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Abstract
The replicated list object is frequently used to model the core functionality of replicated collaborative text editing systems. Since 1989, the convergence property has been a common specification of a replicated list object. Recently, Attiya et al. proposed the strong/weak list specification and conjectured that the well-known Jupiter protocol satisfies the weak list specification. The major obstacle to proving this conjecture is the mismatch between the global property on all replica states prescribed by the specification and the local view each replica maintains in Jupiter using data structures like 1D buffer or 2D state space. To address this issue, we propose CJupiter (Compact Jupiter) based on a novel data structure called n-ary ordered state space for a replicated client/server system with n clients. At a high level, CJupiter maintains only a single n-ary ordered state space which encompasses exactly all states of each replica. We prove that CJupiter and Jupiter are equivalent and that CJupiter satisfies the weak list specification, thus solving the conjecture above.
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1 Introduction

Collaborative text editing systems, like Google Docs [2], Apache Wave [1], or wikis [11], allow multiple users to concurrently edit the same document. For availability, such systems often replicate the document at several replicas. For low latency, replicas are required to respond to user operations immediately without any communication with others and updates are propagated asynchronously.

The replicated list object has been frequently used to model the core functionality (e.g., insertion and deletion) of replicated collaborative text editing systems [5, 8, 13, 25, 16]. A common specification of a replicated list object is the convergence property, proposed by Ellis et al. [8]. It requires the final lists at all replicas be identical after executing the same set of user operations. Recently, Attiya et al. [5] proposed the strong/weak list specification. Beyond the convergence property, the strong/weak list specification specifies global properties on intermediate states going through by replicas. Attiya et al. [5] have proved that the existing RGA protocol [16] satisfies the strong list specification. Meanwhile, it is conjectured that the well-known Jupiter protocol [13, 25], which is behind Google Docs [3] and Apache Wave [1], satisfies the weak list specification.

Jupiter adopts a centralized server replica for propagating updates [7] and client replicas are connected to the server replica via FIFO channels; see Figure 1. Jupiter relies on the technique of operational transformations (OT) [8, 20] to achieve convergence. The basic idea of OT is for each replica to execute any local operation immediately and to transform a remote operation so that it takes into account the concurrent operations previously executed at the replica. Consider a replicated list system consisting of replicas $R_1$ and $R_2$ which initially hold the same list (Figure 2). Suppose that user 1 invokes $o_1 = \text{Ins}(f, 1)$ at $R_1$ and concurrently user 2 invokes $o_2 = \text{Del}(5)$ at $R_2$. After being executed locally, each operation is sent to the other replica. Without OT (Figure 2a), the states of two replicas diverge. With the OT of $o_1$ and $o_2$ (Figure 2b), $o_2$ is transformed to $o'_2 = \text{Del}(6)$ at $R_1$, taking into account the fact that $o_1$ has inserted an element at position 1. Meanwhile, $o_1$ remains unchanged. As a result, two replicas converge to the same list. We note that although the idea of OT is straightforward, many OT-based protocols for replicated list are hard to understand and some of them have even been shown incorrect with respect to convergence [8, 20, 22].

The major obstacle to proving that Jupiter satisfies the weak list specification is the mismatch between the global property on all states prescribed by such a specification and the local view each replica maintains in the protocol. On the one hand, the weak list specification requires that states across the system are pairwise compatible [5]. That is, for any pair of (list) states, there cannot be two elements $a$ and $b$ such that $a$ precedes $b$ in one state but $b$ precedes $a$ in the other. On the other hand, Jupiter uses data structures like 1D buffer [18] or 2D state space [13, 25] which are not “compact” enough to capture all replica states in one. In particular, Jupiter maintains $2n$ 2D state spaces for a system with $n$ clients [25]: Each client maintains a single state space which is synchronized with those of other clients via its counterpart state space maintained by the server. Each 2D state space of a client (as well as its counterpart at the server) consists of a local dimension and a global dimension, keeping track of the operations processed by the client itself and the others, respectively. In this way, replica states of Jupiter are dispersed in multiple 2D state spaces maintained

---

2 Since replicas are required to respond to user operations immediately, the client/server architecture does not imply that clients process operations in the same order.
3 The details about Figure 1 will be described in Examples 4 and 13.
Figure 1: A schedule of four operations adapted from [5], involving a server replica $s$ and three client replicas $c_1$, $c_2$, and $c_3$. The circled numbers indicate the order in which the operations are received at the server. The list contents produced by CJupiter (Section 3) are shown in boxes.

Figure 2: Illustrations of OT (adapted from [9]).

locally at individual replicas.

To resolve the mismatch, we propose CJupiter (Compact Jupiter), a variant of Jupiter, which uses a novel data structure called $n$-ary ordered state space for a system with $n$ clients. CJupiter is compact in the sense that at a high level, it maintains only a single $n$-ary ordered state space which encompasses exactly all states of each replica. Each replica behavior corresponds to a path going through this state space. This makes it feasible for us to reason about global properties and finally prove that Jupiter satisfies the weak list specification, thus solving the conjecture of Attiya et al. The roadmap is as follows:

- (Section 3) We propose CJupiter based on the $n$-ary ordered state space data structure.
- (Section 4) We prove that CJupiter is equivalent to Jupiter in the sense that the behaviors of corresponding replicas of these two protocols are the same under the same schedule of operations. Jupiter is slightly optimized in implementation at clients (but not at the server) by eliminating redundant OTs, which, however, has obscured the similarities among clients and led to the mismatch discussed above.
- (Section 5) We prove that CJupiter satisfies the weak list specification. Thanks to the “compactness” of CJupiter, we are able to focus on a single $n$-ary ordered state space which provides a global view of all possible replica states.

Section 2 presents preliminaries on specifying replicated list data type and OT. Section 6 describes related work. Section 7 concludes the paper. Appendix contains proofs and pseudocode.

2 Preliminaries: Replicated List and Operational Transformation

We describe the system model and specifications of replicated list in the framework for specifying replicated data types [7, 6, 5].
2.1 System Model

A highly-available replicated data store consists of replicas that process user operations on the replicated objects and communicate updates to each other with messages. To be highly-available, replicas are required to respond to user operations immediately without any communication with others. A replica is defined as a state machine \( R = (\Sigma, \sigma_0, E, \Delta) \), where 1) \( \Sigma \) is a set of states; 2) \( \sigma_0 \in \Sigma \) is the initial state; 3) \( E \) is a set of possible events; and 4) \( \Delta : \Sigma \times E \rightarrow \Sigma \) is a transition function. The state transitions determined by \( \Delta \) are local steps of a replica, describing how it interacts with the following three kinds of events from users and other replicas:

- \( \text{do}(o, v) \): a user invokes an operation \( o \in O \) on the replicated object and immediately receives a response \( v \in \text{Val} \). We leave the users unspecified and say that the replica generates the operation \( o \);
- \( \text{send}(m) \): the replica sends a message \( m \) to some replicas; and
- \( \text{receive}(m) \): the replica receives a message \( m \).

A protocol is a collection \( R \) of replicas. An execution \( \alpha \) of a protocol \( R \) is a sequence of all events occurring at the replicas in \( R \). We denote by \( R(e) \) the replica at which an event \( e \) occurs. For an execution (or generally, an event sequence) \( \alpha \), we denote by \( e \prec_\alpha e' \) (or \( e \prec e' \)) that \( e \) precedes \( e' \) in \( \alpha \). An execution \( \alpha \) is well-formed if for every replica \( R \): 1) the subsequence of events \( \langle e_1, e_2, \ldots \rangle \) at \( R \), denoted \( \alpha_{|R} \), is well-formed, namely there is a sequence of states \( \langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots \rangle \), such that \( \sigma_i = \Delta(\sigma_{i-1}, e_i) \) for all \( i \); and 2) every receive \( \text{receive}(m) \) event at \( R \) is preceded by a send \( \text{send}(m) \) event in \( \alpha \). We consider only well-formed executions.

We are often concerned with replica behaviors and states when studying a protocol. The behavior of replica \( R \) in \( \alpha \) is a sequence of the form: \( \sigma_0, e_1, \sigma_1, e_2, \ldots \) where \( \langle e_1, e_2, \ldots \rangle = \alpha_{|R} \) and \( \sigma_i = \Delta(\sigma_{i-1}, e_i) \) for all \( i \). A replica state \( \sigma \) of \( R \) in \( \alpha \) can be represented by the events in a prefix of \( \alpha_{|R} \) it has processed. Specifically, \( \sigma_0 = () \) and \( \sigma_i = \sigma_{i-1} \circ e_i = \langle e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_i \rangle \).

We now define the causally-before, concurrent, and totally-before relations on events in an execution.

In an execution \( \alpha \), event \( e \) is causally before \( e' \), denoted \( e \xrightarrow{\text{hb}} e' \) (or \( e \xrightarrow{\text{hb}} e' \)), if one of the following conditions holds [10]: 1) Thread of execution: \( R(e) = R(e') \): \( e \prec e' \); 2) Message delivery: \( e = \text{send}(m) \) \& \( e' = \text{receive}(m) \); 3) Transitivity: \( \exists e'' : e \xrightarrow{\text{hb}} e'' \wedge e'' \xrightarrow{\text{hb}} e' \).

Events \( e, e' \in \alpha \) are concurrent, denoted \( e \parallel e' \) (or \( e \parallel e' \)), if it is neither \( e \xrightarrow{\text{hb}} e' \) nor \( e' \xrightarrow{\text{hb}} e \). A relation on events in an execution \( \alpha \), denoted \( e \xrightarrow{\text{tb}} e' \) (or \( e \xrightarrow{\text{tb}} e' \)), is a totally-before relation consistent with the causally-before relation \( \xrightarrow{\text{hb}} \) on events in \( \alpha \) if it is total: \( \forall e, e' \in \alpha : e \xrightarrow{\text{tb}} e' \vee e' \xrightarrow{\text{tb}} e \), and it is consistent: \( \forall e, e' \in \alpha : e \xrightarrow{\text{tb}} e' \Rightarrow e \xrightarrow{\text{tb}} e' \).

2.2 Specifying Replicated Objects

A replicated object is specified by a set of abstract executions which record user operations (corresponding to do events) and visibility relations on them [7]. An abstract execution is a pair \( A = (H, \text{vis}) \), where \( H \) is a sequence of do events and \( \text{vis} \subseteq H \times H \) is an acyclic visibility relation such that: 1) if \( e_1 \prec_H e_2 \) and \( R(e_1) = R(e_2) \), then \( e_1 \xrightarrow{\text{vis}} e_2 \); 2) if \( e_1 \xrightarrow{\text{vis}} e_2 \), then \( e_1 \prec_H e_2 \); and 3) \( \text{vis} \) is transitive: \( (e_1 \xrightarrow{\text{vis}} e_2 \wedge e_2 \xrightarrow{\text{vis}} e_3) \Rightarrow e_1 \xrightarrow{\text{vis}} e_3 \).

An abstract execution \( A' = (H', \text{vis}') \) is a prefix of another abstract execution \( A = (H, \text{vis}) \) if \( H' \) is a prefix of \( H \) and \( \text{vis}' = \text{vis} \cap (H' \times H') \). A specification \( S \) of a replicated object is a prefix-closed set of abstract executions, namely if \( A \in S \), then \( A' \in S \) for each prefix \( A' \) of \( A \). A protocol \( R \) satisfies a specification \( S \), denoted \( R \models S \), if any (concrete) execution \( \alpha \) of
A replicated list object supports three types of user operations [5] (\(U\) for some universe):

- **Ins\((a, p)\)**: inserts \(a \in U\) at position \(p \in \mathbb{N}\) and returns the updated list. For \(p\) larger than the list size, we assume an insertion at the end. We assume that all inserted elements are unique, which can be achieved by attaching replica identifiers and sequence numbers.
- **Del\((a, p)\)**: deletes an element at position \(p \in \mathbb{N}\) and returns the updated list. For \(p\) larger than the list size, we assume an deletion at the end. The parameter \(a \in U\) is used to record the deleted element [22], which will be referred to in condition 1(a) of the weak list specification defined later.
- **Read**: returns the contents of the list.

