

# An Asynchronous Scheme for Rollback Recovery in Message-Passing Concurrent Programming Languages<sup>\*</sup>

Germán Vidal

VRAIN, Universitat Politècnica de València  
gvidal@dsic.upv.es

**Abstract.** Rollback recovery strategies are well-known in concurrent and distributed systems. In this context, recovering from unexpected failures is even more relevant given the non-deterministic nature of execution, which means that it is practically impossible to foresee all possible process interactions. In this work, we consider a message-passing concurrent programming language where processes interact through message sending and receiving, but shared memory is not allowed. In this context, we design a checkpoint-based rollback recovery strategy that does not need a central coordination. For this purpose, we extend the language with three new operators: `check`, `commit`, and `rollback`. Furthermore, our approach is purely asynchronous, which is an essential ingredient to developing a source-to-source program instrumentation implementing a rollback recovery strategy.

© Germán Vidal. This is the author's version of the work. It is posted here for your personal use. Not for redistribution. The definitive version was published in the Proceedings of the 39th ACM/SIGAPP Symposium on Applied Computing (SAC '24), April 8–12, 2024, Avila, Spain, ACM.  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3605098.3636051>.

**Keywords:** message-passing concurrency, rollback recovery, checkpointing

## 1 Introduction

Some popular approaches to rollback recovery in message passing systems can be found in the survey by Elnozahy *et al* [1]. Most of these approaches are based on so called *checkpointing*, where processes save their state periodically so that, upon a failure, the system can use the saved states—called checkpoints—to recover a previous but consistent state of the system.

In contrast to [1], which is focused on *transparent* approaches to rollback recovery, our proposal is oriented to extending a programming language with *explicit* rollback recovery operators. In particular, we consider the following three basic operators:

- `check()`: it saves the current state of the process (a checkpoint) and returns a unique identifier, e.g.,  $\tau$ .
- `commit( $\tau$ )`: this call commits a checkpoint  $\tau$ , i.e., the computation performed since the call to `check()` is considered definitive and the state saved in checkpoint  $\tau$  is discarded.
- `rollback( $\tau$ )`: this call is used to recover a saved state (the one associated to checkpoint  $\tau$ ).

---

<sup>\*</sup> This work has been partially supported by grant PID2019-104735RB-C41 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033, by French ANR project DCore ANR-18-CE25-0007, and by *Generalitat Valenciana* under grant CIPROM/2022/6 (FassLow).

We consider in this work a typical message-passing (asynchronous) concurrent programming language like, e.g., (a subset of) Erlang [2]. The considered language mostly follows the actor model [6], where a running application consists of a number of processes (or actors) that can only communicate through message sending and receiving, but shared memory is not allowed. Furthermore, we consider that processes can be dynamically spawned at run-time, in contrast to session-based programming based on (multiparty) session types [7] where the number of partners is typically fixed.

As is common, when a process rolls back to a particular checkpoint, we require the entire system to be *causally consistent*, i.e., no message can be received if—after the rollback—it has not been sent, or no process may exist if it has not been spawned. This notion of *causality* follows the well-known Lamport’s “happened before” relation [8], which says that action  $a$  happened before action  $b$  if

- both actions are performed by the same process and  $a$  precedes  $b$ ,
- action  $a$  is the sending of a message and action  $b$  is the receiving of this message, or
- action  $a$  is the spawning of a new process  $p$  and action  $b$  is any action performed by process  $p$ .

Hence, in order to have a causally consistent rollback recovery strategy, whenever a rollback operator is executed, one should not only recover the corresponding previous state of this process, but possibly also propagate the rollback operation to other processes.

Extending the language with explicit operators for rollback recovery can be useful in a number of contexts. For example, they can be used to improve an ordinary “try\_catch” statement so that a rollback is used to undo the actions performed so far whenever an exception is raised, thus avoiding inconsistent states. In general, this operators can be used to enforce fault tolerance by allowing the user to define a sort of *transactions* so that either all of them are performed or none (see, e.g., the combination of message-passing concurrency and software transactional memory in [15]).

## 2 An Asynchronous Message-Passing Concurrent Language

In this section, we present the essentials of a simple message-passing concurrent language where processes can (dynamically) spawn new processes and can (only) interact through message sending and receiving (i.e., there is no shared memory). This is the case, e.g., of the functional and concurrent language Erlang [2], which can be seen as a materialization of the *actor model* [6].

Although we are not going to formally introduce the syntax and semantics of the considered subset of Erlang (which can be found elsewhere, e.g., in [10,9]) let us illustrate it with a simple example:

*Example 1.* Consider the Erlang program shown in Figure 1, where we have a bank account server and a single client that performs a couple of operations. Execution starts with a single process that calls function `init/0`,<sup>1</sup> This process then spawns two new processes using the predefined function `spawn/1`: the “bank account server” and the “client”. The argument of `spawn` contains the function that should execute the new process (`bank(100)` and `client(S)`, respectively). Function `spawn/1` returns the pid (for *process identifier*) of the spawned process, a fresh identifier that uniquely identifies each running process. Variable `S` is thus bound to the pid of the bank account server.

The server is basically an endless loop which is waiting for client requests. A `receive` statement is used for this purpose. In particular, this receive statement accepts two types of messages:

<sup>1</sup> As in Erlang, we denote function symbols with  $f/n$  where  $n$  is the arity of function  $f$ . Moreover, variables start with an uppercase letter.

```

init() -> S = spawn(fun() -> bank(100) end),
        spawn(fun() -> client(S) end).
bank(B) -> receive
    {C,get} ->
        C ! B, bank(B);
    {C,withdraw,N} ->
        try
            C ! ack,
            ... // some safety checks
            C ! ok, bank(NB)
        catch
            _:_ -> bank(B)
        end
end.
client(S) -> S ! {self(),get},
            receive
                Amount -> ...
            end,
            S ! {self(),withdraw,50}, ...

```

Fig. 1: Example program (bank account server)

- `{C,get}`, where variable `C` is the pid of the client, and `get` is a constant (called *atom* in Erlang);
- `{C,withdraw,N}`, where variable `C` is the pid of the client, `withdraw` is a constant, and `N` is the amount to be withdrawn from the account.

Both requests include the pid of the client in order to get a reply from the server. The client process only performs two operations. First, it sends a request to the server to get the current balance, where message sending is denoted with a statement of the form `target_pid ! message`. Then, it waits for an answer, which will eventually bind variable `Amount` to this balance.<sup>2</sup> Then, after performing some operations (not shown), it sends a second request to the server to withdraw \$50. We omit the following operations to keep the example as simple as possible.

The *state* of the bank account server (the current balance) is stored in the argument of function `bank/1` (initialized to \$100 when the process was spawned). Then, depending on the request, the server proceeds as follows:

- For a request to get the current balance, a message is sent back to the client: `C ! B`, and a recursive call `bank(B)` is performed to execute the receive statement again.
- For a withdrawal request, the server sends an ack to the client, then performs some safety checks (not shown) and either sends `ok` back to the client and updates the balance to `NB`, or cancels the operation and does a recursive call `bank(B)` with the old balance (if an exception is raised during the safety checks). We omit part of the code for simplicity.

---

<sup>2</sup> Here, we are simulating a synchronous communication between the client and the server by sending the client's own pid (using the built-in function `self/0`), and having a receive statement after the message sending, a common pattern in Erlang.




Fig. 2: Graphical representation of the execution in Example 1 (time flows from top to bottom)

A graphical representation of the program’s execution—assuming the safety checks are passed—is shown in Figure 2.

In the remainder of the paper, we will ignore the *sequential* component of the language and will focus on its concurrent actions: process spawning, message sending, and message receiving. Some features of the considered language follows:

- processes can be dynamically spawned at run time;
- message-passing is asynchronous;<sup>3</sup>
- message receiving suspends the execution until a matching message reaches the process;
- messages can be delivered to a process at any point in time and stored in a local *mailbox* (a queue), but they will not be processed until a receive statement is executed (if any).

We let  $s, s', \dots$  denote *states*, typically including an environment and an expression (or statement) to be evaluated. The structure of states is not relevant for the purpose of this paper, though.

**Definition 1 (process configuration).** A process configuration is denoted by a tuple of the form  $\langle p, s \rangle$ , where  $p$  is the pid of the process and  $s$  is its current state.

**Definition 2 (message).** A message has the form  $(p, p', v)$ , where  $p$  is the pid of the sender,  $p'$  that of the receiver, and  $v$  is a value.<sup>4</sup>

A *system* is either a process configuration, a message, or the parallel composition of two systems  $S_1 \mid S_2$ , where “ $\mid$ ” is commutative and associative. We borrow the idea of using *floating* messages from [13] (in contrast to using a *global* mailbox as in [10]).

A floating message represents a message that has been already sent but not yet delivered (i.e., the message is on the network). Furthermore, process mailboxes are abstracted away for simplicity, thus a floating message can also represent a message that is already stored in a process mailbox but is not yet consumed. As in Erlang, we assume that the order of messages sent directly from process  $p$  to process  $p'$  is preserved when they are all delivered. We do not formalize this constraint for simplicity, but could easily be ensured by introducing triples of the form  $(p, p', vs)$  where  $vs$  is a queue of messages instead of a single message.

