

Algebraic Laws for True Concurrency

Yong Wang

College of Computer Science and Technology,
Faculty of Information Technology,
Beijing University of Technology, Beijing, China

Abstract. We find the algebraic laws for true concurrency. Eventually, we establish a whole axiomatization for true concurrency called *APTC* (Algebra for Parallelism in True Concurrency). The theory *APTC* has four modules: *BATC* (Basic Algebra for True Concurrency), *APTC* (Algebra for Parallelism in True Concurrency), recursion and abstraction. And also, we show the applications and extensions of *APTC*.

Keywords: True Concurrency; Behavioral Equivalence; Prime Event Structure; Axiomatization

1. Introduction

Parallelism and concurrency [7] are the core concepts within computer science. There are mainly two camps in capturing concurrency: the interleaving concurrency and the true concurrency.

The representative of interleaving concurrency is bisimulation/rooted branching bisimulation equivalences. *CCS* (Calculus of Communicating Systems) [3] is a calculus based on bisimulation semantics model. Hennessy and Milner (HM) logic for bisimulation equivalence is also designed. Later, algebraic laws to capture computational properties modulo bisimulation equivalence was introduced in [1], this work eventually founded the comprehensive axiomatization modulo bisimulation equivalence – *ACP* (Algebra of Communicating Processes) [4].

The other camp of concurrency is true concurrency. The researches on true concurrency are still active. Firstly, there are several truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences, the representatives are: pomset bisimulation equivalence, step bisimulation equivalence, history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation equivalence, and especially hereditary history-preserving (hhp-) bisimulation equivalence [8] [9], the well-known finest truly concurrent bisimulation equivalence. These truly concurrent bisimulations are studied in different structures [5] [6] [7]: Petri nets, event structures, domains, and also a uniform form called TSI (Transition System with Independence) [13]. There are also several logics based on different truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences, for example, SFL (Separation Fixpoint Logic) and TFL (Trace Fixpoint Logic) [13] are extensions on true concurrency of mu-calculi [10] on bisimulation equivalence, and also a logic with reverse modalities [11] [12] based on the so-called reverse bisimulations with a reverse flavor. It must be pointed out that, a uniform

Correspondence and offprint requests to: Yong Wang, Pingleyuan 100, Chaoyang District, Beijing, China. e-mail: wangy@bjut.edu.cn

logic for true concurrency [14] [15] was represented several years ago, which used a logical framework to unify several truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences, including pomset bisimulation, step bisimulation, hp-bisimulation and hhp-bisimulation.

There are simple comparisons between HM logic for bisimulation equivalence and the uniform logic [14] [15] for truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences, the algebraic laws [1], *ACP* [4] for bisimulation equivalence, and *what* for truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences, which is still missing.

Yes, we try to find the algebraic laws for true concurrency following the way paved by *ACP* for bisimulation equivalence. And finally, we establish a whole axiomatization for true concurrency called *APTC*. The theory *APTC* has four modules: *BATC* (Basic Algebra for True Concurrency), *APTC* (Algebra for Parallelism in True Concurrency), recursion and abstraction. With the help of placeholder in section 8.1, we get an intuitive result for true concurrency: $a \bowtie b = a \cdot b + b \cdot a + a \parallel b + a \mid b$ modulo truly concurrent bisimilarities pomset bisimulation equivalence, step bisimulation equivalence and history-preserving bisimulation equivalence, with a, b are atomic actions (events), \bowtie is the whole true concurrency operator, \cdot is the temporal causality operator, $+$ is the a kind of structured conflict, \parallel is the parallel operator and \mid is the communication merge.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we introduce some preliminaries, including a brief introduction to *ACP*, and also preliminaries on true concurrency. We introduce *BATC* in section 3, *APTC* in section 4, recursion in section 5, and abstraction in section 6. In section 7, we show the applications of *APTC* by an example called alternating bit protocol. We show the modularity and extension mechanism of *APTC* in section 8. We establish an axiomatization for hhp-bisimilarity in section 9. Finally, in section 10, we conclude this paper.

2. Backgrounds

2.1. Process Algebra

In this subsection, we introduce the preliminaries on process algebra *ACP* [4], which is based on the interleaving bisimulation semantics. *ACP* has an almost perfect axiomatization to capture laws on bisimulation equivalence, including equational logic and bisimulation semantics, and also the soundness and completeness bridged between them.

2.1.1. *ACP*

ACP captures several computational properties in the form of algebraic laws, and proves the soundness and completeness modulo bisimulation/rooted branching bisimulation equivalence. These computational properties are organized in a modular way by use of the concept of conservational extension, which include the following modules, note that, every algebra are composed of constants and operators, the constants are the computational objects, while operators capture the computational properties.

1. ***BPA* (Basic Process Algebras).** *BPA* has sequential composition \cdot and alternative composition $+$ to capture sequential computation and nondeterminacy. The constants are ranged over A , the set of atomic actions. The algebraic laws on \cdot and $+$ are sound and complete modulo bisimulation equivalence.
2. ***ACP* (Algebra of Communicating Processes).** *ACP* uses the parallel operator \parallel , the auxiliary binary left merge \ll to model parallelism, and the communication merge \mid to model communications among different parallel branches. Since a communication may be blocked, a new constant called deadlock δ is extended to A , and also a new unary encapsulation operator ∂_H is introduced to eliminate δ , which may exist in the processes. The algebraic laws on these operators are also sound and complete modulo bisimulation equivalence. Note that, these operators in a process can be eliminated by deductions on the process using axioms of *ACP*, and eventually be steadied by \cdot and $+$, this is also why bisimulation is called an *interleaving* semantics.
3. **Recursion.** To model infinite computation, recursion is introduced into *ACP*. In order to obtain a sound and complete theory, guarded recursion and linear recursion are needed. The corresponding axioms are *RSP* (Recursive Specification Principle) and *RDP* (Recursive Definition Principle), *RDP* says the solutions of a recursive specification can represent the behaviors of the specification, while *RSP* says that a guarded recursive specification has only one solution, they are sound with respect to *ACP* with

guarded recursion modulo bisimulation equivalence, and they are complete with respect to *ACP* with linear recursion modulo bisimulation equivalence.

4. **Abstraction.** To abstract away internal implementations from the external behaviors, a new constant τ called silent step is added to A , and also a new unary abstraction operator τ_I is used to rename actions in I into τ (the resulted *ACP* with silent step and abstraction operator is called ACP_τ). The recursive specification is adapted to guarded linear recursion to prevent infinite τ -loops specifically. The axioms for τ and τ_I are sound modulo rooted branching bisimulation equivalence (a kind of weak bisimulation equivalence). To eliminate infinite τ -loops caused by τ_I and obtain the completeness, *CFAR* (Cluster Fair Abstraction Rule) is used to prevent infinite τ -loops in a constructible way.

ACP can be used to verify the correctness of system behaviors, by deduction on the description of the system using the axioms of *ACP*. Base on the modularity of *ACP*, it can be extended easily and elegantly. For more details, please refer to the book of *ACP* [4].

2.1.2. 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.*

2.1.3. 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.*

2.2. True Concurrency

In this subsection, we introduce the concepts of prime event structure, and also concurrent behavior equivalence [5] [6] [7], and also we extend prime event structure with silent event τ , and explain the concept of weakly true concurrency, i.e., concurrent behaviorial equivalence with considering silent event τ [16].

2.2.1. Event Structure

We give the definition of prime event structure (PES) [5] [6] [7] extended with the silent event τ as follows.

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 $\tau^* = \epsilon$, 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 $\neg(e \# e')$.

The prime event structure without considering silent event τ is the original one in [5] [6] [7].

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 (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 $C \xRightarrow{X} C'$ is called a weak pomset transition from C to C' , where we define $\xRightarrow{e} \triangleq \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{\tau^*}$. And $\xRightarrow{X} \triangleq \xrightarrow{X} \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{\tau^*}$, for every $e \in X$. When the events in X are pairwise concurrent, we say that $C \xRightarrow{X} C'$ is a weak step.*

We will also suppose that all the PESs in this paper are image finite, that is, for any PES \mathcal{E} and $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$ and $a \in \Lambda$, $\{e \in \mathbb{E} | C \xrightarrow{e} C' \wedge \lambda(e) = a\}$ and $\{e \in \hat{\mathbb{E}} | C \xRightarrow{e} C' \wedge \lambda(e) = a\}$ is finite.

2.2.2. Concurrent Behavioral Equivalence

Definition 2.17 (Pomset, step bisimulation). *Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A pomset bisimulation is a relation $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$, such that if $(C_1, C_2) \in R$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow{X_1} C'_1$ then $C_2 \xrightarrow{X_2} C'_2$, with $X_1 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_1$, $X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_2$, $X_1 \sim X_2$ and $(C'_1, C'_2) \in R$, and vice-versa. We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_p \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a pomset bisimulation R , such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in R$. By replacing pomset transitions with steps, we can get the definition of step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_s \mathcal{E}_2$.*

Definition 2.18 (Weak pomset, step bisimulation). *Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A weak pomset bisimulation is a relation $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$, such that if $(C_1, C_2) \in R$, and $C_1 \xRightarrow{X_1} C'_1$ then $C_2 \xRightarrow{X_2} C'_2$, with $X_1 \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1$, $X_2 \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2$, $X_1 \sim X_2$ and $(C'_1, C'_2) \in R$, and vice-versa. We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are weak pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_p \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a weak pomset bisimulation R , such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in R$. By replacing weak pomset transitions with weak steps, we can get the definition of weak step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are weak step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_s \mathcal{E}_2$.*

Definition 2.19 (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*

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

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 $X_1 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_1$, $X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_2$, $x_1 \in \mathbb{E}_1$, $x_2 \in \mathbb{E}_2$.

Definition 2.20 (Weakly posetal product). *Given two PESs $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$, the weakly posetal product of their configurations, denoted $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \overline{\times} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$, is defined as*

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

A subset $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \overline{\times} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ is called a weakly 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 $X_1 \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1$, $X_2 \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2$, $x_1 \in \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1$, $x_2 \in \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2$. Also, we define $f(\tau^*) = f(\tau^*)$.

Definition 2.21 ((Hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). *A history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a posetal relation $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \overline{\times} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ such that if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} C'_1$, then $C_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} C'_2$, with*

$(C'_1, f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], C'_2) \in R$, and vice-versa. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_{hp} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a hp-bisimulation R such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in R$.

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

Definition 2.22 (Weak (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). A weak history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a weakly posetal relation $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ such that if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R$, and $C_1 \xRightarrow{e_1} C'_1$, then $C_2 \xRightarrow{e_2} C'_2$, with $(C'_1, f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], C'_2) \in R$, and vice-versa. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are weak history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{hp} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a weak hp-bisimulation R such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in R$.

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

Proposition 2.23 (Weakly concurrent behavioral equivalence). (Strongly) concurrent behavioral equivalences imply weakly concurrent behavioral equivalences. That is, \sim_p implies \approx_p , \sim_s implies \approx_s , \sim_{hp} implies \approx_{hp} , \sim_{hhp} implies \approx_{hhp} .

Proof. From the definition of weak pomset transition, weak step transition, weakly posetal product and weakly concurrent behavioral equivalence, it is easy to see that $\xRightarrow{e} = \xRightarrow{\epsilon} \xRightarrow{e} \xRightarrow{\epsilon}$ for $e \in \mathbb{E}$, where ϵ is the empty event. \square

Note that in the above definitions, truly concurrent behavioral equivalences are defined by events $e \in \mathcal{E}$ and prime event structure \mathcal{E} , in contrast to interleaving behavioral equivalences by actions $a, b \in \mathcal{P}$ and process (graph) \mathcal{P} . Indeed, they have correspondences, in [13], models of concurrency, including Petri nets, transition systems and event structures, are unified in a uniform representation – TSI (Transition System with Independence). If x is a process, let $C(x)$ denote the corresponding configuration (the already executed part of the process x , of course, it is free of conflicts), when $x \xrightarrow{e} x'$, the corresponding configuration $C(x) \xrightarrow{e} C(x')$ with $C(x') = C(x) \cup \{e\}$, where e may be caused by some events in $C(x)$ and concurrent with the other events in $C(x)$, or entirely concurrent with all events in $C(x)$, or entirely caused by all events in $C(x)$. Though the concurrent behavioral equivalences (Definition 2.17, 2.18, 2.21 and 2.22) are defined based on configurations (pasts of processes), they can also be defined based on processes (futures of configurations), we omit the concrete definitions. One key difference between definitions based on configurations and processes is that, the definitions based on configurations are stressing the structures of two equivalent configurations and the concrete atomic events may be different, but the definitions based on processes require not only the equivalent structures, but also the same atomic events by their labels, since we try to establish the algebraic equations modulo the corresponding concurrent behavior equivalences.

With a little abuse of concepts, in the following of the paper, we will not distinguish actions and events, prime event structures and processes, also concurrent behavior equivalences based on configurations and processes, and use them freely, unless they have specific meanings. Usually, in congruence theorem and soundness, we show them in a structure only flavor (equivalences based on configuration); but in proof of the completeness theorem, we must require not only the equivalent structure, but also the same set of atomic events.

3. Basic Algebra for True Concurrency

In this section, we will discuss the algebraic laws for prime event structure \mathcal{E} , exactly for causality \leq and conflict \sharp . We will follow the conventions of process algebra, using \cdot instead of \leq and $+$ instead of \sharp . The resulted algebra is called Basic Algebra for True Concurrency, abbreviated *BATC*.

3.1. Axiom System of *BATC*

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* consists of the laws given in Table 1.

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	$(x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot (y \cdot z)$

Table 1. Axioms of $BATC$

No.	Rewriting Rule
RA3	$x + x \rightarrow x$
RA4	$(x + y) \cdot z \rightarrow x \cdot z + y \cdot z$
RA5	$(x \cdot y) \cdot z \rightarrow x \cdot (y \cdot z)$

Table 2. Term rewrite system of $BATC$

Intuitively, the axiom A1 says that the binary operator $+$ satisfies commutative law. The axiom A2 says that $+$ satisfies associativity. A3 says that $+$ satisfies idempotency. The axiom A4 is the right distributivity of the binary operator \cdot to $+$. And A5 is the associativity of \cdot .

3.2. Properties of $BATC$

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

1. $\mathbb{E} \subset \mathcal{B}(BATC)$;
2. if $e \in \mathbb{E}, t \in \mathcal{B}(BATC)$ then $e \cdot t \in \mathcal{B}(BATC)$;
3. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(BATC)$ then $t + s \in \mathcal{B}(BATC)$.

Theorem 3.2 (Elimination theorem of $BATC$). *Let p be a closed $BATC$ term. Then there is a basic $BATC$ term q such that $BATC \vdash p = q$.*

Proof. (1) Firstly, suppose that the following ordering on the signature of $BATC$ is defined: $\cdot > +$ and the symbol \cdot is given the lexicographical status for the first argument, then for each rewrite rule $p \rightarrow q$ in Table 2 relation $p >_{lpo} q$ can easily be proved. We obtain that the term rewrite system shown in Table 2 is strongly normalizing, for it has finitely many rewriting rules, and $>$ is a well-founded ordering on the signature of $BATC$, and if $s >_{lpo} t$, for each rewriting rule $s \rightarrow t$ is in Table 2 (see Theorem 2.12).

(2) Then we prove that the normal forms of closed $BATC$ terms are basic $BATC$ terms.

Suppose that p is a normal form of some closed $BATC$ term and suppose that p is not a basic term. Let p' denote the smallest sub-term of p which is not a basic term. It implies that each sub-term of p' is a basic term. Then we prove that p is not a term in normal form. It is sufficient to induct on the structure of p' :

- Case $p' \equiv e, e \in \mathbb{E}$. p' is a basic term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic term, so this case should not occur.
- Case $p' \equiv p_1 \cdot p_2$. By induction on the structure of the basic term p_1 :
 - Subcase $p_1 \in \mathbb{E}$. p' would be a basic term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic term;
 - Subcase $p_1 \equiv e \cdot p'_1$. RA5 rewriting rule can be applied. So p is not a normal form;
 - Subcase $p_1 \equiv p'_1 + p''_1$. RA4 rewriting rule can be applied. So p is not a normal form.
- Case $p' \equiv p_1 + p_2$. By induction on the structure of the basic terms both p_1 and p_2 , all subcases will lead to that p' would be a basic term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic term.

□

$$\begin{array}{c}
\overline{e \xrightarrow{e} \checkmark} \\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e} \checkmark}{x + y \xrightarrow{e} \checkmark} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{e} x'}{x + y \xrightarrow{e} x'} \quad \frac{y \xrightarrow{e} \checkmark}{x + y \xrightarrow{e} \checkmark} \quad \frac{y \xrightarrow{e} y'}{x + y \xrightarrow{e} y'} \\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e} \checkmark}{x \cdot y \xrightarrow{e} y} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{e} x'}{x \cdot y \xrightarrow{e} x' \cdot y}
\end{array}$$

Table 3. Single event transition rules of *BATC*

$$\begin{array}{c}
\overline{X \xrightarrow{X} \checkmark} \\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{X} \checkmark}{x + y \xrightarrow{X} \checkmark} (X \subseteq x) \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{X} x'}{x + y \xrightarrow{X} x'} (X \subseteq x) \quad \frac{y \xrightarrow{Y} \checkmark}{x + y \xrightarrow{Y} \checkmark} (Y \subseteq y) \quad \frac{y \xrightarrow{Y} y'}{x + y \xrightarrow{Y} y'} (Y \subseteq y) \\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{X} \checkmark}{x \cdot y \xrightarrow{X} y} (X \subseteq x) \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{X} x'}{x \cdot y \xrightarrow{X} x' \cdot y} (X \subseteq x)
\end{array}$$

Table 4. Pomset transition rules of *BATC*

3.3. Structured Operational Semantics of *BATC*

In this subsection, we will define a term-deduction system which gives the operational semantics of *BATC*. We give the operational transition rules for operators \cdot and $+$ as Table 3 shows. And the predicate $\xrightarrow{e} \checkmark$ represents successful termination after execution of the event e .

Theorem 3.3 (Congruence of *BATC* with respect to bisimulation equivalence). *Bisimulation equivalence \sim_{HM} is a congruence with respect to *BATC*.*

Proof. The axioms in Table 1 of *BATC* are the same as the axioms of *BPA* (Basic Process Algebra) [1] [2] [4], so, bisimulation equivalence \sim_{HM} is a congruence with respect to *BATC*. \square

Theorem 3.4 (Soundness of *BATC* modulo bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be *BATC* terms. If $BATC \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{HM} y$.*

Proof. The axioms in Table 1 of *BATC* are the same as the axioms of *BPA* (Basic Process Algebra) [1] [2] [4], so, *BATC* is sound modulo bisimulation equivalence. \square

Theorem 3.5 (Completeness of *BATC* modulo bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed *BATC* terms, if $p \sim_{HM} q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. The axioms in Table 1 of *BATC* are the same as the axioms of *BPA* (Basic Process Algebra) [1] [2] [4], so, *BATC* is complete modulo bisimulation equivalence. \square

The pomset transition rules are shown in Table 4, different to single event transition rules in Table 3, the pomset transition rules are labeled by pomsets, which are defined by causality \cdot and conflict $+$.

Theorem 3.6 (Congruence of *BATC* with respect to pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Pomset bisimulation equivalence \sim_p is a congruence with respect to *BATC*.*

Proof. It is easy to see that pomset bisimulation is an equivalent relation on *BATC* terms, we only need to prove that \sim_p is preserved by the operators \cdot and $+$.

- Causality operator \cdot . Let x_1, x_2 and y_1, y_2 be *BATC* processes, and $x_1 \sim_p y_1$, $x_2 \sim_p y_2$, it is sufficient to prove that $x_1 \cdot x_2 \sim_p y_1 \cdot y_2$.

By the definition of pomset bisimulation \sim_p (Definition 2.17), $x_1 \sim_p y_1$ means that

$$x_1 \xrightarrow{X_1} x'_1 \quad y_1 \xrightarrow{Y_1} y'_1$$

with $X_1 \subseteq x_1$, $Y_1 \subseteq y_1$, $X_1 \sim Y_1$ and $x'_1 \sim_p y'_1$. The meaning of $x_2 \sim_p y_2$ is similar. By the pomset transition rules for causality operator \cdot in Table 4, we can get

$$x_1 \cdot x_2 \xrightarrow{X_1} x_2 \quad y_1 \cdot y_2 \xrightarrow{Y_1} y_2$$

with $X_1 \subseteq x_1$, $Y_1 \subseteq y_1$, $X_1 \sim Y_1$ and $x_2 \sim_p y_2$, so, we get $x_1 \cdot x_2 \sim_p y_1 \cdot y_2$, as desired. Or, we can get

$$x_1 \cdot x_2 \xrightarrow{X_1} x'_1 \cdot x_2 \quad y_1 \cdot y_2 \xrightarrow{Y_1} y'_1 \cdot y_2$$

with $X_1 \subseteq x_1$, $Y_1 \subseteq y_1$, $X_1 \sim Y_1$ and $x'_1 \sim_p y'_1$, $x_2 \sim_p y_2$, so, we get $x_1 \cdot x_2 \sim_p y_1 \cdot y_2$, as desired.

- **Conflict operator $+$.** Let x_1, x_2 and y_1, y_2 be *BATC* processes, and $x_1 \sim_p y_1$, $x_2 \sim_p y_2$, it is sufficient to prove that $x_1 + x_2 \sim_p y_1 + y_2$. The meanings of $x_1 \sim_p y_1$ and $x_2 \sim_p y_2$ are the same as the above case, according to the definition of pomset bisimulation \sim_p in Definition 2.17.

By the pomset transition rules for conflict operator $+$ in Table 4, we can get four cases:

$$x_1 + x_2 \xrightarrow{X_1} \surd \quad y_1 + y_2 \xrightarrow{Y_1} \surd$$

with $X_1 \subseteq x_1$, $Y_1 \subseteq y_1$, $X_1 \sim Y_1$, so, we get $x_1 + x_2 \sim_p y_1 + y_2$, as desired. Or, we can get

$$x_1 + x_2 \xrightarrow{X_1} x'_1 \quad y_1 + y_2 \xrightarrow{Y_1} y'_1$$

with $X_1 \subseteq x_1$, $Y_1 \subseteq y_1$, $X_1 \sim Y_1$, and $x'_1 \sim_p y'_1$, so, we get $x_1 + x_2 \sim_p y_1 + y_2$, as desired. Or, we can get

$$x_1 + x_2 \xrightarrow{X_2} \surd \quad y_1 + y_2 \xrightarrow{Y_2} \surd$$

with $X_2 \subseteq x_2$, $Y_2 \subseteq y_2$, $X_2 \sim Y_2$, so, we get $x_1 + x_2 \sim_p y_1 + y_2$, as desired. Or, we can get

$$x_1 + x_2 \xrightarrow{X_2} x'_2 \quad y_1 + y_2 \xrightarrow{Y_2} y'_2$$

with $X_2 \subseteq x_2$, $Y_2 \subseteq y_2$, $X_2 \sim Y_2$, and $x'_2 \sim_p y'_2$, so, we get $x_1 + x_2 \sim_p y_1 + y_2$, as desired.

□

Theorem 3.7 (Soundness of *BATC* modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be *BATC* terms. If $\text{BATC} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_p y$.*

Proof. Since pomset bisimulation \sim_p is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 1 is sound modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence.

- **Axiom A1.** Let p, q be *BATC* processes, and $p + q = q + p$, it is sufficient to prove that $p + q \sim_p q + p$. By the pomset transition rules for operator $+$ in Table 4, we get

$$\begin{array}{cc} \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \surd}{p + q \xrightarrow{P} \surd} (P \subseteq p) & \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \surd}{q + p \xrightarrow{P} \surd} (P \subseteq p) \\ \\ \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{p + q \xrightarrow{P} p'} (P \subseteq p) & \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{q + p \xrightarrow{P} p'} (P \subseteq p) \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} \sqrt{\quad}}{p+q \xrightarrow{Q} \sqrt{\quad}} (Q \subseteq q) \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} \sqrt{\quad}}{q+p \xrightarrow{Q} \sqrt{\quad}} (Q \subseteq q) \\
\\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} q'}{p+q \xrightarrow{Q} q'} (Q \subseteq q) \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} q'}{q+p \xrightarrow{Q} q'} (Q \subseteq q)
\end{array}$$

So, $p+q \sim_p q+p$, as desired.

- **Axiom A2.** Let p, q, s be *BATC* processes, and $(p+q)+s = p+(q+s)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p+q)+s \sim_p p+(q+s)$. By the pomset transition rules for operator $+$ in Table 4, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{\quad}}{(p+q)+s \xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{\quad}} (P \subseteq p) \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{\quad}}{p+(q+s) \xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{\quad}} (P \subseteq p) \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{(p+q)+s \xrightarrow{P} p'} (P \subseteq p) \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{p+(q+s) \xrightarrow{P} p'} (P \subseteq p) \\
\\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} \sqrt{\quad}}{(p+q)+s \xrightarrow{Q} \sqrt{\quad}} (Q \subseteq q) \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} \sqrt{\quad}}{p+(q+s) \xrightarrow{Q} \sqrt{\quad}} (Q \subseteq q) \\
\\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} q'}{(p+q)+s \xrightarrow{Q} q'} (Q \subseteq q) \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} q'}{p+(q+s) \xrightarrow{Q} q'} (Q \subseteq q) \\
\\
\frac{s \xrightarrow{S} \sqrt{\quad}}{(p+q)+s \xrightarrow{S} \sqrt{\quad}} (S \subseteq s) \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{S} \sqrt{\quad}}{p+(q+s) \xrightarrow{S} \sqrt{\quad}} (S \subseteq s) \\
\\
\frac{s \xrightarrow{S} s'}{(p+q)+s \xrightarrow{S} s'} (S \subseteq s) \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{S} s'}{p+(q+s) \xrightarrow{S} s'} (S \subseteq s)
\end{array}$$

So, $(p+q)+s \sim_p p+(q+s)$, as desired.

- **Axiom A3.** Let p be a *BATC* process, and $p+p = p$, it is sufficient to prove that $p+p \sim_p p$. By the pomset transition rules for operator $+$ in Table 4, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{\quad}}{p+p \xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{\quad}} (P \subseteq p) \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{\quad}}{p \xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{\quad}} (P \subseteq p) \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{p+p \xrightarrow{P} p'} (P \subseteq p) \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{p \xrightarrow{P} p'} (P \subseteq p)
\end{array}$$

So, $p+p \sim_p p$, as desired.

- **Axiom A4.** Let p, q, s be *BATC* processes, and $(p+q) \cdot s = p \cdot s + q \cdot s$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p+q) \cdot s \sim_p p \cdot s + q \cdot s$. By the pomset transition rules for operators $+$ and \cdot in Table 4, we get

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{\quad}}{(p+q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{P} s} (P \subseteq p) \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{\quad}}{p \cdot s + q \cdot s \xrightarrow{P} s} (P \subseteq p)$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{(p+q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{P} p' \cdot s} (P \subseteq p) \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{p \cdot s + q \cdot s \xrightarrow{P} p' \cdot s} (P \subseteq p) \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} \surd}{(p+q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{Q} s} (Q \subseteq q) \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} \surd}{p \cdot s + q \cdot s \xrightarrow{Q} s} (Q \subseteq q) \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} q'}{(p+q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{Q} q' \cdot s} (Q \subseteq q) \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} q'}{p \cdot s + q \cdot s \xrightarrow{Q} q' \cdot s} (Q \subseteq q)
\end{array}$$

So, $(p+q) \cdot s \sim_p p \cdot s + q \cdot s$, as desired.

- **Axiom A5.** Let p, q, s be *BATC* processes, and $(p \cdot q) \cdot s = p \cdot (q \cdot s)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p \cdot q) \cdot s \sim_p p \cdot (q \cdot s)$. By the pomset transition rules for operator \cdot in Table 4, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \surd}{(p \cdot q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{P} q \cdot s} (P \subseteq p) \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \surd}{p \cdot (q \cdot s) \xrightarrow{P} q \cdot s} (P \subseteq p) \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{(p \cdot q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{P} (p' \cdot q) \cdot s} (P \subseteq p) \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{p \cdot (q \cdot s) \xrightarrow{P} p' \cdot (q \cdot s)} (P \subseteq p)
\end{array}$$

With an assumption $(p' \cdot q) \cdot s = p' \cdot (q \cdot s)$, so, $(p \cdot q) \cdot s \sim_p p \cdot (q \cdot s)$, as desired.

□

Theorem 3.8 (Completeness of *BATC* modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed *BATC* terms, if $p \sim_p q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. Firstly, by the elimination theorem of *BATC*, we know that for each closed *BATC* term p , there exists a closed basic *BATC* term p' , such that $\text{BATC} \vdash p = p'$, so, we only need to consider closed basic *BATC* terms.

The basic terms (see Definition 3.1) modulo associativity and commutativity (AC) of conflict $+$ (defined by axioms A1 and A2 in Table 1), and this equivalence is denoted by $=_{AC}$. Then, each equivalence class s modulo AC of $+$ has the following normal form

$$s_1 + \cdots + s_k$$

with each s_i either an atomic event or of the form $t_1 \cdot t_2$, and each s_i is called the summand of s .

Now, we prove that for normal forms n and n' , if $n \sim_p n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$. It is sufficient to induct on the sizes of n and n' .

- Consider a summand e of n . Then $n \xrightarrow{e} \surd$, so $n \sim_p n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{e} \surd$, meaning that n' also contains the summand e .
- Consider a summand $t_1 \cdot t_2$ of n . Then $n \xrightarrow{t_1} t_2$, so $n \sim_p n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{t_1} t'_2$ with $t_2 \sim_p t'_2$, meaning that n' contains a summand $t_1 \cdot t'_2$. Since t_2 and t'_2 are normal forms and have sizes smaller than n and n' , by the induction hypotheses $t_2 \sim_p t'_2$ implies $t_2 =_{AC} t'_2$.

So, we get $n =_{AC} n'$.

Finally, let s and t be basic terms, and $s \sim_p t$, there are normal forms n and n' , such that $s = n$ and $t = n'$. The soundness theorem of *BATC* modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence (see Theorem 3.7) yields $s \sim_p n$ and $t \sim_p n'$, so $n \sim_p s \sim_p t \sim_p n'$. Since if $n \sim_p n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$, $s = n =_{AC} n' = t$, as desired. □

The step transition rules are defined in Table 5, different to pomset transition rules, the step transition rules are labeled by steps, in which every event is pairwise concurrent.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{X \xrightarrow{X} \sqrt{}} (\forall e_1, e_2 \in X \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
\\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{X} \sqrt{}}{x + y \xrightarrow{X} \sqrt{}} (X \subseteq x, \forall e_1, e_2 \in X \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
\\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{X} x'}{x + y \xrightarrow{X} x'} (X \subseteq x, \forall e_1, e_2 \in X \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
\\
\frac{y \xrightarrow{Y} \sqrt{}}{x + y \xrightarrow{Y} \sqrt{}} (Y \subseteq y, \forall e_1, e_2 \in Y \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
\\
\frac{y \xrightarrow{Y} y'}{x + y \xrightarrow{Y} y'} (Y \subseteq y, \forall e_1, e_2 \in Y \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
\\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{X} \sqrt{}}{x \cdot y \xrightarrow{X} y} (X \subseteq x, \forall e_1, e_2 \in X \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
\\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{X} x'}{x \cdot y \xrightarrow{X} x' \cdot y} (X \subseteq x, \forall e_1, e_2 \in X \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})
\end{array}$$

Table 5. Step transition rules of *BATC*

Theorem 3.9 (Congruence of *BATC* with respect to step bisimulation equivalence). *Step bisimulation equivalence \sim_s is a congruence with respect to *BATC*.*

Proof. It is easy to see that step bisimulation is an equivalent relation on *BATC* terms, we only need to prove that \sim_s is preserved by the operators \cdot and $+$.

- Causality operator \cdot . Let x_1, x_2 and y_1, y_2 be *BATC* processes, and $x_1 \sim_s y_1$, $x_2 \sim_s y_2$, it is sufficient to prove that $x_1 \cdot x_2 \sim_s y_1 \cdot y_2$.
By the definition of step bisimulation \sim_s (Definition 2.17), $x_1 \sim_s y_1$ means that

$$x_1 \xrightarrow{X_1} x'_1 \quad y_1 \xrightarrow{Y_1} y'_1$$

with $X_1 \subseteq x_1$, $\forall e_1, e_2 \in X_1$ are pairwise concurrent, $Y_1 \subseteq y_1$, $\forall e_1, e_2 \in Y_1$ are pairwise concurrent, $X_1 \sim Y_1$ and $x'_1 \sim_s y'_1$. The meaning of $x_2 \sim_s y_2$ is similar.

By the step transition rules for causality operator \cdot in Table 5, we can get

$$x_1 \cdot x_2 \xrightarrow{X_1} x_2 \quad y_1 \cdot y_2 \xrightarrow{Y_1} y_2$$

with $X_1 \subseteq x_1$, $\forall e_1, e_2 \in X_1$ are pairwise concurrent, $Y_1 \subseteq y_1$, $\forall e_1, e_2 \in Y_1$ are pairwise concurrent, $X_1 \sim Y_1$ and $x_2 \sim_s y_2$, so, we get $x_1 \cdot x_2 \sim_s y_1 \cdot y_2$, as desired.

Or, we can get

$$x_1 \cdot x_2 \xrightarrow{X_1} x'_1 \cdot x_2 \quad y_1 \cdot y_2 \xrightarrow{Y_1} y'_1 \cdot y_2$$

with $X_1 \subseteq x_1$, $\forall e_1, e_2 \in X_1$ are pairwise concurrent, $Y_1 \subseteq y_1$, $\forall e_1, e_2 \in Y_1$ are pairwise concurrent, $X_1 \sim Y_1$ and $x'_1 \sim_s y'_1$, $x_2 \sim_s y_2$, so, we get $x_1 \cdot x_2 \sim_s y_1 \cdot y_2$, as desired.

- Conflict operator $+$. Let x_1, x_2 and y_1, y_2 be *BATC* processes, and $x_1 \sim_s y_1$, $x_2 \sim_s y_2$, it is sufficient to prove that $x_1 + x_2 \sim_s y_1 + y_2$. The meanings of $x_1 \sim_s y_1$ and $x_2 \sim_s y_2$ are the same as the above case, according to the definition of step bisimulation \sim_s in Definition 2.17.

By the step transition rules for conflict operator $+$ in Table 5, we can get four cases:

$$x_1 + x_2 \xrightarrow{X_1} \sqrt{ } \quad y_1 + y_2 \xrightarrow{Y_1} \sqrt{ }$$

with $X_1 \subseteq x_1$, $\forall e_1, e_2 \in X_1$ are pairwise concurrent, $Y_1 \subseteq y_1$, $\forall e_1, e_2 \in Y_1$ are pairwise concurrent, $X_1 \sim Y_1$, so, we get $x_1 + x_2 \sim_s y_1 + y_2$, as desired.

Or, we can get

$$x_1 + x_2 \xrightarrow{X_1} x'_1 \quad y_1 + y_2 \xrightarrow{Y_1} y'_1$$

with $X_1 \subseteq x_1$, $\forall e_1, e_2 \in X_1$ are pairwise concurrent, $Y_1 \subseteq y_1$, $\forall e_1, e_2 \in Y_1$ are pairwise concurrent, $X_1 \sim Y_1$, and $x'_1 \sim_s y'_1$, so, we get $x_1 + x_2 \sim_s y_1 + y_2$, as desired.

Or, we can get

$$x_1 + x_2 \xrightarrow{X_2} \surd \quad y_1 + y_2 \xrightarrow{Y_2} \surd$$

with $X_2 \subseteq x_2$, $\forall e_1, e_2 \in X_2$ are pairwise concurrent, $Y_2 \subseteq y_2$, $\forall e_1, e_2 \in Y_2$ are pairwise concurrent, $X_2 \sim Y_2$, so, we get $x_1 + x_2 \sim_s y_1 + y_2$, as desired.

Or, we can get

$$x_1 + x_2 \xrightarrow{X_2} x'_2 \quad y_1 + y_2 \xrightarrow{Y_2} y'_2$$

with $X_2 \subseteq x_2$, $\forall e_1, e_2 \in X_2$ are pairwise concurrent, $Y_2 \subseteq y_2$, $\forall e_1, e_2 \in Y_2$ are pairwise concurrent, $X_2 \sim Y_2$, and $x'_2 \sim_s y'_2$, so, we get $x_1 + x_2 \sim_s y_1 + y_2$, as desired.

□

Theorem 3.10 (Soundness of *BATC* modulo step bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be *BATC* terms. If $\text{BATC} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_s y$.*

Proof. Since step bisimulation \sim_s is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 1 is sound modulo step bisimulation equivalence.

- **Axiom A1.** Let p, q be *BATC* processes, and $p + q = q + p$, it is sufficient to prove that $p + q \sim_s q + p$. By the step transition rules for operator $+$ in Table 5, we get

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \surd}{p + q \xrightarrow{P} \surd} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \surd}{q + p \xrightarrow{P} \surd} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{p + q \xrightarrow{P} p'} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{q + p \xrightarrow{P} p'} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} \surd}{p + q \xrightarrow{Q} \surd} (Q \subseteq q, \forall e_1, e_2 \in Q \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} \surd}{q + p \xrightarrow{Q} \surd} (Q \subseteq q, \forall e_1, e_2 \in Q \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} q'}{p + q \xrightarrow{Q} q'} (Q \subseteq q, \forall e_1, e_2 \in Q \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} q'}{q + p \xrightarrow{Q} q'} (Q \subseteq q, \forall e_1, e_2 \in Q \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

So, $p + q \sim_s q + p$, as desired.

- **Axiom A2.** Let p, q, s be *BATC* processes, and $(p + q) + s = p + (q + s)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p + q) + s \sim_s p + (q + s)$. By the step transition rules for operator $+$ in Table 5, we get

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \checkmark}{(p + q) + s \xrightarrow{P} \checkmark} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \checkmark}{p + (q + s) \xrightarrow{P} \checkmark} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{(p + q) + s \xrightarrow{P} p'} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{p + (q + s) \xrightarrow{P} p'} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} \checkmark}{(p + q) + s \xrightarrow{Q} \checkmark} (Q \subseteq q, \forall e_1, e_2 \in Q \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} \checkmark}{p + (q + s) \xrightarrow{Q} \checkmark} (Q \subseteq q, \forall e_1, e_2 \in Q \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} q'}{(p + q) + s \xrightarrow{Q} q'} (Q \subseteq q, \forall e_1, e_2 \in Q \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} q'}{p + (q + s) \xrightarrow{Q} q'} (Q \subseteq q, \forall e_1, e_2 \in Q \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{s \xrightarrow{S} \checkmark}{(p + q) + s \xrightarrow{S} \checkmark} (S \subseteq s, \forall e_1, e_2 \in S \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{s \xrightarrow{S} \checkmark}{p + (q + s) \xrightarrow{S} \checkmark} (S \subseteq s, \forall e_1, e_2 \in S \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{s \xrightarrow{S} s'}{(p + q) + s \xrightarrow{S} s'} (S \subseteq s, \forall e_1, e_2 \in S \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\frac{s \xrightarrow{S} s'}{p + (q + s) \xrightarrow{S} s'} (S \subseteq s, \forall e_1, e_2 \in S \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

So, $(p + q) + s \sim_s p + (q + s)$, as desired.

- **Axiom A3.** Let p be a *BATC* process, and $p + p = p$, it is sufficient to prove that $p + p \sim_s p$. By the step transition rules for operator $+$ in Table 5, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \surd}{p + p \xrightarrow{P} \surd} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
& \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \surd}{p \xrightarrow{P} \surd} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
& \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{p + p \xrightarrow{P} p'} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
& \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{p \xrightarrow{P} p'} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})
\end{aligned}$$

So, $p + p \sim_s p$, as desired.

- **Axiom A4.** Let p, q, s be *BATC* processes, and $(p + q) \cdot s = p \cdot s + q \cdot s$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p + q) \cdot s \sim_s p \cdot s + q \cdot s$. By the step transition rules for operators $+$ and \cdot in Table 5, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \surd}{(p + q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{P} s} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
& \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \surd}{p \cdot s + q \cdot s \xrightarrow{P} s} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
& \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{(p + q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{P} p' \cdot s} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
& \frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{p \cdot s + q \cdot s \xrightarrow{P} p' \cdot s} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
& \frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} \surd}{(p + q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{Q} s} (Q \subseteq q, \forall e_1, e_2 \in Q \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
& \frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} \surd}{p \cdot s + q \cdot s \xrightarrow{Q} s} (Q \subseteq q, \forall e_1, e_2 \in Q \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
& \frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} q'}{(p + q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{Q} q' \cdot s} (Q \subseteq q, \forall e_1, e_2 \in Q \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
& \frac{q \xrightarrow{Q} q'}{p \cdot s + q \cdot s \xrightarrow{Q} q' \cdot s} (Q \subseteq q, \forall e_1, e_2 \in Q \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})
\end{aligned}$$

So, $(p + q) \cdot s \sim_s p \cdot s + q \cdot s$, as desired.

- **Axiom A5.** Let p, q, s be *BATC* processes, and $(p \cdot q) \cdot s = p \cdot (q \cdot s)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p \cdot q) \cdot s \sim_s p \cdot (q \cdot s)$. By the step transition rules for operator \cdot in Table 5, we get

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \surd}{(p \cdot q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{P} q \cdot s} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\overline{e \xrightarrow{e} \surd} \\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e} \surd}{x + y \xrightarrow{e} \surd} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{e} x'}{x + y \xrightarrow{e} x'} \quad \frac{y \xrightarrow{e} \surd}{x + y \xrightarrow{e} \surd} \quad \frac{y \xrightarrow{e} y'}{x + y \xrightarrow{e} y'} \\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e} \surd}{x \cdot y \xrightarrow{e} y} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{e} x'}{x \cdot y \xrightarrow{e} x' \cdot y}
\end{array}$$

Table 6. (Hereditary) hp-transition rules of *BATC*

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} \surd}{p \cdot (q \cdot s) \xrightarrow{P} q \cdot s} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{(p \cdot q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{P} (p' \cdot q) \cdot s} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.}) \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{P} p'}{p \cdot (q \cdot s) \xrightarrow{P} p' \cdot (q \cdot s)} (P \subseteq p, \forall e_1, e_2 \in P \text{ are pairwise concurrent.})
\end{array}$$

With an assumption $(p' \cdot q) \cdot s = p' \cdot (q \cdot s)$, so, $(p \cdot q) \cdot s \sim_s p \cdot (q \cdot s)$, as desired.

□

Theorem 3.11 (Completeness of *BATC* modulo step bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed *BATC* terms, if $p \sim_s q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. Firstly, by the elimination theorem of *BATC*, we know that for each closed *BATC* term p , there exists a closed basic *BATC* term p' , such that $\text{BATC} \vdash p = p'$, so, we only need to consider closed basic *BATC* terms.

The basic terms (see Definition 3.1) modulo associativity and commutativity (AC) of conflict $+$ (defined by axioms A1 and A2 in Table 1), and this equivalence is denoted by $=_{AC}$. Then, each equivalence class s modulo AC of $+$ has the following normal form

$$s_1 + \cdots + s_k$$

with each s_i either an atomic event or of the form $t_1 \cdot t_2$, and each s_i is called the summand of s .

Now, we prove that for normal forms n and n' , if $n \sim_s n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$. It is sufficient to induct on the sizes of n and n' .

- Consider a summand e of n . Then $n \xrightarrow{e} \surd$, so $n \sim_s n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{e} \surd$, meaning that n' also contains the summand e .
- Consider a summand $t_1 \cdot t_2$ of n . Then $n \xrightarrow{t_1} t_2 (\forall e_1, e_2 \in t_1 \text{ are pairwise concurrent})$, so $n \sim_s n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{t_1} t'_2 (\forall e_1, e_2 \in t_1 \text{ are pairwise concurrent})$ with $t_2 \sim_s t'_2$, meaning that n' contains a summand $t_1 \cdot t'_2$. Since t_2 and t'_2 are normal forms and have sizes smaller than n and n' , by the induction hypotheses if $t_2 \sim_s t'_2$ then $t_2 =_{AC} t'_2$.

So, we get $n =_{AC} n'$.

Finally, let s and t be basic terms, and $s \sim_s t$, there are normal forms n and n' , such that $s = n$ and $t = n'$. The soundness theorem of *BATC* modulo step bisimulation equivalence (see Theorem 3.10) yields $s \sim_s n$ and $t \sim_s n'$, so $n \sim_s s \sim_s t \sim_s n'$. Since if $n \sim_s n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$, $s = n =_{AC} n' = t$, as desired. □

The transition rules for (hereditary) hp-bisimulation of *BATC* are defined in Table 6, they are the same as single event transition rules in Table 3.

