Towards Bridging Time and Causal Reversibility

Marco Bernardo and Claudio Antares Mezzina

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

NiRvAna Kick off meeting @ Fano

Reversibility?

and backward

Different interpretations of reversibility in different fields:

- Petri nets = the ability to return to the initial marking
- Distributed systems = the ability to return to a past consistent state
- Performances evaluation = time reversibility
- Thermodynamics = entropy is minimised when a process is nearly reversible

- In a reversible system we can observe two directions of computation: forward

Our Aim

- Our focus is in the relationship between time and causal consistent reversibility
- from a process algebraic point of view

Causal Consistent Reversibility

- If something goes wrong start undoing from the last action till the "nearest" safe state
- In a distributed system it is hard to tell which was the last performed action
- A good approximation is to consider as last action any action which has no causes
- Causal Consistent reversibility relates causality with reversibility
- Concurrent/independent actions can be reverted in any order

Causal Consistent Reversibility in PA

There exist two approaches to reverse CCS

- Dynamic approach proposed by Danos & Krivine
 - uses a stack-based memory to remember all the actions
 - more suitable with calculi with reduction semantics
- Static approach proposed by Ulidowski & Phillips
 - makes all the operator static
 - very handy with CCS-like calculi with LTSs

Static Reversibility

 $a.P + b.Q \xrightarrow{a} P$

After the reduction we lose informations about the discarded branch and the executed action

$$a.P + b.Q \xrightarrow{a[i]}$$

The red terms are considered decorations of the process

$$a[i].P+b.Q$$

Dynamic operators (e.g., prefixes and non-deterministic choices) are forgetful

- a[i].P+b.Q
- = C[P]

Time Reversibility

- Time reversibility is instrumental to develop efficient analysis methods
- Considered in the performance evaluation field
- Related to time-reversal Markov chains
- A continuous-time Markov chain is time reversible if its behaviour remains the same when the direction of time is reversed [Kelly]
 - Mostly used in the theory of queuing networks

[Kelly] Reversibility and Stochastic Networks. John Wiley & Sons, 1979.



Markov process syllabus

- A reversible process is an ergodic process
- A CTMC is time reversible iff $(X(t_i))_{1 \le i \le n}$ has the same joint distribution
- In which case X(t) and its reversed Xr(t) are stocastically equivalent
- verify the partial balance equation for every state

$$\pi(s) \cdot q_{s,s'} = 7$$

ution as
$$(X(t'-t_i))_{1 \le i \le n}$$

For a stationary CTMC to be time reversible it is necessary and sufficient to

 $\pi(s') \cdot q_{s',s}$

RMPC - Syntax Reversible Markovian Process Calculus

- Each action is paired with a real positive rate λ, μ
- Cooperation is done à la CSP $\|_L$
- No recursion (otherwise infinite state)
- From a stochastic process algebra a CTMC can be derived [Hillston]

[Hillston] J. Hillston. A Compositional Approach to Performance Modelling. Cambridge University Press, 1996.

$P, Q ::= \mathbf{0} | (a, \lambda) \cdot P | P + Q | P ||_L Q$ $R, S ::= P | (a, \lambda)[i] R | R + S | R ||_L S$

RMPC Semantics

ACT1
$$\frac{\operatorname{std}(R)}{(a,\lambda).R \xrightarrow{(a,\lambda)[i]}} (a,\lambda)[i] R$$

ACT2
$$\frac{R \xrightarrow{(b,\mu)[j]}}{R} \xrightarrow{(j \neq i)} R' \quad j \neq i}{(a,\lambda)[i].R \xrightarrow{(b,\mu)[j]}} (a,\lambda)[i].R'$$

CHO
$$\frac{R \xrightarrow{(a,\lambda)[i]} R' \quad \mathtt{std}(S)}{R+S \xrightarrow{(a,\lambda)[i]} R'+S}$$

$$\operatorname{PAR} \frac{R \xrightarrow{(a,\lambda)[i]} R' \quad a \notin L \quad i \notin \operatorname{key}(S)}{R \parallel_L S \xrightarrow{(a,\lambda)[i]} R' \parallel_L S}$$

$$\operatorname{ACT1} \frac{\operatorname{std}(R)}{(a,\lambda).R \xrightarrow{(a,\lambda)[i]} (a,\lambda)[i]R}} \quad \operatorname{ACT1}^{\bullet} \frac{\operatorname{std}(R)}{(a,\lambda)[i].R \xrightarrow{(a,\overline{\lambda})[i]} (a,\lambda).R}} \quad \operatorname{How do we set}$$

$$\operatorname{ACT2} \frac{R \xrightarrow{(b,\mu)[j]} R' \quad j \neq i}{(a,\lambda)[i].R \xrightarrow{(b,\mu)[j]} (a,\lambda)[i].R'}} \quad \operatorname{ACT2}^{\bullet} \frac{R \xrightarrow{(b,\overline{\mu})[j]} (a,\lambda)[i].R' \quad j \neq i}{(a,\lambda)[i].R \xrightarrow{(b,\overline{\mu})[j]} (a,\lambda)[i].R'}} \quad \operatorname{How do we set}$$

