

Verification of Distributed Quantum Protocols

— Yong Wang —



Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Backgrounds	2
2.1	Operational Semantics	2
2.2	Proof Techniques	3
2.3	APTC with Localities	3
2.3.1	Operational Semantics	3
2.3.2	BATC with Localities	7
2.3.3	APTC with Localities	9
2.3.4	Recursion	14
2.3.5	Abstraction	17
2.4	APPTC with Localities	20
2.4.1	Operational Semantics	20
2.4.2	BAPTC with Localities	25
2.4.3	APPTC with Localities	27
2.4.4	Recursion	33
2.4.5	Abstraction	35
2.5	Operational Semantics for Quantum Computing	39
3	APTC with Localities for Open Quantum Systems	48
3.1	BATC with Localities for Open Quantum Systems	48
3.2	APTC with Localities for Open Quantum Systems	50
3.3	Recursion	55
3.4	Abstraction	58
3.5	Quantum Entanglement	64
3.6	Unification of Quantum and Classical Computing for Open Quantum Systems . .	66
4	Applications of qAPTC with Localities	68
4.1	Verification of BB84 Protocol	68
4.2	Verification of E91 Protocol	70
4.3	Verification of B92 Protocol	72
4.4	Verification of DPS Protocol	75
4.5	Verification of BBM92 Protocol	77
4.6	Verification of SARG04 Protocol	79

4.7	Verification of COW Protocol	81
4.8	Verification of SSP Protocol	83
4.9	Verification of S09 Protocol	86
4.10	Verification of KMB09 Protocol	88
4.11	Verification of S13 Protocol	90
5	APPTC with Localities for Closed Quantum Systems	94
5.1	<i>BAPTC</i> with Localities for Closed Quantum Systems	94
5.2	<i>APPTC</i> with Localities for Closed Quantum Systems	97
5.3	Recursion	104
5.4	Abstraction	107
5.5	Quantum Measurement	112
5.6	Quantum Entanglement	112
5.7	Unification of Quantum and Classical Computing for Closed Quantum Systems .	115
6	Applications of qAPPTC with Localities	117
6.1	Verification of Quantum Teleportation Protocol	117
6.2	Verification of BB84 Protocol	119
6.3	Verification of E91 Protocol	121
6.4	Verification of B92 Protocol	124
6.5	Verification of DPS Protocol	126
6.6	Verification of BBM92 Protocol	128
6.7	Verification of SARG04 Protocol	130
6.8	Verification of COW Protocol	133
6.9	Verification of SSP Protocol	135
6.10	Verification of S09 Protocol	137
6.11	Verification of KMB09 Protocol	140
6.12	Verification of S13 Protocol	142

1 Introduction

Truly concurrent process algebras are generalizations to the traditional process algebras for true concurrency, CTC [7] to CCS [1] [2], APTC [8] to ACP [3], π_{tc} [9] to π calculus [5] [6], APPTC [10] to probabilistic process algebra [13] [14] [15], APTC with localities [11] [12] to process algebra with localities [16].

In quantum process algebras, there are several well-known work [17] [20] [21] [18] [19] [24] [25] [17] [27], and we ever did some work [30] [31] [32] to unify quantum and classical computing under the framework of ACP [3] and probabilistic process algebra [13].

Now, it is the time to utilize truly concurrent process algebras with localities [11] [12] to model quantum computing and unify quantum and classical computing in this book. Since this work is with localities, it is suitable to verify the distribution of quantum communication protocols. This book is organized as follows. In chapter 2, we introduce the preliminaries. In chapter 3 and 4, we introduce the utilization of APTC with localities to unify quantum and classical computing and its usage in verification of distributed quantum communication protocols. In chapter 5 and 6, we introduce the utilization of APPTC with localities to unifying quantum and classical computing and its usage in verification of distributed quantum communication protocols.

2 Backgrounds

To make this book self-satisfied, we introduce some preliminaries in this chapter, including some introductions on operational semantics, proof techniques, truly concurrent process algebra [8] [7] [9] which is based on truly concurrent operational semantics, and also probabilistic truly concurrent process algebra and probabilistic truly concurrent operational semantics, and also operational semantics for quantum computing.

2.1 Operational Semantics

The semantics of *ACP* is based on bisimulation/rooted branching bisimulation equivalences, and the modularity of *ACP* relies on the concept of conservative extension, for the conveniences, we introduce some concepts and conclusions on them.

Definition 2.1 (Bisimulation). *A bisimulation relation R is a binary relation on processes such that: (1) if pRq and $p \xrightarrow{a} p'$ then $q \xrightarrow{a} q'$ with $p'Rq'$; (2) if pRq and $q \xrightarrow{a} q'$ then $p \xrightarrow{a} p'$ with $p'Rq'$; (3) if pRq and pP , then qP ; (4) if pRq and qP , then pP . Two processes p and q are bisimilar, denoted by $p \sim_{HM} q$, if there is a bisimulation relation R such that pRq .*

Definition 2.2 (Congruence). *Let Σ be a signature. An equivalence relation R on $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$ is a congruence if for each $f \in \Sigma$, if $s_i R t_i$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, ar(f)\}$, then $f(s_1, \dots, s_{ar(f)}) R f(t_1, \dots, t_{ar(f)})$.*

Definition 2.3 (Branching bisimulation). *A branching bisimulation relation R is a binary relation on the collection of processes such that: (1) if pRq and $p \xrightarrow{a} p'$ then either $a \equiv \tau$ and $p'Rq'$ or there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $q \xrightarrow{\tau} \dots \xrightarrow{\tau} q_0$ such that pRq_0 and $q_0 \xrightarrow{a} q'$ with $p'Rq'$; (2) if pRq and $q \xrightarrow{a} q'$ then either $a \equiv \tau$ and pRq' or there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $p \xrightarrow{\tau} \dots \xrightarrow{\tau} p_0$ such that p_0Rq and $p_0 \xrightarrow{a} p'$ with $p'Rq'$; (3) if pRq and pP , then there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $q \xrightarrow{\tau} \dots \xrightarrow{\tau} q_0$ such that pRq_0 and q_0P ; (4) if pRq and qP , then there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $p \xrightarrow{\tau} \dots \xrightarrow{\tau} p_0$ such that p_0Rq and p_0P . Two processes p and q are branching bisimilar, denoted by $p \approx_{bHM} q$, if there is a branching bisimulation relation R such that pRq .*

Definition 2.4 (Rooted branching bisimulation). *A rooted branching bisimulation relation R is a binary relation on processes such that: (1) if pRq and $p \xrightarrow{a} p'$ then $q \xrightarrow{a} q'$ with $p' \approx_{bHM} q'$; (2) if pRq and $q \xrightarrow{a} q'$ then $p \xrightarrow{a} p'$ with $p' \approx_{bHM} q'$; (3) if pRq and pP , then qP ; (4) if pRq and qP , then pP . Two processes p and q are rooted branching bisimilar, denoted by $p \approx_{rbHM} q$, if there is a rooted branching bisimulation relation R such that pRq .*

Definition 2.5 (Conservative extension). *Let T_0 and T_1 be TSSs (transition system specifications) over signatures Σ_0 and Σ_1 , respectively. The TSS $T_0 \oplus T_1$ is a conservative extension of T_0 if the LTSs (labeled transition systems) generated by T_0 and $T_0 \oplus T_1$ contain exactly the same transitions $t \xrightarrow{a} t'$ and tP with $t \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma_0)$.*

Definition 2.6 (Source-dependency). *The source-dependent variables in a transition rule of ρ are defined inductively as follows: (1) all variables in the source of ρ are source-dependent; (2) if $t \xrightarrow{a} t'$ is a premise of ρ and all variables in t are source-dependent, then all variables in t' are source-dependent. A transition rule is source-dependent if all its variables are. A TSS is source-dependent if all its rules are.*

Definition 2.7 (Freshness). *Let T_0 and T_1 be TSSs over signatures Σ_0 and Σ_1 , respectively. A term in $\mathbb{T}(T_0 \oplus T_1)$ is said to be fresh if it contains a function symbol from $\Sigma_1 \setminus \Sigma_0$. Similarly, a transition label or predicate symbol in T_1 is fresh if it does not occur in T_0 .*

Theorem 2.8 (Conservative extension). *Let T_0 and T_1 be TSSs over signatures Σ_0 and Σ_1 , respectively, where T_0 and $T_0 \oplus T_1$ are positive after reduction. Under the following conditions, $T_0 \oplus T_1$ is a conservative extension of T_0 . (1) T_0 is source-dependent. (2) For each $\rho \in T_1$, either the source of ρ is fresh, or ρ has a premise of the form $t \xrightarrow{a} t'$ or tP , where $t \in \mathbb{T}(\Sigma_0)$, all variables in t occur in the source of ρ and t' , a or P is fresh.*

2.2 Proof Techniques

In this subsection, we introduce the concepts and conclusions about elimination, which is very important in the proof of completeness theorem.

Definition 2.9 (Elimination property). *Let a process algebra with a defined set of basic terms as a subset of the set of closed terms over the process algebra. Then the process algebra has the elimination to basic terms property if for every closed term s of the algebra, there exists a basic term t of the algebra such that the algebra $\vdash s = t$.*

Definition 2.10 (Strongly normalizing). *A term s_0 is called strongly normalizing if does not an infinite series of reductions beginning in s_0 .*

Definition 2.11. *We write $s >_{lpo} t$ if $s \rightarrow^+ t$ where \rightarrow^+ is the transitive closure of the reduction relation defined by the transition rules of an algebra.*

Theorem 2.12 (Strong normalization). *Let a term rewriting system (TRS) with finitely many rewriting rules and let $>$ be a well-founded ordering on the signature of the corresponding algebra. If $s >_{lpo} t$ for each rewriting rule $s \rightarrow t$ in the TRS, then the term rewriting system is strongly normalizing.*

2.3 APTC with Localities

2.3.1 Operational Semantics

Definition 2.13 (Prime event structure with silent event). *Let Λ be a fixed set of labels, ranged over a, b, c, \dots and τ . A (Λ -labelled) prime event structure with silent event τ is a tuple $\mathcal{E} = \langle \mathbb{E}, \leq, \# \rangle$, where \mathbb{E} is a denumerable set of events, including the silent event τ . Let $\hat{\mathbb{E}} = \mathbb{E} \setminus \{\tau\}$, exactly excluding τ , it is obvious that $\hat{\tau}^* = \epsilon$, where ϵ is the empty event. Let $\lambda : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \Lambda$ be a labelling function and let $\lambda(\tau) = \tau$. And $\leq, \#$ are binary relations on \mathbb{E} , called causality and conflict respectively, such that:*

1. \leq is a partial order and $[e] = \{e' \in \mathbb{E} \mid e' \leq e\}$ is finite for all $e \in \mathbb{E}$. It is easy to see that $e \leq \tau^* \leq e' = e \leq \tau \leq \dots \leq \tau \leq e'$, then $e \leq e'$.
2. $\#$ is irreflexive, symmetric and hereditary with respect to \leq , that is, for all $e, e', e'' \in \mathbb{E}$, if $e \# e' \leq e''$, then $e \# e''$.

Then, the concepts of consistency and concurrency can be drawn from the above definition:

1. $e, e' \in \mathbb{E}$ are consistent, denoted as $e \sim e'$, if $\neg(e \# e')$. A subset $X \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ is called consistent, if $e \sim e'$ for all $e, e' \in X$.

2. $e, e' \in \mathbb{E}$ are concurrent, denoted as $e \parallel e'$, if $\neg(e \leq e')$, $\neg(e' \leq e)$, and $\neg(e \# e')$.

Definition 2.14 (Configuration). Let \mathcal{E} be a PES. A (finite) configuration in \mathcal{E} is a (finite) consistent subset of events $C \subseteq \mathcal{E}$, closed with respect to causality (i.e. $[C] = C$). The set of finite configurations of \mathcal{E} is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$. We let $\hat{C} = C \setminus \{\tau\}$.

A consistent subset of $X \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ of events can be seen as a pomset. Given $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{E}$, $\hat{X} \sim \hat{Y}$ if \hat{X} and \hat{Y} are isomorphic as pomsets. In the following of the paper, we say $C_1 \sim C_2$, we mean $\hat{C}_1 \sim \hat{C}_2$.

Definition 2.15 (Pomset transitions and step). Let \mathcal{E} be a PES and let $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$, and $\emptyset \neq X \subseteq \mathbb{E}$, if $C \cap X = \emptyset$ and $C' = C \cup X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$, then $C \xrightarrow{X} C'$ is called a pomset transition from C to C' . When the events in X are pairwise concurrent, we say that $C \xrightarrow{X} C'$ is a step.

Definition 2.16 (Posetal product). Given two PESs $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$, the posetal product of their configurations, denoted $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \overline{\times} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$, is defined as

$$\{(C_1, f, C_2) \mid C_1 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), C_2 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), f : C_1 \rightarrow C_2 \text{ isomorphism}\}.$$

A subset $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \overline{\times} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ is called a posetal relation. We say that R is downward closed when for any $(C_1, f, C_2), (C'_1, f', C'_2) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \overline{\times} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$, if $(C_1, f, C_2) \subseteq (C'_1, f', C'_2)$ pointwise and $(C'_1, f', C'_2) \in R$, then $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R$.

For $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$, we define $f[x_1 \mapsto x_2] : X_1 \cup \{x_1\} \rightarrow X_2 \cup \{x_2\}$, $z \in X_1 \cup \{x_1\}$, (1) $f[x_1 \mapsto x_2](z) = x_2$, if $z = x_1$; (2) $f[x_1 \mapsto x_2](z) = f(z)$, otherwise. Where $X_1 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_1, X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_2, x_1 \in \mathbb{E}_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{E}_2$.

Let Loc be the set of locations, and $u, v \in Loc^*$. Let \ll be the sequential ordering on Loc^* , we call v is an extension or a sublocation of u in $u \ll v$; and if $u \not\ll v$ $v \not\ll u$, then u and v are independent and denoted $u \diamond v$.

Definition 2.17 (Consistent location association). A relation $\varphi \subseteq (Loc^* \times Loc^*)$ is a consistent location association (cla), if $(u, v) \in \varphi \& (u', v') \in \varphi$, then $u \diamond u' \Leftrightarrow v \diamond v'$.

Definition 2.18 (Static location pomset, step bisimulation). Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A static location pomset bisimulation is a relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$, such that if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow[u]{X_1} C'_1$ then $C_2 \xrightarrow[v]{X_2} C'_2$, with $X_1 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_1, X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_2, X_1 \sim X_2$ and $(C'_1, C'_2) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$, and vice-versa. We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are static location pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_p^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a static location pomset bisimulation R_φ , such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in R_\varphi$. By replacing pomset transitions with steps, we can get the definition of static location step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are static location step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_s^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.19 (Static location (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). A static location history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a posetal relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \overline{\times} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ such that if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} C'_1$, then $C_2 \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} C'_2$, with $(C'_1, f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], C'_2) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$, and vice-versa. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are static location history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_{hp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a static location hp-bisimulation R_φ such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in R_\varphi$.

A static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimulation is a downward closed static location hp-bisimulation. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_{hhp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.20 (Weak static location pomset, step bisimulation). *Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A weak static location pomset bisimulation is a relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$, such that if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow[u]{X_1} C'_1$ then $C_2 \xrightarrow[v]{X_2} C'_2$, with $X_1 \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1, X_2 \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2, X_1 \sim X_2$ and $(C'_1, C'_2) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$, and vice-versa. We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are weak static location pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_p^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a weak static location pomset bisimulation R_φ , such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in R_\varphi$. By replacing weak pomset transitions with weak steps, we can get the definition of weak static location step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are weak static location step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_s^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.*

Definition 2.21 (Weak static location (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). *A weak static location history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a weakly posetal relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \overline{\times} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ such that if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} C'_1$, then $C_2 \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} C'_2$, with $(C'_1, f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], C'_2) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$, and vice-versa. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are weak static location history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{hp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a weak static location hp-bisimulation R_φ such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in R_\varphi$.*

A weak static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimulation is a downward closed weak static location hp-bisimulation. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are weak static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{hhp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.22 (Branching static location pomset, step bisimulation). *Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \surd represent a state with $\surd \downarrow$. Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A branching static location pomset bisimulation is a relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$, such that:*

1. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow[u]{X} C'_1$ then
 - either $X \equiv \tau^*$, and $(C'_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $C_2 \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_2^0$, such that $(C_1, C_2^0) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2^0 \xrightarrow[v]{X} C'_2$ with $(C'_1, C'_2) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$;
2. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_2 \xrightarrow[v]{X} C'_2$ then
 - either $X \equiv \tau^*$, and $(C_1, C'_2) \in R_\varphi$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $C_1 \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_1^0$, such that $(C_1^0, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_1^0 \xrightarrow[u]{X} C'_1$ with $(C'_1, C'_2) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$;
3. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_1 \downarrow$, then there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $C_2 \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_2^0$ such that $(C_1, C_2^0) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2^0 \downarrow$;
4. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2 \downarrow$, then there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $C_1 \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_1^0$ such that $(C_1^0, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_1^0 \downarrow$.

We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are branching static location pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{bp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a branching static location pomset bisimulation R_φ , such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in R_\varphi$.

By replacing pomset transitions with steps, we can get the definition of branching static location step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are branching static location step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{bs}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.23 (Rooted branching static location pomset, step bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \surd represent a state with $\surd \downarrow$. Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A rooted branching static location pomset bisimulation is a relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$, such that:

1. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow[u]{X} C'_1$ then $C_2 \xrightarrow[v]{X} C'_2$ with $C'_1 \approx_{bp}^{sl} C'_2$;
2. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_2 \xrightarrow[v]{X} C'_2$ then $C_1 \xrightarrow[u]{X} C'_1$ with $C'_1 \approx_{bp}^{sl} C'_2$;
3. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_1 \downarrow$, then $C_2 \downarrow$;
4. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2 \downarrow$, then $C_1 \downarrow$.

We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are rooted branching static location pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{rbp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a rooted branching static location pomset bisimulation R_φ , such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in R_\varphi$.

By replacing pomset transitions with steps, we can get the definition of rooted branching static location step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are rooted branching static location step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{rbs}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.24 (Branching static location (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \surd represent a state with $\surd \downarrow$. A branching static location history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a posetal relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \overline{\times} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ such that:

1. if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} C'_1$ then
 - either $e_1 \equiv \tau$, and $(C'_1, f[e_1 \mapsto \tau], C_2) \in R_\varphi$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $C_2 \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_2^0$, such that $(C_1, f, C_2^0) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2^0 \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} C'_2$ with $(C'_1, f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], C'_2) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$;
2. if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_2 \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} C'_2$ then
 - either $X \equiv \tau$, and $(C_1, f[e_2 \mapsto \tau], C'_2) \in R_\varphi$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $C_1 \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_1^0$, such that $(C_1^0, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_1^0 \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} C'_1$ with $(C'_1, f[e_2 \mapsto e_1], C'_2) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$;
3. if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_1 \downarrow$, then there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $C_2 \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_2^0$ such that $(C_1, f, C_2^0) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2^0 \downarrow$;
4. if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2 \downarrow$, then there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $C_1 \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_1^0$ such that $(C_1^0, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_1^0 \downarrow$.

No.	Axiom
A1	$x + y = y + x$
A2	$(x + y) + z = x + (y + z)$
A3	$x + x = x$
A4	$(x + y) \cdot z = x \cdot z + y \cdot z$
A5	$(x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot (y \cdot z)$
L1	$\epsilon :: x = x$
L2	$u :: (x \cdot y) = u :: x \cdot u :: y$
L3	$u :: (x + y) = u :: x + u :: y$
L4	$u :: (v :: x) = uv :: x$

Table 1: Axioms of BATC with static localities

$\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are branching static location history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{bh}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a branching static location hp-bisimulation R_φ such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in R_\varphi$.

A branching static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimulation is a downward closed branching static location hhp-bisimulation. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are branching static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{bh}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.25 (Rooted branching static location (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \checkmark represent a state with $\checkmark \downarrow$. A rooted branching static location history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a posetal relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ such that:

1. if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} C'_1$, then $C_2 \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} C'_2$ with $C'_1 \approx_{bh}^{sl} C'_2$;
2. if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_2 \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} C'_2$, then $C_1 \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} C'_1$ with $C'_1 \approx_{bh}^{sl} C'_2$;
3. if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_1 \downarrow$, then $C_2 \downarrow$;
4. if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2 \downarrow$, then $C_1 \downarrow$.

$\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are rooted branching static location history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{rbh}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a rooted branching static location hp-bisimulation R_φ such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in R_\varphi$.

A rooted branching static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimulation is a downward closed rooted branching static location hp-bisimulation. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are rooted branching static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{rbh}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

2.3.2 BATC with Localities

Let Loc be the set of locations, and $loc \in Loc$, $u, v \in Loc^*$, ϵ is the empty location. A distribution allocates a location $u \in Loc^*$ to an action e denoted $u :: e$ or a process x denoted $u :: x$.

In the following, let $e_1, e_2, e'_1, e'_2 \in \mathbb{E}$, and let variables x, y, z range over the set of terms for true concurrency, p, q, s range over the set of closed terms. The set of axioms of BATC with static localities ($BATC^{sl}$) consists of the laws given in Table 1.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{e \xrightarrow[\epsilon]{e} \surd} \quad \frac{}{loc :: e \xrightarrow[loc]{e} \surd} \\
\\
\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} x'}{loc :: x \xrightarrow[loc \ll u]{e} loc :: x'} \\
\\
\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} \surd}{x + y \xrightarrow[u]{e} \surd} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} x'}{x + y \xrightarrow[u]{e} x'} \quad \frac{y \xrightarrow[u]{e} \surd}{x + y \xrightarrow[u]{e} \surd} \quad \frac{y \xrightarrow[u]{e} y'}{x + y \xrightarrow[u]{e} y'} \\
\\
\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} \surd}{x \cdot y \xrightarrow[u]{e} y} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} x'}{x \cdot y \xrightarrow[u]{e} x' \cdot y}
\end{array}$$

Table 2: Single event transition rules of BATC with static localities

Definition 2.26 (Basic terms of BATC with static localities). *The set of basic terms of BATC with static localities, $\mathcal{B}(BATC^{sl})$, is inductively defined as follows:*

1. $\mathbb{E} \subset \mathcal{B}(BATC^{sl})$;
2. if $u \in Loc^*$, $t \in \mathcal{B}(BATC^{sl})$ then $u :: t \in \mathcal{B}(BATC^{sl})$;
3. if $e \in \mathbb{E}$, $t \in \mathcal{B}(BATC^{sl})$ then $e \cdot t \in \mathcal{B}(BATC^{sl})$;
4. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(BATC^{sl})$ then $t + s \in \mathcal{B}(BATC^{sl})$.

Theorem 2.27 (Elimination theorem of BATC with static localities). *Let p be a closed BATC with static localities term. Then there is a basic BATC with static localities term q such that $BATC^{sl} \vdash p = q$.*

In this subsection, we will define a term-deduction system which gives the operational semantics of BATC with static localities. We give the operational transition rules for operators \cdot and $+$ as Table 2 shows. And the predicate $\xrightarrow[u]{e} \surd$ represents successful termination after execution of the event e at the location u .

Theorem 2.28 (Congruence of BATC with static localities with respect to static location pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Static location pomset bisimulation equivalence \sim_p^{sl} is a congruence with respect to BATC with static localities.*

Theorem 2.29 (Soundness of BATC with static localities modulo static location pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be BATC with static localities terms. If $BATC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_p^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.30 (Completeness of BATC with static localities modulo static location pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed BATC with static localities terms, if $p \sim_p^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.31 (Congruence of BATC with static localities with respect to static location step bisimulation equivalence). *Static location step bisimulation equivalence \sim_s^{sl} is a congruence with respect to BATC with static localities.*

Theorem 2.32 (Soundness of BATC with static localities modulo static location step bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be BATC with static localities terms. If $BATC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_s^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.33 (Completeness of BATC with static localities modulo static location step bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed BATC with static localities terms, if $p \sim_s^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.34 (Congruence of BATC with static localities with respect to static location hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Static location hp-bisimulation equivalence \sim_{hp}^{sl} is a congruence with respect to BATC with static localities.*

Theorem 2.35 (Soundness of BATC with static localities modulo static location hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be BATC with static localities terms. If $BATC \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{hp}^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.36 (Completeness of BATC with static localities modulo static location hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed BATC with static localities terms, if $p \sim_{hp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.37 (Congruence of BATC with static localities with respect to static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence \sim_{hhp}^{sl} is a congruence with respect to BATC with static localities.*

Theorem 2.38 (Soundness of BATC with static localities modulo static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be BATC with static localities terms. If $BATC \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{hhp}^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.39 (Completeness of BATC with static localities modulo static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed BATC with static localities terms, if $p \sim_{hhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

2.3.3 APTC with Localities

We give the transition rules of APTC with static localities as Table 3 shows.

In the following, we show that the elimination theorem does not hold for truly concurrent processes combined the operators \cdot , $+$ and $\llbracket _ \rrbracket$. Firstly, we define the basic terms for APTC with static localities.

Definition 2.40 (Basic terms of APTC with static localities). *The set of basic terms of APTC with static localities, $\mathcal{B}(APTC^{sl})$, is inductively defined as follows:*

$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} \checkmark}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} x'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y'}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} y'}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y'}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} x' \wp y'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad (e_1 \leq e_2)}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} \checkmark}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad (e_1 \leq e_2)}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} x'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y' \quad (e_1 \leq e_2)}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} y'}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y' \quad (e_1 \leq e_2)}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} x' \wp y'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{x \mid y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \checkmark}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{x \mid y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} x'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y'}{x \mid y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} y'}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y'}{x \mid y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} x' \wp y'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(x) \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(x) \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(x) \xrightarrow{e_1} \Theta(x')}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_2} x' \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(x) \xrightarrow{e_2} \Theta(x')}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad y \not\rightarrow^{e_2} \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{\tau} \checkmark}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \not\rightarrow^{e_2} \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{\tau} x'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad y \not\rightarrow^{e_3} \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3)}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \checkmark}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \not\rightarrow^{e_3} \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3)}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} x'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_3} \checkmark \quad y \not\rightarrow^{e_2} \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2), e_1 \leq e_3)}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{\tau} \checkmark}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_3} x' \quad y \not\rightarrow^{e_2} \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2), e_1 \leq e_3)}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{\tau} x'}$

Table 3: Transition rules of APTC with static localities

1. $\mathbb{E} \subset \mathcal{B}(APTC^{sl})$;
2. if $u \in Loc^*, t \in \mathcal{B}(APTC^{sl})$ then $u :: t \in \mathcal{B}(APTC^{sl})$;
3. if $e \in \mathbb{E}, t \in \mathcal{B}(APTC^{sl})$ then $e \cdot t \in \mathcal{B}(APTC^{sl})$;
4. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(APTC^{sl})$ then $t + s \in \mathcal{B}(APTC^{sl})$;
5. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(APTC^{sl})$ then $t \parallel s \in \mathcal{B}(APTC^{sl})$.

Theorem 2.41 (Congruence theorem of APTC with static localities). *Static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to APTC with static localities.*

So, we design the axioms of parallelism in Table 4, including algebraic laws for parallel operator \parallel , communication operator $|$, conflict elimination operator Θ and unless operator \triangleleft , and also the whole parallel operator \bowtie . Since the communication between two communicating events in different parallel branches may cause deadlock (a state of inactivity), which is caused by mismatch of two communicating events or the imperfectness of the communication channel. We introduce a new constant δ to denote the deadlock, and let the atomic event $e \in \mathbb{E} \cup \{\delta\}$.

Based on the definition of basic terms for APTC with static localities (see Definition 2.40) and axioms of parallelism (see Table 4), we can prove the elimination theorem of parallelism.

Theorem 2.42 (Elimination theorem of parallelism). *Let p be a closed APTC with static localities term. Then there is a basic APTC with static localities term q such that $APTC^{sl} \vdash p = q$.*

Theorem 2.43 (Generalization of APTC with static localities with respect to BATC with static localities). *APTC with static localities is a generalization of BATC with static localities.*

Theorem 2.44 (Soundness of APTC with static localities modulo static location pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be APTC with static localities terms. If $APTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_p^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.45 (Completeness of APTC with static localities modulo static location pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed APTC with static localities terms, if $p \sim_p^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.46 (Soundness of APTC with static localities modulo static location step bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be APTC with static localities terms. If $APTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_s^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.47 (Completeness of APTC with static localities modulo static location step bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed APTC with static localities terms, if $p \sim_s^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.48 (Soundness of APTC with static localities modulo static location hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be APTC with static localities terms. If $APTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{hp}^{sl} y$.*

No.	Axiom
A6	$x + \delta = x$
A7	$\delta \cdot x = \delta$
P1	$x \bowtie y = x \parallel y + x \mid y$
P2	$x \parallel y = y \parallel x$
P3	$(x \parallel y) \parallel z = x \parallel (y \parallel z)$
P4	$x \parallel y = x \ll y + y \ll x$
P5	$(e_1 \leq e_2) \quad e_1 \ll (e_2 \cdot y) = (e_1 \ll e_2) \cdot y$
P6	$(e_1 \leq e_2) \quad (e_1 \cdot x) \ll e_2 = (e_1 \ll e_2) \cdot x$
P7	$(e_1 \leq e_2) \quad (e_1 \cdot x) \ll (e_2 \cdot y) = (e_1 \ll e_2) \cdot (x \bowtie y)$
P8	$(x + y) \ll z = (x \ll z) + (y \ll z)$
P9	$\delta \ll x = \delta$
C1	$e_1 \mid e_2 = \gamma(e_1, e_2)$
C2	$e_1 \mid (e_2 \cdot y) = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot y$
C3	$(e_1 \cdot x) \mid e_2 = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot x$
C4	$(e_1 \cdot x) \mid (e_2 \cdot y) = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot (x \bowtie y)$
C5	$(x + y) \mid z = (x \mid z) + (y \mid z)$
C6	$x \mid (y + z) = (x \mid y) + (x \mid z)$
C7	$\delta \mid x = \delta$
C8	$x \mid \delta = \delta$
CE1	$\Theta(e) = e$
CE2	$\Theta(\delta) = \delta$
CE3	$\Theta(x + y) = \Theta(x) \triangleleft y + \Theta(y) \triangleleft x$
CE4	$\Theta(x \cdot y) = \Theta(x) \cdot \Theta(y)$
CE5	$\Theta(x \parallel y) = ((\Theta(x) \triangleleft y) \parallel y) + ((\Theta(y) \triangleleft x) \parallel x)$
CE6	$\Theta(x \mid y) = ((\Theta(x) \triangleleft y) \mid y) + ((\Theta(y) \triangleleft x) \mid x)$
U1	$(\#(e_1, e_2)) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_2 = \tau$
U2	$(\#(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_3 = e_1$
U3	$(\#(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3) \quad e_3 \triangleleft e_1 = \tau$
U4	$e \triangleleft \delta = e$
U5	$\delta \triangleleft e = \delta$
U6	$(x + y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) + (y \triangleleft z)$
U7	$(x \cdot y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \cdot (y \triangleleft z)$
U8	$(x \parallel y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \parallel (y \triangleleft z)$
U9	$(x \mid y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \mid (y \triangleleft z)$
U10	$x \triangleleft (y + z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
U11	$x \triangleleft (y \cdot z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
U12	$x \triangleleft (y \ll z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
U13	$x \triangleleft (y \mid z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
L5	$u :: (x \bowtie y) = u :: x \bowtie u :: y$
L6	$u :: (x \parallel y) = u :: x \parallel u :: y$
L7	$u :: (x \mid y) = u :: x \mid u :: y$
L8	$u :: (\Theta(x)) = \Theta(u :: x)$
L9	$u :: (x \triangleleft y) = u :: x \triangleleft u :: y$
L10	$u :: \delta = \delta$

Table 4: Axioms of parallelism

$$\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} \surd}{\partial_H(x) \xrightarrow[u]{e} \surd} \quad (e \notin H) \qquad \frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} x'}{\partial_H(x) \xrightarrow[u]{e} \partial_H(x')} \quad (e \notin H)$$

Table 5: Transition rules of encapsulation operator ∂_H

No.	Axiom
D1	$e \notin H \quad \partial_H(e) = e$
D2	$e \in H \quad \partial_H(e) = \delta$
D3	$\partial_H(\delta) = \delta$
D4	$\partial_H(x + y) = \partial_H(x) + \partial_H(y)$
D5	$\partial_H(x \cdot y) = \partial_H(x) \cdot \partial_H(y)$
D6	$\partial_H(x \parallel y) = \partial_H(x) \parallel \partial_H(y)$
L11	$u :: \partial_H(x) = \partial_H(u :: x)$

Table 6: Axioms of encapsulation operator

Theorem 2.49 (Completeness of APTC with static localities modulo static location hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed APTC with static localities terms, if $p \sim_{hp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.50 (Soundness of APTC with static localities modulo static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be APTC with static localities terms. If $APTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{hhp}^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.51 (Completeness of APTC with static localities modulo static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed APTC with static localities terms, if $p \sim_{hhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

The transition rules of encapsulation operator ∂_H are shown in Table 5.

Based on the transition rules for encapsulation operator ∂_H in Table 5, we design the axioms as Table 6 shows.

Theorem 2.52 (Congruence theorem of encapsulation operator ∂_H). *Static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to encapsulation operator ∂_H .*

Theorem 2.53 (Elimination theorem of APTC with static localities). *Let p be a closed APTC with static localities term including the encapsulation operator ∂_H . Then there is a basic APTC with static localities term q such that $APTC \vdash p = q$.*

Theorem 2.54 (Soundness of APTC with static localities modulo static location pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be APTC with static localities terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H . If $APTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_p^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.55 (Completeness of APTC with static localities modulo static location pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed APTC with static localities terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H , if $p \sim_p^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.56 (Soundness of APTC with static localities modulo static location step bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be APTC with static localities terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H . If $APTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_s^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.57 (Completeness of APTC with static localities modulo static location step bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed APTC with static localities terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H , if $p \sim_s^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.58 (Soundness of APTC with static localities modulo static location hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be APTC with static localities terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H . If $APTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{hp}^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.59 (Completeness of APTC with static localities modulo static location hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed APTC with static localities terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H , if $p \sim_{hp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.60 (Soundness of APTC with static localities modulo static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be APTC with static localities terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H . If $APTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{hhp}^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.61 (Completeness of APTC with static localities modulo static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed APTC with static localities terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H , if $p \sim_{hhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

2.3.4 Recursion

In this section, we introduce recursion to capture infinite processes based on APTC with static localities. Since in APTC with static localities, there are four basic operators $::$, \cdot , $+$ and \parallel , the recursion must be adapted this situation to include \parallel .

In the following, E, F, G are recursion specifications, X, Y, Z are recursive variables.

Definition 2.62 (Recursive specification). *A recursive specification is a finite set of recursive equations*

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= t_1(X_1, \dots, X_n) \\ &\dots \\ X_n &= t_n(X_1, \dots, X_n) \end{aligned}$$

where the left-hand sides of X_i are called recursion variables, and the right-hand sides $t_i(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ are process terms in APTC with static localities with possible occurrences of the recursion variables X_1, \dots, X_n .