Theorem 3.12 (Congruence of *BATC* with respect to hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Hp-bisimulation equivalence \sim_{hp} is a congruence with respect to *BATC*.*

Proof. It is easy to see that history-preserving bisimulation is an equivalent relation on *BATC* terms, we only need to prove that \sim_{hp} is preserved by the operators \cdot and $+$.

- Causality operator \cdot . Let x_1, x_2 and y_1, y_2 be *BATC* processes, and $x_1 \sim_{hp} y_1, x_2 \sim_{hp} y_2$, it is sufficient to prove that $x_1 \cdot x_2 \sim_{hp} y_1 \cdot y_2$.
By the definition of hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp} (Definition 2.21), $x_1 \sim_{hp} y_1$ means that there is a posetal relation $(C(x_1), f, C(y_1)) \in \sim_{hp}$, and

$$x_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} x'_1 \quad y_1 \xrightarrow{e_2} y'_1$$

with $(C(x'_1), f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], C(y'_1)) \in \sim_{hp}$. The meaning of $x_2 \sim_{hp} y_2$ is similar.
By the hp-transition rules for causality operator \cdot in Table 6, we can get

$$x_1 \cdot x_2 \xrightarrow{e_1} x_2 \quad y_1 \cdot y_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} y_2$$

with $x_2 \sim_{hp} y_2$, so, we get $x_1 \cdot x_2 \sim_{hp} y_1 \cdot y_2$, as desired.
Or, we can get

$$x_1 \cdot x_2 \xrightarrow{e_1} x'_1 \cdot x_2 \quad y_1 \cdot y_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} y'_1 \cdot y_2$$

with $x'_1 \sim_{hp} y'_1, x_2 \sim_{hp} y_2$, so, we get $x_1 \cdot x_2 \sim_{hp} y_1 \cdot y_2$, as desired.

- Conflict operator $+$. Let x_1, x_2 and y_1, y_2 be *BATC* processes, and $x_1 \sim_{hp} y_1, x_2 \sim_{hp} y_2$, it is sufficient to prove that $x_1 + x_2 \sim_{hp} y_1 + y_2$. The meanings of $x_1 \sim_{hp} y_1$ and $x_2 \sim_{hp} y_2$ are the same as the above case, according to the definition of hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp} in Definition 2.21.
By the hp-transition rules for conflict operator $+$ in Table 6, we can get four cases:

$$x_1 + x_2 \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y_1 + y_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd$$

so, we get $x_1 + x_2 \sim_{hp} y_1 + y_2$, as desired.
Or, we can get

$$x_1 + x_2 \xrightarrow{e_1} x'_1 \quad y_1 + y_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} y'_1$$

with $x'_1 \sim_{hp} y'_1$, so, we get $x_1 + x_2 \sim_{hp} y_1 + y_2$, as desired.
Or, we can get

$$x_1 + x_2 \xrightarrow{e'_1} \surd \quad y_1 + y_2 \xrightarrow{e'_2} \surd$$

so, we get $x_1 + x_2 \sim_{hp} y_1 + y_2$, as desired.
Or, we can get

$$x_1 + x_2 \xrightarrow{e'_1} x'_2 \quad y_1 + y_2 \xrightarrow{e'_2} y'_2$$

with $x'_2 \sim_{hp} y'_2$, so, we get $x_1 + x_2 \sim_{hp} y_1 + y_2$, as desired.

□

Theorem 3.13 (Soundness of *BATC* modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be *BATC* terms. If $\text{BATC} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{hp} y$.*

Proof. Since hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 1 is sound modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence.

- **Axiom A1.** Let p, q be *BATC* processes, and $p + q = q + p$, it is sufficient to prove that $p + q \sim_{hp} q + p$. By the hp-transition rules for operator $+$ in Table 6, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{p+q \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{q+p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{p+q \xrightarrow{e_1} p'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{q+p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'} \\
\\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{p+q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{q+p \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{p+q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{q+p \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}
\end{array}$$

So, for $(C(p+q), f, C(q+p)) \in \sim_{hp}$, $(C((p+q)'), f[e_1 \mapsto e_1], C((q+p)')) \in \sim_{hp}$ and $(C((p+q)'), f[e_2 \mapsto e_2], C((q+p)')) \in \sim_{hp}$, that is, $p+q \sim_{hp} q+p$, as desired.

- **Axiom A2.** Let p, q, s be *BATC* processes, and $(p+q) + s = p + (q+s)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p+q) + s \sim_{hp} p + (q+s)$. By the hp-transition rules for operator $+$ in Table 6, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{(p+q) + s \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{p + (q+s) \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{(p+q) + s \xrightarrow{e_1} p'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{p + (q+s) \xrightarrow{e_1} p'} \\
\\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(p+q) + s \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{p + (q+s) \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p+q) + s \xrightarrow{e_2} q'} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{p + (q+s) \xrightarrow{e_2} q'} \\
\\
\frac{s \xrightarrow{e_3} \checkmark}{(p+q) + s \xrightarrow{e_3} \checkmark} \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{e_3} \checkmark}{p + (q+s) \xrightarrow{e_3} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{s \xrightarrow{e_3} s'}{(p+q) + s \xrightarrow{e_3} s'} \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{e_3} s'}{p + (q+s) \xrightarrow{e_3} s'}
\end{array}$$

So, for $(C((p+q) + s), f, C(p + (q+s))) \in \sim_{hp}$, $(C(((p+q) + s)'), f[e_1 \mapsto e_1], C((p + (q+s))')) \in \sim_{hp}$ and $(C(((p+q) + s)'), f[e_2 \mapsto e_2], C((p + (q+s))')) \in \sim_{hp}$ and $(C(((p+q) + s)'), f[e_3 \mapsto e_3], C((p + (q+s))')) \in \sim_{hp}$, that is, $(p+q) + s \sim_{hp} p + (q+s)$, as desired.

- **Axiom A3.** Let p be a *BATC* process, and $p+p = p$, it is sufficient to prove that $p+p \sim_{hp} p$. By the hp-transition rules for operator $+$ in Table 6, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{p+p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{p+p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}
\end{array}$$

So, for $(C(p+p), f, C(p)) \in \sim_{hp}$, $(C((p+p)'), f[e_1 \mapsto e_1], C((p)')) \in \sim_{hp}$, that is, $p+p \sim_{hp} p$, as desired.

- **Axiom A4.** Let p, q, s be *BATC* processes, and $(p+q) \cdot s = p \cdot s + q \cdot s$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p+q) \cdot s \sim_{hp} p \cdot s + q \cdot s$. By the hp-transition rules for operators $+$ and \cdot in Table 6, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{(p+q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_1} s} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{p \cdot s + q \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_1} s} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{(p+q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \cdot s} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{p \cdot s + q \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \cdot s} \\
\\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{(p+q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_2} s} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{p \cdot s + q \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_2} s} \\
\\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p+q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \cdot s} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{p \cdot s + q \cdot s \xrightarrow{Q} q' \cdot s}
\end{array}$$

So, for $(C((p+q) \cdot s), f, C(p \cdot s + q \cdot s)) \in \sim_{hp}$, $(C(((p+q) \cdot s)'), f[e_1 \mapsto e_1], C((p \cdot s + q \cdot s)')) \in \sim_{hp}$ and $(C(((p+q) \cdot s)'), f[e_2 \mapsto e_2], C((p \cdot s + q \cdot s)')) \in \sim_{hp}$, that is, $(p+q) \cdot s \sim_{hp} p \cdot s + q \cdot s$, as desired.

- **Axiom A5.** Let p, q, s be *BATC* processes, and $(p \cdot q) \cdot s = p \cdot (q \cdot s)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p \cdot q) \cdot s \sim_{hp} p \cdot (q \cdot s)$. By the hp-transition rules for operator \cdot in Table 6, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{(p \cdot q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_1} q \cdot s} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{p \cdot (q \cdot s) \xrightarrow{e_1} q \cdot s} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{(p \cdot q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_1} (p' \cdot q) \cdot s} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{p \cdot (q \cdot s) \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \cdot (q \cdot s)}
\end{array}$$

With an assumption $(p' \cdot q) \cdot s = p' \cdot (q \cdot s)$, for $(C((p \cdot q) \cdot s), f, C(p \cdot (q \cdot s))) \in \sim_{hp}$, $(C(((p \cdot q) \cdot s)'), f[e_1 \mapsto e_1], C((p \cdot (q \cdot s)')) \in \sim_{hp}$, that is, so, $(p \cdot q) \cdot s \sim_{hp} p \cdot (q \cdot s)$, as desired.

□

Theorem 3.14 (Completeness of *BATC* modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed *BATC* terms, if $p \sim_{hp} q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. Firstly, by the elimination theorem of *BATC*, we know that for each closed *BATC* term p , there exists a closed basic *BATC* term p' , such that $BATC \vdash p = p'$, so, we only need to consider closed basic *BATC* terms.

The basic terms (see Definition 3.1) modulo associativity and commutativity (AC) of conflict $+$ (defined by axioms A1 and A2 in Table 1), and this equivalence is denoted by $=_{AC}$. Then, each equivalence class s modulo AC of $+$ has the following normal form

$$s_1 + \dots + s_k$$

with each s_i either an atomic event or of the form $t_1 \cdot t_2$, and each s_i is called the summand of s .

Now, we prove that for normal forms n and n' , if $n \sim_{hp} n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$. It is sufficient to induct on the sizes of n and n' .

- Consider a summand e of n . Then $n \xrightarrow{e} \surd$, so $n \sim_{hp} n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{e} \surd$, meaning that n' also contains the summand e .
- Consider a summand $e \cdot s$ of n . Then $n \xrightarrow{e} s$, so $n \sim_{hp} n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{e} t$ with $s \sim_{hp} t$, meaning that n' contains a summand $e \cdot t$. Since s and t are normal forms and have sizes smaller than n and n' , by the induction hypotheses $s \sim_{hp} t$ implies $s =_{AC} t$.

So, we get $n =_{AC} n'$.

Finally, let s and t be basic terms, and $s \sim_{hp} t$, there are normal forms n and n' , such that $s = n$ and $t = n'$. The soundness theorem of *BATC* modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence (see Theorem 3.13) yields $s \sim_{hp} n$ and $t \sim_{hp} n'$, so $n \sim_{hp} s \sim_{hp} t \sim_{hp} n'$. Since if $n \sim_{hp} n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$, $s = n =_{AC} n' = t$, as desired. □

Theorem 3.15 (Congruence of *BATC* with respect to hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Hhp-bisimulation equivalence \sim_{hhp} is a congruence with respect to *BATC*.*

Proof. It is easy to see that hhp-bisimulation is an equivalent relation on *BATC* terms, we only need to prove that \sim_{hhp} is preserved by the operators \cdot and $+$.

- Causality operator \cdot . Let x_1, x_2 and y_1, y_2 be *BATC* processes, and $x_1 \sim_{hhp} y_1, x_2 \sim_{hhp} y_2$, it is sufficient to prove that $x_1 \cdot x_2 \sim_{hhp} y_1 \cdot y_2$.
By the definition of hhp-bisimulation \sim_{hhp} (Definition 2.21), $x_1 \sim_{hhp} y_1$ means that there is a posetal relation $(C(x_1), f, C(y_1)) \in \sim_{hhp}$, and

$$x_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} x'_1 \quad y_1 \xrightarrow{e_2} y'_1$$

with $(C(x'_1), f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], C(y'_1)) \in \sim_{hhp}$. The meaning of $x_2 \sim_{hhp} y_2$ is similar.
By the hhp-transition rules for causality operator \cdot in Table 6, we can get

$$x_1 \cdot x_2 \xrightarrow{e_1} x_2 \quad y_1 \cdot y_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} y_2$$

with $x_2 \sim_{hhp} y_2$, so, we get $x_1 \cdot x_2 \sim_{hhp} y_1 \cdot y_2$, as desired.
Or, we can get

$$x_1 \cdot x_2 \xrightarrow{e_1} x'_1 \cdot x_2 \quad y_1 \cdot y_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} y'_1 \cdot y_2$$

with $x'_1 \sim_{hhp} y'_1, x_2 \sim_{hhp} y_2$, so, we get $x_1 \cdot x_2 \sim_{hhp} y_1 \cdot y_2$, as desired.

- Conflict operator $+$. Let x_1, x_2 and y_1, y_2 be *BATC* processes, and $x_1 \sim_{hhp} y_1, x_2 \sim_{hhp} y_2$, it is sufficient to prove that $x_1 + x_2 \sim_{hhp} y_1 + y_2$. The meanings of $x_1 \sim_{hhp} y_1$ and $x_2 \sim_{hhp} y_2$ are the same as the above case, according to the definition of hhp-bisimulation \sim_{hhp} in Definition 2.21.
By the hhp-transition rules for conflict operator $+$ in Table 6, we can get four cases:

$$x_1 + x_2 \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y_1 + y_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd$$

so, we get $x_1 + x_2 \sim_{hhp} y_1 + y_2$, as desired.
Or, we can get

$$x_1 + x_2 \xrightarrow{e_1} x'_1 \quad y_1 + y_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} y'_1$$

with $x'_1 \sim_{hhp} y'_1$, so, we get $x_1 + x_2 \sim_{hhp} y_1 + y_2$, as desired.
Or, we can get

$$x_1 + x_2 \xrightarrow{e'_1} \surd \quad y_1 + y_2 \xrightarrow{e'_2} \surd$$

so, we get $x_1 + x_2 \sim_{hhp} y_1 + y_2$, as desired.
Or, we can get

$$x_1 + x_2 \xrightarrow{e'_1} x'_2 \quad y_1 + y_2 \xrightarrow{e'_2} y'_2$$

with $x'_2 \sim_{hhp} y'_2$, so, we get $x_1 + x_2 \sim_{hhp} y_1 + y_2$, as desired.

□

Theorem 3.16 (Soundness of *BATC* modulo hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be *BATC* terms. If $BATC \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{hhp} y$.*

Proof. Since hhp-bisimulation \sim_{hhp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 1 is sound modulo hhp-bisimulation equivalence.

- **Axiom A1.** Let p, q be *BATC* processes, and $p + q = q + p$, it is sufficient to prove that $p + q \sim_{hhp} q + p$.
By the hhp-transition rules for operator $+$ in Table 6, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{p+q \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{q+p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{p+q \xrightarrow{e_1} p'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{q+p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'} \\
\\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{p+q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{q+p \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{p+q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{q+p \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}
\end{array}$$

So, for $(C(p+q), f, C(q+p)) \in \sim_{hhp}$, $(C((p+q)'), f[e_1 \mapsto e_1], C((q+p)')) \in \sim_{hhp}$ and $(C((p+q)'), f[e_2 \mapsto e_2], C((q+p)')) \in \sim_{hhp}$, that is, $p+q \sim_{hhp} q+p$, as desired.

- **Axiom A2.** Let p, q, s be *BATC* processes, and $(p+q) + s = p + (q+s)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p+q) + s \sim_{hhp} p + (q+s)$. By the hhp-transition rules for operator $+$ in Table 6, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{(p+q) + s \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{p + (q+s) \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{(p+q) + s \xrightarrow{e_1} p'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{p + (q+s) \xrightarrow{e_1} p'} \\
\\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(p+q) + s \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{p + (q+s) \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p+q) + s \xrightarrow{e_2} q'} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{p + (q+s) \xrightarrow{e_2} q'} \\
\\
\frac{s \xrightarrow{e_3} \checkmark}{(p+q) + s \xrightarrow{e_3} \checkmark} \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{e_3} \checkmark}{p + (q+s) \xrightarrow{e_3} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{s \xrightarrow{e_3} s'}{(p+q) + s \xrightarrow{e_3} s'} \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{e_3} s'}{p + (q+s) \xrightarrow{e_3} s'}
\end{array}$$

So, for $(C((p+q) + s), f, C(p + (q+s))) \in \sim_{hhp}$, $(C(((p+q) + s)'), f[e_1 \mapsto e_1], C((p + (q+s))')) \in \sim_{hhp}$ and $(C(((p+q) + s)'), f[e_2 \mapsto e_2], C((p + (q+s))')) \in \sim_{hhp}$ and $(C(((p+q) + s)'), f[e_3 \mapsto e_3], C((p + (q+s))')) \in \sim_{hhp}$, that is, $(p+q) + s \sim_{hhp} p + (q+s)$, as desired.

- **Axiom A3.** Let p be a *BATC* process, and $p + p = p$, it is sufficient to prove that $p + p \sim_{hhp} p$. By the hhp-transition rules for operator $+$ in Table 6, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{p+p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{p+p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}
\end{array}$$

So, for $(C(p+p), f, C(p)) \in \sim_{hhp}$, $(C((p+p)'), f[e_1 \mapsto e_1], C((p)')) \in \sim_{hhp}$, that is, $p+p \sim_{hhp} p$, as desired.

- **Axiom A4.** Let p, q, s be *BATC* processes, and $(p+q) \cdot s = p \cdot s + q \cdot s$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p+q) \cdot s \sim_{hhp} p \cdot s + q \cdot s$. By the hhp-transition rules for operators $+$ and \cdot in Table 6, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{(p+q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_1} s} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{p \cdot s + q \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_1} s} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{(p+q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \cdot s} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{p \cdot s + q \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \cdot s} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{(p+q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_2} s} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{p \cdot s + q \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_2} s} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p+q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \cdot s} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{p \cdot s + q \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \cdot s}
\end{array}$$

So, for $(C((p+q) \cdot s), f, C(p \cdot s + q \cdot s)) \in \sim_{hhp}$, $(C(((p+q) \cdot s)'), f[e_1 \mapsto e_1], C((p \cdot s + q \cdot s)')) \in \sim_{hhp}$ and $(C(((p+q) \cdot s)'), f[e_2 \mapsto e_2], C((p \cdot s + q \cdot s)')) \in \sim_{hhp}$, that is, $(p+q) \cdot s \sim_{hhp} p \cdot s + q \cdot s$, as desired.

- **Axiom A5.** Let p, q, s be *BATC* processes, and $(p \cdot q) \cdot s = p \cdot (q \cdot s)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p \cdot q) \cdot s \sim_{hhp} p \cdot (q \cdot s)$. By the hhp-transition rules for operator \cdot in Table 6, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{(p \cdot q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_1} q \cdot s} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{p \cdot (q \cdot s) \xrightarrow{e_1} q \cdot s} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{(p \cdot q) \cdot s \xrightarrow{e_1} (p' \cdot q) \cdot s} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{p \cdot (q \cdot s) \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \cdot (q \cdot s)}
\end{array}$$

With an assumption $(p' \cdot q) \cdot s = p' \cdot (q \cdot s)$, for $(C((p \cdot q) \cdot s), f, C(p \cdot (q \cdot s))) \in \sim_{hhp}$, $(C(((p \cdot q) \cdot s)'), f[e_1 \mapsto e_1], C((p \cdot (q \cdot s)')) \in \sim_{hhp}$, that is, so, $(p \cdot q) \cdot s \sim_{hhp} p \cdot (q \cdot s)$, as desired.

□

Theorem 3.17 (Completeness of *BATC* modulo hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed *BATC* terms, if $p \sim_{hhp} q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. Firstly, by the elimination theorem of *BATC*, we know that for each closed *BATC* term p , there exists a closed basic *BATC* term p' , such that $BATC \vdash p = p'$, so, we only need to consider closed basic *BATC* terms.

The basic terms (see Definition 3.1) modulo associativity and commutativity (AC) of conflict $+$ (defined by axioms A1 and A2 in Table 1), and this equivalence is denoted by $=_{AC}$. Then, each equivalence class s modulo AC of $+$ has the following normal form

$$s_1 + \dots + s_k$$

with each s_i either an atomic event or of the form $t_1 \cdot t_2$, and each s_i is called the summand of s .

Now, we prove that for normal forms n and n' , if $n \sim_{hhp} n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$. It is sufficient to induct on the sizes of n and n' .

- Consider a summand e of n . Then $n \xrightarrow{e} \surd$, so $n \sim_{hhp} n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{e} \surd$, meaning that n' also contains the summand e .
- Consider a summand $e \cdot s$ of n . Then $n \xrightarrow{e} s$, so $n \sim_{hhp} n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{e} t$ with $s \sim_{hhp} t$, meaning that n' contains a summand $e \cdot t$. Since s and t are normal forms and have sizes smaller than n and n' , by the induction hypotheses $s \sim_{hhp} t$ implies $s =_{AC} t$.

So, we get $n =_{AC} n'$.

Finally, let s and t be basic terms, and $s \sim_{hhp} t$, there are normal forms n and n' , such that $s = n$ and $t = n'$. The soundness theorem of *BATC* modulo history-preserving bisimulation equivalence (see Theorem 3.16) yields $s \sim_{hhp} n$ and $t \sim_{hhp} n'$, so $n \sim_{hhp} s \sim_{hhp} t \sim_{hhp} n'$. Since if $n \sim_{hhp} n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$, $s = n =_{AC} n' = t$, as desired. □

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \surd} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} x'} \\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y'}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} y'} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y'}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} x' \parallel y'}
\end{array}$$

Table 7. Transition rules of parallel operator \parallel

4. Algebra for Parallelism in True Concurrency

In this section, we will discuss parallelism in true concurrency. We know that parallelism can be modeled by left merge and communication merge in *ACP* (Algebra of Communicating Process) [1] [4] with an interleaving bisimulation semantics. Parallelism in true concurrency is quite different to that in interleaving bisimulation: it is a fundamental computational pattern (modeled by parallel operator \parallel) and cannot be merged (replaced by other operators). The resulted algebra is called Algebra for Parallelism in True Concurrency, abbreviated *APTC*.

4.1. Parallelism as a Fundamental Computational Pattern

Through several propositions, we show that parallelism is a fundamental computational pattern. Firstly, we give the transition rules for parallel operator \parallel as follows, it is suitable for all truly concurrent behavioral equivalence, including pomset bisimulation, step bisimulation, hp-bisimulation and hhp-bisimulation.

We will show that Milner's expansion law [1] does not hold modulo any truly concurrent behavioral equivalence, as the following proposition shows.

Proposition 4.1 (Milner's expansion law modulo truly concurrent behavioral equivalence). *Milner's expansion law does not hold modulo any truly concurrent behavioral equivalence, that is:*

1. For atomic event e_1 and e_2 ,
 - (a) $e_1 \parallel e_2 \not\sim_p e_1 \cdot e_2 + e_2 \cdot e_1$;
 - (b) $e_1 \parallel e_2 \not\sim_s e_1 \cdot e_2 + e_2 \cdot e_1$;
 - (c) $e_1 \parallel e_2 \not\sim_{hp} e_1 \cdot e_2 + e_2 \cdot e_1$;
 - (d) $e_1 \parallel e_2 \not\sim_{hhp} e_1 \cdot e_2 + e_2 \cdot e_1$;
2. Specially, for auto-concurrency, let e be an atomic event,
 - (a) $e \parallel e \not\sim_p e \cdot e$;
 - (b) $e \parallel e \not\sim_s e \cdot e$;
 - (c) $e \parallel e \not\sim_{hp} e \cdot e$;
 - (d) $e \parallel e \not\sim_{hhp} e \cdot e$.

Proof. In nature, it is caused by $e_1 \parallel e_2$ and $e_1 \cdot e_2 + e_2 \cdot e_1$ (specially $e \parallel e$ and $e \cdot e$) having different causality structure. They are based on the following obvious facts according to transition rules for parallel operator in Table 7:

1. $e_1 \parallel e_2 \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \surd$, while $e_1 \cdot e_2 + e_2 \cdot e_1 \not\rightarrow^{\{e_1, e_2\}}$;
2. specially, $e \parallel e \xrightarrow{\{e, e\}} \surd$, while $e \cdot e \not\rightarrow^{\{e, e\}}$.

□

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




Fig. 1.

Definition 4.2 (Basic terms of *APTC*). *The set of basic terms of *APTC*, $\mathcal{B}(\text{APTC})$, is inductively defined as follows:*

1. $\mathbb{E} \subset \mathcal{B}(\text{APTC})$;
2. if $e \in \mathbb{E}, t \in \mathcal{B}(\text{APTC})$ then $e \cdot t \in \mathcal{B}(\text{APTC})$;
3. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(\text{APTC})$ then $t + s \in \mathcal{B}(\text{APTC})$;
4. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(\text{APTC})$ then $t \parallel s \in \mathcal{B}(\text{APTC})$.

Proposition 4.3 (About elimination theorem of *APTC*). 1. *Let p be a closed *APTC* term. Then there may not be a closed *BATC* term q such that $\text{APTC} \vdash p = q$;*
 2. *Let p be a closed *APTC* term. Then there may not be a closed basic *APTC* term q such that $\text{APTC} \vdash p = q$.*

Proof. 1. By Proposition 4.1;

2. We show this property through two aspects:

- (a) The left and right distributivity of \cdot to \parallel , and \parallel to \cdot , do not hold modulo any truly concurrent bisimulation equivalence.

Left distributivity of \cdot to \parallel : $(e_1 \cdot e_2) \parallel (e_1 \cdot e_3) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_1\}} e_2 \parallel e_3$, while $e_1 \cdot (e_2 \parallel e_3) \not\xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_1\}}$.

Right distributivity of \cdot to \parallel : $(e_1 \cdot e_3) \parallel (e_2 \cdot e_3) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} e_3 \parallel e_3 \xrightarrow{\{e_3, e_3\}} \surd$, while $(e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot e_3 \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} e_3 \not\xrightarrow{\{e_3, e_3\}}$.

Left distributivity of \parallel to \cdot : $(e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot (e_1 \parallel e_3) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} e_1 \parallel e_3 \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_3\}} \surd$, while $e_1 \parallel (e_2 \cdot e_3) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} e_3 \not\xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_3\}}$.

Right distributivity of \parallel to \cdot : $(e_1 \parallel e_3) \cdot (e_2 \parallel e_3) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_3\}} e_2 \parallel e_3 \xrightarrow{\{e_2, e_3\}} \surd$, while $(e_1 \cdot e_2) \parallel e_3 \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_3\}} e_2 \not\xrightarrow{\{e_2, e_3\}}$.

This means that there are not normal forms for the closed basic *APTC* terms.

- (b) There are causality relations among different parallel branches can not be expressed by closed basic *APTC* terms.

We consider the graph as Fig. 1 illustrates. There are four events labeled a, b, c, d , and there are three causality relations: c after a , d after b , and c after b . This graph can not be expressed by basic *APTC* terms. a and b are in parallel, c after a , so c and a are in the same parallel branch; d after b , so d and b are in the same parallel branch; so c and d are in different parallel branches. But, c after b means that c and d are in the same parallel branch. This causes contradictions, it means that the graph in Fig. 1 can not be expressed by closed basic *APTC* terms.

□

Until now, we see that parallelism acts as a fundamental computational pattern, and any elimination theorem does not hold any more. In nature, an event structure \mathcal{E} (see Definition 2.13) is a graph defined by causality and conflict relations among events, while concurrency and consistency are implicitly defined by causality and conflict. The above conclusions say that an event structure \mathcal{E} cannot be fully structured, the

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{x \mid y \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \checkmark} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{x \mid y \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} x'} \\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y'}{x \mid y \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} y'} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y'}{x \mid y \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} x' \ \& \ y'}
\end{array}$$

Table 8. Transition rules of communication operator \mid

explicit parallel operator \parallel in a fully structured event structure combined by \cdot , $+$ and \parallel can not be replaced by \cdot and $+$, and a fully structured event structure combined by \cdot , $+$ and \parallel has no a normal form.

The above propositions mean that a perfectly sound and complete axiomatization of parallelism for truly concurrent bisimulation equivalence (like *ACP* [4] for bisimulation equivalence) *cannot* be established. Then, what can we do for *APTC*?

4.2. Axiom System of Parallelism

Though a fully sound and complete axiomatization for *APTC* seems impossible, we must and can do something, we believe. We also believe that the future is fully implied by the history, let us reconsider parallelism in interleaving bisimulation. In *ACP* [4], the full parallelism is captured by an auxiliary left merge and communication merge, left merge captures the interleaving bisimulation semantics, while communication merge expresses the communications among parallel branches. In true concurrency, if we try to define parallelism explicitly like *APTC*, the left merge captured Milner's expansion law does not hold any more, while communications among different parallel branches captured by communication merge still stand there. So, it is reasonable to assume that causality relations among different parallel branches are all communications among them. The communication between two parallel branches is defined as a communicating function between two communicating events $e_1, e_2 \in \mathbb{E}$, $\gamma(e_1, e_2) : \mathbb{E} \times \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$.

The communications among parallel branches are still defined by the communication operator \mid , which is expressed by four transition rules in Table 8. The whole parallelism semantics is modeled by the parallel operator \parallel and communication operator \mid , we denote the whole parallel operator as $\&$ (for the transition rules of $\&$, we omit them).

Note that the last transition rule for the parallel operator \parallel in Table 7 should be modified to the following one.

$$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y'}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} x' \ \& \ y'}$$

By communication operator \mid , the causality relation among different parallel branches are structured (we will show the algebra laws on communication operator in the following). Now, let us consider conflicts in parallelism. The conflicts exist within the same parallel branches can be captured by $+$ by a structured way, but, how to express conflicts among events in different parallel branches? The conflict relation is also a binary relation between two events $e_1, e_2 \in \mathbb{E}$, $\#(e_1, e_2) : \mathbb{E} \times \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$, and we know that $\#$ is irreflexive, symmetric and hereditary with respect to \cdot , that is, for all $e, e', e'' \in \mathbb{E}$, if $e \# e' \cdot e''$, then $e \# e''$ (see Definition 2.13).

These conflicts among different parallel branches must be eliminated to make the concurrent process structured. We are inspired by modeling of priority in *ACP* [4], the conflict elimination is also captured by two auxiliary operators, the unary conflict elimination operator Θ and the binary unless operator \triangleleft . The transition rules for Θ and \triangleleft are expressed by ten transition rules in Table 9.

In four transition rules in Table 9, there is a new constant τ called silent step (see section 6), this makes the semantics of conflict elimination is really based on weakly true concurrency (see Definition 2.18 and Definition 2.22), and we should move it to section 6. But the movement would make *APTC* incomplete

$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(x) \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(x) \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(x) \xrightarrow{e_1} \Theta(x')}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_2} x' \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(x) \xrightarrow{e_2} \Theta(x')}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y \nrightarrow^{e_2} \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow{\tau} \surd}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \nrightarrow^{e_2} \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow{\tau} x'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y \nrightarrow^{e_3} \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3)}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \nrightarrow^{e_3} \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3)}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow{e_1} x'}$
$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_3} \surd \quad y \nrightarrow^{e_2} \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2), e_1 \leq e_3)}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow{\tau} \surd}$	$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_3} x' \quad y \nrightarrow^{e_2} \quad (\sharp(e_1, e_2), e_1 \leq e_3)}{x \triangleleft y \xrightarrow{\tau} x'}$

Table 9. Transition rules of conflict elimination

(conflicts among different parallel branches cannot be expressed), let us forget this regret and just remember that τ can be eliminated, without anything on weakly true concurrency.

Ok, causality relations and conflict relations among events in different parallel branches are structured. In the following, we prove the congruence theorem.

Theorem 4.4 (Congruence theorem of *APTC*). *Truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p , \sim_s , \sim_{hp} and \sim_{hhp} are all congruences with respect to *APTC*.*

Proof. (1) Case pomset bisimulation equivalence \sim_p .

- Case parallel operator \parallel . Let x_1, x_2 and y_1, y_2 be *APTC* processes, and $x_1 \sim_p y_1$, $x_2 \sim_p y_2$, it is sufficient to prove that $x_1 \parallel x_2 \sim_p y_1 \parallel y_2$.
By the definition of pomset bisimulation \sim_p (Definition 2.17), $x_1 \sim_p y_1$ means that

$$x_1 \xrightarrow{X_1} x'_1 \quad y_1 \xrightarrow{Y_1} y'_1$$

with $X_1 \subseteq x_1$, $Y_1 \subseteq y_1$, $X_1 \sim Y_1$ and $x'_1 \sim_p y'_1$. The meaning of $x_2 \sim_p y_2$ is similar. By the pomset transition rules for parallel operator \parallel in Table 7, we can get

$$x_1 \parallel x_2 \xrightarrow{\{X_1, X_2\}} \surd \quad y_1 \parallel y_2 \xrightarrow{\{Y_1, Y_2\}} \surd$$

with $X_1 \subseteq x_1$, $Y_1 \subseteq y_1$, $X_2 \subseteq x_2$, $Y_2 \subseteq y_2$, $X_1 \sim Y_1$ and $X_2 \sim Y_2$, so, we get $x_1 \parallel x_2 \sim_p y_1 \parallel y_2$, as desired. Or, we can get

$$x_1 \parallel x_2 \xrightarrow{\{X_1, X_2\}} x'_1 \quad y_1 \parallel y_2 \xrightarrow{\{Y_1, Y_2\}} y'_1$$

with $X_1 \subseteq x_1$, $Y_1 \subseteq y_1$, $X_2 \subseteq x_2$, $Y_2 \subseteq y_2$, $X_1 \sim Y_1$, $X_2 \sim Y_2$, and $x'_1 \sim_p y'_1$, so, we get $x_1 \parallel x_2 \sim_p y_1 \parallel y_2$, as desired.

Or, we can get

$$x_1 \parallel x_2 \xrightarrow{\{X_1, X_2\}} x'_2 \quad y_1 \parallel y_2 \xrightarrow{\{Y_1, Y_2\}} y'_2$$

with $X_1 \subseteq x_1$, $Y_1 \subseteq y_1$, $X_2 \subseteq x_2$, $Y_2 \subseteq y_2$, $X_1 \sim Y_1$, $X_2 \sim Y_2$, and $x'_2 \sim_p y'_2$, so, we get $x_1 \parallel x_2 \sim_p y_1 \parallel y_2$, as desired.

Or, we can get

$$x_1 \parallel x_2 \xrightarrow{\{X_1, X_2\}} x'_1 \bowtie x'_2 \quad y_1 \parallel y_2 \xrightarrow{\{Y_1, Y_2\}} y'_1 \bowtie y'_2$$

with $X_1 \subseteq x_1$, $Y_1 \subseteq y_1$, $X_2 \subseteq x_2$, $Y_2 \subseteq y_2$, $X_1 \sim Y_1$, $X_2 \sim Y_2$, $x'_1 \sim_p y'_1$ and $x'_2 \sim_p y'_2$, and also the assumption $x'_1 \bowtie x'_2 \sim_p y'_1 \bowtie y'_2$, so, we get $x_1 \parallel x_2 \sim_p y_1 \parallel y_2$, as desired.

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	$e_1 \parallel (e_2 \cdot y) = (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot y$
P5	$(e_1 \cdot x) \parallel e_2 = (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot x$
P6	$(e_1 \cdot x) \parallel (e_2 \cdot y) = (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot (x \bowtie y)$
P7	$(x + y) \parallel z = (x \parallel z) + (y \parallel z)$
P8	$x \parallel (y + z) = (x \parallel y) + (x \parallel z)$
P9	$\delta \parallel x = \delta$
P10	$x \parallel \delta = \delta$
C11	$e_1 \mid e_2 = \gamma(e_1, e_2)$
C12	$e_1 \mid (e_2 \cdot y) = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot y$
C13	$(e_1 \cdot x) \mid e_2 = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot x$
C14	$(e_1 \cdot x) \mid (e_2 \cdot y) = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot (x \bowtie y)$
C15	$(x + y) \mid z = (x \mid z) + (y \mid z)$
C16	$x \mid (y + z) = (x \mid y) + (x \mid z)$
C17	$\delta \mid x = \delta$
C18	$x \mid \delta = \delta$
CE19	$\Theta(e) = e$
CE20	$\Theta(\delta) = \delta$
CE21	$\Theta(x + y) = \Theta(x) \triangleleft y + \Theta(y) \triangleleft x$
CE22	$\Theta(x \cdot y) = \Theta(x) \cdot \Theta(y)$
CE23	$\Theta(x \parallel y) = ((\Theta(x) \triangleleft y) \parallel y) + ((\Theta(y) \triangleleft x) \parallel x)$
CE24	$\Theta(x \mid y) = ((\Theta(x) \triangleleft y) \mid y) + ((\Theta(y) \triangleleft x) \mid x)$
U25	$(\#(e_1, e_2)) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_2 = \tau$
U26	$(\#(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_3 = e_1$
U27	$(\#(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3) \quad e_3 \triangleleft e_1 = \tau$
U28	$e \triangleleft \delta = e$
U29	$\delta \triangleleft e = \delta$
U30	$(x + y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) + (y \triangleleft z)$
U31	$(x \cdot y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \cdot (y \triangleleft z)$
U32	$(x \parallel y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \parallel (y \triangleleft z)$
U33	$(x \mid y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \mid (y \triangleleft z)$
U34	$x \triangleleft (y + z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
U35	$x \triangleleft (y \cdot z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
U36	$x \triangleleft (y \parallel z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
U37	$x \triangleleft (y \mid z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$

Table 10. Axioms of parallelism

- Case communication operator \mid . It can be proved similarly to the case of parallel operator \parallel , we omit it. Note that, a communication is defined between two single communicating events.
- Case conflict elimination operator Θ . It can be proved similarly to the above cases, we omit it. Note that the conflict elimination operator Θ is a unary operator.
- Case unless operator \triangleleft . It can be proved similarly to the case of parallel operator \parallel , we omit it. Note that, a conflict relation is defined between two single events.

(2) The cases of step bisimulation \sim_s , hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp} and hhp-bisimulation \sim_{hhp} can be proven similarly, we omit them. \square

So, we design the axioms of parallelism in Table 10, including algebraic laws for parallel operator \parallel , communication operator \mid , 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 $e \in \mathbb{E} \cup \{\delta\}$.

We explain the intuitions of the axioms of parallelism in Table 10 in the following. The axiom A6 says

that the deadlock δ is redundant in the process term $t + \delta$. $A7$ says that the deadlock blocks all behaviors of the process term $\delta \cdot t$.

The axiom $P1$ is the definition of the whole parallelism \parallel , which says that $s \parallel t$ either is the form of $s \parallel t$ or $s \mid t$. $P2$ says that \parallel satisfies commutative law, while $P3$ says that \parallel satisfies associativity. $P4$, $P5$ and $P6$ are the defining axioms of \parallel , say the $s \parallel t$ executes s and t concurrently. $P7$ and $P8$ are the right and left distributivity of \parallel to $+$. $P9$ and $P10$ say that both $\delta \parallel t$ and $t \parallel \delta$ all block any event.

$C11$, $C12$, $C13$ and $C14$ are the defining axioms of the communication operator \mid which say that $s \mid t$ makes a communication between s and t . $C15$ and $C16$ are the right and left distributivity of \mid to $+$. $C17$ and $C18$ say that both $\delta \mid t$ and $t \mid \delta$ all block any event.

$CE19$ and $CE20$ say that the conflict elimination operator Θ leaves atomic events and the deadlock unchanged. $CE21 - CE24$ are the functions of Θ acting on the operators $+$, \cdot , \parallel and \mid . $U25$, $U26$ and $U27$ are the defining laws of the unless operator \triangleleft , in $U25$ and $U27$, there is a new constant τ , the silent step, we will discuss τ in details in section 6, in these two axioms, we just need to remember that τ really keeps silent. $U28$ says that the deadlock δ cannot block any event in the process term $e \triangleleft \delta$, while $U29$ says that $\delta \triangleleft e$ does not exhibit any behavior. $U30 - U37$ are the disguised right and left distributivity of \triangleleft to the operators $+$, \cdot , \parallel and \mid .

4.3. Properties of Parallelism

Based on the definition of basic terms for $APTC$ (see Definition 4.2) and axioms of parallelism (see Table 10), we can prove the elimination theorem of parallelism.

Theorem 4.5 (Elimination theorem of parallelism). *Let p be a closed $APTC$ term. Then there is a basic $APTC$ term q such that $APTC \vdash p = q$.*

Proof. (1) Firstly, suppose that the following ordering on the signature of $APTC$ is defined: $\parallel > \cdot > +$ and the symbol \parallel is given the lexicographical status for the first argument, then for each rewrite rule $p \rightarrow q$ in Table 11 relation $p >_{lpo} q$ can easily be proved. We obtain that the term rewrite system shown in Table 11 is strongly normalizing, for it has finitely many rewriting rules, and $>$ is a well-founded ordering on the signature of $APTC$, and if $s >_{lpo} t$, for each rewriting rule $s \rightarrow t$ is in Table 11 (see Theorem 2.12).

(2) Then we prove that the normal forms of closed $APTC$ terms are basic $APTC$ terms.

Suppose that p is a normal form of some closed $APTC$ term and suppose that p is not a basic $APTC$ term. Let p' denote the smallest sub-term of p which is not a basic $APTC$ term. It implies that each sub-term of p' is a basic $APTC$ term. Then we prove that p is not a term in normal form. It is sufficient to induct on the structure of p' :

- Case $p' \equiv e, e \in \mathbb{E}$. p' is a basic $APTC$ term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic $APTC$ term, so this case should not occur.
- Case $p' \equiv p_1 \cdot p_2$. By induction on the structure of the basic $APTC$ term p_1 :
 - Subcase $p_1 \in \mathbb{E}$. p' would be a basic $APTC$ term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic $APTC$ term;
 - Subcase $p_1 \equiv e \cdot p'_1$. $RA5$ rewriting rule in Table 2 can be applied. So p is not a normal form;
 - Subcase $p_1 \equiv p'_1 + p''_1$. $RA4$ rewriting rule in Table 2 can be applied. So p is not a normal form;
 - Subcase $p_1 \equiv p'_1 \parallel p''_1$. p' would be a basic $APTC$ term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic $APTC$ term;
 - Subcase $p_1 \equiv p'_1 \mid p''_1$. $RC11$ rewrite rule in Table 11 can be applied. So p is not a normal form;
 - Subcase $p_1 \equiv \Theta(p'_1)$. $RCE19$ and $RCE20$ rewrite rules in Table 11 can be applied. So p is not a normal form.
- Case $p' \equiv p_1 + p_2$. By induction on the structure of the basic $APTC$ terms both p_1 and p_2 , all subcases will lead to that p' would be a basic $APTC$ term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic $APTC$ term.

No.	Rewriting Rule
RA6	$x + \delta \rightarrow x$
RA7	$\delta \cdot x \rightarrow \delta$
RP1	$x \bowtie y \rightarrow x \parallel y + x \mid y$
RP2	$x \parallel y \rightarrow y \parallel x$
RP3	$(x \parallel y) \parallel z \rightarrow x \parallel (y \parallel z)$
RP4	$e_1 \parallel (e_2 \cdot y) \rightarrow (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot y$
RP5	$(e_1 \cdot x) \parallel e_2 \rightarrow (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot x$
RP6	$(e_1 \cdot x) \parallel (e_2 \cdot y) \rightarrow (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot (x \bowtie y)$
RP7	$(x + y) \parallel z \rightarrow (x \parallel z) + (y \parallel z)$
RP8	$x \parallel (y + z) \rightarrow (x \parallel y) + (x \parallel z)$
RP9	$\delta \parallel x \rightarrow \delta$
RP10	$x \parallel \delta \rightarrow \delta$
RC11	$e_1 \mid e_2 \rightarrow \gamma(e_1, e_2)$
RC12	$e_1 \mid (e_2 \cdot y) \rightarrow \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot y$
RC13	$(e_1 \cdot x) \mid e_2 \rightarrow \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot x$
RC14	$(e_1 \cdot x) \mid (e_2 \cdot y) \rightarrow \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot (x \bowtie y)$
RC15	$(x + y) \mid z \rightarrow (x \mid z) + (y \mid z)$
RC16	$x \mid (y + z) \rightarrow (x \mid y) + (x \mid z)$
RC17	$\delta \mid x \rightarrow \delta$
RC18	$x \mid \delta \rightarrow \delta$
RCE19	$\Theta(e) \rightarrow e$
RCE20	$\Theta(\delta) \rightarrow \delta$
RCE21	$\Theta(x + y) \rightarrow \Theta(x) \triangleleft y + \Theta(y) \triangleleft x$
RCE22	$\Theta(x \cdot y) \rightarrow \Theta(x) \cdot \Theta(y)$
RCE23	$\Theta(x \parallel y) \rightarrow ((\Theta(x) \triangleleft y) \parallel y) + ((\Theta(y) \triangleleft x) \parallel x)$
RCE24	$\Theta(x \mid y) \rightarrow ((\Theta(x) \triangleleft y) \mid y) + ((\Theta(y) \triangleleft x) \mid x)$
RU25	$(\#(e_1, e_2)) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_2 \rightarrow \tau$
RU26	$(\#(e_1, e_2), e_2 \cdot e_3) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_3 \rightarrow e_1$
RU27	$(\#(e_1, e_2), e_2 \cdot e_3) \quad e_3 \triangleleft e_1 \rightarrow \tau$
RU28	$e \triangleleft \delta \rightarrow e$
RU29	$\delta \triangleleft e \rightarrow \delta$
RU30	$(x + y) \triangleleft z \rightarrow (x \triangleleft z) + (y \triangleleft z)$
RU31	$(x \cdot y) \triangleleft z \rightarrow (x \triangleleft z) \cdot (y \triangleleft z)$
RU32	$(x \parallel y) \triangleleft z \rightarrow (x \triangleleft z) \parallel (y \triangleleft z)$
RU33	$(x \mid y) \triangleleft z \rightarrow (x \triangleleft z) \mid (y \triangleleft z)$
RU34	$x \triangleleft (y + z) \rightarrow (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
RU35	$x \triangleleft (y \cdot z) \rightarrow (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
RU36	$x \triangleleft (y \parallel z) \rightarrow (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
RU37	$x \triangleleft (y \mid z) \rightarrow (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$

Table 11. Term rewrite system of *APTC*

- Case $p' \equiv p_1 \parallel p_2$. By induction on the structure of the basic *APTC* terms both p_1 and p_2 , all subcases will lead to that p' would be a basic *APTC* term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic *APTC* term.
- Case $p' \equiv p_1 \mid p_2$. By induction on the structure of the basic *APTC* terms both p_1 and p_2 , all subcases will lead to that p' would be a basic *APTC* term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic *APTC* term.
- Case $p' \equiv \Theta(p_1)$. By induction on the structure of the basic *APTC* term p_1 , *RCE19* – *RCE24* rewrite rules in Table 11 can be applied. So p is not a normal form.
- Case $p' \equiv p_1 \triangleleft p_2$. By induction on the structure of the basic *APTC* terms both p_1 and p_2 , all subcases will lead to that p' would be a basic *APTC* term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic *APTC* term.