<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, synchronous communication can be simulated using a combination of message sending and receiving, as seen in Example 1.

<sup>4</sup> We note that the pid of the sender is not really needed when the order of messages is not relevant. Nevertheless, we keep the current format for compatibility with other, related definitions (e.g., [12]).

$$\begin{array}{l}
(Seq) \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{seq}} s'}{\langle p, s \rangle \mapsto \langle p, s' \rangle} \\
(Send) \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{send}(p', v)} s'}{\langle p, s \rangle \mapsto \langle p, p', v \rangle \mid \langle p, s' \rangle} \\
(Receive) \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{rec}(\kappa, cs)} s' \text{ and } \text{matchrec}(cs, v) = cs_i}{\langle p', p, v \rangle \mid \langle p, s \rangle \mapsto \langle p, s'[\kappa \leftarrow cs_i] \rangle} \\
(Spawn) \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{spawn}(\kappa, s_0)} s' \text{ and } p' \text{ is a fresh pid}}{\langle p, s \rangle \mapsto \langle p, s'[\kappa \leftarrow p'] \rangle \mid \langle p', s_0 \rangle} \\
(Par) \quad \frac{S_1 \mapsto S'_1 \text{ and } id(S'_1) \cap id(S_2) = \emptyset}{S_1 \mid S_2 \mapsto S'_1 \mid S_2}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 3: Standard semantics

As in [10,12], the semantics of the language is defined in a modular way, so that the labeled transition relations  $\rightarrow$  and  $\mapsto$  model the evaluation of expressions (or statements) and the evaluation of systems, respectively.

We skip the definition of the local semantics ( $\rightarrow$ ) since it is not necessary for our developments; we refer the interested reader to [10]. As for the rules of the operational semantics that define the reduction of systems, we follow the recent formulation in [16]. The transition rules are shown in Figure 3:

- Sequential, local steps are dealt with rule *Seq*, which propagates the reduction from the local level to the system level.
- Rule *Send* applies when the local evaluation requires sending a message as a side effect. The local step  $s \xrightarrow{\text{send}(p', v)} s'$  is labeled with the information that must flow from the local level to the system level: the pid of the target process,  $p'$ , and the message value,  $v$ . The system rule then adds a new message of the form  $\langle p, p', v \rangle$  to the system.
- In order to receive a message, the situation is somehow different. Here, we need some information to flow both from the local level to the system level (the clauses  $cs$  of the receive statement) and vice versa (the selected clause,  $cs_i$ , if any). For this purpose, in rule *Receive*, the label of the local step includes a special variable  $\kappa$ —a sort of *future*—that denotes the position of the receive expression within state  $s$ . The rule then checks if there is a floating message  $v$  addressed to process  $p$  that matches one of the constraints in  $cs$ . This is done by the auxiliary function `matchrec`, which returns the selected clause  $cs_i$  of the receive statement in case of a match (the details are not relevant here). Then, the reduction proceeds by binding  $\kappa$  in  $s'$  with the selected clause  $cs_i$ , which we denote by  $s'[\kappa \leftarrow cs_i]$ .
- Rule *Spawn* also requires a bidirectional flow of information. Here, the label of the local step includes the future  $\kappa$  and the state of the new process  $s_0$ . It then produces a fresh pid,  $p'$ , adds the new process  $\langle p', s_0 \rangle$  to the system, and updates the state  $s'$  by binding  $\kappa$  to  $p'$  (since `spawn` reduces to the pid of the new process), which we denote by  $s'[\kappa \leftarrow p']$ .
- Finally, rule *Par* is used to lift an evaluation step to a larger system. The auxiliary function `id` takes a system  $S$  and returns the set of pids in  $S$ , in order to ensure that new pids are indeed fresh in the complete system.

We let  $\mapsto^*$  denote the transitive and reflexive closure of  $\mapsto$ . Given systems  $S_0, S_n$ ,  $S_0 \mapsto^* S_n$  denotes a *derivation* under the standard semantics. An *initial* system has the form  $\langle p, s_0 \rangle$ , i.e., it contains a single

process. A system  $S'$  is *reachable* if there exists a derivation  $S \mapsto^* S'$  such that  $S$  is an initial system. A derivation  $S \mapsto^* S'$  is *well-defined* under the standard semantics if  $S$  is a reachable system.

As mentioned before, in this work we focus on the concurrent actions of processes. For this purpose, in the examples, we describe the actions of a process as a sequential stream of concurrent actions, ignoring all other details and hiding the structure of the underlying code. In particular, we consider the following actions:

- $p \leftarrow \text{spawn}()$ , for process spawning, where  $p$  is the (fresh) pid of the new process (returned by the call to  $\text{spawn}()$ );
- $\text{send}(p, v)$ , for sending a message, where  $p$  is the pid of the target process and  $v$  the message value;
- $\text{rec}(v)$ , for receiving message  $v$ .


*Example 2.* For instance, the execution of Example 1 as shown in Figure 2 can be represented as follows:

init	bank	client
$\text{bank} \leftarrow \text{spawn}()$	$\text{rec}(\text{get})$	$\text{send}(\text{bank}, \text{get})$
$\text{client} \leftarrow \text{spawn}()$	$\text{send}(\text{client}, B)$	$\text{rec}(B)$
	$\text{rec}(\text{withdraw})$	$\text{send}(\text{bank}, \text{withdraw})$
	$\text{send}(\text{client}, \text{ack})$	$\text{rec}(\text{ack})$
	$\text{send}(\text{client}, \text{ok})$	$\text{rec}(\text{ok})$

### 3 Operators for Checkpoint-Based Rollback Recovery

Now, we present three new explicit operators for checkpoint-based rollback recovery in our message-passing concurrent language:

- $\text{check}()$  introduces a *checkpoint* for the current process. Its reduction returns a fresh identifier,  $\tau$ , associated to the checkpoint. As a side-effect, the current state is saved.
- $\text{commit}(\tau)$  can then be used to discard the state saved in checkpoint  $\tau$ .
- Finally,  $\text{rollback}(\tau)$  recovers the state saved in checkpoint  $\tau$ , possibly following a different execution path. Graphically,



where  $s[t]$  denotes an arbitrary state whose next expression to be reduced is  $t$ .

The reduction rules of the local semantics can be found in Figure 4. Here, we consider that a local state has the form  $\theta, e$ , where  $\theta$  is the current environment (a variable substitution) and  $e$  is an expression (to be evaluated).

Rule *Check* reduces the call to a future,  $\kappa$ , which also occurs in the label of the transition step. As we will see in the next section, the corresponding rule in the system semantics will perform the associated side-effect (creating a checkpoint) and will also bind  $\kappa$  with the (fresh) identifier for this checkpoint.

Rules *Commit* and *Rollback* pass the corresponding information to the system semantics in order to do the associated side effects. Both rules reduce the call to the constant “*ok*” (an atom commonly used in Erlang when a function call does not return any value).

In the following, we extend the notation in the previous section with three new actions:  $\tau \leftarrow \text{check}()$ ,  $\text{commit}(\tau)$ , and  $\text{rollback}(\tau)$ , with the obvious meaning.

$$\begin{array}{l}
 (\textit{Check}) \quad \theta, \textit{check}() \xrightarrow{\textit{check}(\kappa)} \theta, \kappa \\
 (\textit{Commit}) \quad \theta, \textit{commit}(\tau) \xrightarrow{\textit{commit}(\tau)} \theta, \textit{ok} \\
 (\textit{Rollback}) \quad \theta, \textit{rollback}(\tau) \xrightarrow{\textit{rollback}(\tau)} \theta, \textit{ok}
 \end{array}$$

Fig. 4: Rollback recovery operators

```

bank(B) -> T = check(),
  receive
    {C,get} ->
      C ! B, commit(T), bank(B);
    {C,withdraw,N} ->
      try
        C ! ack,
        ... // some safety checks
        commit(T), C ! ok, bank(NB)
      catch
        _:_ -> rollback(T),bank(B)
      end
  end.
end.

```

Fig. 5: Example 1 including rollback recovery operators

*Example 3.* Consider again the program in Example 1, where function `bank/1` is now modified as shown in Figure 5. Assuming that the safety checks fail and the bank account server calls `rollback` (instead of `commit`), the sequence of actions for process `bank` are now the following:

```

τ1 ← check(); rec(get); send(client, B); commit(τ1);
τ2 ← check(); rec(withdraw); send(client, ack); rollback(τ2)

```

A graphical representation of the new execution can be found in Figure 6. Intuitively speaking, it proceeds as follows:

- The bank account server calls `check()` at the start of each cycle, creating a checkpoint with the current state of the process. In the first call, it returns  $\tau_1$  (so  $T$  is bound to  $\tau_1$ ).
- Since the “get” operation completes successfully, we have `commit(τ1)` which removes the saved checkpoint and the current state becomes irreversible. A recursive call to `bank(B)` starts a new cycle.
- The next cycle starts by creating a new checkpoint  $\tau_2$ . After the withdrawal request, the server sends an ack to the client. Here, we assume that something bad happens and an exception is raised. Therefore, execution jumps to the rollback operation, which recovers the state at checkpoint  $\tau_2$  but now calls `bank(B)` with the old balance. Furthermore, all causally dependent operations are undone too (the case of the receiving of message `ack` in the client process).
- Finally, the call to `bank(B)` starts a new cycle, which creates a new checkpoint ( $\tau_3$ ), and so forth. Note that the client does not need to resend the withdrawal request, since the rollback operation will put the message back on the network.




