

Specializing anti-unification for interaction models composition via gate connections

Joel Nguetoum¹², Boutheina Bannour¹, Pascale Le Gall², and Erwan Mahe¹

¹ Université Paris-Saclay, CEA, List, F-91120, Palaiseau, France


² Université Paris-Saclay, CentraleSupélec, MICS, F-91192, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

Abstract. Interaction models describe distributed systems as algebraic terms, with gates marking interaction points between local views. Composing local models into a coherent global one requires aligning these gates while respecting the algebraic laws of interaction operators. We specialize anti-unification (or generalization) via a special constant-preserving variant, which preserves designated constants while generalizing the remaining structure. We develop a dedicated rule-based procedure, for computing these generalizations, prove its termination, soundness, and completeness, extend it modulo equational theories, and integrate it into a standard anti-unification framework. A prototype tool demonstrates the approach’s ability to recompose global interactions from partial views.

1 Introduction

Context. Our goal is to use anti-unification to merge partial views of a distributed system into a coherent global view. The notion of *anti-unification* (or *generalization*) was introduced independently by Plotkin [27] and Reynolds [28] as the process of computing the most specific generalization of a set of terms. Given two terms s and t , the task is to find a term r and substitutions σ_s and σ_t such that $r\sigma_s = s$ and $r\sigma_t = t$. This contrasts with *unification* [23], which seeks a substitution σ such that $s\sigma = t\sigma$. While unification computes a common instance, anti-unification computes a *most specific/least general generalization* (lgg) from which the original terms can be recovered. Anti-unification has applications in recursion-scheme detection [16], inductive synthesis of recursive functions [32], and automated software repair [30,11]. However, most existing work focuses on *syntactic* generalization. *Semantics-driven* approaches [18,10] leverage semantic equivalences between terms to be able to anti-unify a wider class of terms.

Interactions [25] describe distributed systems via atomic *emission* and *reception* actions and the empty behavior \emptyset which are structured by *weak-sequencing* (seq), *alternative* (alt) and *parallel* (par) composition, as well as *repetition* (loop). Interactions are related to *Multiparty Session Types* [31] and can be drawn in the manner of *Message Sequence Charts* [1] or *UML sequence diagrams* [2]. The diagram on the right of Fig. 1 depicts an interaction k . Operators are represented by boxes, with seq being implicit and time flowing from top to bottom. Vertical lines, called *lifelines*, represent individual subsystems (here, a signaling

Fig. 1: Composing interactions i and j into k .

server ss , a dialing client dc , and a target client tc). Horizontal arrows represent value passing (vp). Here, dc dials ss (via message dia), which then notifies tc (not). Finally, tc can either (represented by alt) refuse the connection and warn another system (wrn) not shown here, or accept it by sending con to dc , which is answered by an acknowledgment ack .

Method. Our objective is to build a global interaction k from partial views i and j defined over a partition of the lifelines (on Fig. 1, k is defined over $\{dc, ss, tc\}$, i over $\{tc\}$ and j over $\{dc, ss\}$).

We represent interactions as terms, which allows us to encode their composition as an anti-unification problem (on Fig. 1, anti-unification allows e.g., the superimposition of the alt operator in i and j).

Our originality lies in identifying the communication channels connecting these partial views as special constants called *gates*. For example, on Fig. 1, the gate a relate the emission $tc!not$ in i and the reception $ss?not$ in j . These two actions must be coupled in the resulting interaction k to form a value passing $vp(tc!not, ss?not)$.

Intermediate terms s and t are derived from i and j by substituting related actions by the gate that relates them (a , b , and c on Fig. 1). This yields mappings λ_i and λ_j such that $s\lambda_i = i$ and $t\lambda_j = j$.

Applying our *special constant-preserving anti-unification* modulo an equational theory E yields a generalization r of s and t with substitutions σ_s, σ_t such that $r\sigma_s =_E s$, $r\sigma_t =_E t$. As the generalization preserves the gates, r contains the three gates a , b , and c . Here, E includes $alt(x, y) \approx alt(y, x)$ (commutativity of alt) and $seq(\emptyset, x) \approx x$ (\emptyset neutral element for seq). The composed interaction k can then be built from r , as illustrated on Fig. 1, by applying a substitution σ_r derived from σ_s and σ_t , along with a mapping λ_k derived from λ_i and λ_j .

Related work Compositionality for distributed systems is an active topic in Multi-party Session Types (MPST) [21, 26, 14, 13, 33]. Choreography-based lan-

guages, including MPST and our interaction language, represent systems as algebraic terms with equational laws defining operator semantics. MPSTs specify a global type and, via projection, derive local types that ensure safety and avoid deadlocks, at the cost of restrictive structural forms (e.g., “choice at sender”). [21] composes partial views expressed as CCS-like local types, while [26,33] consider partial MPSTs interacting with the environment, but remain constrained by operational assumptions. [14,13] introduce gateways relaying messages between sessions, enabling open-system composition. Similar ideas exist for Communicating Finite State Machines (CFSMs) [3,15,22], where composition relies on gateways or safe CFSM classes. Our anti-unification-based composition relies only on algebraic equations to merge partial terms, enabling a broader class of behaviors without structural or operational constraints.

Contributions and paper organization. In Sec.2 we present standard concepts and notations related to term algebras and anti-unification. In Sec.3 we introduce *special constant-preserving (sc-preserving) anti-unification*, which preserves designated constants while generalizing other subterms. We establish its relation to standard anti-unification, and characterize conditions for the existence and uniqueness of sc-preserving least general generalizations (lggs).

In Sec.4, we prove termination, soundness, and completeness of our *rule-based algorithm* for computing sc-preserving lggs.

In Sec.5, we extend sc-preserving anti-unification *modulo equational theories* [10,8]. In Sec.6, we show that *interaction composition* reduces to sc-preserving anti-unification by encoding gates as special constants to align local views, proving preservation of local behaviors via projection. Finally, we present an experimental validation of a prototype tool [5] that implements sc-preserving generalization modulo equations, demonstrating its ability to recombine interactions taken from the literature.

2 Preliminaries

Lists. For any set X , we denote by X^* (resp. X^n for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and X^+) the set of all lists (resp. lists of length n and non-empty lists) of elements of X . ε denotes the empty list and for any list $\bar{x} \in X^*$ of length $|\bar{x}|$, $\forall i \in [1, |\bar{x}|]$, x_i denotes the element of \bar{x} at index i . For any $p, q \in X^*$, we say that p is a strict prefix of q , denoted by $p \triangleleft q$, iff there exists some $p' \in X^+$ such that $q = p.p'$ where “.” denotes list concatenation. This defines a strict partial order \triangleleft on lists.

Terms. We adopt notations from [18]. Let $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a family of function symbols indexed by their arity and \mathcal{V} be a countable set of variables. The set of \mathcal{F} -terms over \mathcal{V} , denoted $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$, is defined inductively by $t ::= x \mid f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ where $x \in \mathcal{V}$, $f \in \mathcal{F}_n$ and $t_1, \dots, t_n \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})^n$. For any $f \in \mathcal{F}_n$ and any list of n terms $\bar{t} \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})^n$, we may denote the term $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ by $f(\bar{t})$. Constants are function symbols in \mathcal{F}_0 . The head symbol of a term is $\text{head}(x) = x$ and $\text{head}(f(\bar{t})) = f$. Given a term t , $\text{Var}(t)$ is the set of variables occurring in it. If

$\text{Var}(t) = \emptyset$, t is said to be ground and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ denotes the set of all ground terms. The set of positions of t , denoted $\text{pos}(t) \subset \mathbb{N}^*$, is defined by $\text{pos}(x) = \{\varepsilon\}$ and $\text{pos}(f(\bar{t})) = \{\varepsilon\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{|\bar{t}|} \{i.p \mid p \in \text{pos}(t_i)\}$, where the empty list ε identifies the root position. For $p \in \text{pos}(t)$, the subterm at position p is denoted $t|_p$. The *size* of a term t is defined inductively as $\text{size}(x) = 1$, and $\text{size}(f(\bar{t})) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{|\bar{t}|} \text{size}(t_i)$.

Substitutions. A substitution $\sigma : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ is a mapping which differs from the identity only on a finite number of variables. The application of σ to a term t , written $t\sigma$ using the usual postfix notation, is defined as $x\sigma$ if $t \in \mathcal{V}$, and $f(t_1\sigma, \dots, t_n\sigma)$ if $t = f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, where $f \in \mathcal{F}_n$. The *domain*, *range* and *variable range* of σ are resp. defined as $\text{Dom}(\sigma) = \{x \mid x\sigma \neq x\}$, $\text{Ran}(\sigma) = \{x\sigma \mid x \in \text{Dom}(\sigma)\}$, and $\text{VRan}(\sigma) = \bigcup_{x \in \text{Dom}(\sigma)} \text{Var}(x\sigma)$. A substitution can be written as $\{x_1 \mapsto t_1, \dots, x_n \mapsto t_n\}$, listing only the bindings for the variables in its domain. The identity substitution is denoted as $\text{Id}_{\mathcal{V}}$. The *composition* $\sigma\theta$ of substitutions σ and θ is defined by $t\sigma\theta = (t\sigma)\theta$ for any term t .

A substitution σ is a *renaming* if there exists a substitution σ^{-1} such that $\sigma\sigma^{-1} = \text{Id}_{\mathcal{V}}$.

Two terms t and t' are *renaming-equivalent* if there exists a renaming σ with $t\sigma = t'$.

