

An automata-based approach for synchronizable mailbox communication

Romain Delpy

LaBRI, Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, Bordeaux INP, Talence, France

Anca Muscholl

LaBRI, Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, Bordeaux INP, Talence, France

Grégoire Sutre

LaBRI, Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, Bordeaux INP, Talence, France

Abstract

We revisit finite-state communicating systems with round-based communication under mailbox semantics. Mailboxes correspond to one FIFO buffer per process (instead of one buffer per pair of processes in peer-to-peer systems). Round-based communication corresponds to sequences of rounds in which processes can first send messages, then only receive (and receives must be in the same round as their sends). A system is called synchronizable if every execution can be re-scheduled into an equivalent execution that is a sequence of rounds. Previous work mostly considered the setting where rounds have fixed size. Our main contribution shows that the problem whether a mailbox communication system complies with the round-based policy, with no size limitation on rounds, is PSPACE-complete. For this we use a novel automata-based approach, that also allows to determine the precise complexity (PSPACE) of several questions considered in previous literature.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Logic and verification

Keywords and phrases Concurrent programming, Mailbox communication, Verification

Funding This work was (partially) supported by the grant ANR-23-CE48-0005 of the French National Research Agency ANR (project PaVeDyS).

1 Introduction

Message-passing is a key synchronization feature for concurrent programming and distributed systems. In this model, processes running asynchronously synchronize by exchanging messages over unbounded channels. The usual semantics is based on peer-to-peer communication, which is very popular for reasoning about telecommunication protocols. More recently, mailbox communication received increased attention because of its usage in multi-thread programming, as provided by languages like Rust or Erlang. Mailbox communication means that every process has a single incoming communication buffer on which incoming messages from other processes are multiplexed (a mailbox).

Message-passing programs are well-known to be challenging for formal verification since they can easily simulate Turing machines with unbounded channels. Some approximation techniques can help to recover decidability. Among the best known approaches are lossy channel systems [1, 8] and partial-order methods [13]. The latter tightly relate to (high-level) message sequence charts (HMSC), a communication formalism capturing multi-party session types [17, 15, 16]. An HMSC protocol is a graph with nodes labelled by communication scenarios, a.k.a. message sequence charts. Processes still evolve asynchronously, so that the division into nodes cannot be enforced by global synchronization. Such round-based communication is actually quite frequent in distributed computing, for example as building block in the Heard-Of model [5]. Often a distributed protocol consists of several rounds, where each round first has a phase where processes only send messages, then a phase where they only receive. We refer to such rounds as `sr`-rounds.

Recently **sr**-round-based communication and mailbox communication were considered together in [3]. It turned out that this combination is very attractive for formal verification. The paper [3] proposed a model where **sr**-rounds have fixed size, and showed that control-state reachability in this model becomes decidable (in PSPACE). The question whether a system complies with the **sr**-round model with given round size was shown to be decidable in [6]. It is also known how to decide if a system complies with the **sr**-round model when the round size is not known in advance [11]. All these properties motivate a genuine interest in the **sr**-round model on top of mailbox communication. A bit surprisingly, apart from control-state reachability, similar questions were shown to be undecidable for peer-to-peer communication [9].

In this paper we revisit the framework of [3] and propose an automata-based approach to deal with systems complying with the **sr**-round mailbox model (we refer to this property as *mb-synchronizability*). Importantly, we do not impose any size restriction on the rounds, as in previous works. This makes sense, because even when we can infer an upper bound on the size as in [11], this upper bound is exponential in the number of processes, so its practical use is somewhat limited. We establish that the complexity of all problems listed below is PSPACE-complete for *mb-synchronizable* systems:

- Global-state reachability (Theorem 3.6).
- Model-checking against a reasonable class of regular properties (Theorem 4.3).
- Check if a peer-to-peer system can be simulated as a mailbox system (modulo rescheduling executions, Theorem 4.8).

Our main result is that one can check in PSPACE if a system is **mb**-synchronizable (Theorem 5.16), the complexity being tight. An interesting byproduct of our results is that when we fix the number of processes all the problems above can be solved in PTIME (actually NLOGSPACE).

Comparison with related work. Our technique helps to establish the precise complexity of several problems considered in the papers mentioned above. To be precise, our definition of **sr**-round mailbox model (*mb-synchronizability*) slightly differs from the one used in [3, 6, 11] (but coincides with a variant introduced in [2]). The latter paper uses a partial-order variant of PDL (LCPDL) to show an EXPTIME upper bound for the synchronizability problem for their notion of synchronizability. Using MSO logic and special tree-width, the paper [2] also shows that checking if a system is synchronizable with fixed round size is decidable. Knowing if a round size exists is shown to be decidable with elementary complexity in [11], without exact bounds.

For convenience, technical terms and notations in the electronic version of this manuscript are hyper-linked to their definitions (cf. <https://ctan.org/pkg/knowledge>).

Proofs that are missing in the main text can be found in the appendix.

2 Message-passing systems and synchronizability

Throughout the paper, \mathbb{P} denotes a finite non-empty set of *processes*, and \mathbb{M} denotes a finite non-empty set of *message contents*. We consider here peer-to-peer communication between distinct processes. Formally, the set of (communication) *channels* is the set Ch of all pairs $(p, q) \in \mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{P}$ such that $p \neq q$, and the set of (communication) *actions* is $Act = \{p!q(m), q?p(m) \mid (p, q) \in Ch, m \in \mathbb{M}\}$. An action $p!q(m)$ denotes a *send* by p of message m to q and an action $q?p(m)$ denotes a *receive* by p of message m from q . In both cases, the process performing the action is p . Throughout the paper, we let S and R denote

the sets of send actions and receive actions, formally, $S = \{p!q(m) \mid (p, q) \in Ch, m \in \mathbb{M}\}$ and $R = \{p?q(m) \mid (q, p) \in Ch, m \in \mathbb{M}\}$.

A communicating finite state machine [4] is a finite set of processes that exchange messages, each process being given as a finite LTS. Recall that a (finite) *labeled transition system*, LTS for short, is a quadruple (L, A, \rightarrow, i) where L is a (finite) set of *states*, A is a finite alphabet, $\rightarrow \subseteq L \times A \times L$ is a set of *transitions*, and $i \in L$ is an *initial* state. We will sometimes consider LTS without initial state. In the following definition, Act_p denotes the set of actions $a \in Act$ performed by p .

► **Definition 2.1. [Communicating Finite-State Machine]** A CFM is a tuple $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$, where each \mathcal{A}_p is a finite LTS $\mathcal{A}_p = (L_p, Act_p, \rightarrow_p, i_p)$. States in L_p are called local states. The size of \mathcal{A} is defined as $\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} (|L_p| + |\rightarrow_p|)$.

In this paper, we mainly study and compare two semantics of communication: peer-to-peer and mailbox. These two semantics differ in the implementation of the communication network. In the *peer-to-peer semantics*, each channel (p, q) is implemented by a dedicated fifo buffer. This is the classical semantics for *communicating finite-state machines* [4]. In the *mailbox semantics*, each process q is equipped with a fifo buffer that acts as a *mailbox*: all messages towards q are enqueued in this buffer. Put differently, the channels (p, q) with same receiver q are multiplexed into a single buffer.

We define both semantics of CFM jointly, by viewing *channels* and *mailboxes* as (fifo) message *buffers*:

► **Definition 2.2. [Process network]** A process network over \mathbb{P} is a pair $\mathcal{N} = (\mathbb{B}, \text{bf})$ where \mathbb{B} is a finite set of fifo buffers and $\text{bf} : Ch \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ is a map that assigns a *buffer* to each *channel*.

The *peer-to-peer semantics* is induced by the *process network* $\text{p2p} = (\mathbb{B}, \text{bf})$ where $\mathbb{B} = Ch$ and bf is the identity. Here, \mathbb{B} coincides with the set of communication *channels*. The *mailbox semantics* is induced by the *process network* $\text{mb} = (\mathbb{B}, \text{bf})$ where $\mathbb{B} = \mathbb{P}$ and $\text{bf}(p, q) = q$. Here, \mathbb{B} is a set of *mailboxes*, one per process.

► **Remark 2.3.** For both *peer-to-peer semantics* and *mailbox semantics* we have that the *buffer* determines the recipient: $\text{bf}(p, q) = \text{bf}(p', q')$ implies $q = q'$. We call such *process networks many-to-one*.

Given a CFM and a *process network* we define the associated global transition system:

► **Definition 2.4. [Global transition system]** Let $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$ be a CFM, and $\mathcal{N} = (\mathbb{B}, \text{bf})$ be a *process network* over \mathbb{P} . The global transition system associated with \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{N} is the LTS $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{A}) = (C_{\mathcal{A}}, Act, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}, c_{in})$ with set of configurations $C_{\mathcal{A}} = G \times ((Ch \times \mathbb{M})^*)^{\mathbb{B}}$ consisting of global states $G = \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} L_p$ (i.e., products of local states) and *buffer contents*, with $((\ell_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}, (w_b)_{b \in \mathbb{B}}) \xrightarrow{a}_{\mathcal{A}} ((\ell'_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}, (w'_b)_{b \in \mathbb{B}})$ if

- $\ell_p \xrightarrow{a}_p \ell'_p$ and $\ell_q = \ell'_q$ for $q \neq p$, where p is the process performing a .
- *Send actions*: if $a = p!q(m)$ then $w'_b = w_b((p, q), m)$ and $w'_{b'} = w_{b'}$ for $b' \neq b$, where $b = \text{bf}(p, q)$.
- *Receive actions*: if $a = p?q(m)$ then $(p, q), m) w'_b = w_b$ and $w'_{b'} = w_{b'}$ for $b' \neq b$, where $b = \text{bf}(p, q)$.

The initial configuration is $c_{in} = ((i_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}, \varepsilon^{\mathbb{B}})$.

► An *execution* of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{A})$ is a sequence $\rho = c_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} c_1 \cdots \xrightarrow{a_n} c_n$ with $c_i \in C_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $c_{i-1} \xrightarrow{a_i}_{\mathcal{A}} c_i$ for every i . The sequence $a_1 \cdots a_n$ is the *label* of the *execution*. The *execution* is *initial* if $c_0 = c_{in}$.

► Remark 2.5. Note that in the definition above we added the channel name to the message content inserted in a buffer. This is to exclude *executions* like $p!q(m) q?r(m)$ with $p \neq r$. Without this addition such *executions* would be allowed in the mailbox semantics, which is clearly not intended.

► **Definition 2.6.** [Trace] A trace of a CFM \mathcal{A} over a process network \mathcal{N} is a sequence $u \in Act^*$ such that there exists an initial execution of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{A})$ labelled by u . The set of all traces of \mathcal{A} is denoted by $Tr_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{A})$.

As we will also need to consider infixes of *executions*, we introduce action sequences which are coherent w.r.t. the fifo behavior that we expect from a process network:

► **Definition 2.7.** [Viable sequence] Let $\mathcal{N} = (\mathbb{B}, \text{bf})$ be a process network. A sequence of actions $v \in Act^*$ is called \mathcal{N} -viable if for every buffer $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}$:

- for every prefix u of v , the number of receives from \mathbf{b} in u is less or equal the number of sends to \mathbf{b} in u ;
- for every k , if the k -th receive from \mathbf{b} in v has label $q?p(m)$ then the k -th send to \mathbf{b} in v has label $p!q(m)$.

There is a strong connection between traces and viable sequences. For every sequence $u \in Act^*$, u is a trace of \mathcal{A} over \mathcal{N} iff u is \mathcal{N} -viable and u is recognized by $\prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \mathcal{A}_p$. Here, $\prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \mathcal{A}_p$ denotes the asynchronous product of the LTS \mathcal{A}_p , viewed as automata with every state final.

► Remark 2.8. It is easy to see that if a sequence is *mb-viable* then it is also *p2p-viable*. In fact, for every process network \mathcal{N} , we have that \mathcal{N} -viability implies *p2p-viability*. However, the converse is not true. For example, $p_0!p_1(m_0) p_2!p_1(m_1) p_1?p_2(m_1)$ is *p2p-viable*, but not *mb-viable* because m_1 is enqueued after m_0 in p_1 's mailbox, so it cannot be received first.