The operations above, as well as a special NOP (i.e., “do nothing”), form \(\mathcal{O}\) and all possible list contents form Val. Ins and Del are collectively called **list updates**. We denote by \(\text{elems}(A) = \{a \mid \text{do}(\text{Ins}(a, _), _) \in H\}\) the set of all elements inserted into the list in an abstract execution \(A = (H, \text{vis})\).

We adopt the convergence property in [5] which requires that two Read operations that observe the same set of list updates return the same response. Formally, an abstract execution \(A = (H, \text{vis})\) belongs to the convergence property \(\mathcal{A}\) if and only if for any pair of Read events \(e_1 = \text{do}(\text{Read}, w_1) \triangleq a_1^1 \ldots a_1^{n-1}\) and \(e_2 = \text{do}(\text{Read}, w_2) \triangleq a_2^0 \ldots a_2^{n-1}\) \((a_i^j \in \text{elems}(A))\), it holds that \(\text{vis}_{\text{Ins, Del}}^{-1}(e_1) = \text{vis}_{\text{Ins, Del}}^{-1}(e_2) \implies w_1 = w_2\), where \(\text{vis}_{\text{Ins, Del}}^{-1}(e)\) denotes the set of list updates visible to \(e\).

The weak list specification requires the ordering between elements that are not deleted to be consistent across the system [5].

**Definition 1 (Weak List Specification \(\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}\) [5])**. An abstract execution \(A = (H, \text{vis})\) belongs to the weak list specification \(\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}\) if and only if there is a relation \(\text{lo} \subseteq \text{elems}(A) \times \text{elems}(A)\), called the list order, such that:

1. Each event \(e = \text{do}(o, w) \in H\) returns a sequence of elements \(w = a_0 \ldots a_{n-1}\), where \(a_i \in \text{elems}(A)\), such that:
   a. \(w\) contains exactly the elements visible to \(e\) that have been inserted, but not deleted:
      \[\forall a. a \in w \iff \left(\text{do}(\text{Ins}(a, _), _) \leq_{\text{vis}} e\right) \land \neg \left(\text{do}(\text{Del}(a, _), _) \leq_{\text{vis}} e\right).\]
   b. The list order is consistent with the order of the elements in \(w\):
      \[\forall i, j. (i < j) \implies (a_i, a_j) \in \text{lo}.\]
   c. Elements are inserted at the specified position: \(op = \text{Ins}(a, k) \implies a = \text{a}_{\text{min}}\{k, n-1\}\).

2. \(\text{lo}\) is irreflexive and for all events \(e = \text{do}(op, w) \in H\), it is transitive and total on \(\{a \mid a \in w\}\).

**Example 2 (Weak List Specification)**. In the execution depicted in Figure 1 (produced by C.Jupiter), there exist three states with list contents \(w_1 = ba\), \(w_2 = ax\), and \(w_3 = xb\), respectively. This is allowed by the weak list specification with the list order \(lo\): \(b \xrightarrow{\text{lo}} a\) on \(w_1\), \(a \xrightarrow{\text{lo}} x\) on \(w_2\), and \(x \xrightarrow{\text{lo}} b\) on \(w_3\). However, an execution is not allowed by the weak list specification if it contained two states with, say \(w = ab\) and \(w' = ba\).
2.4 Operational Transformation (OT)

The OT of transforming \( o_1 \in \mathcal{O} \) with \( o_2 \in \mathcal{O} \) is expressed by the function \( o'_1 = OT(o_1, o_2) \). We also write \( (o'_1, o'_2) = OT(o_1, o_2) \) to denote both \( o'_1 = OT(o_1, o_2) \) and \( o'_2 = OT(o_2, o_1) \). To ensure the convergence property, OT functions are required to satisfy CP1 (Convergence Property 1) \(^8\): Given two operations \( o_1 \) and \( o_2 \), if \( (o'_1, o'_2) = OT(o_1, o_2) \), then \( \sigma; o_1; o_2; o'_1 \) should hold, meaning that the same state is obtained by applying \( o_1 \) and \( o_2 \) in sequence, and applying \( o_2 \) and \( o'_1 \) in sequence, on the same initial state \( \sigma \). A set of OT functions satisfying CP1 for a replicated list object \(^8\) \([8, 9, 22]\) can be found in Figure \(A.1\).

3 The CJupiter Protocol

In this section we propose CJupiter (Compact Jupiter) for a replicated list based on the data structure called \( n \)-ary ordered state space. Like Jupiter, CJupiter also adopts a client/server architecture. For convenience, we assume that the server does not generate operations \(^25, 5\).

It mainly serializes operations and propagates them from one client to others. We denote by ‘\( \prec \)’ the total order on the set of operations established by the server. Note that ‘\( \prec \)’ is consistent with the causally-before relation ‘\( \prec_{hb} \)’. To facilitate the comparison of Jupiter and CJupiter, we refer to ‘\( \prec_{hb} \)’ and ‘\( \prec \)’ together as the schedule of operations.

3.1 Data Structure: \( n \)-ary Ordered State Space

For a client/server system with \( n \) clients, CJupiter maintains \((n+1)\) \( n \)-ary ordered state spaces, one per replica (CSS, for the server and CSS\(_c\), for client \( c_i \)). Each CSS is a directed graph whose vertices represent states and edges are labeled with operations; see Appendix \([B.1]\).

An operation \( op \) of type \( Op \) is a tuple \( op = (o, oid, ctx, sctx) \), where 1) \( o \) is the signature of type \( \mathcal{O} \) described in Section \(2.3\) 2) \( oid \) is a globally unique operation identifier which is a pair \((cid, seq)\) consisting of the client id and a sequence number; 3) \( ctx \) is an operation context which is a set of \( oids \), denoting the operations that are causally before \( op \); and 4) \( sctx \) is a set of \( oids \), denoting the operations that, as far as \( op \) knows, have been executed before \( op \) at the server. At a given replica, \( sctx \) is used to determine the total order ‘\( \prec \)’ relation between two operations as in Algorithm \([B.1]\).

The OT function of two operations \( op, op' \in Op \), denoted \( (op, op') : Op, op'\langle op \rangle : Op \rangle = OT(op, op') \), is defined based on that of \( op, op' \in \mathcal{O} \), denoted \( (o, o') \in OT(op, op') \), such that \( op\langle op' \rangle = (o, op.oid, op.ctx \cup \{op.oid\}, op.sctx) \) and \( op'\langle op \rangle = (o', op'.oid, op'.ctx \cup \{op.oid\}, op'.sctx) \).

A vertex \( v \) of type Vertex is a pair \( v = (oids, edges) \), where \( oids \) is the set of operations (represented by their identifiers) that have been executed, and \( edges \) is an ordered set of edges of type Edge from \( v \) to other vertices, labeled with operations. That is, each edge \( (op : Op, v : Vertex) \). Edges from the same vertex are totally ordered by their \( op \) components. For each vertex \( v \) and each edge \( e = (op, u) \) from \( v \) to \( u \), it is required to

- the \( ctx \) of \( op \) associated with \( e \) matches the \( oids \) of \( v \): \( op.ctx = v.oids \);
- the \( oids \) of \( u \) consists of the \( oids \) of \( v \) and the \( oid \) of \( op \): \( u.oids = v.oids \cup \{op.oid\} \).

**Definition 3 (n-ary Ordered State Space).** An \( n \)-ary ordered state space is a set of vertices such that
1. Vertices are uniquely identified by their \( oids \).
2. For each vertex \( u \) with \( |u.edges| \geq 2 \), let \( u' \) be its child vertex along the \textbf{first} edge \( e_{uv} = (op', u') \) and \( v \) another child vertex along \( e_{uv} = (op, v) \). There exist (Figure \(3\))
The second condition models OTs in CJupiter described in Section 3.2, and the choice of the “first” edge is justified in Lemmas 5 and 7.

### 3.2 The CJupiter Protocol

Each replica in CJupiter maintains an $n$-ary ordered state space $S$ and keeps the most recent vertex $cur$ (initially $(\emptyset, \emptyset)$) of $S$. Following [23], we describe CJupiter in three parts; see Appendix B.2 for pseudocode.

**Local Processing Part.** When a client receives an operation $o \in O$ from a user, it
1. applies $o$ locally, obtaining a new list $val \in Val$;
2. generates $op \in Op$ by attaching to $o$ a unique operation identifier and the operation context $S.cur.oids$, representing the set of operations that are causally before $op$;
3. creates a vertex $v$ with $v.oids = S.cur.oids \cup \{op.oid\}$, appends $v$ to $S$ by linking it to $S.cur$ via an edge labeled with $op$, and updates $cur$ to be $v$;
4. sends $op$ to the server asynchronously and returns $val$ to the user.

**Server Processing Part.** To establish the total order `$\prec_s$` on operations, the server maintains the set $soids$ of operations it has executed. When the server receives an operation $op \in Op$ from client $c_i$, it
1. updates $op.sctx$ to be $soids$ and updates $soids$ to include $op.oid$;
2. transforms $op$ with an operation sequence in $S$ to obtain $op'$ by calling $S.XFORM(op)$ (see below), and applies $op'$ (specifically, $op'.o$) locally;
3. sends $op$ (instead of $op'$) to other clients asynchronously.
**Remote Processing Part.** When a client receives an operation \( op \in Op \) from the server, it transforms \( op \) with an operation sequence in \( S \) to obtain \( op' \) by calling \( S.XFORM(op) \) (see below), and applies \( op' \) (specifically, \( op'.a \)) locally.

**OTs in CJupiter.** The procedure \( S.XFORM(op : Op) \) transforms \( op \) with an operation sequence in an \( n \)-ary ordered state space \( S \). Specifically, it

1. locates the vertex \( u \) whose \( oids \) matches the \( ctx \) of \( op \), i.e., \( u.oids = op.ctx \)
2. iteratively transforms \( op \) with an operation sequence consisting of operations along the

   - **first** edges from \( u \) to the final vertex \( cur \) of \( S \) (Figure 3):
     - a. obtains the vertex \( u' \) and the operation \( op' \) associated with the first edge of \( u \);
     - b. transforms \( op \) with \( op' \) to obtain \( op(op') \) and \( op'(op) \);
     - c. creates a vertex \( v' \) with \( v'.oids = v.oids \cup \{ op.oid \} \);
     - d. links \( v' \) to \( v \) via an edge labeled with \( op'(op) \) and \( v \) to \( u \) via an edge labeled with \( op \);
     - e. updates \( u, v, \) and \( op \) to \( u', v', \) and \( op(op') \), respectively;
3. when \( u \) is the final vertex \( cur \) of \( S \), links \( v \) to \( u \) via an edge labeled with \( op \), updates \( cur \) to be \( v \), and returns the last transformed operation \( op \).

To keep track of the construction of the \( n \)-ary ordered state spaces in CJupiter, for each state space, we introduce a superscript \( k \) to refer to the one after the \( k \)-th step (i.e., after processing \( k \) operations), counting from 0. For instance, the state space \( CSS_{c_i} \) (resp. \( CSS_s \)) after the \( k \)-th step maintained by client \( c_i \) (resp. the server \( s \)) is denoted by \( CSS_{c_i}^k \) (resp. \( CSS_s^k \)). This notational convention also applies to Jupiter (reviewed in Section 4.1).

**Example 4 (Illustration of CJupiter).** Figure 5 illustrates client \( c_3 \) in CJupiter under the schedule of Figure 4. For convenience, we denote, for instance, a vertex \( v \) with \( v.oids = \{ o_1, o_2 \} \) by \( v_{i4} \) and an operation \( o_3 \) with \( o_3.ctx = \{ o_1, o_2 \} \) by \( o_3 \{ o_1, o_2 \} \). We have also mixed the notations of operations of types \( O \) and \( Op \) when no confusion arises. We map various vertices and operations in this example to the ones (i.e., \( u, u', v, v', op, op' \)) used in the description of the CJupiter protocol.

