

A Minimal Formulation of Session Types

Alen Arslanagić¹, Jorge A. Pérez¹, and Dan Frumin¹

¹University of Groningen, The Netherlands

January 16, 2023

Abstract

Session types are a type-based approach to the verification of message-passing programs. They specify communication structures essential for program correctness; a session type says what and when should be exchanged through a channel. Central to session-typed languages are *sequencing* constructs in types and processes that explicitly specify the order of actions in a protocol.

In this paper we study session types without sequencing. The resulting framework of *minimal* session types is arguably the simplest form of session types one could conceive. In the context of a core process calculus with sessions and higher-order concurrency (abstraction-passing), we establish two main technical results. First, we prove that every process P typable with standard session types can be compiled down into a process $\mathcal{D}(P)$ typable with minimal session types. Second, we prove that P and $\mathcal{D}(P)$ are behaviorally equivalent. These results indicate that having sequencing constructs in processes and session types is convenient but *redundant*: only sequentiality in processes is truly indispensable, as it can correctly codify sequentiality in types.

Our developments draw inspiration from work by Parrow on behavior-preserving decompositions of untyped processes. By casting Parrow’s results in the realm of typed processes, our developments reveal a conceptually simple formulation of session types and a principled avenue to the integration of session types into programming languages without sequencing in types.

1 Introduction

Session types are a type-based approach to the verification of message-passing programs. A session type specifies what and when should be exchanged through a channel. This makes session types a useful tool to enforce safety and liveness properties related to communication correctness. Originated in the realm of concurrency theory, session types have had a significant impact on the foundations of programming languages [14], but also on their practice [1]. Our goal in this work is to understand to what extent session types can admit simpler, more fundamental formulations. This foundational question has concrete practical ramifications, as we discuss next.

In session-typed languages, *sequencing* constructs in types and processes specify the intended structure of message-passing protocols. For example, in the session type $S = ?(\text{int}); ?(\text{int}); !\langle \text{bool} \rangle; \text{end}$, sequencing (denoted ‘;’) allows us to specify a protocol for a channel that *first* receives (?) two integers, *then* sends (!) a boolean, and *finally* ends. As such, S could type a service that checks for integer equality. Sequencing in types goes hand-in-hand with sequencing in processes, which is specified using prefix constructs (denoted ‘.’). The π -calculus process $P = s?(x_1).s?(x_2).s!\langle x_1 = x_2 \rangle.\mathbf{0}$ is an implementation of the equality service: it *first* expects two values on name s , *then* outputs a boolean on s , and *finally* stops. Thus, name s in P conforms to the session type S . Session types can also specify sequencing within labeled choices and recursion; these typed constructs are also in close match with their respective process expressions.

Session types have been originally developed as a typing discipline for π -calculus for the analysis of message-passing protocols between exactly two parties [12]. Since then session types have been extended in many directions. We find, for instance, multiparty session types [13], and extensions




Figure 1: The process decomposition, illustrated. Arrows in magenta indicate synchronizations orchestrated by the decomposition $\mathcal{D}(P)$.

with dependent types, assertions, exceptions, and time (cf. [8, 14] for surveys). All these extensions seek to address natural research questions on the expressivity and applicability of session types theories.

Here we address a different, if opposite, question: *is there a minimal formulation of session types?* This is an appealing question from a theoretical perspective, but seems particularly relevant to the practice of session types: identifying the “core” of session types could enable their integration in languages whose type systems do not have certain advanced constructs present in session types, such as sequencing. For instance, the Go programming language offers primitive support for message-passing concurrency; it comes with a static verification mechanism which can only enforce that messages exchanged along channels correspond with their declared payload types—it cannot ensure essential correctness properties associated with the ordering of messages and the structure of the protocols. This observation has motivated the development of advanced static verification tools based on session types for Go programs; see, e.g., [20, 19].

This paper identifies and studies the properties of an elementary formulation of session types, which we call *minimal session types*. Minimal session types are session types without sequencing. That is, in session types such as $!\langle U \rangle; S$ and $?(U); S$, we stipulate that S can only correspond to end, the type of the terminated protocol.

Adopting minimal session types entails dispensing with sequencing, which is arguably the most distinctive feature of session types. While this may appear as a far too drastic restriction, it turns out that it is not: we show that for every process P typable under standard (non minimal) session types, there is a *decomposition* of P , denoted $\mathcal{D}(P)$, a process that codifies the sequencing information given by the session types (protocols) of P using additional synchronizations, extracted from its protocols. Figure 1 illustrates the key idea of the decomposition using the process P and session type S motivated above. Because P contains three actions in sequence (as stipulated by S), its decomposition $\mathcal{D}(P)$ consists of three processes in parallel—each of them implementing one action of P —as well as of mechanisms for orchestrating these parallel processes: the synchronizations on names c_2, \dots, c_5 ensure that the sequencing in P is preserved and that received names are properly propagated. These three parallel processes are typable with minimal session types (in the figure, they are given below each process), which are obtained by suitably “slicing” S .

Our main finding is that $\mathcal{D}(P)$ satisfies two important properties: first, it is well-typed using minimal session types (*static correctness*); second, it is behaviorally equivalent to P (*dynamic correctness*). These properties ensure that having sequencing in both types and processes is convenient but *redundant*: only sequencing at the level of processes is truly indispensable.

The definition of $\mathcal{D}(P)$ is interesting on its own, as it draws inspiration from a known result by Parrow [21], who showed that any *untyped* π -calculus process can be decomposed as a collection of *trio processes*, i.e., processes with at most three nested prefixes [21].

The question of how to relate session types with other type systems has attracted interest in the past. Session types have been encoded into, for instance, generic types [9] and linear types [7, 5, 6]. As such, these prior studies concern the *relative expressiveness* of session types, where the expressivity of session types stands with respect to that of some other type system. In sharp contrast, we study the *absolute expressiveness* of session types: how session types can be explained in terms of themselves. To our knowledge, this is the first study of its kind.

Session types have been developed on top of different process languages (mainly, dialects of the π -calculus), and so choosing the target language for minimal session types is an important decision in our developments. In this paper, our target language is **HO**, the core process calculus for session-based concurrency studied by Kouzapas et al. [17, 18]. **HO** is a very small language, which only supports passing of abstractions (i.e., functions from names to processes) and lacks name-passing and recursion. Nonetheless, **HO** is very expressive, because both features can be encoded in **HO** in a fully abstract way. Moreover, **HO** has a well-developed theory of behavioral equivalences [18]. The combination of minimal number of features and expressivity makes **HO** an excellent candidate for studying a minimal formulation of session types. Indeed, as we will see, several aspects of our decomposition take advantage of the higher-order nature of **HO**. Being a higher-order language, **HO** is very different from the (untyped, first-order) π -calculus considered by Parrow [21]. Therefore, our technical results arise in a context very different from Parrow’s.

Contributions & Outline. In summary, in this paper we present the following contributions:

1. We identify the class of *minimal session types* (MST) as a simple fragment of standard session types for **HO** without sequencing that retains its absolute expressiveness (Definition 3.1).
2. We show how to decompose standard session types into minimal session types, and how to decompose processes typable with standard session types into processes typable with minimal session types. This is a result of static correctness (Theorem 3.1).
3. We show that the decomposition of a process is behaviorally equivalent to the original process. This is a result of *dynamic correctness*, formalized in terms of *MST bisimulations*, a typed behavioral equivalence that we introduce here (Theorem 4.1).
4. We develop optimizations and extensions of our decomposition that bear witness to its robustness.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall the preliminaries on the session type system for **HO**, which is the core process calculus for session-based concurrency on which we base our developments. In Section 3 we present *minimal session types*, and the decomposition of well-typed **HO** processes into minimal session types processes, accompanied by explanations and examples. In Section 4 we show the correctness of the decomposition, by establishing an *MST bisimulation* between an **HO** process and its decomposition. In Section 5 we examine two optimizations of the decomposition that are enabled by the higher-order nature of our setting. In Section 6 we discuss extensions of our approach to consider constructs for branching and selection. Finally, in Section 7 we elaborate further on related work and in Section 8 we present some closing remarks. The appendix contains omitted definitions and proofs.

Differences with the conference version. An earlier version of this paper was presented at ECOOP 2019 [3]. The current paper revises the conference version, includes further examples, and incorporates a major addition: Section 4 on dynamic correctness, including the notion of an MST bisimulation and the constructed bisimulation relation, is completely new to this presentation.

Colors. Throughout the paper we use different colors (such as pink and green) to improve readability. However, the usage of colors is not indispensable, and the paper can be followed in black-and-white.

2 The Source Language

We start by recalling the syntax, semantics, and type system for HO, the higher-order process calculus for session-based concurrency studied by Kouzapas et al. [17, 18]. Our presentation of HO follows the aforementioned papers, which concern definitions and results for HO π , the super-calculus of HO with name-passing, abstraction-passing, and recursion.

HO is arguably the simplest language for session types: it supports passing of abstractions (functions from names to processes) but does not support name-passing nor process recursion. Still, HO is very expressive: it can encode name-passing, recursion, and polyadic communication via type-preserving encodings that are fully-abstract with respect to contextual equivalence [17].

2.1 Syntax and Semantics

Definition 2.1 (HO processes). The syntax of names, variables, values, and HO processes is defined as follows:

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

We use a, b, c, \dots to range over *shared names*, and s, \bar{s}, \dots to range over *session names*. Shared names are used for unrestricted, non-deterministic interactions; session names are used for linear, deterministic interactions. We write n, m to denote session or shared names, and assume that the sets of session and shared names are disjoint. The *dual* of a name n is denoted \bar{n} ; we define $\bar{\bar{s}} = s$ and $\bar{\bar{a}} = a$, i.e., duality is only relevant for session names. Variables are denoted with x, y, z, \dots . An abstraction $\lambda x. P$ is a process P with parameter x . *Values* V, W, \dots include variables and abstractions, but not names.

Process $V u$ is the application which substitutes name u on abstraction V . Constructs for inaction $\mathbf{0}$, parallel composition $P_1 \mid P_2$, and name restriction $(\nu n) P$ are standard. HO lacks name-passing and recursion, but they are expressible in the language (see Example 2.1 below).

To enhance readability, we often omit trailing $\mathbf{0}$'s, so we write, e.g., $u!\langle V \rangle$ instead of $u!\langle V \rangle. \mathbf{0}$. Also, we write $u!\langle \rangle. P$ and $u?(x). P$ whenever the exchanged value is not relevant (cf. Remark 3.2).

Restriction for shared names $(\nu a) P$ is as usual; session name restriction $(\nu s) P$ simultaneously binds session names s and \bar{s} in P . Functions $\mathbf{fv}(P)$, $\mathbf{fn}(P)$, and $\mathbf{fs}(P)$ denote, respectively, the sets of free variables, names, and session names in P , and are defined as expected. If $\mathbf{fv}(P) = \emptyset$, we call P *closed*. We write $P\{u/y\}$ (resp., $P\{V/y\}$) for the capture-avoiding substitution of name u (resp., value V) for y in process P . We identify processes up to consistent renaming of bound names, writing \equiv_α for this congruence. We shall rely on Barendregt's variable convention, under which free and bound names are different in every mathematical context.

The operational semantics of HO is defined in terms of a *reduction relation*, denoted \longrightarrow . Reduction is closed under *structural congruence*, denoted \equiv , which is defined as the smallest congruence on processes such that:

$$\begin{aligned} P \mid \mathbf{0} &\equiv P & P_1 \mid P_2 &\equiv P_2 \mid P_1 & P_1 \mid (P_2 \mid P_3) &\equiv (P_1 \mid P_2) \mid P_3 & (\nu n) \mathbf{0} &\equiv \mathbf{0} \\ P \mid (\nu n) Q &\equiv (\nu n) (P \mid Q) & (n \notin \mathbf{fn}(P)) & & P &\equiv Q & \text{if } P &\equiv_\alpha Q \end{aligned}$$

We assume the expected extension of \equiv to values V . The reduction relation expresses the behavior

$$\begin{aligned}
t!\langle \ulcorner \tilde{u} \urcorner \rangle . P &\triangleq t!\langle \lambda z. z?(x).(x \tilde{u}) \rangle . P \\
t?\langle \ulcorner \tilde{x} \urcorner \rangle . Q &\triangleq t?(y).((\nu z)(y z \mid z!\langle \lambda \tilde{x}. Q \rangle)) \\
\ulcorner \tilde{S} \urcorner &\triangleq (?(\llbracket \tilde{S} \rrbracket \multimap \diamond); \text{end}) \multimap \diamond \\
\ulcorner \tilde{S} \urcorner &\triangleq (?(\langle \llbracket \tilde{S} \rrbracket \rangle \multimap \diamond); \text{end}) \multimap \diamond \\
\ulcorner \tilde{C} \multimap \diamond \urcorner &\triangleq \llbracket \tilde{C} \rrbracket \multimap \diamond \\
\ulcorner \tilde{C} \rightarrow \diamond \urcorner &\triangleq \llbracket \tilde{C} \rrbracket \rightarrow \diamond \\
\llbracket !\langle U \rangle; S \rrbracket &\triangleq !\langle \ulcorner U \urcorner \rangle; \llbracket S \rrbracket \\
\llbracket ?\langle U \rangle; S \rrbracket &\triangleq ?(\ulcorner U \urcorner); \llbracket S \rrbracket \\
\llbracket C_1, \dots, C_n \rrbracket &\triangleq \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket C_n \rrbracket
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 2: Encoding name passing in HO

of processes; it is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\lambda x. P) u &\longrightarrow P\{u/x\} && \text{[App]} \\
n!\langle V \rangle . P \mid \bar{n}?(x). Q &\longrightarrow P \mid Q\{V/x\} && \text{[Pass]} \\
P \longrightarrow P' &\Rightarrow (\nu n) P \longrightarrow (\nu n) P' && \text{[Res]} \\
P \longrightarrow P' &\Rightarrow P \mid Q \longrightarrow P' \mid Q && \text{[Par]} \\
P \equiv Q &\longrightarrow Q' \equiv P' \Rightarrow P \longrightarrow P' && \text{[Cong]}
\end{aligned}$$

Rule [App] defines name application (β -reduction). Rule [Pass] defines a shared or session interaction, depending on the nature of n . Other rules are standard π -calculus rules. We write \longrightarrow^k for a k -step reduction, and \longrightarrow^* for the reflexive, transitive closure of \longrightarrow .

We illustrate HO processes and their semantics by means of an example.

Example 2.1 (Encoding Name-Passing). The HO calculus lacks the name-passing primitives of HO π . Hence, it cannot express reductions of the form

$$n!\langle m \rangle . P \mid \bar{n}?(x). Q \longrightarrow P \mid Q\{m/x\} \quad (1)$$

Fortunately, name-passing can be encoded in HO in a fully-abstract way: as shown in [17], one can use abstraction passing to “pack” a name. To this end, Figure 2 defines the required syntactic sugar, at the level of processes and types. Then, the reduction (1) can be mimicked as

$$\begin{aligned}
n!\langle \ulcorner m \urcorner \rangle . P \mid \bar{n}?\langle \ulcorner x \urcorner \rangle . Q &= n!\langle \lambda z. z?(x).(x m) \rangle . P \mid \bar{n}?(y).(\nu s)(y s \mid \bar{s}!\langle \lambda x. Q \rangle) \\
&\longrightarrow P \mid (\nu s)(\lambda z. z?(x).(x m) s \mid \bar{s}!\langle \lambda x. Q \rangle) \\
&\longrightarrow P \mid (\nu s)(s?(x).(x m) \mid \bar{s}!\langle \lambda x. Q \rangle) \\
&\longrightarrow P \mid (\lambda x. Q) m \\
&\longrightarrow P \mid Q\{m/x\}
\end{aligned}$$

◁

Remark 2.1 (Polyadic Communication). HO as presented above allows only for *monadic communication*, i.e., the exchange of tuples of values with length 1. We will find it convenient to use HO with *polyadic communication*, i.e., the exchange of tuples of values $\tilde{V} = (V_1, \dots, V_k)$, with length $|\tilde{V}| = k$. We will use similar notation for tuples of names and variables, and we will use ϵ to denote the empty tuple.

In HO, polyadicity appears in session synchronizations and applications, but not in synchronizations on shared names. This entails having the following reduction rules:

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda \tilde{x}. P) \tilde{u} &\longrightarrow P\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\} \\ s!\langle \tilde{V} \rangle . P \mid \bar{s}?(x). Q &\longrightarrow P \mid Q\{\tilde{V}/x\} \end{aligned}$$

where the simultaneous substitutions $P\{\tilde{u}/\tilde{x}\}$ and $P\{\tilde{V}/x\}$ are as expected. This polyadic HO can be readily encoded into (monadic) HO [18]; for this reason, by a slight abuse of notation we will often write HO when we actually mean “polyadic HO”.

We discuss two simple examples that illustrate how HO can implement mechanisms resembling servers and forms of partial instantiation; these mechanisms shall come in handy later, when defining the process decomposition in Section 3.

Example 2.2 (A Server of a Kind). Let S_a denote the process $a?(x).(x r)$, which receives an abstraction on the shared name a and then applies it to r . Consider the following process composition:

$$\begin{aligned} P &= (\nu r) (\nu a) (a!\langle V \rangle . \mathbf{0} \mid a!\langle W \rangle . \mathbf{0} \mid S_a \mid \bar{r}?(x_1). \bar{r}?(x_2). Q) \\ V &= \lambda y. (y!\langle V' \rangle . S_a\{y/r\}) \\ W &= \lambda z. (z!\langle W' \rangle . S_a\{z/r\}) \end{aligned}$$

where V' and W' are some unspecified shared values. In P , process S_a operates as a server that provides r upon an invocation on a . Dually, the outputs on a are requests to this server. One possible reduction sequence for P is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} P &\longrightarrow (\nu r) (\nu a) (a!\langle W \rangle . \mathbf{0} \mid V r \mid \bar{r}?(x_1). \bar{r}?(x_2). Q) \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu r) (\nu a) (a!\langle W \rangle . \mathbf{0} \mid r!\langle V' \rangle . S_a \mid \bar{r}?(x_1). \bar{r}?(x_2). Q) \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu r) (\nu a) (a!\langle W \rangle . \mathbf{0} \mid S_a \mid \bar{r}?(x_2). Q\{V'/x_1\}) = P' \end{aligned}$$

In this reduction sequence, the value V in the first request is instantiated with the name r by consuming a copy of S_a available in P . However, a copy of the server S_a is restored through the value V , after an communication on r . This way, in P' the exchange of W' on r can take place:

$$P' \longrightarrow^* (\nu r) (\nu a) (S_a \mid Q\{V'/x_1\}\{W'/x_2\})$$

Example 2.3 (Partial Instantiation). Let S_a and S_b be servers as defined in the previous example:

$$S_a = a?(x).(x r) \quad S_b = b?(x).(x v)$$

Further, let R be a process in which requests to S_a and S_b are nested within abstractions:

$$R = a!\langle \lambda y. b!\langle \lambda z. V(y, z) \rangle \rangle$$

Notice how the polyadic application ‘ $V(y, z)$ ’ is enclosed in the innermost abstraction. Now consider the following composition:

$$P = (\nu a, b) R \mid S_a \mid S_b$$

The structure of R induces a form of partial instantiation for y, z , implemented by combining synchronizations and β -reductions. To see this, let us inspect one possible reduction chain for P :

$$\begin{aligned} P &\longrightarrow (\nu b) (\lambda y. b!\langle \lambda z. V(y, z) \rangle r) \mid S_b \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu b) b!\langle \lambda z. V(r, z) \rangle \mid S_b = P' \end{aligned}$$

The first request of R , aimed to obtain name r , is realized by the first reduction, i.e., the communication with S_a on name a : the result is the application of the top-level abstraction to r . Subsequently, the application step substitutes y with r . Hence, in P' , names in the nested application are only *partially instantiated*: at this point, we have ‘ $V(r, z)$ ’.

Process P' can then execute the same steps to instantiate z with name v by interacting with S_b . After two reductions, we obtain the fully instantiated application $V(r, v)$:

$$P' \longrightarrow \lambda z. V(r, z) v \longrightarrow V(r, v)$$

2.2 Session Types for HO

We give essential definitions and properties for the session type system for HO, following [18].

Definition 2.2 (Session Types for HO). Let us write \diamond to denote the process type. The syntax of value types U , channel types C , and session types S for HO is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} U &::= C \rightarrow \diamond \mid C \multimap \diamond & C &::= S \mid \langle U \rangle \\ S &::= !\langle U \rangle; S \mid ?(U); S \mid \mu t. S \mid \mathbf{t} \mid \mathbf{end} \end{aligned}$$

As we have seen, HO only admits the exchange of abstractions; accordingly, value types include $C \rightarrow \diamond$ and $C \multimap \diamond$, which denote *shared* and *linear* higher-order types, respectively. Channel types include session types and the shared types $\langle U \rangle$.

Session types follow the standard binary session type syntax [12], in which sequencing specifies communication structures. This way, the *output type* $!\langle U \rangle; S$ describes a session in which first a value of type U is sent, and then the session proceeds as S . Dually, the *input type* $?(U); S$ describes a session in which first a value of type U is received, and then the session proceeds as S . In examples, we often assume basic types (such as `int`, `bool`, `str`) are exchanged in communications. Session types also include *recursive types* $\mu t. S$, in which the variable t is assumed to occur guarded in S , i.e., types such as $\mu t. t$ are not allowed. In most cases, recursive types will be *tail-recursive*, although instances of *non-tail-recursive* session types will also be relevant (cf. Example 3.3). Finally, type `end` is the type of the terminated protocol.

Notation 2.1. As mentioned in the introduction, we shall study session types in which the continuation S in $!\langle U \rangle; S$ and $?(U); S$ is always `end`. Given this, we may sometimes omit trailing `end`'s and write $!\langle U \rangle$ and $?(U)$ rather than $!\langle U \rangle; \mathbf{end}$ and $?(U); \mathbf{end}$, respectively.

In theories of session types *duality* is a key notion: implementations derived from dual session types will respect their protocols at run-time, avoiding communication errors. Intuitively, duality is obtained by exchanging $!$ by $?$ (and vice versa), including the fixed point construction. We write S dual T if session types S and T are dual according to this intuition; the formal definition is coinductive, and given in [18] (see also [10]).

We consider shared, linear, and session *environments*, denoted Γ , Λ , and Δ , resp.:

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

Γ maps variables and shared names to value types; Λ maps variables to linear higher-order types. Δ maps session names to session types. While Γ admits weakening, contraction, and exchange principles, both Λ and Δ are only subject to exchange. The domains of Γ , Λ , and Δ are assumed pairwise distinct. We write $\Delta_1 \cdot \Delta_2$ to denote the disjoint union of Δ_1 and Δ_2 .

We write $\Gamma \setminus x$ to denote the environment obtained from Γ by removing the assignment $x : C \rightarrow \diamond$, for some C . Notations $\Delta \setminus u$ and $\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}$ are defined similarly and have the expected readings. With a slight abuse of notation, given a tuple of variables \tilde{x} , we sometimes write $(\Gamma, \Delta)(\tilde{x})$ to denote the tuple of types assigned to the variables in \tilde{x} by the environments Γ and Δ .

The typing judgements for values V and processes P are denoted

$$\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash V \triangleright U \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$$

Figure 3 shows the typing rules; we briefly describe them and refer the reader to [18] for a full account. The shared type $C \rightarrow \diamond$ is derived using Rule (PROM) only if the value has a linear type with an empty linear environment. Rule (EPROM) allows us to freely use a shared type variable as linear. Abstraction values are typed with Rule (ABS). Application typing is governed by Rule (APP): the type C of an application name u must match the type of the application variable x ($C \multimap \diamond$ or

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

Figure 3: Typing Rules for HO.

$C \rightarrow \diamond$). Rules (REQ) and (ACC) type interaction along shared names; the type of the sent/received object V (i.e., U) should match the type of the subject s ($\langle U \rangle$). In Rule (SEND), the type U of the value V should appear as a prefix in the session type $! \langle U \rangle; S$ of u . Rule (RCV) is its dual.

To state type soundness, we require two auxiliary definitions on session environments. First, a session environment Δ is *balanced* (written $\text{balanced}(\Delta)$) if whenever $s : S_1, \bar{s} : S_2 \in \Delta$ then $S_1 \text{ dual } S_2$. Second, we define the reduction relation \longrightarrow on session environments as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta, s :! \langle U \rangle; S_1, \bar{s} :? \langle U \rangle; S_2 &\longrightarrow \Delta, s : S_1, \bar{s} : S_2 \\ \Delta, s : \oplus \{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}, \bar{s} : \&\{l_i : S'_i\}_{i \in I} &\longrightarrow \Delta, s : S_k, \bar{s} : S'_k \quad (k \in I) \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2.1 (Type Soundness [18]). Suppose $\Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ with $\text{balanced}(\Delta)$. Then $P \longrightarrow P'$ implies $\Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta' \vdash P' \triangleright \diamond$ and $\Delta = \Delta'$ or $\Delta \longrightarrow \Delta'$ with $\text{balanced}(\Delta')$.

Remark 2.2 (Typed Polyadic Communication). When using processes with polyadic communication (cf. Remark 2.1), we shall assume the extension of the type system defined in [18].

Example 2.4 (Typing name-passing constructs). In Example 2.1 we recalled how to encode name-passing constructs in HO; now we show that this translation is typed. Following the name-passing encoding from [17] we define a syntactic sugar for types. The following typing rules for name-passing are derivable:

$$\text{(SENDN)} \frac{\Gamma; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash \tilde{b} \triangleright \tilde{C}}{\Gamma; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2; \Delta_1, \Delta_2, t : !(\ulcorner \tilde{C} \urcorner); \text{end} \vdash t!(\ulcorner \tilde{b} \urcorner).P \triangleright \diamond}$$

$$\text{(RCVN)} \frac{\Gamma; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash \tilde{x} \triangleright \tilde{C}}{\Gamma \setminus x; \Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2; \Delta_1 \setminus \Delta_2, t : ?(\ulcorner \tilde{C} \urcorner); \text{end} \vdash t?(\ulcorner \tilde{x} \urcorner).P \triangleright \diamond}$$

Example 2.5 (Typing Recursive Servers). Here we show how to type the processes from Example 2.2. Let us define:

$$T = \mu t. !\langle U \rangle; t \quad C = \langle T \multimap \diamond \rangle$$

where U is some value type. We recall process P from Example 2.2 with the additional typing information on bound names r and a :

$$P = (\nu r : T) (\nu a : C) (a!\langle V \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid a!\langle W \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid S_a \mid \bar{r}?(x_1).\bar{r}?(x_2).Q)$$

$$V = \lambda y. (y!\langle V' \rangle).S_a\{y/r\}$$

$$W = \lambda z. (z!\langle W' \rangle).S_a\{z/r\}$$

where S_a stands for $a?(x).(x r)$. Let us assume there is a shared environment Γ under which V' and W' implement type U :

$$\Gamma; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash V' \triangleright U \quad (2)$$

$$\Gamma; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash W' \triangleright U \quad (3)$$

Also, we assume that process $\bar{r}?(x_1).\bar{r}?(x_2).Q$ is well-typed under the following environments:

$$\Gamma, a : C; \emptyset; \bar{r} : \bar{T} \vdash \bar{r}?(x_1).\bar{r}?(x_2).Q \triangleright \diamond \quad (4)$$

Under these assumptions, it holds that the body of process P correctly implements name a with type C , i.e.,

$$\Gamma; \emptyset; r : T \vdash (\nu a : C) (a!\langle V \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid a!\langle W \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid S_a) \triangleright \diamond$$

We detail the corresponding typing derivations:

$$\text{(LVar)} \frac{}{\Gamma, a : C; x : T \multimap \diamond; \emptyset \vdash x \triangleright T \multimap \diamond} \quad \text{(Sess)} \frac{}{\Gamma, a : C; \emptyset; y : T \vdash y \triangleright T} \quad (5)$$

$$\text{(App)} \frac{}{\Gamma, a : C; x : T \multimap \diamond; y : T \vdash x y \triangleright \diamond}$$

$$\text{(Acc)} \frac{(5) \quad \text{(Sh)} \frac{}{\Gamma, a : C; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash a \triangleright \langle T \multimap \diamond \rangle} \quad \text{(LVar)} \frac{}{\Gamma, a : C; x : T \multimap \diamond; \emptyset \vdash x \triangleright T \multimap \diamond}}{\Gamma, a : C; \emptyset; y : T \vdash a?(x).(x y) \triangleright \diamond} \quad (6)$$

$$\text{(Send)} \frac{(6) \quad (2)}{\Gamma, a : C; \emptyset; y : T \vdash y!\langle V' \rangle.S_a\{y/r\} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{(Sess)} \frac{}{\Gamma, a : C; \emptyset; y : T \vdash y \triangleright T} \quad (7)$$

$$\text{(Abs)} \frac{}{\Gamma, a : C; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash V \triangleright T \multimap \diamond}$$

$$\text{(Nil)} \frac{}{\Gamma, a : C; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{(Sh)} \frac{}{\Gamma, a : C; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash a \triangleright \langle T \multimap \diamond \rangle} \quad (7)$$

$$\text{(Req)} \frac{}{\Gamma, a : C; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash a!\langle V \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (8)$$

In the following derivation tree the right-hand side is shown similarly to (8) using assumption (3) instead of (2):

$$\text{(Par)} \frac{(8) \quad \overline{\Gamma, a : C; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash a!\langle W \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\Gamma, a : C; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash a!\langle V \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid a!\langle W \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (9)$$

Finally we have:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(Par)} \frac{(9) \quad \overline{\Gamma, a : C; \emptyset; r : T \vdash S_a \triangleright \diamond}}{\Gamma, a : C; \emptyset; r : T \vdash a!\langle V \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid a!\langle W \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid S_a \mid \bar{r}?(x_1).\bar{r}?(x_2).Q \triangleright \diamond} \quad (4) \\ \text{(Par)} \frac{\Gamma, a : C; \emptyset; r : T, \bar{r} : \bar{T} \vdash a!\langle V \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid a!\langle W \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid S_a \mid \bar{r}?(x_1).\bar{r}?(x_2).Q \triangleright \diamond}{\Gamma; \emptyset; r : T, \bar{r} : \bar{T} \vdash (\nu a : C) (a!\langle V \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid a!\langle W \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid S_a \mid \bar{r}?(x_1).\bar{r}?(x_2).Q) \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{(Res)} \frac{\Gamma; \emptyset; r : T, \bar{r} : \bar{T} \vdash (\nu a : C) (a!\langle V \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid a!\langle W \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid S_a \mid \bar{r}?(x_1).\bar{r}?(x_2).Q) \triangleright \diamond}{\Gamma; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash (\nu r : T) (\nu a : C) (a!\langle V \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid a!\langle W \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid S_a \mid \bar{r}?(x_1).\bar{r}?(x_2).Q) \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{(ResS)} \end{array}$$

Above, we have omitted details of the right-hand side derivation; it is the same as (6) with name y substituted with r .

Example 2.6 (Typing Nested Abstractions). Here we show how to type process P from Example 2.3. Let types C_1 and C_2 be defined as $C_i = \langle S_i \multimap \diamond \rangle$ where $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and S_i stands for a tail-recursive type. For simplicity, we assume that value V has the following typing:

$$a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash V \triangleright (S_1, S_2) \multimap \diamond \quad (10)$$

The following holds:

$$\emptyset; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash (\nu a : C_1) (\nu b : C_2) R \mid S_a \mid S_b \triangleright \diamond \quad (11)$$

In the following typing derivations, we rely on the following two typing rules for polyadic elements; they can be derived from monadic typing rules from Figure 3 (see Remark A.1 for details):

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(PolySess)} \frac{}{\Gamma; \emptyset; \tilde{u} : \tilde{S} \vdash \tilde{u} \triangleright \tilde{S}} \\ \text{(PolyApp)} \frac{\rightsquigarrow \in \{-\circ, \rightarrow\} \quad \Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_1 \vdash V \triangleright \tilde{C} \rightsquigarrow \diamond \quad \Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta_2 \vdash \tilde{u} \triangleright \tilde{C}}{\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash V \tilde{u}} \end{array}$$

Now, we detail the typing derivations that show (11):

$$\text{(PolyApp)} \frac{(10) \quad \text{(PolySess)} \frac{}{a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; y : S_1, z : S_2 \vdash y, z \triangleright S_1, S_2}}{a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; y : S_1, z : S_2 \vdash V(y, z) \triangleright \diamond} \quad (12)$$

$$\text{(Abs)} \frac{(12) \quad \text{(Sess)} \frac{}{a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; z : S_2 \vdash z \triangleright S_2}}{a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; y : S_1 \vdash \lambda z. V(y, z) \triangleright S_2 \multimap \diamond} \quad (13)$$

$$\text{(Req)} \frac{\text{(Nil)} \frac{}{a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{(Sh)} \frac{}{a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash b \triangleright \langle S_2 \multimap \diamond \rangle} \quad (13)}{a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; y : S_1 \vdash b!\langle \lambda z. V(y, z) \rangle \triangleright \diamond} \quad (14)$$

$$\text{(Abs)} \frac{(14) \quad \text{(Sess)} \frac{}{a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; y : S_1 \vdash y \triangleright S_1}}{a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \lambda y. b!\langle \lambda z. V(y, z) \rangle \triangleright S_1 \multimap \diamond} \quad (15)$$

$$\text{(Req)} \frac{a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond \quad \text{(Sh)} \frac{}{a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash a \triangleright \langle S_1 \multimap \diamond \rangle} \quad (15)}{a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash a! \langle \lambda y. b! \langle \lambda z. V(y, z) \rangle \rangle \triangleright \diamond} \quad (16)$$

Finally we have:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(Par)} \frac{\text{(16)} \frac{}{a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash S_a \triangleright \diamond}}{a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash R \mid S_a \triangleright \diamond} \quad \frac{}{a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash S_b \triangleright \diamond}}{\text{(Par)} \frac{}{a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash R \mid S_a \mid S_b \triangleright \diamond}} \\ \text{(Res)} \frac{}{a : C_1; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash (\nu b : C_2) R \mid S_a \mid S_b \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{(Res)} \frac{}{\emptyset; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash (\nu a : C_1) (\nu b : C_2) R \mid S_a \mid S_b \triangleright \diamond} \end{array}$$

In the above typing derivation, we remark that the judgments

$$a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash S_a \triangleright \diamond \quad (17)$$

$$a : C_1, b : C_2; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash S_b \triangleright \diamond \quad (18)$$

are shown similarly as in (6) from Example 2.5. Indeed, to derive (17) reusing the derivation tree from (6) we need to substitute y with r and then weaken the shared environment (6) with $b : C_2$ (see Lemma A.2). Similarly, by substituting a with b and y with r in the derivation tree (6) and then by weakening the shared environment with $a : C_1$ in its conclusion we can obtain (18).

Notation 2.2 (Type Annotations). *We shall often annotate bound names and variables with their respective type. We will write, e.g., $(\nu s : S)P$ to denote that the type of s in P is S . Similarly for values: we shall write $\lambda u : C.P$. Also, letting $\rightsquigarrow \in \{\multimap, \rightarrow\}$, we may write $\lambda u : C^{\rightsquigarrow}.P$ to denote that the value is linear (if $\rightsquigarrow = \multimap$) or shared (if $\rightsquigarrow = \rightarrow$). That is, we write $\lambda u : C^{\rightsquigarrow}.P$ if $\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash \lambda u. P \triangleright C \rightsquigarrow \diamond$, for some Γ, Λ , and Δ .*

Having introduced the core session process language HO, we now move to detail its type-preserving decomposition into minimal session types.

3 Decomposing Session-Typed Processes

In this section we define minimal session types and present a *decomposition* of well-typed processes: given a process P typable with (standard) session types, our decomposition returns a process denoted $\mathcal{D}(P)$, typable with minimal session types.

The definition of $\mathcal{D}(P)$ follows Parrow's *trio processes* for the π -calculus [21]. A trio process is a process with at most three sequential prefixes. Roughly speaking, if P is a process with k sequential actions, then $\mathcal{D}(P)$ will contain k trios running in parallel: each of them will enact exactly one action from P . The decomposition is carefully designed to ensure that trios trigger each other by preserving the sequencing in P .

This section is organized as follows. First, in Section 3.1, we use examples to discuss some key ideas of the decomposition. Then, in Section 3.2, we give the full definitions of minimal session types and the decomposition functions. We define decomposition functions for types $\mathcal{G}(-)$ and for processes $\mathcal{D}(-)$. The former “slices” a session type S and returns a list of minimal session types, corresponding to individual actions in S ; the latter breaks down an HO process into a parallel composition of processes. We demonstrate these notions on a number of examples in Section 3.3. Finally, in Section 3.4 we establish the *static correctness* result (Theorem 3.1): if P is well-typed under session types S_1, \dots, S_n , then $\mathcal{D}(P)$ is typable using the minimal session types $\mathcal{G}(S_1), \dots, \mathcal{G}(S_n)$. The issue of dynamic correctness, i.e., the operational correspondence between P and $\mathcal{D}(P)$, is treated separately in Section 4.

Remark 3.1 (Color Convention). We use colors to differentiate the operations on processes (in pink) and on types (in green). The usage of the colors is for visual aid only, and is not important for the mathematical content of the presented material.




Figure 4: Our decomposition function $\mathcal{D}(-)$, illustrated. Nodes represent process states, ‘ \parallel ’ represents parallel composition of processes, black arrows stand for actions, and red arrows indicate synchronizations that preserve the sequentiality of the source process by activating trios and propagating (bound) values.

3.1 Key Ideas

Consider a process P_1 that implements the (standard) session type $S = ?(\text{str}); ?(\text{int}); !(\text{bool}); \text{end}$ along name u . In process P_1 , name u is not a single-use resource; rather, it is used several times to implement the communication actions in S ; Figure 4 (top) graphically depicts the actions and the corresponding states.

The decomposition $\mathcal{D}(P_1)$ is illustrated in the bottom part of Figure 4: it is defined as the parallel composition of four processes Q_i (for $i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$). Each process Q_1 , Q_2 , and Q_3 mimic one action of P_1 on an indexed name u_i , while Q_4 simulates the termination of the session. This way, a single name u in P_1 is decomposed into a sequence of names u_1, u_2, u_3 in $\mathcal{D}(P_1)$.

The processes Q_1 , Q_2 , Q_3 , and Q_4 are composed in parallel, but we would like to retain the same sequentiality of actions on the channels u_i as we have on the channel u . To that end, each process Q_i , with the exception of Q_1 , does not perform its designated action on u_i until it gets activated by the previous process. In turn, after Q_i performs an action on u_i it evolves to a state Q'_i , which is responsible for activating the next process Q_{i+1} . In Figure 4, the activations are indicated by red arrows. In general, the decomposition orchestrates the activation of sub-processes, following the sequencing prescribed by the session types of the given process. Therefore, assuming a well-typed source process, our decomposition codifies the sequentiality in session types into the process level.

The activation mechanism includes the *propagation* of values across sub-processes (cf. the labels on red arrows). This establishes a flow of values from sub-processes binding them to those that use them (i.e., it makes variable bindings explicit). For example, in P_1 , the Boolean value being sent over as part of the session S might depend on the previously received string and integer values. Therefore, both of those values have to be propagated to the process Q_3 , which is responsible for sending out the Boolean.

In this example a single name $u : S$ is decomposed into a sequence $\tilde{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$: each $u_i \in \tilde{u}$ is a single-use resource, as prescribed by its minimal session type. Such is the case for non-recursive types S . When S is recursive, the situation is more interesting: each action of S can be repeated many times, and therefore the names \tilde{u} should be propagated across trios to enable potentially many uses. As an example, consider the recursive session type $S = \mu t. ?(\text{int}); !(\text{int}); t$, in which an input and an output actions are repeated indefinitely. Consider the following process

$$R_1 = \underbrace{r?(z)}_{T_1}. \underbrace{r! \langle -z \rangle}_{T_2}. \underbrace{r?(z)}_{T_3}. \underbrace{r! \langle z \rangle}_{T_4}. \underbrace{V r}_{T_5}$$

which makes use of the channel $r : S$ and where V has type $S \rightarrow \diamond$. Figure 5 (top) gives the first four

actions of R_1 and the corresponding states: the body of type S prescribes two actions on name r , performed sequentially in R_1 and R_2 ; subsequent actions (enabled in R_3 and R_4) correspond to a “new instance” of the body of S .

The decomposition $\mathcal{D}(R_1)$, depicted in Figure 5 (bottom), generates a trio process for each prefix in R_1 ; we denote prefixes with their corresponding trios T_1, \dots, T_5 . The type decomposition function on types, $\mathcal{G}(-)$, slices S into two *minimal tail-recursive types*: $M_1 = \mu t.?(int);t$ and $M_2 = \mu t.!(int);t$.

In the recursive case, a key idea is that trios that mimic actions prescribed by a recursive session types should reuse names, which should be propagated across trios. This way, for instance, trios T_1 and T_3 mimic the same (input) action, and so they both should use the same name (r_1). To achieve this, we devise a mechanism that propagates names with tail-recursive types (such as (r_1, r_2)) through the trios. These propagation actions are represented by blue arrows in Figure 5 (bottom). In our example, T_3 gathers the complete decomposition of names from preceding trios (r_1, r_2); it mimics an input action on r_1 and makes (r_1, r_2) available to future trios (i.e., T_4 and T_5).

Since the same tail-recursive names can be (re)used infinitely often, we propagate tail-recursive names through the following process. All the names \tilde{r} corresponding to the decomposition of a tail-recursive name r are bound in the process

$$c^r?(x).x\tilde{r},$$

which is similar to the servers discussed in Example 2.2. We call these processes *recursive propagators*, and each tail-recursive name in the original process P has a dedicated propagator in $\mathcal{D}(P)$ on the channel c^r . Whenever a trio has to perform an action $\alpha(r_i)$ on one of the decomposed tail-recursive names (i.e., a decomposition of an input action ‘ $r?(y).$ ’ or an output action ‘ $r!(V).$ ’ on the name r), it first has to request the name from the corresponding recursive propagator by performing an output action $c^r!\langle N \rangle$, where value N is the abstraction

$$N = \lambda \tilde{z}. \alpha(z_i).(\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \mid c^r?(x).x\tilde{z}).$$

A synchronization on c^r will result in the reduction:

$$c^r?(x).x\tilde{r} \mid c^r!\langle N \rangle \longrightarrow \alpha(r_i).(\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \mid c^r?(x).x\tilde{r}).$$

The resulting process first simulates $\alpha(r)$ and subsequently reinstates the recursive propagator on c^r , for the benefit of the other trios requiring access to the names \tilde{r} . See Examples 3.9 and 3.10 below (Page 24) for further illustration of this method.

This decomposition strategy handles HO processes with recursive types which are *simple* and *contractive*. That is, recursive types of the form $\mu t.S$, where the body $S \neq t$ does not itself contain recursive types. Unless stated otherwise, we consider *tail-recursive* session types such as, e.g., $S = \mu t.?(int);?(bool);!\langle bool \rangle;t$. Non-tail-recursive session types such as $\mu t.?(T, t) \rightarrow \diamond$;end, used in the fully-abstract encoding of HO π into HO [17], can also be accommodated; see Example 3.3 below.

3.2 The Decomposition

Here we formally present the decomposition of HO processes. We start introducing some preliminary definitions, including the definition of an auxiliary function, called the *breakdown function*.

Following Parrow [21] we adopt some useful terminology and notation on trios. The *context* of a trio is a tuple of variables \tilde{x} , possibly empty, which makes variable bindings explicit. We use a reserved set of *propagator names* (or simply *propagators*), denoted with c_k, c_{k+1}, \dots , to carry contexts and trigger the subsequent trio. A process with less than three sequential prefixes is called a *degenerate trio*. Also, a *leading trio* is the one that receives a context, performs an action, and triggers the next trio; a *control trio* only activates other trios.

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




Figure 5: Decomposition of processes with recursive session types, illustrated. Dashed blue arrows represent the propagation of tail-recursive names (r_1, r_2) across trios.