Fig. 6: Graphical representation of the execution in Example 3 (time flows from top to bottom)

## 4 Designing an Asynchronous Rollback Recovery Strategy

Let us now consider the design of a *practical* rollback recovery strategy. In principle, we have the following requirements:

1. First, rollback recovery should be performed without the need of a central coordination. For practical applications, it would be virtually impossible to synchronize all processes, especially the remote ones. This implies that every process interaction must be based on (asynchronous) message-passing.
2. Secondly, recovery must bring the system to a *consistent* global state. For this purpose, we will propagate checkpoints following the causal dependencies of a process. In particular, every process spawning or message sending will introduce a *forced* checkpoint (following the terminology of [1]). Consequently, if a process rolls back to a given checkpoint, we might have to also roll back other processes to the respective (forced) checkpoints.

In order to materialize this strategy, we extend the standard semantics to store the checkpoints of each process as well as some information regarding its actions; namely, we add a *history* containing a list of the following elements:  $check(\tau, s)$ , where  $\tau$  is a checkpoint identifier and  $s$  is a state;  $send(p, \ell)$ , where  $p$  is a pid and  $\ell$  is a message tag (see below);  $rec(\mathcal{C}, p, p', \{\ell, v\})$ , where  $\mathcal{C}$  is a set of checkpoint identifiers,  $p, p'$  are pids, and  $\{\ell, v\}$  is a message  $v$  tagged with  $\ell$ ; and  $spawn(p)$ , where  $p$  is a pid.

**Definition 3 (extended process configuration).** An extended process configuration is denoted by a tuple of the form  $\langle \Delta, p, s \rangle$ , where  $\Delta$  is a history,  $p$  is the pid of the process and  $s$  is its current state.



In the following, we let  $[]$  denote an empty list and  $x:xs$  a list with head  $x$  and tail  $xs$ . Messages are now extended in two ways. First, message values are wrapped with a tag so that they can be uniquely identified (as in [12]). And, secondly, they now include the set of *active* checkpoints of the sender so that they can be propagated to the receiver (as *forced* checkpoints):

**Definition 4.** An extended message has the form  $(C, p, p', \{\ell, v\})$ , where  $C$  is a set of checkpoint identifiers,  $p$  is the pid of the sender,  $p'$  that of the receiver, and  $\{\ell, v\}$  is a tagged value.

Besides ordinary (extended) messages, we also introduce a new kind of messages, called system notifications:

**Definition 5 (system notification).** A system notification has the form  $((p, p', v))$ , where  $p$  is the pid of the sender,  $p'$  that of the receiver, and  $v$  is the message value.<sup>5</sup>

This new kind of messages is necessary since, according to the standard semantics, delivered messages are not processed unless there is a corresponding receive statement. In our strategy, though, we might need to send a notification to a process at any point in time. This is why system notifications are needed. An implementation of this strategy could be carried over using run-time monitors (as in the reversible choreographies of [5]).

In the following, a system is given by the parallel composition of extended process configurations, messages, and system notifications. Before presenting the instrumented semantics for rollback recovery, there is one more issue which is worth discussing. The strategy sketched above will not always work if we accept *nested* checkpoints. For instance, given a sequence of actions like

$\dots, \tau_1 \leftarrow \text{check}(), \dots, \tau_2 \leftarrow \text{check}(), \dots, \text{commit}(\tau_1), \dots$

we might have a problem if a subsequent call to  $\text{rollback}(\tau_2)$  is produced. In general, we cannot delete the saved state of a checkpoint ( $\tau_1$  above) if there is some other active checkpoint ( $\tau_2$  above) whose rollback would require the (deleted!) saved state. In order to overcome this drawback, there are several possible solutions:

- We can forbid (or delay) checkpoints (either proper or forced) when there is already an active checkpoint in a process. Although some works avoid nested checkpoints (e.g., [14]), we consider it overly restrictive.
- As an alternative, we propose the *delay* of commit operations when a situation like the above one is produced. This strategy has little impact in practice since the checkpoint responsible for the delay will typically either commit or roll back in a short lapse of time.

In the following, we let  $\overline{\text{check}}(\tau, s)$  denote a checkpoint whose commit operation has been *delayed* (and, thus, is not active anymore).

## 5 Rollback Recovery Semantics

In this section, we introduce a labeled transition relation,  $\leftrightarrow$ , that formally specifies our rollback recovery strategy.

The first rule, *Check*, introduces a new checkpoint in the history of a process (Figure 7), where  $s$  denotes the saved state.

Consider now the extension of the rules in the standard semantics to deal with checkpoints (Figure 8). Rules *Seq* and *Par* are extended in a trivial way since the history is not modified. In rule *Par*, we assume now that  $\text{id}(S)$  returns, not only the set of pids, but also the set of message tags in  $S$ .

<sup>5</sup> We note that system notifications are not tagged since they will never be undone.

$$(Check) \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{check}(\kappa)} s' \text{ and } \tau \text{ is a fresh identifier}}{\langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle \text{check}(\tau, s) : \Delta, p, s'[\kappa \leftarrow \tau] \rangle}$$

Fig. 7: Rollback recovery semantics: check()

$$\begin{array}{l}
(Seq) \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{seq}} s'}{\langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle \Delta, p, s' \rangle} \quad (Send) \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{send}(p', v)} s', C = \text{chks}(\Delta), \text{ and } \ell \text{ is fresh}}{\langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle C, p, p', \{\ell, v\} \mid \text{add}(\text{send}(p', \ell), \Delta), p, s' \rangle} \\
(Receive) \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{rec}(\kappa, cs)} s', \text{ matchrec}(cs, v) = cs_i, C = \text{chks}(\Delta), \text{ and } C' \setminus C = \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n\}}{\langle C', p', p, \{\ell, v\} \mid \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle \text{add}(\text{rec}(C', p', \{\ell, v\}), \text{check}(\tau_1, s) : \dots : \text{check}(\tau_n, s) : \Delta), p, s'[\kappa \leftarrow cs_i] \rangle} \\
(Spawn) \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{spawn}(\kappa, s_0)} s', p' \text{ is a fresh pid, and } \text{chks}(\Delta) = \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n\}}{\langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle \text{add}(\text{spawn}(p'), \Delta), p, s'[\kappa \leftarrow p'] \mid \langle [\text{check}(\tau_1, \perp), \dots, \text{check}(\tau_n, \perp)], p', s_0 \rangle} \\
(Par) \quad \frac{S_1 \hookrightarrow S'_1 \text{ and } id(S'_1) \cap id(S_2) = \emptyset}{S_1 \mid S_2 \hookrightarrow S'_1 \mid S_2}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 8: Rollback recovery semantics: core rules

As for rule *Send*, we perform several extensions. As mentioned before, every message  $v$  is now wrapped with a (fresh) tag  $\ell$  and, moreover, it includes the set of (active) checkpoint identifiers,  $C$ , which is computed using function `chks` (Figure 9). Finally, we add a new element, `send`( $p', \ell$ ), to the history if there is at least one active checkpoint. We use the auxiliary function `add` for this purpose (Figure 9).

Rule *Receive* proceeds now as follows. First, we take the set of checkpoint identifiers from the message and delete those which are already active in the process. If there are no new checkpoints ( $C' \setminus C = \emptyset$  and  $n = 0$ ), this rule is trivially equivalent to the same rule in the standard semantics. Otherwise, a number of new *forced* checkpoints are introduced.

Finally, rule *Spawn* is extended in two ways: a new element is added to the process history (assuming there is at least one active checkpoint) and the spawned process is initialized with a number of forced checkpoints, one for each active checkpoint in process  $p$ . Here,  $\perp$  is used as a special “null” value which will be useful later to detect that the process must be deleted in case of a rollback.

It is easy to see that the rollback recovery semantics so far is a conservative extension of the standard semantics: if there are no active checkpoints, the rules in Figure 8 are equivalent to those in Figure 3.

Let us now consider the rollback rules (Figure 10). Roughly speaking, the execution of a rollback involves the following steps:

- First, the process is *blocked* so that the forward rules (Figures 7 and 8) cannot be applied. In particular, when a process configuration is adorned with some superscripts, the forward rules are not applicable.
- Then, the process recovers the state saved in the checkpoint and puts all received messages (since the checkpoint occurred) back on the network.
- The rollback is then propagated to all processes where a forced checkpoint might have been introduced: spawned processes and recipients of a message (since the checkpoint).
- Finally, the process keeps waiting for the rollbacks of these forced checkpoints to complete in order to resume its normal, forward computation.

