

Minimal Session Types for the π -calculus

Alen Arslanagić, Jorge A. Pérez, and Anda-Amelia Palamariuc

University of Groningen, The Netherlands

January 24, 2024

Abstract

Session types are a discipline for the static verification of message-passing programs. A session type specifies a channel’s protocol as *sequences* of exchanges. It is most relevant to investigate session-based concurrency by identifying the *essential notions* that enable program specification and verification. Following that perspective, prior work identified *minimal* session types (MSTs), a sub-class of session types without the sequentiality construct, which specifies the structure of communication actions. This formulation of session types led to establish a *minimality result*: every process typable with standard session types can be compiled down to a process typable using MSTs, which mimics sequentiality in types via additional process synchronizations. Such a minimality result is significant because it justifies session types in terms of themselves, without resorting to external notions; it was proven for a higher-order session π -calculus, in which values are abstractions (functions from names to processes).

In this paper, we study MSTs and their associated minimality result but now for the session π -calculus, the (first-order) language in which values are names and for which session types have been more widely studied. We first show that this new minimality result can be obtained by composing known results. Then, we develop optimizations of this new minimality result and prove that the associated transformation into processes with MSTs satisfies dynamic correctness.

1 Introduction

Session types are a type-based approach to statically ensure that message-passing programs correctly implement some predefined protocols [9, 10]. A session type stipulates the sequence and payload of the messages exchanged along a channel. Sequentiality, denoted by the action prefix ‘;’, is arguably the most distinctive construct of session types, as it allows to specify structured communications. For instance, in the session type $S = ?(\text{int}); ?(\text{int}); !\langle \text{bool} \rangle; \text{end}$, this construct conveniently specifies a channel protocol that *first* receives (‘?’) two integers, *then* sends (‘!’) a Boolean, and *finally* ends.

Because sequentiality is so useful for protocol specification and verification, a natural question is whether it could be recovered by other, simpler means. To investigate this question, Arslanagić et al. [3] defined *minimal session types* (MSTs), an alternative formulation of session types. The difference between standard and minimal session types concerns sequentiality in types: MSTs is the sub-class of session types without sequentiality. To see the difference, consider session types for input and output, denoted ‘! $\langle U \rangle; S$ ’ and ‘? $\langle U \rangle; S$ ’, respectively: in standard session types, the type S denotes an arbitrary (session) protocol; in MSTs, the type S can only be ‘end’, the type of the terminated protocol. Arslanagić et al. established a *minimality result*: every well-typed session process can be *decomposed* into a process typable with MSTs. Their approach to decomposition is inspired by Parrow’s work on *trios processes* for the untyped π -calculus [18]. The minimality result justifies session types in terms of themselves, without resorting to external notions, and shows that sequentiality in types is useful but not indispensable, because it can be precisely mimicked by the process decomposition.

The minimality result based on MSTs in [3] was proven for HO, a *higher-order* process calculus in which values are abstractions (functions from names to processes). HO does not include name




Figure 1: First approach to a minimality result for π : Decompose by Composing.

passing nor process recursion, but it can encode them precisely [13, 15]. An important question left open in [3] is whether the minimality result holds for a *first-order* session π -calculus, i.e., a language in which values are names. This is a relevant question, as session types have been more widely studied in the first-order setting, from foundational and practical angles. Unlike HO, the session π -calculus we consider, dubbed π in the following, natively supports recursion and recursive types.

In this paper, we report *two positive answers* to this question. Our *first answer* is simple, perhaps even deceptively so. In order to establish the minimality result for π , we compose the decomposition in [3] with the mutual encodings between HO and π given in [13, 15]. We call this the *decompose by composing* approach.

More precisely, let $\mu\pi$ and μHO denote the process languages π and HO with MSTs (rather than with standard session types). Also, let $\mathcal{D}(\cdot)$ denote the decomposition function from HO to μHO defined in [3]. Kouzapas et al. [13, 15] gave typed encodings from π to HO (denoted $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_g^1$) and from HO to π (denoted $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^2$). Therefore, given $\mathcal{D}(\cdot)$, $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_g^1$, and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^2$, to define a decomposition function $\mathcal{F}(\cdot) : \pi \rightarrow \mu\pi$, it suffices to compose these three functions following Figure 1. This is sound for our purposes, because $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_g^1$ and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^2$ preserve sequentiality in processes and their types.

The correctness of the decomposition function $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ follows from that of its constituent functions. $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ is significant, as it provides an elegant, positive answer to the question of whether the minimality result in [3] holds for π and all its constructs, including recursion. Indeed, it proves that the kind of values exchanged do not influence sequentiality in session types: the minimality result of [3] is not specific to the abstraction-passing language HO.

Unfortunately, $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ is not entirely satisfactory. A side effect of composing $\mathcal{D}(\cdot)$, $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_g^1$, and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^2$ is that the resulting decomposition of π into $\mu\pi$ exhibits some *suboptimal features*, in particular redundant synchronizations. These shortcomings are particularly noticeable in the treatment of processes with recursion and recursive types. The *second answer* to the open question from [3] is an optimized variant of $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$, dubbed $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$, which avoids redundant synchronizations and treats recursive processes and variables directly, exploiting the fact that π supports recursion natively.

Contributions. The main contributions of this paper are:

1. Two new minimality results for π . The first leverages the function $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$, obtained by following the “decompose by composing” approach in Figure 1 (Theorem 3.1); the second exploits $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$, an optimized variant of $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ without redundant communications (Theorem 4.1). Also, $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$ provides direct support for recursion and recursive types. We provide metrics for the improvements in moving from $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ to $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$ (Lemma 4.1).
2. The minimality results are, in essence, a guarantee of *static correctness* for our decompositions. In the case of the optimized decomposition $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$, we complement this static guarantee with a *dynamic correctness* guarantee: following [2], we prove that well-typed processes P and $\mathcal{F}^*(P)$ are behaviorally equivalent (Theorem 4.2).
3. Examples that illustrate the workings of $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
n &::= a, b \mid s, \bar{s} \\
u, w &::= n \mid x, y, z \\
V, W &::= \textcolor{brown}{u} \mid \boxed{\lambda x. P} \mid \boxed{x, y, z} \\
P, Q &::= u!\langle V \rangle. P \mid u?(x). P \mid \boxed{Vu} \mid P \mid Q \mid (\nu n) P \mid \mathbf{0} \mid \textcolor{brown}{X} \mid \mu X. P
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 2: Syntax of $\text{HO}\pi$. The calculus π is the sub-language of $\text{HO}\pi$ that lacks $\boxed{}$ constructs, whereas HO is the sub-language that lacks $\textcolor{brown}{}$ constructs.

Organization. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Next, Section 2 collects definitions and results from prior works, useful to our developments. Section 3 develops the “decompose by composing” approach, and presents the first minimality result for π . Section 4 reports the optimized decomposition function, our second minimality result, and its dynamic correctness guarantee. Section 5 discusses by example the extension of $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$ with constructs for labeled choices (selection and branching). Section 6 discusses related works, and in particular compares our approach and results against the work by Dardha et al. [5, 6, 4]. Finally, Section 7 concludes.

Omitted technical material appears in the appendices. Throughout the paper, we use colors: they are meant to facilitate reading, but are not indispensable for following the text. In particular, we use green color for notions from prior works, and red and blue colors to distinguish elements of our first and second decompositions, respectively.

Origin of the Results. This paper is an extended and revised version of a conference paper that appeared at PPDP’21 [1] and was presented as a short paper at EXPRESS/SOS’21. With respect to [1], the current presentation includes complete technical details and extended examples; in particular, Section 5 is new and Section 6 has been substantially extended.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we recall the syntax, semantics, and session type system of $\text{HO}\pi$ [14, 15].¹ As mentioned above, we are concerned with π , which is the first-order sub-language of $\text{HO}\pi$. We also recall the mutual encodings between π and HO , the other relevant sub-language of $\text{HO}\pi$ [13, 15]. Finally, we briefly discuss MSTs for HO and overview the minimality result in [3, 2].

2.1 $\text{HO}\pi$ (and its Sub-languages HO and π)

Syntax. Figure 2 gives the syntax of processes P, Q, \dots , values V, W, \dots , and conventions for names. Identifiers a, b, c, \dots denote *shared names*, while s, \bar{s}, \dots are used for *session names*. *Names* (shared or sessions) are denoted by m, n, \dots , and x, y, z, \dots range over variables. A notion of duality applies to names: the dual of n is denoted \bar{n} . Duality is defined only on session names; this way, $\bar{\bar{s}} = s$, but $\bar{a} = a$.

We write \tilde{x} to denote a tuple (x_1, \dots, x_n) , and use ϵ to denote the empty tuple. Given a tuple \tilde{x} , we use $|\tilde{x}|$ to denote its length. With a slight abuse of notation, we sometimes write \tilde{x} to refer to its associated finite set of elements (and vice versa).

An abstraction $\lambda x. P$ binds x to its body P . In processes, sequentiality is specified via prefixes. The *output* prefix, $u!\langle V \rangle. P$, sends value V on name u , then continues as P . Its dual is the *input* prefix, $u?(x). P$, in which variable x is bound. In the following we shall consider *polyadic* communication (i.e., communication of tuples of values), and so we have output and input prefixes of the form $u!\langle \tilde{V} \rangle. P$ and $u?(x). P$, respectively. Parallel composition, $P \mid Q$, specifies the combined

¹We consider $\text{HO}\pi$ without labeled choices (selection and branching); these constructs will be discussed in Section 5.

$(\lambda x. P) u \longrightarrow P\{u/x\}$	[App]
$n!\langle V \rangle. P \mid \bar{n}?(x). Q \longrightarrow P \mid Q\{V/x\}$	[Pass]
$P \longrightarrow P' \Rightarrow (\nu n) P \longrightarrow (\nu n) P'$	[Res]
$P \longrightarrow P' \Rightarrow P \mid Q \longrightarrow P' \mid Q$	[Par]
$P \equiv Q \longrightarrow Q' \equiv P' \Rightarrow P \longrightarrow P'$	[Cong]
$P_1 \mid P_2 \equiv P_2 \mid P_1 \quad P_1 \mid (P_2 \mid P_3) \equiv (P_1 \mid P_2) \mid P_3$	
$P \mid \mathbf{0} \equiv P \quad P \mid (\nu n) Q \equiv (\nu n) (P \mid Q) \quad (n \notin \text{fn}(P))$	
$(\nu n) \mathbf{0} \equiv \mathbf{0} \quad \mu X. P \equiv P\{\mu X. P/X\} \quad P \equiv Q \text{ if } P \equiv_\alpha Q$	

Figure 3: Reduction Semantics of $\text{HO}\pi$.

behavior of two processes running simultaneously. Restriction $(\nu n) P$ binds the endpoints n, \bar{n} in process P . Process $\mathbf{0}$ denotes inaction. Recursive variables and recursive processes are denoted X and $\mu X. P$, respectively. Replication is denoted by the shorthand notation $*P$, which stands for $\mu X. (P \mid X)$.

The sets of free variables, sessions, and names of a process are denoted $\text{fv}(P)$, $\text{fs}(P)$, and $\text{fn}(P)$. A process P is *closed* if $\text{fv}(P) = \emptyset$. We write $u!\langle \rangle. P$ and $u?(\cdot). P$ when the communication objects are not relevant. Also, we omit trailing occurrences of $\mathbf{0}$.

As shown in Figure 2, the sub-languages π and HO of $\text{HO}\pi$ differ as follows: application Vu is only present in HO ; constructs for recursion $\mu X. P$ are present in π but not in HO .

Reduction Semantics. The operational semantics of $\text{HO}\pi$, enclosed in Figure 3, is expressed through a *reduction relation*, denoted \longrightarrow . Reduction is closed under *structural congruence*, \equiv , which identifies equivalent processes from a structural perspective. We write $P\{V/x\}$ to denote the capture-avoiding substitution of variable x with value V in P . As customary, the capture-avoiding, simultaneous substitution in the polyadic setting is denoted $\{\tilde{V}/\tilde{x}\}$, with the assumption that $|\tilde{V}| = |\tilde{x}|$. We write σ, σ', \dots to range over substitutions, and write $\{\}$ to denote the empty substitution. In Figure 3, Rule [App] denotes application, which only concerns names. Rule [Pass] defines a shared or session interaction on channel n 's endpoints. The remaining rules are standard.

We shall often write $P \longrightarrow^k P'$ to denote a sequence of $k > 0$ reductions between P and P' .

Labeled Transition System (LTS). We define the interaction of processes with their environment using action labels ℓ :

$$\ell ::= \tau \mid (\nu \tilde{m}) n!\langle V \rangle \mid n?\langle V \rangle$$

Label τ defines internal actions. Action $(\nu \tilde{m}) n!\langle V \rangle$ denotes the sending of value V over channel n with a possible empty set of restricted names \tilde{m} (we may write $n!\langle V \rangle$ when \tilde{m} is empty). Dually, the action for value reception is $n?\langle V \rangle$. We write $\text{fn}(\ell)$ and $\text{bn}(\ell)$ to denote the sets of free/bound names in ℓ , respectively. Given $\ell \neq \tau$, we say ℓ is a *visible action*; we write $\text{subj}(\ell)$ to denote its *subject*. This way, we have: $\text{subj}((\nu \tilde{m}) n!\langle V \rangle) = \text{subj}(n?\langle V \rangle) = n$. *Dual actions* occur on subjects that are dual between them and carry the same object; thus, output is dual to input. We define duality on actions as the least symmetric relation \asymp on action labels that satisfies:

$$(\nu \tilde{m}) n!\langle V \rangle \asymp \bar{n}?\langle V \rangle$$

The (early) labeled transition system (LTS) for *untyped* processes is given in Figure 4. We write $P_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} P_2$ with the usual meaning. The rules are standard [17, 16]; we comment on some of

$\langle \text{APP} \rangle$	$\langle \text{SND} \rangle$	$\langle \text{RV} \rangle$
$\frac{}{(\lambda x. P) V \xrightarrow{\tau} P\{V/x\}}$	$\frac{}{n!\langle V \rangle. P \xrightarrow{n!\langle V \rangle} P}$	$\frac{}{n?(x). P \xrightarrow{n?\langle V \rangle} P\{V/x\}}$
$\langle \text{ALPHA} \rangle$	$\langle \text{RES} \rangle$	$\langle \text{NEW} \rangle$
$\frac{P \equiv_{\alpha} Q \quad Q \xrightarrow{\ell} P'}{P \xrightarrow{\ell} P'}$	$\frac{P \xrightarrow{\ell} P' \quad n \notin \text{fn}(\ell)}{(\nu n) P \xrightarrow{\ell} (\nu n) P'}$	$\frac{P \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}) n!\langle V \rangle} P' \quad m_1 \in \text{fn}(V)}{(\nu m_1) P \xrightarrow{(\nu m_1, \tilde{m}) n!\langle V \rangle} P'}$
$\langle \text{PAR}_L \rangle$	$\langle \text{TAU} \rangle$	$\langle \text{REC} \rangle$
$\frac{P \xrightarrow{\ell} P' \quad \text{bn}(\ell) \cap \text{fn}(Q) = \emptyset}{P \mid Q \xrightarrow{\ell} P' \mid Q}$	$\frac{P \xrightarrow{\ell_1} P' \quad Q \xrightarrow{\ell_2} Q' \quad \ell_1 \asymp \ell_2}{P \mid Q \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu \text{bn}(\ell_1) \cup \text{bn}(\ell_2))(P' \mid Q')}$	$\frac{P\{\mu X. P/X\} \xrightarrow{\ell} P'}{\mu X. P \xrightarrow{\ell} P'}$

Figure 4: The Untyped LTS for $\text{HO}\pi$ processes. We omit Rule $\langle \text{PAR}_R \rangle$.

$U ::= C \mid L$	$C ::= S \mid \langle S \rangle \mid \langle L \rangle$
$L ::= U \rightarrow \diamond \mid U \multimap \diamond$	$S ::= !\langle U \rangle; S \mid ?(U); S \mid \mu t. S \mid \mathbf{t} \mid \text{end}$
.....	
$U ::= \tilde{C} \rightarrow \diamond \mid \tilde{C} \multimap \diamond$	$C ::= M \mid \langle U \rangle$
$\gamma ::= \text{end} \mid \mathbf{t}$	$M ::= \gamma \mid !\langle \tilde{U} \rangle; \gamma \mid ?(\tilde{U}); \gamma \mid \mu t. M$

Figure 5: STs for $\text{HO}\pi$ (top) and MSTs for HO (bottom).

them. A process with an output prefix can interact with the environment with an output action that carries a value V (Rule $\langle \text{SND} \rangle$). Dually, in Rule $\langle \text{RV} \rangle$ a receiver process can observe an input of an arbitrary value V . Rule $\langle \text{RES} \rangle$ enables an observable action from a process with an outermost restriction, provided that the restricted name does not occur free in the action. If a restricted name occurs free in the carried value of an output action, the process performs scope opening (Rule $\langle \text{NEW} \rangle$). Rule $\langle \text{REC} \rangle$ handles recursion unfolding. Rule $\langle \text{TAU} \rangle$ states that two parallel processes which perform dual actions can synchronise by an internal transition. Rules $\langle \text{PAR}_L \rangle / \langle \text{PAR}_R \rangle$ and $\langle \text{ALPHA} \rangle$ define standard treatments for actions under parallel composition and α -renaming.

In defining (typed) behavioral equivalences for processes, later on we shall consider a *typed* LTS, i.e., an enhancement of the untyped LTS in Figure 4 with session types.

2.2 Session Types for $\text{HO}\pi$

Figure 5 (top) gives the syntax of types. Value types U include the first-order types C and the higher-order types L . In our examples we use other value (base) types, such as `int` and `bool`.

Session types are denoted with S and shared types with $\langle S \rangle$ and $\langle L \rangle$. We write \diamond to denote the *process type*. The functional types $U \rightarrow \diamond$ and $U \multimap \diamond$ denote *shared* and *linear* higher-order types, respectively. The *output type* $!\langle U \rangle; S$ is assigned to a name that first sends a value of type U and then follows the type described by S . Dually, $?(U); S$ denotes an *input type*. Type `end` is the termination type. We assume the *recursive type* $\mu t. S$ is guarded, i.e., the type variable t only appears under prefixes. This way, types such as, e.g., the type $\mu t. t$ are not allowed. The sets of free/bound variables of a type S are defined as usual; the sole binder is $\mu t. S$. Closed session types do not have free type variables.

Session types for π exclude L from value types U and $\langle L \rangle$ from C ; session types for HO exclude

$\begin{array}{c} \text{(SESS)} \\ \Gamma; \emptyset; \{u : S\} \vdash u \triangleright S \end{array}$		$\begin{array}{c} \text{(SH)} \\ \Gamma, u : U; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash u \triangleright U \end{array}$	
$\begin{array}{c} \text{(LVAR)} \\ \Gamma; \{x : C \multimap \diamond\}; \emptyset \vdash x \triangleright C \multimap \diamond \end{array}$		$\begin{array}{c} \text{(RVAR)} \\ \Gamma, X : \Delta; \emptyset; \Delta \vdash X \triangleright \diamond \end{array}$	
$\begin{array}{c} \text{(ABS)} \\ \Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_1 \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta_2 \vdash x \triangleright C \\ \hline \Gamma \backslash x; \Lambda; \Delta_1 \backslash \Delta_2 \vdash \lambda x. P \triangleright C \multimap \diamond \end{array}$		$\begin{array}{c} \text{(APP)} \\ \Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_1 \vdash V \triangleright C \rightsquigarrow \diamond \quad \rightsquigarrow \in \{\multimap, \rightarrow\} \quad \Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta_2 \vdash u \triangleright C \\ \hline \Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash V u \triangleright \diamond \end{array}$	
$\begin{array}{c} \text{(PROM)} \\ \Gamma; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash V \triangleright C \multimap \diamond \\ \hline \Gamma; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash V \triangleright C \rightarrow \diamond \end{array}$		$\begin{array}{c} \text{(EPROM)} \\ \Gamma; \Lambda, x : C \multimap \diamond; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \\ \hline \Gamma, x : C \rightarrow \diamond; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \end{array}$	
$\begin{array}{c} \text{(END)} \\ \Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad u \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma, \Lambda, \Delta) \\ \hline \Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, u : \text{end} \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \end{array}$			
$\begin{array}{c} \text{(REC)} \\ \Gamma, X : \Delta; \emptyset; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \\ \hline \Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta \vdash \mu X. P \triangleright \diamond \end{array}$		$\begin{array}{c} \text{(PAR)} \\ \Gamma; \Lambda_i; \Delta_i \vdash P_i \triangleright \diamond \quad i = 1, 2 \\ \hline \Gamma; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2; \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash P_1 \mid P_2 \triangleright \diamond \end{array}$	
$\begin{array}{c} \text{(NIL)} \\ \hline \Gamma; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond \end{array}$			
$\begin{array}{c} \text{(SEND)} \\ u : S \in \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \quad \Gamma; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash V \triangleright U \\ \hline \Gamma; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2; ((\Delta_1, \Delta_2) \backslash u : S), u : \langle U \rangle; S \vdash u ! \langle V \rangle. P \triangleright \diamond \end{array}$			
$\begin{array}{c} \text{(REQ)} \\ \Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_1 \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash u \triangleright \langle U \rangle \quad \Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta_2 \vdash V \triangleright U \quad (U = S) \vee (U = L) \\ \hline \Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash u ! \langle V \rangle. P \triangleright \diamond \end{array}$			
$\begin{array}{c} \text{(ACC)} \\ \Gamma; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash u \triangleright \langle U \rangle \\ \hline \Gamma; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash x \triangleright U \quad (U = S) \vee (U = L) \end{array}$			
$\begin{array}{c} \text{(RCV)} \\ \Gamma; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1, u : S \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash x \triangleright U \\ \hline \Gamma \backslash x; \Lambda_1 \backslash \Lambda_2; \Delta_1 \backslash \Delta_2, u : ?(U); S \vdash u ?(x). P \triangleright \diamond \end{array}$		$\Gamma \backslash x; \Lambda_1 \backslash \Lambda_2; \Delta_1 \backslash \Delta_2 \vdash u ?(x). P \triangleright \diamond$	
$\begin{array}{c} \text{(RESS)} \\ \Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, s : S_1, \bar{s} : S_2 \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad S_1 \text{ dual } S_2 \\ \hline \Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash (\nu s) P \triangleright \diamond \end{array}$		$\begin{array}{c} \text{(RES)} \\ \Gamma, a : \langle S \rangle; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \\ \hline \Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash (\nu a) P \triangleright \diamond \end{array}$	

Figure 6: Typing Rules for $\text{HO}\pi$.

C from value types U .

We write $S_1 \text{ dual } S_2$ if S_1 is the *dual* of S_2 . Intuitively, duality converts $!$ into $?$ (and vice-versa). This intuitive definition is enough for our purposes; the formal definition is co-inductive, see [15, 14]. Typing *environments* are defined below:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &::= \emptyset \mid \Gamma, x : U \rightarrow \diamond \mid \Gamma, u : \langle S \rangle \mid \Gamma, u : \langle L \rangle \mid \Gamma, X : \Delta \\ \Lambda &::= \emptyset \mid \Lambda, x : U \multimap \diamond \\ \Delta &::= \emptyset \mid \Delta, u : S \end{aligned}$$

We shall refer to Δ as the *session environment*. Γ , Λ , and Δ satisfy different structural principles. Γ maps variables and shared names to value types, and recursive variables to session environments; it admits weakening, contraction, and exchange principles. Λ maps variables to linear higher-order types, and so it is relevant only for processes featuring passing of abstractions. Δ maps session

names to session types. Both Λ and Δ are only subject to exchange. The domains of Γ , Λ and Δ (denoted $\text{dom}(\Gamma)$, $\text{dom}(\Lambda)$, and $\text{dom}(\Delta)$, respectively) are assumed pairwise distinct.

Given Γ , we write $\Gamma \setminus x$ to denote the environment obtained from Γ by removing the assignment $x : U \rightarrow \diamond$, for some U . This notation applies similarly to Δ and Λ ; we write $\Delta \setminus \Delta'$ (and $\Lambda \setminus \Lambda'$) with the expected meaning. Notation $\Delta_1 \cdot \Delta_2$ means the disjoint union of Δ_1 and Δ_2 . We define *typing judgements* for values V and processes P :

$$\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash V \triangleright U \qquad \Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$$

The judgement on the left says that under environments Γ , Λ , and Δ value V has type U ; the judgement on the right says that under environments Γ , Λ , and Δ process P has the process type \diamond . The typing rules are presented in Figure 6.

Type soundness for $\text{HO}\pi$ relies on two auxiliary notions:

Definition 2.1 (Session Environments: Balanced/Reduction). Let Δ be a session environment.

- Δ is *balanced*, written $\text{balanced}(\Delta)$, if whenever $s : S_1, \bar{s} : S_2 \in \Delta$ then S_1 dual S_2 .
- We define reduction \longrightarrow on session environments as:

$$\Delta, s : \langle U \rangle; S_1, \bar{s} : ?(U); S_2 \longrightarrow \Delta, s : S_1, \bar{s} : S_2$$

Theorem 2.1 (Type Soundness [14]). *Suppose $\Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ with $\text{balanced}(\Delta)$. Then $P \longrightarrow P'$ implies $\Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta' \vdash P' \triangleright \diamond$ and $\Delta = \Delta'$ or $\Delta \longrightarrow \Delta'$ with $\text{balanced}(\Delta')$.*

2.3 Typed Encodings between π and HO

The encodings $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_g^1 : \pi \rightarrow \text{HO}$ and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^2 : \text{HO} \rightarrow \pi$ are *typed*: each consists of a translation on processes and a translation on types. This way, $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^1$ translates types for first-order processes into types for higher-order processes, while $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^2$ operates in the opposite direction—see Figures 8 and 9, respectively. Remarkably, these translations on processes and types do not alter their sequentiality.

From π to HO . To mimic the sending of name w , the encoding $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_g^1$ encloses w within the body of an input-guarded abstraction. The corresponding input process receives this higher-order value, applies it on a restricted session, and sends the encoded continuation through the session’s dual.

Several auxiliary notions are used to encode recursive processes; we describe them intuitively (see [15] for full details). The key idea is to encode recursive processes in π using a “duplicator” process in HO , circumventing linearity by replacing free names with variables. The parameter g is a map from process variables to sequences of name variables. To handle linearity, auxiliary mappings are defined: $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ maps sequences of session names into sequences of variables, and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_\emptyset$ maps processes with free names to processes without free names (but with free variables instead):

Definition 2.2 (Auxiliary Mappings). We define mappings $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_\Psi$ as follows:

- $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket : \mathcal{N}^\omega \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}^\omega$ is a map of sequences of lexicographically ordered names to sequences of variables, defined inductively as:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \epsilon \rrbracket &= \epsilon \\ \llbracket n, \tilde{m} \rrbracket &= x_n, \llbracket \tilde{m} \rrbracket \quad (x \text{ fresh}) \end{aligned}$$

- Given a set of session names and variables Ψ , the map $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_\Psi : \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}$ is as in Figure 7.

The encoding $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^1$ depends on the auxiliary function $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^1$, defined on value types. Following the encoding on processes, this mapping on values takes a first-order value type and encodes it into a linear higher-order value type, which encloses an input type that expects to receive another higher-order type. Notice how the innermost higher-order value type is either shared or linear, following the nature of the given type.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\llbracket w! \langle \lambda x. Q \rangle . P \rrbracket_{\Psi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u! \langle \lambda x. \llbracket Q \rrbracket_{\Psi, x} \cdot \llbracket P \rrbracket_{\Psi} & \llbracket w \triangleright \{l_i : P_i\}_{i \in I} \rrbracket_{\Psi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u \triangleright \{l_i : \llbracket P_i \rrbracket_{\Psi}\}_{i \in I} \\
\llbracket w?(x). P \rrbracket_{\Psi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u?(x). \llbracket P \rrbracket_{\Psi} & \llbracket w \triangleleft l. P \rrbracket_{\Psi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u \triangleleft l. \llbracket P \rrbracket_{\Psi} \\
\llbracket (\nu n) P \rrbracket_{\Psi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\nu n) \llbracket P \rrbracket_{\Psi, n} & \llbracket (\lambda x. Q) w \rrbracket_{\Psi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\lambda x. \llbracket Q \rrbracket_{\Psi, x}) u \\
\llbracket P \mid Q \rrbracket_{\Psi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \llbracket P \rrbracket_{\Psi} \mid \llbracket Q \rrbracket_{\Psi} & \llbracket x w \rrbracket_{\Psi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x u \\
\llbracket \mathbf{0} \rrbracket_{\Psi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{0} &
\end{array}$$

In all cases: $u = \begin{cases} x_n & \text{if } w \text{ is a name } n \text{ and } n \notin \Psi \text{ (} x \text{ fresh)} \\ w & \text{otherwise: } w \text{ is a variable or a name } n \text{ and } n \in \Psi \end{cases}$

Figure 7: Auxiliary mapping used to encode HO π into HO (Definition 2.2).

Terms:

$$\begin{array}{l}
\llbracket u! \langle w \rangle . P \rrbracket_g^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u! \langle \lambda z. z?(x). (x w) \rangle . \llbracket P \rrbracket_g^1 \\
\llbracket u?(x:C). Q \rrbracket_g^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u?(y). (\nu s)(y s \mid \bar{s}! \langle \lambda x. \llbracket Q \rrbracket_g^1 \rangle . \mathbf{0}) \\
\llbracket P \mid Q \rrbracket_g^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \llbracket P \rrbracket_g^1 \mid \llbracket Q \rrbracket_g^1 \\
\llbracket (\nu n) P \rrbracket_g^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\nu n) \llbracket P \rrbracket_g^1 \\
\llbracket \mathbf{0} \rrbracket_g^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{0} \\
\llbracket \mu X. P \rrbracket_g^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\nu s)(\bar{s}! \langle V \rangle . \mathbf{0} \mid s?(z_X). \llbracket P \rrbracket_{g, \{X \rightarrow \tilde{n}\}}^1) \\
\text{where } (\tilde{n} = \text{fn}(P)) \\
V = \lambda(\|\tilde{n}\|, y). y?(z_X). \llbracket \llbracket P \rrbracket_{g, \{X \rightarrow \tilde{n}\}}^1 \rrbracket_{\emptyset} \\
\llbracket X \rrbracket_g^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\nu s)(z_X(\tilde{n}, s) \mid \bar{s}! \langle z_X \rangle . \mathbf{0}) \quad (\tilde{n} = g(X))
\end{array}$$

Types:

$$\begin{array}{l}
[S]^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (?(\langle S \rangle^1 \multimap \diamond); \text{end}) \multimap \diamond \\
\langle S \rangle^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (?(\langle S \rangle^1 \rightarrow \diamond); \text{end}) \multimap \diamond \\
\langle ! \langle U \rangle; S \rangle^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ! \langle [U]^1 \rangle; \langle S \rangle^1 \\
\langle ? \langle U \rangle; S \rangle^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ? \langle [U]^1 \rangle; \langle S \rangle^1 \\
\langle \langle S \rangle \rangle^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \langle S \rangle^1 \rangle \quad \langle \mu t. S \rangle^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu t. \langle S \rangle^1 \\
\langle \text{end} \rangle^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{end} \quad \langle \mathbf{t} \rangle^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{t}
\end{array}$$

Figure 8: Typed encoding of π into HO, selection from [15]. Above, $\text{fn}(P)$ is a lexicographically ordered sequence of free names in P . Maps $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\Psi}$ are in Definition 2.2 and Figure 7.

From HO to π . The encoding $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^2$ simulates higher-order communication using first-order constructs, following Sangiorgi [19]. The idea is to use *trigger names*, which point towards copies of input-guarded server processes that should be activated. The encoding of abstraction sending distinguishes two cases: if the abstraction body does not contain any free session names (which are linear), then the server can be replicated. Otherwise, if the value contains session names then its corresponding server name must be used exactly once. The encoding of abstraction receiving

Terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket u!\langle \lambda x. Q \rangle. P \rrbracket^2 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} (\nu a)(u!\langle a \rangle. (\llbracket P \rrbracket^2 \mid * a?(y). y?(x). \llbracket Q \rrbracket^2)) & \text{if } \text{fs}(Q) = \emptyset \\ & \text{with } *P = \mu X. (P \mid X) \\ (\nu a)(u!\langle a \rangle. (\llbracket P \rrbracket^2 \mid a?(y). y?(x). \llbracket Q \rrbracket^2)) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\llbracket u?(x). P \rrbracket^2 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u?(x). \llbracket P \rrbracket^2 \\
\llbracket x u \rrbracket^2 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\nu s)(x!\langle s \rangle. \bar{s}!\langle u \rangle. \mathbf{0}) \\
\llbracket (\lambda x. P) u \rrbracket^2 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\nu s)(s?(x). \llbracket P \rrbracket^2 \mid \bar{s}!\langle u \rangle. \mathbf{0})
\end{aligned}$$

Types:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle !\langle S \multimap \diamond \rangle; S_1 \rangle^2 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} !\langle \langle ?(\langle S \rangle^2); \text{end} \rangle; \langle S_1 \rangle^2 \\
\langle ?(S \multimap \diamond); S_1 \rangle^2 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ?(\langle ?(\langle S \rangle^2); \text{end} \rangle; \langle S_1 \rangle^2
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 9: Typed encoding of HO into π [15].

proceeds inductively, noticing that the variable is now a placeholder for a first-order name. The encoding of application is also in two cases; both of them depend on the creation of a fresh session, which is used to pass around the applied name.

2.4 Minimal Session Types and the Minimality Result for HO

As mentioned above, MSTs are session types without sequencing: in session types such as $!\langle U \rangle; S$ and $?(U); S$, the type S can only correspond to end . The syntax of MSTs for HO is in Figure 5 (bottom). Recall that we write μHO to denote HO with MSTs. The decomposition $\mathcal{D}(\cdot)$ in [3] relies crucially on polyadic communication. Hence, following [13, 15], value types are of the form $\tilde{C} \rightarrow \diamond$ and $\tilde{C} \multimap \diamond$. Similarly, minimal session types for output and input are of the form $!\langle \tilde{U} \rangle; \text{end}$ and $?(\tilde{U}); \text{end}$: they communicate tuples of values but lack a continuation.

Trios Processes. Following Parrow [18], we define the decomposition $\mathcal{D}(\cdot)$ on HO processes in terms of a *breakdown function* $\mathcal{B}_x^k(\cdot)$, which translates a process into a composition of *trios processes* (or simply *trios*). A trio is a process with exactly three nested prefixes. If P is a sequential process with k nested actions, then $\mathcal{D}(P)$ will contain k trios running in parallel: each trio in $\mathcal{D}(P)$ will enact exactly one prefix from P ; the breakdown function must be carefully designed to ensure that trios trigger each other in such a way that $\mathcal{D}(P)$ preserves the prefix sequentiality in P . While trios decompositions elegantly induce processes typable with MSTs, they are not a goal in themselves; rather, they offer one possible path to better understand sequentiality in session types.

We use some useful terminology from [18]. The *context* of a trio is a tuple of variables \tilde{x} , possibly empty, which makes variable bindings explicit. We use a reserved set of *propagator names* (or simply *propagators*), denoted by c_k, c_{k+1}, \dots , to carry contexts and trigger the next trio. Propagators with recursive types are denoted by c_k^r, c_{k+1}^r, \dots . We say that a *leading trio* is the one that receives a context, performs an action, and triggers the next one; a *control trio* only activates other trios.

The Breakdown Function: Preliminaries The breakdown function works on both processes and values. The breakdown of process P is denoted by $\mathcal{B}_x^k(P)$, where k is the index for the propagator c_k , and \tilde{x} is the context to be received by the previous trio. Similarly, the breakdown of a value V is denoted by $\mathcal{V}_x^k(V)$.

Table 1 gives $\mathcal{B}_x^k(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{V}_x^k(\cdot)$ as defined in [3]. As we explain below, the decompositions exploit type information. Hence, in the table we include side conditions derived from typing; notice that for session types we have either $C = S$ or $C = \langle S \rangle$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}(!\langle U \rangle; S) &= \begin{cases} !\langle \mathcal{G}(U) \rangle & \text{if } S = \text{end} \\ !\langle \mathcal{G}(U) \rangle, \mathcal{G}(S) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\mathcal{G}(\langle U \rangle; S) &= \begin{cases} \langle \mathcal{G}(U) \rangle & \text{if } S = \text{end} \\ \langle \mathcal{G}(U) \rangle, \mathcal{G}(S) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\mathcal{G}(\mu t. S) &= \begin{cases} \mathcal{R}(S) & \text{if } \text{tr}(\mu t. S) \\ \mu t. \mathcal{G}(S) & \text{if } \neg \text{tr}(\mu t. S) \text{ and } \mathcal{G}(S) \text{ is a singleton} \end{cases} \\
\mathcal{G}(\text{end}) &= \text{end} \\
\mathcal{G}(t) &= t \\
\mathcal{G}(C \multimap \diamond) &= \mathcal{G}(C) \multimap \diamond \\
\mathcal{G}(C \rightarrow \diamond) &= \mathcal{G}(C) \rightarrow \diamond \\
\mathcal{G}(\langle U \rangle) &= \langle \mathcal{G}(U) \rangle \\
\mathcal{R}(t) &= \epsilon \\
\mathcal{R}(!\langle U \rangle; S) &= \mu t. !\langle \mathcal{G}(U) \rangle; t, \mathcal{R}(S) \\
\mathcal{R}(\langle U \rangle; S) &= \mu t. \langle \mathcal{G}(U) \rangle; t, \mathcal{R}(S)
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 10: Decomposing session types into minimal session types (Definition 2.6)

Before commenting on the entries in Table 1 and formally defining $\mathcal{D}(\cdot)$, let us introduce some auxiliary notations and notions. Let η_1, η_2 , and η_3 denote some mathematical objects (say, a name or a finite sequence of names). We shall use the one-line conditional

$$\eta_1 = (c) :: \eta_2 : \eta_3$$

to express that the equality $\eta_1 = \eta_2$ holds if the Boolean condition c is true, and that the equality $\eta_1 = \eta_3$ holds otherwise.

Let $\tilde{u} = (a, b, s, s', \dots)$ be a finite tuple of names. We shall write $\text{init}(\tilde{u})$ to denote the tuple $(a_1, b_1, s_1, s'_1, \dots)$. We say that a process has been *initialized* if it only involves *indexed names* (i.e., all of its names have some index).

Definition 2.3 (Predicates on Types (and Names)). Given a session type C , we write $\text{tr}(C)$ to indicate that C is a tail-recursive session type, and $\text{lin}(C)$ otherwise. Given $u : C$, we write $\text{lin}(u)$ if $C = S$ and $\neg \text{tr}(S)$ and $\text{tr}(u)$ otherwise.

Definition 2.4 (Subsequent index substitution). Let n_i be an indexed name. We define $\text{next}(n_i) = (\text{lin}(n_i)) :: \{n_{i+1}/n_i\} : \{\}$.

In order to determine the required number of propagators (c_k, c_{k+1}, \dots) required in the breakdown of processes and values, we define the *degree* of a process:

Definition 2.5 (Degree of a Process). Let P be an HO process. The *degree* of P , denoted $\mathcal{P}P$, is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}P = \begin{cases} \mathcal{P}Q + 1 & \text{if } P = u_i !\langle V \rangle. Q \text{ or } P = u_i ?(y). Q \\ \mathcal{P}P' & \text{if } P = (\nu s : S) P' \\ \mathcal{P}Q + \mathcal{P}R + 1 & \text{if } P = Q \mid R \\ 1 & \text{if } P = V u_i \text{ or } P = \mathbf{0} \end{cases}$$

The Breakdown Function: Intutions The breakdown function relies on type information: names are decomposed based on their session types; also, the shape of decomposed process depends on whether the associated session type is tail-recursive or not. Moreover, we shall rely on

P	$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P)$	
$u_i! \langle V \rangle . Q$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> $\neg \text{tr}(S)$: $c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_i!\langle \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}^{k+1}(V\sigma) \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)$ $\text{tr}(S)$: $c_k?(\tilde{x}).c^u!\langle N_V \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(Q)$ where: $N_V = \lambda \tilde{z}. z_{[S]}!\langle \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}^{k+1}(V) \rangle . (\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \mid c^u?(x).x \tilde{z})$	$u_i : S$ $\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(V)$ $\tilde{w} = \text{fv}(Q)$ $\sigma = \text{next}(u_i)$ $\tilde{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_{ \mathcal{R}^*(S) })$
$u_i?(y) . Q$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> $\text{tr}(S)$: $c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_i?(y). \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)$ $\neg \text{tr}(S)$: $c_k?(\tilde{x}).c^u!\langle N_y \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(Q)$ where: $N_y = \lambda \tilde{z}. z_{[S]}?(y). (\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \mid c^u?(x).x \tilde{z})$	$u_i : S$ $\tilde{w} = \text{fv}(Q)$ $\sigma = \text{next}(u_i)$ $\tilde{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_{ \mathcal{R}^*(S) })$
$V(\tilde{r}, u_i)$	$c_k?(\tilde{x}). \overbrace{c^{r_1}!\langle \lambda \tilde{z}_1. c^{r_2}!\langle \lambda \tilde{z}_2. \dots . c^{r_n}!\langle \lambda \tilde{z}_n. Q \rangle \rangle}^{n= \tilde{r} }$ where: $Q = \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}^{k+1}(V)(\tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_n, \tilde{m})$	$u_i : C$ $\forall r_i \in \tilde{r}. (r_i : S_i \wedge \text{tr}(S_i) \wedge \tilde{z}_i = (z_1^i, \dots, z_{ \mathcal{R}^*(S_i) }^i))$ $\tilde{m} = (u_i, \dots, u_{i+ \mathcal{G}(C) -1})$
$(\nu s : C) P'$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> $\neg \text{tr}(C)$: $(\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{G}(C)) \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P'\sigma)$ $\text{tr}(C)$: $(\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{G}(C)) (\nu c^s) c^s?(x).x \tilde{s} \mid (\nu \tilde{c}^s) c^{\tilde{s}}?(x).x \tilde{s} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P'\sigma)$ 	$\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(P')$ $\tilde{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_{ \mathcal{G}(C) })$ $\tilde{\tilde{s}} = (\tilde{s}_1, \dots, \tilde{s}_{ \mathcal{G}(C) })$ $\sigma = \{s_1 \tilde{s}_1 / s \tilde{s}\}$
$Q \mid R$	$c_k?(\tilde{x}). \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{y} \rangle . \overline{c_{k+l+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{y}}^{k+1}(Q) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+l+1}(R)$	$\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(Q)$ $\tilde{w} = \text{fv}(R)$ $l = \lceil Q \rceil$
$\mathbf{0}$	$c_k?(). \mathbf{0}$	
V	$\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(V)$	
y	y	
$\lambda(\tilde{y}z) . P$	$\lambda(\tilde{y}^1, \dots, \tilde{y}^n, \tilde{z}) : (\tilde{M})^{\rightsquigarrow} . N$ where: $\tilde{M} = (\mathcal{G}(S_1), \dots, \mathcal{G}(S_n), \mathcal{G}(C))$ $N = (\nu \tilde{c}) (\nu \tilde{c}_r) \prod_{i \in [\tilde{y}]} (c^{y_i}?(x).x \tilde{y}^i) \mid \overline{c_1}!\langle \tilde{x} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^1(P\{z_1/z\})$	$\tilde{y}z : \tilde{S}C$ $\forall y_i \in \tilde{y}. (y_i : S_i \wedge \text{tr}(S_i) \wedge \tilde{y}^i = (y_1^i, \dots, y_{ \mathcal{G}(S_i) }^i))$ $\tilde{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_{ \mathcal{G}(C) })$ $\tilde{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_{ P })$ $\tilde{c}_r = \bigcup_{r \in \tilde{y}} c^r$

Table 1: The breakdown function for HO processes and values [3, 2].

decompositions/functions on types, denoted $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$, and $\mathcal{R}^*(\cdot)$, which will be defined later on, in Definition 2.6. Next, we describe the most interesting cases of Table 1; the reader is referred to [3, 2] for details and examples.