3.2.1 Minimal Session Types and Decomposing Types

We start by introducing minimal session types as a fragment of Definition 2.2:

Definition 3.1 (Minimal Session Types). The syntax of *minimal session types* for HO is defined as follows:

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

The above definition is minimal in its use of sequencing, which is only present in recursive session types such as $\mu t. !\langle U \rangle; \mathbf{t}$ and $\mu t. ?\langle U \rangle; \mathbf{t}$ —these are tail-recursive session types with exactly one session prefix. Clearly, this minimal type structure induces a reduced set of typable HO processes. A type system for HO based on minimal session types can be straightforwardly obtained by specializing the definitions, typing rules, and results summarized in Section 2.2. We refer to HO processes and terms typeable with minimal session types as *MST processes and terms*, respectively.

We now define how to “slice” a standard session type into a *list* of minimal session types. We need the following auxiliary definition.

Definition 3.2 (Predicates on Types and Names). Let C be a channel type.

- We write $\text{tr}(C)$ to indicate that C is a tail-recursive session type.
- Given $u : C$, we write $\text{lin}(u)$ if a session type (i.e. $C = S$ for some S) that is not tail recursive.

With a slight abuse of notation, we write $\text{tr}(u)$ to mean $u : C$ and $\text{tr}(C)$ (and similarly for $\neg \text{tr}(u)$).

Definition 3.3 (Decomposing Session Types). Given the session, higher-order, and shared types of Definition 2.2, the *type decomposition function* $\mathcal{G}(-)$ is defined using the auxiliary function $\mathcal{R}(-)$ as in Figure 6. We write $|\mathcal{G}(S)|$ to denote the length of $\mathcal{G}(S)$ (and similarly for $\mathcal{R}(-)$).

The decomposition is self-explanatory; intuitively, if a session type S contains k input/output actions, the list $\mathcal{G}(S)$ will contain k minimal session types. For a tail recursive $\mu t. S$, $\mathcal{G}(\mu t. S)$ is a list of minimal recursive session types, obtained using the auxiliary function $\mathcal{R}(-)$ on S : if S has k prefixes then the list $\mathcal{G}(\mu t. S)$ will contain k minimal recursive session types.

We illustrate Definition 3.3 with three examples.

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

Figure 6: Decomposing session types into minimal session types (Definition 3.3)

Example 3.1 (Decomposition a Non-recursive Type). Let $S = ?(\text{int}); ?(\text{int}); !\langle \text{bool} \rangle; \text{end}$ be the session type given in Section 1. Then $\mathcal{G}(S)$ denotes the list $?\langle \text{int} \rangle, ?\langle \text{int} \rangle, !\langle \text{bool} \rangle$. \triangleleft

Example 3.2 (Decomposing a Recursive Type). Let $S = \mu t.S'$ be a recursive session type, with $S' = ?(\text{int}); ?(\text{bool}); !\langle \text{bool} \rangle; t$. By Definition 3.3, since S is tail-recursive, $\mathcal{G}(S) = \mathcal{R}(S')$. Further, $\mathcal{R}(S') = \mu t.?\langle \mathcal{G}(\text{int}) \rangle; t, \mathcal{R}(?\langle \text{bool} \rangle; !\langle \text{bool} \rangle; t)$. By definition of $\mathcal{R}(-)$, we obtain

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

(using $\mathcal{G}(\text{int}) = \text{int}$ and $\mathcal{G}(\text{bool}) = \text{bool}$). Since $\mathcal{R}(t) = \epsilon$, we obtain

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

\triangleleft

In addition to tail-recursive types that are handled by $\mathcal{R}(-)$, we need to support non-tail-recursive types of form $\mu t.?((\tilde{T}, t) \rightarrow \diamond); \text{end}$ that are essential for the encoding of recursion in $\text{HO}\pi$ into HO . The following example illustrates such a decomposition.

Example 3.3 (Decomposing a Non-tail-recursive Type). Let $S = \mu t.?(?\langle \text{str} \rangle; !\langle \text{str} \rangle; \text{end}, t) \rightarrow \diamond; \text{end}$ be a non-tail-recursive type. We obtain the following decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}(S) &= \mu t.\mathcal{G}(?\langle \text{str} \rangle; !\langle \text{str} \rangle; \text{end}, t) \rightarrow \diamond; \text{end} \\
&= \mu t.?\langle \mathcal{G}(\langle \text{str} \rangle; !\langle \text{str} \rangle; \text{end}, t) \rightarrow \diamond \rangle \\
&= \mu t.?(?\langle \text{str} \rangle, !\langle \text{str} \rangle, t) \rightarrow \diamond = M
\end{aligned}$$

We can see that we have generated minimal non-tail-recursive type M . \triangleleft

Now, we illustrate the encoding of $\text{HO}\pi$ recursive processes into HO from [17] using the non-tail-recursive type S given in the above example.

Example 3.4 (Encoding Recursion). Consider the process $P = \mu X.a?(m).a!\langle m \rangle.X$, which contains recursion and so it is not an HO process. Still, P can be encoded into HO as follows [17]:

$$\llbracket P \rrbracket = a?(m).a!\langle m \rangle.(\nu s)(V(a, s) \mid \bar{s}!\langle V \rangle)$$

where the value V is an abstraction that potentially reduces to $\llbracket P \rrbracket$:

$$V = \lambda(x_a, y_1). y_1?(z_x). x_a?(m). x_a!\langle m \rangle. (\nu s) (z_x (x_a, s) \mid \bar{s}!\langle z_x \rangle. \mathbf{0})$$

As detailed in [17], this encoding relies on non-tail-recursive types. In particular, the bound name s in $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ is typed with the following type, discussed above in Example 3.3:

$$S = \mu t. ?((?(\text{str}); !(\text{str}); \text{end}, t) \rightarrow \diamond); \text{end}$$

We compose $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ with an appropriate client process to illustrate the encoding of recursion. Below R stands for some unspecified process such that $a \in \text{rn}(R)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket P \rrbracket \mid a!\langle W \rangle. a?(b). R &\longrightarrow^2 (\nu s) (V (a, s) \mid \bar{s}!\langle V \rangle) \mid R \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu s) (s?(z_x). a?(m). a!\langle m \rangle. (\nu s') (z_x (a, s') \mid \bar{s}'!\langle z_x \rangle) \mid \bar{s}!\langle V \rangle) \mid R \\ &\longrightarrow a?(m). a!\langle m \rangle. (\nu s') (V (a, s') \mid \bar{s}'!\langle V \rangle) \mid R \\ &= \llbracket P \rrbracket \mid R \end{aligned}$$

3.2.2 Decomposing Processes

As we have seen, each session type S is decomposed into $\mathcal{G}(S)$, a list of minimal session types. Accordingly, given an assignment $s : S$, we decompose s into a series of names, one for each action in S . We use *indexed names* to formalize the names used by minimally typed processes. Formally, an indexed name is a pair (n, i) with $i \in \mathbb{N}$, which we denote as n_i . We refer to processes with indexed names as *indexed processes*.

The decomposition of processes is defined in Definition 3.9, and it relies on a breakdown function, denoted $\mathcal{B}_x^k(-)$, which operates on indexed processes. Before we dive into those functions we present some auxiliary definitions.

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

Definition 3.4 (Decomposing an Unfolded Recursive Type). Let S be a session type. The function $\mathcal{R}^*(-)$: is defined as follows

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

Example 3.5. Let $T = ?(\text{bool}); !(\text{bool}); S$ be a derived unfolding of S from Example 3.2. Then, by Definition 3.3, $\mathcal{R}^*(T)$ is the list of minimal recursive types obtained as follows: first, $\mathcal{R}^*(T) = \mathcal{R}^*(!(\text{bool}); \mu t. S')$ and after one more step, $\mathcal{R}^*(!(\text{bool}); \mu t. S') = \mathcal{R}^*(\mu t. S')$. Finally, we have $\mathcal{R}^*(\mu t. S') = \mathcal{R}(S')$. We get the same list of minimal types as in Example 3.2: $\mathcal{R}^*(T) = \mu t. ?(\text{int}); t, \mu t. ?(\text{bool}); t, \mu t. !(\text{bool}); t$. \triangleleft

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

Definition 3.5 (Index function). Let S be an (unfolded) recursive session type. The function $[S]$ is defined as follows:

$$[S] = \begin{cases} [S'\{S/t\}]_0^* & \text{if } S = \mu t. S' \\ [S]_0^* & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $[S]_l^*$:

$$\begin{aligned} [\mu t.S]_l^* &= |\mathcal{R}(S)| - l + 1 \\ [! \langle U \rangle; S]_l^* &= [S]_{l+1}^* \\ [? \langle U \rangle; S]_l^* &= [S]_{l+1}^* \end{aligned}$$

Example 3.6. Let $S' = ?(\text{bool}); ! \langle \text{bool} \rangle; S$ where S is as in Example 3.2. Then $[S'] = 2$ since the top-most prefix of S' ($?(\text{bool});$) is the second prefix in the body of S . \triangleleft

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

Definition 3.6 (Degree of a Process). Let P be an HO process. The *degree* of P , denoted $\mathcal{D}(P)$, is defined as follows:

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

We define an auxiliary function that “initializes” the indices of a tuple of names, for turning a regular process into an indexed process.

Definition 3.7 (Initializing an indexed process). Let $\tilde{u} = (a, b, s, s', r, r', \dots)$ be a finite tuple of names. We shall write $\text{init}(\tilde{u})$ to denote the tuple of indexed names $(a_1, b_1, s_1, s'_1, r_1, r'_1, \dots)$.

Definition 3.8 (Subsequent index substitution). Let n_i be an indexed name. We define $\text{next}(n_i) = (\text{lin}(n_i)) ? \{n_{i+1}/n_i\} : \{\}$.

Remark 3.2. Recall that we write $\langle c_k? \rangle$ and $\langle \overline{c_k}! \rangle$ to denote input and output prefixes in which the value communicated along c_k is not relevant. While $\langle c_k? \rangle$ stands for $\langle c_k?(x) \rangle$, $\langle \overline{c_k}! \rangle$ stands for $\langle \overline{c_k}! \langle \lambda x. \mathbf{0} \rangle \rangle$. Their corresponding minimal types are $?(\text{end} \rightarrow \diamond)$ and $! \langle \text{end} \rightarrow \diamond \rangle$, which are denoted by $?(-)$ and $!(-)$, respectively.

Given a typed process P , we write $\text{rn}(P)$ to denote the set of free names of P whose types are recursive. As mentioned above, for each $r \in \text{rn}(P)$ with $r : S$ we shall rely on a control trio of the form $c^r? \langle x \rangle . x \tilde{r}$, where $\tilde{r} = r_1, \dots, r_{|\mathcal{G}(S)|}$.

Definition 3.9 (Decomposition of a Process). Let P be a closed HO process with $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P)$ and $\tilde{v} = \text{rn}(P)$. The *decomposition* of P , denoted $\mathcal{D}(P)$, is defined as:

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

where: $k > 0$; $\tilde{c} = (c_k, \dots, c_{k+\mathcal{D}(P)-1})$; $\tilde{c}_r = \bigcup_{r \in \tilde{v}} c^r$; $\sigma = \{\text{init}(\tilde{u})/\tilde{u}\}$.

Notice that when $\text{rn}(P) = \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{D}(P) = (\nu \tilde{c}) (\langle \overline{c_k}! \rangle . \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^k(P\sigma))$. We now discuss the breakdown of process P , denoted $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P)$.

The Breakdown Function. Given a context \tilde{x} and a $k > 0$, the breakdown of an indexed process P , denoted $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P)$, is defined recursively on the structure of processes. The definition of $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(-)$ relies on an auxiliary breakdown function on values, denoted $\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(-)$. When $V = y$, then the breakdown function is simply the identity: $\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(y) = y$.

The breakdown function relies on type information, in two ways. First, names are decomposed based on their session types. Second, for most constructs the shape of decomposed process depends on whether the associated session type is tail-recursive or not. The definition of the breakdown function is given in Table 1. Next, we describe each of the cases of the definition. In Section 3.3 (Page 21) we develop several examples.

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

Table 1: The breakdown function for processes and values.

Output: The decomposition of $u_i!\langle V \rangle.Q$ is arguably the most interesting case, as both the sent value V and the continuation Q have to be decomposed. We distinguish two cases:

- If $\neg\text{tr}(u_i)$ then u_i is linear or shared, and then we have:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i!\langle V \rangle.Q) = c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_i!\langle \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V\sigma) \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)$$

This decomposition consists of a leading trio that mimics an output action in parallel with the breakdown of Q . The context \tilde{x} must include the free variables of V and Q , which are denoted

\tilde{y} and \tilde{w} , respectively. These tuples are not necessarily disjoint: variables with shared types can appear free in both V and Q . The value V is then broken down with parameters \tilde{y} and $k+1$; the latter serves to consistently generate propagators for the trios in the breakdown of V , denoted $\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V\sigma)$ (see below). The substitution σ increments the index of session names; it is applied to both V and Q before they are broken down. By taking $\sigma = \text{next}(u_i)$ we distinguish two cases (see Definition 3.8):

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

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

In case $V = y$, the same strategy applies; because $\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(y\sigma) = y$, we have:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i!(y).Q) = c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_i!(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!(\tilde{w}) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)$$

Notice that variable y is not propagated further if it does not appear free in Q .

- If $\text{tr}(u_i)$ then u_i is tail-recursive and then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i!(V).Q) &= c_k?(\tilde{x}).c^u!\langle N_V \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(Q) \\ \text{where: } N_V &= \lambda\tilde{z}.z_{[S]}!\langle \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V) \rangle.(\overline{c_{k+1}}!(\tilde{w}) \mid c^u?(x).x\tilde{z}) \end{aligned}$$

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

In case $V = y$, we have $\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(y\sigma) = y$ and $\mathcal{I}y\mathcal{J} = 0$, hence:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i!(y).Q) = c_k?(\tilde{x}).c^u!\langle \lambda\tilde{z}.z_{[S]}!(y).(\overline{c_{k+1}}!(\tilde{w}) \mid c^u?(x).x\tilde{z}) \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(Q)$$

Input: To decompose a process $u_i?(y).Q$ we distinguish two cases, as before: (i) name u_i is linear or shared or (ii) tail-recursive. In case (i), the breakdown is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i?(y).Q) = c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!(\tilde{w}) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)$$

where $\tilde{w} = \mathbf{fv}(Q)$. A leading trio mimics the input action and possibly extends the context with the received variable y . The substitution σ is defined as in the output case.

In case (ii), when u_i has tail-recursive session type S , the decomposition is as in the output case:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i?(y).Q) = c_k?(\tilde{x}).c^u!\langle \lambda\tilde{z}.z_{[S]}?(y).(\overline{c_{k+1}}!(\tilde{w}) \mid c^u?(x).x\tilde{z}) \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(Q)$$

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

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(V(\tilde{r}, u_i)) = c_k?(\tilde{x}).\overbrace{c^{r_1}!\langle \lambda\tilde{z}_1.c^{r_2}!\langle \lambda\tilde{z}_2.\dots.c^{r_n}!\langle \lambda\tilde{z}_n.\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(V)(\tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_n, \tilde{m}) \rangle \rangle \rangle}^{n=|\tilde{r}|}$$

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

The decomposition first receives a context \tilde{x} for value V : we break down V with \tilde{x} as a context since these variables need to be propagated to the abstracted process. Subsequently, an output on c^{r_1} sends a value containing n abstractions that occur nested within output prefixes—this is similar to the mechanism for partial instantiation shown in Example 2.3. For each $j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, each abstraction binds \tilde{z}_j and sends the next abstraction along $c^{r_{j+1}}$. The innermost abstraction abstracts over \tilde{z}_n and encloses the process $\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(V)(\tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_n, \tilde{m})$, which effectively mimics the application. This abstraction nesting binds all variables \tilde{z}_i , the decompositions of all tail-recursive names (\tilde{r}) .

The breakdown of a value application of the form $y(\tilde{r}, u_i)$ results into the following specific case:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(y(\tilde{r}, u_i)) = c_k^?(x) \cdot \overbrace{c^{r_1}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_1. c^{r_2}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_2. \dots \cdot c^{r_n}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_n. y(\tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_n, \tilde{m}) \rangle \rangle \rangle}^{n=|\tilde{r}|}$$

Restriction: The decomposition of $(\nu s : C) P'$ depends on C :

- If $\neg \text{tr}(C)$ then

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k((\nu s : C) P') = (\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{G}(C)) \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P' \sigma)$$

By construction, $\tilde{x} = \mathbf{fv}(P')$. Similarly as in the decomposition of u_i into \tilde{m} discussed above, we use the type C of s to obtain the tuple \tilde{s} of length $|\mathcal{G}(C)|$. We initialize the index of s in P' by applying the substitution σ . This substitution depends on C : if it is a shared type then $\sigma = \{s_1/s\}$; otherwise, if C is a session type, then $\sigma = \{s_1 \bar{s}_1 / s \bar{s}\}$.

- Otherwise, if $\text{tr}(C)$ then we have:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k((\nu s : C) P') = (\nu \tilde{s} : \mathcal{R}(S)) (\nu c^s) c^s?(x).x \tilde{s} \mid (\nu c^{\bar{s}}) c^{\bar{s}}?(x).x \tilde{\bar{s}} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P')$$

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

Composition: The breakdown of a process $Q \mid R$ is as follows:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(Q \mid R) = c_k^?(x) \cdot \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{y} \rangle \cdot \overline{c_{k+l+1}}! \langle \tilde{w} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{y}}^{k+1}(Q) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+l+1}(R)$$

A control trio triggers the breakdowns of Q and R ; it does not mimic any action of the source process. The tuple $\tilde{y} \subseteq \tilde{x}$ (resp. $\tilde{w} \subseteq \tilde{x}$) collects the free variables in Q (resp. R). To avoid name conflicts, the trigger for the breakdown of R is $\overline{c_{k+l+1}}$, with $l = \#Q$.

Inaction: To breakdown $\mathbf{0}$, we define a degenerate trio with only one input prefix that receives a context that by construction will always be empty (i.e., $\tilde{x} = \epsilon$, cf. Remark 3.2):

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\mathbf{0}) = c_k^?().\mathbf{0}$$

Value: For simplicity, let us consider values of the form $V = \lambda(\tilde{y}, z) : (\tilde{S}, C) \rightsquigarrow . P$, where $\text{tr}(y_i)$ holds for every $y_i \in \tilde{y}$ and $\neg \text{tr}(z)$, and $\rightsquigarrow \in \{-, \rightarrow\}$. The general case is defined similarly. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(\lambda(\tilde{y}, z) : (\tilde{S}, C) \rightsquigarrow . P) &= \lambda(\tilde{y}^1, \dots, \tilde{y}^n, \tilde{z}) : (\tilde{M}) \rightsquigarrow . N \quad \text{where:} \\ \tilde{M} &= \mathcal{G}(S_1), \dots, \mathcal{G}(S_n), \mathcal{G}(C) \\ N &= (\nu \tilde{c}) (\nu \tilde{c}_r) \prod_{i \in \tilde{y}} c^{y_i}?(x).x \tilde{y}^i \mid \overline{c_1}! \langle \tilde{x} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^1(P\{z_1/z\}) \end{aligned}$$

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

3.3 The Decomposition by Example

We illustrate the decompositions by means of several examples.

3.3.1 Decomposing Processes with Non-Recursive Names

Example 3.7. Consider process $P = (\nu u)(Q \mid R)$ whose body implements end-points of channel u with session type $S = ?(U); ?(\text{bool}); \text{end}$, with $U = (?(\text{bool}); \text{end}) \multimap \diamond$, where:

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= u?(x). \overbrace{u?(y).(\nu s)(x \bar{s} \mid s!\langle y \rangle)}^{Q'} \\ R &= \bar{u}\langle V \rangle. \bar{u}\langle \text{true} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \\ V &= \lambda z. z?(b). \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

The process P reduces as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P &\longrightarrow (\nu u)(u?(y).(\nu s)(V \bar{s} \mid s!\langle y \rangle) \mid \bar{u}\langle \text{true} \rangle. \mathbf{0}) \longrightarrow (\nu s)(V \bar{s} \mid s!\langle \text{true} \rangle) \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu s)(\bar{s}(b). \mathbf{0} \mid s!\langle \text{true} \rangle) = P' \end{aligned}$$

By Definition 3.9 we have that the decomposition of P is as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}(P) = (\nu c_1, \dots, c_{10})(\bar{c}_1!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(P\sigma))$$

where $\sigma = \{u_1 \bar{u}_1 / u \bar{u}\}$. We have:

$$\mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(P\sigma) = (\nu u_1, u_2) c_1?(). \bar{c}_2!\langle \rangle. \bar{c}_3!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^2(Q\sigma) \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^8(R\sigma)$$

The breakdowns of sub-processes Q and R are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^2(Q\sigma) &= c_2?(). u_1?(x). \bar{c}_3!\langle x \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^3(Q'\sigma') \\ \mathcal{B}_x^3(Q'\sigma') &= c_3?(x). u_2?(y). \bar{c}_4!\langle x, y \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}^4((\nu s)(x \bar{s} \mid s!\langle y \rangle)) \\ \mathcal{B}_{x,y}^4((\nu s)(x \bar{s} \mid s!\langle y \rangle)) &= (\nu s_1)(c_4?(x, y). \bar{c}_5!\langle x \rangle. \bar{c}_6!\langle y \rangle \mid c_5?(x). x \bar{s}_1 \mid c_6?(y). s_1!\langle y \rangle. \bar{c}_7!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?(). \mathbf{0}) \\ \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^8(R\sigma) &= c_8?(). \bar{u}_1!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle. \bar{c}_9!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^9(u_2!\langle \text{true} \rangle. \mathbf{0}) \\ \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^9(u_2!\langle \text{true} \rangle. \mathbf{0}) &= c_9?(). \bar{u}_2!\langle \text{true} \rangle. \bar{c}_{10}\langle \rangle \mid c_{10}?(). \mathbf{0} \\ \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) &= \lambda z_1. ((\nu c_1^V, c_2^V) \bar{c}_1^V!\langle \rangle \mid c_1^V?(). z_1?(b). \bar{c}_2^V!\langle \rangle \mid c_2^V?(). \mathbf{0}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma' = \{u_2 \bar{u}_2 / u \bar{u}\}$. By $\mathcal{G}(-)$ from Definition 3.3 we decompose S into M_1 and M_2 given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= ?(\mathcal{G}(U)); \text{end} = ?(U); \text{end} \\ M_2 &= ?(\text{bool}); \text{end} \end{aligned}$$

Above we may notice that $\mathcal{G}(U) = U$. We remark that $\mathcal{D}(P)$ accordingly implements indexed names u_1, u_2 typed with M_1, M_2 , respectively.

Let us inspect the reductions of $\mathcal{D}(P)$. First, there are three synchronizations on c_1, c_2 , and c_8 :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(P) &\longrightarrow (\nu c_2, \dots, c_{10}) (\nu u_1, u_2) \overline{c_2}!\langle \rangle. \overline{c_8}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^2(Q\sigma) \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^8(R\sigma) \\ &\longrightarrow^2 (\nu c_3, \dots, c_7, c_9, c_{10}) \overline{u_1}?(x). \overline{c_3}!\langle x \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^3(Q'\sigma') \\ &\quad \mid \overline{u_1}!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle. \overline{c_9}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^9(u_2!\langle \text{true} \rangle. \mathbf{0}) = D^1 \end{aligned}$$

After reductions on propagators, D^1 is able to mimic the original synchronization on channel u (highlighted above). It is followed by two administrative reductions on c_3 and c_9 :

$$\begin{aligned} D^1 &\longrightarrow (\nu c_3, \dots, c_7, c_9, c_{10}) \overline{c_3}!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle \mid c_3?(x). u_2?(y). \overline{c_4}!\langle x, y \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}^4((\nu s) (x \bar{s} \mid s!\langle y \rangle)) \mid \\ &\quad \overline{c_9}!\langle \rangle \mid c_9?(). \overline{u_2}!\langle \text{true} \rangle. \overline{c_{10}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{10}?(). \mathbf{0} \\ &\longrightarrow^2 (\nu c_4, \dots, c_7, c_{10}) \overline{u_2}?(y). \overline{c_4}!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V), y \rangle \mid \\ &\quad (\nu s_1) (c_4?(x, y). \overline{c_5}!\langle x \rangle. \overline{c_6}!\langle y \rangle \mid c_5?(x). x \bar{s}_1 \mid c_6?(y). s_1!\langle y \rangle. \overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?(). \mathbf{0}) \mid \\ &\quad \overline{u_2}!\langle \text{true} \rangle. \overline{c_{10}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{10}?(). \mathbf{0} = D^2 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, D^2 can mimic the next synchronization of the original process on name u_2 . Following up on that, synchronization on c_{10} takes place:

$$\begin{aligned} D^2 &\longrightarrow^2 (\nu c_4, \dots, c_7) \overline{c_4}!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V), \text{true} \rangle \mid \\ &\quad (\nu s_1) (c_4?(x, y). \overline{c_5}!\langle x \rangle. \overline{c_6}!\langle y \rangle \mid c_5?(x). x \bar{s}_1 \mid c_6?(y). s_1!\langle y \rangle. \overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?(). \mathbf{0}) = D^3 \end{aligned}$$

Now, we can see that the next three reductions on c_4, c_5 , and c_6 appropriately propagate values $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)$ and true to the breakdown of sub-processes. Subsequently, value $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)$ is applied to name \bar{s}_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} D^3 &\longrightarrow (\nu c_5, \dots, c_7) (\nu s_1) (\overline{c_5}!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle. \overline{c_6}!\langle \text{true} \rangle \mid c_5?(x). x \bar{s}_1 \mid c_6?(y). s_1!\langle y \rangle. \overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?(). \mathbf{0}) \\ &\longrightarrow^2 (\nu c_7) (\nu s_1) (\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \bar{s}_1 \mid s_1!\langle \text{true} \rangle. \overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?(). \mathbf{0}) \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu c_7) (\nu s_1) ((\nu c_1^V, c_2^V) \overline{c_1^V}!\langle \rangle \mid c_1^V?(). s_1?(b). \overline{c_2^V}!\langle \rangle \mid c_2^V?(). \mathbf{0}) \mid s_1!\langle \text{true} \rangle. \overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?(). \mathbf{0} = D^4 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, after synchronization on c_1^V we reach the process D^5 that is clearly able to simulate P' , and its internal communication on the channel s :

$$D^4 \longrightarrow (\nu c_7) (\nu s_1) ((\nu c_2^V) s_1?(b). \overline{c_2^V}!\langle \rangle \mid c_2^V?(). \mathbf{0}) \mid s_1!\langle \text{true} \rangle. \overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?(). \mathbf{0} = D^5$$

◁

Example 3.8 (Breaking Down Name-Passing). Consider the following process P , in which a channel m is passed, through which a boolean value is sent back:

$$P = (\nu u) (u!\langle \ulcorner m \urcorner \rangle. \overline{m}?(b) \mid \overline{u}?\langle \ulcorner x \urcorner \rangle. x!\langle \text{true} \rangle)$$

After expanding the syntactic sugar of name-passing, we get a process $P = (\nu u) (Q \mid R)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= u!\langle V \rangle. \overline{m}?(y). (\nu s) (y s \mid \bar{s}!\langle \lambda b. \mathbf{0} \rangle) & V &= \lambda z. z?(x). (x m) \\ R &= \overline{u}?(y). (\nu s) (y s \mid \bar{s}!\langle W \rangle) & W &= \lambda x. x!\langle W' \rangle \text{ with } W' = \lambda z. z?(x). (x \text{true}) \end{aligned}$$

Note that to mimic the name-passing synchronization, we require exactly four reduction steps:

$$P \longrightarrow^4 \llbracket \overline{m}?(b) \mid m!\langle \text{true} \rangle \rrbracket \longrightarrow^4 \mathbf{0} \quad (19)$$

We will now investigate the decomposition of P and its reduction chain. First, we use Definition 3.6 to compute $\llbracket Q \rrbracket = 6$, and similarly, $\llbracket R \rrbracket = 5$. Therefore, $\llbracket P \rrbracket = 12$. Following Definition 3.9, we see that $\sigma = \{m_1 \overline{m}_1 / m \overline{m}\}$, which we silently apply. Taking $k = 1$, the breakdown of P and its subprocesses is shown in Table 2.

$\mathcal{D}(P) = (\nu c_1, \dots, c_{12}) \left(\overline{c_1}!\langle \rangle \mid (\nu u_1) (c_1?().\overline{c_2}!\langle \rangle.\overline{c_8}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^2(Q) \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^8(R)) \right)$
$\mathcal{B}_\epsilon^2(Q) = c_2?().u_1!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle.\overline{c_3}!\langle \rangle \mid c_3?().\overline{m_1}?(y).\overline{c_4}!\langle y \rangle \mid$ $(\nu s_1) (c_4?(y).\overline{c_5}!\langle y \rangle.\overline{c_6}!\langle \rangle \mid c_5?(y).(y s_1) \mid c_6?().\overline{s_1}!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\lambda b. \mathbf{0}) \rangle.\overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?())$
$\mathcal{B}_\epsilon^8(R) = c_8?().\overline{u_1}?(y).\overline{c_9}!\langle y \rangle \mid$ $(\nu s_1) (c_9?(y).\overline{c_{10}}!\langle y \rangle.\overline{c_{11}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{10}?(y).(y s_1) \mid c_{11}?().\overline{s_1}!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(W) \rangle.\overline{c_{12}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{12}?())$
$\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) = \lambda z_1. (\nu c_1^V, c_2^V) (\overline{c_1^V}!\langle \rangle \mid c_1^V?().z_1?(x).\overline{c_2^V}!\langle x \rangle \mid c_2^V?(x).(x m_1))$
$\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\lambda b. \mathbf{0}) = \lambda b_1. (\nu c_1^b) (\overline{c_1^b}!\langle \rangle \mid c_1^b?())$
$\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(W) = \lambda x_1. (\nu c_1^W, c_2^W) (\overline{c_1^W}!\langle \rangle \mid c_1^W?().x_1!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(W') \rangle.\overline{c_2^W}!\langle \rangle \mid c_2^W?())$
$\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(W') = \lambda z_1. (\nu c_1^{W'}, c_2^{W'}) (\overline{c_1^{W'}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_1^{W'}?().z_1?(x).\overline{c_2^{W'}}!\langle x \rangle \mid c_2^{W'}?(x).(x \text{true}))$

Table 2: The decomposition on processes discussed in Example 3.8.

In Table 2 we have omitted substitutions that have no effect and trailing $\mathbf{0}$ s. The first interesting action appears after synchronizations on c_1 , c_2 , and c_8 . At that point, the process will be ready to mimic the first action that is performed by P , i.e., u_1 will send $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)$, the breakdown of V , from the breakdown of Q to the breakdown of R . Next, c_9 and c_{10} will synchronize, and $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)$ is passed further along, until s_1 is ready to be applied to it in the breakdown of R . At this point, we know that $P \xrightarrow{7} (\nu \tilde{c}) P'$, where $\tilde{c} = (c_3, \dots, c_{12})$, and

$$P' = \overline{c_3}!\langle \rangle \mid c_3?().\overline{m_1}?(y).\overline{c_4}!\langle y \rangle$$

$$\mid (\nu s_1) (c_4?(y).\overline{c_5}!\langle y \rangle.\overline{c_6}!\langle \rangle \mid c_5?(y).y s_1 \mid c_6?().\overline{s_1}!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\lambda b. \mathbf{0}) \rangle.\overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?())$$

$$\mid (\nu s_1) (\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) s_1 \mid \overline{s_1}!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(W) \rangle.\overline{c_{12}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{12}?())$$

After s_1 is applied, the trio guarded by c_3 will be activated, where z_1 has been substituted by s_1 . Then $\overline{s_1}$ and s_1 will synchronize, and the breakdown of W is passed along. Then c_4 and c_{19} synchronize, and now m_1 is ready to be applied to $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(W)$, which was the input for c_4 in the breakdown of V . After this application, c_3 and c_1^W can synchronize with their duals, and we know that $(\nu \tilde{c}) P' \xrightarrow{8} (\nu \tilde{c}') P''$, where $\tilde{c}' = (c_4, \dots, c_7, c_2^{W'})$, and

$$P'' = \overline{m_1}?(y).\overline{c_4}!\langle y \rangle \mid m_1!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(W') \rangle.\overline{c_2^{W'}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_2^{W'}?()$$

$$\mid (\nu s_1) (c_4?(y).\overline{c_5}!\langle y \rangle.\overline{c_6}!\langle \rangle \mid c_5?(y).y s_1 \mid c_6?().\overline{s_1}!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\lambda b. \mathbf{0}) \rangle.\overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?())$$

Remarkably, P'' is standing by to mimic the encoded exchange of value true . Indeed, the decomposition of the four-step reduced process in (19) will reduce in three steps to a process that is equal (up to \equiv_α) to the process we obtained here. This strongly suggests a tight operational correspondence between a process and its decomposition, which we will explore in Section 4. \triangleleft

3.3.2 Decomposing Processes with Recursive Names

Next, we illustrate the decomposition of processes involving names with tail-recursive types. Recall process R_1 , which we used in Section 3.1 to motivate the need for recursive propagators:

$$R_1 = r?(z).r!\langle -z \rangle.r?(z).r!\langle z \rangle.V r$$

Two following examples illustrate the low-level workings of the propagation mechanism of the decomposition in Figure 5. The first example illustrates how the propagation of recursive names works in the case of input and output actions on names with recursive types (the “first part” of R_1). The second example shows how an application where a value is applied to a tuple of names with recursive names is broken down (the “second part” of R_1).

Example 3.9 (Decomposing Processes with Recursive Names (I)). Let $P = r?(x).r!\langle x \rangle.P'$ be a process where r has type $S = \mu t.?(int);!(int);t$ and $r \in \mathbf{fn}(P')$. By Definition 3.9 we have:

$$\mathcal{D}(P) = (\nu \tilde{c}) (\nu c^r) (\overline{c_1}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(P) \mid c^r?(x).x(r_1, r_2))$$

where $\tilde{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_{|P|})$. The control trio in the parallel composition provides a decomposition of r on name c^r , which is *shared*. The decomposition $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(P)$ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(P) &= \overline{c_1}!\langle \rangle \mid c_1?().c^r!\langle N_1 \rangle \mid c_2?(y).c^r!\langle N_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^3(P') \\ N_1 &= \lambda(z_1, z_2).z_1?(x).c^r?(x).x(z_1, z_2) \\ N_2 &= \lambda(z_1, z_2).z_2!\langle x \rangle.\overline{c_3}!\langle \rangle.c^r?(x).x(z_1, z_2) \end{aligned}$$

Each trio in $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(P)$ that mimics some action on r requests the sequence \tilde{r} from the server on c^r . We can see that this request is realized by a higher-order communication: trios send abstractions (N_1 and N_2) to the server; these abstractions contain further actions of trios and it will be applied to the sequence \tilde{r} . Hence, the formal arguments for these values are meant to correspond to \tilde{r} .

After two reductions (the trio activation on c_1 and the communication on c^r), we have:

$$\mathcal{D}(P) \longrightarrow^2 (\nu c_2, \dots, c_{|P|}) r_1?(x).\overline{c_2}!\langle x \rangle.c^r?(x).x(r_1, r_2) \mid c_2?(y).c^r!\langle N_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^3(P') = P_1$$

By synchronizing with the top-level server on c^r , the bound names in N_1 are instantiated with r_1, r_2 . Now, the first trio in P_1 is able to mimic the action on r_1 that is followed by the activation of the next trio on c_2 . Then, the server on c^r gets reinstated making names r_1, r_2 available for future trios. The break down of the output action follows the same pattern. \triangleleft

Example 3.10 (Decomposing Processes with Recursive Names (II)). Let $S = \mu t.?(int);!(int);t$ and $T = \mu t.?(bool);!(bool);t$, and define $Q = V(u, v)$ as a process where $u : S$ and $v : T$, where V is some value of type $(S, T) \rightarrow \diamond$. By Definition 3.9, the decomposition of Q is as in the previous example, except that now there are two servers, one for u and one for v :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(Q) &= (\nu c_1 \tilde{c}) (\nu c^u c^v) (c^u?(x).x(u_1, u_2) \mid c^v?(x).x(v_1, v_2) \mid \overline{c_1}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(Q)) \\ \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(Q) &= c_1?().c^u!\langle \lambda(x_1, x_2).c^v!\langle \lambda(y_1, y_2).V_\epsilon(V)(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) \rangle \rangle \end{aligned}$$

with $\tilde{c} = (c_2, \dots, c_{|Q|})$. Process Q is broken down in such a way that it communicates with both servers to collect \tilde{u} and \tilde{v} . To this end, $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(Q)$ is a process in which abstractions are nested using output prefixes and whose innermost process is an application. After successive communications with multiple servers this innermost application will have collected all names in \tilde{u} and \tilde{v} .

Observe that we use two nested outputs, one for each name with recursive types in Q . We now look at the reductions of $\mathcal{D}(Q)$ to analyze how the communication of nested abstractions allows us to collect all name sequences needed. After the first reduction along c_1 we have:

$$\mathcal{D}(Q) \longrightarrow (\nu \tilde{c}) (\nu c^u c^v) (c^u?(x).x(u_1, u_2) \mid c^v?(x).x(v_1, v_2) \mid c^u!\langle \lambda(x_1, x_2).c^v!\langle \lambda(y_1, y_2).V_\epsilon(V)(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) \rangle \rangle) = R^1$$

From R^1 we have a synchronization along name c^u :

$$R^1 \longrightarrow (\nu \tilde{c}) (\nu c^u c^v) ((\lambda(x_1, x_2).c^v!\langle \lambda(y_1, y_2).V_\epsilon(V)(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) \rangle)(u_1, u_2) \mid c^v?(x).x(v_1, v_2)) = R^2$$

Upon receiving the value, the server applies it to (u_1, u_2) , thus obtaining the following process:

$$R^2 \longrightarrow (\nu \tilde{c}) (\nu c^u c^v) (c^v!\langle \lambda(y_1, y_2).V_\epsilon(V)(u_1, u_2, y_1, y_2) \rangle \mid c^v?(x).x(v_1, v_2)) = R^3$$

Up to here, we have partially instantiated name variables of a value with the sequence \tilde{u} . Next, the first trio in R^3 can communicate with the server on name c^v :

$$\begin{aligned} R^3 &\longrightarrow (\nu \tilde{c}) (\nu c^u c^v) (\lambda(y_1, y_2).V_\epsilon(V)(u_1, u_2, y_1, y_2)(v_1, v_2)) \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu \tilde{c}) (\nu c^u c^v) (V_\epsilon(V)(u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2)) \end{aligned}$$

This completes the instantiation of name variables with appropriate sequences of names with recursive types. At this point, $\mathcal{D}(Q)$ can proceed to mimic the application in Q . \triangleleft

Example 3.11 (Breakdown of Recursion Encoding). We recall process $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ from Example 3.4:

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket P \rrbracket &= a?(m).a!\langle m \rangle.(\nu s) (V(a, s) \mid \bar{s}!\langle V \rangle) \\ V &= \lambda(x_a, y_1).y_1?(z_x).x_a?(m).x_a!\langle m \rangle.(\nu s) (z_x(x_a, s) \mid \bar{s}!\langle z_x \rangle).\mathbf{0}\end{aligned}$$

Here, bound name s is typed with S , from Example 3.3, defined as:

$$S = \mu t.?(?(\text{str});!\langle \text{str} \rangle;\text{end}, t) \rightarrow \diamond;\text{end}$$

We now analyze $\mathcal{D}(\llbracket P \rrbracket)$ and its reduction chain. By Definition 3.6, we have $\mathcal{V}(\llbracket P \rrbracket) = 7$. Then, we choose $k = 1$ and observe that $\sigma = \{a_1\bar{a}_1/a\bar{a}\}$. Following Definition 3.9, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}(\llbracket P \rrbracket) &= (\nu c_1, \dots, c_7) (\nu c^a) (c^a?(x).x(a_1, a_2) \mid \bar{c}_1!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(\llbracket P \rrbracket\sigma)) \\ \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(\llbracket P \rrbracket) &= c_1?().c^a!\langle \lambda(z_1, z_2).z_1?(m).\bar{c}_2!\langle m \rangle.c^a?(x).x(z_1, z_2) \rangle \\ &\quad \mid c_2?(m).c^a!\langle \lambda(z_1, z_2).z_2!\langle m \rangle.\bar{c}_3!\langle \rangle.c^a?(x).x(z_1, z_2) \rangle \\ &\quad \mid (\nu s_1) (c_3?().\bar{c}_4!\langle \rangle.\bar{c}_5!\langle \rangle \mid c_4?().\bar{c}^a!\langle \lambda(z_1, z_2). \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)(z_1, z_2, s_1) \rangle \\ &\quad \mid c_5?().\bar{s}_1!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle.\bar{c}_7!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?())\end{aligned}$$

In accordance with Example 3.3, the type of s_1 in the decomposed process is

$$M = \mu t.?(?(\text{str}), !\langle \text{str} \rangle, t) \rightarrow \diamond.$$

The decomposition relies twice on $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)$, the breakdown of value V , which we give below. For this, we observe that V is an abstraction of a process Q with $|Q| = 7$. We also α -convert the process abstracted in $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)$ renaming bound propagators c_1, \dots, c_7 to c_1^V, \dots, c_7^V to avoid name clashes.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) &= \lambda(x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}, y_1).(\nu c_1^V, \dots, c_7^V) (\bar{c}_1^V!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(Q) \{c_1^V, \dots, c_7^V/c_1, \dots, c_7\} \mid c^{x_a}(x).x(x_{a_1}, x_{a_2})) \\ \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(Q) &= c_1?(y_1).y_1?(z_x).\bar{c}_2!\langle z_x \rangle \\ &\quad \mid c_2?(z_x).c^a!\langle \lambda(z_1, z_2).z_1?(m).\bar{c}_3!\langle z_x, m \rangle.c^a?(x).x(z_1, z_2) \rangle \\ &\quad \mid c_3?(z_x).c^a!\langle \lambda(z_1, z_2).z_2!\langle m \rangle.\bar{c}_4!\langle z_x \rangle.c^a?(x).x(z_1, z_2) \rangle \\ &\quad \mid (\nu s_1) (c_4?(x_z).\bar{c}_5!\langle z_x \rangle.\bar{c}_6!\langle z_x \rangle \mid \\ &\quad \quad c_5?(z_x).c^a!\langle \lambda(z_1, z_2).z_x(z_1, z_2, s_1) \rangle \mid c_6?(z_x).\bar{s}_1!\langle z_x \rangle.\bar{c}_7!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?())\end{aligned}$$

We follow the reduction chain on $\mathcal{D}(\llbracket P \rrbracket)$ until it is ready to mimic the first action with channel a , which is an input. First, c_1 will synchronize, after which c^a sends the abstraction to which then (a_1, a_2) is applied. We obtain $\mathcal{D}(\llbracket P \rrbracket) \rightarrow^3 (\nu c_2, \dots, c_7, c^a) P'$, where

$$\begin{aligned}P' &= a_1?(m).\bar{c}_2!\langle m \rangle.c^a?(x).x(a_1, a_2) \\ &\quad \mid c_2?(m).c^a!\langle \lambda(z_1, z_2).z_2!\langle m \rangle.\bar{c}_3!\langle \rangle.c^a?(x).x(z_1, z_2) \rangle \\ &\quad \mid (\nu s_1) (c_3?().\bar{c}_4!\langle \rangle.\bar{c}_5!\langle \rangle \mid c_4?().\bar{c}^a!\langle \lambda(z_1, z_2). \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)(z_1, z_2, s_1) \rangle \mid \\ &\quad \quad c_5?().\bar{s}_1!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle.\bar{c}_7!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?())\end{aligned}$$

Note that this process is awaiting an input on channel a_1 , after which c_2 can synchronize with its dual. At that point, c^a is ready to receive another abstraction that mimics an input on a_1 . This strongly suggests a tight operational correspondence between a process P and its decomposition in the case where P performs higher-order recursion. \triangleleft

3.4 Static Correctness

Having presented and illustrated our decomposition, we may now state its technical results. Given an environment $\Delta = \Delta_1, \Delta_2$, below we write $\Delta_1 \circ \Delta_2$ to indicate the split of Δ into a Δ_1 containing non-recursive names and a Δ_2 containing recursive names.