The classical *happens-before* relation [14], frequently used in reasoning about distributed systems, orders the actions of each process and every (matched) send action before its matching receive. The happens-before relation naturally associates a partial order with every trace, known as *message sequence chart*:

► **Definition 2.9.** [Message Sequence Chart] An MSC over \mathbb{P} is an Act-labeled partially ordered set $\mathcal{M} = (E, \leq_{hb}, \lambda)$ of events E , with $\lambda : E \rightarrow Act$ and $\leq_{hb} = (\leq_{\mathbb{P}} \cup \text{msg})^*$ the least partial order containing the relations $\leq_{\mathbb{P}}$ and *msg*, which are defined as:

1. For every process p , the set of events on p is totally ordered by $\leq_{\mathbb{P}}$, and $\leq_{\mathbb{P}}$ is the union of these total orders.
2. *msg* is the set of matching send/receive event pairs. In particular, $(e, f) \in \text{msg}$ implies $\lambda(e) = p!q(m)$ and $\lambda(f) = q?p(m)$ for some $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$ and $m \in \mathbb{M}$. Moreover, *msg* is a partial bijection between sends and receives such that every receive is paired with a (unique) send. A send is called *matched* if it is in the domain of *msg*, and *unmatched* otherwise.

The fifo behavior of message buffers implies that not every MSC arises as possible behavior. We formalise this for any process network $\mathcal{N} = (\mathbb{B}, \text{bf})$ by defining a *buffer order*¹ $<_{\mathcal{N}}$ on sends to the same buffer. Let $e <_{\mathcal{N}} e'$ if e, e' are of type $p!q$ and $s!r$, resp., with $\text{bf}(p, q) = \text{bf}(s, r)$, and

¹ This definition of $<_{\mathcal{N}}$ is tailored for *many-to-one process networks*, but for simplicity we have chosen not to mention the restriction in the definition. Note that $<_{\mathcal{N}}$ is a strict partial order.



$p_0!p_1(m_0) p_1!p_2(m_1) p_2?p_1(m_1) p_2!p_1(m_2) p_1?p_0(m_0)$

(a) A sequence and its MSC. An **unmatched** send action is marked by a special arrowhead, as for m_2 .

$p_0!p_1(m_0) p_1!p_2(m_1) p_2?p_1(m_1)$

$p_1!p_0(m_2) p_0?p_1(m_2) p_2!p_1(m_3) p_1?p_2(m_3)$

(b) A *weakly-synchronous* sequence [2] that is not **mb-synchronizable**.

■ **Figure 1** Two examples of MSCs.

- either e is **matched** and e' is **unmatched**,
- or $(e, f), (e', f') \in \text{msg}$ and $f <_{\mathbb{P}} f'$.

► **Definition 2.10.** [**Valid MSC**] Given a *process network* \mathcal{N} , an **MSC** $\mathcal{M} = (E, \leq_{\text{hb}}, \lambda)$ is called \mathcal{N} -**valid** if the relation $(<_{\text{hb}} \cup <_{\mathcal{N}})$ is *acyclic*.

It is easy to see that an **MSC** is **p2p-valid** iff **matched** messages on any channel (p, q) never overtake and **unmatched** sends by p to q are $\leq_{\mathbb{P}}$ -ordered after the **matched** sends. An **MSC** is **mb-valid** iff for any sends $s <_{\text{hb}} s'$ to the same process, either they are both **matched** and their receives satisfy $r <_{\mathbb{P}} r'$, or s' is **unmatched**. Figure 1a shows an **mb-valid** **MSC**. An **mb-valid** **MSC** is the same as an **MSC** obtained from a **trace** that satisfies *causal delivery* in [3], and it is called *mailbox MSC* in [2].

If $u = u[1] \cdots u[n]$ is a **p2p-viable** sequence of actions then we can associate an **MSC** with u by setting $\text{msc}(u) = (E, \leq_{\text{hb}}, \lambda)$ with $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$, $\lambda(e_i) = u[i]$, and the orders defined as expected:

- $e_i \leq_{\mathbb{P}} e_j$ if $u[i]$ and $u[j]$ are performed by the same process and $i \leq j$.
- $(e_i, e_j) \in \text{msg}$ if there exists $k \geq 1$ and a **buffer** $b \in \text{Ch}$ such that $u[i]$ is the k -th send to b and $u[j]$ is the k -th receive from b .

Note that $\text{msc}(u)$ only depends (up to isomorphism) on the projection of u on each process. *Caveat:* Throughout the paper we switch between reasoning on \mathcal{N} -**viable** sequences (when we use automata) and their associated **MSC** (when we use partial orders). So when we refer to a position in a (**viable**) sequence u we often see it directly as an event of $\text{msc}(u)$, without further mentioning it.

► **Remark 2.11.** By definition, for any \mathcal{N} -**viable** sequence u the associated **MSC** $\text{msc}(u)$ is \mathcal{N} -**valid**. For the converse, if the **process network** is **many-to-one** and the **MSC** \mathcal{M} is \mathcal{N} -**valid** then every (labelled) linearization of the partial order $(<_{\text{hb}} \cup <_{\mathcal{N}})^*$ of \mathcal{M} is \mathcal{N} -**viable**. Indeed, all receives from the same buffer are totally ordered by $\leq_{\mathbb{P}}$ when the **process network** is **many-to-one**, and the corresponding sends are ordered in the same way because of the **buffer order**. For example, the sequence shown in Figure 1a is **mb-viable**, but $p_1!p_2(m_1) p_2?p_1(m_1) p_2!p_1(m_2) p_0!p_1(m_0) p_1?p_0(m_0)$ is not.

For a **process network** \mathcal{N} and a **CFM** \mathcal{A} we write $\text{msc}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{A}) = \{\text{msc}(u) \mid u \in \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{A})\}$ for the set of **MSCs** associated with initial **executions** of \mathcal{A} . By Remark 2.11, the set $\text{msc}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{A})$ consists only of \mathcal{N} -**valid** **MSCs**. The next definition introduces an equivalence relation \equiv on **CFM traces** that is ubiquitous in this paper. Two **traces** are equivalent up to commuting

adjacent actions that are neither performed by the same process, nor a matching send/receive pair:

► **Definition 2.12.** [Equivalence \equiv] Two *p2p-viable* sequences $u, v \in Act^*$ are called equivalent if $msc(u) = msc(v)$ (up to isomorphism), and we write $u \equiv v$ in this case.

► Remark 2.13. Two *p2p-viable* sequences are *equivalent* iff they have the same projection on each process.

► Remark 2.14. If $u, v \in Act^*$ are both \mathcal{N} -viable with $u \equiv v$, then $u \in Tr_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{A})$ iff $v \in Tr_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{A})$. However, \equiv does not preserve \mathcal{N} -viability, e.g. $p!q(m) r!q(m) q?p(m) \equiv r!q(m) p!q(m) q?p(m)$, but the left-hand side is *mb-viable* while the right-hand side is not.

For the rest of the section $\mathcal{N} = (\mathbb{B}, \text{bf})$ always refers to a *process network*. In order to be able to cope with partial *executions* we start by observing that *unmatched* sends to a *buffer* restrict the product of \mathcal{N} -viable sequences. Let u and v be two \mathcal{N} -viable sequences. The product $u *_{\mathcal{N}} v$ is defined if for every *buffer* $b \in \mathbb{B}$, if there is an *unmatched* send to b in u , then there is no receive from b in v . When it is defined, $u *_{\mathcal{N}} v$ is equal to uv . Note that the partial binary operation $*_{\mathcal{N}}$ is associative. Moreover, if $u_0 *_{\mathcal{N}} \dots *_{\mathcal{N}} u_i *_{\mathcal{N}} \dots *_{\mathcal{N}} u_j *_{\mathcal{N}} u_{j+1} \dots *_{\mathcal{N}} u_n$ is defined then $u_0 *_{\mathcal{N}} \dots *_{\mathcal{N}} u_i *_{\mathcal{N}} u_{j+1} \dots *_{\mathcal{N}} u_n$ is also defined, for every $i < j$. Note also that, when it is defined, the $*_{\mathcal{N}}$ -product of two \mathcal{N} -viable sequences is \mathcal{N} -viable.

► **Definition 2.15.** [Exchanges, synchronizability]

1. An \mathcal{N} -exchange is any \mathcal{N} -viable sequence $w \in S^* R^*$.
2. An \mathcal{N} -viable sequence u is called \mathcal{N} -synchronous if it is a $*_{\mathcal{N}}$ -product of \mathcal{N} -exchanges. It is called \mathcal{N} -synchronizable if $u \equiv v$ for some \mathcal{N} -synchronous sequence v .
3. A CFM \mathcal{A} is \mathcal{N} -synchronizable if all its traces $u \in Tr_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{A})$ are \mathcal{N} -synchronizable.

► Remark 2.16. The above definition of \mathcal{N} -synchronizability for $\mathcal{N} = \text{mb}$ differs from the one initially used by [3, 6] and later called *weak-synchronizability* in [2] (*mb-synchronizable* here coincides with *strongly synchronizable* in [2]). An *mb-viable* sequence of actions u is *weakly-synchronizable* if it is *equivalent* to a $*_{\text{p2p}}$ -product v of *mb-exchanges*. However, v is not required to be *mb-viable*. *Weak-synchronizability* yields more synchronizable traces, however some of them are spurious. In particular one cannot use the decompositions into *exchanges* from [3, 2] to check regular properties of *executions*, as we do in Section 4 later. Figure 1b shows an example distinguishing the definitions. The sequence there corresponds to a decomposition in *exchanges* according to [3, 2], but it is not *mb-viable*.

We end this section by a comparison between synchronizability for *peer-to-peer semantics* and *mailbox semantics*. These two notions are incomparable, in general. First, *mb-synchronizability* does not imply *p2p-synchronizability* simply because a system under *mb-semantics* has less *executions* than under *p2p-semantics*. Conversely, the following *execution* is *mb-viable* and *p2p-synchronizable*, but not *mb-synchronizable* (as we will see later the *unmatched* send makes it non-decomposable): $p!r(a) q!p(b) p?q(b) p!q(c) q?p(c) r!q(d) r?p(a)$. Finally, we note that *p2p-synchronizability* was shown to be undecidable in [2].

3 Reachability for mb-synchronizable systems

We start this section by showing that state reachability for *mb-synchronizable CFMs* is PSPACE-complete. The decidability (in exponential time) for *mb-synchronizable CFMs* can be already be inferred from [2] using the partial order logic LCPDL. The main point of this section is to introduce an automata-based approach to deal with *mb-synchronizable CFMs*.

Although the set of **mb-synchronous** traces of a CFM is not regular in general, the projection of this set on (**marked**) send actions turns out to be regular. This crucial property is used later as a basic ingredient by our algorithm for deciding **mb-synchronizability**.

We start with an important observation saying that **mb-synchronizability** allows to focus on send actions. However, **unmatched** and **matched** sends need to be distinguished. So we introduce an extended alphabet $\bar{S} = \{\bar{s} \mid s \in S\}$. Sequences over $S \cup \bar{S}$ will be referred to as **ms-sequences**. For any **mb-viable** sequence u , we annotate every **unmatched** send $p!q(m)$ in u by $\overline{p!q(m)}$ and we denote by **marked**(u) the sequence obtained in this way. For example, for $u = p!q(m)p!r(m')r?p(m')$ we have **marked**(u) = $\overline{p!q(m)}p!r(m')r?p(m')$. The **ms-sequence** $\text{ms}(u)$ associated with an **mb-viable** sequence u is the projection of **marked**(u) on $S \cup \bar{S}$.

- **Lemma 3.1.** 1. For any **mb-exchanges** u, v with $\text{ms}(u) = \text{ms}(v)$, we have $u \equiv v$.
 2. For any **mb-exchange** $u = vv'$ with $v \in S^*, v' \in R^*$, we define $\hat{u} = vv''$ with v'' obtained from v' by ordering the receives as their matching sends in v . Then \hat{u} is **mb-viable** and $u \equiv \hat{u}$.