Output: The decomposition of $u_i! \langle V \rangle . Q$ requires decomposing both the sent value V and the continuation Q . We distinguish two cases, depending on the type S of u_i :

- If $\neg \text{tr}(S)$ then u_i is linear or shared, and so the decomposition consists of a leading trio that mimics an output action in parallel with the breakdown of Q . The context \tilde{x} must include the free variables of V and Q , which are denoted \tilde{y} and \tilde{w} , respectively. These tuples are

not necessarily disjoint: variables with shared types can appear free in both V and Q . The value V is then broken down with parameters \tilde{y} and $k + 1$; the latter serves to consistently generate propagators for the trios in the breakdown of V , denoted $\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V\sigma)$. The substitution σ increments the index of session names; it is applied to both V and Q before they are broken down. By taking $\sigma = \text{next}(u_i)$ we distinguish two cases:

- If name u_i is linear (i.e., it has a session type) then its future occurrences are renamed into u_{i+1} , and $\sigma = \{u_{i+1}/u_i\}$;
- Otherwise, if u_i is shared, then $\sigma = \{\}$.

Note that if u_i is linear then it appears either in V or Q and σ affects only one of them. The last prefix activates the breakdown of Q with its corresponding context \tilde{w} .

In case $V = y$, the same strategy applies; notice that variable y is not propagated further if it does not appear free in Q .

- If $\text{tr}(S)$ then u_i is tail-recursive, and so the decomposition consists of a leading trio that mimics the output action running in parallel with the breakdown of Q . After receiving the context \tilde{x} , the leading trio sends an abstraction N_V along c^u , which performs several tasks. First, N_V collects the sequence of names \tilde{u} ; then, it mimics the output action of P along one of such names (denoted $u_{[S]}$, see below) and triggers the next trio, with context \tilde{w} ; finally, it reinstates the server on c^u for the next trio that uses u . Indexing is not relevant in this case.

Input: To decompose a process $u_i?(y).Q$ we distinguish two cases, as before: (i) name u_i is linear or shared or (ii) tail-recursive. In case (i), the breakdown consists of a leading trio that mimics the input action and possibly extends the context with the received variable y . In case (ii), when u_i has tail-recursive session type S , the decomposition is as in the output case.

Application: For simplicity we consider the breakdown of applications of the form $V(\tilde{r}, u_i)$, where every $r_i \in \tilde{r}$ is such that $\text{tr}(r_i)$ and only u_i is such that $\neg\text{tr}(u_i)$. The general case involves different orders in names and multiple names with non-recursive types, and is defined similarly.

Before commenting on process $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(V(\tilde{r}, u_i))$, let us discuss how names in (\tilde{r}, u_i) are decomposed using types. Letting $|\tilde{r}| = n$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, for each $r_i \in \tilde{r}$ (with $r_i : S_i$) we generate a sequence $\tilde{z}_i = (z_1^i, \dots, z_{|\mathcal{R}^*(S_i)|}^i)$ as in the output case. We decompose name u_i (with $u_i : C$) as $\tilde{m} = (u_i, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{G}(C)|-1})$.

The decomposition first receives a context \tilde{x} for value V : we break down V with \tilde{x} as a context since these variables need to be propagated to the abstracted process. Subsequently, an output on c^{r_1} sends a value containing n abstractions that occur nested within output prefixes—as explained in [2], this is similar to a partial instantiation mechanism. For each $j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, each abstraction binds \tilde{z}_j and sends the next abstraction along $c^{r_{j+1}}$. The innermost abstraction abstracts over \tilde{z}_n and encloses the process $\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(V)(\tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_n, \tilde{m})$, which effectively mimics the application. This abstraction nesting binds all variables \tilde{z}_i , the decompositions of all tail-recursive names (\tilde{r}) .

Composition: The breakdown of a process $Q \mid R$ consists of a control trio that triggers the breakdowns of Q and R ; it does not mimic any action of the source process. In the decomposed process $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(Q \mid R)$, the tuple $\tilde{y} \subseteq \tilde{x}$ (resp. $\tilde{w} \subseteq \tilde{x}$) collects the free variables in Q (resp. R). To avoid name conflicts, the trigger for the breakdown of R is $\overline{c_{k+l+1}}$, with $l = |\mathcal{Q}|$ (cf. Definition 2.5).

Restriction: To decompose $(\nu s : C)P'$ we examine C ; the interesting case is when $\text{tr}(C)$. In that case, we decompose s into $\tilde{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_{|\mathcal{G}(S)|})$ and \bar{s} into $\tilde{\bar{s}} = (\bar{s}_1, \dots, \bar{s}_{|\mathcal{G}(S)|})$. Notice that as $\text{tr}(C)$ we have $C \equiv \mu t.S$, therefore $\mathcal{G}(C) = \mathcal{R}(S)$. The breakdown introduces two servers in parallel with the breakdown of P' ; they provide names for s and \bar{s} along c^s and $c^{\bar{s}}$, respectively. The server on c^s (resp. $c^{\bar{s}}$) receives a value and applies it to the sequence \tilde{s} (resp. $\tilde{\bar{s}}$). We restrict over \tilde{s} and propagators c^s and $c^{\bar{s}}$.

Inaction: To breakdown $\mathbf{0}$, we define a so-called *degenerate* trio with only one input prefix that receives a context that by construction will always be empty (i.e., $\tilde{x} = \epsilon$).

Value: Let us discuss the particular case of values of the form $\lambda(\tilde{y}, z) : (\tilde{S}, C)^{\rightsquigarrow}.P$, where $\text{tr}(y_i)$ holds for every $y_i \in \tilde{y}$ and $\neg \text{tr}(z)$, and $\rightsquigarrow \in \{-\circ, \rightarrow\}$. The general case is defined similarly.

In the process for the decomposed value, denoted $\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(\lambda(\tilde{y}, z) : (\tilde{S}, C)^{\rightsquigarrow}.P)$, every y_i (with $y_i : S_i$) is decomposed into $\tilde{y}^i = (y_1, \dots, y_{|\mathcal{G}(S_i)|})$. We use C to decompose z into \tilde{z} . We abstract over $\tilde{y}^1, \dots, \tilde{y}^n, \tilde{z}$; the body of the abstraction (i.e. N) is the composition of recursive names propagators, the control trio, and the breakdown of P , with name index initialized with the substitution $\{z_1/z\}$. For every $y_i \in \tilde{y}$ there is a server $c^{y_i}?(x).x\tilde{y}^i$ as a subprocess in the abstracted composition—the rationale for these servers is as in previous cases. We restrict the propagators $\tilde{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_{|P|})$: this enables us to type the value in a shared environment when $\rightsquigarrow = \rightarrow$. Also, we restrict special propagator names $\tilde{c}_r = \bigcup_{r \in \tilde{v}} c^r$.

Decomposing Types We may now formally introduce the decompositions on types (and some associated notions), which have been informally used above.

Definition 2.6 (Decomposing Session Types). Given the session, higher-order, and shared types of Figure 5, the *type decomposition function* $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$ is defined using the auxiliary function $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ as in Figure 10. We write $|\mathcal{G}(S)|$ to denote the length of $\mathcal{G}(S)$ (and similarly for $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$).

Notice that $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$ is a partial function, which operates on a sub-class of non-tail-recursive session types: in Figure 10, the condition ‘ $\mathcal{G}(S)$ is a singleton’ allows us to decompose types such as ‘ $\mu t.?(?(\text{str});!(\text{str});\text{end}, t) \rightarrow \diamond; \text{end}$ ’, which is non-tail-recursive and features sequencing as an argument but not at the top-level.

To handle the unfolding of recursive types, we shall use the following auxiliary function, which decomposes guarded recursive types, by first ignoring all the actions until the recursion.

Definition 2.7 (Decomposing an Unfolded Recursive Type). Let S be a session type. The function $\mathcal{R}^*(\cdot)$ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}^*(\mu t.S) &= \mathcal{R}(S) \\ \mathcal{R}^*(?(U);S) &= \mathcal{R}^*(S) \\ \mathcal{R}^*(!(U);S) &= \mathcal{R}^*(S)\end{aligned}$$

Given an unfolded recursive session type S , the auxiliary function $[S]$ returns the position of the top-most prefix of S within its body.

Definition 2.8 (Index function). Let S be an (unfolded) recursive session type. The function $[S]$ is defined as follows:

$$[S] = \begin{cases} [S'\{S/t\}]_0^* & \text{if } S = \mu t.S' \\ [S]_0^* & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad [T]_l^* = \begin{cases} |\mathcal{R}(S)| - l + 1 & \text{if } T = \mu t.S \\ [S]_{l+1}^* & \text{if } T = !(U);S \text{ or } T = ?(U);S \end{cases}$$

Example 2.1. Let $S = \mu t.?(int);?(bool);!(bool);t$ and $T = ?(bool);!(bool);S$. Then $[T] = 2$ since the top-most prefix of T ($?(bool);$) is the second prefix in the body of S .

The Process Decomposition and the Minimality Result. Having introduced the breakdown function, we can now define the decomposition of HO processes:

Definition 2.9 (Decomposing Processes [3, 2]). Let P be a closed HO process such that $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P)$. The *decomposition* of P , denoted $\mathcal{D}(P)$, is defined as:

$$\mathcal{D}(P) = (\nu \tilde{c}) (\overline{c_k}! \langle \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P\sigma))$$

where: $k > 0$; $\tilde{c} = (c_k, \dots, c_{k+|P|-1})$; $\sigma = \{\text{init}(\tilde{u})/\tilde{u}\}$; and the breakdown function $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\cdot)$, is as defined in Table 1.

As already mentioned, the *minimality result* in [3] ensures that if P is a well-typed HO process then $\mathcal{D}(P)$ is a well-typed μ HO process. It attests that the sequentiality in the session types for P is appropriately accommodated by the decomposition $\mathcal{D}(P)$. Its proof relies on an auxiliary result establishing the typability of $\mathcal{B}_x^k(P)$.

In the following, given a session environment $\Delta = \Delta_1, \Delta_2$, we shall write $\Delta_1 \circ \Delta_2$ to indicate the split of Δ into an environment Δ_1 containing non-recursive names and a (disjoint) environment Δ_2 containing recursive names. Also, we will use Θ, Θ', \dots to denote session environments induced by our decompositions.

Lemma 2.1 (Typability of $\mathcal{B}_x^k(\cdot)$ [3]). *Let P be an indexed HO process and V be a value.*

1. *If $\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \circ \Delta_\mu \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ then $\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_x^k(P) \triangleright \diamond$, where:*
 - $k > 0$
 - $\tilde{r} = \text{dom}(\Delta_\mu)$
 - $\Phi = \prod_{r \in \tilde{r}} c^r : \langle \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r)) \multimap \diamond \rangle$
 - $\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(P)$
 - $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}$
 - $\text{dom}(\Theta) = \{c_k, \dots, c_{k+\lfloor P \rfloor - 1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lfloor P \rfloor - 1}}\}$
 - $\Theta(c_k) = ?(U_1, \dots, U_n)$, where $(\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \mathcal{G}(\Lambda))(\tilde{x}) = (x_1 : U_1, \dots, x_n : U_n)$
 - $\text{balanced}(\Theta)$
2. *If $\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \circ \Delta_\mu \vdash V \triangleright \tilde{T} \multimap \diamond$ then $\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta) \vdash \mathcal{V}_x^k(V) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(\tilde{T}) \multimap \diamond$, where:*
 - $\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(V)$
 - $\Phi = \prod_{r \in \tilde{r}} c^r : \langle \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r)) \multimap \diamond \rangle$

Theorem 2.2 (Minimality Result for HO [3]). *Let P be a closed HO process (i.e. $\text{fv}(P) = \emptyset$) with $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P)$. If $\Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta \circ \Delta_\mu \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$, then $\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma); \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta\sigma), \mathcal{G}(\Delta_\mu\sigma) \vdash \mathcal{D}(P) \triangleright \diamond$, where $\sigma = \{\text{init}(\tilde{u})/\tilde{u}\}$.*

Having summarized the results on which our developments stand (in particular, the minimality result for HO), we now move on to establish the minimality result for π .

3 Decompose by Composing

In this section, our goal is to obtain a minimality result for π following the “decompose by composing” approach (cf. Figure 1). We start by defining $\mu\pi$, i.e., the language π equipped with MSTs. Then, we define a decomposition function $\mathcal{F}(\cdot) : \pi \rightarrow \mu\pi$, given in terms of a breakdown function denoted $\mathcal{A}_x^k(\cdot)_g$ (cf. Table 2). As anticipated, this breakdown function will result from the composition of $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_g^1$, $\mathcal{B}_x^k(\cdot)$, and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^2$, that is, $\mathcal{A}_x^k(\cdot)_g = \llbracket \mathcal{B}_x^k(\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_g^1) \rrbracket^2$. Using $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$, we shall obtain the desired minimality result for π , which will be given by Theorem 3.1.

Remark 3.1. In the following we focus on π , and so we sometimes use typing judgments of the form $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$, i.e., the judgment introduced in Section 2.2 but without the environment Λ , which is not relevant for first-order processes. Based on the rules in Figure 6, we can derive typing rules for π with polyadic communication. Such rules, given in Figure 11, use the shortened typing judgments for π .

3.1 Key Ideas

Conceptually, the breakdown function $\mathcal{A}_x^k(\cdot)_g$ can be obtained in two steps:

1. First, we use the composition $\mathcal{B}_x^k(\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_g^1)$, which given a π process returns a μ HO process.
2. Second, we use $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^2$ to transform the μ HO process obtained in (1) into a $\mu\pi$ process.

We illustrate these two steps in detail, considering output, input, and recursive processes.

(POLYVAR) $\Gamma, \tilde{x} : \tilde{M}_x; \tilde{y} : \tilde{M}_y \vdash \tilde{x}\tilde{y} \triangleright \tilde{M}_x \tilde{M}_y$	
(POLYSEND) $\frac{\Gamma; \Delta_1, u : S \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Delta_2 \vdash \tilde{x} \triangleright \tilde{C}}{\Gamma; \Delta_1, \Delta_2, u : !\langle \tilde{C} \rangle; S \vdash u! \langle \tilde{x} \rangle . P \triangleright \diamond}$	(POLYRCV) $\frac{\Gamma; \Delta_1, u : S \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Delta_2 \vdash \tilde{x} \triangleright \tilde{C}}{\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}; \Delta_1 \setminus \Delta_2, u : ?(\tilde{C}); S \vdash u?(\tilde{x}) . P \triangleright \diamond}$
(POLYRESS) $\frac{\Gamma; \Delta, \tilde{s} : \tilde{S}_1, \tilde{s} : \tilde{S}_2 \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad S_1 \text{ dual } S_2}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash (\nu \tilde{s}) P \triangleright \diamond}$	(POLYRES) $\frac{\Gamma; \Delta, \tilde{a} : \tilde{C} \vdash P \triangleright \diamond}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash (\nu \tilde{a}) P \triangleright \diamond}$
(REQ) $\frac{\Gamma; \emptyset \vdash u \triangleright \langle \tilde{S} \rangle \quad \Gamma; \Delta_1 \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Delta_2 \vdash \tilde{x} \triangleright \tilde{S}}{\Gamma; \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash u! \langle \tilde{x} \rangle . P \triangleright \diamond}$	(ACC) $\frac{\Gamma; \emptyset \vdash u \triangleright \langle \tilde{S} \rangle \quad \Gamma; \Delta_1 \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Delta_2 \vdash \tilde{x} \triangleright \tilde{S}}{\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}; \Delta_1 \setminus \Delta_2 \vdash u?(\tilde{x}) . P \triangleright \diamond}$

Figure 11: Derived typing rules for the polyadic variant of π (cf. Remark 3.1)

3.1.1 Output and Input Processes

Output. Given $P = u_i! \langle w_j \rangle . Q$, we first obtain:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\llbracket u_i! \langle w_j \rangle . Q \rrbracket_g^1) = c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_i! \langle W \rangle . \overline{c_{k+3}}! \langle \tilde{x} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^{k+3}(\llbracket Q\sigma \rrbracket_g^1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= (u_i : S) :: \{u_{i+1}/u_i\} : \{\} \\ W &= \lambda z_1. (\overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \rangle \mid c_{k+1}?(z_1).z_1?(x).\overline{c_{k+2}}! \langle x \rangle \mid c_{k+2}?(x).(x \tilde{w})) \end{aligned}$$

Then, we transform $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\llbracket u_i! \langle w_j \rangle . Q \rrbracket_g^1)$ into the following $\mu\pi$ process, using $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i! \langle w_j \rangle . Q)_g &= \llbracket \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\llbracket u_i! \langle w_j \rangle . Q \rrbracket_g^1) \rrbracket^2 \\ &= c_k?(\tilde{x}).(\nu a) (u_i! \langle a \rangle . (\overline{c_{k+3}}! \langle \tilde{x} \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^{k+3}(Q\sigma)_g \mid \\ &\quad a?(y).y?(z_1).\overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle z_1 \rangle \mid c_{k+1}?(z_1).z_1?(x).\overline{c_{k+2}}! \langle x \rangle \mid \\ &\quad c_{k+2}?(x).(\nu s) (x! \langle s \rangle . \overline{s}! \langle \tilde{w} \rangle))) \end{aligned}$$

We briefly describe the resulting process. The subprocess mimicking the output action on u_i is guarded by an input on c_k . Then, the output of w_j on u_i is mimicked via several steps: first, a private name a is sent along u_i ; then, after several redirections involving local trios, the breakdown of w_j is sent along name s . We can see that the output action on u_i enables the forwarding of the context \tilde{x} to the breakdown of Q , the continuation of the output.

Another form of output is when both u_i and/or w_j have recursive types. We shall refer to names with tail-recursive types as *recursive names*. This output case with recursive names is similar to the one just discussed, and given in Table 2.

Input. The breakdown of $u_i?(w).Q$ is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i?(w).Q)_g &= \llbracket \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\llbracket u_i?(w).Q \rrbracket_g^1) \rrbracket^2 \\ &= c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{x}, y \rangle \mid \\ &\quad (\nu s_1) (c_{k+1}?(y).\overline{c_{k+2}}! \langle y \rangle . \overline{c_{k+3}}! \langle \tilde{x} \rangle \mid \\ &\quad c_{k+2}?(y).(\nu s) (y! \langle s \rangle . \overline{s}! \langle s_1 \rangle) \mid \\ &\quad c_{k+3}?(y).(\nu a) (\overline{s_1}! \langle a \rangle . (\overline{c_{k+l+4}}! \langle \rangle \mid c_{k+l+4}?(z_1).0 \mid \\ &\quad a?(y').y'?(z_1).(\overline{c_{k+4}}! \langle \tilde{x} \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^{k+4}(Q\{w_1/w\}\sigma)_g))) \end{aligned}$$

In this case, the activation on c_k enables the input on u_i . After several redirections, the actual input of variables \tilde{w} is on a name received for y' , which binds them in the breakdown of Q . Hence, the context \tilde{x} does not get extended for an inductive call: it only gets extended locally (it is propagated by c_{k+1}). Indeed, the context is always empty and propagators only enable subsequent actions. The context does play a role in breaking down input actions with recursive names: in that case, the variables z_X (generated in the encoding of recursion, cf. Figure 8) get propagated as context.

3.1.2 Recursion

Now, we illustrate the resulting decomposition for processes involving tail-recursive names.

Output. The breakdown of $r!\langle w_j \rangle.Q$ when $\text{tr}(r)$ is as follows:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(r!\langle w_j \rangle.Q) = c_k?(\tilde{x}).(\nu a_1) c^r!\langle a_1 \rangle.(\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^{k+3}(P)_g \mid a_1?(y_1).y_1?(\tilde{z}).W)$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} W = & (\nu a_2) (z_{\iota(S)}!\langle a_2 \rangle.(\overline{c_{k+3}}!\langle \tilde{x} \rangle.c^r?(b).(\nu s) (b!\langle s \rangle.\overline{s}!\langle \tilde{z} \rangle) \mid \\ & a_2?(y_2).y_2?(z'_1).(\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{k+1}?().z'_1?(x).\overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle x \rangle \mid \\ & c_{k+2}?(x).(\nu s') (x!\langle s' \rangle.\overline{s'}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle))) \end{aligned}$$

This breakdown follows the essential ideas of the case $\neg \text{tr}(r)$, discussed above. The difference is the following: before mimicking the action on r , the process has to obtain the decomposition of name r by a communication on c^r . Again, as a consequence of composing encodings, this communication is carried out via several channel redirections: first, the fresh name a_1 is sent along c^r ; then, a name is received on a_1 , along which the breakdown of r , denoted by \tilde{z} , is finally received. Notice that here we obtain the entire decomposition of r . However, to properly mimic the original output action in W , we need one specific channel from \tilde{z} , which is appropriately selected based on its type S by the index function $\iota(\cdot)$ given in Definition 3.4—this is the first action of W , i.e., $z_{\iota(S)}$. Finally, the entire decomposition of r is again made available for future trios by communication on c^r . This way, we are able to send back recursive names so they can be used in the next instance of a recursive body.

Recursive process. The process $\mu X.P$ is broken down as given below. Recall that the mapping $\|\cdot\|$ has been defined in Definition 2.2.

$$\begin{aligned} & (\nu s_1) (c_k?(\tilde{x}).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{x} \rangle.\overline{c_{k+3}}!\langle \tilde{x} \rangle \mid \\ & c_{k+1}?(\tilde{x}).(\nu a_1) (\overline{s_1}!\langle a_1 \rangle.(\overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{k+2}?()) \mid \\ & c_{k+3}?(\tilde{x}).s_1?(z_x).\overline{c_{k+4}}!\langle \tilde{x}, z_x \rangle \mid \\ & \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}, z_x}^{k+4}(P)_{g, \{X \rightarrow \tilde{n}\}} \mid \\ & * a_1?(y'_1).y'_1?(\|\tilde{n}^1\|, \dots, \|\tilde{n}^m\|, y_1).\hat{P})) \end{aligned}$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P} = & (\nu \tilde{c}) (\prod_{0 < i \leq m} c^{n_i}?(b).(\nu s') (b!\langle s' \rangle.\overline{s'}!\langle \|\tilde{n}^i\| \rangle) \mid \\ & \overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle \tilde{x} \rangle \mid c_{k+2}?(\tilde{x}).y_1?(z_x).\overline{c_{k+3}}!\langle \tilde{x}, z_x \rangle \mid \|\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}, z_x}^{k+3}(P)_{g, \{X \rightarrow \tilde{n}\}}\|_{\tilde{c}, \tilde{c}_r}) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, above we assume that $\tilde{n} = \text{fn}(P)$, $m = |\tilde{n}|$, $\|\tilde{n}\| = (\|n_1\|, \dots, \|n_m\|)$, $\|n_i\| : S_i$ and $\|\tilde{n}^i\| = (\|n_1^i\|, \dots, \|n_{|\mathcal{H}(S_i)|}^i\|)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.

The breakdown of this process works in coordination with the breakdown of the recursive variable X (described below). The main mechanism here is concerned with controlling (i) the activation of new instances of recursive body (i.e., P) and (ii) the propagation of recursive names to a subsequent instance (i.e., $\tilde{n} = \text{fn}(P)$). The first instance is given by $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}, z_x}^{k+4}(P)_{g, \{X \rightarrow \tilde{n}\}}$. Notice

$$\begin{aligned}
C &::= M \mid \langle M \rangle \\
\gamma &::= \text{end} \mid \mathbf{t} \\
M &::= \gamma \mid !\langle \tilde{C} \rangle; \gamma \mid ?(\tilde{C}); \gamma \mid \mu \mathbf{t}. M
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 12: Minimal Session Types for π (cf. Definition 3.1)

that by the definition of other cases, this instance will first collect all the recursive names by the communication with top-level providers on names c^r for $r \in \tilde{n}$. The mechanism for generating subsequent instances is given by the replicated process $*a_1?(y'_1).y'_1?(\|\tilde{n}^1\|, \dots, \|\tilde{n}^m\|, y_1).\hat{P}$. Recall that replication is supported via the encoding $*P = \mu X.(P \mid X)$. Here, the intention is that this process again receives decompositions of recursive names in \tilde{n} on shared name a_1 from the breakdown of X : to see this, notice that link to a_1 is propagated to the breakdown of P via name z_x .

Recursive Variable. Following the previous description, the variable X is broken down as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\nu s_1) (c_k?(z_x).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle z_x \rangle.\overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle z_x \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_{k+2}?(z_x).\overline{s_1}!\langle z_x \rangle.\overline{c_{k+3}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{k+3}?) \mid \\
&\quad c_{k+1}?(z_x).(\nu a_1) (c^{n_1}!\langle a_1 \rangle.(a_1?(y_1).y_1?(\tilde{z}_1) \dots (\nu a_j) Q)))
\end{aligned}$$

where:

$$Q = (c^{n_j}!\langle a_j \rangle.(a_j?(y_j).y_j?(\tilde{z}_j).(\nu s') (z_x!\langle s' \rangle.\overline{s'}!\langle \tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_j, s_1 \rangle)))$$

and $\tilde{n} = g(X)$, $|\tilde{n}| = j$, $n_i : S$, and $\tilde{z}_i = (z_1^i, \dots, z_{\mathcal{R}_o(S_i)}^i)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, j\}$.

As described above, the main role of this breakdown is to send back decomposition of all recursive names used in a recursive body (given by $\tilde{n} = g(X)$) to a next instance of a recursive body. This breakdown accomplishes this by (i) first collecting recursive names by communication on c^r for $r \in \tilde{n}$ with trios of a breakdown of the recursive body, and (ii) the propagating those names to a subsequent instance by communication on z_x . As explained in the previous case, this link is established at the entry of recursive process, and propagated throughout trios of its decomposition up to this process.

3.2 Formal Definitions

We start by defining MSTs for π :

Definition 3.1 (Minimal Session Types, MSTs). *Minimal session types* for π are defined in Figure 12.

The breakdown function $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\cdot)_g$ for all constructs of π is given in Tables 2 and 3; it relies on several auxiliary definitions, most notably:

- The *degree* of a process P , denoted $\mathcal{P}P$;
- The functions $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$, which decompose session types into MSTs.

We now formally define these notions.

Definition 3.2 (Degree of a Process). The *degree* of a process P , denoted $\mathcal{P}P$, is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}u_i!\langle w_j \rangle.Q &= \mathcal{P}Q + 3 & \mathcal{P}(\nu s : S) Q &= \mathcal{P}Q & \mathcal{P}\mathbf{0} &= 1 \\
\mathcal{P}u_i?(x : C).Q &= \mathcal{P}Q + 5 & \mathcal{P}Q \mid R &= \mathcal{P}Q + \mathcal{P}R + 1 \\
\mathcal{P}X &= 4 & \mathcal{P}\mu X.Q &= \mathcal{P}Q + 4
\end{aligned}$$

P	$\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P)_g$	
$u_i!(w_j).Q$	$c_k?(\tilde{x}).(\nu a)(u_i!(a).(\overline{c_{k+3}}!\langle\tilde{x}\rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^{k+3}(Q\sigma)_g \mid$ $a?(y).y?(z_1).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle z_1\rangle \mid$ $c_{k+1}?(z_1).z_1?(x).\overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle x\rangle \mid$ $c_{k+2}?(x).(\nu s)(x!(s).\overline{s}!\langle\tilde{w}\rangle)))$	$w_j : C$ $k = j + \mathcal{H}(C) - 1$ $\tilde{w} = (w_j, \dots, w_k)$ $\sigma = \text{next}(u_i)$
$u_i?(w).Q$	$c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle\tilde{x}, y\rangle \mid$ $(\nu s_1)(c_{k+1}?(y).\overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle y\rangle.\overline{c_{k+3}}!\langle\tilde{x}\rangle \mid$ $c_{k+2}?(y).(\nu s)(y!(s).\overline{s}!\langle s_1\rangle) \mid$ $c_{k+3}?(x).(\nu a)(\overline{s_1}!\langle a\rangle.$ $(\overline{c_{k+l+4}}!\langle\rangle \mid c_{k+l+4}?(.).\mathbf{0} \mid \hat{Q}_{\tilde{x}})))$ where: $\hat{Q}_{\tilde{x}} = a?(y').y'?(w).(\overline{c_{k+4}}!\langle\tilde{x}\rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^{k+4}(Q\{w_1/w\}\sigma)_g)$	$w : C$ $\tilde{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_{ \mathcal{H}(C) })$ $l = \lceil Q \rceil$ $\sigma = \text{next}(u_i)$
$r_i!(w_j).P$	$c_k?(\tilde{x}).(\nu a_1)c^r!\langle a_1\rangle.$ $(\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^{k+3}(P)_g \mid a_1?(y_1).y_1?(\tilde{z}).W)$ where: $W = (\nu a_2)(z_{\iota(S)}!\langle a_2\rangle.$ $(\overline{c_{k+3}}!\langle\tilde{x}\rangle.c^r?(b).(\nu s)(b!(s).\overline{s}!\langle\tilde{z}\rangle) \mid$ $a_2?(y_2).y_2?(z'_1).$ $(\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle\rangle \mid c_{k+1}?(.).z'_1?(x).\overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle x\rangle \mid$ $c_{k+2}?(x).(\nu s')(x!(s').\overline{s'}!\langle\tilde{w}\rangle)))$	$r : S \wedge \text{tr}(S)$ $\tilde{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_{ \mathcal{R}_o(S) })$ $\tilde{c} = (c_{k+1}, c_{k+2})$ $w : C$ $k = j + \mathcal{H}(C) - 1$ $\tilde{w} = (w_j, \dots, w_k)$
$r_i?(w).P$	$c_k?(\tilde{x}).(\nu a_1)$ $(c^r!\langle a_1\rangle.((\nu s_1)(c_{k+1}?(y).\overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle y\rangle.\overline{c_{k+3}}!\langle\rangle \mid$ $c_{k+2}?(y).(\nu s)(y!(s).\overline{s}!\langle s_1\rangle) \mid$ $c_{k+3}?(.).(\nu a_2)(s_1!\langle a_2\rangle.(\overline{c_{k+l+4}}!\langle\rangle \mid c_{k+l+4}?(.).\mathbf{0} \mid$ $a_2?(y_2).y_2?(w).(\overline{c_{k+4}}!\langle\tilde{x}\rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^{k+4}(P\{w_1/w\}\sigma)_g))) \mid$ $a_1?(y_1).y_1?(\tilde{z}).z_{\iota(S)}?(y).$ $(\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle y\rangle.c^r?(b).(\nu s')(b!(s').\overline{s'}!\langle\tilde{z}\rangle)))$	$r : S \wedge \text{tr}(S)$ $\tilde{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_{ \mathcal{R}_o(S) })$ $l = \lceil P \rceil$ $w : C$ $\tilde{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_{ \mathcal{H}(C) })$

Table 2: Decompose by composing (Part 1/2): Breakdown function $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\cdot)_g$ (cf. Definition 3.5).

We define how to obtain MSTs for π from standard session types:

Definition 3.3 (Decomposing First-Order Types). The decomposition function $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$ on finite types, obtained by combining the mappings $\langle \cdot \rangle^1$, $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$, and $\langle \cdot \rangle^2$, is defined in Figure 13 (top, where omitted cases are defined homomorphically). It is extended to account for recursive session types in Figure 13 (center).

The auxiliary function $\mathcal{R}_o(\cdot)$, given in Figure 13 (bottom), is used in Table 2 to decompose *guarded* tail-recursive types: it skips session prefixes until a type of form $\mu t.S$ is encountered; when that occurs, the recursive type is decomposed using $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$.

We give the definition of the index function for π recursive types by composing the index function $[\cdot]$ (for HO recursive types, cf. Definition 2.8) and the encoding of types from Figures 8 and 9. This composition is straightforward: notice that $[\cdot]$ counts prefixes of session types, and that the encodings of types from Figures 8 and 9 do not alter the number of prefixes.

Definition 3.4 (Index function). Let S be an (unfolded) recursive session type. The function $\iota(S)$ is defined as follows:

$$\iota(S) = \begin{cases} \hat{\iota}_0(S'\{S/t\}) & \text{if } S = \mu t.S' \\ \hat{\iota}_0(S) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \hat{\iota}_l(T) = \begin{cases} \hat{\iota}_{l+1}(S) & \text{if } T = !\langle U \rangle; S \text{ or } T = ?\langle U \rangle; S \\ |\mathcal{R}(S)| - l + 1 & \text{if } T = \mu t.S \end{cases}$$

P	$\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P)_g$	
$(\nu s) P'$	$(\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}(C)) \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P'\sigma)_g$	$s : C$ $\tilde{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_{ \mathcal{H}(C) })$ $\sigma = \{s_1 \bar{s}_1 / s \bar{s}\}$
$(\nu r) P'$	$(\nu \tilde{r} : \mathcal{R}(S)) c^r?(b).(\nu s') (b!\langle s' \rangle. \bar{s}'!\langle \tilde{r} \rangle) \mid$ $c^{\bar{r}}?(b).(\nu s') (b!\langle s' \rangle. \bar{s}'!\langle \tilde{r} \rangle) \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P'\sigma)_g$	$r : \mu t.S$ $\text{tr}(\mu t.S)$ $\sigma = \{r_1 \bar{r}_1 / r \bar{r}\}$ $\tilde{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_{ \mathcal{R}(S) })$ $\tilde{\bar{r}} = (\bar{r}_1, \dots, \bar{r}_{ \mathcal{R}(S) })$
$Q_1 \mid Q_2$	$c_k?(\tilde{x}). \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{y} \rangle. \overline{c_{k+l+1}}!\langle \tilde{z} \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^{k+1}(Q_1)_g \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+l+1}(Q_2)_g$	$\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(Q_1)$ $\tilde{z} = \text{fv}(Q_2)$ $l = \lceil Q \rceil$
0	$c_k?().0$	
$\mu X.P$	$(\nu s_1) (c_k?(\tilde{x}). \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{x} \rangle. \overline{c_{k+3}}!\langle \tilde{x} \rangle \mid$ $c_{k+1}?(\tilde{x}). (\nu a_1) (s_1!\langle \bar{a}_1 \rangle. (\overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{k+2}?() \mid$ $c_{k+3}?(\tilde{x}). s_1?(z_x). \overline{c_{k+4}}!\langle \tilde{x}, z_x \rangle \mid$ $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}, z_x}^{k+4}(P)_{g, \{X \rightarrow \tilde{n}\}} \mid$ $* a_1?(y_1). y_1'!(\ \tilde{n}^1\ , \dots, \ \tilde{n}^m\ , y_1). \hat{P}))$ where: $\hat{P} = (\nu \tilde{c}) (\prod_{0 < i \leq m} c^{n_i}?(b).(\nu s') (b!\langle s' \rangle. \bar{s}'!\langle \ \tilde{n}^i\ \rangle) \mid$ $\overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle \tilde{x} \rangle \mid c_{k+2}?(\tilde{x}). y_1?(z_x). \overline{c_{k+3}}!\langle \tilde{x}, z_x \rangle \mid$ $\ \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}, z_x}^{k+3}(P)_{g, \{X \rightarrow \tilde{n}\}}\ _{\tilde{c}, \tilde{c}_r})$	$\tilde{n} = \text{fn}(P)$ $m = \tilde{n} $ $\ \tilde{n}\ = (\ n_1\ , \dots, \ n_m\)$ $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. $\ n_i\ : S_i$ $\ \tilde{n}^i\ = (\ n_1^i\ , \dots, \ n_{ \mathcal{H}(S_i) }^i\)$ $\tilde{c} = (c_{k+2}, \dots,$ $c_{k+\lceil P \rceil_{g, \{X \rightarrow \tilde{n}\}} + 1})$ $\tilde{c}_r = \bigcup_{v \in \tilde{n}} c^v$
X	$(\nu s_1) (c_k?(z_x). \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle z_x \rangle. \overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle z_x \rangle \mid$ $c_{k+2}?(z_x). \bar{s}_1!\langle z_x \rangle. \overline{c_{k+3}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{k+3}?() \mid$ $c_{k+1}?(z_x). (\nu a_1) (c^{n_1}!\langle a_1 \rangle.$ $(a_1?(y_1). y_1?(\tilde{z}_1). \dots (\nu a_j) Q)))$ where: $Q = (c^{n_j}!\langle a_j \rangle. (a_j?(y_j). y_j?(\tilde{z}_j).$ $(\nu s') (z_x!\langle s' \rangle. \bar{s}'!\langle \tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_j, s_1 \rangle)))$	$\tilde{n} = g(X)$ $ \tilde{n} = j$ $i \in \{1, \dots, j\}$ $n_i : S \wedge \text{tr}(S_i)$ $\tilde{z}_i = (z_1^i, \dots, z_{ \mathcal{R}_o(S_i) }^i)$

Table 3: Decompose by composing (Part 2/2): Breakdown function $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\cdot)_g$ (cf. Definition 3.5).

Given a typed process P , we write $\text{rn}(P)$ to denote the set of free names of P whose types are recursive. We are finally ready to define the decomposition function $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$, the analog of Definition 2.9 but for processes in π :

Definition 3.5 (Process Decomposition). Let P be a closed π process with $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P)$ and $\tilde{v} = \text{rn}(P)$. Given the breakdown function $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\cdot)_g$ in Tables 2 and 3, the decomposition $\mathcal{F}(P)$ is defined as:

$$\mathcal{F}(P) = (\nu \tilde{c}) (\nu \tilde{c}_r) \left(\overline{c_k}!\langle \rangle.0 \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{c}}^k(P\sigma)_g \mid \prod_{r \in \tilde{v}} c^r?(b).(\nu s) (b!\langle s \rangle. \bar{s}'!\langle \tilde{r} \rangle) \right)$$

where: $k > 0$, $\tilde{c} = (c_k, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil - 1})$; $\tilde{c}_r = \bigcup_{r \in \tilde{v}} c^r$; $\sigma = \{\text{init}(\tilde{u})/\tilde{u}\}$; for each $r \in \tilde{v}$, we have $r : S$ and $\tilde{r} = r_1, \dots, r_{|\mathcal{H}(S)|}$.

3.3 Examples

We illustrate our constructions by means of two representative examples, involving delegation and recursive processes/types.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}(!\langle C \rangle; S) &= \begin{cases} M & \text{if } S = \text{end} \\ M, \mathcal{H}(S) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
&\quad \text{where } M = !\langle \langle ?(\langle ?(\mathcal{H}(C)); \text{end} \rangle); \text{end} \rangle; \text{end} \rangle; \text{end} \\
\mathcal{H}(?(C); S) &= \begin{cases} M & \text{if } S = \text{end} \\ M, \mathcal{H}(S) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
&\quad \text{where } M = ?(\langle ?(\langle ?(\mathcal{H}(C)); \text{end} \rangle); \text{end} \rangle; \text{end} \rangle; \text{end} \\
\mathcal{H}(\text{end}) &= \text{end} \\
\mathcal{H}(S_1, \dots, S_n) &= \mathcal{H}(S_1), \dots, \mathcal{H}(S_n) \\
\mathcal{H}(\langle S \rangle) &= \langle \mathcal{H}(S) \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}(\mu t.S) &= \begin{cases} \mathcal{R}(S) & \text{if } \mu t.S \text{ is tail-recursive} \\ \mu t.\mathcal{H}(S) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\mathcal{R}(!\langle S \rangle; S') &= \mu t.!\langle \langle ?(\langle ?(\mathcal{H}(S)); \text{end} \rangle); \text{end} \rangle; \text{end} \rangle; t, \mathcal{R}(S') \\
\mathcal{R}(?(S); S') &= \mu t.?(\langle ?(\langle ?(\mathcal{H}(S)); \text{end} \rangle); \text{end} \rangle; \text{end} \rangle; t, \mathcal{R}(S') \\
\mathcal{H}(t) &= t \\
\mathcal{R}(t) &= \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_o(?(S); S') = \mathcal{R}_o(S') \quad \mathcal{R}_o(!\langle S \rangle; S') = \mathcal{R}_o(S') \quad \mathcal{R}_o(\mu t.S) = \mathcal{R}_o(S)$$

Figure 13: Decomposition of session types $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$ (cf. Definition 3.3)

Example 3.1 (A Process with Delegation). Let P be a π process which incorporates name-passing and implements channels u and \bar{w} with types $S = !\langle \bar{T} \rangle; \text{end}$ and $T = ?(\text{int}); !\langle \text{bool} \rangle; \text{end}$, respectively:

$$P = (\nu u : S) \left(\underbrace{u!\langle w \rangle. \bar{w}?(t). \bar{w}!\langle \text{odd}(t) \rangle. \mathbf{0}}_R \mid \underbrace{\bar{w}?(x). x!\langle 5 \rangle. x?(b). \mathbf{0}}_Q \right) \quad (1)$$

$$\longrightarrow \bar{w}?(t). \bar{w}!\langle \text{odd}(t) \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid w!\langle 5 \rangle. w?(b). \mathbf{0} \quad (2)$$

We have that $\lceil P \rceil = 25$. Then, the decomposition of P into a collection of first-order processes typed with minimal session types is:

$$\mathcal{F}(P) = (\nu c_1, \dots, c_{25}) (\bar{c}_1! \langle \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid (\nu u_1) \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^1((R \mid Q)\sigma'))$$

where $\sigma = \text{init}(\text{fn}(P))$ and $\sigma' = \sigma \cdot \{u_1 \bar{u}_1 / u \bar{u}\}$. We omit parameter g , as it is empty. We have:

$$\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^1((R \mid Q)\sigma') = c_1?(). \bar{c}_2! \langle \rangle. \bar{c}_{13}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^2(R\sigma') \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{13}(Q\sigma')$$

We use some abbreviations for subprocesses of R and Q :

$$\begin{aligned}
R' &= \bar{w}_1?(t). R'' & R'' &= \bar{w}_1! \langle \text{odd}(t) \rangle. \mathbf{0} \\
Q' &= x_1! \langle 5 \rangle. Q'' & Q'' &= x_1?(b). \mathbf{0}
\end{aligned}$$

The breakdown of R is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^2(R) &= c_2?().(\nu a_1) (u_1!\langle a_1 \rangle.(\overline{c_5}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^5(R') \mid \\
&\quad a_1?(y_1).y_1?(z_1).\overline{c_3}!\langle z_1 \rangle \mid c_3?(z_1).z_1?(x).\overline{c_4}!\langle x \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_4?(x).(\nu s) (x!\langle s \rangle.\overline{s}!\langle w_1, w_2 \rangle))) \\
\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^5(R') &= c_5?().\overline{w_1}?(y_2).\overline{c_6}!\langle y_2 \rangle \mid \\
&\quad (\nu s_1) (c_6?(y_2).\overline{c_7}!\langle y_2 \rangle.\overline{c_8}!\langle \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_7?(y_2).(\nu s') (y_2!\langle s' \rangle.\overline{s'}!\langle s_1 \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \mid \\
&\quad c_8?().(\nu a_2) (\overline{s_1}!\langle a_2 \rangle.(\overline{c_{10}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{10}?().\mathbf{0} \mid \\
&\quad a_2?(y_3).y_3?(t_1).(\overline{c_9}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^9(R'')))) \\
\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^9(R'') &= c_9?().(\nu a) (\overline{w_2}!\langle a \rangle.(\overline{c_{12}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{12}?().\mathbf{0} \mid \\
&\quad a?(y).y?(z_1).\overline{c_{11}}!\langle z_1 \rangle \mid c_{10}?(z_1).z_1?(x).\overline{c_{11}}!\langle x \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_{11}?(x).(\nu s) (x!\langle s \rangle.\overline{s}!\langle \text{odd}(t) \rangle)))
\end{aligned}$$

The breakdown of Q is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{13}(Q) &= c_{13}?().\overline{u_1}?(y_4).\overline{c_{14}}!\langle y_4 \rangle \mid (\nu s_1) (c_{14}?(y).\overline{c_{15}}!\langle y \rangle.\overline{c_{16}}!\langle \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_{15}?(y_4).(\nu s'') (y_4!\langle s'' \rangle.\overline{s''}!\langle s_1 \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid c_{16}?(.).(\nu a_3) (s_1!\langle a_3 \rangle.(\overline{c_{21}}!\langle \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_{21}?().\mathbf{0} \mid a_3?(y_5).y_5?(x_1, x_2).(\overline{c_{17}}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{17}(Q'))))) \\
\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{17}(Q') &= c_{17}?().(\nu a_4) (x_1!\langle a_4 \rangle.(\overline{c_{20}}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{20}(Q'') \mid a_4?(y_6).y_6?(z_1).\overline{c_{18}}!\langle z_1 \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_{18}?(z_1).z_1?(x).\overline{c_{19}}!\langle x \rangle \mid c_{19}?(x).(\nu s''') (x!\langle s''' \rangle.\overline{s'''}!\langle 5 \rangle))) \\
\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{20}(Q'') &= c_{20}?().x_2?(y).\overline{c_{21}}!\langle y \rangle \mid \\
&\quad (\nu s_1) (c_{21}?(y).\overline{c_{22}}!\langle y \rangle.\overline{c_{23}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{22}?(y).(\nu s) (y!\langle s \rangle.\overline{s}!\langle s_1 \rangle) \mid \\
&\quad c_{23}?(x).\overline{c_{24}}!\langle x \rangle.(\overline{c_{25}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{25}?().\mathbf{0} \mid \\
&\quad a?(y').y'?(b_1).(\overline{c_{24}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{24}?().\mathbf{0})))
\end{aligned}$$

Type S is broken down into MSTs M_1 and M_2 , as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
M_1 &= ?(\langle ?(\langle ?(\langle \text{int} \rangle; \text{end}); \text{end}); \text{end} \rangle; \text{end} \\
M_2 &= !\langle ?(\langle ?(\langle ?(\langle \text{bool} \rangle; \text{end}); \text{end}); \text{end} \rangle; \text{end}
\end{aligned}$$

Names $\overline{w_1}$ and $\overline{w_2}$ are typed with M_1 and M_2 , respectively. Then, name u_1 is typed with M , given by:

$$M = !\langle ?(\langle ?(\langle ?(\overline{M_1}, \overline{M_2}); \text{end}); \text{end}); \text{end} \rangle; \text{end} \rangle; \text{end}$$

Consider the reductions of $\mathcal{F}(P)$ that mimic the exchange of w along u in P . We first have three synchronizations on c_1, c_2, c_{13} :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}(P) &\longrightarrow^3 (\nu \tilde{c}) ((\nu a_1) (u_1!\langle a_1 \rangle.(\overline{c_5}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^5(R') \mid \\
&\quad a_1?(y_1).y_1?(z_1).\overline{c_3}!\langle z_1 \rangle \mid c_3?(z_1).z_1?(x).\overline{c_4}!\langle x \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_4?(x).(\nu s) (x!\langle s \rangle.\overline{s}!\langle w_1, w_2 \rangle))) \mid \overline{u_1}?(y_4).\overline{c_{14}}!\langle y_4 \rangle \mid \\
&\quad (\nu s_1) (c_{14}?(y).\overline{c_{15}}!\langle y \rangle.\overline{c_{16}}!\langle \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_{15}?(y_4).(\nu s'') (y_4!\langle s'' \rangle.\overline{s''}!\langle s_1 \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \mid \\
&\quad c_{16}?(.).(\nu a_3) (s_1!\langle a_3 \rangle.(\overline{c_{21}}!\langle \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_{21}?().\mathbf{0} \mid a_3?(y_5).y_5?(x_1, x_2).(\overline{c_{17}}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{17}(Q')))))
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{c} = (c_3, \dots, c_{12}, c_{14}, \dots, c_{25})$. Then, the broken down process R communicates with process Q through channel u_1 by passing name a_1 (highlighted above). Here we notice that the original

transmission of value w is not immediately mimicked on channel u , but it is delegated to some other channel through a series of channel redirections starting with the transmission of name a_1 . Further, the received name a_1 is locally propagated by c_{14} and c_{15} . This represents redundant communications on propagators induced by breaking down sequential prefixes produced by two encodings $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_g^1$ and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^2$ (i.e., those communications are not present in P). Another synchronization occurs on c_{16} .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(P) \longrightarrow^7 & (\nu \tilde{c}_*) (\nu a_1) (\overline{c_5}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^5(R') \mid a_1?(y_1).y_1?(z_1).\overline{c_3}! \langle z_1 \rangle \mid \\ & c_3?(z_1).z_1?(x).\overline{c_4}! \langle x \rangle \mid c_4?(x).(\nu s) (x!\langle s \rangle.\overline{s}! \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle) \mid \\ & (\nu s_1) ((\nu s'') (a_1!\langle s'' \rangle.\overline{s''}! \langle s_1 \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid (\nu a_3) (s_1!\langle a_3 \rangle.\overline{c_{21}}! \langle \rangle \mid \\ & c_{21}?().\mathbf{0} \mid a_3?(y_5).y_5?(x_1, x_2).(\overline{c_{17}}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{17}(Q'))))) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{c}_* = (c_3, \dots, c_{12}, c_{17}, \dots, c_{25})$.

