.M)B : \tau}$$

for $\Gamma = \Gamma' \wedge \Delta$. Notice that

$$[\text{F:ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma', x : \sigma^j \models M : \tau \quad \Delta \models B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \models M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

Therefore, $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M}' : \tau$ and the result follows.

2) Rule [R : Fetch].

Then $\mathbb{M} = M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$, where $B = \{N_1, \dots, N_k\}$, $k \geq 1$, $\#(x, M) = k$, and $\text{head}(M) = x$. The reduction is as follows:

$$[\text{R : Fetch}] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x \quad B = \{N_1, \dots, N_k\}, k \geq 1 \quad \#(x, M) = k}{M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \rightarrow M\{N_1/x\} \langle\langle (B \setminus N_1)/x \rangle\rangle + \dots + M\{N_k/x\} \langle\langle (B \setminus N_k)/x \rangle\rangle}$$

To simplify the proof we take $k = 2$, as the case $k > 2$ is similar. Therefore, by inversion of the typing derivation and $B = \{N_1, N_2\}$:

$$[\text{F:ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma', x : \sigma \wedge \sigma \models M : \tau \quad \frac{[\text{F:bag}] \frac{\Delta_1 \models N_1 : \sigma \quad [\text{F:bag}] \frac{\Delta_2 \models N_2 : \sigma \quad \frac{[\text{F:1}]}{\models 1 : \omega}}{\Delta_2 \models \{N_2\} : \sigma}}{\Delta \models B : \sigma \wedge \sigma}}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \models M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}}$$

where $\Delta = \Delta_1 \wedge \Delta_2$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma' \wedge \Delta$. By the Substitution Lemma (Lemma 2.2.3), there exists a derivation Π_1 of $(\Gamma', x : \sigma) \wedge \Delta_1 \models M\{N_1/x\} : \tau$ and a derivation Π_2 of $(\Gamma', x : \sigma) \wedge \Delta_2 \models M\{N_2/x\} : \tau$. Therefore, one has the following derivation:

$$[\text{F:sum}] \frac{[\text{F:ex-sub}] \frac{\Pi_1 \quad \Delta_2 \models \{N_2\} : \sigma}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \models M\{N_1/x\} \langle\langle \{N_2\}/x \rangle\rangle : \tau} \quad [\text{F:ex-sub}] \frac{\Pi_2 \quad \Delta_1 \models \{N_1\} : \sigma}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \models M\{N_2/x\} \langle\langle \{N_1\}/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \models M\{N_1/x\} \langle\langle \{N_2\}/x \rangle\rangle + M\{N_2/x\} \langle\langle \{N_1\}/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

Assuming $\mathbb{M}' = \{N_1/x\} \langle\langle \{N_2\}/x \rangle\rangle + M\{N_2/x\} \langle\langle \{N_1\}/x \rangle\rangle$, the result follows.

3) Rule [R : Fail].

Then $\mathbb{M} = M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$ where $B = \{N_1, \dots, N_k\}$, $k \geq 0$, $\#(x, M) \neq k$ and we can perform the following reduction:

$$[\text{R : Fail}] \frac{\#(x, M) \neq \text{size}(B) \quad \tilde{y} = (\text{mfv}(M) \setminus x) \uplus \text{mfv}(B)}{M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \rightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}}$$

with $\mathbb{M}' = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$. By hypothesis, one has the derivation:

$$[\text{F:ex-sub}] \frac{\Delta \models B : \sigma^j \quad \Gamma', x : \sigma^k \models M : \tau}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \models M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

Notice that we also have from $\#(x, M) \neq \text{size}(B)$ that $j \neq k$. Hence $\Gamma = \Gamma' \wedge \Delta$ and we may type the following:

$$\frac{[\text{F:fail}] \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} : \tau} \dots [\text{F:fail}] \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} : \tau}}{[\text{F:sum}] \Gamma \vdash \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} : \tau}$$

4) Rule $[\text{R: Cons}_1]$.

Then $\mathbb{M} = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} B$ where $B = \langle N_1, \dots, N_k \rangle$, $k \geq 0$ and we can perform the following reduction:

$$[\text{R: Cons}_1] \frac{\text{size}(B) = k \quad \tilde{y} = \text{mfv}(B)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} B \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}}}$$

where $\mathbb{M}' = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}}$. By hypothesis and inversion of the typing derivation, there exists the following derivation:

$$[\text{F:app}] \frac{[\text{F:fail}] \frac{}{\Gamma' \vdash \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} : \pi' \rightarrow \tau} \quad \Delta \vdash B : \pi}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \vdash \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} B : \tau}}$$

Hence $\Gamma = \Gamma' \wedge \Delta$ and we may type the following:

$$[\text{F:sum}] \frac{[\text{F:fail}] \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}} : \tau} \dots [\text{F:fail}] \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}} : \tau}}{\Gamma \vdash \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}} : \tau}$$

5) Rule $[\text{R: Cons}_2]$.

Then $\mathbb{M} = \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$ where $B = \langle N_1, \dots, N_k \rangle$, $k \geq 1$ and we can perform the following reduction:

$$[\text{R: Cons}_2] \frac{\text{size}(B) = k \quad \#(x, \tilde{z}) + k \neq 0 \quad \tilde{y} = \text{mfv}(B)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{(\tilde{z} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{y}}}$$

where $\mathbb{M}' = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{(\tilde{z} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{y}}$. By hypothesis and inversion of the typing derivation, there exists a derivation:

$$[\text{F:ex-sub}] \frac{[\text{F:fail}] \frac{\text{dom}((\Gamma', x : \sigma^k)^\dagger) = \tilde{z}}{\Gamma', x : \sigma^k \vdash \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} : \tau} \quad \Delta \vdash B : \sigma^j}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \vdash \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}}$$

Hence $\Gamma = \Gamma' \wedge \Delta$ and we may type the following:

$$[\text{F:sum}] \frac{[\text{F:fail}] \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fail}^{(\tilde{z} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{y}} : \tau} \dots [\text{F:fail}] \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fail}^{(\tilde{z} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{y}} : \tau}}{\Gamma \vdash \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{(\tilde{z} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{y}} : \tau}$$

6) Rule $[\text{R: TCont}]$.

Then $\mathbb{M} = C[M]$ and the reduction is as follows:

$$[\text{R: TCont}] \frac{M \longrightarrow M'_1 + \dots + M'_l}{C[M] \longrightarrow C[M'_1] + \dots + C[M'_l]}$$

where $\mathbb{M}' = C[M'_1] + \dots + C[M'_l]$. The proof proceeds by analysing the context C :

1. $C = [\cdot] B$.

In this case $\mathbb{M} = M B$, for some B , and the following derivation holds:

$$[\mathbf{F}:\text{app}] \frac{\Gamma' \Vdash M : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta \Vdash B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \Vdash M B : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma' \wedge \Delta$.

Since $\Gamma' \Vdash M : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau$ and $M \rightarrow M'_1 + \dots + M'_l$, it follows by IH that $\Gamma' \Vdash M'_1 + \dots + M'_l : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau$. By applying $[\mathbf{F}:\text{sum}]$, one has $\Gamma' \Vdash M'_i : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau$, for $i = 1, \dots, l$. Therefore, we may type the following:

$$[\mathbf{F}:\text{sum}] \frac{\forall i \in 1, \dots, l \quad [\mathbf{F}:\text{app}] \frac{\Gamma' \Vdash M'_i : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta \Vdash B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \Vdash (M'_i B) : \tau}}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \Vdash (M'_1 B) + \dots + (M'_l B) : \tau}$$

Thus, $\Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{M}' : \tau$, and the result follows.

2. $C = ([\cdot]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$.

This case is similar to the previous one.

- 7) Rule $[\mathbf{R} : \text{ECont}]$.

Then $\mathbb{M} = D[\mathbb{M}'']$ where $\mathbb{M}'' \rightarrow \mathbb{M}'''$ then we can perform the following reduction:

$$[\mathbf{R} : \text{ECont}] \frac{\mathbb{M}'' \rightarrow \mathbb{M}'''}{D[\mathbb{M}''] \rightarrow D[\mathbb{M}''']}$$

Hence $\mathbb{M}' = D[\mathbb{M}''']$. The proof proceeds by analysing the context D :

1. $D = [\cdot] + \mathbb{N}$. In this case $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{M}'' + \mathbb{N}$ by inversion of the typing derivation:

$$[\mathbf{F}:\text{sum}] \frac{\Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{M}'' : \tau \quad \Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{N} : \tau}{\Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{M}'' + \mathbb{N} : \tau}$$

Since $\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M}'' : \tau$ and $\mathbb{M}'' \rightarrow \mathbb{M}'''$, by IH, it follows that $\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M}''' : \tau$ and we may type the following:

$$[\mathbf{F}:\text{sum}] \frac{\Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{M}''' : \tau \quad \Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{N} : \tau}{\Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{M}''' + \mathbb{N} : \tau}$$

Therefore, $\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M}' : \tau$ and the result follows.

2. $D = \mathbb{N} + [\cdot]$. This case is similar to the previous one.

□

A.2 Appendix to § 2.3.3

Theorem 2.5 (Consistency Stability Under \longrightarrow) *If \mathbb{M} is a consistent $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ -expression and $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}'$ then \mathbb{M}' is consistent.*

Proof: By structural induction on the reduction rules. We will consider two key reduction rules, the other cases follow analogously via application of the IH.

1. Rule [RS:Ex-Sub]. In this case, we have

$$[\text{RS:Ex-Sub}] \frac{B = \{M_1\} \frown \dots \frown \{M_k\} \quad k \geq 1 \quad M \neq \text{fail}^{\bar{y}}}{M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} M \langle \langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \rangle \cdots \langle \langle B_i(k)/x_k \rangle \rangle}$$

Notice that if a bag is consistent then each element in the bag is consistent, that is, for any permutation B_i of the bag B then each $B_i(n)$ is consistent. Then, the assumption of consistency for $(M[x \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$, along with each element of the bag being consistent implies consistency of $\sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} M \langle \langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \rangle \cdots \langle \langle B_i(k)/x_k \rangle \rangle$ for each permutation of B .

2. Rule [RS:Lin-Fetch]. In this case, we have

$$[\text{RS:Lin-Fetch}] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x}{M \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow M \{ \{ N/x \} \}}$$

This case follows from the fact that $M \{ \{ N/x \} \}$ preserves consistency. The argument is by structural induction, with base case of $M = x$ together with the fact that N is consistent trivially implies that $x \{ \{ N/x \} \}$ must also be consistent. As for the inductive step, notice that ‘adding’ N to the structure of M does not break any of the consistency requirements: the consistency of $M \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle$ implies that the free variables of M and N are disjoint. \square

Lemma 2.3.1 (Linear Anti-substitution Lemma for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}$) *Let M and N be $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}$ -terms such that $\text{head}(M) = x$. The following hold:*

- *If $\Gamma, x : \sigma^{k-1} \vdash M \{ \{ N/x \} \} : \tau$, with $k > 1$, then there exist Γ_1, Γ_2 such that $\Gamma_1, x : \sigma^k \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$, where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$.*
- *If $\Gamma \vdash M \{ \{ N/x \} \} : \tau$, with $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, then there exist Γ_1, Γ_2 such that $\Gamma_1, x : \sigma \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$, where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$.*

Proof: By induction on the structure of M :

- 1) When $M = x$ then we have $x \{ \{ N/x \} \} = N$ and may derive the derivation of $\Gamma \vdash N : \tau$ with $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$. By taking $\Gamma_1 = \emptyset$ and $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma$ as $\Gamma = \emptyset \wedge \Gamma$ the case follows as $\Gamma \vdash N : \tau$ and

$$[\text{TS: var}] \frac{}{x : \sigma \vdash x : \sigma}$$

- 2) When $M = (M B)$ then we have that $(M B) \{ \{ N/x \} \} = (M \{ \{ N/x \} \}) B$. Let us consider two cases:

I) When $x \in \text{fv}(M \{ \{ N/x \} \})$

$$[\text{TS: app}] \frac{\Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1} \vdash M \{ \{ N/x \} \} : \pi \rightarrow \tau' \quad \Delta \vdash B : \pi}{(\Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1}) \wedge \Delta \vdash (M \{ \{ N/x \} \}) B : \tau'}$$

By the IH we have that $\Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1} \vdash M\{N/x\} : \pi \rightarrow \tau'$ implies that $\exists \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2$ such that $\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$ with $\Gamma' = \Gamma'_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$.

$$[\text{TS : app}] \frac{\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k \vdash M\{N/x\} : \pi \rightarrow \tau' \quad \Delta \vdash B : \pi}{(\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k) \wedge \Delta \vdash M B : \tau'}$$

II) When $x \notin \text{fv}(M\{N/x\})$

$$[\text{TS : app}] \frac{\Gamma' \vdash M\{N/x\} : \pi \rightarrow \tau' \quad \Delta \vdash B : \pi}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \vdash (M\{N/x\}) B : \tau'}$$

By the IH we have that $\Gamma' \vdash M\{N/x\}[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \pi \rightarrow \tau'$ implies that $\exists \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2$ such that $\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma \vdash M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$ with $\Gamma' = \Gamma'_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$.

$$[\text{TS : app}] \frac{\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma \vdash M : \pi \rightarrow \tau' \quad \Delta \vdash B : \pi}{(\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma) \wedge \Delta \vdash M B : \tau'}$$

3) When $M = M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$ then we have that $(M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle)\{N/x\} = (M\{N/x\})[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$ where $x \neq y$.

I) When $x \in \text{fv}(M\{N/x\})$:

$$[\text{TS : share}] \frac{\Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1}, \tilde{y} : \delta^j \vdash (M\{N/x\}) : \tau}{[\text{TS : ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1}, y : \delta^j \vdash (M\{N/x\})[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \delta^j}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \vdash (M\{N/x\})[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}}$$

By the IH we have that $\Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1}, \tilde{y} : \delta^j \vdash (M\{N/x\}) : \tau$ implies that $\exists \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2$ such that $\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k, \tilde{y} : \delta^j \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$ with $\Gamma', y : \delta^j = (\Gamma'_1, y : \delta^j) \wedge \Gamma_2$.

$$[\text{TS : share}] \frac{\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k, \tilde{y} : \delta^j \vdash M : \tau}{[\text{TS : ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k, y : \delta^j \vdash M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \delta^j}{\Gamma'_1 \wedge \Delta \vdash (M)[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}}$$

II) When $x \notin \text{fv}(M\{N/x\})$:

$$[\text{TS : share}] \frac{\Gamma', \tilde{y} : \delta^k \vdash (M\{N/x\}) : \tau}{[\text{TS : ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma', y : \delta^k \vdash (M\{N/x\})[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \delta^k}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \vdash (M\{N/x\})[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}}$$

By the IH we have that $\Gamma', y : \delta^k \vdash (M\{N/x\}) : \tau$ implies that $\exists \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2$ such that $\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma, \tilde{y} : \delta^k \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$ with $\Gamma', y : \delta^k = (\Gamma'_1, y : \delta^k) \wedge \Gamma_2$.

$$[\text{TS : share}] \frac{\Gamma', x : \sigma, \tilde{y} : \delta^k \vdash M : \tau}{[\text{TS : ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma', x : \sigma, y : \delta^k \vdash M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \delta^k}{\Gamma' \wedge \Delta \vdash (M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y])\{N/x\}\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}}$$

4) When $M = M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$ then we have that $(M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y])\{N/x\} = (M\{N/x\})[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$ where $x \neq y$.

I) When $x \in \text{fv}(M\{N/x\})$:

$$[\text{TS:share}] \frac{\Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1}, \tilde{y} : \delta^j \vdash (M\{N/x\}) : \tau}{\Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1}, y : \delta^j \vdash (M\{N/x\})[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

By the IH we have that $\Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1}, \tilde{y} : \delta^j \vdash (M\{N/x\}) : \tau$ implies that $\exists \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2$ such that $\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k, \tilde{y} : \delta^j \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$ with $\Gamma', y : \delta^j = (\Gamma'_1, y : \delta^j) \wedge \Gamma_2$.

$$[\text{TS:share}] \frac{\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k, \tilde{y} : \delta^j \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k, y : \delta^j \vdash M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

II) When $x \notin \text{fv}(M\{N/x\})$:

$$[\text{TS:share}] \frac{\Gamma', \tilde{y} : \delta^k \vdash (M\{N/x\}) : \tau}{\Gamma', y : \delta^k \vdash (M\{N/x\})[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

By the IH we have that $\Gamma', y : \delta^k \vdash (M\{N/x\}) : \tau$ implies that $\exists \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2$ such that $\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma, \tilde{y} : \delta^k \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$ with $\Gamma', y : \delta^k = (\Gamma'_1, y : \delta^k) \wedge \Gamma_2$.

$$[\text{TS:share}] \frac{\Gamma', x : \sigma, \tilde{y} : \delta^k \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma', x : \sigma, y : \delta^k \vdash M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

5) When $M = M\langle N/y \rangle$ then we have that $(M\langle N/y \rangle)\{N/x\} = (M\{N/x\})\langle N/y \rangle$ where $x \neq y$.

I) When $x \in \text{fv}(M\{N/x\})$:

$$[\text{TS:ex-lin-sub}] \frac{\Delta \vdash N : \delta \quad \Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1}, y : \delta \vdash (M\{N/x\}) : \tau}{\Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1}, y : \delta, \Delta \vdash (M\{N/x\})\langle N/y \rangle : \tau}$$

By the IH we have that $\Gamma', x : \sigma^{k-1}, y : \delta \vdash (M\{N/x\}) : \tau$ implies that $\exists \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2$ such that $\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k, \tilde{y} : \delta^j \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$ with $\Gamma', y : \delta^j = (\Gamma'_1, y : \delta^j) \wedge \Gamma_2$.

$$[\text{TS:ex-lin-sub}] \frac{\Delta \vdash N : \delta \quad \Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k, y : \delta \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma^k, y : \delta, \Delta \vdash M\langle N/y \rangle : \tau}$$

II) When $x \notin \text{fv}(M\{N/x\})$:

$$[\text{TS:ex-lin-sub}] \frac{\Delta \vdash N : \delta \quad \Gamma', y : \delta \vdash (M\{N/x\}) : \tau}{\Gamma', y : \delta, \Delta \vdash (M\{N/x\})\langle N/y \rangle : \tau}$$

By the IH we have that $\Gamma', y : \delta \vdash (M\{N/x\}) : \tau$ implies that $\exists \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2$ such that $\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma, \tilde{y} : \delta^k \vdash M : \tau$, and $\Gamma_2 \vdash N : \sigma$ with $\Gamma', y : \delta^k = (\Gamma'_1, y : \delta^k) \wedge \Gamma_2$.

$$[\text{TS:ex-lin-sub}] \frac{\Delta \vdash N : \delta \quad \Gamma'_1, x : \sigma, y : \delta \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma'_1, x : \sigma, y : \delta, \Delta \vdash M\langle N/y \rangle : \tau}$$

6) When $M = \lambda y. M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$ then linear head substitution is undefined on this term as $\text{head}(M) \neq x$.

7) When $M = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ then M is not well typed.

□

Theorem 2.7 (Subject Expansion for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}$) *If $\Gamma \vdash M' : \tau$ and $M \longrightarrow M'$ then $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$.*

Proof: By induction on the reduction rule applied. There are five possible cases.

1) When M' is reduced to via the Rule [RS:Beta]:

$$[\text{RS:Beta}] \frac{}{(\lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B \longrightarrow M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle}$$

Then $M' = M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$ can be type as followed:

$$[\text{TS:ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \vdash M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \vdash M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

From the typing of M' we can deduce that $M = (\lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B$ may be typed by:

$$[\text{TS:abs}] \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \vdash M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \sigma^k \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \sigma^k}$$

$$[\text{TS:app}] \frac{}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \vdash (\lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B : \tau}$$

2) When M' is reduced to via the Rule [RS:Ex-Sub]:

$$[\text{RS:Ex-Sub}] \frac{B = \lambda M_1 \dots \lambda M_k \quad k \geq 1 \quad M \neq \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}}{M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} M \langle\langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle\rangle \dots \langle\langle B_i(k)/x_k \rangle\rangle}$$

Then $M' = M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$ can be type as followed:

$$\frac{\Gamma, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \vdash M : \tau \quad \Delta_1 \vdash B_i(1) : \sigma}{\vdots \quad \Delta_k \vdash B_i(k) : \sigma}$$

$$[\text{TS:ex-lin-sub}] \frac{\Gamma, \Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_k \vdash M \langle\langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle\rangle \dots \langle\langle B_i(k)/x_k \rangle\rangle : \tau \quad \forall B_i \in \text{PER}(B)}{[\text{TS:sum}] \quad \Gamma, \Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_k \vdash \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} M \langle\langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle\rangle \dots \langle\langle B_i(k)/x_k \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

From the typing of M' we can deduce that $M = (\lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B$ may be typed by:

$$\frac{\Delta_k \vdash M_k : \sigma}{\vdots \quad \Gamma, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \vdash M : \tau}$$

$$[\text{TS:bag}] \frac{\Delta_1 \vdash M_1 : \sigma \quad \vdots \quad \Gamma, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \vdash M : \tau}{\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_k \vdash B : \sigma^k} \quad \Gamma, x : \sigma^k \vdash M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau$$

$$[\text{TS:ex-sub}] \frac{}{\Gamma, \Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_k \vdash M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

3) When M' is reduced to via the Rule [RS:Lin-Fetch]:

$$[\text{RS:Lin-Fetch}] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x}{M \langle\langle N/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow M \{N/x\}}$$

The result follow from Lemma 2.3.1.

4) When M' is reduced to via the Rule [RS : TCont]:

$$[\text{RS : TCont}] \frac{M \longrightarrow M'_1 + \dots + M'_k}{C[M] \longrightarrow C[M'_1] + \dots + C[M'_k]}$$

Hence the proof follows by the IH on M .

5) When M' is reduced to via the Rule [RS : ECont]:

$$[\text{RS : ECont}] \frac{M \longrightarrow M'}{D[M] \longrightarrow D[M']}$$

Hence the proof follows by the IH on M .

□

Lemma 2.3.2 (Substitution Lemma for $\hat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^j$) *If $\Gamma, x : \sigma \models M : \tau$, $\text{head}(M) = x$, and $\Delta \models N : \sigma$ then $\Gamma, \Delta \models M\{N/x\} : \tau$.*

Proof: By structural induction on M with $\text{head}(M) = x$. There are six cases to be analyzed:

1) $M = x$.

In this case, $x : \sigma \models x : \sigma$ and $\Gamma = \emptyset$. Observe that $x\{N/x\} = N$, since $\Delta \models N : \sigma$, by hypothesis, the result follows.

2) $M = M' B$.

Then $\text{head}(M' B) = \text{head}(M') = x$, and the derivation is the following by inversion of the typing derivation:

$$[\text{FS:app}] \frac{\Gamma_1, x : \sigma \models M' : \delta^j \rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma_2 \models B : \delta^k}{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, x : \sigma \models M' B : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$, and j, k are non-negative integers, possibly different. Since $\Delta \vdash N : \sigma$, by IH, the result holds for M' , that is,

$$\Gamma_1, \Delta \models M'\{N/x\} : \delta^j \rightarrow \tau$$

which gives the derivation:

$$[\text{FS:app}] \frac{\Gamma_1, \Delta \models M'\{N/x\} : \delta^j \rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma_2 \models B : \delta^k}{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Delta \models (M'\{N/x\})B : \tau}$$

From Def. 2.14, $(M' B)\{N/x\} = (M'\{N/x\})B$, therefore, $\Gamma, \Delta \models (M' B)\{N/x\} : \tau$ and the result follows.

3) $M = M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$.

Then $\text{head}(M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]) = \text{head}(M') = x$, for $y \neq x$. Therefore by inversion of the typing derivation,

$$[\text{FS:share}] \frac{\Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta, x : \sigma \models M' : \tau \quad y \notin \Gamma_1 \quad k \neq 0}{\Gamma_1, y : \delta^k, x : \sigma \models M'[y_1, \dots, y_k \leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k$. By IH, the result follows for M' , that is,

$$\Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta, \Delta \models M'\{N/x\} : \tau$$

and we have the derivation:

$$[\text{FS:share}] \frac{\Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta, \Delta \models M' \{N/x\} : \tau \quad y \notin \Gamma_1 \quad k \neq 0}{\Gamma_1, y : \delta^k, \Delta \models M' \{N/x\} [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

From Def. 2.14 one has $M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \{N/x\} = M' \{N/x\} [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$. Therefore, $\Gamma, \Delta \models M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \{N/x\} : \tau$ and the result follows.

4) $M = M'[\leftarrow y]$.

Then $\text{head}(M'[\leftarrow y]) = \text{head}(M') = x$ with $x \neq y$,

$$[\text{FS:weak}] \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma \models M : \tau}{\Gamma, y : \omega, x : \sigma \models M[\leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

and $M'[\leftarrow y] \{N/x\} = M' \{N/x\} [\leftarrow y]$. Then by the IH:

$$[\text{FS:weak}] \frac{\Gamma, \Delta \models M \{N/x\} : \tau}{\Gamma, y : \omega, \Delta \models M \{N/x\} [\leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

5) $M = M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$.

Then $\text{head}(M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle) = \text{head}(M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]) = x \neq y$ by inversion of the typing derivation we have:

$$[\text{FS:ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma_1, \hat{y} : \delta^k, x : \sigma \models M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau \quad \Gamma_2 \models B : \delta^j}{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, x : \sigma \models M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

and $M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle \{N/x\} = M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \{N/x\} \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$. By IH:

$$[\text{FS:ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma_1, \hat{y} : \delta^k, \Delta \models M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \{N/x\} : \tau \quad \Gamma_2 \models B : \delta^j}{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Delta \models M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \{N/x\} \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

6) $M = M' \langle\langle M''/y \rangle\rangle$.

Then $\text{head}(M' \langle\langle M''/y \rangle\rangle) = \text{head}(M') = x \neq y$, by inversion of the typing derivation we have:

$$[\text{FS:ex-lin-sub}] \frac{\Delta \models M'' : \delta \quad \Gamma, y : \delta, x : \sigma \models M : \tau}{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, x : \sigma \models M' \langle\langle M''/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

and $M' \langle\langle M''/y \rangle\rangle \{N/x\} = M' \{N/x\} \langle\langle M''/y \rangle\rangle$. Then by the IH:

$$[\text{FS:ex-lin-sub}] \frac{\Delta \models M'' : \delta \quad \Gamma, y : \delta, \Delta \models M' \{N/x\} : \tau}{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Delta \models M' \{N/x\} \langle\langle M''/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

□

Theorem 2.8 (Subject Reduction in $\hat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$) *If $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ and $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}'$ then $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M}' : \tau$.*

Proof: By structural induction on the reduction rule from Fig. 2.5 applied in $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$. There are nine cases to be analyzed:

1) Rule [RS:Beta].

Then $\mathbb{M} = (\lambda x. M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B$ and the reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Beta}] \frac{}{(\lambda x. M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B \longrightarrow M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle}$$

where $\mathbb{M}' = M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$. Since $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ we get the following derivation by inversion of the typing derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{[\text{FS:share}] \quad \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_j : \sigma \models M : \tau}{[\text{FS:abs-sh}] \quad \Gamma', x : \sigma^j \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau}}{[\text{FS:app}] \quad \Gamma' \models \lambda x. M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta \models B : \sigma^k}}{\Gamma', \Delta \models (\lambda x. M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B : \tau}}$$

for $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$ and $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma')$. Notice that:

$$\frac{\frac{[\text{FS:share}] \quad \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_j : \sigma \models M : \tau}{[\text{FS:ex-sub}] \quad \Gamma', x : \sigma^j \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad \Delta \models B : \sigma^k}}{\Gamma', \Delta \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle : \tau}}$$

Therefore $\Gamma', \Delta \models \mathbb{M}' : \tau$ and the result follows.

2) Rule [RS:Ex-Sub].

Then $\mathbb{M} = M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$ where $B = \{N_1, \dots, N_k\}$. By inversion of the typing derivation the reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Ex-Sub}] \frac{B = \{N_1, \dots, N_k\} \quad k \geq 1 \quad M \neq \text{fail}_{\tilde{x}}}{M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} M \langle \langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \rangle \cdots \langle \langle B_i(k)/x_k \rangle \rangle}}$$

and $\mathbb{M}' = \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} M \langle \langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \rangle \cdots \langle \langle B_i(k)/x_k \rangle \rangle$. To simplify the proof we take $k = 2$, as the case $k > 2$ is similar. Therefore,

- $B = \{N_1, N_2\}$; and
- $\text{PER}(B) = \{\{N_1, N_2\}, \{N_2, N_1\}\}$

Since $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ we get a derivation where we first type the bag B with the derivation Π , given next:

$$[\text{FS:bag}] \frac{\Delta_1 \models N_1 : \sigma \quad \frac{[\text{FS:bag}] \quad \frac{\Delta_2 \models N_2 : \sigma \quad \frac{[\text{FS:1}] \quad \overline{\models 1 : \omega}}{\Delta_2 \models \{N_2\} : \sigma}}{\Delta_2 \models \{N_2\} : \sigma}}{\Delta \models B : \sigma \wedge \sigma}}$$

The full derivation is as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{[\text{FS:share}] \quad \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, x_2 : \sigma \models M : \tau}{[\text{FS:ex-sub}] \quad \Gamma', x : \sigma \wedge \sigma \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad \Pi}}{\Gamma', \Delta \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle : \tau}}$$

where $\Delta = \Delta_1, \Delta_2$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. We can build a derivation $\Pi_{1,2}$ of $\Gamma', \Delta \models M \langle \langle N_1/x_1 \rangle \rangle \langle \langle N_2/x_2 \rangle \rangle : \tau$ as :

$$\frac{[\text{FS:ex-lin-sub}] \quad \frac{\Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, x_2 : \sigma \models M : \tau \quad \Delta_1 \models N_1 : \sigma}{[\text{FS:ex-lin-sub}] \quad \Gamma, \Delta_1, x_2 : \sigma \models M \langle \langle N_1/x_1 \rangle \rangle : \tau \quad \Delta_2 \models N_2 : \sigma}}{\Gamma', \Delta \models M \langle \langle N_1/x_1 \rangle \rangle \langle \langle N_2/x_2 \rangle \rangle : \tau}}$$

Similarly, we can obtain a derivation $\Pi_{2,1}$ of $\Gamma', \Delta \models M \langle \langle N_2/x_1 \rangle \rangle \langle \langle N_1/x_2 \rangle \rangle : \tau$. Finally, applying Rule [FS:sum]:

$$[\text{FS:sum}] \frac{\Pi_{1,2} \quad \Pi_{2,1}}{\Gamma', \Delta \vdash M \langle N_1/x_1 \rangle \langle N_2/x_k \rangle + M \langle N_2/x_1 \rangle \langle N_1/x_k \rangle : \tau}$$

and the result follows.

3) Rule [RS:Lin-Fetch].

Then $\mathbb{M} = M \langle N/x \rangle$ where $\text{head}(M) = x$. The reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Lin-Fetch}] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x}{M \langle N/x \rangle \longrightarrow M \{N/x\}}$$

and $\mathbb{M}' = M \{N/x\}$. Since $\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M} : \tau$ we get the following derivation by inversion of the typing derivation:

$$[\text{FS:ex-lin-sub}] \frac{\Delta \vdash N : \sigma \quad \Gamma', x : \sigma \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma', \Delta \vdash M \langle N/x \rangle : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. By the Substitution Lemma (Lemma 2.3.2), we obtain a derivation $\Gamma', \Delta \vdash M \{N/x\} : \tau$, and the result follows.

4) Rule [RS:TCont].

Then $\mathbb{M} = C[M]$ and the reduction is as follows:

$$[\text{RS:TCont}] \frac{M \longrightarrow M'_1 + \dots + M'_k}{C[M] \longrightarrow C[M'_1] + \dots + C[M'_k]}$$

with $\mathbb{M}' = C[M'_1] + \dots + C[M'_k]$. The proof proceeds by analysing the context C .

There are four cases:

1. $C = [\cdot] B$.

In this case $\mathbb{M} = M B$, for some B . Since $\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M} : \tau$ by inversion of the typing derivation, one has the derivation:

$$[\text{FS:app}] \frac{\Gamma' \vdash M : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma', \Delta \vdash M B : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. From $\Gamma' \vdash M : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau$ and the reduction $M \longrightarrow M'_1 + \dots + M'_k$, one has by IH that $\Gamma' \vdash M'_1 + \dots + M'_k : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau$, which entails $\Gamma' \vdash M'_i : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau$, for $i = 1, \dots, k$, via Rule [FS:sum]. Finally, we may type the following:

$$[\text{FS:sum}] \frac{\forall i \in 1, \dots, l \quad [\text{FS:app}] \frac{\Gamma' \vdash M'_i : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma', \Delta \vdash (M'_i B) : \tau}}{\Gamma', \Delta \vdash (M'_1 B) + \dots + (M'_l B) : \tau}$$

Since $\mathbb{M}' = (C[M'_1]) + \dots + (C[M'_l]) = M'_1 B + \dots + M'_l B$, the result follows.

2. Cases $C = [\cdot] \langle N/x \rangle$ and $C = [\cdot] [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ are similar to the previous one.

3. $C = [\cdot] [\leftarrow x] \langle 1/x \rangle$

In this case $\mathbb{M} = C[M] = M [\leftarrow x] \langle 1/x \rangle$. Since $\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M} : \tau$ by inversion of the typing derivation, one has a derivation

$$[\text{FS:ex-sub}] \frac{[\text{FS:weak}] \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma, x : \omega \vdash M [\leftarrow x] : \tau} \quad [\text{FS:wf-bag}] \frac{[\text{TS:1}] \frac{}{\vdash 1 : \omega}}{\vdash 1 : \omega}}{\Gamma \vdash M [\leftarrow x] \langle 1/x \rangle : \tau}}$$

From $M \longrightarrow M_1 + \dots + M_k$ and $\Gamma \Vdash M : \tau$, by the IH, it follows that $\Gamma \Vdash M_1 + \dots + M_k : \tau$, and consequently, $\Gamma \Vdash M_i$, via application of [FS:sum]. Therefore, there exists a derivation

$$\frac{\Gamma \Vdash M_i : \tau}{\Gamma, x : \omega \Vdash M_i[\leftarrow x] : \tau \quad \Vdash 1 : \omega} \quad \Gamma \Vdash M_i[\leftarrow x] \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle : \tau$$

for each $i = 1, \dots, k$. By applying [FS:sum], we obtain $\Gamma \Vdash M_1[\leftarrow x] \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle + \dots + M_k[\leftarrow x] \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle : \tau$, and the result follows.

5) Rule [RS:ECont].

Then $\mathbb{M} = D[\mathbb{M}_1]$ where $\mathbb{M}_1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}_2$ then we can perform the following reduction:

$$[\text{RS:ECont}] \frac{\mathbb{M}_1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}_2}{D[\mathbb{M}_1] \longrightarrow D[\mathbb{M}_2]}$$

and $\mathbb{M}' = D[\mathbb{M}_2]$.

The proof proceeds by analysing the context D . There are two cases: $D = [\cdot] + \mathbb{N}$ and $D = \mathbb{N} + [\cdot]$. We analyze only the first one:

$D = [\cdot] + \mathbb{N}$. In this case $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{M}_1 + \mathbb{N}$ and by inversion of the typing derivation:

$$[\text{FS:sum}] \frac{\Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{M}_1 : \tau \quad \Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{N} : \tau}{\Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{M}_1 + \mathbb{N} : \tau}$$

From $\Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{M}_1 : \tau$ and $\mathbb{M}_1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}_2$, by IH, one has that $\Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{M}_2 : \tau$. Hence we may type the following:

$$[\text{FS:sum}] \frac{\Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{M}_2 : \tau \quad \Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{N} : \tau}{\Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{M}_2 + \mathbb{N} : \tau}$$

Since $\mathbb{M}' = D[\mathbb{M}_2] = \mathbb{M}_2 + \mathbb{N}$, the result follows.

6) Rule [RS:Fail].

Then $\mathbb{M} = M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$ where $B = \{N_1, \dots, N_l\}$ and the reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Fail}] \frac{k \neq \text{size}(B) \quad \tilde{y} = (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}) \cup \text{fv}(B)}{M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}}$$

where $\mathbb{M}' = \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$. Since $\Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{M}$ and by inversion of the typing derivation, one has a derivation:

$$\frac{[\text{FS:ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \Vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma', x : \sigma^k \Vdash M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau} \quad \Delta \Vdash B : \sigma^j}{[\text{FS:ex-sub}] \Gamma', \Delta \Vdash M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. We may type the following:

$$[\text{FS:fail}] \frac{}{\Gamma', \Delta \Vdash \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} : \tau}$$

since Γ', Δ contain assignments on the free variables in M and B . Therefore, $\Gamma \Vdash \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} : \tau$, by applying [FS:sum], it follows that $\Gamma \Vdash \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} : \tau$, as required.

7) Rule [RS:Cons₁].

Then $\mathbb{M} = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} B$ where $B = \langle N_1, \dots, N_k \rangle$ and the reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Cons}_1] \frac{B = \langle N_1, \dots, N_k \rangle \quad \tilde{y} = \text{fv}(B)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} B \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}}}$$

and $\mathbb{M}' = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}}$. Since $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ and by inversion of the typing derivation, one has the derivation:

$$\frac{[\text{FS:fail}] \frac{}{\Gamma' \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} : \omega \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta \models B : \pi}}{[\text{FS:app}] \frac{}{\Gamma', \Delta \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} B : \tau}}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. After $\text{PER}(B)$ applications of [FS:sum], we obtain $\Gamma \models \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}} : \tau$, and the result follows.

8) Rule [RS:Cons₂].

Then $\mathbb{M} = (\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}}[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$ for $B = \langle N_1, \dots, N_k \rangle$ and the reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Cons}_2] \frac{B = \langle N_1, \dots, N_k \rangle \quad k + |\tilde{x}| \neq 0 \quad \tilde{y} = \text{fv}(B)}{(\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}}[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}\tilde{z}}}$$

with $\mathbb{M}' = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}\tilde{z}}$. Since $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ and by inversion of the typing derivation, one has the derivation:

$$\frac{[\text{FS:fail}] \frac{}{\Delta, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_j : \sigma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}} : \tau \quad x \notin \Delta \quad k \neq 0}}{[\text{FS:share}] \frac{}{\Delta, x : \sigma^j \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}}[x_1, \dots, x_j \leftarrow x] : \tau} \quad \Delta \models B : \sigma^k}}{[\text{FS:ex-sub}] \frac{}{\Gamma, \Delta \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}}[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle : \tau}}$$

Hence $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$ and $\mathbb{M}' = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}\tilde{z}}$ and we may type the following:

$$\frac{[\text{FS:fail}] \frac{}{\Gamma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}\tilde{z}} : \tau \quad \dots}}{[\text{FS:sum}] \frac{}{\Gamma \models \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}\tilde{z}} : \tau}}$$

9) Rule [RS:Cons₃].

Then $\mathbb{M} = \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}\tilde{u}x}$ and the reduction is

$$[\text{RS:Cons}_3] \frac{\tilde{z} = \text{fv}(N)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}\tilde{u}x} \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}\tilde{u}\tilde{z}}}$$

with $\mathbb{M}' = \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}\tilde{u}\tilde{z}}$. Since $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M}$ and by inversion of the typing derivation, one has the derivation

$$\frac{[\text{FS:fail}] \frac{}{\Gamma', x : \sigma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}\tilde{u}x} : \tau \quad \Delta \models N : \sigma}}{[\text{FS:ex-lin-sub}] \frac{}{\Gamma', \Delta \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}\tilde{u}x} \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle : \tau}}$$

where $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma')$, $\text{dom}(\Gamma') = \tilde{y}$ and $\text{dom}(\Delta) = \tilde{z} = \text{fv}(N)$.

We can type the following:

$$[\text{FS:fail}] \frac{}{\Gamma', \Delta \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}\tilde{u}\tilde{z}} : \tau}$$

and the result follows. \square

Theorem 2.10 (Consistency enforced by typing) *Let \mathbb{M} be a $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ -expression. If $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M}$ then \mathbb{M} is consistent.*

Proof: By induction on the typing derivation, with a case analysis on the last applied rule (Figure 2.7). We only consider the cases for the typing rules that relate to the sharing construct and the explicit substitution. First, consider conditions 1(i) to 1(iv), which are related to $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$. The conditions are as follows (i) \tilde{x} contains pairwise distinct variables; (ii) every $x_i \in \tilde{x}$ must occur exactly once in M ; (iii) x_i is not a sharing variable; (iv) M is consistent. By considering rule [FS:share], we have:

$$[\text{FS:share}] \frac{\Gamma, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models M : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma) \quad k \neq 0}{\Gamma, x : \sigma^k \models M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau}$$

Condition 1(i) follows from uniqueness of variables within the context. Condition 1(ii) follows from the premise, which ensures that M is well-formed with a context including each x_i ; linearity conditions imply that each x_i must be consumed so it must occur in M . Condition 1(iii) also follows directly from the well-formedness of M : each x_i is typed with a strict type, and the rule ensures that the sharing variable x is typed with the multiset type σ^k . Finally condition 1(iv) is ensured by the IH.

For conditions 2(i) to 2(iv) which are (i) the variable x must occur exactly once in M ; (ii) x cannot be a sharing variable; (iii) M and N are consistent; (iv) $\text{fv}(M) \cap \text{fv}(N) = \emptyset$. Consider the case of rule [FS:ex-lin-sub]:

$$[\text{FS:ex-lin-sub}] \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma \models M : \tau \quad \Delta \models N : \sigma}{\Gamma, \Delta \models M\langle N/x \rangle : \tau}$$

First, because Γ and Δ are disjoint, x cannot appear within Δ and M must consume the type of $x : \sigma$; hence x must occur in M , satisfying condition 2(i) and 2(iv). Second, $\Gamma, x : \sigma$ ensures a strict type for x ; if x were a sharing variable in M then x would have a multiset type π . Therefore, condition 2(ii) is satisfied. Finally, condition (iii) is satisfied by induction on M and N . \square

Proposition 2.3.2 ($\langle \cdot \rangle^\circ$ Preserves Consistency) *Let \mathbb{M} be a λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} -expression. Then $\langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ$ is a consistent $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$ -expression.*

Proof: By induction on the structure of \mathbb{M} . Notice that $\langle \cdot \rangle^\circ$ ensures consistency for bound variables: it replaces all occurrences of a bound variable (say y) with fresh bound variables (say, y_1, \dots, y_k). Thus, the following hold for bound variables: (i) they occur once within a term and (ii) they are not shared themselves, as the sharing of variables only occurs when handling binders associated to explicit substitutions and abstractions. As for free variables, the translation $\langle \cdot \rangle^\circ$ replaces each occurrence with a fresh variable, and does so before applying $\langle \cdot \rangle^\circ$; this ensures that free variables that are already shared are not shared again. Because of this design, the translations preserve consistency. \square

A.3 Appendix to § 2.5.2

A.3.1 Encoding $\langle \cdot \rangle^\circ$

Auxiliary Encoding: From λ_{\oplus} into $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}$

The encoding commutes with linear substitution: $\langle M\{N/x\} \rangle^\circ = \langle M \rangle^\circ \{ \langle N \rangle^\circ / x \}$

Proof: By induction of the structure of M in $M\{\langle(N)\rangle^\bullet/x\}$. \square

[Well-typedness preservation for $\langle(-)\rangle^\bullet$] Let B and \mathbb{M} be a bag and an expression in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} , respectively.

1. If $\Gamma \vdash B : \sigma$ then $\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \vdash \langle(B)\rangle^\bullet : \sigma$.
2. If $\Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M} : \sigma$ then $\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \vdash \langle(\mathbb{M})\rangle^\bullet : \sigma$.

Proof:

By mutual induction on the typing derivations for B and \mathbb{M} , with an analysis of the last rule applied.

Part (1) includes two cases:

- i) Rule $[T : 1]$: Then $B = 1$ and the thesis follows trivially, because the encoding of terms/bags (cf. Figure 2.8) ensures that $\langle(1)\rangle^\bullet = 1$.
- ii) Rule $[T : \text{bag}]$. Then $B = \wr M \wr \cdot A$, where M is a term and A is a bag, and

$$[T : \text{bag}] \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma \quad \Delta \vdash A : \pi}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \vdash \wr M \wr \cdot A : \sigma \wedge \pi}$$

By the IHs, we have both $\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \vdash \langle(M)\rangle^\bullet : \sigma$ and $\widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \vdash \langle(A)\rangle^\bullet : \pi$. The thesis then follows by applying Rule $[TS : \text{bag}]$ in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\zeta}$:

$$[TS : \text{bag}] \frac{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \vdash \langle(M)\rangle^\bullet : \sigma \quad \widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \vdash \langle(A)\rangle^\bullet : \pi}{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \vdash \wr \langle(M)\rangle^\bullet \wr \cdot \langle(A)\rangle^\bullet : \sigma \wedge \pi}$$

Part (2) considers six cases:

- i) Rule $[T : \text{var}]$: Then $\mathbb{M} = x$ and

$$[T : \text{var}] \frac{}{x : \sigma \vdash x : \sigma}$$

By the encoding of terms (cf. Fig. 2.8), we infer $x : \sigma \vdash x : \sigma$ and so the thesis holds immediately.

- ii) Rule $[T : \text{abs}]$: Then $\mathbb{M} = \lambda x.M$ and

$$[T : \text{abs}] \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma^n \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.M : \sigma^n \rightarrow \tau}$$

By the encoding of terms (cf. Fig. 2.8), we have $\langle(\mathbb{M})\rangle^\bullet = \lambda x.\langle(M\langle x_1, \dots, x_n/x \rangle)\rangle^\bullet[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$, where $\#(x, M) = n$ and each x_i is fresh.

We work on the premise $\Gamma, x : \sigma^n \vdash M : \tau$ before appealing to the IH.

Then, by n applications of Lemma 2.5.1 to this judgment, we obtain

$$\Gamma, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_n : \sigma \vdash M\langle x_1, \dots, x_n/x \rangle : \tau \tag{A.1}$$

By IH on (A.1) we have

$$\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_n : \sigma \vdash \langle(M\langle x_1, \dots, x_n/x \rangle)\rangle^\bullet : \tau \tag{A.2}$$

Starting from (A.2), we then have the following type derivation for $\langle(\mathbb{M})\rangle^\bullet$, which concludes the proof for this case:

$$\frac{[\text{TS : share}] \frac{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_n : \sigma \vdash \langle M \langle x_1, \dots, x_n/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet : \tau}{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, x : \sigma^n \vdash \langle M \langle x_1, \dots, x_n/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet [x_1, \dots, x_n \leftarrow x] : \tau}}{[\text{TS : abs-sh}] \widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \vdash \lambda x. (\langle M \langle x_1, \dots, x_n/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet [x_1, \dots, x_n \leftarrow x]) : \sigma^n \rightarrow \tau}$$

iii) Rule [T : app]: Then $\mathbb{M} = M B$ and

$$[\text{T : app}] \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \pi \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta \vdash B : \pi}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \vdash M B : \tau}$$

By IH we have both $\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \vdash \langle M \rangle^\bullet : \pi \rightarrow \tau$ and $\widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \vdash \langle B \rangle^\bullet : \pi$, and the thesis follows easily by Rule [TS : app] in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^\dagger$:

$$[\text{TS : app}] \frac{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \vdash \langle M \rangle^\bullet : \pi \rightarrow \tau \quad \widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \vdash \langle B \rangle^\bullet : \pi}{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \vdash \langle M \rangle^\bullet \langle B \rangle^\bullet : \tau}$$

iv) Rule [T : ex-sub]: Then $\mathbb{M} = M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$ and the proof is split in two cases, depending on the shape of B :

(a) $B = 1$. In this case, $\mathbb{M} = M \langle\langle 1/x \rangle\rangle$ and we obtain the following type derivation:

$$[\text{T : ex-sub}] \frac{\vdash 1 : \omega \quad [\text{T : weak}] \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma, x : \omega \vdash M : \tau}}{\Gamma \vdash M \langle\langle 1/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

By IH we have both $\vdash 1 : \omega$ and $\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \vdash \langle M \rangle^\bullet : \tau$. By the encoding of terms (Figure 2.8), $\langle M \langle\langle 1/x \rangle\rangle \rangle^\bullet = \langle M \rangle^\bullet [\leftarrow x] \langle\langle 1/x \rangle\rangle$, and the result holds by the following type derivation:

$$[\text{TS : ex-sub}] \frac{\vdash 1 : \omega \quad [\text{TS : weak}] \frac{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \vdash \langle M \rangle^\bullet : \tau}{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, x : \omega \vdash \langle M \rangle^\bullet [\leftarrow x] : \tau}}{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \vdash \langle M \rangle^\bullet [\leftarrow x] \langle\langle 1/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

(b) $B = \{N_1, \dots, N_n\}$, $n \geq 1$. Suppose w.l.o.g. that $n = 2$, then $B = \{N_1, N_2\}$ and

$$[\text{T : bag}] \frac{\Delta_1 \vdash N_1 : \sigma \quad \Delta_2 \vdash N_2 : \sigma}{\Delta_1 \wedge \Delta_2 \vdash \{N_1\} \cdot \{N_2\} : \sigma^2} \quad \Gamma, x : \sigma^2 \vdash M : \tau$$

$$[\text{T : ex-sub}] \frac{\Delta_1 \wedge \Delta_2 \vdash \{N_1\} \cdot \{N_2\} : \sigma^2 \quad \Gamma, x : \sigma^2 \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta_1 \wedge \Delta_2 \vdash M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

By IH we have $\widehat{\Delta}_1^\dagger \vdash \langle N_1 \rangle^\bullet : \sigma$ and $\widehat{\Delta}_2^\dagger \vdash \langle N_2 \rangle^\bullet : \sigma$. We can expand $\Gamma, x : \sigma^2 \vdash M : \tau$ into $\Gamma, x : \sigma \wedge \sigma \vdash M : \tau$. By Lemma 2.5.1 and the IH on this last sequent we obtain

$$\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, y_1 : \sigma, y_2 : \sigma \vdash \langle M \langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet : \tau$$

where $\#(x, M) = 2$ and y_1, y_2 are fresh variables with the same type as x .

Now, by the encoding of terms (Figure 2.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle M \langle\langle \{N_1, N_2\}/x \rangle\rangle \rangle^\bullet &= \langle M \langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet \langle \langle N_1 \rangle^\bullet / y_1 \rangle \langle \langle N_2 \rangle^\bullet / y_2 \rangle + \\ &\quad \langle M \langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet \langle \langle N_1 \rangle^\bullet / y_2 \rangle \langle \langle N_2 \rangle^\bullet / y_1 \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{M}' \end{aligned}$$

We give typing derivations in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^\dagger$ for each summand. First, let Π_1 be the following derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{\widehat{\Delta}_1^\dagger \vdash \langle N_1 \rangle^\bullet : \sigma \quad \widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, y_1 : \sigma, y_2 : \sigma \vdash \langle M \langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet : \tau}{\widehat{\Delta}_2^\dagger \vdash \langle N_2 \rangle^\bullet : \sigma \quad \widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, y_2 : \sigma, \widehat{\Delta}_1^\dagger \vdash \langle M \langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet \langle \langle N_1 \rangle^\bullet / y_1 \rangle : \tau}}{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}_1^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}_2^\dagger \vdash \langle M \langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet \langle \langle N_1 \rangle^\bullet / y_1 \rangle \langle \langle N_2 \rangle^\bullet / y_2 \rangle : \tau}$$

Similarly, we can obtain a derivation Π_2 for:

$$\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}_1^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}_2^\dagger \vdash \langle M \langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet \langle \langle N_1 \rangle^\bullet / y_2 \rangle \langle \langle N_2 \rangle^\bullet / y_1 \rangle : \tau$$

From Π_1 , Π_2 , and Rule [TS : sum], the thesis follows:

$$[\text{TS : sum}] \frac{\Pi_1 \quad \Pi_2}{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}_1^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}_2^\dagger \vdash M' : \tau}$$

v) Rule [T : weak]: Then $M = M$ and

$$[\text{T : weak}] \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma, x : \omega \vdash M : \sigma}$$

Because [TS : weak] is a silent typing rule in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} , we have that $x \notin \text{fv}(M)$ and so this case does not apply.

vi) Rule [T : sum]:

This case follows easily by IH. □

Properties

We divide the proof of well-formedness preservation: we first prove it for $\langle \cdot \rangle^\bullet$, then we extend it to $\langle \cdot \rangle^\circ$.

Lemma 2.5.2 (Well-formedness preservation for $\langle \cdot \rangle^\bullet$) *Let B and M be a bag and an expression in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} , respectively. Also, let Γ be a context such that $\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger$ is defined. We have:*

1. *If $\Gamma \models B : \pi$ then $\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \models \langle B \rangle^\bullet : \pi$.*
2. *If $\Gamma \models M : \sigma$ then $\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \models \langle M \rangle^\bullet : \sigma$.*

Proof: By mutual induction on the typing derivations for B and M , with an analysis of the last rule (from Fig. 2.4) applied. We proceed with the following nine cases:

1. This case includes two subcases:

(a) Rule [F : wf-bag].

Then by inversion of the typing derivation,

$$[\text{F:wf-bag}] \frac{\Gamma \vdash B : \sigma}{\Gamma \models B : \sigma}$$

By Proposition A.3.1 we have $\Gamma \vdash B : \sigma$ implies $\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \vdash \langle B \rangle^\bullet : \sigma$. Notice that the encoding $\langle \cdot \rangle^\bullet$ given in Fig. 2.8, is a restriction of $\langle \cdot \rangle^\bullet$ to λ_{\oplus} . Therefore, $\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \vdash \langle B \rangle^\bullet : \sigma$, and the result follows after an application of [FS:wf-bag].

(b) Rule [F : bag].

In this case $B = \lambda M \cdot A$, where M is a term and A is a bag, and we have the following derivation by inversion of the typing derivation:

$$[\text{F : bag}] \frac{\Gamma \models M : \sigma \quad \Delta \models A : \sigma^k}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \models \lambda M \cdot A : \sigma^{k+1}}$$

with $\text{dom}(\Gamma) = \text{fv}(M)$ and $\text{dom}(\Delta) = \text{fv}(A)$. By the IHs, we have both

- $\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \vdash \langle M \rangle^\bullet : \sigma$; and
- $\widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \vdash \langle A \rangle^\bullet : \sigma^k$.

By applying Rule [FS:bag] from Fig. 2.7, for λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} , we obtain the following derivation:

$$[\text{FS:bag}] \frac{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \vdash \langle M \rangle^\bullet : \sigma \quad \widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \vdash \langle A \rangle^\bullet : \sigma^k}{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \vdash \lambda \langle M \rangle^\bullet \cdot \langle A \rangle^\bullet : \sigma^{k+1}}$$

Since $\langle \lambda M \cdot A \rangle^\bullet = \lambda \langle M \rangle^\bullet \cdot \langle A \rangle^\bullet$, one has $\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \vdash \langle \lambda M \cdot A \rangle^\bullet : \sigma^{k+1}$, and the result follows.

2. This case is divided in seven subcases:

(a) Rule [F : wf-expr].

Then the thesis follows trivially from type preservation in $\langle - \rangle^\circ$ of Proposition A.3.1.

(b) Rule [F : weak].

In this case, $\mathbb{M} = M$ and by inversion of the typing derivation we have the derivation

$$[\text{F : weak}] \frac{\Gamma_1 \models M : \tau}{\Gamma_1, x : \omega \models M : \tau}$$

Because [weak] is a silent well-formed rule in λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} , we have that $x \notin \text{fv}(M)$ and so this case does not apply.

(c) Rule [F : abs].

In this case $\mathbb{M} = \lambda x.M$ by inversion of the typing derivation and we have the derivation:

$$[\text{F : abs}] \frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma^n \models M : \tau}{\Gamma \models \lambda x.M : \sigma^n \rightarrow \tau}$$

By the encoding given in Fig. 2.8, we have $\langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\bullet = \lambda x. \langle M \langle x_1, \dots, x_n/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet [x_1, \dots, x_n \leftarrow x]$, where $\#(x, M) = n$ and each x_i is fresh and has the same type as x . From $\Gamma, x : \sigma^n \models M : \tau$, we obtain after n applications of Proposition 2.5.1 and Lemma 2.5.1:

$$\Gamma, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_n : \sigma \models M \langle x_1, \dots, x_n/x \rangle : \tau$$

By IH we have:

$$\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_n : \sigma \models \langle M \langle x_1, \dots, x_n/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet : \tau$$

which gives us the following derivation:

$$[\text{FS:share}] \frac{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_n : \sigma \models \langle M \langle x_1, \dots, x_n/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet : \tau}{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, x : \sigma^n \models \langle M \langle x_1, \dots, x_n/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet [x_1, \dots, x_n \leftarrow x] : \tau}$$

$$[\text{FS:abs-sh}] \frac{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, x : \sigma^n \models \langle M \langle x_1, \dots, x_n/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet [x_1, \dots, x_n \leftarrow x] : \tau}{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \models \lambda x. \langle M \langle x_1, \dots, x_n/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet [x_1, \dots, x_n \leftarrow x] : \sigma^n \rightarrow \tau}$$

and the result follows.

(d) Rule [F : app].

In this case $\mathbb{M} = MB$, and by inversion of the typing derivation we have the derivation:

$$[\text{F : app}] \frac{\Gamma \models M : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta \models B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma \wedge \Delta \models MB : \tau}$$

By IH we have both $\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \models (M)^\bullet : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau$ and $\widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \models (B)^\bullet : \sigma^k$, and the result follows easily by Rule [FS:app] in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^\dagger$:

$$[\text{FS:app}] \frac{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger \models (M)^\bullet : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau \quad \widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \models (B)^\bullet : \sigma^k}{\widehat{\Gamma}^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \models (M)^\bullet (B)^\bullet : \tau}$$

(e) Rule [F : ex-sub].

Then $\mathbb{M} = M\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$ and the proof is split in two cases, depending on the shape of B :

i. When $\#(x, M) = \text{size}(B) = k \geq 1$.

Then we have $B = \{N_1, \dots, N_n\}$, $n \geq 1$. Suppose w.l.o.g. that $n = 2$, then $B = \{N_1, N_2\}$ and by inversion of the typing derivation we have the following derivation:

$$[\text{F : bag}] \frac{\Delta_1 \models N_1 : \sigma \quad \Delta_2 \models N_2 : \sigma}{\Delta_1 \wedge \Delta_2 \models \{N_1\} \cdot \{N_2\} : \sigma^2} \quad \Gamma_1, x : \sigma^2 \models M : \tau$$

$$[\text{F : ex-sub}] \frac{\Gamma_1 \wedge \Delta_1 \wedge \Delta_2 \models M\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}{\Gamma_1 \wedge \Delta_1 \wedge \Delta_2 \models M\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, \Delta_1, \Delta_2$. By IH we have both

- $\widehat{\Delta}_1^\dagger \vdash (N_1)^\bullet : \sigma$; and
- $\widehat{\Delta}_2^\dagger \vdash (N_2)^\bullet : \sigma$; and
- $\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, x : \sigma^2 \vdash (M)^\bullet : \tau$

We can expand $\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, x : \sigma^2 \vdash (M)^\bullet : \tau$ into $\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, x : \sigma \wedge \sigma \vdash (M)^\bullet : \tau$, which gives $\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, y_1 : \sigma, y_2 : \sigma \vdash (M)^\bullet \langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle : \tau$, after two applications of Proposition 2.5.1 along with the application of Lemma 2.5.1, with y_1, y_2 fresh variables of the same type as x . Since the encoding $(\cdot)^\bullet$ commutes with the linear substitution $\langle \cdot / \cdot \rangle$ (Proposition 2.5.1), it follows that, $\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, y_1 : \sigma, y_2 : \sigma \vdash (M\langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle)^\bullet : \tau$.

Let Π_1 be the derivation obtained after two consecutive applications of Rule [FS:ex-lin-sub]:

$$\frac{\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, y_1 : \sigma, y_2 : \sigma \vdash (M\langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle)^\bullet : \tau \quad \widehat{\Delta}_1^\dagger \vdash (N_1)^\bullet : \sigma}{\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, y_2 : \sigma, \widehat{\Delta}_1^\dagger \vdash (M\langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle)^\bullet \langle (N_1)^\bullet / y_1 \rangle : \tau} \quad \widehat{\Delta}_2^\dagger \vdash (N_2)^\bullet : \sigma$$

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}_1^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}_2^\dagger \vdash (M\langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle)^\bullet \langle (N_1)^\bullet / y_1 \rangle \langle (N_2)^\bullet / y_2 \rangle : \tau$$

Similarly, we can obtain a derivation Π_2 for:

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}_1^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}_2^\dagger \vdash (M\langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle)^\bullet \langle (N_1)^\bullet / y_2 \rangle \langle (N_2)^\bullet / y_1 \rangle : \tau$$

By the encoding given in Figure 2.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (M\langle\langle \{N_1, N_2\}/x \rangle\rangle)^\bullet &= (M\langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle)^\bullet \langle (N_1)^\bullet / y_1 \rangle \langle (N_2)^\bullet / y_2 \rangle + \\ &\quad (M\langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle)^\bullet \langle (N_1)^\bullet / y_2 \rangle \langle (N_2)^\bullet / y_1 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$[\text{FS:sum}] \frac{\Pi_1 \quad \Pi_2}{\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}_1^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}_2^\dagger \models \langle M \langle \langle N_1, N_2 \rangle / x \rangle \rangle^\bullet : \tau}$$

and the result follows.

ii. $\#(x, M) = k \neq \text{size}(B)$.

In this case, $\text{size}(B) = j$ for some $j \neq k$, and by inversion of the typing derivation we have the following derivation:

$$[\text{F:ex-sub}] \frac{\Delta \models B : \sigma^j \quad \Gamma_1, x : \sigma^k \models M : \tau}{\Gamma_1 \wedge \Delta \models M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \wedge \Delta$. By IH we have both

- $\widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \models \langle B \rangle^\bullet : \sigma^j$; and
- $\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, \hat{x} : \sigma^k \models \langle M \rangle^\bullet : \tau$.

We analyse two cases, depending on the number k of occurrences of x in M :

A. $k = 0$.

From $\Gamma_1, x : \omega \models M : \tau$, which we get $\Gamma_1 \models M : \tau$, via Rule $[\text{F:weak}]$. The IH gives $\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger \models \langle M \rangle^\bullet : \tau$, which entails:

$$[\text{FS:weak}] \frac{\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger \models \langle M \rangle^\bullet : \tau}{\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, x : \omega \models \langle M \rangle^\bullet [\leftarrow x] : \tau \quad \widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \models \langle B \rangle^\bullet : \sigma^j}$$

$$[\text{FS:ex-sub}] \frac{\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, x : \omega \models \langle M \rangle^\bullet [\leftarrow x] : \tau \quad \widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \models \langle B \rangle^\bullet : \sigma^j}{\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \models \langle M \rangle^\bullet [\leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle : \tau}$$

By the encoding given in Figure 2.8, $\langle M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\bullet = \langle M \rangle^\bullet [\leftarrow x] \langle \langle B \rangle^\bullet / x \rangle$, and the result follows.

B. $k > 0$.

By applying Proposition 2.5.1 in $\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, x : \sigma^k \models \langle M \rangle^\bullet : \tau$, we obtain

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models \langle M \rangle^\bullet \langle x_1, \dots, x_k/x \rangle : \tau$$

From Proposition 2.5.1 and Lemma 2.5.1, it follows that $\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models \langle M \langle x_1, \dots, x_k/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet : \tau$, which entails $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma_1)$ since $k \neq 0$. First we give Π :

$$[\text{FS:share}] \frac{\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models \langle M \langle x_1, \dots, x_k/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet : \tau}{\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, x : \sigma^k \models \langle M \langle x_1, \dots, x_k/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet [x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau}$$

finally we give the full derivation:

$$[\text{FS:ex-sub}] \frac{\widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \models \langle B \rangle^\bullet : \sigma^j \quad \Pi}{\widehat{\Gamma}_1^\dagger, \widehat{\Delta}^\dagger \models \langle M \langle x_1, \dots, x_k/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet [x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B \rangle^\bullet / x \rangle : \tau}$$

(f) Rule $[\text{F:fail}]$.

The result follows trivially, because the encoding of failure in Fig. 2.8 is such that $\langle \text{fail}^{\bar{x}} \rangle^\bullet = \text{fail}^{\bar{x}}$.

(g) Rule $[\text{F:sum}]$.

This case follows easily by IH.

□

Theorem 2.12 (Well-formedness Preservation for $\langle \cdot \rangle^\bullet$) *Let B and M be a bag and an expression in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\downarrow}$, respectively.*

1. If $\Gamma \models B : \pi$ then $\Gamma^\dagger \models \langle B \rangle^\circ : \pi$.
2. If $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \sigma$ then $\Gamma^\dagger \models \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ : \sigma$.

Proof: By mutual induction on the typing derivations $\Gamma \models B : \sigma$ and $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \sigma$, exploiting both Proposition 2.5.1 and Lemma 2.5.1. The analysis for bags (Part 1) follows directly from the IHs and will be omitted.

As for Part 2, there are two main cases to consider:

- i) $\mathbb{M} = M$.

Without loss of generality, assume $\text{fv}(M) = \{x, y\}$. Then,

$$x : \sigma_1^j, y : \sigma_2^k \models M : \tau \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $\#(x, M) = j$ and $\#(y, M) = k$, for some positive integers j and k .

After $j + k$ applications of Lemma 2.5.1 we obtain:

$$x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_j : \sigma_1, y_1 : \sigma_2, \dots, y_k : \sigma_2 \models M \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle \langle \tilde{y}/y \rangle : \tau$$

where $\tilde{x} = x_1, \dots, x_j$ and $\tilde{y} = y_1, \dots, y_k$. From Proposition 2.5.1 and Lemma 2.5.1 one has

$$x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_j : \sigma_1, y_1 : \sigma_2, \dots, y_k : \sigma_2 \models \langle M \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle \langle \tilde{y}/y \rangle \rangle^\circ : \tau$$

Since $x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_j : \sigma_1, y_1 : \sigma_2, \dots, y_k : \sigma_2 = x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_j : \sigma_1, y_1 : \sigma_2, \dots, y_k : \sigma_2$, we have the following derivation:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{[FS:share]} \frac{x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_j : \sigma_1, y_1 : \sigma_2, \dots, y_k : \sigma_2 \models \langle M \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle \langle \tilde{y}/y \rangle \rangle^\circ : \tau}{x : \sigma_1^j, y_1 : \sigma_2, \dots, y_k : \sigma_2 \models \langle M \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle \langle \tilde{y}/y \rangle \rangle^\circ [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau} \\ \text{[FS:share]} \frac{x : \sigma_1^j, y_1 : \sigma_2, \dots, y_k : \sigma_2 \models \langle M \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle \langle \tilde{y}/y \rangle \rangle^\circ [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau}{x : \sigma_1^j, y : \sigma_2^k \models \langle M \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle \langle \tilde{y}/y \rangle \rangle^\circ [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x][\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau} \end{array}$$

By expanding Def. 2.20, we have

$$\langle M \rangle^\circ = \langle M \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle \langle \tilde{y}/y \rangle \rangle^\circ [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x][\tilde{y} \leftarrow y],$$

which completes the proof for this case.

- ii) $\mathbb{M} = M_1 + \dots + M_n$.

This case proceeds easily by IH, using Rule [FS:sum].

□

A.3.2 Completeness and Soundness

Theorem 2.13 (Operational Completeness) Let \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{N} be well-formed λ_{\oplus}^{ζ} expressions. Suppose $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow_{[\mathbf{R}]} \mathbb{M}$.

1. If $[\mathbf{R}] = [\mathbf{R} : \text{Beta}]$ then $\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ \longrightarrow^{\leq 2} \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ$;
2. If $[\mathbf{R}] = [\mathbf{R} : \text{Fetch}]$ then $\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ \longrightarrow^+ \langle \mathbb{M}' \rangle^\circ$, for some \mathbb{M}' such that $\mathbb{M} \equiv_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}'$.
3. If $[\mathbf{R}] \neq [\mathbf{R} : \text{Beta}]$ and $[\mathbf{R}] \neq [\mathbf{R} : \text{Fetch}]$ then $\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ \longrightarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ$.

Proof: By induction on the rule from Fig. 2.2 applied to infer $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$, distinguishing three cases.

Below $[x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}]$ abbreviates $[\tilde{x}_1 \leftarrow x_1] \dots [\tilde{x}_k \leftarrow x_k]$:

- 1) The rule applied is $[\mathbf{R}] = [\mathbf{R} : \text{Beta}]$.

In this case, $\mathbb{N} = (\lambda x.M)B$, the reduction is

$$[\mathbf{R} : \mathbf{Beta}] \frac{}{(\lambda x.M)B \longrightarrow M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle}$$

and $\mathbb{M} = M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$. Below we assume $\text{fv}(\mathbb{N}) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and $\tilde{x}_i = x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{j_i}}$, where $j_i = \#(x_i, N)$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$. On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{N})^\circ &= ((\lambda x.M)B)^\circ \\ &= (((\lambda x.M)B) \langle\tilde{x}_1/x_1\rangle \cdots \langle\tilde{x}_k/x_k\rangle)^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\ &= ((\lambda x.M')B')^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\ &= ((\lambda x.M')^\circ (B')^\circ) [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\ &= ((\lambda x.(M' \langle\tilde{y}/x\rangle)^\circ [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x]) (B')^\circ) [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\ &\longrightarrow_{[\mathbf{RS}:\mathbf{Beta}]} ((M' \langle\tilde{y}/x\rangle)^\circ [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle (B')^\circ/x \rangle\rangle) [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] = \mathbb{L} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where we define M' and B' to be M and B after the substitutions of $\langle\tilde{x}_1/x_1\rangle \cdots \langle\tilde{x}_k/x_k\rangle$. On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{M})^\circ &= (M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle)^\circ \\ &= (M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \langle\tilde{x}_1/x_1\rangle \cdots \langle\tilde{x}_k/x_k\rangle)^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\ &= (M' \langle\langle B'/x \rangle\rangle)^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

We need to analyse two sub-cases: either $\#(x, M') = \text{size}(B) = k \geq 1$ or $\#(x, M') = k$ and our first sub-case is not met.

i) If $\#(x, M') = \text{size}(B) = k \geq 1$ then we can reduce \mathbb{L} using Rule $[\mathbf{RS} : \mathbf{Ex} - \text{sub}]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L} &\longrightarrow_{\sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(\langle B \rangle)} (M' \langle\tilde{y}/x\rangle)^\circ \langle\langle B_i(1)/y_1 \rangle\rangle \cdots \langle\langle B_i(n)/y_n \rangle\rangle} [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\ &= (\mathbb{M})^\circ \end{aligned}$$

From (A.4) and (A.5) and $\tilde{y} = y_1 \dots y_n$, one has the desired result.

ii) Otherwise, $\#(x, M) = k$ (either $k = 0$ or $k \neq \text{size}(B)$).

Expanding the encoding in (A.5) :

$$\begin{aligned} (M)^\circ &= (M' \langle\langle B'/x \rangle\rangle)^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\ &= ((M' \langle\tilde{y}/x\rangle)^\circ [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle (B')^\circ/x \rangle\rangle) [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $(M)^\circ = \mathbb{L}$ and $(\mathbb{N})^\circ \longrightarrow (\mathbb{M})^\circ$.

2) The rule applied is $[\mathbf{R}] = [\mathbf{R} : \mathbf{Fetch}]$.

Then $\mathbb{N} = M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$ and the reduction is

$$[\mathbf{R} : \mathbf{Fetch}] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x \quad B = \langle N_1, \dots, N_n \rangle, n \geq 1 \quad \#(x, M) = n}{M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n M \{ \langle N_i/x \rangle \} \langle\langle B \setminus N_i/x \rangle\rangle}$$

with $\mathbb{M} = \sum_{i=1}^n M \{ \langle N_i/x \rangle \} \langle\langle B \setminus N_i/x \rangle\rangle$.

Below we assume $\text{fv}(\mathbb{N}) = \text{fv}(M \langle\langle N1 \rangle\rangle/x) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$. We distinguish two cases:

1. $n = 1$.

Then $B = \wr N_1 \int$ and $\mathbb{N} = M \langle \langle \wr N_1 \int / x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow M \{ \{ N_1 / x \} \langle \langle 1 / x \rangle \rangle = \mathbb{M}$.

On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbb{N})^\circ &= (M \langle \langle \wr N_1 \int / x \rangle \rangle)^\circ \\
&= (M \langle \langle \wr N_1 \int / x \rangle \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1 / x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k / x_k \rangle)^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&= (M' \langle \langle \wr N'_1 \int / x \rangle \rangle)^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&= (M' \langle y_1 / x \rangle)^\circ \langle (N'_1)^\circ / y_1 \rangle [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}], \text{ notice that } \text{head}(M') = y_1 \\
&= (M'')^\circ \langle (N'_1)^\circ / y_1 \rangle [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Lin-Fetch}]} (M'')^\circ \{ (N'_1)^\circ / y_1 \} [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}]
\end{aligned}$$

where we define M' and N'_1 to be M and N_1 after the substitutions of $\langle \tilde{x}_1 / x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k / x_k \rangle$; similarly, we define M'' to be M' after the substitution of y_1 for x . On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbb{M})^\circ &= (M \{ \{ N_1 / x \} \langle \langle 1 / x \rangle \rangle \})^\circ \\
&= (M \{ \{ N_1 / x \} \langle \langle 1 / x \rangle \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1 / x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k / x_k \rangle \})^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&= (M' \{ \{ N'_1 / x \} \langle \langle 1 / x \rangle \rangle \})^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&= (M' \{ \{ N'_1 / x \} \})^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}]
\end{aligned}$$

By the congruence defined in Fig. 2.13 for λ_{\oplus}^{ξ} , one has $M \langle \langle 1 / x \rangle \rangle \equiv_{\lambda} M$.

Therefore, $\mathbb{M} = M \{ \{ N_1 / x \} \langle \langle 1 / x \rangle \rangle \equiv_{\lambda} M \{ \{ N_1 / x \} \} = \mathbb{M}'$. Expanding $(\mathbb{M}')^\circ$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbb{M}')^\circ &= (M \{ \{ N_1 / x \} \})^\circ \\
&= (M \{ \{ N_1 / x \} \langle \tilde{x}_1 / x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_j / x_j \rangle \})^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&= (M' \{ \{ N'_1 / x \} \})^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&= (M')^\circ \{ (N'_1)^\circ / x \} [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}]
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $(\mathbb{N})^\circ \longrightarrow (\mathbb{M}')^\circ$ and the result follows.

2. $n > 1$

To simplify the proof, we take $n = 2$ (the analysis when $n > 2$ is similar). Then $B = \wr N_1, N_2 \int$ and the reduction is

$$\mathbb{N} = M \langle \langle B / x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow M \{ \{ N_1 / x \} \langle \langle \wr N_2 \int / x \rangle \rangle \} + M \{ \{ N_2 / x \} \langle \langle \wr N_1 \int / x \rangle \rangle \} = \mathbb{M}$$

Notice that $\#(x, M) = 2$, we take y_1, y_2 fresh variables. On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ = \langle M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&= \langle M' \langle \langle B'/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&= \langle \langle M' \langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ \langle \langle N'_1 \rangle^\circ / y_1 \rangle \langle \langle N'_2 \rangle^\circ / y_2 \rangle \\
&\quad + \langle \langle M' \langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ \langle \langle N'_2 \rangle^\circ / y_1 \rangle \langle \langle N'_1 \rangle^\circ / y_2 \rangle [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&= \langle \langle M'' \rangle^\circ \langle \langle N'_1 \rangle^\circ / y_1 \rangle \langle \langle N'_2 \rangle^\circ / y_2 \rangle \rangle^\circ \\
&\quad + \langle \langle M'' \rangle^\circ \langle \langle N'_2 \rangle^\circ / y_1 \rangle \langle \langle N'_1 \rangle^\circ / y_2 \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&\xrightarrow{2}_{[\text{RS:Lin-Fetch}]} \langle \langle M'' \rangle^\circ \{ \langle \langle N'_1 \rangle^\circ / y_1 \rangle \} \langle \langle N'_2 \rangle^\circ / y_2 \rangle \rangle^\circ \\
&\quad + \langle \langle M'' \rangle^\circ \{ \langle \langle N'_2 \rangle^\circ / y_1 \rangle \} \langle \langle N'_1 \rangle^\circ / y_2 \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&= \mathbb{L}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

where we define M' and B' to be M and B after the substitutions of $\langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle$ and N'_1, N'_2 are the elements of the bag B' . Similarly, we define M'' to be M' after the substitution $\langle y_1, y_2/x \rangle$. On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ &= \langle M \{ \langle N_1/x \rangle \} \langle \langle N_2 \rangle / x \rangle + M \{ \langle N_2/x \rangle \} \langle \langle N_1 \rangle / x \rangle \rangle^\circ \\
&= \langle M \{ \langle N_1/x \rangle \} \langle \langle N_2 \rangle / x \rangle \rangle^\circ + \langle M \{ \langle N_2/x \rangle \} \langle \langle N_1 \rangle / x \rangle \rangle^\circ \\
&= \langle M \{ \langle N_1/x \rangle \} \langle \langle N_2 \rangle / x \rangle \rangle^\circ \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&\quad + \langle M \{ \langle N_2/x \rangle \} \langle \langle N_1 \rangle / x \rangle \rangle^\circ \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&= \langle M' \{ \langle N'_1/x \rangle \} \langle \langle N'_2 \rangle / x \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&\quad + \langle M' \{ \langle N'_2/x \rangle \} \langle \langle N'_1 \rangle / x \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&= \langle M' \{ \langle N'_1/x \rangle \} \rangle^\circ \langle \langle N'_2 \rangle^\circ / y_2 \rangle [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&\quad + \langle M' \{ \langle N'_2/x \rangle \} \rangle^\circ \langle \langle N'_1 \rangle^\circ / y_2 \rangle [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}]
\end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

The reductions in (A.6) and (A.7) lead to identical expressions, up to renaming of shared variables, which are taken to be fresh by definition. In both cases, we have taken the same fresh variables.

- 3) The rule applied is $[\text{R}] \neq [\text{R:Beta}]$ and $[\text{R}] \neq [\text{R:Fetch}]$. There are two possible cases. Below $[x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}]$ abbreviates $[x_1 \leftarrow x_1] \cdots [x_n \leftarrow x_n]$:

I) $[\text{R}] = [\text{R:Fail}]$

Then $\mathbb{N} = M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$ and the reduction is

$$[\text{R:Fail}] \frac{\#(x, M) \neq \text{size}(B) \quad \tilde{y} = (\text{mfv}(M) \setminus x) \uplus \text{mfv}(B)}{M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}}$$

where $\mathbb{M} = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$. Below assume $\text{fv}(\mathbb{N}) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$.

On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ = \langle M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_n/x_n \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\
&= \langle M' \langle \langle B'/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\
&= \langle M' \langle y_1, \dots, y_k/x \rangle \rangle^\circ [y_1, \dots, y_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B' \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Fail}]} \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] = \mathbb{L}
\end{aligned}$$

where we define M' and B' to be M and B after the substitutions of $\langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle$.
On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ &= \langle \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \rangle^\circ = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \langle \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \rangle^\circ \\
&= \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \langle \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] = \mathbb{L}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ \longrightarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ$ and the result follows.

II) $[\mathbb{R}] = [\mathbb{R} : \text{Cons}_1]$.

Then $\mathbb{N} = \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} B$ and the reduction is

$$[\mathbb{R} : \text{Cons}_1] \frac{\text{size}(B) = k \quad \tilde{z} = \text{mfv}(B)}{\mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} B \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y} \uplus \tilde{z}}}$$

and $\mathbb{M}' = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y} \uplus \tilde{z}}$. Below we assume $\text{fv}(\mathbb{N}) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$.

On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} B \rangle^\circ = \langle \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} B \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_n/x_n \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\
&= \langle \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} B' \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] = \langle \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \rangle^\circ \langle B' \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\
&= \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \langle B' \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Cons}_1]} \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y} \uplus \tilde{z}} [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] = \mathbb{L}
\end{aligned}$$

where we define B' to be B after the substitutions of $\langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle$. Similarly, \tilde{y}' and \tilde{z}' are \tilde{y} and \tilde{z} after the substitution $\langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle$. On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ &= \langle \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y} \uplus \tilde{z}} \rangle^\circ \\
&= \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \langle \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y} \uplus \tilde{z}} \rangle^\circ \\
&= \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \langle \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}' \uplus \tilde{z}'} \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\
&= \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}' \uplus \tilde{z}'} [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] = \mathbb{L}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ \longrightarrow \mathbb{L} = \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ$, and the result follows.

III) $[\mathbb{R}] = [\mathbb{R} : \text{Cons}_2]$

Then $\mathbb{N} = \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$ and the reduction is

$$[\mathbb{R} : \text{Cons}_2] \frac{\text{size}(B) = k \quad \#(x, \tilde{y}) + k \neq 0 \quad \tilde{z} = \text{mfv}(B)}{\mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y} \uplus \tilde{z}}}$$

and $\mathbb{M} = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{(\tilde{y} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{z}}$. Below we assume $\text{fv}(\mathbb{N}) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$.

On the one hand, we have: (below $\tilde{y} = y_1, \dots, y_m$)

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ \\
&= \langle \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_n/x_n \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\
&= \langle \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \langle y_1/x \rangle \cdots \langle y_m/x \rangle \rangle^\circ [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B' \rangle^\circ / x \rangle [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \quad (\text{A.8}) \\
&= \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}'} [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B' \rangle^\circ / x \rangle [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\
&\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Cons}_2]} \text{fail}^{(\tilde{y}' \setminus x) \cup \tilde{z}'} [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}]
\end{aligned}$$

As \tilde{y} consists of free variables, in $\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_n/x_n \rangle$ the substitutions also occur on \tilde{y} resulting in a new \tilde{y}' where all x_i 's are replaced with their fresh components in \tilde{x}_i . Similarly for z' and B' as well as \tilde{y}' being \tilde{y} with each x replaced with a fresh y_i . On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ &= \langle \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{(\tilde{y} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{z}} \rangle^\circ = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \langle \text{fail}^{(\tilde{y} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{z}} \rangle^\circ \\
&= \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \langle \text{fail}^{(\tilde{y}' \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{z}'} \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] = \text{fail}^{(\tilde{y}' \setminus x) \cup \tilde{z}'} [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \quad (\text{A.9})
\end{aligned}$$

The reductions in (A.8) and (A.9) lead to identical expressions.

As before, the reduction via Rule [R] could occur inside a context (cf. Rules [R: TCont] and [R: ECont]). We consider only the case when the contextual rule used is [R: TCont]. We have $\mathbb{N} = C[N]$. When we have $C[N] \longrightarrow_{[\text{R}]} C[M]$ such that $N \longrightarrow_{[\text{R}]} M$ we need to show that $\langle C[N] \rangle^\circ \longrightarrow^j \langle C[M] \rangle^\circ$ for some j dependent on [R]. Firstly, let us assume [R] = [R: Cons₂] then we take $j = 1$. Let us take $C[\cdot]$ to be $[\cdot]B$ and $\text{fv}(NB) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle NB \rangle^\circ &= \langle NB \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\
&= \langle N'B' \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] = \langle N' \rangle^\circ \langle B' \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}]
\end{aligned}$$

We take $N'B' = NB \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle$, and by the IH that $\langle N \rangle^\circ \longrightarrow \langle M \rangle^\circ$ and hence we can deduce that $\langle N' \rangle^\circ \longrightarrow \langle M' \rangle^\circ$ where $M'B' = MB \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle$. Finally,

$$\langle N' \rangle^\circ \langle B' \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \longrightarrow \langle M' \rangle^\circ \langle B' \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}]$$

and hence $\langle C[N] \rangle^\circ \longrightarrow \langle C[M] \rangle^\circ$. \square

Theorem 2.14 (Operational Soundness) *Let \mathbb{N} be a well-formed λ_{\oplus}^{ℓ} expression. Suppose $\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ \longrightarrow \mathbb{L}$. Then, there exists \mathbb{N}' such that $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow_{[\text{R}]} \mathbb{N}'$ and*

1. If [R] = [R: Beta] then $\mathbb{L} \longrightarrow^{\leq 1} \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle^\circ$;
2. If [R] \neq [R: Beta] then $\mathbb{L} \longrightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{N}'' \rangle^\circ$, for \mathbb{N}'' such that $\mathbb{N}' \equiv_{\lambda} \mathbb{N}''$.

Proof: By induction on the structure of \mathbb{N} with the following six cases given below, where $[x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}]$ abbreviates $[\tilde{x}_1 \leftarrow x_1] \cdots [\tilde{x}_k \leftarrow x_k]$:

i) $\mathbb{N} = x$:

Then $\langle x \rangle^\circ = x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x]$, and no reductions can be performed.

ii) $\mathbb{N} = \lambda x.N$:

Suppose $\text{fv}(N) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \lambda x.N \rangle^\circ &= \langle \lambda x.N \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\ &= \langle \lambda x.N' \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] = \lambda x. \langle N' \langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle \rangle^\circ [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}], \end{aligned}$$

where N' is N after the substitutions $\langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle$ and no reductions can be performed.

iii) $\mathbb{N} = NB$:

Suppose $\text{fv}(NB) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle NB \rangle^\circ = \langle NB \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_n/x_n \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\ &= \langle N'B' \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] = \langle N' \rangle^\circ \langle B' \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where $\tilde{x}_i = x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ij}$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and N', B' are N and B after performing the substitutions $\langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle$. By the reduction rules in Fig. 2.5 there are three possible reductions starting in \mathbb{N} :

(a) $\langle N' \rangle^\circ \langle B' \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}]$ reduces via rule [RS:Beta].

In this case $N = \lambda x.N_1$, and the encoding in (A.10) gives $N' = N \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_n/x_n \rangle$, which implies $N' = \lambda x.N'_1$ and the following holds:

$$\langle N' \rangle^\circ = \langle \lambda x.N'_1 \rangle^\circ = (\lambda x. \langle N'_1 \langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle \rangle^\circ [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x]) = (\lambda x. \langle N'' \rangle^\circ [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x])$$

Thus, we have the following [RS:Beta] reduction from (A.10):

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle N' \rangle^\circ \langle B' \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] = (\lambda x. \langle N'' \rangle^\circ [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] \langle B' \rangle^\circ) [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\ &\rightarrow_{[\text{RS:Beta}]} \langle N'' \rangle^\circ [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B' \rangle^\circ / x \rangle [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] = \mathbb{L} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where N'' is N' after the substitutions $\langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle$. Notice that the expression \mathbb{N} can perform the following [R:Beta]-reduction:

$$\mathbb{N} = (\lambda x.N_1)B \rightarrow_{[\text{R:Beta}]} N_1 \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$$

Assuming $\mathbb{N}' = N_1 \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$, there are two cases:

i. $\#(x, M) = \text{size}(B) = k \geq 1$.

On the one hand:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle^\circ &= \langle N_1 \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ \\ &= \langle N_1 \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_n/x_n \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\ &= \langle N'_1 \langle \langle B'/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\ &= \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(\langle B \rangle)} \langle N'_1 \langle y_1, \dots, y_k/x \rangle \rangle^\circ \langle B_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \cdots \\ &\quad \langle B_i(k)/y_k \rangle [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\ &= \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(\langle B \rangle)} \langle N''_1 \rangle^\circ \langle B_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle B_i(k)/y_k \rangle [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \end{aligned}$$

where N''_1 is N'_1 after the substitution $\langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle$.

On the other hand, after an application of Rule [RS : Ex – Sub]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L} &= \langle N'' \rangle^\bullet [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B' \rangle^\bullet / x \rangle [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\ &\longrightarrow \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(\langle B \rangle^\bullet)} \langle N''_i \rangle^\bullet \langle B_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle B_i(k)/y_k \rangle [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\ &= \langle N' \rangle^\circ \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows.

ii. Otherwise, either $\#(x, N_1) = k = 0$ or $\#(x, N_1) \neq \text{size}(B)$. In this case:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle N' \rangle^\circ &= \langle N_1 \langle B/x \rangle \rangle^\circ \\ &= \langle N_1 \langle B/x \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_n/x_n \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\ &= \langle N'_1 \langle B'/x \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\ &= \langle N'' \rangle^\bullet [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B' \rangle^\bullet / x \rangle [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] = \mathbb{L} \end{aligned}$$

From (A.11): $\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ \longrightarrow \mathbb{L} = \langle N' \rangle^\circ$ and the result follows.

(b) $\langle N' \rangle^\bullet \langle B' \rangle^\bullet [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}]$ reduces via rule [RS:Cons₁].

In this case we would have $N = \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$, and the encoding in (A.10) gives $N' = N \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_n/x_n \rangle$, which implies $N' = \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$, we let $\text{size}(B) = k$ and the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle N' \rangle^\bullet \langle B' \rangle^\bullet [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] = \langle \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \rangle^\bullet \langle B' \rangle^\bullet [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\ &= \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \langle B' \rangle^\bullet [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}] \\ &\longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \uplus \tilde{z}} [x_{1n} \leftarrow x_{1n}], \text{ where } \tilde{z} = \text{fv}(B') \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

The expression \mathbb{N} can perform the following [R] = [R : Cons₁]-reduction:

$$\mathbb{N} = \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} B \longrightarrow_{[R]} \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \uplus \tilde{z}} \text{ where } \tilde{z} = \text{mfv}(B) \quad (\text{A.13})$$

From (A.12) and (A.13), we infer that $\mathbb{L} = \langle N' \rangle^\circ$ and so the result follows.

(c) Suppose that $\langle N' \rangle^\bullet \longrightarrow \langle N'' \rangle^\bullet$.

This case follows from the IH.

iv) $\mathbb{N} = N \langle B/x \rangle$:

Suppose $\text{fv}(N \langle B/x \rangle) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle N \langle B/x \rangle \rangle^\circ = \langle N \langle B/x \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\ &= \langle N' \langle B'/x \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

where N', B' are N and B after performing the substitutions $\langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle$. Let us consider the two possibilities of the encoding:

1) $\#(x, M) = \text{size}(B) = k \geq 1$.

Then we continue equation (A.14) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle N' \langle B'/x \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\ &= \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(\langle B' \rangle^\bullet)} \langle N'_i \langle y_1, \dots, y_n/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet \langle B_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \cdots \\ &\quad \langle B_i(n)/y_n \rangle [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\ &= \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(\langle B' \rangle^\bullet)} \langle N''_i \rangle^\bullet \langle B_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle B_i(n)/y_n \rangle [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.15})$$

where N'' is N' after performing the substitutions $\langle y_1, \dots, y_n/x \rangle$. There are three possible reductions, these being from rules [RS:Lin-Fetch], [RS:Cons₃], and [RS:Cont].

I) Suppose that $\text{head}(N'') = y_1$.

Then one has to consider the shape of the bag B' :

A) When B' has only one element N_1 then from (A.15) and by letting $B = \{N_1\}$ and $B' = \{N'_1\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle N'' \rangle^\circ \langle \langle N'_1 \rangle^\circ / y_1 \rangle [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}], \text{ since } \text{head}(M') = y_1 \\ &\longrightarrow \langle N'' \rangle^\circ \{ \langle N'_1 \rangle^\circ / y_1 \} [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] = \mathbb{L} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

We also have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{N} &= N \langle \{N_1\}/x \rangle \\ &\longrightarrow N \{N_1/x\} \langle \{1/x\} \rangle = \mathbb{N}' \equiv_\lambda N \{N_1/x\} = \mathbb{N}'' \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

From (A.16) and (A.17), we infer that $\mathbb{L}' = \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle^\circ$ and so the result follows.

B) When B' has more than one element. Let us say that $B = \{N_1, N_2\}$ and $B' = \{N'_1, N'_2\}$ and cases for larger bags proceed similarly then from (A.15). (Below we use the fact that $\text{head}(M') = y_1$)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle N'' \rangle^\circ \langle \langle N'_1 \rangle^\circ / y_1 \rangle \langle \langle N'_2 \rangle^\circ / y_2 \rangle [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\ &\quad + \langle N'' \rangle^\circ \langle \langle N'_2 \rangle^\circ / y_1 \rangle \langle \langle N'_1 \rangle^\circ / y_2 \rangle [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}], \\ &\longrightarrow \langle N'' \rangle^\circ \{ \langle N'_1 \rangle^\circ / y_1 \} \{ \langle N'_2 \rangle^\circ / y_2 \} [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\ &\quad + \langle N'' \rangle^\circ \{ \langle N'_2 \rangle^\circ / y_1 \} \{ \langle N'_1 \rangle^\circ / y_2 \} [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] = \mathbb{L} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

We also have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{N} &= N \langle \{N_1, N_2\}/x \rangle \\ &\longrightarrow N \{N_1/x\} \langle \{N_2\}/x \rangle + N \{N_2/x\} \langle \{N_1\}/x \rangle = \mathbb{N}' \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

From (A.18) and (A.19), we infer that $\mathbb{L}' = \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle^\circ$ and so the result follows.

II) Suppose that $N'' = \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}}$. Then we proceed similarly as from (A.15):

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(\langle B' \rangle^\circ)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \langle B_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle B_i(n)/y_n \rangle \\ &\longrightarrow^* \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(\langle B' \rangle^\circ)} \text{fail}^{(\tilde{z} \setminus \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}) \uplus \tilde{y}}, \text{ since } \text{head}(M') = y_1 \\ &= \mathbb{L}' \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

where $\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(B_i(1)) \uplus \cdots \uplus \text{fv}(B_i(n))$. We also have that

$$\mathbb{N} = \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \langle \langle B \rangle / x \rangle \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{(\tilde{z} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{y}} = \mathbb{N}' \quad (\text{A.21})$$

where $\tilde{y} = \text{mfv}(B)$. From (A.20) and (A.21), we infer that $\mathbb{L}' = \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle^\circ$ and so the result follows.

III) Suppose that $N'' \longrightarrow N'''$

This case follows by the IH.

2) Otherwise we continue equation (A.14) as follows where $\#(x, M) = k$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle N' \langle \langle B' \rangle / x \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\ &= \langle N' \langle y_1 \cdots y_k/x \rangle \rangle^\circ [y_1 \cdots y_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle \langle B' \rangle \rangle^\circ / x \rangle [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\ &= \langle N'' \rangle^\circ [y_1 \cdots y_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle \langle B' \rangle \rangle^\circ / x \rangle [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.22})$$

Let us consider the two possible cases:

I) $\#(x, M) = \text{size}(B) = k = 0$.

Then we have:

$$\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ = \langle N' \rangle^\circ \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \quad (\text{A.23})$$

Reductions can only appear in $\langle N' \rangle^\circ$ and the case follows by the IH.

II) Otherwise we can perform the reduction:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle N'' \rangle^\circ [y_1 \cdots y_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B' \rangle^\circ / x \rangle [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] \\ &\longrightarrow \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}'} [x_{1k} \leftarrow x_{1k}] = \mathbb{L}' \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.24})$$

where $\tilde{z}' = \text{fv}(N'') \uplus \text{fv}(B')$. We also have that

$$\mathbb{N} = N \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} = \mathbb{N}' \quad (\text{A.25})$$

where $\tilde{z} = \text{mfv}(M) \uplus \text{mfv}(B)$.

From (A.24) and (A.25), we infer that $\mathbb{L}' = \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle^\circ$ and so the result follows.

v) $\mathbb{N} = \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$

Then $\langle \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \rangle^\circ = \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$, and no reductions can be performed.

vi) $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}_1 + \mathbb{N}_2$:

This case holds by the IH. □

A.3.3 Success Sensitiveness

Proposition 2.5.2 (Preservation of head term) *The head of a term is preserved when applying the translation $\langle \cdot \rangle^\circ$, i.e.,*

$$\forall M \in \lambda_{\oplus}^{\neq}. \text{head}(M) = \checkmark \iff \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle M \rangle^\circ) = \checkmark.$$

Proof: By induction on the structure of M . We only need to consider terms of the following form.

1) When $M = \checkmark$ the case is immediate.

2) When $M = NB$ with $\text{fv}(NB) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and $\#(x_i, M) = j_i$ we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle NB \rangle^\circ) &= \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle NB \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_1] \cdots [x_k \leftarrow x_k]) \\ &= \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle NB \rangle^\circ) = \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle N \rangle^\circ) \end{aligned}$$

and $\text{head}(NB) = \text{head}(N)$, by the IH we have $\text{head}(N) = \checkmark \iff \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle N \rangle^\circ) = \checkmark$.

3) When $M = N \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$, we must have that $\#(x, M) = \text{size}(B)$ for the head of this term to be \checkmark .

Let $\text{fv}(N \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and $\#(x_i, M) = j_i$. We have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle M \rangle^\circ) &= \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle N \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_1] \cdots [x_k \leftarrow x_k]) \\ &= \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle N \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ) \\ &= \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} \langle N \langle x_1, \dots, x_k/x \rangle \rangle^\circ \langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle B_i(k)/x_k \rangle) \\ &= \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle N \langle x_1, \dots, x_k/x \rangle \rangle^\circ \langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle B_i(k)/x_k \rangle) \\ &= \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle N \langle x_1, \dots, x_k/x \rangle \rangle^\circ) \end{aligned}$$

and $\text{head}(N \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle) = \text{head}(N)$, by the IH we have

$$\text{head}(N) = \checkmark \iff \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle N \rangle^\circ) = \checkmark$$

□

Theorem 2.15 (Success Sensitivity) *Let \mathbb{M} be a well-formed $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ -expression. Then,*

$$\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark} \iff (\mathbb{M})^{\circ} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}.$$

Proof: By induction on the structure of expressions $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\checkmark}$. We proceed with the proof in two parts.

1) Suppose that $\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$. We will prove that $(\mathbb{M})^{\circ} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$.

By operational completeness (Theorem 2.13) we have that if $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow_{[\mathbb{R}]} \mathbb{M}'$ then

1. If $[\mathbb{R}] = [\mathbb{R} : \text{Beta}]$ then $(\mathbb{M})^{\circ} \longrightarrow^{\leq 2} (\mathbb{M}')^{\circ}$;
2. If $[\mathbb{R}] = [\mathbb{R} : \text{Fetch}]$ then $(\mathbb{M})^{\circ} \longrightarrow^{+} (\mathbb{M}'')^{\circ}$, for some \mathbb{M}'' such that $\mathbb{M}' \equiv_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}''$.
3. If $[\mathbb{R}] \neq [\mathbb{R} : \text{Beta}]$ and $[\mathbb{R}] \neq [\mathbb{R} : \text{Fetch}]$ then $(\mathbb{M})^{\circ} \longrightarrow (\mathbb{M}')^{\circ}$;

Notice that neither our reduction rules (in Figure 2.5), or our congruence \equiv_{λ} (in Figure 2.18), or our encoding $(\Downarrow_{\checkmark})^{\circ} = \checkmark$ create or destroy a \checkmark occurring in the head of term. By Proposition 2.5.2 the encoding preserves the head of a term being \checkmark . The encoding acts homomorphically over sums, therefore, if a \checkmark appears as the head of a term in a sum, it will stay in the encoded sum. We can iterate the operational completeness lemma and obtain the result.

2) Suppose that $(\mathbb{M})^{\circ} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$. We will prove that $\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$.

From Def. 2.27 we have that $(\mathbb{M})^{\circ} \Downarrow_{\checkmark} \implies \exists M_1, \dots, M_k. \mathbb{M} \longrightarrow^{*} M_1 + \dots + M_k$ and $\text{head}(M_j) = \checkmark$, for some $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

Notice that if $(\mathbb{M})^{\circ}$ is itself a term headed with \checkmark , say $\text{head}((\mathbb{M})^{\circ}) = \checkmark$, then \mathbb{M} is itself headed with \checkmark , from Proposition 2.5.2.

Based on the shape of $(\mathbb{M})^{\circ}$, we consider two cases. The first case, when $(\mathbb{M})^{\circ} = M_1 + \dots + M_k$, $k \geq 2$, and \checkmark occurs in the head of an M_j , follows a similar reasoning. Then \mathbb{M} has one of the forms:

1. $\mathbb{M} = N_1$, then N_1 must contain the subterm $M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$ and $\text{size}(B) = \#(x, M)$. Since, $(M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle)^{\circ} = \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(\langle B \rangle)} (M \langle \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle \rangle)^{\circ} \langle B_i(1)/x_i \rangle \dots \langle B_i(k)/x_i \rangle$, we can apply Proposition 2.5.2 as we may apply $\text{head}_{\Sigma}((M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle)^{\circ})$.
2. $\mathbb{M} = N_1 + \dots + N_l$ for $l \geq 2$.

The reasoning is similar and uses the fact that the encoding distributes homomorphically over sums.

The second case is when $(\mathbb{M})^{\circ} \longrightarrow^{*} M_1 + \dots + M_k$, and $\text{head}(M_j) = \checkmark$, for some j and M_j . By operational soundness (Theorem 2.14) we have that if $(\mathbb{M})^{\circ} \longrightarrow \mathbb{L}$ then there exist \mathbb{M}' such that $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow_{[\mathbb{R}]} \mathbb{M}'$ and

1. If $[\mathbb{R}] = [\mathbb{R} : \text{Beta}]$ then $\mathbb{L} \longrightarrow^{\leq 1} (\mathbb{M}')^{\circ}$;
2. If $[\mathbb{R}] \neq [\mathbb{R} : \text{Beta}]$ then $\mathbb{L} \longrightarrow^{*} (\mathbb{M}'')^{\circ}$, for \mathbb{M}'' such that $\mathbb{M}' \equiv_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}''$.

The reasoning is similar to the previous case, since our reduction rules do not introduce/eliminate \checkmark occurring in the head of terms and by taking \mathbb{L} to be $M_1 + \dots + M_k$ with $\text{head}(M_j) = \checkmark$, for some j and M_j the result follows.

□

A.4 Appendix to § 2.5.3

A.4.1 Type Preservation

Proposition 2.5.3 *Suppose σ^j and σ^k are arbitrary strict types (Def. 2.6), for some $j, k \geq 0$. Following Fig. 2.17, consider their encoding into session types $\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, m)}^\dagger$ and $\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}^\dagger$, respectively, where τ_1, τ_2 are strict types and $n, m \geq 0$.*

We have $\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, m)}^\dagger = \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}^\dagger$ under the following conditions:

1. *If $j > k$ then we take τ_1 to be an arbitrary strict type and $m = 0$; also, we take τ_2 to be σ and $n = j - k$.*
2. *If $j < k$ then we take τ_1 to be σ and $m = k - j$; also, we take τ_2 to be an arbitrary strict type and $n = 0$.*
3. *Otherwise, if $j = k$ then we take $m = n = 0$. Also, τ_1, τ_2 are arbitrary strict types.*

Proof:

We shall prove the case of (1) and the case of (2) follows immediately. The case of (3) is immediate by the encoding on types defined in Definition 2.30. Hence we take $j > k$, τ_1 to be an arbitrary type and $m = 0$; also, we take τ_2 to be σ and $n = j - k$. Hence we want to show that $\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\dagger = \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\dagger$. We have the following

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\dagger &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma^{k-1} \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\dagger)))) \\ \llbracket \sigma^{k-1} \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\dagger &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma^{k-2} \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\dagger)))) \\ &\vdots \\ \llbracket \sigma^1 \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\dagger &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger) \otimes (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\dagger)))) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\dagger &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma^{j-1} \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\dagger)))) \\ \llbracket \sigma^{j-1} \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\dagger &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma^{j-2} \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\dagger)))) \\ &\vdots \\ \llbracket \sigma^{j-k+1} \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\dagger &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma^{j-k} \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\dagger)))) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $n = j - k$, hence we wish to show that $\llbracket \sigma^n \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\dagger = \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\dagger$. Finally we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\dagger &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger) \otimes (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n-1)}^\dagger)))) \\ \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n-1)}^\dagger &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger) \otimes (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n-2)}^\dagger)))) \\ &\vdots \\ \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, 1)}^\dagger &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger) \otimes (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, 0)}^\dagger)))) \\ \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, 0)}^\dagger &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& \&1)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \sigma^n \rrbracket_{(\tau,0)}^{\hat{\zeta}} &= \oplus((\& \mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\hat{\zeta}}) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma^{n-1} \rrbracket_{(\tau,0)}^{\hat{\zeta}})))) \\
\llbracket \sigma^{n-1} \rrbracket_{(\tau,0)}^{\hat{\zeta}} &= \oplus((\& \mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\hat{\zeta}}) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma^{n-2} \rrbracket_{(\tau,0)}^{\hat{\zeta}})))) \\
&\vdots \\
\llbracket \sigma^1 \rrbracket_{(\tau,0)}^{\hat{\zeta}} &= \oplus((\& \mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\hat{\zeta}}) \otimes (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\tau,0)}^{\hat{\zeta}})))) \\
\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\tau,0)}^{\hat{\zeta}} &= \oplus((\& \mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \& \mathbf{1}))
\end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 2.16 (Type Preservation for $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^{\hat{\zeta}}$) Let B and \mathbb{M} be a bag and an expression in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\hat{\zeta}}$, respectively.

1. If $\Gamma^\dagger \models B : \pi$ then $\llbracket B \rrbracket_u^{\hat{\zeta}} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^{\hat{\zeta}}, u : \llbracket \pi \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^{\hat{\zeta}}$, for some strict type σ and index $i \geq 0$.
2. If $\Gamma^\dagger \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ then $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\hat{\zeta}} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^{\hat{\zeta}}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\hat{\zeta}}$.

Proof: By mutual induction on the typing derivation of B and \mathbb{M} , with an analysis for the last rule applied. Recall that the encoding of types ($\llbracket - \rrbracket^{\hat{\zeta}}$) has been given in Definition 2.30.

1. We consider two cases:

(a) Rule [FS:wf-bag]:

In this case we have the following derivation:

$$\text{[FS:wf-bag]} \frac{\Gamma^\dagger \vdash B : \pi}{\Gamma^\dagger \models B : \pi}$$

There are two cases to be analyzed:

- i) We may type bags with the [TS:bag] Rule.
This case is similar to that of [FS:bag]
- ii) We may type bags with the [TS:1] Rule.
That is,

$$\text{[TS:1]} \frac{}{\vdash \mathbf{1} : \omega}$$

Our encoding gives us:

$$\llbracket \mathbf{1} \rrbracket_x^{\hat{\zeta}} = x.\text{some}_0; x(y_n).(y_n.\overline{\text{some}}; y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_0; x.\overline{\text{none}})$$

and the encoding of ω can be either:

A. $\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,0)}^{\hat{\zeta}} = \overline{\&((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\& \oplus \perp))}$; or

B. $\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^{\hat{\zeta}} = \overline{\&((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\& \oplus ((\& \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\hat{\zeta}}) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i-1)}^{\hat{\zeta}}))))}$

and one can build the following type derivation (rules from Figure 2.11):

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[T}\&\text{d}^x\text{]} \frac{\text{[T}\mathbf{1}\text{]} \frac{}{y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \vdash y_n : \mathbf{1}}{y_n.\overline{\text{some}}; y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \vdash y_n : \&\mathbf{1}}}{y_n.\overline{\text{some}}; y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \vdash y_n : \&\mathbf{1}} \quad \text{[T}\&\text{x}\text{]} \frac{}{x.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash x : \&A} \\
\text{[T}\wp\text{]} \frac{\text{[T}\oplus\text{]} \frac{}{x.\text{some}_0; x.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash x : \oplus \&A}}{(y_n.\overline{\text{some}}; y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_0; x.\overline{\text{none}}) \vdash y_n : \&\mathbf{1}, x : \oplus \&A} \\
\text{[T}\oplus\text{]} \frac{\text{[T}\wp\text{]} \frac{}{x(y_n).(y_n.\overline{\text{some}}; y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_0; x.\overline{\text{none}}) \vdash x : (\&\mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&A)}}{x.\text{some}_0; x(y_n).(y_n.\overline{\text{some}}; y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_0; x.\overline{\text{none}}) \vdash x : \oplus ((\&\mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&A))}
\end{array}$$

Since A is arbitrary, we can take $A = \mathbf{1}$ for $\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,0)}^\dagger$ and $A = ((\&\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i-1)}^\dagger))$ for $\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\dagger$, in both cases, the result follows.

(b) Rule [FS:bag]:

Then $B = \lambda M \int \cdot A$ and we have the following derivation:

$$[\text{FS:bag}] \frac{\Gamma^\dagger \models M : \sigma \quad \Delta^\dagger \models A : \sigma^k}{\Gamma^\dagger, \Delta^\dagger \models \lambda M \int \cdot A : \sigma^{k+1}}$$

To simplify the proof, we will consider $k = 2$ (the case $k > 2$ follows analogously).
By IH we have

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, x_i : \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger \\ \llbracket A \rrbracket_x^\dagger \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, x : \llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^\dagger \end{aligned}$$

By Definition 2.29,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \lambda M \int \cdot A \rrbracket_x^\dagger = & x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\lambda M \int \cdot A)}; x(y_i).x.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(\lambda M \int \cdot A)}; x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(x_i). \\ & (x_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M)}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger \mid \llbracket A \rrbracket_x^\dagger \mid y_i.\overline{\text{none}}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.26})$$

Let Π_1 be the derivation:

$$[\text{T} \oplus_{\overline{w}}^x] \frac{\llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, x_i : \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger}{x_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M)}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, x_i : \oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger} \quad [\text{T} \&^x] \frac{}{y_i.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash y_i : \&\mathbf{1}}}{[\text{T}]} \frac{}{x_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M)}; \underbrace{\llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger \mid y_i.\overline{\text{none}}}_{P_1} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, x_i : \oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger, y_i : \&\mathbf{1}}$$

Let $P_1 = (x_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M)}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger \mid y_i.\overline{\text{none}})$ in the the derivation Π_2 below:

$$[\text{T} \otimes] \frac{\Pi_1 \quad \llbracket A \rrbracket_x^\dagger \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, x : \llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^\dagger}{\bar{x}(x_i).(P_1 \mid \llbracket A \rrbracket_x^\dagger) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, y_i : \&\mathbf{1}, x : (\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^\dagger)}}{[\text{T} \&_{\text{d}}^x]} \frac{}{x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(x_i).(P_1 \mid \llbracket A \rrbracket_x^\dagger) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, y_i : \&\mathbf{1}, x : \&((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^\dagger))} \quad P_2$$

Let $P_2 = (x.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}(x_i).(P_1 \mid \llbracket A \rrbracket_x^\dagger))$ in the derivation below (the last two rules that were applied are $[\text{T} \oplus_{\overline{w}}^x]$ and $[\text{T} \wp]$):

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pi_2 \\ & \vdots \\ & P_2 \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, y_i : \&\mathbf{1}, x : \&((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^\dagger)) \\ [\text{T} \oplus_{\overline{w}}^x] & \frac{}{x.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(\lambda M \int \cdot A)}; P_2 \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, y_i : \&\mathbf{1}, x : \oplus \&((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^\dagger))} \\ & \frac{}{x(y_i).x.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(\lambda M \int \cdot A)}; P_2 \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, x : (\&\mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^\dagger)))} \\ & \frac{}{x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\lambda M \int \cdot A)}; x(y_i).x.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(\lambda M \int \cdot A)}; P_2 \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\dagger, x : \oplus((\&\mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\dagger) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^\dagger))))} \\ & \underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_{\llbracket \lambda M \int \cdot A \rrbracket_x^\dagger} \end{aligned}$$

From Definitions 2.24 (duality) and 2.30, we infer:

$$\oplus((\& \mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus [\![\sigma]\!]^\dagger) \otimes ([\![\sigma \wedge \sigma]\!]_{(\tau,j)}^\dagger)))) = [\![\sigma \wedge \sigma \wedge \sigma]\!]_{(\tau,j)}^\dagger$$

Therefore, $[\![M \int \cdot A]\!]_x^\dagger \vdash [\![\Gamma^\dagger, \Delta^\dagger]\!]^\dagger, x : [\![\sigma \wedge \sigma \wedge \sigma]\!]_{(\tau,j)}^\dagger$ and the result follows.

2. The proof of type preservation for expressions, relies on the analysis of nine cases:

(a) Rule [FS:wf-expr]:

Then we have the following derivation:

$$[\text{FS:wf-expr}] \frac{\Gamma^\dagger \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma^\dagger \models M : \tau}$$

Cases follow from their corresponding case from [FS:-]. In the case of [TS:var] we have:

$$[\text{TS:var}] \frac{}{x : \tau \vdash x : \tau}$$

By Definition 2.30, $[\![x : \tau]\!]^\dagger = x : \& \overline{[\![\tau]\!]^\dagger}$, and by Figure 2.16, $[\![x]\!]_u^\dagger = x.\overline{\text{some}}; [x \leftrightarrow u]$. The thesis holds thanks to the following derivation:

$$[\text{T}\&\tilde{d}] \frac{[\text{Tid}] \frac{}{[x \leftrightarrow u] \vdash x : \overline{[\![\tau]\!]^\dagger}, u : [\![\tau]\!]^\dagger}}{x.\overline{\text{some}}; [x \leftrightarrow u] \vdash x : \& \overline{[\![\tau]\!]^\dagger}, u : [\![\tau]\!]^\dagger}}$$

(b) Rule [FS:abs-sh]:

Then $M = \lambda x.(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])$, and the derivation is:

$$[\text{FS:share}] \frac{\Delta^\dagger, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models M : \tau}{\Delta^\dagger, x : \sigma \wedge \dots \wedge \sigma \models M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad x \notin \Delta^\dagger} \quad [\text{FS:abs-sh}] \frac{}{\Delta^\dagger \models \lambda x.(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) : \sigma^k \rightarrow \tau}$$

To simplify the proof we will consider $k = 2$ ($k > 2$ follows similarly).

By the IH, we have

$$[\![M]\!]_u^\dagger \vdash [\![\Delta^\dagger, x_1 : \sigma, x_2 : \sigma]\!]^\dagger, u : [\![\tau]\!]^\dagger.$$

From Def. 2.29 and Def. 2.30, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} [\![\Delta^\dagger, x_1 : \sigma, x_2 : \sigma]\!]^\dagger &= [\![\Delta^\dagger]\!]^\dagger, x_1 : \& \overline{[\![\sigma]\!]^\dagger}, x_2 : \& \overline{[\![\sigma]\!]^\dagger} \\ [\![\lambda x.M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x]]\!]_u^\dagger &= u.\overline{\text{some}}; u(x). [\![M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x]]\!]_u^\dagger \\ &= u.\overline{\text{some}}; u(x). x.\overline{\text{some}}.\tilde{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \\ &\quad | x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (fv(M)\setminus x_1, x_2)}; x(x_1).x.\overline{\text{some}}. \\ &\quad \tilde{x}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_0; y_2.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} | x.\overline{\text{some}}; \\ &\quad x.\text{some}_{u, (fv(M)\setminus x_2)}; x(x_2).x.\overline{\text{some}}; \tilde{x}(y_3). \\ &\quad (y_3.\text{some}_{u, fv(M)}; y_3.\text{close}; [\![M]\!]_u^\dagger | x.\overline{\text{none}})) \end{aligned}$$

We shall split the expression into three parts:

$$\begin{aligned}
N_1 &= x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(y_3).(y_3.\text{some}_{u,\text{fv}(M)};y_3.\text{close};\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp | x.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
N_2 &= x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_0;y_2.\text{close};\mathbf{0} | x.\overline{\text{some}};x.\text{some}_{u,(\text{fv}(M)\setminus x_2)}; \\
&\quad x(x_2).N_1) \\
N_3 &= u.\overline{\text{some}};u(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0;y_1.\text{close};\mathbf{0} | x.\overline{\text{some}}; \\
&\quad x.\text{some}_{u,(\text{fv}(M)\setminus x_1,x_2)};x(x_1).N_2)
\end{aligned}$$

and we obtain the derivation for term N_1 as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{[\text{T}\perp]}{\frac{[\text{T}\oplus_w^\sharp]}{\frac{[\text{T}\otimes]}{\frac{[\text{T}\&_d^\sharp]}{x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(y_3).(y_3.\text{some}_{u,\text{fv}(M)};y_3.\text{close};\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp | x.\overline{\text{none}}) \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger, x_1 : \sigma, x_2 : \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x : (\oplus\perp) \otimes (\&A)}}{y_3.\text{close};\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger, x_1 : \sigma, x_2 : \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket f\tau \rrbracket^\sharp, y_3 : \perp} \quad [\text{T}\&^x] \frac{}{x.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash x : \&A}}{y_3.\text{some}_{u,\text{fv}(M)};y_3.\text{close};\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger, x_1 : \sigma, x_2 : \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, y_3 : \oplus\perp} \quad [\text{T}\&^x] \frac{}{x.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash x : \&A}}{\bar{x}(y_3).(y_3.\text{some}_{u,\text{fv}(M)};y_3.\text{close};\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp | x.\overline{\text{none}}) \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger, x_1 : \sigma, x_2 : \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x : (\oplus\perp) \otimes (\&A)}}{x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(y_3).(y_3.\text{some}_{u,\text{fv}(M)};y_3.\text{close};\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp | x.\overline{\text{none}}) \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger, x_1 : \sigma, x_2 : \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp} \\
N_1
\end{array}$$

Notice that the last rule applied $[\text{T}\&_d^\sharp]$ assigns $x : \&((\oplus\perp) \otimes (\&A))$. Again, since A is arbitrary, take $A = \oplus((\&[\sigma]^\sharp) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i-1)}^\sharp))$, obtaining $x : \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp$. In order to obtain a type derivation for N_2 , consider the derivation Π_1 :

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{[\text{T}\wp]}{\frac{[\text{T}\oplus_w^\sharp]}{\frac{[\text{T}\&_d^\sharp]}{x.\overline{\text{some}};x.\text{some}_{u,(\text{fv}(M)\setminus x_2)};x(x_2).N_1 \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, x_1 : \&[\sigma]^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \oplus((\&[\sigma]^\sharp) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp))}}{N_1 \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, x_1 : \&[\sigma]^\sharp, x_2 : \&[\sigma]^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp} \quad [\text{T}\wp]}{x(x_2).N_1 \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, x_1 : \&[\sigma]^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x : (\&[\sigma]^\sharp) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp)} \\
\frac{[\text{T}\oplus_w^\sharp]}{\frac{[\text{T}\&_d^\sharp]}{x.\overline{\text{some}};x.\text{some}_{u,(\text{fv}(M)\setminus x_2)};x(x_2).N_1 \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, x_1 : \&[\sigma]^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \&\oplus((\&[\sigma]^\sharp) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp))}}{x.\overline{\text{some}};x.\text{some}_{u,(\text{fv}(M)\setminus x_2)};x(x_2).N_1 \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, x_1 : \&[\sigma]^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \&\oplus((\&[\sigma]^\sharp) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp))} \\
\Pi_1
\end{array}$$

We take $P_1 = x.\overline{\text{some}};x.\text{some}_{u,(\text{fv}(M)\setminus x_2)};x(x_2).N_1$ and $\Gamma_1^\dagger = \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, x_1 : \&[\sigma]^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp$ and continue the derivation of N_2

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{[\text{T}\&_d^\sharp]}{\frac{[\text{T}\otimes]}{\frac{[\text{T}\oplus_w^\sharp]}{x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_0;y_2.\text{close};\mathbf{0} | P_1) \vdash \Gamma_1^\dagger, x : (\oplus\perp) \otimes (\&\oplus((\&[\sigma]^\sharp) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp)))}}{\bar{x}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_0;y_2.\text{close};\mathbf{0} | P_1) \vdash \Gamma_1^\dagger, x : (\oplus\perp) \otimes (\&\oplus((\&[\sigma]^\sharp) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp)))}}{\frac{[\text{T}\cdot]}{\mathbf{0} \vdash} \quad \Pi_1}{y_2.\text{close};\mathbf{0} \vdash y_2 : \perp} \quad \vdots}}{y_2.\text{some}_0;y_2.\text{close};\mathbf{0} \vdash y_2 : \oplus\perp} \quad P_1 \vdash \Gamma_1^\dagger, x : \&\oplus((\&[\sigma]^\sharp) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp))} \\
\frac{[\text{T}\&_d^\sharp]}{\frac{[\text{T}\&_d^\sharp]}{x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_0;y_2.\text{close};\mathbf{0} | P_1) \vdash \Gamma_1^\dagger, x : \llbracket \sigma \wedge \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp} \\
N_2
\end{array}$$

Finally, we type N_3 by first having the derivation Π_2 :

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[T}\wp\text{]} \frac{N_2 \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, x_1 : \&\overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \overline{\llbracket \sigma \wedge \omega \rrbracket^\sharp}_{(\sigma,i)}}{x(x_1).N_2 \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x : (\&\overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}) \wp \overline{\llbracket \sigma \wedge \omega \rrbracket^\sharp}_{(\sigma,i)}} \\
\text{[T}\oplus_{\bar{w}}^x\text{]} \frac{x.\text{some}_{u,(\text{fv}(M)\setminus x_1, x_2)}; x(x_1).N_2 \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \oplus((\&\overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}) \wp \overline{\llbracket \sigma \wedge \omega \rrbracket^\sharp}_{(\sigma,i)})}{x.\text{some}_{u,(\text{fv}(M)\setminus x_1, x_2)}; x(x_1).N_2 \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \oplus((\&\overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}) \wp \overline{\llbracket \sigma \wedge \omega \rrbracket^\sharp}_{(\sigma,i)})} \\
\text{[T}\&_d^x\text{]} \frac{P_2 \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \&\oplus((\&\overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}) \wp \overline{\llbracket \sigma \wedge \omega \rrbracket^\sharp}_{(\sigma,i)})}{P_2 \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \&\oplus((\&\overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}) \wp \overline{\llbracket \sigma \wedge \omega \rrbracket^\sharp}_{(\sigma,i)})}
\end{array}$$

We let $P_2 = x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u,(\text{fv}(M)\setminus x_1, x_2)}; x(x_1).N_2$ and $\Gamma_2^\dagger = \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp$. We continue the derivation of $N_3 = u.\overline{\text{some}}; u(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid P_2)$:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[T}\cdot\text{]} \frac{}{\mathbf{0} \vdash} \\
\text{[T}\perp\text{]} \frac{}{y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \vdash y_1 : \perp} \\
\text{[T}\oplus_{\bar{w}}^x\text{]} \frac{y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \vdash y_1 : \oplus \perp \quad \Pi_2}{y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \vdash y_1 : \oplus \perp \quad \Pi_2} \\
\text{[T}\otimes\text{]} \frac{\bar{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid P_2) \vdash \Gamma_2^\dagger, x : (\oplus \perp) \otimes (\&\oplus((\&\overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}) \wp \overline{\llbracket \sigma \wedge \omega \rrbracket^\sharp}_{(\sigma,i)}))}{\bar{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid P_2) \vdash \Gamma_2^\dagger, x : (\oplus \perp) \otimes (\&\oplus((\&\overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}) \wp \overline{\llbracket \sigma \wedge \omega \rrbracket^\sharp}_{(\sigma,i)}))} \\
\text{[T}\&_d^x\text{]} \frac{x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid P_2) \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \overline{\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}_{(\sigma,i)}}{x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid P_2) \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \overline{\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}_{(\sigma,i)}} \\
\text{[T}\wp\text{]} \frac{u(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid P_2) \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, u : (\overline{\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}_{(\sigma,i)}) \wp (\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp)}{u(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid P_2) \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, u : (\overline{\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}_{(\sigma,i)}) \wp (\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp)} \\
\text{[T}\&_d^x\text{]} \frac{N_3 \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \&((\overline{\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}_{(\sigma,i)}) \wp (\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp))}{N_3 \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \&((\overline{\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}_{(\sigma,i)}) \wp (\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp))}
\end{array}$$

Since $\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp = \&(\overline{\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp}_{(\sigma,i)}) \wp \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp$, we have proven that $\llbracket \lambda x.M[\bar{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp$ and the result follows.

(c) Rule [FS:app]:

Then $\mathbb{M} = M B$, and the derivation is

$$\text{[FS:app]} \frac{\Gamma^\dagger \models M : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau \quad \Delta^\dagger \models B : \sigma^k}{\Gamma^\dagger, \Delta^\dagger \models M B : \tau}$$

By IH, we have both

- $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp$;
- and $\llbracket B \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket^\sharp_{(\tau_2, n)}$, for some τ_2 and some n .

From the fact that \mathbb{M} is well-formed and Def. 2.29 and Def. 2.30, we have:

- $B = \{N_1, \dots, N_k\}$;
- $\llbracket M B \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp))$;
- $\llbracket \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp = \&(\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket^\sharp_{(\tau_1, m)}) \wp \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp$, for some τ_1 and some m .

Also, since $\llbracket B \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket^\sharp_{(\tau_2, n)}$, we have the following derivation Π :

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[Tid]} \frac{}{[v \leftrightarrow u] \vdash v : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp} \\
\text{[T}\otimes\text{]} \frac{\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket^\sharp_{(\tau_2, n)}}{\bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, v : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket^\sharp_{(\tau_2, n)} \otimes \overline{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp} \\
\text{[T}\oplus_{\bar{w}}^v\text{]} \frac{\bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, v : \oplus(\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket^\sharp_{(\tau_2, n)} \otimes \overline{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp}), u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp}{v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\sharp, v : \oplus(\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket^\sharp_{(\tau_2, n)} \otimes \overline{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp}), u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp}
\end{array}$$

Notice that

$$\oplus(\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}^{\neq} \otimes \overline{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\neq}}) = \overline{\llbracket \sigma^k \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^{\neq}}$$

Therefore, by one application of [Tcut] we obtain the derivations ∇_i , for each $B_i \in \text{PER}(B)$:

$$[\text{Tcut}] \frac{\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\neq} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^{\neq}, v : \mathcal{E}(\overline{\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, m)}^{\neq}} \wp \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\neq})) \quad \Pi_i}{(\nu v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\neq} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^{\neq})) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^{\neq}, \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^{\neq}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\neq}}$$

In order to apply [Tcut], we must have that $\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, m)}^{\neq} = \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}^{\neq}$, therefore, the choice of τ_1, τ_2, n and m , will consider the different possibilities for j and k , as in Proposition 2.5.3.

We can then conclude that $\llbracket MB \rrbracket_u^{\neq} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^{\neq}, \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^{\neq}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\neq}$:

$$[\text{T}\&] \frac{\text{For each } B_i \in \text{PER}(B) \quad \nabla_i}{\bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\neq} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^{\neq})) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^{\neq}, \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^{\neq}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\neq}}$$

and the result follows.

(d) Rule [FS:share]:

Then $\mathbb{M} = M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]$ and

$$[\text{FS:share}] \frac{\Delta^\dagger, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models M : \tau \quad x \notin \Delta^\dagger \quad k \neq 0}{\Delta^\dagger, x : \sigma_k \models M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau}$$

The proof for this case is contained within 2(b).

(e) Rule [FS:weak]:

Then $\mathbb{M} = M[\leftarrow x]$ and

$$[\text{FS:weak}] \frac{\Gamma^\dagger \models M : \tau}{\Gamma^\dagger, x : \omega \models M[\leftarrow x] : \tau}$$

However $\Gamma^\dagger, x : \omega$ is not a core context hence we disallow the case.