□

4.4. Structured Operational Semantics of Parallelism

It is quite a challenge to prove the algebraic laws in Table 10 is sound/complete or unsound/incomplete modulo truly concurrent behavioral equivalence (pomset bisimulation equivalence, step bisimulation equivalence, hp-bisimulation equivalence and hhp-bisimulation equivalence), in this subsection, we try to do these.

Theorem 4.6 (Generalization of the algebra for parallelism with respect to *BATC*). *The algebra for parallelism is a generalization of BATC.*

Proof. It follows from the following three facts.

1. The transition rules of *BATC* in section 3 are all source-dependent;
2. The sources of the transition rules for the algebra for parallelism contain an occurrence of \bowtie , or \parallel , or $|$, or Θ , or \triangleleft ;
3. The transition rules of *APTC* are all source-dependent.

So, the algebra for parallelism is a generalization of *BATC*, that is, *BATC* is an embedding of the algebra for parallelism, as desired. \square

Theorem 4.7 (Soundness of parallelism modulo step bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be *APTC* terms. If $APTC \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_s y$.*

Proof. Since step bisimulation \sim_s is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to the operators \bowtie , \parallel , $|$, Θ and \triangleleft , we only need to check if each axiom in Table 10 is sound modulo step bisimulation equivalence.

Though transition rules in Table 7, 8, and 9 are defined in the flavor of single event, they can be modified into a step (a set of events within which each event is pairwise concurrent), we omit them. If we treat a single event as a step containing just one event, the proof of this soundness theorem does not exist any problem, so we use this way and still use the transition rules in Table 7, 8, and 9.

We omit the defining axioms, including axioms *P1*, *C11*, *CE19*, *CE20*, *U25*–*U27* (the soundness of *U25* and *U27* is remained to section 6); we also omit the trivial axioms related to δ , including axioms *A6*, *A7*, *P9*, *P10*, *C17*, *C18*, *U28* and *U29*; in the following, we only prove the soundness of the non-trivial axioms, including axioms *P2*–*P8*, *C12*–*C16*, *CE21*–*CE24* and *U30*–*U37*.

- **Axiom P2.** Let p, q be *APTC* processes, and $p \parallel q = q \parallel p$, it is sufficient to prove that $p \parallel q \sim_s q \parallel p$. By the transition rules for operator \parallel in Table 7, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{p \parallel q \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{q \parallel p \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \checkmark} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{p \parallel q \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{q \parallel p \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p'} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{p \parallel q \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} q'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{q \parallel p \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} q'} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{p \parallel q \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p' \bowtie q'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{q \parallel p \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} q' \bowtie p'}
\end{array}$$

So, with the assumption $p' \bowtie q' = q' \bowtie p'$, $p \parallel q \sim_s q \parallel p$, as desired.

- **Axiom P3.** Let p, q, r be *APTC* processes, and $(p \parallel q) \parallel r = p \parallel (q \parallel r)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p \parallel q) \parallel r \sim_s p \parallel (q \parallel r)$. By the transition rules for operator \parallel in Table 7, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad r \xrightarrow{e_3} \checkmark}{(p \parallel q) \parallel r \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad r \xrightarrow{e_3} \checkmark}{p \parallel (q \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}} \checkmark} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad r \xrightarrow{e_3} \checkmark}{(p \parallel q) \parallel r \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}} p'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad r \xrightarrow{e_3} \checkmark}{p \parallel (q \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}} p'}
\end{array}$$

There are also two cases that two process terms successfully terminate, we omit them.

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_3} \checkmark}{(p \parallel q) \parallel r \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}} p' \bowtie q'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_3} \checkmark}{p \parallel (q \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}} p' \bowtie q'}$$

There are also other cases that just one process term successfully terminate, we also omit them.

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_3} r'}{(p \parallel q) \parallel r' \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}} (p' \bowtie q') \bowtie r'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_3} r'}{p \parallel (q \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}} p' \bowtie (q' \bowtie r')}$$

So, with the assumption $(p' \bowtie q') \bowtie r' = p' \bowtie (q' \bowtie r')$, $(p \parallel q) \parallel r \sim_s p \parallel (q \parallel r)$, as desired.

- **Axiom P4.** Let q be an *APTC* process, and $e_1 \parallel (e_2 \cdot q) = (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot q$, it is sufficient to prove that $e_1 \parallel (e_2 \cdot q) \sim_s (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot q$. By the transition rules for operator \parallel in Table 7, we get

$$\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad e_2 \cdot q \xrightarrow{e_2} q}{e_1 \parallel (e_2 \cdot q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} q}$$

$$\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad e_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot q \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} q}$$

So, $e_1 \parallel (e_2 \cdot q) \sim_s (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot q$, as desired.

- **Axiom P5.** Let p be an *APTC* process, and $(e_1 \cdot p) \parallel e_2 = (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot p$, it is sufficient to prove that $(e_1 \cdot p) \parallel e_2 \sim_s (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot p$. By the transition rules for operator \parallel in Table 7, we get

$$\frac{e_1 \cdot p \xrightarrow{e_1} p \quad e_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(e_1 \cdot p) \parallel e_2 \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p}$$

$$\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad e_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot p \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p}$$

So, $(e_1 \cdot p) \parallel e_2 \sim_s (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot p$, as desired.

- **Axiom P6.** Let p, q be *APTC* processes, and $(e_1 \cdot p) \parallel (e_2 \cdot q) = (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot (p \bowtie q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(e_1 \cdot p) \parallel (e_2 \cdot q) \sim_s (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot (p \bowtie q)$. By the transition rules for operator \parallel in Table 7, we get

$$\frac{e_1 \cdot p \xrightarrow{e_1} p \quad e_2 \cdot q \xrightarrow{e_2} q}{(e_1 \cdot p) \parallel (e_2 \cdot q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p \bowtie q}$$

$$\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad e_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot (p \bowtie q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p \bowtie q}$$

So, $(e_1 \cdot p) \parallel (e_2 \cdot q) \sim_s (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot (p \bowtie q)$, as desired.

- **Axiom P7.** Let p, q, r be *APTC* processes, and $(p + q) \parallel r = (p \parallel r) + (q \parallel r)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p + q) \parallel r \sim_s (p \parallel r) + (q \parallel r)$. By the transition rules for operators $+$ and \parallel in Table 5 and 7, we get

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(p + q) \parallel r \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(p \parallel r) + (q \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \checkmark}$$

$$\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(p + q) \parallel r \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \checkmark} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(p \parallel r) + (q \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \checkmark}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{(p+q) \parallel r \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{(p \parallel r) + (q \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p'} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_1} q' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{(p+q) \parallel r \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} q'} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_1} q' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{(p \parallel r) + (q \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} q'} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p+q) \parallel r \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} r'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p \parallel r) + (q \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} r'} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p+q) \parallel r \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} r'} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p \parallel r) + (q \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} r'} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p+q) \parallel r \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p' \bowtie r'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p \parallel r) + (q \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p' \bowtie r'} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_1} q' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p+q) \parallel r \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} q' \bowtie r'} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_1} q' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p \parallel r) + (q \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} q' \bowtie r'}
\end{array}$$

So, $(p+q) \parallel r \sim_s (p \parallel r) + (q \parallel r)$, as desired.

- **Axiom P8.** Let p, q, r be *APTC* processes, and $p \parallel (q+r) = (p \parallel q) + (p \parallel r)$, it is sufficient to prove that $p \parallel (q+r) \sim_s (p \parallel q) + (p \parallel r)$. By the transition rules for operators $+$ and \parallel in Table 5 and 7, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{p \parallel (q+r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \surd} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{(p \parallel q) + (p \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \surd} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{p \parallel (q+r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \surd} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{(p \parallel q) + (p \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \surd} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{p \parallel (q+r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{(p \parallel q) + (p \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p'} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{p \parallel (q+r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{(p \parallel q) + (p \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p'} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{p \parallel (q+r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} q'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p \parallel q) + (p \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} q'} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{p \parallel (q+r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} r'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p \parallel q) + (p \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} r'} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{p \parallel (q+r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p' \bowtie q'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p \parallel q) + (p \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p' \bowtie q'} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{p \parallel (q+r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p' \bowtie r'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p \parallel q) + (p \parallel r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p' \bowtie r'}
\end{array}$$

So, $p \parallel (q + r) \sim_s (p \parallel q) + (p \parallel r)$, as desired.

- **Axiom C12.** Let q be an *APTC* process, and $e_1 \mid (e_2 \cdot q) = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot q$, it is sufficient to prove that $e_1 \mid (e_2 \cdot q) \sim_s \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot q$. By the transition rules for operator \mid in Table 8, we get

$$\frac{\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} \sqrt{\quad} \quad e_2 \cdot q \xrightarrow{e_2} q}{e_1 \mid (e_2 \cdot q) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} q}}{\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} \sqrt{\quad} \quad e_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{\quad}}{\gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot q \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} q}}$$

So, $e_1 \mid (e_2 \cdot q) \sim_s \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot q$, as desired.

- **Axiom C13.** Let p be an *APTC* process, and $(e_1 \cdot p) \mid e_2 = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot p$, it is sufficient to prove that $(e_1 \cdot p) \mid e_2 \sim_s \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot p$. By the transition rules for operator \mid in Table 8, we get

$$\frac{\frac{e_1 \cdot p \xrightarrow{e_1} p \quad e_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{\quad}}{(e_1 \cdot p) \mid e_2 \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p}}{\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} \sqrt{\quad} \quad e_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{\quad}}{\gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot p \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p}}$$

So, $(e_1 \cdot p) \mid e_2 \sim_s \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot p$, as desired.

- **Axiom C14.** Let p, q be *APTC* processes, and $(e_1 \cdot p) \mid (e_2 \cdot q) = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot (p \bowtie q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(e_1 \cdot p) \mid (e_2 \cdot q) \sim_s \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot (p \bowtie q)$. By the transition rules for operator \mid in Table 8, we get

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{e_1 \cdot p \xrightarrow{e_1} p \quad e_2 \cdot q \xrightarrow{e_2} q}{(e_1 \cdot p) \mid (e_2 \cdot q) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p \bowtie q}}{\frac{e_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} \sqrt{\quad} \quad e_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{\quad}}{\gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot (p \bowtie q) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p \bowtie q}}}$$

So, $(e_1 \cdot p) \mid (e_2 \cdot q) \sim_s \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot (p \bowtie q)$, as desired.

- **Axiom C15.** Let p, q, r be *APTC* processes, and $(p + q) \mid r = (p \mid r) + (q \mid r)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p + q) \mid r \sim_s (p \mid r) + (q \mid r)$. By the transition rules for operators $+$ and \mid in Table 5 and 8, we get

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \sqrt{\quad} \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{\quad}}{(p + q) \mid r \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \sqrt{\quad}} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \sqrt{\quad} \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{\quad}}{(p \mid r) + (q \mid r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \sqrt{\quad}} \\ \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_1} \sqrt{\quad} \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{\quad}}{(p + q) \mid r \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \sqrt{\quad}} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_1} \sqrt{\quad} \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{\quad}}{(p \mid r) + (q \mid r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \sqrt{\quad}} \\ \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{\quad}}{(p + q) \mid r \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{\quad}}{(p \mid r) + (q \mid r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p'} \\ \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_1} q' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{\quad}}{(p + q) \mid r \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} q'} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_1} q' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{\quad}}{(p \mid r) + (q \mid r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} q'} \\ \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \sqrt{\quad} \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p + q) \mid r \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} r'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \sqrt{\quad} \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p \mid r) + (q \mid r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} r'} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p+q) \mid r \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} r'} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p \mid r) + (q \mid r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} r'} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p+q) \mid r \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p' \ \& \ r'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p \mid r) + (q \mid r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p' \ \& \ r'} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_1} q' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p+q) \mid r \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} q' \ \& \ r'} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_1} q' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p \mid r) + (q \mid r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} q' \ \& \ r'}
\end{array}$$

So, $(p+q) \mid r \sim_s (p \mid r) + (q \mid r)$, as desired.

- **Axiom C16.** Let p, q, r be *APTC* processes, and $p \mid (q+r) = (p \mid q) + (p \mid r)$, it is sufficient to prove that $p \mid (q+r) \sim_s (p \mid q) + (p \mid r)$. By the transition rules for operators $+$ and \mid in Table 5 and 8, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{p \mid (q+r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \surd} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{(p \mid q) + (p \mid r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \surd} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{p \mid (q+r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \surd} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{(p \mid q) + (p \mid r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \surd} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{p \mid (q+r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{(p \mid q) + (p \mid r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p'} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{p \mid (q+r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{(p \mid q) + (p \mid r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p'} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{p \mid (q+r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} q'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p \mid q) + (p \mid r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} q'} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{p \mid (q+r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} r'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p \mid q) + (p \mid r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} r'} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{p \mid (q+r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p' \ \& \ q'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p \mid q) + (p \mid r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p' \ \& \ q'} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{p \mid (q+r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p' \ \& \ r'} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad r \xrightarrow{e_2} r'}{(p \mid q) + (p \mid r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p' \ \& \ r'}
\end{array}$$

So, $p \mid (q+r) \sim_s (p \mid q) + (p \mid r)$, as desired.

- **Axiom CE21.** Let p, q be *APTC* processes, and $\Theta(p+q) = \Theta(p) \triangleleft q + \Theta(q) \triangleleft p$, it is sufficient to prove that $\Theta(p+q) \sim_s \Theta(p) \triangleleft q + \Theta(q) \triangleleft p$. By the transition rules for operators $+$ in Table 5, and Θ and \triangleleft in Table 9, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd(\#(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(p+q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd(\#(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(p) \triangleleft q + \Theta(q) \triangleleft p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd(\#(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(p+q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd(\#(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(p) \triangleleft q + \Theta(q) \triangleleft p \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'(\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(p+q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \Theta(p')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'(\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(p) \triangleleft q + \Theta(q) \triangleleft p \xrightarrow{e_1} \Theta(p')} \\
\\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'(\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(p+q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \Theta(q')} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'(\sharp(e_1, e_2))}{\Theta(p) \triangleleft q + \Theta(q) \triangleleft p \xrightarrow{e_2} \Theta(q')}
\end{array}$$

So, $\Theta(p+q) \sim_s \Theta(p) \triangleleft q + \Theta(q) \triangleleft p$, as desired.

- **Axiom CE22.** Let p, q be *APTC* processes, and $\Theta(p \cdot q) = \Theta(p) \cdot \Theta(q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\Theta(p \cdot q) \sim_s \Theta(p) \cdot \Theta(q)$. By the transition rules for operators \cdot in Table 5, and Θ in Table 9, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{\Theta(p \cdot q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \Theta(q)} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{\Theta(p) \cdot \Theta(q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \Theta(q)} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{\Theta(p \cdot q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \Theta(p' \cdot q)} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{\Theta(p) \cdot \Theta(q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \Theta(p') \cdot \Theta(q)}
\end{array}$$

So, with the assumption $\Theta(p' \cdot q) = \Theta(p') \cdot \Theta(q)$, $\Theta(p \cdot q) \sim_s \Theta(p) \cdot \Theta(q)$, as desired.

- **Axiom CE23.** Let p, q be *APTC* processes, and $\Theta(p \parallel q) = ((\Theta(p) \triangleleft q) \parallel q) + ((\Theta(q) \triangleleft p) \parallel p)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\Theta(p \parallel q) \sim_s ((\Theta(p) \triangleleft q) \parallel q) + ((\Theta(q) \triangleleft p) \parallel p)$. By the transition rules for operators $+$ in Table 5, and Θ and \triangleleft in Table 9, and \parallel in Table 7 we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{\Theta(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \surd} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{((\Theta(p) \triangleleft q) \parallel q) + ((\Theta(q) \triangleleft p) \parallel p) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \surd} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{\Theta(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \Theta(p')} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{((\Theta(p) \triangleleft q) \parallel q) + ((\Theta(q) \triangleleft p) \parallel p) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \Theta(p')} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\Theta(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \Theta(q')} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{((\Theta(p) \triangleleft q) \parallel q) + ((\Theta(q) \triangleleft p) \parallel p) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \Theta(q')} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\Theta(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \Theta(p' \bowtie q')} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{((\Theta(p) \triangleleft q) \parallel q) + ((\Theta(q) \triangleleft p) \parallel p) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} ((\Theta(p') \triangleleft q') \bowtie q') + ((\Theta(q') \triangleleft p') \bowtie p')}
\end{array}$$

So, with the assumption $\Theta(p' \bowtie q') = ((\Theta(p') \triangleleft q') \bowtie q') + ((\Theta(q') \triangleleft p') \bowtie p')$, $\Theta(p \parallel q) \sim_s ((\Theta(p) \triangleleft q) \parallel q) + ((\Theta(q) \triangleleft p) \parallel p)$, as desired.

- **Axiom CE24.** Let p, q be *APTC* processes, and $\Theta(p \mid q) = ((\Theta(p) \triangleleft q) \mid q) + ((\Theta(q) \triangleleft p) \mid p)$, it is

sufficient to prove that $\Theta(p \mid q) \sim_s ((\Theta(p) \triangleleft q) \mid q) + ((\Theta(q) \triangleleft p) \mid p)$. By the transition rules for operators $+$ in Table 5, and Θ and \triangleleft in Table 9, and \mid in Table 8 we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{\Theta(p \mid q) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{((\Theta(p) \triangleleft q) \mid q) + ((\Theta(q) \triangleleft p) \mid p) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{\Theta(p \mid q) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \Theta(p')} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{((\Theta(p) \triangleleft q) \mid q) + ((\Theta(q) \triangleleft p) \mid p) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \Theta(p')} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\Theta(p \mid q) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \Theta(q')} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{((\Theta(p) \triangleleft q) \mid q) + ((\Theta(q) \triangleleft p) \mid p) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \Theta(q')} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\Theta(p \mid q) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \Theta(p' \bowtie q')} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{((\Theta(p) \triangleleft q) \mid q) + ((\Theta(q) \triangleleft p) \mid p) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} ((\Theta(p') \triangleleft q') \bowtie q') + ((\Theta(q') \triangleleft p') \bowtie p')}
\end{array}$$

So, with the assumption $\Theta(p' \bowtie q') = ((\Theta(p') \triangleleft q') \bowtie q') + ((\Theta(q') \triangleleft p') \bowtie p')$, $\Theta(p \mid q) \sim_s ((\Theta(p) \triangleleft q) \mid q) + ((\Theta(q) \triangleleft p) \mid p)$, as desired.

- **Axiom U30.** Let p, q, r be *APTC* processes, and $(p + q) \triangleleft r = (p \triangleleft r) + (q \triangleleft r)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p + q) \triangleleft r \sim_s (p \triangleleft r) + (q \triangleleft r)$. By the transition rules for operators $+$ and \triangleleft in Table 5 and 9, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{(p + q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{(p \triangleleft r) + (q \triangleleft r) \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(p + q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(p \triangleleft r) + (q \triangleleft r) \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{(p + q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \triangleleft r} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{(p \triangleleft r) + (q \triangleleft r) \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \triangleleft r} \\
\\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p + q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \triangleleft r} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p \triangleleft r) + (q \triangleleft r) \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \triangleleft r}
\end{array}$$

Let us forget anything about τ . So, $(p + q) \triangleleft r \sim_s (p \triangleleft r) + (q \triangleleft r)$, as desired.

- **Axiom U31.** Let p, q, r be *APTC* processes, and $(p \cdot q) \triangleleft r = (p \triangleleft r) \cdot (q \triangleleft r)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p \cdot q) \triangleleft r \sim_s (p \triangleleft r) \cdot (q \triangleleft r)$. By the transition rules for operators \cdot and \triangleleft in Table 5 and 9, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{(p \cdot q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{e_1} q \triangleleft r} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{(p \triangleleft r) \cdot (q \triangleleft r) \xrightarrow{e_1} q \triangleleft r} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{(p \cdot q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{e_1} (p' \cdot q) \triangleleft r} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{(p \triangleleft r) \cdot (q \triangleleft r) \xrightarrow{e_1} (p' \triangleleft r) \cdot (q \triangleleft r)}
\end{array}$$

Let us forget anything about τ . With the assumption $(p' \cdot q) \triangleleft r = (p' \triangleleft r) \cdot (q \triangleleft r)$, so, $(p \cdot q) \triangleleft r \sim_s (p \triangleleft r) \cdot (q \triangleleft r)$, as desired.

- **Axiom U32.** Let p, q, r be *APTC* processes, and $(p \parallel q) \triangleleft r = (p \triangleleft r) \parallel (q \triangleleft r)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p \parallel q) \triangleleft r \sim_s (p \triangleleft r) \parallel (q \triangleleft r)$. By the transition rules for operators \parallel and \triangleleft in Table 7 and 9, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(p \parallel q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(p \triangleleft r) \parallel (q \triangleleft r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(p \parallel q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p' \triangleleft r} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(p \triangleleft r) \parallel (q \triangleleft r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} p' \triangleleft r} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p \parallel q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} q' \triangleleft r} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p \triangleleft r) \parallel (q \triangleleft r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} q' \triangleleft r} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p \parallel q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} (p' \bowtie q') \triangleleft r} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p \triangleleft r) \parallel (q \triangleleft r) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} (p' \triangleleft r) \bowtie (q' \triangleleft r)}
\end{array}$$

Let us forget anything about τ . With the assumption $(p' \bowtie q') \triangleleft r = (p' \triangleleft r) \bowtie (q' \triangleleft r)$, so, $(p \parallel q) \triangleleft r \sim_s (p \triangleleft r) \parallel (q \triangleleft r)$, as desired.

- **Axiom U33.** Let p, q, r be *APTC* processes, and $(p \mid q) \triangleleft r = (p \triangleleft r) \mid (q \triangleleft r)$, it is sufficient to prove that $(p \mid q) \triangleleft r \sim_s (p \triangleleft r) \mid (q \triangleleft r)$. By the transition rules for operators \mid and \triangleleft in Table 8 and 9, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(p \mid q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(p \triangleleft r) \mid (q \triangleleft r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(p \mid q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p' \triangleleft r} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{(p \triangleleft r) \mid (q \triangleleft r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} p' \triangleleft r} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p \mid q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} q' \triangleleft r} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p \triangleleft r) \mid (q \triangleleft r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} q' \triangleleft r} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p \mid q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} (p' \bowtie q') \triangleleft r} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{(p \triangleleft r) \mid (q \triangleleft r) \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} (p' \triangleleft r) \bowtie (q' \triangleleft r)}
\end{array}$$

Let us forget anything about τ . With the assumption $(p' \bowtie q') \triangleleft r = (p' \triangleleft r) \bowtie (q' \triangleleft r)$, so, $(p \mid q) \triangleleft r \sim_s (p \triangleleft r) \mid (q \triangleleft r)$, as desired.

- **Axiom U34.** Let p, q, r be *APTC* processes, and $p \triangleleft (q + r) = (p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r$, it is sufficient to prove that $p \triangleleft (q + r) \sim_s (p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r$. By the transition rules for operators $+$ and \triangleleft in Table 5 and 9, we get

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{p \triangleleft (q + r) \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}{(p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark}$$

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{p \triangleleft (q + r) \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \triangleleft (q + r)} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{(p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{e_1} (p' \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r}$$

Let us forget anything about τ . With the assumption $p' \triangleleft (q + r) = (p' \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r$, so, $p \triangleleft (q + r) \sim_s (p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r$, as desired.

- **Axiom U35.** Let p, q, r be *APTC* processes, and $p \triangleleft (q \cdot r) = (p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r$, it is sufficient to prove that $p \triangleleft (q \cdot r) \sim_s (p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r$. By the transition rules for operators \cdot and \triangleleft in Table 5 and 9, we get

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{p \triangleleft (q \cdot r) \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{(p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}$$

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{p \triangleleft (q \cdot r) \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \triangleleft (q \cdot r)} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{(p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{e_1} (p' \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r}$$

Let us forget anything about τ . With the assumption $p' \triangleleft (q \cdot r) = (p' \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r$, so, $p \triangleleft (q \cdot r) \sim_s (p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r$, as desired.

- **Axiom U36.** Let p, q, r be *APTC* processes, and $p \triangleleft (q \parallel r) = (p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r$, it is sufficient to prove that $p \triangleleft (q \parallel r) \sim_s (p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r$. By the transition rules for operators \parallel and \triangleleft in Table 7 and 9, we get

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{p \triangleleft (q \parallel r) \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{(p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}$$

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{p \triangleleft (q \parallel r) \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \triangleleft (q \parallel r)} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{(p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{e_1} (p' \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r}$$

Let us forget anything about τ . With the assumption $p' \triangleleft (q \parallel r) = (p' \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r$, so, $p \triangleleft (q \parallel r) \sim_s (p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r$, as desired.

- **Axiom U37.** Let p, q, r be *APTC* processes, and $p \triangleleft (q \mid r) = (p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r$, it is sufficient to prove that $p \triangleleft (q \mid r) \sim_s (p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r$. By the transition rules for operators \mid and \triangleleft in Table 8 and 9, we get

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{p \triangleleft (q \mid r) \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{(p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}$$

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{p \triangleleft (q \mid r) \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \triangleleft (q \mid r)} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{(p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r \xrightarrow{e_1} (p' \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r}$$

Let us forget anything about τ . With the assumption $p' \triangleleft (q \mid r) = (p' \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r$, so, $p \triangleleft (q \mid r) \sim_s (p \triangleleft q) \triangleleft r$, as desired.

□

Theorem 4.8 (Completeness of parallelism modulo step bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed *APTC* terms, if $p \sim_s q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. Firstly, by the elimination theorem of *APTC* (see Theorem 4.5), we know that for each closed *APTC* term p , there exists a closed basic *APTC* term p' , such that $APTC \vdash p = p'$, so, we only need to consider closed basic *APTC* terms.

The basic terms (see Definition 4.2) modulo associativity and commutativity (AC) of conflict $+$ (defined by axioms A1 and A2 in Table 1) and associativity and commutativity (AC) of parallel \parallel (defined by axioms P2 and P3 in Table 10), and these equivalences is denoted by $=_{AC}$. Then, each equivalence class s modulo AC of $+$ and \parallel has the following normal form

$$s_1 + \cdots + s_k$$

with each s_i either an atomic event or of the form

$$t_1 \cdots t_m$$

with each t_j either an atomic event or of the form

$$u_1 \parallel \cdots \parallel u_l$$

with each u_l an atomic event, and each s_i is called the summand of s .

Now, we prove that for normal forms n and n' , if $n \sim_s n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$. It is sufficient to induct on the sizes of n and n' .

- Consider a summand e of n . Then $n \xrightarrow{e} \surd$, so $n \sim_s n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{e} \surd$, meaning that n' also contains the summand e .
- Consider a summand $t_1 \cdot t_2$ of n ,
 - if $t_1 \equiv e'$, then $n \xrightarrow{e'} t_2$, so $n \sim_s n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{e'} t'_2$ with $t_2 \sim_s t'_2$, meaning that n' contains a summand $e' \cdot t'_2$. Since t_2 and t'_2 are normal forms and have sizes smaller than n and n' , by the induction hypotheses if $t_2 \sim_s t'_2$ then $t_2 =_{AC} t'_2$;
 - if $t_1 \equiv e_1 \parallel \cdots \parallel e_l$, then $n \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_l\}} t_2$, so $n \sim_s n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_l\}} t'_2$ with $t_2 \sim_s t'_2$, meaning that n' contains a summand $(e_1 \parallel \cdots \parallel e_l) \cdot t'_2$. Since t_2 and t'_2 are normal forms and have sizes smaller than n and n' , by the induction hypotheses if $t_2 \sim_s t'_2$ then $t_2 =_{AC} t'_2$.

So, we get $n =_{AC} n'$.

Finally, let s and t be basic *APTC* terms, and $s \sim_s t$, there are normal forms n and n' , such that $s = n$ and $t = n'$. The soundness theorem of parallelism modulo step bisimulation equivalence (see Theorem 4.7) yields $s \sim_s n$ and $t \sim_s n'$, so $n \sim_s s \sim_s t \sim_s n'$. Since if $n \sim_s n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$, $s = n =_{AC} n' = t$, as desired. \square

Theorem 4.9 (Soundness of parallelism modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be *APTC* terms. If $APTC \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_p y$.*

Proof. Since pomset bisimulation \sim_p is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to the operators \mathbb{X} , \parallel , \mid , Θ and \triangleleft , we only need to check if each axiom in Table 10 is sound modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence.

From the definition of pomset bisimulation (see Definition 2.17), we know that pomset bisimulation is defined by pomset transitions, which are labeled by pomsets. In a pomset transition, the events in the pomset are either within causality relations (defined by \cdot) or in concurrency (implicitly defined by \cdot and $+$, and explicitly defined by \mathbb{X}), of course, they are pairwise consistent (without conflicts). In Theorem 4.7, we have already proven the case that all events are pairwise concurrent, so, we only need to prove the case of events in causality. Without loss of generality, we take a pomset of $P = \{e_1, e_2 : e_1 \cdot e_2\}$. Then the pomset transition labeled by the above P is just composed of one single event transition labeled by e_1 succeeded by another single event transition labeled by e_2 , that is, $\xrightarrow{P} = \xrightarrow{e_1} \xrightarrow{e_2}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of parallelism modulo step bisimulation equivalence (see Theorem 4.7), we can prove that each axiom in Table 10 is sound modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence, we omit them. \square

Theorem 4.10 (Completeness of parallelism modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed *APTC* terms, if $p \sim_p q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. Firstly, by the elimination theorem of *APTC* (see Theorem 4.5), we know that for each closed *APTC* term p , there exists a closed basic *APTC* term p' , such that $APTC \vdash p = p'$, so, we only need to consider closed basic *APTC* terms.

The basic terms (see Definition 4.2) modulo associativity and commutativity (AC) of conflict $+$ (defined by axioms A1 and A2 in Table 1) and associativity and commutativity (AC) of parallel \parallel (defined by axioms P2 and P3 in Table 10), and these equivalences is denoted by $=_{AC}$. Then, each equivalence class s modulo AC of $+$ and \parallel has the following normal form

$$s_1 + \cdots + s_k$$

with each s_i either an atomic event or of the form

$$t_1 \cdots t_m$$

with each t_j either an atomic event or of the form

$$u_1 \parallel \cdots \parallel u_l$$

with each u_l an atomic event, and each s_i is called the summand of s .

Now, we prove that for normal forms n and n' , if $n \sim_p n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$. It is sufficient to induct on the sizes of n and n' .

- Consider a summand e of n . Then $n \xrightarrow{e} \surd$, so $n \sim_p n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{e} \surd$, meaning that n' also contains the summand e .
- Consider a summand $t_1 \cdot t_2$ of n ,
 - if $t_1 \equiv e'$, then $n \xrightarrow{e'} t_2$, so $n \sim_p n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{e'} t'_2$ with $t_2 \sim_p t'_2$, meaning that n' contains a summand $e' \cdot t'_2$. Since t_2 and t'_2 are normal forms and have sizes smaller than n and n' , by the induction hypotheses if $t_2 \sim_p t'_2$ then $t_2 =_{AC} t'_2$;
 - if $t_1 \equiv e_1 \parallel \cdots \parallel e_l$, then $n \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_l\}} t_2$, so $n \sim_p n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_l\}} t'_2$ with $t_2 \sim_p t'_2$, meaning that n' contains a summand $(e_1 \parallel \cdots \parallel e_l) \cdot t'_2$. Since t_2 and t'_2 are normal forms and have sizes smaller than n and n' , by the induction hypotheses if $t_2 \sim_p t'_2$ then $t_2 =_{AC} t'_2$.

So, we get $n =_{AC} n'$.

Finally, let s and t be basic *APTC* terms, and $s \sim_p t$, there are normal forms n and n' , such that $s = n$ and $t = n'$. The soundness theorem of parallelism modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence (see Theorem 4.9) yields $s \sim_p n$ and $t \sim_p n'$, so $n \sim_p s \sim_p t \sim_p n'$. Since if $n \sim_p n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$, $s = n =_{AC} n' = t$, as desired. \square

Theorem 4.11 (Soundness of parallelism modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be *APTC* terms. If $APTC \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{hp} y$.*

Proof. Since hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to the operators \mathbb{I} , \parallel , $|$, Θ and \triangleleft , we only need to check if each axiom in Table 10 is sound modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence.

From the definition of hp-bisimulation (see Definition 2.21), we know that hp-bisimulation is defined on the posetal product (C_1, f, C_2) , $f : C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ isomorphism. Two process terms s related to C_1 and t related to C_2 , and $f : C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ isomorphism. Initially, $(C_1, f, C_2) = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, and $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in \sim_{hp}$. When $s \xrightarrow{e} s'$ ($C_1 \xrightarrow{e} C'_1$), there will be $t \xrightarrow{e} t'$ ($C_2 \xrightarrow{e} C'_2$), and we define $f' = f[e \mapsto e']$. Then, if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in \sim_{hp}$, then $(C'_1, f', C'_2) \in \sim_{hp}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of parallelism modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence (see Theorem 4.9), we can prove that each axiom in Table 10 is sound modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence, we just need additionally to check the above conditions on hp-bisimulation, we omit them. \square

Theorem 4.12 (Completeness of parallelism modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed *APTC* terms, if $p \sim_{hp} q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. Firstly, by the elimination theorem of *APTC* (see Theorem 4.5), we know that for each closed *APTC* term p , there exists a closed basic *APTC* term p' , such that $APTC \vdash p = p'$, so, we only need to consider closed basic *APTC* terms.

The basic terms (see Definition 4.2) modulo associativity and commutativity (AC) of conflict $+$ (defined by axioms A1 and A2 in Table 1) and associativity and commutativity (AC) of parallel \parallel (defined by axioms P2 and P3 in Table 10), and these equivalences is denoted by $=_{AC}$. Then, each equivalence class s modulo AC of $+$ and \parallel has the following normal form

$$s_1 + \cdots + s_k$$

with each s_i either an atomic event or of the form

$$t_1 \cdots t_m$$

with each t_j either an atomic event or of the form

$$u_1 \parallel \cdots \parallel u_l$$

with each u_l an atomic event, and each s_i is called the summand of s .

Now, we prove that for normal forms n and n' , if $n \sim_{hp} n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$. It is sufficient to induct on the sizes of n and n' .

- Consider a summand e of n . Then $n \xrightarrow{e} \sqrt{}$, so $n \sim_{hp} n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{e} \sqrt{}$, meaning that n' also contains the summand e .
- Consider a summand $t_1 \cdot t_2$ of n ,
 - if $t_1 \equiv e'$, then $n \xrightarrow{e'} t_2$, so $n \sim_{hp} n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{e'} t'_2$ with $t_2 \sim_{hp} t'_2$, meaning that n' contains a summand $e' \cdot t'_2$. Since t_2 and t'_2 are normal forms and have sizes smaller than n and n' , by the induction hypotheses if $t_2 \sim_{hp} t'_2$ then $t_2 =_{AC} t'_2$;
 - if $t_1 \equiv e_1 \parallel \cdots \parallel e_l$, then $n \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_l\}} t_2$, so $n \sim_{hp} n'$ implies $n' \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_l\}} t'_2$ with $t_2 \sim_{hp} t'_2$, meaning that n' contains a summand $(e_1 \parallel \cdots \parallel e_l) \cdot t'_2$. Since t_2 and t'_2 are normal forms and have sizes smaller than n and n' , by the induction hypotheses if $t_2 \sim_{hp} t'_2$ then $t_2 =_{AC} t'_2$.

So, we get $n =_{AC} n'$.

Finally, let s and t be basic *APTC* terms, and $s \sim_{hp} t$, there are normal forms n and n' , such that $s = n$ and $t = n'$. The soundness theorem of parallelism modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence (see Theorem 4.9) yields $s \sim_{hp} n$ and $t \sim_{hp} n'$, so $n \sim_{hp} s \sim_{hp} t \sim_{hp} n'$. Since if $n \sim_{hp} n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$, $s = n =_{AC} n' = t$, as desired. \square

Proposition 4.13 (About Soundness and Completeness of parallelism modulo hhp-bisimulation equivalence). *1. Let x and y be *APTC* terms. If $APTC \vdash x = y \not\Rightarrow x \sim_{hhp} y$;*

*2. If p and q are closed *APTC* terms, then $p \sim_{hhp} q \not\Rightarrow p = q$.*

Proof. Imperfectly, the algebraic laws in Table 10 are not sound and complete modulo hhp-bisimulation equivalence, we just need enumerate several key axioms in Table 10 are not sound modulo hhp-bisimulation equivalence.

From the definition of hhp-bisimulation (see Definition 2.21), we know that an hhp-bisimulation is a downward closed hp-bisimulation. That is, for any posetal products (C_1, f, C_2) and (C'_1, f, C'_2) , if $(C_1, f, C_2) \sqsubseteq (C'_1, f', C'_2)$ pointwise and $(C'_1, f', C'_2) \in \sim_{hhp}$, then $(C_1, f, C_2) \in \sim_{hhp}$.

Now, let us consider the axioms *P7* and *P8* (the right and left distributivity of \parallel to $+$). Let $s_1 = (a+b) \parallel c$, $t_1 = (a \parallel c) + (b \parallel c)$, and $s_2 = a \parallel (b+c)$, $t_2 = (a \parallel b) + (a \parallel c)$. We know that $s_1 \sim_{hp} t_1$ and $s_2 \sim_{hp} t_2$ (by Theorem 4.11), we prove that $s_1 \not\sim_{hhp} t_1$ and $s_2 \not\sim_{hhp} t_2$. Let $(C(s_1), f_1, C(t_1))$ and $(C(s_2), f_2, C(t_2))$ are the corresponding posetal products.

- **Axiom P7.** $s_1 \xrightarrow{\{a,c\}} \sqrt{(s'_1)} (C(s_1) \xrightarrow{\{a,c\}} C(s'_1))$, then $t_1 \xrightarrow{\{a,c\}} \sqrt{(t'_1)} (C(t_1) \xrightarrow{\{a,c\}} C(t'_1))$, we define $f'_1 = f_1[a \mapsto a, c \mapsto c]$, obviously, $(C(s_1), f_1, C(t_1)) \in \sim_{hp}$ and $(C(s'_1), f'_1, C(t'_1)) \in \sim_{hp}$. But, $(C(s_1), f_1, C(t_1)) \in \sim_{hhp}$ and $(C(s'_1), f'_1, C(t'_1)) \in \sim_{hhp}$, just because they are not downward closed. Let $(C(s'_1), f'_1, C(t'_1))$, and $f''_1 = f_1[c \mapsto c]$, $s_1 \xrightarrow{c} s''_1 (C(s_1) \xrightarrow{c} C(s''_1))$, $t_1 \xrightarrow{c} t''_1 (C(t_1) \xrightarrow{c} C(t''_1))$, it is easy to see that $(C(s'_1), f'_1, C(t'_1)) \sqsubseteq (C(s''_1), f''_1, C(t''_1))$ pointwise, while $(C(s'_1), f'_1, C(t'_1)) \notin \sim_{hp}$, because s''_1 and $C(s'_1)$ exist, but t''_1 and $C(t'_1)$ do not exist.
- **Axiom P8.** $s_2 \xrightarrow{\{a,c\}} \sqrt{(s'_2)} (C(s_2) \xrightarrow{\{a,c\}} C(s'_2))$, then $t_2 \xrightarrow{\{a,c\}} \sqrt{(t'_2)} (C(t_2) \xrightarrow{\{a,c\}} C(t'_2))$, we define $f'_2 = f_2[a \mapsto a, c \mapsto c]$, obviously, $(C(s_2), f_2, C(t_2)) \in \sim_{hp}$ and $(C(s'_2), f'_2, C(t'_2)) \in \sim_{hp}$. But, $(C(s_2), f_2, C(t_2)) \in \sim_{hhp}$ and $(C(s'_2), f'_2, C(t'_2)) \in \sim_{hhp}$, just because they are not downward closed. Let $(C(s'_2), f'_2, C(t'_2))$, and $f''_2 = f_2[a \mapsto a]$, $s_2 \xrightarrow{a} s''_2 (C(s_2) \xrightarrow{a} C(s''_2))$, $t_2 \xrightarrow{a} t''_2 (C(t_2) \xrightarrow{a} C(t''_2))$, it is easy to see that $(C(s'_2), f'_2, C(t'_2)) \sqsubseteq (C(s''_2), f''_2, C(t''_2))$ pointwise, while $(C(s'_2), f'_2, C(t'_2)) \notin \sim_{hp}$, because s''_2 and $C(s'_2)$ exist, but t''_2 and $C(t'_2)$ do not exist.

The unsoundness of parallelism modulo hhp-bisimulation equivalence makes the completeness of parallelism modulo hhp-bisimulation equivalence meaningless. Further more, unsoundness of *P7* and *P8* lead to the elimination theorem of *APTC* (see Theorem 4.5) failing, so, the non-existence of normal form also makes the completeness impossible. \square

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

Table 12. 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	$\partial_H(x \parallel y) = \partial_H(x) \parallel \partial_H(y)$

Table 13. Axioms of encapsulation operator

Actually, a finite sound and complete axiomatization for parallel composition \parallel modulo hhp-bisimulation equivalence does not exist, about the axiomatization for hhp-bisimilarity, please refer to section 9 for details.

In following sections, we will discuss nothing about hhp-bisimulation, because the following encapsulation, recursion and abstraction are based on the algebraic laws in this section.

Finally, let us explain the so-called absorption law [18] in a straightforward way. Process term $P = a \parallel (b + c) + a \parallel b + b \parallel (a + c)$, and process term $Q = a \parallel (b + c) + b \parallel (a + c)$, equated by the absorption law.

Modulo \sim_s , \sim_p , and \sim_{hp} , by use of the axioms of *BATC* and *APTC*, we have the following deductions:

$$\begin{aligned} P &= a \parallel (b + c) + a \parallel b + b \parallel (a + c) \\ &\stackrel{P8}{=} a \parallel b + a \parallel c + a \parallel b + b \parallel a + b \parallel c \\ &\stackrel{P2}{=} a \parallel b + a \parallel c + a \parallel b + a \parallel b + b \parallel c \\ &\stackrel{A3}{=} a \parallel b + a \parallel c + b \parallel c \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= a \parallel (b + c) + b \parallel (a + c) \\ &\stackrel{P8}{=} a \parallel b + a \parallel c + b \parallel a + b \parallel c \\ &\stackrel{P2}{=} a \parallel b + a \parallel c + a \parallel b + b \parallel c \\ &\stackrel{A3}{=} a \parallel b + a \parallel c + b \parallel c \end{aligned}$$

It means that $P = Q$ modulo \sim_s , \sim_p , and \sim_{hp} , that is, $P \sim_s Q$, $P \sim_p Q$ and $P \sim_{hp} Q$. But, $P \neq Q$ modulo \sim_{hhp} , which means that $P \not\sim_{hhp} Q$.

4.5. Encapsulation

The mismatch of two communicating events in different parallel branches can cause deadlock, so the deadlocks in the concurrent processes should be eliminated. Like *ACP* [4], we also introduce the unary encapsulation operator ∂_H for set H of atomic events, which renames all atomic events in H into δ . The whole algebra including parallelism for true concurrency in the above subsections, deadlock δ and encapsulation operator ∂_H , is called Algebra for Parallelism in True Concurrency, abbreviated *APTC*.