We extend the decomposition function $\mathcal{G}(-)$ to typing environments in the obvious way. We rely on the following notation. Given a tuple of names $\tilde{s} = s_1, \dots, s_n$ and a tuple of (session) types $\tilde{S} = S_1, \dots, S_n$ of the same length, we write $\tilde{s} : \tilde{S}$ to denote a list of typing assignments $s_1 : S_1, \dots, s_n : S_n$.

Definition 3.10 (Decomposition of Environments). Let Γ , Λ , and Δ be typing environments. We define $\mathcal{G}(\Gamma)$, $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$, and $\mathcal{G}(\Delta)$ inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}(\Delta, u_i : S) &= \mathcal{G}(\Delta), (u_i, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{G}(S)|-1}) : \mathcal{G}(S) \\ \mathcal{G}(\Gamma, u_i : \langle U \rangle) &= \mathcal{G}(\Gamma), u_i : \mathcal{G}(\langle U \rangle) \\ \mathcal{G}(\Gamma, x : U) &= \mathcal{G}(\Gamma), x : \mathcal{G}(U) \\ \mathcal{G}(\Lambda, x : U) &= \mathcal{G}(\Lambda), x : \mathcal{G}(U) \\ \mathcal{G}(\emptyset) &= \emptyset\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let P be an indexed HO process and V be a value.*

1. *If $\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \circ \Delta_\mu \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ then $\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_x^k(P) \triangleright \diamond$, where:*

- $k > 0$
- $\tilde{r} = \text{dom}(\Delta_\mu)$
- $\Phi = \prod_{r \in \tilde{r}} c^r : \langle \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r)) \multimap \diamond \rangle$
- $\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(P)$
- $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}$
- $\text{dom}(\Theta) = \{c_k, \dots, c_{k+|P|-1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+|P|-1}}\}$
- $\Theta(c_k) = ?(U_1, \dots, U_n)$, where $(\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \mathcal{G}(\Lambda))(\tilde{x}) = (x_1 : U_1, \dots, x_n : U_n)$
- $\text{balanced}(\Theta)$

2. *If $\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \circ \Delta_\mu \vdash V \triangleright \tilde{T} \multimap \diamond$ then $\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta) \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(V) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(\tilde{T}) \multimap \diamond$, where:*

- $\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(V)$
- $\Phi = \prod_{r \in \tilde{r}} c^r : \langle \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r)) \multimap \diamond \rangle$

Proof. By mutual induction on the structure of P and V . See Appendix B.1 for details. \square

Using the above lemma we can prove our static correctness result, which explains how our decomposition induces minimal session types.

Theorem 3.1 (Static Correctness). *Let P be a closed HO process (i.e. $\text{fv}(P) = \emptyset$) with $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P)$. If $\Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta \circ \Delta_\mu \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$, then $\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma); \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta\sigma), \mathcal{G}(\Delta_\mu\sigma) \vdash \mathcal{D}(P) \triangleright \diamond$, where $\sigma = \{\text{init}(\tilde{u})/\tilde{u}\}$.*

Proof. Directly from the definitions, using Lemma 3.1. See Appendix B.2 for details. \square

4 Dynamic Correctness

In this section, we establish the dynamic correctness of our decomposition, stated in terms of a typed behavioral equivalence. More specifically, we would like to show that any typed process P is equivalent to its decomposition $\mathcal{D}(P)$. But how do we even state it formally? Both P and $\mathcal{D}(P)$ are typed HO processes (as any minimally typed process is also an HO process), so we can consider compare them as HO terms inside the HO type system. The conventional notion of typed equivalence for HO processes is contextual equivalence, which is given a local characterization in terms of *higher-order bisimulations* [18]. In our case, however, contextual equivalence is not the right choice: contextual equivalence applies to processes of the *same type*, whereas the process P and its decomposition $\mathcal{D}(P)$ have different types and typing contexts. Instead of using contextual equivalence, we generalize the notion of higher-order bisimilarity to a notion that we call *MST bisimilarity*, which relates processes of (potentially) different types.

This section is organized as follows. In Section 4.1 we recall the notion of higher-order bisimulation, used for characterizing behavioral equivalence in HO, and discuss its limitations for our purposes.

We use higher-order bisimulation as a basis to give a formal definition of MST bisimulation in Section 4.2, which we will use as a notion of behavioral equivalence for comparing P and $\mathcal{D}(P)$. In order to show that our decomposition is correct, in Section 4.3 we exhibit a bisimulation relation \mathcal{S} which relates a process and its decomposition, containing a number of intermediate pairs, working from a motivating example in Section 4.3.1. Finally, in Section 4.4 we show that \mathcal{S} is indeed an MST bisimulation.

4.1 Behavioral Equivalence in HO and its Limitations

Let us begin by recalling the notion of HO bisimulation, defined in [18] to characterize contextual equivalence of HO processes.

Definition 4.1 (Definition 17 in [18]). A typed relation \mathfrak{R} is an HO *bisimulation* if for all $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \mathfrak{R} \Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1$,

- 1) Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \widetilde{m}_1) n!(V_1)} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ then there exist Q_2, Δ'_2 , and Λ'_2 such that $\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \widetilde{m}_2) n!(V_2)} \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ where, for a fresh t ,

$$\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1'' \vdash (\nu \widetilde{m}_1)(P_2 \mid t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1) \mathfrak{R} \Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2'' \vdash (\nu \widetilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \mid t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2)$$

- 2) Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$, with ℓ not an output, then there exist Q_2, Λ'_2 , and Δ'_2 such that $\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\hat{\ell}} \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ and $\Gamma_1; \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2 \mathfrak{R} \Gamma_2; \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$.

- 3) The symmetric cases of 1, 2.

The largest such bisimulation is called HO *bisimilarity*, denoted by $\approx^{\mathbb{H}}$.

There are two points worth highlighting in this definition. Firstly, the labeled transition system $\xrightarrow{\ell}$ used in the definition of $\approx^{\mathbb{H}}$ is what is called the *refined transition system*, different from the standard labeled transition system for the higher-order π -calculus. The idea behind the refined transition system is that we want to disallow arbitrary inputs $P \xrightarrow{x(V)} P'$; having to consider such transitions in the definition of bisimilarity is undesirable, because it involves input of an arbitrary (higher-order) value V , making the definition very much non-local and ensuring that the bisimulations are very large. As it turns out, due to the typed nature of the system, it suffices to consider inputs of the processes of a very particular kind—*characteristic values*, defined based on the type.

Secondly, because the inputs are restricted in the refined LTS, there is some price to pay in the handling of the outputs. If an output action $P_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \widetilde{m}_1) n!(V_1)} P_2$ is matched by an output action $Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \widetilde{m}_2) n!(V_2)} Q_2$, then we need to ensure that the output processes V_1 and V_2 are somehow related. We have to ensure this in the output clause, because on the receiving end transitions inputting values V_1 or V_2 might not even be considered. To that extent, we package the values V_1 or V_2 in *trigger processes* (denoted $t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1$ and $t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2$), which are defined based on the typing. We then make them part of the processes that are considered at the “next step” of the bisimulation.

This notion of HO bisimilarity works for processes of the same type. For our case, we need to compare processes of different, but related types. To that extent we make several changes to the definition above. Firstly, during the decomposition a single name x in a source process is decomposed into a sequence of names x_1, \dots, x_k in the target process. So in the definition of MST bisimilarity we match an action on a name x with an action on an *indexed* name x_i . Secondly, such discrepancy between names might arise in input and output values. This also needs to be considered as part of the definition. For this, we need to accommodate the difference between characteristic values and trigger processes for MST and HO. In the next subsection we work out the details sketched above.

4.2 MST Bisimilarity

In this section we define a generalized version of HO bisimilarity allowing for comparing MST and HO process terms. Our goal is to define *MST bisimilarity* (denoted \approx^M), a typed behavioral equivalence, which we give in Definition 4.9. To define \approx^M , we require some auxiliary definitions, in particular:

- A refined LTS on typed processes (Definition 4.5);
- A relation \bowtie on values (Definition 4.6) and on names (Definition 4.14);
- A revised notion of trigger processes (Definition 4.8).

Refined LTS and characteristic values. The idea behind defining the refined LTS is to restrict the input of arbitrary processes (values) and make the transition system image-finite (modulo names).

The *refined LTS* for HO is defined in [18] in three layers. First comes the *untyped LTS* $P \xrightarrow{\ell} P'$, which describes reductions of untyped processes in the usual style of the LTS semantics for π -calculus. Secondly, there is a notion of the *environmental LTS* $(\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1) \xrightarrow{\ell} (\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2)$, which describes reductions of typing environments. This LTS describes the way a typing context can evolve in accordance with its session types. On top of these layers there are notions of *refined environmental LTS* and *refined LTS for processes*. The former restricts the environmental LTS to inputs on characteristic values, as we discussed in Section 4.1. Finally, the refined LTS for processes restricts the untyped LTS to those actions which are supported by the refined environmental LTS.

We follow this approach for defining the refined LTS for MST processes. Both the untyped LTS for processes and the environmental LTS for MST processes coincides with the same LTSs for HO (or, to be more precise, with its restriction to minimal session types). It remains, then, to define the refined environmental LTS for MST processes, with the idea that the refined LTS restricts inputs to the inputs on *minimal characteristic values* and *minimal trigger values*.

Definition 4.2 (Minimal trigger value). Given a value type $C \rightsquigarrow \diamond$ and fresh (indexed) name t_1 , the *minimal trigger value* on t_1 of type $\mathcal{G}(C) \rightsquigarrow \diamond$ is defined as the abstraction

$$\lambda \tilde{x}. t_1?(y).y \tilde{x}$$

where $\tilde{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{|\mathcal{G}(C)|})$.

Definition 4.3 (Minimal characteristic values). Let u be a name and $i > 0$. We define $\langle - \rangle_i^u$ and $\langle - \rangle$ on types as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \langle ?(L); S \rangle_i^u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u_i?(x).(t_1!\langle \ulcorner u_{i+1}, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{G}(S)|} \urcorner \rangle | \langle L \rangle_i^x) & \langle S \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{s} \quad (|\tilde{s}| = |\mathcal{G}(S)|, \tilde{s} \text{ fresh}) \\ \langle !(L); S \rangle_i^u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u_i!\langle \langle L \rangle \rangle.t_1!\langle \ulcorner u_{i+1}, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{G}(S)|} \urcorner \rangle.\mathbf{0} & \langle \langle L \rangle \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a_1 \quad (a_1 \text{ fresh}) \\ \langle \text{end} \rangle_i^u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{0} & \langle C \rightarrow \diamond \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda(x_1, \dots, x_{|\mathcal{G}(C)|}). \langle C \rangle_1^x \\ \langle \mu t. S \rangle_i^u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle S \{ \text{end}/t \} \rangle_i^u & \langle C \multimap \diamond \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda(x_1, \dots, x_{|\mathcal{G}(C)|}). \langle C \rangle_1^x \\ \langle \langle L \rangle \rangle_i^u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u_1!\langle \langle L \rangle \rangle.t_1!\langle \ulcorner u_1 \urcorner \rangle.\mathbf{0} & \\ \langle C \rightarrow \diamond \rangle_i^x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \langle C \rangle & \\ \langle C \multimap \diamond \rangle_i^x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \langle C \rangle & \end{array}$$

where t_1 is a fresh (indexed) name. In this definition we use name-passing constructs, as outlined in Example 2.1.

Definition 4.4 (Refined environmental LTS). The refined LTS, denoted \vdash_{m}^{ℓ} , is defined on top of the environmental LTS using the following rules:

$$\frac{[\text{MTR}] \quad (\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1) \xrightarrow{\ell} (\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2) \quad \ell \neq n?(V)}{(\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1) \vdash_{\text{m}}^{\ell} (\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2)}$$

$$\frac{[\text{MRcv}] \quad (\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1) \xrightarrow{n?(V)} (\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2) \quad (V \equiv \langle L \rangle) \vee (V \equiv \lambda \tilde{x}. t_1?(y).(y \tilde{x})) \quad \text{with } t_1 \text{ fresh}}{(\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1) \xrightarrow{n?(V)}_{\text{m}} (\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2)}$$

where $\lambda \tilde{x}. t_1?(y).(y \tilde{x})$ is a minimal trigger value of type $\mathcal{G}(C)$ (Definition 4.2).

Finally, the refined LTS for MST processes is just a combination of the untyped LTS with the refined environmental LTS:

Definition 4.5 (Refined LTS). The environmental refined LTS extends to the typed refined LTS on processes. We write $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \xrightarrow{\ell}_{\text{m}} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ when

- $P_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} P_2$, and
- $(\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1) \xrightarrow{\ell}_{\text{m}} (\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2)$.

We write $\xrightarrow{\ell}_{\text{m}}$ for the weak version of the transition $\xrightarrow{\ell}_{\text{m}}$. Notice that while the untyped LTS and the non-refined environmental LTS coincide with that of HO, the refinement that we impose on the environmental LTS is different from its HO counterpart. Specifically in Rule [MRcv] we take special care to use minimal characteristic processes $\langle - \rangle$, instead of general HO characteristic process $\{-\}_c$ as defined in [18].

Relating trigger and characteristic values. As we mentioned earlier, the notion of bisimulation that we consider requires matching transitions of the source HO term with the transitions of the target MST term. However, the two transitions might differ on the inputs of characteristic values. We accommodate for that difference by establishing a relation between the trigger and characteristic values of HO and MST.

Definition 4.6. We define the relation \bowtie between HO processes and indexed processes inductively as:

$$\frac{|\tilde{x}| = |\mathcal{G}(C)|}{\lambda x : C. t?(y).y x \bowtie \lambda \tilde{x} : \mathcal{G}(C). t_1?(y).y \tilde{x}} \quad \overline{\{C \rightsquigarrow \diamond\}_c} \bowtie \overline{\langle C \rightsquigarrow \diamond \rangle}$$

where $\lambda \tilde{x} : \mathcal{G}(C). t_1?(y).(y \tilde{x})$ is a minimal trigger value of type $\mathcal{G}(C) \rightsquigarrow \diamond$ (Definition 4.2) and $\{-\}_c$ denotes the characteristic values defined in [18]. We write $\lambda x : C. t_1?(y).y x$ to mean that value $\lambda x. t_1?(y).y x$ is of type $C \rightsquigarrow \diamond$.

Trigger processes and MST bisimilarity. Before we give the definition of MST bisimilarity, we establish the following notations:

Definition 4.7 (Indexed name). Given a name n , we write \check{n} to either denote n or any indexed name n_i , with $i > 0$.

Definition 4.8 (Trigger process). Given a value V , a trigger process for a fresh (indexed) name t_1 is defined as:

$$t_1 \leftarrow_{\text{H}} V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} t_1?(\tilde{x}).(V \tilde{x})$$

where $|\tilde{x}| = |\tilde{C}|$ for $V : \tilde{C} \rightsquigarrow \diamond$.

Lemma 4.1. *If $\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash V \triangleright \tilde{C} \rightsquigarrow \diamond$, then $\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, t_1 : ?(\tilde{C}) \vdash t_1 \leftarrow_{\text{H}} V \triangleright \diamond$.*

Finally, we are ready to formally define MST bisimilarity.

Definition 4.9 (MST Bisimilarity). A typed relation \mathfrak{R} is an *MST bisimulation* if for all $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \mathfrak{R} \Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1$,

- 1) Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \widetilde{m}_1) n!(V_1)} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ then there exist $Q_2, \Delta'_2,$ and Λ'_2 such that $\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \widetilde{m}_2) \check{n}!(V_2)}_{\mathfrak{m}} \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ where, for a fresh t ,

$$\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1'' \vdash (\nu \widetilde{m}_1)(P_2 \mid t \leftarrow_{\mathfrak{H}} V_1) \mathfrak{R} \Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2'' \vdash (\nu \widetilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \mid \check{t} \leftarrow_{\mathfrak{H}} V_2)$$

- 2) Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1 \xrightarrow{n?(V_1)} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ then there exist $Q_2, \Lambda'_2,$ and Δ'_2 such that $\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\check{n}?(V_2)}_{\mathfrak{m}} \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ where $V_1 \bowtie V_2$ and $\Gamma_1; \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2 \mathfrak{R} \Gamma_2; \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$,
- 3) The symmetric cases of 1 and 2.

The largest such bisimulation is called *MST bisimilarity*, denoted by $\approx^{\mathfrak{M}}$.

In all clauses, we use the refined LTS (Definition 4.5) and rely on notation \check{n} (Definition 4.7). In the output clause, we use the triggers (Definition 4.8). In the input clause, we use the relation \bowtie on values (Definition 4.6).

We discuss differences between MST bisimilarity and higher-order bisimilarity as defined in [18]. First, an action in P_1 must be matched by an action on an indexed name in Q_1 , and refined LTS actions in P_1 are matched by minimal refined LTS actions in Q_1 (Definition 4.6). As a consequence of the latter, in the input case the observed values are not identical but related by \bowtie (Definition 4.6). In other words, whenever P_1 receives a trigger or a characteristic value, then Q_1 should receive their minimal counterparts (Definition 4.2 and Definition 4.3). Further, as names could be indexed on the right-hand side, the typing environments could differ for open processes, so the MST bisimilarity assumes different typing environments on both sides.

4.3 The Bisimulation Relation

Our goal is to complement our static correctness result (Theorem 3.1) by proving the following statement about the decomposition of processes (Definition 3.9):

Theorem 4.1. *Let P be an HO process such that $\Gamma; \Delta; \Lambda \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$. We have*

$$\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash P \approx^{\mathfrak{M}} \mathcal{G}(\Gamma); \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta) \vdash \mathcal{D}(P)$$

To show that P and $\mathcal{D}(P)$ are MST-bisimilar, we provide a concrete bisimulation relation \mathcal{S} that contains $(P, \mathcal{D}(P))$. Defining \mathcal{S} to be just the set of such pairs is, however, not going to work; instead, the relation \mathcal{S} should also contain pairs corresponding to “intermediate” states in which the process and its decomposition may get “desynchronized”. Before we give the concrete definition of \mathcal{S} we look at an example, illustrating the need for such intermediate pairs.

4.3.1 A Motivating Example

Consider the following process:

$$P_1 = u?(t).v?(x).(\nu s : S) (u!\langle x \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid t s \mid \bar{s}!\langle x \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \mid \bar{v}!\langle V \rangle.\mathbf{0}$$

where $u : ?(\langle U_t \rangle); !\langle U_V \rangle; \text{end}$ and $v : S$ with $S = ?(U_V), U_t = S \rightarrow \diamond$, and U_V is some shared value type, i.e. $U_V = S_V \rightarrow \diamond$, for some session type S_V . Further, V is some value, such that $V = \lambda y : S_V. R$.

Thus, P_1 is typed using the typing of its constituents:

$$\frac{\emptyset; \emptyset; \bar{v} : \bar{S} \vdash \bar{v}!\langle V \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond \quad \emptyset; \emptyset; u : ?(\langle U_t \rangle); !\langle U_V \rangle; \text{end}, v : S \vdash u?(t).v?(x).(\nu s : S) (u!\langle x \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid t s \mid \bar{s}!\langle x \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \triangleright \diamond}{\emptyset; \emptyset; u : ?(\langle U_t \rangle); !\langle U_V \rangle; \text{end}, v : S, \bar{v} : \bar{S} \vdash P_1 \triangleright \diamond}$$




Figure 7: Transitions of P_1 and $Q_1 = \mathcal{D}(P_1)$ in Section 4.3.1. The blue nodes represent processes that contain characteristic values and trigger processes induced by the bisimilarities defined in [18].

The decomposition of P_1 is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}(P_1) &= (\nu \tilde{c}) (\bar{c}_1! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(P_1)) \\
&= (\nu \tilde{c}) (\bar{c}_1! \langle \rangle \mid c_1?().\bar{c}_2! \langle \rangle.\bar{c}_{11}! \langle \rangle \\
&\quad \mid c_2?().u_1?(t).\bar{c}_3! \langle t \rangle \mid c_3?(t).v_1?(x).\bar{c}_4! \langle t, x \rangle \\
&\quad \mid (\nu s_1) (c_4?(t, x).\bar{c}_5! \langle x \rangle.\bar{c}_6! \langle t, x \rangle \mid c_5?(x).u_2! \langle x \rangle.\bar{c}_6! \langle \rangle \mid c_6?() \\
&\quad \mid c_7?(t, x).\bar{c}_8! \langle t \rangle.\bar{c}_9! \langle x \rangle \mid c_8?(t).t s_1 \mid c_9?(x).\bar{s}_1! \langle x \rangle.\bar{c}_{10}! \langle \rangle \mid c_{10}?()) \\
&\quad \mid c_{11}?().\bar{v}_1! \langle \nu_\epsilon(V) \rangle.\bar{c}_{12}! \langle \rangle \mid c_{12}?()),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{c} = c_1, \dots, c_{12}$. Let us write Q_1 for the decomposition $\mathcal{D}(P_1)$.

We wish to show $P_1 \approx^M Q_1$. For this, we must exhibit a relation \mathcal{S} included in \approx^M such that $(P_1, \mathcal{D}(P_1)) \in \mathcal{S}$. To illustrate the notions required to define the additional pairs, we consider

possible transitions of P_1 and Q_1 , denoted schematically in Figure 7. First, let us consider a possible (refined) transition of P_1 , an input on u of a characteristic value:

$$P_1 \xrightarrow{u?(V_C)} v?(x).(\nu s : S) (u!\langle x \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid V_C s \mid \bar{s}!\langle x \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \mid \bar{v}!\langle V \rangle.\mathbf{0} = P_2$$

where $V_C = \{U_t\}_c = \lambda y : S.y?(x').(!\langle \rangle).\mathbf{0} \mid x' s'$ is the *characteristic value* of U_t .¹ Process Q_1 can weakly match this input action on the indexed name u_1 . This input does not involve V_C but the *minimal* characteristic value of type U_t (Definition 4.3). We have:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} Q'_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} Q''_1 \xrightarrow{u_1?(V_C^m)} & (\nu \tilde{c}_\bullet) \bar{c}_3!\langle V_C^m \rangle \mid c_3?(t).v_1?(x).\bar{c}_4!\langle t, x \rangle \mid \bar{c}_{11}!\langle \rangle \\ & \mid (\nu s_1) (c_4?(t, x).\bar{c}_5!\langle x \rangle.\bar{c}_7!\langle t, x \rangle \mid c_5?(x).u_2!\langle x \rangle.\bar{c}_6!\langle \rangle \mid c_6?() \mid \\ & \mid c_7?(t, x).\bar{c}_8!\langle t \rangle.\bar{c}_9!\langle x \rangle \mid c_8?(t).t s_1 \mid c_9?(x).\bar{s}_1!\langle x \rangle.\bar{c}_{10}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{10}?()) \\ & \mid c_{11}?().\bar{v}_1!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle.\bar{c}_{12}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{12}?() = Q_2 \end{aligned}$$

where $V_C^m = \langle U_t \rangle = \lambda(y_1).y_1?(x').(t_1!\langle \rangle).\mathbf{0} \mid x' \tilde{s}'$, with $y_1 :?(S)$, $|\tilde{s}'| = |\mathcal{G}(S_V)|$, and $\tilde{c}_\bullet = c_3, \dots, c_{12}$.

Hence, we should have $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$. Observe that Q_2 is not exactly the decomposition of P_2 . First, V_C^m is not the breakdown of V_C . Second, V_C^m is not at the same position in Q_2 as V_C ; the later being in the application position and the former being pushed through several propagators. Therefore, the relation \mathcal{S} needs to (1) relate V_C and V_C^m and (2) account for the fact that a value related to V_C and thus it needs to be propagated (as in Q_2). To address the first point, we establish a relation \boxtimes between characteristic values and their minimal counterparts. For the second point, we record this fact by “decomposing” the process as $P_2 = P'_2\{V_C/t\}$, and propagating the information about this substitution when computing the set of processes that are related to P_2 .

The same considerations we mentioned also apply to the value V , which is transmitted internally, via a synchronization:

$$P_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu s) (u!\langle V \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid V_C s \mid \bar{s}!\langle V \rangle.\mathbf{0}) = P_3$$

Value V transmitted in P_2 should be related to its corresponding breakdown $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)$, which should be propagated through the decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} Q'_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} Q''_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} & (\nu \tilde{c}_{\bullet\bullet}) \bar{c}_4!\langle V_C^m, \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle \\ & \mid (\nu s_1) (c_4?(t, x).\bar{c}_5!\langle x \rangle.\bar{c}_7!\langle t, x \rangle \mid c_5?(x).u_2!\langle x \rangle.\bar{c}_6!\langle \rangle \mid c_6?() \mid \\ & \mid c_7?(t, x).\bar{c}_8!\langle t \rangle.\bar{c}_9!\langle x \rangle \mid c_8?(t).t s_1 \mid c_9?(x).\bar{s}_1!\langle x \rangle.\bar{c}_{10}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{10}?()) \mid \\ & \mid \bar{c}_{12}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{12}?() = Q_3 \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{c}_{\bullet\bullet} = c_4, \dots, c_{10}, c_{12}$.

Now, in P_3 we can observe the output of V along u :

$$P_3 \xrightarrow{u!\langle V \rangle} (\nu s) (\mathbf{0} \mid V_C s \mid \bar{s}!\langle x \rangle.\mathbf{0}) = P_4$$

Process Q_3 mimics this action by sending the process $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)$ along name u_2 :

$$\begin{aligned} Q_3 \xrightarrow{u_2!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle} & (\nu \tilde{c}_*) \bar{c}_7!\langle V_C^m, \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle \mid \bar{c}_6!\langle \rangle \mid c_6?() \mid \\ & \mid c_7?(t, x).\bar{c}_8!\langle t \rangle.\bar{c}_9!\langle x \rangle \mid c_8?(t).t s_1 \mid c_9?(x).\bar{s}_1!\langle x \rangle.\bar{c}_{10}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{10}?() = Q_4 \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{c}_* = c_6, \dots, c_{10}$. Following the definition of higher-order bisimilarity, we should have:

$$P_4 \parallel t' \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V \mathcal{S} Q_4 \parallel t'_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)$$

¹We use **blue** to denote characteristic values and trigger processes that do not occur in the original process, but which are induced by the bisimilarities defined in [18].

for a fresh t' , where we have used ‘ \parallel ’ (rather than ‘ $|$ ’) to denote process composition: we find it convenient to highlight those sub-processes in parallel that originate from trigger and characteristic processes.

We can see that the trigger process for V on the left-hand side should be matched with a trigger process for the *breakdown* of V on the right-hand side. Moreover, the definition of trigger processes should be generalized to polyadic values, as $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)$ could be polyadic (see Definition 4.8).

Let us briefly consider how $P_4 \parallel t' \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V$ evolves after due to the synchronization in sub-process V_c s within P_4 :

$$P_4 \parallel t' \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu s) (s?(x').(t!\langle \rangle | x' s') \parallel \bar{s}!\langle V \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \parallel t' \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V = P_6 \parallel t' \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V$$

We can see that Q_4 can mimic this synchronization after a few administrative reductions on propagators:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_4 &\xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu c_9 c_{10}) \overline{c_9}!\langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle | s_1?(x').(t_1!\langle \rangle | x' \tilde{s}') | c_9?(x).\overline{s_1}!\langle x \rangle.\overline{c_{10}}!\langle \rangle | c_{10}?(()) \parallel t'_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \\ &= Q_6 \parallel t'_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we need to have:

$$P_6 \parallel t' \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V \mathcal{S} Q_6 \parallel t'_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)$$

To ensure that this pair is in \mathcal{S} , we introduce an auxiliary relation, denoted \diamond (Definition 4.15), which allows us to account for the sub-processes that originate from characteristic values or trigger processes (in blue). We need to account for them separately, because one of them is not the decomposition of the other. We thus decree:

$$\begin{aligned} &s?(x').(t!\langle \rangle | x' s') \diamond s_1?(x').(t_1!\langle \rangle | x' \tilde{s}') \\ &t' \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V \diamond t'_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \end{aligned}$$

Next, the synchronization on s in P_6 is mimicked by Q_6 with a synchronization on s_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} P_6 \parallel t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V &\xrightarrow{\tau} (t!\langle \rangle.\mathbf{0} | V s') \parallel t' \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V = P_8 \parallel t' \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V \\ Q_6 \parallel t'_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) &\xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu c_{10}) (t_1!\langle \rangle | \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \tilde{s}') | \overline{c_{10}}!\langle \rangle | c_{10}?(()) = Q_8 \parallel t'_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can see that after the output on the trigger name t there is an application that activates R , the body of V :

$$\begin{aligned} P_8 &\xrightarrow{t!\langle \rangle} V s' \xrightarrow{\tau} R\{s'/y\} \\ Q_8 &\xrightarrow{t!\langle \rangle} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \tilde{s}' \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu \tilde{c}_{**}) \overline{c_{12}}!\langle \rangle | \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^{12}(R) \{\tilde{s}'/\tilde{y}\} \equiv \mathcal{D}(R\{s'/y\}) \end{aligned}$$

We reached the point where we relate process $R\{s'/y\}$ with its decomposition $\mathcal{D}(R\{s'/y\})$. Hence, the remaining pairs in \mathcal{S} are obtained in the same way.

Key insights. We summarize some key insights from the example:

- A received value can either be a pure value or a characteristic value. In the former case, the pure value has to be related to its decomposition, but in the later case the value should be related to an MST characteristic value of the same type. We define the relation \boxtimes on values to account for this (Definition 4.13).
- Trigger processes mentioned in the output case of MST bisimilarity should be matched with their minimal counterparts, and the same applies to processes originating from such trigger processes. The relation \diamond accounts for this (see Definition 4.15).
- Any value in process P could have been previously received. The definition of \mathcal{S} takes this into account by explicitly relating processes with substitutions (see Definition 4.17). That is, for P , it relates $P'\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ such that $P'\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} = P$. Here, the substitution $\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ records values that should be propagated.

4.3.2 The relation \mathcal{S}

In this section we give the definition of the relation \mathcal{S} (Definition 4.17), following the insights gathered from the example. More specifically, we define

- a relation \boxtimes on values, which includes the relation \bowtie from Definition 4.6, (Definition 4.13);
- a relation \diamond on processes, for relating characteristic and trigger processes with their MST counterparts, (Definition 4.15);
- a set $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P)$ of processes *correlated* to a process $P\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$, (Table 3).

Because we will be working extensively with indexed processes, we will use the following function, which returns a set of all valid indexing substitutions for a list of names.

Definition 4.10 (Indexed names substitutions). Let $\tilde{u} = (a, b, r, \bar{r}, r', \bar{r}', s, \bar{s}, s', \bar{s}', \dots)$ be a finite tuple of names, where a, b, \dots denote shared names, $r, \bar{r}, r', \bar{r}', \dots$ denote tail-recursive names, and $s, \bar{s}, s', \bar{s}', \dots$ denote linear (non tail-recursive names). We write $\text{index}(\tilde{u})$ to denote

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

Any substitution $\sigma \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P))$ turns an HO process P into an indexed process $P\sigma$.

Correlated values. The main ingredient in defining the relation \mathcal{S} is the the set $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P)$, which contains processes *correlated* to process P with a substitution $\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$. The substitution, as discussed above, denotes previously received values, and we assume that $\text{fv}(P) = \tilde{x}$. Essentially, $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(-)$ computes a breakdown of $P\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ in parallel with an activating trio, that mimics the original actions of P up to transitions on propagators. The activating trio propagates not the original values \tilde{W} , but the values related to \tilde{W} . To do that we introduce the set $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(V)$ of correlated values and the relation \boxtimes on values, which are defined mutually recursively in the three following definitions.

Definition 4.11 (Broken down values). Given a value V , the set $\mathcal{C}(V)$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{C}(V) = \bigcup \{ \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(V') : V = V'\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \text{ and } V' \text{ is not a variable} \}$$

We extend $\mathcal{C}(-)$ to work on a list of values \tilde{V} component-wise, that is:

$$\mathcal{C}(V_1, \dots, V_n) = \{B_1, \dots, B_n : B_i \in \mathcal{C}(V_i) \text{ for } i \in 1 \dots n\}.$$

This way, the elements in $\mathcal{C}(V)$ differ in the propagated values \tilde{W} . Consider the following example:

Example 4.1. Let $V = \lambda y. y!\langle V_1 \rangle. y!\langle V_2 \rangle. \mathbf{0}$. There are four possibilities of V' , \tilde{W} , and \tilde{x} such that $V = V'\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$. That is,

- $V = V^1\{V_1 V_2 / x_1 x_2\}$ where $V^1 = \lambda y. y!\langle x_1 \rangle. y!\langle x_2 \rangle. \mathbf{0}$
- $V = V^2\{V_1 / x_1\}$ where $V^2 = \lambda y. y!\langle x_1 \rangle. y!\langle V_2 \rangle. \mathbf{0}$
- $V = V^3\{V_2 / x_2\}$ where $V^3 = \lambda y. y!\langle V_1 \rangle. y!\langle x_2 \rangle. \mathbf{0}$
- Finally, we can take the identity substitution $\tilde{W} = \epsilon$ and $\tilde{x} = \epsilon$.

Thus, we have $\mathcal{C}(V) = \{\mathcal{C}_{x_1 x_2}^{V_1 V_2}(V^1), \mathcal{C}_{x_1}^{V_1}(V^2), \mathcal{C}_{x_2}^{V_2}(V^3), \mathcal{C}_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon}(V)\}$.

Definition 4.12. Given a value V , the set $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(V)$, where $\text{fn}(V) = \tilde{x}$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(V) = \{ \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(V) \{ \tilde{B} / \tilde{x} \} \mid \tilde{W} \boxtimes \tilde{B} \}.$$

Definition 4.13 (Relating values). The relation \boxtimes on values (with indexed names) is defined as follows:

$$V_1 \boxtimes V_2 \iff \begin{cases} \exists V'_1, \sigma \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(V'_1)). V_1 = V'_1 \sigma \wedge V'_1 \bowtie V_2 & \text{if } V_1 \text{ is a characteristic or a trigger value} \\ V_2 \in \mathcal{C}(V_1) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where \bowtie is the relation from Definition 4.6.

Thus, in the definition of $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(V)$, the value V is related to the triggered break down values with \tilde{B} substituted for \tilde{x} such that $\tilde{W} \boxtimes \tilde{B}$.

Additionally, to define $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(-)$ for processes, we have to observe the behaviour of processes enclosed in the received trigger and characteristic values. Further, we have to observe the behaviour of trigger processes of shape $t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V$. For this we need to define a relation \diamond on processes that contains pairs

$$((C)^x, \langle C \rangle_1^x), (t?(y).yx, t_1?(y).y\tilde{x}), (t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V, t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} W)$$

where $x : C$ and $|\tilde{x}| = |\mathcal{G}(C)|$ and $V \boxtimes W$.

Before we define \diamond we need the following auxiliary definition:

Definition 4.14 (Relating names). We define \diamond as the relation on names defined as

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

where ϵ denotes the empty list.

Now, we are ready to relate processes, modulo indexed names (cf. Definition 4.7), using the relation \diamond defined as follows:

Definition 4.15 (\diamond Indexed process relation). We define the relation \diamond as

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{[\text{IPAPP}]}{V \boxtimes W \quad x_i \diamond \tilde{x}} \quad \frac{[\text{IPPAR}]}{P \diamond P' \quad Q \diamond Q'} \quad \frac{[\text{IPINACT}]}{\mathbf{0} \diamond \mathbf{0}} \\ \hline V x_i \diamond W \tilde{x} \quad P \mid Q \diamond P' \mid Q' \\ \\ \frac{[\text{IPSEND}]}{P\sigma \diamond P' \quad V\sigma \boxtimes W \quad \sigma = \text{next}(n_i)} \quad \frac{[\text{IPRCV}]}{P\sigma \diamond P' \quad \sigma = \text{next}(n_i)} \quad \frac{[\text{IPNEWS}]}{P \diamond P' \quad \tilde{m}_1 \diamond \tilde{m}_2} \\ \hline n_i! \langle V \rangle . P \diamond n_i! \langle W \rangle . P' \quad n_i?(y).P \diamond n_i?(y).P' \quad (\nu \tilde{m}_1) P \diamond (\nu \tilde{m}_2) P' \end{array}$$

We can now show the property that we wanted, namely that: the bodies of trigger values and minimal trigger values (Definition 4.2) are related; the bodies of characteristic values and minimal characteristic values (Definition 4.3) are related; and that the trigger processes and minimal trigger processes (Definition 4.8) are related, with appropriate name substitutions.

Lemma 4.2. *We have:*

$$\{((C)^x \{x_i, t_1/x, t\}, \langle C \rangle_i^x), (t_1?(y).yx \{x_i/x\}, t_1?(y).y\tilde{x}), (t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V\sigma, t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} W)\} \subset \diamond$$

where $i, j > 0$, $x : C$, $\tilde{x} = (x_i, \dots, x_{i+|\mathcal{G}(C)|-1})$, $\sigma \in \text{index}(\tilde{u})$, $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(V)$, and $V\sigma \boxtimes W$.

Proof (Sketch). We may notice that \diamond relates process up to incremented indexed names and values related by $V\sigma \boxtimes W$ for some σ . More precisely, free names as subject of actions are indexed and incremented accordingly in a related process, and names as objects of output actions are broken down in a related process, by $V\sigma \bowtie W$ when $V\sigma = m_i$, that is $m_i \bowtie \tilde{m}$ where $m_i : C$ and $\tilde{m} = (m_i, \dots, m_{i+|\mathcal{G}(C)|-1})$.

For the first pair $((C)^x \{x_i, t_1/x, t\}, \langle C \rangle_i^x)$ by inspection of Definition 4.7 we can observe that $\langle C \rangle_i^x$ is essentially $(C)^x$ with its subject names indexed and incremented (starting with index i) and objects names broken down. Thus, it is contained in \diamond . Similarly, $(t?(y).yx \{x_i/x\}, t_1?(y).y\tilde{x})$ is contained by observing that $x_i \diamond \tilde{x}$. Finally, for $(t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V\sigma, t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} W)$, by Definition 4.8, $V\sigma \boxtimes W$. \square

Correlated processes. Finally, we can use the introduced notions to define the set $\mathcal{C}^-(-)$ of correlated processes. As mentioned, the set $\mathcal{C}_x^{\tilde{W}}(P)$ contains processes correlated to process P with a substitution $\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$. The definition of $\mathcal{C}^-(-)$ is given in Table 3. Before looking into the details, we first describe how the $\mathcal{C}^-(-)$ is used.

We introduce auxiliary notions for treating free (tail-recursive) names in processes.

Definition 4.16 (Auxiliary Notions). Let P be an HO process.

- We write $\text{fnp}(P)$ to denote the set of free propagator names in P .
- We define $\text{rfv}(P)$ to denote free tail-recursive names in values in P .
- We define $\text{cr}(P)$ to denote free names of form c^r in P .
- We define $\text{rfni}(P)$ such that $r \in \text{rfni}(P)$ if and only if $(r_i, \dots, r_j) \subseteq \text{rn}(P)$ for some $i, j > 0$.
- Given $r : S$ and $\tilde{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_{|\mathcal{G}(S)|})$, we write $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}}$ to denote the process

$$\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} = \prod_{r \in \tilde{v}} c^{r?}(x).x \tilde{r}$$

Definition 4.17 (Relation \mathcal{S}). Let $P\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ be a well-typed process such that $\text{fn}(P) \cap \text{fn}(\tilde{W}) = \emptyset$, and let the \mathcal{C} -set be as in Table 3. We define the relation \mathcal{S} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} = \{ & (P\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}, (\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}) R) : R \in \mathcal{C}_x^{\tilde{W}\sigma}(P\sigma) \\ & \text{with } \tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}), \sigma \in \text{index}(\tilde{u}), \tilde{c}_r = \text{cr}(R), \tilde{c} = \text{fnp}(R) \} \end{aligned}$$

Now we describe the definition of $\mathcal{C}^-(-)$ in Table 3. Essentially, $\mathcal{C}^-(-)$ computes a breakdown of $P\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ in parallel with an activating trio, that mimics the original actions of P up to transitions on propagators. This is done with the help of $\mathcal{J}^-(-)$ (also given in Table 3), which computes a closure of a process with respect to τ -transitions on propagators.

To define the \mathcal{C} -set we distinguish processes that do not appear in the given process, but that are composed in parallel by the clauses of MST bisimilarity (Definition 4.9). For this we use the following notions:

Definition 4.18 (Trigger Collections). We let H, H' to range over *trigger collections*: processes of the form $P_1 \mid \dots \mid P_n$ (with $n \geq 1$), where each P_i is a trigger process or a process that originates from a trigger or from a characteristic value.

Example 4.2. Let $H_1 = t_1 \leftrightarrow_{\text{H}} V \mid [C]^{u_1} \mid t_2!(u_2).\mathbf{0}$ where t_1, t_2, u_1, u_2 are channel names, V is a value, and C a channel type. Then, we could see that $t_2!(u_2).\mathbf{0}$ originates from a characteristic value. Thus, H_1 is a trigger collection.

Notice that we write P to denote a “pure” process that is not composed with a trigger collection. For processes with trigger collections, the following notation is relevant:

Definition 4.19 (Process in parallel with a trigger or a characteristic process). We write $P \parallel Q$ to stand for $P \mid Q$ where either P or Q is a trigger collection.

Now we can describe all the cases in the definitions of the \mathcal{J} -set and the \mathcal{C} -set in Table 3 (Page 37). Observe that the second and third columns in Table 3 are closely related: the third column lists side conditions for the definitions in the second column. Note that in each case we assume the substitution $\rho = \{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$. We start with the cases for $\mathcal{C}_x^{\tilde{W}}(P)$:

P	$\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P)$	
$Q_1 \parallel Q_2$	$\{R_1 \parallel R_2 : R_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{W}_1}(Q_1), R_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{w}}^{\tilde{W}_2}(Q_2)\}$	$\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(Q_1), \tilde{w} = \text{fv}(Q_2)$ $\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} = \{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \cdot \{\tilde{W}_2/\tilde{w}\}$
$(\nu m : C) Q$	$\{(\nu \tilde{m} : \mathcal{G}(C)) (\nu \tilde{c}^m) R : R \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(Q\sigma)\}$	$\tilde{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_{ \mathcal{G}(C) })$ $\sigma = \{m_1 \tilde{m}_1 / m \tilde{m}\}$ $\tilde{c}^m = (\text{tr}(C)) ? c^m \cdot c^{\tilde{m}}; \epsilon$
Q	$\{\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid \overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{B} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P)\}$ $\cup \{\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v} \tilde{r}} \mid R : R \in \mathcal{J}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P), \tilde{r} = \text{rfni}(R)\}$	$\tilde{W} \boxtimes \tilde{B}$ $\tilde{v} = \text{rn}(P\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$
H	$\{\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \parallel H' : H\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \diamond H'\}$	$\tilde{v} = \text{rn}(H\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$
P	$\mathcal{J}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P)$	
$u_i! \langle V_1 \rangle . Q$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> $-\text{tr}(C)$: $\{u_i! \langle V_2 \rangle . \overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{z}}^k(Q\sigma)\}$ $\text{tr}(C)$: $\{c^u! \langle M_{V_2}^{\tilde{B}_2} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^k(Q), M_{V_2}^{\tilde{B}_2} \tilde{u} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^k(Q),$ $u_{ S }! \langle V_2 \rangle . (\overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid c^u?(x).x \tilde{u}) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^k(Q)\}$ where: $M_V^{\tilde{B}} = \lambda \tilde{z}. z_{ S }! \langle V \rangle . (\overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{B} \rangle \mid c^u?(x).x \tilde{z})$	$\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(V_1), \tilde{w} = \text{fv}(Q)$ $\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} = \{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \cdot \{\tilde{W}_2/\tilde{w}\}$ $\sigma = \text{next}(u_i)$ $V_1 \sigma \{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \boxtimes V_2, \tilde{W}_2 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_2$ $\tilde{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_{ \mathcal{R}^*(S) })$ $\tilde{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_{ \mathcal{R}^*(S) })$
$u_i?(y) . Q$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> $-\text{tr}(C)$: $\{u_i?(y) . \overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{B}y \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^k(Q\sigma)\}$ $\text{tr}(C)$: $\{c^u! \langle M_y^{\tilde{B}} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^k(Q), M_y^{\tilde{B}} \tilde{u} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^k(Q),$ $u_{ S }?(y) . (\overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{B}y \rangle \mid c^u?(x).x \tilde{u}) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^k(Q)\}$ where: $M_y^{\tilde{B}} = \lambda \tilde{z}. z_{ S }?(y) . (\overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{B}y \rangle \mid c^u?(x).x \tilde{z})$	$\tilde{W} \boxtimes \tilde{B}$ $\sigma = \text{next}(u_i)$ $\tilde{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_{ \mathcal{R}^*(S) })$ $\tilde{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_{ \mathcal{R}^*(S) })$
$V_1(\tilde{r}, u_i)$	$\overbrace{\{c^{r_l}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_l . c^{r_{l+1}}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_{l+1} . \dots . c^{r_n}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_n . Q_l \rangle \rangle\}}^{ \tilde{r} - l + 1}$, $\lambda \tilde{z}_l . \overbrace{c^{r_{l+1}}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_{l+1} . \dots . c^{r_n}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_n . Q_l \rangle \rangle}^{ \tilde{r} - l} \tilde{r}_l,$ $: 1 \leq l \leq n, V_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \boxtimes V_2$ $\cup \{V_2 \tilde{r}_1, \dots, \tilde{r}_n, \tilde{m} : V_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \boxtimes V_2\}$ where: $Q_l = V_2(\tilde{r}_1, \dots, \tilde{r}_{l-1}, \tilde{z}_l, \dots, \tilde{z}_n, \tilde{m})$	$\forall r_i \in \tilde{r}. (r_i : S_i \wedge \text{tr}(S_i) \wedge$ $\tilde{z}_i = (z_1^i, \dots, z_{ \mathcal{R}^*(S_i) }^i),$ $\tilde{r}_i = (r_1^i, \dots, r_{ \mathcal{R}^*(S_i) }^i))$ $u_i : C$ $\tilde{m} = (u_i, \dots, u_{i+ \mathcal{G}(C) -1})$
$Q_1 \mid Q_2$	$\{\overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{B}_1 \rangle . \overline{c_{k+l}}! \langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{y}}^k(Q_1) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+l}(Q_2)\}$ \cup $\{(R_1 \mid R_2) : R_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{W}_1}(Q_1), R_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}}^{\tilde{W}_2}(Q_2)\}$	$l = \lceil Q_1 \rceil, \tilde{W}_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_1, \tilde{W}_2 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_2$ $\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(Q_1), \tilde{z} = \text{fv}(Q_2)$ $\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} = \{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \cdot \{\tilde{W}_2/\tilde{z}\}$
$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathbf{0}$	

Table 3: The sets $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P)$ and $\mathcal{J}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P)$.