Equational theory. Terms of an algebra $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ can be subject to properties expressed using equations. An equation is a couple (t, t') of terms in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})^2$, written as $t \approx t'$. Given a set of equations E , the equational theory $=_E$ is the least congruence on $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ that contains E and is closed under substitutions.

E-generalization. For two terms $r, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$, we say that r is *less specific* than t modulo a set of equations E , written $r \preceq_E t$, if there exists a substitution σ such that $r\sigma =_E t$. We also say that r is *E-more general* than t as it is possible to transform r , via the application of a substitution, into a term that is *E-equivalent* to the more specific t . The relation \preceq_E is a *preorder*, i.e. is reflexive and transitive. We denote by \prec_E and \simeq_E the corresponding strict and equivalence relations, i.e. $r \prec_E t$ iff $(r \preceq_E t) \wedge (t \not\preceq_E r)$ and $r \simeq_E t$ iff $(r \preceq_E t) \wedge (t \preceq_E r)$.

A term r is a *E-generalization* of two terms s and t if there exist substitutions σ_s and σ_t such that $r\sigma_s =_E s$ and $r\sigma_t =_E t$, i.e., $r \preceq_E s$ and $r \preceq_E t$. The substitutions σ_s and σ_t are the *witnessing substitutions*. Intuitively, r captures a common structure of s and t modulo E , abstracting some differences by variables. For instance, given $E = \{f(x, f(y, z)) \approx f(f(x, y), z)\}$ an *E-generalization* of $s = f(f(a, u), u)$ and $t = f(a, f(v, v))$, is $r = f(a, f(x, x))$ with $\sigma_s = \{x \mapsto u\}$ and $\sigma_t = \{x \mapsto v\}$. The term $r' = f(a, f(x, y))$ is also an *E-generalization* of s and t but r' is strictly more general than r , i.e. $r' \prec_E r$, since $r'\{y \mapsto x\} = r$ and $r \not\preceq_E r'$.

A *least general E-generalization* (*E-lgg*) r is an *E-generalization* that is *maximal* with respect to \preceq_E , i.e., there exists no generalization r' such that $r \prec_E r'$. Dually, a *most general E-generalization* (*E-mgg*) reduces s and t to a single variable x (up to renaming), i.e., $r = x$. It does not capture any structure and is mainly of algorithmic interest.

When $E = \emptyset$ we will remove the E - prefix and use the wording lgg, mgg etc., as well as the notations \preceq , \prec , \simeq . The existence and uniqueness of lggs up to variable renaming has been established, for example, in [23].

3 Constant-preserving generalization

Let us introduce a set $\mathfrak{F}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_0$ of *special constants*. In the following, we generically denote by $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}, \dots$ elements of \mathfrak{F}_0 , and by u, v, w, \dots the *ordinary constants* in $\mathcal{F}_0 \setminus \mathfrak{F}_0$. For $t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$, let $SC(t)$ denote the set of special constants occurring in t , and extend this to sets by $SC(\{t_1, \dots, t_n\}) = \bigcup_{i=1}^n SC(t_i)$.

For $r, s, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$, r is a *special constant-preserving generalization* (scpg) of s and t if there exist witnessing substitutions σ_s and σ_t such that r is a generalization of s and t via σ_s and σ_t that do not introduce special constants:

Definition 1. *The set of special constant-preserving (sc-preserving) generalizations of two terms $s, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ is defined as:*

$$CPG(s, t) = \left\{ r \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V}) \mid \begin{array}{l} \exists \sigma_s, (r\sigma_s = s) \wedge (SC(Ran(\sigma_s)) = \emptyset) \\ \exists \sigma_t, (r\sigma_t = t) \wedge (SC(Ran(\sigma_t)) = \emptyset) \end{array} \right\}$$

Using the above notation, we observe that, since **(1)** σ_s and σ_t do not associate terms with special constants to variables, and that **(2)** the equalities $r\sigma_s = s$ and $r\sigma_t = t$ hold, this implies that all special constants appearing in s or in t are preserved in r :

Lemma 1. *For any two terms $s, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ we have:*

$$CPG(s, t) \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow ((SC(s) = SC(t)) \wedge (\forall r \in CPG(s, t), SC(r) = SC(s)))$$

Proof. Assume $SC(s) \neq SC(t)$. Without loss of generality, let $\mathfrak{a} \in SC(s) \setminus SC(t)$. Suppose, for contradiction, that $r \in CPG(s, t)$ witnessing substitutions σ_s and σ_t . Since $r\sigma_t = t$ and $\mathfrak{a} \notin SC(t)$, \mathfrak{a} cannot occur in r . But $r\sigma_s = s$ requires $\mathfrak{a} \in SC(Ran(\sigma_s))$, contradicting the sc-preserving condition.

Let r in $CPG(s, t)$ with witnessing substitutions σ_s and σ_t . As $s = r\sigma_s$, we have $SC(s) = SC(r\sigma_s) = SC(r) \cup SC(Ran(\sigma_s)) = SC(r)$. \square

In Def. 2, we introduce sc-preserving lggs and mggs (scplgg and resp. scpmgg).

Definition 2. *For any $s, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$, we have that $r \in CPG(s, t)$ is an sc-preserving mgg (resp. lgg) of s and t if $\nexists r' \in CPG(s, t)$ s.t. $r' \prec r$ (resp. $r \prec r'$) i.e., r is minimal (resp. maximal) in $CPG(s, t)$ w.r.t. \preceq .*

It transpires that if an scplgg exists, then it is an lgg:

Property 1. A sc-preserving lgg of s and t in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ is an lgg of s and t .




Fig. 2: Example illustrating generalizations and sc-preserving generalizations

Proof. Let r be an scplgg of s and t with witnessing substitutions σ_s and σ_t . Suppose, for contradiction, that a generalization r' of s and t with witnessing substitutions σ'_s, σ'_t exists such that $r \prec r'$, i.e., $r\sigma = r'$ for some substitution σ . Then $r\sigma\sigma'_s = r\sigma_s = s$. Restricting domains of σ and σ_s to $\text{Var}(r)$, we deduce $\sigma\sigma'_s = \sigma_s$. Hence, $SC(\text{Ran}(\sigma'_s)) \subseteq SC(\text{Ran}(\sigma_s))$. Since $r \in CPG(s, t)$, $SC(\text{Ran}(\sigma_s)) = \emptyset$ and we get $SC(\text{Ran}(\sigma'_s)) = \emptyset$. A similar reasoning holds by replacing the index s by t . Thus, r' is also sc-preserving, contradicting the maximality of r in $CPG(s, t)$. \square

Consider the following example: $s = f(\mathbf{a}, g(u, u))$ and $t = f(\mathbf{a}, g(v, v))$. On Fig. 2, we provide several generalizations of (s, t) and how they are related via the \preceq relation. Here, $r = f(\mathbf{a}, g(x, x))$ (① on Fig. 2) is an lgg i.e., it minimally abstracts the differences between s and t and it is sc-preserving i.e., the special constant \mathbf{a} remains. As for $r' = f(\mathbf{a}, g(x, y))$ (② on Fig. 2), it is also sc-preserving, but it is not least generalizing. Indeed, $r'\{y \mapsto x\} = r$.

Now consider a different example with $s = f(\mathbf{a}, g(\mathbf{b}, u))$ and $t = f(\mathbf{a}, g(v, \mathbf{b}))$. Here, any generalization would require a variable to map to a term with special constants: for instance, the candidate $r = f(\mathbf{a}, g(x, y))$ would require $x\sigma_s = \mathbf{b}$ and $y\sigma_t = \mathbf{b}$, thus violating the sc-preservation.

Lemma 2. *If a sc-preserving lgg exists, it is unique up to renaming equivalence.*

Proof. Let r be a scplgg of s and t . By Prop. 1, r is an lgg, which is unique up to renaming by [23]. \square

Conflict positions [9, 10, 8] are common positions in s and t at which a difference occurs. If there are no such positions then $s = t$.

We distinguish in Def. 3 conflict positions in which the diverging subterms do or do not contain special constants.

Definition 3. Let $s, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$. A position $p \in \text{pos}(s) \cap \text{pos}(t)$ is a conflict position (*cpos*) iff $\text{head}(s|_p) \neq \text{head}(t|_p)$ and $\forall q \triangleleft p, \text{head}(s|_q) = \text{head}(t|_q)$. Moreover, it is a failure cpos (*fcpos*) iff $SC(s|_p) \neq \emptyset$ or $SC(t|_p) \neq \emptyset$ and a solvable cpos (*scpos*) otherwise.

We denote by $\text{cpos}(s, t)$ (resp. $\text{scpos}(s, t)$, $\text{fcpos}(s, t)$) the set of *cpos* (resp. *scpos*, *fcpos*) of any two terms s and t . The absence of failure conflict positions guarantees the existence of *scpg*, and conversely:

Lemma 3. Given s and t in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$, $(CPG(s, t) = \emptyset) \Leftrightarrow (\text{fcpos}(s, t) \neq \emptyset)$

Proof. By induction on $N = \text{size}(s) + \text{size}(t)$. If $N = 2$, then s and t are both constant symbols.

- If $s \neq t$, then the only generalization of s and t is a variable x (up to renaming). Then:
 - If $CPG(s, t) = \emptyset$, then x is not sc-preserving. This implies that $SC(s) \neq \emptyset$ or $SC(t) \neq \emptyset$. Hence ε is a fcpos of s and t so $\text{fcpos}(s, t) \neq \emptyset$.
 - If $\text{fcpos}(s, t) \neq \emptyset$ then let's consider one such *fcpos*. As s and t are constants, it can only be ε . We have that $SC(s|_\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$ or $SC(t|_\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$. We deduce that x is not a sc-preserving generalization. Hence $CPG(s, t) = \emptyset$.
- If $s = t$, there is no fcpos, whether s is a special constant or not. Generalizations of s and t are either a variable x or s . If s is (resp. is not) a special constant, then s (resp. x) is a sc-preserving generalization and $CPG(s, t) \neq \emptyset$.