Proof. For item 1, as $\text{ms}(u) = \text{ms}(v)$ and u, v are both **mb-viable**, we get that for each process p , the sequence of receives by p in u and v , resp., are the same. We derive from $u, v \in S^*R^*$ that u and v have the same projection on each process, and thus $u \equiv v$. For item 2 it is easy to check that \hat{u} is **mb-viable**, hence $u \equiv \hat{u}$ by item 1. ◀

► **Remark 3.2.** It is worth noting that Lemma 3.1 does not hold anymore under **p2p**-semantics. For example, the two **p2p-exchanges** $u = p_1!p_2(a)p_3!p_2(b)p_2?p_3(b)p_2?p_1(a)$ and $\hat{u} = p_1!p_2(a)p_3!p_2(b)p_2?p_1(a)p_2?p_3(b)$ have the same **marked** sequence, but they are not equivalent. This is the main reason why our decidability results don't carry over to the **p2p**-semantics.

Executable **mb-exchanges**

We now show how to check if an **ms-sequence** corresponds to an executable **mb-exchange** of a CFM \mathcal{A} . Since we use the same construction also for the model-checking problem in Section 4 we give a more general formulation below.

Given an **mb-viable** sequence u and two sets $D, D' \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, we write $D \overset{u}{\rightsquigarrow} D'$ if no process from D receives any message in u , and D' contains D and those processes q such that u has some **unmatched** send to q . We refer to processes in D, D' as *deaf* processes. It is routinely checked that, for every **mb-viable** sequences u_1, \dots, u_n , the product $u_1 *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} u_n$ is defined iff $D_0 \overset{u_1}{\rightsquigarrow} D_1 \dots \overset{u_n}{\rightsquigarrow} D_n$ for some sets D_0, \dots, D_n .

► **Definition 3.3.** [**R-diamond**] Let $\mathcal{A} = (L, S \cup \bar{S} \cup R, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}})$ be an LTS. We say that \mathcal{A} is **R-diamond** if for all states $\ell, \ell' \in L$ and all receives $a, a' \in R$ performed by different processes, we have $\ell \xrightarrow{aa'}_{\mathcal{A}} \ell'$ iff $\ell \xrightarrow{a'a}_{\mathcal{A}} \ell'$.

For any states ℓ, ℓ' of \mathcal{A} , sets $D, D' \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ and **mb-viable** sequence u , we write $(\ell, D) \overset{u}{\rightsquigarrow}_{\mathcal{A}} (\ell', D')$ if $\ell \xrightarrow{\text{marked}(u)}_{\mathcal{A}} \ell'$ and $D \overset{u}{\rightsquigarrow} D'$. The next lemma shows how to adapt an **R-diamond** LTS to work on **ms-sequences** instead of **mb-synchronous** sequences (a similar idea appears in [11]):

► **Lemma 3.4.** Assume that $\mathcal{A} = (L, S \cup \bar{S} \cup R, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}})$ is an **R-diamond** LTS. Then we can construct an LTS with ε -transitions $\mathcal{A}_{\text{sync}} = ((L \cup L^3) \times 2^{\mathbb{P}}, S \cup \bar{S}, \rightarrow_{\text{sync}})$ such that for any $v \in (S \cup \bar{S})^*$, states $\ell, \ell' \in L$, and sets $D, D' \subseteq \mathbb{P}$:

$$(\ell, D) \xrightarrow{v}_{\text{sync}} (\ell', D') \quad \text{iff} \quad \exists u \text{ **mb-synchronous** s.t. } v = \text{ms}(u) \text{ and } (\ell, D) \overset{u}{\rightsquigarrow}_{\mathcal{A}} (\ell', D')$$

Proof. The LTS \mathcal{A}_{sync} has the following transitions, for any $\ell, \ell' \in L$, $D, D' \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, $a \in S \cup \bar{S}$:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (\ell, D) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon}_{sync} (\ell, \hat{\ell}, \hat{\ell}, D) & \text{for any } \hat{\ell} \in L \\ (\ell, \ell', \hat{\ell}, D) \xrightarrow{a}_{sync} (\ell_1, \ell'_1, \hat{\ell}, D) & \text{if } a = p!q(m), q \notin D, \ell \xrightarrow{a}_{\mathcal{A}} \ell_1, \ell' \xrightarrow{q?p(m)}_{\mathcal{A}} \ell'_1 \\ (\ell, \ell', \hat{\ell}, D) \xrightarrow{a}_{sync} (\ell_1, \ell', \hat{\ell}, D') & \text{if } a = \overline{p!q(m)}, \ell \xrightarrow{a}_{\mathcal{A}} \ell_1, D' = D \cup \{q\} \\ (\ell, \ell', \hat{\ell}, D) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon}_{sync} (\ell', D) & \text{if } \ell = \hat{\ell} \end{array} \right.$$

In other words, from a state $(\ell, D) \in L \times 2^{\mathbb{P}}$ the LTS \mathcal{A}_{sync} first guesses a “middle” state $\hat{\ell} \in L$ for the current **exchange**, as the state reached after the sends. Then it switches to state $(\ell, \hat{\ell}, \hat{\ell}, D)$. The first component and the second component track sends and their matching receives (if **matched**) in a “synchronous” fashion. The LTS \mathcal{A}_{sync} also guesses the end of the current **mb-exchange**, checking that the first component has reached the middle state $\hat{\ell}$ guessed originally. The claimed property of \mathcal{A}_{sync} follows from Lemma 3.1 (2) and from \mathcal{A} being **R-diamond**. ◀

Fix now a **CFM** \mathcal{A} . We abusively use the same notation $\rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$ as above for LTS: for any **global states** $g, g' \in G$ of \mathcal{A} , sets $D, D' \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ and **mb-viable** sequence u , we write $(g, D) \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{A}} (g', D')$ if u labels an **execution** in $\mathcal{T}_{mb}(\mathcal{A})$ from the configuration $(g, \varepsilon^{\mathbb{B}})$ to some configuration $(g', (w_b)_{b \in \mathbb{B}})$, and $D \rightsquigarrow D'$. We obtain from the previous lemma that:

► **Lemma 3.5.** *Let \mathcal{A} be a **CFM**, $g, g' \in G$ two **global states** of \mathcal{A} , and $D, D' \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ two sets of processes. One can construct automata \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} with $O(|G|^3 \times 2^{|\mathbb{P}|})$ states such that*

$$\begin{aligned} L(\mathcal{B}) &= \left\{ v \in (S \cup \bar{S})^* \mid \exists u \text{ **mb-exchange** s.t. } v = ms(u) \text{ and } (g, D) \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{A}} (g', D') \right\}, \\ L(\mathcal{C}) &= \left\{ v \in (S \cup \bar{S})^* \mid \exists u \text{ **mb-synchronous** s.t. } v = ms(u) \text{ and } (g, D) \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{A}} (g', D') \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Assume that $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$. Let \mathcal{Q} denote the asynchronous product $\prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \bar{\mathcal{A}}_p$, where each $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_p$ is the LTS obtained from \mathcal{A}_p by adding a transition $\ell_p \xrightarrow{\bar{s}}_p \ell'_p$ for each transition $\ell_p \xrightarrow{s}_p \ell'_p$ with $s \in S$. Note that \mathcal{Q} is **R-diamond**. Moreover, it is routinely checked that, for every **mb-viable** sequence u , the relation $\rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$ coincides with the relation $\rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{Q}}$.

For \mathcal{C} we take the automaton \mathcal{Q}_{sync} constructed according to Lemma 3.4, and set the initial state to (g, D) and the final state to (g', D') . For \mathcal{B} , we need to tinker a bit with \mathcal{Q}_{sync} to ensure that we read only one **exchange**. So we remove all transitions from/to states in $L \times 2^{\mathbb{P}}$ except the transitions from (g, D) , which we set as initial, and the transitions to (g', D') , which we set as final. If $(g, D) = (g', D')$ then we make two different states for the initial and the final one. ◀

Using Lemma 3.5 we establish the upper bound of the global-state reachability problem for **mb-synchronizable CFMs** (the lower bound is straightforward). By global-state reachability we mean the existence of a reachable configuration with a specified global state. Decidability was shown in [6] for weak-synchronizability (correcting the proof in [3]) and assuming a uniform bound on the size of **exchanges**.

► **Theorem 3.6.** *The global-state reachability problem for **mb-synchronizable CFMs** is PSPACE-complete.*

Proof. Note first that if \mathcal{A} is a **CFM** and u, v two **mb-viable** sequences u, v with $u \equiv v$ then $c_{in} \xrightarrow{u}_{\mathcal{A}} c$ implies that $c_{in} \xrightarrow{v}_{\mathcal{A}} c'$ for some c' with the same global state as c . Since we assume that the **CFM** is **mb-synchronizable** we can choose v to be **mb-synchronous**. Thus we

can use automaton \mathcal{C} from Lemma 3.5 to show the upper bound. This automaton can clearly be constructed on-the-fly in polynomial space.

For the lower bound we reduce from the problem of intersection of NFA. Let $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ be NFA over the alphabet Σ . We use processes p_1, \dots, p_n where each p_i simulates \mathcal{A}_i . Process p_1 starts by guessing a letter a of Σ , making a transition on a and sending a to p_2 . Afterwards each process p_i receives a letter a from p_{i-1} , makes a transition on a , then sends a to p_{i+1} . Back again at p_1 , the procedure restarts. Figure 2 shows the principle.

Upon reaching a final state, p_1 can send message `accept` to p_2 and then stop. If p_i receives `accept` from p_{i-1} while being in a final state, it relays `accept` to p_{i+1} , and then stops.

One can see that every trace of the CFM is **mb-synchronizable**, as every message is in its own **exchange**. Moreover, the global-state $(\text{accept})_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$ is reachable if and only if the intersection of $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ is non-empty. ◀

4 Model-checking regular properties

In this section we introduce a class of properties against which we can verify **mb-synchronizable** CFMs. We look for regular properties P over the alphabet $S \cup R \cup \bar{S}$, so we exploit the **marked sends** to refer (indirectly) to messages. The model-checking problem we consider is the following:

CFM-VS-REGULAR PROPERTY

INPUT: **mb-synchronizable** CFM \mathcal{A} , regular property $P \subseteq (S \cup \bar{S} \cup R)^*$.

OUTPUT: Yes if for every **mb-synchronous** trace $u \in Tr_{\text{mb}}(\mathcal{A})$ we have $\text{marked}(u) \in P$.

The properties we consider are regular, **R-closed** subsets of $(S \cup \bar{S} \cup R)^*$:

► **Definition 4.1.** [**R-closed properties**] Let \equiv_R be the reflexive-transitive closure of the relation consisting of all pairs $(uabv, ubav)$ with $u, v \in (S \cup \bar{S} \cup R)^*$, $a, b \in R$, and a, b performed by distinct processes. A property $P \subseteq (S \cup \bar{S} \cup R)^*$ is called **R-closed** if it is closed under \equiv_R (i.e., for any $u \equiv_R v$ we have $u \in P$ iff $v \in P$).

As an example, we can consider a system with a central process c and a set of orbiting processes p_1, \dots, p_n . The central process gives tasks to the orbiting processes, and they send back their results. We can state a property expressing a round-based behavior for c : it sends tasks to orbiting processes, and if a process p_i does not send back to c in the next round, it will not participate in further rounds anymore. The opposite property consists of all sequences from $A^*S_c^*c!p_i(m)S_c^*R^+(\bigcup_{j \neq i} S_{p_j})^+R^+S_c^+R^*A^*p_i!c(m')A^*$ for some i and m, m' , and $A = S \cup \bar{S} \cup R$. As the above property is **R-closed**, its complement is too.

We will show that if the regular property is **R-closed** then the model-checking problem stated above is PSPACE-complete. Before that recall that both being **mb-viable** and being **mb-synchronous** (assuming **mb-viable**) are non regular properties. However, it is not necessary to be able to express the above, as we will apply the property to **mb-synchronous traces** of CFM. The next lemma is similar to Lemma 3.4:

► **Lemma 4.2.** Let $P \subseteq (S \cup \bar{S} \cup R)^*$ be regular and **R-closed**. Then the set

$$\text{Sync}(P) = \{v \in (S \cup \bar{S})^* \mid \exists u \text{ mb-synchronous s.t. } v = \text{ms}(u) \text{ and } \text{marked}(u) \in P\}$$

is regular. If P is given by an **R-diamond** NFA with n states, then we can construct an NFA for $\text{Sync}(P)$ with $O(n^3 \cdot 2^{|\mathbb{P}|})$ states.