---

4 The vertex \( u \) exists due to the FIFO communication between the clients and the server.
After receiving and applying \( o_1 = \text{INS}(x, 0) \) of client \( c_1 \) from the server, client \( c_3 \) generates \( o_4 = \text{INS}(b, 1) \). It applies \( o_4 \) locally, creates a new vertex \( v_{14} \), and appends it to \( \text{CSS}_1 \), via an edge from \( v_1 \) labeled with \( o_4 \{ o_1 \} \). Then, \( o_4 \{ o_1 \} \) is propagated to the server.

Next, client \( c_3 \) receives \( o_2 = \text{DEL}(x, 0) \) of client \( c_1 \) from the server. The operation context of \( o_2 \) is \( \{ o_1 \} \), matching the \( \text{oids} \) of \( v_1 \) (\( u \)). By \( \text{xFORM} \), \( o_2 \{ o_1 \} \) (\( \text{op} \)) is transformed with \( o_4 \{ o_1 \} \) (\( \text{op}' \)): \( \text{OT}(o_2 \{ o_1 \}) = \text{DEL}(x, 0), o_4 \{ o_1 \} = \text{INS}(b, 1) \) = \( \{ o_2 \{ o_1, o_4 \} = \text{DEL}(x, 0), o_4 \{ o_1, o_2 \} = \text{INS}(b, 0) \} \). As a result, \( v_{124} \) (\( u' \)) is created and is linked to \( v_{12} \) (\( v \)) and \( v_{14} \) (\( u' \)) via the edges labeled with \( o_4 \{ o_1, o_2 \} \) and \( o_2 \{ o_1, o_4 \} \), respectively. Because \( o_2 \) is unaware of \( o_4 \) at the server (\( o_4.\text{sctx} = \emptyset \) now), the edge from \( v_1 \) to \( v_{12} \) is ordered before (to the left of) that from \( v_1 \) to \( v_{14} \) in \( \text{CSS}_3 \).

Finally, client \( c_3 \) receives \( o_3 \{ o_1 \} = \text{INS}(a, 0) \) of client \( c_2 \) from the server. The operation context of \( o_3 \) is \( \{ o_1 \} \), matching the \( \text{oids} \) of \( v_1 \) (\( u \)). By \( \text{xFORM} \), \( o_3 \{ o_1 \} \) will be transformed with the operation sequence consisting of operations along the \( \text{first} \) edges from \( v_1 \) to the final vertex \( v_{124} \) of \( \text{CSS}_3 \), namely \( o_2 \{ o_1 \} \) from \( v_1 \) and \( o_4 \{ o_1, o_2 \} \) from \( v_{12} \). Specifically, \( o_3 \{ o_1 \} \) (\( \text{op} \)) is first transformed with \( o_2 \{ o_1 \} \) (\( \text{op}' \)): \( \text{OT}(o_3 \{ o_1 \}) = \text{INS}(a, 0), o_2 \{ o_1 \} = \text{DEL}(x, 1) \) = \( \{ o_3 \{ o_1, o_2 \} = \text{INS}(a, 0), o_2 \{ o_1, o_3 \} = \text{DEL}(x, 1) \} \). Since \( o_3 \) is aware of \( o_2 \) but unaware of \( o_4 \) at the server, the new edge from \( v_1 \) labeled with \( o_3 \{ o_1 \} \) is placed before that with \( o_4 \{ o_1 \} \) but after that with \( o_2 \{ o_1 \} \). Then, \( o_3 \{ o_1, o_2 \} \) (\( \text{op} \)) is transformed with \( o_4 \{ o_1, o_2 \} \) (\( \text{op}' \)), yielding \( v_{1234} \) and \( o_3 \{ o_1, o_2, o_4 \} \). Client \( c_3 \) applies \( o_3 \{ o_1, o_2, o_4 \} \), obtaining the list content \( ba \).

The choice of the “first” edges in OTs is necessary to establish equivalence between \( \text{CJupiter} \) and \( \text{Jupiter} \), particularly \( \text{at the server side} \). First, the operation sequence along the first edges from a vertex of \( \text{CSS}_s \) at the server admits a simple characterization.

**Lemma 5 (CJupiter’s “First” Rule).** Let \( \text{OP} = \{ op_1, op_2, \ldots, op_m \} \) (\( op \in \text{OP} \)) be the operation sequence the server has currently processed in total order \( \prec \). For any vertex \( v \) in the current \( \text{CSS}_s \), the path along the \( \text{first} \) edges from \( v \) to the final vertex of \( \text{CSS}_s \) consists of the operations of \( \text{OP} \setminus v \) in total order \( \prec \) (may be empty if \( v \) is the final vertex of \( \text{CSS}_s \)), where

\[
\text{OP} \setminus v = \{ op \in \text{OP} \mid op.\text{oid} \in \{ op_1.\text{oid}, op_2.\text{oid}, \ldots, op_m.\text{oid} \} \setminus v.\text{oids} \}.
\]

**Example 6 (CJupiter’s “First” Rule).** Consider \( \text{CSS}_s \) at the server shown in Figure 4 under the schedule of Figure 1; see Figure 3 for its construction. Suppose that the server has processed all four operations. That is, we take \( \text{OP} = \{ o_1, o_2, o_3, o_4 \} \) in Lemma 5 (we mix operations of types \( \text{O} \) and \( \text{Op} \)). Then, the path along the first edges from vertex \( v_1 \) (resp. \( v_{13} \)) consists of the operations \( \text{OP} \setminus v_1 = \{ o_2, o_3, o_4 \} \) (resp. \( \text{OP} \setminus v_{13} = \{ o_2, o_4 \} \)) in total order \( \prec \).

Based on Lemma 5, the operation sequence with which an operation transforms \( \text{at the server} \) can be characterized as follows, which is exactly the same with that for Jupiter 24.

**Lemma 7 (CJupiter’s OT Sequence).** In \( \text{xFORM} \) of CJupiter, the operation sequence \( L \) (may be empty) with which an operation \( op \) transforms \( \text{at the server} \) consists of the operations that are both totally ordered by \( \prec \) before and concurrent by \( \parallel \) with \( op \). Furthermore, the operations in \( L \) are totally ordered by \( \prec \).

**Example 8 (CJupiter’s OT Sequence).** Consider the behavior of the server summarized in Figure 4 under the schedule of Figure 1. According to Lemma 5, the operation sequence with which \( op = o_4 \) transforms consists of operations \( o_2 \) (i.e., \( o_2 \{ o_1 \} \)) from vertex \( v_1 \) and \( o_3 \),
(i.e., \(o_3\{o_1, o_2\}\)) from vertex \(v_{12}\) in total order \(\prec_s\), which are both totally ordered by \(\prec_s\) before and concurrent by \(\parallel\) with \(o_4\).

### 3.3 CJupiter is Compact

Although \((n + 1)\) \(n\)-ary ordered state spaces are maintained by CJupiter for a system with \(n\) clients, they are all the same. That is, at a high level, CJupiter maintains only a single \(n\)-ary ordered state space.

**Proposition 9** \((n + 1) \Rightarrow 1\). In CJupiter, the replicas that have processed the same set of operations (in terms of their oids) have the same \(n\)-ary ordered state space.

Informally, this proposition holds because we have kept all “by-product” states/vertices of OTs in the \(n\)-ary ordered state spaces, and each client is “synchronized” with the server. Since all replicas will eventually process all operations, the final \(n\)-ary ordered state spaces at all replicas are the same. The construction order may differ replica by replica.

**Example 10** (CJupiter is Compact). Figure 4 shows the same final \(n\)-ary ordered state space constructed by CJupiter for each replica under the schedule of Figure 1. (Figure B.1 shows the step-by-step construction for each replica.) Each replica behavior (i.e., the sequence of state transitions) corresponds to a path going through this state space. As illustrated, the server \(s\) and client \(c_1\) go along the path \(v_0 \xrightarrow{o_1} v_1 \xrightarrow{o_2} v_{12} \xrightarrow{o_3} v_{123} \xrightarrow{o_4} v_{1234}\), client \(c_2\) goes along the path \(v_0 \xrightarrow{o_1} v_1 \xrightarrow{o_3} v_{13} \xrightarrow{o_2} v_{123} \xrightarrow{o_4} v_{1234}\), and client \(c_3\) goes along the path \(v_0 \xrightarrow{o_1} v_1 \xrightarrow{o_4} v_{14} \xrightarrow{o_2} v_{124} \xrightarrow{o_3} v_{1234}\).

Together with the fact that the OT functions satisfy CP1, Proposition 9 implies that

**Theorem 11** (CJupiter \(\models A_{cp}\)). CJupiter satisfies the convergence property \(A_{cp}\).

### 4 CJupiter is Equivalent to Jupiter

We now prove that CJupiter is equivalent to Jupiter (reviewed in Section 4.1) from perspectives of both the server and clients. Specifically, we prove that the behaviors of the servers are the same (Section 4.2), and that the behaviors of each pair of corresponding clients are the same (Section 4.3). Consequently, we have that

**Theorem 12** (Equivalence). Under the same schedule, the behaviors (Section 2.1) of corresponding replicas in CJupiter and Jupiter are the same.

### 4.1 Review of Jupiter

We review the Jupiter protocol in [25], a multi-client description of Jupiter first proposed in [13]. Consider a client/server system with \(n\) clients. Jupiter [25] maintains \(2n\) 2D state spaces (Appendix C.1), each consisting of a local dimension and a global dimension. Specifically, each client \(c_i\) maintains a 2D state space, denoted \(\text{DSS}_{c_i}\), with the local dimension for operations generated by the client and the global dimension by others. The server maintains \(n\) 2D state spaces, one for each client. The state space for client \(c_i\), denoted \(\text{DSS}_{s_i}\), consists of the local dimension for operations from client \(c_i\) and the global dimension from others.

---

5 The Jupiter protocol in [13] uses 1D buffers, but does not explicitly describe the multi-client scenario.
Jupiter is similar to CJupiter with two major differences: First, in xFORM(op : Op, d ∈ \{LOCAL, GLOBAL\}) of Jupiter, the operation sequence with which op transforms is determined by the parameter d, indicating the local/global dimension described above (instead of following the first edges as in CJupiter). Second, in Jupiter, the server propagates the transformed operation (instead of the original one it receives) to other clients. As with CJupiter, we describe Jupiter in three parts. We omit the details that are in common with and have been explained in CJupiter; see Appendix C.2 for pseudocode.

**Local Processing Part.** When client \( c_i \) receives an operation \( o \in \mathcal{O} \) from a user, it applies \( o \) locally, generates \( op \in Op \) for \( o \), saves \( op \) along the local dimension at the end of its 2D state space DSS\(_{c_i}\), and sends \( op \) to the server asynchronously.

**Server Processing Part.** When the server receives an operation \( op \in Op \) from client \( c_i \), it first transforms \( op \) with an operation sequence along the global dimension in DSS\(_{c_i}\) to obtain \( op' \) by calling xFORM\((op, GLOBAL)\) (see below), and applies \( op' \) locally. Then, for each \( j \neq i \), it saves \( op' \) at the end of DSS\(_{c_j}\) along the global dimension. Finally, \( op' \) (instead of \( op \)) is sent to other clients asynchronously.

**Remote Processing Part.** When client \( c_i \) receives an operation \( op \in Op \) from the server, it transforms \( op \) with an operation sequence along the local dimension in its 2D state space DSS\(_{c_i}\) to obtain \( op' \) by calling xFORM\((op, LOCAL)\) (see below), and applies \( op' \) locally.

**OTs in Jupiter.** In the procedure xFORM\((op : Op, d : LG = \{LOCAL, GLOBAL\})\) of Jupiter, the operation sequence with which \( op \) transforms is determined by an extra parameter \( d \). Specifically, it first locates the vertex \( u \) whose \( oids \) matches the operation context \( op.ctx \) of \( op \), and then iteratively transforms \( op \) with an operation sequence along the \( d \) dimension from \( u \) to the final vertex of this 2D state space.