The next step involves a communication on a_1 : session name s'' is passed and substitutes variable y_1 .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(P) \longrightarrow^8 & (\nu \tilde{c}_*) (\nu s'') (\overline{c_5}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^5(R') \mid \\ & s''?(z_1).\overline{c_3}! \langle z_1 \rangle \mid c_3?(z_1).z_1?(x).\overline{c_4}! \langle x \rangle \mid \\ & c_4?(x).(\nu s) (x!\langle s \rangle.\overline{s}! \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle) \mid \\ & (\nu s_1) (\overline{s''}! \langle s_1 \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid (\nu a_3) (s_1!\langle a_3 \rangle.\overline{c_{21}}! \langle \rangle \mid c_{21}?().\mathbf{0} \mid \\ & a_3?(y_5).y_5?(x_1, x_2).(\overline{c_{17}}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{17}(Q'))))) \end{aligned}$$

After the synchronization on channel s'' , name z_1 is further sent to the next parallel process through the propagator c_3 :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(P) \longrightarrow^{10} & (\nu \tilde{c}_{**}) (\nu s_1) (\overline{c_5}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^5(R') \mid \\ & s_1?(x).\overline{c_4}! \langle x \rangle \mid c_4?(x).(\nu s) (x!\langle s \rangle.\overline{s}! \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle) \mid \\ & (\nu a_3) (s_1!\langle a_3 \rangle.\overline{c_{21}}! \langle \rangle \mid c_{21}?().\mathbf{0} \mid a_3?(y_5).y_5?(x_1, x_2).(\overline{c_{17}}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{17}(Q'))))) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{c}_{**} = (c_4, \dots, c_{12}, c_{17}, \dots, c_{25})$.

Communication on s_1 leads to variable x being substituted by name a_3 , which is then passed on c_4 to the next process. In addition, inaction is simulated by synchronization on c_{21} .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(P) \longrightarrow^{13} & (\nu \tilde{c}_\bullet) (\nu a_3) (\overline{c_5}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^5(R') \mid (\nu s) (a_3!\langle s \rangle.\overline{s}! \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle) \mid \\ & a_3?(y_5).y_5?(x_1, x_2).(\overline{c_{17}}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{17}(Q'))) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{c}_\bullet = (c_5, \dots, c_{12}, c_{17}, \dots, c_{25})$.

Now, the distribution of the decomposition of w from one process to another can finally be simulated by two reductions: first, a synchronization on a_3 sends the endpoint of session s , which replaces variable y_5 ; afterwards, the dual endpoint is used to send the names w_1, w_2 , substituting the variables x_1, x_2 .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(P) \longrightarrow^{14} & (\nu \tilde{c}_{\bullet\bullet}) (\nu s) (\overline{c_5}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^5(R') \mid \overline{s}! \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle \mid s?(x_1, x_2).(\overline{c_{17}}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{17}(Q'))) \\ \longrightarrow & (\nu \tilde{c}_{\bullet\bullet}) (\overline{c_5}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^5(R') \mid \overline{c_{17}}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{17}(Q') \{w_1 w_2 / x_1 x_2\}) = V \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{c}_{\bullet\bullet} = (c_5, \dots, c_{12}, c_{17}, \dots, c_{25})$.

Here, we remark that prefix $s?(x_1, x_2)$ binds variables x_1, x_2 in the breakdown of the continuation (i.e., $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{17}(Q')$). Thus, there is no need for propagators to pass contexts: propagators here only serve to enforce the ordering of actions. On the other hand, this relies on a process nesting that is induced by the application of encoding $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^2$ in the composition. Thus, the trio structure is lost.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^1(P\{r_1/r\})_\emptyset &= (\nu s_1) (c_1?().\overline{c_2}!\langle \rangle.\overline{c_4}!\langle \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_2?().(\nu a_1) (s_1!\langle a_1 \rangle.\overline{c_3}!\langle \rangle \mid c_3?().\mathbf{0} \mid \\
&\quad c_4?().s_1?(z_x).\overline{c_5}!\langle z_x \rangle \mid \\
&\quad R^5 \mid * a_1?(y'_1).y'_1?(x_{r_1}, x_{r_2}, y_1).\hat{P})) \\
\text{where:} \\
\hat{P} &= (\nu \tilde{c}) (c^r?(b).(\nu s') (b!\langle s' \rangle.\overline{s'}!\langle x_{r_1}, x_{r_2} \rangle) \mid \overline{c_1}!\langle \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_1?().y_1?(z_x).\overline{c_2}!\langle z_x \rangle \mid R^2\{x_{r_1}, x_{r_2}/r_1, r_2\}) \\
R^k &= c_k?(z_x). \\
&\quad (\nu a_1) (c^r!\langle a_1 \rangle.((\nu s_1) (c_{k+1}?(y).\overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle y \rangle.\overline{c_{k+3}}!\langle \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_{k+2}?(y).(\nu s) (y!\langle s \rangle.\overline{s'}!\langle s_1 \rangle) \mid \\
&\quad c_{k+3}?().(\nu a_2) (s_1!\langle a_2 \rangle.\overline{c_{k+l+4}}!\langle \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_{k+l+4}?().\mathbf{0} \mid a_2?(y_2).y_2?(w_1). \\
&\quad (\nu \tilde{c}) (\overline{c_{k+4}}!\langle z_x \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{z_x}^{k+4}(r_2!\langle -w_1 \rangle.X)_g))) \mid \\
&\quad a_1?(y_1).y_1?(z_1, z_2).z_1?(y). \\
&\quad \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle y \rangle.c^r?(b).(\nu s') (b!\langle s' \rangle.\overline{s'}!\langle z_1, z_2 \rangle)))) \\
\mathcal{A}_{z_x}^{k+4}(r_2!\langle -w_1 \rangle.X)_g &= c_k?(z_x).(\nu a_1) c^r!\langle a_1 \rangle. \\
&\quad (\mathcal{A}_{z_x}^{k+7}(X)_g \mid a_1?(y_1).y_1?(\tilde{z}).W) \\
W &= (\nu a_2) (z_2!\langle a_2 \rangle.\overline{c_{k+7}}!\langle z_x \rangle.c^r?(b).(\nu s) (b!\langle s \rangle.\overline{s'}!\langle \tilde{z} \rangle) \mid \\
&\quad a_2?(y_2).y_2?(z'_1).(\nu \tilde{c}) (\overline{c_{k+5}}!\langle \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_{k+5}?().z'_1?(x).\overline{c_{k+6}}!\langle x \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_{k+6}?(x).(\nu s') (x!\langle s' \rangle.\overline{s'}!\langle -w_1 \rangle)))) \\
\mathcal{A}_{z_x}^{k+7}(X)_g &= (\nu s_1) (c_{k+7}?(z_x).\overline{c_{k+8}}!\langle z_x \rangle.\overline{c_{k+9}}!\langle z_x \rangle \mid \\
&\quad c_{k+8}?(z_x).(\nu a_1) (c^r!\langle a_1 \rangle.(c_{k+9}?(z_x).\overline{s_1}!\langle z_x \rangle.\overline{c_{k+10}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{k+10}?(()) \mid \\
&\quad a_1?(y_1).y_1?(r_1, r_2).(\nu s') (z_x!\langle s' \rangle.\overline{s'}!\langle r_1, r_2, s_1 \rangle)))))) \\
\text{with } g &= \{X \mapsto r_1, r_2\}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 14: Breakdown of a recursive process (Example 3.2)

Undoubtedly, the first reduction of process P in (1) has been simulated. We may notice that in V names w_1, w_2 substitute x_1, x_2 and the subsequent reduction on w can be simulated on name w_1 . The subsequent reductions follow the same pattern. Thus, the outcome of our decomposition function is a behaviorally equivalent process that is typed with MSTs.

Example 3.2 (A Recursive Process). Let r be a channel with the tail-recursive session type $S = \mu t.?(int);!\langle int \rangle;t$. We decompose r using S and obtain two channels typed with MSTs as in Figure 13:

$$\begin{aligned}
r_1 &: \mu t.?(\langle ?(?(\langle ?(int);end \rangle);end);end \rangle);t \\
r_2 &: \mu t.!\langle ?(?(\langle ?(int);end \rangle);end);end \rangle ;t
\end{aligned}$$

Consider now the process $P = \mu X.r?(w).r!\langle -w \rangle.X$. Let us write P' to denote the “body” of P , i.e., $P' = r?(w).r!\langle -w \rangle.X$. Then, process $\mathcal{F}(P)$ is

$$(\nu \tilde{c}) (\nu c^r) (c^r?(b).(\nu s) (b!\langle s \rangle.\overline{s'}!\langle r_1, r_2 \rangle) \mid \overline{c_1}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^1(P\{r_1/r\})_\emptyset)$$

where $\tilde{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_{\lceil P \rceil})$ and $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^1(P\{r_1/r\})_\emptyset$ is in Figure 14.

In Figure 14, $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^1(P\{r_1/r\})$ simulates recursion in P using replication. Given some index k , process R^k mimics actions of the recursive body. It first gets a decomposition of r by interacting with the process providing recursive names on c^r (for the first instance, this is a top-level process in $\mathcal{F}(P)$). Then, it mimics the first input action on the channel received for z_1 (that is, r_1): the input of actual names for w_1 is delegated through channel redirections to name y_2 (both prefixes are highlighted in Figure 14). Once the recursive name is used, the decomposition of recursive name is made available for the breakdown of the continuation by a communication on c^r . Similarly, in the continuation, the second action on r , output, is mimicked by r_2 (received for z_2), with the output of actual name w_1 delegated to \bar{z}' (both prefixes are highlighted in Figure 14).

Subprocess R^5 is a breakdown of the first instance of the recursive body. The replication guarded by a_1 produces a next instance, i.e., process $R^2\{x_{r_1}, x_{r_2}/r_1, r_2\}$ in \hat{P} . By communication on a_1 and a few reductions on propagators, it gets activated: along a_1 it first receives a name for y'_1 along which it also receives: (i) recursive names r_1, r_2 for variables x_{r_1}, x_{r_2} , and (ii) a name for y_1 along which it will receive a_1 again, for future instances, as it can be seen in $\mathcal{A}_{zx}^{k+7}(X)_g$.

3.4 Results

We close this section by establishing the minimality result for π using the typability of $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$. We need some auxiliary definitions to characterize the propagators required to decompose recursive processes.

Lemma 2.1 states typability results by introducing two typing environments, denoted Θ and Φ . While environment Θ is used to type linear propagators (e.g., c_k, c_{k+1}, \dots) generated by the breakdown function $\mathcal{B}^-(\cdot)$, environment Φ types shared propagators used in trios that propagate breakdown of recursive names (e.g., c^r, c^v, \dots where r and v are recursive names).

Definition 3.6 (Session environment for propagators). Let Θ be the session environment and Φ be the recursive propagator environment defined in Lemma 2.1. Then, by applying the encoding $\langle \cdot \rangle^2$, we define Θ' and Φ' as follows: $\Theta' = \langle \Theta \rangle^2, \Phi' = \langle \Phi \rangle^2$.

We can use $\Theta' = \langle \Theta \rangle^2$ in the following statement, where we state the typability result for the breakdown function. The proof composes previously established results:

Lemma 3.1 (Typability of Breakdown). *Let P be an initialized π process. If $\Gamma; \Delta, \Delta_\mu \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$, then $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma), \Phi'; \mathcal{H}(\Delta), \Theta' \vdash \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^k(P)_g \triangleright \diamond$, where:*

- $k > 0$;
- $\tilde{r} = \text{dom}(\Delta_\mu)$;
- $\Phi' = \prod_{r \in \tilde{r}} c^r : \langle \langle ?(\mathcal{R}_o(\Delta_\mu(r))) ; \text{end} \rangle \rangle$;
- $\text{balanced}(\Theta')$ with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta') = \{c_k, c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil-1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P \rceil-1}}\}$$

such that $\Theta'(c_k) = ?(\cdot); \text{end}$.

Proof. Directly from Lemma 2.1 and from Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 from [15]. See Appendix A.2 for details. \square

We now consider typability for the decomposition function, using $\Phi' = \langle \Phi \rangle^2$ as in Definition 3.6.

Theorem 3.1 (Minimality Result for π). *Let P be a closed π process, with $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P)$ and $\tilde{v} = \text{rn}(P)$. If $\Gamma; \Delta, \Delta_\mu \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$, where Δ_μ only involves recursive session types, then $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma\sigma); \mathcal{H}(\Delta\sigma), \mathcal{H}(\Delta_\mu\sigma) \vdash \mathcal{F}(P) \triangleright \diamond$, where $\sigma = \{\text{init}(\tilde{u})/\tilde{u}\}$.*

Proof. Directly by using Lemma 3.1; see Appendix A.2 for details. \square

While Theorem 3.1 gives a useful *static* guarantee about the correctness of our decomposition of P into $\mathcal{F}(P)$, a *dynamic* guarantee that confirms that P and $\mathcal{F}(P)$ are behaviorally equivalent is most relevant. Before establishing such a dynamic guarantee, we explore to what extent $\mathcal{F}(P)$ can be optimized, i.e., whether redundancies induced by the “decompose by composing” approach can be safely eliminated.

4 An Optimized Decomposition

Although conceptually simple, the “decompose by composing” approach to the minimality result induces some suboptimal features. Considering this, in this section we propose $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$, an optimization of $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ with less synchronizations and direct support for recursion, and establish its correctness properties, in terms of its corresponding minimality result (static correctness, Theorem 4.1, Page 34) but also *dynamic correctness* (Theorem 4.2, Page 39).

4.1 Motivation: Suboptimal Features of “Decompose by Composing”

To motivate our insights, consider the process $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i?(w).Q)_g$ as presented in Section 3.1 and Table 2. We identify some *suboptimal features* of a decomposition based on $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\cdot)_g$:

Channel redirections While the given process receives a name for variable w along u_i , its breakdown does not input a breakdown of w directly, but does so through a series of channel redirections: u_i receives a name along which it sends the restricted name s , along which it sends the restricted name s_1 and so on. Finally, the name received for y' receives \tilde{w} , the breakdown of w . This redundancy is perhaps more evident in Definition 3.3, which gives the translation of types by composition: the mimicked input action is five-level nested for the original name. This resulting type is due to the composition of $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_g^1$ and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_g^2$.

Redundant synchronizations on propagators Also, $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i?(w).Q)_g$ features redundant communications on propagators. For example, the bound name y is locally propagated by c_{k+1} and c_{k+2} . This is the result of breaking down sequential prefixes induced by $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_g^1$ (not present in the original process).

Trio structure is lost Last but not least, the trio structure is lost as subprocess $\hat{Q}_{\tilde{x}}$ is guarded and nested, and it inductively invokes the function on continuation Q . This results in an arbitrary level of process nesting, which is induced by the final application of encoding $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_g^2$ in the composition.

The shortcomings of $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\cdot)_g$ are also evident in the treatment of recursive processes and names. Because HO does not feature recursion constructs, $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_g^1$ encodes them by relying on abstraction passing and shared abstractions. Then, going back to π via $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_g^2$, these representations are translated to a process involving a replicated subprocess. However, going through this path the encoding of recursive process becomes convoluted. Moreover, all non-optimal features already discussed for the case of input are also present in the decomposition of recursion.

Based on these observations, here we develop an optimized decomposition function, denoted $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$ (Definition 4.8), that avoids the shortcomings described above. The optimized decomposition relies on a streamlined breakdown function, denoted $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\cdot)$, which produces a composition of trios processes, with a fixed maximum number of nested prefixes. The decomposed process avoids channel redirections and only introduces propagators that codify the sequentiality of the original process.

Roadmap. To facilitate reading, we summarize notations and definitions related to $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ and their corresponding notions for the optimized decomposition $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$ —see Table 4.

	Section 3	This section
Degree of P	$\lceil P \rceil$ (Definition 3.2)	$\lceil P \rceil^*$ (Definition 4.3)
Decomposition of S	$\mathcal{H}(S)$ and $\mathcal{R}(S)$ (Figure 13)	$\mathcal{H}^*(S)$ and $\mathcal{R}^*(S)$ (Figure 15)
Breakdown of P	$\mathcal{A}_x^k(P)_g$ (Tables 2 and 3)	$\mathcal{A}_x^k(P)$ and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_x^k(P)_g$ (Tables 5 and 6)
Decomposition of P	$\mathcal{F}(P)$ (Definition 3.5)	$\mathcal{F}^*(P)$ (Definition 4.8)

Table 4: Summary of notations used in our two decompositions.

4.2 Preliminaries

As before, we need to decompose a session type into a *list* of minimal session types:

Definition 4.1 (Decomposing Types). Let S and C be a session and a channel type, resp. (cf. Figure 5). The *type decomposition function* $\mathcal{H}^*(\cdot)$ is defined in Figure 15.

As before, we need two auxiliary functions for decomposing recursive types, denoted $\mathcal{R}^*(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{R}_o^*(\cdot)$.

A comparison between $\mathcal{H}^*(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$ (Figure 13) is already useful to understand the intent and scope of the optimized decomposition. Consider, e.g., the decompositions of the session type $!\langle C \rangle; S$ (with $S \neq \text{end}$):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}(!\langle C \rangle; S) &= !\langle \langle ?(\langle ?(\mathcal{H}(C)); \text{end} \rangle); \text{end} \rangle; \text{end} \rangle; \text{end}, \mathcal{H}(S) \\ \mathcal{H}^*(!\langle C \rangle; S) &= !\langle \mathcal{H}^*(C) \rangle; \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(S)\end{aligned}$$

These differences at the level of induced MSTs will be useful in our formal comparison of the two decompositions, in Section 4.5.

Example 4.1 (Decomposing a Recursive Type). Let $S = \mu t. S'$ be a recursive session type, with $S' = ?(\text{int}); ?(\text{bool}); !\langle \text{bool} \rangle; t$. By Figure 15, since S is tail-recursive, $\mathcal{H}^*(S) = \mathcal{R}^*(S')$. Further,

$$\mathcal{R}^*(S') = \mu t. ?(\mathcal{H}^*(\text{int})); t, \mathcal{R}^*(?(\text{bool}); !\langle \text{bool} \rangle; t)$$

By definition of $\mathcal{R}^*(\cdot)$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}^*(S) = \mu t. ?(\text{int}); t, \mu t. ?(\text{bool}); t, \mu t. !\langle \text{bool} \rangle; t, \mathcal{R}^*(t)$$

(using $\mathcal{H}^*(\text{int}) = \text{int}$ and $\mathcal{H}^*(\text{bool}) = \text{bool}$). Since $\mathcal{R}^*(t) = \epsilon$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^*(S) = \mu t. ?(\text{int}); t, \mu t. ?(\text{bool}); t, \mu t. !\langle \text{bool} \rangle; t$$

Example 4.2 (Decomposing an Unfolded Recursive Type). Let $T = ?(\text{bool}); !\langle \text{bool} \rangle; S$ be a derived unfolding of S from Example 4.1. Then, by Figure 15, $\mathcal{R}_o^*(T)$ is the list of minimal recursive types obtained as follows: first, $\mathcal{R}_o^*(T) = \mathcal{R}_o^*(!\langle \text{bool} \rangle; \mu t. S')$ and after one more step, $\mathcal{R}_o^*(!\langle \text{bool} \rangle; \mu t. S') = \mathcal{R}_o^*(\mu t. S')$. Finally, we have $\mathcal{R}_o^*(\mu t. S') = \mathcal{R}^*(S')$. We get the same list of minimal types as in Example 4.1:

$$\mathcal{R}_o^*(T) = \mu t. ?(\text{int}); t, \mu t. ?(\text{bool}); t, \mu t. !\langle \text{bool} \rangle; t$$

Definition 4.2 (Decomposing Environments). Given environments Γ and Δ , we define $\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma)$ and $\mathcal{H}^*(\Delta)$ inductively as $\mathcal{H}^*(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}^*(\Delta, u_i : S) &= \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta), (u_i, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{H}^*(S)|-1}) : \mathcal{H}^*(S) \\ \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma, u_i : \langle S \rangle) &= \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), u_i : \mathcal{H}^*(\langle S \rangle)\end{aligned}$$

We now define the (optimized) degree of a process. A comparison with the previous definition (Definition 3.2) provides further indication of the improvements induced by optimized decomposition.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}^*(! \langle C \rangle; S) &= \begin{cases} ! \langle \mathcal{H}^*(C) \rangle; \text{end} & \text{if } S = \text{end} \\ ! \langle \mathcal{H}^*(C) \rangle; \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(S) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\mathcal{H}^*(? \langle C \rangle; S) &= \begin{cases} ? \langle \mathcal{H}^*(C) \rangle; \text{end} & \text{if } S = \text{end} \\ ? \langle \mathcal{H}^*(C) \rangle; \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(S) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\mathcal{H}^*(\text{end}) &= \text{end} \\
\mathcal{H}^*(\langle S \rangle) &= \langle \mathcal{H}^*(S) \rangle \\
\mathcal{H}^*(S_1, \dots, S_n) &= \mathcal{H}^*(S_1), \dots, \mathcal{H}^*(S_n) \\
\mathcal{H}^*(\mu \mathbf{t}. S') &= \mathcal{R}^*(S') \\
\mathcal{H}^*(S) &= \mathcal{R}_o^*(S) \quad \text{where } S \neq \mu \mathbf{t}. S' \\
\mathcal{R}^*(\mathbf{t}) &= \epsilon \\
\mathcal{R}^*(! \langle C \rangle; S) &= \mu \mathbf{t}. ! \langle \mathcal{H}^*(C) \rangle; \mathbf{t}, \mathcal{R}^*(S) \\
\mathcal{R}^*(? \langle C \rangle; S) &= \mu \mathbf{t}. ? \langle \mathcal{H}^*(C) \rangle; \mathbf{t}, \mathcal{R}^*(S) \\
\mathcal{R}_o^*(? \langle C \rangle; S) &= \mathcal{R}_o^*(! \langle C \rangle; S) = \mathcal{R}_o^*(S) \\
\mathcal{R}_o^*(\mu \mathbf{t}. S) &= \mathcal{R}^*(S)
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 15: Optimized decomposition of session types $\mathcal{H}^*(\cdot)$ (cf. Definition 4.1)

Definition 4.3 (Degree of a Process). The *optimized degree* of a process P , denoted $\llbracket P \rrbracket^*$, is inductively defined as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \llbracket Q \rrbracket^* + 1 & \text{if } P = u_i ! \langle y \rangle . Q \text{ or } P = u_i ? \langle y \rangle . Q \\ \llbracket Q \rrbracket^* & \text{if } P = (\nu s : S) Q \\ \llbracket Q \rrbracket^* + 1 & \text{if } P = (\nu r : S) Q \text{ and } \text{tr}(S) \\ \llbracket Q \rrbracket^* + \llbracket R \rrbracket^* + 1 & \text{if } P = Q \mid R \\ 1 & \text{if } P = \mathbf{0} \text{ or } P = X \\ \llbracket Q \rrbracket^* + 1 & \text{if } P = \mu X . Q \end{cases}$$

As before, given a finite tuple of names $\tilde{u} = (a, b, s, s', \dots)$, we write $\text{init}(\tilde{u})$ to denote the tuple $(a_1, b_1, s_1, s'_1, \dots)$; recall that a process is initialized if all of its names are indexed.

Given two tuples of indexed names \tilde{u} and \tilde{x} , it is useful to collect those names in \tilde{x} that appear in \tilde{u} .

Definition 4.4 (Free indexed names). Let \tilde{u} and \tilde{x} be two tuples of names. We define the set $\text{fnb}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{x})$ as $\{z_k : z_i \in \tilde{u} \wedge z_k \in \tilde{x}\}$.

As usual, we treat sets of names as tuples (and vice-versa). By abusing notation, given a process P , we shall write $\text{fnb}(P, \tilde{y})$ to stand for $\text{fnb}(\text{fn}(P), \tilde{y})$. Then, we have that $\text{fnb}(P, \tilde{x}) \subseteq \tilde{x}$. In the definition of the breakdown function, this notion allows us to conveniently determine a *context* for a subsequent trio.

Definition 4.5. Given a process P , we write $\text{frv}(P)$ to denote that P has a free recursive variable.

Remark 4.1. Whenever $c_k ? \langle \tilde{y} \rangle$ (resp. $\overline{c_k} ! \langle \tilde{y} \rangle$) with $\tilde{y} = \epsilon$, we shall write $c_k ? ()$ (resp. $\overline{c_k} ! \langle \rangle$) to stand for $c_k ? \langle y \rangle$ (resp. $\overline{c_k} ! \langle y \rangle$) such that $c_k : ? \langle \langle \text{end} \rangle \rangle; \text{end}$ (resp. $\overline{c_k} : ! \langle \langle \text{end} \rangle \rangle; \text{end}$).

Definition 4.6 (Index function). Let S be an (unfolded) recursive session type. The function $\iota(S)$ is defined as follows:

$$\iota(S) = \begin{cases} \hat{\iota}_0(S' \{S/\mathbf{t}\}) & \text{if } S = \mu \mathbf{t}. S' \\ \hat{\iota}_0(S) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \hat{\iota}_l(T) = \begin{cases} \hat{\iota}_{l+1}(S) & \text{if } T = ! \langle U \rangle; S \text{ or } T = ? \langle U \rangle; S \\ |\mathcal{R}^*(S)| - l + 1 & \text{if } T = \mu \mathbf{t}. S \end{cases}$$

	P	$\mathcal{A}_x^k(P)$
1	$u_i?(y).Q$	$c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_l?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle\tilde{z}\rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)$ $y_j : S \quad \tilde{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_{ \mathcal{H}^*(S) })$ $\tilde{w} = (\text{lin}(u_i)) :: \{u_i\} : \epsilon \quad \tilde{z} = \text{fnb}(Q, \tilde{x}\tilde{y} \setminus \tilde{w})$ $l = (\text{tr}(u_i)) :: \iota(S) : i \quad \sigma = \text{next}(u_i) \cdot \{y_1/y\}$
2	$u_i!\langle y_j \rangle.Q$	$c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_l!\langle\tilde{y}\rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle\tilde{z}\rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)$ $y_j : S \quad \tilde{y} = (y_j, \dots, y_{j+ \mathcal{H}^*(S) -1})$ $\tilde{w} = (\text{lin}(u_i)) :: \{u_i\} : \epsilon \quad \tilde{z} = \text{fnb}(Q, \tilde{x} \setminus \tilde{w})$ $l = (\text{tr}(u_i)) :: \iota(S) : i \quad \sigma = \text{next}(u_i)$
3	$(\nu s : C) Q$	$(\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}^*(C)) \mathcal{A}_x^k(Q\sigma)$ $\tilde{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_{ \mathcal{H}^*(C) }) \quad \sigma = \{s_1\bar{s}_1/\bar{s}\bar{s}\}$
4	$(\nu s : \mu\text{t}.S) Q$	$(\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{R}^*(S)) (c_k?(\tilde{x}).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle\tilde{z}\rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(Q))$ $\text{tr}(\mu\text{t}.S) \quad \tilde{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_{ \mathcal{R}^*(S) })$ $\tilde{z} = \tilde{x}, \tilde{s}, \tilde{\bar{s}} \quad \tilde{\bar{s}} = (\bar{s}_1, \dots, \bar{s}_{ \mathcal{R}^*(S) })$
5	$Q_1 \mid Q_2$	$c_k?(\tilde{x}).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle\tilde{y}\rangle.\overline{c_{k+l+1}}!\langle\tilde{z}\rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^{k+1}(Q_1) \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+l+1}(Q_2)$ $l = \lceil Q_1 \rceil^* \quad \tilde{y} = \text{fnb}(Q_1, \tilde{x}) \quad \tilde{z} = \text{fnb}(Q_2, \tilde{x})$
6	$\mathbf{0}$	$c_k?().\mathbf{0}$
7	$\mu X.P$	$(\nu c_X^r) (c_k?(\tilde{x}).\overline{c_{k+1}}^r!\langle\tilde{z}\rangle.\mu X.c_X^r?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_{k+1}}^r!\langle\tilde{y}\rangle.X \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(P)_g)$ $\tilde{n} = \text{fs}(P) \quad \tilde{z} = \tilde{y} \quad g = \{X \mapsto \tilde{z}\}$ $\tilde{n} : \tilde{C} \quad \tilde{z} = \text{nbd}(\tilde{n} : \tilde{C})$

Table 5: Optimized breakdown function $\mathcal{A}_x^k(\cdot)$. The auxiliary function $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_x^k(\cdot)_g$ is given in Table 6.

Definition 4.7 (Name breakdown). Let $u_i : C$ be an indexed name with its session type. We write $\text{nbd}(u_i : C)$ to denote

$$\text{nbd}(u_i : C) = (u_i, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{H}^*(C)|-1})$$

We extend $\text{nbd}(\cdot)$ to work on lists of assignments (name, type), as follows:

$$\text{nbd}((u_i^1, \dots, u_j^n) : (C_1, \dots, C_n)) = \text{nbd}(u_i^1 : C_1) \cdot \dots \cdot \text{nbd}(u_j^n : C_n)$$

4.3 The Optimized Decomposition

We define the optimized decomposition $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$ by relying on the revised breakdown function $\mathcal{A}_x^k(\cdot)$ (cf. Section 4.3.1). Given a context \tilde{x} and a $k > 0$, $\mathcal{A}_x^k(\cdot)$ is defined on initialized processes. Table 5 gives the definition: we use an auxiliary function for recursive processes, denoted $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_x^k(\cdot)_g$, where parameter g maps recursive variables to a list of name variables (cf. Section 4.3.2).

In the following, to keep presentation simple, we assume recursive processes $\mu X.P$ in which P does not contain a subprocess of shape $\mu Y.P'$. The generalization of our decomposition without this assumption is not difficult, but is notationally heavy.

4.3.1 The Optimized Breakdown Function

We describe entries 1-7 in Table 5, assuming the side conditions given in the table.

where s is decomposed using C : $\tilde{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_{|\mathcal{H}^*(C)|})$. Since (νs) binds s and \bar{s} (or only s if C is a shared type) the substitution σ is simply $\{s_1 \bar{s}_1 / s \bar{s}\}$ and initializes indexes in Q .

4. **Restriction (Recursive name)** As in the previous case, in the breakdown of $(\nu s : \mu t.S) Q$ the name s is decomposed into \tilde{s} by relying on $\mu t.S$. Here the breakdown consists of the breakdown of Q running in parallel with a control trio, which appends restricted (recursive) names \tilde{s} and $\bar{\tilde{s}}$ to the context, i.e., $\tilde{z} = \tilde{x}, \tilde{s}, \bar{\tilde{s}}$.
5. **Composition** The breakdown of process $Q_1 \mid Q_2$ uses a control trio to trigger the breakdowns of Q_1 and Q_2 , similarly as before.
6. **Inaction** The breakdown of $\mathbf{0}$ is an input prefix that receives an empty context ($\tilde{x} = \epsilon$).
7. **Recursion** The breakdown of $\mu X.P$ is as follows:

$$(\nu c_X^r) (c_k^r(\tilde{x}).\bar{c}_{k+1}^r! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle. \mu X. c_X^r(\tilde{y}).\bar{c}_{k+1}^r! \langle \tilde{y} \rangle. X \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(P)_g)$$

We have a control trio and the breakdown of P , obtained using the auxiliary function $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\cdot)_g$ (Table 6). The trio receives the context \tilde{x} on c_k and propagates it further. To ensure typability, we bind all session free names of P using the context \tilde{z} , which contains the decomposition of those free names (cf. Definition 4.7). This context is needed to break down P , and so we record it as $g = \{X \mapsto \tilde{z}\}$ in the definition of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{x}}^{k+1}(P)_g$. This way, \tilde{z} will be propagated all the way until reaching X .

Next, the recursive trio is enabled, and receives \tilde{y} along c_X^r , with $|\tilde{z}| = |\tilde{y}|$ and $l = |P|$. The tuple \tilde{y} is propagated to the first trio of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{x}}^{k+1}(P)_g$. By definition of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{x}}^{k+1}(P)_g$, its propagator c_X^r will send the same context as received by the first trio. Hence, the recursive part of the control trio keeps sending this context to the next instances of recursive trios of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{x}}^{k+1}(P)_g$.

Notice that the leading trio actually has four prefixes. This simplifies our presentation: this trio can be broken down into two trios by introducing an extra propagator c_{k+1}^r to send over c_{k+2}^r .

4.3.2 Handling P in $\mu X.P$

As already mentioned, we use the auxiliary function $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\cdot)_g$ in Table 6 to generate *recursive trios*. We concentrate on discussing entries 8-11 in Table 6; the other entries are similar as before. A key observation is that parameter g can be empty. To see this, consider a process like $P = \mu X.(Q_1 \mid Q_2)$ where X occurs free in Q_1 but not in Q_2 . If X occurs free in Q_1 then its decomposition will have a non-empty g , whereas the g for Q_2 will be empty. In the recursive trios of Table 6, the difference between $g \neq \emptyset$ and $g = \emptyset$ is subtle: in the former case, X appears guarded by a propagator; in the latter case, it appears unguarded in a parallel composition. This way, trios in the breakdown of Q_2 replicate themselves on a trigger from the breakdown of Q_1 .

Having discussed this difference, we only describe the cases when $g \neq \emptyset$:

- 8 / 9. **Output and Input** The breakdown of $u_i! \langle y_j \rangle. Q$ consists of the breakdown of Q in parallel with a leading trio, a recursive process whose body is defined as in $\mathcal{B}(\cdot)$. As names $g(X)$ may not appear free in Q , we must ensure that a context \tilde{z} for the recursive body is propagated. The breakdown of $r?(y).Q$ is defined similarly.
10. **Parallel Composition** We discuss the breakdown of $Q_1 \mid Q_2$ assuming $\text{frv}(Q_1)$. We take $\tilde{y}_1 = g(X) \cup \text{fnb}(Q_1, \tilde{x})$ to ensure that $g(X)$ is propagated to the breakdown of X . The role of c_{k+l+1}^r is to enact a new instance of the breakdown of Q_2 ; it has a shared type to enable replication. In a running process, the number of these triggers in parallel denotes the number of available instances of Q_2 .

11. Recursive Variable In this case, the breakdown is a control trio that receives the context \tilde{x} from a preceding trio and propagates it again to the first control trio of the breakdown of a recursive process along c_X^r . Notice that by construction we have $\tilde{x} = g(X)$.

We may now define the optimized process decomposition $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$:

Definition 4.8 (Decomposing Processes, Optimized). Let P be a process with $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P)$ and $\tilde{v} = \text{rn}(P)$. Given the breakdown function $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\cdot)$ in Table 5, the *optimized decomposition* of P , denoted $\mathcal{F}^*(P)$, is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}^*(P) = (\nu \tilde{c}) (\overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{r} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{r}}^k(P\sigma))$$

where: $k > 0$; $\tilde{c} = (c_k, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1})$; \tilde{r} such that for $v \in \tilde{v}$ and $v : S \ (v_1, \dots, v_{|\mathcal{R}^*(S)|}) \subseteq \tilde{r}$; and $\sigma = \{\text{init}(\tilde{u})/\tilde{u}\}$.

The definition of $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$ is similar to the definition of $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ given in Definition 3.5. The optimizations are internal to the definition of the breakdown function; notice that the handling of recursive names needed in $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ is not needed in $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$, as they are now handled by the auxiliary function $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\cdot)_g$.

4.4 Examples

Here we illustrate $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{H}^*(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\cdot)$, and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\cdot)_g$ by revisiting the two examples from Section 3.

Example 4.3 (Example 3.1, Revisited). Consider again the process $P = (\nu u) (A \mid B)$ as in Example 3.1. Recall that P implements session types $S = !\langle \overline{T} \rangle; \text{end}$ and $T = ?(\text{int}); !\langle \text{bool} \rangle; \text{end}$.

By Definition 4.3, $\lceil P \rceil^* = 9$. The optimized decomposition of P is:

$$\mathcal{F}^*(P) = (\nu \tilde{c}) (\overline{c_1}! \langle \rangle \mid (\nu u_1) \mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^1((A \mid B)\sigma'))$$

where $\sigma' = \text{init}(\text{fn}(P)) \cdot \{u_1 \overline{u_1}/u\overline{u}\}$ and $\tilde{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_9)$. We have:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^1((A \mid B)\sigma') = c_1?(). \overline{c_2}! \langle \rangle. \overline{c_6}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^2(A\sigma') \mid \mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^6(B\sigma')$$

The breakdowns of sub-processes A and B are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^2(A\sigma') &= c_2?(). u_1! \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle. \overline{c_3}! \langle \rangle \mid c_3?(). \overline{w_1}?(t). \overline{c_4}! \langle \rangle \mid \\ &\quad c_4?(). \overline{w_2}! \langle \text{odd}(t) \rangle. \overline{c_5}! \langle \rangle \mid c_5?(). \mathbf{0} \\ \mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^6(B\sigma') &= c_6?(). \overline{u_1}?(x_1, x_2). \overline{c_7}! \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle \mid c_7?(x_1, x_2). x_1! \langle 5 \rangle. \overline{c_8}! \langle x_2 \rangle \mid \\ &\quad c_8?(x_2). x_2?(b_1). \overline{c_9}! \langle \rangle \mid c_9?(). \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

Name w is decomposed as indexed names $\overline{w_1}, \overline{w_2}$; by using $\mathcal{H}^*(\cdot)$ (Definition 4.1) on T , their MSTs are $M_1 = !\langle \text{int} \rangle; \text{end}$ and $M_2 = ?(\text{bool}); \text{end}$, respectively. Name u_1 is the decomposition of name u and it is typed with $!\langle \overline{M_1}, \overline{M_2} \rangle; \text{end}$.

We discuss the reduction steps from $\mathcal{F}^*(P)$. After a few administrative reductions on c_1 , c_2 , and c_6 , $\mathcal{F}^*(P)$ mimics the first source communication:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^*(P) &\longrightarrow^3 (\nu \tilde{c}_*) (u_1! \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle. \overline{c_3}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^3(\overline{w}?(t). \overline{w}! \langle \text{odd}(t) \rangle. \mathbf{0}) \mid \\ &\quad \overline{u_1}?(x_1, x_2). \overline{c_7}! \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{x_1, x_2}^7(x! \langle 5 \rangle. x?(b). \mathbf{0})) \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu \tilde{c}_*) (\overline{c_3}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^2(\overline{w}?(t). \overline{w}! \langle \text{odd}(t) \rangle. \mathbf{0}) \mid \overline{c_7}! \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{x_1, x_2}^7(x! \langle 5 \rangle. x?(b). \mathbf{0})) \end{aligned}$$

Above, $\tilde{c}_* = (c_3, c_4, c_5, c_7, c_8, c_9)$. After reductions on c_3 and c_7 , name w_1 substitutes x_1 and the communication along w_1 can be mimicked:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^*(P) &\longrightarrow^6 (\nu \tilde{c}_{**}) (\overline{w_1}?(t). \overline{c_4}! \langle \rangle \mid c_4?(). \overline{w_2}! \langle \text{odd}(t) \rangle. \overline{c_5}! \langle \rangle \mid c_5?(). \mathbf{0} \mid \\ &\quad w_1! \langle 5 \rangle. \overline{c_8}! \langle w_2 \rangle \mid c_8?(x_2). x_2?(b_1). \overline{c_9}! \langle \rangle \mid c_9?(). \mathbf{0}) \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu \tilde{c}_{**}) (\overline{c_4}! \langle 5 \rangle \mid c_4?(t). \overline{w_2}! \langle \text{odd}(t) \rangle. \overline{c_5}! \langle \rangle \mid c_5?(). \mathbf{0} \mid \\ &\quad \overline{c_8}! \langle w_2 \rangle \mid c_8?(x_2). x_2?(b_1). \overline{c_9}! \langle \rangle \mid c_9?(). \mathbf{0}) \end{aligned}$$

Above, $\tilde{c}_{**} = (c_4, c_5, c_8, c_9)$. Further reductions follow similarly.