Proof. Let P be given by an *R-diamond* NFA $\mathcal{P} = (L, S \cup \bar{S} \cup R, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{P}}, \ell_0, F)$ with n states. We may assume w.l.o.g. that \mathcal{P} contains no ε -transition. Consider the LTS with ε -transitions \mathcal{P}_{sync} obtained from Lemma 3.4. Recall that this LTS has $O(n^3 \times 2^{|\mathbb{P}|})$ states. As NFA for $\text{Sync}(P)$, we take \mathcal{P}_{sync} , with (ℓ_0, \emptyset) as initial state, and $F \times 2^{\mathbb{P}}$ as final states. \blacktriangleleft

► **Theorem 4.3.** *The CFM-VS-REGULAR PROPERTY problem is PSPACE-complete if the property is *R-closed*. There exist properties that are not *R-closed* for which the problem is undecidable.*

Proof. For the upper bound, consider an *mb-synchronizable* CFM $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$ and an *R-closed* regular property $P \subseteq (S \cup \bar{S} \cup R)^*$ given by an NFA \mathcal{P} . Since P is *R-closed*, its complement P^{co} is also *R-closed*. As in the proof of Lemma 3.5, let \mathcal{Q} denote the asynchronous product $\prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \bar{\mathcal{A}}_p$, where each $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_p$ is the LTS obtained from \mathcal{A}_p by adding a transition $\ell_p \xrightarrow{\bar{s}}_p \ell'_p$ for each transition $\ell_p \xrightarrow{s}_p \ell'_p$ with $s \in S$. Note that \mathcal{Q} is *R-diamond*, so its language $Q = L(\mathcal{Q})$ is *R-closed*. We derive that $Q \cap P^{co}$ is *R-closed*. It is routinely checked that $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P})$ is a positive instance of CFM-VS-REGULAR PROPERTY iff the set $\text{Sync}(Q \cap P^{co})$, as defined in Lemma 4.2, is empty. To derive the PSPACE upper bound from this lemma, we still need to provide an *R-diamond* NFA for $Q \cap P^{co}$. This *R-diamond* NFA is simply the synchronous product of \mathcal{Q} and the minimal automaton of P^{co} . The latter is *R-diamond* since P^{co} is *R-closed*, and it can be constructed on-the-fly in polynomial space from \mathcal{P} . Now it suffices to check emptiness of the NFA for $\text{Sync}(Q \cap P^{co})$ from Lemma 4.2. The lower bound is again straightforward.

For the undecidability of model-checking a property that is not *R-closed* we use a straightforward reduction from PCP. Let $(u_i, v_i)_{i=1 \dots k}$ be an instance of PCP over the binary alphabet $\{0, 1\}$. We can have three processes p, U, V and process p who sends, in rounds, some pair (u_i, v_i) to U and V , resp. That is, p sends u_i (v_i , resp.) letter by letter to U (V , resp.). The processes U and V do nothing except receiving whatever p sends to them.

There is a solution to the given PCP instance iff there is a *trace* consisting of a single fully *matched mb-exchange* where U and V perform the same receives in lock-step. So we take as property P the regular language $P = (S \cup \bar{S} \cup R)^* \setminus P^{co}$ where $P^{co} = S^* \{U?p(0)V?p(0), U?p(1)V?p(1)\}^*$. \blacktriangleleft

4.1 Comparing p2p and mb semantics


Given a protocol that was designed for p2p communication, it can be useful to know whether the protocol can be also deployed under mailbox communication. We call this property mailbox-similarity:

► **Definition 4.4.** [Mailbox-similarity] *A p2p-viable sequence of actions u is called mailbox-similar if there exists some mb-viable sequence v such that $u \equiv v$. A CFM \mathcal{A} is called mailbox-similar if every trace from $Tr_{p2p}(\mathcal{A})$ is mailbox-similar.*


Equivalently, a CFM \mathcal{A} is *mailbox-similar* if every MSC from $\text{msc}_{p2p}(\mathcal{A})$ is *mb-valid*. Unsurprisingly, as it is often the case under p2p semantics, *mailbox-similarity* is undecidable without further restrictions:

► **Lemma 4.5.** *The question whether a given CFM is mailbox-similar is undecidable.*

In the remainder of this section, we show that *mailbox-similarity* becomes decidable if we assume that the CFM is *mb-synchronizable*. Recall that the latter means that every trace from $Tr_{mb}(\mathcal{A})$ is *mb-synchronizable*.



■ **Figure 2** The MSC of a trace of the CFM for automata intersection.



■ **Figure 3** MSC of $u = p_2!p_1(m_1) p_1!p_2(m_2) p_1?p_2(m_1) p_2?p_1(m_2) p_3!p_2(m_3)$, with the two SCCs of its communication graph. Note that $1 \preceq_{\text{mb}}^u 2$, but neither $1 \preceq_{p_2p}^u 2$ nor $2 \preceq_{p_2p}^u 1$ holds.

The next lemma shows how to check that two positions in an **mb-synchronous** sequence u are causally-ordered, i.e., there is some $(\prec_{\text{hb}} \cup \prec_{\text{mb}})$ -path between these positions (as usual, this refers to a path between associated events in $\text{msc}(u)$). We mark these positions by using a “tagged” alphabet $\Sigma = (S \cup \bar{S} \cup R) \times \{\circ, \bullet\}$.

► **Lemma 4.6.** *We can construct an R -diamond automaton \mathcal{D} with $O(|\mathbb{P}|)$ states over the alphabet Σ such that for every **mb-synchronous** sequence $u \in \text{Act}^*$ and every positions $i < j$ of u such that $u[i]$ and $u[j]$ are in S , there is a $(\prec_{\text{hb}} \cup \prec_{\text{mb}})$ -path from $u[i]$ to $u[j]$ iff \mathcal{D} accepts the word $\text{marked}(u)$ tagged by \bullet at i and j and by \circ elsewhere.*

Proof. Recall that $\preceq_{\text{hb}} = (\prec_{\mathbb{P}} \cup \text{msg})^*$ is the happens-before order. The automaton \mathcal{D} will guess a $(\prec_{\mathbb{P}} \cup \text{msg} \cup \prec_{\text{mb}})$ -path from $u[i]$ to $u[j]$. It will actually use only send actions of $\text{marked}(u)$, relying on the fact that u is **mb-synchronous**. That is, \mathcal{D} guesses a subsequence of positions $i_1 < \dots < i_t$ of u , with each $u[i_k] \in S$, as described in the following. Let $i_0 = i$ and $i_{t+1} = j$. We have three cases, and \mathcal{D} guesses in which case we are:

- $u[i_k], u[i_{k+1}]$ are performed by the same process p . After i_k the automaton \mathcal{D} remembers the pair $(\prec_{\mathbb{P}}, p)$ until it guesses i_{k+1} .
- $u[i_k], u[i_{k+1}]$ are both sends to the same process p , and $u[i_k]$ is **matched**. After i_k the automaton \mathcal{D} remembers (\prec_{mb}, p) until it guesses i_{k+1} .
- $u[i_k]$ is **matched**, its receive $u[h]$ is performed by the same process p as $u[i_{k+1}]$, and $h < i_{k+1}$. After i_k the automaton \mathcal{D} remembers the pair (msg, S, p) . After the next receive action, \mathcal{D} changes its state to (msg, R, p) until it guesses i_{k+1} . The assumption that u is **mb-synchronous** guarantees that the receive $u[h]$ **matched** with $u[i_k]$ has already occurred when \mathcal{D} guesses i_{k+1} .

By construction, if \mathcal{D} accepts $\text{marked}(u)$, then we have a $(\prec_{\text{hb}} \cup \prec_{\text{mb}})$ -path from $u[i]$ to $u[j]$, with $i < j$ the two positions tagged by \bullet in $\text{marked}(u)$.

For the left-to-right implication, assume that $u[i]$ and $u[j]$ are in S and that we have a $(\prec_{\text{hb}} \cup \prec_{\text{mb}})$ -path from $u[i]$ to $u[j]$. This path is a sequence $i = i_0 < i_1 < \dots < i_t < i_{t+1} = j$ of positions of u , such that each pair of consecutive indices is related by $\prec_{\mathbb{P}}$, \prec_{mb} or msg . Moreover, we may assume w.l.o.g. that there are no two consecutive $\prec_{\mathbb{P}}$ -arcs on this path. If the path contains only $\prec_{\mathbb{P}}$ and \prec_{mb} -arcs, then \mathcal{D} applies one of the first two rules above. Consider now a msg -arc $(u[i_k], u[i_{k+1}])$. As $u[i_{k+1}]$ is a receive, we get that $u[i_{k+1}] \prec_{\mathbb{P}} u[i_{k+2}]$. Moreover, $u[i_{k+2}]$ is a send since there are no two consecutive $\prec_{\mathbb{P}}$ -arcs on the path. So \mathcal{D} can apply the third rule to go from i_k to i_{k+2} . We get that \mathcal{D} accepts the word $\text{marked}(u)$ tagged by \bullet at i and j and by \circ elsewhere. The number of states of \mathcal{D} is $4 * |\mathbb{P}| + 2$ (2 for initial/final state). ◀

► **Lemma 4.7.** *For any receive action $r \in R$, we can construct an R -diamond automaton \mathcal{P}_r with $O(|\mathbb{P}|)$ states over the alphabet $(S \cup \bar{S} \cup R)$ such that for every mb-synchronous sequence u , it holds that ur is p2p-viable and not mailbox-similar iff \mathcal{P}_r accepts $\text{marked}(u)$.*

Proof sketch. Consider a receive action $r = q?p(m)$. Let W_r denote the set of words $w \in \Sigma^*$ such that w contains exactly two positions $i < j$ tagged by \bullet , $w[i]$ is an unmatched send to q , $w[j]$ is $\bar{p}!q(m)$, and no $w[h]$ with $h < j$ is an unmatched send from p to q . It is easily seen that W_r is recognized by an R -diamond NFA \mathcal{W}_r with three states. Let \mathcal{E}_r denote the synchronous product of \mathcal{W}_r and the R -diamond automaton \mathcal{D} from Lemma 4.6. The desired automaton \mathcal{P}_r is obtained from \mathcal{E}_r by untagging it, that is, by replacing each tagged action $(a, t) \in \Sigma$ by a . As \mathcal{E}_r is R -diamond, so is \mathcal{P}_r . By construction, \mathcal{P}_r satisfies the lemma condition. The details can be found in the appendix. ◀

We derive from the previous lemma that $\text{mailbox-similarity}$ can be solved in PSPACE for $\text{mb-synchronizable CFMs}$. The proof uses Lemma 4.2 and is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.3 (see appendix).

► **Theorem 4.8.** *The question whether a given $\text{mb-synchronizable CFM}$ is mailbox-similar is PSPACE-complete.*

5 Checking $\text{mb-synchronizability}$

In this section we show our main result, namely an algorithm to know if a CFM is mb-synchronizable . As a side result we obtain optimal complexity bounds for some problems considered in [6, 11].

The high-level schema of the algorithm is to look for a minimal witness for non- $\text{mb-synchronizability}$. This amounts to searching for an $\text{mb-synchronous trace}$ that violates $\text{mb-synchronizability}$ after adding one (receive) action. Of course, we need Theorem 3.6 to guarantee that the $\text{mb-synchronous trace}$ is executable. In addition, we have to detect the violation of $\text{mb-synchronizability}$, and for this we need to determine if an exchange is non-decomposable into smaller exchanges . Section 5.1 shows automata for non-decomposable exchanges , and in Section 5.2 we present the algorithm that finds minimal witnesses.


5.1 Automata for atomic exchanges

In this section we consider sequences of actions that cannot be split into smaller pieces without separating messages [10, 11]. We introduce these notions for arbitrary $\text{many-to-one process networks } \mathcal{N}$. Later we will fix $\mathcal{N} = \text{mb}$ since reachability over synchronizable sequences is decidable in this setting.