$$\operatorname{CIIO} \frac{R \xrightarrow{(a,\lambda)[i]} R' \quad \operatorname{std}(S)}{R + S \xrightarrow{(a,\lambda)[i]} R' + S}} \quad \operatorname{CIIO}^{\bullet} \frac{R \xrightarrow{(a,\overline{\lambda})[i]} R' \quad \operatorname{std}(S)}{R + S \xrightarrow{(a,\overline{\lambda})[i]} R' + S}} \quad \operatorname{CIIO}^{\bullet} \frac{R \xrightarrow{(a,\overline{\lambda})[i]} R' \quad \operatorname{std}(S)}{R + S \xrightarrow{(a,\overline{\lambda})[i]} R' + S}} \quad \operatorname{PaR}^{\bullet} \frac{R \xrightarrow{(a,\lambda)[i]} R' \quad s \neq L \quad i \notin \operatorname{key}(S)}{R \parallel_{L} S \xrightarrow{(a,\lambda)[i]} R' \parallel_{L} S}} \quad \operatorname{PaR}^{\bullet} \frac{R \xrightarrow{(a,\overline{\lambda})[i]} R' \quad a \notin L \quad i \notin \operatorname{key}(S)}{R \parallel_{L} S \xrightarrow{(a,\overline{\lambda})[i]} R' \parallel_{L} S}} \quad \operatorname{Coo}^{\bullet} \frac{R \xrightarrow{(a,\overline{\lambda})[i]} R' \quad S' \quad a \in L}{R \parallel_{L} S \xrightarrow{(a,\overline{\lambda})[i]} R' \parallel_{L} S'}} \quad \operatorname{Coo}^{\bullet} \frac{R \xrightarrow{(a,\overline{\lambda})[i]} R' \quad S' \quad a \in L}{R \parallel_{L} S \xrightarrow{(a,\overline{\lambda})[i]} R' \parallel_{L} S'}}$$

std(R) = history less process



RMPC results 1/2

Lemma 1 (loop lemma). Let $R \in \mathcal{P}$ be a reachable process. Then $R \xrightarrow{(a,\lambda)[i]} S$ $iff S \xrightarrow{(a,\overline{\lambda})[i]} R.$

Theorem 1 (causal consistency). Let ω_1 and ω_2 be coinitial computations. Then $\omega_1 \simeq \omega_2$ iff ω_1 and ω_2 are cofinal too.

To prove causal consistency there is no need to specify how $\,\lambda\,$ is calculated

Explanation of causal consistency on traces







RMPC results 2/2

Theorem 2 (time reversibility). Let $R \in \mathcal{P}$ be an initial process. If every backward rate is equal to the corresponding forward rate, then $\mathcal{M}[\![R]\!]$ is time reversible.

 $(r,s) \in \mathcal{S}_R \times \mathcal{S}_S.$

Markov Chain associated to process R

Corollary 3 (product form). Let $R, S \in \mathcal{P}$ be initial processes and $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. If every backward rate is equal to the corresponding forward rate and the set of states S of $\mathcal{M}[\![R \parallel_L S]\!]$ is equal to $\mathcal{S}_R \times \mathcal{S}_S$ where \mathcal{S}_R is the set of states of $\mathcal{M}[R]$ and \mathcal{S}_S is the set of states of $\mathcal{M}[S]$, then $\pi(r,s) = \pi_R(r) \cdot \pi_S(s)$ for all



RMPC results sum up

- rate is)
- Reversibility induced by RMPC is time reversible if we set $\lambda = \lambda$
- Hence when $\lambda = \overline{\lambda}$ reversibility in RMPC is **both** time and causal consistent

Reversibility induced by RMPC is causal consistent (whatever the negative)

Future work

- The cooperation operator may not require communication keys
 - No communication keys = no state explosion with recursion

$$P = (a, \lambda) \cdot P$$

 Find new condition (e.g., different from rate equality) under which time and causal reversibility holds



Easter egg **Probabilistic bisimulation**

- back and forth bisimulation coincides with strong bisimulation [DNMVaandrager90]
- Following this result we have shown that back and forth markovian normal bisimulation with rates)
- Open question: what about Sproston&Donatelli's Backward Bisimulation

bisimulation coincides with markovian bisimulation (e.g., the extortion of

Ester egg 2 Process Algebras and Markovian Chains [Brinksma&Hermanns]

Maximal progress of TPL (and revTPL) has tight connection with Markov chains [3]: a behaviour $\tau . P + (\lambda) . Q$ (where λ is a rate) will not be delayed since τ is instantaneously enabled. This somehow resembles the maximal progress for the timeout operator.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{STOUT} & \frac{X \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}}}{} & \operatorname{std}(X) & \operatorname{std}(Y) \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ &$$