This process is formalized in rule *Rollback*, where function `chk` takes a checkpoint identifier  $\tau$  and a history  $\Delta = a_1 : \dots : a_m : \text{check}(\tau, s_\tau) : \Delta'$  and returns a tuple  $(\Delta', s_\tau, L, P, Ms)$ , where  $L$  is a set with the tags of the

$$\text{chks}(\Delta) = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } \Delta = [] \\ \tau \cup \text{chks}(\Delta') & \text{if } \Delta = \text{check}(\tau, s) : \Delta' \\ \text{chks}(\Delta') & \text{if } \Delta = \overline{\text{check}}(\tau, s) : \Delta' \end{cases}$$

$$\text{add}(a, \Delta) = \begin{cases} \Delta & \text{if } \text{chks}(\Delta) = \emptyset \\ a : \Delta & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Fig. 9: Auxiliary functions (I)

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Rollback}) \quad & \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{rollback}(\tau)} s' \text{ and } \text{chk}(\tau, \Delta) = (\Delta', s_\tau, L, \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}, Ms)}{\langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle \Delta', p, s' \oplus s_\tau \rangle^{\tau, p, L, \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}} \mid ((p, p_1, \{p, \text{roll}, \tau\}) \mid \dots \mid ((p, p_n, \{p, \text{roll}, \tau\}) \mid Ms)} \\ (\text{Roll1}) \quad & \frac{\tau \in \Delta \text{ and } \text{chk}(\tau, \Delta) = (\Delta', s_\tau, L, \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}, Ms)}{((p', p, \{p_\tau, \text{roll}, \tau\}) \mid \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle \Delta', p, s_\tau \rangle^{\tau, p_\tau, p', L, \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}} \mid ((p, p_1, \{p_\tau, \text{roll}, \tau\}) \mid \dots \mid ((p, p_n, \{p_\tau, \text{roll}, \tau\}) \mid Ms)} \\ (\text{Roll2}) \quad & \frac{\tau \notin \Delta}{((p', p, \{p_\tau, \text{roll}, \tau\}) \mid \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle^{\tau, p_\tau, p', \emptyset, \emptyset}} \\ (\text{Roll3}) \quad & ((p', p, \{p_\tau, \text{roll}, \tau\}) \mid \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle^{\tau', p_1, p_2, L, P} \hookrightarrow \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle^{\tau', p_1, p_2, L, P} \mid ((p, p', \{done\text{-}async, \tau\})) \quad \text{if } \tau' \leq \Delta \tau \\ (\text{Undo-send}) \quad & (\mathcal{C}, p', p, \{\ell, v\}) \mid \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle^{\tau, p_\tau, p_r, L, P} \hookrightarrow \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle^{\tau, p_\tau, p_r, L \setminus \{\ell\}, P} \quad \text{if } \ell \in L \\ (\text{Undo-dep1}) \quad & ((p', p, \{done\text{-}async, \tau\}) \mid \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle^{\tau, p_\tau, p_r, \emptyset, P} \hookrightarrow \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle^{\tau, p_\tau, p_r, \emptyset, P \setminus \{p\}} \\ (\text{Undo-dep2}) \quad & ((p', p, \{done\text{-}sync, \tau\}) \mid \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle^{\tau, p_\tau, p_r, \emptyset, P} \hookrightarrow \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle^{\tau, p_\tau, p_r, \emptyset, P \setminus \{p\}} \mid ((p, p', \{resume, \tau\})) \\ (\text{Resume1}) \quad & \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle^{\tau, p_\tau, p_r, \emptyset, \emptyset} \hookrightarrow \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \quad \text{if } p = p_\tau \\ (\text{Resume2}) \quad & \langle \Delta, p, \perp \rangle^{\tau, p_\tau, p_r, \emptyset, \emptyset} \hookrightarrow ((p, p_r, \{done\text{-}async, \tau\})) \quad \text{if } p \neq p_\tau \\ (\text{Resume3}) \quad & \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle^{\tau, p_\tau, p_r, \emptyset, \emptyset} \hookrightarrow \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle^\tau \mid ((p, p_r, \{done\text{-}sync, \tau\})) \quad \text{if } p \neq p_\tau \text{ and } s \neq \perp \\ (\text{Resume4}) \quad & ((p', p, \{resume, \tau\}) \mid \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle^\tau \hookrightarrow \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Fig. 10: Rollback recovery semantics: rollback rules

sent messages,  $P$  includes the pids of the spawned processes as well as the pids of the message recipients, and  $Ms$  is a set with the received messages (all of them within  $a_1, \dots, a_m$ ). The function definition can be found in Figure 11. The blocked configuration is adorned with the superscripts  $\tau, p, p, L, P$ . The pid  $p$  is duplicated since we will later distinguish the pid of the process that started the rollback from that of the process propagating it (which may be different, see below). Moreover, note that rule *Rollback* does not recover the saved state  $s_\tau$  but  $s' \oplus s_\tau$ . Nevertheless, in this paper, we assume that  $s' \oplus s_\tau = s_\tau$  for simplicity. However, other definitions of “ $\oplus$ ” are possible. For instance, we might have  $s' \oplus s_\tau = (\theta_\tau, e')$  if we want to combine the saved environment with the next expression to be evaluated (as in Example 3), where  $s' = (\theta', e')$  and  $s_\tau = (\theta_\tau, e_\tau)$ .

Rollback requests are propagated to other processes by means of system notifications of the following form:  $((p, p_i, \{p_\tau, \text{roll}, \tau\}))$ . This is dealt with rules *Roll1*, *Roll2*, and *Roll3*. If the system notification reaches a process in normal, forward mode and the (forced) checkpoint exists (denoted with  $\tau \in \Delta$ ), then rule *Roll1* proceeds almost analogously to rule *Rollback*; the main difference is that the superscripts with the pids of the process that started the rollback and the one that sent the system notification are generally different.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{chk}(\tau, \Delta) &= \begin{cases} (\Delta', s, \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) & \text{if } \Delta = \text{check}(\tau, s) : \Delta' \\ (\Delta', s, L, P \cup \{p\}, Ms) & \text{if } \Delta = \text{spawn}(p) : \Delta' \text{ and } \text{chk}(\tau, \Delta') = (\Delta', s, L, P, Ms) \\ (\Delta', s, L \cup \{\ell\}, P \cup \{p\}, Ms) & \text{if } \Delta = \text{send}(p, \ell) : \Delta' \text{ and } \text{chk}(\tau, \Delta') = (\Delta', s, L, P, Ms) \\ (\Delta', s, L, P, Ms \cup \{(C, p, p', \{\ell, v\})\}) & \text{if } \Delta = \text{rec}(C, p, p', \{\ell, v\}) : \Delta' \text{ and } \text{chk}(\tau, \Delta') = (\Delta', s, L, P, Ms) \\ \text{chk}(\tau, \Delta') & \text{otherwise, with } \Delta = a : \Delta' \end{cases} \\
\text{last}(\tau, \Delta) &= \begin{cases} \text{true} & \text{if } \Delta = \text{check}(\tau, s) : \Delta' \\ \text{false} & \text{if } \Delta = \text{check}(\tau', s) : \Delta', \tau \neq \tau' \\ \text{last}(\tau, \Delta') & \text{otherwise, with } \Delta = a : \Delta' \end{cases} \quad \text{delay}(\tau, \Delta) = \begin{cases} \overline{\text{check}(\tau, s) : \Delta'} & \text{if } \Delta = \text{check}(\tau, s) : \Delta' \\ a : \text{delay}(\tau, \Delta') & \text{otherwise, with } \Delta = a : \Delta' \end{cases} \\
\text{dp}(\tau, \Delta) &= P \text{ if } \text{chk}(\tau, \Delta) = (\Delta', s, L, P, Ms) \\
\text{del}(\tau, \Delta) &= \begin{cases} \Delta' & \text{if } \Delta = \text{check}(\tau, s) : \Delta' \\ \text{del}(\tau, \Delta') & \text{otherwise, with } \Delta = a : \Delta' \end{cases} \quad \text{delayed}(\Delta) = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } \Delta = \square \\ \{\tau\} & \text{if } \Delta = \overline{\text{check}(\tau, s) : \Delta'} \\ \text{delayed}(\Delta') & \text{otherwise, with } \Delta = a : \Delta' \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 11: Auxiliary functions (II)

Rule *Roll2* applies when the checkpoint does not exist ( $\tau \notin \Delta$ ), e.g., because the message propagating the rollback was not yet received. In this case, we still block the process to avoid it receives the message before the rollback is complete. There are two kinds of system notifications to let a process know that the requested rollback has been completed: *done-async* is asynchronous and expects no reply, while *done-sync* keeps the process waiting for a reply before resuming its computation. Finally, if the process is already in rollback mode, we distinguish two cases: if the ongoing rollback is older, denoted by  $\tau' \leq_{\Delta} \tau$ , the rollback is considered “done” and rule *Roll3* sends a system notification of the form  $((p, p', \{\text{done-async}, \tau\}))$  back to process  $p'$ ; otherwise (i.e., if the requested rollback is older than the ongoing one), the rollback request is ignored until the process ends the current rollback.<sup>6</sup>

In order for a blocked process to resume its forward computation, all sent messages ( $L$ ) must be deleted from the network, and all process dependencies ( $P$ ) corresponding to forced checkpoints must be completed. This is dealt with rules *Undo-send*, *Undo-dep1*, and *Undo-dep2*. Note that rule *Undo-dep2* sends a system notification of the form  $((p, p', \{\text{resume}, \tau\}))$  back to process  $p'$  so that it can resume its normal computation (in contrast to rule *Undo-dep1*). This additional communication is needed to avoid a situation where a process resumes its execution and receives again the messages that were put back on the network before they can be deleted by the process propagating the rollback.