(f) Rule [FS:ex-sub]:

Then $\mathbb{M} = M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$ and

$$[\text{FS:ex-sub}] \frac{\Delta^\dagger \models B : \sigma^j \quad \Gamma^\dagger, x : \sigma^k \models M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau}{\Gamma^\dagger, \Delta^\dagger \models M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

By Proposition 2.5.3 and IH we have both

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^{\neq} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^{\neq}, x : \overline{\llbracket \sigma_k \rrbracket_{(\tau, n)}^{\neq}}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\neq} \\ \llbracket B \rrbracket_x^{\neq} \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^{\neq}, x : \llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau, m)}^{\neq} \end{aligned}$$

From Def. 2.29, we have

$$\llbracket M[\bar{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \rrbracket_u^{\neq} = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu x)(\llbracket M[\bar{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^{\neq} \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^{\neq})$$

Therefore, for each $B_i \in \text{PER}(B)$, we obtain the following derivation Π_i :

$$[\text{Tcut}] \frac{\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, x : \llbracket \sigma_k \rrbracket_{(\tau,n)}^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta \quad \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, x : \llbracket \sigma_j \rrbracket_{(\tau,m)}^\zeta}{(\forall x)(\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\zeta \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\zeta) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta}$$

We must have that $\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau,m)}^\zeta = \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\tau,n)}^\zeta$ which holds by the conditions in Proposition 2.5.3. Therefore, from Π_i and multiple applications of [T&] it follows that

$$[\text{T&}] \frac{\forall \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} \Pi_i}{\bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\forall x)(\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\zeta \mid x.\text{some}_w; \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\zeta) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta}$$

that is, $\llbracket M[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \langle B/x \rangle \rrbracket^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger, \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta$ and the result follows.

(g) Rule [FS:ex-lin-sub]:

Then $\mathbb{M} = M \langle N/x \rangle$ and

$$[\text{FS:ex-lin-sub}] \frac{\Delta^\dagger \models N : \sigma \quad \Gamma^\dagger, x : \sigma \models M : \tau}{\Gamma^\dagger, \Delta^\dagger \models M \langle N/x \rangle : \tau}$$

By IH we have both

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, x : \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\zeta \\ \llbracket M \rrbracket_x^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, x : \&\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta. \end{aligned}$$

From Def. 2.29, $\llbracket M \langle N/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\zeta = (\forall x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \mid x.\text{some}_{f_N(N)}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\zeta)$ and

$$[\text{TCut}] \frac{\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta, x : \&\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\zeta \quad \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, x : \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\zeta}{(\forall x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \mid x.\text{some}_{f_N(N)}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\zeta) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta}$$

Observe that for the application of Rule [TCut] we used the fact that $\overline{\bigoplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\zeta} = \&\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\zeta$. Therefore, $\llbracket M \langle N/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta$ and the result follows.

(h) Rule [FS:fail]:

Then $\mathbb{M} = M \langle N/x \rangle$ and

$$[\text{FS:fail}] \frac{(x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_n : \sigma_n)^\dagger = x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_n : \sigma_n}{x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_n : \sigma_n \models \text{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_n} : \tau}$$

From Definition 2.29, $\llbracket \text{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_n} \rrbracket_u^\zeta = u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid x_k.\overline{\text{none}}$ and

$$[\text{T&}^u] \frac{\llbracket u.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta \quad \llbracket x_1.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash \&\llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket^\zeta \quad \dots \quad \llbracket x_k.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash \&\llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket^\zeta, \dots, x_n : \&\llbracket \sigma_n \rrbracket^\zeta \rrbracket}{\llbracket u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid x_k.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash \&\llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket^\zeta, \dots, x_n : \&\llbracket \sigma_n \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta \rrbracket}$$

Therefore, $\llbracket \text{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_n} \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \&\llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket^\zeta, \dots, x_n : \&\llbracket \sigma_n \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta$ and the result follows.

(i) Rule [FS:sum]:

This case follows easily by IH. □

A.4.2 Completeness and Soundness

Theorem 2.17 (Consistency Stability Under \equiv) Let \mathbb{M} be a consistent $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\sharp}$ -expression. If $\mathbb{M} \equiv \mathbb{M}'$ then \mathbb{M}' is consistent.

Proof: By induction on the structure of \mathbb{M} . Let us consider first two conditions 1 and 2 as other conditions are analogous. The congruence rules that concern the sharing construct of condition 1 are:

$$\begin{aligned} M[\leftarrow x]\langle\langle 1/x \rangle\rangle &\equiv_{\lambda} M \\ MA[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle &\equiv_{\lambda} (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle)A \quad (*) \\ M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]\langle\langle A/y \rangle\rangle[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle &\equiv_{\lambda} (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle)[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]\langle\langle A/y \rangle\rangle \quad (**) \\ (*) \text{ with } x_i \in \tilde{x} \Rightarrow x_i \notin \text{fv}(A) &\quad (***) \text{ with } x_i \in \tilde{x} \Rightarrow x_i \notin \text{fv}(A) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that these rules neither add or remove occurrences of shared variables neither do they allow shared variables to be extruded from their bindings by their side conditions. Also, they do not introduce new sharing on already shared variables. Hence, conditions 1(i) to 1(iv) are preserved by these rules.

Now consider the congruence rules concerning the explicit substitution of condition 2:

$$\begin{aligned} MB\langle N/x \rangle &\equiv_{\lambda} (M\langle N/x \rangle)B \quad \text{with } x \notin \text{fv}(B) \\ M\langle N_2/y \rangle\langle N_1/x \rangle &\equiv_{\lambda} M\langle N_1/x \rangle\langle N_2/y \rangle \quad \text{with } x \notin \text{fv}(N_2), y \notin \text{fv}(N_1) \end{aligned}$$

As before, variables are not duplicated or eliminated from terms and by the side conditions of the rules they cannot extrude bound variables. Similarly, the rules do not introduce any sharing or new free variables. Hence conditions 2(i) to 2(iv) are satisfied. \square

Proposition 2.5.4 Suppose N is a well-formed, partially open $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\sharp}$ -term with $\text{head}(N) = x$. Then, there exist an index set I , names \tilde{y} and n , and processes P_i such that the following four conditions hold:

1.

$$\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow^* \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (\llbracket x \rrbracket_n^{\sharp} \mid P_i)$$

2. There exists a $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\sharp}$ -term N' such that $N \equiv_{\lambda} N'$ and:

$$\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (\llbracket x \rrbracket_n^{\sharp} \mid P_i)$$

3. For any well-formed and partially open $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\sharp}$ -term M :

$$\llbracket N\{M/x\} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow^* \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_n^{\sharp} \mid P_i)$$

4. There exists a $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\sharp}$ -term M' such that $M' \equiv_{\lambda} N\{M/x\}$ and:

$$\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_n^{\sharp} \mid P_i)$$

Proof: Let us consider each part:

1) We proceed by induction on the structure of N .

I) $N = x$.

Then $\llbracket x \rrbracket_u^{\sharp}$. Hence $I = \emptyset$ and $\tilde{y} = \emptyset$.

II) $N = (M B)$.

Then $\text{head}(M B) = \text{head}(M) = x$ and

$$\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\xi = \llbracket M B \rrbracket_u^\xi = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\xi \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\xi))$$

and the result follows by induction on $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\xi$.

III) $N = M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$. Not possible due to the assumption of partially open terms.

IV) $N = (M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y])\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$.

Then $\text{head}((M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y])\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle) = \text{head}((M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y])) = x$ when $\tilde{y} = \emptyset$, $B = 1$ and $\text{head}(M) = x$.

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\xi &= \llbracket (M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y])\langle\langle 1/y \rangle\rangle \rrbracket_u^\xi = (\nu y)(\llbracket M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \rrbracket_u^\xi \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_y^\xi) \\ &= (\nu y)(y.\overline{\text{some}}_{\tilde{y}}(z).(z.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; z.\overline{\text{close}}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\xi \mid y.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\ &\quad y.\text{some}_\emptyset; y(z).(z.\overline{\text{some}}; z.\overline{\text{close}} \mid y.\text{some}_\emptyset; y.\overline{\text{none}})) \\ &\longrightarrow^* \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\xi \end{aligned}$$

Then the result follows by induction on $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\xi$.

V) When $N = M\langle\langle N'/y \rangle\rangle$, then $\text{head}(M\langle\langle N'/y \rangle\rangle) = \text{head}(M) = x$ and

$$\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\xi = \llbracket M\langle\langle N'/y \rangle\rangle \rrbracket_u^\xi = (\nu y)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\xi \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^\xi)$$

Then true by induction on $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\xi$

2) In this case, notice how reductions are only introduced when N has sub-term $(M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y])\langle\langle 1/y \rangle\rangle$ from case 1(IV), however from the congruence of Fig. 2.18 we may rewrite this sub-term to be M which eliminates the need for reductions. Inductively, performing this application of \equiv_λ provides the result.

3) This case is similar to the first, with the clear difference that linear head substitution must also be used. However, we can inductively push the linear head substitution inside the term to reach the head variable. Consider the base case when $N = x$ and we have some well-formed partially open term M . Then $\llbracket N\{M/x\} \rrbracket_u^\xi = \llbracket x\{M/x\} \rrbracket_u^\xi = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\xi$. Hence $I = \emptyset$ and $\tilde{y} = \emptyset$ matching that of case 1(i).

Next, let us consider the case of $N\{M/x\} = M'\langle\langle N'/y \rangle\rangle\{M/x\} = M'\{M/x\}\langle\langle N'/y \rangle\rangle$. By considering 1(V) we can see the evaluating the translation of creates the same process shape up to linear head substitution. Other cases follow analogously.

4) This is a consequence of both (2) and (3). □

Notation A.4.1 We use the notation $\text{fv}(M).\overline{\text{none}}$ and $\tilde{x}.\overline{\text{none}}$ where $\text{fv}(M)$ or \tilde{x} are equal to x_1, \dots, x_k to describe a process of the form $x_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid x_k.\overline{\text{none}}$

Theorem 2.18 (Operational Completeness) Let \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{M} be well-formed, partially open $\widehat{\lambda}_\oplus^\xi$ expressions. If $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$ then there exist Q and \mathbb{M}' such that $\mathbb{M}' \equiv_\lambda \mathbb{M}$, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\xi \longrightarrow^* Q = \llbracket \mathbb{M}' \rrbracket_u^\xi$.

Proof: By induction on the reduction rule applied to infer $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$. We have five cases.

1. Case [RS:Beta]:

Then $\mathbb{N} = (\lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B \rightarrow M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle = \mathbb{M}$.

On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \llbracket (\lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B \rrbracket_u^\sharp \\
&= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v)(\llbracket \lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).(\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\
&= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v)(v.\overline{\text{some}}; v(x). \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid \\
&\quad v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).(\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\
&\rightarrow \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v)(v(x). \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid \bar{v}(x).(\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\
&\rightarrow \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v, x)(\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp \mid [v \leftrightarrow u]) \\
&\rightarrow \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu x)(\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp)
\end{aligned} \tag{A.27}$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu x)(\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \tag{A.28}$$

Therefore, by (A.27) and (A.28) the result follows.

2. Case [RS:Ex-Sub]:

Then $N = M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$, with $B = \{N_1, \dots, N_k\}$, $k \geq 1$ and $M \neq \text{fail}^{\tilde{v}}$. The reduction is

$$\mathbb{N} = M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \rightarrow \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} M \langle\langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle\rangle \cdots \langle\langle B_i(k)/x_k \rangle\rangle = \mathbb{M}.$$

We detail the encodings of $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp$. To simplify the proof, we will consider $k = 1$ (the case $k > 1$ follows analogously).

On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \llbracket M[x_1 \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu x)(\llbracket M[x_1 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \\
&= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu x)(x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; \\
&\quad x.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M) \setminus x_1}; x(x_1).x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_2.\text{close}; \\
&\quad \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; x(y_1).x.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(B_i(1))}; x.\overline{\text{some}}; \\
&\quad \bar{x}(x_1).(x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y_2). \\
&\quad (y_2.\overline{\text{some}}; y_2.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}}))) \\
&\rightarrow^* \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu x, y_1, x_1, y_2)(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \\
&\quad y_2.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_2.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid y_2.\overline{\text{some}}; y_2.\overline{\text{close}} \mid \\
&\quad x.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp) \\
&\rightarrow^* \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu x_1)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp)
\end{aligned} \tag{A.29}$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \llbracket \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} M \langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} \llbracket M \langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp \\ &= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu x_1) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.30})$$

Therefore, by (A.29) and (A.30) the result follows.

3. Case [RS:Lin-Fetch]:

Then we have $\mathbb{N} = M \langle N'/x \rangle$ with $\text{head}(M) = x$ and $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow M\{N'/x\} = \mathbb{M}$.

On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \llbracket M \langle N'/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp = (\nu x) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \\ &\rightarrow^* (\nu x) (\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (\llbracket x \rrbracket_j^\sharp \mid P_i) \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \quad (*) \\ &= (\nu x) (\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (\llbracket x \rrbracket_j^\sharp \mid P_i) \mid x.\text{some}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \\ &\rightarrow (\nu x) (\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (\llbracket x \leftrightarrow j \rrbracket \mid P_i) \mid \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \\ &\rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (P_i \mid \llbracket N' \rrbracket_j^\sharp) = \mathcal{Q} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.31})$$

where the reductions denoted by $(*)$ are inferred via Proposition 2.5.4.

On the other hand, we have by Proposition 2.5.4 :

$$\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \llbracket M\{N'/x\} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \rightarrow^* \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (P_i \mid \llbracket N' \rrbracket_j^\sharp) \quad (\text{A.32})$$

We also have by Proposition 2.5.4 and (A.32) that there exists M' such that $M' \equiv_\lambda M\{N'/x\}$ with:

$$\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (P_i \mid \llbracket N' \rrbracket_j^\sharp) \quad (\text{A.33})$$

Therefore, by (A.31) and (A.33) the result follows.

4. Case [RS:TCont] and [RS:ECont]: These cases follow by IH.

5. Case [RS:Fail]:

Then, $\mathbb{N} = M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B \rangle / x \rangle$ with $k \neq \text{size}(B)$ and

$$\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} = \mathbb{M},$$

where $\tilde{y} = (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}) \cup \text{fv}(B)$.

Let us assume that $k > l$ and we proceed similarly for $k < l$. Hence $k = l + m$ for some $m \geq 1$.

On the one hand, we have (A.34), this can be seen in Fig. A.1.

On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \llbracket \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} \llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \\ &= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}) \cup \text{fv}(B).\overline{\text{none}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.35})$$

Therefore, by (A.34) and (A.35) the result follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \llbracket M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp \\
&= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\forall x) (\llbracket M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \\
&= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\forall x) (x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\})}); \\
&\quad x(x_1) \dots x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_k).(y_k.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_k.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_k\})}); \\
&\quad x(x_k).x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(y_{k+1}).(y_{k+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_{k+1}.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \dots) \\
&\quad \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B)}; x(y_1).x.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(B)}; x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(x_1).(x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \\
&\quad \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(l))}; x(y_l).x.\text{some}_{y_l, \text{fv}(B_i(l))}; x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(x_l).(x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(l))}; \\
&\quad \llbracket B_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\sharp \mid y_l.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{some}}; y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}})) \\
\longrightarrow^* &\bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\forall x, y_1, x_1, \dots, y_l, x_l) (y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid \dots \mid y_l.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_l.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \\
&\quad x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_{l+1}.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_{l+1}, \dots, x_k\})}); \\
&\quad x(x_{l+1}) \dots x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_k).(y_k.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_k.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_k\})}; x(x_k) \cdot \\
&\quad x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(y_{k+1}).(y_{k+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_{k+1}.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \dots) \mid \\
&\quad x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid \dots \mid x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(l))}; \llbracket B_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\sharp \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid y_l.\overline{\text{none}} \\
&\quad x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{some}}; y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}})) \\
\longrightarrow^* &\bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\forall x, x_1, \dots, x_l) (x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_{l+1}, \dots, x_k\})}; x(x_{l+1}) \cdot \dots \\
&\quad x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_k).(y_k.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_k.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_k\})}; x(x_k) \cdot \\
&\quad x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(y_{k+1}).(y_{k+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_{k+1}.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\
&\quad x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid \dots \mid x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(l))}; \llbracket B_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
\longrightarrow &\bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\forall x_1, \dots, x_l) (u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid x_l.\overline{\text{none}} \mid (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}).\overline{\text{none}} \mid \\
&\quad x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid \dots \mid x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(l))}; \llbracket B_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\sharp) \\
\longrightarrow^* &\bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}) \cup \text{fv}(B).\overline{\text{none}}
\end{aligned} \tag{A.34}$$

Figure A.1: Reductions of an encoded explicit substitution

6. Case $[\text{RS:Cons}_1]$:

Then, $\mathbb{N} = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} B$ with $B = \{N_1, \dots, N_k\}$ and $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \cup \tilde{y}} = \mathbb{M}$, where $\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(B)$.

On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x}} B \rrbracket_u^\sharp \\
&= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v) (\llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp)) \\
&= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v) (v.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid \tilde{x}.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp)) \\
&\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} u.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid \tilde{x}.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid \tilde{y}.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \\
&= \bigoplus_{\text{PER}(B)} u.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid \tilde{x}.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid \tilde{y}.\overline{\mathbf{none}}
\end{aligned} \tag{A.36}$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \llbracket \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x} \cup \tilde{y}} \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{\text{PER}(B)} \llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x} \cup \tilde{y}} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \\
&= \bigoplus_{\text{PER}(B)} u.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid \tilde{x}.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid \tilde{y}.\overline{\mathbf{none}}
\end{aligned} \tag{A.37}$$

Therefore, by (A.36) and (A.37) the result follows.

7. Cases [RS:Cons₂] and [RS:Cons₃]: These cases follow by IH similarly to Case 7.

□

Theorem 2.19 (Operational Soundness) *Let \mathbb{N} be a well-formed, partially open $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^\sharp$ expression. If $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \longrightarrow^* Q$ then there exist Q' and \mathbb{N}' such that $Q \longrightarrow^* Q'$, $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^* \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^\sharp = Q'$.*

Proof: By induction on the structure of \mathbb{N} and then induction on the number of reductions of $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^* Q$

1) $\mathbb{N} = x$, $\mathbb{N} = \mathbf{fail}^0$ and $\mathbb{N} = \lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])$.

These cases are trivial since no reduction can take place.

2) $\mathbb{N} = (M B)$.

Then,

$$\llbracket (M B) \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp))$$

and we are able to perform the reductions from $\llbracket (M B) \rrbracket_u^\sharp$.

We now proceed by induction on k , with $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \longrightarrow^k Q$.

The interesting case is when $k \geq 1$ (the case $k = 0$ is trivial).

Then, for some process R and n, m such that $k = n + m$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).(\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\
&\longrightarrow^m \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v) (R \mid v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).(\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\
&\longrightarrow^n Q
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the first $m \geq 0$ reduction steps are internal to $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\sharp$; type preservation in $\mathfrak{s}\pi$ ensures that, if they occur, these reductions do not discard the possibility of synchronizing with $v.\mathbf{some}$.

Then, the first of the $n \geq 0$ reduction steps towards Q is a synchronization between R and $v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \mathbf{fv}(B)}$.

We consider two sub-cases, depending on the values of m and n :

I) When $m = 0$ and $n \geq 1$:

Thus $R = \llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\dagger$, and there are two possibilities of having an unguarded $v.\overline{\mathbf{some}}$ or $v.\overline{\mathbf{none}}$ without internal reductions. By the diamond property (Proposition 2.3.1) we will be reducing each non-deterministic choice of a process simultaneously. Then we have the following for each case:

A) $M = (\lambda x.M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \quad (p \geq 0)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\dagger &= \llbracket (\lambda x.M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \rrbracket_v^\dagger \\ &= (v\tilde{y})(\llbracket (\lambda x.M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \rrbracket_v^\dagger \mid y_1.\mathbf{some}_{\mathbf{fv}(N_1)}; \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket_{y_1}^\dagger \mid \cdots \\ &\quad \mid y_p.\mathbf{some}_{\mathbf{fv}(N_p)}; \llbracket N_p \rrbracket_{y_p}^\dagger) \\ &= (v\tilde{y})(\llbracket (\lambda x.M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \rrbracket_v^\dagger \mid Q''), \text{ for } \tilde{y} = y_1, \dots, y_p \\ &= (v\tilde{y})(v.\overline{\mathbf{some}}; v(x).\llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^\dagger \mid Q'') \end{aligned}$$

where $Q'' = y_1.\mathbf{some}_{\mathbf{fv}(N_1)}; \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket_{y_1}^\dagger \mid \cdots \mid y_p.\mathbf{some}_{\mathbf{fv}(N_p)}; \llbracket N_p \rrbracket_{y_p}^\dagger$.

With this shape for M , the encoding of \mathbb{N} becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\dagger &= \llbracket (M B) \rrbracket_u^\dagger \\ &= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (v\nu)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\dagger \mid v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \mathbf{fv}(B)}; \bar{\nu}(x).(\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\dagger \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\ &= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (v\nu)((v\tilde{y})(v.\overline{\mathbf{some}}; v(x).\llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^\dagger \mid Q'') \mid \\ &\quad v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \mathbf{fv}(B)}; \bar{\nu}(x).(\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\dagger \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\ &\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (v\nu, \tilde{y})(v(x).\llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^\dagger \mid \bar{\nu}(x).(\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\dagger \mid [v \leftrightarrow u]) \mid Q'') = Q_1 \\ &\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (v\nu, \tilde{y}, x)(\llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^\dagger \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\dagger \mid [v \leftrightarrow u] \mid Q'') = Q_2 \\ &\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (v\nu, \tilde{y})(\llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\dagger \mid Q'') = Q_3 \end{aligned}$$

We also have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{N} &= (\lambda x.M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle B \\ &\equiv_\lambda ((\lambda x.M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B) \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \\ &\longrightarrow M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle = \mathbb{M} \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_v^\dagger &= \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \rrbracket_v^\dagger \\ &= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (v\nu)(\llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^\dagger \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\dagger \mid Q'') \end{aligned}$$

We consider different possibilities for $n \geq 1$; in all of the thesis holds:

i) $n = 1$:

Then $Q = Q_1$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\neq} \rightarrow^1 Q_1$. In addition,

$$[a] \quad Q_1 \rightarrow^2 Q_3 = Q',$$

$$[b] \quad \mathbb{N} \rightarrow^1 M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle = \mathbb{N}',$$

$$[c] \quad \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u^{\neq} = Q_3.$$

and the result follows.

ii) $n = 2$:

Then $Q = Q_2$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\neq} \rightarrow^2 Q_2$. In addition,

$$\bullet \quad Q_2 \rightarrow^1 Q_3 = Q',$$

$$\bullet \quad \mathbb{N} \rightarrow^1 M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle = \mathbb{N}'$$

$$\bullet \quad \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u^{\neq} = Q_3$$

and the result follows.

iii) $n \geq 3$:

Then $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\neq} \rightarrow^3 Q_3 \rightarrow^l Q$, for $l \geq 0$. In addition, $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow M'$ and $Q_3 = \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u^{\neq}$. By the IH, there exist Q' and \mathbb{N}' such that $Q \rightarrow^i Q'$, $M' \rightarrow_{\equiv \lambda}^j \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^{\neq} = Q'$. Finally, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\neq} \rightarrow^3 Q_3 \rightarrow^l Q \rightarrow^i Q'$ and $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow M' \rightarrow_{\equiv \lambda}^j \mathbb{N}'$, and the result follows.

B) $M = \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{z}}$.

$$\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\neq} = \llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \rrbracket_v^{\neq} = v.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid \tilde{z}.\overline{\mathbf{none}}$$

With this shape for M , the encoding of \mathbb{N} becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\neq} &= \llbracket (M B) \rrbracket_u^{\neq} \\ &= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (v\nu)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\neq} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{\nu}(x).(\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^{\neq} \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\ &= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (v\nu)(v.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid \tilde{z}.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{\nu}(x).(\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^{\neq} \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\ &\rightarrow \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} u.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid \tilde{z}.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid \text{fv}(B).\overline{\mathbf{none}} \\ &= \bigoplus_{\text{PER}(B)} u.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid \tilde{z}.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid \text{fv}(B).\overline{\mathbf{none}} \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\mathbb{N} = \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{z}} B \rightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{z} \cup \text{fv}(B)} = \mathbb{M}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\neq} &= \llbracket \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{z} \cup \text{fv}(B)} \rrbracket_u^{\neq} \\ &= \bigoplus_{\text{PER}(B)} \llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{z} \cup \text{fv}(B)} \rrbracket_u^{\neq} \\ &= \bigoplus_{\text{PER}(B)} u.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid \tilde{z}.\overline{\mathbf{none}} \mid \text{fv}(B).\overline{\mathbf{none}} \end{aligned}$$

II) When $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$, the distinguish two cases:

A) $n = 0$:

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (v\nu)(R \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{\nu}(x).(\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^{\neq} \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) &= Q, \\ \text{and } \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\neq} &\rightarrow^m R. \end{aligned}$$

By the IH there exist R' and M' such that $R \rightarrow^i R'$, $M \rightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^j M'$, and $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u^\sharp = R'$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x). (\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\ &\rightarrow^m \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v) (R \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x). (\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) = Q \\ &\rightarrow^i \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v) (R' \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x). (\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) = Q' \end{aligned}$$

and so the $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^\sharp$ term can reduce as follows: $\mathbb{N} = (M B) \rightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^j M' B = \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^\sharp = Q'$.

B) $n \geq 1$:

Then R has an occurrence of an unguarded $v.\overline{\text{some}}$ or $v.\overline{\text{none}}$, which implies it is of the form $\llbracket (\lambda x. M' [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle N_1 / y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p / y_p \rangle \rrbracket_v^\sharp$ or $\llbracket \text{fail} \rrbracket_v^\sharp$, and the case follows by IH.

This concludes the analysis for the case $\mathbb{N} = (M B)$.

3) $\mathbb{N} = M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$.

The sharing variable x is not free and the result follows by vacuity.

4) $\mathbb{N} = (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$. Then,

$$\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \llbracket (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu x) (\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp)$$

D) $\text{size}(\tilde{x}) = \text{size}(B)$.

Then let us consider the shape of the bag B .

A) When $B = 1$

We have the following

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= (\nu x) (\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \\ &= (\nu x) (x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_i). (y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_i.\overline{\text{close}}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\ &\quad x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y_n). (y_n.\overline{\text{some}}; y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}})) \\ &\rightarrow (\nu x) (\bar{x}(y_i). (y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_i.\overline{\text{close}}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\ &\quad x(y_n). (y_n.\overline{\text{some}}; y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}})) = Q_1 \\ &\rightarrow (\nu x, y_i) (y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_i.\overline{\text{close}}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}} \mid y_n.\overline{\text{some}}; \\ &\quad y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}}) = Q_2 \\ &\rightarrow (\nu x, y_i) (y_i.\overline{\text{close}}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}} \mid y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}}) = Q_3 \\ &\rightarrow (\nu x) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\text{some}_\emptyset; x.\overline{\text{none}}) = Q_4 \\ &\rightarrow \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp = Q_5 \end{aligned}$$

Notice how Q_2 has a choice however the x name can be closed at any time so for simplicity we only perform communication across this name once all other names have completed their reductions.

Now proceed by induction on the number of reductions $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \rightarrow^k Q$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \llbracket (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp \\
&= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\forall x) (\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \\
&= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\forall x) (x.\overline{\text{some}}.\tilde{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus x_1, \dots, x_l)}; \\
&\quad x(x_1) \dots x.\overline{\text{some}}.\tilde{x}(y_l).(y_l.\text{some}_0; y_l.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus x_l)}; x(x_l). \\
&\quad x.\overline{\text{some}}; \tilde{x}(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_{l+1}.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \dots) \mid \\
&\quad x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B)}; x(y_1).x.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(B)}; x.\overline{\text{some}}; \tilde{x}(x_1).(x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \\
&\quad \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(l))}; x(y_l).x.\text{some}_{y_l, \text{fv}(B_i(l))}; x.\overline{\text{some}}; \tilde{x}(x_l).(x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(l))}; \\
&\quad \llbracket B_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\sharp \mid y_l.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\text{some}_0; x(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{some}}; y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_0; x.\overline{\text{none}})) \\
&\rightarrow^{5l} \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\forall x, x_1, y_1, \dots, x_l, y_l) (y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid \dots y_l.\text{some}_0; y_l.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid \\
&\quad x.\overline{\text{some}}; \tilde{x}(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_{l+1}.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\
&\quad x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(l))}; \llbracket B_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\sharp \mid y_l.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \\
&\quad x.\text{some}_0; x(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{some}}; y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_0; x.\overline{\text{none}})) \\
&\rightarrow^5 \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\forall x, y_1, \dots, x_l, y_l) (y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid \dots y_l.\text{some}_0; y_l.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \\
&\quad \mid \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(l))}; \llbracket B_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\sharp \mid y_l.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
&\rightarrow^l \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\forall x_1, \dots, x_l) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid \dots \mid x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(l))}; \llbracket B_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\sharp) \\
&= Q_{6l+5}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure A.2: Reductions of encoded explicit substitution

- i) $k = 0$:
This case is trivial.
- ii) $k = 1$: ($2 \leq k \leq 4$: is similar.)
Then, $Q = Q_1$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \rightarrow^1 Q_1$. In addition, $Q_1 \rightarrow^4 Q_5 = Q'$, $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow^0 M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle \equiv_\lambda M$ and $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp = Q_5$, and the result follows.
- iii) $k \geq 5$:
Then $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \rightarrow^5 Q_5 \rightarrow^l Q$, for $l \geq 0$. Since $Q_5 = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp$, by the IH it follows that there exist Q' and \mathbb{N}' such that $Q \rightarrow^i Q'$, $M \rightarrow^j \equiv_\lambda \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^\sharp = Q'$. Then, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \rightarrow^5 Q_5 \rightarrow^l Q \rightarrow^i Q'$ and by the contextual reduction one has $\mathbb{N} = (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle \rightarrow^j \equiv_\lambda \mathbb{N}'$ and the case holds.
- B) $B = \{N_1, \dots, N_l\}$, for $l \geq 1$.
Then, consider the reductions in Fig. A.2.
The proof follows by induction on the number of reductions $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \rightarrow^k Q$.
- i) $k = 0$:
This case is trivial. Take $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp = Q = Q'$ and $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}'$.
- ii) $1 \leq k \leq 6l + 5$:

Then, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \rightarrow^k Q_k$. Observing the reductions in Fig. A.2, one has $Q_k \rightarrow^{6l+5-k} Q_{6l+5} = Q'$,
 $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow^1 \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} M \langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle B_i(l)/x_l \rangle = \mathbb{N}'$ and
 $\llbracket \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} M \langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle B_i(l)/x_l \rangle \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q_{6l+5}$, and the result follows.

iii) $k > 6l + 5$:

Then, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \rightarrow^{6l+5} Q_{6l+5} \rightarrow^n Q$, for $n \geq 1$. In addition,
 $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow^1 \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} M \langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle B_i(l)/x_l \rangle$ and
 $Q_{6l+5} = \llbracket \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} M \langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle B_i(l)/x_l \rangle \rrbracket_u^{\sharp}$. By the IH there exist
 Q' and \mathbb{N}' such that $Q \rightarrow^i Q'$,

$$\sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} M \langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle B_i(l)/x_l \rangle \rightarrow_{\equiv_{\lambda}}^j \mathbb{N}'$$

and $\llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q'$. Finally,

$$\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \rightarrow^{6l+5} Q_{6l+5} \rightarrow^n Q \rightarrow^i Q' \text{ and}$$

$$\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} M \langle B_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle B_i(l)/x_l \rangle \rightarrow_{\equiv_{\lambda}}^j \mathbb{N}'.$$

II) $\text{size}(\tilde{x}) > \text{size}(B)$.

Then, $\mathbb{N} = M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle B/x \rangle$ with $B = \{N_1, \dots, N_l\}$, for $k > l$. Also,

$$\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} = \mathbb{M} \text{ and } \tilde{z} = (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}) \cup \text{fv}(B).$$

On the one hand, we have Fig. A.3. Hence $k = l + m$ for some $m \geq 1$

Now we proceed by induction on the number of reductions $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \rightarrow^j Q$.

A) $j = 0$:

This case is trivial.

B) $1 \leq j \leq 7l + 6$:

Then,

$$\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \rightarrow^j Q_j \rightarrow^{7l+6-j} Q_{7l+6} = Q', \mathbb{N} \rightarrow^1 \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} = \mathbb{N}' \text{ and}$$

$$\llbracket \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q_{7l+6}, \text{ and the result follows.}$$

C) $j > 7l + 6$:

Then, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \rightarrow^{7l+6} Q_{7l+6} \rightarrow^n Q$, for $n \geq 1$. Also, $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow^1 \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}}$.
 However no further reductions can be performed.

III) $\text{size}(\tilde{x}) < \text{size}(B)$.

Proceeds similarly to the previous case.

5) $\mathbb{N} = M \langle N'/x \rangle$.

Then,

$$\llbracket M \langle N'/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = (\nu x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\sharp})$$

Then we have

$$\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = (\nu x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\sharp})$$

$$\rightarrow^m (\nu x)(R \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\sharp})$$

$$\rightarrow^n Q$$

for some process R , where \rightarrow^n is a reduction that initially synchronizes with $x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}$ when $n \geq 1$, $n + m = k \geq 1$. Type preservation in $\text{s}\pi$ ensures reducing $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \rightarrow^m$ does not consume possible synchronizations with $x.\text{some}$ if they occur. Let us consider the the possible sizes of both m and n .

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\dagger &= \llbracket M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \rrbracket_u^\dagger \\
&= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\forall x) (\llbracket M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\dagger) \\
&= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\forall x) (x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\})}); \\
&\quad x(x_1) \dots x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_k).(y_k.\text{some}_0; y_k.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_k\})}); x(x_k). \\
&\quad x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(y_{k+1}).(y_{k+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_{k+1}.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \dots) \mid \\
&\quad x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B)}; x(y_1).x.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(B)}; x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(x_1).(x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\dagger \\
&\quad \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(l))}; x(y_l).x.\text{some}_{y_l, \text{fv}(B_i(l))}; x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(x_l).(x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(l))}); \\
&\quad \llbracket B_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\dagger \mid y_l.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\text{some}_0; x(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{some}}; y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_0; x.\overline{\text{none}})) \\
&\rightarrow^{5l} \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\forall x, y_1, x_1, \dots, y_l, x_l) (y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid \dots \mid y_l.\text{some}_0; y_l.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \\
&\quad x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\text{some}_0; y_{l+1}.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_{l+1}, \dots, x_k\})}); \\
&\quad x(x_{l+1}) \dots x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_k).(y_k.\text{some}_0; y_k.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_k\})}); x(x_k). \\
&\quad x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(y_{k+1}).(y_{k+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_{k+1}.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \dots) \mid \\
&\quad x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\dagger \mid \dots \mid x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(l))}; \llbracket B_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\dagger \mid \\
&\quad y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid y_l.\overline{\text{none}} \\
&\quad x.\text{some}_0; x(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{some}}; y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x.\text{some}_0; x.\overline{\text{none}})) \\
&\rightarrow^{l+5} \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\forall x, x_1, \dots, x_l) (x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_{l+1}, \dots, x_k\})}; x(x_{l+1}). \dots \\
&\quad x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}(y_k).(y_k.\text{some}_0; y_k.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}; x.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_k\})}); x(x_k). \\
&\quad x.\overline{\text{some}};\bar{x}(y_{k+1}).(y_{k+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_{k+1}.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\
&\quad x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\dagger \mid \dots \mid x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(l))}; \llbracket B_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\dagger \mid x.\overline{\text{none}}) \\
&\rightarrow \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\forall x_1, \dots, x_l) (u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid x_l.\overline{\text{none}} \mid (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}).\overline{\text{none}} \\
&\quad \mid x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\dagger \mid \dots \mid x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(l))}; \llbracket B_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\dagger) \\
&\rightarrow^l \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}).\overline{\text{none}} \mid \text{fv}(B).\overline{\text{none}} \\
&= \mathcal{Q}_{7l+6}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure A.3: Reductions of an encoded explicit substitution that leads to failure

I) For $m = 0$ and $n \geq 1$.

In this case $R = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\dagger$ and there are two possibilities of having an unguarded $x.\overline{\text{some}}$ or $x.\overline{\text{none}}$ without internal reductions.

A) $M = \text{fail}^{x, \tilde{y}}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= (\nu x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \\
&= (\nu x)(\llbracket \text{fail}^{x, \tilde{y}} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \\
&= (\nu x)(u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{y}.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \\
&\longrightarrow u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{y}.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \text{fv}(N').\overline{\text{none}}
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that no further reductions can be performed.

Thus,

$$\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \longrightarrow u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{y}.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \text{fv}(N').\overline{\text{none}} = Q'.$$

We also have that

$$\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \cup \text{fv}(N')} = N' \text{ and } \llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \cup \text{fv}(N')} \rrbracket_u^\sharp = Q',$$

and the result follows.

B) $\text{head}(M) = x$

By the diamond property (Proposition 2.3.1) we will be reducing each non-deterministic choice of a process simultaneously. Then by Proposition 2.5.4 we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp &\longrightarrow^* (\nu x)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(\llbracket x \rrbracket_j^\sharp \mid P_i) \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \\
&= (\nu x)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(x.\overline{\text{some}}; [x \leftrightarrow j] \mid P_i) \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \\
&\longrightarrow (\nu x)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})([x \leftrightarrow j] \mid P_i) \mid \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^\sharp) = Q_1 \\
&\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(\llbracket N' \rrbracket_j^\sharp \mid P_i) = Q_2
\end{aligned}$$

We also have that

$$\mathbb{N} = M\langle N'/x \rangle \longrightarrow M\{N'/x\} = M'.$$

where by Proposition 2.5.4 we obtain

$$\llbracket M\{N'/x\} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \longrightarrow^* \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(\llbracket N' \rrbracket_j^\sharp \mid P_i) = Q_2.$$

and finally from Proposition 2.5.4 there exists an \mathbb{M} with $\mathbb{M} \equiv_\lambda M'$ such that:

$$\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(\llbracket N' \rrbracket_j^\sharp \mid P_i) = Q_2.$$

for simplicity we assume that $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \longrightarrow Q_1$

- i) $n = 1$: Then $Q = Q_1$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \longrightarrow^1 Q_1$. Since, $Q_1 \longrightarrow^1 Q_2 = Q'$, $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow^1 M\{N'/x\} \equiv_\lambda \mathbb{M} = N'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp = Q_2$, the result follows.
- ii) $n \geq 2$: Then, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \longrightarrow^2 Q_2 \longrightarrow^l Q$, for $l \geq 0$. Also, $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$, $Q_2 = \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp$. By the IH there exist Q' and N' such that $Q \longrightarrow^i Q'$, $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^j N'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u^\sharp = Q'$. Finally, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \longrightarrow^2 Q_2 \longrightarrow^l Q \longrightarrow^i Q'$ and $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{M} \longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^j N'$, and the result follows.

II) For $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$.

A) $n = 0$:

Then,

$$(\nu x)(R \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^\xi) = Q \text{ and } \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\xi \longrightarrow^m R.$$

By the IH there exist R' and M' such that $R \longrightarrow^i R'$, $M \longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^j M'$ and $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u^\xi = R'$.

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\xi &= (\nu x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\xi \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^\xi) \\ &\longrightarrow^m (\nu x)(R \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^\xi) = Q. \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$Q \longrightarrow^i (\nu x)(R' \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^\xi) = Q'$$

and the term can reduce as follows:

$$\mathbb{N} = M \langle N' / x \rangle \longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^j \sum_{M'_i \in \mathbb{M}'} M'_i \langle N' / x \rangle = N' \text{ and } \llbracket N' \rrbracket_u^\xi = Q'.$$

B) When $n \geq 1$

Then R has an occurrence of an unguarded $x.\overline{\text{some}}$ or $x.\overline{\text{non}}$, and the case follows by IH. □

A.4.3 Success Sensitiveness

Proposition 2.5.5 (Preservation of Success) *The \checkmark at the head of a partially open term is preserved to an unguarded occurrence of \checkmark when applying the translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^\xi$ up to reductions and vice-versa. That is to say:*

1. $\forall M \in \widehat{\lambda}_\oplus^\xi : \text{head}(M) = \checkmark \implies \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\xi \longrightarrow^* (P \mid \checkmark) \oplus Q$
2. $\forall M \in \widehat{\lambda}_\oplus^\xi : \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\xi = (P \mid \checkmark) \oplus Q \implies \text{head}(M) = \checkmark$

Proof: In both cases, by induction on the structure of M .

1. We only need to consider terms of the following form:

- $M = \checkmark$.

This case is immediate.

- $M = N B$.

By definition, $\text{head}(N B) = \text{head}(N)$. Hence we consider that $\text{head}(N) = \checkmark$. Then,

$$\llbracket N B \rrbracket_u^\xi = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v)(\llbracket N \rrbracket_v^\xi \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\xi))$$

and by the IH \checkmark is unguarded in $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\xi$ after a sequence of reductions.

- $M = (N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$.

By definition, $\text{head}((N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle) = \text{head}(N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) = \text{head}(N) = \checkmark$ where $\tilde{x} = x_1, \dots, x_k$ and $\#(x, M) = \text{size}(B)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\xi &= \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu x)(\llbracket N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\xi \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\xi) \\ &\longrightarrow^* \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu \tilde{x})(\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\xi \mid x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; \\ &\quad \llbracket B_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\xi \mid \dots \mid x_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(k))}; \llbracket B_i(k) \rrbracket_{x_k}^\xi) \end{aligned}$$

and by the IH \checkmark is unguarded in $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\xi$ after a sequence of reductions.

- $M = M' \langle N/x \rangle$.

By definition, $\text{head}(M' \langle N/x \rangle) = \text{head}(M') \checkmark$. Then,

$$\llbracket M' \langle N/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp = (\text{vx})(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N)}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\sharp)$$

and by the IH \checkmark is unguarded in $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp$.

2. We only need to consider terms of the following form:

- $M = \checkmark$.

This case is trivial.

- $M = N B$.

Then,

$$\llbracket N B \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\text{vx})(\llbracket N \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp)).$$

The only occurrence of an unguarded \checkmark is within $\llbracket N \rrbracket_v^\sharp$. By the IH we have that $\text{head}(N) = \checkmark$ and finally $\text{head}(N B) = \text{head}(N)$.

- $M = (N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle B/x \rangle$.

Then,

$$\llbracket (N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle B/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\text{vx})(\llbracket N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp)$$

However in both $\llbracket N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp$ and $\llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp$ we have that both are guarded and hence \checkmark cannot occur without synchronizations.

- $M = M' \langle N/x \rangle$.

Then,

$$\llbracket M' \langle N/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp = (\text{vx})(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N)}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\sharp),$$

an unguarded occurrence of \checkmark can only occur within $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u^\sharp$. By the IH we have $\text{head}(M') = \checkmark$ and hence $\text{head}(M' \langle N/x \rangle) = \text{head}(M')$.

□

Theorem 2.20 (Success Sensitivity) *Let \mathbb{M} be a closed well-formed $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^\sharp$ -expression. Then,*

$$\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark} \iff \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \Downarrow_{\checkmark}.$$

Proof: We proceed with the proof in two parts.

1) Suppose that $\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$. We will prove that $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$.

By Def. 2.27, there exists $\mathbb{M}' = M_1 + \dots + M_k$ such that $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow^* \mathbb{M}'$ and with $\text{head}(M_j) = \checkmark$, for some $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. By completeness there exists Q such that $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \longrightarrow^* Q = \llbracket \mathbb{M}' \rrbracket_u^\sharp$.

We wish to show that there exists Q' such that $Q \longrightarrow^* Q'$ and Q' has an unguarded occurrence of \checkmark .

Since $Q = \llbracket \mathbb{M}' \rrbracket_u^\sharp$ and due to compositionality and the homomorphic preservation of non-determinism, we have that

$$Q = \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_u^\sharp \oplus \dots \oplus \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_u^\sharp$$

By Proposition 2.5.5 (1) we have that

$$\text{head}(M_j) = \checkmark \implies \llbracket M_j \rrbracket_u^\sharp \longrightarrow^* (P \mid \checkmark) \oplus Q''$$

for some Q'' . Hence, $Q \longrightarrow^* (P \mid \checkmark) \oplus Q'' = Q'$, as wanted.

2) Suppose that $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$. We will prove that $\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$.

By operational soundness (Theorem 2.19): if $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} \longrightarrow^* Q$ then there exist Q' and \mathbb{N}' such that $Q \longrightarrow^* Q'$, $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow_{\equiv_{\lambda}}^* \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} = Q'$. Since $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} \longrightarrow^* P_1 \oplus \dots \oplus P_k$, and $P_j = P'_j \mid \checkmark$, for some j .

Notice that if $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark}$ is itself a term with unguarded \checkmark , say $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} = P \mid \checkmark$, then \mathbb{M} is itself headed with \checkmark , from Proposition 2.5.2 (2).

In the case $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} = P_1 \oplus \dots \oplus P_k$, $k \geq 2$, and \checkmark occurs unguarded in an P_j , The encoding acts homomorphically over sums and the reasoning is similar. We have that $P_j = P'_j \mid \checkmark$ we apply Proposition 2.5.2 (2).

□

Appendix B

Appendix of Chapter 3

B.1 Appendix to § 3.2

B.1.1 Diamond Property for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$

Proposition B.1.1 (Diamond Property for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$) For all $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{N}_2$ in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$ s.t. $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}_2$ with $\mathbb{N}_1 \neq \mathbb{N}_2$ then $\exists \mathbb{M}$ s.t. $\mathbb{N}_1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{N}_2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$.

Proof: We give a short argument to convince the reader of this. Notice that an expression can only perform a choice of reduction steps when it is a nondeterministic sum of terms in which multiple terms can perform independent reductions. For simplicity sake we will only consider an expression \mathbb{N} that consist of two terms where $\mathbb{N} = N + M$. We also have that $N \longrightarrow N'$ and $M \longrightarrow M'$. Then we let $\mathbb{N}_1 = N' + M$ and $\mathbb{N}_2 = N + M'$ by the $[\mathbb{R} : \text{ECont}]$ rules. Finally we prove that \mathbb{M} exists by letting $\mathbb{M} = N' + M'$. \square

B.2 Appendix to § 3.3

Here we prove subject reduction (SR) for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$ (Theorem 3.1). It follows from two substitution lemmas: one for substituting a linear variable (Lemma B.2.1) and another for an unrestricted variable (Lemma B.2.2). Proofs of both lemmas are standard, by structural induction; we give a complete proof of SR in Theorem B.1.

Lemma B.2.1 (Linear Substitution Lemma for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$) If $\Theta; \Gamma, x : \sigma \models M : \tau$, $\text{head}(M) = x$, and $\Theta; \Delta \models N : \sigma$ then $\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models M\{N/x\}$.

Proof: By structural induction on M with $\text{head}(M) = x$. There are three cases to be analyzed:

1. $M = x$.

In this case, $\Theta; x : \sigma \models x : \sigma$ and $\Gamma = \emptyset$. Observe that $x\{N/x\} = N$, since $\Theta; \Delta \models N : \sigma$, by hypothesis, the result follows.

2. $M = M' B$.

In this case, $\text{head}(M' B) = \text{head}(M') = x$, and one has the following derivation:

$$[\mathbf{F}:\text{app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_1, x : \sigma \models M : (\delta^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Gamma_2 \models B : (\delta^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, x : \sigma \models M B : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$, δ is a strict type and j, k are non-negative integers, possibly different. By IH, we get $\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Delta \models M' \{N/x\} : (\delta^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau$, which gives the following derivation:

$$[\mathbf{F}:\text{app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Delta \models M' \{N/x\} : (\delta^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Gamma_2 \models B : (\delta^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Delta \models (M' \{N/x\}) B : \tau}$$

Therefore, from Def. 3.4, one has $\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Delta \models (M' \{N/x\}) B : \tau$, and the result follows.

3. $M = M' \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$.

In this case, $\text{head}(M' \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle) = \text{head}(M') = x$, with $x \neq y$, and one has the following derivation:

$$[\mathbf{F}:\text{ex-sub}] \frac{\Theta, y' : \eta; \Gamma_1, \hat{y} : \delta^k, x : \sigma \models M : \tau \quad \Theta; \Gamma_2 \models B : (\delta^j, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, x : \sigma \models M' \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$, δ is a strict type and j, k are positive integers. By IH, we get $\Theta, y' : \eta; \Gamma_1, \hat{y} : \delta^k, \Delta \models M' \{N/x\} : \tau$ and

$$[\mathbf{F}:\text{ex-sub}] \frac{\Theta, y' : \eta; \Gamma_1, \hat{y} : \delta^k, \Delta \models M' \{N/x\} : \tau \quad \Theta; \Gamma_2 \models B : (\delta^j, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Delta \models M' \{N/x\} \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

From Def. 3.4, $M' \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle \{N/x\} = M' \{N/x\} \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$, therefore, $\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models (M' \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle) \{N/x\} : \tau$ and the result follows. \square

Lemma B.2.2 (Unrestricted Substitution Lemma for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{1/2}$) *If $\Theta, x' : \eta; \Gamma \models M : \tau$, $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$, $\eta_i = \sigma$, and $\Theta; \cdot \models N : \sigma$ then $\Theta, x' : \eta; \Gamma \models M \{N/x[i]\}$.*

Proof: By structural induction on M with $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$. There are three cases to be analyzed:

1. $M = x[i]$.

In this case,

$$\frac{[\mathbf{F}:\text{var}^\ell]}{\Theta, x' : \eta; x : \eta_i \models x : \sigma} \quad [\mathbf{F}:\text{var}^1] \frac{}{\Theta, x' : \eta; \cdot \models x[i] : \sigma}$$

and $\Gamma = \emptyset$. Observe that $x[i] \{N/x[i]\} = N$, since $\Theta, x' : \eta; \Gamma \models M \{N/x[i]\}$, by hypothesis, the result follows.

2. $M = M' B$.

In this case, $\text{head}(M' B) = \text{head}(M') = x[i]$, and one has the following derivation:

$$[\mathbf{F}:\text{app}] \frac{\Theta, x' : \eta; \Gamma_1 \models M' : (\delta^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta, x' : \sigma; \Gamma_2 \models B : (\delta^k, \varepsilon') \quad \varepsilon \sim \varepsilon'}{\Theta, x' : \eta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \models M' B : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$, δ is a strict type and j, k are non-negative integers, possibly different.

By IH, we get $\Theta, x' : \eta; \Gamma_1 \models M' \{N/x[i]\} : (\delta^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau$, which gives the following derivation:

$$[\mathbf{F}:\text{app}] \frac{\Theta, x' : \eta; \Gamma_1 \models M' \{N/x[i]\} : (\delta^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta, x' : \eta; \Gamma_2 \models B : (\delta^k, \varepsilon') \quad \varepsilon \sim \varepsilon'}{\Theta, x' : \eta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \models (M' \{N/x[i]\}) B : \tau}$$

From Def. 3.4, one has $\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \models (M' \{N/x[i]\})B : \tau$, and the result follows.

3. $M = M' \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$.

In this case, $\text{head}(M' \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle) = \text{head}(M') = x[i]$, with $x \neq y$, and one has the following derivation:

$$[\text{F:ex-sub}] \frac{\Theta, y^1 : \varepsilon, x : \eta; \Gamma_1, \hat{y} : \delta^k \models M : \tau \quad \Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma_2 \models B : (\delta^j, \varepsilon') \quad \varepsilon \sim \varepsilon'}{\Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \models M' \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$, δ is a strict type and j, k are positive integers. By IH, we get $\Theta, y^1 : \varepsilon, x : \eta; \Gamma_1, \hat{y} : \delta^k \models M' \{N/x[i]\} : \tau$ and

$$[\text{F:ex-sub}] \frac{\Theta, y^1 : \varepsilon, x : \eta; \Gamma_1, \hat{y} : \delta^k \models M' \{N/x[i]\} : \tau \quad \Theta, x : \sigma; \Gamma_2 \models B : (\delta^j, \varepsilon') \quad \varepsilon \sim \varepsilon'}{\Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \models M' \{N/x[i]\} \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

Then, $M' \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle \{N/x[i]\} = M' \{N/x[i]\} \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$, and the result follows. \square

Theorem B.1 (SR in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{1/2}$) *If $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ and $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}'$ then $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M}' : \tau$.*

Proof: By structural induction on the reduction rules. We proceed by analysing the rule applied in \mathbb{M} . There are seven cases:

1. **Rule [R : Beta].**

Then $\mathbb{M} = (\lambda x.M)B \longrightarrow M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle = \mathbb{M}'$. Since $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$, one has the derivation:

$$[\text{F:abs}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', \hat{x} : \sigma^j \models M : \tau}{\Theta; \Gamma' \models \lambda x.M : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau} \quad [\text{F:app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma' \models \lambda x.M : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models (\lambda x.M)B : \tau}$$

for $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. Notice that

$$[\text{F:ex-sub}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', \hat{x} : \sigma^j \models M : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models M \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

Therefore, $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M}' : \tau$ and the result follows.

2. **Rule [R : Fetch^ℓ].**

Then $\mathbb{M} = M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle$, where $C = \lambda N_1 \dots \lambda N_k$, $k \geq 1$, $\#(x, M) = k$ and $\text{head}(M) = x$. The reduction applying the [R : Fetch^ℓ] rule is as:

$$\frac{\text{head}(M) = x \quad C = \lambda N_1 \dots \lambda N_k, \quad k \geq 1 \quad \#(x, M) = k}{M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow M \{N_1/x\} \langle\langle (C \setminus N_1) * U/x \rangle\rangle + \dots + M \{N_k/x\} \langle\langle (C \setminus N_k) * U/x \rangle\rangle}$$

To simplify the proof we take $k = 2$, as the case $k > 2$ is similar. Therefore, $c = \lambda N_1 \dots \lambda N_2$ and applying rule [F:ex-sub] we obtain:

$$\frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', \hat{x} : \sigma^2 \models M : \tau \quad [\text{F:bag}] \frac{\Theta; \cdot \models U : \varepsilon \quad \Theta; \Delta \models \lambda N_1 \dots \lambda N_2 : \sigma^2}{\Theta; \Delta \models C * U : (\sigma^2, \varepsilon)} \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle : \tau} \quad \Pi$$

with Π the derivation

$$[\mathbf{F}: \text{bag}^\ell] \frac{\Theta; \Delta_1 \models N_1 : \sigma \quad [\mathbf{F}: \text{bag}^\ell] \frac{\Theta; \Delta_2 \models N_2 : \sigma \quad [\mathbf{F}: 1^\ell] \overline{\Theta; - \models 1 : \omega}}{\Theta; \Delta_2 \models \lambda N_2 \int : \sigma}}{\Theta; \Delta \models \lambda N_1 \int \cdot \lambda N_2 \int : \sigma^2}$$

where $\Delta = \Delta_1, \Delta_2$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. By Lemma B.2.1, there exist derivations Π_1 of $\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma', x : \sigma, \Delta_1 \models M\{N_1/x\} : \tau$ and Π_2 of $\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma', x : \sigma, \Delta_2 \models M\{N_2/x\} : \tau$. Therefore, one has the following derivation where we omit the second case of the sum:

$$[\mathbf{F}: \text{sum}] \frac{[\mathbf{F}: \text{ex-sub}] \frac{\Pi_1 \quad [\mathbf{F}: \text{bag}] \frac{\Theta; \cdot \models U : \varepsilon \quad \Theta; \Delta \models \lambda N_2 \int : \sigma}{\Theta; \Delta \models \lambda N_2 \int * U : (\sigma, \varepsilon)}}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta_1 \models M\{N_1/x\} \langle \langle \lambda N_2 \int * U/x \rangle \rangle : \tau} \quad \vdots}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M\{N_1/x\} \langle \langle \lambda N_2 \int * U/x \rangle \rangle + M\{N_2/x\} \langle \langle \lambda N_1 \int * U/x \rangle \rangle : \tau}$$

Assuming $\mathbb{M}' = M\{N_1/x\} \langle \langle \lambda N_2 \int * B^! /x \rangle \rangle + M\{N_2/x\} \langle \langle \lambda N_1 \int * B^! /x \rangle \rangle$, the result follows.

3. **Rule** $[\mathbf{R}: \text{Fetch}^!]$.

Then $\mathbb{M} = M \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle$, where $U = \lambda N_1 \int^! \diamond \dots \diamond \lambda N_i \int^!$ and $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$. The reduction is as:

$$[\mathbf{R}: \text{Fetch}^!] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x[i] \quad U_i = \lambda N_i \int^!}{M \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow M\{N_i/x[i]\} \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle}$$

By hypothesis, one has the derivation:

$$[\mathbf{F}: \text{ex-sub}] \frac{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma', \hat{x} : \sigma^j \models M : \tau \quad \frac{\Pi \quad [\mathbf{F}: \text{bag}] \frac{\Theta; \cdot \models U : \varepsilon \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C : \sigma^k}{\Theta; \Delta \models C * U : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon)} \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle : \tau}}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle : \tau}$$

Where Π has the form

$$[\mathbf{F}: \diamond \text{bag}^!] \frac{[\mathbf{F}: \text{bag}^!] \frac{\Theta; \cdot \models N_1 : \varepsilon_1}{\Theta; \cdot \models \lambda N_1 \int^! : \varepsilon_1} \quad \dots \quad [\mathbf{F}: \text{bag}^!] \frac{\Theta; \cdot \models N_i : \varepsilon_i}{\Theta; \cdot \models \lambda N_i \int^! : \varepsilon_i}}{\Theta; \cdot \models \lambda N_1 \int^! \diamond \dots \diamond \lambda N_i \int^! : \varepsilon}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. Notice that if $\varepsilon_i = \delta$ and $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ then $\eta_i = \delta$. By Lemma B.2.2, there exists a derivation Π_1 of $\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma', \hat{x} : \sigma^j \models M\{N_i/x[i]\} : \tau$. Therefore, one has the following derivation applying rule $[\mathbf{F}: \text{ex-sub}]$:

$$\frac{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma', \hat{x} : \sigma^j \models M\{N_i/x[i]\} : \tau \quad [\mathbf{F}: \text{bag}] \frac{\Theta; \cdot \models U : \varepsilon \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C : \sigma^k}{\Theta; \Delta \models C * U : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon)} \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M\{N_i/x[i]\} \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle : \tau}$$

4. **Rule** $[\mathbf{R}: \text{Fail}^\ell]$.

Then $\mathbb{M} = M \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle$ where $\#(x, M) \neq \text{size}(C)$ and we can perform the reduction:

$$[\mathbf{R}: \text{Fail}^\ell] \frac{\#(x, M) \neq \text{size}(C) \quad \tilde{y} = (\text{mlfv}(M) \setminus x) \uplus \text{mlfv}(C)}{M \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}}}$$

with $M' = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$. By hypothesis, one has the derivation:

$$[\text{F:ex-sub}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', \hat{x} : \sigma^2 \models M : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C * U : (\sigma^2, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

From $\#(x, M) \neq \text{size}(B)$ we have that $j \neq k$. Hence $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$ and we type the following:

$$[\text{F:fail}] \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma^\dagger) = \tilde{y}}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} : \tau} \quad \dots \quad [\text{F:fail}] \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma^\dagger) = \tilde{y}}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} : \tau} \\ [\text{F:sum}] \frac{}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} : \tau}$$

5. **Rule [R : Fail¹].**

Then $M = M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle$ where $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$, $U_i = 1^1$ and we can perform the reduction:

$$[\text{R : Fail}^1] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x[i] \quad U_i = 1^1}{M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow M\{\{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\}\} \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle}$$

with $M' = M\{\{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\}\} \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle$. By hypothesis, one has the derivation:

$$[\text{F:ex-sub}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', \hat{x} : \sigma^j \models M : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C * U : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. By Lemma B.2.2, there is a derivation Π_1 of $\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', \hat{x} : \sigma^j \models M\{\{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\}\} : \tau$. Therefore, one has the derivation: (the last rule applied is [R : ex-sub])

$$\frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', \hat{x} : \sigma^j \models M\{\{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\}\} : \tau \quad [\text{F:bag}] \frac{\Theta; \cdot \models U : \varepsilon \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : \sigma^k}{\Theta; \Delta \models C * U : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon)} \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M\{\{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\}\} \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

6. **Rule [R : Cons₁].**

Then $M = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} B$ where $B = C * U$, $C = \lambda N_1 \int \dots \int \lambda N_k \int$, $k \geq 0$ and we can perform the following reduction:

$$[\text{R : Cons}_1] \frac{\text{size}(C) = k \quad \tilde{y} = \text{mlfv}(C)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} C * U \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}}}$$

where $M' = \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}}$. By hypothesis, one has

$$[\text{F:fail}] \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma^\dagger) = \tilde{x}}{\Theta; \Gamma' \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau} \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon \\ [\text{F:app}] \frac{}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} B : \tau}$$

Hence $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$ and we may type the following:

$$[\text{F:fail}] \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma^\dagger) = \tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}} : \tau} \quad \dots \quad [\text{F:fail}] \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma^\dagger) = \tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}} : \tau} \\ [\text{F:sum}] \frac{}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}} : \tau}$$

7. **Rule [R : Cons₂].**

Then $M = \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$ where $B = \lambda N_1 \int \dots \int \lambda N_k \int$, $k \geq 1$ and one has the reduction:

$$[\mathbf{R} : \text{Cons}_2] \frac{\#(z, \tilde{x}) = \text{size}(C) \quad \tilde{y} = \text{mlfv}(C) \quad \tilde{y} = \text{mlfv}(C)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \langle\langle C * U/z \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{(\tilde{x} \setminus z) \uplus \tilde{y}}}$$

where $\mathbb{M}' = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{(\tilde{z} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{y}}$. By hypothesis, there exists a derivation:

$$\frac{[\mathbf{F} : \text{fail}] \frac{\text{dom}((\Gamma', \hat{x} : \sigma^j)^\dagger) = \tilde{z}}{\Theta, x^i : \eta; \Gamma', \hat{x} : \sigma^j \models M : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}}{[\mathbf{F} : \text{ex-sub}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models \text{fail}^{(\tilde{z} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{y}} : \tau}}$$

Hence $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$ and we may type the following:

$$\frac{[\mathbf{F} : \text{fail}] \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma^\dagger) = (\tilde{z} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{y}}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \text{fail}^{(\tilde{z} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{y}} : \tau} \quad \dots \quad [\mathbf{F} : \text{fail}] \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma^\dagger) = (\tilde{z} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{y}}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \text{fail}^{(\tilde{z} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{y}} : \tau}}{[\mathbf{F} : \text{sum}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \models \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{(\tilde{z} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{y}} : \tau}}$$

8. **Rule** $[\mathbf{R} : \text{TCont}]$.

Then $\mathbb{M} = C[M]$ and the reduction is as follows:

$$[\mathbf{R} : \text{TCont}] \frac{M \longrightarrow M'_1 + \dots + M'_l}{C[M] \longrightarrow C[M'_1] + \dots + C[M'_l]}$$

where $\mathbb{M}' = C[M'_1] + \dots + C[M'_l]$. The proof proceeds by analysing the context C :

(a) $C = [\cdot] B$.

In this case $\mathbb{M} = M B$, for some B , and the following derivation holds:

$$[\mathbf{F} : \text{app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma' \models M : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M B : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. Since $\Theta; \Gamma' \models M : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau$ and $M \longrightarrow M'_1 + \dots + M'_l$, it follows by IH that $\Gamma' \models M'_1 + \dots + M'_l : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau$. By applying $[\mathbf{F} : \text{sum}]$, one has $\Theta; \Gamma' \models M'_i : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau$, for $i = 1, \dots, l$. Therefore, we may type the following:

$$[\mathbf{F} : \text{sum}] \frac{\forall i \in 1, \dots, l \quad [\mathbf{F} : \text{app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma' \models M'_i : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M'_i B : \tau}}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models (M'_1 B) + \dots + (M'_l B) : \tau}$$

Thus, $\Gamma \models \mathbb{M}' : \tau$, and the result follows.

(b) $C = ([\cdot]) \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$.

This case is similar to the previous.

9. **Rule** $[\mathbf{R} : \text{ECont}]$.

Then $\mathbb{M} = D[\mathbb{M}']$ where $\mathbb{M}' \rightarrow \mathbb{M}''$ then we can perform the following reduction:

$$[\mathbf{R} : \text{ECont}] \frac{\mathbb{M}' \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}''}{D[\mathbb{M}'] \longrightarrow D[\mathbb{M}'']}$$

Hence $\mathbb{M}' = D[\mathbb{M}'']$. The proof proceeds by analysing the context D ($D = [\cdot] + \mathbb{N}$ or $D = \mathbb{N} + [\cdot]$), and follows easily by induction hypothesis.

□

B.2.1 Examples

This section contains examples illustrating the constructions and results given in Section 3.3.

Example B.1

The following is a wf-derivation Π_2 for the bag concatenation $\lambda x \int * 1^!$:

$$\frac{\frac{[F:\text{var}^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta'; x : \sigma \models x : \sigma} \quad [F:1^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta'; - \models 1 : \omega}}{[F:\text{bag}^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta'; x : \sigma \models \lambda x \int \cdot 1 : \sigma}} \quad [F:1^!]}{[F:\text{bag}] \frac{}{\Theta'; x : \sigma \models (\lambda x \int * 1^!) : (\sigma, \sigma')}} \quad \square$$

Example B.2 Cont.B.1

The following is a well-formedness derivation (labels of the rules being applied are omitted) for term $\Delta_4 = \lambda x.x[1](\lambda x \int * 1^!)$:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\Theta, x^! : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau; x : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \models x : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau}{\Theta, x^! : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau; - \models x[1] : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau} \quad \Pi_2 \quad \eta \sim \sigma'}{\Theta, x^! : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau; x : \sigma \models x[1](\lambda x \int * 1^!) : \tau}}{\Theta; - \models \lambda x.(x[1](\lambda x \int * 1^!)) : (\sigma, (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau) \rightarrow \tau} \quad \square$$

Example B.3

Below we show the wf-derivation for the bag $A = (\lambda x[1] \int \cdot \lambda x \int) * \lambda x[2] \int^!$.

First, let Π be the following derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{[F:\text{var}^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; x : \sigma_3 \models x : \sigma_3} \quad [F:\text{var}^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; x : \sigma_3 \models x : \sigma_3} \quad [F:1^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; - \models 1 : \omega}}{[F:\text{var}^!]} \quad [F:\text{bag}^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; x : \sigma_3 \models \lambda x \int \cdot 1 : \sigma_3}}{[F:\text{bag}^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; x : \sigma_3 \models \lambda x[1] \int \cdot \lambda x \int : \sigma_3^2}} \quad \square$$

From Π we can obtain the well-formedness derivation Π_A for A :

$$\frac{\frac{\Pi \quad [F:\text{var}^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; x : \sigma_2 \models x : \sigma_2}}{[F:\text{var}^!]} \quad [F:\text{bag}^!]}{[F:\text{bag}] \frac{}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; x : \sigma_3 \models \underbrace{(\lambda x[1] \int \cdot \lambda x \int) * \lambda x[2] \int^!}_A : (\sigma_3^2, \sigma_2)}} \quad \square$$

where $\eta = \sigma_3 \diamond \sigma_2$.

Example B.4

Below we present the wf-derivation Π_B of the bag $B = \lambda x \int * 1^!$:

$$\frac{\frac{[\mathbf{F}:\mathbf{var}^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; x : \sigma_3 \models x : \sigma_3} \quad [\mathbf{F}:\mathbf{1}^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; - \models 1 : \omega}}{[\mathbf{F}:\mathbf{bag}^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; x : \sigma_3 \models \lambda x \cdot 1 : \sigma_3^1}} \quad [\mathbf{F}:\mathbf{1}^1] \frac{}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; - \models 1^1 : \sigma'}}{[\mathbf{F}:\mathbf{bag}] \frac{}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; x : \sigma_3 \models (\lambda x \cdot 1^1) : (\sigma_3, \sigma')}}}$$

□

Example B.5

To illustrate our well-formed rules, let M be the following λ_{\oplus}^{\neq} -term:

$$M = \lambda x. (y(\underbrace{(\lambda x[1] \cdot \lambda x)}_A) * \underbrace{\lambda x[2] \cdot 1^1}_B) (\lambda x \cdot 1^1).$$

To ease the notation M is an abstraction $\lambda x. ((yA) B)$, where $A = (\lambda x[1] \cdot \lambda x) * \lambda x[2] \cdot 1^1$ and $B = \lambda x \cdot 1^1$. From the derivation Π_A (Example B.3) we obtain the wf-derivation Π'_A for the application yA :

$$\frac{[\mathbf{F}:\mathbf{var}^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Delta \models y : (\sigma_3^k, \eta'')} \quad \Pi_A}{[\mathbf{F}:\mathbf{app}] \frac{}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; x : \sigma_3 \models A : (\sigma_3^2, \sigma_2) \quad \eta'' \sim \sigma_2}}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; x : \sigma_3, \Delta \models yA : (\sigma_3^j, \eta') \rightarrow \tau}$$

where $\eta = \sigma_3 * \sigma_2$, for some list type η' and integers k, j . From the premise $\eta'' \sim \sigma_2$ it follows that $\eta'' = \sigma_2 \diamond \eta'''$ for an arbitrary η''' . From the derivation Π_B (Example B.4) we obtain the well-formed derivation for term M :

$$\frac{\frac{\Pi'_A \quad \Pi_B}{[\mathbf{F}:\mathbf{app}] \frac{}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; x : \sigma_3, \Delta \models yA : (\sigma_3^j, \eta') \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta, x^1 : \eta; x : \sigma_3 \models B : (\sigma_3, \sigma') \quad \eta' \sim \sigma'}}{[\mathbf{F}:\mathbf{abs}] \frac{}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; x : \sigma_3, x : \sigma_3, \Delta \models (yA)B : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Delta)}}{\Theta; \Delta \models \lambda x. ((yA)B) : (\sigma_3^2, \eta) \rightarrow \tau}}$$

where $\Delta = y : (\sigma_3^k, \eta'') \rightarrow ((\sigma_3^j, \eta') \rightarrow \tau)$. From the premise $\eta' \sim \sigma'$ we obtain that $\eta' = \sigma' \diamond \eta''''$, where σ' is an arbitrary strict type and η'''' is an arbitrary list type. □

B.3 Appendix to § 3.4.1**Definition B.1 Structural Congruence**

Structural congruence is defined as the least congruence relation on processes such that:

$$\begin{array}{lll} P \equiv_\alpha Q \Rightarrow P \equiv Q & P \mid \mathbf{0} \equiv P & P \mid Q \equiv Q \mid P \\ (\nu x)\mathbf{0} \equiv \mathbf{0} & (P \mid Q) \mid R \equiv P \mid (Q \mid R) & [x \leftrightarrow y] \equiv [y \leftrightarrow x] \\ x \notin \text{fn}(P) \Rightarrow ((\nu x)P) \mid Q \equiv (\nu x)(P \mid Q) & & (\nu x)(\nu y)P \equiv (\nu y)(\nu x)P \\ P \oplus (Q \oplus R) \equiv (P \oplus Q) \oplus R & & P \oplus Q \equiv Q \oplus P \\ (\nu x)(P \mid (Q \oplus R)) \equiv (\nu x)(P \mid Q) \oplus (\nu x)(P \mid R) & & \mathbf{0} \oplus \mathbf{0} \equiv \mathbf{0} \end{array}$$

□

B.4 Appendix to § 3.4.2

We need a few auxiliary notions to formalize reduction for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{1/z}$.

Definition B.2 Head

We amend Definition 3.3 for the case of terms in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{1/z}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{head}(x) &= x & \text{head}(x[i]) &= x[i] \\
\text{head}(M B) &= \text{head}(M) & \text{head}(\lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])) &= \lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \\
\text{head}(M \langle N/x \rangle) &= \text{head}(M) & \text{head}(M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket) &= \text{head}(M) \\
\text{head}((M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle) &= (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle & \text{head}(\mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x}}) &= \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \\
\text{head}(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) &= \begin{cases} x & \text{If } \text{head}(M) = y \text{ and } y \in \tilde{x} \\ \text{head}(M) & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Definition B.3 Linear Head Substitution

Given an M with $\text{head}(M) = x$, the linear substitution of a term N for the head variable x of the term M , written $M\{N/x\}$ is inductively defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}
x\{N/x\} &= N & (M B)\{N/x\} &= (M\{N/x\}) B \\
(M \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket)\{N/x\} &= (M\{N/x\}) \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket & & x \neq y \\
(M \langle L/y \rangle)\{N/x\} &= (M\{N/x\}) \langle L/y \rangle & & x \neq y \\
((M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]) \langle \langle B/y \rangle \rangle)\{N/x\} &= (M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y])\{N/x\} \langle \langle B/y \rangle \rangle & & x \neq y \\
(M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y])\{N/x\} &= (M\{N/x\})[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] & & x \neq y
\end{aligned}$$

□

Following Def. 3.5, we define contexts for terms and expressions. While expression contexts are as in Def. 3.5; the term contexts for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{1/z}$ involve explicit linear and unrestricted substitutions, rather than an explicit substitution: this is due to the reduction strategy we have chosen to adopt, as we always wish to evaluate explicit substitutions first. We assume that the terms that fill in the holes respect the conditions on explicit linear substitutions (i.e., variables appear in a term only once, shared variables must occur in the context), similarly for explicit unrestricted substitutions.

Definition B.4 Evaluation Contexts

Contexts for terms and expressions are defined by the following grammar:

$$\begin{aligned}
C[\cdot], C'[\cdot] &::= ([\cdot])B \mid ([\cdot]) \langle N/x \rangle \mid ([\cdot]) \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \mid ([\cdot])[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \mid ([\cdot])[\leftarrow x] \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle \\
D[\cdot], D'[\cdot] &::= M + [\cdot] \mid [\cdot] + M
\end{aligned}$$

The result of replacing a hole with a $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{1/z}$ -term M in a context $C[\cdot]$, denoted with $C[M]$, has to be a term in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{1/z}$. □

This way, e.g., the hole in context $C[\cdot] = ([\cdot]) \langle N/x \rangle$ cannot be filled with y , since $C[y] = (y) \langle N/x \rangle$ is not a well-defined term. Indeed, $M \langle N/x \rangle$ requires that x occurs exactly once within M . Similarly, we cannot fill the hole with \mathbf{fail}^z with $z \neq x$, since $C[\mathbf{fail}^z] = (\mathbf{fail}^z) \langle N/x \rangle$ is also not a well-defined term, for the same reason.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{fv}(x) = \{x\} & \text{fv}(M B) = \text{fv}(M) \cup \text{fv}(B) \\
\text{fv}(x[i]) = \emptyset & \text{fv}(\lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) = \text{fv}(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \setminus \{x\} \\
\text{fv}(1) = \emptyset & \text{fv}(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle) = (\text{fv}(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \setminus \{x\}) \uplus \text{fv}(B) \\
\text{fv}(\lambda M) = \text{fv}(M) & \text{fv}(M \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle) = \text{fv}(M) \cup \text{fv}(N) \\
\text{fv}(\lambda M)^\dagger = \text{fv}(M) & \text{fv}(M \llbracket U/x^\dagger \rrbracket) = \text{fv}(M) \\
\text{fv}(C * U) = \text{fv}(C) & \text{fv}(\mathbb{M} + \mathbb{N}) = \text{fv}(\mathbb{M}) \cup \text{fv}(\mathbb{N}) \\
\text{fv}(\lambda M) \cdot C = \text{fv}(M) \cup \text{fv}(C) & \text{fv}(\text{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_n}) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}
\end{array}$$

Figure B.1: Free Variables for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[RS:Beta]} \frac{}{(\lambda x.(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]))B \longrightarrow (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle} \\
\\
\text{[RS:Fetch}^\ell] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x}{M \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow M \{ \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle \}} \\
\text{[RS:Fetch}^\dagger] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x[i] \quad U_i = \lambda N^\dagger}{M \llbracket U/x^\dagger \rrbracket \longrightarrow M \{ \langle \langle N/x[i] \rangle \rangle \llbracket U/x^\dagger \rrbracket \}} \\
\text{[RS:Ex-Sub]} \frac{C = \lambda M_1 \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda M_k \quad M \neq \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}}{M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} M \langle \langle C_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \rangle \dots \langle \langle C_i(k)/x_k \rangle \rangle \llbracket U/x^\dagger \rrbracket} \\
\\
\text{[RS:Fail}^\ell] \frac{k \neq \text{size}(C) \quad \tilde{y} = (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{\tilde{x}\}) \cup \text{fv}(C)}{M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \\ U_i = 1^\dagger} \\
\text{[RS:Fail}^\dagger] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x[i] \quad \tilde{y} = \text{fv}(M)}{M \llbracket U/x^\dagger \rrbracket \longrightarrow M \{ \langle \langle \text{fail}^0/x[i] \rangle \rangle \llbracket U/x^\dagger \rrbracket \}} \\
\\
\text{[RS:Cons}_1] \frac{\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(C)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} C * U \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}}} \\
\text{[RS:Cons}_2] \frac{\text{size}(C) = |\tilde{x}| \quad \tilde{z} = \text{fv}(C)}{(\text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}}[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \uplus \tilde{z}}} \\
\\
\text{[RS:Cons}_3] \frac{\tilde{z} = \text{fv}(N)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \cup \tilde{x}} \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \cup \tilde{z}}} \quad \text{[RS:Cons}_4] \frac{}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \llbracket U/x^\dagger \rrbracket \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}}
\end{array}$$

Figure B.2: Reduction Rules for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$ (contextual rules omitted)

Operational Semantics

As in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$, the reduction relation \longrightarrow on $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$ operates lazily on expressions; it is defined by the rules in Fig. B.2, and relies on a notion of linear free variables given in Fig. B.1.

As expected, rule [RS : Beta] results into an explicit substitution $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$, where $B = C * U$ is a bag with a linear part C and an unrestricted part U .

In the case $|\tilde{x}| = k = \text{size}(C)$ and $M \neq \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$, this explicit substitution expands into a sum of terms involving explicit linear and unrestricted substitutions $\langle\langle N/x \rangle\rangle$ and $\llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$, which are the ones to reduce into a head substitution, via rule [RS:Ex-Sub]. Intuitively, rule [RS:Ex-Sub] “distributes” an explicit substitution into a sum of terms involving explicit linear substitutions; it considers all possible permutations of the elements in the bag among all shared variables. Explicit linear/unrestricted substitutions evolve either into a head substitution $\{N/x\}$ (with $N \in B$), via rule [RS:Fetch^ℓ], or $\{N/x\}\llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ (with $U \in B$) via rule [RS:Fetch¹], depending on whether the head of the term is a linear or an unrestricted variable.

In the case $|\tilde{x}| = k \neq \text{size}(C)$ or $M = \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$, the term $M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$ will be a redex of either rule [RS:Fail^ℓ] or [RS:Cons₂]. The latter has a side condition $|\tilde{x}| = \text{size}(C)$, because we want to give priority for application of [RS:Fail^ℓ] when there is a mismatch of linear variables and the number of linear resources. Rule [RS:Fail¹] applies to an unrestricted substitution $M\llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ when the head of M is an unrestricted variable, say $x[i]$, that aims to consume the i -th component of the bag U which is empty, i.e., $U_i = 1^1$; then the term reduces to a term where all the head of M is substituted by fail^0 , the explicit unrestricted substitution is not consumed and continues in the resulting term. Consuming rules [RS:Cons₁], [RS:Cons₃] and [RS:Cons₄] the term fail consume either a bag, or an explicit linear substitution, or an explicit unrestricted substitution, respectively.

Notice that the left-hand sides of the reduction rules in $\hat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \ddagger}$ do not interfere with each other. Similarly to $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \ddagger}$, reduction in $\hat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \ddagger}$ satisfies a *diamond property*.

Example B.6

We continue to illustrate the different behaviors of the terms below w.r.t. the reduction rules for $\hat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \ddagger}$ (Fig. B.2):

1. The case with a linear variable x in which the linear bag has size one, is close to the standard *meaning* of applying an identity function to a term:

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda x. x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x]) \{ N' \} * U' &\longrightarrow_{[\text{R:Beta}]} x_1[x_1 \leftarrow x] \langle\langle \{ N' \} * U' / x \rangle\rangle \\ &\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Ex-Sub}]} x_1 \langle\langle N' / x_1 \rangle\rangle \llbracket U' / x^1 \rrbracket \\ &\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Fetch}^{\ell}]} x_1 \{ N' / x_1 \} \llbracket U' / x^1 \rrbracket \\ &= N' \llbracket U' / x^1 \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

2. The case of an abstraction of one unrestricted variable that aims to consume the first element of the unrestricted bag, which fails to contain a resource in the first component.

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda x. x[1][\leftarrow x]) 1 * 1^1 \diamond U' &\longrightarrow_{[\text{R:Beta}]} x[1][\leftarrow x] \langle\langle 1 * 1^1 \diamond U' / x \rangle\rangle \\ &\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Ex-Sub}]} x[1] \llbracket 1^1 \diamond U' / x^1 \rrbracket \\ &\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Fail}^1]} x[1] \{ \text{fail}^0 / x[1] \} \llbracket 1^1 \diamond U' / x^1 \rrbracket \\ &= \text{fail}^0 \llbracket 1^1 \diamond U' / x^1 \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

3. The case of an abstraction of one unrestricted variable that aims to consume the i th component of the unrestricted bag U' . In the case $C' = 1$ and $U'_i \neq 1^1$ the reduction is:

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda x. x[i][\leftarrow x]) C' \diamond U' &\longrightarrow_{[\text{R:Beta}]} x[i][\leftarrow x] \langle\langle C' \diamond U' / x \rangle\rangle \\ &\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Ex-Sub}]} x[i] \llbracket C' \diamond U' / x^1 \rrbracket \\ &\longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Fetch}^1]} x[i] \{ N' / x[i] \} \llbracket C' \diamond U' / x^1 \rrbracket = N \llbracket C' \diamond U' / x^1 \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

where $U'_i = \{N'\}^!$. Otherwise, $U'_i = 1^!$ and the reduction relies again on the size of the linear bag C : if $\#(x, x[i]) = \text{size}(C')$ the reduction ends with an application of $[\mathbf{R} : \mathbf{fail}^!]$; otherwise, it ends with an application $[\mathbf{R} : \mathbf{fail}^{\ell}]$.

□

B.4.1 Well-formedness rules for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \ell}$

Similarly to $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \ell}$ we present a set “well-formedness” rules for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \ell}$ -terms, -bags and -expressions, based on an intersection type system for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \ell}$, defined upon strict, multiset, list, tuple types, as introduced for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \ell}$ and presented in Fig. B.3. Linear contexts Γ, Δ and unrestricted contexts Θ, Υ are the same as in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \ell}$, as well as well-formedness judgements $\Theta; \Gamma \vdash \mathbb{M} : \sigma$.

Definition B.5 Well-formedness in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \ell}$

An expression \mathbb{M} is well formed if there exists a Θ, Γ and a τ such that $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ is entailed via the rules in Fig. B.3. □

Well-formed rules for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \ell}$ are essentially the same as the ones for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \ell}$. Rules $[\mathbf{FS} : \mathbf{abs-sh}]$ and $[\mathbf{FS} : \mathbf{Esub}]$ are modified to take into account the sharing construct $[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$. Rule $[\mathbf{FS} : \mathbf{share}]$ is exclusive for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \ell}$ and requires, for each $i = 1, \dots, k$, the variable assignment $x_i : \sigma$, to derive the well-formedness of $M[x_1, \dots, x_n \leftarrow x] : \tau$ (in addition to variable assignments in Θ and Γ).

Lemma B.4.1 (Linear Substitution Lemma for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \ell}$) *If $\Theta; \Gamma, x : \sigma \models M : \tau$, $\text{head}(M) = x$, and $\Theta; \Delta \models N : \sigma$ then $\Gamma, \Delta \models M\{N/x\} : \tau$.*

Proof: By structural induction on M with $\text{head}(M) = x$. There are six cases to be analyzed:

1. $M = x$

In this case, $\Theta; x : \sigma \models x : \sigma$ and $\Gamma = \emptyset$. Observe that $x\{N/x\} = N$, since $\Delta \models N : \sigma$, by hypothesis, the result follows.

2. $M = M' B$.

Then $\text{head}(M' B) = \text{head}(M') = x$, and the derivation is the following:

$$[\mathbf{FS} : \mathbf{app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_1, x : \sigma \models M' : (\delta^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Gamma_2 \models B : (\delta^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, x : \sigma \models M' B : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$, and j, k are non-negative integers, possibly different. Since $\Delta \vdash N : \sigma$, by IH, the result holds for M' , that is,

$$\Gamma_1, \Delta \models M'\{N/x\} : (\delta^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau$$

which gives the derivation:

$$[\mathbf{FS} : \mathbf{app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Delta \models M'\{N/x\} : (\delta^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Gamma_2 \models B : (\delta^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Delta \models (M'\{N/x\})B : \tau}$$

From Def. B.3, $(M' B)\{N/x\} = (M'\{N/x\})B$, and the result follows.

3. $M = M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$.

Then $\text{head}(M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]) = \text{head}(M') = x$, for $y \neq x$. Therefore,

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[FS:var}^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta; x : \sigma \models x : \sigma} \quad \text{[FS:var}^!] \frac{\Theta, x : \eta; x : \eta_i, \Delta \models x : \sigma}{\Theta, x : \eta; \Delta \models x[i] : \sigma} \quad \text{[FS:1}^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta; - \models 1 : \omega} \\
\\
\text{[FS:1}^!] \frac{}{\Theta; - \models 1^! : \sigma} \quad \text{[FS:weak]} \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \tau}{\Theta; \Gamma, x : \omega \models M[\leftarrow x] : \tau} \\
\\
\text{[FS:sum]} \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \sigma \quad \Theta; \Gamma \models N : \sigma}{\Theta; \Gamma \models M + N : \sigma} \\
\text{[FS:abs-sh]} \frac{\Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma, x : \sigma^k \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) : (\sigma^k, \eta) \rightarrow \tau} \\
\\
\text{[FS:app]} \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \models M : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon)}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models M B : \tau} \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon \\
\\
\text{[FS:bag]} \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \models C : \sigma^k \quad \Theta; - \models U : \eta}{\Theta; \Gamma \models C * U : (\sigma^k, \eta)} \quad \text{[FS:} \diamond \text{-bag}^!] \frac{\Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon \quad \Theta; - \models V : \eta}{\Theta; - \models U \diamond V : \varepsilon \diamond \eta} \\
\\
\text{[FS:bag}^!] \frac{\Theta; - \models M : \sigma}{\Theta; - \models \lambda M^! : \sigma} \quad \text{[FS:bag}^\ell] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \sigma \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C : \sigma^k}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models \lambda M \wr . C : \sigma^{k+1}} \\
\\
\text{[FS:share]} \frac{x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma) \quad k \neq 0 \quad \Theta; \Gamma, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models M : \tau}{\Theta; \Gamma, x : \sigma^k \models M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau} \\
\text{[FS:Esub}^\ell] \frac{\Theta; \Delta \models N : \sigma}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models M \langle N/x \rangle : \tau} \\
\\
\text{[FS:Esub}^!] \frac{\Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma \models M : \tau \quad \Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma \models M \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket : \tau} \\
\\
\text{[FS:Esub]} \frac{\Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma, x : \sigma^j \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle : \tau} \quad \text{[FS:fail]} \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma) = \tilde{x}}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} : \tau}
\end{array}$$

Figure B.3: Well-Formedness Rules for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^! \wr$

$$\text{[FS:share]} \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta, x : \sigma \models M' : \tau \quad y \notin \Gamma_1 \quad k \neq 0}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k, x : \sigma \models M'[y_1, \dots, y_k \leftarrow x] : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k$. By IH, the result follows for M' , that is,

$$\Theta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta, \Delta \models M' \{N/x\} : \tau$$

and we have the derivation:

$$[\text{FS:share}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta, \Delta \models M' \{N/x\} : \tau \quad y \notin \Gamma_1 \quad k \neq 0}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k, \Delta \models M' \{N/x\} [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

From Def. B.3 $M' [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \{N/x\} = M' \{N/x\} [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$, and the result follows.

4. $M = M' [\leftarrow y]$.

Then $\text{head}(M' [\leftarrow y]) = \text{head}(M') = x$ with $x \neq y$,

$$[\text{FS:weak}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma, x : \sigma \models M : \tau}{\Theta; \Gamma, y : \omega, x : \sigma \models M [\leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

and $M' [\leftarrow y] \{N/x\} = M' \{N/x\} [\leftarrow y]$. Then by the induction hypothesis:

$$[\text{FS:weak}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models M \{N/x\} : \tau}{\Theta; \Gamma, y : \omega, \Delta \models M \{N/x\} [\leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

5. If $M = M' \langle M''/y \rangle$ then $\text{head}(M' \langle M''/y \rangle) = \text{head}(M') = x \neq y$,

$$[\text{FS:ex-sub}^\ell] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma, y : \delta, x : \sigma \models M : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models M'' : \delta}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, x : \sigma \models M' \langle M''/y \rangle : \tau}$$

and $M' \langle M''/y \rangle \{N/x\} = M' \{N/x\} \langle M''/y \rangle$. Then by the induction hypothesis:

$$[\text{FS:ex-sub}^\ell] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma, y : \delta, \Delta \models M' \{N/x\} : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models M'' : \delta}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Delta \models M' \{N/x\} \langle M''/y \rangle : \tau}$$

6. If $M = M' \llbracket U/y^! \rrbracket$ then $\text{head}(M' \llbracket U/y^! \rrbracket) = \text{head}(M') = x$, and the proofs is similar to the case above. □

Lemma B.4.2 (Unrestricted Substitution Lemma for $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \ell}$) If $\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma \models M : \tau$, $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$, $\eta_i = \sigma$, and $\Theta; \cdot \models N : \sigma$ then $\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma \models M \{N/x[i]\}$.

Proof: By structural induction on M with $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$. There are three cases to be analyzed:

1. $M = x[i]$.

In this case,

$$\frac{[\text{F:var}^\ell] \quad \Theta, x^! : \eta; x : \eta_i \models x : \sigma}{[\text{F:var}^!]} \frac{\Theta, x^! : \eta; x : \eta_i \models x : \sigma}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \cdot \models x[i] : \sigma}$$

and $\Gamma = \emptyset$. Observe that $x[i] \{N/x[i]\} = N$, since $\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma \models M \{N/x[i]\}$, by hypothesis, the result follows.

2. $M = M' B$.

In this case, $\text{head}(M' B) = \text{head}(M') = x[i]$, and one has the following derivation:

$$[\text{F:app}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1 \models M : (\delta^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta, x^1 : \sigma; \Gamma_2 \models B : (\delta^k, \varepsilon') \quad \varepsilon \sim \varepsilon'}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \models M B : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$, δ is a strict type and j, k are non-negative integers, possibly different.

By IH, we get $\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1 \models M' \{N/x[i]\} : (\delta^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau$, which gives the derivation:

$$[\text{F:app}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1 \models M' \{N/x[i]\} : (\delta^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_2 \models B : (\delta^k, \varepsilon') \quad \varepsilon \sim \varepsilon'}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \models (M' \{N/x[i]\}) B : \tau}$$

From Def. 3.4, $M' \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle \{N/x[i]\} = M' \{N/x[i]\} \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$, and the result follows.

3. $M = M' [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$.

Then $\text{head}(M' [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]) = \text{head}(M') = x[i]$, for $y \neq x$. Therefore,

$$[\text{FS:share}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta \models M' : \tau \quad y \notin \Gamma_1 \quad k \neq 0}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k \models M' [y_1, \dots, y_k \leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k$. By IH, the result follows for M' , that is,

$$\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta \models M' \{N/x[i]\} : \tau$$

and we have the derivation:

$$[\text{FS:share}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta \models M' \{N/x[i]\} : \tau \quad y \notin \Gamma_1 \quad k \neq 0}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k \models M' \{N/x[i]\} [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

From Def. B.3 $M' [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \{N/x[i]\} = M' \{N/x[i]\} [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$, and the result follows.

4. $M = M' [\leftarrow y]$.

Then $\text{head}(M' [\leftarrow y]) = \text{head}(M') = x[i]$ with $x \neq y$,

$$[\text{FS:weak}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \models M : \tau}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, y : \omega \models M [\leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

and $M' [\leftarrow y] \{N/x[i]\} = M' \{N/x[i]\} [\leftarrow y]$. Then by the induction hypothesis:

$$[\text{FS:weak}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \models M \{N/x[i]\} : \tau}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, y : \omega \models M \{N/x[i]\} [\leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

5. $M = M' \langle\langle M''/y \rangle\rangle$.

Then $\text{head}(M' \langle\langle M''/y \rangle\rangle) = \text{head}(M') = x[i]$ with $x \neq y$,

$$[\text{FS:ex-sub}^\ell] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, y : \delta \models M : \tau \quad \Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Delta \models M'' : \delta}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, \Delta \models M' \langle\langle M''/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

and $M' \langle\langle M''/y \rangle\rangle \{N/x[i]\} = M' \{N/x[i]\} \langle\langle M''/y \rangle\rangle$. Then by the induction hypothesis:

$$[\text{FS:ex-sub}^\ell] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, y : \delta \models M' \{N/x[i]\} : \tau \quad \Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Delta \models M'' : \delta}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models M' \{N/x[i]\} \langle\langle M''/y \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

6. $M = M' \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket$.

Then $\text{head}(M' \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket) = \text{head}(M') = x[i]$,

$$[\text{FS:ex-sub}^!]\frac{\Theta, x^! : \eta, y^! : \varepsilon; \Gamma \models M : \tau \quad \Theta, x^! : \eta; - \models U : \varepsilon}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma \models M \llbracket U/y^! \rrbracket : \tau}$$

and $M' \llbracket U/y^! \rrbracket \{N/x[i]\} = M' \{N/x[i]\} \llbracket U/y^! \rrbracket$. Then by the induction hypothesis:

$$[\text{FS:ex-sub}^!]\frac{\Theta, x^! : \eta, y^! : \varepsilon; \Gamma \models M' \{N/x[i]\} : \tau \quad \Theta, x^! : \eta; - \models U : \eta}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma \models M' \{N/x[i]\} \llbracket U/y^! \rrbracket : \tau}$$

□

Theorem B.2 (SR in $\hat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{!}$) If $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ and $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}'$ then $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M}' : \tau$.

Proof: By structural induction on the reduction rule from Fig. B.2 applied in $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$.

1. Rule [RS:Beta].

Then $\mathbb{M} = (\lambda x. M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B$ and the reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Beta}]\frac{}{(\lambda x. M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B \longrightarrow M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle}$$

where $\mathbb{M}' = M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$. Since $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ we get the following derivation:

$$\begin{array}{c} [\text{FS:share}] \frac{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_j : \sigma \models M : \tau}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma', x : \sigma^j \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau} \\ [\text{FS:abs-sh}] \frac{}{\Theta; \Gamma' \models \lambda x. M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon} \\ [\text{FS:app}] \frac{}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models (\lambda x. M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B : \tau} \end{array}$$

for $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$ and $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma')$. Notice that:

$$[\text{FS:share}] \frac{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_j : \sigma \models M : \tau}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma', x : \sigma^j \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau} \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon \\ [\text{FS:ex-sub}] \frac{}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

Therefore $\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models \mathbb{M}' : \tau$ and the result follows.

2. Rule [RS:Ex-Sub].

Then $\mathbb{M} = M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle$ where $C = \{N_1\} \dots \{N_k\}$. The reduction applying rule [RS:Ex-Sub] is:

$$\frac{C = \{M_1\} \dots \{M_k\} \quad M \neq \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}}{M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} M \langle\langle C_i(1)/x_1 \rangle\rangle \dots \langle\langle C_i(k)/x_k \rangle\rangle \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket}$$

and $\mathbb{M}' = \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} M \langle\langle C_i(1)/x_1 \rangle\rangle \dots \langle\langle C_i(k)/x_k \rangle\rangle \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket$. To simplify the proof we take $k = 2$, as the case $k > 2$ is similar. Therefore,

- $C = \{N_1\} \cdot \{N_2\}$; and
- $\text{PER}(C) = \{\{N_1\} \cdot \{N_2\}, \{N_2\} \cdot \{N_1\}\}$.

Since $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ we get a derivation: (we omit the labels [FS:ex-sub] and [FS:share])

$$\frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, x_2 : \sigma \models M : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma) \quad k \neq 0}{\frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x : \sigma^2 \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle : \tau}}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. Consider the wf derivation for $\Pi_{1,2}$: (we omit the labels [FS:ex-sub¹] and [FS:ex-sub^ℓ])

$$\frac{\frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, x_2 : \sigma \models M : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta_1 \models N_1 : \sigma}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x_2 : \sigma, \Delta_1 \models M \langle \langle N_1/x_1 \rangle \rangle : \tau} \quad \Theta; \Delta_2 \models N_2 : \sigma}{\frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M \langle \langle N_1/x_1 \rangle \rangle \langle \langle N_2/x_2 \rangle \rangle : \tau \quad \Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M \langle \langle N_1/x_1 \rangle \rangle \langle \langle N_2/x_2 \rangle \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket : \tau}}$$

Similarly, we can obtain a derivation $\Pi_{2,1}$ of $\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M \langle \langle N_2/x_1 \rangle \rangle \langle \langle N_1/x_2 \rangle \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket : \tau$. Finally, applying [FS:sum]:

$$[\text{FS:sum}] \frac{\Pi_{1,2} \quad \Pi_{2,1}}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M \langle \langle N_1/x_1 \rangle \rangle \langle \langle N_2/x_2 \rangle \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket + M \langle \langle N_2/x_1 \rangle \rangle \langle \langle N_1/x_2 \rangle \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket : \tau}$$

and the result follows.

3. Rule [RS:Fetch^ℓ].

Then $\mathbb{M} = M \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle$ where $\text{head}(M) = x$. The reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Fetch}^{\ell}] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x}{M \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow M \{ \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle \}}$$

and $\mathbb{M}' = M \{ \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle \}$. Since $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ we get the following derivation:

$$[\text{FS:ex-sub}^{\ell}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma', x : \sigma \models M : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models N : \sigma}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. By Lemma B.4.1, we obtain the derivation $\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M \{ \langle \langle N/x \rangle \rangle \} : \tau$.

4. Rule [RS:Fetch¹].

Then $\mathbb{M} = M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ where $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$. The reduction is:

$$\frac{\text{head}(M) = x[i] \quad U_i = \{N\}^1}{M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \longrightarrow M \{ \langle \langle N/x[i] \rangle \rangle \} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket}$$

and $\mathbb{M}' = M \{ \langle \langle N/x[i] \rangle \rangle \} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$. Since $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ we get the following derivation:

$$[\text{FS:ex-sub}^1] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \models M : \tau \quad \Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma \models M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket : \tau}$$

By Lemma B.4.2, we obtain the derivation $\Theta; \Gamma \models M \{ \langle \langle N/x[i] \rangle \rangle \} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket : \tau$.

5. Rule [RS:TCont].

Then $\mathbb{M} = C[M]$ and the reduction is as follows:

$$[\text{RS:TCont}] \frac{M \longrightarrow M'_1 + \dots + M'_k}{C[M] \longrightarrow C[M'_1] + \dots + C[M'_k]}$$

with $M' = C[M] \longrightarrow C[M'_1] + \dots + C[M'_k]$. The proof proceeds by analysing the context C . There are four cases:

(a) $C = [\cdot] B$.

In this case $M = M B$, for some B . Since $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ one has a derivation:

$$[\text{FS:app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma' \models M : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M B : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. From $\Gamma' \models M : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau$ and the reduction $M \longrightarrow M'_1 + \dots + M'_k$, one has by IH that $\Gamma' \models M'_1 + \dots + M'_k : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau$, which entails $\Gamma' \models M'_i : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau$, for $i = 1, \dots, k$, via rule $[\text{FS:sum}]$. Finally, we may type the following applying the $[\text{FS:sum}]$ rule:

$$\frac{\forall i \in 1, \dots, l \quad [\text{FS:app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma' \models M'_i : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M'_i B : \tau}}{\Gamma', \Delta \models (M'_1 B) + \dots + (M'_l B) : \tau}$$

Since $M' = (C[M'_1]) + \dots + (C[M'_l]) = M'_1 B + \dots + M'_l B$, the result follows.

(b) Cases $C = [\cdot] \langle N/x \rangle$ and $C = [\cdot] [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ are similar to the previous.

(c) Other cases proceed similarly.

6. Rule $[\text{RS:ECont}]$.

This case is analogous to the previous.

7. Rule $[\text{RS:Fail}^\ell]$.

Then $M = M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle$ where $C = \lambda N_1 \dots \lambda N_l$ and the reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Fail}^\ell] \frac{k \neq \text{size}(C) \quad \tilde{y} = (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{\tilde{x}\}) \cup \text{fv}(C)}{M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}}$$

where $M' = \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$. Since $\Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models M$, one has a derivation:

$$\frac{[\text{FS:ex-sub}] \frac{\Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models M : \tau}{\Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma', x : \sigma^k \models M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau} \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C * U : (\sigma^j, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{[\text{FS:ex-sub}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M[x_1, \dots, x_k] \leftarrow x \langle C * U/x \rangle : \tau}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M[x_1, \dots, x_k] \leftarrow x \langle C * U/x \rangle : \tau}}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. We may type the following:

$$[\text{FS:fail}] \frac{}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} : \tau}$$

since Γ', Δ contain assignments on the free variables in M and B . Therefore, $\Theta; \Gamma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} : \tau$, by applying $[\text{FS:sum}]$, it follows that $\Theta; \Gamma \models \sum_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} : \tau$, as required.

8. Rule $[\text{RS:Fail}^!]$.

Then $M \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket$ where $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$ and $B = U_i = 1^!$ and the reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Fail}^!]\frac{\text{head}(M) = x[i] \quad U_i = 1^! \quad \tilde{y} = \text{fv}(M)}{M \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket \longrightarrow M\{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\} \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket}$$

with $M' = M\{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\} \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket$. By hypothesis, one has the derivation:

$$[\text{FS:Esub}^!]\frac{\Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma \models M : \tau \quad \Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma \models M \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket : \tau}$$

By Lemma B.4.2, there exists a derivation Π_1 of $\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma' \models M\{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\} : \tau$. Thus,

$$[\text{FS:Esub}^!]\frac{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma \models M\{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\} : \tau \quad \Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma \models M\{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\} \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket : \tau}$$

9. Rule $[\text{RS:Cons}_1]$.

Then $M = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} B$ where $B = \lambda N_1 \int \dots \int \lambda N_k$ and the reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Cons}_1]\frac{\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(C)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} C * U \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}}}$$

and $M' = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}}$. Since $\Gamma \models M : \tau$, one has the derivation:

$$\begin{array}{c} [\text{F:fail}] \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma^\dagger) = \tilde{x}}{\Theta; \Gamma' \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon} \\ [\text{F:app}] \frac{}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} B : \tau} \end{array}$$

Hence $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$ and we may type the following:

$$[\text{F:sum}]\frac{[\text{F:fail}] \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma^\dagger) = \tilde{x}}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}} : \tau} \dots [\text{F:fail}] \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma^\dagger) = \tilde{x}}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}} : \tau}}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \uplus \tilde{y}} : \tau}$$

The proof for the cases of $[\text{RS:Cons}_2]$, $[\text{RS:Cons}_3]$ and $[\text{RS:Cons}_4]$ proceed similarly

□

B.5 Appendix to § 3.4.3

B.5.1 Encodability Criteria

We follow the criteria in [Gorla \(2010\)](#), a widely studied abstract framework for establishing the *quality* of encodings. A *language* \mathcal{L} is a pair: a set of terms and a reduction semantics \longrightarrow on terms (with reflexive, transitive closure denoted \longrightarrow^*). A correct encoding translates terms of a source language $\mathcal{L}_1 = (\mathcal{M}, \longrightarrow_1)$ into terms of a target language $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{P}, \longrightarrow_2)$ by respecting certain criteria. The criteria in [Gorla \(2010\)](#) concern *untyped* languages; because we treat *typed* languages, we follow [Kouzapas et al. \(2019\)](#) in requiring that encodings satisfy the following criteria:

1. **Type preservation:** For every well-typed M , it holds that $\llbracket M \rrbracket$ is well-typed.
2. **Operational Completeness:** For every M, M' such that $M \xrightarrow{*}_1 M'$, it holds that $\llbracket M \rrbracket \xrightarrow{*}_2 \approx_2 \llbracket M' \rrbracket$.

3. **Operational Soundness:** For every M and P such that $\llbracket M \rrbracket \xrightarrow{*}_2 P$, there exists an M' such that $M \xrightarrow{*}_1 M'$ and $P \xrightarrow{*}_2 \approx_2 \llbracket M' \rrbracket$.
4. **Success Sensitiveness:** For every M , it holds that $M \checkmark_1$ if and only if $\llbracket M \rrbracket \checkmark_2$, where \checkmark_1 and \checkmark_2 denote a success predicate in \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{P} , respectively.

In addition to these semantic criteria, we shall also consider *compositionality*: a composite source term is encoded as the combination of the encodings of its sub-terms. Success sensitiveness complements completeness and soundness, giving information about observable behaviors. The so-called success predicates \checkmark_1 and \checkmark_2 serve as a minimal notion of *observables*; the criterion then says that observability of success of a source term implies observability of success in the corresponding target term, and vice-versa.

B.5.2 Correctness of $(\cdot)^\circ$

The correctness of the encoding from $(\cdot)^\circ$ from $\lambda_{\oplus}^{1/2}$ to $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{1/2}$ relies on an encoding on contexts (Def. B.6), auxiliary propositions (Propositions B.5.1 and B.5.2) for well-formedness preservation (Theorem B.5.3), operational soundness (Theorem B.4) and completeness (Theorem B.5), and success sensitivity (Theorem B.6).

Definition B.6 Encoding on Contexts

We define an encoding $(\cdot)^\dagger$ on contexts:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Theta)^\dagger &= \Theta & (\emptyset)^\dagger &= \emptyset \\ (x : \tau, \Gamma)^\dagger &= x : \tau, (\Gamma)^\dagger & (x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)) & \\ (x : \tau, \dots, x : \tau, \Gamma)^\dagger &= x : \tau \wedge \dots \wedge \tau, (\Gamma)^\dagger & (x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)) & \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition B.5.1 *Let M, N be terms. We have:*

1. $\llbracket M\{N/x\} \rrbracket^\circ = \llbracket M \rrbracket^\circ \{ \llbracket N \rrbracket^\circ / x \}$.
2. $\llbracket M\langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle \rrbracket^\circ = \llbracket M \rrbracket^\circ \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle$, where $\tilde{x} = x_1, \dots, x_k$ is sequence of pairwise distinct fresh variables.

Proof: By induction of the structure of M . □

Proposition B.5.2 (Well-formedness Preservation under Linear Substitutions) *Let $M \in \lambda_{\oplus}^{1/2}$. If $\Theta; \Gamma, x : \sigma \models M : \tau$ and $\Theta; \Gamma \models x_i : \sigma$ then $\Theta; \Gamma, x_i : \sigma \models M\langle x_i/x \rangle : \tau$.*

Proof: Standard, by induction on the well-formedness derivation rules in Fig. 3.3. □

Proposition B.5.3 (Well-formedness preservation for $(\cdot)^\circ$) *Let B and \mathbb{M} be a bag and an expression in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{1/2}$, respectively.*

1. *If $\Theta; \Gamma \models B : (\sigma^k, \eta)$ then $(\Theta)^\dagger; (\Gamma^\dagger)^\dagger \models (B)^\circ : (\sigma^k, \eta)$ and $\forall x : \pi \in \Gamma, \pi = \tau$ for some τ .*
2. *If $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \sigma$ then $(\Theta)^\dagger; (\Gamma^\dagger)^\dagger \models (\mathbb{M})^\circ : \sigma$ and $\forall x : \pi \in \Gamma, \pi = \tau$ for some τ .*

Theorem B.3 (Well-formedness Preservation for $(\cdot)^\circ$) *Let B and \mathbb{M} be a bag and an expression in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{1/2}$, respectively.*

1. *If $\Theta; \Gamma \models B : (\sigma^k, \eta)$ then $(\Theta)^\dagger; (\Gamma^\dagger)^\dagger \models (B)^\circ : (\sigma^k, \eta)$.*
2. *If $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \sigma$ then $(\Theta)^\dagger; (\Gamma^\dagger)^\dagger \models (\mathbb{M})^\circ : \sigma$.*

Proof: By mutual induction on the typing derivations $\Theta; \Gamma \Vdash B : (\sigma^k, \eta)$ and $\Theta; \Gamma \Vdash \mathbb{M} : \sigma$, exploiting Proposition B.5.3. The analysis for bags Part 1. follows directly from the IHs and will be omitted. As for Part 2. there are two main cases to consider:

1. $\mathbb{M} = M$.

Without loss of generality, assume $\text{fv}(M) = \{x, y\}$. Then, $\Theta; \hat{x} : \sigma_1^j, \hat{y} : \sigma_2^k \Vdash M : \tau$ where $\#(x, M) = j$ and $\#(y, M) = k$, for some positive integers j and k .

After $j + k$ applications of Proposition B.5.2 we obtain:

$$\Theta; x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_j : \sigma_1, y_1 : \sigma_2, \dots, y_k : \sigma_2 \Vdash M \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle \langle \tilde{y}/y \rangle : \tau$$

where $\tilde{x} = x_1, \dots, x_j$ and $\tilde{y} = y_1, \dots, y_k$. From Proposition B.5.3 one has

$$\langle \Theta \rangle_{\bullet}^{\dagger}; (x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_j : \sigma_1, y_1 : \sigma_2, \dots, y_k : \sigma_2)_{\bullet}^{\dagger} \Vdash \langle M \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle \langle \tilde{y}/y \rangle \rangle^{\circ} : \tau$$

Since $(x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_j : \sigma_1, y_1 : \sigma_2, \dots, y_k : \sigma_2)_{\bullet}^{\dagger} = x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_j : \sigma_1, y_1 : \sigma_2, \dots, y_k : \sigma_2$ and $\langle \Theta \rangle_{\bullet}^{\dagger} = \Theta$, we have the following derivation:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{[FS : share]} \frac{\Theta; x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_j : \sigma_1, y_1 : \sigma_2, \dots, y_k : \sigma_2 \Vdash \langle M \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle \langle \tilde{y}/y \rangle \rangle^{\circ} : \tau}{\Theta; x : \sigma_1^j, y_1 : \sigma_2, \dots, y_k : \sigma_2 \Vdash \langle M \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle \langle \tilde{y}/y \rangle \rangle^{\circ} [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau} \\ \text{[FS : share]} \frac{\Theta; x : \sigma_1^j, y_1 : \sigma_2, \dots, y_k : \sigma_2 \Vdash \langle M \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle \langle \tilde{y}/y \rangle \rangle^{\circ} [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau}{\Theta; x : \sigma_1^j, y : \sigma_2^k \Vdash \langle M \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle \langle \tilde{y}/y \rangle \rangle^{\circ} [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x][\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau} \end{array}$$

By expanding Def. 3.13, we have

$$\langle M \rangle^{\circ} = \langle M \langle \tilde{x}/x \rangle \langle \tilde{y}/y \rangle \rangle^{\circ} [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x][\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$$

which completes the proof for this case.

2. $\mathbb{M} = M_1 + \dots + M_n$:

This case proceeds easily by IH, using Rule [FS : sum].

□

Theorem B.4 (Operational Completeness) Let \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{N} be well-formed $\lambda_{\oplus}^{\dagger}$ expressions. Suppose $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow_{[\mathbb{R}]} \mathbb{M}$.

1. If $[\mathbb{R}] = [\mathbb{R} : \text{Beta}]$ then $\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^{\circ} \longrightarrow^{\leq 2} \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^{\circ}$;
2. If $[\mathbb{R}] = [\mathbb{R} : \text{Fetch}]$ then $\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^{\circ} \longrightarrow^{+} \langle \mathbb{M}' \rangle^{\circ}$, for some \mathbb{M} .
3. If $[\mathbb{R}] \neq [\mathbb{R} : \text{Beta}]$ and $[\mathbb{R}] \neq [\mathbb{R} : \text{Fetch}]$ then $\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^{\circ} \longrightarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^{\circ}$.

Proof: We proceed by induction on the the rule from Fig. 3.1 applied to infer $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$, distinguishing the three cases: (below $[x_1 \leftarrow x_n]$ abbreviates $[\tilde{x}_1 \leftarrow x_1] \cdots [\tilde{x}_n \leftarrow x_n]$).

1. The rule applied is $[\mathbb{R}] = [\mathbb{R} : \text{Beta}]$.

In this case, $\mathbb{N} = (\lambda x. M')B$, where $B = C * U$, the reduction is

$$[\mathbb{R} : \text{Beta}] \frac{}{(\lambda x. M)B \longrightarrow M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle}$$

and $\mathbb{M} = M' \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$. Below we assume $\text{lfv}(\mathbb{N}) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and $\tilde{x}_i = x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{j_i}}$, where $j_i = \#(x_i, N)$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$. On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^{\circ} &= \langle (\lambda x. M')B \rangle^{\circ} = \langle ((\lambda x. M')B) \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle \rangle^{\circ} [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \langle (\lambda x. M'')B' \rangle^{\circ} [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] = \langle (\lambda x. M'') \langle \langle B' \rangle \rangle \rangle^{\circ} [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \langle (\lambda x. \langle \langle M'' \rangle \langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle \rangle^{\circ} [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B' \rangle \rangle \rangle^{\circ} [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &\longrightarrow_{[\mathbb{R} : \text{Beta}]} \langle \langle \langle M'' \rangle \langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle \rangle^{\circ} [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle \langle B' \rangle \rangle / x \rangle \rangle^{\circ} [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] = \mathbb{L} \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ &= \langle M' \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ = \langle M' \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &= \langle M'' \langle \langle B'/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

We need to analyze two sub-cases: either $\#(x, M) = \text{size}(C)$ or $\#(x, M) = k \geq 0$ and our first sub-case is not met.

(a) If $\#(x, M) = \text{size}(C)$ then we can reduce \mathbb{L} as: (via $[\text{RS} : \text{Ex} - \text{sub}]$)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L} &\longrightarrow \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C \rangle^\bullet)} \langle M'' \langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle \rangle^\circ \langle C_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(n)/y_n \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ \end{aligned}$$

From (B.1) and (B.2) and $\tilde{y} = y_1 \dots y_n$, one has the result.

(b) Otherwise, $\#(x, M) = n \geq 0$.

Expanding the encoding in (B.2) :

$$\langle M \rangle^\circ = \langle M'' \langle \langle B'/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] = \langle M'' \langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle \rangle^\circ [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B' \rangle^\bullet / x \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_k]$$

Therefore $\langle M \rangle^\circ = \mathbb{L}$ and $\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ \longrightarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ$.

2. The rule applied is $[\text{R}] = [\text{R} : \text{Fetch}^\ell]$.

Then $\mathbb{N} = M \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle$ and the reduction applying the $[\text{R} : \text{Fetch}^\ell]$ rule is:

$$\frac{\text{head}(M) = x \quad C = \lambda N_1 \lambda \dots \lambda N_k, \quad k \geq 1 \quad \#(x, M) = k}{M \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow M \{ \{ N_1/x \} \} \langle \langle C \setminus N_1 \rangle * U/x \rangle + \dots + M \{ \{ N_k/x \} \} \langle \langle C \setminus N_k \rangle * U/x \rangle}$$

with $\mathbb{M} = M \{ \{ N_1/x \} \} \langle \langle C \setminus N_1 \rangle * U/x \rangle + \dots + M \{ \{ N_k/x \} \} \langle \langle C \setminus N_k \rangle * U/x \rangle$.

Below we assume $\text{fv}(\mathbb{N}) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and $\tilde{x}_i = x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{j_i}}$, where $j_i = \#(x_i, N)$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

On the one hand, we have: (last rule is $[\text{RS} : \text{Fetch}^\ell]$)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle M \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ = \langle M \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \langle M' \langle \langle C' * U/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C \rangle^\bullet)} \langle M' \langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle \rangle^\circ \langle C_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(k)/y_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C \rangle^\bullet)} \langle M'' \rangle^\circ \langle C_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(k)/y_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &\longrightarrow \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C \rangle^\bullet)} \langle M'' \{ \{ C_i(1)/y_1 \} \} \rangle^\circ \langle C_i(2)/y_2 \rangle \\ &\quad \cdots \langle C_i(k)/y_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \mathbb{L} \end{aligned}$$

We assume for simplicity that $\text{head}(M'') = y_1$. On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ &= \langle M \{ \{ N_1/x \} \} \langle \langle C \setminus N_1 \rangle * U/x \rangle + \dots + M \{ \{ N_k/x \} \} \langle \langle C \setminus N_k \rangle * U/x \rangle \rangle^\circ \\ &= \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C \rangle^\bullet)} \langle M'' \{ \{ C_i(1)/y_1 \} \} \rangle^\circ \langle C_i(2)/y_2 \rangle \\ &\quad \cdots \langle C_i(k)/y_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \mathbb{L} \end{aligned}$$

From these developments from $\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ$ and $\langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ$, and $\tilde{y} = y_1 \dots y_n$, one has the result.

3. The rule applied is $[R] = [R : \text{Fetch}^1]$.

Then $\mathbb{N} = M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle$ and the reduction is

$$[R : \text{Fetch}^1] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x[i] \quad U_i = \lambda N^!}{M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow M \{N/x[i]\} \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle}$$

with $\mathbb{M} = M \{N/x[i]\} \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle$. Below we assume $\text{fv}(\mathbb{N}) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and $\tilde{x}_i = x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{j_i}}$, where $j_i = \#(x_i, N)$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

On the one hand, we have: (the last rule is $[RS : \text{Fetch}^1]$)

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{N})^\circ &= (M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle)^\circ = (M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \langle\tilde{x}_1/x_1\rangle \cdots \langle\tilde{x}_k/x_k\rangle)^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= (M' \langle\langle C' * U/x \rangle\rangle)^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle\langle C' \rangle\rangle)} (\langle M'(\tilde{y}/x) \rangle)^\circ \langle C_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(k)/y_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle\langle C' \rangle\rangle)} (\langle M'' \rangle)^\circ \langle C_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(k)/y_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &\longrightarrow \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle\langle C' \rangle\rangle)} (\langle M'' \{N/x[i]\} \rangle)^\circ \langle C_i(2)/y_2 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(k)/y_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \mathbb{L} \end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

On the other hand, assuming for simplicity that $\text{head}(M'') = x[i]$ and $U_i = N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{M})^\circ &= (M \{N/x[i]\} \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle)^\circ \\ &= \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle\langle C' \rangle\rangle)} (\langle M'' \{N/x[i]\} \rangle)^\circ \langle C_i(2)/y_2 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(k)/y_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] = \mathbb{L} \end{aligned} \tag{B.4}$$

From (B.3) and (B.4), one has the result.

4. The rule applied is $[R] \neq [R : \text{Beta}]$ and $[R] \neq [R : \text{Fetch}]$. There are two possible cases:

(a) $[R] = [R : \text{Fail}^\ell]$

Then $\mathbb{N} = M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle$ and the reduction is

$$[R : \text{Fail}^\ell] \frac{\#(x, M) \neq \text{size}(C) \quad \tilde{z} = (\text{mlfv}(M) \setminus x) \uplus \text{mlfv}(C)}{M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}}}$$

where $\mathbb{M} = \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$. Below assume $\text{fv}(\mathbb{N}) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$.

On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{N})^\circ &= (M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle)^\circ = (M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \langle\tilde{x}_1/x_1\rangle \cdots \langle\tilde{x}_n/x_n\rangle)^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &= (M' \langle\langle C' * U/x \rangle\rangle)^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &= (M' \langle y_1, \dots, y_k/x \rangle)^\circ [y_1, \dots, y_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle C' * U/x \rangle\rangle [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &\longrightarrow_{[RS : \text{Fail}^\ell]} \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}, \tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_n} [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] = \mathbb{L} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$(\mathbb{M})^\circ = \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} (\text{fail}^{\tilde{z}})^\circ = \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}, \tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_n} [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] = \mathbb{L}$$

Therefore, $(\mathbb{N})^\circ \longrightarrow (\mathbb{M})^\circ$ and the result follows.

(b) $[R] = [R : \text{Fail}^1]$ Then $N = M \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle$ and the reduction is

$$[R : \text{Fail}^1] \frac{\#(x, M) = \text{size}(C) \quad U_i = 1^1 \quad \text{head}(M) = x[i]}{M \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow M \{ \text{fail}^0/x[i] \} \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle}$$

where $M = M \{ \text{fail}^0/x[i] \} \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle$.Below we assume $\text{fv}(N) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and $\tilde{x}_i = x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{j_i}}$, where $j_i = \#(x_i, N)$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$.On the one hand, we have: (the last rule applied was $[RS : \text{Fail}^1]$)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle N \rangle^\circ &= \langle M \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ = \langle M \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \langle M' \langle \langle C' * U/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C' \rangle)} \langle M' \langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle \rangle^\circ \langle C_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(k)/y_k \rangle \langle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rangle [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C' \rangle)} \langle M'' \rangle^\circ \langle C_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(k)/y_k \rangle \langle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rangle [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &\longrightarrow \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C' \rangle)} \langle M'' \{ \text{fail}^0/x[i] \} \rangle^\circ \langle C_i(2)/y_2 \rangle \\ &\quad \cdots \langle C_i(k)/y_k \rangle \langle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rangle [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \mathbb{L} \end{aligned}$$

We assume for simplicity that $\text{head}(M'') = x[i]$. On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle M \rangle^\circ &= \langle M \{ \text{fail}^0/x[i] \} \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ \\ &= \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C' \rangle)} \langle M'' \{ \text{fail}^0/x[i] \} \rangle^\circ \langle C_i(2)/y_2 \rangle \\ &\quad \cdots \langle C_i(k)/y_k \rangle \langle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rangle [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \mathbb{L} \end{aligned}$$

From the $\langle M \rangle^\circ$ and $\langle M \rangle^\circ$ above one has the result.(c) $[R] = [R : \text{Cons}_1]$.Then $N = (\text{fail}^{\tilde{z}}) C * U$ and the reduction is

$$[R : \text{Cons}_1] \frac{\tilde{z} = \text{mlfv}(C)}{(\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}) C * U \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \uplus \tilde{z}}}$$

and $M' = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \uplus \tilde{z}}$. Below we assume $\text{fv}(N) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$.

On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle N \rangle^\circ &= \langle (\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} B) \rangle^\circ = \langle (\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} C * U \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_n/x_n \rangle) \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &= \langle (\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} C' * U) \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] = \langle (\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}) \rangle^\circ \langle C' * U \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &= \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \langle C' * U \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \longrightarrow_{[RS : \text{Cons}_1]} \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \uplus \tilde{z}} [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &= \mathbb{L} \end{aligned}$$

Where $\tilde{y} \uplus \tilde{z} = \tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_n$. On the other hand, we have:

$$\langle M \rangle^\circ = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \langle \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \uplus \tilde{z}} \rangle^\bullet [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] = \sum_{\text{PER}(B)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \cup \tilde{z}} [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] = \mathbb{L}$$

Therefore, $\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ \longrightarrow \mathbb{L} = \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^\circ$, and the result follows.

(d) $[\mathbb{R}] = [\mathbb{R} : \text{Cons}_2]$

Then $\mathbb{N} = \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \langle \langle C * U/z \rangle \rangle$ and the reduction is

$$[\mathbb{R} : \text{Cons}_2] \frac{\#(z, \tilde{y}) = \text{size}(C) \quad \tilde{z} = \text{mlfv}(C)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \langle \langle C * U/z \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\langle \tilde{x} \setminus z \rangle \uplus \tilde{z}}}$$

and $\mathbb{M} = \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\langle \tilde{y} \setminus x \rangle \uplus \tilde{z}}$. Below we assume $\text{fv}(\mathbb{N}) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$.

On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \langle \langle C * U/z \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ = \langle \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \langle \langle C * U/z \rangle \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_n/x_n \rangle \rangle^\bullet [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &= \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C \rangle^\bullet)} \langle \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet \langle C_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(k)/y_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &\xrightarrow{[\mathbb{R} : \text{Cons}_3]} \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C \rangle^\bullet)} \langle \text{fail}^{\langle \tilde{y} \setminus \tilde{y} \rangle \uplus \tilde{z}} \rangle^\bullet \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &\xrightarrow{[\mathbb{R} : \text{Cons}_4]} \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C \rangle^\bullet)} \langle \text{fail}^{\langle \tilde{y} \setminus \tilde{y} \rangle \uplus \tilde{z}} \rangle^\bullet [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

As \tilde{y} consists of free variables, we have that in $\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \langle \langle C * U/z \rangle \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_n/x_n \rangle$ the substitutions also occur on \tilde{y} resulting in a new \tilde{y}' where all x_i 's are replaced with their fresh components in \tilde{x}_i . Similarly \tilde{y}' is \tilde{y} with each x replaced with a fresh y_i . On the other hand, we have:

$$\langle M \rangle^\circ = \langle \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\langle \tilde{y} \setminus x \rangle \uplus \tilde{z}} \rangle^\circ = \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C \rangle^\bullet)} \langle \text{fail}^{\langle \tilde{y}' \setminus \tilde{y}' \rangle \uplus \tilde{z}} \rangle^\bullet [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \quad (\text{B.6})$$

The reductions in (B.5) and (B.6) lead to identical expressions.

As before, the reduction via rule $[\mathbb{R}]$ could occur inside a context (cf. Rules $[\mathbb{R} : \text{TCont}]$ and $[\mathbb{R} : \text{ECont}]$). We consider only the case when the contextual rule used is $[\mathbb{R} : \text{TCont}]$. We have $\mathbb{N} = C[N]$. When we have $C[N] \xrightarrow{[\mathbb{R}]} C[M]$ such that $N \xrightarrow{[\mathbb{R}]} M$ we need to show that $\langle C[N] \rangle^\circ \xrightarrow{j} \langle C[M] \rangle^\circ$ for some j dependent on $[\mathbb{R}]$. Firstly let us assume $[\mathbb{R}] = [\mathbb{R} : \text{Cons}_2]$ then we take $j = 1$. Let us take $C[\cdot]$ to be $[\cdot]B$ and $\text{fv}(NB) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ then

$$\langle NB \rangle^\circ = \langle NB \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle \rangle^\bullet [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] = \langle N'B' \rangle^\bullet [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] = \langle N' \rangle^\bullet \langle B' \rangle^\bullet [x_1 \leftarrow x_k]$$

We take $N'B' = NB \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle$, we have by the IH that $\langle N \rangle^\bullet \xrightarrow{j} \langle M \rangle^\bullet$ and hence we can deduce that $\langle N' \rangle^\bullet \xrightarrow{j} \langle M' \rangle^\bullet$ where $M'B' = MB \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle$. Finally we have $\langle N' \rangle^\bullet \langle B' \rangle^\bullet [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \xrightarrow{j} \langle M' \rangle^\bullet \langle B' \rangle^\bullet [x_1 \leftarrow x_k]$ and hence $\langle C[N] \rangle^\circ \xrightarrow{j} \langle C[M] \rangle^\circ$. \square

Theorem B.5 (Operational Soundness) *Let \mathbb{N} be a well-formed $\lambda_{\oplus}^{1\frac{1}{2}}$ expression. Suppose $\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ \longrightarrow \mathbb{L}$. Then, there exists \mathbb{N}' such that $\mathbb{N} \xrightarrow{[\mathbb{R}]} \mathbb{N}'$ and*

1. If $[\mathbb{R}] = [\mathbb{R} : \text{Beta}]$ then $\mathbb{L} \xrightarrow{\leq 1} \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle^\circ$;
2. If $[\mathbb{R}] \neq [\mathbb{R} : \text{Beta}]$ then $\mathbb{L} \xrightarrow{*} \langle \mathbb{N}'' \rangle^\circ$, for \mathbb{N}'' such that $\mathbb{N}' \equiv_{\lambda} \mathbb{N}''$.