► **Definition 5.1. [Atomic sequences]** *An \mathcal{N} -viable sequence $u \in \text{Act}^*$ is \mathcal{N} -atomic (or atomic for short) if $u \equiv v *_{\mathcal{N}} w$ with v, w both \mathcal{N} -viable implies that one of v, w is empty.*

To check atomicity we can use a graph criterium introduced already in [12] (see also [10]), that is similar to the notion of conflict graph used in [3]:

► **Definition 5.2. [Communication graph]** *Let u be an \mathcal{N} -viable sequence, and $\mathcal{M} = \text{msg}(u)$. The \mathcal{N} -communication graph of u is the directed graph $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u) = (V, E)$ where V is the set of all events of \mathcal{M} and the edges are defined by $(e, e') \in E$ if $e <_{\mathbb{P}} e'$ or $e <_{\mathcal{N}} e'$ or $\{(e, e'), (e', e)\} \cap \text{msg} \neq \emptyset$.*



■ **Figure 4** A well-labeling of the *ms-sequence* bottom right, witnessing a path in the communication graph of the *MSC* left, from the last to the first event of process p_0 . The s_i and r_i vertices of the communication graph correspond respectively to the send and receive of message m_i .

The right part of Figure 4 shows (partly) the *communication graph* of the *MSC* in the left part. The cycle witnesses that the *MSC* is \mathcal{N} -atomic for $\mathcal{N} \in \{\text{mb}, \text{p2p}\}$, according to the next lemma.

► **Lemma 5.3.** *Let $u \in \text{Act}^*$ be a \mathcal{N} -viable sequence and $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$ the \mathcal{N} -communication graph of $\text{msc}(u)$. Then u is \mathcal{N} -atomic if and only if $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$ is strongly connected.*

From Lemma 5.3 we can infer a decomposition of any *trace* in *atomic* subsequences that is unique up to permuting adjacent *atomic* sequences that are not ordered in the sense of the next definition:

► **Definition 5.4.** [**Skeleton**] *Let u be a \mathcal{N} -viable sequence with $\mathcal{M} = \text{msc}(u)$ and $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$ be the \mathcal{N} -communication graph of \mathcal{M} . Fix some arbitrary topological indexing $\{1, \dots, n\}$ of the SCCs of $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$. We define the skeleton of u as $\text{skel}(u) = (\{1, \dots, n\}, \preceq_{\mathcal{N}}^u)$, where $\preceq_{\mathcal{N}}^u$ is the partial order induced by setting $i \prec_{\mathcal{N}}^u j$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ if there is some $\prec_{\mathbb{P}}$ -arc or some *mb*-arc in $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$ from the SCC with index i to the SCC with index j .*

► **Remark 5.5.** Assume that $u = u_1 *_{\mathcal{N}} \dots *_{\mathcal{N}} u_n$ where each u_i is \mathcal{N} -atomic and non-empty, and we index the SCCs according to the order of the u_i . Then we obtain $\text{skel}(u) = (\{1, \dots, n\}, \preceq_{\mathcal{N}}^u)$ with $i \prec_{\mathcal{N}}^u j$ if either both u_i and u_j contain some actions on the same process; or they both contain some send to the same *buffer*, with the one in u_i being *matched*. See Figure 3 for an example.

► **Lemma 5.6.** *Let u be an \mathcal{N} -viable sequence. Then there exist some \mathcal{N} -atomic non-empty sequences u_1, \dots, u_k such that $u \equiv u_1 *_{\mathcal{N}} \dots *_{\mathcal{N}} u_k$. Such a decomposition into \mathcal{N} -atomic non-empty sequences is unique up to the partial order $\preceq_{\mathcal{N}}^u$ of $\text{skel}(u)$.*

Throughout the remaining of this section we fix $\mathcal{N} = \text{mb}$. We will show now a simple, automaton-compatible condition to certify that an *ms-sequence* $v = \text{ms}(u)$ corresponds to an *mb-atomic exchange* u . First we note that, in order for the *communication graph* $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ to be strongly connected, there must exist for every process p that is active in u some path from the last action of p to the first action of p (if there are at least two actions of p in u). A process p is called *active* in u if there is at least some action performed by p in u (resp., if $v = \text{ms}(u)$ contains either a send performed by p , or a *matched* send to p). We look for such a path for every *active* process and then we need to connect all such paths together.

Let $u \in \text{Act}^*$ be an *mb-exchange*. For some suitable integer n we define a labeling of $v = \text{ms}(u)$ as an injective mapping $\pi : \{0, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, |v|\}$ where $\pi(i) = j$ means that

position j of v is labeled by i . We say that π is a *well-labeling* of v (of size n) if, for every $0 \leq i < n$:

- either $\pi(i) < \pi(i + 1)$ and, for some process p :
 - $v[\pi(i)]$ and $v[\pi(i + 1)]$ are both sends by p , or
 - $v[\pi(i)]$ and $v[\pi(i + 1)]$ are both sends to p , with $v[\pi(i)]$ **matched** (direct arc)
- or $v[\pi(i)]$ is a send by p and $v[\pi(i + 1)]$ is a **matched** send to p (indirect arc).

An example of such labeling is shown in Figure 4. Informally, one can see the two types of arcs between positions of v as:

- A **direct arc** between two sends corresponds to the **process order** $\leq_{\mathbb{P}}$ or the **mailbox order** \leq_{mb} in $\text{msc}(u)$. For example, we have a **direct arc** from position 2 to 3 in Figure 4.
- An **indirect arc** between two sends stems from composing edges of the **communication graph** $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ that involve a receive event. An **indirect arc** is specific to **mb-exchanges**: in $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ we can go from the event of $v[i]$ to the receive associated with the event of $v[j]$ (since u is an **mb-exchange** this receive is after $v[i]$), and then follow the message edge backwards to the event of $v[j]$. For example, we have an **indirect arc** from position 1 to 2 in Figure 4.

► **Lemma 5.7.** *Let u be an **mb-exchange** with $\mathcal{M} = \text{msc}(u)$, and $v = \text{ms}(u)$. There is a path in the **communication graph** $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ from the event of \mathcal{M} corresponding to $v[i]$ to the event corresponding to $v[j]$ if and only if there is a *well-labeling* of v starting at i and ending at j .*

Proof. For the right-to-left direction, let π be a **well-labeling** of v starting at i and ending at j . As π is a **well-labeling**, there is a path in $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ from the event corresponding to $v[\pi(k)]$ to the one of $v[\pi(k + 1)]$, for every k in the domain of π . Each such path is either a direct edge, or consists of two edges, as explained before the statement of the lemma in the main body.

For the left-to-right direction, we suppose there is a path Π in $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ from the event of $v[i]$ to the event of $v[j]$. We construct a labeling π of v that starts at i and ends at j , by labelling the positions of v that correspond to the events of Π with their respective rank on Π . Suppose that n positions are labeled and let $0 \leq k < n$. We show the existence of an arc from $\pi(k)$ to $\pi(k + 1)$, which is either direct or indirect. There are three cases:

- There is no receive between the event of $v[\pi(k)]$ and the one of $v[\pi(k + 1)]$ on Π . Thus $v[\pi(k)]$, $v[\pi(k + 1)]$ are consecutive on Π and are either ordered by $<_{\mathbb{P}}$ or by $<_{\text{mb}}$. This gives a **direct arc** from $\pi(k)$ to $\pi(k + 1)$.
- Between the event of $v[\pi(k)]$ and the one of $v[\pi(k + 1)]$ we see on Π the receive matching $v[\pi(k)]$ before the receive matching $v[\pi(k + 1)]$. Note that both receives must be on the same process (as all receives between $v[\pi(k)]$ and $v[\pi(k + 1)]$), so they are ordered by $<_{\mathbb{P}}$. Thus, the events of $v[\pi(k)]$ and $v[\pi(k + 1)]$, respectively, are ordered by $<_{\text{mb}}$. This gives a **direct arc** from $\pi(k)$ to $\pi(k + 1)$.
- Between the event of $v[\pi(k)]$ and the one of $v[\pi(k + 1)]$ we have on Π the receive matching the event of $v[\pi(k + 1)]$ on the same process as the event of $v[\pi(k)]$. This gives an **indirect arc** from $\pi(k)$ to $\pi(k + 1)$. ◀

► **Remark 5.8.** In Lemma 5.7, we only talk about send actions. If we are interested in a path in $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ to a receive action, we just need to exhibit the path to its corresponding send action.

We can infer a bound on the size of **well-labelings**, using the pigeonhole principle on the **direct arcs** and **indirect arcs** going through each process.

► **Lemma 5.9.** *Let $u \in \text{Act}^*$ be an **mb-exchange** and $v = \text{ms}(u)$. If there is a path in the communication graph $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ between $v[i]$ and $v[j]$ then there is a **well-labeling** of $\text{ms}(u)$ starting at position i and ending at position j of size at most $|\mathbb{P}|^2 + |\mathbb{P}|$.*

We construct now two kinds of automata, both working on **ms-sequences** $v = \text{ms}(u)$. Automaton \mathcal{B}_p will check for a process p that is **active** in u , that all actions performed by p are on a cycle in $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$. Automaton \mathcal{B}_{all} will check that all actions of **active** processes in u appear together on a cycle in $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$, by looking for a cycle going through all active processes at least once. The detailed construction of these automata is described in Appendix B. Finally we take the product of all automata \mathcal{B}_p such that p is **active** and the automaton \mathcal{B}_{all} . The resulting automaton has $|\mathbb{P}|^{O(|\mathbb{P}|^3)}$ states and verifies the following property: for every **mb-exchange** u , it holds that u is **atomic** iff $\text{ms}(u)$ is accepted by the automaton. By taking the product of this last automaton with the automaton verifying that the **ms-sequence** corresponds to an **mb-exchange** (see Lemma 3.5), we immediately get:

► **Lemma 5.10.** *Let \mathcal{A} be a CFM, g, g' two global states of \mathcal{A} and $D, D' \subseteq \mathbb{P}$. One can construct an automaton \mathcal{B} with $O(|G|^3 \cdot |\mathbb{P}|^{O(|\mathbb{P}|^3)})$ states, such that*

$$L(\mathcal{B}) = \left\{ v \in (S \cup \bar{S})^* \mid \exists u \text{ atomic mb-exchange s.t. } v = \text{ms}(u) \text{ and } (g, D) \xrightarrow{u}_{\mathcal{A}} (g', D') \right\}$$

5.2 Verifying mb-synchronizability

To check **mb-synchronizability** we look for an **mb-viable trace** that is not equivalent to a $*_{\text{mb}}$ -product of **mb-exchanges**. Such a *witness* u must contain some **atomic** factor v that is not equivalent to an **mb-exchange**. In other words, $u \equiv u' *_{\text{mb}} v *_{\text{mb}} u''$ for some u', u'' , with $v' \notin S^*R^*$ for every $v \equiv v'$. It is enough to reason on **atomic** factors, since for any **exchange** u where $u \equiv u_1 *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} u_n$ with each u_i **atomic**, all factors u_i are also **exchanges**. Note that an **atomic** v is not equivalent to an **mb-exchange** iff some process in v does a send after a receive.

The next lemmas refer to the structure of *minimal witnesses* for non-**mb-synchronizability**.


► **Lemma 5.11.** *Let $u = vr$ be an **mb-viable** sequence with $r \in R$. There exist **mb-atomic** non-empty sequences v_1, \dots, v_n and indices $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ such that (1) $v \equiv v_1 *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} v_n$, and (2) $u \equiv v_1 *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} v_{i-1} *_{\text{mb}} w *_{\text{mb}} v_{j+1} *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} v_n$ with $w = (v_i *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} v_j)r$ being **mb-atomic**.*

► **Lemma 5.12.** *Let $u = vr$ be an **mb-viable** sequence with $r \in R$, such that v is not **mb-atomic**. We denote by s the send event **matched** with r in u , and by q the process of r . Then u is **mb-atomic** iff for every decomposition $v \equiv v_1 *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} v_n$ with v_i **mb-atomic** for all i : (1) v_1 contains s or some **unmatched** send to process q , and (2) v_n contains s or some action performed by process q .*

An example of such a decomposition is shown in Figure 5.