Finally, once both  $L$  and  $P$  are empty (i.e., all sent messages are undone and the rollbacks of all associated forced checkpoints are completed), we can apply the *Resume* rules. Rule *Resume1* applies when the process is the one that started the rollback, and it simply removes the superscripts. Rule *Resume2* applies when the forced checkpoint was introduced by a process spawning and, thus, it is deleted from the system (and a system notification is sent back to  $p$ ). Otherwise (the case of a process with a forced checkpoint associated to a message receiving), we proceed in two steps: first, rule *Resume3* sends a system notification to process  $p_r$  (the one that propagated the rollback) but remains blocked; then, once it receives a system notification of the form  $((p_r, p, \{\text{resume}, \tau\}))$ , rule *Resume4* resumes its normal, forward computation.

<sup>6</sup> Note that a deadlock is not possible, no matter if we have processes with mutual dependencies. Consider, e.g., two processes,  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ , such that each process  $p_i$  creates a checkpoint  $\tau_i$ , sends a message tagged with  $\ell_i$  addressed to the other process and, finally, starts a rollback to checkpoint  $\tau_i$ . In this case, it might be the case that message  $\ell_1$  reaches  $p_2$  before checkpoint  $\tau_2$  or  $\ell_2$  reaches  $p_1$  before checkpoint  $\tau_1$ , but both things are not possible at the same time (a message would need to travel back in time).

Roughly speaking, a user-defined rollback will follow a sequence of the form

$$\text{Rollback} + \text{Undo-send}^* + [\text{Undo-dep1} | \text{Undo-dep2}]^* + \text{Resume1}$$

while a propagated rollback will typically have the form

$$\text{Roll1} + \text{Undo-send}^* + [\text{Undo-dep1} | \text{Undo-dep2}]^* + \text{Resume2}$$

(if the forced checkpoint is associated to process spawning) or

$$\text{Roll1} + \text{Undo-send}^* + [\text{Undo-dep1} | \text{Undo-dep2}]^* + \text{Resume3} + \text{Resume4}$$

(if the forced checkpoint is associated to message sending). We also have a couple of corner cases when the process does not include the requested checkpoint (e.g., because the message was not yet received), where we apply rules *Roll2* + *Resume3* + *Resume4*, and when the process is already doing a *larger* rollback (i.e., to a checkpoint which is older than the one requested), where rule *Roll3* is applied. Note that we are only showing the rules applied to the main process.

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{(Commit)} \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{commit}(\tau)} s', \text{last}(\tau, \Delta) = \text{true}, \text{ and } \text{dp}(\tau, \Delta) = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}}{\langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \leftrightarrow \langle \text{del}(\tau, \Delta), p, s' \rangle \mid \langle (p, p_1, \{\text{commit}, \tau\}) \mid \dots \mid (p, p_n, \{\text{commit}, \tau\}) \rangle} \\
 \text{(Delay)} \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{commit}(\tau)} s' \text{ and } \text{last}(\tau, \Delta) = \text{false}}{\langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \leftrightarrow \langle \text{delay}(\tau, \Delta), p, s' \rangle} \\
 \text{(Commit2)} \quad \frac{\text{last}(\tau, \Delta) = \text{true} \text{ and } \text{dp}(\tau, \Delta) = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}}{\langle (p', p, \{\text{commit}, \tau\}) \mid \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \leftrightarrow \langle \text{del}(\tau, \Delta), p, s \rangle \mid \langle (p, p_1, \{\text{commit}, \tau\}) \mid \dots \mid (p, p_n, \{\text{commit}, \tau\}) \rangle} \\
 \text{(Delay2)} \quad \frac{\text{last}(\tau, \Delta) = \text{false}}{\langle (p', p, \{\text{commit}, \tau\}) \mid \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \leftrightarrow \langle \text{delay}(\tau, \Delta), p, s \rangle} \\
 \text{(Commit3)} \quad \frac{\tau \in \text{delayed}(\Delta), \text{last}(\tau) = \text{true}, \text{ and } \text{dp}(\tau, \Delta) = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}}{\langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \leftrightarrow \langle \text{del}(\tau, \Delta), p, s \rangle \mid \langle (p, p_1, \{\text{commit}, \tau\}) \mid \dots \mid (p, p_n, \{\text{commit}, \tau\}) \rangle}
 \end{array}$$

Fig. 12: Rollback recovery semantics: commit rules

Let us finally consider the rules for `commit` (Figure 12). Basically, we have a distinction on whether the checkpoint is the last active one or not (as discussed in Section 4). In the first case, rule *Commit* deletes every element in the history up to the given checkpoint and propagates the commit operation to all its dependencies. In the latter case, the commit operation is delayed. Here, we use the auxiliary functions `last`, `del`, and `delay`, which are defined in Figure 11.

Rules *Commit2* and *Delay2* are perfectly analogous, but the process starts by receiving a system notification rather than a user operation. Finally, rule *Commit3* checks whether there is some delayed commit that can be already done. This rule only needs to be considered whenever a checkpoint is removed from a process.

$$\begin{array}{l}
(\underline{Seq}) \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{seq}} s'}{\langle h, p, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{seq}(s) : h, p, s' \rangle} \\
(\underline{Send}) \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{send}(p', v)} s' \text{ and } \ell \text{ is a fresh symbol}}{\langle h, p, s \rangle \rightarrow (p, p', \{\ell, v\}) \mid \langle \text{send}(s, p', \ell) : h, p, s' \rangle} \\
(\underline{Receive}) \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{rec}(\kappa, cs)} s' \text{ and } \text{matchrec}(cs, v) = cs_i}{(p', p, \{\ell, v\}) \mid \langle h, p, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{rec}(s, p, p', \{\ell, v\}) : h, p, s'[\kappa \leftarrow cs_i] \rangle} \\
(\underline{Spawn}) \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{spawn}(\kappa, s_0)} s' \text{ and } p' \text{ is a fresh pid}}{\langle h, p, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{spawn}(s, p') : h, p, s'[\kappa \leftarrow p'] \rangle \mid \langle [], p', s_0 \rangle} \\
(\underline{Check}) \quad \frac{s \xrightarrow{\text{check}(\kappa)} s' \text{ and } \tau \text{ is a fresh identifier}}{\langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{check}(\tau, s) : \Delta, p, s'[\kappa \leftarrow \tau] \rangle} \\
(\underline{Par}) \quad \frac{S_1 \rightarrow_l S'_1 \text{ and } \ell(S'_1) \cap \ell(S_2) = \emptyset}{S_1 \mid S_2 \rightarrow_l S'_1 \mid S_2}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 13: Reversible semantics: forward rules

## 6 Soundness of Rollback Recovery Strategy

In this section, we consider the soundness of our approach to rollback recovery. Essentially, we want to prove that every step under the rollback recovery semantics is either equivalent to an step under the standard semantics or to an step under a causally consistent reversible semantics for the language. Therefore, we will be able to conclude that our rollback recovery semantics is also causally consistent in the sense that no action is undone until all its consequences have been already undone.

First, let us present the reversible semantics of [11,12], where we omit the *replay* component (using an execution trace) since it is not relevant in our context. Furthermore, there are a few, minor differences:

- First, we consider floating messages and rule *Par* to lift reductions to a larger system (as in [13,9]). The resulting semantics is straightforwardly equivalent but the formulation of the rules is simpler.
- We consider a generic state,  $s$ , rather than a pair  $\theta, e$  (environment, expression) as in [11,12]. This is a simple generalization to improve readability but does not affect the behavior of the system rules.
- Finally, we do not consider a rule for the predefined function *self()* (that returns the pid of the current process) since it is not relevant in the context this work (but could be added easily).

The *uncontrolled* reversible semantics is defined in Figures 13 and 14. The forward rules (Fig. 13) are similar to the forward rules of the rollback recovery semantics in Fig. 8. Here, the main difference is that history items store the state *at every step*. Moreover, each step adds an item to the current history, in contrast to our rollback recovery semantics which only does so when there is some active checkpoint. The backward rules, however, are rather different to our rollback rules in Figure 10. On the one hand, they are *uncontrolled*, which means that they are not driven by a particular rollback request. In other words, every causally consistent backward execution can be proved. Furthermore, they are not always asynchronous (e.g., the case of rule *Spawn*, which requires a synchronization between the process performing the spawn and the spawned process).