Definition 2.63 (Solution). *Processes p_1, \dots, p_n are a solution for a recursive specification $\{X_i = t_i(X_1, \dots, X_n) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$ (with respect to static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences $\sim_s^{sl} (\sim_p^{sl}, \sim_{hp}^{sl}, \sim_{hhp}^{sl})$) if $p_i \sim_s^{sl} (\sim_p^{sl}, \sim_{hp}^{sl}, \sim_{hhp}^{sl}) t_i(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.*

$$\frac{t_i(\langle X_1|E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n|E \rangle) \xrightarrow[u]{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \surd}{\langle X_i|E \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \surd}$$

$$\frac{t_i(\langle X_1|E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n|E \rangle) \xrightarrow[u]{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} y}{\langle X_i|E \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} y}$$

Table 7: Transition rules of guarded recursion

Definition 2.64 (Guarded recursive specification). *A recursive specification*

$$\begin{aligned}
X_1 &= t_1(X_1, \dots, X_n) \\
&\dots \\
X_n &= t_n(X_1, \dots, X_n)
\end{aligned}$$

is guarded if the right-hand sides of its recursive equations can be adapted to the form by applications of the axioms in APTC with static localities and replacing recursion variables by the right-hand sides of their recursive equations,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(u_{11} :: a_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{1i_1} :: a_{1i_1}) \cdot s_1(X_1, \dots, X_n) + \dots + (u_{k1} :: a_{k1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{ki_k} :: a_{ki_k}) \cdot s_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) \\
&+ (v_{11} :: b_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{1j_1} :: b_{1j_1}) + \dots + (v_{l1} :: b_{l1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{lj_l} :: b_{lj_l})
\end{aligned}$$

where $a_{11}, \dots, a_{1i_1}, a_{k1}, \dots, a_{ki_k}, b_{11}, \dots, b_{1j_1}, b_{l1}, \dots, b_{lj_l} \in \mathbb{E}$, and the sum above is allowed to be empty, in which case it represents the deadlock δ .

Definition 2.65 (Linear recursive specification). *A recursive specification is linear if its recursive equations are of the form*

$$\begin{aligned}
&(u_{11} :: a_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{1i_1} :: a_{1i_1})X_1 + \dots + (u_{k1} :: a_{k1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{ki_k} :: a_{ki_k})X_k \\
&+ (v_{11} :: b_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{1j_1} :: b_{1j_1}) + \dots + (v_{l1} :: b_{l1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{lj_l} :: b_{lj_l})
\end{aligned}$$

where $a_{11}, \dots, a_{1i_1}, a_{k1}, \dots, a_{ki_k}, b_{11}, \dots, b_{1j_1}, b_{l1}, \dots, b_{lj_l} \in \mathbb{E}$, and the sum above is allowed to be empty, in which case it represents the deadlock δ .

For a guarded recursive specifications E with the form

$$\begin{aligned}
X_1 &= t_1(X_1, \dots, X_n) \\
&\dots \\
X_n &= t_n(X_1, \dots, X_n)
\end{aligned}$$

the behavior of the solution $\langle X_i|E \rangle$ for the recursion variable X_i in E , where $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, is exactly the behavior of their right-hand sides $t_i(X_1, \dots, X_n)$, which is captured by the two transition rules in Table 7.

No.	Axiom
<i>RDP</i>	$\langle X_i E \rangle = t_i(\langle X_1 E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n E \rangle) \quad (i \in \{1, \dots, n\})$
<i>RSP</i>	if $y_i = t_i(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then $y_i = \langle X_i E \rangle \quad (i \in \{1, \dots, n\})$

Table 8: Recursive definition and specification principle

Theorem 2.66 (Conservativity of APTC with static localities and guarded recursion). *APTC with static localities and guarded recursion is a conservative extension of APTC with static localities.*

Theorem 2.67 (Congruence theorem of APTC with static localities and guarded recursion). *Static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to APTC with static localities and guarded recursion.*

The *RDP* (Recursive Definition Principle) and the *RSP* (Recursive Specification Principle) are shown in Table 8.

Theorem 2.68 (Elimination theorem of APTC with static localities and linear recursion). *Each process term in APTC with static localities and linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with E a linear recursive specification.*

Theorem 2.69 (Soundness of APTC with static localities and guarded recursion). *Let x and y be APTC with static localities and guarded recursion terms. If APTC with guarded recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \sim_s^{sl} y$;
2. $x \sim_p^{sl} y$;
3. $x \sim_{hp}^{sl} y$;
4. $x \sim_{hhp}^{sl} y$.

Theorem 2.70 (Completeness of APTC with static localities and linear recursion). *Let p and q be closed APTC with static localities and linear recursion terms, then,*

1. if $p \sim_s^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;
2. if $p \sim_p^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;
3. if $p \sim_{hp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;
4. if $p \sim_{hhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.

$$\overline{\tau \xrightarrow{\tau} \surd}$$

Table 9: Transition rule of the silent step

2.3.5 Abstraction

To abstract away from the internal implementations of a program, and verify that the program exhibits the desired external behaviors, the silent step τ (and making τ distinct by τ^e) and abstraction operator τ_I are introduced, where $I \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ denotes the internal events. The silent step τ represents the internal events, when we consider the external behaviors of a process, τ events can be removed, that is, τ events must keep silent. The transition rule of τ is shown in Table 9. In the following, let the atomic event e range over $\mathbb{E} \cup \{\delta\} \cup \{\tau\}$, and let the communication function $\gamma : \mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\} \times \mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\} \rightarrow \mathbb{E} \cup \{\delta\}$, with each communication involved τ resulting into δ .

The silent step τ as an atomic event, is introduced into E . Considering the recursive specification $X = \tau X$, τs , $\tau \tau s$, and $\tau \dots s$ are all its solutions, that is, the solutions make the existence of τ -loops which cause unfairness. To prevent τ -loops, we extend the definition of linear recursive specification (Definition 5.13) to the guarded one.

Definition 2.71 (Guarded linear recursive specification). *A recursive specification is linear if its recursive equations are of the form*

$$(u_{11} :: a_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{1i_1} :: a_{1i_1})X_1 + \dots + (u_{k1} :: a_{k1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{ki_k} :: a_{ki_k})X_k \\ + (v_{11} :: b_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{1j_1} :: b_{1j_1}) + \dots + (v_{l1} :: b_{l1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{lj_l} :: b_{lj_l})$$

where $a_{11}, \dots, a_{1i_1}, a_{k1}, \dots, a_{ki_k}, b_{11}, \dots, b_{1j_1}, b_{l1}, \dots, b_{lj_l} \in \mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\}$, and the sum above is allowed to be empty, in which case it represents the deadlock δ .

A linear recursive specification E is guarded if there does not exist an infinite sequence of τ -transitions $\langle X|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle X'|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle X''|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \dots$.

Theorem 2.72 (Conservativity of APTC with static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *APTC with static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of APTC with static localities and linear recursion.*

Theorem 2.73 (Congruence theorem of APTC with static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Rooted branching static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbp}^{sl} , \approx_{rbs}^{sl} and \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to APTC with static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion.*

We design the axioms for the silent step τ in Table 10.

Theorem 2.74 (Elimination theorem of APTC with static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Each process term in APTC with static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1|E \rangle$ with E a guarded linear recursive specification.*

No.	Axiom
B1	$e \cdot \tau = e$
B2	$e \cdot (\tau \cdot (x + y) + x) = e \cdot (x + y)$
B3	$x \parallel \tau = x$
L13	$u :: \tau = \tau$

Table 10: Axioms of silent step

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} \surd}{\tau_I(x) \xrightarrow[u]{e} \surd} \quad e \notin I \qquad \frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} x'}{\tau_I(x) \xrightarrow[u]{e} \tau_I(x')} \quad e \notin I \\
\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} \surd}{\tau_I(x) \xrightarrow[\tau]{\tau} \surd} \quad e \in I \qquad \frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} x'}{\tau_I(x) \xrightarrow[\tau]{\tau} \tau_I(x')} \quad e \in I
\end{array}$$

Table 11: Transition rule of the abstraction operator

Theorem 2.75 (Soundness of APTC with static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Let x and y be APTC with static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion terms. If APTC with static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \approx_{rbs}^{sl} y$;
2. $x \approx_{rbp}^{sl} y$;
3. $x \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} y$;
4. $x \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} y$.

Theorem 2.76 (Completeness of APTC with static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Let p and q be closed APTC with static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion terms, then,*

1. *if $p \approx_{rbs}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
2. *if $p \approx_{rbp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
3. *if $p \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
4. *if $p \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

The unary abstraction operator τ_I ($I \subseteq \mathbb{E}$) renames all atomic events in I into τ . APTC with static localities and silent step and abstraction operator is called $APTC_\tau$ with static localities. The transition rules of operator τ_I are shown in Table 11.

Theorem 2.77 (Conservativity of $APTC_\tau$ with static localities and guarded linear recursion). *$APTC_\tau$ with static localities and guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of APTC with static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion.*

No.	Axiom
TI1	$e \notin I \quad \tau_I(e) = e$
TI2	$e \in I \quad \tau_I(e) = \tau$
TI3	$\tau_I(\delta) = \delta$
TI4	$\tau_I(x + y) = \tau_I(x) + \tau_I(y)$
TI5	$\tau_I(x \cdot y) = \tau_I(x) \cdot \tau_I(y)$
TI6	$\tau_I(x \parallel y) = \tau_I(x) \parallel \tau_I(y)$
L14	$u :: \tau_I(x) = \tau_I(u :: x)$
L15	$e \notin I \quad \tau_I(u :: e) = u :: e$
L16	$e \in I \quad \tau_I(u :: e) = \tau$

Table 12: Axioms of abstraction operator

Theorem 2.78 (Congruence theorem of $APTC_\tau$ with static localities and guarded linear recursion). *Routed branching static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbp}^{sl} , \approx_{rbs}^{sl} , \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to $APTC_\tau$ with static localities and guarded linear recursion.*

We design the axioms for the abstraction operator τ_I in Table 12.

Theorem 2.79 (Soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with static localities and guarded linear recursion). *Let x and y be $APTC_\tau$ with static localities and guarded linear recursion terms. If $APTC_\tau$ with static localities and guarded linear recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \approx_{rbs}^{sl} y$;
2. $x \approx_{rbp}^{sl} y$;
3. $x \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} y$;
4. $x \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} y$.

Though τ -loops are prohibited in guarded linear recursive specifications (see Definition 2.71) in a specifiable way, they can be constructed using the abstraction operator, for example, there exist τ -loops in the process term $\tau_{\{a\}}(\langle X | X = aX \rangle)$. To avoid τ -loops caused by τ_I and ensure fairness, the concept of cluster and *CFAR* (Cluster Fair Abstraction Rule) [4] are still valid in true concurrency, we introduce them below.

Definition 2.80 (Cluster). *Let E be a guarded linear recursive specification, and $I \subseteq \mathbb{E}$. Two recursion variable X and Y in E are in the same cluster for I iff there exist sequences of transitions $\langle X | E \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\{b_{11}, \dots, b_{1i}\}} \dots [u] \xrightarrow{\{b_{m1}, \dots, b_{mi}\}} \langle Y | E \rangle$ and $\langle Y | E \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{\{c_{11}, \dots, c_{1j}\}} \dots \xrightarrow[v]{\{c_{n1}, \dots, c_{nj}\}} \langle X | E \rangle$, where $b_{11}, \dots, b_{mi}, c_{11}, \dots, c_{nj} \in I \cup \{\tau\}$.*

$u_1 :: a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_k :: a_k$ or $(u_1 :: a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_k :: a_k)X$ is an exit for the cluster C iff: (1) $u_1 :: a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_k :: a_k$ or $(u_1 :: a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_k :: a_k)X$ is a summand at the right-hand side of the recursive equation for a recursion variable in C , and (2) in the case of $(u_1 :: a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_k :: a_k)X$, either $a_l \notin I \cup \{\tau\}$ ($l \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$) or $X \notin C$.

No.	Axiom
<i>CFAR</i>	If X is in a cluster for I with exits $\{(u_{11} :: a_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{1i} :: a_{1i})Y_1, \dots, (u_{m1} :: a_{m1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{mi} :: a_{mi})Y_m,$ $v_{11} :: b_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{1j} :: b_{1j}, \dots, v_{n1} :: b_{n1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{nj} :: b_{nj}\},$ then $\tau \cdot \tau_I(\langle X E \rangle) =$ $\tau \cdot \tau_I(\langle u_{11} :: a_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{1i} :: a_{1i} \rangle \langle Y_1 E \rangle + \dots + \langle u_{m1} :: a_{m1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{mi} :: a_{mi} \rangle \langle Y_m E \rangle$ $+ v_{11} :: b_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{1j} :: b_{1j} + \dots + v_{n1} :: b_{n1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{nj} :: b_{nj})$

Table 13: Cluster fair abstraction rule

Theorem 2.81 (Soundness of *CFAR*). *CFAR* is sound modulo rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbs}^{sl} , \approx_{rbp}^{sl} , \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} .

Theorem 2.82 (Completeness of *APTCT* _{τ} with static localities and guarded linear recursion and *CFAR*). Let p and q be closed *APTCT* _{τ} with static localities and guarded linear recursion and *CFAR* terms, then,

1. if $p \approx_{rbs}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;
2. if $p \approx_{rbp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;
3. if $p \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;
4. if $p \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.

2.4 APPTC with Localities

2.4.1 Operational Semantics

Let *Loc* be the set of locations, and $u, v \in Loc^*$. Let \ll be the sequential ordering on *Loc*^{*}, we call v is an extension or a sublocation of u in $u \ll v$; and if $u \not\ll v$ $v \not\ll u$, then u and v are independent and denoted $u \diamond v$.

Definition 2.83 (Probabilistic prime event structure with silent event). Let Λ be a fixed set of labels, ranged over a, b, c, \dots and τ . A (Λ -labelled) prime event structure with silent event τ is a quintuple $\mathcal{E} = \langle \mathbb{E}, \leq, \#, \#_\pi, \lambda \rangle$, where \mathbb{E} is a denumerable set of events, including the silent event τ . Let $\hat{\mathbb{E}} = \mathbb{E} \setminus \{\tau\}$, exactly excluding τ , it is obvious that $\hat{\tau}^* = \epsilon$, where ϵ is the empty event. Let $\lambda: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \Lambda$ be a labelling function and let $\lambda(\tau) = \tau$. And $\leq, \#, \#_\pi$ are binary relations on \mathbb{E} , called causality, conflict and probabilistic conflict respectively, such that:

1. \leq is a partial order and $[e] = \{e' \in \mathbb{E} | e' \leq e\}$ is finite for all $e \in \mathbb{E}$. It is easy to see that $e \leq \tau^* \leq e' = e \leq \tau \leq \dots \leq \tau \leq e'$, then $e \leq e'$.
2. $\#$ is irreflexive, symmetric and hereditary with respect to \leq , that is, for all $e, e', e'' \in \mathbb{E}$, if $e \# e' \leq e''$, then $e \# e''$;
3. $\#_\pi$ is irreflexive, symmetric and hereditary with respect to \leq , that is, for all $e, e', e'' \in \mathbb{E}$, if $e \#_\pi e' \leq e''$, then $e \#_\pi e''$.

Then, the concepts of consistency and concurrency can be drawn from the above definition:

1. $e, e' \in \mathbb{E}$ are consistent, denoted as $e \sim e'$, if $\neg(e \# e')$ and $\neg(e \#_{\pi} e')$. A subset $X \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ is called consistent, if $e \sim e'$ for all $e, e' \in X$.
2. $e, e' \in \mathbb{E}$ are concurrent, denoted as $e \parallel e'$, if $\neg(e \leq e')$, $\neg(e' \leq e)$, and $\neg(e \# e')$ and $\neg(e \#_{\pi} e')$.

Definition 2.84 (Configuration). Let \mathcal{E} be a PES. A (finite) configuration in \mathcal{E} is a (finite) consistent subset of events $C \subseteq \mathcal{E}$, closed with respect to causality (i.e. $[C] = C$). The set of finite configurations of \mathcal{E} is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$. We let $\hat{C} = C \setminus \{\tau\}$.

A consistent subset of $X \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ of events can be seen as a pomset. Given $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{E}$, $\hat{X} \sim \hat{Y}$ if \hat{X} and \hat{Y} are isomorphic as pomsets. In the following of the paper, we say $C_1 \sim C_2$, we mean $\hat{C}_1 \sim \hat{C}_2$.

Definition 2.85 (Pomset transitions and step). Let \mathcal{E} be a PES and let $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$, and $\emptyset \neq X \subseteq \mathbb{E}$, if $C \cap X = \emptyset$ and $C' = C \cup X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$, then $C \xrightarrow[u]{X} C'$ is called a pomset transition from C to C' .

When the events in X are pairwise concurrent, we say that $C \xrightarrow[u]{X} C'$ is a step.

Definition 2.86 (Probabilistic transitions). Let \mathcal{E} be a PES and let $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$, the transition $C \xrightarrow{\pi} C^{\pi}$ is called a probabilistic transition from C to C^{π} .

Definition 2.87 (Weak pomset transitions and weak step). Let \mathcal{E} be a PES and let $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$, and $\emptyset \neq X \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}$, if $C \cap X = \emptyset$ and $\hat{C}' = \hat{C} \cup X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$, then $C \xrightarrow[u]{X} C'$ is called a weak pomset transition from C to C' , where we define $\xrightarrow[u']{e} \triangleq \xrightarrow[u']{e} \xrightarrow{\tau^*}$. And $\xrightarrow[u]{X} \triangleq \xrightarrow[u']{e} \xrightarrow{\tau^*}$, for every $e \in X$.

When the events in X are pairwise concurrent, we say that $C \xrightarrow[u]{X} C'$ is a weak step.

Definition 2.88 (Consistent location association). A relation $\varphi \subseteq (Loc^* \times Loc^*)$ is a consistent location association (cla), if $(u, v) \in \varphi \& (u', v') \in \varphi$, then $u \diamond u' \Leftrightarrow v \diamond v'$.

Definition 2.89 (Probabilistic static location pomset, step bisimulation). Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation is a relation $R_{\varphi} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$, such that (1) if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_{\varphi}$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow[u]{X_1} C'_1$ then $C_2 \xrightarrow[v]{X_2} C'_2$, with $X_1 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_1, X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_2, X_1 \sim X_2$ and $(C'_1, C'_2) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$, and vice-versa; (2) if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_{\varphi}$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow{\pi} C_1^{\pi}$ then $C_2 \xrightarrow{\pi} C_2^{\pi}$ and $(C_1^{\pi}, C_2^{\pi}) \in R_{\varphi}$, and vice-versa; (3) if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_{\varphi}$, then $\mu(C_1, C) = \mu(C_2, C)$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})/R_{\varphi}$; (4) $[\sqrt{\cdot}]_{R_{\varphi}} = \{\sqrt{\cdot}\}$. We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are probabilistic static location pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_{pp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation R_{φ} , such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in R_{\varphi}$. By replacing pomset transitions with steps, we can get the definition of probabilistic static location step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are probabilistic static location step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_{ps}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.90 (Probabilistic static location (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). A probabilistic static location history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a posetal relation $R_{\varphi} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \overline{\times} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ such that (1) if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_{\varphi}$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} C'_1$, then $C_2 \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} C'_2$, with $(C'_1, f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], C'_2) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$, and vice-versa; (2) if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_{\varphi}$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow{\pi} C_1^{\pi}$ then $C_2 \xrightarrow{\pi} C_2^{\pi}$ and $(C_1^{\pi}, f, C_2^{\pi}) \in R_{\varphi}$, and vice-versa; (3) if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_{\varphi}$, then $\mu(C_1, C) = \mu(C_2, C)$ for each

$C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})/R_\varphi$; (4) $[\sqrt{\cdot}]_{R_\varphi} = \{\sqrt{\cdot}\}$. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are probabilistic static location history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_{p\text{hp}}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation R_φ such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in R_\varphi$.

A probabilistic static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimulation is a downward closed probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are probabilistic static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_{p\text{hhp}}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.91 (Weak probabilistic static location pomset, step bisimulation). Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A weak probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation is a relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$, such that (1) if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow[u]{X_1} C'_1$ then $C_2 \xrightarrow[v]{X_2} C'_2$, with $X_1 \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1, X_2 \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2, X_1 \sim X_2$ and $(C'_1, C'_2) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$, and vice-versa; (2) if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow{\pi} C_1^\pi$ then $C_2 \xrightarrow{\pi} C_2^\pi$ and $(C_1^\pi, C_2^\pi) \in R_\varphi$, and vice-versa; (3) if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, then $\mu(C_1, C) = \mu(C_2, C)$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})/R_\varphi$; (4) $[\sqrt{\cdot}]_{R_\varphi} = \{\sqrt{\cdot}\}$. We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are weak probabilistic static location pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{pp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a weak probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation R_φ , such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in R_\varphi$. By replacing weak pomset transitions with weak steps, we can get the definition of weak probabilistic static location step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are weak probabilistic static location step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{ps}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.92 (Weak probabilistic static location (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). A weak probabilistic static location history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a weakly posetal relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \overline{\times} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ such that (1) if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} C'_1$, then $C_2 \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} C'_2$, with $(C'_1, f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], C'_2) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$, and vice-versa; (2) if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow{\pi} C_1^\pi$ then $C_2 \xrightarrow{\pi} C_2^\pi$ and $(C_1^\pi, f, C_2^\pi) \in R_\varphi$, and vice-versa; (3) if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, then $\mu(C_1, C) = \mu(C_2, C)$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})/R_\varphi$; (4) $[\sqrt{\cdot}]_{R_\varphi} = \{\sqrt{\cdot}\}$. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are weak probabilistic static location history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{p\text{hp}}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a weak probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation R_φ such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in R_\varphi$.

A weak probabilistic static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimulation is a downward closed weak probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are weak probabilistic static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{p\text{hhp}}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.93 (Branching probabilistic static location pomset, step bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let $\sqrt{\cdot}$ represent a state with $\sqrt{\cdot} \downarrow$. Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A branching probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation is a relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$, such that:

1. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow[u]{X} C'_1$ then
 - either $X \equiv \tau^*$, and $(C'_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) probabilistic transitions and τ -transitions $C_2 \rightsquigarrow^* \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_2^0$, such that $(C_1, C_2^0) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2^0 \xrightarrow[v]{X} C'_2$ with $(C'_1, C'_2) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$;
2. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_2 \xrightarrow[v]{X} C'_2$ then
 - either $X \equiv \tau^*$, and $(C_1, C'_2) \in R_\varphi$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) probabilistic transitions and τ -transitions $C_2 \rightsquigarrow^* \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_2^0$, such that $(C_2^0, C_1) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2^0 \xrightarrow[u]{X} C'_2$ with $(C_1, C'_2) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$;

3. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_1 \downarrow$, then there is a sequence of (zero or more) probabilistic transitions and τ -transitions $C_2 \rightsquigarrow^* \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_2^0$ such that $(C_1, C_2^0) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2^0 \downarrow$;
4. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2 \downarrow$, then there is a sequence of (zero or more) probabilistic transitions and τ -transitions $C_2 \rightsquigarrow^* \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_1^0$ such that $(C_1^0, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_1^0 \downarrow$;
5. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, then $\mu(C_1, C) = \mu(C_2, C)$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})/R_\varphi$;
6. $[\surd]_{R_\varphi} = \{\surd\}$.

We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are branching probabilistic static location pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{pbp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a branching probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation R_φ , such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in R_\varphi$.

By replacing pomset transitions with steps, we can get the definition of branching probabilistic static location step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are branching probabilistic static location step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{pbs}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.94 (Rooted branching probabilistic static location pomset, step bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \surd represent a state with $\surd \downarrow$. Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A rooted branching probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation is a relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$, such that:

1. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_1 \rightsquigarrow C_1^\pi \xrightarrow[u]{X} C_1'$ then $C_2 \rightsquigarrow C_2^\pi \xrightarrow[v]{X} C_2'$ with $C_1' \approx_{pbp}^{sl} C_2'$;
2. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_2 \rightsquigarrow C_2^\pi \xrightarrow[v]{X} C_2'$ then $C_1 \rightsquigarrow C_1^\pi \xrightarrow[u]{X} C_1'$ with $C_1' \approx_{pbp}^{sl} C_2'$;
3. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_1 \downarrow$, then $C_2 \downarrow$;
4. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2 \downarrow$, then $C_1 \downarrow$.

We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are rooted branching probabilistic static location pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{prbp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a rooted branching probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation R_φ , such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in R_\varphi$.

By replacing pomset transitions with steps, we can get the definition of rooted branching probabilistic static location step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are rooted branching probabilistic static location step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{prbs}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.95 (Branching probabilistic static location (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \surd represent a state with $\surd \downarrow$. A branching probabilistic static location history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a posetal relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \overline{\times} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ such that:

1. if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} C_1'$ then
 - either $e_1 \equiv \tau$, and $(C_1', f[e_1 \mapsto \tau], C_2) \in R_\varphi$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) (zero or more) probabilistic transitions and τ -transitions $C_2 \rightsquigarrow^* \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_2^0$, such that $(C_1, f, C_2^0) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2^0 \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} C_2'$ with $(C_1', f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], C_2') \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$;

2. if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_2 \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} C'_2$ then
 - either $X \equiv \tau$, and $(C_1, f[e_2 \mapsto \tau], C'_2) \in R_\varphi$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) probabilistic transitions and τ -transitions $C_1 \rightsquigarrow^* \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_1^0$, such that $(C_1^0, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_1^0 \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} C'_1$ with $(C'_1, f[e_2 \mapsto e_1], C'_2) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$;
3. if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_1 \downarrow$, then there is a sequence of (zero or more) probabilistic transitions and τ -transitions $C_2 \rightsquigarrow^* \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_2^0$ such that $(C_1, f, C_2^0) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2^0 \downarrow$;
4. if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2 \downarrow$, then there is a sequence of (zero or more) probabilistic transitions and τ -transitions $C_1 \rightsquigarrow^* \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_1^0$ such that $(C_1^0, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_1^0 \downarrow$;
5. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, then $\mu(C_1, C) = \mu(C_2, C)$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})/R_\varphi$;
6. $[\checkmark]_{R_\varphi} = \{\checkmark\}$.

$\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are branching probabilistic static location history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{pbhp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a branching probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation R_φ such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in R_\varphi$.

A branching probabilistic static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimulation is a downward closed branching probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are branching probabilistic static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{pbhhp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.96 (Rooted branching probabilistic static location (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \checkmark represent a state with $\checkmark \downarrow$. A rooted branching probabilistic static location history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a posetal relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \overline{\times} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ such that:

1. if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_1 \rightsquigarrow C_1^\pi \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} C'_1$, then $C_2 \rightsquigarrow C_2^\pi \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} C'_2$ with $C_1^\pi \approx_{pbhp}^{sl} C'_1$;
2. if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, and $C_2 \rightsquigarrow C_2^\pi \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} C'_2$, then $C_1 \rightsquigarrow C_1^\pi \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} C'_1$ with $C_1^\pi \approx_{pbhp}^{sl} C'_1$;
3. if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_1 \downarrow$, then $C_2 \downarrow$;
4. if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$ and $C_2 \downarrow$, then $C_1 \downarrow$.

$\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are rooted branching probabilistic static location history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a rooted branching probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation R_φ such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in R_\varphi$.

A rooted branching probabilistic static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimulation is a downward closed rooted branching probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are rooted branching probabilistic static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

No.	Axiom
A1	$x + y = y + x$
A2	$(x + y) + z = x + (y + z)$
A3	$x + x = x$
A4	$(x + y) \cdot z = x \cdot z + y \cdot z$
A5	$(x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot (y \cdot z)$
L1	$\epsilon :: x = x$
L2	$u :: (x \cdot y) = u :: x \cdot u :: y$
L3	$u :: (x + y) = u :: x + u :: y$
L4	$u :: (v :: x) = uv :: x$
PA1	$x \boxplus_{\pi} y = y \boxplus_{1-\pi} x$
PA2	$x \boxplus_{\pi} (y \boxplus_{\rho} z) = (x \boxplus_{\frac{\pi}{\pi+\rho-\pi\rho}} y) \boxplus_{\pi+\rho-\pi\rho} z$
PA3	$x \boxplus_{\pi} x = x$
PA4	$(x \boxplus_{\pi} y) \cdot z = x \cdot z \boxplus_{\pi} y \cdot z$
PA5	$(x \boxplus_{\pi} y) + z = (x + z) \boxplus_{\pi} (y + z)$

Table 14: Axioms of BATC with probabilistic static localities

2.4.2 BAPTC with Localities

Let Loc be the set of locations, and $loc \in Loc$, $u, v \in Loc^*$, ϵ is the empty location.

In the following, let $e_1, e_2, e'_1, e'_2 \in \mathbb{E}$, and let variables x, y, z range over the set of terms for true concurrency, p, q, s range over the set of closed terms. The set of axioms of BATC with probabilistic static localities ($BAPTC^{sl}$) consists of the laws given in Table 14.

Definition 2.97 (Basic terms of BATC with probabilistic static localities). *The set of basic terms of BATC with probabilistic static localities, $\mathcal{B}(BAPTC^{sl})$, is inductively defined as follows:*

1. $\mathbb{E} \subset \mathcal{B}(BAPTC^{sl})$;
2. if $u \in Loc^*, t \in \mathcal{B}(BAPTC^{sl})$ then $u :: t \in \mathcal{B}(BAPTC^{sl})$;
3. if $e \in \mathbb{E}, t \in \mathcal{B}(BAPTC^{sl})$ then $e \cdot t \in \mathcal{B}(BAPTC^{sl})$;
4. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(BAPTC^{sl})$ then $t + s \in \mathcal{B}(BAPTC^{sl})$;
5. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(BAPTC)$ then $t \boxplus_{\pi} s \in \mathcal{B}(BAPTC)$.

Theorem 2.98 (Elimination theorem of BATC with probabilistic static localities). *Let p be a closed BATC with probabilistic static localities term. Then there is a basic BATC with probabilistic static localities term q such that $BAPTC^{sl} \vdash p = q$.*

In this subsection, we will define a term-deduction system which gives the operational semantics of BATC with probabilistic static localities. We give the operational transition rules for operators \cdot and $+$ as Table 16 shows. And the predicate $\xrightarrow[u]{e} \checkmark$ represents successful termination after execution of the event e at the location u . Like the way in [13], we also introduce the counterpart \check{e} of the event e , and also the set $\check{\mathbb{E}} = \{\check{e} | e \in \mathbb{E}\}$.

Firstly, we give the definition of PDFs in Table 15.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(e, \check{e}) &= 1 \\
\mu(x \cdot y, x' \cdot y) &= \mu(x, x') \\
\mu(x + y, x' + y') &= \mu(x, x') \cdot \mu(y, y') \\
\mu(x \boxplus_{\pi} y, z) &= \pi \mu(x, z) + (1 - \pi) \mu(y, z) \\
\mu(x, y) &= 0, \text{ otherwise}
\end{aligned}$$

Table 15: PDF definitions of *BAPTC*

Theorem 2.99 (Congruence of BATC with probabilistic static localities with respect to probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation equivalence \sim_{pp}^{sl} is a congruence with respect to BATC with probabilistic static localities.*

Theorem 2.100 (Soundness of BATC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be BATC with probabilistic static localities terms. If $BAPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{pp}^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.101 (Completeness of BATC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed BATC with probabilistic static localities terms, if $p \sim_{pp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.102 (Congruence of BATC with probabilistic static localities with respect to probabilistic static location step bisimulation equivalence). *Probabilistic static location step bisimulation equivalence \sim_{ps}^{sl} is a congruence with respect to BATC with probabilistic static localities.*

Theorem 2.103 (Soundness of BATC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location step bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be BATC with probabilistic static localities terms. If $BAPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{ps}^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.104 (Completeness of BATC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location step bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed BATC with probabilistic static localities terms, if $p \sim_{ps}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.105 (Congruence of BATC with probabilistic static localities with respect to probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation equivalence \sim_{php}^{sl} is a congruence with respect to BATC with probabilistic static localities.*

Theorem 2.106 (Soundness of BATC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be BATC with probabilistic static localities terms. If $BATC \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{php}^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.107 (Completeness of BATC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed BATC with probabilistic static localities terms, if $p \sim_{php}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

$$\begin{array}{c}
\overline{e \rightsquigarrow \check{e}} \\
\overline{x \rightsquigarrow x'} \\
\overline{x \cdot y \rightsquigarrow x' \cdot y} \\
\overline{x \rightsquigarrow x' \quad y \rightsquigarrow y'} \\
\overline{x + y \rightsquigarrow x' + y'} \\
\frac{x \rightsquigarrow x'}{x \boxplus_{\pi} y \rightsquigarrow x'} \quad \frac{y \rightsquigarrow y'}{x \boxplus_{\pi} y \rightsquigarrow y'} \\
\overline{\check{e} \xrightarrow[\epsilon]{e} \checkmark} \quad \overline{loc :: \check{e} \xrightarrow[loc]{e} \checkmark} \\
\overline{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} x'} \\
\overline{loc :: x \xrightarrow[loc \ll u]{e} loc :: x'} \\
\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} \checkmark}{x + y \xrightarrow[u]{e} \checkmark} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} x'}{x + y \xrightarrow[u]{e} x'} \quad \frac{y \xrightarrow[u]{e} \checkmark}{x + y \xrightarrow[u]{e} \checkmark} \quad \frac{y \xrightarrow[u]{e} y'}{x + y \xrightarrow[u]{e} y'} \\
\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} \checkmark}{x \cdot y \xrightarrow[u]{e} y} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} x'}{x \cdot y \xrightarrow[u]{e} x' \cdot y}
\end{array}$$

Table 16: Single event transition rules of BATC with probabilistic static localities

Theorem 2.108 (Congruence of BATC with probabilistic static localities with respect to probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence \sim_{phhp}^{sl} is a congruence with respect to BATC with probabilistic static localities.*

Theorem 2.109 (Soundness of BATC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be BATC with probabilistic static localities terms. If $BATC \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{phhp}^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.110 (Completeness of BATC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed BATC with probabilistic static localities terms, if $p \sim_{phhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

2.4.3 APPTC with Localities

Firstly, we give the definition of PDFs in Table 17.

