

Standard axioms for  $|$  and **nil**:

$$P|\mathbf{nil} \equiv P \quad (P|Q)|R \equiv P|(Q|R) \quad P|Q \equiv Q|P \text{ if } P : 0$$

Standard scope axioms:

$$\begin{aligned} (\nu x)(P|Q) &\equiv (\nu x)P|Q && \text{if } x \notin fn(Q) && (\nu x)(\nu y)P &\equiv (\nu y)(\nu x)P \\ (\nu x)(P|Q) &\equiv P|(\nu x)Q && \text{if } x \notin fn(P) \end{aligned}$$

Fusion axioms:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x=x \rangle &\equiv \mathbf{nil} && \langle x=y \rangle | x.P &\equiv \langle x=y \rangle | y.P && \langle x=y \rangle | \langle x \rangle &\equiv \langle x=y \rangle | \langle y \rangle \\ (\nu x)\langle x=y \rangle &\equiv \mathbf{nil} && \langle x=y \rangle | \bar{x}.P &\equiv \langle x=y \rangle | \bar{y}.P && \langle x=y \rangle | z.P &\equiv \langle x=y \rangle | z.(\langle x=y \rangle | P) \\ \langle x=y \rangle &\equiv \langle y=x \rangle && \langle x=y \rangle | \langle x=z \rangle &\equiv \langle x=y \rangle | \langle y=z \rangle && \langle x=y \rangle | \bar{z}.P &\equiv \langle x=y \rangle | \bar{z}.(\langle x=y \rangle | P) \end{aligned}$$

The structural congruence between  $\pi_F$ -process, written  $\equiv$ , is the smallest equivalence relation satisfying these axioms and closed with respect to contexts

Can factor out datums and fusions to get *standard form*

$$\langle \vec{u}=\vec{v} \rangle \mid (\nu \vec{x})(\langle \vec{y} \rangle \mid P),$$

where  $\vec{x}$ s distinct and contained in the  $\vec{y}$ s,  $P$  contains no datums or fusions in its top level.

*Interface*  $\langle \vec{u}=\vec{v} \rangle \mid (\nu \vec{x})(\langle \vec{y} \rangle \mid \_)$  is unique: given

$$\langle \vec{u}_1=\vec{v}_1 \rangle \mid (\nu \vec{x}_1)(\langle \vec{y}_1 \rangle \mid P_1) \equiv \langle \vec{u}_2=\vec{v}_2 \rangle \mid (\nu \vec{x}_2)(\langle \vec{y}_2 \rangle \mid P_2),$$

the fusions  $\langle \vec{u}_1=\vec{v}_1 \rangle$  and  $\langle \vec{u}_2=\vec{v}_2 \rangle$  denote same equivalence relation  $|\vec{x}_1| = |\vec{x}_2|$ , and the datums  $\vec{y}_1, \vec{y}_2$  are identical and the processes  $P_1, P_2$  structurally congruent up to the name-equivalence and  $\alpha$ -conversion of the  $\vec{x}$ s.

*Connection* operator  $\textcircled{C}$  connects interfaces. If  $P$  and  $Q$  have standard forms  $\langle \vec{u}_1 = \vec{v}_1 \rangle | (\nu \vec{x}_1) (\langle \vec{y}_1 \rangle | P_1)$  and  $\langle \vec{u}_2 = \vec{v}_2 \rangle | (\nu \vec{x}_2) (\langle \vec{y}_2 \rangle | P_2)$  respectively, then

$$P \textcircled{C} Q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \vec{u}_1 \vec{u}_2 = \vec{v}_1 \vec{v}_2 \rangle | (\nu \vec{x}_1 \vec{x}_2) (\langle \vec{y}_1 = \vec{y}_2 \rangle | P_1 | P_2),$$

Fusion calculus processes:

$$P ::= \mathbf{nil} \mid P|P \mid (\nu x)P \mid z\vec{x}.P \mid \bar{z}\vec{x}.P.$$

Fusion calculus reaction relation

$$(\nu \vec{u})(z\vec{x}.P \mid \bar{z}\vec{y}.Q \mid R) \searrow P\sigma \mid Q\sigma \mid R\sigma,$$

where  $\text{ran}(\sigma), \text{dom}(\sigma) \subseteq \{\vec{x}, \vec{y}\}$  and  $\vec{u} = \text{dom}(\sigma) \setminus \text{ran}(\sigma)$  and  $\sigma(v) = \sigma(w)$  if and only if  $(v, w) \in E(\langle \vec{x} = \vec{y} \rangle)$ .

To explain side-condition: Consider the equivalence relation generated from the equalities  $\vec{x} = \vec{y}$ . The side-conditions ensure that, for each equivalence class, every element is mapped by  $\sigma$  to a single free witness.

Or, equivalently, “there may be no free fusions left”

$$\begin{array}{c}
x.P \xrightarrow{x} P \quad \bar{x}.P \xrightarrow{\bar{x}} P \\
x.P \mid \bar{y}.Q \xrightarrow{?x=y} P \circledast Q \quad x.P \mid \bar{x}.Q \xrightarrow{\tau} P \circledast Q \\
\frac{P \xrightarrow{\alpha} P'}{P \mid Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} P' \mid Q} \quad \frac{P \xrightarrow{\alpha} P'}{Q \mid P \xrightarrow{\alpha} Q \mid P'} \quad \frac{P \xrightarrow{\alpha} P', \quad x \notin \alpha}{(\nu x)P \xrightarrow{\alpha} (\nu x)Q} \quad \frac{P' \equiv P \xrightarrow{\alpha} Q \equiv Q'}{P' \xrightarrow{\alpha} Q'}
\end{array}$$

*Quotiented* labelled transition system. We do not distinguish between  $?x=y$  and  $?y=x$ . The final rule closes the LTS with respect to the structural congruence.