The transition rules of encapsulation operator ∂_H are shown in Table 12.

Based on the transition rules for encapsulation operator ∂_H in Table 12, we design the axioms as Table 13 shows.

No.	Rewriting Rule
RD1	$e \notin H \quad \partial_H(e) \rightarrow e$
RD2	$e \in H \quad \partial_H(e) \rightarrow \delta$
RD3	$\partial_H(\delta) \rightarrow \delta$
RD4	$\partial_H(x + y) \rightarrow \partial_H(x) + \partial_H(y)$
RD5	$\partial_H(x \cdot y) \rightarrow \partial_H(x) \cdot \partial_H(y)$
RD6	$\partial_H(x \parallel y) \rightarrow \partial_H(x) \parallel \partial_H(y)$

Table 14. Term rewrite system of encapsulation operator ∂_H

The axioms D1 – D3 are the defining laws for the encapsulation operator ∂_H , D1 leaves atomic events outside H unchanged, D2 renames atomic events in H into δ , and D3 says that it leaves δ unchanged. D4 – D6 say that in term $\partial_H(t)$, all transitions of t labeled with atomic events in H are blocked.

Theorem 4.14 (Conservativity of *APTC* with respect to the algebra for parallelism). *APTC is a conservative extension of the algebra for parallelism.*

Proof. It follows from the following two facts (see Theorem 2.8).

1. The transition rules of the algebra for parallelism in the above subsections are all source-dependent;
2. The sources of the transition rules for the encapsulation operator contain an occurrence of ∂_H .

So, *APTC* is a conservative extension of the algebra for parallelism, as desired. \square

Theorem 4.15 (Congruence theorem of encapsulation operator ∂_H). *Truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p , \sim_s , \sim_{hp} and \sim_{hhp} are all congruences with respect to encapsulation operator ∂_H .*

Proof. (1) Case pomset bisimulation equivalence \sim_p .

Let x and y be *APTC* processes, and $x \sim_p y$, it is sufficient to prove that $\partial_H(x) \sim_p \partial_H(y)$.

By the definition of pomset bisimulation \sim_p (Definition 2.17), $x \sim_p y$ means that

$$x \xrightarrow{X} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{Y} y'$$

with $X \subseteq x$, $Y \subseteq y$, $X \sim Y$ and $x' \sim_p y'$.

By the pomset transition rules for encapsulation operator ∂_H in Table 12, we can get

$$\partial_H(x) \xrightarrow{X} \sqrt{(X \not\subseteq H)} \quad \partial_H(y) \xrightarrow{Y} \sqrt{(Y \not\subseteq H)}$$

with $X \subseteq x$, $Y \subseteq y$, and $X \sim Y$, so, we get $\partial_H(x) \sim_p \partial_H(y)$, as desired.

Or, we can get

$$\partial_H(x) \xrightarrow{X} \partial_H(x')(X \not\subseteq H) \quad \partial_H(y) \xrightarrow{Y} \partial_H(y')(Y \not\subseteq H)$$

with $X \subseteq x$, $Y \subseteq y$, $X \sim Y$, $x' \sim_p y'$ and the assumption $\partial_H(x') \sim_p \partial_H(y')$, so, we get $\partial_H(x) \sim_p \partial_H(y)$, as desired.

(2) The cases of step bisimulation \sim_s , hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp} and hhp-bisimulation \sim_{hhp} can be proven similarly, we omit them. \square

Theorem 4.16 (Elimination theorem of *APTC*). *Let p be a closed *APTC* term including the encapsulation operator ∂_H . Then there is a basic *APTC* term q such that $APTC \vdash p = q$.*

Proof. (1) Firstly, suppose that the following ordering on the signature of *APTC* is defined: $\| > \cdot > +$ and the symbol \parallel is given the lexicographical status for the first argument, then for each rewrite rule $p \rightarrow q$ in Table 14 relation $p >_{lpo} q$ can easily be proved. We obtain that the term rewrite system shown in Table 14 is strongly normalizing, for it has finitely many rewriting rules, and $>$ is a well-founded ordering on the signature of *APTC*, and if $s >_{lpo} t$, for each rewriting rule $s \rightarrow t$ is in Table 14 (see Theorem 2.12).

(2) Then we prove that the normal forms of closed *APTC* terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H are basic *APTC* terms.

Suppose that p is a normal form of some closed *APTC* term and suppose that p is not a basic *APTC*

term. Let p' denote the smallest sub-term of p which is not a basic *APTC* term. It implies that each sub-term of p' is a basic *APTC* term. Then we prove that p is not a term in normal form. It is sufficient to induct on the structure of p' , following from Theorem 4.3, we only prove the new case $p' \equiv \partial_H(p_1)$:

- Case $p_1 \equiv e$. The transition rules *RD1* or *RD2* can be applied, so p is not a normal form;
- Case $p_1 \equiv \delta$. The transition rules *RD3* can be applied, so p is not a normal form;
- Case $p_1 \equiv p'_1 + p''_1$. The transition rules *RD4* can be applied, so p is not a normal form;
- Case $p_1 \equiv p'_1 \cdot p''_1$. The transition rules *RD5* can be applied, so p is not a normal form;
- Case $p_1 \equiv p'_1 \parallel p''_1$. The transition rules *RD6* can be applied, so p is not a normal form.

□

Theorem 4.17 (Soundness of *APTC* modulo step bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be *APTC* terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H . If $\text{APTC} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_s y$.*

Proof. Since step bisimulation \sim_s is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to the operator ∂_H , we only need to check if each axiom in Table 13 is sound modulo step bisimulation equivalence.

Though transition rules in Table 12 are defined in the flavor of single event, they can be modified into a step (a set of events within which each event is pairwise concurrent), we omit them. If we treat a single event as a step containing just one event, the proof of this soundness theorem does not exist any problem, so we use this way and still use the transition rules in Table 12.

We omit the defining axioms, including axioms *D1*–*D3*, and we only prove the soundness of the non-trivial axioms, including axioms *D4*–*D6*.

- **Axiom *D4*.** Let p, q be *APTC* processes, and $\partial_H(p + q) = \partial_H(p) + \partial_H(q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\partial_H(p + q) \sim_s \partial_H(p) + \partial_H(q)$. By the transition rules for operator $+$ in Table 5 and ∂_H in Table 12, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad (e_1 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p + q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad (e_1 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p) + \partial_H(q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_2 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p + q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_2 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p) + \partial_H(q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad (e_1 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p + q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \partial_H(p')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad (e_1 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p) + \partial_H(q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \partial_H(p')} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_2 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p + q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \partial_H(q')} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_2 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p) + \partial_H(q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \partial_H(q')}
\end{array}$$

So, $\partial_H(p + q) \sim_s \partial_H(p) + \partial_H(q)$, as desired.

- **Axiom *D5*.** Let p, q be *APTC* processes, and $\partial_H(p \cdot q) = \partial_H(p) \cdot \partial_H(q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\partial_H(p \cdot q) \sim_s \partial_H(p) \cdot \partial_H(q)$. By the transition rules for operator \cdot in Table 5 and ∂_H in Table 12, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad (e_1 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p \cdot q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \partial_H(q)} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad (e_1 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p) \cdot \partial_H(q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \partial_H(q)} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad (e_1 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p \cdot q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \partial_H(p' \cdot q)} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad (e_1 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p) \cdot \partial_H(q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \partial_H(p') \cdot \partial_H(q)}
\end{array}$$

So, with the assumption $\partial_H(p' \cdot q) = \partial_H(p') \cdot \partial_H(q)$, $\partial_H(p \cdot q) \sim_s \partial_H(p) \cdot \partial_H(q)$, as desired.

- **Axiom *D6*.** Let p, q be *APTC* processes, and $\partial_H(p \parallel q) = \partial_H(p) \parallel \partial_H(q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\partial_H(p \parallel q) \sim_s \partial_H(p) \parallel \partial_H(q)$. By the transition rules for operator \parallel in Table 7 and ∂_H in Table 12, we get

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_1, e_2 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \surd} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_1, e_2 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p) \parallel \partial_H(q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \surd}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_1, e_2 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \partial_H(p')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_1, e_2 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p) \parallel \partial_H(q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \partial_H(p')} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1, e_2 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \partial_H(q')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1, e_2 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p) \parallel \partial_H(q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \partial_H(q')} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1, e_2 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \partial_H(p' \bowtie q')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1, e_2 \notin H)}{\partial_H(p) \parallel \partial_H(q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \partial_H(p') \bowtie \partial_H(q')}
\end{array}$$

So, with the assumption $\partial_H(p' \bowtie q') = \partial_H(p') \bowtie \partial_H(q')$, $\partial_H(p \parallel q) \sim_s \partial_H(p) \parallel \partial_H(q)$, as desired. \square

Theorem 4.18 (Completeness of *APTC* modulo step bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed *APTC* terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H , if $p \sim_s q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. Firstly, by the elimination theorem of *APTC* (see Theorem 4.16), we know that the normal form of *APTC* does not contain ∂_H , and for each closed *APTC* term p , there exists a closed basic *APTC* term p' , such that $\text{APTC} \vdash p = p'$, so, we only need to consider closed basic *APTC* terms.

Similarly to Theorem 4.8, we can prove that for normal forms n and n' , if $n \sim_s n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$.

Finally, let s and t be basic *APTC* terms, and $s \sim_s t$, there are normal forms n and n' , such that $s = n$ and $t = n'$. The soundness theorem of *APTC* modulo step bisimulation equivalence (see Theorem 4.17) yields $s \sim_s n$ and $t \sim_s n'$, so $n \sim_s s \sim_s t \sim_s n'$. Since if $n \sim_s n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$, $s = n =_{AC} n' = t$, as desired. \square

Theorem 4.19 (Soundness of *APTC* modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be *APTC* terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H . If $\text{APTC} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_p y$.*

Proof. Since pomset bisimulation \sim_p is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to the operator ∂_H , we only need to check if each axiom in Table 13 is sound modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence.

From the definition of pomset bisimulation (see Definition 2.17), we know that pomset bisimulation is defined by pomset transitions, which are labeled by pomsets. In a pomset transition, the events in the pomset are either within causality relations (defined by \cdot) or in concurrency (implicitly defined by \cdot and $+$, and explicitly defined by \bowtie), of course, they are pairwise consistent (without conflicts). In Theorem 4.17, we have already proven the case that all events are pairwise concurrent, so, we only need to prove the case of events in causality. Without loss of generality, we take a pomset of $P = \{e_1, e_2 : e_1 \cdot e_2\}$. Then the pomset transition labeled by the above P is just composed of one single event transition labeled by e_1 succeeded by another single event transition labeled by e_2 , that is, $\xrightarrow{P} = \xrightarrow{e_1} \xrightarrow{e_2}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of *APTC* modulo step bisimulation equivalence (see Theorem 4.17), we can prove that each axiom in Table 13 is sound modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence, we omit them. \square

Theorem 4.20 (Completeness of *APTC* modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed *APTC* terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H , if $p \sim_p q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. Firstly, by the elimination theorem of *APTC* (see Theorem 4.16), we know that the normal form of *APTC* does not contain ∂_H , and for each closed *APTC* term p , there exists a closed basic *APTC* term p' , such that $\text{APTC} \vdash p = p'$, so, we only need to consider closed basic *APTC* terms.

Similarly to Theorem 4.18, we can prove that for normal forms n and n' , if $n \sim_p n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$.

Finally, let s and t be basic *APTC* terms, and $s \sim_p t$, there are normal forms n and n' , such that $s = n$ and $t = n'$. The soundness theorem of *APTC* modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence (see Theorem 4.19) yields $s \sim_p n$ and $t \sim_p n'$, so $n \sim_p s \sim_p t \sim_p n'$. Since if $n \sim_p n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$, $s = n =_{AC} n' = t$, as desired. \square

Theorem 4.21 (Soundness of *APTC* modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let x and y be *APTC* terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H . If $\text{APTC} \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{hp} y$.*

Proof. Since hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to the operator ∂_H , we only need to check if each axiom in Table 13 is sound modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence.

From the definition of hp-bisimulation (see Definition 2.21), we know that hp-bisimulation is defined on

the posetal product $(C_1, f, C_2), f : C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ isomorphism. Two process terms s related to C_1 and t related to C_2 , and $f : C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ isomorphism. Initially, $(C_1, f, C_2) = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, and $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in \sim_{hp}$. When $s \xrightarrow{e} s'$ ($C_1 \xrightarrow{e} C'_1$), there will be $t \xrightarrow{e} t'$ ($C_2 \xrightarrow{e} C'_2$), and we define $f' = f[e \mapsto e]$. Then, if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in \sim_{hp}$, then $(C'_1, f', C'_2) \in \sim_{hp}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of *APTC* modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence (see Theorem 4.19), we can prove that each axiom in Table 13 is sound modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence, we just need additionally to check the above conditions on hp-bisimulation, we omit them. \square

Theorem 4.22 (Completeness of *APTC* modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence). *Let p and q be closed *APTC* terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H , if $p \sim_{hp} q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. Firstly, by the elimination theorem of *APTC* (see Theorem 4.16), we know that the normal form of *APTC* does not contain ∂_H , and for each closed *APTC* term p , there exists a closed basic *APTC* term p' , such that $APTC \vdash p = p'$, so, we only need to consider closed basic *APTC* terms.

Similarly to Theorem 4.20, we can prove that for normal forms n and n' , if $n \sim_{hp} n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$.

Finally, let s and t be basic *APTC* terms, and $s \sim_{hp} t$, there are normal forms n and n' , such that $s = n$ and $t = n'$. The soundness theorem of *APTC* modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence (see Theorem 4.21) yields $s \sim_{hp} n$ and $t \sim_{hp} n'$, so $n \sim_{hp} s \sim_{hp} t \sim_{hp} n'$. Since if $n \sim_{hp} n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$, $s = n =_{AC} n' = t$, as desired. \square

5. Recursion

In this section, we introduce recursion to capture infinite processes based on *APTC*. Since in *APTC*, there are three 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.

5.1. Guarded Recursive Specifications

Definition 5.1 (Recursive specification). *A recursive specification is a finite set of recursive equations*

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

...

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

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 *APTC* with possible occurrences of the recursion variables X_1, \dots, X_n .

Definition 5.2 (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 truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences $\sim_s(\sim_p, \sim_{hp})$) if $p_i \sim_s(\sim_p, \sim_{hp}) t_i(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.*

Definition 5.3 (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 *APTC* and replacing recursion variables by the right-hand sides of their recursive equations,

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

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

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

Table 15. Transition rules of guarded recursion

Definition 5.4 (Linear recursive specification). *A recursive specification is linear if its recursive equations are of the form*

$$(a_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{1i_1})X_1 + \dots + (a_{k1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{ki_k})X_k + (b_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{1j_1}) + \dots + (b_{l_{j_1}} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{j_l}})$$

where $a_{11}, \dots, a_{1i_1}, a_{k1}, \dots, a_{ki_k}, b_{11}, \dots, b_{1j_1}, b_{l_{j_1}}, \dots, b_{l_{j_l}} \in \mathbb{E}$, 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

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

...

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

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 15.

Theorem 5.5 (Conservativity of *APTC* with guarded recursion). *APTC with guarded recursion is a conservative extension of *APTC*.*

Proof. Since the transition rules of *APTC* are source-dependent, and the transition rules for guarded recursion in Table 15 contain only a fresh constant in their source, so the transition rules of *APTC* with guarded recursion are a conservative extension of those of *APTC*. \square

Theorem 5.6 (Congruence theorem of *APTC* with guarded recursion). *Truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p , \sim_s and \sim_{hp} are all congruences with respect to *APTC* with 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 *APTC* and replacing recursion variables by the right-hand sides of their recursive equations;
2. truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p , \sim_s and \sim_{hp} are all congruences with respect to all operators of *APTC*.

\square

5.2. Recursive Definition and Specification Principles

The *RDP* (Recursive Definition Principle) and the *RSP* (Recursive Specification Principle) are shown in Table 16.

RDP follows immediately from the two transition rules for guarded recursion, which express that $\langle X_i|E \rangle$ and $t_i(\langle X_1|E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n|E \rangle)$ have the same initial transitions for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. *RSP* follows from the fact that guarded recursive specifications have only one solution.

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 16. Recursive definition and specification principle

Theorem 5.7 (Elimination theorem of *APTC* with linear recursion). *Each process term in *APTC* with linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with E a linear recursive specification.*

Proof. By applying structural induction with respect to term size, each process term t_1 in *APTC* with linear recursion generates a process can be expressed in the form of equations

$$t_i = (a_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{i1i_1})t_{i1} + \dots + (a_{ik_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{ik_i i_k})t_{ik_i} + (b_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{i1i_1}) + \dots + (b_{il_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{il_i i_l})$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let the linear recursive specification E consist of the recursive equations

$$X_i = (a_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{i1i_1})X_{i1} + \dots + (a_{ik_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{ik_i i_k})X_{ik_i} + (b_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{i1i_1}) + \dots + (b_{il_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{il_i i_l})$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Replacing X_i by t_i for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ is a solution for E , *RSP* yields $t_1 = \langle X_1 | E \rangle$. \square

Theorem 5.8 (Soundness of *APTC* with guarded recursion). *Let x and y be *APTC* with guarded recursion terms. If *APTC* with guarded recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \sim_s y$;
2. $x \sim_p y$;
3. $x \sim_{hp} y$.

Proof. (1) Soundness of *APTC* with guarded recursion with respect to step bisimulation \sim_s .

Since step bisimulation \sim_s is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to *APTC* with guarded recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 16 is sound modulo step bisimulation equivalence.

Though transition rules in Table 15 are defined in the flavor of single event, they can be modified into a step (a set of events within which each event is pairwise concurrent), we omit them. If we treat a single event as a step containing just one event, the proof of this soundness theorem does not exist any problem, so we use this way and still use the transition rules in Table 15.

- *RDP*. $\langle X_i | E \rangle = t_i(\langle X_1 | E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n | E \rangle) \quad (i \in \{1, \dots, n\})$, it is sufficient to prove that $\langle X_i | E \rangle \sim_s t_i(\langle X_1 | E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n | E \rangle) \quad (i \in \{1, \dots, n\})$. By the transition rules for guarded recursion in Table 15, we get

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

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

So, $\langle X_i | E \rangle \sim_s t_i(\langle X_1 | E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n | E \rangle) \quad (i \in \{1, \dots, n\})$, as desired.

- *RSP*. if $y_i = t_i(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then $y_i = \langle X_i | E \rangle \quad (i \in \{1, \dots, n\})$, it is sufficient to prove that if $y_i = t_i(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then $y_i \sim_s \langle X_i | E \rangle \quad (i \in \{1, \dots, n\})$. By the transition rules for guarded recursion in Table 15, we get

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

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{t_i(\langle X_1|E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n|E \rangle) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \surd}{y_i \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \surd} \\
\\
\frac{t_i(\langle X_1|E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n|E \rangle) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} y}{\langle X_i|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} y} \\
\\
\frac{t_i(\langle X_1|E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n|E \rangle) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} y}{y_i \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} y}
\end{array}$$

So, if $y_i = t_i(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then $y_i \sim_s \langle X_i|E \rangle$ ($i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$), as desired.

(2) Soundness of *APTC* with guarded recursion with respect to pomset bisimulation \sim_p .

Since pomset bisimulation \sim_p is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to the guarded recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 16 is sound modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence.

From the definition of pomset bisimulation (see Definition 2.17), we know that pomset bisimulation is defined by pomset transitions, which are labeled by pomsets. In a pomset transition, the events in the pomset are either within causality relations (defined by \cdot) or in concurrency (implicitly defined by \cdot and $+$, and explicitly defined by \mathbb{I}), of course, they are pairwise consistent (without conflicts). In (1), we have already proven the case that all events are pairwise concurrent, so, we only need to prove the case of events in causality. Without loss of generality, we take a pomset of $P = \{e_1, e_2 : e_1 \cdot e_2\}$. Then the pomset transition labeled by the above P is just composed of one single event transition labeled by e_1 succeeded by another single event transition labeled by e_2 , that is, $\xrightarrow{P} = \xrightarrow{e_1} \xrightarrow{e_2}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of *APTC* with guarded recursion modulo step bisimulation equivalence (1), we can prove that each axiom in Table 16 is sound modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence, we omit them.

(3) Soundness of *APTC* with guarded recursion with respect to hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp} .

Since hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to guarded recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 16 is sound modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence.

From the definition of hp-bisimulation (see Definition 2.21), we know that hp-bisimulation is defined on the posetal product (C_1, f, C_2) , $f : C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ isomorphism. Two process terms s related to C_1 and t related to C_2 , and $f : C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ isomorphism. Initially, $(C_1, f, C_2) = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, and $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in \sim_{hp}$. When $s \xrightarrow{e} s'$ ($C_1 \xrightarrow{e} C'_1$), there will be $t \xrightarrow{e} t'$ ($C_2 \xrightarrow{e} C'_2$), and we define $f' = f[e \mapsto e]$. Then, if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in \sim_{hp}$, then $(C'_1, f', C'_2) \in \sim_{hp}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of *APTC* with guarded recursion modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence (2), we can prove that each axiom in Table 16 is sound modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence, we just need additionally to check the above conditions on hp-bisimulation, we omit them. \square

Theorem 5.9 (Completeness of *APTC* with linear recursion). *Let p and q be closed *APTC* with linear recursion terms, then,*

1. *if $p \sim_s q$ then $p = q$;*
2. *if $p \sim_p q$ then $p = q$;*
3. *if $p \sim_{hp} q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. Firstly, by the elimination theorem of *APTC* with guarded recursion (see Theorem 5.7), we know that each process term in *APTC* with linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1|E \rangle$ with E a linear recursive specification.

It remains to prove the following cases.

(1) If $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle \sim_s \langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle$ for linear recursive specification E_1 and E_2 , then $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle$.

Let E_1 consist of recursive equations $X = t_X$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and E_2 consists of recursion equations $Y = t_Y$ for $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Let the linear recursive specification E consist of recursion equations $Z_{XY} = t_{XY}$, and $\langle X|E_1 \rangle \sim_s \langle Y|E_2 \rangle$, and t_{XY} consists of the following summands:

$$\frac{x \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \sqrt{\quad}}{\pi_{n+1}(x) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \sqrt{\quad}} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} x'}{\pi_{n+1}(x) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \pi_n(x')}$$

Table 17. Transition rules of encapsulation operator ∂_H

No.	Axiom
PR1	$\pi_n(x + y) = \pi_n(x) + \pi_n(y)$
PR2	$\pi_n(x \parallel y) = \pi_n(x) \parallel \pi_n(y)$
PR3	$\pi_{n+1}(e_1 \parallel \dots \parallel e_k) = e_1 \parallel \dots \parallel e_k$
PR4	$\pi_{n+1}((e_1 \parallel \dots \parallel e_k) \cdot x) = (e_1 \parallel \dots \parallel e_k) \cdot \pi_n(x)$
PR5	$\pi_0(x) = \delta$
PR6	$\pi_n(\delta) = \delta$

Table 18. Axioms of projection operator

1. t_{XY} contains a summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)Z_{X'Y'}$ iff t_X contains the summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)X'$ and t_Y contains the summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)Y'$ such that $\langle X'|E_1 \rangle \sim_s \langle Y'|E_2 \rangle$;
2. t_{XY} contains a summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$ iff t_X contains the summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$ and t_Y contains the summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$.

Let σ map recursion variable X in E_1 to $\langle X|E_1 \rangle$, and let ψ map recursion variable Z_{XY} in E to $\langle X|E_1 \rangle$. So, $\sigma((a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)X') \equiv (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)\langle X'|E_1 \rangle \equiv \psi((a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)Z_{X'Y'})$, so by *RD*P, we get $\langle X|E_1 \rangle = \sigma(t_X) = \psi(t_{XY})$. Then by *RSP*, $\langle X|E_1 \rangle = \langle Z_{XY}|E \rangle$, particularly, $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle = \langle Z_{X_1Y_1}|E \rangle$. Similarly, we can obtain $\langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle = \langle Z_{X_1Y_1}|E \rangle$. Finally, $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle = \langle Z_{X_1Y_1}|E \rangle = \langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle$, as desired.

(2) If $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle \sim_p \langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle$ for linear recursive specification E_1 and E_2 , then $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle$.

It can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it.

(3) If $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle \sim_{hp} \langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle$ for linear recursive specification E_1 and E_2 , then $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle$.

It can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it. \square

5.3. Approximation Induction Principle

In this subsection, we introduce approximation induction principle (*AIP*) and try to explain that *AIP* is still valid in true concurrency. *AIP* can be used to try and equate truly concurrent bisimilar guarded recursive specifications. *AIP* says that if two process terms are truly concurrent bisimilar up to any finite depth, then they are truly concurrent bisimilar.

Also, we need the auxiliary unary projection operator π_n for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{N} \triangleq \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. The transition rules of π_n are expressed in Table 17.

Based on the transition rules for projection operator π_n in Table 17, we design the axioms as Table 18 shows.

The axioms *PR1* – *PR2* say that $\pi_n(s + t)$ and $\pi_n(s \parallel t)$ can execute transitions of s and t up to depth n . *PR3* says that $\pi_{n+1}(e_1 \parallel \dots \parallel e_k)$ executes $\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$ and terminates successfully. *PR4* says that $\pi_{n+1}((e_1 \parallel \dots \parallel e_k) \cdot t)$ executes $\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$ and then executes transitions of t up to depth n . *PR5* and *PR6* say that $\pi_0(t)$ and $\pi_n(\delta)$ exhibit no actions.

Theorem 5.10 (Conservativity of *APTC* with projection operator and guarded recursion). *APTC with projection operator and guarded recursion is a conservative extension of APTC with guarded recursion.*

Proof. It follows from the following two facts (see Theorem 2.8).

1. The transition rules of *APTC* with guarded recursion are all source-dependent;
2. The sources of the transition rules for the projection operator contain an occurrence of π_n .

\square

Theorem 5.11 (Congruence theorem of projection operator π_n). *Truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p , \sim_s , \sim_{hp} and \sim_{hhp} are all congruences with respect to projection operator π_n .*

Proof. (1) Case pomset bisimulation equivalence \sim_p .

Let x and y be *APTC* with projection operator and guarded recursion processes, and $x \sim_p y$, it is sufficient to prove that $\pi_{n+1}(x) \sim_p \pi_{n+1}(y)$.

By the definition of pomset bisimulation \sim_p (Definition 2.17), $x \sim_p y$ means that

$$x \xrightarrow{X} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{Y} y'$$

with $X \subseteq x$, $Y \subseteq y$, $X \sim Y$ and $x' \sim_p y'$.

By the pomset transition rules for projection operator π_n in Table 17, we can get

$$\pi_{n+1}(x) \xrightarrow{X} \sqrt{\quad} \quad \pi_{n+1}(y) \xrightarrow{Y} \sqrt{\quad}$$

with $X \subseteq x$, $Y \subseteq y$, and $X \sim Y$, so, we get $\pi_{n+1}(x) \sim_p \pi_{n+1}(y)$, as desired.

Or, we can get

$$\pi_{n+1}(x) \xrightarrow{X} \pi_n(x') \quad \pi_{n+1}(y) \xrightarrow{Y} \pi_n(y')$$

with $X \subseteq x$, $Y \subseteq y$, $X \sim Y$, $x' \sim_p y'$ and the assumption $\pi_n(x') \sim_p \pi_n(y')$, so, we get $\pi_{n+1}(x) \sim_p \pi_{n+1}(y)$, as desired.

(2) The cases of step bisimulation \sim_s , hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp} and hhp-bisimulation \sim_{hhp} can be proven similarly, we omit them. \square

Theorem 5.12 (Elimination theorem of *APTC* with linear recursion and projection operator). *Each process term in *APTC* with linear recursion and projection operator is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with E a linear recursive specification.*

Proof. By applying structural induction with respect to term size, each process term t_1 in *APTC* with linear recursion and projection operator π_n generates a process can be expressed in the form of equations

$$t_i = (a_{i11} \parallel \cdots \parallel a_{i1i_1})t_{i1} + \cdots + (a_{ik_i1} \parallel \cdots \parallel a_{ik_i i_k})t_{ik_i} + (b_{i11} \parallel \cdots \parallel b_{i1i_1}) + \cdots + (b_{il_i1} \parallel \cdots \parallel b_{il_i i_l})$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let the linear recursive specification E consist of the recursive equations

$$X_i = (a_{i11} \parallel \cdots \parallel a_{i1i_1})X_{i1} + \cdots + (a_{ik_i1} \parallel \cdots \parallel a_{ik_i i_k})X_{ik_i} + (b_{i11} \parallel \cdots \parallel b_{i1i_1}) + \cdots + (b_{il_i1} \parallel \cdots \parallel b_{il_i i_l})$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Replacing X_i by t_i for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ is a solution for E , *RSP* yields $t_1 = \langle X_1 | E \rangle$.

That is, in E , there is not the occurrence of projection operator π_n . \square

Theorem 5.13 (Soundness of *APTC* with projection operator and guarded recursion). *Let x and y be *APTC* with projection operator and guarded recursion terms. If *APTC* with projection operator and guarded recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \sim_s y$;
2. $x \sim_p y$;
3. $x \sim_{hp} y$.

Proof. (1) Soundness of *APTC* with projection operator and guarded recursion with respect to step bisimulation \sim_s .

Since step bisimulation \sim_s is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to *APTC* with projection operator and guarded recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 18 is sound modulo step bisimulation equivalence.

Though transition rules in Table 17 are defined in the flavor of single event, they can be modified into a step (a set of events within which each event is pairwise concurrent), we omit them. If we treat a single event as a step containing just one event, the proof of this soundness theorem does not exist any problem, so we use this way and still use the transition rules in Table 17.

We only prove the soundness of the non-trivial axioms *PR1*, *PR2* and *PR4*.

- **Axiom PR1.** Let p and q be *APTC* with guarded recursion and projection operator processes. $\pi_n(p+q) = \pi_n(p) + \pi_n(q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\pi_n(p+q) \sim_s \pi_n(p) + \pi_n(q)$. By the transition rules for projection operator π_n in Table 17 and $+$ in Table 5, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \checkmark}{\pi_{n+1}(p+q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \checkmark}{\pi_{n+1}(p) + \pi_{n+1}(q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \checkmark} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{\{e'_1, \dots, e'_k\}} \checkmark}{\pi_{n+1}(p+q) \xrightarrow{\{e'_1, \dots, e'_k\}} \checkmark} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{\{e'_1, \dots, e'_k\}} \checkmark}{\pi_{n+1}(p) + \pi_{n+1}(q) \xrightarrow{\{e'_1, \dots, e'_k\}} \checkmark} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} p'}{\pi_{n+1}(p+q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \pi_n(p')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} p'}{\pi_{n+1}(p) + \pi_{n+1}(q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \pi_n(p')} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{\{e'_1, \dots, e'_k\}} q'}{\pi_{n+1}(p+q) \xrightarrow{\{e'_1, \dots, e'_k\}} \pi_n(q')} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{\{e'_1, \dots, e'_k\}} q'}{\pi_{n+1}(p) + \pi_{n+1}(q) \xrightarrow{\{e'_1, \dots, e'_k\}} \pi_n(q')}
\end{array}$$

, we get

So, $\pi_n(p+q) \sim_s \pi_n(p) + \pi_n(q)$, as desired.

- **Axiom PR2.** Let p, q be *APTC* with guarded recursion and projection operator processes, and $\pi_n(p \parallel q) = \pi_n(p) \parallel \pi_n(q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\pi_n(p \parallel q) \sim_s \pi_n(p) \parallel \pi_n(q)$. By the transition rules for operator \parallel in Table 7 and π_n in Table 17, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{\pi_{n+1}(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{\pi_{n+1}(p) \parallel \pi_{n+1}(q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \checkmark} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{\pi_{n+1}(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \pi_n(p')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{\pi_{n+1}(p) \parallel \pi_{n+1}(q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \pi_n(p')} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\pi_{n+1}(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \pi_n(q')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\pi_{n+1}(p) \parallel \pi_{n+1}(q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \pi_n(q')} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\pi_{n+1}(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \pi_n(p' \bowtie q')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\pi_{n+1}(p) \parallel \pi_{n+1}(q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \pi_n(p') \bowtie \pi_n(q')}
\end{array}$$

So, with the assumption $\pi_n(p' \bowtie q') = \pi_n(p') \bowtie \pi_n(q')$, $\pi_n(p \parallel q) \sim_s \pi_n(p) \parallel \pi_n(q)$, as desired.

- **Axiom PR4.** Let p be an *APTC* with guarded recursion and projection operator process, and $\pi_{n+1}(e \cdot p) = e \cdot \pi_n(p)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\pi_{n+1}(e \cdot p) \sim_s e \cdot \pi_n(p)$. By the transition rules for operator \cdot in Table 5 and π_n in Table 17, we get

$$\frac{e_1 \parallel \dots \parallel e_k \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \checkmark}{\pi_{n+1}((e_1 \parallel \dots \parallel e_k) \cdot p) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \pi_n(p)} \quad \frac{e_1 \parallel \dots \parallel e_k \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \checkmark}{(e_1 \parallel \dots \parallel e_k) \cdot \pi_n(p) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \pi_n(p)}$$

So, $\pi_{n+1}(e \cdot p) \sim_s e \cdot \pi_n(p)$, as desired.

(2) Soundness of *APTC* with guarded recursion and projection operator with respect to pomset bisimulation \sim_p .

Since pomset bisimulation \sim_p is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to *APTC* with guarded recursion and projection operator, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 18 is sound modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence.

No.	Axiom
<i>AIP</i>	if $\pi_n(x) = \pi_n(y)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $x = y$

Table 19. *AIP*

From the definition of pomset bisimulation (see Definition 2.17), we know that pomset bisimulation is defined by pomset transitions, which are labeled by pomsets. In a pomset transition, the events in the pomset are either within causality relations (defined by \cdot) or in concurrency (implicitly defined by \cdot and $+$, and explicitly defined by \parallel), of course, they are pairwise consistent (without conflicts). In (1), we have already proven the case that all events are pairwise concurrent, so, we only need to prove the case of events in causality. Without loss of generality, we take a pomset of $P = \{e_1, e_2 : e_1 \cdot e_2\}$. Then the pomset transition labeled by the above P is just composed of one single event transition labeled by e_1 succeeded by another single event transition labeled by e_2 , that is, $\xrightarrow{P} = \xrightarrow{e_1} \xrightarrow{e_2}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of *APTC* with guarded recursion and projection operator modulo step bisimulation equivalence (1), we can prove that each axiom in Table 18 is sound modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence, we omit them.

(3) Soundness of *APTC* with guarded recursion and projection operator with respect to hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp} .

Since hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to *APTC* with guarded recursion and projection operator, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 18 is sound modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence.

From the definition of hp-bisimulation (see Definition 2.21), we know that hp-bisimulation is defined on the posetal product (C_1, f, C_2) , $f : C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ isomorphism. Two process terms s related to C_1 and t related to C_2 , and $f : C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ isomorphism. Initially, $(C_1, f, C_2) = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, and $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in \sim_{hp}$. When $s \xrightarrow{e} s'$ ($C_1 \xrightarrow{e} C'_1$), there will be $t \xrightarrow{e} t'$ ($C_2 \xrightarrow{e} C'_2$), and we define $f' = f[e \mapsto e]$. Then, if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in \sim_{hp}$, then $(C'_1, f', C'_2) \in \sim_{hp}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of *APTC* with guarded recursion and projection operator modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence (2), we can prove that each axiom in Table 18 is sound modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence, we just need additionally to check the above conditions on hp-bisimulation, we omit them. \square

Then *AIP* is given in Table 19.

Theorem 5.14 (Soundness of *AIP*). *Let x and y be *APTC* with projection operator and guarded recursion terms.*

1. If $\pi_n(x) \sim_s \pi_n(y)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $x \sim_s y$;
2. If $\pi_n(x) \sim_p \pi_n(y)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $x \sim_p y$;
3. If $\pi_n(x) \sim_{hp} \pi_n(y)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $x \sim_{hp} y$.

Proof. (1) If $\pi_n(x) \sim_s \pi_n(y)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $x \sim_s y$.

Since step bisimulation \sim_s is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to *APTC* with guarded recursion and projection operator, we only need to check if *AIP* in Table 19 is sound modulo step bisimulation equivalence.

Let p, p_0 and q, q_0 be closed *APTC* with projection operator and guarded recursion terms such that $\pi_n(p_0) \sim_s \pi_n(q_0)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We define a relation R such that pRq iff $\pi_n(p) \sim_s \pi_n(q)$. Obviously, p_0Rq_0 , next, we prove that $R \in \sim_s$.

Let pRq and $p \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \checkmark$, then $\pi_1(p) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \checkmark$, $\pi_1(p) \sim_s \pi_1(q)$ yields $\pi_1(q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \checkmark$. Similarly, $q \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \checkmark$ implies $p \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \checkmark$.

Let pRq and $p \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} p'$. We define the set of process terms

$$S_n \triangleq \{q' | q \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} q' \text{ and } \pi_n(p') \sim_s \pi_n(q')\}$$

1. Since $\pi_{n+1}(p) \sim_s \pi_{n+1}(q)$ and $\pi_{n+1}(p) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \pi_n(p')$, there exist q' such that $\pi_{n+1}(q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \pi_n(q')$ and $\pi_n(p') \sim_s \pi_n(q')$. So, S_n is not empty.
2. There are only finitely many q' such that $q \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} q'$, so, S_n is finite.
3. $\pi_{n+1}(p) \sim_s \pi_{n+1}(q)$ implies $\pi_n(p') \sim_s \pi_n(q')$, so $S_n \supseteq S_{n+1}$.

So, S_n has a non-empty intersection, and let q' be in this intersection, then $q \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} q'$ and $\pi_n(p') \sim_s \pi_n(q')$, so $p'Rq'$. Similarly, let pq , we can obtain $q \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} q'$ implies $p \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} p'$ such that $p'Rq'$.

Finally, $R \in_s$ and $p_0 \sim_s q_0$, as desired.

(2) If $\pi_n(x) \sim_p \pi_n(y)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $x \sim_p y$.

Since pomset bisimulation \sim_p is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to *APTC* with guarded recursion and projection operator, we only need to check if *AIP* in Table 19 is sound modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence.

From the definition of pomset bisimulation (see Definition 2.17), we know that pomset bisimulation is defined by pomset transitions, which are labeled by pomsets. In a pomset transition, the events in the pomset are either within causality relations (defined by \cdot) or in concurrency (implicitly defined by \cdot and $+$, and explicitly defined by \mathbb{I}), of course, they are pairwise consistent (without conflicts). In (1), we have already proven the case that all events are pairwise concurrent, so, we only need to prove the case of events in causality. Without loss of generality, we take a pomset of $P = \{e_1, e_2 : e_1 \cdot e_2\}$. Then the pomset transition labeled by the above P is just composed of one single event transition labeled by e_1 succeeded by another single event transition labeled by e_2 , that is, $\xrightarrow{P} = \xrightarrow{e_1} \xrightarrow{e_2}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of *AIP* modulo step bisimulation equivalence (1), we can prove that *AIP* in Table 19 is sound modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence, we omit them.

(3) If $\pi_n(x) \sim_{hp} \pi_n(y)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $x \sim_{hp} y$.

Since hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to *APTC* with guarded recursion and projection operator, we only need to check if *AIP* in Table 19 is sound modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence.

From the definition of hp-bisimulation (see Definition 2.21), we know that hp-bisimulation is defined on the posetal product (C_1, f, C_2) , $f : C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ isomorphism. Two process terms s related to C_1 and t related to C_2 , and $f : C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ isomorphism. Initially, $(C_1, f, C_2) = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, and $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in_{hp}$. When $s \xrightarrow{e} s'$ ($C_1 \xrightarrow{e} C'_1$), there will be $t \xrightarrow{e} t'$ ($C_2 \xrightarrow{e} C'_2$), and we define $f' = f[e \mapsto e]$. Then, if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in_{hp}$, then $(C'_1, f', C'_2) \in_{hp}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of *AIP* modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence (2), we can prove that *AIP* in Table 19 is sound modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence, we just need additionally to check the above conditions on hp-bisimulation, we omit them. \square

Theorem 5.15 (Completeness of *AIP*). *Let p and q be closed *APTC* with linear recursion and projection operator terms, then,*

1. if $p \sim_s q$ then $\pi_n(p) = \pi_n(q)$;
2. if $p \sim_p q$ then $\pi_n(p) = \pi_n(q)$;
3. if $p \sim_{hp} q$ then $\pi_n(p) = \pi_n(q)$.

Proof. Firstly, by the elimination theorem of *APTC* with guarded recursion and projection operator (see Theorem 5.12), we know that each process term in *APTC* with linear recursion and projection operator is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with E a linear recursive specification:

$$X_i = (a_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{i1i_1})X_{i1} + \dots + (a_{ik_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{ik_i i_k})X_{ik_i} + (b_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{i1i_1}) + \dots + (b_{il_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{il_i i_l})$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

It remains to prove the following cases.

(1) if $p \sim_s q$ then $\pi_n(p) = \pi_n(q)$.

Let $p \sim_s q$, and fix an $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there are p', q' in basic *APTC* terms such that $p' = \pi_n(p)$ and $q' = \pi_n(q)$. Since \sim_s is a congruence with respect to *APTC*, if $p \sim_s q$ then $\pi_n(p) \sim_s \pi_n(q)$. The soundness theorem yields

$$\frac{\tau}{\tau \rightarrow \surd}$$

Table 20. Transition rule of the silent step

$p' \sim_s \pi_n(p) \sim_s \pi_n(q) \sim_s q'$. Finally, the completeness of $APTC$ modulo \sim_s (see Theorem 4.17) ensures $p' = q'$, and $\pi_n(p) = p' = q' = \pi_n(q)$, as desired.

(2) if $p \sim_p q$ then $\pi_n(p) = \pi_n(q)$.

Let $p \sim_p q$, and fix an $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there are p', q' in basic $APTC$ terms such that $p' = \pi_n(p)$ and $q' = \pi_n(q)$. Since \sim_p is a congruence with respect to $APTC$, if $p \sim_p q$ then $\pi_n(p) \sim_p \pi_n(q)$. The soundness theorem yields $p' \sim_p \pi_n(p) \sim_p \pi_n(q) \sim_p q'$. Finally, the completeness of $APTC$ modulo \sim_p (see Theorem 4.19) ensures $p' = q'$, and $\pi_n(p) = p' = q' = \pi_n(q)$, as desired.

(3) if $p \sim_{hp} q$ then $\pi_n(p) = \pi_n(q)$.

Let $p \sim_{hp} q$, and fix an $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there are p', q' in basic $APTC$ terms such that $p' = \pi_n(p)$ and $q' = \pi_n(q)$. Since \sim_{hp} is a congruence with respect to $APTC$, if $p \sim_{hp} q$ then $\pi_n(p) \sim_{hp} \pi_n(q)$. The soundness theorem yields $p' \sim_{hp} \pi_n(p) \sim_{hp} \pi_n(q) \sim_{hp} q'$. Finally, the completeness of $APTC$ modulo \sim_{hp} (see Theorem 4.21) ensures $p' = q'$, and $\pi_n(p) = p' = q' = \pi_n(q)$, as desired. \square

6. 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 $I \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ 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 20. 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 was firstly introduced by Milner in his CCS [3], the algebraic laws about τ were introduced in [1], and finally the axiomatization of τ and τ_I formed a part of ACP [4]. Though τ has been discussed in the interleaving bisimulation background, several years ago, we introduced τ into true concurrency, called weakly true concurrency [16], and also designed its logic based on a uniform logic for true concurrency [14] [15].

In this section, we try to find the algebraic laws of τ and τ_I in true concurrency, or, exactly, to what extent the laws of τ and τ_I in interleaving bisimulation fit the situation of true concurrency.

6.1. Rooted Branching Truly Concurrent Bisimulation Equivalence

In section 2.2, we introduce τ into event structure, and also give the concept of weakly true concurrency. In this subsection, we give the concepts of rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences, based on these concepts, we can design the axiom system of the silent step τ and the abstraction operator τ_I . Similarly to rooted branching bisimulation equivalence, rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences are following.

Definition 6.1 (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 branching pomset bisimulation is a relation $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$, such that:*

1. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow{X} C'_1$ then
 - either $X \equiv \tau^*$, and $(C'_1, C_2) \in R$;
 - or there is a sequence of (zero or more) τ -transitions $C_2 \xrightarrow{\tau^*} C_2^0$, such that $(C_1, C_2^0) \in R$ and $C_2^0 \xrightarrow{X} C'_2$ with $(C'_1, C'_2) \in R$;

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

We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are branching pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{bp} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a branching pomset bisimulation R , such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in R$.

