

Comparing Channel Restrictions of Communicating State Machines, High-level Message Sequence Charts, and Multiparty Session Types

Felix Stutz Damien Zufferey

MPI-SWS, Kaiserslautern, Germany

{fstutz,zufferey}@mpi-sws.org

Communicating state machines provide a formal foundation for distributed computation. Unfortunately, they are Turing-complete and, thus, challenging to analyse. In this paper, we classify restrictions on channels which have been proposed to work around the undecidability of verification questions. We compare half-duplex communication, existential B -boundedness, and k -synchronisability. These restrictions do not prevent the communication channels from growing arbitrarily large but still restrict the power of the model. Each restriction gives rise to a set of languages so, for every pair of restrictions, we check whether one subsumes the other or if they are incomparable. We investigate their relationship in two different contexts: first, the one of communicating state machines, and, second, the one of communication protocol specifications using high-level message sequence charts. Surprisingly, these two contexts yield different conclusions. In addition, we integrate multiparty session types, another approach to specify communication protocols, into our classification. We show that multiparty session type languages are half-duplex, existentially 1-bounded, and 1-synchronisable. To show this result, we provide the first formal embedding of multiparty session types into high-level message sequence charts.

Acknowledgements and Funding. The authors would like to thank Emanuele D’Osualdo, Georg Zetsche and the anonymous reviewers for their feedback and suggestions. This research was funded in part by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft project 389792660-TRR 248.

1 Introduction

Communicating state machines (CSMs) are one of the foundational models of message-passing concurrency. Unfortunately, the combination of multiple processes and unbounded FIFO channels yields a Turing-complete model of computation even when the processes are finite-state [14]. The communication channels can be used as memory and, therefore, most verification questions for CSMs are not algorithmically solvable. To regain decidability, one needs to exploit properties of specific systems. For instance, if all the runs of some communicating state machine use finite memory, it is possible to verify this system. This restriction, known as universal boundedness [24], admits only systems with finitely many reachable states.

In this paper, we compare three channel restrictions which allow infinite state systems while making interesting verification questions decidable. We compare half-duplex communication [17], existential B -boundedness [24], and k -synchronisability [13, 28].

We explain all three restrictions with the CSM in Fig. 1a. There, a process P sends a list, element by element, to a process Q . After receiving the list’s end, Q sends an acknowledgement back to P .




Figure 1: Sending a list expressed in different formalisms. The left part is an implementation of the protocol specified in the middle and right parts.

Half-duplex communication requires that, at all times, at least one of both channels between two processes is empty. While P sends the list, the channel can grow arbitrarily large. However, Q always receives all the messages until *nil* before replying. When Q replies, the channel from P to Q is empty. Hence, the CSM is half-duplex.

Existential B-boundedness means that, for every execution, we can reorder the sends and receptions such that the channels carry at most B messages. This CSM is existentially 1-bounded. Each reception is possible directly after the send.

k-synchronisability requires that every execution can be reordered and split into phases where up to k messages are first sent and then received. This CSM is 1-synchronisable because every message can be received directly after it was sent.

The original definitions of channel restrictions are phrased in terms of executions of a CSM. We present a characterisation for each restriction which only considers the generated language. This also allows us to reason about languages specified or generated in different ways. We consider languages given by protocol specifications and implementations. For implementations, we consider *CSM-definable languages*, i.e., languages which can be generated by a CSM.

Interestingly, for CSMs, these channel restrictions have not yet been compared thoroughly. In this paper, we close this gap and provide a classification of channel restrictions for CSM-definable languages. For instance, this answers a question for the FIFO point-to-point setting which has been posed for the mailbox setting by Bouajjani et al. [13] as we prove that existential B -boundedness and k -synchronisability are incomparable for CSM-definable languages. Overall, we give examples for every possible intersection and, thus, prove that none of the restrictions subsumes another one in this context. Our results for CSM-definable languages are summarised in Fig. 2a. In fact, we disprove one of the three known results from the literature [35, Thm. 7.1] which has been cited recently as part of a summary [12, Prop. 41]. This indicates that, despite their simplicity, these definitions hide some subtleties. Our classification provides a careful treatment — giving minimal examples for the sake of understandability.

Such a classification is interesting as focusing on languages or systems adhering to one of the channel restrictions can be key for solving verification problems algorithmically. For instance, control-state reachability and model checking LCPDL (propositional dynamic logic with loop and converse) formulas are decidable for k -synchronisable systems [28, 12]. Later, we highlight the impact of channel restrictions on verification questions and whether one can check if a system adheres to a restriction.

Protocol Specifications. Instead of considering arbitrary CSMs, it is possible to start with a global description written in a dedicated protocol specification formalism such as High-level Message Sequence




Figure 2: Comparing half-duplex, existential B -bounded, and k -synchronisable systems. The **results** are known results, **results** are new, and the **result** disproves an existing result. Hypotheses with rounded corners indicate inclusions while pointed corners indicate incomparability results.

Charts (HMSCs) [6, 26], Multiparty Session Types (MSTs) [32, 33], or Choreography Automata (CA) [7]. A protocol is a global specification of all the processes' actions together while an implementation only gives the local actions of each process. Fig. 1 shows, along the CSM, two protocol specifications. The key difference between a protocol specification and an implementation is that the protocol specification explicitly connects a send event to the corresponding receive event. In the HMSC (Fig. 1b), the arrows connect sends to receptions. The MST¹ (Fig. 1c) specifies communication by *sender* \rightarrow *receiver* : *message*. The CSM (Fig. 1a) does not specify this connection upfront and it may not exist. This makes CSMs strictly more general than protocols. For instance, an incorrect implementation of the protocol could have P terminate before receiving the acknowledgement.

The CSM, HMSC, and MST all have the same language. Thus, our observations on channel restrictions also hold for the HMSC and the MST. We also say that the CSM *implements* the protocol specified by the HMSC (or the MST) as they accept the same language and the CSM is deadlock free. In general, there are several approaches to obtain a CSM which implements a protocol (if one exists). For instance, a protocol specification can be projected on to each process. In this paper, we do not consider this problem. A protocol specification gives rise to a language, i.e., the protocol. We only need the protocol as our definitions for channel restrictions apply to languages, e.g., *HMSC*- and *MST*-definable languages.

For protocols, the classification of channel restrictions was less studied than for CSMs. Fig. 2b summarises our results. It was only known that each HMSC-definable language is existentially B -bounded for some B [24]. Surprisingly, the classification changes in the context of protocols. For restrictions which differ (H2 to H5, and H7), we give distinguishing examples. When one restriction subsumes another one (H1, H6, and H8), we prove it. For instance, H6 proves that 1-synchronisability entails half-duplex communication while H5 is an example which is half-duplex, existentially B -bounded, k -synchronisable but not 1-synchronisable.

Embedding MSTs into HMSCs. In addition to our results about CSM- and HMSC-definable languages, we provide the first formal embedding from MSTs into HMSCs. The contribution is two-fold. First, we situate MSTs in the picture of common channel restrictions and prove that languages specified by multiparty session types are half-duplex, existentially 1-bounded, and 1-synchronisable. This sheds a new light on why MSTs are effectively analysable. Second, we did recently show that using insights

¹ We actually present a global type in an MST framework here but only use the term after its formal introduction in Section 5

from the domain of HMSCs in the domain of MSTs is a promising research direction as we made the effective MST verification techniques applicable to patterns from distributed computing [38]. Hence, our formal embedding can act as a crucial building block for further advances which are facilitated by insights from both domains.

Contributions. In this paper, we make three main contributions. (1) We provide an exhaustive classification of channel restrictions for CSM-definable languages. In this process, we disprove a recent result from the literature. (2) We provide an exhaustive classification of channel restrictions for HMSC- and MST-definable languages. (3) We give the first formal embedding of MSTs into HMSCs.

Outline. After providing some preliminary definitions in Section 2, we define the channel restrictions formally in Section 3 and summarise their impact on the decidability of verification questions. Subsequently, we establish our results on HMSCs (Section 4), MSTs (Section 5), and CSMs (Section 6). We discuss related work in Section 7.

2 Preliminaries

Finite and Infinite Words. For an alphabet Σ , the set of finite words over Σ is denoted by Σ^* , the set of infinite words by Σ^ω , while we write $\Sigma^\infty = \Sigma^* \cup \Sigma^\omega$ for their union. For two strings $u \in \Sigma^*$ and $v \in \Sigma^\infty$, u is said to be a *prefix* of v , denoted by $u \leq v$, if there is some $w \in \Sigma^\infty$ such that $u \cdot w = v$. For two alphabets Σ and Δ with $\Delta \subseteq \Sigma$, the *projection* of $w \in \Sigma^\infty$ on to Δ , denoted by $w \downarrow_\Delta$, is the word which is obtained by omitting every letter in w that does not belong to Δ .

Message Alphabet. \mathcal{P} is a finite set of processes, ranged over by P, Q, R, \dots , and \mathcal{V} a finite set of messages. For a process P , we define the alphabet $\Sigma_P = \{P \triangleright Q!m, P \triangleleft Q?m \mid Q \in \mathcal{P}, m \in \mathcal{V}\}$ of events. The event $P \triangleright Q!m$ denotes process P sending a message m to Q , and $P \triangleleft Q?m$ denotes process P receiving a message m from Q . Note that the process performing the action is always the first one, e.g., the receiver P in $P \triangleleft Q?m$. The alphabet $\Sigma = \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \Sigma_P$ denotes all send and receive events while $\Sigma_{\text{sync}} = \{P \rightarrow Q : m \mid P, Q \in \mathcal{P} \text{ and } m \in \mathcal{V}\}$ is the set where sending and receiving a message is specified at the same time. We fix \mathcal{P} , \mathcal{V} , Σ , and Σ_{sync} in the rest of the paper. We write $w \downarrow_{P \triangleright Q! _}$ to select all send events in w where P sends a message to Q and $\mathcal{V}(w)$ to project the send and receive events to their message values.

Distributed Executions. We use these specialised alphabets to model specifications in which multiple distributed processes communicate by exchanging messages. Furthermore, these executions cannot be any word but need to comply with conditions that correspond to the asynchronous communication over reliable FIFO channels. We call such words channel-compliant.

Definition 1 ([38]) A protocol is a set of complete channel-compliant words where:

1. Channel-compliant: A word $w \in \Sigma^\infty$ is channel-compliant if messages are received after they are sent and, between two processes, the reception order is the same as the send order. Formally, for each prefix w' of w , we require $\mathcal{V}(w' \downarrow_{Q \triangleleft P? _})$ to be a prefix of $\mathcal{V}(w' \downarrow_{P \triangleright Q! _})$, for every $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$.
2. Complete: A channel-compliant word $w \in \Sigma^\infty$ is complete if it is infinite or the send and receive events match: if $w \in \Sigma^*$, then $\mathcal{V}(w \downarrow_{P \triangleright Q! _}) = \mathcal{V}(w \downarrow_{Q \triangleleft P? _})$ for every $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$.

To pinpoint the corresponding send and receive events, we define a notion of *matching*.

Definition 2 (Matching Sends and Receptions) In a word $w = e_1 \dots \in \Sigma^\infty$, a send event $e_i = P \triangleright Q!m$ is matched by a receive event $e_j = Q \triangleleft P?m$, denoted by $e_i \vdash e_j$, if $i < j$ and $\mathcal{V}((e_1 \dots e_i) \downarrow_{P \triangleright Q! _}) = \mathcal{V}((e_1 \dots e_j) \downarrow_{Q \triangleleft P? _})$. A send event e_i is unmatched if there is no such receive event e_j .

If a sequence of events is channel-compliant, it is trivial that for each channel between two processes, either all send events are matched or there is an index from which all send events are unmatched.

In this paper, we consider protocols that can be specified with high-level messages sequence charts. We define *prefix message sequence charts* to allow unmatched send events, inspired by the work of Genest et al. [24, Def. 3.1]. The definition of a (prefix) MSC can look intimidating. In Fig. 3, we show pictorially what each component corresponds to.

Definition 3 ((Prefix) Message Sequence Charts) A prefix message sequence chart is a 5-tuple $M = (N, p, f, l, (\leq_P)_{P \in \mathcal{P}})$ where

- N is a set of send (S) and receive (R) event nodes ($N = S \uplus R$),
- $p: N \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ maps each event node to the process acting on it,
- $f: S \rightarrow R$ is an injective partial function linking corresponding send and receive event nodes,
- $l: N \rightarrow \Sigma$ labels every event node with an event, and
- $(\leq_P)_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$ is a family of total orders for the event nodes of each process: $\leq_P \subseteq p^{-1}(P) \times p^{-1}(P)$.