Example 4.4 (Example 3.2, Revisited). Consider again the tail-recursive session type $S = \mu t.?(int);!(int);t$. Also, let R be a process implementing a channel r with type S :

$$R = \mu X.r?(z).r!(-z).X$$

We decompose name r using S and obtain two channels typed with MSTs as in Figure 15. We have: $r_1 : \mu t.?(int);t$ and $r_2 : \mu t.!(int);t$.

The trios produced by $\mathcal{A}_e^k(R)$ satisfy two properties: they (1) mimic the recursive behavior of R and (2) use the same decomposition of channel r (i.e., r_1, r_2) in every instance.

To accomplish (1), each trio of the breakdown of the recursion body is a recursive trio. For (2), we need two things. First, we expect to receive all recursive names in the context \tilde{x} when entering the decomposition of the recursion body; further, each trio should use one recursive name from the names received and propagate *all* of them to subsequent trio. Second, we need an extra control trio when breaking down prefix μX : this trio (i) receives recursive names from the last trio in the breakdown of the recursion body and (ii) activates another instance with these recursive names.

Using these ideas, process $\mathcal{A}_{r_1, r_2}^1(R)$ is as follows (we write R' to stand for $r?(z).r!(-z).X$):

$$c_1?(r_1, r_2).\overline{c_2}!(r_1, r_2).\mu X.c_X^r?(y_1, y_2).\overline{c_2}!(y_1, y_2).X \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{r_1, r_2}^2(R')$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{r_1, r_2}^2(R')$ is the composition of three recursive trios:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu X.c_2^r?(y_1, y_2).r_1?(z_1).\overline{c_3}!(y_1, y_2, z_1).X \mid \\ & \mu X.c_3^r?(y_1, y_2, z_1).r_2?(-z_1).\overline{c_4}!(y_1, y_2).X \mid \mu X.c_4^r?(y_1, y_2).\overline{c_X}!(y_1, y_2).X \end{aligned}$$

c_2^r will first activate the recursive trios with context (r_1, r_2) . Next, each trio uses one of r_1, r_2 and propagate them both mimicking the recursion body. The last recursive trio sends r_1, r_2 back to the top-level control trio, so it can enact another instance of the decomposition of the recursion body by activating the first recursive trio.

4.5 Measuring the Optimization

Before discussing the static and dynamic correctness of $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$, here we measure the improvements over $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$. A key metric for comparison is the number of prefixes/synchronizations induced by each decomposition. This includes (1) the number of prefixes involved in *channel redirections* and (2) the *number of propagators*; both can be counted by already defined notions:

1. Channel redirections can be counted by the levels of nesting in the decompositions of types (cf. Figures 13 and 15).
2. The number of propagators is determined by the degree of a process (cf. Definitions 3.2 and 4.3).

These two metrics are related; let us discuss them in detail.

Channel redirections. The decompositions of types for $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$ abstractly describe the respective channel redirections. The type decomposition for $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ (Figure 13) defines 5 levels of nesting for the translation of input/output types. Then, at the level of (decomposed) processes, channels with these types implement redirections: the nesting levels correspond to 5 additional prefixes in the decomposed process that mimic a source input/output action. In contrast, the type decomposition for $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$ (Figure 15) induces no nesting, and so at the level of processes there are no additional prefixes.

Number of propagators. We define auxiliary functions to count the number of propagators induced by $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$. These functions, denoted $\#(\cdot)$ and $\#^*(\cdot)$, respectively, are defined using the degree functions $\langle \cdot \rangle$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle^*$ given by Definitions 3.2 and 4.3, respectively.

Remarkably, $\langle \cdot \rangle$ and $\#(\cdot)$ are not equal. The difference lies in the number of tail-recursive names in a process. In $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ there are propagators c_k but also propagators c^r for recursive names. Definition 3.2, however, only counts the former kind of propagators. For any P , the number of propagators c^r in $\mathcal{F}(P)$ is the number of free and bound tail-recursive names in P . We remark that, by definition, there may be more than one occurrence of a propagator c^r in $\mathcal{F}(P)$: there is at least one prefix with subject c^r ; further occurrences depend on the sequentiality structure of the (recursive) type assigned to r . On the other hand, in $\mathcal{F}^*(P)$ there are propagators c_k and propagators c_X^r , whose number corresponds to the number of recursive variables in the process. To define $\#(\cdot)$ and $\#^*(\cdot)$, we write $\text{brn}(P)$ to denote bound occurrences of recursive names and $\#_X(P)$ to denote the number of occurrences of recursive variables.

Definition 4.9 (Propagators in $\mathcal{F}(P)$ and $\mathcal{F}^*(P)$). Given a process P , the number of propagators in each decomposition is given by

$$\#(P) = \langle P \rangle + 2 \cdot |\text{brn}(P)| + |\text{rn}(P)| \quad \#^*(P) = \langle P \rangle^* + \#_X(P)$$

Notice that $\#^*(P)$ gives the exact number of actions induced by propagators in $\mathcal{F}^*(P)$; in contrast, due to propagators c^r , $\#(P)$ gives the *least* number of such actions in $\mathcal{F}(P)$.

In general, we have $\#(P) \geq \#^*(P)$, but we can be more precise for a broad class of processes. We say that a process $P \neq \mathbf{0}$ is in *normal form* if $P = (\nu \tilde{n})(Q_1 \mid \dots \mid Q_n)$, where each Q_i (with $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$) is not $\mathbf{0}$ and does not contain restriction nor parallel composition at the top-level. We have the following result; see Appendix A.3 for details.

Lemma 4.1. *If P is in normal form then $\#(P) \geq \frac{5}{3} \cdot \#^*(P)$.*

This result implies that the number of (extra) synchronizations induced by propagators in $\mathcal{F}(P)$ is larger than in $\mathcal{F}^*(P)$.

4.6 Static Correctness

Here we establish the analog of Theorem 3.1 (Section 3.4) but for $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$. We rely on an auxiliary predicate:

Definition 4.10 (Indexed Names). Suppose some typing environments Γ, Δ . Let \tilde{x}, \tilde{y} be two tuples of indexed names. We write $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{x})$ for the predicate

$$\forall z_i. (z_i \in \tilde{x} \Leftrightarrow \exists m. ((z_i, \dots, z_{i+m-1}) \subseteq \tilde{y} \wedge m = |\mathcal{H}^*((\Gamma, \Delta)(z_i))|))$$

We now state our static correctness results (typability with respect to MSTs) for the auxiliary function $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}}^k(\cdot)_g$, the breakdown function $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P)$, and the optimized decomposition $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$:

Lemma 4.2 (Typability of Auxiliary Breakdown: $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}}^k(\cdot)_g$). *Let P be an initialized process. If $\Gamma \cdot X : \Delta_\mu; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ then:*

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta \vdash \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P)_g \triangleright \diamond \quad (k > 0)$$

where

- $\tilde{x} \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$ such that $\Delta \setminus \tilde{x} = \emptyset$;
- $\tilde{y} = \tilde{v} \cdot \tilde{m}$, where $\tilde{m} = \text{codom}(g)$ and \tilde{v} is such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\tilde{v}, \tilde{x})$ holds;
- $\Theta = \Theta_\mu, \Theta_X(g)$ where
 - $\text{dom}(\Theta_\mu) = \{c_k^r, c_{k+1}^r, \dots, c_{k+\langle P \rangle^*-1}^r\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}^r}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\langle P \rangle^*-1}^r}\}$

– Let $\tilde{N} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_\mu \cdot \Delta))(\tilde{y})$. Then

$$\Theta_\mu(c_k^r) = \begin{cases} \mu t. ?(\tilde{N}); t & \text{if } g \neq \emptyset \\ \langle \tilde{N} \rangle & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

– $\text{balanced}(\Theta_\mu)$

– $\Theta_X(g) = \bigcup_{X \in \text{dom}(g)} c_X^r : \langle \tilde{M}_X \rangle$ where $\tilde{M}_X = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_\mu))(g(X))$.

Proof. By induction on the structure of P ; see Appendix A.4 for details. \square

Lemma 4.3 (Typability of Breakdown). *Let P be an initialized process. If $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ then*

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \tilde{x}), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P) \triangleright \diamond \quad (k > 0)$$

where

- $\tilde{x} \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$ and \tilde{y} such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{x})$ holds.
- $\text{dom}(\Theta) = \{c_k, c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^* - 1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^* - 1}}\}$
- $\Theta(c_k) = ?(\tilde{M}); \text{end}$, where $\tilde{M} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta))(\tilde{y})$.
- $\text{balanced}(\Theta)$

Proof. By induction of the structure of P and Lemma 4.2; see Appendix A.4 for details. \square

We now (re)state the minimality result, now based on the decomposition $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$.

Theorem 4.1 (Minimality Result for π , Optimized). *Let P be a process with $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P)$. If $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ then $\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma\sigma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta\sigma) \vdash \mathcal{F}^*(P) \triangleright \diamond$, where $\sigma = \{\text{init}(\tilde{u})/\tilde{u}\}$.*

Proof. Direct by Definition 4.8 and Lemma 4.3; see Appendix A.5 for details. \square

4.7 Dynamic Correctness

As a complement to the minimality result just given, here we establish that P and $\mathcal{F}^*(P)$ are *behaviorally equivalent* (Theorem 4.2). The notion of behavioral equivalence that we consider is *MST-bisimilarity* (cf. Definition 4.20, \approx^M), a variant of *characteristic bisimilarity*, one of the session-typed behavioral equivalences studied in [14].

4.7.1 Preliminaries

We require some auxiliary definitions and notations from [14].

Typed Labeled Transition System. Our typed LTS is obtained by coupling the untyped LTS given in Figure 4 with a labeled transition relation on typing environments, given in Figure 16. Building upon the reduction relation for session environments in Definition 2.1, such a relation is defined on triples of environments by extending the LTSs in [17, 16]; it is denoted

$$(\Gamma_1, \Lambda_1, \Delta_1) \xrightarrow{\ell} (\Gamma_2, \Lambda_2, \Delta_2)$$

Recall that Γ admits weakening. Using this principle (not valid for Λ and Δ), we have $(\Gamma', \Lambda_1, \Delta_1) \xrightarrow{\ell} (\Gamma', \Lambda_2, \Delta_2)$ whenever $(\Gamma, \Lambda_1, \Delta_1) \xrightarrow{\ell} (\Gamma', \Lambda_2, \Delta_2)$. Some intuitions follow.

Input Actions are defined by Rules [SRV] and [SHRV]. In Rule [SRV] the type of value V and the type of the object associated to the session type on s should coincide. The resulting type tuple must contain the environments associated to V . The dual endpoint \bar{s} cannot be present in the session environment: if it were present the only possible communication would be the interaction between the two endpoints (cf. Rule [TAU]). Following similar principles, Rule [SHRV] defines input actions for shared names.

Output Actions are defined by Rules [SSND] and [SHSND]. Rule [SSND] states the conditions for observing action $(\nu \tilde{m}) s! \langle V \rangle$ on a type tuple $(\Gamma, \Lambda, \Delta \cdot s : S)$. The session environment $\Delta, s : S$ should include the session environment of the sent value V (denoted Δ' in the rule), *excluding* the session environments of names m_j in \tilde{m} which restrict the scope of value V (denoted Δ_j in the rule). Analogously, the linear variable environment Λ' of V should be included in Λ . The rule defines the scope extrusion of session names in \tilde{m} ; consequently, environments associated to their dual endpoints (denoted Δ'_j in the rule) appear in the resulting session environment. Similarly for shared names in \tilde{m} that are extruded. All free values used for typing V (denoted Λ' and Δ' in the rule) are subtracted from the resulting type tuple. The prefix of session s is consumed by the action. Rule [SHSND] follows similar ideas for output actions on shared names: the name must be typed with $\langle U \rangle$; conditions on value V are identical to those on Rule [SSND].

Other Actions Rule [TAU] defines internal transitions: it reduces the session environment (cf. Definition 2.1) or keeps it unchanged.

We illustrate Rule [SSND] by means of an example:

Example 4.5. Consider the environment tuple $(\Gamma; \emptyset; s : ! \langle ! \langle S \rangle ; \text{end} \rangle \multimap \diamond ; \text{end}, s' : S)$ and the typed value $V = \lambda x. x! \langle s' \rangle . m?(z). \mathbf{0}$ with

$$\Gamma; \emptyset; s' : S, m : ?(\text{end}); \text{end} \vdash V \triangleright (! \langle S \rangle ; \text{end}) \multimap \diamond$$

Then, by Rule [SSND], we can derive:

$$(\Gamma; \emptyset; s : ! \langle ! \langle S \rangle ; \text{end} \rangle \multimap \diamond ; \text{end}, s' : S) \xrightarrow{(\nu m) s! \langle V \rangle} (\Gamma; \emptyset; s : \text{end}, \bar{m} : ! \langle \text{end} \rangle ; \text{end})$$

Observe how the protocol along s is partially consumed; also, the resulting session environment is extended with \bar{m} , the dual endpoint of the extruded name m .

Notation 4.1. Given a value V of type U , we sometimes annotate the output action $(\nu \tilde{m}) n! \langle V \rangle$ with the type of V as $(\nu \tilde{m}) n! \langle V : U \rangle$.

The typed LTS combines the LTSs in Figures 4 and 16.

Definition 4.11 (Typed Labeled Transition System). A *typed transition relation* is a typed relation $\Gamma; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} \Delta_2 \vdash P_2$ where:

1. $P_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} P_2$ and
2. $(\Gamma, \emptyset, \Delta_1) \xrightarrow{\ell} (\Gamma, \emptyset, \Delta_2)$ with $\Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta_i \vdash P_i \triangleright \diamond$ ($i = 1, 2$).

We write \Rightarrow for the reflexive and transitive closure of \rightarrow , $\xRightarrow{\ell}$ for the transitions $\Rightarrow \xrightarrow{\ell} \Rightarrow$, and $\xRightarrow{\hat{\ell}}$ for $\xRightarrow{\ell}$ if $\ell \neq \tau$ otherwise \Rightarrow .

A typed transition relation requires type judgements with an empty Λ , i.e., an empty environment for linear higher-order types. Notice that for open process terms (i.e., with free variables), we can always apply Rule [EProm] (cf. Figure 6) and obtain an empty Λ . As it will be clear below (cf. Definition 4.13), we will be working with closed process terms, i.e., processes without free variables.

$\frac{[\text{SRV}] \quad \bar{s} \notin \text{dom}(\Delta) \quad \Gamma; \Lambda'; \Delta' \vdash V \triangleright U}{(\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, s : ?(U); S) \xrightarrow{s?(V)} (\Gamma; \Lambda, \Lambda'; \Delta, \Delta', s : S)}$	$\frac{[\text{SHRV}] \quad \Gamma; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash a \triangleright \langle U \rangle \quad \Gamma; \Lambda'; \Delta' \vdash V \triangleright U}{(\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta) \xrightarrow{a?(V)} (\Gamma; \Lambda, \Lambda'; \Delta, \Delta')}$
$\frac{[\text{SSND}] \quad \begin{array}{c} \Gamma, \Gamma'; \Lambda'; \Delta' \vdash V \triangleright U \quad \Gamma'; \emptyset; \Delta_j \vdash m_j \triangleright U_j \quad \bar{s} \notin \text{dom}(\Delta) \\ \Delta' \setminus (\cup_j \Delta_j) \subseteq (\Delta, s : S) \quad \Gamma'; \emptyset; \Delta'_j \vdash \bar{m}_j \triangleright U'_j \quad \Lambda' \subseteq \Lambda \end{array}}{(\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, s : !(U); S) \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}) s!(V)} (\Gamma, \Gamma'; \Lambda \setminus \Lambda'; (\Delta, s : S, \cup_j \Delta'_j) \setminus \Delta')}$	
$\frac{[\text{SHSND}] \quad \begin{array}{c} \Gamma, \Gamma'; \Lambda'; \Delta' \vdash V \triangleright U \quad \Gamma'; \emptyset; \Delta_j \vdash m_j \triangleright U_j \quad \Gamma; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash a \triangleright \langle U \rangle \\ \Delta' \setminus (\cup_j \Delta_j) \subseteq \Delta \quad \Gamma'; \emptyset; \Delta'_j \vdash \bar{m}_j \triangleright U'_j \quad \Lambda' \subseteq \Lambda \end{array}}{(\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta) \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}) a!(V)} (\Gamma, \Gamma'; \Lambda \setminus \Lambda'; (\Delta, \cup_j \Delta'_j) \setminus \Delta')}$	$\frac{[\text{TAU}] \quad \Delta_1 \longrightarrow \Delta_2 \vee \Delta_1 = \Delta_2}{(\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_1) \xrightarrow{\tau} (\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_2)}$

Figure 16: Labeled Transition System for Typed Environments.

Typed Relations. We now define *typed relations* and *contextual equivalence* (i.e., barbed congruence). To define typed relations, we first define *confluence* over session environments Δ . Recall that Δ captures session communication, which is deterministic. The notion of confluence allows us to abstract away from alternative computation paths that may arise due to non-interfering reductions of session names.

Definition 4.12 (Session Environment Confluence). Two session environments Δ_1 and Δ_2 are *confluent*, denoted $\Delta_1 \rightleftharpoons \Delta_2$, if there exists a Δ such that: i) $\Delta_1 \longrightarrow^* \Delta$ and ii) $\Delta_2 \longrightarrow^* \Delta$ (here we write \longrightarrow^* for the multi-step reduction in Definition 2.1).

We illustrate confluence by means of an example:

Example 4.6 (Session Environment Confluence). Consider the (balanced) session environments:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_1 &= \{s_1 : T_1, s_2 : ?(U_2); \text{end}, \bar{s}_2 : !(U_2); \text{end}\} \\ \Delta_2 &= \{s_1 : T_1, s_2 : !(U_1); ?(U_2); \text{end}, \bar{s}_2 : ?(U_1); !(U_2); \text{end}\} \end{aligned}$$

Following Definition 2.1, we have that $\Delta_1 \longrightarrow \{s_1 : T_1, s_2 : \text{end}, \bar{s}_2 : \text{end}\}$ and $\Delta_2 \longrightarrow \{s_1 : T_1, s_2 : \text{end}, \bar{s}_2 : \text{end}\}$. Therefore, Δ_1 and Δ_2 are confluent. \square

Typed relations relate only closed processes whose session environments are balanced and confluent:

Definition 4.13 (Typed Relation). We say that a binary relation over typing judgements

$$\Gamma_1; \emptyset; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \triangleright \diamond \mathfrak{R} \Gamma_2; \emptyset; \Delta_2 \vdash P_2 \triangleright \diamond$$

is a *typed relation* whenever:

1. P_1 and P_2 are closed;
2. Δ_1 and Δ_2 are balanced (cf. Definition 2.1); and
3. $\Delta_1 \rightleftharpoons \Delta_2$ (cf. Definition 4.12).

Notation 4.2 (Typed Relations). Given a typed relation $\Gamma_1; \emptyset; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \triangleright \diamond \mathfrak{R} \Gamma_2; \emptyset; \Delta_2 \vdash P_2 \triangleright \diamond$, to reduce eye strain we shall write:

$$\Gamma_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \mathfrak{R} \Gamma_2; \Delta_2 \vdash P_2$$

$$\begin{array}{ll}
[?(C);S]^u & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u?(x).(t!\langle u \rangle.0 \mid [C]^x) & [S]_c & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} s \quad (s \text{ fresh}) \\
[!(C);S]^u & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u!\langle [C]_c \rangle.t!\langle u \rangle.0 & [\langle S \rangle]_c & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a \quad (a \text{ fresh}) \\
[\mu t.S]^u & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [S\{\text{end}/t\}]^u \\
[\text{end}]^u & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0 \\
[\langle S \rangle]^u & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u!\langle [S]_c \rangle.t!\langle u \rangle.0
\end{array}$$

Figure 17: Characteristic processes (left) and characteristic values (right), as introduced in Definition 4.14.

Characteristic Bisimilarity Characteristic bisimilarity equates typed processes by relying on *characteristic trigger processes*. Intuitively, characteristic processes arise in characterizations of contextual equivalence to (succintly) capture the arbitrary contexts in which an exchanged name can be used by a recipient. This notion, which we recall below, needs to be adjusted for our purposes.

Definition 4.14 (Characteristic trigger process [14]). The *characteristic trigger process* for type C is

$$t \Leftarrow_C v : C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} t?(x).(\nu s)(s?(y).[C]^y \mid \bar{s}!\langle v \rangle.0)$$

where $[C]^y$ is the *characteristic process* for C on name y (cf. Figure 17).

We may now state the definition of characteristic bisimilarity that applies in our (first-order) setting:

Definition 4.15 (Characteristic Bisimilarity). A typed relation \mathfrak{R} is a *characteristic bisimulation* if for all $\Gamma_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \mathfrak{R} \Gamma_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1$,

- 1) Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \widetilde{m}_1)n!\langle V_1:U_1 \rangle} \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ then there exist Q_2, V_2, Δ'_2 such that $\Gamma_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \widetilde{m}_2)n!\langle V_2:U_2 \rangle} \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ and, for a fresh t ,

$$\Gamma_1; \Delta''_1 \vdash (\nu \widetilde{m}_1)(P_2 \mid t \Leftarrow_C V_1 : U_1) \mathfrak{R} \Gamma_2; \Delta''_2 \vdash (\nu \widetilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \mid t \Leftarrow_C V_2 : U_2)$$

- 2) For all $\Gamma_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ such that ℓ is not an output, there exist Q_2, Δ'_2 such that $\Gamma_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ and $\Gamma_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2 \mathfrak{R} \Gamma_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$; and
- 3) The symmetric cases of 1 and 2.

The largest such bisimulation is called *characteristic bisimilarity*, denoted by \approx^C .

4.7.2 MST-bisimilarity and Main Result

We introduce MST-bisimilarity (denoted \approx^M), and discuss key differences with respect to characteristic bisimilarity. One of the differences is that we let an action along a name n to be mimicked by an action on a possibly indexed name n_i , for some i .

Definition 4.16 (Indexed name). Given a name n , we write \check{n} to either denote n or any indexed name n_i , with $i > 0$.

Suppose we wish to relate P and Q using \approx^M , and that P performs an output action involving name v . In our setting, Q should send a *tuple* of names: the decomposition of v . Another difference is that output objects should be related by the relation \diamond :

Definition 4.17 (Relating names). We define the relation on names \diamond as follows:

$$\frac{}{\epsilon \diamond \epsilon} \quad \frac{\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash n_i \triangleright C}{n_i \diamond (n_i, \dots, n_{i+|\mathcal{H}^*(C)|-1})} \quad \frac{\tilde{n} \diamond \tilde{m}_1 \quad n_i \diamond \tilde{m}_2}{\tilde{n}, n_i \diamond \tilde{m}_1, \tilde{m}_2}$$

where ϵ denotes the empty list.

Our variants of characteristic and trigger processes are defined as follows:

Definition 4.18 (Minimal characteristic processes). Given a type C , name u , and index i , we define the *minimal* characteristic processes $\langle C \rangle_i^u$ and $\langle C \rangle_c$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle C \rangle_i^u &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u_i?(x).(t_1!\langle u_{i+1}, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{H}^*(S)|} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \langle C \rangle_i^x) \\ \langle !\langle C \rangle; S \rangle_i^u &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u_i!\langle \langle C \rangle_c \rangle. t_1!\langle u_{i+1}, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{H}^*(S)|} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \\ \langle \text{end} \rangle_i^u &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{0} \\ \langle \langle C \rangle \rangle_i^u &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u_1!\langle \langle C \rangle_c \rangle. t_1!\langle u_1 \rangle. \mathbf{0} \\ \langle \mu t. S \rangle_i^u &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle S\{\text{end}/t\} \rangle_i^u \\ \langle S \rangle_c &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{s} \quad (|\tilde{s}| = |\mathcal{H}^*(S)|, \tilde{s} \text{ fresh}) \\ \langle \langle C \rangle \rangle_c &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a_1 \quad (a_1 \text{ fresh}) \end{aligned}$$

where t_1 is a fresh (indexed) name.

Given this definition, we may now revise Definition 4.14.

Definition 4.19 (Minimal characteristic trigger process). Given a type C , the trigger process is

$$t \Leftarrow_{\mathbf{m}} v_i : C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} t_1?(x).(\nu s_1)(s_1?(\tilde{y}). \langle C \rangle_i^y \mid \overline{s_1}!\langle \tilde{v} \rangle. \mathbf{0})$$

where $v_i \diamond \tilde{v}$, $y_i \diamond \tilde{y}$, and $\langle C \rangle_i^y$ is a minimal characteristic process for type C on name y (see Definition 4.18).

We are now ready to define MST-bisimilarity. In the following, we shall adopt Notation 4.2(2) for typed relations in order to explicitly account for the effect of the decompositions in the types/assignments recorded in Γ .

Definition 4.20 (MST-Bisimilarity). A typed relation \mathfrak{R} is an *MST bisimulation* if for all $\Gamma_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \mathfrak{R} \Gamma_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1$,

1. Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_1) n! \langle v : C_1 \rangle} \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ then there exist Q_2 , Δ'_2 , and σ_v such that $\Gamma_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) \tilde{n}! \langle \tilde{v} : \mathcal{H}^*(C) \rangle} \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ where $v\sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ and, for a fresh t ,

$$\Gamma_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash (\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2 \mid t \Leftarrow_{\mathbf{c}} v : C_1) \mathfrak{R} \Gamma_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash (\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \mid t \Leftarrow_{\mathbf{m}} v\sigma : C_1)$$

2. Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \xrightarrow{n?(v)} \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ then there exist Q_2 , Δ'_2 , and σ_v such that $\Gamma_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tilde{n}?(\tilde{v})} \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ where $v\sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ and $\Gamma_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2 \mathfrak{R} \Gamma_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$,

3. Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$, with ℓ not an output or input, then there exist Q_2 and Δ'_2 such that $\Gamma_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\hat{\ell}} \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ and $\Gamma_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2 \mathfrak{R} \Gamma_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ and $\text{sub}(\ell) = n$ implies $\text{sub}(\hat{\ell}) = \tilde{n}$.

4. The symmetric cases of 1, 2, and 3.

The largest such bisimulation is called *MST bisimilarity* (\approx^M).

We can now state our dynamic correctness result:

Theorem 4.2 (Operational Correspondence). *Let P be a process such that $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P$. We have*

$$\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \approx^M \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta) \vdash \mathcal{F}^*(P)$$

The proof of this theorem is by coinduction: we exhibit a binary relation \mathcal{S} such that $(P, \mathcal{F}^*(P)) \in \mathcal{S}$ and is an MST bisimulation. The proof that \mathcal{S} is an MST bisimulation is given by Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.10 in the next sub-section.

4.8 Proof of Theorem 4.2

4.8.1 Preliminaries

In this section we define the relation \mathcal{S} used in the proof of Theorem 4.2. We require some auxiliary notions.

First, we define a relation \diamond on processes, which corresponds to the extension of the relation on indexed names given by Definition 4.17:

Definition 4.21 (Relation \diamond on processes). Given the relation \diamond on names (Definition 4.17), we define the relation \diamond on processes as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{[IPSNd]} \\ \frac{P\sigma \diamond P' \quad v\sigma \diamond \tilde{v} \quad \sigma = \text{next}(n_i)}{n_i! \langle v \rangle . P \diamond n_i! \langle \tilde{v} \rangle . P'} \quad \text{[IPINACT]} \quad \frac{}{\mathbf{0} \diamond \mathbf{0}} \\ \\ \text{[IPRCV]} \quad \frac{P\sigma \diamond P' \quad v\sigma \diamond \tilde{v} \quad \sigma = \text{next}(n_i)}{n_i?(y) . P \diamond n_i?(y) . P'} \quad \text{[IPNEWS]} \quad \frac{P \diamond P' \quad \tilde{m}_1 \diamond \tilde{m}_2}{(\nu \tilde{m}_1) P \diamond (\nu \tilde{m}_2) P'} \end{array}$$

We have the following properties for \diamond :

Lemma 4.4. *We have: $(t \leftarrow_c v : C\{t_1, v_i/t, v\}, t_1 \leftarrow_m v_i : C) \in \diamond$ for $i > 0$.*

Proof. Directly by Definitions 4.14, 4.19 and 4.21. □

Lemma 4.5. *Relation \diamond is an MST bisimulation.*

Proof. Straightforward by transition induction. □

As we have seen, the output clause of MST bisimilarity “appends” trigger processes in parallel to the processes under comparison. The following definitions introduce notations which are useful for distinguishing the triggers included in a process.

Definition 4.22 (Trigger Collections).

- We let H, H' to range over *trigger collections*: processes of the form $P_1 \mid \dots \mid P_n$ (with $n \geq 1$), where each P_i is a trigger process or a process that originates from a trigger process.
- We write $P \parallel Q$ to stand for $P \mid Q$ where either P or Q is a trigger collection.

Example 4.7. Let $H_1 = t \leftarrow_c v : C \mid [C]^u \mid t'!\langle n \rangle . \mathbf{0}$ where v, t, t', u, n are channel names, C a channel type. We could see that $[C]^u$ and $t'!\langle n \rangle . \mathbf{0}$ originate from a trigger process. Thus, H_1 is a trigger collection.

Definition 4.23 (Propagators of P). We define $\text{fnp}(P)$ to denote the set of free propagator names in P .

The following definition is useful when constructing an MST bisimulation for *recursive processes*, i.e., processes P such that $\text{frv}(P)$ holds (cf. Definition 4.5). The *depth* of a recursive variable denotes the number of prefixes preceding the occurrence of a recursive variable X or a subprocess of the form $\mu X.Q$; in turn, this depth will be related to the current trio mimicking a given process.

Definition 4.24 (Depth of recursive variable). Let P be a recursive process. The functions $\delta(P)$ and $\widehat{\delta}(P)$ are mutually defined as follows:

$$\delta(P) = \begin{cases} \widehat{\delta}(P) & \text{if } \text{frv}(P) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \widehat{\delta}(P) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } P = \mu X.Q \text{ or } P = X \\ \delta(Q) + 1 & \text{if } P = \alpha.Q \\ \delta(Q) + \delta(R) & \text{if } P = Q \mid R \\ \delta(Q) & \text{if } P = (\nu s) Q \end{cases}$$

Definition 4.25. The predicate $\mathcal{D}_X(P, Q, d)$ holds whenever there exist Q, Q' such that (i) $P \equiv Q' \{ \mu X.Q/X \}$ and (ii) $\delta(Q') = d$.

Finally, we introduce a notation on (indexed) names and substitutions:

Definition 4.26 (Indexed names substitutions). Let $\tilde{u} = (a, b, s, \bar{s}, s', r, r', \dots)$ be a finite tuple of names. We write $\text{index}(\tilde{u})$ to denote

$$\text{index}(\tilde{u}) = \left\{ \{a_1, b_1, s_i, \bar{s}_i, s'_j, \bar{s}'_j, r_1, r'_1, \dots / a, b, s, s', r, r', \dots\} : i, j, \dots > 0 \right\}$$

4.8.2 The relation \mathcal{S} : Ingredients and Properties

Having all auxiliary notions in place, we are ready to define \mathcal{S} :

Definition 4.27 (Relation \mathcal{S}). Let $P\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$ be a well-typed process, with $\tilde{u} : \tilde{C}$. We define the relation \mathcal{S} as follows:

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(P\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}, R) : R \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{w}}(P\sigma), \\ \sigma \in \text{index}(\tilde{u} \cup \tilde{x} \cup \text{fn}(P)), \tilde{w} = \text{nbd}(\tilde{u}\sigma : \tilde{C}), \tilde{y} = \text{nbd}(\tilde{x}\sigma : \tilde{C})\}$$

where the set $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{w}}(\cdot)$ as in Table 7.

The definition of \mathcal{S} follows Parrow's proof of dynamic correctness for the trios in the untyped π -calculus. Intuitively, processes in the set $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{w}}(P)$ represent processes that are “correlated” to P , up to synchronizations induced by propagators. In our case, the presence of trigger processes and recursive processes induces significant differences with respect to Parrow's definition. Given a process P , we have two mutually defined sets: $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(P)$ and $\mathcal{J}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(P)$, which are both given in Table 7. The idea is that $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(P)$ deals with trigger processes and top-level activation of propagators, whereas $\mathcal{J}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(P)$ collects processes without triggers that are involved in the overall activation of propagators. Handling recursive processes requires dedicated treatment; this is formalized by the auxiliary sets $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(P)$ (defined in Table 8) and $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\tilde{x}, \rho}^k(P)_g^d$ (defined in Tables 9 and 10).

Properties. We prove a series of lemmas that establish a form of *operational correspondence*, divided in completeness and soundness properties. We first need the following result. Following Parrow [18], we refer to prefixes that do not correspond to prefixes of the original process (i.e. prefixes on propagators c_i), as *non-essential prefixes*. The relation \mathcal{S} is closed under reductions that involve non-essential prefixes.

Lemma 4.6. *Given an indexed process $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$, the set $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(P_1)$ is closed under τ transitions on non-essential prefixes. That is, if $R_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(P_1)$ and $R_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} R_2$ is inferred from the actions on non-essential prefixes, then $R_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(P_1)$.*

Proof (Sketch). By the induction on the structure of P_1 and the inspection of definition of $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{J}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(\cdot)$ in Table 7 and Table 8. \square

P	$\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(P)$	
$Q_1 \parallel Q_2$	$\{R_1 \parallel R_2 : R_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{u}_1}(Q_1), R_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}}^{\tilde{u}_2}(Q_2)\}$	$\tilde{y} = \text{fnb}(Q_1, \tilde{x})$ $\tilde{z} = \text{fnb}(Q_2, \tilde{x})$ $\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} = \{\tilde{u}_1/\tilde{y}\} \cdot \{\tilde{u}_2/\tilde{z}\}$
$(\nu s : C) Q$	$\{(\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}^*(C)) R : \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(Q\sigma)\}$	$\tilde{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_{ \mathcal{H}^*(C) })$ $\sigma = \{s_1 \tilde{s}_1 / s \tilde{s}\}$
Q	if $\mathcal{D}_X(Q, Q', d)$: $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(\mu X.Q')^d$ otherwise: $\{(\nu \tilde{c}) R : R = \overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{u} \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(Q)\}$ \cup $\{(\nu \tilde{c}) R : R \in \mathcal{J}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(Q)\}$	$\tilde{c} = \text{fnp}(R)$ $d \geq 1$ (cf. Definition 4.25 for $\mathcal{D}_-(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$)
H	$\{H' : H \{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \diamond H'\}$	
P	$\mathcal{J}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(P)$	
$n_i?(y).Q$	$\{n_l \rho?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{z} \rho \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)\}$	$y : S$ $\tilde{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_{ \mathcal{H}^*(S) })$ $\tilde{w} = (\text{lin}(n_i)) :: \{n_i\} : \epsilon$ $\tilde{z} = \text{fnb}(Q, \tilde{x} \tilde{y} \setminus \tilde{w})$ $\rho = \{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$ $\sigma = \text{next}(n_i) \cdot \{y_1/y\}$ $l = (\text{tr}(S)) :: \iota(S) : i$
$n_i!\langle y_j \rangle.Q$	$\{n_l \rho! \langle \tilde{y} \rho \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{z} \rho \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)\}$	$y_j : S$ $\tilde{y} = (y_j, \dots, y_{j+ \mathcal{H}^*(S) -1})$ $\tilde{w} = (\text{lin}(n_i)) :: \{n_i\} : \epsilon$ $\tilde{z} = \text{fnb}(Q, \tilde{x} \setminus \tilde{w})$ $\rho = \{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$ $\sigma = \text{next}(n_i)$ $l = (\text{tr}(S)) :: \iota(S) : i$
$Q_1 \mid Q_2$	$\{\overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{y} \rho \rangle.\overline{c_{k+l}}! \langle \tilde{z} \rho \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(Q_1) \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+l}(Q_2)\}$ \cup $\{(R_1 \mid R_2) : R_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{u}_1}(Q_1), R_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}}^{\tilde{u}_2}(Q_2)\}$	$\tilde{y} = \text{fnb}(Q_1, \tilde{x})$ $\tilde{z} = \text{fnb}(Q_2, \tilde{x})$ $\rho = \{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$ $l = \lceil Q_1 \rceil^*$
$\mu X.P$	$\{\overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{z} \rho \rangle.\mu X.c_X^r?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y} \rangle.X \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{x}}^{k+1}(P)_g\}$	$\tilde{n} = \text{fn}(P)$ $\tilde{n} : \tilde{C} \wedge \tilde{m} = \text{nbd}(\tilde{n} : \tilde{C})$ $\tilde{z} = \tilde{x} \cup \tilde{m}, \tilde{z} = \tilde{y} $ $g = \{X \mapsto \tilde{m}\}$
$\mathbf{0}$	$\{\mathbf{0}\}$	

Table 7: The sets $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(P)$ (upper part) and $\mathcal{J}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(P)$ (lower part).

Operational Completeness. We first consider transitions using the untyped LTS; in Lemma 4.8 we will consider transitions with the typed LTS.

Lemma 4.7. Assume $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$ is a process and $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}SQ_1$.

1. Whenever $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_1) n! \langle v : C_1 \rangle} P_2$, such that $\tilde{n} \notin P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$, then there exist Q_2 and σ_v such

P	$\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(P)^d$
$\mu X.Q$	$N \cup \left\{ (\nu \tilde{c}) (\mu X.c_X^r?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_{k+1}^r}!\langle\tilde{y}\rangle.X \mid c_k^r?(\tilde{x}).c_X^r!\langle\tilde{x}\rangle.X \mid R) : R \in \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\tilde{x}}^k(Q)_g^d \right\}$ <p>where:</p> $N = \begin{cases} M \cup \left\{ (\nu \tilde{c}) (\overline{c_k^r}!\langle\tilde{z}\rho\rangle.\mu X.c_X^r?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_k^r}!\langle\tilde{y}\rangle.X \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{x}}^k(Q)_g) \right\} & \text{if } d = 0 \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ $M = \begin{cases} \left\{ (\nu \tilde{c}) (\mu X.c_X^r?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_{k+1}^r}!\langle\tilde{y}\rangle.X \mid c_X^r!\langle\tilde{x}\rho\rangle.\mu X.c_k^r?(\tilde{x}).c_X^r!\langle\tilde{x}\rangle.X) : R \in \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\tilde{x}}^k(Q)_g^0 \right\} & \text{if } g \neq \emptyset \\ \left\{ (\nu \tilde{c}) (\mu X.c_X^r?().\overline{c_{k+1}^r}!\langle\rangle.X \mid R \mid c_X^r!\langle\rangle \mid \mu X.c_k^r?().(c_X^r!\langle\rangle \mid X)) : R \in \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\tilde{x}}^k(Q)_g^0 \right\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ <hr/> <p>Also: $\tilde{c} = \text{fnp}(R) \quad \tilde{x} = \text{fs}(Q) \quad g = \{X \mapsto \tilde{x}\} \quad \rho = \{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$</p>

Table 8: The set $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(P)$. The set $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\tilde{x},\rho}^k(P)_g^d$ is defined in Tables 9 and 10.

that $Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \widetilde{m}_2) \tilde{n}!\langle\tilde{v}:\mathcal{H}^*(C_1)\rangle} Q_2$ where $v\sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ and, for a fresh t ,

$$(\nu \widetilde{m}_1)(P_2 \parallel t \leftarrow_{\mathbf{c}} v : C_1) \mathcal{S} (\nu \widetilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbf{m}} v\sigma_v : C_1)$$

2. Whenever $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n?(v)} P_2$, such that $\bar{n} \notin P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$, then there exist Q_2 and σ_v such that $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tilde{n}?(v)} Q_2$ where $v\sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$,

3. Whenever $P_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} P_2$ then there exists Q_2 such that $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} Q_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$.

Proof. By transition induction. See Appendix A.6 for details. \square

The following statement builds upon the previous one to the case of typed LTS (Definition 4.11):

Lemma 4.8. Assume $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$ is a process and $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} Q_1$.

1. Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \widetilde{m}_1) n!\langle v:C_1 \rangle} \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ then there exist Q_2 , Δ'_2 , and σ_v such that $\Gamma_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \widetilde{m}_2) \tilde{n}!\langle\tilde{v}:\mathcal{H}^*(C)\rangle} \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ where $v\sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ and, for a fresh t ,

$$(\nu \widetilde{m}_1)(P_2 \parallel t \leftarrow_{\mathbf{c}} v : C_1) \mathcal{S} (\nu \widetilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \parallel t \leftarrow_{\mathbf{m}} v\sigma_v : C_1)$$

2. Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \xrightarrow{n?(v)} \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ then there exist Q_2 , Δ'_2 , and σ_v such that $\Gamma_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tilde{n}?(v)} \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ where $v\sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$,

3. Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ then there exist Q_2 and Δ'_2 such that $\Gamma_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$.

Proof. The proof uses results of Lemma 4.7. We consider the first case, as the other two are similar. By the definition of the typed LTS (Definition 4.11) we have:

$$\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \triangleright \diamond \quad (3)$$

$$(\Gamma_1; \emptyset; \Delta_1) \xrightarrow{(\nu \widetilde{m}_1) n!\langle v:C_1 \rangle} (\Gamma_1; \emptyset; \Delta_2) \quad (4)$$

P	$\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\tilde{x},\rho}^k(P)_g^d$ when $g \neq \emptyset$
$n_i! \langle y_j \rangle . Q$	$\left\{ n_l! \langle \tilde{y} \rho \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rho \rangle . \mu X . c_k^r?(\tilde{x}) . n_l! \langle \tilde{y} \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)_g \right\}$ if $\delta(Q) = d$ $N \cup \left\{ \mu X . c_k^r?(\tilde{x}) . n_l! \langle \tilde{y} \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X \mid R : R \in \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\tilde{z},\rho}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)_g^d \right\}$ otherwise <hr/> $N = \begin{cases} \{B \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)_g\} & \text{if } \delta(Q) = d+1 \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ $B = \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rho \rangle . \mu X . c_k^r?(\tilde{x}) . n_l! \langle \tilde{y} \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X$ <hr/> $y_j : T \quad \tilde{y} = (y_j, \dots, y_{j+ \mathcal{H}^*(T) -1}) \quad \tilde{w} = (\text{lin}(u_i)) :: \{u_i\} : \epsilon$ <hr/> $\tilde{z} = g(X) \cup \text{fnb}(Q, \tilde{x} \setminus \tilde{w}) \quad l = (\text{tr}(u_i)) :: \iota(S) : i \quad \sigma = \text{next}(u_i)$
$n_i?(y) . Q$	$\left\{ n_l?(y) . \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rho \rangle . \mu X . c_k^r?(\tilde{x}) . n_l?(y) . \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)_g \right\}$ if $\delta(Q) = d$ $N \cup \left\{ \mu X . c_k^r?(\tilde{x}) . n_l?(y) . \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X \mid R : R \in \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\tilde{z},\rho}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)_g^d \right\}$ otherwise <hr/> $N = \begin{cases} \{B \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)_g\} & \text{if } \delta(Q) = d+1 \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ $B = \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rho \rangle . \mu X . c_k^r?(\tilde{x}) . n_l?(y) . \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X$ <hr/> $y : T \quad \tilde{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_{ \mathcal{H}^*(T) }) \quad \tilde{w} = (\text{lin}(u_i)) :: \{u_i\} : \epsilon$ <hr/> $\tilde{z} = g(X) \cup \text{fnb}(Q, \tilde{x}\tilde{y} \setminus \tilde{w}) \quad l = (\text{tr}(u_i)) :: \iota(S) : i \quad \sigma = \text{next}(u_i) \cdot \{y_1/y\}$
$Q_1 \mid Q_2$	$N \cup \left\{ \mu X . c_k^r?(\tilde{x}) . (\overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{y}_1 \rangle . X \mid c_{k+l+1}^r! \langle \tilde{y}_2 \rangle) \mid R_1 \mid R_2 : \right.$ $\left. R_1 \in \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\tilde{y}_1,\rho}^{k+1}(Q_1)_{g_1}^d, R_2 \in \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\tilde{y}_2,\rho}^{k+l+1}(Q_2)_{g_2}^d \right\}$ <hr/> $N = \begin{cases} \{B \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}_1}^{k+1}(Q_1)_{g_1} \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}_2}^{k+l+1}(Q_2)_{g_2}\} & \text{if } \delta(Q_1) = d \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ $B = \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{y}_1 \rho \rangle . \mu X . c_k^r?(\tilde{x}) . (\overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{y}_1 \rangle . X \mid c_{k+l+1}^r! \langle \tilde{y}_2 \rangle)$ <hr/> $\text{frv}(Q_1) \quad \tilde{y}_1 = g(X) \cup \text{fnb}(Q_1, \tilde{x}) \quad \tilde{y}_2 = \text{fnb}(Q_2, \tilde{x}) \quad l = \lceil Q_1 \rceil^*$
$(\nu s) Q$	$N \cup \left\{ \mu X . (\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}^*(C)) c_k?(\tilde{x}) . \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X \mid R : R \in \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\tilde{z},\rho}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)_g^d \right\}$ <hr/> $N = \begin{cases} \{(\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}^*(C)) B \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)_g\} & \text{if } \delta(Q_1) = d \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ $B = \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rho \rangle . \mu X . (\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}^*(C)) c_k?(\tilde{x}) . \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X$ <hr/> $s : S \quad \tilde{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_{ \mathcal{H}^*(S) }) \quad \tilde{\bar{s}} = (\bar{s}_1, \dots, \bar{s}_{ \mathcal{H}^*(S) })$ <hr/> $\tilde{n} = (\text{lin}(s)) :: \tilde{n} : \epsilon \quad \tilde{z} = \tilde{x}, \tilde{s}, \tilde{n} \quad \sigma = \{s_1 \bar{s}_1 / s \bar{s}\}$
X	$\{\mathbf{0}\}$

Table 9: The set $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\tilde{x},\rho}^k(P)_g^d$ when $g \neq \emptyset$. (Table 10 covers the case $g = \emptyset$.)