Proof: By induction on the structure of \mathbb{N} :

1. Cases $\mathbb{N} = x$, $\mathbb{N} = x[i]$, $\mathbf{fail}^{\bar{y}}$ and $\mathbb{N} = \lambda x.N$, are trivial, since no reductions can be performed.

2. $\mathbb{N} = NB$:

Suppose $\text{lfv}(NB) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle NB \rangle^\circ = \langle NB \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_n/x_n \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] = \langle N' B' \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &= \langle N' \rangle^\circ \langle B' \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where $\tilde{x}_i = x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ij_i}$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$. By the reduction rules in Fig. B.2 there are three possible reductions starting in \mathbb{N} :

(a) $\langle N' \rangle^\circ \langle B' \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n]$ reduces via a [RS : Beta].

In this case $N = \lambda x.N_1$, and the encoding in (B.7) gives $N' = N \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_n/x_n \rangle$, which implies $N' = \lambda x.N'_1$ and the following holds:

$$\langle N' \rangle^\circ = \langle (\lambda x.N'_1) \rangle^\circ = (\lambda x. \langle N'_1 \langle \tilde{y}/x \rangle \rangle^\circ [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x]) = (\lambda x. \langle N'' \rangle^\circ [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x])$$

Thus, we have the following [RS : Beta] reduction from (B.7):

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N} \rangle^\circ &= \langle N' \rangle^\circ \langle B' \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] = (\lambda x. \langle N'' \rangle^\circ [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x]) \langle B' \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &\xrightarrow{[\text{RS:Beta}]} \langle N'' \rangle^\circ [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B' \rangle^\circ / x \rangle [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] = \mathbb{L} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Notice that the expression \mathbb{N} can perform the following [R : Beta] reduction:

$$\mathbb{N} = (\lambda x.N_1)B \xrightarrow{[\text{R:Beta}]} N_1 \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$$

Assuming $\mathbb{N}' = N_1 \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$ and we take $B = C * U$, there are two cases:

i. $\#(x, M) = \text{size}(C) = k$.

On the one hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle^\circ &= \langle N_1 \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ = \langle N_1 \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_n/x_n \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &= \langle N'_1 \langle \langle B'/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &= \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C \rangle^\circ)} \langle N'_1 \langle y_1, \dots, y_k/x \rangle \rangle^\circ \langle C_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \\ &\quad \cdots \langle C_i(k)/y_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &= \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C \rangle^\circ)} \langle N''_1 \rangle^\circ \langle C_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \\ &\quad \cdots \langle C_i(k)/y_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, via application of rule [RS : Ex-Sub]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L} &= \langle N'' \rangle^\circ [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B' \rangle^\circ / x \rangle [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &\xrightarrow{\sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C \rangle^\circ)} \langle N''_1 \rangle^\circ \langle C_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(k)/y_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_n]} \\ &= \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle^\circ \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows.

ii. Otherwise $\#(x, N_1) \neq \text{size}(C)$.

In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle^\circ &= \langle N_1 \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ = \langle N_1 \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \langle \tilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \tilde{x}_n/x_n \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &= \langle N'_1 \langle \langle B'/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] = \langle N'' \rangle^\circ [\tilde{y} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B' \rangle^\circ / x \rangle [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &= \mathbb{L} \end{aligned}$$

From (B.8): $(\mathbb{N})^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{L} = (\mathbb{N}')^\circ$ and the result follows.

(b) $(\mathbb{N}')^\circ \bullet (B')^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n]$ reduces via a $[\text{RS} : \text{Cons}_1]$.

In this case, $N = \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$, and the encoding in (B.7) gives $N' = N(\tilde{x}_1/x_1) \dots (\tilde{x}_n/x_n)$, which implies $N' = \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$, we let $B = C * U$, $\tilde{z} = \text{lfv}(C')$ and the following:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{N})^\circ &= (\mathbb{N}')^\circ \bullet (B')^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] = (\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}})^\circ \bullet (B')^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \\ &= \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} (B')^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_n] \rightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \uplus \tilde{z}} [x_1 \leftarrow x_n]. \end{aligned}$$

The expression \mathbb{N} can perform the reduction:

$$\mathbb{N} = \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} B \rightarrow_{[\text{R:Cons}_1]} \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \uplus \tilde{z}}, \text{ where } \tilde{z} = \text{mlfv}(C)$$

Thus, $\mathbb{L} = (\mathbb{N}')^\circ$ and so the result follows.

(c) Suppose that $(\mathbb{N}')^\circ \rightarrow (\mathbb{N}'')^\circ$. This case follows from the induction hypothesis.

3. $\mathbb{N} = N \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$:

Suppose $\text{lfv}(N \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{N})^\circ &= (N \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle)^\circ = (N \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle (\tilde{x}_1/x_1) \dots (\tilde{x}_k/x_k))^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= (N' \langle \langle B'/x \rangle \rangle)^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Let us consider the two possibilities of the encoding where we take $B = C * U$:

(a) Where $\#(x, M) = \text{size}(B) = k$

Then we continue equation (B.9) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{N})^\circ &= (N' \langle \langle B'/x \rangle \rangle)^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C' \rangle)} (N' \langle y_1, \dots, y_n/x \rangle)^\circ \langle C_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \\ &\quad \dots \langle C_i(n)/y_n \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C' \rangle)} (N'')^\circ \langle C_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \dots \langle C_i(n)/y_n \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

There are five possible reductions that can take place, these being $[\text{RS:Fetch}^\ell]$, $[\text{RS:Fetch}^1]$, $[\text{RS:Fail}^1]$, $[\text{RS:Cons}_3]$ and when we apply the $[\text{RS:Cont}]$ rules

i. Suppose that $\text{head}(N'') = y_1$ and for simplicity we assume C' has only one element N_1 then from (B.10) and by letting $C' = \lambda N_1 \int$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{N})^\circ &= (N'')^\circ \langle \langle N_1 \int \bullet \rangle / y_1 \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &\rightarrow (N'')^\circ \{ \langle N_1 \int \bullet \rangle / y_1 \} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] = \mathbb{L} \end{aligned}$$

Also, $\mathbb{N} = N \langle \langle \lambda N_1 \int * U/x \rangle \rangle \rightarrow N \{ \langle N_1/x \rangle \} \langle \langle 1 * U/x \rangle \rangle = \mathbb{N}'$. Then $\mathbb{L}' = (\mathbb{N}')^\circ$ and the result follows.

ii. Suppose that $\text{head}(N'') = x[i]$ and then from (B.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{N})^\circ &= (N'')^\circ \langle C_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \dots \langle C_i(n)/y_n \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &\rightarrow (N'')^\circ \{ \langle U/x[i] \rangle \} \langle C_i(1)/y_1 \rangle \dots \langle C_i(n)/y_n \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \mathbb{L} \end{aligned}$$

We also have that $\mathbb{N} = N\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow N\{U_{\text{ind}}/x^1\}\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle = \mathbb{N}'$.
Then, $\mathbb{L}' = \langle\langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle\rangle^\circ$ and so the result follows.

iii. Suppose that $N'' = \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{z}}$ proceed similarly then from (B.10)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle\rangle^\circ &= \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle\langle C' \rangle\rangle^\bullet)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{z}'} \langle\langle C_i(1)/y_1 \rangle\rangle \cdots \langle\langle C_i(n)/y_n \rangle\rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &\longrightarrow^* \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle\langle C' \rangle\rangle^\bullet)} \mathbf{fail}^{(\tilde{z}' \setminus y_1, \dots, y_n) \uplus \tilde{y}} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &\longrightarrow^* \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle\langle C' \rangle\rangle^\bullet)} \mathbf{fail}^{(\tilde{z}' \setminus y_1, \dots, y_n) \uplus \tilde{y}} [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] = \mathbb{L}' \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{y} = \text{lfv}(C_i(1)) \uplus \cdots \uplus \text{lfv}(C_i(n))$. We also have that

$$\mathbb{N} = \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \mathbf{fail}^{(\tilde{z} \setminus x) \uplus \tilde{y}} = \mathbb{N}', \text{ where } \tilde{y} = \text{mfv}(B).$$

Then, $\mathbb{L}' = \langle\langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle\rangle^\circ$ and so the result follows.

iv. Suppose that $N'' \longrightarrow N'''$. This case follows by the induction hypothesis

(b) Otherwise, we continue from equation (B.9), where $\#(x, M) \neq k$, as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle\rangle^\circ &= \langle\langle N' \langle\langle B'/x \rangle\rangle^\bullet \rangle\rangle^\circ [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \langle\langle N' \langle y_1 \cdots y_k/x \rangle \rangle^\bullet \rangle [y_1 \cdots y_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle \langle B' \rangle^\bullet /x \rangle\rangle [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &= \langle\langle N'' \rangle^\bullet \rangle [y_1 \cdots y_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle \langle B' \rangle^\bullet /x \rangle\rangle [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \end{aligned}$$

We can perform the reduction

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle\rangle^\circ &= \langle\langle N'' \rangle^\bullet \rangle [y_1 \cdots y_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle \langle B' \rangle^\bullet /x \rangle\rangle [x_1 \leftarrow x_k] \\ &\longrightarrow \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{z}'} [x_1 \leftarrow x_k], \text{ where } \tilde{z}' = \text{fv}(N'') \uplus \text{fv}(C') = \mathbb{L}' \end{aligned}$$

We also have that

$$\mathbb{N} = N\langle\langle C/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{z}} = \mathbb{N}', \text{ where } \tilde{z} = \text{mlfv}(M) \uplus \text{mlfv}(C).$$

Then, $\mathbb{L}' = \langle\langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle\rangle^\circ$ and so the result follows.

4. $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}_1 + \mathbb{N}_2$:

Then this case holds by the induction hypothesis. □

B.5.3 Success Sensitiveness of $\langle\langle \cdot \rangle\rangle^\circ$

We now consider success sensitiveness, a property that complements (and relies on) operational completeness and soundness. For the purposes of the proof, we consider the extension of $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \frac{1}{2}}$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \frac{1}{2}}$ with dedicated constructs and predicates that specify success.

Definition B.7

We extend the syntax of terms for $\lambda_{\oplus}^{! \frac{1}{2}}$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{! \frac{1}{2}}$ with the same \checkmark construct. In both cases, we assume \checkmark is well formed. Also, we also define $\text{head}(\checkmark) = \checkmark$ and $\langle\langle \checkmark \rangle\rangle^\bullet = \checkmark$ □

An expression \mathbb{M} has success, denoted $\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$, when there is a sequence of reductions from \mathbb{M} that leads to an expression that includes a summand that contains an occurrence of \checkmark in head position.

Definition B.8 Success in $\lambda_{\oplus}^{1\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{1\frac{1}{2}}$

In $\lambda_{\oplus}^{1\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{1\frac{1}{2}}$, we define $\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$ if and only if there exist M_1, \dots, M_k such that $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow^* M_1 + \dots + M_k$ and $\text{head}(M'_j) = \checkmark$, for some $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and term M'_j such that $M_j \equiv_{\lambda} M'_j$. \square

Notation B.5.1 We use the notation $\text{head}_{\Sigma}(\mathbb{M})$ to be that $\forall M_i, M_j \in \mathbb{M}$ we have that $\text{head}(M_i) = \text{head}(M_j)$ hence we say that $\text{head}_{\Sigma}(\mathbb{M}) = \text{head}(M_i)$ for some $M_i \in \mathbb{M}$

Proposition B.5.4 (Preservation of Head term) The head of a term is preserved when applying the encoding $\langle \cdot \rangle^{\circ}$. That is to say:

$$\forall M \in \lambda_{\oplus}^{1\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{head}(M) = \checkmark \iff \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle M \rangle^{\circ}) = \checkmark$$

Proof:

By induction on the structure of M . We only need to consider terms of the following form.

1. When $M = \checkmark$ the case is immediate.
2. When $M = NB$ with $\text{fv}(NB) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and $\#(x_i, M) = j_i$ we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle NB \rangle^{\circ}) &= \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle NB \langle \widetilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \dots \langle \widetilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle \rangle^{\circ} [x_1 \leftarrow x_1] \dots [x_k \leftarrow x_k]) \\ &= \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle NB \rangle^{\bullet}) = \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle N \rangle^{\bullet}) \end{aligned}$$

and $\text{head}(NB) = \text{head}(N)$, by the IH we have $\text{head}(N) = \checkmark \iff \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle N \rangle^{\bullet}) = \checkmark$.

3. When $M = N \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle$, we must have that $\#(x, M) = \text{size}(C)$ for the head of this term to be \checkmark . Let $\text{fv}(N \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and $\#(x_i, M) = j_i$. We have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle N \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^{\circ}) &= \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle N \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \langle \widetilde{x}_1/x_1 \rangle \dots \langle \widetilde{x}_k/x_k \rangle \rangle^{\circ} [x_1 \leftarrow x_1] \dots [x_k \leftarrow x_k]) \\ &= \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle N \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \rangle^{\bullet}) \\ &= \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle C \rangle^{\bullet})} \langle N \langle \widetilde{x}/x \rangle \rangle^{\bullet} \langle C_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \dots \langle C_i(k)/x_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket) \\ &= \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle N \langle \widetilde{x}/x \rangle \rangle^{\bullet} \langle C_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \dots \langle C_i(k)/x_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket) \\ &= \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle N \langle \widetilde{x}/x \rangle \rangle^{\bullet}) \end{aligned}$$

and $\text{head}(N \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle) = \text{head}(N)$, by the IH $\text{head}(N) = \checkmark \iff \text{head}_{\Sigma}(\langle N \rangle^{\bullet}) = \checkmark$. \square

Theorem B.6 (Success Sensitivity) Let \mathbb{M} be a well-formed expression. We have $\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$ if and only if $\langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^{\circ} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$.

Proof: By induction on the structure of expressions $\lambda_{\oplus}^{1\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{1\frac{1}{2}}$.

1. Suppose that $\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$. We will prove that $\langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^{\circ} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$.

By operational completeness (Theorem B.4) we have that if $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow_{[R]} M'$ then

- (a) If $[R] = [R : \text{Beta}]$ then $\langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^{\circ} \longrightarrow^{\leq 2} \langle M' \rangle^{\circ}$;
- (b) If $[R] = [R : \text{Fetch}]$ then $\langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^{\circ} \longrightarrow^+ \langle M'' \rangle^{\circ}$, for some M'' such that $M' \equiv_{\lambda} M''$.
- (c) If $[R] \neq [R : \text{Beta}]$ and $[R] \neq [R : \text{Fetch}]$ then $\langle \mathbb{M} \rangle^{\circ} \longrightarrow \langle M' \rangle^{\circ}$;

Notice that neither our reduction rules (in Def. B.2), or our congruence \equiv_λ (in Fig. 3.12), or our encoding ($(\checkmark)^\circ = \checkmark$) create or destroy a \checkmark occurring in the head of term. By Proposition B.5.4 the encoding preserves the head of a term being \checkmark . The encoding acts homomorphically over sums, therefore, if a \checkmark appears as the head of a term in a sum, it will stay in the encoded sum. We can iterate the operational completeness lemma and obtain the result.

2. Suppose that $(\mathbb{M})^\circ \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$. We will prove that $\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$.

By operational soundness (Theorem B.5) we have that if $(\mathbb{M})^\circ \longrightarrow \mathbb{L}$ then there exist \mathbb{M}' such that $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow_{[\mathbb{R}]} \mathbb{M}'$ and

- (a) If $[\mathbb{R}] = [\mathbb{R} : \text{Beta}]$ then $\mathbb{L} \longrightarrow^{\leq 1} (\mathbb{M}')^\circ$;
- (b) If $[\mathbb{R}] \neq [\mathbb{R} : \text{Beta}]$ then $\mathbb{L} \longrightarrow^* (\mathbb{M}'')^\circ$, for \mathbb{M}'' such that $\mathbb{M}' \equiv_\lambda \mathbb{M}''$.

Since $(\mathbb{M})^\circ \longrightarrow^* M_1 + \dots + M_k$, and $\text{head}(M'_j) = \checkmark$, for some j and M'_j , s.t. $M_j \equiv_\lambda M'_j$.

Notice that if $(\mathbb{M})^\circ$ is itself a term headed with \checkmark , say $\text{head}((\mathbb{M})^\circ) = \checkmark$, then \mathbb{M} is itself headed with \checkmark , from Proposition B.5.4. In the case $(\mathbb{M})^\circ = M_1 + \dots + M_k$, $k \geq 2$, and \checkmark occurs in the head of an M_j , the reasoning is similar. \mathbb{M} has one of the forms:

- (a) $\mathbb{M} = N_1$, then N_1 must contain the subterm $M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle$ and $\text{size}(C) = \#(x, M)$.

The encoding of \mathbb{M} is:

$$\langle\langle M \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \rangle\rangle^\circ = \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(\langle\langle C \rangle\rangle^\bullet)} \langle\langle M(\tilde{x}/x) \rangle\rangle^\bullet \langle\langle C_i(1)/x_i \rangle\rangle \dots \langle\langle C_i(k)/x_i \rangle\rangle \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket.$$

We can apply Proposition B.5.4 and the result follows.

- (b) $\mathbb{M} = N_1 + \dots + N_l$ for $l \geq 2$.

This reasoning is similar and uses the fact that the encoding distributes homomorphically over sums.

In the case where $(\mathbb{M})^\circ \longrightarrow^+ M_1 + \dots + M_k$, and $\text{head}(M'_j) = \checkmark$, for some j and M'_j , such that $M_j \equiv_\lambda M'_j$, the reasoning is similar to the previous, since our reduction rules do not introduce/eliminate \checkmark occurring in the head of terms.

□

B.6 Appendix to § 3.4.4

B.6.1 Type Preservation

Lemma B.6.1 $\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, m)}^{\checkmark} = \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}^{\checkmark}$ and $\llbracket (\sigma^j, \eta) \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, m)}^{\checkmark} = \llbracket (\sigma^k, \eta) \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}^{\checkmark}$ hold, provided that τ_1, τ_2, n and m are as follows:

1. If $j > k$ then take τ_1 to be an arbitrary type, $m = 0$, take τ_2 to be σ and $n = j - k$.
2. If $j < k$ then take τ_1 to be σ , $m = k - j$, take τ_2 to be an arbitrary type and $n = 0$.
3. Otherwise, if $j = k$ then take $m = n = 0$. In this case, τ_1, τ_2 are unimportant.

Proof: We shall prove the case of (1) for the first equality, and the case for the second equality and of (2) are analogous. The case of (3) follows by the encoding on types in Def. 3.15.

Hence take $j, k, \tau_1, \tau_2, m, n$ satisfying the conditions in (1): $j > k$, τ_1 to be an arbitrary type, $m = 0$, $\tau_2 = \sigma$ and $n = j - k$. We want to show that $\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta = \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\zeta$. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\zeta &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\zeta) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma^{k-1} \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\zeta)))) \\ \llbracket \sigma^{k-1} \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\zeta &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\zeta) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma^{k-2} \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\zeta)))) \\ &\vdots \\ \llbracket \sigma^1 \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\zeta &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\zeta) \otimes (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\zeta)))) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma^{j-1} \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta)))) \\ \llbracket \sigma^{j-1} \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma^{j-2} \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta)))) \\ &\vdots \\ \llbracket \sigma^{j-k+1} \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma^{j-k} \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta)))) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $n = j - k$, hence we wish to show that $\llbracket \sigma^n \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta = \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\zeta$. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\zeta &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n)}^\zeta) \otimes (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n-1)}^\zeta)))) \\ \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n-1)}^\zeta &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n-1)}^\zeta) \otimes (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, n-2)}^\zeta)))) \\ &\vdots \\ \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, 1)}^\zeta &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_{(\sigma, 1)}^\zeta) \otimes (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, 0)}^\zeta)))) \\ \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, 0)}^\zeta &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& \mathbf{1})) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \sigma^n \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma^{n-1} \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta)))) \\ \llbracket \sigma^{n-1} \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma^{n-2} \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta)))) \\ &\vdots \\ \llbracket \sigma^1 \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& ((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta) \otimes (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta)))) \\ \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, 0)}^\zeta &= \oplus((\&1) \wp (\oplus \& \mathbf{1})) \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma B.6.2 *If $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ Then*

1. *If $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta, x^! : \llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\zeta$ then $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta, x^! : \llbracket \varepsilon \rrbracket^\zeta$.*
2. *If $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta, u : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta$ then $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta, u : (\sigma^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta$.*

Proof:

1. We consider the first case where if $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta, x^! : \llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\zeta$ then $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta, x^! : \llbracket \varepsilon \rrbracket^\zeta$ and by Def. 3.15, $\llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\zeta = \&_{\eta_i \in \eta} \{1; \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket^\zeta\}$. We now proceed by induction on the structure of M :

(a) $M = x$.

By Fig. 3.8, $\llbracket x \rrbracket_u^\sharp = x.\overline{\text{some}}; [x \leftrightarrow u]$. We have the following derivation:

$$\frac{[(\text{Tid})] \frac{}{[x \leftrightarrow u] \vdash x : \overline{A}, u : A; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp, x^! : \llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\sharp}}{[\text{T}\&_d^\sharp] \frac{}{x.\overline{\text{some}}; [x \leftrightarrow u] \vdash x : \&\overline{A}, u : A; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp, x^! : \llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\sharp}}{}}$$

For some type A. Notice the derivation is independent of $x^! : \llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\sharp$, hence holds when $M = x$. Note that we do not consider $M = y$ where $y \neq x$, this is due to the case being trivial due to the typing of y being independent on x .

(b) $M = x[\text{ind}]$.

By Fig. 3.8, $\llbracket x[\text{ind}] \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \overline{x^!}?(x_i).x_i.l_{\text{ind}}; [x_i \leftrightarrow u]$. We have the following derivation applying $[\text{Tcopy}]$:

$$\frac{[(\text{Tid})] \frac{}{[x_i \leftrightarrow u] \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x_i : \overline{\llbracket \eta_{\text{ind}} \rrbracket^\sharp}; x^! : \&_{\eta_i \in \eta} \{1_i; \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket^\sharp\}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp}}{[\text{T}\oplus_i] \frac{}{x_i.l_{\text{ind}}; [x_i \leftrightarrow u] \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x_i : \oplus_{\eta_i \in \eta} \{1_i; \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket^\sharp\}; x^! : \oplus_{\eta_i \in \eta} \{1_i; \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket^\sharp\}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp}}{x^!?(x_i).x_i.l_{\text{ind}}; [x_i \leftrightarrow u] \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp; x^! : \oplus_{\eta_i \in \eta} \{1_i; \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket^\sharp\}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp}}{}}$$

On the other hand we have derivation:

$$\frac{[(\text{Tid})] \frac{}{[x_i \leftrightarrow u] \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x_i : \overline{\llbracket \varepsilon_{\text{ind}} \rrbracket^\sharp}; x^! : \&_{\varepsilon_i \in \varepsilon} \{1_i; \llbracket \varepsilon_i \rrbracket^\sharp\}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp}}{[\text{T}\oplus_i] \frac{}{x_i.l_{\text{ind}}; [x_i \leftrightarrow u] \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, x_i : \oplus_{\varepsilon_i \in \varepsilon} \{1_i; \llbracket \varepsilon_i \rrbracket^\sharp\}; x^! : \oplus_{\varepsilon_i \in \varepsilon} \{1_i; \llbracket \varepsilon_i \rrbracket^\sharp\}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp}}{[\text{Tcopy}] \frac{}{x^!?(x_i).x_i.l_{\text{ind}}; [x_i \leftrightarrow u] \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp; x^! : \oplus_{\varepsilon_i \in \varepsilon} \{1_i; \llbracket \varepsilon_i \rrbracket^\sharp\}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp}}{}}$$

By $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ we have that $\varepsilon_{\text{ind}} = \eta_{\text{ind}}$. Similarly for the case of $M = y[\text{ind}]$ with $y \neq x$ we use the argument that the typing of y is independent on x .

(c) $M = M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$.

If $y = x$ the case proceeds similarly to (1a) otherwise we proceed by induction on M' .

(d) $M = \lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])$.

From Def. 3.14 it follows that

$$\llbracket \lambda x.M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp = u.\overline{\text{some}}; u(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^!).\text{close}; \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp.$$

We give the final derivation in parts. The first part we name Π_1 derived by:

$$\frac{[\text{T}\perp] \frac{}{\llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket^\sharp, x^\ell : \overline{\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp, x^! : \overline{\llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\sharp}}{x.\text{close}; \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash x : \perp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket^\sharp, x^\ell : \overline{\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp, x^! : \overline{\llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\sharp}}{[\text{T}?] \frac{}{x.\text{close}; \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash x : \perp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket^\sharp, x^\ell : \overline{\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp, x^! : \overline{\llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp}}{[\text{T}\wp] \frac{}{x(x^!).\text{close}; \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash x : (? \overline{\llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\sharp}) \wp (\perp), u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket^\sharp, x^\ell : \overline{\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp}}{[\text{T}\wp] \frac{}{x(x^\ell).x(x^!).\text{close}; \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash x : \overline{\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp} \wp ((? \overline{\llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\sharp}) \wp (\perp)), u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket^\sharp; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp}}{}}$$

We take $P = x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; [M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^{\sharp}$ and continue the derivation:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\Pi_1 \\
\vdots \\
\frac{P \vdash x : \overline{[\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp}} \wp ((?[\eta]^\sharp) \wp (\perp)), u : [\tau]^\sharp, [\Gamma']^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}{[\text{T}\&\tilde{d}]^{\sharp}} \\
\frac{x.\overline{\text{some}}; P \vdash x : \&(\overline{[\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp}} \wp ((?[\eta]^\sharp) \wp (\perp))), u : [\tau]^\sharp, [\Gamma']^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}{[\text{T}\wp]} \\
\frac{u(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}; P \vdash u : \&(\overline{[\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp}} \wp ((?[\eta]^\sharp) \wp (\perp))) \wp [\tau]^\sharp, [\Gamma']^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}{[\text{T}\&\tilde{d}]^{\sharp}} \\
u.\overline{\text{some}}; u(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}; P \vdash u : \&(\&(\overline{[\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp}} \wp ((?[\eta]^\sharp) \wp (\perp))) \wp [\tau]^\sharp), [\Gamma']^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp
\end{array}$$

By Definition 3.15 we have that $\overline{([\sigma^k, \eta] \rightarrow \tau)^\sharp} = \&(\&(\overline{[\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp}} \wp ((?[\eta]^\sharp) \wp (\perp))) \wp [\tau]^\sharp)$. In this case we must have that the variable names for x from our hypothesis and x from M must be distinct.

(e) $M = (M' B)$, or $M = (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$, or $M = M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$.

The proof follows similarly to that of (1b).

(f) $M = M' \langle\langle N/x \rangle\rangle$

Case follows by that of (1a) and applying induction hypothesis on $[M']_u^{\sharp}$.

(g) When $M = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ Case follows by that of (1a).

2. If $[M]_u^{\sharp} \vdash [\Gamma]^\sharp, u : [(\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp$ then $[M]_u^{\sharp} \vdash [\Gamma]^\sharp, u : [(\sigma^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp$ follows from previous case along a similar argument. \square

Theorem B.7 (Type Preservation for $[\cdot]_u^{\sharp}$) Let B and \mathbb{M} be a bag and an expression in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\sharp}$, respectively.

1. If $\Theta; \Gamma \models B : (\sigma^k, \eta)$ then $[B]_u^{\sharp} \models [\Gamma]^\sharp, u : [(\sigma^k, \eta)]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp}; [\Theta]^\sharp$.
2. If $\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbb{M} : \tau$ then $[\mathbb{M}]_u^{\sharp} \models [\Gamma]^\sharp, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp$.

Proof: The proof is by mutual induction on the typing derivation of B and \mathbb{M} , with an analysis for the last rule applied. Recall that the encoding of types ($[-]^\sharp$) has been given in Def. 3.15.

1. We have the following derivation where we take $B = C * U$:

$$\frac{[\text{FS:bag}] \quad \Theta; \Gamma \models C : \sigma^k \quad \Theta; \cdot \models U : \eta}{\Theta; \Gamma \models C * U : (\sigma^k, \eta)}$$

Our encoding gives:

$$[C * U]_u^{\sharp} = x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}(x^\ell).(\overline{[C]_{x^\ell}^{\sharp}} \mid \bar{x}(x^1).(!x^1(x_i).[U]_{x_i}^{\sharp} \mid x.\overline{\text{close}})).$$

In addition, the encoding of (σ^k, η) is:

$$\overline{([\sigma^k, \eta]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp})} = \oplus(\overline{([\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp})} \otimes ((?[\eta]^\sharp) \otimes (\mathbf{1}))) \text{ (for some } i \geq 0 \text{ and strict type } \sigma)$$

And one can build the following type derivation in parts (rules from Fig. 3.6). The first part we name Π_1 derived by:

$$\frac{\frac{[\mathbf{T}!]}{[U]_{x_i}^{\sharp} \vdash x_i : [\eta]^{\sharp}; [\Theta]^{\sharp}} \quad [\mathbf{T}\mathbf{1}]}{!x^!(x_i). [U]_{x_i}^{\sharp} \vdash x^! : ![\eta]^{\sharp}; [\Theta]^{\sharp}} \quad [\mathbf{T}\mathbf{1}]}{x.\overline{\text{close}} \vdash x : \mathbf{1}; [\Theta]^{\sharp}} \quad [\mathbf{T}\mathbf{1}]}{[\mathbf{T}\otimes]} \frac{\overline{!x^!(x_i). [U]_{x_i}^{\sharp} \mid x.\overline{\text{close}}} \vdash x : (![\eta]^{\sharp}) \otimes (\mathbf{1}); [\Theta]^{\sharp}}{[\mathbf{T}\otimes]} \frac{[\mathbf{T}\mathbf{1}]}{x.\overline{\text{close}} \vdash x : \mathbf{1}; [\Theta]^{\sharp}}}{\overline{!x^!(x_i). [U]_{x_i}^{\sharp} \mid x.\overline{\text{close}}} \vdash x : (![\eta]^{\sharp}) \otimes (\mathbf{1}); [\Theta]^{\sharp}}$$

We take $P = \overline{!x^!(x_i). [U]_{x_i}^{\sharp} \mid x.\overline{\text{close}}}$ and continue the derivation:

$$\frac{[\mathbf{T}\otimes]}{[\mathbf{T}\oplus_{\overline{w}}^{\sharp}]} \frac{\frac{[\mathbf{C}]_{x^{\ell}}^{\sharp} \vdash [\Gamma]^{\sharp}, x^{\ell} : [\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp}; [\Theta]^{\sharp} \quad \Pi_1}{\overline{!x^!(x_i). ([C]_{x^{\ell}}^{\sharp} \mid P) \vdash [\Gamma]^{\sharp}, x : ([\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp}) \otimes (![\eta]^{\sharp}) \otimes (\mathbf{1}); [\Theta]^{\sharp}}}}{x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; \overline{!x^!(x_i). ([C]_{x^{\ell}}^{\sharp} \mid P) \vdash [\Gamma]^{\sharp}, x : ([\sigma^k, \eta]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp})}}$$

Hence true provided both $[\mathbf{C}]_{x^{\ell}}^{\sharp} \vdash [\Gamma]^{\sharp}, x^{\ell} : [\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp}; [\Theta]^{\sharp}$ and $[U]_{x_i}^{\sharp} \vdash x_i : [\eta]^{\sharp}; [\Theta]^{\sharp}$ hold. Let us consider the two cases:

(a) For $[\mathbf{C}]_{x^{\ell}}^{\sharp} \vdash [\Gamma]^{\sharp}, x^{\ell} : [\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp}; [\Theta]^{\sharp}$ to hold we must consider two cases on the shape of C :

i. When $C = 1$ we may type bags with the $[\mathbf{FS}:1^{\ell}]$ rule. That is,

$$[\mathbf{FS}:1^{\ell}] \frac{}{\Theta; - \models \mathbf{1} : \omega}$$

Our encoding gives:

$$[\mathbf{1}]_{x^{\ell}}^{\sharp} = x^{\ell}.\text{some}_{\emptyset}; x^{\ell}(y_n). (y_n.\overline{\text{some}}; y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x^{\ell}.\text{some}_{\emptyset}; x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{none}}).$$

and the encoding of ω can be either:

A. $[\omega]_{(\sigma,0)}^{\sharp} = \overline{\&((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\& \oplus \perp))}$; or

B. $[\omega]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp} = \overline{\&((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\& \oplus ((\& [\sigma]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp}) \wp ([\omega]_{(\sigma,i-1)}^{\sharp}))))}$

And one can build the following type derivation in parts (rules from Fig. 3.6). The first part we name Π_1 derived by:

$$[\mathbf{T}\&\overline{a}] \frac{[\mathbf{T}\mathbf{1}]}{y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \vdash y_n : \mathbf{1}; [\Theta]^{\sharp}} \quad [\mathbf{T}\&x] \frac{[\mathbf{T}\&x]}{x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash x^{\ell} : \&A; [\Theta]^{\sharp}}}{[\mathbf{T}\oplus_{\overline{w}}^{\sharp}]} \frac{[\mathbf{T}\oplus_{\overline{w}}^{\sharp}]}{y_n.\overline{\text{some}}; y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \vdash y_n : \&\mathbf{1}; [\Theta]^{\sharp}} \quad [\mathbf{T}\oplus_{\overline{w}}^{\sharp}]}{x^{\ell}.\text{some}_{\emptyset}; x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash x^{\ell} : \oplus \&A; [\Theta]^{\sharp}}}{y_n.\overline{\text{some}}; y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x^{\ell}.\text{some}_{\emptyset}; x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash y_n : \&\mathbf{1}, x^{\ell} : \oplus \&A; [\Theta]^{\sharp}}$$

We take $P = y_n.\overline{\text{some}}; y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x^{\ell}.\text{some}_{\emptyset}; x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{none}}$ and continue the derivation:

$$[\mathbf{T}\oplus_{\overline{w}}^{\sharp}] \frac{[\mathbf{T}\wp]}{x^{\ell}(y_n).P \vdash x^{\ell} : (\&\mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&A); [\Theta]^{\sharp}} \quad \Pi_1}{x^{\ell}.\text{some}_{\emptyset}; x^{\ell}(y_n).P \vdash x^{\ell} : \oplus ((\&\mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&A)); [\Theta]^{\sharp}}$$

Since A is arbitrary, we can take $A = \mathbf{1}$ for $[\omega]_{(\sigma,0)}^{\sharp}$ and $A = ((\& [\sigma]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp}) \wp ([\omega]_{(\sigma,i-1)}^{\sharp}))$ for $[\omega]_{(\sigma,i)}^{\sharp}$, in both cases, the result follows.

ii. When $C = \lambda M \cdot C'$ we may type bags with the $[\mathbf{FS}:\text{bag}^{\ell}]$ rule.

$$[\mathbf{FS}:\text{bag}^{\ell}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma' \models M : \sigma \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C' : \sigma^k}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models \lambda M \cdot C' : \sigma^k}$$

Where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. To simplify the proof, we will consider $k = 3$.

By IH we have

$$\llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x_i : \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp} \quad \llbracket C' \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^{\sharp} \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x^\ell : \llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^{\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}$$

By Def. 3.14,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \lambda M \rrbracket \cdot C' \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^{\sharp} &= x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(\lambda M \cdot C)}; x^\ell(y_i).x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(\lambda M \cdot C)}; x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \overline{x^\ell}(x_i). \\ &\quad (x_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M)}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp} \mid \llbracket C' \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^{\sharp} \mid y_i.\overline{\text{none}}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Let Π_1 be the derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{[\text{T}\oplus_{\overline{w}}^{\sharp}]}{x_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M)}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x_i : \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}{[\text{T} \mid]} \quad \frac{[\text{T}\&^{\sharp}]}{y_i.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash y_i : \&\mathbf{1}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}}{\underbrace{x_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M)}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp} \mid y_i.\overline{\text{none}}}_{P_1} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x_i : \oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}, y_i : \&\mathbf{1}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}$$

Let $P_1 = (x_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M)}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp} \mid y_i.\overline{\text{none}})$, in the the derivation Π_2 below:

$$\frac{\frac{[\text{T}\otimes]}{x^\ell(x_i).(P_1 \mid \llbracket C' \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^{\sharp}) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket^{\sharp}, \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^{\sharp}, y_i : \&\mathbf{1}, x^\ell : (\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^{\sharp}); \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}{[\text{T}\&_{\text{d}}^{\sharp}]} \quad \frac{\Pi_1 \quad \llbracket C' \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^{\sharp} \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x^\ell : \llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^{\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}{x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \overline{x^\ell}(x_i).(P_1 \mid \llbracket C' \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^{\sharp}) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket^{\sharp}, \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^{\sharp}, y_i : \&\mathbf{1}, x^\ell : \&((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^{\sharp})); \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}{P_2}}{[\text{T}\&_{\text{d}}^{\sharp}]}$$

Let $P_2 = (x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \overline{x^\ell}(x_i).(P_1 \mid \llbracket C' \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^{\sharp}))$ in the derivation below:

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pi_2 \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &\quad \frac{[\text{T}\oplus_{\overline{w}}^{\sharp}]}{x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(\lambda M \cdot C)}; P_2 \vdash \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket^{\sharp}, y_i : \&\mathbf{1}, x^\ell : \&((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^{\sharp})); \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}{[\text{T}\wp]} \quad \frac{[\text{T}\wp]}{x^\ell(y_i).x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(\lambda M \cdot C)}; P_2 \vdash \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x^\ell : (\&\mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^{\sharp}))); \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}{[\text{T}\oplus_{\overline{w}}^{\sharp}]} \\ &\quad \llbracket \lambda M \rrbracket \cdot C' \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^{\sharp} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x^\ell : \oplus((\&\mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^{\sharp}))))); \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp} \end{aligned}$$

From Definitions 3.11 (duality) and 3.15, we infer:

$$\oplus((\&\mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}) \otimes (\llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^{\sharp})))) = \llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^{\sharp}$$

Therefore, $\llbracket \lambda M \rrbracket \cdot C' \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^{\sharp} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x^\ell : \llbracket \sigma \wedge \sigma \wedge \sigma \rrbracket_{(\tau,j)}^{\sharp}$ and the result follows.

- (b) For $\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp} \vdash x_i : \llbracket \eta \rrbracket^{\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}$ we consider U to be a binary concatenation of 2 components, one being an empty unrestricted bag and the other being $\lambda M \rrbracket^{\sharp}$. Hence we take $U = 1^{\sharp} \diamond \lambda M \rrbracket^{\sharp}$ with $\eta = \sigma_1 \diamond \sigma_2$, $\llbracket \eta \rrbracket^{\sharp} = \&\{1_1; \llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket^{\sharp}, 1_2; \llbracket \sigma_2 \rrbracket^{\sharp}\}$ by Def. 3.15 and finally by Def. 3.14 we have $\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp} = x_i.\text{case}\{1_1 : \llbracket 1^{\sharp} \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp}, 1_2 : \llbracket \lambda M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp}\}$, $\llbracket 1^{\sharp} \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp} = x_i.\overline{\text{none}}$ and $\llbracket \lambda M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp} = \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp}$, we can conclude $\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp} = x_i.\text{case}\{1_1 : x_i.\overline{\text{none}}, 1_2 : \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp}\}$. Hence we have:

$$\frac{[\text{FS:bag}^!]}{\frac{[\text{FS:bag}^!]}{\Theta; \cdot \models 1^! : \sigma_1} \quad \frac{[\text{FS:bag}^!]}{\Theta; \cdot \models M : \sigma_2}}{\Theta; \cdot \models 1^! \diamond \lambda M^! : \sigma_1 \diamond \sigma_2}}$$

By the induction hypothesis we have that $\Theta; \cdot \models M : \sigma$ implies $\llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp} \models x_i : \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}$

$$[\text{T}\&] \frac{[\text{T}\&^x] \frac{x_i.\text{none} \vdash x_i : \llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket^{\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp} \quad \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp} \vdash x_i : \llbracket \sigma_2 \rrbracket^{\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}{x_i.\text{case}\{1_1 : x_i.\text{none}, 1_2 : \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp}\} \vdash x_i : \&\{1_1; \llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket^{\sharp}, 1_2; \llbracket \sigma_2 \rrbracket^{\sharp}\}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}}{x_i.\text{case}\{1_1 : x_i.\text{none}, 1_2 : \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp}\} \vdash x_i : \&\{1_1; \llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket^{\sharp}, 1_2; \llbracket \sigma_2 \rrbracket^{\sharp}\}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}$$

Therefore, $x_i.\text{case}\{1_1 : x_i.\text{none}, 1_2 : \llbracket M \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp}\} \vdash x_i : \&\{1_1; \llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket^{\sharp}, 1_2; \llbracket \sigma_2 \rrbracket^{\sharp}\}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}$ and the result follows.

2. The proof of type preservation for expressions, relies on the analysis of twelve cases:

(a) **Rule [FS:var^ℓ]:** Then we have the following derivation:

$$[\text{FS:var}^{\ell}] \frac{}{\Theta; x : \tau \models x : \tau}$$

By Def. 3.15, $\llbracket x : \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp} = x : \&\overline{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}}$, and by Fig. 3.8, $\llbracket x \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = x.\overline{\text{some}}; [x \leftrightarrow u]$. The thesis holds thanks to the following derivation:

$$[\text{T}\&_d^x] \frac{[(\text{Tid})] \frac{}{[x \leftrightarrow u] \vdash x : \overline{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}}{x.\overline{\text{some}}; [x \leftrightarrow u] \vdash x : \&\overline{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}}{x.\overline{\text{some}}; [x \leftrightarrow u] \vdash x : \&\overline{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}$$

(b) **Rule [FS:var[!]]:** Then we have the following derivation provided $\eta_{ind} = \tau$:

$$[\text{FS:var}^!]$$

$$\frac{[\text{FS:var}^{\ell}] \frac{}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; x : \eta_{ind} \models x : \tau}}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \cdot \models x[ind] : \tau}}$$

By Def. 3.15, $\llbracket \Theta, x^! : \eta \rrbracket^{\sharp} = \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x^! : \&\overline{\eta_i \in \eta \{1_i; \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket^{\sharp}\}}$, and by Fig. 3.8, $\llbracket x[ind] \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = \overline{x^!?(x_i).x_i.ind}; [x_i \leftrightarrow u]$. The thesis holds thanks to the following derivation:

$$[\text{T}\oplus_i]$$

$$[\text{Tcopy}] \frac{[(\text{Tid})] \frac{}{[x_i \leftrightarrow u] \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x_i : \overline{\llbracket \eta_{ind} \rrbracket^{\sharp}}; x^! : \&\overline{\eta_i \in \eta \{1_i; \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket^{\sharp}\}}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}{x_i.ind; [x_i \leftrightarrow u] \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x_i : \oplus_{\eta_i \in \eta \{1_i; \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket^{\sharp}\}}; x^! : \oplus_{\eta_i \in \eta \{1_i; \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket^{\sharp}\}}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}}{\overline{x^!?(x_i).x_i.ind}; [x_i \leftrightarrow u] \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x^! : \oplus_{\eta_i \in \eta \{1_i; \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket^{\sharp}\}}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}}$$

(c) **Rule [FS:weak]:** Then we have the following derivation:

$$[\text{FS:weak}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \tau}{\Theta; \Gamma, x : \omega \models M[\leftarrow x] : \tau}$$

By Def. 3.15, $\llbracket \Gamma, x : \omega \rrbracket^{\sharp} = \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x^{\ell} : \overline{\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)}^{\sharp}}$, and by Fig. 3.8,

$$\llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{some}}.x^{\ell}(y_i).(y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_i.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{none}}).$$

By IH, we have $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^{\sharp}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}$. The thesis holds thanks to the following derivation which we give in parts. The first part we name Π_1 derived by:

$$\frac{[\mathbb{T}\perp] \frac{[M]_u^\sharp \vdash [\Gamma]^\sharp, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}{y_i.\text{close}; [M]_u^\sharp \vdash y_i:\perp, [\Gamma]^\sharp, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}}{[\mathbb{T}\oplus_w^\sharp] \frac{y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_i.\text{close}; [M]_u^\sharp \vdash y_i:\oplus\perp, [\Gamma]^\sharp, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}}$$

We take $P = y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_i.\text{close}; [M]_u^\sharp$ and continue the derivation:

$$\frac{[\mathbb{T}\otimes] \frac{\Pi_1 \frac{[\mathbb{T}\&^x] \frac{x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash x^\ell : \&A}{x^\ell(y_i).(P \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \vdash x^\ell : (\oplus\perp) \otimes (\&A), [\Gamma]^\sharp, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}}{[M[\leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \vdash x^\ell : \&((\oplus\perp) \otimes (\&A)), [\Gamma]^\sharp, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}}}{[\mathbb{T}\&_d^\sharp] \frac{x^\ell(y_i).(P \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \vdash x^\ell : (\oplus\perp) \otimes (\&A), [\Gamma]^\sharp, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}{[M[\leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \vdash x^\ell : \&((\oplus\perp) \otimes (\&A)), [\Gamma]^\sharp, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}}$$

Since A is arbitrary, we can take $A = 1$ for $[\omega]_{(\sigma,0)}^\sharp$ and $A = ((\&[\sigma]^\sharp) \wp ([\omega]_{(\sigma,i-1)}^\sharp))$ for $[\omega]_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp$ where $i > 0$, in both cases, the result follows.

(d) **Rule [FS : abs-sh]:**

Then $\mathbb{M} = \lambda x.(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])$, and the derivation is:

$$[\text{FS:abs-sh}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, x : \sigma^k \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \lambda x.(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) : (\sigma^k, \eta) \rightarrow \tau}$$

By IH, we have $[M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \vdash u : [\tau]^\sharp, [\Gamma]^\sharp, x^\ell : \overline{[\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp}; [\Theta]^\sharp, x^1 : \overline{[\eta]^\sharp}$. From Def. 3.14, it follows $[\lambda x.M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp = u.\overline{\text{some}}; u(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; [M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp$

We give the final derivation in parts. The first part we name Π_1 derived by:

$$\frac{[\mathbb{T}\perp] \frac{[M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \vdash u : [\tau]^\sharp, [\Gamma]^\sharp, x^\ell : \overline{[\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp}; [\Theta]^\sharp, x^1 : \overline{[\eta]^\sharp}}{x.\text{close}; [M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \vdash x:\perp, u : [\tau]^\sharp, [\Gamma]^\sharp, x^\ell : \overline{[\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp}; [\Theta]^\sharp, x^1 : \overline{[\eta]^\sharp}}}{[\mathbb{T}?] \frac{x.\text{close}; [M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \vdash x:\perp, u : [\tau]^\sharp, [\Gamma]^\sharp, x^\ell : \overline{[\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp}; [\Theta]^\sharp, x^1 : \overline{[\eta]^\sharp}}{x(x^1).x.\text{close}; [M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \vdash x : (?[\overline{[\eta]^\sharp}]) \wp (\perp), u : [\tau]^\sharp, [\Gamma]^\sharp, x^\ell : \overline{[\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp}; [\Theta]^\sharp}}{[\mathbb{T}\wp] \frac{x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; [M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \vdash x : \overline{[\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp} \wp ((?[\overline{[\eta]^\sharp}]) \wp (\perp)), u : [\tau]^\sharp, [\Gamma]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}}$$

We take $P = x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; [M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp$ and continue the derivation:

$$\frac{\Pi_1 \quad \vdots \quad [\mathbb{T}\&_d^\sharp] \frac{P \vdash x : \overline{[\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp} \wp ((?[\overline{[\eta]^\sharp}]) \wp (\perp)), u : [\tau]^\sharp, [\Gamma]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}{x.\overline{\text{some}}; P \vdash x : \&(\overline{[\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp} \wp ((?[\overline{[\eta]^\sharp}]) \wp (\perp))), u : [\tau]^\sharp, [\Gamma]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}}{[\mathbb{T}\wp] \frac{u(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}; P \vdash u : \&(\overline{[\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp} \wp ((?[\overline{[\eta]^\sharp}]) \wp (\perp))) \wp [\tau]^\sharp, [\Gamma]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}{u.\overline{\text{some}}; u(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}; P \vdash u : \&(\overline{[\sigma^k]_{(\sigma,i)}^\sharp} \wp ((?[\overline{[\eta]^\sharp}]) \wp (\perp))) \wp [\tau]^\sharp, [\Gamma]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}}$$

By Definition 3.15 we have that $\llbracket (\sigma^k, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp = \&(\&(\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)}^\sharp) \wp ((\overline{\llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\sharp}) \wp (\perp))) \wp \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp$. Hence the case holds by $\llbracket \lambda x. M[x^\ell \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash u : \llbracket (\sigma^k, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\sharp; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp$.

(e) **Rule [FS : app]:** Then $\mathbb{M} = M B$, where $B = C * U$ and the derivation is:

$$[\text{FS:app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \Vdash M : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \Vdash B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \Vdash M B : \tau}$$

By IH, we have both

- $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp$
- $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket (\sigma^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp$, by Lemma B.6.2
- $\llbracket B \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}^\sharp; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp$, for some τ_2 and some n .

Therefore, from the fact that \mathbb{M} is well-formed and Definitions 3.14 and 3.15, we have:

- $\llbracket M(C * U) \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^\sharp))$;
- $\llbracket (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp = \oplus(\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, m)}^\sharp) \otimes (\llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\sharp)$, for some τ_1 and some m .

Also, since $\llbracket B \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}^\sharp$, we have the following derivation Π_i :

$$[\text{T}\otimes] \frac{[\text{Tid}] \frac{\llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\sharp, x : \llbracket (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}^\sharp; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp}{[v \leftrightarrow u] \vdash v : \overline{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp}}{\bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\sharp, v : \llbracket (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}^\sharp \otimes \overline{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp}}{v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\sharp, v : \oplus(\llbracket \sigma^k, \varepsilon \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}^\sharp) \otimes \overline{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp}}$$

Notice that $\oplus(\llbracket \sigma^k, \varepsilon \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}^\sharp) \otimes \overline{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp} = \overline{\llbracket (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp}$. Therefore, by one application of [Tcut] we obtain the derivations ∇_i , for each $C_i \in \text{PER}(C)$:

$$[\text{Tcut}] \frac{\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\sharp, v : \llbracket (\sigma^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp \quad \Pi_i}{(\nu v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp)) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\sharp, \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp}$$

In order to apply [Tcut], we must have that $\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, m)}^\sharp = \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}^\sharp$, therefore, the choice of τ_1, τ_2, n and m , will consider the different possibilities for j and k , as in Proposition B.6.1. We can then conclude that $\llbracket MB \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\sharp, \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp$:

$$[\text{T}\&] \frac{\text{For each } C_i \in \text{PER}(C) \quad \nabla_i}{\bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_x^\sharp)) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\sharp, \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp}}$$

and the result follows.

(f) **Rule [FS : share]:** Then $\mathbb{M} = M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]$ and the derivation is:

$$[\text{FS : share}] \frac{\Theta; \Delta, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \Vdash M : \tau \quad x \notin \Delta \quad k \neq 0}{\Theta; \Delta, x : \sigma_k \Vdash M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau}$$

To simplify the proof we will consider $k = 1$ (the case in which $k > 1$ follows similarly).

By IH, we have $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \vdash \llbracket \Delta, x_1 : \sigma \rrbracket^\sharp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\sharp; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\sharp$. From Definitions 3.14 and 3.15, it follows

- $\llbracket \Delta, x_1 : \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp} = \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x_1^{\ell} : \&\overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}}$.
- $\llbracket M[x_1, \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{some}}.x^{\ell}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; 0$
 $\mid x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{some}}; x^{\ell}.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus x_1)};$
 $x^{\ell}(x_1).x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{some}}.x^{\ell}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)};$
 $y_2.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{none}})$

We shall split the expression into two parts:

$$N_1 = x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{some}}.x^{\ell}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_2.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{none}})$$

$$N_2 = x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{some}}.x^{\ell}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; 0 \mid$$

$$x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{some}}; x^{\ell}.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus x_1)}; x^{\ell}(x_1).N_1)$$

and we obtain the derivation for term N_1 as follows where we omit $\llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^{\sharp}$. We give the derivation in two parts, the first we being Π_1 :

$$\frac{[\text{T}\perp] \frac{\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \vdash \llbracket \Delta, x_1 : \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}}{y_2.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \vdash \llbracket \Delta, x_1 : \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}, y_2 : \perp}}{y_2.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_2.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \vdash \llbracket \Delta, x_1 : \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}, y_2 : \oplus \perp} [\text{T}\oplus_{\overline{w}}^x]$$

We take $P = y_2.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_2.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp}$ and continue the derivation:

$$[\text{T}\otimes] \frac{\frac{\Pi_1 \frac{[\text{T}\&^x] \frac{}{x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash x^{\ell} : \&A}}{x^{\ell}(y_2).(P \mid x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{none}}) \vdash \llbracket \Delta, x_1 : \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x^{\ell} : (\oplus \perp) \otimes (\&A)}}{x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{some}}.x^{\ell}(y_2).(P \mid x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{none}}) \vdash \llbracket \Delta, x_1 : \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x^{\ell} : \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)}^{\sharp}}}{N_1} [\text{T}\&_{\overline{d}}^x]$$

Notice that the last rule applied $[\text{T}\&_{\overline{d}}^x]$ assigns $x : \&((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\&A))$. Again, since A is arbitrary, we can take $A = \oplus((\&\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i-1)}^{\sharp}))$, obtaining $x : \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)}^{\sharp}$.

In order to obtain a type derivation for N_2 , consider the derivation Π_2 :

$$[\text{T}\wp] \frac{N_1 \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x_1 : \&\overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x^{\ell} : \llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)}^{\sharp}}{x^{\ell}(x_1).N_1 \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^{\sharp}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x^{\ell} : (\&\overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}}) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)}^{\sharp})} [\text{T}\oplus_{\overline{w}}^x]$$

$$[\text{T}\&_{\overline{d}}^x] \frac{x^{\ell}.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus x_1)}; x^{\ell}(x_1).N_1 \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^{\sharp}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x^{\ell} : \oplus((\&\overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}}) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)}^{\sharp}))}{x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{some}}; x^{\ell}.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus x_1)}; x^{\ell}(x_1).N_1 \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^{\sharp}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}, x^{\ell} : \&\oplus((\&\overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^{\sharp}}) \wp (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)}^{\sharp}))} [\text{T}\&_{\overline{d}}^x]$$

We take $P_1 = x^{\ell}.\overline{\text{some}}; x^{\ell}.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus x_1)}; x^{\ell}(x_1).N_1$ and $\Gamma_1 = \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^{\sharp}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\sharp}$ and continue the derivation of N_2

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{[T\cdot] \frac{}{0 \vdash -; [\Theta]^\sharp}}{y_1.\text{close}; 0 \vdash y_1 : \perp; [\Theta]^\sharp} \quad \Pi_2}{[T\oplus_w^x] \frac{}{y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; 0 \vdash y_1 : \oplus \perp; [\Theta]^\sharp} \quad P_1 \vdash \Gamma_1, x^\ell : \& \oplus ((\& [\sigma]^\sharp) \wp (\overline{[\omega]^\sharp_{(\sigma,i)}})); [\Theta]^\sharp} \\
\frac{[T\otimes] \frac{}{x^\ell(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; 0 \mid P_1) \vdash \Gamma_1, x^\ell : (\oplus \perp) \otimes (\& \oplus ((\& [\sigma]^\sharp) \wp (\overline{[\omega]^\sharp_{(\sigma,i)}})); [\Theta]^\sharp}}{x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.x^\ell(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; 0 \mid P_1) \vdash \Gamma_1, x^\ell : \overline{[\sigma \wedge \omega]^\sharp_{(\sigma,i)}}; [\Theta]^\sharp} \\
\hline
N_2
\end{array}$$

Hence the theorem holds for this case.

(g) **Rule [FS : ex-sub]:** Then $\mathbb{M} = (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$ and

$$\text{[FS:ex-sub]} \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, x : \sigma^j \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

By Proposition B.6.1 and IH we have:

$$\begin{array}{l}
\frac{}{[M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \vdash [\Gamma]^\sharp, x^\ell : \overline{[\sigma^j]^\sharp_{(\tau,n)}}, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp, x^1 : \overline{[\eta]^\sharp}} \\
\frac{}{[M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \vdash [\Gamma]^\sharp, x^\ell : \overline{[\sigma^j]^\sharp_{(\tau,n)}}, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp, x^1 : \overline{[\varepsilon]^\sharp}} \quad (*) \\
\frac{}{[B]_x^\sharp \vdash [\Delta]^\sharp, x : \overline{[\sigma^k, \varepsilon]^\sharp_{(\tau,m)}}; [\Theta]^\sharp}
\end{array}$$

Where (*) by is derived from Lemma B.6.2. From Def. 3.14, we have

$$[M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle]_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\text{vx})(x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; [M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \mid [C_i * U]_x^\sharp)$$

Therefore, for each $B_i \in \text{PER}(B)$, we obtain the following derivation Π_i :

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{[M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \vdash [\Gamma]^\sharp, x^\ell : \overline{[\sigma^j]^\sharp_{(\tau,n)}}, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp, x^1 : \overline{[\varepsilon]^\sharp}}{[T\perp] \frac{}{x.\text{close}; [M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \vdash x : \perp, [\Gamma]^\sharp, x^\ell : \overline{[\sigma^j]^\sharp_{(\tau,n)}}, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp, x^1 : \overline{[\varepsilon]^\sharp}} \\
\frac{[T?] \frac{}{x.\text{close}; [M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \vdash x : \perp, [\Gamma]^\sharp, x^\ell : \overline{[\sigma^j]^\sharp_{(\tau,n)}}, u : [\tau]^\sharp, x^1 : \overline{[\varepsilon]^\sharp}; [\Theta]^\sharp}}{[T\wp] \frac{}{x(x^1).x.\text{close}; [M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \vdash x : (!\overline{[\varepsilon]^\sharp}) \wp \perp, [\Gamma]^\sharp, x^\ell : \overline{[\sigma^j]^\sharp_{(\tau,n)}}, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp} \\
\frac{[T\wp] \frac{}{x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; [M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \vdash x : \overline{[\sigma^j]^\sharp_{(\tau,n)}} \wp ((!\overline{[\varepsilon]^\sharp}) \wp \perp), [\Gamma]^\sharp, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}}{[T\&d] \frac{}{x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; [M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp \vdash x : \overline{[\sigma^j, \varepsilon]^\sharp_{(\tau,n)}}, [\Gamma]^\sharp, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}
\end{array}$$

We take $P_1 = x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; [M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u^\sharp$ and continue the derivation of Π_i

$$\text{[Tcut]} \frac{P_1 \vdash x : \overline{[\sigma^j, \varepsilon]^\sharp_{(\tau,n)}}, [\Gamma]^\sharp, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp \quad [C_i * U]_x^\sharp \vdash [\Delta]^\sharp, x : \overline{[\sigma^k, \varepsilon]^\sharp_{(\tau,m)}}; [\Theta]^\sharp}{(\text{vx})(P_1 \mid [C_i * U]_x^\sharp) \vdash [\Gamma]^\sharp, [\Delta]^\sharp, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}$$

We must have that $\overline{[\sigma^j]^\sharp_{(\tau,m)}} = \overline{[\sigma^k]^\sharp_{(\tau,m)}}$ which by our restrictions allows. Therefore, from Π_i and multiple applications of [T&] it follows that

$$[\text{T}\&] \frac{\forall \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} \quad \Pi_i}{\bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu x)(P_1 \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^\zeta) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta, \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta}$$

that is, $\llbracket M[x_1 \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma, \Delta \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta$ and the result follows.

(h) **Rule [FS:ex-sub^ℓ]**: Then $\mathbb{M} = M \langle N/x \rangle$ and

$$[\text{FS:ex-sub}^\ell] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma, x : \sigma \models M : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models N : \sigma}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models M \langle N/x \rangle : \tau}$$

By IH we have both

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\zeta, x : \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta \\ \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta, x : \&\overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\zeta}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta \end{aligned}$$

From Definition 3.14, $\llbracket M \langle N/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\zeta = (\nu x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N)}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\zeta)$ and

$$[\text{TCut}] \frac{\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta, x : \&\overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\zeta}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta \quad \frac{[\text{T}\oplus^x] \quad \frac{\llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\zeta, x : \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta}{x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N)}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\zeta, x : \oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\zeta}}{(\nu x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N)}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\zeta) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta, \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta}}{\llbracket M \langle N/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta, \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta}$$

Observe that for the application of rule [TCut] we used the fact that $\oplus \overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\zeta} = \&\overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket^\zeta}$.

Therefore, $\llbracket M \langle N/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta, \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta$ and the result follows.

(i) **Rule [FS:ex-sub¹]**: Then $\mathbb{M} = M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ and

$$[\text{FS:ex-sub}^1] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \models M : \tau \quad \Theta; - \models U : \eta}{\Theta; \Gamma \models M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket : \tau}$$

By IH we have both

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\zeta \vdash x_i : \llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta \\ \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta; x^1 : \overline{\llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\zeta}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta \end{aligned}$$

From Definition 3.14, $\llbracket M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u^\zeta = (\nu x^1)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\zeta)$ and

$$[\text{TCut}] \frac{\frac{[\text{T}?] \quad \frac{\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta; x^1 : \overline{\llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\zeta}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta}{\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta; x^1 : ?\overline{\llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\zeta}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta}}{(\nu x^1)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\zeta \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\zeta) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta}}{[\text{T}!] \quad \frac{\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\zeta \vdash x_i : \llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta}{!x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\zeta \vdash x^1 : !\overline{\llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\zeta}; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta}}{\llbracket M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta}$$

Observe that for the application of rule [TCut] we used the fact that $!\overline{\llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\zeta} = ?\overline{\llbracket \eta \rrbracket^\zeta}$.

Therefore, $\llbracket M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u^\zeta \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket^\zeta, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^\zeta; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^\zeta$ and the result follows.

(j) **Rule [FS:fail]**: Then $\mathbb{M} = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ where $\tilde{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$ and

$$[\text{FS:fail}] \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma) = \tilde{x}}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} : \tau}$$

From Definition 3.14, $\llbracket \text{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_n} \rrbracket_u^\zeta = u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid x_n.\overline{\text{none}}$ and

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[T}\&^n\text{]} \frac{}{x_n.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash x_n : \& \overline{[\sigma_n]}^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp} \\
\text{[T}\&^{x_1}\text{]} \frac{}{x_1.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash_1 : \& \overline{[\sigma_1]}^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp} \quad \vdots \\
\text{[T}\&^u\text{]} \frac{}{u.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp} \quad \frac{}{x_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \cdots \mid x_k.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash x_1 : \& \overline{[\sigma_1]}^\sharp, \dots, x_n : \& \overline{[\sigma_n]}^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp} \\
\text{[T]} \frac{}{u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \cdots \mid x_k.\overline{\text{none}} \vdash x_1 : \& \overline{[\sigma_1]}^\sharp, \dots, x_n : \& \overline{[\sigma_n]}^\sharp, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp}
\end{array}$$

Thus, $[\text{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_n}]_u^\sharp \vdash x_1 : \& \overline{[\sigma_1]}^\sharp, \dots, x_n : \& \overline{[\sigma_n]}^\sharp, u : [\tau]^\sharp; [\Theta]^\sharp$ and the result follows.

(k) Rule [FS : sum]: This case follows easily by IH.

□

B.6.2 Operational Correspondence: Completeness and Soundness

Proposition B.6.1 *Let N be a well-formed linearly closed $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{1/2}$ -term with $\text{head}(N) = x$ (x denoting either linear or unrestricted occurrence of x) such that $\text{lfv}(N) = \emptyset$ and N does not fail, that is, there is no $Q \in \widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{1/2}$ for which there is a reduction $N \longrightarrow_{[\text{RS:Fail}]} Q$. Then,*

$$[\![N]\!]_u^\sharp \longrightarrow^* \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (\llbracket x \rrbracket_n^\sharp \mid P_i)$$

for some index set I , names \tilde{y} and n , and processes P_i .

Proof: By induction on the structure of N .

1. $N = x$ or $N = x[j]$:

These cases are trivial, and follow taking $I = \emptyset$ and $\tilde{y} = \emptyset$.

2. $N = (M B)$:

Then $\text{head}(M B) = \text{head}(M) = x$ then

$$[\![N]\!]_u^\sharp = [\![M B]\!]_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} (\nu v) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_{\tilde{y}}^\sharp \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{lfv}(B)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_{\tilde{y}}^\sharp))$$

and the proof follows by induction on $[\![M]\!]_u^\sharp$.

3. $N = (M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]) \langle \langle C * U / y \rangle \rangle$:

Then $\text{head}((M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]) \langle \langle C * U / y \rangle \rangle) = \text{head}((M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y])) = x$. As $N \longrightarrow_{[\text{R}]}$ where $[\text{R}] \neq [\text{RS : Fail}]$ we must have that $\text{size}(\tilde{y}) = \text{size}(C)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \llbracket (M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]) \langle C * U / y \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\forall y)(y.\overline{\text{some}}; y(y^\ell).y(y^1).y.\text{close}; \llbracket M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_y^\sharp) \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\forall y)(y.\overline{\text{some}}; y(y^\ell).y(y^1).y.\text{close}; \llbracket M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \\
&\quad y.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; \overline{y}(y^\ell).(\llbracket C_i \rrbracket_{y^\ell}^\sharp \mid \overline{y}(y^1).(!y^1.(y_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{y_i}^\sharp \mid y.\overline{\text{close}}))) \\
&\longrightarrow^* \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\forall y^\ell, y^1)(\llbracket M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y^\ell] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket C_i \rrbracket_{y^\ell}^\sharp \mid !y^1.(y_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{y_i}^\sharp) \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\forall y^\ell, y^1)(y^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{y}^\ell(z_1).(z_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; z_1.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid y^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \\
&\quad y^\ell.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{y_1, \dots, y_n\})}; y^\ell(y_1) \dots y^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{y}^\ell(z_n).(z_n.\text{some}_\emptyset; z_n.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \\
&\quad \mid y^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; y^\ell.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{y_n\})}; y^\ell(y_n).y^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{y}^\ell(z_{n+1}).(z_{n+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; \\
&\quad z_{n+1}.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid y^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \dots) \mid y^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; y^\ell(z_1).y^\ell.\text{some}_{z_1, \text{fv}(C)}; \\
&\quad y^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{y}^\ell(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(1))}; \llbracket C_i(1) \rrbracket_{y_1}^\sharp \mid \dots y^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(n))}; y^\ell(z_n). \\
&\quad y^\ell.\text{some}_{z_n, \text{fv}(C_i(n))}; y^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{y}^\ell(y_n).(y_n.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(n))}; \llbracket C_i(n) \rrbracket_{y_n}^\sharp \mid y^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; \\
&\quad y^\ell(z_{n+1}).(z_{n+1}.\overline{\text{some}}; z_{n+1}.\overline{\text{close}} \mid y^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; y^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid z_1.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\
&\quad \dots \mid z_n.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid !y^1.(y_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{y_i}^\sharp) \\
&\longrightarrow^* \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\forall \tilde{y}, y^1)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid y_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(1))}; \llbracket C_i(1) \rrbracket_{y_1}^\sharp \mid \dots \mid y_n.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(n))}; \\
&\quad \llbracket C_i(n) \rrbracket_{y_n}^\sharp \mid !y^1.(y_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{y_i}^\sharp)
\end{aligned}$$

and the result follows by induction on $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp$.

4. $N = M \langle N' / y \rangle$ and $N = M \llbracket u / y^1 \rrbracket$:

These cases follow easily by induction on $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp$.

□

Completeness

Here again, because of the diamond property (Proposition B.1.1), it suffices to consider a completeness result based on a single reduction step in $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\dagger \sharp}$:

Notation B.6.1 We use the notation $\text{fv}(M).\overline{\text{none}}$ and $\tilde{x}.\overline{\text{none}}$ where $\text{fv}(M)$ or \tilde{x} are equal to x_1, \dots, x_k to describe a process of the form $x_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid x_k.\overline{\text{none}}$

Theorem B.8 (Well Formed Operational Completeness) Let \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{M} be well-formed, linearly closed $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\dagger \sharp}$ expressions. If $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$ then there exists Q such that $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \longrightarrow^* Q \equiv \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp$.

Proof:

By induction on the reduction rule applied to infer $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$. We have ten cases.

1. **Case [RS : Beta]:**

Then $\mathbb{N} = (\lambda x.(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]))B \longrightarrow (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle = \mathbb{M}$, where $B = C * U$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} &= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket \lambda x.(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp})) \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\mathbf{v}v)(v.\overline{\text{some}}; v(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \\
&\quad \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).(\llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp} \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\
&\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\mathbf{v}v)(v(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \mid \bar{v}(x).(\llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp} \\
&\quad \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\
&\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\mathbf{v}v, x)(x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp} \mid [v \leftrightarrow u]) \\
&\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\mathbf{v}x)(x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}) = \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp}
\end{aligned}$$

and the result follows.

2. **Case [RS : Ex-Sub]:**

Then $\mathbb{N} = M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle$, with $C = \{M_1\} \dots \{M_k\}$, $k \geq 0$ and $M \neq \text{fail}^{\bar{v}}$.

The reduction is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{N} &= M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \\
&\longrightarrow \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} M\langle\langle C_i(1)/x_1 \rangle\rangle \dots \langle\langle C_i(k)/x_k \rangle\rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket = \mathbb{M}
\end{aligned}$$

We detail the encodings of $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp}$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp}$. To simplify the proof, we will consider $k = 1$ (the case in which $k > 1$ is follows analogously, similarly the case of $k = 0$ is contained within the proof of $k = 1$).

On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} &= \llbracket M[x_1 \leftarrow x]\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\mathbf{v}x)(x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M[x_1 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}) \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\mathbf{v}x)(x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M[x_1 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}(x^\ell). \\
&\quad (\llbracket C_i \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^{\sharp} \mid \bar{x}(x^1).(!x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp} \mid x.\overline{\text{close}}))) \quad (:= P_{\mathbb{N}})
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{\mathbb{N}} &\longrightarrow^* \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu x^\ell, x^1) (\llbracket M[x_1 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\ell \mid \llbracket C_i \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^\ell \mid !x^1.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\ell) \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu x^\ell, x^1) (x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\text{close}; 0 \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \\
&\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M) \setminus x_1}; x^\ell(x_1).x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}};\overline{x^\ell}(y_2).(y_2.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_2.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\ell \mid \\
&\quad x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(B_i(1))}; x^\ell(y_1).x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(C_i(1))}; x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}};\overline{x^\ell}(x_1). \\
&\quad (x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(1))}; \llbracket C_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\ell \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell(y_2).(y_2.\overline{\text{some}}; y_2.\overline{\text{close}} \mid \\
&\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid !x^1.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\ell) \\
&\longrightarrow^* \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu x_1, x^1) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\ell \mid x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(1))}; \llbracket C_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\ell \mid !x^1.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\ell) = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\ell
\end{aligned}$$

and the result follows.

3. Case [RS:Fetch^ℓ]:

Then we have $\mathbb{N} = M \langle N/x \rangle$ with $\text{head}(M) = x$ and $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow M \{N/x\} = \mathbb{M}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\ell &= \llbracket M \langle N/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\ell \\
&= (\nu x) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\ell \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N)}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\ell) \\
&\longrightarrow^* (\nu x) (\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (\llbracket x \rrbracket_j^\ell \mid P_i) \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N)}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\ell) \quad (*) \\
&= (\nu x) (\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (\llbracket x \rrbracket_j^\ell \mid P_i) \mid x.\text{some}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\ell) \\
&\longrightarrow (\nu x) (\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) ([x \leftrightarrow j] \mid P_i) \mid \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\ell) \\
&\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (P_i \mid \llbracket N \rrbracket_j^\ell) = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\ell
\end{aligned}$$

where the reductions denoted by (*) are inferred via Proposition B.6.1, and the result follows.

4. Case [RS:Fetch¹]:

Then, $\mathbb{N} = M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ with $\text{head}(M) = x^1[k]$, $U_i = \llbracket N \rrbracket_j^1$ and $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow M \{N/x^1\} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket = \mathbb{M}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\ell &= \llbracket M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u^\ell = (\nu x^1) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\ell \mid !x^1.(x_k). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}^\ell) \\
&\longrightarrow^* (\nu x^1) (\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (\llbracket x^1[k] \rrbracket_j^\ell \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_k). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}^\ell) \quad (*) \\
&= (\nu x^1) (\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (\overline{x^1}?(x_k).x_k.l_i; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_k). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}^\ell) \quad (*) \\
&\longrightarrow (\nu x^1) (\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) ((\nu x_k)(x_k.l_i; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] \mid \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}^\ell) \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_k). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}^\ell) \\
&= (\nu x^1) (\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) ((\nu x_k)(x_k.l_i; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] \mid x_k.\text{case}(i. \llbracket U_i \rrbracket_x^\ell)) \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_k). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}^\ell) \\
&\longrightarrow (\nu x^1) (\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (\llbracket \llbracket N \rrbracket_j^1 \rrbracket_j^\ell \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_k). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}^\ell) \\
&= (\nu x^1) (\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y}) (\llbracket N \rrbracket_j^\ell \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_k). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}^\ell) = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\ell
\end{aligned}$$

where the reductions denoted by $(*)$ are inferred via Proposition B.6.1.

5. **Cases [RS : TCont] and [RS : ECont]:**

These cases follow by IH.

6. **Case [RS:Fail^l]:**

Then, $\mathbb{N} = M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle$ with $k \neq \text{size}(C)$ and

$\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} = \mathbb{M}$, where $\tilde{y} = (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}) \cup \text{fv}(C)$.

Let $\text{size}(C) = l$ and we assume that $k > l$ (proceed similarly for $k < l$). Hence $k = l + m$ for

some $m \geq 1$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \llbracket M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\forall x)(x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \\
&\quad x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}(x^\ell).(\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^\sharp \mid \bar{x}(x^1).(!x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{close}}))) \\
\longrightarrow^* &\bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\forall x^\ell, x^1)(\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^\sharp \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\forall x^\ell, x^1)(x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}^\ell(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; 0 \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \\
&\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \bar{x})}; x^\ell(x_1) \dots x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}^\ell(y_k).(y_k.\text{some}_0; y_k.\text{close}; \mathbf{0} \mid \\
&\quad x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus x_k)}; x^\ell(x_k).x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}^\ell(y_{k+1}).(y_{k+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; \\
&\quad y_{k+1}.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \dots) \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; x^\ell(y_1).x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(C)}; \\
&\quad x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}^\ell(x_1).(x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(1))}; \llbracket C_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(l))}; \\
&\quad x^\ell(y_l).x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_l, \text{fv}(C_i(l))}; x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \bar{x}^\ell(x_l).(x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(l))}; \llbracket C_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\sharp \mid \\
&\quad y_l.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_0; x^\ell(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{some}}; y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_0; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}))) \mid \\
&\quad !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp \quad (:= P_{\mathbb{N}}) \\
\longrightarrow^* &\bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\forall x^\ell, x^1, y_1, x_1, \dots, y_l, x_l)(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; 0 \mid \dots \mid y_l.\text{some}_0; \\
&\quad y_l.\text{close}; 0 \mid x.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}^\ell(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\text{some}_0; y_{l+1}.\text{close}; 0 \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \\
&\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus x_{l+1}, \dots, x_k)}; x^\ell(x_{l+1}) \dots x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}^\ell(y_k).(y_k.\text{some}_0; y_k.\text{close}; 0 \mid \\
&\quad x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus x_k)}; x^\ell(x_k).x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\bar{x}^\ell(y_{k+1}).(y_{k+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; \\
&\quad y_{k+1}.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \dots) \mid x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(1))}; \llbracket C_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid \dots \mid \\
&\quad x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(l))}; \llbracket C_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\sharp \mid y_l.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid y_l.\overline{\text{none}}.x^\ell.\text{some}_0; x^\ell(y_{l+1}). \\
&\quad (y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{some}}; y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_0; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) \\
\longrightarrow &\bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\forall x^1, x_1, \dots, x_l)(u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid x_l.\overline{\text{none}} \mid (\text{fv}(M) \setminus x_1, \dots, x_k). \\
&\quad \overline{\text{none}} \mid x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(1))}; \llbracket C_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid \dots \mid x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(l))}; \llbracket C_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\sharp \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) \\
\longrightarrow^* &\bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\forall x^1)(u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid (\text{fv}(M) \setminus x_1, \dots, x_k).\overline{\text{none}} \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) \\
&\equiv \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid (\text{fv}(M) \setminus x_1, \dots, x_k).\overline{\text{none}} = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp
\end{aligned}$$

and the result follows.

7. Case [RS:Fail¹]:

Then, $\mathbb{N} = M\llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ with $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$, $U_i = \mathbf{1}^1$ and $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow M\{\{\text{fail}^0/x^1\}\}\llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$, where

$\tilde{y} = \text{lfv}(M)$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\dagger &= \llbracket M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u^\dagger = (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid !x^1.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger) \\
&\longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket x[i]_j \rrbracket_j^\dagger \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_k). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}^\dagger) \quad (*) \\
&= (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{x}^1?(x_k).x_k.l_i; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_k). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}^\dagger) \quad (*) \\
&\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})((\mathbf{v}x_k)(x_k.l_i; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] \mid \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}^\dagger) \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_k). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}^\dagger) \\
&= (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})((\mathbf{v}x_k)(x_k.l_i; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] \mid x_k.\text{case}_{U_i \in U} \{1_i : \llbracket U_i \rrbracket_x^\dagger\}) \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_k). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}^\dagger) \\
&\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket 1^1 \rrbracket_j^\dagger \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_k). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}^\dagger) \\
&= (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(j.\text{none} \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_k). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}^\dagger) = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\dagger
\end{aligned}$$

and the result follows.

8. **Case [RS : Cons₁]:**

Then, $\mathbb{N} = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} C * U$ and $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}\oplus\tilde{y}} = \mathbb{M}$ where $\tilde{y} = \text{lfv}(C)$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\dagger &= \llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} C * U \rrbracket_u^\dagger \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \rrbracket_v^\dagger \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{lfv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^\dagger)) \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\mathbf{v}v)(v.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{x}.\overline{\text{none}} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{lfv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^\dagger)) \\
&\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{x}.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{y}.\overline{\text{none}} = \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{x}.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{y}.\overline{\text{none}} = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\dagger
\end{aligned}$$

and the result follows.

9. **Cases [RS : Cons₂], [RS : Cons₃] and [RS : Cons₄]:**

These cases follow by IH similarly to the previous. □

Soundness

Theorem B.9 (Well Formed Weak Operational Soundness) *Let \mathbb{N} be a well-formed, linearly closed $\tilde{\lambda}_{\oplus}^\dagger$ expression. If $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\dagger \longrightarrow^* Q$ then there exist Q' and \mathbb{N}' such that $Q \longrightarrow^* Q'$, $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^* \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^\dagger \equiv Q'$.*

Proof: By induction on the structure of \mathbb{N} and then induction on the number of reductions of $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\dagger \longrightarrow^* Q$.

1. **Base case:** $\mathbb{N} = x$, $\mathbb{N} = x[j]$, $\mathbb{N} = \text{fail}^0$ and $\mathbb{N} = \lambda x.(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])$.

No reductions can take place, and the result follows trivially. $Q = \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\dagger \longrightarrow^0 \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\dagger = Q'$ and $x \longrightarrow^0 x = \mathbb{N}'$.

2. $\mathbb{N} = M(C * U)$.

Then, $\llbracket M(C * U) \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}))$, and we are able to perform the reductions from $\llbracket M(C * U) \rrbracket_u^{\sharp}$.

We now proceed by induction on k , with $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \rightarrow^k Q$. There are two main cases:

(a) When $k = 0$ the thesis follows easily:

We have $Q = \llbracket M(C * U) \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \rightarrow^0 \llbracket M(C * U) \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q'$ and $M(C * U) \rightarrow^0 M(C * U) = \mathbb{N}'$.

(b) The interesting case is when $k \geq 1$.

Then, for some process R and n, m such that $k = n + m$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} &= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp})) \\ &\rightarrow^m \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v) (R \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp})) \\ &\rightarrow^n Q \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the first $m \geq 0$ reduction steps are internal to $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp}$; type preservation in $\pi\tau$ ensures that, if they occur, these reductions do not discard the possibility of synchronizing with $v.\text{some}$. Then, the first of the $n \geq 0$ reduction steps towards Q is a synchronization between R and $v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}$.

We consider two sub-cases, depending on the values of m and n :

i. $m = 0$ and $n \geq 1$:

Then $R = \llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp}$ as $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \rightarrow^0 \llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp}$. Notice that there are two possibilities of having an unguarded:

$$\text{A. } M = (\lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])) \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^! \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^! \rrbracket \text{ with } (p, q \geq 0)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} &= \llbracket (\lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])) \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^! \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^! \rrbracket \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \\ &= (\nu y_1, \dots, y_p, z_1^!, \dots, z_q^!) (\llbracket \lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \mid y_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N_1)}; \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket_{y_1}^{\sharp} \mid \cdots \\ &\quad \mid y_p.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N_p)}; \llbracket N_p \rrbracket_{y_p}^{\sharp} \mid !z_1^!.(z_1).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{z_1}^{\sharp} \mid \cdots \mid !z_q^!.(z_q).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{z_q}^{\sharp}) \\ &= (\nu \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) (\llbracket \lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \mid Q'') \\ &= (\nu \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) (v.\overline{\text{some}}; v(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^!).x(x^!).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \mid Q'') \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{y} = y_1, \dots, y_p$, $\tilde{z} = z_1^!, \dots, z_q^!$ and

$$\begin{aligned} Q'' &= y_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N_1)}; \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket_{y_1}^{\sharp} \mid \cdots \mid y_p.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N_p)}; \llbracket N_p \rrbracket_{y_p}^{\sharp} \mid \\ &\quad \mid !z_1^!.(z_1).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{z_1}^{\sharp} \mid \cdots \mid !z_q^!.(z_q).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{z_q}^{\sharp}. \end{aligned}$$

With this shape for M , we then have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} &= \llbracket (M B) \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp})) \\
&\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) (v(x).x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \\
&\quad \mid Q'' \mid \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp})) \quad = Q_1 \\
&\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}, x) (x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \\
&\quad \mid Q'' \mid [v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}) \quad = Q_2 \\
&\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}, x) (x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid Q'' \\
&\quad \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}) \quad = Q_3
\end{aligned}$$

We also have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{N} &= (\lambda x. (M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \rangle \cdots \langle \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^1 \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^1 \rrbracket (C * U)) \\
&\equiv_\lambda (\lambda x. (M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) (C * U)) \langle \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \rangle \cdots \langle \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^1 \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^1 \rrbracket \\
&\longrightarrow M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle (C * U)/x \rangle \rangle \langle \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \rangle \cdots \langle \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^1 \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^1 \rrbracket = \mathbb{M}
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} &= \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle (C * U)/x \rangle \rangle \langle \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \rangle \cdots \langle \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^1 \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}, x) (x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp} \mid Q'')
\end{aligned}$$

We consider different possibilities for $n \geq 1$; in all the cases, the result follows.

When $n = 1$: We have $Q = Q_1$, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow^1 Q_1$. We also have that

- $Q_1 \longrightarrow^2 Q_3 = Q'$,
- $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow^1 M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle = \mathbb{N}'$
- and $\llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q_3$.

When $n = 2$: the analysis is similar.

When $n \geq 3$: We have $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow^3 Q_3 \longrightarrow^l Q$, for $l \geq 0$. We also know that $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}$, $Q_3 = \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp}$. By the IH, there exist Q', \mathbb{N}' such that $Q \longrightarrow^i Q'$, $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^j \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q'$. Finally, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow^3 Q_3 \longrightarrow^l Q \longrightarrow^i Q'$ and $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M} \longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^j \mathbb{N}'$.

B. $M = \text{fail}_{\tilde{z}}$.

Then, $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} = \llbracket \text{fail}_{\tilde{z}} \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} = v.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{z}.\overline{\text{none}}$. With this shape for M , we

have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} &= \llbracket (M (C * U)) \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{lfv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp})) \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v) (v.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{z}.\overline{\text{none}} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{lfv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp})) \\
&\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{B_i \in \text{PER}(B)} u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{z}.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \text{lfv}(C_i).\overline{\text{none}}
\end{aligned}$$

We also have that $\mathbb{N} = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} C * U \longrightarrow \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \oplus \text{lfv}(C)} = \mathbb{M}$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} &= \llbracket \sum_{\text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \oplus \text{lfv}(C)} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = \bigoplus_{\text{PER}(C)} \llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \oplus \text{lfv}(C)} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \\
&= \bigoplus_{\text{PER}(C)} u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{z}.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \text{lfv}(C).\overline{\text{none}}.
\end{aligned}$$

ii. When $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$, we distinguish two cases:

A. When $n = 0$:

Then, $\bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v) (R \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{lfv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp})) = Q$ and $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow^m R$ where $m \geq 1$. Then by the IH there exist R' and \mathbb{M}' such that $R \longrightarrow^i R'$, $M \longrightarrow_{\equiv_{\lambda}}^j \mathbb{M}'$, and $\llbracket \mathbb{M}' \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = R'$. Hence we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} &= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{lfv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp})) \\
&\longrightarrow^m \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v) (R \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{lfv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp})) \\
&= Q
\end{aligned}$$

We also know that

$$\begin{aligned}
Q &\longrightarrow^i \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v) (R' \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{lfv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp})) \\
&= Q'
\end{aligned}$$

and so the $\widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^{\dagger \sharp}$ term can reduce as follows: $\mathbb{N} = (M (C * U)) \longrightarrow_{\equiv_{\lambda}}^j M' (C * U) = \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q'$.

B. When $n \geq 1$:

Then R has an occurrence of an unguarded $v.\overline{\text{some}}$ or $v.\overline{\text{none}}$, hence it is of the form $\llbracket (\lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^{\dagger} \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^{\dagger} \rrbracket) \rrbracket_v^{\sharp}$ or $\llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \rrbracket_v^{\sharp}$. This case follows by IH.

This concludes the analysis for the case $\mathbb{N} = (M (C * U))$.

3. $\mathbb{N} = M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$.

The sharing variable x is not free and the result follows by vacuity.

4. $\mathbb{N} = M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp \\ &= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu x)(x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider three cases.

(a) When $\text{size}(\tilde{x}) = \text{size}(C)$. Then let us consider the shape of the bag C .

i. When $C = 1$.

We have the following

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= (\nu x)(x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket 1 * U \rrbracket_x^\sharp) \\ &= (\nu x)(x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}(x^\ell). \\ &\quad (\llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^\sharp \mid \bar{x}(x^1).(!x^1.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{close}}))) \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu x)(x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \bar{x}(x^\ell).(\llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^\sharp \mid \bar{x}(x^1). \\ &\quad (!x^1.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{close}}))) &= Q_1 \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu x, x^\ell)(x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^\sharp \mid \bar{x}(x^1). \\ &\quad (!x^1.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{close}}))) &= Q_2 \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu x, x^\ell, x^1)(x.\text{close}; \llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^\sharp \mid !x^1.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp \mid x.\overline{\text{close}}) &= Q_3 \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu x^\ell, x^1)(\llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^\sharp \mid !x^1.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) &= Q_4 \\ &= (\nu x^\ell, x^1)(x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.x^\ell(y_i).(y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_i.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\ &\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell(y_n).(y_n.\overline{\text{some}}; y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid !x^1.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu x^\ell, x^1)(\bar{x}^\ell(y_i).(y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_i.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\ &\quad x^\ell(y_n).(y_n.\overline{\text{some}}; y_n.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid !x^1.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) &= Q_5 \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu x^\ell, x^1, y_i)(y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_i.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}} \mid y_i.\overline{\text{some}}; y_i.\overline{\text{close}} \\ &\quad \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}} \mid !x^1.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) &= Q_6 \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu x^\ell, x^1, y_i)(y_i.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}} \mid y_i.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}} \\ &\quad \mid !x^1.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) &= Q_7 \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu x^\ell, x^1)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}} \mid !x^1.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) &= Q_8 \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu x^1)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid !x^1.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) = \llbracket M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= Q_9 \end{aligned}$$

Notice how Q_8 has a choice however the x^ℓ name can be closed at any time so for simplicity we only perform communication across this name once all other names have completed their reductions.

Now we proceed by induction on the number of reductions $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \longrightarrow^k Q$.

A. When $k = 0$, the result follows trivially. Just take $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp = Q = Q'$.

B. When $k = 1$.

We have $Q = Q_1$, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \longrightarrow^1 Q_1$ We also have that $Q_1 \longrightarrow^8 Q_9 = Q'$, $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket = M$ and $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp = Q_9$

C. When $2 \leq k \leq 8$.

Proceeds similarly to the previous case

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} &= \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu x)(x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\text{close}; \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}) \\
&\longrightarrow^4 \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu x^\ell, x^1)(\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid \llbracket C_i \rrbracket_{x^\ell}^{\sharp} \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp}) \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu x^\ell, x^1)(x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; 0 \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \\
&\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_l\})}; x^\ell(x_1) \dots x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_l).(y_l.\text{some}_0; y_l.\text{close}; 0 \\
&\quad \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_l\})}; x^\ell(x_l).x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; \\
&\quad y_{l+1}.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \dots) \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; x^\ell(y_1).x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(C)}; \\
&\quad x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(x_1).(x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(1))}; \llbracket C_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^{\sharp} \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(l))}; \\
&\quad x^\ell(y_l).x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_l, \text{fv}(C_i(l))}; x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(x_l).(x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(l))}; \llbracket C_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^{\sharp} \\
&\quad \mid y_l.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_0; x^\ell(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{some}}; y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_0; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}})) \\
&\quad \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp}) \\
&\longrightarrow^{5l} \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu x^\ell, x^1, x_1, y_1, \dots, x_l, y_l)(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; 0 \mid \dots y_l.\text{some}_0; \\
&\quad y_l.\text{close}; 0 \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_{l+1}.\text{close}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\
&\quad x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(1))}; \llbracket C_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^{\sharp} \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(l))}; \llbracket C_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^{\sharp} \mid y_l.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \\
&\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_0; x^\ell(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{some}}; y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_0; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp}) \\
&\longrightarrow^5 \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu x^1, x_1, y_1, \dots, x_l, y_l)(y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1.\text{close}; 0 \mid \dots y_l.\text{some}_0; y_l.\text{close}; 0 \\
&\quad \mid \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(1))}; \llbracket C_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^{\sharp} \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(l))}; \llbracket C_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^{\sharp} \\
&\quad \mid y_l.\overline{\text{none}} \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp}) \\
&\longrightarrow^l \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu x^1, x_1 \dots, x_l)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(1))}; \llbracket C_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^{\sharp} \mid \dots \\
&\quad \mid x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(l))}; \llbracket C_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^{\sharp} \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^{\sharp}) \\
&= \llbracket \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} M \langle C_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \dots \langle C_i(l)/x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q_{6l+9}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure B.4: Encoded Reduction of Explicit Substitution (Success)

D. When $k \geq 9$.

We have $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow^9 Q_9 \longrightarrow^l Q$, for $l \geq 0$. Since $Q_9 = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp}$ we apply the induction hypothesis we have that there exist Q', \mathbb{N}' s.t. $Q \longrightarrow^i Q', M \longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^j \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q'$. Then, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow^5 Q_5 \longrightarrow^l Q \longrightarrow^i Q'$ and by the contextual reduction rule it follows that $\mathbb{N} = (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^j \mathbb{N}'$ and the case holds.

ii. When $C = \lambda N_1 \int \dots \int N_l \int$, for $l \geq 1$. Then the reduction is shown in Figure B.4. The proof follows by induction on the number of reductions $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow^k Q$.

- A. When $k = 0$, the result follows trivially. Just take $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q = Q'$.
- B. When $1 \leq k \leq 6l + 9$.
 Let Q_k such that $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \rightarrow^k Q_k$. We also have that $Q_k \rightarrow^{6l+9-k} Q_{6l+9} = Q'$,
 $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow^1 \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} M \langle C_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(l)/x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket = \mathbb{N}'$ and
 $\llbracket \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} M \langle C_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(l)/x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q_{6l+9}$.
- C. When $k > 6l + 9$.
 Then, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \rightarrow^{6l+9} Q_{6l+9} \rightarrow^n Q$ for $n \geq 1$. Also,
 $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow^1 \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} M \langle C_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(l)/x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ and
 $Q_{6l+9} = \llbracket \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} M \langle C_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(l)/x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u^{\sharp}$.
 By the induction hypothesis, there exist Q' and \mathbb{N}' such that $Q \rightarrow^i Q'$,
 $\sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} M \langle C_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(l)/x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rightarrow_{\equiv \lambda}^j \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q'$.
 Finally, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \rightarrow^{6l+9} Q_{6l+9} \rightarrow^n Q \rightarrow^i Q'$ and

$$\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} M \langle C_i(1)/x_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_i(l)/x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rightarrow_{\equiv \lambda}^j \mathbb{N}'.$$

(b) When $\text{size}(\tilde{x}) > \text{size}(C)$.

Then we have $\mathbb{N} = M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle$ with $C = \{N_1 \int \cdots \int N_l \int \quad k > l$.
 $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} = \mathbb{M}$ and $\tilde{z} = (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}) \cup \text{fv}(C)$. On the one hand,
 we have the reduction of Figure B.5: Hence $k = l + m$ for some $m \geq 1$

The rest of the proof is by induction on the number of reductions $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \rightarrow^j Q$.

- i. When $j = 0$, the result follows trivially. Just take $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q = Q'$.
- ii. When $1 \leq j \leq 7l + 10$.
 Let Q_j be such that $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \rightarrow^j Q_j$. By the steps above one has
 $Q_j \rightarrow^{7l+10-j} Q_{7l+6} = Q'$,
 $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow^1 \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} = \mathbb{N}'$; and $\llbracket \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q_{7l+10}$.
- iii. When $j > 7l + 10$.
 In this case, we have

$$\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \rightarrow^{7l+10} Q_{7l+10} \rightarrow^n Q,$$

for $n \geq 1$. We also know that $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow^1 \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}}$. However no further reductions can be performed.

(c) When $\text{size}(\tilde{x}) < \text{size}(C)$, the proof proceeds similarly to the previous case.

5. $\mathbb{N} = M \langle N'/x \rangle$.

In this case, $\llbracket M \langle N'/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = (\nu x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\sharp})$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} &= (\nu x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}) \\ &\rightarrow^m (\nu x)(R \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}) \\ &\rightarrow^n Q, \end{aligned}$$

for some process R . Where \rightarrow^n is a reduction that initially synchronizes with $x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}$ when $n \geq 1$, $n + m = k \geq 1$. Type preservation in $\text{s}\pi$ ensures reducing $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp} \rightarrow^m$ does not consume possible synchronizations with $x.\text{some}$, if they occur. Let us consider the the possible sizes of both m and n .

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \llbracket M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\text{vx})(x.\overline{\text{some}}; x(x^\ell).x(x^1).x.\overline{\text{close}}; \llbracket M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) \\
&\longrightarrow^4 \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\text{vx}^\ell, x^1)(\llbracket M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid \llbracket C_i \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) \\
&= \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\text{vx}^\ell, x^1)(x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_1).(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\overline{\text{close}}; 0 \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \\
&\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\})}; x^\ell(x_1) \dots x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_k).(y_k.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_k.\overline{\text{close}}; 0 \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \\
&\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_k\})}; x^\ell(x_k).x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_{k+1}).(y_{k+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_{k+1}.\overline{\text{close}}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \\
&\quad \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}})) \dots \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; x^\ell(y_1).x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(C)}; x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; x^\ell(x_1).(x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(1))}; \\
&\quad \llbracket C_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(l))}; x^\ell(y_l).x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_l, \text{fv}(C_i(l))}; x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \overline{x^\ell}(x_l). \\
&\quad (x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(l))}; \llbracket C_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\sharp \mid y_l.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{some}}; y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{close}} \mid \\
&\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}})) \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) \\
&\longrightarrow^{5l} \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\text{vx}^\ell, x^1, y_1, x_1, \dots, y_l, x_l)(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1.\overline{\text{close}}; 0 \mid \dots \mid y_l.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_l.\overline{\text{close}}; 0 \\
&\quad x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{close}}; 0 \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_{l+1}, \dots, x_k\})}; \\
&\quad x^\ell(x_{l+1}) \dots x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_k).(y_k.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_k.\overline{\text{close}}; 0 \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_k\})}; x^\ell(x_k). \\
&\quad x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \overline{x^\ell}(y_{k+1}).(y_{k+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_{k+1}.\overline{\text{close}}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}})) \dots \mid \\
&\quad x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(1))}; \llbracket C_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid \dots \mid x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(l))}; \llbracket C_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\sharp \mid y_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid y_l.\overline{\text{none}} \\
&\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell(y_{l+1}).(y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{some}}; y_{l+1}.\overline{\text{close}} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) \\
&\longrightarrow^{l+5} \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\text{vx}^\ell, x^1, x_1, \dots, x_l)(x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_{l+1}, \dots, x_k\})}; x^\ell(x_{l+1}) \dots \\
&\quad x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}.\overline{x^\ell}(y_k).(y_k.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_k.\overline{\text{close}}; 0 \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_k\})}; x^\ell(x_k). \\
&\quad x^\ell.\overline{\text{some}}; \overline{x^\ell}(y_{k+1}).(y_{k+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_{k+1}.\overline{\text{close}}; \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}}) \mid \\
&\quad x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(1))}; \llbracket C_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid \dots \mid x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(l))}; \llbracket C_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\sharp \mid x^\ell.\overline{\text{none}} \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) \\
&\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\text{vx}^1, x_1, \dots, x_l)(u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x_1.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \dots \mid x_l.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \\
&\quad (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}).\overline{\text{none}} \mid x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(1))}; \llbracket C_i(1) \rrbracket_{x_1}^\sharp \mid \dots \mid x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C_i(l))}; \llbracket C_i(l) \rrbracket_{x_l}^\sharp) \\
&\longrightarrow^l \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}).\overline{\text{none}} \mid \text{fv}(C).\overline{\text{none}} \\
&= \llbracket \sum_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \mathcal{Q}_{7l+10}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure B.5: Encoded Reduction of Explicit Substitution (Failure)

(a) For $m = 0$ and $n \geq 1$.

We have that $R = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp}$ as $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow^0 \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp}$.

Notice that there are two possibilities of having an unguarded $x.\overline{\text{some}}$ or $x.\overline{\text{none}}$ without internal reductions:

i. $M = \text{fail}^{x,\tilde{y}}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} &= (\nu x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}) \\ &= (\nu x)(\llbracket \text{fail}^{x,\tilde{y}} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}) \\ &= (\nu x)(u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{y}.\overline{\text{none}} \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}) \\ &\longrightarrow u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{y}.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \text{fv}(N').\overline{\text{none}} \end{aligned}$$

Notice that no further reductions can be performed. Thus,

$$\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow u.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \tilde{y}.\overline{\text{none}} \mid \text{fv}(N').\overline{\text{none}} = Q'.$$

We also have that $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \cup \text{fv}(N')} = \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{y} \cup \text{fv}(N')} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q'$.

ii. $\text{head}(M) = x$.

By the diamond property we will be reducing each non-deterministic choice of a process simultaneously. Then we have the following

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} &= (\nu x)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(\llbracket x \rrbracket_j^{\sharp} \mid P_i) \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}) \\ &= (\nu x)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(x.\overline{\text{some}}; [x \leftrightarrow j] \mid P_i) \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}) \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu x)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})([x \leftrightarrow j] \mid P_i) \mid \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}) = Q_1 \\ &\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(\llbracket N' \rrbracket_j^{\sharp} \mid P_i) = Q_2 \end{aligned}$$

In addition, $\mathbb{N} = M \langle N'/x \rangle \longrightarrow M \{N'/x\} = \mathbb{M}$. Finally,

$$\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = \llbracket M \{N'/x\} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = \bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(\llbracket N' \rrbracket_j^{\sharp} \mid P_i) = Q_2.$$

A. When $n = 1$:

Then, $Q = Q_1$ and $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow^1 Q_1$. Also,

$$Q_1 \longrightarrow^1 Q_2 = Q', \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow^1 M \{N'/x\} = \mathbb{N}' \text{ and } \llbracket M \{N'/x\} \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q_2.$$

B. When $n \geq 2$:

Then $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow^2 Q_2 \longrightarrow^l Q$, for $l \geq 0$. Also, $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$, $Q_2 = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp}$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist Q' and \mathbb{N}' such that $Q \longrightarrow^i Q'$, $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow_{\equiv \lambda}^j \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = Q'$. Finally, $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow^2 Q_2 \longrightarrow^l Q \longrightarrow^i Q'$ and $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{M} \longrightarrow_{\equiv \lambda}^j \mathbb{N}'$.

(b) For $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$.

i. When $n = 0$.

Then $(\nu x)(R \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}) = Q$ and $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \longrightarrow^m R$ where $m \geq 1$. By the IH there exist R' and \mathbb{M}' such that $R \longrightarrow^i R'$, $M \longrightarrow_{\equiv \lambda}^j \mathbb{M}'$ and $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} = R'$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} &= (\nu x)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^{\sharp} \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}) \\ &\longrightarrow^m (\nu x)(R \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^{\sharp}) = Q \end{aligned}$$

Also, $Q \rightarrow^i (\nu x)(R' \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{ifv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x^\dagger) = Q'$, and the term can reduce as follows: $\mathbb{N} = M \llbracket N' / x \rrbracket \rightarrow_{\text{IH}}^j \sum_{M'_i \in \mathbb{M}'} M'_i \llbracket N' / x \rrbracket = \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^\dagger = Q'$

- ii. When $n \geq 1$. Then R has an occurrence of an unguarded $x.\overline{\text{some}}$ or $x.\overline{\text{none}}$, this case follows by IH.

6. $\mathbb{N} = M \llbracket U / x^1 \rrbracket$.

In this case, $\llbracket M \llbracket U / x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u^\dagger = (\nu x^1)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger)$. Then,

$$\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\dagger = (\nu x^1)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\dagger \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger) \rightarrow^m (\nu x^1)(R \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger) \rightarrow^n Q.$$

for some process R . Where \rightarrow^n is a reduction initially synchronises with $!x^1.(x_i)$ when $n \geq 1$, $n + m = k \geq 1$. Type preservation in $\text{s}\pi$ ensures reducing $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\dagger \rightarrow^m$ doesn't consume possible synchronisations with $!x^1.(x_i)$ if they occur. Let us consider the the possible sizes of both m and n .

- (a) For $m = 0$ and $n \geq 1$.

In this case, $R = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\dagger$ as $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\dagger \rightarrow^0 \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\dagger$.

Notice that the only possibility of having an unguarded $\overline{x^1}?(x_i)$ without internal reductions is when $\text{head}(M) = x[\text{ind}]$. By the diamond property we will be reducing each non-deterministic choice of a process simultaneously. Then we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\dagger &= (\nu x^1)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(\llbracket x[\text{ind}] \rrbracket_j^\dagger \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger) \\ &= (\nu x^1)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(\overline{x^1}?(x_i).x_i.\text{ind}; [x_i \leftrightarrow j] \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger) \\ &\rightarrow (\nu x^1)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})((\nu x_i)(x_i.\text{ind}; [x_i \leftrightarrow j] \mid \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger) \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger) = Q_1 \\ &= (\nu x^1)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})((\nu x_i)(x_i.\text{ind}; [x_i \leftrightarrow j] \mid x_i.\text{case}(\text{ind}.\llbracket U_{\text{ind}} \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger)) \mid P_i) \\ &\quad \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger) \\ &\rightarrow (\nu x^1)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})((\nu x_i)([x_i \leftrightarrow j] \mid \llbracket U_{\text{ind}} \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger) \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger) = Q_2 \\ &\rightarrow (\nu x^1)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(\llbracket U_{\text{ind}} \rrbracket_j^\dagger \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger) = Q_3 \end{aligned}$$

We consider the two cases of the form of U_{ind} and show that the choice of U_{ind} is inconsequential

- When $U_i = \lambda N^1$:

In this case, $\mathbb{N} = M \llbracket U / x^1 \rrbracket \rightarrow M \{\lambda N / x^1\} \llbracket U / x^1 \rrbracket = \mathbb{M}$. and

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\dagger &= \llbracket M \{\lambda N / x^1\} \llbracket U / x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u^\dagger \\ &= (\nu x^1)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \tilde{y})(\llbracket \lambda N \rrbracket_j^\dagger \mid P_i) \mid !x^1.(x_i).\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\dagger) = Q_3 \end{aligned}$$

- When $U_i = 1^!$:

In this case, $\mathbb{N} = M \llbracket U / x^1 \rrbracket \rightarrow M \{\text{fail}^0 / x^1\} \llbracket U / x^1 \rrbracket = \mathbb{M}$.

Notice that $\llbracket 1^! \rrbracket_j^\dagger = j.\text{none}$ and that $\llbracket \text{fail}^0 \rrbracket_j^\dagger = j.\overline{\text{none}}$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= \llbracket M \{ \text{fail}^0 / x^! \} \llbracket U / x^! \rrbracket_u^\sharp \rrbracket_u^\sharp \\
&= (\nu x^!)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \bar{y})(\llbracket \text{fail}^0 \rrbracket_j^\sharp \mid P_i) \mid !x^!.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) \\
&= (\nu x^!)(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (\nu \bar{y})(\llbracket 1^! \rrbracket_j^\sharp \mid P_i) \mid !x^!.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) = Q_3
\end{aligned}$$

Both choices give an \mathbb{M} that are equivalent to Q_3 .

i. When $n \leq 2$.

In this case, $Q = Q_n$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \rightarrow^n Q_n$.

Also, $Q_n \rightarrow^{3-n} Q_3 = Q'$, $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow^1 \mathbb{M} = \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp = Q_2$.

ii. When $n \geq 3$.

We have $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \rightarrow^3 Q_3 \rightarrow^l Q$ for $l \geq 0$. We also know that $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$, $Q_3 = \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp$.

By the IH, there exist Q and \mathbb{N}' such that $Q \rightarrow^i Q'$, $\mathbb{M} \rightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^j \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^\sharp = Q'$.

Finally, $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \rightarrow^2 Q_3 \rightarrow^l Q \rightarrow^i Q'$ and $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{M} \rightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^j \mathbb{N}'$.

(b) For $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$.

i. When $n = 0$.

Then $(\nu x^!)(R \mid !x^!.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) = Q$ and $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \rightarrow^m R$ where $m \geq 1$. By the IH there exist R' and \mathbb{M}' such that $R \rightarrow^i R'$, $M \rightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^j \mathbb{M}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{M}' \rrbracket_u^\sharp = R'$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^\sharp &= (\nu x^!)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid !x^!.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) \\
&\rightarrow^m (\nu x^!)(R \mid !x^!.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) = Q.
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, $Q \rightarrow^i (\nu x^!)(R' \mid !x^!.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp) = Q$, and the term can reduce as follows: $\mathbb{N} = M \llbracket U / x^! \rrbracket \rightarrow_{\equiv_\lambda}^j \sum_{M'_i \in \mathbb{M}'} M'_i \llbracket U / x^! \rrbracket = \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^\sharp = Q'$.

ii. When $n \geq 1$.

Then R has an occurrence of an unguarded $x^!?(x_i)$, and the case follows by IH. □

B.6.3 Success Sensitiveness of $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^\sharp$

We say that a process occurs *guarded* when it occurs behind a prefix (input, output, closing of channels, servers, server request, choice an selection and non-deterministic session behaviour). Formally,

Definition B.9

A process $P \in \mathfrak{SP}$ is *guarded* if $\alpha.P$, $\alpha; P$ or $x.\text{case}_{i \in I} \{ 1_i : P \}$, where $\alpha = \bar{x}(y), x(y), x.\overline{\text{close}}, x.\text{close}$, $x.\overline{\text{some}}, x.\text{some}_{(w_1, \dots, w_n)}, x.1_i, !x(y), \bar{x}?(y)$. We say it occurs *unguarded* if it is not guarded for any prefix. □

Proposition B.6.2 (Preservation of Success) For all $M \in \widehat{\lambda}_{\oplus}^\sharp$, the following hold:

1. $\text{head}(M) = \checkmark \implies \llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp = P \mid \checkmark \oplus Q$
2. $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u^\sharp = P \mid \checkmark \oplus Q \implies \text{head}(M) = \checkmark$

Proof:

Proof of both cases by induction on the structure of M .

1. We only need to consider terms of the following form:

(a) $M = \checkmark$:

This case is immediate.

(b) $M = N (C * U)$:

Then, $\text{head}(N (C * U)) = \text{head}(N)$. If $\text{head}(N) = \checkmark$, then

$$\llbracket M(C * U) \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v) (\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^\sharp)).$$

By the IH, \checkmark is unguarded in $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u^\sharp$.

(c) $M = M' \langle N/x \rangle$

Then we have that $\text{head}(M' \langle N/x \rangle) = \text{head}(M') = \checkmark$. Then $\llbracket M' \langle N/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp = (\nu x) (\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N)}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\sharp)$ and by the IH \checkmark is unguarded in $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u^\sharp$.

(d) $M = M' \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket$

Then we have that $\text{head}(M' \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket) = \text{head}(M') = \checkmark$. Then $\llbracket M' \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket \rrbracket_u^\sharp = (\nu x^!) (\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid !x^!.(x_i). \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}^\sharp)$ and by the IH \checkmark is unguarded in $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u^\sharp$.

2. We only need to consider terms of the following form:

(a) **Case** $M = \checkmark$:

Then, $\llbracket \checkmark \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \checkmark$ which is an unguarded occurrence of \checkmark and that $\text{head}(\checkmark) = \checkmark$.

(b) **Case** $M = N(C * U)$:

Then, $\llbracket N(C * U) \rrbracket_u^\sharp = \bigoplus_{C_i \in \text{PER}(C)} (\nu v) (\llbracket N \rrbracket_v^\sharp \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}(x).([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C_i * U \rrbracket_x^\sharp))$. The only occurrence of an unguarded \checkmark can occur is within $\llbracket N \rrbracket_v^\sharp$. By the IH, $\text{head}(N) = \checkmark$ and finally $\text{head}(N B) = \text{head}(N)$.

(c) **Case** $M = M' \langle N/x \rangle$:

Then, $\llbracket M' \langle N/x \rangle \rrbracket_u^\sharp = (\nu x) (\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u^\sharp \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N)}; \llbracket N \rrbracket_x^\sharp)$, an unguarded occurrence of \checkmark can only occur within $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u^\sharp$. By the IH, $\text{head}(M') = \checkmark$ and hence $\text{head}(M' \langle N/x \rangle) = \text{head}(M')$.

(d) **Case** $M = M' \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket$: This case is analogous to the previous.

□

Theorem B.10 (Success Sensitivity) *The encoding $\llbracket - \rrbracket_u^\sharp : \widehat{\lambda}_\oplus^\sharp \rightarrow \mathfrak{s}\pi$ is success sensitive on well formed linearly closed expression if for any expression we have $\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$ iff $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$.*

Proof: We proceed with the proof in two parts.

1. Suppose that $\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$. We will prove that $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$.

By Def. B.8, there exists $\mathbb{M}' = M_1, \dots, M_k$ such that $\mathbb{M} \longrightarrow^* \mathbb{M}'$ and $\text{head}(M'_j) = \checkmark$, for some $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and term M'_j such that $M_j \equiv_\lambda M'_j$. By completeness, there exists Q such that $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^\sharp \longrightarrow^* Q = \llbracket \mathbb{M}' \rrbracket_u^\sharp$.

We wish to show that there exists Q' such that $Q \longrightarrow^* Q'$ and Q' has an unguarded occurrence of \checkmark .

From $Q = \llbracket \mathbb{M}' \rrbracket_u^\sharp$ and due to compositionality and the homomorphic preservation of non-determinism we have that $Q = \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_u^\sharp \oplus \dots \oplus \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_u^\sharp$.

By Proposition B.6.2 (1) we have that $\text{head}(M_j) = \checkmark \implies \llbracket M_j \rrbracket_u^\sharp = P \mid \checkmark \oplus Q'$. Hence Q reduces to a process that has an unguarded occurrence of \checkmark .

2. Suppose that $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$. We will prove that $\mathbb{M} \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$.

By operational soundness (Lemma B.9) we have that if $\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} \longrightarrow^* Q$ then there exist Q' and \mathbb{N}' such that $Q \longrightarrow^* Q'$, $\mathbb{N} \longrightarrow_{\cong}^* \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket \mathbb{N}' \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} = Q'$.

Since $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} \longrightarrow^* P_1 \oplus \dots \oplus P_k$, and $P_j = P_j'' \mid \checkmark$, for some j and P_j'' , such that $P_j \equiv P_j'$.

Notice that if $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark}$ is itself a term with unguarded \checkmark , say $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} = P \mid \checkmark$, then \mathbb{M} is itself headed with \checkmark , from Proposition B.6.2 (2).

In the case $\llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_u^{\checkmark} = P_1 \oplus \dots \oplus P_k$, $k \geq 2$, and \checkmark occurs unguarded in an P_j , The encoding acts homomorphically over sums and the reasoning is similar. We have that $P_j = P_j' \mid \checkmark$ we apply Proposition B.6.2 (2).

□

Appendix C

Appendix of Chapter 4

C.1 Full $\mathfrak{s}\pi^+$: Replicated Servers and Clients

Full $\mathfrak{s}\pi^+$ includes unrestricted session behaviors (replicated servers and clients), not presented in Section 4.2. Here we discuss how to add these omitted unrestricted sessions to the system described in Section 4.2. The proofs of Type Preservation (Theorem 4.1) and Deadlock-freedom (Theorem 4.2) in Appendix C.5 concern Full $\mathfrak{s}\pi^+$.

- To the syntax of processes in Figure 4.1 (top) we add two prefixes, $?\bar{x}[y];P$ and $!x(y);P$, for client requests and server definitions, respectively. Both prefixes bind y in P .
- Now $fn(P)$ denotes the set of free names of P , including those used for unrestricted sessions. We write $fn(P)$ to denote the set of free linear names of P , and $fnp(P)$ for the set of free non-linear names. Note that $fnp(P) = fn(P) \setminus fn(P)$.
- To the structural congruence in Figure 4.1 (bottom) we add a rule that cleans up unused servers:

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(!x(y);P \mid Q) \equiv Q \quad (\text{if } x \notin fn(Q)).$$

- To the lazy semantics in Figure 4.2 we add the following rule that initiates a session between a client and a copy of a server:

$$\begin{aligned} [\rightsquigarrow?] \quad & (\mathbf{v}x) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[?\bar{x}[y_i];P_i] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[!x(z);Q_j] \right) \\ & \rightsquigarrow_x \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j \left[(\mathbf{v}x) \left((\mathbf{v}w) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[P_i\{w/z\}] \mid Q_j\{w/z\} \right) \mid !x(z);Q_j \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

- Writing $?\Gamma$ to denote that $\forall x \in \Gamma. \exists A. \Gamma(x) = ?A$, to the typing rules in Figure 4.3 we add:

$$\begin{aligned} [\text{T?}] \quad & \frac{P \vdash \Gamma, y : A}{?\bar{x}[y];P \vdash \Gamma, x : ?A} & [\text{T!}] \quad & \frac{P \vdash ?\Gamma, y : A}{!x(y);P \vdash ?\Gamma, x : !A} & [\text{TWEAKEN}] \quad & \frac{P \vdash \Gamma}{P \vdash \Gamma, x : ?A} \\ & & [\text{TCONTRACT}] \quad & \frac{P \vdash \Gamma, x : ?A, x' : ?A}{P\{x/x'\} \vdash \Gamma, x : ?A} \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we replace Rule $[\text{T}\oplus\text{some}]$ with the following:

$$[\text{T}\oplus\text{some}] \quad \frac{P \vdash \&\Gamma, ?\Delta, x : A}{x.\text{some}_{\text{dom}(\Gamma)};P \vdash \&\Gamma, ?\Delta, x : \oplus A}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& [\rightarrow_{\text{ID}}] \quad (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbb{N}[x \leftrightarrow y] \mid Q) \longrightarrow (\mathbb{N})[Q\{y/x\}] \\
& [\rightarrow_{\mathbf{1}\perp}] \quad (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbb{N}[\bar{x}[]] \mid \mathbb{N}'[x();Q]) \longrightarrow (\mathbb{N})[\mathbf{0}] \mid (\mathbb{N}')[Q] \\
& [\rightarrow_{\otimes\otimes}] \quad (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbb{N}[\bar{x}[y];(P \mid Q)] \mid \mathbb{N}'[x(z);R]) \longrightarrow (\mathbb{N})[(\mathbf{v}x)(Q \mid (\mathbf{v}y)(P \mid (\mathbb{N}')[R\{y/z\}]))] \\
& [\rightarrow_{\oplus\&}] \quad \forall k' \in K. (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbb{N}[\bar{x}.k';P] \mid \mathbb{N}'[x.\text{case}\{k : Q^k\}_{k \in K}]) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbb{N})[P] \mid (\mathbb{N}')[Q^{k'}]) \\
& [\rightarrow_{?!}] \quad (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbb{N}[\bar{x}[y];P] \mid \mathbb{N}'[!x(z);Q]) \longrightarrow (\mathbb{N}')[(\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}y)((\mathbb{N})[P] \mid Q\{y/z\}) \mid !x(z);Q)] \\
& [\rightarrow_{\text{some}}] \quad (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbb{N}[\bar{x}.\text{some};P] \mid \mathbb{N}'[x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n};Q]) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbb{N})[P] \mid (\mathbb{N}')[Q]) \\
& [\rightarrow_{\text{none}}] \quad (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbb{N}[\bar{x}.\text{none}] \mid \mathbb{N}'[x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n};Q]) \longrightarrow (\mathbb{N})[\mathbf{0}] \mid (\mathbb{N}')[\bar{w}_1.\text{none} \mid \dots \mid \bar{w}_n.\text{none}] \\
& [\rightarrow_{\equiv}] \quad \frac{P \equiv P' \quad P' \longrightarrow Q' \quad Q' \equiv Q}{P \longrightarrow Q} \qquad [\rightarrow_{\mathbf{v}}] \quad \frac{P \longrightarrow P'}{(\mathbf{v}x)(P \mid Q) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(P' \mid Q)} \\
& [\rightarrow_{\mid}] \quad \frac{P \longrightarrow P'}{P \mid Q \longrightarrow P' \mid Q} \qquad [\rightarrow_{\#}] \quad \frac{P \longrightarrow P'}{P \# Q \longrightarrow P' \# Q}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure C.1: Eager reduction semantics for $s\pi^+$.

C.2 An Alternative Eager Semantics for $s\pi^+$

Let us consider a variant of $s\pi^+$ in which syntax, typing, and structural congruence are as in § 4.2, but with an *eagerly committing* semantics. The idea is simple: we fully commit to a non-deterministic choice once a prefix synchronizes.

The eager reduction semantics, denoted \longrightarrow , is given in Figure C.1. This semantics implements the full commitment of non-deterministic choices by committing ND-contexts to D-contexts as follows:

Definition C.1

The *commitment* of an ND-context \mathbb{N} , denoted (\mathbb{N}) , is defined as follows:

$$(\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket) := [\cdot] \qquad (\mathbb{N} \mid P) := (\mathbb{N}) \mid P \qquad ((\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbb{N} \mid P)) := (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbb{N}) \mid P) \qquad (\mathbb{N} \# P) := (\mathbb{N})$$

□

Proposition C.2.1 *For any ND-context \mathbb{N} , the context (\mathbb{N}) is a D-context.*


Just as $s\pi^+$ with lazy semantics, $s\pi^+$ with \longrightarrow satisfies type preservation and deadlock-freedom. See Appendix C.5.1 for details.

Theorem C.1 (Type Preservation: Eager Semantics) *If $P \vdash \Gamma$, then both $P \equiv Q$ and $P \longrightarrow Q$ (for any S) imply $Q \vdash \Gamma$.*

Proof: [Proof (Sketch)] If $P \equiv Q$, the thesis follows directly from Theorem 4.1. If $P \longrightarrow Q$, we apply induction on the derivation of the reduction. In each case, we show that the commitment of ND-contexts (Definition C.1) preserves typing. □

$$\begin{aligned}
M &= (x_1 \lambda x_2 \lambda x_3 \mathbb{1} \mathbb{S} \mathbb{S}) \langle \langle \lambda \text{fail}^0, y, I \mathbb{S} / x_1, x_2, x_3 \rangle \rangle \\
&\quad \begin{aligned}
&\searrow (\text{fail}^0 \lambda x_2 \lambda x_3 \mathbb{1} \mathbb{S} \mathbb{S}) \langle \langle \lambda y, I \mathbb{S} / x_2, x_3 \rangle \rangle = N_1 \\
&\longrightarrow (y \lambda x_2 \lambda x_3 \mathbb{1} \mathbb{S} \mathbb{S}) \langle \langle \lambda \text{fail}^0, I \mathbb{S} / x_2, x_3 \rangle \rangle = N_2 \\
&\swarrow (I \lambda x_2 \lambda x_3 \mathbb{1} \mathbb{S} \mathbb{S}) \langle \langle \lambda \text{fail}^0, y \mathbb{S} / x_2, x_3 \rangle \rangle = N_3
\end{aligned}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket M \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_0; \llbracket \text{fail}^0 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid (\mathbf{v}z_2)(z_2.\text{some}_y; \llbracket y \rrbracket_{z_2} \mid (\mathbf{v}z_3)(z_3.\text{some}_0; \llbracket I \rrbracket_{z_3} \\
&\quad \mid \prod_{(x_i, x_j, x_k) \in \pi(\{z_1, z_2, z_3\})} (\mathbf{v}v)(\bar{x}_i.\text{some}; [x_i \leftrightarrow v] \mid v.\text{some}_{v, x_j, x_k}; \bar{v}[z]; \\
&\quad \quad (\llbracket \lambda x_j \lambda x_k \mathbb{1} \mathbb{S} \mathbb{S} \rrbracket_z \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])))
\end{aligned}$$



The processes above are as follows:

$$Q(a, b) = v.\text{some}_{u, a, b}; \bar{v}[z]; (\llbracket \lambda a \lambda b \mathbb{1} \mathbb{S} \mathbb{S} \rrbracket_z \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])$$

$$P_1(a, b) = (\mathbf{v}z_2)(z_2.\text{some}_y; \llbracket y \rrbracket_{z_2} \mid (\mathbf{v}z_3)(z_3.\text{some}_0; \llbracket I \rrbracket_{z_3} \mid (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket \text{fail}^0 \rrbracket_v \mid Q(a, b))))$$

$$P_2(a, b) = (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_0; \llbracket \text{fail}^0 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid (\mathbf{v}z_3)(z_3.\text{some}_0; \llbracket I \rrbracket_{z_3} \mid (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket y \rrbracket_v \mid Q(a, b))))$$

$$P_3(a, b) = (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_0; \llbracket \text{fail}^0 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid (\mathbf{v}z_2)(z_2.\text{some}_y; \llbracket y \rrbracket_{z_2} \mid (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket I \rrbracket_v \mid Q(a, b))))$$

Figure C.2: Example C.1: Reductions of M and of $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u$ under lazy and eager semantics. In $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u$, we write ' $\pi(X)$ ' for the permutations of finite set X .

Theorem C.2 (Deadlock-freedom: Eager Semantics) *If $P \vdash \mathbf{0}$ and $P \neq \mathbf{0}$, then there is R such that $P \longrightarrow R$.*

Proof: [Proof (Sketch)] First, we write P in such a way that we can access all its unblocked prefixes. Then we inductively show that there must be at least one pair of such prefixes that are connected by a restriction. Hence, these prefixes are duals and thus the process can reduce. \square

It is insightful to formally contrast our lazy and eager semantics. We discuss two different ways.

Lazy vs Eager, Part I: Translating λ_c^l . One way of comparing \rightsquigarrow and \longrightarrow is to establish the correctness of the translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_-^l$ (Figure 4.7) but now in the eager case. It turns out that the eager semantics leads to a *strictly weaker* form of correctness, whereby completeness and weak soundness (cf. Definition 4.6) hold up to a precongruence \preceq_{\perp} instead of an equivalence (as in Theorem 4.6).

The precongruence \succeq_{\perp} is defined as follows:

$$\frac{}{P \succeq_{\perp} P} \quad \frac{P_i \succeq_{\perp} P'_i \quad i \in \{1,2\}}{P_1 \perp P_2 \succeq_{\perp} P'_1} \quad \frac{P \succeq_{\perp} P' \quad Q \succeq_{\perp} Q'}{P | Q \succeq_{\perp} P' | Q'} \quad \frac{P \succeq_{\perp} P'}{(\mathbf{v}x)P \succeq_{\perp} (\mathbf{v}x)P'}$$

Intuitively, $P \succeq_{\perp} Q$ says that P has at least as many branches as Q . Translation correctness up to \succeq_{\perp} thus means that \longrightarrow is “too eager”, as it *prematurely commits* to branches.

App. C.7 proves that the translation under the eager semantics satisfies such criteria. Before discussing the corresponding completeness and soundness results, we present an example.

Example C.1

To contrast commitment in eager and lazy semantics (and their effect on the translation’s correctness), recall from Example 4.6 the term M (4.3):

$$M = (x_1 \ \lambda x_2 \ \lambda x_3 \ 1 \ \int \int) \langle \langle \text{fail}^0, y, I \rangle / x_1, x_2, x_3 \rangle$$

Figure C.2 recalls the three branching reductions from M to N_1, N_2 and N_3 . It also depicts a side-by-side comparison of the reductions of $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u$ under the lazy (\rightsquigarrow) and eager (\longrightarrow) semantics. In the figure, \rightsquigarrow^* and \longrightarrow^* denote the reflexive, transitive closures of \rightsquigarrow and \longrightarrow , respectively.

Under \rightsquigarrow there are three different reduction paths, each resulting directly in the translation of one of N_1, N_2, N_3 : after the first choice, the following choices are preserved. In contrast, under \longrightarrow there are six different reduction paths, each resulting in a process that relates to the translation of one of N_1, N_2, N_3 through \succeq_{\perp} : after the first choice for an item from the bag is made, the semantics commits to choices for the other items. \square

The correctness properties induced by \longrightarrow are *loose* (rather than *tight*, as in § 4.4; cf. Definition 4.6):

Theorem C.3 (Loose Completeness (Under \longrightarrow)) *If $N \longrightarrow M$ for a well-formed closed λ_C -term N , then there exists Q such that $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \longrightarrow^* Q$ and $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\perp} Q$.*

Proof: [Proof (Sketch)] By induction on reductions. See § C.8.1 for details. \square

Theorem C.4 (Loose Weak Soundness (Under \longrightarrow)) *If $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \longrightarrow^* Q$ for a well-formed closed λ_C -term N , then there exist N' and Q' such that (i) $N \longrightarrow^* N'$ and (ii) $Q \longrightarrow^* Q'$ with $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\perp} Q'$.*

While \rightsquigarrow reduces multiple branches of a choice in lockstep, \longrightarrow reduces only one branch and discards the rest. Accordingly, weak soundness under \rightsquigarrow (Theorem C.15) relates a sequence of lazy reductions to a sequence of reductions in λ_C^{ℓ} . In contrast, Theorem C.4 is weaker: it relates a sequence of eager reductions to a subset of branches, as some branches may have been eagerly discarded. Hence, the proof of Theorem C.4 has the added complexity of showing that every branch that is eagerly discarded must also be precongruent to a source reduction. This makes it difficult to apply induction directly, as we do not know which branches have been discarded in \mathfrak{sp}^+ .

