Theoretical Foundations of the UML Lecture 14: Realising Local-Choice MSGs

Joost-Pieter Katoen

Lehrstuhl für Informatik 2 Software Modeling and Verification Group

moves.rwth-aachen.de/teaching/ss-20/fuml/

June 9, 2020

Joost-Pieter Katoen Theoretical Foundations of the UML



3 A Realisation Algorithm for MSGs

▲ 御 ▶ → ● ▶

< ∃ >

æ



3 A Realisation Algorithm for MSGs

Joost-Pieter Katoen Theoretical Foundations of the UML

æ

Today's lecture

An algorithm to realise local-choice MSGs using CFMs with synchronisation messages.

Results:

• An algorithm that generates a CFM from local-choice MSGs.

Joost-Pieter Katoen Theoretical Foundations of the UML

э



3 A Realisation Algorithm for MSGs

Joost-Pieter Katoen Theoretical Foundations of the UML

<ロト < 同ト < ヨト < ヨト

æ

Non-local choice



Inconsistency if process p behaves according to vertex v_1 and process q behaves according to vertex v_2

 \implies realisation by a CFM may yield a deadlock

Problem:

Subsequent behavior in G is determined by distinct processes. When several processes independently decide to initiate behavior, they might start executing different successor MSCs (= vertices). This is called a non-local choice.

< ロ > (同 > (回 > (回 >)))

э

Local choice property

Definition (Local choice)

Let MSG $G = (V, \rightarrow, v_0, F, \lambda)$. MSG G is <u>local choice</u> if for every branching vertex $v \in V$ it holds:

$$\exists \text{process } p. \ \left(\forall \pi \in \text{Paths}(v). \ |\min(\pi')| = 1 \land \min(\pi') \subseteq E_p \right)$$

where for $\pi = vv_1v_2...v_n$ we have $\pi' = v_1v_2...v_n$.



Joost-Pieter Katoen Theoretical Foundations of the UML

Definition (Local choice)

Let MSG $G = (V, \rightarrow, v_0, F, \lambda)$. MSG G is local choice if for every branching vertex $v \in V$ it holds:

 $\exists \text{process } \boldsymbol{p}. \ \left(\forall \pi \in \text{Paths}(\boldsymbol{v}). \ | \min(\pi') | = 1 \land \min(\pi') \subseteq E_{\boldsymbol{p}} \right)$

where for $\pi = vv_1v_2...v_n$ we have $\pi' = v_1v_2...v_n$.

Intuition:

There is a single process that initiates behavior along every path from the branching vertex v. This process decides how to proceed. In a realisation by a CFM, it can inform the other processes how to proceed.

Local choice or not?

Deciding whether MSG G is local choice or not is in P.



3 A Realisation Algorithm for MSGs

Joost-Pieter Katoen Theoretical Foundations of the UML

æ

(人間) くうり くうり

An example local-choice MSG on black board.

Joost-Pieter Katoen Theoretical Foundations of the UML

æ



Theorem

[Genest et al., 2005]

Any local-choice MSG G is safely realisable by a CFM with synchronisation data (which is of size linear in G).

Proof

As MSG G is local choice, at every branch v of G there is a unique process, p(v), say, such that on every path from v the unique minimal event occur at p(v). Then:

- Process p(v) determines the successor vertex of v.
- 2 Process p(v) informs all other processes about its decision by adding synchronisation data to the exchanged messages.
- Synchronisation data is the successor vertex (in G) from v chosen by p(v).

ъ

Structure of the CFM of local choice MSG G

Let MSG $G = (V, \rightarrow, v_0, F, \lambda)$ be local choice.

Define the CFM $\mathcal{A}_G = (((S_p, \Delta_p))_{p \in \mathcal{P}}, \mathbb{D}, s_{init}, F')$ with:

• Local automaton $\mathcal{A}_p = (S_p, \Delta_p)$ as defined on next slides

pairs (V,E)

Joost-Pieter Katoen Theoretical Foundations of the UML

t downward - closed wrt <p

Structure of the CFM of local choice MSG G

Let MSG $G = (V, \rightarrow, v_0, F, \lambda)$ be local choice.

Define the CFM $\mathcal{A}_G = (((S_p, \Delta_p))_{p \in \mathcal{P}}, \mathbb{D}, s_{init}, F')$ with:

• Local automaton $\mathcal{A}_p = (S_p, \Delta_p)$ as defined on next slides

(本語) (本語) (本語) (語) 語

Structure of the CFM of local choice MSG G

Let MSG $G = (V, \rightarrow, v_0, F, \lambda)$ be local choice. Define the CFM $\mathcal{A}_G = (((S_p, \Delta_p))_{p \in \mathcal{P}}, \mathbb{D}, s_{init}, F')$ with: Local automaton $\mathcal{A}_p = (\mathcal{S}_p, \Delta_p)$ as defined on next slides Side 13 + 14

synchronisation data = vertices in the MSG

State space of local automaton \mathcal{A}_p



that is, E is downward-closed with respect to $<_p$ in MSC $\lambda(v)$



3

御 と く ヨ と く ヨ と

•
$$S_p = V \times E_p$$
 such that for any $s = (v, E) \in S_p$:
 $\forall e, e' \in \lambda(v). \ (e <_p e' \text{ and } e' \in E \text{ implies } e \in E)$
that is, E is downward-closed with respect to $<_p$ in MSC $\lambda(v)$

- Intuition: a state (v, E) means that process p is currently in vertex v of MSG G and has already performed the events E of $\lambda(v)$
- Initial state of \mathcal{A}_p is (v_0, \emptyset)

Transition relation of local automaton \mathcal{A}_p



Joost-Pieter Katoen Theoretical Foundations of the UML

• Executing events within a vertex of the MSG G:

$$e \in E_p \cap \lambda(v) \text{ and } e \notin E$$
$$(v, E) \xrightarrow{l(e), v} (v, E \cup \{e\})$$

Note: since E ∪ {e} is downward-closed wrt. <_p, e is enabled
Taking an edge (possibly a self-loop) of the MSG G:

$$E = E_p \cap \lambda(v) \text{ and } e \in E_p \cap \lambda(w) \text{ and}$$
$$vu_0 \dots u_n w \in V^* \text{ with } p \text{ not active in } u_0 \dots u_n$$
$$(v, E) \xrightarrow{l(e), w} p(w, \{e\})$$

Note: vertex w is the first successor vertex of v on which p is active

▲御 ▶ ▲ 御 ▶ ▲ 御 ▶



On the black board.

Joost-Pieter Katoen Theoretical Foundations of the UML

▲口 → ▲御 → ▲注 → ▲注 →

14/14

臣





Local antomation Az