▶ **Example 13** (Illustration of Jupiter). Figure 6 illustrates client \( c_3 \), as well as the server \( s \), in Jupiter under the schedule of Figure 1. The first three state transitions made by client \( c_3 \) in Jupiter due to the operation sequence consisting of \( o_1 \) from client \( c_1 \), \( o_4 \) generated by itself, and \( o_2 \) from client \( c_1 \) are the same with those in CJupiter; see CSS\(_{c_1}^1\), CSS\(_{c_3}^2\), and CSS\(_{c_3}^3\) of Figure 5 and DSS\(_{c_1}^1\), DSS\(_{c_3}^2\), and DSS\(_{c_3}^3\) of Figure 6.

We now elaborate on the fourth state transition of client \( c_3 \) in Jupiter. First, client \( c_2 \) propagates its operation \( o_3\{o_1\} = \text{Ins}(a, 0) \) to the server \( s \). At the server, \( o_3\{o_1\} \) is transformed with \( o_2\{a_1\} = \text{Del}(x, 0) \) in DSS\(_{c_2}^3\), obtaining \( o_3\{o_1, o_2\} = \text{Ins}(a, 0) \). In addition to being stored in DSS\(_{c_1}^3\) and DSS\(_{c_3}^3\), the transformed operation \( o_3\{o_1, o_2\} \) is then redirected by the server to clients \( c_1 \) and \( c_3 \). At client \( c_3 \), the operation context of \( o_3\{o_1, o_2\} \) (i.e., \( \{o_1, o_2\} \)) matches the \( oids \) of \( v_{12}(u) \) in DSS\(_{c_3}^4\). By xFORM, \( o_3\{o_1, o_2\} \) (\( op' \)) is transformed with \( o_4\{o_1, o_2\} \) (\( op' \)), yielding \( v_{1234} \) and \( o_3\{o_1, o_2, o_4\} \). Finally, client \( c_3 \) applies \( o_3\{o_1, o_2, o_4\} \), obtaining the list content \( ba \).

We highlight three differences between CJupiter and Jupiter, by comparing the behaviors of client \( c_3 \) in this example and Example 14. First, the fourth operation the server \( s \) redirects to client \( c_3 \) is the transformed operation \( o_3\{o_1, o_2\} = \text{Ins}(a, 0) \), instead of the original one \( o_3\{o_1\} = \text{Ins}(a, 0) \) generated by client \( c_2 \). Second, each vertex in the \( n \)-ary ordered state space of CJupiter (such as CSS\(_{c_3}^2\) of Figure 5) is not restricted to have only two child vertices, while Jupiter does. Third, because the transformed operations are propagated by the server, Jupiter is slightly optimized in implementation at clients by eliminating redundant OTs. For example, in CSS\(_{c_3}^2\) of Figure 5, the original operation \( o_3\{o_1\} \) of client \( c_2 \) redirected by the server should be first transformed with \( o_2\{o_1\} \) to obtain \( o_3\{o_1, o_2\} \). In Jupiter, however,

\[ ^6 \text{Although they happen to have the same signature Ins}(a, 0), \text{they have different operation contexts.} \]
such a transformation which has been done at the server (i.e., in DSS_{s_2}) is not necessary at client c_3 (i.e., in DSS_{c_3}).

4.2 The Servers Established Equivalent

As shown in [25] (see the “Jupiter” section and Definition 8 of [25]), the operation sequence with which an incoming operation transforms at the server in xFORM of Jupiter can be characterized exactly as in xFORM of CJupiter (Lemma 7). By mathematical induction on the operation sequence the server processes, we can prove that the state spaces of Jupiter and CJupiter at the server are essentially the same. Formally, the n-ary ordered state space CSS_s of CJupiter equals the union \(^7\) of all 2D state spaces DSS_{s_i} maintained at the server.

---

\(^7\) The union is taken on state spaces which are (directed) graphs as sets of vertices and edges. The order of edges of n-ary ordered state spaces should be respected when DSS_{s_i}’s are unioned to obtain CSS_s.
for each client \( c_i \) in Jupiter. For example, CSS\(_k\) of Figure 4 is the union of the three DSS\(_i\)’s of Figure 6. More specifically, we have

\[ \text{CSS}_k^i = \bigcup_{i=1}^{i=k} \text{DSS}_i^c(\text{op}_i), \quad 1 \leq k \leq m, \]

where \( c(\text{op}_i) \) denotes the client that generates the operation \( \text{op}_i \) (more specifically, \( \text{op}_i.o \))

The equivalence of clients are thus established.

4.3 The Clients Established Equivalent

As discussed in Example 13, Jupiter is slightly optimized in implementation at clients by eliminating redundant OTs. Formally, by mathematical induction on the operation sequence client \( c_i \) processes, we can prove that DSS\(_i\) of Jupiter is a part (i.e., subgraph) of CSS\(_i\) of CJupiter. The equivalence of clients follows since the final transformed operations (for an original one) executed at \( c_i \) in Jupiter and CJupiter are the same, regardless of the optimization adopted by Jupiter at clients.

\[ \text{DSS}_k^i \subseteq \text{CSS}_k^i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, k \geq 1. \]

\[ \text{(*)} \]

\[ \text{Theorem 17 (Equivalence of Clients). Under the same schedule, the behaviors (Section 2.1) of each pair of corresponding clients in CJupiter and Jupiter are the same.} \]

5 CJupiter Satisfies the Weak List Specification

The following theorem, together with Theorem 12, solves the conjecture of Attiya et al. \[5\].

\[ \text{Theorem 18 (CJupiter} = \text{A}_{\text{weak})}. \text{CJupiter satisfies the weak list specification } \text{A}_{\text{weak}}. \]

\[ \text{Proof. For each execution } \alpha \text{ of CJupiter, we construct an abstract execution } A = (H, \text{vis}) \]

with vis = \( \text{h} \rightarrow_{\alpha} \text{vis} \) (Section 2.1). We then prove the conditions of \( \text{A}_{\text{weak}} \) (Definition 1) in the order 1(c), 1(a), 1(b), and 2.

Condition 1(c) follows from the local processing of CJupiter. Condition 1(a) holds due to the FIFO communication and the property of OTs that when transformed in CJupiter, the type and effect of an Ins\((a,p)\) (resp. a Del\((a,p)\)) remains unchanged (with a trivial exception of being transformed to be NOP), namely to insert (resp. delete) the element \( a \) (possibly at a different position than \( p \)).

To show that \( A = (H, \text{vis}) \) belongs to \( \text{A}_{\text{weak}} \), we define the list order relation \( \text{lo} \) in Definition 19 below, and then prove that \( \text{lo} \) satisfies conditions 1(b) and 2 of Definition 1. \[ \text{\square} \]
Definition 19 (List Order ‘lo’). Let \( \alpha \) be an execution. For \( a, b \in \text{elems}(A) \), \( a \xrightarrow{\text{lo}} b \) if and only if there exists an event \( e \in \alpha \) with returned list \( w \) such that \( a \) precedes \( b \) in \( w \).

By definition, 1) \( \text{lo} \) is transitive and total on \( \{ a \mid a \in w \} \) for all events \( e = \text{do}(a, w) \in H \); and 2) \( \text{lo} \) satisfies 1(b) of Definition[1] The irreflexivity of \( \text{lo} \) can be rephrased in terms of the pairwise state compatibility property.

Definition 20 (State Compatibility). Two list states \( w_1 \) and \( w_2 \) are compatible, if and only if for any two common elements \( a \) and \( b \) of \( w_1 \) and \( w_2 \), their relative orderings are the same in \( w_1 \) and \( w_2 \).

Lemma 21 (Irreflexivity). Let \( \alpha \) be an execution and \( A = (H, \text{vis}) \) the abstract execution constructed from \( \alpha \) as described in the proof of Theorem[18]. The list order \( \text{lo} \) based on \( \alpha \) is irreflexive if and only if the list states (i.e., returned lists) in \( A \) are pairwise compatible.

The proof relies on the following lemma about paths in \( n \)-ary ordered state spaces.

Lemma 22 (Simple Path). Let \( P_{v_1 \rightarrow v_2} \) be a path from vertex \( v_1 \) to vertex \( v_2 \) in an \( n \)-ary ordered state space. Then, there are no duplicate operations (in terms of their oids) along the path \( P_{v_1 \rightarrow v_2} \). We call such a path a simple path.

Therefore, it remains to prove that all list states in an execution of CJupiter are pairwise compatible, which concludes the proof of Theorem[18]. By Proposition[19] we can focus on the state space \( CSS_s \) at the server. We first prove several properties about vertex pairs and paths of \( CSS_s \), which serve as building blocks for the proof of the main result (Theorem[26]).

By mathematical induction on the operation sequence processed in the total order \( \prec_s \) at the server and by contradiction (in the inductive step), we can show that

Lemma 23 (LCA). In CJupiter, each pair of vertices in the \( n \)-ary ordered state space \( CSS_s \) (as a rooted directed acyclic graph) has a unique LCA (Lowest Common Ancestor).

In the following, we are concerned with the paths to a pair of vertices from their LCA.

Lemma 24 (Disjoint Paths). Let \( v_0 \) be the unique LCA of a pair of vertices \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) in the \( n \)-ary ordered state space \( CSS_s \), denoted \( v_0 = \text{LCA}(v_1, v_2) \). Then, the set of operations \( O_{v_0 \rightarrow v_1} \) along a simple path \( P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_1} \) is disjoint in terms of the operation oids from the set of operations \( O_{v_0 \rightarrow v_2} \) along a simple path \( P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_2} \).

The next lemma gives a sufficient condition for two states (vertices) being compatible in terms of disjoint simple paths to them from a common vertex.

Lemma 25 (Compatible Paths). Let \( P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_1} \) and \( P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_2} \) be two paths from vertex \( v_0 \) to vertices \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \), respectively in the \( n \)-ary ordered state space \( CSS_s \). If they are disjoint simple paths, then the list states of \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) are compatible.

The desired pairwise state compatibility property follows, when we take the common vertex \( v_0 \) in Lemma[25] as the LCA of the two vertices \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) under consideration.

Theorem 26 (Pairwise State Compatibility). Every pair of list states in the state space \( CSS_s \) are compatible.

Proof. Consider vertices \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) in \( CSS_s \). 1) By Lemma[23] they have a unique LCA, denoted \( v_0 \); 2) By Lemma[22] \( P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_1} \) and \( P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_2} \) are simple paths; 3) By Lemma[24] \( P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_1} \) and \( P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_2} \) are disjoint; and 4) By Lemma[25] the list states of \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) are compatible.

---

The LCAs of two vertices \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) in a rooted directed acyclic graph is a set of vertices \( V \) such that 1) Each vertex in \( V \) has both \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) as descendants; 2) In \( V \), no vertex is an ancestor of another. The uniqueness further requires \( |V| = 1 \).
6 Related Work

Convergence is the main property for implementing a highly-available replicated list object [8, 25]. Since 1989 [8], a number of OT [8]-based protocols have been proposed. These protocols can be classified according to whether they rely on a total order on operations [25]. Various protocols like Jupiter [13, 25] establish a total order via a central server, a sequencer, or a distributed timestamping scheme [1, 24, 18, 12, 23]. By contrast, protocols like adOPTed [15] rely only on a partial (causal) order on operations [8, 14, 21, 20, 19].

In 2016, Attiya et al. [5] propose the strong/weak list specification of a replicated list object. They prove that the existing CRDT (Conflict-free Replicated Data Types) [17]-based RGA protocol [16] satisfies the strong list specification, and conjecture that the well-known OT-based Jupiter protocol [13, 25] satisfies the weak list specification.