Parallel with a trigger collection: The \mathcal{C} -set of $Q_1 \parallel Q_2$ is defined as:

$$\{R_1 \parallel R_2 : R_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{W}_1}(Q_1), R_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{w}}^{\tilde{W}_2}(Q_2)\}$$

By Definition 4.19, either Q_1 or Q_2 is a trigger collection. Notice that a composition $Q_1 \mid Q_2$

(where both Q_1 and Q_2 are “pure”) is handled by $\mathcal{J}(-)$, see below. We treat $Q_1 \parallel Q_2$ compositionally: we split the substitution into parts concerning Q_1 and Q_2 , i.e., $\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} = \{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \cdot \{\tilde{W}_2/\tilde{w}\}$ such that $\tilde{y} = \mathbf{fv}(Q_1)$ and $\tilde{w} = \mathbf{fv}(Q_2)$, and relate it to a parallel composition whose components come from a corresponding \mathcal{C} -set.

Restriction: The \mathcal{C} -set of $(\nu m : C) Q$ is inductively defined as:

$$\left\{ (\nu \tilde{m} : \mathcal{G}(C)) R : (\nu \tilde{c}^m) R \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(Q\sigma) \right\}$$

where $\sigma = \{m_1\overline{m_1}/m\overline{m}\}$ and $\tilde{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_{|\mathcal{G}(C)|})$ is the decomposition of m under C . The elements are processes from the \mathcal{C} -set of Q with names \tilde{m} restricted. In the case when restricted name m is a tail-recursive then we also restrict the special propagator names c^m and \overline{c}^m which appear in R . Notice that the processes of the form $(\nu m)(Q_1 \parallel Q_2)$, which are induced by the output clause of MST bisimilarity, are treated in this case in the definition of $\mathcal{C}(-)$.

Pure process: The \mathcal{C} -set of a pure process Q is defined as follows:

$$\left\{ \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid \overline{c_k}!(\tilde{B}) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(Q) : \tilde{W} \boxtimes \tilde{B} \right\} \cup \left\{ \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v} \setminus \tilde{r}} \mid R : R \in \mathcal{J}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(Q), \tilde{r} = \mathbf{rfni}(R) \right\}$$

where $\tilde{v} = \mathbf{rn}(Q\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$. The elements in the first set are essentially the decomposition of Q (without restrictions of recursive propagators, which are handled in \mathcal{S}) up to different possibilities of values \tilde{B} that are \boxtimes -related to \tilde{W} (see Definition 4.13). Here, we remark that $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}}$ is recursive name providers for all tail-recursive names of Q and \tilde{W} (by $\tilde{v} = \mathbf{rn}(Q\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$). The second set contains elements of the \mathcal{J} -set of Q in parallel with $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v} \setminus \tilde{r}}$ where $\tilde{r} = \mathbf{rfni}(R)$. By Definition 4.16 we can see that $\mathbf{rfni}(R)$ denotes tail-recursive names already gathered in R by communications that consumed $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{r}}$: thus, we have $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v} \setminus \tilde{r}}$ as providers at top level.

In this sense, the processes from the second set can be seen as reducts of the processes from the first set. For example, if we examine the \mathcal{C} -set corresponding to the process P_2 from Figure 7, we note that the process Q_2 belongs to the first set, and the processes Q'_2 and Q''_3 belong to the second set.

Trigger collection: The \mathcal{C} -set of a trigger collection H contains its minimal counterparts, defined using the relation \diamond (Definition 4.15):

$$\left\{ \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \parallel H' : H\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \diamond H' \right\}.$$

where $\tilde{v} = \mathbf{rn}(H\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$. In this case we do not use the information on the substitution $\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$, because the substitution information is needed for values that are, or were, propagated. However, because H is a trigger collection, it will only contain propagators as part of values. The substitutions related the propagators in values are already handled by the relation \boxtimes , invoked by \diamond . As in the case with pure processes, the process $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{r}}$ is the recursive names provider for the tail-recursive names of H .

We now discuss the cases for $\mathcal{J}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P)$:

Output: The \mathcal{J} -set of $u_i! \langle V_1 \rangle . Q$ depends on whether (i) u_i is linear or shared name (i.e., $-\mathbf{tr}(u_i)$) or (ii) u_i is a tail-recursive name (i.e., $\mathbf{tr}(u_i)$). In sub-case (i) \mathcal{J} -set is defined as follows:

$$\left\{ u_i! \langle V_2 \rangle . \overline{c_k}!(\tilde{B}_2) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{z}}^k(Q\sigma) : V_1\sigma\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \boxtimes V_2, \tilde{W}_2 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_2 \right\}$$

where $\sigma = \mathbf{next}(u_i)$. By the definition, the substitution σ depends on whether u_i is linear or shared: in the former case, we use a substitution that increments u_i ; in the latter case we use

an identity substitution. We split \widetilde{W} into \widetilde{W}_1 and \widetilde{W}_2 , associated to the emitted value V_1 and the continuation Q , respectively.

Instead of the emitted value V_1 we consider values V_2 that are \boxtimes -related to $V_1\sigma\{\widetilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\}$. This way, we uniformly handle cases when (i) V_1 is a pure value, (ii) variable, and (iii) a characteristic value. In particular, if V_1 is a pure value, the set $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\widetilde{W}_1}(V_1\sigma)$ is included in all the values \boxtimes -related to $V_1\sigma\{\widetilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\}$.

Further, the propagator c_k activates the next trio with the values \widetilde{B}_2 such that $\widetilde{W}_2 \boxtimes \widetilde{B}_2$: as \widetilde{W}_2 denotes previously received values, we take a context of \boxtimes -related values. Again, received values could be either trigger and characteristic values (required to be observed by MST bisimilarity, cf. Definition 4.9) or pure values originated from internal actions. Again, by \boxtimes (Definition 4.13) we account for both cases.

In sub-case (ii), when u_i is a tail-recursive name, the elements are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \{c^u\langle M_{V_2}^{\widetilde{B}_2} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^k(Q), M_{V_2}^{\widetilde{B}_2} \tilde{u} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^k(Q), u_{[S]}!\langle V_2 \rangle.(\overline{c_k}!\langle \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid c^{u?}(x).x \tilde{u}) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^k(Q) \\ & \quad : V_1\{\widetilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \boxtimes V_2, \widetilde{W}_2 \boxtimes \widetilde{B}_2\} \\ & \text{where } M_V^{\widetilde{B}} = \lambda \tilde{z}. z_{[S]}!\langle V \rangle.(\overline{c_k}!\langle \widetilde{B} \rangle \mid c^{u?}(x).x \tilde{z}) \end{aligned}$$

The first element is a process obtained by the activation from the preceding trio. The second element is a result of a communication of the first element with top-level provider \mathcal{R}_{u_i} (Definition 4.16) on channel c^u . By this synchronization, the decomposition of recursive name u , that is \tilde{u} , is gathered in application $M_{V_2}^{\widetilde{B}_2} \tilde{u}$. Finally, the third element represents the result of the application: it is a process ready to mimic the original output action on $u_{[S]}$. Differently from sub-case (i), here we do not have to increment index of u_i in Q and V_1 as indices of recursive names are obtained based on the type S , that is $[S]$.

Input: The \mathcal{J} -set of $u_i?(y).Q$ depends on whether (i) u_i is linear or shared name (i.e., $\neg \text{tr}(u_i)$) or (ii) u_i is a tail-recursive name (i.e., $\text{tr}(u_i)$). In both sub-cases \mathcal{J} -set is defined similarly to the output case, with only one caveat: we need to expand the context for the continuation with a newly received value y . The \mathcal{J} -set in sub-case (i) is defined as follows:

$$\{u_i?(y).\overline{c_k}!\langle \widetilde{B}y \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^k(Q\sigma) : \widetilde{W} \boxtimes \widetilde{B}\}$$

where $\sigma = \text{next}(u_i)$. The \mathcal{J} -set in sub-case (ii) is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \{c^u\langle M_y^{\widetilde{B}} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^k(Q), M_y^{\widetilde{B}} \tilde{u} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^k(Q), u_{[S]}?(y).\overline{c_k}!\langle \widetilde{B}y \rangle \mid c^{u?}(x).x \tilde{z} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^k(Q) : \widetilde{W} \boxtimes \widetilde{B}\} \\ & \text{where:} \\ & M_y^{\widetilde{B}} = \lambda \tilde{z}. z_{[S]}?(y).\overline{c_k}!\langle \widetilde{B}y \rangle \mid c^{u?}(x).x \tilde{z}. \end{aligned}$$

The elements of the set represent steps of obtaining name $u_{[S]}$, along which the original action is mimicked, by synchronizing with the top-level provider \mathcal{R}_{u_i} , obtained in the corresponding \mathcal{C} -set.

Application: The \mathcal{J} -set of $V_1(\tilde{r}, u_i)$ where \tilde{r} are tail-recursive names, is a union of two sets as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \overbrace{\{c^{r_l}!\langle \lambda \tilde{z}_l.c^{r_{l+1}}!\langle \lambda \tilde{z}_{l+1} \dots .c^{r_n}!\langle \lambda \tilde{z}_n.Q_l \rangle \rangle \rangle\}}^{|\tilde{r}|-l+1}, \\ & (\lambda \tilde{z}_l.c^{r_{l+1}}!\langle \lambda \tilde{z}_{l+1} \dots .c^{r_n}!\langle \lambda \tilde{z}_n.Q_l \rangle \rangle) \tilde{r}_l : 1 \leq l \leq n, V_1\{\widetilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \boxtimes V_2\} \\ & \cup \{V_2 \tilde{r}_1, \dots, \tilde{r}_n, \tilde{m} : V_1\{\widetilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \boxtimes V_2\} \end{aligned}$$

where:

$$Q_l = V_2(\tilde{r}_1, \dots, \tilde{r}_{l-1}, \tilde{z}_l, \dots, \tilde{z}_n, \tilde{m})$$

The first set contains intermediate processes emerging while collecting recursive names using synchronizations with recursive name providers. We can see that the body of the inner-most abstraction, Q_l , is an application of V_2 (such that $V_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{y}\} \boxtimes V_2$) to partially instantiated recursive names: l denotes that decompositions of first $l-1$ recursive names are retrieved. The final tuple in arguments of Q_l , $\tilde{m} = (u_i, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{G}(C)|-1})$, is a full decomposition of non-recursive (linear or shared) name u_i . Just like in the previous cases, by taking V_2 as a \boxtimes -related value to $V_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{y}\}$, we uniformly handle all the three possibilities for V_1 (pure value, variable, and characteristic value).

In the first set, the first element is a process is ready to send an abstraction to an appropriate name provider, in order to retrieve the decomposition of l -th recursive name. The second element is a process that results from a communication of the first element with a provider: an application which will instantiate l -th recursive name in Q_l . Finally, the second set contains application processes in which the decompositions of all n recursive names are gathered, and it is ready to mimic the silent action (application reduction) of the original process.

Parallel composition: The \mathcal{J} -set of $Q_1 \mid Q_2$ is defined using two sets:

$$\begin{aligned} & \{ \overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{B}_1 \rangle . \overline{c_{k+l}}! \langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{y}}^k(Q_1) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+l}(Q_2) : \tilde{W}_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_1, \tilde{W}_2 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_2 \} \\ & \cup \\ & \{ (R_1 \mid R_2) : R_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{W}_1}(Q_1), R_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}}^{\tilde{W}_2}(Q_2) \} \end{aligned}$$

The first set contains a control trio that is ready to activate the decomposition of the two components in parallel. Just like in the other cases, the control trio propagates values that are \boxtimes -related to \tilde{W}_1 and \tilde{W}_2 . In order to close the set with respect to the τ -actions on propagators, the second set contains the composition of processes drawn from the \mathcal{C} -sets of Q_1 and Q_2 , with appropriate substitutions.

4.4 Proving Operational Correspondence

Recall that we aim to establish Theorem 4.1. To that end, we prove that \mathcal{S} (Definition 4.17) is an MST bisimulation, by establishing two results:

- Lemma 4.6 covers the case in which the given process performs an action, which is matched by an action of the decomposed process. In terms of operational correspondence (see, e.g., [11]), this establishes *completeness* of the decomposition.
- Lemma 4.7 covers the converse direction, in which the decomposed process performs an action, which is matched by the initial process. This established the *soundness* of the decomposition.

For proving both operational completeness and soundness, we will need the following result. Following Parrow [21], we refer to prefixes that do not correspond to prefixes of the original process, i.e. prefixes on propagators c_i , as *non-essential prefixes*. Then the relation \mathcal{S} is closed under reductions that involve non-essential prefixes.

Lemma 4.3. *Given an indexed process $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$, the set $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P_1)$ is closed under τ -transitions on non-essential prefixes. That is, if $R_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P_1)$ and $R_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} R_2$ is inferred from the actions on non-essential prefixes, then $R_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P_1)$.*

Proof. By the induction on the structure of P_1 . See Appendix C.1 for more details. \square

Operational completeness. We first consider transitions using the unrestricted and untyped LTS; in Lemma 4.6 we will consider transitions with the refined LTS.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ is a process such that $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \triangleright \diamond$ with $\text{balanced}(\Delta_1)$ and $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} Q_1$.*

1. *Whenever $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_1)n!(V_1)} P_2$, such that $\bar{n} \notin \text{fn}(P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$, then there exist Q_2 and V_2 such that $Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2)\tilde{n}!(V_2)} Q_2$ and, for a fresh t ,*

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2 \parallel t \leftarrow_{\text{H}} V_1)\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\text{H}} V_2)$$

2. *Whenever $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n?(V_1)} P_2$, such that $\bar{n} \notin \text{fn}(P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$, then there exist Q_2 , V_2 , and σ such that $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tilde{n}?(V_2)} Q_2$ where $V_1\sigma \boxtimes V_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$,*

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

Proof. By transition induction. See Appendix C.2 for more details. \square

The following statement builds upon the previous one to address the case of the typed LTS (Definition 4.5):

Lemma 4.5. *Assume $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ is a process and $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} Q_1$.*

1. *Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_1)n!(V_1)} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ then there exist Q_2 , V_2 , Δ'_2 , and Λ'_2 such that $\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2)\tilde{n}!(V_2)} \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ and, for a fresh t ,*

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2 \parallel t \leftarrow_{\text{H}} V_1)\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\text{H}} V_2)$$

2. *Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n?(V_1)} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ then there exist Q_2 , V_2 , σ , Λ'_2 , and Δ'_2 such that $\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tilde{n}?(V_2)} \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ where $V_1\sigma \boxtimes V_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$,*

3. *Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{\tau} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ then there exist Q_2 , Λ'_2 , and Δ'_2 such that $\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$.*

Proof. The proof uses results of Lemma 4.4. We consider the first case, the other two being similar. By the definition of the typed LTS we have:

$$\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \tag{20}$$

$$(\Gamma_1; \emptyset; \Delta_1) \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m})n!(V)} (\Gamma_1; \emptyset; \Delta_2) \tag{21}$$

By (21) we further have

$$\text{[SSnd]} \frac{\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma, \Gamma'; \Lambda'; \Delta' \vdash V \triangleright U & \Gamma'; \emptyset; \Delta_j \vdash m_j \triangleright U_j & \bar{n} \notin \text{dom}(\Delta) \\ \Delta' \setminus (\cup_j \Delta_j) \subseteq (\Delta, n : S) & \Gamma'; \emptyset; \Delta'_j \vdash \bar{m}_j \triangleright U'_j & \Lambda' \subseteq \Lambda \end{array}}{(\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, s : !\langle U \rangle; S) \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m})n!(V)} (\Gamma, \Gamma'; \Lambda \setminus \Lambda'; (\Delta, n : S, \cup_j \Delta'_j) \setminus \Delta')}$$

By (20) and the condition $\bar{n} \notin \text{dom}(\Delta)$ we have $\bar{n} \notin \text{fn}(P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$. Therefore, we can apply Item 1 of Lemma 4.4. \square

Finally, we are in a position to address the case of the refined typed LTS (Definition 4.5):

Lemma 4.6. *Assume $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ is a process and $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} Q_1$.*

1. Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_1) n!(V_1)} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ then there exist $Q_2, V_2, \Delta'_2,$ and Λ'_2 such that $\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) \tilde{n}!(V_2)}_m \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ and, for a fresh t ,

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2 \parallel t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1)\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2)$$

2. Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n?(V_1)} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ then there exist $Q_2, V_2, \Lambda'_2,$ and Δ'_2 such that $\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tilde{n}?(V_2)}_m \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ where $V_1 \bowtie V_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$,
3. Whenever $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{\tau} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ then there exist $Q_2, \Lambda'_2,$ and Δ'_2 such that $\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tau}_m \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$.

Proof. By case analysis of the transition label ℓ . It uses results of Lemma 4.5. We consider two cases: (i) $\ell \equiv n?(V_1)$ and (ii) $\ell \neq n?(V_1)$.

- (i) Case $\ell \equiv n?(V_1)$. This case concerns Part (2) of the lemma. In this case we know $P_1 = n?(y).Q$. We have the following transition inference tree:

$$\text{(Rv)} \frac{}{(n?(y).P_2)\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n?(V_1)} P_2} \quad (22)$$

$$\text{(RRcv)} \frac{(22) \quad V_1 \equiv \{U\}_c \vee V_1 \equiv \lambda x. t?(y).(yx) \text{ } t \text{ fresh}}{(n?(y).P_2)\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n?(V_1)} P_2} \quad (23)$$

From (22) and Lemma 4.5 we know that there exist $Q_2,$ and V_2 such that $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tilde{n}?(V_2)} Q_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$ where $V_1 \sigma \boxtimes V_2$. Since V_1 is a characteristic or a trigger value, we have $V_1 \bowtie V_2$ and that V_2 is a minimal characteristic or a trigger value. Hence, $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tilde{n}?(V_2)}_m Q_2$ using the Rule MTR (Definition 4.5).

- Case $\ell \neq n?(V)$. This case concerns Parts (1) and (3) of the lemma. We only consider the first part, when $\ell \equiv (\nu \tilde{m}_1) n!(V_1)$, since the other part is similar.

We apply Lemma 4.4 to obtain Q_2 such that $Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) \tilde{n}!(V_2)} Q_2$, and, for a fresh t ,

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2 \parallel t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1)\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2).$$

Since we are dealing with an output action, we can immediately conclude that $Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) \tilde{n}!(V_2)}_m Q_2$. □

Operational soundness. For the proof of operational soundness we follow the same strategy of stratifying it into three lemmas.

Lemma 4.7. Assume $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ is a process and $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} Q_1$.

1. Whenever $Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) n_i!(V_2)} Q_2$, such that $\bar{n}_i \notin \mathbf{fn}(Q_1)$, then there exist P_2 and V_2 such that $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) n!(V_2)} P_2$ and, for a fresh t ,

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2 \parallel t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1)\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2).$$

2. Whenever $Q_1 \xrightarrow{n_i?(V_2)} Q_2$, such that $\bar{n}_i \notin \mathbf{fn}(Q_1)$, there exist $P_2, V_2,$ and σ such that $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n?(V_1)} P_2$ where $V_1 \sigma \boxtimes V_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$.

3. Whenever $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} Q_2$ either (i) $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} Q_2$ or (ii) there exists P_2 such that $P_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} P_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$.

Proof (Sketch). By transition induction. See Appendix C.3 for more details. \square

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

1. Whenever $\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) \check{n}!(V_2)} \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ then there exist $P_2, V_1, \Delta'_1,$ and Λ'_1 such that $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_1) n!(V_1)} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ and, for a fresh t ,

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2 \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1)\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \parallel t_1 \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2)$$

2. Whenever $\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\check{n}?(V_2)} \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ then there exist $P_2, V_1, \sigma, \Lambda'_1,$ and Δ'_1 such that $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n?(V_1)} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ where $V_1\sigma \boxtimes V_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$,

3. Whenever $\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ then there exist $P_2, \Lambda'_1,$ and Δ'_1 such that $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{\tau} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$.

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

1. Whenever $\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) \check{n}!(V_2)} \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ then there exist $P_2, V_1, \Delta'_1,$ and Λ'_1 such that $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_1) n!(V_1)} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ and, for a fresh t ,

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2 \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1)\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \parallel t_1 \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2)$$

2. Whenever $\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\check{n}?(V_2)} \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ then there exist $P_2, V_1, \Lambda'_1,$ and Δ'_1 such that $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n?(V_1)} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ where $V_1 \bowtie V_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$,

3. Whenever $\Gamma_2; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2 \vdash Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} \Lambda'_2; \Delta'_2 \vdash Q_2$ then there exist $P_2, \Lambda'_1,$ and Δ'_1 such that $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{\tau} \Lambda'_1; \Delta'_1 \vdash P_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$.

Summary. Together, Lemmas 4.6 and 4.7 imply that \mathcal{S} is an MST-bisimilarity. In summary, we have shown Theorem 4.1, i.e., that for any typed process P , we have that

$$\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash P \approx^{\mathbb{M}} \mathcal{G}(\Gamma); \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta) \vdash \mathcal{D}(P).$$

In this section we have defined a notion of MST bisimilarity, following the notion HO bisimilarity for non-minimal processes. Following the strategy of Parrow in the untyped setting, we defined a relation \mathcal{S} containing all pairs $(P, \mathcal{D}(P))$, which we proved to be an MST bisimulation.

5 Optimizations of the Decomposition

In this section we discuss two optimizations that can be applied to the decomposition process. These optimizations simplify the structure of the trios and the nature of the underlying communication discipline.

The first optimization replaces trios in the decomposition with *duos* (i.e., processes with at most two sequential prefixes). The decomposition in Section 3 follows Parrow's approach in that it converts a process into a parallel composition of trios. The use of trios seems to be necessary in (plain) π -calculus; in our first optimization we show that, by exploiting the higher-order nature of communications in HO, the trios can be replaced by duos.

The second optimization replaces polyadic communications (sending and receiving several values at once) with monadic communications (sending and receiving only a single value per prefix). In the decomposition, we use polyadic communications in order to propagate dependencies through sub-processes. We show that the use of monadic communication prefixes is sufficient for that task.

From Trios to Duos. In the first optimization we replace trios with *duos*, i.e., processes with at most two sequential prefixes. This optimization is enabled by the higher-order nature of HO. In the translation we make of *thunk processes*, i.e., inactive processes that can be activated upon reception. We write $\{\{P\}\}$ to stand for the thunk process $\lambda x : \langle \text{end} \rightarrow \diamond \rangle . P$, for a fresh $x \notin \text{fn}(P)$. We write $\text{run } \{\{P\}\}$ to denote the application of a thunk to a (dummy) name of type $\text{end} \rightarrow \diamond$. This way, we have a reduction $\text{run } \{\{P\}\} \rightarrow P$.

The key idea behind replacing trios with duos is to transform a trio like

$$c_k?(\tilde{x}).u!\langle V \rangle . c_{k+1}!\langle \tilde{z} \rangle$$

into the composition of two duos, the second one being a ‘‘control’’ duo:

$$c_k?(x).c_0!\langle \{\{u!\langle V \rangle . c_{k+1}!\langle \tilde{z} \rangle\}\} \rangle \mid c_0?(y).(\text{run } y) \quad (24)$$

The first action (on c_k) is as before; the two remaining prefixes (on u and c_{k+1}) are encapsulated into a thunk. This thunk is sent via an additional propagator (denoted c_0) to the control duo that activates it upon reception. Because of this additional propagator, this transformation involves minor modifications in the definition of the degree function $\{\{-\}$ (cf. Definition 3.6).

In some cases, the breakdown function in Section 3.2 already produces duos. Breaking down input and output prefixes and parallel composition involves proper trios; following the scheme illustrated by (24), we can define a map $\{\{-\}$ to transform these trios into duos:

$$\begin{aligned} \{\{c_k?(x).u_i!\langle V \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{z} \rangle\}\} &= c_k?(x). \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \{\{u_i!\langle V \rangle . \overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle \tilde{z} \rangle\}\} \rangle \mid c_{k+1}?(y).(\text{run } y) \\ \{\{c_k?(x).u_i?(y). \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{x}' \rangle\}\} &= c_k?(x). \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \{\{u_i?(y). \overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle \tilde{x}' \rangle\}\} \rangle \mid c_{k+1}?(y).(\text{run } y) \\ \{\{c_k?(x). \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{y} \rangle . \overline{c_{k+l+1}}!\langle \tilde{z} \rangle\}\} &= c_k?(x). \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \{\{\overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle \tilde{y} \rangle . \overline{c_{k+l+2}}!\langle \tilde{z} \rangle\}\} \rangle \mid c_{k+1}?(y).(\text{run } y) \end{aligned}$$

In breaking down prefixes involving tail-recursive names (Table 1) we encounter trios of the following form:

$$\mathcal{B}(u_i?(y).Q) = c_k?(x).c^u!\langle N_y \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(Q) \quad \text{where} \quad N_y = \lambda \tilde{z}. z_{[S]}?(y).(\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \mid c^u?(x).x \tilde{z})$$

Here we can see that the top-level process is a duo and that only N_y packs a proper trio process. By applying the same idea we can translate this trio into the following composition of duos:

$$\{\{z_{[S]}?(y).(\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \mid c^u?(x).x \tilde{z})\}\} = z_{[S]}?(y). \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \{\{\overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \mid c^u?(x).x \tilde{z}\}\} \rangle \mid c_{k+1}?(y). \text{run } y$$

This is the idea behind the breakdown of a process starting with an input prefix; the breakdown of a process with an output prefix follows the same lines.

From Polyadic to Monadic Communication. Our second optimization replaces polyadic communications, used for the propagators, with monadic communications. Recall that propagators in $\mathcal{B}(-)$ serve two purposes: they (i) encode sequentiality by properly activating trios and (ii) propagate bound values. By separating propagators along those two roles, we can dispense with polyadic communication in the breakdown function.

We define *monadic breakdown*, $\mathcal{B}(-)$, and *monadic decomposition*, $\mathcal{D}(-)$, which use two *kinds* of propagators: (i) propagators for only activating trios of form c_k (where $k > 0$ is an index) and (ii) for propagating bound values of form c_x (where x is some variable). We depict the mechanism of the monadic breakdown in Figure 8. The main idea is to establish a direct link between trio that binds the variable x and trios that make use of x on propagator channel c_x . Thus, propagators on c_k only serve to activate next trios: they do so by *receiving* an abstraction that contains the next trio.

Formally, we define a *monadic decomposition*, $\mathcal{D}(P)$, that simplifies Definition 3.9 as follows:

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

where $k > 0$, $\tilde{c} = (c_k, \dots, c_{k+\{P\}-1})$, and the initializing substitution $\sigma = \{\text{index}(\tilde{u})/\tilde{u}\}$ is the same as in Definition 3.9.




Figure 8: Our monadic decomposition function $D(-)$, illustrated. As in Figure 4, nodes represent process states, ‘ \parallel ’ represents parallel composition of processes, black arrows stand for actions, and red arrows indicate synchronizations that preserve the sequentiality of the source process; also, blue arrows indicates synchronizations that propagate (bound) values.

$$\begin{aligned}
 V_x &= \lambda y. y?(z).c_x!\langle x \rangle.(\nu s) (z s \mid \bar{s}!\langle z \rangle) \\
 W_x^{\rightsquigarrow} &= \begin{cases} \bar{c}_x!\langle x \rangle & \text{if } \rightsquigarrow = \dashv\!\!\dashv \\ (\nu s) (V_x s \mid \bar{s}!\langle V_x \rangle) & \text{if } \rightsquigarrow = \rightarrow \end{cases} \\
 \mathbf{B}^k(u_i?(x : C \rightsquigarrow \diamond).Q) &= (\nu c_x) (c_k?(x).u_i?(x).(\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \rangle \mid W_x^{\rightsquigarrow})) \mid \mathbf{B}^{k+1}(Q\sigma) \\
 \mathbf{B}^k(u_i!\langle x \rangle.Q) &= c_k?(x).c_x?(x).u_i!\langle x \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathbf{B}^{k+1}(Q\sigma) \\
 \mathbf{B}^k(u_i!\langle V \rangle.Q) &= c_k?(x).u_i!\langle V(V\sigma) \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathbf{B}^{k+1}(Q\sigma) \\
 \mathbf{B}^k(x u_i) &= c_k?(x).c_x?(x).x \tilde{m} \\
 \mathbf{B}^k(V u_i) &= c_k?(x).V(V) \tilde{m} \\
 \mathbf{B}^k((\nu s) P') &= (\nu \tilde{s}) \mathbf{B}^k(P'\sigma) \\
 \mathbf{B}^k(Q \mid R) &= c_k?(x).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}[Q]_{j+1}}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathbf{B}^{k+1}(Q) \mid \mathbf{B}^{k+1}[Q]_{j+1}(R) \\
 \mathbf{V}(y) &= y \\
 \mathbf{V}(\lambda y : C^{\rightsquigarrow}.P) &= \lambda(y_1, \dots, y_{|\mathcal{G}(C)|}) : \mathcal{G}(C)^{\rightsquigarrow}.(\nu c_1, \dots, c_{|P|}) (\overline{c_1}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathbf{B}^1(P\{y_1/y\}))
 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 9: Monadic breakdown of processes and values

The monadic break down function $\mathbf{B}^k(-)$, given in Figure 9, simplifies the one in Table 1 by using only one parameter, namely k . In Figure 9 we use σ to denote the subsequent substitution $\text{next}(u_i)$, the same as in Table 1, and use \tilde{m} to denote the breakdown $(u_i, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{G}(C)|-1})$ of the name u_i .

The breakdown function $\mathbf{B}^k(-)$ uses propagators c_k ($k > 0$) for encoding sequentiality and dedicated propagators c_x for each variable x . As propagators c_k now only serve to encode sequentiality, only dummy values are being communicated along these channels (see Remark 3.2).

Let us describe the breakdown of a process with an input prefix, as it illustrates the key points common to all the other cases. The breakdown $\mathbf{B}^k(u_i?(x).Q)$ consists of a trio in parallel with the breakdown of the continuation $\mathbf{B}^{k+1}(Q\sigma)$ with name c_x restricted. The trio is first activated on c_k . This is followed by the prefix that mimics original input action on indexed name u_i . Upon receiving value x , two things will happen in parallel. First, the next trio will be activated on name c_{k+1} .

Second, the value x received on u_i is propagated further by the dedicated process W_x^{\rightsquigarrow} .

The specific mechanism of propagation depends on whether a received value is linear ($\rightsquigarrow = \rightarrow$) or shared ($\rightsquigarrow = \Rightarrow$). In the former case, we simply propagate a value along the *linear* name c_x once. In the later case, we cannot propagate the value only once, because a shared variable can be used in multiple trios. Thus, W_x^{\rightarrow} implements a recursive mechanism that repeatedly sends a value on the *shared* name c_x . The recursion is encoded in the same way as in Example 3.4: action $c_x!\langle x \rangle$ is enclosed in value V that gets appropriately duplicated upon a synchronization.

The breakdown function for values, $\mathbf{V}(-)$, is accordingly changed to invoke $\mathbf{B}^1(-)$ for breaking down a function body.

For simplicity, we defined the decomposition of the output process using a subprocess with four prefixes. Alternatively, we could have used a decomposition that relies on two trios, by introducing abstraction passing as in the previous section.

Let us illustrate the monadic breakdown by the means of an example:

Example 5.1 (Monadic Decomposition). We again consider process $P = (\nu u) (Q \mid R)$ as in Example 3.7 where:

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= u?(x). \overbrace{u?(y).(\nu s) (x \bar{s} \mid s!\langle y \rangle)}^{Q'} \\ R &= \bar{u}\langle V \rangle. \bar{u}\langle \text{true} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \\ V &= \lambda z. z?(w). \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

Let us recall the reductions of P :

$$\begin{aligned} P &\longrightarrow u?(y).(\nu s) (V \bar{s} \mid s!\langle y \rangle) \mid \bar{u}\langle \text{true} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \longrightarrow (\nu s) (V \bar{s} \mid s!\langle \text{true} \rangle) \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu s) (\bar{s}?(w). \mathbf{0} \mid s!\langle \text{true} \rangle) = P' \end{aligned}$$

The monadic decomposition of P is as follows:

$$\mathbf{D}(P) = (\nu c_1, \dots, c_{10}) (\nu u_1, u_2) (\bar{c}_1!\langle \rangle \mid \mathbf{B}^1(P\sigma))$$

where $\sigma = \{u_1 \bar{u}_1 / u \bar{u}\}$. We have:

$$\mathbf{B}^1(P\sigma) = c_1?(). \bar{c}_2!\langle \rangle. \bar{c}_8!\langle \rangle \mid \mathbf{B}^2(Q\sigma) \mid \mathbf{B}^8(R\sigma)$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}^2(Q\sigma) &= (\nu c_x) (c_2?(). u_1?(x). (\bar{c}_3!\langle \rangle \mid \bar{c}_x!\langle x \rangle) \mid \mathbf{B}^3(Q'\sigma')) \\ \mathbf{B}^3(Q'\sigma') &= (\nu c_y) (c_3?(). u_2?(y). (\bar{c}_4!\langle \rangle \mid W_y) \mid \mathbf{B}^4((\nu s) (x \bar{s} \mid s!\langle y \rangle))) \\ \mathbf{B}^4((\nu s) (x \bar{s} \mid s!\langle y \rangle)) &= (\nu s_1) c_4?(). \bar{c}_5!\langle \rangle. \bar{c}_6!\langle \rangle \mid c_5?(). c_x?(x). x \bar{s}_1 \mid \\ &\quad c_6?(). c_y?(y). s_1!\langle y \rangle. \bar{c}_7!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?(). \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{B}^8(R\sigma) &= c_8?(). \bar{u}_1!\langle \mathbf{V}(V) \rangle. \bar{c}_9!\langle \rangle \mid \mathbf{B}^9(\bar{u}_2!\langle \text{true} \rangle. \mathbf{0}) \\ \mathbf{B}^9(\bar{u}_2!\langle \text{true} \rangle. \mathbf{0}) &= c_9?(). \bar{u}_2!\langle \text{true} \rangle. \bar{c}_{10}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{10}?(). \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{V}(V) &= \lambda z_1. (\nu c_1^V, c_2^V) \bar{c}_1^V!\langle \rangle \mid \\ &\quad (\nu c_w) c_1^V?(z). z_1?(w). (\bar{c}_2^V!\langle \rangle \mid W_w) \mid c_2^V?(). \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

where $W_x = (\nu s) (V_x s \mid \bar{s}!\langle V_x \rangle)$ with $V_x = \lambda y. y?(z). c_x!\langle x \rangle. (\nu s) (z \bar{s} \mid s!\langle z \rangle)$. We may observe that $\mathbf{D}(P)$ correctly implements u_1 and u_2 typed with MSTs M_1 and M_2 (resp.) as given in Example 3.7. Now, we inspect the reductions of $\mathbf{D}(P)$. First we have three reductions on propagators:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}(P) &\longrightarrow (\nu c_2, \dots, c_{10}) (\nu u_1, u_2) \bar{c}_2!\langle \rangle. \bar{c}_8!\langle \rangle \mid \mathbf{B}^2(Q\sigma) \mid \mathbf{B}^8(R\sigma) \\ &\longrightarrow^2 (\nu c_3, \dots, c_7, c_9, c_{10}) (\nu c_x) (\bar{u}_1?(x). (\bar{c}_3!\langle \rangle \mid \bar{c}_x!\langle x \rangle) \mid \mathbf{B}^3(Q'\sigma')) \\ &\quad \mid \bar{u}_1!\langle \mathbf{V}(V) \rangle. \bar{c}_9!\langle \rangle \mid \mathbf{B}^9(\bar{u}_2!\langle \text{true} \rangle. \mathbf{0}) = D^1 \end{aligned}$$

Now, the synchronization on u_1 can take a place in D^1 (on the prefixes highlighted above). We can see that value $\mathbf{V}(V)$ received on u_1 can be propagated along c_x to a trio using it. Following up on that, propagators c_3 and c_9 are synchronized.

$$\begin{aligned} D^1 &\longrightarrow (\nu c_3, \dots, c_7, c_9, c_{10}) (\nu c_x) (\overline{c_3}!\langle \rangle \mid c_x!\langle \mathbf{V}(V) \rangle \mid \\ &\quad \mid (\nu c_y) (c_3?(y).u_2?(y).\overline{c_4}!\langle \rangle \mid W_y) \mid \mathbf{B}^4((\nu s) (x \bar{s} \mid s!\langle y \rangle))) \mid \overline{c_9}!\langle \rangle \mid \mathbf{B}^9(\overline{u_2}!\langle \mathbf{true} \rangle.\mathbf{0}) \\ &\longrightarrow^2 (\nu c_4, \dots, c_7, c_{10}) (\nu c_x) (c_x!\langle \mathbf{V}(V) \rangle \mid \\ &\quad \mid (\nu c_y) (\overline{u_2}?(y).\overline{c_4}!\langle \rangle \mid W_y) \mid \mathbf{B}^4((\nu s) (x \bar{s} \mid s!\langle y \rangle))) \mid \overline{u_2}!\langle \mathbf{true} \rangle.\overline{c_{10}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{10}?(y).\mathbf{0} = D^2 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, D^2 can mimic the synchronization on name u_2 . Again, this is followed by synchronizations on propagators.

$$\begin{aligned} D^2 &\longrightarrow (\nu c_4, \dots, c_7, c_{10}) (\nu c_x) (c_x!\langle \mathbf{V}(V) \rangle \mid (\nu c_y) (\overline{c_4}!\langle \rangle \mid W_y\{\mathbf{true}/y\} \mid \mathbf{B}^4((\nu s) (x \bar{s} \mid s!\langle y \rangle)))) \\ &\quad \mid \overline{c_{10}}!\langle \rangle \mid c_{10}?(y).\mathbf{0} \\ &\longrightarrow^4 (\nu c_7) (\nu c_x) (c_x!\langle \mathbf{V}(V) \rangle \mid (\nu c_y) (W_y\{\mathbf{true}/y\} \mid (\nu s_1) c_x?(x).x \bar{s}_1 \\ &\quad \mid c_y?(y).s_1!\langle y \rangle.\overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?(y).\mathbf{0})) = D^3 \end{aligned}$$

The subprocess $W_y\{\mathbf{true}/y\}$ is dedicated to providing the value \mathbf{true} on a shared name c_y . Specifically, it reduces as follow Its reductions are as follows:

$$W_y\{\mathbf{true}/y\} \longrightarrow^2 c_y!\langle \mathbf{true} \rangle.W_y\{\mathbf{true}/y\}$$

In this example, the shared value received on y is used only once; in the general case, a process could use a shared value multiple times: thus there could be multiple trios requesting the shared value on c_y .

With this information, we have the following reductions of the decomposed process:

$$\begin{aligned} D^3 &\longrightarrow^2 (\nu c_7) (\nu c_x) (c_x!\langle \mathbf{V}(V) \rangle \mid (\nu c_y) (c_y!\langle \mathbf{true} \rangle.W_y\{\mathbf{true}/y\} \mid (\nu s_1) c_x?(x).x \bar{s}_1 \\ &\quad \mid c_y?(y).s_1!\langle y \rangle.\overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?(y).\mathbf{0})) = D^4 \end{aligned}$$

In D^4 a value for x is requested on name c_x before it is applied to name \bar{s}_1 . Similarly, a value for y is gathered by the communication on c_y . These values are retrieved in two reductions steps as follows:

$$D^4 \longrightarrow^2 (\nu c_7) (\nu s_1) \mathbf{V}(V) \bar{s}_1 \mid s_1!\langle \mathbf{true} \rangle.\overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?(y).\mathbf{0} \mid (\nu c_y) W_y\{\mathbf{true}/y\} = D^5$$

We remark that $(\nu c_y) W_y\{\mathbf{true}/y\}$ reduces to $(\nu c_y) \overline{c_y}!\langle \mathbf{true} \rangle.W_y\{\mathbf{true}/y\}$ which is behaviorally equivalent to the inactive process.

Next, the application of the value is followed by the synchronization on propagator c_1^V :

$$\begin{aligned} D^5 &\longrightarrow (\nu c_7) (\nu s_1) (\nu c_1^V, c_2^V) c_1^V!\langle \rangle \mid (\nu c_w) c_1^V?(w).\bar{s}_1?(w).\overline{c_2^V}!\langle \rangle \mid W_w \mid c_2^V?(w).\mathbf{0} \\ &\quad \mid s_1!\langle \mathbf{true} \rangle.\overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?(y).\mathbf{0} \mid (\nu c_y) W_y\{\mathbf{true}/y\} \\ &\longrightarrow (\nu c_7) (\nu s_1) (\nu c_2^V) (\nu c_w) \bar{s}_1?(w).\overline{c_2^V}!\langle \rangle \mid W_w \mid c_2^V?(w).\mathbf{0} \\ &\quad \mid s_1!\langle \mathbf{true} \rangle.\overline{c_7}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?(y).\mathbf{0} \mid (\nu c_y) W_y\{\mathbf{true}/y\} = D^6 \end{aligned}$$

Here, we can see that D^6 can simulate P' , and its internal communication on the channel s .

6 Extension with Labeled Choice

In this section we discuss how to extend our approach to include sessions with *selection* and *branching* – constructs which are used commonly in session types to express deterministic choices. Forgoing formal proofs, we illustrate by examples how to harness the expressive power of abstraction-passing to decompose these constructs at the process level. First, we demonstrate how to break down

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

Figure 10: Typing rules for selection and branching.

selection and branching constructs in absence of recursion in Section 6.1. Then, in Section 6.2 we explore the interplay of recursion and labeled choice, as it requires special attention. Finally, in Section 6.3 we sketch how the operational correspondence proof can be adapted to account for branching and selection.