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

Definition 6.2 (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 rooted branching pomset bisimulation is a relation $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$, such that:

1. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow{X} C'_1$ then $C_2 \xrightarrow{X} C'_2$ with $C'_1 \approx_{bp} C'_2$;
2. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R$, and $C_2 \xrightarrow{X} C'_2$ then $C_1 \xrightarrow{X} C'_1$ with $C'_1 \approx_{bp} C'_2$;
3. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R$ and $C_1 \downarrow$, then $C_2 \downarrow$;
4. if $(C_1, C_2) \in R$ and $C_2 \downarrow$, then $C_1 \downarrow$.

We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are rooted branching pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{rbp} \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a rooted branching pomset bisimulation R , such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in R$.

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

Definition 6.3 (Branching (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \surd represent a state with $\surd \downarrow$. A branching history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a weakly posetal relation $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \overline{\times} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ such that:

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

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

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

Definition 6.4 (Rooted branching (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). *Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \surd represent a state with $\surd \downarrow$. A rooted branching history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a weakly posetal relation $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ such that:*

1. *if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R$, and $C_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} C'_1$, then $C_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} C'_2$ with $C'_1 \approx_{bhp} C'_2$;*
2. *if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R$, and $C_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} C'_2$, then $C_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} C'_1$ with $C'_1 \approx_{bhp} C'_2$;*
3. *if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R$ and $C_1 \downarrow$, then $C_2 \downarrow$;*
4. *if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in R$ and $C_2 \downarrow$, then $C_1 \downarrow$.*

$\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are rooted branching history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{rbhp} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a rooted branching hp-bisimulation R such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in R$.

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

6.2. Guarded Linear Recursion

The silent step τ as an atomic event, is introduced into E . Considering the recursive specification $X = \tau X, \tau s$, $\tau \tau s$, 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 5.4) to the guarded one.

Definition 6.5 (Guarded linear recursive specification). *A recursive specification is linear if its recursive equations are of the form*

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

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 6.6 (Conservativity of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion). *APTC with silent step and guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of APTC with linear recursion.*

Proof. Since the transition rules of *APTC* with linear recursion are source-dependent, and the transition rules for silent step in Table 20 contain only a fresh constant τ in their source, so the transition rules of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of those of *APTC* with linear recursion. \square

Theorem 6.7 (Congruence theorem of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbp} , \approx_{rbs} and \approx_{rbhbp} are all congruences with respect to APTC with 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 *APTC* and replacing recursion variables by the right-hand sides of their recursive equations;
2. truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p, \sim_s and \sim_{hp} are all congruences with respect to all operators of *APTC*, while truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p, \sim_s and \sim_{hp} imply the corresponding rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulations $\approx_{rbp}, \approx_{rbs}$ and \approx_{rbhbp} (see Proposition 2.23), so rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulations $\approx_{rbp}, \approx_{rbs}$ and \approx_{rbhbp} are all congruences with respect to all operators of *APTC*;
3. While \mathbb{E} is extended to $\mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\}$, it can be proved that rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulations $\approx_{rbp}, \approx_{rbs}$ and \approx_{rbhbp} are all congruences with respect to all operators of *APTC*, we omit it.

\square

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

Table 21. Axioms of silent step

6.3. Algebraic Laws for the Silent Step

We design the axioms for the silent step τ in Table 21.

The axioms B1, B2 and B3 are the conditions in which τ really keeps silent to act with the operators \cdot , $+$ and \parallel .

Theorem 6.8 (Elimination theorem of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Each process term in *APTC* with 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. By applying structural induction with respect to term size, each process term t_1 in *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion generates a process can be expressed in the form of equations

$$t_i = (a_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{i1i_1})t_{i1} + \dots + (a_{ik_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{ik_i i_k})t_{ik_i} + (b_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{i1i_1}) + \dots + (b_{il_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{il_i i_l})$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let the linear recursive specification E consist of the recursive equations

$$X_i = (a_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{i1i_1})X_{i1} + \dots + (a_{ik_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{ik_i i_k})X_{ik_i} + (b_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{i1i_1}) + \dots + (b_{il_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{il_i i_l})$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Replacing X_i by t_i for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ is a solution for E , *RSP* yields $t_1 = \langle X_1 | E \rangle$. \square

Theorem 6.9 (Soundness of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Let x and y be *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion terms. If *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \approx_{rbs} y$;
2. $x \approx_{rbp} y$;
3. $x \approx_{rbhp} y$.

Proof. (1) Soundness of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion with respect to rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} .

Since rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 21 is sound modulo rooted branching step bisimulation equivalence.

Though transition rules in Table 20 are defined in the flavor of single event, they can be modified into a step (a set of events within which each event is pairwise concurrent), we omit them. If we treat a single event as a step containing just one event, the proof of this soundness theorem does not exist any problem, so we use this way and still use the transition rules in Table 20.

- **Axiom B1.** Assume that $e \cdot \tau = e$, it is sufficient to prove that $e \cdot \tau \approx_{rbs} e$. By the transition rules for operator \cdot in Table 5 and τ in Table 20, we get

$$\frac{e \xrightarrow{e} \sqrt{}}{e \cdot \tau \xrightarrow{e \cdot \tau} \sqrt{}}$$

$$\frac{e \xrightarrow{e} \sqrt{}}{e \xrightarrow{e} \sqrt{}}$$

So, $e \cdot \tau \approx_{rbs} e$, as desired.

- **Axiom B2.** Let p and q be *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion processes, and assume that $e \cdot (\tau \cdot (p + q) + p) = e \cdot (p + q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $e \cdot (\tau \cdot (p + q) + p) \approx_{rbs} e \cdot (p + q)$. By the transition rules for operators \cdot and $+$ in Table 5 and τ in Table 20, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{e \xrightarrow{e} \surd \quad p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{e \cdot (\tau \cdot (p + q) + p) \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd} \\
\\
\frac{e \xrightarrow{e} \surd \quad p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{e \cdot (p + q) \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd} \\
\\
\frac{e \xrightarrow{e} \surd \quad p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{e \cdot (\tau \cdot (p + q) + p) \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{e_1} p'} \\
\\
\frac{e \xrightarrow{e} \surd \quad p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{e \cdot (p + q) \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{e_1} p'} \\
\\
\frac{e \xrightarrow{e} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{e \cdot (\tau \cdot (p + q) + p) \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{\tau} \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd} \\
\\
\frac{e \xrightarrow{e} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{e \cdot (p + q) \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd} \\
\\
\frac{e \xrightarrow{e} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{e \cdot (\tau \cdot (p + q) + p) \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{\tau} \xrightarrow{e_2} q'} \\
\\
\frac{e \xrightarrow{e} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{e \cdot (p + q) \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}
\end{array}$$

So, $e \cdot (\tau \cdot (p + q) + p) \approx_{rbs} e \cdot (p + q)$, as desired.

- **Axiom B3.** Let p be an *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion process, and assume that $p \parallel \tau = p$, it is sufficient to prove that $p \parallel \tau \approx_{rbs} p$. By the transition rules for operator \parallel in Table 7 and τ in Table 20, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e} \surd}{p \parallel \tau \xrightarrow{e} \surd} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e} p'}{p \parallel \tau \xrightarrow{e} p'}
\end{array}$$

So, $p \parallel \tau \approx_{rbs} p$, as desired.

(2) Soundness of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion with respect to rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} .

Since rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 21 is sound modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} .

From the definition of rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} (see Definition 6.2), we know that rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} is defined by weak pomset transitions, which are labeled by pomsets with τ . In a weak pomset transition, the events in the pomset are either within causality relations (defined by \cdot) or in concurrency (implicitly defined by \cdot and $+$, and explicitly defined by \bowtie), of course, they are pairwise consistent (without conflicts). In (1), we have already proven the case that all events are pairwise concurrent, so, we only need to prove the case of events in causality. Without loss of generality, we take a pomset of $P = \{e_1, e_2 : e_1 \cdot e_2\}$. Then the weak pomset transition labeled by the above P is just composed of

one single event transition labeled by e_1 succeeded by another single event transition labeled by e_2 , that is,
 $\xRightarrow{P} \xRightarrow{e_1} \xRightarrow{e_2}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion modulo rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} (1), we can prove that each axiom in Table 21 is sound modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} , we omit them.

(3) Soundness of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion with respect to rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} .

Since rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 21 is sound modulo rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} .

From the definition of rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} (see Definition 6.4), we know that rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} is defined on the weakly posetal product (C_1, f, C_2) , $f: \hat{C}_1 \rightarrow \hat{C}_2$ isomorphism. Two process terms s related to C_1 and t related to C_2 , and $f: \hat{C}_1 \rightarrow \hat{C}_2$ isomorphism. Initially, $(C_1, f, C_2) = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, and $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in \approx_{rbhp}$. When $s \xrightarrow{e} s'$ ($C_1 \xrightarrow{e} C'_1$), there will be $t \xRightarrow{e} t'$ ($C_2 \xRightarrow{e} C'_2$), and we define $f' = f[e \mapsto e]$. Then, if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in \approx_{rbhp}$, then $(C'_1, f', C'_2) \in \approx_{rbhp}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation equivalence (2), we can prove that each axiom in Table 21 is sound modulo rooted branching hp-bisimulation equivalence, we just need additionally to check the above conditions on rooted branching hp-bisimulation, we omit them. \square

Theorem 6.10 (Completeness of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Let p and q be closed *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion terms, then,*

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

Proof. Firstly, by the elimination theorem of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion (see Theorem 6.8), we know that each process term in *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with E a guarded linear recursive specification.

It remains to prove the following cases.

(1) If $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$ for guarded linear recursive specification E_1 and E_2 , then $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$.

Firstly, the recursive equation $W = \tau + \dots + \tau$ with $W \neq X_1$ in E_1 and E_2 , can be removed, and the corresponding summands aW are replaced by a , to get E'_1 and E'_2 , by use of the axioms *RDP*, *A3* and *B1*, and $\langle X | E_1 \rangle = \langle X | E'_1 \rangle$, $\langle Y | E_2 \rangle = \langle Y | E'_2 \rangle$.

Let E_1 consists of recursive equations $X = t_X$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and E_2 consists of recursion equations $Y = t_Y$ for $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, and are not the form $\tau + \dots + \tau$. Let the guarded linear recursive specification E consists of recursion equations $Z_{XY} = t_{XY}$, and $\langle X | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y | E_2 \rangle$, and t_{XY} consists of the following summands:

1. t_{XY} contains a summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)Z_{X'Y'}$ iff t_X contains the summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)X'$ and t_Y contains the summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)Y'$ such that $\langle X' | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y' | E_2 \rangle$;
2. t_{XY} contains a summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$ iff t_X contains the summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$ and t_Y contains the summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$;
3. t_{XY} contains a summand $\tau Z_{X'Y'}$ iff $XY \neq X_1Y_1$, t_X contains the summand $\tau X'$, and $\langle X' | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y | E_2 \rangle$;
4. t_{XY} contains a summand $\tau Z_{X'Y'}$ iff $XY \neq X_1Y_1$, t_Y contains the summand $\tau Y'$, and $\langle X | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y' | E_2 \rangle$.

Since E_1 and E_2 are guarded, E is guarded. Constructing the process term u_{XY} consist of the following summands:

1. u_{XY} contains a summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)\langle X' | E_1 \rangle$ iff t_X contains the summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)X'$ and t_Y contains the summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)Y'$ such that $\langle X' | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y' | E_2 \rangle$;
2. u_{XY} contains a summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$ iff t_X contains the summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$ and t_Y contains the summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$;
3. u_{XY} contains a summand $\tau \langle X' | E_1 \rangle$ iff $XY \neq X_1Y_1$, t_X contains the summand $\tau X'$, and $\langle X' | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y | E_2 \rangle$.

Let the process term s_{XY} be defined as follows:

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

Table 22. Transition rule of the abstraction operator

1. $s_{XY} \triangleq \tau\langle X|E_1 \rangle + u_{XY}$ iff $XY \neq X_1Y_1$, t_Y contains the summand $\tau Y'$, and $\langle X|E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y'|E_2 \rangle$;
2. $s_{XY} \triangleq \langle X|E_1 \rangle$, otherwise.

So, $\langle X|E_1 \rangle = \langle X|E_1 \rangle + u_{XY}$, and $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)(\tau\langle X|E_1 \rangle + u_{XY}) = (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)((\tau\langle X|E_1 \rangle + u_{XY}) + u_{XY}) = (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)((\langle X|E_1 \rangle + u_{XY}) + u_{XY}) = (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)\langle X|E_1 \rangle$, hence, $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)s_{XY} = (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)\langle X|E_1 \rangle$.

Let σ map recursion variable X in E_1 to $\langle X|E_1 \rangle$, and let ψ map recursion variable Z_{XY} in E to s_{XY} . It is sufficient to prove $s_{XY} = \psi(t_{XY})$ for recursion variables Z_{XY} in E . Either $XY \equiv X_1Y_1$ or $XY \neq X_1Y_1$, we all can get $s_{XY} = \psi(t_{XY})$. So, $s_{XY} = \langle Z_{XY}|E \rangle$ for recursive variables Z_{XY} in E is a solution for E . Then by *RSP*, particularly, $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle = \langle Z_{X_1Y_1}|E \rangle$. Similarly, we can obtain $\langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle = \langle Z_{X_1Y_1}|E \rangle$. Finally, $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle = \langle Z_{X_1Y_1}|E \rangle = \langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle$, as desired.

(2) If $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbp} \langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle$ for guarded linear recursive specification E_1 and E_2 , then $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle$. It can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it.

(3) If $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbhb} \langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle$ for guarded linear recursive specification E_1 and E_2 , then $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle$. It can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it. \square

6.4. Abstraction

The unary abstraction operator τ_I ($I \subseteq \mathbb{E}$) renames all atomic events in I into τ . *APTC* with silent step and abstraction operator is called *APTC _{τ}* . The transition rules of operator τ_I are shown in Table 22.

Theorem 6.11 (Conservativity of *APTC _{τ}* with guarded linear recursion). *APTC _{τ} with guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of APTC with silent step and guarded linear recursion.*

Proof. Since the transition rules of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion are source-dependent, and the transition rules for abstraction operator in Table 22 contain only a fresh operator τ_I in their source, so the transition rules of *APTC _{τ}* with guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of those of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion. \square

Theorem 6.12 (Congruence theorem of *APTC _{τ}* with guarded linear recursion). *Rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbp} , \approx_{rbs} and \approx_{rbhb} are all congruences with respect to APTC _{τ} with guarded linear recursion.*

Proof. (1) Case rooted branching pomset bisimulation equivalence \approx_{rbp} .

Let x and y be *APTC _{τ}* with guarded linear recursion processes, and $x \approx_{rbp} y$, it is sufficient to prove that $\tau_I(x) \approx_{rbp} \tau_I(y)$.

By the transition rules for operator τ_I in Table 22, we can get

$$\tau_I(x) \xrightarrow{X} \surd (X \notin I) \quad \tau_I(y) \xrightarrow{Y} \surd (Y \notin I)$$

with $X \subseteq x$, $Y \subseteq y$, and $X \sim Y$.

Or, we can get

$$\tau_I(x) \xrightarrow{X} \tau_I(x')(X \notin I) \quad \tau_I(y) \xrightarrow{Y} \tau_I(y')(Y \notin I)$$

with $X \subseteq x$, $Y \subseteq y$, and $X \sim Y$ and the hypothesis $\tau_I(x') \approx_{rbp} \tau_I(y')$.

Or, we can get

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>	$\tau_I(x \parallel y) = \tau_I(x) \parallel \tau_I(y)$

Table 23. Axioms of abstraction operator

$$\tau_I(x) \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \sqrt{(X \subseteq I)} \quad \tau_I(y) \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \sqrt{(Y \subseteq I)}$$

with $X \subseteq x$, $Y \subseteq y$, and $X \sim Y$.

Or, we can get

$$\tau_I(x) \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \tau_I(x')(X \subseteq I) \quad \tau_I(y) \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \tau_I(y')(Y \subseteq I)$$

with $X \subseteq x$, $Y \subseteq y$, and $X \sim Y$ and the hypothesis $\tau_I(x') \approx_{rbp} \tau_I(y')$.

So, we get $\tau_I(x) \approx_{rbp} \tau_I(y)$, as desired

(2) The cases of rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} , rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} can be proven similarly, we omit them. \square

We design the axioms for the abstraction operator τ_I in Table 23.

The axioms *TI1*–*TI3* are the defining laws for the abstraction operator τ_I ; *TI4*–*TI6* say that in process term $\tau_I(t)$, all transitions of t labeled with atomic events from I are renamed into τ .

Theorem 6.13 (Soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion). *Let x and y be $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion terms. If $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \approx_{rbs} y$;
2. $x \approx_{rbp} y$;
3. $x \approx_{rbhp} y$.

Proof. (1) Soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion with respect to rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} .

Since rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 23 is sound modulo rooted branching step bisimulation equivalence.

Though transition rules in Table 22 are defined in the flavor of single event, they can be modified into a step (a set of events within which each event is pairwise concurrent), we omit them. If we treat a single event as a step containing just one event, the proof of this soundness theorem does not exist any problem, so we use this way and still use the transition rules in Table 23.

We only prove soundness of the non-trivial axioms *TI4*–*TI6*, and omit the defining axioms *TI1*–*TI3*.

- **Axiom *TI4*.** Let p, q be $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion processes, and $\tau_I(p + q) = \tau_I(p) + \tau_I(q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\tau_I(p + q) \approx_{rbs} \tau_I(p) + \tau_I(q)$. By the transition rules for operator $+$ in Table 5 and τ_I in Table 22, we get

$$\begin{array}{cc} \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \sqrt{(e_1 \notin I)}}{\tau_I(p + q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \sqrt{}} & \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \sqrt{(e_1 \notin I)}}{\tau_I(p) + \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \sqrt{}} \\ \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{(e_2 \notin I)}}{\tau_I(p + q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{}} & \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{(e_2 \notin I)}}{\tau_I(p) + \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{}} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad (e_1 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p+q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \tau_I(p')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad (e_1 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p) + \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \tau_I(p')} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p+q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \tau_I(q')} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p) + \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \tau_I(q')} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad (e_1 \in I)}{\tau_I(p+q) \xrightarrow{\tau} \surd} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad (e_1 \in I)}{\tau_I(p) + \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{\tau} \surd} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p+q) \xrightarrow{\tau} \surd} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p) + \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{\tau} \surd} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad (e_1 \in I)}{\tau_I(p+q) \xrightarrow{\tau} \tau_I(p')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad (e_1 \in I)}{\tau_I(p) + \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{\tau} \tau_I(p')} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p+q) \xrightarrow{\tau} \tau_I(q')} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p) + \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{\tau} \tau_I(q')}
\end{array}$$

So, $\tau_I(p+q) \approx_{rbs} \tau_I(p) + \tau_I(q)$, as desired.

- **Axiom TI5.** Let p, q be $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion processes, and $\tau_I(p \cdot q) = \tau_I(p) \cdot \tau_I(q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\tau_I(p \cdot q) \approx_{rbs} \tau_I(p) \cdot \tau_I(q)$. By the transition rules for operator \cdot in Table 5 and τ_I in Table 22, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad (e_1 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p \cdot q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \tau_I(q)} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad (e_1 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p) \cdot \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \tau_I(q)} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad (e_1 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p \cdot q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \tau_I(p' \cdot q)} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad (e_1 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p) \cdot \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \tau_I(p') \cdot \tau_I(q)} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad (e_1 \in I)}{\tau_I(p \cdot q) \xrightarrow{\tau} \tau_I(q)} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad (e_1 \in I)}{\tau_I(p) \cdot \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{\tau} \tau_I(q)} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad (e_1 \in I)}{\tau_I(p \cdot q) \xrightarrow{\tau} \tau_I(p' \cdot q)} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad (e_1 \in I)}{\tau_I(p) \cdot \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{\tau} \tau_I(p') \cdot \tau_I(q)}
\end{array}$$

So, with the assumption $\tau_I(p' \cdot q) = \tau_I(p') \cdot \tau_I(q)$, $\tau_I(p \cdot q) \approx_{rbs} \tau_I(p) \cdot \tau_I(q)$, as desired.

- **Axiom TI6.** Let p, q be $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion processes, and $\tau_I(p \parallel q) = \tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\tau_I(p \parallel q) \approx_{rbs} \tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q)$. By the transition rules for operator \parallel in Table 7 and τ_I in Table 22, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_1, e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \surd} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_1, e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \surd} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_1, e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \tau_I(p')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_1, e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \tau_I(p')} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1, e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \tau_I(q')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1, e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \tau_I(q')}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1, e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \tau_I(p' \bowtie q')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1, e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \tau_I(p') \bowtie \tau_I(q')} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad (e_1 \notin I, e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad (e_1 \notin I, e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad (e_1 \notin I, e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \tau_I(p')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad (e_1 \notin I, e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \tau_I(p')} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1 \notin I, e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \tau_I(q')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1 \notin I, e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \tau_I(q')} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1 \notin I, e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \tau_I(p' \bowtie q')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1 \notin I, e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{e_1} \tau_I(p') \bowtie \tau_I(q')} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad (e_1 \in I, e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad (e_1 \in I, e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad (e_1 \in I, e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \tau_I(p')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad (e_1 \in I, e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \tau_I(p')} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1 \in I, e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \tau_I(q')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1 \in I, e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \tau_I(q')} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1 \in I, e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \tau_I(p' \bowtie q')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1 \in I, e_2 \notin I)}{\tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{e_2} \tau_I(p') \bowtie \tau_I(q')} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad (e_1, e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \checkmark} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad (e_1, e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \checkmark} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad (e_1, e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \tau_I(p')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark \quad (e_1, e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \tau_I(p')} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1, e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \tau_I(q')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1, e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \tau_I(q')} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1, e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \tau_I(p' \bowtie q')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q' \quad (e_1, e_2 \in I)}{\tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q) \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \tau_I(p') \bowtie \tau_I(q')}
\end{array}$$

So, with the assumption $\tau_I(p' \bowtie q') = \tau_I(p') \bowtie \tau_I(q')$, $\tau_I(p \parallel q) \approx_{rbs} \tau_I(p) \parallel \tau_I(q)$, as desired.

(2) Soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion with respect to rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} .

Since rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 23 is sound modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} .

From the definition of rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} (see Definition 6.2), we know that rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} is defined by weak pomset transitions, which are labeled by pomsets with τ . In a weak pomset transition, the events in the pomset are either within causality relations

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

Table 24. Cluster fair abstraction rule

(defined by \cdot) or in concurrency (implicitly defined by \cdot and $+$, and explicitly defined by \parallel), of course, they are pairwise consistent (without conflicts). In (1), we have already proven the case that all events are pairwise concurrent, so, we only need to prove the case of events in causality. Without loss of generality, we take a pomset of $P = \{e_1, e_2 : e_1 \cdot e_2\}$. Then the weak pomset transition labeled by the above P is just composed of one single event transition labeled by e_1 succeeded by another single event transition labeled by e_2 , that is, $\xRightarrow{P} = \xRightarrow{e_1} \xRightarrow{e_2}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion modulo rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} (1), we can prove that each axiom in Table 23 is sound modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} , we omit them.

(3) Soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion with respect to rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} .

Since rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 23 is sound modulo rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} .

From the definition of rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} (see Definition 6.4), we know that rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} is defined on the weakly posetal product $(C_1, f, C_2), f : \hat{C}_1 \rightarrow \hat{C}_2$ isomorphism. Two process terms s related to C_1 and t related to C_2 , and $f : \hat{C}_1 \rightarrow \hat{C}_2$ isomorphism. Initially, $(C_1, f, C_2) = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, and $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in \approx_{rbhp}$. When $s \xrightarrow{e} s' (C_1 \xrightarrow{e} C'_1)$, there will be $t \xRightarrow{e} t' (C_2 \xRightarrow{e} C'_2)$, and we define $f' = f[e \mapsto e]$. Then, if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in \approx_{rbhp}$, then $(C'_1, f', C'_2) \in \approx_{rbhp}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation equivalence (2), we can prove that each axiom in Table 23 is sound modulo rooted branching hp-bisimulation equivalence, we just need additionally to check the above conditions on rooted branching hp-bisimulation, we omit them. \square

Though τ -loops are prohibited in guarded linear recursive specifications (see Definition 6.5) 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) [17] are still valid in true concurrency, we introduce them below.

Definition 6.14 (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 $\langle X|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\{b_{11}, \dots, b_{1i}\}} \dots \xrightarrow{\{b_{m1}, \dots, b_{mi}\}} \langle Y|E \rangle$ and $\langle Y|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\{c_{11}, \dots, c_{1j}\}} \dots \xrightarrow{\{c_{n1}, \dots, c_{nj}\}} \langle X|E \rangle$, where $b_{11}, \dots, b_{mi}, c_{11}, \dots, c_{nj} \in I \cup \{\tau\}$.
 $a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_k$ or $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_k)X$ is an exit for the cluster C iff: (1) $a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_k$ or $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_k)X$ is a summand at the right-hand side of the recursive equation for a recursion variable in C , and (2) in the case of $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_k)X$, either $a_i \notin I \cup \{\tau\} (i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\})$ or $X \notin C$.*

Theorem 6.15 (Soundness of *CFAR*). *CFAR is sound modulo rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbs} , \approx_{rbp} and \approx_{rbhp} .*

Proof. (1) Soundness of *CFAR* with respect to rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} .

Let X be in a cluster for I with exits $\{(a_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{1i})Y_1, \dots, (a_{m1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{mi})Y_m, b_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{1j}, \dots, b_{n1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{nj}\}$. Then $\langle X|E \rangle$ can execute a string of atomic events from $I \cup \{\tau\}$ inside the cluster of X , followed by an exit $(a_{i'1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{i'i'})Y_{i'}$ for $i' \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ or $b_{j'1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{j'j}$ for $j' \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Hence, $\tau_I(\langle X|E \rangle)$ can execute a string of τ^* inside the cluster of X , followed by an exit $\tau_I((a_{i'1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{i'i'})\langle Y_{i'}|E \rangle)$ for $i' \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ or $\tau_I(b_{j'1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{j'j})$ for $j' \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. And these τ^* are non-initial in $\tau\tau_I(\langle X|E \rangle)$, so they are truly silent by

the axiom $B1$, we obtain $\tau\tau_I(\langle X|E \rangle) \approx_{rbs} \tau \cdot \tau_I((a_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{1i})\langle Y_1|E \rangle + \dots + (a_{m1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{mi})\langle Y_m|E \rangle + b_{11} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{1j} + \dots + b_{n1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{nj})$, as desired.

(2) Soundness of $CFAR$ with respect to rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} .

From the definition of rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} (see Definition 6.2), we know that rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} is defined by weak pomset transitions, which are labeled by pomsets with τ . In a weak pomset transition, the events in the pomset are either within causality relations (defined by \cdot) or in concurrency (implicitly defined by \cdot and $+$, and explicitly defined by \parallel), of course, they are pairwise consistent (without conflicts). In (1), we have already proven the case that all events are pairwise concurrent, so, we only need to prove the case of events in causality. Without loss of generality, we take a pomset of $P = \{e_1, e_2 : e_1 \cdot e_2\}$. Then the weak pomset transition labeled by the above P is just composed of one single event transition labeled by e_1 succeeded by another single event transition labeled by e_2 , that is, $\xRightarrow{P} = \xRightarrow{e_1} \xRightarrow{e_2}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of $CFAR$ modulo rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} (1), we can prove that $CFAR$ in Table 24 is sound modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} , we omit them.

(3) Soundness of $CFAR$ with respect to rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} .

From the definition of rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} (see Definition 6.4), we know that rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} is defined on the weakly posetal product (C_1, f, C_2) , $f : \hat{C}_1 \rightarrow \hat{C}_2$ isomorphism. Two process terms s related to C_1 and t related to C_2 , and $f : \hat{C}_1 \rightarrow \hat{C}_2$ isomorphism. Initially, $(C_1, f, C_2) = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, and $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in \approx_{rbhp}$. When $s \xrightarrow{e} s' (C_1 \xrightarrow{e} C'_1)$, there will be $t \xrightarrow{e} t' (C_2 \xrightarrow{e} C'_2)$, and we define $f' = f[e \mapsto e]$. Then, if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in \approx_{rbhp}$, then $(C'_1, f', C'_2) \in \approx_{rbhp}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of $CFAR$ modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation equivalence (2), we can prove that $CFAR$ in Table 24 is sound modulo rooted branching hp-bisimulation equivalence, we just need additionally to check the above conditions on rooted branching hp-bisimulation, we omit them. \square

Theorem 6.16 (Completeness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and $CFAR$). *Let p and q be closed $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and $CFAR$ terms, then,*

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

Proof. (1) For the case of rooted branching step bisimulation, the proof is following.

Firstly, in the proof the Theorem 6.10, we know that each process term p in $APTC$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1|E \rangle$ with E a guarded linear recursive specification. And we prove if $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle$, then $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle$.

The only new case is $p \equiv \tau_I(q)$. Let $q = \langle X|E \rangle$ with E a guarded linear recursive specification, so $p = \tau_I(\langle X|E \rangle)$. Then the collection of recursive variables in E can be divided into its clusters C_1, \dots, C_N for I . Let

$$(a_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{i1}i1})Y_{i1} + \dots + (a_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{im_i}im_i})Y_{im_i} + b_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{i1}i1} + \dots + b_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{im_i}im_i}$$

be the conflict composition of exits for the cluster C_i , with $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$.

For $Z \in C_i$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, we define

$$s_Z \triangleq (a_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{i1}i1})\tau_I(\langle Y_{i1}|E \rangle) + \dots + (a_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{im_i}im_i})\tau_I(\langle Y_{im_i}|E \rangle) + b_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{i1}i1} + \dots + b_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{im_i}im_i}$$

For $Z \in C_i$ and $a_1, \dots, a_j \in \mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\}$ with $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_j)\tau_I(\langle Z|E \rangle) \\ &= (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_j)\tau_I((a_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{i1}i1})\langle Y_{i1}|E \rangle + \dots + (a_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{im_i}im_i})\langle Y_{im_i}|E \rangle + b_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{i1}i1} + \dots + b_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{im_i}im_i}) \\ &= (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_j)s_Z \end{aligned}$$

Let the linear recursive specification F contain the same recursive variables as E , for $Z \in C_i$, F contains the following recursive equation

$$Z = (a_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{i1}i1})Y_{i1} + \dots + (a_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{im_i}im_i})Y_{im_i} + b_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{i1}i1} + \dots + b_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{im_i}im_i}$$

It is easy to see that there is no sequence of one or more τ -transitions from $\langle Z|F \rangle$ to itself, so F is guarded.

For

$$s_Z = (a_{1i1} \parallel \cdots \parallel a_{k_{i1}i1})Y_{i1} + \cdots + (a_{1im_i} \parallel \cdots \parallel a_{k_{im_i}im_i})Y_{im_i} + b_{1i1} \parallel \cdots \parallel b_{l_{i1}i1} + \cdots + b_{1im_i} \parallel \cdots \parallel b_{l_{im_i}im_i}$$

is a solution for F . So, $(a_1 \parallel \cdots \parallel a_j)\tau_I(\langle Z|E \rangle) = (a_1 \parallel \cdots \parallel a_j)s_Z = (a_1 \parallel \cdots \parallel a_j)\langle Z|F \rangle$.

So,

$$\langle Z|F \rangle = (a_{1i1} \parallel \cdots \parallel a_{k_{i1}i1})\langle Y_{i1}|F \rangle + \cdots + (a_{1im_i} \parallel \cdots \parallel a_{k_{im_i}im_i})\langle Y_{im_i}|F \rangle + b_{1i1} \parallel \cdots \parallel b_{l_{i1}i1} + \cdots + b_{1im_i} \parallel \cdots \parallel b_{l_{im_i}im_i}$$

Hence, $\tau_I(\langle X|E \rangle) = \langle Z|F \rangle$, as desired.

(2) For the case of rooted branching pomset bisimulation, it can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it.

(3) For the case of rooted branching hp-bisimulation, it can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it. \square

Finally, in section 4, during conflict elimination, the axioms $U25$ and $U27$ are $(\sharp(e_1, e_2)) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_2 = \tau$ and $(\sharp(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3) \quad e_3 \triangleleft e_1 = \tau$. Their functions are like abstraction operator τ_I , their rigorous soundness can be proven similarly to Theorem 6.9 and Theorem 6.13, really, they are based on weakly true concurrency. We just illustrate their intuition through an example.

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \Theta((a \cdot b \cdot c) \parallel (d \cdot e \cdot f) \quad (\sharp(b, e))) \\ &\stackrel{CE23}{=} (\Theta(a \cdot b \cdot c) \triangleleft (d \cdot e \cdot f)) \parallel (d \cdot e \cdot f) + (\Theta(d \cdot e \cdot f) \triangleleft (a \cdot b \cdot c)) \parallel (a \cdot b \cdot c) \quad (\sharp(b, e)) \\ &\stackrel{CE22}{=} (a \cdot b \cdot c) \triangleleft (d \cdot e \cdot f) \parallel (d \cdot e \cdot f) + ((d \cdot e \cdot f) \triangleleft (a \cdot b \cdot c)) \parallel (a \cdot b \cdot c) \quad (\sharp(b, e)) \\ &\stackrel{U31, U35}{=} (a \cdot \tau \cdot \tau) \parallel (d \cdot e \cdot f) + (d \cdot \tau \cdot \tau) \parallel (a \cdot b \cdot c) \\ &\stackrel{B1}{=} a \parallel (d \cdot e \cdot f) + d \parallel (a \cdot b \cdot c) \end{aligned}$$

We see that the conflict relation $\sharp(b, e)$ is eliminated.

7. Applications

APTC provides a formal framework based on truly concurrent behavioral semantics, which can be used to verify the correctness of system behaviors. In this section, we tend to choose one protocol verified by *ACP* [4] – alternating bit protocol (ABP) [19].

The ABP protocol is used to ensure successful transmission of data through a corrupted channel. This success is based on the assumption that data can be resent an unlimited number of times, which is illustrated in Fig.2, we alter it into the true concurrency situation.

1. Data elements d_1, d_2, d_3, \dots from a finite set Δ are communicated between a Sender and a Receiver.
2. If the Sender reads a datum from channel A_1 , then this datum is sent to the Receiver in parallel through channel A_2 .
3. The Sender processes the data in Δ , formes new data, and sends them to the Receiver through channel B .
4. And the Receiver sends the datum into channel C_2 .
5. If channel B is corrupted, the message communicated through B can be turn into an error message \perp .
6. Every time the Receiver receives a message via channel B , it sends an acknowledgement to the Sender via channel D , which is also corrupted.
7. Finally, then Sender and the Receiver send out their outputs in parallel through channels C_1 and C_2 .

In the truly concurrent ABP, the Sender sends its data to the Receiver; and the Receiver can also send its data to the Sender, for simplicity and without loss of generality, we assume that only the Sender sends its data and the Receiver only receives the data from the Sender. The Sender attaches a bit 0 to data elements d_{2k-1} and a bit 1 to data elements d_{2k} , when they are sent into channel B . When the Receiver reads a datum,




Fig. 2. Alternating bit protocol

it sends back the attached bit via channel D . If the Receiver receives a corrupted message, then it sends back the previous acknowledgement to the Sender.

Then the state transition of the Sender can be described by *APTC* as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_b &= \sum_{d \in \Delta} r_{A_1}(d) \cdot T_{db} \\
 T_{db} &= \left(\sum_{d' \in \Delta} (s_B(d', b) \cdot s_{C_1}(d')) + s_B(\perp) \right) \cdot U_{db} \\
 U_{db} &= r_D(b) \cdot S_{1-b} + (r_D(1-b) + r_D(\perp)) \cdot T_{db}
 \end{aligned}$$

where s_B denotes sending data through channel B , r_D denotes receiving data through channel D , similarly, r_{A_1} means receiving data via channel A_1 , s_{C_1} denotes sending data via channel C_1 , and $b \in \{0, 1\}$.

And the state transition of the Receiver can be described by *APTC* as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
 R_b &= \sum_{d \in \Delta} r_{A_2}(d) \cdot R'_b \\
 R'_b &= \sum_{d' \in \Delta} \{r_B(d', b) \cdot s_{C_2}(d') \cdot Q_b + r_B(d', 1-b) \cdot Q_{1-b}\} + r_B(\perp) \cdot Q_{1-b} \\
 Q_b &= (s_D(b) + s_D(\perp)) \cdot R_{1-b}
 \end{aligned}$$

where r_{A_2} denotes receiving data via channel A_2 , r_B denotes receiving data via channel B , s_{C_2} denotes sending data via channel C_2 , s_D denotes sending data via channel D , and $b \in \{0, 1\}$.

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.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(s_B(d', b), r_B(d', b)) &\triangleq c_B(d', b) \\
\gamma(s_B(\perp), r_B(\perp)) &\triangleq c_B(\perp) \\
\gamma(s_D(b), r_D(b)) &\triangleq c_D(b) \\
\gamma(s_D(\perp), r_D(\perp)) &\triangleq c_D(\perp)
\end{aligned}$$

Let R_0 and S_0 be in parallel, then the system $R_0 S_0$ can be represented by the following process term.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(R_0 \bowtie S_0))) = \tau_I(\partial_H(R_0 \bowtie S_0)) \\
&\text{where } H = \{s_B(d', b), r_B(d', b), s_D(b), r_D(b) | d' \in \Delta, b \in \{0, 1\}\} \\
&\{s_B(\perp), r_B(\perp), s_D(\perp), r_D(\perp)\} \\
&I = \{c_B(d', b), c_D(b) | d' \in \Delta, b \in \{0, 1\}\} \cup \{c_B(\perp), c_D(\perp)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 7.1 (Correctness of the ABP protocol). *The ABP protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(R_0 \bowtie S_0))$ exhibits desired external behaviors.*

Proof. By use of the algebraic laws of *APTC*, we have the following expansions.

$$\begin{aligned}
R_0 \bowtie S_0 &\stackrel{P1}{=} R_0 \parallel S_0 + R_0 \mid S_0 \\
&\stackrel{RDP}{=} (\sum_{d \in \Delta} r_{A_2}(d) \cdot R'_0) \parallel (\sum_{d \in \Delta} r_{A_1}(d) T_{d0}) \\
&\quad + (\sum_{d \in \Delta} r_{A_2}(d) \cdot R'_0) \mid (\sum_{d \in \Delta} r_{A_1}(d) T_{d0}) \\
&\stackrel{P6, C14}{=} \sum_{d \in \Delta} (r_{A_2}(d) \parallel r_{A_1}(d)) R'_0 \bowtie T_{d0} + \delta \cdot R'_0 \bowtie T_{d0} \\
&\stackrel{A6, A7}{=} \sum_{d \in \Delta} (r_{A_2}(d) \parallel r_{A_1}(d)) R'_0 \bowtie T_{d0}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_H(R_0 \bowtie S_0) &= \partial_H(\sum_{d \in \Delta} (r_{A_2}(d) \parallel r_{A_1}(d)) R'_0 \bowtie T_{d0}) \\
&= \sum_{d \in \Delta} (r_{A_2}(d) \parallel r_{A_1}(d)) \partial_H(R'_0 \bowtie T_{d0})
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can get the following equations.

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_H(R_0 \bowtie S_0) &= \sum_{d \in \Delta} (r_{A_2}(d) \parallel r_{A_1}(d)) \cdot \partial_H(T_{d0} \bowtie R'_0) \\
\partial_H(T_{d0} \bowtie R'_0) &= c_B(d', 0) \cdot (s_{C_1}(d') \parallel s_{C_2}(d')) \cdot \partial_H(U_{d0} \bowtie Q_0) + c_B(\perp) \cdot \partial_H(U_{d0} \bowtie Q_1) \\
\partial_H(U_{d0} \bowtie Q_1) &= (c_D(1) + c_D(\perp)) \cdot \partial_H(T_{d0} \bowtie R'_0) \\
\partial_H(Q_0 \bowtie U_{d0}) &= c_D(0) \cdot \partial_H(R_1 \bowtie S_1) + c_D(\perp) \cdot \partial_H(R'_1 \bowtie T_{d0}) \\
\partial_H(R'_1 \bowtie T_{d0}) &= (c_B(d', 0) + c_B(\perp)) \cdot \partial_H(Q_0 \bowtie U_{d0}) \\
\partial_H(R_1 \bowtie S_1) &= \sum_{d \in \Delta} (r_{A_2}(d) \parallel r_{A_1}(d)) \cdot \partial_H(T_{d1} \bowtie R'_1) \\
\partial_H(T_{d1} \bowtie R'_1) &= c_B(d', 1) \cdot (s_{C_1}(d') \parallel s_{C_2}(d')) \cdot \partial_H(U_{d1} \bowtie Q_1) + c_B(\perp) \cdot \partial_H(U_{d1} \bowtie Q'_0) \\
\partial_H(U_{d1} \bowtie Q'_0) &= (c_D(0) + c_D(\perp)) \cdot \partial_H(T_{d1} \bowtie R'_1) \\
\partial_H(Q_1 \bowtie U_{d1}) &= c_D(1) \cdot \partial_H(R_0 \bowtie S_0) + c_D(\perp) \cdot \partial_H(R'_0 \bowtie T_{d1}) \\
\partial_H(R'_0 \bowtie T_{d1}) &= (c_B(d', 1) + c_B(\perp)) \cdot \partial_H(Q_1 \bowtie U_{d1})
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\partial_H(R_0 \bowtie S_0) = \langle X_1 | E \rangle$, where E is the following guarded linear recursion specification:

$$\begin{aligned}
\{X_1 &= \sum_{d \in \Delta} (r_{A_2}(d) \parallel r_{A_1}(d)) \cdot X_{2d}, Y_1 = \sum_{d \in \Delta} (r_{A_2}(d) \parallel r_{A_1}(d)) \cdot Y_{2d}, \\
X_{2d} &= c_B(d', 0) \cdot X_{4d} + c_B(\perp) \cdot X_{3d}, Y_{2d} = c_B(d', 1) \cdot Y_{4d} + c_B(\perp) \cdot Y_{3d}, \\
X_{3d} &= (c_D(1) + c_D(\perp)) \cdot X_{2d}, Y_{3d} = (c_D(0) + c_D(\perp)) \cdot Y_{2d}, \\
X_{4d} &= (s_{C_1}(d') \parallel s_{C_2}(d')) \cdot X_{5d}, Y_{4d} = (s_{C_1}(d') \parallel s_{C_2}(d')) \cdot Y_{5d}, \\
X_{5d} &= c_D(0) \cdot Y_1 + c_D(\perp) \cdot X_{6d}, Y_{5d} = c_D(1) \cdot X_1 + c_D(\perp) \cdot Y_{6d}, \\
X_{6d} &= (c_B(d, 0) + c_B(\perp)) \cdot X_{5d}, Y_{6d} = (c_B(d, 1) + c_B(\perp)) \cdot Y_{5d} \\
&|d, d' \in \Delta\}
\end{aligned}$$

Then we apply abstraction operator τ_I into $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_I(\langle X_1 | E \rangle) &= \sum_{d \in \Delta} (r_{A_1}(d) \parallel r_{A_2}(d)) \cdot \tau_I(\langle X_{2d} | E \rangle) \\
&= \sum_{d \in \Delta} (r_{A_1}(d) \parallel r_{A_2}(d)) \cdot \tau_I(\langle X_{4d} | E \rangle) \\
&= \sum_{d, d' \in \Delta} (r_{A_1}(d) \parallel r_{A_2}(d)) \cdot (s_{C_1}(d') \parallel s_{C_2}(d')) \cdot \tau_I(\langle X_{5d} | E \rangle) \\
&= \sum_{d, d' \in \Delta} (r_{A_1}(d) \parallel r_{A_2}(d)) \cdot (s_{C_1}(d') \parallel s_{C_2}(d')) \cdot \tau_I(\langle Y_1 | E \rangle)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can get $\tau_I(\langle Y_1 | E \rangle) = \sum_{d, d' \in \Delta} (r_{A_1}(d) \parallel r_{A_2}(d)) \cdot (s_{C_1}(d') \parallel s_{C_2}(d')) \cdot \tau_I(\langle X_1 | E \rangle)$.