If $N > 2$, then $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ with $n \geq 1$ or $t = g(t_1, \dots, t_m)$ with $m \geq 1$. Let us suppose the left case $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ (the right case being equivalent).

- If $\text{head}(t) \neq f$, then the only generalization of s and t (up to variable renaming) is a variable x . Let us suppose that there exists a fcpos, then it will be ε because $\text{head}(s) = f \neq \text{head}(t)$ and $SC(s)$ or $SC(t)$ will be not empty. It means that x is not sc-preserving. Hence $CPG(s, t) = \emptyset$.
Conversely, if $CPG(s, t) = \emptyset$, then x is not an sc-preserving generalization. By definition, it means that $SC(s) \neq \emptyset$ or $SC(t) \neq \emptyset$. In addition to the fact that $f \neq \text{head}(t)$, we deduce that ε is a fcpos of s and t .
- If $\text{head}(t) = f$, let us introduce $t = f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$. Then one of the following two possibilities applies: (1) either for all i , $CPG(s_i, t_i) \neq \emptyset$. By induction hypothesis, no subterm pairs (s_i, t_i) has a fcpos, thus there is no fcpos for s and t . For $r_i \in CPG(s_i, t_i)$, $f(r_1, \dots, r_n)$ is in $CPG(s, t)$ and $CPG(s, t) \neq \emptyset$; or (2) for some i , $CPG(s_i, t_i) = \emptyset$. By induction, there exists a fcpos p_i for s_i and t_i . Then, $i.p_i$ is a fcpos of s and t with either $SC(s|_{i.p_i})$ or $SC(t|_{i.p_i})$ not empty. Let us suppose there exists $r \in CPG(s, t)$. Either r is a variable, and in this case, r is not sc-preserving since $SC(s|_{i.p_i})$ or $SC(t|_{i.p_i})$ is not empty; or r is of the form $f(r_1, \dots, r_n)$, and in this case r_i would be in $CPG(s_i, t_i)$. Contradiction with the hypothesis $CPG(s_i, t_i) = \emptyset$. And $CPG(s, t) = \emptyset$.

□

4 Algorithm for sc-preserving generalizations

Following [4,18], generalization problems are represented as *anti-unification triples* (AUTs), written $x : s \triangleq t$ for ground terms $s, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$. The variable x denotes an mgg of s and t , witnessed by the substitutions $\{x \mapsto s\}$ and $\{x \mapsto t\}$. The *size* of an AUT is $\text{size}(x : s \triangleq t) = \text{size}(s) + \text{size}(t)$. Def.4 introduces notations on sets of AUTs.

Definition 4. Let A be a subset of the set $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})^2$ of all AUTs.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Index}(A) &= \cup_{(x:s \triangleq t) \in A} \{x\} & \text{Pairs}(A) &= \cup_{(x:s \triangleq t) \in A} \{(s, t)\} \\ \text{Left}(A) &= \cup_{(x:s \triangleq t) \in A} \{x \mapsto s\} & \text{Right}(A) &= \cup_{(x:s \triangleq t) \in A} \{x \mapsto t\} \end{aligned}$$

A *configuration* is a tuple $c = \langle A | S | \theta | x_0 \rangle$, where $A \subset \mathcal{A}$ is a set of so-called *active* AUTs, $S \subset \mathcal{A}$ the store of so-called *solved* AUTs, θ the accumulated index-variable mappings, and x_0 the root variable. We denote by $\text{Left}(c)$ and $\text{Right}(c)$ the substitutions $\text{Left}(A \cup S)$ and $\text{Right}(A \cup S)$ respectively.

Starting from an initial configuration $c_0 = \langle \{x_0 : s_0 \triangleq t_0\} | \emptyset | \text{Id}_{\mathcal{V}} | x_0 \rangle$ an anti-unification algorithm such as the ones from [10,18] computes a lgg of s_0 and t_0 via applying successive transformations from c_0 until reaching a configuration $c = \langle \emptyset | S | \theta | x_0 \rangle$ in which the set of active AUTs is empty. Once this is done, the lgg is obtained by applying the substitution θ to the root variable x_0 i.e. $x_0\theta$ is a lgg of s_0 and t_0 . The corresponding witnessing substitutions are $\sigma_L = \text{Left}(c)$ and $\sigma_R = \text{Right}(c)$, satisfying $x_0\theta\sigma_L = s_0$ and $x_0\theta\sigma_R = t_0$.

$\begin{aligned} \text{(Decompose)} \quad & \frac{\langle \{x : f(\bar{s}) \triangleq f(\bar{t})\} \cup A \mid S \mid \theta \mid x_0 \rangle}{\langle \bigcup_{i \in [1, n]} \{x_i : s_i \triangleq t_i\} \cup A \mid S \mid \theta \{x \mapsto f(\bar{x})\} \mid x_0 \rangle} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} f \in \mathcal{F}_n \\ \bar{s}, \bar{t} \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})^n \\ \bar{x} : n \text{ fresh vars} \end{array} \right. \\ \\ \text{(Solve)} \quad & \frac{\langle \{x : s \triangleq t\} \cup A \mid S \mid \theta \mid x_0 \rangle}{\langle A \mid \{x : s \triangleq t\} \cup S \mid \theta \mid x_0 \rangle} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{head}(s) \neq \text{head}(t) \\ SC(s) = SC(t) = \emptyset \\ \nexists y \text{ s.t. } (y : s \triangleq t) \in S \end{array} \right. \\ \\ \text{(Recover)} \quad & \frac{\langle \{x : s \triangleq t\} \cup A \mid S \mid \theta \mid x_0 \rangle}{\langle A \mid S \mid \theta \{x \mapsto y\} \mid x_0 \rangle} \quad \{ \exists y \text{ s.t. } (y : s \triangleq t) \in S \} \end{aligned}$
--

Fig. 3: sc-preserving generalization rules (no equations)

On Fig.3, we introduce the inference rules of our sc-preserving anti-unification algorithm. The rule **Decompose** replaces in A an AUT $x : f(\bar{s}) \triangleq f(\bar{t})$ with a set of smaller AUTs $x_i : s_i \triangleq t_i$, introducing fresh variables $x_i \notin \text{Index}(A \cup S) \cup \text{Dom}(\theta)$, and extending θ with $\sigma = \{x \mapsto f(\bar{x})\}$. The rule **Solve** transfers an AUT from A to S when $\text{head}(s) \neq \text{head}(t)$, no duplicate $(y : s \triangleq t)$ exists in S , and both terms are free of special constants ($SC(s) = SC(t) = \emptyset$). The rule **Recover**

reuses a previously solved pair $(y : s \triangleq t) \in S$ by extending θ with $\{x \mapsto y\}$, enforcing variable sharing across identical subproblems. It should be noted that if we remove the condition $SC(s) = SC(t) = \emptyset$ in the Solve rule on Fig.3, then these rules correspond to the usual anti-unification rules [10].

4.1 Examples and relation to conflict positions

Example 1. We give below a derivation trace using the rules of Fig.3 from the initial configuration $\langle \{x_0 : f(\mathbf{a}, g(u, u)) \triangleq f(\mathbf{a}, g(v, v))\} \mid \emptyset \mid Id_V \mid x_0 \rangle$, by using the first capital letter of the name of the rules to identify them.

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{(D)} \frac{\langle \{x_0 : f(\mathbf{a}, g(u, u)) \triangleq f(\mathbf{a}, g(v, v))\} \mid \emptyset \mid Id_V \mid x_0 \rangle}{\langle \{x_1 : \mathbf{a} \triangleq \mathbf{a}, x_2 : g(u, u) \triangleq g(v, v)\} \mid \emptyset \mid \{x_0 \mapsto f(x_1, x_2)\} \mid x_0 \rangle} \\
 \text{(D)} \frac{\langle \{x_2 : g(u, u) \triangleq g(v, v)\} \mid \emptyset \mid \{x_0 \mapsto f(x_1, x_2)\} \{x_1 \mapsto \mathbf{a}\} \mid x_0 \rangle}{\langle \{x_3 : u \triangleq v, x_4 : u \triangleq v\} \mid \emptyset \mid \{x_0 \mapsto f(\mathbf{a}, x_2)\} \{x_2 \mapsto g(x_3, x_4)\} \mid x_0 \rangle} \\
 \text{(S)} \frac{\langle \{x_3 : u \triangleq v, x_4 : u \triangleq v\} \mid \emptyset \mid \{x_0 \mapsto f(\mathbf{a}, x_2)\} \{x_2 \mapsto g(x_3, x_4)\} \mid x_0 \rangle}{\langle \{x_4 : u \triangleq v\} \mid \{x_3 : u \triangleq v\} \mid \{x_0 \mapsto f(\mathbf{a}, g(x_3, x_4))\} \mid x_0 \rangle} \\
 \text{(R)} \frac{\langle \{x_4 : u \triangleq v\} \mid \{x_3 : u \triangleq v\} \mid \{x_0 \mapsto f(\mathbf{a}, g(x_3, x_4))\} \mid x_0 \rangle}{\langle \emptyset \mid \{x_3 : u \triangleq v\} \mid \{x_0 \mapsto f(\mathbf{a}, g(x_3, x_4))\} \{x_4 \mapsto x_3\} \mid x_0 \rangle}
 \end{array}$$

In the last step, we have $x_0\theta = f(\mathbf{a}, g(x_3, x_3))$ with $\{x_3 \mapsto u\}$ and $\{x_3 \mapsto v\}$ as left and right instantiations.