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \overline{Seq} \quad \langle \text{seq}(s) : h, p, s' \rangle \leftarrow \langle h, p, s \rangle \\
 \overline{Send} \quad (p, p', \{\ell, v\}) \mid \langle \text{send}(s, p', \ell) : h, p, s' \rangle \leftarrow \langle h, p, s \rangle \\
 \overline{Receive} \quad \langle \text{rec}(s, p, p', \{\ell, v\}) : h, p, s' \rangle \leftarrow (p', p, \{\ell, v\}) \mid \langle h, p, s \rangle \\
 \overline{Spawn} \quad \langle \text{spawn}(s, p') : h, p, s' \rangle \mid \langle [], p', s_0 \rangle \leftarrow \langle h, p, s \rangle \\
 \overline{Check} \quad \langle \text{check}(\tau, s) : h, p, s' \rangle \leftarrow \langle h, p, s \rangle \\
 \overline{Par} \quad \frac{S_1 \leftarrow_l S'_1}{S_1 \mid S_2 \leftarrow_l S'_1 \mid S_2}
 \end{array}$$

Fig. 14: Reversible semantics: backward rules

The uncontrolled reversible semantics,  $\Rightarrow$ , can then be defined as the union of the two transition relations defined in Figures 13 and 14, i.e.,  $(\Rightarrow) = (\rightarrow \cup \leftarrow)$ . The causal consistency of  $\Rightarrow$  can be proved analogously to [12, Theorem 4.17] since, as mentioned above, there are only some minor differences.

In the following, we omit the steps with rule *Par* (since they are the same in both semantics) and only show reductions on the selected process. Furthermore, we assume a *fair* selection strategy for processes, so that each process is eventually reduced.

Now, we prove that the rollback recovery semantics is indeed a conservative extension of the standard semantics. For this purpose, we introduce the following auxiliary function *sta* that defines a projection from rollback recovery configurations to standard configurations:

$$\text{sta}(S) = \begin{cases} \text{sta}(S_1) \mid \text{sta}(S_2) & \text{if } S = S_1 \mid S_2 \\ \langle p, s \rangle & \text{if } S = \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \\ (p, p', v) & \text{if } S = (\mathcal{C}, p, p', \{\ell, v\}) \end{cases}$$

Functions *sta* is extended to derivations in the obvious way.

In the following, we consider some minimal requirements on derivations under the rollback recovery semantics in order to be well-defined:

- As usual, the derivation should start with a *reachable* system, where a system  $S$  is reachable if there exists an initial system  $S_0$  of the form  $\langle [], p, s \rangle$  such that  $S_0 \rightarrow^* S$ .
- The calls `commit`( $\tau$ ) and `rollback`( $\tau$ ) can only be made by the same process that created the checkpoint  $\tau$  (i.e., that called `check` and was reduced to  $\tau$ ).
- Every call to either `commit`( $\tau$ ) or `rollback`( $\tau$ ) must be preceded by a call to `check` returning  $\tau$ .
- A process can only have one action for every checkpoint  $\tau$ , either `commit`( $\tau$ ) or `rollback`( $\tau$ ), but not both.

We assume that these requirements hold for all derivations. In particular, it would be easy to prove that they hold when the new operators are used to improve `try_catch` as proposed before. In general, one could introduce a *compliance check* at the type level to prevent undesired situations (as in [14]).

The next result states that our rollback recovery semantics is a conservative extension of the standard semantics:

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $d$  be a well-defined derivation under the rollback recovery semantics where only the forward rules in Figure 8 are applied. Then,  $\text{sta}(d)$  is a derivation under the standard semantics.*

$$\begin{array}{l}
(Par) \quad \frac{S_1 \rightsquigarrow S'_1}{S_1 \mid S_2 \rightsquigarrow S'_1 \mid S_2} \\
(Seq) \quad \langle\langle \text{seq}(s') : h, p, s \rangle\rangle_{\varphi} \rightsquigarrow \langle\langle h, p, s' \rangle\rangle_{\varphi} \\
(Check) \quad \langle\langle \text{check}(\tau, s') : h, p, s \rangle\rangle_{\varphi} \rightsquigarrow \langle\langle h, p, s' \rangle\rangle_{\varphi \setminus \{\tau\}} \\
(SP) \quad \langle\langle \square, p, s \rangle\rangle_{\varphi \cup \{\text{sp}\}} \rightsquigarrow \langle\langle \square, p, s \rangle\rangle_{\varphi} \\
(Receive) \quad \langle\langle \text{rec}(s', p', p, \{\ell, v\}) : h, p, s \rangle\rangle_{\varphi} \rightsquigarrow \langle\langle h, p, s' \rangle\rangle_{\varphi \setminus \{\ell\}} \mid (p', p, \{\ell, v\}) \\
(Spawn1) \quad \langle\langle \text{spawn}(s'', p') : h, p, s \rangle\rangle_{\varphi} \mid \langle\langle \square, p', s' \rangle\rangle_{\varphi} \rightsquigarrow \langle\langle h, p, s'' \rangle\rangle_{\varphi} \\
(Spawn2) \quad \langle\langle \text{spawn}(s'', p') : h, p, s \rangle\rangle_{\varphi} \mid \langle\langle h', p', s' \rangle\rangle_{\varphi'} \rightsquigarrow \langle\langle \text{spawn}(s'', p') : h, p, s \rangle\rangle_{\varphi} \mid \langle\langle h', p', s' \rangle\rangle_{\varphi' \cup \{\tau, \text{sp}\}} \\
(Send1) \quad \langle\langle \text{send}(s'', p', \ell) : h, p, s \rangle\rangle_{\varphi} \mid (p, p', \{\ell, v\}) \rightsquigarrow \langle\langle h, p, s'' \rangle\rangle_{\varphi} \\
(Send2) \quad \langle\langle \text{send}(s'', p', \ell) : h, p, s \rangle\rangle_{\varphi} \mid \langle\langle h', p', s' \rangle\rangle_{\varphi'} \rightsquigarrow \langle\langle \text{send}(s'', p', \ell) : h, p, s \rangle\rangle_{\varphi} \mid \langle\langle h', p', s' \rangle\rangle_{\varphi' \cup \{\tau, \ell\}}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 15: Controlled backward semantics

*Proof.* The claim follows trivially since the components  $p$  and  $s$  are the same in both semantics and, moreover, the addition of a history  $\Delta$  in the rules of Figure 8 imposes no additional restriction.  $\square$

On top of the uncontrolled semantics, [10,12] introduce a *controlled* semantics that can be used to *drive* backward computations in order to satisfy different requests, e.g.,

- go backwards one (or more) steps;
- go backwards up to the introduction of a checkpoint;
- go backwards up to the sending of a given message;
- go backwards up to the spawning of a given process;
- etc.

Notably, all these requests are carried over in a causal consistent way, thus they often require other processes to go backwards too. The rules of the controlled backward semantics of [10, Figure 15] (adapted to the notation in this paper) can be found in Figure 15. Here, we only consider three kinds of rollback requests:

- $\tau$ , which starts a (causally consistent) rollback until checkpoint  $\tau$ ;
- $\ell$ , which undoes all actions up to the receiving of a message tagged with  $\ell$ ; and
- $\text{sp}$ , which undoes all the actions of a process (and then deletes it).

The controlled backward semantics is given by a transition relation,  $\rightsquigarrow$ , that can be found in Figure 15. Here, configurations have the form  $\langle\langle h, p, s \rangle\rangle_{\varphi}$ , where  $h$  is a history,  $p$  a pid,  $s$  an state, and  $\varphi$  is a (possibly empty) set of rollback requests. Given a configuration  $\langle\langle h, p, s \rangle\rangle_{\varphi}$  and a checkpoint identifier  $\tau$ , a rollback starts with an initial configuration of the form  $\langle\langle h, p, s \rangle\rangle_{\{\tau\}}$ . In the following, in order to simplify the reduction rules, we consider that our semantics satisfies the following structural equivalence:

$$(SC) \quad \langle\langle h, p, s \rangle\rangle_{\emptyset} \equiv \langle\langle h, p, s \rangle\rangle$$

Let us briefly explain the rules:<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> We assume a determinizing convention where a rule applies only if no earlier rule applies.