The OT-based protocols typically use data structures like 1D buffer [18], 2D state space [13, 25], or \( N \)-dimensional interaction model [15] to keep track of OTs or choose correct OTs to perform. As a generalization of 2D state space, our \( n \)-ary ordered state space is similar to the \( N \)-dimensional interaction model. However, they are proposed for different system models. In an \( n \)-ary ordered state space, edges from the same vertex are ordered, utilizing the existence of a total order on operations. By contrast, the \( N \)-dimensional interaction model relies only on a partial order on operations. Consequently, the simple characterization of OTs in xFORM of CJupiter does not apply in the \( N \)-dimensional interaction model.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

We prove that the Jupiter protocol [13, 25] satisfies the weak list specification [5], thus solving the conjecture recently proposed by Attiya et al. [5]. To this end, we have designed CJupiter based on a novel data structure called \( n \)-ary ordered state space. In the future, we will explore how to algebraically manipulate and reason about \( n \)-ary ordered state spaces.

References


A  The OT System

According to Section 2.1, we represent the replica state in an OT system (including both Jupiter and CJupiter) as a sequence of operations \(\langle o_1, o_2, \cdots, o_m \rangle\) (where, \(o_i \in \mathcal{O}\)).

The function

\[
\text{Apply}: \Sigma \times \mathcal{O} \to \Sigma \times \text{Val}
\]

applies an operation \(o\) to a state \(\sigma\), returning a new state \(\sigma \circ o\) and the list content produced by performing \(\sigma \circ o\) on the initial list.

Figure A.1 shows the OT functions satisfying CP1 for a replicated list object \([8, 9]\). Operations \(\text{Ins}\) and \(\text{Del}\) have been extended with an extra parameter \(pr\) for “priority” \([9]\). It helps to resolve the conflicts when two concurrent \(\text{Ins}\) operations are intended to insert different elements at the same position. We assume that the operations generated by the replica with a smaller identifier have a higher priority. When a conflict occurs, the insertion position of the \(\text{Ins}\) operation with a higher priority will be shifted.

We highlight one property of OTs that when transformed in both Jupiter and CJupiter, the type and effect of an insertion (resp. a deletion) \(\text{Ins}(a, p)\) (resp. \(\text{Del}(a, p)\)) remains unchanged (with a trivial exception of being transformed to be NOP), namely to insert (resp. delete) the element \(a\) (possibly at a different position than \(p\)).

Figure 3 illustrates an OT of two operations \(op, op' \in \mathit{Op}\) in both the \(n\)-ary ordered state space of CJupiter and the 2D state space of Jupiter:

\[
(\text{op}(op'), \text{op'}(op)) = \text{OT}(op, op').
\]

Algorithm A.1 lists the constants used in Jupiter and/or CJupiter.

Algorithm A.1 Constants.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\hline
\text{▷ for both Jupiter and CJupiter} \\
\hline
1: \textbf{SID} = 0 \\
2: \textbf{CID} = \{1 \cdots n\} \\
3: \textbf{RID} = \{0 \cdots n\} \\
4: \textbf{SEQ} = \mathbb{N}_0 \\
5: \textbf{Enum} \ \textbf{LG} \ \{\text{LOCAL} = 0, \text{GLOBAL} = 1\} \\
6: \textbf{Enum} \ \textbf{Ord} \ \{\text{LT} = -1, \text{GT} = 1\} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{▷ for Jupiter} \quad \text{▷ for CJupiter}\]
The OT functions satisfying CP1 for a replicated list object [8, 9]. The parameter “pr” means “priority” which helps to resolve the conflicts when two concurrent Ins operations are intended to insert elements at the same position. In implementations, it is often to take the unique ids of replicas as priorities. The elements to be deleted in Del operations are irrelevant and are thus represented by ‘_’s. NOP means “do nothing”. Since we assume that all inserted elements are unique, the case of $\text{OT}(\text{Ins}(a_1, p_1, pr_1), \text{Ins}(a_2, p_2, pr_2)) = \text{NOP}$ with $p_1 = p_2 \land a_1 = a_2$ in [9] will never apply.
B The C Jupiter Protocol

B.1 Data Structure: $n$-ary Ordered State Space

Algorithm B.1 Operation in C Jupiter.

1: Class $\textit{Op}$ begin
2:  Var $o$ : $\mathcal{O}$
3:  Var $oid$ : $\text{CID} \times \text{SEQ}$
4:  Var $ctx$ : $2^{\text{CID}} \times \text{SEQ} = \emptyset$
5:  Var $sctx$ : $2^{\text{CID}} \times \text{SEQ} = \emptyset$

7:   if $op.oid \in op'.sctx$ then
8:      return $\text{LT}$ \texttt{\textup{\scriptsize $\triangleright$ op $\prec_r$ op'}}
9:   else if $op'.oid \in op.sctx$ then
10:      return $\text{GT}$ \texttt{\textup{\scriptsize $\triangleright$ op'$\prec_r$ op}}
11:      \texttt{\textup{\footnotesize $\triangleright$ Here, r must be a client replica, i.e., r $\in$ CID}}
12:     else if $op.oid.cid \neq r$ then \texttt{\textup{\scriptsize $\triangleright$ op is redirected by the server to client r}}
13:     return $\text{LT}$ \texttt{\textup{\scriptsize $\triangleright$ op'$\prec_r$ op'}}
14:     else \texttt{\textup{\scriptsize $\triangleright$ op.oid.cid $\neq$ r. It must be the case that op''.oid.cid $\neq$ r.}}
15:     return $\text{GT}$ \texttt{\textup{\scriptsize $\triangleright$ op'$\prec_r$ op}}
16: end if
17: end procedure

19:   $(o, o') \leftarrow \textit{OT}(op.o, op'.o')$ \texttt{\textup{\scriptsize $\triangleright$ call OT on $\mathcal{O}$}}
20:   $\textit{Op} op(op') = \text{new} \ \textit{Op}(o, op.oid, op.ctx \cup \{op'.oid\}, op.sctx)$
21:   $\textit{Op} op'(op) = \text{new} \ \textit{Op}(o', op'.oid, op'.ctx \cup \{op.oid\}, op'.sctx)$
22: end procedure \texttt{\textup{\scriptsize $\triangleright$ Class $\textit{Op}$}}
23: end
Algorithm B.2 Vertex in the $n$-ary ordered state space.

1. Class Vertex begin
2.   Var oids : $2^{CID} \times SEQ = \emptyset$
3.   Var edges : SortedSet(Edge) = \emptyset
4.   procedure firstEdge(r : RID) : Edge
5.     return the first edge according to Edge.COMpare(e : Edge, e' : Edge, r : RID)
6.   end procedure
7. end ▷ Class Vertex

Algorithm B.3 Edge in the $n$-ary ordered state space.

1. Class Edge begin
2.   Var op : Op = Λ
3.   Var v : Vertex = Λ
4.   procedure Compare(e : Edge, e' : Edge, r : RID) : Ord
5.     return Compare(e.op, e'.op, r)
6.   end procedure
7. end ▷ Class Edge
Algorithm B.4 The \( n \)-ary ordered state space.

1: Class CStateSpace begin
2: Var cur : Vertex = new Vertex()
3: Var r : RID

4: procedure XForm(op : Op) : Op
5: Vertex u ← LOCATE(op)
6: Vertex v ← new Vertex(u.oids \( \cup \{ op.oid \} \), \( \emptyset \))
7: while u \( \neq \) cur do \( \triangleright \) See Figure 3
8: Edge \( e' \) ← u.FIRSTEDGE(r)
9: Vertex \( u' \) ← \( e'.v \)
10: Op \( op' \) ← \( e'.op \)
11: \( \langle op(op'), op'(op) \rangle \) ← OT(op, op')
12: Vertex \( v' \) ← new Vertex(v.oids \( \cup \{ op'.oid \} \), \( \emptyset \))
13: LINK(v, v', op'(op))
14: LINK(u, v, op)
15: u ← u'
16: v ← v'
17: op ← op(op')
18: end while
19: LINK(u, v, op)
20: cur ← v
21: return op
22: end procedure

23: procedure LOCATE(op : Op) : Vertex
24: return Vertex v with v.oids = op.ctx
25: end procedure

26: procedure LINK(u : Vertex, v : Vertex, op : Op)
27: Edge e ← new Edge(op, v)
28: u.edges.ADD(e)
29: end procedure

30: end \( \triangleright \) Class CStateSpace
B.2 The CJupiter Protocol

Algorithm B.5

1: **Class** Client **begin**
2: Var cid : CID
3: Var seq : SEQ = 0
4: Var state : Σ = ∅
5: Var S : CStateSpace = new CStateSpace(cid)

6: procedure DO(o : O) : Val
7: (state, val) ← APPLY(state, o)
8: seq ← seq + 1
9: Op op ← new Op(o, (cid, seq), S.cur.oids, ∅)
10: Vertex v ← new Vertex(S.cur.oids ∪ {op.oid}, ∅)
11: LINK(S.cur, v, op)
12: S.cur ← v
13: Send(SID, op)
14: return val
15: **end procedure**

16: procedure RECEIVE(op : Op)
17: Op op' ← S.xForm(op)
18: state ← state ◦ op'.o
19: **end procedure**
20: **end**

▷ Class Client

▷ Local Processing

▷ send op to the server

▷ Remote Processing
Algorithm B.6 Server in C.Jupiter.

1: **Class** Server **begin**

2: Var state : Σ = ∅  \[\triangleright\text{a sequence of } o \in O\]

3: Var soids : \(2^{CID \times SEQ} = \emptyset\)

4: Var S : CStateSpace = new CStateSpace(SID)

5: **procedure** RECEIVE(op : Op) \[\triangleright\text{Server Processing}\]

6: \(op.sctx \leftarrow \text{soids}\)

7: \(\text{soids} \leftarrow \text{soids} \cup \{\text{op.oid}\}\)

8: \(Op \ op' \leftarrow S.xForm(op)\)

9: \(\text{state} \leftarrow \text{state} \circ \text{op'.o}\)

10: **for all** c ∈ CID \ {op.oid.cid} **do**

11: \(\text{SEND}(c, op)\) \[\triangleright\text{send } op \ (\text{not } op') \text{ to client } c\]

12: **end for**

13: **end procedure**

14: **end** \[\triangleright\text{Class Server}\]
Figure B.1 Illustration of C-Jupiter under the schedule of Figure 1. The replica behaviors are indicated by the paths in the $n$-ary ordered state spaces. (To be continued)
Figure B.1 (Continued.) Illustration of C Jupiter under the schedule of Figure 1. The replica behaviors are indicated by the paths in the n-ary ordered state spaces.
B.3 Proof for Lemma 5 (CJupiter’s “First” Rule)

Proof. By mathematical induction on the operation sequence $O$ the server processes.

Base Case: $O = \langle \rangle$. CSS$_s$ contains only the initial vertex $v_0 = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ and the first edge from $v_0$ is empty.

Inductive Hypothesis: Suppose that the lemma holds for $O_k = \langle \rangle\text{.}$

Inductive Step: Consider $O_{k+1} = \langle \text{op}_1, \text{op}_2, \ldots, \text{op}_k, \text{op}_{k+1} \rangle$. Suppose that the matching vertex of operation $\text{op}_{k+1}$ is $v$ (i.e., $v.\text{oids} = \text{op}_{k+1}.\text{ctx}$). We distinguish between $v$ being the final vertex of CSS$_s$, denoted $v_k$, or not.

Case 1: $v = v_k$. According to the procedure xForm of CJupiter (Algorithm B.4), the state space CSS$_{s+1}$ is obtained by extending CSS$_s$ with a new edge from $v_k$ labeled with $\text{op}_{k+1}$. Thus, each path consisting of first edges in CSS$_s$ is extended by the edge labeled with $\text{op}_{k+1}$, meeting the second condition of the lemma in CSS$_{s+1}$. In addition, the first edge from the final vertex of CSS$_{s+1}$ is empty, meeting the first condition.