More in details, to prove Theorem C.4, we first show that \succeq_{\perp} is stable under reductions. We need a way of denoting all possible reductions from a process. We define $P \longrightarrow \{P_i\}_{i \in I}$, for a fixed (maximal) finite set $I = \{i \mid P \longrightarrow P_i\}$. Similarly, we define $P \longrightarrow^* \{P_i\}_{i \in I}$ inductively: if $P \longrightarrow^* \{P_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $P_i \longrightarrow \{P_j\}_{j \in J_i}$ for each $i \in I$, then $P \longrightarrow^* \{P_j\}_{j \in J}$ with $J = \bigcup_{i \in I} J_i$. We then have the following:

Proposition C.2.2 *If $P \succeq_{\perp} Q$ and $P \longrightarrow^* \{P_i\}_{i \in I}$, then there exist J and $\{Q_j\}_{j \in J}$ such that $Q \longrightarrow^* \{Q_j\}_{j \in J}$, $J \subseteq I$, and for each $j \in J$, $P_j \succeq_{\perp} Q_j$.*

Proof: [Proof (Sketch)] By induction on the derivation rules of the precongruence \succeq_{\perp} . See § C.8.2 for details. \square

Then, using Proposition C.2.2 we prove the following:

Lemma C.2.1 *Let N be a well-formed closed term. If $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \longrightarrow^* Q$, then there exist N' and $\{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$ such that (i) $N \longrightarrow^* N'$ and (ii) $Q \longrightarrow^* \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$ where for each $j \in I$, $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\perp} Q_j$.*

Lemma C.2.1 ensures that the translation does not add behaviors not present in the source term. Theorem C.4 then follows directly from Lemma C.2.1 by taking an arbitrary Q_i .

Lazy vs Eager, Part II: Behavioral Equivalence. One may ask if the differences between \rightsquigarrow and \longrightarrow are confined to the ability to correctly translate λ_C^ℓ , or, relatedly, whether λ_C^ℓ 's formulation is responsible for these differences.

We now compare \rightsquigarrow and \longrightarrow *independently from λ_C^ℓ* by resorting to *behavioral equivalences*. We define a simple behavioral notion of equivalence on $s\pi^+$ processes, parametric in \rightsquigarrow or \longrightarrow ; then, we prove that there are classes of processes that are equal with respect to \rightsquigarrow , but incomparable with respect to \longrightarrow (Theorem C.5). A key ingredient is the following notion of observable on processes:

Definition C.2

A process P has a *ready-prefix* α , denoted $P \downarrow_\alpha$, if and only if there exist N, P' such that $P \equiv N[\alpha; P']$. \square

We may now define:

Definition C.3 Ready-Prefix Bisimilarity

A relation \mathbb{B} on $s\pi^+$ processes is a (*strong*) *ready-prefix bisimulation with respect to \rightsquigarrow* if and only if, for every $(P, Q) \in \mathbb{B}$,

1. For every P' such that $P \rightsquigarrow P'$, there exists Q' such that $Q \rightsquigarrow Q'$ and $(P', Q') \in \mathbb{B}$;
2. For every Q' such that $Q \rightsquigarrow Q'$, there exists P' such that $P \rightsquigarrow P'$ and $(P', Q') \in \mathbb{B}$;
3. For every $\alpha \bowtie \beta$, $P \downarrow_\alpha$ if and only if $Q \downarrow_\beta$.

P and Q are *ready-prefix bisimilar with respect to \rightsquigarrow* , denoted $P \sim_L Q$, if there exists a relation \mathbb{B} that is a ready-prefix bisimulation with respect to \rightsquigarrow such that $(P, Q) \in \mathbb{B}$.

A (*strong*) *ready-prefix bisimulation with respect to \longrightarrow* is defined by replacing every occurrence of ' \rightsquigarrow ' by ' \longrightarrow ' in the definition above. We write $P \sim_E Q$ if P and Q are *ready-prefix bisimilar with respect to \longrightarrow* . \square

Ready-prefix bisimulation can highlight a subtle but significant difference between the behavior induced by our lazy and eager semantics. To demonstrate this, we consider session-typed implementations of a vending machine.

Example C.2 Two Vending Machines

Consider vending machines VM_1 and VM_2 consisting of three parts: (1) an interface, which interacts with the user to send money and choose between coffee (c) and tea (t); (2) a brewer, which produces either beverage; (3) a system, which collects the money and forwards the user's choice to the brewer. A $s\pi^+$ specification follows (below € and $\text{€}2$ stand for names):

$$\begin{aligned} VM_1 &:= (\mathbf{v}x)(\text{IF}_1 \mid (\mathbf{v}y)(\text{Brewer} \mid \text{System})) \\ VM_2 &:= (\mathbf{v}x)(\text{IF}_2 \mid (\mathbf{v}y)(\text{Brewer} \mid \text{System})) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{IF}_1 &:= \bar{x}[\text{€}2]; (\overline{\text{€}2} \mid (\bar{x}.c;\bar{x} \parallel \bar{x}.t;\bar{x})) \\
\text{IF}_2 &:= \bar{x}[\text{€}2]; (\overline{\text{€}2} \mid \bar{x}.c;\bar{x}) \parallel \bar{x}[\text{€}2]; (\overline{\text{€}2} \mid \bar{x}.t;\bar{x}) \\
\text{System} &:= x(\text{€}); x.\text{case} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} c : \bar{y}.c;x(); \text{€}(); \bar{y}[] \\ t : \bar{y}.t;x(); \text{€}(); \bar{y}[] \end{array} \right\} \\
\text{Brewer} &:= y.\text{case} \{ c : y(); \text{Brew}_c, t : y(); \text{Brew}_t \}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Brew}_c \vdash \emptyset$, $\text{Brew}_t \vdash \emptyset$, such that $\text{VM}_1 \vdash \emptyset$, $\text{VM}_2 \vdash \emptyset$.

We give two implementations of the interface: IF_1 sends the money and then chooses coffee or tea; IF_2 chooses sending the money and then requesting coffee, or sending the money and then requesting tea. Then, IF_1 and IF_2 result in two different vending machines, VM_1 and VM_2 .

We have $\text{VM}_1 \not\sim_E \text{VM}_2$: the eager semantics distinguishes between the implementations; e.g., IF_1 has a single money slot, a button for coffee, and another button for tea, whereas IF_2 has two money slots, one for coffee, and another for tea. In contrast, under the lazy semantics, these machines are indistinguishable: $\text{VM}_1 \sim_L \text{VM}_2$. \square

Example C.2 highlights a difference in behavior between \rightsquigarrow and \longrightarrow when a moment of choice is subtly altered. The following theorem captures this distinction (see § C.9):

Theorem C.5 *Take $R \equiv \mathbb{N}[\alpha_1; (P \parallel Q)] \vdash \emptyset$ and $S \equiv \mathbb{N}[\alpha_2; P \parallel \alpha_3; Q] \vdash \emptyset$, where $\alpha_1 \bowtie \alpha_2 \bowtie \alpha_3$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ require a continuation. Suppose that $P \not\sim_L Q$ and $P \not\sim_E Q$. Then (i) $R \sim_L S$ but (ii) $R \not\sim_E S$.*

Processes (4.4) and (4.5) from § 4.4 (Page 164) provide another example of a change in the moment of choice, different from the one discussed above. In (4.4), the choice depends on α_1 and α_2 . In (4.5), the choice does not depend on α_1 or α_2 , but on choices made in the context in which the process resides. Though the choice is subtly changed between (4.4) and (4.5), the impact is significant: these processes are not ready-prefix bisimilar, with respect to neither semantics. This is because, under both lazy and eager semantics, in (4.4) the two branches evolve in lockstep, whereas in (4.5) they evolve independently.

C.3 Beyond Linear Resources

Our results extend to the language λ_C , an extension of λ_C^ℓ with a more general bag which includes unrestricted resources: resources that may be used zero or more times. Figure C.3 gives the syntax of λ_C -terms, bags and contexts.

A key difference with λ_C^ℓ is that variables x, y, z, \dots have linear and unrestricted occurrences. Notation $x[1]$ denotes a *linear* occurrence of x ; we often omit the annotation ‘[1]’, and a sequence \tilde{x} always involves linear occurrences. Notation $x[i]$ denotes an *unrestricted* occurrence of x , explicitly referencing the i -th element of an unrestricted (ordered) bag. The structure of a bag is now split into a linear and an unrestricted component: as in λ_C^ℓ , linear resources in bags cannot be duplicated, but unrestricted resources are always duplicated when consumed. The empty unrestricted bag is denoted $1^!$. Notation U_i denotes the singleton bag at the i -th position in U ; if there is no i -th position in U , then U_i defaults to $1^!$. We use ‘*’ to combine a linear and an unrestricted bag, and unrestricted bags are joined via the non-commutative ‘ \diamond ’.

To account for the explicit distinction between linear and unrestricted occurrences of variables, we now have two forms of explicit substitution:

- $M\langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle$, a linear substitution as in λ_C^ℓ ;
- $M\llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket$, an unrestricted substitution of an unrestricted bag U for an unrestricted variable $x^!$ in M , with the assumption that $x^!$ does not appear in another unrestricted substitution in M .

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--|---------------------|
| $M, N, L ::= x[*]$ | variable | $ M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ | sharing |
| $ \lambda x.M$ | abstraction | $ \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ | failure |
| $ (M B)$ | application | $ M\langle\langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle\rangle$ | linear substitution |
| $ M\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle$ | intermediate substitution | | |
| $ M\llbracket U/x \rrbracket$ | unrestricted substitution | | |
| $[*] ::= [1] \mid [i] \quad i \in \mathbb{N}$ | annotations | $A, B ::= C * U$ | bag |
| $U, V ::= 1^! \mid \wr M \wr^! \mid U \diamond V$ | unrestricted bag | $C, D ::= 1 \mid \wr M \wr \cdot C$ | linear bag |
| $C ::= [\cdot] \mid (C B) \mid C\langle\langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle\rangle \mid C\llbracket U/x \rrbracket \mid C[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$ | | | context |

Figure C.3: Syntax of $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$.

The reduction rules for $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$, extend the rules given in Figure 4.5 with some modifications to accommodate the two-component format of bags and dedicated rules for the new constructs. Here, we describe the most interesting new rules: Rule [RS:Ex-Sub] for explicit substitution, and also Rules [R:Fetch[!]] and [R:Fail[!]] for unrestricted substitution.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[RS:Ex-Sub]} \\
\frac{\text{size}(C) = |\tilde{x}| \quad M \neq \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x}}}{(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow M\langle\langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle\rangle\llbracket U/x \rrbracket} \\
\\
\text{[RS:Fetch[!]]} \\
\frac{\text{head}(M) = x[i] \quad U_i = \wr N \wr^!}{M\llbracket U/x \rrbracket \longrightarrow M\{N/x[i]\}\llbracket U/x \rrbracket} \\
\\
\text{[RS:Fail[!]]} \\
\frac{\text{head}(M) = x[i] \quad U_i = 1^!}{M\llbracket U/x \rrbracket \longrightarrow M\{\mathbf{fail}^0/x[i]\}\llbracket U/x \rrbracket}
\end{array}$$

An explicit substitution $(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle$ reduces to a term in which the linear and unrestricted parts of the bag are separated into their own explicit substitutions $M\langle\langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle\rangle\llbracket U/x \rrbracket$, if successful. The fetching of linear/unrestricted resources from their corresponding bags is done by the appropriated fetch rules. The reduction of an unrestricted substitution $M\llbracket U/x \rrbracket$, where the head variable of M is $x[i]$, depends on U_i :

- If $U_i = \wr N \wr^!$, then the term reduces via Rule [R:Fetch[!]] by substituting the head occurrence of $x[i]$ in M with N , denoted $M\{N/x[i]\}$; note that U_i remains available after this reduction.
- If $U_i = 1^!$, the head variable is instead substituted with failure via Rule [R:Fail[!]].

The definition of $\text{head}(M)$ is as in Figure 4.5 (bottom), extended with $\text{head}(x[i]) = x[i]$ and $\text{head}(M\llbracket U/x \rrbracket) = \text{head}(M)$. The complete set of rules is in App. C.4.1.

Well-typedness and well-formedness. Types for $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ extend the types for $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}^{\ell}$ in Section 4.3.2 with:

$$\sigma, \tau, \delta ::= \mathbf{unit} \mid (\pi, \eta) \rightarrow \sigma$$

$$\eta, \varepsilon ::= \sigma \mid \varepsilon \diamond \eta \quad \text{list} \qquad (\pi, \eta) \quad \text{tuple}$$

The list type $\varepsilon \diamond \eta$ types the concatenation of unrestricted bags. It can be recursively unfolded into a finite composition of strict types $\sigma_1 \diamond \dots \diamond \sigma_n$, for some $n \geq 1$, with length n and σ_i its i -th strict

type ($1 \leq i \leq n$). We write $x^i : \eta$ to denote for $x[1] : \eta_1, \dots, x[k] : \eta_k$ where η has length k . The tuple type (π, η) types concatenation of a linear bag of type π with an unrestricted bag of type η . Finally strict types are amended to allow for unrestricted functional types which go from tuple types to strict types $(\pi, \eta) \rightarrow \sigma$ rather than multiset types to strict types.

We separate contexts into two parts: linear (Γ, Δ, \dots) and unrestricted $(\Theta, \Upsilon, \dots)$:

$$\Gamma, \Delta ::= - \mid \Gamma, x : \pi \mid \Gamma, x : \sigma \qquad \Theta, \Upsilon ::= - \mid \Theta, x^i : \eta$$

Both linear and unrestricted occurrences of variables may occur at most once in a context. Judgments have the form $\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \tau$. We write $\models M : \tau$ to denote $-; - \models M : \tau$.

Well-formedness rules for λ_C extend the rules given in Figure 4.6 with specific rules to handle unrestricted resources, among those, we select Rules $[\text{FS} : \text{var}^!]$, $[\text{FS} : \text{abs-sh}]$, $[\text{FS} : \text{Esub}^!]$ and $[\text{FS} : \text{bag}^!]$, for typing unrestricted occurrences of a variable, abstraction of a sharing term, explicit substitution and unrestricted bags, respectively.

$$\begin{array}{c} [\text{FS} : \text{var}^!] \\ \frac{\Theta, x^i : \eta; x : \eta_i, \Delta \models x : \sigma}{\Theta, x^i : \eta; \Delta \models x[i] : \sigma} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} [\text{FS} : \text{abs-sh}] \\ \frac{\Theta, x^i : \eta; \Gamma, x : \sigma^k \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) : (\sigma^k, \eta) \rightarrow \tau} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} [\text{FS} : \text{Esub}^!] \\ \frac{\Theta, x^i : \eta; \Gamma \models M : \tau \quad \Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma \models M[U/x^i] : \tau} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} [\text{FS} : \text{bag}^!] \\ \frac{\Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon \quad \Theta; - \models V : \eta}{\Theta; - \models U \diamond V : \varepsilon \diamond \eta} \end{array}$$

In Rule $[\text{FS} : \text{Esub}^!]$, $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ denotes the fact that $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1 \diamond \dots \diamond \varepsilon_k \diamond \dots \diamond \varepsilon_n$ and $\eta = \eta_1 \diamond \dots \diamond \eta_k$ are two list types, with $n \geq k$, such that the following hold: for all i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, $\varepsilon_i = \eta_i$. The complete set of well-formedness rules for λ_C is in App. C.4.1.

Extended translation. To extend the translation in Fig. 4.7 to λ_C : The access and use of unrestricted resources in λ_C is codified in $\pi\tau^+$ by combining labeled choices and clients/servers (App. C.4.2).

Note: for the sake of generality the proofs in the appendices concern λ_C .

C.4 Extensions in Detail: Eager Semantics and Unrestricted Resources

C.4.1 λ_C : An Extension of λ_C^ℓ with Unrestricted Bags

Figure C.4 defines the free linear variables of a term, denoted $\text{lfv}(M)$. Figure C.5 gives the reduction rules for λ_C , extending the rules given in Figure 4.5 with Rules $[\text{R} : \text{Fetch}^!]$ and $[\text{R} : \text{Fail}^!]$ for unrestricted substitution.

Well-typedness and well-formedness. Types for λ_C extend the types for λ_C^ℓ in Section 4.3.2 with:

$$\sigma, \tau, \delta ::= \mathbf{unit} \mid (\pi, \eta) \rightarrow \sigma$$

$$\eta, \varepsilon ::= \sigma \mid \varepsilon \diamond \eta \quad \text{list} \qquad (\pi, \eta) \quad \text{tuple}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{fv}(x) = \{x\} & \text{fv}((M B)) = \text{fv}(M) \cup \text{fv}(B) \\
\text{fv}(x[i]) = \emptyset & \text{fv}(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) = (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{\tilde{x}\}) \cup \{x\} \\
\text{fv}(1) = \emptyset & \text{fv}(\lambda x.(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])) = \text{fv}(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \setminus \{x\} \\
\text{fv}(\wr M) = \text{fv}(M) & \text{fv}(M \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle) = (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}) \cup \text{fv}(C) \\
\text{fv}(C * U) = \text{fv}(C) & \text{fv}(M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle) = (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x\}) \cup \text{fv}(B) \\
\text{fv}(\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}) = \{\tilde{x}\} & \text{fv}(\wr M \wr \cdot C) = \text{fv}(M) \cup \text{fv}(C)
\end{array}$$

In the case $\text{fv}(M) = \emptyset$, the term M is called *linearly closed*.

Figure C.4: Free Linear Variables

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[RS:Beta]} \\
\hline
(\lambda x.M) B \longrightarrow M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[RS:Ex-Sub]} \\
\hline
\text{size}(C) = |\tilde{x}| \quad M \neq \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \\
(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow M \langle \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle \rangle \llbracket U/x \rrbracket
\end{array} \\
\\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[RS:Fetch}^\ell] \\
\hline
\text{head}(M) = x_j \quad 0 < i \leq \text{size}(C) \\
M \langle \langle C/\tilde{x}, x_j \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow (M \{C_i/x_j\}) \langle \langle (C \setminus C_i)/\tilde{x} \rangle \rangle
\end{array} \\
\\
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[RS:Fail}^\ell] \\
\hline
\text{size}(C) \neq |\tilde{x}| \quad \tilde{y} = (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{\tilde{x}\}) \cup \text{fv}(C) \\
(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[RS:Fetch}^1] \\
\hline
\text{head}(M) = x[i] \quad U_i = \wr N^1 \\
M \llbracket U/x \rrbracket \longrightarrow M \{N/x[i]\} \llbracket U/x \rrbracket
\end{array} \\
\\
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[RS:Fail}^1] \\
\hline
\text{head}(M) = x[i] \quad U_i = 1^1 \\
M \llbracket U/x \rrbracket \longrightarrow M \{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\} \llbracket U/x \rrbracket
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[RS:Cons}_1] \\
\hline
\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(C) \\
\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}}(C * U) \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}}
\end{array} \\
\\
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[RS:Cons}_2] \\
\hline
\text{size}(C) = |\tilde{x}| \quad \tilde{z} = \text{fv}(C) \\
(\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}}[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}\tilde{z}}
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[RS:Cons}_3] \\
\hline
\tilde{z} = \text{fv}(C) \\
\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}\tilde{x}} \langle \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}\tilde{z}}
\end{array} \\
\\
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[RS:Cons}_4] \\
\hline
\text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \llbracket U/x \rrbracket \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[RS: TCont]} \\
\hline
M \longrightarrow N \\
C[M] \longrightarrow C[N]
\end{array}
\end{array}$$

Figure C.5: Reduction rules for λ_c .

The list type $\varepsilon \diamond \eta$ types the concatenation of unrestricted bags. It can be recursively unfolded into a finite composition of strict types $\sigma_1 \diamond \dots \diamond \sigma_n$, for some $n \geq 1$, with length n and σ_i its i -th strict type ($1 \leq i \leq n$). We write $x^1 : \eta$ to denote for $x[1] : \eta_1, \dots, x[k] : \eta_k$ where η has length k . The tuple type (π, η) types concatenation of a linear bag of type π with an unrestricted bag of type η . Finally strict types are amended to allow for unrestricted functional types which go from tuple types to strict

types $(\pi, \eta) \rightarrow \sigma$ rather than multiset types to strict types.

Definition C.4 $\eta \sim \varepsilon$

Let ε and η be two list types, with the length of ε greater or equal to that of η . We say that ε *embraces* η , denoted $\eta \sim \varepsilon$, whenever there exist ε' and ε'' such that: i) $\varepsilon = \varepsilon' \diamond \varepsilon''$; ii) the size of ε' is that of η ; iii) for all i , $\varepsilon'_i = \eta_i$. □

We separate contexts into two parts: linear (Γ, Δ, \dots) and unrestricted $(\Theta, \Upsilon, \dots)$:

$$\Gamma, \Delta ::= - \mid \Gamma, x : \pi \mid \Gamma, x : \sigma \qquad \Theta, \Upsilon ::= - \mid \Theta, x^! : \eta$$

Both linear and unrestricted occurrences of variables may occur at most once in a context.

Judgments have the form $\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \tau$. We write $\models M : \tau$ to denote $-; - \models M : \tau$.

Definition C.5 Well-formedness in λ_C

A λ_C -term M is *well-formed* if there exists a context Θ and Γ and a type τ such that the rules in Figure C.6 entail $\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \tau$. □

A congruence. Some terms, though syntactically different, display the same behavior. For example, assuming $x \notin \text{fv}(M)$, this holds for $M[\![U/x^!]\!]$ and M : the former describes a substitution that “does nothing” and would result in M itself. This notion is formalized through a *congruence* (\equiv_λ) closed under syntax, given in Figure C.7.

C.4.2 Translating λ_C into (Full) $s\pi^+$

Figure 4.7 gives the translation of λ_C^{ℓ} into $s\pi^+$. Here we extend this translation to consider the extended calculus λ_C . The key differences are in the translation of unrestricted variable occurrences, intermediate substitution, abstraction, and the new structure of bags. Figure C.8 gives the translation that maps terms in λ_C into processes in full $s\pi^+$, denoted $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_u^{\sharp}$.

The translation of an unrestricted variable $x[j]$ first connects to a server along channel x via a request $?x^! [x_j]$ followed by a selection on $\bar{x}_i.j$.

Process $\llbracket \lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \rrbracket_u$ first confirms its behavior along u , followed by the reception of a channel x . The channel x provides a linear channel x^ℓ and an unrestricted channel $x^!$ for dedicated substitutions of the linear and unrestricted bag components. This separation is also present in the translation of $\llbracket M \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u$, for the same reason.

Process $\llbracket M (C * U) \rrbracket_u$ consists of synchronizations between the translation of $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v^{\sharp}$ and $\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x$: the translation of $C * U$ evolves when M is an abstraction, say $\lambda x. (M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])$. The channel x^ℓ provides the linear behavior of the bag C while $x^!$ provides the behavior of U ; this is done by guarding the translation of U with a server connection, such that every time a channel synchronizes with it a fresh copy of U is spawned.

Process $\llbracket M[\![U/x^!]\!] \rrbracket_u$ consists of the composition of the translation of M and a server guarding the translation of U : in order for $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u$ to gain access to $\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}$ it must first synchronize with the server channel $x^!$ to spawn a fresh copy of the translation of U .

To complete this section, Figure C.9 gives the translation of intersection types for λ_C to session types for full $s\pi^+$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{[\text{FS:var}^\ell]}{\Theta; x : \sigma \models x : \sigma} \qquad \frac{[\text{FS:var}^!]}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; x : \eta_i, \Delta \models x : \sigma} \qquad \frac{[\text{FS:1}^\ell]}{\Theta; - \models 1 : \omega} \\
\\
\frac{[\text{FS:bag}^\ell]}{\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \sigma \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C : \sigma^k} \qquad \frac{[\text{FS:1}^!]}{\Theta; - \models 1^! : \sigma} \qquad \frac{[\text{FS:bag}^!]}{\Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon \quad \Theta; - \models V : \eta} \\
\qquad \qquad \qquad \Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models \llbracket M \rrbracket \cdot C : \sigma^{k+1} \qquad \qquad \qquad \Theta; - \models U \diamond V : \varepsilon \diamond \eta \\
\\
\frac{[\text{FS:bag}]}{\Theta; \Gamma \models C : \sigma^k \quad \Theta; - \models U : \eta} \qquad \frac{[\text{FS:fail}]}{\text{dom}(\Gamma^\dagger) = \tilde{x}} \qquad \frac{[\text{FS:weak}]}{\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \tau} \\
\qquad \qquad \qquad \Theta; \Gamma \models C * U : (\sigma^k, \eta) \qquad \qquad \qquad \Theta; \Gamma^\dagger \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} : \tau \qquad \qquad \qquad \Theta; \Gamma, x : \omega \models M[\leftarrow x] : \tau \\
\\
\frac{[\text{FS:shar}]}{\Theta; \Gamma, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models M : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma) \quad k \neq 0} \\
\qquad \qquad \qquad \Theta; \Gamma, x : \sigma^k \models M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau \\
\\
\frac{[\text{FS:abs-sh}]}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma, x : \sigma^k \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)} \\
\qquad \qquad \qquad \Theta; \Gamma \models \lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) : (\sigma^k, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \\
\\
\frac{[\text{FS:app}]}{\Theta; \Gamma \models M : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon} \\
\qquad \qquad \qquad \Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models (M B) : \tau \\
\\
\frac{[\text{FS:Esub}]}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma, x : \sigma^j \models M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon} \\
\qquad \qquad \qquad \Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle : \tau \\
\\
\frac{[\text{FS:Esub}^\ell]}{\Theta; \Gamma, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models M : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C : \sigma^k} \\
\qquad \qquad \qquad \Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models M \langle \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle \rangle : \tau \\
\\
\frac{[\text{FS:Esub}^!]}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma \models M : \tau \quad \Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon} \\
\qquad \qquad \qquad \Theta; \Gamma \models M \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket : \tau
\end{array}$$

Figure C.6: Well-Formedness Rules for $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$.**Definition C.6**

The translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ in Figure C.9 extends to a linear context

$$\Gamma = x_1 : \sigma_1, \dots, x_m : \sigma_m, v_1 : \pi_1, \dots, v_n : \pi_n$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\tilde{x} \# \text{fv}(B)}{(M B) \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle \equiv_{\lambda} (M \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle) B} \quad \frac{x \notin \text{fv}(M)}{M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \equiv_{\lambda} M} \\
\\
\frac{x \notin \text{fv}(B)}{(M B) \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \equiv_{\lambda} (M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket) B} \quad \frac{\tilde{x} \# \text{fv}(A)}{((M A) [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \equiv_{\lambda} ((M [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle) A} \\
\\
\frac{\tilde{x} \# \text{fv}(A) \quad \tilde{y} \# \text{fv}(B)}{\left(((M [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]) \langle \langle A/y \rangle \rangle) [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \right) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle \equiv_{\lambda} \left((M [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]) \langle \langle B/y \rangle \rangle \right) [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \right) \langle \langle A/x \rangle \rangle} \\
\\
\frac{\tilde{x} \# \text{fv}(B) \quad \tilde{y} \# \text{fv}(C)}{\left((M [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]) \langle \langle B/y \rangle \rangle \right) \langle \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle \rangle \equiv_{\lambda} \left((M \langle \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle \rangle) [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \right) \langle \langle B/y \rangle \rangle} \\
\\
\frac{x \notin \text{fv}(B) \quad \tilde{y} \# \text{fv}(U)}{\left((M [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]) \langle \langle B/y \rangle \rangle \right) \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \equiv_{\lambda} \left((M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket) [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \right) \langle \langle B/y \rangle \rangle} \\
\\
\frac{\tilde{x} \# \text{fv}(C_2) \quad \tilde{y} \# \text{fv}(C_1)}{(M \langle \langle C_2/\tilde{y} \rangle \rangle) \langle \langle C_1/\tilde{x} \rangle \rangle \equiv_{\lambda} (M \langle \langle C_1/\tilde{x} \rangle \rangle) \langle \langle C_2/\tilde{y} \rangle \rangle} \quad \frac{\tilde{x} \# \text{fv}(U) \quad y \notin \text{fv}(C)}{(M \langle \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle \rangle) \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket \equiv_{\lambda} (M \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket) \langle \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle \rangle} \\
\\
\frac{x \notin \text{fv}(U) \quad y \notin \text{fv}(V)}{(M \llbracket V/\tilde{x} \rrbracket) \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket \equiv_{\lambda} (M \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket) \llbracket V/x^1 \rrbracket}
\end{array}$$

Figure C.7: Congruence in λ_C .

and an unrestricted context $\Theta = x^1[1] : \eta_1, \dots, x^1[k] : \eta_k$ as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l}
\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket = x_1 : \& \llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket, \dots, x_m : \& \llbracket \sigma_m \rrbracket, v_1 : \overline{\llbracket \pi_1 \rrbracket}_{(\sigma, i_1)}, \dots, v_n : \overline{\llbracket \pi_n \rrbracket}_{(\sigma, i_n)} \\
\llbracket \Theta \rrbracket = x^1[1] : \llbracket \eta_1 \rrbracket, \dots, x^1[k] : \llbracket \eta_k \rrbracket
\end{array}$$

□

C.5 Proofs of Type Preservation and Deadlock-freedom for (Full) $s\pi^+$

Here we prove Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 (type preservation and deadlock-freedom for the lazy semantics, respectively), as well as the analogue results for the eager semantics. In fact, deadlock-freedom for the lazy semantics follows from deadlock-freedom for the eager semantics, so we present the proofs for the eager semantics first.

C.5.1 Eager Semantics

Subject Congruence

Theorem C.6 *If $P \vdash \Gamma$ and $P \equiv Q$, then $Q \vdash \Gamma$.*

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket x \rrbracket_u &= \bar{x}.\text{some}; [x \leftrightarrow u] & \llbracket x[j] \rrbracket_u &= ?\bar{x}^1[x_i]; \bar{x}_i.j; [x_i \leftrightarrow u] \\
\llbracket \lambda x.M \rrbracket_u &= \bar{u}.\text{some}; u(x); \bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \\
\llbracket M \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \\
\llbracket M \langle C * U \rangle \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\
\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x &= x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}[x^\ell]; (\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \bar{x}[x^1]; (!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \bar{x}[])) \\
\llbracket \langle M_j \rangle \cdot C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} &= \frac{x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; x(y_i); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some};}{x^\ell[z_i]; (z_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_j)}; \llbracket M_j \rrbracket_{z_i} \mid (\llbracket C \setminus M_j \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \bar{y}_i.\text{none}))} \\
\llbracket \mathbf{1} \rrbracket_{x^\ell} &= x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y_n); (\bar{y}_n.\text{some}; \bar{y}_n[] \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none}) \\
\llbracket \mathbf{1}^! \rrbracket_x &= \bar{x}.\text{none} & \llbracket \langle N \rangle^! \rrbracket_x &= \llbracket N \rrbracket_x & \llbracket U \rrbracket_x &= x.\text{case}\{i : \llbracket U_i \rrbracket_x\}_{U_i \in U} \\
\llbracket M \langle \langle M_1 \rangle \cdot \langle M_2 \rangle / x_1, x_2 \rangle \rrbracket_u &= \frac{(\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid (\mathbf{v}z_2)(z_2.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_2)}; \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{z_2} \\ & \quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, x_2\}} \prod_{x_{i_2} \in \{x_1, x_2 \setminus x_{i_1}\}} \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \{z_2/x_{i_2}\}) \dots)}{\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \{z_2/x_{i_2}\} \dots} \\
\llbracket M \langle U/x \rangle \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
\llbracket M \langle \leftarrow x \rangle \rrbracket_u &= \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_i]; (y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_i(); \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none}) \\
\llbracket M \langle \tilde{x} \leftarrow x \rangle \rrbracket_u &= \frac{\bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_i]; (y_i.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_i()); \mathbf{0}}{\bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M) \setminus \tilde{x}}; \prod_{x_i \in \tilde{x}} x^\ell(x_i); \llbracket M \langle (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i) \leftarrow x \rangle \rrbracket_u} \\
\llbracket \text{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_k} \rrbracket_u &= \bar{u}.\text{none} \mid \bar{x}_1.\text{none} \mid \dots \mid \bar{x}_k.\text{none}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure C.8: Translation of λ_C into $\mathfrak{s}\pi^+$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \text{unit} \rrbracket &= \&\mathbf{1} & \llbracket \eta \rrbracket &= !\&\eta_i \in \eta \{i : \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket\} \\
\llbracket (\sigma^k, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket &= \&(\overline{\llbracket (\sigma^k, \eta) \rrbracket}_{(\sigma, i)} \wp \llbracket \tau \rrbracket) & \llbracket (\sigma^k, \eta) \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)} &= \oplus(\overline{\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket}_{(\sigma, i)}) \otimes ((\llbracket \eta \rrbracket) \otimes (\mathbf{1})) \\
\llbracket \sigma \wedge \pi \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)} &= \oplus((\&\mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket) \otimes (\llbracket \pi \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)})))) \\
\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)} &= \begin{cases} \oplus((\&\mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&\mathbf{1})) & \text{if } i = 0 \\ \oplus((\&\mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&((\oplus \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket) \otimes (\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i-1)})))) & \text{if } i > 0 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure C.9: Translation of intersection types into session types (cf. Def. C.6).

Proof: By induction on the derivation of the structural congruence. We first detail the base cases:

- $P \equiv_\alpha P' \implies P \equiv P'$. Since alpha-renaming only affects bound names, it does not affect the names in Γ , so clearly $P' \vdash \Gamma$.
- $[x \leftrightarrow y] \equiv [y \leftrightarrow x]$.

$$\overline{[x \leftrightarrow y] \vdash x:A, y:\bar{A}} \equiv \overline{[y \leftrightarrow x] \vdash x:A, y:\bar{A}}$$

- $P|Q \equiv Q|P$.

$$\frac{P \vdash \Gamma \quad Q \vdash \Delta}{P|Q \vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \equiv \frac{Q \vdash \Delta \quad P \vdash \Gamma}{Q|P \vdash \Gamma, \Delta}$$

- $(P|Q)|R \equiv P|(Q|R)$.

$$\frac{\frac{P \vdash \Gamma \quad Q \vdash \Delta}{P|Q \vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \quad R \vdash \Lambda}{(P|Q)|R \vdash \Gamma, \Delta, \Lambda} \equiv \frac{P \vdash \Gamma \quad \frac{Q \vdash \Delta \quad R \vdash \Lambda}{Q|R \vdash \Delta, \Lambda}}{P|(Q|R) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta, \Lambda}$$

- $P|\mathbf{0} \equiv P$

$$\frac{P \vdash \Gamma \quad \overline{\mathbf{0} \vdash \emptyset}}{P|\mathbf{0} \vdash \Gamma} \equiv P \vdash \Gamma$$

- $(\mathbf{v}x)(P|Q) \equiv (\mathbf{v}x)(Q|P)$.

$$\frac{P \vdash \Gamma, x:A \quad Q \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A}}{(\mathbf{v}x)(P|Q) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \equiv \frac{Q \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A} \quad P \vdash \Gamma, x:A}{(\mathbf{v}x)(Q|P) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta}$$

- $x \notin \text{fn}(Q) \implies (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}y)(P|Q)|R) \equiv (\mathbf{v}y)((\mathbf{v}x)(P|R)|Q)$.

$$\frac{\frac{P \vdash \Gamma, y:A, x:B \quad Q \vdash \Delta, y:\bar{A}}{(\mathbf{v}y)(P|Q) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta, x:B} \quad R \vdash \Lambda, x:\bar{B}}{(\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}y)(P|Q)|R) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta, \Lambda} \equiv$$

$$\frac{\frac{P \vdash \Gamma, y:A, x:B \quad R \vdash \Lambda, x:\bar{B}}{(\mathbf{v}x)(P|R) \vdash \Gamma, \Lambda, y:A} \quad Q \vdash \Delta, y:\bar{A}}{(\mathbf{v}y)((\mathbf{v}x)(P|R)|Q) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta, \Lambda}$$

- $x \notin \text{fn}(Q) \implies (\mathbf{v}x)((P|Q)|R) \equiv (\mathbf{v}x)(P|R)|Q$.

$$\frac{\frac{P \vdash \Gamma, x:A \quad Q \vdash \Delta}{P|Q \vdash \Gamma, \Delta, x:A} \quad R \vdash \Lambda, x:\bar{A}}{(\mathbf{v}x)((P|Q)|R) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta, \Lambda} \equiv \frac{\frac{P \vdash \Gamma, x:A \quad R \vdash \Lambda, x:\bar{A}}{(\mathbf{v}x)(P|R) \vdash \Gamma, \Lambda} \quad Q \vdash \Delta}{(\mathbf{v}x)(P|R)|Q \vdash \Gamma, \Delta, \Lambda}$$

- $x \notin \text{fn}(Q) \implies (\mathbf{v}x)(!x(y);P|Q) \equiv Q$.

$$\frac{\frac{P \vdash ?\Gamma, y:A}{!x(y);P \vdash ?\Gamma, x:!A} \quad \frac{Q \vdash \Delta}{Q \vdash \Delta, x:?\bar{A}}}{(\mathbf{v}x)(!x(y);P|Q) \vdash ?\Gamma, \Delta} \equiv \frac{Q \vdash \Delta}{Q \vdash ?\Gamma, \Delta}$$

- $P \dagger Q \equiv Q \dagger P$.

$$\frac{P \vdash \Gamma \quad Q \vdash \Gamma}{P \dagger Q \vdash \Gamma} \equiv \frac{Q \vdash \Gamma \quad P \vdash \Gamma}{Q \dagger P \vdash \Gamma}$$

- $(P \dagger Q) \dagger R \equiv P \dagger (Q \dagger R)$

$$\frac{\frac{P \vdash \Gamma \quad Q \vdash \Gamma}{P \dagger Q \vdash \Gamma} \quad R \vdash \Gamma}{(P \dagger Q) \dagger R \vdash \Gamma} \equiv \frac{P \vdash \Gamma \quad \frac{Q \vdash \Gamma \quad R \vdash \Gamma}{Q \dagger R \vdash \Gamma}}{P \dagger (Q \dagger R) \vdash \Gamma}$$

- $P \Downarrow P \equiv P$.

$$\frac{P \vdash \Gamma \quad P \vdash \Gamma}{P \Downarrow P \vdash \Gamma} \equiv P \vdash \Gamma$$

The inductive cases follow from the IH straightforwardly. Note that the rules for parallel composition do not apply directly behind the output prefix and restriction. \square

Subject Reduction

Lemma C.5.1 *Suppose $P \vdash \Gamma, x:A$.*

1. If $P = \mathbf{N}[\bar{x}[]]$, then $A = \mathbf{1}$.
2. If $P = \mathbf{N}[x(); P']$, then $A = \perp$.
3. If $P = \mathbf{N}[\bar{x}[y]; (P' \mid P'')]$, then $A = B \otimes C$.
4. If $P = \mathbf{N}[x(y); P']$, then $A = B \wp C$.
5. If $P = \mathbf{N}[\bar{x}.j; P']$, then $A = \oplus\{i : B_i\}_{i \in I}$ where $j \in I$.
6. If $P = \mathbf{N}[x.\text{case}\{i : P'_i\}_{i \in I}]$, then $A = \&\{i : B_i\}_{i \in I}$.
7. If $P = \mathbf{N}[\bar{x}.\text{some}; P']$, then $A = \&B$.
8. If $P = \mathbf{N}[\bar{x}.\text{none}]$, then $A = \&B$.
9. If $P = \mathbf{N}[x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n}]$, then $A = \oplus B$.
10. If $P = \mathbf{N}[\bar{x}[y]; P']$, then $A = ?B$.
11. If $P = \mathbf{N}[\!|x(y); P']$, then $A = !B$.

Proof: Each item follows by induction on the structure of the ND-context. The base case follows by inversion of typing, and the inductive cases follow from the IH straightforwardly. \square

Lemma C.5.2 *For each of the following items, assume $\Gamma \# \Delta$.*

1. If $\mathbf{N}[x \leftrightarrow y] \vdash \Gamma, x:A$ and $Q \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A}$, then $\langle \mathbf{N} \rangle [Q\{y/x\}] \vdash \Gamma, \Delta$.
2. If $\mathbf{N}[\bar{x}[]] \vdash \Gamma, x:\mathbf{1}$, then $\langle \mathbf{N} \rangle [\mathbf{0}] \vdash \Gamma$.
3. If $\mathbf{N}[x(); Q] \vdash \Gamma, x:\perp$, then $\langle \mathbf{N} \rangle [Q] \vdash \Gamma$.
4. If $bn(\mathbf{N}) \# fn(\mathbf{N}')$ and $\mathbf{N}[\bar{x}[y]; (P \mid Q)] \vdash \Gamma, x:A \otimes B$ and $\mathbf{N}'[x(z); R] \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A} \wp \bar{B}$, then $\langle \mathbf{N} \rangle [(\mathbf{v}x)(Q \mid (\mathbf{v}y)(P \mid \langle \mathbf{N}' \rangle [R\{y/z\}]))] \vdash \Gamma, \Delta$.
5. If $\mathbf{N}[\bar{x}.j; P] \vdash \Gamma, x:\oplus\{i : A_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $j \in I$, then $\langle \mathbf{N} \rangle [P] \vdash \Gamma, x:A_j$.
6. If $\mathbf{N}[x.\text{case}\{i : P_i\}_{i \in I}] \vdash \Gamma, x:\&\{i : A_i\}_{i \in I}$, then $\langle \mathbf{N} \rangle [P_i] \vdash \Gamma, x:A_i$ for every $i \in I$.
7. If $\mathbf{N}[\bar{x}.\text{some}; P] \vdash \Gamma, x:\&A$, then $\langle \mathbf{N} \rangle [P] \vdash \Gamma, x:A$.
8. If $\mathbf{N}[\bar{x}.\text{none}] \vdash \Gamma, x:\&A$, then $\langle \mathbf{N} \rangle [\mathbf{0}] \vdash \Gamma$.
9. If $\mathbf{N}[x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n}; P] \vdash \Gamma, x:\oplus A$, then $\langle \mathbf{N} \rangle [P] \vdash \Gamma, x:A$ and $\langle \mathbf{N} \rangle [\bar{w}_1.\text{none} \mid \dots \mid \bar{w}_n.\text{none}] \vdash \Gamma$.
10. If $bn(\mathbf{N}') \# fn(\mathbf{N})$ and $\mathbf{N}[\bar{x}[y]; P] \vdash \Gamma, x:?A$ and $\mathbf{N}'[\!|x(y); Q] \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{!A}$, then $\langle \mathbf{N}' \rangle [(\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}y)(\langle \mathbf{N} \rangle [P] \mid Q\{y/z\}) \mid \!|x(z); Q)]$.

Proof: For each item, we apply induction on the structure of the ND-contexts and detail the base cases. For simplicity, we assume no names in Γ and Δ were derived with [TWEAKEN].

1.

$$\overline{[x \leftrightarrow y] \vdash x:A, y:\bar{A}} \quad Q \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad Q\{y/x\} \vdash \Delta, y:\bar{A}$$

2.

$$\overline{\bar{x}[] \vdash x:\mathbf{1}} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \overline{\mathbf{0} \vdash \mathbf{0}}$$

3.

$$\frac{Q \vdash \Gamma}{x(); Q \vdash \Gamma, x:\perp} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad Q \vdash \Gamma$$

4.

$$\frac{\frac{P \vdash \Gamma, y:A \quad Q \vdash \Gamma', x:B}{\bar{x}[y]; (P|Q) \vdash \Gamma, \Gamma', x:A \otimes B} \quad \frac{R \vdash \Delta, z:\bar{A}, x:\bar{B}}{x(z); R \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A} \wp \bar{B}} \quad \Longrightarrow}{\frac{Q \vdash \Gamma', x:B \quad \frac{P \vdash \Gamma, y:A \quad R\{y/z\} \vdash \Delta, y:\bar{A}, x:\bar{B}}{(\mathbf{v}y)(P|R\{y/z\}) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta, x:\bar{B}}}{(\mathbf{v}x)(Q | (\mathbf{v}y)(P|R\{y/z\})) \vdash \Gamma, \Gamma', \Delta}}$$

5.

$$\frac{P \vdash \Gamma, x:A_j \quad j \in I}{\bar{x}.j; P \vdash \Gamma, x:\oplus\{i:A_i\}_{i \in I}} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad P \vdash \Gamma, x:A_j$$

6.

$$\frac{\forall i \in I. P_i \vdash \Gamma, x:A_i}{x.\text{case}\{i:P_i\}_{i \in I} \vdash \Gamma, x:\&\{i:A_i\}} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \forall i \in I. P_i \vdash \Gamma, x:A_i$$

7.

$$\frac{P \vdash \Gamma, x:A}{\bar{x}.\text{some}; P \vdash \Gamma, x:\&A} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad P \vdash \Gamma, x:A$$

8.

$$\overline{\bar{x}.\text{none} \vdash x:\&A} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \overline{\mathbf{0} \vdash \mathbf{0}}$$

9.

$$\frac{P \vdash w_1:\&B_1, \dots, w_n:\&B_n, x:A}{x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n}; P \vdash w_1:\&B_1, \dots, w_n:\&B_n, x:\oplus A} \quad \Longrightarrow$$

$$P \vdash w_1:\&B_1, \dots, w_n:\&B_n, x:A \quad \frac{\overline{\bar{w}_1.\text{none} \vdash w_1:\&B_1} \quad \dots \quad \overline{\bar{w}_n.\text{none} \vdash w_n:\&B_n}}{\overline{\bar{w}_1.\text{none} | \dots | \bar{w}_n.\text{none} \vdash w_1:\&B_1, \dots, w_n:\&B_n}}$$

10. This item depends on whether $x \in \text{fn}(P)$.

- $x \in \text{fn}(P)$:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{P\{x'/x\} \vdash \Gamma, y:A, x':?A}{?x[y]; (P\{x'/x\}) \vdash \Gamma, x:?A, x':?A}}{?x[y]; P \vdash \Gamma, x:?A} \quad \frac{Q \vdash ?\Delta, z:\bar{A}}{!x(z); Q \vdash ?\Delta, x:\bar{A}}}{\frac{P \vdash \Gamma, y:A, x:?A \quad Q\{y/z\}\{w'/w\}_{w \in ?\Delta} \vdash ?\Delta', y:\bar{A}}{(\mathbf{v}y)(P \mid Q\{y/z\}\{w'/w\}_{w \in ?\Delta}) \vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta', x:?A} \quad !x(z); Q \vdash ?\Delta, x:\bar{A}}{(\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}y)(P \mid Q\{y/z\}\{w'/w\}_{w \in ?\Delta}) \mid !x(z); Q) \vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta, ?\Delta'}}{(\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}y)(P \mid Q\{y/z\}) \mid !x(z); Q) \vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta} \implies$$

- $x \notin \text{fn}(P)$:

$$\frac{\frac{P \vdash \Gamma, y:A}{?x[y]; P \vdash \Gamma, x:?A} \quad \frac{Q \vdash ?\Delta, z:\bar{A}}{!x(z); Q \vdash ?\Delta, x:\bar{A}}}{\frac{P \vdash \Gamma, y:A \quad Q\{y/z\}\{w'/w\}_{w \in ?\Delta} \vdash ?\Delta', y:\bar{A}}{(\mathbf{v}y)(P \mid Q\{y/z\}\{w'/w\}_{w \in ?\Delta}) \vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta'} \quad !x(z); Q \vdash ?\Delta, x:\bar{A}}{(\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}y)(P \mid Q\{y/z\}\{w'/w\}_{w \in ?\Delta}) \mid !x(z); Q) \vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta, ?\Delta'}}{(\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}y)(P \mid Q\{y/z\}) \mid !x(z); Q) \vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta} \implies$$

The inductive cases follow straightforwardly. Notice that the conditions on the bound and free names of the ND-contexts in items 4 and 10 make sure that no names are captured when embedding one context in the other. \square

Theorem C.7 (SR for the Eager Semantics) *If $P \vdash \Gamma$ and $P \longrightarrow Q$, then $Q \vdash \Gamma$.*

Proof: By induction on the derivation of the reduction.

- Rule $[\rightarrow_{\text{ID}}]$.

$$\frac{N[x \leftrightarrow y] \vdash \Gamma, x:A \quad Q \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A}}{(\mathbf{v}x)(N[x \leftrightarrow y] \mid Q) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \implies \langle N \rangle [Q\{y/x\}] \vdash \Gamma, \Delta \text{ (Lemma C.5.2.1)}$$

- Rule $[\rightarrow_{\perp}]$.

$$\frac{N[\bar{x}] \vdash \Gamma, x:\mathbf{1} \text{ (Lemma C.5.1.1)} \quad N'[x(); Q] \vdash \Delta, x:\perp \text{ (Lemma C.5.1.2)}}{vx(N[\bar{x}] \mid N'[x(); Q]) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \implies$$

$$\frac{\langle N \rangle [\mathbf{0}] \vdash \Gamma \text{ (Lemma C.5.2.2)} \quad \langle N' \rangle [Q] \vdash \Delta \text{ (Lemma C.5.2.3)}}{\langle N \rangle [\mathbf{0}] \mid \langle N' \rangle [Q] \vdash \Gamma, \Delta}$$

- Rule $[\rightarrow_{\otimes \wp}]$.

$$\frac{N[\bar{x}[y]; (P \mid Q)] \vdash \Gamma, x:A \otimes B \text{ (Lemma C.5.1.3)} \quad N'[x(z); R] \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A} \wp \bar{B} \text{ (Lemma C.5.1.4)}}{(\mathbf{v}x)(N[\bar{x}[y]; (P \mid Q)] \mid N'[x(z); R]) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \implies$$

$$\langle N \rangle [(\mathbf{v}x)(Q \mid \mathbf{v}y(P \mid \langle N' \rangle [R\{y/z\}]))] \vdash \Gamma, \Delta \text{ (Lemma C.5.2.4)}$$

- Rule $[\rightarrow_{\oplus \&}]$.

$$\frac{\frac{\mathbb{N}[\bar{x}.j; P] \vdash \Gamma, x: \oplus \{i: A_i\}_{i \in I} \quad j \in I \text{ (Lemma C.5.1.5)}}{\mathbb{N}'[x.\text{case}\{i: Q_i\}_{i \in I}] \vdash \Delta, x: \& \{i: \bar{A}_i\}_{i \in I} \text{ (Lemma C.5.1.6)}}}{(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbb{N}[\bar{x}.j; P] \mid \mathbb{N}'[x.\text{case}\{i: Q_i\}_{i \in I}]) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \implies$$

$$\frac{\frac{\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle [P] \vdash \Gamma, x: A_j \text{ (Lemma C.5.2.5)} \quad \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle [Q_j] \vdash \Delta, x: \bar{A}_j \text{ (Lemma C.5.2.6)}}{(\mathbf{v}x)(\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle [P] \mid \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle [Q_j]) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta}}$$

- Rule $[\rightarrow_{\text{some}}]$.

$$\frac{\frac{\mathbb{N}[\bar{x}.\text{some}; P] \vdash \Gamma, x: \& A \text{ (Lemma C.5.1.7)}}{\mathbb{N}'[x()(w_1, \dots, w_n); Q] \vdash \Delta, x: \oplus \bar{A} \text{ (Lemma C.5.1.9)}}}{(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbb{N}[\bar{x}.\text{some}; P] \mid \mathbb{N}'[x()(w_1, \dots, w_n); Q]) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \implies$$

$$\frac{\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle [P] \vdash \Gamma, x: A \text{ (Lemma C.5.2.7)} \quad \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle [Q] \vdash \Delta, x: \bar{A} \text{ (Lemma C.5.2.9)}}{(\mathbf{v}x)(\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle [P] \mid \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle [Q]) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta}$$

- Rule $[\rightarrow_{\text{none}}]$.

$$\frac{\frac{\mathbb{N}[\bar{x}.\text{none}] \vdash \Gamma, x: \& A \text{ (Lemma C.5.1.8)}}{\mathbb{N}'[x()(w_1, \dots, w_n); Q] \vdash \Delta, x: \oplus \bar{A} \text{ (Lemma C.5.1.9)}}}{(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbb{N}[\bar{x}.\text{none}] \mid \mathbb{N}'[x()(w_1, \dots, w_n); Q]) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \implies$$

$$\frac{\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle [\mathbf{0}] \vdash \Gamma \text{ (Lemma C.5.2.8)} \quad \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle [\bar{w}_1.\text{none} \mid \dots \mid \bar{w}_n.\text{none}] \vdash \Delta \text{ (Lemma C.5.2.9)}}{\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle [\mathbf{0}] \mid \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle [\bar{w}_1.\text{none} \mid \dots \mid \bar{w}_n.\text{none}] \vdash \Gamma, \Delta}$$

- Rule $[\rightarrow_{?!}]$.

$$\frac{\mathbb{N}[\bar{x}[y]; P] \vdash \Gamma, x: ?A \text{ (Lemma C.5.1.10)} \quad \mathbb{N}'[!x(z); Q] \vdash \Delta, x: \bar{A} \text{ (Lemma C.5.1.11)}}{(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbb{N}[\bar{x}[y]; P] \mid \mathbb{N}'[!x(z); Q]) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta}$$

$$\implies \langle \mathbb{N}' \rangle [(\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}y)(\langle \mathbb{N} \rangle [P] \mid Q\{y/z\}) \mid !x(z); Q)] \vdash \Gamma, \Delta \text{ (Lemma C.5.2.10)}$$

- Rule $[\rightarrow_{\equiv}]$. Assume $P \equiv P'$ and $P' \rightarrow Q'$ and $Q' \equiv Q$. By Theorem C.6, $P' \vdash \Gamma$. By the IH, $Q' \vdash \Gamma$. By Theorem C.6, $Q \vdash \Gamma$.

- Rule $[\rightarrow_{\mathbf{v}}]$. Assume $P \rightarrow P'$.

$$\frac{P \vdash \Gamma, x: A \quad Q \vdash \Delta, x: \bar{A}}{(\mathbf{v}x)(P \mid Q) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \implies \frac{P' \vdash \Gamma, x: A \text{ (IH)} \quad Q \vdash \Delta, x: \bar{A}}{(\mathbf{v}x)(P' \mid Q) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta}$$

- Rule $[\rightarrow_{\mid}]$. Assume $P \rightarrow P'$.

$$\frac{P \vdash \Gamma \quad Q \vdash \Delta}{P \mid Q \vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \implies \frac{P' \vdash \Gamma \text{ (IH)} \quad Q \vdash \Delta}{P' \mid Q \vdash \Gamma, \Delta}$$

- Rule $[\rightarrow_{\parallel}]$. Assume $P \rightarrow P'$.

$$\frac{P \vdash \Gamma \quad Q \vdash \Gamma}{P \parallel Q \vdash \Gamma} \implies \frac{P' \vdash \Gamma \text{ (IH)} \quad Q \vdash \Gamma}{P' \parallel Q \vdash \Gamma}$$

□

Deadlock-freedom

The proof uses several definitions and lemmas, which we summarize:

- Definition C.7 defines single-choice multi-hole contexts, where holes may only appear on one side of non-deterministic choices. Definition C.8 yields deterministic multi-hole contexts from single-choice multi-hole contexts by committing non-deterministic choices to the sides of holes. Lemma C.5.3 ensures typing remains consistent when committing a single-choice multi-hole context.
- Lemma C.5.4 states that any typable process not equivalent to $\mathbf{0}$ can be written as an S-context with each hole replaced by a prefixed process. Let us refer to this as the *S-context form*.
- Lemma C.5.5 states that if a process in S-context form is typable under empty context and has a forwarder as one of its prefixes, that process contains a cut on one of the forwarder's subjects.
- Lemma C.5.6 states that the number of prefixed processes of a process in S-context form is at least the number of cuts in the S-context. This lemma is key to the proof of Deadlock Freedom, as it is necessary to show the next lemma.
- Lemma C.5.7 states that if a process in S-context form is typable under empty context, then there must be two of its prefixed processes that share a subject.

Definition C.7 Single-choice Multi-hole Contexts

We define *single-choice multi-hole contexts* (S-contexts, for short) as follows:

$$\mathbf{S} ::= [\cdot]_i \mid (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{S} \mid \mathbf{S}) \mid \mathbf{S} \mid \mathbf{S} \mid \mathbf{S} \parallel P$$

An S-context is n -ary if it has n holes $[\cdot]_1, \dots, [\cdot]_n$. We write $\mathbf{S}[P_1, \dots, P_n]$ to denote the process obtained from the n -ary multi-hole context \mathbf{S} by replacing each i -th hole in \mathbf{S} with P_i . Given an S-context \mathbf{S} with hole indices I and a sequence of processes $(P_i)_{i \in I}$, we write $\mathbf{S}[P_i]_{i \in I}$ to denote the process obtained from \mathbf{S} by replacing each hole with index i in \mathbf{S} with P_i . We say an S-context is a *deterministic multi-hole context* (DM-context, for short) if its holes do not appear inside any non-deterministic choices. \square

Definition C.8 Commitment of Single-choice Multi-hole Contexts

We define the *commitment* of S-context \mathbf{S} , by abuse of notation denoted $\llbracket \mathbf{S} \rrbracket$ (cf. Section 4.5), as follows, yielding a deterministic multi-hole context:

$$\llbracket [\cdot]_i \rrbracket := [\cdot]_i \quad \llbracket \mathbf{S} \mid \mathbf{S}' \rrbracket := \llbracket \mathbf{S} \rrbracket \mid \llbracket \mathbf{S}' \rrbracket \quad \llbracket (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{S} \mid \mathbf{S}') \rrbracket := (\mathbf{v}x)(\llbracket \mathbf{S} \rrbracket \mid \llbracket \mathbf{S}' \rrbracket) \quad \llbracket \mathbf{S} \parallel P \rrbracket := \llbracket \mathbf{S} \rrbracket$$

\square

Lemma C.5.3 *If $\mathbf{S}[P_i]_{i \in I} \vdash \Gamma$, then $\llbracket \mathbf{S} \rrbracket [P_i]_{i \in I} \vdash \Gamma$.*

Proof: Straightforward, by induction on the structure of \mathbf{S} . \square

Lemma C.5.4 *If $P \vdash \Gamma$ and $P \not\equiv \mathbf{0}$, then there exist S-context \mathbf{S} with indices I and sequence of prefixed processes $(\alpha_i; P_i)_{i \in I}$ such that $P \equiv \mathbf{S}[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I}$.*

Proof: Using structural congruence, we first remove all cuts with unused servers and parallel compositions with $\mathbf{0}$, obtaining $P' \equiv P$. Since $P \not\equiv \mathbf{0}$, $P' \not\equiv \mathbf{0}$. Then, we construct \mathbf{S} by induction on the typing derivation of P' . Rules [EMPTY] and [TWEAKEN] do not occur, because of how we obtained P' from P . The structural rules [TMIX], [TCUT], and [TWEAKEN] are simply copied. In case of rule [T \perp], we arbitrarily pick a branch to continue the construction of \mathbf{S} with, while copying the entire other branch. The other rules, which type prefixes, add a hole to \mathbf{S} ; we mark the hole with index i and refer to the prefixed process typed by the rule as $\alpha_i; P_i$. Clearly, $P \equiv P' = \mathbf{S}[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I}$. \square

Lemma C.5.5 *If $P = \mathbf{S}[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I} \vdash \emptyset$ and there is $j \in I$ s.t. $\alpha_j = [x \leftrightarrow y]$, then there are $\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{N}', Q$ such that $P = \mathbf{N}[(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}'[[x \leftrightarrow y]] \mid Q)]$.*

Proof: Note that there must be a restriction on x in P , because x appears free in $[x \leftrightarrow y]$ but $P \vdash \emptyset$. First, we obtain \mathbf{N} from P by replacing the restriction on x in P with a hole, referring the parallel component in which $[x \leftrightarrow y]$ appears as P' and the other parallel component as Q . Then, we obtain \mathbf{N}' from P' by replacing $[x \leftrightarrow y]$ with a hole. Clearly, $P = \mathbf{N}[(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}'[[x \leftrightarrow y]] \mid Q)]$. \square

Lemma C.5.6 *If the derivation of $P = \mathbf{S}[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I} \vdash \Gamma$ and \mathbf{S} is deterministic and contains n cuts, then $|I| \geq n + 1$.*

Proof: We apply strong induction on the number n of cuts in \mathbf{S} :

- Case $n = 0$. Any \mathbf{S} -context must have at least one hole, so \mathbf{S} has at least one hole. Hence, $|I| \geq 1 = n + 1$.
- Case $n = n' + 1$. By abuse of notation, $P = P_1 \mid \dots \mid P_k$, where for each $1 \leq k' \leq k$, $P_{k'}$ is not a parallel composition. By assumption, $m \geq 1$ of the P_1, \dots, P_k are cuts. W.l.o.g., assume P_1, \dots, P_m are cuts.

For each $1 \leq j \leq m$, by inversion of rule [TMIX], $P_j \vdash \Gamma_j$, and by construction, there are \mathbf{S}_j, I_j s.t. $P_j = \mathbf{S}_j[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_j}$ where \mathbf{S}_j is deterministic. We have for each $1 \leq j \leq m$ and $1 \leq j' \leq m$ where $j \neq j'$ that $I_j \# I_{j'}$, and $\bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq m} I_j \subseteq I$. Then, for each $1 \leq j \leq m$, let $1 \leq n_j \leq n$ be the number of cuts in \mathbf{S}_j . Since P_{m+1}, \dots, P_k are not cuts, we have $\sum_{1 \leq j \leq m} n_j = n$.

Take any $1 \leq j \leq m$. We have $P_j = (\mathbf{v}x)(P'_j \mid P''_j)$, and by inversion of rule [TCUT], $P'_j \vdash \Gamma'_j, x:A$ and $P''_j \vdash \Gamma''_j, x:\bar{A}$ where $\Gamma_j = \Gamma'_j, \Gamma''_j$. By construction, there are $\mathbf{S}'_j, \mathbf{S}''_j, I'_j, I''_j$ s.t. $P'_j = \mathbf{S}'_j[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I'_j}$ and $P''_j = \mathbf{S}''_j[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I''_j}$ and \mathbf{S}'_j and \mathbf{S}''_j are deterministic. We have $I'_j \# I''_j$ and $I'_j \cup I''_j = I_j$.

Let n'_j and n''_j be the number of cuts in \mathbf{S}'_j and \mathbf{S}''_j , respectively. We have that $n'_j + n''_j + 1 = n_j$. Since $n_j \leq n = n' + 1$, then $n'_j, n''_j \leq n'$. Then, by the IH, $|I'_j| \geq n'_j + 1$ and $|I''_j| \geq n''_j + 1$. Therefore, $|I_j| = |I'_j \cup I''_j| = |I'_j| + |I''_j| \geq n'_j + n''_j + 1 + 1 = n_j + 1$.

In conclusion,

$$\begin{aligned} |I| &\geq |\bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq m} I_j| = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq m} |I_j| \geq \sum_{1 \leq j \leq m} (n_j + 1) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq j \leq m} n_j + m = n + m \geq n + 1. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma C.5.7 *If $P = \mathbf{S}[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I} \vdash \emptyset$ where for each $i \in I$, $\alpha_i \neq [x \leftrightarrow y]$ for any x and y , then there are $j, k \in I$ where $j \neq k$ and $x = \text{subj}(\alpha_j) = \text{subj}(\alpha_k)$, and there are $\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{N}_j, \mathbf{N}_k$ such that $P = \mathbf{N}[(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}_j[\alpha_j] \mid \mathbf{N}_k[\alpha_k])]$.*

Proof: Let $Q = \langle \mathbf{S} \rangle[(\alpha_i)_{i \in I}]$. Then Q is deterministic and, by Lemma C.5.3, $Q \vdash \emptyset$. Let n be the number of cuts in \mathbf{S} . By Lemma C.5.6, $|I| \geq n + 1$.

Suppose, for contradiction, that for every $j, k \in I$ where $j \neq k$, we have $\text{subj}(\alpha_j) \neq \text{subj}(\alpha_k)$. Since $Q \vdash \emptyset$, for each $j \in I$, $\text{subj}(\alpha_j)$ must be bound by a cut, so \mathbf{S} must contain $|I|$ cuts. This means $|I| = n$, contradicting the fact that $|I| \geq n + 1$. Therefore, there must be $j, k \in I$ where $j \neq k$ such that $\text{subj}(\alpha_j) = \text{subj}(\alpha_k)$.

Hence, we can take $x = \text{subj}(\alpha_j) = \text{subj}(\alpha_k)$. Since $P \vdash \emptyset$ but x appears free in $\alpha_j; P_j$ and $\alpha_k; P_k$, there must be a restriction on x in \mathbf{S} containing the holes $[\]_j$ and $[\]_k$. We now obtain \mathbf{N} from P by replacing the restriction on x in P with a hole, referring to the parallel component in which $\alpha_j; P_j$

appears as P_j and the component in which $\alpha_k;P_k$ appears as P_k . Then, we obtain \mathbf{N}_j and \mathbf{N}_k from P_j and P_k , respectively, by replacing $\alpha_j;P_j$ and $\alpha_k;P_k$ with a hole. Clearly, $P = \mathbf{N}[(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}_j[\alpha_j;P_j] \mid \mathbf{N}_k[\alpha_k;P_k])]$. \square

Theorem C.2 (Deadlock-freedom: Eager Semantics) *If $P \vdash \emptyset$ and $P \neq \mathbf{0}$, then there is R such that $P \longrightarrow R$.*

Proof: By Lemma C.5.4, there are S-context \mathbf{S} with hole indices I and sequence of prefixed processes $(\alpha_i;P_i)_{i \in I}$ such that $P \equiv \mathbf{S}[(\alpha_i;P_i)_{i \in I}]$. The next step depends on whether there is a forwarder process among the α_i .

- If there exists $j \in I$ s.t. $\alpha_j = [x \leftrightarrow y]$ for some x and y , then by Lemma C.5.5 there are $\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{N}', Q$ s.t. $\mathbf{S}[(\alpha_i;P_i)_{i \in I}] = \mathbf{N}[(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}'[[x \leftrightarrow y]] \mid Q)]$.

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}'[[x \leftrightarrow y]] \mid Q) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{N}')[Q\{y/x\}] = R' \quad (\text{by rule } [\rightarrow_{\text{ID}}])$$

$$\mathbf{S}[(\alpha_i;P_i)_{i \in I}] = \mathbf{N}[(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}'[[x \leftrightarrow y]] \mid Q)] \longrightarrow \mathbf{N}[R'] = R \quad (\text{by rules } [\rightarrow_{\mathbf{v}}], [\rightarrow_{\perp}], [\rightarrow_{\perp\perp}])$$

$$P \longrightarrow R \quad (\text{by rule } [\rightarrow_{\equiv}])$$

- If for each $i \in I$, $\alpha_i \neq x \leftrightarrow y$ for any x and y , then by Lemma C.5.7 there are $j, k \in I$ where $j \neq k$ and $x = \text{subj}(\alpha_j) = \text{subj}(\alpha_k)$ for some x , and $\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{N}_j, \mathbf{N}_k$ such that $\mathbf{S}[(\alpha_i;P_i)_{i \in I}] = \mathbf{N}[(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}_j[\alpha_j;P_j] \mid \mathbf{N}_k[\alpha_k;P_k])]$.

We now show by cases on α_j that there is R' such that $(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}_j[\alpha_j;P_j] \mid \mathbf{N}_k[\alpha_k;P_k]) \longrightarrow R'$. First, note that by typability, if the type for x in $\mathbf{N}_j[\alpha_j;P_j]$ is A , then the type for x in $\mathbf{N}_k[\alpha_k;P_k]$ is \bar{A} . In the following cases, we determine more precisely the form of A by typing inversion on $\mathbf{N}_j[\alpha_j;P_j]$, and then determine the form of α_k by typing inversion using the form of \bar{A} . Note that we can exclude any cases where α_j or α_k are forwarder processes, as we assume they are not.

- If $\alpha_j;P_j = \bar{x}[]$, then $A = \mathbf{1}$ and $\bar{A} = \perp$. Hence, $\alpha_k;P_k = x();P_k$. By rule $[\rightarrow_{\perp\perp}]$, there is R' such that

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}_j[\bar{x}[]] \mid \mathbf{N}_k[x();P_k]) \longrightarrow R'.$$

- If $\alpha_j;P_j = \bar{x}[y];(P'_j \mid P''_j)$ for some y , then $A = B \otimes C$ and $\bar{A} = \bar{B} \wp \bar{C}$ for some B and C . Hence, $\alpha_k;P_k = x(z);P_k$ for some z . By rule $[\rightarrow_{\otimes \wp}]$, there is R' such that

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}_j[\bar{x}[y];(P'_j \mid P''_j)] \mid \mathbf{N}_k[x(z);P_k]) \longrightarrow R'.$$

- If $\alpha_j;P_j = \bar{x}.l';P_j$, then $A = \oplus\{l : B_l\}_{l \in L}$ and $\bar{A} = \wp\{\bar{l} : \bar{B}_l\}_{l \in L}$ for some $(B_l)_{l \in L}$ where $l' \in L$. Hence, $\alpha_k;P_k = x.\text{case}\{l : P'_k\}_{l \in L}$. By rule $[\rightarrow_{\oplus \wp}]$, there is R' such that

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}_j[\bar{x}.l';P_j] \mid \mathbf{N}_k[x.\text{case}\{l : P'_k\}_{l \in L}]) \longrightarrow R'.$$

- If $\alpha_j;P_j = \bar{x}.\text{some};P_j$, then $A = \oplus B$ and $\bar{A} = \wp \bar{B}$ for some B . Hence, $\alpha_k = x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n};P_k$ for some w_1, \dots, w_n . By rule $[\rightarrow_{\text{some}}]$, there is R' such that

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}_j[\bar{x}.\text{some};P_j] \mid \mathbf{N}_k[x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n};P_k]) \longrightarrow R'.$$

- If $\alpha_j;P_j = \bar{x}.\text{none}$, then $A = \oplus B$ and $\bar{A} = \wp \bar{B}$ for some B . Hence, $\alpha_k = x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n};P_k$ for some w_1, \dots, w_n . By rule $[\rightarrow_{\text{none}}]$, there is R' such that

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}_j[\bar{x}.\text{none}] \mid \mathbf{N}_k[x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n};P_k]) \longrightarrow R'.$$

- If $\alpha_j; P_j = ?\bar{x}[y]; P_j$ for some y , then $A = ?B$ and $\bar{A} = !\bar{B}$ for some B . Hence, $\alpha_k; P_k = !x(z); P_k$ for some z . By rule $[\rightarrow ?!]$, there is R' such that

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbb{N}_j[?\bar{x}[y]; P_j] \mid \mathbb{N}_k[!x(z); P_k]) \longrightarrow R'.$$

- Otherwise, α_j is a receiving prefix and α_k is thus a sending prefix. By cases on α_k , the proof is analogous to above.

In conclusion,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{S}[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I} &= \mathbb{N}[(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbb{N}_j[\alpha_j; P_j] \mid \mathbb{N}_k[\alpha_k; P_k])] \\ \mathbb{N}[(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbb{N}_j[\alpha_j; P_j] \mid \mathbb{N}_k[\alpha_k; P_k])] &\longrightarrow \mathbb{N}[R'] = R && \text{(by rules } [\rightarrow \mathbf{v}], [\rightarrow |], [\rightarrow \parallel]) \\ P &\longrightarrow R. && \text{(by rule } [\rightarrow \equiv]) \end{aligned}$$

□

C.5.2 Lazy Semantics

Subject Reduction

Lemma C.5.8 *For both of the following items, assume $\Gamma \# \Delta$.*

1. If $\forall i \in I. \forall j \in J. \text{bn}(\mathbf{C}_i) \# \text{fn}(\mathbf{D}_j)$ and $\forall i \in I. \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}[y_i]; (P_i \mid Q_i)] \vdash \Gamma, x:A \otimes B$ and $\forall j \in J. \mathbf{D}_j[x(z); R_j] \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A} \wp \bar{B}$, then $\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[(\mathbf{v}x)(Q_i \mid (\mathbf{v}w)(P_i\{w/y_i\} \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[R_j\{w/z\}]))] \vdash \Gamma, \Delta$.
2. If $\forall i \in I. \forall j \in J. \text{bn}(\mathbf{D}_j) \# \text{fn}(\mathbf{C}_i)$ and $\forall i \in I. \mathbf{C}_i[?\bar{x}[y_i]; P_i] \vdash \Gamma, x:A$ and $\forall j \in J. \mathbf{D}_j[!x(z); Q_j] \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A}$, then $\prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[(\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}w)(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[P_i\{w/y_i\}] \mid Q_j\{w/z\}) \mid !x(z); Q_j)] \vdash \Gamma, \Delta$.

Proof: Both items follow by induction on the structures of the D-contexts. For each item, we detail the base case, where $\forall i \in I. \mathbf{C}_i = [\cdot]$ and $\forall j \in J. \mathbf{D}_j = [\cdot]$. The inductive cases follow from the IH straightforwardly.

1.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall i \in I. \frac{P_i \vdash \Gamma, y_i:A \quad Q_i \vdash \Delta, x:B}{\bar{x}[y_i]; (P_i \mid Q_i) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta, x:A \otimes B} \quad \forall j \in J. \frac{R_j \vdash \Delta, z:\bar{A}, x:\bar{B}}{x(z); R_j \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A} \wp \bar{B}} &\implies \\ \forall i \in I. P_i\{w/y_i\} \vdash \Gamma, w:A \quad \frac{\forall j \in J. R_j\{w/z\} \vdash \Delta, w:\bar{A}, x:\bar{B}}{\prod_{j \in J} R_j\{w/z\} \vdash \Delta, w:\bar{A}, x:\bar{B}} & \\ \forall i \in I. Q_i \vdash \Delta, x:B \quad \forall i \in I. (\mathbf{v}w)(P_i\{w/y_i\} \mid \prod_{j \in J} R_j\{w/z\}) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta, x:\bar{B} & \\ \hline \forall i \in I. (\mathbf{v}x)(Q_i \mid (\mathbf{v}w)(P_i\{w/y_i\} \mid \prod_{j \in J} R_j\{w/z\})) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta, \Delta & \\ \hline \prod_{i \in I} (\mathbf{v}x)(Q_i \mid (\mathbf{v}w)(P_i\{w/y_i\} \mid \prod_{j \in J} R_j\{w/z\})) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta, \Delta & \end{aligned}$$

2. This item depends on whether $x \in \text{fn}(P_i)$ or not, for each $i \in I$. For simplicity, we only consider the cases where either $\forall i \in I. x \in \text{fn}(P_i)$ or $\forall i \in I. x \notin \text{fn}(P_i)$.

- $\forall i \in I. x \in \text{fn}(P_i)$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\forall i \in I. \frac{P_i\{x'/x\} \vdash \Gamma, y_i:A, x':?A}{\overline{\overline{?x[y_i]; (P_i\{x'/x\}) \vdash \Gamma, x:?A, x':?A}}}}{\overline{?x[y_i]; P_i \vdash \Gamma, x:?A}} \quad \forall j \in J. \frac{Q_j \vdash ?\Delta, x:\bar{A}}{!x(z); Q_j \vdash ?\Delta, x:\bar{A}} \quad \Longrightarrow \\
\\
\frac{\forall i \in I. \frac{P_i\{w/y_i\} \vdash \Gamma, w:A, x:?A}{\overline{\overline{P_i\{w/y_i\} \vdash \Gamma, w:A, x:?A}}} \quad \forall j \in J. \frac{Q_j\{w/z\}\{v'/v\}_{v \in ?\Delta} \vdash ?\Delta', w:\bar{A}}{\overline{Q_j\{w/z\}\{v'/v\}_{v \in ?\Delta} \vdash ?\Delta', w:\bar{A}}} \\
\forall j \in J. \frac{(\mathbf{vw}) \left(\prod_{i \in I} P_i\{w/y_i\} \mid Q_j\{w/z\}\{v'/v\}_{v \in ?\Delta} \right) \vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta', x:?A \quad \forall j \in J. \frac{Q_j \vdash ?\Delta, x:\bar{A}}{!x(z); Q_j \vdash ?\Delta, x:\bar{A}}}{\overline{(\mathbf{vw}) \left(\prod_{i \in I} P_i\{w/y_i\} \mid Q_j\{w/z\}\{v'/v\}_{v \in ?\Delta} \right) \mid !x(z); Q_j \vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta, ?\Delta'}} \\
\overline{\overline{\prod_{j \in J} (\mathbf{vx}) \left((\mathbf{vw}) \left(\prod_{i \in I} P_i\{w/y_i\} \mid Q_j\{w/z\}\{v'/v\}_{v \in ?\Delta} \right) \mid !x(z); Q_j \right) \vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta, ?\Delta'}}} \\
\overline{\overline{\prod_{j \in J} (\mathbf{vx}) \left((\mathbf{vw}) \left(\prod_{i \in I} P_i\{w/y_i\} \mid Q_j\{w/z\} \right) \mid !x(z); Q_j \right) \vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta}}
\end{array}$$

- $\forall i \in I. x \notin \text{fn}(P_i)$.

$$\forall i \in I. \frac{P_i \vdash \Gamma, y_i:A}{\overline{\overline{?x[y_i]; P_i \vdash \Gamma, x:?A}}} \quad \forall j \in J. \frac{Q_j \vdash ?\Delta, x:\bar{A}}{!x(z); Q_j \vdash ?\Delta, x:\bar{A}} \quad \Longrightarrow$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\forall i \in I. \frac{P_i\{w/y_i\} \vdash \Gamma, w:A}{\overline{\overline{P_i\{w/y_i\} \vdash \Gamma, w:A}}} \quad \forall j \in J. \frac{Q_j\{w/z\}\{v'/v\}_{v \in ?\Delta} \vdash ?\Delta', w:\bar{A}}{\overline{Q_j\{w/z\}\{v'/v\}_{v \in ?\Delta} \vdash ?\Delta', w:\bar{A}}} \\
\forall j \in J. \frac{(\mathbf{vw}) \left(\prod_{i \in I} P_i\{w/y_i\} \mid Q_j\{w/z\}\{v'/v\}_{v \in ?\Delta} \right) \vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta'}{\overline{(\mathbf{vw}) \left(\prod_{i \in I} P_i\{w/y_i\} \mid Q_j\{w/z\}\{v'/v\}_{v \in ?\Delta} \right) \vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta'}} \\
\forall j \in J. \frac{(\mathbf{vw}) \left(\prod_{i \in I} P_i\{w/y_i\} \mid Q_j\{w/z\}\{v'/v\}_{v \in ?\Delta} \right) \vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta', x:?A \quad \forall j \in J. \frac{Q_j \vdash ?\Delta, x:\bar{A}}{!x(z); Q_j \vdash ?\Delta, x:\bar{A}}}{\overline{(\mathbf{vw}) \left(\prod_{i \in I} P_i\{w/y_i\} \mid Q_j\{w/z\}\{v'/v\}_{v \in ?\Delta} \right) \mid !x(z); Q_j \vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta, ?\Delta'}} \\
\overline{\overline{\prod_{j \in J} (\mathbf{vx}) \left((\mathbf{vw}) \left(\prod_{i \in I} P_i\{w/y_i\} \mid Q_j\{w/z\}\{v'/v\}_{v \in ?\Delta} \right) \mid !x(z); Q_j \right) \vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta, ?\Delta'}}} \\
\overline{\overline{\prod_{j \in J} (\mathbf{vx}) \left((\mathbf{vw}) \left(\prod_{i \in I} P_i\{w/y_i\} \mid Q_j\{w/z\} \right) \mid !x(z); Q_j \right) \vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta}}
\end{array}$$

□

Theorem C.8 (SR for the Lazy Semantics) *If $P \vdash \Gamma$ and $P \rightsquigarrow_S Q$, then $Q \vdash \Gamma$.*

Proof: By induction on the derivation of the reduction.

- Rule $[\rightsquigarrow_{\text{ID}}]$.

$$\frac{\frac{\forall i \in I. \mathbf{C}_i[x \leftrightarrow y] \vdash \Gamma, x:A}{\frac{\frac{\frac{\forall i \in I. \mathbf{C}_i[x \leftrightarrow y] \vdash \Gamma, x:A}{\mathbb{H}_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[x \leftrightarrow y] \vdash \Gamma, x:A} \quad Q \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A}}{(\mathbf{v}x) \left(\mathbb{H}_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[x \leftrightarrow y] \mid Q \right) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta}}{\frac{\forall i \in I. \mathbf{C}_i[Q\{y/x\}] \vdash \Gamma, \Delta \text{ (Lemma C.5.2.1)}}{\mathbb{H}_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[Q\{y/x\}] \vdash \Gamma, \Delta}}}{\Rightarrow}}$$

- Rule $[\rightsquigarrow_{\perp}]$.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\forall i \in I. \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}] \vdash \Gamma, x:\mathbf{1} \text{ (Lemma C.5.1.1)}}{\frac{\frac{\mathbb{H}_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}] \vdash \Gamma, x:\mathbf{1}}{\forall j \in J. \mathbf{D}_j[x(); Q_j] \vdash \Delta, x:\perp \text{ (Lemma C.5.1.2)}}{\frac{\frac{\mathbb{H}_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[x(); Q_j] \vdash \Delta, x:\perp}{(\mathbf{v}x) \left(\mathbb{H}_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}] \mid \mathbb{H}_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[x(); Q_j] \right) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta}}}{\Rightarrow}}}{\frac{\frac{\forall i \in I. \mathbf{C}_i[\mathbf{0}] \vdash \Gamma \text{ (Lemma C.5.2.2)} \quad \frac{\forall j \in J. \mathbf{D}_j[Q_j] \vdash \Delta \text{ (Lemma C.5.2.3)}}{\frac{\frac{\mathbb{H}_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\mathbf{0}] \vdash \Gamma}{\mathbb{H}_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\mathbf{0}] \mid \mathbb{H}_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[Q_j] \vdash \Gamma, \Delta}}{\mathbb{H}_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\mathbf{0}] \mid \mathbb{H}_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[Q_j] \vdash \Gamma, \Delta}}}{\Rightarrow}}$$

- Rule $[\rightsquigarrow_{\otimes \wp}]$.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\forall i \in I. \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}[y_i]; (P_i \mid Q_i)] \vdash \Gamma, x:A \otimes B \text{ (Lemma C.5.1.3)}}{\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathbb{H}_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}[y_i]; (P_i \mid Q_i)] \vdash \Gamma, x:A \otimes B}{\forall j \in J. \mathbf{D}_j[x(z); R_j] \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A} \wp \bar{B} \text{ (Lemma C.5.1.4)}}{\frac{\frac{\mathbb{H}_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[x(z); R_j] \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A} \wp \bar{B}}{(\mathbf{v}x) \left(\mathbb{H}_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}[y_i]; (P_i \mid Q_i)] \mid \mathbb{H}_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[x(z); R_j] \right) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta}}}{\Rightarrow}}}{\frac{\mathbb{H}_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i \left[(\mathbf{v}x) \left(Q_i \mid (\mathbf{v}w) \left(P_i\{w/y_i\} \mid \mathbb{H}_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[R_j\{w/z\}] \right) \right) \right] \vdash \Gamma, \Delta \text{ (Lemma C.5.8.1)}}{\Rightarrow}}$$

- Rule $[\rightsquigarrow_{\oplus \&}]$. Take any $k' \in K$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\forall i \in I. \\
\mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}.k'; P_i] \vdash \Gamma, x: \oplus \{k : A_k\}_{k \in K} \\
\text{(Lemma C.5.1.5)} \\
\hline
\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}.k'; P_i] \vdash \Gamma, x: \oplus \{k : A_k\}_{k \in K} \\
\forall j \in J. \\
\mathbf{D}_j[x.\text{case}\{k : Q_j^k\}_{k \in K}] \vdash \Delta, x: \& \{k : \bar{A}_k\}_{k \in K} \\
\text{(Lemma C.5.1.6)} \\
\hline
\prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[x.\text{case}\{k : Q_j^k\}_{k \in K}] \vdash \Delta, x: \& \{k : \bar{A}_k\}_{k \in K} \\
\hline
(\mathbf{v}x) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}.k'; P_i] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[x.\text{case}\{k : Q_j^k\}_{k \in K}] \right) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta \quad \Rightarrow \\
\hline
\frac{\forall i \in I. \mathbf{C}_i[P_i] \vdash \Gamma, x:A \quad \text{(Lemma C.5.2.5)} \quad \forall j \in J. \mathbf{D}_j[Q_j^k] \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A} \quad \text{(Lemma C.5.2.6)}}{\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[P_i] \vdash \Gamma, x:A \quad \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[Q_j^k] \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A}} \\
\hline
(\mathbf{v}x) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[P_i] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[Q_j^k] \right) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta
\end{array}$$

- Rule $[\rightsquigarrow_{\text{some}}]$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\forall i \in I. \\
\mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}.\text{some}; P_i] \vdash \Gamma, x: \& A \\
\text{(Lemma C.5.1.7)} \\
\hline
\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}.\text{some}; P_i] \vdash \Gamma, x: \& A \\
\forall j \in J. \\
\mathbf{D}_j[x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n}; Q_j] \vdash \Delta, x: \oplus \bar{A} \\
\text{(Lemma C.5.1.9)} \\
\hline
\prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n}; Q_j] \vdash \Delta, x: \oplus \bar{A} \\
\hline
(\mathbf{v}x) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}.\text{some}; P_i] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n}; Q_j] \right) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta \quad \Rightarrow \\
\hline
\frac{\forall i \in I. \mathbf{C}_i[P_i] \vdash \Gamma, x:A \quad \text{(Lemma C.5.2.7)} \quad \forall j \in J. \mathbf{D}_j[Q_j] \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A} \quad \text{(Lemma C.5.2.9)}}{\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[P_i] \vdash \Gamma, x:A \quad \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[Q_j] \vdash \Delta, x:\bar{A}} \\
\hline
(\mathbf{v}x) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[P_i] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[Q_j] \right) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta
\end{array}$$

- Rule $[\rightsquigarrow_{\text{none}}]$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\forall i \in I. \\
\mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}.\text{none}] \vdash \Gamma, x: \& A \\
\text{(Lemma C.5.1.8)} \\
\hline
\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}.\text{none}] \vdash \Gamma, x: \& A \\
\forall j \in J. \\
\mathbf{D}_j[x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n}; Q_j] \vdash \Delta, x: \oplus \bar{A} \\
\text{(Lemma C.5.1.9)} \\
\hline
\prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n}; Q_j] \vdash \Delta, x: \oplus \bar{A} \\
\hline
(\mathbf{v}x) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}.\text{none}] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[x.\text{some}_{w_1, \dots, w_n}; Q_j] \right) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta \quad \Rightarrow \\
\hline
\frac{\forall i \in I. \mathbf{C}_i[\mathbf{0}] \vdash \Gamma \quad \text{(Lemma C.5.2.8)}}{\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[P_i] \vdash \Gamma} \\
\forall j \in J. \mathbf{D}_j[\bar{w}_1.\text{none} \mid \dots \mid \bar{w}_n.\text{none}] \vdash \Delta \quad \text{(Lemma C.5.2.9)} \\
\hline
\prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[\bar{w}_1.\text{none} \mid \dots \mid \bar{w}_n.\text{none}] \vdash \Delta \\
\hline
\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\mathbf{0}] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[\bar{w}_1.\text{none} \mid \dots \mid \bar{w}_n.\text{none}] \vdash \Gamma, \Delta
\end{array}$$

- Rule $[\rightsquigarrow_{?I}]$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\forall i \in I. \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}[y_i]; P_i] \vdash \Gamma, x: ?A \quad (\text{Lemma C.5.1.10}) \\
\hline
\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}[y_i]; P_i] \vdash \Gamma, x: ?A \\
\forall j \in J. \mathbf{D}_j[!x(z); Q_j] \vdash \Delta, x: !\bar{A} \quad (\text{Lemma C.5.1.11}) \\
\hline
\prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[!x(z); Q_j] \vdash \Delta, x: !\bar{A} \\
\hline
(\mathbf{v}x) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}[y_i]; P_i] \mid \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j[!x(z); Q_j] \right) \vdash \Gamma, \Delta \quad \Longrightarrow \\
\prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{D}_j \left[(\mathbf{v}x) \left((\mathbf{v}w) \left(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[P_i\{w/z\}] \mid Q_j\{w/z\} \right) \mid !x(z); Q_j \right) \right] \vdash \Gamma, \Delta \quad (\text{Lemma C.5.8.2})
\end{array}$$

□

Deadlock Freedom

Definition C.9 Multi-hole Non-deterministic Reduction Contexts

$$\mathbf{M} ::= [\cdot] \mid (\mathbf{v}x)(P \mid \mathbf{M}) \mid P \mid \mathbf{M} \mid \mathbf{M} \parallel \mathbf{M}$$

□

Lemma C.5.9 *If $\mathbf{N}[\alpha; P] \vdash \Gamma, x:A$ and $x = \text{subj}(\alpha)$, then there are \mathbf{M} and $(\alpha_i; P_i)_{i \in I}$ such that $\mathbf{N}[\alpha; P] = \mathbf{M}[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I}$ where $x \notin \text{fn}(\mathbf{M})$ and $x \in \bigcap_{i \in I} \text{fn}(\alpha_i; P_i)$ and there is $i' \in I$ such that $\alpha_{i'}; P_{i'} = \alpha; P$.*

Lemma C.5.10 *For every multi-hole ND-context \mathbf{M} with indices I :*

- *If \mathbf{M} has two or more holes, there are \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{M}_1 with indices I_1, \mathbf{M}_2 with indices I_2 such that $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_1 \parallel \mathbf{M}_2]$ where $I_1 \# I_2$ and $I = I_1 \cup I_2$.*
- *If \mathbf{M} has only one hole, there is \mathbf{C} such that $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{C}$.*

Definition C.10

$$\text{flat}(\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M} \parallel \mathbf{M}']) := \text{flat}(\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}]) \parallel \text{flat}(\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}']) \quad \text{flat}(\mathbf{C}) := \mathbf{C}$$

□

Lemma C.5.11 *If $\mathbf{M}[P_i]_{i \in I} \vdash \Gamma$ where $x \notin \text{fn}(\mathbf{M})$ and $\forall i \in I. x \in \text{fn}(P_i)$, then there are $(\mathbf{C}_i)_{i \in I}$ such that $\text{flat}(\mathbf{M})[P_i]_{i \in I} = \prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[P_i]$ where $\forall i \in I. x \notin \text{fn}(\mathbf{C}_i)$.*

Lemma C.5.12 *If*

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[\text{flat}(\mathbf{M})[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[\text{flat}(\mathbf{M}')[\beta_j; Q_j]_{j \in J}]) \rightsquigarrow_S R,$$

then

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{M}[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[\mathbf{M}'[\beta_j; Q_j]_{j \in J}]) \rightsquigarrow_S R.$$

Proof: By induction on the structures of \mathbf{M} and \mathbf{M}' . By Lemma C.5.10, we only have to consider two cases for \mathbf{M} ($\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_1 \parallel \mathbf{M}_2]$ and $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{C}$), and similarly for \mathbf{M}' . We only detail the base case ($\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{M}' = \mathbf{C}'$) and a representative inductive case ($\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_1 \parallel \mathbf{M}_2]$ and $\mathbf{M}' = \mathbf{C}'$).

- $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{M}' = \mathbf{C}'$. Note that \mathbf{M} and \mathbf{M}' have only one hole; w.l.o.g., assume $I = J = \{1\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} flat(\mathbf{M})[\alpha_1; P_1] &= flat(\mathbf{C})[\alpha_1; P_1] = \mathbf{C}[\alpha_1; P_1] = \mathbf{M}[\alpha_1; P_1] \\ flat(\mathbf{M}')[\beta_1; Q_1] &= flat(\mathbf{C}')[\beta_1; Q_1] = \mathbf{C}'[\beta_1; Q_1] = \mathbf{M}'[\beta_1; Q_1] \end{aligned}$$

The thesis follows by assumption and equality.

- $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_1 \# \mathbf{M}_2]$ and $\mathbf{M}' = \mathbf{C}'$. Note that \mathbf{M}' has only one hole; w.l.o.g., assume $J = \{1\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[flat(\mathbf{M})[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[flat(\mathbf{M}')[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[flat(\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_1 \# \mathbf{M}_2])[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[flat(\mathbf{C}')[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[(flat(\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_1]) \# flat(\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_2]))[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[\mathbf{C}'[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

There are I_1 and I_2 such that $I_1 \# I_2$ and $I = I_1 \cup I_2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[flat(\mathbf{M})[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[flat(\mathbf{M}')[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[flat(\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_1])[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_1} \# flat(\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_2])[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_2}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[\mathbf{C}'[\beta_1; Q_1]]). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{by (C.1)}) \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Let $\mathbf{N}_1 = \mathbf{N}[\cdot \# flat(\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_2])[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_2}]$.

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[flat(\mathbf{M})[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[flat(\mathbf{M}')[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}_1[flat(\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_1])[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_1}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[\mathbf{C}'[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \quad (\text{by (C.2)}) \\ &\rightsquigarrow_S R \quad (\text{by assumption}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}_1[\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_1][\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_1}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[\mathbf{C}'[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_1][\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_1} \# flat(\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_2])[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_2}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[\mathbf{C}'[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \\ &\rightsquigarrow_S R \quad (\text{by IH on (C.3)}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Let $\mathbf{N}_2 = \mathbf{N}[\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_1][\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_1} \# \cdot]$.

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_1][\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_1} \# flat(\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_2])[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_2}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[\mathbf{C}'[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}_2[flat(\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_2])[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_2}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[\mathbf{C}'[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \\ &\rightsquigarrow_S R \quad (\text{by (C.4)}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}_2[\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_2][\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_2}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[\mathbf{C}'[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_1][\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_1} \# \mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_2][\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_2}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[\mathbf{C}'[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_1[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_1}] \# \mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_2[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_2}]] \mid \mathbf{N}'[\mathbf{C}'[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \\ &\rightsquigarrow_S R \quad (\text{by IH on (C.5)}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_1[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_1}] \# \mathbf{M}_2[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I_2}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[\mathbf{C}'[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{C}[(\mathbf{M}_1 \# \mathbf{M}_2)[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I}]] \mid \mathbf{N}'[\mathbf{C}'[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{M}_1 \# \mathbf{M}_2][\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[\mathbf{C}'[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{M}[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[\mathbf{M}'[\beta_1; Q_1]]) \\ &\rightsquigarrow_S R \quad (\text{by rule } [\rightsquigarrow_{\mathbf{v}\#}] \text{ on (C.6)}) \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem C.9 *If $P \vdash \Gamma$ and $P \longrightarrow R$, then $P \rightsquigarrow_S R$.*

Proof: By induction on the derivation of the reduction. The inductive cases of rules $[\rightarrow_{\equiv}]$, $[\rightarrow_v]$, $[\rightarrow]$, and $[\rightarrow_{\perp}]$ follow from the IH straightforwardly, using the corresponding closure rule for \rightsquigarrow . As representative base case, we consider rule $[\rightarrow_{1\perp}]$: $P = (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[\bar{x}] \mid \mathbf{N}'[x();Q]) \rightarrow R$.

By inversion of typing, $\mathbf{N}[\bar{x}] \vdash \Gamma, x:A$, so by Lemma C.5.9, there are \mathbf{M} and $(\alpha_i; P_i)_{i \in I}$ such that $\mathbf{N}[\bar{x}] = \mathbf{M}[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I}$ where $x \notin \text{fn}(\mathbf{M})$ and $x \in \bigcap_{i \in I} \text{fn}(\alpha_i; P_i)$ and there is $i' \in I$ such that $\alpha_{i'}; P_{i'} = \bar{x}$. Similarly, there are \mathbf{M}' and $(\beta_j; Q_j)_{j \in J}$ such that $\mathbf{N}'[x();Q] = \mathbf{M}'[\beta_j; Q_j]_{j \in J}$ where $x \notin \text{fn}(\mathbf{M}')$ and $x \in \bigcap_{j \in J} \text{fn}(\beta_j; Q_j)$ and there is $j' \in J$ such that $\beta_{j'}; Q_{j'} = x();Q$.

By Lemma C.5.11, $\text{flat}(\mathbf{M})[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I} = \prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\alpha_i; P_i]$ and $\text{flat}(\mathbf{M}')[\beta_j; Q_j]_{j \in J} = \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{C}'_j[\beta_j; Q_j]$. By typability, there is $I' \subseteq I$ such that $\forall i \in I'. \alpha_i \bowtie \bar{x}$ and $\forall i \in I \setminus I'. \alpha_i \not\bowtie \bar{x}$; hence, $i' \in I'$. Similarly, there is $J' \subseteq J$ such that $\forall j \in J'. \beta_j \bowtie x()$ and $\forall j \in J \setminus J'. \beta_j \not\bowtie x()$; hence, $j' \in J'$. Then, by Definition 4.3, $\text{flat}(\mathbf{M})[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I} \succeq_x \prod_{i \in I'} \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}]$ and $\text{flat}(\mathbf{M}')[\beta_j; Q_j]_{j \in J} \succeq_x \prod_{j \in J'} \mathbf{C}_j[x();Q_j]$. By rule $[\rightsquigarrow_{1\perp}]$,

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(\prod_{i \in I'} \mathbf{C}_i[\bar{x}] \mid \prod_{j \in J'} \mathbf{C}_j[x();Q_j]) \rightsquigarrow_x R,$$

so by rule $[\rightsquigarrow_{\succeq_x}]$,

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(\text{flat}(\mathbf{M})[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I} \mid \text{flat}(\mathbf{M}')[\beta_j; Q_j]_{j \in J}) \rightsquigarrow_x R.$$

Then, by Lemma C.5.12,

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{M}[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I} \mid \mathbf{M}'[\beta_j; Q_j]_{j \in J}) \rightsquigarrow_x R.$$

As second base case, we consider rule $[\rightarrow_{\text{ID}}]$: $P = (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}[x \leftrightarrow y] \mid Q) \rightarrow R$.

By inversion of typing, $\mathbf{N}[x \leftrightarrow y] \vdash \Gamma, x:A, y:\bar{A}$, so by Lemma C.5.9, there are \mathbf{M} and $(\alpha_i; P_i)_{i \in I}$ such that $\mathbf{N}[x \leftrightarrow y] = \mathbf{M}[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I}$ where $x \notin \text{fn}(\mathbf{M})$ and $x \in \bigcap_{i \in I} \text{fn}(\alpha_i; P_i)$ and there is $i' \in I$ such that $\alpha_{i'}; P_{i'} = [x \leftrightarrow y]$.

By Lemma C.5.11, $\text{flat}(\mathbf{M})[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I} = \prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}_i[\alpha_i; P_i]$. By typability, there is $I' \subseteq I$ such that $\forall i \in I'. \alpha_i = [x \leftrightarrow y]$ and $\forall i \in I \setminus I'. \alpha_i \neq [x \leftrightarrow y]$; hence, $i' \in I'$.

Then, by Definition 4.3, $\text{flat}(\mathbf{M})[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I} \succeq_{x,y} \prod_{i \in I'} \mathbf{C}_i[[x \leftrightarrow y]]$. By rule $[\rightsquigarrow_{\text{ID}}]$,

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(\prod_{i \in I'} \mathbf{C}_i[[x \leftrightarrow y]] \mid Q) \rightsquigarrow_{x,y} R,$$

so by rule $[\rightsquigarrow_{\succeq_{x,y}}]$,

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(\text{flat}(\mathbf{M})[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I} \mid Q) \rightsquigarrow_{x,y} R.$$

Then, by Lemma C.5.12,

$$(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{M}[\alpha_i; P_i]_{i \in I} \mid Q) \rightsquigarrow_{x,y} R. \quad \square$$

Theorem C.10 (DF: Lazy Semantics) *If $P \vdash \emptyset$ and $P \neq \mathbf{0}$, then $P \rightsquigarrow_S R$ for some S and R .*

Proof: As a corollary of Theorems C.2 and C.9. □

C.6 Proofs of Subject Reduction and Subject Expansion for $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$

Here we prove Theorems 4.3 and 4.4 (subject reduction and subject expansion, respectively) for $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$.

C.6.1 Subject Reduction

Lemma C.6.1 (Substitution Lemma for λ_C)

1. (Linear) If $\Theta; \Gamma, x : \sigma \models M : \tau$, $\text{head}(M) = x$, and $\Theta; \Delta \models N : \sigma$ then $\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models M\{N/x\} : \tau$.
2. (Unrestricted) If $\Theta, x^i : \eta; \Gamma \models M : \tau$, $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$, $\eta_i = \sigma$, and $\Theta; \cdot \models N : \sigma$ then $\Theta, x^i : \eta; \Gamma \models M\{N/x[i]\}$.

Proof:

1. By structural induction on M with $\text{head}(M) = x$. There are six cases to be analyzed:

(a) $M = x$

In this case, $\Theta; x : \sigma \models x : \sigma$ and $\Gamma = \emptyset$. Observe that $x\{N/x\} = N$, since $\Delta \models N : \sigma$, by hypothesis, the result follows.

(b) $M = M' B$.

Then $\text{head}(M' B) = \text{head}(M') = x$, and the derivation is the following:

$$[\text{FS:app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_1, x : \sigma \models M' : (\delta^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Gamma_2 \models B : (\delta^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, x : \sigma \models M' B : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$, and j, k are non-negative integers, possibly different. Since $\Delta \vdash N : \sigma$, by IH, the result holds for M' , that is,

$$\Gamma_1, \Delta \models M'\{N/x\} : (\delta^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau$$

which gives the derivation:

$$[\text{FS:app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Delta \models M'\{N/x\} : (\delta^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Gamma_2 \models B : (\delta^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Delta \models (M'\{N/x\})B : \tau}$$

From Figure C.5, $(M' B)\{N/x\} = (M'\{N/x\})B$, and the result follows.

(c) $M = M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$.

Then $\text{head}(M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]) = \text{head}(M') = x$, for $y \neq x$. Therefore,

$$[\text{FS:share}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta, x : \sigma \models M' : \tau \quad y \notin \Gamma_1 \quad k \neq 0}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k, x : \sigma \models M'[y_1, \dots, y_k \leftarrow x] : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k$. By IH, the result follows for M' , that is,

$$\Theta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta, \Delta \models M'\{N/x\} : \tau$$

and we have the derivation:

$$[\text{FS:shar}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta, \Delta \models M'\{N/x\} : \tau \quad y \notin \Gamma_1 \quad k \neq 0}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k, \Delta \models M'\{N/x\}[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

From Figure C.5, $M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]\{N/x\} = M'\{N/x\}[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$, and the result follows.

(d) $M = M'[\leftarrow y]$.

Then $\text{head}(M'[\leftarrow y]) = \text{head}(M') = x$ with $x \neq y$,

$$[\text{FS:weak}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma, x : \sigma \models M : \tau}{\Theta; \Gamma, y : \omega, x : \sigma \models M[\leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

and $M'[\leftarrow y]\{N/x\} = M'\{N/x\}[\leftarrow y]$. Then by the induction hypothesis:

$$[\text{FS:weak}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models M\{N/x\} : \tau}{\Theta; \Gamma, y : \omega, \Delta \models M\{N/x\}[\leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

(e) If $M = M'\langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle$.

Then $\text{head}(M'\langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle) = \text{head}(M') = x \neq y_1, \dots, y_k$,

$$[\text{FS:Esub}^\ell] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta, x : \sigma \models M' : \tau \quad \Theta; \Gamma_2 \models C : \delta^k}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, x : \sigma \models M'\langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle : \tau}$$

and $M'\langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle\{N/x\} = M'\{N/x\}\langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle$. Then by the induction hypothesis:

$$[\text{FS:Esub}^\ell] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Delta, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta \models M'\{N/x\} : \tau \quad \Theta; \Gamma_2 \models C : \delta^k}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Delta \models M'\{N/x\}\langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle : \tau}$$

(f) If $M = M'\llbracket U/y \rrbracket$ then $\text{head}(M'\llbracket U/y \rrbracket) = \text{head}(M') = x$, and the proofs is similar to the case above.

2. By structural induction on M with $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$. There are three cases to be analyzed:

(a) $M = x[i]$.

In this case,

$$[\text{FS:var}^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta, x^i : \eta; x : \eta_i \models x : \sigma}$$

$$[\text{FS:var}^!] \frac{}{\Theta, x^i : \eta; \cdot \models x[i] : \sigma}$$

and $\Gamma = \emptyset$. Observe that $x[i]\{N/x[i]\} = N$, since $\Theta, x^i : \eta; \Gamma \models M\{N/x[i]\}$, by hypothesis, the result follows.

(b) $M = M' B$.

In this case, $\text{head}(M' B) = \text{head}(M') = x[i]$, and one has the following derivation:

$$[\text{FS:app}] \frac{\Theta, x^i : \eta; \Gamma_1 \models M : (\delta^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta, x^i : \sigma; \Gamma_2 \models B : (\delta^k, \varepsilon') \quad \varepsilon \sim \varepsilon'}{\Theta, x^i : \eta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \models M B : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$, δ is a strict type and j, k are non-negative integers, possibly different.

By the induction hypothesis, we get $\Theta, x^i : \eta; \Gamma_1 \models M'\{N/x[i]\} : (\delta^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau$, which gives the derivation:

$$[\text{FS:app}] \frac{\Theta, x^i : \eta; \Gamma_1 \models M'\{N/x[i]\} : (\delta^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta, x^i : \eta; \Gamma_2 \models B : (\delta^k, \varepsilon') \quad \varepsilon \sim \varepsilon'}{\Theta, x^i : \eta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \models (M'\{N/x[i]\})B : \tau}$$

From Figure C.5, $M'\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle\{N/x[i]\} = M'\{N/x[i]\}\langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$, and the result follows.

(c) $M = M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$.

Then $\text{head}(M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]) = \text{head}(M') = x[i]$, for $y \neq x$. Therefore,

$$[\text{FS:shar}] \frac{\Theta, x^i : \eta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta \models M' : \tau \quad y \notin \Gamma_1 \quad k \neq 0}{\Theta, x^i : \eta; \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k \models M'[y_1, \dots, y_k \leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k$. By the induction hypothesis, the result follows for M' , that is,

$$\Theta, x^i : \eta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta \models M'\{N/x[i]\} : \tau$$

and we have the derivation:

$$[\text{FS:shar}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta \models M' \{N/x[i]\} : \tau \quad y \notin \Gamma_1 \quad k \neq 0}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k \models M' \{N/x[i]\} [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

From Figure C.5 $M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \{N/x[i]\} = M' \{N/x[i]\} [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$, and the result follows.

(d) $M = M'[\leftarrow y]$.

Then $\text{head}(M'[\leftarrow y]) = \text{head}(M') = x[i]$ with $x \neq y$,

$$[\text{FS:weak}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \models M : \tau}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, y : \omega \models M[\leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

and $M'[\leftarrow y] \{N/x[i]\} = M' \{N/x[i]\} [\leftarrow y]$. By the induction hypothesis:

$$[\text{FS:weak}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \models M \{N/x[i]\} : \tau}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, y : \omega \models M \{N/x[i]\} [\leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

(e) $M = M' \langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle$.

Then $\text{head}(M' \langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle) = \text{head}(M') = x[i]$ with $x \neq y$,

$$[\text{FS:Esub}^\ell] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta \models M : \tau \quad \Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Delta \models C : \delta^k}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, \Delta \models M \langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle : \tau}$$

and $M' \langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle \{N/x[i]\} = M' \{N/x[i]\} \langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle$. By the induction hypothesis:

$$[\text{FS:Esub}^\ell] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta \models M' \{N/x[i]\} : \tau \quad \Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Delta \models C : \delta^k}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, \Delta \models M' \{N/x[i]\} \langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle : \tau}$$

(f) $M = M' \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket$.

Then $\text{head}(M' \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket) = \text{head}(M') = x[i]$,

$$[\text{FS:Esub}^1] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta, y : \varepsilon_1; \Gamma \models M' : \tau \quad \Theta, x^1 : \eta; - \models U : \varepsilon_2 \quad \varepsilon_1 \sim \varepsilon_2}{\Theta; \Gamma \models M' \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket : \tau}$$

and $M' \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket \{N/x[i]\} = M' \{N/x[i]\} \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket$. Then by the induction hypothesis:

$$[\text{FS:Esub}^1] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta, y : \varepsilon_1; \Gamma \models M' \{N/x[i]\} : \tau \quad \Theta, x^1 : \eta; - \models U : \varepsilon_2 \quad \varepsilon_1 \sim \varepsilon_2}{\Theta; \Gamma \models M' \{N/x[i]\} \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket : \tau}$$

□

Theorem C.11 (SR in λ_C) *If $\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \tau$ and $M \longrightarrow M'$ then $\Theta; \Gamma \models M' : \tau$.*

Proof : By structural induction on the reduction rule from Fig. C.5 applied in $M \longrightarrow M'$.

1. **Rule [RS:Beta].**

Then $M = (\lambda x. N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B$ and the reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Beta}] \frac{}{(\lambda x. N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B \longrightarrow N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle}$$

where $M' = N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$. Since $\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \tau$ we get the following derivation:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[FS:share]} \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_j : \sigma \models N : \tau}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x : \sigma^j \models N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau} \\
\text{[FS:abs-sh]} \frac{\Theta; \Gamma' \models \lambda x. N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models (\lambda x. N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B : \tau} \\
\text{[FS:app]}
\end{array}$$

for $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$ and $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma')$. Notice that:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[FS:share]} \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_j : \sigma \models N : \tau}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x : \sigma^j \models N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau} \\
\text{[FS:Esub]} \frac{\Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}
\end{array}$$

Therefore $\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models M' : \tau$ and the result follows.

2. **Rule [RS:Ex-Sub].**

Then $M = N[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle$ where $C = \lambda N_1 \int \dots \int \lambda N_k \int$. The reduction is:

$$\text{[RS:Ex-Sub]} \frac{C = \lambda N_1 \int \dots \int \lambda N_k \int \quad N \neq \text{fail}^{\tilde{v}}}{N[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow N \langle\langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle\rangle \ll U/x^1 \ll}$$

and $M' = N \langle\langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle\rangle \ll U/x^1 \ll$. To simplify the proof we take $k = 2$, as the case $k > 2$ is similar. Therefore $C = \lambda N_1 \int \cdot \lambda N_2 \int$.

Since $\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \tau$ we get a derivation: (we omit the labels [FS : Esub] and [FS:share])

$$\frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, x_2 : \sigma \models N : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma) \quad k \neq 0}{\frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x : \sigma^2 \models N[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C * U : (\sigma^2, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models N[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle : \tau}}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. Consider the wf derivation for $\Pi_{1,2}$: (we omit the labels [FS : Esub¹] and [FS : Esub^ℓ])

$$\frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, x_2 : \sigma \models N : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C : \sigma^k}{\frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', \Delta \models N \langle\langle C/x_1, x_2 \rangle\rangle : \tau \quad \Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models N \langle\langle C/x_1, x_2 \rangle\rangle \ll U/x^1 \ll} : \tau}$$

and the result follows.

3. **Rule [RS:Fetch^ℓ].**

Then $M = N \langle\langle C/\tilde{x}, x_j \rangle\rangle$ where $\text{head}(N) = x_j$. The reduction is:

$$\text{[RS:Fetch}_i^{\ell}] \frac{\text{head}(N) = x_j}{N \langle\langle C/\tilde{x}, x_j \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow N \{ \{ C_i/x_j \} \} \langle\langle (C \setminus C_i)/\tilde{x} \rangle\rangle}$$

and $M' = N \{ \{ C_i/x_j \} \} \langle\langle (C \setminus C_i)/\tilde{x} \rangle\rangle$. Since $\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \tau$ we get the following derivation:

$$\text{[FS:Esub}^{\ell}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma', \tilde{x} : \sigma^{k-1}, x_j : \sigma \models N : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C : \sigma^k}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models N \langle\langle C/\tilde{x}, x_j \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$ and $\Delta = \Delta_i, \Delta'_i$ with $\Theta; \Delta_i \models C_i : \sigma$. By Lemma C.6.1, we obtain the derivation $\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models N \{ \{ C_i/x_j \} \} \langle\langle (C \setminus C_i)/\tilde{x} \rangle\rangle : \tau$ via:

$$[\text{FS:Esub}^\ell] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta_i, \tilde{x} : \sigma^{k-1} \models N\{C_i/x_j\} : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta'_i \models C \setminus C_i : \sigma^{k-1}}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models N\{C_i/x_j\} \langle (C \setminus C_i) / \tilde{x} \rangle : \tau}$$

4. Rule $[\text{RS:Fetch}^1]$.

Then $M = N\llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ where $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$. The reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Fetch}^1] \frac{\text{head}(N) = x[i] \quad U_i = \{N_i\}^1}{N\llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \longrightarrow N\{N_i/x[i]\}\llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket}$$

and $M' = N\{N_i/x[i]\}\llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$. Since $\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \tau$ we get the following derivation:

$$[\text{FS:Esub}^1] \frac{\Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma \models N : \tau \quad \Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma \models N\llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket : \tau}$$

By Lemma C.6.1, we obtain the derivation $\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \models N\{N_i/x[i]\}$, and the result follows from:

$$[\text{FS:Esub}^1] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \models N\{N_i/x[i]\} : \tau \quad \Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma \models N\{N_i/x[i]\}\llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket : \tau}$$

5. Rule $[\text{RS:TCont}]$.

Then $M = C[N]$ and the reduction is as follows:

$$[\text{RS:TCont}] \frac{N \longrightarrow N'}{C[N] \longrightarrow C[N']}$$

with $M' = C[N']$. The proof proceeds by analysing the context C . There are three cases:

(a) $C = [\cdot] B$.

In this case $M = N B$, for some B . Since $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ one has a derivation:

$$[\text{FS:app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma' \models N : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models N B : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. From $\Gamma' \models N : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau$ and the reduction $N \longrightarrow N'$, one has by IH that $\Gamma' \models N' : \sigma^j \rightarrow \tau$. Finally, we may type the following:

$$[\text{FS:app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma' \models N' : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models N' B : \tau}$$

Since $M' = (C[N']) = N' B$, the result follows.

(b) Cases $C = [\cdot] \langle N/x \rangle$ and $C = [\cdot] \langle \tilde{x} \leftarrow x \rangle$ are similar to the previous.

6. Rule $[\text{RS:Fail}^\ell]$.

Then $M = N[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle$ where $k \neq \text{size}(C)$, $\tilde{y} = (\text{fv}(N) \setminus \{\tilde{x}\}) \cup \text{fv}(C)$ and the reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Fail}^\ell] \frac{k \neq \text{size}(C) \quad \tilde{y} = (\text{fv}(N) \setminus \{\tilde{x}\}) \cup \text{fv}(C)}{N[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}}$$

where $M' = \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$. Since $\Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models M$, one has a derivation:

$$\frac{[\text{FS:Esub}] \frac{\Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models N : \tau}{\Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma', x : \sigma^k \models N[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau} \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C * U : (\sigma^j, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{[\text{FS:Esub}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models N[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. We may type the following:

$$[\text{FS:fail}] \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma', \Delta) = \tilde{x}}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} : \tau}$$

since Γ', Δ contain assignments on the free variables in M and B . Therefore, $\Theta; \Gamma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} : \tau$, by applying $[\text{FS:sum}]$ as required.

7. Rule $[\text{RS:Fail}^1]$.

Then $M = N \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ where $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$ and $U_i = 1^1$ and the reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Fail}^1] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x[i] \quad U_i = 1^1}{N \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \longrightarrow N\{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket}$$

with $M' = N\{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$. By the induction hypothesis, one has the derivation:

$$[\text{FS:Esub}^1] \frac{\Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma \models N : \tau \quad \Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma \models N \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket : \tau}$$

By Lemma C.6.1, there exists a derivation Π_1 of $\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma' \models N\{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\} : \tau$. Thus,

$$[\text{FS:Esub}^1] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \models N\{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\} : \tau \quad \Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma \models N\{\text{fail}^0/x[i]\} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket : \tau}$$

8. Rule $[\text{RS:Cons}_1]$.

Then $M = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} B$ and the reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Cons}_1] \frac{\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(C)}{\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} C * U \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \cup \tilde{y}}}$$

and $M' = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \cup \tilde{y}}$. Since $\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \tau$, one has the derivation:

$$\frac{[\text{F:fail}] \frac{}{\Theta; \Gamma' \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau} \quad [\text{FS:bag}] \frac{\Theta; \Delta \models C : \sigma^k \quad \Theta; - \models U : \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Delta \models C * U : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}}{[\text{FS:app}] \frac{}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} : C * U : \tau}}$$

Hence $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$ and we may type the following:

$$[\text{F:fail}] \frac{}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \text{fail}^{\tilde{x} \cup \tilde{y}} : \tau}$$

9. The proof for the cases of $[\text{RS:Cons}_2]$, $[\text{RS:Cons}_3]$ and $[\text{RS:Cons}_4]$ proceed similarly. \square

C.6.2 Subject Expansion

The full well-typed rules can be seen in Figure C.10.

Lemma C.6.2 (Anti-Substitution Lemma for λ_C)

1. (Linear) If $\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M\{N/x\} : \tau$ then there exists Γ', Δ and σ such that $\Theta; \Gamma', x : \sigma \vdash M : \tau$ and $\Theta; \Delta \vdash N : \sigma$ with $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$.
2. (Unrestricted) If $\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \vdash M\{N/x[i]\}$ with $\eta_i = \sigma$ then $\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ and $\Theta; \cdot \vdash N : \sigma$.

Proof:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{[\text{TS:var}^\ell]}{\Theta; x : \sigma \vdash x : \sigma} \quad \frac{[\text{TS:var}^!]}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; x : \eta_i, \Delta \vdash x : \sigma} \quad \frac{[\text{TS:1}^\ell]}{\Theta; - \vdash 1 : \omega} \quad \frac{[\text{TS:weak}]}{\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M : \tau} \\
\frac{[\text{TS:abs-sh}]}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma, x : \sigma^k \vdash M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)}{\Theta; \Gamma \vdash \lambda x. (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) : (\sigma^k, \eta) \rightarrow \tau} \quad \frac{[\text{TS:bag}^\ell]}{\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M : \sigma \quad \Theta; \Delta \vdash C : \sigma^k}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \vdash \lambda M \}. C : \sigma^{k+1}} \\
\frac{[\text{TS:app}]}{\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \vdash B : (\sigma^j, \eta)}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \vdash M B : \tau} \quad \frac{[\text{TS:bag}^!]}{\Theta; - \vdash U : \varepsilon \quad \Theta; - \vdash V : \eta}{\Theta; - \vdash U \diamond V : \varepsilon \diamond \eta} \\
\frac{[\text{TS:shar}]}{\Theta; \Gamma, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \vdash M : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma) \quad k \neq 0}{\Theta; \Gamma, x : \sigma^k \vdash M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau} \quad \frac{[\text{TS:bag}]}{\Theta; \Gamma \vdash C : \sigma^k \quad \Theta; - \vdash U : \eta}{\Theta; \Gamma \vdash C * U : (\sigma^k, \eta)} \\
\frac{[\text{TS:Esub}^\ell]}{\Theta; \Gamma, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \vdash M : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \vdash C : \sigma^k}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \vdash M \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle : \tau} \quad \frac{[\text{TS:Esub}^!]}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma \vdash M : \tau \quad \Theta; - \vdash U : \eta}{\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket : \tau} \\
\frac{[\text{TS:Esub}]}{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma, x : \sigma^j \vdash M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \vdash B : (\sigma^k, \eta)}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \vdash (M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle : \tau}
\end{array}$$

Figure C.10: Well-Typed Rules for λ_C .

1. By structural induction on M with $\text{head}(M) = x$. There are six cases to be analyzed:

- (a) $M = x$.
- (b) In this case, $x\{N/x\} = N$ and so $\Gamma \vdash N : \sigma$. Take $\Gamma' = -$ and $\Delta = \Gamma$ then $\Theta; x : \sigma \vdash x : \sigma$ and $\Delta \vdash N : \sigma$ by hypothesis, the result follows.
- (c) $M = M' B$.

From Figure C.5, $(M' B)\{N/x\} = (M'\{N/x\})B$. Let $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$ for some Γ_1, Γ_2 and the derivation is the following:

$$[\text{TS:app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_1 \vdash M'\{N/x\} : (\delta^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Gamma_2 \vdash B : (\delta^j, \eta)}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash (M'\{N/x\})B : \tau}$$

where $j \geq 0$. By IH there exists $\Gamma'_1, \Delta, \sigma$ such that $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma'_1, \Delta$ with $\Theta; \Gamma'_1, x : \sigma \vdash M' : (\delta^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau$ and $\Theta; \Delta \vdash N : \sigma$. Which gives the derivation:

$$[\text{TS:app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma'_1, x : \sigma \vdash M' : (\delta^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Gamma_2 \vdash B : (\delta^j, \eta)}{\Theta; \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2, x : \sigma \vdash M' B : \tau}$$

By taking $\Gamma' = \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2$ the result follows.

(d) $M = M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$ with $y \neq x$.

Then from Figure C.5, $M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]\{N/x\} = M'\{N/x\}[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$. Let $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k$ with $k \neq 0$. Therefore,

$$[\text{TS:shar}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta \vdash M'\{N/x\} : \tau \quad y \notin \Gamma_1 \quad k \neq 0}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k \vdash M'\{N/x\}[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

By IH there exists $\Gamma'_1, \Delta, \sigma$ such that $\Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta = \Gamma'_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta, \Delta$ with $\Theta; \Gamma'_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta, x : \sigma \vdash M' : \tau$ and $\Theta; \Delta \vdash N : \sigma$. Which gives the derivation:

$$[\text{TS:share}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma'_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta, x : \sigma \vdash M' : \tau \quad y \notin \Gamma_1 \quad k \neq 0}{\Theta; \Gamma'_1, y : \delta^k, x : \sigma \vdash M'[y_1, \dots, y_k \leftarrow x] : \tau}$$

By taking $\Gamma' = \Gamma'_1, y : \delta^k$ the result follows.

(e) $M = M'[\leftarrow y]$ with $x \neq y$.

Then $M'[\leftarrow y]\{N/x\} = M'\{N/x\}[\leftarrow y]$. Therefore,

$$[\text{TS:weak}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M\{N/x\} : \tau}{\Theta; \Gamma, y : \omega \vdash M\{N/x\}[\leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

By IH there exists Γ', Δ, σ such that $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$ with $\Theta; \Gamma', x : \sigma \vdash M' : \tau$ and $\Theta; \Delta \vdash N : \sigma$. Which gives the derivation:

$$[\text{TS:weak}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma', x : \sigma \vdash M : \tau}{\Theta; \Gamma', y : \omega, x : \sigma \vdash M[\leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

By taking $\Gamma' = \Gamma', y : \omega$ the result follows.

(f) If $M = M'\langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle$ with $x \neq y_1, \dots, y_k$.

Then $M'\langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle\{N/x\} = M'\{N/x\}\langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle$ and

$$[\text{TS:Esub}^\ell] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta \vdash M'\{N/x\} : \tau \quad \Theta; \Gamma_2 \vdash C : \delta^k}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash M'\{N/x\}\langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle : \tau}$$

By IH there exists $\Gamma'_1, \Delta, \sigma$ such that $\Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta = \Gamma'_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta, \Delta$ with $\Theta; \Gamma'_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta, x : \sigma \vdash M' : \tau$ and $\Theta; \Delta \vdash N : \sigma$. Which gives the derivation:

$$[\text{TS:Esub}^\ell] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma'_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta, x : \sigma \vdash M' : \tau \quad \Theta; \Gamma_2 \vdash C : \delta^k}{\Theta; \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2, x : \sigma \vdash M'\langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle : \tau}$$

By taking $\Gamma' = \Gamma'_1, \Gamma_2$ the result follows.

(g) If $M = M'\llbracket U/y \rrbracket$ then $\text{head}(M'\llbracket U/y \rrbracket) = \text{head}(M') = x$, and the proofs is similar to the case above.

2. By structural induction on M with $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$. There are three cases to be analyzed:

(a) $M = x[i]$.

Observe that $x[i]\{N/x[i]\} = N$ and let $\Theta, x^i : \eta; \Gamma \vdash x[i]\{N/x[i]\} : \sigma$ with $\eta_i = \sigma$. In this case $\Gamma = \cdot$, and we have both

$$\begin{array}{c} [\text{TS:var}^\ell] \\ \hline \Theta, x^i : \eta; x : \eta_i \vdash x : \sigma \\ [\text{TS:var}^!] \\ \hline \Theta, x^i : \eta; \cdot \vdash x[i] : \sigma \end{array}$$

and $\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \vdash N : \sigma$ and the result follows.

(b) $M = M' B$.

From Figure C.5, $M' \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle \{N/x[i]\} = M' \{N/x[i]\} \langle\langle B/y \rangle\rangle$, let $\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash (M' \{N/x[i]\}) B : \tau$ where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$ and $\eta_i = \sigma$ we derive:

$$[\text{TS:app}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1 \vdash M' \{N/x[i]\} : (\delta^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_2 \vdash B : (\delta^j, \varepsilon)}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash (M' \{N/x[i]\}) B : \tau}$$

for some strict type δ . By IH $\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1 \vdash M' : (\delta^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau$ and $\Theta; \cdot \vdash N : \sigma$ and we derive:

$$[\text{TS:app}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1 \vdash M' : (\delta^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta, x^1 : \sigma; \Gamma_2 \vdash B : (\delta^j, \varepsilon)}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash M' B : \tau}$$

and the result follows.

(c) $M = M' [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$.

From Figure C.5 $M' [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \{N/x[i]\} = M' \{N/x[i]\} [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y]$, let $\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k \vdash M' \{N/x[i]\} [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau$ with $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k$ and $\eta_i = \sigma$, then we derive:

$$[\text{TS:shar}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta \vdash M' \{N/x[i]\} : \tau \quad y \notin \Gamma_1 \quad k \neq 0}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k \vdash M' \{N/x[i]\} [\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

By IH $\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta \vdash M' : \tau$ and $\Theta; \cdot \vdash N : \sigma$ and we derive:

$$[\text{TS:shar}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta \vdash M' : \tau \quad y \notin \Gamma_1 \quad k \neq 0}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma_1, y : \delta^k \vdash M' [y_1, \dots, y_k \leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

and the result follows.

(d) $M = M' [\leftarrow y]$.

From Figure C.5 $M' [\leftarrow y] \{N/x[i]\} = M' \{N/x[i]\} [\leftarrow y]$, let $\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, y : \omega \vdash M' \{N/x[i]\} [\leftarrow y] : \tau$ with $\Gamma = \Gamma, y : \omega$ and $\eta_i = \sigma$, then we derive:

$$[\text{TS:weak}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \vdash M' \{N/x[i]\} : \tau}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, y : \omega \vdash M' \{N/x[i]\} [\leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

By IH $\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \vdash M' : \tau$ and $\Theta; \cdot \vdash N : \sigma$ and we derive:

$$[\text{TS:weak}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \vdash M : \tau}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, y : \omega \vdash M [\leftarrow y] : \tau}$$

and the result follows.

(e) $M = M' \langle\langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle\rangle$.