Example 2. Here, applying the rules of Fig.3 does not allow us to empty the set of active AUT, as no sc-preserving generalization exists.

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{(D)} \frac{\langle \{x_0 : f(\mathbf{a}, g(\mathbf{b}, u)) \triangleq f(\mathbf{a}, g(v, \mathbf{b}))\} \mid \emptyset \mid Id_V \mid x_0 \rangle}{\langle \{x_1 : \mathbf{a} \triangleq \mathbf{a}, x_2 : g(\mathbf{b}, u) \triangleq g(v, \mathbf{b})\} \mid \emptyset \mid \{x_0 \mapsto f(x_1, x_2)\} \mid x_0 \rangle} \\
 \text{(D)} \frac{\langle \{x_2 : g(\mathbf{b}, u) \triangleq g(v, \mathbf{b})\} \mid \emptyset \mid \{x_0 \mapsto f(x_1, x_2)\} \{x_1 \mapsto \mathbf{a}\} \mid x_0 \rangle}{\langle \{x_3 : \mathbf{b} \triangleq v, x_4 : u \triangleq \mathbf{b}\} \mid \emptyset \mid \{x_0 \mapsto f(\mathbf{a}, x_2)\} \{x_2 \mapsto g(x_3, x_4)\} \mid x_0 \rangle}
 \end{array}$$

The examples above illustrate that all introduced AUTs correspond to pairs of terms s, t located at the same position p in both s_0 and t_0 and which have the same parent symbols at any position q in s_0 and t_0 with $q \triangleleft p$.

Lemma 4. *There is a derivation from c_0 to $c = \langle \{x : s \triangleq t\} \cup A \mid S \mid \theta \mid x_0 \rangle$ iff $\exists p \in \text{pos}(s_0) \cap \text{pos}(t_0)$ s.t. $s_0|_p = s$, $t_0|_p = t$, and for all $q \triangleleft p$, $\text{head}(s_0|_q) = \text{head}(t_0|_q)$.*

Sketch of proof. This trivially holds for $c = c_0$ with the position being the root ε . For any other AUT, we may simply remark that only **Decompose** introduces new AUTs, each step descending one level with identical heads. \square

On Def.5 we characterize final configurations of our algorithm as those which are irreducible by the rules of Fig.3.

Definition 5. *Let $c = \langle A \mid S \mid \theta \mid x_0 \rangle$ be a configuration reachable from c_0 . c is said to be final if c is irreducible by the rules of Fig.3. Moreover if $A = \emptyset$, c is said to be solved final configuration.*

In Lem.5, we relate final configurations that are reachable from c_0 to the failure conflict positions of the initial terms s_0 and t_0 .

Lemma 5. *For any final configuration $c = \langle A|S|\theta|x_0 \rangle$ we have:*

$$\text{Pairs}(A) \subseteq \bigcup_{p \in \text{fcpos}(s_0, t_0)} \{(s_0|_p, t_0|_p)\}$$

Sketch of proof. Let $c = \langle A|S|\theta|x_0 \rangle$ be a final configuration. For $x : s \triangleq t$ in A , $\text{head}(s) \neq \text{head}(t)$ (otherwise **Decompose** could be applied) and $SC(s) \neq \emptyset$ or $SC(t) \neq \emptyset$ (otherwise **Solve** or **Recover** could be applied). This combined with Lem.4 implies that $\exists p \in \text{fcpos}(s_0, t_0)$ s.t. $s = s_0|_p$ and $t = t_0|_p$. \square

4.2 Properties

Termination of our anti-unification algorithm can be directly proved via reasoning on a decreasing multiset measure.

Theorem 1 (Termination). *Derivations from c_0 applying the rules of Fig.3 are finite.*

Proof. Let us first define, for a configuration $c = \langle A|S|\theta|x_0 \rangle$, the multiset ¹

$$\mu(c) = \{\!\!\{\text{size}(x : s \triangleq t) \mid x : s \triangleq t \in A\}\!\!\}$$

which cumulates the sizes of all AUTs in the active set A . Let $c = \langle A|S|\theta|x_0 \rangle$ and $c' = \langle A'|S'|\theta'|x_0 \rangle$ be configurations where c' is obtained from c by a single application of a rule of Fig. 3. We show that ² $\mu(c) >_{mul} \mu(c')$ by case analysis. If **Solve** or **Recover** are applied, some $x : s \triangleq t$ is removed from A . As $A' \subsetneq A$, we directly obtain: $\mu(c') = \mu(c) \setminus \{\!\!\{\text{size}(x : s \triangleq t)\}\!\!\}$. Therefore, $\mu(c) >_{mul} \mu(c')$. If **Decompose** is applied, given $f \in \mathcal{F}$ of arity $n \geq 0$, some $x : f(\bar{s}) \triangleq f(\bar{t}) \in A$ is replaced by $\bigcup_{i \in [1..n]} \{x_i : s_i \triangleq t_i\}$. This gives rise to the following equality:

$$\mu(c') = \left(\mu(c) \setminus \{\!\!\{\text{size}(x : f(\bar{s}) \triangleq f(\bar{t}))\}\!\!\} \right) \cup \bigcup_{i \in [1..n]} \{\!\!\{\text{size}(x_i : s_i \triangleq t_i)\}\!\!\}.$$

We get $\mu(c) >_{mul} \mu(c')$ as for each i , $\text{size}(x_i : s_i \triangleq t_i) < \text{size}(x : f(\bar{s}) \triangleq f(\bar{t}))$.

As $>_{mul}$ is a well-founded order, any derivation under rules of Fig. 3 is finite. \square

If we note $\langle A_0|S_0|\theta_0|x_0 \rangle$ an initial configuration $c_0 = \langle x_0 : s_0 \triangleq t_0 | \emptyset | Id_V | x_0 \rangle$ with ground terms s_0 and t_0 , we have $\text{Dom}(\text{Left}(c_0)) = \text{Dom}(\text{Right}(c_0)) = \text{Index}(A_0 \cup S_0) = \text{Var}(x_0\theta_0)$, all equal to $\{x_0\}$. Moreover, $\text{VRan}(\theta) = \text{Var}(x_0\theta) \setminus \{x_0\}$. These properties are invariant on all the reachable configurations:

¹ Multisets are denoted $\{\!\!\{\dots\}\!\!\}$ when explicitly listing elements by repeating them as many times as their multiplicity.

² For two multisets M and N , $M >_{mul} N$ iff N can be obtained from M by iteratively replacing one element of M by any number of smaller elements.

Lemma 6. *If $c = \langle A|S|\theta|x_0 \rangle$ derives from c_0 via the rules of Fig.3 then:*

- $\text{Dom}(\text{Left}(c)) = \text{Dom}(\text{Right}(c)) = \text{Index}(A \cup S) = \text{Var}(x_0\theta);$
- $\text{VRan}(\theta) = \text{Var}(x_0\theta) \setminus \{x_0\};$
- $x_0\theta$ is a generalization of s_0 and t_0 with respective witnessing substitutions $\text{Left}(c)$ and $\text{Right}(c)$.

Proof. Let us reason by induction on the derivations.

• **Base case:** The initial configuration c_0 is such that $A_0 = \{x_0 : s_0 \triangleq t_0\}$, $S_0 = \emptyset$ and $\theta_0 = \text{Id}_V$ and thus $\text{Left}(c_0) = \{x_0 \mapsto s_0\}$ and $\text{Right}(c_0) = \{x_0 \mapsto t_0\}$. Therefore:

- $\text{Dom}(\text{Left}(c_0)) = \text{Dom}(\text{Right}(c_0)) = \{x_0\}$ and $\text{Index}(A_0 \cup S_0) = \text{Index}(A_0) = \{x_0\}$ and $\text{Var}(x_0\theta_0) = \text{Var}(x_0) = \{x_0\}$
- $\text{VRan}(\theta_0) = \text{Var}(x_0\theta_0) \setminus \{x_0\}$
- $x_0\theta_0 = x_0$ is a generalization of s_0 and t_0 (it is the mgg) with witnessing substitutions $\text{Left}(c_0)$ and $\text{Right}(c_0)$

• **Induction:** Given a configuration c , we denote $\sigma_L = \text{Left}(c)$ and $\sigma_R = \text{Right}(c)$. Let us suppose the the property holds for a certain configuration c reachable from c_0 . Let then suppose that c' is reached from c by applying a single step. This step must correspond to the application of either:

- **Solve:** there exist an AUT a s.t. $A' = A \setminus \{a\}$ and $S' = S \cup \{a\}$ and we have $\theta' = \theta$, $\sigma'_L = \sigma_L$ and $\sigma'_R = \sigma_R$ therefore the three items hold because $A' \cup S' = A \cup S$ and the substitutions are unchanged.
- **Recover:** there are two AUTs $x : s \triangleq t$ and $y : s \triangleq t$ s.t. $a' \in S$ and $A' = A \setminus \{x : s \triangleq t\}$, $\theta' = \theta\{x \mapsto y\}$ (with $x \notin \text{Dom}(\theta)$ and $x \notin \text{VRan}(\theta)$) and all others unchanged. Then:

- $\text{Dom}(\sigma'_L) = \text{Dom}(\sigma_L) \setminus \{x\}$ and $\text{Dom}(\sigma'_R) = \text{Dom}(\sigma_R) \setminus \{x\}$
- $\text{Index}(A' \cup S') = (\text{Index}(A \cup S) \setminus \{x\})$ and $\text{Var}(x_0\theta') = \text{Var}(x_0\theta) \setminus \{x\}$