Figure 3: Highlighting the elements of a (prefix) MSC: $(N, p, f, l, (\leq_P)_{P \in \mathcal{P}})$

A prefix MSC M induces a partial order \leq_M on N that is defined co-inductively²:

$$\frac{e \leq_P e'}{e \leq_M e'} \text{ PROC} \quad \frac{s \in S}{s \leq_M f(s)} \text{ SND-RCV} \quad \frac{}{e \leq_M e} \text{ REFL} \quad \frac{e \leq_M e' \quad e' \leq_M e''}{e \leq_M e''} \text{ TRANS}$$

The labelling function l respects the function f between S and R : for every pair of event nodes $e, e' \in N$ with $f(e) = e'$, we have $l(e) = p(e) \triangleright p(e')!m$ and $l(e') = p(e') \triangleleft p(e)?m$ for some $m \in \mathcal{V}$ and for every e where $f(e)$ is undefined, we have $l(e) = p(e) \triangleright P!m$ for some $P \neq p(e)$ according to its destination.

We say that M is *degenerate* if there is some P and Q such that there are $e_1, e_2 \in p^{-1}(P)$ with $e_1 \neq e_2$, $l(e_1) = l(e_2)$, $e_1 \leq_P e_2$ and $f(e_2) \leq_Q f(e_1)$. We say that M *respects FIFO order* if M is not degenerate and for every pair of processes P, Q , and for every two event nodes $e_1 \leq_M e_2$ with $l(e_i) = P \triangleright Q!_-$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, it holds that $f(e_2)$ is undefined if $f(e_1)$ is undefined as well as that it holds that $\mathcal{V}(w_P) = \mathcal{V}(f(w_P))$ where w_P is the (unique) linearisation of $p^{-1}(P)$.

In this paper, we do only consider prefix message sequence charts that respect FIFO order.

If f is total, we omit the term *prefix* and call M a *message sequence chart (MSC)*. If N is finite for an MSC M , we call M a *basic MSC (BMSC)*. We denote the set of BMSCs by \mathcal{M} . When M is clear from context, we simply write \leq instead of \leq_M . For a prefix MSC M , the language $\mathcal{L}(M)$ contains a sequence $l(w)$ for each linearisation w of N compatible with \leq_M . When unambiguous, we may refer to event nodes or sequences thereof by their (event) labels or omit the label function l .

A prefix MSC, in contrast to an MSC, allows send event nodes for any channel to be unmatched from some point on. The concatenation $M_1 \cdot M_2$, or simply $M_1 M_2$, of an MSC M_1 and a prefix MSC M_2 is defined as expected (see Definition 14 in Appendix A.2 for the formal definition). The concatenation requires that, for any individual process, all event nodes in M_1 happen before the event nodes in M_2 . However, the induced partial order on N may permit linearisations in which an event node from M_2 of one process occurs before an event node from M_1 of another process.

²Note that we cannot use the standard reflexive and transitive closure since we consider infinite sequences of events. Co-induction lifts the reflexive, transitive closure of the union of the send-receive relation and all process orders, i.e., $(\{(s, f(s)) \mid s \in S\} \cup \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \leq_P)^*$, to infinite sets of event nodes.

For every channel-compliant word w , one can construct a unique prefix MSC M such that w is a linearisation of M .

Lemma 1 ($\text{msc}(-)$ ([24], Section 3.1)) *Let $w \in \Sigma^\infty$ be a channel-compliant word. Then, there is unique prefix MSC, denoted by $\text{msc}(w)$, such that w is a linearisation of $\text{msc}(w)$. In case the above conditions are not satisfied, $\text{msc}(w)$ is undefined.*

All sequences of events we consider in this work are channel-compliant. For sequences from MSCs (considered in Section 4), this trivially holds, while for sequences from execution prefixes of CSMs (considered in Section 6), Lemma 7 in Appendix B.1 ensures this.

3 Channel Restrictions

In this section, we present different channel restrictions and their implications on decidability of interesting verification questions. Their application is discussed subsequently: for HMSCs in Section 4.1, for MSTs in Section 5.3, and for CSMs in Section 6.1.

3.1 Definitions

3.1.1 Half-duplex Communication

Cécé and Finkel [17, Def. 8] introduced the restriction of half-duplex communication which intuitively requires that, for any two processes P and Q , the channel from P to Q is empty before Q sends a message to P . We define the restriction of half-duplex on sequences of events and show that it is equivalent to the original definition in Appendix B.1.

Definition 4 (Half-duplex) *A sequence of events w is called half-duplex if for every prefix w' of w and pair of processes P and Q , one of the following holds: $\mathcal{V}(w' \downarrow_{P \triangleright Q!}) = \mathcal{V}(w' \downarrow_{Q \triangleleft P?})$ or $\mathcal{V}(w' \downarrow_{Q \triangleright P!}) = \mathcal{V}(w' \downarrow_{P \triangleleft Q?})$. A language $L \subseteq \Sigma^\infty$ is half-duplex if every word $w \in L$ is.*

3.1.2 Existential B-boundedness

While the previous property restricts the channel for at least one direction to be empty, one can also bound the size of channels and consider linearisations that are possible adhering to such bounds. On the one hand, one can consider a universal bound that applies for every linearisation. However, this yields finite-state systems [24] and disallows very simple protocols, e.g., the example in Fig. 1. On the other hand, one can consider an existential bound on the channels which solely asks that there is one linearisation of the distributed execution for which the channels are bounded. This allows infinite-state systems and admits the earlier example.

Definition 5 (B-bounded [24]) *Let $B \in \mathbb{N}$ be a natural number. A word w is B-bounded if for every prefix w' of w and pair of processes P and Q , it holds that $|w' \downarrow_{P \triangleright Q!}| - |w' \downarrow_{Q \triangleleft P?}| \leq B$.*

Definition 6 (Existentially B-bounded [24]) *Let $B \in \mathbb{N}$. A prefix MSC M is existentially B-bounded if there is a B-bounded linearisation for M . A sequence of events w is existentially B-bounded if $\text{msc}(w)$ is defined and existentially B-bounded. A language L is existentially B-bounded if every word $w \in L$ is. We may use not existentially bounded as abbreviation for not existentially B-bounded for any B .*

3.1.3 k -synchronisability

The restriction of k -synchronisability was introduced for mailbox communication [13] and later refined and adapted to the point-to-point setting [28]. We define k -synchronisability following definitions by Giusto et al. [28, Defs. 6 and 7]. The definition of k -synchronisability builds upon the notion when a prefix MSC is k -synchronous. Its first condition requires that there is some linearisation of the prefix MSC while its second condition requires causal delivery to hold. In contrast to the mailbox setting, the first condition always entails the second condition for the point-to-point setting.

Point-to-point Communication implies Causal Delivery. We first adapt the definition of causal delivery [28, Def. 4] for point-to-point FIFO channels [28, Section 6]. Unfortunately, this discussion leaves room for interpreting what causal delivery exactly is for point-to-point systems. Based on the description that a process P can receive messages from two distinct processes Q and R in any order, regardless of the dependency between the corresponding send events, we decided to literally adapt the definition of causal delivery as follows.

Definition 7 (Causal delivery) *Let $M = (N, p, f, l, (\leq_P)_{P \in \mathcal{P}})$ be an MSC. We say that M satisfies causal delivery if there is a linearisation $w = e_1 \dots$ of N such that for any two events $e_i \leq_M e_j$ with $e_i = P \triangleright Q!_-$ and $e_j = P \triangleright Q!_-,$ either e_j is unmatched in w or there are $e_{i'} \leq_M e_{j'}$ such that $e_i \vdash e_{i'}$ and $e_j \vdash e_{j'}$ in w .*

We show that $\text{msc}(w)$ for every w (if defined) satisfies causal delivery (as proven in Appendix B.2).

Lemma 2 *Let $w \in \Sigma^\infty$ such that $\text{msc}(w)$ is defined. Then, $\text{msc}(w)$ satisfies causal delivery.*

In combination with the fact that, given a linearisation w of a prefix MSC M , $\text{msc}(w)$ is isomorphic to M , this yields that causal delivery is satisfied if there is a linearisation.

Corollary 1 *Every prefix MSC with a linearisation satisfies causal delivery.*

With this, we can simplify the definition by omitting the second condition without changing its meaning. In addition, we extend it to apply for MSCs with infinite sets of event nodes.

Definition 8 (k -synchronous and k -synchronisable) *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be a positive natural number. We say that a prefix MSC $M = (N, p, f, l, (\leq_P)_{P \in \mathcal{P}})$ is k -synchronous if*

1. *there is a linearisation of event nodes w compliant with \leq_M which can be split into a sequence of k -exchanges (also called message exchange if k not given or clear from context), i.e., $w = w_1 \dots$ such that for all i , it holds that $l(w_i) \in S^{\leq k} \cdot R^{\leq k}$; and*
2. *for all e, e' in w such that $e \vdash e'$, there is some i with e, e' in w_i .³*

*A linearisation w is k -synchronisable⁴ if $\text{msc}(w)$ is k -synchronous. A language L is k -synchronisable if every word $w \in L$ is. We may use *not synchronisable* as abbreviation for *not k -synchronisable for any k* .*

³This is equivalent to the following: for all e and $f(e)$ in w , there is some i with $e, f(e)$ in w_i .

⁴One could distinguish between universal and existential k -synchronisability, i.e., to distinguish the existence of a k -synchronisable linearisation rather than all linearisations being k -synchronisable. However, the universal version does not make much sense in practice. Thus, we omit the term existential.

3.2 Algorithmic Verification and Channel Restrictions

It is important to note that we use the term *restriction* as a property of a system which occurs naturally and not something that is imposed on its semantics. However, both have a tight connection: a system *naturally* satisfies a restriction if *imposing* the restriction does not change its possible behaviours. If this is the case, one can exploit this for algorithmic verification and only check behaviours that satisfy the restriction without harming correctness.

For each channel restriction, we recall known results about checking membership and which verification problems become decidable.

Half-duplex Communication. For CSMs with two processes, membership is decidable [17, Thm. 31]. The set of reachable configurations is computable in polynomial time which renders many verification questions like the *unspecified reception problem* decidable (see [17, Thm. 16] for a detailed list of verification problems) while model checking PLTL or CTL is still undecidable. Half-duplex CSMs with more than two processes are Turing-powerful [17, Thm. 38] so verification becomes undecidable and checking membership is of little interest.

Existential B -boundedness. For CSMs, membership is undecidable, unless CSMs are known to be deadlock free and B is given [24, Fig. 3]. For protocols, we will see that they are always existentially B -bounded for some B and thus a correct implementation of a protocol also is. It is quite straightforward that control-state reachability is decidable but not typically studied for these systems [12]. Intuitively, it can be solved by exhaustively enumerating the reachability graph of the CSM while pruning configurations exceeding the bound B . For HMSCs, model checking is undecidable for LTL [6, Thm. 3] and decidable for MSO [37, Thm. 1].

k -synchronisability. For CSMs, membership for a given k is decidable in EXPTIME [12, Rem. 30], originally shown decidable by Di Giusto et al. [28], while it is undecidable if k is not given [12, Thm. 22]. For HMSCs, both questions are decidable in polynomial time, while we show that MSTs are always 1-synchronisable. Model checking for k -synchronisable systems is decidable and in EXPTIME when formulas are represented in LCPDL. This follows from combining that such systems have bounded (special) tree-width [12, Prop. 28] and results by Bollig and Finkel [11]. Control-state reachability was shown to be decidable for k -synchronisable systems [28, Thm. 6].

4 High-level Message Sequence Charts

Message sequence charts have been used as compact representation for executions of CSMs. The (prefix) message sequence charts obtained from different executions of CSMs can be analysed to determine which channel restriction is satisfied [24, 28]. In addition, we do also use message sequence charts as building blocks for high-level message sequence charts [39, 48] which specify protocols.

We define these following the presentation by Alur et al. [4, 5]. A BMSC corresponds to “straight line code” in which each process follows a single sequence of event nodes. A *high-level message sequence chart* (HMSC) adds a regular control structure (branching and loops).

Definition 9 (High-Level Message Sequence Charts) A high-level message sequence chart (HMSC) is a structure (V, E, v^I, V^T, μ) where V is a finite set of vertices, $E \subseteq V \times V$ is a set of directed edges, $v^I \in V$ is an initial vertex, $V^T \subseteq V$ is a set of terminal vertices, and $\mu : V \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is a function mapping every vertex to a BMSC.

To obtain the language of an HMSC, we start with initial paths through the HMSC. As usual, we are interested only in maximal paths, i.e., either infinite or ending in a terminal vertex. We can expand each




Figure 4: BMSCs which satisfy different channels restrictions

such path into a sequence of BMSCs, concatenate this sequence of BMSCs, and take the language of the resulting MSC. The language of the HMSC is the union of the languages of the MSCs generated by all its initial paths – see Appendix A.3 for the formal definition. For simplicity, we assume every vertex in an HMSC is reachable from the initial vertex and every initial non-maximal path can be completed to a maximal one.