By (4) we further have

$$\begin{array}{c}
\Gamma, \Gamma'; \Lambda'; \Delta' \vdash V \triangleright U \quad \Gamma'; \emptyset; \Delta_j \vdash m_j \triangleright U_j \quad \bar{n} \notin \text{dom}(\Delta) \\
\Delta' \setminus (\cup_j \Delta_j) \subseteq (\Delta, n : S) \quad \Gamma'; \emptyset; \Delta'_j \vdash \bar{m}_j \triangleright U'_j \quad \Lambda' \subseteq \Lambda \\
\hline
\text{[SSnd]} \quad (\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, n : !\langle C_1 \rangle; S) \xrightarrow{(\nu \bar{m}_1) n! \langle v : C_1 \rangle} (\Gamma, \Gamma'; \Lambda \setminus \Lambda'; (\Delta, n : S, \cup_j \Delta'_j) \setminus \Delta')
\end{array}$$

By (3) and the condition $\bar{n} \notin \text{dom}(\Delta)$ we have $\bar{n} \notin \text{fn}(P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\})$. Therefore, we can apply Item 1 of Lemma 4.7. \square

P	$\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{\tilde{x},\rho}^k(P)_g^d$ when $g = \emptyset$
$n_i!\langle y_j \rangle.Q$	$\{n_l!\langle \tilde{y}\rho \rangle.c_{k+1}^r!\langle \tilde{z}\rho \rangle \mid \mu X.c_k^r?(\tilde{x}).(n_l!\langle \tilde{y} \rangle.c_{k+1}^r!\langle \tilde{z} \rangle \mid X) \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)_g\}$
$n_i?(y).Q$	$\{n_l?(\tilde{y}).c_{k+1}^r!\langle \tilde{z}\rho \rangle \mid \mu X.c_k^r?(\tilde{x}).(n_l?(\tilde{y}).c_{k+1}^r!\langle \tilde{z} \rangle \mid X) \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)_g\}$
$Q_1 \mid Q_2$	$\{c_{k+1}^r!\langle \tilde{y}_1\rho \rangle \mid c_{k+l+1}^r!\langle \tilde{y}_2\rho \rangle \mid \mu X.c_k^r?(\tilde{x}).(c_{k+1}^r!\langle \tilde{y}_1 \rangle \mid c_{k+l+1}^r!\langle \tilde{y}_2 \rangle \mid X) \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}_1}^{k+1}(Q_1)_{g_1} \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}_2}^{k+l+1}(Q_2)_{g_2}\}$
$(\nu s : C) Q$	$\{c_{k+1}^r!\langle \tilde{z}\rho \rangle \mid \mu X.(\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}^*(C)) c_k?(\tilde{x}).(c_{k+1}^r!\langle \tilde{z} \rangle \mid X) \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(Q)_g\}$

Table 10: The set $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{\tilde{x},\rho}^k(P)_g^d$ when $g = \emptyset$. Side conditions are the same as for corresponding cases from Table 9 (when $g \neq \emptyset$).

Operational Soundness. For the proof of operational soundness we follow the same strategy as before: we first establish a lemma for the untyped LTS, then we extend it to the case of the typed LTS.

Lemma 4.9. Assume $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$ is a process and $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} Q_1$.

1. Whenever $Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) n_i! \langle \tilde{v} : \mathcal{H}^*(C_1) \rangle} Q_2$, such that $\tilde{n}_i \notin \text{fn}(Q_1)$, then there exist P_2 and σ_v such that $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_1) n! \langle v : C_1 \rangle} P_2$ where $v\sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ where $v\sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ and, for a fresh t ,

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2 \parallel t \Leftarrow_{\mathcal{C}} v : C_1) \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \parallel t_1 \Leftarrow_{\mathcal{M}} v\sigma_v : C_1)$$

2. Whenever $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tilde{n}?(v)} Q_2$ then there exist P_2 and σ_v such that $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n?(v)} P_2$ where $v\sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$,
3. Whenever $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} Q_2$ either (i) $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} Q_2$ or (ii) there exists P_2 such that $P_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} P_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$.

Proof (Sketch). Following Parrow's approach, we refer to prefixes corresponding to prefixes of the original process as *essential prefixes*. We remark that a prefix in $\mathcal{F}^*(P)$ is non-essential if and only if it is a prefix on a propagator name. First, we discuss the case when a transition is inferred without any actions from essential prefixes. In this case we know that an action can only involve propagator prefixes and by inspection of definition of $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(P_1)$ that $\ell = \tau$. This concerns the sub-case (i) of Part 3 and it directly follows by Lemma 4.6.

Now, assume $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} Q_2$ when ℓ involves essential prefixes. This concerns Part 1, Part 2, and sub-case (ii) of Part 3. This case is mainly the inverse of the proof of Lemma 4.7. As Parrow, here we note that an essential prefix is unguarded in Q_1 if and only if it is unguarded in P_1 . That is, by inspection of the definition, we see that function $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{u}}(P_1)$ does not unguard essential prefixes of P_1 that its members mimic (the propagators serve as guards). \square

Lemma 4.10. Assume $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$ is a process and $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} Q_1$.

1. Whenever $\Gamma_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) \tilde{n}! \langle \tilde{v} : \mathcal{H}^*(C_1) \rangle} \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ then there exist P_2 , σ_v , and Δ'_1 such that $\Gamma_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_1) n! \langle v : C_1 \rangle} \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ and, for a fresh t ,

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2 \parallel t \Leftarrow_{\mathcal{C}} v : C_1) \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \parallel t_1 \Leftarrow_{\mathcal{M}} v\sigma_v : C_1)$$

2. Whenever $\Gamma_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tilde{n}?(v)} \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ then there exist P_2 , σ_v , and Δ'_1 such that $\Gamma_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n?(v)} \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ where $v\sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$,
3. Whenever $\Gamma_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ either (i) $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} Q_2$ or (ii) there exist P_2 and Δ'_1 such that $\Gamma_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{\tau} \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$.

Proof (Sketch). Analogous to the proof of Lemma 4.8, using Lemma 4.9. \square

We close this section by stating again Theorem 4.2 and giving its proof.

Theorem 4.2 (Operational Correspondence). *Let P be a process such that $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P$. We have*

$$\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \approx^M \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta) \vdash \mathcal{F}^*(P)$$

Proof. By Lemmas 4.9 and 4.10 we know \mathcal{S} is an MST bisimulation. So, we need to show $(P, \mathcal{F}^*(P)) \in \mathcal{S}$. Let P_1 be such that $P_1\{\tilde{r}/\tilde{x}\} = P$ where $\tilde{r} = \text{rn}(P)$. Further, let $\sigma = \bigcup_{v \in \tilde{r}} \{v_1/v\}$, so we have $\sigma \in \text{index}(\tilde{r})$. Then, let $\tilde{r}_* = \text{nb}(\tilde{r} : \tilde{S})$ and $\tilde{x}_* = \text{nb}(\tilde{x} : \tilde{S})$ where $\tilde{r} : \tilde{S}$. Therefore, by Definition 4.8 and Table 7 we have $\mathcal{F}^*(P) \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}_*}^{\tilde{r}_*}(P_1)$. Finally, by Definition 4.27 we have $(P, \mathcal{F}^*(P)) \in \mathcal{S}$. \square

5 Extension with Labeled Choices

In this section, we briefly discuss the extension of $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$ with *labeled choices*. In session-based concurrency, labeled choices are implemented via branching and selection constructs, denoted $u_i \triangleright \{l_j : P_j\}_{j \in I}$ (for some finite set I) and $u_i \triangleleft l_j.Q$, respectively. Intuitively, a branching construct specifies the offer of a finite number of alternative behaviors (P_1, P_2, \dots) , whereas a selection construct signals the choice of one of them. Put differently, branching and selection implement deterministic choices via the input and output of labels; the reduction rule is as follows:

$$n \triangleleft l_j.Q \mid \bar{n} \triangleright \{l_i : P_i\}_{i \in I} \longrightarrow Q \mid P_j \quad (j \in I)$$

Branching and selection come with dedicated session types, denoted $\&\{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\oplus\{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}$, respectively, for some finite index set I . The corresponding typing rules are:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(BRA)} \\ \frac{\forall i \in I \quad \Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, u : S_i \vdash P_i \triangleright \diamond}{\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, u : \&\{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I} \vdash u \triangleright \{l_i : P_i\}_{i \in I} \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{(SEL)} \\ \frac{\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, u : S_j \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad j \in I}{\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, u : \oplus\{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I} \vdash u \triangleleft l_j.P \triangleright \diamond} \end{array}$$

Our decomposition strategy can be extended to account for labeled choice (and their types). This entails the extension of the type decomposition function $\mathcal{H}^*(\cdot)$ (Definition 4.1) and of the breakdown function $\mathcal{A}_x^k(P)$ (Table 5); this latter extension will be denoted $\mathcal{A}_x^{\boxplus k}(\cdot)$.

For simplicity, we focus on *finite* processes, without recursion / recursive session types. One of the challenges involved in extending our approach to account for both labeled choices and recursion concerns *non-uniform* termination: in a branching type $\&\{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}$ not only each S_i can be different, but some of them may denote recursive (non terminating) behaviors while the rest may not. Handling this potential non-uniformity requires care. We base our presentation on the corresponding breakdown for the case of the higher-order calculus HO, as presented in [2].

To uniformly handle the potential differences in a branching type $\&\{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}$, we break down branching and selection types as follows:

Definition 5.1 (Decomposing Types: Labeled Choices). We extend the type decomposition function $\mathcal{H}^*(\cdot)$ (Definition 4.1) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^*(\&\{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}) &= \&\{l_i : ?(\mathcal{H}^*(S_i)); \text{end}\}_{i \in I} \\ \mathcal{H}^*(\oplus\{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}) &= \oplus\{l_i : !\langle \mathcal{H}^*(S_i) \rangle; \text{end}\}_{i \in I} \end{aligned}$$

This decomposition follows the intuition that branching and selection correspond to the input and output of labels, respectively.

Definition 5.2 (Decomposing Processes: Labeled Choice). Given a $k \geq 0$ and a tuple of names \tilde{x} , the decomposition function $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^{\boxplus k}(\cdot)$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^{\boxplus k}(u_i \triangleright \{l_j : P_j\}_{j \in I}) &= c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_i \triangleright \{l_j : (\nu \tilde{c}_j) u_i?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{x}\tilde{y} \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}}^{\boxplus k+1}(P_j\{y_1/u_i\})\}_{j \in I} \\ \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^{\boxplus k}(u_i \triangleleft l_j.Q) &= c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_i \triangleleft l_j.(\nu \tilde{u} : \mathcal{H}^*(S_j)) u_i!\langle \tilde{u} \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{x} \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^{\boxplus k+1}(Q\{s_1/u_i\})\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{u} = (u_{i+1}, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{H}^*(S_j)|})$ and $\tilde{\tilde{u}} = (\overline{u_{i+1}}, \dots, \overline{u_{i+|\mathcal{H}^*(S_j)|}})$.

For the remaining constructs, $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^{\boxplus k}(\cdot)$ corresponds to $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\cdot)$ (Table 5).

Observe how, in the case of branching, once a particular branch l_i has been selected, we receive the names on which to provide sessions from the branch $\mathcal{H}^*(S_i)$; the corresponding selection process communicates these names. To account for the different session types of the branches S_i , the names involved in the decomposition are bound (i.e., hidden).

We illustrate the workings of $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}}^{\boxplus k}(\cdot)$ by means of the following example, adapted from [2]:

Example 5.1. Consider a mathematical server Q that offers clients two operations: addition and negation of integers. The server uses name u to implement the following session type:

$$S = \&\{\underbrace{\text{add} : ?(\text{int});?(\text{int});!\langle \text{int} \rangle;\text{end}}_{S_{\text{add}}}, \underbrace{\text{neg} : ?(\text{int});!\langle \text{int} \rangle;\text{end}}_{S_{\text{neg}}}\}$$

This way, the **add** branch receives two integers and sends over their sum; the **neg** branch has a single input of an integer followed by an output of its negation.

Let us consider a possible implementation for the server Q and for a client R that selects the first branch to add integers 16 and 26:

$$\begin{aligned}Q &\triangleq u \triangleright \{\underbrace{\text{add} : u?(a).u?(b).u!\langle a+b \rangle}_{Q_{\text{add}}}, \underbrace{\text{neg} : u?(a).u!\langle -a \rangle}_{Q_{\text{neg}}}\} \\ R &\triangleq \bar{u} \triangleleft \text{add}.\bar{u}!\langle \mathbf{16} \rangle.\bar{u}!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\bar{u}?(r)\end{aligned}$$

The composed process $P \triangleq (\nu u)(Q \mid R)$ can reduce as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}P &\longrightarrow (\nu u)(u?(a).u?(b).u!\langle a+b \rangle \mid \bar{u}!\langle \mathbf{16} \rangle.\bar{u}!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\bar{u}?(r)) \\ &\longrightarrow^2 (\nu u)(u!\langle \mathbf{16} + \mathbf{26} \rangle \mid \bar{u}?(r)) = P'\end{aligned}$$

First, following Definition 5.1, the decomposition of S is the minimal session type M , defined as follows:

$$M = \mathcal{H}^*(S) = \&\{\text{add} : ?((?(\text{int}), ?(\text{int}), !\langle \text{int} \rangle)), \text{neg} : ?((?(\text{int}), !\langle \text{int} \rangle))\}$$

Let us now discuss the decomposition of P . Using Definition 5.2 we have:

$$D = (\nu c_1, \dots, c_7)(c_1?().\overline{c_2}!\langle \rangle.\overline{c_3}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^{\boxplus 2}(Q\sigma_2) \mid \mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^{\boxplus 3}(R\sigma_2)) \quad (5)$$

where $\sigma_2 = \{u_1\bar{u}_1/u\bar{u}\}$. The breakdown of process Q is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^{\boxplus 2}(Q\sigma_2) &= c_2?().u_1 \triangleright \{\text{add} : (\nu \tilde{c}_j) u_1?(y_1, y_2, y_3).\overline{c_1}!\langle y_1, y_2, y_3 \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{y_1, y_2, y_3}^{\boxplus 1}(Q_{\text{add}}\{y_1/u_1\}), \\ &\quad \text{neg} : (\nu \tilde{c}_j) u_1?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_1}!\langle y_1, y_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{y_1, y_2}^{\boxplus 1}(Q_{\text{neg}}\{y_1/u_1\})\}\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_{y_1, y_2, y_3}^{\boxplus 1}(Q_{\text{add}}\{y_1/u_1\}) &= c_1?(y_1, y_2, y_3) \mid c_1?(y_1, y_2, y_3).y_1?(a).\overline{c_2}!\langle y_2, y_3, a \rangle \mid \\ &\quad c_2?(y_2, y_3, a).y_2?(b).\overline{c_3}!\langle y_3, a, b \rangle \mid c_3?(y_3, a, b).y_3!\langle a + b \rangle.c_4?() \mid c_4?() \\ \mathcal{A}_{y_1, y_2}^{\boxplus 1}(Q_{\text{neg}}\{y_1/u_1\}) &= c_1?(y_1, y_2) \mid c_1?(y_1, y_2).y_1?(a).\overline{c_2}!\langle y_2, a \rangle \mid \\ &\quad c_2?(y_2, a).y_2!\langle -a \rangle.\overline{c_3}!\langle \rangle \mid c_3?()\end{aligned}$$

In process $\mathcal{A}_{y_1, y_2, y_3}^{\boxplus 1}(Q_{\text{add}}\{y_1/u_1\})$, name u_1 implements M . Following the common trio structure, the first prefix awaits activation on c_2 . The next prefix mimics the branching action of Q on u_1 . Then, each branch consists of the input of the breakdown of the continuation of channel u , that is y_1, y_2, y_3 . This input does not have a counterpart in Q ; it is meant to synchronize with process $\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^{\boxplus 3}(R\sigma_2)$, the breakdown of the corresponding selection process.

In the bodies of the abstractions we break down Q_{add} and Q_{neg} , but not before adjusting the names on which the broken down processes provide the sessions. For this, we substitute u with y_1 in both processes, ensuring that the broken down names are bound by the input. By binding decomposed names in the input we account for different session types of the original name in branches, while preserving typability: this way the decomposition of different branches can use (i) the same names but typed with different minimal types and (ii) a different number of names, as it is the case in this example.

The decomposition of the client process R , which implements the selection, is as follows:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^{\boxplus 3}(R\sigma_2) = c_3?(\epsilon).\overline{u_1} \triangleleft \text{add} . (\nu u_2, u_3, u_4) \overline{u_1}!\langle u_2, u_3, u_4 \rangle.\overline{c_4}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^{\boxplus 4}(\overline{u_2}!\langle \mathbf{16} \rangle.\overline{u_2}!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\overline{u_2}?(r))$$

where:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^{\boxplus 4}(\overline{u_2}!\langle \mathbf{16} \rangle.\overline{u_2}!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\overline{u_2}?(r)) = c_4?().\overline{u_2}!\langle \mathbf{16} \rangle.\overline{c_5}!\langle \rangle \mid c_5?().\overline{u_3}!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\overline{c_6}!\langle \rangle \mid c_6?().\overline{u_4}?(r).\overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?()$$

After receiving the context on c_3 (empty in this case), the selection action on u_1 is mimicked; then, the breakdown of channel continuation, u_2, u_3, u_4 , that are locally bound, are sent along name u_1 . The intention is to use these names to connect the selected branch and the continuation of a selection process: the subprocess encapsulated in the branch will use (u_2, u_3, u_4) , while the dual names $(\overline{u_2}, \overline{u_3}, \overline{u_4})$ are present in the breakdown of the continuation.

Let us briefly examine the reductions of the decomposed process D in (5). First, c_1 , c_2 , and c_3 will synchronize. We have $D \rightarrow^4 D_1$, where

$$\begin{aligned}D_1 &= (\nu c_4 \dots c_7) (\nu u_1) (u_1 \triangleright \{\text{add} : (\nu \tilde{c}_j) u_1?(y_1, y_2, y_3).\overline{c_1}!\langle \tilde{y} \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{y_1, y_2, y_3}^{\boxplus 1}(Q_{\text{add}}\{y_1/u_1\}), \\ &\quad \text{neg} : (\nu \tilde{c}_j) u_1?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_1}!\langle y_1, y_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{y_1, y_2}^{\boxplus 1}(Q_{\text{neg}}\{y_1/u_1\})\} \\ &\quad \mid \overline{u_1} \triangleleft \text{add} . (\nu u_2, u_3, u_4) \overline{u_1}!\langle u_2, u_3, u_4 \rangle.\overline{c_4}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^{\boxplus 4}(\overline{u_2}!\langle \mathbf{16} \rangle.\overline{u_2}!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\overline{u_2}?(r)))\end{aligned}$$

Now, the processes chooses the label **add** on u_1 . The process D_1 will reduce further as $D_1 \rightarrow D_2 \rightarrow^2 D_3$, where:

$$\begin{aligned}D_2 &= (\nu \tilde{c}_j) u_1?(y_1, y_2, y_3).\overline{c_1}!\langle \tilde{y} \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{y_1, y_2, y_3}^{\boxplus 1}(Q_{\text{add}}\{y_1/u_1\}) \mid \\ &\quad (\nu u_2, u_3, u_4) \overline{u_1}!\langle u_2, u_3, u_4 \rangle.\overline{c_4}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^{\boxplus 4}(\overline{u_2}!\langle \mathbf{16} \rangle.\overline{u_2}!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\overline{u_2}?(r)) \\ D_3 &= \overline{u_2}?(a).\overline{c_2}!\langle u_3, u_4, a \rangle \mid c_2?(y_2, y_3, a).y_2?(b).\overline{c_3}!\langle y_3, a, b \rangle \mid \\ &\quad c_3?(y_3, a, b).y_3!\langle a + b \rangle.\overline{c_4}!\langle \rangle \mid \\ &\quad c_4?().\overline{u_2}!\langle \mathbf{16} \rangle.\overline{c_5}!\langle \rangle \mid c_5?().\overline{u_3}!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\overline{c_6}!\langle \rangle \mid c_6?().\overline{u_4}?(r).\overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?()\end{aligned}$$

Now, process D_3 can mimic the original transmission of the integer 16 on channel u_2 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}D_3 &\rightarrow \overline{c_2}!\langle \overline{u_3}, \overline{u_4}, \mathbf{16} \rangle \mid c_2?(y_2, y_3, a).y_2?(b).\overline{c_3}!\langle y_3, a, b \rangle \mid \\ &\quad c_3?(y_3, a, b).y_3!\langle a + b \rangle.\overline{c_4}!\langle \rangle \mid c_4?() \mid \\ &\quad \overline{c_5}!\langle \rangle \mid c_5?().\overline{u_3}!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\overline{c_6}!\langle \rangle \mid c_6?().\overline{u_4}?(r).\overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?() = D_4\end{aligned}$$

Finally, D_4 reduces to D_5 as follows:

$$D_4 \longrightarrow^5 \bar{u}_4! \langle a + b \rangle . \bar{c}_4! \langle \rangle \mid c_4?() \mid u_4?(r) . \bar{c}_7! \langle \rangle \mid c_7?() = D_5$$

This way, the steps from D to D_5 attest to the fact that our extended decomposition correctly simulates the steps from P to P' .

6 Related Work

Closely related work has been already discussed throughout the paper. In this section, we comment on other related literature.

A source of inspiration for our developments is the trios decomposition by Parrow [18], which he studied for an untyped π -calculus with replication; in contrast, π processes are typed and feature recursion. We stress that our goal is to clarify the role of sequentiality in session types by using processes with MSTs, which lack sequentiality. While Parrow’s approach elegantly induces processes typable with MSTs (and suggests a clean approach to establish dynamic correctness), defining trios decompositions for π is just one path towards our goal.

The present work differs significantly with respect to our previous work [3, 2], which used HO as source language. Session communication in HO is based on abstraction-passing, whereas here we focus on the name-passing calculus π . This difference has several ramifications. While in HO propagators carry abstractions, in our case propagators are binding and carry names. Also, names must be decomposed and propagating them requires care. Further novelties appear when decomposing processes with recursion, which require a dedicated collection of *recursive trios*; in contrast, an explicit construct for recursion is not present in HO. The proof of dynamic correctness for π shares some similarities with the same proof for HO, given in [2]; however, the technical details of moving from higher-order concurrency to first-order concurrency are substantial—from the behavioral equivalences used to the construction of the required bisimilarities (cf. Section 4.8).

Our work aims to understand session types in terms of themselves, by considering to the subclass of session types without sequentiality, as defined by MSTs. Prior works have related session types with *different* type systems—see, e.g., [11, 5, 6, 7, 8]. Kobayashi [11] was the first to define a formal relationship between session types and *usage types*, expressed as typed encodings of processes; this relationship was thoroughly studied by Dardha et al. [5, 6, 4] (see below). Demangeon and Honda [7] connect a linearly-typed π -calculus with subtyping and a session-typed calculus via a full abstraction result. Both works rely on convenient constructs in the target language (e.g., case constructors and variant types) to achieve correct encodability. The work of Gay et al. [8] addresses a similar problem but by adopting a π -calculus without such additional features: they consider the correct encodability of session types into a generic type system for a simple π -calculus. Their work demonstrates that the translation of session types for branching and selection in the presence of subtyping is a challenging endeavor.

The work by Dardha et al. [5, 6, 4] develops further the translation first suggested by Kobayashi [11]. They compile a session π -calculus down into a π -calculus with the linear type system of [12] extended with variant types. They represent sequentiality using a continuation-passing style (CPS): a session type is interpreted as a linear type carrying a pair, consisting of the original payload type and a new linear channel type, to be used for ensuing interactions. The differences between this CPS approach and our work are also technical: the approach in [5] thus involves translations connecting *two* different π -calculi and *two* different type systems. In contrast, our approach based on MSTs justifies sequentiality using a single typed process framework. Another difference concerns process recursion and recursive session types: while the works [5, 6] consider only finite processes (no recursion nor recursive types), the work [4] considers recursive session types as a way of supporting replicated processes (a specific class of unrestricted behaviors). In contrast, the decompositions we have considered here support full process recursion.

Despite these concrete differences, it is interesting to compare our approach and the CPS approach. To substantiate our comparisons, we introduce some selected notions for the linearly-

typed π -calculus considered by Dardha et al. (the reader is referred to [6] for a thorough description and technical results).

Definition 6.1 (Linearly-Typed π -calculus Processes [6]). The syntax of processes P, Q, \dots , values v, v', \dots , and of linear types τ, τ', \dots is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Processes } P, Q, &:= x!\langle \tilde{v} \rangle.P \mid x?(y).P \mid (\nu v) P \mid \mathbf{0} \mid P \mid Q \mid \text{case } v \text{ of } \{l_{i_}(x_i) \triangleright P_i\}_{i \in I} \\ \text{Values } v, v' &:= x \mid \star \mid l_v \\ \text{Types } \tau, \tau' &:= l_o[\tilde{\tau}] \mid l_i[\tilde{\tau}] \mid l_{\#}[\tilde{\tau}] \mid \emptyset[] \mid \#[\tilde{\tau}] \mid \langle l_i : \tau_i \rangle_{i \in I} \mid \mathbf{Unit} \end{aligned}$$

At the level of processes, the main difference with respect to the syntax of $\mathbf{HO}\pi$ in Figure 2 is the case construct ‘**case** v **of** $\{l_{i_}(x_i) \triangleright P_i\}_{i \in I}$ ’, which together with the variant value ‘ l_v ’ implement a form of deterministic choice. This choice is decoupled from a synchronization: indeed, the process **case** $l_{j_}v$ **of** $\{l_{i_}(x_i) \triangleright P_i\}_{i \in I}$ (with $j \in I$) autonomously reduces to $P_j\{v/x_j\}$. At the level of types, the grammar above first defines types $l_o[\tilde{\tau}]$, $l_i[\tilde{\tau}]$, and $l_{\#}[\tilde{\tau}]$ for the linear exchange messages of type $\tilde{\tau}$: output, input, and both output and input, respectively. Then, the types $\emptyset[]$ and $\#[\tilde{\tau}]$ are assigned to channels without any capabilities and with arbitrary capabilities, respectively. Finally, we have the variant type $\langle l_i : \tau_i \rangle_{i \in I}$ associated to the case construct and the unit type **Unit**.

As already mentioned, the key idea of the CPS approach is to represent one message exchange using *two* channels: one is the message itself, the other is a continuation for the next sequential action in the session. We illustrate this approach by example.

Example 6.1 (The CPS Approach, By Example). Consider the session type S and the processes Q and R from Example 5.1. Under the CPS approach, the session type S is represented as linear types as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket S \rrbracket &= l_i[\langle \text{add} : \llbracket S_{\text{add}} \rrbracket, \text{neg} : \llbracket S_{\text{neg}} \rrbracket \rangle] & \llbracket S_{\text{add}} \rrbracket &= l_i[\text{int}, l_i[\text{int}, l_o[\text{int}, \emptyset[]]]] \\ & & \llbracket S_{\text{neg}} \rrbracket &= l_i[\text{int}, l_o[\text{int}, \emptyset[]]] \end{aligned}$$

This way, sequentiality in S arises in $\llbracket S \rrbracket$ as nesting of pairs—the later that an action appears in a session type, the deeper it will appear in the corresponding linear type. Accordingly, the encoding of session-typed processes as linear processes, denoted $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_f$, is illustrated below; the parameter f records continuations:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket P \rrbracket_{\emptyset} &= (\nu u) \llbracket Q \mid R \rrbracket_{\emptyset} = (\nu u) \llbracket Q \rrbracket_{\emptyset} \mid \llbracket R \rrbracket_{\emptyset} \\ \llbracket Q \rrbracket_{\emptyset} &= u?(y).\text{case } y \text{ of } \{\text{add_}c_1 \triangleright \llbracket Q_{\text{add}} \rrbracket_{u \rightarrow c_1}, \text{neg_}c_1 \triangleright \llbracket Q_{\text{neg}} \rrbracket_{u \rightarrow c_1}\} \\ \llbracket Q_{\text{add}} \rrbracket_{u \rightarrow c_1} &= c_1?(a, c_2).c_2?(b, c_3).(\nu c_4) c_3!\langle a + b, c_4 \rangle.\mathbf{0} \\ \llbracket Q_{\text{neg}} \rrbracket_{u \rightarrow c_1} &= c_1?(a, c_2).(\nu c_3) c_2!\langle -a, c_3 \rangle.\mathbf{0} \\ \llbracket R \rrbracket_{\emptyset} &= (\nu c_1) u!\langle \text{add_}c_1 \rangle.(\nu c_2) c_1!\langle \mathbf{16}, c_2 \rangle.(\nu c_3) c_2!\langle \mathbf{26}, c_3 \rangle.c_3?(r).\mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

Observe how the branching construct in Q is encoded using two constructs: an input prefix immediately followed by a case construct. Also, notice the use of restrictions (νc_i) (with $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$) in the encoding of output prefixes: this is crucial to avoid interferences and ensure that session communications are mimicked in the intended order.

Based on the above example, we may identify two sources of comparison between our decompositions into MSTs and the CPS approach. At the level of types, there is clear resemblance between MSTs and the class of linear types needed to encode finite session types in the CPS approach. At the level of processes, both approaches use a similar principle, namely to generate fresh names to encode the sequential structure of sessions. While the CPS approach follows a *dynamic* discipline to generate such names (i.e., they are generated by the encoding of output-like actions), the decomposition approach follows a *static discipline*, i.e., fresh names are generated based on the length of the source session types.




Figure 18: Summary of expressiveness results for $\text{HO}\pi$. Solid lines indicate correct encodings and decompositions; dotted lines indicate sub-languages.

7 Concluding Remarks

We studied minimal session types (MSTs) for π —the sub-language of $\text{HO}\pi$ [13, 15] with first-order communication, recursion, and recursive types—and obtained new minimality results based on two different decompositions of processes. Introduced in [3], MSTs express a specific form of minimality, which eschews from sequentiality in types; hence, our minimality results for π mean that sequentiality in types is a convenient and yet not indispensable feature, as it can be represented by name-passing processes while remaining in a session-typed setting.

Following the approach for HO [3, 2], which is inspired by Parrow’s trios processes [18], we defined two process decompositions for π . They use type information to transform processes typable with standard session types into processes typable with MSTs. The first decomposition, denoted $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$, is obtained by composing existing encodability results and the decomposition / minimality result for HO ; the second decomposition, denoted $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$, optimizes the first one by (i) removing redundant synchronizations and (ii) using the native support of recursion in π . For both decompositions we establish the minimality result (cf. Theorems 3.1 and 4.1), which is actually a result of static correctness (i.e., preservation of typability). The gains in moving from $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ to $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$ can be accounted for in very precise terms, as attested by Lemma 4.1. For the optimized decomposition $\mathcal{F}^*(\cdot)$ we proved also a dynamic correctness result (Theorem 4.2), which formally attests that a process and its decomposition are behaviorally equivalent. This result thus encompasses a result of operational correspondence; its proof leverages existing characterizations of contextual equivalence for π [14], and adapts them to the case of MSTs. This way, our technical results together confirm the significance of MSTs; they also indicate that a minimality result is independent from the kind of communicated objects, either abstractions (functions from names to processes, as studied in [3, 2]) or names (as studied here).

Sequentiality is the key distinguishing feature in the specification of message-passing programs using session types. Our minimality results for π and HO should not be interpreted as meaning that sequentiality in session types is redundant in *modeling and specifying* processes; rather, we claim that it is not an essential notion to *verifying* them. Because we can type-check session typed processes using type systems that do not directly support sequentiality in types, our decompositions suggest a technique for implementing session types into languages whose type systems do not support sequentiality.

All in all, besides settling a question left open in [3, 2], our work deepens our understanding about the essential mechanisms in session-based concurrency and about the connection between the first-order and higher-order paradigms in the typed setting. Figure 18 depicts the formal connections between $\text{HO}\pi$ and its sub-languages, based on: (i) the mutual encodability results between π and HO [13, 15]; (ii) the minimality result for HO [3, 2]; and (iii) the decompositions and minimality results for π obtained here.

There are several interesting items for future work. First, it would be interesting to consider asynchronous communication and subtyping in the context of our decompositions, both first-order and higher-order. Second, following the discussion in Section 6, it would be insightful to formulate a “hybrid” approach that combines and unifies the CPS approach [11, 5, 6] and our approach based on MSTs. Strengths of our approach include direct support for recursion and recursive types, and dynamic correctness guarantees given in terms of well-studied behavioral equivalences; on the other hand, the CPS approach offers a simple alternative to represent non-uniform session structures, such as those present in labeled choices.

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to the anonymous reviewers and to Dan Frumin for useful comments and suggestions, which helped us to improve our paper. This research has been supported by the Dutch Research Council (NWO) under project No. 016.Vidi.189.046 (‘Unifying Correctness for Communicating Software’).

References

- [1] A. Arslanagic, A. Palamariuc, and J. A. Pérez. Minimal session types for the π -calculus. In N. Veltri, N. Benton, and S. Ghilezan, editors, *PPDP 2021: 23rd International Symposium on Principles and Practice of Declarative Programming, Tallinn, Estonia, September 6-8, 2021*, pages 12:1–12:15. ACM, 2021.
- [2] A. Arslanagic, J. A. Pérez, and D. Frumin. A minimal formulation of session types. *CoRR*, abs/2301.05301, 2023.
- [3] A. Arslanagic, J. A. Pérez, and E. Voogd. Minimal session types (pearl). In A. F. Donaldson, editor, *33rd European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, ECOOP 2019, July 15-19, 2019, London, United Kingdom*, volume 134 of *LIPICs*, pages 23:1–23:28. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019.
- [4] O. Dardha. Recursive session types revisited. In M. Carbone, editor, *Proceedings Third Workshop on Behavioural Types, BEAT 2014, Rome, Italy, 1st September 2014*, volume 162 of *EPTCS*, pages 27–34, 2014.
- [5] O. Dardha, E. Giachino, and D. Sangiorgi. Session types revisited. In *Proc. of PPDP 2012*, pages 139–150. ACM, 2012.
- [6] O. Dardha, E. Giachino, and D. Sangiorgi. Session types revisited. *Inf. Comput.*, 256:253–286, 2017.
- [7] R. Demangeon and K. Honda. Full abstraction in a subtyped pi-calculus with linear types. In *Proc. of CONCUR 2011*, volume 6901 of *LNCS*, pages 280–296. Springer, 2011.
- [8] S. J. Gay, N. Gesbert, and A. Ravara. Session types as generic process types. In J. Borgström and S. Crafa, editors, *Proceedings Combined 21st International Workshop on Expressiveness in Concurrency and 11th Workshop on Structural Operational Semantics, EXPRESS 2014, and 11th Workshop on Structural Operational Semantics, SOS 2014, Rome, Italy, 1st September 2014.*, volume 160 of *EPTCS*, pages 94–110, 2014.
- [9] K. Honda. Types for Dyadic Interaction. In E. Best, editor, *CONCUR’93*, volume 715 of *LNCS*, pages 509–523. Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [10] K. Honda, V. T. Vasconcelos, and M. Kubo. Language primitives and type disciplines for structured communication-based programming. In *ESOP’98*, volume 1381 of *LNCS*, pages 22–138. Springer, 1998.

- [11] N. Kobayashi. Type systems for concurrent programs. In B. K. Aichernig and T. S. E. Maibaum, editors, *Formal Methods at the Crossroads. From Panacea to Foundational Support, 10th Anniversary Colloquium of UNU/IIST, the International Institute for Software Technology of The United Nations University, Lisbon, Portugal, March 18-20, 2002, Revised Papers*, volume 2757 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 439–453. Springer, 2002.
- [12] N. Kobayashi, B. C. Pierce, and D. N. Turner. Linearity and the Pi-Calculus. *TOPLAS*, 21(5):914–947, Sept. 1999.
- [13] D. Kouzapas, J. A. Pérez, and N. Yoshida. On the relative expressiveness of higher-order session processes. In P. Thiemann, editor, *Programming Languages and Systems - 25th European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2016, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2016, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, April 2-8, 2016, Proceedings*, volume 9632 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 446–475. Springer, 2016.
- [14] D. Kouzapas, J. A. Pérez, and N. Yoshida. Characteristic bisimulation for higher-order session processes. *Acta Inf.*, 54(3):271–341, 2017.
- [15] D. Kouzapas, J. A. Pérez, and N. Yoshida. On the relative expressiveness of higher-order session processes. *Inf. Comput.*, 268, 2019.
- [16] D. Kouzapas and N. Yoshida. Globally governed session semantics. *LMCS*, 10(4), 2014.
- [17] D. Kouzapas, N. Yoshida, R. Hu, and K. Honda. On asynchronous eventful session semantics. *MSCS*, 2015.
- [18] J. Parrow. Trios in concert. In G. D. Plotkin, C. Stirling, and M. Tofte, editors, *Proof, Language, and Interaction, Essays in Honour of Robin Milner*, pages 623–638. The MIT Press, 2000. Online version, dated July 22, 1996, available at <http://user.it.uu.se/~joachim/trios.pdf>.
- [19] D. Sangiorgi. *Expressing Mobility in Process Algebras: First-Order and Higher Order Paradigms*. PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1992.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Preliminaries	3
2.1	HO π (and its Sub-languages HO and π)	3
2.2	Session Types for HO π	5
2.3	Typed Encodings between π and HO	7
2.4	Minimal Session Types and the Minimality Result for HO	9
3	Decompose by Composing	14
3.1	Key Ideas	14
3.1.1	Output and Input Processes	15
3.1.2	Recursion	16
3.2	Formal Definitions	17
3.3	Examples	19
3.4	Results	24
4	An Optimized Decomposition	25
4.1	Motivation: Suboptimal Features of “Decompose by Composing”	25
4.2	Preliminaries	26
4.3	The Optimized Decomposition	28
4.3.1	The Optimized Breakdown Function	28
4.3.2	Handling P in $\mu X.P$	30
4.4	Examples	31
4.5	Measuring the Optimization	32
4.6	Static Correctness	33
4.7	Dynamic Correctness	34
4.7.1	Preliminaries	34
4.7.2	MST-bisimilarity and Main Result	37
4.8	Proof of Theorem 4.2	39
4.8.1	Preliminaries	39
4.8.2	The relation \mathcal{S} : Ingredients and Properties	40
5	Extension with Labeled Choices	45
6	Related Work	48
7	Concluding Remarks	50
A	Proofs	54
A.1	Auxiliary Results	54
A.2	Proof of Theorem 3.1	54
A.3	Proof of Lemma 4.1	55
A.4	Proof of Lemma 4.2	56
A.5	Proof of Theorem 4.1 (Minimality Result, Optimized)	74
A.6	Proof of Lemma 4.7	75

A Proofs

A.1 Auxiliary Results

We rely on the following properties of the type system in Section 2.2.

Lemma A.1 (Substitution Lemma). $\Gamma; \Delta, x : S \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ and $u \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ implies $\Gamma; \Delta, u : S \vdash P\{u/x\} \triangleright \diamond$.

Lemma A.2 (Shared environment weakening). If $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ then $\Gamma, u : \langle C \rangle; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$.

Lemma A.3 (Shared environment strengthening). If $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ and $u \notin \text{fn}(P)$ then $\Gamma \setminus u; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$.

A.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Lemma 3.1 (Typability of Breakdown). Let P be an initialized π process. If $\Gamma; \Delta, \Delta_\mu \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$, then $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma), \Phi'; \mathcal{H}(\Delta), \Theta' \vdash \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^k(P)_g \triangleright \diamond$, where:

- $k > 0$;
- $\tilde{r} = \text{dom}(\Delta_\mu)$;
- $\Phi' = \prod_{r \in \tilde{r}} c^r : \langle \langle ?(\mathcal{R}_o(\Delta_\mu(r))) \rangle; \text{end} \rangle$;
- $\text{balanced}(\Theta')$ with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta') = \{c_k, c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil - 1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P \rceil - 1}}\}$$

such that $\Theta'(c_k) = ?(\cdot); \text{end}$.

Proof.

$$\Gamma; \Delta, \Delta_\mu \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad (\text{Assumption}) \quad (6)$$

$$\langle \Gamma \rangle^1; \langle \Delta \rangle^1, \langle \Delta_\mu \rangle^1 \vdash \llbracket P \rrbracket_g^1 \triangleright \diamond \quad (\text{Theorem 5.1 [15], (10)}) \quad (7)$$

$$\mathcal{G}(\langle \Gamma \rangle^1), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\langle \Delta \rangle^1), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^k(\llbracket P \rrbracket_g^1) \triangleright \diamond \quad (\text{Lemma 2.1, (11)}) \quad (8)$$

$$\llbracket \mathcal{G}(\langle \Gamma \rangle^1) \rrbracket^2, \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket^2; \llbracket \mathcal{G}(\langle \Delta \rangle^1) \rrbracket^2, \llbracket \Theta \rrbracket^2 \vdash \llbracket \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^k(\llbracket P \rrbracket_g^1) \rrbracket^2 \triangleright \diamond \quad (\text{Theorem 5.2 [15], (12)}) \quad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{H}(\Gamma), \Phi'; \mathcal{H}(\Delta), \Theta' \vdash \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^k(P)_g \triangleright \diamond \quad (\text{Definition of } \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^k(\cdot)_g, \quad (10)$$

Definitions 3.3 and 3.6, (4))

□

Theorem 3.1 (Minimality Result for π). Let P be a closed π process, with $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P)$ and $\tilde{v} = \text{rn}(P)$. If $\Gamma; \Delta, \Delta_\mu \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$, where Δ_μ only involves recursive session types, then $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma\sigma); \mathcal{H}(\Delta\sigma), \mathcal{H}(\Delta_\mu\sigma) \vdash \mathcal{F}(P) \triangleright \diamond$, where $\sigma = \{\text{init}(\tilde{u})/\tilde{u}\}$.