Thus, by the induction hypothesis, the first item holds. As we also have $\text{VRan}(\theta') = \text{VRan}(\theta) \setminus \{x\}$, the second item also holds by induction. Then:

- $x\{x \mapsto y\}\sigma'_L = y\sigma'_L = s = y\sigma_L = x\sigma_L$
- $\forall z \in \text{Var}(x_0\theta) \setminus \{x\}, z\{x \mapsto y\} = z$ and thus $z\{x \mapsto y\}\sigma'_L = z\sigma'_L = z\sigma_L$ since σ'_L and σ_L differ only on x

Hence $\{x \mapsto y\}\sigma'_L = \sigma_L$. The previous two points also hold for σ_R and σ'_R . Therefore, as $\text{Var}(x_0\theta') = \text{Dom}(\sigma'_L) = \text{Dom}(\sigma'_R)$ by the first item we have:

- $x_0\theta'\sigma'_L = x_0\theta\{x \mapsto y\}\sigma'_L = x_0\theta\sigma_L$
- $x_0\theta'\sigma'_R = x_0\theta\{x \mapsto y\}\sigma'_R = x_0\theta\sigma_R$

Thus, by the induction hypothesis, the third item holds

- **Decompose:** an AUT $a = x : f(\bar{s}) \triangleq f(\bar{t}) \in A$ is replaced by $n \geq 0$ AUTs $a_i = x_i : s_i \triangleq t_i$ with n fresh variables \bar{x} so that:

- $A' = (A \setminus \{a\}) \cup \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ and $S' = S$
- $\theta' = \theta\{x \mapsto f(\bar{x})\}$
- $\sigma'_L = (\sigma_L \setminus \{x \mapsto f(\bar{x})\}) \cup \{x_1 \mapsto s_1, \dots, x_n \mapsto s_n\}$
- $\sigma'_R = (\sigma_R \setminus \{x \mapsto f(\bar{x})\}) \cup \{x_1 \mapsto t_1, \dots, x_n \mapsto t_n\}$

We then have:

- $\text{Index}(A' \cup S') = (\text{Index}(A \cup S) \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$
- $\text{Dom}(\sigma'_L) = (\text{Dom}(\sigma_L) \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$
- $\text{Dom}(\sigma'_R) = (\text{Dom}(\sigma_R) \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$
- $\text{VRan}(\theta') = (\text{VRan}(\theta) \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$
- $\text{Var}(x_0\theta') = (\text{Var}(x_0\theta) \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$

Thus, by the induction hypothesis, the first and second items hold. Also:

- $x\{x \mapsto f(\bar{x})\}\sigma'_L = f(\bar{x})\sigma'_L = f(x_1\sigma'_L, \dots, x_n\sigma'_L) = f(\bar{s}) = x\sigma_L$
- $\forall z \in \text{Var}(x_0\theta) \setminus \{x\}, z\{x \mapsto f(\bar{x})\} = z$ and thus $z\{x \mapsto f(\bar{x})\}\sigma'_L = z\sigma'_L = z\sigma_L$ since σ'_L and σ_L differ only on x

Hence, $\{x \mapsto f(\bar{x})\}\sigma'_L = \sigma_L$. The previous two points also hold for σ_R and σ'_R .

Therefore, as $\text{Var}(x_0\theta') = \text{Dom}(\sigma'_L) = \text{Dom}(\sigma'_R)$ by the first item we have:

- $x_0\theta'\sigma'_L = x_0\theta\{x \mapsto f(\bar{x})\}\sigma'_L = x_0\theta\sigma_L$
- $x_0\theta'\sigma'_R = x_0\theta\{x \mapsto f(\bar{x})\}\sigma'_R = x_0\theta\sigma_R$

Thus, by the induction hypothesis the third item holds.

Lemma 7 (SC-preservation). *Let c be a solved configuration derived from c_0 by successive applications of the rules of Fig. 3, then $x_0\theta \in \text{CPG}(s_0, t_0)$.*

Proof. By Lem.6, $x_0\theta$ is a generalization of s_0 and t_0 . Let us prove that it is sc-preserving. By Lem.6, $\text{Dom}(\text{Left}(c)) = \text{Dom}(\text{Right}(c)) = \text{Index}(A \cup S) = \text{Index}(S)$ since A is empty for a solved configuration. Each binding in $\text{Left}(c)$ (resp. $\text{Right}(c)$) is of the form $x \mapsto s$ (resp. $x \mapsto t$) with $x : s \triangleq t \in S$. As by construction, the set of solved AUTs only contains special-constant-free AUTs, we have $SC(\text{Ran}(\text{Left}(c))) = SC(\text{Ran}(\text{Right}(c))) = \emptyset$ so that $x_0\theta \in \text{CPG}(s_0, t_0)$. \square

Theorem 2 (Soundness). *Let c be a solved configuration derived from c_0 by successive applications of the rules of Fig. 3, then $x_0\theta$ is a scplgg of s_0 and t_0 .*

Proof. Let $c = \langle \emptyset | S | \theta | x_0 \rangle$ reached from c_0 . By Lem.7, $x_0\theta \in \text{CPG}(s_0, t_0)$. Assume that there is an sc-preserving lgg r and a substitution ρ with $x_0\theta\rho = r$ and ρ not a renaming. Take $\text{Dom}(\rho) = \text{Var}(x_0\theta)$. Since ρ is not a renaming, there exists y in $\text{Dom}(\rho)$ that verifies either **(1)** $\exists y' \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{y\}, y\rho = y'\rho \in \mathcal{V}$, i.e. ρ merges at least two variables occurring in $x_0\theta$ or **(2)** $y\rho \notin \mathcal{V}$.

Case **(1)**. By Lem.6, the active set being empty, $\text{Index}(S) = \text{Var}(x_0\theta) = \text{Dom}(\rho)$, so y and y' index solved AUTs in S : $y : s \triangleq t \in S$ and $y' : s' \triangleq t' \in S$. By Lem.4 there are solvable positions p, p' with $s_0|_p = s, t_0|_p = t$ and $s_0|_{p'} = s', t_0|_{p'} = t'$. Now $r|_p = (x_0\theta\rho)|_p = (x_0\theta)|_p\rho = y\rho$ and similarly $r|_{p'} = y'\rho$. Given that we know that $y\rho = y'\rho$, this implies $r|_p = r|_{p'}$. Since $r \in \text{CPG}(s_0, t_0)$ there are witnesses σ_L, σ_R with $r\sigma_L = s_0$ and $r\sigma_R = t_0$, hence $s_0|_p = r|_p\sigma_L = r|_{p'}\sigma_L = s_0|_{p'}$ and similarly $t_0|_p = r|_p\sigma_R = r|_{p'}\sigma_R = t_0|_{p'}$. We deduce $s = s'$ and $t = t'$. Thus S contains two solved AUTs with identical subproblems, which Recover forbids. Contradiction.

Case **(2)**. Again $\text{Index}(S) = \text{Var}(x_0\theta)$ so $y \in \text{Index}(S)$ and $y : s \triangleq t \in S$. By Lem.4 there is a solvable position p with $s_0|_p = s, t_0|_p = t$. Now $r|_p = (x_0\theta\rho)|_p = (x_0\theta)|_p\rho = y\rho$, which by hypothesis is a non-variable term. But $r \in \text{CPG}(s_0, t_0)$, so its witnessing substitutions σ_L, σ_R satisfy $r\sigma_L = s_0$ and

$$\text{(Fail)} \frac{\langle \{x : s \triangleq t\} \cup A \mid S \mid \theta \mid x_0 \rangle}{\perp} \{ SC(s) \neq SC(t) \}$$

Fig. 4: (Fail) a derived rule to complete rules of Fig.3

$r\sigma_R = t_0$. Applying σ_L and σ_R to $r|_p = y\rho$ yields s and t , respectively; hence $\text{head}(s) = \text{head}(t) = \text{head}(y\rho)$. Thus the solved AUT $y : s \triangleq t$ has identical root symbols which Solve forbids. Contradiction. \square

Theorem 3 (Completeness). *For any $r, s_0, t_0 \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$, if r is a sc-preserving lgg of s_0 and t_0 then there is a derivation from c_0 to a final configuration $\langle \emptyset | S | \theta | x_0 \rangle$ such that $r \simeq x_0\theta$.*

Proof. Let us suppose r is an scplgg of s_0 and t_0 . Then $CPG(s_0, t_0) \neq \emptyset$ so by Lem.3, we must have $fcpos(s_0, t_0) = \emptyset$. Then by Lem.5, for any final configuration $c = \langle A | S | \theta | x_0 \rangle$ we must have $A = \emptyset$. Because the algorithm is terminating (Th.1) one such configuration exists. Then by Th.2, we must have that $x\theta$ is a sclgg of s_0 and t_0 . Finally, by Lem.2 we have $r \simeq x_0\theta$. \square

Let us remark that, for any $c = \langle A | S | \theta | x_0 \rangle$, if $\exists x : s \triangleq t \in A$ s.t. $SC(s) \neq SC(t)$, then, in any c' reachable from c , A' cannot be empty. Indeed, if $\text{head}(s) \neq \text{head}(t)$, only Solve may remove $x : s \triangleq t$ from A and it cannot be applied. If $\text{head}(s) = \text{head}(t)$ with $s = f(\bar{s})$ and $t = f(\bar{t})$ then $\exists i \in [1, |\bar{s}|]$ s.t. $SC(s_i) \neq SC(t_i)$. Then, applying Decompose results in adding a $y : s_i \triangleq t_i$ with $SC(s_i) \neq SC(t_i)$ to A' . By induction, from c' , no successor c'' can have $A'' = \emptyset$. As a result, one cannot find a scpg by exploring successors of c . Thus, we can pre-emptively prune the exploration of configurations by applying the higher priority Fail rule from Fig.4. Its use will speed up the detection of failure cases (see Sec.6).