Example 1 Figure 1b shows an HMSC composed of two BMSCs. MSCs of the HMSC are obtained by following the control structure and concatenating the corresponding BMSCs. The language contains all linearisations of these MSCs.

4.1 Channel Restrictions of HMSCs

We say that an HMSC is half-duplex, existentially B -bounded or k -synchronisable respectively if its language is. It is straightforward that checking an HMSC for k -synchronisability amounts to checking its BMSCs.

Proposition 1 *An HMSC H is k -synchronisable iff all BMSCs of H are k -synchronisable.*

For the presentation of our results, we follow the numbering laid out in Fig. 2b. Note that any BMSC can always be turned into a HMSC with a single initial and terminal vertex. Therefore, it is trivial that all BMSC examples also apply to HMSCs.

Lemma 3 ([24], Prop. 3.1) $(H1)$: *Any HMSC H is existentially B -bounded for some B .*

We prove this result in a slightly different way in Appendix C.2. Basically, one computes the bound for the BMSC of every vertex in H and takes the maximum. This works since every MSC of H is a concatenation of individual BMSCs which can be scheduled in a way that the channels are empty after each BMSC.

Example 2 $(H2)$: $\exists B$ -bounded, k -synchronisable, and not half-duplex. Consider the BMSC in Fig. 4a. It is $\exists 1$ -bounded as there is one message per channel, 2-synchronisable since the message exchange can be split into one phase of two sends and two subsequent receives and not half-duplex because both messages can traverse their channel at the same time.

Example 3 $(H3)$: $\exists B$ -bounded, not half-duplex, and not synchronisable. It is obvious that the BMSC M in Fig. 4b is not half-duplex. We show that M is not k -synchronisable for any k . Let us denote the event nodes for each process P with p_1, \dots as ordered by the total process order. It is straightforward that one of p_1 and q_1 has to be part of the first k -exchange. However, since the respective corresponding reception

happens after the other's event node, both have to be a part of the first k -exchange. Since these receive event nodes (transitively) depend on all other event nodes, all event nodes have to be part of a single k -exchange for M . However, R first has to receive from Q in order to send back to it and therefore, there is no single k -exchange for M and M is not k -synchronisable for any k .

Example 4 [H4]: *half-duplex, $\exists B$ -bounded, and not synchronisable. Let us consider the BMSC in Fig. 4c. It is straightforward that it is half-duplex and existentially 1-bounded. However, it is not k -synchronisable for any k . In particular, the first and last event node (of any total order induced by the BMSC) must belong to the same message exchange but two more linearly dependent message exchanges need to happen in between.*

Example 5 [H5]: *half-duplex, $\exists B$ -bounded, k -synchronisable but not 1-synchronisable. Consider the BMSC in Fig. 4d. It is easy to see that it is not 1- or 2-synchronisable but 3-synchronisable, half-duplex and existentially 1-bounded. Note that it is straightforward to amend the example such that it is still half-duplex but the parameters B and k need to be increased.*

Lemma 4 [H6]: Every 1-synchronisable HMSC is half-duplex.

Intuitively, in any BMSC of an HMSC, every send event node has a corresponding receive event node. Therefore, a message that has been sent needs to have been received directly afterwards and the per-process order is total so any process has to receive a message before it sends a message back. The full proof can be found in Appendix C.3.

5 Multiparty Session Types

In this section, we recall global types from Multiparty Session Types (MSTs) as a way to specify protocols. We present an embedding for MSTs into HMSCs, prove it correct, and use it to show that MSTs are half-duplex, existentially 1-bounded, and 1-synchronisable.

5.1 Specifying Protocols with Global Types

We now define global types in the framework of MSTs as a syntax for protocol specifications. The syntax of global types is defined following classical MST frameworks [45, Def. 3.2]. The calculus focuses on the core message-passing primitives of asynchronous MSTs and does not incorporate features like subsessions or delegation. However, it does incorporate a recent generalisation that allow a sender to send to different receivers upon branching [38].

Definition 10 (Syntax of Global Types [38]) Global types for MSTs are defined by the grammar:

$$G ::= 0 \mid \sum_{i \in I} P \rightarrow Q_i : m_i . G_i \mid \mu t . G \mid t$$

An expression $P \rightarrow Q : m$ stands for a send and receive event: $P \triangleright Q ! m$ and $Q \triangleleft P ? m$. Since global types always specify send and the receive events together, they specify complete channel-compliant sequences of events. For a *choice*, the sender process decides which branch to take and each branch of a choice needs to be uniquely distinguishable ($\forall i, j \in I. i \neq j \Rightarrow Q_i \neq Q_j \vee m_i \neq m_j$). If there is a single alternative (and no actual choice), we omit writing the sum operator. Loops are encoded by the least fixed point operator and recursion must be guarded, i.e., there is at least one message between μt and t . We assume, without loss of generality, that all occurrences of recursion variables t are bound and every variable t

is distinct. Recursion only happens at the tail (and there is no additional parameter) and, therefore, the language of a global type can be defined with an automaton – as expected by following the structure of a global type, splitting the message exchanges into send and receive events while not only accounting for finite but also infinite executions. We give one language as example and refer to Appendix D.1 for a formal definition.

Example 6 *The type language for the global type in Section 1, $\mu t. (P \rightarrow Q : \text{cons}. t + P \rightarrow Q : \text{nil}. Q \rightarrow P : \text{ack}. 0)$, is the union of a set of finite executions and infinite executions:*

$$(P \triangleright Q ! \text{cons}. Q \triangleleft P ? \text{cons})^* . P \triangleright Q ! \text{nil}. Q \triangleleft P ? \text{nil}. Q \triangleright P ! \text{ack}. P \triangleleft Q ? \text{ack} \quad \text{and} \quad (P \triangleright Q ! \text{cons}. Q \triangleleft P ? \text{cons})^\omega$$

Remark 1 *For readers familiar with MSTs, it may be strange that we do not define local types. In fact, one correctness criterion for local types requires that their composition generates the same language as the original global type. All channel restrictions are defined using languages, so it suffices to consider global types for our purposes.*

Example 7 *Consider the global type: $P \rightarrow Q : m_1. R \rightarrow S : m_2$. The type language for this type contains only the word $P \triangleright Q ! m_1. Q \triangleleft P ? m_1. R \triangleright S ! m_2. S \triangleleft R ? m_2$. On the other hand, if we want to describe the same protocol with a HMSC, it always allows any permutation of the events where $P \triangleright Q ! m_1$ occurs before $Q \triangleleft P ? m_1$ and $R \triangleright S ! m_2$ before $S \triangleleft R ? m_2$.*

Intuitively, some events in a distributed setting shall not be ordered since they are independent, e.g., happen on different processes as in the previous example. To this end, we recall an indistinguishability relation \sim that captures the reordering allowed by CSMs with FIFO channels (which will be defined in Definition 12). In MSTs, similar reordering rules are applied (e.g., [33, Def. 3.2 and 5.3]).

Definition 11 (Indistinguishability relation \sim [38]) *Let $\sim_i \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*$, for $i \geq 0$, be a family of indistinguishability relations. For all $w \in \Sigma^*$, we have $w \sim_0 w$. For $i = 1$, we define:*

- (1) *If $P \neq R$, then $w.P \triangleright Q ! m. R \triangleright S ! m'. u \sim_1 w.R \triangleright S ! m'. P \triangleright Q ! m. u$.*
- (2) *If $Q \neq S$, then $w.Q \triangleleft P ? m. S \triangleleft R ? m'. u \sim_1 w.S \triangleleft R ? m'. Q \triangleleft P ? m. u$.*
- (3) *If $P \neq S \wedge (P \neq R \vee Q \neq S)$, then $w.P \triangleright Q ! m. S \triangleleft R ? m'. u \sim_1 w.S \triangleleft R ? m'. P \triangleright Q ! m. u$.*
- (4) *If $|w \downarrow_{P \triangleright Q !}| > |w \downarrow_{Q \triangleleft P ?}|$, then $w.P \triangleright Q ! m. Q \triangleleft P ? m'. u \sim_1 w.Q \triangleleft P ? m'. P \triangleright Q ! m. u$.*

Let w, w', w'' be sequences of events such that $w \sim_1 w'$ and $w' \sim_i w''$ for some i . Then, $w \sim_{i+1} w''$. We define $w \sim u$ if there is n such that $w \sim_n u$.

This formalises how messages can be swapped for finite executions of protocols. The infinite case requires special technical treatment for which we refer to the work by Majumdar et al. [38].

The relation is lifted to languages as expected. For a language L , we have:

$$\mathcal{C}^\sim(L) = \left\{ w' \mid \bigvee \begin{array}{l} w' \in \Sigma^* \wedge \exists w \in \Sigma^*. w \in L \text{ and } w' \sim w \\ w' \in \Sigma^\omega \wedge \exists w \in \Sigma^\omega. w \in L \text{ and } w' \preceq^\omega w \end{array} \right\}.$$

The indistinguishability relation \sim does not change the order of send and receive events of a single process. The relation \sim captures all reorderings which naturally appear when global types from MSTs are implemented with CSMs. For a global type G , its semantics is given by its *execution language* $\mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(G))$. Furthermore, the indistinguishability relation captures exactly the events that are independent in any HMSC. Phrased differently, HMSC include these reorderings by design.

Lemma 5 *Let H be any HMSC. Then, $\mathcal{L}(H) = \mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(H))$.*

The proof is in Appendix D.2. A similar result for CSMs has previously been proven [38, Lemma 21].

Theorem 1 *For channel-compliant words, the indistinguishability relation \sim preserves satisfaction of half-duplex communication, existential B-boundedness, and k-synchronisability.*

The proof can be found in Appendix D.3.

5.2 Encoding Global Types from MSTs into HMSCs

Global types from MSTs can be turned into HMSCs while preserving the protocol they specify. In this step, we account for the orders that can and cannot be enforced in an asynchronous point-to-point setting with the indistinguishability relation \sim . The main difference between the automata-based semantics of global types from MSTs and the semantics of HMSCs is that an automaton carries the events on the edges and an HMSC carries events as labels of the event nodes in the BMSCs associated with the vertices.

In the translation, we use the following notation. M_\emptyset is the empty BMSC ($N = \emptyset$) and $M(P \rightarrow Q : m)$ is the BMSC with two event nodes: e_1, e_2 such that $f(e_1) = e_2, l(e_1) = P \triangleright Q!m$, and $l(e_2) = Q \triangleleft P?m$.

From a global type G , we construct an HMSC $H(G) = (V, E, v^J, V^T, \mu, \lambda)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \{G' \mid G' \text{ is a subterm of } G\} \cup \{(\sum_{i \in I} P \rightarrow Q_i : m_i.G_i, j) \mid \sum_{i \in I} P \rightarrow Q_i : m_i.G_i \text{ occurs in } G \wedge j \in I\} \\ E &= \{(\mu t.G', G') \mid \mu t.G' \text{ occurs in } G\} \cup \{(t, \mu t.G') \mid t, \mu t.G' \text{ occurs in } G\} \\ &\quad \cup \{(\sum_{i \in I} P \rightarrow Q_i : m_i.G_i, (\sum_{i \in I} P \rightarrow Q_i : m_i.G_i, j)) \mid (\sum_{i \in I} P \rightarrow Q_i : m_i.G_i, j) \in V\} \\ &\quad \cup \{((\sum_{i \in I} P \rightarrow Q_i : m_i.G_i, j), G_j) \mid (\sum_{i \in I} P \rightarrow Q_i : m_i.G_i, j) \in V\} \\ v^J &= G \quad V^T = \{0\} \quad \mu(v) = \begin{cases} M(P \rightarrow Q_i : m_j) & \text{if } v = (\sum_{i \in I} P \rightarrow Q_i : m_i.G_i, j) \\ M_\emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

This translation does not yield the HMSC with the least number of vertices since vertices with a single successor could be merged to form larger BMSCs. Here, every BMSC contains at most one message exchange. We obtain the following correctness statement for the embedding:

Theorem 2 *For any global type G , it holds that $\mathcal{L}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(H(G))$ and $\mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(G)) = \mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(H(G)))$.*

We provide the technical developments to show Theorem 2 in Appendix D.4.

Remark 2 *The first part of Theorem 2 uses \subseteq instead of $=$ as HMSCs do not order indistinguishable events and we consider the type language of G . Example 7 shows that using the execution language rather than the type language in the second part is inevitable for equality and does not weaken the claim.*

5.3 Channel Restrictions of Global Types

Example 8 [H7]: *half-duplex, $\exists 1$ -bounded, 1-synchronisable but not in MSTs.*

Consider the HMSC in Fig. 5. It is straightforward that it is half-duplex, existentially 1-bounded, and 1-synchronisable. Both P and Q send the same message to R independently in each branch. Intuitively, R chooses which branch to take by the order it decides to receive both messages. Subsequently, it notifies Q about this choice. Such a communication pattern cannot be expressed in the MST framework. If one tried to model it with R actually choosing the branch, l and r would always occur before the receptions so the languages are different.