► **Lemma 5.13.** *Let $u = vr$ be **mb-viable** with $r \in R$ and v is **mb-synchronizable**. Let also s be the send matching r in u , and q the process doing r . Then u is not **mb-synchronizable** iff there exist $(v_i)_{i=1}^n$ with $v \equiv v_1 * \dots * v_n$, indices $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq n$, and $p \in \mathbb{P}$ s.t.:*

1. Each v_i is **mb-atomic**.
2. For every $1 \leq j < k$ we have $i_j \prec_{\text{mb}}^v i_{j+1}$.
3. v_{i_1} contains s or some **unmatched** send to process q ; v_{i_k} contains s or some action performed by process q .



■ **Figure 5** The MSC of an atomic sequence. It is not **mb-synchronizable** by Lemma 5.13, each u_i consists of message i , the indices are $(1, 2, 3, 5)$, and $m = 2$.

4. There exists $1 \leq m < k$ such that v_{i_m} contains a receive by p and $v_{i_{m+1}}$ a send by p .

Note that while we can guess **mb-synchronous** sequences without storing messages (Lemma 3.5), we need to be careful when guessing u in Lemma 5.13 so that it is **mb-viable**. E.g., by reversing message 2 in Figure 5 the sequence becomes non-**mb-viable**.

► **Lemma 5.14.** Let $u = vr$ be a **p2p-viable** sequence with $r \in R$ and v **mb-viable**. Let q be the process performing r . Then u is equivalent to an **mb-viable** sequence if and only if there is no non-empty $(\prec_{hb} \cup \prec_{mb})$ -path from $v[i]$ to $v[j]$ for some $i < j$ such that $v[i]$ is an unmatched send to q and $v[j]$ is the send matching r in u .

The next lemma shows how to check the existence of a $(\prec_{hb} \cup \prec_{mb})$ -path between two positions of an **ms-sequence**, using the automaton from Lemma 4.6.

► **Lemma 5.15.** One can construct an automaton \mathcal{D} with $O(|\mathbb{P}|)$ states over the alphabet $(S \cup \bar{S}) \times \{\circ, \bullet\} \cup \{\#\}$ with the following properties:

1. \mathcal{D} accepts only words from $(\Sigma^* \#)^*$ containing exactly two positions in $(S \cup \bar{S}) \times \{\bullet\}$.
2. For every $u = u_1 *_{mb} \dots *_{mb} u_n$ **mb-viable**, with each u_i an **exchange**, \mathcal{D} accepts tagged $v = ms(u_1) \# \dots \# ms(u_n)$ iff, there is a $(\prec_{hb} \cup \prec_{mb})$ -path from $u[i]$ to $u[j]$, where $i < j$ are the positions of u corresponding to the positions tagged by \bullet in v .

We have now all ingredients to show our main result. We use Lemma 5.13 to guess the witness sequence, **exchange** by **exchange**, and to be sure that the sequence is **mb-viable** we rely on Lemmas 5.14 and 5.15, complementing the automaton on-the-fly. The lower bound is obtained, as before, by reduction from the intersection emptiness problem for finite automata.

► **Theorem 5.16.** The question whether a **CFM** is **mb-synchronizable** is PSPACE-complete.

Proof. For the upper bound we use Lemma 5.13 to guess a minimal non-**mb-synchronizable** sequence $u = vr$. Recall that q is the process executing r , and s the matching send of r in u . First we rely on the automaton of Lemma 5.10 in order to guess the **atomic exchanges** v_i composing v on-the-fly. At the same time we guess the subsequence of indices $i_1 < \dots < i_k$ and the events that witness that $i_j \prec_{mb}^v i_{j+1}$ (cf. Definition 5.4).

We keep record of the current pair (g, D) , where g is a global state of the **CFM** and D a set of **deaf** processes, as we guess each v_i , to check that the sequence v labels an **execution**. When we process v_{i_k} , we remember its alphabet over $S \cup \bar{S}$ until we guess $v_{i_{k+1}}$, and check that $i_k \prec_{mb}^v i_{k+1}$ (cf. Remark 5.5). We also guess m as of item (5) in Lemma 5.13, and check (5). After we have done v_n , we must have reached (g, D) such that the receive r can be done in state g . By verifying that u is **mb-viable** as described below, we know that s is **matched** with r .

We check that u is **mb-viable** with Lemma 5.15. From Lemma 5.14 we know that u is **mb-viable** iff there is no **unmatched** send s' to q s.t. there is a $(\leq_{hb} \cup \prec_{mb})$ -path from s' to s

in v . We use the complement \mathcal{D}^{co} of \mathcal{D} , which is exponential in $|\mathbb{P}|$ but can be constructed on-the-fly in linear space. We make one copy $\mathcal{D}^{co}(p')$ of \mathcal{D}^{co} for every process $p' \neq q$. Each $\mathcal{D}^{co}(p')$ tags the first **unmatched** send of type $p'!q$ and s with \bullet . We make every $\mathcal{D}^{co}(p')$ read the tagged $\text{ms}(v_1)\#\dots\#\text{ms}(v_n)$ by adding the $\#$ after each **atomic mb-exchange** we read. Each $\mathcal{D}^{co}(p')$ should accept. This guarantees that no send of type $\overline{p'!q}$ has a $(\leq_{\text{hb}} \cup <_{\text{mb}})$ -path to s .

For the lower bound, we use the same reduction as in Theorem 3.6, and if we reach $(\text{accept})_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$, we use two other processes to do a non-**mb-synchronizable** gadget (see Figure 7 in the appendix). This way, the CFM is **mb-synchronizable** if and only if the intersection of the automata $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ is empty. \blacktriangleleft

Theorem 5.16 yields two interesting corollaries. In the statements below we say that a CFM is k -**mb-synchronizable** if for every **trace** $u \in \text{Tr}_{\text{mb}}(\mathcal{A})$, we have $u \equiv u_1 * \dots * u_n$ for some **mb-exchanges** u_i where $|u_i| \leq k$. The next result has been shown decidable in [2] (with non-elementary complexity):

► **Theorem 5.17.** *Let k be an integer given in binary. The question whether a CFM is k -mb-synchronizable is PSPACE-complete. The lower bound already holds for k in unary.*

Proof. Using Theorem 5.16 we first check that the CFM is **mb-synchronizable**. Then we use the automaton \mathcal{C} from Lemma 3.5 to compute pairs (g, D) of global state and set of **deaf** processes that are reachable by some **mb-synchronous** sequence. Finally we check whether the automaton of Lemma 5.10 accepts only **exchanges** of size at most k . Since the size of our automata is exponential the test can be done in PSPACE. The lower bound can be obtained as in the proof of Theorem 5.16 (see Figure 2). \blacktriangleleft

For the second result and weak synchronizability, decidability was obtained in [11]. Our proof based on automata seems more direct and simpler than the one of [11]:

► **Theorem 5.18.** *The question whether for a given CFM \mathcal{A} there exists some k such that \mathcal{A} is k -mb-synchronizable, is PSPACE-complete.*

Proof. For the upper bound we proceed as in the previous proof. The difference is that at the end we check whether the automaton of Lemma 5.10 accepts an infinite language from a reachable pair (g, D) . The language of this automaton is infinite iff there is no k as stated by the theorem. The lower bound can be obtained as in the proof of Theorem 5.16. \blacktriangleleft

6 Conclusion

We have introduced a novel automata-based approach to reason about communication in the **sr-round mailbox** model. We showed that knowing whether a system complies with this model is PSPACE-complete. An interesting theoretical question is whether we can apply similar techniques to other types of communication. On the practical side it would be interesting to implement our algorithms and compare e.g. with existing tools like Soter [7] that targets safety properties for a relaxed model of Erlang. Our automata-based techniques may be easier to implement than previous approaches, and could even adapt to a dynamic setting.

References

- 1 Parosh Aziz Abdulla and Bengt Jonsson. Verifying programs with unreliable channels. *Inf. Comput.*, 127(2):91–101, 1996. doi:10.1006/INCO.1996.0053.

- 2 Benedikt Bollig, Cinzia Di Giusto, Alain Finkel, Laetitia Laversa, Étienne Lozes, and Amrita Suresh. A unifying framework for deciding synchronizability. In Serge Haddad and Daniele Varacca, editors, *32nd International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2021, August 24-27, 2021, Virtual Conference*, volume 203 of *LIPICs*, pages 14:1–14:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.CONCUR.2021.14.
- 3 Ahmed Bouajjani, Constantin Enea, Kailiang Ji, and Shaz Qadeer. On the completeness of verifying message passing programs under bounded asynchrony. In *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 30*, pages 372–391. Springer, 2018.
- 4 Daniel Brand and Pitro Zafiropulo. On communicating finite-state machines. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 30(2):323–342, 1983.
- 5 Bernadette Charron-Bost and André Schiper. The Heard-Of model: computing in distributed systems with benign faults. *Distributed Comput.*, 22(1):49–71, 2009. doi:10.1007/S00446-009-0084-6.
- 6 Cinzia Di Giusto, Laetitia Laversa, and Etienne Lozes. On the k-synchronizability of systems. In *23rd International Conference on Foundations of Software Science and Computer Systems (FOSSACS 2020)*, volume 12077, pages 157–176. Springer, 2020.
- 7 Emanuele D’Osualdo, Jonathan Kochems, and C.-H. Luke Ong. Automatic verification of erlang-style concurrency. In Francesco Logozzo and Manuel Fähndrich, editors, *Static Analysis - 20th International Symposium, SAS 2013, Seattle, WA, USA, June 20-22, 2013. Proceedings*, volume 7935 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 454–476. Springer, 2013. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-38856-9_24.
- 8 Alain Finkel and Philippe Schnoebelen. Well-structured transition systems everywhere! *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 256(1-2):63–92, 2001. doi:10.1016/S0304-3975(00)00102-X.
- 9 Blaise Genest, Dietrich Kuske, and Anca Muscholl. On communicating automata with bounded channels. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 80(1-3):147–167, 2007.
- 10 Blaise Genest, Anca Muscholl, Helmut Seidl, and Marc Zeitoun. Infinite-state high-level mscs: Model-checking and realizability. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 72(4):617–647, 2006. doi:10.1016/J.JCSS.2005.09.007.
- 11 Cinzia Di Giusto, Laetitia Laversa, and Étienne Lozes. Guessing the buffer bound for k-synchronizability. *Int. J. Found. Comput. Sci.*, 34(8):1051–1076, 2023. doi:10.1142/S0129054122430018.
- 12 Loïc Hélouët and Pierre Le Maigat. Decomposition of message sequence charts. In Edell Sherratt, editor, *SAM 2000, 2nd Workshop on SDL and MSC, Col de Porte, Grenoble, France, June 26-28, 2000*, pages 47–60. Verimag, IRISA, SDL Forum, 2000.
- 13 Dietrich Kuske and Anca Muscholl. Communicating automata. In Jean-Éric Pin, editor, *Handbook of Automata Theory*, pages 1147–1188. European Mathematical Society Publishing House, Zürich, Switzerland, 2021. doi:10.4171/AUTOMATA-2/9.
- 14 Leslie Lamport. Time, clocks, and the ordering of events in a distributed system. *Commun. ACM*, 21(7):558–565, 1978.
- 15 Elaine Li, Felix Stutz, Thomas Wies, and Damien Zufferey. Complete multiparty session type projection with automata. In Constantin Enea and Akash Lal, editors, *Computer Aided Verification - 35th International Conference, CAV 2023, Paris, France, July 17-22, 2023, Proceedings, Part III*, volume 13966 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 350–373. Springer, 2023. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-37709-9_17.
- 16 Rupak Majumdar, Madhavan Mukund, Felix Stutz, and Damien Zufferey. Generalising projection in asynchronous multiparty session types. In Serge Haddad and Daniele Varacca, editors, *32nd International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2021, August 24-27, 2021, Virtual Conference*, volume 203 of *LIPICs*, pages 35:1–35:24. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.CONCUR.2021.35.

- 17 Felix Stutz. Asynchronous multiparty session type implementability is decidable - lessons learned from message sequence charts. In Karim Ali and Guido Salvaneschi, editors, *37th European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, ECOOP 2023, July 17-21, 2023, Seattle, Washington, United States*, volume 263 of *LIPICs*, pages 32:1–32:31. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ECOOP.2023.32.