Case 2: $v \neq v_k$. According to the procedure xForm of CJupiter (Algorithm B.4), the server transforms $\text{op}_{k+1}$ with the operation sequence, denoted $L_k$, along the first edges from $v$ to the final vertex $v_k$ of CSS$_s$, obtaining the state space CSS$_{s+1}$ with final vertex $v_{k+1}$. By inductive hypothesis, $L_k$ consists of the operations in $O_k \setminus v$ in the total order $\prec$. To prove that the lemma holds for CSS$_{s+1}$, we need to check that (Figure B.2):

1. It holds for old vertices in CSS$_s$. Each path consisting of first edges from vertices in CSS$_s$ is extended by the edge labeled with $\text{op}_{k+1}$, meeting the second condition of the lemma in CSS$_{s+1}$.

2. It holds for new vertices in CSS$_{s+1} \setminus$ CSS$_s$. This is because these new vertices form a path along which the corresponding operation sequence is exactly $L_k$.
B.4 Proof for Lemma 7 (CJupiter’s OT Sequence)

Proof. We show that if \( L \) is not empty, then
1. All operations in \( L \) are totally ordered by ‘\( \prec_s \)’ before \( \text{op} \). This holds because operation \( \text{op} \) is the last one in the total order ‘\( \prec_s \)’.
2. All operations in \( L \) are concurrent by ‘\( \| \)’ with \( \text{op} \). By contradiction. Suppose that some \( \text{op}' \) in \( L \) is not concurrent with \( \text{op} \). Then it must be the case that \( \text{op}' \rightarrow \text{op} \) and thus \( \text{op}' \) is not in \( L \).
3. \( L \) consists of all the operations satisfying 2) and 3) and all operations in \( L \) are totally ordered by ‘\( \prec_s \)’. This is due to Lemma 5.

\[ \blacktriangleleft \]

B.5 Proof for Proposition 9 \((n + 1 \Rightarrow 1)\)

Proof. By mathematical induction on the number of operations in the schedule. Because all operations are serialized at the server, we proceed by mathematical induction on the operation sequence
\[
O = \langle \text{op}_1, \text{op}_2, \ldots, \text{op}_m \rangle \ (\text{op}_i \in \text{Op})
\]
the server processes in total order ‘\( \prec_s \)’.

Base Case. \( O = \langle \text{op}_1 \rangle \). There is only one operation in the schedule. When all replicas have eventually processed this operation, they obviously have the same \( n \)-ary ordered state space. Formally,
\[
\text{CSS}_s^1 = \text{CSS}_{c_i}^1, \ \forall 1 \leq i \leq n.
\]

Inductive Hypothesis. \( O = \langle \text{op}_1, \text{op}_2, \ldots, \text{op}_k \rangle \). Suppose that when all replicas have eventually processed all the \( k \) operations, they have the same \( n \)-ary ordered state space. Formally,
\[
\text{CSS}_s^k = \text{CSS}_{c_i}^k, \ \forall 1 \leq i \leq n.
\]

Inductive Step. \( O = \langle \text{op}_1, \text{op}_2, \ldots, \text{op}_{k+1} \rangle \). Suppose that the \((k + 1)\)-st operation \( \text{op}_{k+1} \) processed at the server is generated by client \( c_j \). We shall prove that for any client \( c_i \), when it has eventually processed all these \((k + 1)\) operations, it has the same \( n \)-ary ordered state space as the server. Formally,
\[
\text{CSS}_{c_i}^{k+1} = \text{CSS}_{c_i}^{k+1}, \ \forall 1 \leq i \leq n.
\]

In the following, we distinguish client \( c_i \) that generates \( \text{op}_{k+1} \) (more specifically, \( \text{op}_{k+1}, o \) of type \( O \)) from other clients.

Case 1: \( i \neq j \). The \( n \)-ary ordered state space \( \text{CSS}_{c_i}^{k+1} \) at the server is obtained by applying the \((k + 1)\)-st operation \( \text{op}_{k+1} \) to \( \text{CSS}_{c_i}^k \), denoted by
\[
\text{CSS}_{c_i}^{k+1} = \text{op}_{k+1} \otimes \text{CSS}_{c_i}^k.
\]

Since the communication is FIFO and in CJupiter the original operation (i.e., \( \text{op}_{k+1} \) here) rather than the transformed one is propagated to clients by the server, the \( n \)-ary ordered state space \( \text{CSS}_{c_i}^{k+1} \) at client \( c_i \) is obtained by applying the operation \( \text{op}_{k+1} \) to \( \text{CSS}_{c_i}^k \), denoted by
\[
\text{CSS}_{c_i}^{k+1} = \text{op}_{k+1} \otimes \text{CSS}_{c_i}^k.
\]
By the inductive hypothesis,

$$CSS_i^k = CSS_i^{c_j}, \quad i \neq j.$$  

Therefore, we have

$$CSS_i^{k+1} = CSS_i^{k+1}.$$  

**Case 2:** \(i = j\). Now we consider client \(c_j\) that generates the operation \(op_{k+1}\).

Let \(\sigma_{j+1}^{c_j} \triangleq \langle op_1^{c_j}, op_2^{c_j}, \ldots, op_{k+1}^{c_j} \rangle\) be a permutation of \(\sigma_{k+1}^e \triangleq O\) (i.e., \(\langle op_1, op_2, \ldots, op_{k+1} \rangle\)), be the operation sequence executed at client \(c_j\). The operation \(op_{k+1}\) may not be the last one executed at client \(c_j\). Instead, suppose \(op_{k+1}\) is the \(l\)-th (\(1 \leq l \leq k + 1\)) operation executed at client \(c_j\), namely \(op_l^{c_j} \equiv op_{k+1}\).

The operation \(op_l^{c_j}\) splits the sequence \(\sigma_{k+1}^{c_j}\) into three parts: the subsequence \(\sigma_{1, l-1}^{c_j}\) consisting of the first \((l - 1)\) operations, the subsequence \(\sigma_{l, k+1}^{c_j}\) containing the operation \(op_l^{c_j} \equiv op_{k+1}\) only, and the subsequence \(\sigma_{l+1, k+1}^{c_j}\) consisting of the last \((k - l + 1)\) operations. We formally denote this by

$$\sigma_{k+1}^{c_j} = \sigma_{1, l-1}^{c_j} \circ op_{k+1} \circ \sigma_{l+1, k+1}^{c_j}.$$  

We remark that all operations in \(\sigma_{l+1, k+1}^{c_j}\) are concurrent by \(\ll\) with \(op_{k+1}\), because they are generated by other clients than \(c_j\) before \(op_{k+1}\) reaches these clients and \(op_{k+1}\) is generated before they reach \(op_{k+1}\)'s local replica (i.e., \(c_j\)). Furthermore, due to the FIFO communication, the operations in \(\sigma_{l+1, k+1}^{c_j}\) are totally ordered by \(\ll\).

Let \(\sigma_l^{c_j} \triangleq \langle op_1^{c_j}, op_2^{c_j}, \ldots, op_l^{c_j}, op_{l+1}^{c_j}, \ldots, op_{k+1}^{c_j} \rangle\) be the operation sequence obtained by deleting \(op_l^{c_j}\) (i.e., \(op_{k+1}\)) from \(\sigma_{k+1}^{c_j}\), namely

$$\sigma_l^{c_j} = \sigma_{1, l-1}^{c_j} \circ \sigma_{l+1, k+1}^{c_j}.$$  

Thus, \(\sigma_l^{c_j}\) is a permutation of \(\sigma_e^i \triangleq \langle op_1, op_2, \ldots, op_k \rangle\).

In the following, we prove that the \(n\)-ary ordered state space \(CSS_{c_j}^{k+1}\) at client \(c_j\) constructed by executing \(\sigma_{k+1}^{c_j}\) in sequence, namely

$$CSS_{c_j}^{k+1} = \sigma_{k+1}^{c_j} \circ CSS_0^{c_j},$$  

is the same with the \(n\)-ary ordered state space \(CSS_{c_j}^{k+1}\) at the server constructed by applying the \((k + 1)\)-st operation \(op_{k+1}\) to \(CSS_e^i\), namely

$$CSS_{c_j}^{k+1} = op_{k+1} \circ CSS_e^i.$$  

By the inductive hypothesis, \(CSS_e^i\) would be the same with the \(n\)-ary ordered state space \(CSS_{c_j}^{k}\) constructed at client \(c_j\) if it had processed \(\sigma_{k}^{c_j}\) in sequence. Formally,

$$CSS_{c_j}^{k} = CSS_{c_j}^{k} \triangleq \sigma_k^{c_j} \circ CSS_0^{c_j}.$$  

Therefore, it suffices to prove that the \(n\)-ary ordered state space \(CSS_{c_j}^{k+1}\) at client \(c_j\) constructed by executing

$$\sigma_{k+1}^{c_j} = \sigma_{1, l-1}^{c_j} \circ op_{k+1} \circ \sigma_{l+1, k+1}^{c_j}$$  

(1)

1 We abuse the symbol \(\ll\) for representing states to denote operation sequences. This is reasonable because replica states are defined by the operations a replica has processed (Section 2.1).
in sequence would be the same with the $n$-ary ordered state space constructed at client $c_j$ if it had processed
\[
\sigma_k^{c_j} \circ \text{op}_{k+1} = \sigma_{1,j-1}^{c_j} \circ \sigma_{k+1}^{c_j} \circ \text{op}_{k+1}
\]
in sequence.

We first consider the $n$-ary ordered state space obtained by applying $\text{op}_{k+1}$ to $\text{CSS}_{c_j}^k$ (which is obtained after executing $\sigma_k^{c_j}$) at client $c_j$, corresponding to (2). The matching vertex of $\text{op}_{k+1}$ is $\sigma_{1,j-1}^{c_j}$. According to Lemma 7 and the inductive hypothesis that $\text{CSS}_{s}^k = \text{CSS}_{c_j}^k$, the operation sequence $L$ with which $\text{op}_{k+1}$ transforms consists of exactly the (possibly transformed) operations in $\sigma_{1,j}^{c_j}+1$:
\[
L: \text{op}_{l+1}^{c_j} \{ \sigma_{1,l-1}^{c_j} \}, \text{op}_{l+2}^{c_j} \{ \sigma_{1,l-1}^{c_j} \circ \text{op}_{l+1}^{c_j} \}, \ldots, \\
\text{op}_{l+3}^{c_j} \{ \sigma_{1,l-1}^{c_j} \circ \text{op}_{l+1}^{c_j} \circ \text{op}_{l+2}^{c_j} \}, \text{op}_{l+4}^{c_j} \{ \sigma_{1,l-1}^{c_j} \circ \text{op}_{l+1}^{c_j} \circ \ldots \circ \text{op}_{l}^{c_j} \}.
\]

We now consider the construction of $\text{CSS}_{c_j}^{k+1}$ by executing $\sigma_{k+1}^{c_j}$ in three stages, corresponding to (1).

1. At the beginning, it grows as $\text{CSS}_{c_j}^k$ does when executing the common subsequence $\sigma_{1,j-1}^{c_j}$.
2. Next, the operation $\text{op}_{k+1}$ is generated at client $c_j$. According to the local processing of C-Jupiter, the $n$-ary ordered state space grows by saving $\text{op}_{k+1}$ at the final vertex (corresponding to) $\sigma_{1,j-1}^{c_j}$ along a new edge.
3. Then, the sequence $\sigma_{k+1,j}^{c_j}$ of operations (from the server) are processed at client $c_j$. Each operation in $\sigma_{k+1,j}^{c_j}$, when executed in sequence, not only "simulates" the growth of $\text{CSS}_{c_j}^k$, but also completes one step of the iterative operational transformations of $\text{op}_{k+1}$ with the sequence $L$ mentioned above when applying $\text{op}_{k+1}$ to $\text{CSS}_{c_j}^k$. (This can be proved by mathematical induction.) We take as an example the case of the first operation $\text{op}_{l+1}^{c_j}$. After transforming with some subsequence of operations (which may be empty) in $\sigma_{1,j-1}^{c_j}$, operation $\text{op}_{l+1}^{c_j}$ is transformed as $\text{op}_{l+1}^{c_j} \{ \sigma_{1,l-1}^{c_j} \}$. At that time, $\text{op}_{l+1}^{c_j} \{ \sigma_{1,l-1}^{c_j} \}$ is then transformed with $\text{op}_{k+1} \{ \sigma_{1,j-1}^{c_j} \}$, which is also performed when applying $\text{op}_{k+1}$ to $\text{CSS}_{c_j}^k$:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{OT}(\text{op}_{l+1}^{c_j} \{ \sigma_{1,l-1}^{c_j} \}, \text{op}_{k+1} \{ \sigma_{1,j-1}^{c_j} \}) \\
= (\text{op}_{l+1}^{c_j} \{ \sigma_{1,l-1}^{c_j} \circ \text{op}_{k+1} \}, \text{op}_{k+1} \{ \sigma_{1,j-1}^{c_j} \circ \text{op}_{l+1}^{c_j} \}).
\end{align*}
\]

As it goes on, after executing $\sigma_{k+1}^{c_j}$ in sequence, we obtain an $n$-ary ordered state space same with that obtained by applying $\text{op}_{k+1}$ to $\text{CSS}_{c_j}^k$. 

\[\Box\]
The Jupiter Protocol

We review the Jupiter protocol in [25], a multi-client description of Jupiter first proposed in [13].