Figure 5: half-duplex, $\exists 1$ -bounded, and 1-synchronisable but not expressible in MSTs

We show that protocols specified as global types satisfy all discussed channel restrictions (with the minimal reasonable parameter).

Theorem 3 [H8]: *The execution language $\mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(G))$ is half-duplex, existentially 1-bounded, and 1-synchronisable for any global type G .*

The proof uses the embedding to obtain an HMSC built of BMSCs with at most one message exchange and exploits previously shown properties about HMSCs. Details can be found in Appendix D.5.

Remark 3 (Choreography automata are half-duplex, $\exists 1$ -bounded, and 1-synchronisable)

In this section, we looked at MSTs which are rooted in process algebra. With choreography automata [7], a similar concept has been studied from automata theory perspective. Basically, a protocol specification is an automaton whose transitions are labelled by $P \rightarrow Q : m$. In contrast to global types from MSTs, they do not impose constraints on choice, i.e., there does not need to be a unique process chooses which branch to take next and do not employ an indistinguishability relation but require to explicitly spell out all possible reorderings. This feature can lead to complications w.r.t. implementing such protocols but does not change the satisfaction of channel restrictions. In fact, protocols specified by choreography automata are also half-duplex, existentially 1-bounded, and 1-synchronisable.

6 Communicating State Machines

In this section, we first present communicating state machines (CSMs) as formal model for distributed processes which communicate messages asynchronously via reliable point-to-point FIFO channels. If a CSM implements a protocol specification, both languages are the same – modulo \sim which does not alter satisfaction of channel restrictions. This entails that CSMs implementing protocol specifications satisfy the same channel restrictions as presented in previous sections. Here, we investigate the channel restrictions of general CSMs which might not implement a protocol specified as global type or HMSC.

Definition 12 (Communicating state machines) A state machine $A = (Q, \Delta, \delta, q_0, F)$ is a 5-tuple where Q is a finite set of states, Δ is an alphabet, $\delta \subseteq Q \times (\Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}) \times Q$ is a transition relation, $q_0 \in Q$ is an initial state, and $F \subseteq Q$ is a set of final states. We write $q \xrightarrow{a} q'$ for $(q, a, q') \in \delta$. A run of A is a sequence $\rho = q_0 \xrightarrow{w_0} q_1 \xrightarrow{w_1} \dots$, with $q_i \in Q$ and $w_i \in \Delta \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ for $i \geq 0$, such that q_0 is the initial state, and for each $i \geq 0$, it holds that $(q_i, w_i, q_{i+1}) \in \delta$. The trace of the run is the finite or infinite word $w_0 w_1 \dots \in \Sigma^\infty$. The path of the run is the finite or infinite sequence $q_0 q_1 \dots \in Q^\infty$. A run is called maximal if it is infinite or ends at a final state. Accordingly, the corresponding trace and path are called maximal. The language $\mathcal{L}(A)$ of A is the set of its maximal traces.

We call $\mathcal{A} = \{A_P\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$ a communicating state machine (CSM) over \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{V} if A_P is a finite state machine with alphabet Σ_P for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$. The state machine for P is denoted by $(Q_P, \Sigma_P, \delta_P, q_{0,P}, F_P)$. Intuitively, a CSM allows a set of state machines, one for each process in \mathcal{P} , to communicate by sending and receiving messages. For this, each pair of processes $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $P \neq Q$, is connected by two directed message channels. A transition $q_P \xrightarrow{P \triangleright Q!m} q'_P$ in the state machine of P denotes that P sends message m to Q if P is in the state q and changes its local state to q' . The channel $\langle P, Q \rangle$ is appended by message m . For receptions, a transition $q_Q \xrightarrow{Q \triangleleft P?m} q'_Q$ in the state machine of Q corresponds to Q retrieving the message m from the head of the channel when its local state is \hat{q} which is updated to \hat{q}' . The run of a CSM always starts with empty channels and each finite state machine is its respective initial state. The formalisation of this intuition is standard and can be found in Appendix A.4.

As for HMSCs, the language of a CSM is closed under \sim .

Lemma 6 ([38], Lemma 21) Let \mathcal{A} be a CSM. Then $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}))$.

Implementing Protocol Specifications. Given a protocol specification, one can try to generate an implementation which admits the same language. This problem is known as implementability or realisability in the HMSC setting [27, 5, 36]. In the MST setting [32], this is done in two steps. First, the global type is projected on to local types. Second, a type system ensures that the implementations follow the local types, i.e., a refinement check. However, one can design CSMs from scratch that yield systems which cannot be captured by protocol specifications like HMSCs or global types from MSTs.

6.1 Channel Restrictions of CSMs

We say that an CSM is half-duplex, existentially B -bounded, or k -synchronisable respectively if its language is. Again, we follow the outline presented in Fig. 2a.

Example 9 [C1]: *half-duplex, $\exists B$ -bounded, and k -synchronisable. The CSM in Fig. 1a is $\exists 1$ -bounded, 1-synchronisable, and half-duplex.*

Any BMSC can easily be implemented with an CSM by simple letting each process follow its linear trajectory of eventnodes. We call this projection. Therefore, we can use three of the BMSCs presented in Fig. 4 to show the hypotheses for CSMs:

Example 10 For, [C2], the projection of Fig. 4c (used to show [H4]) is half-duplex, $\exists B$ -bounded, and not synchronisable. For [C3], the projection of Fig. 4b (used to show [H3]) is $\exists B$ -bounded, not half-duplex, and not synchronisable. For [C4], the projection of Fig. 4a (used to show [H2]) is $\exists B$ -bounded, k -synchronisable, and not half-duplex.

Example 11 [C5]: *k -synchronisable, not half-duplex and not \exists -bounded;*

[C6]: *k -synchronisable, half-duplex and not \exists -bounded.*

We consider two CSMs constructed from the state machines in Fig. 6. For [C5], we consider the CSM consisting of both state machines. It is 1-synchronisable but not existentially bounded and not half-duplex. It is 1-synchronisable because every linearisation can be split into single send events that constitute 1-exchanges. It is neither existentially B -bounded for any B nor half-duplex since none of the messages will be received so both channels can grow arbitrarily. For [C6], it can easily be turned into a half-duplex CSM by removing one of the send events. Then, the CSM is 1-synchronisable and half-duplex but not existentially bounded.




Figure 6: CSM with FSMs for P (left) and for Q (right)

This example disproves a result from the literature [35, Thm. 7.1], which states that every k -synchronisable system is existentially B -bounded for some B and has been cited recently as part of a summary [12, Prop. 41]. In the proof, it is neglected that unreceived messages remain in the channels after a message exchange. Our example satisfies their assumption that CSMs do not have states with mixed choice, i.e., each state either is final, has send options to choose from, or receive options to choose from. We do not impose any assumptions on mixed choice in this work. Still, all the presented examples do not have states with mixed choice so the presented relationships also hold for this subset of CSMs.

Corollary 2 *Existential B -boundedness and k -synchronisability for CSMs are incomparable.*

The previous result follows immediately from the CSMs constructed in Example 11. Our result considers the point-to-point FIFO setting. For the mailbox setting, the analogous question is an open problem [13].

Turing-powerful Encodings. On the one hand, it is well-known that CSMs are Turing-complete [14] and Cécé and Finkel [17, Thm. 36] showed that half-duplex communication does not impair expressiveness of CSMs with more than two processes. On the other hand, each of existential B -boundedness and k -synchronisability render some verification questions decidable. Therefore, the encodings of Turing-completeness [14, 17] are examples for CSMs which are not existentially B -bounded for any B nor k -synchronisable for any k and either half-duplex ([C7]) or not half-duplex ([C8]).

7 Related Work

We now cover related work which is not already cited in the earlier sections.

The origins of MSTs date back to 1993 when Honda et al. [31] proposed a binary version for typing communication in the domain of process algebra. In 2008, Honda et al. [32] generalised the idea to multiparty systems. While the connection of MSTs and CSMs has been studied soon after MSTs had been proposed [16, 19], we provide, to the best of our knowledge, the first formal connection of MSTs to HMSCs, even though HMSC-like visualisations have been used in the community of session types, e.g. [15, Fig. 1], [33, Figs. 1 and 2]. For binary session types, it is known how to compute the bound B of universally B -bounded types [20, 22]. Lange et al. [35] proposed k -multiparty consistency (k -MC) for CSMs as extension of multiparty consistency for MSTs. We did not consider k -MC in this work for two reasons. First, they assume an existential bound (of k) on channels. Second, as an extension of multiparty consistency, k -MC focuses on implementability rather than channel restrictions.

HMSCs and variants thereof have been extensively studied [26, 25, 23, 44]. The connection to CSMs has been investigated in particular for different forms of implementability [27, 5, 36], also called realisability [5], which is undecidable in general [26, 5], and implied scenarios [42, 41] which arise when implementing HMSCs with CSMs. Several restrictions to check implementability adopted a limited form of choice [8, 29, 42, 41, 18] which is similar to the one in global types from MSTs. For more details, we refer to work by Majumdar et al. [38].

While we consider finite state machines as model for processes, research has also been conducted on communicating systems where processes are given more computational power, e.g., pushdown automata [30, 47, 3]. However, as noted before, our setting is already Turing-powerful. In Section 3.2, we surveyed how channel restrictions can yield decidability. Incomplete approaches consider subclasses which enable the effective computation of symbolic representations (of channel contents) for reachable states [9, 34]. Other approaches change the semantics of channels, e.g., by making them lossy [2, 1, 34], input-bounded [10], or by restricting the communication topology [43, 46].

While we build on the most recent definitions of synchronisability [28], we refer to the work by Finkel and Lozes [21] and Bouajjani et al. [13] for earlier work on synchronisability. Bollig et. al [12] studied the connection of different notions of synchronisability for MSCs and MSO logic which yields interesting decidability results. We refer to their work for more details but briefly point to the slightly different use of terminology: k -synchronisability is called weak (k -)synchronisability by Bollig where the omission of k indicates a system is synchronisable for some k ; while strong (k -)synchronisability does solely apply to the mailbox setting.

8 Conclusion

We presented a comprehensive comparison of half-duplex, existential B -bounded, and k -synchronisable communication. We showed that the three restrictions are different for CSMs. For HMSCs, the half-duplex restriction and k -synchronisability are different and included in existential B -boundedness. Furthermore, all 1-synchronisable HMSC-definable languages are half-duplex. This subclass contains global types from MSTs which are also existentially 1-bounded. We established the first formal embedding of global types from MSTs into HMSCs which can be used to combine insights from both domains for further advances on implementing protocol specifications.

References

- [1] Parosh Aziz Abdulla, C. Aiswarya & Mohamed Faouzi Atig (2016): *Data Communicating Processes with Unreliable Channels*. In Martin Grohe, Eric Koskinen & Natarajan Shankar, editors: *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS '16, New York, NY, USA, July 5-8, 2016*, ACM, pp. 166–175, doi:10.1145/2933575.2934535. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1145/2933575.2934535>.
- [2] Parosh Aziz Abdulla, Ahmed Bouajjani & Bengt Jonsson: *On-the-Fly Analysis of Systems with Unbounded, Lossy FIFO Channels*. In Alan J. Hu & Moshe Y. Vardi, editors: *Computer Aided Verification, 10th International Conference, CAV'98, Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 28 - July 2, 1998, Proceedings*.
- [3] C. Aiswarya, Paul Gastin & K. Narayan Kumar (2014): *Verifying Communicating Multi-pushdown Systems via Split-Width*. In Franck Cassez & Jean-François Raskin, editors: *Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis - 12th International Symposium, ATVA 2014, Sydney, NSW, Australia, November 3-7, 2014, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 8837*, Springer, pp. 1–17, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-11936-6_1. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-11936-6_1.
- [4] Rajeev Alur, Kousha Etessami & Mihalis Yannakakis (2003): *Inference of Message Sequence Charts*. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* 29(7), pp. 623–633, doi:10.1109/TSE.2003.1214326. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2003.1214326>.
- [5] Rajeev Alur, Kousha Etessami & Mihalis Yannakakis (2005): *Realizability and verification of MSC graphs*. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 331(1), pp. 97–114, doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2004.09.034. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2004.09.034>.
- [6] Rajeev Alur & Mihalis Yannakakis (1999): *Model Checking of Message Sequence Charts*. In Jos C. M. Baeten & Sjouke Mauw, editors: *CONCUR '99: Concurrency Theory, 10th International Conference, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, August 24-27, 1999, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 1664*, Springer, pp. 114–129, doi:10.1007/3-540-48320-9_10. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-48320-9_10.
- [7] Franco Barbanera, Ivan Lanese & Emilio Tuosto (2020): *Choreography Automata*. In Simon Bliudze & Laura Bocchi, editors: *Coordination Models and Languages - 22nd IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference, COORDINATION 2020, Held as Part of the 15th International Federated Conference on Distributed Computing Techniques, DisCoTec 2020, Valletta, Malta, June 15-19, 2020, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 12134*, Springer, pp. 86–106, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-50029-0_6. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-50029-0_6.
- [8] Hanène Ben-Abdallah & Stefan Leue (1997): *Syntactic Detection of Process Divergence and Non-local Choice in Message Sequence Charts*. In Ed Brinksma, editor: *Tools and Algorithms for Construction and Analysis of Systems, Third International Workshop, TACAS '97, Enschede, The Netherlands, April 2-4, 1997, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 1217*, Springer, pp. 259–274, doi:10.1007/BFb0035393. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0035393>.
- [9] Bernard Boigelot, Patrice Godefroid, Bernard Willems & Pierre Wolper (1997): *The Power of QDDs (Extended Abstract)*. In Pascal Van Hentenryck, editor: *Static Analysis, 4th International Symposium, SAS '97, Paris, France, September 8-10, 1997, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 1302*, Springer, pp. 172–186, doi:10.1007/BFb0032741. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0032741>.
- [10] Benedikt Bollig, Alain Finkel & Amrita Suresh (2020): *Bounded Reachability Problems Are Decidable in FIFO Machines*. In Igor Konnov & Laura Kovács, editors: *31st International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2020, September 1-4, 2020, Vienna, Austria (Virtual Conference), LIPIcs 171, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik*, pp. 49:1–49:17, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2020.49. Available at <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2020.49>.
- [11] Benedikt Bollig & Paul Gastin (2019): *Non-Sequential Theory of Distributed Systems*. CoRR abs/1904.06942. arXiv:1904.06942.