Proof.

$$\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad (\text{Assumption}) \quad (11)$$

$$\Gamma\sigma; \Delta\sigma \vdash P\sigma \triangleright \diamond \quad (\text{Lemma A.1, (6)}) \quad (12)$$

$$\mathcal{H}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi'; \mathcal{H}(\Delta\sigma), \Theta' \vdash \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^k(P\sigma)_g \triangleright \diamond \quad (P \text{ is initialized, Lemma 3.1}) \quad (13)$$

To complete the proof, let us construct a well-formed derivation tree

$$(\text{PAR}, |\tilde{v}| - 1 \text{ times}) \frac{\text{for } r \in \tilde{v} \quad \mathcal{H}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi'; \tilde{r} : \mathcal{H}(S) \vdash c^r?(b).(\nu s) (b!\langle s \rangle. \overline{s}!\langle \tilde{r} \rangle) \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{H}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi'; \mathcal{H}(\Delta_\mu\sigma) \vdash \prod_{r \in \tilde{v}} P^r} \quad (14)$$

where $S = \Delta_\mu(r)$. By the definition of Φ' we have $c^r : \langle \langle ?(\mathcal{R}_o(\Delta_\mu(r))); \text{end} \rangle \rangle \in \Phi'$ and by Definition 3.3 we have $\mathcal{R}_o(\Delta_\mu(r)) = \mathcal{H}(S)$, so the right-hand of (14) is well-typed.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{(NIL)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi'; \mathcal{H}(\Delta\sigma) \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \\
\text{(SEND)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi'; \mathcal{H}(\Delta\sigma), \overline{c_k}! \langle \cdot \rangle; \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_k}! \langle \cdot \rangle} \quad (14) \\
\text{(PAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi'; \mathcal{H}(\Delta\sigma), \mathcal{H}(\Delta_\mu\sigma), \overline{c_k}! \langle \cdot \rangle; \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_k}! \langle \cdot \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \prod_{r \in \tilde{v}} P^r} \\
\text{(PAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi'; \mathcal{H}(\Delta\sigma), \mathcal{H}(\Delta_\mu\sigma), \overline{c_k}! \langle \cdot \rangle; \text{end}, \Theta' \vdash \overline{c_k}! \langle \cdot \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \prod_{r \in \tilde{v}} P^r \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^k(P\sigma)_g \triangleright \diamond} \\
\text{(POLYRESS)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}(\Gamma\sigma); \mathcal{H}(\Delta\sigma), \mathcal{H}(\Delta_\mu\sigma) \vdash (\nu \tilde{c}) (\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\prod_{r \in \tilde{v}} P^r \mid \overline{c_k}! \langle \cdot \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^k(P\sigma)_g)}
\end{array} \quad (15)$$

□

A.3 Proof of Lemma 4.1

Lemma 4.1. *If P is in normal form then $\#(P) \geq \frac{5}{3} \cdot \#^*(P)$.*

Proof. Because $\#(P) \geq \mathcal{J}P + 2 \cdot |\text{brn}(P)|$ (Definition 4.9), it suffices to show that

$$\mathcal{J}P + 2 \cdot |\text{brn}(P)| \geq \frac{5}{3} \cdot \#^*(P)$$

The proof is by induction on structure of P . We show one base case (output prefix followed by inaction) and three inductive cases (input, restriction, and parallel composition); other cases are similar:

- Case $P = u!\langle x \rangle. \mathbf{0}$. Then $\mathcal{J}P = 4$, $|\text{brn}(P)| = 0$, and $\mathcal{J}P^* = 2$. So, we have $\mathcal{J}P + 2 \cdot |\text{brn}(P)| \geq \frac{5}{3} \cdot \#^*(P)$.
- Case $P = u!\langle x \rangle. P'$ with $P' \not\equiv \mathbf{0}$. By IH we know $\mathcal{J}P' + |\text{brn}(P')| \geq \frac{5}{3} \cdot \#^*(P')$. We know $\mathcal{J}P = \mathcal{J}P' + 3$, $\mathcal{J}P^* = \mathcal{J}P'^* + 1$ and $\#_X(P) = \#_X(P')$. So, $\mathcal{J}P' + 2 \cdot |\text{brn}(P')| + 3 \geq \frac{5}{3} \cdot \#^*(P) + 1 > \frac{5}{3} \cdot (\#^*(P) + 1)$.
- Case $P = (\nu r : S) P'$ with $\text{tr}(S)$. Then $\mathcal{J}P = \mathcal{J}P'$ (by Definition 3.2) and $|\text{brn}(P)| = |\text{brn}(P')| + 1$. Further, we have $\#_X(P) = \#_X(P')$ and $\mathcal{J}P^* = \mathcal{J}P'^* + 1$. Now, by IH we can conclude that $\mathcal{J}P + 2 \cdot (|\text{brn}(P)| + 1) \geq \frac{5}{3} \cdot \#^*(P) + 1 > \frac{5}{3} \cdot (\#^*(P) + 1)$.
- Case $P = P_1 \mid \dots \mid P_n$. By IH we know

$$\mathcal{J}P_i + 2 \cdot |\text{brn}(P_i)| \geq \frac{5}{3} \cdot \#^*(P_i) \quad (16)$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. We know $\mathcal{J}P = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{J}P_i + (n-1)$, $|\text{brn}(P)| = \sum_{i=1}^n |\text{brn}(P_i)|$, and $\mathcal{J}P^* = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{J}P_i^* + (n-1)$. So, we should show

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{J}P_i + 2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n |\text{brn}(P_i)| + (n-1) \geq \frac{5}{3} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \#^*(P_i) + (n-1) \right) \quad (17)$$

That is,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\mathcal{J}P_i + 2 \cdot |\text{brn}(P_i)| + 1) \geq \frac{5}{3} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n (\#^*(P_i) + 1)$$

Equivalent to

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\mathcal{J}P_i + 2 \cdot |\text{brn}(P_i)| + 1) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{5}{3} \cdot (\#^*(P_i) + 1) \right)$$

We show that for each $i = \{1, \dots, n\}$ the following holds:

$$\textcolor{red}{\lceil} P_i \textcolor{red}{\rceil} + 2 \cdot |\text{brn}(P_i)| + 1 \geq \frac{5}{3} \cdot (\#^*(P_i) + 1)$$

That is

$$A = \frac{\textcolor{red}{\lceil} P_i \textcolor{red}{\rceil} + 2 \cdot |\text{brn}(P_i)| + 1}{\#^*(P_i) + 1} \geq \frac{5}{3}$$

As P is in normal form, we know that $P_i \equiv \alpha.P'_i$ where α is some prefix. So, by Definition 3.2 and Definition 4.3 we know that for some p^* and p we have $\textcolor{blue}{\lceil} P_i \textcolor{blue}{\rceil}^* = p^* + \textcolor{blue}{\lceil} P'_i \textcolor{blue}{\rceil}^*$, $\#_X(P_i) = \#_X(P'_i)$, and $\textcolor{red}{\lceil} P_i \textcolor{red}{\rceil} = p + \textcolor{red}{\lceil} P'_i \textcolor{red}{\rceil}$. We can distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $P'_i \neq \mathbf{0}$ and (ii) otherwise. We consider sub-case (i). By (16) we have:

$$A \geq \frac{\frac{5}{3} \cdot \#^*(P'_i) + p + 1}{\#^*(P'_i) + p^* + 1} \geq \frac{5}{3}$$

We need to find a prefix α such that p and $\frac{p}{p^*}$ are the least. We notice that for the output prefix we have $p = 3$ and $\frac{p}{p^*} = \frac{3}{1}$. So, the following holds

$$\frac{\frac{5}{3} \cdot \#^*(P'_i) + 4}{\#^*(P'_i) + 2} = \frac{5}{3} \cdot \frac{\#^*(P'_i) + \frac{12}{5}}{\#^*(P'_i) + 2} \geq \frac{5}{3}$$

Now, we consider sub-case (ii) when $P'_i = \mathbf{0}$. In this case we have $\textcolor{red}{\lceil} P'_i \textcolor{red}{\rceil} + 2 \cdot \text{brn}(P'_i) = \#^*(P'_i) = 1$. We pick p and p^* as in the previous sub-case. So, we have

$$\frac{\textcolor{red}{\lceil} P_i \textcolor{red}{\rceil} + 2 \cdot |\text{brn}(P_i)| + 1}{\#^*(P_i) + 1} = \frac{1 + 3 + 1}{2 + 1} = \frac{5}{3}$$

We can then conclude that inequality (17) holds. □

A.4 Proof of Lemma 4.2

Lemma A.4. *Let \tilde{r} and S be tuple of channel names and a recursive session type, respectively. If $\tilde{r} : \mathcal{R}_o^*(!\langle C \rangle; S)$ and $k = \iota(!\langle C \rangle; S)$ then $r_k : \mu\mathbf{t}.!\langle \mathcal{H}^*(C) \rangle; \mathbf{t}$.*

Lemma A.5 (Typing Broken-down Variables). *If $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash z_i \triangleright C$ then $\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta) \vdash \tilde{z} \triangleright \mathcal{H}^*(C)$ where $\tilde{z} = (z_i, \dots, z_{i+|\mathcal{H}^*(C)|-1})$.*

Lemma 4.2 (Typability of Auxiliary Breakdown: $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_y^k(\cdot)_g$). *Let P be an initialized process. If $\Gamma \cdot X : \Delta_\mu; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ then:*

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta \vdash \hat{\mathcal{A}}_y^k(P)_g \triangleright \diamond \quad (k > 0)$$

where

- $\tilde{x} \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$ such that $\Delta \setminus \tilde{x} = \emptyset$;
- $\tilde{y} = \tilde{v} \cdot \tilde{m}$, where $\tilde{m} = \text{codom}(g)$ and \tilde{v} is such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\tilde{v}, \tilde{x})$ holds;
- $\Theta = \Theta_\mu, \Theta_X(g)$ where

$$\text{dom}(\Theta_\mu) = \{c_k^r, c_{k+1}^r, \dots, c_{k+\textcolor{blue}{\lceil} P \textcolor{blue}{\rceil}^* - 1}^r\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}^r}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\textcolor{blue}{\lceil} P \textcolor{blue}{\rceil}^* - 1}^r}\}$$

– Let $\tilde{N} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_\mu \cdot \Delta))(\tilde{y})$. Then

$$\Theta_\mu(c_k^r) = \begin{cases} \mu t.?(\tilde{N}); \mathbf{t} & \text{if } g \neq \emptyset \\ \langle \tilde{N} \rangle & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

– $\text{balanced}(\Theta_\mu)$

– $\Theta_X(g) = \bigcup_{X \in \text{dom}(g)} c_X^r : \langle \tilde{M}_X \rangle$ where $\tilde{M}_X = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_\mu))(g(X))$.

Proof. By induction on the structure of P . We consider five cases, taking $g \neq \emptyset$; the analysis when $g = \emptyset$ is similar.

1. Case $P = X$. The only rule that can be applied here is RVAR:

$$(\text{RVAR}) \frac{}{\Gamma \cdot X : \Delta; \Delta \vdash X \triangleright \diamond} \quad (18)$$

Let $\tilde{x} = \emptyset$ as $\text{fn}(P) = \emptyset$. So, $\tilde{y} = \tilde{m}$ where $\tilde{m} = g(X)$. Since $\llbracket X \rrbracket^* = 1$ we have $\Theta_\mu = \{c_k^r : \mu t.?(\tilde{N}); \mathbf{t}\}$ where $\tilde{N} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta))(\tilde{y})$. In this case $\Delta_\mu = \Delta$, thus $\tilde{N} = \tilde{M}$. We shall then prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus x); \Theta \vdash \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}}^k(X)_g \triangleright \diamond \quad (19)$$

By Table 6 we have:

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}}^k(X)_g = \mu X. c_k^r ?(\tilde{y}). c_X^r !\langle \tilde{y} \rangle. X$$

The following tree proves this case:

$$\begin{array}{c} (\text{RVAR}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus x), X : \Theta; \Theta \vdash X} \quad (\text{POLYSEND}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus x), X : \Theta; \tilde{y} : \tilde{M} \vdash \tilde{y} \triangleright \tilde{M}} \\ (\text{REQ}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus x), X : \Theta; c_X^r : \langle \tilde{M} \rangle, \tilde{y} : \tilde{M} \vdash c_X^r !\langle \tilde{y} \rangle. X} \end{array} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} (\text{POLYSEND}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus x), X : \Theta; \tilde{y} : \tilde{M} \vdash \tilde{y} \triangleright \tilde{M}} \\ (\text{RCV}) \frac{(20)}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus x), X : \Theta; \Theta \vdash c_k^r ?(\tilde{y}). c_X^r !\langle \tilde{y} \rangle. X \triangleright \diamond} \\ (\text{REC}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus x); \Theta \vdash \mu X. c_k^r ?(\tilde{y}). c_X^r !\langle \tilde{y} \rangle. X \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (21)$$

where $\Theta = \Theta_\mu, \overline{c_X^r} : \mu t.!(\tilde{M}); \mathbf{t}$.

2. Case $P = u_i !\langle z_j \rangle. P'$. Let $u_i : C$. We distinguish three sub-cases: (i) $C = S = \mu t.!(C_z); S'$, (ii) $C = S = !\langle C_z \rangle; S'$, and (iii) $C = \langle C_z \rangle$. We consider first two sub-cases, as (iii) is shown similarly. The only rule that can be applied here is SEND:

$$(\text{SEND}) \frac{\Gamma \cdot X : \Delta_\mu; \Delta \cdot u_i : S' \vdash P' \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma \cdot X : \Delta_\mu; \Delta_z \vdash z_j \triangleright C}{\Gamma \cdot X : \Delta_\mu; \Delta \cdot u_i : S \cdot \Delta_z \vdash u_i !\langle z_j \rangle. P' \triangleright \diamond} \quad (22)$$

Then, by IH on the right assumption of (22) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}'); \Theta' \vdash \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P')_g \triangleright \diamond \quad (23)$$

where $\tilde{x}' \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$ such that $(\Delta, r : S') \setminus \tilde{x}' = \emptyset$, and $\tilde{y}' = \tilde{v}' \cup \tilde{m}$ where $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta, r : S'}(\tilde{v}', \tilde{x}')$. Also, $\Theta' = \Theta'_\mu, \Theta_X$ where Θ'_μ such that $\text{balanced}(\Theta'_\mu)$ with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta'_\mu) = \{c_{k+1}^r, c_{k+2}^r, \dots, c_{k+\llbracket P' \rrbracket^*+1}^r\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+2}^r}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\llbracket P' \rrbracket^*-1}^r}, \overline{c_{k+\llbracket P' \rrbracket^*+1}^r}\}$$

and $\Theta'_\mu(c_{k+1}^r) = \mu t.?(\tilde{N}'); \mathbf{t}$ where $\tilde{N}' = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_\mu \cdot \Delta \cdot u_i : S))(\tilde{y}')$. By applying Lemma A.5 on the second assumption of (22) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \cdot X : \Delta_\mu); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_z) \vdash \tilde{z} \triangleright \mathcal{H}^*(C_z) \triangleright \diamond \quad (24)$$

Let $\sigma = \text{next}(u_i)$ and in sub-case (i) $\sigma_1 = \{\tilde{n}/\tilde{u}\}$ where $\tilde{n} = (u_{i+1}, \dots, u_{i+\mathcal{H}^*(S)})$ and $\tilde{u} = (u_i, \dots, u_{i+\mathcal{H}^*(S)-1})$, otherwise (ii) $\sigma_1 = \epsilon$. We define $\tilde{x} = \tilde{x}', z$ and $\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}'\sigma_1, \tilde{z} \cdot u_i$.

By construction $\tilde{x} \subseteq P$ and $(\Delta \cdot u_i : S \cdot \Delta_z) \setminus \tilde{x} = \emptyset$. Further, we may notice that $\tilde{y} = \tilde{v} \cdot \tilde{m}$ such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta, u_i : S, \Delta_z}(\tilde{v}, \tilde{x})$ and $\tilde{y}' = \tilde{m} \cup \text{fnb}(P', \tilde{y})$. Let $\Theta = \Theta_\mu, \Theta_X$ where

$$\Theta_\mu = \Theta'_\mu, c_k^r : \mu t. ?(\tilde{N}); t, \overline{c_{k+1}^r} : \mu t. !(\tilde{N}'); t$$

where $\tilde{N} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_\mu \cdot \Delta \cdot u_i : S \cdot \Delta_z))(\tilde{y})$. By construction and since $\lceil P \rceil^* = \lceil P' \rceil^* + 1$ we have

$$\text{dom}(\Theta_\mu) = \{c_k^r, c_{k+1}^r, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1}^r\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}^r}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1}^r}\}$$

and $\text{balanced}(\Theta_\mu)$.

By Table 6 we have:

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}_y^k(P)_g = \mu X. c_k^r ?(\tilde{y}). u_l !(\tilde{z}). c_{k+1}^r !(\tilde{y}'\sigma_1). X \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}'\sigma_1}^{k+1}(P'\sigma)_g \quad (25)$$

where in sub-case (i) $l = i$ and in sub-case (ii) $l = \iota(S)$. We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta \vdash \hat{\mathcal{A}}_y^k(P)_g \triangleright \diamond \quad (26)$$

Let $\Delta_1 = \Delta, u_i : S, \Delta_z$ and $\tilde{u}_i = \text{nbd}(u_i : S)$. We use some auxiliary sub-trees:

$$(\text{RVAR}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta; \Theta \vdash X \triangleright \diamond} \quad (27)$$

$$(\text{POLYSEND}) \frac{(\text{POLYVAR}) \frac{(\text{POLYVAR}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta; \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta, u_i \sigma : S') \vdash \tilde{y}'\sigma_1 \triangleright \tilde{N}'}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta; \Theta, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta, u_i \sigma : S') \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}^r} !(\tilde{y}'\sigma_1). X \triangleright \diamond}}{(27)} \quad (28)$$

Here, in typing the right-hand assumption, we may notice that in sub-case (i) $\mathcal{H}^*(u_i : S) = \tilde{u}_i : !(\mathcal{H}^*(C_z)); \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(S')$ and $\mathcal{H}^*(u_i \sigma : S') = \tilde{u}_{i+1} : \mathcal{H}^*(S')$ where $\tilde{u}_{i+1} = (u_{i+1}, \dots, u_{i+\lceil \mathcal{H}^*(S') \rceil})$. So the right-hand side follows by Definition 4.10 and Lemma A.1. Otherwise, in sub-case (ii) by Definition 4.2 and Figure 15 we know $\mathcal{H}^*(u_i : S) = \mathcal{H}^*(u_i \sigma : S')$ and by definition $\tilde{u}_i \subseteq \tilde{m} \subseteq \tilde{y}'\sigma_1$.

$$(\text{POLYSEND}) \frac{(\text{POLYVAR}) \frac{(\text{POLYVAR}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta; \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1) \vdash u_l !(\tilde{z}). \overline{c_{k+1}^r} !(\tilde{y}'\sigma_1). X \triangleright \diamond}}{(28)} \quad (24)}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta; \Theta, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1) \vdash u_l !(\tilde{z}). \overline{c_{k+1}^r} !(\tilde{y}'\sigma_1). X \triangleright \diamond} \quad (29)$$

$$(\text{POLYRCV}) \frac{(\text{POLYVAR}) \frac{(\text{POLYVAR}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta; \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1) \vdash \tilde{y} \triangleright \tilde{N}'}}{(29)} \quad (30)}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta; \Theta \vdash c_k^r ?(\tilde{y}). u_l !(\tilde{z}). \overline{c_{k+1}^r} !(\tilde{y}'\sigma_1). X \triangleright \diamond} \quad (30)$$

$$(\text{REC}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta \vdash \mu X. c_k^r ?(\tilde{y}). u_l !(\tilde{z}). \overline{c_{k+1}^r} !(\tilde{y}'\sigma_1). X \triangleright \diamond}$$

We may notice that by Definition 4.2 and Figure 15 we have $\mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1) = \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta), \tilde{u}_i : \mathcal{H}^*(S), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_z)$. So, in sub-case (i) as $u_i = u_l$ we have $\mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1)(u_l) = !(\mathcal{H}^*(C_z)); \text{end}$. In sub-case (ii), by Lemma A.4 and as $u_l = u_{\iota(S)}$ we know $\mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1)(u_l) = \mu t. !(\mathcal{H}^*(C_z)); t$. The following tree proves this case:

$$(\text{PAR}) \frac{(\text{POLYRCV}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta \vdash \mu X. c_k^r ?(\tilde{y}). u_l !(\tilde{z}). \overline{c_{k+1}^r} !(\tilde{y}'\sigma_1). X \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}'\sigma_1}^{k+1}(P'\sigma)_g \triangleright \diamond} \quad (23)}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta \vdash \mu X. c_k^r ?(\tilde{y}). u_l !(\tilde{z}). \overline{c_{k+1}^r} !(\tilde{y}'\sigma_1). X \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}'\sigma_1}^{k+1}(P'\sigma)_g \triangleright \diamond} \quad (31)$$

Note that we have used the following for the right assumption of (31):

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}'\sigma_1}^{k+1}(P') \equiv_\alpha \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}'\sigma_1}^{k+1}(P'\sigma)$$

3. Case $P = u_i?(z).P'$. We distinguish three sub-cases: (i) $C = S = \mu t.?(C_z);S'$, (ii) $C = S = ?(C_z);S'$, and (iii) $C = \langle C_z \rangle$. The only rule that can be applied here is Rcv:

$$(\text{RCV}) \frac{\Gamma \cdot X : \Delta_\mu; \Delta, u_i : S', \Delta_z \vdash P' \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma \cdot X : \Delta_\mu; \Delta_z \vdash z \triangleright C}{(\Gamma \setminus z) \cdot X : \Delta_\mu; \Delta, u_i : S \vdash u_i?(z).P' \triangleright \diamond} \quad (32)$$

Let $\tilde{x}' \subseteq \text{fn}(P')$ such that $(\Delta \cdot u_i : S' \cdot \Delta_z) \setminus \tilde{x}' = \emptyset$ and $\tilde{y}' = \tilde{v} \cup \tilde{m}$ such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta, u_i : S'}(\tilde{v}', \tilde{x}')$. Also, $\Theta' = \Theta'_\mu, \Theta_X(g)$ where $\text{balanced}(\Theta'_\mu)$ with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta'_\mu) = \{c_{k+1}^r, c_{k+2}^r, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^*+1}^r\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+2}^r}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^*+1}^r}\}$$

and $\Theta'_\mu(c_{k+1}^r) = \mu t.?(\tilde{N}'); \mathbf{t}$, where $\tilde{N}' = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_\mu \cdot \Delta \cdot u_i : S))(\tilde{y}')$. Then, by IH on the right assumption of (22) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}'); \Theta'_\mu \vdash \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (33)$$

By applying Lemma A.5 to the second assumption of (22), we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma) \cdot X : \Theta_\mu; \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_z) \vdash \tilde{z} \triangleright \mathcal{H}^*(C) \quad (34)$$

Let $\sigma = \text{next}(u_i)$ and in sub-case (i) $\sigma_1 = \{\tilde{n}/\tilde{u}\}$ where $\tilde{n} = (u_{i+1}, \dots, u_{i+\mathcal{H}^*(S)})$ and $\tilde{u} = (u_i, \dots, u_{i+\mathcal{H}^*(S)-1})$, otherwise in sub-case (ii) $\sigma_1 = \epsilon$. We define $\tilde{x} = \tilde{x}'\sigma \setminus z$ and $\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}'\sigma_1 \setminus \tilde{z}$ with $|\tilde{z}| = |\mathcal{H}^*(C)|$. By construction $\tilde{x} \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$ and $(\Delta, r : S) \setminus \tilde{x} = \emptyset$. Further, we may notice that $\tilde{y} = \tilde{v} \cdot \tilde{m}$, where \tilde{v} is such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta, r : S, \Delta_z}(\tilde{v}, \tilde{x})$ and $\tilde{y} = \tilde{m} \cup \text{fnb}(P', \tilde{y}\tilde{z})$. Let $\Theta = \Theta_\mu, \Theta_X$ where

$$\Theta_\mu = \Theta'_\mu, c_k^r : \mu t.?(\tilde{N}'); \mathbf{t}, \overline{c_{k+1}^r} : \mu t.!(\tilde{N}'); \mathbf{t}$$

where $\tilde{N} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_\mu \cdot \Delta \cdot u_i : S, \Delta_z))(\tilde{y})$. By construction and since $\lceil P \rceil^* = \lceil P' \rceil^* + 1$ we have

$$\text{dom}(\Theta_\mu) = \{c_k^r, c_{k+1}^r, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1}^r\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}^r}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1}^r}\}$$

and $\text{balanced}(\Theta_\mu)$.

By Table 6 we have:

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P)_g = \mu X. c_k^r?(\tilde{y}). u_l?(\tilde{z}). c_{k+1}^r!(\tilde{y}'\sigma_1). X \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}}^{k+1}(P'\sigma)_g \quad (35)$$

where in sub-case (i) $l = i$ and in sub-case (ii) $l = \iota(S)$. Let $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}$. We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1 \setminus z); \Theta \vdash \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P)_g \triangleright \diamond \quad (36)$$

We use some auxiliary sub-trees:

$$(\text{RVAR}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma) \cdot X : \Theta; \Theta \vdash X \triangleright \diamond} \quad (37)$$

$$(\text{POLYSEND}) \frac{(37) \quad (\text{POLYVAR}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma) \cdot X : \Theta; \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta, u_l : S', \Delta_z) \vdash \tilde{y}'\sigma_1 \triangleright \tilde{N}'}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma) \cdot X : \Theta; \Theta, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1) \vdash c_{k+1}^r!(\tilde{y}'\sigma_1). X \triangleright \diamond} \quad (38)$$

Here, in typing the right-hand assumption, we may notice that in sub-case (i) $\mathcal{H}^*(u_i : S) = \tilde{u}_i : ?(\mathcal{H}^*(C_z)); \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(S')$ and $\mathcal{H}^*(u_i\sigma : S') = \tilde{u}_{i+1} : \mathcal{H}^*(S')$ where $\tilde{u}_{i+1} = (u_{i+1}, \dots, u_{i+\lceil \mathcal{H}^*(S') \rceil})$ and by definition $\tilde{u}_{i+1} \subseteq \tilde{y}'\sigma_1$. So the right-hand side follows by Definition 4.10 and Lemma A.1. Otherwise, in sub-case (ii) by Definition 4.2 and Figure 15 we know $\mathcal{H}^*(u_i : S) = \mathcal{H}^*(u_i\sigma : S')$.

$$(\text{POLYRCV}) \frac{(38) \quad (34)}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus z) \cdot X : \Theta; \Theta, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta, u_i : S) \vdash u_l?(\tilde{z}). c_{k+1}^r!(\tilde{y}'\sigma_1). X \triangleright \diamond} \quad (39)$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus z) \cdot X : \Theta; \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta, r : S) \vdash \tilde{y} \triangleright \tilde{N}} \\
\text{(POLYRCV)} \frac{(39)}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1 \setminus z) \cdot X : \Theta; \Theta \vdash c_k^r?(\tilde{y}).u_l?(\tilde{z}).c_{k+1}^r! \langle \tilde{y}' \sigma_1 \rangle . X \triangleright \diamond} \\
\text{(REC)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1 \setminus z); \Theta \vdash \mu X. c_k^r?(\tilde{y}).u_l?(\tilde{z}).c_{k+1}^r! \langle \tilde{y}' \sigma_1 \rangle . X \triangleright \diamond}
\end{array} \quad (40)$$

We may notice that by Definition 4.2 and Figure 15 we have

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1) = \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta), \tilde{u}_i : \mathcal{H}^*(S), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_z)$$

So, in sub-case (i) as $u_i = u_l$ we have $\mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1)(u_l) = ?(\mathcal{H}^*(C_z)); \text{end}$. In sub-case (ii), by Lemma A.4 and as $u_l = u_{l(S)}$ we know $\mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1)(u_l) = \mu t. ?(\mathcal{H}^*(C_z)); t$. The following tree proves this case:

$$\text{(PAR)} \frac{(40) \quad (33)}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1 \setminus z); \Theta \vdash \mu X. c_k^r?(\tilde{y}).u_l?(\tilde{z}).c_{k+1}^r! \langle \tilde{y}' \sigma_1 \rangle . X \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}' \sigma_1}^{k+1}(P' \sigma)_g} \quad (41)$$

Note that we have used the following for the right assumption of (41):

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P') \equiv_{\alpha} \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}' \sigma_1}^{k+1}(P' \sigma)$$

4. Case $P = Q_1 \mid Q_2$. The only rule that can be applied here is PAR:

$$\text{(PAR)} \frac{\Gamma \cdot X : \Delta_\mu; \Delta_1 \vdash Q_1 \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma \cdot X : \Delta_\mu; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_2 \triangleright \diamond}{\Gamma \cdot X : \Delta_\mu; \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \mid Q_2 \triangleright \diamond} \quad (42)$$

Here we assume $\text{frv}(Q_1)$. So, by IH on the first and second assumption of (42) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus x_1); \Theta_1 \vdash \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}_1}^k(Q_1)_g \triangleright \diamond \quad (43)$$

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus x_1); \Theta_2 \vdash \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}_2}^{k+l+1}(Q_2)_\emptyset \triangleright \diamond \quad (44)$$

where for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ we have $\tilde{x}_i \subseteq \text{fn}(Q_i)$ such that $\Delta_i \setminus \tilde{x} = \emptyset$, and $\tilde{y}_i = \tilde{v}_i \cdot \tilde{m}_i$, where \tilde{v}_i is such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta_i}(\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{x}_i)$ and $\tilde{m}_i = \text{codom}(g_i)$. Further, $\Theta_i = \Theta_\mu^i \cdot \Theta_X(g_i)$ where

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{dom}(\Theta_\mu^1) &= \{c_{k+1}^r, c_{k+2}^r, \dots, c_{k+l+1}^r\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+2}^r}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+l+1}^r}\} \\
\text{dom}(\Theta_\mu^2) &= \{c_{k+l+1}^r, c_{k+l+2}^r, \dots, c_{k+l+1+l}^r\}
\end{aligned}$$

and $\Theta_\mu^1(c_{k+1}^r) = \mu t. ?(\tilde{N}^1); t$ and $\Theta_\mu^2(c_{k+l+1}^r) = \langle \tilde{N}^2 \rangle$ with $\tilde{N}^i = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_\mu \cdot \Delta_i))(\tilde{y}_i)$.

Let $\Delta = \Delta_1 \cdot \Delta_2$. We define $\tilde{x} = \tilde{x}_1 \cdot \tilde{x}_2$ and $\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}_1 \cdot \tilde{y}_2$. By construction $\tilde{x} \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$ and $(\Delta_1 \cdot \Delta_2) \setminus \tilde{x} = \emptyset$. Further, we may notice that $\tilde{y} = \tilde{v} \cdot \tilde{m}$, where $\tilde{m} = \text{codom}(g)$ and $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\tilde{v}, \tilde{x})$. We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta \vdash \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P)_g \triangleright \diamond \quad (45)$$

where $\Theta = \Theta_1 \cdot \Theta_2 \cdot \Theta'$ with

$$\Theta' = c_k^r : \mu t. ?(\tilde{N}); t \cdot \overline{c_{k+1}^r} : \mu t. ! \langle \tilde{N}_1 \rangle; t$$

By Table 6 we have:

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P)_g = \mu X. c_k^r?(\tilde{y}).(\overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{y}_1 \rangle . X \mid c_{k+l+1}^r! \langle \tilde{y}_2 \rangle) \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}_1}^{k+1}(Q_1)_g \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}_2}^{k+l+1}(Q_2)_\emptyset$$

We use some auxiliary sub-trees:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{(NIL)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta' \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta'; \tilde{y}_2 : \tilde{N}_2 \vdash \tilde{y}_2 \triangleright \tilde{N}_2} \\
\text{(SND)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta'; \tilde{y}_2 : \tilde{N}_2 \vdash c_{k+l+1}^r! \langle \tilde{y}_2 \rangle}
\end{array} \quad (46)$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{(RVAR)} \frac{\text{(SND)} \frac{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta'; \Theta' \vdash X \triangleright \diamond}{\text{(SND)}}}{\text{(PAR)} \frac{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta'; \Theta' \cdot \tilde{y}_1 : \tilde{N}_1 \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{y}_1 \rangle . X \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta'; \Theta' \cdot \tilde{y} : \tilde{N} \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{y}_1 \rangle . X \mid c_{k+l+1}^r! \langle \tilde{y}_2 \rangle \triangleright \diamond}} \\
\text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta'; \tilde{y}_1 : \tilde{N}_1 \vdash \tilde{y}_1 \triangleright \tilde{N}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta'; \tilde{y} : \tilde{N} \vdash \tilde{y} \triangleright \tilde{N}} \\
\text{(46)}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{(RCV)} \frac{\text{(REC)} \frac{\text{(47)} \frac{\text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta'; \tilde{y} : \tilde{N} \vdash \tilde{y} \triangleright \tilde{N}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta'; \Theta' \vdash c_k^r?(\tilde{y}).(\overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{y}_1 \rangle . X \mid c_{k+l+1}^r! \langle \tilde{y}_2 \rangle) \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta' \vdash \mu X. c_k^r?(\tilde{y}).(\overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{y}_1 \rangle . X \mid c_{k+l+1}^r! \langle \tilde{y}_2 \rangle) \triangleright \diamond}} \\
\text{(48)}
\end{array}$$

The following tree proves this case:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{(PAR)} \frac{\text{(48)} \frac{\text{(PAR)} \frac{\text{(43)} \frac{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta \vdash \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}_1}^{k+1}(Q_1)_{g_1} \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}_2}^{k+l+1}(Q_2)_{g_2} \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta_1 \cdot \Theta_2 \vdash \mu X. c_k^r?(\tilde{y}).(\overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{y}_1 \rangle . X \mid c_{k+l+1}^r! \langle \tilde{y}_2 \rangle) \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}_1}^{k+1}(Q_1)_g \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}_2}^{k+l+1}(Q_2)_\emptyset \triangleright \diamond}} \\
\text{(44)}
\end{array}$$

5. Case $P = (\nu s : C) P'$. We distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $C = S$ and (ii) $C = \langle C' \rangle$. We only consider sub-case (i) as the other is similar. First, we α -convert P as follows:

$$P \equiv_\alpha (\nu s_1 : C) P' \{s_1 \overline{s_1} / s \overline{s}\}$$

The only rule that can be applied is RESS:

$$\text{(RESS)} \frac{\Gamma; \Delta_\mu \cdot \Delta \cdot s_1 : S \cdot \overline{s_1} : \overline{S} \vdash P' \{s_1 \overline{s_1} / s \overline{s}\} \triangleright \diamond}{\Gamma; \Delta_\mu \cdot \Delta \vdash (\nu s_1 : S) P' \{s_1 \overline{s_1} / s \overline{s}\} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (49)$$

By IH on the assumption of (49) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta' \vdash \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}'}^k(P' \{s_1 \overline{s_1} / s \overline{s}\})_g \triangleright \diamond \quad (50)$$

where $\tilde{x}' \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$ such that $(\Delta \cdot s_1 : S \cdot \overline{s_1} : \overline{S}) \setminus \tilde{x}' = \emptyset$, and $\tilde{y}' = \tilde{v}' \cup \tilde{m}$ where indexed $_{\Gamma, \Delta \cdot s_1 : S \cdot \overline{s_1} : \overline{S}}(\tilde{v}', \tilde{x}')$. Also, $\Theta' = \Theta'_\mu, \Theta_X$, where Θ'_μ such that $\text{balanced}(\Theta'_\mu)$ with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta'_\mu) = \{c_{k+1}^r, c_{k+2}^r, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^*+1}^r\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+2}^r}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^*+1}^r}\}$$

and $\Theta'_\mu(c_{k+1}^r) = \mu t. ?(\tilde{N}'); t$ where $\tilde{N}' = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_\mu \cdot \Delta \cdot s_1 : S \cdot \overline{s_1} : \overline{S}))(\tilde{y}')$.

We define $\tilde{x} = \tilde{x}' \setminus (s_1, \overline{s_1})$ and $\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}' \setminus (\tilde{s}, \tilde{\tilde{s}})$ where $\tilde{s} = \text{nbd}(s_1 : S)$ and $\tilde{\tilde{s}} = \text{nbd}(\overline{s_1} : \overline{S})$. By construction $\tilde{x} \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$ and $\Delta \setminus \tilde{x} = \emptyset$. Further, $\tilde{y} = \tilde{v} \cdot \tilde{m}$ where indexed $_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\tilde{v}, \tilde{x})$.

Let $\Theta = \Theta', \Theta''_\mu$ where

$$\Theta''_\mu = c_k^r : \mu t. ?(\tilde{N}); t, \overline{c_{k+1}^r} : \mu t. ! \langle \tilde{N}' \rangle; t$$

where $\tilde{N} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_\mu \cdot \Delta \cdot u_i : S))(\tilde{y})$. By construction and since $\lceil P \rceil^* = \lceil P' \rceil^* + 1$ we have

$$\text{dom}(\Theta_\mu) = \{c_k^r, c_{k+1}^r, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1}^r\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}^r}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1}^r}\}$$

By Table 6 we have:

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P)_g = \mu X. (\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}^*(C)) c_k^r?(\tilde{y}). \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{y}' \rangle . X \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}'}^k(P' \{s_1 \overline{s_1} / s \overline{s}\})_g$$

We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta \vdash \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P)_g \triangleright \diamond \quad (51)$$

We use the auxiliary sub-trees:

$$\text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma) \cdot X : \Theta''_\mu; \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta), \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}^*(S), \tilde{\bar{s}} : \mathcal{H}^*(\bar{S}) \vdash \tilde{y}' \triangleright \tilde{N}'} \quad (52)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(RVAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma) \cdot X : \Theta_\mu; \Theta''_\mu \vdash X \triangleright \diamond} \quad (52) \\ \text{(POLYSEND)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma) \cdot X : \Theta_\mu; \Theta_\mu \cdot \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta), \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}^*(S), \tilde{\bar{s}} : \mathcal{H}^*(\bar{S}) \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y}' \rangle . X \triangleright \diamond} \quad (53) \end{array}$$

The following tree proves this case:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta) \vdash \tilde{y} \triangleright \tilde{N}} \quad (53) \\ \text{(POLYRCV)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta''_\mu; \Theta''_\mu \cdot \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}^*(S), \tilde{\bar{s}} : \mathcal{H}^*(\bar{S}) \vdash c_k?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y}' \rangle . X \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{(POLYRESS)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot X : \Theta''_\mu; \Theta''_\mu \vdash (\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}^*(S)) c_k?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y}' \rangle . X \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{(REC)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta''_\mu \vdash \mu X.(\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}^*(S)) c_k?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y}' \rangle . X \triangleright \diamond} \quad (50) \\ \text{(PAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta \vdash \mu X.(\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}^*(S)) c_k?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y}' \rangle . X \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P\{s_1\bar{s}_1/s\bar{s}\})_g \triangleright \diamond} \end{array}$$

This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.2. \square

Lemma 4.3 (Typability of Breakdown). *Let P be an initialized process. If $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ then*

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \tilde{x}), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P) \triangleright \diamond \quad (k > 0)$$

where

- $\tilde{x} \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$ and \tilde{y} such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{x})$ holds.
- $\text{dom}(\Theta) = \{c_k, c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+[P]^*-1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+[P]^*-1}}\}$
- $\Theta(c_k) = ?(\tilde{M}); \text{end}$, where $\tilde{M} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta))(\tilde{y})$.
- $\text{balanced}(\Theta)$

Proof. By induction on the structure of P . By assumption $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$. We consider nine cases. We separately treat input and output cases depending on whether the subject name of the prefix is recursive or not.

1. Case $P = \mathbf{0}$. The only rule that can be applied here is **NIL**. By inversion of this rule, we have: $\Gamma; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond$. We shall then prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \Theta \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(\mathbf{0}) \triangleright \diamond \quad (54)$$

where $\tilde{x} \subseteq \text{fn}(\mathbf{0}) = \epsilon$ and $\Theta = \{c_k : ?(\langle \text{end} \rangle); \text{end}\}$. Since by Remark 4.1 we know that $c_k?().\mathbf{0}$ stands for $c_k?(y).\mathbf{0}$ with $c_k : ?(\langle \text{end} \rangle); \text{end}$.

By Table 5: $\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^k(\mathbf{0}) = c_k?().\mathbf{0}$. The following tree proves this case:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(NIL)} \frac{}{\Gamma'; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad c_k \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma) \\ \text{(END)} \frac{}{\Gamma'; \emptyset; c_k : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{(SH)} \frac{}{\Gamma'; \emptyset \vdash y \triangleright \langle \text{end} \rangle} \\ \text{(RCV)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), y : \langle \text{end} \rangle; \Theta \vdash c_k?().\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \end{array}$$

where $\Gamma' = \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), y : \langle \text{end} \rangle$. We know $c_k \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$ since we use reserved names for propagator channels.

2. Case $P = u_i?(z).P'$. We distinguish two sub-cases, depending on whether u_i is linear or not:
 (i) $u_i \in \text{dom}(\Delta)$ and (ii) $u_i \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$. We consider sub-case (i) first. For this case Rule RCV can be applied:

$$(\text{RCV}) \frac{\Gamma; \Delta, u_i : S, \Delta_z \vdash P' \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Delta_z \vdash z \triangleright C}{\Gamma \setminus z; \Delta, u_i : ?(C); S \vdash u_i?(z).P' \triangleright \diamond} \quad (55)$$

By IH on the first assumption of (55) we know:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma'_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (56)$$

where $\tilde{x}' \subseteq \text{fn}(P')$ and \tilde{y}' such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\tilde{y}', \tilde{x}')$. Also, $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}'$, $\Delta'_1 = \Delta \setminus \tilde{x}'$, and $\text{balanced}(\Theta_1)$ with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta_1) = \{c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^*}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+2}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^*}}\}$$

and $\Theta_1(c_{k+1}) = ?(\tilde{M}'); \text{end}$ where $\tilde{M}' = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta, u_i : S, \Delta_z))(\tilde{y}')$.