Let us briefly recall the labeled choice constructs in HO, following [17]. On the level of processes, selection and branching are modeled using labeled choice:

$$P, Q ::= \dots \mid u \triangleleft l . P \mid u \triangleright \{l_i : P_i\}_{i \in I}$$

The process $u \triangleleft l . P$ selects the label l on channel u and then proceeds as P . The process $u \triangleright \{l_i : P_i\}_{i \in I}$ receives a label on the channel u and proceeds with the continuation branch P_i based on the received label. Selection and branching constructs can synchronize with each other, as represented in the operational semantics by the following reduction rule:

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

At the level of types, selection and branching are represented with the following types:

$$S ::= \dots \mid \oplus \{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I} \mid \& \{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}$$

The *selection type* $\oplus \{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}$ and the *branching type* $\& \{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}$ are used to type, respectively, the selection and branching process constructs. Note the implicit sequencing in the sessions involving selection and branching: the exchange of a label l_i precedes the execution of one of the stipulated protocol S_i . The typing rules for type-checking branching and selection processes are given in Figure 10.

Given these process constructs and types, what are the minimal versions of the session types with labeled choice? We do not consider branching and selection as atomic actions as their purpose is to make a choice of a stipulated protocol. In other words, it is not meaningful to type a channel with branching type in which all protocols are end. Thus, we extend the minimal syntax types Definition 3.1 with branching and selection constructs as follows:

$$M ::= \dots \mid \oplus \{l_i : M_i\}_{i \in I} \mid \& \{l_i : M_i\}_{i \in I}$$

That is, MSTs also include branching and selection types with MSTs nested in branches.

Next we explain our strategy for extending the breakdown function to account for selection and branching.

6.1 Breaking Down Selection and Branching

Notice that in a branching process $u \triangleright \{l_i : P_i\}_{i \in I}$ each subprocess P_i can have a different session with a different degree. Abstraction-passing allows to uniformly handle these kinds of processes. We extend the breakdown function in Definition 3.3 to selection and branching as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\& \{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}) &= \& \{l_i : !(\mathcal{G}(S_i) \multimap \diamond)\}_{i \in I} \\ \mathcal{G}(\oplus \{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}) &= \oplus \{l_i : ?(\mathcal{G}(S_i) \multimap \diamond)\}_{i \in I} \end{aligned}$$

This decomposition follows the intuition that branching and selection correspond to the input and output of labels, respectively. For example, in the case of branching, once a particular branch l_i

has been selected, we would like to input names on which to provide sessions from the branch $\mathcal{G}(S_i)$. In our higher-order setting, we do not input or output names directly. Instead, we send out an abstraction of the continuation process, which binds those names. It is then the job of the (complementary) selecting process to activate that abstraction with the names we want to select.

To make this more concrete, let us consider decomposition of branching and selection at the level of processes through the following extended example.

Example 6.1. Consider a mathematical server Q that offers clients two operations: addition and negation of integers. The server uses name u to implement the following session type:

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

The branches have session types with different lengths: one receives two integers and sends over their sum, the other has a single input of an integer followed by an output of its negation. Let us consider a possible implementation for the server Q and for a client R that selects the first branch to add integers 16 and 26:

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

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

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

Let us discuss the decomposition of P . First, the decomposition of S is the minimal session type M , defined as follows:

$$M = \mathcal{G}(S) = \&\{\text{add} : !\langle(?(\text{int}), ?(\text{int}), !\langle\text{int}\rangle) \multimap \diamond\rangle, \text{neg} : !\langle(?(\text{int}), !\langle\text{int}\rangle) \multimap \diamond\rangle\}$$

Following Definition 3.9, we decompose P as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}(P) = (\nu c_1 \dots c_7) (\bar{c}_1!\langle \rangle \mid (\nu u_1) (c_1?(\cdot).\bar{c}_2!\langle \rangle.\bar{c}_3!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^2(Q\sigma_2) \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^3(R\sigma_2)))$$

where $\sigma_2 = \{u_1\bar{u}_1/u\bar{u}\}$. The breakdown of the server process Q , which implements the branching, is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^2(Q\sigma_2) &= c_2?(\cdot).u_1 \triangleright \{\underbrace{\text{add} : u_1!\langle \lambda(y_1, y_2, y_3).(\nu c_1^V \dots c_4^V) \bar{c}_1^V!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(Q_{\text{add}}\{y_1/u\})\sigma_V \rangle}_{V}, \\ &\quad \underbrace{\text{neg} : u_1!\langle \lambda(y_1, y_2).(\nu c_1^W \dots c_3^W) \bar{c}_1^W!\langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(Q_{\text{neg}}\{y_1/u\})\sigma_W \rangle}_{W}\} \end{aligned}$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(Q_{\text{add}}\{y_1/u\}) &= c_1?(\cdot).y_1?(a).\bar{c}_2!\langle a \rangle \mid c_2?(a).y_2?(b).\bar{c}_3!\langle a, b \rangle \mid c_3?(a, b).y_3!\langle a+b \rangle.\bar{c}_4!\langle \rangle \mid c_4?(\cdot) \\ \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^1(Q_{\text{neg}}\{y_1/u\}) &= c_1?(\cdot).y_1?(a).\bar{c}_2!\langle a \rangle \mid c_2?(a).y_2!\langle -a \rangle.\bar{c}_3!\langle \rangle \mid c_3?(\cdot) \end{aligned}$$

with $\sigma_V = \{c_1^V, \dots, c_4^V/c_1, \dots, c_4\}$ and $\sigma_W = \{c_1^W, c_2^W, c_3^W/c_1, c_2, c_3\}$. In process $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon^2(Q\sigma_2)$, name u_1 implements the minimal session type M . Following the common trio structure, the first prefix awaits activation on c_2 . The next prefix mimics the branching action of Q on u_1 . Then, each branch consists of the output of an abstraction along u_1 . This output does not have a counterpart in Q ; it is meant to synchronize with process $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon^3(R\sigma_2)$, the breakdown of the corresponding selection process (see below).

The abstractions sent along u_1 encapsulate the breakdown of subprocesses in the two branches (Q_{add} and Q_{neg}). An abstraction in the branch has the same structure as the breakdown of a value $\lambda y : C^{\rightarrow}. P$ in Table 1: it is a composition of a control trio and the breakdown of a subprocess; the generated propagators are restricted. In the first branch the server needs three actions to perform the session, and in the second branch the server needs to perform two actions. Because of that the first abstraction binds three names y_1, y_2, y_3 , and the second abstraction binds two names y_1, y_2 .

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

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

$$\mathcal{B}_\epsilon^3(R\sigma_2) = (\nu u_2, u_3, u_4) c_3?().\bar{u}_1 \triangleleft \text{add}.\bar{u}_1?(z).\bar{c}_4!\langle \rangle.z(u_2, u_3, u_4) \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^4(\bar{u}_2!\langle \mathbf{16} \rangle.\bar{u}_2!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\bar{u}_2?(r))$$

where:

$$\mathcal{B}_\epsilon^4(\bar{u}_2!\langle \mathbf{16} \rangle.\bar{u}_2!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\bar{u}_2?(r)) = c_4?().\bar{u}_2!\langle \mathbf{16} \rangle.\bar{c}_5!\langle \rangle \mid c_5?().\bar{u}_3!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\bar{c}_6!\langle \rangle \mid c_6?().\bar{u}_4?(r).\bar{c}_7!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?()$$

After receiving the context on c_3 (empty in this case), the selection action on u_1 is mimicked; then, an abstraction (an encapsulation of the selected branch) is received and applied to (u_2, u_3, u_4) , which are locally bound. The intention is to use these names to connect the received abstraction and the continuation of a selection process: the subprocess encapsulated within the abstraction will use (u_2, u_3, u_4) , while the dual names $(\bar{u}_2, \bar{u}_3, \bar{u}_4)$ are present in the breakdown of the continuation.

For simplicity, we defined $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon^3(R\sigma_2)$ using a subprocess with four prefixes. Alternatively, we could have used a decomposition that relies on two trios, by introducing abstraction passing as in Section 5.

We will now examine the reductions of the decomposed process $\mathcal{D}(P)$. First, c_1, c_2 , and c_3 will synchronize. We have $\mathcal{D}(P) \longrightarrow^4 D_1$, where

$$D_1 = (\nu c_4 \dots c_7) (\nu u_1) (u_1 \triangleright \{\text{add} : u_1!\langle V \rangle, \text{neg} : u_1!\langle W \rangle\} \\ \mid (\nu u_2, u_3, u_4) (\lambda(y_1, y_2, y_3).\bar{u}_1 \triangleleft \text{add}.\bar{u}_1?(z).\bar{c}_4!\langle \rangle.z(y_1, y_2, y_3))(u_2, u_3, u_4) \mid \\ \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^4(\bar{u}_2!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\bar{u}_2?(r)))$$

In D_1 , (u_2, u_3, u_4) will be applied to the abstraction; after that, the process chooses the label **add** on u_1 . Process D_1 will reduce further as $D_1 \longrightarrow^2 D_2 \longrightarrow^2 D_3$, where:

$$D_2 = (\nu c_4 \dots c_7) (\nu u_1) (u_1!\langle V \rangle \mid (\nu u_2, u_3, u_4) (\bar{u}_1?(z).\bar{c}_4!\langle \rangle.z(u_2, u_3, u_4) \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^4(\bar{u}_2!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\bar{u}_2?(r)))) \\ D_3 = (\nu c_4 \dots c_7) (\nu u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4) (\bar{c}_4!\langle \rangle.V(u_2, u_3, u_4) \mid \\ c_4?().\bar{u}_2!\langle \mathbf{16} \rangle.\bar{c}_5!\langle \rangle \mid c_5?().\bar{u}_3!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\bar{c}_6!\langle \rangle \mid c_6?().\bar{u}_4?(r).\bar{c}_7!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?())$$

Then D_3 reduces as $D_3 \longrightarrow D_4 \longrightarrow D_5$, where:

$$D_4 = (\nu c_5 \dots c_7) (\nu u_2, u_3, u_4) ((\nu c_1^V \dots c_4^V) (\bar{c}_1^V!\langle \rangle \mid c_1^V?(a).\bar{c}_2^V!\langle a \rangle \mid c_2^V?(a).u_3?(b).\bar{c}_3^V!\langle a, b \rangle \mid \\ c_3^V?(a, b).u_4!\langle a + b \rangle.\bar{c}_4^V!\langle \rangle \mid c_4^V?()) \mid \\ \bar{u}_2!\langle \mathbf{16} \rangle.\bar{c}_5^V!\langle \rangle \mid c_5?().\bar{u}_3!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\bar{c}_6^V!\langle \rangle \mid c_6?().\bar{u}_4?(r).\bar{c}_7^V!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?()) \\ D_5 = (\nu c_5 \dots c_7) (\nu u_2, u_3, u_4) ((\nu c_2^V \dots c_4^V) (u_2?(a).\bar{c}_2^V!\langle a \rangle \mid c_2^V?(a).u_3?(b).\bar{c}_3^V!\langle a, b \rangle \mid \\ c_3^V?(a, b).u_4!\langle a + b \rangle.\bar{c}_4^V!\langle \rangle \mid c_4^V?()) \mid \\ \bar{u}_2!\langle \mathbf{16} \rangle.\bar{c}_5^V!\langle \rangle \mid c_5?().\bar{u}_3!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\bar{c}_6^V!\langle \rangle \mid c_6?().\bar{u}_4?(r).\bar{c}_7^V!\langle \rangle \mid c_7?())$$

Now, process D_5 can mimic the original transmission of the integer 16 on channel u_2 as follows:

$$D_5 \longrightarrow (\nu c_5 \dots c_7) (\nu u_2, u_3, u_4) ((\nu c_2^V \dots c_4^V) (\overline{c_2^V}!\langle \mathbf{16} \rangle \mid c_2^V?(a).u_3?(b).\overline{c_3^V}!\langle a, b \rangle \mid c_3^V?(a, b).u_4!\langle a + b \rangle.\overline{c_4^V}!\langle \rangle \mid c_4^V?()) \mid \overline{c_5^V}!\langle \rangle \mid c_5^V?().\overline{u_3}!\langle \mathbf{26} \rangle.\overline{c_6^V}!\langle \rangle \mid c_6^V?().\overline{u_4}?(r).\overline{c_7^V}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7^V?()) = D_6$$

Finally, process D_6 reduces to D_7 in three steps, as follows:

$$D_6 \longrightarrow^3 (\nu c_5 \dots c_7) (\nu u_4) ((\nu c_4^V) (u_4!\langle \mathbf{16} + \mathbf{26} \rangle.\overline{c_4^V}!\langle \rangle \mid c_4^V?()) \mid \overline{u_4}?(r).\overline{c_7^V}!\langle \rangle \mid c_7^V?()) = D_7$$

Clearly, process D_7 correctly simulates the synchronizations of the process P' . \triangleleft

6.2 The Interplay of Selection/Branching and Recursion

Now, we discuss by example how recursive session types involving branching/selection are broken down. For simplicity, we consider recursive types without nested recursion and in which the recursive step is followed immediately by branching or selection, without any intermediate actions, i.e. types of the following form:

$$\mu t. \&\{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I} \quad \mu t. \oplus \{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}$$

where none of S_i contain branching/selection or recursion.

In this case, the decomposition of branching recursive types should be defined differently than for tail-recursive types: a type such as $\mu t. \&\{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}$ does not necessarily describe a channel with an infinite behavior, because some of the branches S_i can result in termination. In such case, decomposing all actions in the type $\&\{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}$ as their own recursive types using the $\mathcal{R}(-)$ function would be incorrect.

Instead, we decompose the body of the recursive type with $\mathcal{G}(-)$ itself:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\mu t. \&\{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}) &= \mu t. \&\{l_i : !\langle \mathcal{G}(S_i) \multimap \diamond \rangle\}_{i \in I} \\ \mathcal{G}(\mu t. \oplus \{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}) &= \mu t. \oplus \{l_i : ?\langle \mathcal{G}(\overline{S_i}) \multimap \diamond \rangle\}_{i \in I} \end{aligned}$$

If some branch S_i contains the recursion variable t , then it will appear in $\mathcal{G}(S_i)$, because $\mathcal{G}(t) = t$. That is, recursion variables will appear as part of the abstraction $\mathcal{G}(\overline{S_i}) \multimap \diamond$. That means that the decomposition of a tail-recursive type form can produce a minimal *non*-tail-recursive types.

Now, we illustrate this decomposition on the level of processes.

Example 6.2. We consider a process P with a name r that is typed as follows:

$$S = \mu t. \&\{l_1 : ?(\text{str}); !\langle \text{int} \rangle; t, l_2 : \text{end}\}.$$

For simplicity, we give P in $\text{HO}\pi$ (which includes HO with recursion as sub-calculus):

$$\begin{aligned} P &= R \mid Q \\ R &= \mu X. r \triangleright \{l_1 : r?(t).r!\langle \text{len}(t) \rangle.X, l_2 : \mathbf{0}\} \\ Q &= \bar{r} \triangleleft l_1.\bar{r}!\langle \text{"Hello"} \rangle.\bar{r}?(a_1).\bar{r} \triangleleft l_1.\bar{r}!\langle \text{"World"} \rangle.\bar{r}?(a_2).\bar{r} \triangleleft l_2.\mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

That is, P contains a server R which either accepts a new request to calculate a length of a string, or to terminate. Dually, P contains a client Q , which uses the server twice before terminating.

We can give an equivalent process in HO by encoding the recursion (as done in [17]):

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket P \rrbracket &= \llbracket R \rrbracket \mid Q \\ \llbracket R \rrbracket &= (\nu s) (V r, s \mid \bar{s}!\langle V \rangle) \\ V &= \lambda(x_r, x_s). x_s?(y).x_r \triangleright \{l_1 : x_r?(t).x_r!\langle \text{len}(t) \rangle\}.(\nu s) (y(x_r, s) \mid \bar{s}!\langle y \rangle), l_2 : \mathbf{0}\} \end{aligned}$$

The decomposition of S , denoted M^* , is the following minimal session type:

$$M^* = \mathcal{G}(S) = \mu t. \& \{ l_1 : ! \langle ?(\text{str}), ! \langle \text{int} \rangle, t \rangle \multimap \diamond, l_2 : \text{end} \}$$

As in the previous example (Example 6.1), the continuation of a selected branch will be packed in an abstraction and sent over. This abstraction binds names on which the session actions should be performed. In addition, if a branch contains a recursive call, then the last argument of the abstraction will be a name on which the next instance of the recursion will be mimicked. We illustrate this mechanism by giving the decomposition of $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ and inspecting its reductions.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\llbracket P \rrbracket) &= (\nu c_1, \dots, c_{12}) \overline{c_1}! \langle \rangle \mid c_1?(). \overline{c_2}! \langle \rangle. \overline{c_5}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^2(\llbracket R \rrbracket) \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^5(Q) \\ \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^2(\llbracket R \rrbracket) &= (\nu s_1) (c_2?(). \overline{c_3}! \langle \rangle. \overline{c_4}! \langle \rangle \mid c_3?(). \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)(r_1, s_1) \mid c_4?(). \overline{s_1}! \langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle) \\ \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) &= \lambda(x_{r_1}, x_{s_1}). (\nu c_1^V c_2^V) \overline{c_1^V}! \langle \rangle \mid c_1^V?(). x_{s_1}? (y). \overline{c_2^V}! \langle y \rangle \mid c_2^V? (y). x_{r_1} \triangleright \{ l_1 : x_{r_1}! \langle W \rangle, l_2 : \mathbf{0} \} \\ W &= \lambda(z_1, z_2, z_3). (\nu c_1^W \dots c_5^W) \overline{c_1^W}! \langle \rangle \mid c_1^W?(). z_1? (t). \overline{c_2^W}! \langle t \rangle \mid c_2^W? (t). z_2! \langle \text{len}(t) \rangle. \overline{c_3^W}! \langle \rangle \\ &\quad \mid (\nu s_1) (c_3^W?(). \overline{c_4^W}! \langle \rangle. \overline{c_5^W}! \langle \rangle \mid c_4^W?(). y(z_3, s_1) \mid c_5^W?(). \overline{s_1}! \langle y \rangle) \\ \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^5(Q) &= (\nu r_2 : ?(\text{str}), r_3 : ! \langle \text{int} \rangle, r_4 : M^*) \\ &\quad c_5?(). \overline{r_1} \triangleleft l_1. \overline{c_6}! \langle \rangle. \overline{r_1}?(y). y(r_2, r_3, r_4) \mid \\ &\quad c_6?(). \overline{r_2}! \langle \text{"Hello"} \rangle. \overline{c_7}! \langle \rangle \mid c_7?(). \overline{r_3}?(t). \overline{c_{11}}! \langle \rangle \mid \\ &\quad (\nu r_5 : ?(\text{str}), r_6 : ! \langle \text{int} \rangle, r_7 : M^*) \\ &\quad c_8?(). \overline{r_4} \triangleleft l_1. \overline{c_{12}}! \langle \rangle. \overline{r_4}?(y). y(r_5, r_6, r_7) \mid c_9?(). \overline{r_5}! \langle \text{"World"} \rangle. \overline{c_{10}}! \langle \rangle \mid \\ &\quad c_{10}?(). \overline{r_6}?(t). \overline{c_{11}}! \langle \rangle \mid c_{11}?(). \overline{r_7} \triangleleft l_2. \overline{c_{12}}! \langle \rangle \mid c_{12}?() \end{aligned}$$

In the process $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon^5(Q)$, the restricted names (r_2, r_3, r_4) are the decomposition of the name r for the branch l_1 . To calculate their types, we unfold S :

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \mu t. \& \{ l_1 : ?(\text{str}); ! \langle \text{int} \rangle; t, l_2 : \text{end} \} \equiv \& \{ l_1 : ?(\text{str}); ! \langle \text{int} \rangle; t, l_2 : \text{end} \} \{ S/t \} \\ &= \& \{ l_1 : ?(\text{str}); ! \langle \text{int} \rangle; S, l_2 : \text{end} \}, \end{aligned}$$

and we look at the decomposition of the type corresponding to the branch l_1 :

$$\mathcal{G}(?(\text{str}); ! \langle \text{int} \rangle; S) = (?(\text{str}), ! \langle \text{int} \rangle, M^*)$$

Now we inspect a few reductions of $\mathcal{D}(P)$. First, we have synchronizations on c_1, \dots, c_4 . This is followed by the application of the exchanged value $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)$ to names r_1, s_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\llbracket P \rrbracket) &\longrightarrow^* (\nu c_1^V c_2^V) \overline{c_1^V}! \langle \rangle \mid c_1^V?(). s_1? (y). \overline{c_2^V}! \langle y \rangle \mid c_2^V? (y). r_1 \triangleright \{ l_1 : x_{r_1}! \langle W \rangle, l_2 : \mathbf{0} \} \\ &\quad \mid \overline{s_1}! \langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle \mid \overline{c_5}! \langle \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^5(Q) = D_1 \end{aligned}$$

Then, after synchronizations on c_1^V, s_1 , and c_2^V in D_1 we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &\longrightarrow^* (\nu c_6, \dots, c_{12}) r_1 \triangleright \{ l_1 : r_1! \langle W \{ \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) / y \} \rangle, l_2 : \mathbf{0} \} \mid \\ &\quad (\nu r_2 : ?(\text{str}), r_3 : ! \langle \text{int} \rangle, r_4 : M^*) \\ &\quad \overline{r_1} \triangleleft l_1. \overline{c_6}! \langle \rangle. \overline{r_1}?(y). y(r_2, r_3, r_4) \mid \\ &\quad c_6?(). \overline{r_2}! \langle \text{"Hello"} \rangle. \overline{c_7}! \langle \rangle \mid c_7?(). \overline{r_3}?(t). \overline{c_{11}}! \langle \rangle \mid \\ &\quad (\nu r_5 : ?(\text{str}), r_6 : ! \langle \text{int} \rangle, r_7 : M^*) \\ &\quad c_8?(). \overline{r_4} \triangleleft l_1. \overline{c_{12}}! \langle \rangle. \overline{r_4}?(y). y(r_5, r_6, r_7) \mid c_9?(). \overline{r_5}! \langle \text{"World"} \rangle. \overline{c_{10}}! \langle \rangle \mid \\ &\quad c_{10}?(). \overline{r_6}?(t). \overline{c_{11}}! \langle \rangle \mid c_{11}?(). \overline{r_7} \triangleleft l_2. \overline{c_{12}}! \langle \rangle \mid c_{12}?() = D_2 \end{aligned}$$

D_2 can mimic a silent select action on r_1 ; this is followed by a reception of value $W\{\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)/y\}$ on name \bar{r}_1 , which is then applied to names (r_2, r_3, r_4) . The resulting process is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_2 \longrightarrow^* & (\nu c_8, \dots, c_{12}) (\nu r_2 : ?(\text{str}), r_3 : !(\text{int}), r_4 : M^*) \\
& (\nu c_1^W \dots c_5^W) \bar{c}_1^W! \langle \rangle \mid c_1^W?() . r_2?(t) . \bar{c}_2^W! \langle t \rangle \mid c_2^W?() . r_3! \langle \text{len}(t) \rangle . \bar{c}_3^W! \langle \rangle \\
& \mid (\nu s_1) (c_3^W?() . \bar{c}_4^W! \langle \rangle . \bar{c}_5^W! \langle \rangle \mid c_4^W?() . \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)(r_4, \bar{s}_1) \mid c_5^W?() . s_1! \langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle) \mid \\
& \bar{r}_2! \langle \text{"Hello"} \rangle . \bar{c}_7! \langle \rangle \mid c_7?() . \bar{r}_3?(t) . \bar{c}_{11}! \langle \rangle \mid \\
& (\nu r_5 : ?(\text{str}), r_6 : !(\text{int}), r_7 : M^*) \\
& c_8?() . \bar{r}_4 \triangleleft l_1 . \bar{c}_{12}! \langle \rangle . \bar{r}_4?(y) . y(r_5, r_6, r_7) \mid c_9?() . \bar{r}_5! \langle \text{"World"} \rangle . \bar{c}_{10}! \langle \rangle \mid \\
& c_{10}?() . \bar{r}_6?(t) . \bar{c}_{11}! \langle \rangle \mid c_{11}?() . \bar{r}_7 \triangleleft l_2 . \bar{c}_{12}! \langle \rangle \mid c_{12}?() = D_3
\end{aligned}$$

The next interesting process emerges once silent actions on r are mimicked by r_2 and r_3 :

$$\begin{aligned}
D_3 \longrightarrow^* & (\nu c_8, \dots, c_{12}) (\nu r_4 : M^*) (\nu s_1) \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)(r_4, s_1) \mid \bar{s}_1! \langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle \mid \\
& (\nu r_5 : ?(\text{str}), r_6 : !(\text{int}), r_7 : M^*) \\
& c_8?() . \bar{r}_4 \triangleleft l_1 . \bar{c}_{12}! \langle \rangle . \bar{r}_4?(y) . y(r_5, r_6, r_7) \mid c_9?() . \bar{r}_5! \langle \text{"World"} \rangle . \bar{c}_{10}! \langle \rangle \mid \\
& c_{10}?() . \bar{r}_6?(t) . \bar{c}_{11}! \langle \rangle \mid c_{11}?() . \bar{r}_7 \triangleleft l_2 . \bar{c}_{12}! \langle \rangle \mid c_{12}?() = D_4
\end{aligned}$$

In D_4 , name r_4 with type M^* , is applied to the abstraction $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V)$, which encapsulates a “new instance” of the recursive branch process. After application, we obtain the following process:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_4 \longrightarrow^* & (\nu c_8, \dots, c_{12}) (\nu r_4 : M^*) (\nu s_1) (\nu c_1^V c_2^V) \bar{c}_1^V! \langle \rangle \mid c_1^V?() . s_1?(y) . \bar{c}_2^V! \langle y \rangle \mid \\
& c_2^V?(y) . r_4 \triangleright \{l_1 : r_4! \langle V_1 \rangle, l_2 : \mathbf{0}\} \mid s_1! \langle \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(V) \rangle \mid \\
& (\nu r_5 : ?(\text{str}), r_6 : !(\text{int}), r_7 : M^*) \\
& c_8?() . \bar{r}_4 \triangleleft l_1 . \bar{c}_{12}! \langle \rangle . \bar{r}_4?(y) . y(r_5, r_6, r_7) \mid c_9?() . \bar{r}_5! \langle \text{"World"} \rangle . \bar{c}_{10}! \langle \rangle \mid \\
& c_{10}?() . \bar{r}_6?(t) . \bar{c}_{11}! \langle \rangle \mid c_{11}?() . \bar{r}_7 \triangleleft l_2 . \bar{c}_{12}! \langle \rangle \mid c_{12}?() = D_5
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can see that after few administrative reductions (on c_1^V , s_1 , and c_2^V) the process is able to mimic the a next selection on r on name r_4 . As the process again selects l_1 , we can see that the next selection will occur on name r_7 , again typed with M^* . \triangleleft

We would like to finish this subsection with the following remark. So far we have only considered recursive types which did not contain any actions between recursion and branching/selection. However, types with prefixed branching

$$\mu t . \alpha_1 . \dots . \alpha_n . \& \{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I},$$

where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are some session prefixes, can also be accommodated in the same framework, as these types can be written equivalently without prefixed branching:

$$\alpha_1 . \dots . \alpha_n . \mu t . \& \{l_i : S_i \{ \alpha_1 . \dots . \alpha_n . t / t \} \}_{i \in I}.$$

6.3 Adapting Operational Correspondence

We briefly remark on how to adapt the operational correspondence result from Section 4. For the operational correspondence result, and the related lemmas, we must enforce additional constraints on the processes that we break down. These concerns arise from the following fact. When a type $\& \{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}$ is broken down as

$$\mathcal{G}(\& \{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}) = \& \{l_i : !(\mathcal{G}(S_i) \multimap \diamond)\}_{i \in I},$$

an additional action gets introduced on the level of MST processes. After performing the branching, an abstraction needs to be sent out. This additional action will be matched by a corresponding

abstraction-input action on the side of selection, if present. However, this abstraction-sending action does not correspond to any action of the source process.

Therefore, to show the operational correspondence between the source term and its decomposition, we need to restrict our attention to processes in which branching and selection types are both present in (matching) pairs. Specifically, we assume the following conditions on the source process P :

- P is a well-typed, that is $\Gamma; \Delta; \Lambda \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ with $\text{balanced}(\Delta)$;
- for any name u , $u \in \text{fn}(P)$ with $u : S$ such that S involves selection or branching constructs if and only if $\bar{u} \in \text{fn}(P)$.

Intuitively, these two conditions ensure that every branching action in P has its complement (and vice-versa). Note that for closed typeable processes both the balancedness condition and the second condition on names are vacuously true.

With this condition in place, we need to enlarge the relation \mathcal{S} in order to account for silent actions that are introduced by the breakdown of selection and branching constructs. That is, when matching the original silent action involving selection/branching, the corresponding broken down process need to perform several silent actions, in order to be able to mimic the process continuation.

7 Related Work

We draw inspiration from insights developed by Parrow [21], who showed that every process in the untyped, summation-free π -calculus with replication is weakly bisimilar to its decomposition into trios (i.e., $P \approx \mathcal{D}(P)$). As already mentioned, we are concerned with a different technical setting: our decomposition treats processes from a calculus without name-passing but with higher-order concurrency (abstraction-passing), supports recursive types, and can accommodate labeled choices. Our goals are different than those of Parrow [21]: for us, trios processes are a relevant instrument for defining and justifying minimal session types, but they are not an end in themselves. Still, we retain the definitional style and terminology for trios from [21], which are elegant and clear.

Our main results connect the typability and the behaviour of a process with its decomposition, as witnessed by the static and dynamic correctness theorems. Static correctness was not considered by Parrow, as he worked in an untyped setting. As for dynamic correctness, a similar result was established in [21], linking the process and its decomposition through weak bisimilarity. In our setting we had to use a different, typed notion of bisimilarity. An obstacle here is that known notions of typed bisimilarity for session-typed processes, such as those given by Kouzapas et al. [18], only relate processes typed under the *same* typing environments. To that extent, our notion of equivalence (MST bisimulations) is more flexible than prior related notions as it (i) relates processes typable under different environments (e.g., Δ and $\mathcal{G}(\Delta)$) and (ii) admits that actions along a name s from P can be matched by $\mathcal{D}(P)$ using actions along indexed names s_k , for some k (and viceversa).

As mentioned in the introduction, our approach is broadly related to works that relate session types with other type systems for the π -calculus (cf. [16, 5, 6, 7, 9]). Hence, these works target the *relative expressiveness* of session-typed process languages, by encoding processes between two different systems. By contrast, we relate a session types system with its subsystem of minimal types. Thus, by explaining session types in terms of themselves, our work emerges as the first study of *absolute expressiveness* in the context of session types.

In this context, works by Kobayashi [16] and Dardha et al. [5, 6] are worth discussing. Kobayashi [16] encoded a finite session π -calculus into a π -calculus with linear types with usages (without sequencing); this encoding uses a continuation-passing style to codify a session name using multiple linear channels. Dardha et al. [5, 6] formalize and extend Kobayashi’s approach. They use two separate encodings, one for processes and one for types. The encoding of processes uses a freshly generated linear name to mimic each session action; this fresh name becomes an additional argument in communications. The encoding of types codifies sequencing in session types by nesting payload types. In contrast, we “slice” the n actions occurring in a session $s : S$ along indexed names s_1, \dots, s_n

with minimal session types— n slices of S . Hence, Dardha et al.’s could be described as codifying sequencing in a “dynamic style”, via the freshly generated names, whereas we follow a “static style” using names that are indexed according to the corresponding session type.

Recently, Jacobs [15] developed a small programming calculus with a single fork-like construct and a linear type system, which can be used to encode session-typed communications. His system can be seen as a distillation of Wadler’s GV [23] which is, in essence, a λ -calculus with session-based concurrency; in contrast, HO can be seen as a π -calculus in which abstractions can be exchanged. While similar in spirit, our work and the developments by Jacobs are technically distant; we observe that the operational correspondences developed in [15] are strictly simpler than our dynamic correspondence result (Theorem 4.1) although they are mechanized in the Coq proof assistant.

Finally, we elaborate further on our choice of HO as source language for minimal session types. HO is one of the sub-calculi of $\text{HO}\pi$, a higher-order process calculus with recursion and both name- and abstraction-passing. The basic theory of $\text{HO}\pi$ was studied by Kouzapas et al. [17, 18] as a hierarchy of session-typed calculi based on relative expressiveness. Our results enable us to place HO with minimal session types firmly within this hierarchy. Still, the definition of minimal session types does not rely on having HO as source language, as they can be defined on top of other process languages. In fact, in separate work we have defined minimal session types on top of the first-order sub-calculus of $\text{HO}\pi$ [2]. This development attests that minimal session types admit meaningful formulations independently from the kind of communicated objects (abstractions or names).

8 Concluding Remarks

We have presented a minimal formulation of session types, one of the most studied classes of behavioral types for message-passing programs. This minimal formulation forgoes sequencing on the level of types. We formally connect standard and minimal session types (MSTs), through a *decomposition* of session-typed processes, adopting the higher-order process calculus HO as target language. Following Parrow [21], we defined the decomposition of a process P , denoted $\mathcal{D}(P)$, as a collection of *trio processes* (processes with at most three actions) that trigger each other mimicking the sequencing in the original process. We proved that typability of P using standard session types implies the typability of $\mathcal{D}(P)$ with minimal session types; we also established that P and $\mathcal{D}(P)$ are behaviourally equivalent through an *MST bisimulation*. Our results hold for all session types constructs, including labeled choices and recursive types.

From a foundational standpoint, our study of minimal session types is a conceptual contribution to the theory of behavioral types, in that we clarify the status of sequencing in theories of session types. As remarked in Section 1, there are many session types variants, and their expressivity often comes at the price of an involved underlying theory. Our work contributes in the opposite direction, as we identified a simple yet expressive fragment of an established session-typed framework [17, 18], which allows us to justify session types in terms of themselves. Understanding further the underlying theory of minimal session types (e.g., notions such as type-based compatibility) is an exciting direction for future work.

As mentioned above, one insight derived from our results is that sequentiality in session types is convenient but not indispensable. Convenience is an important factor in the design of type systems for message-passing programs, because types are abstract specifications of communication structures. By identifying sequencing as a source of redundancy, our minimal formulation of session types does not contradict or invalidate the prior work on standard session types and their extensions; rather, it contributes to our understanding of the sources of convenience of those advanced type systems.

In formulating minimal session types we have committed to a specific notion of minimality, tied to sequencing constructs in types—arguably the most distinctive feature in session types. There could be other notions of minimality, unrelated to sequencing but worth exploring nevertheless. Consider, for instance, the framework of *context-free* session types [22], which extend standard session types by allowing sequencing of the form $S;T$. This form of sequential composition is quite powerful, and yet it could be seen as achieving a form of minimality different from the one we studied here:

as illustrated in [22, Section 5], context-free session types allow to describe the communication of tree-structured data while minimizing the need for channel creation and avoiding channel passing.

Our work can be seen as a new twist on Parrow’s decomposition results in the *untyped* setting [21]. While Parrow’s work indeed does not consider types, in fairness we must observe that when Parrow’s work appeared (1996) the study of types (and typed behavioral equivalences) for the π -calculus was rather incipient (for instance, the widely known formulation of binary session types, given in [12], appeared in 1998). That said, we would like to stress that our results are not merely an extension of Parrow’s work with session types, for types in our setting drastically narrow down the range of conceivable decompositions. Additionally, in this work we exploit features not supported in [21], most notably higher-order concurrency (cf. Section 5).

Finally, from a practical standpoint, we believe that our approach paves a new avenue to the integration of session types in programming languages whose type systems lack sequencing, such as Go. It is natural to envision program analysis tools which, given a message-passing program that should conform to protocols specified as session types, exploit our decomposition as an intermediate step in the verification of communication correctness. Remarkably, our decomposition lends itself naturally to an implementation—in fact, we generated our examples automatically using MISTY, an associated artifact written in Haskell [4].

Acknowledgments We are grateful to Erik Voogd, who as a BSc student was one of the authors in the conference version of this paper [3].

References

- [1] D. Ancona, V. Bono, M. Bravetti, J. Campos, G. Castagna, P. Deniélou, S. J. Gay, N. Gesbert, E. Giachino, R. Hu, E. B. Johnsen, F. Martins, V. Mascardi, F. Montesi, R. Neykova, N. Ng, L. Padovani, V. T. Vasconcelos, and N. Yoshida. Behavioral types in programming languages. *Foundations and Trends in Programming Languages*, 3(2-3):95–230, 2016.
- [2] A. Arslanagic, A. Palamariuc, and J. A. Pérez. Minimal session types for the π -calculus. In N. Veltri, N. Benton, and S. Ghilezan, editors, *PPDP 2021: 23rd International Symposium on Principles and Practice of Declarative Programming, Tallinn, Estonia, September 6-8, 2021*, pages 12:1–12:15. ACM, 2021.
- [3] A. Arslanagić, J. A. Pérez, and E. Voogd. Minimal Session Types (A Pearl). In *33rd European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, ECOOP 2019, July 15-19, 2019, London, UK, 2019*. To appear.
- [4] A. Arslanagic, J. A. Pérez, and E. Voogd. Minimal session types (artifact). *Dagstuhl Artifacts Ser.*, 5(2):05:1–05:3, 2019.
- [5] O. Dardha, E. Giachino, and D. Sangiorgi. Session types revisited. In *Proc. of PPDP 2012*, pages 139–150. ACM, 2012.
- [6] O. Dardha, E. Giachino, and D. Sangiorgi. Session types revisited. *Inf. Comput.*, 256:253–286, 2017.
- [7] R. Demangeon and K. Honda. Full abstraction in a subtyped pi-calculus with linear types. In *Proc. of CONCUR 2011*, volume 6901 of *LNCS*, pages 280–296. Springer, 2011.
- [8] M. Dezani-Ciancaglini and U. de’ Liguoro. Sessions and Session Types: an Overview. In *WS-FM’09*, volume 6194 of *LNCS*, pages 1–28. Springer, 2010.
- [9] S. J. Gay, N. Gesbert, and A. Ravara. Session types as generic process types. In J. Borgström and S. Crafa, editors, *Proceedings Combined 21st International Workshop on Expressiveness in Concurrency and 11th Workshop on Structural Operational Semantics, EXPRESS 2014, and*

- 11th Workshop on Structural Operational Semantics, SOS 2014, Rome, Italy, 1st September 2014.*, volume 160 of *EPTCS*, pages 94–110, 2014.
- [10] S. J. Gay, P. Thiemann, and V. T. Vasconcelos. Duality of session types: The final cut. In S. Balzer and L. Padovani, editors, *Proceedings of the 12th International Workshop on Programming Language Approaches to Concurrency- and Communication-centric Software, PLACES@ETAPS 2020, Dublin, Ireland, 26th April 2020*, volume 314 of *EPTCS*, pages 23–33, 2020.
 - [11] D. Gorla. Towards a unified approach to encodability and separation results for process calculi. *Inf. Comput.*, 208(9):1031–1053, 2010.
 - [12] K. Honda, V. T. Vasconcelos, and M. Kubo. Language primitives and type disciplines for structured communication-based programming. In *ESOP'98*, volume 1381 of *LNCS*, pages 22–138. Springer, 1998.
 - [13] K. Honda, N. Yoshida, and M. Carbone. Multiparty Asynchronous Session Types. In *POPL'08*, pages 273–284. ACM, 2008.
 - [14] H. Hüttel, I. Lanese, V. T. Vasconcelos, L. Caires, M. Carbone, P. Deniélou, D. Mostrous, L. Padovani, A. Ravara, E. Tuosto, H. T. Vieira, and G. Zavattaro. Foundations of session types and behavioural contracts. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 49(1):3, 2016.
 - [15] J. Jacobs. A self-dual distillation of session types. In K. Ali and J. Vitek, editors, *36th European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, ECOOP 2022, June 6-10, 2022, Berlin, Germany*, volume 222 of *LIPICs*, pages 23:1–23:22. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
 - [16] N. Kobayashi. Type systems for concurrent programs. In *Formal Methods at the Crossroads*, volume 2757 of *LNCS*, pages 439–453. Springer, 2003.
 - [17] D. Kouzapas, J. A. Pérez, and N. Yoshida. On the relative expressiveness of higher-order session processes. In P. Thiemann, editor, *Programming Languages and Systems - 25th European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2016, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2016, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, April 2-8, 2016, Proceedings*, volume 9632 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 446–475. Springer, 2016. Extended version to appear in *Information and Computation* (Elsevier).
 - [18] D. Kouzapas, J. A. Pérez, and N. Yoshida. Characteristic bisimulation for higher-order session processes. *Acta Inf.*, 54(3):271–341, 2017.
 - [19] J. Lange, N. Ng, B. Toninho, and N. Yoshida. A static verification framework for message passing in go using behavioural types. In M. Chaudron, I. Crnkovic, M. Chechik, and M. Harman, editors, *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2018, Gothenburg, Sweden, May 27 - June 03, 2018*, pages 1137–1148. ACM, 2018.
 - [20] N. Ng and N. Yoshida. Static deadlock detection for concurrent go by global session graph synthesis. In A. Zaks and M. V. Hermenegildo, editors, *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Compiler Construction, CC 2016, Barcelona, Spain, March 12-18, 2016*, pages 174–184. ACM, 2016.
 - [21] J. Parrow. Trios in concert. In G. D. Plotkin, C. Stirling, and M. Tofte, editors, *Proof, Language, and Interaction, Essays in Honour of Robin Milner*, pages 623–638. The MIT Press, 2000. Online version, dated July 22, 1996, available at <http://user.it.uu.se/~joachim/trios.pdf>.
 - [22] P. Thiemann and V. T. Vasconcelos. Context-free session types. In J. Garrigue, G. Keller, and E. Sumii, editors, *Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on*

Functional Programming, ICFP 2016, Nara, Japan, September 18-22, 2016, pages 462–475. ACM, 2016.