From Figure C.5 $M' \langle\langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle\rangle \{N/x[i]\} = M' \{N/x[i]\} \langle\langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle\rangle$, let $\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', \Delta \vdash M' \{N/x[i]\} \langle\langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle\rangle : \tau$ with $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$ and $\eta_i = \sigma$, then we derive:

$$[\text{TS:Esub}^\ell] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta \vdash M' \{N/x[i]\} : \tau \quad \Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Delta \vdash C : \delta^k}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', \Delta \vdash M' \{N/x[i]\} \langle\langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle\rangle : \tau}$$

By IH $\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \vdash M' : \tau$ and $\Theta; \cdot \vdash N : \sigma$ and we derive:

$$[\text{TS:Esub}^{\ell}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', y_1 : \delta, \dots, y_k : \delta \vdash M : \tau \quad \Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Delta \vdash C : \delta^k}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', \Delta \vdash M \langle C/y_1, \dots, y_k \rangle : \tau}$$

and the result follows.

$$(f) \quad M = M' \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket.$$

From Figure C.5 $M' \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket \{N/x[i]\} = M' \{N/x[i]\} \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket$, let $\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M' \{N/x[i]\} \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket : \tau$ and $\eta_i = \sigma$, then we derive:

$$[\text{TS:Esub}^1] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta, y : \varepsilon; \Gamma \vdash M' \{N/x[i]\} : \tau \quad \Theta, x^1 : \eta; - \vdash U : \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M' \{N/x[i]\} \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket : \tau}$$

By IH $\Theta, x^1 : \eta, y : \varepsilon; \Gamma \vdash M' : \tau$ and $\Theta; \cdot \vdash N : \sigma$ and we derive:

$$[\text{TS:Esub}^1] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta, y : \varepsilon; \Gamma \vdash M' : \tau \quad \Theta, x^1 : \eta; - \vdash U : \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M' \llbracket U/y^1 \rrbracket : \tau}$$

and the result follows. \square

Theorem C.12 (Subject Expansion in λ_C) *If $\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M' : \tau$ and $M \longrightarrow M'$ then $\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M : \tau$.*

Proof: By structural induction on the reduction rule from Fig. C.5 applied in $M \longrightarrow M'$.

1. **Rule [RS:Beta].**

Then $M' = N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$ and the reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Beta}] \frac{}{(\lambda x. N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B \longrightarrow N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle}$$

where $M = (\lambda x. N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B$. Since $\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M' : \tau$ we get the following derivation:

$$[\text{TS:share}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_j : \sigma \vdash N : \tau}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x : \sigma^j \vdash N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau} \quad \Theta; \Delta \vdash B : (\sigma^j, \eta)$$

$$[\text{TS:Esub}] \frac{}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \vdash N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle : \tau}$$

for $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. Notice that:

$$[\text{TS:share}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_j : \sigma \vdash N : \tau}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x : \sigma^j \vdash N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau}$$

$$[\text{TS:abs-sh}] \frac{}{\Theta; \Gamma' \vdash \lambda x. N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau} \quad \Theta; \Delta \vdash B : (\sigma^j, \eta)$$

$$[\text{TS:app}] \frac{}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \vdash (\lambda x. N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B : \tau}$$

Therefore $\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \vdash (\lambda x. N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B : \tau$ and the result follows.

Then $M = (\lambda x. N[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])B$ and the reduction is:

2. **Rule [RS:Ex-Sub].**

Then $M' = N \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ where $C = \lambda N_1 \dots \lambda N_k$. The reduction is:

$$[\text{RS:Ex-Sub}] \frac{C = \lambda N_1 \dots \lambda N_k \quad N \neq \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}}{N[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow N \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket}$$

and $M = N[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle$. To simplify the proof we take $k = 2$, as the case $k > 2$ is similar. Therefore $C = \{N_1\} \cdot \{N_2\}$.

Since $\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M' : \tau$ we get a derivation (we omit the labels $[\text{TS} : \text{Esub}^1]$ and $[\text{TS} : \text{Esub}^6]$):

$$\frac{\frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, x_2 : \sigma \vdash N : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \vdash C : \sigma^2}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', \Delta \vdash N \langle C/x_1, x_2 \rangle : \tau} \quad \Theta; - \vdash U : \eta}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \vdash N \langle C/x_1, x_2 \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. Consider the typing derivation (we omit the labels $[\text{TS} : \text{Esub}]$ and $[\text{TS} : \text{share}]$)

$$\frac{\frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x_1 : \sigma, x_2 : \sigma \vdash N : \tau}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma', x : \sigma^2 \vdash N[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] : \tau} \quad \Theta; \Delta \vdash C * U : (\sigma^2, \eta)}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \vdash N[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle : \tau}$$

and the result follows.

3. Rule $[\text{RS} : \text{Fetch}^6]$.

Then $M' = N\{C_i/x_j\} \langle (C \setminus C_i)/\tilde{x} \rangle$ where $\text{head}(N) = x_j$. The reduction is:

$$[\text{RS} : \text{Fetch}_i^6] \frac{\text{head}(N) = x_j}{N \langle C/\tilde{x}, x_j \rangle \longrightarrow N\{C_i/x_j\} \langle (C \setminus C_i)/\tilde{x} \rangle}$$

and $M = N \langle C/\tilde{x}, x_j \rangle$. Since $\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M' : \tau$ we get the following derivation:

$$[\text{TS} : \text{Esub}^6] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta_i, \tilde{x} : \sigma^{k-1} \vdash N\{C_i/x_j\} : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta'_i \vdash C \setminus C_i : \sigma^{k-1}}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \vdash N\{C_i/x_j\} \langle (C \setminus C_i)/\tilde{x} \rangle : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$ and $\Delta = \Delta_i, \Delta'_i$. By Lemma C.6.2, we obtain the derivation $\Theta; \Gamma', \tilde{x} : \sigma^{k-1}, x_j : \sigma \vdash N : \tau$ and $\Theta; \Delta_j \vdash C_j : \sigma$ via:

$$[\text{TS} : \text{Esub}^6] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma', \tilde{x} : \sigma^{k-1}, x_j : \sigma \vdash N : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \vdash C : \sigma^k}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \vdash N \langle C/\tilde{x}, x_j \rangle : \tau}$$

4. Rule $[\text{RS} : \text{Fetch}^1]$.

Then $M' = N\{N_i/x[i]\} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ where $\text{head}(M) = x[i]$. The reduction is:

$$[\text{RS} : \text{Fetch}^1] \frac{\text{head}(M) = x[i] \quad U_i = \{N_i\}^1}{N \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \longrightarrow N\{N_i/x[i]\} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket}$$

and $M = N \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$. Since $\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M' : \tau$ we get the following derivation:

$$[\text{TS} : \text{Esub}^1] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \vdash N\{N_i/x[i]\} : \tau \quad \Theta; - \vdash U : \eta}{\Theta; \Gamma \vdash N\{N_i/x[i]\} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket : \tau}$$

By Lemma C.6.2, we obtain the derivation $\Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma \vdash N : \tau$, and the result follows from:

$$[\text{TS} : \text{Esub}^1] \frac{\Theta, x : \eta; \Gamma \vdash N : \tau \quad \Theta; - \vdash U : \eta}{\Theta; \Gamma \vdash N \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket : \tau}$$

5. Rule $[\text{RS} : \text{TCont}]$.

Then $M' = C[N']$ and the reduction is as follows:

$$[\text{RS:TCont}] \frac{N \longrightarrow N'}{C[N] \longrightarrow C[N']}$$

with $M = C[N]$. The proof proceeds by analysing the context C . There are three cases:

(a) $C = [\cdot] B$.

In this case $M' = N' B$, for some B . Since $\Gamma \vdash M' : \tau$ one has a derivation:

$$[\text{TS:app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma' \vdash N' : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \vdash B : (\sigma^j, \eta)}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \vdash N' B : \tau}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma', \Delta$. From $\Gamma' \vdash N' : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau$ and the reduction $N \longrightarrow N'$, one has by IH that $\Gamma' \vdash N : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau$. Finally, we may type the following:

$$[\text{TS:app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma' \vdash N : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \vdash B : (\sigma^j, \eta)}{\Theta; \Gamma', \Delta \vdash N B : \tau}$$

Since $M = (C[N]) = NB$, the result follows.

(b) Cases $C = [\cdot] \langle N/x \rangle$ and $C = [\cdot] \langle \tilde{x} \leftarrow x \rangle$ are similar to the previous.

6. Rules $[\text{RS:Fail}^\ell]$, $[\text{RS:Fail}^!]$ and $[\text{RS:Cons}_1]$. These cases are trivial, since 1 , $1^!$ and $\text{fail}^{\tilde{x}\cup\tilde{y}}$ are not well-typed. □

C.7 Proof of Tight Correctness of the Translation under the Lazy Semantics

Here we prove Theorem 4.6.

Definition C.11 Success

We define $\text{head}(\check{\nu}_\lambda) = \check{\nu}_\lambda$ and $\llbracket \check{\nu}_\lambda \rrbracket_u = \check{\nu}_\pi$. We define *success* for terms $M \in \lambda_C$ and $P \in s\pi^+$.

- $M \Downarrow_{\check{\nu}_\lambda}$ if and only if, there exist $M'_1, \dots, M'_k \in \lambda_C$ such that $M \longrightarrow^* M'$ and $\text{head}(M') = \check{\nu}_\lambda$.
- $P \Downarrow_{\check{\nu}_\pi}$ if and only if, there exist $Q_1, Q_2 \in s\pi^+$ such that $P \longrightarrow^* (Q_1 \mid \check{\nu}_\pi) \uplus Q_2$.
- $P \Downarrow_{\check{\nu}_\pi}$ if and only if, there exist S and $Q_1, Q_2 \in s\pi^+$ such that $P \rightsquigarrow_S^* (Q_1 \mid \check{\nu}_\pi) \uplus Q_2$.

□

C.7.1 Type Preservation

Lemma C.7.1 $\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, m)} = \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}$ and $\llbracket (\sigma^j, \eta) \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, m)} = \llbracket (\sigma^k, \eta) \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}$ hold, provided that τ_1, τ_2, n and m are as follows:

1. If $j > k$ then take τ_1 to be an arbitrary type, $m = 0$, take τ_2 to be σ and $n = j - k$.
2. If $j < k$ then take τ_1 to be σ , $m = k - j$, take τ_2 to be an arbitrary type and $n = 0$.
3. Otherwise, if $j = k$ then take $m = n = 0$. In this case, τ_1, τ_2 are unimportant.

Proof: This proof proceeds by analyzing the conditions on types, following Chapter 3. □

Lemma C.7.2 If $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ then the following hold:

1. If $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket, x^! : \llbracket \eta \rrbracket$ then $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket, x^! : \llbracket \varepsilon \rrbracket$.

2. If $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$ then $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket (\sigma^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$.

Proof: The proof is by mutual induction on the the derivations of If $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket, x^! : \llbracket \bar{\eta} \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$ and on the structure of M .

We use Def. C.6 that establishes $\llbracket \eta \rrbracket = !\&_{\eta_i \in \eta} \{i : \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket\}$ and by duality $\llbracket \bar{\eta} \rrbracket = ?\oplus_{\eta_i \in \eta} \{i : \llbracket \bar{\eta}_i \rrbracket\}$.

1. $M = x$.

By the translation in Fig. C.8: $\llbracket x \rrbracket_u = \bar{x}.\text{some}; [x \leftrightarrow u]$. We have the following derivation, for some type A :

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{[TID]} \frac{}{[x \leftrightarrow u] \vdash x : \bar{A}, u : A} \\ \text{[TWEAKEN]} \frac{}{[x \leftrightarrow u] \vdash x : \bar{A}, u : A, x^! : \llbracket \bar{\eta} \rrbracket} \\ \text{[T\&]} \frac{}{\bar{x}.\text{some}; [x \leftrightarrow u] \vdash x : \&\bar{A}, u : A, x^! : \llbracket \bar{\eta} \rrbracket} \end{array}$$

The derivation is independent of $x^! : \llbracket \bar{\eta} \rrbracket$, hence the result trivially holds for $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket = x : \&\bar{A}, u : A$.

2. $M = x[k]$.

By the translation in Fig. C.8: $\llbracket x[k] \rrbracket_u = ?x^! [x_i]; \bar{x}_i.k; [x_i \leftrightarrow u]$. We have the following derivation:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{[TID]} \frac{}{[x_i \leftrightarrow u] \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, x_i : \llbracket \eta_k \rrbracket} \\ \text{[T}\oplus\text{]} \frac{}{\bar{x}_i.k; [x_i \leftrightarrow u] \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, x_i : \oplus_{\eta_i \in \eta} \{i : \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket\}} \\ \text{[T?]} \frac{}{?x^! [x_i]; \bar{x}_i.k; [x_i \leftrightarrow u] \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, x^! : ?\oplus_{\eta_i \in \eta} \{i : \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket\}} \end{array}$$

Since $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ we have that $\varepsilon_k = \eta_k$ for each $k = 1, \dots, |\eta|$. Thus, the same derivation above, replacing η_i 's for ε_i 's entails $?x^! [x_i]; \bar{x}_i.k; [x_i \leftrightarrow u] \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, x^! : \llbracket \varepsilon \rrbracket$, and the result follows. For the case of $M = y[k]$ with $y \neq x$ we use the argument that the typing of y is independent on x .

3. $M = \lambda y. (M'[\bar{y} \leftarrow y])$.

From the translation in Fig. C.8:

$$\llbracket \lambda y. M'[\bar{y} \leftarrow y] \rrbracket_u = \bar{u}.\text{some}; u(y); \bar{y}.\text{some}; \underbrace{y(y^\ell); y(y^!); y() : \llbracket M'[\bar{y} \leftarrow y] \rrbracket_u}_P$$

Π_1

\vdots

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{[T}\perp\text{]} \frac{}{\llbracket M'[\bar{y} \leftarrow y] \rrbracket_u \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, y^\ell : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket, y^! : \llbracket \bar{\eta} \rrbracket} \\ \text{[T}\wp\text{]} \frac{}{y(); \llbracket M'[\bar{y} \leftarrow y] \rrbracket_u \vdash y : \perp, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, y^\ell : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket, y^! : \llbracket \bar{\eta} \rrbracket} \\ \text{[T}\wp\text{]} \frac{}{y(y^!); y(); \llbracket M'[\bar{y} \leftarrow y] \rrbracket_u \vdash y : (\llbracket \bar{\eta} \rrbracket) \wp (\perp), u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, y^\ell : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket} \\ \text{[T\&some]} \frac{}{y(y^\ell); y(y^!); y(); \llbracket M'[\bar{y} \leftarrow y] \rrbracket_u \vdash y : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)} \wp ((\llbracket \bar{\eta} \rrbracket) \wp (\perp)), u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket} \\ \text{[T}\wp\text{]} \frac{}{\bar{y}.\text{some}; P \vdash y : \&(\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)} \wp ((\llbracket \bar{\eta} \rrbracket) \wp (\perp))), u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket} \\ \text{[T\&some]} \frac{}{u(y); \bar{y}.\text{some}; P \vdash u : \&(\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)} \wp ((\llbracket \bar{\eta} \rrbracket) \wp (\perp))) \wp \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket} \\ \text{[T\&some]} \frac{}{\bar{u}.\text{some}; u(y); \bar{y}.\text{some}; P \vdash u : \underbrace{\&(\&(\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma, i)} \wp ((\llbracket \bar{\eta} \rrbracket) \wp (\perp))) \wp \llbracket \tau \rrbracket}_{\llbracket (\sigma^k, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket}, \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket} \end{array}$$

Def. C.6

Let us consider the following two cases:

- $y = x$

By the IH there exists a derivation Π'_1 of $\llbracket M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \rrbracket_u \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, y^\ell : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket, y^! : \llbracket \varepsilon \rrbracket$. Following the steps above we obtain $\bar{u}.some; u(y); \bar{y}.some; P \vdash u : \llbracket (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$.

- $y \neq x$

Then we have that $\llbracket \Theta \rrbracket = \llbracket \Theta' \rrbracket, x^! : \llbracket \varepsilon \rrbracket$. By the IH there exists a derivation Π'_1 of $\llbracket M'[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y] \rrbracket_u \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, y^\ell : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}, \llbracket \Theta' \rrbracket, y^! : \llbracket \eta \rrbracket, x^! : \llbracket \varepsilon \rrbracket$ and then redo the steps above and obtain $\bar{u}.some; u(y); \bar{y}.some; P \vdash u : \llbracket (\sigma^k, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket^\sharp, \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta' \rrbracket, x^! : \llbracket \varepsilon \rrbracket$.

4. The analysis of the other cases proceeds similarly. \square

Theorem C.13 (Type Preservation) *Let B and M be a bag and an term in λ_C , respectively.*

1. If $\Theta; \Gamma \models B : (\sigma^k, \eta)$ then $\llbracket B \rrbracket_u \models \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket (\sigma^k, \eta) \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$.
2. If $\Theta; \Gamma \models M : \tau$ then $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \models \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$.

Proof:

The proof is by mutual induction on the typing derivation of B and M' , with an analysis for the last rule applied. Recall that the translation of types ($\llbracket - \rrbracket$) has been given in Def. C.6. We will be silently performing [TCONTRACT] to split the translation of unrestricted context in derivation trees of π^+ processes as well as combining multiple [TWEAKEN] when convenient.

1. For $B = C * U$:

$$\text{[FS:bag]} \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \models C : \sigma^k \quad \Theta; \cdot \models U : \eta}{\Theta; \Gamma \models C * U : (\sigma^k, \eta)}$$

Our translation gives: $\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_u = x.some_{\text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}[x^\ell].(\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} | \bar{x}[x^!].(!x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} | \bar{x}[]))$. In addition, the translation of (σ^k, η) is:

$$\llbracket (\sigma^k, \eta) \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)} = \oplus((\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}) \otimes ((\llbracket \eta \rrbracket) \otimes (\mathbf{1}))) \quad (\text{for some } i \geq 0 \text{ and strict type } \sigma)$$

And one can build the following type derivation (rules from Fig. 4.3):

$$\text{[T} \oplus \text{some]} \frac{\text{[T} \otimes \text{]} \frac{\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, x^\ell : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}{\bar{x}[x^\ell].(\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} | \bar{x}[x^!].(!x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} | \bar{x}[])) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, x : (\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}) \otimes ((\llbracket \eta \rrbracket) \otimes (\mathbf{1})), \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}{\text{[T} \otimes \text{]} \frac{\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \vdash x_i : \&\eta_i \in \eta \{i; \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket\}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket \quad \text{[T1]} \frac{\bar{x}[] \vdash x : \mathbf{1}}{\bar{x}[] \vdash x : \mathbf{1}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}{\bar{x}[x^!].(!x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} | \bar{x}[])} \vdash x : (\llbracket \eta \rrbracket) \otimes (\mathbf{1}), \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}{\bar{x}[x^\ell].(\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} | \bar{x}[x^!].(!x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} | \bar{x}[])) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, x : (\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}) \otimes ((\llbracket \eta \rrbracket) \otimes (\mathbf{1})), \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}{\text{[T} \oplus \text{some]} \frac{\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, x^\ell : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}{x.some_{\text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}[x^\ell].(\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} | \bar{x}[x^!].(!x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} | \bar{x}[])) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, x : (\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}) \otimes ((\llbracket \eta \rrbracket) \otimes (\mathbf{1})), \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}}$$

The result follows provided both $\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, x^\ell : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \vdash x_i : \&\eta_i \in \eta \{i; \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket\}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$ hold.

- (a) For $\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, x^\ell : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$ to hold analyze the shape of C :

For $C = \mathbf{1}$:

$$[\text{FS:1}^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta; - \models \mathbf{1} : \omega}$$

Our translation gives: $\llbracket \mathbf{1} \rrbracket_{x^\ell} = x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell(y_n); (\overline{y_n}.\text{some}; \overline{y_n} \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; \overline{x^\ell}.\text{none})$.
and the translation of ω can be either:

- i. $\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,0)} = \overline{\&((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\& \oplus \perp))}$; or
- ii. $\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)} = \overline{\&((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\& \oplus ((\& \overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}) \wp (\overline{\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i-1)}}))))}$

And one can build the following type derivation (rules from Fig. 4.3):

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\overline{y_n} \mid \vdash y_n : \mathbf{1}}{\overline{y_n} \mid \vdash y_n : \mathbf{1}, [\Theta]}}{\overline{y_n}.\text{some}; \overline{y_n} \mid \vdash y_n : \&\mathbf{1}, [\Theta]} \quad \frac{\frac{\overline{x^\ell}.\text{none} \vdash x^\ell : \&A}{\overline{x^\ell}.\text{none} \vdash x^\ell : \&A, [\Theta]}}{\overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}_\emptyset; \overline{x^\ell}.\text{none} \vdash x^\ell : \oplus \&A, [\Theta]}}{\frac{(\overline{y_n}.\text{some}; \overline{y_n} \mid \vdash y_n : \&\mathbf{1}, x^\ell : \oplus \&A, [\Theta])}{x^\ell(y_n); (\overline{y_n}.\text{some}; \overline{y_n} \mid \vdash y_n : \&\mathbf{1}, x^\ell : \oplus \&A, [\Theta])} \quad \frac{\overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}_\emptyset; \overline{x^\ell}.\text{none} \vdash x^\ell : (\&\mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&A), [\Theta]}}{x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell(y_n); (\overline{y_n}.\text{some}; \overline{y_n} \mid \vdash y_n : \&\mathbf{1}, x^\ell : \oplus \&A), [\Theta]}}$$

Since A is arbitrary, we can take $A = \mathbf{1}$ for $\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,0)}$ and $A = ((\& \overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}) \wp (\overline{\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i-1)}}))$ for $\llbracket \omega \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}$, in both cases, the result follows.

(b) For $C = \lambda M' \lambda C' : \sigma^k$:

$$[\text{FS:bag}^\ell] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma' \models M' : \sigma \quad \Theta; \Delta \models C' : \sigma^k}{\Theta; \Gamma' \wedge \Delta \models \lambda M' \lambda C' : \sigma^k}$$

Where $\Gamma = \Gamma' \wedge \Delta$. To simplify the proof, we will consider $k = 3$.

By IH we have $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, x_i : [\sigma], [\Theta]$ and $\llbracket C' \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, x^\ell : [\sigma \wedge \sigma]_{(\tau,j)}, [\Theta]$.

Our translation Fig. C.8 gives:

$$\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} = x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; x^\ell(y_i); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(C)}; \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; \overline{x^\ell}[x_i]. \quad (\text{C.7})$$

$$(x_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M')}; \llbracket M' \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \llbracket C' \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \overline{y_i}.\text{none})$$

Let Π_1 be the derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\llbracket M' \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, x_i : [\sigma], [\Theta]}{x_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M')}; \llbracket M' \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, x_i : \oplus [\sigma], [\Theta]}{\overline{y_i}.\text{none} \vdash y_i : \&\mathbf{1}, [\Theta]} \quad \frac{\overline{y_i}.\text{none} \vdash y_i : \&\mathbf{1}}{\overline{y_i}.\text{none} \vdash y_i : \&\mathbf{1}, [\Theta]}}{\overline{y_i}.\text{none} \vdash y_i : \&\mathbf{1}, [\Theta]}}{\frac{x_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M')}; \llbracket M' \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \overline{y_i}.\text{none} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, x_i : \oplus [\sigma], y_i : \&\mathbf{1}, [\Theta]}}$$

Let $P = \llbracket M' \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \llbracket C' \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \overline{y_i}.\text{none}$, in the derivation Π_2 below:

$$[\text{T}\&\text{some}] \frac{[\text{T}\otimes] \frac{\Pi_1 \llbracket C' \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, x^\ell : [\sigma \wedge \sigma]_{(\tau,j)}, [\Theta]}{x^\ell[x_i].P \mid \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, [\Delta], y_i : \&\mathbf{1}, x^\ell : (\oplus [\sigma]) \otimes ([\sigma \wedge \sigma]_{(\tau,j)}), [\Theta]}}{x^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell[x_i].P \mid \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket, [\Delta], y_i : \&\mathbf{1}, x^\ell : \&((\oplus [\sigma]) \otimes ([\sigma \wedge \sigma]_{(\tau,j)})), [\Theta]}}{P_2}$$

Let $P_2 = \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[x_i].P$ in the derivation below:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\Pi_2 \\
\vdots \\
\text{[T}\oplus\text{some]} \frac{P_2 \vdash [\Gamma], y_i : \& \mathbf{1}, x^\ell : \&((\oplus[\sigma]) \otimes ([\sigma \wedge \sigma]_{(\tau,j)})), [\Theta]}{x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(C)}; P_2 \vdash [\Gamma], y_i : \& \mathbf{1}, x^\ell : \oplus \&((\oplus[\sigma]) \otimes ([\sigma \wedge \sigma]_{(\tau,j)})), [\Theta]} \\
\text{[T}\wp\text{]} \frac{x^\ell(y_i); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(C)}; P_2 \vdash [\Gamma], x^\ell : (\& \mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&((\oplus[\sigma]) \otimes ([\sigma \wedge \sigma]_{(\tau,j)}))), [\Theta]}{x^\ell(y_i); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(C)}; P_2 \vdash [\Gamma], x^\ell : (\& \mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&((\oplus[\sigma]) \otimes ([\sigma \wedge \sigma]_{(\tau,j)}))), [\Theta]} \\
\text{[T}\oplus\text{some]} \frac{\text{[C]}_{x^\ell} \vdash [\Gamma], x^\ell : \underbrace{\oplus((\& \mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&((\oplus[\sigma]) \otimes ([\sigma \wedge \sigma]_{(\tau,j)}))))}_{[\sigma \wedge \sigma \wedge \sigma]_{(\tau,j)}}, [\Theta]}{\text{[C]}_{x^\ell} \vdash [\Gamma], x^\ell : \oplus((\& \mathbf{1}) \wp (\oplus \&((\oplus[\sigma]) \otimes ([\sigma \wedge \sigma]_{(\tau,j)}))))}, [\Theta]} \quad \text{Def. C.6}
\end{array}$$

Therefore, $\text{[C]}_{x^\ell} \vdash [\Gamma], x^\ell : [\sigma \wedge \sigma \wedge \sigma]_{(\tau,j)}, [\Theta]$ and the result follows.

(c) For $\text{[U]}_{x_i} \vdash x_i : \&_{\eta_i \in \eta} \{i : [\eta_i]\}, [\Theta]$.

To simplify the proof, we consider $U = 1^! \diamond \lambda M' \uparrow^!$ with $\eta = \sigma_1 \diamond \sigma_2$ and $\&_{\eta_i \in \eta} = \& \{1 : [\sigma_1], 2 : [\sigma_2]\}$.

Our translation gives $\text{[U]}_{x_i} = x_i.\text{case} \{1 : \bar{x}_i.\text{none}, 2 : \text{[M']}_{x_i}\}$. Hence, we have:

$$\text{[FS:}\diamond\text{-bag}^! \text{]} \frac{\text{[FS:bag}^! \text{]} \frac{\Theta; \cdot \models M' : \sigma_2}{\Theta; \cdot \models \lambda M' \uparrow^! : \sigma_2}}{\Theta; \cdot \models 1^! : \sigma_1} \quad \text{[FS:bag}^! \text{]} \frac{\Theta; \cdot \models M' : \sigma_2}{\Theta; \cdot \models \lambda M' \uparrow^! : \sigma_2}$$

By the induction hypothesis we have that $\Theta; \cdot \models M' : \sigma$ implies $\text{[M']}_{x_i} \models x_i : [\sigma], [\Theta]$. Thus,

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[T}\&\text{none]} \frac{\bar{x}_i.\text{none} \vdash x_i : [\sigma_1]}{\bar{x}_i.\text{none} \vdash x_i : [\sigma_1], [\Theta]} \\
\text{[TWEAKEN]} \frac{\bar{x}_i.\text{none} \vdash x_i : [\sigma_1], [\Theta]}{\bar{x}_i.\text{none} \vdash x_i : [\sigma_1], [\Theta]} \quad \text{[M']}_{x_i} \vdash x_i : [\sigma_2], [\Theta] \\
\text{[T}\&\text{]} \frac{\bar{x}_i.\text{none} \vdash x_i : [\sigma_1], [\Theta]}{x_i.\text{case} \{1 : \bar{x}_i.\text{none}, 2 : \text{[M']}_{x_i}\} \vdash x_i : \& \{1 : [\sigma_1], 2 : [\sigma_2]\}, [\Theta]}
\end{array}$$

Therefore, $x_i.\text{case} \{1 : \bar{x}_i.\text{none}, 2 : \text{[M']}_{x_i}\} \vdash x_i : \& \{1 : [\sigma_1], 2 : [\sigma_2]\}, [\Theta]$ and the result follows.

2. The proof of type preservation for terms, relies on the analysis of ten cases:

(a) **Rule** $\text{[FS:var}^\ell\text{]}$: Then we have the following derivation:

$$\text{[FS:var}^\ell\text{]} \frac{}{\Theta; x : \tau \models x : \tau}$$

By Def. C.6, $[x : \tau] = x : \& \overline{[\tau]}$, and by Fig. C.8, $[x]_u = \bar{x}.\text{some}; [x \leftrightarrow u]$. The result follows from the derivation:

$$\text{[T}\&\text{some]} \frac{\text{[TID]} \frac{}{[x \leftrightarrow u] \vdash x : \overline{[\tau]}, u : [\tau], [\Theta]}}{\bar{x}.\text{some}; [x \leftrightarrow u] \vdash x : \& \overline{[\tau]}, u : [\tau], [\Theta]}}{\bar{x}.\text{some}; [x \leftrightarrow u] \vdash x : \& \overline{[\tau]}, u : [\tau], [\Theta]}$$

(b) **Rule** $\text{[FS:var}^! \text{]}$: Then we have the following derivation provided $\eta_k = \tau$:

$$\frac{[\text{FS:var}^\ell] \frac{}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; x : \eta_k \vdash x : \tau}}{[\text{FS:var}^1] \frac{}{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; - \vdash x[k] : \tau}}$$

By Def. C.6, $[\Theta, x^1 : \eta] = [\Theta], x^1 : \overline{! \&_{\eta_i \in \eta} \{i; [\eta_i]\}}$, and by our translation (in Fig. C.8), $[x[k]]_u = ?x^1[x_i]; \bar{x}_i.k; [x_i \leftrightarrow u]$. The result follows from the derivation:

$$\frac{[\text{TID}] \frac{}{[x_i \leftrightarrow u] \vdash u : [\tau], x_i : [\eta_k], [\Theta]}}{[\text{T}\oplus] \frac{}{\bar{x}_i.k; [x_i \leftrightarrow u] \vdash u : [\tau], x_i : \oplus_{\eta_i \in \eta} \{i; [\eta_i]\}, [\Theta]}}{[\text{T}?] \frac{}{?x^1[x_i]; \bar{x}_i.k; [x_i \leftrightarrow u] \vdash u : [\tau], x^1 : ? \oplus_{\eta_i \in \eta} \{i; [\eta_i]\}, [\Theta]}}$$

(c) **Rule [FS:weak]:** Then we have the following derivation:

$$[\text{FS:weak}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M' : \tau}{\Theta; \Gamma, x : \omega \vdash M'[\leftarrow x] : \tau}$$

By Def. C.6, $[\Gamma, x : \omega] = [\Gamma], x^\ell : \overline{[\omega]_{(\sigma, i)}}$, and by our translation Fig. C.8,

$$[M'[\leftarrow x]]_u = x^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_i].(y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_i(); [M']_u | \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none}).$$

By IH, we have $[M']_u \vdash [\Gamma], u : [\tau], [\Theta]$. The result follows from the derivation, omitting labels:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{[M']_u \vdash [\Gamma], u : [\tau], [\Theta]}{y_i(); [M']_u \vdash y_i : \perp, [\Gamma], u : [\tau], [\Theta]}{y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_i(); [M']_u \vdash y_i : \oplus \perp, [\Gamma], u : [\tau], [\Theta]}}{\bar{x}^\ell[y_i].(y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_i()); [M']_u | \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none}} \vdash x^\ell : (\oplus \perp) \otimes (\&A), [\Gamma], u : [\tau], [\Theta]}}{\frac{\bar{x}^\ell.\text{none} \vdash x^\ell : \&A}{x^\ell.\text{none} \vdash x^\ell : \&A, [\Theta]}} \frac{}{[M'[\leftarrow x]]_u \vdash x^\ell : \&((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\&A)), [\Gamma], u : [\tau], [\Theta]}}$$

Since A is arbitrary, we can take $A = 1$ for $[\omega]_{(\sigma, 0)}$ and $A = \overline{((\& \overline{[\sigma]}) \wp ([\omega]_{(\sigma, i-1)}))}$ for $[\omega]_{(\sigma, i)}$ where $i > 0$, in both cases, the result follows.

(d) **Rule [FS:abs-sh]:**

Then $M = \lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])$, and the derivation is:

$$[\text{FS:abs-sh}] \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma, x : \sigma^k \vdash M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)}{\Theta; \Gamma \vdash \lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) : (\sigma^k, \eta) \rightarrow \tau}$$

By IH, we have $[M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u \vdash u : [\tau], [\Gamma], x^\ell : \overline{[\sigma^k]_{(\sigma, i)}, [\Theta]}, x^1 : \overline{[\eta]}$ and our translation (in Fig. C.8) gives $[\lambda x.M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u = \bar{u}.\text{some}; u(x); \bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x(); [M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u$, whose type derivation $[M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u \vdash u : ((\sigma^k, \eta) \rightarrow \tau), [\Gamma], [\Theta]$, was given in the proof of Lemma C.7.2, item 3.

(e) **Rule [FS:app]:** Then $M = M' B$, where $B = C * U$ and the derivation is:

$$[\text{FS:app}] \frac{\Theta; \Gamma \vdash M' : (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \vdash B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \vdash M' B : \tau}$$

By IH, we have both

- $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$;
- $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket (\sigma^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$, by Lemma C.7.2;
- $\llbracket B \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, u : \llbracket (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$, for some τ_2 and some n .

Therefore, from the fact that M is well-formed and Fig. C.8 and C.6, we have:

- $\llbracket M'(C * U) \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v \mid v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x))$;
- $\llbracket (\sigma^j, \eta) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket = \oplus(\llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, m)} \otimes (!\llbracket \eta \rrbracket))$, for some τ_1 and some m .

Also, since $\llbracket B \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, u : \llbracket (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$, we have the following derivation Π :

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\llbracket v \leftrightarrow u \rrbracket \vdash v : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \rrbracket}{\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, x : \llbracket (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket} \quad \llbracket v \leftrightarrow u \rrbracket \vdash v : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}{\bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x) \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, v : \llbracket (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)} \otimes \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}}{v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x) \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, v : \underbrace{\oplus(\llbracket (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)} \otimes \llbracket \tau \rrbracket)}_{\llbracket (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}$$

In order to apply [TCUT], we must have that $\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau_1, m)} = \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\tau_2, n)}$, therefore, the choice of τ_1, τ_2, n and m , will consider the different possibilities for j and k , as in Proposition C.7.1.

$$\text{[TCUT]} \frac{\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, v : \llbracket (\sigma^j, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \tau \rrbracket; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket \quad \Pi}{(\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v \mid v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket B \rrbracket_x)) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}$$

We can then conclude that $\llbracket M'B \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$ and the result follows.

(f) **Rule [FS : share]:** Then $M = M'[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]$ and the derivation is:

$$\text{[FS : share]} \frac{\Theta; \Delta, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models M' : \tau \quad x \notin \Delta \quad k \neq 0}{\Theta; \Delta, x : \sigma \models M'[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] : \tau}$$

To simplify the proof we will consider $k = 1$ (the case in which $k > 1$ follows similarly).

By IH, we have $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Delta, x_1 : \sigma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket; \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$. From Fig. C.8 and C.6, it follows

- $\llbracket \Delta, x_1 : \sigma \rrbracket = \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, x_1^\ell : \&\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket$.
- $\llbracket M'[x_1, \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u = \overline{x^\ell}.\mathbf{some}; \overline{x^\ell}[y_1].(y_1.\mathbf{some}_\emptyset; y_1()); \mathbf{0} \mid \overline{x^\ell}.\mathbf{some}; x^\ell.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus x_1}; \prod_{x_i \in x_1} x(x_i); \overline{x^\ell}.\mathbf{some}; \overline{x^\ell}[y_2].(y_2.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_2()); \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid \overline{x^\ell}.\mathbf{none}$

We shall split the expression into two parts:

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= \overline{x^\ell}.\mathbf{some}; \overline{x^\ell}[y_2].(y_2.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_2()); \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid \overline{x^\ell}.\mathbf{none} \\ N_2 &= \overline{x^\ell}.\mathbf{some}; \overline{x^\ell}[y_1].(y_1.\mathbf{some}_\emptyset; y_1()); \mathbf{0} \mid \overline{x^\ell}.\mathbf{some}; x^\ell.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus x_1}; x(x_1); N_1 \end{aligned}$$

and we obtain the derivation for term N_1 as follows where we omit $\llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$ and derivation labels:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{[M']_u \vdash [\Delta, x_1 : \sigma], u : [\tau]}{y_2(); [M']_u \vdash [\Delta, x_1 : \sigma], u : [\tau], y_2 : \perp}}{y_2.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_2(); [M']_u \vdash [\Delta, x_1 : \sigma], u : [\tau], y_2 : \oplus \perp} \quad x^\ell.\text{none} \vdash x^\ell : \&A}{x^\ell[y_2].(y_2.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_2(); [M']_u \mid x^\ell.\text{none}) \vdash [\Delta, x_1 : \sigma], u : [\tau], x^\ell : ((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\&A))}}{x^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell[y_2].(y_2.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_2(); [M']_u \mid x^\ell.\text{none}) \vdash [\Delta, x_1 : \sigma], u : [\tau], x^\ell : \overline{[\omega]_{(\sigma, i)}}}}{N_1}$$

Notice that the last rule applied [T&some] assigns $x : \&((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\&A))$. Again, since A is arbitrary, we can take $A = \oplus((\&[\sigma]) \wp (\overline{[\omega]_{(\sigma, i-1)}}))$, obtaining $x : \overline{[\omega]_{(\sigma, i)}}$.

In order to obtain a type derivation for N_2 , consider the derivation Π_1 :

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{[T\wp] \frac{N_1 \vdash [\Delta], x_1 : \&[\sigma], u : [\tau], x^\ell : \overline{[\omega]_{(\sigma, i)}}, [\Theta]}{x(x_i); N_1 \vdash [\Delta], u : [\tau], x^\ell : (\&[\sigma]) \wp (\overline{[\omega]_{(\sigma, i)}}), [\Theta]}}{[T\parallel] \frac{\prod_{x_i \in x_1} x(x_i); N_1 \vdash [\Delta], u : [\tau], x^\ell : (\&[\sigma]) \wp (\overline{[\omega]_{(\sigma, i)}}), [\Theta]}}{x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus x_1}; \prod_{x_i \in x_1} x(x_i); N_1 \vdash [\Delta], u : [\tau], x^\ell : \oplus((\&[\sigma]) \wp (\overline{[\omega]_{(\sigma, i)}}), [\Theta]}}}{x^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus x_1}; \prod_{x_i \in x_1} x(x_i); N_1 \vdash [\Delta], u : [\tau], x^\ell : \&\oplus((\&[\sigma]) \wp (\overline{[\omega]_{(\sigma, i)}}), [\Theta]}}$$

We take $P_1 = x^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus x_1}; \prod_{x_i \in x_1} x(x_i); N_1$ and $\Gamma_1 = [\Delta], u : [\tau]$ and continue the derivation of N_2

$$\frac{\frac{[T\cdot] \frac{\mathbf{0} \vdash -, [\Theta]}{y_1(); \mathbf{0} \vdash y_1 : \perp, [\Theta]}}{y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1(); \mathbf{0} \vdash y_1 : \oplus \perp, [\Theta]} \quad \begin{array}{c} \Pi_1 \\ \vdots \end{array}}{y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1(); \mathbf{0} \mid P_1 \vdash \Gamma_1, x^\ell : \&\oplus((\&[\sigma]) \wp (\overline{[\omega]_{(\sigma, i)}}), [\Theta]}}{[T\otimes] \frac{x^\ell[y_1].(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1(); \mathbf{0} \mid P_1) \vdash \Gamma_1, x^\ell : ((\oplus \perp) \otimes (\&\oplus((\&[\sigma]) \wp (\overline{[\omega]_{(\sigma, i)}}), [\Theta])))}{x^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell[y_1].(y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1(); \mathbf{0} \mid P_1) \vdash \Gamma_1, x^\ell : \overline{[\sigma \wedge \omega]_{(\sigma, i)}}, [\Theta]}}{N_2}$$

Hence the theorem holds for this case.

(g) **Rule [FS : Esub]:** Then $M = (M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle$ and

$$[\text{FS:Esub}] \frac{\Theta, x^! : \eta; \Gamma, x : \sigma^j \models M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] : \tau \quad \Theta; \Delta \models B : (\sigma^k, \varepsilon) \quad \eta \sim \varepsilon}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models (M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle : \tau}$$

By Proposition C.7.1 and IH we have:

$$\begin{array}{l} [M'[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]]_u \vdash [\Gamma], x^\ell : \overline{[\sigma^j]_{(\tau, n)}}, u : [\tau], [\Theta], x^! : \overline{[\eta]} \\ [M'[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]]_u \vdash [\Gamma], x^\ell : \overline{[\sigma^j]_{(\tau, n)}}, u : [\tau], [\Theta], x^! : \overline{[\varepsilon]} \text{, by Lemma C.7.2} \\ [B]_x \vdash [\Delta], x : \overline{[\sigma^k, \varepsilon]_{(\tau, m)}}, [\Theta] \end{array}$$

From Fig. C.8, we have

$$[M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle B/x \rangle \rangle]_u = (\mathbf{v}.x)(x.\text{some}; x(x^!); x(x^!); x()); [M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]]_u \mid [C * U]_x$$

Therefore we obtain the following derivation Π :

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[T}\perp\text{]} \frac{\llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, x^\ell : \overline{\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket}_{(\tau,n)}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket, x^! : \overline{\llbracket \varepsilon \rrbracket}}{x(); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \vdash x : \perp, \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, x^\ell : \overline{\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket}_{(\tau,n)}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket, x^! : \overline{\llbracket \varepsilon \rrbracket}} \\
\text{[T}\wp\text{]} \frac{\llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \vdash x : (\overline{\llbracket \varepsilon \rrbracket}) \wp \perp, \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, x^\ell : \overline{\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket}_{(\tau,n)}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}{x(x^!); x(); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \vdash x : (\overline{\llbracket \varepsilon \rrbracket}) \wp \perp, \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, x^\ell : \overline{\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket}_{(\tau,n)}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket} \\
\text{[T}\wp\text{]} \frac{\llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \vdash x : \overline{\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket}_{(\tau,n)} \wp ((\overline{\llbracket \varepsilon \rrbracket}) \wp \perp), \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}{x(x^\ell); x(x^!); x(); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \vdash x : \overline{\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket}_{(\tau,n)} \wp ((\overline{\llbracket \varepsilon \rrbracket}) \wp \perp), \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket} \\
\text{[T}\&\text{some] } \frac{\llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \vdash x : \overline{\llbracket \sigma^j, \varepsilon \rrbracket}_{(\tau,n)}, \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}{\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^!); x(); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \vdash x : \overline{\llbracket \sigma^j, \varepsilon \rrbracket}_{(\tau,n)}, \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}
\end{array}$$

We take $P_1 = \bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^!); x(); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u$ and continue the derivation of Π

$$\text{[TCUT]} \frac{P_1 \vdash x : \overline{\llbracket \sigma^j, \varepsilon \rrbracket}_{(\tau,n)}, \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket} \quad \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, x : \overline{\llbracket \sigma^k, \varepsilon \rrbracket}_{(\tau,m)}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}{(\mathbf{v}x)(P_1 \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}$$

We must have that $\llbracket \sigma^j \rrbracket_{(\tau,n)} = \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\tau,n)}$ which by our restrictions allows. It follows that $\llbracket M'[x_1 \leftarrow x] \llbracket B/x \rrbracket \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \Gamma, \Delta \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$ and the result follows.

(h) **Rule [FS:Esub $^\ell$]:** Then $M = M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle$, with $C = \lambda N_1 \int \dots \int \lambda N_k \int$ and

$$\text{[FS:Esub}^\ell\text{]} \frac{\Theta; \Delta, x_1 : \sigma, \dots, x_k : \sigma \models M' : \tau \quad \Theta; \Gamma, \vdash C : \sigma^k}{\Theta; \Gamma, \Delta \models M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle : \tau}$$

with $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_k$ and:

$$\text{[FS:bag}^\ell\text{]} \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_k \models N_k : \sigma \quad \text{[FS:1}^1\text{]} \frac{}{\Theta; - \models 1^! : \sigma}}{\Theta; \Gamma_2, \dots, \Gamma_k \models C : \sigma^{k-1}} \quad \vdots \\
\text{[FS:bag}^\ell\text{]} \frac{\Theta; \Gamma_1 \models N_1 : \sigma \quad \text{[FS:bag}^\ell\text{]} \frac{}{\Theta; \Gamma_2, \dots, \Gamma_k \models C : \sigma^{k-1}}}{\Theta; \Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_k \models \lambda M' \int \cdot C : \sigma^k}$$

By IH we have both

$$\llbracket N_1 \rrbracket_{x_1} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma_1 \rrbracket, x_1 : \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket \quad \dots \quad \llbracket N_k \rrbracket_{x_k} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma_k \rrbracket, x_k : \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket \\
\llbracket C \rrbracket_x \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, x : \llbracket \sigma^k \rrbracket_{(\sigma,i)}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket \quad \text{and} \quad \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, x_1 : \& \overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}, \dots, x_k : \& \overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$$

From Fig. C.8,

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket M' \langle \lambda N_1 \int \dots \int \lambda N_k \int / x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N_1)}; \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots \\
&\quad (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N_k)}; \llbracket N_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
&\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \\
&\quad \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots)
\end{aligned}$$

Let us take $k = 1$ and for $k > 1$ cases follow similarly omitting labels:

$$\frac{\frac{\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_i\} \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, z_1 : \& \overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}{\prod_{x_i \in \{x_1\}} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_i\} \vdash \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, z_1 : \& \overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}} \quad \frac{\llbracket N_1 \rrbracket_x \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, x : \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}{z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N_1)}; \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, z_1 : \oplus \overline{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}}{(\mathbf{v}z_1) \left(\prod_{x_i \in \{x_1\}} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_i\} \mid z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(N_1)}; \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \right) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}$$

Therefore, $\llbracket M' \langle N_1/x_1 \rangle \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$ and the result follows.

(i) **Rule [FS:Esub¹]**: Then $M = M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ and

$$\text{[FS:Esub}^1\text{]} \frac{\Theta, x^1 : \eta; \Gamma \models M' : \tau \quad \Theta; - \models U : \eta}{\Theta; \Gamma \models M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket : \tau}$$

By IH we have both

$$\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \vdash x_i : \&\eta_i \in \eta \{i; \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket\}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket \quad \text{and} \quad \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, x^1 : \overline{\llbracket \eta \rrbracket}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$$

From Definition Fig. C.8, $\llbracket M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i})$ and

$$\text{[TCUT]} \frac{\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, x^1 : \overline{\llbracket \eta \rrbracket}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket} \quad \text{[T!]} \frac{\llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \vdash x_i : \&\eta_i \in \eta \{i; \llbracket \eta_i \rrbracket\}, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}{!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \vdash x^1 : \llbracket \eta \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}{(\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}$$

Therefore, $\llbracket M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u \vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$ and the result follows.

(j) **Rule [FS : fail]**: Then $M = \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x}}$ where $\tilde{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$ and

$$\text{[FS:fail]} \frac{\text{dom}(\Gamma) = \tilde{x}}{\Theta; \Gamma \models \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x}} : \tau}$$

From Fig. C.8, $\llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_n} \rrbracket_u = \bar{u}.\mathbf{none} \mid \bar{x}_1.\mathbf{none} \mid \dots \mid \bar{x}_k.\mathbf{none}$ and

$$\text{[TMIX]} \frac{\frac{\bar{u}.\mathbf{none} \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket}{\bar{u}.\mathbf{none} \vdash u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket} \quad \frac{\frac{\bar{x}_1.\mathbf{none} \vdash_1 : \&\llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket} \quad \frac{\bar{x}_n.\mathbf{none} \vdash x_n : \&\llbracket \sigma_n \rrbracket}}{\bar{x}_n.\mathbf{none} \vdash x_n : \&\llbracket \sigma_n \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}{\bar{x}_1.\mathbf{none} \vdash_1 : \&\llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket} \quad \vdots}{\bar{u}.\mathbf{none} \mid \bar{x}_1.\mathbf{none} \mid \dots \mid \bar{x}_k.\mathbf{none} \vdash x_1 : \&\llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket, \dots, x_n : \&\llbracket \sigma_n \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}}{\bar{u}.\mathbf{none} \mid \bar{x}_1.\mathbf{none} \mid \dots \mid \bar{x}_k.\mathbf{none} \vdash x_1 : \&\llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket, \dots, x_n : \&\llbracket \sigma_n \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket}$$

Thus, $\llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{x_1, \dots, x_n} \rrbracket_u \vdash x_1 : \&\llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket, \dots, x_n : \&\llbracket \sigma_n \rrbracket, u : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket$ and the result follows. \square

C.7.2 Completeness

Definition C.12 Linearly Partially Open Terms

We say that a λ_C -term M is *linearly partially open* if $\forall x \in \text{lfv}(M)$ implies that x is not a sharing variable. \square

Proposition C.7.1 *Suppose N is a well-formed linearly partially open λ_C -term with $\text{head}(N) = x$ (x denoting either linear or unrestricted occurrence of x). Then,*

$$\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}y_1)(\dots(\mathbf{v}y_m)(\llbracket x \rrbracket_n \mid P_m) \dots \mid P_1)$$

which we shall denote as: $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket x \rrbracket_n \mid P)$, for some names $\tilde{y} =$ and n , and processes P .

Proof: The proof is by induction on the structure of N .

1. $N = x$: then $\llbracket x \rrbracket_u = \bar{x}.\text{some}; [x \leftrightarrow u]$. Hence $P = \mathbf{0}$ and $\tilde{y} = \mathbf{0}$.
2. $N = x[j]$: then $\llbracket x[j] \rrbracket_u = ?\bar{x}^1[x_i]; \bar{x}_i.j; [x_i \leftrightarrow u]$. Hence $P = \mathbf{0}$ and $\tilde{y} = \mathbf{0}$.
3. $N = M(C * U)$: then $\text{head}(M(C * U)) = \text{head}(M) = x$ and

$$\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = \llbracket M(C * U) \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket (C * U) \rrbracket_x))$$

The result follows by induction hypothesis applied on $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u$.

4. $N = (M[\tilde{y} \leftarrow y])\langle\langle C * U/y \rangle\rangle$: this case does not apply since $\text{head}(N) \neq x$.
5. $N = M\langle\langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle\rangle$: then $\text{head}(M\langle\langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle\rangle) = \text{head}(M) = x$. Let $C = \lambda M_1 \int \dots \lambda M_k \int$

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_i \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_i \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_i, \dots, x_{i-1}\}} \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \end{aligned}$$

The result follows by induction hypothesis applied on $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u$.

6. $N = M\llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$: then $\text{head}(M\llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket) = \text{head}(M) = x$ and

$$\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = \llbracket M\llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i})$$

The result follows by induction hypothesis applied on $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u$.

□

Theorem C.14 (Completeness (Under \sim)) *If $N \longrightarrow M$ for a well-formed closed λ_C -term N , then $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \sim^* \llbracket M \rrbracket_u$.*

Proof: By induction on the reduction rule applied to infer $N \longrightarrow M$. We have five cases.

1. Case [RS : Beta]:

Then $N = (\lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]))B \longrightarrow (M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle = M$, where $B = C * U$. The result follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket \lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \rrbracket_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}v)(\bar{v}.\text{some}; v(x); \bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \mid \\ &\quad v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\ &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}v)(v(x); \bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \mid \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\ &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}v)((\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u]) \\ &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \end{aligned}$$

2. Case [RS : Ex-Sub]: Then $N = M'[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle$, with $C = \lambda M_1 \int \dots \lambda M_k \int$, $k \geq 0$ and $M' \neq \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}}$.

The reduction is $N = M'[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow M'\langle\langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle\rangle\llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket = M$.

We detail the translations of $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u$ and $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u$. To simplify the proof, we will consider $k = 2$ (the case in which $k > 2$ is follows analogously. Similarly the case of $k < 2$ it contained within $k = 2$). The result follows from:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M'[x_1 \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}[x^\ell]; (\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \bar{x}[x^1]; \\
 &\quad (!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \bar{x}[])))(:= P_{\mathbb{N}}) \\
 &\rightsquigarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\llbracket M'[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket \lambda M_1 \int \cdot \lambda M_2 \int \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_1]; (y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1()); \mathbf{0} \\
 &\quad \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus \bar{x}}; \prod_{x_i \in \bar{x}} x(x_{i_1}); \llbracket M'[(\bar{x} \setminus x_{i_1}) \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \\
 &\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; x(y_1); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_i, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[z_1]; \\
 &\quad (z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \llbracket \lambda M_2 \int \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \bar{y}_1.\text{none})) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &\rightsquigarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\llbracket \lambda M_2 \int \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid (\mathbf{v}z_1)(\prod_{x_i \in \bar{x}} \llbracket M'[(\bar{x} \setminus x_{i_1}) \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \mid \\
 &\quad z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1})) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; x(y_2); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_2, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[z_2]; \\
 &\quad (z_2.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_2)}; \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{z_2} \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \bar{y}_2.\text{none})) \mid \\
 &(\mathbf{v}z_1)(\prod_{x_i \in \bar{x}} \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_2]; (y_2.\text{some}_0; y_2()); \mathbf{0} \\
 &\quad \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus (\bar{x} \setminus x_{i_1})}; \prod_{x_{i_2} \in (\bar{x} \setminus x_{i_1})} x(x_{i_2}); \llbracket M'[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \mid \\
 &\quad z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1})) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &\longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \\
 &\quad (\mathbf{v}z_2)((\mathbf{v}z_1)(\prod_{x_{i_1} \in \bar{x}} \prod_{x_{i_2} \in (\bar{x} \setminus x_{i_1})} x(x_{i_2}); \llbracket M'[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \mid \\
 &\quad z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1}) \mid z_2.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_2)}; \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{z_2})) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &\longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}z_2)((\mathbf{v}z_1)(\prod_{x_{i_1} \in \bar{x}} \prod_{x_{i_2} \in (\bar{x} \setminus x_{i_1})} x(x_{i_2}); \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \mid \\
 &\quad z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1}) \mid z_2.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_2)}; \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{z_2})) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u
 \end{aligned}$$

3. Case [RS:Fetch^ℓ]:

Then we have $N = M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle$ with $\text{head}(M') = x_j$, $C = M_1, \dots, M_k$ and $N \longrightarrow M' \{M_i/x_j\} \langle (C \setminus M_i)/x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_j \rangle = M$, for some $M_i \in C$.

On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k, x_j \rangle \rrbracket_u \\
&= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
&\quad \mid \prod_{x_i \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \\
&\quad \prod_{x_k \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \\
&= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
&\quad \mid \prod_{x_i \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \\
&\quad \prod_{x_k \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} (\mathbf{v}y)(\llbracket x_j \rrbracket_y \mid P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \\
&\quad \dots) \quad (*) \\
&= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
&\quad \mid \prod_{x_i \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \\
&\quad \prod_{x_k \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \\
&\quad (\mathbf{v}y)(\overline{x_j}.\text{some}; [x_j \leftrightarrow y] \mid P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots)
\end{aligned} \tag{C.8}$$

where (*) is inferred via Proposition C.7.1.

Let us consider the case when $j = k$ and $M_i = M_1$ the other cases proceed similarly. Then we have the following reduction:

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
&\quad \mid \prod_{x_i \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \\
&\quad \prod_{x_k \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \\
&\quad (\mathbf{v}y)(\overline{x_k}.\text{some}; [x_k \leftrightarrow y] \mid P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \\
&\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}z_1)(\llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
&\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_2} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}} \dots \\
&\quad \prod_{x_k \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \\
&\quad (\mathbf{v}y)([z_1 \leftrightarrow y] \mid P) \{z_2/x_{i_2}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \\
&\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}z_2)(z_2.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_2)}; \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{z_2} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
&\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_2} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}} \dots \\
&\quad \prod_{x_k \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \\
&\quad (\mathbf{v}y)(\llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_y \mid P) \{z_2/x_{i_2}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots)
\end{aligned} \tag{C.9}$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket M \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M' \{M_1/x_k\} \langle (C \setminus M_1)/x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \rangle \rrbracket_u \\
&= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_2)}; \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_{k-1})(z_{k-1}.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_{k-1}} \\
&\quad \mid \prod_{x_i \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_{k-1}} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-2}}\}} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \\
&\quad \{z_{k-1}/x_{i_{k-1}}\} \dots)
\end{aligned} \tag{C.10}$$

Therefore, by (C.9), (C.10) and taking $M_{j_k} = M_i$ the result follows.

4. Case [RS:Fetch¹]:

Then, $N = M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ with $\text{head}(M') = x^1[k]$, $U_k = \lambda N \rfloor^1$ and $N \longrightarrow M' \{N/x^1\} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket = M$.
The result follows from

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}y)(\llbracket x^1[k] \rrbracket_j \mid P) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \quad (*) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}y)(?x^1[x_i]; \bar{x}_i.k; [x_i \leftrightarrow j] \mid P) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}y)(?x^1[x_i]; \bar{x}_i.k; [x_i \leftrightarrow j] \mid P) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid (\mathbf{v}x_i)((\mathbf{v}y)(\bar{x}_i.k; [x_i \leftrightarrow j] \mid P) \mid \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i})) \quad (\text{C.11}) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid (\mathbf{v}x_i)((\mathbf{v}y)(\bar{x}_i.k; [x_i \leftrightarrow j] \mid P) \mid x_i.\text{case}\{i : \llbracket U_i \rrbracket_{x_i}\}_{U_i \in U})) \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid (\mathbf{v}x_i)((\mathbf{v}y)([x_i \leftrightarrow j] \mid P) \mid \llbracket U_i \rrbracket_{x_i})) \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid (\mathbf{v}y)(\llbracket U_i \rrbracket_j \mid P)) \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid (\mathbf{v}y)(\llbracket N \rrbracket_j \mid P)) = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u
 \end{aligned}$$

where the reductions denoted by $(*)$ are inferred via Proposition C.7.1.

5. Case [RS:TCont]: This case follows by IH.

6. Case [RS:Fail^l]:

Then we have $N = M'[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle$ with $k \neq \text{size}(C)$ and $N \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} = M$, where $\tilde{y} = (\text{lfv}(M') \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}) \cup \text{lfv}(C)$. Let $C = \lambda M_1 \rfloor \dots \lambda M_l \rfloor$ and we assume that $k > l$ and we proceed similarly for $k < l$. Hence $k = l + m$ for some $m \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M'[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle \rrbracket_u \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^l); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^l); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \\
 &\quad x.\text{some}_{\text{lfv}(C)}; \bar{x}[x^l]; (\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^l} \mid \bar{x}[x^1]; (!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \bar{x}))) \\
 &\rightsquigarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^l)(\llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^l}) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^l)(\bar{x}^l.\text{some}; \bar{x}^l[y_1]; (y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1()); \mathbf{0} \\
 &\quad \mid \bar{x}^l.\text{some}; \bar{x}^l.\text{some}_{u, \text{lfv}(M') \setminus \tilde{x}}; \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \tilde{x}} x(x_{i_1}); \dots \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^l.\text{some}; \bar{x}^l[y_k]; (y_k.\text{some}_0; y_k()); \mathbf{0} \\
 &\quad \mid \bar{x}^l.\text{some}; \bar{x}^l.\text{some}_{u, \text{lfv}(M') \setminus (\tilde{x} \setminus \{x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\})}; \prod_{x_{i_k} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus \{x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\})} x(x_{i_k}); \\
 &\quad \llbracket M'[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u) \mid x^l.\text{some}_{\text{lfv}(C)}; x(y_1); x^l.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{lfv}(C)}; \bar{x}^l.\text{some}; \bar{x}^l[z_1]; \\
 &\quad (z_1.\text{some}_{\text{lfv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \bar{y}_1.\text{none} \mid \dots \mid x^l.\text{some}_{\text{lfv}(C)}; x(y_l); x^l.\text{some}_{y_l, \text{lfv}(M_l)}; \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^l.\text{some}; \bar{x}^l[z_l]; (z_l.\text{some}_{\text{lfv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \llbracket \mathbf{1} \rrbracket_{x^l} \mid \bar{y}_l.\text{none}) \dots) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 & \quad (:= P_{\mathbb{N}})
 \end{aligned}$$

we reduce $P_{\mathbb{N}}$ arbitrarily synchronising along channels x^l, y_1, \dots, y_l .

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_{\mathbb{N}} \rightsquigarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\llbracket \mathbf{1} \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_l)(z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \\
& \quad \prod_{x_i \in \tilde{x}} \cdots \prod_{x_i \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_{i-1})} \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; \overline{x^\ell}[y_{l+1}]; (y_{l+1}.\text{some}_0; y_{l+1}()); \mathbf{0} \\
& \quad \mid \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_i)}; \prod_{x_{i+1} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_i)} x(x_{i+1}); \cdots \\
& \quad \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; \overline{x^\ell}[y_k]; (y_k.\text{some}_0; y_k()); \mathbf{0} \\
& \quad \mid \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_{i-1})}; \prod_{x_{i_k} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_{i-1})} x(x_{i_k}); \\
& \quad \llbracket M'[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_l/x_{i_l}\} \cdots) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
& = (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(x^\ell.\text{some}_0; x(y_{l+1}); (\overline{y_{l+1}}.\text{some}; \overline{y_{l+1}}) \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_0; \overline{x^\ell}.\text{none}) \\
& \quad \mid (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_l)(z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \\
& \quad \prod_{x_i \in \tilde{x}} \cdots \prod_{x_i \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_{i-1})} \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; \overline{x^\ell}[y_{l+1}]; (y_{l+1}.\text{some}_0; y_{l+1}()); \mathbf{0} \\
& \quad \mid \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_i)}; \prod_{x_{i+1} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_i)} x(x_{i+1}); \cdots \\
& \quad \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; \overline{x^\ell}[y_k]; (y_k.\text{some}_0; y_k()); \mathbf{0} \\
& \quad \mid \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_{i-1})}; \prod_{x_{i_k} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_{i-1})} x(x_{i_k}); \\
& \quad \llbracket M'[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_l/x_{i_l}\} \cdots) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
& \rightsquigarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\overline{x^\ell}.\text{none} \mid (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_l)(z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \\
& \quad \prod_{x_i \in \tilde{x}} \cdots \prod_{x_i \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_{i-1})} \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_i)}; \\
& \quad \prod_{x_{i+1} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_i)} x(x_{i+1}); \cdots \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; \overline{x^\ell}[y_k]; (y_k.\text{some}_0; y_k()); \mathbf{0} \\
& \quad \mid \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_{i-1})}; \prod_{x_{i_k} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_{i-1})} x(x_{i_k}); \\
& \quad \llbracket M'[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_l/x_{i_l}\} \cdots) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
& \rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_l)(z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \\
& \quad \prod_{x_i \in \tilde{x}} \cdots \prod_{x_i \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_{i-1})} \overline{u}.\text{none} \mid (\overline{\text{fv}(M') \setminus \tilde{x}}).\text{none} \mid (\overline{z_1, \dots, z_l}).\text{none}) \cdots) \mid \\
& \quad !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
& \rightsquigarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\prod_{x_i \in \tilde{x}} \cdots \prod_{x_i \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_i, \dots, x_{i-1})} \overline{u}.\text{none} \mid (\overline{\text{fv}(M') \setminus \tilde{x}}).\text{none} \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
& \equiv \overline{u}.\text{none} \mid (\overline{\text{fv}(M') \setminus \tilde{x}}).\text{none} = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u
\end{aligned}$$

7. Case [RS:Fail¹]:

Then, $N = M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ with $\text{head}(M') = x[i]$, $U_i = \mathbf{1}^1$ and $N \longrightarrow M' \{ \text{fail}^0/x^1 \} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$. The result follows from

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket x[i] \rrbracket_j \mid P) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \quad (*) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(?x^1[x_i]; \bar{x}_i.i; [x_i \leftrightarrow j] \mid P) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x_i)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{x}_i.i; [x_i \leftrightarrow j] \mid P) \mid \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x_i)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{x}_i.i; [x_i \leftrightarrow j] \mid P) \mid x_i.\mathbf{case}\{i: \llbracket U_i \rrbracket_{x_i}\}_{U_i \in U}) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &\rightsquigarrow *(\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket U_i \rrbracket_j \mid P) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket 1^1 \rrbracket_j \mid P) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{j}.\mathbf{none} \mid P) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u
 \end{aligned}$$

8. Case [RS : Cons₁]: Then we have $N = \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x}} C * U$ and $N \longrightarrow \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x} \cup \tilde{y}} = M$ where $\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(C)$. Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x}} C * U \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \rrbracket_v \mid v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}v)(\bar{v}.\mathbf{none} \mid \tilde{x}.\mathbf{none} \mid v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\
 &\rightsquigarrow \tilde{x}.\mathbf{none} \mid \bar{u}.\mathbf{none} \mid \tilde{y}.\mathbf{none} = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u
 \end{aligned}$$

9. Cases [RS : Cons₂] and [RS : Cons₃]: These cases follow by IH similarly to Case 7.
 10. Case [RS:Cons₄]: Then we have $N = \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ and $N \longrightarrow \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} = M$, and

$$\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = \llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \rrbracket_u \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \quad (\text{C.12})$$

$$= (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\bar{u}.\mathbf{none} \mid \tilde{x}.\mathbf{none} \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \equiv \bar{u}.\mathbf{none} \mid \tilde{x}.\mathbf{none} = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \quad (\text{C.13})$$

□

C.7.3 Soundness

Theorem C.15 (Weak Soundness (Under \rightsquigarrow)) *If $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^* Q$ for a well-formed closed λ_C -term N , then there exist Q' and N' such that $Q \rightsquigarrow^* Q'$, $N \longrightarrow^* N'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u \equiv Q'$.*

Proof: By induction on the structure of N and then induction on the number of reductions of $\llbracket N \rrbracket \rightsquigarrow^* Q$.

1. **Base case:** $N = x$, $N = x[j]$, $N = \mathbf{fail}^0$ and $N = \lambda x.(M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])$.

No reductions can take place, and the result follows trivially. $Q = \llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^0 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u = Q'$ and $N \longrightarrow^0 N = N'$.

2. $N = M(C * U)$.

Then, $\llbracket M(C * U) \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \mid v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u]))$, and we are able to perform the reductions from $\llbracket M(C * U) \rrbracket_u$.

We now proceed by induction on k , with $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^k Q$. There are two main cases:

- (a) When $k = 0$ the thesis follows easily:

$$\text{We have } Q = \llbracket M(C * U) \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^0 \llbracket M(C * U) \rrbracket_u = Q' \text{ and } M(C * U) \longrightarrow^0 M(C * U) = N'.$$

(b) The interesting case is when $k \geq 1$.

Then, for some process R and n, m such that $k = n + m$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \mid v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\ &\rightsquigarrow^m (\mathbf{v}v)(R \mid v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \rightsquigarrow^n Q \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the first $m \geq 0$ reduction steps are internal to $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v$; type preservation in $\mathfrak{st}\pi^+$ ensures that, if they occur, these reductions do not discard the possibility of synchronizing with $\bar{v}.\mathbf{some}$. Then, the first of the $n \geq 0$ reduction steps towards Q is a synchronization between R and $v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}$.

We consider two sub-cases, depending on the values of m and n :

i. $m = 0$ and $n \geq 1$:

Then $R = \llbracket M \rrbracket_v$ as $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \rightsquigarrow^0 \llbracket M \rrbracket_v$. Notice that there are two possibilities of having an unguarded:

A. $M = (\lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])) \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^! \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^! \rrbracket$ ($p, q \geq 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M \rrbracket_v &= \llbracket (\lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])) \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^! \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^! \rrbracket \rrbracket_v \\ &= (\mathbf{v}z_q^!)(\cdots(\mathbf{v}z_1^!)(\llbracket (\lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])) \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \rrbracket_v \mid \\ &\quad !z_1^!(z_1); \llbracket U_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \cdots \mid !z_q^!(z_q); \llbracket U_q \rrbracket_{z_q}) = Q \end{aligned}$$

Which we shall write as:

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= (\mathbf{v}z_q^!, \dots, z_1^!)(\llbracket (\lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])) \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \rrbracket_v \mid \\ &\quad !z_1^!(z_1); \llbracket U_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \cdots \mid !z_q^!(z_q); \llbracket U_q \rrbracket_{z_q}) \end{aligned}$$

for simplicity to represent the process. We also use this to simplify the translation of linear explicit substitutions of bags from:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M \langle \wr M_1 \wr \cdots \wr M_k \wr / x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle \rrbracket_v &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots \\ &\quad (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \\ &\quad \llbracket M \rrbracket_v \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \cdots) \end{aligned}$$

to be represented as:

$$\llbracket M \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle \rrbracket_v = (\mathbf{v}\tilde{z})(\tilde{z}.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; \llbracket C \rrbracket_{\tilde{z}} \mid \prod_{\tilde{x}_i \in \text{PER}(\tilde{x})} \llbracket M \rrbracket_v \{\tilde{z}/\tilde{x}_i\}).$$

These representations are purely for simplicity and are not an alternative to the actual translation. We continue expanding the sub-process

$\llbracket (\lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])) \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \rrbracket_v$ which we shall denote P using the above shortened and simplified notation:

$$\begin{aligned} P &= (\mathbf{v}\tilde{w}_p)(\tilde{w}_p.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(C_p)}; \llbracket C_p \rrbracket_{\tilde{w}_p} \mid \\ &\quad \prod_{\tilde{y}_{p_i} \in \text{PER}(\tilde{y}_p)} \cdots (\mathbf{v}\tilde{w}_1)(\tilde{w}_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(C_1)}; \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket_{\tilde{w}_1} \mid \\ &\quad \prod_{\tilde{y}_{i_1} \in \text{PER}(\tilde{y}_1)} \llbracket (\lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])) \rrbracket_v \{\tilde{w}_1/\tilde{y}_{i_1}\} \cdots \{\tilde{w}_p/\tilde{y}_{p_i}\}) \end{aligned}$$

Hence we represent $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v$ as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket M \rrbracket_v &= (\mathbf{v}z_q^!, \dots, z_1^!)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{w}_p)(\tilde{w}_p.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(C_p)}; \llbracket C_p \rrbracket_{\tilde{w}_p} | \\
 &\quad \prod_{\tilde{y}_{p_i} \in \text{PER}(\tilde{y}_p)} \dots (\mathbf{v}\tilde{w}_1)(\tilde{w}_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(C_1)}; \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket_{\tilde{w}_1} | \\
 &\quad \prod_{\tilde{y}_{1_i} \in \text{PER}(\tilde{y}_1)} \llbracket \lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \rrbracket_v \{ \tilde{w}_1/\tilde{y}_{1_i} \} \dots \{ \tilde{w}_p/\tilde{y}_{p_i} \}) \\
 &\quad | !z_1^!(z_1); \llbracket U_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \dots | !z_q^!(z_q); \llbracket U_q \rrbracket_{z_q})
 \end{aligned}$$

Finally we shall simplify the process to become:

$$\llbracket M \rrbracket_v = (\mathbf{v}\tilde{z}, \tilde{w})(\prod_{i \in I} \llbracket \lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \rrbracket_v \{ \tilde{w}/\tilde{y}_i \} | \mathcal{Q}'')$$

With this shape for M , we then have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M(C * U) \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v | v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x | [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}v)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{z}, \tilde{w})(\prod_{i \in I} \llbracket \lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \rrbracket_v \{ \tilde{w}/\tilde{y}_i \} | \mathcal{Q}'') \\
 &\quad | v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x | [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}v)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{z}, \tilde{w})(\prod_{i \in I} \bar{v}.\mathbf{some}; v(x); \bar{x}.\mathbf{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \\
 &\quad \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \{ \tilde{w}/\tilde{y}_i \} | \mathcal{Q}'') | v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x | [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}v)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{z}, \tilde{w})(\prod_{i \in I} v(x); \bar{x}.\mathbf{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \{ \tilde{w}/\tilde{y}_i \} | \mathcal{Q}'') = Q_1 \\
 &\quad | \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x | [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}v)([v \leftrightarrow u] | (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{z}, \tilde{w})(\prod_{i \in I} \bar{x}.\mathbf{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \\
 &\quad \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \{ \tilde{w}/\tilde{y}_i \} | \mathcal{Q}'') | \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) = Q_2 \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{z}, \tilde{w})(\prod_{i \in I} \bar{x}.\mathbf{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \\
 &\quad \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \{ \tilde{w}/\tilde{y}_i \} | \mathcal{Q}'') | \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x) = Q_3
 \end{aligned}$$

We also have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 N &= (\lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])) \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \dots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^! \rrbracket \dots \llbracket U_q/z_q^! \rrbracket (C * U) \\
 &\equiv_\lambda (\lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) (C * U)) \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \dots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^! \rrbracket \dots \llbracket U_q/z_q^! \rrbracket \\
 &\longrightarrow M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle (C * U)/x \rangle \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \dots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^! \rrbracket \dots \llbracket U_q/z_q^! \rrbracket \\
 &= M
 \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket M \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle (C * U)/x \rangle \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \dots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^! \rrbracket \dots \llbracket U_q/z_q^! \rrbracket \rrbracket_u \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{z}, \tilde{w})(\prod_{i \in I} \bar{x}.\mathbf{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \{ \tilde{w}/\tilde{y}_i \} | \mathcal{Q}'') \\
 &\quad | \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x
 \end{aligned}$$

We consider different possibilities for $n \geq 1$; in all the cases, the result follows.

When $n = 1$: We have $Q = Q_1$, $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^1 Q_1$. We also have that

- $Q_1 \rightsquigarrow^2 Q_3 = Q'$,
- $N \longrightarrow^1 M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle (C * U)/x \rangle \rangle \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^1 \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^1 \rrbracket$
 $= N'$
- and $\llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle (C * U)/x \rangle \rangle \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^1 \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u$
 $= Q_3$.

When $n = 2$: the analysis is similar.

When $n \geq 3$: We have $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^3 Q_3 \rightsquigarrow^l Q$, for $l \geq 0$. We also know that $N \longrightarrow M$, $Q_3 = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u$. By the IH, there exist Q', N' such that $Q \rightsquigarrow^i Q'$, $M \longrightarrow^j N'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u = Q'$. Finally, $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^3 Q_3 \rightsquigarrow^l Q \rightsquigarrow^i Q'$ and $N \rightarrow M \longrightarrow^j N'$.

B. $M = \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}}$.

Then, $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v = \llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \rrbracket_v = \bar{v}.\text{none} \mid \tilde{z}.\text{none}$. With this shape for M , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket (M (C * U)) \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}v)(\bar{v}.\text{none} \mid \tilde{z}.\text{none} \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\ &\rightsquigarrow \tilde{z}.\text{none} \mid \bar{u}.\text{none} \mid \overline{\text{fv}(C)}.\text{none} \end{aligned}$$

We also have that $N = \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} C * U \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{z} \cup \text{fv}(C)} = M$. Furthermore,

$$\llbracket M \rrbracket_u = \llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{z} \cup \text{fv}(C)} \rrbracket_u = \tilde{z}.\text{none} \mid \bar{u}.\text{none} \mid \overline{\text{fv}(C)}.\text{none}$$

ii. When $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$, we distinguish two cases:

A. When $n = 0$:

Then, $(\mathbf{v}v)(R \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) = Q$ and $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^m R$ where $m \geq 1$. Then by the IH there exist R' and M' such that $R \rightsquigarrow^i R'$, $M \longrightarrow^j M'$, and $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u = R'$. Hence we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) \\ &\rightsquigarrow^m (\mathbf{v}v)(R \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) = Q \end{aligned}$$

We also know that

$$Q \rightsquigarrow^i (\mathbf{v}v)(R \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x]; (\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \mid [v \leftrightarrow u])) = Q'$$

and so the λ_C term can reduce as follows: $N = (M (C * U)) \longrightarrow^j M' (C * U) = N'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u = Q'$.

B. When $n \geq 1$:

Then R has an occurrence of an unguarded $\bar{v}.\text{some}$ or $\bar{v}.\text{none}$, hence it is of the form

$$\llbracket (\lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^1 \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^1 \rrbracket) \rrbracket_v, \text{ or } \llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \rrbracket_v.$$

This case follows by IH.

This concludes the analysis for the case $N = (M (C * U))$.

3. $N = M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$.

The sharing variable x is not free and the result follows by vacuity.

4. $N = M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle (C * U)/x \rangle \rangle$. Then we have

$$\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle (C * U)/x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^!); x()); \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x$$

Let us consider three cases.

(a) When $\text{size}(\tilde{x}) = \text{size}(C)$. Then let us consider the shape of the bag C .

i. When $C = 1$.

We have the following

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket 1 * U \rrbracket_x) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \\
 &\quad x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}[x^\ell]; (\llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \bar{x}[x^1]; (!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \bar{x}[]))) \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \bar{x}[x^\ell]; (\llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \bar{x}[x^1]; (!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \bar{x}[]))) = Q_1 \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}[x^1]; (!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \bar{x}[])) \mid (\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell})) = Q_2 \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}[] \mid (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid (\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(x(x^1); \llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell}))) = Q_3 \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid (\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell}))) = Q_4 \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid (\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_i]; (y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_i()); \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid \mid \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none})x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y_i); (\bar{y}_i.\text{some}; \bar{y}_i[] \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none}))) \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid (\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\bar{x}^\ell[y_i]; (y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_i()); \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none}) \mid \\
 &\quad x(y_i); (\bar{y}_i.\text{some}; \bar{y}_i[] \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none}))) = Q_5 \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid (\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\bar{x}^\ell.\text{none} \mid (\mathbf{v}y_i)(y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_i()); \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid \\
 &\quad \bar{y}_i.\text{some}; \bar{y}_i[] \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none}))) = Q_6 \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid (\mathbf{v}y_i)(y_i.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_i()); \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid \bar{y}_i.\text{some}; \bar{y}_i[])) = Q_7 \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid (\mathbf{v}y_i)(y_i(); \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid \bar{y}_i[])) = Q_8 \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \llbracket M \rrbracket_u) = \llbracket M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = Q_9
 \end{aligned}$$

Notice how Q_6 has a choice however the x^ℓ name can be closed at any time so for simplicity we perform communication across this name first followed by all other communications that can take place.

Now we proceed by induction on the number of reductions $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^k Q$.

A. When $k = 0$, the result follows trivially. Just take $N = N'$ and $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = Q = Q'$.

B. When $k = 1$.

We have $Q = Q_1$, $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^1 Q_1$ We also have that $Q_1 \rightsquigarrow^8 Q_9 = Q'$, $N \longrightarrow M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket = N'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u = Q_9$

C. When $2 \leq k \leq 8$.

Proceeds similarly to the previous case

D. When $k \geq 9$.

We have $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^9 Q_9 \rightsquigarrow^l Q$, for $l \geq 0$. Since $Q_9 = \llbracket M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u$ we apply the induction hypothesis we have that there exist Q', N' s.t. $Q \rightsquigarrow^i Q'$, $M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \longrightarrow^j N'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u = Q'$. Then, $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^5 Q_5 \rightsquigarrow^l Q \rightsquigarrow^i Q'$ and by the contextual reduction rule it follows that $N = (M[\leftarrow x]) \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow M \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \longrightarrow^j N'$ and the case holds.

ii. When $C = \wr N_1 \wr \dots \wr N_l \wr$, for $l \geq 1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle (C * U/x) \rangle \rrbracket_u \\
&= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \\
&\rightsquigarrow^4 (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid (\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell}))) \\
&= (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid (\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_1]; (y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1()); \mathbf{0} \\
&\quad \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M) \setminus \bar{x}}; \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \bar{x}} x(x_{i_1}); \dots \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_1]; (y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1()); \mathbf{0} \\
&\quad \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M) \setminus (\bar{x} \setminus x_1, \dots, x_{i_{l-1}})}; \prod_{x_{i_j} \in (\bar{x} \setminus x_1, \dots, x_{i_{l-1}})} x(x_{i_j}); \llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \dots)) \\
&\quad \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; x(y_1); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[z_1]; \\
&\quad (z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \bar{y}_1.\text{none} \mid \dots \\
&\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; x(y_l); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_l, \text{fv}(M_l)}; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[z_l]; \\
&\quad (z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \bar{y}_l.\text{none} \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \dots)))
\end{aligned}$$

We shall now perform multiple non-committing reductions at once. Notice that non-determinism guards the same prefixes denying the use of the reduction $[\rightsquigarrow_{\geq x}]$ hence denying the commitment of non-determinism.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rightsquigarrow^{6l} (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid (\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \\
&\quad (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_l)(z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \\
&\quad \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \bar{x}} \prod_{x_{i_j} \in (\bar{x} \setminus x_1, \dots, x_{i_{l-1}})} \llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_l/x_{i_l}\} \dots))) \\
&= (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid (\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(x^\ell.\text{some}_0; x(y_{l+1}); (\bar{y}_{l+1}.\text{some}; \bar{y}_{l+1}[] \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_0; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none}) \mid \\
&\quad (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_l)(z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \\
&\quad \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \bar{x}} \prod_{x_{i_j} \in (\bar{x} \setminus x_1, \dots, x_{i_{l-1}})} \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \\
&\quad \bar{x}^\ell[y_{l+1}]; (y_{l+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}; y_{l+1}()); \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_l/x_{i_l}\} \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none})) \dots))) \\
&\rightsquigarrow^5 (\mathbf{v}x^1)(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \\
&\quad (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_l)(z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \\
&\quad \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \bar{x}} \prod_{x_{i_j} \in (\bar{x} \setminus x_1, \dots, x_{i_{l-1}})} \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_l/x_{i_l}\} \dots)) \\
&= \llbracket M \langle \int M_1 \int \dots \int M_l \int / x_1, \dots, x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = Q_{6l+9}
\end{aligned}$$

The proof follows by induction on the number of reductions $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^k Q$.

A. When $k = 0$, the result follows trivially. Just take $N = N'$ and $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = Q = Q'$.

B. When $1 \leq k \leq 6l + 9$.

Let Q_k such that $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^k Q_k$. We also have that $Q_k \rightsquigarrow^{6l+9-k} Q_{6l+9} = Q'$,

$N \xrightarrow{1} M \langle \int M_1 \int \dots \int M_l \int / x_1, \dots, x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket = N'$ and

$\llbracket M \langle \int M_1 \int \dots \int M_l \int / x_1, \dots, x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = Q_{6l+9}$.

C. When $k > 6l + 9$.

Then, $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^{6l+9} Q_{6l+9} \rightsquigarrow^n Q$ for $n \geq 1$. Also,

$N \longrightarrow^1 M \langle \lambda M_1 \int \dots \dots \lambda M_l \int / x_1, \dots, x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ and
 $Q_{6l+9} = \llbracket M \langle \lambda M_1 \int \dots \dots \lambda M_l \int / x_1, \dots, x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u$.
 By the induction hypothesis, there exist Q' and N' such that $Q \rightsquigarrow^i Q'$,
 $M \langle \lambda M_1 \int \dots \dots \lambda M_l \int / x_1, \dots, x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \longrightarrow^j N'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u = Q'$.
 Finally, $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^{6l+9} Q_{6l+9} \rightsquigarrow^n Q \rightsquigarrow^i Q'$ and

$$N \longrightarrow M \langle \lambda M_1 \int \dots \dots \lambda M_l \int / x_1, \dots, x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \longrightarrow^j N'.$$

(b) When $\text{size}(\tilde{x}) > \text{size}(C)$.

Then we have $N = M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle$ with $C = \lambda N_1 \int \dots \lambda N_l \int \quad k > l$.
 $N \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}} = M'$ and $\tilde{z} = (\text{fv}(M) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}) \cup \text{fv}(C)$. On the one hand, we have:
 Hence $k = l + m$ for some $m \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \\
 &\quad x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}[x^\ell]; (\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \bar{x}[x^1]; (!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \bar{x}[])) \\
 &\rightsquigarrow^4 (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\llbracket M[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell}) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_1]; (y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1()); \mathbf{0} \\
 &\quad \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M) \setminus \tilde{x}}; \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \tilde{x}} x(x_{i_1}); \dots \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_k]; (y_k.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_k()); \mathbf{0} \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \\
 &\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M) \setminus (\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}})}; \prod_{x_{i_k} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}})} x(x_{i_k}); \llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u) \mid \\
 &\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; x(y_1); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[z_1]; \\
 &\quad (z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \bar{y}_1.\text{none} \mid \dots x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; x(y_l); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_l, \text{fv}(M_l)}; \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[z_l]; (z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \llbracket \mathbf{1} \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \bar{y}_l.\text{none}) \dots) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &(:= Q_4)
 \end{aligned} \tag{C.14}$$

we reduce Q_4 arbitrarily synchronising along channels x^ℓ, y_1, \dots, y_l .

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_4 &\rightsquigarrow^{6l} (\mathbf{v}x^l)((\mathbf{v}x^l)(\llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^l} \mid (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_l)(z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \\
&\quad \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \tilde{x}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_l} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{l-1}})} \overline{x^l}.\text{some}; \overline{x^l}[y_{l+1}]; (y_{l+1}.\text{some}_0; y_{l+1}()); \mathbf{0} \\
&\quad \mid \overline{x^l}.\text{some}; x^l.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}(\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_l}); \prod_{x_{i_{l+1}} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_l})} x(x_{i_{l+1}}); \cdots \\
&\quad \overline{x^l}.\text{some}; \overline{x^l}[y_k]; (y_k.\text{some}_0; y_k()); \mathbf{0} \\
&\quad \mid \overline{x^l}.\text{some}; x^l.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}(\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}); \prod_{x_{i_k} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}})} x(x_{i_k}); \\
&\quad \llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_l/x_{i_l}\} \cdots) \mid !x^l(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
&= (\mathbf{v}x^l)((\mathbf{v}x^l)(x^l.\text{some}_0; x(y_{l+1}); (\overline{y_{l+1}}.\text{some}; \overline{y_{l+1}} \mid x^l.\text{some}_0; \overline{x^l}.\text{none}) \\
&\quad \mid (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_l)(z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \\
&\quad \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \tilde{x}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_l} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{l-1}})} \overline{x^l}.\text{some}; \overline{x^l}[y_{l+1}]; (y_{l+1}.\text{some}_0; y_{l+1}()); \mathbf{0} \\
&\quad \mid \overline{x^l}.\text{some}; x^l.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}(\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_l}); \prod_{x_{i_{l+1}} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_l})} x(x_{i_{l+1}}); \cdots \\
&\quad \overline{x^l}.\text{some}; \overline{x^l}[y_k]; (y_k.\text{some}_0; y_k()); \mathbf{0} \\
&\quad \mid \overline{x^l}.\text{some}; x^l.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}(\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}); \prod_{x_{i_k} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}})} x(x_{i_k}); \\
&\quad \llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_l/x_{i_l}\} \cdots) \mid !x^l(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
&\rightsquigarrow^5 (\mathbf{v}x^l)((\mathbf{v}x^l)(\overline{x^l}.\text{none} \mid (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_l)(z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \\
&\quad \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \tilde{x}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_l} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{l-1}})} x^l.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}(\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_l}); \\
&\quad \prod_{x_{i_{l+1}} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_l})} x(x_{i_{l+1}}); \cdots \overline{x^l}.\text{some}; \overline{x^l}[y_k]; (y_k.\text{some}_0; y_k()); \mathbf{0} \\
&\quad \mid \overline{x^l}.\text{some}; x^l.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M)}(\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}); \prod_{x_{i_k} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}})} x(x_{i_k}); \\
&\quad \llbracket M[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_l/x_{i_l}\} \cdots) \mid !x^l(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
&\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^l)((\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_l)(z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \\
&\quad \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \tilde{x}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_l} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{l-1}})} \overline{u}.\text{none} \mid (\overline{\text{fv}(M)} \setminus \tilde{x}).\text{none} \mid \\
&\quad (\overline{z_1}, \dots, \overline{z_l}).\text{none}) \cdots) \mid !x^l(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
&\rightsquigarrow^l (\mathbf{v}x^l)(\prod_{x_{i_1} \in \tilde{x}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_l} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{l-1}})} \overline{u}.\text{none} \mid (\overline{\text{fv}(M)} \setminus \tilde{x}).\text{none} \mid \overline{\text{fv}(C)}. \text{none} \mid \\
&\quad !x^l(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
&\equiv \overline{u}.\text{none} \mid (\overline{\text{fv}(M)} \setminus \tilde{x}).\text{none} \mid \overline{\text{fv}(C)}. \text{none} = \llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \rrbracket_u = Q_{7l+10}
\end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof is by induction on the number of reductions $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^j Q$.

- i. When $j = 0$, the result follows trivially. Just take $N = N'$ and $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = Q = Q'$.
- ii. When $1 \leq j \leq 7l + 10$.
Let Q_j be such that $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^j Q_j$. By the steps above one has

$$Q_j \rightsquigarrow^{7l+10-j} Q_{7l+6} = Q',$$

$$N \longrightarrow^1 \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{z}} = N'; \text{ and } \llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \rrbracket_u = Q_{7l+10}.$$

iii. When $j > 7l + 10$.

In this case, we have $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^{7l+10} Q_{7l+10} \rightsquigarrow^n Q$, for $n \geq 1$. We also know that $N \rightsquigarrow^1 \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{z}}$. However no further reductions can be performed.

(c) When $\text{size}(\tilde{x}) < \text{size}(C)$, the proof proceeds similarly to the previous case.

5. $N = M \langle C / \tilde{x} \rangle$.

In this case let us consider $C = \lambda M_1 \int \dots \lambda M_k \int$,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M \langle C / \tilde{x} \rangle \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \\ &\rightsquigarrow^m (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} R \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \\ &\rightsquigarrow^n Q, \end{aligned}$$

for some process R . Where \rightsquigarrow^n is a reduction that initially synchronizes with $z_i.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_i)}$ for some $i \leq k$ when $n \geq 1$, $n + m = k \geq 1$. Type preservation in \mathfrak{sp}^+ ensures reducing $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \rightsquigarrow^m$ does not consume possible synchronizations with $\tilde{z}_i.\mathbf{some}$, if they occur. Let us consider the possible sizes of both m and n .

(a) For $m = 0$ and $n \geq 1$.

We have that $R = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u$ as $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^0 \llbracket M \rrbracket_u$.

Notice that there are two possibilities of having an unguarded $\tilde{z}_i.\mathbf{some}$ or $\tilde{z}_i.\mathbf{none}$ without internal reductions:

i. $M = \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}} \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \tilde{x}.\mathbf{none} \mid \tilde{y}.\mathbf{none} \mid \bar{u}.\mathbf{none} \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \\ &\quad \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \\ &\equiv (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \\ &\quad \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \mid \bar{z}_1.\mathbf{none} \mid \dots \mid \bar{z}_k.\mathbf{none} \mid \tilde{y}.\mathbf{none} \mid \bar{u}.\mathbf{none}) \dots) \\ &\rightsquigarrow^k \overline{\text{fv}(C)}.\mathbf{none} \mid \tilde{y}.\mathbf{none} \mid \bar{u}.\mathbf{none} = Q', \end{aligned}$$

and no further reductions can be performed. We also have that $N \longrightarrow \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y} \cup \text{fv}(C)} = N'$ and $\llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{y} \cup \text{fv}(C)} \rrbracket_u = Q'$.

ii. $\text{head}(M) = x_i$.

Then we have the following

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket x_i \rrbracket_j \mid P)\{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \cdots) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \\ &\quad (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{x}_i.\mathbf{some}; [x_i \leftrightarrow j] \mid P)\{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \cdots) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that multiple reductions can take place along any of the channels z_l . Let us consider for simplicity that $i = l = k$.

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{x}_k.\mathbf{some}; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] \mid P)\{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \\ &\quad \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \cdots) \end{aligned}$$

We show the full process of the reduction in this case for correctness. Applying multiple reductions of the form $[\rightsquigarrow_{\mathbf{v}}]$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{x}_k.\mathbf{some}; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] \mid P)\{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \cdots)}{[\rightsquigarrow_{\mathbf{v}}]} \quad \rightsquigarrow_{z_k} R_k \\ & \quad \vdots \\ & \frac{(\mathbf{v}z_2)(z_2.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_2)}; \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{z_2} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{x}_k.\mathbf{some}; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] \mid P)\{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \cdots)}{[\rightsquigarrow_{\mathbf{v}}]} \quad \rightsquigarrow_{z_k} R_1 \\ & \frac{(\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{x}_k.\mathbf{some}; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] \mid P)\{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \cdots)}{[\rightsquigarrow_{\mathbf{v}}]} \quad \rightsquigarrow_{z_k} (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid R_1) \\ & \quad \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{x}_k.\mathbf{some}; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] \mid P)\{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \cdots) \end{aligned}$$

where $R_i = (\mathbf{v}z_i)(z_i.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_i)}; \llbracket M_i \rrbracket_{z_i} \mid R_{i+1})$ for $i < k$

Hence we wish to show the following reduction:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ & \quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{x}_k.\mathbf{some}; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] \mid P)\{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \cdots) \quad \rightsquigarrow_{z_k} R_k \end{aligned}$$

We apply the reduction rule

$$\frac{P \succeq_{z_k} P' \quad Q \succeq_{z_k} Q' \quad (\mathbf{v}z_k)(P' \mid Q') \rightsquigarrow_{z_k} R_k}{(\mathbf{v}z_k)(P \mid Q) \rightsquigarrow_{z_k} R_k}$$

Where we take $P = z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \succeq_{z_k} z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} = P'$ and Notice that when $x_{i_k} = x_k$ we have that the substitution $\{z_k/x_{i_k}\}$ takes place

$$\begin{aligned}
 Q &= \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{x}_k.\text{some}; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] | P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \\
 &= \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_{k-1}} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-2}}\}} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{z}_k.\text{some}; [z_k \leftrightarrow j] | P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \\
 &\quad \{z_{k-1}/x_{i_{k-1}}\} \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}} \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_k}\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_{k-1}} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-2}}, x_{i_k}\}} \\
 &\quad (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{x}_k.\text{some}; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] | P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \\
 &\succeq_{z_k} \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_{k-1}} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-2}}\}} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{z}_k.\text{some}; [z_k \leftrightarrow j] | P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \\
 &\quad \{z_{k-1}/x_{i_{k-1}}\} \\
 &= Q'
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence we wish to show the following reduction $(\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} | Q') \rightsquigarrow_{z_k} R_k$ We do this via the rule $[\rightsquigarrow_{\text{some}}]$ to obtain

$$R_k = (\mathbf{v}z_k) \left(\llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_{k-1}} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-2}}\}} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})([z_k \leftrightarrow j] | P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_{k-1}/x_{i_{k-1}}\} \right)$$

Hence we continue with the following reductions:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(\llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
 &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_{k-1}} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-2}}\}} \\
 &\quad (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})([x_k \leftrightarrow j] | P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_{k-1}/x_{i_{k-1}}\} \cdots) = Q_1 \\
 &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_{k-1})(\llbracket M_{k-1} \rrbracket_{z_{k-1}} \\
 &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_{k-1}} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-2}}\}} \\
 &\quad (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket M_k \rrbracket_j | P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_{k-1}/x_{i_{k-1}}\} \cdots) = Q_2
 \end{aligned}$$

In addition, $N = M \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle \longrightarrow M \{M_k/x_k\} \langle C \setminus M_k/\tilde{x} \setminus x_k \rangle = M'$. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M \{M_k/x_k\} \langle C \setminus M_k/\tilde{x} \setminus x_k \rangle \rrbracket_u \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_{k-1})(\llbracket M_{k-1} \rrbracket_{z_{k-1}} \\
 &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_{k-1}} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-2}}\}} \\
 &\quad (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket M_k \rrbracket_j | P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_{k-1}/x_{i_{k-1}}\} \cdots) = Q_2
 \end{aligned}$$

A. When $n = 1$:

Then, $Q = Q_1$ and $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^1 Q_1$. Also, $Q_1 \rightsquigarrow^1 Q_2 = Q'$, $N \longrightarrow^1 M \{M_k/x_k\} \langle C \setminus M_k/\tilde{x} \setminus x_k \rangle = N'$ and $\llbracket M \{M_k/x_k\} \langle C \setminus M_k/\tilde{x} \setminus x_k \rangle \rrbracket_u = Q_2$.

B. When $n \geq 2$:

Then $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^2 Q_2 \rightsquigarrow^l Q$, for $l \geq 0$. Also, $N \longrightarrow M'$, $Q_2 = \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist Q' and N' such that $Q \rightsquigarrow^i Q'$, $M' \longrightarrow^j N'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u = Q'$. Finally, $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^2 Q_2 \rightsquigarrow^l Q \rightsquigarrow^i Q'$ and $N \longrightarrow M' \longrightarrow^j N'$.

(b) For $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$.

i. When $n = 0$.

Then

$$Q = (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} R\{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\}) \cdots)$$

and $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^m R$ where $m \geq 1$. By the IH there exist R' and M' such that $R \rightsquigarrow^i R'$, $M \rightarrow^j M'$ and $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u = R'$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &\rightsquigarrow^m (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} R\{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\}) \cdots) = Q \\ &\rightsquigarrow^i (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} R'\{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\}) \cdots) = Q' \end{aligned}$$

Also, $N = M \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle \rightarrow^j M' \langle C/\tilde{x} \rangle = N'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u = Q'$

ii. When $n \geq 1$. Then R has an occurrence of an unguarded $\bar{x}_i.\text{some}$ or $\bar{x}_i.\text{none}$, this case follows by IH.

6. $N = M \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket$.

In this case, $\llbracket M \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x^!)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i})$. Then,

$$\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x^!)(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \mid !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \rightsquigarrow^m (\mathbf{v}x^!)(R \mid !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \rightsquigarrow^n Q.$$

for some process R . Where \rightsquigarrow^n is a reduction initially synchronises with $!x^!(x_i)$ when $n \geq 1$, $n + m = k \geq 1$. Type preservation in st^+ ensures reducing $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \rightsquigarrow^m$ doesn't consume possible synchronisations with $!x^!(x_i)$ if they occur. Let us consider the the possible sizes of both m and n .

(a) For $m = 0$ and $n \geq 1$.

In this case, $R = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u$ as $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^0 \llbracket M \rrbracket_u$.

Notice that the only possibility of having an unguarded $?x^![x_i]$ without internal reductions is when $\text{head}(M) = x[j]$ for some index j . Then we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}x^!)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket x[j] \rrbracket_k \mid P) \mid !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x^!)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(?x^![x_i]; \bar{x}_i.j; [x_i \leftrightarrow k] \mid P) \mid !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\ &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^!)((\mathbf{v}x_i)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{x}_i.j; [x_i \leftrightarrow k] \mid P) \mid \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \mid !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = Q_1 \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x^!)((\mathbf{v}x_i)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{x}_i.j; [x_i \leftrightarrow k] \mid P) \mid x_i.\text{case}\{i : \llbracket U_i \rrbracket_{x_i}\}_{U_i \in U}) \mid \\ &\quad !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\ &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^!)((\mathbf{v}x_i)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})([x_i \leftrightarrow k] \mid P) \mid \llbracket U_j \rrbracket_{x_i}) \mid !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = Q_2 \\ &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{v}x^!)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket U_j \rrbracket_k \mid P) \mid !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = Q_3 \end{aligned}$$

We consider the two cases of the form of U_j and show that the choice of U_j is inconsequential

- When $U_j = \lambda N^{\dagger}$:
In this case, $N = M \llbracket U/x^{\dagger} \rrbracket \longrightarrow M \{N/x^{\dagger}\} \llbracket U/x^{\dagger} \rrbracket = M'$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M \{N/x^{\dagger}\} \llbracket U/x^{\dagger} \rrbracket \rrbracket_u \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x^{\dagger})((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket N \rrbracket_k | P) | !x^{\dagger}(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = Q_3 \end{aligned}$$

- When $U_i = 1^{\dagger}$:
In this case, $N = M \llbracket U/x^{\dagger} \rrbracket \longrightarrow M \{\text{fail}^0/x^{\dagger}\} \llbracket U/x^{\dagger} \rrbracket = M'$.
Notice that $\llbracket 1^{\dagger} \rrbracket_k = \bar{k}.\text{none}$ and that $\llbracket \text{fail}^0 \rrbracket_k = \bar{k}.\text{none}$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M \{\text{fail}^0/x^{\dagger}\} \llbracket U/x^{\dagger} \rrbracket \rrbracket_u \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x^{\dagger})((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket \text{fail}^0 \rrbracket_k | P) | !x^{\dagger}(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x^{\dagger})((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket 1^{\dagger} \rrbracket_k | P) | !x^{\dagger}(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = Q_3 \end{aligned}$$

Both choices give an M that are equivalent to Q_3 .

- When $n \leq 2$.

In this case, $Q = Q_n$ and $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^n Q_n$.

Also, $Q_n \rightsquigarrow^{3-n} Q_3 = Q'$, $N \longrightarrow^1 M' = N'$ and $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u = Q_2$.

- When $n \geq 3$.

We have $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^3 Q_3 \rightsquigarrow^l Q$ for $l \geq 0$. We also know that $N \rightarrow M'$, $Q_3 = \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u$.

By the IH, there exist Q and N' such that $Q \rightsquigarrow^i Q'$, $M' \longrightarrow^j N'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u = Q'$.

Finally, $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^3 Q_3 \rightsquigarrow^l Q \rightsquigarrow^i Q'$ and $N \rightarrow M' \longrightarrow^j N'$.

- For $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$.

- When $n = 0$.

Then $(\mathbf{v}x^{\dagger})(R | !x^{\dagger}(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = Q$ and $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^m R$ where $m \geq 1$. By the IH there exist R' and M' such that $R \rightsquigarrow^i R'$, $M \longrightarrow^j M'$ and $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u = R'$. Hence,

$$\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x^{\dagger})(\llbracket M \rrbracket_u | !x^{\dagger}(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \rightsquigarrow^m (\mathbf{v}x^{\dagger})(R | !x^{\dagger}(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = Q.$$

In addition, $Q \rightsquigarrow^i (\mathbf{v}x^{\dagger})(R' | !x^{\dagger}(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = Q$, and the term can reduce as follows: $N = M \llbracket U/x^{\dagger} \rrbracket \longrightarrow^j M' \llbracket U/x^{\dagger} \rrbracket = N'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u = Q'$.

- When $n \geq 1$.

Then R has an occurrence of an unguarded $!x^{\dagger}(x_i)$, and the case follows by IH.

□

C.7.4 Success Sensitivity

Proposition C.7.2 (Preservation of Success) *For all closed $M \in \lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$, the following hold:*

- $\text{head}(M) = \checkmark \implies \llbracket M \rrbracket = (\mathbf{v}\tilde{x})(P | \checkmark)$
- $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u = P | \checkmark \nmid Q \implies \text{head}(M) = \checkmark$

Proof:

Proof of both cases by induction on the structure of M .

- We only need to consider terms of the following form:

- $M = \checkmark$:

This case is immediate.

(b) $M = N (C * U)$:

Then, $\text{head}(N (C * U)) = \text{head}(N)$. If $\text{head}(N) = \checkmark$, then

$$\llbracket M(C * U) \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket N \rrbracket_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)).$$

By the IH, \checkmark is unguarded in $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u$.

(c) $M = M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle$

Then we have that $\text{head}(M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle) = \text{head}(M') = \checkmark$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \end{aligned}$$

and by the IH \checkmark is unguarded in $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u$ hence unguarded in every summand in $\llbracket M \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle \rrbracket_u$.

(d) $M = M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$

Then we have that $\text{head}(M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket) = \text{head}(M') = \checkmark$. Then $\llbracket M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i})$ and by the IH \checkmark is unguarded in $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u$.

2. We only need to consider terms of the following form:

(a) **Case** $M = \checkmark$:

Then, $\llbracket \checkmark \rrbracket_u = \checkmark$ which is an unguarded occurrence of \checkmark and that $\text{head}(\checkmark) = \checkmark$.

(b) **Case** $M = N(C * U)$:

Then, $\llbracket N(C * U) \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket N \rrbracket_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x))$. The only occurrence of an unguarded \checkmark can occur is within $\llbracket N \rrbracket_v$. By the IH, $\text{head}(N) = \checkmark$ and finally $\text{head}(N (C * U)) = \text{head}(N)$.

(c) **Case** $M = M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle$:

Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \end{aligned}$$

An unguarded occurrence of \checkmark can only occur within $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u$. By the IH, $\text{head}(M') = \checkmark$ and hence $\text{head}(M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle) = \text{head}(M')$.

(d) **Case** $M = M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$: This case is analogous to the previous.

□

Theorem C.16 (Success Sensitivity (Under \rightsquigarrow)) $M \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$ if and only if $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$ for well-formed closed terms M .

Proof: We proceed with the proof in two parts.

1. Suppose that $M \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$. We will prove that $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$.

By Def. C.11, there exists M' such that $M \longrightarrow^* M'$ and $\text{head}(M') = \checkmark$. By completeness, if $M \longrightarrow^* M'$ then there exist Q, Q' such that $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \equiv Q \rightsquigarrow^* Q'$ and $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \equiv Q'$.

We wish to show that there exists Q'' such that $Q' \rightsquigarrow^* Q''$ and Q'' has an unguarded occurrence of \checkmark .

By Proposition C.7.2 (1) we have that $\text{head}(M') = \checkmark \implies \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}\tilde{x})(P \mid \checkmark)$. Finally $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}\tilde{x})(P \mid \checkmark) \equiv Q'$. Hence Q reduces to a process that has an unguarded occurrence of \checkmark .

2. Suppose that $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$. We will prove that $M \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$.

By operational soundness we have that if $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^* Q$ then there exist M' and Q' such that: (i) $M \longrightarrow^* M'$ and (ii) $Q \rightsquigarrow^* Q'$ with $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \equiv Q'$.

Since $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \rightsquigarrow^* Q$, and $Q = Q'' \mid \checkmark$ and $Q \rightsquigarrow^* Q'$ we must have that $Q'' \rightsquigarrow^* Q'''$ with $Q' = Q''' \mid \checkmark$. As $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \equiv Q'$ we have that $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u =$. Finally applying Proposition C.7.2 (2) we have that $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u = Q''' \mid \checkmark$ is itself a term with unguarded \checkmark , then M is itself headed with \checkmark .

□

C.8 Proof of Loose Correctness of the Translation under the Eager Semantics

C.8.1 Completeness

Theorem C.3 (Loose Completeness (Under \longrightarrow)) *If $N \longrightarrow M$ for a well-formed closed λ_C -term N , then there exists Q such that $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \longrightarrow^* Q$ and $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\perp} Q$.*

Proof: By induction on the reduction rule applied to infer $N \longrightarrow M$. We have five cases.

1. Case [RS : Beta]: Then $N = (\lambda x. (M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]))B \longrightarrow (M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])\langle\langle B/x \rangle\rangle = M$, where $B = C * U$. The result follows easily, since

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket \lambda x. (M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \rrbracket_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}v)(\bar{v}.\text{some}; v(x); \bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \mid \\
 &\quad v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) \\
 &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}v)(v(x); \bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \mid \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) \\
 &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}v)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \mid [v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x) \\
 &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x) = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u
 \end{aligned} \tag{C.15}$$

2. Case [RS : Ex-Sub]: Then $N = M'[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x]\langle\langle C * U/x \rangle\rangle$, with $C = \lambda M_1 \dots \lambda M_k$, $k \geq 0$ and $M' \neq \text{fail}^{\bar{v}}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket \lambda x. (M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \rrbracket_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) \\
&= (\mathbf{v}v)(\bar{v}.\text{some}; v(x); \bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \mid \\
&\quad v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) \\
&\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}v)(v(x); \bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \mid \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) \\
&\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}v)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \mid [v \leftrightarrow u]) \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x) \\
&\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x) = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u
\end{aligned} \tag{C.16}$$

3. Case [RS : Ex-Sub]: Then $N = M'[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle$, with $C = \lambda M_1 \dots \lambda M_k$, $k \geq 0$ and $M' \neq \text{fail}^{\tilde{v}}$.

The reduction is $N = M'[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle \longrightarrow M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket = M$.

We detail the translations of $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u$ and $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u$. To simplify the proof, we consider $k = 2$ (the case in which $k > 2$ is follows analogously. Similarly the case of $k = 0, 1$ it contained within $k = 2$). On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M'[x_1 \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle \rrbracket_u \\
&= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M'[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x) \\
&= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M'[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}[x^\ell].(\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \\
&\quad \mid \bar{x}[x^1].(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \bar{x}[])) \quad (:= P_{\mathbb{N}})
\end{aligned} \tag{C.17}$$

The reduction is $N = M'[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle \longrightarrow M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket = M$.

We detail the translations of $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u$ and $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u$. To simplify the proof, we consider $k = 2$ (the case in which $k > 2$ is follows analogously. Similarly the case of $k = 0, 1$ it contained within $k = 2$). On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M'[x_1 \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle \rrbracket_u \\
&= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M'[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x) \\
&= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M'[x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}[x^\ell].(\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \\
&\quad \mid \bar{x}[x^1].(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \bar{x}[])) \quad (:= P_{\mathbb{N}})
\end{aligned} \tag{C.18}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_{\mathbb{N}} &\longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\llbracket M' \llbracket x_1, x_2 \leftarrow x \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket \{ M_1 \} \cdot \{ M_2 \} \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; \overline{x^\ell}[y_1]; (y_1.\text{some}_0; y_1()); \mathbf{0} \\
 &\quad \mid \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus \bar{x}}; \prod_{x_{i_1} \in x_1, x_2} x(x_{i_1}); \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; \overline{x^\ell}[y_2]; \\
 &\quad (y_2.\text{some}_0; y_2()); \mathbf{0} \mid \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus \bar{x}}; \prod_{x_{i_2} \in (x_1, x_2) \setminus x_{i_1}} x(x_{i_2}); \\
 &\quad \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; \overline{x^\ell}[y_3]; (y_3.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_3()); \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid \overline{x^\ell}.\text{none}))) \\
 &\quad \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; x(y_1); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(C)}; \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; \overline{x^\ell}[z_1]; \\
 &\quad (z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_j)}; \llbracket M_j \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \overline{y_1}.\text{none} \mid \\
 &\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; x(y_2); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_2, \text{fv}(C)}; \overline{x^\ell}.\text{some}; \overline{x^\ell}[z_2]; \\
 &\quad (z_2.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_j)}; \llbracket M_j \rrbracket_{z_2} \mid \overline{y_2}.\text{none} \mid \\
 &\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_0; x(y_3); (\overline{y_3}.\text{some}; \overline{y_3}[] \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_0; \overline{x^\ell}.\text{none}))) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
 &\longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid (\mathbf{v}z_2)(z_2.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_2)}; \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{z_2} \mid \\
 &\quad \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{ z_1/x_{i_1} \} \{ z_2/x_{i_2} \})) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}
 \end{aligned}$$

Where x_{i_1}, x_{i_2} is an arbitrary permutation of x_1, x_2 . On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket M \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M' \langle M_1/x_1 \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket_u \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid (\mathbf{v}z_2)(z_2.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_2)}; \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{z_2} \\
 &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, x_2\}} \prod_{x_{i_2} \in \{x_1, x_2\} \setminus \{x_{i_1}\}} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{ z_1/x_{i_1} \} \{ z_2/x_{i_2} \})) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \quad (\text{C.19}) \\
 &\succeq \llbracket (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \\
 &\quad (\mathbf{v}z_2)(z_2.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_2)}; \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket_{z_2} \mid \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{ z_1/x_{i_1} \} \{ z_2/x_{i_2} \})) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (C.18) and (C.19) the result follows.

4. Case [RS:Fetch^ℓ]: Then, we have $N = M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle$ with $\text{head}(M') = x_j$, $C = M_1, \dots, M_k$ and $N \longrightarrow M' \{ M_i/x_j \} \langle (C \setminus M_i)/x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_j \rangle = M$, for some $M_i \in C$. On the one hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots \mid (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
 &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{ z_1/x_{i_1} \} \dots \{ z_k/x_{i_k} \} \dots) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots \mid (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
 &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket x_j \rrbracket_v \mid P) \{ z_1/x_{i_1} \} \dots \{ z_k/x_{i_k} \} \dots) \quad (*) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots \mid (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
 &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \\
 &\quad (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\overline{x_j}.\text{some}; [x_j \leftrightarrow v] \mid P) \{ z_1/x_{i_1} \} \dots \{ z_k/x_{i_k} \} \dots)
 \end{aligned} \tag{C.20}$$

where $(*)$ is inferred via Proposition C.7.1. Let us consider the case when $x_{i_k} = x_j$ the other cases proceed similarly. Then, we have reduction:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} | \\
& \quad \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(\llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} | (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})([x_k \leftrightarrow v] | P)\{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_{k-1}/x_{i_{k-1}}\} \cdots) \\
& \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} | \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_{k-1})(z_{k-1}.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_{k-1})}; \llbracket M_{k-1} \rrbracket_{z_{k-1}} | \\
& \quad (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket M_k \rrbracket_v | P)\{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_{k-1}/x_{i_{k-1}}\} \cdots)
\end{aligned} \tag{C.21}$$

for some permutation $x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}$ of the bag x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} . On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket M \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M' \{M_k/x_k\} \langle (C \setminus M_k)/x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \rangle \rrbracket_u \\
&= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} | \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_{k-1})(z_{k-1}.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_{k-1})}; \llbracket M_{k-1} \rrbracket_{z_{k-1}} \\
& \quad | \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_{k-1}} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-2}}\}} \\
& \quad (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket M_k \rrbracket_v | P)\{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_{k-1}/x_{i_{k-1}}\} \cdots) \\
&\succeq_{\#} (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} | \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_{k-1})(z_{k-1}.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(M_{k-1})}; \llbracket M_{k-1} \rrbracket_{z_{k-1}} \\
& \quad | (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket M_k \rrbracket_v | P)\{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_{k-1}/x_{i_{k-1}}\} \cdots)
\end{aligned} \tag{C.22}$$

Therefore, by (C.21) and (C.22) the result follows.

5. Case [RS:Fetch¹]: Then we have $N = M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ with $\text{head}(M') = x^1[k]$, $U_k = \lambda N^1$ and $N \longrightarrow M' \{N/x^1\} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket = M$. The result follows easily from

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u | !x^1(x_k); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}) \\
&\longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket x^1[k] \rrbracket_j | P) | !x^1(x_k); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}) \quad (*) \\
&= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(?x^1[x_k]; \bar{x}_k.k; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] | P) | !x^1(x_k); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}) \\
&\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\mathbf{v}x_k)(\bar{x}_k.k; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] | \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}) | P) | !x^1(x_k); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}) \\
&= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\mathbf{v}x_k)(\bar{x}_k.k; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] | x_k.\mathbf{case}\{i: \llbracket U_i \rrbracket_x\}_{U_i \in U} | P) | !x^1(x_k); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}) \\
&\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket \lambda N^1 \rrbracket_j | P) | !x^1(x_k); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}) \\
&= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket N \rrbracket_j | P) | !x^1(x_k); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}) = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u
\end{aligned} \tag{C.23}$$

where the reductions denoted by $(*)$ are inferred via Proposition C.7.1.

6. Cases [RS : TCont] : This case follows by IH.

7. Case [RS:Fail^l]: Then we have $N = M' [x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle (C * U/x) \rangle$ with $k \neq \text{size}(C)$ and $N \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} = M$, where $\tilde{y} = (\text{fv}(M') \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}) \cup \text{fv}(C)$. Let $\text{size}(C) = l$ and we assume

that $k > l$ and we proceed similarly for $k > l$. Hence $k = l + m$ for some $m \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M' [x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle \langle C * U / x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M' [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u | \\
 &\quad \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M' [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u | \\
 &\quad x.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}[x^\ell].(\llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} | \bar{x}[x^1].(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} | \bar{x}[])) \\
 &\longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\llbracket M' [\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u | \llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} | !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_1]; (y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1()); \mathbf{0} \\
 &\quad | \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus \tilde{x}}; \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \tilde{x}} x(x_{i_1}); \dots \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_k]; \\
 &\quad (y_k.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_k()); \mathbf{0} | \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus \tilde{x}}; \prod_{x_{i_k} \in (\tilde{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}})} x(x_{i_k}); \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_{k+1}]; (y_{k+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_{k+1}()); \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u | \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none})) \dots) \\
 &\quad | \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; x(y_1); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[z_1]; \\
 &\quad (z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} | \bar{y}_1.\text{none} | \\
 &\quad \dots \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; x(y_l); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_l, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[z_l]; \dots \\
 &\quad (z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} | \bar{y}_l.\text{none} | \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y_{l+1}); (\bar{y}_{l+1}.\text{some}; \bar{y}_{l+1}[] | \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none})) \dots) | !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
 & \quad (:= P_{\mathbb{N}})
 \end{aligned} \tag{C.24}$$

we reduce $P_{\mathbb{N}}$ arbitrarily discarding non-deterministic sums.

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_{\mathbb{N}} &\longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)((\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} | \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} | \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_{k+1}]; (y_{k+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_{k+1}()); \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} | \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none})) \dots) | \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C) \setminus (M_1, \dots, M_k)}; x(y_{k+1}); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_{k+1}, \text{fv}(C) \setminus (M_1, \dots, M_k)}; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^\ell[z_{k+1}]; (z_{k+1}.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_{k+1})}; \llbracket M_{k+1} \rrbracket_{z_{k+1}} | \bar{y}_1.\text{none} | \\
 &\quad \dots \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; x(y_l); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_l, \text{fv}(M_l)}; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[z_l]; \dots \\
 &\quad (z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} | \bar{y}_l.\text{none} | \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y_{l+1}); (\bar{y}_{l+1}.\text{some}; \bar{y}_{l+1}[] | \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none})) \dots) | !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
 &\longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} | \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} | \\
 &\quad \bar{u}.\text{none} | (\overline{\text{fv}(M')} \setminus \tilde{x}).\text{none} | \bar{z}_1.\text{none} | \dots | \bar{z}_k.\text{none} | (\overline{\text{fv}(C)} \setminus (M_1, \dots, M_k)).\text{none})) \dots) \\
 &\quad | !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
 &\longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\bar{u}.\text{none} | (\overline{\text{fv}(M')} \setminus \tilde{x}).\text{none} | \overline{\text{fv}(C)}. \text{none}) | !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &\equiv \bar{u}.\text{none} | (\overline{\text{fv}(M')} \setminus \tilde{x}).\text{none} | \overline{\text{fv}(C)}. \text{none} = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u
 \end{aligned}$$

8. Case [RS:Fail¹]: Then we have $N = M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ with $\text{head}(M') = x[i]$, $U_i = 1^1$ and $N \longrightarrow M' \{\text{fail}^0/x^1\} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$. The result follows easily from

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
&\longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket x[i] \rrbracket_j \mid P) \mid !x^1(x_k); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}) \quad (*) \\
&= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(?x^1[x_k]; \bar{x}_k.i; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] \mid P) \mid !x^1(x_k); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}) \quad (*) \\
&\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\mathbf{v}x_k)(x_k.l_i; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] \mid \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}) \mid P) \mid !x^1(x_k); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}) \\
&= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\mathbf{v}x_k)(x_k.l_i; [x_k \leftrightarrow j] \mid x_k.case(i. \llbracket U_i \rrbracket_x) \mid P) \mid !x^1(x_k); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}) \\
&\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket 1^1 \rrbracket_j \mid P) \mid !x^1(x_k); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}) = (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\bar{j}.none \mid P) \mid !x^1(x_k); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_k}) \\
&= \llbracket M \rrbracket_u
\end{aligned} \tag{C.25}$$

9. Case [RS : Cons₁]: Then we have $N = \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} C * U$ and $N \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}} = M$ where $\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(C)$. The result follows easily from

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} C * U \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \rrbracket_v \mid v.some_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) \\
&= (\mathbf{v}v)(\bar{v}.none \mid \tilde{x}.none \mid v.some_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) \\
&\longrightarrow \bar{u}.none \mid \tilde{x}.none \mid \tilde{y}.none = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u
\end{aligned} \tag{C.26}$$

10. Cases [RS : Cons₂] and [RS : Cons₃]: These cases follow by IH similarly to Case 7.
11. Case [RS:Cons₄]: Then we have $N = \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ and $N \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} = M$. The result follows easily from

$$\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = \llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket \text{fail}^{\tilde{y}} \rrbracket_u \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \tag{C.27}$$

$$= (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\bar{u}.none \mid \tilde{x}.none \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \equiv \bar{u}.none \mid \tilde{x}.none = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u \tag{C.28}$$

□

C.8.2 Soundness

We define $P \longrightarrow \{P_i\}_{i \in I}$, for a fixed finite set I where $I = \{i \text{ s.t. } P \longrightarrow P_i\}$. Similarly we define $P \longrightarrow^* \{P_i\}_{i \in I}$ to be defined inductively by $P \longrightarrow^* \{P_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $P_i \longrightarrow \{P_j\}_{j \in J_i}$ for each $i \in I$ then $P \longrightarrow^* \{P_j\}_{j \in J}$ with $J = \cup_{i \in I} J_i$

Proposition C.2.2 *If $P \succeq_{\dagger} Q$ and $P \longrightarrow^* \{P_i\}_{i \in I}$, then there exist J and $\{Q_j\}_{j \in J}$ such that $Q \longrightarrow^* \{Q_j\}_{j \in J}$, $J \subseteq I$, and for each $j \in J$, $P_j \succeq_{\dagger} Q_j$.*

Proof:

Proof by induction on the precongruence rules.

- When $P = P \succeq_{\dagger} P = Q$ then all reductions in P are matched in Q .
- When $P = P_1 \dagger P_2 \succeq_{\dagger} Q$ with $P_i \succeq_{\dagger} Q$ $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Let us take $i = 1$ Then by the rule:

$$\frac{P_1 \longrightarrow P'_1}{P_1 \dagger P_2 \longrightarrow P'_1 \dagger P_2} [\dagger]$$

we have $P_1 \parallel P_2 \rightarrow \{P'_{1_i}\}_{i \in I_1} \parallel P_2$ and $P_1 \parallel P_2 \rightarrow P_1 \parallel \{P'_{2_i}\}_{i \in I_2}$ for some I_1, I_2 . Hence we have that $P_1 \parallel P_2 \rightarrow \{P'_i\}_{i \in I_1 \cup I_2}$ where $P'_i = P'_{1_i} \parallel P_2$ if $i \in I_1$ and $P'_i = P_1 \parallel P'_{2_i}$ if $i \in I_2$. By the induction hypothesis $P_1 \succeq_{\parallel} Q$ and $P_1 \rightarrow \{P'_i\}_{i \in I_1}$ imply $\exists J', \{Q_j\}_{j \in J'}$ s.t. $Q \rightarrow^* \{Q_j\}_{j \in J'}$, $J' \subseteq I_1$ and $P_j \succeq_{\parallel} Q_j$, $\forall j \in J'$. We take $J = J'$ and hence we can deduce $P \rightarrow \{P'_i\}_{i \in I_1 \cup I_2}$, $Q \rightarrow^* \{Q_j\}_{j \in J}$. Finally we have that $\forall j \in J$.

$$\frac{P'_{1_j} \succeq_{\parallel} Q_j}{P'_{1_j} \parallel P_2 \succeq_{\parallel} Q}$$

- When $P = P_1 \mid P_2$ with $P_1 \mid P_2 \succeq_{\parallel} Q$. Then by the rule:

$$\frac{P_1 \rightarrow P'_1}{P_1 \mid P_2 \rightarrow P'_1 \mid P_2} [\rightarrow \mid]$$

we have $P_1 \mid P_2 \rightarrow \{P'_{1_i}\}_{i \in I_1} \mid P_2$ and $P_1 \mid P_2 \rightarrow P_1 \mid \{P'_{2_i}\}_{i \in I_2}$ for some I_1, I_2 . Hence we have that $P_1 \mid P_2 \rightarrow \{P'_i\}_{i \in I_1 \cup I_2}$ where $P'_i = P'_{1_i} \mid P_2$ if $i \in I_1$ and $P'_i = P_1 \mid P'_{2_i}$ if $i \in I_2$. By the induction hypothesis $P_1 \mid P_2 \succeq_{\parallel} Q$ and $P_1 \rightarrow \{P'_i\}_{i \in I_1}$ imply $\exists J'_1, \{Q_j\}_{j \in J'_1}$ s.t. $Q \rightarrow^* \{Q_j\}_{j \in J'_1}$, $J'_1 \subseteq I_1$ and $P'_{1_j} \succeq_{\parallel} Q_j$, $\forall j \in J'_1$. Similarly we have that $P_2 \rightarrow \{P'_{2_i}\}_{i \in I_2}$ imply $\exists J'_2, \{Q_j\}_{j \in J'_2}$ s.t. $Q \rightarrow^* \{Q_j\}_{j \in J'_2}$, $J'_2 \subseteq I_2$ and $P_{2_j} \succeq_{\parallel} Q_j$, $\forall j \in J'_2$. We take $J \in J = J'_1 \cup J'_2$ and hence we can deduce $P \rightarrow \{P'_i\}_{i \in I_1 \cup I_2}$, $Q \rightarrow^* \{Q_j\}_{j \in J}$. Finally we have that $\forall j \in J$ $P_j \succeq_{\parallel} Q_j$.

- When $P = (\mathbf{v}x)P_1$ with $(\mathbf{v}x)P_1 \succeq_{\parallel} Q$. Then by the rule:

$$\frac{P_1 \rightarrow P'}{(\mathbf{v}x)P_1 \rightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)P'} [\rightarrow \mathbf{v}]$$

we have $(\mathbf{v}x)P_1 \rightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)\{P'_i\}_{i \in I}$ for some I . By the induction hypothesis $(\mathbf{v}x)P_1 \succeq_{\parallel} Q$ and $(\mathbf{v}x)P_1 \rightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)\{P'_i\}_{i \in I}$ imply $\exists J', \{Q_j\}_{j \in J'}$ s.t. $Q \rightarrow^* \{Q_j\}_{j \in J'}$, $J' \subseteq I$ and $P'_j \succeq_{\parallel} Q_j$, $\forall j \in J'$. We take $J = J'$ and hence we can deduce $P \rightarrow \{P'_i\}_{i \in I}$, $Q \rightarrow^* \{Q_j\}_{j \in J}$. Finally we have that $\forall j \in J$

$$\frac{P'_j \succeq_{\parallel} Q_j}{(\mathbf{v}x)P'_j \succeq_{\parallel} (\mathbf{v}x)Q_j}$$

□

Lemma C.2.1 *Let N be a well-formed closed term. If $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^* Q$, then there exist N' and $\{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$ such that (i) $N \rightarrow^* N'$ and (ii) $Q \rightarrow^* \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$ where for each $j \in I$, $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\parallel} Q_j$.*

Proof: By induction on the structure of N and then induction on the number of reductions of $\llbracket N \rrbracket \rightarrow^* Q$.

1. **Base case:** $N = x$, $N = x[j]$, $N = \text{fail}^0$ and $N = \lambda x.(M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])$.

No reductions can take place, and the result follows trivially. Take $I = \{a\}$,

$$Q = \llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^0 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u = Q_a \text{ and } x \rightarrow^0 x = N'.$$

2. $N = M'(C * U)$.