We get $\tau_I(\partial_H(R_0 \bowtie S_0)) = \sum_{d, d' \in \Delta} (r_{A_1}(d) \parallel r_{A_2}(d)) \cdot (s_{C_1}(d') \parallel s_{C_2}(d')) \cdot \tau_I(\partial_H(R_0 \bowtie S_0))$. So, the ABP protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(R_0 \bowtie S_0))$ exhibits desired external behaviors. \square

8. Extensions

APTC also has the modularity as *ACP*, so, *APTC* can be extended easily. By introducing new operators or new constants, *APTC* can have more properties, modularity provides *APTC* an elegant fashion to express a new property. In this section, we take examples of placeholder which maybe capture the nature of true concurrency, renaming operator which is used to rename the atomic events and firstly introduced by Milner in his CCS [3], state operator which can explicitly define states, and a more complex extension called guards which can express conditionals.

8.1. Placeholder

Through verification of ABP protocol [19] in section 7, we see that the verification is in a structural symmetric way. Let we see the following example.

$$\begin{aligned}
(a \cdot r_b) \bowtie w_b &= (a \parallel w_b) \cdot r_b + \gamma(a, w_b) \cdot r_b \\
&= \delta \cdot r_b + \delta \cdot r_b \\
&= \delta + \delta \\
&= \delta
\end{aligned}$$

With $\gamma(r_b, w_b) \triangleq c_b$. The communication c_b does not occur and the above equation should be able to be equal to $a \cdot c_b$. How to deal this situation?

It is caused that the two communicating actions are not at the same causal depth. That is, we must pad something in hole of $(a \cdot r_b) \bowtie ([_] \cdot w_b)$ to make r_b and w_b in the same causal depth.

Can we pad τ into that hole? No. Because $\tau \cdot w_b \neq w_b$. We must pad something new to that hole.

$$\overline{\textcircled{S}} \rightarrow \checkmark$$

Table 25. Transition rule of the shadow constant

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

Table 26. Axioms of shadow constant

8.1.1. Transition Rules of Shadow Constant

We introduce a constant called shadow constant \textcircled{S} to act for the placeholder that we ever used to deal entanglement in quantum process algebra. The transition rule of the shadow constant \textcircled{S} is shown in Table 25. The rule say that \textcircled{S} can terminate successfully without executing any action.

Theorem 8.1 (Conservativity of $APTC$ with respect to the shadow constant). *$APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and shadow constant is a conservative extension of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion.*

Proof. It follows from the following two facts (see Theorem 2.8).

1. The transition rules of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion in section 6 are all source-dependent;
2. The sources of the transition rules for the shadow constant contain an occurrence of \textcircled{S} .

□

8.1.2. Axioms for Shadow Constant

We design the axioms for the shadow constant \textcircled{S} in Table 26. And for \textcircled{S}_i^e , we add superscript e to denote \textcircled{S} is belonging to e and subscript i to denote that it is the i -th shadow of e . And we extend the set \mathbb{E} to the set $\mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\} \cup \{\delta\} \cup \{\textcircled{S}_i^e\}$.

The mismatch of action and its shadows in parallelism will cause deadlock, that is, $e \parallel \textcircled{S}^{e'} = \delta$ with $e \neq e'$. We must make all shadows \textcircled{S}_i^e are distinct, to ensure f in hp-bisimulation is an isomorphism.

Theorem 8.2 (Soundness of the shadow constant). *Let x and y be $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the shadow constant terms. If $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the shadow constant $\vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \approx_{rbs} y$;
2. $x \approx_{rbp} y$;
3. $x \approx_{rbhp} y$.

Proof. (1) Soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the shadow constant with respect to rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} .

Since rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the shadow constant, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 26 is sound modulo rooted branching step bisimulation equivalence.

Though transition rules in Table 25 are defined in the flavor of single event, they can be modified into a step (a set of events within which each event is pairwise concurrent), we omit them. If we treat a single

event as a step containing just one event, the proof of this soundness theorem does not exist any problem, so we use this way and still use the transition rules in Table 26.

The proof of soundness of $SC1 - SC9$ modulo rooted branching step bisimulation is trivial, and we omit it.

(2) Soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the shadow constant with respect to rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} .

Since rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the shadow constant, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 26 is sound modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} .

From the definition of rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} (see Definition 6.2), we know that rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} is defined by weak pomset transitions, which are labeled by pomsets with τ . In a weak pomset transition, the events in the pomset are either within causality relations (defined by \cdot) or in concurrency (implicitly defined by \cdot and $+$, and explicitly defined by \parallel), of course, they are pairwise consistent (without conflicts). In (1), we have already proven the case that all events are pairwise concurrent, so, we only need to prove the case of events in causality. Without loss of generality, we take a pomset of $P = \{e_1, e_2 : e_1 \cdot e_2\}$. Then the weak pomset transition labeled by the above P is just composed of one single event transition labeled by e_1 succeeded by another single event transition labeled by e_2 , that is, $\xRightarrow{P} = \xRightarrow{e_1} \xRightarrow{e_2}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the shadow constant modulo rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} (1), we can prove that each axiom in Table 26 is sound modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} , we omit them.

(3) Soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the shadow constant with respect to rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} .

Since rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the shadow constant, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 26 is sound modulo rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} .

From the definition of rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} (see Definition 6.4), we know that rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} is defined on the weakly posetal product (C_1, f, C_2) , $f : \hat{C}_1 \rightarrow \hat{C}_2$ isomorphism. Two process terms s related to C_1 and t related to C_2 , and $f : \hat{C}_1 \rightarrow \hat{C}_2$ isomorphism. Initially, $(C_1, f, C_2) = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, and $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in \approx_{rbhp}$. When $s \xrightarrow{e} s'$ ($C_1 \xrightarrow{e} C'_1$), there will be $t \xRightarrow{e} t'$ ($C_2 \xRightarrow{e} C'_2$), and we define $f' = f[e \mapsto e]$. Then, if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in \approx_{rbhp}$, then $(C'_1, f', C'_2) \in \approx_{rbhp}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the shadow constant modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation equivalence (2), we can prove that each axiom in Table 26 is sound modulo rooted branching hp-bisimulation equivalence, we just need additionally to check the above conditions on rooted branching hp-bisimulation, we omit them. \square

Theorem 8.3 (Completeness of the shadow constant). *Let p and q be closed $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and CFAR and the shadow constant terms, then,*

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

Proof. (1) For the case of rooted branching step bisimulation, the proof is following.

Firstly, in the proof the Theorem 6.16, we know that each process term p in $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with E a guarded linear recursive specification. And we prove if $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$, then $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$

There are no necessary to induct with respect to the structure of process term p , because there are no new cases. The only new situation is that now the set \mathbb{E} contains some new constants $\textcircled{\$}_i^e$ for $e \in \mathbb{E}$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\textcircled{\$}_i^e$ does not do anything, so, naturedly, if $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$, the only thing is that we should prevent $\textcircled{\$}$ -loops in the recursion in a specific way as same as preventing τ -loops, then $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$.

(2) For the case of rooted branching pomset bisimulation, it can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it.

(3) For the case of rooted branching hp-bisimulation, it can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it. \square

8.1.3. Some Discussions on True Concurrency

With the shadow constant, we have

$$(a \cdot r_b) \bowtie w_b = (a \cdot r_b) \bowtie (\mathbb{S}_1^a \cdot w_b) \\ = a \cdot c_b$$

with $\gamma(r_b, w_b) \triangleq c_b$.

And we see the following example:

$$\begin{aligned} a \bowtie b &= a \parallel b + a \mid b \\ &= a \parallel b + a \parallel b + a \parallel b + a \mid b \\ &= a \parallel (\mathbb{S}_1^a \cdot b) + (\mathbb{S}_1^b \cdot a) \parallel b + a \parallel b + a \mid b \\ &= (a \parallel \mathbb{S}_1^a) \cdot b + (\mathbb{S}_1^b \parallel b) \cdot a + a \parallel b + a \mid b \\ &= a \cdot b + b \cdot a + a \parallel b + a \mid b \end{aligned}$$

What do we see? Yes. The parallelism contains both interleaving and true concurrency. This may be why true concurrency is called **true concurrency**.

8.1.4. Verification of Traditional Alternating Bit Protocol

With the help of shadow constant, now we can verify the traditional alternating bit protocol (ABP) [19].

The ABP protocol is used to ensure successful transmission of data through a corrupted channel. This success is based on the assumption that data can be resent an unlimited number of times, which is illustrated in Fig.3, we alter it into the true concurrency situation.

1. Data elements d_1, d_2, d_3, \dots from a finite set Δ are communicated between a Sender and a Receiver.
2. If the Sender reads a datum from channel A .
3. The Sender processes the data in Δ , formes new data, and sends them to the Receiver through channel B .
4. And the Receiver sends the datum into channel C .
5. If channel B is corrupted, the message communicated through B can be turn into an error message \perp .
6. Every time the Receiver receives a message via channel B , it sends an acknowledgement to the Sender via channel D , which is also corrupted.

The Sender attaches a bit 0 to data elements d_{2k-1} and a bit 1 to data elements d_{2k} , when they are sent into channel B . When the Receiver reads a datum, it sends back the attached bit via channel D . If the Receiver receives a corrupted message, then it sends back the previous acknowledgement to the Sender.

Then the state transition of the Sender can be described by *APTC* as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} S_b &= \sum_{d \in \Delta} r_A(d) \cdot T_{db} \\ T_{db} &= \left(\sum_{d' \in \Delta} (s_B(d', b) \cdot \mathbb{S}^{s_C(d')}) + s_B(\perp) \right) \cdot U_{db} \\ U_{db} &= r_D(b) \cdot S_{1-b} + (r_D(1-b) + r_D(\perp)) \cdot T_{db} \end{aligned}$$

where s_B denotes sending data through channel B , r_D denotes receiving data through channel D , similarly, r_A means receiving data via channel A , $\mathbb{S}^{s_C(d')}$ denotes the shadow of $s_C(d')$.

And the state transition of the Receiver can be described by *APTC* as follows.




Fig. 3. Alternating bit protocol

$$\begin{aligned}
 R_b &= \sum_{d \in \Delta} \textcircled{S}^{r_A(d)} \cdot R'_b \\
 R'_b &= \sum_{d' \in \Delta} \{r_B(d', b) \cdot s_C(d') \cdot Q_b + r_B(d', 1-b) \cdot Q_{1-b}\} + r_B(\perp) \cdot Q_{1-b} \\
 Q_b &= (s_D(b) + s_D(\perp)) \cdot R_{1-b}
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\textcircled{S}^{r_A(d)}$ denotes the shadow of $r_A(d)$, r_B denotes receiving data via channel B , s_C denotes sending data via channel C , s_D denotes sending data via channel D , and $b \in \{0, 1\}$.

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.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \gamma(s_B(d', b), r_B(d', b)) &\triangleq c_B(d', b) \\
 \gamma(s_B(\perp), r_B(\perp)) &\triangleq c_B(\perp) \\
 \gamma(s_D(b), r_D(b)) &\triangleq c_D(b) \\
 \gamma(s_D(\perp), r_D(\perp)) &\triangleq c_D(\perp)
 \end{aligned}$$

Let R_0 and S_0 be in parallel, then the system $R_0 S_0$ can be represented by the following process term.

$$\tau_I(\partial_H(\Theta(R_0 \parallel S_0))) = \tau_I(\partial_H(R_0 \parallel S_0))$$

where $H = \{s_B(d', b), r_B(d', b), s_D(b), r_D(b) | d' \in \Delta, b \in \{0, 1\}\} \\ \{s_B(\perp), r_B(\perp), s_D(\perp), r_D(\perp)\}$

$$I = \{c_B(d', b), c_D(b) | d' \in \Delta, b \in \{0, 1\}\} \cup \{c_B(\perp), c_D(\perp)\}.$$

Then we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 8.4 (Correctness of the ABP protocol). *The ABP protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(R_0 \parallel S_0))$ exhibits desired external behaviors.*

$$\frac{x \xrightarrow{e} \surd}{\rho_f(x) \xrightarrow{f(e)} \surd} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{e} x'}{\rho_f(x) \xrightarrow{f(e)} \rho_f(x')}$$

Table 27. Transition rule of the renaming operator

Proof. Similarly, we can get $\tau_I(\langle X_1|E \rangle) = \sum_{d,d' \in \Delta} r_A(d) \cdot s_C(d') \cdot \tau_I(\langle Y_1|E \rangle)$ and $\tau_I(\langle Y_1|E \rangle) = \sum_{d,d' \in \Delta} r_A(d) \cdot s_C(d') \cdot \tau_I(\langle X_1|E \rangle)$.

So, the ABP protocol $\tau_I(\partial_H(R_0 \bowtie S_0))$ exhibits desired external behaviors. \square

8.2. Renaming

8.2.1. Transition Rules of Renaming Operator

Renaming operator $\rho_f(t)$ renames all actions in process term t , and assumes a renaming function $f : \mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\} \rightarrow \mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\}$ with $f(\tau) \triangleq \tau$, which is expressed by the following two transition rules in Table 27.

Theorem 8.5 (Conservativity of $APTC$ with respect to the renaming operator). *$APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and renaming operator is a conservative extension of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion.*

Proof. It follows from the following two facts (see Theorem 2.8).

1. The transition rules of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion in section 6 are all source-dependent;
2. The sources of the transition rules for the renaming operator contain an occurrence of ρ_f .

\square

Theorem 8.6 (Congruence theorem of the renaming operator). *Rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbp} , \approx_{rbs} and \approx_{rbhp} are all congruences with respect to $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the renaming operator.*

Proof. (1) Case rooted branching pomset bisimulation equivalence \approx_{rbp} .

Let x and y be $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the renaming operator processes, and $x \approx_{rbp} y$, it is sufficient to prove that $\rho_f(x) \approx_{rbp} \rho_f(y)$.

By the transition rules for operator ρ_f in Table 27, we can get

$$\rho_f(x) \xrightarrow{f(X)} \surd \quad \rho_f(y) \xrightarrow{f(Y)} \surd$$

with $X \subseteq x$, $Y \subseteq y$, and $X \sim Y$.

Or, we can get

$$\rho_f(x) \xrightarrow{f(X)} \rho_f(x') \quad \rho_f(y) \xrightarrow{f(Y)} \rho_f(y')$$

with $X \subseteq x$, $Y \subseteq y$, and $X \sim Y$ and the hypothesis $\rho_f(x') \approx_{rbp} \rho_f(y')$.

So, we get $\rho_f(x) \approx_{rbp} \rho_f(y)$, as desired

(2) The cases of rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} , rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} can be proven similarly, we omit them. \square

8.2.2. Axioms for Renaming Operators

We design the axioms for the renaming operator ρ_f in Table 28.

$RN1 - RN2$ are the defining equations for the renaming operator ρ_f ; $RN3 - RN5$ say that in $\rho_f(t)$, the labels of all transitions of t are renamed by means of the mapping f .

No.	Axiom
RN1	$\rho_f(e) = f(e)$
RN2	$\rho_f(\delta) = \delta$
RN3	$\rho_f(x + y) = \rho_f(x) + \rho_f(y)$
RN4	$\rho_f(x \cdot y) = \rho_f(x) \cdot \rho_f(y)$
RN5	$\rho_f(x \parallel y) = \rho_f(x) \parallel \rho_f(y)$

Table 28. Axioms of renaming operator

Theorem 8.7 (Soundness of the renaming operator). *Let x and y be $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the renaming operator terms. If $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the renaming operator $\vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \approx_{rbs} y$;
2. $x \approx_{rbp} y$;
3. $x \approx_{rbhp} y$.

Proof. (1) Soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the renaming operator with respect to rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} .

Since rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the renaming operator, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 28 is sound modulo rooted branching step bisimulation equivalence.

Though transition rules in Table 27 are defined in the flavor of single event, they can be modified into a step (a set of events within which each event is pairwise concurrent), we omit them. If we treat a single event as a step containing just one event, the proof of this soundness theorem does not exist any problem, so we use this way and still use the transition rules in Table 28.

We only prove soundness of the non-trivial axioms RN3–RN5, and omit the defining axioms RN1–RN2.

- **Axiom RN3.** Let p, q be $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the renaming operator processes, and $\rho_f(p + q) = \rho_f(p) + \rho_f(q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\rho_f(p + q) \approx_{rbs} \rho_f(p) + \rho_f(q)$. By the transition rules for operator $+$ in Table 5 and ρ_f in Table 27, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{\rho_f(p + q) \xrightarrow{f(e_1)} \surd} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{\rho_f(p) + \rho_f(q) \xrightarrow{f(e_1)} \surd} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{\rho_f(p + q) \xrightarrow{f(e_2)} \surd} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{\rho_f(p) + \rho_f(q) \xrightarrow{f(e_2)} \surd} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{\rho_f(p + q) \xrightarrow{f(e_1)} \rho_f(p')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{\rho_f(p) + \rho_f(q) \xrightarrow{f(e_1)} \rho_f(p')} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\rho_f(p + q) \xrightarrow{f(e_2)} \rho_f(q')} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\rho_f(p) + \rho_f(q) \xrightarrow{f(e_2)} \rho_f(q')}
\end{array}$$

So, $\rho_f(p + q) \approx_{rbs} \rho_f(p) + \rho_f(q)$, as desired.

- **Axiom RN4.** Let p, q be $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the renaming operator processes, and $\rho_f(p \cdot q) = \rho_f(p) \cdot \rho_f(q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\rho_f(p \cdot q) \approx_{rbs} \rho_f(p) \cdot \rho_f(q)$. By the transition rules for operator \cdot in Table 5 and ρ_f in Table 27, we get

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{\rho_f(p \cdot q) \xrightarrow{f(e_1)} \rho_f(q)} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd}{\rho_f(p) \cdot \rho_f(q) \xrightarrow{f(e_1)} \rho_f(q)}$$

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{\rho_f(p \cdot q) \xrightarrow{f(e_1)} \rho_f(p' \cdot q)} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{\rho_f(p) \cdot \rho_f(q) \xrightarrow{f(e_1)} \rho_f(p') \cdot \rho_f(q)}$$

So, with the assumption $\rho_f(p' \cdot q) = \rho_f(p') \cdot \rho_f(q)$, $\rho_f(p \cdot q) \approx_{rbs} \rho_f(p) \cdot \rho_f(q)$, as desired.

- **Axiom RN5.** Let p, q be $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the renaming operator processes, and $\rho_f(p \parallel q) = \rho_f(p) \parallel \rho_f(q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\rho_f(p \parallel q) \approx_{rbs} \rho_f(p) \parallel \rho_f(q)$. By the transition rules for operator \parallel in Table 7 and ρ_f in Table 27, we get

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{\rho_f(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{f(e_1), f(e_2)\}} \surd} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{\rho_f(p) \parallel \rho_f(q) \xrightarrow{\{f(e_1), f(e_2)\}} \surd} \\ \\ \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{\rho_f(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{f(e_1), f(e_2)\}} \rho_f(p')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{\rho_f(p) \parallel \rho_f(q) \xrightarrow{\{f(e_1), f(e_2)\}} \rho_f(p')} \\ \\ \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\rho_f(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{f(e_1), f(e_2)\}} \rho_f(q')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\rho_f(p) \parallel \rho_f(q) \xrightarrow{\{f(e_1), f(e_2)\}} \rho_f(q')} \\ \\ \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\rho_f(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{f(e_1), f(e_2)\}} \rho_f(p' \bowtie q')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\rho_f(p) \parallel \rho_f(q) \xrightarrow{\{f(e_1), f(e_2)\}} \rho_f(p') \bowtie \rho_f(q')} \end{array}$$

So, with the assumption $\rho_f(p' \bowtie q') = \rho_f(p') \bowtie \rho_f(q')$, $\rho_f(p \parallel q) \approx_{rbs} \rho_f(p) \parallel \rho_f(q)$, as desired.

(2) Soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the renaming operator with respect to rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} .

Since rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the renaming operator, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 28 is sound modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} .

From the definition of rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} (see Definition 6.2), we know that rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} is defined by weak pomset transitions, which are labeled by pomsets with τ . In a weak pomset transition, the events in the pomset are either within causality relations (defined by \cdot) or in concurrency (implicitly defined by \cdot and $+$, and explicitly defined by \bowtie), of course, they are pairwise consistent (without conflicts). In (1), we have already proven the case that all events are pairwise concurrent, so, we only need to prove the case of events in causality. Without loss of generality, we take a pomset of $P = \{e_1, e_2 : e_1 \cdot e_2\}$. Then the weak pomset transition labeled by the above P is just composed of one single event transition labeled by e_1 succeeded by another single event transition labeled by e_2 , that is, $\xRightarrow{P} = \xRightarrow{e_1} \xRightarrow{e_2}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the renaming operator modulo rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} (1), we can prove that each axiom in Table 28 is sound modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} , we omit them.

(3) Soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the renaming operator with respect to rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} .

Since rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the renaming operator, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 28 is sound modulo rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} .

From the definition of rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} (see Definition 6.4), we know that rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} is defined on the weakly posetal product (C_1, f, C_2) , $f : \hat{C}_1 \rightarrow \hat{C}_2$ isomorphism. Two process terms s related to C_1 and t related to C_2 , and $f : \hat{C}_1 \rightarrow \hat{C}_2$ isomorphism. Initially, $(C_1, f, C_2) = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, and $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in \approx_{rbhp}$. When $s \xrightarrow{e} s' (C_1 \xrightarrow{e} C'_1)$, there will be $t \xrightarrow{e} t' (C_2 \xrightarrow{e} C'_2)$, and we define $f' = f[e \mapsto e]$. Then, if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in \approx_{rbhp}$, then $(C'_1, f', C'_2) \in \approx_{rbhp}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the renaming operator modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation equivalence (2), we can prove that each axiom in Table 28 is

sound modulo rooted branching hp-bisimulation equivalence, we just need additionally to check the above conditions on rooted branching hp-bisimulation, we omit them. \square

Theorem 8.8 (Completeness of the renaming operator). *Let p and q be closed $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and CFAR and the renaming operator terms, then,*

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

Proof. (1) For the case of rooted branching step bisimulation, the proof is following.

Firstly, in the proof the Theorem 6.16, we know that each process term p in $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with E a guarded linear recursive specification. And we prove if $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$, then $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$

Structural induction with respect to process term p can be applied. The only new case (where $RN1-RN5$ are needed) is $p \equiv \rho_f(q)$. First assuming $q = \langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with a guarded linear recursive specification E , we prove the case of $p = \rho_f(\langle X_1 | E \rangle)$. Let E consist of guarded linear recursive equations

$$X_i = (a_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{i1}i1})X_{i1} + \dots + (a_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{im_i}im_i})X_{im_i} + b_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{i1}i1} + \dots + b_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{im_i}im_i}$$

for $i \in 1, \dots, n$. Let F consist of guarded linear recursive equations

$$Y_i = (f(a_{1i1}) \parallel \dots \parallel f(a_{k_{i1}i1}))Y_{i1} + \dots + (f(a_{1im_i}) \parallel \dots \parallel f(a_{k_{im_i}im_i}))Y_{im_i} + f(b_{1i1}) \parallel \dots \parallel f(b_{l_{i1}i1}) + \dots + f(b_{1im_i}) \parallel \dots \parallel f(b_{l_{im_i}im_i})$$

for $i \in 1, \dots, n$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho_f(\langle X_i | E \rangle) \\ \stackrel{\text{RDP}}{=} & \rho_f((a_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{i1}i1})X_{i1} + \dots + (a_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{im_i}im_i})X_{im_i} + b_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{i1}i1} + \dots + b_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{im_i}im_i}) \\ \stackrel{\text{RN1-RN5}}{=} & (f(a_{1i1}) \parallel \dots \parallel f(a_{k_{i1}i1}))\rho_f(X_{i1}) + \dots + (f(a_{1im_i}) \parallel \dots \parallel f(a_{k_{im_i}im_i}))\rho_f(X_{im_i}) \\ & + f(b_{1i1}) \parallel \dots \parallel f(b_{l_{i1}i1}) + \dots + f(b_{1im_i}) \parallel \dots \parallel f(b_{l_{im_i}im_i}) \end{aligned}$$

Replacing Y_i by $\rho_f(\langle X_i | E \rangle)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ is a solution for F . So by RSP , $\rho_f(\langle X_1 | E \rangle) = \langle Y_1 | F \rangle$, as desired.

- (2) For the case of rooted branching pomset bisimulation, it can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it.
- (3) For the case of rooted branching hp-bisimulation, it can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it. \square

8.3. State Operator for APTC

8.3.1. Transition Rules of State Operator

State operator permits explicitly to describe states, where S denotes a finite set of states, $action(s, e)$ denotes the visible behavior of e in state s with $action : S \times \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$, $effect(s, e)$ represents the state that results if e is executed in s with $effect : S \times \mathbb{E} \rightarrow S$. State operator $\lambda_s(t)$ which denotes process term t in s , is expressed by the following transition rules in Table 29. Note that $action$ and $effect$ are extended to $\mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\}$ by defining $action(s, \tau) \triangleq \tau$ and $effect(s, \tau) \triangleq s$. We use $e_1 \% e_2$ to denote that e_1 and e_2 are in race condition.

Theorem 8.9 (Conservativity of $APTC$ with respect to the state operator). *$APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and state operator is a conservative extension of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion.*

Proof. It follows from the following two facts.

1. The transition rules of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion are all source-dependent;
2. The sources of the transition rules for the state operator contain an occurrence of λ_s .

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e} \surd}{\lambda_s(x) \xrightarrow{\text{action}(s,e)} \surd} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{e} x'}{\lambda_s(x) \xrightarrow{\text{action}(s,e)} \lambda_{\text{effect}(s,e)}(x')} \\
\\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} (e_1 \% e_2)}{\lambda_s(x \parallel y) \xrightarrow{\text{action}(s,e_1)} \lambda_{\text{effect}(s,e_1)}(y)} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} (e_1 \% e_2)}{\lambda_s(x \parallel y) \xrightarrow{\text{action}(s,e_1)} \lambda_{\text{effect}(s,e_1)}(x' \parallel y)} \\
\\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} y \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_1 \% e_2)}{\lambda_s(x \parallel y) \xrightarrow{\text{action}(s,e_2)} \lambda_{\text{effect}(s,e_2)}(x)} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} y \xrightarrow{e_2} y' \quad (e_1 \% e_2)}{\lambda_s(x \parallel y) \xrightarrow{\text{action}(s,e_2)} \lambda_{\text{effect}(s,e_2)}(x \parallel y')} \\
\\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{\lambda_s(x \parallel y) \xrightarrow{\{\text{action}(s,e_1), \text{action}(s,e_2)\}} \surd} \\
\\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd}{\lambda_s(x \parallel y) \xrightarrow{\{\text{action}(s,e_1), \text{action}(s,e_2)\}} \lambda_{\text{effect}(s,e_1) \cup \text{effect}(s,e_2)}(x')} \\
\\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y'}{\lambda_s(x \parallel y) \xrightarrow{\{\text{action}(s,e_1), \text{action}(s,e_2)\}} \lambda_{\text{effect}(s,e_1) \cup \text{effect}(s,e_2)}(y')} \\
\\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y'}{\lambda_s(x \parallel y) \xrightarrow{\{\text{action}(s,e_1), \text{action}(s,e_2)\}} \lambda_{\text{effect}(s,e_1) \cup \text{effect}(s,e_2)}(x' \parallel y')}
\end{array}$$

Table 29. Transition rule of the state operator

□

Theorem 8.10 (Congruence theorem of the state operator). *Rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbp} , \approx_{rbs} and \approx_{rbhp} are all congruences with respect to $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the state operator.*

Proof. (1) Case rooted branching pomset bisimulation equivalence \approx_{rbp} .

Let x and y be $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the state operator processes, and $x \approx_{rbp} y$, it is sufficient to prove that $\lambda_s(x) \approx_{rbp} \lambda_s(y)$.

By the transition rules for operator λ_s in Table 29, we can get

$$\lambda_s(x) \xrightarrow{\text{action}(s,X)} \surd \quad \lambda_s(y) \xrightarrow{\text{action}(s,Y)} \surd$$

with $X \subseteq x$, $Y \subseteq y$, and $X \sim Y$.

Or, we can get

$$\lambda_s(x) \xrightarrow{\text{action}(s,X)} \lambda_{\text{effect}(s,X)}(x') \quad \lambda_s(y) \xrightarrow{\text{action}(s,Y)} \lambda_{\text{effect}(s,Y)}(y')$$

with $X \subseteq x$, $Y \subseteq y$, and $X \sim Y$ and the hypothesis $\lambda_{\text{effect}(s,X)}(x') \approx_{rbp} \lambda_{\text{effect}(s,Y)}(y')$.

So, we get $\lambda_s(x) \approx_{rbp} \lambda_s(y)$, as desired

(2) The cases of rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} , rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} can be proven similarly, we omit them. □

8.3.2. Axioms for State Operators

We design the axioms for the state operator λ_s in Table 30.

Theorem 8.11 (Soundness of the state operator). *Let x and y be $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the state operator terms. If $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the state operator $\vdash x = y$, then*

No.	Axiom
SO1	$\lambda_s(e) = action(s, e)$
SO2	$\lambda_s(\delta) = \delta$
SO3	$\lambda_s(x + y) = \lambda_s(x) + \lambda_s(y)$
SO4	$\lambda_s(e \cdot y) = action(s, e) \cdot \lambda_{effect(s, e)}(y)$
SO5	$\lambda_s(x \parallel y) = \lambda_s(x) \parallel \lambda_s(y)$

Table 30. Axioms of state operator

1. $x \approx_{rbs} y$;
2. $x \approx_{rbp} y$;
3. $x \approx_{rbhp} y$.

Proof. (1) Soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the state operator with respect to rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} .

Since rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the state operator, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 30 is sound modulo rooted branching step bisimulation equivalence.

Though transition rules in Table 29 are defined in the flavor of single event, they can be modified into a step (a set of events within which each event is pairwise concurrent), we omit them. If we treat a single event as a step containing just one event, the proof of this soundness theorem does not exist any problem, so we use this way and still use the transition rules in Table 30.

We only prove soundness of the non-trivial axioms SO3–SO5, and omit the defining axioms SO1–SO2.

- **Axiom SO3.** Let p, q be $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the state operator processes, and $\lambda_s(p + q) = \lambda_s(p) + \lambda_s(q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\lambda_s(p + q) \approx_{rbs} \lambda_s(p) + \lambda_s(q)$. By the transition rules for operator $+$ and λ_s in Table 29, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \sqrt{\quad}}{\lambda_s(p + q) \xrightarrow{action(s, e_1)} \sqrt{\quad}} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \sqrt{\quad}}{\lambda_s(p) + \lambda_s(q) \xrightarrow{action(s, e_1)} \sqrt{\quad}} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{\quad}}{\lambda_s(p + q) \xrightarrow{action(s, e_2)} \sqrt{\quad}} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} \sqrt{\quad}}{\lambda_s(p) + \lambda_s(q) \xrightarrow{action(s, e_2)} \sqrt{\quad}} \\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{\lambda_s(p + q) \xrightarrow{action(s, e_1)} \lambda_{effect(s, e_1)}(p')} \quad \frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p'}{\lambda_s(p) + \lambda_s(q) \xrightarrow{action(s, e_1)} \lambda_{effect(s, e_1)}(p')} \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\lambda_s(p + q) \xrightarrow{action(s, e_2)} \lambda_{effect(s, e_2)}(q')} \quad \frac{q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\lambda_s(p) + \lambda_s(q) \xrightarrow{action(s, e_2)} \lambda_{effect(s, e_2)}(q')}
\end{array}$$

So, $\lambda_s(p + q) \approx_{rbs} \lambda_s(p) + \lambda_s(q)$, as desired.

- **Axiom SO4.** Let q be $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the state operator processes, and $\lambda_s(e \cdot q) = action(s, e) \cdot \lambda_{effect(s, e)}(q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\lambda_s(e \cdot q) \approx_{rbs} action(s, e) \cdot \lambda_{effect(s, e)}(q)$. By the transition rules for operator \cdot and λ_s in Table 29, we get

$$\frac{e \xrightarrow{e} \sqrt{\quad}}{\lambda_s(e \cdot q) \xrightarrow{action(s, e)} \lambda_{effect(s, e)}(q)} \quad \frac{action(s, e) \xrightarrow{action(s, e)} \sqrt{\quad}}{action(s, e) \cdot \lambda_{effect(s, e)}(q) \xrightarrow{action(s, e)} \lambda_{effect(s, e)}(q)}$$

So, $\lambda_s(e \cdot q) \approx_{rbs} action(s, e) \cdot \lambda_{effect(s, e)}(q)$, as desired.

- **Axiom SO5.** Let p, q be $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the state operator processes, and $\lambda_s(p \parallel q) = \lambda_s(p) \parallel \lambda_s(q)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\lambda_s(p \parallel q) \approx_{rbs} \lambda_s(p) \parallel \lambda_s(q)$. By the transition rules for operator \parallel and λ_s in Table 29, we get for the case $\neg(e_1 \% e_2)$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{\lambda_s(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{action(s,e_1), action(s,e_2)\}} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{\lambda_s(p) \parallel \lambda_s(q) \xrightarrow{\{action(s,e_1), action(s,e_2)\}} \checkmark} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{\lambda_s(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{action(s,e_1), action(s,e_2)\}} \lambda_{effect(s,e_1) \cup effect(s,e_2)}(p')} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{\lambda_s(p) \parallel \lambda_s(q) \xrightarrow{\{action(s,e_1), action(s,e_2)\}} \lambda_{effect(s,e_1) \cup effect(s,e_2)}(p')} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\lambda_s(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{action(s,e_1), action(s,e_2)\}} \lambda_{effect(s,e_1) \cup effect(s,e_2)}(q')} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\lambda_s(p) \parallel \lambda_s(q) \xrightarrow{\{action(s,e_1), action(s,e_2)\}} \lambda_{effect(s,e_1) \cup effect(s,e_2)}(q')} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\lambda_s(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{\{action(s,e_1), action(s,e_2)\}} \lambda_{effect(s,e_1) \cup effect(s,e_2)}(p' \bowtie q')} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\lambda_s(p) \parallel \lambda_s(q) \xrightarrow{\{action(s,e_1), action(s,e_2)\}} \lambda_{effect(s,e_1) \cup effect(s,e_2)}(p') \bowtie \lambda_{effect(s,e_1) \cup effect(s,e_2)}(q')}
\end{array}$$

So, with the assumption $\lambda_{effect(s,e_1) \cup effect(s,e_2)}(p' \bowtie q') = \lambda_{effect(s,e_1) \cup effect(s,e_2)}(p') \bowtie \lambda_{effect(s,e_1) \cup effect(s,e_2)}(q')$, $\lambda_s(p \parallel q) \approx_{rbs} \lambda_s(p) \parallel \lambda_s(q)$, as desired. For the case $e_1 \% e_2$, we get

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \not\xrightarrow{e_2}}{\lambda_s(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{action(s,e_1)} \lambda_{effect(s,e_1)}(q)} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \checkmark \quad q \not\xrightarrow{e_2}}{\lambda_s(p) \parallel \lambda_s(q) \xrightarrow{action(s,e_1)} \lambda_{effect(s,e_1)}(q)} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \not\xrightarrow{e_2}}{\lambda_s(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{action(s,e_1)} \lambda_{effect(s,e_1)}(p' \bowtie q)} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} p' \quad q \not\xrightarrow{e_2}}{\lambda_s(p) \parallel \lambda_s(q) \xrightarrow{action(s,e_1)} \lambda_{effect(s,e_1)}(p') \bowtie \lambda_{effect(s,e_1)}(q)} \\
\\
\frac{p \not\xrightarrow{e_1} \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{\lambda_s(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{action(s,e_2)} \lambda_{effect(s,e_2)}(p)}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} \checkmark}{\lambda_s(p) \parallel \lambda_s(q) \xrightarrow{action(s, e_2)} \lambda_{effect(s, e_2)}(p)} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\lambda_s(p \parallel q) \xrightarrow{action(s, e_2)} \lambda_{effect(s, e_2)}(p) \bowtie q'} \\
\\
\frac{p \xrightarrow{e_1} \quad q \xrightarrow{e_2} q'}{\lambda_s(p) \parallel \lambda_s(q) \xrightarrow{action(s, e_2)} \lambda_{effect(s, e_2)}(p) \bowtie \lambda_{effect(s, e_2)}(q')}
\end{array}$$

So, with the assumption $\lambda_{effect(s, e_1)}(p' \bowtie q) = \lambda_{effect(s, e_1)}(p') \bowtie \lambda_{effect(s, e_1)}(q)$ and $\lambda_{effect(s, e_2)}(p \bowtie q') = \lambda_{effect(s, e_2)}(p) \bowtie \lambda_{effect(s, e_2)}(q')$, $\lambda_s(p \parallel q) \approx_{rbs} \lambda_s(p) \parallel \lambda_s(q)$, as desired.

(2) Soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the state operator with respect to rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} .

Since rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the state operator, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 30 is sound modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} .

From the definition of rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} (see Definition 6.2), we know that rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} is defined by weak pomset transitions, which are labeled by pomsets with τ . In a weak pomset transition, the events in the pomset are either within causality relations (defined by \cdot) or in concurrency (implicitly defined by \cdot and $+$, and explicitly defined by \bowtie), of course, they are pairwise consistent (without conflicts). In (1), we have already proven the case that all events are pairwise concurrent, so, we only need to prove the case of events in causality. Without loss of generality, we take a pomset of $P = \{e_1, e_2 : e_1 \cdot e_2\}$. Then the weak pomset transition labeled by the above P is just composed of one single event transition labeled by e_1 succeeded by another single event transition labeled by e_2 , that is, $\xRightarrow{P} = \xRightarrow{e_1} \xRightarrow{e_2}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the state operator modulo rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} (1), we can prove that each axiom in Table 30 is sound modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation \approx_{rbp} , we omit them.

(3) Soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the state operator with respect to rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} .

Since rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the state operator, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 30 is sound modulo rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} .

From the definition of rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} (see Definition 6.4), we know that rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} is defined on the weakly posetal product $(C_1, f, C_2), f : \hat{C}_1 \rightarrow \hat{C}_2$ isomorphism. Two process terms s related to C_1 and t related to C_2 , and $f : \hat{C}_1 \rightarrow \hat{C}_2$ isomorphism. Initially, $(C_1, f, C_2) = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, and $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in \approx_{rbhp}$. When $s \xrightarrow{e} s' (C_1 \xrightarrow{e} C'_1)$, there will be $t \xRightarrow{e} t' (C_2 \xRightarrow{e} C'_2)$, and we define $f' = f[e \mapsto e]$. Then, if $(C_1, f, C_2) \in \approx_{rbhp}$, then $(C'_1, f', C'_2) \in \approx_{rbhp}$.

Similarly to the proof of soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and the state operator modulo rooted branching pomset bisimulation equivalence (2), we can prove that each axiom in Table 30 is sound modulo rooted branching hp-bisimulation equivalence, we just need additionally to check the above conditions on rooted branching hp-bisimulation, we omit them. \square

Theorem 8.12 (Completeness of the state operator). *Let p and q be closed $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and CFAR and the state operator terms, then,*

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

Proof. (1) For the case of rooted branching step bisimulation, the proof is following.

Firstly, we know that each process term p in $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion is equal to a process

term $\langle X_1|E \rangle$ with E a guarded linear recursive specification. And we prove if $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle$, then $\langle X_1|E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1|E_2 \rangle$

Structural induction with respect to process term p can be applied. The only new case (where $SO1-SO5$ are needed) is $p \equiv \lambda_{s_0}(q)$. First assuming $q = \langle X_1|E \rangle$ with a guarded linear recursive specification E , we prove the case of $p = \lambda_{s_0}(\langle X_1|E \rangle)$. Let E consist of guarded linear recursive equations

$$X_i = (a_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{i1}i1})X_{i1} + \dots + (a_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{im_i}im_i})X_{im_i} + b_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{i1}i1} + \dots + b_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{im_i}im_i}$$

for $i \in 1, \dots, n$. Let F consist of guarded linear recursive equations

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i(s) &= (action(s, a_{1i1}) \parallel \dots \parallel action(s, a_{k_{i1}i1}))Y_{i1}(effect(s, a_{1i1}) \cup \dots \cup effect(s, a_{k_{i1}i1})) \\ &+ \dots + (action(s, a_{1im_i}) \parallel \dots \parallel action(s, a_{k_{im_i}im_i}))Y_{im_i}(effect(s, a_{1im_i}) \cup \dots \cup effect(s, a_{k_{im_i}im_i})) \\ &+ action(s, b_{1i1}) \parallel \dots \parallel action(s, b_{l_{i1}i1}) + \dots + action(s, b_{1im_i}) \parallel \dots \parallel action(s, b_{l_{im_i}im_i}) \end{aligned}$$

for $i \in 1, \dots, n$.

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda_s(\langle X_i|E \rangle) \\ \stackrel{RDP}{=} &\lambda_s((a_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{i1}i1})X_{i1} + \dots + (a_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{im_i}im_i})X_{im_i} + b_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{i1}i1} + \dots + b_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{im_i}im_i}) \\ \stackrel{SO1-SO5}{=} &(action(s, a_{1i1}) \parallel \dots \parallel action(s, a_{k_{i1}i1}))\lambda_{effect(s, a_{1i1}) \cup \dots \cup effect(s, a_{k_{i1}i1})}(X_{i1}) \\ &+ \dots + (action(s, a_{1im_i}) \parallel \dots \parallel action(s, a_{k_{im_i}im_i}))\lambda_{effect(s, a_{1im_i}) \cup \dots \cup effect(s, a_{k_{im_i}im_i})}(X_{im_i}) \\ &+ action(s, b_{1i1}) \parallel \dots \parallel action(s, b_{l_{i1}i1}) + \dots + action(s, b_{1im_i}) \parallel \dots \parallel action(s, b_{l_{im_i}im_i}) \end{aligned}$$

Replacing $Y_i(s)$ by $\lambda_s(\langle X_i|E \rangle)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ is a solution for F . So by RSP , $\lambda_{s_0}(\langle X_1|E \rangle) = \langle Y_1(s_0)|F \rangle$, as desired.

(2) For the case of rooted branching pomset bisimulation, it can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it.

(3) For the case of rooted branching hp-bisimulation, it can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it. \square

8.4. Guards

Traditional process algebras, such as CCS [2] [3] and ACP [4], are well-known for capturing concurrency based on the interleaving bisimulation semantics. These algebras do not involve anything about data and conditionals, because data are hidden behind of actions. There are some efforts to extend these algebras with conditionals, for example, [21] extended ACP with guards. But these work did not form a perfect solution, just because it is difficult to deal the interleaving concurrency with conditionals.

Based on *APTC*, we add guards into it by adopting the solution of [21] in two ways: (1) the same solution to guards to form a Boolean Algebra; (2) the similar operational semantics based on configuration, which has two parts: the processes and the data states. Finally, we get some further results as follows:

1. we design a sound and complete theory of concurrency and parallelism with guards;
2. we design a sound and complete theory of recursion including concurrency with guards;
3. we design a sound and complete theory of abstraction with guards;
4. we design a sound Hoare logic [20] including concurrency and parallelism, recursion, and abstraction.

8.4.1. Operational Semantics

In this section, we extend truly concurrent bisimilarities to the ones containing data states.

Definition 8.13 (Prime event structure with silent event and empty event). *Let Λ be a fixed set of labels, ranged over a, b, c, \dots and τ, ϵ . A $(\Lambda$ -labelled) prime event structure with silent event τ and empty event ϵ is a tuple $\mathcal{E} = \langle \mathbb{E}, \leq, \# \rangle$, where \mathbb{E} is a denumerable set of events, including the silent event τ and empty event ϵ . Let $\hat{\mathbb{E}} = \mathbb{E} \setminus \{\tau, \epsilon\}$, exactly excluding τ and ϵ , it is obvious that $\hat{\tau}^* = \epsilon$. Let $\lambda : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \Lambda$ be a labelling function and let $\lambda(\tau) = \tau$ and $\lambda(\epsilon) = \epsilon$. 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 8.14 (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. $[C] = C$), and a data state $s \in S$ with S the set of all data states, denoted $\langle C, s \rangle$. The set of finite configurations of \mathcal{E} is denoted by $\langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}), S \rangle$. We let $\hat{C} = C \setminus \{\tau\} \cup \{\epsilon\}$.

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 8.15 (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 $\langle C, s \rangle \xrightarrow{X} \langle C', s' \rangle$ is called a pomset transition from $\langle C, s \rangle$ to $\langle C', s' \rangle$. When the events in X are pairwise concurrent, we say that $\langle C, s \rangle \xrightarrow{X} \langle C', s' \rangle$ is a step. It is obvious that $\rightarrow^* \xrightarrow{X} \rightarrow^* = \xrightarrow{X} \rightarrow^*$ and $\rightarrow^* \xrightarrow{e} \rightarrow^* = \xrightarrow{X} \rightarrow^*$ for any $e \in \mathbb{E}$ and $X \subseteq \mathbb{E}$.