- [23] P. Wadler. Propositions as sessions. In P. Thiemann and R. B. Findler, editors, *ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming, ICFP'12, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 9-15, 2012*, pages 273–286. ACM, 2012.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The Source Language	4
2.1	Syntax and Semantics	4
2.2	Session Types for HO	7
3	Decomposing Session-Typed Processes	11
3.1	Key Ideas	12
3.2	The Decomposition	13
3.2.1	Minimal Session Types and Decomposing Types	14
3.2.2	Decomposing Processes	16
3.3	The Decomposition by Example	21
3.3.1	Decomposing Processes with Non-Recursive Names	21
3.3.2	Decomposing Processes with Recursive Names	23
3.4	Static Correctness	25
4	Dynamic Correctness	26
4.1	Behavioral Equivalence in HO and its Limitations	27
4.2	MST Bisimilarity	28
4.3	The Bisimulation Relation	30
4.3.1	A Motivating Example	30
4.3.2	The relation \mathcal{S}	34
4.4	Proving Operational Correspondence	40
5	Optimizations of the Decomposition	43
6	Extension with Labeled Choice	47
6.1	Breaking Down Selection and Branching	48
6.2	The Interplay of Selection/Branching and Recursion	51
6.3	Adapting Operational Correspondence	53
7	Related Work	54
8	Concluding Remarks	55
A	Appendix to Section 3.2	60
A.1	Auxiliary Results	60
B	Appendix to Section 3.4	61
B.1	Proof of Lemma 3.1	61
B.2	Proof of Theorem 3.1	74
C	Appendix to Section 4	76
C.1	Proof of Lemma 4.3	76
C.2	Proof of Lemma 4.4	78
C.3	Proof of Lemma 4.7	91

A Appendix to Section 3.2

A.1 Auxiliary Results

Remark A.1. We derive polyadic rules for typing $\text{HO}\pi$ as an expected extension of HO typing rules:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{PolyVar} \frac{}{\Gamma, \tilde{x} : \tilde{U}_x; \tilde{y} : \tilde{U}_y; \emptyset \vdash \tilde{x}\tilde{y} : \tilde{U}_x\tilde{U}_y} \\
\text{PolySess} \frac{}{\Gamma; \emptyset; \tilde{u} : \tilde{S} \vdash \tilde{u} \triangleright \tilde{S}} \\
\text{PolyRcv} \frac{\Gamma; \Lambda_1; \Delta, u : S \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Lambda_2; \emptyset \vdash \tilde{x} \triangleright \tilde{U}}{\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}; \Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2; \Delta, u : ?(\tilde{U}); S \vdash u?(\tilde{x}).P \triangleright \diamond} \\
\text{PolySend} \frac{u : S \in \Delta \quad \Gamma; \Lambda_1; \Delta \vdash P \quad \Gamma; \Lambda_2; \emptyset \vdash \tilde{x} \triangleright \tilde{U}}{\Gamma; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2; (\Delta \setminus u : S), u : !(\tilde{U}); S \vdash u!(\tilde{x}).P} \\
\text{PolyApp} \frac{\rightsquigarrow \in \{-\circ, \rightarrow\} \quad \Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_1 \vdash V \triangleright \tilde{C} \rightsquigarrow \diamond \quad \Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta_2 \vdash \tilde{u} \triangleright \tilde{C}}{\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash V \tilde{u}} \\
\text{PolyAbs} \frac{\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_1 \vdash P \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta_2 \vdash \tilde{x} \triangleright \tilde{C}}{\Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}; \Lambda; \Delta_1 \setminus \Delta_2 \vdash \lambda \tilde{x}. P \triangleright \tilde{C} \rightarrow \diamond} \\
\text{PolyRes} \frac{\Gamma, \tilde{a} : \langle \tilde{U} \rangle; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash P}{\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash (\nu \tilde{a}) P} \\
\text{PolyResS} \frac{\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, \tilde{s} : \tilde{S}_1, \tilde{s} : \tilde{S}_2 \vdash P \quad \tilde{S}_1 \text{ dual } \tilde{S}_2}{\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash (\nu \tilde{s}) P}
\end{array}$$

Lemma A.1 (Substitution Lemma [17]). $\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, x : S \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ and $u \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma, \Lambda, \Delta)$ implies $\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, u : S \vdash P\{u/x\} \triangleright \diamond$.

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

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

- If $\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ and $u \notin \text{fn}(P)$ then $\Gamma \setminus u; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$.

B Appendix to Section 3.4

We use the following auxiliary lemma:

Lemma B.1. *Let \tilde{z} be tuple of channel names, U a higher-order type, and S a recursive session type. If $\tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(\langle U \rangle; S)$ and $k = \langle \langle U \rangle; S \rangle$ then $z_k : \mu t. \langle \mathcal{G}(U) \rangle; t$.*

B.1 Proof of Lemma 3.1

Lemma 3.1. *Let P be an indexed HO process and V be a value.*

1. *If $\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \circ \Delta_\mu \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$ then $\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P) \triangleright \diamond$, where:*

- $k > 0$
- $\tilde{r} = \text{dom}(\Delta_\mu)$
- $\Phi = \prod_{r \in \tilde{r}} c^r : \langle \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r)) \rightarrow \diamond \rangle$
- $\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(P)$
- $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}$
- $\text{dom}(\Theta) = \{c_k, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil - 1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P \rceil - 1}}\}$
- $\Theta(c_k) = ?(U_1, \dots, U_n)$, where $(\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \mathcal{G}(\Lambda))(\tilde{x}) = (x_1 : U_1, \dots, x_n : U_n)$
- $\text{balanced}(\Theta)$

2. *If $\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \circ \Delta_\mu \vdash V \triangleright \tilde{T} \rightarrow \diamond$ then $\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta) \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(V) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(\tilde{T}) \rightarrow \diamond$, where:*

- $\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(V)$
- $\Phi = \prod_{r \in \tilde{r}} c^r : \langle \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r)) \rightarrow \diamond \rangle$

Proof. By mutual induction on the structure of P and V . Here, we analyze only Part (1) of the theorem, as Part (2) and Part (3) are proven similarly:

1. By assumption $\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, \Delta_\mu \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$. There are four cases, depending on the shape of P . We consider two representative cases. We omit other cases as they are similar.

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

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma); \emptyset; \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\mathbf{0}) \triangleright \diamond \quad (25)$$

where $\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(\mathbf{0}) = \emptyset$ and $\Theta = \{c_k : ?(\text{end} \rightarrow \diamond)\}$. By Table 1: $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(\mathbf{0}) = c_k ?(\cdot). \mathbf{0}$. By convention we know that $c_k ?(\cdot). \mathbf{0}$ stands for $c_k ?(y). \mathbf{0}$ with $c_k : ?(\text{end} \rightarrow \diamond)$. The following tree proves this case:

$$\frac{\text{Nil} \frac{}{\Gamma'; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad c_k \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma) \quad \text{EProm} \frac{\text{LVar} \frac{}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma); y \triangleright \text{end} \rightarrow \diamond; \emptyset \vdash y \triangleright \text{end} \rightarrow \diamond}}{\Gamma'; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash y \triangleright \text{end} \rightarrow \diamond}}{\text{Prom} \frac{}{\Gamma'; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash y \triangleright \text{end} \rightarrow \diamond}}}{\text{Rcv} \frac{\Gamma'; \emptyset; c_k : \text{end} \rightarrow \diamond \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma); \emptyset; \Theta \vdash c_k ?(\cdot). \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}$$

where $\Gamma' = \mathcal{G}(\Gamma), y : \text{end} \rightarrow \diamond$. We know $c_k \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$ since we use reserved names for propagators channels.

(b) Case $P = u_i ! \langle V \rangle . P'$. We distinguish three sub-cases: (i) $u_i \in \text{dom}(\Delta)$ and (ii) $u_i \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, and (iii) $u_i \in \text{dom}(\Delta_\mu)$.

We consider sub-case (i) first. For this case Rule SEND can be applied:

$$\text{Send} \frac{\Gamma; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1, \Delta_{\mu_1} \vdash P' \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2, \Delta_{\mu_2} \vdash V \triangleright U \quad u_i : S \in \Delta_1, \Delta_2}{\Gamma; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2; ((\Delta_1, \Delta_2) \setminus \{u_i : S\}), u_i : ! \langle U \rangle; S, \Delta_{\mu_1}, \Delta_{\mu_2} \vdash u_i ! \langle V \rangle . P' \triangleright \diamond} \quad (26)$$

Let $\tilde{w} = \text{fv}(P')$. Also, let $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{w}$ and Θ_1 be a balanced environment such that

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

and $\Theta_1(c_{k+1}) = ?(\tilde{M}_1)$ where $\tilde{M}_1 = (\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1))(\tilde{w})$. We define:

$$\Phi_i = \prod_{r \in \text{dom}(\Delta_{\mu_i})} c^r : \langle \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_{\mu_i}(r)) \multimap \diamond \rangle \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\} \quad (27)$$

Then, by IH on the first assumption of (26) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma'_1), \Phi_1; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (28)$$

Let $\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(V)$ and $\Gamma'_2 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{y}$. Then, by IH (Part 2) on the second assumption of (26) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_2; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_2); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2) \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(U) \quad (29)$$

We may notice that if $U = C \rightarrow \diamond$ then $\Lambda_2 = \emptyset$ and $\Delta_2 = \emptyset$. Let $\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(P)$. We define $\Theta = \Theta_1, \Theta'$, where:

$$\Theta' = c_k : ?(\tilde{M}), \overline{c_{k+1}} : !(\tilde{M}_2)$$

with $\tilde{M} = (\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2))(\tilde{x})$. By Definition 3.6, we know $\lceil P \rceil = \lceil P' \rceil + 1$, so

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

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

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

We know $\text{fv}(P') \subseteq \text{fv}(P)$ and $\text{fv}(V) \subseteq \text{fv}(P)$ that is $\tilde{w} \subseteq \tilde{x}$ and $\tilde{y} \subseteq \tilde{x}$. Let $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}$ and $\Phi = \Phi_1, \Phi_2$. We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}((\Delta_1, \Delta_2) \setminus \{u_i : S\}), u_i : ! \langle U \rangle; S, \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i! \langle V \rangle . P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (30)$$

Let $\sigma = \{u_{i+1}/u_i\}$. To type the left-hand side component of $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i! \langle V \rangle . P')$ we use some auxiliary derivations:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Nil} \frac{}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{End} \frac{}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \overline{c_{k+1}} : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{PolyVar} \frac{}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1); \emptyset \vdash \tilde{w} \triangleright \tilde{M}_2} \\ \text{PolySend} \frac{}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1); \overline{c_{k+1}} : ! \langle \tilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}} ! \langle \tilde{w} \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{End} \frac{}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1); \overline{c_{k+1}} : ! \langle \tilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end}, u_i : \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}} ! \langle \tilde{w} \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \end{array} \quad (31)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(Lemma A.1) with } \{\tilde{n}/\tilde{u}\} \frac{}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_2; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_2); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2 \sigma) \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V \sigma) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(U)} \\ \text{(Lemma A.3) with } \Phi_1 \frac{}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_2); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2 \sigma) \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V \sigma) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(U)} \end{array} \quad (29) \quad (32)$$

$$\text{Send} \frac{u_i : ! \langle \mathcal{G}(U) \rangle; \text{end} \in \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2 \sigma), u_i : ! \langle \mathcal{G}(U) \rangle; \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : ! \langle \tilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end} \quad (31) \quad (32)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2 \sigma), u_i : ! \langle \mathcal{G}(U) \rangle; \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : ! \langle \tilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end} \vdash} \quad (33)$$

$$\text{End} \frac{u_i ! \langle \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V \sigma) \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}} ! \langle \tilde{w} \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2 \sigma), u_i : ! \langle \mathcal{G}(U) \rangle; \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : ! \langle \tilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end}, c_k : \text{end} \vdash} \quad (33)$$

$$\text{PolyRcv} \frac{\text{PolyVar} \frac{(33) \quad \mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_2); \emptyset \vdash \tilde{x} : \widetilde{M}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2\sigma), u_i : !\langle \mathcal{G}(U) \rangle; \text{end}, \Theta' \vdash c_k ?(\tilde{x}).u_i !\langle \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V\sigma) \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{w} \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1\sigma), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+r+1}(P'\sigma) \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1\sigma), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+r+1}(P'\sigma) \triangleright \diamond}} \quad (34)$$

The following tree proves this case:

$$\text{Par} \frac{\text{(Lemma A.1) with } \{\tilde{n}/\tilde{u}\} \frac{(28) \quad \mathcal{G}(\Gamma'_1), \Phi_1; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1\sigma), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+r+1}(P'\sigma) \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1\sigma), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+r+1}(P'\sigma) \triangleright \diamond}}{\text{(Lemma A.3) with } \tilde{x} \setminus \tilde{w} \text{ and } \Phi_2 \frac{(34) \quad \mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1\sigma), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+r+1}(P'\sigma) \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1\sigma), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+r+1}(P'\sigma) \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2) \setminus \{u_i : S\}, u_i : !\langle U \rangle; S, \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i !\langle V \rangle . P') \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2) \setminus \{u_i : S\}, u_i : !\langle U \rangle; S, \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i !\langle V \rangle . P') \triangleright \diamond}} \quad (35)$$

where $\tilde{n} = (u_{i+1}, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{G}(S)|})$ and $\tilde{u} = (u_i, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{G}(S)|-1})$. This concludes sub-case (i). Now, we consider sub-case (ii). For this sub-case Rule REQ can be applied:

$$\text{Req} \frac{\Gamma; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash u \triangleright \langle U \rangle \quad \Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_1, \Delta_{\mu_1} \triangleright P' \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta_2, \Delta_{\mu_2} \vdash V \triangleright U}{\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Delta_{\mu_1}, \Delta_{\mu_2} \vdash u !\langle V \rangle . P' \triangleright \diamond} \quad (36)$$

Let $\tilde{w} = \text{fv}(P')$. Further, let $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{w}$ and let Θ_1, Φ_1 , and Φ_2 be environments defined as in sub-case (i). By IH on the second assumption of (36) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma'_1), \Phi_1; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (37)$$

Let $\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(V)$. By IH on the second assumption of (26) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_2; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2) \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(U) \quad (38)$$

Let $\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(P)$ and $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}$. We define $\Theta = \Theta_1, \Theta'$, where:

$$\Theta' = c_k : ?(\widetilde{M}), \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle$$

with $\widetilde{M} = (\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \mathcal{G}(\Lambda))(\tilde{x})$. By Definition 3.6, we know $\lceil P \rceil = \lceil P' \rceil + 1$, so

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

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

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i !\langle V \rangle . P') = c_k ?(\tilde{x}).u_i !\langle \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V) \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{w} \rangle . \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P')$$

We know $\text{fv}(P') \subseteq \text{fv}(P)$ and $\text{fv}(V) \subseteq \text{fv}(P)$ that is $\tilde{w} \subseteq \tilde{x}$ and $\tilde{y} \subseteq \tilde{x}$.

To prove

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i !\langle V \rangle . P')$$

we use some auxiliary derivations:

$$\text{PolySend} \frac{\text{End} \frac{\text{Nil} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \overline{c_{k+1}} : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{w} \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{w} \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{w} \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}} \quad (39)$$

$$\text{Req} \frac{\text{(39) \quad (Lemma A.3) with } \Phi_1 \frac{(38) \quad \mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2) \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(U)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2), \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i !\langle \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V) \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{w} \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2), \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i !\langle \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V) \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{w} \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2), \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i !\langle \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V) \rangle . \overline{c_{k+1}} !\langle \tilde{w} \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}} \quad (40)$$

$$\text{PolyRcv} \frac{\text{PolyVar} \frac{(40) \quad \mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \emptyset \vdash \tilde{x} \triangleright \widetilde{M}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2), \Theta' \vdash c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_i!\langle \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V) \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2), \Theta' \vdash c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_i!\langle \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V) \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}} \quad (41)$$

The following tree proves this case:

$$\text{Par} \frac{(41) \quad \text{(Lemma A.3) with } \tilde{x} \setminus \tilde{w} \text{ and } \Phi_2 \frac{(37) \quad \mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i!\langle V \rangle.P') \triangleright \diamond}} \quad (42)$$

This concludes sub-case (ii).

Now, we consider sub-case (iii). Here we know $P = u_i!\langle V \rangle.P'$ and $u_i : S \in \Delta_\mu$. For this case Rule SEND can be applied:

$$\text{Send} \frac{\Gamma; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1, \Delta_{\mu_1} \vdash P' \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Lambda_2; \Delta_2, \Delta_{\mu_2} \vdash V \triangleright U \quad u_i : S' \in \Delta_{\mu_1}, \Delta_{\mu_2}}{\Gamma; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2; \Delta_1, \Delta_2, ((\Delta_{\mu_1}, \Delta_{\mu_2}) \setminus \{u_i : S'\}), u_i : !\langle U \rangle; S' \vdash u_i!\langle V \rangle.P' \triangleright \diamond} \quad (43)$$

Let $\tilde{w} = \text{fv}(P')$. Let $\Theta_1, \Theta', \Theta, \Phi_1$, and Φ_2 be defined as in the previous sub-case. Also, let $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{w}$. Then, by IH on the first assumption of (43) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma'_1), \Phi_1; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (44)$$

Let $\Gamma'_2 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{y}$. Then, by IH (Part 2) on the second assumption of (43) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma'_2), \Phi_2; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_2); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2) \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(U) \quad (45)$$

By Table 1 we have:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P) = c_k?(\tilde{x}).c^u!\langle N_V \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P') \\ \text{where } N_V = \lambda \tilde{z}. z_{[S]}!\langle \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V) \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \mid c^u?(x).x \tilde{z}$$

We notice that $u_i \in \text{rn}(V), \text{rn}(P)$ since u_i has tail-recursive type S . Hence, by (27) we know $(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)(c^u) = \langle \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond \rangle$. Further, we know that $S = !\langle U \rangle; S'$ and by Definition 3.3, $\mathcal{R}^*(S) = \mathcal{R}^*(S')$. So we define $\Phi = \Phi_1, \Phi_2$. Let $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}$ where $\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(P)$. We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i!\langle V \rangle.P') \triangleright \diamond$$

We use auxiliary derivations:

$$\text{PolyApp} \frac{\text{LVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; x : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond; \emptyset \vdash x \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; x : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond; \emptyset \vdash x \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; x : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond; \tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash x \tilde{z} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{PolySess} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash \tilde{z} \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(S)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash \tilde{z} \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(S)} \quad (46)$$

$$\text{Acc} \frac{(46) \quad \text{Sh} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash c^u \triangleright \langle \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond \rangle}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash c^u \triangleright \langle \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond \rangle}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \Theta', \tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash c^u?(x).x \tilde{z} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{LVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; x : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond; \emptyset \vdash x \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; x : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond; \emptyset \vdash x \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \Theta', \tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash c^u?(x).x \tilde{z} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (47)$$

$$\text{End} \frac{\text{Nil} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad c_{k+1} \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma, \Phi)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; c_{k+1} : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (48)$$

$$\text{PolySend} \frac{c_{k+1} ! \langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle; \text{end} \in \Theta' \quad (48) \quad \text{PolyVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_2); \emptyset \vdash \widetilde{w} \triangleright \widetilde{M}_2}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_2); \emptyset \vdash \widetilde{w} \triangleright \widetilde{M}_2}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1); \overline{c_{k+1}} ! \langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}} ! \langle \widetilde{w} \rangle \triangleright \diamond} \quad (49)$$

$$\text{Par} \frac{(49) \quad (47)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1); \overline{c_{k+1}} ! \langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle, \widetilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}} ! \langle \widetilde{w} \rangle \mid c^u?(x).x \widetilde{z} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (50)$$

$$\text{Send} \frac{(50) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{(Lemma A.2) with } \Phi_1 \frac{(44)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma'_2), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_2); \emptyset \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(U)} \\ \text{(Lemma A.2) with } \tilde{z} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_2); \emptyset \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(U)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_2); \emptyset \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(U)} \end{array}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2), \widetilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S), \overline{c_{k+1}} ! \langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle \vdash z_{[S]} ! \langle \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V) \rangle . (\overline{c_{k+1}} ! \langle \widetilde{w} \rangle \mid c^u?(x).x \widetilde{z})} \quad (51)$$

By Lemma B.1 we know that if $\widetilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S)$ then $z_{[S]} : \mu t. ! \langle \mathcal{G}(U) \rangle; t$.

$$\text{PolyAbs} \frac{(51) \quad \text{PolySess} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \widetilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash \widetilde{z} \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(S)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \widetilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash \widetilde{z} \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(S)}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2), \overline{c_{k+1}} ! \langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle \vdash N_V \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond} \quad (52)$$

$$\text{Req} \frac{\text{LVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash c^u \triangleright \langle \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond \rangle}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash c^u \triangleright \langle \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond \rangle} \quad \text{Nil} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2), \overline{c_{k+1}} ! \langle \widetilde{M}_2 \rangle \vdash c^u ! \langle N_V \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (53)$$

$$\text{PolyRcv} \frac{(53) \quad \text{PolyVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2); \emptyset \vdash \widetilde{x} \triangleright \widetilde{M}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2); \emptyset \vdash \widetilde{x} \triangleright \widetilde{M}}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2), \Theta' \vdash c_k ?(\widetilde{x}).c^u ! \langle N_V \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (54)$$

The following tree proves this case:

$$\text{Par} \frac{(54) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{(Lemma A.2) with } \Phi_2 \frac{(44)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma'_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{w}}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond} \\ \text{(Lemma A.3) with } \tilde{y} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{w}}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{w}}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond} \end{array}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(r ! \langle V \rangle . P') \triangleright \diamond} \quad (55)$$

This concludes the analysis for the output case $P = u_i ! \langle V \rangle . P'$. We remark that the proof for the case when $V = y$ is specialization of above the proof where $\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(y) = y$, $\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(y) = y$ and it holds that $y\sigma = y$.

- (c) Case $P = u_i ?(y).P'$. We distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $u_i \in \text{dom}(\Delta)$, (ii) $u_i \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$, and (iii) $u_i \in \text{dom}(\Delta_\mu)$. We consider sub-cases (i) and (ii); we omit sub-case (iii) as it follows the same reasoning as the corresponding sub-case of the previous (Send) case.

We consider sub-case (i) first. For this case Rule RCV can be applied:

$$\text{Rcv} \frac{\Gamma; \Lambda_1; \Delta', u_i : S, \Delta_\mu \vdash P' \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Lambda_2; \emptyset \vdash y \triangleright U}{\Gamma \setminus y; \Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2; \Delta', u_i : ?(U); S, \Delta_\mu \vdash u_i ?(y).P' \triangleright \diamond} \quad (56)$$

Let $\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(P)$ and $\tilde{w} = \text{fv}(P')$. Also, let $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{w}$ and Θ_1 be a balanced environment such that

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

and $\Theta_1(c_{k+1}) = ?(\widetilde{M}')$ where $\widetilde{M}' = (\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1))(\widetilde{w})$. We define:

$$\Phi = \prod_{r \in \text{dom}(\Delta_\mu)} c^r : \langle \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_{\mu_i}(r)) \rightarrow \diamond \rangle \quad (57)$$

Then, by IH on the first assumption of (56) we know:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma'_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta', u_i : S), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{w}}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (58)$$

By Definition 3.3 and Definition 3.10 and the second assumption of (56) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma); \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_2); \emptyset \vdash y \triangleright \mathcal{G}(U) \quad (59)$$

We define $\Theta = \Theta_1, \Theta'$, where

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

with $\widetilde{M} = (\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2))(\widetilde{x})$. By Definition 3.6, $\lceil P \rceil = \lceil P' \rceil + 1$ so

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

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

$$\mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{x}}^k(u_i?(y).P') = c_k?(x).u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{w}}^{k+1}(P'\{u_{i+1}/u_i\})$$

Let $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \widetilde{x}$. We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1 \setminus y), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta', u_i : ?(U); S), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{x}}^k(u_i?(y).P')$$

The left-hand side component of $\mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{x}}^k(u_i?(y).P')$ is typed using some auxiliary derivations:

$$\text{PolySend} \frac{\text{End} \frac{\text{Nil} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \overline{c_{k+1}} : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1), \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_2); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1), \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_2); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end}, u_i : \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\text{PolyVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1); \emptyset \vdash \widetilde{w} \triangleright \widetilde{M}'}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1); \emptyset \vdash \widetilde{w} \triangleright \widetilde{M}'}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \overline{c_{k+1}} : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \overline{c_{k+1}} : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}} \quad (60)$$

$$\text{End} \frac{\text{Rcv} \frac{\text{End} \frac{\text{Rcv} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); u_i : ?(\mathcal{G}(U)); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); u_i : ?(\mathcal{G}(U)); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end}, c_k : \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); u_i : ?(\mathcal{G}(U)); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); u_i : ?(\mathcal{G}(U)); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); u_i : ?(\mathcal{G}(U)); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}} \quad (61)$$

$$\text{PolyRcv} \frac{\text{PolyVar} \frac{\text{End} \frac{\text{Rcv} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); u_i : ?(\mathcal{G}(U)); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); u_i : ?(\mathcal{G}(U)); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); u_i : ?(\mathcal{G}(U)); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); u_i : ?(\mathcal{G}(U)); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); u_i : ?(\mathcal{G}(U)); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}} \quad (62)$$

The following tree proves this case:

$$\text{Par} \frac{\text{End} \frac{\text{Rcv} \frac{\text{End} \frac{\text{Rcv} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); u_i : ?(\mathcal{G}(U)); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); u_i : ?(\mathcal{G}(U)); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); u_i : ?(\mathcal{G}(U)); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); u_i : ?(\mathcal{G}(U)); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); u_i : ?(\mathcal{G}(U)); \text{end}, \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}} \quad (62) \quad \text{(Lemma A.1) with } \{\widetilde{n}/\widetilde{w}\} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1 \setminus y), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta', u_{i+1} : S), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{w}}^{k+1}(P'\{u_{i+1}/u_i\}) \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1 \setminus y), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta', u_i : ?(U); S), \Theta \vdash c_k?(x).u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{w}}^{k+1}(P'\{u_{i+1}/u_i\}) \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1 \setminus y), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta', u_i : ?(U); S), \Theta \vdash c_k?(x).u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{w}}^{k+1}(P'\{u_{i+1}/u_i\}) \triangleright \diamond}} \quad (63)$$

where $\tilde{n} = (u_{i+1}, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{G}(S)|})$ and $\tilde{u} = (u_i, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{G}(S)|-1})$. We may notice that if $y \in \text{fv}(P')$ then $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma_1 \setminus y$. On the other hand, when $y \notin \text{fv}(P')$ then $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma_1$ so we need to apply Lemma A.3 with y after Lemma A.1 to (58) in (63). Note that we have used the following for the right assumption of (63):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\Delta', u_i : S) \{\tilde{n}/\tilde{u}\} &= \mathcal{G}(\Delta', u_{i+1} : S) \\ \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P') \{\tilde{n}/\tilde{u}\} &= \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P' \{u_{i+1}/u_i\}) \end{aligned}$$

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

$$\text{Acc} \frac{\Gamma; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash u_i \triangleright \langle U \rangle \quad \Gamma; \Lambda_1; \Delta, \Delta_\mu \vdash P' \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Lambda_2; \emptyset \vdash y \triangleright U}{\Gamma \setminus y; \Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2; \Delta, \Delta_\mu \vdash u_i?(y).P' \triangleright \diamond} \quad (64)$$

Let $\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(P)$ and $\tilde{w} = \text{fv}(P')$. Furthermore, let $\Theta_1, \Theta, \Gamma_1, \Gamma'_1$, and Φ be defined as in sub-case (i). By IH on the second assumption of (64) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma'_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (65)$$

By Definition 3.3 and Definition 3.10 and the first assumption of (64) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash u_i \triangleright \langle \mathcal{G}(U) \rangle \quad (66)$$

By Definition 3.3, Definition 3.10, and the third assumption of (64) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_2); \emptyset \vdash y \triangleright \mathcal{G}(U) \quad (67)$$

By Table 1, we have:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i?(y).P') = c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P' \{u_{i+1}/u_i\}) \quad (68)$$

We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1 \setminus y), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i?(y).P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (69)$$

To this end, we use some auxiliary derivations:

$$\text{PolySend} \frac{\text{End} \frac{\text{Nil} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \overline{c_{k+1}} : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1); \emptyset \vdash \tilde{w} \triangleright \widetilde{M}'}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (70)$$

$$\text{End} \frac{\text{Acc} \frac{(66) \quad (70) \quad (67)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end}, c_k : \text{end} \vdash u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (71)$$

$$\text{PolyRcv} \frac{\text{PolyVar} \frac{(71) \quad \mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); \emptyset \vdash \tilde{x} \triangleright \widetilde{M}'}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1 \setminus y), \Phi; \emptyset; \Theta' \vdash c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1 \setminus y), \Phi; \emptyset; \Theta \vdash c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond} \quad (72)$$

The following tree proves this sub-case:

$$\text{Par} \frac{(72) \quad (65)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1 \setminus y), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta), \Theta \vdash c_k?(\tilde{x}).u_i?(y).\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle.\mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond} \quad (73)$$

As in sub-case (i), we may notice that if $y \in \text{fv}(P')$ then $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma_1 \setminus y$. On the other hand, if $y \notin \text{fv}(P')$ then $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma_1$ so we need to apply Lemma A.3 with y to (65) in (73). This concludes the analysis for the input case $P = u_i?(y).P'$. This concludes sub-case (ii).

Now, we consider sub-case (iii). Here we know $P = u_i?(V).P'$ and $u_i : S \in \Delta_\mu$.

$$\text{Rcv} \frac{\Gamma; \Lambda_1; \Delta', \Delta_\mu, u_i : S' \vdash P' \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \Lambda_2; \emptyset \vdash y \triangleright U}{\Gamma \setminus y; \Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2; \Delta', \Delta_\mu, u_i : ?(U); S' \vdash u_i?(y).P' \triangleright \diamond} \quad (74)$$

Let $\tilde{w} = \text{fv}(P')$. Let $\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta'$, and Φ be defined as in the sub-case (i). Also, let $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{w}$. Then, by IH on the first assumption of (74) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma'_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta'), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond \quad (75)$$

Further, by IH on the second assumption of (74) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_2); \emptyset \vdash y \triangleright \mathcal{G}(U) \quad (76)$$

By Table 1 we have:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P) = c_k?(x).c^u!\langle N_y \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P')$$

where $N_y = \lambda \tilde{z}. z_{[S]}?(y).(\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \mid c^u?(x).x \tilde{z})$

Notice that $u_i \in \text{rn}(P)$ as $\text{tr}(u_i)$. Hence, by (57) we know $\Phi(c^u) = \langle \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond \rangle$. Further, we know that $S = ?(U); S'$ and by Definition 3.3, $\mathcal{R}^*(S) = \mathcal{R}^*(S')$. Let $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}$ where $\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(P)$. Thus, we shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1 \setminus y), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta'), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i?(y).P') \triangleright \diamond$$

We use auxiliary derivations:

$$\text{PolyApp} \frac{\text{LVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; x : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond; \emptyset \vdash \quad x \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash \quad \tilde{z} \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(S)} \quad \text{PolySess} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash \quad \tilde{z} \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(S)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; x : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond; \tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash \quad x \tilde{z} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; x : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond; \tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash \quad x \tilde{z} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (77)$$

$$\text{Acc} \frac{\text{Sh} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \quad c^u \triangleright \langle \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond \rangle}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash \quad c^u?(x).x \tilde{z} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{LVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; x : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond; \emptyset \vdash \quad x \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash \quad c^u?(x).x \tilde{z} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash \quad c^u?(x).x \tilde{z} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (78)$$

$$\text{End} \frac{\text{Nil} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond \quad c_{k+1} \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma, \Phi)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; c_{k+1} : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; c_{k+1} : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (79)$$

$$\text{PolySend} \frac{c_{k+1} : !\langle \tilde{M}' \rangle; \text{end} \in \Theta' \quad \text{PolyVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1); \emptyset \vdash \tilde{w} \triangleright \tilde{M}'}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \tilde{M}' \rangle \vdash \quad \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \tilde{M}' \rangle \vdash \quad \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \triangleright \diamond} \quad (80)$$

$$\text{Par} \frac{\text{(80)} \quad \text{(78)}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1); \Theta', \tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash \quad \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \mid c^u?(x).x \tilde{z} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (81)$$

$$\text{Rcv} \frac{(81) \quad (76)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle, \tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash z_{[S]}?(y).(\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{w} \rangle \mid c^u?(x).x \tilde{z})} \quad (82)$$

By Lemma B.1 we know that if $\tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S)$ then $z_{[S]} : \mu t.?(G(U));t$.

$$\text{PolyAbs} \frac{(51) \quad \text{PolySess} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{z} : \mathcal{R}^*(S) \vdash \tilde{z} \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(S)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle \vdash N_y \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle \vdash N_y \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond}} \quad (83)$$

$$\text{LVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash c^u \triangleright \langle \mathcal{R}^*(S) \multimap \diamond \rangle \quad \text{Nil} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle \vdash c^u!\langle N_y \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2); \overline{c_{k+1}} : !\langle \widetilde{M}' \rangle \vdash c^u!\langle N_y \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}} \quad (84)$$

$$\text{PolyRcv} \frac{(84) \quad \text{PolyVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \emptyset \vdash \tilde{x} \triangleright \widetilde{M}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1 \setminus y), \Phi; \emptyset; \Theta' \vdash c_k?(x).c^u!\langle N_y \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1 \setminus y), \Phi; \emptyset; \Theta' \vdash c_k?(x).c^u!\langle N_y \rangle.\mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}} \quad (85)$$

The following tree proves this case:

$$\text{Par} \frac{(85) \quad (\text{Lemma A.3}) \text{ with } \tilde{y} \frac{(75)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1 \setminus y), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta'), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P') \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1 \setminus y), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta'), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(u_i?(y)P') \triangleright \diamond}} \quad (86)$$

This concludes sub-case (iii).

- (d) Case $P = V(\tilde{r}, u_i)$. We assume a certain order in the tuple (\tilde{r}, u_i) : names in \tilde{r} have recursive session types $\tilde{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_n) : (S_1, \dots, S_n)$, and u_i has non-recursive session type $u_i : C$. We distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $V : \tilde{S}C \multimap \diamond$ and (ii) $V : \tilde{S}C \triangleright \diamond$. We will consider only sub-case (i) since the other is similar. For this case Rule POLYAPP can be applied:

$$\text{PolyApp} \frac{\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_1, \Delta_{\mu_1} \vdash V \triangleright \tilde{S}C \multimap \diamond \quad \Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta_2, \Delta_{\mu_2} \vdash (\tilde{r}, u_i) \triangleright \tilde{S}C}{\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Delta_{\mu_1}, \Delta_{\mu_2} \vdash V(\tilde{r}, u_i)} \quad (87)$$

Let $\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(V)$ and $\Gamma_1 \setminus \tilde{x}$. Let $\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(V)$ and let Θ_1 be a balanced environment such that

$$\text{dom}(\Theta_1) = \{c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+\lceil V \rceil}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil V \rceil}}\}$$

and $\Theta_1(c_{k+1}) = ?(\widetilde{M})$ and $\Theta_1(\overline{c_{k+1}}) = !\langle \widetilde{M} \rangle$ where $\widetilde{M} = (\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \mathcal{G}(\Lambda))(\tilde{x})$.

We define:

$$\Phi_1 = \prod_{r \in \text{dom}(\Delta_{\mu_1})} c^r : \langle \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_{\mu_1}(r)) \multimap \diamond \rangle \quad (88)$$

Then, by IH (Part 2) on the first assumption of (87) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi_1; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(V) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(\tilde{S}C) \multimap \diamond \quad (89)$$

By Definition 3.10 and Definition 3.3 and the second assumption of (87) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma); \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2), \mathcal{G}(\Delta_{\mu_2}) \vdash (\tilde{r}_1, \dots, \tilde{r}_n, \tilde{m}) : \mathcal{G}(\tilde{S}C) \quad (90)$$

where $\tilde{r}_i = (r_i^i, \dots, r_{i+|\mathcal{G}(S_i)|-1}^i)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $\tilde{m} = (u_i, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{G}(C)|-1})$. We define $\Phi = \Phi_1, \Phi_2$ where:

$$\Phi_2 = \prod_{r \in \text{dom}(\Delta_{\mu_2})} c^r : \langle \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_{\mu_2}(r)) \multimap \diamond \rangle$$

We define $\Theta = \Theta_1, c_k : ?(\tilde{M})$.

We will first consider the case where $n = 3$; the proof is then generalized for any $n \geq 1$:

- If $n = 3$ then $P = V(r_1, r_2, r_3, u_i)$. By Table 1 we have:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(V(r_1, r_2, r_3, u_i)) = c_k ?(\tilde{x}).c^{r_1} ! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_1. c^{r_2} ! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_2. c^{r_3} ! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_3. Q \rangle . \mathbf{0} \rangle . \mathbf{0} \rangle . \mathbf{0}$$

where $Q = \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(V)(\tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_n, \tilde{m})$; $\tilde{z}_i = (z_1^i, \dots, z_{|\mathcal{G}(S_i)|}^i)$ for $i = \{1, 2, 3\}$; $\tilde{m} = (u_i, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{G}(C)|-1})$.

We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1 \Delta_2), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(V(\tilde{r}, u_i)) \triangleright \diamond \quad (91)$$

We use auxiliary derivations:

$$\text{(Lemma A.2) with } \Phi_2 \frac{(89)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(V) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(\tilde{S}C) \multimap \diamond} \quad (92)$$

$$\text{(Lemma A.1) with } \sigma \frac{(90)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2), \mathcal{G}(\Delta_{\mu_2}) \vdash (\tilde{z}_1, \tilde{z}_2, \tilde{z}_3, \tilde{m}) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(\tilde{S}C)} \quad (93)$$

$$\text{PolyApp} \frac{(92) \quad (93)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta_1, \mathcal{G}(\Delta_{\mu_2}) \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(V)(\tilde{z}_1, \tilde{z}_2, \tilde{z}_3, \tilde{m})} \quad (94)$$

where $\sigma = \{\tilde{n}_1/\tilde{z}_1\} \cdot \{\tilde{n}_2/\tilde{z}_2\} \cdot \{\tilde{n}_3/\tilde{z}_3\}$ with $\tilde{n}_i = (r_i^i, \dots, r_{i+|\mathcal{G}(S_i)|-1}^i)$ for $i = \{1, 2, 3\}$.

$$\text{PolyAbs} \frac{(94) \quad \text{PolySess} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{z}_3 : \mathcal{G}(S_3) \vdash \tilde{z}_3 \triangleright \mathcal{G}(S_3)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1 \Delta_2), \Theta_1 \vdash \lambda \tilde{z}_3. Q \triangleright \mathcal{G}(S_3) \multimap \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1 \Delta_2), \Theta_1 \vdash \lambda \tilde{z}_3. Q \triangleright \mathcal{G}(S_3) \multimap \diamond} \quad (95)$$

$$\text{Req} \frac{(95) \quad \text{Nil} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0}} \quad \text{LVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash c^{r_3} \triangleright \langle \mathcal{G}(S_3) \multimap \diamond \rangle}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash c^{r_3} \triangleright \langle \mathcal{G}(S_3) \multimap \diamond \rangle}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1 \Delta_2), \Theta_1, \tilde{z}_1 : \mathcal{G}(S_1), \tilde{z}_2 : \mathcal{G}(S_2) \vdash c^{r_3} ! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_3. Q \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (96)$$

$$\text{PolyAbs} \frac{(96) \quad \text{PolySess} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{z}_2 : \mathcal{G}(S_2) \vdash \tilde{z}_2 \triangleright \mathcal{G}(S_2)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{z}_2 : \mathcal{G}(S_2) \vdash \tilde{z}_2 \triangleright \mathcal{G}(S_2)}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1 \Delta_2), \Theta_1, \tilde{z}_1 : \mathcal{G}(S_1) \vdash \lambda \tilde{z}_2. c^{r_3} ! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_3. Q \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \mathcal{G}(S_2) \multimap \diamond} \quad (97)$$

$$\text{Req} \frac{(97) \quad \text{Nil} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0}} \quad \text{LVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash c^{r_2} \triangleright \langle \mathcal{G}(S_2) \multimap \diamond \rangle}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash c^{r_2} \triangleright \langle \mathcal{G}(S_2) \multimap \diamond \rangle}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1 \Delta_2), \Theta_1, \tilde{z}_1 : \mathcal{G}(S_1) \vdash c^{r_2} ! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_2. c^{r_3} ! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_3. Q \rangle . \mathbf{0} \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (98)$$

$$\text{PolyAbs} \frac{(98) \quad \text{PolySess} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{z}_1 : \mathcal{G}(S_1) \vdash \tilde{z}_1 \triangleright \mathcal{G}(S_1)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{z}_1 : \mathcal{G}(S_1) \vdash \tilde{z}_1 \triangleright \mathcal{G}(S_1)}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1 \Delta_2), \Theta_1 \vdash \lambda \tilde{z}_1. c^{r_2} ! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_2. c^{r_3} ! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_3. Q \rangle . \mathbf{0} \rangle . \mathbf{0} \triangleright \mathcal{G}(S_1) \multimap \diamond} \quad (99)$$

$$\text{Req} \frac{(99) \quad \text{Nil} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1 \Delta_2), \Theta_1 \vdash c^{r_1!} \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_1. c^{r_2!} \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_2. c^{r_3!} \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_3. Q \rangle. \mathbf{0} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \rangle. \mathbf{0}}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1 \Delta_2), \Theta_1 \vdash c^{r_1!} \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_1. c^{r_2!} \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_2. c^{r_3!} \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_3. Q \rangle. \mathbf{0} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \rangle. \mathbf{0}}}{\text{LVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash c^{r_1} \triangleright \langle \mathcal{G}(S_1) \multimap \diamond \rangle}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash c^{r_1} \triangleright \langle \mathcal{G}(S_1) \multimap \diamond \rangle}} \quad (100)$$

The following tree proves this case:

$$\text{PolyRcv} \frac{\text{PolyVar} \frac{(100) \quad \mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \emptyset \vdash \tilde{x} \triangleright \widetilde{M}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(V(\tilde{r}, u_i)) \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(V(\tilde{r}, u_i)) \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(V(\tilde{r}, u_i)) \triangleright \diamond}}$$

- Now we consider the general case for any $n \geq 1$:

By Table 1 we have:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(V \tilde{r}) = c_k?(\tilde{x}). \overbrace{c^{r_1!} \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_1. \dots c^{r_n!} \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_n. Q \rangle \dots \rangle}^{n=|\tilde{r}|}$$

where $Q = \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(V)(\tilde{r}_1, \dots, \tilde{r}_n, \tilde{m})$ with: $\tilde{z}_i = (z_1^i, \dots, z_{|\mathcal{G}(S_i)|}^i)$ for $i = \{1, \dots, n\}$; and $\tilde{m} = (u_i, \dots, u_{i+|\mathcal{G}(C)|-1})$.

We shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1 \Delta_2), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(V(\tilde{r}, u_i)) \triangleright \diamond \quad (101)$$

We construct auxiliary derivations parametrized by k and denoted by $d(k)$. If $k = n$, derivation $d(n)$ is defined as:

$$\text{(Lemma A.2) with } \Phi_2 \frac{(89)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(V) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(\widetilde{SC}) \multimap \diamond} \quad (102)$$

$$\text{PolyAbs} \frac{(102) \quad \text{(Lemma A.1) with } \sigma \frac{(90)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_{\mu_2}) \vdash (\tilde{r}_1, \dots, \tilde{r}_n, \tilde{m}) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(\widetilde{SC})}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta_1, \mathcal{G}(\Delta_{\mu_2}) \vdash \lambda \tilde{z}_n. Q \triangleright \mathcal{G}(S_n) \multimap \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta_1, \mathcal{G}(\Delta_{\mu_2}) \vdash \lambda \tilde{z}_n. Q \triangleright \mathcal{G}(S_n) \multimap \diamond} \quad (103)$$

where $\sigma = \prod_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \{\tilde{n}_i / \tilde{z}_i\}$ with $\tilde{n}_i = (r_i^i, \dots, r_{i+|\mathcal{G}(S_i)|-1}^i)$ for $i = \{1, \dots, n\}$.

$$\text{Req} \frac{(103) \quad \text{Nil} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0}} \quad \text{LVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash c^{r_n} \triangleright \langle \mathcal{G}(S_n) \multimap \diamond \rangle}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash c^{r_n} \triangleright \langle \mathcal{G}(S_n) \multimap \diamond \rangle}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta_1, \mathcal{G}(\Delta_{\mu_2}) \vdash c^{r_n!} \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_n. Q \rangle. \mathbf{0}} \quad (104)$$

Otherwise, if $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, derivation $d(k)$ is as follows:

$$\text{PolyAbs} \frac{d(k+1) \quad \text{PolyVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{z}_k : \mathcal{G}(S_k) \vdash \tilde{z}_k \triangleright \mathcal{G}(S_k)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{z}_k : \mathcal{G}(S_k) \vdash \tilde{z}_k \triangleright \mathcal{G}(S_k)}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta_1, (\tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_{k-1}) : (\mathcal{G}(S_1), \dots, \mathcal{G}(S_{k-1})) \vdash \lambda \tilde{z}_k. \overbrace{c^{r_{k+1}!} \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_{k+1}. \dots c^{r_n!} \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_n. Q \rangle. \mathbf{0} \dots \rangle}^{n-k} \overbrace{\triangleright \mathcal{G}(S_1) \multimap \diamond}^{n-k}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta_1, (\tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_{k-1}) : (\mathcal{G}(S_1), \dots, \mathcal{G}(S_{k-1})) \vdash \lambda \tilde{z}_k. \overbrace{c^{r_{k+1}!} \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_{k+1}. \dots c^{r_n!} \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_n. Q \rangle. \mathbf{0} \dots \rangle}^{n-k} \overbrace{\triangleright \mathcal{G}(S_1) \multimap \diamond}^{n-k}} \quad (105)$$

$$\text{Acc} \frac{(105) \quad \mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash c^{r_1} \triangleright \langle \mathcal{G}(S_1) \multimap \diamond \rangle}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta_1, (\tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_{k-1}) : (\mathcal{G}(S_1), \dots, \mathcal{G}(S_{k-1})) \vdash \overbrace{c^{r_k!} \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_k. \dots c^{r_n!} \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_n. Q \rangle. \mathbf{0} \dots \rangle}^{n-k+1} \overbrace{\triangleright \mathcal{G}(S_1) \multimap \diamond}^{n-k+1}} \quad (106)$$

The following tree proves this case:

$$\text{PolyRcv} \frac{\text{PolyVar} \frac{d(1) \quad \mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \emptyset \vdash \tilde{x} \triangleright \widetilde{M}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(V(\tilde{r}, u_i)) \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(V(\tilde{r}, u_i)) \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(V(\tilde{r}, u_i)) \triangleright \diamond}}$$

2. This part concerns values. Without a loss of generality we assume $\tilde{T} = \tilde{S}, C$ with $\tilde{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_n)$ such that $\text{tr}(S_i)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. We can distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $V = y$ and (ii) $V = \lambda \tilde{y}, z. P$.