- [12] Benedikt Bollig, Cinzia Di Giusto, Alain Finkel, Laetitia Laversa, Étienne Lozes & Amrita Suresh (2021): *A Unifying Framework for Deciding Synchronizability*. In Serge Haddad & Daniele Varacca, editors: *32nd International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2021, August 24-27, 2021, Virtual Conference, LIPIcs 203*, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, pp. 14:1–14:18, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2021.14. Available at <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2021.14>.
- [13] Ahmed Bouajjani, Constantin Enea, Kailiang Ji & Shaz Qadeer (2018): *On the Completeness of Verifying Message Passing Programs Under Bounded Asynchrony*. In Hana Chockler & Georg Weissenbacher, editors: *Computer Aided Verification - 30th International Conference, CAV 2018, Held as Part of the Federated Logic Conference, FloC 2018, Oxford, UK, July 14-17, 2018, Proceedings, Part II, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 10982*, Springer, pp. 372–391, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-96142-2_23. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96142-2_23.
- [14] Daniel Brand & Pitro Zafiropulo (1983): *On Communicating Finite-State Machines*. *J. ACM* 30(2), pp. 323–342, doi:10.1145/322374.322380. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1145/322374.322380>.
- [15] Marco Carbone, Kohei Honda, N. Yoshida, R. Milner, G. Brown & Steve Ross-Talbot (2005): *A Theoretical Basis of Communication-Centred Concurrent Programming*.
- [16] Giuseppe Castagna, Mariangiola Dezani-Ciancaglini & Luca Padovani (2012): *On Global Types and Multi-Party Session*. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* 8(1), doi:10.2168/LMCS-8(1:24)2012. Available at [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-8\(1:24\)2012](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-8(1:24)2012).
- [17] Gérard Cécé & Alain Finkel (2005): *Verification of programs with half-duplex communication*. *Inf. Comput.* 202(2), pp. 166–190, doi:10.1016/j.ic.2005.05.006. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2005.05.006>.
- [18] Haitao Dan, Robert M. Hierons & Steve Counsell (2010): *Non-local Choice and Implied Scenarios*. In José Luiz Fiadeiro, Stefania Gnesi & Andrea Maggiolo-Schettini, editors: *8th IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering and Formal Methods, SEFM 2010, Pisa, Italy, 13-18 September 2010*, IEEE Computer Society, pp. 53–62, doi:10.1109/SEFM.2010.14. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1109/SEFM.2010.14>.
- [19] Pierre-Malo Deniérou & Nobuko Yoshida (2012): *Multiparty Session Types Meet Communicating Automata*. In Helmut Seidl, editor: *Programming Languages and Systems - 21st European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2012, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2012, Tallinn, Estonia, March 24 - April 1, 2012. Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 7211*, Springer, pp. 194–213, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-28869-2_10. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-28869-2_10.
- [20] Manuel Fähndrich, Mark Aiken, Chris Hawblitzel, Orion Hodson, Galen C. Hunt, James R. Larus & Steven Levi (2006): *Language support for fast and reliable message-based communication in singularity OS*. In Yolande Berbers & Willy Zwaenepoel, editors: *Proceedings of the 2006 EuroSys Conference, Leuven, Belgium, April 18-21, 2006*, ACM, pp. 177–190, doi:10.1145/1217935.1217953. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1145/1217935.1217953>.
- [21] Alain Finkel & Étienne Lozes (2017): *Synchronizability of Communicating Finite State Machines is not Decidable*. In Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Piotr Indyk, Fabian Kuhn & Anca Muscholl, editors: *44th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2017, July 10-14, 2017, Warsaw, Poland, LIPIcs 80*, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, pp. 122:1–122:14, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2017.122. Available at <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2017.122>.
- [22] Simon J. Gay & Vasco Thudichum Vasconcelos (2010): *Linear type theory for asynchronous session types*. *J. Funct. Program.* 20(1), pp. 19–50, doi:10.1017/S0956796809990268. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956796809990268>.
- [23] Thomas Gazagnaire, Blaise Genest, Loïc Hélouët, P. S. Thiagarajan & Shaofa Yang (2007): *Causal Message Sequence Charts*. In Luís Caires & Vasco Thudichum Vasconcelos, editors: *CONCUR 2007 - Concurrency*

- Theory, 18th International Conference, CONCUR 2007, Lisbon, Portugal, September 3-8, 2007, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 4703*, Springer, pp. 166–180, doi:10.1007/978-3-540-74407-8_12. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74407-8_12.
- [24] Blaise Genest, Dietrich Kuske & Anca Muscholl (2007): *On Communicating Automata with Bounded Channels*. *Fundam. Inform.* 80(1-3), pp. 147–167. Available at <http://content.iospress.com/articles/fundamenta-informaticae/fi80-1-3-09>.
 - [25] Blaise Genest & Anca Muscholl (2005): *Message Sequence Charts: A Survey*. In: *Fifth International Conference on Application of Concurrency to System Design (ACSD 2005)*, 6-9 June 2005, St. Malo, France, IEEE Computer Society, pp. 2–4, doi:10.1109/ACSD.2005.25. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACSD.2005.25>.
 - [26] Blaise Genest, Anca Muscholl & Doron A. Peled (2003): *Message Sequence Charts*. In Jörg Desel, Wolfgang Reisig & Grzegorz Rozenberg, editors: *Lectures on Concurrency and Petri Nets, Advances in Petri Nets [This tutorial volume originates from the 4th Advanced Course on Petri Nets, ACPN 2003, held in Eichstätt, Germany in September 2003. In addition to lectures given at ACPN 2003, additional chapters have been commissioned]*, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science 3098*, Springer, pp. 537–558, doi:10.1007/978-3-540-27755-2_15. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-27755-2_15.
 - [27] Blaise Genest, Anca Muscholl, Helmut Seidl & Marc Zeitoun (2006): *Infinite-state high-level MSCs: Model-checking and realizability*. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 72(4), pp. 617–647, doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2005.09.007. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2005.09.007>.
 - [28] Cinzia Di Giusto, Laetitia Laversa & Étienne Lozes (2020): *On the k-synchronizability of Systems*. In Jean Goubault-Larrecq & Barbara König, editors: *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures - 23rd International Conference, FOSSACS 2020, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2020, Dublin, Ireland, April 25-30, 2020, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 12077*, Springer, pp. 157–176, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-45231-5_9. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45231-5_9.
 - [29] Loïc Hélouët & Claude Jard (2000): *Conditions for synthesis of communicating automata from HMSCs*. In: *In 5th International Workshop on Formal Methods for Industrial Critical Systems (FMICS)*.
 - [30] Alexander Heußner, Jérôme Leroux, Anca Muscholl & Grégoire Sutre (2012): *Reachability Analysis of Communicating Pushdown Systems*. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* 8(3), doi:10.2168/LMCS-8(3:23)2012. Available at [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-8\(3:23\)2012](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-8(3:23)2012).
 - [31] Kohei Honda (1993): *Types for Dyadic Interaction*. In Eike Best, editor: *CONCUR '93, 4th International Conference on Concurrency Theory, Hildesheim, Germany, August 23-26, 1993, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 715*, Springer, pp. 509–523, doi:10.1007/3-540-57208-2_35. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-57208-2_35.
 - [32] Kohei Honda, Nobuko Yoshida & Marco Carbone (2008): *Multiparty asynchronous session types*. In George C. Necula & Philip Wadler, editors: *Proceedings of the 35th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2008, San Francisco, California, USA, January 7-12, 2008*, ACM, pp. 273–284, doi:10.1145/1328438.1328472. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1145/1328438.1328472>.
 - [33] Kohei Honda, Nobuko Yoshida & Marco Carbone (2016): *Multiparty Asynchronous Session Types*. *J. ACM* 63(1), pp. 9:1–9:67, doi:10.1145/2827695. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1145/2827695>.
 - [34] Chris Köcher (2021): *Reachability Problems on Reliable and Lossy Queue Automata*. *Theory Comput. Syst.* 65(8), pp. 1211–1242, doi:10.1007/s00224-021-10031-2. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00224-021-10031-2>.
 - [35] Julien Lange & Nobuko Yoshida (2019): *Verifying Asynchronous Interactions via Communicating Session Automata*. In Isil Dillig & Serdar Tasiran, editors: *Computer Aided Verification - 31st International Conference, CAV 2019, New York City, NY, USA, July 15-18, 2019, Proceedings, Part I, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 11561*, Springer, pp. 97–117, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-25540-4_6. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25540-4_6.

- [36] Markus Lohrey (2003): *Realizability of high-level message sequence charts: closing the gaps*. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 309(1-3), pp. 529–554, doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2003.08.002. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2003.08.002>.
- [37] P. Madhusudan (2001): *Reasoning about Sequential and Branching Behaviours of Message Sequence Graphs*. In Fernando Orejas, Paul G. Spirakis & Jan van Leeuwen, editors: *Automata, Languages and Programming, 28th International Colloquium, ICALP 2001, Crete, Greece, July 8-12, 2001, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 2076, Springer, pp. 809–820, doi:10.1007/3-540-48224-5_66. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-48224-5_66.
- [38] Rupak Majumdar, Madhavan Mukund, Felix Stutz & Damien Zufferey (2021): *Generalising Projection in Asynchronous Multiparty Session Types*. In Serge Haddad & Daniele Varacca, editors: *32nd International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2021, August 24-27, 2021, Virtual Conference, LIPIcs* 203, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, pp. 35:1–35:24, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2021.35. Available at <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2021.35>.
- [39] Sjouke Mauw & Michel A. Reniers (1997): *High-level message sequence charts*. In Ana R. Cavalli & Amadeo Sarma, editors: *SDL '97 Time for Testing, SDL, MSC and Trends - 8th International SDL Forum, Evry, France, 23-29 September 1997, Proceedings*, Elsevier, pp. 291–306.
- [40] Robin Milner (1999): *Communicating and mobile systems - the Pi-calculus*. Cambridge University Press.
- [41] Arjan J. Mooij, Nicolae Goga & Judi Romijn (2005): *Non-local Choice and Beyond: Intricacies of MSC Choice Nodes*. In Maura Cerioli, editor: *Fundamental Approaches to Software Engineering, 8th International Conference, FASE 2005, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2005, Edinburgh, UK, April 4-8, 2005, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 3442, Springer, pp. 273–288, doi:10.1007/978-3-540-31984-9_21. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-31984-9_21.
- [42] Henry Muccini (2003): *Detecting Implied Scenarios Analyzing Non-local Branching Choices*. In Mauro Pezzè, editor: *Fundamental Approaches to Software Engineering, 6th International Conference, FASE 2003, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2003, Warsaw, Poland, April 7-11, 2003, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 2621, Springer, pp. 372–386, doi:10.1007/3-540-36578-8_26. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-36578-8_26.
- [43] Wuxu Peng & S. Purushothaman (1992): *Analysis of a Class of Communicating Finite State Machines*. *Acta Informatica* 29(6/7), pp. 499–522, doi:10.1007/BF01185558. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01185558>.
- [44] Abhik Roychoudhury, Ankit Goel & Bikram Sengupta (2012): *Symbolic Message Sequence Charts*. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* 21(2), pp. 12:1–12:44, doi:10.1145/2089116.2089122. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1145/2089116.2089122>.
- [45] Alceste Scalas & Nobuko Yoshida (2019): *Less is more: multiparty session types revisited*. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 3(POPL), pp. 30:1–30:29, doi:10.1145/3290343. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290343>.
- [46] Salvatore La Torre, P. Madhusudan & Gennaro Parlato (2008): *Context-Bounded Analysis of Concurrent Queue Systems*. In C. R. Ramakrishnan & Jakob Rehof, editors: *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, 14th International Conference, TACAS 2008, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2008, Budapest, Hungary, March 29-April 6, 2008. Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 4963, Springer, pp. 299–314, doi:10.1007/978-3-540-78800-3_21. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78800-3_21.
- [47] Tayssir Touili & Mohamed Faouzi Atig (2010): *Verifying parallel programs with dynamic communication structures*. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 411(38-39), pp. 3460–3468, doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2010.05.028. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2010.05.028>.
- [48] International Telecommunication Union (1996): *Z.120: Message Sequence Chart*. Technical Report, International Telecommunication Union. Available at <https://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-Z.120>.