A Proofs

Model-checking regular properties

► **Lemma 4.5.** *The question whether a given CFM is mailbox-similar is undecidable.*

Proof. We show a reduction from the configuration reachability problem for CFM with peer-to-peer semantics. This problem is well-known to be undecidable even when (a) there are only two processes and (b) the target configuration has empty buffers. Assume that we are given a CFM \mathcal{A} with two processes p and q and let (ℓ_p, ℓ_q) be a global state. We introduce a fresh message $\$$ and an additional process r that does only $r?q(\$)$. In addition, we modify the processes p and q as follows. From the local state ℓ_p , process p may choose to move to a new local state and then perform $p!r(\$)p?q(\$)p!q(\$)$. From the local state ℓ_q , the process q may choose to move to a new local state and then perform $q!p(\$)q?p(\$)q!r(\$)$. Let us call \mathcal{B} the resulting CFM with process r and modified processes p and q . We show that the configuration $((\ell_p, \ell_q), (\varepsilon, \varepsilon))$ is reachable in $\mathcal{T}_{\text{p2p}}(\mathcal{A})$ if, and only if, \mathcal{B} is not mailbox-similar.

Assume that u is the label of an initial execution of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{p2p}}(\mathcal{A})$ ending in $((\ell_p, \ell_q), (\varepsilon, \varepsilon))$. Consider the p2p-viable sequence $w = p!r(\$)q!p(\$)p?q(\$)p!q(\$)q?p(\$)q!r(\$)r?q(\$)$. The MSC of w is depicted in Figure 6. The sequence $v = uw$ is clearly a p2p-viable trace of \mathcal{B} . Observe that there is a $(\prec_{\text{hb}} \cup \prec_{\text{mb}})$ -cycle $p!r(\$) \prec_{\text{hb}} q!r(\$) \prec_{\text{mb}} p!r(\$)$ in $\text{msc}(v)$. Hence, $\text{msc}(v)$ is not mb-valid, which means that v is not mailbox-similar.


Conversely, assume that v is a trace of \mathcal{B} over p2p that is not mailbox-similar. Since v is p2p-viable but not mb-viable, the process r necessarily moves in v . This is because any p2p-viable sequence over two processes is also mb-viable. So r performs $r?q(\$)$ in v . This in turn entails that the projection of v on p ends with $p!r(\$)p?q(\$)p!q(\$)$ and that the projection of v on q ends with $q!p(\$)q?p(\$)q!r(\$)$. It follows that $((\ell_p, \ell_q, i_r), (\varepsilon, \dots, \varepsilon))$ is visited by an initial execution of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{p2p}}(\mathcal{B})$ whose label is equivalent to v . We derive that $((\ell_p, \ell_q), (\varepsilon, \varepsilon))$ is reachable in $\mathcal{T}_{\text{p2p}}(\mathcal{A})$. ◀

► **Lemma 4.7.** *For any receive action $r \in R$, we can construct an R -diamond automaton \mathcal{P}_r with $O(|\mathbb{P}|)$ states over the alphabet $(S \cup \bar{S} \cup R)$ such that for every mb-synchronous sequence u , it holds that ur is p2p-viable and not mailbox-similar iff \mathcal{P}_r accepts $\text{marked}(u)$.*


Proof. Consider a receive action $r = q?p(m)$. Let W_r denote the set of words $w \in \Sigma^*$ such that w contains exactly two positions $i < j$ tagged by \bullet , $w[i]$ is an unmatched send to q , $w[j]$ is $\overline{p!q(m)}$, and no $w[h]$ with $h < j$ is an unmatched send from p to q . It is easily seen that W_r is recognized by an R -diamond NFA \mathcal{W}_r with three states. Let \mathcal{E}_r denote the synchronous product of \mathcal{W}_r and the R -diamond automaton \mathcal{D} from Lemma 4.6. The desired automaton \mathcal{P}_r is obtained from \mathcal{E}_r by untagging it, that is, by replacing each tagged action $(a, t) \in \Sigma$ by a . As \mathcal{E}_r is R -diamond, so is \mathcal{P}_r . Let us show that \mathcal{P}_r satisfies the condition of the lemma. We assume, for the remainder of the proof, that v is an mb-synchronous sequence.

Suppose that $u = vq?p(m)$ is p2p-viable and not mailbox-similar. Let j denote the position in v of the send matching $q?p(m)$. Note that $v[j]$ is a send $p!q(m)$ that is unmatched in v . Since u is p2p-viable, no $v[h]$ with $h < j$ is an unmatched send from p to q . Moreover, by Lemma 5.14, there is a non-empty $(\prec_{\text{hb}} \cup \prec_{\text{mb}})$ -path from some $v[i]$ with $i < j$ to $v[j]$ such that $v[i]$ is an unmatched send to q . Let w denote the word $\text{marked}(v)$ tagged by \bullet at i and j and by \circ elsewhere. By construction, we have $w \in W_r$ and $w \in L(\mathcal{D})$, hence, $w \in L(\mathcal{E}_r)$. It follows that the untagged word $\text{marked}(v)$ is in $L(\mathcal{P}_r)$.

Conversely, if $\text{marked}(v) \in L(\mathcal{P}_r)$ then $\text{marked}(v)$ is obtained by untagging some w in $L(\mathcal{E}_r) = W_r \cap L(\mathcal{D})$. We derive from the definition of W_r and the property satisfied by \mathcal{D}



■ **Figure 6** Gadget to reduce reachability in peer-to-peer semantics to non-mailbox-similarity.



■ **Figure 7** Gadget for non-mb-synchronizability.

that there exist two positions $i < j$ in v such that, on the one hand, $v[i]$ is an **unmatched** send to q , $v[j]$ is $p!q(m)$, and no $v[h]$ with $h < j$ is an **unmatched** send from p to q , and on the other hand, there is a $(<_{hb} \cup <_{mb})$ -path from $v[i]$ to $v[j]$. It follows that $v \ q?p(m)$ is **p2p-viable** and, by Lemma 5.14, that $v \ q?p(m)$ is not **mailbox-similar**. ◀

► **Theorem 4.8.** *The question whether a given mb-synchronizable CFM is mailbox-similar is PSPACE-complete.*

Proof. For the upper bound, consider an **mb-synchronizable** CFM $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$. We observe that \mathcal{A} is not **mailbox-similar** iff there exists $r \in R$ and an **mb-synchronous** sequence u such that ur is a **trace** in $Tr_{p2p}(\mathcal{A})$ and ur is not **mailbox-similar**. The “if” direction is trivial, and the “only if” direction can be shown by taking a non-mailbox-similar **trace** in $Tr_{p2p}(\mathcal{A})$ of minimal length. As in the proofs of Lemma 3.5 and Theorem 4.3, let \mathcal{Q} denote the asynchronous product $\prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \bar{\mathcal{A}}_p$, where each $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_p$ is the LTS obtained from \mathcal{A}_p by adding a transition $\ell_p \xrightarrow{\bar{s}} \ell'_p$ for each transition $\ell_p \xrightarrow{s} \ell'_p$ with $s \in S$. Moreover, given $r \in R$, let us define the language Q_r as the right derivative $Q_r = \{w \in (S \cup \bar{S} \cup R)^* \mid wr \in L(\mathcal{Q})\}$. Note that \mathcal{Q} is **R-diamond**, so Q_r is **R-closed**. Let \mathcal{P}_r denote the **R-diamond** automaton obtained from Lemma 4.6, and let P_r denote its **R-closed** language $P_r = L(\mathcal{P}_r)$. It is routinely checked that \mathcal{A} is **mailbox-similar** iff for every $r \in R$, the set $\text{Sync}(Q_r \cap P_r)$, as defined in Lemma 4.2, is empty. To derive the PSPACE upper bound from this lemma, we provide, as **R-diamond** NFA for $Q_r \cap P_r$, the synchronous product of \mathcal{Q}_r and \mathcal{P}_r , where \mathcal{Q}_r is obtained from \mathcal{Q} by considering as final those **global states** g such that there is a transition $g \xrightarrow{r} g'$ in \mathcal{Q} . Note that \mathcal{Q}_r and \mathcal{P}_r can both be constructed on-the-fly in polynomial space. Now it suffices to check emptiness of the NFA for $\text{Sync}(Q_r \cap P_r)$ from Lemma 4.2.

The lower bound can be obtained as in the proof of Theorem 5.16 (see Figure 2), replacing the red part by some gadget that is not **mailbox-similar** (for instance, the gadget of Figure 6). ◀

Checking mb-synchronizability

► **Lemma 5.3.** *Let $u \in Act^*$ be a \mathcal{N} -viable sequence and $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$ the \mathcal{N} -communication graph of $\text{msc}(u)$. Then u is \mathcal{N} -atomic if and only if $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$ is strongly connected.*

Proof. For the left-to-right implication let us suppose that u is **\mathcal{N} -atomic**, but there is more than one strongly connected component (SCC for short) in $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$. Assume that the SCCs of $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$ are C_1, \dots, C_k , sorted in some topological order. First we claim that for every SCC C_i , the restriction $\mathcal{M}_i := \mathcal{M}|_{C_i}$ of $\text{msc}(u)$ to C_i is an **\mathcal{N} -valid msc**. First note that any two events that form a message in $\text{msc}(u)$ are in the same \mathcal{M}_i , for some i . As the **process**

order $<_{\mathbb{P}}$ of \mathcal{M}_i is inherited from $\text{msc}(u)$, and the network order $<_{\mathcal{N}}$ is constructed from the two other orders, \mathcal{M}_i is \mathcal{N} -valid. Consider for each i a linearization u_i of the partial order $(\leq_{\text{hb}} \cup <_{\mathcal{N}})^*$ of \mathcal{M}_i , and recall that each u_i is \mathcal{N} -viable. We claim now that $u_1 *_{\mathcal{N}} \dots *_{\mathcal{N}} u_k$ is defined. Otherwise there would be a **buffer** \mathbf{b} such that there is an **unmatched** send to \mathbf{b} in u_i and a **matched** send to \mathbf{b} in u_j , for some $i < j$. This would mean that there is an edge from C_j to C_i in $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$ (caused by $<_{\mathcal{N}}$), which contradicts the topological order. Since $u \equiv u_1 *_{\mathcal{N}} \dots *_{\mathcal{N}} u_k$, we obtain a contradiction to u being \mathcal{N} -atomic.

Now we show the right-to-left implication. We suppose that $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$ is strongly connected, but u is not \mathcal{N} -atomic. Then there exist v and w non-empty \mathcal{N} -viable sequences such that $u \equiv v *_{\mathcal{N}} w$. We then have that, in $\text{msc}(u)$, there is no msg-arc between events of v and w , and there is neither a $<_{\mathbb{P}}$ nor a $<_{\mathcal{N}}$ -arc from an event of w to an event of v . Therefore, in $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$ there is no path from any event of w to any event of v , so $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$ is not strongly connected. Contradiction. \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 5.6.** *Let u be an \mathcal{N} -viable sequence. Then there exist some \mathcal{N} -atomic non-empty sequences u_1, \dots, u_k such that $u \equiv u_1 *_{\mathcal{N}} \dots *_{\mathcal{N}} u_k$. Such a decomposition into \mathcal{N} -atomic non-empty sequences is unique up to the partial order $\preceq_{\mathcal{N}}^u$ of $\text{skel}(u)$.*

Proof. Let $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$ be the \mathcal{N} -communication graph of $\text{msc}(u)$. By Lemma 5.3 the SCCs C_1, \dots, C_k of $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$ induce \mathcal{N} -atomic subsequences u_1, \dots, u_k with $u \equiv u_1 *_{\mathcal{N}} \dots *_{\mathcal{N}} u_k$. Conversely, if $u \equiv u' *_{\mathcal{N}} v *_{\mathcal{N}} u''$, with v non-empty and \mathcal{N} -atomic, then v induces an SCC of $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$. This is due to Lemma 5.3, and to the fact that our product $*_{\mathcal{N}}$ prevents backward $<_{\mathcal{N}}$ -arcs in $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$ from v to u' , or from u'' to v . Note also that the partial order on the SCCs of $H_{\mathcal{N}}(u)$ is generated by $<_{\mathbb{P}}$ -arcs or $<_{\mathcal{N}}$ -arcs, which yields the second statement. \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 5.9.** *Let $u \in \text{Act}^*$ be an **mb-exchange** and $v = \text{ms}(u)$. If there is a path in the communication graph $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ between $v[i]$ and $v[j]$ then there is a **well-labeling** of $\text{ms}(u)$ starting at position i and ending at position j of size at most $|\mathbb{P}|^2 + |\mathbb{P}|$.*

Proof. To show this bound, we first bound the number of **indirect arcs**, and then show that between two **indirect arcs** we have a bounded number of positions.