- Rule *Par* is identical to that in the reversible semantics.
- Rule *Seq* just updates the current state and keep going backwards.
- Rule *Check* recovers the saved state and removes  $\tau$  from the current set of requests  $\varphi$  (assuming  $\tau \in \varphi$ ).
- Rule *SP* removes a request  $\mathbf{sp}$  from the current set  $\varphi$  (if  $\mathbf{sp} \in \varphi$ ) and the configuration is in its initial state (i.e., with an empty history). If the derivation is well defined,  $\varphi$  will be empty after the step.
- Rule *Receive* just puts a received message back on the network and removes the request  $\ell$  from  $\varphi$  (assuming  $\ell \in \varphi$ ).
- Rules *Spawn1* and *Spawn2* deal with undoing a spawn. If the spawned process is in its initial state (i.e., has an empty history), it is deleted and the element is removed from the history. Otherwise, rule *Spawn2* puts the spawned process in rollback mode and adds the requests  $\tau$  and  $\mathbf{sp}$  to its (possibly empty) current set of rollback requests  $\varphi'$ .
- Rules *Send1* and *Send2* take care of undoing the sending of a message. If the message is on the network, the first rule deletes it and removes the corresponding element from the history. Otherwise, rule *Send2* propagates the rollback mode to the receiver of the message adding the requests  $\tau$  and  $\ell$  to its (possibly empty) set of rollback requests  $\varphi'$ .

Note that we do not have a specific rule to end a rollback and resume the forward computation (with the rules of Figure 13) but it actually terminates when the set of rollbacks is empty by applying the structural equivalence above (*SC*). In the following, we let  $\text{rolldel}(S)$  denote the system that results from  $S$  by removing all ongoing rollbacks. Furthermore, a system is *initial* under the reversible semantics if it is composed by a single process with an empty history. A system  $S$  is *reachable* if there exist an initial system  $S_0$  and a derivation  $S_0 \rightleftharpoons^* S$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $S$  be a reachable system under the reversible semantics. If  $S \rightsquigarrow^* S'$ , then  $\text{rolldel}(S) \rightleftharpoons^* \text{rolldel}(S')$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is perfectly analogous to that of Theorem 25 in [10]. □

In the following, we assume that a process history always contain the complete sequence of elements which are needed to perform an eventual rollback (this is an easy consequence of the notion of well-defined derivation and the definition of the rollback recovery semantics).

The soundness of the forward rules (Figure 8) is straightforward, since every step has a direct counterpart under either the standard or the (forward) reversible semantics. Now, we focus on the rollback rules (Figure 10).

**Definition 6.** *Let  $S_{rr}$  be a system of the rollback recovery semantics and  $S_r$  a system of the reversible semantics. We define an equivalence relation “ $\approx$ ” as follows:  $S_{rr} \approx S_r$  if  $\llbracket S_{rr} \rrbracket = \llbracket S_r \rrbracket$ , where the auxiliary functions  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$  and  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$  are defined as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket S_1 \mid S_2 \rrbracket &= \llbracket S_1 \rrbracket \mid \llbracket S_2 \rrbracket \\
 \llbracket (\mathcal{C}, p, p', \{\ell, v\}) \rrbracket &= (p, p', \{\ell, v\}) \\
 \llbracket ((p, p', v)) \rrbracket &= \epsilon \\
 \llbracket \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \rrbracket &= \langle \tilde{\Delta}, p, s \rangle \\
 \llbracket \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle^{\tau, p_\tau, p_r, L, P} \rrbracket &= \langle \tilde{\Delta}, p, s \rangle
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\widetilde{\Delta} = \begin{cases} \text{send}(p, \ell) : \widetilde{\Delta}' & \text{if } \Delta = \text{send}(p, \ell) : \Delta' \\ \text{rec}(p, p', \{\ell, v\}) : \widetilde{\Delta}' & \text{if } \Delta = \text{rec}(C, p, p', \{\ell, v\}) : \Delta' \\ \text{spawn}(p) : \widetilde{\Delta}' & \text{if } \Delta = \text{spawn}(p) : \Delta' \\ \text{check}(\tau, s) : \widetilde{\Delta}' & \text{if } \Delta = \text{check}(\tau, s) : \Delta' \\ \widetilde{\Delta}' & \text{if } \Delta = \overline{\text{check}}(\tau, s) : \Delta' \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket S_1 \mid S_2 \rrbracket &= \llbracket S_1 \rrbracket \mid \llbracket S_2 \rrbracket \\ \llbracket (p, p', \{\ell, v\}) \rrbracket &= (p, p', \{\ell, v\}) \\ \llbracket \langle h, p, s \rangle \rrbracket &= \langle \overline{h}, p, s \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\overline{h} = \begin{cases} \overline{h}' & \text{if } h = \text{seq}(s) : h' \\ \text{send}(p, \ell) : \overline{h}' & \text{if } h = \text{send}(s, p, \ell) : h' \\ \text{rec}(p, p', \{\ell, v\}) : \overline{h}' & \text{if } h = \text{rec}(s, p, p', \{\ell, v\}) : h' \\ \text{spawn}(p) : \overline{h}' & \text{if } h = \text{spawn}(s, p) : h' \\ \text{check}(\tau, s) : \overline{h}' & \text{if } h = \text{check}(\tau, s) : h' \end{cases}$$

Now, we prove that, for every rollback derivation under the rollback recovery semantics, there exists an equivalent rollback derivation under the controlled backward semantics, and vice versa. This will allow us to state the soundness of the rollback recovery semantics (together with Theorem 2). In the following, we only consider the case  $s \oplus s_\tau = s_\tau$  and omit sequential steps in process histories for simplicity.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $S_0 = \langle \Delta, p, s \rangle \mid S_1$  be a system of the rollback recovery semantics, where we assume that there is no ongoing rollback, and  $S'_0 = \langle h, p, s \rangle \mid S'_1$  be a system of reversible semantics such that  $S_0 \approx S'_0$ . Then, we have a derivation  $d$  of the form*

$$S_0 \hookrightarrow ((\Delta', p, s_\tau))^{\tau, p_\tau, p_r, L, P} \mid S_1 \hookrightarrow^* ((\Delta', p, s_\tau))^{\tau, p_\tau, p_r, \emptyset, \emptyset} \mid S_2$$

under the rollback recovery semantics iff there exists a derivation  $d'$  of the form

$$\langle \langle h, p, s \rangle \rangle_{\{\tau\}} \mid S'_1 \hookrightarrow^* \langle \langle h', p, s_\tau \rangle \rangle_{\emptyset} \mid S'_2$$

under the controlled backward semantics such that  $((\Delta', p, s_\tau))^{\tau, p_\tau, p_r, \emptyset, \emptyset} \mid S_2 \approx \langle h', p, s_\tau \rangle \mid S'_2$ .

*Proof.* We prove the “if” direction. The “only if” will easily follow since the rollback rules in Figure 10 are deterministic by definition. We prove the claim by induction on the *depth*  $D$  of the derivation, i.e., on the length of the maximum *chain* of process dependencies (via either  $\text{spawn}(s, p)$  or  $\text{send}(s, p, \ell)$ ) in the derivation.

Base case ( $D = 0$ ). In this case,  $h$  can only have occurrences of  $\text{rec}$  and  $\text{check}$  (recall that we are ignoring sequential steps). Therefore,  $d'$  performs a number of steps with rule *Receive*, followed by a final step with rule *Check*, then recovering the state in  $\text{check}(\tau, s)$ . Trivially, the rollback rules achieve the same result in one step by applying either rule *Rollback* or *Roll1*, depending on whether it is a user-defined rollback or a rollback propagated from other process because of a forced checkpoint.

Consider now the inductive case ( $D > 0$ ). Assume that  $h$  has the form  $h = a_1 : \dots : a_n : \text{check}(\tau, s_\tau) : h'$ . We make a case distinction on each element  $a_i$  in the history:

- $a_i = \text{rec}(s', p, p', \{\ell, v\})$ . This case is similar to the base case, since each element of this form will be undone by putting the message back on the network (rule *Receive* in Figure 15), similarly to either rule *Rollback* or *Roll1* in Figure 10.
- $a_i = \text{spawn}(s', p')$ . In this case, we know that the history of process  $p'$  must start with an element of the form  $\text{check}(\tau, \perp)$  since  $S_0 \approx S'_0$ .<sup>8</sup> Since the history of  $p'$  is never empty (it will contain, at least, one element:  $\text{check}(\tau, \perp)$ ), the controlled backward semantics will first apply rule *Spawn2* to propagate the rollback to  $p'$ . Then, the controlled backward semantics will reduce  $p'$  until its history is empty and rule *Spawn1* removes it. We have a similar behavior in the rollback recovery semantics by either applying rule *Rollback* or *Roll1* first, so that the rollback is propagated to process  $p'$ , and eventually applying rule *Resume2* (which removes process  $p'$ ) and rule *Undo-dep1* (which removes the process dependency from the set  $P$ ). Hence, the claim follows by applying the inductive hypothesis to the rollback derivation for  $p'$  since the depth of its derivation is strictly smaller.
- $a_i = \text{send}(s', p', \ell)$ . Here, we distinguish two cases. If this is not the *oldest* dependency with process  $p'$  (i.e., there exists  $a_j = \text{spawn}(s'', p')$  or  $a_j = \text{send}(s'', p', \ell')$  for some  $j > i$ ), then it is ignored. This is safe since we know that a rollback to an earlier state will be introduced by the oldest dependency. A similar behavior is obtained in the rollback recovery semantics by applying rule *Roll3*. Otherwise (i.e., it is the oldest dependency with process  $p'$ ), we proceed similarly to the previous case:
  - If the message has not been yet received by process  $p'$ , rule *Send1* removes it from the network and we are done. A similar effect is achieved in the rollback recovery semantics by applying rule *Roll2*, *Resume3*, and *Resume4*.
  - Otherwise, if the message has been received by process  $p'$ , we know that the history of  $p'$  must contain an element of the form  $\text{check}(\tau, s'')$  just before the element  $\text{rec}(s', p, p', \{\ell, v\})$  since  $S_0 \approx S'_0$ . Hence, the controlled backward semantics proceeds by applying rule *Send2*, then reducing  $p'$  up to the removal of the element  $\text{check}(\tau, s'')$  and, then, applying rule *Send1* to remove the message from the network. In the rollback recovery semantics, we achieve a similar result by first applying either rule *Rollback* or *Roll1*, which propagates the rollback to process  $p'$ , and eventually applying rule *Undo-send* to remove the message from the network. As before, the claim then follows by applying the inductive hypothesis to the rollback derivation for  $p'$ .  $\square$