A Standard Definitions

A.1 Notations for Prefixes

In this section, we provide more notation for prefixes that is only used in the Appendix.

Definition 13 *Let w be some word. The set $\text{pref}(w)$ contains all prefixes of w . We lift $\text{pref}(-)$ to languages as expected: $\text{pref}(L) = \{u \mid \exists v \in L. u \leq v\}$.*

A.2 Message Sequence Charts

Definition 14 (Concatenation of MSCs) *Let $M_i = (N_i, p_i, f_i, l_i, (\leq_p^i)_{P \in \mathcal{P}})$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ where M_1 is a BMSC and M_2 is an MSC with disjoint sets of events, i.e., $N_1 \cap N_2 = \emptyset$. We define their concatenation $M_1 \cdot M_2$ as the MSC $M = (N, p, f, l, (\leq_p)_{P \in \mathcal{P}})$ where:*

- $N := N_1 \cup N_2$,
- for $\zeta \in \{p, f, l\}$: $\zeta(e) := \begin{cases} \zeta(e) & \text{if } e \in N_1 \\ \zeta(e) & \text{if } e \in N_2 \end{cases}$, and
- $\forall P \in \mathcal{P}: \leq_P := \leq_P^1 \cup \leq_P^2 \cup \{(e_1, e_2) \mid e_1 \in N_1 \wedge e_2 \in N_2 \wedge p(e_1) = p(e_2) = P\}$.

Note that we did not define the most general concatenation operator. First, one could also concatenate prefix MSCs and second we could have allowed an infinite set of events for P in M_1 if the set of events for P is empty in M_2 , however, this definition suits our purposes.

A.3 Semantics of HMSCs

Definition 15 (Language of an HMSC) *Let $H = (V, E, v^I, V^T, \mu)$ be an HMSC. The language of H is defined as*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(H) := & \{w \mid w \in \mathcal{L}(\mu(v_1)\mu(v_2)\dots\mu(v_n)) \text{ with } v_1 = v^I \wedge \forall 0 \leq i < n : (v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E \wedge v_n \in V^T\} \\ & \cup \{w \mid w \in \mathcal{L}(\mu(v_1)\mu(v_2)\dots) \text{ with } v_1 = v^I \wedge \forall i \geq 0 : (v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E\} \end{aligned}$$

A.4 Semantics of CSMs

With $\text{Chan} = \{\langle P, Q \rangle \mid P, Q \in \mathcal{P}, P \neq Q\}$, we denote the set of channels. The set of global states of a CSM is given by $\prod_{P \in \mathcal{P}} Q_P$. Given a global state q , q_P denotes the state of P in q . A *configuration* of a CSM \mathcal{A} is a pair (q, ξ) , where q is a global state and $\xi : \text{Chan} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^\infty$ is a mapping of each channel to its current content. The initial configuration (q_0, ξ_ε) consists of a global state q_0 where the state of each process is the initial state $q_{0,P}$ of A_P and a mapping ξ_ε which maps each channel to the empty word ε . A configuration (q, ξ) is said to be *final* iff each individual local state q_P is final for every P and ξ is ξ_ε .

The global transition relation \rightarrow is defined as follows:

- $(q, \xi) \xrightarrow{P \triangleright Q!m} (q', \xi')$ if $(q_P, P \triangleright Q!m, q'_P) \in \delta_P$, $q_R = q'_R$ for every process $R \neq P$, $\xi'(\langle P, Q \rangle) = \xi(\langle P, Q \rangle) \cdot m$ and $\xi'(c) = \xi(c)$ for every other channel $c \in \text{Chan}$.
- $(q, \xi) \xrightarrow{Q \triangleleft P?m} (q', \xi')$ if $(q_Q, Q \triangleleft P?m, q'_Q) \in \delta_Q$, $q_R = q'_R$ for every process $R \neq Q$, $\xi'(\langle P, Q \rangle) = m \cdot \xi'(\langle P, Q \rangle)$ and $\xi'(c) = \xi(c)$ for every other channel $c \in \text{Chan}$.

- $(q, \xi) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} (q', \xi)$ if $(q_P, \varepsilon, q'_P) \in \delta_P$ for some process P , and $q_Q = q'_Q$ for every process $Q \neq P$.

We might call a run of $\{\{A_P\}\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$ (which might not end in a final state) an *execution prefix* of $\{\{A_P\}\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$.

A run of the CSM always starts with an initial configuration (q_0, ξ_0) , and is a finite or infinite sequence $(q_0, \xi_0) \xrightarrow{w_0} (q_1, \xi_1) \xrightarrow{w_1} \dots$ for which $(q_i, \xi_i) \xrightarrow{w_i} (q_{i+1}, \xi_{i+1})$. The word $w_0 w_1 \dots \in \Sigma^\infty$ is said to be the *trace* of the run. A run is called maximal if it is either infinite or finite and ends in a final configuration. As before, the trace of a maximal run is maximal. The language $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ of the CSM \mathcal{A} consists of its set of maximal traces.

B Supplementary Material on Channel Restrictions for Section 3

B.1 Equivalence of Definitions for Half-duplex Communication

In this section, we prove that our definition of half-duplex (Definition 4) and the original definition by Cécé and Finkel are equivalent. To be precise, we consider the *natural generalisation* [17, Section 4] of the half-duplex definition [17, Def. 8].

Definition 16 (Natural generalisation of half-duplex [17]) *A CSM is called half-duplex if for each reachable configuration and for every pair of processes P and Q , at most one of the channels $\langle P, Q \rangle$ and $\langle Q, P \rangle$ is non-empty.*

Let us recall a lemma that summarises properties of execution prefixes of CSMs.

Lemma 7 ([38], Lemma 19) *Let $\{\{A_P\}\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$ be a CSM. Then, for any run $(q_0, \xi_0) \xrightarrow{w_0} \dots \xrightarrow{w_n} (q, \xi)$ with trace $w = w_0 \dots w_n$, it holds that (1) $\xi(\langle P, Q \rangle) = u$ where $\mathcal{V}(w \downarrow_{P \triangleright Q! _}) = \mathcal{V}(w \downarrow_{Q \triangleleft P? _}) \cdot u$ for every pair of processes $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$ and (2) w is channel-compliant. Maximal traces of $\{\{A_P\}\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$ are channel-compliant and complete.*

Intuitively, the lemma relates all events a CSM has executed and its current channel contents. With this, the equivalence of both definitions follows directly.

Corollary 3 *Both definitions of half-duplex communication, i.e., Definition 4 and Definition 16, are equivalent.*

B.2 Existence of Linearisations Entails Causal Delivery

Proof of Lemma 2. Let $w = e_1 \dots$ be a sequence of events. We claim that w is the witness for causal delivery of $\text{msc}(w)$. Let $e_i \leq_{\text{msc}(w)} e_j$ be two distinct events such that $e_i = P \triangleright Q! _$ and $e_j = P \triangleright Q! _$. Notice that $i < j$ since w is a linearisation of $\text{msc}(w)$. We do a case analysis whether e_j is matched in w . Suppose that e_j is unmatched in w , then causal delivery holds. Suppose that e_j is matched in w . Then, there is some $e_{j'}$ with $e_j \leq_{\text{msc}(w)} e_{j'}$ and thus $j < j'$ such that $e_j \vdash e_{j'}$. By definition, it holds that

$$\mathcal{V}((e_1 \dots e_{j'}) \downarrow_{Q \triangleleft P? _}) = \mathcal{V}((e_1 \dots e_j) \downarrow_{P \triangleright Q! _}).$$

We know that $\mathcal{V}((e_1 \dots e_i) \downarrow_{P \triangleright Q! _}) \leq \mathcal{V}((e_1 \dots e_j) \downarrow_{P \triangleright Q! _})$. Therefore, there is a prefix $\mathcal{V}((e_1 \dots e_{i'}) \downarrow_{Q \triangleleft P? _})$ of the sequence $\mathcal{V}((e_1 \dots e_{j'}) \downarrow_{Q \triangleleft P? _})$ for some i' such that $\mathcal{V}((e_1 \dots e_{i'}) \downarrow_{Q \triangleleft P? _}) = \mathcal{V}((e_1 \dots e_i) \downarrow_{P \triangleright Q! _})$. Therefore, it holds that $e_{i'} \leq_{\text{msc}(w)} e_{j'}$. For causal delivery, it remains to show that $i < i'$. Towards a contradiction, suppose that $i' \leq i$. Since every event either represents a send or receive event, it cannot hold that $i' = i$ and therefore $i' < i$. However, in combination with $\mathcal{V}((e_1 \dots e_{i'}) \downarrow_{Q \triangleleft P? _}) = \mathcal{V}((e_1 \dots e_i) \downarrow_{P \triangleright Q! _})$, this renders the conditions in the definition of $\text{msc}(-)$ (Lemma 1), for the prefix $e_1 \dots e_i$ unsatisfied and thus $\text{msc}(w)$ would be undefined which is a contradiction. \square

C Supplementary Material on HMSCs for Section 4

C.1 Complete Channel-compliant Words

It is easy to check that HMSCs specify complete channel-compliant words.

Proposition 2 *The language $\mathcal{L}(H)$, respectively $\mathcal{L}(M)$, for any HMSC H , respectively MSC M , is a set of complete channel-compliant words.*

C.2 Every HMSC is Existentially B -bounded for some B

Proof of Lemma 3. Given a single BMSC M' , half the number of events is a straightforward bound on channels. One can also compute a tightest bound B for which M' is existentially B -bounded. For more details, we refer to work by Genest et al. [24, Section 3.3] where they define a linearisation function $\text{OPT}(-)$ for MSCs similar to $\text{qOPT}(-)$ but optimised for least channel bound. For HMSCs, any $H = (V, E, v^I, V^T, \mu)$ is constructed using a finite number of BMSCs in $\mu(V)$. Consider the maximum bound B of all individual bounds for BMSCs in $\mu(V)$. We claim that H is existentially B -bounded so we need to show that every MSC M of H is existentially B -bounded. By construction, M is the concatenation of (a possibly infinite number of) BMSCs $M'_1 \dots$. We can construct a linearisation $w = w_1 \dots$ of M such that w_i is a linearisation of M'_i for every i . By definition of BMSCs, there is a receive event for every send event and hence all channels are empty after $w_1 \dots w_i$ for every i . Combining these observations yields that w is B -bounded and therefore M is existentially B -bounded. \square

C.3 Every 1-synchronisable HMSC is Half-duplex

Proof of Lemma 4. Let H be an 1-synchronisable HMSC. We show that $\mathcal{L}(H)$ is half-duplex. To this end, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{L}(M)$ for every MSC M of H is half-duplex. Let $M = (N, p, f, l, (\leq_P)_{P \in \mathcal{P}})$ be an MSC of H . By assumption, M is 1-synchronisable. Let \bar{w} be the linearisation of M from Definition 8. Since M is an MSC and the way \bar{w} is chosen as witness for 1-synchronisability, every send event is immediately followed by its corresponding receive event in \bar{w} .

