

HEREDITARY HISTORY-PRESERVING BISIMILARITY: CHARACTERIZATIONS VIA BACKWARD READY MULTISETS

MARCO BERNARDO , ANDREA ESPOSITO , AND CLAUDIO A. MEZZINA 

Dipartimento di Scienze Pure e Applicate, Università di Urbino, Italy

e-mail address: marco.bernardo@uniurb.it, andrea.esposito@uniurb.it, claudio.mezzina@uniurb.it

ABSTRACT. We devise two complementary characterizations of hereditary history-preserving bisimilarity (HHPB): a denotational one, based on stable configuration structures, and an operational one, formulated in a reversible process calculus. Our characterizations rely on forward-reverse bisimilarity augmented with backward ready multiset equality. This shifts the emphasis from uniquely identifying events, as done in previous characterizations, to counting occurrences of identically labeled events associated with incoming transitions, which yields a more lightweight behavioral equivalence than HHPB. We show that our characterizations correctly distinguish between autoconcurrency and autocausation, but are valid only in the absence of non-local conflicts. We then study the logical foundations of these characterizations by relating event identifier logic, which captures the classical view of HHPB, and backward ready multiset logic, developed for our new equivalence.

1. INTRODUCTION

Understanding and comparing the behavior of concurrent systems is a central problem in semantics and verification. Since such systems may exhibit nondeterminism, causality, and concurrency in complex ways, it is not enough to describe what actions they can perform: one must also capture how these actions relate – whether they are causally dependent, mutually exclusive, or truly concurrent. To reason about concurrent systems, bisimulation has emerged as the canonical tool. Bisimilar systems cannot be distinguished by any experiment that proceeds step by step: whatever one system can do, the other can match, with the resulting states remaining equivalent. This makes bisimulation a cornerstone of process equivalence, compositional reasoning, and congruence-based program verification. However, classical bisimulation – such as strong bisimilarity [Par81, Mil89] – is based on interleaving semantics: concurrency is represented as nondeterministic interleaving of actions [HM85] over labeled transition systems [Kel76]. While sufficient for analyzing communication protocols or sequential behaviors, interleaving semantics combines independence with nondeterminism and cannot distinguish between fundamentally different concurrent structures. For instance, a process that performs two independent actions concurrently and a process that performs the same actions sequentially in either order become indistinguishable. Such a loss of information affects verification tasks, refinement reasoning, and expressiveness results.

Key words and phrases: Bisimilarity, True Concurrency, Reversibility, Modal Logic.

This limitation has motivated the development of true concurrency models – such as Petri nets [Pet62], event structures [Win86], and reversible variants of process calculi [DK04, PU07a] – where causality, conflict, and concurrency are modeled explicitly. Within these models, bisimulation must be refined to account for the richer structure: it is required to match not only the performed actions, but also the causal histories leading to those actions. This generates finer equivalences constituting the spectrum of truly concurrent bisimilarities [GG01, Fec04, PU12], which includes history-preserving bisimilarity (HPB) [RT88] and hereditary history-preserving bisimilarity (HHPB) [Bed91]. They are particularly important because they turn out to be the coarsest and the finest equivalences, respectively, that are preserved under action refinement and are capable of respecting causality, branching, and their interplay while abstracting from choices between identical alternatives [GG01]; moreover, HHPB can be obtained as a special case of a categorical definition of bisimilarity over concurrency models [JNW96]. These equivalences ensure that two systems behave the same not only in terms of which actions they can perform, but also in terms of how these actions arise from concurrent or dependent pasts. They are crucial in applications where dependency information matters like, e.g., reversible computing, distributed memory models, causality-aware verification, and concurrency theory at large.

HPB and HHPB are defined over event structures [Win86] or their variants akin to labeled transition systems, which are called configuration structures [GP09]. A configuration is a finite set of non-conflicting events, which contains all the events causing the ones in the configuration itself. The bisimulation game compares transitions between configurations. While HPB considers only outgoing transitions, HHPB takes into account also incoming transitions. In other words, the former stepwise matches only forward computations, whereas the latter examines backward computations too. Both equivalences rely on ternary bisimulation relations, where the third component is a labeling- and causality-preserving bijection between the sets of events executed so far in the two structures, with the bijection being built incrementally during the bisimulation game. This makes HPB and HHPB hard to reason about and mechanize.

Logical characterizations of both equivalences have been provided in [PU14, BC14]. Furthermore, an axiomatization for HHPB has been developed over forward-only processes in [FL05]. Finally, HPB is known to coincide with causal bisimilarity [DD89, DD90], hence the latter offers a characterization, as well as an axiomatization via [DP92], for the former. In this paper, we concentrate on characterizing HHPB.

The first alternative characterization of HHPB appeared in [Bed91] for configuration graphs of prime event structures. The characterizing equivalence is called back-and-forth bisimilarity – not to be confused with the homonymous one in [DMV90], which retrieves an interleaving semantics by constraining backward computations to take place along the corresponding forward computations even in the presence of concurrency. The main difference between HHPB and back-and-forth bisimilarity is that the latter relies on binary bisimulation relations, hence no labeling- and causality-preserving bijection is stepwise built during the bisimulation game. The characterization result holds under the assumption of no autoconcurrency, i.e., the absence of configurations from which it is possible to execute two identically labeled, distinct events that are not in conflict with each other.

In Figures 1(a) and (b) we show the configuration graphs respectively associated with the following two processes for a given action a :




Figure 1: Configuration graphs: autoconcurrency (a), autocausation (b), and autoconflict

- Autoconcurrency on a , which is expressed as $a \parallel a$ where \parallel stands for parallel composition. There are two equally labeled, non-conflicting events, denoted by $\parallel a$ and $\parallel a$, that can be executed in any order.
- Autocausation on a , which is expressed as $a . a$ where dot represents action prefix. There are two equally labeled, non-conflicting events, denoted by a and $.a$, such that the former has to be executed before the latter.

These two configuration graphs are back-and-forth bisimilar as witnessed by the symmetric binary relation that contains the pairs of configurations (\emptyset, \emptyset) , $(\{\parallel a\}, \{a\})$, $(\{\parallel a\}, \{a\})$, and $(\{\parallel a, \parallel a\}, \{a, .a\})$. However, they are not hereditary history-preserving bisimilar because, with respect to the last pair, there is no (labeling- and) causality-preserving bijection that maps the two independent events $\parallel a$ and $\parallel a$ to the two causally-related events a and $.a$.

The second alternative characterization of HHPB was given in [PU07b]. The characterizing equivalence is the forward-reverse bisimilarity – very close in spirit to the back-and-forth bisimilarity of [Bed91] – originally defined in [PU07a] for a reversible variant of CCS [Mil89] called CCSK. The operational semantics of CCSK produces labeled transition systems based on a forward transition relation and a backward one ensuring the loop property [DK04]. Each transition label comprises an action and a communication key; the latter is necessary when building backward transitions so as to know who synchronized with whom in the forward direction. In [PU07b] forward-reverse bisimilarity was generalized to configuration graphs of prime event structures and shown to coincide with HHPB in the absence of repeated, identically labeled events along forward computations, which implies the absence of autoconcurrency (and autocausation), i.e., the assumption made in [Bed91].

In [PU12] it was shown, by working on stable configuration structures, how to relax the conditions under which the two characterization results of [Bed91] and [PU07b] hold. Specifically, it is sufficient to require the absence of equidepth autoconcurrency, i.e., the absence of identically labeled events occurring at the same depth within a configuration; the depth of an event is defined as the length of the longest causal chain of events up to and including the considered event.

The third alternative characterization of HHPB was provided in [AC20] and, unlike the previous two, does not need any restrictive assumption. Based on earlier work [AC17] – in which HHPB was shown to coincide with back-and-forth barbed bisimulation congruence over singly-labeled processes, i.e., processes with no autoconcurrency and autoconflict (see Figure 1(c)) – it refers to the setting of a different reversible variant of CCS called RCCS [DK04, DK05, Kri12]. While in CCSK all executed actions and discarded alternative subprocesses are kept within the syntax of processes so as to enable reversibility, in RCCS the same information is stored into stack-based memories attached to processes; the two approaches have been proven to be equivalent in [LMM21]. The idea in [AC20] is to import HHPB in the RCCS setting by encoding memories, i.e., the past behavior, as identified

configuration structures. These are stable configuration structures enriched with unique event identifiers, used in transition labels and exploited when undoing synchronizations. The characterizing equivalence, called back-and-forth bisimilarity and defined over RCCS processes, relies on ternary bisimulation relations in which the third component is a bijection between the sets of identifiers of the actions executed so far in the two processes.

Having to reintroduce a third component in the bisimulation relations in order to characterize HHPB exactly, i.e., also in the presence of equidepth autoconcurrency, amounts to certifying that “reversibility is not just back and forth” [AC20], i.e., the forward and backward bisimulation games alone are not enough. The question then becomes whether and to what extent a systematic event identification is really necessary to reach HHPB.

This question also arises from the fact that, in the aforementioned bisimulation games, CCSK transition labels such as $a[i]$ and $a[j]$ are deemed to be different if the two keys i and j are different [PU07a] – which results in the absence of repeated, identically labeled events along forward computations [PU07b] – while identified RCCS transition labels like $i:a$ and $j:a$ are viewed as compatible even if i and j are different [AC20]. On the one hand, in CCSK the two processes $a \parallel a$ and $a.a$ are told apart by forward-reverse bisimilarity because the former evolves to $a[i] \parallel a[j]$, which can undo $a[i]$ and $a[j]$ in any order, while the latter evolves to $a[i].a[j]$, from which only $a[j]$ can be undone, hence undoing $a[i]$ cannot be matched by undoing $a[j]$. On the other hand, in identified RCCS the same two processes are distinguished by back-and-forth bisimilarity because, although undoing $i:a$ can be matched by undoing $j:a$, it is not possible to establish a suitable bijection from a distributed memory containing $i:a$ in a location and $j:a$ in another location to a centralized memory containing $j:a$ on top of $i:a$.

In this paper we pursue an approach different from event identification. We observe that, in many distinguishing examples, what matters is not the identity of individual events, but the number of incoming transitions labeled with a given action from a configuration. This suggests that instead of uniquely identifying events, it may suffice to count them. Building on this idea, we introduce backward ready multisets, a multiset-based abstraction of the past behavior of configurations; they are extensions of the backward ready sets exploited in [BEM24] to axiomatize forward-reverse bisimilarity over reversible concurrent processes. These multisets record, for each label, how many distinct ways an action can be undone, thus capturing essential concurrency information without relying on global event identifiers nor labeling- and causality-preserving bijections.

Let us consider again Figures 1(a) and (b). If we look at the two top (resp. bottom) configurations, we note that the one on the left has two outgoing (resp. incoming) transitions, while the one on the right has only one. As for the top configuration on the left, in principle we may not know whether the branch is due to the fact that the two events are concurrent or conflicting. However, for the bottom configuration on the left we can certainly say that the two events are concurrent, as the models we are considering are truly concurrent and hence the configuration graph of process $a.a + a.a$ where $+$ stands for nondeterministic choice (see Figure 1(d)) cannot be isomorphic to the one of $a \parallel a$ because it must have two different bottom configurations ($\{+a, +a\}$ and $\{+a, +.a\}$) instead of a single one.

This paper, which is a rectified and extended version of [BEM25], is organized as follows. After recalling in Section 2 the definitions of stable configuration structure [GP09], HHPB [Bed91], and event identifier logic [PU14], we provide the following contributions:

- In Section 3 we exhibit a denotational characterization on stable configuration structures. HHPB turns out to coincide with forward-reverse bisimilarity extended with a clause for

checking the equality of the backward ready multisets of matching configurations. The result holds in the absence of non-local conflicts, i.e., under the assumption that, for each maximal set of conflicting events (i.e., events not occurring together in any configuration), all the events in the set are caused by the same event.

- In Section 4 we exhibit an operational characterization based on a variant of the reversible process calculus of [BR23, BEM24] where executed action identification is limited to synchronizations. After revising its proved operational semantics inspired by [DP92] so as to faithfully account for causality and concurrency, we set up a backward-ready-multiset variant of forward-reverse bisimilarity and devise a backward ready multiset logic characterizing it. Then we define a denotational semantics based on stable configuration structures in which events are formalized as proof terms [BC88, BC94], so as to import the notion of HHPB. We show that, in the absence of non-local conflicts, the stable configuration structures associated with two processes are hereditary history-preserving bisimilar iff the two processes are equated by the backward-ready-multiset variant of forward-reverse bisimilarity.
- In Section 5 we address the investigation of the relationships between the event identifier logic of [PU14] and our backward ready multiset logic.

Section 6 concludes the paper with directions for future work.

2. HEREDITARY HISTORY-PRESERVING BISIMILARITY

In this section we recall hereditary history-preserving bisimilarity [Bed91] over stable configuration structures [GP09] (Section 2.1) along with its logical characterization based on event identifier logic [PU14] (Section 2.2).

2.1. HHPB over Stable Configuration Structures. Configuration structures [GP09] are variants of event structures [Win86] representing their underlying labeled transition system view. A state, called configuration, is the set of non-conflicting events occurred so far. Given two arbitrary events in a configuration, they are either causally related or independent of each other. Every configuration is finite and left-closed with respect to causality, i.e., it contains all the events causing the ones in the configuration itself.

In the following definitions taken from [GG01], we assume a countable set \mathcal{A} of action labels. Furthermore, we denote by $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathcal{E})$ the set of finite subsets of set \mathcal{E} , while $f \upharpoonright X$ denotes the restriction of function f to set X .

Definition 2.1. A *configuration structure* is a triple $C = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{C}, \ell)$ where:

- \mathcal{E} is a set of *events*.
- $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathcal{E})$ is a set of *configurations*.
- $\ell : \bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{C}} X \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a *labeling function*. ■

As shown in [GG01], while the configurations of a prime event structure [Win86] form a configuration structure, the configurations of a stable event structure [Win86] form a stable configuration structure in the following sense.

Definition 2.2. A configuration structure $C = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{C}, \ell)$ is said to be *stable* iff it is:

- Rooted: $\emptyset \in \mathcal{C}$.
- Connected: $\forall X \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\emptyset\}. \exists e \in X. X \setminus \{e\} \in \mathcal{C}$.

- Closed under bounded unions and intersections: $\forall X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{C}. X \cup Y \subseteq Z \implies X \cup Y, X \cap Y \in \mathcal{C}$. ■

The notions of causality and concurrency for events can be defined locally to configurations, while the notion of conflict has to be defined globally.

Definition 2.3. Let $C = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{C}, \ell)$ be a stable configuration structure and $X \in \mathcal{C}$ be one of its configurations:

- The *causality relation* over $X \in \mathcal{C}$ is defined by letting $e_1 \leq_X e_2$ for two events $e_1, e_2 \in X$ iff $e_2 \in Y$ implies $e_1 \in Y$ for all $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $Y \subseteq X$. We write $e_1 <_X e_2$ when $e_1 \leq_X e_2$ and $e_1 \neq e_2$.
- Two distinct events $e_1, e_2 \in X$ are *concurrent* in X , written $e_1 \text{ co}_X e_2$, iff $e_1 \not\leq_X e_2$ and $e_2 \not\leq_X e_1$.
- Two distinct events $e_1, e_2 \in \mathcal{E}$ are *conflicting*, written $e_1 \# e_2$, iff there is no $Z \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $e_1, e_2 \in Z$. ■

A notion of transition between configurations can be naturally introduced.

Definition 2.4. Let $C = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{C}, \ell)$ be a stable configuration structure, $a \in \mathcal{A}$, and $X, X' \in \mathcal{C}$. We say that there is an a -labeled *transition* from X to X' , written $X \xrightarrow{a}_C X'$, iff $X \subseteq X'$, $X' \setminus X = \{e\}$, and $\ell(e) = a$. ■

HHPB [Bed91] performs the bisimulation game both in the forward direction and in the backward one. Since there is a single transition relation, in the bisimulation game a distinction is made between the outgoing transitions of two matching configurations X_1 and X_2 (i.e., $X_1 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_1} X'_1$ and $X_2 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_2} X'_2$ in the forward direction) and their incoming transitions (i.e., $X'_1 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_1} X_1$ and $X'_2 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_2} X_2$ in the backward direction).

Definition 2.5. We say that two stable configuration structures $C_i = (\mathcal{E}_i, \mathcal{C}_i, \ell_i)$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, are *hereditary history-preserving bisimilar*, written $C_1 \sim_{\text{HHPB}} C_2$, iff there exists a hereditary history-preserving bisimulation between C_1 and C_2 , i.e., a relation $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_1 \times \mathcal{C}_2 \times \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}_1 \times \mathcal{E}_2)$ such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in \mathcal{B}$ and, whenever $(X_1, X_2, f) \in \mathcal{B}$, then:

- f is a bijection from X_1 to X_2 that preserves:
 - Labeling: $\ell_1(e) = \ell_2(f(e))$ for all $e \in X_1$.
 - Causality: $e \leq_{X_1} e' \iff f(e) \leq_{X_2} f(e')$ for all $e, e' \in X_1$.
- For each $X_1 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_1} X'_1$ there exist $X_2 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_2} X'_2$ and $f' \subseteq \mathcal{E}_1 \times \mathcal{E}_2$ such that $(X'_1, X'_2, f') \in \mathcal{B}$ and $f' \upharpoonright X_1 = f$, and vice versa.
- For each $X'_1 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_1} X_1$ there exist $X'_2 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_2} X_2$ and $f' \subseteq \mathcal{E}_1 \times \mathcal{E}_2$ such that $(X'_1, X'_2, f') \in \mathcal{B}$ and $f \upharpoonright X'_1 = f'$, and vice versa. ■

2.2. Event Identifier Logic. HHPB is characterized by *event identifier logic* [PU14]. The set \mathcal{L}_{EI} of its formulas is generated by the following syntax:

$$\phi ::= \text{true} \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi \wedge \phi \mid \langle x : a \rangle \phi \mid (x : a)\phi \mid \langle\langle x \rangle\rangle \phi$$

where $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $x \in \mathcal{I}$, with \mathcal{I} being a countable set of identifiers. The unary operators $\langle x : a \rangle$ and $(x : a)$ act as binders for the identifiers inside them. Therefore, the set of identifiers that occur *free* in $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}$ is defined by induction on the syntactical structure of ϕ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
fi(\text{true}) &= \emptyset \\
fi(\neg\phi) &= fi(\phi) \\
fi(\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2) &= fi(\phi_1) \cup fi(\phi_2) \\
fi(\langle x : a \rangle \phi) &= fi(\phi) \setminus \{x\} \\
fi((x : a)\phi) &= fi(\phi) \setminus \{x\} \\
fi(\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle \phi) &= fi(\phi) \cup \{x\}
\end{aligned}$$

where we say that ϕ is *closed* if $fi(\phi) = \emptyset$, *open* otherwise.

In order to assign meaning to open formulas, environments are employed to indicate what events the free identifiers are bound to. Given a configuration structure $C = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{C}, \ell)$, an *environment* is a partial function $\rho : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$. Given $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}$, we say that ρ is a *permissible* environment for X and ϕ iff ρ maps every free identifier in ϕ to an event in X . Denoting with $\text{dom}(\rho)$ the domain of ρ , $\text{rge}(\rho)$ the codomain of ρ , and ρ_ϕ the restriction $\rho \upharpoonright fi(\phi)$, permissibility is formalized as $fi(\phi) \subseteq \text{dom}(\rho) \wedge \text{rge}(\rho_\phi) \subseteq X$. The set of permissible environments for X and ϕ is indicated by $pe(X, \phi)$.