Definition 8.16 (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 $\langle C, s \rangle \xrightarrow{X} \langle C', s' \rangle$ is called a weak pomset transition from $\langle C, s \rangle$ to $\langle C', s' \rangle$, where we define $\xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{\tau^*}$. And $\xrightarrow{X} \xrightarrow{\tau^*} \xrightarrow{e} \xrightarrow{\tau^*}$, for every $e \in X$. When the events in X are pairwise concurrent, we say that $\langle C, s \rangle \xrightarrow{X} \langle C', s' \rangle$ is a weak step.

We will also suppose that all the PESs in this paper are image finite, that is, for any PES \mathcal{E} and $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$ and $a \in \Lambda$, $\{e \in \mathbb{E} \mid \langle C, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle C', s' \rangle \wedge \lambda(e) = a\}$ and $\{e \in \hat{\mathbb{E}} \mid \langle C, s \rangle \xRightarrow{e} \langle C', s' \rangle \wedge \lambda(e) = a\}$ is finite.

Definition 8.17 (Pomset, step bisimulation). Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A pomset bisimulation is a relation $R \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, such that if $(\langle C_1, s \rangle, \langle C_2, s \rangle) \in R$, and $\langle C_1, s \rangle \xrightarrow{X_1} \langle C'_1, s' \rangle$ then $\langle C_2, s \rangle \xrightarrow{X_2} \langle C'_2, s' \rangle$, with $X_1 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_1$, $X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{E}_2$, $X_1 \sim X_2$ and $(\langle C'_1, s' \rangle, \langle C'_2, s' \rangle) \in R$ for all $s \in S$, and vice-versa. We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_p \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a pomset bisimulation R , such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R$. By replacing pomset transitions with steps, we can get the definition of step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_s \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 8.18 (Weak pomset, step bisimulation). Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be PESs. A weak pomset bisimulation is a relation $R \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, such that if $(\langle C_1, s \rangle, \langle C_2, s \rangle) \in R$, and $\langle C_1, s \rangle \xRightarrow{X_1} \langle C'_1, s' \rangle$ then $\langle C_2, s \rangle \xRightarrow{X_2} \langle C'_2, s' \rangle$, with $X_1 \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1$, $X_2 \subseteq \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2$, $X_1 \sim X_2$ and $(\langle C'_1, s' \rangle, \langle C'_2, s' \rangle) \in R$ for all $s \in S$, and vice-versa. We say that $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are weak pomset bisimilar, written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_p \mathcal{E}_2$, if there exists a weak pomset bisimulation R , such that $(\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle, \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle) \in R$. By replacing weak pomset transitions with weak steps, we can get the definition of weak step bisimulation. When PESs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are weak step bisimilar, we write $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_s \mathcal{E}_2$.

Definition 8.19 (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

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

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 $(\langle C_1, s \rangle, f, \langle C_2, s \rangle), (\langle C'_1, s' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, s' \rangle) \in \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, if $(\langle C_1, s \rangle, f, \langle C_2, s \rangle) \subseteq (\langle C'_1, s' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, s' \rangle)$ pointwise and $(\langle C'_1, s' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, s' \rangle) \in R$, then $(\langle C_1, s \rangle, f, \langle C_2, s \rangle) \in R$.

For $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$, we define $f[x_1 \mapsto x_2] : X_1 \cup \{x_1\} \rightarrow X_2 \cup \{x_2\}$, $z \in X_1 \cup \{x_1\}$, $(1)f[x_1 \mapsto x_2](z) = x_2$, 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 8.20 (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*

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

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 $((\langle C_1, s \rangle, f, \langle C_2, s \rangle), ((\langle C'_1, s' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, s' \rangle) \in \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle)$, if $((\langle C_1, s \rangle, f, \langle C_2, s \rangle) \subseteq ((\langle C'_1, s' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, s' \rangle))$ pointwise and $((\langle C'_1, s' \rangle, f', \langle C'_2, s' \rangle) \in R$, then $((\langle C_1, s \rangle, f, \langle C_2, s \rangle) \in R$.

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

Definition 8.21 ((Hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). *A history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a posetal relation $R \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$ such that if $((\langle C_1, s \rangle, f, \langle C_2, s \rangle) \in R$, and $\langle C_1, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle C'_1, s' \rangle$, then $\langle C_2, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle C'_2, s' \rangle$, with $((\langle C'_1, s' \rangle, f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], \langle C'_2, s' \rangle) \in R$ for all $s \in S$, and vice-versa. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \sim_{hp} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a hp-bisimulation R such that $((\emptyset, \emptyset), \emptyset, (\emptyset, \emptyset)) \in R$.*

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

Definition 8.22 (Weak (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). *A weak history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a weakly posetal relation $R \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \overline{\times} \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$ such that if $((\langle C_1, s \rangle, f, \langle C_2, s \rangle) \in R$, and $\langle C_1, s \rangle \xRightarrow{e_1} \langle C'_1, s' \rangle$, then $\langle C_2, s \rangle \xRightarrow{e_2} \langle C'_2, s' \rangle$, with $((\langle C'_1, s' \rangle, f[e_1 \mapsto e_2], \langle C'_2, s' \rangle) \in R$ for all $s \in S$, and vice-versa. $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are weak history-preserving (hp-)bisimilar and are written $\mathcal{E}_1 \approx_{hp} \mathcal{E}_2$ if there exists a weak hp-bisimulation R such that $((\emptyset, \emptyset), \emptyset, (\emptyset, \emptyset)) \in R$.*

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

8.4.2. BATC with Guards

In this subsection, we will discuss the guards for $BATC$, which is denoted as $BATC_G$. Let \mathbb{E} be the set of atomic events (actions), G_{at} be the set of atomic guards, δ be the deadlock constant, and ϵ be the empty event. We extend G_{at} to the set of basic guards G with element ϕ, ψ, \dots , which is generated by the following formation rules:

$$\phi ::= \delta \mid \epsilon \mid \neg\phi \mid \psi \in G_{at} \mid \phi + \psi \mid \phi \cdot \psi$$

In the following, let $e_1, e_2, e'_1, e'_2 \in \mathbb{E}$, $\phi, \psi \in G$ 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 predicate $test(\phi, s)$ represents that ϕ holds in the state s , and $test(\epsilon, s)$ holds and $test(\delta, s)$ does not hold. $effect(e, s) \in S$ denotes $s' \text{ in } s \xrightarrow{e} s'$. The predicate weakest precondition $wp(e, \phi)$ denotes that $\forall s \in S, test(\phi, effect(e, s))$ holds.

The set of axioms of $BATC_G$ consists of the laws given in Table 31.

Note that, by eliminating atomic event from the process terms, the axioms in Table 31 will lead to a Boolean Algebra. And $G9$ is a precondition of e and ϕ , $G10$ is the weakest precondition of e and ϕ . A data environment with $effect$ function is sufficiently deterministic, and it is obvious that if the weakest precondition is expressible and $G9, G10$ are sound, then the related data environment is sufficiently deterministic.

Definition 8.23 (Basic terms of $BATC_G$). *The set of basic terms of $BATC_G$, $\mathcal{B}(BATC_G)$, is inductively defined as follows:*

1. $\mathbb{E} \subset \mathcal{B}(BATC_G)$;
2. $G \subset \mathcal{B}(BATC_G)$;
3. if $e \in \mathbb{E}, t \in \mathcal{B}(BATC_G)$ then $e \cdot t \in \mathcal{B}(BATC_G)$;
4. if $\phi \in G, t \in \mathcal{B}(BATC_G)$ then $\phi \cdot t \in \mathcal{B}(BATC_G)$;

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	$(x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot (y \cdot z)$
A6	$x + \delta = x$
A7	$\delta \cdot x = \delta$
A8	$\epsilon \cdot x = x$
A9	$x \cdot \epsilon = x$
G1	$\phi \cdot \neg\phi = \delta$
G2	$\phi + \neg\phi = \epsilon$
G3	$\phi\delta = \delta$
G4	$\phi(x + y) = \phi x + \phi y$
G5	$\phi(x \cdot y) = \phi x \cdot \phi y$
G6	$(\phi + \psi)x = \phi x + \psi x$
G7	$(\phi \cdot \psi) \cdot x = \phi \cdot (\psi \cdot x)$
G8	$\phi_0 \cdots \phi_n = \delta$ if $\forall s \in S, \exists i \leq n. test(\neg\phi_i, s)$
G9	$wp(e, \phi)e\phi = wp(e, \phi)e$
G10	$\neg wp(e, \phi)e\neg\phi = \neg wp(e, \phi)e$

Table 31. Axioms of $BATC_G$

No.	Rewriting Rule
RA3	$x + x \rightarrow x$
RA4	$(x + y) \cdot z \rightarrow x \cdot z + y \cdot z$
RA5	$(x \cdot y) \cdot z \rightarrow x \cdot (y \cdot z)$
RA6	$x + \delta \rightarrow x$
RA7	$\delta \cdot x \rightarrow \delta$
RA8	$\epsilon \cdot x \rightarrow x$
RA9	$x \cdot \epsilon \rightarrow x$
RG1	$\phi \cdot \neg\phi \rightarrow \delta$
RG2	$\phi + \neg\phi \rightarrow \epsilon$
RG3	$\phi\delta \rightarrow \delta$
RG4	$\phi(x + y) \rightarrow \phi x + \phi y$
RG5	$\phi(x \cdot y) \rightarrow \phi x \cdot \phi y$
RG6	$(\phi + \psi)x \rightarrow \phi x + \psi x$
RG7	$(\phi \cdot \psi) \cdot x \rightarrow \phi \cdot (\psi \cdot x)$
RG8	$\phi_0 \cdots \phi_n \rightarrow \delta$ if $\forall s \in S, \exists i \leq n. test(\neg\phi_i, s)$
RG9	$wp(e, \phi)e\phi \rightarrow wp(e, \phi)e$
RG10	$\neg wp(e, \phi)e\neg\phi \rightarrow \neg wp(e, \phi)e$

Table 32. Term rewrite system of $BATC_G$

5. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(BATC_G)$ then $t + s \in \mathcal{B}(BATC_G)$.

Theorem 8.24 (Elimination theorem of $BATC_G$). *Let p be a closed $BATC_G$ term. Then there is a basic $BATC_G$ term q such that $BATC_G \vdash p = q$.*

Proof. (1) Firstly, suppose that the following ordering on the signature of $BATC_G$ is defined: $\cdot > +$ and the symbol \cdot is given the lexicographical status for the first argument, then for each rewrite rule $p \rightarrow q$ in Table 32 relation $p >_{lpo} q$ can easily be proved. We obtain that the term rewrite system shown in Table 32 is strongly normalizing, for it has finitely many rewriting rules, and $>$ is a well-founded ordering on the signature of $BATC_G$, and if $s >_{lpo} t$, for each rewriting rule $s \rightarrow t$ is in Table 32 (see Theorem 2.12).

(2) Then we prove that the normal forms of closed $BATC_G$ terms are basic $BATC_G$ terms.

Suppose that p is a normal form of some closed $BATC_G$ term and suppose that p is not a basic term. Let p' denote the smallest sub-term of p which is not a basic term. It implies that each sub-term of p' is a basic term. Then we prove that p is not a term in normal form. It is sufficient to induct on the structure of p' :

$\overline{\langle \epsilon, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \sqrt{}, s \rangle}$	
$\overline{\langle e, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \sqrt{}, s' \rangle}$	if $s' \in \text{effect}(e, s)$
$\overline{\langle \phi, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \sqrt{}, s \rangle}$	if $\text{test}(\phi, s)$
$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \sqrt{}, s' \rangle}{\langle x + y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \sqrt{}, s' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle x', s' \rangle}{\langle x + y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle x', s' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \sqrt{}, s' \rangle}{\langle x + y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \sqrt{}, s' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle y', s' \rangle}{\langle x + y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle y', s' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \sqrt{}, s' \rangle}{\langle x \cdot y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle y, s' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle x', s' \rangle}{\langle x \cdot y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle x' \cdot y, s' \rangle}$

Table 33. Single event transition rules of $BATC_G$

- Case $p' \equiv e, e \in \mathbb{E}$. p' is a basic term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic term, so this case should not occur.
- Case $p' \equiv \phi, \phi \in G$. p' is a basic term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic term, so this case should not occur.
- Case $p' \equiv p_1 \cdot p_2$. By induction on the structure of the basic term p_1 :
 - Subcase $p_1 \in \mathbb{E}$. p' would be a basic term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic term;
 - Subcase $p_1 \in G$. p' would be a basic term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic term;
 - Subcase $p_1 \equiv e \cdot p'_1$. $RA5$ or $RA9$ rewriting rule can be applied. So p is not a normal form;
 - Subcase $p_1 \equiv \phi \cdot p'_1$. $RG1, RG3, RG4, RG5, RG7$, or $RG8$ rewriting rules can be applied. So p is not a normal form;
 - Subcase $p_1 \equiv p'_1 + p''_1$. $RA4, RA6, RG2$, or $RG6$ rewriting rules can be applied. So p is not a normal form.
- Case $p' \equiv p_1 + p_2$. By induction on the structure of the basic terms both p_1 and p_2 , all subcases will lead to that p' would be a basic term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic term.

□

We will define a term-deduction system which gives the operational semantics of $BATC_G$. We give the operational transition rules for ϵ , atomic guard $\phi \in G_{at}$, atomic event $e \in \mathbb{E}$, operators \cdot and $+$ as Table 33 shows. And the predicate $\xrightarrow{e} \sqrt{}$ 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 pomset transition rules of $BATC_G$, and omit them.

Theorem 8.25 (Congruence of $BATC_G$ with respect to truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). (1) Pomset bisimulation equivalence \sim_p is a congruence with respect to $BATC_G$.

(2) Step bisimulation equivalence \sim_s is a congruence with respect to $BATC_G$.

(3) Hp-bisimulation equivalence \sim_{hp} is a congruence with respect to $BATC_G$.

(4) Hhp-bisimulation equivalence \sim_{hhp} is a congruence with respect to $BATC_G$.

Proof. (1) It is easy to see that pomset bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $BATC_G$ terms, we only need to prove that \sim_p is preserved by the operators \cdot and $+$. It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(2) It is easy to see that step bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $BATC_G$ terms, we only need to

prove that \sim_s is preserved by the operators \cdot and $+$. It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(3) It is easy to see that hp-bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $BATC_G$ terms, we only need to prove that \sim_{hp} is preserved by the operators \cdot and $+$. It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(4) It is easy to see that hhp-bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $BATC_G$ terms, we only need to prove that \sim_{hhp} is preserved by the operators \cdot and $+$. It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers. \square

Theorem 8.26 (Soundness of $BATC_G$ modulo truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). (1) Let x and y be $BATC_G$ terms. If $BATC \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_p y$.

(2) Let x and y be $BATC_G$ terms. If $BATC \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_s y$.

(3) Let x and y be $BATC_G$ terms. If $BATC \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{hp} y$.

(4) Let x and y be $BATC_G$ terms. If $BATC \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{hhp} y$.

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

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

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

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

Theorem 8.27 (Completeness of $BATC_G$ modulo truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). (1) Let p and q be closed $BATC_G$ terms, if $p \sim_p q$ then $p = q$.

(2) Let p and q be closed $BATC_G$ terms, if $p \sim_s q$ then $p = q$.

(3) Let p and q be closed $BATC_G$ terms, if $p \sim_{hp} q$ then $p = q$.

(4) Let p and q be closed $BATC_G$ terms, if $p \sim_{hhp} q$ then $p = q$.

Proof. (1) Firstly, by the elimination theorem of $BATC_G$, we know that for each closed $BATC_G$ term p , there exists a closed basic $BATC_G$ term p' , such that $BATC_G \vdash p = p'$, so, we only need to consider closed basic $BATC_G$ terms.

The basic terms (see Definition 8.23) modulo associativity and commutativity (AC) of conflict $+$ (defined by axioms A1 and A2 in Table 31), and this equivalence is denoted by $=_{AC}$. Then, each equivalence class s modulo AC of $+$ has the following normal form

$$s_1 + \cdots + s_k$$

with each s_i either an atomic event, or an atomic guard, or of the form $t_1 \cdot t_2$, and each s_i is called the summand of s .

Now, we prove that for normal forms n and n' , if $n \sim_p n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$. It is sufficient to induct on the sizes of n and n' .

- Consider a summand e of n . Then $\langle n, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \sqrt{}, s' \rangle$, so $n \sim_p n'$ implies $\langle n', s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \sqrt{}, s \rangle$, meaning that n' also contains the summand e .
- Consider a summand ϕ of n . Then $\langle n, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \sqrt{}, s \rangle$, if $test(\phi, s)$ holds, so $n \sim_p n'$ implies $\langle n', s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \sqrt{}, s \rangle$, if $test(\phi, s)$ holds, meaning that n' also contains the summand ϕ .
- Consider a summand $t_1 \cdot t_2$ of n . Then $\langle n, s \rangle \xrightarrow{t_1} \langle t_2, s' \rangle$, so $n \sim_p n'$ implies $\langle n', s \rangle \xrightarrow{t_1} \langle t'_2, s' \rangle$ with $t_2 \sim_p t'_2$, meaning that n' contains a summand $t_1 \cdot t'_2$. Since t_2 and t'_2 are normal forms and have sizes smaller than n and n' , by the induction hypotheses $t_2 \sim_p t'_2$ implies $t_2 =_{AC} t'_2$.

So, we get $n =_{AC} n'$.

Finally, let s and t be basic terms, and $s \sim_p t$, there are normal forms n and n' , such that $s = n$ and

$t = n'$. The soundness theorem of $BATC_G$ modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence (see Theorem 8.26) yields $s \sim_p n$ and $t \sim_p n'$, so $n \sim_p s \sim_p t \sim_p n'$. Since if $n \sim_p n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$, $s = n =_{AC} n' = t$, as desired.

- (2) It can be proven similarly as (1).
- (3) It can be proven similarly as (1).
- (4) It can be proven similarly as (1). □

Theorem 8.28 (Sufficient determinacy). *All related data environments with respect to $BATC_G$ can be sufficiently deterministic.*

Proof. It only needs to check $effect(t, s)$ function is deterministic, and is sufficient to induct on the structure of term t . The only matter is the case $t = t_1 + t_2$, with the help of guards, we can make $t_1 = \phi_1 \cdot t'_1$ and $t_2 = \phi_2 \cdot t'_2$, and $effect(t)$ is sufficiently deterministic. □

8.4.3. $APTC$ with Guards

In this subsection, we will extend $APTC$ with guards, which is abbreviated $APTC_G$. The set of basic guards G with element ϕ, ψ, \dots , which is extended by the following formation rules:

$$\phi ::= \delta | \epsilon | \neg\phi | \psi \in G_{at} | \phi + \psi | \phi \cdot \psi | \phi \parallel \psi$$

The set of axioms of $APTC_G$ including axioms of $BATC_G$ in Table 31 and the axioms are shown in Table 34.

Definition 8.29 (Basic terms of $APTC_G$). *The set of basic terms of $APTC_G$, $\mathcal{B}(APTC_G)$, is inductively defined as follows:*

1. $\mathbb{E} \subset \mathcal{B}(APTC_G)$;
2. $G \subset \mathcal{B}(APTC_G)$;
3. if $e \in \mathbb{E}, t \in \mathcal{B}(APTC_G)$ then $e \cdot t \in \mathcal{B}(APTC_G)$;
4. if $\phi \in G, t \in \mathcal{B}(APTC_G)$ then $\phi \cdot t \in \mathcal{B}(APTC_G)$;
5. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(APTC_G)$ then $t + s \in \mathcal{B}(APTC_G)$.
6. if $t, s \in \mathcal{B}(APTC_G)$ then $t \parallel s \in \mathcal{B}(APTC_G)$.

Based on the definition of basic terms for $APTC_G$ (see Definition 8.29) and axioms of $APTC_G$, we can prove the elimination theorem of $APTC_G$.

Theorem 8.30 (Elimination theorem of $APTC_G$). *Let p be a closed $APTC_G$ term. Then there is a basic $APTC_G$ term q such that $APTC_G \vdash p = q$.*

Proof. (1) Firstly, suppose that the following ordering on the signature of $APTC_G$ is defined: $\parallel > \cdot > +$ and the symbol \parallel is given the lexicographical status for the first argument, then for each rewrite rule $p \rightarrow q$ in Table 35 relation $p >_{lpo} q$ can easily be proved. We obtain that the term rewrite system shown in Table 35 is strongly normalizing, for it has finitely many rewriting rules, and $>$ is a well-founded ordering on the signature of $APTC_G$, and if $s >_{lpo} t$, for each rewriting rule $s \rightarrow t$ is in Table 35 (see Theorem 2.12).

- (2) Then we prove that the normal forms of closed $APTC_G$ terms are basic $APTC_G$ terms.

Suppose that p is a normal form of some closed $APTC_G$ term and suppose that p is not a basic $APTC_G$ term. Let p' denote the smallest sub-term of p which is not a basic $APTC_G$ term. It implies that each sub-term of p' is a basic $APTC_G$ term. Then we prove that p is not a term in normal form. It is sufficient to induct on the structure of p' :

- Case $p' \equiv e, e \in \mathbb{E}$. p' is a basic $APTC_G$ term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic $APTC_G$ term, so this case should not occur.
- Case $p' \equiv \phi, \phi \in G$. p' is a basic term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic term, so this case should not occur.
- Case $p' \equiv p_1 \cdot p_2$. By induction on the structure of the basic $APTC_G$ term p_1 :

No.	Axiom
P1	$x \bowtie y = x \parallel y + x \mid y$
P2	$e_1 \parallel (e_2 \cdot y) = (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot y$
P3	$(e_1 \cdot x) \parallel e_2 = (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot x$
P4	$(e_1 \cdot x) \parallel (e_2 \cdot y) = (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot (x \bowtie y)$
P5	$(x + y) \parallel z = (x \parallel z) + (y \parallel z)$
P6	$x \parallel (y + z) = (x \parallel y) + (x \parallel z)$
P7	$\delta \parallel x = \delta$
P8	$x \parallel \delta = \delta$
P9	$\epsilon \parallel x = x$
P10	$x \parallel \epsilon = x$
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	$x \mid \delta = \delta$
C9	$\epsilon \mid x = \delta$
C10	$x \mid \epsilon = \delta$
CE1	$\Theta(e) = e$
CE2	$\Theta(\delta) = \delta$
CE3	$\Theta(\epsilon) = \epsilon$
CE4	$\Theta(x + y) = \Theta(x) \triangleleft y + \Theta(y) \triangleleft x$
CE5	$\Theta(x \cdot y) = \Theta(x) \cdot \Theta(y)$
CE6	$\Theta(x \parallel y) = ((\Theta(x) \triangleleft y) \parallel y) + ((\Theta(y) \triangleleft x) \parallel x)$
CE7	$\Theta(x \mid y) = ((\Theta(x) \triangleleft y) \mid y) + ((\Theta(y) \triangleleft x) \mid x)$
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	$e \triangleleft \epsilon = e$
U7	$\epsilon \triangleleft e = e$
U8	$(x + y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) + (y \triangleleft z)$
U9	$(x \cdot y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \cdot (y \triangleleft z)$
U10	$(x \parallel y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \parallel (y \triangleleft z)$
U11	$(x \mid y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \mid (y \triangleleft z)$
U12	$x \triangleleft (y + z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
U13	$x \triangleleft (y \cdot z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
U14	$x \triangleleft (y \parallel z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
U15	$x \triangleleft (y \mid z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
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	$\partial_H(x \parallel y) = \partial_H(x) \parallel \partial_H(y)$
G11	$\phi(x \parallel y) = \phi x \parallel \phi y$
G12	$\phi(x \mid y) = \phi x \mid \phi y$
G13	$\phi \parallel \delta = \delta$
G14	$\delta \parallel \phi = \delta$
G15	$\phi \mid \delta = \delta$
G16	$\delta \mid \phi = \delta$
G17	$\phi \parallel \epsilon = \phi$
G18	$\epsilon \parallel \phi = \phi$
G19	$\phi \mid \epsilon = \delta$
G20	$\epsilon \mid \phi = \delta$
G21	$\phi \parallel \neg \phi = \delta$
G22	$\Theta(\phi) = \phi$
G23	$\partial_H(\phi) = \phi$
G24	$\phi_0 \parallel \dots \parallel \phi_n = \delta$ if $\forall s_0, \dots, s_n \in S, \exists i \leq n. test(\neg \phi_i, s_0 \cup \dots \cup s_n)$

Table 34. Axioms of $APTC_G$

No.	Rewriting Rule
RP1	$x \bowtie y \rightarrow x \parallel y + x \mid y$
RP2	$e_1 \parallel (e_2 \cdot y) \rightarrow (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot y$
RP3	$(e_1 \cdot x) \parallel e_2 \rightarrow (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot x$
RP4	$(e_1 \cdot x) \parallel (e_2 \cdot y) \rightarrow (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot (x \bowtie y)$
RP5	$(x + y) \parallel z \rightarrow (x \parallel z) + (y \parallel z)$
RP6	$x \parallel (y + z) \rightarrow (x \parallel y) + (x \parallel z)$
RP7	$\delta \parallel x \rightarrow \delta$
RP8	$x \parallel \delta \rightarrow \delta$
RP9	$\epsilon \parallel x \rightarrow x$
RP10	$x \parallel \epsilon \rightarrow x$
RC1	$e_1 \mid e_2 \rightarrow \gamma(e_1, e_2)$
RC2	$e_1 \mid (e_2 \cdot y) \rightarrow \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot y$
RC3	$(e_1 \cdot x) \mid e_2 \rightarrow \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot x$
RC4	$(e_1 \cdot x) \mid (e_2 \cdot y) \rightarrow \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot (x \bowtie y)$
RC5	$(x + y) \mid z \rightarrow (x \mid z) + (y \mid z)$
RC6	$x \mid (y + z) \rightarrow (x \mid y) + (x \mid z)$
RC7	$\delta \mid x \rightarrow \delta$
RC8	$x \mid \delta \rightarrow \delta$
RC9	$\epsilon \mid x \rightarrow \delta$
RC10	$x \mid \epsilon \rightarrow \delta$
RCE1	$\Theta(e) \rightarrow e$
RCE2	$\Theta(\delta) \rightarrow \delta$
RCE3	$\Theta(\epsilon) \rightarrow \epsilon$
RCE4	$\Theta(x + y) \rightarrow \Theta(x) \triangleleft y + \Theta(y) \triangleleft x$
RCE5	$\Theta(x \cdot y) \rightarrow \Theta(x) \cdot \Theta(y)$
RCE6	$\Theta(x \parallel y) \rightarrow ((\Theta(x) \triangleleft y) \parallel y) + ((\Theta(y) \triangleleft x) \parallel x)$
RCE7	$\Theta(x \mid y) \rightarrow ((\Theta(x) \triangleleft y) \mid y) + ((\Theta(y) \triangleleft x) \mid x)$
RU1	$(\sharp(e_1, e_2)) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_2 \rightarrow \tau$
RU2	$(\sharp(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_3 \rightarrow e_1$
RU3	$(\sharp(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3) \quad e_3 \triangleleft e_1 \rightarrow \tau$
RU4	$e \triangleleft \delta \rightarrow e$
RU5	$\delta \triangleleft e \rightarrow \delta$
RU6	$e \triangleleft \epsilon \rightarrow e$
RU7	$\epsilon \triangleleft e \rightarrow e$
RU8	$(x + y) \triangleleft z \rightarrow (x \triangleleft z) + (y \triangleleft z)$
RU9	$(x \cdot y) \triangleleft z \rightarrow (x \triangleleft z) \cdot (y \triangleleft z)$
RU10	$(x \parallel y) \triangleleft z \rightarrow (x \triangleleft z) \parallel (y \triangleleft z)$
RU11	$(x \mid y) \triangleleft z \rightarrow (x \triangleleft z) \mid (y \triangleleft z)$
RU12	$x \triangleleft (y + z) \rightarrow (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
RU13	$x \triangleleft (y \cdot z) \rightarrow (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
RU14	$x \triangleleft (y \parallel z) \rightarrow (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
RU15	$x \triangleleft (y \mid z) \rightarrow (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
RD1	$e \notin H \quad \partial_H(e) \rightarrow e$
RD2	$e \in H \quad \partial_H(e) \rightarrow \delta$
RD3	$\partial_H(\delta) \rightarrow \delta$
RD4	$\partial_H(x + y) \rightarrow \partial_H(x) + \partial_H(y)$
RD5	$\partial_H(x \cdot y) \rightarrow \partial_H(x) \cdot \partial_H(y)$
RD6	$\partial_H(x \parallel y) \rightarrow \partial_H(x) \parallel \partial_H(y)$
RG11	$\phi(x \parallel y) \rightarrow \phi x \parallel \phi y$
RG12	$\phi(x \mid y) \rightarrow \phi x \mid \phi y$
RG13	$\phi \parallel \delta \rightarrow \delta$
RG14	$\delta \parallel \phi \rightarrow \delta$
RG15	$\phi \mid \delta \rightarrow \delta$
RG16	$\delta \mid \phi \rightarrow \delta$
RG17	$\phi \parallel \epsilon \rightarrow \phi$
RG18	$\epsilon \parallel \phi \rightarrow \phi$
RG19	$\phi \mid \epsilon \rightarrow \delta$
RG20	$\epsilon \mid \phi \rightarrow \delta$
RG21	$\phi \parallel \neg \phi \rightarrow \delta$
RG22	$\Theta(\phi) \rightarrow \phi$
RG23	$\partial_H(\phi) \rightarrow \phi$
RG24	$\phi_0 \parallel \dots \parallel \phi_n \rightarrow \delta$ if $\forall s_0, \dots, s_n \in S, \exists i \leq n. test(\neg \phi_i, s_0 \cup \dots \cup s_n)$

Table 35. Term rewrite system of $APTC_G$

- Subcase $p_1 \in \mathbb{E}$. p' would be a basic $APTC_G$ term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic $APTC_G$ term;
- Subcase $p_1 \in G$. p' would be a basic term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic term;
- Subcase $p_1 \equiv e \cdot p'_1$. $RA5$ or $RA9$ rewriting rules in Table 32 can be applied. So p is not a normal form;
- Subcase $p_1 \equiv \phi \cdot p'_1$. $RG1$, $RG3$, $RG4$, $RG5$, $RG7$, or $RG8$ rewriting rules can be applied. So p is not a normal form;
- Subcase $p_1 \equiv p'_1 + p''_1$. $RA4$, $RA6$, $RG2$, or $RG6$ rewriting rules in Table 32 can be applied. So p is not a normal form;
- Subcase $p_1 \equiv p'_1 \parallel p''_1$. $RP2$ - $RP10$ rewrite rules in Table 35 can be applied. So p is not a normal form;
- Subcase $p_1 \equiv p'_1 \mid p''_1$. $RC1$ - $RC10$ rewrite rules in Table 35 can be applied. So p is not a normal form;
- Subcase $p_1 \equiv \Theta(p'_1)$. $RCE1$ - $RCE7$ rewrite rules in Table 35 can be applied. So p is not a normal form;
- Subcase $p_1 \equiv \partial_H(p'_1)$. $RD1$ - $RD6$ rewrite rules in Table 35 can be applied. So p is not a normal form.
- Case $p' \equiv p_1 + p_2$. By induction on the structure of the basic $APTC_G$ terms both p_1 and p_2 , all subcases will lead to that p' would be a basic $APTC_G$ term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic $APTC_G$ term.
- Case $p' \equiv p_1 \parallel p_2$. By induction on the structure of the basic $APTC_G$ terms both p_1 and p_2 , all subcases will lead to that p' would be a basic $APTC_G$ term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic $APTC_G$ term.
- Case $p' \equiv p_1 \mid p_2$. By induction on the structure of the basic $APTC_G$ terms both p_1 and p_2 , all subcases will lead to that p' would be a basic $APTC_G$ term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic $APTC_G$ term.
- Case $p' \equiv \Theta(p_1)$. By induction on the structure of the basic $APTC_G$ term p_1 , $RCE1$ – $RCE7$ rewrite rules in Table 35 can be applied. So p is not a normal form.
- Case $p' \equiv p_1 \triangleleft p_2$. By induction on the structure of the basic $APTC_G$ terms both p_1 and p_2 , all subcases will lead to that p' would be a basic $APTC_G$ term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic $APTC_G$ term.
- Case $p' \equiv \partial_H(p_1)$. By induction on the structure of the basic $APTC_G$ terms of p_1 , all subcases will lead to that p' would be a basic $APTC_G$ term, which contradicts the assumption that p' is not a basic $APTC_G$ term.

□

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

Theorem 8.31 (Generalization of $APTC_G$ with respect to $BATC_G$). *$APTC_G$ is a generalization of $BATC_G$.*

Proof. It follows from the following three facts.

1. The transition rules of $BATC_G$ in section 8.4.2 are all source-dependent;
2. The sources of the transition rules $APTC_G$ contain an occurrence of \bowtie , or \parallel , or \mid , or Θ , or \triangleleft ;
3. The transition rules of $APTC_G$ are all source-dependent.

So, $APTC_G$ is a generalization of $BATC_G$, that is, $BATC_G$ is an embedding of $APTC_G$, as desired. □

Theorem 8.32 (Congruence of $APTC_G$ with respect to truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). (1) *Pomset bisimulation equivalence \sim_p is a congruence with respect to $APTC_G$.*

(2) *Step bisimulation equivalence \sim_s is a congruence with respect to $APTC_G$.*

(3) *Hp-bisimulation equivalence \sim_{hp} is a congruence with respect to $APTC_G$.*

(4) *Hhp-bisimulation equivalence \sim_{hhp} is a congruence with respect to $APTC_G$.*

$\frac{}{\langle e_1 \parallel \dots \parallel e_n, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}} \langle \surd, s' \rangle} \text{ if } s' \in \text{effect}(e_1, s) \cup \dots \cup \text{effect}(e_n, s)}$	
$\frac{}{\langle \phi_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \phi_n, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \surd, s \rangle} \text{ if } \text{test}(\phi_1, s), \dots, \text{test}(\phi_n, s)$	
$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle \surd, s' \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle \surd, s'' \rangle}{\langle x \parallel y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \langle \surd, s' \cup s'' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle x', s' \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle \surd, s'' \rangle}{\langle x \parallel y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \langle x', s' \cup s'' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle \surd, s' \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle y', s'' \rangle}{\langle x \parallel y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \langle y', s' \cup s'' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle x', s' \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle y', s'' \rangle}{\langle x \parallel y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \langle x' \bowtie y', s' \cup s'' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle \surd, s' \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} (e_1 \% e_2)}{\langle x \parallel y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle y, s' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle x', s' \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} (e_1 \% e_2)}{\langle x \parallel y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle x' \bowtie y, s' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle y, s \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle \surd, s'' \rangle \quad (e_1 \% e_2)}{\langle x \parallel y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle x, s'' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle y, s \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle y', s'' \rangle \quad (e_1 \% e_2)}{\langle x \parallel y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle x \bowtie y', s'' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle \surd, s' \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle \surd, s'' \rangle}{\langle x \mid y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \langle \surd, \text{effect}(\gamma(e_1, e_2), s) \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle x', s' \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle \surd, s'' \rangle}{\langle x \mid y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \langle x', \text{effect}(\gamma(e_1, e_2), s) \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle \surd, s' \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle y', s'' \rangle}{\langle x \mid y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \langle y', \text{effect}(\gamma(e_1, e_2), s) \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle x', s' \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle y', s'' \rangle}{\langle x \mid y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\gamma(e_1, e_2)} \langle x' \bowtie y', \text{effect}(\gamma(e_1, e_2), s) \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle \surd, s' \rangle \quad (\#(e_1, e_2))}{\langle \Theta(x), s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle \surd, s' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle \surd, s'' \rangle \quad (\#(e_1, e_2))}{\langle \Theta(x), s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle \surd, s'' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle x', s' \rangle \quad (\#(e_1, e_2))}{\langle \Theta(x), s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle \Theta(x'), s' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle x'', s'' \rangle \quad (\#(e_1, e_2))}{\langle \Theta(x), s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle \Theta(x''), s'' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle \surd, s' \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \nrightarrow^{e_2} \quad (\#(e_1, e_2))}{\langle x \triangleleft y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle \surd, s' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle x', s' \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \nrightarrow^{e_2} \quad (\#(e_1, e_2))}{\langle x \triangleleft y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle x', s' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle \surd, s \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \nrightarrow^{e_3} \quad (\#(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3)}{\langle x \triangleleft y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle \surd, s' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle x', s' \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \nrightarrow^{e_3} \quad (\#(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3)}{\langle x \triangleleft y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle x', s' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_3} \langle \surd, s' \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \nrightarrow^{e_2} \quad (\#(e_1, e_2), e_1 \leq e_3)}{\langle x \triangleleft y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle \surd, s' \rangle}$	$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_3} \langle x', s' \rangle \quad \langle y, s \rangle \nrightarrow^{e_2} \quad (\#(e_1, e_2), e_1 \leq e_3)}{\langle x \triangleleft y, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle x', s' \rangle}$
$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \surd, s' \rangle}{\langle \partial_H(x), s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \surd, s' \rangle} \quad (e \notin H)$	$\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle x', s' \rangle}{\langle \partial_H(x), s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \partial_H(x'), s' \rangle} \quad (e \notin H)$

Table 36. Transition rules of $APTC_G$

Proof. (1) It is easy to see that pomset bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $APTC_G$ terms, we only need to prove that \sim_p is preserved by the operators $\parallel, |, \Theta, \triangleleft, \partial_H$. It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(2) It is easy to see that step bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $APTC_G$ terms, we only need to prove that \sim_s is preserved by the operators $\parallel, |, \Theta, \triangleleft, \partial_H$. It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(3) It is easy to see that hp-bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $APTC_G$ terms, we only need to prove that \sim_{hp} is preserved by the operators $\parallel, |, \Theta, \triangleleft, \partial_H$. It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(4) It is easy to see that hhp-bisimulation is an equivalent relation on $APTC_G$ terms, we only need to

prove that \sim_{hhp} is preserved by the operators $\parallel, |, \Theta, \triangleleft, \partial_H$. It is trivial and we leave the proof as an exercise for the readers. \square

Theorem 8.33 (Soundness of $APTC_G$ modulo truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). (1) Let x and y be $APTC_G$ terms. If $APTC \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_p y$.

(2) Let x and y be $APTC_G$ terms. If $APTC \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_s y$.

(3) Let x and y be $APTC_G$ terms. If $APTC \vdash x = y$, then $x \sim_{hp} y$.

Proof. (1) Since pomset bisimulation \sim_p is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 34 is sound modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(2) Since step bisimulation \sim_s is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 34 is sound modulo step bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers.

(3) Since hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 34 is sound modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence. We leave the proof as an exercise for the readers. \square

Theorem 8.34 (Completeness of $APTC_G$ modulo truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). (1) Let p and q be closed $APTC_G$ terms, if $p \sim_p q$ then $p = q$.

(2) Let p and q be closed $APTC_G$ terms, if $p \sim_s q$ then $p = q$.

(3) Let p and q be closed $APTC_G$ terms, if $p \sim_{hp} q$ then $p = q$.

Proof. (1) Firstly, by the elimination theorem of $APTC_G$ (see Theorem 8.30), we know that for each closed $APTC_G$ term p , there exists a closed basic $APTC_G$ term p' , such that $APTC \vdash p = p'$, so, we only need to consider closed basic $APTC_G$ terms.

The basic terms (see Definition 8.29) modulo associativity and commutativity (AC) of conflict $+$ (defined by axioms A1 and A2 in Table 31), and these equivalences is denoted by $=_{AC}$. Then, each equivalence class s modulo AC of $+$ has the following normal form

$$s_1 + \cdots + s_k$$

with each s_i either an atomic event, or an atomic guard, or of the form

$$t_1 \cdots t_m$$

with each t_j either an atomic event, or an atomic guard, or of the form

$$u_1 \parallel \cdots \parallel u_l$$

with each u_l an atomic event, or an atomic guard, and each s_i is called the summand of s .

Now, we prove that for normal forms n and n' , if $n \sim_p n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$. It is sufficient to induct on the sizes of n and n' .

- Consider a summand e of n . Then $\langle n, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \sqrt{}, s' \rangle$, so $n \sim_p n'$ implies $\langle n', s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \sqrt{}, s' \rangle$, meaning that n' also contains the summand e .
- Consider a summand ϕ of n . Then $\langle n, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \sqrt{}, s \rangle$, if $test(\phi, s)$ holds, so $n \sim_p n'$ implies $\langle n', s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \sqrt{}, s \rangle$, if $test(\phi, s)$ holds, meaning that n' also contains the summand ϕ .
- Consider a summand $t_1 \cdot t_2$ of n ,
 - if $t_1 \equiv e'$, then $\langle n, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e'} \langle t_2, s' \rangle$, so $n \sim_p n'$ implies $\langle n', s \rangle \xrightarrow{e'} \langle t'_2, s' \rangle$ with $t_2 \sim_p t'_2$, meaning that n' contains a summand $e' \cdot t'_2$. Since t_2 and t'_2 are normal forms and have sizes smaller than n and n' , by the induction hypotheses if $t_2 \sim_p t'_2$ then $t_2 =_{AC} t'_2$;
 - if $t_1 \equiv \phi'$, then $\langle n, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle t_2, s \rangle$, if $test(\phi', s)$ holds, so $n \sim_p n'$ implies $\langle n', s \rangle \rightarrow \langle t'_2, s \rangle$ with $t_2 \sim_p t'_2$, if $test(\phi', s)$ holds, meaning that n' contains a summand $\phi' \cdot t'_2$. Since t_2 and t'_2 are normal forms and have sizes smaller than n and n' , by the induction hypotheses if $t_2 \sim_p t'_2$ then $t_2 =_{AC} t'_2$;
 - if $t_1 \equiv e_1 \parallel \cdots \parallel e_l$, then $\langle n, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_l\}} \langle t_2, s' \rangle$, so $n \sim_p n'$ implies $\langle n', s \rangle \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_l\}} \langle t'_2, s' \rangle$ with $t_2 \sim_p t'_2$,

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\langle t_i(\langle X_1|E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n|E \rangle), s \rangle \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \langle \surd, s' \rangle}{\langle \langle X_i|E \rangle, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \langle \surd, s' \rangle} \\
\\
\frac{\langle t_i(\langle X_1|E \rangle, \dots, \langle X_n|E \rangle), s \rangle \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \langle y, s' \rangle}{\langle \langle X_i|E \rangle, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}} \langle y, s' \rangle}
\end{array}$$

Table 37. Transition rules of guarded recursion

- meaning that n' contains a summand $(e_1 \parallel \dots \parallel e_l) \cdot t'_2$. Since t_2 and t'_2 are normal forms and have sizes smaller than n and n' , by the induction hypotheses if $t_2 \sim_p t'_2$ then $t_2 =_{AC} t'_2$;
- if $t_1 \equiv \phi_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \phi_l$, then $\langle n, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle t_2, s \rangle$, if $test(\phi_1, s), \dots, test(\phi_l, s)$ hold, so $n \sim_p n'$ implies $\langle n', s \rangle \rightarrow \langle t'_2, s \rangle$ with $t_2 \sim_p t'_2$, if $test(\phi_1, s), \dots, test(\phi_l, s)$ hold, meaning that n' contains a summand $(\phi_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \phi_l) \cdot t'_2$. Since t_2 and t'_2 are normal forms and have sizes smaller than n and n' , by the induction hypotheses if $t_2 \sim_p t'_2$ then $t_2 =_{AC} t'_2$.

So, we get $n =_{AC} n'$.

Finally, let s and t be basic $APTC_G$ terms, and $s \sim_p t$, there are normal forms n and n' , such that $s = n$ and $t = n'$. The soundness theorem of $APTC_G$ modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence (see Theorem 8.33) yields $s \sim_p n$ and $t \sim_p n'$, so $n \sim_p s \sim_p t \sim_p n'$. Since if $n \sim_p n'$ then $n =_{AC} n'$, $s = n =_{AC} n' = t$, as desired.

(2) It can be proven similarly as (1).

(3) It can be proven similarly as (1). □

Theorem 8.35 (Sufficient determinacy). *All related data environments with respect to $APTC_G$ can be sufficiently deterministic.*

Proof. It only needs to check $effect(t, s)$ function is deterministic, and is sufficient to induct on the structure of term t . The new matter is the case $t = t_1 \bowtie t_2$, because t_1 and t_2 may be in race condition, the whole thing is $t_1 \bowtie t_2 = t_1 \cdot t_2 + t_2 \cdot t_1 + t_1 \parallel t_2 + t_1 \mid t_2$. We can make $effect(t)$ be sufficiently deterministic: eliminating non-determinacy caused by race condition during modeling time by use of empty event ϵ . We can make $t = t_1 \parallel t_2$ ($t_1 \% t_2$) be $t = (\epsilon \cdot t_1) \parallel t_2$ or $t = t_1 \parallel (\epsilon \cdot t_2)$ during modeling phase, and then $effect(t, s)$ becomes sufficiently deterministic. □

8.4.4. Recursion

In this subsection, we introduce recursion to capture infinite processes based on $APTC_G$. In the following, E, F, G are recursion specifications, X, Y, Z are recursive variables.