We first consider sub-case (i). By assumption $\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta \vdash y \triangleright C \rightsquigarrow \diamond$.

Further, we can distinguish two sub-sub-cases (a) $\rightsquigarrow = \dashv\circ$ and (b) $\rightsquigarrow = \dashv\rightarrow$. In sub-sub-case (a), when $\rightsquigarrow = \dashv\circ$, only Rule LVAR can be applied and by inversion $\Lambda = \{y : \tilde{T} \dashv\circ \diamond\}$ and $\Delta = \emptyset$. By Table 1 we have $\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(y) = y$ and by Definition 3.3 and Definition 3.10 we have $\mathcal{G}(\Delta) = \{\mathcal{G}(\tilde{T} \dashv\circ \diamond)\}$. Hence, we prove the following judgment by applying Rule LVAR:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma); \mathcal{G}(\Delta); \emptyset \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(y) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(\tilde{T} \dashv\circ \diamond)$$

In sub-sub-case (b) only Rule SH can be applied and by inversion we have $\Gamma = \{y : \tilde{T} \dashv\rightarrow \diamond\}$, $\Lambda = \emptyset$, and $\Delta = \emptyset$. Similarly to (a), by Definition 3.3 and Definition 3.10 we have $\mathcal{G}(\Gamma) = \{\mathcal{G}(\tilde{T} \dashv\rightarrow \diamond)\}$. Hence, we prove the following judgment by applying Rule SH:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma); \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(y) \triangleright \mathcal{G}(\tilde{T} \dashv\rightarrow \diamond)$$

This concludes sub-case (i). Now, we consider sub-case (ii).

This is the second sub-case concerning values when $V = \lambda \tilde{y}, z. P$ where $\tilde{y} = y_1, \dots, y_n$. By assumption we have $\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, \Delta_\mu \vdash V \triangleright \tilde{S}, C \rightsquigarrow \diamond$. Here we distinguish two sub-sub-cases (a) $\rightsquigarrow = \dashv\circ$ and (b) $\rightsquigarrow = \dashv\rightarrow$:

- $\rightsquigarrow = \dashv\circ$. By assumption, $\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta, \Delta_\mu \vdash V \triangleright \tilde{S}, C \dashv\circ \diamond$. In this case Rule ABS can be applied. Firstly, we α -convert value V as follows:

$$V \equiv_\alpha \lambda \tilde{y}, z_1. P\{z_1/z\} \quad (107)$$

For this case only Rule ABS can be applied:

$$\text{Abs} \frac{\Gamma; \Lambda; \Delta_1, \Delta_{\mu_1} \vdash P\{z_1/z\} \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta_2, \Delta_{\mu_2} \vdash \tilde{y}, z_1 \triangleright \tilde{S}, C}{\Gamma \setminus z_1; \Lambda; \Delta_1 \setminus \Delta_2, \Delta_{\mu_1} \setminus \Delta_{\mu_2} \vdash \lambda \tilde{y}, z_1. P\{z_1/z\} \triangleright \tilde{S}, C \dashv\circ \diamond} \quad (108)$$

Let $\tilde{x} = \text{fv}(P)$ and $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \tilde{x}$. Also, let Θ_1 be a balanced environment such that

$$\text{dom}(\Theta_1) = \{c_1, \dots, c_{|\mathcal{P}\tilde{S}|}\} \cup \{\bar{c}_2, \dots, \bar{c}_{|\mathcal{P}\tilde{S}|}\}$$

and $\Theta_1(c_1) = ?(\tilde{M}); \text{end}$ with $\tilde{M} = (\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus y_1), \mathcal{G}(\Lambda))(\tilde{x})$. We define:

$$\Phi_i = \prod_{r \in \text{dom}(\Delta_{\mu_i})} c^r : \langle \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_{\mu_i}(r)) \dashv\circ \diamond \rangle \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\}$$

Then, by IH (Part 1) on the first assumption of (108) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1), \Phi_1; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^1(P\{y_1/y\}) \triangleright \diamond \quad (109)$$

Let $\tilde{T} = \mathcal{G}(S_1), \dots, \mathcal{G}(S_n), \mathcal{G}(C)$. By Definition 3.3 and Definition 3.10 and the second assumption of (108) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma); \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_2) \vdash \tilde{y}^1, \dots, \tilde{y}^n, \tilde{z} \triangleright \tilde{T} \quad (110)$$

where $\tilde{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_{|\mathcal{G}(C)|})$ and $\tilde{y}^i = (y_1^i, \dots, y_{|\mathcal{G}(S_i)|}^i)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

We define $\Theta = \Theta_1, \bar{c}_k : !(\tilde{M})$. By Table 1, we have:

$$\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}}(\lambda y_1, \dots, y_n, z. P) = \lambda(\tilde{y}^1, \dots, \tilde{y}^n, \tilde{z}) : (\tilde{T})^{\rightsquigarrow} . N$$

where

$$N = (\nu \tilde{c}) (\nu \tilde{c}_r) \prod_{i \in |\tilde{y}|} (c^{y^i?}(x).x \tilde{y}^i \mid \bar{c}_1! \langle \tilde{x} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^1(P\{z_1/z\}))$$

with $\tilde{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_{|P|})$ and $\tilde{c}_r = \bigcup_{r \in \tilde{y}} c^r$.

We use an auxiliary derivation:

$$\text{Send} \frac{\text{Nil} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1; \emptyset; c_k : \text{end} \vdash \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{PolyVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \emptyset \vdash \tilde{x} \triangleright \widetilde{M}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \bar{c}_1 : ! \langle \widetilde{M} \rangle; \text{end} \vdash \bar{c}_1! \langle \tilde{x} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \bar{c}_1 : ! \langle \widetilde{M} \rangle; \text{end} \vdash \bar{c}_1! \langle \tilde{x} \rangle. \mathbf{0} \triangleright \diamond} \quad (111)$$

$$\text{LVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1; x : \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_{\mu_2}(y^i)) \multimap \diamond; \emptyset \vdash}{x \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_{\mu_2}(y^i)) \multimap \diamond} \quad (112)$$

$$\text{PolyApp} \frac{\text{PolySess} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1; \emptyset; \tilde{y}^i : \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_{\mu_2}(y^i)) \vdash}{\tilde{y}^i \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_{\mu_2}(y^i))} \quad (112)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1; x : \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_{\mu_2}(y^i)) \multimap \diamond; \tilde{y}^i : \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_{\mu_2}(y^i)) \vdash (b \tilde{y}^i)} \quad (113)$$

$$\text{Acc} \frac{\text{Sh} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash c^{y^i} \triangleright}{\langle \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_{\mu}(y^i)) \multimap \diamond \rangle} \quad \text{LVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1; x : \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_{\mu}(y^i)) \multimap \diamond; \emptyset \vdash}{\vdash x \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_{\mu}(y^i)) \multimap \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi_1; \emptyset; \tilde{y}^i : \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_{\mu_1}(y^i)) \vdash c^{y^i?}(x).x \tilde{y}^i} \quad (113) \quad (114)$$

$$\text{Par} (|\tilde{y}| - 1 \text{ times}) \frac{\text{for } y^i \in \tilde{y} \quad (114)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \mathcal{G}(\Delta_{\mu_2}) \vdash \prod_{i \in |\tilde{y}|} (c^{y^i?}(x).x \tilde{y}^i) \triangleright \diamond} \quad (115)$$

$$\text{PolyResS} \frac{\text{Par} \frac{\text{(Lemma A.2) with } \tilde{x} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \Theta_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^1(P\{z_1/z\}) \triangleright \diamond}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \Theta \vdash \bar{c}_1! \langle \tilde{x} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^1(P\{z_1/z\}) \triangleright \diamond} \quad (111)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \Theta \vdash \bar{c}_1! \langle \tilde{x} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^1(P\{z_1/z\}) \triangleright \diamond} \quad (109)}{\frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \mathcal{G}(\Delta_{\mu_2}), \Theta \vdash}{\prod_{i \in |\tilde{y}|} (c^{y^i?}(x).x \tilde{y}^i \mid \bar{c}_1! \langle \tilde{x} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^1(P\{z_1/z\}) \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{PolyRes}}{\frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1 \setminus \Phi_2; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \mathcal{G}(\Delta_{\mu_2}), \Theta \vdash}{(\nu \tilde{c}_r) \prod_{i \in |\tilde{y}|} (c^{y^i?}(x).x \tilde{y}^i \mid \bar{c}_1! \langle \tilde{x} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^1(P\{z_1/z\}) \triangleright \diamond} \quad \text{PolyResS}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma), \Phi_1 \setminus \Phi_2; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1), \mathcal{G}(\Delta_{\mu_2}) \vdash N \triangleright \diamond} \quad (116)$$

The following tree proves this part:

$$\text{Abs} \frac{\text{(116)} \quad \text{(110)}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus z_1), \Phi_1 \setminus \Phi_2; \mathcal{G}(\Lambda); \mathcal{G}(\Delta_1 \setminus \Delta_2) \vdash \lambda(\tilde{y}^1, \dots, \tilde{y}^n, \tilde{z}) : (\tilde{T})^{-\circ}. N \triangleright \diamond} \quad (117)$$

- $\rightsquigarrow = \rightarrow$. By assumption, $\Gamma; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash V \triangleright C \rightarrow \diamond$. In this case Rule PROM can be applied:

$$\text{Prom} \frac{\text{Abs} \frac{\Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta \vdash P\{y_1/y\} \triangleright \diamond \quad \Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta \vdash y_1 \triangleright C}{\Gamma \setminus z_1; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \lambda \tilde{y}, z_1. P\{z_1/z\} \triangleright C \multimap \diamond}}{\Gamma \setminus z_1; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \lambda \tilde{y}, z_1. P\{z_1/z\} \triangleright C \rightarrow \diamond} \quad (118)$$

Now, we can see that we can specialize previous sub-case by taking $\Delta_1 \setminus \Delta_2 = \emptyset$ (resp. $\Delta_{\mu_1} \setminus \Delta_{\mu_2} = \emptyset$), that is $\Delta_1 = \Delta_2$ (resp. $\Delta_{\mu_1} = \Delta_{\mu_2}$) and $\Lambda = \emptyset$. Subsequently, we have $\Phi_1 \setminus \Phi_2 = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda) = \emptyset$, and $\mathcal{G}(\Delta_1 \setminus \Delta_2) = \emptyset$. Thus, we can apply Rule PROM to (117) to prove this sub-case as follows:

$$\text{Prom} \frac{(117)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma \setminus z_1); \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \lambda(\tilde{y}^1, \dots, \tilde{y}^n, \tilde{z}) : (\tilde{T})^\rightarrow. N \triangleright \diamond}$$

This concludes this part (and the proof). □

B.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Theorem 3.1 (Static Correctness). *Let P be a closed HO process (i.e. $\text{fv}(P) = \emptyset$) with $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P)$. If $\Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta \circ \Delta_\mu \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$, then $\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma); \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta\sigma), \mathcal{G}(\Delta_\mu\sigma) \vdash \mathcal{D}(P) \triangleright \diamond$, where $\sigma = \{\text{init}(\tilde{u})/\tilde{u}\}$.*

Proof. By assumption $\Gamma; \emptyset; \Delta \circ \Delta_\mu \vdash P \triangleright \diamond$. Then, by applying Lemma A.1 we have:

$$\Gamma\sigma; \emptyset; \Delta\sigma \circ \Delta_\mu\sigma \vdash P\sigma \triangleright \diamond \quad (119)$$

By Lemma 3.1 on (119) we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_1\sigma), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta\sigma), \Theta \vdash \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^k(P\sigma) \triangleright \diamond \quad (120)$$

where Θ is balanced with $\text{dom}(\Theta) = \{c_k, c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P \rceil - 1}\} \cup \{\overline{c_{k+1}}, \dots, \overline{c_{k+\lceil P \rceil - 1}}\}$, and $\Theta(c_k) = ?(\cdot)$, and $\Phi = \prod_{r \in \text{dom}(\Delta_\mu)} c^r : \langle \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r)) \rightarrow \diamond \rangle$. By assumption, $\text{fv}(P) = \emptyset$.

By Definition 3.9, we shall prove the following judgment:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma); \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta\sigma) \circ \mathcal{G}(\Delta_\mu\sigma) \vdash (\nu \tilde{c}) (\nu \tilde{c}_r) \left(\prod_{r \in \tilde{v}} c^r?(x).x \tilde{r} \mid \overline{c_k!} \langle \cdot \rangle. \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^k(P\sigma) \right)$$

where: $k > 0$; $\tilde{v} = \text{rn}(P)$; $\tilde{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_{|\mathcal{G}(S)|})$ for each $r \in \tilde{v}$.

We know $\text{dom}(\Delta_\mu) = \tilde{v}$. We assume that recursive session types are unfolded. By Definition 3.10 and Definition 3.3, for $r \in \text{dom}(\Delta_\mu)$ we have:

$$\mathcal{G}(\Delta_\mu)(r) = \mathcal{R}(\Delta_\mu(r)) = \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r))$$

We use a family of auxiliary derivations parametrized by $r \in \tilde{v}$.

$$\text{PolyApp} \frac{\text{LVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi; x : \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r)) \rightarrow \diamond; \emptyset \vdash}{x \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r)) \rightarrow \diamond} \quad \text{PolySess} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{r} : \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r)) \vdash}{\tilde{r} \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r))}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi; x : \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r)) \rightarrow \diamond; \tilde{r} : \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r)) \vdash (x \tilde{r})} \quad (121)$$

$$\text{Acc} \frac{\text{Sh} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi; \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash c^r \triangleright}{\langle \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r)) \rightarrow \diamond \rangle} \quad \text{LVar} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi; x : \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r)) \rightarrow \diamond; \emptyset \vdash}{\vdash x \triangleright \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r)) \rightarrow \diamond}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi; \emptyset; \tilde{r} : \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r)) \vdash c^r?(x).x \tilde{r}} \quad (122)$$

We will then use:

$$\text{Par } (|\tilde{v}| - 1 \text{ times}) \frac{\text{for } r \in \tilde{v} \quad (122)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta_\mu\sigma) \vdash \prod_{r \in \tilde{v}} c^r?(x).x \tilde{r}} \quad (123)$$

where we apply Rule PAR $|\tilde{v}| - 1$ times and for every $r \in \tilde{v}$ we apply derivation (122). Notice that by Definition 3.10 and Definition 3.3 we have $\mathcal{G}(\Delta_\mu\sigma) = \prod_{r \in \tilde{v}} \tilde{r} : \mathcal{R}^*(\Delta_\mu(r))$.

$$\text{Par} \frac{\text{Sess} \frac{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi; \emptyset; \overline{c_k} : !\langle \cdot \rangle; \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_k} ! \langle \cdot \rangle . \mathbf{0}}{(120)}}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta\sigma), \Theta, \overline{c_k} : !\langle \cdot \rangle; \text{end} \vdash \overline{c_k} ! \langle \cdot \rangle . \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^k(P\sigma)} \quad (124)$$

The following tree proves this case:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Par} \frac{(123) \quad (124)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma), \Phi; \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta\sigma), \Theta, \overline{c_k} : !\langle \cdot \rangle; \text{end} \circ \mathcal{G}(\Delta_\mu\sigma) \vdash} \\ \text{PolyRes} \frac{\prod_{r \in \tilde{v}} (c^r?(x).x \tilde{r}) \mid \overline{c_k} ! \langle \cdot \rangle . \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^k(P\sigma)}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma); \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta\sigma), \Theta, \overline{c_k} : !\langle \cdot \rangle; \text{end} \circ \mathcal{G}(\Delta_\mu\sigma) \vdash} \\ \text{PolyResS} \frac{(\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\prod_{r \in \tilde{v}} (c^r?(x).x \tilde{z}) \mid \overline{c_k} ! \langle \cdot \rangle . \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^k(P\sigma))}{\mathcal{G}(\Gamma\sigma); \emptyset; \mathcal{G}(\Delta\sigma) \circ \mathcal{G}(\Delta_\mu\sigma) \vdash (\nu \tilde{c}) (\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\prod_{r \in \tilde{v}} (c^r?(x).x \tilde{r}) \mid \overline{c_k} ! \langle \cdot \rangle . \mathbf{0} \mid \mathcal{B}_\epsilon^k(P\sigma))} \end{array} \quad (125)$$

□

C Appendix to Section 4

C.1 Proof of Lemma 4.3

Lemma 4.3. *Given an indexed process $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$, the set $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P_1)$ is closed under τ -transitions on non-essential prefixes. That is, if $R_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P_1)$ and $R_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} R_2$ is inferred from the actions on non-essential prefixes, then $R_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P_1)$.*

Proof. By the induction on the structure of P_1 . We consider two base cases:

- Case $P_1 = \mathbf{0}$. Let \tilde{B} such that $\tilde{W} \boxtimes \tilde{B}$. Then, the elements of $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(\mathbf{0})$ are $R_1 = (\nu c_k) \overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{B} \rangle \mid c_k?(\tilde{x}).\mathbf{0}$ and $R_2 = \mathbf{0}$. Clearly, $R_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} R_2$.
- Case $P_1 = V_1(\tilde{r}, u)$. Let $n = |\tilde{r}|$. Then, we have

$$\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P_1) = N_1 \cup N_4 \cup (\cup_{1 \leq l \leq n} N_2^l) \cup (\cup_{1 \leq l \leq n-1} N_3^l)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= \{\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}, \tilde{r}} \mid \overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{B} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P_1) : \tilde{W} \boxtimes \tilde{B}\} \\ N_2^l &= \{\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}, r_1, \dots, r_n} \mid \overbrace{c^{r_1}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_l . c^{r_{l+1}}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_{l+1} . \dots . c^{r_n}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_n . Q_l^{V_2} \rangle \rangle}^{|\tilde{r}|-l+1} \rangle : V_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \boxtimes V_2\} \\ N_3^l &= \{\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}, r_{l+1}, \dots, r_n} \mid \overbrace{\lambda \tilde{z}_l . c^{r_{l+1}}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_{l+1} . \dots . c^{r_n}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_n . Q_l^{V_2} \rangle \rangle}^{|\tilde{r}|-l} \rangle \tilde{r}_l : V_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \boxtimes V_2\} \\ N_4 &= \{\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid V_2(\tilde{r}_1, \dots, \tilde{r}_n, \tilde{m}) : V_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \boxtimes V_2\} \end{aligned}$$

with

$$Q_l^{V_2} = V_2(\tilde{r}_1, \dots, \tilde{r}_{l-1}, \tilde{z}_l, \dots, \tilde{z}_n, \tilde{m})$$

We can see that for $R_1 \in N_1$ there exist $R_2^0 \in N_2^0$ such that $R_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} R_2^0$. Further, we could see that for $R_2^l \in N_2^l$ there is $R_3^l \in N_3^l$ such that $R_2^l \xrightarrow{\tau} R_3^l$. Now, we can see that for $R_3^l \in N_3^l$ there is $R_2^{l+1} \in N_2^{l+1}$ such that $R_3^l \xrightarrow{\tau} R_2^{l+1}$. Finally, we have for

$$R_3^n \in N_3^n = \{\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid \lambda \tilde{z}_n . Q_n^{V_2} \tilde{r}_n : V_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \boxtimes V_2\}$$

there is $R_4 \in N_4$ such that $R_3^n \xrightarrow{\tau} R_4$.

We consider two inductive cases as remaining cases are similar:

- Case $P_1 = u_i! \langle V_1 \rangle . P_2$. We distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $\neg \text{tr}(u_i)$ and (ii) $\text{tr}(u_i)$. In both sub-cases, we distinguish two kinds of an object value V_1 : (a) $V_1 \equiv x$, such that $\{V_x/x\} \in \{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ and (b) $V_1 = \lambda y : C . P'$, that is V_1 is a pure abstraction.

First, we consider sub-case (i). Let $\tilde{y} = \text{fv}(V_1)$, $\tilde{w} = \text{fv}(P_2)$, \tilde{W}_1 , and \tilde{W}_2 such that $\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} = \{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \cdot \{\tilde{W}_2/\tilde{w}\}$. Further, let $\tilde{v} = \text{rn}(P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$ and $\sigma = \{u_{i+1}/u_i\}$. Then, by the definition of $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(-)$ (Table 3), we have that $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(u_i! \langle V_1 \rangle . P_2) = N_1 \cup N_2$ where:

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= \{\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid \overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{B} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P_1) : \tilde{W} \boxtimes \tilde{B}\} \\ N_2 &= \{\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid u_i! \langle V_2 \rangle . \overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k_2}(P_2 \sigma) : V_1 \sigma \{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \boxtimes V_2, \tilde{W}_2 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_2\} \end{aligned}$$

We can see that in both cases of V_1 , a variable or a pure abstraction, we have that for $R_1 \in N_1$ there is $R_2 \in N_2$ such that $R_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} R_2$. In the sub-case (a) by $\{V_x/x\} \in \{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ we have $V_2 \in \tilde{B}$,

such that $V_x \boxtimes V_2$, that by τ -move substitutes x in $\mathcal{B}_x^k(P_1)$. Thus, by $x\sigma\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} = V_x$ we have $V_1\sigma\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \boxtimes V_2$. In the sub-case (b), by definition of $\mathcal{B}^-(-)$ we have that by τ -move $\tilde{B}_1 \subseteq \tilde{B}$ substitute \tilde{y} in $\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V_1\sigma)$ so we have $R_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} R_2$ where

$$V_2 = \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{y}}(V_1\sigma)\{\tilde{B}_1/\tilde{y}\}$$

Now, we may notice that by Table 3 we have

$$V_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{W}_1}(V_1\sigma)$$

Hence, by Definition 4.11 and Definition 4.13 we have $V_1\sigma\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \boxtimes V_2$. Further, we may notice that there is no τ -transition involving non-essential prefixes in R_2 . This concludes this sub-case.

Now, we consider sub-case (ii). Let $\tilde{y} = \mathbf{fv}(V_1)$, $\tilde{w} = \mathbf{fv}(P_2)$, \tilde{W}_1 , and \tilde{W}_2 such that $\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} = \{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \cdot \{\tilde{W}_2/\tilde{w}\}$. Then, we have $\mathcal{C}_x^{\tilde{W}}(P_1) = N_1 \cup N_2 \cup N_3 \cup N_4$ where

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= \{\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid \overline{c_k}!\langle \tilde{B} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_x^k(P_1) : \tilde{W} \boxtimes \tilde{B}\} \\ N_2 &= \{\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid c^u!\langle M_{V_2}^{\tilde{B}_2} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^k(P_2) : V_1\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \boxtimes V_2, \tilde{W}_2 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_2\} \\ N_3 &= \{\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}\setminus u} \mid M_{V_2}^{\tilde{B}_2} \tilde{u} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^k(Q) : V_1\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \boxtimes V_2, \tilde{W}_2 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_2\} \\ N_4 &= \{\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}\setminus u} \mid u_{[S]}!\langle V_2 \rangle . \overline{c_k}!\langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle . c^u?(b) . (b\tilde{u}) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^k(P_2) : V_1\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \boxtimes V_2, \tilde{W}_2 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_2\} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$M_{V_2}^{\tilde{B}_2} = \lambda\tilde{z} . z_{[S]}!\langle V_2 \rangle . \overline{c_k}!\langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid c^u?(b) . (b\tilde{z})$$

As in the previous sub-case, we can see that in both cases of V_1 , a variable or a pure abstraction, we have that for $R_1 \in N_1$ there is $R_2 \in N_2$ such that $R_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} R_2$, for appropriate choice of \tilde{B} , \tilde{B}_2 , and k . Similarly, by the communication on shared name c^u for $R_2 \in N_2$ there is $R_3 \in N_3$ such that $R_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} R_3$. Finally, for $R_3 \in N_3$ there is $R_4 \in N_4$ such that $R_3 \xrightarrow{\tau} R_4$ by the application. This concludes output case.

- Case $P_1 = Q_1 \mid Q_2$. Let $\tilde{y} = \mathbf{fv}(Q_1)$, $\tilde{w} = \mathbf{fv}(Q_2)$, \tilde{W}_1 , and \tilde{W}_2 such that $\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} = \{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \cdot \{\tilde{W}_2/\tilde{w}\}$. Then, by the definition of $\mathcal{C}^-(-)$ (Table 3), we have that $\mathcal{C}_x^{\tilde{W}}(Q_1 \mid Q_2) = N_1 \cup N_2 \cup N_3$ where:

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= \{\overline{c_k}!\langle \tilde{B} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_x^k(Q_1 \mid Q_2) : \tilde{W} \boxtimes \tilde{B}\} \\ N_2 &= \{\overline{c_k}!\langle \tilde{B}_1 \rangle . \overline{c_{k+l}}!\langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{y}}^k(Q_1) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+l}(Q_2) : \tilde{W}_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_1, \tilde{W}_2 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_2\} \\ N_3 &= \{R_1 \mid R_2 : R_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{W}_1}(Q_1), R_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{w}}^{\tilde{W}_2}(Q_2)\} \end{aligned}$$

with $l = \mathcal{?}Q_1\mathcal{?}$.

We show that the thesis holds for processes in each of these three sets:

1. Clearly, by picking appropriate \tilde{B} , \tilde{B}_1 , and \tilde{B}_2 , for any $R_1^1 \in N_1$ there is R_2^1 such that $R_1^1 \xrightarrow{\tau} R_2^1$ and $R_2^1 \in N_2$.
2. Now, we consider set N_3 . Let us pick $R^3 = R_1 \mid R_2 \in N_3$, for some $R_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{W}_1}(Q_1)$ and $R_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{w}}^{\tilde{W}_2}(Q_2)$. By the definition of $\mathcal{C}^-(-)$ (Table 3) we know all propagator names are restricted element-wise in R^3 , and so there is no communication between R_1 and R_2 on propagator prefixes. This ensures that any τ -actions emanating from R^3 arise from R_1 or R_2 separately, not from their interaction. The thesis then follows by IH, for we know that if $R_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} R_1'$ then $R_1' \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{W}_1}(Q_1)$; similarly, if $R_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} R_2'$ then $R_2' \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{w}}^{\tilde{W}_2}(Q_2)$. Thus, by the definition $R_1' \mid R_2' \in N_3$.

3. Finally, we show that for any $R_2 \in N_2$ if $R_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} R'_2$ then $R'_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(Q_1 \mid Q_2)$. We know that $R_2 = \overline{c_k}!\langle \tilde{B}_1 \rangle . \overline{c_{k+l}}!\langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{y}}^k(Q_1) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+l}(Q_2)$, where \tilde{B}_i are such that $\tilde{W}_i \boxtimes \tilde{B}_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Clearly, by a synchronization on c_k , we have

$$R_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} \overline{c_{k+l}}!\langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid B_{Q_1} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+l}(Q_2) = R'_2$$

where B_{Q_1} stands for the derivative of $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{y}}^k(Q_1)$ after the synchronization (and substitution of \tilde{B}_1).

To show that R'_2 is already in $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(Q_1 \mid Q_2)$, we consider an $R^3 \in N_3$ such that

$$R^3 = \overline{c_k}!\langle \tilde{B}_1 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{y}}^k(Q_1) \mid \overline{c_{k+l}}!\langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+l}(Q_2)$$

Note that there is a τ -transition on c_k such that $R^3 \xrightarrow{\tau} R'_2$. Because processes in N_3 satisfy the thesis (cf. the previous sub-sub-case), we have that $R'_2 \in N_3$. Therefore, $R'_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(Q_1 \mid Q_2)$, as desired. This concludes parallel composition case.

This concludes the proof. \square

C.2 Proof of Lemma 4.4

For the proof we will use the following syntactic sugar.

Definition C.1 (Function $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma}^{-}(-)$). Let P be a HO process, ρ be a values substitution, and σ be an indexed name substitution. We define $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma}^{\rho}(P)$ as follows:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma}^{\rho}(P_1) = \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}\sigma}(P_1\sigma) \quad \text{with } \rho = \{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$$

Lemma 4.4. Assume $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ is a process such that $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \triangleright \diamond$ with $\text{balanced}(\Delta_1)$ and $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} Q_1$.

1. Whenever $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_1)n!(V_1)} P_2$, such that $\bar{n} \notin \text{fn}(P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$, then there exist Q_2 and V_2 such that $Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2)\tilde{n}!(V_2)} Q_2$ and, for a fresh t ,

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2 \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\text{H}} V_1)\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \parallel t_1 \leftrightarrow_{\text{H}} V_2)$$

2. Whenever $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n?(V_1)} P_2$, such that $\bar{n} \notin \text{fn}(P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$, then there exist Q_2 , V_2 , and σ such that $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tilde{n}?(V_2)} Q_2$ where $V_1\sigma \boxtimes V_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$,

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

Proof. By transition induction. Let $\rho_1 = \{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$. By inversion of $P_1\rho_1 \mathcal{S} Q_1$ we know there is $\sigma_1 \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_1\rho_1))$ such that $Q_1 \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_1}^{\rho_1}(P_1)$. Then, we need the following assertion on the index substitution. If $P_1\rho_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} P_2\rho_2$ and $\text{subj}(\ell) = n$ such that $\neg \text{tr}(n)$ then there exists Q_2 such that $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\check{\ell}} Q_2$ with $\text{subj}(\check{\ell}) = n_i$ and $Q_2 \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_2}^{\rho_2}(P_2)$ such that $\sigma_2 \in \text{index}(P_2\rho_2)$ and $\text{next}(n_i) \in \sigma_2$.

First, we consider three base cases: Rules **Snd**, **Rv**, and **App**. Then, we distinguish five inductive cases and analyze three cases (as cases **Par_R** and **Par_L**, and **New** and **Res** are similar). Thus, in total we consider six cases:

1. Case $\langle \text{Snd} \rangle$. Then $P_1 = n!(V_1).P_2$. We first consider the case when P_1 is not a trigger collection, and then briefly discuss the case when it is a trigger collection.

We distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $\neg \text{tr}(n)$ and (ii) $\text{tr}(n)$. In both sub-cases, we distinguish two kinds of an object value V_1 : (a) $V_1 \equiv x$, such that $\{V_x/x\} \in \{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ and (b) $V_1 = \lambda y : C.P'$, that is V_1 is a pure abstraction. Next, we consider two sub-cases:

i) Sub-case $\neg \text{tr}(n)$. Let $\widetilde{W}_1, \widetilde{W}_2, \widetilde{y}$, and \widetilde{w} such that

$$P_1\{\widetilde{W}/\widetilde{x}\} = n!\langle V_1\{\widetilde{W}_1/\widetilde{y}\}\rangle.P_2\{\widetilde{W}_2/\widetilde{w}\}$$

We have the following transition:

$$\langle \text{Snd} \rangle \frac{}{P_1\{\widetilde{W}/\widetilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n!\langle V_1\{\widetilde{W}_1/\widetilde{y}\}\rangle} P_2\{\widetilde{W}_2/\widetilde{w}\}}$$

Let $\sigma_1 \in \text{index}(\widetilde{u})$ where $\widetilde{u} = \text{fn}(P_1\{\widetilde{W}/\widetilde{x}\})$ such that $\{n_i/n\} \in \sigma_1$. Also, let $\sigma_2 = \sigma_1 \cdot \text{next}(n_i)$. Further, let $\widetilde{v} = \text{rn}(P_1\{\widetilde{W}/\widetilde{x}\})$, $\widetilde{c}_r = \cup_{r \in \widetilde{v}} c^r$, $\widetilde{c}_k = (c_k, \dots, c_{k+1} \uparrow_{P_1} \downarrow_{-1})$, and $\widetilde{c}_{k+1} = (c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+1} \uparrow_{P_1} \downarrow_{-1})$. When P_1 is not a trigger, by the definition of \mathcal{S} (Table 3), for both sub-cases, we have $Q_1 \in N_1 \cup N_2$ where:

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= \{(\nu \widetilde{c}_r) (\nu \widetilde{c}_k) \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{v}} \mid \overline{c_k}!\langle \widetilde{B} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{x}}^k(P_1\sigma_1) : \widetilde{W} \boxtimes \widetilde{B}\} \\ N_2 &= \{(\nu \widetilde{c}_r) (\nu \widetilde{c}_{k+1}) \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{v}} \mid n_i!\langle V_2 \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_2) : \\ &\quad V_1\sigma\{\widetilde{W}_1/\widetilde{y}\} \boxtimes V_2, \widetilde{W}_2 \boxtimes \widetilde{B}_2\} \end{aligned}$$

If $Q_1 \in N_1$, then there is some $Q_2 \in N_2$ such that Q_1 reduces to Q_2 through communication on non-essential prefixes. By Lemma 4.3 it is then sufficient to consider the situation when $Q_2 \in N_2$. Let $\widetilde{v}_1 = \text{rn}(P_2\{\widetilde{W}_2/\widetilde{z}\})$, $\widetilde{v}_2 = \text{rn}(V_2\{\widetilde{W}_1/\widetilde{y}\})$, $\widetilde{c}_{r_1} = \cup_{r \in \widetilde{v}_1} c^r$, and $\widetilde{c}_{r_2} = \cup_{r \in \widetilde{v}_2} c^r$. By Definition 4.16 and the assumption that $P_1\{\widetilde{W}/\widetilde{x}\}$ is well-typed we have $\widetilde{c}_r = \widetilde{c}_{r_1} \cdot \widetilde{c}_{r_2}$ and $\widetilde{c}_{r_1} \cap \widetilde{c}_{r_2} = \emptyset$. In that case we have the following transition:

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \text{Snd} \rangle \frac{}{\langle \text{Par}_L \rangle \frac{n_i!\langle V_2 \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle \xrightarrow{n_i!\langle V_2 \rangle} \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle}{n_i!\langle V_2 \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_2) \xrightarrow{n_i!\langle V_2 \rangle} R_1}} \\ &\langle \text{Par}_R \rangle \frac{\mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{v}} \mid n_i!\langle V_2 \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_2) \xrightarrow{n_i!\langle V_2 \rangle} R_1}{(\nu \widetilde{c}_r) (\nu \widetilde{c}_{k+1}) (\mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{v}} \mid n_i!\langle V_2 \rangle.\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{z}}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_2))} \quad \widetilde{c}_r \cdot \widetilde{c}_{k+1} \cap \text{fn}(n_i!\langle V_2 \rangle) = \emptyset} \\ &\langle \text{New} \rangle \frac{}{Q'_2} \end{aligned} \tag{126}$$

where $Q'_2 = (\nu \widetilde{c}_{r_1}) (\nu \widetilde{c}_{k+1}) \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{v}} \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_2)$ with $V_1\{\widetilde{W}_1/\widetilde{y}\}\sigma_2 \boxtimes V_2$ and $\widetilde{W}_2\sigma_1 \boxtimes \widetilde{B}_2$. Then, we shall show the following:

$$(P_2 \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\text{H}} V_1)\{\widetilde{W}/\widetilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} (\nu \widetilde{c}_{r_2})(Q'_2 \parallel t_1 \leftrightarrow_{\text{H}} V_2) \tag{127}$$

By assumption that $P_1\{\widetilde{W}/\widetilde{x}\}$ is well-typed, we know $\widetilde{v} = \widetilde{v}_1 \cdot \widetilde{v}_2$ and $\widetilde{v}_1 \cap \widetilde{v}_2 = \emptyset$. Thus, by Definition 4.16 we know $\mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{v}} = \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{v}_1} \mid \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{v}_2}$, that is

$$\begin{aligned} &(\nu \widetilde{c}_{r_2})(Q'_2 \parallel t_1 \leftrightarrow_{\text{H}} V_2) \\ &\equiv (\nu \widetilde{c}_{r_1}) (\nu \widetilde{c}_{r_2}) (\nu \widetilde{c}_{k+1}) (\mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{v}_1} \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{B} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_1) \mid \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{v}_2} \parallel t_1 \leftrightarrow_{\text{H}} V_2) \\ &\equiv (\nu \widetilde{c}_r) (\nu \widetilde{c}_{k+1}) (\mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{v}_1} \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{B} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_1) \mid \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{v}_2} \parallel t_1 \leftrightarrow_{\text{H}} V_2) \\ &= (\nu \widetilde{c}_r) (\nu \widetilde{c}_{k+1}) R \end{aligned}$$

From the definition of \mathcal{S} (Definition 4.17) we have that $n \notin \text{fn}(\widetilde{W}_2)$ and thus $\widetilde{W}_2\sigma_1 = \widetilde{W}_2\sigma_2$. Thus, by the definition of \widetilde{B}_2 ($\widetilde{W}_2\sigma_2 \boxtimes \widetilde{B}_2$) we can see that

$$\mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{v}_1} \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \widetilde{B} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_1) \mid \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{v}_2} \in \mathcal{C}_{\widetilde{w}}^{\widetilde{W}_2\sigma_2}(P_2\sigma_2) \tag{128}$$

Now, we can see that assertion $\text{next}(n_i) \in \sigma_2$ holds, as by definition $\sigma_2 = \sigma_1 \cdot \text{next}(n_i)$. Let $\sigma'_2 = \sigma_2 \cdot \{t_1/t\}$. Then, we have

$$\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{W}_1\sigma'_2}(t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1\sigma_2) = \{P' : (t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1)\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\}\sigma_2 \diamond P'\}$$

As $(t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1)\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\}\sigma_2 = t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\}\sigma_2$ and $V_1\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\}\sigma_2 \boxtimes V_2$ we have

$$(t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1)\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\}\sigma_2 \diamond (t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2) \quad (129)$$

that is

$$\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_2} \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{W}_1\sigma'_2}(t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1\sigma_2)$$

Finally, by Table 3 we have

$$\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}\sigma'_2}(P_2\sigma_2 \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1\sigma_2) = \{R_1 \parallel R_2 : R_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{w}}^{\tilde{W}_2\sigma'_2}(P_2\sigma_2), R_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{W}_1\sigma'_2}(t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1\sigma_2)\}$$

So, by this, (128), and (129) we have:

$$R \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}\sigma'_2}(P_2\sigma'_2 \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1\sigma_2)$$

Further, by $\sigma'_2 = \sigma_1 \cdot \text{next}(n_i) \cdot \{t_j/t\}$ and Definition 4.10, we have

$$\sigma'_2 \in \text{index}(\text{fn}((P_2 \parallel t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1)\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}))$$

Hence, the goal (127) follows. This concludes sub-case $\neg\text{tr}(n)$.

ii) Sub-case $\text{tr}(n)$. Let $\tilde{W}_1, \tilde{W}_2, \tilde{y}$, and \tilde{w} be such that

$$P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} = n!\langle V_1\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\}\rangle.P_2\{\tilde{W}_2/\tilde{w}\}$$

The transition inference tree is as follows:

$$\langle \text{Snd} \rangle \frac{}{P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n!\langle V_1\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\}\rangle} P_2\{\tilde{W}_2/\tilde{w}\}}$$

Let $\sigma_1 \in \text{index}(\tilde{u})$ where $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$. Also, let $\tilde{v} = \text{rn}(P_1)$, $\tilde{c}_r = \cup_{r \in \tilde{v}} c^r$, $\tilde{c}_k = (c_k, \dots, c_{k+1} \uparrow_{P_1} \downarrow_{-1})$, $\tilde{c}_{k+1} = (c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+1} \uparrow_{P_1} \downarrow_{-1})$, and let S be such that $n : S$. Then, by the definition of \mathcal{S} (Definition 4.17) we have $Q_1 \in N_1 \cup N_2 \cup N_3 \cup N_4$ where

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}_k) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid \overline{c_k}!\langle \tilde{B} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P_1\sigma_1) : \tilde{W}\sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}\} \\ N_2 &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid c^n!\langle M_{V_2}^{\tilde{B}_2} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_1) : \tilde{W}_2\sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_2\} \\ N_3 &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid M_{V_2}^{\tilde{B}_2} \tilde{n} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_1) : V_1\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\}\sigma_1 \boxtimes V_2, \tilde{W}_2\sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_2\} \\ N_4 &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v} \setminus n} \mid n_{[S]}!\langle V_2 \rangle \cdot (\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid c^{n?}(x).x \tilde{z} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_1) \\ &\quad : V_1\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\}\sigma_1 \boxtimes V_2, \tilde{W}_2\sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_2\} \end{aligned}$$

with

$$M_{V_2}^{\tilde{B}_2} = \lambda \tilde{z}. z_{[S]}!\langle V_2 \rangle \cdot (\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid c^{n?}(x).x \tilde{z})$$

If $Q_1 \in N_1 \cup N_2 \cup N_3$, then Q_1 reduces to some $Q_4 \in N_4$ through communication on non-essential prefixes. By Lemma 4.3 it suffices to consider the case when $Q_4 \in N_4$. Let $\tilde{v}_1 = \text{rn}(P_2)$, $\tilde{v}_2 = \text{rn}(V_2)$, $\tilde{c}_{r_1} = \cup_{r \in \tilde{v}_1} c^r$, and $\tilde{c}_{r_2} = \cup_{r \in \tilde{v}_2} c^r$. By Definition 4.16 and the

assumption that $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ is well-typed we have $\tilde{c}_r = \tilde{c}_{r_1} \cdot \tilde{c}_{r_2}$ and $\tilde{c}_{r_1} \cap \tilde{c}_{r_2} = \emptyset$. We then infer the following transition:

$$Q_4 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{c}_{r_2}) n_{\{S\}}! \langle V_2 \rangle} Q'_4$$

where $Q'_4 = (\nu \tilde{c}_{r_1}) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v} \setminus n} \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid c^{n?}(b). (b \tilde{n}) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2 \sigma_1)$. Then, we shall show the following

$$(P_2 \parallel t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1) \{ \tilde{W}/\tilde{x} \} \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{c}_{r_2}) (Q'_4 \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2) \quad (130)$$

By assumption that $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ is well-typed, we know $\tilde{v} = \tilde{v}_1 \cdot \tilde{v}_2$ and $\tilde{v}_1 \cap \tilde{v}_2 = \emptyset$. Hence, by Definition 4.16 we know $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} = \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_1} \mid \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_2}$, that is

$$\begin{aligned} Q'_4 &\equiv (\nu \tilde{c}_{r_1}) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v} \setminus n} \mid c^{n?}(x). x \tilde{n} \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2 \sigma_1) \\ &= (\nu \tilde{c}_{r_1}) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2 \sigma_1) \\ &= (\nu \tilde{c}_{r_1}) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_1} \mid \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_2} \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2 \sigma_1) \end{aligned}$$

That is, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(\nu \tilde{c}_{r_2}) (Q'_4 \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2) \\ &\equiv (\nu \tilde{c}_{r_2}) ((\nu \tilde{c}_{r_1}) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_1} \mid \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_2} \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2 \sigma_1) \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2) \\ &\equiv (\nu \tilde{c}_{r_1}) (\nu \tilde{c}_{r_2}) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) (\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_1} \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2 \sigma_1) \mid \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_2} \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2) \\ &\equiv (\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) (\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_1} \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2 \sigma_1) \mid \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_2} \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2) = (\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) R \end{aligned}$$

Now, by Definition 4.8 we may notice that $\tilde{v}_2 = \mathbf{rn}(t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2)$. Let $\sigma'_1 = \sigma_1 \cdot \{t_1/t\}$. So, by Table 3 we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_1} \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2 \sigma_1) \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{w}}^{\tilde{W}_2 \sigma_1}(P_2 \sigma_1)$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_2} \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{W}_1 \sigma_1}(t_1 \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1 \sigma'_1) \quad (131)$$

Thus, by the definition of the parallel composition case of $\mathcal{C}^-(-)$ (Table 3) we have

$$R \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W} \sigma'_1}((P_2 \parallel t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1) \sigma'_1)$$

Now, we can notice that $\tilde{c}_r = \mathbf{cr}(R)$ and $\tilde{c}_{k+1} = \mathbf{fpr}(R)$. Further, we have

$$\sigma'_1 \in \mathbf{index}(\mathbf{fn}((P_2 \parallel t \leftarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1) \{ \tilde{W}/\tilde{x} \}))$$

Thus, (130) follows. This concludes sub-case $\mathbf{tr}(n)$ of case $\langle \mathbf{Snd} \rangle$.