We give the transition rules of APTC with probabilistic static localities as Table 18 and 19 shows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(\delta, \check{\delta}) &= 1 \\
\mu(x \bowtie y, x' \parallel y' + x' \mid y') &= \mu(x, x') \cdot \mu(y, y') \\
\mu(x \parallel y, x' \parallel y + y' \parallel x) &= \mu(x, x') \cdot \mu(y, y') \\
\mu(x \parallel y, x' \parallel y) &= \mu(x, x') \\
\mu(x \mid y, x' \mid y') &= \mu(x, x') \cdot \mu(y, y') \\
\mu(\Theta(x), \Theta(x')) &= \mu(x, x') \\
\mu(x \triangleleft y, x' \triangleleft y) &= \mu(x, x') \\
\mu(x, y) &= 0, \text{ otherwise}
\end{aligned}$$

Table 17: PDF definitions of *APPTC*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{x \rightsquigarrow x' \quad y \rightsquigarrow y'}{x \bowtie y \rightsquigarrow x' \parallel y' + x' \mid y'} \\
&\frac{x \rightsquigarrow x' \quad y \rightsquigarrow y'}{x \parallel y \rightsquigarrow x' \parallel y + y' \parallel x} \\
&\frac{x \rightsquigarrow x'}{x \parallel y \rightsquigarrow x' \parallel y} \\
&\frac{x \rightsquigarrow x' \quad y \rightsquigarrow y'}{x \mid y \rightsquigarrow x' \mid y'} \\
&\frac{x \rightsquigarrow x'}{\Theta(x) \rightsquigarrow \Theta(x')} \\
&\frac{x \rightsquigarrow x'}{x \triangleleft y \rightsquigarrow x' \triangleleft y}
\end{aligned}$$

Table 18: Probabilistic transition rules of *APTTC* with probabilistic static localities

$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} \surd}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} x'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y'}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} y'}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y'}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} x' \wp y'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_1 \leq e_2)}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} \surd}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_1 \leq e_2)}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} x'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y' \quad (e_1 \leq e_2)}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} y'}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y' \quad (e_1 \leq e_2)}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} x' \wp y'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{x \mid y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \surd}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{x \mid y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} x'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y'}{x \mid y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} y'}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y'}{x \mid y \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} x' \wp y'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(x) \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(x) \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(x) \xrightarrow{e_1} \Theta(x')}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_2} x' \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(x) \xrightarrow{e_2} \Theta(x')}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad (\sharp_\pi(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(x) \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (\sharp_\pi(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(x) \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad (\sharp_\pi(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(x) \xrightarrow{e_1} \Theta(x')}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_2} x' \quad (\sharp_\pi(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(x) \xrightarrow{e_2} \Theta(x')}$

Table 19: Action transition rules of APTC with probabilistic static localities

$\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \checkmark \quad y \rightarrow^{e_2} (\#(e_1, e_2))}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{\tau} \checkmark}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} x' \quad y \rightarrow^{e_2} (\#(e_1, e_2))}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{\tau} x'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \checkmark \quad y \rightarrow^{e_3} (\#(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3)}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \checkmark}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} x' \quad y \rightarrow^{e_3} (\#(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3)}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} x'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e_3} \checkmark \quad y \rightarrow^{e_2} (\#(e_1, e_2), e_1 \leq e_3)}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{\tau} \checkmark}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e_3} x' \quad y \rightarrow^{e_2} (\#(e_1, e_2), e_1 \leq e_3)}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{\tau} x'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \checkmark \quad y \rightarrow^{e_2} (\#\pi(e_1, e_2))}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{\tau} \checkmark}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} x' \quad y \rightarrow^{e_2} (\#\pi(e_1, e_2))}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{\tau} x'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \checkmark \quad y \rightarrow^{e_3} (\#\pi(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3)}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \checkmark}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} x' \quad y \rightarrow^{e_3} (\#\pi(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3)}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} x'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e_3} \checkmark \quad y \rightarrow^{e_2} (\#\pi(e_1, e_2), e_1 \leq e_3)}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{\tau} \checkmark}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e_3} x' \quad y \rightarrow^{e_2} (\#\pi(e_1, e_2), e_1 \leq e_3)}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow[u]{\tau} x'}$

Table 20: Action transition rules of APTC with probabilistic static localities (continuing)

In the following, we show that the elimination theorem does not hold for truly concurrent processes combined the operators \cdot , $+$, \boxplus_π and \parallel . Firstly, we define the basic terms for APTC with probabilistic static localities.

Definition 2.111 (Basic terms of APTC with probabilistic static localities). *The set of basic terms of APTC with probabilistic static localities, $\mathcal{B}(APPTC^{sl})$, is inductively defined as follows:*

1. $\mathbb{E} \subset \mathcal{B}(APPTC^{sl})$;
2. if $u \in Loc^*$, $t \in \mathcal{B}(APPTC^{sl})$ then $u :: t \in \mathcal{B}(APPTC^{sl})$;
3. if $e \in \mathbb{E}$, $t \in \mathcal{B}(APPTC^{sl})$ then $e \cdot t \in \mathcal{B}(APPTC^{sl})$;
4. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(APPTC^{sl})$ then $t + s \in \mathcal{B}(APPTC^{sl})$;
5. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(APPTC^{sl})$ then $t \boxplus_\pi s \in \mathcal{B}(APPTC^{sl})$;
6. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(APPTC^{sl})$ then $t \parallel s \in \mathcal{B}(APPTC^{sl})$.

Theorem 2.112 (Congruence theorem of APTC with probabilistic static localities). *Probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_{pp}^{sl} , \sim_{ps}^{sl} , \sim_{php}^{sl} and \sim_{phpp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to APTC with probabilistic static localities.*

Theorem 2.113 (Elimination theorem of parallelism). *Let p be a closed APTC with probabilistic static localities term. Then there is a basic APTC with probabilistic static localities term q such that $APPTC^{sl} \vdash p = q$.*

Theorem 2.114 (Generalization of APTC with probabilistic static localities with respect to BATC with probabilistic static localities). *APTC with probabilistic static localities is a generalization of BATC with probabilistic static localities.*

Theorem 2.115 (Soundness of APTC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be APTC with probabilistic static localities terms. If $APPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{pp}^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.116 (Completeness of APTC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed APTC with probabilistic static localities terms, if $p \sim_{pp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.117 (Soundness of APTC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location step bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be APTC with probabilistic static localities terms. If $APPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{ps}^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.118 (Completeness of APTC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location step bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed APTC with probabilistic static localities terms, if $p \sim_{ps}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.119 (Soundness of APTC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be APTC with probabilistic static localities terms. If $APPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{php}^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.120 (Completeness of APTC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed APTC with probabilistic static localities terms, if $p \sim_{php}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.121 (Soundness of APTC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be APTC with probabilistic static localities terms. If $APPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{phhp}^{sl} y$.*

Theorem 2.122 (Completeness of APTC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed APTC with probabilistic static localities terms, if $p \sim_{phhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

The transition rules of encapsulation operator ∂_H are shown in Table 21.

Based on the transition rules for encapsulation operator ∂_H in Table 21, we design the axioms as Table 22 shows.

Theorem 2.123 (Congruence theorem of encapsulation operator ∂_H). *Probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_{pp}^{sl} , \sim_{ps}^{sl} , \sim_{php}^{sl} and \sim_{phhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to encapsulation operator ∂_H .*

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{x \rightsquigarrow x'}{\partial_H(x) \rightsquigarrow \partial_H(x')} \\
\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} \surd}{\partial_H(x) \xrightarrow[u]{e} \surd} \quad (e \notin H) \qquad \frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} x'}{\partial_H(x) \xrightarrow[u]{e} \partial_H(x')} \quad (e \notin H)
\end{array}$$

Table 21: Transition rules of encapsulation operator ∂_H

No.	Axiom
D1	$e \notin H \quad \partial_H(e) = e$
D2	$e \in H \quad \partial_H(e) = \delta$
D3	$\partial_H(\delta) = \delta$
D4	$\partial_H(x + y) = \partial_H(x) + \partial_H(y)$
D5	$\partial_H(x \cdot y) = \partial_H(x) \cdot \partial_H(y)$
D6	$\partial_H(x \parallel y) = \partial_H(x) \parallel \partial_H(y)$
L11	$u :: \partial_H(x) = \partial_H(u :: x)$
PD1	$\partial_H(x \boxplus_\pi y) = \partial_H(x) \boxplus_\pi \partial_H(y)$

Table 22: Axioms of encapsulation operator

Theorem 2.124 (Elimination theorem of APTC with probabilistic static localities). *Let p be a closed APTC with probabilistic static localities term including the encapsulation operator ∂_H . Then there is a basic APTC with probabilistic static localities term q such that $\text{APTC} \vdash p = q$.*

Theorem 2.125 (Soundness of APTC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be APTC with probabilistic static localities terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H . If $\text{APPTC}^{\text{sl}} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{pp}^{\text{sl}} y$.*

Theorem 2.126 (Completeness of APTC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed APTC with probabilistic static localities terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H , if $p \sim_{pp}^{\text{sl}} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.127 (Soundness of APTC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location step bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be APTC with probabilistic static localities terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H . If $\text{APPTC}^{\text{sl}} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{ps}^{\text{sl}} y$.*

Theorem 2.128 (Completeness of APTC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location step bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed APTC with probabilistic static localities terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H , if $p \sim_{ps}^{\text{sl}} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.129 (Soundness of APTC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be APTC with probabilistic static localities terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H . If $\text{APPTC}^{\text{sl}} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{php}^{\text{sl}} y$.*

Theorem 2.130 (Completeness of APTC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed APTC with probabilistic static localities terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H , if $p \sim_{php}^{\text{sl}} q$ then $p = q$.*

Theorem 2.131 (Soundness of APTC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be APTC with probabilistic static localities terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H . If $\text{APPTC}^{\text{sl}} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{phhp}^{\text{sl}} y$.*

Theorem 2.132 (Completeness of APTC with probabilistic static localities modulo probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed APTC with probabilistic static localities terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H , if $p \sim_{phhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

2.4.4 Recursion

In the following, E, F, G are recursion specifications, X, Y, Z are recursive variables.

Definition 2.133 (Recursive specification). *A recursive specification is a finite set of recursive equations*

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= t_1(X_1, \dots, X_n) \\ &\dots \\ X_n &= t_n(X_1, \dots, X_n) \end{aligned}$$

where the left-hand sides of X_i are called recursion variables, and the right-hand sides $t_i(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ are process terms in APTC with probabilistic static localities with possible occurrences of the recursion variables X_1, \dots, X_n .

Definition 2.134 (Solution). *Processes p_1, \dots, p_n are a solution for a recursive specification $\{X_i = t_i(X_1, \dots, X_n) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$ (with respect to probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences $\sim_{ps}^{sl} (\sim_{pp}^{sl}, \sim_{php}^{sl}, \sim_{phhp}^{sl})$) if $p_i \sim_{ps}^{sl} (\sim_{pp}^{sl}, \sim_{php}^{sl}, \sim_{phhp}^{sl}) t_i(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.*

Definition 2.135 (Guarded recursive specification). *A recursive specification*

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= t_1(X_1, \dots, X_n) \\ &\dots \\ X_n &= t_n(X_1, \dots, X_n) \end{aligned}$$

is guarded if the right-hand sides of its recursive equations can be adapted to the form by applications of the axioms in APTC with probabilistic static localities and replacing recursion variables by the right-hand sides of their recursive equations,

$$\begin{aligned} &((u_{111} \parallel a_{111} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{11i_1} \parallel a_{11i_1}) \cdot s_1(X_1, \dots, X_n) + \dots + (u_{1k1} \parallel a_{1k1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{1ki_k} \parallel a_{1ki_k}) \cdot \\ &s_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) + (v_{111} \parallel b_{111} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{11j_1} \parallel b_{11j_1}) + \dots + (v_{11j_1} \parallel b_{11j_1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{11j_l} \parallel b_{11j_l})) \boxplus_{\pi_1} \\ &\dots \boxplus_{\pi_{m-1}} ((u_{m11} \parallel a_{m11} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{m1i_1} \parallel a_{m1i_1}) \cdot s_1(X_1, \dots, X_n) + \dots + (u_{mk1} \parallel a_{mk1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{mki_k} \parallel \\ &a_{mki_k}) \cdot s_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) + (v_{m11} \parallel b_{m11} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{m1j_1} \parallel b_{m1j_1}) + \dots + (v_{m1j_1} \parallel b_{m1j_1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{m1j_l} \parallel b_{m1j_l})) \end{aligned}$$

where $a_{111}, \dots, a_{11i_1}, a_{1k1}, \dots, a_{1ki_k}, b_{111}, \dots, b_{11j_1}, b_{11j_1}, \dots, b_{1j_l}, \dots, a_{m11}, \dots, a_{m1i_1}, a_{mk1}, \dots, a_{mki_k}, b_{m11}, \dots, b_{m1j_1}, b_{m1j_1}, \dots, b_{m1j_l} \in \mathbb{E}$, and the sum above is allowed to be empty, in which case it represents the deadlock δ .

Definition 2.136 (Linear recursive specification). *A recursive specification is linear if its recursive equations are of the form*

$$\begin{aligned} &((u_{111} \parallel a_{111} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{11i_1} \parallel a_{11i_1})X_1 + \dots + (u_{1k1} \parallel a_{1k1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{1ki_k} \parallel a_{1ki_k})X_k + (v_{111} \parallel b_{111} \parallel \\ &\dots \parallel v_{11j_1} \parallel b_{11j_1}) + \dots + (v_{11j_1} \parallel b_{11j_1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{11j_l} \parallel b_{11j_l})) \boxplus_{\pi_1} \dots \boxplus_{\pi_{m-1}} ((u_{m11} \parallel a_{m11} \parallel \dots \parallel \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(\langle X|E \rangle, y) &= \mu(\langle t_X|E \rangle, y) \\ \mu(x, y) &= 0, \text{ otherwise}\end{aligned}$$

Table 23: PDF definitions of recursion

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{t_i(\langle X_1|E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n|E \rangle) \xrightarrow[u]{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \surd}{\langle X_i|E \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \surd} \\ \frac{t_i(\langle X_1|E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n|E \rangle) \xrightarrow[u]{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} y}{\langle X_i|E \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} y}\end{aligned}$$

Table 24: Transition rules of guarded recursion

$u_{m1i_1} :: a_{m1i_1})X_1 + \dots + (u_{mk1} :: a_{mk1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{mki_k} :: a_{mki_k})X_k + (v_{m11} :: b_{m11} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{m1j_1} :: b_{m1j_1}) + \dots + (v_{m1j_1} :: b_{m1j_1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{mlj_l} :: b_{mlj_l})$
where $a_{111}, \dots, a_{11i_1}, a_{1k1}, \dots, a_{1ki_k}, b_{111}, \dots, b_{11j_1}, b_{11j_1}, \dots, b_{1j_l}, \dots, a_{m11}, \dots, a_{m1i_1}, a_{mk1}, \dots, a_{mki_k}, b_{m11}, \dots, b_{m1j_1}, b_{m1j_1}, \dots, b_{mlj_l} \in \mathbb{E}$, and the sum above is allowed to be empty, in which case it represents the deadlock δ .

Firstly, we give the definition of PDFs in Table 23.

For a guarded recursive specifications E with the form

$$\begin{aligned}X_1 &= t_1(X_1, \dots, X_n) \\ &\dots \\ X_n &= t_n(X_1, \dots, X_n)\end{aligned}$$

the behavior of the solution $\langle X_i|E \rangle$ for the recursion variable X_i in E , where $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, is exactly the behavior of their right-hand sides $t_i(X_1, \dots, X_n)$, which is captured by the two transition rules in Table 24.

Theorem 2.137 (Conservativity of APTC with probabilistic static localities and guarded recursion). *APTC with probabilistic static localities and guarded recursion is a conservative extension of APTC with probabilistic static localities.*

Theorem 2.138 (Congruence theorem of APTC with probabilistic static localities and guarded recursion). *Probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_{pp}^{sl} , \sim_{ps}^{sl} , \sim_{php}^{sl} and \sim_{phhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to APTC with probabilistic static localities and guarded recursion.*

No.	Axiom
<i>RDP</i>	$\langle X_i E \rangle = t_i(\langle X_1 E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n E \rangle) \quad (i \in \{1, \dots, n\})$
<i>RSP</i>	if $y_i = t_i(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then $y_i = \langle X_i E \rangle \quad (i \in \{1, \dots, n\})$

Table 25: Recursive definition and specification principle

The *RDP* (Recursive Definition Principle) and the *RSP* (Recursive Specification Principle) are shown in Table 25.

Theorem 2.139 (Elimination theorem of APTC with probabilistic static localities and linear recursion). *Each process term in APTC with probabilistic static localities and linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with E a linear recursive specification.*

Theorem 2.140 (Soundness of APTC with probabilistic static localities and guarded recursion). *Let x and y be APTC with probabilistic static localities and guarded recursion terms. If APTC with guarded recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \sim_{ps}^{sl} y$;
2. $x \sim_{pp}^{sl} y$;
3. $x \sim_{php}^{sl} y$;
4. $x \sim_{phhp}^{sl} y$.

Theorem 2.141 (Completeness of APTC with probabilistic static localities and linear recursion). *Let p and q be closed APTC with probabilistic static localities and linear recursion terms, then,*

1. *if $p \sim_{ps}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
2. *if $p \sim_{pp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
3. *if $p \sim_{php}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
4. *if $p \sim_{phhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

2.4.5 Abstraction

In the following, let the atomic event e range over $\mathbb{E} \cup \{\delta\} \cup \{\tau\}$, and let the communication function $\gamma : \mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\} \times \mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\} \rightarrow \mathbb{E} \cup \{\delta\}$, with each communication involved τ resulting into δ .

The silent step τ as an atomic event, is introduced into E . Considering the recursive specification $X = \tau X$, τs , $\tau \tau s$, and $\tau \dots s$ are all its solutions, that is, the solutions make the existence of τ -loops which cause unfairness. To prevent τ -loops, we extend the definition of linear recursive specification (Definition 2.136) to the guarded one.

$$\overline{\tau \rightsquigarrow \tilde{\tau}}$$

$$\overline{\tau \xrightarrow{\tau} \surd}$$

Table 26: Transition rule of the silent step

No.	Axiom
B1	$(y = y + y, z = z + z) \quad x \cdot ((y + \tau \cdot (y + z)) \boxplus_{\pi} w) = x \cdot ((y + z) \boxplus_{\pi} w)$
B2	$(y = y + y, z = z + z) \quad x \parallel ((y + \tau \parallel (y + z)) \boxplus_{\pi} w) = x \parallel ((y + z) \boxplus_{\pi} w)$
L13	$u :: \tau = \tau$

Table 27: Axioms of silent step

Definition 2.142 (Guarded linear recursive specification). *A recursive specification is linear if its recursive equations are of the form*

$$\begin{aligned} & ((u_{111} :: a_{111} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{11i_1} :: a_{11i_1})X_1 + \dots + (u_{1k1} :: a_{1k1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{1ki_k} :: a_{1ki_k})X_k + (v_{111} :: b_{111} \parallel \\ & \dots \parallel v_{11j_1} :: b_{11j_1}) + \dots + (v_{11j_1} :: b_{11j_1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{11j_l} :: b_{11j_l})) \boxplus_{\pi_1} \dots \boxplus_{\pi_{m-1}} ((u_{m11} :: a_{m11} \parallel \dots \parallel \\ & u_{m1i_1} :: a_{m1i_1})X_1 + \dots + (u_{mk1} :: a_{mk1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{mki_k} :: a_{mki_k})X_k + (v_{m11} :: b_{m11} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{m1j_1} :: \\ & b_{m1j_1}) + \dots + (v_{m1j_1} :: b_{m1j_1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{m1j_l} :: b_{m1j_l})) \end{aligned}$$

where $a_{111}, \dots, a_{11i_1}, a_{1k1}, \dots, a_{1ki_k}, b_{111}, \dots, b_{11j_1}, b_{11j_l}, \dots, b_{11j_l}, \dots$

$a_{m11}, \dots, a_{m1i_1}, a_{mk1}, \dots, a_{mki_k}, b_{m11}, \dots, b_{m1j_1}, b_{m1j_l}, \dots, b_{m1j_l} \in \mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\}$, and the sum above is allowed to be empty, in which case it represents the deadlock δ .

A linear recursive specification E is guarded if there does not exist an infinite sequence of τ -transitions $\langle X|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle X'|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle X''|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \dots$.

Theorem 2.143 (Conservativity of APTC with probabilistic static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *APTC with probabilistic static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of APTC with probabilistic static localities and linear recursion.*

Theorem 2.144 (Congruence theorem of APTC with probabilistic static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Routed branching probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{prbp}^{sl} , \approx_{prbs}^{sl} and \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to APTC with probabilistic static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion.*

We design the axioms for the silent step τ in Table 27.

Theorem 2.145 (Elimination theorem of APTC with probabilistic static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Each process term in APTC with probabilistic static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1|E \rangle$ with E a guarded linear recursive specification.*

Theorem 2.146 (Soundness of APTC with probabilistic static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Let x and y be APTC with probabilistic static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion terms. If APTC with probabilistic static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{x \rightsquigarrow x'}{\tau_I(x) \rightsquigarrow \tau_I(x')} \\
\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} \surd}{\tau_I(x) \xrightarrow[u]{e} \surd} \quad e \notin I \qquad \frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} x'}{\tau_I(x) \xrightarrow[u]{e} \tau_I(x')} \quad e \notin I \\
\frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} \surd}{\tau_I(x) \xrightarrow[\tau]{e} \surd} \quad e \in I \qquad \frac{x \xrightarrow[u]{e} x'}{\tau_I(x) \xrightarrow[\tau]{e} \tau_I(x')} \quad e \in I
\end{array}$$

Table 28: Transition rule of the abstraction operator

1. $x \approx_{prbs}^{sl} y$;
2. $x \approx_{prbp}^{sl} y$;
3. $x \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} y$;
4. $x \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} y$.

Theorem 2.147 (Completeness of APTC with probabilistic static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Let p and q be closed APTC with probabilistic static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion terms, then,*

1. *if $p \approx_{prbs}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
2. *if $p \approx_{prbp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
3. *if $p \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
4. *if $p \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

The unary abstraction operator τ_I ($I \subseteq \mathbb{E}$) renames all atomic events in I into τ . APTC with probabilistic static localities and silent step and abstraction operator is called $APPTC_\tau$ with probabilistic static localities. The transition rules of operator τ_I are shown in Table 28.

Theorem 2.148 (Conservativity of $APPTC_\tau$ with probabilistic static localities and guarded linear recursion). *$APPTC_\tau$ with probabilistic static localities and guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of APTC with probabilistic static localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion.*

Theorem 2.149 (Congruence theorem of $APPTC_\tau$ with probabilistic static localities and guarded linear recursion). *Rooted branching probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{prbp}^{sl} , \approx_{prbs}^{sl} , \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to $APPTC_\tau$ with probabilistic static localities and guarded linear recursion.*

We design the axioms for the abstraction operator τ_I in Table 29.

No.	Axiom
<i>TI1</i>	$e \notin I \quad \tau_I(e) = e$
<i>TI2</i>	$e \in I \quad \tau_I(e) = \tau$
<i>TI3</i>	$\tau_I(\delta) = \delta$
<i>TI4</i>	$\tau_I(x + y) = \tau_I(x) + \tau_I(y)$
<i>TI5</i>	$\tau_I(x \cdot y) = \tau_I(x) \cdot \tau_I(y)$
<i>TI6</i>	$\tau_I(x \parallel y) = \tau_I(x) \parallel \tau_I(y)$
<i>L14</i>	$u :: \tau_I(x) = \tau_I(u :: x)$
<i>L15</i>	$e \notin I \quad \tau_I(u :: e) = u :: e$
<i>L16</i>	$e \in I \quad \tau_I(u :: e) = \tau$
<i>PTI1</i>	$\tau_I(x \boxplus_{\pi} y) = \tau_I(x) \boxplus_{\pi} \tau_I(y)$

Table 29: Axioms of abstraction operator

VR_1	$\frac{x = y + (u_1 :: i_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_m :: i_m) \cdot x, y = y + y}{\tau \cdot \tau_I(x) = \tau \cdot \tau_I(y)}$
VR_2	$\frac{x = z \boxplus_{\pi} (u + (u_1 :: i_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_m :: i_m) \cdot x), z = z + u, z = z + z}{\tau \cdot \tau_I(x) = \tau \cdot \tau_I(z)}$
VR_3	$\frac{x = z + (u_1 :: i_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_m :: i_m) \cdot y, y = z \boxplus_{\pi} (u + (v_1 :: j_1 \parallel \dots \parallel v_n :: j_n) \cdot x), z = z + u, z = z + z}{\tau \cdot \tau_I(x) = \tau \cdot \tau_I(y') \text{ for } y' = z \boxplus_{\pi} (u + (u_1 :: i_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_m :: i_m) \cdot y')}$

Table 30: Recursive verification rules

Theorem 2.150 (Soundness of $APPTC_{\tau}$ with probabilistic static localities and guarded linear recursion). *Let x and y be $APPTC_{\tau}$ with probabilistic static localities and guarded linear recursion terms. If $APPTC_{\tau}$ with probabilistic static localities and guarded linear recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \approx_{prbs}^{sl} y$;
2. $x \approx_{prbp}^{sl} y$;
3. $x \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} y$;
4. $x \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} y$.

Though τ -loops are prohibited in guarded linear recursive specifications in a specifiable way, they can be constructed using the abstraction operator, for example, there exist τ -loops in the process term $\tau_{\{a\}}(\langle X | X = aX \rangle)$. To avoid τ -loops caused by τ_I and ensure fairness, we introduce the following recursive verification rules as Table 30 shows, note that $i_1, \dots, i_m, j_1, \dots, j_n \in I \subseteq \mathbb{E} \setminus \{\tau\}$.

Theorem 2.151 (Soundness of VR_1, VR_2, VR_3). *VR_1, VR_2 and VR_3 are sound modulo probabilistic rooted branching probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences $\approx_{prbp}^{sl}, \approx_{prbs}^{sl}, \approx_{prbhp}^{sl}$ and \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} .*

2.5 Operational Semantics for Quantum Computing

in quantum processes, to avoid the abuse of quantum information which may violate the no-cloning theorem, a quantum configuration $\langle C, \varrho \rangle$ [17] [20] [21] [18] [19] [24] [25] [17] [27] is usually consisted of a traditional configuration C and state information ϱ of all (public) quantum information variables. Though quantum information variables are not explicitly defined and are hidden behind quantum operations or unitary operators, more importantly, the state information ϱ is the effects of execution of a series of quantum operations or unitary operators on involved quantum systems, the execution of a series of quantum operations or unitary operators should not only obey the restrictions of the structure of the process terms, but also those of quantum mechanics principles. Through the state information ϱ , we can check and observe the functions of quantum mechanics principles, such as quantum entanglement, quantum measurement, etc.

So, the operational semantics of quantum processes should be defined based on quantum process configuration $\langle C, \varrho \rangle$, in which $\varrho = \varsigma$ of two state information ϱ and ς means equality under the framework of quantum information and quantum computing, that is, these two quantum processes are in the same quantum states.

Let Loc be the set of locations, and $u, v \in Loc^*$. Let \ll be the sequential ordering on Loc^* , we call v is an extension or a sublocation of u in $u \ll v$; and if $u \not\ll v$ $v \not\ll u$, then u and v are independent and denoted $u \diamond v$.

Definition 2.152 (Consistent location association). *A relation $\varphi \subseteq (Loc^* \times Loc^*)$ is a consistent location association (cla), if $(u, v) \in \varphi \& (u', v') \in \varphi$, then $u \diamond u' \Leftrightarrow v \diamond v'$.*

Definition 2.153 (Pomset transitions and step). *Let \mathcal{E} be a PES and let $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$, and $\emptyset \neq X \subseteq \mathbb{E}$, if $C \cap X = \emptyset$ and $C' = C \cup X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$, then $\langle C, s \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{X} \langle C', s' \rangle$ is called a pomset transition from $\langle C, s \rangle$ to $\langle C', s' \rangle$ at location u . When the events in X are pairwise concurrent, we say that $\langle C, s \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{X} \langle C', s' \rangle$ is a step. It is obvious that $\rightarrow^* \xrightarrow[u]{X} \rightarrow^* = \xrightarrow[u]{X}$ and $\rightarrow^* \xrightarrow[u]{e} \rightarrow^* = \xrightarrow[u]{e}$ for any $e \in \mathbb{E}$ and $X \subseteq \mathbb{E}$.*

Definition 2.154 (Weak pomset transitions and weak step). *Let \mathcal{E} be a PES and let $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$, and $\emptyset \neq X \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}$, if $C \cap X = \emptyset$ and $\hat{C}' = \hat{C} \cup X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$, then $\langle C, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{X} \langle C', \varrho' \rangle$ is called a weak pomset transition from $\langle C, \varrho \rangle$ to $\langle C', \varrho' \rangle$ at location u , where we define $\xrightarrow[u]{e} \triangleq \xrightarrow[u]{e} \xrightarrow[u]{\tau^*}$. And $\xrightarrow[u]{X} \triangleq \xrightarrow[u]{\tau^*} \xrightarrow[u]{e} \xrightarrow[u]{\tau^*}$, for every $e \in X$. When the events in X are pairwise concurrent, we say that $\langle C, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{X} \langle C', \varrho' \rangle$ is a weak step.*

Definition 2.155 (Probabilistic transitions). *Let \mathcal{E} be a PES and let $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$, the transition $\langle C, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\pi} \langle C^\pi, \varrho \rangle$ is called a probabilistic transition from $\langle C, \varrho \rangle$ to $\langle C^\pi, \varrho \rangle$.*

We will also suppose that all the PESs in this chapter are image finite, that is, for any PES \mathcal{E} and $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$ and $a \in \Lambda$, $\{\langle C, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\pi} \langle C^\pi, \varrho \rangle\}$, $\{e \in \mathbb{E} | \langle C, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle C', \varrho' \rangle \wedge \lambda(e) = a\}$ and $\{e \in \hat{\mathbb{E}} | \langle C, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle C', \varrho' \rangle \wedge \lambda(e) = a\}$ is finite.

Definition 2.156 (Static location pomset, step bisimulation). *Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A static location pomset bisimulation is a relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, such that if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{X_1} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{X_2} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$, with $X_1 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_1$, $X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_2$, $X_1 \sim X_2$ and*

$(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$ for all $\varrho, \varrho' \in S$, and vice-versa. We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are static location pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_p^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a static location pomset bisimulation R_φ , such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R_\varphi$. By replacing pomset transitions with steps, we can get the definition of static location step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are static location step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_s^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.157 (Weak static location pomset, step bisimulation). Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A weak static location pomset bisimulation is a relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, such that if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{X_1} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{X_2} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$, with $X_1 \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1, X_2 \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2, X_1 \sim X_2$ and $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$ for all $\varrho, \varrho' \in S$, and vice-versa. We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are weak static location pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_p^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a weak static location pomset bisimulation R_φ , such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R_\varphi$. By replacing weak pomset transitions with weak steps, we can get the definition of weak static location step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are weak static location step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_s^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.158 (Posetal product). Given two PESs $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$, the posetal product of their configurations, denoted $\langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, is defined as

$$\{(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \mid C_1 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), C_2 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), f : C_1 \rightarrow C_2 \text{ isomorphism}\}.$$

A subset $R \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$ is called a posetal relation. We say that R is downward closed when for any $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle), (\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \sqsubseteq (\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle)$ pointwise and $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R$, then $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R$.

For $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$, we define $f[x_1 \mapsto x_2] : X_1 \cup \{x_1\} \rightarrow X_2 \cup \{x_2\}, z \in X_1 \cup \{x_1\}, (1) f[x_1 \mapsto x_2](z) = x_2, \text{if } z = x_1; (2) f[x_1 \mapsto x_2](z) = f(z), \text{ otherwise.}$ Where $X_1 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_1, X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_2, x_1 \in \mathbb{E}_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{E}_2$.

Definition 2.159 (Weakly posetal product). Given two PESs $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$, the weakly posetal product of their configurations, denoted $\langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, is defined as

$$\{(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \mid C_1 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), C_2 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), f : \hat{C}_1 \rightarrow \hat{C}_2 \text{ isomorphism}\}.$$

A subset $R \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$ is called a weakly posetal relation. We say that R is downward closed when for any $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle), (\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \sqsubseteq (\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle)$ pointwise and $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R$, then $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R$.

For $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$, we define $f[x_1 \mapsto x_2] : X_1 \cup \{x_1\} \rightarrow X_2 \cup \{x_2\}, z \in X_1 \cup \{x_1\}, (1) f[x_1 \mapsto x_2](z) = x_2, \text{if } z = x_1; (2) f[x_1 \mapsto x_2](z) = f(z), \text{ otherwise.}$ Where $X_1 \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1, X_2 \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2, x_1 \in \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1, x_2 \in \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2$. Also, we define $f(\tau^*) = f(\tau^*)$.

Definition 2.160 (Static location (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). A static location history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a posetal relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$ such that if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$, then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$, with $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ for all $\varrho, \varrho' \in S$, and vice-versa. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are static location history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_{hp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a static location hp-bisimulation R_φ such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \emptyset, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R_\varphi$.

A static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimulation is a downward closed static location hp-bisimulation. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_{hhp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.161 (Weak static location (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). A weak static location history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a weakly posetal relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$ such that if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$, then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$, with $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ for all $\varrho, \varrho' \in S$, and vice-versa. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are weak static location history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{hp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a weak static location hp-bisimulation R_φ such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \emptyset, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R_\varphi$.

A weakly static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimulation is a downward closed weak static location hp-bisimulation. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are weak static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{hhp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.162 (Branching static location pomset, step bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \checkmark represent a state with $\checkmark \downarrow$. Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A branching static location pomset bisimulation is a relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, such that:

1. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{X} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ then
 - either $X \equiv \tau^*$, and $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ with $\varrho' \in \tau(\varrho)$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle$, such that $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{X} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$ with $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$;
2. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{X} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$ then
 - either $X \equiv \tau^*$, and $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_\varphi$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle$, such that $(\langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{X} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ with $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$;
3. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$, then there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle$ such that $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle \downarrow$;
4. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$, then there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle$ such that $(\langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle \downarrow$.

We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are branching static location pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{bp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a branching static location pomset bisimulation R_φ , such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R_\varphi$.

By replacing pomset transitions with steps, we can get the definition of branching static location step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are branching static location step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{bs}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.163 (Rooted branching static location pomset, step bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \checkmark represent a state with $\checkmark \downarrow$. Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A rooted branching static location pomset bisimulation is a relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, such that:

1. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{X} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{X} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$ with $\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle \approx_{bp}^{sl} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$;

2. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{X} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$ then $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{X} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ with $\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle \approx_{bp}^{sl} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$;
3. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$, then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$;
4. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$, then $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$.

We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are rooted branching static location pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{rbp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a rooted branching static location pomset bisimulation R_φ , such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R_\varphi$.

By replacing pomset transitions with steps, we can get the definition of rooted branching static location step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are rooted branching static location step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{rbs}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.164 (Branching static location (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \surd represent a state with $\surd \downarrow$. A branching static location history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a weakly posetal relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$ such that:

1. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ then
 - either $e_1 \equiv \tau$, and $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f[e_1 \mapsto \tau^{e_1}], \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle$, such that $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$ with $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$;
2. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$ then
 - either $e_2 \equiv \tau$, and $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f[e_2 \mapsto \tau^{e_2}], \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_\varphi$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle$, such that $(\langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ with $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f[e_2 \mapsto e_1], \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$;
3. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$, then there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle$ such that $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle \downarrow$;
4. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$, then there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle$ such that $(\langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle \downarrow$.

$\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are branching static location history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{bhp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a branching static location hp-bisimulation R such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \emptyset, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R_\varphi$.

A branching static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimulation is a downward closed branching static location hp-bisimulation. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are branching static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{bhhp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.165 (Rooted branching static location (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \checkmark represent a state with $\checkmark \downarrow$. A rooted branching static location history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a weakly posetal relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$ such that:

1. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1}_u \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$, then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2}_v \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$ with $\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle \approx_{bhp}^{sl} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$;
2. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2}_v \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$, then $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1}_u \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ with $\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle \approx_{bhp}^{sl} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$;
3. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$, then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$;
4. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$, then $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$.