The soundness of the rollback recovery semantics can now be stated as follows. Here, we let  $\rightarrow^+$  denote the reflexive closure of relation  $\rightarrow$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $d$  be a well-defined derivation. Then, every forward step  $S_1 \hookrightarrow S_2$  in  $d$  can be projected to one or zero steps under the standard semantics:  $\text{sta}(S_1) \rightarrow^+ \text{sta}(S_2)$ . Moreover, for every rollback derivation  $S_1 \hookrightarrow^* S_2$  in  $d$  using the rules in Figure 10 with  $S_1 \approx S'_1$ , there exists an equivalent derivation  $\text{rolldel}(S'_1) \rightleftharpoons \text{rolldel}(S'_2)$  under the reversible semantics such that  $S_2 \approx S'_2$ .*

*Proof.* The first claim on the forward steps is a direct consequence of Theorem 1. We note that the Commit rules (Figure 12) are considered *forward* steps too. However, they do not modify the projected system. This is why we consider the reflexive closure in  $\text{sta}(S_1) \rightarrow^+ \text{sta}(S_2)$ , since in this case we have  $\text{sta}(S_1) = \text{sta}(S_2)$ . The second claim about rollback derivations is an easy consequence of Lemma 1 and Theorem 2.  $\square$

<sup>8</sup> Originally, these forced checkpoints are not included in the controlled backward semantics (since they are not needed there). Here, however, we consider that these redundant elements have been added following the structure of  $S_0$ . Note that it does not change the semantics since rule *Check* (Figure 15) will eventually remove them anyway.

## 7 Discussion

Our work shares some similarities with [4], where a new programming model for globally consistent checkpoints is introduced. However, we aim at extending an existing language (like Erlang) rather than defining a new one. There is also a relation with [15], which presents a hybrid model combining message-passing concurrency and software transactional memory. However, the underlying language is different and, moreover, their transactions cannot include process spawning (which is delayed after the transition terminates).

A closely related approach is [14], which introduces a rollback recovery strategy for *session-based programming*, where some primitives for rollback recovery are defined. However, they consider a different setting (a variant of  $\pi$ -calculus) and the number of parties is fixed (no dynamic process spawning); furthermore, nested checkpoints are not allowed. Also, [3] presents a calculus to formally model distributed systems subject to crash failures, where recovery mechanisms can be encoded by a small set of primitives. As in the previous case, a variant of  $\pi$ -calculus is considered. Furthermore, the authors focus on crash recovery without relying on a form of checkpointing, in contrast to our approach.

The closest approach is that of [16], where causal consistent rollback recovery for message-passing concurrent programs is considered. However, there are significant differences with our approach. First, [16] defines a rollback procedure based on a reversible semantics, which means that a process must save the state in *every* step. Moreover, a rollback implies undoing *all* the actions of a process in a stepwise manner (a consequence of the fact that the reversible semantics was originally introduced for reversible debugging in [10]). Furthermore, the operational semantics in [16] is not fully asynchronous. All in all, it represents an interesting theoretical result but cannot be used as a basis for a practical implementation.

In contrast, in this work we have designed a rollback recovery strategy for a message-passing concurrent language that is purely asynchronous and does not need a central coordination. Therefore, it represents a good foundation for the development of a practical implementation of rollback recovery based on a source-to-source program instrumentation. As future work, we plan to develop a proof-of-concept implementation of the proposed scheme and to further study the properties of the rollback recovery semantics (including efficiency issues). In particular, we will experimentally evaluate the behavior of the rollback recovery strategy on larger, more realistic examples.

**Acknowledgements.** The author would like to thank Ivan Lanese and Adrián Palacios for their useful remarks and discussions on a preliminary version of this work. I would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their suggestions to improve this paper.

## References

1. Elnozahy, E.N., Alvisi, L., Wang, Y., Johnson, D.B.: A survey of rollback-recovery protocols in message-passing systems. *ACM Comput. Surv.* **34**(3), 375–408 (2002)
2. URL: <https://www.erlang.org/> (2021)
3. Fabbretti, G., Lanese, I., Stefani, J.B.: A behavioral theory for crash failures and erlang-style recoveries in distributed systems. Tech. Rep. RR-9511, INRIA (2023), <https://hal.science/hal-04123758>
4. Field, J., Varela, C.A.: Transactors: a programming model for maintaining globally consistent distributed state in unreliable environments. In: Palsberg, J., Abadi, M. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL 2005)*. pp. 195–208. ACM (2005)
5. Francalanza, A., Mezzina, C.A., Tuosto, E.: Reversible choreographies via monitoring in erlang. In: Bonomi, S., Rivière, E. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 18th IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference on Distributed Applications and Interoperable Systems (DAIS 2018)*, held as part of DisCoTec 2018. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 10853, pp. 75–92. Springer (2018). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93767-0\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93767-0_6)

6. Hewitt, C., Bishop, P.B., Steiger, R.: A universal modular ACTOR formalism for artificial intelligence. In: Nilsson, N.J. (ed.) *Proceedings of the 3rd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. pp. 235–245. William Kaufmann (1973), <http://ijcai.org/Proceedings/73/Papers/027B.pdf>
7. Honda, K., Yoshida, N., Carbone, M.: Multiparty asynchronous session types. In: Necula, G.C., Wadler, P. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 35th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL 2008)*. pp. 273–284. ACM (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1328438.1328472>
8. Lamport, L.: Time, clocks, and the ordering of events in a distributed system. *Commun. ACM* **21**(7), 558–565 (1978). <https://doi.org/10.1145/359545.359563>
9. Lanese, I., Medic, D.: A general approach to derive uncontrolled reversible semantics. In: Konnov, I., Kovács, L. (eds.) *31st International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2020*. LIPIcs, vol. 171, pp. 33:1–33:24. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2020). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2020.33>
10. Lanese, I., Nishida, N., Palacios, A., Vidal, G.: A theory of reversibility for Erlang. *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming* **100**, 71–97 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlamp.2018.06.004>
11. Lanese, I., Palacios, A., Vidal, G.: Causal-consistent replay debugging for message passing programs. In: Pérez, J.A., Yoshida, N. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 39th IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference on Formal Techniques for Distributed Objects, Components, and Systems (FORTE 2019)*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 11535, pp. 167–184. Springer (2019). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-21759-4\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-21759-4_10)
12. Lanese, I., Palacios, A., Vidal, G.: Causal-consistent replay reversible semantics for message passing concurrent programs. *Fundam. Informaticae* **178**(3), 229–266 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3233/FI-2021-2005>
13. Lanese, I., Sangiorgi, D., Zavattaro, G.: Playing with bisimulation in Erlang. In: Boreale, M., Corradini, F., Loreti, M., Pugliese, R. (eds.) *Models, Languages, and Tools for Concurrent and Distributed Programming – Essays Dedicated to Rocco De Nicola on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 11665, pp. 71–91. Springer (2019). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-21485-2\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-21485-2_6)
14. Mezzina, C.A., Tiezzi, F., Yoshida, N.: Rollback recovery in session-based programming. In: Jongmans, S., Lopes, A. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 25th IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference on Coordination Models and Languages, COORDINATION 2023*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 13908, pp. 195–213. Springer (2023). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-35361-1\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-35361-1_11)
15. Swalens, J., Koster, J.D., Meuter, W.D.: Transactional actors: communication in transactions. In: Jannesari, A., de Oliveira Castro, P., Sato, Y., Mattson, T. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 4th ACM SIGPLAN International Workshop on Software Engineering for Parallel Systems, SEPSSPLASH 2017*. pp. 31–41. ACM (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3141865.3141866>
16. Vidal, G.: From reversible computation to checkpoint-based rollback recovery for message-passing concurrent programs. In: Cámara, J., Jongmans, S.S. (eds.) *Formal Aspects of Component Software - 19th International Conference, FACS 2023, Virtual Event, October 19-20, 2023, Proceedings*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer (2023), to appear (see <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.04873>)