Let $w \in \mathcal{L}(M)$ be any word. We show that w is half-duplex. Towards a contradiction, suppose that the channel from Q to P is not empty and P attempts to send a message to Q after the prefix $w_1 \dots w_j$ of w : $w_{j+1} = P \triangleright Q!_-$ and $\mathcal{V}(w_1 \dots w_j \Downarrow_{P \triangleleft Q?_-}) \leq \mathcal{V}(w_1 \dots w_j \Downarrow_{Q \triangleright P!_-})$. Thus, there is $i \leq j$ such that $w_i = Q \triangleright P!_-$ which is unmatched. By definition, the per-process order $\leq_M \cap (p^{-1}(P) \times p^{-1}(P))$ is total for every process P . In the linearisation \bar{w} , the corresponding receive event happens directly after w_i so the next event by P must be the corresponding reception which contradicts the assumption that w_{j+1} is a send event of P . \square

D Supplementary Material on Multiparty Session Types and the Indistinguishability Relation for Section 5

D.1 Semantics of Global Types from MSTs

Definition 17 ([38], Def. 10: Type language for global types) *The type language of a global type G is given as language of a finite state machine $\text{GAut}(G)$. To this end, an auxiliary state machine is defined as $M(G) = (Q_{M(G)}, \Sigma_{\text{sync}}, \delta_{M(G)}, q_{0,M(G)}, F_{M(G)})$ with:*

- $Q_{M(G)}$ is a set consisting of all syntactic subterms in G and the term 0,

- $\delta_{M(G)}$ is the smallest set containing $(\sum_{i \in I} P \rightarrow Q_i : m_i \cdot G_i, P \rightarrow Q_i : m_i \cdot G_i)$ for each $i \in I$, as well as $(\mu t. G', \varepsilon, \mu t. G')$ and $(t, \varepsilon, \mu t. G')$ for each subterm $\mu t. G'$ of G ,
- $q_{0, M(G)} = G$, and
- $F_{M(G)} = \{0\}$.

Each message $P \rightarrow Q : m$ of Σ_{sync} is split into two events: $P \triangleright Q!m$ followed by $Q \triangleleft P?m$, using $\text{Exp}(M) = (Q_{\text{Exp}(M)}, \Sigma, \delta_{\text{Exp}(M)}, q_{0, \text{Exp}(M)}, F_{\text{Exp}(M)})$ which is defined as follows when input a state machine $M = (Q_M, \Sigma_{\text{sync}}, \delta_M, q_{0M}, F_M)$:

- $Q_{\text{Exp}(M)} = Q_M \cup (Q_M \times \Sigma_{\text{sync}} \times Q_M)$,
- $\delta_{\text{Exp}(M)}$ is the smallest set containing the transitions $(s, P \triangleright Q!m, (s, P \rightarrow Q : m, s'))$ and $((s, P \rightarrow Q : m, s'), Q \triangleleft P?m, s')$ for each transition $(s, P \rightarrow Q : m, s') \in \delta_M$,
- $q_{0, \text{Exp}(M)} = q_{0M}$, and
- $F_{\text{Exp}(M)} = F_M$.

The finite state machine $\text{GAut}(G) := \text{Exp}(M(G))$ gives the type language $\mathcal{L}(\text{GAut}(G))$ of any global type G . It is straightforward that the semantics specify complete channel-compliant sequences of events. For brevity, $\mathcal{L}(G)$ denotes $\mathcal{L}(\text{GAut}(G))$.

D.2 HMSCs Closed under Indistinguishability Relation

Proof of Lemma 5. We prove the claim by two inclusions. The first inclusion $\mathcal{L}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(H))$ trivially holds. We show that $\mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(H)) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(H)$.

We first prove a claim that we will use for both $\mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(H)) \cap \Sigma^*$ and $\mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(H)) \cap \Sigma^\omega$.

Claim I: Let M be some MSC of H . Let w be a sequence of events such that there is $w' \in \mathcal{L}(M)$ with $w \sim_1 w'$. Then, $w \in \mathcal{L}(M)$.

Proof of Claim I. We do a case analysis on the rule of \sim which has been applied to obtain $w \sim_1 w'$. In all cases, it is crucial to observe that two consecutive events are swapped and hence transitive dependencies in \leq_M cannot kick in and the events either have to be ordered by the total process orders or constitute send-reception pairs.

- (1) Here, two send events for different processes are swapped. These two events cannot be ordered by \leq_M (without some intermediate receive event which is not present) and therefore $w \in \mathcal{L}(M)$.
- (2) In this case, two receive events for different processes are swapped. Again, they cannot be ordered by \leq_M without some intermediate send event and the claim follows.
- (3) This case deals with swapping a send event $P \triangleright Q!m$ and a receive event $S \triangleleft R?m'$. The first condition $P \neq S$ ensures that both events do not belong to the same process. However, this does not suffice. We do a case split according to the disjunction of the conditions.
First, $P \neq R$ entails that the sender of the send event is neither the sender nor the receiver of the receive event. Then, both events cannot be related by the process order but they do also not constitute a send-reception pair (ordered through f) and hence the claim follows.
Second, $Q \neq S$ entails that the receiver of the send event and the receiver of the receive event are not the same. This ensures that we do not swap a reception before the corresponding send event. Again, they cannot be ordered by \leq_M .

- (4) This case also deals with swapping a send event $P \triangleright Q!m$ and a receive event $Q \triangleleft P?m'$. Note that m might be the same as m' and the side condition is needed to ensure that both do not constitute a pair of send and receive event so that they were ordered through f .

End Proof of Claim I.

We first consider the case of finite sequences of events. Let $u \in \mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(H)) \cap \Sigma^*$. We show that $u \in \mathcal{L}(H)$. By definition, there is an MSC M of H such that $u \in \mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(M)) \cap \Sigma^*$. Therefore, there is $u' \in \mathcal{L}(M)$ such that $u' \sim_n u$ for some n . By applying *Claim I* n -times, the claim follows.

Second, let $u \in \mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(H)) \cap \Sigma^\omega$. By definition, there is an MSC M of H such that $u \in \mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(M)) \cap \Sigma^\omega$. Therefore, there is $v \in \mathcal{L}(M)$ such that $u \preceq^\omega v$ which means that for every prefix u' of u , there is some prefix v' of v such that $u' \preceq v'$, i.e., there is some w such that $u'w \sim v'$. From the case for finite sequences, it follows that $u' \in \text{pref}(\mathcal{L}(M))$ for every finite prefix u' of u . Note that there is a single (infinite) MSC M for which this applies. Therefore, the path of every prefix u' in H is the same and can be extended for longer prefixes. Since every prefix u' of u is in $\text{pref}(\mathcal{L}(M))$, the infinite sequence u is in $\mathcal{L}(M)$ and hence in $\mathcal{L}(H)$. \square

D.3 Indistinguishability Relation Preserves Satisfaction of Channel Restrictions for Channel-compliant Words

Proof of Theorem 1. Let w be a complete channel-compliant word.

First, suppose that w is half-duplex. It is straightforward to check that \sim does not swap any two events $Q \triangleleft P?m$ and $Q \triangleright P!m'$ and hence the condition for half-duplex is preserved.

Second, suppose that w is existentially B -bounded for some B . Then, we know that $\text{msc}(w)$ is a prefix MSC which admits a B -bounded linearisation. Analogous to the proof of Lemma 5, we can show that any (even infinite) prefix MSC is closed under \sim . Therefore, for any w' for which $w' \sim w$, it holds that $\text{msc}(w) = \text{msc}(w')$ and the latter still admits the same B -bounded linearisation.

Third, suppose that w is k -synchronisable. Recall that k -synchronisability is also defined on $\text{msc}(w)$ and hence the same reasoning as for the second case applies. \square

D.4 Correctness of the Embedding of Global Types from MSTs into HMSCs

Prior to giving the correctness statement of the embedding, we define a translation from HMSCs of special shape to FSMs.

Definition 18 We say that an HMSC $H = (V, E, v^I, V^T, \mu)$ is a 1-HMSC iff every BMSC in $\mu(V)$ consists of at most one send and one receive event.

Definition 19 (Quasi-optimal translation of H) Let $H = (V, E, v^I, V^T, \mu)$ be a HMSC such that for every $v \in V$, $\mu(v) = M_0$ or $\mu(v) = M(P \rightarrow Q : m)$ for some P, Q and m . We define the function $\text{qOPT}(M)$ if M is either M_0 or $M(P \rightarrow Q : m)$: $\text{qOPT}(M_0) = \varepsilon$ and $\text{qOPT}(M(P \rightarrow Q : m)) = P \rightarrow Q : m$. The state machine $\text{qOPT}(H(G)) = (Q, \Sigma_G, \delta, q_0, F)$ is defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \{v^1, v^2 \mid v \in V\} & q_0 &= \{v^1 \mid v = v^I\} & F &= \{v^2 \mid v \in V^T\} \\ \delta &= \{(v^1, \text{qOPT}(\mu(v)), v^2) \mid v \in V \wedge \text{qOPT}(\mu(v)) \in \Sigma_{\text{sync}} \cup \{\varepsilon\}\} \cup \{(v^2, u^1) \mid (v, u) \in E\} \end{aligned}$$

Note that the above conditions are satisfied by $H(G)$ for any global type G . Recall that we defined $\text{Exp}(-)$ in Definition 17 to expand the alphabet Σ_{sync} to Σ , i.e., to split into send and receive events.

Lemma 8 (Correctness of Definition 19) *Let H be a 1-HMSC. Then, $\mathcal{L}(\text{Exp}(\text{qOPT}(H))) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(H)$ and $\mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(\text{Exp}(\text{qOPT}(H)))) = \mathcal{L}(H)$.*

Proof. The expansion operator $\text{Exp}(-)$ is a technical mean to let two alphabets match. However, in case we do not apply the indistinguishability relation, it does not matter and we will waive $\text{Exp}(-)$ in our proofs for readability.

For the first claim, we prove the following:

Claim I: Let w be some word with the following run in $\text{qOPT}(H)$:

$$v_1^1, v_1^2, v_2^1, v_2^2, \dots, v_n^1, v_n^2.$$

We claim that $w \in \mathcal{L}(\mu(v_1)\mu(v_2)\cdots\mu(v_n))$ with the same vertices.

Proof of Claim I: We prove this by induction on the number of vertices n . Note that, as $\mu(v_i)$ can be M_\emptyset for some i , this is not necessarily an induction on $|w|$. For the base case, let $n = 0$. Then, the word is empty and the claim trivially holds. For the induction step, let us assume that the claim holds for n and w . We prove it for $n + 1$ and w' . By construction $w' = wx$ where x is either ε or $P \rightarrow Q : m$ (respectively $P \triangleright Q ! m. Q \triangleleft P ? m$ in the expansion). The run in $\text{qOPT}(H)$ is $v_1^1, v_1^2, \dots, v_n^1, v_n^2, v_{n+1}^1, v_{n+1}^2$. By construction, $x \in \mathcal{L}(\mu(v_{n+1}))$. Hence, $wx \in \mathcal{L}(\mu(v_1)\cdots\mu(v_{n+1}))$ which proves Claim I.

End Proof of Claim I.

Claim I shows the inclusion for the finite case when v_n is final:

$$\mathcal{L}(\text{Exp}(\text{qOPT}(H))) \cap \Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{L}(H) \cap \Sigma^*.$$

It remains to show the infinite case: $\mathcal{L}(\text{Exp}(\text{qOPT}(H))) \cap \Sigma^\omega \subseteq \mathcal{L}(H) \cap \Sigma^\omega$.

Let $w \in \mathcal{L}(\text{Exp}(\text{qOPT}(H))) \cap \Sigma^\omega$ be some infinite word. We show that there is some infinite path v_1, v_2, \dots in H with linearisation w . Consider a tree \mathcal{T} where each node corresponds to some path π in H whose linearisations are prefixes w' of w . The root is labelled by the empty path. The children of a node π are paths that extend π by a single node — these exist from the reasoning in the induction step for Claim I. HMSC H is finitely branching and so is \mathcal{T} . By König's Lemma, there is an infinite path in \mathcal{T} whose linearisation is w which concludes the proof of the first claim.

We prove the second claim by proving two inclusions. The first inclusion $\mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(\text{Exp}(\text{qOPT}(H)))) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(H)$ follows from the first claim and Lemma 5. For the second inclusion, we show the following:

Claim II: Let $\pi = v_1, \dots, v_n$ be some path in H . For all sequences $w \in \text{pref}(\mathcal{L}(\mu(v_1)\cdots\mu(v_n)))$, there is some $w' \in \mathcal{L}(\text{Exp}(\text{qOPT}(H)))$ with some run $v_1^1, v_1^2, \dots, v_n^1, v_n^2$ such that $w \preceq w'$.

Proof of Claim II: We prove this by induction on the number of vertices n . For the base case, let $n = 0$. Then, the word is actually empty and the claim trivially holds. For the induction step, let us assume that the claim holds for n with w_n and w'_n and we prove it for $n + 1$ with w_{n+1} and w'_{n+1} . We know that $w_{n+1} \in \mathcal{L}(\mu(v_1)\cdots\mu(v_{n+1}))$. By definition of the language operator for HMSCs, $w_{n+1} \sim w_n.x (*)$ such that $w_n \in \mathcal{L}(\mu(v_1)\cdots\mu(v_n))$ and $x \in \mathcal{L}(\mu(v_{n+1}))$. For w_n , there is w'_n with the run $v_1^1, v_1^2, \dots, v_n^1, v_n^2$ in $\text{Exp}(\text{qOPT}(H))$. By construction, we can extend this run for $w'_n.x$ as follows: $v_1^1, v_1^2, \dots, v_n^1, v_n^2, v_{n+1}^1, v_{n+1}^2$. By the induction hypothesis and $(*)$, $w_{n+1} \preceq w'_n.x$, which concludes the proof.