$\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are rooted branching static location history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a rooted branching static location hp-bisimulation R_φ such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \emptyset, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R_\varphi$.

A rooted branching static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimulation is a downward closed rooted branching static location hp-bisimulation. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are rooted branching static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.166 (Probabilistic static location pomset, step bisimulation). Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation is a relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, such that (1) if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_{\text{varphi}}$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{X_1}_u \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{X_2}_v \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$, with $X_1 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_1, X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_2, X_1 \sim X_2$ and $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$ for all $\varrho, \varrho' \in S$, and vice-versa; (2) if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\pi} \langle C_1^\pi, \varrho \rangle$ then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\pi} \langle C_2^\pi, \varrho \rangle$ and $(\langle C_1^\pi, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2^\pi, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and vice-versa; (3) if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, then $\mu(C_1, C) = \mu(C_2, C)$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})/R_\varphi$; (4) $[\checkmark]_{R_\varphi} = \{\checkmark\}$. We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are probabilistic static location pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_{pp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation R_φ , such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R_\varphi$. By replacing probabilistic pomset transitions with probabilistic steps, we can get the definition of probabilistic static location step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are probabilistic static location step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_{ps}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.167 (Weakly probabilistic static location pomset, step bisimulation). Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A weakly probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation is a relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, such that (1) if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{X_1}_u \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{X_2}_v \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$, with $X_1 \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1, X_2 \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2, X_1 \sim X_2$ and $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$ for all $\varrho, \varrho' \in S$, and vice-versa; (2) if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\pi} \langle C_1^\pi, \varrho \rangle$ then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\pi} \langle C_2^\pi, \varrho \rangle$ and $(\langle C_1^\pi, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2^\pi, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and vice-versa; (3) if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, then $\mu(C_1, C) = \mu(C_2, C)$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})/R_\varphi$; (4) $[\checkmark]_{R_\varphi} = \{\checkmark\}$. We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are weakly probabilistic static location pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{pp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a weakly probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation R_φ , such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R_\varphi$. By replacing weakly probabilistic static location pomset transitions with weakly probabilistic static location steps, we can get the definition of weakly probabilistic static location step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are weakly probabilistic static location step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{ps}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.168 (Posetal product). *Given two PESs $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$, the posetal product of their configurations, denoted $\langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, is defined as*

$$\{(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \mid C_1 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), C_2 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), f : C_1 \rightarrow C_2 \text{ isomorphism}\}.$$

A subset $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$ is called a posetal relation. We say that R_φ is downward closed when for any $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle), (\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \subseteq (\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle)$ pointwise and $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, then $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$.

For $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$, we define $f[x_1 \mapsto x_2] : X_1 \cup \{x_1\} \rightarrow X_2 \cup \{x_2\}$, $z \in X_1 \cup \{x_1\}$, (1) $f[x_1 \mapsto x_2](z) = x_2$, if $z = x_1$; (2) $f[x_1 \mapsto x_2](z) = f(z)$, otherwise. Where $X_1 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_1$, $X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_2$, $x_1 \in \mathbb{E}_1$, $x_2 \in \mathbb{E}_2$.

Definition 2.169 (Weakly posetal product). *Given two PESs $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$, the weakly posetal product of their configurations, denoted $\langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, is defined as*

$$\{(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \mid C_1 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), C_2 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), f : \hat{C}_1 \rightarrow \hat{C}_2 \text{ isomorphism}\}.$$

A subset $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$ is called a weakly posetal relation. We say that R_φ is downward closed when for any $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle), (\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \subseteq (\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle)$ pointwise and $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, then $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$.

For $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$, we define $f[x_1 \mapsto x_2] : X_1 \cup \{x_1\} \rightarrow X_2 \cup \{x_2\}$, $z \in X_1 \cup \{x_1\}$, (1) $f[x_1 \mapsto x_2](z) = x_2$, if $z = x_1$; (2) $f[x_1 \mapsto x_2](z) = f(z)$, otherwise. Where $X_1 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_1$, $X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_2$, $x_1 \in \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1$, $x_2 \in \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2$. Also, we define $f(\tau^*) = f(\tau^*)$.

Definition 2.170 (Probabilistic static location (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). *A probabilistic static location history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a posetal relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$ such that (1) if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$, then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$, with $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$ for all $\varrho, \varrho' \in S$, and vice-versa; (2) if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\pi} \langle C_1^\pi, \varrho \rangle$ then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\pi} \langle C_2^\pi, \varrho \rangle$ and $(\langle C_1^\pi, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2^\pi, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and vice-versa; (3) if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, then $\mu(C_1, C) = \mu(C_2, C)$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})/R_\varphi$; (4) $[\sqrt{\cdot}]_{R_\varphi} = \{\sqrt{\cdot}\}$. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are probabilistic static location history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_{\text{php}}^{\text{sl}} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation R_φ such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \emptyset, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R_\varphi$.*

A probabilistic static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimulation is a downward closed probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are probabilistic static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_{\text{php}}^{\text{sl}} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.171 (Weakly probabilistic static location (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). *A weakly probabilistic static location history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a weakly posetal relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$ such that (1) if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$, then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$, with $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$ for all $\varrho, \varrho' \in S$, and vice-versa; (2) if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\pi} \langle C_1^\pi, \varrho \rangle$ then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\pi} \langle C_2^\pi, \varrho \rangle$ and $(\langle C_1^\pi, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2^\pi, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and vice-versa; (3) if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, then $\mu(C_1, C) = \mu(C_2, C)$*

for each $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})/R_\varphi$; (4) $[\surd]_{R_\varphi} = \{\surd\}$. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are weakly probabilistic static location history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{php}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a weakly probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation R_φ such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R_\varphi$.

A weakly probabilistic static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimulation is a downward closed weakly probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are weakly probabilistic static location hereditary history-preserving (hhp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{phhp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.172 (Probabilistic static location branching pomset, step bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \surd represent a state with $\surd \downarrow$. Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A probabilistic static location branching pomset bisimulation is a relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, such that:

1. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{X} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ then
 - either $X \equiv \tau^*$, and $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ with $\varrho' \in \tau(\varrho)$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) probabilistic transitions and τ -transitions $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow^* \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle$, such that $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{X} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$ with $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$;
2. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{X} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$ then
 - either $X \equiv \tau^*$, and $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_\varphi$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) probabilistic transitions and τ -transitions $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow^* \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle$, such that $(\langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{X} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ with $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$;
3. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$, then there is a sequence of (zero or more) probabilistic transitions and τ -transitions $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow^* \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle$ such that $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle \downarrow$;
4. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$, then there is a sequence of (zero or more) probabilistic transitions and τ -transitions $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow^* \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle$ such that $(\langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle \downarrow$;
5. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, then $\mu(C_1, C) = \mu(C_2, C)$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})/R_\varphi$;
6. $[\surd]_{R_\varphi} = \{\surd\}$.

We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are probabilistic static location branching pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{pbp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a probabilistic static location branching pomset bisimulation R_φ , such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R_\varphi$.

By replacing probabilistic pomset transitions with steps, we can get the definition of probabilistic branching step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are probabilistic branching step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{pbs}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.173 (Probabilistic static location rooted branching pomset, step bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \surd represent a state with $\surd \downarrow$. Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A probabilistic static location rooted branching pomset bisimulation is a relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, such that:

1. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \xrightarrow[u]{X} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \xrightarrow[v]{X} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$ with $\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle \approx_{pbp}^{sl} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$;
2. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \xrightarrow[v]{X} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$ then $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \xrightarrow[u]{X} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ with $\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle \approx_{pbp}^{sl} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$;
3. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$, then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$;
4. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$, then $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$.

We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are probabilistic static location rooted branching pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{prbp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a probabilistic static location rooted branching pomset bisimulation R_φ , such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R_\varphi$.

By replacing pomset transitions with steps, we can get the definition of probabilistic static location rooted branching step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are probabilistic static location rooted branching step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{prbs}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.174 (Probabilistic static location branching (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \surd represent a state with $\surd \downarrow$. A probabilistic static location branching history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a weakly posetal relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$ such that:

1. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ then
 - either $e_1 \equiv \tau$, and $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f[e_1 \mapsto \tau], \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) probabilistic transitions and τ -transitions $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow^* \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle$, such that $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$ with $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$;
2. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$ then
 - either $e_2 \equiv \tau$, and $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f[e_2 \mapsto \tau], \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_\varphi$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) probabilistic transitions and τ -transitions $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow^* \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle$, such that $(\langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ with $(\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle, f[e_2 \mapsto e_1], \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle) \in R_{\varphi \cup \{(u,v)\}}$;
3. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$, then there is a sequence of (zero or more) probabilistic transitions and τ -transitions $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow^* \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle$ such that $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_2^0, \varrho^0 \rangle \downarrow$;

4. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$, then there is a sequence of (zero or more) probabilistic transitions and τ -transitions $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow^* \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle$ such that $(\langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_1^0, \varrho^0 \rangle \downarrow$;
5. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R_\varphi$, then $\mu(C_1, C) = \mu(C_2, C)$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})/R_\varphi$;
6. $[\surd]_{R_\varphi} = \{\surd\}$.

$\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are probabilistic static location branching history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{pbhp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a probabilistic static location branching hp-bisimulation R_φ such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \emptyset, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R_\varphi$.

A probabilistic branching hereditary history-preserving (hbp-)bisimulation is a downward closed probabilistic branching hp-bisimulation. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are probabilistic branching hereditary history-preserving (hbp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{pbhbp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 2.175 (Probabilistic static location rooted branching (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \surd represent a state with $\surd \downarrow$. A probabilistic static location rooted branching history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a weakly posetal relation $R_\varphi \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$ such that:

1. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$, then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$ with $\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle \approx_{pbhp}^{sl} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$;
2. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$, and $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$, then $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle$ with $\langle C'_1, \varrho' \rangle \approx_{pbhp}^{sl} \langle C'_2, \varrho' \rangle$;
3. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$, then $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$;
4. if $(\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle, f, \langle C_2, \varrho \rangle) \in R_\varphi$ and $\langle C_2, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$, then $\langle C_1, \varrho \rangle \downarrow$.

$\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are probabilistic static location rooted branching history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a probabilistic static location rooted branching hp-bisimulation R_φ such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \emptyset, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R_\varphi$.

A probabilistic static location rooted branching hereditary history-preserving (hbp-)bisimulation is a downward closed probabilistic static location rooted branching hp-bisimulation. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are probabilistic static location rooted branching hereditary history-preserving (hbp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} \mathcal{E}_2$.

No.	Axiom
A1	$x + y = y + x$
A2	$(x + y) + z = x + (y + z)$
A3	$x + x = x$
A4	$(x + y) \cdot z = x \cdot z + y \cdot z$
A5	$(x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot (y \cdot z)$
L1	$\epsilon :: x = x$
L2	$u :: (x \cdot y) = u :: x \cdot u :: y$
L3	$u :: (x + y) = u :: x + u :: y$
L4	$u :: (v :: x) = uv :: x$

Table 31: Axioms of qBATC with localities

3 APTC with Localities for Open Quantum Systems

In this chapter, we introduce APTC with localities for open quantum systems, including BATC with localities for open quantum systems abbreviated $qBATC^{sl}$ in section 3.1, APTC with localities for open quantum systems abbreviated $qAPTC^{sl}$ in section 3.2, recursion in section 3.3, abstraction in section 3.4, quantum entanglement in section 3.5 and unification of quantum and classical computing for open quantum systems in section 3.6.

Note that, in open quantum systems, quantum operations denoted \mathbb{E} are the atomic actions (events), and a quantum operation $e \in \mathbb{E}$.

3.1 BATC with Localities for Open Quantum Systems

Let Loc be the set of locations, and $loc \in Loc$, $u, v \in Loc^*$, ϵ is the empty location. A distribution allocates a location $u \in Loc^*$ to an action e denoted $u :: e$ or a process x denoted $u :: x$.

In the following, x, y, z range over the set of terms for true concurrency, p, q, s range over the set of closed terms. The set of axioms of qBATC with localities consists of the laws given in Table 31.

Definition 3.1 (Basic terms of $qBATC$ with localities). *The set of basic terms of $qBATC$ with localities, $\mathcal{B}(qBATC^{sl})$, is inductively defined as follows:*

1. $\mathbb{E} \subset \mathcal{B}(qBATC^{sl})$;
2. if $u \in Loc^*$, $t \in \mathcal{B}(qBATC^{sl})$ then $u :: t \in \mathcal{B}(qBATC^{sl})$;
3. if $e \in \mathbb{E}$, $t \in \mathcal{B}(qBATC^{sl})$ then $e \cdot t \in \mathcal{B}(qBATC^{sl})$;
4. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(qBATC^{sl})$ then $t + s \in \mathcal{B}(qBATC^{sl})$.

Theorem 3.2 (Elimination theorem of $qBATC$ with localities). *Let p be a closed $qBATC$ with localities term. Then there is a basic $qBATC$ with localities term q such that $qBATC^{sl} \vdash p = q$.*

Proof. The same as that of $BATC^{sl}$, we omit the proof, please refer to [11] for details. \square

$\frac{\langle e, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[e]{e} \langle \sqrt{\cdot}, \varrho' \rangle}{\epsilon}$	$\frac{\langle loc :: e, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[loc]{e} \langle \sqrt{\cdot}, \varrho' \rangle}{loc}$
$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle}{loc :: x, \varrho \xrightarrow[loc \ll u]{e} \langle loc :: x', \varrho' \rangle}$	
$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \sqrt{\cdot}, \varrho' \rangle}{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \sqrt{\cdot}, \varrho' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle}{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \sqrt{\cdot}, \varrho' \rangle}{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \sqrt{\cdot}, \varrho' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle y', \varrho' \rangle}{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle y', \varrho' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \sqrt{\cdot}, \varrho' \rangle}{\langle x \cdot y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle y, \varrho' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle}{\langle x \cdot y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle x' \cdot y, \varrho' \rangle}$

Table 32: Transition rules of qBATIC with localities

We give the operational transition rules of operators $::$, \cdot and $+$ as Table 32 shows.

Theorem 3.3 (Congruence of $qBATIC$ with localities with respect to static location truly concurrent bisimulations). *Static location truly concurrent bisimulations \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to $qBATIC$ with localities.*

Proof. It is obvious that static location truly concurrent bisimulations \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} are all equivalent relations with respect to $qBATIC$ with localities. So, it is sufficient to prove that static location truly concurrent bisimulations \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} are preserved for $::$, \cdot and $+$ according to the transition rules in Table 32, that is, if $x \sim_p^{sl} x'$ and $y \sim_p^{sl} y'$, then $loc :: x \sim_p^{sl} loc :: y$, $x + y \sim_p^{sl} x' + y'$ and $x \cdot y \sim_p^{sl} x' \cdot y'$; if $x \sim_s^{sl} x'$ and $y \sim_s^{sl} y'$, then $loc :: x \sim_s^{sl} loc :: y$, $x + y \sim_s^{sl} x' + y'$ and $x \cdot y \sim_s^{sl} x' \cdot y'$; if $x \sim_{hp}^{sl} x'$ and $y \sim_{hp}^{sl} y'$, then $loc :: x \sim_{hp}^{sl} loc :: y$, $x + y \sim_{hp}^{sl} x' + y'$ and $x \cdot y \sim_{hp}^{sl} x' \cdot y'$; and if $x \sim_{hhp}^{sl} x'$ and $y \sim_{hhp}^{sl} y'$, then $loc :: x \sim_{hhp}^{sl} loc :: y$, $x + y \sim_{hhp}^{sl} x' + y'$ and $x \cdot y \sim_{hhp}^{sl} x' \cdot y'$. The proof is quit trivial, and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers. \square

Theorem 3.4 (Soundness of $qBATIC$ with localities modulo static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). *The axiomatization of $qBATIC$ with localities is sound modulo static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} . That is,*

1. let x and y be $qBATIC$ with localities terms. If $qBATIC$ with localities $\vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_p^{sl} y$;
2. let x and y be $qBATIC$ with localities terms. If $qBATIC$ with localities $\vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_s^{sl} y$;
3. let x and y be $qBATIC$ with localities terms. If $qBATIC$ with localities $\vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{hp}^{sl} y$;

4. let x and y be qBATC with localities terms. If qBATC with localities $\vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{hhp}^{sl} y$.

Proof. (1) Since static location pomset bisimulation \sim_p^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 31 is sound modulo static location pomset bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(2) Since static location step bisimulation \sim_s^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 31 is sound modulo static location step bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(3) Since static location hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 31 is sound modulo static location hp-bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(4) Since static location hhp-bisimulation \sim_{hhp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 31 is sound modulo static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers. \square

Theorem 3.5 (Completeness of qBATC with localities modulo static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). *The axiomatization of qBATC with localities is complete modulo static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} . That is,*

1. let p and q be closed qBATC with localities terms, if $p \sim_p^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;
2. let p and q be closed qBATC with localities terms, if $p \sim_s^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;
3. let p and q be closed qBATC with localities terms, if $p \sim_{hp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;
4. let p and q be closed qBATC with localities terms, if $p \sim_{hhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.

Proof. According to the definition of static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} , $p \sim_p^{sl} q$, $p \sim_s^{sl} q$, $p \sim_{hp}^{sl} q$ and $p \sim_{hhp}^{sl} q$ implies both the bisimilarities between p and q , and also the in the same quantum states. According to the completeness of $BATC^{sl}$ (please refer to [11] for details), we can get the completeness of qBATC with localities. \square

3.2 APTC with Localities for Open Quantum Systems

We give the transition rules of qAPTC with localities in Table 34, it is suitable for all static location truly concurrent behavioral equivalence, including static location pomset bisimulation, static location step bisimulation, static location hp-bisimulation and static location hhp-bisimulation.

The axioms for qAPTC with localities are listed in Table 35.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle \quad (\#(e_1, e_2))}{\langle \Theta(x), \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} \quad \frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_2} \langle \surd, \varrho'' \rangle \quad (\#(e_1, e_2))}{\langle \Theta(x), \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_2} \langle \surd, \varrho'' \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle \quad (\#(e_1, e_2))}{\langle \Theta(x), \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle \Theta(x'), \varrho' \rangle} \quad \frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_2} \langle x'', \varrho'' \rangle \quad (\#(e_1, e_2))}{\langle \Theta(x), \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_2} \langle \Theta(x''), \varrho'' \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \not\rightarrow^{e_2} \quad (\#(e_1, e_2))}{\langle x \triangleleft y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\tau} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} \quad \frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \not\rightarrow^{e_2} \quad (\#(e_1, e_2))}{\langle x \triangleleft y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\tau} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle \surd, \varrho \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \not\rightarrow^{e_3} \quad (\#(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3)}{\langle x \triangleleft y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} \quad \frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \not\rightarrow^{e_3} \quad (\#(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3)}{\langle x \triangleleft y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_3} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \not\rightarrow^{e_2} \quad (\#(e_1, e_2), e_1 \leq e_3)}{\langle x \triangleleft y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\tau} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} \quad \frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_3} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \not\rightarrow^{e_2} \quad (\#(e_1, e_2), e_1 \leq e_3)}{\langle x \triangleleft y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\tau} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle}{\langle \partial_H(x), \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} \quad (e \notin H) \quad \frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle}{\langle \partial_H(x), \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \partial_H(x'), \varrho' \rangle} \quad (e \notin H)
\end{array}$$

Table 34: Transition rules of qAPTC with localities

No.	Axiom
A6	$x + \delta = x$
A7	$\delta \cdot x = \delta$
P1	$x \bowtie y = x \parallel y + x \mid y$
P2	$x \parallel y = y \parallel x$
P3	$(x \parallel y) \parallel z = x \parallel (y \parallel z)$
P4	$x \parallel y = x \parallel y + y \parallel x$
P5	$(e_1 \leq e_2) \quad e_1 \parallel (e_2 \cdot y) = (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot y$
P6	$(e_1 \leq e_2) \quad (e_1 \cdot x) \parallel e_2 = (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot x$
P7	$(e_1 \leq e_2) \quad (e_1 \cdot x) \parallel (e_2 \cdot y) = (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot (x \bowtie y)$
P8	$(x + y) \parallel z = (x \parallel z) + (y \parallel z)$
P9	$\delta \parallel x = \delta$
C1	$e_1 \mid e_2 = \gamma(e_1, e_2)$
C2	$e_1 \mid (e_2 \cdot y) = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot y$
C3	$(e_1 \cdot x) \mid e_2 = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot x$
C4	$(e_1 \cdot x) \mid (e_2 \cdot y) = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot (x \bowtie y)$
C5	$(x + y) \mid z = (x \mid z) + (y \mid z)$
C6	$x \mid (y + z) = (x \mid y) + (x \mid z)$
C7	$\delta \mid x = \delta$
C8	$x \mid \delta = \delta$
CE1	$\Theta(e) = e$
CE2	$\Theta(\delta) = \delta$
CE3	$\Theta(x + y) = \Theta(x) \triangleleft y + \Theta(y) \triangleleft x$
CE4	$\Theta(x \cdot y) = \Theta(x) \cdot \Theta(y)$
CE5	$\Theta(x \parallel y) = ((\Theta(x) \triangleleft y) \parallel y) + ((\Theta(y) \triangleleft x) \parallel x)$
CE6	$\Theta(x \mid y) = ((\Theta(x) \triangleleft y) \mid y) + ((\Theta(y) \triangleleft x) \mid x)$
U1	$(\#(e_1, e_2)) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_2 = \tau$
U2	$(\#(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_3 = e_1$
U3	$(\#(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3) \quad e_3 \triangleleft e_1 = \tau$
U4	$e \triangleleft \delta = e$
U5	$\delta \triangleleft e = \delta$
U6	$(x + y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) + (y \triangleleft z)$
U7	$(x \cdot y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \cdot (y \triangleleft z)$
U8	$(x \parallel y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \parallel (y \triangleleft z)$
U9	$(x \mid y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \mid (y \triangleleft z)$
U10	$x \triangleleft (y + z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
U11	$x \triangleleft (y \cdot z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
U12	$x \triangleleft (y \parallel z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
U13	$x \triangleleft (y \mid z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
L5	$u :: (x \bowtie y) = u :: x \bowtie u :: y$
L6	$u :: (x \parallel y) = u :: x \parallel u :: y$
L7	$u :: (x \mid y) = u :: x \mid u :: y$
L8	$u :: (\Theta(x)) = \Theta(u :: x)$
L9	$u :: (x \triangleleft y) = u :: x \triangleleft u :: y$
L10	$u :: \delta = \delta$
D1	$e \notin H \quad \partial_H(e) = e$
D2	$e \in H \quad \partial_H(e) = \delta$
D3	$\partial_H(\delta) = \delta$
D4	$\partial_H(x + y) = \partial_H(x) + \partial_H(y)$
D5	$\partial_H(x \cdot y) = \partial_H(x) \cdot \partial_H(y)$
D6	$\partial_H(x \parallel y) = \partial_H(x) \parallel \partial_H(y)$
L11	$u :: \partial_H(x) = \partial_H(u :: x)$

Definition 3.6 (Basic terms of $qAPTC$ with localities). *The set of basic terms of $qAPTC$ with localities, $\mathcal{B}(qAPTC^{sl})$, is inductively defined as follows:*

1. $\mathbb{E} \subset \mathcal{B}(qAPTC^{sl})$;
2. if $u \in Loc^*$, $t \in \mathcal{B}(qAPTC^{sl})$ then $u :: t \in \mathcal{B}(qAPTC^{sl})$;
3. if $e \in \mathbb{E}$, $t \in \mathcal{B}(qAPTC^{sl})$ then $e \cdot t \in \mathcal{B}(qAPTC^{sl})$;
4. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(qAPTC^{sl})$ then $t + s \in \mathcal{B}(qAPTC^{sl})$;
5. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(qAPTC^{sl})$ then $t \parallel s \in \mathcal{B}(qAPTC^{sl})$.

Theorem 3.7 (Elimination theorem of $qAPTC$ with localities). *Let p be a closed $qAPTC$ with localities term. Then there is a basic $qAPTC$ with localities term q such that $qAPTC^{sl} \vdash p = q$.*

Proof. The same as that of $APTC^{sl}$, we omit the proof, please refer to [11] for details. \square

Theorem 3.8 (Generalization of $qAPTC^{sl}$ with localities). *$qAPTC^{sl}$ is a generalization of $qBATIC$ with localities.*

Proof. It follows from the following three facts.

1. The transition rules of $qBATIC$ with localities in are all source-dependent;
2. The sources of the transition rules $qAPTC$ with localities contain an occurrence of \bowtie , or \parallel , or \ll , or $|$, or Θ , or \triangleleft , or ∂_H ;
3. The transition rules of $qAPTC$ with localities are all source-dependent.

So, $qAPTC$ with localities is a generalization of $qBATIC$ with localities, that is, $qBATIC$ with localities is an embedding of $qAPTC$ with localities, as desired. \square

Theorem 3.9 (Congruence theorem of $qAPTC$ with localities). *Static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to $qAPTC$ with localities.*

Proof. It is obvious that static location truly concurrent bisimulations \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} are all equivalent relations with respect to $qAPTC$ with localities. So, it is sufficient to prove that static location truly concurrent bisimulations \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} are preserved for \bowtie , \parallel , \ll , $|$, Θ , \triangleleft and ∂_H according to the transition rules in Table 34, that is, if $x \sim_p^{sl} x'$ and $y \sim_p^{sl} y'$, then $x \bowtie y \sim_p^{sl} x' \bowtie y'$, $x \parallel y \sim_p^{sl} x' \parallel y'$, $x \ll y \sim_p^{sl} x' \ll y'$, $x | y \sim_p^{sl} x' | y'$, $\Theta(x) \sim_p^{sl} \Theta(x')$, $x \triangleleft y \sim_p^{sl} x' \triangleleft y'$, and $\partial_H(x) \sim_p^{sl} \partial_H(x')$; if $x \sim_s^{sl} x'$ and $y \sim_s^{sl} y'$, then $x \bowtie y \sim_s^{sl} x' \bowtie y'$, $x \parallel y \sim_s^{sl} x' \parallel y'$, $x \ll y \sim_s^{sl} x' \ll y'$, $x | y \sim_s^{sl} x' | y'$, $\Theta(x) \sim_s^{sl} \Theta(x')$, $x \triangleleft y \sim_s^{sl} x' \triangleleft y'$, and $\partial_H(x) \sim_s^{sl} \partial_H(x')$; if $x \sim_{hp}^{sl} x'$ and $y \sim_{hp}^{sl} y'$, then $x \bowtie y \sim_{hp}^{sl} x' \bowtie y'$, $x \parallel y \sim_{hp}^{sl} x' \parallel y'$, $x \ll y \sim_{hp}^{sl} x' \ll y'$, $x | y \sim_{hp}^{sl} x' | y'$, $\Theta(x) \sim_{hp}^{sl} \Theta(x')$, $x \triangleleft y \sim_{hp}^{sl} x' \triangleleft y'$, and $\partial_H(x) \sim_{hp}^{sl} \partial_H(x')$; and if $x \sim_{hhp}^{sl} x'$ and $y \sim_{hhp}^{sl} y'$, then $x \bowtie y \sim_{hhp}^{sl} x' \bowtie y'$, $x \parallel y \sim_{hhp}^{sl} x' \parallel y'$, $x \ll y \sim_{hhp}^{sl} x' \ll y'$, $x | y \sim_{hhp}^{sl} x' | y'$, $\Theta(x) \sim_{hhp}^{sl} \Theta(x')$, $x \triangleleft y \sim_{hhp}^{sl} x' \triangleleft y'$ and $\partial_H(x) \sim_{hhp}^{sl} \partial_H(x')$. The proof is quit trivial, and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers. \square

Theorem 3.10 (Soundness of $qAPTC$ with localities modulo static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). *Let x and y be $qAPTC$ with localities terms. If $qAPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \sim_s^{sl} y$;
2. $x \sim_p^{sl} y$;
3. $x \sim_{hp}^{sl} y$;
4. $x \sim_{hhp}^{sl} y$.

Proof. (1) Since static location pomset bisimulation \sim_p^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 35 is sound modulo static location pomset bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(2) Since static location step bisimulation \sim_s^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 35 is sound modulo static location step bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(3) Since static location hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 35 is sound modulo static location hp-bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(4) Since static location hhp-bisimulation \sim_{hhp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 35 is sound modulo static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers. \square

Theorem 3.11 (Completeness of $qAPTC$ with localities modulo static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). *Let x and y be $qAPTC$ with localities terms.*

1. If $x \sim_s^{sl} y$, then $qAPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$;
2. if $x \sim_p^{sl} y$, then $qAPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$;
3. if $x \sim_{hp}^{sl} y$, then $qAPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$;
4. if $x \sim_{hhp}^{sl} y$, then $qAPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$.

Proof. According to the definition of static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} , $p \sim_p^{sl} q$, $p \sim_s^{sl} q$, $p \sim_{hp}^{sl} q$ and $p \sim_{hhp}^{sl} q$ implies both the bisimilarities between p and q , and also the in the same quantum states. According to the completeness of APTC (please refer to [11] for details), we can get the completeness of $qAPTC$ with localities. \square

3.3 Recursion

Definition 3.12 (Recursive specification). *A recursive specification is a finite set of recursive equations*

$$X_1 = t_1(X_1, \dots, X_n)$$

$$\frac{t_i(\langle X_1|E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n|E \rangle) \xrightarrow[u]{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \surd}{\langle X_i|E \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \surd}$$

$$\frac{t_i(\langle X_1|E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n|E \rangle) \xrightarrow[u]{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} y}{\langle X_i|E \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} y}$$

Table 36: Transition rules of guarded recursion

...

$$X_n = t_n(X_1, \dots, X_n)$$

where the left-hand sides of X_i are called *recursion variables*, and the right-hand sides $t_i(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ are *process terms* in qAPTC with localities and possible occurrences of the recursion variables X_1, \dots, X_n .

Definition 3.13 (Solution). *Processes p_1, \dots, p_n are a solution for a recursive specification $\{X_i = t_i(X_1, \dots, X_n) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$ (with respect to static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences $\sim_s^{sl} (\sim_p^{sl}, \sim_{hp}^{sl}, \sim_{hhp}^{sl})$) if $p_i \sim_s^{sl} (\sim_p^{sl}, \sim_{hp}^{sl}, \sim_{hhp}^{sl}) t_i(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.*

Definition 3.14 (Guarded recursive specification). *A recursive specification*

$$X_1 = t_1(X_1, \dots, X_n)$$

...

$$X_n = t_n(X_1, \dots, X_n)$$

is *guarded* if the right-hand sides of its recursive equations can be adapted to the form by applications of the axioms in qAPTC with localities and replacing recursion variables by the right-hand sides of their recursive equations,

$$(u_{11} :: a_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{1i_1} :: a_{1i_1}) \cdot s_1(X_1, \dots, X_n) + \dots + (u_{k1} :: a_{k1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{ki_k} :: a_{ki_k}) \cdot s_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) \\
+ (v_{11} :: b_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{1j_1} :: b_{1j_1}) + \dots + (v_{l1} :: b_{l1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{lj_l} :: b_{lj_l})$$

where $a_{11}, \dots, a_{1i_1}, a_{k1}, \dots, a_{ki_k}, b_{11}, \dots, b_{1j_1}, b_{l1}, \dots, b_{lj_l} \in \mathbb{E}$, and the sum above is allowed to be empty, in which case it represents the deadlock δ .

Definition 3.15 (Linear recursive specification). *A recursive specification is linear* if its recursive equations are of the form

$$(u_{11} :: a_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{1i_1} :: a_{1i_1})X_1 + \dots + (u_{k1} :: a_{k1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{ki_k} :: a_{ki_k})X_k \\
+ (v_{11} :: b_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{1j_1} :: b_{1j_1}) + \dots + (v_{l1} :: b_{l1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{lj_l} :: b_{lj_l})$$

where $a_{11}, \dots, a_{1i_1}, a_{k1}, \dots, a_{ki_k}, b_{11}, \dots, b_{1j_1}, b_{l1}, \dots, b_{lj_l} \in \mathbb{E}$, and the sum above is allowed to be empty, in which case it represents the deadlock δ .

No.	Axiom
<i>RDP</i>	$\langle X_i E \rangle = t_i(\langle X_1 E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n E \rangle) \quad (i \in \{1, \dots, n\})$
<i>RSP</i>	if $y_i = t_i(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then $y_i = \langle X_i E \rangle \quad (i \in \{1, \dots, n\})$

Table 37: Recursive definition and specification principle

Theorem 3.16 (Conservativity of *qAPTC* with localities and guarded recursion). *qAPTC with localities and guarded recursion is a conservative extension of qAPTC with localities.*

Proof. It follows from the following three facts.

1. The transition rules of *qAPTC* with localities in are all source-dependent;
2. The sources of the transition rules *qAPTC* with localities and guarded recursion contain only one constant;
3. The transition rules of *qAPTC* with localities and guarded recursion are all source-dependent.

So, *qAPTC* with localities and guarded recursion is a conservative extension of *qAPTC* with localities, as desired. \square

Theorem 3.17 (Congruence theorem of *qAPTC* with localities and guarded recursion). *Static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} , \sim_{hhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to qAPTC with localities and guarded recursion.*

Proof. It follows the following two facts:

1. in a guarded recursive specification, right-hand sides of its recursive equations can be adapted to the form by applications of the axioms in *qAPTC* with localities and replacing recursion variables by the right-hand sides of their recursive equations;
2. static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to all operators of *qAPTC* with localities.

\square

The *RDP* (Recursive Definition Principle) and the *RSP* (Recursive Specification Principle) are shown in Table 37.

Theorem 3.18 (Elimination theorem of *qAPTC* with localities and linear recursion). *Each process term in qAPTC with localities and linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with E a linear recursive specification.*

Proof. The same as that of *APTC^{sl}* with linear recursion, we omit the proof, please refer to [11] for details. \square

Theorem 3.19 (Soundness of $qAPTC$ with localities and guarded recursion). *Let x and y be $qAPTC$ with localities and guarded recursion terms. If $qAPTC^{sl}$ with guarded recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \sim_s^{sl} y$;
2. $x \sim_p^{sl} y$;
3. $x \sim_{hp}^{sl} y$;
4. $x \sim_{hhp}^{sl} y$.

Proof. (1) Since static location pomset bisimulation \sim_p^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 37 is sound modulo static location pomset bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(2) Since static location step bisimulation \sim_s^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 37 is sound modulo static location step bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(3) Since static location hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 37 is sound modulo static location hp-bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(4) Since static location hhp-bisimulation \sim_{hhp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 37 is sound modulo static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers. \square

Theorem 3.20 (Completeness of $qAPTC$ with localities and linear recursion). *Let p and q be closed $qAPTC$ with localities and linear recursion terms, then,*

1. if $p \sim_s^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;
2. if $p \sim_p^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;
3. if $p \sim_{hp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;
4. if $p \sim_{hhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.