By applying Lemma A.5 to the second assumption of (55) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_z) \vdash \tilde{z} \triangleright \mathcal{H}^*(C) \quad (57)$$

Let $\tilde{x} = \tilde{x}', u \setminus z$ and $\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}'\sigma, u_i \setminus \tilde{z}$ such that $|\tilde{z}| = \mathcal{H}^*(C)$, where $\sigma = \{\tilde{n}/\tilde{u}\}$ with $\tilde{n} = (u_{i+1}, \dots, u_{i+\lceil \mathcal{H}^*(S) \rceil})$ and $\tilde{u} = (u_i, \dots, u_{i+\lceil \mathcal{H}^*(S) \rceil - 1})$. We may notice that by Definition 4.10 $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{x})$ holds. We define $\Theta = \Theta_1, \Theta'$, where

$$\Theta' = c_k : ?(\tilde{M}); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \tilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end}$$

with $\tilde{M} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta, u_i : ?(C); S))(\tilde{y})$. By Definition 4.3, $\lceil P \rceil^* = \lceil P' \rceil^* + 1$ so

$$\text{dom}(\Theta) = \{c_k, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^* - 1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^* - 1}}\}$$

and Θ is balanced since $\Theta(c_{k+1})$ dual $\Theta(\overline{c_{k+1}})$ and Θ_1 is balanced. By Table 5:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(u_i?(z).P') = c_k?(y).u_i?(z).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{y}'\sigma \rangle.0 \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'\sigma}^{k+1}(P'\{u_{i+1}/u_i\})$$

Also, let $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}$ and $\Delta_1 = \Delta \setminus \tilde{x}$. We may notice that $\Delta_1 = \Delta'_1$. We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1 \setminus z); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(u_i?(z).P')$$

We type sub-process $c_k?(y).u_i?(z).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{y}'\sigma \rangle.0$ with some auxiliary derivations:

$$\begin{array}{c} (\text{NIL}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \emptyset \vdash 0 \triangleright \diamond} \\ (\text{END}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \overline{c_{k+1}} : \text{end} \vdash 0 \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (58)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} (\text{POLYVAR}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \Delta_1, u_{i+1} : S), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_z) \vdash \tilde{y}'\sigma \triangleright \tilde{M}'} \\ (\text{POLYSEND}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \tilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \Delta_1, u_{i+1} : S), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_z) \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{y}'\sigma \rangle.0 \triangleright \diamond} \\ (\text{END}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \tilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end}, u_i : \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \Delta_1, u_{i+1} : S), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_z) \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{y}'\sigma \rangle.0 \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (59)$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
(59) \quad (57) \\
\text{(POLYRCV)} \frac{}{} \\
\text{(END)} \frac{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus z); u_i : ?(\mathcal{H}^*(U)); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_2) \vdash u_i ?(\widetilde{z}). \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \widetilde{y}' \sigma \rangle. \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus z); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end}, c_k : \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_2) \vdash u_i ?(\widetilde{z}). \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \widetilde{y}' \sigma \rangle. \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}
\end{array} \quad (60)$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
(60) \\
\text{(POLYRCV)} \frac{\text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{}{} \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus z); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_2) \vdash \widetilde{y} \triangleright \widetilde{M}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1 \setminus z); \Theta' \vdash c_k ?(\widetilde{y}). u_i ?(z). \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \widetilde{y}' \sigma \rangle. \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}
\end{array} \quad (61)$$

where $\Delta_2 = \Delta, u_i : ?(C); S \setminus \Delta_1$. Using (61), the following tree proves this case:

$$\begin{array}{c}
(56) \\
(61) \quad \frac{}{} \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma'_1 \setminus z); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}'\sigma}^{k+1}(P'\{u_{i+1}/u_i\}) \triangleright \diamond \\
\text{(PAR)} \frac{}{} \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1 \setminus z); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1), \Theta \vdash c_k ?(\widetilde{y}). u_i ?(\widetilde{z}). \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \widetilde{y}' \sigma \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}'\sigma}^{k+1}(P'\{u_{i+1}/u_i\}) \triangleright \diamond
\end{array} \quad (62)$$

Note that we have used the following for the right assumption of (62):

$$\mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P') \equiv_{\alpha} \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}'\sigma}^{k+1}(P'\{u_{i+1}/u_i\})$$

Next, we comment the case when $u_i \notin \widetilde{x}$. In this case $\Delta_1 = \Delta \setminus \widetilde{x}, u_i : ?(C); S$. Hence, in the right hand-side of (62) instead of $\mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1)$ we would have $\mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \widetilde{x}, u_{i+1} : S)$ and in the left-hand side we have $u_i : ?(\mathcal{H}^*(C)); \text{end}$ as a linear environment. Then, we would need to apply Lemma A.1 with $\{u_i/u_{i+1}\}$ to the right-hand side before invoking (56). We remark that similar provisos apply to the following cases when the assumption is $u_i \notin \widetilde{x}$.

This concludes sub-case (i). We now consider sub-case (ii), i.e., $u_i \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$. Here Rule ACC can be applied:

$$\text{(ACC)} \frac{\Gamma; \emptyset \vdash u_i \triangleright \langle C \rangle \quad \Gamma; \Delta, z : C \vdash P' \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; z : C \vdash z \triangleright C}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash u_i ?(z). P' \triangleright \diamond} \quad (63)$$

By IH on the second assumption of (63) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma'_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}'\sigma}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (64)$$

where \widetilde{x}' and \widetilde{y}' are as in sub-case (i). Also, $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma \setminus \widetilde{x}'$ and $\Delta'_1 = \Delta \setminus \widetilde{y}'$ and $\text{balanced}(\Theta_1)$ with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta_1) = \{c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^*}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+2}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^*}}\}$$

and $\Theta_1(c_{k+1}) = ?(\widetilde{M}'); \text{end}$ where $\widetilde{M}' = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta, z : C))(\widetilde{y}')$.

By applying Lemma A.5 to the first and third assumptions of (63) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \emptyset \vdash u_i \triangleright \langle \mathcal{H}^*(C) \rangle \quad (65)$$

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(z : C) \vdash \widetilde{z} \triangleright \mathcal{H}^*(C) \quad (66)$$

We define $\widetilde{x} = \widetilde{x}' \cup u \setminus z$ and $\widetilde{y} = \widetilde{y}' \cup u_i \setminus \widetilde{z}$ where $|\widetilde{z}| = |\mathcal{H}^*(C)|$. Notice that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\widetilde{y}, \widetilde{x})$. Let $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus x$. We define $\Theta = \Theta_1, \Theta'$, where

$$\Theta' = c_k : ?(\widetilde{M}'); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end}$$

with $\widetilde{M} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta))(\widetilde{y})$. By Definition 4.3, $\lceil P \rceil^* = \lceil P' \rceil^* + 1$ so

$$\text{dom}(\Theta) = \{c_k, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1}}\}$$

and Θ is balanced since $\Theta(c_{k+1})$ dual $\Theta(\overline{c_{k+1}})$ and Θ_1 is balanced.

By Table 5, we have:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(u_i?(z).P') = c_k?(\tilde{y}).u_i?(z).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle\tilde{y}'\rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P') \quad (67)$$

We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(u_i?(z).P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (68)$$

To this end, we use some auxiliary derivations:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(NIL)} \\ \hline \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond \\ \text{(END)} \hline \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \emptyset; \overline{c_{k+1}} : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond \end{array} \quad (69)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(POLYVAR)} \\ \hline \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_2), z : \mathcal{H}^*(C) \vdash \tilde{y}' \triangleright \widetilde{M}' \\ \text{(POLYSEND)} \hline \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle\widetilde{M}'\rangle; \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_2), z : \mathcal{H}^*(C) \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle\tilde{y}'\rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond \end{array} \quad (70)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(POLYACC)} \quad \frac{(65) \quad (70) \quad (66)}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle\widetilde{M}'\rangle; \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_2) \vdash u_i?(z).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle\tilde{y}'\rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{(END)} \hline \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle\widetilde{M}'\rangle; \text{end}, c_k : \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_2) \vdash u_i?(z).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle\tilde{y}'\rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond \end{array} \quad (71)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(POLYVAR)} \\ \hline \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_2) \vdash \tilde{y} \triangleright \widetilde{M} \\ \text{(POLYRCV)} \hline \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \Theta' \vdash c_k?(\tilde{y}).u_i?(z).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle\tilde{y}'\rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond \end{array} \quad (72)$$

where $\Delta_2 = \Delta \setminus \Delta_1$.

Using (64) and (72), the following tree proves this sub-case:

$$\begin{array}{c} (72) \quad (64) \\ \hline \text{(PAR)} \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1), \Theta \vdash c_k?(\tilde{y}).u_i?(z).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle\tilde{y}'\rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond \end{array} \quad (73)$$

Note that if $u \notin \text{fn}(P')$ we need to apply Lemma A.3 with u_i to the right assumption of (73) before applying (64). This concludes the analysis of the input case.

3. Case $P = u_i!\langle z_j \rangle.P'$. We distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $u_i \in \text{dom}(\Delta)$ and (ii) $u_i \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$. We consider sub-case (i) first. For this case Rule SEND can be applied:

$$\text{(SEND)} \frac{\Gamma; \Delta_1, u_i : S \vdash P' \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Delta_z \vdash z_j \triangleright C \quad u_i : S \in \Delta}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash u_i!\langle z_j \rangle.P' \triangleright \diamond} \quad (74)$$

where $\Delta = \Delta_1, \Delta_z, u_i : !\langle C \rangle; S$.

By IH on the first assumption of (74) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma'_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (75)$$

where $\tilde{x}' \subseteq \text{fv}(P')$ and \tilde{y}' such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta_1, u_i : S}(\tilde{y}', \tilde{x}')$. Also, $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{y}'$, $\Delta'_1 = \Delta_1 \setminus \tilde{y}'$, and $\text{balanced}(\Theta_1)$ with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta_1) = \{c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^*}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+2}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^*}}\}$$

and $\Theta_1(c_{k+1}) = ?(\widetilde{M}_1); \text{end}$ where $\widetilde{M}_1 = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1, u_i : S))(\tilde{y}')$.

By Lemma A.5 and the first assumption of (74) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_z) \vdash \tilde{z} \triangleright \mathcal{H}^*(C) \quad (76)$$

where $\tilde{z} = (z_j, \dots, z_{j+|\mathcal{H}^*(C)|-1})$. We assume $\tilde{x} = \tilde{x}', u, z$. Since $\tilde{x}' \subseteq \text{fn}(P')$ follows that $\tilde{x} \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$. Let $\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}'\sigma, u_i, \tilde{z}$ where $\sigma = \{\tilde{n}/\tilde{u}\}$ with $\tilde{n} = (u_{i+1}, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{H}^*(S)|})$ and $\tilde{u} = (u_i, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{H}^*(S)|-1})$. We have $\tilde{z} = \text{fmb}(z, \tilde{y})$. By Definition 4.10 it follows that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{x})$. We define $\Theta = \Theta_1, \Theta'$, where:

$$\Theta' = c_k : ?(\tilde{M}); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \tilde{M}_1 \rangle; \text{end}$$

with $\tilde{M} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta))(\tilde{y})$. By Definition 4.3, we know $\lceil P \rceil^* = \lceil P' \rceil^* + 1$, so

$$\text{dom}(\Theta) = \{c_k, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1}}\}$$

and Θ is balanced since $\Theta(c_{k+1})$ dual $\Theta(\overline{c_{k+1}})$ and Θ_1 is balanced.

By Table 5, we have:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(u_i! \langle z \rangle . P') = c_k ?(\tilde{y}).u_i! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y}'\sigma \rangle . \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'\sigma}^{k+1}(P' \{u_{i+1}/u_i\})$$

Let $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x} = \Gamma'_1$ and $\Delta \setminus \tilde{x} = \Delta'_1$. We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(u_i! \langle z \rangle . P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (77)$$

To type the sub-process $c_k ?(\tilde{y}).u_i! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y}'\sigma \rangle . \mathbf{0}$ of $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(u_i! \langle z \rangle . P')$ we use the following auxiliary derivations:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(NIL)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{(END)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \overline{c_{k+1}} : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (78)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1, u_{i+1} : S \setminus \Delta'_1) \vdash \tilde{y}'\sigma \triangleright \tilde{M}_1} \\ \text{(POLYSEND)} \frac{(78) \quad \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1, u_{i+1} : S \setminus \Delta'_1) \vdash \tilde{y}'\sigma \triangleright \tilde{M}_1}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \tilde{M}_1 \rangle; \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1, u_{i+1} : S \setminus \Delta'_1) \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y}'\sigma \rangle . \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{(END)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \tilde{M}_1 \rangle; \text{end}, u_i : \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1, u_{i+1} : S \setminus \Delta'_1) \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y}'\sigma \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (79)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(SEND)} \frac{(79) \quad (76)}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \Delta'_1), \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \tilde{M}_1 \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y}'\sigma \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{(END)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \Delta'_1), \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \tilde{M}_1 \rangle; \text{end}, c_k : \text{end} \vdash u_i! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y}'\sigma \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (80)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \Delta'_1) \vdash \tilde{y} : \tilde{M}} \\ \text{(POLYRCV)} \frac{(80) \quad \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \Delta'_1) \vdash \tilde{y} : \tilde{M}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \Theta' \vdash c_k ?(\tilde{y}).u_i! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y}'\sigma \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (81)$$

Using (75) and (81), the following tree proves this case:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(PAR)} \frac{(81) \quad \frac{(75) \quad \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'\sigma}^{k+1}(P' \{u_{i+1}/u_i\}) \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(u_i! \langle z \rangle . P') \triangleright \diamond}}{} \end{array} \quad (82)$$

Note that we have used the following for the right assumption of (62):

$$\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P') \equiv_{\alpha} \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'\sigma}^{k+1}(P' \{u_{i+1}/u_i\})$$

We now consider sub-case (ii). For this sub-case Rule REQ can be applied:

$$(\text{REQ}) \frac{\Gamma; \emptyset \vdash u \triangleright \langle C \rangle \quad \Gamma; \Delta_1 \triangleright P' \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Delta_z \vdash z \triangleright C}{\Gamma; \Delta_1, \Delta_z \vdash u_i! \langle z \rangle . P' \triangleright \diamond} \quad (83)$$

Let $\tilde{x}' \subseteq \text{fn}(P')$ and \tilde{y} such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta_1}(\tilde{y}', \tilde{x}')$. Further, let $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}'$ and $\Delta'_1 = \Delta_1 \setminus \tilde{x}'$. Also, let Θ_1 be environment defined as in sub-case (i).

By IH on the second assumption of (83) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma'_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (84)$$

By Lemma A.5 and the first and third assumptions of (83) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \emptyset \vdash u_i \triangleright \mathcal{H}^*(\langle C \rangle) \quad (85)$$

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_z) \vdash \tilde{z} \triangleright \mathcal{H}^*(C) \quad (86)$$

We define $\tilde{x} = \tilde{x}' \cup z \cup u$ and $\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}' \cup \tilde{z} \cup u_i$ where $|\tilde{z}| = |\mathcal{H}^*(C)|$. Notice that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{x})$. Let $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x} = \Gamma'_1 \setminus u$ and $\Delta \setminus \tilde{x} = \Delta'_1$.

By Table 5, we have:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(u_i! \langle z \rangle . P') = c_k?(\tilde{y}).u_i! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y}' \rangle . \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P')$$

We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(u_i! \langle z \rangle . P')$$

We use some auxiliary derivations:

$$\begin{array}{c} (\text{NIL}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \\ (\text{END}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \emptyset; \overline{c_{k+1}} : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (\text{POLYVAR}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1 \setminus \Delta'_1) \vdash \tilde{y}' : \widetilde{M}_1} \\ (\text{POLYSEND}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1 \setminus \Delta'_1), \overline{c_{k+1}} : ! \langle \widetilde{M}_1 \rangle ; \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y}' \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (87)$$

$$(\text{POLYREQ}) \frac{(85) \quad (87) \quad (86)}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1 \setminus \Delta'_1), \overline{c_{k+1}} : ! \langle \widetilde{M}_1 \rangle ; \text{end}, \tilde{z} : \mathcal{H}^*(C) \vdash u_i! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y}' \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (88)$$

$$(\text{POLYRCV}) \frac{(88) \quad (\text{POLYVAR}) \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \Delta_1 \setminus \Delta'_1, \tilde{z} : \mathcal{H}^*(C) \vdash \tilde{y} \triangleright \widetilde{M}}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \Theta \vdash c_k?(\tilde{y}).u_i! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y}' \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (89)$$

The following tree proves this case:

$$\begin{array}{c} (84) \\ (\text{PAR}) \frac{(89) \quad \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(u_i! \langle z \rangle . P') \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (90)$$

We remark that if $u_i \notin \text{fn}(P')$ we need to apply Lemma A.3 with u_i to the right assumption of (90) before applying (84). This concludes the analysis for the output case $P = u_i! \langle z \rangle . P'$.

4. Case $P = (\nu s : C) P'$. We distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $C = S$ and (ii) $C = \langle C \rangle$. First, we α -convert P as follows:

$$P \equiv_\alpha (\nu s_1 : C) P' \{s_1 \overline{s_1} / s \overline{s}\}$$

We consider sub-case (i) first. For this case Rule RES can be applied:

$$(\text{RES}) \frac{\Gamma; \Delta, s_1 : S, \overline{s_1} : \overline{S} \vdash P' \{s_1 \overline{s_1} / s \overline{s}\} \triangleright \diamond}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash (\nu s_1 : S) P' \{s_1 \overline{s_1} / s \overline{s}\} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (91)$$

By IH on the assumption of (91) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \tilde{x}, s_1 : S, \overline{s_1} : \overline{S}), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P' \{s_1 \overline{s_1} / s \overline{s}\}) \triangleright \diamond \quad (92)$$

where $\tilde{x} \subseteq \text{fn}(P')$ such that $s_1, \overline{s_1} \notin \tilde{x}$ and \tilde{y} such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{x})$. Also, $\text{balanced}(\Theta_1)$ with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta_1) = \{c_k, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^* - 1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^* - 1}}\}$$

and $\Theta_1(c_k) = ?(\tilde{M}); \text{end}$ with $\tilde{M} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta))(\tilde{y})$.

Note that we take $\Theta = \Theta_1$ since $\lceil P \rceil^* = \lceil P' \rceil^*$. By Definitions 4.1 and 4.2 and (92), we know that:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \tilde{x}), \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}^*(S), \overline{\tilde{s}} : \mathcal{H}^*(\overline{S}) \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P' \{s_1 \overline{s_1} / s \overline{s}\}) \triangleright \diamond \quad (93)$$

where $\tilde{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_{|\mathcal{H}^*(S)|})$ and $\overline{\tilde{s}} = (\overline{s_1}, \dots, \overline{s_{|\mathcal{H}^*(S)|}})$. By Table 5, we have:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k((\nu s) P') = (\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}^*(S)) \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P' \{s_1 \overline{s_1} / s \overline{s}\})$$

The following tree proves this sub-case:

$$(\text{POLYRES}) \frac{(93)}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \tilde{x}) \vdash (\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{H}^*(S)) \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P' \{s_1 \overline{s_1} / s \overline{s}\}) \triangleright \diamond} \quad (94)$$

We now consider sub-case (ii). Similarly to sub-case (i) we first α -convert P as follows:

$$P \equiv_\alpha (\nu s_1) P' \{s_1 / s\}$$

For this sub-case Rule RES can be applied:

$$(\text{RES}) \frac{\Gamma, s_1 : \langle C \rangle; \Delta \vdash P' \{s_1 / s\} \triangleright \diamond}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash (\nu s_1) P' \{s_1 / s\} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (95)$$

By IH on the first assumption of (95) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}, s_1 : \langle C \rangle); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \tilde{x}), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P' \{s_1 / s\}) \triangleright \diamond \quad (96)$$

where $\tilde{x} \subseteq \text{fn}(P')$ such that $s_1 \notin \tilde{x}$ and \tilde{y} such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{x})$. Also, $\text{balanced}(\Theta_1)$ with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta_1) = \{c_k, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^* - 1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^* - 1}}\}$$

and $\Theta_1(c_k) = ?(\tilde{M}); \text{end}$ with $\tilde{M} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta))(\tilde{y})$.

Here we also take $\Theta = \Theta_1$ since $\lceil P \rceil^* = \lceil P' \rceil^*$. We notice that by Definitions 4.1 and 4.2 and (96):

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}, s_1 : \mathcal{H}^*(\langle C \rangle)); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \tilde{x}), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P' \{s_1 / s\}) \triangleright \diamond \quad (97)$$

By Table 5, we have:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k((\nu s) P') = (\nu s_1 : \mathcal{H}^*(\langle C \rangle)) \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P' \{s_1 / s\})$$

The following tree proves this sub-case:

$$(\text{POLYRES}) \frac{(97)}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \tilde{x}), \Theta \vdash (\nu s_1 : \mathcal{H}^*(\langle C \rangle)) \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P' \{s_1 / s\}) \triangleright \diamond} \quad (98)$$

5. Case $P = Q \mid R$. For this case only Rule PAR can be applied:

$$(\text{PAR}) \frac{\Gamma; \Delta_1 \vdash Q \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Delta_2 \vdash R \triangleright \diamond}{\Gamma; \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash Q \mid R \triangleright \diamond} \quad (99)$$

By IH on the first assumption of (99) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma'_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}_1}^{k+1}(Q) \triangleright \diamond \quad (100)$$

where $\tilde{x}_1 \subseteq \text{fn}(Q)$ and \tilde{y}_1 such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta_1}(\tilde{y}_1, \tilde{x}_1)$. Also, $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}_1$, $\Delta'_1 = \Delta_1 \setminus \tilde{x}_1$, and $\text{balanced}(\Theta_1)$ with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta_1) = \{c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+l+1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+2}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+l+2}}\}$$

and $\Theta_1(c_{k+1}) = ?(\widetilde{M}_1); \text{end}$ with $\widetilde{M}_1 = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1))(\tilde{y}_1)$.

By IH on the second assumption of (99) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma'_2); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_2), \Theta_2 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}_2}^{k+l+1}(R) \triangleright \diamond \quad (101)$$

where $\tilde{x}_2 \subseteq \text{fn}(R)$ and \tilde{y}_2 such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta_2}(\tilde{y}_2, \tilde{x}_2)$ and $l = |Q|$. Also, $\Gamma'_2 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}_2$, $\Delta'_2 = \Delta_2 \setminus \tilde{x}_2$ and $\text{balanced}(\Theta_2)$ with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta_2) = \{c_{k+l+1}, \dots, c_{k+l+2}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+l+2}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+l+3}}\}$$

and $\Theta_2(c_{k+l+1}) = ?(\widetilde{M}_2); \text{end}$ with $\widetilde{M}_2 = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_2))(\tilde{y}_2)$.

We define $\tilde{x} = \tilde{x}_1 \cup \tilde{x}_2$. We may notice that $\tilde{x} \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$ since $\text{fn}(P) = \text{fn}(Q) \cup \text{fn}(R)$. Accordingly, we define $\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}_1, \tilde{y}_2$. By definition, $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta_1, \Delta_2}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{x})$ holds. Further, let $\widetilde{M} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1, \Delta_2))(\tilde{y})$. We define $\Theta = \Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta'$ where:

$$\Theta' = c_k : ?(\widetilde{M}); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_1 \rangle; \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+l+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end}$$

By construction Θ is balanced since $\Theta(c_{k+1})$ dual $\Theta(\overline{c_{k+1}})$, $\Theta(c_{k+l+1})$ dual $\Theta(\overline{c_{k+l+1}})$, and Θ_1 and Θ_2 are balanced.

By Table 5 we have:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(Q \mid R) = c_k ?(\tilde{y}). \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{y}_1 \rangle. \overline{c_{k+l+1}} !\langle \tilde{y}_2 \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}_1}^{k+1}(Q) \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}_2}^{k+l+1}(R)$$

We may notice that $\tilde{y}_1 = \text{fnb}(Q, \tilde{y})$ and $\tilde{y}_2 = \text{fnb}(R, \tilde{y})$ hold by the construction of \tilde{y} . Let $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}$. We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1, \Delta'_2), \Theta \vdash c_k ?(\tilde{y}). \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{y}_1 \rangle. \overline{c_{k+l+1}} !\langle \tilde{y}_2 \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}_1}^{k+1}(Q) \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}_2}^{k+l+1}(R) \triangleright \diamond$$

To type $c_k ?(\tilde{y}). \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{y}_1 \rangle. \overline{c_{k+l+1}} !\langle \tilde{y}_2 \rangle. \mathbf{0}$, we use some auxiliary derivations:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(NIL)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0}} \\ \text{(END)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \overline{c_{k+l+1}} : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0}} \quad \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_2), \vdash \widetilde{M}_2} \\ \text{(POLYSEND)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_2), \overline{c_{k+l+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_{k+l+1}} !\langle \tilde{z} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{(END)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_2), \overline{c_{k+l+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_{k+l+1}} !\langle \tilde{z} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (102)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1) \vdash \widetilde{M}_1} \\ \text{(POLYSEND)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1, \Delta'_2), \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_1 \rangle; \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+l+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{y}_1 \rangle. \overline{c_{k+l+1}} !\langle \tilde{y}_2 \rangle. \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{(END)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1, \Delta'_2), \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_1 \rangle; \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+l+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end}, c_k : \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{y}_1 \rangle. \overline{c_{k+l+1}} !\langle \tilde{y}_2 \rangle. \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (103)$$

$$\text{(POLYRCV)} \frac{\text{(103)} \quad \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1, \Delta'_2) \vdash \tilde{x} \triangleright \tilde{M}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \Theta' \vdash c_k?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle\tilde{y}_1\rangle.\overline{c_{k+l+1}}!\langle\tilde{y}_2\rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \Theta' \vdash c_k?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle\tilde{y}_1\rangle.\overline{c_{k+l+1}}!\langle\tilde{y}_2\rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (104)$$

$$\text{(Lemma A.2) with } \Gamma'_1 \setminus \Gamma_1 \frac{\text{(100)}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}_1}^{k+1}(Q) \triangleright \diamond} \quad (105)$$

$$\text{(Lemma A.2) with } \Gamma'_2 \setminus \Gamma_1 \frac{\text{(101)}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_2), \Theta_2 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}_2}^{k+l+1}(R) \triangleright \diamond} \quad (106)$$

$$\text{(PAR)} \frac{\text{(105)} \quad \text{(106)}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1, \Delta'_2), \Theta_1, \Theta_2 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^{k+1}(Q) \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+l+1}(R) \triangleright \diamond} \quad (107)$$

The following tree proves this case:

$$\text{(PAR)} \frac{\text{(104)} \quad \text{(107)}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1, \Delta'_2), \Theta \vdash c_k?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle\tilde{y}_1\rangle.\overline{c_{k+l+1}}!\langle\tilde{y}_2\rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}_1}^{k+1}(Q) \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}_2}^{k+l+1}(R) \triangleright \diamond}$$

6. Case $P = \mu X.P'$. The only rule that can be applied here is REC:

$$\frac{\Gamma, X : \Delta; \Delta \vdash P' \triangleright \diamond}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash \mu X.P'} \quad (108)$$

We remark that by (108) we know $x : S \in \Delta \implies \text{tr}(S)$. Then, by applying Lemma 4.2 on the assumption of (108) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta \vdash \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P')_g \triangleright \diamond \quad (109)$$

We take $\tilde{x}' = \text{fn}(P')$, so we have $\Delta \setminus x' = \emptyset$. Further, \tilde{y}' is such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\tilde{y}', \tilde{x}')$. Let $\Theta' = \Theta'_\mu, \Theta_X(g)$ with $\Theta_X(g) = c_X^r : \langle \tilde{M}' \rangle$ with $\tilde{M}' = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta))(\tilde{y}')$. Further, $\tilde{x}' \subseteq P'$ and \tilde{y}' such that $\Delta \setminus x' = \emptyset$ and $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\tilde{y}', \tilde{x}')$. Also, $\text{balanced}(\Theta'_\mu)$ with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta'_\mu) = \{c_{k+1}^r, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^*}^r\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}^r}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^*}^r}\}$$

where $\Theta'_\mu(c_{k+1}) = c_k : ?(\tilde{M}'); \text{end}$.

Let $l = \lceil P' \rceil^*$ and \tilde{z} such that $|\tilde{y}'| = |\tilde{z}|$. Further, let $\tilde{x} \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$ and $\tilde{y} = \text{nbd}(\tilde{x} : \tilde{S})$. By definition we have $\tilde{x} \subseteq \tilde{x}'$. By Table 5, we have:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P) = (\nu c_X^r) (c_k?(\tilde{y}).\overline{c_{k+1}^r}!\langle\tilde{y}'\rangle.\mu X.c_X^r?(\tilde{z}).\overline{c_{k+1}^r}!\langle\tilde{z}\rangle.X \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P')_g)$$

Let $\Theta_\mu = \Theta'_\mu \cdot \Theta''_\mu$ where:

$$\Theta''_\mu = \overline{c_k^r} : \mu t. ?(\tilde{M}); t \cdot \overline{c_{k+1}^r} : \mu t. !\langle \tilde{M}' \rangle; t$$

We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot \Delta_\mu \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P) \triangleright \diamond \quad (110)$$

Let $\Theta'_X = c_X^r : \mu t. ?(\tilde{M}'); t \cdot \overline{c_X^r} : \mu t. !\langle \tilde{M}' \rangle; t$. We use some auxiliary sub-trees:

$$\frac{\text{(RVAR)} \frac{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}), X : \Theta''; \Theta'' \vdash X \triangleright \diamond}{\text{(SEND)}} \quad \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}), X : \Theta''; \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta) \vdash \tilde{z} \triangleright \widetilde{M}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}), X : \Theta''; \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta), \Theta'' \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X \triangleright \diamond} \quad (111)$$

$$\frac{\text{(POLYRCV)} \frac{\text{(111)} \quad \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta) \vdash \tilde{z} \triangleright \widetilde{M}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}), X : \Theta''; \Theta'' \vdash c_X^r ? (\tilde{z}). \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X \triangleright \diamond}}{\text{(REC)} \frac{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta'' \vdash \mu X . c_X^r ? (\tilde{z}). \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X \triangleright \diamond}}{\quad} \quad (112)$$

where $\Theta'' = \overline{c_{k+1}^r} : \mu t. ! \langle \widetilde{M} \rangle ; t, c_X^r : \mu t. ? (\widetilde{M}) ; t$.

$$\text{(POLYSEND)} \frac{\text{(112)} \quad \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta) \vdash \tilde{y}' \triangleright \widetilde{M}'}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta), \overline{c_{k+1}^r} : \mu t. ! \langle \widetilde{M} \rangle ; t, c_X^r : \mu t. ? (\widetilde{M}) ; t \vdash c_{k+1}^r ! \langle \tilde{y}' \rangle . \mu X . c_X^r ? (\tilde{z}). \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X \triangleright \diamond}}{\quad} \quad (113)$$

$$\text{(POLYRCV)} \frac{\text{(113)} \quad \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \tilde{y} : \widetilde{M} \vdash \tilde{y} \triangleright \widetilde{M}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot \Theta''_\mu \cdot c_X^r : \mu t. ? (\widetilde{M}) ; t \vdash c_k ? (\tilde{y}). \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{y}' \rangle . \mu X . c_X^r ? (\tilde{z}). \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X \triangleright \diamond}}{\quad} \quad (114)$$

The following tree proves this case:

$$\text{(RES)} \frac{\text{(PAR)} \frac{\text{(114)} \quad \text{(109)} \quad \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot \Theta_\mu \cdot \Theta'_X \vdash c_k ? (\tilde{y}). \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{y}' \rangle . \mu X . c_X^r ? (\tilde{z}). \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \tilde{x}) \cdot \Theta_\mu \vdash (\nu c_X^r) (c_k ? (\tilde{y}). \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{y}' \rangle . \mu X . c_X^r ? (\tilde{z}). \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P')) \triangleright \diamond}}{\quad} \quad (115)$$

7. Case $P = r! \langle z \rangle . P'$ when $\text{tr}(r)$. For this case Rule SEND can be applied:

$$\text{(SEND)} \frac{\Gamma; \Delta, r : S' \vdash P' \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Delta_z \vdash z \triangleright C}{\Gamma; \Delta, r : S, \Delta_z \vdash r! \langle z \rangle . P' \triangleright \diamond} \quad (116)$$

where $S = ! \langle C \rangle ; S'$.

Then, by IH on the first assumption of (116) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma'_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (117)$$

where $\tilde{x}' \subseteq \text{fn}(P')$ such that $r \in \tilde{x}'$ and \tilde{y}' such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta, r, S}(\tilde{y}', \tilde{x}')$. By this follows that $(r_1, \dots, r_{|\mathcal{H}^*(S)|}) \subseteq \tilde{y}'$. Also, $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}'$, $\Delta'_1 = \Delta \setminus \tilde{y}'$, and $\text{balanced}(\Theta_1)$ with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta_1) = \{c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+|\mathcal{P}'|}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+2}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+|\mathcal{P}'|}}\}$$

and $\Theta_1(c_{k+1}) = ?(\widetilde{M}_1); \text{end}$ where $\widetilde{M}_1 = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta, r : S))(\tilde{y}')$.

By applying Lemma A.5 on the assumption of (74) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_z) \vdash \tilde{z} \triangleright \mathcal{H}^*(C) \quad (118)$$

We assume $\tilde{x} = \tilde{x}', z$. Since $\tilde{x}' \subseteq \text{fn}(P')$ follows that $\tilde{x} \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$. Let $\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}', \tilde{z}$ where $|\tilde{z}| = |\mathcal{H}^*(C)|$. By Definition 4.10 it follows that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta, r, S, \Delta_z}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{x})$. We define $\Theta = \Theta_1, \Theta'$, where:

$$\Theta' = c_k : ?(\widetilde{M}); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : ! \langle \widetilde{M}_1 \rangle ; \text{end}$$

with $\widetilde{M} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta, r : S, \Delta_z))(\widetilde{y})$. By Definition 4.3, we know $\lceil P \rceil^* = \lceil P' \rceil^* + 1$, so

$$\text{dom}(\Theta) = \{c_k, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1}}\}$$

and Θ is balanced since $\Theta(c_{k+1})$ dual $\Theta(\overline{c_{k+1}})$ and Θ_1 is balanced.

By Table 5, we have:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}}^k(r!\langle z \rangle.P') = c_k?(y).r_{\iota(S)}!\langle \widetilde{z} \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{y}' \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P')$$

Let $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \widetilde{x} = \Gamma'_1$ and $\Delta \setminus \widetilde{x} = \Delta'_1$. We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}}^k(r!\langle z \rangle.P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (119)$$

Let $\Delta_1 = \Delta, r : S, \Delta_z$. To type the left-hand side component of $\mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}}^k(r!\langle z \rangle.P')$ we use some auxiliary derivations:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(NIL)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{(END)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \overline{c_{k+1}} : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta, r : S \setminus \Delta'_1) \vdash \widetilde{y}' \triangleright \widetilde{M}_1} \\ \text{(POLYSEND)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_1 \rangle; \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta, r : S \setminus \Delta'_1) \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{y}' \rangle. \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (120)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(POLYSEND)} \frac{(120) \quad (118)}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1 \setminus \Delta'_1), \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_1 \rangle; \text{end} \vdash r_{\iota(S)}!\langle \widetilde{z} \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{y}' \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{(END)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1 \setminus \Delta'_1), \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_1 \rangle; \text{end}, c_k : \text{end} \vdash r_{\iota(S)}!\langle \widetilde{z} \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{y}' \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (121)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1 \setminus \Delta'_1) \vdash \widetilde{y} \triangleright \widetilde{M}} \\ \text{(POLYRCV)} \frac{(121)}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \Theta' \vdash c_k?(y).r_{\iota(S)}!\langle \widetilde{z} \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{y}' \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (122)$$

We may notice that by Definition 4.2 and Figure 15 we have $\mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1 \setminus \Delta'_1) = \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta), \widetilde{r} : \mathcal{R}_\circ^*(S), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_z) \setminus \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1)$. Further, by Lemma A.4 we know $\mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1)(r_{\iota(S)}) = \mu t. !\langle \mathcal{H}^*(C) \rangle; t$.

The following tree proves this case:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(117)} \\ \text{(PAR)} \frac{(122) \quad \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}}^k(r!\langle z \rangle.P') \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (123)$$

8. Case $P = r?(z).P'$ when $\text{tr}(r)$. For this case Rule RCV can be applied:

$$\text{Rcv} \frac{\Gamma; \Delta, r : S', \Delta_z \vdash P' \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Delta_z \vdash z \triangleright C}{\Gamma \setminus z; \Delta, r : S \vdash r?(z).P' \triangleright \diamond} \quad (124)$$

where $S = ?(C); S'$.

Then, by IH on the first assumption of (55) we know:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma'_1); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta'_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (125)$$

where $\widetilde{x}' \subseteq \text{fn}(P')$ such that $r \in \widetilde{x}'$ and \widetilde{y}' such that $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta, r; S}(\widetilde{y}', \widetilde{x}')$. By this it follows that $(r_1, \dots, r_{|\mathcal{H}^*(S)|}) \subseteq \widetilde{y}'$.

Also, $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma \setminus \widetilde{x}'$, $\Delta'_1 = \Delta \setminus \widetilde{x}'$, and $\text{balanced}(\Theta_1)$ with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta_1) = \{c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^*}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+2}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P' \rceil^*}}\}$$

and $\Theta_1(c_{k+1}) = ?(\widetilde{M}')$; end where $\widetilde{M}' = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta, r : S, \Delta_z))(\widetilde{y}')$.

By applying Lemma A.5 to the second assumption of (55) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_z) \vdash z \triangleright \mathcal{H}^*(C) \quad (126)$$

Let $\widetilde{x} = \widetilde{x}' \setminus z$ and $\widetilde{y} = \widetilde{y}' \setminus \widetilde{z}$ such that $|\widetilde{z}| = \mathcal{H}^*(C)$ where. We may notice that by Definition 4.10 $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta, r : S}(\widetilde{y}, \widetilde{x})$ holds. We define $\Theta = \Theta_1, \Theta'$, where

$$\Theta' = c_k : ?(\widetilde{M}'); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end}$$

with $\widetilde{M} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta, , u_i : ?(C); S))(\widetilde{y})$. By Definition 4.3, $\lceil P \rceil^* = \lceil P' \rceil^* + 1$ so

$$\text{dom}(\Theta) = \{c_k, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1}}\}$$

and Θ is balanced since $\Theta(c_{k+1}) \text{ dual } \Theta(\overline{c_{k+1}})$ and Θ_1 is balanced. By Table 5:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}}^k(r?(z).P') = c_k?(\widetilde{y}).r_{\iota(S)}?(\widetilde{z}).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{y}' \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P')$$

Also, let $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \widetilde{x}$ and $\Delta_1 = \Delta \setminus \widetilde{x}$. We may notice that $\Delta_1 = \Delta'_1$. We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1 \setminus z); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}}^k(r?(z).P')$$

Let $\Delta_1 = \Delta, r : S$. The left-hand side component of $\mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}}^k(r?(z).P')$ is typed using some auxiliary derivations:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(NIL)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \Delta_1) \vdash \widetilde{y}' \triangleright \widetilde{M}'} \\ \text{(END)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \overline{c_{k+1}} : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{(POLYSEND)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \Delta_1) \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{y}' \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (127)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(RCV)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus z); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_2) \vdash r_{\iota(S)}?(\widetilde{z}).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{y}' \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{(126)} \\ \text{(END)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus z); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end}, c_k : \text{end}, \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_2) \vdash r_{\iota(S)}?(\widetilde{z}).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{y}' \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (128)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus z); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_2) \vdash \widetilde{y} \triangleright \widetilde{M}} \\ \text{(POLYRCV)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1 \setminus z); \Theta' \vdash c_k?(\widetilde{y}).r_{\iota(S)}?(\widetilde{z}).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{y}' \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (129)$$

where $\Delta_2 = \Delta, r : S \setminus \Delta_1$. We may notice that by Definition 4.2 and Figure 15 we have $\mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_2) = \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta), \widetilde{r} : \mathcal{R}_\circ(S) \setminus \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1)$. Further, by Lemma A.4 we know $\mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_2)(r_{\iota(S)}) = \mu t. ?(\mathcal{H}^*(C)); t$.

The following tree proves this case:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(125)} \\ \text{(PAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma_1 \setminus z); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1), \Theta \vdash c_k?(\widetilde{y}).r_{\iota(S)}?(\widetilde{z}).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{y}' \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (130)$$

9. Case $P = (\nu s : \mu t. S) P'$. For this case Rule RESS can be applied:

$$\text{(RESS)} \frac{\Gamma; \Delta, s : \mu t. S, \overline{s} : \overline{\mu t. S} \vdash P'}{\Gamma; \Delta \vdash (\nu s : \mu t. S) P'} \quad (131)$$

By IH on the assumption of (131) we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}'); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \tilde{x}'), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'}^{k+1}(P') \quad (132)$$

where we take \tilde{y}' such that $\tilde{s}, \tilde{\bar{s}} \subseteq \tilde{y}'$ with $\tilde{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_{|\mathcal{R}^*(S)|})$ and $\tilde{\bar{s}} = (\bar{s}_1, \dots, \bar{s}_{|\mathcal{R}^*(\bar{S})|})$. Accordingly, \tilde{x}' is such that $s, \bar{s} \subseteq \tilde{x}'$. Since $\text{lin}(s)$ and $\text{lin}(\bar{s})$ we know $\tilde{x}' \subseteq \text{fn}(P')$. Also, $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta_1}(\tilde{y}', \tilde{x}')$ where $\Delta_1 = \Delta, s : \mu t.S, \bar{s} : \mu t.\bar{S}$. Also, $\text{balanced}(\Theta_1)$ with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta_1) = \{c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+|\mathcal{P}'|}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+2}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+|\mathcal{P}'|}}\}$$

and $\Theta_1(c_{k+1}) = ?(\tilde{M}')$;end where $\tilde{M} = (\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma), \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta))(\tilde{y}')$.

Let $\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}' \setminus (\tilde{s}, \tilde{\bar{s}})$ and $\tilde{x} = \tilde{x}' \setminus (s, \bar{s})$. Since $s, \bar{s} \notin \text{fn}(P)$ we know $\tilde{x} \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$ and $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma, \Delta}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{x})$.

We define $\Theta = \Theta_1, \Theta'$ where

$$\Theta' = c_k : ?(\tilde{M});\text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \tilde{M}' \rangle;\text{end}$$

By Table 5, we have:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P) = (\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{R}^*(S)) (c_k ?(\tilde{y}). \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{y}' \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'}^k(P'))$$

We should prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \tilde{x}), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P) \triangleright \diamond$$

We use an auxiliary sub-tree:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(NIL)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1 \cap \tilde{x}') \vdash \tilde{y}' \triangleright \tilde{M}'} \\ \text{(POLYSEND)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \cap \tilde{x}), \tilde{s} : \mathcal{R}^*(S), \tilde{\bar{s}} : \mathcal{R}^*(\bar{S}) \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{y}' \rangle. \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (133)$$

where we may notice that

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \cap \tilde{x}), \tilde{s} : \mathcal{R}^*(S), \tilde{\bar{s}} : \mathcal{R}^*(\bar{S}) = \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta_1 \cap \tilde{x}')$$

The following tree proves this case:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(POLYRCV)} \frac{\text{(133)} \quad \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \cap \tilde{x}) \vdash \tilde{y} \triangleright \tilde{M}}}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \Theta', \tilde{s} : \mathcal{R}^*(S), \tilde{\bar{s}} : \mathcal{R}^*(\bar{S}) \vdash c_k ?(\tilde{y}). \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{y}' \rangle. \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (132) \\ \text{(PAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \tilde{x}), \Theta, \tilde{s} : \mathcal{R}^*(S), \tilde{\bar{s}} : \mathcal{R}^*(\bar{S}) \vdash c_k ?(\tilde{y}). \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{y}' \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'}^k(P') \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{(POLYRESS)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta \setminus \tilde{x}), \Theta \vdash (\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{R}^*(S)) (c_k ?(\tilde{y}). \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{y}' \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}'}^k(P')) \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (134)$$

This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.3. \square

A.5 Proof of Theorem 4.1 (Minimality Result, Optimized)

Theorem 4.1 (Minimality Result for π , Optimized). *Let P be a process with $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P)$. If $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ then $\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma\sigma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta\sigma) \vdash \mathcal{F}^*(P) \triangleright \diamond$, where $\sigma = \{\text{init}(\tilde{u})/\tilde{u}\}$.*

Proof. By assumption, $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$. Then by applying Lemma A.1 we have:

$$\Gamma\sigma; \Delta\sigma \vdash P\sigma \triangleright \diamond \quad (135)$$

By Definition 4.8, we shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma\sigma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta\sigma) \vdash (\nu \tilde{c}) (\overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{r} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{r}}^k(P\sigma)) \triangleright \diamond \quad (136)$$

where $\tilde{c} = (c_k, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1})$; $k > 0$; and $\tilde{r} = \bigcup_{v \in \tilde{v}} \{v_1, \dots, v_{|\mathcal{H}^*(S)|}\}$ with $v : S$. Since $\tilde{v} \subseteq \text{fn}(P)$ we know $\text{indexed}_{\Gamma\sigma, \Delta\sigma}(\tilde{r}, \tilde{v})$. Since $P\sigma$ is an initialized process, we apply Lemma 4.3 to (135) to get:

$$\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma\sigma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta\sigma \setminus \tilde{v}), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{r}}^k(P\sigma) \triangleright \diamond \quad (137)$$

where Θ is balanced with

$$\text{dom}(\Theta) = \{c_k, c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P \rceil^*-1}}\}$$

and $\Theta(c_k) = ?(\tilde{M}); \text{end}$ with $\tilde{M} = \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta)(\tilde{r})$.