Theorem 8.36 (Conservativity of $APTC_G$ with guarded recursion). *$APTC_G$ with guarded recursion is a conservative extension of $APTC_G$.*

Proof. Since the transition rules of $APTC_G$ are source-dependent, and the transition rules for guarded recursion in Table 37 contain only a fresh constant in their source, so the transition rules of $APTC_G$ with guarded recursion are a conservative extension of those of $APTC_G$. □

Theorem 8.37 (Congruence theorem of $APTC_G$ with guarded recursion). *Truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p , \sim_s and \sim_{hp} are all congruences with respect to $APTC_G$ with 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 $APTC_G$ and replacing recursion variables by the right-hand sides of their recursive equations;
2. truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p , \sim_s and \sim_{hp} are all congruences with respect to all operators of $APTC_G$.

□

Theorem 8.38 (Elimination theorem of $APTC_G$ with linear recursion). *Each process term in $APTC_G$ with linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with E a linear recursive specification.*

Proof. By applying structural induction with respect to term size, each process term t_1 in $APTC_G$ with linear recursion generates a process can be expressed in the form of equations

$$t_i = (a_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{i1i_1})t_{i1} + \dots + (a_{ik_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{ik_i i_k})t_{ik_i} + (b_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{i1i_1}) + \dots + (b_{il_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{il_i i_l})$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let the linear recursive specification E consist of the recursive equations

$$X_i = (a_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{i1i_1})X_{i1} + \dots + (a_{ik_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{ik_i i_k})X_{ik_i} + (b_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{i1i_1}) + \dots + (b_{il_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{il_i i_l})$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Replacing X_i by t_i for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ is a solution for E , RSP yields $t_1 = \langle X_1 | E \rangle$. \square

Theorem 8.39 (Soundness of $APTC_G$ with guarded recursion). *Let x and y be $APTC_G$ with guarded recursion terms. If $APTC_G$ with guarded recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

- (1) $x \sim_s y$.
- (2) $x \sim_p y$.
- (3) $x \sim_{hp} y$.

Proof. (1) Since step bisimulation \sim_s is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to $APTC_G$ with guarded recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 16 is sound modulo step bisimulation equivalence. We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(2) Since pomset bisimulation \sim_p is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to the guarded recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 16 is sound modulo pomset bisimulation equivalence. We leave them as exercises to the readers.

(3) Since hp-bisimulation \sim_{hp} is both an equivalent and a congruent relation with respect to guarded recursion, we only need to check if each axiom in Table 16 is sound modulo hp-bisimulation equivalence. We leave them as exercises to the readers. \square

Theorem 8.40 (Completeness of $APTC_G$ with linear recursion). *Let p and q be closed $APTC_G$ with linear recursion terms, then,*

- (1) if $p \sim_s q$ then $p = q$.
- (2) if $p \sim_p q$ then $p = q$.
- (3) if $p \sim_{hp} q$ then $p = q$.

Proof. Firstly, by the elimination theorem of $APTC_G$ with guarded recursion (see Theorem 8.38), we know that each process term in $APTC_G$ with linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with E a linear recursive specification. And for the simplicity, without loss of generalization, we do not consider empty event ϵ , just because recursion with ϵ are similar to that with silent event τ , please refer to the proof of Theorem 6.10 for details.

It remains to prove the following cases.

- (1) If $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle \sim_s \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$ for linear recursive specification E_1 and E_2 , then $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$.

Let E_1 consist of recursive equations $X = t_X$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and E_2 consists of recursion equations $Y = t_Y$ for $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Let the linear recursive specification E consist of recursion equations $Z_{XY} = t_{XY}$, and $\langle X | E_1 \rangle \sim_s \langle Y | E_2 \rangle$, and t_{XY} consists of the following summands:

- 1. t_{XY} contains a summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)Z_{X'Y'}$ iff t_X contains the summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)X'$ and t_Y contains the summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)Y'$ such that $\langle X' | E_1 \rangle \sim_s \langle Y' | E_2 \rangle$;
- 2. t_{XY} contains a summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$ iff t_X contains the summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$ and t_Y contains the summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$.

Let σ map recursion variable X in E_1 to $\langle X | E_1 \rangle$, and let π map recursion variable Z_{XY} in E to $\langle X | E_1 \rangle$. So, $\sigma((a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)X') \equiv (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)\langle X' | E_1 \rangle \equiv \pi((a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)Z_{X'Y'})$, so by RDP , we get $\langle X | E_1 \rangle = \sigma(t_X) = \pi(t_{XY})$. Then by RSP , $\langle X | E_1 \rangle = \langle Z_{XY} | E \rangle$, particularly, $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle = \langle Z_{X_1 Y_1} | E \rangle$. Similarly, we can obtain $\langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle = \langle Z_{X_1 Y_1} | E \rangle$. Finally, $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle = \langle Z_{X_1 Y_1} | E \rangle = \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$, as desired.

- (2) If $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle \sim_p \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$ for linear recursive specification E_1 and E_2 , then $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$.

It can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it.

- (3) If $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle \sim_{hp} \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$ for linear recursive specification E_1 and E_2 , then $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$.

$$\frac{\overline{\langle \tau, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \surd, s \rangle} \text{ if } \text{test}(\tau, s)}{\langle \tau, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle \surd, \tau(s) \rangle}$$

Table 38. Transition rule of the silent step

It can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it. \square

8.4.5. 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 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 38. 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 $\tau(s)$ to denote $\text{effect}(\tau, s)$, for the fact that τ only change the state of internal data environment, that is, for the external data environments, $s = \tau(s)$.

In section 8.4.1, we introduce τ into event structure, and also give the concept of weakly true concurrency. In this subsection, we give the concepts of rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences, based on these concepts, we can design the axiom system of the silent step τ and the abstraction operator τ_I .

Definition 8.41 (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 branching pomset bisimulation is a relation $R \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, such that:*

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

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

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

Definition 8.42 (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 rooted branching pomset bisimulation is a relation $R \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$, such that:*

1. if $(\langle C_1, s \rangle, \langle C_2, s \rangle) \in R$, and $\langle C_1, s \rangle \xrightarrow{X} \langle C'_1, s' \rangle$ then $\langle C_2, s \rangle \xrightarrow{X} \langle C'_2, s' \rangle$ with $\langle C'_1, s' \rangle \approx_{bp} \langle C'_2, s' \rangle$;

2. if $(\langle C_1, s \rangle, \langle C_2, s \rangle) \in R$, and $\langle C_2, s \rangle \xrightarrow{X} \langle C'_2, s' \rangle$ then $\langle C_1, s \rangle \xrightarrow{X} \langle C'_1, s' \rangle$ with $\langle C'_1, s' \rangle \approx_{bp} \langle C'_2, s' \rangle$;
3. if $(\langle C_1, s \rangle, \langle C_2, s \rangle) \in R$ and $\langle C_1, s \rangle \downarrow$, then $\langle C_2, s \rangle \downarrow$;
4. if $(\langle C_1, s \rangle, \langle C_2, s \rangle) \in R$ and $\langle C_2, s \rangle \downarrow$, then $\langle C_1, s \rangle \downarrow$.

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

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

Definition 8.43 (Branching (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \checkmark represent a state with $\checkmark \downarrow$. A branching history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a weakly posetal relation $R \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$ such that:

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

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

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

Definition 8.44 (Rooted branching (hereditary) history-preserving bisimulation). Assume a special termination predicate \downarrow , and let \checkmark represent a state with $\checkmark \downarrow$. A rooted branching history-preserving (hp-) bisimulation is a weakly posetal relation $R \subseteq \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1), S \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_2), S \rangle$ such that:

1. if $(\langle C_1, s \rangle, f, \langle C_2, s \rangle) \in R$, and $\langle C_1, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle C'_1, s' \rangle$, then $\langle C_2, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle C'_2, s' \rangle$ with $\langle C'_1, s' \rangle \approx_{bhp} \langle C'_2, s' \rangle$;
2. if $(\langle C_1, s \rangle, f, \langle C_2, s \rangle) \in R$, and $\langle C_2, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_2} \langle C'_2, s' \rangle$, then $\langle C_1, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e_1} \langle C'_1, s' \rangle$ with $\langle C'_1, s' \rangle \approx_{bhp} \langle C'_2, s' \rangle$;
3. if $(\langle C_1, s \rangle, f, \langle C_2, s \rangle) \in R$ and $\langle C_1, s \rangle \downarrow$, then $\langle C_2, s \rangle \downarrow$;
4. if $(\langle C_1, s \rangle, f, \langle C_2, s \rangle) \in R$ and $\langle C_2, s \rangle \downarrow$, then $\langle C_1, s \rangle \downarrow$.

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

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

Definition 8.45 (Guarded linear recursive specification). A linear recursive specification E is guarded if there does not exist an infinite sequence of τ -transitions $\langle X|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle X'|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle X''|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \dots$, and there does not exist an infinite sequence of ϵ -transitions $\langle X|E \rangle \rightarrow \langle X'|E \rangle \rightarrow \langle X''|E \rangle \rightarrow \dots$.

Theorem 8.46 (Conservativity of $APTC_G$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion). $APTC_G$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of $APTC_G$ with linear recursion.

No.	Axiom
B1	$e \cdot \tau = e$
B2	$e \cdot (\tau \cdot (x + y) + x) = e \cdot (x + y)$
B3	$x \parallel \tau = x$
G25	$\phi \cdot \tau = \phi$
G26	$\phi \cdot (\tau \cdot (x + y) + x) = \phi \cdot (x + y)$

Table 39. Axioms of silent step

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

Theorem 8.47 (Congruence theorem of $APTC_G$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbp} , \approx_{rbs} and \approx_{rbhp} are all congruences with respect to $APTC_G$ with 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 $APTC_G$ and replacing recursion variables by the right-hand sides of their recursive equations;
2. truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p , \sim_s and \sim_{hp} are all congruences with respect to all operators of $APTC_G$, while truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \sim_p , \sim_s and \sim_{hp} imply the corresponding rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulations \approx_{rbp} , \approx_{rbs} and \approx_{rbhp} (see Proposition 2.23), so rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulations \approx_{rbp} , \approx_{rbs} and \approx_{rbhp} are all congruences with respect to all operators of $APTC_G$;
3. While \mathbb{E} is extended to $\mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\}$, and G is extended to $G \cup \{\tau\}$, it can be proved that rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulations \approx_{rbp} , \approx_{rbs} and \approx_{rbhp} are all congruences with respect to all operators of $APTC_G$, we omit it.

 \square

We design the axioms for the silent step τ in Table 39.

Theorem 8.48 (Elimination theorem of $APTC_G$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Each process term in $APTC_G$ with 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. By applying structural induction with respect to term size, each process term t_1 in $APTC_G$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion generates a process can be expressed in the form of equations

$$t_i = (a_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{i1i_1})t_{i1} + \dots + (a_{ik_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{ik_i i_k})t_{ik_i} + (b_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{i1i_1}) + \dots + (b_{il_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{il_i i_l})$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let the linear recursive specification E consist of the recursive equations

$$X_i = (a_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{i1i_1})X_{i1} + \dots + (a_{ik_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{ik_i i_k})X_{ik_i} + (b_{i11} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{i1i_1}) + \dots + (b_{il_i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{il_i i_l})$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Replacing X_i by t_i for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ is a solution for E , RSP yields $t_1 = \langle X_1 | E \rangle$. \square

Theorem 8.49 (Soundness of $APTC_G$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Let x and y be $APTC_G$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion terms. If $APTC_G$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

- (1) $x \approx_{rbs} y$.
- (2) $x \approx_{rbp} y$.
- (3) $x \approx_{rbhp} y$.

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

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

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

Theorem 8.50 (Completeness of $APTC_G$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Let p and q be closed $APTC_G$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion terms, then,*

- (1) *if $p \approx_{rbs} q$ then $p = q$.*
- (2) *if $p \approx_{rbp} q$ then $p = q$.*
- (3) *if $p \approx_{rbhp} q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. Firstly, by the elimination theorem of $APTC_G$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion (see Theorem 8.48), we know that each process term in $APTC_G$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with E a guarded linear recursive specification.

It remains to prove the following cases.

- (1) If $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$ for guarded linear recursive specification E_1 and E_2 , then $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$.

Firstly, the recursive equation $W = \tau + \dots + \tau$ with $W \neq X_1$ in E_1 and E_2 , can be removed, and the corresponding summands aW are replaced by a , to get E'_1 and E'_2 , by use of the axioms RDP , $A3$ and $B1$, and $\langle X | E_1 \rangle = \langle X | E'_1 \rangle$, $\langle Y | E_2 \rangle = \langle Y | E'_2 \rangle$.

Let E_1 consists of recursive equations $X = t_X$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and E_2 consists of recursion equations $Y = t_Y$ for $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, and are not the form $\tau + \dots + \tau$. Let the guarded linear recursive specification E consists of recursion equations $Z_{XY} = t_{XY}$, and $\langle X | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y | E_2 \rangle$, and t_{XY} consists of the following summands:

1. t_{XY} contains a summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)Z_{X'Y'}$ iff t_X contains the summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)X'$ and t_Y contains the summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)Y'$ such that $\langle X' | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y' | E_2 \rangle$;
2. t_{XY} contains a summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$ iff t_X contains the summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$ and t_Y contains the summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$;
3. t_{XY} contains a summand $\tau Z_{X'Y'}$ iff $XY \neq X_1Y_1$, t_X contains the summand $\tau X'$, and $\langle X' | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y | E_2 \rangle$;
4. t_{XY} contains a summand $\tau Z_{XY'}$ iff $XY \neq X_1Y_1$, t_Y contains the summand $\tau Y'$, and $\langle X | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y' | E_2 \rangle$.

Since E_1 and E_2 are guarded, E is guarded. Constructing the process term u_{XY} consist of the following summands:

1. u_{XY} contains a summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)\langle X' | E_1 \rangle$ iff t_X contains the summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)X'$ and t_Y contains the summand $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)Y'$ such that $\langle X' | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y' | E_2 \rangle$;
2. u_{XY} contains a summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$ iff t_X contains the summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$ and t_Y contains the summand $b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_n$;
3. u_{XY} contains a summand $\tau\langle X' | E_1 \rangle$ iff $XY \neq X_1Y_1$, t_X contains the summand $\tau X'$, and $\langle X' | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y | E_2 \rangle$.

Let the process term s_{XY} be defined as follows:

1. $s_{XY} \triangleq \tau\langle X | E_1 \rangle + u_{XY}$ iff $XY \neq X_1Y_1$, t_Y contains the summand $\tau Y'$, and $\langle X | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y' | E_2 \rangle$;
2. $s_{XY} \triangleq \langle X | E_1 \rangle$, otherwise.

So, $\langle X | E_1 \rangle = \langle X | E_1 \rangle + u_{XY}$, and $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)(\tau\langle X | E_1 \rangle + u_{XY}) = (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)((\tau\langle X | E_1 \rangle + u_{XY}) + u_{XY}) = (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)(\langle X | E_1 \rangle + u_{XY}) = (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)\langle X | E_1 \rangle$, hence, $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)s_{XY} = (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_m)\langle X | E_1 \rangle$.

Let σ map recursion variable X in E_1 to $\langle X | E_1 \rangle$, and let π map recursion variable Z_{XY} in E to s_{XY} . It is sufficient to prove $s_{XY} = \pi(t_{XY})$ for recursion variables Z_{XY} in E . Either $XY \equiv X_1Y_1$ or $XY \neq X_1Y_1$, we all can get $s_{XY} = \pi(t_{XY})$. So, $s_{XY} = \langle Z_{XY} | E \rangle$ for recursive variables Z_{XY} in E is a solution for E .

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \surd, s' \rangle}{\langle \tau_I(x), s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \surd, s' \rangle} \quad e \notin I \qquad \frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle x', s' \rangle}{\langle \tau_I(x), s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \tau_I(x'), s' \rangle} \quad e \notin I \\
\\
\frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle \surd, s' \rangle}{\langle \tau_I(x), s \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle \surd, \tau(s) \rangle} \quad e \in I \qquad \frac{\langle x, s \rangle \xrightarrow{e} \langle x', s' \rangle}{\langle \tau_I(x), s \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle \tau_I(x'), \tau(s) \rangle} \quad e \in I
\end{array}$$

Table 40. Transition rule of the abstraction operator

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	$\tau_I(x \parallel y) = \tau_I(x) \parallel \tau_I(y)$
G27	$\phi \notin I \quad \tau_I(\phi) = \phi$
G28	$\phi \in I \quad \tau_I(\phi) = \tau$

Table 41. Axioms of abstraction operator

Then by *RSP*, particularly, $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle = \langle Z_{X_1 Y_1} | E \rangle$. Similarly, we can obtain $\langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle = \langle Z_{X_1 Y_1} | E \rangle$. Finally, $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle = \langle Z_{X_1 Y_1} | E \rangle = \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$, as desired.

- (2) If $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbp} \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$ for guarded linear recursive specification E_1 and E_2 , then $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$. It can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it.
- (3) If $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbhb} \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$ for guarded linear recursive specification E_1 and E_2 , then $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$. It can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it. \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 . $APTC_G$ with silent step and abstraction operator is called $APTC_{G_\tau}$. The transition rules of operator τ_I are shown in Table 40.

Theorem 8.51 (Conservativity of $APTC_{G_\tau}$ with guarded linear recursion). *$APTC_{G_\tau}$ with guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of $APTC_G$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion.*

Proof. Since the transition rules of $APTC_G$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion are source-dependent, and the transition rules for abstraction operator in Table 40 contain only a fresh operator τ_I in their source, so the transition rules of $APTC_{G_\tau}$ with guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of those of $APTC_G$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion. \square

Theorem 8.52 (Congruence theorem of $APTC_{G_\tau}$ with guarded linear recursion). *Rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbp} , \approx_{rbs} and \approx_{rbhp} are all congruences with respect to $APTC_{G_\tau}$ with guarded linear recursion.*

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

(2) The cases of rooted branching step bisimulation \approx_{rbs} , rooted branching hp-bisimulation \approx_{rbhp} can be proven similarly, we omit them. \square

We design the axioms for the abstraction operator τ_I in Table 41.

Theorem 8.53 (Soundness of $APTC_{G_\tau}$ with guarded linear recursion). *Let x and y be $APTC_{G_\tau}$ with guarded linear recursion terms. If $APTC_{G_\tau}$ with guarded linear recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

- (1) $x \approx_{rbs} y$.
- (2) $x \approx_{rbp} y$.
- (3) $x \approx_{rbhp} y$.

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

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

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

Though τ -loops are prohibited in guarded linear recursive specifications (see Definition 8.45) 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) [17] are still needed.

Theorem 8.54 (Completeness of $APTC_{G_\tau}$ with guarded linear recursion and *CFAR*). *Let p and q be closed $APTC_{G_\tau}$ with guarded linear recursion and *CFAR* terms, then,*

- (1) *if $p \approx_{rbs} q$ then $p = q$.*
- (2) *if $p \approx_{rbp} q$ then $p = q$.*
- (3) *if $p \approx_{rbhp} q$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. (1) For the case of rooted branching step bisimulation, the proof is following.

Firstly, in the proof the Theorem 8.50, we know that each process term p in $APTC_G$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 | E \rangle$ with E a guarded linear recursive specification. And we prove if $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle \approx_{rbs} \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$, then $\langle X_1 | E_1 \rangle = \langle Y_1 | E_2 \rangle$.

The only new case is $p \equiv \tau_I(q)$. Let $q = \langle X | E \rangle$ with E a guarded linear recursive specification, so $p = \tau_I(\langle X | E \rangle)$. Then the collection of recursive variables in E can be divided into its clusters C_1, \dots, C_N for I . Let

$$(a_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{i1}i1})Y_{i1} + \dots + (a_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{im_i}im_i})Y_{im_i} + b_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{i1}i1} + \dots + b_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{im_i}im_i}$$

be the conflict composition of exits for the cluster C_i , with $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$.

For $Z \in C_i$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, we define

$$s_Z \triangleq (a_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{i1}i1})\tau_I(\langle Y_{i1} | E \rangle) + \dots + (a_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{im_i}im_i})\tau_I(\langle Y_{im_i} | E \rangle) + b_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{i1}i1} + \dots + b_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{im_i}im_i}$$

For $Z \in C_i$ and $a_1, \dots, a_j \in \mathbb{E} \cup \{\tau\}$ with $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_j)\tau_I(\langle Z | E \rangle) \\ &= (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_j)\tau_I((a_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{i1}i1})\langle Y_{i1} | E \rangle + \dots + (a_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{im_i}im_i})\langle Y_{im_i} | E \rangle + b_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{i1}i1} + \dots + b_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{im_i}im_i}) \\ &= (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_j)s_Z \end{aligned}$$

Let the linear recursive specification F contain the same recursive variables as E , for $Z \in C_i$, F contains the following recursive equation

$$Z = (a_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{i1}i1})Y_{i1} + \dots + (a_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{im_i}im_i})Y_{im_i} + b_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{i1}i1} + \dots + b_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{im_i}im_i}$$

It is easy to see that there is no sequence of one or more τ -transitions from $\langle Z | F \rangle$ to itself, so F is guarded.

For

$$s_Z = (a_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{i1}i1})Y_{i1} + \dots + (a_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{im_i}im_i})Y_{im_i} + b_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{i1}i1} + \dots + b_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{im_i}im_i}$$

is a solution for F . So, $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_j)\tau_I(\langle Z | E \rangle) = (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_j)s_Z = (a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_j)\langle Z | F \rangle$.

So,

$$\langle Z | F \rangle = (a_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{i1}i1})\langle Y_{i1} | F \rangle + \dots + (a_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel a_{k_{im_i}im_i})\langle Y_{im_i} | F \rangle + b_{1i1} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{i1}i1} + \dots + b_{1im_i} \parallel \dots \parallel b_{l_{im_i}im_i}$$

(H1)	$\{wp(e, \alpha)\}e\{\alpha\}$ if $e \in \mathbb{E}$
(H2)	$\{\alpha\}\phi\{\alpha \cdot \phi\}$ if $\phi \in G$
(H3)	$\frac{\{\alpha\}t\{\beta\} \quad \{\alpha\}t'\{\beta\}}{\{\alpha\}t+t'\{\beta\}}$
(H4)	$\frac{\{\alpha\}t\{\alpha'\} \quad \{\alpha'\}t'\{\beta\}}{\{\alpha\}t+t'\{\beta\}}$
(H5)	$\frac{\{\alpha\}t\{\alpha'\} \quad \{\beta\}t'\{\beta'\}}{\{\alpha\ \beta\}t\ \beta'\{\alpha'\ \beta'\}}$
(H6)	$\frac{\{\alpha\}t\{\beta\}}{\{\alpha\}\Theta(t)\{\beta\}}$
(H7)	$\frac{\{\alpha\}t\{\beta\}}{\{\alpha\}\partial_H(t)\{\beta\}}$
(H8)	$\frac{\{\alpha\}t\{\beta\}}{\{\alpha\}\tau_I(t)\{\beta\}}$
(H9)	$\frac{\alpha \rightarrow \alpha' \quad \{\alpha'\}t\{\beta'\} \quad \beta' \rightarrow \beta}{\{\alpha\}t\{\beta\}}$
(H10)	For $E = \{x = t_x x \in V_E\}$ a guarded linear recursive specification $\forall y \in V_E$ and $z \in V_E$:
	$\frac{\{\alpha_x\}t_x\{\beta_x\} \quad \dots \quad \{\alpha_y\}t_y\{\beta_y\}}{\{\alpha_z\}\langle z E\rangle\{\beta_z\}}$
(H10')	For $E = \{x = t_x x \in V_E\}$ a guarded linear recursive specification $\forall y \in V_E$ and $z \in V_E$:
	$\frac{\{\alpha_{x_1} \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{x_{n_x}}\}t_x\{\beta_{x_1} \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{x_{n_x}}\} \quad \dots \quad \{\alpha_{y_1} \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{y_{n_y}}\}t_y\{\beta_{y_1} \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{y_{n_y}}\}}{\{\alpha_{z_1} \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{z_{n_z}}\}\langle z E\rangle\{\beta_{z_1} \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{z_{n_z}}\}}$

Table 42. The proof system H

Hence, $\tau_I(\langle X|E \rangle) = \langle Z|F \rangle$, as desired.

- (2) For the case of rooted branching pomset bisimulation, it can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it.
 (3) For the case of rooted branching hp-bisimulation, it can be proven similarly to (1), we omit it. \square

8.4.6. Hoare Logic for $APTC_G$

In this section, we introduce Hoare logic for $APTC_G$. We do not introduce the preliminaries of Hoare logic, please refer to [20] for details.

A partial correct formula has the form

$$\{pre\}P\{post\}$$

where pre are preconditions, $post$ are postconditions, and P are programs. $\{pre\}P\{post\}$ means that pre hold, then P are executed and $post$ hold. We take the guards G of $APTC_G$ as the language of conditions, and closed terms of $APTC_G$ as programs. For some condition $\alpha \in G$ and some data state $s \in S$, we denote $S \models \alpha[s] \rightarrow \langle \alpha, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \sqrt{}, s \rangle$, and $S \models \alpha$ for $\forall s \in S, S \models \alpha[s]$, $S \models \{\alpha\}p\{\beta\}$ for all $s \in S$, $\mu \subseteq \mathbb{E} \cup G$, $S \models \alpha[s]$, $\langle p, s \rangle \xrightarrow{\mu} \langle p', s' \rangle$, $S \models \beta[s']$ with $s' \in S$. It is obvious that $S \models \{\alpha\}p\{\beta\} \Leftrightarrow \alpha p \approx_{rbp} (\approx_{rbs}, \approx_{rbhp}) \alpha p \beta$.

We design a proof system H to deriving partial correct formulas over terms of $APTC_G$ as Table 42 shows. Let Γ be a set of conditions and partial correct formulas, we denote $\Gamma \vdash \{\alpha\}t\{\beta\}$ iff we can derive $\{\alpha\}t\{\beta\}$ in H , note that t does not need to be closed terms. And we write $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ for $S \models \alpha \Rightarrow S \models \beta$.

Theorem 8.55 (Soundness of H). *Let Tr_S be the set of conditions that hold in S . Let p be a closed term of $APTC_{G_\tau}$ with guarded linear recursion and $CFAR$, and $\alpha, \beta \in G$ be guards. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} Tr_S \vdash \{\alpha\}p\{\beta\} &\Rightarrow APTC_{G_\tau} \text{ with guarded linear recursion and } CFAR \vdash \alpha p = \alpha p \beta \\ &\Leftrightarrow \alpha p \approx_{rbs} (\approx_{rbp}, \approx_{rbhp}) \alpha p \beta \\ &\Leftrightarrow S \models \{\alpha\}p\{\beta\} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We only need to prove

$$Tr_S \vdash \{\alpha\}p\{\beta\} \Rightarrow APTC_{G_\tau} \text{ with guarded linear recursion and } CFAR \vdash \alpha p = \alpha p \beta$$

For $H1-H10$, by induction on the length of derivation, the soundness of $H1-H10$ are straightforward. We only prove the soundness of $H10'$.

Let $E = \{x_i = t_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ be a guarded linear recursive specification. Assume that

$$Trs, \{\{\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_i}\}x_i\{\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_i}\} \mid i = 1, \dots, n\} \vdash \{\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_j}\}t_j(x_1, \dots, x_n)\{\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_j}\}$$

for $j = 1, \dots, n$. We would show that $APTC_{G_\tau}$ with guarded linear recursion and $CFAR \vdash (\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_j})X_j = (\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_j})X_j(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_j})$.

We write recursive specifications E' and E'' for

$$E' = \{y_i = (\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_i})t_i(y_1, \dots, y_n) \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$$

$$E'' = \{z_i = (\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_i})t_i(z_1(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_1}), \dots, z_n(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_n})) \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$$

and would show that for $j = 1, \dots, n$,

(1) $(\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_j})X_j = Y_j$;

(2) $Z_j(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_j}) = Z_j$;

(3) $Z_j = Y_j$.

For (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_j})X_j &= (\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_j})t_j(X_1, \dots, X_n) \\ &= (\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_j})t_j((\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_1})X_1, \dots, (\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_n})X_n) \end{aligned}$$

by RDP, we have $(\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_j})X_j = Y_j$.

For (2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z_j(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_j}) &= (\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_j})t_j(Z_1(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_1}), \dots, Z_n(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_n}))(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_j}) \\ &= (\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_j})t_j(Z_1(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_1}), \dots, Z_n(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_n})) \\ &= (\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_j})t_j((Z_1(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_1}))(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_1}), \dots, (Z_n(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_n}))(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_n})) \end{aligned}$$

by RDP, we have $Z_j(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_j}) = Z_j$.

For (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z_j &= (\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_j})t_j(Z_1(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_1}), \dots, Z_n(\beta_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \beta_{n_n})) \\ &= (\alpha_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \alpha_{n_j})t_j(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \end{aligned}$$

by RDP, we have $Z_j = Y_j$. □

9. Axiomatization for Hhp-Bisimilarity

Since hhp-bisimilarity is a downward closed hp-bisimilarity and can be downward closed to single atomic event, which implies bisimilarity. As Moller [22] proven, there is not a finite sound and complete axiomatization for parallelism \parallel modulo bisimulation equivalence, so there is not a finite sound and complete axiomatization for parallelism \parallel modulo hhp-bisimulation equivalence either. Inspired by the way of left merge to modeling the full merge for bisimilarity, we introduce a left parallel composition \ll to model the full parallelism \parallel for hhp-bisimilarity.

In the following subsection, we add left parallel composition \ll to the whole theory. Because the resulting theory is similar to the former, we only list the significant differences, and all proofs of the conclusions are left to the reader.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_1 \leq e_2)}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} \surd} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} \surd \quad (e_1 \leq e_2)}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} x'} \\
\frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} \surd \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y' \quad (e_1 \leq e_2)}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} y'} \quad \frac{x \xrightarrow{e_1} x' \quad y \xrightarrow{e_2} y' \quad (e_1 \leq e_2)}{x \parallel y \xrightarrow{\{e_1, e_2\}} x' \ \& \ y'}
\end{array}$$

Table 43. Transition rules of left parallel operator \parallel

No.	Axiom
A6	$x + \delta = x$
A7	$\delta \cdot x = \delta$
P1	$x \ \& \ y = x \parallel y + x \mid y$
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	$(e_1 \leq e_2) \quad (e_1 \cdot x) \parallel (e_2 \cdot y) = (e_1 \parallel e_2) \cdot (x \ \& \ y)$
P8	$(x + y) \parallel z = (x \parallel z) + (y \parallel z)$
P9	$\delta \parallel x = \delta$
C10	$e_1 \mid e_2 = \gamma(e_1, e_2)$
C11	$e_1 \mid (e_2 \cdot y) = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot y$
C12	$(e_1 \cdot x) \mid e_2 = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot x$
C13	$(e_1 \cdot x) \mid (e_2 \cdot y) = \gamma(e_1, e_2) \cdot (x \ \& \ y)$
C14	$(x + y) \mid z = (x \mid z) + (y \mid z)$
C15	$x \mid (y + z) = (x \mid y) + (x \mid z)$
C16	$\delta \mid x = \delta$
C17	$x \mid \delta = \delta$
CE18	$\Theta(e) = e$
CE19	$\Theta(\delta) = \delta$
CE20	$\Theta(x + y) = \Theta(x) \triangleleft y + \Theta(y) \triangleleft x$
CE21	$\Theta(x \cdot y) = \Theta(x) \cdot \Theta(y)$
CE22	$\Theta(x \parallel y) = ((\Theta(x) \triangleleft y) \parallel y) + ((\Theta(y) \triangleleft x) \parallel x)$
CE23	$\Theta(x \mid y) = ((\Theta(x) \triangleleft y) \mid y) + ((\Theta(y) \triangleleft x) \mid x)$
U24	$(\sharp(e_1, e_2)) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_2 = \tau$
U25	$(\sharp(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3) \quad e_1 \triangleleft e_3 = e_1$
U26	$(\sharp(e_1, e_2), e_2 \leq e_3) \quad e_3 \triangleleft e_1 = \tau$
U27	$e \triangleleft \delta = e$
U28	$\delta \triangleleft e = \delta$
U29	$(x + y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) + (y \triangleleft z)$
U30	$(x \cdot y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \cdot (y \triangleleft z)$
U31	$(x \parallel y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \parallel (y \triangleleft z)$
U32	$(x \mid y) \triangleleft z = (x \triangleleft z) \mid (y \triangleleft z)$
U33	$x \triangleleft (y + z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
U34	$x \triangleleft (y \cdot z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
U35	$x \triangleleft (y \parallel z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$
U36	$x \triangleleft (y \mid z) = (x \triangleleft y) \triangleleft z$

Table 44. Axioms of parallelism with left parallel composition

9.1. APTC with Left Parallel Composition

The transition rules of left parallel composition \parallel are shown in Table 43. With a little abuse, we extend the causal order relation \leq on \mathbb{E} to include the original partial order (denoted by $<$) and concurrency (denoted by $=$).

The new axioms for parallelism are listed in Table 44.

Definition 9.1 (Basic terms of APTC with left parallel composition). *The set of basic terms of APTC, $\mathcal{B}(\text{APTC})$, is inductively defined as follows:*

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	$\partial_H(x \parallel y) = \partial_H(x) \parallel \partial_H(y)$

Table 45. Axioms of encapsulation operator with left parallel composition

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

Theorem 9.2 (Generalization of the algebra for left parallelism with respect to *BATC*). *The algebra for left parallelism is a generalization of BATC.*

Theorem 9.3 (Congruence theorem of *APTC* with left parallel composition). *Truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences $\sim_p, \sim_s, \sim_{hp}$ and \sim_{hhp} are all congruences with respect to *APTC* with left parallel composition.*

Theorem 9.4 (Elimination theorem of parallelism with left parallel composition). *Let p be a closed *APTC* with left parallel composition term. Then there is a basic *APTC* term q such that $APTC \vdash p = q$.*

Theorem 9.5 (Soundness of parallelism with left parallel composition modulo truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). *Let x and y be *APTC* with left parallel composition terms. If $APTC \vdash x = y$, then*

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

Theorem 9.6 (Completeness of parallelism with left parallel composition modulo truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). *Let x and y be *APTC* terms.*

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

The transition rules of encapsulation operator are the same, and the its axioms are shown in 45.

Theorem 9.7 (Conservativity of *APTC* with respect to the algebra for parallelism with left parallel composition). **APTC* is a conservative extension of the algebra for parallelism with left parallel composition.*

Theorem 9.8 (Congruence theorem of encapsulation operator ∂_H). *Truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences $\sim_p, \sim_s, \sim_{hp}$ and \sim_{hhp} are all congruences with respect to encapsulation operator ∂_H .*

Theorem 9.9 (Elimination theorem of *APTC*). *Let p be a closed *APTC* term including the encapsulation operator ∂_H . Then there is a basic *APTC* term q such that $APTC \vdash p = q$.*

Theorem 9.10 (Soundness of *APTC* modulo truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). *Let x and y be *APTC* terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H . If $APTC \vdash x = y$, then*

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

Theorem 9.11 (Completeness of *APTC* modulo truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences). *Let p and q be closed *APTC* terms including encapsulation operator ∂_H ,*

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

9.2. Recursion

Definition 9.12 (Recursive specification). *A recursive specification is a finite set of recursive equations*

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

...

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

*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 *APTC* with possible occurrences of the recursion variables X_1, \dots, X_n .*

Definition 9.13 (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 truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences $\sim_s(\sim_p, \sim_{hp}, \sim_{hhp})$) if $p_i \sim_s(\sim_p, \sim_{hp}, \sim_{hhp})t_i(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.*

Definition 9.14 (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 *APTC* and replacing recursion variables by the right-hand sides of their recursive equations,*

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

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

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

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 .

Theorem 9.16 (Conservativity of *APTC* with guarded recursion). **APTC* with guarded recursion is a conservative extension of *APTC*.*

Theorem 9.17 (Congruence theorem of *APTC* with guarded recursion). *Truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences $\sim_p, \sim_s, \sim_{hp}, \sim_{hhp}$ are all congruences with respect to *APTC* with guarded recursion.*

Theorem 9.18 (Elimination theorem of *APTC* with linear recursion). *Each process term in *APTC* with linear recursion is equal to a process term $\langle X_1 \mid E \rangle$ with E a linear recursive specification.*

Theorem 9.19 (Soundness of *APTC* with guarded recursion). *Let x and y be *APTC* with guarded recursion terms. If *APTC* with guarded recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

1. $x \sim_s y$;

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

Table 46. Axioms of silent step

2. $x \sim_p y$;
3. $x \sim_{hp} y$;
4. $x \sim_{hhp} y$.

Theorem 9.20 (Completeness of *APTC* with linear recursion). *Let p and q be closed *APTC* with linear recursion terms, then,*

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

9.3. Abstraction

Definition 9.21 (Guarded linear recursive specification). *A recursive specification is linear if its recursive equations are of the form*

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

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 $\langle X|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle X'|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle X''|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tau} \dots$.

The transition rules of τ are the same, and axioms of τ are as Table 46 shows.

Theorem 9.22 (Conservativity of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion). *APTC with silent step and guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of *APTC* with linear recursion.*

Theorem 9.23 (Congruence theorem of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbp} , \approx_{rbs} , \approx_{rbhp} , and \approx_{rbhhp} are all congruences with respect to *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion.*

Theorem 9.24 (Elimination theorem of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Each process term in *APTC* with 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 9.25 (Soundness of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Let x and y be *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion terms. If *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

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

Theorem 9.26 (Completeness of *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion). *Let p and q be closed *APTC* with silent step and guarded linear recursion terms, then,*

1. *if $p \approx_{rbs} q$ then $p = q$;*

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	$\tau_I(x \parallel y) = \tau_I(x) \parallel \tau_I(y)$

Table 47. Axioms of abstraction operator

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

Table 48. Cluster fair abstraction rule

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

The transition rules of τ_I are the same, and the axioms are shown in Table 47.

Theorem 9.27 (Conservativity of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion). *$APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion is a conservative extension of $APTC$ with silent step and guarded linear recursion.*

Theorem 9.28 (Congruence theorem of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion). *Rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbp} , \approx_{rbs} , \approx_{rbhp} and \approx_{rbhhp} are all congruences with respect to $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion.*

Theorem 9.29 (Soundness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion). *Let x and y be $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion terms. If $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion $\vdash x = y$, then*

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

Definition 9.30 (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 $\langle X|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\{b_{11}, \dots, b_{1i}\}} \dots \xrightarrow{\{b_{m1}, \dots, b_{mi}\}} \langle Y|E \rangle$ and $\langle Y|E \rangle \xrightarrow{\{c_{11}, \dots, c_{1j}\}} \dots \xrightarrow{\{c_{n1}, \dots, c_{nj}\}} \langle X|E \rangle$, where $b_{11}, \dots, b_{mi}, c_{11}, \dots, c_{nj} \in I \cup \{\tau\}$.
 $a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_k$ or $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_k)X$ is an exit for the cluster C iff: (1) $a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_k$ or $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_k)X$ is a summand at the right-hand side of the recursive equation for a recursion variable in C , and (2) in the case of $(a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_k)X$, either $a_l \notin I \cup \{\tau\}$ ($l \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$) or $X \notin C$.*

Theorem 9.31 (Soundness of CFAR). *CFAR is sound modulo rooted branching truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences \approx_{rbs} , \approx_{rbp} , \approx_{rbhp} and \approx_{rbhhp} .*

Theorem 9.32 (Completeness of $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and CFAR). *Let p and q be closed $APTC_\tau$ with guarded linear recursion and CFAR terms, then,*

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

10. Conclusions

Now, let us conclude this paper. We try to find the algebraic laws for true concurrency, as a uniform logic for true concurrency [14] [15] already existed. There are simple comparisons between Hennessy and Milner (HM) logic for bisimulation equivalence and the uniform logic for truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences, the algebraic laws [1], *ACP* [4] for bisimulation equivalence, and *what* for truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences, which is still missing.

Following the above idea, we find the algebraic laws for true concurrency, which is called *APTC*, an algebra for true concurrency. Like *ACP*, *APTC* also has four modules: *BATC* (Basic Algebra for True Concurrency), *APTC* (Algebra for Parallelism in True Concurrency), recursion and abstraction, and we prove the soundness and completeness of their algebraic laws modulo truly concurrent bisimulation equivalences. And we show its applications in verification of behaviors of system in a truly concurrent flavor, and its modularity by extending a new renaming operator and a new shadow constant into it.

Unlike *ACP*, in *APTC*, the parallelism is a fundamental computational pattern, and cannot be steadied by other computational patterns. We establish a whole theory which has correspondences to *ACP*.

In future, we will pursue the wide applications of *APTC* in verifications of the behavioral correctness of concurrent systems.

References

- [1] M. Hennessy and R. Milner. Algebraic laws for nondeterminism and concurrency. J. ACM, 1985, 32, 137-161.
- [2] R. Milner. Communication and concurrency. Printice Hall, 1989.
- [3] R. Milner. A calculus of communicating systems. LNCS 92, Springer, 1980.
- [4] W. Fokkink. Introduction to process algebra 2nd ed. Springer-Verlag, 2007.
- [5] M. Nielsen, G. D. Plotkin, and G. Winskel. Petri nets, event structures and domains, Part I. Theoret. Comput. Sci. 1981, 13, 85-108.
- [6] G. Winskel. Event structures. In Petri Nets: Applications and Relationships to Other Models of Concurrency, Wilfried Brauer, Wolfgang Reisig, and Grzegorz Rozenberg, Eds., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 1987, vol. 255, Springer, Berlin, 325-392.
- [7] G. Winskel and M. Nielsen. Models for concurrency. In Samson Abramsky, Dov M. Gabbay, and Thomas S. E. Maibaum, Eds., Handbook of logic in Computer Science, 1995, vol. 4, Clarendon Press, Oxford, UK.
- [8] M. A. Bednarczyk. Hereditary history preserving bisimulations or what is the power of the future perfect in program logics. Tech. Rep. Polish Academy of Sciences. 1991.
- [9] S. B. Fröschle and T. T. Hildebrandt. On plain and hereditary history-preserving bisimulation. In Proceedings of MFCS'99, Mirosław Kutylowski, Leszek Pacholski, and Tomasz Wierzbicki, Eds., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 1999, vol. 1672, Springer, Berlin, 354-365.
- [10] J. Bradfield and C. Stirling. Modal mu-calculi. In Handbook of Modal Logic, Patrick Blackburn, Johan van Benthem, and Franck Wolter, Eds., Elsevier, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2006, 721-756.
- [11] I. Phillips and I. Ulidowski. Reverse bisimulations on stable configuration structures. In Proceedings of SOS'09, B. Klin and P. Sobociński, Eds., Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science, 2010, vol. 18. Elsevier, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 62-76.
- [12] I. Phillips and I. Ulidowski. A logic with reverse modalities for history-preserving bisimulations. In Proceedings of EXPRESS'11, Bas Luttik and Frank Valencia, Eds., Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science, 2011, vol. 64, Elsevier, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 104-118.
- [13] J. Gutierrez. On bisimulation and model-checking for concurrent systems with partial order semantics. Ph.D. dissertation. LFCS- University of Edinburgh, 2011.
- [14] P. Baldan and S. Crafa. A logic for true concurrency. In Proceedings of CONCUR'10, Paul Gastin and François Laroussinie, Eds., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2010, vol. 6269, Springer, Berlin, 147-161.
- [15] P. Baldan and S. Crafa. A logic for true concurrency. J.ACM, 2014, 61(4): 36 pages.
- [16] Y. Wang. Weakly true concurrency and its logic. 2016, Manuscript, arXiv:1606.06422.
- [17] F.W. Vaandrager. Verification of two communication protocols by means of process algebra. Report CS-R8608, CWI, Amsterdam, 1986.
- [18] R. Glabbeek and U. Goltz. Refinement of actions and equivalence notions for concurrent systems. Acta Inf. 2001, 37, 4/5, 229-327.
- [19] K.A. Bartlett, R.A. Scantlebury, and P.T. Wilkinson. A note on reliable full-duplex transmission over half-duplex links. Communications of the ACM, 12(5):260-261, 1969.
- [20] C.A.R. Hoare. An axiomatic basis for computer programming. Communications of the ACM, 12(10), October 1969.
- [21] J. F. Groote, A. Ponse. Process algebra with guards: combining hoare logic with process algebra. Formal Aspects of Computing, 1994, 6(2): 115-164.
- [22] F. Moller. 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, 1990.