Then, $\llbracket M'(C * U) \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].(\llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x))$, and we are able to perform the reductions from $\llbracket M'(C * U) \rrbracket_u$.

We now proceed by induction on k , with $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^k Q$. There are two main cases:

(a) When $k = 0$ the thesis follows easily:

We have $i = \{a\}$, $Q = \llbracket M'(C * U) \rrbracket_u \xrightarrow{0} \llbracket M'(C * U) \rrbracket_u = Q_a$ and $M'(C * U) \xrightarrow{0} M'(C * U) = N'$.

(b) The interesting case is when $k \geq 1$.

Then, for some process R and n, m such that $k = n + m$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) \\ &\xrightarrow{m} (\mathbf{v}v)(R \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) \xrightarrow{n} Q \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the first $m \geq 0$ reduction steps are internal to $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v$; type preservation in π^+ ensures that, if they occur, these reductions do not discard the possibility of synchronizing with $\bar{v}.\text{some}$. Then, the first of the $n \geq 0$ reduction steps towards Q is a synchronization between R and $v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}$.

We consider two sub-cases, depending on the values of m and n :

(b.1) Case $m = 0$ and $n \geq 1$:

Then $R = \llbracket M \rrbracket_v$ as $\llbracket M \rrbracket_v \xrightarrow{0} \llbracket M \rrbracket_v$. Notice that there are two possibilities of having an unguarded:

i. $M' = (\lambda x.(M''[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])) \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^1 \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^1 \rrbracket$ ($p, q \geq 0$)

$$\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v = \llbracket (\lambda x.(M''[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])) \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^1 \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_v$$

For simplicity we shall denote

$$\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v = (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})(\llbracket \lambda x.(M''[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \rrbracket_v \mid Q'')$$

where $\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_p$, $\tilde{z} = z_1^1, \dots, z_q^1$ and we continue the evaluation as:

$$\begin{aligned} &= (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})(\llbracket \lambda x.(M''[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \rrbracket_v \mid Q'') \\ &= (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})(\bar{v}.\text{some}; v(x); \bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x(); \llbracket M''[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \mid Q'') \end{aligned}$$

With this shape for M , we then have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket (M' B) \rrbracket_u \\ &= (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v \mid v.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) \\ &\xrightarrow{} (\mathbf{v}v)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})(v(x); \bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M''[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \mid Q'') \mid \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) &= Q_1 \\ &\xrightarrow{} (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}v)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M''[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_v \mid Q'') \mid [v \leftrightarrow u] \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x) &= Q_2 \\ &\xrightarrow{} (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M''[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid Q'') \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x &= Q_3 \end{aligned}$$

We also have that

$$\begin{aligned} N &= (\lambda x.(M''[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])) \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^1 \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^1 \rrbracket (C * U) \\ &\equiv_\lambda (\lambda x.(M''[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x])(C * U)) \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^1 \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^1 \rrbracket \\ &\xrightarrow{} M''[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle (C * U)/x \rangle \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^1 \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^1 \rrbracket = M \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M''[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle (C * U)/x \rangle\rangle \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^1 \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})(\bar{x}.\mathbf{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M''[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u | Q'') | \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \end{aligned}$$

We consider different possibilities for $n \geq 1$; in all the cases, the result follows.

When $n = 1$:

We have $I = \{a\}$, $Q = Q_1$, $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^1 Q_1$. We also have that

- $Q_1 \rightarrow^2 Q_3 = Q_a$,
- $N \rightarrow^1 M''[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle (C * U)/x \rangle\rangle \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^1 \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = N'$
- and $\llbracket M''[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle\langle (C * U)/x \rangle\rangle \langle C_1/\tilde{y}_1 \rangle \cdots \langle C_p/\tilde{y}_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^1 \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = Q_3$.

When $n = 2, 3$: the analysis is similar.

When $n \geq 4$:

We have $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^3 Q_3 \rightarrow^* Q$. We also know that $N \rightarrow M$, $Q_3 = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u$. By the IH, there exist $\{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$, N' such that $Q \rightarrow^* \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$, $M \rightarrow^* N'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\dagger} Q_i \quad \forall i \in I$. Finally, $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^3 Q_3 \rightarrow^l Q \rightarrow^l Q_i$ and $N \rightarrow M \rightarrow^* N'$.

ii. $M' = \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{z}}$.

Then, $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v = \llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{z}} \rrbracket_v = \bar{v}.\mathbf{none} | \tilde{z}.\mathbf{none}$. With this shape for M , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket (M' (C * U)) \rrbracket_u \\ &= (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v | v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] | \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}v)(\bar{v}.\mathbf{none} | \tilde{z}.\mathbf{none} | v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] | \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) \\ &\rightarrow \bar{u}.\mathbf{none} | \tilde{z}.\mathbf{none} | \overline{\text{fv}(C)}.\mathbf{none} \end{aligned}$$

We also have that $N = \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x}} C * U \rightarrow \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x} \cup \text{fv}(C)} = N'$. Furthermore,

$$\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u = \llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x} \cup \text{fv}(C)} \rrbracket_u = \llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x} \cup \text{fv}(C)} \rrbracket_u = \bar{u}.\mathbf{none} | \tilde{z}.\mathbf{none} | \overline{\text{fv}(C)}.\mathbf{none}.$$

(b.2) Case $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$:

We distinguish two cases:

i. When $n = 0$:

Then, $(\mathbf{v}v)(R | v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] | \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) = Q$ and $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^m R$ where $m \geq 1$. Then by the IH there exist $\{R'_i\}_{i \in I}$ and M'' such that $R \rightarrow^* \{R'_i\}_{i \in I}$, $M' \rightarrow^* M''$, and $\llbracket M'' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\dagger} R_i \quad \forall i \in I$. Hence we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}v)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v | v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] | \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) \\ &\rightarrow^m (\mathbf{v}v)(R | v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] | \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x)) = Q \end{aligned}$$

We also know that

$$Q \rightarrow^* \{(\mathbf{v}v)(R'_i | v.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{v}[x].([v \leftrightarrow u] | \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x))\}_{i \in I} = \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$$

and so the λ_C term can reduce as follows: $N = (M' (C * U)) \rightarrow^* M'' (C * U) = N'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\dagger} Q_i \quad \forall i \in I$ via the \succeq_{\dagger} rules.

ii. When $n \geq 1$:

Then R has an occurrence of an unguarded $\bar{v}.\mathbf{some}$ or $\bar{v}.\mathbf{none}$, hence it is of the form

$$\llbracket (\lambda x.(M''[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]) \langle N_1/y_1 \rangle \cdots \langle N_p/y_p \rangle \llbracket U_1/z_1^1 \rrbracket \cdots \llbracket U_q/z_q^1 \rrbracket) \rrbracket_v \text{ or } \llbracket \mathbf{fail}^{\tilde{x}} \rrbracket_v.$$

This concludes the analysis for the case $N = (M' (C * U))$.

3. $N = M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x]$. The sharing variable x is not free and the result follows by vacuity.
4. $N = M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle C * U / x \rangle \rangle$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle C * U / x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\mathbf{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider three cases.

- (a) When $\text{size}(\tilde{x}) = \text{size}(C)$. Then let us consider the shape of the bag C .

- i. When $C = 1$.

We have the following

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\mathbf{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M'[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket 1 * U \rrbracket_x \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\mathbf{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M'[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid x.\mathbf{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}[x^\ell]. \\ &\quad (\llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \bar{x}[x^1].(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \bar{x}[])) \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M'[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \bar{x}[x^\ell].(\llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \bar{x}[x^1].(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \bar{x}[])) = Q_1 \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x, x^\ell)(x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M'[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid \bar{x}[x^1].(!x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \bar{x}[])) = Q_2 \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x, x^\ell, x^1)(x()); \llbracket M'[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \mid \bar{x}[] = Q_3 \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^\ell, x^1)(\llbracket M'[\leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = Q_4 \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x^\ell, x^1)(\bar{x}^\ell.\mathbf{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_i].(y_i.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_i()); \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\mathbf{none}) \mid \\ &\quad x^\ell.\mathbf{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell(y_n); (\bar{y}_n.\mathbf{some}; \bar{y}_n[] \mid x^\ell.\mathbf{some}_\emptyset; \bar{x}^\ell.\mathbf{none}) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^\ell, x^1)(\bar{x}^\ell[y_i].(y_i.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_i()); \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\mathbf{none}) \mid \\ &\quad x^\ell(y_n); (\bar{y}_n.\mathbf{some}; \bar{y}_n[] \mid x^\ell.\mathbf{some}_\emptyset; \bar{x}^\ell.\mathbf{none}) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} = Q_5 \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^\ell, x^1, y_i)(y_i.\mathbf{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_i()); \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\mathbf{none} \mid \bar{y}_i.\mathbf{some}; \bar{y}_i[] \\ &\quad \mid x^\ell.\mathbf{some}_\emptyset; \bar{x}^\ell.\mathbf{none} \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} = Q_6 \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^\ell, x^1, y_i)(y_i()); \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\mathbf{none} \mid \bar{y}_i[] \mid x^\ell.\mathbf{some}_\emptyset; \bar{x}^\ell.\mathbf{none} \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} = Q_7 \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^\ell, x^1)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\mathbf{none} \mid x^\ell.\mathbf{some}_\emptyset; \bar{x}^\ell.\mathbf{none} \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = Q_8 \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = \llbracket M' \llbracket U / x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = Q_9 \end{aligned}$$

Notice how Q_8 has a choice however the x^ℓ name can be closed at any time so for simplicity we only perform communication across this name once all other names have completed their reductions.

Now we proceed by induction on the number of reductions $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \longrightarrow^k Q$.

- A. When $k = 0$, the result follows trivially. Just take $I = \{a\}$, $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = Q = Q_a$.
- B. When $k = 1$.
We have $Q = Q_1$, $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \longrightarrow^1 Q_1$. Let us take $I = a$, we also have that $Q_1 \longrightarrow^8 Q_9 = Q_a$, $N \longrightarrow M' \llbracket U / x^1 \rrbracket = M$ and $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\perp} Q_9$
- C. When $2 \leq k \leq 8$.
Proceeds similarly to the previous case

D. When $k \geq 9$.

We have $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \xrightarrow{9} Q_9 \xrightarrow{l} Q$, for $l \geq 1$. Since $Q_9 = \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u$ we apply the induction hypothesis we have that there $\exists \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}, N'$ s.t. $Q \xrightarrow{*} \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}, M' \xrightarrow{*} N'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\perp} Q_i \quad \forall i \in I$. Then, $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \xrightarrow{9} Q_9 \xrightarrow{l} Q \xrightarrow{*} \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$ and by the contextual reduction rule it follows that $N = (M'[\leftarrow x]) \langle \langle 1/x \rangle \rangle \xrightarrow{*} N'$ and the case holds.

ii. When $C = \lambda N_1 \int \dots \int \lambda N_l \int$, for $l \geq 1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \langle \langle C * U/x \rangle \rangle \rrbracket_u \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \\
 &\xrightarrow{4} (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\llbracket M'[\tilde{x} \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell}) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(x^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_1]; (y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1()); \mathbf{0} \\
 &\quad \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus \tilde{x}}; \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \tilde{x}} x(x_{i_1}); \dots \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_l]; (y_l.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_l()); \mathbf{0} \\
 &\quad \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus (\tilde{x} \setminus (x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{l-1}}))}; \prod_{x_{i_l} \in \tilde{x}} x(x_{i_l}); \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_{l+1}]; (y_{l+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_{l+1}()); \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none})) \dots) \\
 &\quad \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; x(y_1); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[z_1]; \\
 &\quad (z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \bar{y}_1.\text{none} \mid \\
 &\quad \dots x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; x(y_l); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_l, \text{fv}(M_l)}; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[z_l]; \\
 &\quad (z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \bar{y}_l.\text{none} \mid \\
 &\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y_{l+1}); (\bar{y}_{l+1}.\text{some}; \bar{y}_{l+1} \mid \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none})) \dots) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &\xrightarrow{6l} (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)((\mathbf{v}z_1)(\dots (\mathbf{v}z_l)(x^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_{l+1}].(y_{l+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; \\
 &\quad y_{l+1}()); \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_l/x_{i_l}\} \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none}) \\
 &\quad \mid z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_{j_l})}; \llbracket M_{j_l} \rrbracket_{z_l}) \dots \mid z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_{j_1})}; \llbracket M_{j_1} \rrbracket_{z_1}) \mid \\
 &\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x^\ell(y_{l+1}).(\bar{y}_{l+1}.\text{some}; \bar{y}_{l+1} \mid \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none})) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &\xrightarrow{5} (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}z_1)(x_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_{j_1})}; \llbracket M_{j_1} \rrbracket_{x_1} \mid \dots \\
 &\quad (\mathbf{v}z_l)(x_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_{j_l})}; \llbracket M_{j_l} \rrbracket_{x_l} \mid \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_l/x_{i_l}\} \dots) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i})
 \end{aligned}$$

The proof follows by induction on the number of reductions $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \xrightarrow{k} Q$.

A. When $k = 0$, the result follows trivially. Just take $I = \{a\}$, $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = Q = Q_a$.

B. When $1 \leq k \leq 6l + 9$.

Let $I = \{a\}$, Q_k be such that $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \xrightarrow{k} Q_k$. We also have that $Q_k \xrightarrow{6l+9-k} Q_{6l+9} = Q_a$, $N \xrightarrow{*} M' \langle \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_l \rangle \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket = N'$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}x^1) \left((\mathbf{v}z_1) (z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \right. \\
&\quad \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_l) (z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \\
&\quad \mid \parallel_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_l\}} \cdots \parallel_{x_{i_l} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_l \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{l-1}}\}} \\
&\quad \left. \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_l/x_{i_l}\} \cdots \right) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \Big) \\
&\succeq_{\#} (\mathbf{v}x^1) \left((\mathbf{v}z_1) (z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \right. \\
&\quad \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_l) (z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \\
&\quad \mid \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_l/x_{i_l}\} \cdots \Big) \\
&\quad \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \Big) = Q_{6l+9}
\end{aligned}$$

C. When $k > 6l + 9$.

Then, $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \xrightarrow{6l+9} Q_{6l+9} \xrightarrow{n} Q$ for $n \geq 1$. Also,

$N \xrightarrow{1} M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$ and

$\llbracket M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\#} Q_{6l+9}$.

$\exists \{P_j\}_{j \in J}, N'$, s.t. $M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \xrightarrow{*} N'$,
 $\llbracket M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u \xrightarrow{n} P \xrightarrow{*} \{P_j\}_{j \in J}$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\#} P_j \quad \forall j \in J$.

We also have by Prop.C.2.2 that as $\llbracket M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\#} Q_{6l+9}$ and $\llbracket M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_l \rangle \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u \xrightarrow{*} \{Q_j\}_{j \in J}$ implies $\exists \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$ s.t. $Q_{6l+9} \xrightarrow{*} Q_{i \in I}$, $I \subset J$ and $P_i \succeq_{\#} Q_i$, $\forall i \in I$

(b) When $\text{size}(\tilde{x}) > \text{size}(C)$.

Then we have $N = M'[x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle$ with $C = \lambda M_1 \int \cdots \int M_l \int \quad k > l$,
 $N \xrightarrow{\text{fail}} \tilde{z} = M$ and $\tilde{z} = (\text{fv}(M') \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}) \cup \text{fv}(C)$. On the one hand, we have:
Hence $k = l + m$ for some $m \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M' [x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \langle C * U/x \rangle \rrbracket_u \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}.\text{some}; x(x^\ell); x(x^1); x()); \llbracket M' [x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C * U \rrbracket_x \\
 &\rightarrow^4 (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\llbracket M' [x_1, \dots, x_k \leftarrow x] \rrbracket_u \mid \llbracket C \rrbracket_{x^\ell} \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i})) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)(\bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_1]; (y_1.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_1()); \mathbf{0} \\
 &\quad \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus \bar{x}}; \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \bar{x}} x(x_{i_1}); \dots \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_k]; (y_k.\text{some}_\emptyset; y_k()); \mathbf{0} \\
 &\quad \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; x^\ell.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M') \setminus \bar{x}}; \prod_{x_{i_k} \in (\bar{x} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}})} x(x_{i_k}); \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_{k+1}]; (y_{k+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_{k+1}()); \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none})) \dots) \\
 &\quad \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C)}; x(y_1); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_1, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[z_1]; \\
 &\quad (z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \bar{y}_1.\text{none} \mid \\
 &\quad \dots x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; x(y_l); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_l, \text{fv}(C)}; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[z_l]; \dots \\
 &\quad (z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \bar{y}_l.\text{none} \mid \\
 &\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y_{l+1}); (\bar{y}_{l+1}.\text{some}; \bar{y}_{l+1}[] \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none})) \dots)) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
 &\rightarrow^{6k} (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}x^\ell)((\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \mid \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[y_{k+1}]; (y_{k+1}.\text{some}_{u, \text{fv}(M')}; y_{k+1}()); \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none})) \dots) \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(C) \setminus (M_1, \dots, M_k)}; x(y_{k+1}); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_{k+1}, \text{fv}(C) \setminus (M_1, \dots, M_k)}; \\
 &\quad \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[z_{k+1}]; (z_{k+1}.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_{k+1})}; \llbracket M_{k+1} \rrbracket_{z_{k+1}} \mid \bar{y}_1.\text{none} \mid \\
 &\quad \dots x^\ell.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; x(y_l); x^\ell.\text{some}_{y_l, \text{fv}(M_l)}; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{some}; \bar{x}^\ell[z_l]; \dots \\
 &\quad (z_l.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_l)}; \llbracket M_l \rrbracket_{z_l} \mid \bar{y}_l.\text{none} \mid \\
 &\quad x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; x(y_{l+1}); (\bar{y}_{l+1}.\text{some}; \bar{y}_{l+1}[] \mid x^\ell.\text{some}_\emptyset; \bar{x}^\ell.\text{none})) \dots)) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
 &\rightarrow^6 (\mathbf{v}x^1)((\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \mid \\
 &\quad \bar{u}.\text{none} \mid (\text{fv}(M') \setminus \bar{x}).\text{none} \mid \bar{z}_1.\text{none} \mid \dots \mid \bar{z}_k.\text{none} \mid \\
 &\quad (\text{fv}(C) \setminus (M_1, \dots, M_k)).\text{none}) \dots) \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} \\
 &\rightarrow^k \bar{u}.\text{none} \mid (\text{fv}(M') \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}).\text{none} \mid \text{fv}(C).\text{none} \\
 &= \llbracket \text{fail}^{\bar{z}} \rrbracket_u = Q_{7l+10}
 \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof is by induction on the number of reductions $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^j Q$.

- i. When $j = 0$, the result follows trivially. Just take $I = \{a\}$ $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}'$ and $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = Q = Q_a$.
- ii. When $1 \leq j \leq 7k + 10$.
 Let $I = \{a\}$ and Q_j be such that $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^j Q_j$. By the steps above one has
 $Q_j \rightarrow^{7k+10-j} Q_{7k+10} = Q_a$,
 $N \rightarrow^1 \text{fail}^{\bar{z}} = N'$; and $\llbracket \text{fail}^{\bar{z}} \rrbracket_u = Q_{7k+10}$.

iii. When $j > 7k + 10$.

In this case, we have $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \xrightarrow{7k+10} Q_{7k+10} \xrightarrow{n} Q$, for $n \geq 1$. We also know that $N \xrightarrow{1} \text{fail}^{\tilde{z}}$. However no further reductions can be performed.

(c) When $\text{size}(\tilde{x}) < \text{size}(C)$, the proof proceeds similarly to the previous case.

5. $N = M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle$.

In this case we let $C = \lambda M_1 \int \dots \lambda M_k \int$,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(\\ &\quad z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \\ &\quad \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \\ &\xrightarrow{m} (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} R \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \\ &\xrightarrow{n} Q \end{aligned}$$

for some process R . Where \xrightarrow{n} is a reduction that initially synchronizes with $x_i.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_{j_i})}$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, when $n \geq 1$, $n + m = k \geq 1$. Type preservation in sp^+ ensures reducing $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v \xrightarrow{m}$ does not consume possible synchronizations with $\bar{x}_i.\text{some}$, if they occur. Let us consider the the possible sizes of both m and n .

(a) For $m = 0$ and $n \geq 1$.

We have that $R = \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u$ as $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \xrightarrow{0} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u$.

Notice that there are two possibilities of having an unguarded $\bar{x}_i.\text{some}$ or $\bar{x}_i.\text{none}$ without internal reductions:

i. $M' = \text{fail}^{x_i, \tilde{y}}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \llbracket \text{fail}^{x_i, \tilde{y}} \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \\ &\quad \bar{u}.\text{none} \mid \bar{x}_i.\text{none} \mid \tilde{y}.\text{none} \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \end{aligned}$$

by type preservation we have that $\tilde{y} = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \setminus x_i, \tilde{y}'$ for some \tilde{y}'

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
 &\quad \mid \prod_{x_i \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \bar{u}.\text{none} \mid \bar{y}.\text{none} \\
 &\quad \mid \overline{\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}.\text{none}} \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \cdots) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
 &\quad \mid \prod_{x_i \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \bar{u}.\text{none} \mid \bar{y}.\text{none} \\
 &\quad \mid \overline{\{z_1, \dots, z_k\}.\text{none}} \cdots) \\
 &\longrightarrow^k \bar{u}.\text{none} \mid \bar{y}.\text{none} \mid \overline{\text{fv}(C)}.\text{none}
 \end{aligned}$$

Notice that no further reductions can be performed. Thus we take $I = \{a\}$ and,

$$\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \longrightarrow \bar{u}.\text{none} \mid \bar{y}.\text{none} \mid \overline{\text{fv}(C)}.\text{none} = Q_a.$$

We also have that $N \longrightarrow \text{fail}^{\bar{y} \cup \text{fv}(C)} = N'$ and $\llbracket \text{fail}^{\bar{y} \cup \text{fv}(C)} \rrbracket_u = Q_a$.

ii. $\text{head}(M') = x_i$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

Then we have the following

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
 &\quad \mid \prod_{x_i \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \cdots) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
 &\quad \mid \prod_{x_i \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} (\mathbf{v}\bar{y})(\llbracket x_i \rrbracket_j \mid P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \cdots) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
 &\quad \mid \prod_{x_i \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \\
 &\quad (\mathbf{v}\bar{y})(\bar{x}_i.\text{some}; [x_i \leftrightarrow j] \mid P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \cdots)
 \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider an arbitrary sum where $x_{i_k} = x_i$, other cases follow similarly.

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
 &\quad \mid \prod_{x_i \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \cdots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \\
 &\quad (\mathbf{v}\bar{y})(\bar{x}_i.\text{some}; [x_i \leftrightarrow j] \mid P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \cdots) \\
 &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(\llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\
 &\quad \mid (\mathbf{v}\bar{y})([x_k \leftrightarrow j] \mid P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_{k-1}/x_{i_{k-1}}\} \cdots) = Q_1 \\
 &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \cdots (\mathbf{v}z_{k-1})(z_{k-1}.\text{some}_{\text{fv}(M_{k-1})}; \llbracket M_{k-1} \rrbracket_{z_{k-1}} \\
 &\quad \mid (\mathbf{v}\bar{y})(\llbracket M_k \rrbracket_j \mid P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \cdots \{z_{k-1}/x_{i_{k-1}}\} \cdots) = Q_2
 \end{aligned}$$

In addition, $N = M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle \longrightarrow M' \langle \{C_i/x_k\} \langle (C \setminus C_i)/x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \rangle \rangle = M$.

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M' \{C_i/x_k\} \langle (C \setminus C_i)/x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \rangle \rrbracket_u \\ &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{ifv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_{k-1})(z_{k-1}.\text{some}_{\text{ifv}(M_{k-1})}; \llbracket M_{k-1} \rrbracket_{z_{k-1}} \mid \\ &\quad \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_{k-1}} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-2}}\}} \\ &\quad (\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket M_k \rrbracket_j \mid P) \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_{k-1}/x_{i_{k-1}}\} \dots) \\ &\succeq_{\perp} Q_2. \end{aligned}$$

A. When $n = 1$:

Then, $I = \{a\}$, $Q = Q_1$ and $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^1 Q_1$. Also, $Q_1 \rightarrow^1 Q_2 = Q_a$, $N \rightarrow^1 M' \{C_i/x_k\} \langle (C \setminus C_i)/x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \rangle = N'$ and $\llbracket M' \{C_i/x_k\} \langle (C \setminus C_i)/x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \rangle \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\perp} Q_a$.

B. When $n = 2$:

Then, $I = \{a\}$, $Q = Q_2$ and $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^2 Q_2$. Also, $Q_2 \rightarrow^0 Q_2 = Q_a$, $N \rightarrow^1 M' \{C_i/x_k\} \langle (C \setminus C_i)/x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \rangle = N'$ and $\llbracket M' \{C_i/x_k\} \langle (C \setminus C_i)/x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \rangle \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\perp} Q_a$.

C. When $n > 2$:

Then $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^2 Q_2 \rightarrow^l Q$, for $l \geq 1$. Also, $N \rightarrow^1 M$, $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\perp} Q_2$. $\exists \{P_j\}_{j \in J}, N'$, s.t. $M \rightarrow^* N'$, $\llbracket M \rrbracket \rightarrow^l P \rightarrow^* \{P_j\}_{j \in J}$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\perp} P_j \ \forall j \in J$. We also have by Prop.C.2.2 that as $\llbracket M \rrbracket \succeq_{\perp} Q_2$ and $\llbracket M \rrbracket \rightarrow^* \{Q_j\}_{j \in J}$ implies $\exists \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$ s.t. $Q_2 \rightarrow^* \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$, $I \text{ subseteq } J$ and $P_i \succeq_{\perp} Q_i$, $\forall i \in I$

(b) For $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$.

i. When $n = 0$.

Then $(\mathbf{v}x)(R \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{ifv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x) = Q$ and $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^m R$ where $m \geq 1$. By the IH $\exists \{R_i\}_{i \in I}, M''$, s.t. $M' \rightarrow^* M''$, $R \rightarrow^* \{R_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\llbracket M'' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\perp} R_i \ \forall i \in I$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{ifv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{ifv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \\ &\rightarrow^m (\mathbf{v}z_1)(z_1.\text{some}_{\text{ifv}(M_1)}; \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket_{z_1} \mid \dots (\mathbf{v}z_k)(z_k.\text{some}_{\text{ifv}(M_k)}; \llbracket M_k \rrbracket_{z_k} \\ &\quad \mid \prod_{x_{i_1} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}} \dots \prod_{x_{i_k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k \setminus x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\}} R \{z_1/x_{i_1}\} \dots \{z_k/x_{i_k}\} \dots) \\ &\rightarrow^n Q \end{aligned}$$

Also, $Q \rightarrow^* \{(\mathbf{v}x)(R_i \mid x.\text{some}_{\text{ifv}(N')}; \llbracket N' \rrbracket_x)\}_{i \in I} = Q_i$, and the term can reduce as follows:

$$N = M' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle \rightarrow^* M'' \langle C/x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle = N' \text{ and } \llbracket N' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\perp} Q_i \ \forall i \in I$$

ii. When $n \geq 1$. Then R has an occurrence of an unguarded $\bar{x}.\text{some}$ or $\bar{x}.\text{none}$, this case follows by IH and applying Proposition C.2.2.

6. $N = M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket$.

In this case, $\llbracket M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i})$. Then,

$$\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \rightarrow^m (\mathbf{v}x^1)(R \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \rightarrow^n Q.$$

for some process R . Where \rightarrow^n is a reduction initially synchronises with $!x^!(x_i)$ when $n \geq 1$, $n + m = k \geq 1$. Type preservation in $\text{s}\pi^+$ ensures reducing $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_v \rightarrow^m$ doesn't consume possible synchronisations with $!x^!(x_i)$ if they occur. Let us consider the the possible sizes of both m and n .

(a) For $m = 0$ and $n \geq 1$.

In this case, $R = \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u$ as $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^0 \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u$.

Notice that the only possibility of having an unguarded $?x^{\bar{}}[x_i]$ without internal reductions is when $\text{head}(M') = x[\text{ind}]$. By the diamond property we will be reducing each non-deterministic choice of a process simultaneously. Then we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket N \rrbracket_u &= (\mathbf{v}x^!)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket x[\text{ind}] \rrbracket_j | P) | !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^!)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(?x^{\bar{}}[x_i]; \bar{x}_i.\text{ind}; [x_i \leftrightarrow j] | P) | !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &\rightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^!)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\mathbf{v}x_i)(\bar{x}_i.\text{ind}; [x_i \leftrightarrow j] | \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) | P) | !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} = Q_1 \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^!)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\mathbf{v}x_i)(\bar{x}_i.\text{ind}; [x_i \leftrightarrow j] | x_i.\text{case}(\text{ind}.\llbracket U_{\text{ind}} \rrbracket_{x_i})) | P) \\
 &\quad | !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &\rightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^!)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\mathbf{v}x_i)([x_i \leftrightarrow j] | \llbracket U_{\text{ind}} \rrbracket_{x_i}) | P) | !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i} = Q_2 \\
 &\rightarrow (\mathbf{v}x^!)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket U_{\text{ind}} \rrbracket_j | P) | !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = Q_3
 \end{aligned}$$

We consider the two cases of the form of U_{ind} and show that the choice of U_{ind} is inconsequential

- When $U_{\text{ind}} = \llbracket N \rrbracket_j^!$:

In this case, $N = M' \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket \rightarrow M' \{\llbracket N/x^! \rrbracket\} \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket = M$. and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket M \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M' \{\llbracket N/x^! \rrbracket\} \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket \rrbracket_u \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^!)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket \llbracket N \rrbracket_j^! \rrbracket | P) | !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = Q_3
 \end{aligned}$$

- When $U_i = \mathbf{1}^!$:

In this case, $N = M' \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket \rightarrow M' \{\text{fail}^0/x^!\} \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket = M$.

Notice that $\llbracket \mathbf{1}^! \rrbracket_j = \bar{j}.\text{none}$ and that $\llbracket \text{fail}^0 \rrbracket_j = \bar{j}.\text{none}$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket M \rrbracket_u &= \llbracket M' \{\text{fail}^0/x^!\} \llbracket U/x^! \rrbracket \rrbracket_u \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^!)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket \text{fail}^0 \rrbracket_j | P) | !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \\
 &= (\mathbf{v}x^!)((\mathbf{v}\tilde{y})(\llbracket \mathbf{1}^! \rrbracket_j | P) | !x^!(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = Q_3
 \end{aligned}$$

Both choices give an M that are equivalent to Q_3 .

i. When $n \leq 2$.

In this case, $Q = Q_n$ and $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^n Q_n$.

Also, $Q_n \rightarrow^{3-n} Q_3 = Q'$, $N \rightarrow^1 M = N'$ and $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u = Q_2$.

ii. When $n \geq 3$.

We have $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^3 Q_3 \rightarrow^l Q$ for $l \geq 0$. We also know that $N \rightarrow M$, $Q_3 = \llbracket M \rrbracket_u$. By the IH, there exist $\{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$, N' such that $Q \rightarrow^* \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$, $M \rightarrow^* N'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\perp} Q_i \quad \forall i \in I$. Finally, $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \rightarrow^3 Q_3 \rightarrow^l Q \rightarrow \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $N \rightarrow M \rightarrow^* N'$.

(b) For $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$.

(b.1) Case $n = 0$.

Then $(\mathbf{v}x^1)(R \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = Q$ and $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \longrightarrow^m R$ where $m \geq 1$. Then by the IH there exist $\{R'_i\}_{i \in I}$ and M'' such that $R \longrightarrow^* \{R'_i\}_{i \in I}$, $M' \longrightarrow^* M''$, and $\llbracket M'' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\#} R_i \quad \forall i \in I$. Hence we have that

$$\llbracket N \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}x^1)(\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) \longrightarrow^m (\mathbf{v}x^1)(R \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i}) = Q$$

We also know that

$$Q \longrightarrow^* \{(\mathbf{v}x^1)(R'_i \mid !x^1(x_i); \llbracket U \rrbracket_{x_i})\}_{i \in I} = \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$$

and so the λ_C term can reduce as follows: $N = M' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket \longrightarrow^* M'' \llbracket U/x^1 \rrbracket = N'$ and $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\#} Q_i \quad \forall i \in I$ via the $\succeq_{\#}$ rules

(b.2) Case $n \geq 1$.

Then R has an occurrence of an unguarded $?x^1[x_i]$, and the case follows by IH.

□

Theorem C.4 (Loose Weak Soundness (Under \longrightarrow)) *If $\llbracket N \rrbracket_u \longrightarrow^* Q$ for a well-formed closed λ_C -term N , then there exist N' and Q' such that (i) $N \longrightarrow^* N'$ and (ii) $Q \longrightarrow^* Q'$ with $\llbracket N' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\#} Q'$.*

Proof: Immediate from Lemma C.2.1.

□

C.8.3 Success Sensitivity

Theorem C.17 (Success Sensitivity (Under \longrightarrow)) *$M \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$ iff $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$ for well-formed closed terms M .*

Proof: We proceed with the proof in two parts.

1. Suppose that $M \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$. We will prove that $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$.

By Def. C.11, there exists M' such that $M \longrightarrow^* M'$ and $\text{head}(M') = \checkmark$. By completeness, if $M \longrightarrow^* M'$ then there exist Q, Q' such that $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \equiv Q \longrightarrow^* Q'$ and $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\#} Q'$.

We wish to show that there exists Q'' such that $Q' \longrightarrow^* Q''$ and Q'' has an unguarded occurrence of \checkmark .

By Proposition C.7.2 (1) we have that $\text{head}(M') = \checkmark \implies \llbracket M' \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}\tilde{x})(P \mid \checkmark)$. Finally $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u = (\mathbf{v}\tilde{x})(P \mid \checkmark) \succeq_{\#} Q'$ hence Q must be of the form $(\mathbf{v}\tilde{x})(P' \mid \checkmark)$ where $P \succeq_{\#} P'$. Hence Q reduces to a process that has an unguarded occurrence of \checkmark .

2. Suppose that $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$. We will prove that $M \Downarrow_{\checkmark}$.

By operational soundness we have that if $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \longrightarrow^* Q$ then there exist M' and $\{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$ such that: (i) $M \longrightarrow^* M'$ and (ii) $Q \longrightarrow^* \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$ with $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\#} Q_j$, for all $j \in I$.

Since $\llbracket M \rrbracket_u \longrightarrow^* P_1 \# \dots \# P_k$ ($:= Q$), and $P_j = P'_j \mid \checkmark$ and $Q \longrightarrow^* \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$ we must have that each Q_i is of the form $P'_{i_1} \# \dots \# P'_{i_k}$ with $P'_{i_j} = P'_{i_j} \mid \checkmark$. As $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u \succeq_{\#} Q_j$, for all $j \in I$ we have that $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u = (\#_{i \in I} Q_i) \# R$ for some R . Finally applying Proposition C.7.2 (2) we have that $\llbracket M' \rrbracket_u$ is itself a term with unguarded \checkmark , then M is itself headed with \checkmark .

□

C.9 Proof of Separation of Lazy and Eager Semantics

Definition C.13 Dual Prefix

Given prefixes α and β (Definition 4.2), we say α and β are duals, denoted $\alpha \bowtie \beta$, if and only if $\text{subj}\{\alpha\} \cap \text{subj}\{\beta\} \neq \emptyset$. \square

Lemma C.9.1 *Given $P \vdash \emptyset$, if $P \downarrow_\alpha$, then there exist P', β such that $P \longrightarrow^* P' \downarrow_\beta$ and $\alpha \bowtie \beta$.*

Proof: By well-typedness, there appears β in P with $\alpha \bowtie \beta$. However, we may have $P \not\downarrow_\beta$, because β is blocked by other prefixes. Hence, we need to find reductions from P such that we unblock β . However, the prefixes blocking β are connected to dual prefixes, that may be blocked themselves. The crux of this proof is thus to show that we can reduce P , such that we eventually unblock β .

The proof is by induction on the number of names that may block β (IH₁). Initially, this number corresponds to the total number of names appearing in P . Suppose β is blocked by n prefixes γ_i , where γ_n blocks β , and γ_1 is not blocked. We apply another layer of induction on n (IH₂).

In the inductive case, $n \geq 1$. The goal is to perform a reduction that synchronizes γ_1 with its dual, say $\bar{\gamma}_1$. The prefix $\bar{\gamma}_1$ may be blocked by a number of prefixes itself. However, the type system of $\text{s}\pi^+$ is based on CUT, so $\bar{\gamma}_1$ appears in parallel with the duals of $\gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n$ and α . We then may apply IH₁ to find $P \longrightarrow^* P_0 \downarrow_{\bar{\gamma}_1}$. We can then reduce P_0 by synchronizing between γ_1 and $\bar{\gamma}_1$: $P \longrightarrow^* P_0 \longrightarrow P_1$. In P_1 , β is blocked by one less prefix. Hence, by IH₂, $P \longrightarrow^* P_0 \longrightarrow P_1 \longrightarrow^* P' \downarrow_\beta$, proving the thesis.

In the base case, β is not blocked: $P \downarrow_\beta$. Let $P' := P$; trivially, $P \longrightarrow^* P' \downarrow_\beta$, proving the thesis. \square

Theorem C.5 *Take $R \equiv \mathbb{N}[\alpha_1; (P \uplus Q)] \vdash \emptyset$ and $S \equiv \mathbb{N}[\alpha_2; P \uplus \alpha_3; Q] \vdash \emptyset$, where $\alpha_1 \bowtie \alpha_2 \bowtie \alpha_3$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ require a continuation. Suppose that $P \not\sim_{\text{L}} Q$ and $P \not\sim_{\text{E}} Q$. Then (i) $R \sim_{\text{L}} S$ but (ii) $R \not\sim_{\text{E}} S$.*

Proof: For (i), we construct a relation \mathbb{B} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Id}^{\equiv} &:= \{(T, U) \mid T \equiv U\} \\ \mathbb{B}' &:= \{(T, U) \mid T \equiv \mathbb{M}[\beta_1; (V \uplus W)] \vdash \emptyset \text{ and} \\ &\quad U \equiv \mathbb{M}[\beta_2; V \uplus \beta_3; W] \vdash \emptyset \text{ and} \\ &\quad V \not\sim_{\text{L}} W \text{ and} \\ &\quad \beta_1 \bowtie \beta_2 \bowtie \beta_3 \text{ and} \\ &\quad \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 \text{ require a continuation}\} \\ \mathbb{B} &:= \text{Id}^{\equiv} \cup \mathbb{B}' \end{aligned}$$

We prove that \mathbb{B} is a strong ready-prefix bisimulation w.r.t. the lazy semantics by proving the three conditions of Definition C.3 for each $(T, U) \in \mathbb{B}$. We distinguish cases depending on whether $(T, U) \in \text{Id}^{\equiv}$ or $(T, U) \in \mathbb{B}'$.

- $(T, U) \in \text{Id}^{\equiv}$. The three conditions hold trivially.
- $(T, U) \in \mathbb{B}'$. Then $T \equiv \mathbb{M}[\beta_1; (V \uplus W)]$, $U \equiv \mathbb{M}[\beta_2; V \uplus \beta_3; W]$, $V \not\sim_{\text{L}} W$, and $\beta_1 \bowtie \beta_2 \bowtie \beta_3$. We prove each condition separately.

1. Suppose $T \rightsquigarrow T'$. Note that the hole in \mathbb{M} may appear inside a non-deterministic choice. We distinguish three cases: (a) the reduction is inside \mathbb{M} and maintains the branch with the hole, (b) the reduction is inside \mathbb{M} and discards the branch with the hole, or (c) the reduction synchronizes on β_1 .

- (a) The reduction is inside \mathbb{M} and maintains the branch with the hole. Then $T' \equiv \mathbb{M}'[\beta_1; (V \uplus W)]$ and $U \rightsquigarrow U' \equiv \mathbb{M}'[\beta_2; V \uplus \beta_3; W]$. Clearly, $(T', U') \in \mathbb{B}'$, so $(T', U') \in \mathbb{B}$.

- (b) The reduction is inside \mathbf{M} and discards the branch with the hole. Then there exists U' such that $U \rightsquigarrow U' \equiv T'$, so $(T', U') \in \text{Id}^{\equiv}$, and thus $(T', U') \in \mathbb{B}$.
 - (c) The reduction synchronizes on β_1 . Then $T' \equiv \mathbf{M}'[V \uplus W]$ and, since $\beta_1 \bowtie \beta_2 \bowtie \beta_3$, $U \rightsquigarrow U' \equiv \mathbf{M}'[V \uplus W]$. Then $T' \equiv U'$, so $(T', U') \in \text{Id}^{\equiv}$ and thus $(T', U') \in \mathbb{B}$.
2. Suppose $U \rightsquigarrow U'$. By reasoning analogous to above, $T \rightsquigarrow T'$ and $(T', U') \in \mathbb{B}$.
 3. Suppose $T \downarrow \gamma$. If the prefix γ appears in \mathbf{M} , then clearly also $U \downarrow \gamma$. Otherwise, $\gamma = \beta_1$. We have, e.g., $\gamma \bowtie \beta_2$ and clearly $U \downarrow \beta_2$. The other direction is analogous.

It remains to show that $(R, S) \in \mathbb{B}$ which trivially holds.

For (ii), toward a contradiction, assume there exists a strong ready-prefix bisimulation w.r.t. \longrightarrow \mathbb{B} where $(R, S) \in \mathbb{B}$.

By Lemma C.9.1, there exist R', β_1 such that $R \longrightarrow^* R' \downarrow \beta_1$, and $\alpha_1 \bowtie \beta_1$. By the well-typedness of R and S , β_1 must appear in \mathbf{N} , and the reduction $R \longrightarrow^* R'$ takes place in \mathbf{N} . Take $x \in \text{subj}\{\alpha_1\} \cap \text{subj}\{\beta_1\}$ (which is non-empty by Lemma C.9.1). Then $R' \equiv \mathbf{N}'_1[(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}'_2[\beta_1; R'_2] \mid \mathbf{N}'_3[\alpha_1; (P \uplus Q)])]$. Moreover, clearly $S \longrightarrow^* S'$ following the same reductions, resulting in $S' \equiv \mathbf{N}'_1[(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{N}'_2[\beta_1; R'_2] \mid \mathbf{N}'_3[\alpha_2; P \uplus \alpha_3; Q])]$; note that, since $\alpha_1 \bowtie \alpha_2 \bowtie \alpha_3$, also $\alpha_2 \bowtie \beta_1$ and $\alpha_3 \bowtie \beta_1$. At this point, we must have $(R', S') \in \mathbb{B}$.

The synchronization between β_1 and α_1 gives $R' \longrightarrow R'' \equiv \mathbf{N}''[P \uplus Q]$. Then by the bisimulation, there exists S'' such that $S' \longrightarrow S''$ with $(R'', S'') \in \mathbb{B}$. By clause 3 of the bisimulation, R'' and S'' must have the same ready-prefixes, so clearly the reduction $S' \longrightarrow S''$ results from a synchronization between β_1 and either of α_2 and α_3 . W.l.o.g., let us assume this was α_3 . Then $S'' \equiv \mathbf{N}''[Q]$. By assumption, $P \not\sim_E Q$ and thus $P \uplus Q \not\sim_E Q$, so clearly $R'' \not\sim_E S''$. Hence, \mathbb{B} cannot be a strong ready-prefix bisimulation w.r.t. \longrightarrow . In other words, $R \not\sim_E S$. \square

Appendix D

Appendix of Chapter 5

D.1 Proofs of Section 5.3

This section contains the proofs of the main results in Section 5.3.

Proposition D.1.1 *Suppose $\Gamma \vdash_w P$ and $P \xrightarrow{\tau} P'$ then $\text{wt}(P') \prec \text{wt}(P)$.*

Proof: Follows similarly to that of [Deng & Sangiorgi \(2006\)](#). As $P \xrightarrow{\tau} P'$ then by rule $[\bar{w}:\text{Tau}]$ we have:

$$[\bar{w}:\text{Tau}] \frac{Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}\tilde{b})\bar{x}(\tilde{v})} Q'_1 \quad Q_2 \xrightarrow{x(\tilde{v})} Q'_2 \quad \tilde{b} \cap \text{fn}(Q) = \emptyset}{Q_1 \mid Q_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} (\tilde{\mathbf{v}}\tilde{b})(Q'_1 \mid Q'_2)}$$

Where $P = Q_1 \mid Q_2$ and $P' = (\tilde{\mathbf{v}}\tilde{b})(Q'_1 \mid Q'_2)$. By Theorem 5.2 $\Gamma \vdash_w P'$ and hence $\text{wt}(P')$ is defined. We have that $\text{wt}(Q_1 \mid Q_2) = \text{wt}(Q_1) + \text{wt}(Q_2)$ similarly that $\text{wt}((\tilde{\mathbf{v}}\tilde{b})(Q'_1 \mid Q'_2)) = \text{wt}(Q'_1) + \text{wt}(Q'_2)$.

We wish to show the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{wt}(Q'_1) + \text{wt}(Q'_2) &< \text{wt}(Q_1) + \text{wt}(Q_2) \\ &= \text{wt}(Q_1) + \text{wt}(Q_2) + 0_{I(x)} - 0_{I(x)} \end{aligned}$$

Hence it is sufficient to show that $\text{wt}(Q'_1) \preceq \text{wt}(Q_1) - 0_{I(x)}$ and $\text{wt}(Q'_2) \prec \text{wt}(Q_2) + 0_{I(x)}$ which can be reduced to the following two statements:

1. $\Gamma \vdash_w P$ and $P \xrightarrow{x(\tilde{v})} P'$ then $\text{wt}(P') \prec \text{wt}(P) + 0_{I(x)}$
2. $\Gamma \vdash_w P$ and $P \xrightarrow{\bar{x}(\tilde{v})} P'$ then $\text{wt}(P') \preceq \text{wt}(P) - 0_{I(x)}$

We shall show only (1), as (2) follows similarly. As $\Gamma \vdash_w P$ and $P \xrightarrow{x(\tilde{v})} P'$ then there are two cases to consider. Firstly by the rule

$$\frac{}{x(\tilde{y}).Q \xrightarrow{x(\tilde{y})} Q}$$

with $\text{wt}(x(\tilde{y}).Q) = \text{wt}(Q) \prec \text{wt}(Q) + 0_{I(x)}$.

Secondly by the rule:

$$\frac{}{!x(\tilde{y}).Q \xrightarrow{x(\tilde{y})} !x(\tilde{y}).Q \mid Q}$$

with $\text{wt}(!x(\bar{y}).Q) = 0$ and $\text{wt}(Q) \prec 0_{l(x)}$ as by typing $\forall b \in \text{os}(P), l(b) < l(x)$. Finally we have that $\text{wt}(!x(\bar{y}).Q \mid Q) = 0 + \text{wt}(Q) \prec 0 + 0_{l(x)}$. \square

Theorem D.1 (Termination) *If $\Gamma \vdash_w P$ then P terminates.*

Proof: Let us consider the following two cases:

1. When $\text{wt}(P) = 0$ then P has no active outputs. Therefore, P has no enabled synchronizations, and so no reductions can take place. Thus, P terminates.
2. When $0 \prec \text{wt}(P)$ then the set of active inputs is non-empty. If none of the channels in the set of active inputs enables a synchronization then the process must terminate. If synchronizations are enabled then, by Proposition D.1.1, any synchronization strictly reduces the weight of the reduced process. As processes are of finite length and hence weights are finite we may inductively reduce until we reach a process of weight 0 or such that the set of active outputs do not allow for synchronizations.

\square

D.2 Proofs of Section 5.4

In this section we present the proofs of the main results in Section 5.4. Namely, operational completeness (Theorem 5.4) and operational soundness (Theorem 5.5) of the translation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$, which require the substitution lemma (Lemma D.2.1) below. We also present the detailed proof of the proper inclusion $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{S}$ (Theorem 5.6).

Lemma D.2.1 (Substitution Lemma) *Suppose $\Gamma, u : T, v : S \vdash_w P$, with $T = \bar{S}$ and $\text{un}(T)$ for a level function l . Then $\Gamma, z : \langle T, S \rangle \vdash_w (P)[z/u, v]$ for l .*

Proof: By induction on the structure of P .

1. Case $P = \mathbf{0}$.

Then $\Gamma, u : T, v : S \vdash_w \mathbf{0}$ with $T = \bar{S}$ and $\text{un}(T)$ implies that the following derivation is possible:

$$\frac{[\text{W:Nil}]}{\Gamma, u : T, v : S \vdash_w \mathbf{0} \vdash_w \mathbf{0}} \frac{\text{un}(\Gamma, u : T, v : S \vdash_w \mathbf{0})}{\Gamma, u : T, v : S \vdash_w \mathbf{0} \vdash_w \mathbf{0}}$$

The result follows trivially, since one has the derivation:

$$\frac{[\text{W:Nil}]}{\Gamma, z : \langle T, S \rangle \vdash_w \mathbf{0}} \frac{\text{un}(\Gamma, z : \langle T, S \rangle)}{\Gamma, z : \langle T, S \rangle \vdash_w \mathbf{0}}$$

2. Case $P = x(\bar{y}).P'$.

Then there are three cases to consider, based on the rule applied in the derivation of $\Gamma, u : T, v : S \vdash_w x(\bar{y}).P'$, which can be $[\text{W:Lin} - \text{In}_1]$, or $[\text{W:Lin} - \text{In}_2]$ or $[\text{W:Lin} - \text{In}_3]$, depending on whether $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, x : \#^n(\bar{V}) \circ \Gamma_2$, or $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, x : * \#^n(V) \circ \Gamma_2, x : * \#^n(V)$, or $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, x :: * \#^n(V) \circ \Gamma_2, x :: * \#^n(V)$, respectively.

- (a) In the case $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, x : \#^n(\bar{V}) \circ \Gamma_2$, for some contexts Γ_1, Γ_2 , the rule applied is $[\text{W:Lin} - \text{In}_1]$. Thus, by hypothesis, $\Gamma_1, x : \#^n(\bar{V}), u : T, v : S \circ \Gamma_2, u : T, v : S \vdash_w x(\bar{y}).P'$

with $T = \bar{S}$ and $\text{un}(T)$. It follows from the definition of $\text{un}(T)$ that it is not the case that $x = u$ or $x = v$. The derivation is as follows:

$$[\text{W:Lin} - \text{In}_1] \frac{\Gamma_1, x : \#^n(\tilde{V}), u : T, v : S \vdash_w x : \#^n(\tilde{V}) \quad \Gamma_2, \tilde{y} : \tilde{V}, u : T, v : S \vdash_w P' \quad \tilde{y} = y_1, y_2 \quad l(x) = l(y_2)}{(\Gamma_1, x : \#^n(\tilde{V}), u : T, v : S) \circ (\Gamma_2, u : T, v : S) \vdash_w x(\tilde{y}).P'}$$

By the induction hypothesis and $(x(\tilde{y}).P')[z/u, v] = x(\tilde{y}).((P')[z/u, v])$, one has the derivation:

$$[\text{W:Lin} - \text{In}_1] \frac{\Gamma_1, x : \#^n(\tilde{V}), z : \langle T, S \rangle \vdash_w x : \#^n(\tilde{V}) \quad \Gamma_2, \tilde{y} : \tilde{V}, z : \langle T, S \rangle \vdash_w (P')[z/u, v] \quad \tilde{y} = y_1, y_2 \quad l(x) = l(y_2)}{(\Gamma_1, x : \#^n(\tilde{V}), z : \langle T, S \rangle) \circ (\Gamma_2, z : \langle T, S \rangle) \vdash_w x(\tilde{y}).(P')[z/u, v]}$$

and the result follows.

- (b) In the case $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, x :: \#^n(V) \circ \Gamma_2, x :: \#^n(V)$, for some Γ_1, Γ_2 , the rule is $[\text{W:Lin} - \text{In}_3]$. The result follows analogously to case (2a).
- (c) In the case $\Gamma = \Gamma_1, x : \#^n(V) \circ \Gamma_2, x : \#^n(V)$, either $[\text{W:Lin} - \text{In}_2]$ or $[\text{W:Lin} - \text{In}_3]$ could be applied:

Since $\Gamma_1, x : \#^n(V), u : T, v : S \circ \Gamma_2, x : \#^n(V), u : T, v : S \vdash_w x(\tilde{y}).P'$ with $T = \bar{S}$ and $\text{un}(T)$, there are two possibilities:

- i. Case $u = x$.

Then, the context boils down to $\Gamma_1, x : \#^n(V), v : \overline{\#^n(V)} \circ \Gamma_2, x : \#^n(V), v : \#^n(V)$, and the derivation is as follows:

$$[\text{W:Lin} - \text{In}_2] \frac{\Gamma_1, x : \#^n(V), v : \overline{\#^n(V)} \vdash_w x : \#^n(V) \quad \Gamma_2, x : \#^n(V), y_1 : V, y_2 : \mathbf{unit}, v : \#^n(V) \vdash_w P' \quad \tilde{y} = y_1, y_2}{(\Gamma_1, x : \#^n(V), v : \overline{\#^n(V)}) \circ (\Gamma_2, x : \#^n(V), v : \#^n(V)) \vdash_w x(\tilde{y}).P'}$$

By the induction hypothesis, we obtain:

$$[\text{W:Lin} - \text{In}_3] \frac{\Gamma_1, z :: \#^n(V) \vdash_w z : \#^n(V) \quad \Gamma_2, z :: \#^n(V), y_1 : V, y_2 : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w (P')[z/x, v] \quad \tilde{y} = y_1, y_2}{(\Gamma_1, z :: \#^n(V)) \circ (\Gamma_2, z :: \#^n(V)) \vdash_w z(\tilde{y}).(P')[z/x, v]}$$

- ii. Case $u \neq x$. Then the proof follows analogously as in case (2a).

3. Case $P = \bar{x}(y_1, y_2).P'$.

Then there are three cases to consider, based on the rule applied to the derivation $\Gamma, u : T, v : S \vdash_w \bar{x}(y_1, y_2).P'$, which can be $[\text{W:Lin} - \text{Out}]$, or $[\text{W:Lin} - \text{Out}_1]$, or $[\text{W:Lin} - \text{Out}_2]$, depending on the context Γ .

- (a) The rule is $[\text{W:Lin} - \text{Out}]$.

Since $T = \bar{S}$ and $\text{un}(T)$, it follows that we need not consider the case of $x = u$, but we still need to consider the following cases:

- i. $u \neq y_1$.

Then, there exist $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3$ such that $\text{un}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ and $\Gamma, u : T, v : S \vdash_w \bar{x}(y_1, y_2).P'$ can be written as $(\Gamma_1, u : T, v : S, x : \#^n(V_1, V_2)) \circ (\Gamma_2, u : T, v : S, y_1 : V_1) \circ (\Gamma_3, u :$

$T, v : S, y_2 : V_2 \vdash_w \bar{x}(y_1, y_2).P'$. Thus, the following derivation holds:

$$[\text{W:Lin} - \text{Out}] \frac{\begin{array}{l} \Gamma_1, u : T, v : S, x : \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle \vdash_w x : \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle \\ \Gamma_2, u : T, v : S, y_1 : V_1 \vdash_w y_1 : V_1 \\ \Gamma_3, u : T, v : S, y_2 : V_2 \vdash_w P' \quad l(x) = l(y_2) \end{array}}{\Gamma_1' \circ \Gamma_2' \circ \Gamma_3' \vdash_w \bar{x}(y_1, y_2).P'}$$

where

- $\Gamma_1' = \Gamma_1, u : T, v : S, x : \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle$,
- $\Gamma_2' = \Gamma_2, u : T, v : S, y_1 : V_1$
- $\Gamma_3' = \Gamma_3, u : T, v : S, y_2 : V_2$

By applying the induction hypothesis in $\Gamma_3, u : T, v : S, y_2 : V_2 \vdash_w P'$, the judgment $\Gamma_3, z : \langle T, S \rangle, y_2 : V_2 \vdash_w (P') [z/u, v]$ holds. Then there exists a derivation

$$[\text{W:Lin} - \text{Out}] \frac{\begin{array}{l} \Gamma_1, z : \langle T, S \rangle, x : \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle \vdash_w x : \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle \\ \Gamma_2, z : \langle T, S \rangle, y_1 : V_1 \vdash_w y_1 : V_1 \\ \Gamma_3, z : \langle T, S \rangle, y_2 : V_2 \vdash_w (P') [z/u, v] \quad l(x) = l(y_2) \end{array}}{(\Gamma_1, z : \langle T, S \rangle, x : \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle) \circ (\Gamma_2, z : \langle T, S \rangle, y_1 : V_1) \circ (\Gamma_3, z : \langle T, S \rangle, y_2 : V_2) \vdash_w \bar{x}(y_1, y_2).(P') [z/u, v]}$$

and the result follows.

ii. $u = y_1$

Then there exist $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3$ such that $\text{un}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ and $\Gamma, u : T, v : S \vdash_w \bar{x}(y_1, y_2).P'$ can be written as $(\Gamma_1, y_1 : V_1, v : \bar{V}_1, x : \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle) \circ (\Gamma_2, y_1 : V_1, v : \bar{V}_1) \circ (\Gamma_3, y_1 : V_1, v : \bar{V}_1, y_2 : V_2) \vdash_w \bar{x}(y_1, y_2).P'$. Thus, the following derivation holds:

$$[\text{W:Lin} - \text{Out}] \frac{\begin{array}{l} \Gamma_1, y_1 : V_1, v : \bar{V}_1, x : \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle \vdash_w x : \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle \\ \Gamma_2, y_1 : V_1, v : \bar{V}_1 \vdash_w y_1 : V_1 \\ \Gamma_3, y_1 : V_1, v : \bar{V}_1, y_2 : V_2 \vdash_w P' \quad l(x) = l(y_2) \end{array}}{(\Gamma_1, y_1 : V_1, v : \bar{V}_1, x : \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle) \circ (\Gamma_2, y_1 : V_1, v : \bar{V}_1) \circ (\Gamma_3, y_1 : V_1, v : \bar{V}_1, y_2 : V_2) \vdash_w \bar{x}(y_1, y_2).P'}$$

By applying the induction hypothesis in $\Gamma_3, y_1 : V_1, v : \bar{V}_1, y_2 : V_2 \vdash_w P'$ we obtain $\Gamma_3, z : \langle V_1, \bar{V}_1 \rangle, y_2 : V_2 \vdash_w (P') [z/y_1, v]$. Since $\text{un}(\Gamma')$ and $l(x) = l(y_2)$, we have:

$$[\text{W:Lin} - \text{Out}] \frac{\begin{array}{l} \Gamma_1, z : \langle V_1, \bar{V}_1 \rangle, x : \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle \vdash_w x : \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle \\ \Gamma_2, z : \langle V_1, \bar{V}_1 \rangle \vdash_w z : V_1 \\ \Gamma_3, z : \langle V_1, \bar{V}_1 \rangle, y_2 : V_2 \vdash_w P' \quad l(x) = l(y_2) \end{array}}{(\Gamma_1, z : \langle V_1, \bar{V}_1 \rangle, x : \#^n \langle V_1, V_2 \rangle) \circ (\Gamma_2, z : \langle V_1, \bar{V}_1 \rangle) \circ (\Gamma_3, z : \langle V_1, \bar{V}_1 \rangle, y_2 : V_2) \vdash_w \bar{x}(z, y_2).(P') [z/y_1, v]}$$

(b) The rule is $[\text{W:Un} - \text{Out}_1]$.

There are two cases:

i. $u = x$

Then there exist $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3$ such that $\text{un}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ and $\Gamma, u : T, v : S \vdash_w \bar{x}(y_1, y_2).P'$ can be written as $(\Gamma_1, x : \#^n \langle V \rangle, v : \#^n \langle V \rangle) \circ (\Gamma_2, x : \#^n \langle V \rangle, v : \#^n \langle V \rangle, y_1 : V_1) \circ (\Gamma_3, x : \#^n \langle V \rangle, v : \#^n \langle V \rangle) \vdash_w \bar{x}(y_1, y_2).P'$. By the hypothesis $T = \bar{S}$, we conclude that $v : \#^n \langle V \rangle$ is in both Γ' and Γ'' . Thus, the following derivation holds:

$$[\text{W:Un} - \text{Out}_1] \frac{\begin{array}{l} \Gamma_1, x : \#^n \langle V \rangle, v : \overline{\#^n \langle V \rangle} \vdash_w x : \#^n \langle V \rangle \\ \Gamma_2, x : \#^n \langle V \rangle, v : \#^n \langle V \rangle, y_1 : V_1 \vdash_w y_1 : V_1 \\ \Gamma_3, v : \#^n \langle V \rangle, x : \#^n \langle V \rangle, y_2 : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w P' \end{array}}{(\Gamma_1, x : \#^n \langle V \rangle, v : \overline{\#^n \langle V \rangle}) \circ (\Gamma_2, x : \#^n \langle V \rangle, v : \#^n \langle V \rangle, y_1 : V_1) \circ \Gamma_3, x : \#^n \langle V \rangle, v : \#^n \langle V \rangle \vdash_w \bar{x}(y_1, y_2).P'}$$

By applying the induction hypothesis on $\Gamma_3, v : \#^n \langle V \rangle, x : \#^n \langle V \rangle, y_2 : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w P'$ we obtain $\Gamma_3, z : \langle \#^n \langle V \rangle, \#^n \langle V \rangle \rangle, y_2 : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w (P') [z/u, v]$:

$$[\text{W:Un} - \text{Out}_2] \frac{\begin{array}{l} \Gamma_1, z : \langle \#^n \langle V \rangle, \#^n \langle V \rangle \rangle \vdash_w z : \#^n \langle V \rangle \\ \Gamma_2, z : \langle \#^n \langle V \rangle, \#^n \langle V \rangle \rangle, y_1 : V_1 \vdash_w y_1 : V_1 \\ \Gamma_3, z : \langle \#^n \langle V \rangle, \#^n \langle V \rangle \rangle, y_2 : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w P'(P') [z/u, v] \end{array}}{(\Gamma_1, z : \langle \#^n \langle V \rangle, \#^n \langle V \rangle \rangle) \circ (\Gamma_2, z : \langle \#^n \langle V \rangle, \#^n \langle V \rangle \rangle, y_1 : V_1) \circ \Gamma_3, z : \langle \#^n \langle V \rangle, \#^n \langle V \rangle \rangle \vdash_w \bar{z}(y_1, y_2).(P') [z/u, v]}$$

and the result follows.

ii. $u \neq x$

This case is analogous to (3a).

(c) The rule is $[\text{W:Un} - \text{Out}_2]$.

This case is analogous to (3a).

4. Case $P = P' \mid Q$.

Then there exist Γ_1, Γ_2 such that $\Gamma, u : T, v : S \vdash_w P' \mid Q$ has the form $(\Gamma_1, u : T, v : S) \circ (\Gamma_2, u : T, v : S) \vdash_w P' \mid Q$, since $T = \bar{S}$ and $\text{un}(T)$. Thus, the following derivation holds

$$[\text{W:Par}] \frac{\Gamma_1, u : T, v : S \vdash_w P' \quad \Gamma_2, u : T, v : S \vdash_w Q}{(\Gamma_1, u : T, v : S) \circ (\Gamma_2, u : T, v : S) \vdash_w P' \mid Q}$$

By applying the induction hypothesis on $\Gamma_1, u : T, v : S \vdash_w P'$ and $\Gamma_2, u : T, v : S \vdash_w Q$, we obtain

$$[\text{W:Par}] \frac{\Gamma_1, z : \langle T, S \rangle \vdash_w (P') [z/u, v] \quad \Gamma_2, z : \langle T, S \rangle \vdash_w (Q) [z/u, v]}{(\Gamma_1, z : \langle T, S \rangle) \circ (\Gamma_2, z : \langle T, S \rangle) \vdash_w (P') [z/u, v] \mid (Q) [z/u, v]}$$

and the result follows.

5. Case $P = (\mathbf{v}x)P'$.

Then $\Gamma, u : T, v : S \vdash_w (\mathbf{v}x)P'$ with $T = \bar{S}$ and $\text{un}(T)$ which implies that the following derivation holds:

$$[\text{W:Res}] \frac{\Gamma, x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle, u : T, v : S \vdash_w P'}{\Gamma, u : T, v : S \vdash_w (\mathbf{v}x)P'}$$

By applying the induction hypothesis on $\Gamma, x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle, u : T, v : S \vdash_w P'$ we obtain that $\Gamma, x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle, z : \langle T, S \rangle \vdash_w (P') [z/u, v]$. Thus,

$$[\text{W:Res}] \frac{\Gamma, x : \langle V, \bar{V} \rangle, z : \langle T, S \rangle \vdash_w (P') [z/u, v]}{\Gamma, z : \langle T, S \rangle \vdash_w (\mathbf{v}x)(P') [z/u, v]}$$

and the result follows.

6. Case $P = !x(\tilde{y}).P'$.

There are two cases to consider:

(a) $u = x$.

Then $\Gamma, x : \#^n(V), v : \overline{\#^n(V)} \vdash_w !x(\tilde{y}).P'$ then

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \Gamma, x : \#^n(V) \vdash_w x : \#^n(V) \\ \Gamma, x : \#^n(V), v : \overline{\#^n(V)}, y_1 : V, y_2 : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w P' \\ \forall b \in \mathbf{os}(P'), l(b) < n \end{array}}{[\mathbf{W:Un} - \mathbf{In}_1] \frac{}{\Gamma, x : \#^n(V), v : \overline{\#^n(V)} \vdash_w !x(y_1, y_2).P'}}$$

By the induction hypothesis on $\Gamma, x : \#^n(V), v : \overline{\#^n(V)}, y_1 : V, y_2 : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w P'$ we have $\Gamma, z :: \#^n(V), y_1 : V, y_2 : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w (P')[z/u, v]$ hence:

$$[\mathbf{W:Un} - \mathbf{In}_2] \frac{\begin{array}{c} \Gamma, z :: \#^n(V) \vdash_w z : \#^n(V) \\ \Gamma, z :: \#^n(V), y_1 : V, y_2 : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w (P')[z/u, v] \quad \forall b \in \mathbf{os}(P), l(b) < n \end{array}}{\Gamma, z :: \#^n(V) \vdash_w !x(y_1, y_2).(P')[z/u, v]}$$

and the result follows.

(b) $u \neq x$.

This case follows analogously to (2a).

□

Theorem D.2 (Operational Completeness) *Let $P \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $(\Gamma)_l \vdash_w \langle P \rangle$, for some level function l . Then there exists $R \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $P \longrightarrow Q \implies \langle P \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle R \rangle$ and $R \equiv Q$.*

Proof: By induction on the reduction rules \longrightarrow .

1. When $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)(\bar{x}(v).P' \mid \mathbf{lin} y(w).Q' \mid R)$ then $P \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q'[v/w] \mid R) = Q$.

Let us consider the following cases:

(a) When $x : \mathbf{lin}!T.S$, typing ensures $y \notin \mathbf{fn}(P')$, $x \notin \mathbf{fn}(Q')$ and $x, y \notin \mathbf{fn}(R')$.

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P \rangle &= (\mathbf{v}z)((\mathbf{v}u)\bar{z}(v, u). \langle P'[u/x][z/x] \rangle \mid z(w, u). \langle Q'[u/y][z/y] \rangle \mid \langle R' \rangle) \\ &\xrightarrow{\tau} (\mathbf{v}z)(\mathbf{v}u)(\langle P'[u/x][z/x] \rangle \mid \langle Q'[u/y][z/y][v/w] \rangle \mid \langle R' \rangle) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Q &\equiv (\mathbf{v}rs)Q = R' \\ \langle (\mathbf{v}rs)Q \rangle &= (\mathbf{v}r)(\mathbf{v}z)(\langle P'[z/x] \rangle \mid \langle Q'[z/y][v/w] \rangle \mid \langle R' \rangle) \end{aligned}$$

(b) When $x : *!T$. Then

$\langle P \rangle = (\mathbf{v}z)(\bar{z}(v, u). \langle P'[z/x][z/y] \rangle \mid x(w, u). \langle Q'[z/x][z/y] \rangle \mid R[z/x][z/y])$ and the result follow analogously to 1a.

2. When $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)(\bar{x}(v).P' \mid \mathbf{un} y(w).Q' \mid R')$ then $P \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q'[v/w] \mid \mathbf{un} y(w).Q' \mid R') = Q = R$ and typing enforces $x : *!T$.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P \rangle &= (\mathbf{v}z)(\bar{z}(v, u). \langle P'[z/x][z/y] \rangle \mid !z(w, u). \langle Q'[z/x][z/y] \rangle \mid \langle R' \rangle [z/x][z/y]) \\ &\xrightarrow{\tau} (\mathbf{v}z)(\langle P'[z/x][z/y] \rangle \mid \langle Q'[z/x][z/y][v/w] \rangle \mid !z(w, u). \langle Q'[z/x][z/y] \rangle \mid \\ &\quad \langle R' \rangle [z/x][z/y]) \\ &= \langle R \rangle \end{aligned}$$

3. When $P = P' \mid R'$ then $P \longrightarrow Q' \mid R' = Q$ when $P' \longrightarrow Q'$.
By the induction hypothesis $P' \longrightarrow Q'$ implies there exist a R'' such that $\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle\langle R'' \rangle\rangle$ with $Q' \equiv R''$. As $Q' \mid R' \equiv R'' \mid R'$ by [w:Par] $\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle\langle R'' \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle = R$
4. When $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)P'$ then $P \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)Q' = Q$ when $P' \longrightarrow Q'$.
By the induction hypothesis $P' \longrightarrow Q'$ implies there exist a R' such that $\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle$ with $Q' \equiv R'$. As $(\mathbf{v}xy)Q' \equiv (\mathbf{v}xy)R'$ by [w:Res] $\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle (\mathbf{v}xy)P' \rangle\rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle\langle (\mathbf{v}xy)R' \rangle\rangle = R$
5. When $P \longrightarrow Q$ given $P \equiv P'$, $P' \longrightarrow Q'$ and $Q' \equiv Q$ then consider the shape of P :
 - (a) When either $P = R \mid S \equiv S \mid R$, $P = (R \mid S) \mid T \equiv R \mid (S \mid T)$ or $P = P \mid \mathbf{0} \equiv P$ then by [w:Par] the result follow.
 - (b) When $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)\mathbf{0} \equiv \mathbf{0}$ then no reduction is available.
 - (c) When $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)(\mathbf{v}zw)R \equiv (\mathbf{v}zw)(\mathbf{v}xy)R$ then by [w:Res] the result follow.
 - (d) When $P = ((\mathbf{v}xy)R) \mid S \equiv (\mathbf{v}xy)(R \mid S)$ if $x, y \notin \text{fv}(S)$ then by applications of [w:Par] and [w:Res] the result follow.
 - (e) When $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)R \equiv (\mathbf{v}yx)R = P'$ then $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle = (\mathbf{v}z)\langle\langle R[z/x][z/y] \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle$.

□

Theorem D.3 (Operational Soundness) *Let $P \in \mathcal{W}$ with $\langle\langle \Gamma \rangle\rangle_l \vdash_w \langle\langle P \rangle\rangle$, for some level function l . If $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} U$ Then there exists $R, Q \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $P \longrightarrow Q \wedge R \equiv Q \wedge U = \langle\langle R \rangle\rangle$.*

Proof: Proof by induction on the reduction rules. We will omit the symmetry of [w:Par] and [w:Tau]. Consider the following cases:

1. When $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle$ reduces via [w:Tau].

Then

- $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q')$
- $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle = (\mathbf{v}z)(\langle\langle P'[z/x][z/y] \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q'[z/x][z/y] \rangle\rangle) \xrightarrow{\tau} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{b})(\langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q'' \rangle\rangle)$

with $\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle \xrightarrow{(\mathbf{v}\tilde{b})\tilde{z}(v,u)} \langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle$, $\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle \xrightarrow{z(w,u)} \langle\langle Q'' \rangle\rangle$ and $\tilde{b} \cap \text{fn}(\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle) = \emptyset$. We must consider the following cases in the reductions on $\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle$ and $\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle$ respectively.

- (a) When $\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle$ reduces via [w:Out] and $\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle$ reduces via [w:In].

Then $P' = \bar{x}(v).R'$ and $Q' = \text{lin } x(w).S$. Let us consider the following cases for the type of x , this being linear or unrestricted:

- i. When $x : \text{lin!}T.S'$, typing ensures $y \notin \text{fn}(P')$ and $x \notin \text{fn}(Q')$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle P \rangle\rangle &= (\mathbf{v}z)((\mathbf{v}u)\bar{z}(v,u). \langle\langle R[u/x][z/x] \rangle\rangle \mid z(w,u). \langle\langle S[u/y][z/y] \rangle\rangle) \\ &\xrightarrow{\tau} (\mathbf{v}z)(\mathbf{v}u)(\langle\langle R[u/x][z/x] \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle S[u/y][z/y][v/w] \rangle\rangle) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} R &= (\mathbf{v}rs)(\mathbf{v}xy)(R' \mid S[v/w]) \equiv (\mathbf{v}xy)(R' \mid S[v/w]) = Q \\ \langle\langle R \rangle\rangle &= (\mathbf{v}r)(\mathbf{v}z)(\langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle[z/x] \mid \langle\langle S \rangle\rangle[z/y][v/w]) \end{aligned}$$

Finally we have that $P \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(R' \mid S[v/w]) = Q$ via (R-LINCOM).

ii. When $x : *!T$. Then

$\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle = (\mathbf{v}z)(\bar{z}\langle v, u \rangle. \langle\langle R' [z/x][z/y] \rangle\rangle \mid x(w, u). \langle\langle S [z/x][z/y] \rangle\rangle [z/x][z/y])$ and follow analogously to **1(a)i**.

(b) When $\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle$ reduces via $[\bar{w}:\text{Out}]$ and $\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle$ reduces via $[\bar{w}:\text{Rep}]$.

Then $P' = \bar{x}\langle v \rangle. R'$, $Q' = \text{un } x(w). S$ and typing enforces $x : *!T$ with:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle P \rangle\rangle &= (\mathbf{v}z)(\bar{z}\langle v, u \rangle. \langle\langle R' [z/x][z/y] \rangle\rangle \mid !z(w, u). \langle\langle S [z/x][z/y] \rangle\rangle) \\ &\xrightarrow{\tau} (\mathbf{v}z)(\langle\langle R' [z/x][z/y] \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle S [z/x][z/y][v/w] \rangle\rangle \mid !z(w, u). \langle\langle S [z/x][z/y] \rangle\rangle) \\ &= \langle\langle (\mathbf{v}xy)(R' \mid S[v/w] \mid \text{un } y(w). S) \rangle\rangle \\ &= \langle\langle R \rangle\rangle \end{aligned}$$

Finally we have that $P \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(R' \mid S[v/w] \mid \text{un } y(w). S) = Q = R$ via (R-UNCOM).

(c) When either $\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle$ or $\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle$ reduces via $[\bar{w}:\text{Par}]$.

Consider the case of $\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle$ and $\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle$ proceeds similarly. Then $\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle S' \rangle\rangle$ and by $[\bar{w}:\text{Par}]$ $\langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle \xrightarrow{(\mathbf{v}\tilde{b})\bar{z}\langle v, u \rangle} \langle\langle R'' \rangle\rangle$. Hence $\langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle \xrightarrow{tau} (\mathbf{v}\tilde{b})(\langle\langle R'' \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle S' \rangle\rangle) \mid \langle\langle Q'' \rangle\rangle$. By the induction hypothesis, \equiv being associative and commutative and applications of (R-STR) the result follows.

(d) When $\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle$ reduces via $[\bar{w}:\text{Out}]$ and $\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle$ reduces via $[\bar{w}:\text{Res}]$. Then case proceeds analogously to **1b**.

2. When $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle$ reduces via $[\bar{w}:\text{Par}]$ then $P = P' \mid Q'$, $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle$ with $\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle$. By the induction hypothesis and application of (R-PAR) the result follows.
3. When $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle$ reduces via $[\bar{w}:\text{Res}]$ then $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)P'$. By the induction hypothesis and application of (R-RES) the result follows analogously to **2**.

□

Theorem D.4 $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{S}$.

Proof: The inclusion $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ is immediate by definition. To prove that the inclusion is strict, it is sufficient to consider a counterexample, i.e., a process P typable in \mathcal{S} but not typable in $\pi_{\mathcal{W}}$.

Consider the process $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)(\bar{y}\langle w \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \text{un } x(z). \bar{y}\langle w \rangle. \mathbf{0})$ which invokes itself ad infinitum. This process is typed in \mathcal{S} by $w : \mathbf{end} \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} P$ with derivation as

$$[\text{S:Res}] \frac{[\text{S:Par}] \frac{\Pi}{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} \bar{y}\langle w \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \text{un } x(z). \bar{y}\langle w \rangle. \mathbf{0}}} {w : \mathbf{end} \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} (\mathbf{v}xy)(\bar{y}\langle w \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \text{un } x(z). \bar{y}\langle w \rangle. \mathbf{0})}}{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} x : *? \mathbf{end} \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{\text{un}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} x : *? \mathbf{end}} \quad \Pi}{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} \text{un } x(z). \bar{y}\langle w \rangle. \mathbf{0}}} {[\text{S:Un - In}]}}{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} \bar{y}\langle w \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \text{un } x(z). \bar{y}\langle w \rangle. \mathbf{0}}}}$$

where $\Gamma = x : *? \mathbf{end}, y : *! \mathbf{end}, w : \mathbf{end}$ and Π is the following derivation:

$$[\text{S:Un - Out}] \frac{\frac{\text{un}(\Gamma')}{\Gamma' \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} y : *! \mathbf{end}} \quad \frac{\text{un}(\Gamma')}{\Gamma' \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} w : \mathbf{end}} \quad \frac{\text{un}(\Gamma')}{\Gamma' \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{0}}}{\Gamma' \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} \bar{y}\langle w \rangle. \mathbf{0}}$$

with $\Gamma' = x : * ?\mathbf{end}, y : * !\mathbf{end}, w : \mathbf{end}, z : \mathbf{end}$.

Claim. $P \notin \mathcal{W}$.

In fact, if $P \in \mathcal{W}$ then there would exist of a function l such that $\llbracket w : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s P \rrbracket_l$. Thus, we shall show that this l does not exist.

Unfolding the encoding of the derivation of $w : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s P$ we have that

$$\left\llbracket \frac{\vdots}{w : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s P} \right\rrbracket_l = \frac{\vdots}{\langle w : \mathbf{end} \rangle_l \vdash_w \langle (\mathbf{v}xy)(\bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \mathbf{un} x(z).\bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \rangle}$$

And the derivation in $\pi_{\mathcal{W}}$ would be as follows:

$$[\mathbf{W}:\mathbf{Res}] \frac{[\mathbf{W}:\mathbf{Par}] \frac{\Pi_1 \quad \Pi_3}{w : \mathbf{unit}, a :: * \#^{l(x)} \langle (\mathbf{unit}) \rangle_l \vdash_w \bar{a}\langle w, b \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid !a(z, c).\bar{a}\langle w, d \rangle.\mathbf{0}}}{w : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w (\mathbf{v}a)(\bar{a}\langle w, b \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid !a(z, c).\bar{a}\langle w, d \rangle.\mathbf{0})}}{\text{where } \Pi_1 \text{ and } \Pi_3 \text{ are subderivations given below.}}$$

- Π_1 is the derivation of $\Gamma_w \vdash_s \bar{a}\langle w, z \rangle.\mathbf{0}$:

$$[\mathbf{W}:\mathbf{Un} - \mathbf{Out}_1] \frac{\overline{\Gamma_w \vdash_w a : * \#^{l(x)} \langle (\mathbf{unit}) \rangle_l}} \quad \overline{\Gamma_w \vdash_w w : \mathbf{unit}} \quad \overline{\Gamma_w, b : \mathbf{unit} \vdash_w \mathbf{0}}}{\Gamma_w \vdash_w \bar{a}\langle w, b \rangle.\mathbf{0}}$$

where $\Gamma_w = a :: * \#^{l(x)} \langle (\mathbf{unit}) \rangle_l, w : \mathbf{unit}$.

- Π_3 is the subderivation of $\Gamma_w \vdash_s !a(z, c).\bar{a}\langle w, d \rangle.\mathbf{0}$:

$$[\mathbf{W}:\mathbf{Un} - \mathbf{In}_1] \frac{\overline{\Gamma_w \vdash_w a : * \#^{l(x)} \langle (\mathbf{unit}) \rangle_l}} \quad \Pi_2 \quad \forall e \in \mathbf{os}(\bar{a}\langle w, d \rangle.\mathbf{0}), l(e) < l(x)}{\Gamma_w \vdash_w !a(z, c).\bar{a}\langle w, d \rangle.\mathbf{0}}$$

where $\Gamma_w = a :: * \#^{l(x)} \langle (\mathbf{unit}) \rangle_l, w : \mathbf{unit}$ and Π_2 is the subderivation of $\Gamma_{w,z,c} \vdash_w \bar{a}\langle w, d \rangle.\mathbf{0}$:

$$[\mathbf{W}:\mathbf{Un} - \mathbf{Out}_1] \frac{\overline{\Gamma_{w,z,c} \vdash_w a : * \#^{l(x)} \langle (\mathbf{unit}) \rangle_l}} \quad \overline{\Gamma_{w,z,c} \vdash_w w : \mathbf{unit}} \quad \overline{\Gamma_{w,z,c,d} \vdash_w \mathbf{0}}}{\Gamma_{w,z,c} \vdash_w \bar{a}\langle w, d \rangle.\mathbf{0}}$$

where $\Gamma_{w,z,c} = \Gamma_w, z : \mathbf{unit}, c : \mathbf{unit}$ and $\Gamma_{w,z,c,d} = \Gamma_{w,z,c}, d : \mathbf{unit}$.

However, notice that $\mathbf{os}(\bar{a}\langle w, d \rangle.\mathbf{0}) = \{a\}$ and Π_2 imposes the condition $l(x) < l(x)$ on l . Hence, there is no l that can satisfy this condition. \square

D.3 Proofs of Section 5.6

In this section we present the detailed proofs of the results in Section 5.6. Namely, type preservation (Theorem 5.8) and the proper inclusion $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{W}$ (Theorem 5.9). The latter requires the construction on strict partial orders that will induce levels, described in Appendix D.3.1, and the auxiliary results in Lemma D.3.1 - Lemma D.3.6. The section concludes with the proof that $\mathcal{W} \not\subset \mathcal{L}$ (Theorem 5.10).

Theorem D.5 (Type preservation (cf. Theorem 5.8)) *If $\Gamma \otimes \Delta \vdash_s P$ with then there exist Γ', Δ' , and A such that $\langle \Gamma' \rangle_l^\dagger; \langle \Delta' \rangle_l \vdash_\ell \langle P \rangle :: u : A$ and one of the following holds:*

1. $A = \langle \overline{T} \rangle$ when $\{u : T\} \subset \Gamma, \Delta$ with $(\Gamma \succ_T^u \Gamma') \wedge (\Delta \succ_T^u \Delta')$
2. $A = \mathbf{1}$ when $u \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ with $(\Gamma = \Gamma') \wedge (\Delta = \Delta')$.

Proof: By induction on the entries of Table 5.1. Thus, we consider 11 possibilities.

1. **Inaction:**

$$\left[\frac{\text{un}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash_s \mathbf{0}} \right]_u = \frac{}{\langle \Gamma \rangle^\dagger; \cdot \vdash_\ell \mathbf{0} :: u : \mathbf{1}}$$

2. **Independent parallel composition:** If $w \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma, \Delta_1, \Delta) \wedge (\dagger \vee \ddagger^*)$

$$\left[\frac{\Gamma, \Delta_1 \vdash_s P \quad \Gamma, \Delta \vdash_s Q}{(\Gamma, \Delta_1) \circ (\Gamma, \Delta) \vdash_s P \mid Q} \right]_u = \frac{\left[\Gamma', \Delta_1 \vdash_s P \right]_w \quad \frac{\left[\Gamma, \Delta \vdash_s Q \right]_u}{\langle \Gamma' \rangle^\dagger; \langle \Delta' \rangle, w : \mathbf{1} \vdash_\ell \langle Q \rangle :: A}}{\langle \Gamma' \rangle^\dagger; \langle \Delta_1 \rangle, \langle \Delta' \rangle \vdash_\ell (\mathbf{v}w)(\langle P \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle) :: u : A}$$

The condition $u \notin \text{fn}(P)$ of \ddagger^* follows from the fact that $\Gamma, \Delta_1 \vdash_s P$ implies $\Gamma', \Delta_1 \vdash_s P$, if $u \notin \text{fn}(P)$.

- (3a) **Linear composition ($\neg\text{un}(V)$):** if $\neg\text{un}(V) \wedge (\dagger \vee \ddagger^*)$. This involves typing rules [S:Res] and [S:Par].

$$\left[\frac{\frac{\Gamma, \Delta_1, z : V \vdash_s P \quad \Gamma, \Delta, v : \bar{V} \vdash_s Q}{\Gamma, \Delta_1, z : V \circ \Gamma, \Delta, v : \bar{V} \vdash_s P \mid Q}}{\Gamma, \Delta_1 \circ \Gamma, \Delta \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}zv)(P \mid Q)} \right]_u = \frac{\left[\Gamma', \Delta_1, z : V \vdash_s P \right]_z \quad \left[\Gamma, \Delta, z : \bar{V} \vdash_s Q[z/v] \right]_u}{\langle \Gamma' \rangle^\dagger; \langle \Delta_1 \rangle, \langle \Delta' \rangle \vdash_\ell (\mathbf{v}z)(\langle P \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle[z/v]) :: u : A}$$

- (3b) **Unrestricted composition ($\text{un}(V)$):** If $\text{un}(V) \wedge v \notin \text{fn}(P) \wedge z \notin \text{fn}(Q) \wedge (\dagger \vee \ddagger^*)$

$$\left[\frac{\frac{\Gamma, \Delta_1, z : V, v : \bar{V} \vdash_s P \quad \Gamma, \Delta, z : V, v : \bar{V} \vdash_s Q}{\Gamma, \Delta_1, z : V, v : \bar{V} \circ \Gamma, \Delta, z : V, v : \bar{V} \vdash_s P \mid Q}}{\Gamma, \Delta_1 \circ \Gamma, \Delta \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}zv)(P \mid Q)} \right]_u = \frac{\left[\Gamma', \Delta_1, z : V \vdash_s P \right]_z \quad \left[\Gamma, \Delta, z : \bar{V} \vdash_s Q[z/v] \right]_u}{\langle \Gamma' \rangle^\dagger; \langle \Delta_1 \rangle, \langle \Delta' \rangle \vdash_\ell (\mathbf{v}z)(\langle P \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle[z/v]) :: u : A}$$

Conditions $v \notin \text{fn}(P)$ and $z \notin \text{fn}(Q)$ follow with a similar argument as in case 2 above. Premise $\left[\Gamma', \Delta_1, z : V \vdash_s P \right]_z$ can only hold if $v \notin \text{fn}(P)$ (and similarly for Q).

- (4) **Unrestricted input (server):** We consider three sub-cases.

- (a) If $u = x$, $x \notin \text{fn}(P)$, $\neg\text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg\text{cli}(T)$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\frac{\Gamma, x : *?T, y : T \vdash_s P}{\Gamma, x : *?T \vdash_s x : *?T} \right]^u \\ & \frac{\left[\frac{\Gamma, x : *?T \vdash_s \text{un } x(y).P}{\Gamma, x : *?T \vdash_s \text{un } x(y).P} \right]^u}{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma, y : T \vdash_s P}{\llbracket \Gamma, y : T \vdash_s P \rrbracket_w}}{\langle \Gamma \rangle^\dagger; \cdot \vdash_\ell w(y). \langle P \rangle :: w : \langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle}}{\langle \Gamma \rangle^\dagger; \cdot \vdash_\ell w.\text{case}(w(y). \langle P \rangle, \langle P[W/y] \rangle) :: w : \langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle \& \langle \bar{T} \rangle}}{\langle \Gamma \rangle^\dagger; \cdot \vdash_\ell !x(w).w.\text{case}(w(y). \langle P \rangle, \langle P[W/y] \rangle) :: u : !(\langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle) \& \langle \bar{T} \rangle}} \end{aligned}$$

From an application of [S:Var] one obtains that $\Gamma, x : *?T \vdash_s x : *?T$ holds, when $\text{un}(\Gamma)$.

(b) If $u = x, x \notin \text{fn}(P), \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$.

$$\left[\frac{\Gamma, x : *?T, y : T \vdash_s P}{\Gamma, x : *?T \vdash_s x : *?T} \right]^u = \frac{\llbracket \Gamma, y : T \vdash_s P \rrbracket_y}{\langle \Gamma \rangle^\dagger; \cdot \vdash_\ell !x(w). \langle P[W/y] \rangle :: u : !(\bar{T})}$$

From an application of [S:Var] one obtains that $\Gamma, x : *?T \vdash_s x : *?T$ holds, when $\text{un}(\Gamma)$.

(c) If $u = x, x \notin \text{fn}(P), \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T)$

$$\left[\frac{\Gamma, x : *?T, y : T \vdash_s P}{\Gamma, x : *?T \vdash_s x : *?T} \right]^u = \frac{\frac{\llbracket \Gamma, y : T \vdash_s P \rrbracket_w}{\langle \Gamma \rangle^\dagger; \cdot \vdash_\ell w(y). \langle P \rangle :: w : \langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle}}{\langle \Gamma \rangle^\dagger; \cdot \vdash_\ell !x(w).w(y). \langle P \rangle :: u : !(\langle T \rangle \multimap \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle)}$$

Some intuitions follow:

- The first sub-case requires $\neg \text{svr}(T)$ and $\neg \text{cli}(T)$ as the server is unable to distinguish if it will connect to a bound output or a free output; hence, we need to account for both behaviors: the encoding will be $\llbracket \Gamma, y : T \vdash_s P \rrbracket_w$ and $\llbracket \Gamma, y : T \vdash_s P \rrbracket_y$ (i.e., on w and y , respectively), as both can only be true with this condition.
- The second sub-case requires T to produce a server behavior, which is only possible by means of a bound output. When this is the case notice that the left branch of the choice, (i.e., $\llbracket \Gamma, y : T \vdash_s P \rrbracket_w$) would not be well typed.
- The third sub-case is when T is a client: then, the only possibility is a synchronization with a free output. As a consequence, the right-hand side $\llbracket \Gamma, y : T \vdash_s P \rrbracket_y$ is not well typed. Also, notice that u can only correspond to x : this is because server behaviours must appear on the right-hand side of a judgment in DILL.

Finally, the case $\neg \text{svr}(T) = \text{false}$ and $\neg \text{svr}(T) = \text{false}$ is not typable: this is because neither $\llbracket \Gamma, y : T \vdash_s P \rrbracket_w$ or $\llbracket \Gamma, y : T \vdash_s P \rrbracket_y$ can hold.

(5) **Linear input:** We consider two sub-cases.

(a) If $\dagger \vee \ddagger$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\frac{\Gamma, x : \text{lin}?T.S \vdash_s x : \text{lin}?T.S}{\Gamma, \Delta, x : S, y : T \vdash_s P} \right]^u \\ & \frac{\left[\frac{\Gamma, x : \text{lin}?T.S \circ \Gamma, \Delta \vdash_s \text{lin } x(y).P}{\Gamma, \Delta, x : S, y : T \vdash_s P} \right]^u}{\frac{\llbracket \Gamma, \Delta, x : S, y : T \vdash_s P \rrbracket_u}{\langle \Gamma' \rangle^\dagger; \langle \Delta' \rangle, x : \langle T \rangle \otimes \langle S \rangle \vdash_\ell x(y). \langle P \rangle :: u : A}} \end{aligned}$$

(b) If $u = x$:

$$\left[\frac{\frac{\Gamma, x : \text{lin?}T.S \vdash_s x : \text{lin?}T.S}{\Gamma, \Delta, x : S, y : T \vdash_s P}}{\Gamma, x : \text{lin?}T.S \circ \Gamma, \Delta \vdash_s \text{lin } x(y).P} \right]^u = \frac{[\Gamma, \Delta, x : S, y : T \vdash_s P]_x}{(\Gamma)^\dagger; (\Delta), \vdash_\ell x(y). \langle P \rangle :: x : (T) \multimap (\bar{S})}$$

Notice that there is no counterpart to judgement by applying the rule [S:Lin – In₂] within π_{DILL} . That is:

$$\left[\frac{\Gamma_1, x : *?T \vdash_s x : *?T \quad \Gamma_2, x : *?T, y : T \vdash_s P}{(\Gamma_1, x : *?T) \circ (\Gamma_2, x : *?T) \vdash_s \text{lin } x(y).P} \right]^u = \text{Undefined}$$

This is because the linearity of the input is not respected by its typing.

(6a) **Server request, when the type of the request (y) is linear ($\neg \text{un}(T)$):** We consider two possibilities:

(a) If $\neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T) \wedge \neg \text{un}(T) \wedge (\dagger \vee \ddagger)$. This involves typing rule [S:Res]:

$$\left[\frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s z : *!T \quad \Gamma_1, y : T \vdash_s y : T \quad \Gamma_1, x : \bar{T}, \Delta \vdash_s P}{\Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma_1, y : T) \circ (\Gamma_1, x : \bar{T}, \Delta) \vdash_s \bar{z}\langle y \rangle.P}}{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma_1, \Delta) \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}\langle y \rangle.P}} \right]^u = \frac{[\Gamma, z : *!T, x : \bar{T}, \Delta \vdash_s P]_u}{(\Gamma'_1)^\dagger; (\Delta'), x : (T) \multimap (\mathbf{1}) \& (\bar{T}) \vdash_\ell x.\text{inr}; \langle P \rangle :: u : A} = \frac{(\Gamma'_1)^\dagger; (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \bar{z}(x).x.\text{inr}; \langle P \rangle :: u : A}{(\Gamma'_1)^\dagger; (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \bar{z}(x).x.\text{inr}; \langle P \rangle :: u : A}$$

where $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma, z : *!T$ and $(\Gamma'_1)^\dagger = (\Gamma')^\dagger, z : (T) \multimap (\mathbf{1}) \& (\bar{T})$.

(b) If $\text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T) \wedge \neg \text{un}(T) \wedge (\dagger \vee \ddagger)$:

$$\left[\frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s z : *!T \quad \Gamma_1, y : T \vdash_s y : T \quad \Gamma_1, x : \bar{T}, \Delta \vdash_s P}{\Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma_1, y : T) \circ (\Gamma_1, x : \bar{T}, \Delta) \vdash_s \bar{z}\langle y \rangle.P}}{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma_1, \Delta) \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}\langle y \rangle.P}} \right]^u = \frac{[\Gamma, z : *!T, x : \bar{T}, \Delta \vdash_s P]_u}{(\Gamma')^\dagger, z : (\bar{T}); (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \bar{z}(x). \langle P \rangle :: u : A}$$

Note that the case $u = z$ is not allowed; this is the dual situation to why only $u = z$ is allowed in 2 above.

(6b) **Server request, when the type of the request (y) is unrestricted ($\text{un}(T)$):** We consider two possibilities:

(a) If $\neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T), y \notin \text{fn}(P), \text{un}(T) \wedge (\dagger \vee \ddagger)$. This involves typing rule [S:Res]:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\frac{\frac{\Gamma_1, y: T \vdash_s z: *!T \quad \Gamma_1, y: T \vdash_s y: T \quad \Gamma_1, y: T, x: \bar{T}, \Delta \vdash_s P}{(\Gamma_1, y: T) \circ (\Gamma_1, y: T) \circ (\Gamma_1, y: T, x: \bar{T}, \Delta) \vdash_s \bar{z}\langle y \rangle . P}}{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma, z: *!T, \Delta) \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}\langle y \rangle . P}} \right]_u \\
&= \frac{\llbracket \Gamma, z: *!T, x: \bar{T}, \Delta \vdash_s P \rrbracket_u}{\frac{(\Gamma'_1)^\dagger; (\Delta'), x: (\bar{T}) \vdash_\ell \langle P \rangle :: u: A}{(\Gamma'_1)^\dagger; (\Delta'), x: (T) \multimap (\mathbf{1}) \& (\bar{T}) \vdash_\ell x.\mathbf{inr}; \langle P \rangle :: u: A}} \\
&= \frac{(\Gamma'_1)^\dagger; (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \bar{z}(x).x.\mathbf{inr}; \langle P \rangle :: u: A}{(\Gamma'_1)^\dagger; (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \bar{z}(x).x.\mathbf{inr}; \langle P \rangle :: u: A}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma, z: *!T$ and $(\Gamma'_1)^\dagger = (\Gamma')^\dagger, z: (T) \multimap (\mathbf{1}) \& (\bar{T})$.

(b) If $\text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T), y \notin \text{fn}(P), \text{un}(T) \wedge (\dagger \vee \ddagger^*)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\frac{\frac{\Gamma_1, y: T \vdash_s z: *!T \quad \Gamma_1, y: T \vdash_s y: T \quad \Gamma_1, y: T, x: \bar{T}, \Delta \vdash_s P}{(\Gamma_1, y: T) \circ (\Gamma_1, y: T) \circ (\Gamma_1, y: T, x: \bar{T}, \Delta) \vdash_s \bar{z}\langle y \rangle . P}}{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma, z: *!T, \Delta) \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}\langle y \rangle . P}} \right]_u \\
&= \frac{\llbracket \Gamma, z: *!T, x: \bar{T}, \Delta \vdash_s P \rrbracket_u}{\frac{(\Gamma')^\dagger, z: (\bar{T}); (\Delta'), x: (\bar{T}) \vdash_\ell \langle P \rangle :: u: A}{(\Gamma')^\dagger, z: (\bar{T}); (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \bar{z}(x). \langle P \rangle :: u: A}}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma, z: *!T$.

Notice here that also only $u = z$. Also the condition $y \notin \text{fn}(P)$ is required (yet not in 2).

(7a) **Linear bound output, sending a linear channel T .** We have two possibilities:

(a) If $z \neq u \wedge z \notin \text{fn}(P) \wedge y \notin \text{fn}(Q) \wedge (\dagger \vee \ddagger^*)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\frac{\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s z: \text{lin}!T.S \quad \Gamma, x: T \vdash_s x: T \quad \Upsilon_1}{\Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma, x: T) \circ (\Gamma, \Delta'_1, \Delta) \vdash_s \bar{z}\langle x \rangle . (P \mid Q)}}{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma \circ (\Gamma, \Delta_1, \Delta) \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}\langle x \rangle . (P \mid Q)}} \right]_u \\
&= \frac{\llbracket \Gamma', \Delta_1, y: \bar{T} \vdash_s P \rrbracket_y \quad \llbracket \Gamma, \Delta, z: S \vdash_s Q \rrbracket_u}{(\Gamma')^\dagger; (\Delta_1), (\Delta'), z: (T) \multimap (S) \vdash_\ell \bar{z}(y). (\langle P \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle) :: u: A}
\end{aligned}$$

(b) If $z = u, z \notin \text{fn}(P)$ and $y \notin \text{fn}(Q)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\frac{\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s z: \text{lin}!T.S \quad \Gamma, x: T \vdash_s x: T \quad \Upsilon_1}{\Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma, x: T) \circ (\Gamma, \Delta'_1, \Delta) \vdash_s \bar{z}\langle x \rangle . (P \mid Q)}}{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma \circ (\Gamma, \Delta_1, \Delta) \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}\langle x \rangle . (P \mid Q)}} \right]_u \\
&= \frac{\llbracket \Gamma, \Delta_1, y: \bar{T} \vdash_s P \rrbracket_y \quad \llbracket \Gamma, \Delta, z: S \vdash_s Q \rrbracket_z}{(\Gamma)^\dagger; (\Delta_1), (\Delta) \vdash_\ell \bar{z}(y). (\langle P \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle) :: z: (T) \otimes (S)}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma, z : \text{lin!}T.S$ and $\Delta'_1 = \Delta_1, y : \bar{T}$. Moreover, Υ_1 is the following derivation:

$$\frac{\Gamma'' \simeq_S^z \Gamma \quad \Gamma'', \Delta'_1 \vdash_s P \quad \Gamma, \Delta, z : S \vdash_s Q}{\Gamma'', \Delta'_1 \circ \Gamma, \Delta, z : S \vdash_s P \mid Q}$$

We have that $\Gamma \simeq_S^z \Gamma'$ in our typing condition as it collapses the case of S being linear or unrestricted into a single case, rather than having two cases to handle this when applying parallel composition on $P \mid Q$.

(7b) **Linear bound output, sending unrestricted channel T .** We consider two possibilities:

(a) If $z \neq u, z \notin \text{fn}(P), y \notin \text{fn}(Q), x \notin \text{fn}(P) \cup \text{fn}(Q) \wedge (\dagger \vee \ddagger^*)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\frac{\Upsilon_1 \quad \Gamma_1, z : \text{lin!}T.S \vdash_s z : \text{lin!}T.S \quad \Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : T}{(\Gamma_1, z : \text{lin!}T.S) \circ \Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma_1, \Delta_1, \Delta) \vdash_s \bar{z}(x).(P \mid Q)} \right]^u \\ & \left[\frac{\Gamma, z : \text{lin!}T.S \circ \Gamma \circ (\Gamma, \Delta_1, \Delta) \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P \mid Q)}{\Gamma, \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_s P}_y \quad \Gamma, \Delta, z : S \vdash_s Q}_u \\ & = \frac{(\Gamma')^\dagger; (\Delta_1), (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \bar{z}(y).(P \mid Q) :: u : A}{(\Gamma')^\dagger; (\Delta_1), (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \bar{z}(y).(P \mid Q) :: u : A} \end{aligned}$$

(b) If $z = u, z \notin \text{fn}(P), y \notin \text{fn}(Q)$ and $x \notin \text{fn}(P) \cup \text{fn}(Q)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\frac{\Upsilon_1 \quad \Gamma_1, z : \text{lin!}T.S \vdash_s z : \text{lin!}T.S \quad \Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : T}{(\Gamma_1, z : \text{lin!}T.S) \circ \Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma_1, \Delta_1, \Delta) \vdash_s \bar{z}(x).(P \mid Q)} \right]^u \\ & \left[\frac{\Gamma, z : \text{lin!}T.S \circ \Gamma \circ (\Gamma, \Delta_1, \Delta) \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P \mid Q)}{\Gamma, \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_s P}_y \quad \Gamma, \Delta, z : S \vdash_s Q}_z \\ & = \frac{(\Gamma')^\dagger; (\Delta_1), (\Delta) \vdash_\ell \bar{z}(y).(P \mid Q) :: z : (T) \otimes (S)}{(\Gamma')^\dagger; (\Delta_1), (\Delta) \vdash_\ell \bar{z}(y).(P \mid Q) :: z : (T) \otimes (S)} \end{aligned}$$

where

- $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma, x : T, y : \bar{T}$
- $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma'', x : T, y : \bar{T}$
- Υ_1 is the following derivation:

$$\frac{\Gamma'' \simeq_S^z \Gamma \quad \Gamma'', \Delta_1 \vdash_s P \quad \Gamma_1, \Delta, z : S \vdash_s Q}{(\Gamma''_1, \Delta_1, \Delta) \circ \Gamma, z : S \vdash_s P \mid Q}$$

8. **Linear free output ($\neg\text{un}(T)$).** We consider two possibilities:

(a) If $\neg\text{un}(T) \wedge \neg\text{svr}(T) \wedge (\dagger \vee \ddagger)$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : \text{lin!}(T).S \quad \Gamma, v : T \vdash_s v : T \quad \Gamma, \Delta + x : S \vdash_s P}{\Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma, v : T) \circ \Gamma, \Delta \vdash_s \bar{x}(v).P} \right]^u \\ & = \frac{(\Gamma')^\dagger; v : (T) \vdash_\ell [v \leftrightarrow y] :: y : (T) \quad \Gamma, \Delta + x : S \vdash_s P}_u \\ & \frac{(\Gamma')^\dagger; v : (T), (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \bar{x}(y).([v \leftrightarrow y] \mid P) :: u : (\bar{R})}{(\Gamma')^\dagger; v : (T), (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \bar{x}(y).([v \leftrightarrow y] \mid P) :: u : (\bar{R})} \end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma, x : \text{lin!}(T).S$.

(b) If $u = x$, $\neg\text{un}(T)$ and $\neg\text{svr}(T)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : \text{lin}!(T).S \quad \Gamma, v : T \vdash_s v : T \quad \Gamma, \Delta + x : S \vdash_s P}{\Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma, v : T) \circ \Gamma, \Delta \vdash_s \bar{x}(v).P} \right]^u \\ &= \frac{(\Gamma)^\dagger; v : (T) \vdash_\ell [v \leftrightarrow y] :: y : (T) \quad \llbracket \Gamma, \Delta + x : S \vdash_s P \rrbracket_x}{(\Gamma)^\dagger; v : (T), (\Delta) \vdash_\ell \bar{x}(y).([v \leftrightarrow y] \mid \langle P \rangle) :: u : (T) \otimes (\bar{S})} \end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma, x : \text{lin}!(T).S$

We adopt the condition $\neg\text{svr}(T)$ for the sake of simplicity in proofs. If the condition $\text{svr}(T)$ would be allowed, to preserve typability, v would not make any synchronization. That is, we may send a free server in a free output only if the server is never instantiated. Because this is not very meaningful, we exclude this possibility.

9. **Linear free output on x of an unrestricted value v ($\text{un}(T)$).** We have two possibilities:

(a) If $\text{un}(T)$, $\neg\text{svr}(T) \wedge (\dagger \vee \ddagger)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : \text{lin}!T.S \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash_s v : T \quad \Gamma_2, \Delta + x : S \vdash_s P}{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \circ (\Gamma_2, \Delta) \vdash_s \bar{x}(v).P} \right]^u \\ &= \frac{(\Gamma')^\dagger, v : (T); \cdot \vdash_\ell ![v \leftrightarrow y] :: y : (T) \quad \llbracket \Gamma, v : T, \Delta + x : S \vdash_s P \rrbracket_u}{(\Gamma')^\dagger, v : T; (\Delta'), x : (T) \dashv\!\!\dashv (S) \vdash_\ell \bar{x}(y).(![v \leftrightarrow y] \mid P) :: u : A} \end{aligned}$$

(b) If $u = x$, $\text{un}(T)$ and $\neg\text{svr}(T)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : \text{lin}!T.S \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash_s v : T \quad \Gamma_2, \Delta + x : S \vdash_s P}{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \circ (\Gamma_2, \Delta) \vdash_s \bar{x}(v).P} \right]^u \\ &= \frac{\llbracket \Gamma, v : T, \Delta + x : S \vdash_s P \rrbracket_x}{(\Gamma)^\dagger, v : (T); \cdot \vdash_\ell ![v \leftrightarrow y] :: y : (T) \quad \llbracket \Gamma, v : T, \Delta + x : S \vdash_s P \rrbracket_x} \\ &= \frac{\llbracket \Gamma, v : T, \Delta + x : S \vdash_s P \rrbracket_x}{(\Gamma)^\dagger, v : (T); (\Delta) \vdash_\ell \bar{x}(y).(![v \leftrightarrow y] \mid \langle P \rangle) :: x : (T) \otimes (\bar{S})} \end{aligned}$$

where, for both cases:

- $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma, v : T, x : \text{lin}!(T).S$
- $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma, v : T$

10. **Unrestricted free output of a linear v ($\neg\text{un}(T)$).** We have two possibilities:

(a) If $\neg\text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg\text{cli}(T)$, $\neg\text{un}(T)$, $z \notin \text{fn}(P) \wedge (\dagger \vee \ddagger)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : *!T}{\Gamma_1, v : T \vdash_s v : T \quad \Gamma_1, \Delta \vdash_s P} \right]^u \\
& \frac{\left[\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : *!T}{\Gamma_1, v : T \vdash_s v : T \quad \Gamma_1, \Delta \vdash_s P} \right]^u}{\Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma_1, v : T) \circ (\Gamma_1, \Delta) \vdash_s \bar{x}\langle v \rangle . P}^u \\
& \frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma_1, x : *!T, \Delta \vdash_s P}{u}}{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle^\dagger; v : (T) \vdash_\ell [v \leftrightarrow w] :: w : (T)} \quad \langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle^\dagger; (\Delta'), z : \mathbf{1} \vdash_\ell \langle P \rangle :: u : A}}{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle^\dagger; v : (T), (\Delta'), z : (T) \multimap \mathbf{1} \vdash_\ell \bar{z}(w). ([v \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle P \rangle) :: u : A}}{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle^\dagger; v : (T), (\Delta'), z : (T) \multimap \mathbf{1} \& (\bar{T}) \vdash_\ell z.\mathbf{inl}; \bar{z}(w). ([v \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle P \rangle) :: u : A}}{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle^\dagger; v : (T), (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \bar{x}(z). z.\mathbf{inl}; \bar{z}(w). ([v \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle P \rangle) :: u : A}}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma, x : *!T$ and $\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle^\dagger = \langle \Gamma' \rangle^\dagger, x : (T) \multimap \mathbf{1} \& (\bar{T})$.

(b) If $\neg\text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T)$, $\neg\text{un}(T)$, $z \notin \text{fn}(P) \wedge (\dagger \vee \ddagger)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : *!T}{\Gamma_1, v : T \vdash_s v : T \quad \Gamma_1, \Delta \vdash_s P} \right]^u \\
& \frac{\left[\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : *!T}{\Gamma_1, v : T \vdash_s v : T \quad \Gamma_1, \Delta \vdash_s P} \right]^u}{\Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma_1, v : T) \circ (\Gamma_1, \Delta) \vdash_s \bar{x}\langle v \rangle . P}^u \\
& \frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma_1, x : *!T, \Delta \vdash_s P}{u}}{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle^\dagger; v : (T) \vdash_\ell [v \leftrightarrow w] :: w : (T)} \quad \langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle^\dagger; (\Delta'), z : \mathbf{1} \vdash_\ell \langle P \rangle :: u : A}}{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle^\dagger; v : (T), (\Delta'), z : (T) \multimap \mathbf{1} \vdash_\ell \bar{z}(w). ([v \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle P \rangle) :: u : A}}{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle^\dagger; v : (T), (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \bar{x}(z). \bar{z}(w). ([v \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle P \rangle) :: u : A}}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma, x : *!T$ and $\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle^\dagger = \langle \Gamma' \rangle^\dagger, x : (T) \multimap \mathbf{1}$.

11. **Unrestricted free output of an unrestricted v ($\text{un}(T)$).** In this case, we have $\neg\text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T)$, $\text{un}(T)$, $z \notin \text{fn}(P) \wedge (\dagger \vee \ddagger)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : *!T}{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s v : T \quad \Gamma_1, \Delta \vdash_s P} \right]^u \\
& \frac{\left[\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : *!T}{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s v : T \quad \Gamma_1, \Delta \vdash_s P} \right]^u}{\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_1 \circ (\Gamma_1, \Delta) \vdash_s \bar{x}\langle v \rangle . P}^u \\
& \frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma_1, x : *!T, v : T, \Delta \vdash_s P}{u}}{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle^\dagger; \cdot \vdash_\ell ! [v \leftrightarrow w] :: w : (T)} \quad \langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle^\dagger; (\Delta'), z : \mathbf{1} \vdash_\ell \langle P \rangle :: u : A}}{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle^\dagger; (\Delta'), z : (T) \multimap \mathbf{1} \vdash_\ell \bar{z}(w). (! [v \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle P \rangle) :: u : A}}{\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle^\dagger; (\Delta') \vdash_\ell \bar{x}(z). \bar{z}(w). (! [v \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle P \rangle) :: u : A}}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma, x : *!T, v : T$ and $\langle \Gamma'_1 \rangle^\dagger = \langle \Gamma' \rangle^\dagger, x : (T) \multimap \mathbf{1}, v : (T)$.

This concludes the proof of Theorem 5.8 / Theorem D.5. \square

D.3.1 Proving that linear logic typing induces levels

In this subsection we present the entire construction for the proof of Theorem 5.9.

Defining Strict Partial Orders

We define a strict partial order with maximum element as follows.

Definition D.1

Given a finite set S , a *strict partial order (spo)* with *maximum element* is a binary relation R on S that is irreflexive, asymmetric, transitive and has a maximum element:

(Maximum Element) There exists $x \in S$ such that for all $y \in S$ we have $(x, y) \in R$.

□

We will adopt a strict partial order $>$ and denote $(x, y) \in >$ as $x > y$, and read it as ‘ x is greater than y ’.

Definition D.2

Let S be a finite set (with elements w, u, \dots), and let $>$ be a strict partial order on S .

- We define $>|_w$ as the following restriction of $>$: $>|_w \triangleq \{(x, y) \mid (x, y) \in > \wedge x \neq w \wedge y \neq w\}$.
- We define the relation $>^u$ based on $>$ as $>^u \triangleq \{(u, y) \mid \exists t. y > t \vee t > y\}$.
- We use indexes to decorate strict partial orders; this way, e.g., $>_1, >_2, \dots$ denote different partial orders.
We use $>_i^u$ to denote the relation $>^u$ based on the strict partial order $>_i$, for some i .
- $>^+$ denotes the transitive closure of $>$.

□

Intuitively, $>|_w$ is $>$ but without the pairs that include w . Also, $>^u$ declares u to be greater than any element occurring in $>$.

Notation D.3.1 We say that $\Gamma \vdash_s P \in \mathcal{L}(u)$ if $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s P \rrbracket_u$ is defined.

We consider a refinement of the type system for π_S (cf. Figure 5.5) which allows us to infer a strict partial order $>$ on names for processes. This set of rules is given in Figure D.1: it obeys typing judgments of the form

$$\Gamma \vdash_s^u P$$

for some name u .

We often shall appeal to the rules in Figure D.1 in combination with the assumption that the process under consideration is typable in DILL (via an encoding). This way, e.g., in rule $[S_{>} : \text{UnIn}]$ we do not consider the case $\text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T)$ because such a possibility is not typable in DILL.

Given $\Gamma \vdash_s^u P$, we shall say that u is the *maximum element* of order $>$. We always order with strict partial orders, referred simply as spo or “orders” in the following.

Example D.1 An order for a process


Consider the process $P = (\mathbf{v}xz)(\text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0} \mid \bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0})$, typable as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{w : \mathbf{end}, x : *? \mathbf{end} \vdash_s x : *? \mathbf{end} \quad w : \mathbf{end}, z : *! \mathbf{end} \vdash_s z : *! \mathbf{end}}{w : \mathbf{end}, x : *? \mathbf{end}, y : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s \mathbf{0}} \quad \frac{w : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s w : \mathbf{end}}{w : \mathbf{end}, z : *! \mathbf{end} \vdash_s \bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}}}{w : \mathbf{end}, x : *? \mathbf{end} \vdash_s \text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0} \quad w : \mathbf{end}, z : *! \mathbf{end} \vdash_s \bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}}}{w : \mathbf{end}, x : *? \mathbf{end}, z : *! \mathbf{end} \vdash_s \text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0} \mid \bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}}}{w : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xz)(\text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0} \mid \bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0})}$$

Now, since $w : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s P \in \mathcal{L}(u)$, we can build the ordering $>$ such that $w : \mathbf{end} \vdash^u_{>} P$.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{>_{11} \triangleq \{(a, w), (a, y)\}}{w : \mathbf{end}, y : \mathbf{end} \vdash^a_{>_{11}} \mathbf{0}}}{x : * ? \mathbf{end}, w : \mathbf{end} \vdash^x_{>_1} \text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0}}}{z : * ! \mathbf{end}, w : \mathbf{end} \vdash^u_{>_2} \mathbf{0}}}{z : * ! \mathbf{end}, w : \mathbf{end} \vdash^u_{>_2} \bar{z}(w).\mathbf{0}} \quad >_{11} \triangleq \{(a, w), (a, y)\}}}{>_1 = \{(x, w), (x, y)\}} \quad >_2 \triangleq \{(u, z), (u, w)\}}}{> \triangleq \{(x, w), (x, y), (u, z), (u, w), (u, y), (u, x)\}} \quad > \Rightarrow >_1 \cup >_2 \cup \{(u, y), (u, x)\}} \\ w : \mathbf{end} \vdash^u_{>} (\mathbf{v}xz)(\text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0} \mid \bar{z}(w).\mathbf{0})$$

The final relation is $> \triangleq \{(x, w), (x, y), (u, z), (u, w), (u, y), (u, x)\}$, which is illustrated by the diagram below:



Intuitively, u is a name that does not occur in the process, and is greater than both x and z , the names originating from the parallel threads. The order also captures that x is greater than y and w . \square

Properties of Strict Partial Orders

We prove an invariant property of the maximum element of the order with respect to the free names of its associated process P (i.e., every free name in the context is minimal); the property does not hold for the *bound* names of P .

Proposition D.3.1 *If $\Gamma \vdash^u_{>} P$ for some u then for all $x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma) \setminus u$ there is no y such that $x > y$.*

Proof : By structural induction on P . There are 8 cases.

1. When $P = \mathbf{0}$.

Then, by definition $> \triangleq \{(u, x) \mid x \in \Gamma \setminus u\}$, and the result holds trivially.

2. When $P = P' \mid Q$.

Then, the rule applied is $[S_{>} : \text{Par}_1]$ and Γ can be split into $\Gamma', \Delta_1, \Delta_2$ and the derivation is as follows:

$$[S_{>} : \text{Par}_1] \frac{\frac{\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1 \vdash^w_{>_1} P' \quad \Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2 \vdash^u_{>_2} Q}{\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash^u_{>} P' \mid Q} \quad > \triangleq >_1 \downarrow_w \cup >_2 \cup (>_1^u) \downarrow_w \quad w \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash^u_{>} P' \mid Q}$$

Let $x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma) \setminus u$, i.e., $x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2) \setminus u$.

From $x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2) \setminus u$ we have that $x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma')$, or $x \in \text{dom}(\Delta_1)$ or $x \in \text{dom}(\Delta_2)$ (not simultaneously), and $x \neq u$.

- If $x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma')$ then we can apply the IH in both $\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1 \vdash^w_{>_1} P'$ and $\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2 \vdash^u_{>_2} Q$ and conclude that there is no y such that $x >_1 y$ and $x >_2 y$. Here, we need $x \neq w$ to apply the IH on the type derivation for P' . Therefore, there is no y such that $(x, y) \in >_1 \downarrow_w \cup >_2$. Since $>_1^u$ only add relations to u , it follows easily that there is no y such that $x > y$.

- If $x \in \text{dom}(\Delta_1)$ then $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2)$ and we can only apply IH in $\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1 \vdash_{>_1}^w P'$, and conclude that there is no y such that $x >_1 y$. Similarly, $x \neq w$. Therefore, there is no y such that $(x, y) \in >_1 \downarrow_w \cup (>_1^u) \downarrow_w$. By construction, $>_2$ is defined $\text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2)$, since x is not a member, it follows that there is no y such that $x >_2 y$, and the result follows.
- If $x \in \text{dom}(\Delta_2)$ then then $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1)$ we can only apply IH in $\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2 \vdash_{>_2}^u Q$, and conclude that there is no y such that $x >_2 y$. By definition, there is no y such that $(x, y) \in >_1 \downarrow_w \cup (>_1^u) \downarrow_w$.

Therefore, there is no y such that $x > y$.

3. When $P = (\mathbf{v}z\mathbf{v})(P' \mid Q)$.

Then, the rule applied is $[S_{>} : \text{Par}_2]$ and Γ can be split into $\Gamma', \Delta_1, \Delta_2$ and the derivation is as follows:

$$[S_{>} : \text{Par}_2] \frac{z : V, (\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1) \vdash_{>_1}^z P' \quad v : \bar{V}, (\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2) \vdash_{>_2}^u Q \quad > \triangleq >_1 \cup >_2 \cup >_1^u}{\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}z\mathbf{v})(P' \mid Q)}$$

By applying the IH on both premises we get

- for all $x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1)$ and $x \neq z$ there is no y such that $x >_1 y$.
- for all $x \in \text{dom}(v : \bar{V}, \Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2)$ and $x \neq u$ there is no y such that $x >_2 y$.

Let $x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma) \setminus u$, i.e., $x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2) \setminus u$. Then, it follows from both cases above that there is no y such that $(x, y) \in >_1 \cup >_2$. Since $>_1^u$ only add relations to u , it follows that there is no y such that $x > y$.

4. When $P = \text{un } x(y).P'$.

There are two cases to consider, depending on whether $\neg \text{svr}(T)$ or $\text{svr}(T)$.

- In the first case the derivation is as follows:

$$[S_{>} : \text{UnIn}_1] \frac{\Gamma', y : T \vdash_{>_1}^w P' \quad > \triangleq >_1 \downarrow_w \cup (>_1^x) \downarrow_w \quad \neg \text{svr}(T) \quad w \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma', x : *?T \vdash_{>}^x \text{un } x(y).P'}$$

Then $\Gamma', y : T \vdash_{>_1}^w P'$ for a fresh w , by the IH, for all $x' \in \text{dom}(\Gamma', y : T) \setminus w$, there is no y' such that $x' >_1 y'$. Thus, for $z \in \text{dom}(\Gamma', x : *?T) \setminus x$, since $z \neq w$ (w is fresh), it follows that there is no y' such that $(z, y') \in >_1 \downarrow_w$, which implies that there is no y' such that $z > y'$.

- In the second case, the derivation ends with an application of $[S_{>} : \text{UnIn}_2]$, if we have, in addition, that $\neg \text{cli}(T)$ and the proof is analogous to the previous case.

5. When $P = \text{lin } x(y).P'$.

Then the derivation is as follows:

$$[S_{>} : \text{LinIn}] \frac{\Gamma', x : S, y : T \vdash_{>}^u P'}{\Gamma', x : \text{lin}?T.S \vdash_{>}^u \text{lin } x(y).P'}$$

This case follows easily by the induction hypothesis.

6. When $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(y).P'$.

Then the derivation has the form:

$$[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_1] \frac{\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^u P' \quad > \triangleq >_1 \cup \{(u, y)\} \quad u \neq z}{\Gamma', z : *!T \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(y).P'}$$

By the IH, for all $z \in \text{dom}(\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T}) \setminus u$, there is no y' such that $x >_1 y'$. Since $\text{dom}(\Gamma', z : *!T) \subseteq \text{dom}(\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T})$ and $>_1 \subseteq >$ the result follows trivially.

7. When $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}\langle x \rangle.(P' \mid Q)$.

Then we consider the two cases depending on whether $u = z$ or $u \neq z$:

(a) When $u \neq z$.

$$[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_3] \frac{\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^y P' \quad \Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2, z : S \vdash_{>_2}^u Q \quad > \triangleq >_1 \cup >_2 \cup >_1^u \cup \{(u, x)\} \quad u \neq z}{\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2, z : \text{lin}!T.S \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}\langle x \rangle.(P' \mid Q)}$$

By the induction hypothesis:

- for all $x' \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T}) \setminus y$ there is no y' such that $x' >_1 y'$;
- for all $x' \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2, z : S) \setminus u$ there is no y' such that $x' >_2 y'$;

Let $x' \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2, z : \text{lin}!T.S) \setminus u$. Then $x' \neq y$ and $x' \neq u$, and by the IH it follows that there is no y' such that $(x', y') \in >_1 \cup >_2$. Notice that $>_1^u \cup \{(u, x)\}$ only adds relations to u . Therefore, there is no y' such that $x' > y'$.

(b) When $u = z$ the rule applied is $[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_4]$ and the result follows analogously.

8. When $P = x\langle v \rangle.P$ then we consider the type of x .

(a) If $x : \text{lin}!(T).S$ then we consider the structure of T . If $\text{un}(T)$ we apply rule $[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_1]$; otherwise, we apply rule $[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_2]$. In both cases the result follows following the same ideas of the cases above.

(b) If $x : *!T$ then we consider the structure of T . If $\text{un}(T)$ we apply rule $[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_2]$; otherwise, we apply rule $[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_3]$. In both cases the result follows following the same ideas of the cases above.

This concludes the proof of Proposition D.3.1. \square

The following property says that (typable) processes in \mathcal{L} have an ordering $>$ defined by the rules of Figure D.1. Notice that the converse property does not hold in general: the rules for constructing the partial order are less stringent than the typing rules, essentially because linear/unrestricted considerations on the contexts are not needed for constructing the partial order. They are only minimally used; see for instance, the occurrence of ‘ \otimes ’ in rules $[S_{>} : \text{Par}_1]$ and $[S_{>} : \text{Par}_2]$. Later on, Proposition D.3.3 will ensure that $>$ is a strict partial order.

Proposition D.3.2 *If $\Gamma \vdash_s P \in \mathcal{L}(u)$ then $\Gamma \vdash_{>}^u P$.*

Proof:

By induction on the structure of P . There are 8 cases.

1. When $P = \mathbf{0}$.

Then $\Gamma \vdash_s \mathbf{0}$ and $\Gamma \vdash_s \mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{L}(u)$ with $(\Gamma \setminus u)^\dagger; \cdot \vdash_\ell \mathbf{0} :: u : \mathbf{1}$. Also,

$$[S_{>} : \text{Nil}] \frac{> = \{(u, x) \mid x \in \Gamma \setminus u\}}{\Gamma \vdash_{>}^u \mathbf{0}}$$

2. When $P = P' \mid Q$.

Suppose we have $(\Gamma', \Delta_1) \circ (\Gamma', \Delta) \vdash_s P' \mid Q$ and $(\Gamma', \Delta_1) \circ (\Gamma', \Delta) \vdash_s P' \mid Q \in \mathcal{L}(u)$. Then $\llbracket (\Gamma', \Delta_1) \circ (\Gamma', \Delta) \vdash_s P' \mid Q \rrbracket_u$ holds and by case (2) of Table 5.1, it follows that

$(\Gamma')^\dagger; (\Delta_1), (\Delta') \vdash_{\ell} (\mathbf{v}w)(\langle P' \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle) :: u : A$ holds, for some $\Gamma', \Delta_1, \Delta'$ satisfying Definition 5.30, with $u \notin \text{fn}(P')$ and w fresh. Thus, there are derivations Π_1 and Π_2 such that the following holds (cf. proof of Theorem D.5)

$$[\text{L:cut}] \frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{(\Gamma')^\dagger; (\Delta_1) \vdash_{\ell} \langle P' \rangle :: w : \mathbf{1}} \quad \frac{\Pi_2}{(\Gamma')^\dagger; (\Delta'), w : \mathbf{1} \vdash_{\ell} \langle Q \rangle :: u : A}}{(\Gamma')^\dagger; (\Delta_1), (\Delta') \vdash_{\ell} (\mathbf{v}w)(\langle P' \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle) :: u : A}$$

From type preservation (Theorem D.5) it follows that (i) $\Gamma', \Delta_1 \vdash_s P'$ and $\Gamma', \Delta_1 \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(w)$; (ii) $\Gamma', \Delta \vdash_s Q$ and $\Gamma', \Delta \vdash_s Q \in \mathcal{L}(u)$, and by Theorem 5.1, we have by that $\Gamma' \setminus u, \Delta_1 \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(w)$.

By the induction hypothesis there exist $>_1$ and $>_2$ such that:

$$[\text{S}_{>} : \text{Par}_1] \frac{\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1 \vdash_{>_1}^w P' \quad \Gamma' \otimes \Delta \vdash_{>_2}^u Q \quad \Rightarrow_{>_1} \downarrow_w \cup \Rightarrow_{>_2} \cup \Rightarrow_{>_1}^u \downarrow_w \quad w \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta \vdash_{>}^u P' \mid Q}$$

and the result follows.