Fusion bisimulation. A symmetric relation  $\mathcal{S}$  is a *fusion bisimulation* iff whenever  $P\mathcal{S}Q$  then

1.  $P, Q : m > 0$  implies  $P$  and  $Q$  have standard forms  $\langle \vec{u}=\vec{v} \rangle | (\nu \vec{x}) (\langle \vec{y} \rangle | P_1)$  and  $\langle \vec{u}=\vec{v} \rangle | (\nu \vec{x}) (\langle \vec{y} \rangle | Q_1)$  respectively and  $\langle \vec{u}=\vec{v} \rangle | P_1 \mathcal{S} \langle \vec{u}=\vec{v} \rangle | Q_1$ ;
2.  $P, Q : 0$  implies they have standard forms  $\langle \vec{u}=\vec{v} \rangle | P_1$  and  $\langle \vec{u}=\vec{v} \rangle | Q_1$ , and
  - (a) if  $P \xrightarrow{\alpha} P'$  where  $\alpha$  is  $x, \bar{x}$  or  $\tau$ , then  $Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} Q'$  and  $P'\mathcal{S}Q'$
  - (b) if  $P \xrightarrow{?x=y} P'$  then either  $Q \xrightarrow{?x=y} Q'$  or  $Q \xrightarrow{\tau} Q'$ , and  $\langle x=y \rangle | P'\mathcal{S} \langle x=y \rangle | Q'$ ;
3. similarly for  $Q$ .

$$\begin{array}{c}
x.P \xrightarrow{x}_s P \qquad \bar{x}.P \xrightarrow{\bar{x}}_s P \qquad \frac{P \xrightarrow{\alpha_1}_s Q \quad \alpha_1 =_{E(P)} \alpha_2}{P \xrightarrow{\alpha_2}_s Q} * \\
\\
\frac{P \xrightarrow{x}_s P' \quad Q \xrightarrow{\bar{y}}_s Q'}{P|Q \xrightarrow{?x=y}_s P'@Q'} \quad \frac{P \xrightarrow{\bar{x}}_s P' \quad Q \xrightarrow{y}_s Q'}{P|Q \xrightarrow{?x=y}_s P'@Q'} \quad \frac{P \xrightarrow{?x=x}_s Q}{P \xrightarrow{\tau}_s Q} \\
\\
\frac{P \xrightarrow{\alpha}_s P'}{P|Q \xrightarrow{\alpha}_s P'|Q} \quad \frac{P \xrightarrow{\alpha}_s P'}{Q|P \xrightarrow{\alpha}_s Q|P'} \quad \frac{P \xrightarrow{\alpha}_s Q, \quad x \notin \alpha}{(\nu x)P \xrightarrow{\alpha}_s (\nu x)Q}
\end{array}$$

\* We write  $\alpha =_{E(P)} \beta$  if  $\alpha, \beta$  are identical up to  $E(P)$

*Structured* labelled transition system. This LTS does not include a rule involving the structural congruence. We write  $E(P)$  for the equivalence relation on names generated by  $P$ . A simple characterisation is given by  $(x, y) \in E(P)$  if and only if  $P \equiv P|\langle x=y \rangle$ .

Comparison of labelled transitions: fusion calculus,  $\pi_F$ -calculus.

(fusion calculus)	( $\pi_F$ -calculus)
$\bar{u}x.P \xrightarrow{fu} P$	$\bar{u}.\langle x \rangle   P^* \xrightarrow{\pi_F} \langle x \rangle   P^*$
$(\nu x)\bar{u}x.P \xrightarrow{fu} P$	$(\nu x)\bar{u}.\langle x \rangle   P^* \xrightarrow{\pi_F} (\nu x)\langle x \rangle   P^*$
$\bar{u}x.P \mid uy.Q \xrightarrow{fu} P \mid Q$	$\bar{u}.\langle x \rangle   P^* \mid u.\langle y \rangle   Q^* \xrightarrow{\tau} \langle x=y \rangle   P^* \mid Q^*$

The fusion label  $x=y$  states that a fusion has occurred as a consequence of a reaction. Not the same as the label  $?x=y$  in the  $\pi_F$ -calculus, which states that an external fusion must be present for reaction to occur.

The additional information conveyed by a fusion calculus label, is conveyed in the  $\pi_F$ -calculus by the interface of the resulting process.



[ACCL91] *Explicit Substitutions*. Abadi, Cardelli, Curien, Lévy.

[MPW89] *A calculus of mobile processes*. Milner, Parrow, Walker.

[GW00] *Explicit fusions*. Gardner, Wischik.

[VP98] *The fusion calculus: expressiveness and symmetry in mobile processes. The tau-laws of fusion*. Victor, Parrow.

[FU97] *The chi-calculus*. Fu.

[Sang96] *Pi calculus, internal mobility, and agent-passing calculi*. Sangiorgi.

[Mil99] *Communicating and mobile systems: the pi calculus*. Milner.

[GW] *Symmetric action calculi*. Gardner, Wischik.

[G00] *Fusion Systems*. Gardner.

[HY95] *On reduction-based process semantics*. Honda, Yoshida.

[H] *Elementary structures in process theory (1) Sets with renaming*. Honda.

[Y94] *Graph notation for concurrent combinators*. Yoshida.

[GM96] *The Tile Model. Term graph rewriting and the pi calculus*. Gadducci, Montanari.