The satisfaction relation $\models \subseteq (\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{I}}) \times \mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}$, with $\mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{I}}$ being the set of functions from \mathcal{I} to \mathcal{E} , i.e., the set of environments, is defined by induction on the syntactical structure of $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
X &\models_\rho \text{true} \\
X &\models_\rho \neg\phi' && \text{iff } X \not\models_\rho \phi' \\
X &\models_\rho \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 && \text{iff } X \models_\rho \phi_1 \text{ and } X \models_\rho \phi_2 \\
X &\models_\rho \langle x : a \rangle \phi' && \text{iff there exists } X \xrightarrow{\ell(e)}_C X' \text{ such that } \ell(e) = a \text{ and } X' \models_{\rho[x \mapsto e]} \phi' \\
X &\models_\rho (x : a)\phi' && \text{iff there exists } e \in X \text{ such that } \ell(e) = a \text{ and } X \models_{\rho[x \mapsto e]} \phi' \\
X &\models_\rho \langle\langle x \rangle\rangle \phi' && \text{iff there exists } X' \xrightarrow{\ell(e)}_C X \text{ such that } \rho(x) = e \text{ and } X' \models_\rho \phi'
\end{aligned}$$

where it is understood that the environment in the subscript of every occurrence of \models is permissible for the configuration on the left and the formula on the right. Moreover, $\rho[x \mapsto e]$ is equal to $\rho \setminus \{(x, \rho(x))\} \cup \{(x, e)\}$ if $x \in \text{dom}(\rho)$, $\rho \cup \{(x, e)\}$ otherwise.

Let $\mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}^c$ be the set of closed formulas of \mathcal{L}_{EI} . Given $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}^c$, we write $X \models \phi$ as a shorthand for $X \models_\emptyset \phi$ and $C \models \phi$ as a shorthand for $\emptyset \models \phi$. Image finiteness means that no configuration has infinitely many outgoing transitions with the same label.

Theorem 2.6 ([PU14]). *Let $C_i = (\mathcal{E}_i, \mathcal{C}_i, \ell_i)$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, be two image-finite stable configuration structures. Then $C_1 \sim_{\text{HHPB}} C_2$ iff $\forall \phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}^c. C_1 \models \phi \iff C_2 \models \phi$.* ■

3. CHARACTERIZATION ON STABLE CONFIGURATION STRUCTURES

The first characterization that we provide for \sim_{HHPB} is on stable configuration structures. From a ternary bisimulation relation we move to a binary one where, instead of stepwise building a labeling- and causality-preserving bijection between the events of matching configurations – which are the events executed so far in both stable configuration structures – we just count the identically labeled incoming transitions of matching configurations. Given a configuration X , its *backward ready multiset* is defined as $\text{brm}(X) = \{ \{ a \in \mathcal{A} \mid X' \xrightarrow{a}_C X \} \}$ where $\{ \}$ and $\}$ are multiset delimiters. We thus decorate the resulting forward-reverse bisimilarity with the acronym brm, standing for backward ready multiset.




Figure 2: E and F are equated by $\sim_{\text{FRB:brm}}$ but not by \sim_{HHPB} due to non-local conflicts

Definition 3.1. We say that two stable configuration structures $C_i = (\mathcal{E}_i, \mathcal{C}_i, \ell_i)$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, are *brm-forward-reverse bisimilar*, written $C_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} C_2$, iff there exists a brm-forward-reverse bisimulation between C_1 and C_2 , i.e., a relation $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_1 \times \mathcal{C}_2$ such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in \mathcal{B}$ and, whenever $(X_1, X_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, then:

- For each $X_1 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_1} X'_1$ there exists $X_2 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_2} X'_2$ such that $(X'_1, X'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, and vice versa.
- For each $X'_1 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_1} X_1$ there exists $X'_2 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_2} X_2$ such that $(X'_1, X'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, and vice versa.
- $\text{brm}(X_1) = \text{brm}(X_2)$. ■

We emphasize that $\sim_{\text{FRB:brm}}$ distinguishes between autoconcurrency and autocaustion like \sim_{HHPB} . For example, the two configuration structures in Figure 1(a) and (b) are told apart by $\sim_{\text{FRB:brm}}$ because the backward ready multiset of the bottom configuration of the former is $\{ \downarrow a, a \}$ while the one of the bottom configuration of the latter is $\{ \downarrow a \}$. This makes the binary-relation-based $\sim_{\text{FRB:brm}}$ a good candidate to characterize the ternary-relation-based \sim_{HHPB} without the limitations of previous results [Bed91, PU07b, PU12]. However, not even our characterization result – originally stated in [BEM25] without any limitation – holds in general, because a limitation different from the absence of equidepth autoconcurrency comes into play.

As pointed out by I. Ulidowski, I. Phillips, and C. Aubert in a personal communication to the authors, the two configuration structures E and F in Figure 2, which are taken from [PU12, Example 4.7], constitute a counterexample. In the figure, configurations are represented by numbers, the subscripts associated with identical actions identify the events originating actions, and parallel transitions are labeled with the same action with subscript. It turns out that $E \not\sim_{\text{HHPB}} F$ because, starting the bisimulation game from the two initial configurations 1_E and 1_F , we have that:

- If 1_F performs a_3 thus evolving to 4_F , then 1_E can respond by performing a_3 (or equivalently a_1) thus evolving to 4_E (or equivalently 2_E). The initial bijection is $\{(a_3, a_3)\}$.
- If 4_F performs a_2 thus evolving to 6_F , then 4_E can respond by performing a_2 thus evolving to 6_E . The bijection becomes $\{(a_3, a_3), (a_2, a_2)\}$.
- If 6_E performs b_2 thus evolving to 13_E , then 6_F can only respond by performing b_3 thus evolving to 12_F . The bijection becomes $\{(a_3, a_3), (a_2, a_2), (b_2, b_3)\}$ but causality is not preserved because a_2 causes b_2 in E whereas a_2 does not cause b_3 in F as can be seen in the originating event structures in [PU12, Figure 11].

On the other hand, there is no way of telling E and F apart based on $\sim_{\text{FRB:brm}}$, as all configurations reached after three transitions in the forward direction feature the backward ready multiset $\{a, b\}$.

It can be noted that the three conflicting events b_1, b_2, b_3 in E and the three conflicting events b_1, b_2, a_3 in F are not caused by the same event. This can also be seen in process algebraic terms because, following [GV03], E and F can be respectively represented as:

$$((a_1 \cdot b_1) \parallel_{\emptyset} (a_2 \cdot b_2) \parallel_{\emptyset} (a_3 \cdot b_3)) \parallel_{\{a_1, a_3, b_1, b_2, b_3\}} ((a_1 + a_3) \parallel_{\emptyset} (b_1 + b_2) \parallel_{\{b_2\}} (b_2 + b_3))$$

and:

$$((a_1 \cdot b_1) \parallel_{\emptyset} (a_2 \cdot b_2) \parallel_{\emptyset} (a_3 \cdot b_3)) \parallel_{\{a_1, a_3, b_1, b_2\}} ((a_1 + a_3) \parallel_{\{a_3\}} (a_3 + b_2) \parallel_{\{b_2\}} (b_1 + b_2))$$

where a relabeling mapping a_1, a_2, a_3 to a and b_1, b_2, b_3 to b is finally applied.

If we assume that, unlike E and F , all possible conflicts are local, then $\sim_{\text{FRB:brm}}$ coincides with \sim_{HHPB} . By *conflict locality* we mean that, for each maximal set of conflicting events (i.e., events not occurring together in any configuration), all the events in the set are caused by the same event. In other words, whenever multiple events are in mutual conflict, they do not originate from different events, i.e., different subsystems, in the configuration structure.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $C_i = (\mathcal{E}_i, C_i, \ell_i)$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, be two stable configuration structures. Then $C_1 \sim_{\text{HHPB}} C_2$ iff $C_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} C_2$ provided that all possible conflicts are local.*

Proof. The proof is divided into two parts:

- Suppose that $C_1 \sim_{\text{HHPB}} C_2$ due to some hereditary history-preserving bisimulation \mathcal{B} . Then $C_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} C_2$ follows by proving that $\mathcal{B}' = \{(X_1, X_2) \mid (X_1, X_2, f) \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is a brm-forward-reverse bisimulation. Observing that the starting clause and the clauses for outgoing and incoming transitions matching of $\sim_{\text{FRB:brm}}$ (see Definition 3.1) are a simplification of those of \sim_{HHPB} (see Definition 2.5), given $(X_1, X_2) \in \mathcal{B}'$, i.e., $(X_1, X_2, f) \in \mathcal{B}$ for some labeling- and causality-preserving bijection f from X_1 to X_2 , we just have to show that $\text{brm}(X_1) = \text{brm}(X_2)$.

Suppose that this is not the case, say X_1 has fewer incoming a -transitions than X_2 . Without loss of generality, we can assume that X_1 has one incoming a -transition while X_2 has two. Then in C_2 there is a diamond closing into X_2 , i.e., there exist three configurations Y_2 , X'_2 , and X''_2 and two a -labeled events e'_2 and e''_2 such that $Y_2 \xrightarrow{\ell_2(e'_2)}_{C_2} X'_2$, $Y_2 \xrightarrow{\ell_2(e''_2)}_{C_2} X''_2$, $X'_2 \xrightarrow{\ell_2(e''_2)}_{C_2} X_2$, and $X''_2 \xrightarrow{\ell_2(e'_2)}_{C_2} X_2$, with e'_2 and e''_2 concurrent in X_2 .

Due to $(X_1, X_2, f) \in \mathcal{B}$, in C_1 there must be two configurations Y_1 and X'_1 and two a -labeled events e'_1 and e''_1 such that $Y_1 \xrightarrow{\ell_1(e'_1)}_{C_1} X'_1 \xrightarrow{\ell_1(e''_1)}_{C_1} X_1$, with $e'_1 \leq_{X_1} e''_1$ because X_1 has a single incoming a -transition. Since \mathcal{B} is a hereditary history-preserving bisimulation, f should relate $e'_1, e''_1 \in X_1$ with $e'_2, e''_2 \in X_2$ in a causality-preserving way, but this is not possible because $f(e'_1) \not\leq_{X_2} f(e''_1)$ where $f(e'_1) \in \{e'_2, e''_2\}$ and $f(e''_1) \in \{e'_2, e''_2\} \setminus \{f(e'_1)\}$.

- Suppose that $C_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} C_2$ due to some maximal brm-forward-reverse bisimulation \mathcal{B} . Then, given $(X_1, X_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, the existence in C_1 of a sequence of transitions $X_{1,n} \xrightarrow{\ell_1(e_{1,n})}_{C_1} X_{1,n-1} \dots X_{1,1} \xrightarrow{\ell_1(e_{1,1})}_{C_1} X_1$ implies the existence in C_2 of a sequence of transitions $X_{2,n} \xrightarrow{\ell_2(e_{2,n})}_{C_2} X_{2,n-1} \dots X_{2,1} \xrightarrow{\ell_2(e_{2,1})}_{C_2} X_2$ such that $\ell_1(e_{1,h}) = \ell_2(e_{2,h})$ and $(X_{1,h}, X_{2,h}) \in \mathcal{B}$ for all $h = 1, \dots, n$, and vice versa. Note that $e_{1,h} \neq e_{1,k}$ and $e_{2,h} \neq e_{2,k}$ for all $h \neq k$ because in each transition the source configuration and the target configuration differ by one event, which is the executed event (see Definition 2.4).

Thus $C_1 \sim_{\text{HHPB}} C_2$ follows by proving that $\mathcal{B}' = \{(X_1, X_2, \{(e_{1,h}, e_{2,h}) \mid h \in H\}) \mid$

$(X_1, X_2) \in \mathcal{B} \wedge X_{i,|H|} \xrightarrow{\ell_i(e_{i,|H|})}_{C_i} X_{i,|H|-1} \dots X_{i,1} \xrightarrow{\ell_i(e_{i,1})}_{C_i} X_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\} \wedge \ell_1(e_{1,h}) = \ell_2(e_{2,h})$ for all $h \in H \wedge (X_{1,h}, X_{2,h}) \in \mathcal{B}$ for all $h \in H \wedge X_{1,|H|} = \emptyset = X_{2,|H|}$ is a hereditary history-preserving bisimulation. Observing that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in \mathcal{B}$ implies $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in \mathcal{B}'$, take $(X_1, X_2, \{(e_{1,h}, e_{2,h}) \mid h \in H\}) \in \mathcal{B}'$, so that $(X_1, X_2) \in \mathcal{B}$:

- If $X_1 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_1} X'_1$ due to some a -labeled event e_1 , then $X_2 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_2} X'_2$ due to some a -labeled event e_2 such that $(X'_1, X'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$. Since $e_1 \notin X_1$ and $e_2 \notin X_2$, it holds that $(X'_1, X'_2, \{(e_{1,h}, e_{2,h}) \mid h \in H\} \cup \{(e_1, e_2)\}) \in \mathcal{B}'$.

If we start from $X_2 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_2} X'_2$, then we reason in the same way.

- If $X'_1 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_1} X_1$ due to some a -labeled event e_1 , then $X'_2 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_2} X_2$ due to some a -labeled event e_2 such that $(X'_1, X'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$. Since $e_1 \notin X'_1$, $e_2 \notin X'_2$, and $\text{brm}(X_1) = \text{brm}(X_2)$, the latter transition can be selected in such a way to satisfy $\{(e_{1,h}, e_{2,h}) \mid h \in H\} \upharpoonright X'_1 = \{(e_{1,h}, e_{2,h}) \mid h \in H\} \setminus \{(e_1, e_2)\}$, hence $(X'_1, X'_2, \{(e_{1,h}, e_{2,h}) \mid h \in H\} \setminus \{(e_1, e_2)\}) \in \mathcal{B}'$.

If we start from $X'_2 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_2} X_2$, then we reason in the same way.

- $f = \{(e_{1,h}, e_{2,h}) \mid h \in H\}$ certainly is a bijection from X_1 to X_2 – as the events along either computation are different from each other, so the two reached configurations X_1 and X_2 contain the same number of events, and paired in a stepwise manner – that preserves labeling – by definition of \mathcal{B}' . If $|H| \leq 1$ then causality is trivially preserved. Suppose that X_1 and X_2 break causality and, among all the pairs of \mathcal{B} -related configurations that break causality, they are the closest ones to \emptyset and \emptyset (in terms of number of transitions to be executed from either empty configuration). Breaking causality means that $X_1 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_1} X'_1$ due to an a -labeled event $e'_1 \notin X_1$ such that $e_1 \leq_{X'_1} e'_1$ for some $e_1 \in X_1$, but all the responses $X_2 \xrightarrow{a}_{C_2} X'_2$ complying with \mathcal{B} , which is maximal, are such that $g(e_1) \not\leq_{X'_2} g(e'_1)$, where g is f extended with the new pair of events.

(In Figure 2, X_1 and X_2 are states 6_E and 6_F , X'_1 and X'_2 are states 13_E and 12_F , $e_1 = a_2$, $e'_1 = b_2$, $g(e_1) = a_2$, $g(e'_1) = b_3$.)

From X_1 and X_2 we go backward by following the respective computations undertaken in the forward direction with respect to \mathcal{B}' – without undoing e_1 – until we reach Y_1 and Y_2 such that $(Y_1, Y_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ having several incoming transitions. Note that Y_1 and Y_2 have the same number of incoming transitions because \mathcal{B} is a brm-forward-reverse bisimulation.

(In Figure 2, Y_1 and Y_2 are again states 6_E and 6_F .)

In Y_1 and Y_2 we undo two identically labeled transitions matched by \mathcal{B} , respectively corresponding to two events e''_1 and e''_2 , different from the two transitions with which we arrived at Y_1 and Y_2 via the computations undertaken in the forward direction with respect to \mathcal{B}' . Let Y'_1 and Y'_2 be the two newly reached configurations such that $(Y'_1, Y'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.

(In Figure 2, Y'_1 and Y'_2 are states 3_E and 3_F , $e''_1 = a_3$, $e''_2 = a_3$.)

There are two cases:

- * If in Y'_1 it is possible to perform a transition corresponding to e'_1 , then we execute it so as to recreate $e_1 \leq e'_1$ along a different computation of C_1 . Therefore Y'_2 responds by executing an identically labeled transition corresponding to some event e'_2 such that $h(e_1) \leq h(e'_1) = e'_2$, where h is the resulting bijection, as Y'_1 and Y'_2 are closer to \emptyset and \emptyset than X_1 and X_2 – remember the assumption that X_1 and X_2 are the first \mathcal{B} -related configurations that break causality. Let Y''_1 and Y''_2 be the two newly reached configurations such that $(Y''_1, Y''_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.

(In Figure 2, Y_1'' and Y_2'' are states 8_E and 8_F , $e_2' = b_2$.)

In Y_1'' it is possible to perform a transition corresponding to e_1'' otherwise we would not have been able to go from \emptyset to X_1' via Y_1' and X_1 by encountering e_1'' and e_1' . In other words, e_1'' and e_1' are concurrent. If in Y_2'' it were possible to perform a transition corresponding to e_2'' , then in X_2 we had to be able to execute a transition corresponding to e_2' thanks to concurrency, but this contradicts the assumption that X_2 cannot respond to X_1 in a causality-preserving way. Therefore e_2'' and e_2' have to be in conflict with each other (note that $e_2' \notin X_2$ and $e_2'' \notin Y_2''$), but this contradicts the assumption of the absence of conflicting events caused by different events. Indeed, since e_2'' is taken from the bottom side of a diamond opposite to the one of $g(e_1)$, e_2'' must be concurrent to $g(e_1)$, hence if e_2'' and e_2' were conflicting, then they would not be caused by the same event.

- * If in Y_1' it is not possible to perform a transition corresponding to e_1' , then we keep going forward until we find it by executing transitions corresponding to all the events that have been undone by going from X_1 and X_2 back to Y_1 and Y_2 .

If the aforementioned Y_1 and Y_2 did not exist, then while going backward from X_1 and X_2 by following the respective computations undertaken in the forward direction with respect to \mathcal{B}' – without undoing e_1 – we should reach Z_1 and Z_2 such that $(Z_1, Z_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ with at least one of them having several outgoing transitions. The reason is that if neither Y_1 and Y_2 nor Z_1 and Z_2 existed, then there would be a single computation from \emptyset to X_1 and a single computation from \emptyset to X_2 – in which all events are causally related and hence there is no concurrency – thus contradicting $e_1 \leq_{X_1'} e_1'$ and $g(e_1) \not\leq_{X_2'} g(e_1')$ as it would hold that $g(e_1) \leq_{X_2'} g(e_1')$.

However, since after leaving Z_1 and Z_2 towards X_1 and X_2 there would be neither \mathcal{B} -related configurations with several incoming transitions, nor \mathcal{B} -related configurations at least one of which has several outgoing transitions, there would be a single computation from Z_1 to X_1 and a single computation from Z_2 to X_2 – in which all events are causally related and hence there is no concurrency – thus contradicting again $e_1 \leq_{X_1'} e_1'$ and $g(e_1) \not\leq_{X_2'} g(e_1')$ as it would hold that $g(e_1) \leq_{X_2'} g(e_1')$. \square

4. OPERATIONAL CHARACTERIZATION

The second characterization that we provide for \sim_{HHPB} is operational. More precisely, we present a variant of the syntax (Section 4.1) and the proved operational semantics (Section 4.2) of the reversible process calculus of [BR23, BEM24], followed by a redefinition of brm-forward-reverse bisimilarity on that variant along with a modal logic characterization (Section 4.3). Then we develop a denotational semantics for the modified calculus based on stable configuration structures (Section 4.4), so as to import the notion of HHPB. Finally, we prove that, in the absence of non-local conflicts, the stable configuration structures associated with two processes are hereditary history-preserving bisimilar iff the two processes are brm-forward-reverse bisimilar (Section 4.5).