Proof. According to the definition of static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} , $p \sim_p^{sl} q$, $p \sim_s^{sl} q$, $p \sim_{hp}^{sl} q$ and $p \sim_{hhp}^{sl} q$ implies both the bisimilarities between p and q , and also the in the same quantum states. According to the completeness of $APTC^{sl}$ with linear recursion (please refer to [11] for details), we can get the completeness of $qAPTC$ with localities and linear recursion. \square

3.4 Abstraction

Definition 3.21 (Guarded linear recursive specification). *A recursive specification is linear if its recursive equations are of the form*

$$(u_{11} :: a_{11} \parallel \cdots \parallel u_{1i_1} :: a_{1i_1})X_1 + \cdots + (u_{k1} :: a_{k1} \parallel \cdots \parallel u_{ki_k} :: a_{ki_k})X_k \\ + (v_{11} :: b_{11} \parallel \cdots \parallel v_{1j_1} :: b_{1j_1}) + \cdots + (v_{l1} :: b_{l1} \parallel \cdots \parallel v_{lj_l})$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& \overline{\langle \tau, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle \surd, \tau(\varrho) \rangle} & \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle}{\langle \tau_I(x), \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} & e \notin I & \frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle}{\langle \tau_I(x), \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \tau_I(x'), \varrho' \rangle} \quad e \notin I \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle}{\langle \tau_I(x), \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle \surd, \tau(\varrho) \rangle} & e \in I & \frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle}{\langle \tau_I(x), \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle \tau_I(x'), \tau(\varrho) \rangle} \quad e \in I
\end{array}$$

Table 38: Transition rule of $qAPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$

where $a_{11}, \dots, a_{1i_1}, a_{k1}, \dots, a_{ki_k}, b_{11}, \dots, b_{1j_1}, b_{1j_1}, \dots, b_{lj_l} \in \mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\}$, and the sum above is allowed to be empty, in which case it represents the deadlock δ .

A linear recursive specification E is guarded if there does not exist an infinite sequence of τ -transitions $\langle X|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle X'|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle X''|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \dots$.

The transition rules of τ are shown in Table 38, and axioms of τ are as Table 39 shows.

Theorem 3.22 (Conservativity of $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *$qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of $qAPTC$ with localities and linear recursion.*

Proof. Since the transition rules of $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion are source-dependent, and the transition rules for τ in Table 38 contain only a fresh constant τ in their source, so the transition rules of $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of those of $qAPTC$ with localities and guarded linear recursion. \square

Theorem 3.23 (Congruence theorem of $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Rooted branching static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbp}^{sl} , \approx_{rbs}^{sl} , \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} , and \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion.*

Proof. It follows the following three facts:

1. in a guarded linear recursive specification, right-hand sides of its recursive equations can be adapted to the form by applications of the axioms in $qAPTC$ with localities and replacing recursion variables by the right-hand sides of their recursive equations;
2. static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to all operators of $qAPTC$ with localities, while static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p^{sl} , \sim_s^{sl} , \sim_{hp}^{sl} and \sim_{hhp}^{sl} imply the corresponding rooted branching static location truly concurrent bisimulations \approx_{rbp}^{sl} , \approx_{rbs}^{sl} , \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} , so rooted branching static location truly concurrent bisimulations \approx_{rbp}^{sl} , \approx_{rbs}^{sl} , \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to all operators of $qAPTC$ with localities;

No.	Axiom
B1	$e \cdot \tau = e$
B2	$e \cdot (\tau \cdot (x + y) + x) = e \cdot (x + y)$
B3	$x \parallel \tau = x$
L13	$u :: \tau = \tau$

Table 39: Axioms of silent step

3. While \mathbb{E} is extended to $\mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\}$, it can be proved that rooted branching static location truly concurrent bisimulations \approx_{rbp}^{sl} , \approx_{rbs}^{sl} , \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to all operators of $qAPTC$ with localities, we omit it.

□

Theorem 3.24 (Elimination theorem of $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Each process term in $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with E a guarded linear recursive specification.*

Proof. The same as that of $APTC^{sl}$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion, we omit the proof, please refer to [11] for details. □

Theorem 3.25 (Soundness of $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Let x and y be $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion terms. If $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \approx_{rbs}^{sl} y$;
2. $x \approx_{rbp}^{sl} y$;
3. $x \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} y$;
4. $x \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} y$.

Proof. (1) Since rooted branching static location pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 39 is sound modulo rooted branching static location pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(2) Since rooted branching static location step bisimulation \approx_{rbs}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 39 is sound modulo rooted branching static location step bisimulation \approx_{rbs}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(3) Since rooted branching static location hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 39 is sound modulo rooted branching static location hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(4) Since rooted branching static location hhp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 39 is sound modulo rooted branching static location hhp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers. \square

Theorem 3.26 (Completeness of $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Let p and q be closed $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion terms, then,*

1. *if $p \approx_{rbs}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
2. *if $p \approx_{rbp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
3. *if $p \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
4. *if $p \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. According to the definition of static location truly concurrent rooted branching bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbp}^{sl} , \approx_{rbs}^{sl} , \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} , $p \approx_{rbp}^{sl} q$, $p \approx_{rbs}^{sl} q$, $p \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} q$ and $p \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} q$ implies both the rooted branching bisimilarities between p and q , and also the in the same quantum states. According to the completeness of $APTC^{sl}$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion (please refer to [11] for details), we can get the completeness of $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion. \square

The transition rules of τ_I are shown in Table 38, and the axioms are shown in Table 40.

Theorem 3.27 (Conservativity of $qAPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion). *$qAPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion.*

Proof. Since the transition rules of $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion are source-dependent, and the transition rules for abstraction operator in Table 38 contain only a fresh operator τ_I in their source, so the transition rules of $qAPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of those of $qAPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion. \square

Theorem 3.28 (Congruence theorem of $qAPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion). *Rooted branching static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbp}^{sl} , \approx_{rbs}^{sl} , \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to $qAPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion.*

Proof. (1) It is easy to see that rooted branching static location pomset bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $qAPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion terms, we only need to prove that \approx_{rbp}^{sl} is preserved by the operator τ_I . It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(2) It is easy to see that rooted branching static location step bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $qAPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion terms, we only need to prove that \approx_{rbs}^{sl} is preserved by the operator τ_I . It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

No.	Axiom
TI1	$e \notin I \quad \tau_I(e) = e$
TI2	$e \in I \quad \tau_I(e) = \tau$
TI3	$\tau_I(\delta) = \delta$
TI4	$\tau_I(x + y) = \tau_I(x) + \tau_I(y)$
TI5	$\tau_I(x \cdot y) = \tau_I(x) \cdot \tau_I(y)$
TI6	$\tau_I(x \parallel y) = \tau_I(x) \parallel \tau_I(y)$
L14	$u :: \tau_I(x) = \tau_I(u :: x)$
L15	$e \notin I \quad \tau_I(u :: e) = u :: e$
L16	$e \in I \quad \tau_I(u :: e) = \tau$

Table 40: Axioms of abstraction operator

(3) It is easy to see that rooted branching static location hp-bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion terms, we only need to prove that \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} is preserved by the operator τ_I . It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(4) It is easy to see that rooted branching static location hhp-bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion terms, we only need to prove that \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} is preserved by the operator τ_I . It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers. \square

Theorem 3.29 (Soundness of $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion). *Let x and y be $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion terms. If $qAPTC_\tau^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \approx_{rbs}^{sl} y$;
2. $x \approx_{rbp}^{sl} y$;
3. $x \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} y$;
4. $x \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} y$.

Proof. (1) Since rooted branching static location step bisimulation \approx_{rbs}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 40 is sound modulo rooted branching static location step bisimulation \approx_{rbs}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(2) Since rooted branching static location pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 40 is sound modulo rooted branching static location pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(3) Since rooted branching static location hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 40 is sound modulo rooted branching static location hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers.

No.	Axiom
<i>CFAR</i>	<p>If X is in a cluster for I with exits</p> $\{(u_{11} :: a_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{1i} :: a_{1i})Y_1, \dots, (u_{m1} :: a_{m1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{mi} :: a_{mi})Y_m,$ $v_{11} :: b_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{1j} :: b_{1j}, \dots, v_{n1} :: b_{n1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{nj} :: b_{nj}\},$ <p>then $\tau \cdot \tau_I(\langle X E \rangle) =$</p> $\tau \cdot \tau_I((u_{11} :: a_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{1i} :: a_{1i})\langle Y_1 E \rangle + \dots + (u_{m1} :: a_{m1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{mi} :: a_{mi})\langle Y_m E \rangle$ $+ v_{11} :: b_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{1j} :: b_{1j} + \dots + v_{n1} :: b_{n1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{nj} :: b_{nj})$

Table 41: Cluster fair abstraction rule

(4) Since rooted branching static location hhp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 40 is sound modulo rooted branching static location hhp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers. \square

Definition 3.30 (Cluster). *Let E be a guarded linear recursive specification, and $I \subseteq \mathbb{E}$. Two recursion variable X and Y in E are in the same cluster for I iff there exist sequences of transitions $\langle X|E \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\{b_{11}, \dots, b_{1i}\}} \dots [u] \xrightarrow{\{b_{m1}, \dots, b_{mi}\}} \langle Y|E \rangle$ and $\langle Y|E \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{\{c_{11}, \dots, c_{1j}\}} \dots \xrightarrow[v]{\{c_{n1}, \dots, c_{nj}\}} \langle X|E \rangle$, where $b_{11}, \dots, b_{mi}, c_{11}, \dots, c_{nj} \in I \cup \{\tau\}$.*

$u_1 :: a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_k :: a_k$ or $(u_1 :: a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_k :: a_k)X$ is an exit for the cluster C iff: (1) $u_1 :: a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_k :: a_k$ or $(u_1 :: a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_k :: a_k)X$ is a summand at the right-hand side of the recursive equation for a recursion variable in C , and (2) in the case of $(u_1 :: a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_k :: a_k)X$, either $a_l \notin I \cup \{\tau\}$ ($l \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$) or $X \notin C$.

Theorem 3.31 (Soundness of *CFAR*). *$CFAR$ is sound modulo rooted branching static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbs}^{sl} , \approx_{rbp}^{sl} , \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} .*

Proof. (1) Since rooted branching static location step bisimulation \approx_{rbs}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 41 is sound modulo rooted branching static location step bisimulation \approx_{rbs}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(2) Since rooted branching static location pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 41 is sound modulo rooted branching static location pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(3) Since rooted branching static location hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 41 is sound modulo rooted branching static location hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(4) Since rooted branching static location hhp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 41 is sound modulo rooted branching static location hhp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers. \square

No.	Axiom
SC1	$\textcircled{S} \cdot x = x$
SC2	$x \cdot \textcircled{S} = x$
SC3	$e \parallel \textcircled{S}^e = e$
SC4	$\textcircled{S}^e \parallel e = e$
SC5	$e \parallel (\textcircled{S}^e \cdot y) = e \cdot y$
SC6	$\textcircled{S}^e \parallel (e \cdot y) = e \cdot y$
SC7	$(e \cdot x) \parallel \textcircled{S}^e = e \cdot x$
SC8	$(\textcircled{S}^e \cdot x) \parallel e = e \cdot x$
SC9	$(e \cdot x) \parallel (\textcircled{S}^e \cdot y) = e \cdot (x \textcircled{\&}\ y)$
SC10	$(\textcircled{S}^e \cdot x) \parallel (e \cdot y) = e \cdot (x \textcircled{\&}\ y)$
L17	$loc :: \textcircled{S} = \textcircled{S}$

Table 42: Axioms of quantum entanglement

Theorem 3.32 (Completeness of $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and *CFAR*). *Let p and q be closed $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and *CFAR* terms, then,*

1. *if $p \approx_{rbs}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
2. *if $p \approx_{rbp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
3. *if $p \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
4. *if $p \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. According to the definition of static location truly concurrent rooted branching bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbp}^{sl} , \approx_{rbs}^{sl} , \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} , $p \approx_{rbp}^{sl} q$, $p \approx_{rbs}^{sl} q$, $p \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} q$ and $p \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} q$ implies both the rooted branching bisimilarities between p and q , and also the in the same quantum states. According to the completeness of $APTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion (please refer to [11] for details), we can get the completeness of $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion. \square

3.5 Quantum Entanglement

If two quantum variables are entangled, then a quantum operation performed on one variable, then state of the other quantum variable is also changed. So, the entangled states must be all the inner variables or all the public variables. We will introduced a mechanism to explicitly define quantum entanglement in open quantum systems. A new constant called shadow constant denoted \textcircled{S}_i^e corresponding to a specific quantum operation. If there are n quantum variables entangled, they maybe be distributed in different quantum systems, with a quantum operation performed on one variable, there should be one \textcircled{S}_i^e ($1 \leq i \leq n - 1$) executed on each variable in the other $n - 1$ variables. Thus, distributed variables are all hidden behind actions. In the following, we let $\textcircled{S} \in \mathbb{E}$.

The axiom system of the shadow constant \textcircled{S} is shown in Table 42.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\overline{\langle \textcircled{\text{S}}, \varrho \rangle \rightarrow \langle \surd, \varrho \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho' \rangle \xrightarrow{\textcircled{\text{S}}^e} \langle y', \varrho' \rangle}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle x' \wp y', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho' \rangle \xrightarrow{\textcircled{\text{S}}^e} \langle y', \varrho' \rangle}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle y', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho' \rangle \xrightarrow{\textcircled{\text{S}}^e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle y', \varrho' \rangle}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle y', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho' \rangle \xrightarrow{\textcircled{\text{S}}^e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle}
\end{array}$$

Table 43: Transition rules of constant $\textcircled{\text{S}}$

The transition rules of constant $\textcircled{\text{S}}$ are as Table 43 shows.

Theorem 3.33 (Elimination theorem of $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant). *Let p be a closed $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant term. Then there is a closed $qAPTC$ with localities term such that $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant- $p = q$.*

Proof. We leave the proof to the readers as an excise. \square

Theorem 3.34 (Conservativity of $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant). *$qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant is a conservative extension of $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion.*

Proof. We leave the proof to the readers as an excise. \square

Theorem 3.35 (Congruence theorem of $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant). *Routed branching static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbp}^{sl} , \approx_{rbs}^{sl} , \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant.*

Proof. We leave the proof to the readers as an excise. \square

Theorem 3.36 (Soundness of $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant). *Let x and y be closed $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant terms. If $qAPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant- $x = y$, then*

1. $x \approx_{rbs}^{sl} y$;
2. $x \approx_{rbp}^{sl} y$;
3. $x \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} y$;
4. $x \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} y$.

Proof. We leave the proof to the readers as an excise. □

Theorem 3.37 (Completeness of $qAPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant).
Let p and q are closed $qAPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant terms, then,

1. *if $p \approx_{rbs}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
2. *if $p \approx_{rbp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
3. *if $p \approx_{rbhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;*
4. *if $p \approx_{rbhhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. We leave the proof to the readers as an excise. □

3.6 Unification of Quantum and Classical Computing for Open Quantum Systems

We give the transition rules under quantum configuration for traditional atomic actions (events) $e' \in \mathbb{E}$ as Table 44 shows.

And the axioms for traditional actions are the same as those of qBATC with localities. And it is natural can be extended to qAPTC with localities, recursion and abstraction. So, quantum and classical computing are unified under the framework of qAPTC with localities for open quantum systems.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\overline{\langle e', \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[\epsilon]{e'} \langle \surd, \varrho \rangle} \quad \overline{\langle loc :: e', \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[loc]{e'} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle loc :: x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[loc \ll u]{e'} \langle loc :: x', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle \surd, \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle \surd, \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle x', \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle x', \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle \surd, \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle \surd, \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle y', \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle y', \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle \surd, \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x \cdot y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle y, \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle x', \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x \cdot y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle x' \cdot y, \varrho \rangle}
\end{array}$$

Table 44: Transition rules of BATC under quantum configuration




Figure 1: The BB84 protocol.

4 Applications of qAPTC with Localities

Quantum and classical computing in open systems are unified with qAPTC with localities, which have the same equational logic and the same quantum configuration based operational semantics. The unification can be used widely in verification for the behaviors of quantum and classical computing mixed systems with distributed characteristics. In this chapter, we show its usage in verification of the distributed quantum communication protocols.

4.1 Verification of BB84 Protocol

The BB84 protocol is used to create a private key between two parties, Alice and Bob. Firstly, we introduce the basic BB84 protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 1.

1. Alice create two string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as B_a and K_a .
2. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , and the i th qubit in q is $|x_y\rangle$, where x is the i th bit of B_a and y is the i th bit of K_a .
3. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
4. Bob receives q and randomly generates a string of bits B_b with size n .
5. Bob measures each qubit of q according to a basis by bits of B_b . And the measurement results would be K_b , which is also with size n .
6. Bob sends his measurement bases B_b to Alice through a public channel P .
7. Once receiving B_b , Alice sends her bases B_a to Bob through channel P , and Bob receives B_a .
8. Alice and Bob determine that at which position the bit strings B_a and B_b are equal, and they discard the mismatched bits of B_a and B_b . Then the remaining bits of K_a and K_b , denoted as K'_a and K'_b with $K_{a,b} = K'_a = K'_b$.

We re-introduce the basic BB84 protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 1 illustrates.

Now, we assume a special measurement operation $Rand[q; B_a]$ which create a string of n random bits B_a from the q quantum system, and the same as $Rand[q; K_a]$, $Rand[q'; B_b]$. $M[q; K_b]$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q . The generation of n qubits q through two

quantum operations $Set_{K_a}[q]$ and $H_{B_a}[q]$. Alice sends q to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(B_b)$ and Alice receives B_b through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(B_b)$, and the same as $send_P(B_a)$ and $receive_P(B_a)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= Rand[q; B_a] \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= Rand[q; K_a] \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= Set_{K_a}[q] \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= H_{B_a}[q] \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= receive_P(B_b) \cdot A_7 \\
A_7 &= send_P(B_a) \cdot A_8 \\
A_8 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= Rand[q'; B_b] \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= M[q; K_b] \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_P(B_b) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= receive_P(B_a) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot B_6 \\
B_6 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(send_Q(q), receive_Q(q)) &\triangleq c_Q(q) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b)) &\triangleq c_P(B_b) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a)) &\triangleq c_P(B_a)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q), receive_Q(q), send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b), send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a)\}$ and $I = \{Rand[q; B_a], Rand[q; K_a], Set_{K_a}[q], H_{B_a}[q], Rand[q'; B_b], M[q; K_b], c_Q(q), c_P(B_b), c_P(B_a), cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 4.1. *The basic BB84 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$. So, the basic BB84 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

4.2 Verification of E91 Protocol

The E91 protocol[35] is the first quantum protocol which utilizes entanglement and mixes quantum and classical information. In this section, we take an example of verification for the E91 protocol.

The E91 protocol is used to create a private key between two parties, Alice and Bob. Firstly, we introduce the basic E91 protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 2.

1. Alice generates a string of EPR pairs q with size n , i.e., $2n$ particles, and sends a string of qubits q_b from each EPR pair with n to Bob through a quantum channel Q , remains the other string of qubits q_a from each pair with size n .
2. Alice create two string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as B_a and K_a .
3. Bob receives q_b and randomly generates a string of bits B_b with size n .
4. Alice measures each qubit of q_a according to a basis by bits of B_a . And the measurement results would be K_a , which is also with size n .
5. Bob measures each qubit of q_b according to a basis by bits of B_b . And the measurement results would be K_b , which is also with size n .
6. Bob sends his measurement bases B_b to Alice through a public channel P .
7. Once receiving B_b , Alice sends her bases B_a to Bob through channel P , and Bob receives B_a .
8. Alice and Bob determine that at which position the bit strings B_a and B_b are equal, and they discard the mismatched bits of B_a and B_b . Then the remaining bits of K_a and K_b , denoted as K'_a and K'_b with $K_{a,b} = K'_a = K'_b$.




Figure 2: The E91 protocol.

We re-introduce the basic E91 protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 2 illustrates.

Now, $M[q_a; K_a]$ denotes the Alice's measurement operation of q_a , and $\textcircled{S}_{M[q_a; K_a]}$ denotes the responding shadow constant; $M[q_b; K_b]$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q_b , and $\textcircled{S}_{M[q_b; K_b]}$ denotes the responding shadow constant. Alice sends q_b to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q_b)$ and Bob receives q_b through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q_b)$. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(B_b)$ and Alice receives B_b through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(B_b)$, and the same as $send_P(B_a)$ and $receive_P(B_a)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= send_Q(q_b) \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= M[q_a; K_a] \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= \textcircled{S}_{M[q_b; K_b]} \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= receive_P(B_b) \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= send_P(B_a) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q_b) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= \textcircled{\text{S}}_{M[q_a; K_a]} \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= M[q_b; K_b] \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_P(B_b) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= receive_P(B_a) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot B_6 \\
B_6 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. The quantum operation and its shadow constant pair will lead entanglement occur, otherwise, a deadlock δ will occur. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(send_Q(q_b), receive_Q(q_b)) &\triangleq c_Q(q_b) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b)) &\triangleq c_P(B_b) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a)) &\triangleq c_P(B_a)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q_b), receive_Q(q_b), send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b), send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a), M[q_a; K_a], \textcircled{\text{S}}_{M[q_a; K_a]}, M[q_b; K_b], \textcircled{\text{S}}_{M[q_b; K_b]}\}$ and $I = \{c_Q(q_b), c_P(B_b), c_P(B_a), M[q_a; K_a], M[q_b; K_b], cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 4.2. *The basic E91 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(A \parallel B))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$. So, the basic E91 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

4.3 Verification of B92 Protocol

The famous B92 protocol[36] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The B92 protocol is used to create a private key between two parities, Alice and Bob. B92 is a protocol of quantum key distribution (QKD) which uses polarized photons as information carriers. Firstly, we introduce the basic B92 protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 3.




Figure 3: The B92 protocol.

1. Alice create a string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as A .
2. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , carried by polarized photons. If $A_i = 0$, the i th qubit is $|0\rangle$; else if $A_i = 1$, the i th qubit is $|+\rangle$.
3. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
4. Bob receives q and randomly generates a string of bits B with size n .
5. If $B_i = 0$, Bob chooses the basis \oplus ; else if $B_i = 1$, Bob chooses the basis \otimes . Bob measures each qubit of q according to the above basses. And Bob builds a String of bits T , if the measurement produces $|0\rangle$ or $|+\rangle$, then $T_i = 0$; else if the measurement produces $|1\rangle$ or $|-\rangle$, then $T_i = 1$, which is also with size n .
6. Bob sends T to Alice through a public channel P .
7. Alice and Bob determine that at which position the bit strings A and B are remained for which $T_i = 1$. In absence of Eve, $A_i = 1 - B_i$, a shared raw key $K_{a,b}$ is formed by A_i .

We re-introduce the basic B92 protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 3 illustrates.

Now, we assume a special measurement operation $Rand[q; A]$ which create a string of n random bits A from the q quantum system, and the same as $Rand[q'; B]$. $M[q; T]$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q . The generation of n qubits q through a quantum operation $Set_A[q]$. Alice sends q to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$. Bob sends T to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(T)$ and Alice receives T through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(T)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, T, A, B)$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= Rand[q; A] \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= Set_A[q] \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= receive_P(T) \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, T, A, B) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= Rand[q'; B] \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= M[q; T] \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_P(T) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, T, A, B) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(send_Q(q), receive_Q(q)) &\triangleq c_Q(q) \\
\gamma(send_P(T), receive_P(T)) &\triangleq c_P(T)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q), receive_Q(q), send_P(T), receive_P(T)\}$ and $I = \{Rand[q; A], Set_A[q], Rand[q'; B], M[q; T], c_Q(q), c_P(T), cmp(K_{a,b}, T, A, B)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 4.3. *The basic B92 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(A \parallel B))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$. So, the basic B92 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square




Figure 4: The DPS protocol.

4.4 Verification of DPS Protocol

The famous DPS protocol[37] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The DPS protocol is used to create a private key between two parities, Alice and Bob. DPS is a protocol of quantum key distribution (QKD) which uses pulses of a photon which has nonorthogonal four states. Firstly, we introduce the basic DPS protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 4.

1. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , carried by a series of single photons possibly at four time instances.
2. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
3. Bob receives q by detectors clicking at the second or third time instance, and records the time into T with size n and which detector clicks into D with size n .
4. Bob sends T to Alice through a public channel P .
5. Alice receives T . From T and her modulation data, Alice knows which detector clicked in Bob's site, i.e. D .
6. Alice and Bob have an identical bit string, provided that the first detector click represents "0" and the other detector represents "1", then a shared raw key $K_{a,b}$ is formed.

We re-introduce the basic DPS protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 4 illustrates.

Now, we assume $M[q;T]$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q . The generation of n qubits q through a quantum operation $Set_A[q]$. Alice sends q to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$. Bob sends T to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(T)$ and Alice receives T through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(T)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, D)$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= Set_A[q] \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= receive_P(T) \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, D) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= M[q; T] \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= send_P(T) \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, D) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(send_Q(q), receive_Q(q)) &\triangleq c_Q(q) \\
\gamma(send_P(T), receive_P(T)) &\triangleq c_P(T)
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q), receive_Q(q), send_P(T), receive_P(T)\}$

and $I = \{Set_A[q], M[q; T], c_Q(q), c_P(T), cmp(K_{a,b}, D)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 4.4. *The basic DPS protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$. So, the basic DPS protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square




Figure 5: The BBM92 protocol.

4.5 Verification of BBM92 Protocol

The famous BBM92 protocol[38] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The BBM92 protocol is used to create a private key between two parties, Alice and Bob. BBM92 is a protocol of quantum key distribution (QKD) which uses EPR pairs as information carriers. Firstly, we introduce the basic BBM92 protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 5.

1. Alice generates a string of EPR pairs q with size n , i.e., $2n$ particles, and sends a string of qubits q_b from each EPR pair with n to Bob through a quantum channel Q , remains the other string of qubits q_a from each pair with size n .
2. Alice create a string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as B_a .
3. Bob receives q_b and randomly generates a string of bits B_b with size n .
4. Alice measures each qubit of q_a according to bits of B_a , if $B_{a_i} = 0$, then uses x axis (\rightarrow); else if $B_{a_i} = 1$, then uses z axis (\uparrow).
5. Bob measures each qubit of q_b according to bits of B_b , if $B_{b_i} = 0$, then uses x axis (\rightarrow); else if $B_{b_i} = 1$, then uses z axis (\uparrow).
6. Bob sends his measurement axis choices B_b to Alice through a public channel P .
7. Once receiving B_b , Alice sends her axis choices B_a to Bob through channel P , and Bob receives B_a .
8. Alice and Bob agree to discard all instances in which they happened to measure along different axes, as well as instances in which measurements fails because of imperfect quantum efficiency of the detectors. Then the remaining instances can be used to generate a private key $K_{a,b}$.

We re-introduce the basic BBM92 protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 5 illustrates.

Now, $M[q_a; B_a]$ denotes the Alice's measurement operation of q_a , and $\textcircled{S}_{M[q_a; B_a]}$ denotes the responding shadow constant; $M[q_b; B_b]$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q_b , and $\textcircled{S}_{M[q_b; B_b]}$ denotes the responding shadow constant. Alice sends q_b to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q_b)$ and Bob receives q_b through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q_b)$. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public channel

P by classical communicating action $send_P(B_b)$ and Alice receives B_b through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(B_b)$, and the same as $send_P(B_a)$ and $receive_P(B_a)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, B_a, B_b)$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= send_Q(q_b) \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= M[q_a; B_a] \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= \textcircled{S}_{M[q_b; B_b]} \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= receive_P(B_b) \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= send_P(B_a) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, B_a, B_b) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q_b) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= \textcircled{S}_{M[q_a; B_a]} \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= M[q_b; B_b] \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_P(B_b) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= receive_P(B_a) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, B_a, B_b) \cdot B_6 \\
B_6 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. The quantum operation and its shadow constant pair will lead entanglement occur, otherwise, a deadlock δ will occur. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(send_Q(q_b), receive_Q(q_b)) &\triangleq c_Q(q_b) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b)) &\triangleq c_P(B_b) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a)) &\triangleq c_P(B_a)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ \textcircled{ } } B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q_b), receive_Q(q_b), send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b), send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a), M[q_a; B_a], \textcircled{M}[q_a; B_a], M[q_b; B_b], \textcircled{M}[q_b; B_b]\}$ and $I = \{c_Q(q_b), c_P(B_b), c_P(B_a), M[q_a; B_a], M[q_b; B_b], cmp(K_{a,b}, B_a, B_b)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 4.5. *The basic BBM92 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ \textcircled{ } } B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ \textcircled{ } } B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: loc_send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ \textcircled{ } } B)))$. So, the basic BBM92 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ \textcircled{ } } B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

4.6 Verification of SARG04 Protocol

The famous SARG04 protocol[39] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The SARG04 protocol is used to create a private key between two parties, Alice and Bob. SARG04 is a protocol of quantum key distribution (QKD) which refines the BB84 protocol against PNS (Photon Number Splitting) attacks. The main innovations are encoding bits in nonorthogonal states and the classical sifting procedure. Firstly, we introduce the basic SARG04 protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 6.

1. Alice create a string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as K_a .
2. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , and the i th qubit of q has four nonorthogonal states, it is $|\pm x\rangle$ if $K_a = 0$; it is $|\pm z\rangle$ if $K_a = 1$. And she records the corresponding one of the four pairs of nonorthogonal states into B_a with size $2n$.
3. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
4. Alice sends B_a through a public channel P .
5. Bob measures each qubit of q σ_x or σ_z . And he records the unambiguous discriminations into K_b with a raw size $n/4$, and the unambiguous discrimination information into B_b with size n .
6. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public channel P .
7. Alice and Bob determine that at which position the bit should be remained. Then the remaining bits of K_a and K_b is the private key $K_{a,b}$.

We re-introduce the basic SARG04 protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 6 illustrates.

Now, we assume a special measurement operation $Rand[q; K_a]$ which create a string of n random bits K_a from the q quantum system. $M[q; K_b]$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation




Figure 6: The SARG04 protocol.

of q . The generation of n qubits q through a quantum operation $Set_{K_a}[q]$. Alice sends q to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(B_b)$ and Alice receives B_b through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(B_b)$, and the same as $send_P(B_a)$ and $receive_P(B_a)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= Rand[q; K_a] \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= Set_{K_a}[q] \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= send_P(B_a) \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= receive_P(B_b) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= receive_P(B_a) \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= M[q; K_b] \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_P(B_b) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma(\text{send}_Q(q), \text{receive}_Q(q)) &\triangleq c_Q(q) \\ \gamma(\text{send}_P(B_b), \text{receive}_P(B_b)) &\triangleq c_P(B_b) \\ \gamma(\text{send}_P(B_a), \text{receive}_P(B_a)) &\triangleq c_P(B_a)\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{\text{send}_Q(q), \text{receive}_Q(q), \text{send}_P(B_b), \text{receive}_P(B_b), \text{send}_P(B_a), \text{receive}_P(B_a)\}$ and $I = \{\text{Rand}[q; K_a], \text{Set}_{K_a}[q], M[q; K_b], c_Q(q), c_P(B_b), c_P(B_a), \text{cmp}(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 4.6. *The basic SARG04 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} \text{loc}_A :: \text{receive}_A(D_i) \parallel \text{loc}_B :: \text{send}_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$. So, the basic SARG04 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

4.7 Verification of COW Protocol

The famous COW protocol[40] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The COW protocol is used to create a private key between two parties, Alice and Bob. COW is a protocol of quantum key distribution (QKD) which is practical. Firstly, we introduce the basic COW protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 7.

1. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , and the i th qubit of q is "0" with probability $\frac{1-f}{2}$, "1" with probability $\frac{1+f}{2}$ and the decoy sequence with probability f .
2. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
3. Alice sends A of the items corresponding to a decoy sequence through a public channel P .
4. Bob removes all the detections at times $2A-1$ and $2A$ from his raw key and looks whether detector D_{2M} has ever fired at time $2A$.
5. Bob sends B of the times $2A+1$ in which he had a detector in D_{2M} to Alice through the public channel P .
6. Alice receives B and verifies if some of these items corresponding to a bit sequence "1,0".




Figure 7: The COW protocol.

7. Bob sends C of the items that he has detected through the public channel P .
8. Alice and Bob run error correction and privacy amplification on these bits, and the private key $K_{a,b}$ is established.

We re-introduce the basic COW protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 7 illustrates.

Now, we assume The generation of n qubits q through a quantum operation $Set[q]$. $M[q]$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q . Alice sends q to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$. Alice sends A to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(A)$ and Alice receives A through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(A)$, and the same as $send_P(B)$ and $receive_P(B)$, and $send_P(C)$ and $receive_P(C)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b})$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
 A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
 A_1 &= Set[q] \cdot A_2 \\
 A_2 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_3 \\
 A_3 &= send_P(A) \cdot A_4 \\
 A_4 &= receive_P(B) \cdot A_5 \\
 A_5 &= receive_P(C) \cdot A_6 \\
 A_6 &= cmp(K_{a,b}) \cdot A
 \end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= receive_P(A) \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= M[q] \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_P(B) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= send_P(C) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= cmp(K_{a,b}) \cdot B_6 \\
B_6 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(send_Q(q), receive_Q(q)) &\triangleq c_Q(q) \\
\gamma(send_P(A), receive_P(A)) &\triangleq c_P(A) \\
\gamma(send_P(B), receive_P(B)) &\triangleq c_P(B) \\
\gamma(send_P(C), receive_P(C)) &\triangleq c_P(C)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q), receive_Q(q), send_P(A), receive_P(A), send_P(B), receive_P(B), send_P(C), receive_P(C)\}$ and $I = \{Set[q], M[q], c_Q(q), c_P(A), c_P(B), c_P(C), cmp(K_{a,b})\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 4.7. *The basic COW protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$. So, the basic COW protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

4.8 Verification of SSP Protocol

The famous SSP protocol[41] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The SSP protocol is used to create a private key between two parties, Alice and Bob. SSP is a protocol of quantum key distribution (QKD) which uses six states. Firstly, we introduce the basic SSP protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 8.




Figure 8: The SSP protocol.

1. Alice create two string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as B_a and K_a .
2. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , and the i th qubit in q is one of the six states $\pm x$, $\pm y$ and $\pm z$.
3. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
4. Bob receives q and randomly generates a string of bits B_b with size n .
5. Bob measures each qubit of q according to a basis by bits of B_b , i.e., x , y or z basis. And the measurement results would be K_b , which is also with size n .
6. Bob sends his measurement bases B_b to Alice through a public channel P .
7. Once receiving B_b , Alice sends her bases B_a to Bob through channel P , and Bob receives B_a .
8. Alice and Bob determine that at which position the bit strings B_a and B_b are equal, and they discard the mismatched bits of B_a and B_b . Then the remaining bits of K_a and K_b , denoted as K'_a and K'_b with $K_{a,b} = K'_a = K'_b$.

We re-introduce the basic SSP protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 8 illustrates.