Suppose that π is a minimal **well-labeling** starting in i , ending in j , and with more than $|\mathbb{P}|$ **indirect arcs** between consecutive positions. So there are at least two **indirect arcs** on π involving the same process. Let $k < k'$ be such that both $\pi[k], \pi[k+1]$ and $\pi[k'], \pi[k'+1]$ two indices are **indirect arcs** involving process p . So we know that $v[\pi(k+1)]$ and $v[\pi(k'+1)]$ are both of type $S_{\rightarrow p}$. Thus we also have an **indirect arc** from $v[\pi(k)]$ to $v[\pi(k'+1)]$. We could then shorten the size of the **well-labeling**, which contradicts the minimality of π .

Now let us suppose that we have a minimal **well-labeling** with at most $|\mathbb{P}|$ **indirect arcs** and of size larger than $|\mathbb{P}|^2 + |\mathbb{P}|$. This means there exist two indices $k < k'$ of π , such that $k' - k > |\mathbb{P}|$ and such that all arcs in $\pi[k], \dots, \pi[k']$ are **direct arcs**. In particular, $\pi[k] < \pi[k+1] < \dots < \pi[k']$. So we have at least two **direct arcs** $\pi[\ell_1], \pi[\ell_1+1]$ and $\pi[\ell_2], \pi[\ell_2+1]$ involving the same process p and such that $k \leq \ell_1 < \ell_2 \leq k'$. Each of the two **direct arcs** is of type **process order** or **mailbox order**. One can check that in all combinations there is a **direct arc** from $\pi[\ell_1]$ to $\pi[\ell_2]$, so we can obtain a smaller **well-labeling**, contradicting minimality. \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 5.11.** *Let $u = vr$ be an **mb-viable** sequence with $r \in R$. There exist **mb-atomic** non-empty sequences v_1, \dots, v_n and indices $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ such that (1) $v \equiv v_1 *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} v_n$, and (2) $u \equiv v_1 *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} v_{i-1} *_{\text{mb}} w *_{\text{mb}} v_{j+1} *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} v_n$ with $w = (v_i *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} v_j) r$ being **mb-atomic**.*

Proof. The proof follows by analyzing the additional edges of $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ compared to $H_{\text{mb}}(v)$. Let q be the process doing r . The graph $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ is obtained from $H_{\text{mb}}(v)$ by adding the double edge between r and its matching send s , as well as edges from s to all **unmatched** sends s' to process r . Each SCC of $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ is either an SCC of $H_{\text{mb}}(v)$, or a union of SCCs of $H_{\text{mb}}(v)$ and contains s, r . If two SCCs of $H_{\text{mb}}(v)$ are included in the same SCC C of $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ and are ordered in $H_{\text{mb}}(v)$, then every SCC between them is also included in C as well. ◀

► **Lemma 5.12.** *Let $u = vr$ be an **mb-viable** sequence with $r \in R$, such that v is not **mb-atomic**. We denote by s the send event **matched** with r in u , and by q the process of r . Then u is **mb-atomic** iff for every decomposition $v \equiv v_1 *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} v_n$ with v_i **mb-atomic** for all i :*

- (1) v_1 contains s or some **unmatched** send to process q , and
- (2) v_n contains s or some action performed by process q .

Proof. First recall from Lemma 5.6 that the decomposition $v \equiv v_1 *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} v_n$ is unique, up to permuting adjacent factors that are unordered w.r.t. \preceq_{mb}^v . By removing r from u , we remove some arcs from the **communication graph** $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ of u , namely the double arc between s and r , and the arcs from s to every **unmatched** send to q .

For the left-to-right implication we assume that u is **mb-atomic**, or equivalently, $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ is strongly connected by Lemma 5.3. For the first point, if v_1 has neither s nor an **unmatched** send to q , then there would be no back arc from $v_2 \dots v_n r$ to v_1 in $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$. Hence $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ would not be strongly connected. For the second point, if v_n does not contain s , nor any action on q , then it could be reordered after r in u , and there would be no back arc from v_n to $v_1 \dots v_{n-1} r$. Again, $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ would not be strongly connected. In both cases we get a contradiction.

For the right-to-left implication let ℓ be such that v_ℓ contains s . By the first condition, every \preceq_{mb}^v -minimal v_i is such that in $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ there is either a back arc from v_ℓ to v_i , or from r to v_i (if $i = \ell$). By the second condition, every \preceq_{mb}^v -maximal v_i has a forward arc to r in $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$. Since there is also a back arc from r to v_ℓ and since every v_i by itself has a strongly connected **communication graph**, we get that $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$ is strongly connected, so u is **mb-atomic**. ◀

► **Lemma 5.13.** *Let $u = vr$ be **mb-viable** with $r \in R$ and v is **mb-synchronizable**. Let also s be the send matching r in u , and q the process doing r . Then u is not **mb-synchronizable** iff there exist $(v_i)_{i=1}^n$ with $v \equiv v_1 * \dots * v_n$, indices $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq n$, and $p \in \mathbb{P}$ s.t.:*

1. Each v_i is **mb-atomic**.
2. For every $1 \leq j < k$ we have $i_j \prec_{\text{mb}}^v i_{j+1}$.
3. v_{i_1} contains s or some **unmatched** send to process q ; v_{i_k} contains s or some action performed by process q .
4. There exists $1 \leq m < k$ such that v_{i_m} contains a receive by p and $v_{i_{m+1}}$ a send by p .

Proof. First the left-to-right direction. By assumption, $u = vr$ with u not **mb-synchronizable** and v is **mb-synchronizable**.

By Lemma 5.11 we can assume w.l.o.g. that $v \equiv v_1 *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} v_n$ and $u \equiv v_1 *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} v_{i-1} *_{\text{mb}} w *_{\text{mb}} v_{j+1} *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} v_n$, with $w = (v_i *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} v_j) r$ being **mb-atomic** (and containing also s).

Since u is not **mb-synchronizable**, we have that w is not an **mb-exchange** (since each v_k is **mb-exchange**). We have $w = (v_i *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} v_j) r$, so there exist some $i \leq \ell < \ell' \leq j$ such that v_ℓ contains some receive by some process p , and $v_{\ell'}$ some send by p .

We can assume w.l.o.g. that $i \preceq_{\text{mb}}^w \ell$ and $\ell' \preceq_{\text{mb}}^w j$ in $\text{skel}(w)$. Note also that $\ell \prec_{\text{mb}}^w \ell'$ because $v_\ell, v_{\ell'}$ both contain actions of p . So we get a subsequence of indices $i = i_1 < \dots <$

$i_k = j$ satisfying items (2) and (5) of the statement. Item (3) follows from Lemma 5.12 applied to w .

The right-to-left direction is easily checked: because of items (1)-(4) all events of the sequences v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_k} are in the same SCC of $H_{\text{mb}}(u)$. Item (5) says that this SCC cannot be part of an **mb-exchange**. ◀

► **Lemma 5.14.** *Let $u = vr$ be a **p2p-viable** sequence with $r \in R$ and v **mb-viable**. Let q be the process performing r . Then u is equivalent to an **mb-viable** sequence if and only if there is no non-empty $(\prec_{\text{hb}} \cup \prec_{\text{mb}})$ -path from $v[i]$ to $v[j]$ for some $i < j$ such that $v[i]$ is an **unmatched** send to q and $v[j]$ is the send matching r in u .*

Proof. First, we observe that every arc present in $\text{msc}(v)$ is also present in $\text{msc}(u)$. For the left-to-right direction, assume that there is some $(\prec_{\text{hb}} \cup \prec_{\text{mb}})$ -path from $v[i]$ to $v[j]$ for i, j as in the statement. Since $v[j]$ becomes **matched** in u we have an \prec_{mb} -arc from (the event corresponding to) $v[j]$ to (the event corresponding to) $v[i]$, so this creates a cycle for the relation $(\prec_{\text{hb}} \cup \prec_{\text{mb}})$ in $\text{msc}(u)$, hence u is not **mb-viable** by Remark 2.11.

For the right-to-left direction, if u is not **mb-viable**, then $\text{msc}(u)$ contains a $(\prec_{\text{hb}} \cup \prec_{\text{mb}})$ -cycle. The only arcs we added by doing r are \prec_{mb} -arcs from $v[j]$ to every $v[i]$ corresponding to an **unmatched** send to q , and the message arc from $v[j]$ to r . The cycle can arise only if we have a $(\prec_{\text{hb}} \cup \prec_{\text{mb}})$ -path from some $v[i]$ to $v[j]$ with $i < j$ and such that $v[i]$ is an **unmatched** send to q . ◀

► **Lemma 5.15.** *One can construct an automaton \mathcal{D} with $O(|\mathbb{P}|)$ states over the alphabet $(S \cup \bar{S}) \times \{\circ, \bullet\} \cup \{\#\}$ with the following properties:*

1. \mathcal{D} accepts only words from $(\Sigma^* \#)^*$ containing exactly two positions in $(S \cup \bar{S}) \times \{\bullet\}$.
2. For every $u = u_1 *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} u_n$ **mb-viable**, with each u_i an **exchange**, \mathcal{D} accepts tagged $v = \text{ms}(u_1)\# \dots \#\text{ms}(u_n)$ iff, there is a $(\prec_{\text{hb}} \cup \prec_{\text{mb}})$ -path from $u[i]$ to $u[j]$, where $i < j$ are the positions of u corresponding to the positions tagged by \bullet in v .

Proof. As we work on **ms-sequences** and not on **marked** sequences as in Lemma 4.6, we need to add $\#$ at the end of our **exchanges**. We will let the automaton guess when an **exchange** ends. Sometimes it is trivial, as it just needs to see a receive action. However, if no **matched** send had been seen since the last $\#$, the automaton can split each **unmatched** send in its own **exchange**, or group them together. In the end the automata will read $\text{ms}(u_1)\# \dots \#\text{ms}(u_n)$ for the partition $u_1 *_{\text{mb}} \dots *_{\text{mb}} u_n$ it has guessed.

We then change the third rule from Lemma 4.6, so that the automaton goes from (msg, S, p) to (msg, R, p) when reading a $\#$. ◀

B Detailed construction for automata for Lemma 5.10

In both cases, we construct the automaton as follows. The states are lists of bounded length consisting of pairs of sends (**marked** or not) and *timestamps*, and representing **well-labelings**. The initial state is the empty list. When an element of the **ms-sequence** is read, the automaton can non-deterministically choose to add it somewhere in the list, recording when it was added (i.e., how many elements were added before it). The final states are those in which the list with the order of insertions corresponds to a **well-labeling** of the **ms-sequence**. We can slightly modify this automaton to obtain \mathcal{B}_p and \mathcal{B}_{all} , resp. Below, if the first or last action on some process is a receive, then we add its matching send to the list.

- For \mathcal{B}_p the lists are of length at most $|\mathbb{P}|^2 + |\mathbb{P}|$ (by Lemma 5.9). The final states should also require that the first element of the list is the last action of p and the last element of the list is the first action of p .
- For \mathcal{B}_{all} the lists are of length at most $|\mathbb{P}| \cdot (|\mathbb{P}|^2 + |\mathbb{P}|)$. This is obtained using once more Lemma 5.9, after fixing one action per active process. We require from the final states that for every active process p the list contains some action that witnesses it. In addition, it is required that the first and the last entry of the list are on the same process.

One can see that it is not necessary to store the content of the message when constructing the [well-labelings](#). So by taking the product of these automata, we obtain an automaton with $|\mathbb{P}|^{O(|\mathbb{P}|^3)}$ states.