3. When $P = (\mathbf{v}zv)(P' \mid Q)$.

Suppose that $(\Gamma', \Delta_1) \circ (\Gamma', \Delta) \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}zv)(P' \mid Q)$ and $(\Gamma', \Delta_1) \circ (\Gamma', \Delta) \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}zv)(P' \mid Q) \in \mathcal{L}(u)$. Then $\llbracket (\Gamma', \Delta_1) \circ (\Gamma', \Delta) \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}zv)(P' \mid Q) \rrbracket_u$ holds and following case (3) of the proof of Theorem D.5 one has $v \notin \text{fn}(P') \wedge z \notin \text{fn}(Q)$. For $z : V$ we distinguish two cases:

- $\neg \text{un}(V)$:

Then, we have (i) $\Gamma', \Delta_1, z : V \vdash_s P'$ and $\Gamma', \Delta_1, z : V \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(z)$; (ii) $\Gamma', \Delta, v : \bar{V} \vdash_s Q$ and $\Gamma', \Delta, v : \bar{V} \vdash_s Q \in \mathcal{L}(u)$.

- $\text{un}(V)$:

Then, we have (i) $\Gamma', \Delta_1, z : V, v : \bar{V} \vdash_s P'$ and $\Gamma', \Delta_1, z : V, v : \bar{V} \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(z)$; (ii) $\Gamma', \Delta, z : V, v : \bar{V} \vdash_s Q$ and $\Gamma', \Delta, z : V, v : \bar{V} \vdash_s Q \in \mathcal{L}(u)$. Further, by strengthening (Theorem 5.1) it follows that $\Gamma', \Delta_1, z : V \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(z)$ and $\Gamma', \Delta, v : \bar{V} \vdash_s Q \in \mathcal{L}(u)$.

In any case, by applying the induction hypothesis, there exist $>_1$ and $>_2$ such that:

$$[\text{S}_{>} : \text{Par}_2] \frac{z : V, (\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1) \vdash_{>_1}^z P' \quad v : \bar{V}, (\Gamma' \otimes \Delta) \vdash_{>_2}^u Q \quad \Rightarrow_{>_1} \cup \Rightarrow_{>_2} \cup \Rightarrow_{>_1}^u \downarrow_w}{\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}zv)(P' \mid Q)}$$

and the result follows.

4. When $P = \text{un } x(y).P'$.

Suppose that $\Gamma, x : *?T \vdash_s \text{un } x(y).P'$ and $\Gamma, x : *?T \vdash_s \text{un } x(y).P' \in \mathcal{L}(x)$. Then, $\llbracket \Gamma, x : *?T \vdash_s \text{un } x(y).P' \rrbracket_u$ holds and following case (4) of the proof of Theorem D.5, it follows that $u = x$ and $x \notin \text{fn}(P')$. Additionally, one has to consider the structure of T :

- (a) $\neg \text{svr}(T)$:

Then $\Gamma', y : T \vdash_s P'$ and $\Gamma', y : T \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(w)$ for w fresh. By the induction hypothesis there exists a $>_1$ such that:

$$[\text{S}_{>} : \text{UnIn}_1] \frac{\Gamma', y : T \vdash_{>_1}^w P' \quad \Rightarrow_{>_1} \downarrow_w \cup (\Rightarrow_{>_1}^u) \downarrow_w \quad \neg \text{svr}(T) \quad w \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma', x : *?T \vdash_{>}^x \text{un } x(y).P'}$$

(b) $\text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg\text{cli}(T)$:

Then (i) $\Gamma', y : T \vdash_s P'$ and $\Gamma', y : T \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(w)$, where w is fresh; (ii) $\Gamma', y : T \vdash_s P'$ and $\Gamma', y : T \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(y)$. By the induction hypothesis there exists $>_1$ such that:

$$[\mathbf{S}_{>} : \text{UnIn}_2] \frac{\Gamma', y : T \vdash_{>_1}^y P' \quad >=>_1 \cup >_1^x \quad \neg\text{cli}(T) \wedge \text{svr}(T)}{\Gamma', x : *?T \vdash_{>}^x \text{un } x(y).P'}$$

and the result follows.

5. When $P = \text{lin } x(y).P'$.

Suppose that $\Gamma', x : \text{lin}?T.S \vdash_s \text{lin } x(y).P'$ and $\Gamma', x : \text{lin}?T.S \vdash_s \text{lin } x(y).P' \in \mathcal{L}(u)$. Then, $\llbracket \Gamma', x : \text{lin}?T.S \vdash_s \text{lin } x(y).P' \rrbracket_u$ holds, and by case (5) of the proof of Theorem D.5 one has $\Gamma', x : S, y : T \vdash_s P'$ and $\Gamma', x : S, y : T \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(u)$. By the induction hypothesis, there exists a $>$ such that:

$$[\mathbf{S}_{>} : \text{LinIn}] \frac{\Gamma', x : S, y : T \vdash_{>}^u P'}{\Gamma', x : \text{lin}?T.S \vdash_{>}^u \text{lin } x(y).P'}$$

6. When $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(y).P'$.

Suppose that $\Gamma', z : *!T \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(y).P'$ and $\Gamma', z : *!T \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(y).P' \in \mathcal{L}(u)$. Then $u \neq z$ and $\llbracket \Gamma', z : *!T \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(y).P' \rrbracket_u$ holds. Then, by case (6) of the proof of Theorem D.5 there are two cases:

- $\text{un}(T)$:
Then, $\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T} \vdash_s P'$ and $\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T} \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(u)$;
- $\neg\text{un}(T)$:
Then, $\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T}, y : \bar{T} \vdash_s P'$ and $\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T}, y : \bar{T} \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(u)$ with $y \notin \text{fn}(P')$.
By strengthening (Theorem 5.1) it follows that $\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T} \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(u)$.

In any case, by the induction hypothesis, there exists a $>_1$ such that:

$$[\mathbf{S}_{>} : \text{UnOut}_1] \frac{\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^u P' \quad >=>_1 \cup \{(u, y)\} \quad u \neq z}{\Gamma', z : *!T \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(y).P'}$$

and the result follows.

7. When $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P' \mid Q)$.

Suppose that $\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2, z : \text{lin}!T.S \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P' \mid Q)$ and $\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2, z : \text{lin}!T.S \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P' \mid Q) \in \mathcal{L}(u)$. Then, $\llbracket \Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2, z : \text{lin}!T.S \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P' \mid Q) \rrbracket_u$ holds and, by case (7) of the proof of Theorem D.5 and we need to consider the following two cases:

(a) $u \neq z$:

Then, we have that $u \notin \text{fn}(P')$ and we distinguish two additional cases:

- i. $\neg\text{un}(T)$:
Then $\Gamma', \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(y)$ and $\Gamma', \Delta_2, z : S, x : t \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(u)$. By Theorem 5.1, it follows that $\Gamma' \setminus u, \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(y)$.
- ii. $\text{un}(T)$:
Then $y \notin \text{fn}(Q)$, $x \notin \text{fn}(P') \cup \text{fn}(Q)$ and we have both $\Gamma', \Delta_1, y : \bar{T}, x : t \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(y)$ and $\Gamma', \Delta_2, z : S, y : \bar{T}, x : t \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(u)$. By Theorem 5.1 it follows that $\Gamma' \setminus u, \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(y)$ and $\Gamma', \Delta_2, z : S, x : t \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(u)$.

By the induction hypothesis there exist $>_1$ and $>_2$ such that:

$$[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_3] \frac{\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^y P' \quad \Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2, z : S \vdash_{>_2}^u Q \quad \Rightarrow_{>_1 \cup >_2 \cup >_1^u} \{(u, x)\} \quad u \neq z}{\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2, z : \text{lin}!T.S \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P' \mid Q)}$$

and the result follows.

(b) $u = z$:

Then we distinguish two additional cases:

i. $\neg \text{un}(T)$:

Then both $\Gamma', \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(y)$ and $\Gamma', \Delta_2, z : S, x : t \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(z)$.

ii. $\text{un}(T)$:

Then $y \notin \text{fn}(Q)$, $x \notin \text{fn}(P') \cup \text{fn}(Q)$ and we have both $\Gamma', \Delta_1, y : \bar{T}, x : t \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(y)$ and $\Gamma', \Delta_2, z : S, y : \bar{T}, x : t \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(z)$. By Theorem 5.1, it follows that $\Gamma', \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(y)$ and $\Gamma', \Delta_2, z : S, x : t \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(z)$. By the induction hypothesis there exist $>_1$ and $>_2$ such that:

$$[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_4] \frac{\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^y P' \quad \Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2, z : S \vdash_{>_2}^z Q \quad \Rightarrow_{>_1 \cup >_2 \cup >_1^z} \{(z, x)\}}{\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2, z : \text{lin}!T.S \vdash_{>}^z (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P' \mid Q)}$$

and the result follows.

8. When $P = \bar{x}(v).P'$.

Then, we need to consider the typing of x . There are four possibilities:

(a) $x : \text{lin}!(T).S$ and $\neg \text{un}(T)$:

Then, by case (8) Theorem D.5 that $\Gamma', x : S \vdash_s P'$ and $\Gamma', x : S \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(u)$. By the induction hypothesis, there exists a $>_1$ such that:

$$[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_2] \frac{\Gamma', x : S \vdash_{>_1}^u P' \quad \Rightarrow_{>_1 \cup \{(u, v)\}} \neg \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma', v : T, x : \text{lin}!(T).S \vdash_{>}^u \bar{x}(v).P'}$$

(b) $x : \text{lin}!(T).S$ and $\text{un}(T)$:

Then, by case (9) Theorem D.5 that $\Gamma', v : T, x : S \vdash_s P'$ and $\Gamma', v : T, x : S \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(u)$. By the induction hypothesis, there exists a $>$ such that:

$$[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_1] \frac{\Gamma', v : T, x : S \vdash_{>}^u P' \quad \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma', v : T, x : \text{lin}!(T).S \vdash_{>}^u \bar{x}(v).P'}$$

(c) $x : *!T$ and $\neg \text{un}(T)$:

Then, by case (10) of Theorem D.5 that $\Gamma', x : *!T \vdash_s P'$ and $\Gamma', x : *!T \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(u)$. By the induction hypothesis there exists a $>_1$ such that:

$$[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_2] \frac{\Gamma', x : *!T \vdash_{>_1}^u P' \quad \Rightarrow_{>_1 \cup \{(u, v)\}} \neg \text{un}(T) \quad u \neq x}{\Gamma_1, x : *!T, v : T \vdash_{>}^u \bar{x}(v).P'}$$

(d) $x : *!T$ and $\text{un}(T)$:

Then, by case (11) of Theorem D.5 that $\Gamma', x : *!T, v : T \vdash_s P'$ and $\Gamma', x : *!T, v : T \vdash_s P' \in \mathcal{L}(u)$. By the induction hypothesis there exists a $>$ such that:

$$[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_3] \frac{\Gamma', x : *!T, v : T \vdash_{>}^u P' \quad u \neq x \quad \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma_1, x : *!T, v : T \vdash_{>}^u \bar{x}(v).P'}$$

and the result follows.

This concludes the proof of Proposition D.3.2. \square

The following property ensures that the rules from Figure D.1 induce a strict partial order:

Proposition D.3.3 *If $\Gamma \vdash^u P$ then $>$ is a strict partial order with maximum element u .*

Proof: By induction on the last applied rule from Figure D.1; we consider 13 cases:

1. When $[S_{>} : \text{Nil}]$ then:

$$[S_{>} : \text{Nil}] \frac{> \triangleq \{(u, x) \mid x \in \Gamma \setminus u\}}{\Gamma \vdash^u \mathbf{0}}$$

and $>$ is an spo with maximum element u by construction.

2. When $[S_{>} : \text{Par}_1]$ then:

$$[S_{>} : \text{Par}_1] \frac{\Gamma \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1 \vdash^w_1 P \quad \Gamma \otimes \Delta_2 \vdash^u_2 Q \quad > \triangleq >_1 \downarrow_w \cup >_2 \cup (>_1^u) \downarrow_w \quad w \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash^u P \mid Q}$$

By the induction hypothesis both $>_1$ and $>_2$ are spo with maximum element w and u respectively. First we show that $>_1 \downarrow_w \cup >_2$ is an spo:

- (Irreflexive) The union of two irreflexive relations is also irreflexive.
- (Transitive) Suppose that $>_1 \downarrow_w \cup >_2$ is not transitive. Then there exists a pair $(a, b) \in >_1 \downarrow_w \wedge (b, c) \in >_2$ or $(a, b) \in >_2 \wedge (b, c) \in >_1 \downarrow_w$ with $(a, c) \notin >_1 \downarrow_w \cup >_2$. Hence we need to find a common b in both $>_1 \downarrow_w$ and $>_2$, however, typing ensures that these are the names within Γ . By Proposition D.3.1 we have that for all names $d \in \Gamma \setminus u$ there exist no name e that either $(d, e) \in >_1 \downarrow_w$ or $(d, e) \in >_2$.
- (Asymmetric) Similarly, let us assume that $>_1 \downarrow_w \cup >_2$ is not asymmetric. Then there exists a pair (a, b) such that $(a, b) \in >_1 \downarrow_w \wedge (b, a) \in >_2$, however, following a similar argument to that of transitivity, we obtain the same contradiction to Proposition D.3.1.

Secondly we show that $> = >_1 \downarrow_w \cup >_2 \cup \geq_1^u \downarrow_w$ is an spo with maximum element u .

- (Irreflexive) Notice how u is not in any connections within $>_1 \downarrow_w$. Then $\geq_1^u \downarrow_w$ is irreflexive which implies that $>$ is irreflexive.
- (Asymmetric) Notice that for this to hold we must have for all $(u, a) \in \geq_1^u \downarrow_w$ that $(a, u) \notin >_1 \downarrow_w \cup >_2$. As there are no connections with u in $>_1 \downarrow_w$ and that u is the maximum element of $>_2$ there can be no relation (b, u) for any b in $>_1 \downarrow_w \cup >_2$. Hence the relation is asymmetric.
- (Transitive) Notice that $\geq_1^u \downarrow_w$ is transitive: To contradict transitivity we would need to show that there exist names a and b such that $(u, a) \in \geq_1^u \downarrow_w$ and $(a, b) \in >_1 \downarrow_w \cup >_2$ such that $(u, b) \notin >$. However, $(u, a) \in \geq_1^u \downarrow_w$ we get that $(a, b) \in >_1 \downarrow_w$ as a is an element of $>_1$ and b is an element of $>_1$, which imply that $(u, b) \in \geq_1^u \downarrow_w$ contradicting that $(u, b) \notin >$.
- (Maximum) The maximum element is u as it is both the maximum element of $>_2$ and $(u, a) \in \geq_1^u \downarrow_w$. Finally, the construction of $(u, a) \in \geq_1^u \downarrow_w$ ensures that u is larger then every element within $>_1$.

3. When $[S_{>} : \text{Par}_2]$ then:

$$[S_{>} : \text{Par}_2] \frac{z : V, (\Gamma \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1) \vdash_{>_1}^z P \quad v : \bar{V}, (\Gamma \otimes \Delta_2) \vdash_{>_2}^u Q \quad > \triangleq >_1 \cup >_2 \cup >_1^u}{\Gamma \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}z v)(P \mid Q)}$$

By the induction hypothesis both $>_1$ and $>_2$ are spo with maximum element w and u . We argue that $>$ is an spo with maximum element u follows analogously to 2 with the only difference being that the maximum element z of $>_1$ is preserved.

4. When $[S_{>} : \text{LinIn}]$ then:

$$[S_{>} : \text{LinIn}] \frac{\Gamma, x : S, y : T \vdash_{>}^u P}{\Gamma, x : \text{lin}?T.S \vdash_{>}^u \text{lin } x(y).P}$$

By the induction hypothesis both $>$ is an spo with maximum element u .

5. When $[S_{>} : \text{UnIn}_1]$ then:

$$[S_{>} : \text{UnIn}_1] \frac{\Gamma, y : T \vdash_{>}^w P \quad > \triangleq >_1 \downarrow_w \cup (>_1^x) \downarrow_w \quad \neg \text{svr}(T) \quad w \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma, x : *?T \vdash_{>}^x \text{un } x(y).P}$$

By the induction hypothesis $>_1 \downarrow_w$ is a strict partial order with maximum element w . We show that $>$ is a strict partial orders with maximum element x . As both $>_1 \downarrow_w$ and $>_1^x$ are irreflexive then so is their union. Both $>_1 \downarrow_w$ and $>_1^x$ are asymmetric, there are no connections in $>_1 \downarrow_w$ regarding x and $>_1^x$ only contain connection in x hence $>$ is asymmetric. Assume $>$ is not transitive, then there exists names a and b such that $(x, a) \in >_1^x$ and $(a, b) \in >_1 \downarrow_w$ with $(x, b) \notin >$ however $(a, b) \in >_1 \downarrow_w$ implies that $(x, b) \in >_1^x$. Finally by construction x is the largest element of $>_1^x$ which contains all elements of $>_1 \downarrow_w$.

6. When $[S_{>} : \text{UnIn}_2]$ then:

$$[S_{>} : \text{UnIn}_2] \frac{\Gamma, y : T \vdash_{>}^y P \quad > \triangleq >_1 \cup (>_1^x) \quad \neg \text{cli}(T) \wedge \text{svr}(T)}{\Gamma, x : *?T \vdash_{>}^x \text{un } x(y).P}$$

By the induction hypothesis $>_1$ is an spo with maximum element y . The case follows analogously to case 5.

7. When $[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_1]$ then:

$$[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_1] \frac{\Gamma, v : T, x : S \vdash_{>}^u P \quad \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma, v : T, x : \text{lin}!(T).S \vdash_{>}^u \bar{x}(v).P}$$

By the induction hypothesis $>$ is an spo with maximum element u .

8. When $[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_2]$ then:

$$[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_2] \frac{\Gamma, x : S \vdash_{>}^u P \quad > \triangleq >_1 \cup \{(u, v)\} \quad \neg \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma, v : T, x : \text{lin}!(T).S \vdash_{>}^u \bar{x}(v).P}$$

By the induction hypothesis $>_1$ is an spo with maximum element u . We show that $>$ is an spo with maximum element u . Clearly $>$ is irreflexive. As $>_1$ is asymmetric we must show that adding the pair $\{(u, v)\}$ preserves this, but as $v \notin \text{fn}(P)$ then there are no pairs of the form (v, a) or (a, v) for some name a in $>_1$. This same argument is made to show transitivity.

9. When $[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_3]$ then:

$$[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_3] \frac{\Gamma \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^y P \quad \Gamma \otimes \Delta, z : S \vdash_{>_2}^u Q \quad > \triangleq_{>_1} \cup >_2 \cup >_1^u \cup \{(u, x)\} \quad u \neq z}{\Gamma \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2, z : \text{lin}!T.S \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P \mid Q)}$$

By the induction hypothesis both $>_1$ and $>_2$ are strict partial orders with maximum element y and u respectively. $>_1 \downarrow_w \cup >_2 \cup >_1^u \downarrow_w$ is a strict partial order with maximum element u which is argued analogously to that of case 2. Secondly, we show that $>$ is a strict partial order with maximum element u which is then argued analogously to that of case 8.

10. When $[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_4]$ then:

$$[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_4] \frac{\Gamma \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^y P \quad \Gamma \otimes \Delta_2, z : S \vdash_{>_2}^z Q \quad > \triangleq_{>_1} \cup >_2}{\Gamma \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2, z : \text{lin}!T.S \vdash_{>}^z (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P \mid Q)}$$

By the induction hypothesis both $>_1$ and $>_2$ are strict partial orders with maximum element y and z respectively. $>$ follows from the first step of case 2.

11. When $[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_1]$ then:

$$[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_1] \frac{\Gamma, z : *!T, x : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^u P \quad > \triangleq_{>_1} \cup \{(u, y)\} \quad u \neq z}{\Gamma, z : *!T \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(y).P}$$

By the induction hypothesis $>_1$ is a strict partial order with maximum element u . We argue $>$ is a strict partial order with maximum element u analogously to case 8.

12. When $[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_2]$ then:

$$[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_2] \frac{\Gamma, x : *!T, v : T \vdash_{>}^u P \quad u \neq x \quad \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma_1, x : *!T, v : T \vdash_{>}^u \bar{x}(v).P}$$

By the induction hypothesis $>$ is a strict partial order with maximum element u .

13. When $[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_3]$ then:

$$[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_3] \frac{\Gamma, x : *!T \vdash_{>_1}^u P \quad \neg \text{un}(T) \quad > \triangleq_{>_1} \cup \{(u, v)\} \quad u \neq x}{\Gamma_1, x : *!T, v : T \vdash_{>}^u \bar{x}(v).P}$$

By the induction hypothesis $>_1$ is an spo with maximum element u . We argue $>$ is an spo with maximum element u analogously to case 8.

This concludes the proof of Proposition D.3.3. \square

Operations on Strict Partial Orders

Up to here, we have defined the strict partial order induced by a typable process. Because we need to reason compositionally about processes, we should define corresponding ways of combining their partial orders.

Notation D.3.2 We give a shorthand notation on input and output prefixes within S on a name x to be:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{(ch5x, \tilde{y})} &:= (\mathbf{v}yz)\bar{x}(y) && \text{when } \tilde{y} = \{y, z\} \\ &| \bar{x}(y) \mid q x(y) && \text{when } \tilde{y} = \{y\} \end{aligned}$$

The following definition serves to extract causality relations between names of a process, both free and bound.

Definition D.3 Connected Names

Let P be a process and x be a name (either bound or free in P). The *connected names* of P with respect to x , written $\text{cc}(x, P)$, is a finite list of pairs $(n_1, \tilde{m}_1), \dots, (n_k, \tilde{m}_k)$, where each n_i is a name and \tilde{m}_i is a list of names connected to n_i in P . This list of pairs is defined by induction on P as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cc}(x, \alpha_{(ch5x, \{y\})} P') &= (y, \text{cc}(y, P')) :: \text{cc}(x, P') \\ \text{cc}(x, \alpha_{(ch5x, \{y, z\})} P') &= (z, \text{cc}(z, P')) :: \text{cc}(x, P') \\ \text{cc}(x, \alpha_{(ch5w, \bar{y})} P') &= \text{cc}(x, P') && \text{if } w \neq x \\ \text{cc}(x, P) &= \emptyset && \text{if } x \notin \mathbf{n}(P) \\ \text{cc}(x, (P' \mid Q)) &= \text{cc}(x, P') && \text{if } x \in \mathbf{n}(P') \\ \text{cc}(x, (P' \mid Q)) &= \text{cc}(x, Q) && \text{if } x \notin \mathbf{n}(P') \\ \text{cc}(x, (\mathbf{v}yz)P') &= \text{cc}(x, P') \end{aligned}$$

□

Example D.2 C

Consider the process $P = \text{un } x(y). \bar{y}\langle z \rangle. \mathbf{0}$ which, following Notation D.3.2, can be written as $P = \alpha_{(ch5x, \{y\})} \cdot \alpha_{(ch5y, \{z\})} \cdot \mathbf{0}$. The connected names of P w.r.t. x are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cc}(x, \alpha_{(ch5x, \{y\})} \cdot \alpha_{(ch5y, \{z\})} \cdot \mathbf{0}) &= (y, \text{cc}(y, \alpha_{(ch5y, \{z\})} \cdot \mathbf{0})) :: \text{cc}(x, \alpha_{(ch5y, \{z\})} \cdot \mathbf{0}) \\ &= (y, (z, \text{cc}(z, \mathbf{0})) :: \text{cc}(z, \mathbf{0})) :: \text{cc}(x, \mathbf{0}) \\ &= (y, (z, \emptyset) :: \emptyset) :: \emptyset \\ &= (y, (z, \emptyset)) \end{aligned}$$

The connected names of P w.r.t. y are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cc}(y, \alpha_{(ch5x, \{y\})} \cdot \alpha_{(ch5y, \{z\})} \cdot \mathbf{0}) &= \text{cc}(y, \alpha_{(ch5y, \{z\})} \cdot \mathbf{0}) \\ &= (z, \text{cc}(z, \mathbf{0})) :: \text{cc}(z, \mathbf{0}) \\ &= (y, \emptyset) :: \emptyset = (y, \emptyset) \end{aligned}$$

□

Example D.3 Cont. Example D.1

Consider the process $P = (\mathbf{v}xz)(\text{un } x(y). \mathbf{0} \mid \bar{z}\langle w \rangle. \mathbf{0})$ which, following Notation D.3.2, can be written as $P = (\mathbf{v}xz)(\alpha_{(ch5x, \{y\})} \mid \alpha_{(ch5z, \{w\})})$. Then, the connected names of P w.r.t. x and z are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cc}(x, P) &= \text{cc}(x, \alpha_{(ch5x, \{y\})}) = (y, \emptyset) :: \emptyset = (y, \emptyset) \\ \text{cc}(z, P) &= \text{cc}(z, \alpha_{(ch5z, \{w\})}) = (w, \emptyset) :: \emptyset = (w, \emptyset) \end{aligned}$$

□

Given a strict partial order $>$, we now define an extension of $>$ that arises by “joining” (or merging) two elements in $>$ by combining their respective pairs.

Definition D.4 Join of An Order

Let $>$ be an spo with maximal element on a set S , and two elements $x, y \in S$. We define the function $\text{join}(>, x, y)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{join}(>, x, y) = (> \cup \{(x, a) \mid (y, a) \in >\} \\ & \cup \{(a, x) \mid (a, y) \in >\} \\ & \cup \{(y, a) \mid (x, a) \in >\} \\ & \cup \{(a, y) \mid (a, x) \in >\})^+ \end{aligned}$$

□

In the above definition, the transitive closure ($^+$) is needed: if we intend to join x and y , and we have $a > x$ and $y > b$ then we add $a > y$ and $x > b$ but also $a > b$ needs to be added to preserve a strict partial order.

We now define functions that enable us to (i) simplify the pairs contained in the ordering and (ii) potentially extend this ordering by inspecting the process structure. This is done by starting from a basic operation that relates connected names.

Definition D.5 Flattening of An Order

Let A, B, \dots be lists of pairs of names, in the sense of Definition D.3, and $>$ be an spo . First, we define the function $\text{flatcc}(>, A, B)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{flatcc}(>, (x, A) : B, (y, C) : D) &= \text{join}(\text{flatcc}(\text{flatcc}(>, A, C), B, D), x, y) \\ \text{flatcc}(>, \emptyset, \emptyset) &= \text{flatcc}(>, A, \emptyset) = \text{flatcc}(>, \emptyset, A) = > \end{aligned}$$

Second, given a process $P \in \mathcal{L}$, we define the function $\text{flat}(>, P)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{flat}(>, (P \mid Q)) &= \text{flat}(\text{flat}(>, P), Q) \\ \text{flat}(>, (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}\langle y \rangle.P) &= \text{join}(\text{flat}(>, P), x, y) \\ \text{flat}(>, (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}\langle x \rangle.(P \mid Q)) &= \text{join}(\text{flat}(>, P \mid Q), x, y) \\ \text{flat}(>, (\mathbf{v}zv)(P \mid Q)) &= \text{join}(\text{flat}(\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q)), P \mid Q), z, v), (*) \\ \text{flat}(>, \text{lin } x(y).P) &= \text{flat}(>, P) \\ \text{flat}(>, \text{un } x(y).P) &= \text{flat}(>, P) \\ \text{flat}(>, \bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P) &= \text{flat}(>, P) \\ \text{flat}(>, \emptyset) &= > \end{aligned}$$

□

Where $(*)$ requires $z \in \text{fn}(P) \wedge v \in \text{fn}(Q)$. The fact that flattening preserves some relevant structure will be addressed later on, via Lemma D.3.2.

Example D.4 Cont. Example D.3

Consider the flattening of the process $P = (\mathbf{v}xz)(\text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0} \mid \bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0})$ w.r.t. the $\text{spo } > \triangleq \{(x, w), (x, y), (u, z), (u, w), (u, y), (u, x)\}$ built in Example D.1.


To compute $\text{flat}(>, (\mathbf{v}xz)(\text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0} \mid \bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}))$, we first obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(x, \text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0}), \text{cc}(z, \bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0})) &= \text{flatcc}(>, (y, \emptyset) :: \emptyset, (w, \emptyset) :: \emptyset) \\ &= \text{join}(\text{flatcc}(\text{flatcc}(>, \emptyset, \emptyset), \emptyset, \emptyset), y, w) \\ &= \text{join}(>, y, w) \\ &= > \end{aligned}$$

Now we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{flat}(>, P) &= \text{join}(\text{flat}(\text{flat}(\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(x, \text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0}), \text{cc}(z, \bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0})), \text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0}), \bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}), x, z) \\
&= \text{join}(\text{flat}(\text{flat}(>, \text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0}), \bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}), x, z) \\
&= \text{join}(\text{flat}(>, \bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}), x, z) \\
&= \text{join}(>, x, z) \\
&= (> \cup \{(z, w), (z, y)\})
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, in this case, flattening extends the ordering. This can be illustrated by the diagram:



which can be simplified to

$$u \longrightarrow x, z \longrightarrow w, y$$

□

Notation D.3.3 Consider the following notations:

- We write $w, v \asymp x, y$ to denote $(w = x \wedge v = y) \vee (v = x \wedge w = y)$ (that is, if $\{w, v\} \cap \{x, y\} = \{x, y\}$).
- Similarly, we write $w, v \not\asymp x, y$ to denote $w \neq x \wedge v \neq x \wedge w \neq y \wedge v \neq y$ (that is, if $\{w, v\} \cap \{x, y\} = \emptyset$).

We now define a predicate that indicates whether that two names are *compatible* and may be joined.

Definition D.6 Compatibility

The auxiliary predicate $\text{compcc}(A, B, x, y)$ is defined on two lists of connected channels A and B as:

$$\text{compcc}((w, A) : B, (v, C) : D, x, y) = \begin{cases} \text{true} & \text{if } w, v \asymp x, y \\ \text{compcc}(A, C, x, y) \vee \text{compcc}(B, D, x, y) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\text{compcc}(\emptyset, \emptyset, x, y) = \text{compcc}(A, \emptyset, x, y) = \text{compcc}(\emptyset, A, x, y) = \text{false}$$

Let $P \in \mathcal{L}$ be a process, and let x, y be two names. The predicate $\text{comp}(P, x, y)$ is defined on the

structure of P as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{comp}(\mathbf{0}, x, y) &= \text{false} \\
\text{comp}(\bar{w}\langle v \rangle.P', x, y) &= \begin{cases} \text{comp}(P', x, y) & \text{if } w, v \not\asymp x, y \\ \text{false} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\text{comp}((\mathbf{v}w, v)\bar{z}\langle v \rangle.P', x, y) &= \begin{cases} \text{true} & \text{if } w, v \asymp x, y \\ \text{comp}(P', x, y) & \text{if } w, v \not\asymp x, y \\ \text{false} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\text{comp}((\mathbf{v}wv)\bar{z}\langle w \rangle.(P' \mid Q), x, y) &= \begin{cases} \text{true} & \text{if } w, v \asymp x, y \\ \text{comp}(P', x, y) \vee \text{comp}(Q, x, y) & \text{if } w, v \not\asymp x, y \\ \text{false} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\text{comp}(\text{lin } w(v).P', x, y) &= \begin{cases} \text{comp}(P', x, y) & \text{if } w, v \not\asymp x, y \\ \text{false} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\text{comp}(\text{un } w(v).P', x, y) &= \begin{cases} \text{comp}(P', x, y) & \text{if } w, v \not\asymp x, y \\ \text{false} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\text{comp}((\mathbf{v}wv)(P' \mid Q), x, y) &= \begin{cases} \text{true} & \text{if } w, v \asymp x, y \\ \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(w, (\mathbf{v}wv)(P' \mid Q)), & \text{otherwise} \\ \quad \text{cc}(v, (\mathbf{v}wv)(P' \mid Q)), x, y) & \\ \vee \text{comp}(P', x, y) \vee \text{comp}(Q, x, y) & \end{cases} \\
\text{comp}(P' \mid Q, x, y) &= \text{comp}(P', x, y) \vee \text{comp}(Q, x, y)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Note that to verify when the compatible predicate holds we need to check the pairs of names in a restriction, say $(\mathbf{v}wv)$ above, and also the connected names $\text{cc}(\cdot, P)$ of the process.

To illustrate this predicate, consider the following example.

Example D.5 Cont. Example D.4

Recall once again process $P = (\mathbf{v}xz)(\text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0} \mid \bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0})$.

From Example D.3, we have $\text{cc}(x, P) = (y, \mathbf{0}) :: \mathbf{0}$ and $\text{cc}(z, P) = (w, \mathbf{0}) :: \mathbf{0}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{comp}(P, x, z) &= \text{true} \\
\text{comp}(P, y, w) &= \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(z, P), y, w) \vee \text{comp}(\text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0}, y, w) \\
&\quad \vee \text{comp}(\bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}, y, w) \\
&= \text{compcc}((y, \mathbf{0}) :: \mathbf{0}, (w, \mathbf{0}) :: \mathbf{0}, y, w) \vee \text{comp}(\text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0}, y, w) \\
&\quad \vee \text{comp}(\bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}, y, w) \\
&= \text{true} \vee \text{comp}(\text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0}, y, w) \vee \text{comp}(\bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}, y, w) \\
&= \text{true} \\
\text{comp}(P, u, y) &= \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(z, P), u, y) \vee \text{comp}(\text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0}, u, y) \\
&\quad \vee \text{comp}(\bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0}, u, y) \\
&= \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(z, P), u, y) \vee \text{false} \vee \text{false} \\
&= \text{compcc}((y, \mathbf{0}) :: \mathbf{0}, (w, \mathbf{0}) :: \mathbf{0}, u, y) \\
&= \text{false}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the $\text{comp}(P, \cdot, \cdot)$ predicate holds on the names in P that were joined when flattening $>$ in Example D.4:

$$u \longrightarrow x, z \longrightarrow w, y$$

□

The next definition allows for collecting the names that are compatible w.r.t. the Definition D.6:

Definition D.7 Set of compatible names

The set of *compatible names in a process P* , denoted $\text{compN}(P)$, is defined inductively as follows, using Definition D.3 (the connected names of P with respect to x , written $\text{cc}(x, P)$) and Definition D.6:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{compN}(\mathbf{0}) &= \emptyset \\ \text{compN}(\bar{w}\langle v \rangle.P) &= \text{compN}(P) \\ \text{compN}(\mathbf{v}wv\bar{z}\langle v \rangle.P) &= \{(w, v), (v, w)\} \cup \text{compN}(P) \\ \text{compN}(\mathbf{v}wv\bar{z}\langle w \rangle.(P \mid Q)) &= \{(w, v), (v, w)\} \cup \text{compN}(P) \cup \text{compN}(Q) \\ \text{compN}(\text{lin } w\langle v \rangle.P) &= \text{compN}(P) \\ \text{compN}(\text{un } w\langle v \rangle.P) &= \text{compN}(P) \\ \text{compN}(\mathbf{v}wv(P \mid Q)) &= \{(w, v), (v, w)\} \cup \text{compN}(P) \cup \text{compN}(Q) \cup \{(x, y) \mid \\ &\quad \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(w, \mathbf{v}wv(P \mid Q)), \text{cc}(v, \mathbf{v}wv(P \mid Q)), x, y)\} \\ \text{compN}(P \mid Q) &= \text{compN}(P) \cup \text{compN}(Q) \end{aligned}$$

□

For example, the set of compatible names for the process in Example D.4, i.e., $\text{compN}(P) = \{(x, z), (z, x), (y, w), (w, y)\}$.

The next property establishes the relation between (i) the names within a process that can be joined and (ii) the names that are compatible. This result is used in the proof of Lemma D.3.3.

Proposition D.3.4 (flat vs. compN) *Let $P \in \mathcal{L}$ a process and $>$ be an spo . The set of compatible names on a process P , $\text{compN}(P)$, is exactly the set of names in which the function $\text{flat}(>, P)$ applies the join function on.*

Proof: Follows trivially from Definitions D.5 and D.7. □

Example D.6

From Example D.4 we can see that when evaluating $\text{flat}(>, \cdot)$ with $P = \mathbf{v}xz(\text{un } x\langle y \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \bar{z}\langle w \rangle.\mathbf{0})$ then $\text{join}(>, -, -)$ is applied twice, the first time on the pair of channels are y and w and the second time it is applied on x and z . Secondly as prevesly stated $\text{compN}(P) = \{(x, z), (z, x), (y, w), (w, y)\}$ which is exactly the pair of channels that are joined. □

We define a notion of transitive closure up-to compatibility, in the sense defined above.

Definition D.8 Closure of $>$ under P

Let $>$ be an spo and P be a process. We write $a >^*_P b$ if one of the following holds:

1. $a > b$
2. $\exists c. a > c \wedge c >^*_P b$
3. $\exists c. \text{comp}(P, a, c) \wedge c >^*_P b$

$$4. \exists c. a >_P^* c \wedge \text{comp}(P, c, b)$$

When the process P is clear from the context, we shall write ' $a >^* b$ ' rather than ' $a >_P^* b$ '. \square

Intuitively, $a >_P^* b$ identifies 'paths' between names a and b , induced by the relation $>$ and also by the compatible names in P .

Example D.7

Recalling the $\text{spo } > \triangleq \{(x, w), (x, y), (u, z), (u, w), (u, y), (u, x)\}$ built in Example D.1. It is easy to see that $u >_P^* y$ since $u > x \wedge x > y$. Unfortunately, the example does not add any interesting insight with the compatible names, in fact, $x > y \wedge \text{comp}(P, y, w)$ implies $x >_P^* w$, since $x > w$ the compatibility does not add any new information. \square

We are interested in spos which are acyclic (i.e., without loops), a notion that we define considering compatibility between two names, and the closure up-to compatibility just given.

Definition D.9 Acyclic Orders

Let $>$ be an F, P be a process, and x and y be names in P . We define the following predicate.

$$\text{acyclic}(>, P, x, y) = \begin{cases} \text{true,} & \begin{array}{l} i) x \not>_P^* y; \text{ and} \\ ii) (x >_P^* a \implies a \not>_P^* y) \wedge (a >_P^* x \implies y \not>_P^* a); \text{ and} \\ iii) (a >_P^* x \wedge y >_P^* b) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, a, b); \text{ and} \\ iv) a >_P^* x >_P^* b \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, a, b). \end{array} \\ \text{false,} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

\square

Example D.8 Cont. Example D.4


Consider the process $P = (\mathbf{v}xz)(\text{un } x(y).\mathbf{0} \mid \bar{z}(w).\mathbf{0})$ and the spo

$$> \triangleq \{(x, w), (x, y), (u, z), (u, w), (u, y), (u, x), (z, w), (z, y)\}$$

We have checked that $\text{comp}(P, x, z)$ and $\text{comp}(P, y, w)$. Below we check that $\text{acyclic}(>, P, x, z)$:

- $x \not> z$;
- $(x > w \text{ but } w \not> z)$ and $(x > y \text{ but } y \not> z)$. Similarly, $u > x$ but $z \not> u$;
- $u > x \wedge z > y \wedge \neg \text{comp}(P, u, y)$.

Similarly, one can verify that $\text{acyclic}(>, P, y, w)$. In fact, $y \not> w$. Also, $x, u, z > y$ but $\nexists a. w > a$. Note that for the relation to hold the red arrows are disallowed (they would induce a cycle):



\square

The following definition lifts our definition of acyclicity from pairs of names to entire processes:

Definition D.10

Let $P \in \mathcal{L}$ be a process and $>$ an spo . Recall that $\text{compN}(P)$ has been defined in Definition D.7. The predicate $\text{noCycle}(>, P)$ is then defined as:

$$\text{noCycle}(>, P) = \bigwedge_{(x,y) \in \text{compN}(P)} \text{acyclic}(>, P, x, y)$$

\square

Properties

We now state a number of useful properties; all items follow immediately from the definitions.

Proposition D.3.5 *The following properties hold:*

1. $\text{comp}(P, x, y) \iff \text{comp}(P, y, x)$.
2. $\text{comp}(P, x, y) \implies x, y \in n(P)$.
3. $\text{acyclic}(>, P, x, y) \iff \text{acyclic}(>, P, y, x)$.
4. $\text{noCycle}(>, P) \implies \text{noCycle}(>, P')$, where P' is a subprocess of P .
5. If P' is a subprocess of P with $a >_P^* b$ then $a >_{P'}^* b$.
6. If $\Gamma \vdash^u P$ and $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma) \cup n(P)$ then $\nexists y$ such that $x > y \vee y > x \vee \text{comp}(P, x, y)$.
7. If $\Gamma \vdash^u P$ then there is no x such that $\text{comp}(P, u, x)$.
8. If $(\mathbf{v}wv)(P \mid Q) \in \mathcal{L}$ with $\Gamma \vdash^u (\mathbf{v}wv)(P \mid Q)$ then

$$\text{cc}(w, (\mathbf{v}wv)(P \mid Q)) = \text{cc}(w, P)$$

$$\text{cc}(v, (\mathbf{v}wv)(P \mid Q)) = \text{cc}(v, Q)$$

9. If $> = >_1 \cup >_2$ then $>^u = >_1^u \cup >_2^u$.
10. If $\Gamma \vdash^u P$ with $a \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$ and $\text{comp}(P, a, b)$ then $b \in \text{bn}(P)$.
11. If $>_1 \subseteq >$ then $\text{flat}(>_1, P) \subseteq \text{flat}(>, P)$.
12. If $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s P \rrbracket_l$ and l is a subfunction of l' then $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s P \rrbracket_{l'}$.
13. Given a strict partial order $>$, we have $> \subseteq \text{flat}(>, P)$, for any P .
14. Suppose $\Gamma \vdash^u P$ with $a \in \text{dom}(\Gamma) \setminus u$. Assume given a sequence of distinct, channels of compatible channels b_1, \dots, b_n, b such that $\text{comp}(P, a, b_1)$, $\text{comp}(P, b_1, b_2)$, \dots , $\text{comp}(P, b_n, b_{n+1})$. Then $b_{n+1} \in \text{bn}(P)$ and $b_{n+1} \not>^* c$ for any c .
15. Suppose $\Gamma \vdash^u P$ with $a \in \text{dom}(\Gamma) \setminus u$, then $a \not>_P^* c$ for any c .
16. Suppose $\Gamma \vdash^u P$ and $\text{noCycle}(>, P)$ then $a \not>_P^* a$ for any name a .

Proof: Follows easily by the definition. We give a short description for the following cases:

- (6) First, notice that the rules for constructing $>$ in $\Gamma \vdash^u P$ add pairs exclusively from Γ or the names of P . Hence, if x occurs within neither of them then x can be neither greater nor less than any channel. Second, compatible channels are only defined on the names of P , this being either bound or free which x is neither hence is not compatible to any channel either.
- (8) Typing ensures that $w \in \text{fn}(P) \wedge w \notin n(P)$; similarly, $v \notin n(P) \wedge v \in \text{fn}(P)$. This way, the proof then follows by definition.
- (12) The level function defines a hierarchy on channels that avoids cyclic dependencies; adding channels to this function will not affect the dependencies on weights. Intuitively, if a channel does not have any weight dependencies nor is dependent on any weight (such as a channel not occurring in the free or bound names of P) then these weights are not of consequence to the typing.
- (14) If a is free then, by the definition of compatibility, we must have that a is sent within an output prefix and that the compatible channel b_1 is received via an input prefix (say, $q w(b_1).P'$). Now, b_1 is also free within P' and by Proposition D.3.1 we have that there does not exist a c_1 such that $b_1 >' c_1$ for some spoused in the type derivation of $q w(b_1).P'$ and hence $b_1 > c_1$. Therefore, for b_1 to be compatible to b_2 we argue similarly that b_2 must also be bound; this argument may be made inductively along the length of the chain of compatible channels showing that b must also be a bound name and that $b \not>^* c$ for any c .

- (15) First note that from proposition D.3.1 $a \not\prec^* d$. Suppose by contradiction that $a \succ_p^* c$, then there must exist a' such that either $a \succ a' \wedge a' \succ_p^* c$ or $\text{comp}(P, a, a') \wedge a' \succ_p^* c$. From proposition D.3.1 we now that the first case does not hold, therefore, we check $\text{comp}(P, a, a') \wedge a' \succ_p^* c$. From Proposition D.3.5(14) we know that $a' \not\prec d$ for any d hence for $\text{comp}(P, a, a') \wedge a' \succ_p^* c$ to hold then it must be the case that $\text{comp}(P, a, a') \wedge \text{comp}(P, a', a'') \wedge a'' \succ_p^* c$. By performing induction on the chain of compatible channels one can see that every channel in the chain cannot have an element smaller within the spomax and hence $a \not\prec^* c$. \square

Notation D.3.4 We will write ' \succ is an $\text{spomax}(u)$ ' to abbreviate that \succ is a strict partial order with maximal element u .

The following proposition shows that joining compatible channels in an acyclic partial order does not jeopardize acyclicity.

Lemma D.3.1 Let $P \in \mathcal{L}$ and \succ be its $\text{spomax}(u)$. If $\text{noCycle}(\succ, P)$ and $\text{comp}(P, x, y)$ then $\text{join}(\succ, x, y)$ is an $\text{spomax}(u)$ such that $\text{noCycle}(\text{join}(\succ, x, y), P)$.

Proof: We prove two points separately: first, that $\text{join}(\succ, x, y)$ a strict partial order; then, we prove that $\text{noCycle}(\text{join}(\succ, x, y), P)$ holds.

- $\text{join}(\succ, x, y)$ is a strict partial order:

(Irreflexive) Suppose, by contradiction, that there exists a z such that $(z, z) \in \text{join}(\succ, x, y)$. As \succ is irreflexive, $(z, z) \notin \succ$, then it was added by the transitive closure of the sets added in the definition: $\{(x, a) \mid (y, a) \in \succ\}$, $\{(a, x) \mid (a, y) \in \succ\}$, $\{(y, a) \mid (x, a) \in \succ\}$ and $\{(a, y) \mid (a, x) \in \succ\}$.

Then, either $(z, x), (x, z)$ or $(z, y), (y, z)$ are in $\text{join}(\succ, x, y)$. Suppose, w.l.o.g. that the pair is $(z, x), (x, z)$. Suppose w.l.o.g. $(x, z) \in \succ$ and $(z, x) \notin \succ$, i.e., (z, x) was added in $\text{join}(\succ, x, y)$ after closure. Then, $(z, y) \in \succ$ and, by transitivity, we would have $(x, y) \in \succ$. However, by hypothesis, we have $\text{noCycle}(\succ, P)$ and $\text{comp}(P, x, y)$. which imply that $\text{acyclic}(\succ, P, x, y)$, and consequently, $x \not\prec y$. Contradiction.

(Asymmetric) Suppose, by contradiction, that $\text{join}(\succ, x, y)$ is symmetric. Then, either $(a, y), (y, a)$ or $(a, x), (x, a)$ are in $\text{join}(\succ, x, y)$. Let us assume w.l.o.g. that $(a, y), (y, a) \in \text{join}(\succ, x, y)$, and let us, once again, assume w.l.o.g. that $(a, y) \in \succ$. Then $(y, a) \in \text{join}(\succ, x, y)$ implies that $(x, a) \in \succ$, however this contradicts case (ii) $(a, y) \in \succ \implies (x, a) \notin \succ$ coming from the definition of $\text{acyclic}(\succ, P, x, y)$.

(Transitive) The relation is transitive by definition as it is the transitive closure. Finally if b is a maximum element of \succ then by construction b is a maximal element of $\text{join}(\succ, x, y)$.

- $\text{noCycle}(\text{join}(\succ, x, y), P)$ holds:

Let $\succ' = \text{join}(\succ, x, y)$. As $\text{noCycle}(\succ, P)$ already holds we must show that the added relations within the closure with $\{(x, a) \mid (y, a) \in \succ\} \cup \{(a, x) \mid (a, y) \in \succ\} \cup \{(y, a) \mid (x, a) \in \succ\} \cup \{(a, y) \mid (a, x) \in \succ\}$ satisfy $\text{noCycle}(\succ', P)$.

By definition, $\text{noCycle}(\succ', P)$ holds if, for all pairs (c, d) of compatible channels $\text{comp}(P, c, d)$, we have $\text{acyclic}(\succ', P, c, d)$.

We consider the following two cases.

1. When $c, d \notin \{x, y\}$.

Then we must show $\text{acyclic}(\succ', P, c, d)$. Following Definition D.9 we consider four sub-cases.

(i) $c \not>_p^* d$.

First, notice that from $\text{acyclic}(>, P, c, d)$ we have that $c \not>_p^* d$.

Suppose, by contradiction that $c >_p^* d$. Then, (c, d) was added via closure of the sets defining $>'$ ($:= \text{join}(>, x, y)$). Thus, $c >_p^* x$, $x >_p^* d$, $c >_p^* y$ and $y >_p^* d$. However, this implies that $c \not>_p^* d$.

(ii) $(c >_p^* e \implies e \not>_p^* d) \wedge (e >_p^* c \implies d \not>_p^* e)$.

We shall show $(c >_p^* e \implies e \not>_p^* d)$ as the other case follows analogously.

Suppose, by contradiction, that $c >_p^* e$ and $e >_p^* d$. Assume, w.l.o.g., that $c >_p^* e$ (the case $c \not>_p^* e$ is similar) and note that

$$(1) \text{noCycle}(>, P) \wedge \text{comp}(P, c, d) \implies \text{acyclic}(>, P, c, d)$$

$$(2) \text{acyclic}(>, P, c, d) \wedge c > e \implies e \not>_p^* d$$

Thus, $e >_p^* d$ must have been introduced via the transitive closure of the defining sets for $>'$. Then both $e >_p^* x \wedge x >_p^* d$ and $e >_p^* y \wedge y >_p^* d$ hold. There are three cases to consider:

– $e \not>_p^* x \wedge x \not>_p^* d$:

Then, $e >_p^* x$ because $e >_p^* y$ holds, and $x >_p^* d$ because $y >_p^* d$ holds. By transitivity, we would have $e >_p^* d$, which is a contradiction w.r.t. (2).

– $e \not>_p^* x \wedge x >_p^* d$:

Then, $e >_p^* x$ because $e >_p^* y$ holds.

$$(1) c >_p^* e \wedge e >_p^* y \implies c >_p^* y \text{ (by transitivity and$$

Definition D.8)

$$(2) \text{comp}(P, y, x) \wedge x >_p^* d \implies y >_p^* d \text{ (by Definition D.8)}$$

$$(3) \text{acyclic}(>, P, y, x) \wedge \text{comp}(P, c, d) \implies c \not>_p^* y \vee y \not>_p^* d \text{ (by Definition D.9)}$$

From (1), (2), and (3) a contradiction follows.

– $e >_p^* x \wedge x \not>_p^* d$:

Then, $x >_p^* d$ because $y >_p^* d$ holds.

$$(1) c >_p^* e \wedge e >_p^* x \implies \text{ (by Definition D.8)}$$

$$(2) \text{comp}(P, x, y) \wedge y >_p^* d \implies x >_p^* d \text{ (by Definition D.8)}$$

$$(3) \text{acyclic}(>, P, x, y) \wedge \text{comp}(P, c, d) \implies c \not>_p^* x \vee x \not>_p^* d$$

From (1), (2) and (3) follow the contradiction.

(iii) $e >_p^* c \wedge d >_p^* f \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, e, f)$.

Suppose, by contradiction, that $\text{comp}(P, e, f)$. Consider the following cases:

– $e >_p^* c \wedge d >_p^* f$:

Then $\text{noCycle}(>, P) \wedge \text{comp}(P, c, d)$ imply $\text{acyclic}(>, P, c, d)$ giving, by (iii), the contradiction $\neg \text{comp}(P, e, f)$.

– $e >_p^* c \wedge d \not>_p^* f$:

Then $>'$ must introduce $d >_p^* f$. Therefore, we can suppose w.l.o.g that $d >_p^* x$ with either $x >_p^* f$ or $y >_p^* f$. But then this implies that $d >_p^* f$.

– $(e \not>_p^* c \wedge d >_p^* f)$ or $(e \not>_p^* c \wedge d \not>_p^* f)$.

These cases are treated analogously to the previous.

(iv) $e >_p^* x >_p^* f \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, e, f)$.

This can be argued analogously to the case above.

2. $c \in \{x, y\} \vee d \in \{x, y\}$.

The following cases need to be considered, and they are verified similarly to the case 1).

- (a) $c = x$ and $d \neq y$.
Then we must show $\text{acyclic}(\succ', P, x, d)$.
- (b) $c \neq x$ and $d = y$.
Then we must show $\text{acyclic}(\succ', P, c, y)$.
- (c) $c = x$ and $d = y$
Then we must show $\text{acyclic}(\succ', P, x, y)$, which follows easily from $\text{acyclic}(\succ, P, x, y)$.

This concludes the proof of Lemma D.3.1. \square

The following property concerns the preservation of ordering (and maximal element) with respect to flattening, in the important specific case in which a typable process is derived from a cut-rule (and flattening involves the two connected channels).

Lemma D.3.2 *Let \succ be an spo with maximum element u and $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q) \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\text{noCycle}(\succ, (\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q))$. Then, the following hold:*

1. $\text{flatcc}(\succ, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q))$ is an $\text{spomax}(u)$.
2. $\text{noCycle}(\text{flatcc}(\succ, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q)), (\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q))$.

Proof: By induction on the structure of P . We have 7 cases.

1. When $P = \mathbf{0}$.

Then $\text{cc}(\mathbf{0}, x) = \mathbf{0}$ and, by definition, $\text{flatcc}(\succ, \mathbf{0}, \text{cc}(y, Q)) = \succ$. Thus, the result follows by hypothesis.

2. When $P = \bar{w}\langle v \rangle.P'$.

If $w \neq x$ then $\text{cc}(x, P) = \text{cc}(x, P')$, which implies $\text{flatcc}(\succ, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q)) = \text{flatcc}(\succ, \text{cc}(x, P'), \text{cc}(y, Q))$. The result follows by applying the induction hypothesis. If $w = x$ then $P = \bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P'$ and $\text{cc}(x, P) = (v, \text{cc}(v, P')) : \text{cc}(x, P')$ and we proceed by induction on the structure of Q . We distinguish 8 sub-cases:

- (a) When $Q = \mathbf{0}$.

Then $\text{cc}(\mathbf{0}, y) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\text{flatcc}(\succ, (w, \text{cc}(w, P')) : \text{cc}(z, P'), \mathbf{0}) = \succ$ and the result follows by hypothesis.

- (b) When $Q = \bar{w}'\langle v' \rangle.Q'$.

If $w' = y$ then $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q) \notin \mathcal{L}$ which contradicts our hypothesis. Then, it must be that $w' \neq y$ and by definition $\text{cc}(y, Q) = \text{cc}(y, Q')$. Hence, $\text{flatcc}(\succ, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q)) = \text{flatcc}(\succ, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q'))$, applying the induction hypothesis the case follows.

- (c) When $Q = (\mathbf{v}w'v')\bar{z}'\langle v' \rangle.Q'$.

If $z' = y$ then $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q) \notin \mathcal{L}$ which contradicts our hypothesis. Then $z' \neq y$ and by definition $\text{cc}(y, Q) = \text{cc}(x, Q')$. Hence, $\text{flatcc}(\succ, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q)) = \text{flatcc}(\succ, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q'))$, applying the induction hypothesis the case follows.

- (d) When $Q = (\mathbf{v}w'v')\bar{z}'\langle v' \rangle.(Q' \mid Q'')$.

If $z' = y$ then $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q) \notin \mathcal{L}$ which contradicts our hypothesis. Then $z' \neq y$ and we need to consider the following three cases:

- $y \in \text{fn}(Q')$:
Then $\text{cc}(y, Q) = \text{cc}(y, Q')$. Hence, $\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q)) = \text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q'))$, applying the induction hypothesis the case follows.
- $y \notin \text{fn}(Q') \wedge y \in \text{fn}(Q'')$:
Then $\text{cc}(y, Q) = \text{cc}(y, Q'')$. Hence, $\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(P, x), \text{cc}(Q, y)) = \text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q''))$, applying the induction hypothesis the case follows.
- $y \notin \text{fn}(Q') \wedge y \notin \text{fn}(Q'')$.
Then $\text{cc}(y, Q) = \emptyset$, which implies $\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(x, P), \emptyset) \Rightarrow$ and the result follows by hypothesis.

(e) When $Q = \text{lin } w'(v').Q'$ (case $Q = \text{un } w'(v').Q'$ is analogous).

When $w' \neq y$, then $\text{cc}(y, Q) = \text{cc}(y, Q')$. Hence, $\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q)) = \text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q'))$, applying the induction hypothesis the case follows. Otherwise, if $w' = y$, then $Q = \text{lin } y(v').Q'$ and $\text{cc}(y, Q) = (v', \text{cc}(v', Q')) :: \text{cc}(y, Q')$.

We want to prove that:

- $\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q))$ is an spo with maximal element u .
- $\text{noCycle}(\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q)), (\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q))$.

In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{flatcc}(>, (v, \text{cc}(v, P')) :: \text{cc}(x, P'), (v', \text{cc}(v', Q')) :: \text{cc}(y, Q')) \\ &= \text{join}(\text{flatcc}(\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(v, P'), \text{cc}(v', Q')), \text{cc}(x, P'), \text{cc}(y, Q')), v, v'). \end{aligned}$$

We want to use the Lemma D.3.1. Note the following:

i. By definition,

$$\text{noCycle}(>, (\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q)) = \text{true} \iff \bigwedge_{(x,y) \in S} \text{acyclic}(>, (\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q), x, y)$$

where $S = \{(x, y) \mid \text{comp}((\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q), x, y)\}$. Notice that from the definition of P and Q we have $\{(x, y) \mid \text{comp}(P', x, y)\} \subset S$, $\{(x, y) \mid \text{comp}(Q', x, y)\} \subset S$ and that $(v, v') \in S$.

ii. Note that $\text{noCycle}(>, (\mathbf{v}vv')(P' \mid Q'))$. In fact,

$$\text{noCycle}(>, (\mathbf{v}vv')(P' \mid Q')) = \text{true} \iff \bigwedge_R \text{acyclic}(>, (\mathbf{v}vv')(P' \mid Q'), x, y)$$

with $R = \{(x, y) \mid \text{comp}((\mathbf{v}vv')(P' \mid Q'), x, y)\} = \{(x, y) \mid \text{comp}(P', x, y)\} \cup \{(x, y) \mid \text{comp}(Q', x, y)\} \cup \{(v, v')\}$.

The hypothesis that $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q) \in \mathcal{L}$ implies that **(H1)** $(\mathbf{v}vv')(P' \mid Q') \in \mathcal{L}$. Also, by the definition of compatible names we have $\text{compN}((\mathbf{v}vv')(P' \mid Q')) \subseteq \text{compN}((\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q))$, which implies that **(H2)** $\text{noCycle}(>, (\mathbf{v}vv')(P' \mid Q'))$ holds. We can apply the induction hypothesis in **(H1)** and **(H2)** and obtain that

- $>' \triangleq \text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(v, P'), \text{cc}(v', Q'))$ is an spo with maximal element u .
- $\text{noCycle}(>', (\mathbf{v}vv')(P' \mid Q'))$.

Next $\text{noCycle}(>', (\mathbf{v}vv')(P' \mid Q')) \implies \text{noCycle}(>', (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q'))$.

Applying the induction hypothesis again we obtain:

- $>' \triangleq \text{flatcc}(>', \text{cc}(x, P'), \text{cc}(y, Q'))$, and
- $\text{noCycle}(>'', (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q'))$.

Finally, as $\text{noCycle}(>'', (\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q))$, and $\text{comp}(P, v, v')$ we can apply Lemma D.3.1 which implies $>''' \triangleq \text{join}(>'', v, v')$ is an spo with maximum element u and $\text{noCycle}(>''', (\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q))$.

(f) When $Q = (\mathbf{v}wv)(Q' \mid Q'')$.

As $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q) \in \mathcal{L}$ we have $y \notin \{w, v\}$. Hence

- $\text{cc}(y, Q) = \text{cc}(y, (Q' \mid Q''))$, and
- $\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q)) = \text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q' \mid Q''))$

The case follows by the induction hypothesis.

(g) When $Q = Q' \mid Q''$.

This case is similar to 2d above.

3. When $P = (\mathbf{v}wv)\bar{z}\langle v \rangle.P'$.

Then let us consider the following cases:

(a) When $z \neq x$.

Then $\text{cc}(x, P) = \text{cc}(x, P')$. Hence, $\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(P, x), \text{cc}(Q, y)) = \text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(x, P'), \text{cc}(y, Q))$, applying the induction hypothesis the case follows.

(b) When $z = x$.

Then $P = (\mathbf{v}wv)\bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P'$ and $\text{cc}(x, P) = (w, \text{cc}(w, P')) : \text{cc}(x, P')$ and we proceed by induction on the structure of Q , where there are multiple cases that follow as in case 2.

4. When $P = (\mathbf{v}wv)\bar{z}\langle v \rangle.(P' \mid P'')$.

Then let us consider the following cases:

(a) When $z \neq x$.

This case is similar to part 2d, depending whether $x \in \text{fn}(P')$ or $x \in \text{fn}(P'')$.

(b) When $z = x$.

Then $P = (\mathbf{v}wv)\bar{x}\langle v \rangle.(P' \mid P'')$ and $\text{cc}(x, P) = (w, \text{cc}(w, P' \mid P'')) : \text{cc}(z, P' \mid P'')$ and we proceed by induction on the structure of Q , where there are multiple cases that follow as in part 2.

5. When $P = q w(v).P'$.

Then let us consider the following cases:

(a) When $w \neq x$.

Then $\text{cc}(x, P) = \text{cc}(x, P')$. Hence, $\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(x, P), \text{cc}(y, Q)) = \text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(x, P'), \text{cc}(y, Q))$ and the case follows by applying the induction hypothesis.

(b) When $w = x$.

Then $P = q x(v).P'$ and $\text{cc}(x, P) = (v, \text{cc}(v, P')) : \text{cc}(x, P')$ and we proceed by induction on the structure of Q , where there are multiple cases that follow analogously to part 2.

6. When $P = (\mathbf{v}wv)(P' \mid P'')$.

This case is analogous to case 2f.

7. When $P = P' \mid P''$.

This case is similar to case 2d.

This concludes the proof of Lemma D.3.2. \square

The following property also concerns the preservation of ordering (and maximal element) with respect to flattening, but now in a more general setting (beyond two compatible channels).

Lemma D.3.3 *Let $P \in \mathcal{L}$ and $>$ an $\text{spomax}(u)$ such that $\text{noCycle}(>, P)$. Also, let $>_f = \text{flat}(>, P)$. Then $>_f$ is an $\text{spomax}(u)$ and $\text{noCycle}(>_f, P)$ holds.*

Proof: By induction on the structure of P . There are seven cases to consider.

1. When $P = \mathbf{0}$.

Then $\text{flat}(>, \mathbf{0}) = >$ and the result follows trivially.

2. When $P = P' \mid Q$.

By definition, $\text{flat}(>, P' \mid Q) = \text{flat}(\text{flat}(>, P'), Q)$. Also $P' \in \mathcal{L}$ and, by Proposition D.3.5 (4), $\text{noCycle}(>, P')$. Denote $>' := \text{flat}(>, P')$.

By the induction hypothesis $>'$ is an $\text{spomax}(u)$ such that **(H1)** $\text{noCycle}(>', P')$ holds. Note that by definition of $>' := \text{flat}(>, P')$ in combination with Proposition D.3.4, only the compatible names in P' are joined via $\text{join}(P', \cdot, \cdot)$. Thus, we can conclude that **(H2)** $\text{noCycle}(>', P)$.

Now we will show that the following holds:

$$\text{noCycle}(>', Q) = \bigwedge_{(x,y) \in \text{compN}(Q)} \text{acyclic}(>', Q, x, y)$$

Note that

- By hypothesis that $\text{noCycle}(>, P)$, it follows that $\text{noCycle}(>, Q) = \bigwedge_{(x,y) \in \text{compN}(Q)} \text{acyclic}(>, Q, x, y)$ holds.
- We need to analyze the pairs of names that were added in $>'$: by Proposition D.3.4, as $>' = \text{flat}(>, P')$, only pairs of compatible names of P' were joined in $\text{flat}(>, P')$. Thus, by Lemma D.3.1, it follows that $>'$ is an $\text{spomax}(u)$ and that **(H3)** $\text{noCycle}(>', Q)$ holds.

We still need to prove that $>_f := \text{flat}(>', Q)$ is an $\text{spomax}(u)$ and that $\text{noCycle}(>_f, P' \mid Q)$ holds. Note that:

- By applying the induction hypothesis again, with $>_f = \text{flat}(>', Q)$, it follows that **(H4)** $>_f$ is an $\text{spomax}(u)$ and that **(H5)** $\text{noCycle}(>_f, Q)$ holds.
- By definition of $>_f := \text{flat}(>', Q)$ and Proposition D.3.4 only pairs of compatible names were joined via $\text{join}(Q, \cdot, \cdot)$, which is included in the set of compatible names $\text{compN}(P' \mid Q)$. By applying Lemma D.3.1 again, we obtain $\text{noCycle}(>_f, P' \mid Q)$ and the result follows.

3. When $P = (\mathbf{vzv})(P' \mid Q)$.

By definition, $\text{flat}(>, (\mathbf{vzv})(P' \mid Q)) = \text{join}(\text{flat}(\text{flat}(\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(z, P'), \text{cc}(v, Q)), P'), Q), z, v)$.

Denote $>' := \text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(z, P'), \text{cc}(v, Q))$.

By Lemma D.3.2, $>'$ is an $\text{spomax}(u)$ such that $\text{noCycle}(>', P)$ holds. By Proposition D.3.5 (2), it follows that **(H1)** $\text{noCycle}(>', P')$ and **(H2)** $\text{noCycle}(>', Q)$ also hold.

- By the induction hypothesis in **(H1)** with $>'' := \text{flat}(>', P')$, it follows that $>''$ is an $\text{spomax}(u)$ and **(H3)** $\text{noCycle}(>'', P')$.
- Note that, by definition, $>''' := \text{flat}(>'', Q)$ only joins the compatible names of Q . Therefore, it follows that $>'''$ is an $\text{spomax}(u)$ and both $\text{noCycle}(>'', P)$ and **(H4)** $\text{noCycle}(>'', P)$.

Finally, as $\text{comp}(P, z, v)$, we apply Lemma D.3.1 in **(H4)** and $>_f := \text{join}(>''', z, v)$ and obtain that $>_f$ is an $\text{spomax}(u)$ with $\text{noCycle}(>_f, P)$, and the result follows.

4. When $P = q\ x(y).P'$ or $P = \bar{x}(v).P'$.

Then $\text{flat}(>, P) = \text{flat}(>, P')$ and by applying the induction hypothesis on $\text{flat}(>, P')$ the result follows easily.

5. When $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P' \mid Q)$.

Then $\text{flat}(>, (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P' \mid Q)) = \text{join}(\text{flat}(\text{flat}(>, P'), Q), x, y)$.

From the hypothesis $\text{noCycle}(>, P)$ it follows that $\text{noCycle}(>, P')$.

- By the induction hypothesis it follows that $\text{flat}(>, P')$ is an $\text{spomax}(u)$ and $\text{noCycle}(\text{flat}(>, P'), P')$ holds. Similarly to the argument of case (2) above, we also argue that **(H1)** $\text{noCycle}(\text{flat}(>, P'), Q)$ holds.
- Again, by the induction hypothesis $>'' := \text{flat}(>' \text{ flat}(>, P'), Q)$ with both $>''$ being an $\text{spomax}(u)$ and $\text{noCycle}(>'', Q)$. Again we argue similarly to case (2) to show that **(H2)** $\text{noCycle}(>'', P')$.
- Therefore, from **(H1)** and **(H2)**, it follows that both $\text{noCycle}(>'' \mid Q)$ and $\text{noCycle}(>'', P)$ hold.

As $\text{comp}(P, x, y)$ we apply Lemma D.3.1 and $>_f := \text{join}(>'', x, y)$ where $>_f$ is an $\text{spomax}(u)$ with $\text{noCycle}(>_f, P)$.

6. When $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(y).P'$.

This case is similar to the previous case. □

We shall be interested in showing that the composition of two acyclic strict partial orders (associated to specific connected channels) leads to another acyclic strict partial order. Before addressing this important property, we give an extended example that further illustrates partial orders and checking acyclicity in them.

Example D.9

To further illustrate strict partial orders, let us consider the process $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)(Q_1 \mid Q_2)$, where Q_1, Q_2 are as follows:

$$Q_1 = \text{un } x(z).(\mathbf{v}ab)\bar{z}(a).(\text{un } b(c).P_1 \mid P_2)$$

$$Q_2 = (\mathbf{v}ts)\bar{u}(t).(\text{un } s(d).(\mathbf{v}wv)\bar{y}(w).\text{lin } v(e).P_3 \mid P_4)$$

Notice that processes P_1, \dots, P_4 have been left unspecified. We first consider the spo for Q_1 , denoted $>_5$, which is constructed using the rules from Figure D.1 with the following derivations:

$$\Pi_1 = \frac{[S_{>} : \text{UnIn}_1] \quad \frac{\Gamma, c : T \vdash_{>_1}^w P_1 \quad >_2 \triangleq >_1 \downarrow_w \cup (>_1^b) \downarrow_w \quad \text{-svr}(T) \quad w \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma, b : *?T \vdash_{>_2}^b \text{un } b(c).P_1}}{\Gamma, c : T \vdash_{>_1}^w P_1}$$

$$\Pi_2 = \frac{[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_4] \quad \frac{\Pi_1 \quad \Gamma, z : S \vdash_{>_3}^z P_2 \quad >_4 \triangleq >_2 \cup >_3 \cup >_3^z \cup \{(z, a)\}}{\Gamma, z : \text{lin}!(?!T).S \vdash_{>_4}^z (\mathbf{v}ab)\bar{z}(a).(\text{un } b(c).P_1 \mid P_2)}}{\Gamma, z : \text{lin}!(?!T).S \vdash_{>_4}^z (\mathbf{v}ab)\bar{z}(a).(\text{un } b(c).P_1 \mid P_2)}$$

$$[S_{>} : \text{UnIn}_2] \quad \frac{\Pi_2 \quad >_5 \triangleq >_4 \cup (>_4^x)}{\Gamma, x : *?(\text{lin}!(?!T).S) \vdash_{>_5}^x \text{un } x(z).(\mathbf{v}ab)\bar{z}(a).\text{un } b(c).P_1 \mid P_2}$$

The corresponding strict partial orders are depicted in Figure D.2, using the diagram format of Example D.1. We also have added dotted arrows: these represent additional dependencies involving

the names in the unspecified processes P_1 and P_2 . For simplicity, we do not show all these dependencies; for example, within $>_1$ process P_1 may have (bound) channels that are greater than c . For simplicity, we assume that this is not the case.

Similarly, the spo for Q_2 , denoted $>_{10}$, is constructed from the following derivations:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_3 &= [S_{>} : \text{LinIn}] \frac{\Gamma, d : W, y : *!(\text{lin}!(*)T).S, v : \bar{S}, e : *!T \vdash_{>_6}^d P_3}{\Gamma, d : W, y : *!(\text{lin}!(*)T).S, v : \text{lin}?(*)T.\bar{S} \vdash_{>_6}^d \text{lin } v(e).P_3} \\ \Pi_4 &= [S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_1] \frac{\Pi_3 \quad >_7 \triangleq >_6 \cup \{(d, w)\}}{\Gamma, d : W, y : *!(\text{lin}!(*)T).S \vdash_{>_7}^d (\mathbf{v}wv)\bar{y}(w).\text{lin } v(e).P_3} \\ \Pi_5 &= [S_{>} : \text{UnIn}_2] \frac{\Pi_4 \quad >_8 \triangleq >_7 \cup \{>_7^s\} \quad \neg \text{cli}(W) \wedge \text{svr}(W)}{\Gamma, s : *?W, y : *!(\text{lin}!(*)T).S \vdash_{>_8}^s \text{un } s(d).(\mathbf{v}wv)(\bar{y}(w).\text{lin } v(e).P_3)} \\ & \quad [S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_4] \frac{\Pi_5 \quad \Gamma, u : V \vdash_{>_9}^u P_4 \quad >_{10} \triangleq >_8 \cup >_9 \cup >_8^u \cup \{(u, t)\}}{\Gamma, u : \text{lin}!*!W.V, y : *!(\text{lin}!(*)T).S \vdash_{>_{10}}^u Q_2} \end{aligned}$$

These partial orders are given in Figure D.3. Finally, we obtain the partial order $>_{11}$ for P is obtained as follows and shown in Figure D.4.

$$[S_{>} : \text{Par}_2] \frac{\Gamma, x : *?(\text{lin}!(*)T).S \vdash_{>_5}^x Q_1 \quad \Gamma, u : \text{lin}!*!W.V, y : *!(\text{lin}!(*)T).S \vdash_{>_{10}}^u Q_2 \quad >_{11} \triangleq >_5 \cup >_{10} \cup >_5^u}{\Gamma, u : \text{lin}!*!W.V \vdash_{>_{11}}^u P}$$

This example shows that more complex structures can be formed than those shown in Example D.1. For example: both d and b have no relation to each other; however, they both must be larger than Γ and also smaller than u . Furthermore, the dotted lines emerging from P_1 to P_4 show that this diamond/lattice-like shape can occur multiple times within the structure.

It is easy to see that the partial order in Figure D.4 is acyclic. However, this is not the ordered structure we should focus on: to show acyclicity of P with respect to $>_{11}$, i.e., $\text{noCycle}(>_{11}, P)$ (Definition D.10), we should actually consider the closure $>_{11}^*$, as given by Definition D.8. Indeed, checking acyclicity ultimately depends on this closure, which can be non-trivial: we should not only show that there are no cycles in $>_{11}$ but also through connected compatible channels. By the relation between these connected names and the flattening of $>_{11}$ with respect to P (Proposition D.3.4) the extension of $>_{11}$ with respect to these connected names of is of great importance.

To obtain $>_{11}^*$, we first determine the set of connected names of P (Definition D.7):

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{compN}(P) &= \text{compN}((\mathbf{v}xy)(Q_1 \mid Q_2)) \\
&= \{(x,y), (y,x)\} \cup \text{compN}(Q_1) \cup \text{compN}(Q_2) \cup \\
&\quad \{(f,g) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(x, (\mathbf{v}xy)(Q_1 \mid Q_2)), \text{cc}(y, (\mathbf{v}xy)(Q_1 \mid Q_2)), f, g)\} \\
&= \{(x,y), (y,x)\} \cup \text{compN}(\text{un } x(z).(\mathbf{v}ab)\bar{z}\langle a \rangle.(\text{un } b(c).P_1 \mid P_2)) \cup \\
&\quad \text{compN}((\mathbf{v}ts)\bar{u}\langle t \rangle.(\text{un } s(d).(\mathbf{v}wv)\bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\text{lin } v(e).P_3 \mid P_4)) \cup \\
&\quad \{(f,g) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(x, Q_1), \text{cc}(y, Q_2), f, g)\} \\
&= \{(x,y), (y,x)\} \cup \text{compN}((\mathbf{v}ab)\bar{z}\langle a \rangle.(\text{un } b(c).P_1 \mid P_2)) \cup \\
&\quad \{(t,s), (s,t)\} \cup \text{compN}(\text{un } s(d).(\mathbf{v}wv)\bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\text{lin } v(e).P_3) \cup \text{compN}(P_4) \\
&\quad \cup \{(f,g) \mid \text{compcc}((z, (b, \emptyset) :: \emptyset) :: \emptyset, (v, (e, \emptyset) :: \emptyset) :: \emptyset, f, g)\} \\
&= \{(x,y), (y,x), (t,s), (s,t)\} \cup \{(a,b), (b,a)\} \cup \text{compN}(\text{un } b(c).P_1) \cup \\
&\quad \text{compN}(P_2) \cup \text{compN}(\text{un } s(d).(\mathbf{v}wv)\bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\text{lin } v(e).P_3) \cup \text{compN}(P_4) \cup \\
&\quad \{(f,g) \mid \text{compcc}((z, (b, \emptyset)), (v, (e, \emptyset)), f, g)\} \\
&= \{(x,y), (y,x), (t,s), (s,t), (a,b), (b,a)\} \cup \text{compN}(P_1) \cup \text{compN}(P_2) \cup \\
&\quad \text{compN}((\mathbf{v}wv)\bar{y}\langle w \rangle.\text{lin } v(e).P_3) \cup \text{compN}(P_4) \cup \\
&\quad \{(z,v), (v,z), (b,e), (e,b)\} \\
&= \{(x,y), (y,x), (t,s), (s,t), (a,b), (b,a), (z,v), (v,z), (b,e), (e,b)\} \cup \\
&\quad \text{compN}(P_1) \cup \text{compN}(P_2) \cup \{(w,v), (v,w)\} \cup \text{compN}(\text{lin } v(e).P_3) \\
&\quad \cup \text{compN}(P_4) \\
&= \{(x,y), (y,x), (t,s), (s,t), (a,b), (b,a), (w,v), (v,w), (z,v), (v,z), (b,e), \\
&\quad (e,b)\} \cup \text{compN}(P_1) \cup \text{compN}(P_2) \cup \text{compN}(P_3) \cup \text{compN}(P_4)
\end{aligned}$$

Here again, for the sake of readability, we have done some simplifications. For example, we have assumed that $\text{cc}(x, (\mathbf{v}ab)\bar{z}\langle a \rangle.(\text{un } b(c).P_1 \mid P_2)) = \emptyset$ and made similar assumptions for all occurrences within $\{(f,g) \mid \text{compcc}((z, (b, \emptyset) :: \emptyset) :: \emptyset, (v, (e, \emptyset) :: \emptyset) :: \emptyset, f, g)\}$. Strictly speaking, the structure of P_1, \dots, P_4 would determine the shape of the diagram.

Figure D.5 depicts the extension of $>_{11}$ with the pairs on connected names, depicted with red arrows. Showing that there are no cycles within $>_{11}^*$ is non-trivial. As we will see, treating the compositionality of parallel composition can be complex. By virtue of connected names we may now jump between unrelated branches of the diagram, and so we need to ensure that there is no path back to where we began.

To see this, consider the case of y : it is not greater than any element, but is it connected to x (i.e., $(x,y) \in \text{compN}(P)$). Because we also have $x >_{11} z$ with $(z,v) \in \text{compN}(P)$, by Definition D.8 we obtain $y >_{11}^* v$. This relation between y and v is not evident purely from $>_{11}$ and arises from the parallel composition of Q_1 and Q_2 . Still, it is crucial to see that even if the added pairs (in red) entail new bidirectional connections between names, no cycle is induced; intuitively, this is because the existing connections (in black) are kept uni-directional and the operation $>_{11}^*$ requires at least one step in $>_{11}$. That is, the extension with compatible names does not break asymmetry of the given strict partial order(s).

We close this example by observing that every pair of names (x,y) added via compatible names satisfy three useful properties, related to acyclicity (and induced by typing):


1. At least one of them is minimal in the ordering. That is, one or both of them are “leaves” in the tree induced by the partial ordering.
2. Both x and y originate in different “branches” of the tree. That is, there is a successor (such as u) that is greater than both of them.

3. There are no “crisscross connections” between different branches. In our example, we have connections between x and y and between v and z ; a crisscross connection would be formed by x and v , and by y and z .

□

Example D.10

Another important observation is that for every pair of connected channels, at least one of them is minimal in that there is no element smaller than them in the partial order. This alone does not enforce acyclicity take for example the following two spo 's:



The first example is excluded as we also have that connected channels never appear in the same branch of an spo , structurally connected channels occur via restriction or via compatible names and the rules of Figure D.1 ensure this. However cycles of the second form are much more delicate, a rough intuition is that this structure can only be formed if there is a parallel composition on two channels with a with one of the connected channels being from restriction and the other coming from connected channels, however this would require these two processes to be in parallel sharing two channels rather than one which \mathcal{L} ensures. □

We may now move to ensure that the composition of two acyclic strict partial orders (associated to specific connected channels) leads to another acyclic strict partial order on the pairs of connected channels. Recall that the predicate $\text{compcc}(A, B, x, y)$ has been given in Definition D.6.

Lemma D.3.4 *Assume $P_0, P, Q \in \mathcal{L}$ such that*

- $z : V, (\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1) \vdash_{>_1}^z P$
- $v : \bar{V}, (\Gamma' \otimes \Delta) \vdash_{>_2}^u Q$
- $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P)$
- $\text{noCycle}(>_2, Q)$
- $P_0 = (\mathbf{v}zv)(P \mid Q)$
- $\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta \vdash_{>}^u P_0$, where $> = >_1 \cup >_2 \cup >_1^u$

Furthermore, let $C = \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P_0), \text{cc}(v, P_0), a, b)\}$. Then $\text{acyclic}(>, P_0, x, y)$, for all $(x, y) \in C$.

Proof: By induction, first on the structure of P and then on Q . We have six main cases (numbered (1) to (6)), each with multiple sub-cases. Among these, the case of linear output $P = (\mathbf{v}ws)\bar{t}(s).(P' \mid P'')$ (case 3) is the most technically involved.

1. **Case $P = \mathbf{0}$.**

Then $\text{cc}(z, (\mathbf{v}zv)(\mathbf{0} \mid Q)) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\mathbf{0}, \text{cc}(v, (\mathbf{v}zv)(\mathbf{0} \mid Q)), a, b)\} = \mathbf{0}$, and the result follows trivially.

2. **Case $P = \bar{w}\langle s \rangle.P'$ (unrestricted output).**

Then, let $(\Gamma'', w : *!T, s : T) = z : V, (\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1)$. We consider two possibilities:

$$[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_2] \frac{\Gamma'', w : *!T, s : T \vdash_{>_1}^u P' \quad u \neq w \quad \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma'', w : *!T, s : T \vdash_{>_1}^u \bar{w}\langle s \rangle.P'}$$

$$[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_3] \frac{\Gamma'', w : *!T \vdash_{>(1,1)}^u P' \quad \neg \text{un}(T) \quad >_1 \triangleq_{(1,1)} \cup \{(u, s)\} \quad u \neq w}{\Gamma'', w : *!T, s : T \vdash_{>_1}^u \bar{w}\langle s \rangle.P'}$$

Based on these two rules, we have:

- (a) The sub-case $z = w$ is not possible, because none of the rules allow us to have $\vdash_{>}^u$.
- (b) The sub-case $z \neq w$ is possible, and so we distinguish between which of the two rules was applied:

i. The rule is $[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_2]$.

Notice that $\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta \vdash_{>}^u P'_0$ where $P'_0 = (\mathbf{v}z\mathbf{v})(P' \mid Q)$, $> \Rightarrow >_1 \cup >_2 \cup >_1^u$ and $\text{noCycle}(>, P')$. Hence by applying the induction hypothesis, we obtain $\text{acyclic}(>, P'_0, x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P'_0), \text{cc}(v, P'_0), a, b)\}$.

Let us consider the following sets constructed by exploiting the fact that $\text{cc}(z, \bar{w}\langle s \rangle.P') = \text{cc}(z, P')$:

$$\{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P'_0), \text{cc}(v, P'_0), a, b)\} = \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P'), \text{cc}(v, Q), a, b)\} \quad (\text{D.1})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P_0), \text{cc}(v, P_0), a, b)\} &= \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q), a, b)\} \\ &= \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P'), \text{cc}(v, Q), a, b)\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

As the sets defined by (D.1) and (D.2) are equal, then $\text{acyclic}(>, P_0, x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P_0), \text{cc}(v, P_0), a, b)\}$, and the result follows.

ii. The rule is $[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_3]$.

This case follows similarly to 2(b)i with two key differences. First, rather than $\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}z\mathbf{v})(P' \mid Q)$ we have $\Gamma' \otimes (\Delta_1, \Delta \setminus s : T) \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}z\mathbf{v})(P' \mid Q)$ where $>' \Rightarrow >_{(1,1)} \cup >_2 \cup >_{(1,1)}^u$. Second, because typing ensures that s does not occur within P' , then it is easy to show that the added relation (u, s) does not affect $\text{acyclic}(>, (\mathbf{v}z\mathbf{v})(P' \mid Q), x, y)$.

3. **Case $P = (\mathbf{v}ws)\bar{i}\langle s \rangle.(P' \mid P'')$ (linear output).**

This is the most involved case.

Let $\Gamma'' \otimes \Delta'_1, \Delta'_2, t : \text{lin}!T.S = z : V, (\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1)$. Then, either one of the rules

$$[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_3] \frac{\Gamma'' \setminus u \otimes \Delta'_1, w : \bar{T} \vdash_{>(1,1)}^w P' \quad \Gamma'' \otimes \Delta'_1, t : S \vdash_{>(1,2)}^u P'' \quad >_1 \triangleq_{(1,1)} \cup >_{(1,2)} \cup >_1^u \cup \{(u, s)\} \quad u \neq t}{\Gamma'' \otimes \Delta'_1, \Delta'_2, t : \text{lin}!T.S \vdash_{>_1}^u (\mathbf{v}ws)\bar{i}\langle s \rangle.(P' \mid P'')}$$

or

$$[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_4] \frac{\Gamma'' \otimes \Delta'_1, w : \bar{T} \vdash_{>(1,1)}^w P' \quad \Gamma'' \otimes \Delta'_2, t : S \vdash_{>(1,2)}^t P'' \quad >_1 \triangleq_{(1,1)} \cup >_{(1,2)} \cup >_1^t \cup \{(u, s)\}}{\Gamma'' \otimes \Delta'_1, \Delta'_2, t : \text{lin}!T.S \vdash_{>_1}^t (\mathbf{v}ws)\bar{i}\langle s \rangle.(P' \mid P'')}$$

seems to apply. Note that $[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_3]$ does not respect $\vdash_{>_1}^t$, we can disregard this sub-case. Hence, we only consider the sub-case when $[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_4]$ is applied. There are two possibilities: $z = t$ and $z \neq t$. The case $z \neq t$ is similar to Item 2(b)i, therefore, we will only expand the proof for the case $z = t$:

Then let us consider the structure of Q . We have seven cases (denoted 3a – 3g).

(a) **When $Q = 0$.**

Then $(\mathbf{v}z\nu)(P \mid Q) \notin \mathcal{L}$ and typing is contradicted and the case does not apply.

(b) **When $Q = \bar{w}'\langle s' \rangle.Q'$.**

If $w' \neq \nu$ we consider both cases for the rule being applied and the proof follows analogously to Item 2(b)i by applying the induction hypothesis. If $w' = \nu$ then $(\mathbf{v}z\nu)(P \mid Q)$ would be not typable in \mathcal{L} . Hence, this case can be disregarded.

(c) **When $Q = (\mathbf{v}w's')\bar{t}'\langle s' \rangle.Q'$.**

Then the case is analogous to Item 3b (above).

(d) **When $Q = (\mathbf{v}w's')\bar{t}'\langle s' \rangle.(Q' \mid Q'')$.**

Then, $\Gamma''' \otimes \Delta''_1, \Delta''_2, t' : \text{lin}!T'.S' = \nu : \bar{V}, (\Gamma' \otimes \Delta)$ and either one of the rules applies:

$$[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_3] \frac{\Gamma''' \otimes \Delta''_1, t' : S' \vdash_{>(2,2)}^u Q'' \quad \Gamma''' \setminus u \otimes \Delta''_1, s' : \bar{T}' \vdash_{>(2,1)}^{s'} Q' \quad >_2 \triangleq >(2,1) \cup >(2,2) \cup \triangleright_{(2,1)}^u \cup \{(u, w')\}}{\Gamma''' \otimes \Delta''_1, \Delta''_2, t' : \text{lin}!T'.S' \vdash_{>_2}^u (\mathbf{v}w's')\bar{t}'\langle w' \rangle.(Q' \mid Q'')} \quad u \neq t'$$

or

$$[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_4] \frac{\Gamma''' \otimes \Delta''_1, s' : \bar{T}' \vdash_{>(2,1)}^{s'} Q' \quad \Gamma''' \otimes \Delta''_2, t' : S' \vdash_{>(2,2)}^{t'} Q'' \quad >_2 \triangleq >(2,1) \cup >(2,2) \cup \triangleright_{(2,1)}^{t'} \cup \{(u, w')\}}{\Gamma''' \otimes \Delta''_1, \Delta''_2, t' : \text{lin}!T'.S' \vdash_{>_2}^{t'} (\mathbf{v}w's')\bar{t}'\langle w' \rangle.(Q' \mid Q'')}$$

Note that $t' = \nu$ then we run into a contradiction, as $(\mathbf{v}z\nu)(P \mid Q) \notin \mathcal{L}$. Then, we only need to consider the case $t' \neq \nu$.

Let us assume w.l.o.g. that $\nu \in \text{dom}(\Delta''_1)$ and consider the application of rule $[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_3]$. The case involving $[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_4]$ is similar.

When applying $[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_3]$ we first notice that we may construct the following derivation:

$$\Gamma''' \otimes \Delta''_1, \Delta''_2, t : \text{lin}!T.S + \Gamma''' \otimes \Delta''_1, s' : \bar{T}' \vdash_{>_3}^u P'_0$$

where $P'_0 = (\mathbf{v}z\nu)(P \mid Q')$, $>_3 = >_1 \cup >(2,1) \cup \triangleright_1^u$ and $\text{noCycle}(>(2,1), Q')$. Hence, by applying the induction hypothesis we obtain $\text{acyclic}(>_3, P'_0, x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P'_0), \text{cc}(\nu, P'_0), a, b)\}$.

Now as we consider the following sets constructed making use that

$$\text{cc}(\nu, (\mathbf{v}w's')\bar{t}'\langle w' \rangle.(Q' \mid Q'')) = \text{cc}(\nu, (Q' \mid Q'')) = \text{cc}(\nu, Q')$$

as by typing $\nu \notin n(Q'')$:

$$\{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P'_0), \text{cc}(\nu, P'_0), a, b)\} = \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(\nu, Q'), a, b)\} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P_0), \text{cc}(v, P_0), a, b)\} &= \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q), a, b)\} \\
&= \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q'), a, b)\}
\end{aligned}
\tag{D.4}$$

We need to show that $\text{acyclic}(>, P_0, x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q'), a, b)\}$, where $> = >_3 \cup >_{(2,2)}$. By expanding the definition, we have four cases:

i. $x \not>_{P_0}^* y$.

First, because $\text{acyclic}(>, P'_0, x, y)$ we deduce $x \not>_{3, P'_0}^* y$. This in turn implies that if $x >_{P_0}^* y$ were to hold it would imply that we must make use of $>_{(2,2)}$ in the sequence. However we can prove by induction on the length of the sequence $x >_{P_0}^* y$ that this must not be the case and hence $x \not>_{P_0}^* y$. If only one step is made then in the step then $x >_{(2,2), P'_0}^* y$ however then this implies that both x and y occur in the domain of Γ''' ; this in turn implies that there is no c (via Proposition D.3.5(14) and Proposition D.3.1) such that $x >_{(2,2), P'_0}^* c$, which contradicts $x >_{(2,2)} y$. Applying the induction hypotheses we apply the same reasoning that any the step taken within $>_{(2,2)}$ must start from a channel that appears in the names of both P and Q hence must appear in Γ''' .

ii. $(x >_{P_0}^* c \implies c \not>_{P_0}^* y) \wedge (c >_{P_0}^* x \implies y \not>_{P_0}^* c)$.

We only show that $(x >_{P_0}^* c \implies c \not>_{P_0}^* y)$ holds; the proof for the right conjunct is similar.

Since $\text{acyclic}(>, P'_0, x, y)$ then $(x >_{3, P'_0}^* c \implies c >_{3, P'_0}^* y)$. We will show inductively that if $x >_{P_0}^* c$ then $x >_{3, P'_0}^* c$ with $c >_{P_0}^* y$, which will lead to a contradiction.

Following Definition D.8, $x >_{P_0}^* c$ can hold in the following 4 situations:

A. **If $x > c$.**

We have that $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$, otherwise, by Proposition D.3.1, we would have a contradiction with $x > c$. Secondly as $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P_0), \text{cc}(v, P_0), a, b)\}$ then $x \in n(P_0)$ and hence $x \in n(P'_0)$. We may then deduce that $x >_3 c$ with $c \in n(P'_0)$ (notice $x \not>_{(2,2)} c$ by Proposition D.3.5 (6)) and hence also $x >_{3, P'_0}^* c$.

Next, we show that $c >_{P_0}^* y$ cannot hold. There are four cases to be analyzed:

(A.1) Suppose $c > y$: Then we must have that $c >_3 y$ as $c >_{(2,2)}$ implies that $c \in \text{dom}(\Gamma''')$ contradicting Proposition D.3.1. If $c >_3 y$ then $c >_{3, P'_0}^* y$ contradicting $\text{acyclic}(>, P'_0, x, y)$.

(A.2) Suppose there is an e such that $c > e \wedge e >_{P_0}^* y$: Then, $e \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$, otherwise, by Proposition D.3.5 (15), we would have a contradiction with $e >_{P_0}^* y$. Let us consider the three remaining possibilities for e :

- Case $e = u$: we would have $c > u$, which contradicts the fact that u is greatest element w.r.t. $>$, since $\vdash_{>}^u$.
- Case $e \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$: then as $c > e$ we also have by definition $c >_{P_0}^* e$. Hence, as $x >_{P_0}^* c >_{P_0}^* e \implies x >_{P_0}^* e$, we have $x >_{P_0}^* e \implies e >_{P_0}^* y$ but by the induction hypothesis on the length of $c >_{P_0}^* y$ we have $x >_{P_0}^* e \implies e \not>_{P_0}^* y$.
- Case $e \in \text{bn}(Q'')$: then $c > e$, which is a contradiction, as firstly $c >_3 e$ cannot hold (Proposition D.3.5 (6)). Then, we must have that $c >_{(2,2)} e$ holds instead. This requires that $c \in \text{dom}(\Gamma''')$ and hence, by Proposition D.3.1, c cannot be greater than e .

- (A.3) Suppose there is an e such that $\text{comp}(P_0, c, e) \wedge e >_{P_0}^* y$: Then $e \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$ as by Proposition D.3.1 this would contradict $e >_{P_0}^* y$. Let us consider the three remaining possibilities:
- Case $e = u$: this case contradicts $\text{comp}(P_0, c, u)$ as there does not exist a channel c that is compatible with u .
 - Case $e \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$: then $c >_{P_0}^* e$ which implies $x >_{P_0}^* c \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, c, e) \implies x >_{P_0}^* e$. Thus, we have $x >_{P_0}^* e \implies e >_{P_0}^* y$, but by the induction hypothesis on the length of $c >_{P_0}^* y$ we have $x >_{P_0}^* e \implies e \not>_{P_0}^* y$.
 - Case $e \in \text{bn}(Q'')$: then $c \in \text{dom}(\Gamma''')$ and hence contradicting $c >_{P_0}^* y$ as no element is smaller than c .
- (A.4) Suppose there is e such that $c >_{P_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$. Then, there are three cases to consider:
- There is an f such that $c > f \wedge f >_{P_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$. Then we have $x >_{P_0}^* c > f$ and hence $x >_{P_0}^* f$, we reason inductively that $x >_{P_0}^* f \implies f \not>_{P_0}^* e$.
 - There is an f such that $\text{comp}(P_0, c, f) \wedge f >_{P_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$. Then we argue similarly as we have $x >_{P_0}^* c \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, c, f)$ and hence $x >_{P_0}^* f$, we reason inductively that $x >_{P_0}^* f \implies f \not>_{P_0}^* e$.
 - There is no f such that $c > f \wedge f >_{P_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$ or $\text{comp}(P_0, c, f) \wedge f >_{P_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$. Hence $c >_{P_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$ may be considered as $c > e_1 \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e_1, e_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e_n, e) \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$. That is, $c > e_1$ and then there is a sequence of compatible channels that leads to y .

We now proceed to show 3(d)iiA:

First, note that $e_i \neq u$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $e \neq u$ as this would contradict $\text{comp}(P_0, e_i, e_{i+1})$ and $\text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$, respectively. Second, $c \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u \cup \text{bn}(Q'')$ as this would contradict $c >_{P_0}^* e$, hence $c \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$. We proceed by induction on n :

(Base case) When $n = 0$.

Then, it must be the case that $c > e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$ and we consider e :

- $e \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$: we must have that either $y \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ or $y \in \text{bn}(Q'')$. If $y \in \text{bn}(Q'')$ then this contradicts $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q'), a, b)\}$. If $y \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ then we have $c >_{P'_0}^* e$ and $c >_{3, P'_0}^* e$. Also, we have that $\text{comp}(P_0, e, y) \implies \text{comp}(P'_0, e, y)$ but by the induction hypothesis we have that $c \not>_{3, P'_0}^* y$.
- $e \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$: then $y \in \text{bn}(P'_0) \cup \text{dom}(\Gamma'' \otimes \Delta'_1, \Delta'_2, t : \text{lin}!T.S + \Gamma''' \otimes \Delta'_1, s' : \overline{T'})$. Then, we have that $c >_{P'_0}^* e$ and $c >_{3, P'_0}^* e$. Also, $\text{comp}(P_0, e, y) \implies \text{comp}(P'_0, e, y)$ but by the induction hypothesis we have that $c \not>_{3, P'_0}^* y$.
- $e \in \text{bn}(Q'')$ then as c must be within the bound names of P'_0 but then we cannot have that $c >_{(2,2)} e$ hence we must have $c >_{3e}$ which then implies that $e \notin \text{bn}(Q'')$.

(Inductive Step) When $n \geq 1$.

We have that $c >_{P_0}^* e_1 \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e_1, e_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e_{n-1}, e_n) \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$ then we consider e_1 :

- $e_1 \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$ we must have that either $e_2 \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ or $e_2 \in \text{bn}(Q'')$.

If $e_2 \in \text{bn}(Q'')$ then as $P_0 = (\mathbf{v}zv)(P \mid (\mathbf{v}w's')\bar{t}'\langle w' \rangle.(Q' \mid Q''))$ and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{comp}(P_0, e_1, e_2) &= \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q'), e_1, e_2) \vee \\ &\quad \text{comp}(P, e_1, e_2) \vee \text{comp}(Q, e_1, e_2) \\ &= \text{false} \vee \text{false} \vee \text{comp}(Q, e_1, e_2) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{comp}(Q, e_1, e_2) &= \{(w', s')\} \vee \text{comp}(Q', e_1, e_2) \\ &\quad \vee \text{comp}(Q'', e_1, e_2) \\ &= \{(w', s')\} \vee \text{false} \vee \text{comp}(Q'', e_1, e_2) \end{aligned}$$

As $e_1 \notin \{w', s'\}$ then we must have that $\text{comp}(Q'', e_1, e_2)$, which implies $n = 1$ then $e_2 = e$. Thus, we must have that $e_2 \in \text{bn}(Q'')$ and hence all e_i, e and y must be bound names in Q'' . However, this contradicts that $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q'), a, b)\}$. When $e_2 \in \text{bn}(Q')$ the case follows by the induction hypothesis.

- $e_1 \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ then the case follows by the induction hypothesis.
- $e_1 \in \text{bn}(Q'')$ then the case follows analogously to that of 3(d)iiA when $e_2 \in \text{bn}(Q'')$.

B. If $x > e \wedge e >_{P_0}^* c$ for some e .

Then, both x and e are in the names of P'_0 , which implies that $x >_{3, P'_0}^* e$. By the induction hypothesis we have that $e >_{3, P'_0}^* c$ and hence $x >_{3, P'_0}^* c$. We then apply induction on $c >_{P_0}^* y$ showing that x and y cannot be compatible, the argument of which follows from Item 3(d)iiA.

C. If $\text{comp}(P_0, x, e) \wedge e >_{P_0}^* c$ for some e .

Then x cannot be in the domain of $\text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$ and similarly $x \notin \text{bn}(Q'')$ as this would contradict $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q'), a, b)\}$. Therefore, both x and e are in the bound names of P'_0 , which implies that $\text{comp}(P'_0, x, e)$. By the induction hypothesis it follows that $e >_{P_0}^* c$, which implies $e >_{3, P'_0}^* c$. We then apply induction on $c >_{P_0}^* y$ showing that x and y cannot be compatible, the argument of which follows from Item 3(d)iiA.

D. If $x >_{P_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, c)$ for some e .

By the induction hypothesis, if $x >_{P_0}^* e$ then $x >_{3, P'_0}^* e$. Since $\text{comp}(P_0, e, c)$ and $c >_{P_0}^* y$ we can argue analogously to Item 3(d)iiC that $\text{comp}(P'_0, e, c)$ and hence $x >_{3, P'_0}^* c$. We then apply induction on $c >_{P_0}^* y$ showing that x and y cannot be compatible, the argument of which follows from Item 3(d)iiA.

iii. $(c >_{P_0}^* x \wedge y >_{P_0}^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P_0, c, d)$.

As $\text{acyclic}(>_3, P'_0, x, y)$ then for $(x, y) \in C$ we have that $(c >_{3, P'_0}^* x \wedge y >_{3, P'_0}^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P'_0, c, d)$. Let us consider the following cases for c :

A. When $c \in \text{dom}(\Gamma'' \otimes \Delta'_1, \Delta'_2, t : \text{lin}!T.S + \Gamma''' \otimes \Delta''_1, \Delta''_2, t' : \text{lin}!T'.S')$.

Then, there doesn't any channel smaller than c hence we don't have $c >_{P_0}^* x$ and this case is not considered. Similarly for $c \in \text{dom}(\Delta'', t' : S')$.

B. When $c \in \text{bn}((\mathbf{v}zv)(P \mid Q'))$.

Then, we show inductively that if $c >_{P_0}^* x$ then $c >_{3, P'_0}^* x$. Following Definition D.8, $c >_{P_0}^* x$ can hold in the following 4 situations:

(B.1) **If $c > x$.**

Then, $c >_{P'_0}^* x$ since $c \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ and $x \in \text{n}(P'_0)$. As $c \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u \cup \text{n}(Q'')$, then $c \not>_{(2,2)} x$ which implies $c >_3 x$ and also $c >_{3, P'_0}^* x$. As $y >_{P'_0}^* d$ and $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q'), a, b)\}$, it follows that $y \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$ and we must have that $y \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$.

Next we show that if $e \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ and $e >_{P'_0}^* d$ then $e >_{3, P'_0}^* d$; and if $y = e$ then $\neg \text{comp}(P_0, c, d)$:

I) Suppose $y > d$: Then as $y \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ we have $y \not>_{(2,2)} d$ and we may deduce that $y >_3 d$ and hence also $y >_{3, P'_0}^* d$. By the induction hypothesis this implies that $\neg \text{comp}(P'_0, c, d)$ and as $c \notin \text{n}(Q'')$ we may deduce $\neg \text{comp}(Q'', c, d)$. Hence we obtain $\neg \text{comp}(P_0, c, d)$.

II) Suppose there is an e such that $y > e \wedge e >_{P'_0}^* d$: Then, $e \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$ as by Proposition D.3.1 this would contradict $e >_{P'_0}^* d$. Let us consider the three remaining possibilities for e :

- $e = u$: this case is not possible, as we would have $y > u$ and there is no channel larger than u from \vdash_u^u .
- $e \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$: then $y >_{P'_0}^* e$ and $y >_{3, P'_0}^* e$ and, by the induction hypothesis, $e >_{3, P'_0}^* d$. Hence, $y >_{3, P'_0}^* d$ and $\neg \text{comp}(P'_0, c, d)$. As $c \notin \text{n}(Q'')$ we may deduce $\neg \text{comp}(Q'', c, d)$. Hence we obtain $\neg \text{comp}(P_0, c, d)$.
- $e \in \text{bn}(Q'')$: then $y > e$ is a contradiction as this will require $y \in \text{dom}(\Gamma''')$ and hence y cannot be larger than e by Proposition D.3.1.

III) Suppose there is an e such that $\text{comp}(P_0, y, e) \wedge e >_{P'_0}^* d$: Then $y, e \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$ as by Proposition D.3.1 this would contradict $y >_{P'_0}^* d$ and $e >_{P'_0}^* d$ respectively. Let us consider the three remaining possibilities:

- $e = u$: this case contradicts $\text{comp}(P_0, y, u)$ as there does not exist a channel y that is compatible with u .
- $e \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$: then $\text{comp}(P'_0, y, e)$ as y is a bound name in P'_0 , therefore, it cannot occur in Q'' . Thus, there will be no channels compatible with y in Q'' . By the induction hypothesis, since $e >_{P'_0}^* d$ it follows that $e >_{3, P'_0}^* d$. Then, $y >_{3, P'_0}^* d$ with $\neg \text{comp}(P'_0, c, d)$. As $c \notin \text{n}(Q'')$ we may deduce $\neg \text{comp}(Q'', c, d)$. Hence we obtain $\neg \text{comp}(P_0, c, d)$.
- $e \in \text{bn}(Q'')$: then $e \in \text{dom}(\Gamma''')$ and hence contradicting $e >_{P'_0}^* d$ as no element is smaller than e .

IV) $y >_{P'_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, d)$ then firstly notice that there are three cases here:

- There is an f such that $y > f \wedge f >_{P'_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, d)$, in this case we may apply case II).
- There is an f such that $\text{comp}(P_0, y, f) \wedge f >_{P'_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, d)$, in this case we may apply case III).
- There is no f such that $y > f \wedge f >_{P'_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, d)$ or $\text{comp}(P_0, y, f) \wedge f >_{P'_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, d)$, hence $y >_{P'_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, d)$ may be considered as $y > e_1 \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e_1, e_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e_n, e) \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, d)$. That is that $y > e_1$ and then there is a sequence of compatible channels that leads to d .

We now proceed to show **IV**).

Note that $e_i \neq u$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $e \neq u$ as this would contradict $\text{comp}(P_0, e_i, e_{i+1})$ and $\text{comp}(P_0, e, d)$, respectively. Also, $y \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u \cup \text{bn}(Q'')$ as this would contradict $y >_{P_0}^* e$. Hence $y \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$.

We proceed by induction on n :

(Base Case) When $n = 0$.

We have $y > e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, d)$ then we consider e :

- $e \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$ we must have that either $d \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ or $d \in \text{bn}(Q'')$. If $d \in \text{bn}(Q'')$ then $\neg \text{comp}(P_0, c, d)$. If $d \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$, first, notice that $y >_{P'_0}^* e$ and $y >_{3, P'_0}^* d$; second, that $\text{comp}(P_0, e, d) \implies \text{comp}(P'_0, e, d)$. By the induction hypothesis we have that $\neg \text{comp}(P'_0, c, d)$ and hence $\neg \text{comp}(P_0, c, d)$.
- $e \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ then $d \in \text{n}(P'_0) \cup \text{dom}(\Gamma'' \otimes \Delta'_1, \Delta'_2, t : \text{lin}!T.S + \Gamma''' \otimes \Delta''_1, s' : T')$, which implies that $y >_{P'_0}^* e$ and $y >_{3, P'_0}^* e$. Also, since $\text{comp}(P_0, e, d)$ and $e \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ then $d \in \text{n}(P'_0)$. Thus, $\text{comp}(P'_0, e, d)$ but, by the induction hypothesis $\neg \text{comp}(P'_0, c, d)$, and hence $\neg \text{comp}(P_0, c, d)$.
- $e \in \text{bn}(Q'')$ then as y must be within the names of P'_0 as $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q'), a, b)\}$ but then we cannot have that $y >_{(2,2)} e$ as this would imply that $y \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$ and then $y \not>_{(2,2)} e$. Thus, we must have $y >' e$ which then implies that $e \notin \text{bn}(Q'')$.

(Inductive Step) When $n \geq 1$.

We have that $y >_{P_0}^* e_1 \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e_1, e_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e_{n-1}, e_n) \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, d)$ then we consider e_1 :

- $e_1 \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$ we must have that either $e_2 \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ or $e_2 \in \text{bn}(Q'')$.

If $e_2 \in \text{bn}(Q'')$ then as $P_0 = (\mathbf{v}z\nu)(P \mid (\mathbf{v}w's')\bar{t}'\langle w' \rangle.(Q' \mid Q''))$ and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{comp}(P_0, e_1, e_2) &= \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q'), e_1, e_2) \\ &\quad \vee \text{comp}(P, e_1, e_2) \vee \text{comp}(Q, e_1, e_2) \\ &= \text{false} \vee \text{false} \vee \text{comp}(Q, e_1, e_2) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{comp}(Q, e_1, e_2) &= \{(w', s')\} \vee \text{comp}(Q', e_1, e_2) \\ &\quad \vee \text{comp}(Q'', e_1, e_2) \\ &= \{(w', s')\} \vee \text{false} \vee \text{comp}(Q'', e_1, e_2) \end{aligned}$$

Since $e_1 \notin \{(w', s')\}$ then $\text{comp}(Q'', e_1, e_2)$, which implies that if $n = 1$ then $e_2 = e$ and we must have that $e_2 \in \text{bn}(Q'')$. Thus, all e_i , e and d must be bound names in Q'' . As $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q'), a, b)\}$ it follows that at least one of these channels is bound within P or Q' . Let us assume that we have $\text{comp}(P_0, c, d)$ and show that this cannot be the case. As d is bound in Q'' we then must also have $\text{comp}(Q'', c, d)$ which implies that c must also be in the names of Q'' which contradicts $c \in \text{bn}((\mathbf{v}z\nu)(P \mid Q'))$.

- $e_1 \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ then the case follows by the induction hypothesis.

- $e_1 \in \text{bn}(Q'')$ then the case follows analogously to that of **IV**) when $e_2 \in \text{bn}(Q'')$.

(B.2) **If $c > e \wedge e >_{P_0}^* x$ for some e .**

Then, we have that $e \in \text{n}(P'_0)$ and hence $c >_{3,P'_0}^* e$. By the induction hypothesis we have that $e >_{3,P'_0}^* x$ and hence $c >_{3,P'_0}^* x$. We then apply induction on $y >_{P_0}^* d$ showing that c and d cannot be compatible, the argument of which follows from Item **3(d)iiiB**.

(B.3) **If $\text{comp}(P_0, c, e) \wedge e >_{P_0}^* x$.**

Then c cannot be in $\text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$. As $c \in \text{bn}((\mathbf{v}z\nu)(P \mid Q'))$ then $\text{comp}(P_0, c, e)$ implies that $e \in \text{n}(P'_0)$ hence $\text{comp}(P'_0, c, e)$. By the induction hypothesis $e >_{3,P'_0}^* x$ and we may deduce $c >_{3,P'_0}^* x$. We then apply induction on $y >_{P_0}^* d$ showing that c and d cannot be compatible, the argument of which follows from Item **3(d)iiiB**.

(B.4) **If $c >_{P_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, x)$.**

By the induction hypothesis if $x >_{P_0}^* e$ then $c >_{3,P'_0}^* e$. Therefore, we can deduce that $e \in \text{n}(P'_0)$, as $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q'), a, b)\}$ we also have that $x \in \text{n}(P'_0)$. Thus, since $\text{comp}(P_0, e, x)$ it follows that $\text{comp}(P'_0, e, x)$. We then apply induction on $y >_{P_0}^* d$ showing that c and d cannot be compatible, the argument of which follows from Item **3(d)iiiB**.

C. When $c \in \text{bn}(Q'')$.

Then we show that we cannot have that $c >_{P_0}^* x \wedge y >_{P_0}^* d$. We show the case of $c > x$ as all other cases follow similarly in that x will have to be in both Q'' and P'_0 :

Suppose that $c > x$. Since $c \in \text{bn}(Q'')$, this implies that $c >_{(2,2)} x$, therefore, x is in the names of both P'_0 and Q'' . Hence, $x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$. In addition, as $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q'), a, b)\}$ and $y >_{P_0}^* d$ then we have $x >_{P_0}^* d$ but as $x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$ we know that this cannot be the case.

iv. $c >_{P_0}^* x >_{P_0}^* d \implies \neg \text{comp}(P_0, c, d)$.

As shown in **3(d)iii** we have that $(c >_{P_0}^* x \wedge y >_{P_0}^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P_0, c, d)$ and as $\text{comp}(P_0, x, y)$ then we have so $x >_{P_0}^* d \Leftrightarrow y >_{P_0}^* d$ and the result follows.

(e) **When $Q = q w'(s').Q'$.**

Then let us consider the cases of q .

i. When $q = \text{lin}$.

Then $\Gamma''', w' : \text{lin}?T'.S' = v : \bar{V}, (\Gamma' \otimes \Delta)$ and:

$$[\text{S}_> : \text{LinIn}] \frac{\Gamma''', w' : S', s' : T' \vdash_{>_2}^u Q'}{\Gamma''', w' : \text{lin}?T'.S' \vdash_{>_2}^u \text{lin } w'(s').Q'}$$

Let us consider the case of w' and assume $[\text{S}_> : \text{LinOut}_3]$ was applied, as the case involving $[\text{S}_> : \text{LinOut}_4]$ is similar.

A. When $w' = v$ then $T' = T$ and $S' = \bar{S}$.

Notice the following two properties which allow us to apply the induction hypothesis:

- $\Gamma'' \otimes \Delta'_2, z : S + \Gamma''', w' : S', s' : T' \vdash_{>_3}^u (\mathbf{v}z\nu)(P'' \mid Q')$, where $>_3 = >_{(1,2)}$ $\cup >_2 \cup >_{(1,2)}^u$, $\text{noCycle}(>_{(1,2)}, P'')$ and $\text{noCycle}(>_2, Q')$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $\text{acyclic}(>_3, (\mathbf{v}z\nu)(P'' \mid Q'), x, y)$, for all $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, (\mathbf{v}z\nu)(P'' \mid Q')), \text{cc}(v, (\mathbf{v}z\nu)(P'' \mid Q')), a, b)\}$.

- $\Gamma'' \setminus u \otimes \Delta'_1, w : \bar{T} + \Gamma''', w' : S', s' : T' \vdash_{>_4}^u (\mathbf{v}ws')(P' \mid Q')$, where $>_4 = >_{(1,1)} \cup >_2 \cup \succ_{(1,1)}^u$, $\text{noCycle}(>_{(1,1)}, P')$ and $\text{noCycle}(>_2, Q')$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $\text{acyclic}(>_4, (\mathbf{v}ws')(P' \mid Q'), x, y)$, for all $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(w, (\mathbf{v}ws')(P' \mid Q')), \text{cc}(s', (\mathbf{v}ws')(P' \mid Q')), a, b)\}$.

First, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cc}(z, (\mathbf{v}zv)(P \mid Q)) &= \text{cc}(z, P) \\ &= \text{cc}(z, (\mathbf{v}ws)\bar{z}(s').P') \\ &= (w, \text{cc}(w, P')) :: \text{cc}(z, P') \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cc}(v, (\mathbf{v}zv)(P \mid Q)) &= \text{cc}(v, Q) \\ &= \text{cc}(v, \text{lin } v(s').Q') \\ &= (s', \text{cc}(s', Q')) :: \text{cc}(v, Q') \end{aligned}$$

Second, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P_0), \text{cc}(v, P_0), a, b)\} &= \{(w, s'), (s', w)\} \cup \\ &\quad \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(w, P'), \text{cc}(s', Q'), a, b)\} \cup \\ &\quad \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P''), \text{cc}(v, Q'), a, b)\} \end{aligned}$$

We will show that $\text{acyclic}(>, \underbrace{(\mathbf{v}zv)(P \mid Q)}_{P_0}, x, y)$, for all $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P_0), \text{cc}(v, P_0), a, b)\}$, where we take $> = >_3 \cup >_4$:

1) $x \not\prec_{P_0}^* y$ **consider the following:**

- $(x, y) = (w, s')$, the case of (s', w) follows similarly. Then, since $\text{acyclic}(>_4, (\mathbf{v}ws')(P' \mid Q'), x, y)$ and $\text{comp}(P, x, y)$, it follows that $w \not\prec_{4, (\mathbf{v}ws')(P' \mid Q')}^* s'$. This in turn implies that if $w \succ_{P_0}^* s'$ were to hold it would imply that we must make use of $>_3$ in the sequence. As $>_3 = >_{(1,2)} \cup >_2 \cup \succ_{(1,2)}^u$ and $>_4 = >_{(1,1)} \cup >_2 \cup \succ_{(1,1)}^u$ we may restrict this to $>_{(1,2)} \cup \succ_{(1,2)}^u$. As u is the greatest element in $>$ we may also eliminate $\succ_{(1,2)}^u$ by definition hence it leaves us only to show that if $w \succ_{P_0}^* s'$ were to hold it would imply that we must make use of $>_{(1,2)}$ in the sequence and then we must contradict this. We prove by induction on the length of the sequence $w \succ_{P_0}^* s'$ that this must not be the case and hence $w \not\prec_{P_0}^* s'$. If $w \succ_{P_0}^* s'$ is made in one step then we would have $w > s'$ and hence we are forced to apply $>_{(1,2)}$. However $w >_{(1,2)} s'$ cannot hold as $w \in n((\mathbf{v}ws')(P' \mid Q'))$ and hence $w \notin n(P'')$ so is contradicted by Proposition D.3.5 (6). Applying the induction hypotheses we apply the same reasoning that any the step taken within $>_{(1,2)}$ must start from a channel cannot occur within the names of P'' and hence Proposition D.3.5 (6) contradicts the assumption.
- $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(w, P'), \text{cc}(s', Q'), a, b)\}$. Then as $\text{acyclic}(>_4, \underbrace{(\mathbf{v}ws')(P' \mid Q')}_{P'_0}, x, y)$ and $\text{comp}(P'_0, x, y)$ we have $x \not\prec_{4, P'_0}^* y$. As in the previous case we need to show that $w \succ_{P_0}^* s'$ were to hold it would imply that we must make use of $>_3$ and hence by the same reasoning as the previous case that we must make use of $>_{(1,2)}$

which we will contradict. We prove by induction on the length of the sequence $w >_{P_0}^* s'$ that this must not be the case and hence $w \not>_{P_0}^* s'$. If $w >_{P_0}^* s'$ is made in one step then we would have $x > y$ and hence we are forced to apply $>_{(1,2)}$ to have the step $x >_{(1,2)} y$. In addition, we have that either both x and y are bound within P' or Q' , or that one of x or y is free (by Proposition D.3.5 (10)). In the case that both are bound then we know that neither x nor y occur within P'' then we know that $x \not>_{(1,2)} y$. If x is free we know that there is no channel that x is greater than. Finally, if y is free then let us consider the following two cases: **(1.a)** When y is free in Q' then x is bound in P' and hence x is not in the names of either P'' or Q' and we have that $x \not>_{(1,2)} y$. **(1.b)** When y is free in P' then by typing we have that $y \in \text{dom}(\Gamma'' \otimes \Delta'_1, w : \bar{T})$. If $y \in \text{dom}(\Delta'_1, w : \bar{T})$ then by typing $y \notin n(P'')$ hence $x \not> y$. If $y \in \text{dom}(\Gamma'')$ then we must have that y occurs within an output of P' and x occurs within an unrestricted input of Q' i.e. there is a context C_1 and C_2 such that $P' = C_1[\bar{a}\langle y \rangle.P'']$ and $Q' = C_2[\text{un } b\langle y \rangle.Q'']$ for some channel a and b with dual types as only outputs may send bound channels and similarly in order for x to be greater than any channel then it must be received within an unrestricted input by Figure D.1, however we would need that $a : *?T \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T)$ and $b : *?T \wedge \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$ hence a and b do not have dual types and contradict $P_0 \in \mathcal{L}$. Applying the induction hypotheses we apply the same reasoning that any the step taken within $>_{(1,2)}$ must contradict that $P_0 \in \mathcal{L}$.

- $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P'), \text{cc}(v, Q'), a, b)\}$ then the case is the dual to that of 1) in the sense that 1) considers the sub process $(\mathbf{v}ws')(P' \mid Q')$ where as here we are considering $(\mathbf{v}zv)(P'' \mid Q')$ and hence will be omitted.
- 2) $(x >_{P_0}^* c \implies c \not>_{P_0}^* y) \wedge (c >_{P_0}^* x \implies y \not>_{P_0}^* c)$.

We only show that the conjunct $(x >_{P_0}^* c \implies c \not>_{P_0}^* y)$ holds. Consider the following:

- I) $(x, y) = (w, s')$, the case of (s', w) follows similarly.

Then as $\text{acyclic}(>_4, (\mathbf{v}ws')(P' \mid Q'), w, s')$ and $\text{comp}(P'_0, w, s')$ where $P'_0 = (\mathbf{v}ws')(P' \mid Q')$ we have $(w >_{4, P'_0}^* c \implies c \not>_{4, P'_0}^* s')$. We argue similarly to previous cases via contradiction, showing firstly that when we have $c >_{P_0}^* e >_{P_0}^* s'$ we may consider instead $w >_{P_0}^* e \implies e >_{P_0}^* s'$ where $e >_{P_0}^* s'$ as $w >_{P_0}^* c >_{P_0}^* e$. This argument is applied until we obtain an e such that we have that $e >_{P_0}^* s'$ may be represented as $e > f_1$ followed by a chain of pairs of compatible channels with respect to P_0 that leads to s' (this being f_1, f_2 being compatible, f_2, f_3 being compatible, ..., f_n, s' being compatible). Next all channels that enable $w >_{P_0}^* e$ must be bound within P' and we have that $w >_{4, P'_0}^* e$ and $w \not>_{3, P_0}^* g$ for any g . Finally, we show by induction on the length of the chain of compatible channels f_1, \dots, f_n to s' that we cannot have $e >_{P_0}^* s'$ without a contradiction this either being done by the induction hypothesis from $\text{acyclic}(>_4, P'_0, w, s')$ or by contradicting $\text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P_0), \text{cc}(v, P_0), w, s')$.

- II) $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(w, P'), \text{cc}(s', Q'), a, b)\}$.

Let $P'_0 = (\mathbf{v}ws')(P' \mid Q')$, then as $\text{acyclic}(>_4, P'_0, x, y)$ and $\text{comp}(P'_0, x, y)$ we have $(x >_{4, P'_0}^* c \implies c \not>_{4, P'_0}^* y)$.

We show inductively that if $x >_{P_0}^* c$ then $x >_{4, P_0'}^* c$ where $c >_{P_0}^* y$. Following Definition D.8, $x >_{P_0}^* c$ can hold in the following 4 situations:

A) **If $x > c$.**

Then we also have that $x >_{P_0'}^* c$ and as $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$ as by Proposition D.3.1 this would contradict $x > c$ we may deduce that $x \in \text{bn}(P_0')$ and $x >_4 c$ and hence also $x >_{4, P_0'}^* c$. Next we show that $c >_{P_0}^* y$ cannot hold:

i) Suppose $c > y$: Then, this implies $c >_{P_0'}^* y$ and similarly that $c >_{4, P_0'}^* y$, which contradicts $\text{acyclic}(>_4, P_0', x, y)$ as $c \not>_{4, P_0'}^* y$.

ii) Suppose there is an e such that $c > e \wedge e >_{P_0}^* y$: Then, $e \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$ as by Proposition D.3.1 this would contradict $e >_{P_0}^* y$. Let us consider the three remaining possibilities for e :

- Case $e = u$: we would have $c > u$ which contradicts maximality of u w.r.t. $>$, from typing \vdash^u .
- Case $e \in \text{bn}(P_0')$: then $c >_{P_0'}^* e$ hence we have $x >_{P_0'}^* e$ and by the induction hypothesis $e \not>_{P_0}^* y$.
- Case $e \in \text{bn}(P'')$: then $c > e$ is a contradiction as this will require $c \in \text{dom}(\Gamma''')$ and hence C cannot be larger than e by Proposition D.3.1.

iii) Suppose there is an e such that $\text{comp}(P_0, c, e) \wedge e >_{P_0}^* y$: Then $e \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$ as by Proposition D.3.1 this would contradict $e >_{P_0}^* y$. Let us consider the three remaining possibilities:

- $e = u$: this case contradicts $\text{comp}(P_0, c, u)$ as there does not exist a channel c that is compatible with u hence we do not consider the case.
- $e \in \text{bn}(P_0')$: then $c >_{P_0'}^* e$ hence we have $x >_{P_0'}^* e$ and by the induction hypothesis $e \not>_{P_0}^* y$.
- $e \in \text{bn}(P''')$: then $c \in \text{dom}(\Gamma''')$ and hence contradicting $c >_{P_0}^* y$ as no element is smaller than c .

iv) $c >_{P_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$ then firstly notice that there are three cases here:

- There is an f such that $c > f \wedge f >_{P_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$, in this case we may apply case ii).
- There is an f such that $\text{comp}(P_0, c, f) \wedge f >_{P_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$, in this case we may apply case iii).
- There is no f such that $c > f \wedge f >_{P_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$ or $\text{comp}(P_0, c, f) \wedge f >_{P_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$, hence $c >_{P_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$ may be considered as $c > e_1 \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e_1, e_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e_n, e) \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$. That is that $c > e_1$ and then there is a sequence of compatible channels that leads to y .

We now proceed to show iv).

Note that $e_i \neq u$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $e \neq u$ as these would contradict $\text{comp}(P_0, e_i, e_{i+1})$ and $\text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$, respectively. Also, we have that $c \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u \cup \text{bn}(P''')$ as this would contradict $c >_{P_0}^* e$. Thus, $c \in \text{bn}(P_0')$. We proceed by induction on n :

(Base Case) when $n = 0$.

We have $c > e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$ then we consider e

- $e \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$: we must have that either $y \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ or $y \in \text{bn}(P'')$. If $y \in \text{bn}(P'')$ then this contradicts $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(w, P'), \text{cc}(s', Q'), a, b)\}$. If $y \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ then we have $c >_{P'_0}^* e$ and $c >_{4, P'_0}^* e$. Also, $\text{comp}(P_0, e, y) \implies \text{comp}(P'_0, e, y)$, but by the induction hypothesis, $c \not>_{4, P'_0}^* y$.
- $e \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ then we must have that $y \in \text{n}(P'_0) \cup \text{dom}(\Gamma'' \setminus u \otimes \Delta'_1, w : \bar{T} + \Gamma''', w' : S', s' : T')$ and we have that $c >_{P'_0}^* e$ and also $c >_{4, P'_0}^* e$ secondly that $\text{comp}(P_0, e, y) \implies \text{comp}(P'_0, e, y)$ but by the induction hypothesis we have that $c \not>_{4, P'_0}^* y$.
- $e \in \text{bn}(P'')$: then as c must be within the bound names of P'_0 but then we cannot have that $c >_3 e$. Hence we must have $c >_4 e$ which then implies that $e \notin \text{bn}(P'')$.

(Inductive Step) When $n \geq 1$.

We have that $c > e_1 \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e_1, e_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e_{n-1}, e_n) \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, y)$ then we consider e_1 :

- $e_1 \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$ we must have that either $e_2 \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ or $e_2 \in \text{bn}(P'')$.
If $e_2 \in \text{bn}(P'')$ then as $P_0 = (\mathbf{v}z\nu)((\mathbf{v}ws)\bar{z}\langle s \rangle.(P' \mid P'') \mid \text{lin } \nu(s').Q')$ and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{comp}(P_0, e_1, e_2) &= \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q), e_1, e_2) \vee \text{comp}(P, e_1, e_2) \vee \text{comp}(Q, e_1, e_2) \\ &= \text{compcc}((w, \text{cc}(w, P')) :: \text{cc}(z, P''), (s', \text{cc}(s', Q'))) :: \text{cc}(v, Q'), e_1, e_2) \\ &\quad \vee \text{comp}(P, e_1, e_2) \vee \text{comp}(Q, e_1, e_2) \\ &= \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P''), \text{cc}(v, Q'), e_1, e_2) \vee \text{comp}(P, e_1, e_2) \vee \text{comp}(Q, e_1, e_2) \\ &= \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P''), \text{cc}(v, Q'), e_1, e_2) \vee \text{comp}(P, e_1, e_2) \vee \text{false} \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{comp}(P, e_1, e_2) &= \{(w, s)\} \\ &\quad \vee \text{comp}(P', e_1, e_2) \vee \text{comp}(P'', e_1, e_2) \\ &= \{(w, s)\} \vee \text{false} \vee \text{comp}(P'', e_1, e_2) \end{aligned}$$

As $e_1 \notin \{w, s'\}$ then we must have that either $\text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P''), \text{cc}(v, Q'), e_1, e_2)$, which holds by the induction hypothesis, or $\text{comp}(P'', e_1, e_2)$, and hence when $n = 1$ then $e_2 = e$ and we must have that $e_2 \in \text{bn}(P'')$. Therefore, all e_i , e and y must be bound names in P'' but then this contradicts that $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(w, P'), \text{cc}(s', Q'), a, b)\}$.