Now, we assume a special measurement operation $Rand[q; B_a]$ which create a string of n random bits B_a from the q quantum system, and the same as $Rand[q; K_a]$, $Rand[q'; B_b]$. $M[q; K_b]$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q . The generation of n qubits q through two quantum operations $Set_{K_a}[q]$ and $H_{B_a}[q]$. Alice sends q to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(B_b)$ and Alice receives B_b through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(B_b)$, and the same as $send_P(B_a)$ and $receive_P(B_a)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= Rand[q; B_a] \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= Rand[q; K_a] \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= Set_{K_a}[q] \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= H_{B_a}[q] \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= receive_P(B_b) \cdot A_7 \\
A_7 &= send_P(B_a) \cdot A_8 \\
A_8 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= Rand[q'; B_b] \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= M[q; K_b] \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_P(B_b) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= receive_P(B_a) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot B_6 \\
B_6 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(send_Q(q), receive_Q(q)) &\triangleq c_Q(q) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b)) &\triangleq c_P(B_b) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a)) &\triangleq c_P(B_a)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q), receive_Q(q), send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b), send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a)\}$ and $I = \{Rand[q; B_a], Rand[q; K_a], Set_{K_a}[q], H_{B_a}[q], Rand[q'; B_b], M[q; K_b], c_Q(q), c_P(B_b), c_P(B_a), cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.




Figure 9: The S09 protocol.

Theorem 4.8. *The basic SSP protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ } \bowtie \text{ } B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ } \bowtie \text{ } B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ } \bowtie \text{ } B)))$. So, the basic SSP protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ } \bowtie \text{ } B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

4.9 Verification of S09 Protocol

The famous S09 protocol[42] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The S09 protocol is used to create a private key between two parties, Alice and Bob, by use of pure quantum information. Firstly, we introduce the basic S09 protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 9.

1. Alice create two string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as B_a and K_a .
2. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , and the i th qubit in q is $|x_y\rangle$, where x is the i th bit of B_a and y is the i th bit of K_a .
3. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
4. Bob receives q and randomly generates a string of bits B_b with size n .
5. Bob measures each qubit of q according to a basis by bits of B_b . After the measurement, the state of q evolves into q' .
6. Bob sends q' to Alice through the quantum channel Q .
7. Alice measures each qubit of q' to generate a string C .
8. Alice sums $C_i \oplus B_{a_i}$ to get the private key $K_{a,b} = B_b$.

We re-introduce the basic S09 protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 9 illustrates.

Now, we assume a special measurement operation $Rand[q; B_a]$ which create a string of n random bits B_a from the q quantum system, and the same as $Rand[q; K_a]$, $Rand[q'; B_b]$. $M[q; B_b]$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q , and the same as $M[q'; C]$. The generation of n qubits q through two quantum operations $Set_{K_a}[q]$ and $H_{B_a}[q]$. Alice sends q to Bob through

the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$, and the same as $send_Q(q')$ and $receive_Q(q')$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, B_b)$. We omit the sum classical \oplus actions without loss of generality. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= Rand[q; B_a] \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= Rand[q; K_a] \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= Set_{K_a}[q] \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= H_{B_a}[q] \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= receive_Q(q') \cdot A_7 \\
A_7 &= M[q'; C] \cdot A_8 \\
A_8 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, B_b) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= Rand[q'; B_b] \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= M[q; B_b] \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_Q(q') \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, B_b) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(send_Q(q), receive_Q(q)) &\triangleq c_Q(q) \\
\gamma(send_Q(q'), receive_Q(q')) &\triangleq c_Q(q')
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ \textcircled{ } } B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q), receive_Q(q), send_Q(q'), receive_Q(q')\}$ and $I = \{Rand[q; B_a], Rand[q; K_a], Set_{K_a}[q], H_{B_a}[q], Rand[q'; B_b], M[q; K_b], M[q'; C], c_Q(q), c_Q(q'), cmp(K_{a,b}, B_b)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 4.9. *The basic S09 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ \textcircled{ } } B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ \textcircled{ } } B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ \textcircled{ } } B)))$. So, the basic S09 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ \textcircled{ } } B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

4.10 Verification of KMB09 Protocol

The famous KMB09 protocol[43] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The KMB09 protocol is used to create a private key between two parities, Alice and Bob. KMB09 is a protocol of quantum key distribution (QKD) which refines the BB84 protocol against PNS (Photon Number Splitting) attacks. The main innovations are encoding bits in nonorthogonal states and the classical sifting procedure. Firstly, we introduce the basic KMB09 protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 10.

1. Alice create a string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as K_a , and randomly assigns each bit value a random index $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ into B_a .
2. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , accordingly either in $|e_i\rangle$ or $|f_i\rangle$.
3. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
4. Alice sends B_a through a public channel P .
5. Bob measures each qubit of q by randomly switching the measurement basis between e and f . And he records the unambiguous discriminations into K_b , and the unambiguous discrimination information into B_b .
6. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public channel P .
7. Alice and Bob determine that at which position the bit should be remained. Then the remaining bits of K_a and K_b is the private key $K_{a,b}$.

We re-introduce the basic KMB09 protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 10 illustrates.

Now, we assume a special measurement operation $Rand[q; K_a]$ which create a string of n random bits K_a from the q quantum system. $M[q; K_b]$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q . The generation of n qubits q through a quantum operation $Set_{K_a}[q]$. Alice sends q to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the




Figure 10: The KMB09 protocol.

public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(B_b)$ and Alice receives B_b through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(B_b)$, and the same as $send_P(B_a)$ and $receive_P(B_a)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= Rand[q; K_a] \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= Set_{K_a}[q] \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= send_P(B_a) \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= receive_P(B_b) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= receive_P(B_a) \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= M[q; K_b] \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_P(B_b) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(\text{send}_Q(q), \text{receive}_Q(q)) &\triangleq c_Q(q) \\
\gamma(\text{send}_P(B_b), \text{receive}_P(B_b)) &\triangleq c_P(B_b) \\
\gamma(\text{send}_P(B_a), \text{receive}_P(B_a)) &\triangleq c_P(B_a)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{\text{send}_Q(q), \text{receive}_Q(q), \text{send}_P(B_b), \text{receive}_P(B_b), \text{send}_P(B_a), \text{receive}_P(B_a)\}$ and $I = \{\text{Rand}[q; K_a], \text{Set}_{K_a}[q], M[q; K_b], c_Q(q), c_P(B_b), c_P(B_a), \text{cmp}(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 4.10. *The basic KMB09 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} \text{loc}_A :: \text{receive}_A(D_i) \parallel \text{loc}_B :: \text{send}_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$. So, the basic KMB09 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

4.11 Verification of S13 Protocol

The famous S13 protocol[44] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The S13 protocol is used to create a private key between two parities, Alice and Bob. Firstly, we introduce the basic S13 protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 11.

1. Alice create two string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as B_a and K_a .
2. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , and the i th qubit in q is $|x_y\rangle$, where x is the i th bit of B_a and y is the i th bit of K_a .
3. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
4. Bob receives q and randomly generates a string of bits B_b with size n .
5. Bob measures each qubit of q according to a basis by bits of B_b . And the measurement results would be K_b , which is also with size n .
6. Alice sends a random binary string C to Bob through the public channel P .
7. Alice sums $B_{a_i} \oplus C_i$ to obtain T and generates other random string of binary values J . From the elements occupying a concrete position, i , of the preceding strings, Alice get the new states of q' , and sends it to Bob through the quantum channel Q .
8. Bob sums $1 \oplus B_{b_i}$ to obtain the string of binary basis N and measures q' according to these bases, and generating D .




Figure 11: The S13 protocol.

9. Alice sums $K_{a_i} \oplus J_i$ to obtain the binary string Y and sends it to Bob through the public channel P .
10. Bob encrypts B_b to obtain U and sends to Alice through the public channel P .
11. Alice decrypts U to obtain B_b . She sums $B_{a_i} \oplus B_{b_i}$ to obtain L and sends L to Bob through the public channel P .
12. Bob sums $B_{b_i} \oplus L_i$ to get the private key $K_{a,b}$.

We re-introduce the basic S13 protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 11 illustrates.

Now, we assume a special measurement operation $Rand[q; B_a]$ which create a string of n random bits B_a from the q quantum system, and the same as $Rand[q; K_a]$, $Rand[q'; B_b]$. $M[q; K_b]$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q , and the same as $M[q'; D]$. The generation of n qubits q through two quantum operations $Set_{K_a}[q]$ and $H_{B_a}[q]$, and the same as $Set_T[q']$. Alice sends q to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$, and the same as $send_Q(q')$ and $receive_Q(q')$. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(B_b)$ and Alice receives B_b through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(B_b)$, and the same as $send_P(B_a)$ and $receive_P(B_a)$, $send_P(C)$ and $receive_P(C)$, $send_P(Y)$ and $receive_P(Y)$, $send_P(U)$ and $receive_P(U)$, $send_P(L)$ and $receive_P(L)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)$. We omit the sum classical \oplus actions without of loss of generality. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= Rand[q; B_a] \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= Rand[q; K_a] \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= Set_{K_a}[q] \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= H_{B_a}[q] \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= send_P(C) \cdot A_7 \\
A_7 &= send_Q(q') \cdot A_8 \\
A_8 &= send_P(Y) \cdot A_9 \\
A_9 &= receive_P(U) \cdot A_{10} \\
A_{10} &= send_P(L) \cdot A_{11} \\
A_{11} &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= Rand[q'; B_b] \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= M[q; K_b] \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= receive_P(C) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= receive_Q(q') \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= M[q'; D] \cdot B_6 \\
B_6 &= receive_P(Y) \cdot B_7 \\
B_7 &= send_P(U) \cdot B_8 \\
B_8 &= receive_P(L) \cdot B_9 \\
B_9 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot B_{10} \\
B_{10} &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\gamma(\text{send}_Q(q), \text{receive}_Q(q)) \triangleq c_Q(q) \\
&\gamma(\text{send}_Q(q'), \text{receive}_Q(q')) \triangleq c_Q(q') \\
&\gamma(\text{send}_P(C), \text{receive}_P(C)) \triangleq c_P(C) \\
&\gamma(\text{send}_P(Y), \text{receive}_P(Y)) \triangleq c_P(Y) \\
&\gamma(\text{send}_P(U), \text{receive}_P(U)) \triangleq c_P(U) \\
&\gamma(\text{send}_P(L), \text{receive}_P(L)) \triangleq c_P(L)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{\text{send}_Q(q), \text{receive}_Q(q), \text{send}_Q(q'), \text{receive}_Q(q'), \text{send}_P(C), \text{receive}_P(C), \text{send}_P(Y), \text{receive}_P(Y), \text{send}_P(U), \text{receive}_P(U), \text{send}_P(L), \text{receive}_P(L)\}$ and $I = \{\text{Rand}[q; B_a], \text{Rand}[q; K_a], \text{Set}_{K_a}[q], H_{B_a}[q], \text{Rand}[q'; B_b], M[q; K_b], M[q'; D], c_Q(q), c_P(C), c_Q(q'), c_P(Y), c_P(U), c_P(L), \text{cmp}(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 4.11. *The basic S13 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} \text{loc}_A :: \text{receive}_A(D_i) \parallel \text{loc}_B :: \text{send}_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$. So, the basic S13 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

No.	Axiom
A1	$x + y = y + x$
A2	$(x + y) + z = x + (y + z)$
A3	$e + e = e$
A4	$(x + y) \cdot z = x \cdot z + y \cdot z$
A5	$(x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot (y \cdot z)$
A6	$x + \delta = x$
A7	$\delta \cdot x = \delta$
PA1	$x \boxplus_{\pi} y = y \boxplus_{1-\pi} x$
PA2	$x \boxplus_{\pi} (y \boxplus_{\rho} z) = (x \boxplus_{\frac{\pi}{\pi+\rho-\pi\rho}} y) \boxplus_{\pi+\rho-\pi\rho} z$
PA3	$x \boxplus_{\pi} x = x$
PA4	$(x \boxplus_{\pi} y) \cdot z = x \cdot z \boxplus_{\pi} y \cdot z$
PA5	$(x \boxplus_{\pi} y) + z = (x + z) \boxplus_{\pi} (y + z)$
L1	$\epsilon :: x = x$
L2	$u :: (x \cdot y) = u :: x \cdot u :: y$
L3	$u :: (x + y) = u :: x + u :: y$
L4	$u :: (v :: x) = uv :: x$

Table 45: Axioms of $qBAPTC$ with localities

5 APPTC with Localities for Closed Quantum Systems

The theory $APPTC$ with localities for closed quantum systems abbreviated $qAPPTC^{sl}$ has four modules: $qBAPTC^{sl}$, $qAPPTC^{sl}$, recursion and abstraction.

This chapter is organized as follows. We introduce $qBAPTC^{sl}$ in section 5.1, $APPTC$ in section 5.2, recursion in section 5.3, and abstraction in section 5.4. And we introduce quantum measurement in section 5.5, quantum entanglement in section 5.6, and unification of quantum and classical computing in section 5.7.

Note that, for a closed quantum system, the unitary operators are the atomic actions (events) and let unitary operators into \mathbb{E} . And for the existence of quantum measurement, the probabilism is unavoidable.

5.1 $BAPTC$ with Localities for Closed Quantum Systems

In this subsection, we will discuss $qBAPTC$ with localities. Let \mathbb{E} be the set of atomic events (actions, unitary operators).

Let Loc be the set of locations, and $loc \in Loc$, $u, v \in Loc^*$, ϵ is the empty location.

In the following, let $e_1, e_2, e'_1, e'_2 \in \mathbb{E}$, and let variables x, y, z range over the set of terms for true concurrency, p, q range over the set of closed terms.

The set of axioms of $qBAPTC$ with localities consists of the laws given in Table 45.

Definition 5.1 (Basic terms of $qBAPTC$ with localities). *The set of basic terms of $qBAPTC$ with localities, $\mathcal{B}(qBAPTC^{sl})$, is inductively defined as follows:*

1. $\mathbb{E} \subset \mathcal{B}(qBAPTC^{sl})$;
2. if $u \in Loc^*, t \in \mathcal{B}(qBAPTC^{sl})$ then $u :: t \in \mathcal{B}(qBAPTC^{sl})$;
3. if $e \in \mathbb{E}, t \in \mathcal{B}(qBAPTC^{sl})$ then $e \cdot t \in \mathcal{B}(qBAPTC^{sl})$;
4. if $t, t' \in \mathcal{B}(qBAPTC^{sl})$ then $t + t' \in \mathcal{B}(qBAPTC^{sl})$;
5. if $t, t' \in \mathcal{B}(qBAPTC^{sl})$ then $t \boxplus_{\pi} t' \in \mathcal{B}(qBAPTC^{sl})$.

Theorem 5.2 (Elimination theorem of $qBAPTC$ with localities). *Let p be a closed $qBAPTC$ with localities term. Then there is a basic $qBAPTC$ with localities term q such that $qBAPTC \vdash p = q$.*

Proof. The same as that of $BAPTC^{sl}$, we omit the proof, please refer to [12] for details. \square

We will define a term-deduction system which gives the operational semantics of $qBAPTC$ with localities. We give the operational transition rules for atomic event $e \in \mathbb{E}$, operators $::, \cdot$ and $+$ as Table 46 shows. And the predicate $\xrightarrow{e} \checkmark$ represents successful termination after execution of the event e .

Note that, we replace the single atomic event $e \in \mathbb{E}$ by $X \subseteq \mathbb{E}$, we can obtain the static location pomset transition rules of $qBAPTC$ with localities, and omit them.

Theorem 5.3 (Congruence of $qBAPTC$ with localities with respect to probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). *(1) Probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation equivalence \sim_{pp}^{sl} is a congruence with respect to $qBAPTC$ with localities.*

(2) Probabilistic static location step bisimulation equivalence \sim_{ps}^{sl} is a congruence with respect to $qBAPTC$ with localities.

(3) Probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation equivalence \sim_{php}^{sl} is a congruence with respect to $qBAPTC$ with localities.

(4) Probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence \sim_{phhp}^{sl} is a congruence with respect to $qBAPTC$ with localities.

Proof. (1) It is easy to see that probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $qBAPTC$ with localities terms, we only need to prove that \sim_{pp}^{sl} is preserved by the operators $::, \cdot, +$ and \boxplus_{π} . It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(2) It is easy to see that probabilistic static location step bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $qBAPTC$ with localities terms, we only need to prove that \sim_{ps}^{sl} is preserved by the operators $::, \cdot, +$ and \boxplus_{π} . It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(3) It is easy to see that probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $qBAPTC$ with localities terms, we only need to prove that \sim_{php}^{sl} is preserved by the operators $::, \cdot, +$, and \boxplus_{π} . It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(4) It is easy to see that probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $qBAPTC$ with localities terms, we only need to prove that \sim_{phhp}^{sl} is preserved by the operators $::, \cdot, +$, and \boxplus_{π} . It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers. \square

$$\begin{array}{c}
\overline{\langle e, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle \check{e}, \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle x', \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x \cdot y, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle x' \cdot y, \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle x', \varrho \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle y', \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle x' + y', \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle x', \varrho \rangle} \quad \overline{\langle y, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle y', \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x \boxplus_{\pi} y, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle x', \varrho \rangle} \quad \overline{\langle x \boxplus_{\pi} y, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle y', \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle \check{e}, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[\epsilon]{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} \text{ if } \varrho' \in \text{effect}(e, \varrho) \\
\overline{\langle \text{loc} :: \check{e}, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[\text{loc}]{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} x'} \\
\overline{\langle \text{loc} :: x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[\text{loc} \ll u]{e} \langle \text{loc} :: x', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} \quad \overline{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} \quad \overline{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} \quad \overline{\langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle y', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} \quad \overline{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle y', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} \quad \overline{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle x \cdot y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle y, \varrho' \rangle} \quad \overline{\langle x \cdot y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle x' \cdot y, \varrho' \rangle}
\end{array}$$

Table 46: Single event transition rules of $qBAPTC$ with localities

Theorem 5.4 (Soundness of $qBAPTC$ with localities modulo probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). (1) Let x and y be $qBAPTC$ with localities terms. If $qBAPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{pp}^{sl} y$.

(2) Let x and y be $qBAPTC$ with localities terms. If $qBAPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{ps}^{sl} y$.

(3) Let x and y be $qBAPTC$ with localities terms. If $qBAPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{php}^{sl} y$.

(4) Let x and y be $qBAPTC$ with localities terms. If $qBAPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{phhp}^{sl} y$.

Proof. (1) Since probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation \sim_{pp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 45 is sound modulo probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(2) Since probabilistic static location step bisimulation \sim_{ps}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 45 is sound modulo probabilistic static location step bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(3) Since probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation \sim_{php}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 45 is sound modulo probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(4) Since probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation \sim_{phhp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 45 is sound modulo probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers. \square

Theorem 5.5 (Completeness of $qBAPTC$ with localities modulo probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). (1) Let p and q be closed $qBAPTC$ with localities terms, if $p \sim_{pp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.

(2) Let p and q be closed $qBAPTC$ with localities terms, if $p \sim_{ps}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.

(3) Let p and q be closed $qBAPTC$ with localities terms, if $p \sim_{php}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.

(4) Let p and q be closed $qBAPTC$ with localities terms, if $p \sim_{phhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.

Proof. According to the definition of probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_{pp}^{sl} , \sim_{ps}^{sl} , \sim_{php}^{sl} and \sim_{phhp}^{sl} , $p \sim_{pp}^{sl} q$, $p \sim_{ps}^{sl} q$, $p \sim_{php}^{sl} q$ and $p \sim_{phhp}^{sl} q$ implies both the bisimilarities between p and q , and also the in the same quantum states. According to the completeness of $BAPTC^{sl}$ (please refer to [12] for details), we can get the completeness of $qBAPTC^{sl}$. \square

5.2 APPTC with Localities for Closed Quantum Systems

In this subsection, we will extend $APPTC^{sl}$ for closed quantum systems, which is abbreviated $qAPPTC$ with localities.

The set of axioms of $qAPPTC$ with localities including axioms of $qBAPTC$ with localities in Table 45 and the axioms are shown in Table 47.

No.	Axiom
<i>P1</i>	$(x + x = x, y + y = y) \quad x \bowtie y = x \parallel y + x \mid y$
<i>P2</i>	$x \parallel y = y \parallel x$
<i>P3</i>	$(x \parallel y) \parallel z = x \parallel (y \parallel z)$
<i>P4</i>	$(x + x = x, y + y = y) \quad x \parallel y = x \parallel\!\! \parallel y + y \parallel\!\! \parallel x$
<i>P5</i>	$(e_1 \leq e_2) \quad e_1 \parallel\!\! \parallel (e_2 \cdot y) = (e_1 \parallel\!\! \parallel e_2) \cdot y$
<i>P6</i>	$(e_1 \leq e_2) \quad (e_1 \cdot x) \parallel\!\! \parallel e_2 = (e_1 \parallel\!\! \parallel e_2) \cdot x$
<i>P7</i>	$(e_1 \leq e_2) \quad (e_1 \cdot x) \parallel\!\! \parallel (e_2 \cdot y) = (e_1 \parallel\!\! \parallel e_2) \cdot (x \bowtie y)$
<i>P8</i>	$(x + y) \parallel\!\! \parallel z = (x \parallel\!\! \parallel z) + (y \parallel\!\! \parallel z)$
<i>P9</i>	$\delta \parallel\!\! \parallel x = \delta$
<i>C1</i>	$e_1 \mid e_2 = \gamma(e_1, e_2)$
<i>C2</i>	$e_1 \mid (e_2 \cdot y) = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot y$
<i>C3</i>	$(e_1 \cdot x) \mid e_2 = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot x$
<i>C4</i>	$(e_1 \cdot x) \mid (e_2 \cdot y) = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot (x \bowtie y)$
<i>C5</i>	$(x + y) \mid z = (x \mid z) + (y \mid z)$
<i>C6</i>	$x \mid (y + z) = (x \mid y) + (x \mid z)$
<i>C7</i>	$\delta \mid x = \delta$
<i>C8</i>	$x \mid \delta = \delta$
<i>PM1</i>	$x \parallel (y \boxplus_{\pi} z) = (x \parallel y) \boxplus_{\pi} (x \parallel z)$
<i>PM2</i>	$(x \boxplus_{\pi} y) \parallel z = (x \parallel z) \boxplus_{\pi} (y \parallel z)$
<i>PM3</i>	$x \mid (y \boxplus_{\pi} z) = (x \mid y) \boxplus_{\pi} (x \mid z)$
<i>PM4</i>	$(x \boxplus_{\pi} y) \mid z = (x \mid z) \boxplus_{\pi} (y \mid z)$
<i>CE1</i>	$\Theta(e) = e$
<i>CE2</i>	$\Theta(\delta) = \delta$
<i>CE3</i>	$\Theta(x + y) = \Theta(x) \triangleleft y + \Theta(y) \triangleleft x$
<i>CE4</i>	$\Theta(x \cdot y) = \Theta(x) \cdot \Theta(y)$
<i>CE5</i>	$\Theta(x \parallel y) = ((\Theta(x) \triangleleft y) \parallel y) + ((\Theta(y) \triangleleft x) \parallel x)$
<i>CE6</i>	$\Theta(x \mid y) = ((\Theta(x) \triangleleft y) \mid y) + ((\Theta(y) \triangleleft x) \mid x)$
<i>PCE1</i>	$\Theta(x \boxplus_{\pi} y) = \Theta(x) \triangleleft y \boxplus_{\pi} \Theta(y) \triangleleft x$

Table 47: Axioms of $qAPPTC$ with localities

No.	Axiom
<i>U1</i>	$(\sharp(e_1, e_2)) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_2 = \tau$
<i>U2</i>	$(\sharp(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_3 = e_1$
<i>U3</i>	$(\sharp(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3) \quad e_3 \triangleleft e_1 = \tau$
<i>U4</i>	$e \triangleleft \delta = e$
<i>U5</i>	$\delta \triangleleft e = \delta$
<i>U6</i>	$(x + y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) + (y \triangleleft z)$
<i>U7</i>	$(x \cdot y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \cdot (y \triangleleft z)$
<i>U8</i>	$(x \parallel y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \parallel (y \triangleleft z)$
<i>U9</i>	$(x y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) (y \triangleleft z)$
<i>U10</i>	$x \triangleleft (y + z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
<i>U11</i>	$x \triangleleft (y \cdot z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
<i>U12</i>	$x \triangleleft (y \parallel z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
<i>U13</i>	$x \triangleleft (y z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
<i>PU1</i>	$(\sharp_\pi(e_1, e_2)) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_2 = \tau$
<i>PU2</i>	$(\sharp_\pi(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_3 = e_1$
<i>PU3</i>	$(\sharp_\pi(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3) \quad e_3 \triangleleft e_1 = \tau$
<i>PU4</i>	$(x \boxplus_\pi y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \boxplus_\pi (y \triangleleft z)$
<i>PU5</i>	$x \triangleleft (y \boxplus_\pi z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
<i>L5</i>	$u :: (x \bowtie y) = u :: x \bowtie u :: y$
<i>L6</i>	$u :: (x \parallel y) = u :: x \parallel u :: y$
<i>L7</i>	$u :: (x y) = u :: x u :: y$
<i>L8</i>	$u :: (\Theta(x)) = \Theta(u :: x)$
<i>L9</i>	$u :: (x \triangleleft y) = u :: x \triangleleft u :: y$
<i>L10</i>	$u :: \delta = \delta$
<i>PL1</i>	$u :: (x \boxplus_\pi y) = u :: x \boxplus_\pi u :: y$

Table 48: Axioms of $qAPPTC$ with localities (continuing)

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{x \rightsquigarrow x' \quad y \rightsquigarrow y'}{x \bowtie y \rightsquigarrow x' \parallel y' + x' \mid y'} \\
\frac{x \rightsquigarrow x' \quad y \rightsquigarrow y'}{x \parallel y \rightsquigarrow x' \parallel y + y' \parallel x} \\
\frac{x \rightsquigarrow x'}{x \parallel y \rightsquigarrow x' \parallel y} \\
\frac{x \rightsquigarrow x' \quad y \rightsquigarrow y'}{x \mid y \rightsquigarrow x' \mid y'} \\
\frac{x \rightsquigarrow x'}{\Theta(x) \rightsquigarrow \Theta(x')} \\
\frac{x \rightsquigarrow x'}{x \triangleleft y \rightsquigarrow x' \triangleleft y}
\end{array}$$

Table 49: Probabilistic transition rules of $qAPPTC$ with localities

Definition 5.6 (Basic terms of $qAPPTC$ with localities). *The set of basic terms of $qAPPTC$ with localities, $\mathcal{B}(qAPPTC^{sl})$, is inductively defined as follows:*

1. $\mathbb{E} \subset \mathcal{B}(qAPPTC^{sl})$;
2. if $u \in Loc^*, t \in \mathcal{B}(qAPPTC^{sl})$ then $u :: t \in \mathcal{B}(qAPPTC^{sl})$;
3. if $e \in \mathbb{E}, t \in \mathcal{B}(qAPPTC^{sl})$ then $e \cdot t \in \mathcal{B}(qAPPTC^{sl})$;
4. if $t, t' \in \mathcal{B}(qAPPTC^{sl})$ then $t + t' \in \mathcal{B}(qAPPTC^{sl})$;
5. if $t, t' \in \mathcal{B}(qAPPTC^{sl})$ then $t \boxplus_{\pi} t' \in \mathcal{B}(qAPPTC^{sl})$;
6. if $t, t' \in \mathcal{B}(qAPPTC^{sl})$ then $t \parallel t' \in \mathcal{B}(qAPPTC^{sl})$.

Based on the definition of basic terms for $qAPPTC$ with localities (see Definition 5.6) and axioms of $qAPPTC$ with localities, we can prove the elimination theorem of $qAPPTC$ with localities.

Theorem 5.7 (Elimination theorem of $qAPPTC$ with localities). *Let p be a closed $qAPPTC$ with localities term. Then there is a basic $qAPPTC$ with localities term q such that $qAPPTC \vdash p = q$.*

Proof. The same as that of $APPTC^{sl}$, we omit the proof, please refer to [12] for details. \square

We will define a term-deduction system which gives the operational semantics of $qAPPTC$ with localities. Two atomic events e_1 and e_2 are in race condition, which are denoted $e_1 \% e_2$.

$\frac{\langle \check{e}_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \check{e}_n, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[\epsilon]{\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle \quad \text{if } \varrho' \in \text{effect}(e_1, \varrho) \cup \dots \cup \text{effect}(e_n, \varrho)$	
$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle \surd, \varrho'' \rangle}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} \langle \surd, \varrho' \cup \varrho'' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle \surd, \varrho'' \rangle}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} \langle x', \varrho' \cup \varrho'' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle y', \varrho'' \rangle}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} \langle y', \varrho' \cup \varrho'' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle y', \varrho'' \rangle}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} \langle x' \bowtie y', \varrho' \cup \varrho'' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \not\xrightarrow[v]{e_2} (e_1 \% e_2)}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle y, \varrho' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \not\xrightarrow[v]{e_2} (e_1 \% e_2)}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle x' \bowtie y, \varrho' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \not\xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle \surd, \varrho'' \rangle \quad (e_1 \% e_2)}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle x, \varrho'' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \not\xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle y', \varrho'' \rangle \quad (e_1 \% e_2)}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle x \bowtie y', \varrho'' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle \surd, \varrho'' \rangle \quad (e_1 \leq e_2)}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} \langle \surd, \varrho' \cup \varrho'' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle \surd, \varrho'' \rangle \quad (e_1 \leq e_2)}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} \langle x', \varrho' \cup \varrho'' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle y', \varrho'' \rangle \quad (e_1 \leq e_2)}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} \langle y', \varrho' \cup \varrho'' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle y', \varrho'' \rangle \quad (e_1 \leq e_2)}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\{e_1, e_2\}} \langle x' \bowtie y', \varrho' \cup \varrho'' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle \surd, \varrho'' \rangle}{\langle x \mid y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \langle \surd, \text{effect}(\gamma(e_1, e_2), \varrho) \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle \surd, \varrho'' \rangle}{\langle x \mid y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \langle x', \text{effect}(\gamma(e_1, e_2), \varrho) \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle y', \varrho'' \rangle}{\langle x \mid y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \langle y', \text{effect}(\gamma(e_1, e_2), \varrho) \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e_1} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[v]{e_2} \langle y', \varrho'' \rangle}{\langle x \mid y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u \circ v]{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \langle x' \bowtie y', \text{effect}(\gamma(e_1, e_2), \varrho) \rangle}$

Table 50: Action transition rules of $qAPPTC$ with localities

Theorem 5.8 (Generalization of $qAPPTC$ with localities with respect to $qBAPTC$ with localities). *$qAPPTC$ with localities is a generalization of $qBAPTC$ with localities.*

Proof. It follows from the following three facts.

1. The transition rules of $qBAPTC$ with localities in section 5.1 are all source-dependent;
2. The sources of the transition rules $qAPPTC$ with localities contain an occurrence of δ , or \parallel , or \ll , or $|$, or Θ , or \triangleleft ;
3. The transition rules of $qAPPTC$ with localities are all source-dependent.

So, $qAPPTC$ with localities is a generalization of $qBAPTC$ with localities, that is, $qBAPTC$ with localities is an embedding of $qAPPTC$ with localities, as desired. \square

Theorem 5.9 (Congruence of $qAPPTC$ with localities with respect to probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). *(1) Probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation equivalence \sim_{pp}^{sl} is a congruence with respect to $qAPPTC$ with localities.*

(2) Probabilistic static location step bisimulation equivalence \sim_{ps}^{sl} is a congruence with respect to $qAPPTC$ with localities.

(3) Probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation equivalence \sim_{php}^{sl} is a congruence with respect to $qAPPTC$ with localities.

(4) Probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence \sim_{phhp}^{sl} is a congruence with respect to $qAPPTC$ with localities.

Proof. (1) It is easy to see that probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $qAPPTC$ with localities terms, we only need to prove that \sim_{pp}^{sl} is preserved by the operators \parallel , \ll , $|$, Θ , \triangleleft , ∂_H . It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(2) It is easy to see that probabilistic static location step bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $qAPPTC$ with localities terms, we only need to prove that \sim_{ps}^{sl} is preserved by the operators \parallel , \ll , $|$, Θ , \triangleleft , ∂_H . It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(3) It is easy to see that probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $qAPPTC$ with localities terms, we only need to prove that \sim_{php}^{sl} is preserved by the operators \parallel , \ll , $|$, Θ , \triangleleft , ∂_H . It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(4) It is easy to see that probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $qAPPTC$ with localities terms, we only need to prove that \sim_{phhp}^{sl} is preserved by the operators \parallel , \ll , $|$, Θ , \triangleleft , ∂_H . It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers. \square

Theorem 5.10 (Soundness of $qAPPTC$ with localities modulo probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). *(1) Let x and y be $qAPPTC$ with localities terms. If $qAPPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{pp}^{sl} y$.*

(2) Let x and y be $qAPPTC$ with localities terms. If $qAPPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{ps}^{sl} y$.

(3) Let x and y be $qAPPTC$ with localities terms. If $qAPPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{php}^{sl} y$;

(3) Let x and y be $qAPPTC$ with localities terms. If $qAPPTC^{sl} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{phhp}^{sl} y$.

Proof. (1) Since probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation \sim_{pp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 47 is sound modulo probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(2) Since probabilistic static location step bisimulation \sim_{ps}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 47 is sound modulo probabilistic static location step bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(3) Since probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation \sim_{php}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 47 is sound modulo probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(4) Since probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation \sim_{phhp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 47 is sound modulo probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers. \square

Theorem 5.11 (Completeness of $qAPPTC$ with localities modulo probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). (1) Let p and q be closed $qAPPTC$ with localities terms, if $p \sim_{pp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.

(2) Let p and q be closed $qAPPTC$ with localities terms, if $p \sim_{ps}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.

(3) Let p and q be closed $qAPPTC$ with localities terms, if $p \sim_{php}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.

(3) Let p and q be closed $qAPPTC$ with localities terms, if $p \sim_{phhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.

Proof. According to the definition of probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_{pp}^{sl} , \sim_{ps}^{sl} , \sim_{php}^{sl} and \sim_{phhp}^{sl} , $p \sim_{pp}^{sl} q$, $p \sim_{ps}^{sl} q$, $p \sim_{php}^{sl} q$ and $p \sim_{phhp}^{sl} q$ implies both the bisimilarities between p and q , and also the in the same quantum states. According to the completeness of $APPTC^{sl}$ (please refer to [12] for details), we can get the completeness of $qAPPTC^{sl}$. \square

5.3 Recursion

In this subsection, we introduce recursion to capture infinite processes based on $qAPPTC$ with localities. In the following, E, F, G are recursion specifications, X, Y, Z are recursive variables.