4.1. Syntax of Reversible Concurrent Processes. In the representation of a process, we are used to describe only its future behavior. However, in order to support reversibility in the style of [PU07a], we need to equip the syntax with information about the past, in particular the actions that have already been executed. Taking inspiration from CCS [Mil89] and

CSP [BHR84], given a countable set \mathcal{A} of actions including an unobservable one denoted by τ , we extend the syntax of PRPC – Proved Reversible Process Calculus [BR23, BEM24, Esp25] as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P &::= \underline{0} \mid a.P \mid a^{\dagger\xi}.P \mid P + P \mid P \parallel_L P \\ \xi &::= \varepsilon \mid \langle \theta, \theta \rangle_L \end{aligned}$$

where $a \in \mathcal{A}$, $L \subseteq \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\tau\}$, ε is the empty string, θ is a proof term (whose structure will be provided in Section 4.2), and:

- $\underline{0}$ is the terminated process.
- $a.P$ is a process that can execute action a and whose forward continuation is P (unexecuted action prefix).
- $a^{\dagger\xi}.P$ is a process that executed action a and whose forward continuation is inside P , which can undo action a after all executed actions within P have been undone (executed action prefix).
- $P_1 + P_2$ expresses a nondeterministic choice between P_1 and P_2 as far as neither has executed any action yet, otherwise only the one that was selected in the past can move (past-sensitive alternative composition).
- $P_1 \parallel_L P_2$ expresses that P_1 and P_2 proceed independently of each other on actions in $\bar{L} = \mathcal{A} \setminus L$, while they have to synchronize on every action in L (parallel composition).

We can characterize two important classes of processes via as many predicates. Firstly, we define *initial* processes, in which all actions are unexecuted and hence no \dagger -decoration appears:

$$\begin{aligned} &init(\underline{0}) \\ init(a.P) &\text{ iff } init(P) \\ init(P_1 + P_2) &\text{ iff } init(P_1) \wedge init(P_2) \\ init(P_1 \parallel_L P_2) &\text{ iff } init(P_1) \wedge init(P_2) \end{aligned}$$

Secondly, we define *well-formed* processes, whose set we denote by \mathcal{P} , in which both unexecuted and executed actions can occur in certain circumstances:

$$\begin{aligned} &wf(\underline{0}) \\ wf(a.P) &\text{ iff } init(P) \\ wf(a^{\dagger\xi}.P) &\text{ iff } wf(P) \\ wf(P_1 + P_2) &\text{ iff } (wf(P_1) \wedge init(P_2)) \vee (init(P_1) \wedge wf(P_2)) \\ wf(P_1 \parallel_L P_2) &\text{ iff } wf(P_1) \wedge wf(P_2) \end{aligned}$$

Well formedness not only imposes that every unexecuted action is followed by an initial process, but also that in every alternative composition at least one subprocess is initial. Multiple paths may arise in the presence of both alternative and parallel compositions. However, at each occurrence of the former, only the subprocess chosen for execution can move. Although not selected, the other subprocess is kept as an initial subprocess within the overall process, in the same way as executed actions are kept inside the syntax [BC94, PU07a], so as to support reversibility. As an example, in $a^{\dagger}.b.\underline{0} + c.d.\underline{0}$ the subprocess $c.d.\underline{0}$ cannot move because a was selected in the choice between a and c .

It is worth noting that:

- $\underline{0}$ is both initial and well-formed.
- Any initial process is well-formed too.
- \mathcal{P} also contains processes that are not initial like, e.g., $a^{\dagger}.b.\underline{0}$, which can either do b or undo a .

- In \mathcal{P} the relative positions of already executed actions and actions to be executed matter. Precisely, an action of the former kind can never occur after one of the latter kind. For instance, $a^\dagger.b.\underline{0} \in \mathcal{P}$ whereas $b.a^\dagger.\underline{0} \notin \mathcal{P}$.
- In \mathcal{P} the subprocesses of an alternative composition can be both initial, but cannot be both non-initial. For example, $a.\underline{0} + b.\underline{0} \in \mathcal{P}$ while $a^\dagger.\underline{0} + b^\dagger.\underline{0} \notin \mathcal{P}$.

Sometimes we will need to bring a process back to its initial version. This is accomplished by removing all \dagger -decorations through function $to_init : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{init}$, with \mathcal{P}_{init} being the set of initial processes of \mathcal{P} , which is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
to_init(P) &= P && \text{if } init(P) \\
to_init(a^\dagger\xi.P') &= a.to_init(P') \\
to_init(P_1 + P_2) &= to_init(P_1) + to_init(P_2) && \text{if } \neg init(P_1) \vee \neg init(P_2) \\
to_init(P_1 \parallel_L P_2) &= to_init(P_1) \parallel_L to_init(P_2) && \text{if } \neg init(P_1) \vee \neg init(P_2)
\end{aligned}$$

4.2. Proved Operational Semantics. According to [PU07a], dynamic operators such as action prefix and alternative composition have to be made static in the operational semantic rules, so as to retain within the syntax all the information needed to enable reversibility. Unlike [PU07a], we do not generate a forward transition relation and a backward one, but a single transition relation that we deem to be symmetric in order to enforce the *loop property* [DK04]: every executed action can be undone and every undone action can be redone. A backward transition from P' to P is subsumed by the corresponding forward transition t from P to P' . As already done in Sections 2 and 3 as well as in [DMV90, Bed91], we will view t as an *outgoing* transition of P when going forward, while we will view t as an *incoming* transition of P' when going backward.

Following [BEM24, Esp25], for the considered extension of PRPC we provide an operational semantics based on [DP92], which is very concrete as every transition is labeled with a *proof term* [BC88, BC94]. This is an action preceded by the sequence of operator symbols in the scope of which the action occurs inside the source process of the transition. In the case of a binary operator, the corresponding symbol also specifies whether the action occurs to the left or to the right. The syntax that we adopt for the set Θ of proof terms is the following, where $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $L \subseteq \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\tau\}$:

$$\theta ::= a \mid ._a\theta \mid +\theta \mid \mid_L\theta \mid \parallel_L\theta \mid \langle\theta, \theta\rangle_L$$

Note that a proof term describes a path inside a process that uniquely identifies an action.

The proved operational semantic rules are in Table 1 and generate the proved labeled transition system $(\mathcal{P}, \Theta, \longrightarrow)$ where $\longrightarrow \subseteq \mathcal{P} \times \Theta \times \mathcal{P}$ is the proved transition relation. We denote by $\mathbb{P} \subsetneq \mathcal{P}$ the set of processes that are *reachable* from an initial one via \longrightarrow . Not all well-formed processes are reachable; for example, $a^\dagger.\underline{0} \parallel_{\{a\}} \underline{0}$ is not reachable from $a.\underline{0} \parallel_{\{a\}} \underline{0}$ as action a on the left cannot synchronize with any action on the right. From now on, we consider only \mathbb{P} and denote by \mathbb{P}_{init} the subset of its initial processes. Every process in \mathbb{P} may have several outgoing transitions and, if it is not initial, has at least one incoming transition.

The first rule for action prefix (ACT_f where f stands for forward) applies only if P is initial and retains the executed action in the target process of the generated forward transition by decorating the action itself with \dagger . The second rule (ACT_p where p stands for propagation) propagates actions of inner initial subprocesses by putting an a -dot before them in the label for each outer executed a -action prefix that is encountered.

In both rules for alternative composition (CHO_l and CHO_r where l stands for left and r stands for right), the subprocess that has not been selected for execution is retained as an

$(\text{ACT}_f) \frac{\text{init}(P)}{a.P \xrightarrow{a} a^\dagger.P}$	$(\text{ACT}_p) \frac{P \xrightarrow{\theta} P'}{a^\dagger\xi.P \xrightarrow{a^\dagger\xi} a^\dagger\xi.P'}$
$(\text{CHO}_l) \frac{P_1 \xrightarrow{\theta} P'_1 \quad \text{init}(P_2)}{P_1 + P_2 \xrightarrow{+\theta} P'_1 + P_2}$	$(\text{CHO}_r) \frac{P_2 \xrightarrow{\theta} P'_2 \quad \text{init}(P_1)}{P_1 + P_2 \xrightarrow{+\theta} P_1 + P'_2}$
$(\text{PAR}_l) \frac{P_1 \xrightarrow{\theta} P'_1 \quad \text{act}(\theta) \notin L}{P_1 \parallel_L P_2 \xrightarrow{\parallel_L \theta} P'_1 \parallel_L P_2}$	$(\text{PAR}_r) \frac{P_2 \xrightarrow{\theta} P'_2 \quad \text{act}(\theta) \notin L}{P_1 \parallel_L P_2 \xrightarrow{\parallel_L \theta} P_1 \parallel_L P'_2}$
$(\text{SYN}) \frac{P_1 \xrightarrow{\theta_1} P'_1 \quad P_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} P'_2 \quad \text{act}(\theta_1) = \text{act}(\theta_2) \in L}{P_1 \parallel_L P_2 \xrightarrow{\langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L} \text{enr}(P'_1 \parallel_L P'_2, \langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L)}$	

Table 1: Proved operational semantic rules for extended PRPC

initial subprocess in the target process of the generated transition. When both subprocesses are initial, both rules for alternative composition are applicable, otherwise only one of them can be applied and in that case it is the non-initial subprocess that can move, because the other one has been discarded at the moment of the selection. The symbol $+$ or \vdash is added at the beginning of the proof term.

Due to the \dagger -decorations of executed actions inside the process syntax, over the set \mathbb{P}_{seq} of *sequential* processes – in which there are no occurrences of parallel composition – every non-initial process has exactly one incoming transition, proved labeled transition systems turn out to be trees, and well formedness coincides with reachability [BR23].

Example 4.1. The proved labeled transition system underlying the initial sequential process $a.\underline{0}$ has a single transition $a.\underline{0} \xrightarrow{a} a^\dagger.\underline{0}$. In contrast, the proved labeled transition system underlying the initial sequential process $a.\underline{0} + a.\underline{0}$ has the two transitions $a.\underline{0} + a.\underline{0} \xrightarrow{+a} a^\dagger.\underline{0} + a.\underline{0}$ and $a.\underline{0} + a.\underline{0} \xrightarrow{+a} a.\underline{0} + a^\dagger.\underline{0}$. Note that the two target processes are different from each other due to the presence of action decorations, whereas a single a -transition from $a.\underline{0} + a.\underline{0}$ to $\underline{0}$ would be generated in the setting of a forward-only process calculus. ■

The three rules for parallel composition use partial function $\text{act} : \Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ to extract an action from a proof term θ . This function, which will be used throughout the paper, is defined by induction on the syntactical structure of θ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{act}(a) &= a \\
\text{act}(\cdot_a \theta') &= \text{act}(\theta') \\
\text{act}(\vdash \theta') &= \text{act}(\vdash \theta') = \text{act}(\theta') \\
\text{act}(\parallel_L \theta') &= \text{act}(\parallel_L \theta') = \text{act}(\theta') \\
\text{act}(\langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L) &= \begin{cases} \text{act}(\theta_1) & \text{if } \text{act}(\theta_1) = \text{act}(\theta_2) \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

In the first two rules (PAR_l and PAR_r), a single subprocess proceeds by performing an action not belonging to L , with \parallel_L or \parallel_L being placed at the beginning of the proof term. In the third rule (SYN), both subprocesses synchronize on an action in L and the resulting proof term contains both individual proof terms. If $L = \emptyset$ or $L = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\tau\}$, then the two subprocesses are fully independent or fully synchronized, respectively, on observable actions.

The natural target process $P'_1 \parallel_L P'_2$ of a synchronization has to be suitably manipulated in rule SYN to correctly reflect causality and concurrency. More precisely, the \dagger -decoration of every executed action participating in the synchronization has to be enriched with a proof term of the form $\langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L$. This is accomplished by taking $enr(P'_1 \parallel_L P'_2, \langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L) = enr'(P'_1 \parallel_L P'_2, \langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L, \langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L)$ as target process, where partial function $enr' : \mathbb{P} \times \Theta \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$ is defined by induction on the syntactical structure of its first argument $P \in \mathbb{P}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
enr'(\underline{0}, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= \underline{0} \\
enr'(a . P', \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= \text{undefined} \\
enr'(a^{\dagger\xi} . P', \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= \begin{cases} a^{\dagger\bar{\theta}} . P' & \text{if } \theta = a \\ a^{\dagger\xi} . enr'(P', \theta', \bar{\theta}) & \text{if } \theta = ._a \theta' \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
enr'(P_1 + P_2, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= \begin{cases} enr'(P_1, \theta', \bar{\theta}) + P_2 & \text{if } \theta = +\theta' \\ P_1 + enr'(P_2, \theta', \bar{\theta}) & \text{if } \theta = +.\theta' \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
enr'(P_1 \parallel_L P_2, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= \begin{cases} enr'(P_1, \theta', \bar{\theta}) \parallel_L P_2 & \text{if } \theta = \parallel_L \theta' \\ P_1 \parallel_L enr'(P_2, \theta', \bar{\theta}) & \text{if } \theta = \parallel_L.\theta' \\ enr'(P_1, \theta_1, \bar{\theta}) \parallel_L enr'(P_2, \theta_2, \bar{\theta}) & \text{if } \theta = \langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Example 4.2. The proved labeled transition system of the initial process $(a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} a . a . \underline{0}$, which is the synchronization of autoconcurrency with autocausation, has the following two maximal transition sequences:

- $(a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} a . a . \underline{0}$
 $\xrightarrow{\langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, a \rangle_{\{a\}}}$ $(a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, a \rangle_{\{a\}} . a . \underline{0}$
 $\xrightarrow{\langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, .a \rangle_{\{a\}}}$ $(a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, .a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, a \rangle_{\{a\}} . a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, .a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0}$
- $(a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} a . a . \underline{0}$
 $\xrightarrow{\langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, a \rangle_{\{a\}}}$ $(a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, a \rangle_{\{a\}} . a . \underline{0}$
 $\xrightarrow{\langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, .a \rangle_{\{a\}}}$ $(a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, .a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, a \rangle_{\{a\}} . a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, .a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0}$

Note that the target processes of the two sequences are different thanks to the different additional decorations of the pairs of synchronizing executed actions. Without those decorations, the two sequences would end up in the same process $(a^{\dagger} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} a^{\dagger} . a^{\dagger} . \underline{0}$ – thus yielding a diamond-shaped transition system – which would not reflect the fact that the two executed a -actions in $a^{\dagger} . a^{\dagger} . \underline{0}$ cannot be undone in any order as the first one causes the second one. ■

Example 4.3. The proved labeled transition system of the initial process $(a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} (a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0})$, which is the synchronization of autoconcurrency with itself, has the following four maximal transition sequences:

- $(a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} (a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0})$
 $\xrightarrow{\langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, \parallel_{\emptyset} a \rangle_{\{a\}}}$ $(a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, \parallel_{\emptyset} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} (a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, \parallel_{\emptyset} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0})$
 $\xrightarrow{\langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, \parallel_{\emptyset} a \rangle_{\{a\}}}$ $(a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, \parallel_{\emptyset} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, \parallel_{\emptyset} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} (a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, \parallel_{\emptyset} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} \langle \parallel_{\emptyset} a, \parallel_{\emptyset} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0})$

- $(a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} (a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0})$
 $\xrightarrow{\langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}}} (a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} (a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0})$
 $\xrightarrow{\langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}}} (a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} (a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0})$
- $(a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} (a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0})$
 $\xrightarrow{\langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}}} (a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} (a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0})$
 $\xrightarrow{\langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}}} (a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} (a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0})$
- $(a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} (a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0})$
 $\xrightarrow{\langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}}} (a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} (a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0})$
 $\xrightarrow{\langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}}} (a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} (a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} \langle \underline{0} a, \underline{0} a \rangle_{\{a\}} . \underline{0})$

While the target processes of the first (resp. last) two sequences are equal, the target process of the first two sequences is different from the one of the last two sequences due to the different additional decorations of the pairs of synchronizing executed actions. This results in a double-diamond-shaped transition system like the one of $(a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0}) + (a . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a . \underline{0})$. Without those decorations, the four sequences would end up in the same process $(a^{\dagger} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} . \underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} (a^{\dagger} . \underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^{\dagger} . \underline{0})$, thus yielding a single-diamond-shaped transition system. \blacksquare

4.3. Forward-Reverse Bisimilarity and Backward Ready Multisets. We now re-define brm-forward-reverse bisimilarity over \mathbb{P} . Unlike stable configuration structures, for processes we can syntactically construct their (finite) backward ready multisets, intended as the multisets of actions occurring in the labels of their incoming transitions. In the following we use \oplus for multiset union, which adds multiplicities of identical elements, and \otimes for multiset intersection, which multiplies the multiplicities of those elements. The *backward ready multiset* of $P \in \mathbb{P}$ is inductively defined as follows, where $\bar{L} = \mathcal{A} \setminus L$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{brm}(\underline{0}) &= \emptyset \\
\text{brm}(a . P') &= \emptyset \\
\text{brm}(a^{\dagger \xi} . P') &= \begin{cases} \{a\} & \text{if } \text{init}(P') \\ \text{brm}(P') & \text{if } \neg \text{init}(P') \end{cases} \\
\text{brm}(P_1 + P_2) &= \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } \text{init}(P_1) \wedge \text{init}(P_2) \\ \text{brm}(P_1) & \text{if } \neg \text{init}(P_1) \wedge \text{init}(P_2) \\ \text{brm}(P_2) & \text{if } \text{init}(P_1) \wedge \neg \text{init}(P_2) \end{cases} \\
\text{brm}(P_1 \parallel_L P_2) &= (\text{brm}(P_1) \otimes \bar{L}) \oplus (\text{brm}(P_2) \otimes \bar{L}) \oplus (\text{brm}(P_1) \otimes \text{brm}(P_2) \otimes L)
\end{aligned}$$

The first two clauses stated below are analogous to the ones of forward-reverse bisimilarity \sim_{FRB} over a single transition relation defined in [BR23, BEM24, Esp25]. Note the use of function *act* to abstract from operator symbols inside transition labels [BEM24, Esp25].

Definition 4.4. We say that two processes $P_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{P}$ are *brm-forward-reverse bisimilar*, written $P_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P_2$, iff P_1 and P_2 are related by a brm-forward-reverse bisimulation, i.e., a symmetric relation \mathcal{B} over \mathbb{P} such that, whenever $(Q_1, Q_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, then:

- For each $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\theta_1} Q'_1$ there exists $Q_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} Q'_2$ such that $\text{act}(\theta_1) = \text{act}(\theta_2)$ and $(Q'_1, Q'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- For each $Q'_1 \xrightarrow{\theta_1} Q_1$ there exists $Q'_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} Q_2$ such that $\text{act}(\theta_1) = \text{act}(\theta_2)$ and $(Q'_1, Q'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.
- $\text{brm}(Q_1) = \text{brm}(Q_2)$. \blacksquare

Example 4.5. $a.\underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a.\underline{0} \not\sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} a.a.\underline{0}$ because in the forward bisimulation game they respectively reach $a^\dagger.\underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^\dagger.\underline{0}$ and $a^\dagger.a^\dagger.\underline{0}$ after performing two a -transitions, where $\text{brm}(a^\dagger.\underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a^\dagger.\underline{0}) = \{a, a\} \neq \{a\} = \text{brm}(a^\dagger.a^\dagger.\underline{0})$. Likewise, $(a.\underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a.\underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} a.a.\underline{0} \not\sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} (a.\underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a.\underline{0})$. In contrast, $(a.\underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a.\underline{0}) \parallel_{\{a\}} (a.\underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a.\underline{0}) \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} (a.\underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a.\underline{0}) + (a.\underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a.\underline{0}) \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} a.\underline{0} \parallel_{\emptyset} a.\underline{0}$. ■

An axiomatization of $\sim_{\text{FRB:brm}}$ over \mathbb{P} can be derived from the one of \sim_{FRB} in [BEM24] by using backward ready multisets instead of backward ready sets when extending action prefixes at process encoding time.