5 Equational constant-preserving generalization

Sc-preserving anti-unification modulo an equational theory E requires E to be sc-preserving as per Def.6. Otherwise, applying the equations could erase the special-constants (e.g., $f(a_f, x) \approx a_f$ with an absorbing element a_f of f).

Definition 6. *Given an equational theory E :*

- E is sc-preserving if $\forall s, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V}), s =_E t \Rightarrow SC(s) = SC(t)$
- the sc-preserving E -generalizations (E -scpg) of terms $s, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ are:

$$CPG_E(s, t) = \left\{ r \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V}) \mid \begin{array}{l} \exists \sigma_s, (r\sigma_s =_E s) \wedge (SC(\text{Ran}(\sigma_s)) = \emptyset) \\ \exists \sigma_t, (r\sigma_t =_E t) \wedge (SC(\text{Ran}(\sigma_t)) = \emptyset) \end{array} \right\}$$

Similarly as we did for CPG in Lem.1, we characterize the preservation of special constants by CPG_E in Lem.8.

Lemma 8. *For any sc-preserving theory E and $\forall s, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ we have:*

$$CPG_E(s, t) \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow ((SC(s) = SC(t)) \wedge (\forall r \in CPG_E(s, t), SC(r) = SC(s)))$$

Proof. Assume that $r \in CPG_E(s, t)$ exists with witnessing substitutions σ_s and σ_t . Since E is sc-preserving, we have $SC(r\sigma_s) = SC(s)$ and $SC(r\sigma_t) = SC(t)$. But $SC(r\sigma_s) = SC(r\sigma_t) = SC(r)$ because σ_s and σ_t introduce no special constants. Hence, $SC(s) = SC(t)$. The second part is obvious. \square

Unlike the scplgg of Def.2, the E -scplgg of Def.7 are not necessarily unique up to renaming. Consider for instance $s = f(\mathbf{a}, g(u, u))$ and $t = f(g(v, v), \mathbf{a})$ with $E = \{f(x, y) \approx f(y, x)\}$. Here both $r_1 = f(\mathbf{a}, g(x, x))$ and $r_2 = f(g(x, x), \mathbf{a})$ are E -scplggs of s and t . Yet, we may remark that we have $r_1 =_E r_2$.

Definition 7. *For any $s, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$, we have that $r \in CPG_E(s, t)$ is an E -scpmgg (resp. E -scplgg) of s and t if $\nexists r' \in CPG_E(s, t)$ s.t. $r' \prec_E r$ (resp. $r \prec_E r'$) i.e., r is minimal (resp. maximal) in $CPG_E(s, t)$ w.r.t. \preceq_E .*

With Prop.2, we adapt Prop.1 to the case modulo equations.

Property 2. A sc-preserving E -lgg of s and t in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ is an E -lgg.

Proof. Let r be an sc-preserving E -lgg of s and t with witnessing substitutions σ_s and σ_t . Suppose, for contradiction, that a E -generalization r' of s and t with witnessing substitutions σ'_s, σ'_t exists such that $r \prec_E r'$, i.e., $r\sigma =_E r'\sigma$ for some substitution σ . Then $r\sigma\sigma'_s =_E r\sigma_s =_E s$ and $r\sigma\sigma'_t =_E r\sigma_t =_E t$.

Restricting domains of σ, σ_t and σ_s (resp. σ'_t and σ'_s) to $\text{Var}(r)$ (resp. $\text{Var}(r')$), we deduce $\sigma\sigma'_s = \sigma_s$ and $\sigma\sigma'_t = \sigma_t$. Hence, $SC(\text{Ran}(\sigma'_t)) \subseteq SC(\text{Ran}(\sigma_t))$ and $SC(\text{Ran}(\sigma'_s)) \subseteq SC(\text{Ran}(\sigma_s))$. Since r is a sc-preserving E -generalization, $SC(\text{Ran}(\sigma_s)) = SC(\text{Ran}(\sigma_t)) = \emptyset$, hence $SC(\text{Ran}(\sigma'_s)) = \emptyset$ and $SC(\text{Ran}(\sigma'_t)) = \emptyset$. Thus, r' is also sc-preserving, contradicting the maximality of r as an sc-preserving E -generalization. Therefore, r is an E -lgg of s and t . \square

Fig.5 illustrates the relationships between standard generalization [9,10,8] and our sc-preserving (E)-generalization.

The dashed horizontal arrows indicate that our formulation naturally subsumes standard generalization when the set of special constants is empty. Similarly, the plain horizontal arrows show that in the absence of equational axioms, the problem reduces to syntactic generalization. The top and bottom layers resp. correspond to the problem definitions and the inference rules used to solve them.

We update the standard rules $\{D, S, R\}$, substituting S with a S^* that enforces constant preservation³. E -generalization is implemented in [10,18] by introducing additional ad-hoc rules to handle specific theories (e.g. an operator f being associative, commutative, or having a neutral element, etc.) and combinations

³ Our Solve rule from Fig.3 is denoted by S^* on Fig.5 as it differs from the standard Solve rule from [10,18] by the added condition $SC(s) = SC(t) = \emptyset$.




Fig. 5: Relating generalizations

of theories (e.g. f being both associative and having a neutral element, etc.). On Fig.5, we represent this via the set X of additional rules, and the use of D^\dagger instead of D as we do not apply the standard **Decompose** rule if a rule in X can be applied. To achieve sc-preserving E -generalization, we follow the same principle, the only difference being the use of the special S^* rule.

$$(\text{Decompose}_C) \frac{\langle \{x : f(\bar{s}) \triangleq f(\bar{t})\} \cup A \mid S \mid \theta \mid x_0 \rangle}{\langle \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1 : s_1 \triangleq t_i, \\ x_2 : s_2 \triangleq t_{(i \bmod 2)+1} \end{array} \right\} \cup A \mid S \mid \theta\sigma \mid x_0 \rangle} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} f \in \mathcal{F}_2 \\ \bar{s}, \bar{t} \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})^2 \\ \bar{x} : 2 \text{ fresh vars} \\ i \in [1, 2] \\ \sigma = \{x \mapsto f(\bar{x})\} \end{array} \right.$$

Fig.6: Generalization rule for a commutative, non-associative function symbol [10]

On Fig.6, we propose one such ad-hoc rule. If we have $X = \{\text{Decompose}_C\}$ as the X of Fig.5 then the rule **Decompose** of Fig.3 would not be applied if the shared head symbol f is commutative but Decompose_C would be applied instead.

Example 3. Reusing Ex.2, we now assume that g is commutative and non-associative. By applying the rules of Fig.3 together with rule of Fig.6, an sc-preserving E -generalization exists: we have $x_0\theta = f(\mathbf{a}, g(\mathbf{b}, x_4))$ with $\{x_4 \mapsto u\}$ and $\{x_4 \mapsto v\}$ as left and right instantiations.

$$\begin{array}{l} (D) \frac{\langle \{x_0 : f(\mathbf{a}, g(\mathbf{b}, u)) \triangleq f(\mathbf{a}, g(v, \mathbf{b}))\} \mid \emptyset \mid Id_{\mathcal{V}} \mid x_0 \rangle}{\langle \{x_1 : \mathbf{a} \triangleq \mathbf{a}, x_2 : g(\mathbf{b}, u) \triangleq g(v, \mathbf{b})\} \mid \emptyset \mid \{x_0 \mapsto f(x_1, x_2)\} \mid x_0 \rangle} \\ (D) \frac{\langle \{x_2 : g(\mathbf{b}, u) \triangleq g(v, \mathbf{b})\} \mid \emptyset \mid \{x_0 \mapsto f(x_1, x_2)\} \{x_1 \mapsto \mathbf{a}\} \mid x_0 \rangle}{\langle \{x_3 : \mathbf{b} \triangleq \mathbf{b}, x_4 : u \triangleq v\} \mid \emptyset \mid \{x_0 \mapsto f(\mathbf{a}, x_2)\} \{x_2 \mapsto g(x_3, x_4)\} \mid x_0 \rangle} \\ (D) \frac{\langle \{x_4 : u \triangleq v\} \mid \emptyset \mid \{x_0 \mapsto f(\mathbf{a}, x_2)\} \{x_2 \mapsto g(x_3, x_4)\} \{x_3 \mapsto \mathbf{b}\} \mid x_0 \rangle}{\langle \emptyset \mid \{x_4 : u \triangleq v\} \mid \{x_0 \mapsto f(\mathbf{a}, x_2)\} \{x_2 \mapsto g(x_3, x_4)\} \{x_3 \mapsto \mathbf{b}\} \mid x_0 \rangle} \\ (S) \end{array}$$