Definition 5.12 (Guarded recursive specification). A recursive specification

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= t_1(X_1, \dots, X_n) \\ &\dots \\ X_n &= t_n(X_1, \dots, X_n) \end{aligned}$$

is guarded if the right-hand sides of its recursive equations can be adapted to the form by applications of the axioms in $APTC$ and replacing recursion variables by the right-hand sides of their recursive equations,

$$\begin{aligned} &((u_{111} \parallel a_{111} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{11i_1} \parallel a_{11i_1}) \cdot s_1(X_1, \dots, X_n) + \dots + (u_{1k1} \parallel a_{1k1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{1ki_k} \parallel a_{1ki_k}) \cdot \\ &s_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) + (v_{111} \parallel b_{111} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{11j_1} \parallel b_{11j_1}) + \dots + (v_{11j_1} \parallel b_{11j_1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{11j_l} \parallel b_{11j_l})) \boxplus_{\pi_1} \\ &\dots \boxplus_{\pi_{m-1}} ((u_{m11} \parallel a_{m11} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{m1i_1} \parallel a_{m1i_1}) \cdot s_1(X_1, \dots, X_n) + \dots + (u_{mk1} \parallel a_{mk1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{mki_k} \parallel \\ &a_{mki_k}) \cdot s_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) + (v_{m11} \parallel b_{m11} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{m1j_1} \parallel b_{m1j_1}) + \dots + (v_{m1j_1} \parallel b_{m1j_1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{m1j_l} \parallel b_{m1j_l})) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\langle t_i(\langle X_1|E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n|E \rangle), \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle y, \varrho \rangle}{\langle \langle X_i|E \rangle, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle y, \varrho \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle t_i(\langle X_1|E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n|E \rangle), \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle}{\langle \langle X_i|E \rangle, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle t_i(\langle X_1|E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n|E \rangle), \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \langle y, \varrho' \rangle}{\langle \langle X_i|E \rangle, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \langle y, \varrho' \rangle}
\end{array}$$

Table 52: Transition rules of guarded recursion

where $a_{111}, \dots, a_{11i_1}, a_{1k1}, \dots, a_{1ki_k}, b_{111}, \dots, b_{11j_1}, b_{11j_1}, \dots, b_{1l_j}, \dots, a_{m11}, \dots, a_{m1i_1}, a_{1k1}, \dots, a_{mki_k}, b_{111}, \dots, b_{m1j_1}, b_{m1j_1}, \dots, b_{ml_j} \in \mathbb{E}$, and the sum above is allowed to be empty, in which case it represents the deadlock δ .

Definition 5.13 (Linear recursive specification). *A recursive specification is linear if its recursive equations are of the form*

$$((u_{111} :: a_{111} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{11i_1} :: a_{11i_1})X_1 + \dots + (u_{1k1} :: a_{1k1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{1ki_k} :: a_{1ki_k})X_k + (v_{111} :: b_{111} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{11j_1} :: b_{11j_1}) + \dots + (v_{11j_1} :: b_{11j_1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{1l_j} :: b_{1l_j})) \boxplus_{\pi_1} \dots \boxplus_{\pi_{m-1}} ((u_{m11} :: a_{m11} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{m1i_1} :: a_{m1i_1})X_1 + \dots + (u_{mk1} :: a_{mk1} \parallel \dots \parallel u_{mki_k} :: a_{mki_k})X_k + (v_{m11} :: b_{m11} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{m1j_1} :: b_{m1j_1}) + \dots + (v_{m1j_1} :: b_{m1j_1} \parallel \dots \parallel v_{ml_j} :: b_{ml_j}))$$

where $a_{111}, \dots, a_{11i_1}, a_{1k1}, \dots, a_{1ki_k}, b_{111}, \dots, b_{11j_1}, b_{11j_1}, \dots, b_{1l_j}, \dots, a_{m11}, \dots, a_{m1i_1}, a_{mk1}, \dots, a_{mki_k}, b_{m11}, \dots, b_{m1j_1}, b_{m1j_1}, \dots, b_{ml_j} \in \mathbb{E}$, and the sum above is allowed to be empty, in which case it represents the deadlock δ .

Theorem 5.14 (Conservativity of $qAPPTC$ with localities and guarded recursion). *$qAPPTC$ with localities and guarded recursion is a conservative extension of $qAPPTC$ with localities.*

Proof. Since the transition rules of $qAPPTC$ with localities are source-dependent, and the transition rules for guarded recursion in Table 52 contain only a fresh constant in their source, so the transition rules of $qAPPTC$ with localities and guarded recursion are a conservative extension of those of $qAPPTC$ with localities. \square

Theorem 5.15 (Congruence theorem of $qAPPTC$ with localities and guarded recursion). *Probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_{pp}^{sl} , \sim_{ps}^{sl} , \sim_{php}^{sl} and \sim_{phhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to $qAPPTC$ with localities and guarded recursion.*

Proof. It follows the following two facts:

1. in a guarded recursive specification, right-hand sides of its recursive equations can be adapted to the form by applications of the axioms in $qAPPTC$ with localities and replacing recursion variables by the right-hand sides of their recursive equations;

2. probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_{pp}^{sl} , \sim_{ps}^{sl} , \sim_{php}^{sl} and \sim_{phhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to all operators of $qAPPTC$ with localities.

□

Theorem 5.16 (Elimination theorem of $qAPPTC$ with localities and linear recursion). *Each process term in $qAPPTC$ with localities and linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with E a linear recursive specification.*

Proof. The same as that of $APPTC^{sl}$, we omit the proof, please refer to [12] for details. □

Theorem 5.17 (Soundness of $qAPPTC$ with localities and guarded recursion). *Let x and y be $qAPPTC$ with localities and guarded recursion terms. If $qAPPTC^{sl}$ with guarded recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

- (1) $x \sim_{ps}^{sl} y$.
- (2) $x \sim_{pp}^{sl} y$.
- (3) $x \sim_{php}^{sl} y$.
- (4) $x \sim_{phhp}^{sl} y$.

Proof. (1) Since probabilistic static location step bisimulation \sim_{ps}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $qAPPTC$ with localities and guarded recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 37 is sound modulo probabilistic static location step bisimulation equivalence. We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(2) Since probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation \sim_{pp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to the guarded recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 37 is sound modulo probabilistic static location pomset bisimulation equivalence. We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(3) Since probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation \sim_{php}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to guarded recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 37 is sound modulo probabilistic static location hp-bisimulation equivalence. We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(4) Since probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation \sim_{phhp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to guarded recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 37 is sound modulo probabilistic static location hhp-bisimulation equivalence. We leave them as exercises to the readers. □

Theorem 5.18 (Completeness of $qAPPTC$ with localities and linear recursion). *Let p and q be closed $qAPPTC$ with localities and linear recursion terms, then,*

- (1) if $p \sim_{ps}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.
- (2) if $p \sim_{pp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.
- (3) if $p \sim_{php}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.
- (4) if $p \sim_{phhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.

$$\frac{\overline{\tau \rightsquigarrow \tilde{\tau}}}{\langle \tilde{\tau}, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle \sqrt{\cdot}, \tau(\varrho) \rangle}$$

Table 53: Transition rule of the silent step

Proof. According to the definition of probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_{pp}^{sl} , \sim_{ps}^{sl} , \sim_{php}^{sl} and \sim_{phhp}^{sl} , $p \sim_{pp}^{sl} q$, $p \sim_{ps}^{sl} q$, $p \sim_{php}^{sl} q$ and $p \sim_{phhp}^{sl} q$ implies both the bisimilarities between p and q , and also the in the same quantum states. According to the completeness of $APPTC^{sl}$ with linear recursion (please refer to [12] for details), we can get the completeness of $qAPPTC^{sl}$ with linear recursion. \square

5.4 Abstraction

To abstract away from the internal implementations of a program, and verify that the program exhibits the desired external behaviors, the silent step τ and abstraction operator τ_I are introduced, where $I \subseteq \mathbb{E} \cup G_{at}$ denotes the internal events or guards. The silent step τ represents the internal events or guards, when we consider the external behaviors of a process, τ steps can be removed, that is, τ steps must keep silent. The transition rule of τ is shown in Table 53. In the following, let the atomic event e range over $\mathbb{E} \cup \{\epsilon\} \cup \{\delta\} \cup \{\tau\}$, and ϕ range over $G \cup \{\tau\}$, and let the communication function $\gamma : \mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\} \times \mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\} \rightarrow \mathbb{E} \cup \{\delta\}$, with each communication involved τ resulting in δ . We use $\tau(\varrho)$ to denote $effect(\tau, \varrho)$, for the fact that τ only change the state of internal data environment, that is, for the external data environments, $\varrho = \tau(\varrho)$.

Theorem 5.19 (Conservativity of $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *$qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of $qAPPTC$ with localities and linear recursion.*

Proof. Since the transition rules of $qAPPTC$ with localities and linear recursion are source-dependent, and the transition rules for silent step in Table 53 contain only a fresh constant τ in their source, so the transition rules of $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of those of $qAPPTC$ with localities and linear recursion. \square

Theorem 5.20 (Congruence theorem of $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Probabilistic static location rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{prbp}^{sl} , \approx_{prbs}^{sl} , \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{rbhhp} are all congruences with respect to $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion.*

Proof. It follows the following three facts:

1. in a guarded linear recursive specification, right-hand sides of its recursive equations can be adapted to the form by applications of the axioms in $qAPPTC$ with localities and replacing recursion variables by the right-hand sides of their recursive equations;

No.	Axiom
B1	$(y = y + y, z = z + z) \quad x \cdot ((y + \tau \cdot (y + z)) \boxplus_{\pi} w) = x \cdot ((y + z) \boxplus_{\pi} w)$
B2	$(y = y + y, z = z + z) \quad x \parallel ((y + \tau \parallel (y + z)) \boxplus_{\pi} w) = x \parallel ((y + z) \boxplus_{\pi} w)$
L13	$u :: \tau = \tau$

Table 54: Axioms of silent step

2. probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_{pp}^{sl} , \sim_{ps}^{sl} , \sim_{php}^{sl} and \sim_{phhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to all operators of $qAPPTC$ with localities, while probabilistic static location truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_{pp}^{sl} , \sim_{ps}^{sl} , \sim_{php}^{sl} and \sim_{phhp}^{sl} imply the corresponding probabilistic rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulations \approx_{prbp}^{sl} , \approx_{prbs}^{sl} , \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} , so probabilistic static location rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulations \approx_{prbp}^{sl} , \approx_{prbs}^{sl} , \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to all operators of $qAPPTC$ with localities;
3. While \mathbb{E} is extended to $\mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\}$, and G is extended to $G \cup \{\tau\}$, it can be proved that probabilistic static location rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulations \approx_{prbp}^{sl} , \approx_{prbs}^{sl} , \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to all operators of $qAPPTC$ with localities, we omit it.

□

We design the axioms for the silent step τ in Table 54.

Theorem 5.21 (Elimination theorem of $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Each process term in $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with E a guarded linear recursive specification.*

Proof. The same as that of $APPTC^{sl}$, we omit the proof, please refer to [12] for details. □

Theorem 5.22 (Soundness of $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Let x and y be $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion terms. If $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

- (1) $x \approx_{prbs}^{sl} y$.
- (2) $x \approx_{prbp}^{sl} y$.
- (3) $x \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} y$.
- (4) $x \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} y$.

Proof. (1) Since probabilistic rooted branching static location step bisimulation \approx_{prbs}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 54 is sound modulo probabilistic rooted branching static location step bisimulation \approx_{prbs}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(2) Since probabilistic rooted branching static location pomset bisimulation \approx_{prbp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 54 is sound modulo probabilistic rooted branching static location pomset bisimulation \approx_{prbp}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(3) Since probabilistic rooted branching static location hp-bisimulation \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 54 is sound modulo probabilistic rooted branching static location hp-bisimulation \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(4) Since probabilistic rooted branching static location hhp-bisimulation \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 54 is sound modulo probabilistic rooted branching static location hhp-bisimulation \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers. \square

Theorem 5.23 (Completeness of $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Let p and q be closed $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion terms, then,*

- (1) *if $p \approx_{prbs}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*
- (2) *if $p \approx_{prbp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*
- (3) *if $p \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*
- (3) *if $p \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. According to the definition of probabilistic static location rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{prbp}^{sl} , \approx_{prbs}^{sl} , \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} , and \approx_{prbp}^{sl} , \approx_{prbs}^{sl} , \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} implies both the bisimilarities between p and q , and also the in the same quantum states. According to the completeness of $APPTC^{sl}$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion (please refer to [12] for details), we can get the completeness of $qAPPTC^{sl}$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion. \square

The unary abstraction operator τ_I ($I \subseteq \mathbb{E} \cup G_{at}$) renames all atomic events or atomic guards in I into τ . $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and abstraction operator is called $qAPPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$. The transition rules of operator τ_I are shown in Table 55.

Theorem 5.24 (Conservativity of $qAPPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion). *$qAPPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion.*

Proof. Since the transition rules of $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion are source-dependent, and the transition rules for abstraction operator in Table 55 contain only a fresh operator τ_I in their source, so the transition rules of $qAPPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of those of $qAPPTC$ with localities and silent step and guarded linear recursion. \square

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle x', \varrho \rangle}{\langle \tau_I(x), \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle \tau_I(x'), \varrho \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle}{\langle \tau_I(x), \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} \quad e \notin I \qquad \frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle}{\langle \tau_I(x), \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \tau_I(x'), \varrho' \rangle} \quad e \notin I \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle}{\langle \tau_I(x), \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[\tau]{\tau} \langle \surd, \tau(\varrho) \rangle} \quad e \in I \qquad \frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle}{\langle \tau_I(x), \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[\tau]{\tau} \langle \tau_I(x'), \tau(\varrho) \rangle} \quad e \in I
\end{array}$$

Table 55: Transition rule of the abstraction operator

Theorem 5.25 (Congruence theorem of $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion). *Probabilistic static location rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{prbp}^{sl} , \approx_{prbs}^{sl} , \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion.*

Proof. (1) It is easy to see that probabilistic rooted branching static location pomset bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion terms, we only need to prove that \approx_{prbp}^{sl} is preserved by the operators τ_I . It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(2) It is easy to see that probabilistic rooted branching static location step bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion terms, we only need to prove that \approx_{prbs}^{sl} is preserved by the operators τ_I . It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(3) It is easy to see that probabilistic rooted branching static location hp-bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion terms, we only need to prove that \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} is preserved by the operators τ_I . It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(4) It is easy to see that probabilistic rooted branching static location hhp-bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion terms, we only need to prove that \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} is preserved by the operators τ_I . It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers. \square

We design the axioms for the abstraction operator τ_I in Table 56.

Theorem 5.26 (Soundness of $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion). *Let x and y be $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion terms. If $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

- (1) $x \approx_{prbs}^{sl} y$.
- (2) $x \approx_{prbp}^{sl} y$.
- (3) $x \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} y$.
- (4) $x \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} y$.

No.	Axiom
TI1	$e \notin I \quad \tau_I(e) = e$
TI2	$e \in I \quad \tau_I(e) = \tau$
TI3	$\tau_I(\delta) = \delta$
TI4	$\tau_I(x + y) = \tau_I(x) + \tau_I(y)$
PTI1	$\tau_I(x \boxplus_{\pi} y) = \tau_I(x) \boxplus_{\pi} \tau_I(y)$
TI5	$\tau_I(x \cdot y) = \tau_I(x) \cdot \tau_I(y)$
TI6	$\tau_I(x \parallel y) = \tau_I(x) \parallel \tau_I(y)$
L14	$u :: \tau_I(x) = \tau_I(u :: x)$
L15	$e \notin I \quad \tau_I(u :: e) = u :: e$
L16	$e \in I \quad \tau_I(u :: e) = \tau$
PTI1	$\tau_I(x \boxplus_{\pi} y) = \tau_I(x) \boxplus_{\pi} \tau_I(y)$

Table 56: Axioms of abstraction operator

Proof. (1) Since probabilistic rooted branching static location step bisimulation \approx_{prbs}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $qAPPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 56 is sound modulo probabilistic rooted branching static location step bisimulation \approx_{prbs}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(2) Since probabilistic rooted branching static location pomset bisimulation \approx_{prbp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $qAPPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 56 is sound modulo probabilistic rooted branching static location pomset bisimulation \approx_{prbp}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(3) Since probabilistic rooted branching static location hp-bisimulation \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $qAPPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 56 is sound modulo probabilistic rooted branching static location hp-bisimulation \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(4) Since probabilistic rooted branching static location hhp-bisimulation \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $qAPPTC_{\tau}^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 56 is sound modulo probabilistic rooted branching static location hhp-bisimulation \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} . We leave them as exercises to the readers. \square

Though τ -loops are prohibited in guarded linear recursive specifications in a specifiable way, they can be constructed using the abstraction operator, for example, there exist τ -loops in the process term $\tau_{\{a\}}(\langle X | X = aX \rangle)$. To avoid τ -loops caused by τ_I and ensure fairness, we introduce the following recursive verification rules as Table 57 shows, note that $i_1, \dots, i_m, j_1, \dots, j_n \in I \subseteq \mathbb{E} \setminus \{\tau\}$.

Theorem 5.27 (Soundness of VR_1, VR_2, VR_3). *VR_1, VR_2 and VR_3 are sound modulo probabilistic static location rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences $\approx_{prbp}^{sl}, \approx_{prbs}^{sl}, \approx_{prbhp}^{sl}$ and \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} .*

$$\begin{array}{l}
VR_1 \quad \frac{x = y + (u_1 :: i_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_m :: i_m) \cdot x, y = y + y}{\tau \cdot \tau_I(x) = \tau \cdot \tau_I(y)} \\
VR_2 \quad \frac{x = z \boxplus_{\pi} (u + (u_1 :: i_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_m :: i_m) \cdot x), z = z + u, z = z + z}{\tau \cdot \tau_I(x) = \tau \cdot \tau_I(z)} \\
VR_3 \quad \frac{x = z + (u_1 :: i_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_m :: i_m) \cdot y, y = z \boxplus_{\pi} (u + (v_1 :: j_1 \parallel \dots \parallel v_n :: j_n) \cdot x), z = z + u, z = z + z}{\tau \cdot \tau_I(x) = \tau \cdot \tau_I(y') \text{ for } y' = z \boxplus_{\pi} (u + (u_1 :: i_1 \parallel \dots \parallel u_m :: i_m) \cdot y')}
\end{array}$$

Table 57: Recursive verification rules

5.5 Quantum Measurement

In closed quantum systems, there is another basic quantum operation – quantum measurement, besides the unitary operator. Quantum measurements have a probabilistic nature.

There is a concrete but non-trivial problem in modeling quantum measurement.

Let the following process term represent quantum measurement during modeling phase,

$$\beta_1 \cdot t_1 \boxplus_{\pi_1} \beta_2 \cdot t_2 \boxplus_{\pi_2} \dots \boxplus_{\pi_{i-1}} \beta_i \cdot t_i$$

where $\sum_i \pi_i = 1$, $t_i \in \mathcal{B}(qBAPTC)$, β denotes a quantum measurement, and $\beta = \sum_i \lambda_i \beta_i$, β_i denotes the projection performed on the quantum system ϱ , $\pi_i = Tr(\beta_i \varrho)$, $\varrho_i = \beta_i \varrho \beta_i / \pi_i$.

The above term means that, firstly, we choose a projection β_i in a quantum measurement $\beta = \sum_i \lambda_i \beta_i$ probabilistically, then, we execute (perform) the projection β_i on the closed quantum system. This also adheres to the intuition on quantum mechanics.

We define B as the collection of all projections of all quantum measurements, and make the collection of atomic actions be $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E} \cup B$. We see that a projection $\beta_i \in B$ has the almost same semantics as a unitary operator $\alpha \in A$. So, we add the following (probabilistic and action) transition rules into those of $PQRA$.

$$\frac{}{\langle \beta_i, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle \check{\beta}_i, \varrho \rangle}$$

$$\frac{}{\langle \check{\beta}_i, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{\beta_i} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle}$$

Until now, $qAPPTC$ with localities works again. The two main quantum operations in a closed quantum system – the unitary operator and the quantum measurement, are fully modeled in probabilistic process algebra.

5.6 Quantum Entanglement

As in section 3.5, The axiom system of the shadow constant \textcircled{S} is shown in Table 58.

No.	Axiom
SC1	$\mathbb{S} \cdot x = x$
SC2	$x \cdot \mathbb{S} = x$
SC3	$e \parallel \mathbb{S}^e = e$
SC4	$\mathbb{S}^e \parallel e = e$
SC5	$e \parallel (\mathbb{S}^e \cdot y) = e \cdot y$
SC6	$\mathbb{S}^e \parallel (e \cdot y) = e \cdot y$
SC7	$(e \cdot x) \parallel \mathbb{S}^e = e \cdot x$
SC8	$(\mathbb{S}^e \cdot x) \parallel e = e \cdot x$
SC9	$(e \cdot x) \parallel (\mathbb{S}^e \cdot y) = e \cdot (x \text{ \& } y)$
SC10	$(\mathbb{S}^e \cdot x) \parallel (e \cdot y) = e \cdot (x \text{ \& } y)$
L17	$loc :: \mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}$

Table 58: Axioms of quantum entanglement

$$\begin{array}{c}
\overline{\langle \mathbb{S}, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle \mathbb{S}, \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle \mathbb{S}, \varrho \rangle \rightarrow \langle \sqrt{\cdot}, \varrho \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho' \rangle \xrightarrow{\mathbb{S}^e} \langle y', \varrho' \rangle}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle x' \text{ \& } y', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \sqrt{\cdot}, \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho' \rangle \xrightarrow{\mathbb{S}^e} \langle y', \varrho' \rangle}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle y', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho' \rangle \xrightarrow{\mathbb{S}^e} \langle \sqrt{\cdot}, \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle y', \varrho' \rangle}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle y', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \sqrt{\cdot}, \varrho' \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho' \rangle \xrightarrow{\mathbb{S}^e} \langle \sqrt{\cdot}, \varrho' \rangle}{\langle x \parallel y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e} \langle \sqrt{\cdot}, \varrho' \rangle}
\end{array}$$

Table 59: Transition rules of constant \mathbb{S}

The transition rules of constant \textcircled{S} are as Table 59 shows.

Theorem 5.28 (Elimination theorem of $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant). *Let p be a closed $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant term. Then there is a closed $qAPPTC$ with localities term such that $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant $\vdash p = q$.*

Proof. We leave the proof to the readers as an excise. \square

Theorem 5.29 (Conservativity of $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant). *$qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant is a conservative extension of $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion.*

Proof. We leave the proof to the readers as an excise. \square

Theorem 5.30 (Congruence theorem of $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant). *Probabilistic static location rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{prbp}^{sl} , \approx_{prbs}^{sl} , \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} and \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} are all congruences with respect to $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant.*

Proof. We leave the proof to the readers as an excise. \square

Theorem 5.31 (Soundness of $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant). *Let x and y be closed $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant terms. If $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant $\vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \approx_{prbs}^{sl} y$;
2. $x \approx_{prbp}^{sl} y$;
3. $x \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} y$;
4. $x \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} y$.

Proof. We leave the proof to the readers as an excise. \square

Theorem 5.32 (Completeness of $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant). *Let p and q are closed $qAPPTC_\tau^{sl}$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant terms, then,*

1. if $p \approx_{prbs}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;
2. if $p \approx_{prbp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;
3. if $p \approx_{prbhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$;
4. if $p \approx_{prbhhp}^{sl} q$ then $p = q$.

Proof. We leave the proof to the readers as an excise. \square

5.7 Unification of Quantum and Classical Computing for Closed Quantum Systems

We give the transition rules under quantum configuration for traditional atomic actions (events) $e' \in \mathbb{E}$ as Table 60 shows.

And the axioms for traditional actions are the same as those of $qBAPTC^{sl}$. And it is natural can be extended to $qAPPTC^{sl}$, recursion and abstraction. So, quantum and classical computing are unified under the framework of $qAPPTC^{sl}$ for closed quantum systems.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\overline{\langle e', \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle \check{e}, \varrho \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle x', \varrho \rangle}{\langle x \cdot y, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle x' \cdot y, \varrho \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle x', \varrho \rangle \quad \langle y, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle y', \varrho \rangle}{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle x' + y', \varrho \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle x', \varrho \rangle}{\langle x \boxplus_{\pi} y, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle x', \varrho \rangle} \quad \frac{\langle y, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle y', \varrho \rangle}{\langle x \boxplus_{\pi} y, \varrho \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle y', \varrho \rangle} \\
\overline{\langle e', \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[\epsilon]{e'} \langle \surd, \varrho \rangle} \quad \overline{\langle loc :: e', \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[loc]{e'} \langle \surd, \varrho' \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle x', \varrho' \rangle}{\langle loc :: x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[loc \ll u]{e'} \langle loc :: x', \varrho' \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle \surd, \varrho \rangle}{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle \surd, \varrho \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle x', \varrho \rangle}{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle x', \varrho \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle \surd, \varrho \rangle}{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle \surd, \varrho \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle y', \varrho \rangle}{\langle x + y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle y', \varrho \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle \surd, \varrho \rangle}{\langle x \cdot y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle y, \varrho \rangle} \\
\frac{\langle x, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle x', \varrho \rangle}{\langle x \cdot y, \varrho \rangle \xrightarrow[u]{e'} \langle x' \cdot y, \varrho \rangle}
\end{array}$$

Table 60: Transition rules of BAPTC under quantum configuration




Figure 12: Quantum teleportation protocol.

6 Applications of qAPPTC with Localities

Quantum and classical computing in closed systems are unified with qAPPTC with localities, which have the same equational logic and the same quantum configuration based operational semantics. The unification can be used widely in verification for the behaviors of quantum and classical computing mixed systems with distribution characteristics. In this chapter, we show its usage in verification of the distributed quantum communication protocols.

6.1 Verification of Quantum Teleportation Protocol

Quantum teleportation [45] is a famous quantum protocol in quantum information theory to teleport an unknown quantum state by sending only classical information, provided that the sender and the receiver, Alice and Bob, shared an entangled state in advance. Firstly, we introduce the basic quantum teleportation protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 12. In this section, we show how to process quantum entanglement in an implicit way.

1. EPR generates 2-qubits entangled EPR pair $q = q_1 \otimes q_2$, and he sends q_1 to Alice through quantum channel Q_A and q_2 to Bob through quantum channel Q_B ;
2. Alice receives q_1 , after some preparations, she measures on q_1 , and sends the measurement results x to Bob through classical channel P ;
3. Bob receives q_2 from EPR, and also the classical information x from Alice. According to x , he chooses specific Pauli transformation on q_2 .

We re-introduce the basic quantum teleportation protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 12 illustrates.

Now, we assume the generation of 2-qubits q through two unitary operators $Set[q]$ and $H[q]$. EPR sends q_1 to Alice through the quantum channel Q_A by quantum communicating action

$send_{Q_A}(q_1)$ and Alice receives q_1 through Q_A by quantum communicating action $receive_{Q_A}(q_1)$. Similarly, for Bob, those are $send_{Q_B}(q_2)$ and $receive_{Q_B}(q_2)$. After Alice receives q_1 , she does some preparations, including a unitary transformation $CNOT$ and a Hadamard transformation H , then Alice do measurement $M = \sum_{i=0}^3 M_i$, and sends measurement results x to Bob through the public classical channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(x)$, and Bob receives x through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(x)$. According to x , Bob performs specific Pauli transformations σ_x on q_2 . Let Alice, Bob and EPR be a system ABE and let interactions between Alice, Bob and EPR be internal actions. ABE receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$. Note that the entangled EPR pair $q = q_1 \otimes q_2$ is within ABE , so quantum entanglement can be processed implicitly.

Then the state transitions of EPR can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} E &= loc_E :: (Set[q] \cdot E_1) \\ E_1 &= H[q] \cdot E_2 \\ E_2 &= send_{Q_A}(q_1) \cdot E_3 \\ E_3 &= send_{Q_B}(q_2) \cdot E \end{aligned}$$

And the state transitions of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\ A_1 &= receive_{Q_A}(q_1) \cdot A_2 \\ A_2 &= CNOT \cdot A_3 \\ A_3 &= H \cdot A_4 \\ A_4 &= (M_0 \cdot send_P(0) \boxplus_{\frac{1}{4}} M_1 \cdot send_P(1) \boxplus_{\frac{1}{4}} M_2 \cdot send_P(2) \boxplus_{\frac{1}{4}} M_3 \cdot send_P(3)) \cdot A \end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transitions of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} B &= loc_B :: (receive_{Q_B}(q_2) \cdot B_1) \\ B_1 &= (receive_P(0) \cdot \sigma_0 \boxplus_{\frac{1}{4}} receive_P(1) \cdot \sigma_1 \boxplus_{\frac{1}{4}} receive_P(2) \cdot \sigma_2 \boxplus_{\frac{1}{4}} receive_P(3) \cdot \sigma_3) \cdot B_2 \\ B_2 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B \end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(\text{send}_{Q_A}(q_1), \text{receive}_{Q_A}(q_1)) &\triangleq c_{Q_A}(q_1) \\
\gamma(\text{send}_{Q_B}(q_2), \text{receive}_{Q_B}(q_2)) &\triangleq c_{Q_B}(q_2) \\
\gamma(\text{send}_P(0), \text{receive}_P(0)) &\triangleq c_P(0) \\
\gamma(\text{send}_P(1), \text{receive}_P(1)) &\triangleq c_P(1) \\
\gamma(\text{send}_P(2), \text{receive}_P(2)) &\triangleq c_P(2) \\
\gamma(\text{send}_P(3), \text{receive}_P(3)) &\triangleq c_P(3)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A , B and E in parallel, then the system ABE can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B \parallel E)))$$

where $H = \{\text{send}_{Q_A}(q_1), \text{receive}_{Q_A}(q_1), \text{send}_{Q_B}(q_2), \text{receive}_{Q_B}(q_2), \text{send}_P(0), \text{receive}_P(0), \text{send}_P(1), \text{receive}_P(1), \text{send}_P(2), \text{receive}_P(2), \text{send}_P(3), \text{receive}_P(3)\}$ and $I = \{\text{Set}[q], H[q], CNOT, H, M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3, \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, c_{Q_A}(q_1), c_{Q_B}(q_2), c_P(0), c_P(1), c_P(2), c_P(3)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 6.1. *The basic quantum teleportation protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B \parallel E)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B \parallel E))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} \text{loc}_A :: \text{receive}_A(D_i) \parallel \text{loc}_B :: \text{send}_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B \parallel E)))$. So, the basic quantum teleportation protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B \parallel E)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

6.2 Verification of BB84 Protocol

The BB84 protocol [34] is used to create a private key between two parties, Alice and Bob. Firstly, we introduce the basic BB84 protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 13.

1. Alice create two string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as B_a and K_a ;
2. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , and the i th qubit in q is $|x_y\rangle$, where x is the i th bit of B_a and y is the i th bit of K_a ;
3. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob;
4. Bob receives q and randomly generates a string of bits B_b with size n ;
5. Bob measures each qubit of q according to a basis by bits of B_b . And the measurement results would be K_b , which is also with size n ;
6. Bob sends his measurement bases B_b to Alice through a public channel P ;




Figure 13: BB84 protocol.

7. Once receiving B_b , Alice sends her bases B_a to Bob through channel P , and Bob receives B_a ;
8. Alice and Bob determine that at which position the bit strings B_a and B_b are equal, and they discard the mismatched bits of B_a and B_b . Then the remaining bits of K_a and K_b , denoted as K'_a and K'_b with $K_{a,b} = K'_a = K'_b$.

We re-introduce the basic BB84 protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 13 illustrates.

Now, we assume a special measurement operation $Rand[q; B_a] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; B_a]_i$ which create a string of n random bits B_a from the q quantum system, and the same as $Rand[q; K_a] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; K_a]_i$, $Rand[q'; B_b] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q'; B_b]_i$. $M[q; K_b] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q; K_b]_i$ denotes the Bob's measurement on q . The generation of n qubits q through two unitary operators $Set_{K_a}[q]$ and $H_{B_a}[q]$. Alice sends q to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public classical channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(B_b)$ and Alice receives B_b through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(B_b)$, and the same as $send_P(B_a)$ and $receive_P(B_a)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transitions of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; B_a]_i \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; K_a]_i \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= Set_{K_a}[q] \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= H_{B_a}[q] \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= receive_P(B_b) \cdot A_7 \\
A_7 &= send_P(B_a) \cdot A_8 \\
A_8 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transitions of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} Rand[q'; B_b]_i \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} M[q; K_b]_i \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_P(B_b) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= receive_P(B_a) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot B_6 \\
B_6 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(send_Q(q), receive_Q(q)) &\triangleq c_Q(q) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b)) &\triangleq c_P(B_b) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a)) &\triangleq c_P(B_a)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q), receive_Q(q), send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b), send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a)\}$ and $I = \{Rand[q; B_a]_i, Rand[q; K_a]_i, Set_{K_a}[q], H_{B_a}[q], Rand[q'; B_b]_i, M[q; K_b]_i, c_Q(q), c_P(B_b), c_P(B_a), cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 6.2. *The basic BB84 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$. So, the basic BB84 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

6.3 Verification of E91 Protocol

E91 protocol[35] is the first quantum protocol which utilizes entanglement. E91 protocol is used to create a private key between two parities, Alice and Bob. Firstly, we introduce the basic E91 protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 14.




Figure 14: E91 protocol.

1. Alice generates a string of EPR pairs q with size n , i.e., $2n$ particles, and sends a string of qubits q_b from each EPR pair with n to Bob through a quantum channel Q , remains the other string of qubits q_a from each pair with size n ;
2. Alice create two string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as B_a and K_a ;
3. Bob receives q_b and randomly generates a string of bits B_b with size n ;
4. Alice measures each qubit of q_a according to a basis by bits of B_a . And the measurement results would be K_a , which is also with size n ;
5. Bob measures each qubit of q_b according to a basis by bits of B_b . And the measurement results would be K_b , which is also with size n ;
6. Bob sends his measurement bases B_b to Alice through a public channel P ;
7. Once receiving B_b , Alice sends her bases B_a to Bob through channel P , and Bob receives B_a ;
8. Alice and Bob determine that at which position the bit strings B_a and B_b are equal, and they discard the mismatched bits of B_a and B_b . Then the remaining bits of K_a and K_b , denoted as K'_a and K'_b with $K_{a,b} = K'_a = K'_b$.

We re-introduce the basic E91 protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 14 illustrates.

Now, $M[q_a; K_a] = \sum_{i=0}^{2n-1} M[q_a; K_a]_i$ denotes the Alice's measurement operation of q_a , and $\textcircled{S}_{M[q_a; K_a]} = \sum_{i=0}^{2n-1} \textcircled{S}_{M[q_a; K_a]_i}$ denotes the responding shadow constant; $M[q_b; K_b] = \sum_{i=0}^{2n-1} M[q_b; K_b]_i$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q_b , and $\textcircled{S}_{M[q_b; K_b]} = \sum_{i=0}^{2n-1} \textcircled{S}_{M[q_b; K_b]_i}$ denotes the responding shadow constant. Alice sends q_b to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q_b)$ and Bob receives q_b through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q_b)$. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(B_b)$ and Alice receives B_b through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(B_b)$, and the same as $send_P(B_a)$ and $receive_P(B_a)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transitions of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= send_Q(q_b) \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q_a; K_a]_i \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} \textcircled{S}_{M[q_b; K_b]_i} \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= receive_P(B_b) \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= send_P(B_a) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transitions of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q_b) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} \textcircled{S}_{M[q_a; K_a]_i} \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q_b; K_b]_i \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_P(B_b) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= receive_P(B_a) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot B_6 \\
B_6 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. The quantum operation and its shadow constant pair will lead entanglement occur, otherwise, a deadlock δ will occur. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(send_Q(q_b), receive_Q(q_b)) &\triangleq c_Q(q_b) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b)) &\triangleq c_P(B_b) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a)) &\triangleq c_P(B_a)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q_b), receive_Q(q_b), send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b), send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a), M[q_a; K_a]_i, \textcircled{S}_{M[q_a; K_a]_i}, M[q_b; K_b]_i, \textcircled{S}_{M[q_b; K_b]_i}\}$ and $I = \{c_Q(q_b), c_P(B_b), c_P(B_a), M[q_a; K_a], M[q_b; K_b], cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.