We conclude this section by developing a modal logic characterization for $\sim_{\text{FRB:brm}}$ inspired by the one of \sim_{FRB} in [BE23]. The set \mathcal{L}_{BRM} of formulas of the *backward ready multiset logic* is generated by the following syntax:

$$\phi ::= \text{true} \mid M \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi \wedge \phi \mid \langle a \rangle \phi \mid \langle a^\dagger \rangle \phi$$

where $M : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. The satisfaction relation $\models \subseteq \mathbb{P} \times \mathcal{L}_{\text{BRM}}$ is defined by induction on the syntactical structure of $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BRM}}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P &\models \text{true} \\ P &\models M && \text{iff } \text{brm}(P) = M \\ P &\models \neg\phi' && \text{iff } P \not\models \phi' \\ P &\models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 && \text{iff } P \models \phi_1 \text{ and } P \models \phi_2 \\ P &\models \langle a \rangle \phi' && \text{iff there exists } P \xrightarrow{\theta} P' \text{ such that } \text{act}(\theta) = a \text{ and } P' \models \phi' \\ P &\models \langle a^\dagger \rangle \phi' && \text{iff there exists } P' \xrightarrow{\theta} P \text{ such that } \text{act}(\theta) = a \text{ and } P' \models \phi' \end{aligned}$$

Note that every $P \in \mathbb{P}$ is image finite, i.e., it has finitely many outgoing (and incoming) transitions labeled with proof terms containing the same action. Since it is instrumental to prove the next theorem, we define the depth of $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BRM}}$ – intended as an upper bound to the depth of the syntax tree of the considered formula – by induction on the syntactical structure of ϕ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{depth}(\text{true}) &= 0 \\ \text{depth}(M) &= 0 \\ \text{depth}(\neg\phi') &= 1 + \text{depth}(\phi') \\ \text{depth}(\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2) &= 1 + \max(\text{depth}(\phi_1), \text{depth}(\phi_2)) \\ \text{depth}(\langle a \rangle \phi') &= 1 + \text{depth}(\phi') \\ \text{depth}(\langle a^\dagger \rangle \phi') &= 1 + \text{depth}(\phi') \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4.6. *Let $P_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{P}$. Then $P_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P_2$ iff $\forall \phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BRM}}. P_1 \models \phi \iff P_2 \models \phi$.*

Proof. The proof is divided into two parts:

- Assuming that $P_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P_2$ and $P_1 \models \phi$ for an arbitrary formula $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{FRB:brm}}$, we prove that $P_2 \models \phi$ too by proceeding by induction on $k = \text{depth}(\phi)$:
 - If $k = 0$ then ϕ is either **true** or M . In the former case, it is trivially satisfied by P_2 too. In the latter case, it is satisfied by P_2 too because $P_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P_2$ and hence $\text{brm}(P_1) = \text{brm}(P_2)$.
 - If $k \geq 1$ then there are four cases:
 - * If ϕ is $\neg\phi'$ then from $P_1 \models \neg\phi'$ we derive that $P_1 \not\models \phi'$. If it were $P_2 \models \phi'$ then by the induction hypothesis it would hold that $P_1 \models \phi'$, which is not the case. Therefore $P_2 \not\models \phi'$ and hence $P_2 \models \neg\phi'$ too.
 - * If ϕ is $\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ then from $P_1 \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ we derive that $P_1 \models \phi_1$ and $P_1 \models \phi_2$. From the induction hypothesis it follows that $P_2 \models \phi_1$ and $P_2 \models \phi_2$ and hence $P_2 \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ too.

- * If ϕ is $\langle a \rangle \phi'$ then from $P_1 \models \langle a \rangle \phi'$ we derive that there exists $P_1 \xrightarrow{\theta_1} P'_1$ such that $act(\theta_1) = a$ and $P'_1 \models \phi'$. From $P_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P_2$ it then follows that there exists $P_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} P'_2$ such that $act(\theta_2) = a$ and $P'_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P'_2$. By applying the induction hypothesis we derive that $P'_2 \models \phi'$ and hence $P_2 \models \langle a \rangle \phi'$ too.
- * If ϕ is $\langle a^\dagger \rangle \phi'$ then from $P_1 \models \langle a^\dagger \rangle \phi'$ we derive that there exists $P'_1 \xrightarrow{\theta_1} P_1$ such that $act(\theta_1) = a$ and $P'_1 \models \phi'$. From $P_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P_2$ it then follows that there exists $P'_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} P_2$ such that $act(\theta_2) = a$ and $P'_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P'_2$. By applying the induction hypothesis we derive that $P'_2 \models \phi'$ and hence $P_2 \models \langle a^\dagger \rangle \phi'$ too.
- Assuming that P_1 and P_2 satisfy the same formulas in \mathcal{L}_{BRM} , we prove that the symmetric relation $\mathcal{B} = \{(Q_1, Q_2) \in \mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{P} \mid Q_1 \text{ and } Q_2 \text{ satisfy the same formulas in } \mathcal{L}_{\text{BRM}}\}$ is a brm-forward-reverse bisimulation.

Given $(Q_1, Q_2) \in \mathcal{B}$:

- If $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\theta_1} Q'_1$ suppose by contradiction that there is no Q'_2 satisfying the same formulas as Q'_1 such that $Q_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} Q'_2$ and $act(\theta_1) = act(\theta_2)$, i.e., $(Q'_1, Q'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ for no Q'_2 $act(\theta_1)$ -reachable from Q_2 . Since Q_2 has finitely many outgoing transitions, the set of processes that Q_2 can reach by performing an $act(\theta_1)$ -transition is finite, say $\{Q'_{2,1}, \dots, Q'_{2,n}\}$ with $n \geq 0$. Since none of the processes in the set satisfies the same formulas as Q'_1 , for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ there exists $\phi_i \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BRM}}$ such that $Q'_1 \models \phi_i$ but $Q'_{2,i} \not\models \phi_i$.

We can then construct the formula $\langle act(\theta_1) \rangle \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \phi_i$ that is satisfied by Q_1 but not by Q_2 ;

if $n = 0$ then it is sufficient to take $\langle act(\theta_1) \rangle \text{true}$. This formula violates $(Q_1, Q_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, hence there must exist at least one Q'_2 satisfying the same formulas as Q'_1 such that $Q_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} Q'_2$ and $act(\theta_1) = act(\theta_2)$, so that $(Q'_1, Q'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.

- If $Q'_1 \xrightarrow{\theta_1} Q_1$ suppose by contradiction that there is no Q'_2 satisfying the same formulas as Q'_1 such that $Q'_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} Q_2$ and $act(\theta_1) = act(\theta_2)$, i.e., $(Q'_1, Q'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ for no Q'_2 $act(\theta_1)$ -reaching Q_2 . Since Q_2 has finitely many incoming transitions, the set of processes that can reach Q_2 by performing an $act(\theta_1)$ -transition is finite, say $\{Q'_{2,1}, \dots, Q'_{2,n}\}$ with $n \geq 0$. Since none of the processes in the set satisfies the same formulas as Q'_1 , for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ there exists $\phi_i \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BRM}}$ such that $Q'_1 \models \phi_i$ but $Q'_{2,i} \not\models \phi_i$.

We can then construct the formula $\langle act(\theta_1)^\dagger \rangle \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \phi_i$ that is satisfied by Q_1 but not by Q_2 ;

if $n = 0$ then it is sufficient to take $\langle act(\theta_1)^\dagger \rangle \text{true}$. This formula violates $(Q_1, Q_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, hence there must exist at least one Q'_2 satisfying the same formulas as Q'_1 such that $Q'_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} Q_2$ and $act(\theta_1) = act(\theta_2)$, so that $(Q'_1, Q'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.

- The fact that $brm(Q_1) = brm(Q_2)$ follows from the fact that Q_1 and Q_2 satisfy, in particular, the same formulas of the form M . \square

4.4. Denotational Semantics on Stable Configuration Structures. To enable a comparison between hereditary history-preserving bisimilarity over stable configuration structures and brm-forward-reverse bisimilarity over processes, we proceed with the introduction of a denotational semantics for \mathbb{P} based on stable configuration structures. The first step consists of redefining the process operators of Section 4.1 over stable configuration structures. Taking inspiration from [BC94], we do this by using proof terms in Θ to formalize events:

- The terminated stable configuration structure N is defined as $(\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}, \emptyset)$.
- Let $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $C = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{C}, \ell)$ be a stable configuration structure such that $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \Theta$. The action prefix $a.C$ is defined as $(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{C}', \ell')$ where:
 - $\mathcal{E}' = \{a\} \cup \{.a\theta \mid \theta \in \mathcal{E}\}$.
 - $\mathcal{C}' = \{\emptyset\} \cup \{X' \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathcal{E}') \mid \exists X \in \mathcal{C}. X' = \{a\} \cup \{.a\theta \mid \theta \in X\}\}$.
 - $\ell' = \{(a, a)\} \cup \{(.a\theta, \text{act}(.a\theta)) \mid \exists X \in \mathcal{C}. \theta \in X\}$.
- Let $C_i = (\mathcal{E}_i, \mathcal{C}_i, \ell_i)$ be a stable configuration structure such that $\mathcal{E}_i \subseteq \Theta$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. The alternative composition $C_1 + C_2$ is defined as $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{C}, \ell)$ where:
 - $\mathcal{E} = \{+\theta \mid \theta \in \mathcal{E}_1\} \cup \{+\theta \mid \theta \in \mathcal{E}_2\}$.
 - $\mathcal{C} = \{X \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathcal{E}) \mid \exists X_1 \in \mathcal{C}_1. X = \{+\theta \mid \theta \in X_1\}\} \cup \{X \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathcal{E}) \mid \exists X_2 \in \mathcal{C}_2. X = \{+\theta \mid \theta \in X_2\}\}$.
 - $\ell = \{(+\theta, \text{act}(+\theta)) \mid \exists X_1 \in \mathcal{C}_1. \theta \in X_1\} \cup \{(+\theta, \text{act}(+\theta)) \mid \exists X_2 \in \mathcal{C}_2. \theta \in X_2\}$.
- Let $C_i = (\mathcal{E}_i, \mathcal{C}_i, \ell_i)$ be a stable configuration structure such that $\mathcal{E}_i \subseteq \Theta$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $L \subseteq \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\tau\}$. The parallel composition $C_1 \parallel_L C_2$ is defined as $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{C}, \ell)$ where:
 - $\mathcal{E} = \{\parallel_L \theta \mid \theta \in \mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \text{act}(\theta) \notin L\} \cup \{\parallel_L \theta \mid \theta \in \mathcal{E}_2 \wedge \text{act}(\theta) \notin L\} \cup \{(\theta_1, \theta_2)_L \mid \theta_1 \in \mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \theta_2 \in \mathcal{E}_2 \wedge \text{act}(\theta_1) = \text{act}(\theta_2) \in L\}$.
 - $\mathcal{C} = \{X \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathcal{E}) \mid \text{proj}_1(X) \in \mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \text{proj}_2(X) \in \mathcal{C}_2 \wedge \forall e, e' \in X. ((\text{proj}_1(\{e\}) = \text{proj}_1(\{e'\}) \neq \emptyset \vee \text{proj}_2(\{e\}) = \text{proj}_2(\{e'\}) \neq \emptyset) \implies e = e') \wedge [\text{local injectivity of projections}] (e \neq e' \implies [\text{coincidence freeness (a single event per transition)}] \exists Y \subseteq X. (\text{proj}_1(Y) \in \mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \text{proj}_2(Y) \in \mathcal{C}_2 \wedge (e \in Y \iff e' \notin Y)))\}$ with projections being defined as follows:
 - * $\text{proj}_1(X) = \{\theta_1 \in \mathcal{E}_1 \mid \parallel_L \theta_1 \in X \vee \exists \theta_2 \in \mathcal{E}_2. (\theta_1, \theta_2)_L \in X\}$.
 - * $\text{proj}_2(X) = \{\theta_2 \in \mathcal{E}_2 \mid \parallel_L \theta_2 \in X \vee \exists \theta_1 \in \mathcal{E}_1. (\theta_1, \theta_2)_L \in X\}$.
 - $\ell = \{(\parallel_L \theta, \text{act}(\parallel_L \theta)) \mid \exists X_1 \in \mathcal{C}_1. \theta \in X_1 \wedge \text{act}(\theta) \notin L\} \cup \{(\parallel_L \theta, \text{act}(\parallel_L \theta)) \mid \exists X_2 \in \mathcal{C}_2. \theta \in X_2 \wedge \text{act}(\theta) \notin L\} \cup \{((\theta_1, \theta_2)_L, \text{act}((\theta_1, \theta_2)_L)) \mid \exists X_1 \in \mathcal{C}_1. \exists X_2 \in \mathcal{C}_2. \theta_1 \in X_1 \wedge \theta_2 \in X_2 \wedge \text{act}(\theta_1) = \text{act}(\theta_2) \in L\}$.

Our construction reflects a deliberate attempt to balance the fine-grained causal information needed by hereditary history-preserving bisimilarity with the syntactic discipline imposed by the reversible calculus. This requires treating occurrences of executed actions not simply as nodes in a partial order, but as evidence of how alternative or parallel subprocesses have been selected. The key design choice is to let proof terms determine the identity and causal placement of events. Each transition of the process calculus introduces exactly one event in the configuration structure, with the shape of its proof term determining how the event embeds into the partial order: prefix constructors contribute subject causality [BS98], choice constructors determine branching structure, and the synchronization constructor $((\theta_1, \theta_2)_L)$ inserts the necessary causal links between the two participating sides (i.e., object causality [BS98]). In this way, the construction makes concurrency and causality explicit, without resorting to artificial identifiers – the structure of the proof term is the identifier.

With each process $P \in \mathbb{P}$ we then denotationally associate a stable configuration structure semantics in a way similar to [Win86, AC20], with the notable difference that we represent events via proof terms. More precisely, each process is given a pair formed by a stable configuration structure, built by using the operators above, and a configuration of that structure. The idea is that all processes reachable from the same initial process share the same configuration structure. In contrast, the designated configuration uniquely identifies

the specific process through the proof terms labeling a sequence of proved transitions by means of which the considered process is reached from the initial one.

Note that such a sequence is empty if P is initial – which corresponds to the empty configuration – and unique if P is sequential. In the case that P is neither initial nor sequential, if there are several transition sequences reaching it – meaning that non-synchronizing actions of different parallel subprocesses have been executed – then they result in the same configuration [BC94], because independent actions can be executed in any order and the order of the elements within a configuration – which is a set – does not matter.

Definition 4.7. The *stable configuration structure semantics* of $P \in \mathbb{P}$ is the pair $\llbracket P \rrbracket = (C_P, X_P)$ where:

- $C_P = \text{scs}(\text{to_init}(P))$, with the stable configuration structure $\text{scs}(Q)$ associated with an initial process $Q \in \mathbb{P}$ being defined by induction on the syntactical structure of Q as follows:
 - $\text{scs}(\underline{0}) = N$.
 - $\text{scs}(a . Q') = a . \text{scs}(Q')$.
 - $\text{scs}(Q_1 + Q_2) = \text{scs}(Q_1) + \text{scs}(Q_2)$.
 - $\text{scs}(Q_1 \parallel_L Q_2) = \text{scs}(Q_1) \parallel_L \text{scs}(Q_2)$.
- $X_P = \emptyset$ if P is initial, otherwise $X_P = \{\theta_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ such that there exists $P_{i-1} \xrightarrow{\theta_i} P_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ with $P_0 = \text{to_init}(P)$ and $P_n = P$. ■

Example 4.8. $\llbracket a . \underline{0} \parallel_\emptyset a . \underline{0} \rrbracket$ comprises (see Figure 1(a)):

- The two events $\parallel_\emptyset a$ and $\parallel_\emptyset a$.
- The four configurations \emptyset , $\{\parallel_\emptyset a\}$, $\{\parallel_\emptyset a\}$, $\{\parallel_\emptyset a, \parallel_\emptyset a\}$.
- The two maximal computations $\emptyset \xrightarrow{a}_{C_{a . \underline{0} \parallel_\emptyset a . \underline{0}}} \{\parallel_\emptyset a\} \xrightarrow{a}_{C_{a . \underline{0} \parallel_\emptyset a . \underline{0}}} \{\parallel_\emptyset a, \parallel_\emptyset a\}$ and $\emptyset \xrightarrow{a}_{C_{a . \underline{0} \parallel_\emptyset a . \underline{0}}} \{\parallel_\emptyset a\} \xrightarrow{a}_{C_{a . \underline{0} \parallel_\emptyset a . \underline{0}}} \{\parallel_\emptyset a, \parallel_\emptyset a\}$.

In contrast, $\llbracket a . a . \underline{0} \rrbracket$ comprises (see Figure 1(b)):

- The two events a and $.a$.
- The three configurations \emptyset , $\{a\}$, $\{a, .a\}$.
- The only maximal computation $\emptyset \xrightarrow{a}_{C_{a . a . \underline{0}}} \{a\} \xrightarrow{a}_{C_{a . a . \underline{0}}} \{a, .a\}$.

Therefore, $\llbracket a . \underline{0} \parallel_\emptyset a . \underline{0} \rrbracket \not\sim_{\text{HHPB}} \llbracket a . a . \underline{0} \rrbracket$ because a causally precedes $.a$ while $\parallel_\emptyset a$ and $\parallel_\emptyset a$ are independent of each other and hence no (labeling- and) causality-preserving bijection would relate the former two events to the latter two. ■

4.5. Operational Characterization Result. We start by establishing a connection between proved transitions of processes and transitions of stable configuration structures associated with processes.

Lemma 4.9. Let $P, P' \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\theta \in \Theta$. Then $P \xrightarrow{\theta} P'$ iff $X_P \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta)}_{C_P} X_{P'}$.