End Proof of Claim II.

We prove that $\mathcal{L}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(\text{Exp}(\text{qOPT}(H))))$. Let $w \in \mathcal{L}(H)$.

In case w is finite, there is a finite path $\pi = v_1, \dots, v_n$ for which $w \in \mathcal{L}(\mu(v_1)\cdots\mu(v_n))$ where v_n is final. We apply Claim II and know that v_n^2 is also final. We also know that $w \preceq w'$ for some w' with a run through the corresponding states in the automaton. By construction, w' cannot be longer than w and therefore $w \sim w'$ which proves the claim.

In case w is infinite, there is a infinite path $\pi = v_1, \dots$ for which $w \in \mathcal{L}(\mu(v_1, \dots))$. For every prefix u of w , there is n such that $u \in \text{pref}(\mathcal{L}(\mu(v_1)\cdots\mu(v_n)))$. By Claim II, there is $u' \in \mathcal{L}(\text{Exp}(\text{qOPT}(H)))$

with run $v_1^1, v_1^2, \dots, v_n^1, v_n^2$ such that $u \preceq u'$. Consider a tree \mathcal{T} where each node corresponds to a prefix of the run v_1^1, v_1^2, \dots in $\text{Exp}(\text{qOPT}(H))$. The root is labelled by the empty run. The children of a node ρ are the runs that extends ρ by a single transition – which exist by the above reasoning. Since \mathcal{T} is finitely branching, there is an infinite path in \mathcal{T} that corresponds to an infinite run ρ in $\text{Exp}(\text{qOPT}(H))$ for which $w \preceq^\omega \text{trace}(\rho)$ which concludes the proof. \square

With weak bisimulations, we show that $\mathcal{L}(M(G))$ and $\mathcal{L}(\text{qOPT}(H(G)))$ yield the same language for any global type G .

Definition 20 (Weak bisimulation) Let $A = (Q_A, \Sigma, \delta_A, q_{0,A}, F_A), B = (Q_B, \Sigma, \delta_B, q_{0,B}, F_B)$ be two state machines. We say that $R \subseteq Q_A \times Q_B$ is a weak simulation relation for A and B is relation with the following properties:

- for all $a \in \Sigma, s_A, t_A \in S_A, s_B \in S_B$, if $R(s_A, s_B)$ and $(s_A, a, t_A) \in \delta_A$, then there is a $t_B \in Q_B$ such that $(s_B, a, t_B) \in \delta_B^*$,
- for all $s_A, t_A \in S_A, s_B \in S_B$, if $R(s_A, s_B)$ and $(s_A, \varepsilon, t_A) \in \delta_A$, then there is a $t_B \in Q_B$ such that $(s_B, \varepsilon, t_B) \in \delta_B^*$,
- $R_1(q_{0,A}, q_{0,B})$ and $R_2(q_{0,B}, q_{0,A})$, and
- for every $q_A \in F_A$, there is a $q_B \in F_B$ such that $R_1(q_A, q_B)$ and vice versa.

This definition is given as sufficient condition for the original definition of weak simulation by Milner [40, Def. 6.2 and Prop. 6.3]. For clarity in our context, we amended it to refer to two different sets of states instead of merging both to a single set of states.

Proposition 3 Let $A = (Q_A, \Delta, \delta_A, q_{0,A}, F_A), B = (Q_B, \Delta, \delta_B, q_{0,B}, F_B)$ be two state machines. Let $R_1 \subseteq Q_A \times Q_B$ and $R_2 \subseteq Q_B \times Q_A$ be two weak bisimulations for A and B (respectively B and A). Then, $\mathcal{L}(A) = \mathcal{L}(B)$.

Lemma 9 Let G be a global type, $M(G)$ the corresponding state machine with state space $Q = \{q_{G'} \mid G' \text{ is syntactic subterm of } G\}$ and $\text{qOPT}(H(G))$ the state machine built from the HMSC $H(G)$ with states $V = \{v_{G'}^i \mid i \in \{1, 2\}\}$ and G' is a syntactic subterm of G as defined before. Recall that there is one state and two vertices for every syntactic subterm of G . Hence, we index states q and vertices v by these subterms. For the auxiliary vertices in $\text{qOPT}(H(G))$, we use G^i . There are two weak bisimulation relations $R_1 \subseteq Q \times V$ and $R_2 \subseteq V \times Q$ s.t.

- (1) $R_1(q_G, v_G^1)$ and $R_2(v_G^1, q_G)$ as well as
- (2) $R_1(q_0, v_0^2)$ and $R_2(v_0^2, q_0)$.

Proof. We prove the claim by structural induction on G .

- Base $G = 0$:
There is one state in $M(G)$ and two vertices in $\text{qOPT}(H(G))$. It is straightforward to define R_1 and R_2 such that the conditions are satisfied. Both relations are weak bisimulation relations as there is a solely one ε -transition.
- Step $G = \Sigma_{i \in I} P \rightarrow Q_i : m_i . G_i$:
The induction hypothesis holds for every $i \in I$ with R_1^i and R_2^i . We define:

$$R_1 := \bigcup_{i \in I} R_1^i \cup \{(q_G, v_G^1), (q_G, v_G^2)\}, \text{ and}$$

$$R_2 := \bigcup_{i \in I} R_2^i \cup \{(v_G^1, q_G), (v_G^2, q_G)\} \cup \bigcup_{i \in I} \{(v_{G^i}^1, q_{G^i}), (v_{G^i}^2, q_{G^i})\}$$

By this, (1) and (2) are satisfied. For the remaining conditions of a weak bisimulation relation, it suffices to check the added states (and states with new transitions) since the induction hypotheses are sufficient for the rest.

Added states: q_G as well as $v_G^1, v_G^2, v_{G^i}^1, v_{G^i}^2$ for every $i \in I$.

Added transitions: $(q_G, P \rightarrow Q_i : m_i, q_{G^i})$ for every $i \in I$ and $(v_G^1, \varepsilon, v_G^2), (v_G^2, \varepsilon, v_{G^i}^1), (v_{G^i}^1, P \rightarrow Q_i : m_i, v_{G^i}^2)$, and $(v_{G^i}^2, \varepsilon, v_{G^i}^1)$.

We check R_1 and hence q_G :

- $l \in \Sigma_{sync}$ is the only possible transition from q_G to q_{G^i} for every $i \in I$; it suffices to check v_G^1 as the other state v_G^2 that is in relation with R_1 occurs on the path. $R_1(q_G, v_G^1)$ and $v_G^1 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} v_G^2 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} v_{G^i}^1 \xrightarrow{l} v_{G^i}^2 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} v_{G^i}^1$. This is fine by the induction hypotheses: $R_1^i(q_{G^i}, v_{G^i}^1)$. There are no ε -transitions from q_G .

We check R_2 and hence $v_G^1, v_G^2, v_{G^i}^1, v_{G^i}^2$ for every $i \in I$:

- v_G^1 :
One can only take an ε -transition from v_G^1 , i.e., $v_G^1 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} v_G^2$; by definition $R_2(v_G^2, q_G); R_2(v_G^1, q_G)$ and $*$ allows not to move.
 - v_G^2 :
One can only take an ε -transition from v_G^2 , i.e., $v_G^2 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} v_{G^i}^1$ for every $i \in I$; by definition $R_2(v_{G^i}^1, q_G); R_2(v_G^2, q_G)$ and $*$ allows not to move.
 - $v_{G^i}^1$:
One can only take a non- ε -transition from $v_{G^i}^1$, i.e., $v_{G^i}^1 \xrightarrow{l} v_{G^i}^2$; by definition $R_2(v_{G^i}^2, q_G), R_2(v_{G^i}^1, q_G)$ and $q_G \xrightarrow{l} q_{G^i}$ and hence fine.
 - $v_{G^i}^2$:
One can only take an ε -transition from $v_{G^i}^2$ to $v_{G^i}^1$; and by definition $R_2(v_{G^i}^1, q_G), R_2(v_{G^i}^2, q_G)$ by the induction hypotheses and $*$ allows not to move.
- Step $G = \mu t. G'$:
The induction hypothesis holds for G' with R'_1 and R'_2 . Recall that $Q = \{q_{G'} \mid G' \sqsubseteq G\}$. We define:

$$R_1 := R'_1 \cup \{(q_G, v_G^1), (q_G, v_G^2)\}, \text{ and}$$

$$R_2 := R'_2 \cup \{(v_G^1, q_G), (v_G^2, q_G)\}.$$

By this, (1) and (2) are already satisfied. For the conditions for a weak bisimulation relation, it suffices to check the added states and states with new transitions.

Added states: q_G as well as v_G^1 and v_G^2 .

Added transitions: $(v_G^1, \varepsilon, v_{G'}^2), (v_G^2, \varepsilon, v_{G'}^1), (v_t^2, \varepsilon, v_{G'}^1)$ as well as $(q_G, \varepsilon, q_{G'}), (q_t, \varepsilon, q_G)$.

The induction hypotheses apply for all other states and transitions. We check R_1 and hence q_G :

- One cannot take a non- ε -transition from q_G . The only ε -transition that can be taken is to $q_{G'}$; we only need to check v_G^1 as v_G^2 is on its way and also related; from $v_G^1 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} v_G^2 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} v_{G'}^1$ with an ε and by induction hypothesis they are related.

We check R_2 and hence v_G^1, v_G^2 , and v_t^2 .

- v_G^1 :
Only one ε -transition is possible to v_G^2 and both are related with the same state.

- v_G^2 :
Only one ε -transition is possible: $v_G^2 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} v_{G'}^1$ and $q_G \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} q_{G'}$ and by definition the last two are related.
- v_t^2 :
Only one ε -transition is possible: $v_t^2 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} v_G^1$ and $R_2(v_t^2, q_{\mu t.G'})$ where $q_{\mu t.G'} = q_G$ and v_G^1 is in relation with this one and taking no transition suffices.

□

Lemma 10 *Let G be a global type. Then, $\mathcal{L}(G) = \mathcal{L}(\text{Exp}(\text{qOPT}(H(G))))$.*

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{L}(G) = \mathcal{L}(\text{GAut}(G))$ and $\text{GAut}(G) = \text{Exp}(M(G))$. Therefore, it suffices to prove that $\mathcal{L}(M(G)) = \mathcal{L}(\text{qOPT}(H(G)))$ after substituting and omitting $\text{Exp}(-)$. This follows from Lemma 9 and Proposition 3: in the former, we show that there are two weak bisimulations between both automata; in the latter, we state the well-known fact that, then, both languages are equivalent. □

Equipped with this, we can now prove the correctness of the embedding of global types from MSTs into HMSCs.

Proof of Theorem 2. Recall that $\mathcal{L}(G)$ is an abbreviation for $\mathcal{L}(\text{GAut}(G))$. With the first fact of Lemma 8, it suffices to show $\mathcal{L}(\text{GAut}(G)) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\text{Exp}(\text{qOPT}(H(G))))$ for the first claim which follows with Lemma 10.

For the second claim, it suffices to show that

$$\mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(G)) \stackrel{(A)}{=} \mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(\text{Exp}(\text{qOPT}(H(G)))) \stackrel{(B)}{=} \mathcal{C}^\sim(\mathcal{L}(H(G))).$$

(A) follows from Lemma 10 while (B) follows from the second fact of Lemma 8. □

D.5 Languages of Global Types from MSTs are half-duplex, existentially 1-bounded, and 1-synchronisable

Proof of Theorem 3. Let G be some global type. With the correctness of our encoding (Theorem 2), it suffices to show that $H(G)$ has the desired properties.

First, we show that $H(G)$ is existentially 1-bounded. From Lemma 3, we know that every HMSC H is existentially B -bounded for some B . From the proof of Lemma 3, it follows that this is the case for the maximal B for which some individual BMSC of H is existentially B -bounded. For $H(G)$, this maximal B is 1 so the claim follows.

Second, we show that $H(G)$ is 1-synchronisable. We apply Proposition 1 and have to show that every MSC M of $H(G)$ is 1-synchronisable. By construction, any M is the concatenation of (possibly infinitely many) BMSCs M'_1, \dots with at most one message exchange. Therefore, it is straightforward to construct a linearisation of M by concatenating the message exchanges consisting of one send and receive event of every individual BMSC. Therefore, any MSC M of $H(G)$ is 1-synchronisable. This concludes the proof of the first claim.

Third, we know from Lemma 4 that every 1-synchronisable HMSC is half-duplex. Thus, the last claim follows. □