Figure 15: The B92 protocol.

Theorem 6.3. *The basic E91 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ \& } B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ \& } B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ \& } B)))$. So, the basic E91 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ \& } B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

6.4 Verification of B92 Protocol

The famous B92 protocol[36] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The B92 protocol is used to create a private key between two parties, Alice and Bob. B92 is a protocol of quantum key distribution (QKD) which uses polarized photons as information carriers. Firstly, we introduce the basic B92 protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 15.

1. Alice create a string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as A .
2. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , carried by polarized photons. If $A_i = 0$, the i th qubit is $|0\rangle$; else if $A_i = 1$, the i th qubit is $|+\rangle$.
3. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
4. Bob receives q and randomly generates a string of bits B with size n .
5. If $B_i = 0$, Bob chooses the basis \oplus ; else if $B_i = 1$, Bob chooses the basis \otimes . Bob measures each qubit of q according to the above bases. And Bob builds a String of bits T , if the measurement produces $|0\rangle$ or $|+\rangle$, then $T_i = 0$; else if the measurement produces $|1\rangle$ or $|-\rangle$, then $T_i = 1$, which is also with size n .
6. Bob sends T to Alice through a public channel P .
7. Alice and Bob determine that at which position the bit strings A and B are remained for which $T_i = 1$. In absence of Eve, $A_i = 1 - B_i$, a shared raw key $K_{a,b}$ is formed by A_i .

We re-introduce the basic B92 protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 15 illustrates.

Now, we assume a special measurement operation $Rand[q; A] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; A]_i$ which create a string of n random bits A from the q quantum system, and the same as $Rand[q'; B] =$

$\sum_{i=0}^{2n-1} \text{Rand}[q'; B]_i$. $M[q; T] = \sum_{i=0}^{2n-1} M[q; T]_i$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q . The generation of n qubits q through a unitary operator $\text{Set}_A[q]$. Alice sends q to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $\text{send}_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $\text{receive}_Q(q)$. Bob sends T to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $\text{send}_P(T)$ and Alice receives T through channel P by classical communicating action $\text{receive}_P(T)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $\text{cmp}(K_{a,b}, T, A, B)$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $\text{receive}_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $\text{send}_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= \text{loc}_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \text{receive}_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} \text{Rand}[q; A]_i \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= \text{Set}_A[q] \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= \text{send}_Q(q) \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= \text{receive}_P(T) \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= \text{cmp}(K_{a,b}, T, A, B) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= \text{loc}_B :: (\text{receive}_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} \text{Rand}[q'; B]_i \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} M[q; T]_i \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= \text{send}_P(T) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= \text{cmp}(K_{a,b}, T, A, B) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} \text{send}_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(\text{send}_Q(q), \text{receive}_Q(q)) &\triangleq c_Q(q) \\
\gamma(\text{send}_P(T), \text{receive}_P(T)) &\triangleq c_P(T)
\end{aligned}$$

(2)

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q), receive_Q(q), send_P(T), receive_P(T)\}$ and $I = \{\boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^{n-1}} Rand[q; A]_i, Set_A[q], \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^{n-1}} Rand[q'; B]_i, \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^{n-1}} M[q; T]_i, c_Q(q), c_P(T), cmp(K_{a,b}, T, A, B)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 6.4. *The basic B92 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$. So, the basic B92 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

6.5 Verification of DPS Protocol

The famous DPS protocol[37] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The DPS protocol is used to create a private key between two parities, Alice and Bob. DPS is a protocol of quantum key distribution (QKD) which uses pulses of a photon which has nonorthogonal four states. Firstly, we introduce the basic DPS protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 16.

1. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , carried by a series of single photons possibly at four time instances.
2. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
3. Bob receives q by detectors clicking at the second or third time instance, and records the time into T with size n and which detector clicks into D with size n .
4. Bob sends T to Alice through a public channel P .
5. Alice receives T . From T and her modulation data, Alice knows which detector clicked in Bob's site, i.e. D .
6. Alice and Bob have an identical bit string, provided that the first detector click represents "0" and the other detector represents "1", then a shared raw key $K_{a,b}$ is formed.

We re-introduce the basic DPS protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 16 illustrates.

Now, we assume $M[q; T] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q; T]_i$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q . The generation of n qubits q through a unitary operator $Set_A[q]$. Alice sends q to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$. Bob sends T to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(T)$ and Alice receives T through channel




Figure 16: The DPS protocol.

P by classical communicating action $receive_P(T)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, D)$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
 A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
 A_1 &= Set_A[q] \cdot A_2 \\
 A_2 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_3 \\
 A_3 &= receive_P(T) \cdot A_4 \\
 A_4 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, D) \cdot A
 \end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
 B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
 B_1 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q; T]_i \cdot B_2 \\
 B_2 &= send_P(T) \cdot B_3 \\
 B_3 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, D) \cdot B_4 \\
 B_4 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
 \end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \gamma(send_Q(q), receive_Q(q)) &\triangleq c_Q(q) \\
 \gamma(send_P(T), receive_P(T)) &\triangleq c_P(T)
 \end{aligned}$$

(3)

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q), receive_Q(q), send_P(T), receive_P(T)\}$ and $I = \{Set_A[q], \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2n}, i=0}^{2n-1} M[q; T]_i, c_Q(q), c_P(T), cmp(K_{a,b}, D)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 6.5. *The basic DPS protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$. So, the basic DPS protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

6.6 Verification of BBM92 Protocol

The famous BBM92 protocol[38] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The BBM92 protocol is used to create a private key between two parities, Alice and Bob. BBM92 is a protocol of quantum key distribution (QKD) which uses EPR pairs as information carriers. Firstly, we introduce the basic BBM92 protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 17.

1. Alice generates a string of EPR pairs q with size n , i.e., $2n$ particles, and sends a string of qubits q_b from each EPR pair with n to Bob through a quantum channel Q , remains the other string of qubits q_a from each pair with size n .
2. Alice create a string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as B_a .
3. Bob receives q_b and randomly generates a string of bits B_b with size n .
4. Alice measures each qubit of q_a according to bits of B_a , if $B_{a_i} = 0$, then uses x axis (\rightarrow); else if $B_{a_i} = 1$, then uses z axis (\uparrow).
5. Bob measures each qubit of q_b according to bits of B_b , if $B_{b_i} = 0$, then uses x axis (\rightarrow); else if $B_{b_i} = 1$, then uses z axis (\uparrow).
6. Bob sends his measurement axis choices B_b to Alice through a public channel P .
7. Once receiving B_b , Alice sends her axis choices B_a to Bob through channel P , and Bob receives B_a .
8. Alice and Bob agree to discard all instances in which they happened to measure along different axes, as well as instances in which measurements fails because of imperfect quantum efficiency of the detectors. Then the remaining instances can be used to generate a private key $K_{a,b}$.




Figure 17: The BBM92 protocol.

We re-introduce the basic BBM92 protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 17 illustrates.

Now, $M[q_a; B_a] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q_a; K_a]_i$ denotes the Alice's measurement operation of q_a , and $\textcircled{S}_{M[q_a; B_a]} = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} \textcircled{S}_{M[q_a; B_a]_i}$ denotes the responding shadow constant; $M[q_b; B_b] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q_b; B_b]_i$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q_b , and $\textcircled{S}_{M[q_b; B_b]} = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} \textcircled{S}_{M[q_b; B_b]_i}$ denotes the responding shadow constant. Alice sends q_b to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q_b)$ and Bob receives q_b through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q_b)$. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(B_b)$ and Alice receives B_b through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(B_b)$, and the same as $send_P(B_a)$ and $receive_P(B_a)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, B_a, B_b)$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= send_Q(q_b) \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q_a; B_a]_i \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} \textcircled{S}_{M[q_b; B_b]_i} \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= receive_P(B_b) \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= send_P(B_a) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, B_a, B_b) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q_b) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} \textcircled{S}_{M[q_a; B_a]_i} \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} M[q_b; B_b]_i \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_P(B_b) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= receive_P(B_a) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, B_a, B_b) \cdot B_6 \\
B_6 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. The quantum measurement and its shadow constant pair will lead entanglement occur, otherwise, a deadlock δ will occur. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(send_Q(q_b), receive_Q(q_b)) &\triangleq c_Q(q_b) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b)) &\triangleq c_P(B_b) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a)) &\triangleq c_P(B_a)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q_b), receive_Q(q_b), send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b), send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a), \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} M[q_a; B_a]_i, \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} \textcircled{S}_{M[q_a; B_a]_i}, \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} M[q_b; B_b]_i, \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} \textcircled{S}_{M[q_b; B_b]_i}\}$

and $I = \{c_Q(q_b), c_P(B_b), c_P(B_a), M[q_a; B_a], M[q_b; B_b], cmp(K_{a,b}, B_a, B_b)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 6.6. *The basic BBM92 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$. So, the basic BBM92 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

6.7 Verification of SARG04 Protocol

The famous SARG04 protocol[39] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.




Figure 18: The SARG04 protocol.

The SARG04 protocol is used to create a private key between two parities, Alice and Bob. SARG04 is a protocol of quantum key distribution (QKD) which refines the BB84 protocol against PNS (Photon Number Splitting) attacks. The main innovations are encoding bits in nonorthogonal states and the classical sifting procedure. Firstly, we introduce the basic SARG04 protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 18.

1. Alice create a string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as K_a .
2. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , and the i th qubit of q has four nonorthogonal states, it is $|\pm x\rangle$ if $K_a = 0$; it is $|\pm z\rangle$ if $K_a = 1$. And she records the corresponding one of the four pairs of nonorthogonal states into B_a with size $2n$.
3. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
4. Alice sends B_a through a public channel P .
5. Bob measures each qubit of q σ_x or σ_z . And he records the unambiguous discriminations into K_b with a raw size $n/4$, and the unambiguous discrimination information into B_b with size n .
6. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public channel P .
7. Alice and Bob determine that at which position the bit should be remained. Then the remaining bits of K_a and K_b is the private key $K_{a,b}$.

We re-introduce the basic SARG04 protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 18 illustrates.

Now, we assume a special measurement operation $Rand[q; K_a] = \sum_{i=0}^{2n-1} Rand[q; K_a]_i$ which create a string of n random bits K_a from the q quantum system. $M[q; K_b] = \sum_{i=0}^{2n-1} M[q; K_b]_i$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q . The generation of n qubits q through a unitary operator $Set_{K_a}[q]$. Alice sends q to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(B_b)$ and Alice receives B_b through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(B_b)$, and the same as $send_P(B_a)$ and $receive_P(B_a)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; K_a]_i \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= Set_{K_a}[q] \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= send_P(B_a) \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= receive_P(B_b) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= receive_P(B_a) \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q; K_b]_i \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_P(B_b) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(send_Q(q), receive_Q(q)) &\triangleq c_Q(q) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b)) &\triangleq c_P(B_b) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a)) &\triangleq c_P(B_a)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q), receive_Q(q), send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b), send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a)\}$ and $I = \{\boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; K_a]_i, Set_{K_a}[q], \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q; K_b]_i, c_Q(q), c_P(B_b), c_P(B_a), cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.




Figure 19: The COW protocol.

Theorem 6.7. *The basic SARG04 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ } \& B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ } \& B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ } \& B)))$. So, the basic SARG04 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \text{ } \& B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

6.8 Verification of COW Protocol

The famous COW protocol[40] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The COW protocol is used to create a private key between two parities, Alice and Bob. COW is a protocol of quantum key distribution (QKD) which is practical. Firstly, we introduce the basic COW protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 19.

1. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , and the i th qubit of q is "0" with probability $\frac{1-f}{2}$, "1" with probability $\frac{1+f}{2}$ and the decoy sequence with probability f .
2. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
3. Alice sends A of the items corresponding to a decoy sequence through a public channel P .
4. Bob removes all the detections at times $2A-1$ and $2A$ from his raw key and looks whether detector D_{2M} has ever fired at time $2A$.
5. Bob sends B of the times $2A+1$ in which he had a detector in D_{2M} to Alice through the public channel P .
6. Alice receives B and verifies if some of these items corresponding to a bit sequence "1,0".
7. Bob sends C of the items that he has detected through the public channel P .
8. Alice and Bob run error correction and privacy amplification on these bits, and the private key $K_{a,b}$ is established.

We re-introduce the basic COW protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 19 illustrates.

Now, we assume The generation of n qubits q through a unitary operator $Set[q]$. $M[q] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q]_i$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q . Alice sends q to Bob through the

quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$. Alice sends A to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(A)$ and Alice receives A through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(A)$, and the same as $send_P(B)$ and $receive_P(B)$, and $send_P(C)$ and $receive_P(C)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b})$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= Set[q] \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= send_P(A) \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= receive_P(B) \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= receive_P(C) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= cmp(K_{a,b}) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= receive_P(A) \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q]_i \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_P(B) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= send_P(C) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= cmp(K_{a,b}) \cdot B_6 \\
B_6 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(send_Q(q), receive_Q(q)) &\triangleq c_Q(q) \\
\gamma(send_P(A), receive_P(A)) &\triangleq c_P(A) \\
\gamma(send_P(B), receive_P(B)) &\triangleq c_P(B) \\
\gamma(send_P(C), receive_P(C)) &\triangleq c_P(C)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q), receive_Q(q), send_P(A), receive_P(A), send_P(B), receive_P(B), send_P(C), receive_P(C)\}$ and $I = \{Set[q], \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q]_i, c_Q(q), c_P(A), c_P(B), c_P(C), cmp(K_{a,b})\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 6.8. *The basic COW protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$. So, the basic COW protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

6.9 Verification of SSP Protocol

The famous SSP protocol[41] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The SSP protocol is used to create a private key between two parties, Alice and Bob. SSP is a protocol of quantum key distribution (QKD) which uses six states. Firstly, we introduce the basic SSP protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 20.

1. Alice create two string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as B_a and K_a .
2. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , and the i th qubit in q is one of the six states $\pm x$, $\pm y$ and $\pm z$.
3. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
4. Bob receives q and randomly generates a string of bits B_b with size n .
5. Bob measures each qubit of q according to a basis by bits of B_b , i.e., x , y or z basis. And the measurement results would be K_b , which is also with size n .
6. Bob sends his measurement bases B_b to Alice through a public channel P .
7. Once receiving B_b , Alice sends her bases B_a to Bob through channel P , and Bob receives B_a .
8. Alice and Bob determine that at which position the bit strings B_a and B_b are equal, and they discard the mismatched bits of B_a and B_b . Then the remaining bits of K_a and K_b , denoted as K'_a and K'_b with $K_{a,b} = K'_a = K'_b$.

We re-introduce the basic SSP protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 20 illustrates.




Figure 20: The SSP protocol.

Now, we assume a special measurement operation $Rand[q; B_a] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; B_a]_i$ which create a string of n random bits B_a from the q quantum system, and the same as $Rand[q; K_a] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; K_a]_i$, $Rand[q'; B_b] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q'; B_b]_i$. $M[q; K_b] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q; K_b]_i$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q . The generation of n qubits q through two unitary operators $Set_{K_a}[q]$ and $H_{B_a}[q]$. Alice sends q to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(B_b)$ and Alice receives B_b through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(B_b)$, and the same as $send_P(B_a)$ and $receive_P(B_a)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; B_a]_i \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; K_a]_i \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= Set_{K_a}[q] \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= H_{B_a}[q] \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= receive_P(B_b) \cdot A_7 \\
A_7 &= send_P(B_a) \cdot A_8 \\
A_8 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} Rand[q'; B_b]_i \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} M[q; K_b]_i \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_P(B_b) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= receive_P(B_a) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot B_6 \\
B_6 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(send_Q(q), receive_Q(q)) &\triangleq c_Q(q) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b)) &\triangleq c_P(B_b) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a)) &\triangleq c_P(B_a)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q), receive_Q(q), send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b), send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a)\}$ and $I = \{\boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} Rand[q; B_a]_i, \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} Rand[q; K_a]_i, Set_{K_a}[q], H_{B_a}[q], \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} Rand[q'; B_b]_i, \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} M[q; K_b]_i, c_Q(q), c_P(B_b), c_P(B_a), cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 6.9. *The basic SSP protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$. So, the basic SSP protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

6.10 Verification of S09 Protocol

The famous S09 protocol[42] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The S09 protocol is used to create a private key between two parties, Alice and Bob, by use of pure quantum information. Firstly, we introduce the basic S09 protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 21.




Figure 21: The S09 protocol.

1. Alice create two string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as B_a and K_a .
2. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , and the i th qubit in q is $|x_y\rangle$, where x is the i th bit of B_a and y is the i th bit of K_a .
3. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
4. Bob receives q and randomly generates a string of bits B_b with size n .
5. Bob measures each qubit of q according to a basis by bits of B_b . After the measurement, the state of q evolves into q' .
6. Bob sends q' to Alice through the quantum channel Q .
7. Alice measures each qubit of q' to generate a string C .
8. Alice sums $C_i \oplus B_{a_i}$ to get the private key $K_{a,b} = B_b$.

We re-introduce the basic S09 protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 21 illustrates.

Now, we assume a special measurement operation $Rand[q; B_a] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; B_a]_i$ which create a string of n random bits B_a from the q quantum system, and the same as $Rand[q; K_a] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; K_a]_i$, $Rand[q'; B_b] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q'; B_b]_i$. $M[q; B_b] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q; B_b]_i$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q , and the same as $M[q'; C] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q'; C]_i$. The generation of n qubits q through two unitary operators $Set_{K_a}[q]$ and $H_{B_a}[q]$. Alice sends q to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$, and the same as $send_Q(q')$ and $receive_Q(q')$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, B_b)$. We omit the sum classical \oplus actions without of loss of generality. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} Rand[q; B_a]_i \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} Rand[q; K_a]_i \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= Set_{K_a}[q] \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= H_{B_a}[q] \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= receive_Q(q') \cdot A_7 \\
A_7 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} M[q'; C]_i \cdot A_8 \\
A_8 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, B_b) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} Rand[q'; B_b]_i \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} M[q; B_b]_i \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_Q(q') \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, B_b) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(send_Q(q), receive_Q(q)) &\triangleq c_Q(q) \\
\gamma(send_Q(q'), receive_Q(q')) &\triangleq c_Q(q')
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q), receive_Q(q), send_Q(q'), receive_Q(q')\}$ and $I = \{\boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} Rand[q; B_a]_i, \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} Rand[q; K_a]_i, Set_{K_a}[q], H_{B_a}[q], \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} Rand[q'; B_b]_i, \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} M[q; B_b]_i, \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} Rand[q'; C]_i, c_Q(q), c_Q(q'), cmp(K_{a,b}, B_b)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.




Figure 22: The KMB09 protocol.

Theorem 6.10. *The basic S09 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \bowtie B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \bowtie B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \bowtie B)))$. So, the basic S09 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \bowtie B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

6.11 Verification of KMB09 Protocol

The famous KMB09 protocol[43] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The KMB09 protocol is used to create a private key between two parties, Alice and Bob. KMB09 is a protocol of quantum key distribution (QKD) which refines the BB84 protocol against PNS (Photon Number Splitting) attacks. The main innovations are encoding bits in nonorthogonal states and the classical sifting procedure. Firstly, we introduce the basic KMB09 protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 22.

1. Alice create a string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as K_a , and randomly assigns each bit value a random index $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ into B_a .
2. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , accordingly either in $|e_i\rangle$ or $|f_i\rangle$.
3. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
4. Alice sends B_a through a public channel P .
5. Bob measures each qubit of q by randomly switching the measurement basis between e and f . And he records the unambiguous discriminations into K_b , and the unambiguous discrimination information into B_b .
6. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public channel P .
7. Alice and Bob determine that at which position the bit should be remained. Then the remaining bits of K_a and K_b is the private key $K_{a,b}$.

We re-introduce the basic KMB09 protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 22 illustrates.

Now, we assume a special measurement operation $Rand[q; K_a] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; K_a]_i$ which create a string of n random bits K_a from the q quantum system. $M[q; K_b] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q; K_b]_i$

denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q . The generation of n qubits q through a unitary operator $Set_{K_a}[q]$. Alice sends q to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(B_b)$ and Alice receives B_b through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(B_b)$, and the same as $send_P(B_a)$ and $receive_P(B_a)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)$. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; K_a]_i \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= Set_{K_a}[q] \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= send_P(B_a) \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= receive_P(B_b) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= receive_P(B_a) \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q; K_b]_i \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= send_P(B_b) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(send_Q(q), receive_Q(q)) &\triangleq c_Q(q) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b)) &\triangleq c_P(B_b) \\
\gamma(send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a)) &\triangleq c_P(B_a)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{send_Q(q), receive_Q(q), send_P(B_b), receive_P(B_b), send_P(B_a), receive_P(B_a)\}$ and $I = \{\boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; K_a]_i, Set_{K_a}[q], \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q; K_b]_i, c_Q(q), c_P(B_b), c_P(B_a), cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 6.11. *The basic KMB09 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} loc_A :: receive_A(D_i) \parallel loc_B :: send_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$. So, the basic KMB09 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

6.12 Verification of S13 Protocol

The famous S13 protocol[44] is a quantum key distribution protocol, in which quantum information and classical information are mixed.

The S13 protocol is used to create a private key between two parties, Alice and Bob. Firstly, we introduce the basic S13 protocol briefly, which is illustrated in Figure 23.

1. Alice create two string of bits with size n randomly, denoted as B_a and K_a .
2. Alice generates a string of qubits q with size n , and the i th qubit in q is $|x_y\rangle$, where x is the i th bit of B_a and y is the i th bit of K_a .
3. Alice sends q to Bob through a quantum channel Q between Alice and Bob.
4. Bob receives q and randomly generates a string of bits B_b with size n .
5. Bob measures each qubit of q according to a basis by bits of B_b . And the measurement results would be K_b , which is also with size n .
6. Alice sends a random binary string C to Bob through the public channel P .
7. Alice sums $B_{a_i} \oplus C_i$ to obtain T and generates other random string of binary values J . From the elements occupying a concrete position, i , of the preceding strings, Alice get the new states of q' , and sends it to Bob through the quantum channel Q .
8. Bob sums $1 \oplus B_{b_i}$ to obtain the string of binary basis N and measures q' according to these bases, and generating D .
9. Alice sums $K_{a_i} \oplus J_i$ to obtain the binary string Y and sends it to Bob through the public channel P .
10. Bob encrypts B_b to obtain U and sends to Alice through the public channel P .




Figure 23: The S13 protocol.

11. Alice decrypts U to obtain B_b . She sums $B_{a_i} \oplus B_{b_i}$ to obtain L and sends L to Bob through the public channel P .
12. Bob sums $B_{b_i} \oplus L_i$ to get the private key $K_{a,b}$.

We re-introduce the basic S13 protocol in an abstract way with more technical details as Figure 23 illustrates.

Now, we assume a special measurement operation $Rand[q; B_a] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; B_a]_i$ which create a string of n random bits B_a from the q quantum system, and the same as $Rand[q; K_a] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q; K_a]_i$, $Rand[q'; B_b] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} Rand[q'; B_b]_i$. $M[q; K_b] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q; K_b]_i$ denotes the Bob's measurement operation of q , and the same as $M[q'; D] = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} M[q'; D]_i$. The generation of n qubits q through two unitary operators $Set_{K_a}[q]$ and $H_{B_a}[q]$, and the same as $Set_T[q']$. Alice sends q to Bob through the quantum channel Q by quantum communicating action $send_Q(q)$ and Bob receives q through Q by quantum communicating action $receive_Q(q)$, and the same as $send_Q(q')$ and $receive_Q(q')$. Bob sends B_b to Alice through the public channel P by classical communicating action $send_P(B_b)$ and Alice receives B_b through channel P by classical communicating action $receive_P(B_b)$, and the same as $send_P(B_a)$ and $receive_P(B_a)$, $send_P(C)$ and $receive_P(C)$, $send_P(Y)$ and $receive_P(Y)$, $send_P(U)$ and $receive_P(U)$, $send_P(L)$ and $receive_P(L)$. Alice and Bob generate the private key $K_{a,b}$ by a classical comparison action $cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)$. We omit the sum classical \oplus actions without of loss of generality. Let Alice and Bob be a system AB and let interactions between Alice and Bob be internal actions. AB receives external input D_i through channel A by communicating action $receive_A(D_i)$ and sends results D_o through channel B by communicating action $send_B(D_o)$.

Then the state transition of Alice can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= loc_A :: \left(\sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} receive_A(D_i) \cdot A_1 \right) \\
A_1 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} Rand[q; B_a]_i \cdot A_2 \\
A_2 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} Rand[q; K_a]_i \cdot A_3 \\
A_3 &= Set_{K_a}[q] \cdot A_4 \\
A_4 &= H_{B_a}[q] \cdot A_5 \\
A_5 &= send_Q(q) \cdot A_6 \\
A_6 &= send_P(C) \cdot A_7 \\
A_7 &= send_Q(q') \cdot A_8 \\
A_8 &= send_P(Y) \cdot A_9 \\
A_9 &= receive_P(U) \cdot A_{10} \\
A_{10} &= send_P(L) \cdot A_{11} \\
A_{11} &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot A
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_i is the collection of the input data.

And the state transition of Bob can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= loc_B :: (receive_Q(q) \cdot B_1) \\
B_1 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} Rand[q'; B_b]_i \cdot B_2 \\
B_2 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} M[q; K_b]_i \cdot B_3 \\
B_3 &= receive_P(C) \cdot B_4 \\
B_4 &= receive_Q(q') \cdot B_5 \\
B_5 &= \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2^n}, i=0}^{2n-1} M[q'; D]_i \cdot B_6 \\
B_6 &= receive_P(Y) \cdot B_7 \\
B_7 &= send_P(U) \cdot B_8 \\
B_8 &= receive_P(L) \cdot B_9 \\
B_9 &= cmp(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b) \cdot B_{10} \\
B_{10} &= \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} send_B(D_o) \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_o is the collection of the output data.

The send action and receive action of the same data through the same channel can communicate each other, otherwise, a deadlock δ will be caused. We define the following communication functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\gamma(\text{send}_Q(q), \text{receive}_Q(q)) \triangleq c_Q(q) \\
&\gamma(\text{send}_Q(q'), \text{receive}_Q(q')) \triangleq c_Q(q') \\
&\gamma(\text{send}_P(C), \text{receive}_P(C)) \triangleq c_P(C) \\
&\gamma(\text{send}_P(Y), \text{receive}_P(Y)) \triangleq c_P(Y) \\
&\gamma(\text{send}_P(U), \text{receive}_P(U)) \triangleq c_P(U) \\
&\gamma(\text{send}_P(L), \text{receive}_P(L)) \triangleq c_P(L)
\end{aligned}$$

Let A and B in parallel, then the system AB can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$$

where $H = \{\text{send}_Q(q), \text{receive}_Q(q), \text{send}_Q(q'), \text{receive}_Q(q'), \text{send}_P(C), \text{receive}_P(C), \text{send}_P(Y), \text{receive}_P(Y), \text{send}_P(U), \text{receive}_P(U), \text{send}_P(L), \text{receive}_P(L)\}$

and $I = \{\boxplus_{\frac{1}{2n}, i=0}^{2n-1} \text{Rand}[q; B_a]_i, \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2n}, i=0}^{2n-1} \text{Rand}[q; K_a]_i, \text{Set}_{K_a}[q], H_{B_a}[q], \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2n}, i=0}^{2n-1} \text{Rand}[q'; B_b]_i, \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2n}, i=0}^{2n-1} M[q; K_b]_i, \boxplus_{\frac{1}{2n}, i=0}^{2n-1} M[q'; D]_i, c_Q(q), c_P(C), c_Q(q'), c_P(Y), c_P(U), c_P(L), \text{cmp}(K_{a,b}, K_a, K_b, B_a, B_b)\}$.

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 6.12. *The basic S13 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors.*

Proof. We can get $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B))) = \sum_{D_i \in \Delta_i} \sum_{D_o \in \Delta_o} \text{loc}_A :: \text{receive}_A(D_i) \parallel \text{loc}_B :: \text{send}_B(D_o) \parallel \tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$. So, the basic S13 protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(A \parallel B)))$ can exhibit desired external behaviors. \square

References

- [1] R. Milner. (1989). *Communication and concurrency*. Printice Hall.
- [2] R. Milner. (1980). *A calculus of communicating systems*. LNCS 92, Springer.
- [3] W. Fokkink. (2007). *Introduction to process algebra 2nd ed*. Springer-Verlag.
- [4] F.W. Vaandrager. (1986). *Verification of two communication protocols by means of process algebra*. Report CS-R8608, CWI, Amsterdam.
- [5] R. Milner, J. Parrow, and D. Walker. (1992). *A Calculus of Mobile Processes, Part I*. *Information and Computation*, 100(1):1-40.
- [6] R. Milner, J. Parrow, and D. Walker. (1992). *A calculus of mobile processes, Part II*. *Information and Computation*, 100(1):41-77.
- [7] Y. Wang. (2017). *A calculus for true concurrency*. Manuscript, arxiv: 1703.00159.
- [8] Y. Wang. (2016). *Algebraic laws for true concurrency*. Manuscript, arXiv: 1611.09035.
- [9] Y. Wang. (2017). *A calculus of truly concurrent mobile processes*. Manuscript, arXiv: 1704.07774.
- [10] Y. Wang. (2021). *Probabilistic Process Algebra for True Concurrency*. Manuscript, arXiv: 2107.08453.
- [11] Y. Wang. (2021). *Truly Concurrent Process Algebra with Localities*. Manuscript, arXiv: 2109.05936.
- [12] Y. Wang. (2021). *Probabilistic Process Algebra with Localities*. Manuscript, arXiv: 2109.05936.
- [13] S. Andova. (2002). *Probabilistic process algebra*. *Annals of Operations Research* 128(2002):204-219.
- [14] S. Andova, J. Baeten, T. Willemse. (2006). *A Complete Axiomatisation of Branching Bisimulation for Probabilistic Systems with an Application in Protocol Verification*. *International Conference on Concurrency Theory*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [15] S. Andova, S. Georgievska. (2009). *On Compositionality, Efficiency, and Applicability of Abstraction in Probabilistic Systems*. *Conference on Current Trends in Theory and Practice of Computer Science*. Springer-Verlag.
- [16] I. Castellani. (2001). *Process algebras with localities*. *Handbook of Process Algebra*, 945-1045.
- [17] Y. Feng and R. Y. Duan and Z. F. Ji and M. S. Ying. (2007). *Probabilistic bisimulations for quantum processes*. *Information and Computation*, 205(2007): 1608–1639.
- [18] S. J. Gay and R. Nagarajan. (2005). *Communicating quantum processes*. *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, Long Beach, California, USA, ACM Press, 2005: 145–157.

- [19] S. J. Gay and R. Nagarajan. (2006). Typechecking communicating quantum processes. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 2006, 16(2006): 375–406.
- [20] P. Jorrand and M. Lalire. (2005). Toward a quantum process algebra. *Proceedings of the 1st ACM Conference on Computing Frontiers, Ischia, Italy*, ACM Press, 2005: 111–119.
- [21] P. Jorrand and M. Lalire. (2005). From quantum physics to programming languages: a process algebraic approach. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 2005, 3566(2005): 1–16.
- [22] M. Lalire. (2006). Relations among quantum processes: Bisimilarity and congruence. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 2006, 16(2006): 407–428.
- [23] M. Lalire and P. Jorrand. (2004). A process algebraic approach to concurrent and distributed quantum computation: operational semantics. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Quantum Programming Languages, TUCS General Publications*, 2004: 109–126.
- [24] M. Ying and Y. Feng and R. Duan and Z. Ji. (2009). An algebra of quantum processes. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic (TOCL)*, 2009, 10(3): 1–36.
- [25] Y. Feng and R. Duan and M. Ying. (2011). Bisimulations for quantum processes. *Proceedings of the 38th ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL 11)*, ACM Press, 2011: 523–534.
- [26] Y. Deng and Y. Feng. (2012). Open bisimulation for quantum processes. Manuscript, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1201.0416>, 2012.
- [27] Y. Feng and Y. Deng and M. Ying. (2012). Symbolic bisimulation for quantum processes. Manuscript, <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1202.3484>, 2012.
- [28] M.A Nielsen and I. L Chuang. (2000). *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [29] R. Duncan. (2006). *Types for Quantum Computing*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Oxford University, 2006.
- [30] Y. Wang. (2016). Probabilistic Process Algebra to Unifying Quantum and Classical Computing in Closed Systems. arXiv:1610.02500.
- [31] Y. Wang. (2014). Entanglement in Quantum Process Algebra. arXiv:1404.0665.
- [32] Y. Wang. (2014). An Axiomatization for Quantum Processes to Unifying Quantum and Classical Computing. arXiv:1311.2960.
- [33] F. Moller. (1990). The importance of the left merge operator in process algebras. In M.S. Paterson, ed., *Proceedings 17th Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP'90)*, Warwick, LNCS 443, 752–764. Springer.
- [34] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard. (1984). Quantum cryptography: Public-key distribution and coin tossing. *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer, Systems and Signal Processing*, 1984, 175–179.

- [35] A. K. Ekert. (1991). Quantum cryptography based on Bell's theorem. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1991, 67(6):661-663.
- [36] C. H. Bennett. (1992). Quantum cryptography using any two nonorthogonal states. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 68 (21), 3121–3124.
- [37] K. Inoue, E. Woks and Y. Yamamoto. (2002). Differential phase shift quantum key distribution., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89 037902.
- [38] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, N. D. Mermin. (1992). Quantum cryptography without Bell's Theorem. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 68 (5), 557–559.
- [39] V. Scarani, A. Acín, G. Ribordy, and N. Gisin. (2004). Quantum Cryptography Protocols Robust against Photon Number Splitting Attacks for Weak Laser Pulse Implementations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 92 (5), 057901-1–057901-4.
- [40] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, H. Zbinden, et al. (2004). Towards practical and fast Quantum Cryptography. <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0411022v1>.
- [41] H. Bechmann-Pasquinucci, N. Gisin. (1999). Incoherent and coherent eavesdropping in the six-state protocol of quantum cryptography. *Phys. Rev. A.* 59 (6), 4238–4248.
- [42] E. H. SERNA. (2009). Quantum Key Distribution Protocol With Private-Public Key. <http://arxiv.org/abs/0908.2146v4>.
- [43] M. M. Khan, M. Murphy, A. Beige. (2009). High error-rate quantum key distribution for long-distance communication. <http://arxiv.org/abs/0901.3909v4>.
- [44] E. H. SERNA. (2013). Quantum Key Distribution From A Random Seed. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1311.1582v2>.
- [45] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. Wootters. (1993). Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and epr channels. *Physical Review Letters*, 70:1895–1899.