When $e_2 \in \text{bn}(Q')$ the case follows by the induction hypothesis.

- $e_1 \in \text{bn}(P'_0)$ then the case follows by the induction hypothesis.
- $e_1 \in \text{bn}(Q'')$ then the case follows analogously to that of **iv)** when $e_2 \in \text{bn}(Q'')$.

B) **If $x > e \wedge e >_{P_0}^* c$ for some e .**

Then we have that $e \in n(P'_0)$ and hence $x >_{3,P'_0}^* e$. By the induction hypothesis, $e >_{3,P'_0}^* c$ which implies $x >_{3,P'_0}^* c$. We then reason by induction on $c >_{P_0}^* y$ showing that x and y cannot be compatible, the argument of which follows from **A**)

C) **If $\text{comp}(P_0, x, e) \wedge e >_{P_0}^* c$ for some e .**

Then $x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u \cup \text{bn}(Q'')$ as this would contradict $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, P), \text{cc}(v, Q'), a, b)\}$. Hence we have that both x and e are in the bound names of P'_0 , which implies that $\text{comp}(P'_0, x, e)$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $e >_{P_0}^* c$, then finally we have $e >_{3,P'_0}^* c$. We then reason by induction on $c >_{P_0}^* y$ showing that x and y cannot be compatible, the argument of which follows from **A**)

D) $x >_{P_0}^* e \wedge \text{comp}(P_0, e, c)$ **for some e .**

Then by the induction hypothesis if $x >_{P_0}^* e$ then $x >_{3,P'_0}^* e$ as $\text{comp}(P_0, e, c)$ and $c >_{P_0}^* y$ we can argue analogously to **C**) that $\text{comp}(P'_0, e, c)$ and hence $x >_{P_0}^* c$. We then apply induction on $c >_{P_0}^* y$ showing that x and y cannot be compatible, the argument of which follows from **A**)

3) $(c >_{P_0}^* x \wedge y >_{P_0}^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P_0, c, d)$ and $c >_{P_0}^* x >_{P_0}^* d \implies \neg \text{comp}(P_0, c, d)$ are shown similarly to Item 3(d)iii and Item 3(d)iv respectively.

B. When $w' \neq v$ the results follow analogously to 2(b)i applying the induction hypothesis.

ii. When $q = \text{un}$.

Then $\Gamma''', w' : *?T' = v : \bar{V}, (\Gamma' \otimes \Delta)$ and either:

$$[S_{>} : \text{UnIn}_1] \frac{\Gamma''', s' : T' \vdash_{>(2,1)}^w Q' \quad >_2 \triangleq >(2,1) \downarrow_w \cup (>_{(2,1)}^{w'}) \downarrow_w \quad \neg \text{svr}(T') \quad w \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma''', w' : *?T' \vdash_{>_2}^{w'} \text{un } w'(s').Q'}$$

or

$$[S_{>} : \text{UnIn}_2] \frac{\Gamma''', s' : T' \vdash_{>(2,1)}^{s'} Q' \quad >_2 \triangleq >(2,1) \cup (>_{(2,1)}^{w'}) \quad \neg \text{cli}(T') \wedge \text{svr}(T')}{\Gamma''', w' : *?T' \vdash_{>_2}^{w'} \text{un } w'(s').Q'}$$

The case proceeds analogously to that of Item 3(e)i with the exception that in the case of $w' = v$ that $(\mathbf{vzv})(P \mid Q) \notin \mathcal{L}$.

(f) **When $Q = (\mathbf{vw}'s')(Q' \mid Q'')$.**

Then $\Gamma''' \otimes \Delta'_1, \Delta'_2 = v : \bar{V}, (\Gamma' \otimes \Delta)$ and:

$$[S_{>} : \text{Par}_2] \frac{w' : V, (\Gamma''' \setminus u \otimes \Delta'_1) \vdash_{>_1}^z Q' \quad s' : \bar{V}, (\Gamma''' \otimes \Delta'_2) \vdash_{>_2}^u Q'' \quad > \triangleq >_1 \cup >_2 \cup >_1^u}{\Gamma''' \otimes \Delta'_1, \Delta'_2 \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{vw}'s')(Q' \mid Q'')}$$

Since z and v have a linear type then v must occur either within Q' or Q'' but not both. Assume w.l.o.g. that $v \in \text{fn}(Q'')$ then $v \notin \text{dom}(w' : V, (\Gamma''' \setminus u \otimes \Delta'_1)) \vee n(Q')$. By the induction hypothesis, it follows that

$$\Gamma''' \otimes \Delta'_1, \Delta'_2, t : \text{lin!}T.S + s' : \bar{V}, (\Gamma''' \otimes \Delta'_2) \vdash_{>_3}^u (\mathbf{vzv})(P \mid Q''),$$

where $\succ_3 = \succ_1 \cup \succ_{(2,2)} \cup \succ_1^u$ and both $\text{noCycle}(\succ_1, P)$ and $\text{noCycle}(\succ_{(2,2)}, Q'')$. Thus, by the induction hypothesis we have $\text{acyclic}(\succ_3, (\mathbf{v}_{zv})(P \mid Q''), x, y)$, for all $(x, y) \in \{(a, b) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, (\mathbf{v}_{zv})(P \mid Q'')), \text{cc}(v, (\mathbf{v}_{zv})(P \mid Q'')), a, b)\}$. Therefore, since $\text{acyclic}(\succ_3, (\mathbf{v}_{zv})(P \mid Q''), x, y)$ and $\exists c$ such that $v \succ_{(2,1)} c \vee c \succ_{(2,1)} v$ the result holds.

(g) **When** $Q = Q' \mid Q''$.

Then $\Gamma''' \otimes \Delta_1'', \Delta_2'' = v : \bar{V}, (\Gamma' \otimes \Delta)$ and:

$$[\mathbf{S}_{>} : \text{Par}_1] \frac{\Gamma''' \otimes \Delta_2'' \vdash_{\succ_{(2,2)}}^u Q'' \quad \frac{\Gamma''' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1'' \vdash_{\succ_{(2,1)}}^w Q' \quad \succ_2 \triangleq \succ_{(2,1)} \downarrow_w \cup \succ_{(2,2)} \cup (\succ_{(2,1)}^u) \downarrow_w \quad w \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma''' \otimes \Delta_1'', \Delta_2'' \vdash_{\succ_2} (Q' \mid Q'')}}{\Gamma''' \otimes \Delta_1'', \Delta_2'' \vdash_{\succ_2} (Q' \mid Q'')}$$

Result follows analogously from Item 3f.

4. **Case** $P = (\mathbf{v}_{ws})\bar{i}(s).P'$.

Then the case follows for the most part analogously to Item 3.

5. **Case** $P = q w(v).P'$.

Then by duality, the key cases have already been considered, otherwise, induction is applied on the structure of Q and the cases are analogous to that of 3b

6. **Case** $P = (\mathbf{v}_{wv})(P' \mid P'')$ or $P = P' \mid P''$.

We apply induction on the structure of Q and all cases follow analogously from 3f.

□

We can now prove that typable processes (in \mathcal{L}) induce acyclic partial orders:

Lemma D.3.5 *If* $P \in \mathcal{L}(u)$ *with* $\Gamma \vdash_{\succ}^u P$ *then* $\text{noCycle}(\succ, P)$.

Proof: The proof is by induction on the structure of P .

1. **When** $P = \mathbf{0}$.

Then, by Proposition D.3.2, we have the following derivation:

$$[\mathbf{S}_{>} : \text{Nil}] \frac{\succ \triangleq \{(u, x) \mid x \in \Gamma \setminus u\}}{\Gamma \vdash_{\succ}^u \mathbf{0}}$$

Since $\text{compN}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$, one has $\text{noCycle}(\succ, \mathbf{0})$ and the result follows.

2. **When** $P = \text{un } x(y).P'$.

Then we need to consider the type of x :

(a) $\neg \text{cli}(T) \wedge \text{svr}(T)$:

Then, by the proof of Proposition D.3.2, we have the following derivation:

$$[\mathbf{S}_{>} : \text{UnIn}_2] \frac{\Gamma', y : T \vdash_{\succ_1}^y P' \quad \succ = \succ_1 \cup \succ_1^x \quad \neg \text{cli}(T) \wedge \text{svr}(T)}{\Gamma', x : *?T \vdash_{\succ}^x \text{un } x(y).P'}$$

By the induction hypothesis, we have $\text{noCycle}(\succ_1, P')$, and by Definition D.7 we have $\text{compN}(P') = \text{compN}(P)$. It remains to show that $\text{noCycle}(\succ, P)$.

By definition $\text{noCycle}(\succ, P) = \bigwedge_{(a,b) \in \text{compN}(P)} \text{acyclic}(\succ, P, a, b)$, and we will verify the conditions in Definition D.9:

- $a \not>_P^* b$.
As $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ then $a \not>_{1P'}^* b$.
Let us consider the following two cases w.l.o.g.
 - i. When $x = a$ then $\Gamma', x : *?T \vdash_x^> \text{un } x(y).P'$, by applying Proposition D.3.5 (vii) implies $\neg \text{comp}(P, a, b)$ and the condition follows.
 - ii. When $x \neq a$ then $a \not>_1^* b$ by definition hence we must have $a >_{1P'}^* b$. Secondly for $\text{comp}(\text{un } x(y).P', a, b)$ to hold then $\text{comp}(P', a, b)$. Finally by the induction hypothesis $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ implies $a >_{1P'}^* b$ if $\neg \text{comp}(P', a, b)$ and hence $a >_{1P'}^* b$.
- $(a >_P^* c \implies c \not>_P^* b) \wedge (c >_P^* a \implies b \not>_P^* c)$
We show w.l.o.g. that $(a >_P^* c \implies c \not>_P^* b)$.
As $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ then $(a >_{1P'}^* c \implies c \not>_{1P'}^* b)$ and as already stated $x = a$ or $x = b$ contradicts $\text{comp}(P, a, b)$ and hence $a \neq x$. As $\text{compN}(P) = \text{compN}(P')$ and no channel is either greater then or compatible to x it follows that $(a >_P^* c \implies c \not>_P^* b)$.
- $(c >_P^* a \wedge b >_P^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$
Firstly as $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ then $(c >_{1P'}^* a \wedge b >_{1P'}^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P', c, d)$. Let us consider w.l.o.g. the following two cases:
 - i. $c = x$ then $x >_{1P'}^* a$ however when $b >_P^* d$ then as $\Gamma', x : *?T \vdash_x^> \text{un } x(y).P'$ applying Proposition D.3.5 (vii) we have that x is not compatible with any channel hence $\neg \text{comp}(P, x, d)$.
 - ii. When $c \neq x$ the case holds as shown previously no channel can be greater then or compatible to x meaning applying the induction hypothesis the case follows.
- $c >_P^* a >_P^* d \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$
As $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ then $c >_{1P'}^* a >_{1P'}^* d \implies \neg \text{comp}(P', c, d)$. Let us consider w.l.o.g. the following two cases:
 - i. $c = x$ then $x >_{1P'}^* a$ however when $a >_P^* d$ then $\neg \text{comp}(P, x, d)$ is implied by Proposition D.3.5 (vii).
 - ii. When $c \neq x$ the case holds similarly to previous cases by the induction hypothesis.

(b) When $\neg \text{svr}(T)$ then by Proposition D.3.2:

$$[\mathbb{S}_{>} : \text{UnIn}_1] \frac{\Gamma', y : T \vdash_w^> P' \quad > \Rightarrow >_1 \downarrow_w \cup (>_1^u) \downarrow_w \quad \neg \text{svr}(T) \quad w \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma', x : *?T \vdash_x^> \text{un } x(y).P'}$$

The case holds analogously to 2a.

3. **When** $P = \text{lin } x(y).P'$.

Then, by Proposition D.3.2, we have the following derivation:

$$[\mathbb{S}_{>} : \text{LinIn}] \frac{\Gamma', x : S, y : T \vdash_x^u P'}{\Gamma', x : \text{lin}?T.S \vdash_x^u \text{lin } x(y).P'}$$

By the induction hypothesis, it follows that $\text{noCycle}(>, P')$. By Definition D.7, we have that $\text{compN}(P) = \text{compN}(P')$. Thus,

$$\text{noCycle}(>, P) = \bigwedge_{(a,b) \in \text{compN}(P)} \text{acyclic}(>, P, a, b) = \bigwedge_{(a,b) \in \text{compN}(P')} \text{acyclic}(>, P, a, b) \text{ holds,}$$

since $\text{noCycle}(>, P')$ holds.

4. **When** $P = \bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P'$.

Then there are four cases:

(a) $x : \text{lin}!(T).S$ and $\neg \text{un}(T)$:

Then, the derivation is as

$$[\mathbf{S}_{>} : \text{LinOut}_2] \frac{\Gamma', x : S \vdash_{>_1}^u P' \quad > \Rightarrow_{>_1} \cup \{(u, v)\} \quad \neg \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma', v : T, x : \text{lin}!(T).S \vdash_{>}^u \bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P'}$$

By the induction hypothesis, it follows that $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$. We want to prove that

$$\text{noCycle}(>, P) = \bigwedge_{(a,b) \in \text{compN}(P)} \text{acyclic}(>, P, a, b)$$

holds.

i. $a \not>_P^* b$.

Since $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$, it follows that $a \not>_{1, P'}^* b$. By definition, we have $\text{compN}(P) = \text{compN}(P')$ and the condition follows.

ii. $(a >_P^* c \implies c \not>_P^* b) \wedge (c >_P^* a \implies b \not>_P^* c)$.

Note that $u, v \notin \text{compN}(P)$. Thus, $(a >_P^* c \implies a >_{1, P'}^* c)$.

Since $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$, it follows that $(a >_{1, P'}^* c \implies c \not>_{1, P'}^* b)$. Finally, $c \not>_{1, P'}^* b$ implies $c \not>_P^* b$, as $(u, v) \in >$ does not relate with any other pairs in $>_1$. The proof is similar for $(c >_P^* a)$.

iii. $(c >_P^* a \wedge b >_P^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$.

Suppose $(c >_P^* a \wedge b >_P^* d)$. Since $u, v \notin \text{compN}(P)$, it follows that $(c >_{1, P'}^* a \wedge b >_{1, P'}^* d)$ and $\neg \text{comp}(P', c, d)$. Hence, $\neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$, since $>$ does not add new compatible names.

iv. $(c >_P^* a >_P^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$.

This case is similar to the previous one.

(b) $x : \text{lin}!(T).S$ and $\text{un}(T)$:

$$[\mathbf{S}_{>} : \text{LinOut}_1] \frac{\Gamma', v : T, x : S \vdash_{>}^u P' \quad \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma', v : T, x : \text{lin}!(T).S \vdash_{>}^u \bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P'}$$

(c) $x : *!T$ and $\neg \text{un}(T)$:

$$[\mathbf{S}_{>} : \text{UnOut}_2] \frac{\Gamma', x : *!T \vdash_{>_1}^u P' \quad > \Rightarrow_{>_1} \cup \{(u, v)\} \quad u \neq x \quad \neg \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma_1, x : *!T, v : T \vdash_{>}^u \bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P'}$$

(d) $x : *!T$ and $\text{un}(T)$:

$$[\mathbf{S}_{>} : \text{UnOut}_3] \frac{\Gamma', x : *!T, v : T \vdash_{>}^u P' \quad u \neq x \quad \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma_1, x : *!T, v : T \vdash_{>}^u \bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P'}$$

Cases (b) - (d) follow by applying the induction hypothesis in P' , followed by verifying that the conditions (i) - (iv) for acyclicity hold.

5. **When** $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}\langle y \rangle.P'$.

Then, by Proposition D.3.2, we have the following derivation:

$$[\mathbf{S}_{>} : \text{UnOut}_1] \frac{\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^u P' \quad > \Rightarrow_{>_1} \cup \{(u, y)\} \quad u \neq z}{\Gamma', z : *!T \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}\langle y \rangle.P'}$$

By the induction hypothesis we have $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$. By definition, $\text{compN}(P) = \text{compN}(P') \cup \{(x, y), (y, x)\}$.

We need to show $\text{noCycle}(>, P)$:

Let $(a, b) \in \text{compN}(P)$. We will verify that $\text{acyclic}(>, P, a, b)$.

There are two cases to consider:

(a) $(a, b) \in \text{compN}(P')$.

By Proposition D.3.5(7), it follows that there is no x' such that $\text{comp}(P', u, x')$, thus $u \notin \{a, b\}$. Since $\Gamma \vdash_{>_1}^u P'$, it follows that **(H1)** $y \notin n(P') \cup \text{dom}(\Gamma')$, thus $y \notin \{a, b\}$. Also, by Proposition D.3.5(6) and **(H1)**, it follows that there does not exist x' such that **(H2)** $x' >_1 y \vee y >_1 x' \vee \text{comp}(P', x', y)$.

i. $a \not>_P^* b$.

Suppose, by contradiction, that $a >_P^* b$. Then, there exists a path from a to b via $>_P^*$, and it must be the case, by Definition D.8, that either $\text{comp}(P, x, y)$, or $\text{comp}(P, y, x)$ or $u > y$ where used in the path, otherwise, we would have $a >_{1, P'}^* b$, and this contradicts the fact that $a \not>_{1, P'}^* b$, from the hypothesis that $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ holds. Note that u does not occur in the path due to Proposition D.3.5(7). Also notice that $a \neq x$ by Proposition D.3.1 and Proposition D.3.5(15) and similarly $a \neq y$ by **(H2)**. Therefore, the path is, w.l.o.g., either as

$$a >_{1, P'}^* x \wedge \text{comp}(P, x, y) \wedge y >_1 a_{i+1} >_{1, P'}^* b$$

$$\text{or as } a >_{1, P'}^* x \wedge \text{comp}(P, x, y) \wedge \text{comp}(P', y, a_{i+1}) \wedge a_{i+1} >_{1, P'}^* b$$

contradicting **(H2)**. Hence, $a \not>_P^* b$.

ii. $(a >_P^* c \implies c \not>_P^* b) \wedge (c >_P^* a \implies b \not>_P^* c)$.

Suppose that $a >_P^* c$. If there were a path $c >_P^* b$ it has to use either $\text{comp}(P, x, y)$, or $\text{comp}(P, y, x)$ or $u > y$, which is a contradiction (similar to the case above). Therefore, $c \not>_P^* b$. The proof is similar for the implication on the right.

iii. $(c >_P^* a \wedge b >_P^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$.

Firstly, as $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ then $(c >_{1, P'}^* a \wedge b >_{1, P'}^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P', c, d)$. Secondly, suppose $(c >_P^* a \wedge b >_P^* d)$ using the pairs (x, y) , or (y, x) or (u, y) . Let us consider w.l.o.g. the following cases:

A. When $c = u$ with $(u >_P^* a \wedge b >_P^* d)$ then $\neg \text{comp}(P, u, d)$ holds by Proposition D.3.5(7).

B. When $c = x$ with $(x >_P^* a \wedge b >_P^* d)$. Note that y cannot occur in the path $x >_P^* y$, since it contradicts **(H2)**. Therefore, the path is $x >_{1, P'}^* a$ and y has to occur somewhere in $b >_P^* d$. By **(H1)** we have that $y \neq b$; also, y cannot occur internally in the path $b >_P^* d$ without contradicting **(H2)**. It remains to check whether $d = y$ can occur: if that were the case, then we would have the path $b >_P^* y$ as $b >_P^* x \wedge \text{comp}(P, x, y)$ (since u is not compatible with any name). Then, we would have $x >_P^* a \wedge b >_P^* x$ which contradicts case (ii) above. Therefore, this case is only possible in $(x >_{1, P'}^* a \wedge b >_{1, P'}^* d)$, and the result follows by the hypothesis that $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ holds.

C. When $c = y$ with $y >_P^* a \wedge b >_P^* d$.

Then it must be the case that $\text{comp}(P, y, x) \wedge x >_{1, P'}^* a \wedge b >_P^* d$. Since x, y cannot occur within $b >_P^* d$ (otherwise it would contradict case (ii)), then we must have $\text{comp}(P, y, x) \wedge x >_{1, P'}^* a \wedge b >_{1, P'}^* d$. Suppose, by contradiction, that $\text{comp}(P, y, d)$. Since $y \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma') \cup n(P')$, by Proposition D.3.5 (6), it follows that there is no y' such that $y > y' \vee y' > y \vee \text{comp}(P, y, y')$. Therefore,

it must be the case that $d = x$, and we would have $\text{comp}(P, y, x) \wedge x >_{1, P'}^* a \wedge b >_{1, P'}^* x$, which contradicts case (ii), and the result follows.

D. When $c \notin \{u, x, y\}$ with $(c >_P^* a \wedge b >_P^* d)$.

Let us assume the contradiction that we have a pair such that $\text{comp}(P, c, d)$. Then d cannot be u as this contradicts that no element is larger than u . Similarly d cannot be y as this would imply that $c = x$ as that is the only compatible channel with y contradicting $c \notin \{u, x, y\}$. Hence we must have that $\text{comp}(P', c, d)$ but the induction hypotheses though we have that if $(c >_{P'}^* a \wedge b >_{P'}^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P', c, d)$ and $\neg \text{comp}(P', c, d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$ contradicting this.

iv. $c >_P^* a >_P^* d \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$.

Suppose $(c >_P^* a >_P^* d)$ using the pairs (x, y) , or (y, x) or (u, y) . The cases where $c = u$ or $c = x$ are analogous to the analysis above.

It remains to analyze the case $c = y$, for which, we have $\text{comp}(P, y, x) \wedge x >_{1, P'}^* a >_P^* d$. Since $y \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma') \cup \text{n}(P')$, by Proposition D.3.5 (6), it follows that there is no y' such that $y > y' \vee y' > y \vee \text{comp}(P, y, y')$. Therefore, it must be the case that $d = x$, and we would have $\text{comp}(P, y, x) \wedge x >_{1, P'}^* a >_P^* x$. Since y cannot occur in $a >_P^* x$, it follows that $\text{comp}(P, y, x) \wedge x >_{1, P'}^* a >_{1, P'}^* x$, which contradicts the fact that $\text{noCycle}(P', >_1)$.

(b) $(a, b) \in \{(x, y), (y, x)\}$.

We consider $(a, b) = (x, y)$ as the case of (y, x) follows analogously.

i. $x \not>_P^* y$.

As $\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^u P'$ then $x \not>_1 y$ and hence $(x, y) \notin >_1 \cup \{(u, y)\}$.

ii. $(x >_P^* c \implies c \not>_P^* y) \wedge (c >_P^* x \implies y \not>_P^* c)$

As $\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^u P'$ then $\nexists c$ such that $c >_1 y \vee y >_1 c$. We show w.l.o.g. that $(x > c \implies c \not> y)$. The only relation on y is that $u > y$ however we also have that $u >_1 x$ and hence $u > x$. Hence there exists no c .

iii. $(c >_P^* x \wedge y >_P^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$

Analogous to 5(b)ii.

iv. $c >_P^* x >_P^* d \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$

As $\text{noCycle}(P', >_1)$ then $c >_{1, P'}^* x >_{1, P'}^* d \implies \neg \text{comp}(P', c, d)$. Let us consider w.l.o.g. the following cases:

A. When $c = u$ then $\nexists d$ such that $\text{comp}(P, u, d)$.

B. When $c = z$ then $z >_P^* a >_P^* d \implies z >_{P'}^* a >_{P'}^* d$ and $\text{comp}(P, z, d)$ if $\text{comp}(P', z, d)$ which does not hold, hence $\neg \text{comp}(P, z, d)$.

C. When $c \notin \{u, z\}$ the case proceeds analogously to 5(b)ivB.

6. **When** $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(y).P'$.

Then, by Proposition D.3.2, we have the following derivation:

$$[\mathbf{S}_{>} : \text{UnOut}_1] \frac{\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^u P' \quad >=>_1 \cup \{(u, y)\} \quad u \neq z}{\Gamma', z : *!T \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(y).P'}$$

By the induction hypothesis we have $\text{noCycle}(P', >_1)$. By definition, $\text{compN}(P) = \text{compN}(P') \cup \{(x, y), (y, x)\}$.

We need to show $\text{noCycle}(P, >)$:

Let $(a, b) \in \text{compN}(P)$. We will verify that $\text{acyclic}(P, >, a, b)$.

There are two cases to consider:

(a) $(a, b) \in \text{compN}(P')$.

By Proposition D.3.5(7), it follows that there is no x' such that $\text{comp}(P', u, x')$, thus $u \notin \{a, b\}$. Since $\Gamma \vdash_{>_1}^u P'$, it follows that **(H1)** $y \notin n(P') \cup \text{dom}(\Gamma')$, thus $y \notin \{a, b\}$. Also, by Proposition D.3.5(6) and **(H1)**, it follows that there does not exist x' such that **(H2)** $x' >_1 y \vee y >_1 x' \vee \text{comp}(P', x', y)$.

i. $a \not>_p^* b$.

Suppose, by contradiction, that $a >_p^* b$. Then, there exists a path from a to b via $>_p^*$, and it must be the case, by Definition D.8, that either $\text{comp}(P, x, y)$, or $\text{comp}(P, y, x)$ or $u > y$ where used in the path, otherwise, we would have $a >_{1, P'}^* b$, and this contradicts the fact that $a \not>_{1, P'}^* b$, from the hypothesis that $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ holds. Note that u does not occur in the path due to Proposition D.3.5(7). Also notice that $a \neq x$ by Proposition D.3.1/Proposition D.3.5(15) and similarly $a \neq y$ by **(H2)**. Therefore, the path is, w.l.o.g., either as

$$a >_{1, P'}^* x \wedge \text{comp}(P, x, y) \wedge y >_1 a_{i+1} >_{1, P'}^* b$$

$$\text{or as } a >_{1, P'}^* x \wedge \text{comp}(P, x, y) \wedge \text{comp}(P', y, a_{i+1}) \wedge a_{i+1} >_{1, P'}^* b$$

contradicting **(H2)**. Hence, $a \not>_p^* b$.

ii. $(a >_p^* c \implies c \not>_p^* b) \wedge (c >_p^* a \implies b \not>_p^* c)$.

Suppose that $a >_p^* c$. If there were a path $c >_p^* b$ it has to use either $\text{comp}(P, x, y)$, or $\text{comp}(P, y, x)$ or $u > y$, which is a contradiction (similar to the case above). Therefore, $c \not>_p^* b$. The proof is similar for the implication on the right.

iii. $(c >_p^* a \wedge b >_p^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$.

Firstly, as $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ then $(c >_{1, P'}^* a \wedge b >_{1, P'}^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P', c, d)$. Let us consider w.l.o.g. the following cases:

A. When $c = u$ with $(u >_p^* a \wedge b >_p^* d)$ then $\neg \text{comp}(P, u, d)$ holds by Proposition D.3.5(7).

B. When $c = x$ with $(x >_p^* a \wedge b >_p^* d)$. Note that y cannot occur in the path $x >_p^* y$, since it contradicts **(H2)**. Therefore, the path is $x >_{1, P'}^* a$ and y has to occur somewhere in $b >_p^* d$. By **(H1)** we have that $y \neq b$; also, y cannot occur internally in the path $b >_p^* d$ without contradicting **(H2)**. It remains to check whether $d = y$ can occur: if that were the case, then we would have the path $b >_p^* y$ as $b >_p^* x \wedge \text{comp}(P, x, y)$ (since u is not compatible with any name). Then, we would have $x >_p^* a \wedge b >_p^* x$ which contradicts case (ii) above. Therefore, this case is only possible in $(x >_{1, P'}^* a \wedge b >_{1, P'}^* d)$, and the result follows by the hypothesis that $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ holds.

C. When $c = y$ with $y >_p^* a \wedge b >_p^* d$.

Then it must be the case that $\text{comp}(P, y, x) \wedge x >_{1, P'}^* a \wedge b >_p^* d$. Since x, y cannot occur within $b >_p^* d$ (otherwise it would contradict case (ii)), then we must have $\text{comp}(P, y, x) \wedge x >_{1, P'}^* a \wedge b >_{1, P'}^* d$. Suppose, by contradiction, that $\text{comp}(P, y, d)$. Since $y \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma') \cup n(P')$, by Proposition D.3.5 (6), it follows that there is no y' such that $y > y' \vee y' > y \vee \text{comp}(P, y, y')$. Therefore, it must be the case that $d = x$, and we would have $\text{comp}(P, y, x) \wedge x >_{1, P'}^* a \wedge b >_{1, P'}^* x$, which contradicts case (ii), and the result follows.

D. When $c \notin \{u, x, y\}$ with $(c >_p^* a \wedge b >_p^* d)$.

Let us assume the contradiction that we have a pair such that $\text{comp}(P, c, d)$. Then d cannot be u as this contradicts that no element is larger than u . Similarly d cannot be y as this would imply that $c = x$ as that is the only compatible channel with y contradicting $c \notin \{u, x, y\}$. Hence we must have that

$\text{comp}(P', c, d)$ but the induction hypotheses though we have that if $(c >_{P'}^* a \wedge b >_{P'}^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P', c, d)$ and $\neg \text{comp}(P', c, d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$ contradicting this.

iv. $c >_P^* a >_P^* d \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$.

Suppose $(c >_P^* a >_P^* d)$ using either $\text{comp}(P, x, y)$, or $\text{comp}(P, y, x)$ or $u > y$. The cases where $c = u$ or $c = x$ are analogous to the analysis above.

It remains to analyze the case $c = y$, for which, we have $\text{comp}(P, y, x) \wedge x >_{1, P'}^* a >_P^* d$. Since $y \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma') \cup \text{n}(P')$, by Proposition D.3.5 (6), it follows that there is no y' such that $y > y' \vee y' > y \vee \text{comp}(P, y, y')$. Therefore, it must be the case that $d = x$, and we would have $\text{comp}(P, y, x) \wedge x >_{1, P'}^* a >_P^* x$. Since y cannot occur in $a >_P^* x$, it follows that $\text{comp}(P, y, x) \wedge x >_{1, P'}^* a >_{1, P'}^* x$, which contradicts the fact that $\text{noCycle}(P', >_1)$.

(b) $(a, b) \in \{(x, y), (y, x)\}$.

We consider $(a, b) = (x, y)$ as the case of (y, x) follows analogously.

i. $x \not>_P^* y$.

As $\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^u P'$ then $x \not>_1 y$ and hence $(x, y) \notin >_1 \cup \{(u, y)\}$.

ii. $(x >_P^* c \implies c \not>_P^* y) \wedge (c >_P^* x \implies y \not>_P^* c)$

As $\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^u P'$ then $\nexists c$ such that $c >_1 y \vee y >_1 c$. We show w.l.o.g. that $(x > c \implies c \not> y)$. The only relation on y is that $u > y$ however we also have that $u >_1 x$ and hence $u > x$. Hence there exists no c .

iii. $(c >_P^* x \wedge y >_P^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$

Analogous to 6(b)ii.

iv. $c >_P^* x >_P^* d \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$

As $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ then $c >_{1, P'}^* x >_{1, P'}^* d \implies \neg \text{comp}(P', c, d)$. Let us consider w.l.o.g. the following cases:

A. When $c = u$ then $\nexists d$ such that $\text{comp}(P, u, d)$.

B. When $c = z$ then $z >_P^* a >_P^* d \implies z >_{P'}^* a >_{P'}^* d$ and $\text{comp}(P, z, d)$ if $\text{comp}(P', z, d)$ which does not hold, hence $\neg \text{comp}(P, z, d)$.

C. When $c \notin \{u, z\}$ the case proceeds analogously to 6(b)ivB.

7. When $P = P' \mid Q$.

Then, by Proposition D.3.2, we have the following derivation:

$$[S_{>} : \text{Par}_1] \frac{\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1 \vdash_{>_1}^w P' \quad \Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2 \vdash_{>_2}^u Q \quad >=>_1 \downarrow_w \cup >_2 \cup >_1^u \downarrow_w \quad w \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash_{>}^u P' \mid Q}$$

By the induction hypothesis both $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ and $\text{noCycle}(>_2, Q)$ hold.

We need to show $\text{noCycle}(>, P)$:

Let $(a, b) \in \text{compN}(P) = \text{compN}(P') \cup \text{compN}(Q)$. We will verify that $\text{acyclic}(>, P, a, b)$: To simplify the notations, in the following, we will adopt the abbreviations $>>>_1 \triangleq >_1 \downarrow_w$ and $>>>_1 \triangleq >_1^u \downarrow_w = \{(u, y) \mid \exists t. y >_1 t \vee t >_1 y \wedge y \neq w\}$.

(a) When $(a, b) \in \text{compN}(P') \setminus \text{compN}(Q)$:

i. $a \not>_P^* b$.

From $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ we have $a \not>_{1, P'}^* b$. We need to consider the following cases:

A. When $a = u$. From $\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1 \vdash_{>_1}^w P'$ and Proposition D.3.5 (vi) we have a contradiction with the fact that $\text{comp}(P', u, b)$.

- B. When $a = w$. From $\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1 \vdash_{>_1}^w P'$ and Proposition D.3.5 (vii) we have a contradiction with the fact that $\text{comp}(P', w, b)$.
- C. When $a \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \setminus u) \cup \text{dom}(\Delta_1) \cup \text{dom}(\Delta_2)$. By Proposition D.3.1 there is no b such that $a > b$, and the result follows.
- D. When $a \in \text{bn}(P')$.
Then firstly as $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ we have $a \not>_1 \downarrow_w b$. Secondly as $a \notin (\text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2) \setminus u) \cup \text{bn}(Q)$ we apply Proposition D.3.1 implying $a \not>_2 b$. Finally $a \not>_1^u \downarrow_w b$ by definition and the case follows as required.
- ii. $(a >_P^* c \implies c \not>_P^* b) \wedge (c >_P^* a \implies b \not>_P^* c)$
We show w.l.o.g. that $(a >_P^* c \implies c \not>_P^* b)$ as the other conjunct is similar. We consider the following cases:
- A. When $b = u$ or $b = w$.
Then, it follows similarly to Item 7(a)iA and Item 7(a)iB, that we have a contradiction with the fact that $\text{comp}(P', a, b)$.
- B. When $b \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \setminus u)$.
Assume $a >_P^* c$.
Since $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$, it follows that $(a >_{1, P'}^* c \implies c \not>_{1, P'}^* b)$, which implies $(a \gg_{1, P'}^* c \implies c \not>_{1, P'}^* b)$.
We must show that $(c, b) \notin >_2 \cup \gg_1$: Firstly, note that it must be the case that $(c, b) \notin >_2$, since if $(c, b) \in >_2$ then it must be the case that c occurs in both P' and Q , hence $c \in \text{dom}(\Gamma')$. However, from $\Gamma' \otimes \Delta \vdash_{>_2}^u Q$, Proposition D.3.1 and $c \neq u$, it follows that there is no b such that $c >_2 b$, which gives us a contradiction.
Secondly, $(c, b) \notin \gg_1$ holds by definition. In fact, by definition, $\gg_1 = \gg_1^u \downarrow_w = \{(u, y) \mid \exists t. y >_1 t \vee t >_1 y\} \downarrow_w = \{(u, y) \mid \exists t. y >_1 t \vee t >_1 y \wedge y \neq w\}$, therefore, $(c, b) \in \gg_1$ iff $c = u$. However, we cannot have $c = u$ because u is a maximal element (cf. Proposition D.3.3) and this would contradict the fact that $a >_P^* c$.
- C. When $b \in \text{dom}(\Delta_1)$.
Since $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$, it follows that $(a >_{1, P'}^* c \implies c \not>_{1, P'}^* b)$, hence also $(a \gg_{1, P'}^* c \implies c \not>_{1, P'}^* b)$. Note that, as $b \in \text{dom}(\Delta_1)$ then $b \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2)$, therefore, there does not exist c such that $c >_2 b$. Similarly to the case above, $(c, b) \notin \gg_1$ holds by definition.
- D. When $b \in \text{dom}(\Delta_2)$.
This case contradicts the hypothesis that $\text{comp}(P', a, b)$.
- E. When $b \in \text{bn}(P')$.
This case is analogous to Item 7(a)iiC.
- iii. $(c >_P^* a \wedge b >_P^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$
We consider the following cases:
- A. When $b = u$ or $b = w$.
Then, it follows similarly to Item 7(a)iA and Item 7(a)iB, that we have a contradiction with the fact that $\text{comp}(P', a, b)$.
- B. When $b \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \setminus u) \cup \text{dom}(\Delta_1) \cup \text{dom}(\Delta_2)$.
The case follows from Proposition D.3.5(15) as there is no channel d such that $b >_P^* d$.
- C. When $b \in \text{bn}(P')$.
Then the proof follows analogously to case Item 7(a)iiE above.

iv. $c >_P^* a >_P^* d \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$

We consider the following cases:

A. When $c = u$.

From $\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash_{>}^u P' \mid Q$, then from Proposition D.3.5(7), it follows that there is no x such that $\text{comp}(P, u, x)$, therefore, $\neg \text{comp}(P, u, d)$ holds.

B. When $c = w$.

Since $\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1 \vdash_{>}^w P'$, then from Proposition D.3.5(7), it follows that there is no x such that $\text{comp}(P', w, x)$, therefore, $\neg \text{comp}(P, w, d)$ holds.

C. When $c \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \setminus u) \cup \text{dom}(\Delta_1) \cup \text{dom}(\Delta_2)$.

The case follows from Proposition D.3.5(15) as there is no channel a such that $c >_P^* a$.

D. When $c \in \text{bn}(P')$.

Then firstly we must have that $c >_{1,P}^* a$ as $c \not>_{2,P}^* a$ as we have just seen above that there is no e such that $c >_2 e$. Let us consider the following two cases:

If $a >_{1,P'}^* d$ then by the induction hypothesis $\neg \text{comp}(P', c, d)$ holds, which implies $\neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$.

If $a \not>_{1,P}^* d$ then $a \not>_P^* d$ must be introduced via $>_2$. Then there is some sequence $a >_{1,P}^* d_1 >_{2,P}^* \dots >_{1,P}^* d_n >_{2,P}^* d$. In this scenario we have that d_1 is in the relations of both $>_1$ and $>_2$ hence $d_1 \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$ however we are now contradicting that there exists a name e such that $d_1 >_{2,P}^* e$.

(b) When $\text{comp}(Q, a, b) \wedge \neg \text{comp}(P', a, b)$ then the case follows analogously to Item 7a.

(c) When $\text{comp}(P', a, b) \wedge \text{comp}(Q, a, b)$ then $P \notin \mathcal{L}$. This is as typing ensures that $a, b \in \Gamma'$, however then this implies that a and b are not compatible as at most 1 channel may be free.

8. When $P = (\mathbf{v}z\nu)(P' \mid Q)$.

Then, by Proposition D.3.2, we have the following derivation:

$$[\mathbf{S}_{>} : \text{Par}_2] \frac{z : V, (\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1) \vdash_{>}^z P' \quad v : \bar{V}, (\Gamma' \otimes \Delta) \vdash_{>}^u Q \quad >=>_1 \cup >_2 \cup >_1^u}{\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}z\nu)(P' \mid Q)}$$

By the induction hypothesis both $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ and $\text{noCycle}(>_2, Q)$ hold.

We need to show $\text{noCycle}(>, P)$:

By Definition D.7 the set of compatible names is as

$$\text{compN}(P) = \{(z, \nu), (\nu, z)\} \cup \text{compN}(P') \cup \text{compN}(Q) \cup \{(x, y) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, (\mathbf{v}z\nu)(P \mid Q)), \text{cc}(\nu, (\mathbf{v}z\nu)(P \mid Q)), x, y)\}$$

We will verify that $\text{acyclic}(>, P, a, b)$: To simplify the notations, in the following, we will adopt the abbreviation $>> \triangleq >_1^u$

(a) When $(a, b) \in \{(z, \nu), (\nu, z)\}$. We consider the case $(a, b) = (z, \nu)$ as the case of (ν, z) follows similarly.

1) $\nu \not>_P^* z$.

From $v : \bar{V}, (\Gamma' \otimes \Delta) \vdash_{>}^u Q$ and Proposition D.3.1 we know there is no c such that **(H1)** $\nu >_2 c$. From $z : V, (\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1) \vdash_{>}^z P'$ and applying Proposition D.3.5(6) we have that there is no c such that **(H2)** $\nu >_1 c$ (which we may extend to there not existing a c such that **(H3)** $\nu >_1^u c$ by definition) or **(H4)** $\text{comp}(P', \nu, c)$.

Suppose, by contradiction, assume that $v >_p^* z$. Then, from **(H1)** - **(H4)**, we must have $\text{comp}(P, v, d) \wedge d >_p^* z$ for some d . We have one of two options: (i) $d = z$; and (ii) $(v, d) \in \text{compN}(Q)$ as, by definition, we have $(v, d) \notin \{(x, y) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, (\mathbf{v}zv)(P \mid Q)), \text{cc}(v, (\mathbf{v}zv)(P \mid Q)), x, y)\}$.

i. When $d = z$.

Irreflexivity of $>_2$ implies $z \not>_2 z$ and Definition D.9(ii) implies $z \not>_{2,p}^* z$. By Proposition D.3.5(6) $z \not>_1 e \wedge z \not>_1^u e$ for any e and as already shown, z is not compatible to any names in P' . Hence we must have $\text{comp}(Q, z, f) \wedge f \not>_p^* z$ with $(z, f) \in \text{compN}(Q)$. Let us consider the next step taken that f can make:

- A. If $f \not>_2 z$ as this introduces the contradiction $z \not>_2 z$.
- B. If $f >_1 g$ then this implies that $f \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$ contradicting Proposition D.3.1.
- C. If $\text{comp}(P', f, g)$ then this implies that $f \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$ and by Proposition D.3.5(15) there doesn't exist a h such that $g >_p^* h$.
- D. If $f >_2 g$ then the case follows by induction on the length of $f \not>_p^* z$ showing that no path exists.
- E. If $\text{comp}(Q, f, g)$ then the case follows by induction on the length of $f \not>_p^* z$ showing that no path exists.

ii. When $(v, d) \in \text{compN}(Q)$.

Then we must have that $d \in n(Q)$.

If $d \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$ then by Proposition D.3.5(15) we have that $d \not>_1 e$ for any e and by Proposition D.3.5(6) $d \not>_2 e$. It follows that we must have $\text{comp}(P, d, e) \wedge e \not>_p^* z$ and by induction on the length of the chain of connected channels we can see that every channel cannot perform a step within the partial order and hence we may never reach z . In the case $d \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$ then it follows from Proposition D.3.5(15).

2) $(z >_p^* c \implies c \not>_p^* v) \wedge (c >_p^* z \implies v \not>_p^* c)$

As $\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^u P'$ then as $v \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma', z : *!T, x : \bar{T}) \cup n(P')$ we apply Proposition D.3.5(6) and there doesn't exist a c such that $c >_{1,p'}^* v \vee v >_{1,p'}^* c \vee \text{comp}(P', v, c)$. We show w.l.o.g. that $z >_p^* c \implies c \not>_p^* v$. The only relations on v in $>_2$ are that $u >_2 v$ (which we may exclude as u is the greatest channel in $>$ contradicting $z >_p^* u$) or $e >_2 v$ where e is bound (the second condition coming from Proposition D.3.5(6) implying that $e \in \text{dom}(v : \bar{V}, (\Gamma' \otimes \Delta)) \cup n(Q)$ and Proposition D.3.1 implies that $e \notin \text{dom}(v : \bar{V}, (\Gamma' \otimes \Delta)) \cup \text{fn}(Q)$). Hence any compatible channel to e must also be bound (as any free channel f compatible to e would give $f >_{2,p'}^* v$ contradicting Proposition D.3.1), and hence both e and all compatible channels to e must be in the names of Q . Finally any bound name cannot be compatible with the bound names in P' hence $c \not>_p^* v$.

3) $(c >_p^* z \wedge v >_p^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$.

Note that the only channel larger than z is u (obtained from $>_1^u$) and hence $c = u$. From $\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta \vdash_{>_2}^u (\mathbf{v}zv)(P' \mid Q)$ and Proposition D.3.5 we know that no channel is compatible with u hence the case holds.

4) $c >_p^* z >_p^* d \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$.

Again, we note that the only channel larger than z is u and this case proceeds analogously to 3).

(b) When $(a, b) \in \{(x, y) \mid \text{compcc}(\text{cc}(z, (\mathbf{v}zv)(P \mid Q)), \text{cc}(v, (\mathbf{v}zv)(P \mid Q)), x, y)\}$.

Then case holds by Lemma D.3.4.

(c) When $(a, b) \in \text{compN}(P')$ then:

1) $a \not\approx_p^* b$.

As $(a, b) \in \text{compN}(P')$ we must have either i) both a and b are bound names within P' or ii) exactly one of a or b is free within P' (from Proposition D.3.5(10)). When i) then $a \not\approx_{P'}^* b$ by the induction hypothesis from $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$. Let us assume the contradiction $a >_{P'}^* b$ then as $\text{comp}(P, a, b)$ we also have $b >_{P'}^* a$ contradicting Proposition D.3.5(16).

When ii) then the case holds by Proposition D.3.5(15).

By the induction hypothesis both $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ hence $a \not\approx_1 b$, we have that $a \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta) \setminus u$ (if $a = u$ then not b would be compatible) hence $a \in \text{bn}(P')$. As $a \in \text{bn}(P')$ then there does not exist an c such that $a >_2 c$ hence $a \not\approx b$.

2) $(a >_p^* c \implies c \not\approx_p^* b) \wedge (a >_p^* z \implies v \not\approx_p^* b)$

We show $(a >_p^* c \implies c \not\approx_p^* b)$ as the other case follows similarly. As $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ by the induction hypothesis then $(a >_{1, P'}^* c \implies c \not\approx_{1, P'}^* b)$. Let us consider a :

I) $b \in \{u, z, v\}$ then this contradicts $\text{comp}(P', a, b)$.

II) $b \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta)$ then $(a >_{1, P'}^* c \implies c \not\approx_{1, P'}^* b)$. We show that both $c \not\approx_{2, P'}^* b$ and $c \not\approx_{1, P'}^* b$. As $c \neq u$ by $a >_p^* c$ then we have that $c \not\approx_{1, P'}^* b$. As $c \in \text{bn}(P')$ then $c \not\approx_{2, P'}^* b$.

III) $b \in \text{bn}(P')$ then we proceed analogously to II).

IV) $b \in \text{bn}(Q)$ then then this contradicts $\text{comp}(P', a, b)$.

3) $(c >_p^* a \wedge b >_p^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$ then we consider the following cases:

I) When $b \in \{u, z, v\}$ then this contradicts $\text{comp}(P', a, b)$

II) When $b \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta)$ then this contradicts $b >_p^* d$.

III) When $b \in \text{bn}(P')$ then by the induction hypothesis we have that $(c >_{1, P'}^* a \wedge b >_{1, P'}^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P', c, d)$. As $b \in \text{bn}(P')$ then there does not exist a d such that $b >_{2, P'}^* d$ and similarly by definition $b \not\approx_{1, P'}^* d$.

IV) When $b \in \text{bn}(Q)$ then then this contradicts $\text{comp}(P', a, b)$.

4) $c >_p^* a >_p^* d \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$ then as $\text{comp}(P', a, b)$ and $(c >_p^* a \wedge b >_p^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$ the case follows.

(d) When $(a, b) \in \text{compN}(Q)$ then case proceeds similarly to 8c.

9. **When** $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P' \mid Q)$.

(a) Case $u \neq z$.

By Proposition D.3.2, we have the following derivation:

$$[\mathbb{S}_{>} : \text{LinOut}_3] \frac{\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_{>}^y P' \quad \Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2, z : S \vdash_{>}^u Q \quad \text{>} \Rightarrow >_1 \cup >_2 \cup \geq_1^u \cup \{(u, x)\} \quad u \neq z}{\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2, z : \text{lin!}T.S \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P' \mid Q)}$$

By the induction hypothesis, it follows that $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ and $\text{noCycle}(>_2, Q)$.

We want to show that $\text{noCycle}(>, P) = \bigwedge_{(a,b) \in \text{compN}(P)} \text{acyclic}(>, P, a, b)$ where, by Definition D.7, we have that $\text{compN}(P) = \{(x, y), (y, x)\} \cup \text{compN}(P') \cup \text{compN}(Q)$.

1) When $(a, b) \in \{(c, d) \mid \text{comp}(P', c, d)\} \cup \{(c, d) \mid \text{comp}(Q, c, d)\}$

I) When $\text{comp}(P', a, b) \wedge \neg \text{comp}(Q, a, b)$ then we show $\text{acyclic}(>, P, a, b)$:

A) $a \not\approx_p^* b$.

Then as $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ we have $a \not\approx_{1, P'}^* b$. We prove by contradiction assuming that $a >_p^* b$. Let us consider the following cases w.l.o.g.:

- i) When $a = u$ then $\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2, z : \text{lin!}T.S \vdash_{>}^u (\forall xy)\bar{z}(x).(P' \mid Q)$ and by Proposition D.3.5(7) we have the contradiction $\text{comp}(P, u, b)$.
 - ii) When $a = y$ then $\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_{>}^y P'$ and by Proposition D.3.5(7) we have the contradiction $\text{comp}(P', a, b)$.
 - iii) When $a = z$ then as $\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_{>}^y P'$ this contradicts $\text{comp}(P, z, b)$ by Proposition D.3.5(6).
 - iv) When $a \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \setminus u) \cup \text{dom}(\Delta_1) \cup \text{dom}(\Delta_2)$ then case holds as no channel is smaller than a by Proposition D.3.5(15), hence b cannot exist such that $a > b$.
 - v) When $a \in \text{bn}(P')$ then firstly $a \not\prec_1 b$ secondly as $a \not\prec_2 b$ as a does not occur in Q , thirdly $a \not\prec_1^u b$ by definition and finally $\{(u, x)\}$ does not introduce $a > b$. Let us assume the contradiction $a >_{P'}^* b$ then as $\text{comp}(P, a, b)$ we also have $b >_{P'}^* b$ contradicting Proposition D.3.5(16).
 - vi) When $a \in \text{bn}(Q)$ then this contradicts $\text{comp}(P', a, b)$ by Proposition D.3.5(6).
- B) $(a >_{P'}^* e \implies e \not\prec_{P'}^* b) \wedge (e >_{P'}^* a \implies b \not\prec_{P'}^* e)$
 We show that $(a > e \implies e \not\prec b)$ and the other case follows similarly. As established in A) let $a \in \text{bn}(P')$ and we consider the following cases:
- i) When $b = u$ then $\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_{>}^y P'$ contradicts $\text{comp}(P', a, u)$.
 - ii) When $b = y$ then this contradicts $a > y$ as y is the greatest element in $>_1$.
 - iii) When $b = z$ then this contradicts $\text{comp}(P', a, z)$.
 - iv) When $b \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \setminus u)$ then as $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ we have $(a >_{1, P'}^* e \implies e \not\prec_{1, P'}^* b)$. We show that both $e \not\prec_{2, P'}^* b$ and $e \not\prec_{1, P'}^* b$. As $e \neq u$ by $a >_{P'}^* e$ then we have that $e \not\prec_{1, P'}^* b$. As $e \in \text{bn}(P')$ then $e \not\prec_{2, P'}^* b$.
 - v) When $b \in \text{dom}(\Delta_1)$ then as $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ we have $(a >_{1, P'}^* e \implies e \not\prec_{1, P'}^* b)$. As $b \in \text{dom}(\Delta_1)$ then $b \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma' \otimes \Delta)$ hence there doesn't exist e such that $e >_{2, Q}^* b$. Thus, $e \not\prec_1^u b$ holds by definition as e must be u resulting in the contradiction $a >_{P'}^* u$ and finally $(c, b) \notin \{(u, x)\}$ holds trivially.
 - vi) When $b \in \text{dom}(\Delta_2)$ then this contradicts $\text{comp}(P', a, b)$.
 - vii) When $b \in \text{bn}(P')$ then analogous to v).
- C) $(e >_{P'}^* a \wedge b >_{P'}^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, e, d)$
 We consider the following cases:
- i) When $b = u$ then $\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2, z : \text{lin!}T.S \vdash_{>}^u (\forall xy)\bar{z}(x).(P' \mid Q)$ contradicts $\text{comp}(P, a, u)$.
 - ii) When $b = y$ then $\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_{>}^y P'$ contradicts $\text{comp}(P', a, y)$.
 - iii) When $b = z$ then this contradicts $\text{comp}(P', a, z)$.
 - iv) When $b \in \text{dom}(\Gamma' \setminus u) \cup \text{dom}(\Delta_1)$ then there is no d such that $b >_{P'}^* d$
 - v) When $b \in \text{dom}(\Delta_2)$ then this contradicts $\text{comp}(P', a, b)$.
 - vi) When $b \in \text{bn}(P')$ then as $\text{noCycle}(>_1, P')$ we have $(e >_{1, P'}^* a \wedge b >_{1, P'}^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, e, d)$. As $b \in \text{bn}(P')$ then there doesn't exist d such that $b >_{2, P'}^* d$ or $b \not\prec_1^u d$ holds by definition and $\{(u, x)\}$ holds trivially.
- D) $c >_{P'}^* a >_{P'}^* d \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$ then as $\text{comp}(P', a, b)$ and $(c >_{P'}^* a \wedge b >_{P'}^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$ the case follows.

- II) When $\text{comp}(Q, a, b) \wedge \neg \text{comp}(P', a, b)$ then the case follows analogously to I).
- III) When $\text{comp}(P', a, b) \wedge \text{comp}(Q, a, b)$ then $P \notin \mathcal{L}$. This is if typing ensures that $a, b \in \Gamma'$, however then this implies that a and b are not compatible as at most 1 channel may be free.
- 2) When $(a, b) \in \{(x, y), (x, y)\}$.
We consider $(a, b) = (x, y)$ as the case of (y, x) follows analogously.
- I) $x \not>_p^* y$.
Then from $\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^y P'$ and $\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2, z : S \vdash_{>_2}^u Q$ and by Proposition D.3.5(6) we have that $\nexists c$ such that $x >_1 c \vee x >_2 c$. By the definition of $>_1^u$ then $x \not>_1 c$ implies $x \not>_1^u c$ and $x \neq u$ hence $\{(u, x)\}$ does not need to be considered. Let us assume the contradiction $x >_p^* y$, then we must have that $\text{comp}(P, x, d) \wedge d >_p^* y$. The only channel compatible with x is y giving $d = y$ and the contradiction $y >_p^* y$.
- II) $(x > c \implies c \not> y) \wedge (c > x \implies y \not> c)$
As $\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^y P'$ and $\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2, z : S \vdash_{>_2}^u Q$ then $\nexists c$ such that $c >_1 x \vee x >_1 c \vee c >_2 x \vee x >_2 c$. We show w.l.o.g. that $(c > x \implies y \not> c)$. The only relation on x is that $u > x$ however u is the greatest element hence we must have that $y \not> c$.
- III) $(c >_p^* x \wedge y >_p^* d) \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$
Analogous to II).
- IV) $c >_p^* x >_p^* d \implies \neg \text{comp}(P, c, d)$
As $\Gamma' \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^y P'$ and $\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2, z : S \vdash_{>_2}^u Q$ then as established the we only have the relation $u > x$ and as there does not exist any name e such that $\text{comp}(P, u, e)$ the case holds.

(b) When $u = z$.

Then, by Proposition D.3.2, we have the following derivation:

$$[\mathbb{S}_{>} : \text{LinOut}_4] \frac{\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_{>_1}^y P' \quad \Gamma' \otimes \Delta_2, z : S \vdash_{>_2}^z Q \quad > = >_1 \cup >_2 \cup >_1^z \cup \{(z, x)\}}{\Gamma' \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2, z : \text{lin!}T.S \vdash_{>}^z (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P' \mid Q)}$$

This case follows analogously to case 9a above.

□

We now define how to obtain a level function based on a (flattened) partial order:

Definition D.11

Let $>$ be a strict partial order. The level function constructed from $>$, denoted $\ell_{>}$, is defined as:

$$\ell_{>}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \nexists y \text{ such that } x > y \\ \max\{\ell_{>}(y) \mid x > y\} + 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

□

Lemma D.3.6 *If $>_1 \subset >$ then $\ell_{>_1}$ is a subfunction of $\ell_{>}$.*

Main Result

Finally, we can prove Theorem 5.9, our main result:

Theorem D.6 *Suppose $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s P \rrbracket_u$ with $\Gamma \vdash^u P$ and let $>_f = \text{flat}(>, P)$. Then $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s P \rrbracket_{\ell_{>_f}}$.*

Proof: The proof proceeds by induction on P . Note the following:

- (H1) the existence of $>$ is guaranteed by Proposition D.3.2.
- (H2) $>$ is a strict partial order with maximum element u , as ensured by Proposition D.3.3.
- (H3) $\text{noCycle}(>, P)$ holds, by Lemma D.3.5.
- (H4) $>_f$ is a strict partial order with maximal element u and $\text{noCycle}(>_f, P)$ by Lemma D.3.3.

We consider only two key cases (input and composition) and the base case of $P = \mathbf{0}$. All other cases follow by the induction hypothesis.

1. When $P = \mathbf{0}$.

Then we have the following derivations:

- By definition of $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s \mathbf{0} \rrbracket_u$ we have

$$\overline{\langle \Gamma' \rangle^\dagger; \cdot \vdash_\ell \mathbf{0} :: u : \mathbf{1}}$$

- From the proof of Proposition D.3.2, we know

$$[S_{>} : \text{Nil}] \xrightarrow{\triangle} \frac{\{(u, x) \mid x \in \Gamma \setminus u\}}{\Gamma \vdash^u \mathbf{0}}$$

By definition, $>_f = \text{flat}(>, \mathbf{0}) = >$. Hence we may construct $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s \mathbf{0} \rrbracket_{\ell_{>_f}}$ to be:

$$[W:\text{Nil}] \frac{\text{un}(\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\ell_{>}})}{\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\ell_{>}} \vdash_w \mathbf{0}}$$

which holds regardless of the level function.

2. When $P = \text{un } x(y).P'$.

Then $\llbracket \Gamma, x : *?T \vdash_s P \rrbracket_u$ with $u = x$, hence $\Gamma, x : *?T \vdash^x P$ and x is the maximum element within $>$. As

$$[S_{>} : \text{UnIn}_2] \frac{\Gamma, y : T \vdash^y_{>_1} P \quad > \triangleq >_1 \cup (>_1^x) \quad \neg \text{cli}(T) \wedge \text{svr}(T)}{\Gamma, x : *?T \vdash^x_{>} \text{un } x(y).P}$$

By applying the induction hypothesis on $\llbracket \Gamma, y : T \vdash_s P' \rrbracket_u$ and $\Gamma, y : T \vdash^y_{>_1} P'$ it follows that $\llbracket \Gamma, y : T \vdash_s P' \rrbracket_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>_1, P')}}$.

Also, since $>_1 \subset >$ it follows that $\text{flat}(>_1, P') \subset \text{flat}(>, P') = \text{flat}(>, P)$ and $\ell_{\text{flat}(>_1, P')}$ is a subfunction of $\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}$; thus, $\llbracket \Gamma, y : T \vdash_s P' \rrbracket_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}}$. Then we have the following derivation:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \langle \Gamma' \rangle_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}} \vdash_w x : * \#^{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}(x)} (\langle T \rangle_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}}^y) \\ \langle \Gamma' \rangle_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}} \vdash_w y : \langle T \rangle_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}}^y, z : \text{unit} \vdash_w \langle P' \rangle \quad \forall b \in \text{os}(\langle P' \rangle), \ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}(b) < \ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}(x) \end{array}}{\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}} \vdash_w x : * \#^{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}(x)} (\langle T \rangle_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}}^y) \vdash_w !x(y, z). \langle P' \rangle}$$

as the side condition $\forall b \in \text{os}(\langle P' \rangle), \ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}(b) < \ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}(x)$ holds due to x being maximum.

3. When $P = (\mathbf{v}zv)(P' \mid Q)$.

Then $\llbracket \Gamma \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash_s P \rrbracket_u$, hence $\Gamma \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash_u^u (\mathbf{v}zv)(P' \mid Q)$ and u is the maximum element within \triangleright . As we have both the following:

$$\frac{\frac{\llbracket \Gamma', \Delta_1, z : V \vdash_s P' \rrbracket_z \quad \llbracket \Gamma, \Delta_2, z : \bar{V} \vdash_s Q[z/v] \rrbracket_u}{(\Gamma')^\dagger; (\Delta_1), (\Delta_2) \vdash_\ell (\mathbf{v}z)(\langle P' \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle[z/v]) :: u : A}}{[\mathbf{S} : \text{Par}_2] \frac{z : V, (\Gamma \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1) \vdash_{>_1}^z P' \quad v : \bar{V}, (\Gamma \otimes \Delta_2) \vdash_{>_2}^u Q \quad \triangleright \triangleq >_1 \cup >_2 \cup >_1^u}{\Gamma \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}zv)(P' \mid Q)}}$$

where $\Gamma' = \Gamma \setminus u$ and $\Delta_2' = \Delta_2 \setminus u$.

By applying the induction hypothesis on $\llbracket \Gamma', \Delta_1, z : V \vdash_s P' \rrbracket_z$ and $z : V, (\Gamma \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1) \vdash_{>_1}^z P'$ it follows that $\llbracket \Gamma', \Delta_1, z : V \vdash_s P' \rrbracket_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>_1, P')}}$.

Since $>_1 \subset > \subset \text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(z, P'), \text{cc}(v, Q))$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{flat}(>_1, P') &\subset \text{flat}(>, P') \\ &\subset \text{flat}(\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(z, P'), \text{cc}(v, Q)), P') \\ &\subset \text{join}(\text{flat}(\text{flat}(\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(z, P'), \text{cc}(v, Q)), P'), Q), z, v) \\ &= \text{flat}(>, P) \end{aligned}$$

and $\ell_{\text{flat}(>_1, P')}$ is a subfunction of $\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}$ so $\llbracket \Gamma', \Delta_1, z : V \vdash_s P' \rrbracket_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}}$.

Secondly, by the induction hypothesis $\llbracket \Gamma, \Delta_2, v : \bar{V} \vdash_s Q \rrbracket_u$ and $v : \bar{V}, (\Gamma \otimes \Delta_2) \vdash_{>_2}^u Q$ implies that $\llbracket \Gamma, \Delta_2, v : \bar{V} \vdash_s Q \rrbracket_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>_2, Q)}}$.

As $>_2 \subset > \subset \text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(z, P'), \text{cc}(v, Q)) \subset \text{flat}(\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(z, P'), \text{cc}(v, Q)), P')$ then:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{flat}(>_2, Q) &\subset \text{flat}(>, Q) \\ &\subset \text{flat}(\text{flat}(\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(z, P'), \text{cc}(v, Q)), P'), Q) \\ &\subset \text{join}(\text{flat}(\text{flat}(\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(z, P'), \text{cc}(v, Q)), P'), Q), z, v) \\ &= \text{flat}(>, P) \end{aligned}$$

and $\ell_{\text{flat}(>_2, Q)}$ is a subfunction of $\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}$ so $\llbracket \Gamma, \Delta_2, v : \bar{V} \vdash_s Q \rrbracket_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}}$.

Hence we construct the following derivation:

$$[\mathbf{W}:\text{Res}] \frac{[\mathbf{W}:\text{Par}] \frac{\llbracket \Gamma', \Delta_1, z : V \vdash_s P' \rrbracket_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}} \quad \llbracket \Gamma, \Delta_2, v : \bar{V} \vdash_s Q \rrbracket_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}} [z/v]}{(\Gamma)_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}} \otimes (\Delta_1)_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}}, (\Delta_2)_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}}, z :: (V)_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}}^z \vdash_w \langle P' \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle [z/v]}}{(\Gamma)_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}} \otimes (\Delta_1)_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}}, (\Delta_2)_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}} \vdash_w (\mathbf{v}z)(\langle P' \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle [z/v])}}$$

provided that $(V)_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}}^z = (V)_{\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}}^v$.

We show this by induction on the structure V , however, this is evident by the construction on the connected channels and the application of the join function.

- First, notice that within $\text{flat}(>, P)$ the last application performed is $\text{join}(-, z, v)$ which ensures that the channels z and v share all the same channels that are less than them; hence $\ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}(z) = \ell_{\text{flat}(>, P)}(v)$.
- Second, notice that $\text{flatcc}(>, \text{cc}(z, P'), \text{cc}(v, Q))$ is applied first. As the structure of the connected channels is that of the structure of the name constraints on the type of V and that these channels are joined, then the level of these channels also match as required.

□

D.3.2 Proof for Theorem 5.10

Below we present a proof for Theorem 5.10:

Theorem D.7 $\exists P \in \mathcal{W}$ with $\Gamma \vdash_s P$ and $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s P \rrbracket_l$ for some l such that $\nexists z$ s.t. $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s P \rrbracket_z$.

Proof: We provide a counter-example. Consider the process

$$P = (\mathbf{v}xy)(\text{lin } x(z).\text{un } z(w).\mathbf{0} \mid (\mathbf{v}st)\bar{y}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \mid \mathbf{0}))$$

Clearly, P has the following reduction behaviour:

$$\begin{aligned} P &\rightarrow (\mathbf{v}st)(\text{un } s(w).\mathbf{0} \mid (\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.\mathbf{0})) \\ &\rightarrow (\mathbf{v}st)\text{un } s(w).\mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, P terminates. First we type the process in \mathcal{S} then we show that there exists a level function that types the process in $\pi_{\mathcal{W}}$ finally we show that there exists no channel such that the process can be typed in π_{DILL}

1. $P \in \mathcal{S}$

$$(\mathbf{v}xy)(\text{lin } x(z).\text{un } z(w).\mathbf{0} \mid (\mathbf{v}st)\bar{y}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \mid \mathbf{0}))$$

$$\Pi_1 = \frac{\frac{x : \mathbf{end}, z : *?end \vdash_s z : *?end \quad x : \mathbf{end}, z : *?end, w : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s \mathbf{0}}{x : \mathbf{end}, z : *?end \vdash_s \text{un } z(w).\mathbf{0}} \quad \frac{x : \text{lin}?(*?end).\mathbf{end} \vdash_s x : \text{lin}?(*?end).\mathbf{end}}{x : \text{lin}?(*?end).\mathbf{end} \vdash_s \text{lin } x(z).\text{un } z(w).\mathbf{0}}}{x : \text{lin}?(*?end).\mathbf{end} \vdash_s \text{lin } x(z).\text{un } z(w).\mathbf{0}}$$

$$\Pi_2 = \frac{\frac{\Gamma \vdash_s t : *!end \quad \Gamma \vdash_s u : \mathbf{end} \quad \frac{s : *?end, t : *!end, y : \mathbf{end}, u : \mathbf{end}, v : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s \mathbf{0}}{\Gamma \vdash_s \bar{t}\langle u \rangle.\mathbf{0}}}{s : *?end, t : *!end, y : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.\mathbf{0})} \quad \frac{s : *?end, t : *!end, y : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s \mathbf{0}}{s : *?end, t : *!end, y : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \mid \mathbf{0}}}{s : *?end, t : *!end, y : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \mid \mathbf{0}}$$

where $\Gamma = s : *?end, t : *!end, y : \mathbf{end}, u : \mathbf{end}, v : \mathbf{end}$.

$$\Pi_3 = \frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{y : \text{lin}?(*?end).\mathbf{end}, \Gamma_1 \vdash_s x : \text{lin}?T.S}{\Gamma_1 \vdash_s s : *?end} \quad \frac{\frac{\Pi_2}{s : *?end, t : *!end, y : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \mid \mathbf{0}}{y : \text{lin}?(*?end).\mathbf{end}, s : *?end, t : *!end \vdash_s \bar{y}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \mid \mathbf{0})}}{y : \text{lin}?(*?end).\mathbf{end} \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}st)\bar{y}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \mid \mathbf{0})}}{x : \text{lin}?(*?end).\mathbf{end} \vdash_s \text{lin } x(z).\text{un } z(w).\mathbf{0}} \quad \frac{\Pi_1}{x : \text{lin}?(*?end).\mathbf{end} \vdash_s \text{lin } x(z).\text{un } z(w).\mathbf{0}}}{y : \text{lin}?(*?end).\mathbf{end} \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}st)\bar{y}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \mid \mathbf{0})} \quad \frac{\Pi_3}{x : \text{lin}?(*?end).\mathbf{end}, y : \text{lin}?(*?end).\mathbf{end} \vdash_s \text{lin } x(z).\text{un } z(w).\mathbf{0} \mid (\mathbf{v}st)\bar{y}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \mid \mathbf{0})} \cdot \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)(\text{lin } x(z).\text{un } z(w).\mathbf{0} \mid (\mathbf{v}st)\bar{y}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \mid \mathbf{0}))$$

where $\Gamma_1 = s : *?end, t : *!end$.

2. $P \in \mathcal{W}$.

We show the existence of a function $l(\cdot)$ such that $\llbracket \cdot \vdash_s P \rrbracket_l$:

$$\left[\frac{\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{x : \text{lin}?(*?end).end \vdash_s \text{lin } x(z).un z(w).0}}{\Pi_3}}{y : \text{lin}!(*?end).end \vdash_s (\mathbf{vst})\bar{y}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{vuv})\langle \bar{t}\langle u \rangle, \mathbf{0} \rangle \mid \mathbf{0})}}{x : \text{lin}?(*?end).end, y : \text{lin}!(*?end).end \vdash_s \text{lin } x(z).un z(w).0 \mid (\mathbf{vst})\bar{y}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{vuv})\langle \bar{t}\langle u \rangle, \mathbf{0} \rangle \mid \mathbf{0})} \cdot \vdash_s (\mathbf{vx})(\text{lin } x(z).un z(w).0 \mid (\mathbf{vst})\bar{y}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{vuv})\langle \bar{t}\langle u \rangle, \mathbf{0} \rangle \mid \mathbf{0})) \right]_l$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\frac{\llbracket \Pi_1 \rrbracket_l}{x : (\text{lin}?(*?end).end)_l^x \vdash_w x(z, a).!z(w, b).0}}{\llbracket \Pi_3 \rrbracket_l}}{x : (\text{lin}?(*?end).end)_l^x \vdash_w (\mathbf{vs})\bar{x}\langle s, c \rangle.((\mathbf{vu})\langle \bar{s}\langle u, d \rangle, \mathbf{0} \rangle \mid \mathbf{0})} \\ = & \frac{x :: (\text{lin}?(*?end).end)_l^x \vdash_w x(z, a).!z(w, b).0 \mid (\mathbf{vs})\bar{x}\langle s, c \rangle.((\mathbf{vu})\langle \bar{s}\langle u, d \rangle, \mathbf{0} \rangle \mid \mathbf{0})}{\vdash_w (\mathbf{vx})(x(z, a).!z(w, b).0 \mid (\mathbf{vs})\bar{x}\langle s, c \rangle.((\mathbf{vu})\langle \bar{s}\langle u, d \rangle, \mathbf{0} \rangle \mid \mathbf{0}))} \end{aligned}$$

$\llbracket \Pi_1 \rrbracket_l$ is:

$$\left[\frac{\frac{x : end, z : *?end \vdash_s z : *?end \quad x : end, z : *?end, w : end \vdash_s \mathbf{0}}{x : end, z : *?end \vdash_s un z(w).0}}{x : \text{lin}?(*?end).end \vdash_s x : \text{lin}?(*?end).end}}{x : \text{lin}?(*?end).end \vdash_s \text{lin } x(z).un z(w).0} \right]_l =$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\llbracket \Pi_1 \rrbracket_l}{x : (\text{lin}?(*?end).end)_l^x \vdash_w x(z, a).!z(w, b).0} \\ & \frac{z : ((*?end))_l^z, a : (end)_l^a \vdash_w !z(w, b).0 \quad l(x) = l(a)}{x : \#^{l(x)}(((*?end))_l^z, (end)_l^a) \vdash_w x(z, a).!z(w, b).0} \\ & (\mathbf{vx})(x(z, a).!z(w, b).0 \mid (\mathbf{vs})\bar{x}\langle s, c \rangle.((\mathbf{vu})\langle \bar{s}\langle u, d \rangle, \mathbf{0} \rangle \mid \mathbf{0})) \end{aligned}$$

3. $P \notin \mathcal{L}$.

We show that there is no channel a such that $\llbracket \cdot \vdash_s (\mathbf{vx})(\text{lin } x(z).un z(w).0 \mid (\mathbf{vst})\bar{y}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{vuv})\langle \bar{t}\langle u \rangle, \mathbf{0} \rangle \mid \mathbf{0})) \rrbracket_a$. First notice as this is a

closed process we must have that a is a fresh name immediately.

$$\left[\frac{\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{x : \text{lin}?(*?end).end \vdash_s \text{lin } x(z).un z(w).0}}{\Pi_3}{y : \text{lin}!(*?end).end \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}st)\bar{y}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.0) \mid 0)}}{x : \text{lin}?(*?end).end, y : \text{lin}!(*?end).end \vdash_s \text{lin } x(z).un z(w).0 \mid (\mathbf{v}st)\bar{y}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.0) \mid 0)}}{\cdot \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}xy)(\text{lin } x(z).un z(w).0 \mid (\mathbf{v}st)\bar{y}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.0) \mid 0))} \right]_a$$

$$= \frac{\frac{\frac{\llbracket x : \text{lin}?(*?end).end \vdash_s \text{lin } x(z).un z(w).0 \rrbracket_x}{\llbracket x : \text{lin}?(*?end).end \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}st)\bar{x}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.0) \mid 0) \rrbracket_a}}{\cdot \vdash_\ell (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle \text{lin } x(z).un z(w).0 \rangle \mid \langle (\mathbf{v}st)\bar{x}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.0) \mid 0) \rangle) :: a : \mathbf{1}}}{\cdot \vdash_\ell (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle \text{lin } x(z).un z(w).0 \rangle \mid \langle (\mathbf{v}st)\bar{x}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.0) \mid 0) \rangle) :: a : \mathbf{1}}$$

for Π_3 and part of Π_2 :

$$\left[\frac{\frac{\frac{y : \text{lin}!(*?end).end, s : *?end, t : *!end \vdash_s x : \text{lin}!T.S}{s : *?end, t : *!end \vdash_s s : *?end}}{\Pi_2}{s : *?end, t : *!end, y : end \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.0) \mid 0}}{y : \text{lin}!(*?end).end, s : *?end, t : *!end \vdash_s \bar{y}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.0) \mid 0)}}{y : \text{lin}!(*?end).end \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}st)\bar{y}\langle s \rangle.((\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{t}\langle u \rangle.0) \mid 0)} \right]_a =$$

$$\frac{\text{No rule hence not typeable}}{\frac{\llbracket s : *!end \vdash_s (\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{s}\langle u \rangle.0) \rrbracket_s}{\cdot \vdash_\ell (\mathbf{v}y)\bar{s}\langle s \rangle.(\langle (\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{s}\langle u \rangle.0) \rangle \mid 0) :: a : \mathbf{1}}}}{\cdot \vdash_\ell (\mathbf{v}y)\bar{s}\langle s \rangle.(\langle (\mathbf{v}uv)(\bar{s}\langle u \rangle.0) \rangle \mid 0) :: a : \mathbf{1}}$$

for Π_1 :

$$\left[\frac{\frac{\frac{x : \mathbf{end}, z : *? \mathbf{end} \vdash_s z : *? \mathbf{end}}{\quad} \quad \frac{x : \mathbf{end}, z : *? \mathbf{end}, w : \mathbf{end} \vdash_s \mathbf{0}}{\quad}}{\frac{x : \mathbf{end}, z : *? \mathbf{end} \vdash_s \mathbf{un} z(w). \mathbf{0}}{\quad}} \quad \frac{x : \mathbf{lin}?(*? \mathbf{end}). \mathbf{end} \vdash_s x : \mathbf{lin}?(*? \mathbf{end}). \mathbf{end}}{\quad}}{\frac{x : \mathbf{lin}?(*? \mathbf{end}). \mathbf{end} \vdash_s \mathbf{lin} x(z). \mathbf{un} z(w). \mathbf{0}}{\quad}} \right] x =$$

$$\frac{\text{No rule here hence not typeable!}}{\frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma, \Delta, x : \mathbf{end}, z : *? \mathbf{end} \vdash_s \mathbf{un} z(w). \mathbf{0}}{\quad}}{\quad}}{\quad}} \quad \frac{\quad}{\vdash_\ell x(z). \langle \mathbf{un} z(w). \mathbf{0} \rangle :: x : \langle (*? \mathbf{end}) \rangle \multimap \langle \mathbf{end} \rangle}}$$

□

Remark D.3.1 *There are many interesting counter examples of $\mathcal{W} \not\subseteq \mathcal{L}$:*

$$\begin{array}{ll} 1 \mathbf{un} x(y). \mathbf{un} x(z). P & 2 \mathbf{un} x(y). \mathbf{un} z(w). P \\ 3 (\mathbf{un} x(y). P \mid \mathbf{un} x(z). Q) & 4 (\mathbf{un} x(y). P \mid \mathbf{un} z(w). Q) \\ 5 \mathbf{lin} x(y). \mathbf{un} y(z). P & 6 (\mathbf{v}yz)(\bar{x}(y). ((\mathbf{v}wv)\bar{z}(w). P \mid Q_x)) \\ 7 (\mathbf{v}yz)\bar{x}(y). \mathbf{un} z(w). P & 8 \mathbf{un} x(y). (\mathbf{v}wv)\bar{y}(w). P \end{array}$$

The proof of Theorem 5.10 can be seen as 5 and 6 cut together; they illustrate more interesting examples of the differences between the two type systems.

D.4 Operational Correspondence

This section contains the proofs of operational correspondence for the encoding $\langle \cdot \rangle$ for typed process in \mathcal{L} . The main theorems are operational completeness (cf. Theorem D.8) and weak operational soundness (cf. Theorem D.9).

Definition D.12 Substitution Lifting

For processes $P, Q \in \pi_{\text{DILL}}$, we say that P lifts the substitutions of Q on names y, v , written $Q \triangleleft P[v/y]$, if $Q \equiv (\mathbf{v}y)(![v \leftrightarrow y] \mid P)$. □

Theorem D.8 (Operational Completeness) *Let $P \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s P \rrbracket_u$, for some name u . Then there exists $R \in \pi_{\text{DILL}}$ such that $P \longrightarrow Q \implies \langle P \rangle \longrightarrow^* R$ and $R \triangleleft \langle Q \rangle$.*

Proof: The proof is standard, by analyzing the rule applied in P . We will present the interesting cases below:

1. **The rule is (R-LINCOM).**

Then $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)(\bar{x}(v). P' \mid \mathbf{lin} y(z). Q' \mid R')$ and $Q = (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q'[v/z] \mid R')$, and the reduction is as follows:

$$\text{(R-LINCOM)} \quad (\mathbf{v}xy)(\bar{x}(v). P' \mid \mathbf{lin} y(z). Q' \mid R') \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q'[v/z] \mid R')$$

By hypothesis, $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s P \rrbracket_u$, and by Table 5.1 we have

$$\langle \Gamma \rangle^\dagger; \langle \Delta_1 \rangle, \langle \Delta' \rangle \vdash_\ell (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle \bar{x}(y). P' \rangle \mid \langle \mathbf{lin} x(y). Q'[x/y] \mid R'[x/y] \rangle) :: u : A,$$

where $x : V \wedge (u \notin \text{fn}(P')) \wedge ((\neg \text{un}(V)) \vee (\text{un}(V) \wedge y \notin \text{fn}(P') \wedge x \notin \text{fn}(Q')))$. In addition, since $\langle\langle \text{lin } x(y).Q' [x/y] \rangle\rangle$ we must have that $x : \text{lin}?T.S$, which implies $\neg \text{un}(V)$. Let us consider the following two possibilities:

(a) When $x : \text{lin}!(T).S \wedge \neg \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T)$.

Then $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}(a).([v \leftrightarrow a] \mid \langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle) \mid (\mathbf{v}w)(x(z).\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle[x/y] \mid \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle[x/y]))$ with w fresh and reductions:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle P \rangle\rangle &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}a)([v \leftrightarrow a] \mid (\mathbf{v}w)(\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle[x/y][a/z] \mid \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle[x/y])) \mid \langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle) \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}w)(\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle[x/y][a/z][v/a] \mid \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle[x/y])) = R \end{aligned}$$

With

$$\langle\langle (\mathbf{v}xy)(P'' \mid Q'[v/z] \mid R') \rangle\rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}w)(\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle[x/y][v/z] \mid \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle[x/y]))$$

as required.

(b) When $x : \text{lin}!(T).S \wedge \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T)$.

Then $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}(a).(![v \leftrightarrow a] \mid \langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle) \mid (\mathbf{v}w)(x(z).\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle[x/y] \mid \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle[x/y]))$ with w fresh and reductions:

$$\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}a)(![v \leftrightarrow a] \mid (\mathbf{v}w)(\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle[x/y][a/z] \mid \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle[x/y])) \mid \langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle) = R$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle (\mathbf{v}xy)(P'' \mid Q'[v/z] \mid R') \rangle\rangle &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}w)(\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle[x/y][v/z] \mid \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle[x/y])) \\ &\triangleleft (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}z)(![v \leftrightarrow z] \mid (\mathbf{v}w)(\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle[x/y] \mid \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle[x/y]))) \\ &\equiv (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}a)(![v \leftrightarrow a] \mid (\mathbf{v}w)(\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle[x/y][a/z] \mid \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle[x/y]))) \\ &\equiv U_1 \end{aligned}$$

as required.

2. The rule is (R-UNCOM).

Then $P = (\mathbf{v}xy)(\bar{x}(b).P' \mid \text{un } y(d).Q' \mid R')$ and $Q = (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q'[b/d] \mid \text{un } y(d).Q' \mid R')$, and the reduction is as follows:

$$(R\text{-UNCOM}) (\mathbf{v}xy)(\bar{x}(b).P' \mid \text{un } y(d).Q' \mid R') \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q'[b/d] \mid \text{un } y(d).Q' \mid R')$$

The proof proceeds similarly to case Item 1, where typing ensures that $x : V \wedge (u \notin \text{fn}(P')) \wedge (\text{un}(V) \wedge y \notin \text{fn}(P') \wedge x \notin \text{fn}(Q'))$. There are four cases to consider:

- (a) $x : *!T \wedge \neg \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T)$
- (b) $x : *!T \wedge \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T)$
- (c) $x : *!T \wedge \neg \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$
- (d) $x : *!T \wedge \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$

We shall only consider the case (a) with $x : *!T \wedge \neg \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T)$.

In this case, $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}(z).\bar{z}(w).([b \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle) \mid (\mathbf{v}e)(!x(z).z(d).\langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle[x/y] \mid \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle[x/y]))$ with e fresh and reductions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle\!\langle P \rangle\!\rangle &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}z)(\bar{z}(w).([b \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle\!\langle P \rangle\!\rangle) \mid z(d).\langle\!\langle Q' \rangle\!\rangle[x/y]) \mid \\
&\quad (\mathbf{v}e)(!x(z).z(d).\langle\!\langle Q' \rangle\!\rangle[x/y] \mid \langle\!\langle R' \rangle\!\rangle[x/y])) &= U_1 \\
&\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}z)(\langle\!\langle P \rangle\!\rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}w)([b \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle\!\langle Q' \rangle\!\rangle[x/y][w/d])) \mid \\
&\quad (\mathbf{v}e)(!x(z).z(d).\langle\!\langle Q' \rangle\!\rangle[x/y] \mid \langle\!\langle R' \rangle\!\rangle[x/y])) &= U_2 \\
&\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}z)(\langle\!\langle P \rangle\!\rangle \mid \langle\!\langle Q' \rangle\!\rangle[x/y][w/d][b/w]) \mid \\
&\quad (\mathbf{v}e)(!x(z).z(d).\langle\!\langle Q' \rangle\!\rangle[x/y] \mid \langle\!\langle R' \rangle\!\rangle[x/y])) &= U_3
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle\!\langle (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q'[b/d] \mid \text{un } y(d).Q' \mid R') \rangle\!\rangle &= (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}z)(\langle\!\langle P \rangle\!\rangle \mid \langle\!\langle Q' \rangle\!\rangle[x/y][b/d]) \mid \\
&\quad (\mathbf{v}e)(!x(z).z(d).\langle\!\langle Q' \rangle\!\rangle[x/y] \mid \langle\!\langle R' \rangle\!\rangle[x/y]))
\end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

The following technical result is auxiliary to the proof of Operational Soundness (c.f. Theorem D.9), and it guarantees the preservation of reductions within restricted parallel compositions in \mathcal{L} .

Proposition D.4.1 *If $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid (\mathbf{v}cd)(Q \mid R)) \in \mathcal{L}$ then the following hold:*

1. $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q) \in \mathcal{L}$ and $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid R) \in \mathcal{L}$.
2. If $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q) \rightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q')$ then $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid (\mathbf{v}cd)(Q \mid R)) \rightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid (\mathbf{v}cd)(Q' \mid R))$;
3. If $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid R) \rightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid R')$ then $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid (\mathbf{v}cd)(Q \mid R)) \rightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid (\mathbf{v}cd)(Q \mid R'))$.

Proof:

We show each case as follows:

1. We show the case of $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q) \in \mathcal{L}$ as $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid R) \in \mathcal{L}$ follows analogously.

As $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid (\mathbf{v}cd)(Q \mid R)) \in \mathcal{L}$, it follows that, for some contexts $\Gamma, \Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Delta_3$ and types V_1, V_2 and A :

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\llbracket \Gamma, \Delta_1, x : V_1 \vdash_s P \rrbracket_x}{\llbracket \Gamma', \Delta_2, y : \bar{V}_1, c : V_2 \vdash_s Q \rrbracket_c[x/y]} \quad \llbracket \Gamma, \Delta, d : \bar{V}_2 \vdash_s R[c/d] \rrbracket_u[x/y]}{(\Gamma)^\dagger; (\Delta_1), (\Delta') \vdash_\ell (\mathbf{v}c)(\langle\!\langle Q \rangle\!\rangle \mid \langle\!\langle R \rangle\!\rangle[c/d])[x/y] :: u : A}}{(\Gamma)^\dagger; (\Delta_1), (\Delta_2), (\Delta_3) \vdash_\ell (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle\!\langle P \rangle\!\rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}c)(\langle\!\langle Q \rangle\!\rangle \mid \langle\!\langle R \rangle\!\rangle[c/d])[x/y]) :: u : A}$$

Here for simplicity, we assume that the types of x, y, c and d are linear and that $y \in \text{fn}(Q)$, the permutations of x, y and c, d being linear and $y \notin \text{fn}(Q)$ cases follow similarly. Finally, we will assume for this case that A is linear.

$$\frac{\llbracket \Gamma, \Delta_1, x : V_1 \vdash_s P \rrbracket_x \quad \llbracket \Gamma', \Delta_2, y : \bar{V}_1, c : V_2 \vdash_s Q \rrbracket_c[x/y]}{(\Gamma)^\dagger; (\Delta_1), (\Delta_2), (\Delta_3), y : (V_1) \vdash_\ell (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle\!\langle P \rangle\!\rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}c)(\langle\!\langle Q \rangle\!\rangle \mid \langle\!\langle R \rangle\!\rangle[c/d])[x/y]) :: c : (\bar{V}_2)}$$

and hence $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid Q) \in \mathcal{L}$ provided $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P \mid (\mathbf{v}cd)(Q \mid R)) \in \mathcal{L}$.

2. Suppose $(\mathbf{v}_{xy})(P \mid Q) \rightarrow (\mathbf{v}_{xy})(P' \mid Q')$.

Then the only possible reductions that may be performed are those of the form (R-LINCOM) or (R-UNCOM). Let us assume that (R-LINCOM) is performed, P performs the output synchronisation and Q the input and that $x \in \text{fn}(P), x \notin \text{fn}(Q), y \in \text{fn}(Q)$ and $y \notin \text{fn}(P)$, implying that P is of the form $(\bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P'' \mid P''')$ and Q is of the form $(\text{lin } y(v).Q'' \mid Q''')$. By the congruence rules in Figure 5.2:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{v}_{xy})(P \mid (\mathbf{v}cd)(Q \mid R)) &\equiv (\mathbf{v}cd)(\mathbf{v}_{xy})(P \mid Q \mid R) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}cd)(\mathbf{v}_{xy})(\bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P'' \mid P''' \mid \text{lin } y(z).Q'' \mid Q''' \mid R) \\ &\equiv (\mathbf{v}cd)(\mathbf{v}_{xy})(\bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P'' \mid \text{lin } y(v).Q'' \mid P''' \mid Q''' \mid R) \end{aligned}$$

By rules (R-STR), (R-RES) and (R-LINCOM) of Figure 5.2 we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{v}cd)(\mathbf{v}_{xy})(\bar{x}\langle v \rangle.P'' \mid \text{lin } y(v).Q'' \mid P''' \mid Q''' \mid R) &\rightarrow (\mathbf{v}cd)(\mathbf{v}_{xy})(P'' \mid Q'' \mid P''' \mid Q''' \mid R) \\ &\equiv (\mathbf{v}_{xy})(P'' \mid P''' \mid (\mathbf{v}cd)(Q'' \mid Q''' \mid R)) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}_{xy})(P' \mid (\mathbf{v}cd)(Q' \mid R)) \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows.

3. This case is similar to the previous one. □

Theorem D.9 (Weak Operational Soundness) *Let $P \in \mathcal{L}$ with $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash_s P \rrbracket_u$, for some name u . If $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle \rightarrow^* U$ then there exists $R \in \mathcal{L}$ and $V \in \pi_{\text{DILL}}$ such that $P \rightarrow^* R \wedge U \rightarrow^* V \wedge V \triangleleft \langle\langle R \rangle\rangle$.*

Proof: By induction on the structure of P . Consider the following cases:

1. **When $P = \mathbf{0}$.**
Then $\langle\langle \mathbf{0} \rangle\rangle = \mathbf{0}$ and no reductions are available.
2. **When $P = \bar{x}\langle y \rangle.P'$.**
There are many options for $\langle\langle \bar{x}\langle y \rangle.P' \rangle\rangle$ depending on typing. In the case $\langle\langle \bar{x}\langle y \rangle.P' \rangle\rangle = \bar{x}(z).(\llbracket y \leftrightarrow z \rrbracket \mid \langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle)$ then no reduction can be performed, and the result follows trivially. Similarly for all other cases.
3. **When $P = (\mathbf{v}_{xy})\bar{z}\langle y \rangle.P'$.**
Then, either $\langle\langle (\mathbf{v}_{xy})\bar{z}\langle y \rangle.P' \rangle\rangle = \bar{z}(x).x.\text{inr}; \langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle$ or $\langle\langle (\mathbf{v}_{xy})\bar{z}\langle y \rangle.P' \rangle\rangle = \bar{z}(x).\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle$, neither with any reductions.
4. **When $P = (\mathbf{v}_{xy})\bar{z}\langle x \rangle.(P' \mid Q)$.**
Then $\langle\langle (\mathbf{v}_{xy})\bar{z}\langle x \rangle.(P' \mid Q) \rangle\rangle = \bar{z}(y).(\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q \rangle\rangle)$ and no reductions are available.
5. **When $P = \text{lin } x(y).P'$.**
Then $\langle\langle \text{lin } x(y).P' \rangle\rangle = x(y).\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle$ and no reductions are available.
6. **When $P = \text{un } x(y).P'$.**
There are many options for $\langle\langle \text{un } x(y).P' \rangle\rangle$ depending on typing. In the case $\langle\langle \bar{x}\langle y \rangle.P' \rangle\rangle = !x(z).\langle\langle P'[z/y] \rangle\rangle$, then no reduction can be performed. Similarly for all other cases.
7. **When $P = (\mathbf{v}_{xy})(P' \mid Q)$.**
Then $\langle\langle (\mathbf{v}_{xy})(P' \mid Q) \rangle\rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle\langle P' \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q \rangle\rangle[x/y])$ with $y \notin \text{fn}(P)$ and $x \notin \text{fn}(Q)$.
Now we proceed by induction on the structure of P' :

(a) When $P' = \mathbf{0}$.

Then $\langle P \rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{0} \mid \langle Q \rangle[x/y])$.

- By applying rule (Rv) one has $(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{0} \mid \langle Q \rangle[x/y]) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(U)$, if $\mathbf{0} \mid \langle Q \rangle[x/y] \longrightarrow Q$.
- By applying rule (R |) one has $\langle Q \rangle[x/y] \longrightarrow U' \implies \mathbf{0} \mid \langle Q \rangle[x/y] \longrightarrow \mathbf{0} \mid U'$.

By the induction hypothesis, as $\langle Q \rangle[x/y] \longrightarrow^* U'$ then there exists $R' \in \mathcal{L}$ and $V' \in \pi_{\text{DILL}}$ such that

- $Q \longrightarrow^* R'$;
- $U' \longrightarrow^* V'$;
- $V' \triangleleft \langle R' \rangle$.

Hence $(\mathbf{v}xy)(\mathbf{0} \mid Q) \longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{0} \mid R')$ and both $(\mathbf{v}xy)(\mathbf{0} \mid R') \in \mathcal{L}$ and $(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{0} \mid V') \in \pi_{\text{DILL}}$ hold. Therefore,

- $(\mathbf{v}xy)(\mathbf{0} \mid Q) \longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}xy)(\mathbf{0} \mid R')$;
- $(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{0} \mid U') \longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{0} \mid V')$;
- $(\mathbf{v}x)(\mathbf{0} \mid V') \triangleleft \langle (\mathbf{v}xy)(\mathbf{0} \mid R') \rangle$.

and the result follows.

(b) When $P' = \bar{a}\langle b \rangle.P''$.

Then let us consider the following cases:

i. When $a : \text{lin}!(T).S \wedge \neg \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T)$.

Then $\langle \bar{a}\langle b \rangle.P'' \rangle = \bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle P'' \rangle)$.

We now perform induction on the structure of Q :

(i.1) When $Q = \mathbf{0}$.

In this case $\langle P \rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle P'' \rangle) \mid \mathbf{0})$, and the process does not reduce. The result follows trivially.

(i.2) When $Q = \bar{c}\langle d \rangle.Q'$.

Then let us consider the following:

- When $x = a \wedge y = c$ then x and y do not have dual types and $P \notin \mathcal{L}+$.
- When $\neg(x = a \wedge y = c)$.

In the case $c : \text{lin}!(T').S' \wedge \text{un}(T') \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T')$, we have

$\langle \bar{c}\langle d \rangle.Q' \rangle = \bar{c}(z').([d \leftrightarrow z'] \mid \langle Q' \rangle)$ and

$\langle P \rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle P'' \rangle) \mid \bar{c}(z').([d \leftrightarrow z'] \mid \langle Q' \rangle[x/y]))$ and no reduction can be performed.

Other cases follow analogously not allowing reductions to be performed.

(i.3) When $Q = (\mathbf{v}ed)\bar{c}\langle d \rangle.Q'$.

Then let us consider the following:

- When $x = a \wedge y = c$ then $y : *!T'$, x and y do not have dual types and hence not in \mathcal{L} .
- When $\neg(x = a \wedge y = c)$ then we consider the following cases:

I) When $c : *!T' \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T') \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T')$.

Then $\langle (\mathbf{v}ed)\bar{c}\langle d \rangle.Q' \rangle = \bar{c}(e).e.\mathbf{inr}; \langle Q' \rangle$ and $\langle P \rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle P'' \rangle) \mid \bar{c}(e).e.\mathbf{inr}; \langle Q' \rangle[x/y])$ and no reductions are available.

II) When $c : *!T' \wedge \text{svr}(T') \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T')$.

Then $\langle (\mathbf{v}ed)\bar{c}\langle d \rangle.Q' \rangle = \bar{c}(e).\langle Q' \rangle$ and $\langle P \rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle P'' \rangle) \mid \bar{c}(e).\langle Q' \rangle[x/y])$ and no reductions are available.

(i.4) When $Q = (\mathbf{v}de)\bar{c}\langle d \rangle.(Q_1 \mid Q_2)$.

Then $\langle (\mathbf{v}de)\bar{c}\langle d \rangle.(Q_1 \mid Q_2) \rangle = \bar{c}(e).(\langle Q_1 \rangle \mid \langle Q_2 \rangle)$. Let us consider the following:

- When $x = a \wedge y = c$ then x and y do not have dual types and hence not in \mathcal{L} .
- When $\neg(x = a \wedge y = c)$ then $\langle P \rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle P'' \rangle) \mid \bar{c}(e).(\langle Q_1 \rangle \mid \langle Q_2 \rangle)[x/y])$ and no reductions are available.

(i.5) When $Q = \text{lin } c(d).Q'$.

Then $\langle \text{lin } c(d).Q' \rangle = c(d).\langle Q' \rangle$ let us consider the following:

- When $x = a \wedge y = c$.
Then x and y have dual types and hence in \mathcal{L} .
On the one hand, the encoding is as $\langle P \rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle P'' \rangle) \mid x(d).\langle Q' \rangle[x/y])$ with reductions:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P \rangle &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}z)([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle Q' \rangle[x/y][z/d]) \mid \langle P'' \rangle) = U_1 \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle P'' \rangle \mid \langle Q' \rangle[x/y][z/d][b/z]) = U_2 \end{aligned}$$

(note that reductions may be performed within $\langle Q' \rangle$ from U_1 however we leverage the confluence of reductions within π_{DILL})

On the other hand,

$$P = (\mathbf{v}xy)(\bar{x}(b).P'' \mid \text{lin } y(d).Q') \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(P'' \mid Q'[b/d])$$

Notice that $\langle (\mathbf{v}xy)(P'' \mid Q'[b/d]) \rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle P'' \rangle \mid \langle Q' \rangle[x/y][b/d]) \equiv U_2$.
We now perform induction on the length n of $\langle P \rangle \longrightarrow^n U$:

(Base Case) When $n \leq 2$.

Then $\langle P \rangle \longrightarrow^n U_n$.

Take $R = (\mathbf{v}xy)(P'' \mid Q'[b/d])$ and $V = U_2$. Then $P \longrightarrow^* R \wedge U_n \longrightarrow^* U_2 \wedge U_2 \equiv \langle R \rangle$, and the result follows.

(Inductive Step) When $n > 2$.

Then $\langle P \rangle \longrightarrow^2 U_2 \longrightarrow^m U$ and $P \longrightarrow^* R' \wedge U_2 \equiv \langle R' \rangle$. By the induction hypothesis $\langle R' \rangle \longrightarrow^m U$ implies that there exist $R \in \mathcal{L}$ and $V \in \pi_{\text{DILL}}$ such that $R' \longrightarrow^* R \wedge U \longrightarrow^* V \wedge V \triangleleft \langle R \rangle$. Hence $P \longrightarrow^* R' \longrightarrow^* R \wedge U \longrightarrow^* V \wedge V \triangleleft \langle R \rangle$, and the result follows.

- When $\neg(x = a \wedge y = c)$.
Then $\langle P \rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle P'' \rangle) \mid c(d).\langle Q' \rangle[x/y])$ and no reductions are available.

(i.6) When $Q = \text{un } c(d).Q'$.

Let us consider the following:

- When $x = a \wedge y = c$ then x and y do not have dual types and hence not in \mathcal{L} .
- When $\neg(x = a \wedge y = c)$.
In the case $c : *?T' \wedge \text{svr}(T') \wedge \neg\text{cli}(T')$, we have
 $\langle \text{un } c(d).Q' \rangle = !c(z').\langle Q'[z'/d] \rangle$ and $\langle P \rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle P'' \rangle) \mid !c(z').\langle Q'[z'/d] \rangle[x/y])$ and no reduction can be performed.

Other cases follow analogously not allowing reductions to be performed.

(i.7) When $Q = (\mathbf{vcd})(Q_1 \mid Q_2)$.

Then, $\langle\langle \mathbf{vcd}(Q_1 \mid Q_2) \rangle\rangle = (\mathbf{vc})(\langle\langle Q_1 \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q_2 \rangle\rangle[c/d])$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle P \rangle\rangle &= (\mathbf{vx})(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle) \mid (\mathbf{vc})(\langle\langle Q_1 \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q_2 \rangle\rangle[c/d])) \\ &\equiv (\mathbf{vx})(\mathbf{vc})(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle) \mid \langle\langle Q_1 \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q_2 \rangle\rangle[c/d]). \end{aligned}$$

Now we perform induction on the number of reductions n performed in $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle \rightarrow^n U$.

Let us first consider the first reduction:

I) When either

- I.1)** $\langle\langle Q_1 \rangle\rangle \rightarrow U'$; or
- I.2)** $\langle\langle Q_2 \rangle\rangle[c/d] \rightarrow U'$; or
- I.3)** $(\mathbf{vc})(\langle\langle Q_1 \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q_2 \rangle\rangle[c/d]) \rightarrow U'$.

Then, by the induction hypothesis there exists $R' \in \mathcal{L}$ and $V' \in \pi_{\text{DILL}}$ such that either

- I.1)** $Q_1 \rightarrow^* R' \wedge U' \rightarrow^* V' \wedge V' \triangleleft \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle$; or
- I.2)** $Q_2 \rightarrow^* R' \wedge U' \rightarrow^* V' \wedge V' \triangleleft \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle$; or
- I.3)** $(\mathbf{vcd})(Q_1 \mid Q_2) \rightarrow^* R' \wedge U' \rightarrow^* V' \wedge V' \triangleleft \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle$, respectively.

Hence either

I.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle P \rangle\rangle &= (\mathbf{vx})(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle) \mid (\mathbf{vc})(\langle\langle Q_1 \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q_2 \rangle\rangle[c/d])[x/y]) \\ &\rightarrow (\mathbf{vx})(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle) \mid (\mathbf{vc})(U' \mid \langle\langle Q_2 \rangle\rangle[c/d])[x/y]) \\ &= U'' \\ &\rightarrow^m (\mathbf{vx})(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle) \mid (\mathbf{vc})(V' \mid \langle\langle Q_2 \rangle\rangle[c/d])[x/y]) \\ &= V'' \end{aligned}$$

or **I.2)**

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle P \rangle\rangle &\rightarrow (\mathbf{vx})(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle) \mid (\mathbf{vc})(\langle\langle Q_1 \rangle\rangle \mid U'[c/d])[x/y]) \\ &= U'' \\ &\rightarrow^m (\mathbf{vx})(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle) \mid (\mathbf{vc})(\langle\langle Q_1 \rangle\rangle \mid V'[c/d])[x/y]) \\ &= V'' \end{aligned}$$

or **I.3)**

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle P \rangle\rangle &\rightarrow (\mathbf{vx})(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle) \mid U'[x/y]) = U'' \\ &\rightarrow^m (\mathbf{vx})(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle\langle P'' \rangle\rangle) \mid V'[x/y]) = V'' \end{aligned}$$

with either

- I.1)** $P = (\mathbf{vxy})(\bar{a}(b).P'' \mid (\mathbf{vcd})(Q_1 \mid Q_2)) \rightarrow (\mathbf{vxy})(\bar{a}(b).P'' \mid (\mathbf{vcd})(R' \mid Q_2)) = R''$; or
- I.2)** $P \rightarrow (\mathbf{vxy})(\bar{a}(b).P'' \mid (\mathbf{vcd})(Q_1 \mid R')) = R''$ or;
- I.3)** $P \rightarrow (\mathbf{vxy})(\bar{a}(b).P'' \mid R') = R''$.

Hence $R'' \in \mathcal{L}$, $V'' \in \pi_{\text{DILL}}$ and $P \rightarrow^* R'' \wedge U'' \rightarrow^* V'' \wedge V'' \triangleleft \langle\langle R'' \rangle\rangle$.

We now consider the number of reductions taken by $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle \rightarrow^n U$. If $n \leq m + 1$ then we take $R = R''$ and the case follows. If $n > 1 + m$ then we apply the induction hypothesis on $\langle\langle R'' \rangle\rangle \rightarrow^{n-m-1} U$ and the case follows.

II) When $a = x$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P \rangle &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle P'' \rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}z)([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid (\mathbf{v}c)(\langle Q'_1 \rangle \mid \langle Q_2 \rangle [c/d])[x/y])) \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle P'' \rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}c)(\langle Q'_1 \rangle [b/z] \mid \langle Q_2 \rangle [c/d])[x/y]) \end{aligned}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P \rangle &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle P'' \rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}z)([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid (\mathbf{v}c)(\langle Q_1 \rangle \mid \langle Q'_2 \rangle [c/d])[x/y])) \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle P'' \rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}c)(\langle Q_1 \rangle \mid \langle Q'_2 \rangle [c/d][b/z])[x/y]) \end{aligned}$$

We consider only the first case, then by Proposition D.4.1 $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q_1) \in \mathcal{L}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q_1) \rangle &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle P'' \rangle) \mid \langle Q_1 \rangle) \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle P'' \rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}z)([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle Q'_1 \rangle [x/y])) \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle P'' \rangle \mid \langle Q'_1 \rangle [x/y][b/z]) \\ &= \langle (\mathbf{v}xy)(P'' \mid Q'_1) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition D.4.1 as $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q_1) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(P'' \mid Q'_1)$ we have that $(\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid (\mathbf{v}cd)(Q_1 \mid Q_2)) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(P'' \mid (\mathbf{v}cd)(Q'_1 \mid Q_2))$ and the rest of the case now follows by induction on the number of reduction steps.

(i.8) When $Q = Q_1 \mid Q_2$ then the case follows analogously to 7(b)i.

ii. When $a : \text{lin}!(T).S \wedge \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T)$.

Then $\langle \bar{a}(b).P'' \rangle = \bar{a}(z).(![b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle P \rangle)$.

We now perform induction on the structure of Q analogously to that of Item 7(b)i with the exception of following case Q :

When $Q = \text{lin } c(d).Q'$.

Then $\langle \text{lin } c(d).Q' \rangle = c(d).\langle Q' \rangle$. Let us consider the following:

(ii.1) When $x = a \wedge y = c$.

Then x and y have dual types and hence in \mathcal{L} .

On the one hand, the encoding is as as $\langle P \rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}(z).(![b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle P \rangle) \mid x(d).\langle Q' \rangle [x/y])$ with reduction:

$$U_0 = \langle P \rangle \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}z)(![b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle Q' \rangle [x/y][z/d]) \mid \langle P'' \rangle) = U_1$$

On the other hand,

$$P = (\mathbf{v}xy)(\bar{x}(b).P'' \mid \text{lin } y(d).Q') \longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(P'' \mid Q'[b/d])$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (\mathbf{v}xy)(P'' \mid Q'[b/d]) \rangle &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle P'' \rangle \mid \langle Q' \rangle [x/y][b/d]) \\ &\triangleleft (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle P'' \rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}d)(![b \leftrightarrow d] \mid \langle Q' \rangle [x/y])) \\ &\equiv (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle P'' \rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}z)(![b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle Q' \rangle [x/y][z/d])) \\ &\equiv U_1 \end{aligned}$$

We now perform induction on the length n of $\langle P \rangle \longrightarrow^n U$:

(Base Case) When $n \leq 1$ then $\langle P \rangle \longrightarrow^n U_n$ by taking $R = (\mathbf{v}xy)(P'' \mid Q'[b/d])$ and $V = U_1$ we have that $P \longrightarrow^* R \wedge U_n \longrightarrow^* U_1 \wedge U_1 \triangleleft \langle R \rangle$.

(Inductive Step) When $n > 1$ then $\langle P \rangle \rightarrow^1 U_1 \rightarrow^m U$ and $P \rightarrow^* R' \wedge U_2 \equiv \langle R' \rangle$. By the induction hypothesis $\langle R' \rangle \rightarrow^m U$ implies that there exists $R \in \mathcal{L}$ and $V \in \pi_{\text{DILL}}$ such that $R' \rightarrow^* R \wedge U \rightarrow^* V \wedge V \triangleleft \langle R \rangle$. Hence $P \rightarrow^* R' \rightarrow^* R \wedge U \rightarrow^* V \wedge V \triangleleft \langle R \rangle$.

(ii.2) When $\neg(x = a \wedge y = c)$ then $\langle P \rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{a}(z).(![b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle P'' \rangle) \mid c(d). \langle Q' \rangle[x/y])$ and no reductions are available.

iii. When $a : *!T \wedge \neg \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T)$.

Then $\langle \bar{a}(b).P'' \rangle = \bar{a}(z).\bar{z}(w).([b \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle P \rangle)$.

We proceed by induction on the structure of Q analogously to Item 7(b)i with the following exceptional cases for Q :

(iii.1) When $Q = \text{lin } c(d).Q'$.

Then $\langle \text{lin } c(d).Q' \rangle = c(d). \langle Q' \rangle$. Let us consider the following:

- When $x = a \wedge y = c$ then x and y do not have dual types and hence not in \mathcal{L} .
- When $\neg(x = a \wedge y = c)$ then $\langle P \rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{a}(z).\bar{z}(w).([b \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle P \rangle) \mid c(d). \langle Q' \rangle[x/y])$ and no reductions are available.

(iii.2) When $Q = \text{un } c(d).Q'$.

Let us consider the following:

- When $x = a \wedge y = c$ then let us consider the following cases:
 - When $x : *?T \wedge \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$ then x and y do not have dual types and hence not in \mathcal{L} .
 - When $x : *?T \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T)$.
Then x and y have dual types and hence in \mathcal{L} .
On the one hand, the encoding is as $\langle P \rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}(z).\bar{z}(w).([b \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle P \rangle) \mid !x(z).z(d). \langle Q' \rangle[x/y])$ with reductions:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P \rangle &\rightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}z)(\bar{z}(w).([b \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle P \rangle) \mid z(d). \langle Q' \rangle[x/y]) \mid !x(z).z(d). \langle Q' \rangle[x/y]) &= U_1 \\ &\rightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}z)(\langle P \rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}w)([b \leftrightarrow w] \mid \langle Q' \rangle[x/y][w/d])) \mid !x(z).z(d). \langle Q' \rangle[x/y]) &= U_2 \\ &\rightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}z)(\langle P \rangle \mid \langle Q' \rangle[x/y][w/d][b/w]) \mid !x(z).z(d). \langle Q' \rangle[x/y]) &= U_3 \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$P = (\mathbf{v}xy)(\bar{x}(b).P'' \mid \text{lin } y(d).Q') \rightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)(P'' \mid Q'[b/d])$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (\mathbf{v}xy)(P'' \mid Q'[b/d]) \rangle &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle P'' \rangle \mid \langle Q' \rangle[x/y][b/d]) \\ &\triangleleft (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle P'' \rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}d)(! [b \leftrightarrow d] \mid \langle Q' \rangle[x/y])) \\ &\equiv (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle P'' \rangle \mid (\mathbf{v}z)(! [b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle Q' \rangle[x/y][z/d])) \\ &\equiv U_1 \end{aligned}$$

We now perform induction on the length n of $\langle P \rangle \rightarrow^n U$:

(Base Case) When $n \leq 1$ then $\langle P \rangle \rightarrow^n U_n$. Take $R = (\mathbf{v}xy)(P'' \mid Q'[b/d])$ and $V = U_1$. Then, we have that $P \rightarrow^* R \wedge U_n \rightarrow^* U_1 \wedge U_1 \triangleleft \langle R \rangle$, and the result follows.

(Inductive Step) When $n > 1$ then $\langle P \rangle \rightarrow^1 U_1 \rightarrow^m U$ and $P \rightarrow^* R' \wedge U_2 \equiv \langle R' \rangle$. By the induction hypothesis $\langle R' \rangle \rightarrow^m U$ implies

that there exist $R \in \mathcal{L}$ and $V \in \pi_{\text{DILL}}$ such that $R' \longrightarrow^* R \wedge U \longrightarrow^* V \wedge V \triangleleft \langle R \rangle$. Hence, $P \longrightarrow^* R' \longrightarrow^* R \wedge U \longrightarrow^* V \wedge V \triangleleft \langle R \rangle$ and the result follows.

– If $x : *?T \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$ then x and y do not have dual types and hence not in \mathcal{L} .

- When $\neg(x = a \wedge y = c)$.

In the case $c : *?T' \wedge \text{svr}(T') \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T')$, it follows that $\langle \text{un } c(d).Q' \rangle = !c(z').\langle Q'[z'/d] \rangle$ and $\langle P \rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{a}(z).([b \leftrightarrow z] \mid \langle P'' \rangle) \mid !c(z').\langle Q'[z'/d] \rangle[x/y])$ and no reduction can be performed.

Other cases follow analogously not allowing reductions to be performed.

iv. The cases below follow analogously to Item 7(b)iii.

- When $a : *!T \wedge \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \text{cli}(T)$.
- When $a : *!T \wedge \neg \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$.
- When $a : *!T \wedge \text{un}(T) \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$.

Except for the case of $x = a \wedge y = c$ when considering the type of y the encoding of $Q = \text{un } c(d).Q'$ changes due to c having dual type to b but the synchronisations follow similarly.

(c) When $P' = (\mathbf{v}ab)\bar{c}(b).P''$.

Let us consider the following cases:

1) When $c : *!T \wedge \neg \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$.

Then, the encoding gives $\langle (\mathbf{v}ab)\bar{c}(b).P'' \rangle = \bar{c}(a).a.\mathbf{inr}; \langle P'' \rangle$. We proceed by induction on the structure of Q analogously to Item 7b.

We shall only consider the case of $Q = \text{un } y(d).Q'$ with $c = x$.

By duality on typing we have that $\langle \text{un } y(d).Q' \rangle = !y(e).e.\mathbf{case}(z(d).\langle Q' \rangle, \langle Q'[e/d] \rangle)$.

On the one hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q) \rangle &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle P' \rangle \mid \langle Q \rangle[x/y]) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}(a).a.\mathbf{inr}; \langle P'' \rangle \mid !x(e).e.\mathbf{case}(e(d).\langle Q' \rangle, \langle Q'[e/d] \rangle)) &= U_0 \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}a)(a.\mathbf{inr}; \langle P'' \rangle \mid a.\mathbf{case}(e(d).\langle Q' \rangle, \langle Q'[a/d] \rangle)) \mid \\ &\quad !x(e).e.\mathbf{case}(e(d).\langle Q' \rangle, \langle Q'[e/d] \rangle)) &= U_1 \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}a)(\langle P'' \rangle \mid \langle P[a/d] \rangle) \\ &\quad \mid !x(e).e.\mathbf{case}(e(d).\langle Q' \rangle, \langle Q'[e/d] \rangle)) &= U_2 \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q) &= (\mathbf{v}xy)((\mathbf{v}ab)\bar{x}(b).P'' \mid \text{un } y(d).Q') \\ &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)((\mathbf{v}ab)(P'' \mid Q'[b/d]) \mid \text{un } y(d).Q') \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\langle (\mathbf{v}xy)((\mathbf{v}ab)(P'' \mid Q'[b/d]) \mid \text{un } y(d).Q') \rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}a)(\langle P'' \rangle \mid \langle Q'[a/d] \rangle) \mid !x(e).e.\mathbf{case}(e(d).\langle Q' \rangle, \langle Q'[e/d] \rangle))$$

We now perform induction on the length n of $\langle P \rangle \longrightarrow^n U$:

(Base Case) When $n \leq 2$ then $\langle\!\langle P \rangle\!\rangle \rightarrow^n U_n$ by taking $R = (\mathbf{v}xy)((\mathbf{v}ab)(P'' \mid Q'[b/d]) \mid \text{un } y(d).Q')$ and $V = U_2$ we have that $P \rightarrow^* R \wedge U_n \rightarrow^* U_2 \wedge U_2 \triangleleft \langle\!\langle R \rangle\!\rangle$, and the result follows.

(Inductive Step) When $n > 2$ then $\langle\!\langle P \rangle\!\rangle \rightarrow^2 U_2 \rightarrow^m U$ and $P \rightarrow^* R' \wedge U_2 \equiv \langle\!\langle R' \rangle\!\rangle$. By the induction hypothesis $\langle\!\langle R' \rangle\!\rangle \rightarrow^m U$ implies that there exist $R \in \mathcal{L}$ and $V \in \pi_{\text{DILL}}$ such that $R' \rightarrow^* R \wedge U \rightarrow^* V \wedge V \triangleleft \langle\!\langle R \rangle\!\rangle$. Thus, $P \rightarrow^* R' \rightarrow^* R \wedge U \rightarrow^* V \wedge V \triangleleft \langle\!\langle R \rangle\!\rangle$, and the result follows.

2) When $c : *!T \wedge \text{svr}(T) \wedge \neg \text{cli}(T)$.

Then, the encoding gives $\langle\!\langle (\mathbf{v}ab)\bar{c}(b).P'' \rangle\!\rangle = \bar{c}(a).\langle\!\langle P'' \rangle\!\rangle$. We perform induction on the structure of Q analogously to Item 7b.

We shall only consider the case of $Q = \text{un } y(d).Q'$ with $c = x$.

By duality on typing we have that $\langle\!\langle \text{un } y(d).Q' \rangle\!\rangle = !y(d).\langle\!\langle Q' \rangle\!\rangle$.

On the one hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\!\langle (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q) \rangle\!\rangle &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle\!\langle P' \rangle\!\rangle \mid \langle\!\langle Q \rangle\!\rangle[x/y]) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{x}(a).\langle\!\langle P'' \rangle\!\rangle \mid !x(d).\langle\!\langle Q' \rangle\!\rangle) &&= U_0 \\ &\rightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}a)(\langle\!\langle P'' \rangle\!\rangle \mid \langle\!\langle P[a/d] \rangle\!\rangle) \mid !x(d).\langle\!\langle Q' \rangle\!\rangle) &&= U_1 \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q) &= (\mathbf{v}xy)((\mathbf{v}ab)\bar{x}(b).P'' \mid \text{un } y(d).Q') \\ &\rightarrow (\mathbf{v}xy)((\mathbf{v}ab)(P'' \mid Q'[b/d]) \mid \text{un } y(d).Q') \end{aligned}$$

Notice that:

$$\langle\!\langle (\mathbf{v}xy)((\mathbf{v}ab)(P'' \mid Q'[b/d]) \mid \text{un } y(d).Q') \rangle\!\rangle = (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}a)(\langle\!\langle P'' \rangle\!\rangle \mid \langle\!\langle Q'[a/d] \rangle\!\rangle) \mid !x(d).\langle\!\langle Q' \rangle\!\rangle)$$

We now perform induction on the length n of $\langle\!\langle P \rangle\!\rangle \rightarrow^n U$:

(Base Case) When $n \leq 1$ then $\langle\!\langle P \rangle\!\rangle \rightarrow^n U_n$. Take $R = (\mathbf{v}xy)((\mathbf{v}ab)(P'' \mid Q'[b/d]) \mid \text{un } y(d).Q')$ and $V = U_1$, then we have that $P \rightarrow^* R \wedge U_n \rightarrow^* U_1 \wedge U_1 \triangleleft \langle\!\langle R \rangle\!\rangle$ and the result follows.

(Inductive Step) When $n > 1$ then $\langle\!\langle P \rangle\!\rangle \rightarrow^1 U_1 \rightarrow^m U$ and $P \rightarrow^* R' \wedge U_1 \equiv \langle\!\langle R' \rangle\!\rangle$. By the induction hypothesis $\langle\!\langle R' \rangle\!\rangle \rightarrow^m U$ implies that there exist $R \in \mathcal{L}$ and $V \in \pi_{\text{DILL}}$ such that $R' \rightarrow^* R \wedge U \rightarrow^* V \wedge V \triangleleft \langle\!\langle R \rangle\!\rangle$. Thus, $P \rightarrow^* R' \rightarrow^* R \wedge U \rightarrow^* V \wedge V \triangleleft \langle\!\langle R \rangle\!\rangle$, and the result follows.

(d) When $P' = (\mathbf{v}ab)\bar{c}(a).(P_1 \mid P_2)$.

Then we must have that $z \notin \text{fn}(P_1) \wedge y \notin \text{fn}(P_2)$ and $\langle\!\langle (\mathbf{v}ab)\bar{c}(a).(P \mid Q) \rangle\!\rangle = \bar{c}(b).\langle\!\langle P_1 \rangle\!\rangle \mid \langle\!\langle P_2 \rangle\!\rangle$.

We perform induction on the structure of Q analogously to Item 7b.

We shall only consider the case of $Q = \text{lin } y(d).Q'$ with $c = x$ and we have that $\langle\!\langle \text{lin } y(d).Q' \rangle\!\rangle = y(d).\langle\!\langle Q' \rangle\!\rangle$.

On the one hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\!\langle (\mathbf{v}xy)(P' \mid Q) \rangle\!\rangle &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\langle\!\langle P' \rangle\!\rangle \mid \langle\!\langle Q \rangle\!\rangle[x/y]) \\ &= (\mathbf{v}x)(\bar{c}(b).\langle\!\langle P_1 \rangle\!\rangle \mid \langle\!\langle P_2 \rangle\!\rangle \mid x(d).\langle\!\langle Q' \rangle\!\rangle) &&= U_0 \\ &\rightarrow (\mathbf{v}x)((\mathbf{v}a)(\langle\!\langle P_1 \rangle\!\rangle \mid \langle\!\langle Q'[a/d] \rangle\!\rangle) \mid \langle\!\langle Q_2 \rangle\!\rangle) &&= U_1 \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{v}_{xy})(P' \mid Q) &= (\mathbf{v}_{xy})((\mathbf{v}_{ab})\bar{c}(a).(P_1 \mid P_2) \mid \text{lin } y(d).Q') \\ &\rightarrow (\mathbf{v}_{xy})((\mathbf{v}_{ab})(P_1 \mid Q'[a/d]) \mid P_2) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that:

$$\langle\langle (\mathbf{v}_{xy})((\mathbf{v}_{ab})(P_1 \mid Q'[a/d]) \mid P_2) \rangle\rangle = (\mathbf{v}_x)((\mathbf{v}_a)(\langle\langle P_1 \rangle\rangle \mid \langle\langle Q'[a/d] \rangle\rangle) \mid \langle\langle Q_2 \rangle\rangle)$$

We now perform induction on the length n of $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle \rightarrow^n U$:

(Base Case) When $n \leq 1$ then $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle \rightarrow^n U_n$. Take $R = (\mathbf{v}_{xy})((\mathbf{v}_{ab})(P_1 \mid Q'[a/d]) \mid P_2)$ and $V = U_1$. Then, we have that $P \rightarrow^* R \wedge U_n \rightarrow^* U_1 \wedge U_1 \triangleleft \langle\langle R \rangle\rangle$ and the result follows.

(Inductive Step) When $n > 1$ then $\langle\langle P \rangle\rangle \rightarrow^1 U_1 \rightarrow^m U$ and $P \rightarrow^* R' \wedge U_1 \equiv \langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle$. By the induction hypothesis $\langle\langle R' \rangle\rangle \rightarrow^m U$ implies that there exist $R \in \mathcal{L}$ and $V \in \pi_{\text{DILL}}$ such that $R' \rightarrow^* R \wedge U \rightarrow^* V \wedge V \triangleleft \langle\langle R \rangle\rangle$. Thus, $P \rightarrow^* R' \rightarrow^* R \wedge U \rightarrow^* V \wedge V \triangleleft \langle\langle R \rangle\rangle$ and the result follows.

- (e) When $P' = \text{lin } a(b).P''$ or $P' = \text{un } a(b).P''$ the cases follow by duality on the output cases already shown.
- (f) When $P' = (\mathbf{v}_{xy})(P_1 \mid P_2)$ or $P' = P_1 \mid P_2$ then these cases follow by the induction hypothesis.

□

$$\begin{array}{c}
[S_{>} : \text{Nil}] \frac{> \triangleq \{(u, x) \mid x \in \Gamma \setminus u\}}{\Gamma \vdash_{>}^u \mathbf{0}} \\
[S_{>} : \text{LinIn}] \frac{\Gamma, x : S, y : T \vdash_{>}^u P}{\Gamma, x : \text{lin}?T.S \vdash_{>}^u \text{lin } x(y).P} \\
[S_{>} : \text{Par}_1] \frac{\Gamma \otimes \Delta_2 \vdash_{>}^u Q \quad > \triangleq (>_1 \downarrow_w) \cup >_2 \cup ((>_1^u) \downarrow_w) \quad w \text{ fresh wrt } P, Q, \Gamma}{\Gamma \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash_{>}^u P \mid Q} \\
[S_{>} : \text{Par}_2] \frac{z : V, (\Gamma \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1) \vdash_{>}^z P \quad v : \bar{V}, (\Gamma \otimes \Delta_2) \vdash_{>}^u Q \quad > \triangleq >_1 \cup >_2 \cup >_1^u}{\Gamma \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}z v)(P \mid Q)} \\
[S_{>} : \text{UnIn}_1] \frac{\Gamma, y : T \vdash_{>}^w P \quad > \triangleq >_1 \downarrow_w \cup (>_1^x) \downarrow_w \quad \neg \text{svr}(T) \quad w \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma, x : *?T \vdash_{>}^u \text{un } x(y).P} \\
[S_{>} : \text{UnIn}_2] \frac{\Gamma, y : T \vdash_{>}^y P \quad > \triangleq >_1 \cup (>_1^x) \quad \neg \text{cli}(T) \wedge \text{svr}(T)}{\Gamma, x : *?T \vdash_{>}^x \text{un } x(y).P} \\
[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_1] \frac{\Gamma, v : T, x : S \vdash_{>}^u P \quad \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma, v : T, x : \text{lin}!(T).S \vdash_{>}^u \bar{x}(v).P} \\
[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_2] \frac{\Gamma, x : S \vdash_{>}^u P \quad > \triangleq >_1 \cup \{(u, v)\} \quad \neg \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma, v : T, x : \text{lin}!(T).S \vdash_{>}^u \bar{x}(v).P} \\
[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_3] \frac{\Gamma \setminus u \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_{>}^y P \quad \Gamma \otimes \Delta, z : S \vdash_{>}^u Q \quad > \triangleq >_1 \cup >_2 \cup >_1^u \cup \{(u, x)\} \quad u \neq z}{\Gamma \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2, z : \text{lin}!T.S \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P \mid Q)} \\
[S_{>} : \text{LinOut}_4] \frac{\Gamma \otimes \Delta_1, y : \bar{T} \vdash_{>}^y P \quad \Gamma \otimes \Delta_2, z : S \vdash_{>}^z Q \quad > \triangleq >_1 \cup >_2 \cup >_1^z \cup \{(z, x)\}}{\Gamma \otimes \Delta_1, \Delta_2, z : \text{lin}!T.S \vdash_{>}^z (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(x).(P \mid Q)} \\
[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_1] \frac{\Gamma, z : *!T, x : \bar{T} \vdash_{>}^u P \quad > \triangleq >_1 \cup \{(u, y)\} \quad u \neq z}{\Gamma, z : *!T \vdash_{>}^u (\mathbf{v}xy)\bar{z}(y).P} \\
[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_2] \frac{\Gamma, x : *!T, v : T \vdash_{>}^u P \quad u \neq x \quad \text{un}(T)}{\Gamma, x : *!T, v : T \vdash_{>}^u \bar{x}(v).P} \\
[S_{>} : \text{UnOut}_3] \frac{\Gamma, x : *!T \vdash_{>}^u P \quad \neg \text{un}(T) \quad > \triangleq >_1 \cup \{(u, v)\} \quad u \neq x}{\Gamma, x : *!T, v : T \vdash_{>}^u \bar{x}(v).P}
\end{array}$$

Figure D.1: A type system for π_S that induces a strict partial order $>$.




Figure D.2: Partial orders for process Q_1 from Example D.9.




Figure D.3: Partial orders for process Q_2 from Example D.9.




Figure D.4: Partial order for process P from Example D.9.




Figure D.5: Extended partial order for process P from Example D.9.