Finally, we briefly analyze the case when P_1 is a trigger collection. Let σ_1 be defined as above. Let H'_1 be such that $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \sigma_1 \diamond H'_1$. Then, by Table 3, Q_1 is as follows:

$$Q_1 = \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \parallel H'_1$$

where $\tilde{v} = \mathbf{rn}(P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$. Further, by Definition 4.15 we know $H'_1 = n_i! \langle V_2 \rangle . H'_2$ such that $V_1\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \sigma_2 \boxtimes V_2$ and $P_2\{\tilde{W}_2/\tilde{w}\} \sigma_2 \diamond H'_2$ with $\sigma_2 = \sigma_1 \cdot \mathbf{next}(n_i)$. We can see that

$$H'_1 \xrightarrow{n_i! \langle V_2 \rangle} H'_2$$

So, we should show

$$(P_2 \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1) \{ \tilde{W} / \tilde{x} \} \mathcal{S} (\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \parallel H'_2 \mid t_1 \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2) \quad (132)$$

Similarly to previous sub-cases, we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \parallel H'_2 \mid t_1 \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2 \equiv \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_1} \parallel H'_2 \parallel \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_2} \parallel t_1 \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2$$

By $P_2 \{ \tilde{W}_2 / \tilde{w} \} \sigma_2 \diamond H'_2$ and $\tilde{v}_1 = \mathbf{rn}(P_2 \{ \tilde{W}_2 / \tilde{w} \})$ we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_1} \parallel H'_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{w}}^{\tilde{W}_2 \sigma_2} (P_2 \sigma_2) \quad (133)$$

Let $\sigma'_2 = \sigma_2 \cdot \{ t_1 / t \}$. By (133), (131), and definition of $\mathcal{C}^-(-)$ (Table 3) for the parallel composition case we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_1} \parallel H'_2 \parallel \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}_2} \parallel t_1 \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W} \sigma'_2} (P_2 \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1)$$

Thus, we reach goal (132). This concludes case $\langle \mathbf{Snd} \rangle$.

2. Case $\langle \mathbf{Rv} \rangle$. In this case we know $P_1 = n?(y).P_2$. We first consider cases when P_1 is not a trigger collection, and then briefly discuss the case when it is a trigger collection. As in the previous case, we distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $\neg \mathbf{tr}(n)$ and (ii) $\mathbf{tr}(n)$:

- i) Sub-case $\neg \mathbf{tr}(n)$. We have the following transition:

$$\langle \mathbf{Rv} \rangle \frac{}{(n_i?(y).P_2) \{ \tilde{W} / \tilde{x} \} \xrightarrow{n?(V_1)} P_2 \{ \tilde{W} / \tilde{x} \} \{ V_1 / y \}}$$

Here we assume $y \in \mathbf{fv}(P_2)$. Let $\sigma_1 \in \mathbf{index}(\tilde{u})$ with $\tilde{u} = \mathbf{fn}(P_1 \{ \tilde{W} / \tilde{x} \})$ such that $\{ n_i / n \} \in \sigma_1$. Also, let $\sigma_2 = \sigma_1 \cdot \mathbf{next}(n_i)$. Further, let $\tilde{v} = \mathbf{rn}(P_1 \{ \tilde{W} / \tilde{x} \})$, $\tilde{c}_r = \cup_{r \in \tilde{v}} c^r$, $\tilde{c}_k = (c_k, \dots, c_{k+1} \uparrow_{P_1} \downarrow_{-1})$, and $\tilde{c}_{k+1} = (c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+1} \uparrow_{P_1} \downarrow_{-1})$. By the definition of \mathcal{S} (Table 3) we have $Q_1 \in N_1 \cup N_2$ where

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= \{ (\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}_k) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid \overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{B} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k (P_1 \sigma_1) : \tilde{W} \sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B} \} \\ N_2 &= \{ (\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid n_i?(y). \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B} y \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^{k+1} (P_2 \sigma_2) : \tilde{W} \sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B} \} \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the other cases, if $Q_1 \in N_1$, then Q_1 reduces to some $Q'_1 \in N_2$ through communication on non-essential prefixes. Now, we pick V_2 such that $V_1 \sigma_v \cdot \sigma_2 \boxtimes V_2$ where $\sigma_v \in \mathbf{index}(\mathbf{fn}(V) \setminus \tilde{u})$ such that

$$\sigma_v \cdot \sigma_2 \in \mathbf{index}(\mathbf{fn}(P_2 \{ \tilde{W} V_1 / \tilde{x} y \})) \quad (134)$$

By Lemma 4.3 it suffices to consider the case when $Q'_1 \in N_2$, under which we have the following transition:

$$\langle \mathbf{Rv} \rangle \frac{}{n_i?(y). \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B} y \rangle \xrightarrow{n_i?(V_2)} \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B} V_2 \rangle} \quad (135)$$

$$\langle \mathbf{Par}_L \rangle \frac{(135) \quad \mathbf{bn}(n_i?(V_2)) \cap \mathbf{fn}(\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^{k+1} (P_2 \sigma)) = \emptyset}{n_i?(y). \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B} y \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^{k+1} (P_2 \sigma_2) \xrightarrow{n_i?(V_2)} \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B} V_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^{k+1} (P_2 \sigma_2)} \quad (136)$$

$$\langle \mathbf{Res} \rangle \frac{(136) \quad \tilde{c}_r \cdot \tilde{c}_{k+1} \cap \mathbf{fn}(n_i?(V_2)) = \emptyset}{(\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid n_i?(y). \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B} y \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^{k+1} (P_2 \sigma_2) \xrightarrow{n_i?(V_2)} R}$$

where $R = (\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B}V_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_2)$ with $\tilde{W}\sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}$. We can see that assertion $\text{next}(n_i) \in \sigma_2$ holds by the definition. We should show that

$$P_2\{\tilde{W}V_1/\tilde{x}y\} \mathcal{S} R \quad (137)$$

We know $n \notin \text{fn}(\tilde{W})$ and $n \notin \text{fn}(V_1)$. Thus, $\tilde{W}V_1\sigma_v \cdot \sigma_1 = \tilde{W}V_1\sigma_v \cdot \sigma_2$. That is, we may notice that $\tilde{W}V_1\sigma_v \cdot \sigma_2 \boxtimes \tilde{B}V_2$. Further, by the definition of σ_v , we have $P_2\sigma_2 = P_2\sigma_v \cdot \sigma_2$. Thus, we have

$$R \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}y}^{\tilde{W}V_1\sigma_v \cdot \sigma_2}(P_2\sigma_v \cdot \sigma_2)$$

Finally, by this and (134) the goal (137) follows. This concludes sub-case $\neg\text{tr}(n)$.

ii) Sub-case $\text{tr}(n)$. The transition inference tree is as follows:

$$\langle \text{Rv} \rangle \frac{}{(n?(y).P_2)\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n?(V_1)} P_2\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}\{V_1/y\}}$$

Let $\sigma_1 = \text{index}(\tilde{u})$ where $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$. Also, let $\tilde{v} = \text{rn}(P_1)$, $\tilde{c}_r = \cup_{r \in \tilde{v}} c^r$, $\tilde{c}_k = (c_k, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P_1 \rceil - 1})$, $\tilde{c}_{k+1} = (c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P_1 \rceil - 1})$, and let S be such that $n : S$. Then, by the definition of \mathcal{S} (Definition 4.17) we have $Q_1 \in N_1 \cup N_2 \cup N_3 \cup N_4$ where

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}_k) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid \overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{B} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P_1\sigma_1) : \tilde{W}\sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}\} \\ N_2 &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}_k) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid c^n! \langle M_V^{\tilde{B}} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_1) : \tilde{W}\sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}\} \\ N_3 &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}_k) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v} \setminus n} \mid M_V^{\tilde{B}} \tilde{n} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_1) : \tilde{W}\sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}\} \\ N_4 &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v} \setminus n} \mid n_{\lceil S \rceil}?(y).(\overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B}y \rangle \mid c^n?(x).x \tilde{n} \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_1) : \tilde{W}\sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}\} \end{aligned}$$

with

$$M_V^{\tilde{B}} = \lambda \tilde{z}. z_{\lceil S \rceil}?(y).(\overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B}y \rangle \mid c^n?(x).x \tilde{z})$$

Similar to the other cases, if $Q_1 \in N_1 \cup N_2 \cup N_3$, then there exists some $Q'_1 \in N_4$ such that Q_1 reduces to Q'_1 through communication on non-essential prefixes. By Lemma 4.3 it suffice to consider the case when $Q_1 \in N_4$. We infer the following transition:

$$Q_1 \xrightarrow{n_{\lceil S \rceil}?(V_2)} (\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) R$$

where $R = \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v} \setminus n} \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B}V_2 \rangle \mid c^n?(b).(b \tilde{n}) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_1)$ and $V_1\sigma \boxtimes V_2$ for some σ . We should show that

$$P_2\{\tilde{W}V_1/\tilde{x}y\} \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) R \quad (138)$$

We may notice that we have $\tilde{v} = \text{rn}(P_1) = \text{rn}(P_2)$ and as $\text{tr}(n)$ we have $n \in \tilde{v}$. Thus, we have the following structural equivalence

$$R \equiv \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B}V_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}y}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_1)$$

Further, we have $V_1\sigma \boxtimes V_2, \tilde{W}\sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}$. Thus by the definition of $\mathcal{C}_-^-(-)$ (Table 3) the goal (138) follows. This concludes sub-case $\text{tr}(n)$ of case $\langle \text{Rv} \rangle$.

Now, we briefly consider the case when P_1 is a trigger collection. Let σ_1 be defined as above. Let H'_1 be such that $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}\sigma_1 \diamond H'_1$. Then, by definition of \mathcal{S} , we know Q_1 has the following shape:

$$Q_1 = \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \parallel H_1$$

where $\tilde{v} = \text{rn}(P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$. Further, by Definition 4.15 we know $H'_1 = n_i?(y).H'_2$ such that $P_2\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}\sigma_2 \diamond H'_2$, where $\sigma_2 = \sigma_1 \cdot \text{next}(n_i)$. Now, let V_2 be such that $V_1\sigma \boxtimes V_2$, for some σ . We could see that

$$H'_1 \xrightarrow{n_i?(V_2)} H'_2\{V_2/y\}$$

We should show that

$$P_2\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}\{V_1/y\} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \parallel H_2\{V_2/y\} \quad (139)$$

By $P_2\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}\sigma_2 \diamond H'_2$ and noticing that \diamond is closed under the substitution of \boxtimes -related values we have

$$P_2\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}\{V_1/y\}\sigma_2 \diamond H'_2\{V_2/y\}$$

Thus, goal (139) follows. This concludes case $\langle \text{Rv} \rangle$.

3. Case $\langle \text{App} \rangle$. Here we know $P_1 = V_1(\tilde{r}, u)$ where $\tilde{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_n)$. We distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $V_1 = x$ where $\{V_x/x\} \in \{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ and (ii) V_1 is an abstraction. Let $V_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} = \lambda(\tilde{y}, z).P_2$ where $\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}^1, \dots, \tilde{y}^n$. The inference tree is as follows

$$\langle \text{App} \rangle \frac{}{(V_1(\tilde{r}, u))\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{\tau} P_2\{\tilde{r}, u/\tilde{y}, z\}}$$

Let $\sigma_1 = \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_1\rho_1))$ such that $\{u_i/u\} \in \sigma_1$. Further, let $\tilde{v} = \text{rn}(V_1)$, $\tilde{c}_{vr} = \bigcup_{r \in \tilde{v}, \tilde{r}} c^r$, $\tilde{c}_k = (c_k, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P_1 \rceil - 1})$, and $\tilde{c}_{k+1} = (c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+\lceil P_1 \rceil - 1})$. Also, let $\tilde{m} = (u_i, \dots, u_{i+\lceil \mathcal{G}(C) \rceil - 1})$ with $u_i : C$ and $\tilde{r}_i = (r_1^i, \dots, r_{|\mathcal{R}^*(S_i)|}^i)$ with $r_i : S_i$ for $i = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then, by the definition of \mathcal{S} we have $Q_1 \in N$ where N is defined as follows:

$$N = N_1 \cup N_4 \cup (\bigcup_{1 \leq l \leq n} N_2^l) \cup (\bigcup_{1 \leq l \leq n-1} N_3^l)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}_k)(\nu \tilde{c}_{vr}) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}, \tilde{r}} \mid \tilde{c}_k! \langle \tilde{B} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P_1\sigma_1) : \tilde{W}\sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}\} \\ N_2^l &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1})(\nu \tilde{c}_{vr}) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}, r_1, \dots, r_n} \mid \overbrace{c^{r_1!} \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_l. c^{r_1+1}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_{l+1}. \dots . c^{r_n}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_n. Q_l^{V_2} \rangle \rangle \rangle}^{|\tilde{r}|-l+1} : V_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}\sigma_1 \boxtimes V_2\} \\ N_3^l &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1})(\nu \tilde{c}_{vr}) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}, r_{l+1}, \dots, r_n} \mid \lambda \tilde{z}_l. \overbrace{c^{r_{l+1}+1}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_{l+1}. \dots . c^{r_n}! \langle \lambda \tilde{z}_n. Q_l^{V_2} \rangle \rangle}^{|\tilde{r}|-l} \rangle \tilde{r}_l : V_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}\sigma_1 \boxtimes V_2\} \\ N_4 &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1})(\nu \tilde{c}_{vr}) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid V_2(\tilde{r}_1, \dots, \tilde{r}_n, \tilde{m}) : V_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}\sigma_1 \boxtimes V_2\} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$Q_l^{V_2} = V_2(\tilde{r}_1, \dots, \tilde{r}_{l-1}, \tilde{z}_l, \dots, \tilde{z}_n, \tilde{m})$$

Note that for any

$$Q_1 \in N_1 \cup N_4 \cup (\bigcup_{1 \leq l \leq n} N_2^l) \cup (\bigcup_{1 \leq l \leq n-1} N_3^l)$$

there exist $Q'_1 \in N_5$ such that Q_1 reduces to Q'_1 through communication on non-essential prefixes. By Lemma 4.3 it then suffices to consider the case $Q'_1 \in N_5$.

Let $V_2 = \lambda \tilde{y}^1, \dots, \tilde{y}^n, \tilde{z}. Q_2$ where $\tilde{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_{|\mathcal{G}(C)|})$. Then, we have the following transition:

$$Q'_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1})(\nu \tilde{c}_r) R$$

where $R = \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid Q_2\{\tilde{r}_1, \dots, \tilde{r}_n, \tilde{m}/\tilde{y}^1, \dots, \tilde{y}^n, \tilde{z}\}$. We should show that

$$P_2\{\tilde{r}, u/\tilde{y}, z\} \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) (\nu \tilde{c}_{vr}) R \quad (140)$$

By $V_1\rho_1\sigma_1 \boxtimes V_2$ (with $\rho_1 = \{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$) and Definition 4.13 either $V_2 \in \mathcal{C}(V_1\rho_1\sigma_1)$ or $V_1\rho_1 \boxtimes V_2$. In the former case, we know $V_2 \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma'_1}^{\rho'_1}(V'_1)$ where $\rho'_1 = \{\tilde{W}'/\tilde{x}'\}$ is such that $V'_1\rho'_1\sigma'_1 = V_1\rho_1\sigma_1$.

Let \tilde{B}' be such that $\tilde{W}'\sigma'_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}'$. By Table 3 we have

$$V_2 = \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{x}'}(\lambda(\tilde{y}, z). P'_2)\{\tilde{B}'/\tilde{x}'\} = \lambda(\tilde{y}^1, \dots, \tilde{y}^n, \tilde{z}). Q_2\{\tilde{B}'/\tilde{x}'\}$$

where

$$Q_2 = (\nu \tilde{c}_y) \prod_{i \in |\tilde{y}|} (c^{y_i}?(b).(b \tilde{y}^i)) \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{B}' \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}'}^{k+1}(P'_2\{z_1/z\})$$

with $\tilde{c}_y = \bigcup_{i \in |\tilde{y}|} c^{y_i}$ and P'_2 is such that

$$P'_2\{\tilde{W}'/\tilde{x}'\} = P_2$$

Thus, we know

$$R \equiv \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid (\nu \tilde{c}_y) \prod_{i \in |\tilde{y}|} (c^{y_i}?(b).(b \tilde{r}_i)) \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{B}' \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}'}^{k+1}(P'_2\{z_1/z\})$$

Now, we know $(\nu \tilde{c}_{vr}) R \equiv (\nu \tilde{c}_v) R$ where $\tilde{c}_v = \bigcup_{r \in \tilde{v}} c^r$ since $\tilde{c}_{vr} \setminus \tilde{c}_v \not\subseteq \text{fn}(R)$. Further, by renaming bound names we have

$$R \equiv \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid (\nu \tilde{c}_r) \prod_{r \in \tilde{r}} (c^r?(b).(b \tilde{r})) \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{B}' \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}'}^{k+1}(P'_2\{z_1/z\})\{\tilde{c}_r/\tilde{c}_y\}$$

where $\tilde{c}_r = \bigcup_{r \in \tilde{r}} c^r$. Now, by the definition of $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}}$ (Definition 4.16) we know

$$\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}, \tilde{r}} = \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid \prod_{r \in \tilde{r}} (c^r?(x).x \tilde{r})$$

Thus, we have

$$R \equiv (\nu \tilde{c}_r) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}, \tilde{r}} \mid \overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{B}' \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}'}^{k+1}(P'_2\{z_1/z\})\{\tilde{c}_r/\tilde{c}_y\} = (\nu \tilde{c}_r) R'$$

and by the definition we have $R' \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}'}^{\tilde{W}'}(P'_2)$. We may notice that $\tilde{v}, \tilde{r} = \text{rn}(P'_2)$ and $(\nu c_{vr}) R \equiv (\nu c_v) (\nu c_r) R'$.

The later case, when $V_1\rho_1 \boxtimes V_2$, follows by the fact that bodies of characteristic and triggers values are \diamond -related to their minimal counterparts as shown in Lemma 4.2 and that relation \diamond is closed under names substitutions.

So, the goal (140) follows. This concludes case $\langle \text{App} \rangle$ (and base cases). Next, we consider inductive cases.

4. Case $\langle \text{Par}_L \rangle$. In this case we distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $P_1\rho = P'_1\rho'_1 \mid P''_1\rho''_1$ and (ii) $P_1\rho = P'_1\rho'_1 \parallel P''_1\rho''_1$ where P'_1 is a triggers collection. The final rule in the inference tree is:

$$\langle \text{Par}_L \rangle \frac{P'_1\rho'_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} P'_2\rho'_2 \quad \text{bn}(\ell) \cap \text{fn}(P''_1) = \emptyset}{P'_1\rho'_1 \mid P''_1\rho''_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} P'_2\rho'_2 \mid P''_1\rho''_1}$$

Let $\sigma_1 \in \text{index}(\tilde{u})$ where $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$. Further, we know $\rho'_1 = \{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\}$ and $\rho''_1 = \{\tilde{W}_2/\tilde{z}\}$. Further, let σ'_1 and σ''_1 such that

$$P_1\rho_1\sigma_1 = P'_1\rho'_1\sigma'_1 \mid P''_1\rho''_1\sigma''_1$$

In sub-case (i), by the definition of \mathcal{S} (Table 3) we have $Q_1 \in N_1 \cup N_2 \cup N_3$ where

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}_k) (\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\overline{c_k}!\langle \tilde{B} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P'_1\sigma'_1 \mid P''_1\sigma''_1)) : \tilde{W}\sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}\} \\ N_2 &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) (\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\overline{c_{k+1}}!\langle \tilde{B}_1 \rangle, \overline{c_{k+2}}!\langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{y}}^{k+1}(P'_1\sigma'_1) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{z}}^{k+2}(P''_1\sigma''_1)) \\ &\quad : \tilde{W}_i\sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_i, i \in \{1, 2\}\} \\ N_3 &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}) (\nu \tilde{c}_r) R'_1 \mid R''_1 : R'_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{W}_1}(P'_1\sigma'_1), R''_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{z}}^{\tilde{W}_2}(P''_1\sigma''_1)\} \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{c}_k = (c_k, \dots, c_{k+\uparrow P_1 \downarrow -1})$, $\tilde{c}_{k+1} = (c_{k+1}, \dots, c_{k+\uparrow P_1 \downarrow -1})$, and $\tilde{c} = \text{fnp}(R'_1 \mid R''_1)$. Note that for $Q_1 \in N_1 \cup N_2$ there exists some Q'_1 and Q''_1 such that Q_1 reduces to $Q'_1 \mid Q''_1 \in N_3$ through communication on non-essential prefixes, with

$$Q'_1 \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma'_1}^{\rho'_1}(P'_1) \quad (141)$$

$$Q''_1 \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma''_1}^{\rho''_1}(P''_1) \quad (142)$$

Then, by Lemma 4.3 it suffices to consider the case of $Q'_1 \mid Q''_1 \in N_3$. By the definition of \mathcal{S} we have

$$P'_1\rho'_1 \mathcal{S} Q'_1 \quad (143)$$

$$P''_1\rho''_1 \mathcal{S} Q''_1 \quad (144)$$

To apply IH we do the case analysis on the action ℓ :

- Sub-case $\ell \neq (\nu \tilde{m}_1) n!\langle V_1 \rangle$. By (143) and IH we know there is Q'_2 such that $Q'_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} Q'_2$ and

$$P'_2\rho'_2 \mathcal{S} Q'_2 \quad (145)$$

We should show that

$$P'_2\rho'_2 \mid P''_1\rho''_1 \mathcal{S} Q'_2 \mid Q''_1 \quad (146)$$

We know that there is R' such that

$$Q'_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} R' \xrightarrow{\check{\ell}} Q'_2 \quad (147)$$

Thus, by Rule $\langle \text{Par}_L \rangle$ we can infer the following:

$$Q'_1 \mid Q''_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} R' \mid Q''_1$$

Further, we can infer

$$\langle \text{Par}_L \rangle \frac{R' \xrightarrow{\check{\ell}} Q'_2}{R' \mid Q''_1 \xrightarrow{\check{\ell}} Q'_2 \mid Q''_1}$$

Then, by the IH (145) and the definition of \mathcal{S} (Definition 4.17) we know

$$Q'_2 \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2}^{\rho'_2}(P'_2)$$

So, we may notice that

$$\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_1'' \cdot \sigma_2'}^{\rho_1''}(P_1'') = \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_1''}^{\rho_1''}(P_1'')$$

So, by (142) and definition of $\mathcal{C}^-(-)$ we have

$$Q_2' \mid Q_1'' \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_2' \cdot \sigma_1''}^{\rho_2' \cdot \rho_1''}(P_2' \mid P_1'')$$

By IH and assertion, we know that if $\ell = n? \langle V_1 \rangle$ then $\text{next}(n_i) \in \sigma_2'$. So, assertion $\text{next}(n_i) \in \sigma_2' \cdot \sigma_1''$ holds in this case. Now, by (143) we have $\sigma_1'' \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_1'' \rho_1''))$ and by (145) we have $\sigma_2' \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_2' \rho_2'))$. We may notice that if $\ell = n? \langle V_1 \rangle$, by transition rule $\langle \text{SRv} \rangle$ we have $\bar{n} \notin \text{fn}(P_2' \rho_2' \mid P_1'' \rho_1'')$ so by 4.10 we have $\{\bar{n}_j / \bar{n}\} \notin \sigma_1''$ for any $j > 0$. So, we have

$$\sigma_2' \cdot \sigma_1'' \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_2' \rho_2' \mid P_1'' \rho_1''))$$

Thus, the goal (146) follows. This concludes this sub-case.

- Sub-case $\ell \equiv (\nu \tilde{m}_1) n! \langle V_1 \rangle$. This sub-case follows the essential steps of the previous sub-case. By (143) and IH we know there is Q_2' such that $Q_1' \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) n_i! \langle V_2 \rangle} Q_2'$ and

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2' \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1) \rho_1' \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2' \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2) \quad (148)$$

We should show that

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2' \mid P_1'' \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1) \rho_1 \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2' \mid Q_1'' \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2) \quad (149)$$

We pick R' as in the previous sub-case. So, we can infer the following transition:

$$\langle \text{Par}_L \rangle \frac{R' \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) n_i! \langle V_2 \rangle} Q_2'}{R' \mid Q_1'' \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) n_i! \langle V_2 \rangle} Q_2' \mid Q_1''}$$

Next, by Table 3 we can infer the following. First, by (148) we know

$$Q_2' \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2 \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_2'}^{\rho_2'}(P_2' \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1)$$

By IH and assertion, we know $\text{next}(n_i) \in \sigma_2'$. So, assertion $\text{next}(n_i) \in \sigma_2' \cdot \sigma_1''$ holds. Similarly to the previous sub-case, we have

$$\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_1'' \cdot \sigma_2'}^{\rho_1''}(P_1'') = \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_1''}^{\rho_1''}(P_1'')$$

Thus, we have

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2' \mid Q_1'' \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2) \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_1'' \cdot \sigma_2'}^{\rho_1''}((\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2' \mid P_1'' \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1))$$

Now, by (143) we have $\sigma_1'' \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_1'' \rho_1''))$ and by (148) we have $\sigma_2' \in \text{index}(P_2' \rho_2')$. We may notice that if $\ell = n! \langle V_1 \rangle$, by transition rule SSND we have $\bar{n} \notin \text{fn}(P_2' \rho_2' \mid P_1'' \rho_1'')$ so by Definition 4.10 we have $\{\bar{n}_j / \bar{n}\} \notin \sigma_1''$ for any $j > 0$. So, we have

$$\sigma_2' \cdot \sigma_1'' \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_2' \rho_2' \mid P_1'' \rho_1''))$$

Thus, (149) follows.

This concludes case $\langle \text{Par}_L \rangle$.

5. Case $\langle \text{Tau} \rangle$. We distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $P_1\rho_1 = P'_1\rho'_1 \mid P''_1\rho''_1$ and (ii) $P_1\rho_1 = P'_1\rho'_1 \parallel P''_1\rho''_1$ where one of parallel components is a trigger collection. Without loss of generality, we assume $\ell_1 = (\nu \tilde{m}_1) \bar{n}! \langle V_1 \rangle$ and $\ell_2 = n? \langle V_1 \rangle$. The final rule in the inference tree is then as follows:

$$\langle \text{Tau} \rangle \frac{P'_1\rho'_1 \xrightarrow{\ell_1} P'_2\rho'_2 \quad P''_1\rho''_1 \xrightarrow{\ell_2} P''_2\rho''_2 \quad \ell_1 \succ \ell_2}{P'_1\rho'_1 \mid P''_1\rho''_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu \tilde{m}_1) (P'_2\rho'_2 \mid P''_2\rho''_2)}$$

Let $\sigma_1 = \text{index}(\tilde{u})$ where $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$. Further, let σ'_1 and σ''_1 such that

$$P_1\rho_1\sigma_1 = P'_1\rho'_1\sigma'_1 \mid P''_1\rho''_1\sigma''_1$$

We know $\rho'_1 = \{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\}$ and $\rho''_1 = \{\tilde{W}_2/\tilde{w}\}$. By the definition of \mathcal{S} (Table 3) we have $Q_1 \in N_1 \cup N_2 \cup N_3$ where

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}_k) (\overline{c_k}! \langle \tilde{B} \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{x}}^k(P'_1\sigma'_1 \mid P''_1\sigma''_1)) : \tilde{W}\sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}\} \\ N_2 &= \{(\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) (\overline{c_{k+1}}! \langle \tilde{B}_1 \rangle \cdot \overline{c_{k+l+1}}! \langle \tilde{B}_2 \rangle \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{y}}^{k+1}(P'_1\sigma'_1) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+l+1}(P''_1\sigma''_1)) \\ &\quad : \tilde{W}_i\sigma_1 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_i, i \in \{1, 2\}\} \\ N_3 &= \{R'_1 \mid R''_1 : R'_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{W}_1}(P'_1\sigma'_1), R''_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{w}}^{\tilde{W}_2}(P''_1\sigma''_1)\} \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.3, for $Q_1^1 \in N_1$ there exists $Q_1^2 \in N_2$ such that

$$Q_1^1 \xrightarrow{\tau} Q_1^2 \xrightarrow{\tau} Q'_1 \mid Q''_1$$

where $Q'_1 \mid Q''_1 \in N_3$, that is

$$Q'_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma'_1}^{\rho'_1}(P'_1) \tag{150}$$

$$Q''_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma''_1}^{\rho''_1}(P''_1) \tag{151}$$

Thus, in both cases we only consider how $Q'_1 \mid Q''_1$ evolves. By the definition of \mathcal{S} we have

$$P'_1\rho'_1 \mathcal{S} Q'_1 \tag{152}$$

$$P''_1\rho''_1 \mathcal{S} Q''_1 \tag{153}$$

We have the following IH:

- (a) By (152) and IH there is Q'_2 such that $Q'_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_1) \bar{n}_i! \langle V_2 \rangle} Q'_2$ and

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1) (P'_2 \parallel t \leftarrow_{\text{H}} V_1) \rho'_1 \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2) (Q'_2 \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\text{H}} V_2) \tag{154}$$

By Definition 4.17 we know there is $\sigma_v \cdot \sigma'_2 \in \text{index}(\text{fn}((P'_2 \parallel t \leftarrow_{\text{H}} V_1) \rho'_1))$ such that $\sigma_v \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(t \leftarrow_{\text{H}} V_1) \rho'_1)$ and $\sigma'_2 \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P'_2 \rho'_2))$ and

$$Q'_2 \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\text{H}} V_2 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_v \cdot \sigma'_2}^{\rho'_1}(P'_2 \parallel t_1 \leftarrow_{\text{H}} V_1)$$

So, we can infer

$$Q'_2 \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma'_2}^{\rho'_2}(P'_2) \tag{155}$$

(b) By (153) and IH there is Q_2'' such that $Q_1'' \xrightarrow{n_j?(V_2)} Q_2''$ and

$$P_2'' \rho_2'' \mathcal{S} Q_2'' \quad (156)$$

By 4.17 and (156) we know there is $\sigma_2'' \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_2'' \rho_2''))$ such that

$$Q_2'' \in \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_2''}^{\rho_2''}(P_2'') \quad (157)$$

Similarly to the Par_L case, we know there is R' such that

$$Q_1' \xrightarrow{\tau} R' \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) \bar{n}_i! \langle V_2 \rangle} Q_2'$$

where $\check{\ell}_1 = (\nu \tilde{m}_2) \bar{n}_i! \langle V_2 \rangle$. Further, there is R'' such that

$$Q_1'' \xrightarrow{\tau} R'' \xrightarrow{n_j?(V_2)} Q_2''$$

where $\check{\ell}_2 = n_j?(V_2)$. By Rule PAR_L and Rule PAR_R we can infer the following:

$$Q_1' \mid Q_1'' \xrightarrow{\tau} R' \mid R''$$

Now, to proceed we must show $\check{\ell}_1 \asymp \check{\ell}_2$, which boils down to showing that indices of \bar{n}_i and n_j match. For this, we distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $\neg \text{tr}(\bar{n}_i)$ and $\neg \text{tr}(n_j)$ and (ii) $\text{tr}(\bar{n}_i)$ and $\text{tr}(n_j)$. In the former sub-case, we have $\{\bar{n}_i/n\} \in \sigma_1$ and $\{n_j/n\} \in \sigma_1$, where $\sigma_1 = \text{index}(\tilde{u})$. Further, by this and Definition 4.10 we know that $i = j$. Now, we consider the later case. By assumption that $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ is well-typed, we know there Γ_1, Λ_1 , and Δ_1 such that $\Gamma_1; \Lambda_1; \Delta_1 \vdash P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \triangleright \diamond$ with $\text{balanced}(\Delta_1)$. Thus, we have $n : S \in \Delta_1$ and $\bar{n} : T \in \Delta_1$ such that $S \text{ dual } T$. Hence, by the definition of $[-]$ (Definition 3.5) we have $i = [S] = [T] = j$. Hence, we can infer the following transition:

$$\langle \text{Tau} \rangle \frac{R' \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) \bar{n}_i! \langle V_2 \rangle} Q_2' \quad R'' \xrightarrow{n_j?(V_2)} Q_2'' \quad \check{\ell}_1 \asymp \check{\ell}_2}{(R' \mid R'') \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu \tilde{m}_2) (Q_2' \mid Q_2'')}$$

Now, we should show that

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1) (P_2' \rho_2' \mid P_2'' \rho_2'') \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2) (Q_2' \mid Q_2'') \quad (158)$$

Further, we have $(P_2' \mid P_2'') \rho_2' \cdot \rho_2'' = P_2' \rho_2' \mid P_2'' \rho_2''$. So, by (155) and (157) we have

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_2) (Q_2' \mid Q_2'') \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_2', \sigma_2''}^{\rho_2', \rho_2''}((\nu \tilde{m}_1) (P_2' \rho_2' \sigma_2' \mid P_2'' \rho_2'' \sigma_2''))$$

Finally, we need to show $\sigma_2' \cdot \sigma_2'' \in \text{index}(\tilde{u})$, where $\tilde{u} = \text{fn}(P_2' \rho_2' \mid P_2'' \rho_2'')$. By IH we have $\sigma_2' \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_2' \rho_2'))$ and $\sigma_2'' \in \text{index}(\text{fn}(P_2'' \rho_2''))$. Further, as P is well-typed, we have $\bar{n} \in \text{fn}(P_2' \rho_2')$, $n \notin \text{fn}(P_2' \rho_2')$, $\bar{n} \in \text{fn}(\text{fn}(P_2'' \rho_2''))$, and $n \notin \text{fn}(P_2'' \rho_2'')$. Thus, by Definition 4.10 in sub-case $\neg \text{tr}(n)$ we only need to show that for some $k > 0$ we have $\{\bar{n}_k/\bar{n}\} \in \sigma_2'$ and $\{n_k/n\} \in \sigma_2''$. This follows by the assertion as we know $\text{next}(\bar{n}_i) = \{\bar{n}_{i+1}/\bar{n}_i\} \in \sigma_2'$ and $\text{next}(n_i) = \{n_{i+1}/n_i\} \in \sigma_2''$. The sub-case $\text{tr}(n)$ follows directly by the Definition 4.10 as we have $\{\bar{n}_1/\bar{n}\} \in \sigma_2'$ and $\{n_1/n\} \in \sigma_2''$. So, we have $\sigma_2' \cdot \sigma_2'' \in \text{index}(\tilde{u})$. Thus, the goal (158) follows. This concludes case $\langle \text{Tau} \rangle$.

6. Case $\langle \text{New} \rangle$. In this case we know $P_1 = (\nu m : C) P'_1$. The final rule in the transition inference tree is as follows:

$$\langle \text{New} \rangle \frac{P'_1 \rho_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{n}_1) u_i! \langle V_1 \rangle} P_2 \rho_2 \quad m \in \mathbf{fn}(V_1)}{(\nu m) P'_1 \rho_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu m \cdot \tilde{n}_1) u_i! \langle V_1 \rangle} P_2 \rho_1} \quad (159)$$

Let $\sigma_1 = \text{index}(\mathbf{fn}(P_1 \rho_1))$. By the definition of \mathcal{S} (Table 3) we have $Q_1 \in N_1$ where

$$N_1 = \{(\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{c}) (\nu \tilde{m}_2) (\nu \tilde{c}^m) R : R \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}\sigma_1}(P'_1 \sigma_1 \cdot \{m_1 \bar{m}_1 / m \bar{m}\})\}$$

where $\tilde{c}_r = \text{cr}(R)$, $\tilde{m}_2 = (m_1, \dots, m_{|\mathcal{G}(C)|})$, and $\tilde{c}^m = c^m \cdot \bar{c}^m$ if $\text{tr}(C)$, otherwise $\tilde{c}^m = \epsilon$. By IH, if $P'_1 \rho_1 \mathcal{S} Q'_1$ there are Q_2 and V_2 such that

$$Q'_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{n}_2) u_i! \langle V_2 \rangle} Q_2$$

and

$$(\nu \tilde{n}_1) (P_2 \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1) \rho_1 \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{n}_2) (Q_2 \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2) \quad (160)$$

For $Q_1 \in N_1$ we should show that

$$Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2 \cdot \tilde{n}_2) u_i! \langle V_2 \rangle} Q_2 \quad (161)$$

such that

$$(\nu m \cdot \tilde{n}_1) (P_2 \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1) \rho_1 \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{c}'_r \cdot \tilde{m}_2 \cdot \tilde{n}_2) (Q_2 \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2) \quad (162)$$

where $\tilde{c}'_r = \text{cr}(V_2)$. Note that by the definition we have $\mathbf{fnp}(V_2) = \emptyset$. By Lemma 4.3, we know there is R such that $P'_1 \rho_1 \mathcal{S} R$ and

$$Q'_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} R \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{n}_2) u_i! \langle V_2 \rangle} Q_2 \quad (163)$$

Now, by rule $\langle \text{New} \rangle$ we have

$$Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu \tilde{c}'_r) (\nu \tilde{m}_2) R$$

Now, we need to apply Rule $\langle \text{New} \rangle$ $|\tilde{m}_2|$ times to (163) to infer the following:

$$\langle \text{New} \rangle \frac{R' \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{n}_2) u_i! \langle V_2 \rangle} Q_2 \quad \tilde{m}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{fn}(V_2)}{(\nu \tilde{m}_2) R' \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2 \cdot \tilde{n}_2) u_i! \langle V_2 \rangle} Q_2}$$

Therefore, the sub-goal (161) follows. Now, by (160) and by Definition 4.17 we can infer the following:

$$(\nu \tilde{n}_2) (Q_2 \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2) \equiv (\nu \tilde{c}'_r) (\nu \tilde{n}) (\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid R_2 \mid \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{w}} \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2)$$

where $\tilde{v} = \mathbf{rn}(R_2)$, $\tilde{w} = \mathbf{rn}(V_2)$, $\tilde{c}'_r = \text{cr}(V_2)$, and

$$(\nu \tilde{n}) (\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid R_2 \mid \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{w}} \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2) \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_1}^{\rho_1}((\nu \tilde{n}_1) (P_2 \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1))$$

By this and the definition of $\mathcal{C}^-(-)$ (Table 3) we have

$$(\nu \tilde{m}) (\nu \tilde{c}^m) (\nu \tilde{n}) (\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid R_2 \mid \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{w}} \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2) \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\sigma_1}^{\rho_1}((\nu m) (\nu \tilde{n}_1) (P_2 \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1))$$

Further, we may notice

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_2 \cdot \tilde{n}_2) (Q_2 \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2) \equiv (\nu \tilde{c}_r) (\nu \tilde{m}_2) (\nu \tilde{n}) (\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid R_2 \mid \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{w}} \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2)$$

Therefore, the sub-goal (162) follows. This concludes case $\langle \text{New} \rangle$ and the proof. \square

C.3 Proof of Lemma 4.7

Lemma 4.7. *Assume $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ is a process and $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} Q_1$.*

1. *Whenever $Q_1 \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2)n_i!(V_2)} Q_2$, such that $\bar{n}_i \notin \mathbf{fn}(Q_1)$, then there exist P_2 and V_2 such that $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{(\nu \tilde{m}_2)n!(V_2)} P_2$ and, for a fresh t ,*

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2 \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1)\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \parallel t_1 \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2).$$
2. *Whenever $Q_1 \xrightarrow{n_i?(V_2)} Q_2$, such that $\bar{n}_i \notin \mathbf{fn}(Q_1)$, there exist P_2 , V_2 , and σ such that $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n?(V_1)} P_2$ where $V_1\sigma \boxtimes V_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$.*
3. *Whenever $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} Q_2$ either (i) $P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \mathcal{S} Q_2$ or (ii) there exists P_2 such that $P_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} P_2$ and $P_2 \mathcal{S} Q_2$.*

Proof (Sketch). By transition induction. First, we analyze the case of non-essential prefixes, which induce τ -actions that do not correspond to actions in P_1 . This concerns the sub-case (i) of Part 3. This directly follows by Lemma 4.3, that is by the fact that $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P_1)$ is closed under transitions on non-essential prefixes.

Now, assume $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\ell} Q_2$ when ℓ is an essential prefix. This is mainly the converse of the proof of Lemma 4.4 noting that there are no essential actions in $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}}(P_1)$ not matched in P_1 . We consider only one case:

- Case $\langle \text{Snd} \rangle$. In this case we know $P_1 = n!\langle V_1 \rangle.P_2$. We distinguish two sub-cases: (i) $\neg \text{tr}(u_i)$ and (ii) $\text{tr}(u_i)$. In both sub-cases, we distinguish two kinds of an object value V_1 : (a) $V_1 \equiv x$, such that $\{V_x/x\} \in \{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\}$ and (b) $V_1 = \lambda y : C.P'$, that is V_1 is a pure abstraction. We only consider sub-case (a).

Let $\tilde{W}_1, \tilde{W}_2, \tilde{y}$, and \tilde{w} such that

$$P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} = n!\langle V_1\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \rangle.P_2\{\tilde{W}_2/\tilde{w}\}$$

Let $\sigma_1 \in \text{index}(\tilde{u})$ where $\tilde{u} = \mathbf{fn}(P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\})$ such that $\{n_i/n\} \in \sigma_1$. Also, let $\sigma_2 = \sigma_1 \cdot \text{next}(n_i)$. When P_1 is not a trigger, by the definition of \mathcal{S} (Table 3), for both sub-cases, we have $Q_1 \in N_1$ where:

$$N_1 = \{(\nu \tilde{c}_r)(\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{v}} \mid n_i!(V_2).\overline{c_{k+1}}!(\tilde{B}_2) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{k+1}(P_2\sigma_2) : V_1\sigma\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \boxtimes V_2, \tilde{W}_2 \boxtimes \tilde{B}_2\}$$

For $Q_1 \in N_1$ we have the following transition inference tree:

$$\langle \text{Snd} \rangle \frac{}{Q_1 \xrightarrow{n_i!(V_1)} Q_2}$$

where

$$Q_2 = (\nu \tilde{c}_r)(\nu \tilde{c}_{k+1}) \overline{c_{k+1}}!(\tilde{B}_2) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{w}}^k(P_2\sigma_2)$$

We have

$$\langle \text{Snd} \rangle \frac{}{P_1\{\tilde{W}/\tilde{x}\} \xrightarrow{n!\langle V_1\{\tilde{W}_1/\tilde{y}\} \rangle} P_2\{\tilde{W}_2/\tilde{w}\}}$$

We should show that

$$(\nu \tilde{m}_1)(P_2 \parallel t \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_1) \mathcal{S} (\nu \tilde{m}_2)(Q_2 \parallel t_1 \leftrightarrow_{\mathbb{H}} V_2)$$

This immediately follows by the definition of \mathcal{S} and Table 3. This concludes Snd case.

As can be seen the proof of this part is essentially the inverse of the proof of Lemma 4.4. We just need to show that $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{W}\sigma}(P_1\sigma)$ does not introduce extra actions on essential prefixes not present in P_1 . This is evident by the inspection of the definition of $\mathcal{C}^-(-)$. Briefly, only in the case of the input and the output prefix $\mathcal{J}^-(-)$ introduce actions that mimic those prefixes. Remaining cases only introduce actions on non-essential prefixes (τ -actions on propagator names). \square