Proof. The proof is divided into two parts:

- Suppose that $P \xrightarrow{\theta} P'$. We show that $X_P \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta)}_{C_P} X_{P'}$ by proceeding by induction on the number $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ of applications of operational semantic rules in Table 1 that are necessary to derive the transition $P \xrightarrow{\theta} P'$:

- If $n = 1$ then P is $a.Q$ with $\text{init}(Q)$, $a.Q \xrightarrow{a} a^\dagger.Q$ by rule ACT_f , and P' is $a^\dagger.Q$. From $\text{init}(P)$ it follows that $\llbracket P \rrbracket = (C_P, \emptyset)$ and $\llbracket P' \rrbracket = (C_P, \{a\})$, hence $X_P \xrightarrow{a}_{C_P} X_{P'}$.
 - If $n > 1$ then there are three cases:
 - * Let P be $a^\dagger.Q$ so that $P \xrightarrow{a\theta'} P'$ with P' being $a^\dagger.Q'$. Then $Q \xrightarrow{\theta'} Q'$ by rule ACT_p , hence $X_Q \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta')}_{C_Q} X_{Q'}$ by the induction hypothesis with $\llbracket Q \rrbracket = (C_Q, X_Q)$ and $\llbracket Q' \rrbracket = (C_Q, X_{Q'})$.
 Let $\text{to_init}(Q) \xrightarrow{\theta_1} \dots \xrightarrow{\theta_n} Q \xrightarrow{\theta'} Q'$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so $X_Q = \{\theta_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and $X_{Q'} = X_Q \cup \{\theta'\}$. Then $\text{to_init}(P) = a.\text{to_init}(Q) \xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow{a\theta_1} \dots \xrightarrow{a\theta_n} P \xrightarrow{a\theta'} P'$, $\llbracket P \rrbracket = (a.C_Q, X_P)$ with $X_P = \{a\} \cup \{.a\theta_i \mid \theta_i \in X_Q\}$, and $\llbracket P' \rrbracket = (a.C_Q, X_{P'})$ with $X_{P'} = X_P \cup \{.a\theta'\}$ and $.a\theta' \notin X_P$. Thus $X_P \xrightarrow{\text{act}(.a\theta')}_{C_P} X_{P'}$ with $C_P = a.C_Q$.
 - * Let P be $P_1 + P_2$. There are two subcases:
 - If P_1 moves, i.e., $P \xrightarrow{+\theta'} P'$ with P' being $P'_1 + P_2$ and $\text{init}(P_2)$, then $P_1 \xrightarrow{\theta'} P'_1$ by rule CHO_1 , hence $X_{P_1} \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta')}_{C_{P_1}} X_{P'_1}$ by the induction hypothesis with $\llbracket P_1 \rrbracket = (C_{P_1}, X_{P_1})$ and $\llbracket P'_1 \rrbracket = (C_{P_1}, X_{P'_1})$.
 Let $\text{to_init}(P_1) \xrightarrow{\theta_1} \dots \xrightarrow{\theta_n} P_1 \xrightarrow{\theta'} P'_1$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so $X_{P_1} = \{\theta_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and $X_{P'_1} = X_{P_1} \cup \{\theta'\}$. Then $\text{to_init}(P) = \text{to_init}(P_1) + P_2 \xrightarrow{+\theta_1} \dots \xrightarrow{+\theta_n} P_1 + P_2 \xrightarrow{+\theta'} P'$, $\llbracket P \rrbracket = (C_{P_1} + C_{P_2}, X_P)$ with $X_P = \{+\theta_i \mid \theta_i \in X_{P_1}\}$, and $\llbracket P' \rrbracket = (C_{P_1} + C_{P_2}, X_{P'})$ with $X_{P'} = X_P \cup \{+\theta'\}$ and $+\theta' \notin X_P$. Thus $X_P \xrightarrow{\text{act}(+\theta')}_{C_P} X_{P'}$ with $C_P = C_{P_1} + C_{P_2}$.
 - The subcase in which P_2 moves and P_1 is initial is like the previous one.
 - * Let P be $P_1 \parallel_L P_2$. Given two sequences $\vec{\theta}_1$ and $\vec{\theta}_2$ of proof terms labeling two sequences of proved transitions respectively departing from P_1 and P_2 , we characterize their interleaving and synchronization through the function $\text{zip} : \Theta^* \times \Theta^* \times 2^{A \setminus \{\tau\}} \rightarrow \Theta^*$ defined by induction on the sum of the lengths of its first two arguments $\vec{\theta}_1, \vec{\theta}_2 \in \Theta^*$ as follows:

$$\text{zip}(\vec{\theta}_1, \vec{\theta}_2, L) = \begin{cases} \parallel_L \theta' \text{zip}(\vec{\theta}_1, \vec{\theta}_2) & \text{if } \vec{\theta}_1 = \theta' \vec{\theta}_1' \wedge \text{act}(\theta') \notin L \wedge (\vec{\theta}_2 = \varepsilon \vee (\vec{\theta}_2 = \theta'' \vec{\theta}_2' \wedge (\text{act}(\theta'') \in L \vee |\vec{\theta}_1| \geq |\vec{\theta}_2|))) \\ \parallel_L \theta'' \text{zip}(\vec{\theta}_1, \vec{\theta}_2') & \text{if } \vec{\theta}_2 = \theta'' \vec{\theta}_2' \wedge \text{act}(\theta'') \notin L \wedge (\vec{\theta}_1 = \varepsilon \vee (\vec{\theta}_1 = \theta' \vec{\theta}_1' \wedge (\text{act}(\theta') \in L \vee |\vec{\theta}_1| < |\vec{\theta}_2|))) \\ \langle \theta', \theta'' \rangle_L \text{zip}(\vec{\theta}_1, \vec{\theta}_2) & \text{if } \vec{\theta}_1 = \theta' \vec{\theta}_1' \wedge \vec{\theta}_2 = \theta'' \vec{\theta}_2' \wedge \text{act}(\theta') = \text{act}(\theta'') \in L \\ \varepsilon & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
- There are three subcases:
- If $\text{act}(\theta) \notin L$ and P_1 moves, i.e., $P \xrightarrow{\parallel_L \theta'} P'$ with P' being $P'_1 \parallel_L P_2$, then $P_1 \xrightarrow{\theta'} P'_1$ by rule PAR_1 , hence $X_{P_1} \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta')}_{C_{P_1}} X_{P'_1}$ by the induction hypothesis with $\llbracket P_1 \rrbracket = (C_{P_1}, X_{P_1})$ and $\llbracket P'_1 \rrbracket = (C_{P_1}, X_{P'_1})$.
 Let $\text{to_init}(P_1) \xrightarrow{\theta_{1,1}} \dots \xrightarrow{\theta_{1,n_1}} P_1 \xrightarrow{\theta'} P'_1$ with $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, so $X_{P_1} = \{\theta_{1,i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n_1\}$ and $X_{P'_1} = X_{P_1} \cup \{\theta'\}$. Also let $\text{to_init}(P_2) \xrightarrow{\theta_{2,1}} \dots \xrightarrow{\theta_{2,n_2}} P_2$ with $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, so $X_{P_2} = \{\theta_{2,i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n_2\}$. We denote by $\vec{\theta}_1$ and $\vec{\theta}_2$ the two sequences of proof terms. Then

- $to_init(P) = to_init(P_1) \parallel_L to_init(P_2)$ reaches P via a sequence of proved transitions labeled with $zip(\vec{\theta}_1, \vec{\theta}_2, L)$ and afterwards P' via $P \xrightarrow{\parallel_L \theta'} P'$, $\llbracket P \rrbracket = (C_{P_1} \parallel_L C_{P_2}, X_P)$ with $X_P = \{\bar{\theta} \mid \bar{\theta} \text{ in } zip(\vec{\theta}_1, \vec{\theta}_2, L)\}$, and $\llbracket P' \rrbracket = (C_{P_1} \parallel_L C_{P_2}, X_{P'})$ with $X_{P'} = X_P \cup \{\parallel_L \theta'\}$ and $\parallel_L \theta' \notin X_P$. Thus $X_P \xrightarrow{act(\parallel_L \theta')}_{C_P} X_{P'}$ with $C_P = C_{P_1} \parallel_L C_{P_2}$.
- The subcase in which $act(\theta) \notin L$ and P_2 moves is like the previous one.
 - If $act(\theta) \in L$, i.e., $P \xrightarrow{\langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L} P'$ with P' being $enr(P'_1 \parallel_L P'_2, \langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L)$, then $P_k \xrightarrow{\theta_k} P'_k$ for $k \in \{1, 2\}$ by rule SYN, hence $X_{P_k} \xrightarrow{act(\theta_k)}_{C_{P_k}} X_{P'_k}$ by the induction hypothesis with $\llbracket P_k \rrbracket = (C_{P_k}, X_{P_k})$ and $\llbracket P'_k \rrbracket = (C_{P_k}, X_{P'_k})$.
- For $k \in \{1, 2\}$ let $to_init(P_k) \xrightarrow{\theta_{k,1}} \dots \xrightarrow{\theta_{k,n_k}} P_k \xrightarrow{\theta_k} P'_k$ with $n_k \in \mathbb{N}$, so $X_{P_k} = \{\theta_{k,i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n_k\}$ and $X_{P'_k} = X_{P_k} \cup \{\theta_k\}$; we denote by $\vec{\theta}_k$ the sequence of proof terms. Then $to_init(P) = to_init(P_1) \parallel_L to_init(P_2)$ reaches P via a sequence of proved transitions labeled with $zip(\vec{\theta}_1, \vec{\theta}_2, L)$ and afterwards P' via $P \xrightarrow{\langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L} P'$, $\llbracket P \rrbracket = (C_{P_1} \parallel_L C_{P_2}, X_P)$ with $X_P = \{\bar{\theta} \mid \bar{\theta} \text{ in } zip(\vec{\theta}_1, \vec{\theta}_2, L)\}$, and $\llbracket P' \rrbracket = (C_{P_1} \parallel_L C_{P_2}, X_{P'})$ with $X_{P'} = X_P \cup \{\langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L\}$ and $\langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L \notin X_P$. Thus $X_P \xrightarrow{act(\langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L)}_{C_P} X_{P'}$ with $C_P = C_{P_1} \parallel_L C_{P_2}$.
- Suppose that $X_P \xrightarrow{act(\theta)}_{C_P} X_{P'}$. Consider a variant Θ' of Θ in which \dagger , \ddagger , \parallel_L , and \ll_L are given a subscript equal to the subprocess that does not move and this is applied to the corresponding rules in Table 1 as well as the corresponding operations on stable configuration structures in Section 4.4. Although the configuration structure transition $X_P \xrightarrow{act(\theta)}_{C_P} X_{P'}$ is not generated inductively, from the only event θ – enriched as described above – in $X_{P'} \setminus X_P$ we can pinpoint $act(\theta)$ within P and P' .

Assuming that θ does not have subterms of the form $\langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L$, meaning that $X_P \xrightarrow{act(\theta)}_{C_P} X_{P'}$ originated from a single action, we define the notion of process context $C[\bullet] = ctx(\theta)$ by induction on the syntactical structure of $\theta \in \Theta'$ as follows:

$$ctx(\theta) = \begin{cases} \bullet & \text{if } \theta \in \mathcal{A} \\ a^\dagger. ctx(\theta') & \text{if } \theta = ._a \theta' \\ ctx(\theta') + Q & \text{if } \theta = \dagger_Q \theta' \text{ where } init(Q) \\ Q + ctx(\theta') & \text{if } \theta = \ddagger_Q \theta' \text{ where } init(Q) \\ ctx(\theta') \parallel_L Q & \text{if } \theta = \parallel_{L,Q} \theta' \\ Q \parallel_L ctx(\theta') & \text{if } \theta = \ll_{L,Q} \theta' \end{cases}$$

Since X_P is the set of proof terms labeling a sequence of proved transitions from $to_init(P)$ to P , from $X_P \xrightarrow{act(\theta)}_{C_P} X_{P'}$ it follows that P must contain an occurrence of $act(\theta)$ in an initial subprocess of the form $act(\theta). \bar{P}$. Then $P = C[act(\theta). \bar{P}]$ with $act(\theta). \bar{P} \xrightarrow{act(\theta)} act(\theta)^\dagger. \bar{P}$ and hence $P = C[act(\theta). \bar{P}] \xrightarrow{\theta} C[act(\theta)^\dagger. \bar{P}] = P'$.

If θ has subterms of the form $\langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L$, then we proceed in a similar way by constructing a context with as many \bullet -holes as there are synchronizing subprocesses. The following clause has to be added to the inductive definition of process context: $ctx(\theta) = ctx(\theta_1) \parallel_L ctx(\theta_2)$ if $\theta = \langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle_L$. \square

We are now in a position of proving our operational characterization result under the same assumption as the denotational characterization result of Theorem 3.2. Conflict locality is recast in the PRPC setting by requiring that, for each maximal set of conflicting actions

(i.e., actions inside subprocesses composed by nondeterministic choice), no two actions in the set occur in other two subprocesses that are composed in parallel – remember that events are unique while every action may occur several times in a process.

Theorem 4.10. *Let $P_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{P}$. Then $\llbracket P_1 \rrbracket \sim_{\text{HHPB}} \llbracket P_2 \rrbracket$ iff $P_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P_2$ provided that all possible conflicts are local.*

Proof. The proof is divided into two parts:

- Suppose that $\llbracket P_1 \rrbracket \sim_{\text{HHPB}} \llbracket P_2 \rrbracket$. Then $P_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P_2$ follows by proving that the symmetric relation $\mathcal{B} = \{(Q_1, Q_2) \mid \llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket \sim_{\text{HHPB}} \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket\}$ is a brm-forward-reverse bisimulation. Let $(Q_1, Q_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, so that $\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket \sim_{\text{HHPB}} \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket$:
 - If $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\theta_1} Q'_1$ then $X_{Q_1} \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta_1)}_{C_{Q_1}} X_{Q'_1}$ due to Lemma 4.9, hence $X_{Q_2} \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta_2)}_{C_{Q_2}} X_{Q'_2}$ with $\text{act}(\theta_1) = \text{act}(\theta_2)$ and $\llbracket Q'_1 \rrbracket \sim_{\text{HHPB}} \llbracket Q'_2 \rrbracket$ because $\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket \sim_{\text{HHPB}} \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket$, from which it follows that $Q_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} Q'_2$ due to Lemma 4.9 with $(Q'_1, Q'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If $Q'_1 \xrightarrow{\theta_1} Q_1$ then $X_{Q'_1} \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta_1)}_{C_{Q'_1}} X_{Q_1}$ due to Lemma 4.9, hence $X_{Q'_2} \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta_2)}_{C_{Q'_2}} X_{Q_2}$ with $\text{act}(\theta_1) = \text{act}(\theta_2)$ and $\llbracket Q'_1 \rrbracket \sim_{\text{HHPB}} \llbracket Q'_2 \rrbracket$ because $\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket \sim_{\text{HHPB}} \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket$, from which it follows that $Q'_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} Q_2$ due to Lemma 4.9 with $(Q'_1, Q'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - The stable configuration structure semantics preserves actions inside transition labels (Lemma 4.9), uniquely identifies different occurrences of the same action in a process via as many different proof terms in the set of events, and is able to distinguish between causality and concurrency like the proved operational semantics of Table 1. Therefore, from $\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket \sim_{\text{HHPB}} \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket$ – in particular the incoming transition matching between X_{Q_1} and X_{Q_2} and the labeling- and causality-preserving bijection from X_{Q_1} to X_{Q_2} – it follows that there must be a one-to-one correspondence between the incoming proved transitions of Q_1 and the incoming proved transitions of Q_2 , hence $\text{brm}(Q_1) = \text{brm}(Q_2)$.
- Suppose that $P_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P_2$. Then the existence of a sequence of proved transitions $\text{to_init}(P_1) = P_{1,1} \xrightarrow{\theta_{P_{1,1}}} P_{1,2} \dots P_{1,n} \xrightarrow{\theta_{P_{1,n}}} P_1$ implies the existence of a sequence of proved transitions $\text{to_init}(P_2) = P_{2,1} \xrightarrow{\theta_{P_{2,1}}} P_{2,2} \dots P_{2,n} \xrightarrow{\theta_{P_{2,n}}} P_2$ such that $\text{act}(\theta_{P_{1,h}}) = \text{act}(\theta_{P_{2,h}})$ and $P_{1,h} \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P_{2,h}$ for all $h = 1, \dots, n$, and vice versa. Note that $\theta_{P_{1,h}} \neq \theta_{P_{1,k}}$ and $\theta_{P_{2,h}} \neq \theta_{P_{2,k}}$ for all $h \neq k$ because different occurrences of the same action in a process are identified by different proof terms. Thus $\llbracket P_1 \rrbracket \sim_{\text{HHPB}} \llbracket P_2 \rrbracket$ follows by proving that $\mathcal{B} = \{(X_{Q_1}, X_{Q_2}, \{(\theta_{Q_{1,h}}, \theta_{Q_{2,h}}) \mid h \in H\}) \mid Q_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} Q_2 \wedge \text{to_init}(Q_i) = Q_{i,1} \xrightarrow{\theta_{Q_{i,1}}} Q_{i,2} \dots Q_{i,|H|} \xrightarrow{\theta_{Q_{i,|H|}}} Q_i \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\} \wedge \text{act}(\theta_{Q_{1,h}}) = \text{act}(\theta_{Q_{2,h}}) \text{ for all } h \in H \wedge Q_{1,h} \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} Q_{2,h} \text{ for all } h \in H\}$ is a hereditary-history preserving bisimulation. Observing that $Q_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} Q_2$ implies $(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \in \mathcal{B}$ when Q_1 and Q_2 are both initial, take $(X_{Q_1}, X_{Q_2}, \{(\theta_{Q_{1,h}}, \theta_{Q_{2,h}}) \mid h \in H\}) \in \mathcal{B}$, so that $Q_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} Q_2$:
 - If $X_{Q_1} \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta_1)}_{C_{Q_1}} X_{Q'_1}$ then $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\theta_1} Q'_1$ due to Lemma 4.9, hence $Q_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} Q'_2$ with $\text{act}(\theta_1) = \text{act}(\theta_2)$ and $Q'_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} Q'_2$ because $Q_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} Q_2$, from which it follows that $X_{Q_2} \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta_2)}_{C_{Q_2}} X_{Q'_2}$ due to Lemma 4.9. Since $\theta_1 \notin X_{Q_1}$ and $\theta_2 \notin X_{Q_2}$, it holds that $(X_{Q'_1}, X_{Q'_2}, \{(\theta_{Q_{1,h}}, \theta_{Q_{2,h}}) \mid h \in H\} \cup \{(\theta_1, \theta_2)\}) \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - If we start from $X_{Q_2} \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta_2)}_{C_{Q_2}} X_{Q'_2}$, then we reason in the same way.

- If $X_{Q'_1} \xrightarrow{act(\theta_1)} c_{Q'_1} X_{Q_1}$ then $Q'_1 \xrightarrow{\theta_1} Q_1$ due to Lemma 4.9, hence $Q'_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} Q_2$ with $act(\theta_1) = act(\theta_2)$ and $Q'_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} Q'_2$ because $Q_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} Q_2$, from which it follows that $X_{Q'_2} \xrightarrow{act(\theta_2)} c_{Q'_2} X_{Q_2}$ due to Lemma 4.9. Since $\theta_1 \notin X_{Q'_1}$, $\theta_2 \notin X_{Q'_2}$, and $brm(Q_1) = brm(Q_2)$, the latter transition can be selected in such a way to satisfy $\{(\theta_{Q_{1,h}}, \theta_{Q_{2,h}}) \mid h \in H\} \upharpoonright X_{Q'_1} = \{(\theta_{Q_{1,h}}, \theta_{Q_{2,h}}) \mid h \in H\} \setminus \{(\theta_1, \theta_2)\}$, hence $(X_{Q'_1}, X_{Q'_2}, \{(\theta_{Q_{1,h}}, \theta_{Q_{2,h}}) \mid h \in H\} \setminus \{(\theta_1, \theta_2)\}) \in \mathcal{B}$.

If we start from $X_{Q'_2} \xrightarrow{act(\theta_2)} c_{Q'_2} X_{Q_2}$, then we reason in the same way.

- $f = \{(\theta_{Q_{1,h}}, \theta_{Q_{2,h}}) \mid h \in H\}$ certainly is a bijection from X_{Q_1} to X_{Q_2} – as the events along either computation are different from each other, so the two reached configurations X_{Q_1} and X_{Q_2} contain the same number of events, and paired in a stepwise manner – that preserves labeling – by definition of \mathcal{B} . If $|H| \leq 1$ then causality is trivially preserved.