6 Application to the composition of interactions

Recall the interaction composition problem discussed in Fig. 1. Let \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{M} be the universes of lifelines and messages. Atomic actions are $\mathbb{A} = \{l!m, l?m \mid l \in \mathcal{L}, m \in \mathcal{M}\}$, where for any $a \in \mathbb{A}$, $\Delta(a) \in \{!, ?\}$ and $\psi(a) \in \mathcal{M}$ denote its type and message. Value-passings form the set $\mathbb{VP} = \{\mathbf{vp}(l_1, m, l_2) \mid l_1, l_2 \in \mathcal{L}, m \in \mathcal{M}, l_1 \neq l_2\}$. Two actions $u, v \in \mathbb{A}$ are *compatible* iff there exist $l_1, l_2 \in \mathcal{L}$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$ with $l_1 \neq l_2$ such that $\{u, v\} = \{l_1!m, l_2?m\}$; for such actions, we may abusively write $\mathbf{vp}(u, v)$ (resp. $\mathbf{vp}(v, u)$) for $\mathbf{vp}(l_1, m, l_2)$. The set of interactions is $\mathbb{I} = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$, with signature $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in [0, 2]}$ defined as:

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathbb{A} \cup \mathbb{V}\mathbb{P} \cup \{\emptyset\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_1 = \{\text{loop}\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_2 = \{\text{seq}, \text{alt}, \text{par}\}.$$

For any $i \in \mathbb{I}$, $\theta(i) \subset \mathcal{L}$ denotes the lifelines occurring in i , defined by $\theta(l!m) = \theta(l?m) = \{l\}$, $\theta(\text{vp}(l_1, m, l_2)) = \{l_1, l_2\}$, $\theta(\text{loop}(i)) = \theta(i)$, and $\theta(f(i, j)) = \theta(i) \cup \theta(j)$ for $f \in \{\text{seq}, \text{alt}, \text{par}\}$. Semantically, seq , alt , and par are associative, alt and par commutative, and \emptyset is the unit for seq and par . Let E denote the set of equations characterizing these properties.

Given a set \mathfrak{F}_0 of special constants called gates, a *tagging* γ of $i, j \in \mathbb{I}$ is a set such that: **(1)** each $g \in \gamma$ is a tuple (p_i, p_j, \mathbf{a}) with $\mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{F}_0$, $p_i \in \text{pos}(i)$, $p_j \in \text{pos}(j)$, and $i|_{p_i}, j|_{p_j}$ are compatible actions; **(2)** for $g, g' \in \gamma$ with $g' = (p'_i, p'_j, \mathbf{b})$, we have $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b}$ implies $(i|_{p_i} = i|_{p'_i}) \wedge (j|_{p_j} = j|_{p'_j})$. Condition **(1)** ensures each tag relates compatible actions via a gate, while **(2)** enforces uniqueness of actions and gates. We denote by $\Gamma(i, j)$ the set of all taggings of i and j .

Given interactions $i, j, k \in \mathbb{I}$, $(i, j) \overset{\gamma}{\bowtie} k$ means that k is obtained by composing i and j via a tagging $\gamma \in \Gamma(i, j)$ as defined in Def.8. We use *mappings* to replace gate with actions or value-passings. A mapping is a partial function $\lambda : \mathfrak{F}_0 \rightarrow (\mathbb{A} \cup \mathbb{V}\mathbb{P})$, written $\lambda = \{\mathbf{a}_1 \mapsto u_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n \mapsto u_n\}$, so that $\text{Dom}(\lambda) = \{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n\} \subseteq \mathfrak{F}_0$. For $t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathfrak{F}_0)$, $t\lambda$ is defined by $t\lambda$ if $t \in \text{Dom}(\lambda)$, $t\lambda = t$ if $t \in \mathfrak{F}_0 \setminus \text{Dom}(\lambda)$, and $t\lambda = f(t_1\lambda, \dots, t_m\lambda)$ if $t = f(t_1, \dots, t_m)$ with $f \in \mathcal{F}_m$.

Definition 8. For $i, j, k \in \mathbb{I}$ with $\theta(i) \cap \theta(j) = \emptyset$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma(i, j)$, we write $(i, j) \overset{\gamma}{\bowtie} k$ iff:

- $\lambda_i = \{\mathbf{a} \mapsto i|_{p_i} \mid (p_i, p_j, \mathbf{a}) \in \gamma\}$ and $\lambda_j = \{\mathbf{a} \mapsto j|_{p_j} \mid (p_i, p_j, \mathbf{a}) \in \gamma\}$;
- $i = s\lambda_i$ and $j = t\lambda_j$ for some $s, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathfrak{F}_0)$;
- $r \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathfrak{F}_0, \mathcal{V})$ is an E -scpg of s and t with witnesses σ_s, σ_t ;
- σ_r satisfies $\text{Dom}(\sigma_r) = \text{Dom}(\sigma_s)$ and $x\sigma_r = \text{seq}(x\sigma_s, x\sigma_t)$ for all x ;
- λ_k satisfies $\text{Dom}(\lambda_k) = \text{Dom}(\lambda_i)$ and $\mathbf{a}\lambda_k = \text{vp}(\mathbf{a}\lambda_i, \mathbf{a}\lambda_j)$ for all \mathbf{a} ;
- $k = r\sigma_r\lambda_k$.

To prove the soundness of our composition, we adapt the projection-based approach of Lange [21], where a global type is inferred from local session types. Def.9 introduces a projection operator π . In [24], we showed that π preserves interaction semantics, i.e., $\pi_L(i)$ gives the traces of i restricted to actions on L .

Definition 9. The projection π_L onto a subset of lifelines $L \subset \mathcal{L}$ is defined by:

$$\pi_L(l\Delta m) = \begin{cases} l\Delta m & \text{if } l \in L \\ \emptyset & \text{if } l \notin L \end{cases} \quad \pi_L(\text{vp}(l_1, m, l_2)) = \begin{cases} l_1!m & \text{if } l_1 \in L, l_2 \notin L \\ l_2?m & \text{if } l_1 \notin L, l_2 \in L \\ \text{vp}(l_1, m, l_2) & \text{if } l_1 \in L, l_2 \in L \\ \emptyset & \text{if } l_1 \notin L, l_2 \notin L \end{cases}$$

$$\pi_L(\text{loop}(i)) = \text{loop}(\pi_L(i)) \quad \forall f \in \{\text{seq}, \text{alt}, \text{par}\} \quad \pi_L(f(i, j)) = f(\pi_L(i), \pi_L(j))$$

With Th.4, we show that whenever $(i, j) \overset{\gamma}{\bowtie} k$, projecting k on the lifelines of i (resp. j) yields an interaction semantically equivalent to i (resp. j). For this, we extend θ and π to $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathfrak{F}_0, \mathcal{V})$ via $\theta(\mathbf{a}) = \theta(x) = \emptyset$, $\pi_L(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{a}$, and $\pi_L(x) = x$.

Interaction	k	size(k)	Nb. Gates	Avg. composition Time (ms)			
				$(i_{\text{norm}}, j_{\text{norm}})$		$(i_{\text{mut}}, j_{\text{mut}})$	
				with F	without F	with F	without F
ATM[19]	33	[7, 17]		15.016(✓)	timeout	17.757(✓)	timeout
Alt3bit[22]	12	6		4.132(✓)	21.804(✓)	6.01(✓)	32.932(✓)
DistVoting[19]	23	8		8.243(✓)	timeout	10.955(✓)	timeout
FilterCo[22]	11	5		1.396(✓)	1.565(✓)	2.069(✓)	2.339(✓)
Game[22]	16	[5, 6]		2.525(✓)	3.179(✓)	3.163(✓)	4.283(✓)
HealthSys[22]	22	[4, 8]		5.978(✓)	18.496(✓)	7.495(✓)	22.786(✓)
Logistic[22]	26	[6, 11]		9.22(✓)	timeout	12.457(✓)	timeout
ProfOnline[29]	68	[14, 27]		59.567(✓)	timeout	75.474(✓)	timeout
Sanitary[22]	30	[6, 13]		11.491(✓)	40.242(✓)	14.795(✓)	51.265(✓)
TPM[22]	17	7		3.204(✓)	4.911(✓)	4.915(✓)	7.437(✓)
Travel[17]	26	[6, 11]		6.411(✓)	timeout	8.203(✓)	timeout
TwoBuyers[20]	22	[5, 11]		3.78(✓)	5.558(✓)	4.852(✓)	7.162(✓)

Fig. 7: Experiments on interaction composition using anti-unification

Theorem 4. For any $i, j, k \in \mathbb{I}$ with $\theta(i) \cap \theta(j) = \emptyset$ and any $\gamma \in \Gamma(i, j)$, if $(i, j) \overset{\gamma}{\bowtie} k$ then k is a sound E - γ -composition of i and j , meaning:

$$\pi_{\theta(i)}(k) =_E i \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_{\theta(j)}(k) =_E j.$$

Proof. We prove $\pi_{\theta(i)}(k) =_E i$ (the case $\pi_{\theta(j)}(k) =_E j$ is analogous). Let us introduce the terms s, t, r , mappings $\lambda_i, \lambda_j, \lambda_k$ and substitutions $\sigma_s, \sigma_t, \sigma_r$ such that the conditions of Def.8 are satisfied.

First, note that $\theta(r) = \emptyset$. Indeed, r is a generalization of s and t (hence i and j), and cannot contain non-shared constants. As $\theta(i) \cap \theta(j) = \emptyset$, the only shared constants are \emptyset or gate symbols in \mathfrak{F}_0 , so $\pi_{\theta(i)}(r) = r$.

Then, consider that $\forall x \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_r) = \text{Dom}(\sigma_s)$, we have $x\sigma_r = \text{seq}(x\sigma_s, x\sigma_t)$. Because σ_s is used to build s and then i from r , we must have $\theta(x\sigma_s) \subseteq \theta(i)$. Similarly, $\theta(x\sigma_t) \subseteq \theta(j)$. Therefore, given $\theta(i) \cap \theta(j) = \emptyset$, we have $\pi_{\theta(i)}(x\sigma_r) = \pi_{\theta(i)}(\text{seq}(x\sigma_s, x\sigma_t)) =_E x\sigma_s$. As a result, $\pi_{\theta(i)}(r\sigma_r) =_E \pi_{\theta(i)}(r)\sigma_s = r\sigma_s$.