The following tree proves this case:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(NIL)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma\sigma); \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{(POLYVAR)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma\sigma); \tilde{r} : \tilde{M} \vdash \tilde{r} \triangleright \tilde{M}} \\ \text{(END)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma\sigma); c_k : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{(SEND)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma\sigma); \overline{c_k} : !\langle \tilde{M} \rangle; \text{end}, \tilde{r} : \tilde{M} \vdash \overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{r} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{Par} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma\sigma); \overline{c_k} : !\langle \tilde{M} \rangle; \text{end}, \tilde{r} : \tilde{M} \vdash \overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{r} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (137) \\ \text{(RESS)} \frac{}{\mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma\sigma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta\sigma), \overline{c_k} : !\langle \tilde{M} \rangle; \text{end}, \Theta \vdash \overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{r} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{r}}^k(P\sigma) \triangleright \diamond} \\ \mathcal{H}^*(\Gamma\sigma); \mathcal{H}^*(\Delta\sigma) \vdash (\nu \tilde{c}) (\overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{r} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{r}}^k(P\sigma)) \triangleright \diamond \end{array}$$

□

A.6 Proof of Lemma 4.7

For convenience, we define the function $\hat{\mathcal{C}}^-(\cdot)$, relying on $\mathcal{C}^-(\cdot)$, as follows:

Definition A.1 (Function $\hat{\mathcal{C}}^-(\cdot)$). Let P be a process, ρ be a name substitution, and σ be an indexed name substitution. We define $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_\sigma^\rho(P)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{C}}_\sigma^\rho(P_1) &= \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}_*}^{\tilde{u}_*}(P\sigma) \\ \text{with } \rho &= \{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}, \tilde{u}_* = \text{bn}(\tilde{u}\sigma : \tilde{C}), \tilde{x}_* = \text{bn}(\tilde{x}\sigma : \tilde{C}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{u} : \tilde{C}$.

Recall that \mathcal{S} has been defined in Definition 4.27.

Lemma 4.7. Assume $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$ is a process and $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}\mathcal{S}Q_1$.

1. Whenever $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_1) n! \langle v : C_1 \rangle} P_2$, such that $\bar{n} \notin P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$, then there exist Q_2 and σ_v such that $Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) \check{n}! \langle \tilde{v} : \mathcal{H}^*(C_1) \rangle} Q_2$ where $v\sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ and, for a fresh t ,

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2 \parallel t \Leftarrow_{\mathcal{C}} v : C_1) \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \parallel t_1 \Leftarrow_{\mathcal{M}} v\sigma_v : C_1)$$

2. Whenever $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n?(v)} P_2$, such that $\bar{n} \notin P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$, then there exist Q_2 and σ_v such that $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\check{n}?(v)} Q_2$ where $v\sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$,

3. Whenever $P_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} P_2$ then there exists Q_2 such that $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} Q_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$.

Proof. By transition induction. Let $\rho_1 = \{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$. By inversion of $P_1 \mathcal{S} Q_1$ we know there is $\sigma_1 \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_1) \cup \tilde{u} \cup \tilde{x})$, such that $Q_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_1}^{\rho_1}(P_1)$. We need the following assertion on index substitutions.

If $P_1\rho_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} P_2\rho_2$ and $\text{subj}(\ell) = n$ then there exists Q_2 such that $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\check{\ell}} Q_2$ with $\text{subj}(\check{\ell}) = n_i$ and $Q_2 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_2}^{\rho_2}(P_2)$ such that $\sigma_2 \in \text{index}(P_2\rho_2)$, $\text{next}(n_i) \in \sigma_2$, and $\sigma_1 \cdot (\sigma_2 \setminus \text{next}(n_i)) = (\sigma_2 \setminus \text{next}(n_i)) \cdot \sigma_1$.

We proceed as follows.

- First, we consider two base cases: Rules $\langle \text{SND} \rangle$ and $\langle \text{RV} \rangle$.
- Then, we consider two inductive cases: Rules $\langle \text{PAR}_L \rangle$ and $\langle \text{TAU} \rangle$. We omit the inductive cases $\langle \text{NEW} \rangle$ and $\langle \text{RES} \rangle$ as they follow directly by the inductive hypothesis and the definition of the restriction case in $\mathcal{C}^-(\cdot)$ (Table 7).
- Finally, we separately treat cases when a process is recursive. We show two cases ($\langle \text{RV} \rangle$ and $\langle \text{PAR}_L \rangle$) emphasizing the specifics of the recursion breakdown.

Non-recursive cases We detail the four cases mentioned above.

1. Case $\langle \text{SND} \rangle$. We note that we only consider the case when P_1 is a pure process, as the case when P_1 is a trigger collection follows directly by Lemma 4.5.

We distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $P_1 = n!\langle v \rangle.P_2$ and (ii) $P_1 = n!\langle y \rangle.P_2$ with $\{v/y\} \in \rho_1$. In both sub-cases we know there is $\rho_2 = \{\tilde{u}_2/\tilde{x}_2\}$ such that

$$P_1\rho_1 = n\rho_1!\langle v \rangle.P_2\rho_2$$

We have the following transition:

$$\text{SND} \frac{}{P_1\rho_1 \xrightarrow{n\rho_1!\langle v \rangle} P_2\rho_2}$$

Let $\sigma_1 \in \text{index}(\tilde{p})$ where $\tilde{p} = \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_1) \cup \tilde{u} \cup \tilde{x})$ such that $\{n_i/n\} \in \sigma_1$ and $\sigma'_2 = \sigma_2 \cdot \{t_1/t\} \cdot \{t_1/t\}$. Here we take $\sigma_v = \sigma_1$, as we know $v \in \text{fn}(P_1)$. Further, let $\tilde{u}_* = \text{nbd}(\tilde{u}\sigma_1 : \tilde{C})$ and $\tilde{x}_* = \text{nbd}(\tilde{x}\sigma_1 : \tilde{C})$ with $\tilde{u} : \tilde{C}$. Also, let $\tilde{z} = \text{fnb}(P_2, \tilde{x}_* \setminus \tilde{w})$ where $\tilde{w} = \{n_i\}$ if $\text{lin}(n_i)$ otherwise $\tilde{w} = \epsilon$. Then, in both sub-cases, there are two possibilities for the shape of Q_1 , namely:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1^1 &= (\nu \tilde{c}_k) (\overline{c_k}!\langle \tilde{u}_* \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}_*}^k(P_1\sigma_1)) \\ Q_1^2 &= (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) n_i\rho_*!\langle \tilde{v} \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{z}\rho_* \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_2) \end{aligned}$$

where $v\sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ and $\rho_* = \{\tilde{u}_*/\tilde{x}_*\}$. By Lemma 4.6 we know that $Q_1^1 \xrightarrow{\tau} Q_1^2$. Thus, we only consider how Q_1^2 evolves. We can infer the following:

$$Q_1^2 \xrightarrow{n_i\rho_*!\langle \tilde{v} \rangle} Q_2$$

where $Q_2 = (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{z}\rho_* \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_2)$. Then, we should show the following:

$$(P_2 \parallel t \Leftarrow_{\text{C}} v : C_1)\rho_2 \mathcal{S} (Q_2 \parallel t_1 \Leftarrow_{\text{M}} v\sigma_v : C_1) \quad (138)$$

By Table 7 we can see that

$$Q_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}}^{\tilde{z}\rho_*}(P_2\sigma_2) \quad (139)$$

Here we remark that our assertion holds by the definition as we have $\sigma_2 = \sigma_1 \cdot \text{next}(n_i)$.

Next, by Lemma 4.4 we have

$$(t \Leftarrow_{\text{C}} v : C_1)\sigma_2 \diamond (t_1 \Leftarrow_{\text{M}} v\sigma_v : C_1)$$

That is, we have

$$(t_1 \Leftarrow_{\text{M}} v\sigma_v : C_1) \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}}^{\tilde{z}\rho_*}((t \Leftarrow_{\text{C}} v : C_1)\sigma_2) \quad (140)$$

Thus, by (139) and (140) we have

$$(Q_2 \parallel t_1 \Leftarrow_{\text{M}} v\sigma_v : C_1) \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}}^{\tilde{z}\rho_*}((P_2 \parallel t \Leftarrow_{\text{C}} v : C_1)\sigma_2) \quad (141)$$

Now, by Definition 4.4 and Definition 4.7 we know that

$$\tilde{z} = \text{fnb}(P_2, \text{nbd}(\tilde{x} : \tilde{C}) \setminus \tilde{w}) = \text{nbd}(\tilde{x}_2 \sigma_2 : \tilde{C}_2)$$

with $\tilde{x}_2 : \tilde{C}_2$. Similarly, we have

$$\tilde{z} \rho_* = \text{nbd}(\tilde{x}_2 \rho_2 \sigma_2 : \tilde{C}_2)$$

Now, by the assumption $\bar{n} \notin \tilde{v}$ we know $\{\bar{n}_i/\bar{n}\} \notin \sigma_2$. Thus, by $\sigma_2 = \sigma_1 \cdot \text{next}(n_i) \cdot \{t_1/t\}$ and Definition 4.26, we have

$$\sigma_2 \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_2 \parallel t \leftarrow_c v : C_1) \cup \tilde{u}_2 \cup \tilde{x}_2)$$

By this and (141) the goal (138) follows. This concludes $\langle \text{SND} \rangle$ case.

2. Case $\langle \text{Rv} \rangle$. As in above case ($\langle \text{SND} \rangle$), we only consider the case when P_1 is a pure process, as the case when P_1 is a trigger collection follows directly by Lemma 4.5.

Here we know $P_1 = n?(y).P_2$. We know there is $\rho_2 = \{\tilde{u}_2/\tilde{x}_2\}$ such that

$$P_1 \rho_1 = n\rho_1?(y).P_2 \rho_2$$

The transition is as follows:

$$\text{Rv} \frac{}{n\rho_1?(y).P_2 \rho_2 \xrightarrow{n?(v)} P_2 \rho_2 \cdot \{v/y\}}$$

Let $\sigma_1 \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_1) \cup \tilde{u} \cup \tilde{x})$ and $\sigma_2 = \sigma_1 \cdot \text{next}(n_i) \cdot \{y_1/y\}$. Further, let $\tilde{u}_* = \text{nbd}(\tilde{u}\sigma_1 : \tilde{C})$ and $\tilde{x}_* = \text{nbd}(\tilde{x}\sigma_1 : \tilde{C})$ with $\tilde{u} : \tilde{C}$. Also, let $\tilde{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_{|\mathcal{H}^*(S)|})$ and $\tilde{z} = \text{fnb}(P_2, \tilde{x}_* \tilde{y} \setminus \tilde{w})$ where $\tilde{w} = \{n_i\}$ if $\text{lin}(n_i)$ otherwise $\tilde{w} = \epsilon$. Then, there are two possibilities for the shape of Q_1 , namely:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1^1 &= (\nu \tilde{c}_k) (\overline{c_k!} \langle \tilde{u}_* \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}_*}^k(P_1 \sigma_1)) \\ Q_1^2 &= (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) n_i \rho?(y). \overline{c_{k+1}!} \langle \tilde{z} \rho \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(P_2 \sigma_2) \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.6 we know that $Q_1^1 \xrightarrow{\tau} Q_1^2$. Thus, we only consider how Q_1^2 evolves. We can infer the following:

$$Q_1^2 \xrightarrow{n_i \rho?(\tilde{v})} Q_2$$

where $Q_2 = (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) \overline{c_{k+1}!} \langle \tilde{z} \rho \cdot \{\tilde{v}/\tilde{y}\} \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(P_2 \sigma_2)$ and $v \sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ for some $\sigma_v \in \text{index}(v)$. Now, we should show the following:

$$P_2 \rho_2 \cdot \{v/y\} \mathcal{S} Q_2 \tag{142}$$

By Table 7 we can see that

$$Q_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}}^{\tilde{z} \rho_2 \cdot \{\tilde{v}/\tilde{y}\}}(P_2 \sigma_2 \cdot \sigma_v) \tag{143}$$

We may notice that

$$\sigma_2 \cdot \sigma_v \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_2) \cup \tilde{u}_2 \cup \tilde{x}_2)$$

Futher, by the definition we have $(\sigma_2 \cdot \sigma_v) \setminus \text{next}(n_i) = \sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_v$. As $v \notin (\text{fn}(P_1) \cup \tilde{u} \cup \tilde{x}) = \text{codom}(\sigma_1)$, we have $\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_v = \sigma_v \cdot \sigma_1$. That is, our assertion on index substitutions holds.

By Definition 4.4 and Definition 4.7 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{z} &= \text{fnb}(P_2, \text{nb}(\tilde{x} : \tilde{C}) \cdot \tilde{y} \setminus \tilde{w}) \\ &= \text{nb}(\tilde{x}y(\sigma_1 \cdot \text{next}(n_i) \cdot \{y_1/y\}) : \tilde{C}S)\end{aligned}$$

with $y : S$. Similarly, we have

$$\tilde{z}\rho_2 \cdot \{\tilde{v}/\tilde{y}\} = \text{nb}(\tilde{x}y\rho_2 \cdot \{v/y\}(\sigma_2 \cdot \sigma_v) : \tilde{C}S)$$

Thus, by this and (143) the goal (142) follows. This concludes $\langle \text{Rv} \rangle$ case (and the base cases). We remark that base cases concerning triggers collection processes follow by Lemma 4.5. Next, we consider inductive cases.

3. Case $\langle \text{PAR}_L \rangle$. Here we know $P_1 = P'_1 \mid P''_1$. Let ρ'_1 and ρ''_1 be such that

$$P_1\rho_1 = P'_1\rho'_1 \mid P''_1\rho''_1$$

The final rule in the inference tree is as follows:

$$\langle \text{PAR}_L \rangle \frac{P'_1\rho'_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} P'_2\rho'_2 \quad \text{bn}(\ell) \cap \text{fn}(P''_1) = \emptyset}{P'_1\rho'_1 \mid P''_1\rho''_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} P'_2\rho'_2 \mid P''_1\rho''_1}$$

Let $\sigma_1 \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_1) \cup \tilde{u} \cup \tilde{x})$. Further, let σ'_1 and σ''_1 such that

$$P_1\rho_1\sigma_1 = P'_1\rho'_1\sigma'_1 \mid P''_1\rho''_1\sigma''_1$$

Further, let $\tilde{y} = \text{fnb}(P'_1, \tilde{x}_*)$, $\tilde{z} = \text{fnb}(P''_1, \tilde{x}_*)$, $\tilde{u}_* = \text{nb}(\tilde{u}\sigma_1 : \tilde{C})$, $\tilde{x}_* = \text{nb}(\tilde{x}\sigma_1 : \tilde{C})$ with $\tilde{u} : \tilde{C}$, and $\rho_m = \{\tilde{u}_*/\tilde{x}_*\}$. In sub-case (i), by the definition of \mathcal{S} (Table 7), there are following possibilities for Q_1 :

$$\begin{aligned}Q_1^1 &= (\nu \tilde{c}_k) (\overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{u}_* \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}_*}^k(P'_1\sigma'_1)) \\ Q_1^2 &= \overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{y}\rho_m \rangle \cdot \overline{c_{k+l}}! \langle \tilde{z}\rho_m \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}}^k(P'_1\sigma'_1) \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+l}(P''_1\sigma''_1) \\ N_1^3 &= \left\{ (R'_1 \mid R''_1) : \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{y}\rho_m}(P'_1\sigma'_1), R''_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}}^{\tilde{z}\rho_m}(P''_1\sigma''_1) \right\}\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.6 there exist

$$Q'_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma'_1}^{\rho'_1}(P'_1) \tag{144}$$

$$Q''_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\sigma''_1}^{\rho''_1}(P''_1) \tag{145}$$

such that

$$Q_1^1 \xRightarrow{\tau} Q_1^2 \xRightarrow{\tau} Q'_1 \mid Q''_1$$

Thus, in both cases we consider how $Q'_1 \mid Q''_1$ evolves. By the definition of \mathcal{S} we have

$$P'_1\rho'_1 \mathcal{S} Q'_1 \tag{146}$$

$$P''_1\rho''_1 \mathcal{S} Q''_1 \tag{147}$$

To apply IH we do a case analysis on the action ℓ . There are three sub-cases:

- Sub-case $\ell \equiv n?\langle v \rangle$. If $v \in \tilde{u}$ then we take $\sigma_v = \sigma_1$, otherwise $\sigma_v = \{v_j/v\}$ for $j > 0$. Then, by applying IH to (146) we know there is Q'_2 such that $Q'_1 \xrightarrow{n_i?\langle \tilde{v} \rangle} Q'_2$ and

$$P'_2\{\tilde{u}'_2/\tilde{y}_2\} \mathcal{S} Q'_2 \quad (148)$$

where $v\sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ and $\tilde{u}'_2 = \tilde{u}'_1 \cdot \tilde{v}$. We should show that

$$P'_2\rho'_2 \mid P''_1\rho''_1 \mathcal{S} Q'_2 \mid Q''_1 \quad (149)$$

Now, by the assertion on index substitutions, we have $\sigma'_2 \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P'_2) \cup \rho'_2)$ such that $\text{next}(n_i) \in \sigma'_2$, $\sigma'_1 \cdot (\sigma'_2 \setminus \text{next}(n_i)) = (\sigma'_2 \setminus \text{next}(n_i)) \cdot \sigma'_1$, and

$$Q'_2 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma'_2}^{\rho'_2}(P'_2) \quad (150)$$

Now, as by the definition we have $\sigma'_1 \cdot \sigma''_1 = \sigma''_1 \cdot \sigma'_1$, it follows $\sigma''_1 \cdot (\sigma'_2 \setminus \text{next}(n_i)) = (\sigma'_2 \setminus \text{next}(n_i)) \cdot \sigma''_1$.

Thus, the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma'_2 \cdot \sigma''_1}^{\rho'_1 \cdot \rho'_2}(P''_1) &= \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma''_1}^{\rho'_1}(P''_1) \\ \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma'_2 \cdot \sigma''_1}^{\rho'_1 \cdot \rho'_2}(P'_2) &= \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma'_2}^{\rho'_2}(P'_2) \end{aligned}$$

By this, (150), and (145) we have

$$Q'_2 \mid Q''_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma''_1 \cdot \sigma'_2}^{\rho''_1 \cdot \rho'_2}(P''_1 \mid P'_2) \quad (151)$$

Further, we may notice that $\sigma''_1 \cdot \sigma'_2 \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P'_2 \mid P''_1) \cup \rho'_2 \cup \rho''_1)$ and $\text{next}(n_i) \in \sigma''_1 \cdot \sigma'_2$ as by the assumption we have $\bar{n} \notin \text{fn}(P'_2 \mid P''_1) \cup \rho'_2 \cup \rho''_1$. Thus, our assertion holds. Hence, by this and (151) the goal (149) follows.

- Sub-case $\ell = \tau$. By applying IH to (146) we know there is Q'_2 such that $Q'_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} Q'_2$ and

$$P'_2\rho'_2 \mathcal{S} Q'_2 \quad (152)$$

where $\rho'_2 = \{\tilde{u}'_2/\tilde{y}_2\}$. We should show that

$$P'_2\rho'_2 \mid P''_1\rho''_1 \mathcal{S} Q'_2 \mid Q''_1 \quad (153)$$

By (152), we know there is $\sigma_2 \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_2) \cup \rho'_2)$ such that

$$Q'_2 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_2}^{\rho'_2}(P'_2)$$

Further, by remark we know that either $\sigma'_2 = \sigma_1 \cdot \{n_{i+1}/n_i\} \cdot \{\bar{n}_{i+1}/\bar{n}_i\}$ for some $n_i, \bar{n}_i \in \text{fn}(P'_2\rho'_2)$ and $n_i, \bar{n}_i \notin \text{fn}(P''_1\rho''_1)$ or $\sigma'_2 = \sigma_1$ such that

$$\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma'_2}^{\rho'_2}(P'_2) = \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_2}^{\rho'_2}(P'_2)$$

By this we have that

$$\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma'_2}^{\rho'_1}(P'_1) = \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_1}^{\rho'_1}(P'_1)$$

So, we know that

$$Q'_2 \mid Q''_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma'_2}^{\rho'_2 \cdot \rho''_1}(P'_2 \mid P''_1)$$

By (152) and (145) and the definition of σ'_2 the goal (153) follows.

- Sub-case $\ell \equiv (\nu \widetilde{m}_1) n! \langle v : C_1 \rangle$. Here we omit details on substitutions as they are similar to the first sub-case. By applying IH to (146) we know there is Q'_2 such that $Q'_1 \xRightarrow{\ell} Q'_2$ and

$$(\nu \widetilde{m}_1)(P'_2 \parallel t \Leftarrow_{\mathbf{c}} v : C_1) \mathcal{S} \quad (154)$$

$$(\nu \widetilde{m}_2)(Q'_2 \parallel t_1 \Leftarrow_{\mathbf{m}} v \sigma_1 : C_1) \quad (155)$$

We should show that

$$(\nu \widetilde{m}_1)(P'_2 \mid P''_1 \parallel t \Leftarrow_{\mathbf{c}} v : C_1) \mathcal{S} \quad (156)$$

$$(\nu \widetilde{m}_2)(Q'_2 \mid P''_1 \parallel t_1 \Leftarrow_{\mathbf{m}} v \sigma_1 : C_1) \quad (157)$$

By Definition 4.27 and Table 7 from (154) we can infer the following:

$$P'_2 \{\tilde{u}'_1 / \tilde{y}'\} \mathcal{S} Q'_2 \quad (158)$$

So, by (147) and (158) the goal (156) follows.

This concludes the case $\langle \text{PAR}_L \rangle$ case.

4. Case $\langle \text{TAU} \rangle$. Here we know $P_1 = P'_1 \mid P''_1$. Without the loss of generality, we assume $\ell_1 = (\nu \widetilde{m}_1) \overline{n}! \langle v_1 \rangle$ and $\ell_2 = n? \langle v_1 \rangle$. Let $\rho'_1 = \{\tilde{u}'_1 / \tilde{y}\}$ and $\rho''_1 = \{\tilde{u}''_1 / \tilde{z}\}$ such that

$$P_1 \rho_1 = P'_1 \rho'_1 \mid P''_1 \rho''_1$$

Then, the final rule in the inference tree is as follows:

$$\langle \text{TAU} \rangle \frac{P'_1 \rho'_1 \xrightarrow{\ell_1} P'_2 \rho'_2 \quad P''_1 \rho''_1 \xrightarrow{\ell_2} P''_2 \rho''_2 \quad \ell_1 \prec \ell_2}{P'_1 \rho'_1 \mid P''_1 \rho''_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu \widetilde{m}_1) (P'_2 \rho'_2 \mid P''_2 \rho''_2)}$$

Let $\sigma_1, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}, \widetilde{u}_*, \widetilde{x}_*$, and $\rho_{\mathbf{m}}$ be defined as in the previous case. Further, Q_1 can have shapes: Q_1^1, Q_1^2 , and N_1^3 as in the previous case. As in the previous case, we know that there are

$$Q'_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{y} \rho_{\mathbf{m}}} (P'_1 \sigma_1) \quad (159)$$

$$Q''_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}}^{\tilde{z} \rho_{\mathbf{m}}} (P''_1 \sigma_1) \quad (160)$$

such that

$$Q_1^1 \xRightarrow{\tau} Q_1^2 \xRightarrow{\tau} Q'_1 \mid Q''_1$$

Thus, in both cases we consider how $Q'_1 \mid Q''_1$ evolves. By the definition of \mathcal{S} we have

$$P'_1 \rho'_1 \mathcal{S} Q'_1 \quad (161)$$

$$P''_1 \rho''_1 \mathcal{S} Q''_1 \quad (162)$$

We apply the IH component-wise:

- By applying IH to (161) we know there is Q'_2 such that

$$Q'_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \widetilde{m}_2) \overline{n}_i! \langle \tilde{v} \rangle} Q'_2 \quad (163)$$

and

$$(\nu \widetilde{m}_1)(P'_2 \parallel t \Leftarrow_{\mathbf{c}} v : C_1) \rho'_2 \mathcal{S} (\nu \widetilde{m}_2)(Q'_2 \parallel t \Leftarrow_{\mathbf{m}} v \sigma_1 : C_1) \quad (164)$$

where $v\sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ such that $\sigma_v \subseteq \sigma_1$.

Now, by (164) we can infer:

$$P'_2 \rho'_2 \mathcal{S} Q'_2$$

Now, by the assertion on index substitutions, we have $\sigma'_2 \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P'_2) \cup \rho'_2)$ such that $\text{next}(\bar{n}_i) \in \sigma'_2$, $\sigma'_1 \cdot (\sigma'_2 \setminus \text{next}(\bar{n}_i)) = (\sigma'_2 \setminus \text{next}(\bar{n}_i)) \cdot \sigma'_1$, and

$$Q'_2 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma'_2}^{\rho'_2}(P'_2)$$

More precisely, here we know that $\sigma'_2 \subseteq \sigma'_1 \cdot \text{next}(\bar{n}_i) \subseteq \sigma_1 \text{next}(\bar{n}_i)$. So, we have

$$Q'_2 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_1 \cdot \text{next}(\bar{n}_i)}^{\rho'_2}(P'_2) \quad (165)$$

- By applying IH to (162) we know there is Q''_2 such that

$$Q''_1 \xrightarrow{n_j?(\tilde{v})} Q''_2 \quad (166)$$

and

$$P''_2 \rho''_2 \mathcal{S} Q''_2 \quad (167)$$

Now, by the assertion on index substitutions, we have $\sigma''_2 \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P''_2) \cup \rho''_2)$ such that $\text{next}(n_j) \in \sigma''_2$, $\sigma''_1 \cdot (\sigma''_2 \setminus \text{next}(n_j)) = (\sigma''_2 \setminus \text{next}(n_j)) \cdot \sigma''_1$, and

$$Q''_2 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma''_2}^{\rho''_2}(P''_2) \quad (168)$$

More precisely, we know that $\sigma''_2 = \sigma''_1 \cdot \sigma_v \cdot \text{next}(n_j) \subseteq \sigma_1 \cdot \text{next}(n_j)$. So, we have

$$Q''_2 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_1 \cdot \text{next}(n_j)}^{\rho''_2}(P''_2) \quad (169)$$

Now, by (163) we know there is R' such that

$$Q'_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} R' \xrightarrow{\check{\ell}_1} Q'_2$$

where $\check{\ell}_1 = (\nu \tilde{m}_2) \bar{n}_i! \langle \tilde{v} \rangle$. Similarly, by (167) there is R'' such that

$$Q''_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} R'' \xrightarrow{\check{\ell}_2} Q''_2$$

where $\check{\ell}_2 = n_j?(\tilde{w})$.

To proceed we must show $\check{\ell}_1 \succ \check{\ell}_2$, which boils down to showing that indices of \bar{n}_i and n_j match. For this, we distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $\neg \text{tr}(\bar{n}_i)$ and $\neg \text{tr}(n_j)$ and (ii) $\text{tr}(\bar{n}_i)$ and $\text{tr}(n_j)$. In the former sub-case, we have $\{\bar{n}_i/n\} \in \sigma_1$ and $\{n_j/n\} \in \sigma_1$, where $\sigma_1 = \text{index}(\tilde{u})$. Further, by this and Definition 4.26 we know that $i = j$. Now, we consider the latter case. By assumption that $P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$ is well-typed, we know there Γ_1, Λ_1 , and Δ_1 such that $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \triangleright \diamond$ with $\text{balanced}(\Delta_1)$. Thus, we have $n : S \in \Delta_1$ and $\bar{n} : T \in \Delta_1$ such that $S \text{ dual } T$.

Hence, we can infer the following transition:

$$\langle \text{TAU} \rangle \frac{R' \xrightarrow{\check{\ell}_1} Q'_2 \quad R'' \xrightarrow{\check{\ell}_2} Q''_2 \quad \check{\ell}_1 \succ \check{\ell}_2}{(R' \mid R'') \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu \tilde{m}_2) (Q'_2 \mid Q''_2)}$$

Now, we should show that

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1) (P'_2 \rho'_2 \mid P''_2 \rho''_2) \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2) (Q'_2 \mid Q''_2) \quad (170)$$

Now, by (165), (169), and $(P'_2 \mid P''_2) \rho'_2 \cdot \rho''_2 = P'_2 \rho'_2 \mid P''_2 \rho''_2$ we have

$$Q'_2 \mid Q''_2 \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_1 \cdot \text{next}(n_i) \cdot \text{next}(\bar{n}_i)}^{\rho'_2 \cdot \rho''_2} (P'_2 \mid P''_2)$$

Further, we have $\sigma_1 \cdot \text{next}(n_i) \cdot \text{next}(\bar{n}_i) \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P'_2 \mid P''_2) \cup \rho'_2 \cup \rho''_2)$ This follow directly by the definition of σ_1 , that is $\sigma_1 \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_1) \cup \tilde{u} \cup \tilde{x})$, and Definition 4.26.

Finally, by this and the definition of \mathcal{S} (Definition 4.27) the goal (170) follows. This concludes case $\langle \text{TAU} \rangle$.

Recursive cases Now, we consider cases where $P'_1 \equiv \mu X.P_1^*$ is a parallel component of P_1 . We focus on two cases, which highlight the specifics of the breakdown of recursive processes, and omit details that are similar to the corresponding non-recursive cases.

1. Case $\langle \text{RV} \rangle$. Here we know $P_1 = n?(y).P_2$. Further, we know there exist P^* such that $\mathcal{D}_X(P, P^*, d)$ (Definition 4.25). Now, we unfold this definition. Let

$$P_1^1 = \alpha_d \alpha_{d-1} \dots \alpha_1 (X \mid R)$$

where R is some processes, and $\alpha_d = n?(y)$. We know that there is $\mu X.P^*$ such that P_1^1 is its sub-processes and

$$P_1 \equiv P_1^1 \{\mu X.P^* / X\}$$

Here we can distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $p > 0$ and (ii) $p = 0$ and $R \equiv \mathbf{0}$. We know there is $\rho_2 = \{\tilde{u}_2 / \tilde{x}_2\}$ such that

$$P_1 \rho_1 = n\rho_1?(y).P_2 \rho_2$$

The transition is as follows:

$$\langle \text{RV} \rangle \frac{}{P_1^1 \{\mu X.P^* / X\} \xrightarrow{n?(v)} P_2 \rho_2 \cdot \{v/y\}}$$

Let $\sigma_1 = \sigma' \cdot \{n_i/n\}$ where $\sigma' \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_1) \cup \tilde{u} \cup \tilde{x})$ and $\sigma_2 = \sigma_1 \cdot \sigma$ where $\sigma = \text{next}(n_i) \cdot \{y_1/y\}$. Further, let $\tilde{u}_* = \text{nbd}(\tilde{u}\sigma_1 : \tilde{C})$ and $\tilde{x}_* = \text{nbd}(\tilde{x}\sigma_1 : \tilde{C})$ with $\tilde{u} : \tilde{C}$. Also, let $\tilde{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_{|\mathcal{H}^*(S)|})$ and $\tilde{z} = \text{fnb}(P_2, \tilde{x}_* \tilde{y} \setminus \tilde{w})$ where $\tilde{w} = \{n_i\}$ if $\text{lin}(n_i)$ otherwise $\tilde{w} = \epsilon$.

We could see that $d = \delta(\alpha_d, \alpha_{d-1}, \dots, \alpha_1, \mu X.P_1^*)$. So, by Table 8 there are following possibilities for the shape of Q_1 , namely elements in N defined as:

$$N = \{(\nu \tilde{c}) R : R \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{x}_*, \rho}^{\tilde{u}_*} (\mu X.P^*)^d\}$$

Let

$$Q_1^1 = (\nu \tilde{c}) B_1 \mid n_l?(y). \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rho \rangle. \mu X. c_k^r?(\tilde{x}). n_l?(y). \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle. X \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1} (\alpha_d, \alpha_{d-1}. P_1^2 \sigma)_g$$

where B_1 is, intuitively, trios mimicking prefixes before α_d and P_1^2 is such that $P_1^1 = \alpha_d \alpha_{d-1}. P_1^2$. By unfolding the definition of $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{x}_*, \rho}^{\tilde{u}_*} (\mu X.P^*)^d$ we have that $Q_1^1 \in N$. Further, if $R \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{x}_*, \rho}^{\tilde{u}_*} (\mu X.P^*)^d$ then $R \xrightarrow{\tau} Q_1^1$. So, we only analyze how Q_1^1 evolves. We can infer the following:

$$Q_1^1 \xrightarrow{n_i \rho? \langle \tilde{v} \rangle} Q_2$$

where

$$Q_2 = B_1 \mid \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rho \cdot \{\tilde{v}/\tilde{y}\} \rangle . \mu X . c_k^r ? (\tilde{x}) . n_l ? (\tilde{y}) . \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1} (\alpha_{d-1} . P_1^2 \sigma)_g$$

with $v\sigma_v \diamond \tilde{v}$ for some $\sigma_v \in \text{index}(v)$. Now, we should show that

$$P_2 \rho_2 \cdot \{v/y\} \mathcal{S} Q_2 \quad (171)$$

Let $\tilde{u}_z = \tilde{z} \rho_2 \cdot \{\tilde{v}/\tilde{y}\}$. In sub-case (i) we should show that $Q_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}}^{\tilde{u}_z} (\alpha_{d-1} . P_1^2)$. So, we should show that

$$Q_2 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{z}, \rho_2 \cdot \{\tilde{v}/\tilde{y}\}}^{\tilde{u}_z} (P^*)_g^{d-1}$$

This follows by inspecting the definition $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{\tilde{z}, \rho_2 \cdot \{\tilde{v}/\tilde{y}\}}^k (P^*)_g^{d-1}$. That is, we can notice that

$$Q_2^1 = B_1 \mid B_2$$

where $B_2 \in \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{\tilde{z}, \rho_2 \cdot \{\tilde{v}/\tilde{y}\}}^k (\alpha_{d-1} . P_1^2 \sigma)_g^{d-1}$ as $(d-1) + 1 = \delta(\alpha_d . \alpha_{d-1} . P_1^2 \sigma)$. So, (171) follows. This concludes sub-case (i).

In sub-case (ii) we know $P_2 \equiv \alpha_{d-1} . P_1^2 \mid R$. Now, by Table 8 we have $Q_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} Q_2^2$ where

$$Q_2^2 = (\nu \tilde{c}) V_1 \mid c_{k+l+1}^r ! \langle \tilde{u}_{z_2} \rangle \mid V_2$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= B_1 \mid \mu X . c_k^r ? (\tilde{x}) . n_l ? (\tilde{y}) . \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z} \rangle . X \mid \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{u}_{z_1} \rangle . \mu X . c_k^r ? (\tilde{x}) . (\overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{z}_1 \rangle) . X \mid c_{k+l+1}^r ! \langle \tilde{z}_2 \rangle \\ V_2 &= \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}_1}^{k+1} (P_X)_{g_1} \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}_2}^{k+l+1} (R)_\emptyset \end{aligned}$$

Now, we should show that $Q_2^2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}}^{\tilde{u}_z} (\alpha_{d-1} . P_1^2 \mid R)$. By Table 8 we have that

$$\{R_1 \mid R_2 : R_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{z}_1}^{\tilde{u}_{z_1}} (\alpha_{d-1} . P_1^2), R_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}_2}^{\tilde{u}_{z_2}} (R)_\emptyset\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}}^{\tilde{u}_z} (\alpha_{d-1} . P_1^2 \mid R) \quad (172)$$

Further, we know that

$$(\nu \tilde{c}_{k+l+1}) c_{k+l+1}^r ! \langle \tilde{u}_z \rangle \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}_2}^{k+l+1} (R)_\emptyset \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}_2}^{\tilde{u}_{z_2}} (R) \quad (173)$$

$$V_1 \mid V_2 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{z}_1}^{\tilde{u}_{z_1}} (\alpha_{d-1} . P_1^2) \quad (174)$$

Thus, by (172), (173), and (174) we have the following:

$$V_1 \mid V_2 \mid (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+l+1}) c_{k+l+1}^r ! \langle \tilde{u}_z \rangle \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}_2}^{k+l+1} (R)_\emptyset \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}}^{\tilde{u}_z} (\alpha_{d-1} . P_1^2 \mid R)$$

Now, we can notice that $\tilde{c}_{k+l+1} \cap \text{fpn}(V_1) = \emptyset$ and $\tilde{c}_{k+l+1} \cap \text{fpn}(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}_1}^{k+1} (P_X)_{g_1}) = \emptyset$. Further, we have

$$(\nu \tilde{c}_{k+l+1}) \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}_2}^{k+l+1} (R)_\emptyset \approx^c \mathbf{0}$$

(where \approx^c is as in Definition 4.15) as first shared trigger c_{k+l+1} in the breakdown of R is restricted so it could not get activated.

Thus, we have

$$Q_2^2 \equiv V_1 \mid V_2 \mid (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+l+1}) c_{k+l+1}^r ! \langle \tilde{u}_z \rangle \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}_2}^{k+l+1} (R)_\emptyset$$

This concludes the case $\langle \text{Rv} \rangle$. Now, we consider the inductive case.

2. Case $\langle \text{PAR}_L \rangle$. Here we know $P_1 = P'_1 \mid P''_1$. Further, we know there exist P^* such that $\mathcal{D}_X(P, P^*, d)$ (Definition 4.25). Similarly to the previous case, let

$$P_1^1 = \alpha_d \cdot \alpha_{d-1} \cdot \dots \cdot \alpha_1 \cdot (X \mid R)$$

We know there is $\mu X.P^*$ such that P_1^1 is its subprocess and

$$P'_1 \equiv P_1^1 \{\mu X.P^*/X\}$$

Here, we can distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $P''_1 \equiv R$ and (ii) $P''_1 \not\equiv R$. Here, we consider sub-case (i) as it is an interesting case. The sub-case (ii) is similar to the corresponding case of non-recursive process. As in the previous case, we can further distinguish cases in which $p = 0$ and $p > 0$. We consider $p = 0$ and $\ell = n? \langle v \rangle$.

The final rule in the inference tree is as follows:

$$\langle \text{PAR}_L \rangle \frac{P'_1 \{\tilde{u}'_1/\tilde{y}_1\} \xrightarrow{\ell} P'_2 \{\tilde{u}'_2/\tilde{y}_2\} \mid R \{\tilde{w}_1/\tilde{z}_1\} \cdot \{\tilde{u}'_R/\tilde{w}_1\} \quad \text{bn}(\ell) \cap \text{fn}(P''_1) = \emptyset}{P'_1 \{\tilde{u}'_1/\tilde{y}_1\} \mid R \{\tilde{u}''_1/\tilde{z}_1\} \xrightarrow{\ell} P'_2 \{\tilde{u}'_2/\tilde{y}_2\} \mid R \{\tilde{u}''_1/\tilde{z}_1\} \mid R \{\tilde{w}_1/\tilde{z}_1\} \cdot \{\tilde{u}'_R/\tilde{w}_1\}}$$

Let $\sigma_1 \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_1) \cup \tilde{u} \cup \tilde{x})$. Further, let $\tilde{y}_{*1} = \text{fnb}(P'_1, \tilde{x}_*)$, $\tilde{z}_{*1} = \text{fnb}(R, \tilde{x}_*)$, $\tilde{u}_* = \text{nb}(\tilde{u}\sigma_1 : \tilde{C})$ where $\tilde{x}_* = \text{nb}(\tilde{x}\sigma_1 : \tilde{C})$ with $\tilde{u} : \tilde{C}$, and $\rho_m = \{\tilde{u}_*/\tilde{x}_*\}$. By the definition of \mathcal{S} (Table 8), there are following possibilities for Q_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1^1 &= (\nu \tilde{c}_k) (\overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{u}_* \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{x}_*}^k(P_1\sigma_1)) \\ Q_1^2 &= (\nu \tilde{c}_k) \overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{u}_{*2}' \rangle \cdot \overline{c_{k+l}}! \langle \tilde{u}_{*1}'' \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{y}_{*1}}^k(P'_1\sigma_1) \mid \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}_{*1}}^{k+l}(R\sigma_1) \\ N_1^3 &= \{(R'_1 \mid R''_1) : \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{y}_{*1}}^{\tilde{u}_{*2}'}(\mu X.P^*\sigma_1)_g^d, R''_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}_{*1}}^{\tilde{u}_{*1}''}(R\sigma_1)\} \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.6 there exist

$$Q'_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{y}_{*1}}^{\tilde{u}_{*2}'}(\mu X.P^*\sigma_1)_g^d \quad (175)$$

$$Q''_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}_{*1}}^{\tilde{u}_{*1}''}(R\sigma_1) \quad (176)$$

such that

$$Q_1^1 \xRightarrow{\tau} Q_1^2 \xRightarrow{\tau} Q'_1 \mid Q''_1$$

The interesting case is to consider a process Q_1^3 defined as:

$$Q_1^3 = (\nu \tilde{c}) V_1 \mid c_{k+l+1}^r! \langle \tilde{u}_{*1}'' \rangle \mid V_2$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= B_1 \mid \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{u}_{*2}' \rangle \cdot \mu X.c_k^r?(\tilde{y}_{*1}).(\overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{y}_{*2} \rangle \cdot X \mid c_{k+l+1}^r! \langle \tilde{z}_{*2} \rangle) \\ V_2 &= \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{y}_{*2}}^{k+1}(P_X)_{g_1} \mid \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{w}_{*2}}^{k+l+1}(R\{\tilde{w}_2/\tilde{z}_2\})_{\emptyset} \end{aligned}$$

We have $Q_1^3 \approx^c Q'_1 \mid Q''_1$ (where \approx^c is as in Definition 4.15). We may notice that Q_1^3 can be a descendent of the recursive process (following a similar reasoning as in the previous case). So, we consider how Q_1^3 evolves. As in the corresponding case of non-recursive processes, we do the case analysis on ℓ . If $v \in \tilde{u}$ then we take $\sigma_v = \sigma_1$, otherwise $\sigma_v = \{v_j/v\}$ for $j > 0$. Now, we could see that

$$Q_1^3 \xRightarrow{n? \langle \tilde{v} \rangle} Q_2$$

where

$$Q_2 = (\nu \tilde{c}) V_1 \mid \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{u}_{*2}' \rangle \cdot \mu X.c_k^r?(\tilde{y}_{*1}).(\overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \tilde{y}_{*2} \rangle \cdot X \mid c_{k+l+1}^r! \langle \tilde{z}_{*1} \rangle) \mid c_{k+l+1}^r! \langle \tilde{u}_{*R}' \rangle \mid V_2$$

We define Q_2^1 as follows

$$Q_2^1 = (\nu \tilde{c}) V_1 \mid \overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \widetilde{u_{*2}'} \rangle \cdot \mu X \cdot c_k^r? (\widetilde{y_{*1}}) \cdot (\overline{c_{k+1}^r}! \langle \widetilde{y_{*2}} \rangle \cdot X \mid c_{k+l+1}^r! \langle \widetilde{z_{*1}} \rangle) \mid V_2 \mid \\ (\nu \tilde{c}_k) (c_k^r! \langle \widetilde{u_{*1}''} \rangle \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}_{*1}}^k (R)_\emptyset) \mid (\nu \tilde{c}_k) (c_k^r! \langle \widetilde{u_{*R}'} \rangle \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{w}_{*1}}^k (R\{\tilde{w}_1/\tilde{z}_1\})_\emptyset)$$

By definition, we could see that $Q_2^1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}_{*1}}^{\tilde{u}_{*2}}(P_2' \mid R \mid R\{\tilde{w}_1/\tilde{z}_1\})$. Now, by the definition of $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}_{*1}}^-(\cdot)_\emptyset$ we have

$$c_{k+l+1}^r! \langle \widetilde{u_{*1}''} \rangle \mid c_{k+l+1}^r! \langle \widetilde{u_{*R}'} \rangle \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}_{*1}}^{k+l+1} (R)_\emptyset \approx^c \\ (\nu \tilde{c}_k) (c_k^r! \langle \widetilde{u_{*1}''} \rangle \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}_{*1}}^k (R)_\emptyset) \mid (\nu \tilde{c}_k) (c_k^r! \langle \widetilde{u_{*R}'} \rangle \mid \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{w}_{*1}}^k (R\{\tilde{w}_1/\tilde{z}_1\})_\emptyset)$$

As each trio in $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tilde{z}_{*1}}^{k+l+1} (R)_\emptyset$ makes a replica of itself when triggered along a propagator. So, finally we have

$$Q_2 \approx^c Q_2^1$$

This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.7. □