Suppose that X_{Q_1} and X_{Q_2} break causality and, among all the pairs of configurations associated with $\sim_{\text{FRB:brm}}$ -equivalent processes that break causality, they are the closest ones to \emptyset and \emptyset (in terms of number of transitions to be executed from either empty configuration). The rest of the proof is like the one of the corresponding part of the proof of Theorem 3.2, with Lemma 4.9 being exploited as well. \square

5. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN \mathcal{L}_{EI} AND \mathcal{L}_{BRM}

From Theorems 4.10, 4.6, and 2.6 it follows that, under conflict locality, two processes satisfy the same formulas of \mathcal{L}_{BRM} iff their associated stable configuration structures satisfy the same formulas of \mathcal{L}_{EI} . It is therefore interesting to investigate the relationships between the two logics. On the one hand, we show how to reinterpret \mathcal{L}_{EI} over processes (Section 5.1) and \mathcal{L}_{BRM} over stable configuration structures (Section 5.2). On the other hand, we discuss how to translate \mathcal{L}_{BRM} into \mathcal{L}_{EI} (Section 5.3) and vice versa (Section 5.4).

5.1. Reinterpreting \mathcal{L}_{EI} over \mathbb{P} . The only non-trivial case is the one of the binder $(x : a)$. The process analogous of an event in a configuration that is labeled with a certain action is a subprocess starting with an executed occurrence of that action. Indicating with $sp(P)$ the set of all subprocesses of P , let $apt(a^\dagger.P', P)$ be the proof term associated with the execution of action a of the subterm $a^\dagger.P'$ of P . Formally, $apt(a^\dagger.P', P) = \theta$ iff $a^\dagger.P' \in sp(P)$ and there exist $P'', P''' \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $a.to_init(P') \in sp(P'')$, $P'' \xrightarrow{\theta} P'''$, $act(\theta) = a$, and $a^\dagger.to_init(P') \in sp(P''')$.

The satisfaction relation $\models \subseteq (\mathbb{P} \times \Theta^{\mathcal{I}}) \times \mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}$ is defined by induction on the syntactical structure of $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
P &\models_\rho \text{true} \\
P &\models_\rho \neg\phi' && \text{iff } P \not\models_\rho \phi' \\
P &\models_\rho \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 && \text{iff } P \models_\rho \phi_1 \text{ and } P \models_\rho \phi_2 \\
P &\models_\rho \langle x : a \rangle \phi' && \text{iff there exists } P \xrightarrow{\theta} P' \text{ such that } act(\theta) = a \text{ and } P' \models_{\rho[x \mapsto \theta]} \phi' \\
P &\models_\rho (x : a)\phi' && \text{iff there exists } a^\dagger.P' \in sp(P) \text{ such that } P \models_{\rho[x \mapsto apt(a^\dagger.P', P)]} \phi' \\
P &\models_\rho \langle\langle x \rangle\rangle \phi' && \text{iff there exists } P' \xrightarrow{\theta} P \text{ such that } \rho(x) = \theta \text{ and } P' \models_\rho \phi'
\end{aligned}$$

where it is understood that the environment in the subscript of every occurrence of \models is

permissible for the configuration identifying (in the associated denotational semantics) the process on the left – e.g., X_P in the case of process P – and the formula on the right.

Since it is instrumental to prove the next results, we define the depth of $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}$ by induction on the syntactical structure of ϕ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{depth}(\text{true}) &= 0 \\ \text{depth}(\neg\phi') &= 1 + \text{depth}(\phi') \\ \text{depth}(\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2) &= 1 + \max(\text{depth}(\phi_1), \text{depth}(\phi_2)) \\ \text{depth}(\langle x : a \rangle \phi') &= 1 + \text{depth}(\phi') \\ \text{depth}((x : a)\phi') &= 1 + \text{depth}(\phi') \\ \text{depth}(\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle \phi') &= 1 + \text{depth}(\phi') \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 5.1. *Let $P \in \mathbb{P}$. Then $\forall \phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}. \forall \rho \in \text{pe}(X_P, \phi). P \models_\rho \phi \iff \llbracket P \rrbracket \models_\rho \phi$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on $k = \text{depth}(\phi)$:

- If $k = 0$ then ϕ is **true** and both P and $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ satisfy it.
- If $k \geq 1$ then there are five cases:
 - If ϕ is $\neg\phi'$ then by the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P \models_\rho \neg\phi' &\text{ iff } P \not\models_\rho \phi' \\ &\text{ iff } \llbracket P \rrbracket \not\models_\rho \phi' \\ &\text{ iff } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models_\rho \neg\phi' \end{aligned}$$
 - If ϕ is $\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ then by the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P \models_\rho \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 &\text{ iff } P \models_\rho \phi_1 \text{ and } P \models_\rho \phi_2 \\ &\text{ iff } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models_\rho \phi_1 \text{ and } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models_\rho \phi_2 \\ &\text{ iff } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models_\rho \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \end{aligned}$$
 - If ϕ is $\langle x : a \rangle \phi'$ then by Lemma 4.9 and the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P \models_\rho \langle x : a \rangle \phi' &\text{ iff } \text{there is } P \xrightarrow{\theta} P' \text{ s.t. } \text{act}(\theta) = a \text{ and } P' \models_{\rho[x \mapsto \theta]} \phi' \\ &\text{ iff } \text{there is } X_P \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta)}_{C_P} X_{P'} \text{ s.t. } \text{act}(\theta) = a \text{ and } \llbracket P' \rrbracket \models_{\rho[x \mapsto \theta]} \phi' \\ &\text{ iff } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models_\rho \langle x : a \rangle \phi' \end{aligned}$$
 - If ϕ is $(x : a)\phi'$ then by the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P \models_\rho (x : a)\phi' &\text{ iff } \text{there is } a^\dagger. P' \in \text{sp}(P) \text{ s.t. } P \models_{\rho[x \mapsto \text{apt}(a^\dagger, P', P)]} \phi' \\ &\text{ iff } \text{there is } \theta \in X_P \text{ s.t. } \theta = \text{apt}(a^\dagger, P', P) \text{ and } \\ &\quad \llbracket P \rrbracket \models_{\rho[x \mapsto \text{apt}(a^\dagger, P', P)]} \phi' \\ &\text{ iff } \text{there is } \theta \in X_P \text{ s.t. } \text{act}(\theta) = a \text{ and } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models_{\rho[x \mapsto \theta]} \phi' \\ &\text{ iff } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models_\rho (x : a)\phi' \end{aligned}$$
 - If ϕ is $\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle \phi'$ then by Lemma 4.9 and the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P \models_\rho \langle\langle x \rangle\rangle \phi' &\text{ iff } \text{there is } P' \xrightarrow{\theta} P \text{ s.t. } \rho(x) = \theta \text{ and } P' \models_\rho \phi' \\ &\text{ iff } \text{there is } X_{P'} \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta)}_{C_{P'}} X_P \text{ s.t. } \rho(x) = \theta \text{ and } \llbracket P' \rrbracket \models_\rho \phi' \\ &\text{ iff } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models_\rho \langle\langle x \rangle\rangle \phi' \end{aligned}$$

□

To prove that, consequently, \mathcal{L}_{EI} reinterpreted over \mathbb{P} characterizes $\sim_{\text{FRB:brm}}$, we follow [PU14] and hence first show that any substitution of the variables freely occurring in a formula requires a modification of the permissible environment.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $P \in \mathbb{P}$, $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}$, and $\rho \in \text{pe}(X_P, \phi)$. Given a substitution σ that – not necessarily injectively – maps $\text{fi}(\phi)$ to a set of fresh identifiers that do not occur either free or bound in ϕ , let $\sigma(\phi)$ be the formula obtained from ϕ by replacing each occurrence of $x \in \text{fi}(\phi)$*

with $\sigma(x)$ and let $\rho^\sigma \in pe(X_P, \sigma(\phi))$ be the environment obtained from ρ by replacing each $x \in fi(\phi)$ with $\sigma(x)$. Then $P \models_\rho \phi$ iff $P \models_{\rho^\sigma} \sigma(\phi)$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on $k = depth(\phi)$:

- If $k = 0$ then ϕ must be **true**. Since **true** is closed, we have that $\sigma(\mathbf{true}) = \mathbf{true}$ and $\rho^\sigma = \rho$, hence the result trivially follows.
- If $k \geq 1$ then there are five cases:

- If ϕ is $\neg\phi'$ then by the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P \models_\rho \neg\phi' & \text{ iff } P \not\models_\rho \phi' \\ & \text{ iff } P \not\models_{\rho^\sigma} \sigma(\phi') \\ & \text{ iff } P \models_{\rho^\sigma} \sigma(\neg\phi') \end{aligned}$$

- If ϕ is $\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ then by the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P \models_\rho \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 & \text{ iff } P \models_\rho \phi_1 \text{ and } P \models_\rho \phi_2 \\ & \text{ iff } P \models_{\rho^{\sigma_1}} \sigma_1(\phi_1) \text{ and } P \models_{\rho^{\sigma_2}} \sigma_2(\phi_2) \\ & \text{ iff } P \models_{\rho^\sigma} \sigma(\phi_1) \text{ and } P \models_{\rho^\sigma} \sigma(\phi_2) \\ & \text{ iff } P \models_{\rho^\sigma} \sigma(\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2) \end{aligned}$$

provided that $\sigma_1(x) = \sigma_2(x)$ for all $x \in fi(\phi_1) \cap fi(\phi_2)$ and $\sigma \upharpoonright fi(\phi_k) = \sigma_k$ for $k \in \{1, 2\}$.

- If ϕ is $\langle x : a \rangle \phi'$ then by the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P \models_\rho \langle x : a \rangle \phi' & \text{ iff there is } P \xrightarrow{\theta} P' \text{ s.t. } act(\theta) = a \text{ and } P' \models_{\rho[x \mapsto \theta]} \phi' \\ & \text{ iff there is } P \xrightarrow{\theta} P' \text{ s.t. } act(\theta) = a \text{ and } P' \models_{(\rho[x \mapsto \theta])^{\sigma'}} \sigma'(\phi') \\ & \text{ iff there is } P \xrightarrow{\theta} P' \text{ s.t. } act(\theta) = a \text{ and } P' \models_{\rho^\sigma[x \mapsto \theta]} \sigma(\phi') \\ & \text{ iff } P \models_{\rho^\sigma} \sigma(\langle x : a \rangle \phi') \end{aligned}$$

provided that $\sigma = \sigma'$ if $x \notin fi(\phi')$ while $\sigma[x \mapsto \sigma'(x)] = \sigma'$ if $x \in fi(\phi')$.

- If ϕ is $(x : a)\phi'$ then by the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P \models_\rho (x : a)\phi' & \text{ iff there is } a^\dagger. P' \in sp(P) \text{ s.t. } P \models_{\rho[x \mapsto apt(a^\dagger, P', P)]} \phi' \\ & \text{ iff there is } a^\dagger. P' \in sp(P) \text{ s.t. } P \models_{(\rho[x \mapsto apt(a^\dagger, P', P)])^{\sigma'}} \sigma'(\phi') \\ & \text{ iff there is } a^\dagger. P' \in sp(P) \text{ s.t. } P \models_{\rho^\sigma[x \mapsto apt(a^\dagger, P', P)]} \sigma(\phi') \\ & \text{ iff } P \models_{\rho^\sigma} \sigma((x : a)\phi') \end{aligned}$$

provided that $\sigma = \sigma'$ if $x \notin fi(\phi')$ while $\sigma[x \mapsto \sigma'(x)] = \sigma'$ if $x \in fi(\phi')$.

- If ϕ is $\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle \phi'$ then by the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P \models_\rho \langle\langle x \rangle\rangle \phi' & \text{ iff there is } P' \xrightarrow{\theta} P \text{ s.t. } \rho(x) = \theta \text{ and } P' \models_\rho \phi' \\ & \text{ iff there is } P' \xrightarrow{\theta} P \text{ s.t. } \rho^{\sigma'}(\sigma'(x)) = \theta \text{ and } P' \models_{\rho^{\sigma'}} \sigma'(\phi') \\ & \text{ iff there is } P' \xrightarrow{\theta} P \text{ s.t. } \rho^\sigma(\sigma(x)) = \theta \text{ and } P' \models_{\rho^\sigma} \sigma(\phi') \\ & \text{ iff } P \models_{\rho^\sigma} \sigma(\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle \phi') \end{aligned}$$

as $\rho^{\sigma'}(\sigma'(x)) = \rho(x)$, provided that $\sigma \setminus \{(x, \sigma(x))\} = \sigma'$ if $x \notin fi(\phi')$ while $\sigma = \sigma'$ if $x \in fi(\phi')$. \square

Corollary 5.3. *Let $P_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{P}$. Then $P_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P_2$ iff $\exists f_{1,2}. \forall \phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}. \forall \rho \in pe(X_{P_1}, \phi). P_1 \models_\rho \phi \iff P_2 \models_{f_{1,2} \circ \rho} \phi$ where $f_{1,2}$ is a label-preserving bijection from X_{P_1} to X_{P_2} .*

Proof. The proof is divided into two parts:

- Assuming that $P_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P_2$, we observe that the existence of a sequence of proved transitions $to_init(P_1) \xrightarrow{\theta_{P_1,1}} \dots \xrightarrow{\theta_{P_1,n}} P_1$ implies the existence of a sequence of proved transitions $to_init(P_2) \xrightarrow{\theta_{P_2,1}} \dots \xrightarrow{\theta_{P_2,n}} P_2$ such that $act(\theta_{P_1,h}) = act(\theta_{P_2,h})$ for all $h = 1, \dots, n$, and vice versa, where $\{\theta_{P_1,h} \mid 1 \leq h \leq n\} = X_{P_1}$ and $\{\theta_{P_2,h} \mid 1 \leq h \leq n\} = X_{P_2}$.

Note that $n = 0$ when P_1 and P_2 are both initial; moreover $\theta_{P_1,h} \neq \theta_{P_1,k}$ and $\theta_{P_2,h} \neq \theta_{P_2,k}$ for all $h \neq k$. Let $f_{1,2} = \{(\theta_{P_1,h}, \theta_{P_2,h}) \mid 1 \leq h \leq n\}$, which clearly is a labeling-preserving bijection from X_{P_1} to X_{P_2} .

We proceed by induction on $k = \text{depth}(\phi)$:

– If $k = 0$ then ϕ must be **true**, which is trivially satisfied by P_1 and P_2 regardless of their respective permissible environments.

– If $k \geq 1$ then there are five cases:

* If ϕ is $\neg\phi'$ then by the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 \models_{\rho} \neg\phi' & \text{ iff } P_1 \not\models_{\rho} \phi' \\ & \text{ iff } P_2 \not\models_{f_{1,2} \circ \rho} \phi' \\ & \text{ iff } P_2 \models_{f_{1,2} \circ \rho} \neg\phi' \end{aligned}$$

* If ϕ is $\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ then by the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 \models_{\rho} \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 & \text{ iff } P_1 \models_{\rho} \phi_1 \text{ and } P_1 \models_{\rho} \phi_2 \\ & \text{ iff } P_2 \models_{f_{1,2} \circ \rho} \phi_1 \text{ and } P_2 \models_{f_{1,2} \circ \rho} \phi_2 \\ & \text{ iff } P_2 \models_{f_{1,2} \circ \rho} \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \end{aligned}$$

* If ϕ is $\langle x : a \rangle \phi'$ then by $P_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P_2$ and the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 \models_{\rho} \langle x : a \rangle \phi' & \text{ iff there is } P_1 \xrightarrow{\theta_1} P'_1 \text{ s.t. } \text{act}(\theta_1) = a \text{ and } P'_1 \models_{\rho[x \mapsto \theta_1]} \phi' \\ & \text{ iff there is } P_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} P'_2 \text{ s.t. } \text{act}(\theta_2) = a \text{ and } P'_2 \models_{f'_{1,2} \circ \rho[x \mapsto \theta_1]} \phi' \\ & \text{ iff } P_2 \models_{f_{1,2} \circ \rho} \langle x : a \rangle \phi' \end{aligned}$$

provided that $f_{1,2} \cup \{(\theta_1, \theta_2)\} = f'_{1,2}$.

* If ϕ is $(x : a)\phi'$ then by $P_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P_2$ and the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 \models_{\rho} (x : a)\phi' & \text{ iff there is } a^{\dagger}. P'_1 \in \text{sp}(P_1) \text{ s.t. } P_1 \models_{\rho[x \mapsto \text{apt}(a^{\dagger}. P'_1, P_1)]} \phi' \\ & \text{ iff there is } a^{\dagger}. P'_2 \in \text{sp}(P_2) \text{ s.t. } P_2 \models_{f_{1,2} \circ \rho[x \mapsto \text{apt}(a^{\dagger}. P'_1, P_1)]} \phi' \\ & \text{ iff } P_2 \models_{f_{1,2} \circ \rho} (x : a)\phi' \end{aligned}$$

* If ϕ is $\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle \phi'$ then by $P_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P_2$ and the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 \models_{\rho} \langle\langle x \rangle\rangle \phi' & \text{ iff there is } P'_1 \xrightarrow{\theta_1} P_1 \text{ s.t. } \rho(x) = \theta_1 \text{ and } P'_1 \models_{\rho} \phi' \\ & \text{ iff there is } P'_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} P_2 \text{ s.t. } \rho(x) = \theta_2 \text{ and } P'_2 \models_{f'_{1,2} \circ \rho} \phi' \\ & \text{ iff } P_2 \models_{f_{1,2} \circ \rho} \langle\langle x \rangle\rangle \phi' \end{aligned}$$

provided that $f_{1,2} = f'_{1,2} \cup \{(\theta_1, \theta_2)\}$.

- Assuming that there exists a labeling-preserving bijection from X_{P_1} to X_{P_2} such that P_1 and P_2 satisfy the same formulas of \mathcal{L}_{EI} under suitable permissible environments related by the aforementioned bijection, the result follows by proving that the symmetric relation $\mathcal{B} = \{(Q_1, Q_2) \mid \exists f_{1,2}. \forall \phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}. \forall \rho \in \text{pe}(Q_1, \phi). Q_1 \models_{\rho} \phi \iff Q_2 \models_{f_{1,2} \circ \rho} \phi \text{ where } f_{1,2} \text{ is a label-preserving bijection from } X_{Q_1} \text{ to } X_{Q_2}\}$ is a brm-forward-reverse bisimulation.

Given $(Q_1, Q_2) \in \mathcal{B}$:

- If $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\theta_1} Q'_1$ suppose by contradiction that there is no Q'_2 satisfying the same formulas as Q'_1 for some label-preserving bijection $f'_{1,2}$ from $X_{Q'_1}$ to $X_{Q'_2}$ such that $Q_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} Q'_2$ and $\text{act}(\theta_1) = \text{act}(\theta_2)$, i.e., $(Q'_1, Q'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ for no Q'_2 $\text{act}(\theta_1)$ -reachable from Q_2 . Since Q_2 has finitely many outgoing transitions, the set of processes that Q_2 can reach by performing an $\text{act}(\theta_1)$ -transition is finite, say $\{Q'_{2,1}, \dots, Q'_{2,n}\}$ with $n \geq 0$. Since none of the processes in the set satisfies the same formulas as Q'_1 , for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ there exists $\phi_i \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}$ such that $Q'_1 \models_{\rho_i} \phi_i$ but $Q'_{2,i} \not\models_{f'_{1,2,i} \circ \rho_i} \phi_i$ for all labeling-preserving bijections $f'_{1,2,i}$ from $X_{Q'_1}$ to $X_{Q'_{2,i}}$.