Consider then that $\forall(-, -, \mathbf{a}) \in \gamma$ we have $\mathbf{a}\lambda_k = \mathbf{vp}(\mathbf{a}\lambda_i, \mathbf{a}\lambda_j)$. Via a similar reasoning, we have $\pi_{\theta(i)}(\mathbf{a}\lambda_k) = \mathbf{a}\lambda_i$. Therefore $\pi_{\theta(i)}(r\sigma_r\lambda_k) = \pi_{\theta(i)}(r\sigma_r)\lambda_i$.

Finally, as $k = r\sigma_r\lambda_k$, we have $\pi_{\theta(i)}(k) = \pi_{\theta(i)}(r\sigma_r)\lambda_i =_E r\sigma_s\lambda_i = s\lambda_i = i$. \square

Experiments. We have implemented equational sc-preserving anti-unification in a Rust prototype tool [5], which also supports interaction composition and integrates interaction manipulation facilities from an existing Rust-based tool [6]. Experiments were run on an Intel Core i7-13850HX (20-core, 2.1 GHz) with 32 GB RAM, using the Fail (abbreviated F) rule to improve performance, and a timeout threshold of 60s. Fig.7 summarizes experiments on interactions adapted

from the literature [22,29,17,20]. For each interaction k with lifelines L , we randomly generate up to 5 partitions (L_1, L_2) , each of size at least $\lfloor L/2 \rfloor$. For each partition: (1) compute projections $(i = \pi_{L_1}(k), j = \pi_{L_2}(k))$ and their normal forms $(i_{\text{norm}}, j_{\text{norm}})$; (2) apply 7 random commutativity rewrites $\text{par}(x, y) \approx \text{par}(y, x)$ and $\text{alt}(x, y) \approx \text{alt}(y, x)$ using a rewriting tool [7] to produce mutated terms $(i_{\text{mut}}, j_{\text{mut}})$; (3) compose $(i_{\text{norm}}, j_{\text{norm}})$ and $(i_{\text{mut}}, j_{\text{mut}})$, and compare the normal forms of their compositions and that of k to determine success. Each row in Fig.7 corresponds to an interaction: the second column shows its size, the third the range of gates in local partitions, and the last four columns report average composition durations with and without Fail, for $(i_{\text{norm}}, j_{\text{norm}})$ and $(i_{\text{mut}}, j_{\text{mut}})$. A global success (✓) indicates that the result matches the original interaction. Appendix A presents examples of interaction composition with our tool.

7 Conclusion

We introduced a tool-supported method for composing interactions, represented as terms, from partial views tagged with gates (special constants) via sc-preserving anti-unification, which preserves gates while the surrounding structure may be generalized, modulo an equational theory of interactions. Our sc-preserving framework extends and refines anti-unification [10,8] while upholding expected termination, soundness and completeness properties. Future work includes exploring additional equations, such as idempotence, $\text{alt}(x, x) \approx x$, and ad-hoc equations like $\text{seq}(\text{loop}(x), \text{loop}(x)) \approx \text{loop}(x)$, to further enhance anti-unification’s ability to compose interactions.

References

1. Message Sequence Chart (MSC), <https://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-Z.120/>, <https://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-Z.120/>
2. Unified Modeling Language (UML), <https://www.omg.org/spec/UML/>, <https://www.omg.org/spec/UML/>
3. Connecting open systems of communicating finite state machines. Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming (2019)
4. <https://github.com/Ermine516/UnitAU> (2020), accessed: 2025-10-26
5. <https://github.com/Joelnguetaoum/generalizer> (2025), gitHub repository
6. https://github.com/erwanM974/hibou_label (2025), gitHub repository
7. <https://github.com/maude-lang/Maude> (2025), gitHub repository
8. Alpuente, M., Escobar, S., Meseguer, J., Sapiña, J.: Order-sorted equational generalization algorithm revisited. Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence (2022)
9. Alpuente, M., Escobar, S., Meseguer, J., Ojeda, P.: A modular equational generalization algorithm. In: Logic-Based Program Synthesis and Transformation. Berlin, Heidelberg (2009)
10. Alpuente, M., Escobar, S., Espert, J., Meseguer, J.: A modular order-sorted equational generalization algorithm. Information and Computation (2014)
11. Bader, J., Scott, A., Pradel, M., Chandra, S.: Getafix: learning to fix bugs automatically. Proc. ACM Program. Lang. (2019)

12. Bakillah, M., Liang, S.H.L., Zipf, A., Mostafavi, M.A.: A dynamic and context-aware semantic mediation service for discovering and fusion of heterogeneous sensor data. *Journal of Spatial Information Science* (2013)
13. Barbanera, F., Dezani-Ciancaglini, M., Gheri, L., Yoshida, N.: Multicompatibility for multiparty-session composition. *PPDP '23*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2023)
14. Barbanera, F., Dezani-Ciancaglini, M., Lanese, I., Tuosto, E.: Composition and decomposition of multiparty sessions. *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming* (2021)
15. Barbanera, F., Lanese, I., Tuosto, E.: Composition of synchronous communicating systems. *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming* (2023)
16. Barwell, A.D., Brown, C., Hammond, K.: Finding parallel functional pearls: Automatic parallel recursion scheme detection in haskell functions via anti-unification. *Future Generation Computer Systems* (2018)
17. Bouma, J., de Gouw, S., Jongmans, S.S.: Multiparty session typing in java, deductively. In: *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*. Berlin, Heidelberg (2023)
18. Cerna, D.M., Kutsia, T.: Unital anti-unification: Type and algorithms. In: *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics, LIPIcs*. vol. 167 (2020)
19. Edixhoven, L., Jongmans, S.S., Proença, J., Castellani, I.: Branching pomsets: Design, expressiveness and applications to choreographies. *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming* (2024)
20. Honda, K., Yoshida, N., Carbone, M.: Multiparty asynchronous session types. *J. ACM* (2016)
21. Lange, J., Tuosto, E.: Synthesising Choreographies from Local Session Types. In: *CONCUR 2012 – Concurrency Theory* (2012)
22. Lange, J., Tuosto, E., Yoshida, N.: From communicating machines to graphical choreographies. *SIGPLAN Not.* (2015)
23. Lassez, J.L., Maher, M.J., Marriott, K.: Unification revisited. In: *Foundations of Logic and Functional Programming*. pp. 67–113. Berlin, Heidelberg (1988)
24. Mahe, E., Bannour, B., Gaston, C., Gall, P.L.: Efficient interaction-based offline runtime verification of distributed systems with lifeline removal. *Science of Computer Programming* (2025)
25. Mahe, E., Gaston, C., Le Gall, P.: Denotational and operational semantics for interaction languages: Application to trace analysis. *Science of Computer Programming* (2024)
26. Montesi, F., Yoshida, N.: Compositional choreographies. In: D’Argenio, P.R., Mellgratti, H. (eds.) *CONCUR 2013 – Concurrency Theory*. Berlin, Heidelberg (2013)
27. Plotkin, G.D.: A Note on Inductive Generalization. In: *Machine Intelligence 5*. Edinburgh (1970)
28. Reynolds, J.: Transformational systems and the algebraic structure of atomic formulas. In: *Machine Intelligence 5*. Edinburgh (1970)
29. Rocha, M., Simão, A., Sousa, T.: Model-based test case generation from uml sequence diagrams using extended finite state machines. *Software Quality Journal* (2021)
30. Rolim, R., Soares, G., Gheyi, R., D’Antoni, L.: Learning quick fixes from code repositories. *CoRR* (2018)
31. Scalas, A., Yoshida, N.: Less is more: multiparty session types revisited. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* (2019)

32. Schmid, U.: Inductive Synthesis of Functional Programs, Universal Planning, Folding of Finite Programs, and Schema Abstraction by Analogical Reasoning. Lecture Notes in Computer Science (2003)
33. Stolze, C., Miculan, M., Di Gianantonio, P.: Composable partial multiparty session types for open systems. *Software and Systems Modeling* (2023)

A Additional examples of interaction composition

In Sec.6, we have presented a composition procedure of interaction models. The following tables show the result of applying our tool to compose selected local interactions. In each case, the local interactions i and j are associated with a tagging that binds compatible communication actions with the same gate. As in Fig.1, the gates are represented with colored squares next to the arrow of their action. The composition then combines the interaction i and j by merging compatible communication actions into value-passings in an interaction k , while preserving local behavior.

On Table.1, the tagging is $\gamma = \{(121, 1, \text{a}), (122, 221, \text{b}), (22, 222, \text{c})\}$ with:

$$\begin{array}{ll} i|_{121} = \text{center!query} & j|_1 = \text{proxy?query} \\ i|_{122} = \text{center?msg} & j|_{221} = \text{proxy!msg} \\ i|_{22} = \text{center!sig} & j|_{222} = \text{proxy?sig} \end{array}$$

The gates **a**, **b** and **c** are represented with red, purple and blue squares respectively. The composition of i and j gives the interaction k .




Table 1: Illustration of the composition for a simple protocol.




Table 2: Illustration of the composition for an interaction describing the query of sensor data [12].




Table 3: Illustration of the composition for the Game interaction [22].




Table 4: Illustration of the composition for the Health System interaction [22].




Table 5: Illustration of the composition for a Distributed Voting protocol [19].




Table 6: Illustration of the composition for the Professor online interaction [29]