C.1 Data Structure: 2D State Space

For a client/server system with $n$ clients, Jupiter maintains $2n$ 2D state spaces, each of which consists of a local dimension and a global dimension. We first define operations and vertices as follows.

► **Definition 27 (Operation).** Each operation $op$ of type $Op$ (Algorithm C.1) is a tuple $op = (o, oid, ctx)$, where
  - $o$ : the signature of type $O$ described in Section 2.3
  - $oid$ : a globally unique identifier which is a pair $(cid, seq)$ consisting of the client id and a sequence number; and
  - $ctx$ : an operation context which is a set of operation identifiers, denoting the operations that are causally before $op$.

The OT functions of two operations $op, op' \in Op$,

$$OT : Op \times Op \rightarrow Op \times Op$$

$(op(op'), op'(op)) = OT(op, op')$,

are defined based on those of operations $op.o, op'.o \in O$, denoted $(o, o') = OT(op.o, op'.o)$, such that

$$op(op') = (o, op.oid, op.ctx \cup \{op'.oid\})$$

$$op'(op) = (o', op'.oid, op'.ctx \cup \{op.oid\})$$

A 2D state space is a finite set of vertices.

► **Definition 28 (Vertex).** A vertex $v$ of type $Vertex$ (Algorithm C.2) is a pair $v = (oids, edges)$, where
  - $oids \in 2^{N_0 \times N_0}$ is the set of operations (represented by their identifies) that have been executed.
  - $edges$ is an array of two (indexed by LOCAL and GLOBAL) edges of type $Edge$ (Algorithm C.3) from $v$ to two other vertices, labeled with operations. That is, each edge is a pair $(op : Op, v : Vertex)$.

For vertex $u$, we say that $u.edges[LOCAL].op$ is an operation from $u$ along the local dimension/edge and $u.edges[GLOBAL].op$ along the remote dimension/edge. This is similar for the child vertices $u.edges[LOCAL].v$ and $u.edges[GLOBAL].v$ of $u$.

As with in an $n$-ary ordered state space, for each vertex $v$ and each edge $e$ from $v$ in a 2D state space, it is required that

- the $ctx$ of the operation $e.op$ associated with $e$ matches the $oids$ of $v$: $e.op.ctx = v.oids$.
- the $oids$ of the vertex $e.v$ along $e$ consists of the $oids$ of $v$ and the $oid$ of $e.op$: $e.v.oids = v.oids \cup \{e.op.oid\}$.
Algorithm C.1 Operation in Jupiter.

1: Class Op begin
2: Var o : O
3: Var oid : CID × SEQ
4: Var ctx : 2CID × SEQ = ∅

6: (o, o') ← OT(op.o, op.o') ▷ call OT on O
7: Op op(op') = new Op(o, op.oid, op.ctx ∪ {op'.oid})
8: Op op'(op) = new Op(op', op'.oid, op'.ctx ∪ {op.oid})
9: return (op(op'), op'(op))
10: end procedure ▷ Class Op

Algorithm C.2 Vertex in the 2D state space.

1: Class Vertex begin
2: Var oids : 2CID × SEQ = ∅
4: end ▷ Class Vertex

Algorithm C.3 Edge in the 2D state space.

1: Class Edge begin
2: Var op : Op = Λ
3: Var v : Vertex = Λ
4: end ▷ Class Edge

Definition 29 (2D State Space). A set of vertices S is a 2D state space if and only if
1. Vertices are uniquely identified by their oids.
2. For each vertex u with |u.edges| = 2, let u' be its child vertex along the local dimension/edge e_{uu'} = (op', u') and v the other child vertex along the global dimension/edge e_{uv} = (op, v). There exist (Figure 3)
   - a vertex v' with v'.oids = u.oids ∪ {op'.oid, op.oid};
   - an edge e_{vv'} = (op'(op), v') from u' to v;
   - an edge e_{uv'} = (op'(op), v') from v to v'.

The second condition above models OTs in Jupiter.
Algorithm C.4 2D state space.

1: Class StateSpace2D begin
2: Var cur : Vertex = new Vertex()

3: procedure TForm(op : Op, d : LG) : Op
4: Vertex u ← LOCATE(op)
5: Vertex v ← ADD(op, 1 - d, u)
6: while u ≠ cur do  
7: Vertex u′ ← u.edges[d].v
8: Op op′ ← u.edges[d].op
9: (op(op′), op′(op)) ← OT(op, op′)
10: Vertex v′ = new Vertex(v.oids ∪ {op′.oid}, ∅)
11: Edge e_vv′ ← new Edge(op′(op), v′)
12: v.edges[d] ← e_vv′
13: Edge e_uvu′ ← new Edge(op(op′), v′)
14: u′.edges[1 - d] ← e_uvu′
15: u ← u′
16: v ← v′
17: op ← op(op′)
18: end while
19: cur ← v
20: return op
21: end procedure

22: procedure LOCATE(op : Op) : Vertex
23: return Vertex v with v.oids = op.ctx
24: end procedure

25: procedure ADD(op : Op, d : LG, u : Vertex) : Vertex
26: Vertex v ← new Vertex(u.oids ∪ {op.oid}, ∅)
27: Edge e ← new Edge(op, v)
28: u.edges[d] ← e
29: return v
30: end procedure
31: end  

▷ Class StateSpace2D
C.2 The Jupiter Protocol

Each client $c_i$ maintains a 2D state space, denoted $DSS_{c_i}$, with the local dimension for operations generated by the client and the global dimension for operations generated by other clients. The server maintains $n$ 2D state spaces, one for each client. The state space for client $c_i$, denoted $DSS_{s_i}$, consists of the local dimension for operations from client $c_i$ and the global dimension for operations from other clients.

Jupiter is similar to CJupiter with two major differences:
1. In xForm($op : Op, d : LG = \{\text{LOCAL, GLOBAL}\}$) of Jupiter, the operation sequence with which $op$ transforms is determined by an extra parameter $d$; and
2. In Jupiter, the server propagates the transformed operation (instead of the original one it receives from a client) to other clients.

As with CJupiter, we also describe Jupiter in three parts. In the following, we omit the details that are in common with and have been explained in CJupiter.

C.2.1 Local Processing (Do of Algorithm C.5)

When client $c_i$ receives an operation $o \in O$ from a user, it
1. applies $o$ locally;
2. generates $op \in Op$ for $o$ and saves it along the local dimension at the end of its 2D state space $DSS_{c_i}$; and
3. sends $op$ to the server.

C.2.2 Server Processing (Receive of Algorithm C.6)

When the server receives an operation $op \in Op$ from client $c_i$, it
1. transforms $op$ with an operation sequence along the global dimension in the 2D state space $DSS_{s_i}$ to obtain $op'$ by calling xForm($op, \text{GLOBAL}$) (Section C.2.4);
2. applies $op'$ locally;
3. for each $j \neq i$, saves $op'$ at the end of $DSS_{s_j}$ along the global dimension; and
4. sends $op'$ (instead of $op$) to other clients.

C.2.3 Remote Processing (Receive of Algorithm C.5)

When client $c_i$ receives an operation $op \in Op$ from the server, it
1. transforms $op$ with an operation sequence along the local dimension in its 2D state space $DSS_{c_i}$ to obtain $op'$ by calling xForm($op, \text{LOCAL}$) (Section C.2.4); and
2. applies $op'$ locally.

C.2.4 OTs in Jupiter (xForm of Algorithm C.4)

The procedure xForm($op : Op, d : LG = \{\text{LOCAL, GLOBAL}\}$) of Jupiter is similar to xForm($op : Op$) of CJupiter except that in Jupiter, the operation sequence with which $op$ transforms is determined by an extra parameter $d$. Specifically, it
1. locates the vertex $u$ whose oids matches the operation context $op.ctx$ of $op$; and
2. iteratively transforms $op$ with an operation sequence along the $d$ dimension from $u$ to the final vertex $cur$ of this 2D state space.
Algorithm C.5 Client in Jupiter.
1: Class Client begin
2: Var cid : CID
3: Var seq : SEQ = 0
4: Var state : Σ = ⟨⟩
5: Var S : StateSpace2D = new StateSpace2D()
6: procedure do(o : O) : Val  ▶ Local Processing
7: (state, val) ← APPLY(state, o)
8: seq ← seq + 1
9: Op op ← new Op(o, (cid, seq), S.cur.oids)
10: Vertex v ← S.ADD(op, LOCAL, S.cur)
11: S.cur ← v
12: Send(SID, op)  ▶ send op to the server
13: return val
14: end procedure
15: procedure receive(op : Op)  ▶ Remote Processing
16: Op op' ← S.xForm(op, GLOBAL)
17: state ← state ◦ op'.o
18: end procedure
19: end Class Client

Algorithm C.6 Server in Jupiter.
1: Class Server begin
2: Var SS : StateSpace2D[CID]  ▶ one per client
3: Var state : Σ = ⟨⟩
4: procedure receive(op : Op)  ▶ Server Processing
5: Op op' ← SS[op.oid.cid].xForm(op, GLOBAL)
6: state ← state ◦ op'.o
7: for all c ∈ CID \ {op.oid.cid} do
8: SS[c].ADD(op, GLOBAL, SS[c].cur)
9: Send(c, op')  ▶ send op' (not op) to client c
10: end for
11: end procedure
12: end Class Server
Figure C.1 (Rotated) illustration of Jupiter [25] under the schedule of Figure 1.
D Proofs for Section 4: CJupiter is Equivalent to Jupiter

D.1 Proof for Proposition 14 ($n \leftrightarrow 1$)

Proof. By mathematical induction on the operation sequence $O = \langle op_1, op_2, \ldots, op_m \rangle$ the server processes.

**Base Case.** $k = 1$. According to the Jupiter and CJupiter protocols, it is obviously that

$$CSS_a^1 = DSS_{s_{\langle op_1 \rangle}}^1.$$  

**Inductive Hypothesis.** Suppose that ($\star$) holds for $k$:

$$CSS_a^k = \bigcup_{i=1}^{i=k} DSS_{s_{\langle op_i \rangle}}^i.$$  

**Inductive Step.** We shall prove that ($\star$) holds for $(k + 1)$:

$$CSS_a^{k+1} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{i=k+1} DSS_{s_{\langle op_i \rangle}}^i.$$  

By inductive hypothesis, we shall prove that

$$CSS_a^{k+1} \setminus CSS_a^k = DSS_{s_{\langle op_{k+1} \rangle}}^{k+1}.$$  

In other words, the OTs for $op_{k+1}$ performed by the servers in Jupiter and CJupiter are the same. This holds due to two reasons. First, under the same schedule, the matching vertex of $op_{k+1}$ in $DSS_{s_{\langle op_{k+1} \rangle}}^k$ of Jupiter is the same with that in $CSS_a^k$ of CJupiter, determined by its operation context (or the causally-before relation of the schedule). Second, according to Lemma 7 for CJupiter and its counterpart for Jupiter, the operation sequences with which $op_{k+1}$ transforms are the same in both protocols. ▷

D.2 Proof for Proposition 16 ($1 \leftrightarrow 1$)

Proof. By mathematical induction on the operation sequence $O^{c_i} = \langle op_{c_i}^1, op_{c_i}^2, \ldots, op_{c_i}^m \rangle$ the client $c_i$ processes.