Since the formulas ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n may contain different identifiers, let $\{z_\theta \mid \theta \in X_{Q'_1}\}$ be a set of fresh identifiers different from each other and the related environment ρ' be defined by $\rho'(z_\theta) = \theta$ for all $\theta \in X_{Q'_1}$. Also let every substitution σ_i be defined by $\sigma_i(x) = z_{\rho'(x)}$ for all $x \in \text{fv}(\phi_i)$, so that $\rho_i(x) = \rho'(\sigma_i(x))$. It holds that $Q'_1 \models_{\rho'} \sigma_i(\phi_i)$ by Lemma 5.2 and $Q'_{2,i} \not\models_{f'_{1,2,i} \circ \rho'} \sigma_i(\phi_i)$ for all labeling-preserving bijections $f'_{1,2,i}$ from $X_{Q'_1}$ to $X_{Q'_{2,i}}$.

We can then construct the formula $\langle z_{\theta_1} : \text{act}(\theta_1) \rangle \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \sigma_i(\phi_i)$ that is satisfied by Q_1 under ρ such that $\rho[z_{\theta_1} \mapsto \theta_1] = \rho'$ but not by Q_2 under $f_{1,2} \circ \rho$ for all labeling-preserving bijections $f_{1,2}$ from X_{Q_1} to X_{Q_2} ; if $n = 0$ then it is sufficient to take $\langle z_{\theta_1} : \text{act}(\theta_1) \rangle \text{true}$. This formula violates $(Q_1, Q_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, hence there must exist at least one Q'_2 satisfying the same formulas as Q'_1 for some labeling-preserving bijection $f'_{1,2}$ from $X_{Q'_1}$ to $X_{Q'_2}$ such that $Q_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} Q'_2$ and $\text{act}(\theta_1) = \text{act}(\theta_2)$, so that $(Q'_1, Q'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.

- If $Q'_1 \xrightarrow{\theta_1} Q_1$ suppose by contradiction that there is no Q'_2 satisfying the same formulas as Q'_1 for some labeling-preserving bijection $f'_{1,2}$ from $X_{Q'_1}$ to $X_{Q'_2}$ such that $Q'_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} Q_2$ and $\text{act}(\theta_1) = \text{act}(\theta_2)$, i.e., $(Q'_1, Q'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ for no Q'_2 $\text{act}(\theta_1)$ -reaching Q_2 . Since Q_2 has finitely many incoming transitions, the set of processes that can reach Q_2 by performing an $\text{act}(\theta_1)$ -transition is finite, say $\{Q'_{2,1}, \dots, Q'_{2,n}\}$ with $n \geq 0$. Since none of the processes in the set satisfies the same formulas as Q'_1 , for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ there exists $\phi_i \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}$ such that $Q'_1 \models_{\rho_i} \phi_i$ but $Q'_{2,i} \not\models_{f'_{1,2,i} \circ \rho_i} \phi_i$.

Since the formulas ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n may contain different identifiers, let $\{z_\theta \mid \theta \in X_{Q'_1}\}$ be a set of fresh identifiers different from each other and the related environment ρ' be defined by $\rho'(z_\theta) = \theta$ for all $\theta \in X_{Q'_1}$. Also let every substitution σ_i be defined by $\sigma_i(x) = z_{\rho'(x)}$ for all $x \in \text{fv}(\phi_i)$, so that $\rho_i(x) = \rho'(\sigma_i(x))$. It holds that $Q'_1 \models_{\rho'} \sigma_i(\phi_i)$ by Lemma 5.2 and $Q'_{2,i} \not\models_{f'_{1,2,i} \circ \rho'} \sigma_i(\phi_i)$ for all labeling-preserving bijections $f'_{1,2,i}$ from $X_{Q'_1}$ to $X_{Q'_{2,i}}$.

We can then construct the formula $\langle z_{\theta_1} \rangle \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \sigma_i(\phi_i)$ that is satisfied by Q_1 under $\rho = \rho'$ but not by Q_2 under $f_{1,2} \circ \rho$ for all labeling-preserving bijections $f_{1,2}$ from X_{Q_1} to X_{Q_2} ; if $n = 0$ then it is sufficient to take $\langle z_{\theta_1} \rangle \text{true}$. This formula violates $(Q_1, Q_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, hence there must exist at least one Q'_2 satisfying the same formulas as Q'_1 for some labeling-preserving bijection $f'_{1,2}$ from $X_{Q'_1}$ to $X_{Q'_2}$ such that $Q'_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} Q_2$ and $\text{act}(\theta_1) = \text{act}(\theta_2)$, so that $(Q'_1, Q'_2) \in \mathcal{B}$.

- Suppose by contradiction that $\text{brm}(Q_1) \neq \text{brm}(Q_2)$. In order not to fall back into one of the previous cases, we assume that there is an action a with different nonzero multiplicities in $\text{brm}(Q_1)$ and $\text{brm}(Q_2)$. Without loss of generality, we further assume that a occurs with multiplicity 2 in $\text{brm}(Q_1)$ and 1 in $\text{brm}(Q_2)$.

We can then construct the formula $\langle x \rangle \text{true} \wedge \langle y \rangle \text{true}$ that is satisfied by Q_1 under ρ such that $\text{act}(\rho(x)) = \text{act}(\rho(y)) = a$ and $\rho(x) \neq \rho(y)$ but not by Q_2 under $f_{1,2} \circ \rho$ for all labeling-preserving bijections $f_{1,2}$ from X_{Q_1} to X_{Q_2} . This formula violates $(Q_1, Q_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, hence it must be the case that $\text{brm}(Q_1) = \text{brm}(Q_2)$. \square

5.2. Reinterpreting \mathcal{L}_{BRM} over Stable Configuration Structures. Let us denote by $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ the set of all stable configuration structures – whose events are proof terms – that turn out to be the denotational semantics of some $P \in \mathbb{P}$. Recalling that $\llbracket P \rrbracket = (C_P, X_P)$, when writing $\llbracket P \rrbracket \models \phi$ we mean $X_P \models \phi$.

The satisfaction relation $\models \subseteq \llbracket \mathbb{P} \rrbracket \times \mathcal{L}_{\text{BRM}}$ is defined by induction on the syntactical structure of $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BRM}}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket P \rrbracket &\models \text{true} \\ \llbracket P \rrbracket &\models M && \text{iff } \{ \{ a \in \mathcal{A} \mid X_{P'} \xrightarrow{a}_{C_{P'}} X_P \} \} = M \\ \llbracket P \rrbracket &\models \neg \phi' && \text{iff } \llbracket P \rrbracket \not\models \phi' \\ \llbracket P \rrbracket &\models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 && \text{iff } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models \phi_1 \text{ and } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models \phi_2 \\ \llbracket P \rrbracket &\models \langle a \rangle \phi' && \text{iff there exists } X_P \xrightarrow{a}_{C_P} X_{P'} \text{ such that } \llbracket P' \rrbracket \models \phi' \\ \llbracket P \rrbracket &\models \langle a^\dagger \rangle \phi' && \text{iff there exists } X_{P'} \xrightarrow{a}_{C_{P'}} X_P \text{ such that } \llbracket P' \rrbracket \models \phi' \end{aligned}$$

Every process and its associated stable configuration structure satisfy the same formulas of \mathcal{L}_{BRM} . As a consequence, \mathcal{L}_{BRM} reinterpreted over stable configuration structures characterizes \sim_{HHPB} .

Theorem 5.4. *Let $P \in \mathbb{P}$. Then $\forall \phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BRM}}. P \models \phi \iff \llbracket P \rrbracket \models \phi$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on $k = \text{depth}(\phi)$:

- If $k = 0$ then there are two cases:

- If ϕ is **true** then both P and $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ satisfy it.
- If ϕ is M then by Lemma 4.9:

$$\begin{aligned} P \models M &\text{ iff } \text{brm}(P) = M \\ &\text{ iff } \{ \text{act}(\theta) \mid P' \xrightarrow{\theta} P \} = M \\ &\text{ iff } \{ \text{act}(\theta) \mid X_{P'} \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta)}_{C_{P'}} X_P \} = M \\ &\text{ iff } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models M \end{aligned}$$

- If $k \geq 1$ then there are four cases:

- If ϕ is $\neg \phi'$ then by the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P \models \neg \phi' &\text{ iff } P \not\models \phi' \\ &\text{ iff } \llbracket P \rrbracket \not\models \phi' \\ &\text{ iff } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models \neg \phi' \end{aligned}$$

- If ϕ is $\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ then by the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 &\text{ iff } P \models \phi_1 \text{ and } P \models \phi_2 \\ &\text{ iff } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models \phi_1 \text{ and } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models \phi_2 \\ &\text{ iff } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \end{aligned}$$

- If ϕ is $\langle a \rangle \phi'$ then by Lemma 4.9 and the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P \models \langle a \rangle \phi' &\text{ iff there is } P \xrightarrow{\theta} P' \text{ s.t. } \text{act}(\theta) = a \text{ and } P' \models \phi' \\ &\text{ iff there is } X_P \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta)}_{C_P} X_{P'} \text{ s.t. } \text{act}(\theta) = a \text{ and } \llbracket P' \rrbracket \models \phi' \\ &\text{ iff } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models \langle a \rangle \phi' \end{aligned}$$

- If ϕ is $\langle a^\dagger \rangle \phi'$ then by Lemma 4.9 and the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} P \models \langle a^\dagger \rangle \phi' &\text{ iff there is } P' \xrightarrow{\theta} P \text{ s.t. } \text{act}(\theta) = a \text{ and } P' \models \phi' \\ &\text{ iff there is } X_{P'} \xrightarrow{\text{act}(\theta)}_{C_{P'}} X_P \text{ s.t. } \text{act}(\theta) = a \text{ and } \llbracket P' \rrbracket \models \phi' \\ &\text{ iff } \llbracket P \rrbracket \models \langle a^\dagger \rangle \phi' \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 5.5. *Let $P_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{P}$. Then $\llbracket P_1 \rrbracket \sim_{\text{HHPB}} \llbracket P_2 \rrbracket$ iff $\forall \phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BRM}}. \llbracket P_1 \rrbracket \models \phi \iff \llbracket P_2 \rrbracket \models \phi$ provided that all possible conflicts are local.*

Proof. From Theorems 4.10, 4.6 and 5.4 it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket P_1 \rrbracket \sim_{\text{HHPB}} \llbracket P_2 \rrbracket & \text{ iff } P_1 \sim_{\text{FRB:brm}} P_2 \\ & \text{ iff } \forall \phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BRM}}. P_1 \models \phi \iff P_2 \models \phi \\ & \text{ iff } \forall \phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BRM}}. \llbracket P_1 \rrbracket \models \phi \iff \llbracket P_2 \rrbracket \models \phi \end{aligned}$$

□

5.3. Translating \mathcal{L}_{BRM} into \mathcal{L}_{EI} . The main difficulty with this translation is the encoding of multisets, as they are not present in \mathcal{L}_{EI} . In the translation function we thus introduce two additional parameters:

- The first one is a finite set A of actions, e.g., those occurring in a process P . Since $P \models M$ iff $\text{brm}(P) = M$, the \mathcal{L}_{EI} formula corresponding to M has to express the fact that every action in the support of M , i.e., $\text{supp}(M) = \{a \in \mathcal{A} \mid M(a) > 0\}$, can be undone a number of times equal to its multiplicity, while any action in $A \setminus \text{supp}(M)$ cannot be undone at all. We assume that $\text{supp}(M)$ is finite to avoid infinite conjunctions in the translation.
- The second one is a finite sequence $\varrho_n : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{A}$ of pairs each formed by an identifier and an action. It acts like a stack-based memory that keeps track of executed actions, bound to variables via $\langle x : a \rangle$ and $(x : a)$.

The translation function $\mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}} : \mathcal{L}_{\text{BRM}} \times \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathcal{A}) \times \{\varrho_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}\} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{EI}}$ is defined by induction on the syntactical structure of $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BRM}}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\text{true}, A, \varrho_n) &= \text{true} \\ \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(M, A, \varrho_n) &= \bigwedge_{a_i \in \text{supp}(M)} \left(\bigwedge_{k=1}^{M(a_i)} \langle x_{i,k} \rangle \text{true} \wedge \bigwedge_{h=1}^{\sharp(a_i, \varrho_n) - M(a_i)} \neg \langle z_{i,h} \rangle \text{true} \right) \\ &\quad \wedge \bigwedge_{b \in A \setminus \text{supp}(M)} \neg (y : b) \langle y \rangle \text{true} \quad \text{with } y \text{ fresh} \\ \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\neg \phi', A, \varrho_n) &= \neg \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi', A, \varrho_n) \\ \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2, A, \varrho_n) &= \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_1, A, \varrho_n) \wedge \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_2, A, \varrho_n) \\ \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\langle a \rangle \phi', A, \varrho_n) &= \langle x : a \rangle \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi', A, \varrho_n \cup \{(n+1, (x, a))\}) \quad \text{with } x \text{ fresh} \\ \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\langle a^\dagger \rangle \phi', A, \varrho_n) &= (x : a) \langle x \rangle \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi', A, \varrho_n) \quad \text{with } x \text{ fresh} \end{aligned}$$

where in the translation of M the finite sequence ϱ_n is such that:

- $(x_{i,k}, a_i) \in \text{rge}(\varrho_n)$, with $x_{i,k} \neq x_{i,k'}$ for $k \neq k'$ and all the identifiers $x_{i,k}$ being taken starting from the end of ϱ_n , i.e., the top of the stack.
- $\sharp(a_i, \varrho_n)$ is the number of occurrences of a_i in ϱ_n .
- $(z_{i,h}, a_i) \in \text{rge}(\varrho_n)$, with $z_{i,h} \notin \{x_{i,k} \mid 1 \leq k \leq M(a_i)\}$ and $z_{i,h} \neq z_{i,h'}$ for $h \neq h'$.

Theorem 5.6. *Let $P \in \mathbb{P}$, $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BRM}}$, and $\text{act}(P)$ be the set of actions in P . Then $P \models \phi$ iff $\exists \varrho_n. \exists \rho \in \text{pe}(P, \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n)). P \models_\rho \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n)$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on $k = \text{depth}(\phi)$:

- If $k = 0$ then there are two cases:
 - If ϕ is **true** then $\mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\text{true}, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n) = \text{true}$ and P satisfies both formulas (the second one for all ϱ_n and ρ).
 - If ϕ is M then we divide the proof into two parts. Starting from $P \models M$, we derive that $\text{brm}(P) = M$, hence for all $a_i \in \text{supp}(M)$ there exists $P'_{a_i,k} \xrightarrow{\theta_{a_i,k}} P$ for $1 \leq k \leq M(a_i)$ such that $\text{act}(\theta_{a_i,k}) = a_i$, with P having no other incoming transitions. If we consider any sequence of proved transitions $P_1 \xrightarrow{\theta_1} P_2 \xrightarrow{\theta_2} \dots \xrightarrow{\theta_m} P_{m+1}$ such that P_1 is *to_init*(P) and P_{m+1} is P , all the proof terms $\theta_{a_i,k}$ appear in the sequence $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m$ because the

transitions $P'_{a_i,k} \xrightarrow{\theta_{a_i,k}} P$ are all independent from each other.

In the construction of ϱ_n , for all $a_i \in \text{supp}(M)$ we have to consider all the a_i -transitions along any path from $\text{to_init}(P)$ to P . Therefore, we take as n the number of proof terms θ_j in the sequence $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m$ such that $\text{act}(\theta_j) = a_i$ for all $a_i \in \text{supp}(M)$. Since $\text{brm}(P) = M$, the total number of incoming transitions of P is $\sum_{a_i \in \text{supp}(M)} M(a_i)$, while

the number of proof terms θ_j in the sequence $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m$ such that $\text{act}(\theta_j) = a_i$ and $\theta_j \notin \{\theta_{a_i,k} \mid 1 \leq k \leq M(a_i)\}$ is $n - \sum_{a_i \in \text{supp}(M)} M(a_i)$. We can map all numbers

between 1 and $n - \sum_{a_i \in \text{supp}(M)} M(a_i)$ to the pairs $(z_{i,h}, a_i)$ and all numbers between $n - \sum_{a_i \in \text{supp}(M)} M(a_i) + 1$ and n to the pairs $(x_{i,k}, a_i)$.

At this point, we can construct ρ by mapping every $x_{i,k}$ to $\theta_{a_i,k}$ and every $z_{i,h}$ to $\theta_{a_i,h}$ such that there is no transition $P'_{a_i,h} \xrightarrow{\theta_{a_i,h}} P$.

Then $P \models_\rho \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(M, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n) = \bigwedge_{a_i \in \text{supp}(M)} \left(\bigwedge_{k=1}^{M(a_i)} \langle x_{i,k} \rangle \text{true} \wedge \bigwedge_{h=1}^{\#(a_i, \varrho_n) - M(a_i)} \neg \langle z_{i,h} \rangle \text{true} \right) \wedge$

$\bigwedge_{b \in \text{act}(P) \setminus \text{supp}(M)} \neg(y : b) \langle y \rangle \text{true}$ as we now show by considering each of the three main conjunctions separately:

* $P \models_\rho \bigwedge_{k=1}^{M(a_i)} \langle x_{i,k} \rangle \text{true}$ because, from the way we have constructed ρ , we know that it maps every $x_{i,k}$ exactly to the proof term $\theta_{i,k}$ such that there exists a transition $P'_{i,k} \xrightarrow{\theta_{a_i,k}} P$ with $\text{act}(\theta_{a_i,k}) = a_i$. Moreover, every $P'_{i,k}$ trivially satisfies **true**.

* $P \models_\rho \bigwedge_{h=1}^{\#(a_i, \varrho_n) - M(a_i)} \neg \langle z_{i,h} \rangle \text{true}$ because, as in the previous case, we have constructed ρ in such a way that every $z_{i,h}$ is mapped to the proof term $\theta_{a_i,h}$ such that $\text{act}(\theta_{a_i,h}) = a_i$ and there is no transition $P'_{a_i,h} \xrightarrow{\theta_{a_i,h}} P$. Hence, $P \models_\rho \neg \langle z_{i,h} \rangle \text{true}$ for any $z_{i,h}$.

* $P \models_\rho \bigwedge_{b \in \text{act}(P) \setminus \text{supp}(M)} \neg(y : b) \langle y \rangle \text{true}$ because if $b \notin \text{supp}(M)$ then:

- either there is no b^\dagger . $P' \in \text{sp}(P)$ and hence $P \not\models_\rho (y : b) \langle y \rangle \text{true}$, i.e., $P \models_\rho \neg(y : b) \langle y \rangle \text{true}$;
- or, if such a process exists, P does not have any incoming transition $P' \xrightarrow{\theta} P$ such that $\text{act}(\theta) = b$ and hence $P \not\models_{\rho[y \rightarrow \theta]} \langle y \rangle \text{true}$, from which it follows that $P \not\models_\rho (y : b) \langle y \rangle \text{true}$, i.e., $P \models_\rho \neg(y : b) \langle y \rangle \text{true}$.

The converse is straightforward because, if there exist ϱ_n and $\rho \in \text{pe}(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(M, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n))$ such that $P \models_\rho \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(M, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n)$, then we can note that the conjunctions in $\mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(M, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n)$ express the fact that P has exactly $\sum_{a_i \in \text{supp}(M)} M(a_i)$ incoming transitions such

that every $a_i \in \text{supp}(M)$ appears $M(a_i)$ times, while there are no incoming transitions of P labeled with actions not in $\text{supp}(M)$. Thus, we can derive that $\text{brm}(P) = M$, i.e., $P \models M$.

- If $k \geq 1$ then there are four cases:

- If ϕ is $\neg\phi'$ then by the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned}
P \models \neg\phi' & \text{ iff } P \not\models \phi' \\
& \text{ iff } \exists \varrho_n. \exists \rho. P \not\models_{\rho} \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi', \text{act}(P), \varrho_n) \\
& \text{ iff } \exists \varrho_n. \exists \rho. P \models_{\rho} \neg \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi', \text{act}(P), \varrho_n) \\
& \text{ iff } \exists \varrho_n. \exists \rho. P \models_{\rho} \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\neg\phi', \text{act}(P), \varrho_n)
\end{aligned}$$

- If ϕ is $\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ then we divide the proof into two parts. Starting from $P \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$, by the induction hypothesis and Lemma 5.2:

$$\begin{aligned}
P \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 & \text{ implies } P \models \phi_1 \text{ and } P \models \phi_2 \\
& \text{ implies } \exists \varrho_{n_1}. \exists \rho_1. P \models_{\rho_1} \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_1, \text{act}(P), \varrho_{n_1}) \text{ and} \\
& \quad \exists \varrho_{n_2}. \exists \rho_2. P \models_{\rho_2} \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_2, \text{act}(P), \varrho_{n_2}) \\
& \text{ implies } \exists \varrho_{n_1}. \exists \varrho_{n_2}. \exists \rho^{\sigma}. P \models_{\rho^{\sigma}} \sigma(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_1, \text{act}(P), \varrho_{n_1})) \text{ and} \\
& \quad P \models_{\rho^{\sigma}} \sigma(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_2, \text{act}(P), \varrho_{n_2})) \\
& \text{ implies } \exists \varrho_{n_1}. \exists \varrho_{n_2}. \exists \rho^{\sigma}. P \models_{\rho^{\sigma}} \sigma(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_1, \text{act}(P), \varrho_{n_1})) \wedge \\
& \quad \sigma(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_2, \text{act}(P), \varrho_{n_2})) \\
& \text{ implies } \exists \varrho_n. \exists \rho^{\sigma}. P \models_{\rho^{\sigma}} \sigma(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_1, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n)) \wedge \\
& \quad \sigma(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_2, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n)) \\
& \text{ implies } \exists \varrho_n^{\sigma}. \exists \rho^{\sigma}. P \models_{\rho^{\sigma}} \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_1, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n^{\sigma}) \wedge \\
& \quad \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_2, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n^{\sigma}) \\
& \text{ implies } \exists \varrho_n^{\sigma}. \exists \rho^{\sigma}. P \models_{\rho^{\sigma}} \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n^{\sigma})
\end{aligned}$$

where:

- * ρ^{σ} maps a set of fresh identifiers z_{θ} , one for each θ appearing in any path from $\text{to_init}(P)$ to P , to the corresponding proof term, i.e., $\rho^{\sigma}(z_{\theta}) = \theta$.
- * σ is defined as $\sigma(x) = z_{\rho_1(x)}$ for all $x \in \text{fi}(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_1, \text{act}(P), \varrho_{n_1}))$ and $\sigma(x) = z_{\rho_2(x)}$ for all $x \in \text{fi}(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_2, \text{act}(P), \varrho_{n_2}))$.
- * Since $P \models \phi_1$ and $P \models \phi_2$, both ϱ_{n_1} and ϱ_{n_2} have to be built consistently with any path from $\text{to_init}(P)$ to P , hence they can be replaced by a single ϱ_n that is built in the same consistent way.
- * ϱ_n^{σ} is defined as $\varrho_n^{\sigma}(m) = (\sigma(x), a)$ for all $1 \leq m \leq n$ such that $\varrho_n(m) = (x, a)$ and $x \in \text{fi}(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n))$. Since all free identifiers are captured by ϱ_n , $\sigma(\mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n)) = \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n^{\sigma})$.

As for the converse:

$$\begin{aligned}
\exists \varrho_n. \exists \rho. P \models_{\rho} \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n) & \text{ implies } \exists \varrho_n. \exists \rho. P \models_{\rho} \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_1, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n) \wedge \\
& \quad \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_2, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n) \\
& \text{ implies } \exists \varrho_n. \exists \rho. P \models_{\rho} \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_1, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n) \text{ and} \\
& \quad P \models_{\rho} \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi_2, \text{act}(P), \varrho_n) \\
& \text{ implies } P \models \phi_1 \text{ and } P \models \phi_2 \\
& \text{ implies } P \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2
\end{aligned}$$

- If ϕ is $\langle a \rangle \phi'$ then by the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned}
P \models \langle a \rangle \phi' & \text{ iff } \text{there is } P \xrightarrow{\theta} P' \text{ s.t. } \text{act}(\theta) = a \text{ and } P' \models \phi' \\
& \text{ iff } \text{there is } P \xrightarrow{\theta} P' \text{ s.t. } \text{act}(\theta) = a \text{ and} \\
& \quad \exists \varrho_n. \exists \rho. P' \models_{\rho[x \mapsto \theta]} \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi', \text{act}(P'), \varrho_n \cup \{(n+1, (x, a))\}) \\
& \text{ iff } \exists \varrho_n. \exists \rho. P \models_{\rho} \langle x : a \rangle \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi', \text{act}(P), \varrho_n \cup \{(n+1, (x, a))\}) \\
& \text{ iff } \exists \varrho_n. \exists \rho. P \models_{\rho} \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\langle a \rangle \phi', \text{act}(P), \varrho_n)
\end{aligned}$$

– If ϕ is $\langle a^\dagger \rangle \phi'$ then by the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned}
P \models \langle a^\dagger \rangle \phi' & \text{ iff } \text{there is } P' \xrightarrow{\theta} P \text{ s.t. } \text{act}(\theta) = a \text{ and } P' \models \phi' \\
& \text{ iff } \text{there is } P' \xrightarrow{\theta} P \text{ s.t. } \text{act}(\theta) = a \text{ and} \\
& \quad \exists \varrho_n. \exists \rho. P' \models_{\rho[x \mapsto \theta]} \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi', \text{act}(P'), \varrho_n) \\
& \text{ iff } \text{there is } P' \xrightarrow{\theta} P \text{ s.t. } \text{act}(\theta) = a \text{ and} \\
& \quad \exists \varrho_n. \exists \rho. P \models_{\rho[x \mapsto \theta]} \langle \langle x \rangle \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi', \text{act}(P), \varrho_n) \\
& \text{ iff } \text{there is } a^\dagger.P'' \in \text{sp}(P) \text{ s.t. } \text{apt}(a^\dagger.P'', P) = \theta \text{ and} \\
& \quad P \models_{\rho[x \mapsto \text{apt}(a^\dagger.P'', P)]} \langle \langle x \rangle \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi', \text{act}(P), \varrho_n) \\
& \text{ iff } \exists \varrho_n. \exists \rho. P \models_{\rho} (x : a) \langle \langle x \rangle \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\phi', \text{act}(P), \varrho_n) \\
& \text{ iff } \exists \varrho_n. \exists \rho. P \models_{\rho} \mathcal{T}_{\text{BE}}(\langle a^\dagger \rangle \phi', \text{act}(P), \varrho_n)
\end{aligned}$$

□

5.4. Translating \mathcal{L}_{EI} into \mathcal{L}_{BRM} . The challenge of this translation is the encoding of formulas of the form $(x : a)\phi$, because identifiers are not present in \mathcal{L}_{BRM} and the satisfaction of these formulas is not necessarily related to actions to be done or undone in this moment. Rather, it is generically related to executed actions. On the other hand, it is not clear how multisets would come into play. The study of this translation is left for future work.

6. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have proposed an entirely new approach to characterize HHPB, both denotationally and operationally, even in the presence of equidepth autoconcurrency. Unlike [AC20], the focus is on counting identically labeled events rather than uniquely identifying them, thus avoiding bijections between events altogether thanks to a variant of forward-reverse bisimilarity extended with backward ready multisets equality. Moreover, on the operational side, it has turned out that proof terms naturally lend themselves to identification purposes; in a reversible setting like ours, they have been used for the first time in [Aub22]. Finally, we have logically characterized our backward-ready-multiset forward-reverse bisimilarity with backward ready multiset logic and investigated the relationships of the latter with event identifier logic [PU14]. Our results hold in the absence of non-local conflicts.

The operational characterization is particularly important for several reasons. Firstly, in addition to the equational characterization over forward-only processes developed in [FL05], HHPB can be axiomatized over reversible processes by resorting to the approach of [DP92] as applied in [BEM24], provided that backward ready multisets are considered in place of backward ready sets. Secondly, in addition to the logics of [PU14, BC14], HHPB can be characterized also in terms of our backward ready multiset logic. The latter is simpler as it does not make use of variables and binders, but the former contain fragments that have been proven to characterize various behavioral equivalences in the true concurrency spectrum [GG01, Fec04, PU12].

Our results are in line with those of [APU25], where alternative characterizations of HPB and HHPB are given in terms of just forward and backward transitions, without resorting to ternary relations. The approach is based on CCSK and on keyed events structure, where each event is uniquely identified by a key. More recent work [AK25] has introduced a symmetric residuation operation on configuration structures to model reversibility in a purely denotational setting. Stable configuration structures turn out to be closed under this residuation. A semantics is derived in terms of prime event structures, where a switch

operation dualizes causality and conflict. This line of reasoning is closely aligned with our own goals: we also aim to faithfully represent reversible process behavior in a true concurrency model, preserving causal and concurrent relationships. However, our approach differs in how we encode memory and backward moves: rather than relying on residuation, we build memory syntactically – via proof terms – which gives us a more operational perspective. Furthermore, our backward-ready-multiset forward-reverse bisimilarity is proven to coincide with HHPB in a way that is tailored to the structure of our extension of PRPC.

As for future work, we would like to complete the investigation of the relationships between backward ready multiset logic and event identifier logic, as well as to extend it to the logic of [BC14]. Another direction to pursue is whether our results apply to configuration structures that are not stable, i.e., in which it is not necessarily the case that causality among events can be always represented in terms of partial orders, possibly defined locally to each configuration. HHPB has been defined over non-stable models in [Gla06, BGPS22] and a logical characterization for it has been provided in [BGPS22], which is a conservative extension of the one in [BC14]. Finally, in addition to a deeper comparison with recent work [APU25, AK25], we plan to understand what needs to be added to backward-ready-multiset forward-reverse bisimilarity so as to characterize HHPB exactly, i.e., also in the presence of non-local conflicts. In case of success, we will then study the verification of the resulting bisimilarity by taking into account, as far as HHPB is concerned, the undecidability result over finite labeled transition systems extended with an independence relation between transitions of [JNS03] and the polynomial-time algorithm over basic parallel processes of [FJLS10].

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to Rob van Glabbeek for bringing to our attention the process examined in Example 4.2. This research has been supported by the PRIN 2020 project *NiRvAna – Noninterference and Reversibility Analysis in Private Blockchains*, the PRIN 2022 project *DeKLA – Developing Kleene Logics and Their Applications*, and the INdAM-GNCS 2024 project *MARVEL – Modelli Composizionali per l’Analisi di Sistemi Reversibili Distribuiti*.

REFERENCES

- [AC17] C. Aubert and I. Cristescu. Contextual equivalences in configuration structures and reversibility. *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming*, 86:77–106, 2017.
- [AC20] C. Aubert and I. Cristescu. How reversibility can solve traditional questions: The example of hereditary history-preserving bisimulation. In *Proc. of the 31st Int. Conf. on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 2020)*, volume 171 of *LIPIcs*, pages 7:1–7:23, 2020.
- [AK25] C. Aubert and J. Krivine. Reversible computations are computations. In *Proc. of the 41st Int. Conf. on the Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics (MFPS 2025)*, volume 5 of *ENTICS*, 2025.
- [APU25] C. Aubert, I. Phillips, and I. Ulidowski. Bisimulations and reversibility. In *Components Operationally: Reversibility and System Engineering – Essays Dedicated to Jean-Bernard Stefani on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, volume 16065 of *LNCS*, pages 46–67. Springer, 2025.
- [Aub22] C. Aubert. Concurrency in reversible concurrent calculi. In *Proc. of the 14th Int. Conf. on Reversible Computation (RC 2022)*, volume 13354 of *LNCS*, pages 146–163. Springer, 2022.
- [BC88] G. Boudol and I. Castellani. A non-interleaving semantics for CCS based on proved transitions. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 11:433–452, 1988.
- [BC94] G. Boudol and I. Castellani. Flow models of distributed computations: Three equivalent semantics for CCS. *Information and Computation*, 114:247–314, 1994.
- [BC14] P. Baldan and S. Crafa. A logic for true concurrency. *Journal of the ACM*, 61:24:1–24:36, 2014.

- [BE23] M. Bernardo and A. Esposito. Modal logic characterizations of forward, reverse, and forward-reverse bisimilarities. In *Proc. of the 14th Int. Symp. on Games, Automata, Logics, and Formal Verification (GANDALF 2023)*, volume 390 of *EPTCS*, pages 67–81, 2023.
- [Bed91] M.A. Bednarczyk. Hereditary history preserving bisimulations or what is the power of the future perfect in program logics. Technical Report Polish Academy of Sciences, Gdansk, 1991.
- [BEM24] M. Bernardo, A. Esposito, and C.A. Mezzina. Expansion laws for forward-reverse, forward, and reverse bisimilarities via proved encodings. In *Proc. of the Combined 31st Int. Workshop on Expressiveness in Concurrency and 21st Workshop on Structural Operational Semantics (EXPRESS/SOS 2024)*, volume 412 of *EPTCS*, pages 51–70, 2024.
- [BEM25] M. Bernardo, A. Esposito, and C.A. Mezzina. Alternative characterizations of hereditary history-preserving bisimilarity via backward ready multisets. In *Proc. of the 28th Int. Conf. on Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures (FOSSACS 2025)*, volume 15691 of *LNCS*, pages 67–87. Springer, 2025.
- [BGPS22] P. Baldan, D. Gorla, T. Padoan, and I. Salvo. Behavioural logics for configuration structures. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 913:94–112, 2022.
- [BHR84] S.D. Brookes, C.A.R. Hoare, and A.W. Roscoe. A theory of communicating sequential processes. *Journal of the ACM*, 31:560–599, 1984.
- [BR23] M. Bernardo and S. Rossi. Reverse bisimilarity vs. forward bisimilarity. In *Proc. of the 26th Int. Conf. on Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures (FOSSACS 2023)*, volume 13992 of *LNCS*, pages 265–284. Springer, 2023.
- [BS98] M. Boreale and D. Sangiorgi. A fully abstract semantics for causality in the π -calculus. *Acta Informatica*, 35:353–400, 1998.
- [DD89] Ph. Darondeau and P. Degano. Causal trees. In *Proc. of the 16th Int. Coll. on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP 1989)*, volume 372 of *LNCS*, pages 234–248. Springer, 1989.
- [DD90] Ph. Darondeau and P. Degano. Causal trees: Interleaving + causality. In *Proc. of the LITP Spring School on Theoretical Computer Science: Semantics of Systems of Concurrent Processes*, volume 469 of *LNCS*, pages 239–255. Springer, 1990.
- [DK04] V. Danos and J. Krivine. Reversible communicating systems. In *Proc. of the 15th Int. Conf. on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 2004)*, volume 3170 of *LNCS*, pages 292–307. Springer, 2004.
- [DK05] V. Danos and J. Krivine. Transactions in RCCS. In *Proc. of the 16th Int. Conf. on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 2005)*, volume 3653 of *LNCS*, pages 398–412. Springer, 2005.
- [DMV90] R. De Nicola, U. Montanari, and F. Vaandrager. Back and forth bisimulations. In *Proc. of the 1st Int. Conf. on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 1990)*, volume 458 of *LNCS*, pages 152–165. Springer, 1990.
- [DP92] P. Degano and C. Priami. Proved trees. In *Proc. of the 19th Int. Coll. on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP 1992)*, volume 623 of *LNCS*, pages 629–640. Springer, 1992.
- [Esp25] A. Esposito. *A Process Algebraic Theory of Reversible Concurrent Systems with Applications to Noninterference Analysis*. PhD Thesis, 2025.
- [Fec04] H. Fecher. A completed hierarchy of true concurrent equivalences. *Information Processing Letters*, 89:261–265, 2004.
- [FJLS10] S. Fröschle, P. Jančar, S. Lasota, and Z. Sawa. Non-interleaving bisimulation equivalences on basic parallel processes. *Information and Computation*, 208:42–62, 2010.
- [FL05] S. Fröschle and S. Lasota. Decomposition and complexity of hereditary history preserving bisimulation on BPP. In *Proc. of the 16th Int. Conf. on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 2005)*, volume 3653 of *LNCS*, pages 263–277. Springer, 2005.
- [GG01] R.J. van Glabbeek and U. Goltz. Refinement of actions and equivalence notions for concurrent systems. *Acta Informatica*, 37:229–327, 2001.
- [Gla06] R.J. van Glabbeek. On the expressiveness of higher dimensional automata. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 368:168–194, 2006.
- [GP09] R.J. van Glabbeek and G.D. Plotkin. Configuration structures, event structures and Petri nets. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410:4111–4159, 2009.
- [GV03] R.J. van Glabbeek and F. Vaandrager. Bundle event structures and CCSP. In *Proc. of the 14th Int. Conf. on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 2003)*, volume 2761 of *LNCS*, pages 57–71. Springer, 2003.

- [HM85] M. Hennessy and R. Milner. Algebraic laws for nondeterminism and concurrency. *Journal of the ACM*, 32:137–162, 1985.
- [JNS03] M. Jurdzinski, M. Nielsen, and J. Srba. Undecidability of domino games and hhp-bisimilarity. *Information and Computation*, 184:343–368, 2003.
- [JNW96] A. Joyal, M. Nielsen, and G. Winskel. Bisimulation from open maps. *Information and Computation*, 127:164–185, 1996.
- [Kel76] R.M. Keller. Formal verification of parallel programs. *Communications of the ACM*, 19:371–384, 1976.
- [Kri12] J. Krivine. A verification technique for reversible process algebra. In *Proc. of the 4th Int. Workshop on Reversible Computation (RC 2012)*, volume 7581 of *LNCS*, pages 204–217. Springer, 2012.
- [LMM21] I. Lanese, D. Medić, and C.A. Mezzina. Static versus dynamic reversibility in CCS. *Acta Informatica*, 58:1–34, 2021.
- [Mil89] R. Milner. *Communication and Concurrency*. Prentice Hall, 1989.
- [Par81] D. Park. Concurrency and automata on infinite sequences. In *Proc. of the 5th GI Conf. on Theoretical Computer Science (GI-TCS 1981)*, volume 104 of *LNCS*, pages 167–183. Springer, 1981.
- [Pet62] C.A. Petri. *Kommunikation mit Automaten*. PhD Thesis, 1962.
- [PU07a] I. Phillips and I. Ulidowski. Reversing algebraic process calculi. *Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming*, 73:70–96, 2007.
- [PU07b] I. Phillips and I. Ulidowski. Reversibility and models for concurrency. In *Proc. of the 4th Int. Workshop on Structural Operational Semantics (SOS 2007)*, volume 192(1) of *ENTCS*, pages 93–108. Elsevier, 2007.
- [PU12] I. Phillips and I. Ulidowski. A hierarchy of reverse bisimulations on stable configuration structures. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 22:333–372, 2012.
- [PU14] I. Phillips and I. Ulidowski. Event identifier logic. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 24(2):1–51, 2014.
- [RT88] A.M. Rabinovich and B.A. Trakhtenbrot. Behavior structures and nets. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 11:357–404, 1988.
- [Win86] G. Winskel. Event structures. In *Advances in Petri Nets*, volume 255 of *LNCS*, pages 325–392. Springer, 1986.