**Base case.** $k = 1$, namely, $O^{c_i} = \langle op_{c_i}^1 \rangle$. No matter whether $op_{c_i}^1$ (more specifically, $op_{c_i}^1.o$) is generated by client $c_i$ or is an operation propagated to client $c_i$ by the server, it obviously holds that

$$DSS_{c_i}^{1} = CSS_{c_i}^{1}.$$  

**Inductive Hypothesis.** Suppose $O^{c_i} = \langle op_{c_i}^1, op_{c_i}^2, \ldots, op_{c_i}^k \rangle$ and ($\star$) holds for $k$:

$$DSS_{c_i}^{k} \subseteq CSS_{c_i}^{k}.$$  

**Inductive Step.** Client $c_i$ executes the $(k + 1)$-th operation $op_{c_i}^{k+1}$. We shall prove that ($\star$) holds for $(k + 1)$:

$$DSS_{c_i}^{k+1} \subseteq CSS_{c_i}^{k+1}.$$  

We distinguish two cases between $op_{c_i}^{k+1}$ being generated by client $c_i$ or an operation propagated to client $c_i$ by the server.
CASE 1: The operation op\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k+1} is generated by client ci. The new 2D state space DSS\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k+1} of Jupiter (resp. n-ordered state space CSS\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k+1} of CJupiter) is obtained by saving op\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k+1} at the final vertex of the previous state space DSS\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k} (resp. CSS\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k}). Since DSS\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k} \subseteq CSS\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k} (by the inductive hypothesis), we conclude that DSS\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k+1} \subseteq CSS\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k+1}.

CASE 2: The operation op\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k+1} is an operation propagated to client ci by the server. Due to Lemmas 7 for CJupiter and its counterpart for Jupiter, the operation sequences L with which op\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k+1} transforms at the server in both protocols are the same. Since the communication is FIFO, when client ci receives op\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k+1}, all the operations totally ordered by ‘≺’ before op\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k+1} have already been in CSS\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k}. By Proposition 8, the OTs involved in iteratively transforming op\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k+1} with L at the server in both protocols are also performed at client ci in CJupiter. By contrast, in Jupiter, the resulting transformed operation, denoted op\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k+1}⟨L⟩, is propagated to client ci, where the set of OTs performed is a subset of those involved in transforming op\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k+1} with L. Given the inductive hypothesis DSS\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k} \subseteq CSS\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k}, we conclude that DSS\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k+1} \subseteq CSS\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k+1}.

D.3 Proof for Theorem 17 (Equivalence of Clients)

Proof. Note that in the proof for Proposition 16, no matter whether the operation op\textsubscript{ci}\textsuperscript{k+1} is generated by client ci or is an operation propagated to client ci by the server, the final transformed operations executed at ci in Jupiter and CJupiter are the same.
Proofs for Section 5: CJupiter Satisfies the Weak List Specification

E.1 Proof for Lemma 22 (Simple Path)
Proof. Due to the specific structure of OTs (Figure 3), all the transitions associated with the same operation are “parallel” in $n$-ary ordered state spaces. They cannot be in the same path.

E.2 Proof for Lemma 21 (Irreflexivity)
Proof. We prove both directions by contradiction.

"⇐" (if): Suppose by contradiction that $a \xrightarrow{lo} a$ for some $a \in \text{elems}(H)$. According to Lemma 22, a list state $w$ contains no duplicate elements. Therefore, there exist two list states such that for some element $b$, $a \xrightarrow{lo} b$ (namely, $a$ precedes $b$) in one state and $b \xrightarrow{lo} a$ (namely, $b$ precedes $a$) in the other. However, this contradicts the assumption that all list states are pairwise compatible.

"⇒" (only if): Suppose by contradiction that two list states $w_1$ and $w_2$ are incompatible. That is, they have two common elements $a$ and $b$ such that $a \xrightarrow{lo} b$ and $b \xrightarrow{lo} a$ hold. Since $lo$ is transitive on $w_1$ (and $w_2$), we have $a \xrightarrow{lo} a$, contradicting the assumption that $lo$ is irreflexive.
E.3 Proof for Lemma 23 (LCA)

Proof. By mathematical induction on the operation sequence $O = \langle op_1, op_2, \ldots, op_m \rangle$ ($op_i \in Op$) processed in total order ‘$\prec$’ at the server.

Base Case. Initially, the $n$-ary ordered state space $CSS_0$ at the server contains only the single initial vertex $v_0 = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$. The lemma obviously holds.

Inductive Hypothesis. Suppose that the server has processed $k$ operations and that every pair of vertices in the $n$-ary ordered state space $CSS_k$ has a unique LCA.

Inductive Step. The server has processed the $(k+1)$-st operation $op_{k+1}$. We shall prove that every pair of vertices in the $n$-ary ordered state space $CSS_{k+1}$ has a unique LCA. Let

$$CSS_{\Delta} \triangleq CSS_{k+1} \setminus CSS_k$$

be the extra part of $CSS_{k+1}$ obtained by transforming $op_{k+1}$ with some operation sequence, denoted $L$, in $CSS_k$ (Figure E.1). We need to verify that 1) every pair of vertices in $CSS_{\Delta}$ has a unique LCA; and 2) every pair of vertices consisting of one vertex in $CSS_k$ and the other in $CSS_{\Delta}$ has a unique LCA.

The former claim obviously holds because all vertices in $CSS_{\Delta}$ are in a path. We prove the latter by contradiction. Let $v_1$ be any vertex in $CSS_k$ and $v_2$ any vertex in $CSS_{\Delta}$ (Figure E.1). Clearly, the initial vertex $v_0 = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ is a common ancestor of $v_1$ and $v_2$. Suppose by contradiction that there are two LCAs, denoted $v$ and $v'$, of $v_1$ and $v_2$ in $CSS_k$ (they cannot be in $CSS_{\Delta}$).

Note that any path from $v$ or $v'$ to $v_2$ passes through some vertex in the operation sequence $L$ with which $op_{k+1}$ transforms (intuitively, $L$ is the boundary between $CSS_k$ and $CSS_{\Delta}$). Let $v_L$ (resp. $v'_L$) be the last vertex in $L$ in the path from $v$ (resp. $v'$) to $v_2$. Let $v'' = \min\{v_L, v'_L\}$ be the second vertex of $v_L$ and $v'_L$ along $L$. Then, $v$ and $v'$ are two incomparable common ancestors of $v_1$ and $v''$ (i.e., $v_L$ in this example) that are both in $CSS_k$. This, however, contradicts the inductive hypothesis. ◄
Without loss of generality, we assume that $\mathcal{O}_1 \to v_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{O}_2 \to v_\beta$ are in the same “extension ladder” structure.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
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\caption{Illustrations of Case 2 of the proof for Lemma \ref{lemma:disjoint_paths} $v_1$ and $v_2$ are not in the same path from $v_0 = \text{LCA}(v_1, v_2)$.}
\end{figure}

\subsection*{E.4 Proof for Lemma \ref{lemma:disjoint_paths} (Disjoint Paths)}

\begin{proof}
We distinguish two cases according to whether $v_1$ and $v_2$ are in the same path from $v_0 = \text{LCA}(v_1, v_2)$ or not.

\textbf{Case 1: $v_1$ and $v_2$ are in the same path from $v_0 = \text{LCA}(v_1, v_2)$}. In this case, $v_0 = v_1$ or $v_0 = v_2$. Therefore, either $\mathcal{O}_1 \to v_1$ or $\mathcal{O}_2 \to v_2$ is empty. This lemma obviously holds.

\textbf{Case 2: $v_1$ and $v_2$ are not in the same path from $v_0 = \text{LCA}(v_1, v_2)$}. In this case, we prove this lemma by contradiction. Suppose that

\begin{equation}
\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_{v_0 \to v_1} \cap \mathcal{O}_{v_0 \to v_2},
\end{equation}

where $\alpha$ can be either original or transformed (identified by its oid). As illustrated in Figure \ref{fig:disjoint_paths}, the paths $P_{v_0 \to v_1}$ and $P_{v_0 \to v_2}$ are now:

\begin{align*}
P_{v_0 \to v_1} &= P_{v_0 \to v_1}^{\alpha \to v_\alpha' \to v_1}, \\
P_{v_0 \to v_2} &= P_{v_0 \to v_2}^{\alpha \to v_\beta' \to v_2}.
\end{align*}

In the following, we derive a contradiction that $v_0$ is not the unique LCA of $v_1$ and $v_2$. We consider two cases according to how the edges $v_\alpha \to v_\alpha'$ and $v_\beta \to v_\beta'$ are related via OTs in $\text{CSS}_s$.

\textbf{Case 2.1: $v_\alpha \to v_\alpha'$ and $v_\beta \to v_\beta'$ are in the same “extension ladder” structure of OTs}. Without loss of generality, we assume that $v_\beta$ is reachable from $v_\alpha'$; as illustrated in Figure \ref{fig:disjoint_paths_2a}. In this case, $v_\alpha'$ is a lower common ancestor of $v_1$ and $v_2$ than $v_0$. This contradicts the condition $\text{LCA}(v_1, v_2) = v_0$.

\textbf{Case 2.2: $v_\alpha \to v_\alpha'$ and $v_\beta \to v_\beta'$ are in a “step ladder” structure of OTs}. Because all the edges labeled with the same operation $\alpha$ are constructed directly or indirectly from the OTs involving the original form of $\alpha$, there exists some edge $v_\gamma \to v_\gamma'$ that is in the same “extension ladder” with $v_\alpha \to v_\alpha'$ as well as with $v_\beta \to v_\beta'$; as illustrated in Figure \ref{fig:disjoint_paths_2b}. In this case, $v_\gamma'$ is a common ancestor of $v_1$ and $v_2$ other than $v_0$. This contradicts the condition $\text{LCA}(v_1, v_2) = v_0$.
\end{proof}
E.5 Proof for Lemma 25 (Compatible Paths)

Proof. We prove a stronger statement that each pair of vertices consisting of one vertex in $P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_1}$ and the other in $P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_2}$ are compatible, by mathematical induction on the length $l$ of the path $P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_2}$. To this end, we first show that

▶ Claim (One-step Compatibility). Suppose that vertices $v$ and $v'$ are compatible. Let $v''$ be the next vertex of $v'$ along the edge labeled with operation $op$ which does not correspond to any element of the list in vertex $v$. Then, $v$ and $v''$ are compatible.

Proof. Let $C(v, v')$ be the set of common elements of lists in vertices $v$ and $v'$ and $C(v, v'')$ in vertices $v$ and $v''$. By the assumption of this claim, $op$ does not correspond to any element of the list in vertex $v$. Therefore, $C(v, v'')$ is a subset of $C(v, v')$. Furthermore, the total ordering of elements in $C(v, v'')$ is consistent with that in $C(v, v')$. ■

Base Case. $l = 0$. $P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_2}$ contains only the vertex $v_0$. We shall prove that $v_0$ is compatible with every vertex along $P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_1}$. This can be done by mathematical induction on the length of $P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_1}$ with the claim above and the fact that $P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_1}$ is a simple path.

Inductive Hypothesis. Suppose that this lemma holds when the length of $P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_2}$ is $l \geq 1$.

Inductive Step. We shall prove that the $(l + 1)$-st vertex, denoted $v_{l+1}$, of $P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_2}$ is compatible with every vertex along $P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_1}$. This can be done by mathematical induction on the length of $P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_1}$ with the claim above, the fact that $P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_1}$ is a simple path (for $v_0$ and $v_{l+1}$ being compatible), and the fact that $P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_1}$ and $P_{v_0 \rightarrow v_2}$ are disjoint. ◀